UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 97—PART 4

APRIL 26, 1951, TO MAY 24, 1951
(PAGES 4391 TO 5854)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1951

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2-4-52

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy, bowing at this noontide altar may we be vividly conscious that we need turn not back to bygone centuries to hear Thy voice, as if Thou dost speak no longer to us now. Forgive us that we talk so much and are silent so seldom, that we are in such constant motion and are so rarely still; that we depend so implicitly on the effectiveness of our organizations and our own contriving, and so little on the power of Thy spirit.

O God, who hast called our Nation to a position of trust and responsibility throughout the world, we confess before Thee with shame all that has been evil in our history and all the denials, the corruption and the dishonesty that even now make us unworthy to be called a Christian people. Take from us, we beseech Thee, all pride, greed, and injustice; and grant to us the spirit of unselfish service which alone can make us free. Make pure our motives, ridding us as a nation of all base desire for self-advantage which does not include the weal of all lands. So hearing and heeding the voice divine, may our compassion help to heal the open sores of the world as we serve the present age. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 25, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) to give the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KILGORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Offices of the Appropriations Committee was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT ON THE MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 119)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 329 (81st Cong., 1st Sess., 63 Stat. 714), I submit the Second Semiannual Report on the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, covering the period from April 6, 1950 to October 6, 1950.

In making this submission I can do no better than to reiterate the following words which were contained in my letter submitting the First Semiannual Report on June 1, 1950:

By its enactment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and by its earlier provision of aid for Greece and Turkey, the Congress of the United States recognized that the security of the United States required a strengthening of the will and ability of certain free nations to resist the aggression with which they were threatened. The preservation of world peace in a form which free peoples could accept depended then, as it depends now, upon the physical capacity and moral determination of the free world to stem those forces which seek to cloak the whole earth with the mantle of totalitarianism. The mutual defense assistance program represents one part of our effort to assist in the development of this essential capacity and determination and, as the attached report clearly demonstrates, is, and must continue to be, an integral part of the total policy of the United States.

Events since that time have proved beyond reasonable doubt the truth of these principles.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1951.*

(Enclosure: Second Semiannual Report on the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, April 6, 1950, to October 6, 1950.)

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THYE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolution 9

"Joint resolution memorializing the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of Interior and the Congress of the United States to take necessary action to assure equal treatment for Minnesota as compared with North Dakota and other States in respect to seasons and bag limits under presently defined flyways

"Whereas the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior at Washington, D. C., determined in 1950, the existence of four separate flyways, namely, the Atlantic, Mississippi, Central, and Pacific flyways, and allotted to the Mississippi flyway, including the State of Minnesota, a 35-day season on wild fowl and a daily bag limit on ducks of four and eight in possession, with a similar season for geese; and allotted to the Central flyway, including the State of North Dakota, a 45-day season with a daily bag limit on ducks of 5 and 10 in possession with a similar season on geese; and

"Whereas the division of the Mississippi and the Central flyways having in common the border between North Dakota and Minnesota effects an unwarranted discrimination against the people of Minnesota as these two States have similar local nesting conditions and experience similar overlapping flights of wild fowl in season; and

"Whereas Minnesota has cooperated with the Fish and Wildlife Service and Federal authorities at all times, notably setting aside refuges for water fowl of far more acreage than any other State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota*—

"(1) That the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., be requested to reclassify

Minnesota in respect to its determination of flyways so that the States of North Dakota and Minnesota enjoy equal privileges under such reclassification of flyways and the States allotted thereto;

"(2) That copies of this resolution be sent to Albert M. Day, Director of Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D. C., to the Secretary of the Interior at Washington, D. C., and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Passed the house of representatives the 10th day of April 1951.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*

"Passed the senate the 17th day of April 1951.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Approved April 20, 1951.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"*Governor of the State of Minnesota.*"

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to the recent curtailment of metals to industries and businesses in the State of Rhode Island, including such raw materials as aluminum, copper, steel, zinc, and pig iron, and also scrap machinery

"Whereas Rhode Island, a highly industrialized State, has many small manufacturing plants and other industries and businesses which are suffering a real hardship because of a curtailment of metals required for defense production: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are earnestly requested to make an immediate survey of the situation at present existing regarding the curtailment of materials required for defense production in industries and businesses in the State of Rhode Island, including such raw materials as aluminum, copper, steel, zinc, and pig iron, and also scrap machinery and of chemicals, and to take prompt action in order to initiate remedies which will alleviate the hardship to industry because of such curtailment; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. HOEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution 35

"Joint resolution relating to Federal aid in the development of inlets, harbors, ports, and inland waterways of North Carolina

"Whereas it is known that the cost of any permanent work done on these projects has to be borne by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas we recognize the great value these inlets, inland waterways, and harbors have in the economic life of North Carolina and more especially eastern North Carolina; and

"Whereas the North Carolina Members of Congress are a great power in our Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*—

"SECTION 1. The General Assembly of North Carolina hereby respectfully requests the North Carolina Senators and Representatives in Congress to exert all proper influence and use all available means at their command in an effort to have the Federal Government proceed with a program of development and improvement of the inlets, harbors, ports, and inland waterways which are of such vital importance not only to the economic life of this State, but to the entire Nation in the furtherance of its defense program.

"SEC. 2. The governor of the State of North Carolina is respectfully requested to join with our Senators and Representatives in Congress in a concerted effort to secure necessary Federal appropriations to give effect to an adequate program of development, with particular regard to the deepening and widening of the several inlets leading into our harbors and inland waterways, including specifically Lockwood's Folly Inlet and Shallotte Inlet, in Brunswick County, and Oregon Inlet, Hatteras Inlet, and Ocracoke Inlet, in Dare County, these inlets being vitally necessary to the commercial fishing industry of the adjoining sections.

"SEC. 3. The secretary of state is requested to furnish copies of this resolution, properly authenticated and bearing the seal of the State, to the Honorable Kerr Scott, Governor of North Carolina, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with appropriate expressions of respect.

"SEC. 4. This resolution shall become effective from and after its ratification.

"In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 14th day of April 1951.

"H. P. TAYLOR,
"*President of the Senate.*
"W. FRANK TAYLOR,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

PROPOSED IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF STATE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF ALLEGAN, MICH.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Allegan, Mich., relating to a proposed investigation and impeachment of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is the judgment of the City Council of the City of Allegan, Allegan County, Mich, that—

1. Shortly after the cessation of hostilities in World War War II it became apparent to most intelligent people that the Communist government of Russia had dedicated itself to the expansion of communism and the destruction of the free nations of the world;

2. Despite the necessity of opposing communism by the use of all reasonable and available means and forces in the best interest and security of the United States, President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson did, contrary to our welfare and security, aid and abet communism in China and withheld material aid and support from Nationalist China;

3. President Truman and Secretary Acheson did, precedent to June of 1950, contrary to a legislative enactment of the Congress of the United States, with apparent intent to circumvent and evade the will of Congress, arbitrarily and willfully refuse to advance to the government of the Republic of Korea upwards of ten billions of dollars, appropriated by the Congress for the defense of said republic against a possible attack by the Communists of North Korea;

4. By reason of the direct aid given to Red China and the refusal of our State Department to render aid to Nationalist China, and the refusal to advance the moneys appropriated by the Congress for the defense of South Korea, the Communists of North Korea were enabled to, and did, in June of 1950, launch a successful invasion of South Korea, and in which they were later fortified and assisted by Red Chinese armies;

5. Immediately thereafter President Truman did, contrary to his constitutional authority, engage these United States in a war, under the guise and pretext that he was acting under authority of the United Nations and engaging solely in a police action;

6. Having involved this Nation illegally in a war in Korea, the President and the Secretary of State did, in contradiction to the security and welfare of the Armed Forces committed to action in Korea and under his command, arbitrarily refuse authority to Gen. Douglas MacArthur to (a) bomb the staging areas and sources of supply for the Communist hordes, located across the Korean border in Manchuria; (b) blockade the coast of Red China so as to prevent the shipment of supplies and war matériel to Red China; (c) use the armies of Nationalist China stationed on Formosa; (d) equip and arm an estimated 500,000 South Koreans, able, willing, and anxious to fight;

7. By reason of the foregoing acts and policies, thousands of our American men have now become casualties of war, to be followed by untold thousands;

8. General MacArthur did, from bitter experience and first-hand knowledge, in the interest of those fighting under him and for the ultimate security of this Nation, properly and openly publicize his request for authority to wage a war as it should be waged, successfully;

9. President Truman did, we believe at the instigation of Secretary Acheson and by reason of the influence exerted by the British Foreign Office, without justification and contrary to the welfare and security of this Nation, which he has sworn to defend, summarily remove General MacArthur from his position of command in the Asiatic theater;

10. General MacArthur has, insofar as it was within his power to do so, acted in the best interest of those serving under his command and this Nation, and President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson are guilty of gross neglect and incompetence in office and the usurpation of authority to the detriment of and danger to the United States;

Therefore the City Council of the City of Allegan, Allegan County, State of Michigan, memorializes the Congress of the United States to institute an investigation, and if the findings warrant carry out proceedings appropriate to impeach and remove from office the President of the United States, Mr. Harry S. Truman, and the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, as we firmly believe such action is necessary for the safety, security, and future welfare of this Nation.

PETITION TO PRESIDENT REGARDING AMERICA'S MORAL STANDARDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day I received from Rev. Brainard Gibbons, pastor of the First Universalist Church of Wausau, a most interesting communication regarding a community effort which had been sparked by a sermon he had preached on the subject of moral termites. Reverend Gibbons included the text of a petition to President Truman which had been signed by members of his church and other folks in the community. I believe that the subject of this petition will be of deep interest to my colleagues in the Senate. It calls for a spiritual rebirth

on the part of all of us, a rebirth which I for one believe is absolutely indispensable if America is to meet the grave challenge of these times. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this splendid petition be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As citizens of the United States, we want to convey these thoughts to you, the Executive head of our Government, and through you to the Congress and all our fellow countrymen.

Revelations during the last few years of widespread corruption among private citizens and those in positions of public trust are startling and alarming. The internal decay of American morality is a more ominous threat to the ultimate security and well-being of our country than that presented by any external or foreign power.

Pending definite proof, we do not presume to pass judgment on any particular individuals or groups. However, in the larger sense, we can now recognize and confess our own shortcomings which make us fundamentally responsible for this sorry state of affairs. We have been too lax in our own moral standards, too careless in our study of governmental problems, and too indifferent in our election of others to public office.

Therefore, we propose taking two basic steps in an effort to remedy these conditions which place our Nation in such dire jeopardy. First, we shall endeavor to lift our own lives to the highest level of personal morality. Second, we shall attempt to meet our civil duties more conscientiously and intelligently. Issues shall be determined solely by the standard of what is good for all and without concern for partisan politics. Elective offices shall be filled only by those well qualified and of stanch moral integrity, without regard for party labels.

The situation is serious and demands nothing less than a moral rejuvenation, a spiritual rebirth of the American people. To that end we pledge ourselves and so covenant with you, each other, and all citizens of our beloved country.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; with amendments (Rept. No. 298).

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India and I submit a report (No. 297) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a 1-minute statement in connection with the reporting of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the Senator may proceed as requested.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, last Friday the Committee on Foreign Relations, without a dissenting vote, ordered reported S. 872, a bill to furnish emergency food aid to India. It is my privilege today to file the report of the committee on this important bill.

This bill authorizes the sending of 2,000,000 tons of food grains to India, at a cost of about $190,000,000. Half of this, or $95,000,000, is to be in the form of a gift. In effect, each American will need to take less than $1 from his pocket to help India meet the famine which threatens. My mail shows that most Americans are glad to be a part of this humanitarian program.

S. 872 was introduced by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for himself and 29 other Senators. I want at this time to commend him and his cosponsors for the initiative they took in urging the President to give most careful attention to the critical food situation in India.

I hope my colleagues will read this report carefully and will study the bill, so that as soon as possible we may start wheat shipments to our friends in India, many of whom are this very day starving because of food shortages in that country.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1387. A bill to allow a deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes to individuals and corporations for contributions to certain organizations for certain purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1388. A bill for the relief of Wei Yuan and S. T. Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 1389. A bill to reorganize the Department of State in the interest of economy, efficiency, and a more effective administration of foreign affairs; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(See remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NIXON (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1390. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. NIXON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1391. A bill to amend section 8 of the Immigration Act of 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1392. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation or from other tribal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1393. A bill to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1394. A bill to provide additional benefits for dependents of deceased employees of Pacific naval base contractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1395. A bill for the relief of Antonino Tralonga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1396. A bill providing for per capita payments to the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAYBANK (by request):

S. 1397. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See remarks of Mr. MAYBANK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 1398. A bill for the relief of Abraham Jakob Hirschfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1399. A bill for the relief of Annie Litke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF COMMITTEE WITNESSES FROM DISCHARGE BY SUPERIOR OFFICERS

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from California may proceed, as requested.

The bill (S. 1390) to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I have introduced in the Senate today a bill to make it a violation of law for any officer of the Federal Government to dismiss or otherwise discipline a Government employee for testifying before a committee of Congress.

In the next few days congressional committees will open hearings on our far-eastern policy, the conduct of the Korean War, and the dismissal of General MacArthur by the President. It is essential to the security of the Nation and the very lives of the people, as we look into these vitally important issues, that every witness have complete freedom from reprisal when he is given an opportunity to tell what he knows.

There is too much at stake to permit foreign policy and military strategy to be established on the basis of half truths and the suppression of testimony.

Unless protection is given to witnesses who are members of the armed services or employees of the Government, the scheduled hearings will amount to no

more than a parade of yes men for administration policies as they exist.

The bill I have introduced is designed to assure any member of the Armed Forces or other officer or employee of the Government who can offer pertinent and constructive testimony that he can speak the truth without suffering the fate of Admiral Denfeld on account of such testimony.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill making it a punishable offense to employ an alien not lawfully in the United States.

The present law, title 8, section 144, USCA, makes it unlawful to bring in aliens to the country or to harbor or conceal them, when such aliens have not been duly admitted by an immigration inspector. The punishment is set at a maximum fine of $2,000 and imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years per alien brought in. A hiatus in the statute does not affix any penalty for concealing and harboring aliens. The Supreme Court upheld this view in *U. S. v. Evans* (333 U. S. 483). Accordingly, Senator MCCARRAN's omnibus immigration bill contains a revision of the said section providing a penalty for harboring and concealing aliens, as well as the existing penalty for causing or assisting them to enter the country.

In creating an offense of employing an illegally entered alien, the language of my proposed bill tracks exactly that of S. 716, and in addition supplements it with "or any person who shall employ any alien when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully in the United States, or any person who, having employed an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully in the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer."

The latter portion of the added material relates to an employer, who, subsequent to a good-faith hiring, discovers that his employee is not lawfully in the United States. Such an employer must promptly report the presence of his alien employee to an immigration officer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1391) to amend section 8 of the Immigration Act of 1917, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 144) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent or consignee of any means of transportation who—

"(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or

"(2) conceals or harbors, or attempts to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation,

any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, or any person who shall employ any alien when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs."

HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM S. 656

Mr. NEELY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 133), which was ordered to lie over under the rule:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of S. 656, to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, dealing with the possible use of American Indians.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORTS RELATING TO INVESTIGATION OF PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (S. DOCS. NOS. 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, AND 34)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that six recent reports of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services be printed as Senate documents. They are, Eighth report, Improper Payments Made To Procure Freight Traffic Through Port of Orange, Tex., 1951; ninth report, Military Indoctrination Centers; tenth report, Fort Jackson, S. C.; eleventh report, Camp Chaffee, Ark.; twelfth report, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; and thirteenth report, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.

The subcommittee has made thorough investigations and its efforts have already resulted in constructive steps being taken. We are confident that additional steps will be taken as a result of the subcommittee's findings and recommendations. I am sure Senators will be interested in reading these reports, and I ask that they be printed as Senate documents, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

An address delivered by him on the "Truman-MacArthur Controversy," broadcast from Station WWL in New Orleans, La., on April 24, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

A broadcast by him on April 23, 1951, to the people of Pennsylvania, entitled "Happenings in Washington, Program No. 39."

By Mr. MARTIN:

An editorial from a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal paying tribute to the late Gen. Charles G. Dawes.

By Mr. GREEN:

An editorial entitled "Senator BLAIR MOODY," published in the Providence Journal of Wednesday, April 25, 1951.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Project and United States Steel Needs," from the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch of March 10, 1951, and an editorial entitled "A Seaway and Mistaken Economics," from the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of March 11, 1951.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

An article entitled "Who is Letting Our GI's Down?" written by Erle Cocke, Jr., and published in the May 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine, discussing the war in Korea.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

An article entitled "The Treason of 'Liberalism'" written by Forrest Davis and published in the Freeman for February 12, 1951.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Article entitled "State Department Ousts 55 as Security Risks," published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 26, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

A letter from Theodore A. Marks, published in the Democrat, of Flemington, N. J., of April 19, 1951, under the caption "Sees calamity ahead for agriculture and the Nation."

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statements by the National Planning Association and the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, relating to the proposal to furnish food for India.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

An article entitled "MacArthur Practices an Adroit Deception," written by Robert L. Riggs, and published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of April 22, 1951.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

An editorial entitled "General MacArthur's Address," published in the St. Louis Star-Times of April 20, 1951, discussing the recent address by Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the two Houses of Congress in joint meeting.

By Mr. WELKER:

An article entitled "Loyalty of Japanese Shaken," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1951, referring to the effect of the recall of General MacArthur on the Japanese.

PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE PROCEDURES OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—LETTERS FROM ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG AND JOHN T. JONES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 29, 1951, the senior Senator from Ohio introduced a bill, S. 1222, to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and according to the title "To provide for improved procedures of the National Labor Relations Board and to expedite its disposition of cases." In introducing the bill, the senior Senator from Ohio, as reported on page 2963 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, stated that "it is a bill recommended by a Committee of the American Bar Association, with general agreement between labor, management, and other parties interested, to speed up the procedural features of the National Labor Relations Act."

It appears, to the contrary, that certain important segments of labor are vigorously opposed to the Taft bill. I recently received a letter dated April 4, 1951, from Mr. Arthur J. Goldberg, general counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and a letter dated April 12, 1951, signed by Mr. John T. Jones, director of Labor's Non-Partisan League of the United Mine Workers of America, both of which express vigorous opposition to S. 1222.

I ask unanimous consent that these two letters be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1951.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: On March 29, 1951, Senator TAFT introduced a bill, S. 1222, to amend certain of the procedural provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. In introducing the bill, Senator TAFT stated on the floor of the Senate that the bill was recommended by a committee of the American Bar Association "with general agreement between labor, management, and other parties interested, to speed up the procedural features of the National Labor Relations Act."

Senator TAFT's statement that the bill has the general agreement of labor is not correct. The Congress of Industrial Organizations does not support the bill, but opposes it.

The principal purpose of the bill is to facilitate the development of a prehearing motions procedure before the National Labor Relations Board. The asserted justification for such a procedure is that it might permit some cases finally to be disposed of upon a motion to dismiss the complaint, thus eliminating the necessity for hearings in such cases. The CIO is, of course, strongly in favor of speeding up the procedures of the National Labor Relations Board. The CIO has probably suffered greater injury from the dilatory character of the Board's processes than has any other organization. However, it is our belief that the institution of a prehearing motions procedure would serve further to delay Labor Board procedures rather than to expedite them. The motions procedure contemplated by the bill would require a detailed complaint to be drafted by the Board in each unfair labor practice case, and a motion to dismiss the complaint would inevitably be filed in every case in which an employer was the respondent. The creation of this additional procedural step would not normally speed up Board processes. For every case which would be finally disposed of on a motion to dismiss there would be hundreds in which motions to dismiss would be filed simply for purposes of delay.

Moreover, the development of a motions procedure would further complicate and legalize the Board's procedures. In our opinion those procedures are far too complicated and legalistic now. It should not be forgotten that unions and workers are, of necessity, often represented in Board proceedings by laymen.

For these reasons we oppose the bill.

The bill is a product of a subcommittee of the section on labor relations of the American Bar Association. The subcommittee was comprised of various lawyers practicing before the National Labor Relations Board, some of whom represent employers and others of whom represent labor unions. It was explicitly understood that the subcommittee members were in their deliberations simply expressing their own personal views and not those of their clients. In any event, however, the only attorney on the subcommittee who represents the CIO or any of its affiliated unions opposed the motions practice proposal from the outset. Thus there has never been even the slightest basis for supposing that the CIO would support the bill.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
General Counsel.

LABOR'S NON-PARTISAN LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1951.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: On March 29, 1951, Senator TAFT, of Ohio, introduced Senate bill No. 1222 to amend the Taft-Hartley law. He issued a statement that this bill had the general approval of labor. I wish to advise you that this statement is incorrect insofar as the United Mine Workers of America is concerned. This organization has not changed its position with respect to the Taft-Hartley law. We still favor its outright repeal and we are opposed to Senate bill No. 1222 or any other bill that may be introduced that would tend to modify the infamous slave law.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. JONES,
Director, Labor's Non-Partisan League.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be referred jointly to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas has been recognized. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read resolution (S. Res. 132), as follows:

Resolved, That in keeping with the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to raise and support Armed Forces (art. 1, sec. 8), and in keeping with the constitutional prerogative of the Senate to advise the President in the making of treaties (art. 2, sec. 2), the Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, be and hereby are directed to investigate, study, and report recommendations on the following matters:

(1) Commitments of the Executive to foreign governments, including the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam Agreements, and policies and actions by the Secretary of State pursuant thereto;

(2) Action of the President in ordering Armed Forces of the United States into combat in Korea on June 25, 1950, including a determination as to whether the President had authority to issue such order;

(3) Whether any binding commitments have been made to the United Nations or any members thereof that limit freedom of decision and action by the United States in prosecuting the war in Korea to peace with honor;

(4) Dependability of the United Nations as now constituted to restore peace and order in Korea with honor and to deter world war; proposals for perfecting the United Nations as a peace-maintaining organization;

(5) All facts and circumstances bearing on the summary removal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his commands as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief, United Nations Commands; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East, including official communications between General MacArthur, Department of Defense officials, and officers and others in the executive branch, together with any orders or communications bearing upon such removal;

(6) whether the Senate should advise the President that Dean G. Acheson, as Secretary of State, has lost the confidence of the American people and should be removed in the public interest;

(7) effectiveness of air and sea power as major deterrents to war and decisive weapons for victory if world war comes, comparing the relative cost in manpower, financial and other resources of maintaining mastery of the air and seas with that of a defense policy based upon ground forces as the decisive factor, and also comparing resources of a potential enemy for ground warfare and vulnerability of such potential enemy's war industrial potential to demolition by air power, as well as the importance of having mastery of the air for defense of United States industrial centers against destruction by such potential enemy;

(8) the proposals by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as made to a joint meeting of the Congress on April 19, 1951, and stated by him as follows:

"Our victory was complete and our objectives within reach when Red China intervened with numerically superior ground forces. This created a new war and an entirely new situation, a situation not contemplated when our forces were committed against the North Korean invaders, a situation which called for new decisions in the

diplomatic sphere to permit the realistic adjustment of military strategy. Such decisions have not been forthcoming.

"While no man in his right mind would advocate sending our Ground Forces into continental China—and such was never given a thought—the new situation did urgently demand a drastic revision of strategic planning if our political aim was to defeat this new enemy as we had defeated the old.

"Apart from the military need as I saw it to neutralize sanctuary protection given to the enemy north of the Yalu, I felt that military necessity in the conduct of the war made necessary:

"First, the intensification of our economic blockade against China.

"Second, the imposition of a naval blockade against the China coast.

"Third, removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal areas and of Manchuria.

"Fourth, removal of restrictions on the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa with logistical support to contribute to their effective operation against the Chinese mainland.

"For entertaining these views all professionally designed to support our forces committed to Korea and bring hostilities to an end with the least possible delay and at a saving of countless American and Allied lives, I have been severely criticized in lay circles, principally abroad, despite my understanding that from a military standpoint the above views have been fully shared in the past by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff."

(9) whether as a matter of military urgency Formosa must under no circumstances be allowed to fall under Communist control;

(10) action taken by the Executive and progress made toward collaboration of Pacific nations for mutual defense against Communist aggression;

(11) progress of North Atlantic Treaty nations in arming and expansion of defense forces for self-defense and mutual aid since the Senate ratified the treaty on July 21, 1949;

(12) whether the United States should make separate mutual defense treaties with individual nations, including Spain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Committee on Armed Services, jointly.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under a unanimous-consent agreement that I may yield for insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, with respect to the resolution which was referred, I did not understand that opportunity was given for objection to the reference of the resolution. The resolution was more like a speech. I think opportunity should be given to object to the referral before the resolution is referred to the two committees sitting jointly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator object to the resolution being so referred?

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] present before the action is taken. I object temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the order of the distinguished occupant of the chair was to refer the resolution to the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, jointly. No objection was made.

Mr. McFARLAND. No opportunity was given to object.

Mr. WHERRY. It certainly was.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; there was no opportunity, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska submitted a resolution and asked unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, jointly. The present occupant of the chair then stated that the resolution would be accepted and referred. Then I asked permission for the clerk to read the resolution, and after the clerk read the resolution the distinguished occupant of the chair stated that it would be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, jointly.

Mr. McFARLAND. After the resolution was read, no opportunity was given to object. I certainly am not going to stand here and permit a resolution to be offered and referred when no opportunity is given to object. I do not know that I shall have any objection, but I do think that opportunity should be afforded to object. I want Senators who are interested in the subject to be present. Opportunity was not given to object. If it had been given, I would have objected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that when objection was asked for none was heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD be read. Objection was not asked for.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The official reporter will read the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. The question was not asked as to whether there was any objection, after the resolution was read. The Chair merely referred it without giving me the opportunity to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent was given before the resolution was read.

Mr. McFARLAND. I take it that the rules require that a resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rules require that it be referred to a committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I did not hear. Someone was talking to me when the request was made. I did not hear the first request. It certainly is an unusual procedure for a resolution to be referred, or to have a request that it be referred, before it is read. One of my colleagues was talking to me, and if such a request was made I did not hear it. I think I should be given the opportunity to make objection. The other evening I withdrew a motion which I had made in order to accommodate the Senator from Nebraska. I think it is no more than fair that I be given the opportunity to object, if I desire to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us get the record straight. It is necessary to ask unanimous consent to introduce a resolution, because the Senate is in session following a recess. The junior Senator from Nebraska was on his feet, and in terms that everyone could hear, he asked unanimous consent to send to the desk a resolution. He asked that he be permitted to offer it, and that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, jointly. The distinguished occupant of the chair asked if there was any objection. There was none, and he made the order. After that I said to the distinguished occupant of the chair that I would like to have the clerk read the resolution. The resolution was read; and after the resolution was read the distinguished occupant of the chair ordered that it be referred, as he had already done.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; but I was not given an opportunity to object after it was read.

Mr. WHERRY. The order had already been made. It was not necessary to have opportunity for objection then. I was perfectly fair about it. I asked unanimous consent, which was granted. I did not have to have the resolution read, but I thought it ought to be in the body of the RECORD. That is the reason why I asked that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reporter will read the RECORD.

The Official Reporter (Charles J. Drescher) read as follows:

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be referred jointly to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas has been recognized. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

(Here the resolution was read.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. McFARLAND. Where is the unanimous consent to have it referred? It is not there. I submit that I still have the right to object, because the RECORD, as read by the reporter, does not include unanimous consent to have the resolution referred.

Mr. WHERRY. If the reporter will go back and read from the beginning, I used that exact language. I asked unanimous consent to offer the resolution which I sent to the desk.

Mr. McFARLAND. The reporter has read his notes, and that is what we go by.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the reporter read all his notes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reporter will read all of his notes.

The Official Reporter read as follows:

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate, and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be referred jointly to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas has been recognized. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

(Here the resolution was read.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I submit that no request was made for unanimous consent to refer the resolution. The request was merely that it be read. Unanimous consent would be required before it could be referred. Under those circumstances the Chair had no right to order that it be referred. The Senator from Nebraska did not ask unanimous consent that it be referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the Journal Clerk read the Journal entry, because I am as sure as that I am standing here that I asked unanimous consent not only that the resolution be introduced, but that it be referred. I believe that Members of the Senate heard me do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am going by what the reporter has said. I did not hear any such request. If I had heard it, I would have objected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a reading of the Journal entry.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. What do we go by?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal is the official record of the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. What does the Journal entry show?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Journal Clerk that the Journal shows that unanimous consent was given before the resolution was read.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it certainly is strange that I did not hear any unanimous-consent request, that the reporter did not hear any unanimous consent request, but that the Journal Clerk did.

I now ask unanimous consent that the order referring the resolution be vacated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator move that it be vacated?

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that it be vacated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona moves that the order referring the resolution be vacated.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Millikin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Moody
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Nixon
Byrd	Ives	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Schoeppel
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Duff	Lehman	Taft
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Ecton	McCarran	Tobey
Ellender	McCarthy	Underwood
Ferguson	McClellan	Watkins
Flanders	McFarland	Welker
Frear	McKellar	Wherry
Fulbright	McMahon	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Young
Green	Maybank	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. During the quorum call the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has had opportunity to examine the resolution. That was the thing I wanted done; to give opportunity for the interested Senators to be on the floor.

I submit that orderly procedure was not followed here today. When the Official Reporter read the record, and it read one way I submit that the distinguished minority leader should have been willing to abide by what the Official Reporter said the record was. Certainly since I have been majority leader I have never failed to withdraw a request if the minority leader requested me to do so. I do not feel I was treated with the same courtesy. But for the reason that the Senator from Georgia has no objection to the resolution being referred to the joint committees, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for a minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish we could get along with the business of the Senate. I yield for the purpose of insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wish to answer the majority leader.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator will not take too long.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator feels that 1 minute is so very important, which is all the time I want merely to make a modest reply to the majority leader, I will not ask for time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much that the majority leader withdrew his motion. Following the orderly procedure, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the two committees, the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee jointly.

ABOLITION OF STATE DEPARTMENT AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, routine matters may be presented to the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, it was agreed that Senators may submit routine matters for the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To make insertions in the RECORD without debate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and, if I may, under the unanimous-consent agreement, I should like to read a very brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to abolish the State Department as presently constituted and to establish a Department of Foreign Affairs with five divisions on a functional basis.

The Secretary and the five Under Secretaries would be appointed by the President and be subject to confirmation by the Senate. For a period of 6 months from the dates of their confirmation, each Under Secretary would have full authority to remove any person in his division in the interests of economy, efficiency, and security.

The Secretary of Foreign Affairs would have the authority to abolish any of the existing bureaus or divisions in the Department or to assign them to one of the five functional divisions. The existing

bureaus and offices within the State Department are assigned by the bill to one of the functional divisions but could be abolished under the authority given.

Mr. President, this bill is offered as a contribution toward solving the basic twofold problem before the United States today. That problem is how to establish a foreign policy which will command substantial unity and how to place its administration in the hands of persons who will command confidence.

The method proposed will work. It is the same method used in the reorganization of the two Cabinet departments, War and Navy, into the present Department of Defense with its subdepartments of Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The bill is simple, clear, and understandable. I hope that it may have the early consideration of the committee to which it is referred.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1389) to reorganize the Department of State in the interest of economy, efficiency, and a more effective administration of foreign affairs, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a department in the executive branch of the Government to be known as the "Department of Foreign Affairs" consisting of five divisions as follows:

(1) The Division of Administration.
(2) The Division of Foreign Affairs.
(3) The Division of Information.
(4) The Division of International Agencies.
(5) The Division of Trusteeships.

(b) All functions, powers, and duties of the Department of State are hereby transferred to the Department of Foreign Affairs. The Department of State is hereby abolished.

SEC. 2. (a) The Department of Foreign Affairs shall be headed by a Secretary of Foreign Affairs who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

(b) All functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of State are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs. The office of Secretary of State is hereby abolished.

SEC. 3. The five divisions of the Department of Foreign Affairs shall be headed, respectively, by (1) an Under Secretary for Administration, (2) an Under Secretary for Foreign Service, (3) an Under Secretary for Information, (4) an Under Secretary for International Agencies, and (5) an Under Secretary for Trusteeships, each of whom shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall receive compensation at the rate of $18,000 per annum.

SEC. 4. (a) Within the five divisions of the Department of Foreign Affairs, the following offices, bureaus, and other subdivisions are hereby established:

(1) Division of Administration—
(a) Office of Personnel.
(b) Office of Operating Facilities.
(c) Office of Budget and Finance.
(d) International Claims Commission of the United States.
(e) Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service.
(f) Foreign Service Buildings Commission.
(2) Division of Foreign Service—
(a) Board of Foreign Service.
(b) Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asia, and African Affairs.
(c) Bureau of Inter-American Affairs.
(d) Bureau of European Affairs.
(e) Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs.
(3) Division of Information—
(a) Office of International Trade Policy.
(b) Office of Financial and Development Policy.
(c) Office of Transportation and Communication Policy.
(d) Office of Public Affairs.
(e) Office of International Information.
(f) Office of Educational Exchange.
(g) Office of Consular Affairs.
(h) Office of Intelligence Research.
(i) Office of Library and Intelligence Acquisition.
(4) Division of International Agencies.
(a) Bureau of United Nations Affairs.
(b) Institute of Inter-American Affairs.
(c) United States Mission to the United Nations.
(d) Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid.
(e) International Boundary Commission.
(f) Food and Agriculture Organization.
(g) International Labor Organization.
(h) All other multilateral international organizations in which the United States participates.
(5) Division of Trusteeships—
(a) Bureau of German Affairs.
(b) Philippine Alien Property Administration.
(c) Philippine War Damage Commission.
(d) South Pacific Commission.
(e) Bureau of Japanese Affairs.

(b) The Secretary of Foreign Affairs shall, in accord with the objectives of economy and efficiency, assign and transfer to the various offices, bureaus, and subdivisions established by subsection (a) all functions, powers, and duties of the various offices, bureaus and subdivisions of the Department of State: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, with the advice of the Bureau of the Budget, shall abolish any of the offices, bureaus, or subdivisions, existing or herein named when the objectives of economy and efficiency will be served thereby.

(c) For a period of 6 months from his confirmation, the Under Secretary for each division shall have the authority, without regard to the provisions of the Civil Service laws, as amended, to make such removals from the personnel of his division as he feels are necessary to achieve the maximum economy, efficiency, and security.

INCREASED COSTS FOR FARMERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed to make a statement for 4 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that the production costs of farmers are higher today than they have ever been before. In view of an article which appeared in the newspapers last night, to the effect that the President is going to ask that agricultural prices be pegged, I wish to tell the Senate that any idea that nowadays farmers are riding a crest of high prices and prosperity does not jibe with the facts.

Members of the executive committee of the Farm Bureau, who met in Fargo late last week, said that a recent report made by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in summarizing a committee study of farm income and expenditures, shows that in actual purchasing power the net income of American farmers in 1950 amounted to only about two-thirds of their net income in 1945; and farmers' production expenses in 1950 were 60 percent of their gross income, as compared with 52 percent of gross income in 1945.

The North Dakota Farm Bureau leaders said the Senate committee's report reveals that the costs of farm machinery have gone up by 60 percent, while prices of building and fencing materials increased by 70 percent between 1945 and 1950. Taxes paid by farmers also increased sharply, a total of 71 percent, in the 5-year period.

Prices paid by farmers for items used in production and family living, including interest, taxes, and wage rates of hired labor, increased 46 percent between 1945 and February 1951.

Net income for all agriculture has been skidding steadily since 1947, the report states. Farm income for 1950 was two and one-half times as much as farm income in the period 1935 to 1939, while labor income was three and one-half times as much, and corporate income was six times as much. I desired to bring these facts to the attention of Senators. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield, so that I may address a question to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did I correctly understand the Senator from North Dakota to speak about the farmer's income having declined?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I not only agree with the Senator's statement, but I wish to say that, in dollars and cents, farm income is the only income of any group or segment in America which has continued to decline for the past 3 years. Despite what we read in the press about high prices, the farmer's income has gone down and down and down, as the Senator from North Dakota so ably expressed it.

Mr. LANGER. I might add, it has gone down and down and down and down and down. Let us get enough of those downs into the RECORD.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, on the same condition.

NOMINATION OF W. STUART SYMINGTON, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF RFC—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably the nomination of W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I wish to state that the committee held about a 2-hour hearing this morning. I ask that the nomination

be placed on the Executive Calendar until the hearings can be printed, in order that Senators may have the benefit of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question to be addressed to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. LANGER. When is it expected that the hearings on this nomination will be concluded?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that the hearings have been completed.

Mr. LANGER. When will the report be filed?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should think it would be delivered by the Printing Office within 2 or 3 days.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

DELIVERY OF CRITICAL MATERIALS FROM WESTERN GERMANY TO THE COMMUNIST-DOMINATED EAST

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to enable me to address the Senate for a period not to exceed 10 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Maryland for the purpose of a brief statement, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to bring to the attention of the Senate challenging facts just revealed to our Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies concerning deliveries of useful materials and supplies behind the iron curtain from Western Germany.

Recently, upon the increase of reports to us of the flow of critical materials from Western Germany to the Communist-dominated East, we dispatched a staff representative, Kenneth R. Hansen, to Europe. Yesterday he returned with first-hand information, gathered during a thorough and sweeping investigation of the subject.

The condition which is observed is extremely disturbing, particularly because the United States Government has authority and responsibility in its occupation of Western Germany.

This illegal flow of critical goods lessens substantially the ultimate effectiveness of the domestic export controls of the United States. We in this country cannot rest securely behind our export controls if Russia and the countries she dominates can obtain the materials they need from other sources. Our export controls may help us some, but they do not hurt the Communist areas unless there is parallel action throughout the Western World, including Western Germany.

The United States Government, through the Office of the High Commissioner for Germany, has for about 5 years past been in a position of authority and responsibility in Western Germany. The subcommittee investigation is seeking to determine whether the responsible agencies of the United States Government have adequately and properly discharged their authority and responsibility with regard to the control of shipments of critical materials from Western Germany.

Shortly after his arrival in Germany, Mr. Hansen, accompanied by an official of the United States State Department, made an extensive tour of the interzonal border between Eastern and Western Germany and parts of the international border, personally observing the manner in which border authorities are checking items flowing between Western Germany and the East. He finds convincing evidence that the border authorities, with the exception of the United States Military Police Customs Unit, are either poorly trained, poorly instructed, or are interested almost solely in the collection of tariff duties on imports. They pay but scant attention to shipments which might contain critical goods going to the Communists.

The United States Military Police Customs Unit, although not fully trained for the job and certainly understaffed, has been the principal factor in stopping such eastward shipments of critical goods as have been stopped. This customs unit is the only unit which has been making any serious attempt to stop critical and strategic goods, and it is to be commended for its efforts in this regard. However, it must be pointed out that the activities of this unit cover only a portion of the international border and, only recently, a small portion of the interzonal border between Western and Eastern Germany. Almost all of the remaining outlets for German trade are under German control and supervision in any effective sense.

There are several other allied groups which have at various times attempted to supervise these points of exit, but no efforts beyond cursory observation and reporting have been possible because of lack of personnel and the policy followed that export control should be a German responsibility. The net result of this has been that movements of goods across points under United States jurisdiction have decreased considerably and other points of exit not subject to United States control have increased correspondingly.

On his arrival in Germany the staff representative was not satisfied to accept word-of-mouth reports, nor even to make announced inspections of border check points. On the automobile tour of these points which he and other United States officials took, the check points were visited at almost any of the 24 hours of the day, sometimes at such hours as 2 or 4 o'clock in the morning. In this way the border points were not alerted for the inspection and the true state of affairs could be seen.

At one check point which was observed for about an hour before the presence of United States officials became known, trucks were being passed through at the rate of one every 3 minutes without examination of the loads, which ranged up to 30 tons per truck and trailer units. It would be amusing to note, if it were not so grave, that after the presence of the United States group become known, the border officials spent 20 minutes checking one truckload of fish from Denmark.

The staff representative saw rail shipments, whole trains of goods, passing from the allied occupation areas to destinations behind the iron curtain with only cursory or no physical inspection of the shipments. These conditions prevail at a time when it has been publicly announced in a State Department press release dated March 6, 1951, that all West German export controls will be handed over to German officials within the near future.

There have been denials that deliveries of strategic materials were being made by our allies to the Communists. But our staff representative saw the shipments which were being made. Furthermore, it must not be thought these deplorable conditions were in the past. He saw them only a few days ago. They are continuing to exist this very day.

One of the most serious developments in the inspection tour was the inspection of a free port in Germany wherein port officials stated categorically that any goods entering the free port on the basis of any documentation acceptable to the German customs, and with practically no physical inspection of the items, can be loaded for any destination regardless of the consignees stated on the documents; that no report is rendered with respect to changed destination of cargoes; and that the only interest of any official nature is whether or not the loading and storage charges are paid.

This free port area similarly had not been visited or inspected by United States or allied officials for purposes of supervision of the adequacy of inspection operations, or to obtain an evaluation of the extent to which free ports are and have been used as an area of transshipment of strategic or critical materials to eastern-bloc destinations.

The committee representative, in his visit to this free port, ascertained that there is less than one chance in a thousand that an illegal shipment of critical goods will be detected and an even smaller chance that it will be stopped.

Much has been made in recent press releases of smuggling which has been carried on across the interzonal border, but with the border so open, in fact a virtual sieve for critical materials, it appears that smuggling need be resorted to only to take taxable luxury items across the border without paying the tax.

It appears to the subcommittee that the fundamental weakness of the German export licensing system as it is now constituted is one of the most important factors which contribute to the continuation of this illegal trade.

In a press release dated April 14, 1951, our subcommittee declared that there is evident laxity in controls imposed on shipments to Communist areas, with neither central nor competent authority exercising over-all jurisdiction.

One obvious and basic weakness of the present West German licensing system in effect in Western Germany is that over

300 banks which are empowered to deal in foreign exchange are also charged with the issuance of export licenses for a great range of commodities. The determination as to whether a certain item is of strategic or critical importance usually is made by bank clerks who are neither technically trained nor free of financial interest in the export transactions. This means, in effect, that local economic and political pressures can be brought to bear upon these bank licensing officials whose major interest is to encourage exports which will result in financial gains to the banks and their customers, the exporting firms. Certainly these bank clerks cannot be depended upon to make determinations adverse to the financial interests of their employers and clients, particularly when, as matters stand, there is almost no chance of a prosecution resulting from an improper issuance of a license even in the remote case of detection.

Another reason for the break-down is that unless the proposed shipment is specifically prohibited it will be approved. For instance, if a 20-ton crane is shown on the schedules as banned, they freely approve several shipments of 18-ton cranes or if a complete factory installation cannot be exported, they send a number of shipments labeled as spare parts and accessories which upon arrival are assembled into the complete installation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for half a minute?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say that the Senator is doing a great service to the Nation in making this revelation. I think it is shocking that on the day when it was announced by representatives of the Kremlin that there would not be enough room in Korea for the white crosses over the bodies of American troops, this wholesale traffic in strategic materials to build up communism should be continuing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland have at least two additional minutes in order to finish his remarks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a few remarks to make, myself.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked for only 2 minutes so that the Senator from Maryland could finish his statement.

Mr. O'CONOR. I have a few additional remarks to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Maryland has already yielded for questions, and he asked for 10 minutes before he started his speech.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that there is no question today more serious than that which concerns the shipment of materials to our Communist foes. I know the Senator from Arkansas does think it important to hear the facts which I can state in 2 minutes, and which reveal a shocking situation. I ask the Senator for two more minutes in order to bring to my colleague's attention facts which ought to make us ashamed of certain conditions which are now playing a great part in jeopardizing the lives of American boys.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes, with the understanding that the Senator shall not yield for questions.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, instances are reported where manufacturers, upon noting the precise terms of a prohibition against specific shipments, merely alter the measurements and the critical materials move across the border into the hands of the Communists.

One definite indication that the Soviets are benefiting greatly by the deplorable conditions is that the Communist press now criticizes severely the work of our staff representative. Of course, they do not like any disclosures which might stop the flow of much-needed supplies to them.

It is announced that revisions of this procedure are to be sought by the United States officials in Western Germany, but it must be realized that this situation has been in effect without serious attempt at correction during a long and very critical period in West Germany's trade picture under steadily worsening international conditions with respect to east-west relations. During all this time no substantial corrective actions have actually been taken.

We believe that one step, but only one of many necessary steps, toward a solution of the problem lies in the establishment of a central licensing authority whereby the determinations of the strategic or critical nature of goods in the issuance of export licenses are placed in the hands of responsible and disinterested persons. Another step is tighter border controls, not just in the area under United States jurisdiction but all along the border.

This problem of illegal east-west trade is not a small one, but is measured in the tens of millions of dollars.

Many well-informed Allied and West German officials expressed conviction that the illegal trade is of such magnitude as to affect seriously the German trade balance of payments. The continuing adverse German balance of payments have been underwritten by the United States aid programs in the European Payments Union.

This means, in effect, that the United States taxpayer is paying for this illegal trade.

However, our grave concern in this problem is not limited to the monetary loss, great as it is. Even more overwhelming is the fact that uncontrolled trade of this nature strengthens the war potential of the Communist areas while bleeding critical materials from the West.

This situation must not be allowed to continue. We are deeply concerned and intend to continue reporting to the Senate the documentary and pictorial evidence assembled by the staff. An interim report of the subcommittee's findings will be filed in the very near future.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for giving me additional time.

RADIO AND TELEVISION REPORTS OF TESTIMONY OF GENERAL MacARTHUR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for approximately 30 seconds in order that I may make a statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it was stated yesterday that I advocated television and radio reports of hearings on the MacArthur matter. I advocated nothing of the kind. I advocated public hearings. My personal opinion is that if I were conducting the hearings I would not permit radio and television coverage. No such suggestion was made by the Republican Policy Committee.

THE MacARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, ever since General MacArthur's speech on April 19, I, like so many others, have been trying to understand the full meaning of that dramatic occurrence. The tremendous outburst of emotion which the personality of the general evoked, has, I believe, obscured the true meaning of what the general said.

It is rare in history that a major question of governmental policy is presented so forcibly and so dramatically to a Nation as in the present case. General MacArthur has drawn the issue. It is now for the people and the Congress to make the decision.

I sense what the issue is. It is not, however, easy to translate it into simple words. In a broad sense, the issue is whether we should pursue the foreign policy we have been following since the last war or whether we should abruptly abandon it. In other words, are we to proceed as a great power in the grand imperial manner of the past or as a member of the United Nations, 1 among 60, seeking to preserve peace by the difficult democratic process of persuasion and compromise? General MacArthur's approach to the issue is in the traditional, orthodox pattern of the great empires of the past. His policy could succeed in the same way that such policies succeeded in the case of Napoleon, Victoria, or Kaiser Wilhelm. But such a policy cannot, in my opinion, bring lasting peace to the world. We could have, perhaps, a moment of imperial glory, yet I find it difficult to believe that we alone can impose peace upon a reluctant world.

Perhaps it may be useful if with this issue in mind we should examine some of our national characteristics. It is time for taking stock of ourselves with ruthless honesty lest we be beguiled into destroying ourselves.

Mr. President, we are a great people. We have not yet even approached the limits of our physical and spiritual strength. There is little that Americans cannot do if only they can imagine themselves wanting to do it. But we are not without defects in our national character.

We are usually more intent upon the immediate short-term job than upon the long-term task. The job is of today. It is perceptible in all its parts. We can set a time limit upon doing it and generally do it within the time set. Then we can go on to the next job. But the task is unlike this. We cannot always see what it involves. We cannot set a time limit and therefore being unable to finish it within a given period, we rebel against it. No one can beat us at doing a quick job. But our record as doers of long-term tasks is pretty poor. Thus we know how to win a war. But we don't know—or apparently don't care to know—how to win the peace. Twice within this generation we completed the quick job of winning the war and left undone the long task of winning the peace. That is why we are where we are today.

Our enemy does not look upon things as we do. He is presently engaged in the job of disrupting the world so that he may eventually take it over. But this is a task to which he set himself centuries ago. His eye—unlike ours—is less upon the battle than upon the campaign, and less upon the campaign than upon the war. We cherish time. Ours is the only radio system that operates upon split-second accuracy and, regardless of the importance of your message, you will be cut off if you exceed your allotted moments. Time being so precious among us, we count it in seconds, days, months, years. We are eaten up by impatience. But the Russian Communist who disdains time, reckons it in decades and centuries. We are an emotional people. The Communist is coldbloodedly calculating. We are moved by our hearts. He is responsive to his head. Many of the Russian Communists' characteristics are summed up by their behavior in one instance that occurred in the First World War. Then the victorious Germans, by the treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest, stripped them of a huge fraction of their territory. Some men in Russia's high councils wanted to continue the fight. But Lenin said no, and counselled them to silence. "Let the Germans have the territory," he said, "We shall get it back." He could not then know whether they would get it back in a year or a century. But, in Russian calculations, the belief is strong that the race is not always to the swift. Events proved, sooner than might have been expected, that Lenin was right.

Another of our defects is that we are a people enamored of the easy way. Yet, experience teaches that there is no easy way. Achievement, however, is had only at the price of pain and hard work. But, nonetheless, we became so persuaded of the easy way that not long ago many of us thought that to keep the peace we needed only the A-bomb and a few bombers to carry it to disturbers of the peace.

The dim realization that there is no easy way has caused us to fall—only temporarily, I hope—into a mood of petulant frustration. President Truman and General MacArthur are the focal points around which it has formed and erupted with considerable violence.

We are subject to a dangerous illusion. We tend to believe that complex national and international questions can somehow be solved; that is, forever and completely disposed of through the application of some sovereign panacea. This reflects credit upon the goodness of our hearts and the wholesomeness of our intentions, but it reflects less credit upon our thinking minds. For all history testifies that these problems cannot be solved through a remedy that will completely and forever dispose of them. They can be ameliorated; they cannot be solved. We have been told there is no substitute for victory; that somehow victory in arms will be a solution to our troubles. But we have had complete victory in two world wars within the last quarter of a century, and our troubles have increased. In our private lives, we, as individuals, do not ever entirely solve all of our problems with respect to God, our parents, our wives, our children, or our Government. Yet this does not prevent us from leading happy and useful lives. But collectively, as a nation, we cling to the notion that complex problems can be solved, and when we find that this is not true we recoil from them in the mood of a spoiled child who won't play at all unless the terms of the playing are entirely to his satisfaction.

These are some of the factors in our national character against which we must be vigilant. There is still another worthy of our attention. We are impatient of ideas.

We are often obsessed by the desire for action. But it is not unreasonable to ask that ideas precede action. We must never take action for action's sake alone. To do so is to renounce reason and invite disaster. Action for action's sake is merely the refuge of the intellectually impotent; a confession of mental bankruptcy. But we glorify action and the man of action while depreciating ideas and the man of ideas; so, too, we exalt impatience and deplore patience. To patience, some give the ugly name appeasement. Here let me recall the words of a great man who is a man both of ideas and of action. This is what he said not very long ago:

> Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp, clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in a majority or instances, they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands. How many misunderstandings which led to wars could have been removed by temporizing.
>
> The Sermon on the Mount is the last word in Christian ethics. Everyone respects the Quakers. Still, it is not on these terms that ministers assume their responsibilities of guiding states. Their duty is first so to deal with other nations as to avoid strife and war and to eschew aggression in all its forms. But the safety of the state, the lives and freedom of their own countrymen, • • • may make it right and imperative in the last resort • • • that the use of force should not be excluded. • • •
>
> And if this be so, it should be used under the conditions which are most favorable. These are the tormenting dilemmas upon which mankind throughout its history has been so frequently impaled.

The man who wrote these words has had more experience of war and statecraft than any man of our times. His name is Winston Churchill.

We are now confronted by one of the tormenting dilemmas upon which mankind has throughout its history been so frequently impaled. We shall live or die by the manner in which we solve it, saving or condemning the rest of the free world as we go.

Now, let us consider as objectively as we possibly can the issues in the Truman-MacArthur controversy. No one, I think, seriously questions President Truman's authority to dismiss General MacArthur as commander of our Far East forces. The subordination of the military to the civilian authority in our political system was long ago decided in terms of the maxim that "when two ride a horse, one must go in front." Our founding fathers decided that the President is the front rider as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. If the Nation is not now content with this solution of the question by the founding fathers, it may change the President's place on the horse by amending the Constitution. But until it does so, he remains the front rider. One may approve or disapprove of his action in a given case. But no one may reasonably doubt his authority.

Beyond this, there are many military, political, and politico-military questions involved in the present controversy. In our complicated world it is often impossible to say what is a strictly military question, since it is also so often bound up with the political; and what may be meat to the military may be poison to the political. Winning a battle, we may lose a war. I am painfully aware, in this discussion, of my lack of competence as a military expert. My distinguished colleague the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], however, would place more emphasis upon our Navy and Air Force than upon our Ground Forces and he does this with great assurance because he has perhaps a greater military knowledge than I have. But I, less assured in my ignorance, am willing, on strictly military matters, to be guided by the advice of our Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense, all of whom are military experts tried in the crucible of war. They may be wrong and if they are we shall grievously suffer, but they are our military advisers and while their word is not law until the Congress enacts it into law, it is highly persuasive; certainly to one who, like myself, is not a military expert.

General MacArthur's views on the bombing of Red China, whether or not it bombs our bases in Korea and Japan, are opposed not only by his own Government, but also by the governments of the free world, on military and political grounds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Arkansas has great respect for the point of view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Is he aware of the fact that only a year ago the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated that they would not consider spending $20,000,000,000 on the Armed Forces, and that the $13,000,000,000 which was provided was ample for the defense of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that I left the impression that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are omniscient in every respect. I think when they give an estimate of their immediate needs, as a military matter, there still remains an overall decision to be made by those whose responsibility is much broader. That certainly includes our political authority, including the Senate. I am quite unable to see how that particular matter has any pertinence to the question I am discussing.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator says that we must follow the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I suggest that today they say that it requires four times as much money and forces to defend the United States as they said was necessary 1 year ago today. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are the same individuals who made the statement a year ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I said a moment ago was that, I not being a military expert, the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in any particular instance on a military question is highly persuasive with me. It still is. In this instance, as I shall try to develop in the succeeding paragraphs, the Joint Chiefs of Staff by no means stand alone in their view as to the military wisdom of their position.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read to the Senator what General Bradley said on March 15, 1950:

> So if we came here and recommended to you a $30,000,000,000 or $40,000,000,000 budget for defense, I think we would be doing a disservice and that maybe you should get a new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff if I were the one who did that.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Senator WHERRY. Well, of course, your recommendations in the beginning were much higher than that.
>
> General BRADLEY. We had some other recommendations based, however, on unilateral——
>
> Senator WHERRY. That might be true, but they totaled more than the $13,100,000,000.
>
> General BRADLEY. The Joint Chiefs of Staff never went along with this great big figure of $20,000,000,000.

That was their military opinion at that time. Today their military opinion is that we must spend $60,000,000,000 to meet exactly the same threat which existed 1 year ago today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me point out to the Senator that I am certainly not saying that the Joint Chiefs of Staff or anyone else can foresee the future. At that time, with the knowledge then available, that was probably a very reasonable position. Does the Senator take the position that at that time he foresaw the Korean War, and that at that time, March 1950, he differed with the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. I accepted them as experts; but I have come to the point where I do not accept them as experts, particularly when General Bradley makes a foreign-policy speech. I suggest to the Senator that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are absolutely under the control of the administration, and that their recommendations are what the administration demands that they make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think that is a very serious charge which is made by the Senator from Ohio. I can think of nothing which is more likely to cause consternation in this country, to develop a fear which I believe the facts do not warrant, and generally to disrupt our effort in this great struggle with the Russians and with communism, than to state here that in effect he has no confidence in the integrity of the leading military figures in our Government. I think it is a very sad state in which we find ourselves if we are led to such extreme views.

It is a strange thing to me that only a short time ago, before General MacArthur appeared on the scene, by and large the country had faith in General Bradley, whom we all acknowledged to be a great military leader, one of the greatest in the last war. We had faith in General Eisenhower and in General Vandenberg. We had confidence in all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Suddenly those officers have become, in the eyes of the Senator from Ohio, merely political stooges of the President. I do not believe it, and I think it is a very dangerous doctrine to spread abroad in this country. If we lose faith in the integrity of our military men, in addition to the criticism which has been heaped upon the leadership in the political field, we certainly are in a sad state.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to proceed with my speech.

Mr. TAFT. I shall ask only one question, or possibly two questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator read General Bradley's speech in Chicago the day before General MacArthur appeared at the Capitol?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read it as it was reported in the press.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator feel that that was a foreign-policy speech, written, in effect, by the State Department for General Bradley? That is the thing which has shaken my confidence in the integrity of the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that General Bradley would lend himself to the expression of views to which he did not subscribe. I am quite willing to admit that in this case there is agreement on the part of General Bradley and the Department of State. I see nothing wrong with that. I think it is quite fortunate that men of the caliber of General Bradley and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff find themselves in agreement with the political branch of our Government, specifically the Department of State and the President.

I do not wish to intimate to the Senator from Ohio that I do not like to debate with him. I do not want to say that I will not yield at any time, but I should prefer, if he does not mind, to make two or three points in this connection. If he has a question or observation, I shall be delighted to yield for that purpose, but I am just beginning to make this point.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator for yielding.

The Senator referred to my position. I never have claimed to be a military expert, as the Senator suggests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Ohio has been extremely positive in his views about military matters, not only in this connection, but in connection with the debate on the troops-to-Europe issue.

I listened to the Senator from Ohio then with great interest. If I correctly recall, I thought he evidenced confidence in his judgment on military matters, far beyond any confidence which I have in my judgment on such matters.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that case, for example, on the question of troops to Europe, I was greatly persuaded by the opinion of General Eisenhower.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that the questions I discussed in that speech were all questions of foreign policy. I assumed no knowledge of military questions whatever; but in that whole debate the questions discussed were of basic foreign policy of the United States and of economic policy, which places a limit upon our total military effort.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no clear-cut distinction between military and economic policy. Such a distinction has long since vanished from our life. They are too much interrelated to enable us to make such a distinction. But I felt that the Senator from Ohio had much more confidence in his opinion on the military matters involved in that debate than I have in my opinions on the military questions raised by General MacArthur's speech.

General MacArthur's views on the bombing of Red China, whether or not Red China bombs our bases in Korea and Japan, are opposed on military and political grounds not only by his own Government but also by the governments of the free world. Joining this group is L'Osservatore Romano, the newspaper published in the Vatican, which indicated that it did not think MacArthur's way was the way to peace. I do not know how much this article reflects the views of the Pope himself, but we all know that the Vatican is well informed on foreign affairs and it would be a little

wide of the mark to say that its newspaper is a Communist organ.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Would it be just as wide of the mark to intimate that the newspaper published in the Vatican was subservient to the President of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so; either one.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator know that the publication referred to is not an official organ of the Vatican, and that the Vatican itself has so stated?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator was paying attention he would know that I did not state it was an official organ. I stated it was published at the Vatican. As I understand, it has columnists and writers, who are not necessarily speaking for the Pope. For the benefit of the Senator, I will repeat what I said. It was this:

"I do not know how much this article reflects the views of the Pope himself, but we all know that the Vatican is well informed on foreign affairs and it would be a little wide of the mark to say that its newspaper is a Communist organ."

I would say that I think it would be most unusual if anything directly contrary to what the Pope and the hierarchy believe on a matter of this importance appears in that newspaper.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point is that the Senator is not maintaining that it is an official organ of the Vatican.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I did not so state. But I say it appeared in that newspaper, and I say it would be most unusual if it was not in accord with the views of the hierarchy.

It may be, of course, that General MacArthur is right and the whole world is wrong. But, considering the gravity of the possible consequences if we should follow him, I shall go along with the majority in this case until there is a presentration of overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

There is no man in this Nation who does not share General MacArthur's desire to end the Korean war honorably, end our casualties there, and end the Chinese menace to our forces in the East. The quarrel is about the method. The General believes that the method is to bomb the enemy's supply bases in Manchuria, to blockade the Chinese coast, use Chiang Kai-shek's troops on the mainland and send large American reinforcements to Korea. This method raises certain questions in my mind.

Boldness and bravery are one thing. Recklessness and headlong dispatch are another. History teaches us that the fortunes of war are unpredictable; that war once begun no man can tell how far it will spread and in what directions. Hence, I ask:

"Is China our primary enemy, or is Russia our primary enemy?"

If knocking out China should involve us in large losses of men and material, would not this weaken us relative to Russia which up to date has not expended a single man in the wars since the end of the last world war?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas, who is a very able member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and for whom Members on both sides of the aisle have great respect, what he really thinks will be the reaction in Europe if the United Nations forces in Korea should be defeated in the operation now going on? Does he not believe it would undermine the confidence of the European people in the collective-security system if communism is able to overwhelm the United Nations forces in Korea?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it would have a very great effect upon them; that it would undermine their confidence in the material and physical strength of this country and of the United Nations forces. It would be a terrible shock to all of them. On the other hand, I believe it would not adversely affect their respect for the moral position of ourselves and of the United Nations; but while, as I said, I am not a military expert, I do not expect such an eventuality as the Senator from California suggests.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for another question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is generally acknowledged that as of today the Soviet Union has the capability of delivering at least 50 atomic weapons if they are of the mind to do so. They have the equipment and they have the weapons. It is generally agreed that a year from now they will have almost double their present supply of weapons. Does the able Senator from Arkansas think we will be less able to withstand Communist blackmail a year or 2 years from now than we are today?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say to the Senator from California in the first place that I do not concede either of the assumptions. I know nothing of what the Russians have in the way of atomic bombs. Maybe the Senator from California does. But the facts with reference to those matters are very difficult to ascertain. I think the question is highly speculative, and I cannot give any opinion on it. I do not like to question the Senator's information, but I doubt whether the Senator is very sure of his information about how many bombs the Russians have or how they can deliver them.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from California propounded a question as to the psychological reaction on the part of our allies if the United Nations forces in Korea were defeated and driven out of Korea. Recognizing as I do the Senator's acknowledgment of lack of military expertness and joining him with a similar acknowledgment for myself, I ask him, even from that humble basis, militarily speaking, is it not apparent to the Senator from Arkansas that the United Nations forces in Korea have a far better chance of maintaining their position and preventing defeat and disaster so long as they limit their operation and their commitment to Korea, as compared to what their hopeless situation would be if they permitted themselves to become involved in a second front on the mainland of China, or if they deliberately provoked the division of their forces which would inevitably follow their opening up of a second front on the mainland?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oklahoma could not be more right in his views. I think what has led some people astray is that we do not have a very pleasant choice. I mean, we are in Korea, the conditions there are bad, and of course, we would all like to get out of our predicament. But what is being proposed to be done is worse, not better. If the Senator from California can contemplate the defeat of our forces under present conditions, how in the world can he avoid being positive that they would be defeated if they thin their ranks by extending themselves all over the Asiatic mainland?

Mr. KERR. Does not it have every aspect of inviting disaster, rather than of pursuing a program which to this date has been characterized by very substantial success?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to remind everyone who is concerned about this particular aspect of the problem that there is an analogy, I believe, between our present situation and the situation in Greece, during the recent troubles there. The two situations are not exactly the same, because in Greece we were not using our own troops in combat; we had a small mission there, but most of the casualties were Greeks. However, the relationship is somewhat the same, insofar as the so-called sanctuary is concerned. At that time we could very easily have become enraged at the part Yugoslavia was playing, for the Yugoslavs were giving sanctuary to the guerrillas who would cross the border and attack the forces of Greece, and then, when attacked in return, would run back across the border. That was a very frustrating experience; but finally those guerrillas got enough of it.

We could easily have extended the war, for example, by bombing Belgrade—which I think would have been the beginning of world war III, with Yugoslavia at that time of course alined with Russia. But by pursuing what I think was a more cautious and a longer-term policy we succeeded in stopping that guerrilla warfare; and instead of having Yugoslavia entirely against us and in the arms of the Russians, Yugoslavia has now left the camp of the Russians and is in process of coming over to the western views. Our military men

think Yugoslavia is at least a source—I hesitate to say a source of strength to us, but certainly a source of weakness to the Russians, who thus have an exposed area there.

Mr. President, is it too much to hope that if we pursue the present policy in Korea, the Chinese might awaken to the fact that they are playing the Kremlin's game more than their own, and that after a sufficient amount of punishment the Chinese will become tired of losing such large numbers of men? I cannot subscribe to the theory that Chinese like to die any more than Americans or other peoples do. Perhaps the Chinese do not have as much control over their destiny as others do. However, I believe the matter might be worked out in that way; and at least we have a precedent which is very encouraging to the west.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Arkansas is not trying to leave the impression that the United States fought a war in Greece, is he?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A moment ago I stated that the big difference between the situation in Korea and that in Greece is that in the latter case the troops were Greeks, but the management or direction happened to be the same as that in Korea today. In other words, the general who now is in charge of the war in Korea, General Van Fleet, was formerly in charge in Greece. By accident, I was in Athens—I was not there inspecting the military mission—at the time when General Van Fleet was there. He and a score of other very intelligent and able American military men—I forget the exact number—were actually directing that war. They organized the war. There is a very major difference, of course, between the war in Greece and the war in Korea, in that in the former case the casualties were Greeks, whereas in the case of Korea the casualties are very largely Americans.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, the action in Greece was not a war, or at least we took no active part in it. We had possibly 100 advisers there, but they never fired a gun; they had nothing to do with that war or action, except to advise the Greek Government. If it was so successful, as the able Senator from Arkansas would like to have all of us believe, why did not the President of the United States use the same methods in Korea?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In this respect we are using the same methods in Korea, and that is the point which now is at controversy. The main point we are discussing is whether we should extend the war, whether we should invade, we might say, the sanctuary of the Communists. In that respect, there is a great similarity between the war in Greece and the war in Korea. One of the very aggravating aspects of the Greek war was the fact that the Greeks who were under our direction were unable to invade the sanctuary in that case, which at that time was Yugoslavia. That is the only point I am making now, namely, that there is an analogy in that respect. It would have been very helpful temporarily, and would have saved lives, if at that time we could have bombed the bases from which the guerrillas were infiltrating and moving back and forth across the Greek border.

Mr. CAPEHART. Whose lives would have been saved?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator from Indiana that certainly all of us, feel very badly about the casualties we are suffering in Korea; and they are terrible to contemplate; but it seems to me we should not let them blind us, and lead us into abandoning a policy which in the long run would cause us to have far fewer casualties, rather than more casualties. That is the problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for one more question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator from Arkansas willing to leave the impression that we participated in a war in Greece and had soldiers there who fired guns and killed other people?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not sure whether any Americans who were there fired guns. I am sure the whole effort was under the direction of American military men, and that General Van Fleet was the main boss of it. He had a number of colonels and brigadiers there, whom I met; and they were actually winning the war. Whether some of them fired guns, I am not personally aware. However, I do not believe that has anything to do with this matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arkansas, with his characteristic logic, has made an excellent analysis of the possibilities of extending the war, by referring to the situation existing in the Greek area and also the situation in the Asiatic area. Is it not true that the war in Greece, to which the Senator has alluded, was a civil war among the Greek people themselves, a war within their own country? In other words, at least it was ostensibly a case in which a nation was at war with itself, although obviously with outside help. On the other hand the battle in Korea is between one nation state and another nation state. Is there not that difference, insofar as the point to which the Senator from Indiana has been referring?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, the two are not exactly on all fours. My only point was with reference to the question of what might happen to the sanctuary, and whether in the long run it would be wise to attack the bases there, thus solving, let us say, the immediate problem, but also bringing on a much worse one. That case seemed to me to be somewhat similar, in that it would have helped the immediate situation, but also would have resulted in a conflagration in that entire area.

I think a little of that aspect of the problem was involved in the Berlin airlift. In that case the first mistake—which I shall not go into now—was the original agreement. However, I shall not discuss that question now. On the other hand, once we were in that situation, of course we could have used armed forces in an effort to reach a solution, and that might or might not have precipitated a war. At the least, however, it would have involved that risk. In any case, we exercised great self-restraint, and we got past that particular emergency without having it break into a war.

So I believe that fundamentally all these questions must be answered on the basis of one's evaluation of whether a war is inevitable. If we believe that in spite of everything which can be done we must have a war with Russia, then we can reach an entirely different line of questions.

However, my entire argument is based on the theory that it is possible—although we may not be wise enough to achieve it—to avoid an all-out war with Russia. The Senator was not here at the beginning of my remarks, when I read an excerpt from a statement by Winston Churchill, whom I regard as a very great statesman, particularly with reference to political and military matters relating to war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also the intention of the Senator from Arkansas that if that war is to be extended or expanded—in other words, if we are to engage in hostilities on the Asiatic mainland or anywhere else—that should not occur as the result of direct action by us, but rather, should occur as a result of offensive action by the ultimate enemy, namely, Soviet Russia?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes; absolutely so. I desire to make it clear that I am not merely saying that we should tie our hands behind our backs indefinitely, and that, if the enemy wishes to extend the war, we shall not retaliate. I am saying that we should not extend it by our voluntary and affirmative action. We must, of course, recognize that it is possible that that will be done by others, but that is true of anything in life; however, we should not adopt such a course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would that not be the case, for example, up to the present time? We have not bombed the Manchurian air bases.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have not done so, primarily because it has not been necessary militarily, due to the fact that neither the North Koreans nor the Chinese have had a great air armada. Is not that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But, if the North Koreans and Chinese persist in the offensive, if the sky should be filled with waves of bombers and planes supplied by the Soviet to the Chinese Communists, then as a matter of defense, even though we have tried to limit the war, we should be compelled as a matter of defense to strike back, is not that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. Yes, certainly I would say that. In the same way, supposing that the Russians were to unloose a submarine attack tomorrow on our transports. I should then consider that they had very definitely extended the war; that is, if we wish to carry out that line of thought.

But, judging the matter as it is now operating, and as it has been operating until now, both sides seem to have accepted the principle of limiting the war to this area. The Communists have not bombed Japan, they have not used submarines, they have used very few military planes. They have used a few fighters which have come over but which have done very little damage.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am wondering whether the Senator is familiar with the fact that there is a very great difference between the situation in Greece and the situation in Korea. Greece, as the Senator must know, received a United States military mission amounting to approximately 1,000 advisers. True, they were on a battalion level, and perhaps on a regimental level, but they were advisory. In Korea, we alone have approximately 250,000 American Armed Forces. We have sustained 60,000 casualties, and, of those 60,000 casualties, we have had over 10,000 killed; so that in the number of killed alone, we have had 10 times as many as the entire mission which was sent to Greece as advisers to the Greek forces.

The only point I wish to make here—and I am very much interested in the Senators' discussion—is that our Army must not be jeopardized. It is hard for me to understand the reasoning that allows Communist tanks, guns, and ammunition to come in from north of the Yalu River when these war supplies are used to kill American and United Nations forces, while the State Department and the United Nations tell our fighting men that we cannot strike at the Manchurian bases from which those tanks and guns and arms are coming, and then to have them state that in the event planes come over in force we may then, when perhaps too late, strike at their bases.

I merely point out what General Stratemeyer said recently, that if the planes, which we know today are in Manchuria, have an opportunity to surprise the American Air Force, they may render us an almost fatal blow, and by that time they may have so changed the strategic situation in Korea that we shall jeopardize our entire force which is there. I very much question the wisdom of risking the lives of 250,000 American troops, to say nothing of the troops of our allies, under those conditions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since I disclaimed, when I started, any military knowledge, I do not wish to argue with the Senator about a purely military matter, which I regard this as being. I refer to the question of what the Communist air force now in Manchuria could do to our own forces. On that kind of matter, I think our military people are best qualified to judge. If it were their policy that in order to prevent destruction of our Army as a result of a major disaster, bases in Manchuria had to be bombed, I should not argue about it, but I do not understand that to be their decision, and, that being so, I can see grave disadvantages in bringing on an extension of the war.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for a moment, that I may ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from California has given the figure of 250,000, a quarter of a million, American fighting men in Korea, and he gives the sad intelligence that we have had 10,000 killed. Based upon that fundamental statement, what is the total number of troops of all the members of the United Nations who are now in Korea fighting with our 250,000 men? What have the other nations contributed in numbers?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should say that the approximate figure as to men furnished by all the other members of the United Nations members—and, as the Senator will understand, the Republic of Korea is not a member of the United Nations——

Mr. TOBEY. I understand that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should say that the number of soldiers contributed by all the other members of the United Nations put together would not exceed half of what our casualties alone are in Korea—in other words, in the neighborhood of 30,000.

Mr. TOBEY. And we have in the field 250,000 men, 8 times that number.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. And we have lost 10,000 boys by death. How many have they lost by death?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not have those figures at my fingertips, but I think it is in the neighborhood of 1,000.

Mr. TOBEY. One thousand. That is 10 percent; is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. The point I make—and I make it in no spirit of criticism or of caustic comment—is that we are told this is a United Nations war in Korea, and that we, the United States, constitute the major part of the United Nations force. Always in the back of my mind is the question—and I am not clear on the point—whether, when the war is ended in Korea, it will really be considered that it was a United Nations war or a United States war. Based on the figures of death and numbers, I am forced to believe that, regardless of the title of the war, we are bearing the great bulk of the contest in Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that there is no question about that. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot yield for a little debate on the part of other Senators. When I shall have concluded I shall be perfectly willing for the Senator from New Hampshire to debate with the Senator from California.

Mr. TOBEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas it is a question which is in the minds of all Senators. I think the Senator from California made a correct statement of what had been in my mind. I believe we are all entitled to know the facts in the case. At least, I am desirous of knowing the facts. I thank the Senator from California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree that many of us feel that we are suffering casualties in Korea out of all proportion to the total membership of the United Nations. However, I think that issue is beside the point which is particularly under discussion at this time, which is a matter of policy, and of an effort to limit our own losses. If one is thinking primarily of casualties, I cannot imagine how he would wish to extend the war. It is bad enough that 10,000 American soldiers have been killed in a limited war in Korea; but I am unable to see how anyone who feels so strongly about our casualties can think it would help matters to extend the war over Asia. It interests me very much to prevent this from becoming a world-wide conflagration, in which 10,000 casualties would seem as nothing, for we would be suffering that many casualties perhaps daily, or certainly weekly. That is why it seems so strange to me that such an argument should be advanced, and it is certainly the sad part of this whole business, that it can be used to justify the extension of a limited war into a world-wide war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was impressed by what General MacArthur had to say as to the importance of maintaining the perimeter of defense. He cited, very graphically and very pointedly, the importance of maintaining Formosa. Needless to say, we have an obligation in Japan. Further, Korea is close to Japan. So it appears to me that one of our reasons for having large forces in Korea is not merely to stop Communist aggression there but it is because, as General MacArthur has said, Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and the line all the way down into southern Asia is part of the defense of the United States of America. So let us make it clear that our action in Korea is vital to our own defense. General MacArthur says that this perimeter of defense is vital to the security of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is entirely correct, and I appreciate that contribution.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is not the Senator aware of the high-sounding reasons given for the action in Korea as being in the interest of the United Nations by way of affording protection to the free nations of the world against aggression? It is not, so far as the administration

tells us, for the protection of the United States, but in the interest of the United Nations as a protection against aggresion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those two things are not mutually exclusive. I think it is quite possible—in fact, I believe it is true—that they are one and the same thing. In the long run, the strengthening and protection of the United Nations is the strengthening and protection of the United States. To put it the other way, I think that anything which is good for the strengthening of the United States is good for the United Nations. There is a very great degree of similarity or identity of interests in this question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to make a few more points, but I yield briefly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There may be similarity of interest in many fields in the Korean action, but not a similarity of sacrifice. The United States is doing the sacrificing, American boys are doing the sacrificing. The United Nations is bowing out and letting us do this dirty job, and is not giving us the support which it should contribute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator on that point. I think, with a very few exceptions, the other nations have taken their responsibility very casually.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator will tell us who is doing the sacrificing in Indochina, where 150,000 French troops have suffered 37,000 casualties. It is a war against the same communism, against imperialistic, aggressive communism, and the loss of Indochina could be as serious as the loss of Korea.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From a material standpoint I think the loss of southeast Asia probably would be much worse than would be the loss of Korea. Tin, rubber, and oil are produced there, and they are valuable to Russia. It is a very vital area. I understand the British have quite a substantial force in Malaya.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They have 175,000 troops there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not desire to become diverted into an argument. I suppose we could go back and calculate the casualties in the Second World War, but it seems to me that is not a point that is very pertinent to the question we are trying to solve in this debate regarding General MacArthur's policy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The reason I brought up the subject of Malaya and Indochina is because I was deeply moved by General MacArthur's statement. He said there was a global threat, and that we must be prepared to fight on two fronts. If the general is correct in saying that the Communist threat is global, then when the British are fighting in Malaya, the French are fighting in Indochina and are guarding North Africa, and the British are guarding the Suez, these, our allies, are making great contributions in the struggle against communism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is absolutely correct in that statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. With reference to the production of tin, rubber, and oil, referred to a moment ago, will the Senator from Arkansas comment on the reports that one of the principal reasons the British are in Malaya is to obtain tin and rubber? Does the Senator have any solution of the problem, which is definitely one of the most serious problems which our fighting forces in Korea have to face, namely, preventing the British or any other nation from constantly supplying strategic materials to the Russians?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have been told by very responsible officials of the British Embassy that Great Britain is not doing what the Senator has stated. I have been told that they are not supplying tin or rubber to the Communists.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator any comment to make on the report that the British are supplying at least six engines to the Russians?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood that happened some time ago, at the time we were sending machine tools and all sorts of things to Russia. We carried on trade with Russia until recently, as the Senator well knows. It has been only within the past year that it has been practically cut off. We were receiving from Russia manganese, which is very important to us.

Mr. AIKEN. It is common knowledge——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Charges of this kind should not be a matter of common knowledge. They should be very specific and official and not mere gossip. As the Senator from Vermont well knows, there is in this country a great newspaper empire which specializes in rumors regarding Great Britain. It has been going on for 50 years. It would be thought they were at the height of their power in the days of good Queen Bess. That is a lot of nonsense. I do not know the facts. If the Senator did not read the stories in the Chicago Tribune—if that is not his authority—but read them elsewhere, we might well look into the question. I do not know that Great Britain is sending tin and rubber to the Communists. We can read such statements every day in the McCormick press, but I am a little suspicious of what is stated there.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont does not read the Chicago Tribune any more than does the Senator from Arkansas. But I think it is common knowledge that Great Britain is carrying on trade with Communist China at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. She is carrying on trade; yes. There is what we understand as normal trade between Hong Kong and China, but I understood the Senator to say that Great Britain was protecting Malaya in order to produce tin and rubber to supply the Communists in China and Russia. I say I do not know that that is a fact.

Mr. AIKEN. I refer the Senator from Arkansas to the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], who has repeatedly invited the attention of the Senate to the conditions which exist.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They did exist. Whether or not they still exist, I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Maryland spoke this morning on that subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not want to cut off debate, but that is a question about which I have made no research. I should like to get through with my statement.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to yield for a question on that subject.

Mr. KEM. Is it not on that subject. I think it is pertinent to what the Senator from Arkansas stated in his very excellent statement. It is reported in one of the Washington newspapers this morning that the President is about to remove Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State. In that event, no Senator would be obliged to depend for facts upon Mr. Acheson. Can the Senator from Arkansas give the Senate and the people of the United States any ray of hope in that respect?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think I quite understand the Senator's question.

Mr. KEM. Let me repeat my question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Missouri is just as close to the present occupant of the White House, so far as knowing what his plans are, as is the Senator from Arkansas. But I am in no position to answer any such question. I have not been consulted and I do not know what is going to be done with regard to the Secretary of State.

Mr. KEM. I wanted to be sure that the Senator from Arkansas understood my question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not for a question on irrelevant matters.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my view, at least, it is very relevant to the discussion of a moment ago. As the Senator well knows, the British have recognized Communist China, and have sent an Ambassador there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. China has not yet recognized the British Government, but I take it they are willing to do business with them, diplomatically and in every other way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I do not think it is a pertinent question. However, since he has raised it, I may suggest that I am not defending what the British have done. They have done a great many things which I think are erroneous, both in foreign policy and domestic policy. I do not approve of many of the things they have done, among

them some the Senator has mentioned. However, it has no bearing on what I am discussing today.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to proceed with my speech.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I think it would be unfair not to take note of the fact, although many of us would like to get more help from the British, that as of 5 weeks ago they had sent to Korea 16,573 men, who are now fighting there. They are fighting alongside American troops. So far as I know, the British have been cooperating to some degree in the economic blockade of China, and our Government is doing everything it can to get the full cooperation of the British for a complete economic blockade of China.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator knows that many of the things of which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] has been complaining have been carried on by Americans. Many of the ships involved have been American, disguised by the Panamanian flag. We will always have chiselers who will do such things. As I understand, it is certainly not the official policy of the British. I think I know perhaps as much about it as do some of the other Senators. All of this is rather vague, and it is not part of the British policy to carry on any such contraband, official, or legal trade in war material.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall yield for one more question. Then I wish to proceed with my speech. None of the questions have had any bearing on my remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think what I have to say has some bearing on the Senator's remarks. I wonder whether the Senator has noticed that in a certain part of the Senate Chamber there seems to be an unquestioning loyalty, affection and regard for the forces of Chiang Kai-shek, and for Chiang Kai-shek himself. This same generalissimo only recently, was forced to retreat from China and yield to the Communist forces. There seems to be a continuous harassment, embarrassment, and attack upon one great ally that this country has, on whom we can count and depend, and who in the most recent war gave an heroic account of itself. I speak of Great Britain. I ask the Senator how we can expect to have any friends, how we can expect to maintain any allies, how we can expect to have a spirit of cooperation and full participation when a good share of the United States Senate spends its time tearing down, abusing, and misrepresenting one of the greatest countries on the face of the earth? I refer to our one great ally, Great Britain. She may be a little tired, and the old lion may not have too much roar in her, but she is still the best ally we have. In comparison with Chiang Kai-shek, Great Britain is a giant, a fortress of strength. I think we ought to honor the ally we do have.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, I should like to say that I have a much higher opinion of the British than the Senator from Minnesota has of them. However, does the Senator think that we should always agree with them in every case, as when they demanded that we give up Formosa, on the very day General MacArthur spoke before Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator asking me the question?

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator believe that we should accede to every request the British make of us?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly I do not think so. They have done many things with which I have not agreed, particularly in recent years, both in domestic policy and in foreign policy. From what I can judge, a very important part of the present British Government, made up of some elements of the Labor Party, does not agree with anything we are doing. They do not want to rearm. They do not want to go along with us. I do not see that that has any particular significance to the question under discussion. I realize that it was not very long ago that we fought the war of 1812 with them, but I think it is time that we got over our attitude toward the British and tried to evaluate on an objective basis what they think and what they do.

Mr. President, I do not wish to cut off debate, but I would like to complete my prepared remarks.

Who is prepared to say how much the conquest of China might cost us?

Who can tell us how effective bombings may be against a primitive economy such as China's where there are few large factories and thousands of small, scattered handicraft industries?

We can perhaps learn something by reexamining the experience of Japan during 12 years of bombing China. If, however, we conclude that we could knock China out of the war with little loss to ourselves, we would then merely go on to the next question which is even more difficult to answer.

In war, as in life generally, prudent men want to pay a price commensurate with the gain; to weigh the benefits against the risks. General MacArthur seems to believe that if we use his method against China, Russia will not intervene. How does he know this? With what accuracy can he read the minds of the men who direct the destinies of Russia? If we should attack China proper, to what extent would Russia feel obliged to intervene under the terms of the Sino-Russia treaty? Does General MacArthur know what the secret agreements may be between the two countries? How far would Russian prestige in the Orient be dissipated if she should stand idly by and see knocked to pieces her Chinese ally? And if Russia intervened, would we not then, while precipitating the third world war doom our far-eastern forces to destruction, lose Japan, and lay all of southeast Asia open to easy invasion?

If, I ask, we have had to struggle hard to meet even the limited requirements of the Korean War, are we now prepared for the unlimited requirements of the third world war? Have we sufficient planes? Have we enough guns and ammunition? How far along is our guided-missiles project? What is the state of our merchant marine and Navy, especially with respect to antisubmarine devices and submarine-killer ships? What is the state of our civilian defense against Russian A-bomb attacks? What right have we to assume that the Russian bombers will not get through to us when our own Air Force people tell us point blank that many of them will get through to us, just as many of our bombers will get through to the Russians? Where are the meager four divisions that we have promised to send Europe? Are they ready? Are they equipped? Going beyond this, are our Allies ready? Are they equipped? Winston Churchill has it that if you must fight a war, you ought to fight it, if possible, at the most favorable moment. Let us ask ourselves: Is today or tomorrow the most favorable moment for the United States and its allies? Does the risk in this case equal the possible gains?

I was deeply disturbed—to come to another question—by an extraordinary omission in General MacArthur's speech. The United States is one of the founders of the United Nations and its most powerful member while the general himself was the first commander in history of a United Nations force. Yet, never once did he mention the United Nations or the brave men, few though they may be, who are now fighting alongside our troops in Korea. Is this organization dead? If it is not dead, shall we make over-all strategy, involving the life or death of millions of people, without consulting our allies? Shall we commit them to a world war without their consent? Do we prefer to face Russia alone? Shall we make a war with Russia an all-American war?

Shall we, by our impetuousness, cause our allies to fall away from us, until disheartened and hopeless, they make the best deal they can with Russia and become our active or passive enemies?

We all know how difficult it is to hold together a coalition composed as it is of nations with differing interests and points of views. Do we believe that we can cement this shaky structure of the United Nations by cavalierly disregarding the opinions of those who compose it outside ourselves? Shall we gain Chiang Kai-shek and lose Britain, France, Italy, the Low Countries, Scandinavia, Greece, and Turkey? General MacArthur desires that the United States maintain a global policy. Shall we maintain it through that rather small part of the globe that the United States covers? If we are to have a global policy, how shall we conduct it effectively without the invaluable air bases of France, Britain, north Africa, and other places around the globe that we neither own nor control? How shall we protect the sea approaches to the United States without

bases in Greenland, Iceland, and the Azores; territories that are not American real estate?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator, in answer to his question, that if his military ability and prowess were as good as the China lobby and Chiang's lobby, he would be a terrific ally.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Remember, as we ponder these questions, that every Government in the free world is opposed to General MacArthur's views on the solution of the Chinese war. He may be right, but so far he has not convinced our allies, much less a united America, that he is right. He may be right, I repeat, but if we should presently adopt his view concerning the bombing of Red China, we must bear in mind the following possible eventualities:

(a) Russia may not intervene directly. She may simply stand by, aiding the Chinese, until we have suffered grievous losses in beating them down. Then, while we are committed heavily in the east, she may wheel and turn upon an almost defenseless west. Successful in Europe, she would have 270,000,000 slaves of the highest technical skill and the vast productive machinery of that area. We might destroy some of it by bombing Europe; that is, by killing our friends in incomprehensible numbers.

(b) Russia might intervene directly, thereby precipitating the third world war. Is this, I ask you, a favorable moment for us and our allies?

(c) If we accept General MacArthur's method, we must face certain eventualities with respect to our allies.

First. They may disassociate themselves from our policy, leaving us to follow it alone.

Second. We may drag them into a world war, against their will and without their consent, and only as the lesser of two evils.

The struggle with Russia, under the best of circumstances, would, if it should come, be desperate enough. Do we want to face it with resentful, reluctant allies, or with allies who see eye to eye with us, one in resolve, one in faith, one in purpose?

So far, I have said nothing of the possible effects of General MacArthur's proposal upon the non-Communist Orient. It joins with Western Europe in its opposition to the general's China policy. It is something less than enthusiastic about Chiang Kai-shek, and something less than delighted with the western white world generally. The general said, quite rightly, that the Orient is in rebellion against colonialism. But if we should start bombing China and invading it with our troops, or Chinese Nationalist troops landed on the Chinese mainland by our Air Force and Navy, might not the Orient then regard us, a mighty power, as the most dangerous exponent of colonialism that has ever appeared in Asia? Why should we expect orientals to believe in our good intentions as we believe in them? What could we do to reassure them that once in China, we shall not always be in China? What risks do we run here of alienating India, the great non-Communist power of the East? How would we fare, attacking China, among all the peoples of the East who have no reason to love white men? Shall we pursue a policy that, aside from the enormous risks inherent in it of provoking the third world war, is certain to set strongly against us nearly the whole of the free world? Are we prepared, are we ready in our hearts, souls, and minds, to back General MacArthur's proposal against the weight of most of the earth?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I understood the able Senator from Arkansas to say that all the nations of the free world were opposed to General MacArthur's plan to bomb the lines of communication behind the enemy lines in Korea.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my impression.

Mr. KEM. I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas has seen the Associated Press dispatch from Lake Success which appears in the Washington Evening Star of today, and which reads in part as follows——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that I have not seen it, because I have been on the floor so long that I have lost touch with what is going on. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEM. I invite the Senator's attention to this statement in the dispatch:

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., April 26.—The United States has proposed the bombing of enemy bases in Manchuria, if the Communists launch heavy air attacks on United Nations forces in Korea.

A United States spokesman said the recommendation had been outlined to 13 other countries with military forces fighting for the UN in Korea and that no objections had been raised.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator had been present a moment ago, he would recall that we discussed the eventuality of an all-out air attack being launched against us. That is the basis for that press report. I agree, as I think other Senators do, that that would change the situation very substantially. The point at issue is whether, under conditions as they now exist, that is, without any all-out air attack by Russia or any other major change in the situation in that regard, we should precipitate the attack. That is what we were talking about.

Mr. KEM. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that so long as the number of casualties remains as at present, between 1,400 and 2,000 American boys a week, and does not increase, he is not willing that we take the steps suggested?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I did not say that at all. I do not know where the Senator got that idea. That is not the deciding question in the point which I have been trying to make. I did say that I do not understand why the Senator, who is concerned—and rightly, as we all are—over the casualties, would be willing to extend the war, unless under very grave provocation. If the war were extended, instead of 1,000 or 2,000 casualties a week, there quite likely would be 10,000 a week. I do not follow the Senator's reasoning at all.

Mr. KEM. The Senator assumes a fact which is not at all proved, and that is that the steps suggested would extend the war. So far as I know, General MacArthur did not propose to extend the war. The extension of the war is a figment of the imagination of Senators on the other side and spokesmen in the State Department. No one wants to extend the war, but every right-minded American, so far as I know, wants to protect the American boys at the front. To continue a situation in which they are shot at like sitting ducks seems to me to be unthinkable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to go back over that ground. I pointed out in the beginning that the real difference is one of method. There is no difference between the objective of Senators on the other side of the aisle and the objective of Senators on this side of the aisle, or that of General MacArthur. We all want to get out of this war with the least possible number of casualties. We do not want to enter into an extended war. Where we differ is as to what is likely to happen if we follow General MacArthur's suggestions. There is a very grave difference of opinion on that matter. I agree with the Senator that what we seek is the same thing, but we do disagree as to the best and most efficient way to achieve that purpose.

Mr. KEM. It seems to me that while the Senator is talking about defending the Acheson policies on the floor, the United Nations are leaving them and adopting the MacArthur policies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know what justification the Senator has for denominating what has been the official policy supported by our Government and others as the Acheson policy. It seems to me that I read in the press not too long ago that Secretary Acheson had held views about the same as those of General MacArthur. I should like to say here that I think it is a rather bad habit that we have fallen into, of personalizing these policies. I do not wish to keep referring to a policy as someone's policy. These should be objective matters in which we are all seeking to find the policy which is most to the advantage of the United States and of the United Nations. I do not care whose policy it was or who thought of it. What I hope is that we can throw some light on the policy itself.

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator completely that this is not a question of personalities, but of policies. But the policies are designated with the names of their originators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator have any persuasive and final proof that the policy we are following is that of the Secretary of State, and his alone? I do not think the Senator has. I have no idea how it was finally agreed upon. It is a very complicated matter.

Mr. KEM. It is generally understood that the recall of General MacArthur was evidence of the complete domination of Dean Acheson over the foreign policy and military commitments of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the Senator is correct in saying it is generally understood. It has been generally stated by certain newspapers. I have no knowledge about that matter, and I do not propose to continue a debate on that subject. I do not know anything about it. All I know is that he was dismissed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on the matter that was raised by the Senator from Missouri, and which I think the Senator from Arkansas correctly pointed out should not be personalized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to point out to the Senator from Arkansas that no one I know of, from the President of the United States and the Joint Chiefs of Staff down, who has upheld, shall we call it, the present governmental policy in Korea, has proposed that, if the enemy cuts loose with airplanes and submarines, the security of our forces will not demand suitable retribution. But then we have said that means world war III.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. McMAHON. And if it is going to start, let them start it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is entirely right.

Mr. McMAHON. MacArthur wants to start it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not presume there is any disagreement about that. I do not know of anyone on this side of the aisle or anywhere else who does not recognize that if the Russians chose to they could start world war III, and we would certainly respond. They have an opportunity every day to start it. They could have started it at the time of the Berlin airlift. But they did not do it. I am hopeful that we have sense enough not to do it now. And I hope we will not start it. That is the whole point.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I am happy—I say that first and then I will finish the question—I am happy that the Senator has mentioned the Berlin airlift, and he might have made reference to what we did in Greece and Turkey, because there were impetuous spirits then who said that the thing for us to do was to bring the matter to a final conclusion. I ask the Senator if that is not true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. And bring on the war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. But we were steadfast and patient, and did we not work the problem out?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut? I will take not more than a minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have only two more pages of my prepared remarks left, and I should really like to finish. If the Senator will make his interruption short, I will yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will make it short. There is a great difference between the situation mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut and the situation now, and certainly the Senator from Connecticut should be the first to realize it. At the time of the Berlin airlift, and at the time of the Greco-Turkish aid program, we were acting under the assumption that the Soviet Union would not have the atomic weapon for at least another 3 or 4 years. Now we know that they have had it since September of 1949. We are now in a different age than that of even so short a time ago as the time of the Berlin airlift or the time of the Greco-Turkish aid program.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me to make a brief answer to that statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from California has, I think, made an argument for pursuing the policy of steadfastness and patience even better than I have, because I recollect that he voted the other day against even to setting up regional headquarters dispersed 20 miles from Washington, although the Russians are now stockpiling atomic weapons.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from California will agree with me that he has digressed into a matter which is not contained in my speech. I should like to finish, and then we can continue with what the Senator proposes to mention.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of personal privilege, I should appreciate the Senator's yielding, since the Senator from Connecticut has mentioned my name. I promise the Senator from Arkansas it will not take more than half a minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I think I have been as alert as he has to the dangers the world and this country have been facing and are facing at the present time. I have participated in the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee in the effort to obtain some funds for civil defense that will apply to the 150,000,000 people of America, and not to Washington alone.

Mr. McMAHON. I congratulate the Senator, I congratulate him pro tanto.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am sadly aware of the fact that I have raised more questions than I have answered. If my colleagues can answer them, they will have a most respectful hearing on my part. Dogmatism is wrong at any time. But it is downright dangerous when applied to the great issues of life or death that confront us. Yet we must find the answers to our questions, and I do not doubt that we shall find them. Of all the wisdom that went into making this country there must survive a residue by which it can be saved. But, I suggest, we must search for the truth quietly, clamly, carefully, after hearing anybody who can help us and weighing the evidence as best we can. The military and the civilian authority both make mistakes and it is inevitable that they should since they are fallible men. We may make more mistakes but if we do, let us not compound the error by making them through stubbornness, prejudice, or partisanship. The whole is greater than the sum of the parts and the United States is greater than you or me or President Truman or General MacArthur.

Here let me say a personal word. My paths have never crossed those of General MacArthur. And as you know, they have seldom crossed those of President Truman. For a long time we have been walking on opposite sides of the street, neither of us nodding to the other. He has often thought me wrong and unspeakable, while I have sometimes thought him wrong and incomprehensible. I retain the right to agree or disagree with him as the case may be. But I do have a real sympathy for him in the awful responsibility which he alone must carry.

I do not know what the verdict of history upon Mr. Truman will be. His contemporaries, such being the frailty of human nature, are more likely to exaggerate his faults than to enumerate his virtues, while he, as most men, has a full quota of both. I am not in his good graces. I have spoken with him on official business only once in several years. This, however, does not blind me to the fact that he has made decisions on a number of occasions that equal in imagination, courage, and effectiveness any ever taken by an American President. Nearly all of these decisions are without precedent in our history. Some of them are—

The dropping of the A-bomb on Japan.
Aid to Greece and Turkey.
The Marshall plan.
The Berlin airlift.
The North Atlantic Treaty.
The sending of divisions of American troops to Europe in peacetime; troops under the command of General Eisenhower.

The going into Korea, a decision that at the time had the approbation of the Nation and of nearly the whole of the free world.

No one can doubt that, in the absence of some of these stupendous decisions, much of the present free world would now be lost to us and our struggle against Russia would be the more difficult.

These momentous decisions are the President's responsibility, taken though most of them were with the advice and consent of the Congress and the people and the approbation of the military. Mr. Truman remains the President and in these terrible times, I submit that it

is necessary for us to keep him in perspective. Let us not permit his occasional lapses of speech or temperament or his misguided loyalty to unworthy friends to endanger a calm and objective judgment on the present controversy.

AIR SUPPORT FOR WESTERN EUROPEAN DEFENSES

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, some time ago when the troops-for-Europe resolution was under discussion in the Senate, an amendment was offered, asking that the Joint Chiefs of Staff certify that in their opinion there was adequate air cover for four American ground divisions before they were sent to Europe. Yesterday I noticed in the Washington Evening Star a very interesting article entitled "Western Europe's Defenses Now Have Meager Air Support." The article is by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, who, after discussing the situation in considerable detail, summarizes his findings as follows:

But this doesn't remove the grim fact that there just won't be enough tactical air power in Western Europe during 1951–52, barring some such stroke of luck as a sudden satisfactory ending of the Korean war which would permit the United States to switch all its tactical air power and navy and marine aviation from that theater to Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the entire article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN EUROPE'S DEFENSES NOW HAVE MEAGER AIR SUPPORT

(By George Fielding Eliot)

Air power for the defense of Western Europe may be considered in three categories: (1) Strategic; (2) tactical; (3) air defense.

Strategic air power contributes to European security indirectly, by reducing the enemy's offensive capabilities. Strategic air will at first be almost wholly a United States responsibility. Details lie outside the scope of this article.

Tactical air power has three major tasks: (1) To establish air superiority—in GI language, "keeping the so-and-sos off our necks"; (2) isolation of the battlefield—preventing the enemy from bringing up supplies and reinforcements and smashing his depots and rear-area establishments; (3) direct combat support to ground troops. It's a fair rule-of-thumb that, for all these purposes, there should be about one air group—fighters or fighter-bombers—for each division of ground troops in a given theater of operations, plus a due proportion of light bombers and night fighters.

SHORT ON TACTICAL POWER

Air defense, in the strict application of the term is defense of home territory from hostile air attack, as distinguished from tactical air operations in the combat zone. But in Europe, the home territory of some countries of the North Atlantic Alliance may be close to or actually in the combat zone; hence this distinction is not a fine one.

Under present plans there is little prospect of having enough tactical air power to support the prospective number of ground troops in Western Europe's defense forces either this year or next year. This deficiency is made worse by two additional factors: (1) Since inferiority in numbers on the ground is certain, this should be made up for by extra tactical air power, but, in fact, there will be a shortage instead. (2) There will be an inescapable tendency for governments concerned to drain off tactical air power for home defense.

Here is how the situation breaks down by countries:

United States Air Forces, Europe (USAFE) and the British Air Forces of Occupation (BAFO) will have, by the end of 1951, sufficient tactical air power in Europe to provide minimum support for the American and British divisions which then will be under General Eisenhower's command. This will be supplemented in the light and medium bomber field by Bomber Command, RAF, based in Great Britain. But the rest of the Allied forces will be in no such fortunate condition.

FRENCH START FROM SCRATCH

The French Air Force is starting virtually from scratch, and, with all the spirit and good will in the world, it will be lucky to be able to put two tactical groups into the air by the end of this year to support its 10 divisions. Its remaining units will be chiefly useful for air defense.

The Belgian and Dutch Air Forces may, by that time, have one tactical group each. The Italian Air Force is restricted by treaty to 200 combat-type planes, which it is getting this year—but they are F–47's and F–51's, not jets. The net deficiency in tactical air power on the main front (Switzerland to the North Sea) will be about 10–12 groups at the end of 1951.

By the end of 1952, as the ground forces will increase more rapidly than the air forces (in the nature of things—can't be helped) the net deficiency of tactical air power will be of the order of 15–20 groups. After that, as European aircraft production begins to become significant and our own production and Britain's gets into stride on newer models, the tactical air situation will improve rapidly. This year and next are the danger periods from the tactical air point of view.

ONLY TWO SOURCES NOW

There are only two sources from which this deficiency can be made up, as prospects now appear. One is from United States and British naval aviation; the other is the home defense force (Fighter Command) of the RAF.

It would be a serious matter to tie down so highly mobile a weapon as carrier-borne naval aviation to a fixed commitment within a restricted area. By so doing we would, of course, deprive ourselves of all the advantages which mobility and surprise could give us against a comparatively slow-moving foe, all round the perimeter of the vast Soviet Empire. Yet it may be necessary to forego these advantages in the interest of sheer survival.

As for Fighter Command, no British Government in possession of its senses can be expected to fritter away the ultimate defense force of the island of Great Britain in a fight of uncertain outcome. The British were almost overwhelmed in the last war by taking long chances with their fighter defenses. It is probable that very few squadrons of Fighter Command would be made available for air warfare over the Continent unless and until the struggle for air superiority had already been won, or was so nearly won, that it was clear that the intervention of Fighter Command would be decisive of the issue.

AIR SWITCH NECESSARY

This is sound military sense from the Allied viewpoint, too, since the security of the British island as a base of operations and a source of industries (including aircraft) production is essential to the security of Western Europe as a whole.

But this doesn't remove the grim fact that there just won't be enough tactical air power in Western Europe during 1951–52, barring some such stroke of luck as a sudden satisfactory ending of the Korean War which would permit the United States to switch all its tactical air power and Navy and Marine aviation from that theater to Europe.

Facing this prospect, it is easy to see why the United States and British Navies are rushing carriers and naval air groups into commission. It may yet prove that carrier-borne aircraft are the one hope of providing adequate air cover and support for the ground forces defending Western Europe during the critical period that lies just ahead of us.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, in the same connection I noticed on today's ticker a report by the United Press, relating to this subject. I shall read two sentences from that report:

A delayed start is about to be made on the task of providing air support for the Atlantic Pact army.

This problem, which is becoming critical, will stand high on the agenda of American, British, Canadian, and French Air Force chiefs when they meet here next Monday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire United Press dispatch printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A delayed start is about to be made on the task of providing air support for the Atlantic Pact army.

This problem, which is becoming critical, will stand high on the agenda of American, British, Canadian, and French Air Force chiefs when they meet here next Monday.

An informed Pentagon source said the conference can be called a "beginning" of joint efforts to give General Eisenhower's international ground forces adequate tactical air cover. His divisions are vulnerable on that score now.

American plans call for stationing six army divisions in Europe. That normally would indicate six United States Air Force groups. But air force officers are certain, on the basis of current information on other air arms, that their contribution will have to be much greater if Eisenhower's projected 40 divisions are to have enough air cover.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, United States Air Force Chief of Staff, called next week's meeting to discuss matters of mutual interest with Air Marshal Sir John Slessor of the RAF, Air Marshal W. A. Curtis of the Royal Canadian Air Force, and Gen. Charles Francois Lecheres of the French Air Force. Significantly, the chiefs will be accompanied by their supply officers.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say that it seems to me to be something more than surprising—it is no less than astounding—that the question of an adequate air force to protect the American boys who are to be sent to Europe does not have a higher place on the agenda of the Senate in view of the fact that when American boys are being sent to Europe, judging from all the available evidence, they may be shot like sitting ducks.

When the question was under discussion in the Senate, evidence was presented to show that the forces of the free world in Europe, in terms of front-line air power, are today outnumbered by the Russians by as much as 10 to 1. Testimony was offered from no less an authority than Gen. Carl Spaatz that if the American air program is carried out and if Russia does not build a single addi-

tional plane—which, of course, is an implausible assumption—then at the end of 1952 the forces of the free world will be outnumbered, in terms of front-line air defense, by at least 5 to 1. Notwithstanding that evidence, Mr. President, the Senate approved the resolution calling for the sending to Europe of 4 divisions of American ground forces.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Speaking of delayed starts, I am sure the Senator from Missouri noted that we are about to send a military mission of approximately 800 men to Formosa. Does the Senator know of any reason why, if that is good policy today, it was not good policy back in December, at the very moment when the Communists attacked in Korea?

Mr. KEM. I know of no reason why it was not a sound policy last December, and ever since. It would seem to me to be another case of too little and too late.

THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it must be a great surprise to those who are in the galleries and to those who will read what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said here in the Senate Chamber this afternoon, to learn from him that we were in war in Greece or that Greece had a war. Yet that is the impression the Senator from Arkansas attempted to leave with the Senate and with those who were in the galleries and were listening to his remarks, namely, that the United States participated in a war in Greece. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas is going to fool the American people about that. I believe the attention of the Senate should be called to the true facts.

We did send approximately 100 military advisers to Greece, a few years ago; and they advised—to what extent, I do not know, and I do not know of any other Member of the Senate who does know—some 95,000 Greek soldiers, which was the size of the Greek Army. Those 95,000 Greek soldiers, who were advised—there is no question about that—by a small number of American officers, were trying to suppress about 25,000 guerrillas. Many of those guerrillas were Greeks, and some of them came over the border from Yugoslavia. So 95,000 soldiers in the regular Greek Army were trying to suppress 25,000 guerrillas; and we had a few officers in Greece, advising the Greek Army. At no time were any American soldiers there, in the sense in which we generally think of soldiers. At no time did any American fire a shot there; and at no time was there ever a war there.

The facts are that the guerrillas finally were suppressed because of the fact that when the Yugoslav Government broke with the Kremlin, the Yugoslavs denied the guerrillas any further bases in Yugoslavia, whereas theretofore the guerrillas had been crossing into Greece from Yugoslavia. It was guerrilla warfare.

Why any Member of the Senate would attempt to make the American people believe that we had a war in Greece, and that if General MacArthur had handled the war in Korea in the way General Van Fleet handled the situation in Greece, things today in Korea would be different, I cannot understand. I do not know how gullible some persons believe the American people to be or how gullible the other Members of the Senate are regarded as being.

The Senator from Arkansas also said that when a war has begun, no one can tell how far it may spread. All of us can agree 100 percent with that statement; and I am wondering why the President of the United States did not give a little thought to that when he, and he alone, sent United States forces into Korea. Today some persons would like to leave the impression that the Korean War is General MacArthur's war. However, Mr. President, the President of the United States sent the American forces into the Korean War. General MacArthur did not do that. The Republican Party did not do that. The United States Senate did not do that. The Congress of the United States did not do that. No individual Senators on the other side of the aisle did that; no individual Senators on this side of the aisle did that. The President of the United States himself, and he alone, sent the American forces and the United Nations forces into Korea.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. For my own information—although I can get it by examining the RECORD—let me ask how the Senator from Indiana spoke about that matter last June. Did he make any protest, or did he agree with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] the chairman of the Republican policy committee, that if he had been consulted, he would have approved our going into Korea?

Mr. CAPEHART. The answer is very simple, and it is this: I was opposed to it then; I am opposed to it now; and if I had my way, I would take our troops out of Korea this very afternoon.

Mr. McMAHON. I am merely asking for information.

Mr. CAPEHART. The record on that matter is very clear.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator from Indiana make a speech, last June, denouncing our going into Korea?

Mr. CAPEHART. I certainly did; in fact, I made dozens of speeches.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall look them up. I thank the Senator very much for the information. I thought he might agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I simply wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Connecticut has entirely misrepresented what I said at the time of the beginning of the Korean war. I never said that if I had been consulted, I would have advised our going into the Korean war. To the contrary, I said that I thought that if the matter had been put up to Congress, Congress probably would have approved that action after it had been taken, but that there was no choice except to back up the troops, once they were there.

I read now from the speech I made at that time:

> It seems to me that the new policy is adopted at an unfortunate time, and involves a very difficult military operation indeed—the defense of Korea. I sincerely hope that our Armed Forces may be successful in Korea. I sincerely hope that the policy thus adopted will not lead to war with Russia. In any event, I believe the general principle of the policy is right—

That is, of preventing aggression—

> and I see no choice except to back up wholeheartedly and with every available resource the men in our Armed Forces who have been moved into Korea.

As a matter of fact, of course, I was not consulted, and I did not say what I would have done had I been consulted

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been listening for several days to speeches by those who are opposed to General MacArthur. I have listened to one such speech this afternoon. In every one of those speeches we are told that we have not a possible chance of winning in Asia, that we have not a possible chance of winning against Chinese Communists, and that we have not a possible chance of winning in Korea. Every one of them tells us that if we follow General MacArthur's policies we shall get into a third world war. The alternative to that, according to each and every speaker, is to sit in Korea and see X number of American boys killed every day. That is the alternative. I have not heard any other alternative.

The able speaker this afternoon, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and other Senators who were questioning him, said that if the Chinese Communists attacked our troops with airplanes, or used submarines, we would then retaliate. It does not quite make sense to me. Suppose they sent into battle a million troops on land, but never used airplanes, and never used submarines; would that be perfectly all right? Would no one object to it? Is that what we are to understand, that it is only in the event of their attacking our armies with airplanes and using submarines against our ships that we shall retaliate and use the arm which is the strongest—the Air Force? Is that what we are to understand? Is that their policy?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me finish my thought, and then I shall yield. Is that what they mean? Is that their policy? Is it their policy that we shall stay in Korea no longer? These are their words, not mine; these are their thoughts, not mine.

(At this point Mr. CAPEHART yielded for discussion of a message received from the President of the United States, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD under the appropriate headline.)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Did the Senator understand it to be the theme of the Senator from Arkansas, as I did,

that if the Russians or the Chinese Communists were to attack us from across the border with airplanes, we would then be justified in making a retaliatory attack across the border?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is exactly what he said.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Did the Senator get any explanation or answer or statement regarding why, if that be the premise of the Senator from Arkansas, of the Senator from Minnesota, and of other Senators who seem to support the doctrine of those opposing General MacArthur, it is wrong for us now to retaliate across the border when the Red Chinese attack us with tanks, with armor, and with foot soldiers from across the border? Did the Senator hear any statement or explanation which would answer that peculiar line of reasoning?

Mr. CAPEHART. I was about to go into that question when the message came from the President, and I was interrupted. I was about to develop that thought. Senators have said we will retaliate and will do what General MacArthur has recommended, if the enemy sends airplanes into Korea to kill American boys, but if they send 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 or 10,000,000 men or 10,000 tanks across the border to kill American boys, that will be perfectly all right, and we will not do anything at all about it. So long as the Chinese Communists stay on the land, it is said, it makes no difference what they do; but if they get up in the air—and I can well understand, of course, why some of our friends on the other side would talk about getting up in the air, because they are always up in the air—if they get up in the air and attack us, then we are going to retaliate; and we will retaliate also, if they attack us with submarines. What is the difference? What are they thinking about?

There was another very noticeable thing in the speech of the able Senator from Arkansas, namely, that he talked about world war III being precipitated by firebrands. He talked about someone doing what Napoleon once did and what the Kaiser once did, and about our becoming an imperialistic nation; but he wants to stop all that sort of thing.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate certain activities in which this Nation has participated during the past 3 years which might possibly provoke war, possibly lead to war. I refer to military aid to Greece, military aid to Turkey, the Atlantic Pact, military aid to Europe, the Korean war, the sending of General Eisenhower to Europe, and the spending of billions and billions and billions of dollars at the moment for national defense. Those are things those on the other side of the aisle, the opposition, have recommended. They were not recommended by the Republicans; they were not recommended by MacArthur; they were recommended by those on the other side of the aisle who would now accuse the great American, the great general, of trying to start world war III.

For some unknown reason, they seem to wish to think that the American people are so gullible that they do not know that we now have a war in Korea. They keep talking about keeping out of war, and about preserving peace, when we today are at war in Korea, and have been for nearly a year. They talk about a limited war. They are in favor of limiting the war to the little Korean peninsula. If that is the only interest they have, if that is all they expect to accomplish; if, as they tell us, it is impossible for us ever to win on the continent of Asia, then, Mr. President, I say let us withdraw our troops from the United Nations forces in Korea, and let us withdraw them immediately. That is one way to avoid world war III.

Referring to the reasoning of Senators on the other side of the aisle, they say that if we permitted General MacArthur to bomb Manchurian bases it might result in starting world war III. They also admit that if the Chinese Communists sent over airplanes and bombed our forces, we would retaliate, and that would start world war III. Then we are told in the next breath that we cannot possibly win on the coast of Asia. Then, in the name of all that is holy, why are we sticking around in Korea? There is no question about it in my mind. They talk about keeping the friendship of our allies, cooperating with them, and keeping them as friends in order that we may use their territory for bases, in France, and in other nations. It is my best judgment that nothing would please the British or the French more than to see the armies withdrawn from Korea. Why are we remaining there and losing 1,500 American lives every week? The way the war is going there at the moment, we may lose three or four or five times that number.

My position on the whole matter, after listening to the debate during the past 10 days, after listening to General MacArthur, after listening to the President of the United States, after listening to Senators on the floor, and after reading newspaper report after newspaper report, is that I must reach the definite conclusion that the best interests of the United States and of the United Nations lie in withdrawing our armies from Korea, and I so recommend, Mr. President.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

During Mr. CAPEHART's address,

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I presume this is a message from the President on the National Production Act, the so-called extension from June 30. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is there any allotted time for the reading of the message, or what is its status?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Indiana would yield at this point——

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not ask the Senator to do that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall conclude within about 3 or 4 or 5 minutes, after which I shall yield the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not make that request. I merely desire to know when the message may be read, because I have a short statement which I want to make after it is read.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall yield the floor in 4 or 5 minutes.

After the conclusion of Mr. CAPEHART's speech,

THE MacARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I realize that there is a message from the President of the United States to be read, but with the indulgence of the Chair and of the Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I assure the Senator that have I no wish to shut off debate. I want Senators to take as much time as they need. I only wanted to know when the message would be read, so that I could follow with a brief statement.

Mr. McMAHON. It will take me approximately 3 minutes to make what I hope will be a contribution to the discussion and debate.

I think it would be well, in view of the colloquy which has occurred, that I quote from the speech of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] entitled "The Korean Crisis," which he delivered 2 days after the outbreak of the situation in Korea, a copy of which the Senator very courteously gave me. He read a paragraph from it. Perhaps I should read it again. He said:

I sincerely hope that the policy thus adopted will not lead to war with Russia. In any event, I believe the general principle of the policy is right, and I see no choice except to back up wholeheartedly and with every available resource the men in our Armed Forces who have been moved into Korea.

In other words, Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio determined that we were right on the principle involved; and he said the only thing to do, if we were right on the principle—and I know the Senator from Ohio is a man of principle—was to back up that principle by sending armies into Korea. He proceeded:

I shall discuss later the question of whether the President is usurping his powers as Commander in Chief. My own opinion is that he is doing so; that there is no legal authority for what he has done. But I may say that if a joint resolution were introduced asking for approval of the use of our Armed Forces already sent to Korea and full support of them in their present venture, I would vote in favor of it.

In other words, the Senator from Ohio, I repeat, because I notice the Senator has come onto the floor, is a man of principle, and, being a man of principle, he recognizes a principle. That is why he said in his speech:

In any event, I believe the general principle of the policy is right, and I see no choice except to back up wholeheartedly and with every available resource the men in our

Armed Forces who have been moved into Korea.

He said further:

There is no legal authority for what he has done. But I may say that if a joint resolution were introduced asking for approval of the use of our Armed Forces already sent to Korea and full support of them in their present venture, I would vote in favor of it.

The Senator from Ohio would vote in favor of what? He would vote in favor of the implementation of the principle which he believed—and I join with him in the belief—was right.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has been perfectly fair. I just gave him a copy of my statement.

Mr. McMAHON. And I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. TAFT. If I had been consulted about it before the President took action I would have advised against doing anything of the kind. I was expressing the opinion of the Republican conference that we should not go into Korea. But, having gone there, and the general principle being right, if a resolution were presented to the Congress I saw no choice except to give the utmost support to the boys who were in Korea. That is what I said, and it is undoubtedly sound.

My doubt about the Korean matter is not as to the morality of it. After all, the general principle of preventing aggression anywhere in the world is right. The question is as to the practicability of having chosen that particular place, in which we are not strong, where we have to exert infinitely more power than the result would have justified, if we had considered it from the beginning. The doubt revolved about the place. In three instances in the speech doubt is expressed as to whether the President had chosen the proper place to make a demonstration against aggression, if it could be successful. As a matter of fact, we find it cannot be successful. The Communists have not only aggressed against us and against the United Nations itself, but they have conquered half of Korea, and they stand there today as evidence of successful aggression. The United Nations is not willing to punish them. It has abandoned the whole moral principle to which I referred. It can no longer punish the aggressor, because the aggressor is too strong to handle, and because it is inconvenient for our allies to go along in any such punishment. That is what I meant when I said I doubted whether the President had chosen the right place or the right circumstances for the effort to enforce the principle of punishing an aggressor.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator for his interpretation of his speech. The speech speaks for itself. The Senator from Ohio did say that the principle under which we went into Korea was right. So far as the aggressor not being punished for his aggression is concerned, the tides of battle may ebb and flow, and even as we are talking that process is going on, on the battlefields of Korea. But if we are to believe the reports which we have received in the past 2 days, the enemy is paying most heavily for his aggression.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator thinks the principle is right, why is he not for an all-out war against Red China to punish the aggressor who has aggressed against the United Nations?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Ohio was not here, and could not be here because of other official duties, to listen to the Senator from Connecticut on the day before yesterday, when, in approximately 2 hours, I expounded very fully my reasons why we should not precipitate an all-out war in the Far East.

Mr. TAFT. Unfortunately, I was not present. I read the Senator's statement, and I intend to answer it on the floor of the Senate at the proper time.

Mr. McMAHON. I am sure the Senator, with his usual generosity, will permit me to engage in a debate with him with reference to his speech and the philosophy on which it is based. I say to the Senator that I look forward to the occasion with a great deal of anticipation and with the hope that he and I can make a contribution to the enlightenment of the American people, which I trust is the purpose of these debates.

Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point what I think is a most unusual comment in an editorial in one of the great newspapers of the country. I refer to the Christian Science Monitor. The editorial is entitled "Victory by Steadfastness," and was published on April 19, 1951. I do not know whether the editorial was written by Mr. Erwin Canham. It reads as though he wrote it, because it has the earmarks of his style. He has one of the finest brains in America. The editorial reads:

We hope both General MacArthur and the American people get a full measure of joy out of his homecoming celebrations. Parades and cheers are better forms of emotional release than the first violent and vindictive reactions to his removal, still echoing unhappily in congressional charges and countercharges of appeasers and war party. But soon Congress and country must get down to calmer consideration and clearer decision on the basic issues of far-eastern policy.

If another Korea should suddenly flare in Iran or Yugoslavia, the desperate disunity of this moment would hamper effective action by the United States. Even to carry on present undertakings an early end is essential to what Senator DUFF has called a tremendous emotional binge. Too many Americans have been, as he says, "taking sides on the basis of personalities involved and not on a calm dispassionate or clear analysis of the over-all problem—namely, the safety of our country." Another Republican Senator, CAIN of Washington, objecting to politics as usual, seeks to clarify policy by introducing two contrary resolutions—one declaring war on China, the other providing for the recall of troops from Korea.

We thoroughly agree with Senator CAIN's desire to get Congress to act on policy, but believe he has misjudged the situation. The choice is not between all-out war on China and the abandonment of Korea. There is a third and middle course between these extremes. It is less simple, not easy for the impatient to accept—

I presume that would include the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]—

but it is positive and capable of achieving genuine victories. It is the policy of continued and vigorous United Nations effort to demonstrate that aggression does not pay.

As applied in Korea, this course provides for holding South Korea and making the Chinese Reds pay heavily for their intervention. It involves the possibility of a long-drawn, indecisive battle there. But it holds also the possibility of peace on terms which will mean essential defeat for the Communists. Militarily it regards Korea as having certain clear advantages so long as Russia does not come in. The peninsula permits extensive use of sea power and restricts the line the UN's numerically inferior forces must hold. And air cover affords tremendous advantage. So long as it is necessary to fight the Chinese, the ground is possibly the most favorable to be found on the continent of Asia.

But this policy regards Korea as only one active sector in a world-wide struggle. It seeks to limit active hostilities so far as possible. It reckons that time is on the side of the rearming free peoples. Moreover, it considers cooperation by the non-Communist nations as essential to eventual victory in the world struggle. It therefore stresses unity and policies on which UN members can unite rather than unilateral action by any nation. It also is based on a conviction that the struggle is first of all one of ideas, with victory resting not on quick military measures but on the slower conquest of hearts and minds.

This third course is not a policy either for appeasers or for a war party. Few Americans really favor either extreme—whatever politicians shout—and we believe that when the three choices are clearly laid before the people they will choose the middle way. It will use war where necessary to halt aggression, but it will not widen war unless forced by the Communists. It seeks peace—by peaceful means if possible—but not by appeasement. It requires not only steadfast courage against foes but steadfast patience with friends. It is a rugged road, but it leads toward the truest victory.

Mr. President, I have taken the trouble to read the editorial into the RECORD at this point in the debate because it seems to be very appropriate to the remarks which were made by the Senator from Indiana. I may add that although I had not seen the editorial until last evening, and the speech on the same subject which I delivered day before yesterday was written and delivered before I had read the editorial, it so truly states my philosophy in a much briefer form than I could state it on the floor of the Senate day before yesterday, that I wanted to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 118)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 4447–4451.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, by request, I introduce a bill to carry out the

message of the President which has just been read.

The bill (S. 1397) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK (by request), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to state that as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am introducing the proposed legislation which carries out the recommendations of the President's message. This is not my bill. I am doing this by request, in order that a bill may be formally placed before the Banking and Currency Committee for consideration prior to the expiration of all of the present authority on June 30.

I want to make it clear, in no uncertain terms, that this consideration means extensive hearings.

Here is a bill which reaches into the stockroom, the production line, and the cash register of every business in this country. It also reaches into the pantry and the family purse of every home in this country.

Hearings will begin on Monday, May 7, at 10:30 a. m.

For the first week, the committee will hear all the Government officials who will be charged with the administration of the proposed act. I am determined that these officials shall make a clear, concise record of exactly what they propose to do with this authority.

For the next 3 weeks the committee will spend every day with representatives of business, labor, agriculture, and consumers.

In this proposed legislation there are certain provisions to which I am opposed, as my record in the past shows clearly.

It will be impossible, of course, during the 3 weeks of hearings to hear all the persons who are requesting an opportunity to testify. However, insofar as it is possible, the committee will listen with interest to representatives of all the major organizations who will speak in behalf of the interests of every segment of the national economy.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill may be printed in the RECORD in the same type that is used for the printing of the President's message, in order to facilitate the reading of both of them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL TO AMEND THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (CITED AS THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1951)

TITLE I. AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Priorities and allocations

Section 101 revises the so-called antihoarding provisions of the Defense Production Act under which the President may designate as scarce those materials, the supply of which is threatened as a result of accumulations beyond the reasonable demands of business or personal needs. The accumulation of such designated materials is unlawful. The proposed amendment would make it clear that although a material has been designated as scarce by the President, he may prescribe conditions and exceptions allowing the maintenance of substantial inventories of such material when special circumstances, such as the need for increased imports of the material, require such action.

Authority to requisition and condemn

Section 102 adds to the Defense Production Act specific authority to acquire real and personal property by condemnation, as well as by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer. The proposed amendment would afford to the Government an expeditious means of acquiring property when the President deemed such action necessary in the interest of the national defense. Authority to take immediate possession upon filing a condemnation petition and to utilize the property prior to approval of title by the Attorney General is provided in the amendment.

Expansion of productive capacity and supply

Section 103 revises section 303 of the Defense Production Act, the section which presently authorizes limited procurement by the Government of certain materials (in some cases with advance payments or involving anticipated loss on resale). It also provides for the installation of equipment in private and Government-owned facilities. The revisions are summarized as follows:

(1) The procurement authority is broadened to include purchases of critical materials generally, in lieu of the present limitation to purchases of raw materials.

(2) The prohibition in the act on procurement of imported agricultural commodities for resale for other than stockpiling or industrial uses is eliminated and the restrictions relating to resale prices of foreign agricultural commodities are removed.

(3) In order to assure the continuance of necessary domestic production under the ceiling limitations imposed by the stabilization program and to aid in assuring stable prices in the face of temporary increases in certain costs of operation, authority is provided to make limited subsidy payments in the case of high-cost domestic producers of materials and processors of agricultural commodities and in those instances where temporary increases in production, distribution or transportation costs threaten to impair maximum production or supply of a material.

(4) Authority for construction and operation by the Government of facilities for the manufacture and marketing of materials needed in the national defense effort is also provided. This authority, which is similar to that given the Defense Plants Corporation in World War II, would enable the Government to build facilities with due consideration being given to strategic location, and to construct plants which private industry does not wish to undertake in view of their lack of utility for peacetime purposes.

(5) The Government is empowered to install processes and improvements in privately owned facilities, in addition to present authority to install Government-owned equipment in such facilities.

(6) In order to carry out the business-type operations which would be undertaken under the provisions of section 303 of the Defense Production Act, authority is provided for the creation of corporations with specific powers generally accorded corporations.

(7) In order to finance the procurement, loan, and production activities deemed necessary in the defense program, the present limitations on authorized funds is removed, and instead provision is made by means of specific appropriations for determination of the amounts to be made available to carry out these functions.

Price and wage stabilization

Section 104 contains the following revisions in title IV of the Defense Production Act which authorizes price and wage controls and provides for their administration:

(1) Section 402 (d) (3) of the act contains the provisions dealing with the imposition of ceilings on agricultural commodities. That section, among other things, provides that a ceiling may not be imposed below the parity price of the agricultural commodity in question. In view of the fluctuation of parity prices, which are now computed on a monthly basis, considerable difficulty is encountered in imposing ceilings with any degree of permanency on agricultural commodities which are selling at prices close to the parity level. Accordingly, in order to facilitate administration of the stabilization program the proposed amendment provides that for price-control purposes the parity price of a commodity shall be the parity price as of the beginning of the marketing season or year for that commodity. This parity price would be fixed for the duration of the marketing season or year, with parity to be recomputed at the beginning of the next marketing season or year. This approach is similar to that followed under the current price-support program in which an annual support price, based on parity, is announced at the beginning of the marketing season for each commodity.

Another change proposed by amendments to section 402 (d) (3) requires that any subsidy payments under title III of the act to agricultural producers be included in the price received by such producers in ascertaining whether the requirement concerning minimum ceilings at the parity level has been met. In addition, the provision dealing with imposition of ceilings on fluid milk in areas not under marketing agreements would be revised to grant the Secretary of Agriculture authority to determine fair ceiling prices for such products taking into account the general factors applied in determining the price in areas under marketing agreements.

(2) The provision of section 402 (e) (v) exempting from price-control authority, the rates charged by common carriers and other public utilities is revised to provide that only common carriers and public utilities whose rates are subject to the control of a public regulatory body are so exempt. In addition, it is provided that notice of proposed increases and consent to intervention by the Government must be given in the case of all proposed increases in charges, in contrast to the present provision whereby such action is required only in cases involving resale of property or services to the public for which application is filed with the appropriate public authority.

(3) There is added to the present requirement in section 404 for consultation with persons substantially affected by orders and regulations, a provision for consultation with representatives of businessmen, farmers, workers, and consumers.

(4) In order to strengthen enforcement of price controls, the proposed amendments in section 104 provide:

(a) An addition to section 405 (a) of the act empowering the President to prescribe the extent to which payments above price ceilings may be disallowed by the Government for tax and other purposes (similar to present provision in section 405 (b) relating to violations of wage stabilization regulations).

(b) Specific provision in section 409 making such remedies as restitution available although a court may not have granted an injunction or restraining order, and giving State courts jurisdiction over civil actions involving violations of price regulations.

(c) Deletion of the $10,000 limitation in section 409 on the amount recoverable from a price violator in excess of the actual amount involved in the violation.

(d) Provision in section 409 for disallowance for tax and other purposes of fines, penalties or compromise sums paid as a result of price violations.

(e) Addition in section 409 of licensing authority as a further means of enforcing price controls. Under this authority duly licensed persons would be given warnings of their price violations and could suffer suspension of licenses, for a period not to exceed 12 months, for failure to heed such warnings. Appropriate judicial review of suspension actions is provided.

Rent stabilization

Section 105 introduces in the Defense Production Act a new title IV-A on rent stabilization. Under this title the President is granted permissive authority to establish maximum rents on housing accommodations and on business accommodations in any area in which he deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives of the act.

Title IV-A provides that for housing accommodations under control at the effective date of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951, the maximum rents shall be the maximum rents in effect on that date. Mandatory provision is made for adjustment in rents to cover increases in operating and maintenance costs for which landlords have not been previously compensated. For all other housing accommodations the maximum rents may be established by the President giving due consideration to rents prevailing on comparable housing accommodations during the May 24 to June 24, 1950, period, but no consideration shall be given to increases in rents after January 25, 1951. The President is given permissive authority to make such individual and general adjustments increasing or decreasing rents as may be necessary to remove hardships or to correct inequities. Provision for furnishing general information and assistance to tenants and small landlords is included in the title. The President, upon his own initiative or upon that of local advisory boards (which are continued in existence or reconstituted, as the case may be, under this title) may provide for decontrol of maximum rents when he deems maintenance of such control no longer necessary to effectuate the purposes of the title.

For business accommodations, the President may establish maximum rents giving due consideration to rents prevailing on such date as he deems appropriate, but in no event earlier than June 24, 1950. Individuals and general adjustments increasing or decreasing maximum rents may be made to remove hardships or to correct inequities.

Provision is made in this title for protest, review and enforcement procedures, similar to those provided in title IV of the Defense Production Act relating to price and wage stabilization, and criminal sanctions are also provided.

The authority of title IV-A is to be administered through the new independent agency (the Economic Stabilization Agency) created under section 403 of the Defense Production Act.

Control of credit

Section 106 revises section 602 (d) (1) of the act so as to extend control of credit on real estate to existing as well as to new construction. In addition, criminal sanctions are made applicable to violations of orders or regulations issued under section 605 of the act dealing with Government real estate loan programs. Finally, specific authority is added to section 605 for the enforcement of conditions and requirements imposed in connection with the relaxation of residential credit controls under that section.

Section 106 also adds to the Defense Production Act a new subtitle B—Commodity Speculation—which amends the Commodity Exchange Act so as to authorize the President, when he deems such action necessary, to prescribe rules and regulations covering margin requirements for speculative purchases or sales on commodity exchanges. Specific provision is made preserving bona fide hedging transactions.

General provisions

Section 107 makes appropriate changes in the table of contents of the Defense Production Act.

Section 108 makes the following changes in title VII of the Defense Production Act:

(1) Revises section 703 (a) of the act to provide authority for the payment of compensation to one person who is the head of an agency created under the Defense Production Act at a rate comparable to the compensation paid heads of executive departments.

(2) Introduces two new provisions authorizing the President (a) to obtain information necessary in evaluating existing legislative and administrative provisions for national defense, and (b) to dispense with any of the statistical work presently required by law where such action is deemed by the President to be in the interest of national defense.

(3) Changes section 706 of the act to broaden the relief a court may grant when the Government seeks to enjoin violations of the act. This would make it clear that there could be restitution even though no injunctive relief is ordered.

(4) Provides that Federal courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction of criminal cases and of civil cases except where otherwise provided in the act regardless of the amount in controversy, and makes a technical correction to assure effective enforcement of the criminal sanctions provided in the act.

(5) Authorizes the President to provide for the printing and distribution, in such number and manner as he deems appropriate, of reports on the actions taken to carry out the objectives of the Defense Production Act.

(6) Extends the Defense Production Act to June 30, 1953.

TITLE II. MISCELLANEOUS

Section 201 repeals the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, but preserves outstanding actions with respect to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred under the act prior to its repeal. In addition, it is provided that the powers, duties and functions of this section shall be administered by the President through the new independent agency created under section 403 of the Defense Production Act. Provision is made for the transfer to that agency of the functions, records, personnel, and unexpended funds, and so forth, of the Office of the Housing Expediter.

Section 202 provides for veterans' preference in the purchase and rental of newly constructed and newly converted housing accommodations. The President is authorized to administer these provisions and may delegate such authority to any officer or agency of the Government. This authority terminates on June 30, 1953, unless terminated earlier by Presidential proclamation or by a concurrent resolution of the Congress. The veterans' preference povisions are similar to those contained in the existing Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which are now being administered by the Housing Expediter.

In addition, section 202 specifically repeals the provisions of certain appropriation acts according priority rights to World War II veterans in the acquisition of materials required for the construction, alteration, or repair of dwellings to be occupied by them. Any priorities on materials or housing facilities granted to World War II veterans under the Veterans Housing Act of 1946 and prior to the enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951 are specifically preserved.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have just listened to the reading of the message the President has sent to Congress. It is extremely unfortunate that the President has made certain of those proposals at the beginning of the planting season. If the President had set out to find the most effective way to reduce crop production in the United States for this year, he could hardly have found a more effective means than the proposal to freeze the parity prices of farm commodities as of a single date and to hold that freeze for a year.

Mr. President, parity can not be frozen; when the parity price is frozen, it ceases to be parity.

What the President is proposing is not to freeze parity, but to destroy the parity formula.

Mr. President, all of us know that the prices of certain farm commodities will vary as much as 100 percent from one part of the year to another. How can we do what the President demands—in other words, freeze the parity prices as of a certain date—and require those prices to be held for 1 year? If the parity prices of agricultural products are frozen out of season, that is unfair to the consumers. If those prices are frozen when they are lowest, certain self-appointed spokesmen for consumers might be happy, but certainly the result would be to bring the American farmers almost to the point of disaster.

Mr. President, it is apparent that those who for years have harbored the hope of making the farmer dependent upon a Government check for his income, are still guiding the hand of the administration. If the parity prices of agricultural products are frozen as of a certain date, the result will be entirely unfair, for we know that the price of labor is bound to rise, we know that the charges for transportation are constantly rising, and we know that the prices of the things farmers have to buy are constantly rising. We know that interest charges already are on the rise. When those price increases occur, if the prices of the things the farmers produce are frozen, so that those prices cannot rise with the rise in the prices of the things farmers have to buy, the result is to put a squeeze on the farmer, so that he has the choice of either going out of business or of calling on the Government for a hand-out to enable him to keep in production.

Mr. President, let me repeat that it is most unfortunate that the President has seen fit to make such an outlandish and unfair proposal at the very beginning of the planting season. The result can only be reduced planting in a year when maximum production is of vital importance.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is is not a fact that the prices of the things produced by farmers never go up until all other prices rise; in other words, that the parity price is based on the prices of the things the farmers have to buy, and that any change in the parity price follows the changes in other prices?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from South Carolina is absolutely correct. Farm

parity prices never lead the way to higher wage or cost levels; they always follow. If the cost of goods and services which the farmer has to buy is kept down, parity prices have to stay down.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, the higher wage levels lead the parity price levels.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me repeat. I am amazed at a proposition of this kind being placed before the Congress at a time when we are trying to induce maximum production of farm crops.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont does not feel, as I do, that there would be no objection whatever to the policy proposal if wages and industrial goods prices were also frozen at present prices, or frozen at least once a year, as would be the case with respect to commodity prices.

Mr. AIKEN. That would be the only fair way to do, although I do not think there is any absolutely fair way of freezing wages, either, or industrial prices or industrial profits. Quite recently the OPS announced the freezing of profits at not to exceed 85 percent of the profits which prevailed for a corporation during the three best years of the period 1946–49. It did not mean that each manufacturer might make up to 85 percent of the profit he made during those years. It meant, and it has been made plain, that he may make up to 85 percent of the average profit made by the industry during the 3 years. It leaves the independent manufacturer in a very unenviable position. He cannot possibly compete with great corporations who have been financed at Government expense and who have virtual access to the United States Treasury in carrying on their work. In regard to the order freezing profits: Although I think we should try to find some means of keeping them from getting out of hand, yet that is going to react to the serious disadvantage of the small-business man.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. This price freeze comes at a time, does it not, when industrial profits are at an all-time high?

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely. On the subject of profits and wages, I think it was pointed out to a House committee by the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday, or possibly day before yesterday, that the farmer's dollar will now buy 50 percent less goods than in 1945, and that the average hourly earnings of the farmer of 69 cents an hour is 9 cents an hour less than the average hourly earnings of the farmer's hired man. Farm labor for the country averages 78 or 79 cents an hour at the present time. The average hourly earnings of the farmer—the man who owns the farm; the man who, with his family, tries to run it—was given by the Secretary as 69 cents an hour, or 6 cents an hour less than the minimum wage allowed to the poorest worker coming under the minimum-wage law.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is now presiding over the Senate, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have received two telegrams, together with a request that they be read on the floor of the Senate. The telegrams relate to Senate bill 984. I now ask unanimous consent that they may be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegrams will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 25, 1951.*

Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Senate Office Building:

The American Federation of Labor offers its objections to the enactment of S. 984 to provide for the recruitment and importation of Mexican workers for agricultural labor in the United States which is now pending before the Senate.

The bill as reported by the committee does not provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of domestic farm labor and is contrary to the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor which was issued March 26, 1951.

The report clearly indicates that the importation of foreign farm labor would be to depress still further the wages and working conditions of American farm labor, a group which is worse off economically than any other in our population.

The A. F. of L. firmly believes that the need for the importation of foreign labor is overemphasized. At the present time there are approximately 150,000 agricultural workers in Puerto Rico unemployed and there are 190,000 partially employed working less than 30 hours per week. However if there is a genuine need for agricultural labor the Puerto Rican and domestic labor market should be fully utilized before importing foreign labor.

We strongly urge that S. 984 in its present form be recommitted back to committee with instructions to provide for the recruitment of American workers wherever they are needed under decent working conditions and adequate wages before any attempt is made to bring in foreign farm labor.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Senate Majority Leader:

National Farmers Union believes S. 984 should be defeated. Bringing in cheap foreign labor without setting decent standards and without first trying to recruit tremendous numbers of unemployed American agricultural workers breaks faith with the American people and their ideals. This supply of cheap foreign labor threatens both the family farm as the basic pattern of American agriculture and the hard earned gains of American labor. This bill violates President Truman's manpower policy declaration of January 17 giving full assurance that "full use of domestic manpower resources will be made before bringing in foreign workers." It ignores careful findings of Sparkman committee report on low-income rural families revealing existence of equivalent of more than 2,500,000 underemployed agricultural workers. Bill was reported out before President's commission on migratory labor gave its report to the President portraying disgraceful conditions of migrant workers and subservience of many Government officials to pressures of big growers. We urge Senate to reject this bill and consider first legislation for the effective utilization of American workers.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President of National Farmers Union.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am sure a great number of Senators would like to hear the distinguished Senator explain this important legislation, and I ask whether he will yield for a quorum call, on condition that he does not lose the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Lehman
Brewster	Hayden	McCarran
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Maybank
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Watkins
Dworshak	Knowland	Welker
Ellender	Langer	Wherry

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. STENNIS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. THYE, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. HILL Mr. FREAR, Mr. ECTON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KEM, Mr. HUNT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KERR, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. IVES, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. TAFT, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEELY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senate will proceed with dispatch to the consideration of the pending measure. I consider its passage to be urgent, since it is necessary that we implement, as soon as possible, the agreement with the Republic of Mexico for the importation of Mexican labor.

Before proceeding with an explanation of the bill, I should like to make a few remarks on the events which led to its introduction. As will be recalled, an agreement was entered into by our Government in 1948 with the Mexican Government for the importation of Mexican labor. The method adopted for importing workers was that upon certification by the United States Employment Service, an employer could go into Mexico and contract for Mexican labor. Under the agreement which was entered into by the employers of this country with the workers in Mexico, the employers paid all the expenses of transportation from the interior of Mexico, as well as the expenses of subsistence and maintenance while in transit to the place of employment.

The agreement entered into in 1948 was renewed in 1949 with certain changes. Under the agreement of 1948, there was a provision whereby the employers in the United States deducted 10 percent from the wages of the Mexicans and then returned the amount withheld at the termination of employment. The reason for the deduction was to make certain that the Mexican laborer would have funds at the end of his employment and at the same time it would provide an incentive for the worker to carry out his part of the contract. When the agreement was renewed in 1949, the Mexican Government did not agree to this 10-percent deduction, and provision for it was eliminated in the agreement entered into in 1949.

Both the 1948 and 1949 agreements contained another provision which made it obligatory on the part of the employer to furnish a bond of $25 to guarantee the return of the Mexican laborer at the termination of the contract. I may say that there was considerable objection on the part of the employers to that provision in the agreements with Mexico.

The Mexican Government gave notice early this year that it would not consent to continuance of the terms and conditions which now prevail, and that unless the Government of the United States took steps to enact laws whereby a guarantee of compliance by the employer with the individual work contract could be made by the Government of the United States, the agreement would be terminated.

I was privileged during last January and in the early part of February to attend a conference in Mexico City as a representative of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. I participated for a week in discussions with officials of our own Government as well as officials of the Mexican Government on the importation program of agricultural workers. We reached certain conclusions under which the Mexican Government was willing to proceed with future agreements with respect to the employment of Mexican labor in the United States. It was understood at the conference that the United States Government is not now authorized to recruit workers in Mexico. It was also understood that our Government cannot now guarantee the performance of any contract entered into between employers in this country and workers in Mexico.

So, Mr. President, in order for the United States to carry out its part of the agreement entered into between the United States and Mexico, it is necessary to enact the legislation now proposed. To my way of thinking, S. 984 will implement the agreement with Mexico in the best interests of both countries.

I have before me the main provisions which have been agreed to in conference between representatives of our Government and representatives of the Mexican Government. I wish to read those provisions which are in the form of recommendations to our respective Governments.

First. The Mexican Government would establish migratory stations at such places in Mexico as might be agreed upon by the Mexican Government and the United States Government.

Second. Recruiting teams consisting of Mexican and United States representatives would then recruit agricultural workers at places near the residences of the workers, and the workers would be brought to the migratory stations by the Mexican Government.

Third. Following screening by the United States immigration officials, the workers would be transported to reception centers in the United States at the expense of the United States Government. Return transportation from the reception center to the migratory station by this Government would also be guaranteed.

Fourth. At the reception center in the United States, the worker would be free to choose the type of agricultural work he desires, and the employer would be free to select the workers whom he desires. Proper supervision of these negotiations by representatives of both governments would be maintained.

Fifth. Transportation from the reception center to the place of employment and return would be at the expense of the employer, as well as subsistence and other guaranties as required by the individual work contract.

In accordance with our understanding at the conference, I introduced Senate bill 984 to provide authority for our Government to carry out its part of the agreement reached with Mexico. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the bill along with other measures dealing with farm labor. During the course of our proceedings, we received extensive information on the farm-labor situation in the United States. Enactment of legislation providing subsidization of domestic farm labor as well as foreign labor was also recommended to us. However, the committee was of the opinion that the immediate legislation should be confined to its original subject, that is, the implementation of the agreement reached with Mexico this year, and that legislation concerned with a domestic farm-labor program and critical farm-labor shortages should be considered separately. In accordance with this decision, the committee is recommending enactment of Senate bill 984 at this time.

The bill would add a new title to the Agricultural Act of 1949. Section 501 of the proposed title 5 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to—

First. Recruit workers in Mexico for temporary agricultural employment in the United States;

Second. Establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the United States for the purpose of receiving and housing them while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the United States;

Third. Provide transportation from recruitment centers in Mexico to such

reception centers and from such reception centers to recruitment centers after termination of employment;

Fourth. Provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses as may be or may become necessary during the transportation period and while such workers are at reception centers;

Fifth. Assist such workers and employers to negotiate contracts of employment; and

Sixth. Guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation.

The section also provides that the Secretary may recruit Mexicans already in the United States for agricultural employment, provided that such workers originally entered the country legally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I interrupt the distinguished Senator at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the recruiting of Mexican citizens who now are in the United States, is the reference to Mexican citizens who are in the United States legally, or is the reference also to Mexican citizens who may be in the United States illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. The reference is only to those who are in the United States and who entered legally.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, there are several amendments proposed by the committee, and I shall discuss them as I proceed, in the hope of saving time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will pardon me for the interruption.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is perfectly all right.

Mr. President, the section to which I have referred further provides that workers recruited under the program will be free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire. Likewise, employers will be free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers.

Section 502 provides that no workers shall be made available to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States to—

First. Indemnify the United States against any loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts.

Second. Reimburse the United States for expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers in amounts not to exceed $20 per worker.

Mr. President, it will be recalled, as I stated a moment ago, that the Mexican Government will establish centers within Mexico, at its own expense, with the idea of selecting the workers who are eligible to enter the United States. From those centers to points established in the United States, our Government will pay the transportation expenses of workers together with subsistence, but these expenses will be recovered from the employer, up to an amount not exceeding the sum of $20 a person.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will permit, I should like to make a brief observation. If in the process of the application of the provisions of the bill the Senator from Louisiana is sponsoring, there happen to be some differences of opinion as between the position of the Senator from Louisiana and the position of some other Senators, let me say that will not be with the idea of opposing the carrying out any agreement which might have been made between the Government of the United States and the government of another country; but some of us think that possibly the committee did not give sufficient attention to American labor which could be available. Perhaps the Senator has that situation in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that when the bill was first introduced we attempted to take care of labor recruitment not only in Mexico but also in all other countries in the Western Hemisphere, and Puerto Rico and Hawaii. Complications arose in that certain exceptions were desired here and there. Finally, inasmuch as the purpose of the entire proposal is to make an agreement with Mexico alone, the committee decided to confine the bill to that country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question, if he will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the committee obtain any information as to the availability of domestic American farm labor throughout the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; we received a good deal of testimony on the subject. I may say to my distinguished friend that we heard testimony not only pertaining to Senate bill 984, but also to the bill introduced by him and to the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I may ask the Senator from Louisiana another question, Did the committee have available the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. That report had not then been issued.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the committee consider that report after the bill had been reported to the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; we did not. However, the committee voted to report the bill prior to release of the Commission's report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when I was interrupted—and I should like to say that I do not mind interruptions—I was outlining to the Senate the principal provisions of the pending measure, and I had discussed section 502 (1) and (2). I continue my analysis of the bill.

Third. Pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the individual work contract, and is apprehended in the United States, an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the place of employment to the reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by any other employers.

Section 503 provides that no workers recruited under this program shall be available for employment in any area unless the director of State employment security for such area has determined and certified that sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and that the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee is familiar with the fact that that language of the bill, which specifies that the workers shall be available, is possibly a little misleading. It is quite true that they are not available at a particular time, but the domestic workers might be available by the time the harvest season arrived. In order to clarify that point and to get a legislative background, I propound this question to the chairman of the committee: Where the clause provides standards for certifying as to the nonavailability of domestic workers before Mexican workers may be admitted, clause (1) of this section requires certification that sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified, are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed. It seems to me that this clause is merely intended to apply a rule of reasonable availability, taking into consideration all the circumstances existing at the time of certification.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. They might not have been there in March, but they might be available at harvesttime, and if they were available by harvesttime, then the Department of Labor could not certify that there was a lack of workers, because the domestic workers would be there: Is not that the chairman's understanding?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the meaning of that language, as I interpret it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the committee have available the report of the study made by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, as prepared and issued under the supervision of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. He used the following language:

> Unemployment among these marginal farmers is depriving the Nation of the equivalent of more than 2,500,000 workers—

Referring to farm workers. Did the committee have that information?

Mr. ELLENDER. The RECORD will speak for itself, but as I recall, that report was thoroughly discussed by a witness who appeared before the committee. I may say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that, in view of the fact that we had before us another bill which covered both foreign and domestic labor, the first question we decided was whether we should deal with foreign labor alone, or both foreign labor and domestic labor, including offshore labor from our Territorial possessions, such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

The committee members present were unanimous in their decision to deal with the Mexican problem solely. The reason for that decision is that we are confronted with a special condition with respect to the importation of labor from Mexico. The Government of Mexico has notified our Government that it will terminate the agreement with respect to the importation of Mexican labor into this country, and that it will not agree to a program comparable to the one under which we import workers from the Bahamas and other islands under British control.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question on that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If there is not available sufficient domestic farm labor, that is, American citizens, to serve the purpose, what would we lose if we did not make an agreement with any foreign nation?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that that is a question for the administrator of this bill, if it shall be enacted, to determine.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have just read, and I think the language is specific, the rules and regulations under which the administrator of this bill must proceed and the conditions that must exist before Mexican labor is permitted to enter the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My reason for asking questions is that I desire that what we do may be agreeable to our neighbors, but I also want to see that American labor is taken care of. Is it not a fact that the only reason for this proposed legislation is that it is necessary in order to get labor for the farmer?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one of the purposes, yes, and the chief source of foreign labor in this hemisphere is Mexico. That has been the case heretofore.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But should not the chief source of supply be American labor?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question and also for a brief comment on the remark of the able Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. All of us are interested in domestic labor and desire to give citizens of the United States the opportunity to work if they are available. We certainly would not want to give a job to a foreigner at the expense of an American citizen. But I must call the attention of the very able Senator from New Mexico to the fact that there is certain work which must be performed in the harvesting of root crops, such as sugar beets and potatoes which involves what is called "stoop" labor. It is the kind of work which is most tedious. If a job of that kind were offered to the average American worker, under present conditions, when factories and the employers in every other field are bidding for workers, he would take the job which was far more pleasant than the stoop labor required in digging potatoes, or topping sugar beets, or thinning sugar beets, or working in the cotton fields.

It is for that reason that those of us who listened to the testimony in the committee hearings came to a realization and a complete understanding of what faces the producer. We should enact some type of law which will permit the bringing in of Mexican labor or offshore labor, the type of labor willing to work in the beet fields, the onion patches, and fields producing all types of root crops, as well as in the cotton fields. If we do not provide that type of worker, many root and fiber crops will go to waste. The members of the committee recognize that something must be done to relieve the situation.

I know that in the past there have been instances of men looking at a stoop-labor job and saying, "I do not want it." If that kind of a man took such employment, it would be only until he could get something more to his liking. The able Senator from New Mexico knows that as well as do the members of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to my good friend from Minnesota that since he has been a Member of the Senate and has been, in a noble way, representing a great State, he has read in the newspapers and in magazines about the suffering of American Indians in New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, and in many other places. Only a few minutes ago the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] submitted an amendment which he intends to call up, providing for the employment of Indians.

There is stoop labor in my State. If the Senator from Minnesota will go to the little town of Bluewater during the carrot season he will see Indian laborers there. If they were good enough to lift the American flag at Iwo Jima and to fight in Korea, they are good enough to receive employment.

Mr. THYE. There can be but one answer to the Senator, and that is that he is entirely correct. We should employ every Indian who is willing to accept employment. In my State there are many splendid Indian citizens. I have been with them in the northern and northwestern sections of the State. They are fine people. We want to employ them. We are glad to employ everyone who wants work. But if then we are in need of still more laborers we must employ offshore labor, or the crops will deteriorate in the fields. That is the whole answer. The bill would permit the employment of Indians, whether they be in Minnesota, in the Dakotas, in New Mexico, or in any other section of the United States. Every citizen who is seeking employment should be employed, but when we exhaust that list and still do not have enough hands to do the work which must be performed, we have got to get labor from offshore.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Then the Senator from Minnesota agrees with the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is not a Member of this body who wants to be kinder to Mexico than does the Senator from New Mexico. Possibly a month ago the Senator from Minnesota saw in the Washington Evening Star a picture of an amputee at Walter Reed Hospital. His legs and his right arm had been removed. He was a Puerto Rican. Eighty thousand Puerto Ricans fought in the Second World War. Some Puerto Ricans are dying in Korea. Every military cemetery throughout the world contains bodies of Puerto Ricans. More than 50 years ago we took them into our country, possibly against their desires at the time. But why should they not have a little preference? If they are not available, and if Indian labor is not available—and I think I can show the Senate before we get through that there is available plenty of American labor of every type and kind—I would be in favor of the importation of labor, as provided for in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say to my good friend from New Mexico that if Indians are available, he need not fear that they will not be given an opportunity to work. As long as domestic labor is available, certification cannot be made for the importation of Mexican labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that it is not the intent of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to discriminate in any way against the employment of American labor, including Indians. But the question arose as to whether the recruitment and employment of available American labor should be included in a bill which would authorize recruitment and arrangements to employ Mexican labor. I am sure the committee felt that when and if available, American labor should be employed. However, there were complications involved in including the recruitment of American labor along with Mexican labor. For instance, Mexican labor is not entitled to any social-security benefits, whereas domestic labor is so entitled.

The State Department recently concluded an agreement with the Mexican Government which would provide for the recruitment of Mexican labor under the supervision of the two Governments. It appeared necessary to provide legislation to put that agreement into effect. Therefore, the committee decided to restrict this bill so as to cover the Mexican situation alone. But, as one member of the committee, I desire to say that I would gladly consider any proposal

which would provide for recruiting and employing American labor.

If there should happen to be a surplus of labor in Maine, which probably will not occur, and if a shortage of labor should occur in southern California, I would not agree to recruit labor in Maine to send to southern California, because it would not make sense, particularly in view of the fact that labor in Maine probably would not like the type of work to be found in southern California. I think we should employ American labor to the fullest extent before looking outside our borders. On the other hand, I feel that the State Department, having made the agreement with the Government of Mexico, should have legislation which would implement the agreement and make it possible to put it into effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to state to my good friend from New Mexico that had the committee held the hearings which would be necessary to carry out what the Senator is now advocating, I doubt if we would be through with the hearings at this time. In other words, in order to be able to continue the employment of Mexican labor, it is absolutely necessary that this bill be enacted. We are now operating under an agreement which was made between our Government and the Mexican Government in August 1949. That agreement will expire on June 30 and a new agreement will not be entered into unless the bill which we are now discussing is enacted.

For that reason the committee thought it wise to restrict the provisions of the bill to Mexico. If the emergency should become worse, I believe we should deal not only with farm labor, but with industrial labor. In such event, it is my considered judgment that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and not the Committee on Agriculture should consider remedial legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to make another observation along the line suggested by the Senator from Louisiana. I am certain that no one is questioning either the integrity of the committee or the motives behind the action taken by the committee. My concern is engendered by the fact that only last week, in the hearings on appropriations for the Department of Labor witnesses of the service which generally deals with such class of labor testified before the subcommittee that very little or nothing at all had been done with reference to ascertaining what the availability of labor was in the United States. It was an astounding statement. For that reason I am concerned about the bill. It is not that I do not want to go along with the fine idea presented by the Senator from Louisiana and the committee, of trying to fulfill our obligations and our commitments to a friendly foreign nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my good friend that, as he well knows, we have been utilizing foreign labor for many years. The committee decided not to change the present method of dealing with labor from other foreign sources, such as Jamaica and Canada.

The Mexican Government, however, has advised that under no conditions would it continue the present program beyond June 30, 1951, and that it would enter into a new agreement only if it included the main provisions of the tentative agreement entered into by our Government and Mexico this year. That is what we are up against. The evidence is ample that we will need Mexican labor, particularly in the cotton fields of California, Texas, Mississippi, Arkansas, and other Southern States. It is imperative that we get that labor at an early date. There is no doubt in my mind that the Mexican Government will not change its views on terminating the present international agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It may be of interest to the Senator from New Mexico to know that the junior Senator from Minnesota intends to offer an amendment which pertains to the point he raised a moment ago. I think the amendment is in accord with the philosophy expressed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. My amendment reads:

On page 4, line 18, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract American workers for such employment at terms and conditions of employment comparable to those offered to foreign workers."

I intend to offer the amendment. In that way the committee bill would expressly state that there must first have been an effort made to recruit American workers.

I also intend to offer an amendment which reads:

On page 4, line 13, after the word "who", insert a comma and the words: "at the prevailing wage rates and other conditions of employment for such area,".

The amendments would provide two additional safeguards.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean the prevailing wage rate of the American worker or of the Mexican worker?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; the American worker.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly I misunderstood the Senator. I was under the impression he said that the conditions to be imposed upon the American laborer would be the conditions under which the foreign laborer was working.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may point out to the Senator from New Mexico that under the terms of the bill, with the many compensations in the form of health services, insurance, and so forth, actually, the Mexican worker may have the opportunity of getting a better deal than the domestic worker in the form of guaranties.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly that is the reason why I am objecting.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say conditions should be comparable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should hate to have an American laborer—and when I say an American I mean an American, regardless of what his background, nationality, or religious belief may be—work for what some of the starving Mexicans work for. I am against that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think after the Senator from New Mexico has had an opportunity to hear a full explanation of the amendments he will be an ardent supporter.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to remind my good friend from New Mexico that the bill specifically provides that after the Mexican laborer is transported to a reception center in the United States he would enter into an agreement with an employer. He can bargain for such working conditions as he desires.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As between——

Mr. ELLENDER. As between an employer in this country and the worker from Mexico. A contract would be entered into between them. I believe the Senator has read recent articles with respect to conditions that exist in Texas and other States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know of them from my own knowledge.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows, I am sure, the reason these conditions exist.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. The difficulty has been that many Mexicans came into the United States illegally. They came across the Rio Grande. When they went to a farm to work, the farmer said to them, "Now, listen, unless you work for certain wages or under certain conditions, I will report you and you will have to return to Mexico."

Mr. CHAVEZ. That has happened.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. This bill would discourage that practice. The bill would make it obligatory that contracts entered into in the future between American employers and Mexican laborers shall be with Mexican nationals who enter this country legally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know the Senator wants to do the right thing. However, in what position does he think a poor starving Mexican laborer would be in making a contract with the owner of 2,000 acres of cotton in Dona Ana County, N. Mex.?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a provision in the bill under which associations of employers could employ a group of Mexican laborers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In other words, it provides for fair-employment practices?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be up to the two groups. In other words, what we have tried to do is to make it possible for Mexican laborers to be employed in groups and for them to select employers for whom they desire to work and to select the kind of work they desire to perform. That is one of the provisions in the bill. As I have stated, it is in accord with the understanding which was reached between our Government and the Government of Mexico in Mexico City during the latter part of January and early part of February of this year.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does not the agreement, considered with the bill, require

that any such foreign labor be paid going wages within the area, in addition to having the right which comes from competitive bidding for services?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I so stated in my opening remarks.

Mr. President, section 504 provides that workers recruited in Mexico shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws, and that no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment. Section 504 also provides that workers already in the country and who otherwise would be eligible for admission to the United States may remain to accept agricultural employment pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Should not the word "legally" also be used in that same section? They must be here legally before they can remain.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] have proposed such amendments. The committee agreed to an amendment in section 501 to the effect that the Mexican laborer must have entered this country legally in order to be eligible for employment.

Mr. President, section 505 exempts agricultural workers imported from Mexico from social security benefits and taxes, and withholding of, or payment of, such taxes by the employers of such workers. The section further provides that such workers shall not be subject to the head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917.

Section 506 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to utilize the facilities and services of other Federal and State agencies as may be agreed upon, to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the importation of agricultural workers from Mexico.

Section 507, as amended, defines the agricultural employment for which workers can be recruited as that covered by section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended. Section 507 also defines "employer" to include an association or group of employers.

In other words, those two references to the Fair Labor Standards Act and to the Internal Revenue Code provisions, make the bill apply strictly to agricultural labor. As may be recalled, and as I shall indicate in a moment, efforts were made to enlarge the definition to include the canning of agricultural commodities, the ginning and compressing of cotton, and other related work. As I shall show in a few moments the committee deemed it advisable to delete such provisions from the bill.

Section 508 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Attorney General to permit the importation of workers from any other country for agricultural employment, pursuant to the immigration laws, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for employment on farms.

Section 509 provides that the program of importing foreign agricultural workers, as authorized by the act, shall terminate December 31, 1952.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would it not have been better if the committee had considered the bill—which I know is important—from the long-range standpoint? Is not this merely a temporary makeshift idea to try to help out during one season?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not. The sole purpose is to deal with the Mexican problem. We have been importing labor from Mexico, as the Senator knows, for many years. Because of the seriousness of the wetback problem, the Mexican Government has decided that in the future, unless legislation of the character we are now proposing is enacted, no more Mexican labor will be contracted for work in this country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If that is the case, why limit the bill to such a short period of time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would be willing to make the time longer, but the committee agreed to limit the legislation to the period indicated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is the expiration date?

Mr. ELLENDER. December 31, 1952.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What is the reason for the committee amendment in section 508, providing that nothing in this act shall be construed——

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my next point. I shall reach that in a moment.

Mr. CASE. My purpose in raising the question is this: Apparently there is some reason for saying that nothing in this act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Attorney General under the general immigration laws. I was wondering whether the same logic would also suggest that we should say that it is not intended to interfere with the operation of the Displaced Persons Act, or to limit the authority of the Displaced Persons Commission to bring displaced persons here for agricultural employment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Personally I do not believe that such language is necessary, but it does no harm. There were some who thought that unless we put language of that character in the bill it might suggest to the Attorney General or to some other department of Government that it was not intended to continue the method now in vogue for recruiting labor on a temporary basis from Canada, from the Bahamas, and from other offshore islands under the British flag.

Mr. CASE. Of course, the distinguished Senator is familiar with the fact that the law relating to the Displaced Persons Commission definitely contemplates the entry of certain persons for agricultural employment. The same logic which would say that we should guard this bill against misinterpretation in relation to the general immigration laws and the authority of the Attorney General would also suggest that we should say that it is not intended to interfere with the operation of the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Louisiana to say that Senate bill 984 provides that the employer shall pay the prevailing rate of wages in the area of employment to laborers coming from Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not specifically provided. However, as I indicated a while ago during the course of my argument, the contract is to be made between the employer and the Mexican laborer himself. The contract is not between government and government but it is between employer and employee.

From the evidence which I heard in Mexico City, the Mexican laborer who comes into the United States legally usually sees to it that he gets as much as anyone else obtains at the place where he works. As a matter of fact, those are among the first questions asked—"What kind of work have you? How much are you going to pay me? How much do you pay others?" Certainly, in entering into contracts with employers, they have insisted upon receiving at least what the employers pay other employees in the particular locality.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator. I misunderstood him. I thought he had stated that that provision was actually contained in the bill itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend from New York that I have before me a sample individual work contract. It reads in part as follows:

> 4. Payment of wages. The employer shall pay the worker the prevailing wage rate paid to domestic agricultural workers for similar work, and in the manner paid within the area of employment, or the rate specified on the last page of this contract, whichever is the greater. Where higher wages are paid for specialized tasks, such as the operation of vehicles or machinery, Mexican workers shall be paid such wages while assigned to such tasks.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I made inquiry of the Senator a few moments ago with reference to this matter. At that time I asked him whether or not that was a requirement found in the composite bill, the discussions with the Mexican Government, and the requirements of the Mexican Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry. I may have misunderstood my distinguished friend's question.

Mr. CORDON. I thought it was understood; and I was in entire agreement with the answer. Are those the facts?

Mr. ELLENDER. Those are the facts.

Mr. CORDON. Those are the three operations to cover the requirement for payment of going wages in the area where the Mexican national is to be employed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The contract requires that the prevailing wage rates in the area be the minimum wage and in turn the bill guarantees payment by the producer of wages he contracted to pay.

Mr. CORDON. If that sort of an agreement is not signed, then the Mexican Government is not agreeable to its citizens coming to the United States to be employed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one of the conditions to be imposed.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I ask the indulgence of the Senate to discuss the amendments recommended by the committee. It will be noted that in section 501, on page 1, line 9, we struck from the bill the provision which deals with other countries. The purpose of that amendment is simply to make the bill applicable only to the Republic of Mexico. It eliminates all other countries in the Western Hemisphere, as well as Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

In the same section, on page 2, lines 5 and 6, will be found an amendment which inserts the words "under legal entry" after the words "United States." That amendment provides that Mexicans already in the United States can be recruited under this program only if they entered the country legally. This amendment would prevent the utilization of any wet backs in the program and would discourage such illegal immigration.

The third committee amendment is on page 3, in section 502, beginning in line 15. It provides that the employer shall reimburse the United States for expenses incurred by the Government only for transportation and subsistence of workers in amounts not to exceed $20 per worker, instead of requiring reimbursement for administrative costs of recruiting as well as transportation and subsistence payments. It was the thought of some members of the committee that we should make certain that the costs of the regularly paid employees of the Government should not be included; therefore, this particular portion of the bill was amended so as to make provision for reimbursement for "essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department of agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed $20 per worker."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand, this requirement of the employer applies only to such sums as have been spent by the United States, in addition to the regular expenses of the Labor Department in connection with this entire enterprise.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I may state to my good friend from Utah that in the committee some members wanted to reduce that sum from $20 to $10, but we obtained estimates from the Department of Labor that the cost of this service might be more than $20. It may be as much as $35 if it is necessary to transport them an average of 500 miles. But what we are trying to do is to make the employer bear practically all the expenses of this operation. Under the agreements now existing, as I have heretofore stated, the employer must go into Mexico to enter into his contract. He has to travel to Monterrey or other cities within the Republic of Mexico, and there contract for his workers and transport them to the place of employment.

The Mexican Government was violently opposed to that procedure for this reason. Mexico is now engaged in developing her resources on an extensive scale. Her mines are being worked, and agriculture is on the boom. Most of the labor that was recruited by Texas and other States came from the northern part of Mexico. The Mexican Government is anxious that some of the laborers away from the border be utilized, those around Mexico City, for example. There may be quite a number of Mexicans out of employment there. As I have pointed out, the Mexican Government has gone so far as to agree to establish recruitment centers within the Republic of Mexico and to pay the cost of transporting laborers to those centers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Recruiting.

Mr. ELLENDER. Recruitment centers, that is correct. And the Mexican Government is not only to pay for the cost of transportation to the recruiting centers, but also is to pay for the food and utilities necessary to take care of the laborers until they are examined by our immigration officials, by health officials, and until it has been decided that the applicants are eligible under our laws to work in the United States. Our Government agrees to furnish the transportation from those centers to a reception center established on the border in the United States, but it can charge the employer up to $20 per worker for that service.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. At what point do the Mexican laborers enter into the agreement? In Mexico, or at the receiving center in our country?

Mr. ELLENDER. At the reception center in our country.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, no contractor or employer will have to go into Mexico in the future to make a contract?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That was one of the objections made by employers in the United States. They had to go into Mexico, and some of them had to go quite far inland in order to obtain workers. In some cases the trip was rather costly. They also had a little difficulty, as I was informed, with some of the officials in obtaining the number of workers they desired, and in making other necessary arrangements. It was the desire of the employers of this country to try to arrange for a method by which the contracts could be entered into in the United States. For this reason we have provided under the bill that reception centers be established in the United States near the border where employers will enter into contracts with Mexican workers.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. If the contracts are entered into there, I take it the Government assumes no further responsibility, so far as the worker is concerned, in getting him to the job or seeing that he actually remains on the job when he gets to it?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct in that the Government does not guarantee compliance by the worker with the individual work contract.

Mr. WATKINS. Even though the man may work only 1 day, the employer will be responsible for paying up to $20?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Irrespective of the fact that he works only 1 day?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The employer not only assumes the cost up to $20 per capita, as imposed by the bill, but all expenses from the center in the United States to the place of employment.

Mr. WATKINS. That is, provided the employees are taken at the border. Of course, I understand most of the farmers in my State, in Idaho, Colorado, and other States north of New Mexico and Arizona, and probably Texas, are very much dissatisfied with the provision placing the reception centers at the border. They want them located at some central place in their own State. They think the provision is distinctly unfair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. The committee gave consideration to that matter and decided unanimously not to include such a provision.

Mr. WATKINS. What were the reasons?

Mr. ELLENDER. The proposal for local centers was made by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who was desirous of having a center established in Washington. If we were to do that, we would have to establish other centers in, let us say, Memphis, Tenn., or in Colorado, Minnesota, and elsewhere in the United States; and that would involve a tremendous cost which would have to be borne by the Federal Government.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me ask this question in connection with that point, please: Is there any practical situation which would require the establishment of a center at Memphis, Tenn., and the establishment of a center in Minnesota? I understand that very few of the Mexican laborers will be needed in States other than the States near the Mexican border. I have inquired of other Senators about that, and I cannot find that there will be need for Mexican laborers at other points in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Utah is misinformed

if he believes that only Washington and Oregon and Utah desire local centers. If we establish a reception center in the Northwest we shall have to do the same thing in respect to other States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why not?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes, why not—in the first place?

But in the second place, this Mexican labor will not be made available to Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and other States removed from the border, because the farmers in those States simply cannot stand the extra cost. Therefore, they will simply have to forget about using such labor. I have already heard from the farm bureau in my State that the farmers there cannot stand the added expense, and thus such Mexican labor will be of no use to them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Representatives of the Farm Bureau appeared before the committee and took the position that under no circumstances or condition did they want or expect a subsidy from the Federal Government in connection with this matter. The representatives of the Farm Bureau were unanimous in that regard. I do not know of any farm organization, except the Farmers Union, as I recall, which asked that the Federal Government underwrite an expensive farm labor program.

I wish to say to my distinguished friends that the committee took the position that the farmers should and, judging from the evidence, they are willing in most instances, to pay these expenses, rather than to place the burden on the Federal Government.

According to some of the witnesses at the hearings, the Government should not only establish reception centers in various parts of the country but it should also provide for transportation of domestic as well as foreign workers. I produced evidence to show that during World War II the Government spent more than $30,000,000 a year in order to take care of these centers.

Mr. WATKINS. But during World War II all kinds of subsidies were paid—to almost everyone. That was done because of the tremendous desire for the production of food.

Today there is a similar desire. However, if the cost of this labor is made prohibitive, it will not be used, and thus food will not be produced on farms which otherwise would use this labor. I can assure the Senator of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would say that at the present time the farmers, in general, are in good financial condition. Inasmuch as the great majority of the farmers have expressed a willingness to pay for the transportation and other costs of the workers covered by this bill, it is obvious that they do not want any subsidy in that connection, and are willing to have this bill enacted in the form in which it has been reported by the committee.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I happen to know, for instance, that the row-crop farmers, the sugar-beet farmers, the fruit growers, and other farmers in Utah and in the surrounding States who use large numbers of Mexican laborers are not in such a very prosperous condition. In the first place, the farmers in most of those areas have not had a crop of fruit for 2 years. Today their position is such that if they were actually to give away, free, without cost, the fruit to the buyers, and say to them, "Here is fruit; we give it to you and we will pay for the packaging of it" the cost of the fruit still would be prohibitive because of the freight rates and other costs involved, which in the end would make the fruit too expensive for the consumers to use.

Therefore, Mr. President, anything that is done to add to the present burden of those farmers, with the result that they will be put in a position in which they cannot compete with the growers in Texas and other States located at or near the border, will certainly be to the serious disadvantage of the farmers of whom I am speaking, and will also be to the serious disadvantage of the United States as a whole.

Certainly not all the farmers in the United States are in good condition today; in fact, many of them are decidedly not in good condition.

Mr. ELLENDER. I said that I was speaking of farmers generally.

Mr. WATKINS. In the areas where wheat is grown and where subsidies are paid in that connection, the farmers may be in good condition today; but no fruit farmer has received a subsidy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me state to my friend that with respect to the establishment of reception centers, Mr. Baird of Indianola, Miss., was one of the witnesses who testified. He represented the agricultural labor users of the United States at the hearings. He was opposed to the establishment of centers other than on the Mexican border. Many joined him in saying, "If you establish recruitment centers in other areas of the country, we shall want some established in Mississippi, Tennessee, Florida, and other States." That is the situation with which the committee was confronted.

Of course, if the distinguished Senator wants to subsidize this program by having the Federal Government pay all the expenses involved, he will have an opportunity, I suppose, to vote to have that done, because I understand that some amendments to that effect will be offered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am not asking for a lot of subsidies; but if is desired to have sufficient amounts of food produced, sufficient labor will have to be made available to the farmers on a basis on which they can use it.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what we are attempting to do.

Mr. WATKINS. If the cost of the labor is prohibitive, it will be necessary for us to notify the farmers who in the past have been dependent on Mexican labor, "Just forget all about it; there is no use in spraying your fruit trees or in planting row crops," because those farmers simply cannot bear any extra expense. Many of them have lost heavily on their row crops in the past 2 years, anyway.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me point out to the distinguished Senator from Utah that for the past 3 or 4 years I have heard no complaints; the farmers have been paying all these expenses for the transportation of Mexican laborers from their homes to the places of employment in the United States. Under present legislation the farmers have had to do that recruiting themselves, and at their own expense.

In this bill we provide that the recruitment will be done by the Federal Government, and the employer will go to the centers established by the United States, to do the contracting.

As I have said, the method provided in the bill in that connection is not at all different from the method which has been employed in the past in the case of those expenses, because in the past the farmers who have employed that labor have borne all the expenses.

This bill seeks to make certain that the bulk of the cost will be borne by the employers who need the Mexican labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In view of what the Senator from Louisiana has just said, does not he agree that the employers who are within 5 minutes' distance of the Mexican labor will be the only beneficiaries of this measure? Should not legislation be beneficial to the entire United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my good friend that that has not been the case in the past.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I beg to differ with the able Senator; it has been the case in the past.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have evidence to show that farmers came from Mississippi and Arkansas and Tennessee and many other States, into Mexico, where they recruited labor, bringing the labor to their own farms, and paying all the expenses to and from Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But is it not true that along the Mexican border, from Brownsville, Tex., on the Gulf of Mexico, through New Mexico and Arizona, and to the Pacific in California, there will be an advantage?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It takes only about 3 hours for a worker to come from Juarez, Mexico, to New Mexico.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, that is an advantage created by nature. Those people reside near the Mexican border.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Should the law be designed to protect only those who are protected by nature? Should we not have a general law which will protect all our citizens?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say that, as the Senator knows, we do not try to do that in other legislation. Certain States, as the Senator knows, may possess advantages over certain other States, yet all their citizens live under the same law.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. A few moments ago the Senator from Louisiana referred to the fact that during World War II the

Federal Government aided farmers by paying the transportation costs of farm workers. Is it not also true that during the years of World War II the Federal Government paid for the transportation of industrial workers from the east coast and from various other sections of the country to the west coast, where they were to work in the shipyards, thereby, and to that extent, subsidizing those industries? And does that not show in effect that agriculture was not receiving any particular consideration from the Government, or consideration which was not likewise extended to other industries?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct as to that. As I indicated a while ago, I am in agreement with my good friend from New Mexico that it may be that this problem should be studied further. It may be necessary, if conditions abroad do not improve, to do again the very thing that was done before; but I beseech my good friends here not to delay the passage of the pending bill by trying to incorporate in it a program which is entirely different from the one we are now debating. I urge that we pass the bill with a view to continuing the cordial relationship which now exists between our country and the Republic of Mexico. If the pending bill is not passed it will simply mean that the only way by which Mexican labor may come into this country will be for the Mexican workers to swim the Rio Grande. That, too, would be very distasteful to the Mexican people and to the Mexican Government. They urge that a bill of the kind which is now before the Senate be enacted. That is why I am pleading with Senators not to offer amendments to the bill which would remove it from the purview of the tentative agreement which was made between our Government and the Republic of Mexico. I have endeavored to have the bill drafted with that in view. We worked quite a long time in order to get the bill to conform as nearly as possible to the provisions of the agreement which was reached in Mexico City.

I took it upon myself to cooperate, so far as possible, with the House committee which will handle similar legislation in the House. Representative POAGE, from Texas, was in Mexico City when I was there and is familiar with all that transpired at the conferences. We discussed the problem before I introduced the pending bill, and before he introduced the bill in the House, in order that the two bills might be as nearly alike as possible, with a view to carrying out the agreements which were entered into in Mexico City.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Why should we support a measure which is going to be absolutely useless to our people? If the Senator will recall, our people bear the extra expense. Mind you, they must take care of the $20 a head for each person they get. Whether he works a day or not, they must do that anyway. In addition, they are required to pay his transportation to and from the border.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator has often voted in the Senate for bills which did not affect his State very greatly. I cite the fact that, for example, cotton is not grown in Idaho or in other Northern States, yet Senators from those States join with us in providing legislation for the benefit of the cotton farmer.

Mr. WATKINS. At the same time, the Senator was voting to protect the Idaho potato grower.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator did not overlook that.

Mr. ELLENDER. We cannot possibly have a legislative pattern here which will meet the requirements of all the States. As a good lawyer, the Senator understands that. What we are trying to do, I repeat, is to enact legislation which will conform as nearly as possible to the agreement reached between Mexico and our Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether the Senator will yield for a question along this very line.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think all Senators will agree that it is very laudable to try to observe our agreements with a foreign country, but in carrying out the agreement with Mexico, for example, and in trying to comply with it, does not the Senator agree with me that it seems to be consistent, at the same time, not to do anything which would be detrimental to our own citizens, whether they be laborers or whether they be farmers?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am unable to agree with the Senator that we are doing anything detrimental to our own citizens. I, for one, would not stand for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator agrees with me, does he not, that the benefits in this instance will accrue to those along the Mexican border, and will not accrue to the citizens of Idaho, for example?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I thought the Senator had in mind our domestic workers, not the employers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I refer to both the workers and the employers. They are all citizens. In this instance, so far as benefits which are to be derived by the employers are concerned, those benefits will accrue principally to employers along the Mexican border, will they not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That has not been the case, as I pointed out. The evidence is contrary to that statement. There were any number of farmers from Idaho, Minnesota, and Oregon, for example, who were employing Mexican labor, and who, under the agreement which is now in existence, paid all transportation and other incidental expenses.

Mr. WATKINS. They did not have to pay the Government in addition to that, did they?

Mr. ELLENDER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. WATKINS. They did not have to pay the Government $20 a head in addition to that, did they?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; but they had to go into Mexico to get their labor. The contemplation is that the workers will be brought to the border, and the $20 charge is to offset the average cost to the Government of transporting the Mexican laborers to the border and return.

Mr. WATKINS. I may point out to the Senator that part of what he has said may actually be true in certain of the sugar-beet growing sections, because the sugar companies, in order to obtain the contracts with workers, have had to assume a great deal of that cost. They have made the contracts in Mexico, and they have brought the laborers into the United States, where they have permitted the farmers to use them on the farms. They were later used at the factories, when the runs were on, after most of the beets had been harvested.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. That, of course, is not directly an expense to the farmer. We have many other farmers, in addition to the sugar-beet farmers, who employ this labor. It is for those people that I am speaking. For instance, in my State there are large numbers of celery growers, who employ a large amount of the kind of help affected by the bill. Also there are the fruit growers and some of the potato growers, and any number of small-farm operators who use this help and are absolutely required to have it. I thought the legislation was designed to help them, as well as to help the people in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. I thought it was going to help them all, but if it is going to make it impossible for us to use that help, it would put us at a competitive disadvantage. Shipping those people into the United States, and keeping them going from place to place, runs into a great deal of money. As I pointed out, many times they stay but a day or two, and then they get other jobs; and they continue that practice. If it is not going to do any good, I do not think I shall vote for what is said to be a general bill to help people of that type; and if it only helps two or three States, I certainly am not going to vote for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I dislike to disagree with my good friend. The RECORD shows that last year there were 67,421 Mexican laborers under contract. In Arizona there were some 18,000; in Arkansas, there were 5,927; in California, 7,889; in Colorado, 812; in Idaho, 187; in Mississippi, 1,844; in New Mexico, 12,918; in Texas, 29,105.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator have the figures for Utah?

Mr. ELLENDER. None were contracted for employment in Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Last year?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right.

Mr. WATKINS. There was no fruit crop, for one reason. It was frozen out.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is possibly the reason.

Mr. WATKINS. The situation which we are now facing in Utah is different from the situation which existed a year ago. There were some of our farm boys left on the farm, but now they are being taken into the service. Many boys have been taken from the farms, and there is a desperate situation. We shall probably have to call on foreign labor this year to take care of the fruit crop, the sugar-beet crop, and other crops which are coming along. For that reason, I am making a plea to the Senate to make this bill workable so that we can get a

sufficient supply of labor to assure adequate provision of food for the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator is willing to undertake at this time to establish a subsidy program, that is for him to decide. But the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry discussed the question at several meetings——

Mr. WATKINS. Why not fix the amount the Government is to pay, and then let Texas and all the rest of the States involved help take care of the cost?

Mr. ELLENDER. What the committee tried to do was to let the burden be carried by the farmers and not by the Federal Government. That is how it has been done in the past.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me point out how these matters are handled in irrigation States. In Utah there is a canal 25 miles in length. Obviously, the man at the head of the canal takes his water out and has very little expense. If he were required to pay only the expense of getting the water to him, it would be a very easy situation. What we do is to require every man to pay his share of the bill. All pay on substantially the same basis. The man who is 25 miles away pays the same assessment as does the man at the head of the canal. If the canal is too long, it is possibly cut into two divisions, but the man at the upper end knows he must help carry the whole burden, so they will all be on the same competitive basis. It seems to me that is a fair principle. We are used to that in the far West.

Mr. ELLENDER. I imagine that if the principle advocated by my distinguished friend were carried out, we would hear a lot of squawking from the farmers. Some of this labor comes from Puerto Rico and the Bahamas.

Mr. WATKINS. That does not apply to this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. But if we are to be fair, we must take care of the States on the Atlantic coast which now contract for labor from Puerto Rico, the Bahamas, Jamaica, and Canada.

Mr. WATKINS. The cost of water transportation, and similar costs, would about even up the expenses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Today employers who need workers in Florida, in New Jersey, or, in fact, in any of the Atlantic States, deal directly with workers from the Bahamas, Jamaica, and Puerto Rico. At present they pay for part of the cost of recruitment and the expense of transportation and the worker pays the remaining part.

Mr. WATKINS. Is that for seasonal work, such as farm operation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. What the employers do in States such as Florida or any other of the Atlantic Coast States is to go to the United States Employment Service and obtain a certificate showing that labor is not available to carry on the necessary farm work. With that certification they go to foreign governments and a contract is entered into between the employers in this country and workers in the Bahamas or in Jamaica, for illustration. Bonds are posted by the employer, and the worker then comes to this country for seasonal employment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the RECORD should show that farmers on the eastern seaboard who have been accustomed to using labor from the islands offshore do not ask to be included in this bill. They are perfectly satisfied with the arrangement which they have, and they do not want any Government supervision. They make their own arrangements and are happy with them. They said they were not concerned about being included in the proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. But I am sure the Senator is aware that if we should decide to subsidize the transportation of Mexican labor or domestic labor, we would be asked to subsidize the transportation of labor from the islands to this country. If we ever start that, there is no telling where it will end.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. What was done in that regard during World War II?

Mr. ELLENDER. There was an extensive subsidization program at that time. If the Senate is desirous of entering into a subsidization program, it is for the Senate to decide.

Mr. WATKINS. What did the employers on the Atlantic seaboard do?

Mr. ELLENDER. They got the necessary help. The Senator from Iowa has suggested that they are desirous of being excluded from the provisions of the bill because of the friendly relationship they have with the governments of Jamaica, Puerto Rico, and the Bahamas. They do not want the situation disturbed, and they ask to be excluded from the bill, as the Senator just stated. But I am saying that if the Senate should decide to subsidize the transportation of Mexican and domestic labor, they will want to come under the terms of the bill. And if the employers will not want it, you can be sure the representatives of the workers will demand inclusion.

Mr. WATKINS. In most of the Mountain States we would not be asking for any help if the Government would let us alone. There has got to be some equalization somewhere in order to live.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it were not for the emergency——

Mr. WATKINS. And that emergency is almost perpetual.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it were not for the emergency, we would not have to deal with this bill at this time. As I have stated, the Mexican Government will terminate the present agreement June 30 and it is imperative that some program of importing agricultural workers from Mexico be continued in order to supply necessary farm labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator says that if Mexican labor were subsidized, possibly labor from Jamaica would ask for the same thing. I do not consider Puerto Rican labor in the same situation with Mexican or Jamaican labor. The way to correct the situation, so as not to subsidize, is to utilize all our American labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. The pending bill provides that we shall have to use American labor before we can import Mexican labor. I hope the bill, if it is enacted, will be administered to that end.

Mr. President, the fourth amendment section 502, page 4, beginning on line 2, provides that in the case of a worker leaving his place of employment before termination of the contract period, the employer would pay an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost of returning other workers from the place of employment to the reception center only if the worker were apprehended within the United States. The bill as introduced would have required such reimbursement regardless of whether the worker was apprehended or not. In addition, the language has been clarified to avoid the interpretation that the employer would have to pay the costs of apprehension.

The committee received testimony to the effect that under the present program, some of the bonds executed by employers have been forfeited notwithstanding the fact that the Mexican laborers involved had returned voluntarily to the Republic of Mexico.

The fifth amendment, dealing with section 504, at page 4, beginning on line 23, provides that Mexicans already in the United States and eligible for recruitment can be recontracted under the program pursuant to arrangements between the United States and Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, it is understood that the word "legal" is in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. "Under legal entry." That is correct. Two amendments to that effect are pending. One was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The other amendment was submitted by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Personally I do not believe that it is necessary to amend the bill in that respect, for the reason that in order for such Mexicans to remain in the country it would be necessary to obtain the consent of the Mexican Government. I am positive that with respect to Mexican labor which came into the country illegally, the consent of the Mexican Government could not be obtained. However, I am willing to accept an amendment to make it certain that only those who entered legally can be recontracted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from Louisiana think that in order to carry out the purposes of the bill and in order to protect a man who enters legally and is recruited for work, a provision should be written into the bill which would compel the Immigration Bureau to deport the persons who were in the country illegally, because they would be competing against those who were in the country legally?

Mr. ELLENDER. The records show that during last year possibly more than a million Mexicans entered the United

States illegally. More than 500,000 of them were returned to Mexico by the Immigration Service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That leaves 500,000 to compete with the ones who had come in legally.

Mr. ELLENDER. What we are trying to do is to provide that an employer may not employ any Mexican laborer who did not enter the country legally. If there is any other language which the Senator can suggest in order to make the provision stronger, I would cheerfully consider it. As I pointed out a little while ago, the bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall "recruit such workers—including any such workers temporarily in the United States under legal entry."

The amendment which I have been discussing would be at page 4 in section 504. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has suggested that the word "already" be stricken and the word "legally" be inserted. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has suggested that the language be "by virtue of legal entry."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I prefer the language suggested by the Senator from Minnesota to that suggested by the Senator from New Mexico. I think it would make it plainer, and it would be more in accord with the language which we have included in section 501 on page 2.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We discussed the subject, and we both have the same objective. My amendment is basically a refining amendment, and its purpose is to tighten up the language.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I think I convinced an official of the Department of Labor that such language would be superfluous, because as to Mexican employees it would be necessary to obtain the consent of the Mexican Government. Certainly the Mexican Government would not consent to the employment of Mexicans who had entered the United States illegally. That is the very thing that the Mexican Government is fighting; they are fighting against the wetback problem. That is why they are insistent on making it positive and certain that under no conditions shall employers be permitted to hire Mexicans who entered the United States illegally.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know what the Senator's objectives are. It was my purpose, in offering the amendment, to tighten up the provisions and to tie down the language so that there could be no doubt about it in anyone's mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly, I shall not object to that being done. I want to carry out the intention of the bill as I understand it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator, between now and tomorrow, will look over one of the amendments which I have submitted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I have all of the Senator's amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The one that refers to this particular section is lettered "I."

Mr. ELLENDER. I have them all, and I shall look them over tonight.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the amendment which deals with the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know I shall have some time this evening to look them all over.

The sixth amendment, being to section 507, page 6, beginning at line 17, strikes out——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. May I inquire how much longer the Senator will take?

Mr. ELLENDER. Four minutes. I should like to complete my statement. I assure the Senator that if I am not interrupted any more, although I do not mind being interrupted, I shall be able to conclude in 4 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if hoping will help the Senator, I hope he will not be disturbed.

Mr. ELLENDER. The sixth amendment strikes out the addition of horticultural employment, cotton ginning and compressing, crushing of oil seeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonal agricultural products in the definition of agricultural employment. The amendment restricts the use of Mexican laborers to the work defined as agricultural employment in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD definitions of "agricultural employment," as contained in the two references.

There being no objection, the definition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act:

" 'Agriculture' includes farming in all its branches and, among other things, includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil; dairying; the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 114j (g) of title 12y; the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry; and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage, or to market or to carriers for transportation to market."

Section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code:

"The term 'agricultural labor' includes all services performed—

(1) On a farm, in the employ of any person, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

(2) In the employ of the owner or tenant or other operator of a farm, in connection with the operation, management, conservation, improvement, or maintenance of such farm and its tools and equipment, or in salvaging timber or clearing land of brush and other debris left by a hurricane if the major part of such service is performed on a farm.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask a short question of the Senator?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It generally refers to field labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The committee has deleted from the bill the language to which I have referred, namely, with respect to packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Any processing?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

The seventh amendment, dealing with section 507, page 6, beginning on line 21, provides that the Secretary of Labor shall enter into an agreement with an association or group of employers only if those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations of the association or group, or if the Secretary determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of the obligations of the association or group.

The final amendment, which is section 508, on page 7, beginning on line 5, as recommended by the committee, is a new section providing that the act shall not be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General to permit the importation of workers from other foreign countries for agricultural employment, pursuant to the general immigration laws, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for employment on farms.

In conclusion, I should like to discuss two aspects of the farm-labor situation in the United States. It is likely that shortages will occur in the supply of farm labor in various parts of the country this year. It would seem to me that how critical the shortages will be depends on a number of imponderables and it is impossible to determine now just how many more workers will be needed. This bill was not designed to provide a farm-labor program to meet widespread emergencies throughout the country. Your committee believes that legislation on that subject should be considered separately and would require further study with respect to the extent to which such a program would be subsidized by the Federal Government. At the same time this bill does provide sources of farm labor to meet critical shortages in those areas which have heretofore utilized workers imported from Mexico. By continuing and strengthening the program of importing workers from Mexico this bill will undoubtedly help in the production of essential food and fiber in those areas.

The problem most often discussed in relation to the farm-labor situation, particularly in the Southwest, is the wetback problem. I think it should be noted that the bill has been amended to prohibit the utilization of any worker who has entered this country from Mexico illegally. Under the existing agreement wetbacks could be recruited for work in the United States and undoubtedly that provision encouraged further illegal immigration. While the bill does not attempt to solve the problem by imposing additional penalties on employers of wetbacks, it does provide a program

whereby agricultural producers can obtain workers legally. If the bill is not enacted the present international agreement will be terminated and the extensive program of importing farm workers from Mexico will end June 30. I firmly believe it in the interest of the country that the program agreed upon by the Mexican and United States Governments and as authorized by this legislation should be established. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge favorable action on S. 984, as amended.

Mr. President, I wish to state that in order to further assist in connection with the wetback problem, and in conformity with the promise which I made to many members of the Mexican delegation that I would sponsor a bill to make it a punishable offense for an American employer knowingly to employ an alien illegally in this country, such a bill was prepared and introduced by me today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question. What objection would there be to offering the bill which the Senator has introduced today as an amendment to the pending bill, to take care of the wetback problem?

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason why I do not believe we ought to consider such a course is that there is such a provision in a bill which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and that problem is now being considered by the Judiciary Committee.

I do not wish to load down the bill with subject matter which may be more or less foreign to what we are trying to do at the moment and which does not come within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee. I assure my good friend from New Mexico that I shall take the matter up at the first opportunity with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and ask him to consider the bill which I have introduced, separate and apart from the omnibus bill. I am very hopeful that we shall have early action on that bill, and I am hopeful that the Senator will agree with my views, as expressed in that bill, which conforms with the view of many of our friends in Mexico, that the way to deal with the wetback problem is to impose certain restrictions on the employment by corporations or individual employers in this country of aliens illegally in the country, when they hire men whom they know to be illegally in the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am acquainted with the situation from the standpoint of first-hand knowledge. Statements have been made in my presence by persons who are so ruthless that they would prefer to employ a wetback rather than a man entering the country legally, and coming under the provisions of the Senator's bill. Knowing that class of people, I believe that a portion of the bill which the Senator introduced today should be inserted in the pending bill. I shall look it over, and if it is proper, I shall try to work it out so as to offer it as an amendment.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur L. Jennings to be postmaster at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Arthur L. Jennings, to be postmaster at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., will be passed over.

POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining postmaster nominations on the Executive Calendar be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the Chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

GENEVA CONVENTIONS FOR THE PROTECTION OF CERTAIN WAR VICTIMS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTIONS OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive D, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field; Executive E, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick, and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea; Executive F, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, and Executive G, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a Geneva Convention Relating to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which were open for signature from August 12, 1949, until February 12, 1950, and during that period were signed on behalf of the United States of America and a number of other States. Without objection, the injunctions of secrecy will be removed from the conventions, and the conventions, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of each of the following conventions:

(1) Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field,

(2) Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick, and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea,

(3) Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War,

(4) Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which were open for signature from August 12, 1949, until February 12, 1950, and during that period were signed on behalf of the United States of American and a number of other states.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

In the event that the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, it is requested that the Senate do so subject to the reservation made by the plenipotentiary of the United States in signing the convention, namely:

The United States reserves the right to impose the death penalty in accordance with the provisions of article 68, paragraph 2, without regard to whether the offenses referred to therein are punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory at the time the occupation begins.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE, *April 26, 1951.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State, with accompanying commentaries; (2) certified copies of Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949, for the Protection of War Victims.)

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 27, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

James N. Jensen	Robert B. Black
Joseph N. Gonyeau	William G. Roden
Walter C. Schafran	Sidney F. Hansen

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert L. Smith	Frederick W. Folger
Walter Folger	John V. Caffrey
Frederick O. Wooley	Hollis M. Walker, Jr.
Thomas Osman, Jr.	Henry E. Engelbrecht
Lyle W. Lemos	

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be major

CHAPLAIN

×Walker, Jared Allen, 18776A.

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Alexander, William George, 15813A.
×Algermissen, Robert Louis, 15846A.
×Allen, Roy Leon, 15981A.
×Allman, Conrad Scott, 15984A.
×Almquist, Peter Williams, 18073A.
×Anderson, Winston Paine, 15848A.
×Anding, Marvin Ellis, 16026A.
×Archbold, William Elmer, 16020A.
×Armstrong, Luther Erwin, Jr., 15854A.
×Armstrong, Robert Hawkins, 15899A.
×Auger, Gerald Francis, 16009A.
×Austin, Noel Degner, 15825A.
×Badger, William David, Jr., 16004A.
×Bahls, Roy Andrew, 15378A.
×Baker, William Albert, 15887A.
×Bandy, James Ross, Jr., 15874A.
×Barnett, Lloyd, Jr., 15873A.
×Barrett, Joseph Edward, 15982A.
×Bartz, Theodore John, 15851A.
×Beam, Walter John, 16044A.
×Benshoff, James John, 16029A.
×Berry, George Russell, 15806A.
×Beukema, Henry Shaw, 15835A.
×Bevacqua, Eugene Anthony, 16054A.
×Bierman, Clarence Edward, 16045A.
×Bingham, Melvin Edgar, 16031A.
Bingham, William Lane, 15914A.
×Blake, David, 15922A.
×Bolton, Robert Young, 16048A.
×Boning, John, 15955A.
×Bottomly, Heath, 15893A.
×Boutwell, Harold Knight, 15958A.
×Bowers, Bernice Overton, 16049A.
×Bradley, William Francis, 15959A.
×Bright, Robert Paul, 15966A.
×Brotherton, Robert Graham, 15909A.
×Brouns, Robert Christopher, 15811A.
×Brown, George Andrew, 15892A.
×Brundin, Robert Henrik, 15844A.
×Buchanan, Jack, 15804A.
×Buckley, William Robert, Jr., 15930A.
×Burke, Robert Emmett, 15983A.
×Burrell, Gordon Emmons, 15891A.
×Calhoun, John Davis, 15836A.
×Callaghan, Eugene Francis, 15950A.
×Callan, Robert Brown, 15871A.
×Cerasale, Anthony Generos, 16019A.
×Chandler, William Sidney, 15956A.
×Charlson, William Edward, 15932A.
×Cheadle, Geoffrey, 15830A.
×Christenson, John Milton, 16021A.
×Clayton, Lawrence Locke, Jr., 15952A.
×Coble, Clifford Dixon, 15903A.
×Coggins, David Robert, 15987A.
×Cojeran, Stephen, 15994A.
×Cole, Darrell Allan, 16058A.
×Connolly, John William, 15816A.
×Connor, George Walter, 16023A.
×Coons, Richard Laurence, 16039A.
×Courtney, William Taylor, 15948A.
×Cowee, James Oliver, 15901A.
×Creed, Richard Lawrence, Jr., 15939A.
Critchlow, David Madison, 16011A.
×Crowell, Dean Garland, 15969A.
×Cumberpatch, James Richard, 15876A.
×Cupper, Andrew Joseph, 15908A.
×Curto, Domenico Antonio, 15803A.
×Czapar, Charles Harold, 15863A.
×Darr, Wayne Lavern, 15809A.
×Deakin, Bruce Keeley, 15913A.
×de la Mater, Lyall Davies, Jr., 15942A.
×Dennen, Richard Llewellyn, 15837A.
×Duke, Daniel Fitzgerald, Jr., 16043A.
×Dunn, Ray Aloysius, Jr., 15915A.
×Earley, Leonard Eugene, 15971A.
×Edmunds, Alan Clifford, 15875A.
×Eglin, Frederick Irving, Jr., 16007A.
×Emerson, Harold Robert, 15953A.
×Eversole, Delbert Eugene, 16055A.
×Faas, Robert William, 15866A.
×Fairbrother, William Herman, 15961A.
×Farris, Stephen Adam, Jr., 15894A.
×Ferris, Donald Joseph, 15980A.
Filson, Robert Lee, 15974A.
×Fisher, Harold Carl, 15986A.
×Fitton, David Edwards, Jr., 15926A.
×Fleischman, George Walter, Jr., 16000A.
×Fleming, Dale Robert, 15968A.
×Forthoffer, Franklin Oliver, 18310A.
×Fournie, James Carmichael, 16003A.
×Fowler, Horace George, 15989A.
×Fowler, Richard Bernard, 15933A.
×Fullilove, William Charles, 15853A.
×Gafford, Grady Douglas, 16030A.
×Gamble, Louis George, 15850A.
×Garrison, James Samuel, 16037A.
×Geltz, Theodore Hess, 15886A.
×Gerhard, Frederick William, Jr., 15859A.
×Gervais, Frederick Banks, 15945A.
×Geyer, John Russell, 15858A.
×Gillen, Frederick Raymond, 16053A.
×Ginsburgh, Robert Neville, 18108A.
×Glick, Gregg F., 15869A.
×Gray, Bert, 16025A.
×Green, James William, 15821A.
×Greenhill, Noble Franklin, Jr., 15907A.
×Gregor, John Robert, 15805A.
×Gregory, Edgar Willis 2d, 15879A.
×Griffith, Ray Morris, 16017A.
×Grigsby, Howard Burton, 15814A.
×Hale, Francis Joseph, 15822A.
×Halvorzen, Gail Seymour, 15991A.
×Hamm, Paul James, 15938A.
×Hammond, William Robert, 15867A.
×Hanley, John Warren, 15964A.
×Helton, Oscar Underwood, 16012A.
×Hemmig, Ralph Brian, 15975A.
×Hempleman, Glen Roger, 15852A.
×Henderson, Frank David, Jr., 15840A.
×Henderson, Landis Duane, 16032A.
×Henderson, William Justus, 15842A.
×Hendrickson, Leslie H., Jr., 15936A.
×Hennessy, Francis Benedict, 15880A.
×Hinkey, Leo, 15919A.
×Hoffman, George Earl, Jr., 15943A.
×Hoidra, George, 15973A.
×Holme, Brant, Jr., 15997A.
×Horvath, Frederick, 16041A.
×Hoxie, Thomas Byron, 15931A.
×Humberd, Donald Ardman, 15972A.
×Ingalls, Robert Dorrance, Jr., 15965A.
×Ingersoll, George Lyman, 15824A.
×Janeczek, Raymond, 15883A.
×Jentsch, Clarence August Emrich, 16002A.
×Johnson, John Nettleton 3d, 15954A.
×Johnson, Robert Edwin, 15993A.
×Jones, Frank Ross, 16052A.
×Jones, James Brady, 15820A.
×Jones, Paul, Jr., 15860A.
×Kane, Robert Leo, 15812A.
×Keever, Bernard Vincent, 15992A.
×Kincaid, John Peyton, 15941A.
×King, John Creighton, 15925A.
×Kizer, Robert Lester, 16050A.
×Klosson, Kenneth Alan McLean, 18107A.
×Lamp, John Oscar, 15890A.
×Lang, Albert Shumway, 16001A.
×Linhof, Eric, 16046A.
×Livermore, Ross Edward, 16016A.
×Long, Emmett Napoleon, 16024A.
×Lynn, Thomas James, 15905A.
×Mahoney, Thomas Edmund, Jr., 15841A.
×March, Christian Laurin, Jr., 16027A.
×Maxon, George Emmett, Jr., 15910A.
×McCoy, Martin Everett, Jr., 15843A.
×McElvey, John Octavius, 15949A.
×McGlothlin, William Claude, Jr., 15928A.
×McIntire, Jesse Carlton, 16010A.
×McIntyre, Angus Joseph, 16035A.
McLean, Arthur Joseph, 15877A.
×McNeil, Loyd Jimmie, 15988A.
×Merritt, Charles Wilbur, 15996A.
×Merritt, Francis Ellis, Jr., 15962A.
×Mickelwait, Malcolm Pitzer, 15929A.
×Milnor, William Henry, 15861A.
×Mire, Evarice Camile, Jr., 15916A.
×Monihan, James Gregory, Jr., 15940A.
×Moore, John Peter, 15906A.
×Moore, John Tardy, Jr., 15845A.
×Moore, Wallace Daniel, 15937A.
×Morrison, Robert Eugene, 15857A.
×Mortland, Robert Amos, 15868A.
×Mouth, James Harry, 15977A.
×Muller, Hollis LeRoy, Jr., 15960A.
×Mullin, Charles Harris, 15947A.
×Murphy, Edward Conley, 15917A.
×Murray, Donald Henry, 15999A.
×Myslinski, Casimir J., 15934A.
×Nassoiy, Edward Falvey, 16022A.
×Nealon, Ivan Windingland, 15912A.
×Nelson, James Richard, 15855A.
×Norman, Lewis Sheppard, Jr., 15895A.
×Norton, Aloysius Arthur, 15946A.
×O'Bryen, Kenny D., 15817A.
×Owens, Thomas Ralph, 16018A.
×Palmer, Duncan, 15921A.
×Pardee, Munson Hackett, 15872A.
×Peugh, William Earl, 15832A.
×Polak, Richard Everard, 15979A.
×Porter, Frederick Brenton, Jr., 15896A.
×Prahl, Val Edward, 15944A.
×Pruitt, Victor Claude, 16040A.
×Pugh, Lloyd Randolph, Jr., 15902A.
×Ragland, Thomas Ben, Jr., 15838A.
×Reagan, Robert Paul, 15888A.
×Reeves, James, 16033A.
×Reeves, Owen Thornton, 15826A.
×Rhodes, Ralph Leach, 15881A.
×Richards, John Philip, 16057A.
×Rivers, Robert Stafford, 15967A.
×Roberts, Gail Dexter, 15815A.
×Robinson, John Nicholas, Jr., 15864A.
×Rogers, Roland, 15810A.
×Royem, Robert Louis, Jr., 15897A.
×Salzer, Lester LeRoy, 15904A.
×Sampson, Charles William, 15839A.
×Sanders, John, 15963A.
×Scott, Arthur Andrew, 16006A.
×Sellers, Robert Carey, Jr., 15828A.
×Shoemaker, Robert Milton, 15920A.
×Silver, Martin, 16056A.
×Simmons, James Norbert, 15819A.
×Skinner, Wilfred Fulton, 16013A.
×Smith, Foster Lee, 15882A.
Sohn, Bernard, 15827A.
×Southwick, William Elvin, 15990A.
×Stahl, Edward Schuyler, 15951A.
×Steffes, Eugene Quirn, Jr., 15885A.
×Steger, William Elbert, 15833A.
×Stonebraker, Donald Marvin, 15818A.
×Sullivan, William Randolph, 15856A.
×Susott, John Leon, 15918A.
×Symons, Howard Hamlet, 15884A.
×Tanner, Howard Nelson, Jr., 15935A.
×Tisdale, Pierre Anthony, 15834A.
×Trapold, Augustine Charles 3d, 16005A.
×Troupe, John Terney, 16038A.
×Truesdell, William Irwin, 16060A.
×Trumbo, Waller Franklin, 15978A.
×Urban, Robert Sylvester, 16051A.
×Walters, William Henry, 15865A.
×Warren, Kenneth Eugene, 15985A.
×Waterman, Joseph Raymond, 15823A.
×Watters, Burr Sells, Jr., 16028A.
×Weir, John Gordon, 15911A.
×Werner, John Martin, Jr., 15923A.
×Whiting, Carlyle Fairfax, 15900A.
×Williams, John Gordon, Jr., 15870A.
×Williams, Thomas George, 15976A.
×Wilson, Louis Andrew, Jr., 15849A.
×Winter, Ferdinand John, 16047A.
×Wykoff, Gerald Kenneth, 16015A.
×Xenakis, Nick James, 16014A.

To be first lieutenants

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

×Allen, James Rodgers, 17789A.
×Anderson, Andrew Broadus, Jr., 17791A.
×Anderson, Carl Andrew, 17747A.
×Anderson, DeLane Edward, 20693A.
×Barber, Kenneth Hawthorne, 17845A.
×Barondes, Arthur deRohan, 17774A.
×Barton, Raymond Oscar, Jr., 17763A.
×Berry, Richard Parks, 17840A.
×Bertoni, Waldo Emmerson, 17780A.

×Bettis, Harry Moody, Jr., 17785A.
×Braswell, Arnold Webb, 17745A.
×Brill, Jay Richard, 17767A.
×Buckley, John Joseph, Jr., 17752A.
×Buechler, Theodore Bruce, 17833A.
×Burrows, William Claude, 17756A.
×Butler, Blaine Raymond, Jr., 17803A.
×Chanatry, Jared Isaac, 17788A.
×Coons, Charles Eads, 17761A.
×Cowgill, John Daniel, 17860A.
×Creed, John Francis, 17818A.
×Crosby, William J., 17823A.
×Cudahy, Richard Dickson, 17746A.
×D'Allura, Joseph Anthony, 20694A.
×Davis, Robert Carroll, 17855A.
×De Foe, Daniel, 17797A.
×Dent, John Francis, Jr., 17850A.
×Dildy, Sims Gerald, 17848A.
×Di Loreto, Benjamin Joseph, 17764A.
×Dougherty, William Pinkerton, 17831A.
×Eakins, Benjamin Wynn, 17766A.
×Edwards, George Martin, Jr., 17804A.
×Edwards, John Arnold, 17765A.
×Elebash, Clarence Couch, 17796A.
×Gillogly, Harold Sherwood, 17828A.
×Gorrell, Joseph Eugene, 17792A.
×Goss, Raymond, Jr., 17859A.
×Graves, Warren Reed, 17783A.
×Hadley, Russell James, 20695A.
×Hayden, William Comstock, 17751A.
×Heikkinen, Wilho Richard, 17755A.
×Hodge, Phillip E., 17856A.
×Huey, Joseph William, 17844A.
×Hurt, Samuel Fuqua, 17821A.
×Johnston, Floyd Allan, 17822A.
×Josephs, Jay Silverman, 17793A.
×Kastris, John, Jr., 17837A.
×Kavanagh, Donal Denis, 17809A.
×Kerth, Alfred Henry, Jr., 17768A.
×Kipfer, Donald Charles, 17819A.
×Kritzer, Edward Anderton, 17825A.
×La Pointe, George Adelbert, 17771A.
×Leitner, George Newton, 17824A.
×Lewando, Vincent Paul, 17808A.
×Locke, W. Grim, 17800A.
×LoConte, Louis, Jr., 17754A.
×Long, Denman Murray, 17759A.
Lynch, William Henry, 17772A.
×Lyon, William Meredith, 17805A.
×Lyons, Richard Edward, 18306A.
×MacCartney, Gaylord, 17810A.
×Madden, William James, 17839A.
×Mandros, William James, 20692A.
×Mansour, Nasor John, Jr., 17811A.
×Mathis, Robert Couth, 17787A.
×McGinness, William Thornton, 17760A.
×McInerney, Francis William, Jr., 17834A.
×McManaway, James Clifford, Jr., 17799A.
×Miner, Richard Lee, 17777A.
×Moore, Otis Corcoran, 17756A.
×Morgan, Rhonel Earl, 17814A.
×Mounger, William Donald, 17812A.
×Muehlenweg, James Allen, 17778A.
×Mumma, Morton Claire, 3d, 17773A.
×Newton, John R., Jr., 17858A.
×O'Connell, William Thomas, Jr., 17835A.
×Pater, Robert Edwin, 17838A.
×Peppers, Jack Francis, 17846A.
×Phillips, Thomas Albert, Jr., 17776A.
×Pickering, John Charles, 17750A.
×Pomeroy, Robert Murray, 17795A.
×Pompan, Jacob Bernard, 17832A.
×Porter, Philip Steven, 17854A.
×Quanbeck, Alton Harold, 17790A.
×Rosencrans, Evan William, 17807A.
×Rusk, Richard Norman, 17857A.
×Rutter, George Warren, 17770A.
×Sandman, James Gage, 17762A.
×Saville, Rodman, 17794A.
×Schalk, Louis Wellington, 17786A.
×Schoenberg, Irving Bernard, 17820A.
×Scott, Edward Leigh, 17801A.
×Seguin, Richard James, 17753A.
×Selig, Ivan Morange, 17802A.
×Seymoe, Joseph Phillip, 19581A.
×Shively, James Cole, Jr., 17849A.
×Skinner, Richard Ingram, 17830A.
×Skouras, Charles Peter, Jr., 17847A.
×Smith, William Young, 17775A.
×Snyder, Arthur, Jr., 17843A.
×Stein, Richard Neil, 17784A.
×Stelling, Henry Barthold, Jr., 17779A.
×Swenholt, Donald Brunhoff, 17817A.
×Tashjian, Michael Joseph, 17842A.
×Thevenet, Stanley Edward, 17836A.
×Thomas, George Selby, 17813A.
×Van Arsdall, Robert Armes, 17829A.
×Van Fleet, James Alward, Jr., 17852A.
×Waller, Walton Vernon, 17841A.
×Weaver, Paul Elwood, 17769A.
×White, Samuel, Jr., 17781A.
×Williams, Francis Marion, 17798A.
×Williamson, Odell Wynne, Jr., 17853A.
×Withers, John Kesson, 17816A.
×Wurster, Charles Anderson, 17748A.
×Young, Stewart, 17757A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

×Dye, William Eugene, 19972A.

NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of June 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

POSTMASTERS

MINNESOTA

Herbert H. Schur, Mountain Iron.
Josephine M. Wozniak, Ogema.

NORTH CAROLINA

Susie I. Ledbetter, Mount Gilead.
Charles Braxton Craven, Ramseur.
Berdis R. Stone, St. Pauls.

PENNSYLVANIA

Michael C. Barone, Bryn Mawr.
Patrick N. Lindner, Enon Valley.
Guy Edward D'Eletto, Pulaski.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that during this day we may sense the privilege and responsibility of meeting the challenge of each new opportunity for service to Thee and our fellow men.

We are bringing unto Thee our many needs, beseeching Thee that our souls may be cleansed and purified and that all our motives and purposes may be ennobled and redirected to loftier ends.

Lift us by Thy grace to higher levels of faith in Thy guiding and sustaining presence and may we covet more sincerely the benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the God fearing and the faithful.

Kindle within us the light that shone in the minds and hearts of saints and sages, of heroes and patriots who walked the highways of righteousness and served their generation courageously and loyally.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 12, 1951:

H. R. 2615. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

On April 16, 1951:

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the printing of the annual reports of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America as separate House documents.

On April 17, 1951:

H. R. 599. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del., and

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces.

On April 18, 1951:

H. R. 3040. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Ogden, Utah, to the Ogden Chamber of Commerce.

On April 20, 1951:

H. R. 1479. An act for the relief of Joseph Bernstein.

On April 23, 1951:

H. R. 1249. An act for the relief of LaFayette Brewery, Inc.

On April 25, 1951:

H. R. 1. An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2612. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution making an emergency appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3336. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 998. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, April 27, in which to file a report on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1952.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Addonizio	Fisher	Murphy
Anfuso	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Baring	Gore	Powell
Battle	Gwinn	Prouty
Bonner	Harden	Rains
Bramblett	Hart	Redden
Breen	Heffernan	Riehlman
Brehm	Heller	Rivers
Brownson	Herter	Rodino
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Sabath
Buckley	Holifield	Sadlak
Burleson	Irving	St. George
Busbey	Javits	Scott, Hardie
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson	Scrivner
Cannon	Jonas	Sheehan
Chatham	Kee	Shelley
Chelf	Kennedy	Sieminski
Coudert	Kersten, Wis.	Sikes
Dawson	Kilburn	Stockman
D'Ewart	Klein	Towe
Dingell	Lantaff	Whitaker
Dollinger	Lucas	Winstead
Dondero	McKinnon	Wolcott
Doyle	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton
Ellsworth	Morrison	Woodruff
Elston	Moulder	Yates
Fine	Multer	Yorty

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 353 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue for a short while, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3842, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth supplemental appropriation bill. It contains items that were considered before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and before the Subcommittee on Armed Forces.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use 10 minutes, but my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] no doubt will want to consume some time.

The independent offices appropriation bill has an item in this deficiency for the Atomic Energy Commission. We had a budget estimate of $51,300,000. This is all construction money, and it covers the construction of some 10 or 12 projects, but the big main project is at Hanford, Wash., which has a budget estimate in the neighborhood of $50,000,000. May I respectfully call the attention of the membership to page 2 of the report where the committee attempts to set out in some 15 or 20 short lines our recommendations and our feelings in the matter? We cut this estimate about $4,500,000, not with the idea of hamstringing, or delaying, or crippling in any manner or form the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission, but we do think that after a more careful screening, planning, and revision of the projects involved here that some ten, fifteen, or even more millions of savings can be made in construction even though we realize that construction costs are apparently on the incline rather than the decline. But a saving can be made in our opinion, as I said a minute ago, by careful screening and cutting out some of the frills and fads and some of the unnecessary details; and that can be done without curtailing the utility of any of the buildings involved in here.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House in considering this bill will bear in mind that this is a unanimous report of the entire Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is correct that this is a unanimous report from the subcommittee of which he is chairman and of which I am a member. I think it would not be improper to say that to a certain extent we must put into this bill a figure which we reach somewhat blindly, knowing that this amount of money and more will be spent by the Atomic Energy Commission before the present war ends. With the regular commitments which will come before the House in the independent offices bill, on which we begin general debate Monday, the Commission will show a marked increase, not only of money but an increase in the commitments for employees. It seems to me that it would not be out of order, Mr. Chairman, to suggest to you and to the Atomic Energy Commission that the utmost economy, the utmost care and good management now if ever should be exercised by this agency. The pressure of demands for war upon the taxpayers of this country will be so great that they could produce a burden that could change the economy of this country; consequently, we are not too happy, Mr. Chairman, when we find that in those things the cost of which we do know, the operation of a city, the management of a city, the operation of a bus line, the operation of a cafeteria, the building of a road—that in these things where we are able to go into the expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission and compare them with known costs to other public agencies or with a city or a private business, we find I think invariably, Mr. Chairman, that the cost to the Atomic Energy Commission is greater than it has been to the public or private agency. I say hopefully that I believe much of that is being changed, but I do not think completely changed. It has been only a few days since the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] sent our committee figures on the building of a junior high school in the city of Richland, which is the Atomic Energy installation in that area, for which an estimate had been provided of some $1,700,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think you will admit that there are not many junior high schools in the United States which cost $1,700,000; but the actual finished cost of that school to the taxpayers of the United States was $3,800,000. This is an example of what I mean. It is a reasonably recent example, the building having been constructed about a year and a half ago. It is an example of what I mean, that while we have generally a willingness in this Congress to vote the Atomic Energy Commission all the moneys they need with a liberality which is to the credit of the Congress, we have reached a place where it is not only desirable but necessary that we should check the expenditures of the Atomic Energy Commission, not only those which we can compare with the expenditures in business or in other agencies of Government, but we must from now on go more carefully into the expenditures of the Atomic Energy Commission which deal with the production of atomic power and the making of weapons.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is there any money in the appropriation for the building of any school for an atomic-energy project?

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is not in this particular appropriation. Perhaps I did not understand the question?

Mr. FOGARTY. I wanted to know if there is any money being appropriated in this particular bill for the construction of any schools for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is "No," but the gentleman will also understand there was nothing in the previous appropriation for the building of a school at Richland, Wash.; nevertheless a school was built on the grounds, it was a necessary expenditure to provide education for the children, with which both the gentleman and I would agree.

Mr. FOGARTY. The only reason I ask the question is that all of those projects are supposed to be in the Depart-

ment of Education, which comes under the appropriation bill covering the Federal Security Agency. We did have some money in there for the construction of schools in North Carolina. That is the only reason I asked the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I was using that only as an illustration to show that wherever we find the Atomic Energy Commission building something, building a road in California, running a bus line in Tennessee, managing a city in Tennessee, building a school in the State of Washington, and compare the costs of those with the costs of the same operations in private industry or by a county or by a school district or by a State we find the AEC costs to be higher. The gentleman will also recall I said that certain changes have taken place internally in the Commission itself and in the management of the Atomic Energy Commission, and I am hopeful we can look forward to a newer and better day.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman finds as I do when he visits military installations that they use a lot of special-made office furnishings, not only on the inside of the buildings, such as desks, chairs, and cabinets, but also special millwork, special doors, special windows, and special trimmings that cost as much as five times more than standard stock, but is not 1 cent better, in fact, too often its flimsy stuff, dreamed up by a brain-storm designer and architect to raise the cost in order to raise their commission.

Last December I visited a military installation in the State of New Mexico. The minute I drove up to that installation I saw all the outside doors were of special design with three glasses, one glass 12 inches from the bottom of the door, another one up toward the middle, and another one at the top. Those doors cost much more than stock or standard doors, and the stock standard doors would be better and last longer. I hope the committee will see to it that they stop putting a lot of frills and frosting in buildings paid for with tax dollars. Millions upon millions can be saved by using standard materials.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is the gentleman implying that he would expect a Government employee to use the same quality door that a taxpayer would use?

Mr. JENSEN. Maybe that would be too much to expect of the spenders and wasters in power. I visited a number of Government installations of every nature and in every instance they have used a lot of specially made materials and equipment that cost several times more than good, fine, standard stock.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is right. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, upon my request a couple of rather large charts have been prepared which present in rather graphic form certain basic information in regard to military appropriations for the fiscal year 1951. Those charts are now before you and I think they can be seen by all Members who are present. I should like to make reference in the beginning and without interruption, if I may, to the information provided in these charts. Let me say that they will be placed in the RECORD and will be, of course, available to the Members.

Department of Defense, fiscal year 1951

APPROPRIATIONS

[In billions of dollars]

Department	Regular bill	First and second supplementals	Fourth supplemental[1]	Total
Army	4.1	12.4	2.9	19.4
Navy	4.1	6.7	1.6	12.4
Air Force	4.8	9.2	1.9	15.9
Office, Secretary of Defense	.3	.2	0	.5
Total	13.3	28.5	6.4	48.2

MILITARY STRENGTH—END OF YEAR

[In thousands]

Army	630	633	287	1,550
Navy (including Marine Corps)	452	403	84	939
Air Force	416	235	199	850
Total	1,498	1,271	570	3,339

[1] No funds carried in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, for the Department of Defense.

ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

[Billions of dollars]

	Regular bill	First and second supplementals	Fourth supplemental[1]	Total	
				Amount	Percent
Military personnel: Pay, subsistence, clothing, etc.	4.3	3.0	0.8	8.1	17
Operation and maintenance of forces, plant and equipment	3.6	6.4	1.5	11.5	24
Procurement of tanks, planes, ships, and other major equipment	3.1	15.8	3.8	22.7	47
Public works	.3	1.8	.3	2.4	5
Research and development	.6	.6	0	1.2	2
Civilian components, industrial mobilization, etc.	1.4	.9	0	2.3	5
Total	13.3	28.5	6.4	48.2	100

[1] No funds carried in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, for the Department of Defense.

I would like first to direct your attention to the large chart on my right. First, let me say that we passed the regular appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951, the fiscal year ending June 30 of this year, and in that bill you will note we provided roughly $13,000,000,000. That was before Korea, and that bill was approved by the Congress upon the recommendation, generally speaking and without reference to specific details, of men like General Bradley, General Eisenhower, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of whom, however, said that more money was desirable. But in view of the economic condition of the country and the desire not to increase taxes, the clamor for economy and other considerations the Congress approved this amount. The amount was substantially that which had been requested by the President in his budget message to Congress.

Then Korea came, and we provided the Army, as you will note, in the second column, with twelve and four-tenths billion additional, the Navy with six and seven-tenths billion and the Air Force with nine and two-tenths billion and the Office of the Secretary with two-tenths billion, making a total after Korea of twenty-eight and five-tenths billion additional for defense. I should point out that I am referring to the first supplemental bill of last August and the second supplemental of December 15, 1950. You will note from the charts that when the word "billion" is used billion or billions of dollars is meant.

Now in the pending supplemental bill you will observe that the Army is getting two and nine-tenths billion, the Navy one and six-tenths billion, and the Air Force one and nine-tenths billion, making a total of six and four-tenths billion, and making a total appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force of forty-eight and two-tenths billion. That sum, of course, does not include in excess of $12,000,000,000 which has been provided for national defense through the Atomic Energy Commission and programs of economic and military assistance to Western Europe and elsewhere through the Marshall plan, and so forth. So, when we include the twelve billion that gives an over-all picture of appropriations, taking into consideration the pending bill which is before us now, of $60,000,000,000 for defense in one form or another appropriated in fiscal 1951. It is anticipated that this pending legislation will be the end of major requests for funds for the military for the fiscal year 1951.

It might well be asked, "What will be done with the $48,000,000,000 provided the Department of Defense?" The military had on hand when the present fiscal year began about $8,000,000,000 which was available for expenditure for the procurement of items, planes principally, so the Department of Defense actually will have, considering the bill today and the carry-over from last year about $56,000,000,000 for expenditure for military purposes during the fiscal year 1951.

Members of the House know that you cannot buy national defense with dollars only. It takes time. Particularly does it take time for certain highly technical items such as electronics items and the construction of airplanes and many of the gadgets that are essential to modern warfare. So the military will have available to them for expenditures this year $56,000,000,000, but they will actually spend only $19,000,000,000. They anticipate in fiscal 1952 that they will spend about forty-one-plus billion dollars.

It was not necessary that we appropriate all this money. We could have provided contract authorizations for

some of it and made the actual appropriation much less at this time. However, it has been found to be more desirable from various viewpoints to provide the money. There is no loss to the Government and there is no hazard involved in the making of the appropriations. The funds are available for commitment when these various items are contracted for by the Department of Defense.

I think when you consider what we are doing in fiscal year 1951 moneywise you must also consider what we probably will do in fiscal 1952. In other words, it does not make sense to climb up the hill in fiscal year 1951 and rush down the hill in fiscal year 1952. So this program for fiscal 1951 is coordinated with the estimated program for the coming fiscal year—the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951.

We expect to begin our hearings in about 10 days on the fiscal 1952 military appropriation bill. I have no official figures, but it is my belief that the budget request which will be made of the Congress by the President later this week or early next week will be approximately $60,000,000,000. This is the sum that was contained in the President's budget in January of this year. It is a smaller sum than many of us some time ago had anticipated would be requested, but, in my judgment, the budget request will probably be within the range of the $60,000,000,000 budget proposal of last January.

Let us look further at the chart on my right. We show there the military strength as of the end of the year. It is in thousands. In the regular bill we provided for 630,000 men in the Army. In the supplemental bills to date we have provided for 633,000 men. Then we provide for 287,000 in this bill. This gives the Army an end-year strength as of July 1, 1951, of 1,550,000 men—officers and enlisted men.

In the Navy, you will note the chart indicates that in the first regular bill we had 452,000. We added 403,000. We now add 84,000. So the Navy will have 939,000 as of June 30, 1951. This includes the Marines. Of the 939,000, something over 200,000 will be Marines. That will be the Navy strength. The Air Force strength began with the original bill at 416,000. It was increased by 235,000 and here we add 199,000. The end-of-year strength will be about 850,000. The total officers and enlisted men in our Military Establishment at the end of June of this year will be approximately 3,300,000.

When we look at those figures we must recognize there are not enough men provided for the waging of an all-out major war. We might as well say what is obvious to all thinking people, friends and foes alike, that the United States is not now prepared to wage an all-out war against a major power. We are vastly stronger than we were before Korea and with every passing month we are becoming stronger, but we are still far away from the goal of a fully adequate preparedness program. It takes time to train men and provide the highly technical weapons of modern warfare.

I think it can be said that no nation on earth is now fully prepared to fight an all-out war against a major power. Unfortunately, this is not a guaranty against the outbreak of global war. We can only hope that our efforts toward peace will bring success. We want the world to know that the object of our preparedness program is peace and not war. Of course, if a full scale war comes, and we fervently pray that it will not, we must be as well prepared as possible to meet that tragic occurrence. With the broad mobilization base which we are seeking to establish, we hope that we would be able to prevent disaster in the early stages of such a war and proceed to build up our strength and achieve ultimate victory.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HALE. In reference to the figure of half a billion dollars for the Office of Secretary of Defense, although there is nothing surprising to me in the large figure for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the item of a half billion dollars for the Office of Secretary of Defense is surprising, and I think it would be useful if the Committee had more information about that figure.

Mr. MAHON. I can well understand the gentleman's viewpoint. Actually, that half a billion dollars for the Department of Defense is for funds expended for the Department or through the Department. One of the most important items is for retired pay, which is provided for by law, and that runs to a very considerable sum.

Mr. TABER. It amounts to $300,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, it amounts to in excess of $300,000,000.

Another item included there is something in the range of $100,000,000 or more in the form of an emergency fund which is principally for research and development. In one of the supplemental bills, rather than give research and development funds to the different branches of the service we made it available to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, with the understanding that through the Board of Research and Development and through the various Secretaries, the funds could be channeled in the right direction. So that figure becomes more realistic when you understand that picture.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Why should not the item of retirement pay for the Army be charged to the Army and the retirement pay for the Navy be charged to the Navy, and so forth?

Mr. MAHON. That is the way it formerly was. It was thought that we should have reorganization and consolidation of functions insofar as possible and that we might probably have more economy in the administration of the defense program. For that purpose, to achieve economy, the work was centralized and is now handled through the Office of the Secretary of Defense, which seems not illogical.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman said that no other major power was prepared for war with any other major power.

Mr. MAHON. I believe I said that no nation on earth, minor or major, is now prepared for an all-out shooting war against a major power. I think the gentleman will agree with that statement, and we must be realistic about it.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman includes the U. S. S. R. in that?

Mr. MAHON. I certainly would think so. I do not think the gentleman from Ohio believes that the U. S. S. R. is totally and completely prepared for an all-out successful war against a major power, such as our own. And the best proof of that is that such war is not in progress at this time.

Mr. VORYS. I did not know—I am glad to have the gentleman's information.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's logic—his conclusions on that matter—would be as good as my own or better. I think those who would destroy freedom and democracy in America would undertake it if they thought they were strong enough to do it. I believe the course we are now taking to provide a greater degree of preparedness, in the fullest sense of the word, is the best hope for peace and, if war comes, the best hope for victory.

Now, let us turn to this chart on your left, if we may. This is a very revealing chart, and it will be placed in the RECORD. It shows what is being done in broad outline with the money which we are providing. Of course, we must pay soldiers, sailors, and airmen officers and enlisted men, and feed and clothe them. This chart shows that this year we are providing appropriations to the extent of $8,000,000,000, or 17 percent of the total, for that purpose. Then for operations and maintenance of the force—you have to have gasoline and all of those things necessary for the operation of airfields, Navy installations and Army installations—for that purpose we are providing eleven and five-tenths billion for this year, making a total of 24 percent of the total appropriated for the Department of Defense. There was one time when we had much to say about how fast we should produce hardware, meaning airplanes, guns, and weapons. We have spent two or three billion dollars on research and development since World War II hostilities ended, and through the expenditure of those funds we have outmoded practically all the weapons of war which we had in use or storage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

But with conditions as they are now, of course, it is most urgent that we have on hand not necessarily perfect weapons, but the most practical weapons that we can produce to meet the threat which is before us.

So, of the $48,200,000,000 provided this year, 47 percent, or $22,700,000,000, will go for procurement of tanks, planes, ships, and other major equipment.

Let me point out at this moment that we are not getting what we thought we were getting when we passed the previous appropriation bills, by reason of inflation. In the bill before us we have placed $758,000,000 to cover price increases for items previously provided for or for procurement yet to come. The Army part of that is over $678,000,000. The Navy part is over $80,000,000. There are no funds to take up the slack for the Air Force. The Air Force is buying less with the money they have, rather than requesting additional funds to make up what they are losing by reason of inflationary trends. A few significant things might be pointed out with reference to price increases. There are $90,000,000 in this bill because of the increase in the price of tanks.

Blankets have recently gone from $7.82 to $16.

Combat boots have gone from $6.03 to $11.63.

That is an indication of where some of the money is going, but of course this is not a price-stabilization measure before us now.

Again looking at the chart at our left I read the following:

Public works, 5 percent of the total.

Research and development, $1,200,000, or 2 percent.

There are no funds in the supplemental bill for civilian components, but 5 percent of the total expenditure for the year will be for that purpose.

These charts will be placed in the RECORD and will give an over-all explanation of what we are seeking to do.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. With respect to the gentleman's reference to the increased cost due to inflation, which indicated three-quarters of a billion out of a total of $6,400,000,000, representing the increased cost——

Mr. MAHON. The money is for increased costs in the current bill and for previous bills to make up for inadequate funds previously provided for certain items.

Mr. COLE of New York. That does not give us the full picture unless we can know what previous period was used as a base.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. Could the gentleman tell us what that period was?

Mr. MAHON. The over-all increase has cost us several billions of dollars.

Mr. COLE of New York. I do not mean that.

Mr. MAHON. The increase in price has cost us several billion dollars. Some items have gone up 100 percent, some 5 percent.

Mr. COLE of New York. Have gone up over when?

Mr. MAHON. Over pre-Korea.

Mr. COLE of New York. So we can understand that the cost of raw materials is about 10 percent over what it was a year ago.

Mr. MAHON. I would say it would be nearer 15 percent over that.

Mr. COLE of New York. Over what it was a year ago?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; and when you apply that to certain electronic equipment, to blankets, boots, and some other items, it is greater.

Now, as to the supplemental bill before us, all of us want to save money, because we recognize the necessity for maintaining the economic stability of this Government. The President in his budget message of last January estimated there would be a supplemental military request to Congress this year for $10,000,000,000. A few weeks ago, representatives of the three services came before our committee for a preliminary discussion as to requirements. Defense officials made no specific requests at that time, but they indicated that a supplemental bill within the range of nine billion six hundred million might possibly be required. However, there was much uncertainty on that point.

We told these representatives of the services that we would like to defer any expenditure that could safely be deferred if such deferment would not militate against the military build-up and the security of the country; and we said, "If you will carefully survey your needs and make reductions which can be made without injury to the national defense program we will undertake to give you the briefest hearings possible and pass the bill as soon as reasonably possible."

Some of these funds are needed now, and a considerable portion of the funds will be required by the 1st of May; so in keeping with the request of the committee the Department of Defense reconsidered the whole problem and came to us with $6,400,000,000, and we have more or less accepted it in toto after hearing the pros and cons of requirements over a period of days.

In the field, in the committee, and elsewhere, we have sought to do what we could toward getting more for our money and toward delaying expenditure such as for the building of new barracks as substitutes for existing temporary structures when these existing barracks would last 3 or 4 more years, although they might not be all that we would desire.

There is no doubt that if all-out global war should strike within the next few weeks or within the next few months our hindsight would reveal that we should have provided more money now in order that we could move more rapidly with our defense effort. In other words, we will not be making tanks as fast as we can make them; we will not be making other weapons as fast as it is possible for us to make them. That is, in some instances.

The philosophy of the Department of Defense and of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, as I understand it, is that we provide the broadest possible base for industrial mobilization but that we not provide all the hardware and put it on the shelf and await the time that we may need it.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. WIER. The gentleman's observation a minute ago was that the original request of the agencies was for $9,500,000,000. After a request was made of them to cut to the bone they came back with $6,000,000,000. The gentleman mentioned that some of the things involved were delay in the construction of barracks. Would the gentleman itemize a few of the other places in which they made these savings of almost $4,000,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. May I say that it would be in error to make the statement there was a saving of almost $4,000,000,000. I must further make plain that there was no budget estimate. There was no official request of the Congress or the committee that we provide nine billion six hundred million. That was a tentative figure which was first arrived at and after we had gone through these figures with defense officials it was the defense officials themselves who arrived at the figure carried in the current bill. Some items were held over for inclusion in the regular defense appropriation which should be passed by Congress a little later. There were some actual savings but not to the extent of $3,000,000,000. We have sought to expedite our preparedness program in every practical way.

Now as to barracks, we have not sought to retard the program of building barracks. We have endeavored to expedite that. But there are many installations of World War II construction that are in bad repair, and we told officials to patch them up with a few dollars, relatively speaking, rather than to spend millions of dollars building new barracks at this time; we wanted to move along with the program and at the same time do no injury to the defense program and save a lot of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am a little confused but I feel sure there is an explanation. The figures as to military strength indicate that this fourth supplemental will make provision for a total added military strength of 570,000 men. The first and second supplemental made provision for added military strength of 1,271,000. The amount in this bill is six billion four, whereas the amount in the first and second supplemental was twenty-eight billion five. Included in the figures here, as the gentleman has explained, there is three-fourths of a billion involved in price increases. The comparisons I have made make it apparent that either one of the figures is wrong. How is it this bill with less than one-fourth of the funds involved in the other bills makes provision for nearly half as many as the first and second

supplemental bills? Does the gentleman get my point?

Mr. MAHON. I get the point and the answer is easy. The general disposition of some of our people when they are confused is not to be so tolerant as the gentleman from New York but to conclude that everybody in the Military Establishment or in the country or in the Government is crazy. Here is the explanation and the answer to the gentlemen's question: When we had up the Second Supplemental last December it was stated that the supplemental bill then before us did not take into consideration the fact that the Red Chinese had come into the Korean conflict; so we have had additional men brought into the service since that time for which funds had not previously been provided. That is a partial answer to the gentleman's question. The more pertinent answer is that these funds are for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1951, which will end on July 1, 1951. The funds provided will not pay the men for an entire year but for only a fraction of a year. Some of them may not be on the payrolls for more than 1 day. It all depends on how long you pay them, and this is for the supplemental which will be for May and June, a couple of months. That, I believe is the explanation to the gentleman's question, which, I am sure, he would have grasped readily had he had an opportunity to have a look at the figures involved.

Mr. KEATING. So that the 570,000 includes those who may be taken in tomorrow and those who may be taken in on June 30.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. And contemplates the additional figure as of the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his excellent clarification of the situation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did the gentleman say a few minutes ago that we provide the appropriation and establish the fund? I think he said something to that effect; that is, in advance of expenditures.

Mr. MAHON. If we want to order a billion dollars' worth of airplanes, and those airplanes will not be delivered for 3 years and will not have to be paid for for 3 years, we nevertheless have followed the practice and are following the practice of providing the money. Now, you must provide the money or contract authorization in order to make firm contracts with industry. The money is not removed from the Treasury. There is no additional cost. Many thousands of dollars are saved in bookkeeping. It is a more realistic approach than providing the contract authorization one year and then coming back and providing more contract authorizations and cash, and you get yourself lost in a maze of figures and you confuse the American people so that nobody knows how much we are spending because of the confusion between contract authorizations and appropriations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted to clear up. I think the gentleman is in error, if I understand him correctly, when he says we provide the money. Now, we have not yet provided the dollars specified in the appropriation. The Treasury does not provide those vast sums in advance.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is a banker, and I think his explanation is exactly correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The appropriation is made with reference to the authorization, with which I agree.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But you do not provide the dollars in advance?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Because to do so would pile up billions and billions of dollars into the Treasury on which the Treasury pays interest and on which nobody gets any benefit. We provide these funds as they are required to be expended. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is completely correct, as I understand it, and I appreciate his making the issue crystal clear for the record.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want the gentleman from Michigan to listen to this, because I do not fully agree with the point made by the gentleman from Texas. We used to appropriate contract authorizations and then we carried them as contract authorizations and supplemented them in succeeding years with money. We had to show it on the tabulations as contract authorizations. Now we appropriate money. Each year we have to show it as money appropriated but not spent. I see no difference. It is just as confusing one way or the other, and it seems to me it is more confusing to have appropriated the money and have it sitting over there where we have to keep constantly deducting it from the amount of money spent in 1 year, and appropriate the amount of money we spend in a fiscal year here less than the amount of money still in the Treasury waiting to be spent on some contract.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman states a point of view. He might be right, but I prefer the method we are now following.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, so far as confusion is concerned on both sides of the case, I think it exists. But personally I would prefer to have the appropriation made, let the people in this country know it has been made, let them see the tax burden ahead of them, or the deficit, on which they have to buy bonds, so that they will know.

Mr. MAHON. If they want to read further, they will find that Congress has provided this current fiscal year about $80,000,000,000 to $84,000,000,000 in appropriations, but if they will read the fine print they will find that we will spend about $44,000,000,000 during the current fiscal year and that there will be an estimated surplus in the Treasury of $2,000,000,000; that we expect to spend in 1952 about $71,000,000,000 but that we will appropriate for that year probably a sum nearer the range of $90,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is that confusing.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REGAN. I have read the report on the appropriation bill thoroughly, and I commend the gentleman for the thorough manner in which he presented the procurement section of the Army.

One thing I should like to know something about along with the gentleman's discussion of using the old cantonments, and so forth, is that during World War II we spent multiple billions of dollars in building various supplemental airfields around the country. Those concrete runways and other facilities provided then are still pretty much intact; yet I see in the papers that new airfields are being established at considerable cost. I wonder to what extent the gentleman has prevailed on the Air Force to use such facilities as might be available to them without building new ones?

Mr. MAHON. That has been one of the things we have strenuously insisted upon, that old installations which are adaptable and can be used should be used rather than going out and starting from the beginning with new installations, our object being economy in the expenditure of Federal funds. The Air Force had several hundred installations of one kind or another which are not now in use and which will not come into use unless there is an all-out major shooting war.

Generally speaking, the bases where construction is being provided are bases that were formerly in use, and these bases are being reactivated. But for an example to the contrary, take Wichita, Kans., which was a very controversial matter before our committee, where we are spending over $40,000,000. There was no base there, but we had spent several million dollars, about $20,000,000, as I recall, in defense plant buildings for the B–29 plant during World War II, which is now making our jet bomber, the B–47. The B–47 is like all other new aircraft of a highly complicated nature, it has a lot of bugs in it. It is not perfect. The Air Force wanted to have an air base adjacent to the plant so when a B–47 took off and it did not run properly, when it landed on the strip the pilot could just taxi it over to the factory and say, "This gadget won't work just as we think it ought to work, and we want to improve it. We want you to fix it up so we can fly it tomorrow." The decision as to the field at Wichita was in our judgment a wise one. The B–36 was a very imperfect airplane when it was first

produced, but by reason of the fact that Carswell Field, at Fort Worth, Tex., is adjacent to the B–36 plant in Fort Worth, technicians have taken the bugs out of the B–36—remedied its imperfections—much more rapidly and probably have saved 2 or 3 years in perfecting our intercontinental bomber. I think we will perhaps save 2 or 3 years in perfecting the B–47 by the same plan. That is the most outstanding instance of providing for a new military installation.

Mr. REGAN. I thank the gentleman. He has made a good explanation. So many people in west Texas, where some of the inactivated fields were established, cannot understand why those fields are not being reactivated when new installations are being constructed. I think the gentleman's explanation is very sound. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I do not recall at the moment any other new fields. But I certainly agree with my friend that we should practice economy and utilize what we have in a practical manner.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is making an excellent statement and is well informed on his subject. The gentleman referred a few moments ago to the fact that we are not building tanks and planes as fast as we could.

Mr. MAHON. We are building planes, I would say, just about as fast as we could and we are preparing to build tanks in a very big way.

Mr. EVINS. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us what percent of these figures represent an increase over the appropriation for the military prior to Korea; in other words, that would reflect just how much we are speeding up the production. We know how much the increase is, but we do not know the percentage.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will refer to the chart, it shows $13,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year prior to Korea, and now it has gone all the way up to $48,000,000,000, which indicates a build-up not only in military strength but in procurement, procurement being 47 percent of the total. The idea in building tanks is that it is better to have a plant working 8 hours a day 5 days a week and have four or five such plants that could go into a two-shift or a three-shift operation immediately upon the beginning of hostilities, than it is to have just one plant making tanks and running three shifts and pushing hard, because in the event of a war you would be stuck for additional mobilization facilities.

In this bill we have provided the sum of $1,324,000,000 for expanding plant facilities. Not that we are building new plants, but we are expanding plant facilities. We built so many of them in World War II that we have not had to go out and build them from scratch, so to speak.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wonder if the gentleman could give us a breakdown or a more complete explanation than is in the report of that item of $400,000,000 for expedition of production.

Mr. MAHON. As I was just saying to the gentleman, actually the amount in the entire bill is $1,324,000,000 for all purposes for all three services. The gentleman has referred to one part of the program. There is considerable information in the hearings on this program, I will say to my friend. This largely is for machine tools. Here is a manufacturer, like General Motors or Chrysler, who is called upon to build some highly technical military gadget for which there is no commercial market. The Government buys the machine tools and the individual or company, if it is a private plant, naturally furnishes the housing and the plant. The tools belong to the Government. They may be used only to a very small extent, unless an all-out war comes. But they are there to be used. That, generally speaking, is the over-all philosophy of this type of program, which I think is sound.

Mr. Chairman, I have used more time than I should have, but in view of the questions which have been raised, considerable time was required. Even so, many important items in the bill have not been discussed at all. We are dealing in astronomical sums, but the fate of the Nation is involved. We must proceed as rapidly as we can toward increasing our military strength. I, for one, am not willing to guess that we will not have an all-out shooting war with a major power this year. I do not know what the future holds and I doubt that anybody knows. It may be that those who sit in the Kremlin have not made up their timetables. But I do know there is no time for us to lose in our preparations and the building up of our strength. I hope it will develop that all of these weapons which we produce and are getting in position to produce will not be required and that we may achieve our real objective, which is peace.

This is no time to be sidetracked with acrimonious arguments and personalities and side issues. From a bipartisan standpoint it seems to me we need to go forward together with this defense program. I present it to you with complete confidence that all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle are anxious to build up the strength of this Nation and will fully support this measure and actually would like to provide more funds for a greater build-up if such were feasible under the facts and circumstances. The greater build-up will be provided for the new fiscal year which begins on July 1. We expect to begin hearings on the new bill in 10 days and present it to Congress for passage as soon as reasonably possible.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the original budget estimate for deficiencies and supplemental items for the Military Establishment called for $10,000,000,000.

After it became apparent that the Congress was aroused and did not intend to be wasteful in its approach to the spending of money, and after the Budget Bureau and Mr. Lovett, Under Secretary of Defense—I think that is his title, but at any rate he is the individual who is the burden bearer in the Department of Defense—after he and his aides had gone over the situation carefully and the budget had gone over it, estimates were submitted to us for the military totaling $6,421,681,000.

Frankly, I believe that those items will adequately take care of the needs of the armed services up to the 1st of July. There are some items in this bill that I am not very happy about. $1,300,000,000 is in this bill for so-called expediting production, which includes new factories in Government establishments; new machine tools, new machines of all character required for such construction; also the building of some factories to be operated by private industry where the amount involved is so large that it is absolutely impossible for private industry to take it on.

Frankly, there is too much of a spread-out along that line. We have the RFC providing funds for some operations of that character. We have the National Production Authority providing funds, we have the Army providing funds, we have the Navy providing funds, and we have the Air Force providing funds. There is not the coordination that there should be in connection with those operations.

Frankly, I was disturbed as a result of the investigation that was made by the Committee on Expenditures a few weeks ago, that funds have been provided for one concern by both the RFC and the National Production Authority, and without either one knowing that the other was involved. I think we ought to get to the point where there is some semblance of coordination. Frankly, I feel that none of those things should go through without having the approval of someone of the type of Mr. Lovett. He is the strongest character in the defense set-up. I feel that he would go into such questions more thoroughly than anyone connected with the entire organization.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In connection with this expedited action would the gentleman explain what the method of operation is? Does the Government build with its own money these plants and retain title to them? Or how do they operate in connection with some concern that is to run the plant?

Mr. TABER. Some of the plants are built by the Government and belong to the Government.

Mr. KEATING. And are paid for entirely by the Government?

Mr. TABER. And are paid for entirely by the Government, and the equipment is also paid for by the Government.

Mr. KEATING. So that in this expediting production figure here that does not involve loans being made by the Defense Department to individual companies—or does it also include items for that?

Mr. TABER. There might be loans; on the other hand, there is a method provided whereby payment is made as they go along for part of the cost of the things that are to be produced, as the contract approaches say 15 percent, 30 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent, 90 percent, where they pay regularly up to a certain percentage of the amount that has been earned upon the contract to these companies. Otherwise a company that had a large contract for the construction of tanks running into several hundreds of millions of dollars—and those things do exist—would not be able to finance its operations. Of course, you could hardly expect private industry to go ahead and build a factory and equip it for military construction alone where the probabilities would be that they could not have any business after this war surge died down; and we all know that that is the hope of the people of the United States, that that day will come before too long.

There are a great many cases where it is necessary to provide factories with machine tools, the title to which would stay in the Government and the machine tools would be so installed that they could be taken out at the expiration of the contracts. There is a lot of other machinery that goes in on that basis.

Mr. KEATING. That is the type of activity which the gentleman feels should be under the personal direction of a man like the Under Secretary, Mr. Lovett.

Mr. TABER. It is. I feel also that these loans should have an over-all clearance so that there will not be duplication and that there will not be anything that prudent men would say should not be done. I appreciate that war production is wasteful; I appreciate that you cannot upset industrial establishments all over the country and turn them into the making of war materials without tremendous waste even if it is done in the very best way and with the very best of management. On the other hand, I do not like to see any more of that than is necessary. We do need to have the very best brains possible that we can get to keep that within bounds.

Mr. KEATING. And the opportunities for abuse in this field, with such staggering figures involved, are quite obvious.

Mr. TABER. That is true. I may say that the Appropriations Committee—I do not say this in an individual way—has passed a resolution for a full-scale following up of the operations with as competent people as they have been able to reach. The committee intends to go through with that sort of investigation to see that there is just as little of that sort of waste as is possible.

Mr. KEATING. I hope the gentleman now addressing us is a member of that committee.

Mr. TABER. I took on membership on the Armed Services Committee this year. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] took on that matter because we feel that in this particular situation we must devote ourselves to that item because it involves more money, it involves quick decisions, and it involves more of a strain than any of the routine operations of the Government entail and we are doing the best we can. If anybody thinks he is complete master of that particular situation, he would not be.

Mr. KEATING. If a master is procurable in this body I am sure the gentleman now speaking to us would fit that role.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering if there was any testimony before the committee in regard to this matter of plant expansion relative to the number of applications now on file with NPA by private corporations that want to use their own money for expansion purposes?

Mr. TABER. That came before the committee. That was up for consideration and was reported here, as I remember it, a few days before the last recess in the form of the war agencies' bill. I may be wrong about that. It might have been after the recess. There was quite a considerable amount of that sort of thing that came before the National Production Authority and the Bureau of Internal Revenue where they permit some of those people to amortize the funds that they put in on the basis of 5 years life rather than the routine figures. That also would be subject to abuse if it were not carefully watched and carefully supervised.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I happen to know, in my own city, we have one of the largest foundries in the Northwest. This organization made application, as a matter of fact, on the 24th of January. It has under way a big expansion program, and as of this moment NPA has not given permission to that firm to expand its foundry facilities. Of course, it wants to take advantage of this accelerated amortization, but I see no reason why, if the Government is now coming in at this time asking for a billion dollars for plant expansion, this private firm, using its own money, cannot have its application approved without further delay. There are two such instances in my own city, and I imagine they can be duplicated many times over.

Mr. TABER. That is certainly correct, and it should have attention. If the gentleman will give me a memorandum on that I shall make it my business to immediately take it up with the organization that ought to pass on it and find out why it is they do not take care of that sort of thing, because every dollar we can avoid having the Government put up is a boon to the war effort rather than a drawback.

You see, these terrific expenditures that we are having result from this: Frankly, I have not been the least bashful about telling the people involved what I think. If you appropriate too much money and try to buy too much, you boost the prices out of sight, and you get things in shape where you are not going to be able to get money enough to go around to supply the things we really need. That was illustrated in some of the operations of the Munitions Board in buying rubber for stockpiling the way they did and buying wool in the way they did. Of course, the wool price was boosted away out of sight as the direct result of the reciprocal trade agreements that destroyed American production of wool at a time when we needed that production very badly. You get into a lot of things of that kind when your coordination is not as good as it should be. Frankly, I spent considerable time with the head of the Munitions Board going over the situation and advising him how to keep it within bounds. It is very necessary that that matter be reviewed regularly and effectively.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. The statement has been made on the floor this morning that no government is prepared for an all-out war at this time. I am not disputing that statement but I would like to know what happened to the $95,000,000,000 we spent on national defense between 1945 and 1949.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of August 25, and December 15, 1950, under my remarks, there is considerable discussion of that problem. Some of the $90,000,000,000 which the gentleman referred to was rescinded and returned to the Treasury. Well, it really never had been taken from the Treasury, because when the war was over a lot of that money was recaptured by Congress and was unexpended.

The Congress did over a 4-year period prior to the present fiscal year provide $48,000,000,000, in round figures, for the Department of Defense. If you got a breakdown of it similar to the breakdown on the chart here, you would see that a large percentage of it was for pay of personnel and for maintenance and operation. You would see that of the $40,000,000,000 about $8,000,000,000 was used for buying guns and airplanes and things of that kind and about a couple of billion was spent for research and development. In other words, I should like the gentleman to refer to those remarks of last year, which, in my judgment, contain a very appropriate discussion of what happened to those funds.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. Does the gentleman from Texas defend the policy that only $1 out of $7 went for munitions of war?

Mr. MAHON. This is, in a measure, what we must do if we want to keep having the Armed Forces. There are $8,000,000,000 this year that we are providing in our appropriations for pay, clothing, subsistence, and so forth, of the men in the Armed Forces. If we want to say, "No; we will not spend $8,000,000,000; we will let these boys go home and we will spend that for airplanes and

guns"; if we want to say, "We do not want to operate and maintain our forces and equipment"; if we want to say that, we can spend billions more for munitions; and if we do not want that research and development, if we want to build obsolete and outmoded equipment, we could cut that out, and things of that kind.

I think a realistic understanding of this question is something that we need to seek. I, for one, would not have dared to recommend that we disband our Army and spend the total appropriation of $48,000,000,000 for munitions to be put out in warehouses or out in the open air to deteriorate and become obsolete and have nobody to man them. I know the gentleman will completely share that view.

Mr. McVEY. One more question: Let us forget about the boys in the service. We want to provide them with the clothing and food and equipment they need. But what about these civilians in the service? We had one civilian for every two men in uniform. Does the gentleman defend the policy which would put one civilian in the Defense Department for every two men in uniform?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has said he is willing to pay and to clothe and feed our soldiers, and, of course, in that he is entirely correct. In fact, we passed a bill last year that increased the pay of our servicemen by $500,000,000 annually. That is where part of that money has gone, and is going.

As to defending the policy of having two civilians for every one man in the military, that of course is in error. We have, or rather, will have in excess of 1,000,000 civilians in the Department of Defense at the end of this fiscal year, and we will have about 3,400,000 in the Armed Forces, so the ratio would be nearer 1 to 3.

May I say further that we are seeking in every possible way to get men who are in uniform ready to do service on the field of battle. Wherever a man in uniform can be relieved by a civilian we want to make this military man available to fight for the defense of the country, because we have precious few in uniform compared to a potential enemy, and it behooves us to have civilians doing all the work that civilians can do so that we may relieve the military men for training. We have the civilians making guns down here near Washington in the gun factory. We have them in the arsenals all over the country. Without these civilians, of course, we could not have an effective Military Establishment. I think we have too many. That is one thing we have sought to eliminate. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I and others have worked diligently at that job.

As you know prior to Korea the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, had spoken publicly of his great pride in having reduced the number of civilians in the Military Establishment by something like 150,000 or 200,000 people. The American people seemingly were almost unanimous in approving Mr. Johnson's economy action with respect to civilian personnel. It is a very difficult problem which the committee has sought to handle as well as possible.

Mr. McVEY. Referring to the ratio of which I spoke a moment ago, I was not referring to the present time, but to the time covered in my original remark, which time was the period between 1945 and 1949, and I believe I am correct in saying that at that time there was one civilian for every two men in the armed services.

Mr. TABER. I think they had too many in the period between 1945 and 1950.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Following VJ-day in 1945 there was carried on a vast destruction of durable war materials, such as the B–29's and other intricate equipment. Has your committee ever found out who was the official responsible for giving those orders?

Mr. TABER. No, but at that time General Eisenhower was the Chief of Staff, and I think, as I remember it, Mr. Patterson was Secretary of War; but I am not sure about it. It might have been after Mr. Johnson took over. I am not sure about that, either.

But there were not very many B–29's destroyed which were good. The good B–29's were put in mothballs. That is what they call it. Just how they put them away I do not know. And they are now in use. I have heard them describe it, but I could not tell you how they do it now. Those were the ones that were destroyed mostly. The good planes that were destroyed were fighting planes. Those planes, or at least in all probability most of them were obsolete and would not have been of any value to us today. They were fighting planes which were in the service during the war. I think we might have done better in salvaging the aluminum and the other materials than we did, and we might have done better in not letting so many of the engines get into the hands of the Russians.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I wish the distinguished gentleman from New York would give the committee some information in regard to the proviso on page 4. Does that proviso have the effect of nullifying the bill which the House passed a few days ago wherein all realty and all matters of this nature should be cleared by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate? This makes available $400,000,000 for the acquisition of lands and the extension of plants. All those matters are now referred to our committee, and with reference to the Navy particularly under the Act of 1942. This deals with the Navy and I am just somewhat disturbed that this proviso eliminates the necessity of any further compliance with that law.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman give me a little description of what that law provides?

Mr. VINSON. The Act of 1944 requires that all acquisitions and leases for the Navy shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Servises. The other day the House went one step further and carried the same principle through for the Air Force and for the Army. I do not want that statute repealed by this proviso. For instance, now pending before the committee are two very important plants which the Navy contemplates building, costing some $30,000,000 each. The committee has been requested to give its views to the department and we are taking hearings on that matter now. That kind of thing goes on constantly, and I am a little bit disturbed about this proviso because it says:

> That the amount appropriated herein shall be available for expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land and interests therein may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount to be used for the expansion of private plants shall not exceed $400,000,000.

I do not want to nullify that which has been on the statute books since 1944, and for which we have just passed a bill, both through the House and the Senate, extending it to all three branches of the service. I am a little worried about that proviso.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I do not think our committee had any intention of trying to get around any statute that has been approved by the Armed Services Committee or to get ourselves in a position where we were trying to usurp jurisdiction.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, it is not that.

Mr. TABER. I understand, but, frankly, I would not be able to say whether or not that would violate the provisions of that statute. If it does, I would not want it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I share the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that there is no intention here to change the procedure under which we are now operating, which I think is good procedure, that new public-works programs must be cleared by the Armed Services Committee and by the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe that this language will so operate. I want to say for the record that it is not intended that it would operate so. This does have application, in a limited way, to certain plants in the defense production, and this is the kind of thing we have done on numerous other occasions.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. May I say that right now the Navy Department is asking that some $30,000,000 be approved for the acquisition of land and the construction of plants in two different communities, and they are waiting for clearance from the committee. I know there is no intention on the part of the Committee on Appropriations to get around that provision of the statute, but I am a little apprehensive that this will permit the Navy Department, specifically, to

not be required to come in and get a clearance.

Mr. TABER. I think I can answer the gentleman's question now. My judgment on what is sought to be done is that this waives the statute with reference to the amount that might be expended for a particular site, and that sort of thing. It also allows them to proceed ahead of approval by the Attorney General, but I do not think that it waives the requirement for authority on the part of the Congress which would come from a bill coming from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That is the intention. Now, if the intention has not been carried out, I would be very glad to participate in correcting it.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. I shall ask to insert in my remarks a statement with respect to the matter, which makes clear that it is not the intention of the committee to circumvent the procedure or the law under which we now operate as to clearance.

Mr. TABER. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] would give us a memorandum of the data with reference to that statute, and the section, so that we could incorporate it right here in the RECORD.

I think it should be perfectly clear that it is not the intention, and if there is any doubt about it I think it should be corrected.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I came on the floor a little while ago in the midst of the discussion about the number of personnel in the armed services. Did the fact come out as to the number of civilian personnel we have in the armed services?

Mr. TABER. Somewhere over a million, and probably it will increase. There are too many over here at the Pentagon; I am satisfied of that, and there is a very large number in the different arsenals and factories that the Government is operating in connection with the supplying of ammunition and munitions.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I hope the distinguished gentlemen from New York and Texas will merely put in the RECORD that it is not intended that this proviso shall circumvent H. R. 3096 or a Senate bill of the same tenor. That would clear the matter up entirely. I know there is no intention of circumventing that bill but I just do not want the department to think that we have nullified that which we have already enacted.

Mr. TABER. I may say right now that I agree with the gentleman that we have no idea of nullifying the provisions of that bill. I think the gentleman from Texas will say the same thing.

Mr. MAHON. I agree in the statement made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Did I hear the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] say that he felt the armed services were overstaffed by civilian employees? Did I hear the gentleman say that a little while ago?

Mr. MAHON. I do not know that I said that a while ago. I sometimes think that our offices here on the Hill are overstaffed upon some days when Members have to be here in the House most of the time and do not have opportunity to supervise certain essential work in their offices. Then maybe the very next day we may need for or five extra people. I think the bigger your institution gets the more manpower is wasted. I do not have the slightest doubt but that there is overstaffing in various places in the Department of Defense. With the instrumentalities at our disposal we have sought in every way we could to encourage the weeding out of unnecessary employees. But I am not one who would agree that in every respect there is a business institution in America of any great size, or a governmental institution that is not in some instances overstaffed

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask this question, Was it not to be the duty of the Waves and the Wacs to serve in clerical capacities in the armed services?

Mr. TABER. It was. Frankly, I am of the opinion that a great many of the Waves and Wacs are drawing more pay than the civilian help who might take their places in a good many cases and that we should not build up the Waves and the Wacs with the idea that we would save anything by substituting them for civilian help.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 20 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Much as we want the Waves and Wacs to perform their functions in substituting for other military personnel in the Defense Establishment, we must realize that personnel that handles heavy machinery in these ammunition plants and factories cannot be supplanted by Waves and Wacs.

The Waves and Wacs certainly can do clerical work, but I venture to guess that in the long run the Waves and Wacs would probably be more expensive than ordinary civilian employees. They can serve in some certain capacities to advantage.

Mr. JENSEN. The thing I am trying to get at is this: We have Waves and Wacs who are supposed to be doing clerical work and we find they are doing chauffeuring and a lot of other things. Then we have over a million civilian employees in the armed services. I would like to know how many of those civilian employees are employed in the arsenals, in the navy yards and other places where manual labor is performed and who are not in clerical work.

Mr. TABER. This is a guess, not intended as an accurate statement because we did not get as far as that in the over-all picture. I would say that probably 800,000 of the over a million employees are engaged in the different navy yards and establishments like the Watervliet Arsenal, the Springfield Arsenal, the Rock Island Arsenal and places like that. There is an enormous number of civilian personnel that are employed in connection with some of the training centers; that is to maintain the training centers. They belong to maintenance groups. They have even gotten to the point where they have to do the cooking for some of the trainees that are brought in. There is probably 100,000 scattered around in different maintenance jobs of that kind and another 100,000 in the Pentagon. That is my guess as to about how they would be distributed and my guess is as good as anyone's unless we have accurate figures. We will have those figures when we come in here with the regular appropriation bill and we will then know exactly what that picture is. We had no opportunity here to get out any picture except where an individual item was presented to us. Out of the many items that are in the regular annual bill we probably have not covered over 30 percent of those items in this bill, so that we have not had the opportunity to get those details in shape so that we can answer an over-all question of that kind.

Mr. JENSEN. You will have them before the regular bill comes to the floor?

Mr. TABER. When the other bill comes here we will have them.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman give some information in regard to the item on page 2, line 18, welfare of enlisted men, $500,000?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. My information has always been that the welfare funds were made up from the PX's, the post exchanges and organizations of that kind, and that we have never made any direct appropriation for a welfare fund. Am I correct?

Mr. TABER. No. We have made appropriations regularly for the welfare fund. Some of it has been in the nature of libraries, some of it has been in the nature of special-training programs and Army troop publications.

Mr. VINSON. There is precedent for it then.

Mr. TABER. Well, there was, I think, in the Army statute. The information came to me that it was thought that the consolidation bill wiped out that authority. Frankly, I do not know but I have asked someone to try and find out for me so that we might have an opportunity to read it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. In the regular bill, the first and second supplemental, we provided, I believe, $18,000,000 for welfare of enlisted men. We have taken in more men than had been anticipated at the

time those bills were passed, or provided for in those bills, and this $500,000 is to take up that slack, and it provides such things as baseballs and baseball bats and gloves and equipment that will increase the morale, and so forth. Now it is true that through the PX's and through other sources, supplementary funds have been and are now raised. The PX's have been restricted in their operations, but at all times since I have been a member of the committee we have provided for the welfare of the enlisted men.

Mr. VINSON. May I ask this question, with the gentleman's permission? Then as I understand, there is authorization for the Army and the Air Force for appropriations, but no authorization for the Navy.

Mr. MAHON. I am not able at the moment to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. The Navy always did have an item of welfare for enlisted men and it was always carried. It may not be at the present time, but it always used to be. I know, because I have been on that subcommittee and reported bill after bill with those provisions in. To my mind there was very grave doubt as to any justification in the hearings for this item. I felt they made no justification because their expenditures and their obligations did not make the picture look like they needed the money.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to cite for the RECORD, in connection with this discussion, from the act of June 5, 1942, chapter 340, title 50, section 671 which does authorize the Secretary of War to provide such funds, but I am not clear as to the Navy. The Navy program has varied from time to time.

Mr. VINSON. My understanding is, I will say to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from New York, that the welfare money for the Navy comes from the exchanges. I do not recall any statutory authorization for direct appropriations, but that is foreign to the subject because this relates only to the Army.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In this bill there is a billion dollars plus for plant expansion; is that right?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee give consideration to cut-backs of civilian production to take care of the necessity for this plant expansion of a billion dollars? In other words, I understand that an automobile manufacturer is going to erect a new plant building for the production of tanks. Why not cut back on the production of cars?

Mr. TABER. Some of the car production is being cut down and tanks are being produced in those facilities. That takes care of a part of the requirements, more especially as I understand and remember it, on the medium tanks. But, as to some of the larger tank producers and some of the larger airplane factories there did not exist, according to the story that came to me, the facilities for the construction of enough tanks to supply the demand.

Let me give you a little picture of the philosophy on which this estimate has been gotten up. The thought was that it would be much better for our Government to have considerable facilities for the manufacture of ammunition, munitions, tanks, planes, and that sort of thing, rather than go ahead and attempt to manufacture pell-mell with two or three shifts and a lot of high-priced overtime, a tremendous stockpile of planes, guns, and ammunition and all sorts of things like that, that might get out of date and get so they would not be worth anything to the armed services. That has resulted in more plant expansion.

As I stated earlier, I believe the closest scrutiny ought to be given by the armed services to the items that are requested for that purpose. I serve notice right now that as far as I am concerned I shall want a very strict accounting of that sort of thing and of the things they use the money for, as well as the other items that are appropriated for here.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman's concern, as it is the concern of other Members of the House, is that we do not go on and do what we did before, spend hundreds of millions, perhaps billions of dollars for plants, and equip them, and then sell the plants and equipment at the end of the emergency for a few cents on the dollar. Let us not get into that again.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman make the very decided statement he did, that it is his intention to watch very carefully from now on how the military establishment expends the funds this Congress gives it. The gentleman will recall that several times we have brought this up in the full committee. Several of us urged just the other day in the full committee that the Armed Services Legislative Committee keep very close watch upon these many billions of dollars we are forced to make available. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that here, if anywhere, the various committees of the House concerned need a real staff so as to be able to follow up this expenditure?

Mr. TABER. I do not think this expenditure can be watched too closely by the Congress. I think we need to do everything possible to cover it. Frankly, I know that even in spite of that there will be enormous waste, but we should have just as little of it as possible. This bill calls for an end strength of the Army of 1,550,000. And as I understand it they have about 100,000 short of that currently. It calls for an end strength for the Navy of 735,000, which as I understand includes 204,000 for the marines. They are practically up to that figure now. That is, the marines are practically up to that figure now.

It calls for an end strength in the Air Force of 850,000 and an over-all end strength of 3,339,000 men. That includes officers and enlisted men and warrant officers.

The various items appear in the report. I will not take the time to go into the details of them, but I am sure that we can answer any questions within reason about the items which have to be taken care of.

The item for construction and procurement of aircraft is very largely for new facilities to cover that sort of thing.

The items for ships and facilities was considerable there for that sort of thing in the Navy.

In the Air Corps the item for aircraft and related procurement, $700,000,000, has a very considerable item for that purpose.

There are no items here for the establishment of new airplane bases, new barracks, or new real property being acquired for the purpose of setting that sort of thing up except in the Air Force where there is $300,000,000. The items have been screened as carefully as they could be by the committee. Some items have been cut down very markedly as a result of that screening before they have been presented to you here on the floor of the House.

Frankly I have not any intention at the moment of offering any motion to reduce, because I believe we are going to need the things which are set out in the bill here for the Armed Forces at least we have the obligation by the end of this fiscal year. I believe it is going to continue to cost us a very considerable sum of money as we go along.

This year's appropriations presently, as I understand it, total about $42,000,000,000. With this figure it will be about forty-eight and one-half billion to forty-nine billion dollars, and our expenditures may run as high as twenty-one or twenty-two billion dollars before we get through. We may run to $25,000,000,000 if the production begins to roll out of the factories.

The large expenditures next year will come as a result of the personnel being in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for a longer period and the requirement for operations of a larger force such as we are going to have.

I want to call attention to the statements with reference to the Sampson Naval Training Station which appear on pages 445 and 446 and subsequently in the hearings with reference to the Sampson Air Force Base and the construction thereof.

I first called attention of the subcommittee to this late in January and General Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, at the request of the subcommitee in charge of this bill, went up to Sampson and went over the situation. He found a lot of overtime—one man claiming to have worked three successive days for 23½ hours a day. For 1 week's work he received $543. This was such outlandish situation that it compelled General Pick to reduce the number of hours that might be worked to 60 hours per week and that was further reduced to 54 hours and presently has been reduced to 48 hours per week so that these outrageous costs could not happen again.

There is presently in process another investigation by General Pick with the idea of running down other complaints of gross mismanagement and I am satisfied that the general intends to see that the base is put on a decent basis and that excessive costs to the Government are eliminated and to see that the contractors involved pay their bills to their employees.

I am sure that the operations of the committee have saved the Government a considerable sum of money in connection with this job and their work will result in very considerable savings to the Government and to the expediting of the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the extended remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I shall speak only briefly.

As has been pointed out, this fourth supplemental bill carries with it a total for the Armed Services of approximately $6,400,000,000. If we add that to the sum of approximately $41,800,000,000 already made available during the fiscal year, it brings the appropriations for fiscal 1951 up to $48,200,000,000.

Of this total $10,400,000,000 will go to the Army; $12,300,000,000 will go to the Navy; $15,800,000,000 will go to the Air Force; and something over a half billion dollars will go to the Office of Secretary of Defense.

In the present bill there is recommended $2,800,000,000 for the Army; $1,600,000,000 for the Navy; and $1,900,000,000 for the Air Force.

It has been stated that it was originally contemplated to request the Congress at this time for the sum of $9,600,000,000, and that this figure was subsequently reduced by about 33 percent, with a view to taking care of minimum needs up to July 1, and to permitting consideration by the subcommittee of the programs contemplated in fiscal 1952 before undertaking commitments in this connection.

I want to emphasize in passing, Mr. Chairman, that the sums now under consideration have been certified as adequate to meet minimum needs of the armed services up to July 1, the beginning of the next fiscal year, under the conditions prevailing at the time of the testimony by the chiefs of staff of all three branches of the armed services and by other high-ranking officers.

You will find statements to this effect by General Collins, by Admiral Sherman, by General Vandenberg, by General Cates, and by others included in the hearings.

Of course, should it become necessary, it would be possible to expedite the obligation of funds included in the over-all requests for 1952, which it is hoped will shortly be before your subcommittee for consideration.

It has been pointed out that the strength of military personnel provided for as a result of this bill will amount in the aggregate, as of June 30, 1951, to 3,339,000.

One million five hundred and fifty thousand of this total will be in the Army; 735,000 will be in the Navy; 204,000 will be in the Marine Corps; and the balance of 850,000 will be in the Air Force.

The record indicates that this bill will make possible about 90 percent in terms of our present objective in number of wings for the air service; about 90 percent in terms of our present objective in number of planes for the Navy; and about 90 percent in terms of our present objective in number of ships for the Navy.

Sixty-three million nine hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars is provided for the activation of 34 vessels for the Navy and Weather Patrol; $137,000,000 is provided for the construction or conversion of 17 ships under the construction and conversion program authorized March 10, 1951.

This bill is required in broad terms: First, because of the increased strength in military personnel to which I have referred; second, becaue of the increase in productive capacity designed not only to supply our forces in being but also to permit very much greater production almost immediately in case that should at any time become necessary; and third, because of the increase in costs throughout the Nation.

The bill under consideration is really equivalent to a first installment of the 1952 appropriation bill, which will of course contain requests greatly in excess of those now under consideration.

The bill is submitted in the interest of expedition. The subcommittee has given it as much consideration as possible in the time available. I agree, however, with the statements made this morning to the effect that far greater and far more detailed consideration will be called for when the 1952 requests are submitted to your subcommittee.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services has a tremendous responsibility, Mr. Chairman. Every possible step must be taken to assure that all possible waste or unnecessary expenditure is eliminated from the requests that will shortly be submitted.

Just to mention one or two sources of possible waste, I call attention to the report by Senator BYRD acting as chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, under date of April 3, 1951.

In that report it is pointed out that civilian employment in the Military Establishment has been increasing at the rate of about one thousand a day ever since March 1950. It is further pointed out that in the month of February 1951 the civilian personnel increased to the tune of 18,136 in the Army; of 17,251 in the Navy; and of 17,416 in the Air Force; bringing the over-all total as of the end of February to 1,009,678.

That total is expected to increase to about 1,046,737 as of June 30 next.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the Army advises us that as of February 28, 1951, the ratio of civilian to military personnel was 1 to 3.17. That is one civilian on the rolls for every three and seventeen one-hundredths of military personnel. This is a little better than on June 1, 1950, when the ratio was 1 to 2.37, but it is a greater ratio than was maintained at the peak of World War II when the ratio was 1 to something over 4.

Moreover, I have here a statement prepared for me in this connection in respect to other armies of the world. This statement is marked "secret." I do not know why. Similar figures I am quite certain have been published. In any event the statement shows that our ratio is higher than the ratio of any one of the other 5 armies referred to, one of which having a ratio as low as 1 civilian to 14 military personnel.

I think this is a matter that must be gone into with great care when the 1952 requests are presented, with a view to seeing if we are not carrying a civilian personnel which is excessive.

The matter of expediting construction has been referred to.

On April 9 when the third supplemental appropriation bill was before the House I called attention to statements included in the April 1 report of Mr. Wilson, Administrator of Defense Mobilization, and to his testimony before the Appropriations Committee dealing in general with the steps being taken with a view to expediting production.

I pointed out among other things that Mr. Wilson indicated that up to April 1 about $2,700,000,000 had been authorized in terms of accelerated amortization; that an obligation of about $128,000,000 had been assumed in terms of guaranteed loans; and that he anticipated that about $1,600,000,000 would be required by the end of the current fiscal year in terms of direct loans, purchase agreements, and for equipment and the making ready of essential plants.

I emphasized at the time the impact which this large sum of money could have on our economy and the dangers of abuse, but apparently this was only a beginning.

If I read the hearings correctly, including this bill there will have been authorized for the purpose of expediting production in the present fiscal year through the Army about $1,100,000,000, through the Navy about $756,000,000, and through the Air Force about $779,000,000—an over-all total of something like $2,600,000,000 apparently in addition to the totals given us a few weeks ago by the Administrator of Defense Mobilization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there any provision for bringing the men back, rotating the men, who are in Korea? I am told that never in all our history has there been a situation like

the number of months that the men have had to stay on the firing line in Korea.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think that all branches of the service have either in operation or in contemplation plans for rotation of those in Korea.

The Army's plan has been in operation since about the 15th of the month. It has been expected before long to send home about 20,000 soldiers a month. That, of course, is dependent on the general condiitons in Korea.

The Marine Corps also has a plan in operation. About 3,300 have been returned from Korea—1,700 more have been expected before the end of the month.

Returning to the matter of expediting construction, I want to add that since the testimony received by your subcommittee I have been in contact with the Office of Defense Mobilization trying to get an over-all picture but, without success. I hope and expect to have one before long. I gather from the Administrator's office that the picture is not yet available; that it is considered very important that it should be available; and that it is believed that the activity as a whole should be coordinated by someone, presumably by the Administrator of Defense Mobilization, with a view among other things to eliminating waste and possible abuse, and to controlling the effects of this activity upon our economy as a whole.

The acquisition and construction of real property, Mr. Chairman, is another field that will call for the closest possible scrutiny. This applies to all branches of the service and to all questions that arise in this field, including type of project, type of construction, costs, and ways and means to effect economies.

The Members will find in the course of the hearings an account of the operations of a so-called citizens committee appointed to aid the Air Force in affecting economies in respect to some 300 projects aggregating in estimated cost, I believe, something over $5,500,000,000. That committee believes it has been able to suggest practical means of affecting savings which may run as high as a billion dollars.

The opportunity for savings in this field was emphasized very much, to my mind, as a result of an inspection of certain installations in Georgia and Florida recently undertaken by members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the armed services.

Purchases by the quartermaster and other departments is another field that requires closest scrutiny. Members will find in the hearings questions raised by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] in respect to enormous purchases made of various commodities, often over very short periods of time, raising the question whether the size of the purchases has or has not been justified, and the further question, if justified, if they could not have been better made over a longer period of time with less effect on the markets for the commodities in question.

These are simply examples, Mr. Chairman, of items in this tremendously large and tremendously important field in respect to which the most careful consideration must be given if we are to have the assurance that all possible waste and extravagance is eliminated from the picture.

I am going along with this bill, Mr. Chairman. I am going along with it because I believe, as I have already stated, that in substance it is only a small first installment of the 1952 appropriation request. I am going along with it because I believe that speed in respect to building up our armed services is absolutely vital.

We must make America strong at the earliest possible moment. We must build our armed strength up to that point which is necessary to deter any other nation who might otherwise be foolhardy enough to precipitate a world-wide conflict.

The peace of the world, Mr. Chairman, in the last analysis, is dependent upon the military strength of America and of our allies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has well stated, this is simply a forerunner, the first bill of several that will come before us in connection with the fiscal 1952 defense appropriations. This is really the beginning of the activities for fiscal 1952.

I think it is very essential at this time that Congress decide just how closely we intend to watch the expenditure of all these huge sums of money. We quibble and fight for days on end over the Interior Department appropriation bill, for example. I presume there will be struggles over the regular appropriation bill for Agriculture when that hits the floor. We will fight over the elimination of a few million dollars. But here all at once we dump $6,400,000,000 into the laps of the military.

The subcommittee in charge has given it as thorough scrutiny as they have been able, because of limited time. Here today we spend a couple of hours, discussing the main features, and with scarcely 20 percent of the membership on the floor, will send it over to the Senate. We are really operating in the dark on a bill of this magnitude. More of us should show an interest in the expenditure of over $6,000,000,000.

I was disturbed the other day when I went down to Fort Belvoir on a little tour of inspection. I noticed the barracks there looked very unkempt. I asked the officer who was showing me around, "Why don't you people get a little paint and give the boys in these companies an opportunity to brighten up their own living quarters and do away with this drab appearance?" His answer to me startled me. He said that because of local influence or interference it would never do for the boys of the service themselves to put a little paint on those buildings because they might infringe upon the rights of some local painters' union. This seems absurd to me.

I have heard sordid tales about what is going on up in Anchorage, Alaska, where threatened strikes have slowed up construction of necessary facilities.

I am beginning to wonder if in this huge national defense picture we, the Congress of the United States, or the labor unions are going to write the ticket.

When I glance at page 543 of the hearings and when I see, according to the statement by the very efficient clerk of the subcommittee, Mr. Lambert, that such a thing can be allowed to occur as evidently did where a man worked 10 hours a day, Monday through Thursday, and then worked 23½ hours a day each for the following Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and then worked 10 hours on the Monday following, I agree with the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], when he states that that is a deliberate fraud upon the taxpayers of the United States to permit any such happenings. Certainly no man could put in 23½ hours a day for three consecutive days and be worth what the taxpayers put up for that overtime.

Turn over to page 545 in connection with this Sampson Air Force base rehabilitation. We find the administrative payroll for the 1 week set forth there. Look at page 545 and see for yourself where in 1 week, Arnold Kagan, president, receives $1,000 for his end of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the gentleman this question, and the gentleman please will understand that I am not trying to create an embarrassing situation, but when you consider the position of the members of our subcommittee, I do not think you can find three men more seriously interested in the concept of serving the American taxpayers and protecting their interests than the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I certainly have not inferred anything to the contrary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I realize that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think we have some of our very best men on the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. That applies to both sides of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In reference to the painters' situation, that subject matter was brought before our committee through the diligence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The committee went into it very seriously and found discrepancies there beyond the pale of acceptability. There is no question about that. But when you are dealing with the total of manpower that is involved, I mean numerically speaking, you are bound to have this union equation injected into it. I can assure the gentleman we are doing the very best we can to see that these expenditures are

properly applied and that expenditures are curtailed to the nth degree. I really mean that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is the sole purpose of my remarks. We do not want to come here about 5 years from now, may I say to the gentleman from California, and then say we wished we had done something toward preventing waste. The time, as you well know—and I have heard you often plead for economy in these expenditures—the time to do it is now, and we should watch it now. Certainly I think you will agree with me it is up to the Congress of the United States, through the proper subcommittee, not alone the legislative Committee on the Armed Services but also some committee having to do with appropriations, to watch this very carefully.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I am trying to say to the gentleman is that we are watching as carefully as we can under the conditions that exist.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I know you are. I am not criticizing your subcommittee. All I want to do is to bring this whole thing out into the clean sunlight of day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But referring to the painting situation which the gentleman referred to, I will admit there is an apparent discrepancy there in that situation. However, we have to comply with the law that is laid down by the Congress when it comes to military personnel doing work of that kind.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I realize that, but is there any reason why the Committee on Armed Services, the legislative committee, cannot bring something before the Congress to alleviate any such conditions as far as too much union-labor control over what is expended is concerned?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In my opinion, the gentleman has touched on a topic that is within the province and jurisdiction of another committee of the House. I think in calling attention to it he is doing a great service.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That was just a little observation on my part, as illustrating what I am trying to bring out today.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the very good chairman of this committee.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is very kind. Of course, the gentleman from Minnesota would not for a moment want men in the Armed Forces, who supposedly are training for a very tough war, to utilize much of their time working as carpenters, plumbers, and bricklayers, and getting the pay of privates in the military service. In other words, we do not want these boys to spend too much of their time that way, and particularly at reduced rates of pay. I am sure the gentleman feels the same way and I do not want to misrepresent the gentleman's position. But I want to make clear that his position is as I have stated; and, incidentally, if servicemen want to do some of this work—and they have done much of the work here and there throughout the country——

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I answer the gentleman? I have tried to put myself in the place of some of these boys in one of those companies in a particular barracks. I think if I were they, rather than to live in one of those barracks perhaps for 3 months, in that drab, colorless building, I would be glad to put in an evening or two, along with 20 or 30 of the others, brightening it up with a little paint. We should not have to secure the approval of some labor union just to make the living quarters a little more attractive.

Mr. MAHON. And they have done that in many instances. I am sorry that they have not done it at Belvoir and the places to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But, getting back to this pay roll on page 545, detailing the exorbitant weekly salaries drawn by the officials of the contracting company. It may cost the Government of the United States hundreds of millions of dollars unless we do something to correct things of this nature. If you will turn to page 545, you will notice the salaries that the men in connection with this particular company pull down weekly. One thousand dollars, I repeat, to Mr. Arnold Kagan. One thousand dollars to Mr. Sid Feldman. Six hundred dollars to Mr. Nathan Cohen; $500 to Mr. Edward Feldman; $500 to Mr. Hyman J. Feldman; $250 to Mr. Sol Feldman. So far it looks like a family affair. Two hundred and fifty dollars to Mr. Irving Feldman, and $200 a week to Mr. Nathan Cohen. After all, the people of the United States are paying that bill. You cannot tell me that it is necessary to pay up to $4,500 a month to two of these officials on a small construction job. Contracts of this kind should be examined very carefully. I am pointing out this instance as an example of what I mean when I say it is our responsibility to keep a vigilant check on the expenditures of these billions of dollars. This bill is necessary and we must pass it, but at the same time let us guard against waste.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If there is fraud in this business, why is not the Department of Justice doing something about it? Do they have to have their noses rubbed in it?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am not saying that there is fraud. I am calling this to the attention of the Congress now, rather than 5 years from now. I think it is our responsibility, through the various committees of this Congress, to make sure that we do not dump unnecessary billions of dollars down the sewer to accomplish what we must accomplish, and that is, preparation against any prospect of all-out war.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman. Defense funds are no more sacred than any other funds voted by the Congress.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Absolutely. The military must watch their expenditures very carefully. We are now serving notice we will scrutinize what they do.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I might tell the gentleman that the House Committee on Armed Services is looking into the very contract he spoke about.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is fine. I want to compliment the gentleman. I hope it continues.

Mrs. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CHURCH. I regret that there are not more Members present today to discuss a bill containing $6,400,000,000. As the gentleman from Minnesota states, we must support it; nevertheless it does seem to me we should guard against waste. We want our armed services to have everything they need, but not one dollar more.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the lady for her observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who just preceded me, made approximately the same statements before the full committee. One of the statements he left up in the air this afternoon was: Are you going to allow the labor unions or the Congress of the United States to run this country?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I should like to have that question answered, if the gentleman will answer it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not think the question is worth answering because the gentleman has just made a 7-, 8-, or 10-minute speech, but has given very little information that would benefit the Members of Congress here this afternoon.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. He is my good friend. I may say that the gentleman from Minnesota feels that he has accomplished something because it has brought the gentleman from Rhode Island to his feet.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; the only reason I asked for time was that I would like to get some factual information, and that is something I have not yet got and did not get in the full committee in this matter of employment. I am not discussing it on a personal basis with my friend from Minnesota, because I have served with him on subcommittees before and we have gotten along very well together.

He made a statement about the boys in the barracks at Fort Belvoir not being able to paint their own barracks because of political interference in and around

Camp Belvoir. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that if there is any person holding public office within 25 or 50 miles of Fort Belvoir, elected by the people in that vicinity, who is pro labor, I would like to know it; I would like to know one such man that has been elected to public office in that vicinity.

Furthermore, I believe I am correct when I say that Fort Belvoir is now a permanent installation. In all the permanent installations in this country they have a public works department and they have civil service employees who are working at civil service rates. They do their own painting, plumbing, heating, and all repairs. I know there is some restriction on the amount that a new building may cost or on an addition exceeding a certain size if it is built new and that it should be built by outside contractors and so forth. Whether that is a matter of statute law or some regulation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff I do not know, but I know it existed in the last world war and I also know that attempts have been made from time to time to get these boys in the service to do the work. As the gentleman from Texas so well said, during the last war they gave exactly the same answer that they gave to you this afternoon—why should an enlisted man being paid $30, $50, or $60 a month, whatever he is getting, be required to do work that is being paid for at the rate of $12 to $15 a day on the outside? I know that such situations existed during the last world war.

Now as to the case in Alaska, we could not get any factual information about that the other morning. There has been no information come to this committee or to the Members of Congress this afternoon as to the labor unions entering into this controversy at Fort Belvoir. I do not know of any. It does not exist in my part of the country.

And then you refer to a job that has been let at Camp Sampson up in Sampson, N. Y. I do not know the particulars about that job, but as far as I know that was a job that was given to a company on a cost-plus or fixed-fee basis; and we know by experience during the last war that on those contracts given to contractors on a cost-plus or a fixed-fee basis there was no way of controlling the profits. I believe that is something the appropriate authorities should look into. That is something that I do not believe should be allowed to go on. I think that every contract that is given out for repairs or rehabilitation, or for new building should be let on a competitive bid basis. Then we would not have the situation that exists at Camp Sampson at the present time because when a contract is let on competitive bids, the successful bidder must finish the job even though he loses money. But in this particular instance the only way you are going to get costs down is by handling it by the proper Federal authorities whether it is by civil engineers in the public works department of the Navy or whoever it might be was in charge of the particular job.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. During the time of my service on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments it came to the attention of the committee that during World War II many so-called temporary-type barracks were built, that the barracks in some of these camps have been allowed to deteriorate due to lack of attention. I firmly believe from my own experience it is a mistake to put up these temporary wooden so-called shacks during this period of rehabilitating many of our camp sites.

I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on the policy that the Army is using with regard to building new barracks, whether they are to build more of these wooden shacks or whether they are going to really put up good, permanent, fireproof-type of barracks that will not be a constant source of expense and that in the long run will be less expensive than this wooden type of construction. Will the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree 100 percent with what the gentleman said. Up in my own district where we have one of the largest air bases in the country, in the last war, and especially in the Seabee base, there were temporary buildings built, but they were built out of cinder block and brick. They are still standing although they have not been used in 4 or 5 years. They are as good as they were when they were built 8 or 9 years ago. I do not believe we should put up this temporary-type construction. We should put up some permanent type of construction that will stay for years. The upkeep on that type of construction is almost nil.

Mr. HARVEY. Would not the gentleman agree with me that the ultimate cost of these types of fireproof permanent construction barracks is actually less than that of building the so-called temporary wooden-type barracks?

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as the original cost is concerned, I do not know, but I do know that in the long run they would be less over a period of years.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman would not approve of there being charged to the Government salaries like the one paid to Arnold Kagan, president of the construction company, $1,000 a week; Sid Feldman, vice president, $1,000 a week; Nathan Cohen, secretary, $600 a week; Edward Feldman, assistant project manager, $500; Hyman J. Feldman, another assistant manager, $500; and that sort of thing?

Mr. FOGARTY. I certainly do not think they should be, but as long as you are going to allow them to let these contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis you will run into the same thing which happened in the last war and is happening again. It is only about 3 weeks ago that I made a speech on the floor that Government contracts are being given out now to people like General Motors, Ford, and General Electric. Ninety-nine percent of all these defense contracts have been given out to big business on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. Many of them will be subject to renegotiation, however, under the law that we have passed and will be renegotiated, but at the present time there is not 1 percent of all the defense contracts that have been given up to the present time that have gone to small business.

We in this Congress have not done one single thing to force the defense officials of this country to give out these contracts, to parcel out these contracts to small business in the country and we are not going to be able to make them do it unless we take the same action we did in 1940, 1941, or 1942 when we established the Smaller War Plants Corporation. It was not until then that the small businesses of this country got a fair break in the original or prime contracts that were given out by the Government. Until we take action on a bill that was introduced 6, 7, 8, or 9 weeks ago—I do not know just when it was introduced—or enact similar legislation, we can get up here and talk day in and day out about what they ought to do and how they ought to do it. They are not going to do it until we force them to do it by legislation as we did during the First World War.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think my colleague will agree that at least it is a healthy sign when we bring up things of this nature for open discussion on the floor.

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is all I am aiming to do. Let us discuss these things, and if there is anything wrong let us find out what is wrong.

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman, but I do not like to deal with generalities. I like to deal with facts and figures presented to us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is absolutely right about small business being given the run-around. But, who appointed these defense officials?

Mr. FOGARTY. It does not make any difference who appointed them; it would not make any difference at all.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. They come from big business. It does not make any difference who appoints them. It is up to the Congress who appropriates the money when they are giving out these contracts. Congress should have something to say as to who should be given some break in these contracts that are being let and thrown all around the country at the present time, and it is up to us, I think, to enact legislation to force them to do it. That is what we are up against.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the administration in power was the administration of the little people.

Mr. FOGARTY. The administration in power has done more for the little

people of this country than the Republican administration did in a hundred years previous to 1932, but I think that they have been misled in some of the leadership that they have at the present time, men of your particular party, like Mr. Wilson and others, whose company, during the last war, got the major portion of all these defense contracts and now is in the saddle here in Washington and is refusing to recognize little business which, in my opinion, is the backbone of the economy of the country. He has refused to recognize them, and he is a member of your party.

Mr. GROSS. I was not aware of the fact that the Republicans selected Mr. Wilson.

Mr. FOGARTY. They sure did not select him, but I believe the President of the United States, when he selected him, that his selection met with the universal approval over on your side, because he was one of your party. I do not believe there is a man the President appointed that received more universal approval on your side of the aisle than Mr. Wilson did when he was appointed by the President of the United States.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of getting some information from my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. In the full committee yesterday the gentleman will remember that I asked about the item called "Construction of Ships, Navy," the amount of which is $137,000,000, and I asked whether this was entirely to be used for the construction of Navy ships. I understood, and I was assured in the full committee that it was.

Now I wish the gentleman would turn to page 731 of the hearings beginning with the question asked by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] of Admiral Wallin about an expenditure of $5,000,000 to put the *United States*, that is, the large vessel, into commission as a troop transport:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. * * * Will that complete the job on the *United States*, that $5,000,000?

Admiral WALLIN. No, sir.

Later on Admiral Wallin said:

Because the Maritime Administration has charge of this work and the organizational arrangement is that they do the conversion and the plans and everything connected with this type of work, and we reimburse them.

It seems to me that it is a curious thing for the Subcommittee on Armed Services to bring in in this budget an item for the Maritime, which is actually a Maritime Commission budget item.

I am not raising a jurisdictional point here. We are not jealous of the work of the Committee on Armed Services. But looking back over a few years, it has been possible in our subcommittee to put the Maritime Commission into good bookkeeping, to make it reduce its costs, to carry on a very careful check. I see no such check in any of the hearings here and no attempt to make such a check, simply the rather free and easy appropriation of $5,000,000 with the assurance that if the Commission needs more it is to come back and get it.

Just when did the Navy take over the Maritime Commission? Also, if you go down to the bottom of page 732 you will find that you have in here $3,275,000 for the activation of the weather patrol. Then we have the following:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is the Coast Guard under the Navy at the moment?

Admiral LEGGETT. No, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Why does not the Coast Guard come up here and ask for its own money instead of having the Navy Department come in here for this money?

* * * * *

Mr. SCRIVNER. It is easier to get the money for the Navy, for defense purposes, than to explain it for another purpose, is that it?

Admiral LEGGETT. No, sir; I do not think that is quite true. I think this is in connection with Pacific operations where the Coast Guard and the Weather Bureau normally would not have any particular interest in providing that information to the general public.

It does seem to me that the gentleman's committee is establishing a precedent which is a little bit outside of the procedures of the Committee on Appropriations. Perhaps without any attempt to press the jurisdictional point, certainly not to defend the rights of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], I do say that a subcommittee which is thoroughly familiar with the operations of an agency is much better able to tell from experience how much money to give that agency to do a certain job, and it is better for that subcommittee to handle it than for some other agency of the Government, the Navy, in this instance, to come down to some other subcommittee and ask for a sum of money for the Maritime Commission, with which the second subcommittee has not previously dealt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. Will he use the time to answer my questions?

Mr. MAHON. The subcommittee is fortunate in having on it the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who formerly served for many years on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, which handled the Maritime Commission. As I recall, he was formerly the chairman of that subcommittee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We regret very much to lose him, but he is not on that subcommittee now.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will note, the gentleman from Massachusetts took particular interest in the hearings in this particular item. But it did not seem to me irregular to provide money to the Navy to provide repairs for ships of the Navy, that is, ships to be used by the Navy. This work is not being done for the Maritime Commission or for the Coast Guard, it is to be done for the Navy, and it would seem irregular to do it otherwise. However, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the able chairman of the gentleman's subcommittee, is on the floor, and if there are any different views, I am sure we will all be glad to hear them. It does not seem irregular to have the Navy, which wants certain Navy work done for the defense of the country, ask for the funds and justify the funds for that purpose.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I hold a different view. I wonder if the gentleman realizes the goal to which his own argument leads, that is, that anything which may be considered for the defense of the country should be handled by his subcommittee rather than by other subcommittees which may have jurisdiction over the agencies involved. Why do you not take over the atomic energy appropriation? That certainly is for the defense of the country. You are going to shoot off these atomic energy heads when you get them. Why do you not take over that appropriation?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman's logic is somewhat strained.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is not my logic, it is the gentleman's logic.

Mr. MAHON. Anything that is going to be done by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force directly in their programs and that is a part of their budget estimate should be justified, certainly, before us. I do not think the gentleman could quarrel with that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, and yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. I think the point that our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is raising is simply this: We realize in this instance you are spending Navy funds, but the Maritime Commission will more or less call the signals on the work. As our colleague from California has pointed out, the subcommittee dealing with the Maritime Commission is endeavoring to carefully watch the expenditure of their funds. So may I say to my friend from California that what it looks like is simply this, that the Maritime Commission is spending $5,000,000 of the Navy's money and the upshot of it is that the gentleman from California and other members of the committee are going to have to look a little bit harder at that expenditure in the future.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

DODGING RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, frequently from the well of the House there are admissions that our money is being wasted and spent extravagantly. Every time attention is called to that waste or extravagance someone on the majority side says it is the fault of the Republicans. Since 1933 Republicans have been in power just 2 years, and during that period they balanced the budget, reduced taxation. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] just a moment ago, if I understood him correctly, charged the

waste in this incident which has been under discussion to the Republicans and then he named Mr. Wilson as the man who was not treating small-business men fairly. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] remarked, the Republicans did not appoint Mr. Wilson; the Republicans did not confirm him. Apparently the labor unions cannot lead him around by the nose. The ease with which you gentlemen slip out from under the result of your administration's incompetency, and worse, is most amazing. I hope that if the Republicans ever get into power they will be able to dodge responsibility for their acts with equal facility. I do not expect we can ever do it. It will take long, long years of practice and if we become as corrupt as the Democratic—no, not the Democratic, but the New Deal—Party has become, we sure will be ousted, and I hope right quickly.

We are honest now, as I have tried to tell you before. We could not be otherwise. We have no influence to sell and nobody with any money approaches us. The crooks are too smart for that. Moreover, the present outfit in power are experienced experts without conscience or scruples.

Now, about these two bills, the one for the Department of the Interior that we just laid aside, and the one for the Department of Defense which is under consideration.

ACHESON AN UNSAFE ADVISER

Mr. Chairman, because the executive department is a collection of departments and agencies, supposedly coordinating and working together, the success of each somewhat dependent upon the way in which other departments and agencies conduct their affairs, it is well that in considering this appropriation bill we take a look at the manner in which some of the other agencies are operating and at the individuals who direct those agencies' activities.

The Department of the Interior deals with our domestic front, but because our domestic policies must be successfully implemented in order that we may carry out our foreign policies, it is well that we consider the foreign policies we seem to have adopted and those who are administering them, this so that we will not unnecessarily assume a burden which will wreck us, and that we avoid, insofar as we can avoid, indirectly becoming involved or continuing to be involved in a foreign policy which may tend to impair our national security.

We cannot permit the activities of one department to ruin our—at the moment—chief objective, the winning of the war.

At the moment we are engaged in world war III. We became involved in that war without a declaration of war by the Congress—on the order of the President of the United States. That war is being fought under the direction of the United Nations, on which we hold one seat, have one vote. Eleven other nations having an equal vote, an equal voice, but the 11 other nations combined contributing but 10 percent of the fighting men, but 10 percent or less of the munitions of war.

So far no one has in simple language told the American people the objectives of that war.

The Congress, more specifically the Senate and the President, should determine our foreign policy. When in war, the President with the cooperation of the Congress, should outline the objectives of the war, objectives which when attained will mark the end of the war, the beginning of peace.

True, the President is the spokesman for the Nation when our relations with other nations are involved; but from a practical standpoint, while the President and the Senate may determine our foreign policy, nevertheless, without the cooperation of the House—more important yet—without the full support and cooperation of the people, no foreign policy can be successfully implemented.

Wars when once declared are usually directed by military experts.

General MacArthur was, by United Nations, under whose direction this war is being fought and by direction of the President, charged with carrying on the war in Korea. But apparently because he is under the domination of the British Government, is pro-British in his sympathies, has been and is following the British policy of not too abruptly or completely displeasing Communists, Secretary Acheson seems to be in actual command.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson seems to be not only in charge of our foreign policy but to be directing our military activities. The result is that our men are doomed to fight a war where many of them suffer and some die because of the policy of Acheson, which prohibits the use of all of the implements and agencies of war and which so often in previous wars have been used, not only effectively but decisively.

It, therefore, becomes helpful to consider some of the characteristics of Mr. Acheson. Time does not permit a complete recital of his record. A very few words will throw some light upon his character.

From an intellectual standpoint, Dean Acheson is outstanding. He has never been accused of not knowing exactly what he wanted, nor reluctant to use the methods necesary to attain his objective. Nor has it ever been suggested that he has at any time hesitated to use a procedure which would be helpful to his purpose.

Dean Acheson is a lawyer. He has ability, drive, and persistence. He has a profound conviction in the rightness of his own views. He knows what he wants—has a firm idea as to how to accomplish his purpose and is not hampered by any doubt as to the fairness of his methods.

Dean Acheson is a long-time friend of Alger Hiss. He never was so dumb as to be deceived by Hiss. Any other conclusion would be an insult to his intelligence. He was intimate with Hiss. He frequently exchanged views with Hiss. He was often in personal contact with him. It might be said that he collaborated with him; that they were of one mind on many things.

Hiss denied he was a Communist or had associated with Communists. He was supported in his contentions by Acheson and the State Department. Because he made those denials before a tribunal competent to demand an answer, Hiss deliberately falsified when he made answer. Because of that denial he was convicted of perjury.

That conviction carried with it the conclusion that Hiss had been and was a Communist; that he had associated with Communists and furthered their plans.

Hiss had two trials. He had every influence thrown about him, in his behalf, that the State Department and the executive department as a whole could give him. He had the moral support of at least two Justices of the United States Supreme Court. He had a judge in his first trial who was prejudiced in his favor, as is shown by the record. The trial resulted in a disagreement.

In his second trial the presiding judge was fair. He had a fair trial and was convicted. Hiss was convicted of lying when he denied he was a Communist or had associated with Communists.

After that trial was over Secretary of State Acheson, after ample time to consider, aware of the situation, stated that he retained his friendship for Hiss; that he would not turn his back upon him.

Thus, we have Dean Acheson now administering our foreign policy, flatly, publicly upholding, not only a man who was guilty of deliberate, wicked falsifying, but a man who had deliberately associated with and aided those who sought the overthrow of our Government by illegal means. Has Acheson yet uttered a word repudiating him?

Since that declaration Dean Acheson has given no evidence of a change in his views. Some of his present policies favor the enemy we are now fighting.

More recently, Acheson has impaired the efforts of our Armed Forces to attain victory. It is said that his reason is that the full use of our armed might to win a decisive victory might involve us in a wider, bigger war. But we are in war because, and only because, of the policies which Acheson has supported.

The folly of permitting a man with Acheson's record to misdirect our war efforts is apparent to the American people.

The hundreds of thousands of protests which have come to the President and Congress are conclusive proof that the people will with reluctance, and that is a mild statement, support a war in the direction of which Dean Acheson has any active part.

The President is doing a disservice to this country every day that he retains Dean Acheson in office. Let the President, while insisting that our men fight Communists abroad, remove from the executive departments all those who in the past have followed a course which aided the Communists.

Dean Acheson's removal is not only requested—it is demanded—by the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SEMIANNUAL REPORT, MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 329 (81st Cong., 1st sess., 63 Stat. 714), I submit the second semiannual report on the mutual defense assistance program, covering the period from April 6, 1950, to October 6, 1950.

In making this submission I can do no better than to reiterate the following words which were contained in my letter submitting the first semiannual report on June 1, 1950:

By its enactment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and by its earlier provision of aid for Greece and Turkey, the Congress of the United States recognized that the security of the United States required a strengthening of the will and ability of certain free nations to resist the aggression with which they were threatened. The preservation of world peace in a form which free peoples could accept depended then, as it depends now, upon the physical capacity and moral determination of the free world to stem those forces which seek to cloak the whole earth with the mantle of totalitarianism. The mutual defense assistance program represents one part of our effort to assist in the development of this essential capacity and determination and, as the attached report clearly demonstrates, is, and must continue to be, an integral part of the total policy of the United States.

Events since that time have proved beyond a reasonable doubt the truth of these principles.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
April 25, 1951.

(Enclosure: Second semiannual report on the mutual defense assistance program, April 6, 1950, to October 6, 1950.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the fourth supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 3842, may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH JUBILEE CELEBRATION

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 204) appointing Members of the House of Representatives to attend and participate in the Australian Commonwealth Jubilee Celebration, to be held in Canberra, Australia, during May 1951.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House is authorized to appoint not more than four Members of the House of Representatives to attend and participate in the Australian Commonwealth Jubilee Celebration to be held at Canberra, Australia, during May 1951. The expenses incurred by the Members and staff appointed for the purpose of carrying out this resolution shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon submission of vouchers.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the House that such attendance and participation will assist in the furthering of the close relations which exist between the United States and Australia.

SEC. 3. The Members appointed by the Speaker shall file a report on their participation in the jubilee celebration following their return to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri whether or not this was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. CARNAHAN. It was.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of Fortune magazine contains as the featured article a very intemperate attack upon our farm economy, entitled "The Parity Outrage." This article is another exemple of the illogical and contradictory effort on the part of large segments of our metropolitan press to blame all of our inflationary troubles upon the American farmer.

The parity concept to provide economic stabilization for American agriculture was designed to protect the basic structure of our whole productive economy. Instead of being shameless example of special privilege, it is an attempt to give the farmer an equal opportunity with those segments of our economy which have traditionally enjoyed special privilege.

There is no need for me to review here the details of how the parity formula works. There is no need for me to point out that except for a costly and unwise venture into price supports for potatoes, that the history of price supports has been an assurance of a minimum return to the farmer without cost to the American taxpayer.

Present high prices are the result of inflationary influences far removed from American farms. Basically they are the result of an inflationary credit policy. We need to apply many remedies, but all economists agree that these remedies should have the end result of removing surplus moneys from bidding in the consumer market.

It is interesting to check into the business policy of this magazine, Fortune, which maintains that the farmer is entitled to no protection from his Government. Fortune magazine is owned and operated by the Luce Publications. Fortune, as well as the other publications of this company, is a member of the National Association of Magazine Publishers, Inc. I am told that Mr. Francis Pratt, circulation manager for Luce Publications, assisted in the drafting of testimony made before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee by A. L. Cole on behalf of the National Association of Magazine Publishers.

In his testimony Mr. Cole opposed a proposal now before the Post Office Committee to increase postage rates on magazines to a high enough level to assure these magazines being carried through the mails at no cost to the American taxpayer.

The substance of Mr. Cole's testimony was that the majority of American magazines would operate at a deficit if they did not have the benefit of this postal subsidy. In other words, these magazines now make a profit at the expense of the American taxpayer.

I think this contradiction in policy should be called to the attention of the general public. It is a strange fallacy

that this great publication opposes a minimum of assistance without subsidy for the lowest-income group in our country and at the same time wants the Federal Government to continue to subsidize its own enterprise by underwriting a postal deficit which is the principal source of publication profit.

It seems to me that those who come into this fight to strip the farmer or the workingman or any other segment of our economy of a minimum of protection should come forward first with clean hands.

VINDICATION FOR HONORABLE FRANK BUCHANAN

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman FRANK BUCHANAN, has been in the Naval Hospital for the last several weeks. Yesterday he underwent an operation, and I am happy to report that his condition is good.

Mr. BUCHANAN is one of the most able and one of the finest gentlemen of this House. He rendered a great service to the Nation when he served as chairman of the Lobby Investigating Committee in the last Congress.

This great service has made him the target of a smear attack by totalitarian front organizations and by the peddlers of hate and confusion.

The Committee for Constitutional Government, one of the front organizations exposed by the Buchanan committee, has resorted to dishonest and shameful kind of criticism of Mr. BUCHANAN.

Last week as Mr. BUCHANAN lay in his hospital bed, a Federal jury convicted Dr. Edward A. Rumely, head of this front organization, for contempt of Congress. It took but 20 minutes to reach a verdict.

The guilty verdict is a vindication for Mr. BUCHANAN and justifies the action by Members of the House who voted to indict Dr. Rumely.

The Rumely conviction proves the need for a further probe and more thorough investigation of the Rumely outfit. Rumely has much deeper reasons for his defiance of Congress than he dares to say.

The people of this country have a right to know who puts up the many millions of dollars for the Rumely outfit to pollute the stream of public opinion with totalitarian propaganda. For after all the people pay in taxes for the corporate gifts which are falsely given for educational purposes to this front organization. In other words, the people are taxed to pay for propaganda aimed against their welfare.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress extend for 2 years the Defense Production Act of 1950, which is now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1951. I also recommend that the act be strengthened in certain respects.

The Defense Production Act was enacted in September 1950—2 months after the Communist attack on free Korea had made clear the peril in which all free nations stand. It was a legislative expression of the national resolve to meet the world-wide Communist threat with a vast increase in our military and economic strength.

The act provides the basic authority for our defense mobilization program. It contains specific provisions for expanding production and for maintaining economic stability—the two essentials of the defense program.

Since last summer, we have made a strong beginning in getting defense production started, and we have laid the basis for an effective program to stabilize prices and the cost of living.

We have doubled the number of men in our active Armed Forces since last June. We have nearly doubled the rate of production of military planes during the past year. Monthly deliveries of military equipment and supplies have doubled since last June. In Europe, we have joined our associates in the North Atlantic Treaty in establishing a unified defense force, to be made up of units from the treaty countries, under the command of General Eisenhower. The mutual-defense assistance program has been stepped up substantially, and other free nations, particularly in Europe, are rapidly enlarging their defense establishments, as we are.

Since last summer, we have taken initial actions in the fields of taxes, credit controls, price and wage controls, and other measures necessary to stop inflation and keep it stopped.

No one should deceive himself, however, by assuming that we can now relax our strenuous efforts. Quite the opposite is true. What we have done so far consists essentially of laying a solid basis for future effort.

The major impact of the military build-up on our economy is still to come. Our planned expansion of defense production will not reach its peak for at least a year—and the inflationary pressures brought on by the defense effort likewise have not yet reached their peak.

The blunt fact is that the hardest part of the job still lies ahead. Nothing could be more foolhardy than to slacken the intensity of our defense mobilization effort just because we have gotten off to a good start.

When the Congress passed the Defense Production Act and when it passed the military appropriations acts, it clearly intended that we should proceed with all speed to strengthen ourselves and join in strengthening the forces of freedom throughout the world. I have heard no voice raised in favor of turning back before the job is finished.

The full range of powers included in the Defense Production Act will be needed—and needed badly—until we are "over the hump" in our defense-mobilization program. We hope that will be about 2 years from now—always assuming that world war is avoided. All our plans must recognize, of course, that while we hope we can influence the actions of aggressors, we cannot control them—we hope we can prevent general war, but there is no way we can be sure.

For at least the next 2 years we shall be driving urgently forward in our defense-mobilization program. Therefore, it is of the greatest importance that the Defense Production Act be extended for that period.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Titles I, II, and III of the act relate to production.

Since June 1950, the Government has placed orders for planes, tanks, guns, and other military equipment, facilities, and supplies in the amount of over 26 billion dollars. As yet, only a small part of these orders have been filled and the goods delivered. Furthermore, over 58 billion dollars more in orders have yet to be placed before the end of June 1952.

This is a tough production program because we must build our strength as rapidly as we can. The world situation could explode at any time, and we must make every day count.

Consequently, the Government is using extensively the powers granted in the Defense Production Act to divert materials and plants from less important to more important uses. Under these powers, important metals, chemicals, and other materials—including such basic materials as steel, copper, and aluminum—are being controlled and channeled to the places they are most needed.

For the next year, at least, it is obvious that controls over materials will have to become tighter and tighter, as more and more of them will be diverted to essential production. Consequently, the allocations and priorities systems authorized in the Defense Production Act will be even more necessary than they are now.

There is much more to our production program, however, than simply diverting scarce materials and converting existing plants to defense production. As a Nation, we are expanding our ability to produce minerals and fuels; we are building new factories and transportation facilities—we are enlarging the economic capacity of the country, so that, in time, we shall be able to support a high level of military strength, resume our progress in raising living standards, and be stronger for meeting any new military demands.

For example, the capacity of the steel industry, which was 100,000,000 tons a year last June, will be expanded, within 2 years, to at least 117,000,000 tons a year. The aluminum industry had a capacity last June of 750,000 tons a year; by 1953 it should rise to 1,300,000 tons. The electric power capacity of the Nation—67,500,000 kilowatts at the beginning of this year—is being rapidly increased; we need to add at least 22,000,000 more kilowatts in the next 3 years.

The Defense Production Act carries powers under which the Government is helping to build new plants and finance additional output. The Government is making or guaranteeing loans to private businessmen. It is buying some critical materials and equipment—particularly imported materials—and reselling them to private businessmen. It is also supporting the development of new domestic and foreign sources of supply for vital materials. These powers will have to be used to an increasing extent as our defense production expands.

In addition to these production aids under the Defense Production Act, under the Revenue Act of 1950 the Government is allowing businessmen, in certain cases, to write off part of the cost of new plants and equipment needed in the defense effort more rapidly than the usual depreciation periods under the tax laws. Some 5 billion dollars' worth of new plant construction is being encouraged in this way.

Even with the existing production aids, it may not be possible to obtain the supplies and equipment needed unless the Government is given one power to help expand defense production which it does not now have. That is the general power, which was used extensively and successfully in World War II, to build defense plants. At the present time, with some exceptions, whether or not defense plants are built depends finally upon the decision of private businessmen. Certainly if private businessmen can and will build all the necessary facilities, without excessive cost to the taxpayers, that is preferable. But first and foremost, the Government must have the authority to obtain essential production.

To help expand defense production, the Government also needs the power to give special financial aid to high-cost producers in order to obtain essential production from them without increasing price ceilings. Such differential subsidies were used very successfully in World War II, and saved American consumers and taxpayers many millions of dollars, because it was much cheaper to subsidize some high-cost producers than to raise prices on the entire production of the commodities affected.

In summary, to accomplish our defense-production goals, the Defense Production Act should be extended and strengthened, and adequate funds to carry out its provisions should be authorized.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

Titles IV, V, and VI of the Defense Production Act relate to stabilization.

It will be a tough job to accomplish the production goals of our defense effort. It will, in many respects, be even harder to prevent our defense effort from resulting in skyrocketing prices—with increased defense costs, disruption of production, and hardship for millions of families.

For the next 2 or 3 years, the economy will be running at forced draft. Industrial production and employment will be reaching new records. People will be working longer hours, many at overtime pay. Farmers will be producing and selling more crops. All of this will mean higher incomes—more money available for people to spend. At the same time, much of our manpower and plant capacity will be diverted to building defense plants and producing military goods—leaving that much less civilian goods for people to buy.

More money to spend than there are goods to buy—that creates the so-called inflationary gap. Without an effective stabilization program, the excess spending power could be translated into higher and higher prices.

If we are successful in preventing another world war, at the end of 2 or 3 years we should be able to close the inflationary gap by producing enough civilian goods to match the buying power of businesses and consumers. This can be done when our expenditures for military purposes and for new plants will have leveled off—and the vastly increased productive power of the country can be devoted in greater proportion to civilian goods.

But in the meantime, until we are "over the hump," we face an extremely difficult problem in stopping inflation.

Fortunately, we are now in a relatively good position to prepare for the tough period ahead. After the Korean invasion, and again after the Chinese intervention, there were speculative buying rushes by businessmen and consumers which, coupled with the expansion of defense orders, resulted in prices surging upward. The wholesale price index rose 16 percent from June 27, 1950, to February 6, 1951. The index of consumer prices rose 8 percent from June 15, 1950, to February 15, 1951.

Now, however, tax, credit, and price and wage control actions have taken hold. Production has increased substantially, and the buying wave has—at least for the time being—died down. Consequently, the upward rush of prices has been checked. The wholesale price index rose only 0.5 percent between February 6 and April 17, 1951. The latest consumers' price index figures, those of March 15, show a rise of only 0.4 percent in the month following February 15—the first full month of price control. We have made a good beginning and we must now go on to achieve more complete stabilization.

We are now having something of a "breathing spell." But it will not last. This fall and winter the economy will be hit by the full impact of military production. Supplies of civilian goods will be reduced while larger production, employment, and military spending will be putting still greater buying power in the hands of the public.

Inflationary pressures, which are serious now, will be critical then. We must therefore use the present period to get prepared for the hard problems which lie ahead. The present "breathing spell" is a fortunate occurrence—it gives us a chance to get hold of the price structure and build a set of controls which will hold firm. This opportunity will not come again. We must not waste it. The executive agencies will do their utmost with the powers they have and the Congress will need to enact additional legislation.

In taking action now, our simple, central goal must be to bring the rise in prices and the cost of living to a halt—and hold the line. It will take strong and determined measures to do that.

1. Most important of all, we must increase taxes quickly and adequately—paying for Government expenditures as we go, through a fair tax program. This will spread the cost of defense equitably and help stop the inflationary spiral.

2. We must increase personal savings—dollars saved now are subtracted from the buying power pushing prices upward, and will be available later when more consumer goods will be produced.

3. We must reduce borrowing and buying on credit for nondefense purposes—by consumers and businessmen—since borrowed money adds to the pressure on prices.

4. We must have fair ceilings on prices, including the prices of farm products, and on rents, in order to stabilize the cost of living during the defense period, to hold down the cost of the defense program to the taxpayers, and to prevent profiteering.

5. We must stabilize wages and salaries at fair levels, to restrain excessive consumer demand and to prevent rising business costs from forcing price increases.

This is an anti-inflation program that will work. It includes measures to absorb excess purchasing power, and measures to stop prices and costs from jumping upward. This program will work if all these measures are employed to support and reinforce one another. We must fight inflation on every front and with every possible weapon if we are to succeed.

TAXES

A large Federal deficit would be a powerful inflationary force, because the Government would be pouring more money into the economy than it was taking from it. The effects would be multiplied in a period of rising expenditures, when Government orders and the private borrowing and spending which they stimulate exceed the actual budget expenditure figures.

An effective stabilization program requires that we hold Federal expenditures to the minimum necessary for national security and a strong Nation. The January budget reflects such a policy, and I know the Congress will apply the same standard in reviewing it.

An effective stabilization program also requires that taxes be high enough at least to balance the budget.

The Federal Government will show a surplus for the current fiscal year, ending on June 30. This is a good record. But, unfortunately it does not mean we are on a pay-as-we-go basis. During the present quarter and from here on out, until taxes are raised, we will be operating at a deficit. The latest figures show that to balance the budget as defense outlays continue to rise will require the Congress to enact during this year at least the 10 billion dollars in additional taxes I have recommended.

The people of our country are going to have to pay for the defense program sometime; the sensible thing to do is for us to pay for it as we go, through fair taxes.

SAVINGS

This is also the sensible time to put every possible dollar into savings. Every additional dollar saved helps hold down the cost of living, and puts aside money that will be available later on, when consumer goods are again plentiful.

During World War II, the American people invested unprecedented amounts in savings bonds, thus withdrawing billions of dollars which otherwise would have pushed prices upward during the war; after the war those savings helped many a family. It is vital again now to encourage savings, through payroll savings plans and other regular methods of saving bond purchase, and through encouraging people to hold on to their savings bonds as they come due, and thereby earn more interest.

The most effective way of all to assure adequate saving is to provide convincing assurance to savers that inflation will not cut down the value of their savings. This is one of the many reasons why we need to increase taxes and to extend and strengthen present economic stabilization legislation.

CREDIT CONTROLS

Credit controls, like taxation and savings, attack inflation at the source, by reducing purchasing power which would otherwise be directly used to bid up the prices of goods.

A good deal has been done since last June to curtail the expansion of consumer- and real-estate credit. Higher down payments and quicker payment of balances are being required of buyers of new houses, automobiles, household appliances, and other durable goods. These credit controls are already showing good results—for example, the amount of credit outstanding to buyers of automobiles, which had risen steadily since 1945, has declined every month since last October and total installment credit dropped by about half a billion dollars in the first 3 months of this year. The provisions in the Defense Production Act authorizing such credit controls need to be extended; furthermore, we need the authority to control credit terms on the sale of existing houses, as well as new ones.

We are in a less favorable situation regarding bank credit to businessmen. Bank loans have risen, week after week, almost without interruption. Many of these loans are necessary—for example, loans to businessmen to expand defense production. But it is very important to cut down on unnecessary loans. Nonessential business investments should be deferred because they compete for scarce materials and manpower.

Several steps have been taken to dampen bank-credit expansion. The discount rates of the Federal Reserve banks have been raised. The Federal Reserve Board has increased the reserve requirements of member banks almost to the legal maximum. The Treasury has offered long-term nonmarketable bonds in exchange for long-term marketable bonds, in order to cut down the supply of securities that might be used for credit expansion. In addition, the Federal Reserve Board has recently requested all banks and other lenders to cut down on their nonessential lending. Government lending agencies are already applying strict standards in screening and limiting their loans.

It is not yet clear whether further actions will be needed, but we should obviously be prepared to take them. The Government has certain emergency powers it can use to place direct controls over bank lending, if that proves to be necessary. In addition, I believe that the Federal Reserve Board should be given authority by the Congress to impose additional requirements for bank reserves. I expect to transmit specific recommendations on this subject to the Congress in the near future.

Furthermore, I recommend that the Congress authorize the control of margins for speculation on commodity futures markets. Whenever the speculative fever hits these markets, we should be able to dampen it promptly with reasonable requirements for minimum margins. This is the same kind of authority which the Federal Reserve Board now exercises in respect to the stock markets.

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

Price and wage controls do not cure the basic cause of inflation—the inflationary gap between the supply of goods and the volume of buying power.

The cure can come about only by closing the gap, through tax, saving, and credit programs which reduce the demand for goods, on the one hand, and production programs which increase the supply, on the other. But until the inflationary gap is closed through these measures, price and wage controls are indispensable in checking the price rises which otherwise would result. At the present time, it is clear that these controls must be maintained and strengthened.

On January 26, a general ceiling price regulation was issued, freezing most prices at the highest level they had reached in the previous 4 weeks. At the same time, a similar regulation stopped, for the time being, further wage increases.

Both the price and wage freezes of January were intended as emergency measures to hold down price and wage increases temporarily, until more workable regulations could be developed and the staff assembled to put them into effect. These January regulations were a necessary step. But, inevitably, they froze all sorts of distortions and inequities into the price and wage structure.

They left some sellers operating at a loss, and others making excessive profits. They caught many retailers in an unfavorable position as against their wholesalers; many wholesalers as against manufacturers; many manufacturers as against raw materials producers. They caught many workers in the process of negotiating for wage adjustments which other workers had already obtained.

Many of these kinks in the price-wage structure have to be ironed out in order to achieve a situation which is fair and reasonable enough to hold firm against the new inflationary pressures we expect. Necessarily, there will continue to be some differences in the impact of price and wage regulations as among individuals or firms; these will be minimized, but they are inevitable if we are to have real stabilization.

In the case of prices, the Office of Price Stabilization has been moving ahead with the adjustment process since the January freeze. Adjustments have been completed for many products and industries, but not for all. Roll-backs from January prices have been required on a number of raw materials and finished products. More roll-backs are planned. In other cases, some price increases will have to be allowed where sellers are caught unfairly between high costs and low prices. But these increases must be held to the minimum that will result in adequate production and reasonable returns. The upward spiraling of prices which is involved in translating cost increases into price increases must be prevented.

The Office of Price Stabilization expects to complete this adjustment process in the near future, and to have then a firm structure of price control with prices on the average very close to the January level. This adjusted price structure is the line we propose to hold against the new inflationary pressures which we foresee.

The Office of Price Stabilization will move as rapidly as is administratively feasible to apply a general standard of not permitting price increases in any industry when the level of profits for that industry is more than 85 percent of its average profits for the best 3 of 4 years 1946–49.

This standard is roughly the same as that used in the excess profits tax law, and is fair and reasonable during a time of national emergency. Corporate profits are now running at the all-time record rate of 48 billion dollars a year—more than 14 billion dollars higher than in 1948, and about 20 billion dollars higher than in 1949. There is clearly room for cost absorption in profits such as these.

In addition, the Office of Price Stabilization has been directed to work out

specific dollars and cents ceilings on individual commodities wherever possible. This is of vital importance both as a means of checking unwarranted price increases and in order that the buying public may know the legal price and help enforce it.

In the case of wages, unfortunately, the process of changing over from the wage freeze to a fair longer-run wage stabilization program was interrupted by the split-up of the Wage Stabilization Board in February. In the absence of a Board, only slow progress has been made toward establishing fair and workable wage stabilization policies.

Within the last week, however, I have issued an Executive order reestablishing the Wage Stabilization Board. The further development of fair wage stabilization policies for the longer run should now go rapidly forward. In formulating such policies, many factors will have to be weighed, including changes in the cost of living, substandards of living, and cases of hardship or inequity. At the same time, it is obvious that workers will have to forego substantial increases in wages which would be permissible if the danger of inflation were not so great—just as businessmen and farmers will have to forego substantial increases in income for the same reason.

The Defense Production Act has special provisions regarding ceilings on farm products. It prohibits setting price ceilings on agricultural commodities below either the parity price or the highest price attained in the May 24–June 24, 1950, period, whichever is higher. This provision has led to considerable misunderstanding; it has often been said to prevent price ceilings on farm products. This is, of course, not so. Prices of several of the major farm products, including meats, cotton, and wool, are above the legal minimums and consequently are subject to price ceilings. For example, a dollars-and-cents ceiling has been placed on cotton at the producer level.

Prices paid to farmers for some farm commodities, however, are below parity. These prices cannot be controlled, under the present law, until they rise to the parity level. This has led to some proposals to change the law to permit price ceilings to be placed on farm products below parity levels. I do not believe such proposals are justified under present circumstances. The parity principle, which is the basis for our agricultural laws, is the best guide we now have available to judge what is a fair return to farmers.

I do believe, however, that for price control purposes, the parity price for each commodity prevailing at the start of its normal marketing season should be applied throughout the balance of the marketing season, just as is the case in most of our agricultural price-support programs. I recommend that the Defense Production Act be amended to provide for this. Under this amendment, the parity price will continue to be a minimum standard for each price ceiling. The amendment will, however, substantially improve the administration of price control on food products and will forestall the inflationary effects of frequent changes in the computation of the parity price of individual farm commodities.

The current outlook is for stable food prices, at least for some months to come. However, if we find that we cannot hold the line on food prices with the powers recommended here we shall need to consider legislation authorizing the use of other devices, including limited food subsidies, to prevent necessary farm price increases from being reflected in rises in the cost of living. Such subsidies were very successful in World War II and saved consumers and taxpayers far more than they cost. The stabilization agencies are keeping close watch on the areas where need for these susidies may develop, and the Congress will be kept informed.

Price controls will be successful only if buyers and sellers are well informed about what the law and regulations require. The Office of Price Stabilization is now doing its best to inform them. But there is need also for tough and aggressive enforcement action against the small minority who would willfully violate the law. The Defense Production Act needs to be strengthened in a number of respects to tighten up the Government's enforcement powers. For example, the courts should be given authority to impose higher civil penalties for violations than the law now permits.

RENT CONTROL

A serious deficiency in the present stabilization structure is the absence of an effective rent-control law. For millions of families with low or moderate income, rent accounts for as much as 15 percent or more of the total family budget. If costs of living are to be stabilized it is obvious that increases in rents must be stopped and the line held, just as with other prices.

There is still in effect a rent-control law, due to expire on June 30. We are fortunate that this law is still on the books. But it is entirely inadequate to help meet the inflationary pressures which will confront us in the coming months.

The present law was enacted before the Korean outbreak as a last step in the liquidation of the rent controls left over from the war. About 6.7 million housing units are still under Federal control, compared to 16 million housing units under control at the peak of the World War II rent-control program. In addition, one State and one municipality have control measures of their own.

Before the Korean outbreak, it was contemplated that Federal control would be removed from these last remaining units by June 30, 1951, at the latest. Since Korea, however, reactivation of military camps and other installations in various parts of the country has placed great pressures on nearby housing accommodations and in a number of instances has brought a shocking increase in rents. This has become a heavy and totally unjustified burden on many men in service. In some communities where rents have been decontrolled, servicemen's rents have risen as much as 100 percent. In some defense areas, also, expansion of production facilities by private industry and by the military services or the Atomic Energy Commission has begun to send rents soaring. Over the Nation as a whole, the volume of new housing—which was helping to relieve the housing shortage and the pressure on rent levels—has had to be sharply curtailed.

All of these circumstances call for new rent legislation. The Government should have power to establish rent controls in any community where they are needed to stabilize the situation, stop profiteering, and hold down living costs. Of course, if State and local action results in holding rents to reasonable levels, the Federal Government would not act.

In addition to the control of rents on residential housing, an effective stabilization program in this period requires that the Government be able to control business rents. Rents are an important part of the cost of doing business at wholesale and retail levels. With the high levels of business activity, sales and warehouse space has been at a premium for many months. Business rents are rising in many cities and further sharp increases are threatened in the coming months. Unless controls are authorized, many businesses, particularly small firms, will face rent and hence cost increases which will either drive them out of business or require a break in price ceilings.

The keystone of our stabilization program is to share fairly the necessary burdens imposed by the defense effort. We can do this best by holding the cost of living stable, by preventing profiteering by anyone, and by paying for our military needs through higher taxes. A rounded stabilization program, such as I have outlined, can accomplish these ends.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

In this message I have discussed the more important of the amendments which I believe should be made in the Defense Production Act at this time. Others will be presented to the congressional committees by appropriate officials of the executive branch.

In summary, the more important amendments to the act which I now recommend would:

1. Extend the life of the act for 2 years, until June 30, 1953.

2. Authorize the Government to build and operate defense plants where necessary to produce essential materials and equipment.

3. Permit the use of differential subsidies to obtain essential production from high-cost sources of supply without increasing price ceilings.

4. Provide for controls over credit on existing housing, and regulation of speculative trading on commodity exchanges.

5. Allow the parity price for each farm commodity as of the beginning of its marketing season to be used for price-control purposes throughout the marketing season.

6. Provide stronger means to enforce price-control regulations.

7. Authorize effective control over both residential and commercial rents, wherever needed to stabilize the cost of living and the cost of doing business.

If, as we proceed with the defense-mobilization program, it becomes evident that we need further legislative action to assure that our goals are met, I shall make further recommendations to the Congress.

While the Congress is considering these proposals and enacting those which it deems desirable, the executive branch will continue to use vigorously the range of powers it has now. In the course of its forthcoming deliberations, the Congress will have available to it for consideration all of the experience and information which the executive agencies can provide.

We are engaged in a historic effort to hold together all of the free peoples of the world in the face of the greatest danger ever confronting them. As a leader in that effort, we must demonstrate to the whole world that the founding fathers were wise in their faith that our Government of divided powers would never suffer disunity or frustrate necessary action in time of peril. The executive branch and the Congress are both responsive to the American people—and the needs of the people are now both clear and imperative.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 26, 1951.*

SUSPENSION OF IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, COOPER, DINGELL, MILLS, REED of New York, JENKINS, and SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to inquire of the majority leader the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. In response to the inquiry of my friend from Indiana, may I say that on Monday next the Consent Calendar will be called, and then we will take up the bill H. R. 3576, which amends the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. Following that will be general debate on the Independent Offices Appropriation bill for 1952.

I do not know that there is any opposition to the displaced persons bill, since it was reported unanimously out of committee, but if there should be any roll call on Monday on that bill, is it agreeable to the gentleman from Indiana that the roll call take place the following day?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have to bracket together the legislation that will be taken up on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, because of the uncertainty as to the termination of debate and the completion of the appropriation bills. However, on Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, and then there will be a continuation of the consideration of the bill H. R. 3790, the Interior Department appropriation bill, under the 5-minute rule. Following the disposition of that bill, the Independent Offices appropriation bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule.

On the completion of that bill, we will take up H. R. 3791, the India emergency food relief bill. If time allows the bill H. R. 2084, dealing with the power of appointment and reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, will be taken up.

If there are any changes in the program of course they will be announced as quickly as possible, and the leadership on the Republican side will be so advised.

Of course, as usual, conference reports may be called up at any time.

FASCISTS AND COMMUNISTS BOTH WANT A TOTALITARIAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress and the country generally have done a good job on stopping communism. We have certainly done everything within the power of the Congress to stop any sign of communism inside of the Government and outside of the Government. Not only has the legislative branch of our Government done a wonderful job in that direction, but the executive branch also has done a good job in that direction, and we have also had the cooperation of the judiciary. The three branches of the Government have been working together very well, I think, to stop the spread of communism. In addition our boys have been doing a good job on the field of battle in places, although far removed from our own country, nevertheless where we believe it is necessary for them to fight in order to let the aggressors know that we mean business and we are willing to fight in order to secure peace.

While we have been on the alert to stop communism and we should continue to be on the alert to stop communism and continue to do everything within our power to stop any progress of any kind in that direction, we should not overlook the trend toward fascism. The Communists and the Fascists work in different ways, but when they get to the point that they expect to get, namely, when they reach their goal, it means one thing, a totalitarian government, a dictatorship. Whether it is approaching us from the left or whether it is approaching us from the right, it amounts to the same thing in the end.

The Communists' methods and habits and policies are well known, but the methods and habits and policies of the Fascists are not quite so well known. But we do know from studying the history of other countries, especially of Italy and Germany, that certain things happen when the road is being paved for a Fascist highway. Many of the things that happen in Germany and Italy are happening in this country today and have been happening here for the last few years. I look upon this with fear. I hope the country will always be on the alert, not only against communism, but also against fascism. If those who would lead us down the road to fascism continue to try to cause confusion and consternation and distrust of Government officials and distrust of anybody and everybody in public office, finally they hope that we will reach the point where they can say, "We cannot trust anybody in Government, either locally or in our Capitol in Washington. We need a few business or industrial leaders to take over and save our country." That is what happened in other countries. That could happen here.

Mr. Speaker, we have the finest, greatest, and best Government on the face of the earth. I think it is a well-balanced Government. We have a Congress of 531 Members, with 435 Representatives in the House of Representatives elected according to the population of the States, and they are selected for 2 years. That means something. It means that every 2 years the people have the power to change even their form of government or the trend in their government if they so desire by electing their representatives to this great body.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly do not quarrel with what the gentleman said with respect to the Congress, but did I understand him to say that it is some evidence that the fascists may be taking over if businessmen and industrial people come to Washington to help out in connection with the great defense effort that presently confronts it?

Mr. PATMAN. No. The gentleman misunderstood me. I commend them for doing that. They did a fine job in World War II, as well as now, but I was not speaking of them in that sense at all, and I was not speaking of those particular people at all. I said let us hope that the time will not come when there will be such confusion and consternation that those people who would carry us down the highway of fascism will be looking around for somebody to ride the big white horse—big business and industrial leaders, who say they are the only ones who can save us. That has happened in other countries, and we hope it does not happen here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. About 16 years ago this House authorized the appointment of a special committee to investigate communism, fascism, nazism, bigotry, and all other fakirs of that kind. If there is anybody I have contempt for it is a person who has a mind of hate, and I despise a bigot. They are everywhere. Fortunately, we have no tremendous organization now, but the American people must always be watchful of any such movement of that kind.

A little over 20 years ago we had such a movement against the Catholics of the country, and it was brought to the forefront in the Alfred E. Smith campaign which, from a political angle, represents unfortunate pages in American history, but from an historical angle, as we look back, it had a very clarifying effect, as far as Americans who are Catholics are concerned, of which I am one. But we had it manifested in other directions. I can remember in that investigation there was a certain group of powerful businessmen in this country who thought that all of their property and wealth was going to be taxed away from them. They sent men into the youth camps to approach the officers in there to form veteran Fascist organizations. They also sent representatives abroad to study veterans' organizations in Fascist countries abroad. His report was that there should be veterans' organizations in America, especially along the line of the Fascist veterans' organization in France. Very few paid attention to what the committee did on that occasion. However, every bill that we recommended became law, despite the opposition that existed. One of the pieces of legislation was the Foreign Agent Registration Act, which I drafted and introduced, and which was called the McCormack Act. The other was the Smith Act, so-called. It was under legislation that we recommended that the 11 Communists in New York were convicted. That came out of the special committee of which I was chairman. Another one was giving the Army and the Navy the power to control subversive activities in camps, and in navy yards, and on board ship.

Then, in their desperation they approached the late Gen. Smedley Butler, and they wanted him to become the head of this organization. It was fantastic. It is hard to believe, but actually it is a fact. That was 16 years ago. As the gentleman says, it is not beyond the realm of possibility. All of us should vigorously watch any kind of efforts toward a dictatorship, whether to the left or to the right, because history shows that whenever the right dictatorship has obtained control of the people, invariably when that collapses the Communists take over.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for his remarks. I happened to be a Member of the House of Representatives at the time the gentleman was chairman of the first committee which could have been known as Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the RECORD to show that it is to the credit of the late Gen. Smedley Butler, who was the enlisted man's general, as we all remember, that he just used them as a come-on. He was exposing the plot and getting information from those who approached him in order to expose them; and he rendered great service on that occasion as he did throughout his entire life. I want the RECORD to show that General Butler, while approached was simply using those who approached him to get information for the purpose of exposing them, which he did, when we had him before my special committee as a witness.

Mr. PATMAN. I have some information about that and I agree with the gentleman. Gen. Smedley Butler was known as the enlisted man's general. He was just a plain person, but he was an outstanding general; and when they approached him the times were very difficult in this country, you know; people were without jobs, twelve or fifteen million people did not have a place to work; they did not earn money; they had no checks of any kind coming to them; they had no savings; they were almost starving; they were desperate. Gen. Smedley Butler was approached by the other side, the wealthy ones from the right, knowing his contact and sympathy with the under dog, that large group out of employment that would likely do anything in desperation; Gen. Smedley Butler was approached for the purpose of being the man to ride the big white horse I was talking about awhile ago. He was approached by the people from the right. They were not hungry; they were not without jobs; they had everything. They were men of tremendous wealth. They also had the idea that the gold standard was the only thing that would save the United States of America, and they claimed they wanted to preserve, protect, and defend the gold standard; and in order to do that they had to have this organization of these great business and industrial leaders led by Gen. Smedley Butler really to take over the Government of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. But Gen. Smedley Butler, although he was willing to talk to them and to find out what they wanted to do and to get their offers, was telling the distinguished chairman of the committee all the time, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], now majority leader in this great body; and the gentleman from Massachusetts as chairman of the first Un-American Activities Committee did a wonderful job. He held his hearings in secret executive session; he did not have any publicity man to run out and tell the press agents all the time about something sensational or startling that would go into the headlines—never, not one time did he do that. On the other hand he had these sessions in private; he took down the testimony, and after the hearings were over and he could absolutely prove and establish to a certainty the facts, he held public hearings. The hearings were printed and made available to Members of Congress; they are available now, and they would open your eyes if you were to read them. By reason of the report of that first committee by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] certain recommendations were made as to laws that ought to be passed in order to provide proper security to our Nation against sabotage, and every one of those proposals was enacted into law; and every one of the convictions of the Communists and others have been under acts for which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was responsible. He really got something done. But now we are approaching a time just as dangerous.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I properly understand from what the gentleman is saying that he is concerned for fear the condition of the Government and the country is so bad that this man he envisions riding a big white horse is about to take over?

Mr. PATMAN. No; the Government is not.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman does not believe that——

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer. The gentleman has brought up the matter, has asked the question; now I concede to myself the right to answer and I hope the gentleman will permit me to answer. The Government is in a very sound condition. There is no question about that. There has never been a time in the history of this Nation or any nation on the face of the earth when there was greater evidence of loyalty and honesty in Government than during the last 18 years in the United States and since the gentleman mentioned that I want to invite his attention to the fact that commencing in the early part of 1933, March 4, to be exact, up until the present time, in order to whip the greatest depression in our history when 15,000,000 people were walking the streets and highways unemployed, and in order to win the greatest war in our history, when 15,200,000 men and women were enlisted and commissioned in the Armed Forces of our Government in World War II, in addition to the deficit that was created in our financing, we actually collected

from the taxpayers and actually spent $500,000,000,000. I do not mean million, I mean billion. That is a half trillion dollars. And up to this good day with all the congressional investigations by the Democrats, by the Republicans, by the State legislatures, and of all the accusations that have been made by commentators, columnists, and everybody else, not one person has even accused President Franklin D. Roosevelt or President Harry Truman or those closely connected with them with fraudulently taking or fraudulently misapplying one red copper cent, or as much as one red copper cent of that money. That is honesty in government. You cannot eliminate all dishonesty. But, I repeat, generally we have had the finest, the greatest, the most honorable and honest Government in this country during the last 18 years or that any country on the face of the earth has ever experienced or has ever enjoyed.

That is due to the fact we have such a wonderful system. Every 2 years the Members of this House must be elected. Our old forefathers were very wise when they said that certain bills can only originate in the House of Representatives, they may not originate in the other body, which means that every 2 years the people have complete control over their Congress through the election of 435 Representatives. And I am not one who is advocating the changing of that to 4 or 6 years. It ought to remain at 2 years. Two years is long enough for a sorry Representative to serve and a good one will not have any trouble getting reelected at the end of that time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it should remain just exactly like it is.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have been trying to determine in my own mind just what the gentleman is getting at. I do not want the folks out in the country to think that all of us down here are crooks, because we are not.

Mr. PATMAN. No, just the opposite.

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot do anything but reach the conclusion that the gentleman must be very much disturbed, else he would not be up here talking about these things.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I am disturbed that there is such an effort being made to mislead and deceive the people. These efforts are not new, they have been going on for a long time, but I do not know that they have been in such strong hands as they are today. For that reason I do not know what might happen.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman have reference in that comment to the two estimable gentlemen who belong to the other body, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. KEFAUVER?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am not talking about any person in either body, I assure the gentleman.

Now, that is a good system of ours. Every 2 years, the Representatives are elected in this House. You know, those great wise men who wrote our Constitution said that as to the executive branch of the Government the people should be allowed to change the President or the Executive every 4 years. That is a good balance. Every 2 years the Members of the House, who can really run the Government, are elected. If there is a bad trend, it can be corrected, and if it is a good trend, it can continue, and in the other body it is every 6 years. One-third of the 96 Senators are elected every 2 years. That makes a good balance. Then with the judiciary, that is not tied up with either the executive branch or the legislative branch, they are selected for life or during good behavior. I do not know, if we were trying to write another Constitution and trying to have a good balance between the people and their representative bodies and their executive branch of the Government, having in mind the judiciary, in interpreting the laws, that we could possibly improve on the great system we have today and that we have had for over 160 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I know the gentleman has in mind evidence that the special committee, of which I was chairman, uncovered 16 years ago, which was amazing, and I am sure the gentleman sees similar signs today, probably even more aggravated and more broadly distributed and felt than they were then. I could mention names right out of one big financial house in New York City, but it is unnecessary on this occasion. I assume, in answer to my dear friend's inquiry, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that my friend from Texas has in mind that old wise saying "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We are always to be on our guard and always cautious. My friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is calmly and dispassionately calling attention to our colleagues and the people in this country that this is the time to be very careful the same as it was 16 years ago.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is exactly right.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate we must continue to fight communism with all our power and might. We should not cease our efforts in that direction at any time. At the same time, let us remain on the alert against an equally devastating enemy whose ugly head is rearing itself in many places in the United States today, and let us be on the lookout and the watchout and on the alert against any trends toward fascism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial, and also to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous material therewith.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include short excerpts from General MacArthur's speech and a short excerpt from the New Yorker magazine.

Mr. JONAS (at the request of Mr. GROSS) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous material.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the reply of Dr. Hutchinson.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by James Berryman.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, April 30–May 5, on account of Small Business Committee hearings.

To Mr. ELSTON (at the request of Mr. HESS), for 4 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. FISHER (at the request of Mr. WHITTEN), on account of official business.

To Mr. HINSHAW, for the week of April 30 to May 6, on account of official business.

To Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. GORDON), for Thursday, April 26, 1951, on account of official business.

To Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. GORDON), for Thursday, April 26, 1951, on account of official business.

To Mr. CHATHAM (at the request of Mr. GORDON), for week of April 30 to May 6, on account of official business.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found

truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to give the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 30, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

408. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of Veterans' Canteen Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to the requirement contained in section 7 of the act of August 7, 1946 (38 U. S. C. 13f) (H. Doc. No. 117), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3605. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, as amended, to grant annual and sick leave privileges to certain indefinite substitute employees in the postal service; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 3860. A bill to amend the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3861. A bill to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct home and farmhouse loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3862. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3863. A bill to authorize coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 3864. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3865. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3866. A bill providing that gain realized on the sale or exchange of a residence shall, in certain cases, be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 3867. A bill to prohibit the Government from furnishing stamped envelopes containing any lithographing, engraving, or printing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3868. A bill to provide that patents created and held by individual taxpayers shall be treated as capital assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3869. A bill to relieve persons in the military service from refunding to the United States the amount of life-insurance premiums, and interest thereon, guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3870. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine certain claims of oyster growers for damages caused to oyster beds in the United States resulting from wartime naval operations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 3871. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3872. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of the unobligated portion of the amount appropriated for the Department of State so long as the present Secretary of State remains in office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 3873. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 212. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate and study the field service of the Post Office Department, for the purpose of considering and devising plans for the complete reorganization of such field service; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANTAFF: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida to the Congress of the United States requesting the abolition of certain provisions of the laws of the United States of America invoked by the Social Security Administration as the basis for regulations for withholding information as to the names and other information concerning persons who are recipients of welfare payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging legislation to require the publication of names of all persons, firms, and corporations who are doing business with Communist countries and to bar such persons from doing business with the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan relative to requesting the enactment of legislation amending the Federal Income Tax Act with respect to exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to requesting the inclusion in the current river and harbor development appropriation bill an item for providing a second entrance to Honolulu Harbor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3874. A bill for the relief of Teruko Kodama and her child George Kodama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 3875. A bill for the relief of William Hewson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3876. A bill for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3877. A bill for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3878. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Andrew Johnson, Alexander H. Tongue, James F. Sirlouis, James W. Dixon, J. Frank Tongue, Thomas E. Wroten, Halvor H. Hellen, George J. Carey, Robert C. O'Berry, Norman C. Carey, James W. Hungerford, Sarah E. Webster, Nathaniel M. Dare, and Richard J. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3879. A bill for the relief of Charles Cutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Roger T. Nooe, minister ecumenical, Vine Street Christian Church, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose will is our peace, grant that in these times that try the souls of men we may have the wisdom to know Thy way, the courage to dare, and the love to share, with a world unknowing, blind, and unconsoled. Amid the babel of the world's confusion, grant by Thy grace to bestow upon these Thy servants the high privilege of hearing that one voice as the sound of many waters, until they shall make all gifts and all interests consecrate to Thee, to the end that, being master workmen with Thee, they may have a right worthy part in making Thy will to be done on earth as it is in heaven.

In quiet and confidence teach us that our tensions may become growing edges for triumphs of the spirit. Show us that if we would survive, we must seek for more than survival, that making strong our outer defenses we shall be renewed in devotion to those principles that can never die.

Taking counsel of our faith rather than our fears, grant that we may be fortified with the conviction that fierce though the fiends may fight, and long the angels hide, truth and right have the universe on their side.

For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 26, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which convenes in Geneva on May 7 next. I shall leave this country during the early part of next week. I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for an indefinite period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on the coming Monday and Tuesday, because of official business.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on the coming Monday and Tuesday, because of official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, suspending deportation of certain persons, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of William (Vilem) R. Cicovsky from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on September 1, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED LOAN OF MODEL OF U. S. S. "FLORIDA" TO UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the University of Florida had requested the Navy Department to loan the university a model of the U. S. S. *Florida* (BB-30) for exhibition purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PAUL D. BANNING

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY GUAM CONGRESS AND LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Eleventh Guam Congress and the First Guam Legislature (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUDIT REPORT ON VETERANS CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Veterans Canteen Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 17

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Federal Income Tax Act with respect to exemptions

"Whereas the high cost of living has placed a burden on individuals and families, and in order to bring about a more equitable application of the Federal income tax, the exemption to married persons should be $2,500, to single persons $1,000, and the $600 exemption for each dependent, now in the present law, should be retained: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives*, That the members of the house of representatives urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Federal Income Tax Act so as to provide exemptions of $2,500 to married persons, $1,000 to single persons, and $600 for each dependent; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall me transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress.

"Adopted by the house April 16, 1951.

"NORMAN E. PHILLES,
"Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 26

"Joint resolution relative to flood-control studies

"Whereas the United States Army engineers have been authorized to make many flood-control studies which they are unable to undertake for want of sufficient funds; and

"Whereas the immediate construction of many projects authorized to be studied, such as the Guadalupe River and other streams, which includes San Francisquito Creek, is necessary for the protection of the safety of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to make sufficient funds available to the United States Army engineers to permit them to undertake all authorized flood-control studies without delay; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relative to the use of Federal gasoline tax money

"Whereas the Federal Government imposes a 1½-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline sold by the producer or importer thereof; and

"Whereas the ultimate burden of paying such tax is on those who operate motor vehicles over the Nation's highways; and

"Whereas it is only just and equitable that the revenue derived from the Federal gasoline tax be used primarily for the benefit of those who make it possible: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal gas-tax law so that all revenue collected thereunder shall be used solely for the construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of highways throughout the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 3

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the abolition of certain provisions of the laws of the United States of America invoked by the Social Security Administration as the basis for regulations for withholding information as to the names and other information concerning persons who are recipients of welfare payments

"Whereas certain laws enacted by the Congress of the United States purport, or are alleged to purport, to require the several States and their officers and employees to hold in confidence the names and other information concerning those persons who are the recipients of welfare payments participated in by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas said requirement of secrecy constitutes a hindrance to the proper and just administration of social-security laws; and

"Whereas the inability to open such rolls of recipients of public welfare payments to the proper law enforcement authorities and to the public is conducive to fraud and corruption; and

"Whereas the right to make public such names will probably save the State of Florida many thousands of dollars per year: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby requested to repeal those laws which purport, or are alleged by the Social Security Administration to purport, to declare public welfare rolls of a confidential nature, or which restrict the several States, their officers or employees, from opening the same to public inspection; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated, be dispatched by the secretary of state to the President of the United States; the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 30

"Whereas a second entrance to Honolulu Harbor is of vital importance to shipping entering the port of Honolulu; and

"Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers has approved provision for a second entrance to Honolulu Harbor at the Kapalama end of said harbor; and

"Whereas work on the project can commence without delay following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-sixth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested and urged to include in the current river and harbor development appropriation bill an item for providing a second entrance to Honolulu Harbor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, relating to the agricultural conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. AIKEN on April 23, 1951, p. 4133, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the return of certain Greek children kidnaped by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) on April 24, 1951, p. 4226, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the refusal to furnish financial aid to any country furnishing or selling arms or other war materials to Red China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) on April 24, 1951, p. 4226, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the publishing of the names of all persons, firms, and corporations who are doing business with Communist countries and to bar them from doing business with the United States Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) on April 24, 1951, p. 4226, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the restoration of certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) on April 24, 1951, p. 4226, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the members of the North Baptist Church, Ottawa, Kans., relating to the diversion of all grains from the manufacture of distilled, fermented, or malt beverages to the manufacture of food products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by Byers-Tosh Unit, No. 267, the American Legion Auxiliary, Ligonier, Pa., relating to loyalty of certain Government officials, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A statement adopted by the Waukesha County Democratic Organizing Committee, Madison, Wis., relating to the recall of General MacArthur, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., relating to grants of Federal funds to the counties of the Territory of Hawaii for antidisaster expenditures; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Earl A. Bailey Post, No. 430, the American Legion, Department of Texas, Odessa, Tex., favoring the discharge from the Federal service of all persons of subversive tendencies and un-American characteristics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition signed by Ronnie C. Davis and sundry other members of the Distributive Education Club, Luther Burbank Vocational High School, San Antonio, Tex., praying for the restoration of vocational distributive education to the list of vocational services to receive assistance from the George-Barden bill; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by John J. Barron, and several members of the crew of the steamship *Cotton State*, Panama, C. Z., relating to the United Labor Policy Committee; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Sunday Evening Club, of New Kensington, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Federal Council, Royal Arcanum, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and the Regis Bodecker VFW Post, No. 8694, favoring the enactment of legislation providing a 17-percent increase in compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Oklahoma City Council of Churches, Oklahoma City, Okla., signed by Mrs. E. R. Reno, executive secretary, praying for the enactment of legislation to supply urgently needed grain to India; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Saginaw County (Mich.) Board of Supervisors, relating to the death of the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. THYE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution 11

"Joint resolution memorializing the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Congress of the United States to oppose measures altering the tax status of cooperatives

"Whereas business enterprises are made up of several types of business organizations, including proprietorships, partnerships, corporations, and cooperatives, all of which have contributed greatly to the tempo of economic activity within the State; and

"Whereas the largest volume of cooperative business is done in the State of Minnesota and the people of this State, particularly within the rural areas, have been greatly benefited thereby and have received many services through the various cooperative organizations; and

"Whereas the tax position of cooperatives has been thoroughly investigated by the Congress of the United States over a long period of time and these investigations have revealed that under the present laws the cooperatives which have faithfully abided by the principles and regulations under which they have been organized; and

"Whereas any alteration of the present tax status would seriously hamper and restrict the services which the farmers' cooperatives are performing within the State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota*, That the President and the Congress of the United States be requested to oppose any measures to alter the tax status of cooperatives; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 18th day of April 1951.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 18th day of April 1951.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved April 21, 1951.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Monnesota."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature

of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution 12

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to Federal taxes on gasoline and motor fuel

"Whereas the cost of constructing and maintaining our highway system in Minnesota is mounting at an alarming rate and because revenues for said purpose are derived primarily from gasoline and license-plate taxes; and

"Whereas the tax on gasoline was originally a prerogative exercised by the States to the exclusion of the Federal Government who later intruded into this field of taxation by a levy of a cent and one-half, thus reducing by this amount what the State could levy; and

"Whereas the Federal Government now contemplates a levy of an additional cent and a half which would further jeopardize possible State levies on gasoline which would be a serious menace to Minnesota and her local subdivisions; and

"Whereas our county system of highways except as supported by the gasoline tax must depend upon a tax on real and personal property now reaching extremely high rates: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House concurring) strongly urge upon the Congress of the United States to refrain from further taxation on gasoline and that the existing tax be forthwith repealed; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to each member of the Minnesota delegation in Congress.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 18th day of April in the year of our Lord, 1951.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 18th day of April in the year of our Lord, 1951.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved April 21, 1951.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN NEEDED COMMODITIES AT REASONABLE PRICES—RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution entitled "Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to needed commodities from other countries available to the United States at prices which our people and our Government can afford to pay," which resolution was adopted by the General Assembly of Rhode Island on April 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to needed commodities from other countries available to the United States at prices which our people and our Government can afford to pay

Whereas the United States of America is engaged in a vital program of national defense; and

Whereas our country is forced to procure certain much-needed commodities from other nations at prices which cannot be justified, and which burden our economy; and

Whereas such prices add to the inflation which is already of such grave concern; and

Whereas these nations are our professed allies in the cause of human progress; and

Whereas our country has made unprecedented contributions to the common cause: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island respectfully requests the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to cause such representations to be made through the proper channels, as will result in making needed commodities from other countries available to us at prices which our people and our Government can afford to pay; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution.

DEFERMENT OF FARM YOUTHS—PETITION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, like other Senators and Representatives from great agricultural areas, I have been receiving considerable correspondence from farm leaders and rank and file farm workers and proprietors in my State on the issue of the stripping from the farms of essential manpower. As I have pointed out on the Senate floor, the farmers of America are as patriotic, if not more so, as any other group in our population. They have willingly contributed their sons, husbands, brothers, and other relatives to the war effort.

However, it is a fact that the farmers cannot possibly meet the tremendous increased production demands which the Department of Agriculture has placed on them unless there is a minimum of farm manpower on hand to run the machinery and do the thousand and one chores on every farm. As I say, the farmer is not asking for a special privilege but is merely asking that the unique factors in farming be considered by local boards.

The farmer of America, who is basically a rugged individualist, is not the sort to come running to Government unless he feels that he is being particularly damaged, and unfairly so, and unless he feels that the Government itself has set up a contradictory policy.

I have in my hand a petition sent to me by Mr. Clarence Whiffen, of Sheboygan, Wis., containing numerous signatures of farm leaders, cheese company officers, co-op officials, and other dairy groups. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this petition be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, including the signatures attached, and referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, including the signatures attached, as follows:

To Members of Congress from Wisconsin; United States Senators from Wisconsin; Director of Selective Service for United States; Director of Selective Service for Wisconsin; Appeal Board, Madison, Wis.; Local Board No. 68, Selective Service, Sheboygan County, Wis.:

The Sheboygan Press, in an editorial in its issue of Tuesday, March 20, 1951, stated as follows:

"Wisconsin farmers, in response to a request from the Federal Government, will seek the greatest possible production this year.

"Both military and civilian demands have increased sharply, and in an effort to meet new conditions the Government has removed acreage and marketing quotas, except on a few crops. The Government is particularly interested in boosting meat and dairy production. For Wisconsin, the biggest increases are urged in corn, seed alfalfa, and flax. The corn is needed for meat and milk, alfalfa seed for expansion of grassland farming, flax for linseed oil for industry and the meal for livestock feed.

"The Wisconsin corn goal is 2,700,000 acres, an increase of 105,000 over last year's total. Other acreage goals include 3,000,000 in oats, the same as last year; 225,000 in barley, 103,000 in wheat, 10,000 in flax and 62,000 in potatoes. The low potato acreage is the result of the anticipated greater need for other crops."

The undersigned, owners of milk plants and cheese factories, are in constant touch with the farm situation, particularly in relation to the production of dairy products in Sheboygan County, Wis. We feel it our duty to bring to the attention of the authorities a serious situation in connection with the farm help problem in this county and surrounding counties in eastern Wisconsin. At the outset we want to emphasize the fact that we are not asking for any preferential treatment of farm boys in the draft. We fully recognize the fact that the boys from the farms must bear their share in the military needs of our country. On the other hand there are production needs to be met by our civilian population just as important as having a large military establishment, as evidenced by the editorial quoted above. These production needs exist both in industry and in agriculture. The draft regulations recognize this fact when they state "In class II–A shall be placed any registrant whose employment in industry, or other occupation or employment, or whose continued service in an office under the United States, or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interests."

The foregoing quotation relates to other than agricultural commodities. The regulation as to agricultural products is stated as follows: "In class II–C shall be placed any registrant who is employed in the production for market of a substantial quantity of those agricultural commodities which are necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest." The regulations go on to define in more specific detail as to what is meant by production for market of a substantial quantity of agricultural commodities.

During World War II, the need for farm labor was recognized in the so-called Tydings amendment which was passed to conserve an adequate farm labor force. This amendment resulted in a deferment of a large portion of full-time agricultural workers based on production units. There is no such provision in the Selective Service Act of 1948.

It is our conviction that the manpower situation on the farms in this section of Wisconsin is becoming acute. So far the authorities have insisted that there was no shortage of agricultural products and that the withdrawal of various farms from production would not harm the country as a whole or interfere with its defense program. We do not believe that this is any longer a valid argument, particularly with the increased needs as pointed out in the above editorial.

What is the situation on the farms in this part of the State at present? In many instances the registrant who is called for service is the only male member of the farmer's family who can carry on the farm work. In many of these instances the owner of the farm is beyond the age where he can do full farm work or is physically incapacitated. The farmers cannot turn to the cities for help because the manpower situation is inadequate in the cities. Besides, it is common knowledge that the average city boy does not have the required experience or inclination to become a competent farm worker. Faced with this situation the farmer has no alternative except to discontinue farming and sell his livestock and personal property. It may be argued that if his milk cows are sold, they are added to someone else's herd, and there is no loss of production. However, this is not the fact. These farmers are many times unable to sell their cows for milk purposes and the herd is sold to the butcher and slaughtered. We know that in the case of two of the signers of this petition there has been a reduction of dairy herds amongst their patrons in a total of 14 herds, with a prospect of 5 to 7 more in the near future. To some degree all of the signers of this petition have had the same experience. This has already constituted a serious reduction in the production of dairy commodities in this section of the State. In our opinion if the present trend continues the country as a whole and the Military Establishment will feel the shortage acutely in the very near future.

We wish to emphasize the fact that our plea for relief is not based on any sentimental considerations as to the hardship to particular farmers. We know that the induction of a boy from any family into the military service results in some hardship and that there may be many instances in the city as well as on the farm where the withdrawal of a son results in an individual hardship to the father; for instance, in the case of the owner of a small store. Nor do we have any sympathy with the individual who uses his farm status as a mere subterfuge to evade military service. We recognize the fact that there were too many instances of that nature during World War II which have perhaps caused a prejudice against the deferment of farm labor at this time.

Based on our experience, our conviction is that in the present situation the retention of a boy on the farm is necessary to defense effort, where the following conditions exist:

1. The father or employer is producing to the best of his capacity a large amount of dairy and other agricultural products on a fair-sized or large-sized farm.

2. The farm laborer of military age, whether he be the son of the owner or an employee only, is one who has grown up on a farm, and in all probability will make farming his life work, and exclude from consideration the mere casual farm worker.

3. The father or employer is so situated that he cannot procure adequate farm help, either by members of his own family or from other sources.

4. The father or employer is unable to carry on farm work without the help of the registrant, either due to age or physical infirmities, or both, or because of the large volume of farm work.

For the foregoing reasons we earnestly solicit your cooperation in correcting a situation which we believe is becoming acute and dangerous to the best interests of the country. Again we repeat that we do not want any special consideration for farm laborers and that if the same conditions apply in any other essential industry besides farming, the same tests should be applied. We therefore ask a reconsideration of the whole situation and a change in the policy of the persons concerned with selective service so as to conserve necessary farm labor.

The undersigned are all persons buying and marketing dairy products in this part of Wisconsin, and all of us can verify the facts above set forth by our own experience.

Respectfully submitted.

George Froehlich, Secretary and Treasurer, Verifine Dairy Products Co., Sheboygan, Wis.; Walter Linder, Sheboygan Falls; Fred Van Tatenhove, Gibbsville Cheese Factory, Sheboygan Falls; Alfred Eernisse, Lakeside Co-op Cheese Association, Sheboygan; Norman Glander, Holland Co-op Dairy, Oostburg; Virginia Boccoth, Jr., Fairview Cheese Co., Cedar Grove; Earl Morgan, Hoard Co-op Factory, Cedar Grove; Lloyd Preder, Random Lake Cheese Factory, Random Lake; Ervin Deicher, Farmers Central Co-op Cheese Factory, Adell, Wis; Norbert Heise, Beechwood Cheese Factory, Adell; Charles N. Lecker, Cascade Cheese Factory, Cascade; James Lord, Waldo, Wis.; Harvey Schneider, Lima Cheese Factory, Waldo; Sheboygan Falls Creamery Co. (Per) Ernst Boll; Henry Schmidt, Town Line Cheese Factory; Roland L. Strub, White Clover Cheese Factory; Otto Boll, Secretary, Elmgrove Co-op Cheese Factory, Sheboygan Falls; Ewald Grunwald, Johnsonville Cheese Factory, Sheboygan Falls; Walter Schelk, Manager, S & R Cheese Corp., Plymouth, Wis.; Erwin Zimmermann, Crystal Springs Cheese Factory, Plymouth, Wilfred Rieck, Manager, Badger State Cheese Co., Erdman Plant, Sheboygan; C. W. Stange, Riverside Cheese Factory, Elkhart Lake; Herbert Horneck, Rhine Center Cheese Factory, Elkhart Lake; Fred Hasler, Elkhart Lake, Wis.; Ray Aderhold, Secretary-Treasurer, H. J. Bamford Cheese Co., Plymouth, Wis.; Bernard H. Schmidt, West Russell Cheese Factory, Elkhart Lake, Wis.; Lester R. Wordell, Sunny Valley Creamery, Elkhart Lake, Wis.; A. J. Passini, Superintendent, Passini Cheese Co., Plymouth; Edward Lensmire, Lensmire Cheese Factory; Reinhold Pipping, Hulls Crossing Cheese Factory; Melvin Kalk, Valley House Cheese Factory; E. H. Bruggink, General Manager, Wisconsin Cheese Produce Co-op, Plymouth, Wis.; P. Barton, President, B & R Cheese Corp.; Spring Valley Cheese Factory, Plant No. 3, S & R Cheese Corp.; William Abraham, Sunshine Dairy, Sheboygan; Herman Schreiber, Manager, Modern Dairy Cooperative, Sheboygan, Wis.

CLOTHING AND EQUIPMENT FOR UNITED STATES TROOPS IN KOREA—RESOLUTION OF BORUSKY-KRAHN POST, NO. 2631, VFW, LANGDON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Borusky-Krahn Post, No. 2631, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Langdon, N. Dak., relating to the furnishing of clothing and equipment to American Armed Forces in Korea before furnishing such material to troops of other countries.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has come to the attention of this post by direct report from the Korean front that troops of certain of our allies of the United Nations have been provided with new clothing and equipment in every respect when American forces adjacent to those troops were not properly equipped with winter clothing and equipment; further, that the troops provided with the new equipment abandoned same with unwarranted haste in the face of enemy attack; and

Whereas it is recognized there is not unanimous approval on the part of the American people to the presence of American troops in Korea; and

Whereas this Nation is being called upon to bear the brunt of providing the major portion of the UN troops in Korea and to bear the heaviest burden of taxes ever proposed to support them and to stop Communist aggression in the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by Borusky-Krahn Post, No. 2631, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Langdon, N. Dak., That we request the civil and military authorities of the United States to take such steps as will assure American troops being properly clothed and equipped before providing such clothing and equipment to other UN troops; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress from North Dakota and that a copy of same be sent to the commander of the VFW of the Department of North Dakota.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1025. A bill to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 300); and

S. 1183. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 301).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1612. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 299).

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—ADDITIONAL REPORT ON EMERGENCY AGENCY OVERHEAD (S. DOC. NO. 35)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of emergency agency over-

head, which was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

C. Dudley Miller, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

Elvio H. Sadun, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Martin Yanishevsky, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN (by request):

S. 1400. A bill to amend section 77 (c) (3) of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1401. A bill for the relief of Lore A. M. Hennessey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 1402. A bill to provide for the design, development, and construction of an aircraft suitable for local service airlines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 1403. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property at Shumaker, Ark.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1404. A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1405. A bill for the relief of Miklos Friedmann and his wife;

S. 1406. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Aron Katz and his family;

S. 1407. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Mendl Feldman and his family;

S. 1408. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Joseph Weisz and his family;

S. 1409. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Phillip Schonberger and family; and

S. 1410. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Ignatz Kovesi and his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1411. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in custody of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to prohibit the signing by any officer or representative of the United States of any document giving the force of law to any provision of the Yalta Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JENNER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, in order to permit the Long Island Railroad Co., which is now in bankruptcy, to finance a $6,000,000 loan for the installation of safety devices. I have not had time to study this bill in all its implications but I hope that the appropriate committee will give this legislation prompt and intensive consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1400) to amend section 77 (c) (3) of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE MacARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur made another valuable contribution to the solution of the grave problems confronting our country in an address at Chicago yesterday.

The general stated, what many others have stated in recent months, that major decisions in foreign policy, especially with reference to Korea, which should have been made long ago, are yet to be made.

The junior Senator from Nebraska is encouraged to believe that the Senate is becoming concerned over the situation in Korea as well as elsewhere around the globe.

The Committees on the Armed Services and Foreign Relations at their joint meetings, to begin May 3, have a great opportunity to develop recommendations for a global defense policy. We have confidence that the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who will preside over the meetings, will project the investigation wherever the facts may lead and give to the Senate, the Congress, and the American people concrete plans and proposals to lead our country toward speedy victory in Korea and restoration of America's leadership in world affairs.

In view of its significance I ask unanimous consent that General MacArthur's Chicago address, as published in the Washington Evening Star of today, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF MacARTHUR SPEECH

I cannot find the words adequately to express my sense of gratitude for the cordiality of your welcome. The memory of it will long live in my heart and prove a source of added strength to help me meet my responsibilities of citizenship in the great issues which now stir mankind. [Applause.]

I have been encouraged in many ways by the events which have followed my return from long absence abroad. Foremost of the encouraging signs has been the demonstration that the American people are keenly alive to their own responsibilities and do unhesitatingly voice their views on the direction of the policy of government. [Applause.]

It is for future events to ascertain whether they still retain the ultimate authority over government as intended by the Constitution or whether such authority has been lost in the drift from the pattern ordained by the architects of our political institutions. [Applause.]

WRITING PROUD RECORD

I have only recently left many of your sons on the battle line in Korea, and I can report to you they are splendid in every way. [Applause.] Despite the inhibitions under which they fight, they are writing a proud record of valor in indomitable determination unsurpassed in our military annals. [Applause.]

I have believed a realistic policy should fill the long-existing vacuum left in the wake of Red China's commitment to war against us, a policy designed to effect the early restoration of peace through victory, with a consequent saving of countless American lives. [Applause.]

It is difficult to ask men to fight and die unless we give them a realistic mission and the means to accomplish it. [Applause.]

What is our policy in Korea?

VIEWS ARE VARIED

Some will tell you that the pacification and unification of all Korea is the objective, an objective which, indeed, still stands as the formal mandate of the United Nations. Others tend to overlook such a formally stated policy, and will tell you that our objective is achieved upon clearing South Korea of invading forces. Still others ignore both explanations and frankly say that our objective now is to continue to engage the enemy forces in Korea in a prolonged and indecisive campaign of attrition, notwithstanding the constantly increasing cost in American blood. [Applause.]

None of these will tell you in the traditionally ringing tones of the American patriot that our objective is victory over the Nation and men who without provocation or justification have warred against us. [Applause.] And that our forces will be furnished all the sinews and other means essential to achieve that victory with a minimum of cost in human life. The tragedy is that since the advent of the war with Red China there has been no definition of the political policy which would provide a solution for the new problem thereby created.

POLICY VACUUM

This has resulted in a policy vacuum heretofore unknown to war. [Applause.] However great the effort to distract attention from the main issues by introducing into public discussion extraneous and irrelevant matters, the fundamental question still remains the same: "What is the policy for Korea?" [Applause.]

Our losses there in ratio to the men committed have already reached staggering proportions. These losses are progressively mounting by thousands each month. It is this steady increase that arouses in the mothers and fathers of America's sons such understandable anguish and uncertainty.

Nor is it difficult for those nations, with but token forces in ratio to our own, calmly to advocate no deviation from this course. It is in this situation of complete unrealism that while meticulously implementing the directives given me, I have strongly urged

the need for a positive policy attuned to the military realities and designed to stop through strength this slaughter of America's sons. [Applause.]

ENEMY BULLETS IMPARTIAL

I have endeavored since my return home to keep the issue on a higher level than partisan politics. [Applause.] The lives of your sons call for this measure of consideration. For the enemy bullets have no respect for political affiliation and strike down the son of a Democrat just as surely as the son of a Republican. [Applause.]

Although my pul lic life is now closed and I no longer—[shouts of "No!"]—it is closed—[laughter and further cries of "No!"] and I no longer carry any responsibilities of the national administration, I feel my responsibility of national citizenship no less deeply. [Applause.] I shall continue to advocate a positive and realistic policy for Korea, one designed to bring the war to an early and honorable end with maximum protection for your sons now engaged.

WILL CONTINUE FIGHT

I shall continue to fight against that greatest scourge of mankind, communism, as long as God gives me the power to fight. [Applause.] I shall work with you in the discharge of our common responsibilities of citizenship, to the end that American policy be based upon the thoughts and the needs and the aspirations of the American people unyielding to undue and exaggerated political pressures from abroad. [Applause.]

I shall stand with you for an America rededicated to those sacred and immutable ideals and concepts which guided our forefathers when drawing the design of American freedom. [Applause.] For although without command, authority, or responsibility, I still proudly possess that to me the greatest of all honors and distinctions. I am an American. [Applause.]

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. O'CONOR:

An address entitled "The Importance of Individual Thinking," delivered by Senator SMITH of Maine at the Hood College Convocation held at Frederick, Md., on April 21, 1951.

By Mr. WHERRY:

Article by David Lawrence entitled "Prolonging Korea Stalemate Laid to Democratic Leaders," published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 27, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

A resolution on policy adopted at the Conference to Fight High Prices and Inflation, held under the auspices of the Liberal Party at the Central High School of Needle Trades on Thursday, April 19, 1951.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Recommendations of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce regarding an emergency Federal tax program.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "Program for a Victory," by Walter Lippmann, dealing with a means of victory in Korea, published in the Washington Post of April 22, 1951.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Article entitled "Ankara Government Worried," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 27, 1951, dealing with the place of Turkey in the defense program.

PROTEST AGAINST FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION DECISION IN WISCONSIN NATURAL-GAS RATE CASE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the most important issues in the minds of the people of Wisconsin is the tremendous increases in natural-gas rates which have been inflicted on them. Those increases are seriously contributing to the mounting inflationary pressures. The increases, moveover, will serve to place Wisconsin businesses at a competitive disadvantage, insofar as their costs as compared with costs of industries in other States are concerned.

WISCONSIN OFFICIALS TO VISIT HERE

I had hoped to be able to make a rather full presentation on this issue on the floor of the Senate. I might state at this point that the distinguished chief executive of my State, the Honorable Walter Kohler, Jr., will be in Washington shortly on this issue, in conjunction with other leading officials of my State, including the mayor of our largest city, the Honorable Frank Zeidler, of Milwaukee.

Recognizing, however, the tremendous number of national and international issues facing us, I am not going to take the time of the Senate to comment at this point. However, I have prepared a statement which I commend to the attention of my colleagues, and in particular to the attention of members of the Federal Power Commission and of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. I am having the statement placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, rather than delivered on the Senate floor. I trust that they will review it with all the earnest attention which they would have given it, had it been possible for me to explore it orally and at length on the Senate floor.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, the text of my statement, to be followed afterward by a Milwaukee common council resolution on this issue, and the text of an editorial contained in the Milwaukee Journal of April 19.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC MUST BE PROTECTED

The people of Wisconsin were indeed shocked last week when they received the news that the Federal Power Commission by a 4 to 1 decision, had refused to hear evidence that the natural gas rates of the Phillips Petroleum Co. are excessive.

To be sure, the people of Wisconsin were not completely surprised by this news, because unfortunately, the Federal Power Commission for 3 years has tolerated the incredible stalling tactics of the Phillips Petroleum Co. That company has put roadblock after roadblock in the way of a review of the rates charged Badger and other midwestern consumers.

In the days preceding the FPC's action, I protested repeatedly to the Commission against the possibility of its acceptance of the Phillips motion limiting the present hearing to a purely jurisdictional question. In spite of my pleas, however, and in spite of the pleas of other officials of Wisconsin, the FPC turned us down and granted the Phillips motion.

COMMISSIONER BUCHANAN'S SOUND DISSENT

I do want to commend Commissioner Thomas C. Buchanan in whose dissenting opinion a clear presentation in the public interest was made. Commissioner Buchanan warned that the FPC was making a grave mistake in not looking into the gas rates at the same time it was determining jurisdiction. He pointed out that while the majority ruling seemed to have the merit of attempting to put first things first and seeking orderly procedure in the public interest, the action might actually have the opposite result.

The Commissioner indicated his well-justified fears that what the FPC decision meant in effect was a 3-year delay, because that is the average time that elapses in those cases where jurisdiction was the major issue, a 3-year delay between the date of the conclusion of the formal hearing and the date of the final decision, judgment, or decree in the appellate courts.

Thus, there would be no way of securing refunds for the people of Milwaukee even if such were found to be justified after the 3-year judicial delay. Why? Because the natural gas act makes no provision for reparations.

PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN DEEPLY SUSPICIOUS

Mr. President, the people of Wisconsin are good winners and good losers, if they are convinced the game is being played fair. However, there is a deep suspicion in our minds and hearts that there is back of this legal hocus-pocus on the part of the FPC some smelling shenanigans. We want, however, to be fair. We do not want to smear any individual or any agency. But the facts speak eloquently for themselves.

It seems an ironic fact that here we have a national administration which constantly speaks of its alleged love for the common man and yet there is a long series of its actions—legislative and administrative—which indicate that the administration seems actually to care very little indeed about whether or not the average man is gouged, i. e., is being charged all the rates that the traffic will bear.

I RESPECT INDEPENDENCE OF FPC

Now, Mr. President, I want to point out that I fully respect the Administrative Procedure Act. I do not want to see the Federal Power Commission dictated to by any one, including any one in the legislative branch. I have never, of course, taken any steps which could be construed as dictation either to that or any other agency. I respect the Commission's chairman and its members. However, I have a responsibility to the people of Wisconsin to serve their welfare and the FPC has a responsibility to serve the consumers of the Nation. I am extremely doubtful, however, that it could ever be impartially stated that the FPC has been diligently serving the consumers.

COMMISSION PLAYING FOOTSY WITH PRIVATE INTERESTS

Instead, it seems to have been playing footsy with certain private interests. I do not make that interpretation lightly. As a matter of fact that inference has been drawn by some of the most conservative circles of Wisconsin, by men who dearly prize, as I do, the free enterprise system and the system of independent, co-equal branches of the Government.

The Federal Power Commission has not heard the last from the people of Wisconsin or of America on this issue. If it thinks it can continue to frustrate the legitimate interests of the people, it has another guess coming.

APPEAL TO OPS

I am going to make two suggestions at this point:

1. I appeal to Mr. Eric Johnston, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization to have members of his staff investigate the effects of the drastic increase in natural gas rates. I believe that the inflationary sprial which has been engendered by this gas-rate increase well merits the OES's and OPS's review.

2. I further appeal to the Federal Power Commission to reconsider its refusal to probe

the prices charged by the Phillips Petroleum Co. The FPC's decision definitely need not be final.

KERR BILL'S VETO IS BEING UPSET

Mr. President, I want to point out that last year the President of the United States vetoed the natural-gas bill which would have removed the companies like Phillips from Federal Power Commission control. The President thus killed a bill which most Republicans and I personally had voted against. But now, in effect what is being done is that the Kerr bill is being resurrected and put in effect to all intents and purposes to the complete satisfaction of the natural-gas companies which backed it.

I do not question the motives or sincerity of those here in the Senate or elsewhere who have favored the exemption of these natural gas producers from Federal control. Among them are some of my dearest colleagues. But I do say that some of these folks' desire for exemption is in striking contrast to their apparent desire to have Government control practically everything else in our economy.

It is to the credit of the President of the United States that he recognized the danger of the Kerr bill. I earnestly hope that President Truman will now take cognizance of this present situation and that he will recognize that his sound decision of a year ago is now being upset by his own appointees. I make these comments completely irrespective of all partisan politics.

FPC'S PECULIAR PROCEDURE IN OKLAHOMA

Let me note before proceeding that the story of the hearing at Bartlesville, Okla., is a shocking commentary on the FPC. After stalling for 3 years, the Commission finally allowed a hearing. Representatives from the State government of Wisconsin, including our able Attorney General Vernon Thompson, journeyed all the way down to Oklahoma, bringing their voluminous records with them, in addition to their witnesses. However, on their arrival they were stunned to learn that what was going to be considered by the FPC was not the reasonableness of the rates, but the ridiculous question—based on a last minute motion—of whether Phillips Petroleum was in effect acting as a natural-gas company.

We might just as well argue whether the Federal Power Commission is actually a commission. As a matter of fact, perhaps there might be some doubt on that latter point. But there is certainly no doubt on the point that Phillips Petroleum does produce and sell natural gas and that it should be subject to regulation in order to protect American consumers.

BEHIND-THE-SCENES OPERATORS AT WORK

Now, Mr. President, this is not the first time in American history that the fact has dawned on the American people that there were behind-the-scenes operators who seem to be exceptionally successful in selling a special-interest viewpoint. I earnestly hope that the facts on this rate issue, when and if fully brought out, will not be such as to further completely demoralize the American public. But I say that the full facts must and should be brought out, regardless of consequences.

POSSIBLE INTRODUCTION OF INVESTIGATION BILL

I have been considering for some time the introduction of legislation to ask that a special subcommittee be set up by the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee to investigate the background of the Phillips Petroleum Co.'s dealings with the Michigan-Wisconsin pipeline company, as well as related natural-gas operations. I have hesitated to introduce such legislation because I well recognize the staggering workload which already exists on my colleagues in the Senate. I well recognize, moreover, that this whole subject is so extremely technical, so complicated, as to require the most intensive and prolonged study by experts.

For those reasons I have held back on the introduction of a bill. However, if it appears that we will have no other recourse, then it may be necessary to introduce such a bill and fight with all my might and main for its adoption and for the launching of such an investigation.

I INTEND TO FULFILL MY RESPONSIBILITY

I will not stand idly by while the people of my State are gouged. I do not believe that mere words on the Senate floor or words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or words in letters to the Federal Power Commission or to any other agency—that such words completely fulfill my responsibility for protection of the American people.

For the present, such words are the only instrument that I have available; but words can be powerful indeed if they awaken the public conscience and if they awaken the splendid conscience of Members of the Congress as well as members of the executive branch who genuinely have the public interest in mind.

Whereas the public interest of the many consumers of natural gas residing in the city of Milwaukee requires that the subject of reasonable and just rates should be thoroughly examined so that it may be ascertained whether the rates charged by gas operators to pipeline companies serving the State of Wisconsin are just and reasonable within the provisions of law and to the end that unjust and unreasonable rates can be promptly and adequately adjusted downward; and

Whereas it is apparent that the pipeline supplying the Milwaukee area bases its charges, to some extent, upon the rates which are charged to it by the producer; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has now before it in the Phillips Petroleum Co. proceedings the matter of determining reasonable rates, but has, upon the motion of Phillips Petroleum, limited the issues thus far to technical ones relating to jurisdiction, which issues will not permit an examination or factual presentation into the matter of reasonableness of rates; and

Whereas it is required in the public interests that such factual presentation be had and that a thorough examination be made into the matter of rates to determine what constitutes just and reasonable rates; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Power Commission be respectfully requested to broaden the issues in the Phillips Petroleum matter so that a complete factual presentation may be had with respect as to whether or not the rates charged are reasonable and just as is required in the public interests, and that copies of this resolution be presented to the Federal Power Commission and each Commissioner thereof and to the United States Senators representing the State of Wisconsin and the Representatives in Congress representing the city of Milwaukee; and be it further

Resolved, That with respect to the application or the filings of the Wisconsin-Michigan Pipe Line Co. for an increase in natural gas rates, the city attorney be requested to take such steps and initiate such proceedings as may be required so as to intervene in the proceedings relative to such filings and in opposition to such applied-for increases.

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

FPC'S ATTITUDE IS INTOLERABLE

The next investigation Congress orders might be to find out what the Federal Power Commission conceives its duty to be. Is it the protection of the public or the protection of natural-gas producers?

Current experience of Wisconsin and Milwaukee is that the FPC isn't interested in consumers at all. It seems to be dedicated to keeping consumers from getting a hearing.

For 3 years Wisconsin and Milwaukee have tried to get the FPC to investigate the rates for natural gas charged at the wellhead by the Phillips Petroleum Co. There is ample evidence that those rates are excessive.

After allowing the Phillips company to stall action since 1948, the FPC recently agreed to set a date for hearing. Phillips complained that Washington was too far from its gas office headquarters in Bartlesville, Okla., to haul records. With its usual courtesy to Phillips, the FPC consented to take its own voluminous records to Bartlesville. Our city and State and others interested in the case had to carry their records and witnesses there, too.

No sooner had everyone arrived in Bartlesville, with records and baggage, than the FPC announced in Washington that it would not hear the rate case until it decided whether Phillips was in fact acting as a natural-gas company. As Phillips produces and sells gas, this is as academic as the argument over whether the elephant exists.

While this silly argument went on in the guise of a hearing which opened April 3, everyone who carried his records to Bartlesville sat around and waited to use them. All witnesses against Phillips were in Bartlesville without access to the FPC members in Washington. They were kept from reaching the Commissioners to ask directly about the strange FPC rulings and attempting to convince the Commissioners that the concern of consumers was too vital to waste time on inanities.

"They've got us waiting out in the sticks of Oklahoma with records we can't use while they talk issues everyone thought were settled long ago," a Milwaukee official complained the other day.

Now, a new and more intolerable FPC ruling has been handed down. Rates won't be considered in Bartlesville at all, the FPC has informed everyone. The hearing will be confined entirely to the question of jurisdiction. If rates ever are considered, it will be at a later hearing.

That means that the whole trip to Bartlesville and the long wait there have been a complete waste of time and effort. Knowing the propensities of the FPC for stalling and the ability of Phillips to keep the jurisdictional question tied up in the hearings and in courts, the rate question seems doomed to a dim and distant future.

This means, too, that the FPC has again submitted to political pressure from the natural-gas producers. It is allowing Phillips to get by with uncontrolled rates and to delay any attempt to bring them under control. This, in spite of a mandate a year ago when Congress upheld President Truman's veto of the Kerr gas bill which would have exempted Phillips and companies like it from FPC control.

And, as usual, it's the consumer who pays because he can't get a hearing from a Government agency which was set up to protect his interests.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 9, after the word "from", it is proposed to strike out "foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and such countries) or

from Hawaii or Puerto Rico" and insert "the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico."

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, public resentment arising from the dismissal of General MacArthur has brought clearly before the American people the question of the determination of our foreign policy in the Far East, having special reference to the war in which we are engaged with the Chinese Communists. From the determination of what that policy should be we can judge better whether the President was or was not justified in his dismissal of General MacArthur. I do not see how anyone can justify the manner in which that dismissal was handled.

There is, of course, no question that we are at war with Communist China, whether war is declared or is not declared. The President himself, in his radio address to the Nation, referred many times to our contest in Korea as war. The important issue is how we shall fight that war. We have presented to us three alternative proposals.

First, there is the present policy of the administration, as expressed by the President and General Bradley—a stalemate war with no prospect of bringing it to a conclusion, except the pious hope that the Chinese Communists will quit.

Second, there is the Acheson policy, which has certainly in the past proposed to bring that war to an end by an appeasement peace involving, at least potentially, a Korea dominated by communism, the surrender of Formosa, and the admission of Chinese Communists into the United Nations.

A third policy may be called the MacArthur policy, that of confining our own troops to Korea, but using every means possible to win the war through the support of Chinese Nationalists, the bombing of communications and air bases, and the weakening of Chinese operations in Manchuria.

One difficulty with the Truman policy from the over-all standpoint is that it cannot go on forever. So I believe that in the end the choice must be between the Acheson policy and the MacArthur policy.

I am very much concerned that unless Congress clearly expresses its definite opinion in opposition to the Acheson policy, we shall wake up some morning and find that policy already adopted, in the face of the overwhelming disapproval of the American people and of the Congress itself.

Nearly all the speakers on the other side of the aisle in this Chamber have disowned, one by one, the various policies which Mr. Acheson has espoused in the past. But no one in the administration has negatived the possibilities of those policies, still urged upon as so strenuously by the British Government in the United Nations. I say that no one in the administration has done so—not the President in his speech to the Nation; not Mr. Acheson in his speech last week to the Nation; not General Bradley in his speech; not the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in his speech; nor, I think, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] in his speech.

In order to understand why I fear the adoption of the Acheson policy, it is necessary to review the history of the attitude of this administration toward communism in the Far East.

In the first place, of course, at Yalta the administration agreed that Russia could take over in Manchuria the position which had been occupied by Japan. We went to war with Japan largely because of the aggression of the Japanese on China and in Manchuria; and yet at Yalta, in violation of every principle of American foreign policy since the days of John Hay, and in violation of the principle of the open door in China, we established Russian domination of Manchuria. Not only that, but we did it without telling our ally, who had fought by our side for 5 years, that we were undertaking to trade away to Russia her most important industrial province, until 4 months after that agreement was made at Yalta.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is asserting that we gave Russia dominance in Manchuria. Will the Senator define those provisions of the Yalta agreement which he believes brought about that dominance?

Mr. TAFT. Under the agreement made at Yalta, Russia was permitted to occupy the railroads of Manchuria and the port of Dairen. She was also permitted to occupy Port Arthur, and to establish exactly the position which the Japanese had had in Manchuria, which had led to their complete military domination of Manchuria. The Yalta agreement, of course, led again to a complete Russian domination of Manchuria.

The Russians disarmed the Japanese. They proceeded to arm the Chinese Communists. The Chinese Communists were not even in Manchuria when the Russians came in. The Russians invited the Communists in. They armed them. They interfered in every way with the effort of the Chinese Nationalists to get into Manchuria. They turned away the American fleet at the ports of Manchuria when it was trying to assist the Chinese Nationalists to come in. They did so, of course, because of the general power given to them in the Yalta agreement.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator aware that we spent $300,000,000 transferring Chinese troops by air, and transporting them into Manchuria? Does not the Senator know that?

Mr. TAFT. So long as General Wedemeyer was in China, he did his utmost to help Chiang. The moment General Wedemeyer was recalled, we abandoned all further assistance to the Chinese Nationalist troops.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator know——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield no further until I finish the discussion of what happened.

After that had happened, the State Department sent General Marshall to China. His instructions were to tell Chiang Kai-shek that he must take Communists into his cabinet or he would get no help from us. He insisted upon truces at the very time when the Nationalist troops could have won a victory against the Communists. He insisted upon a truce, and insisted upon Chiang withdrawing any interference in the passes by which the Communist troops were able to enter Manchuria.

Finally, Chiang refused to take Communists into his cabinet. Certainly our experience in Czechoslovakia shows what would have happened if he had done it. It would have meant Communist domination of the Central Government. General Marshall then stopped all the aid which already had been promised to Chiang. Although he had half a billion dollars in his pocket which he could have spent to advance the Nationalist cause, he did not spend a cent. Further, he hampered in every way the operations of the Nationalists, and he brought about a result whereby the Nationalist troops were seriously hampered in their entire battle with the Chinese Communists.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, the Senator is asserting some things——

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if the Senator would mind asking me questions. This is only preliminary to the speech which I intend to make. The whole subject is capable of indefinite expansion. We could go through the white paper and all the other documents. I hope the committee which is considering this question will have all the facts before it. I state what I admit is my conclusion. Others may reach other conclusions; yet I am convinced that when the facts are brought out, the conclusion of the American people will coincide with my conclusion.

We could talk for 10 days in a debate on this particular question. I state my conclusion. The Senator is free to state his conclusion from the facts at any time he chooses to do so. So, except for brief questions, I do not intend to yield, because I wish to get to the main point of the speech which I am making.

Mr. McMAHON. I have sympathy for the position which has been taken by the Senator from Ohio, because I myself have a like ambition. However, in view of the way the debate was carried on

yesterday, and in view of the fact that on various occasions the Senator from Ohio made two or three minute speeches in opposition to the views being advanced by some of us on this side of the aisle, I thought he might be willing to allow us to make some observations.

However, in view of the fact that the Senator wants questions, perhaps I can give him one.

Is the Senator aware that immediately following VJ day we transported 500,000 Chinese Nationalist Government troops to reoccupy areas previously held by the Japanese?

Mr. TAFT. I know that we assisted. I would not say how many troops were transported.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator know that this assistance gave to Chiang control over the areas and the arms held by 1,200,000 Japanese troops?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think that is true.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator know that we supplied arms to the Chinese Nationalists sufficient to equip 39 divisions?

Mr. TAFT. Not after the World War ended.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; we did.

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator know that we supplied immense quantities of artillery, small arms, and aircraft?

Mr. TAFT. We supplied a certain amount of small arms, but not a great deal of artillery. We did not supply the airplanes we agreed to supply. General Marshall cut them off arbitrarily when he went to China. Later he cut off any further supply of arms which we had agreed and contracted to give to the Nationalist Government.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator know that 936 airplanes and airforce material sufficient for an 8⅓-group air force were turned over to the Nationalists, so that they had unchallenged air superiority?

Mr. TAFT. I know that a number of airplanes were turned over to the Chinese Nationalists.

Mr. McMAHON. Nine hundred and thirty-six.

Mr. TAFT. I know that parts were not supplied. I know that when it came to the question of oil and gasoline for the Nationalists, Mr. Remington, in the Department of Commerce, saw to it that no permits were granted to get the necessary gasoline which was required to operate those planes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. TAFT. I know that the State Department by their export policy hampered every effort to furnish assistance to the Chinese Nationalists.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator know that 131 naval vessels were transferred from the United States to the Nationalist Government?

Mr. TAFT. I would not know one way or the other about that.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Would the able Senator from Ohio give us information as to who this man Remington is to whom he referred?

Mr. TAFT. He has been convicted of falsely stating he was not a Communist, but he sat at the desk of the Export Division of the Department of Commerce and held up the Chinese Nationalist applications for aviation gasoline as far as he could do it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize also that the same Mr. Remington was the head of the ad hoc committee which had the clearance of all foreign shipments, of permits to all nations, including Russia—the same Remington?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I am familiar with that.

Mr. FERGUSON. That he was also one of the economic advisers who worked in the White House? Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. TAFT. I am familiar with that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Ohio familiar with the fact also that nine of our Liberty ships which we had given to Nationalist China, but on which we held a mortgage, were, with what our Minister Rankin in Formosa said was the connivance of the British, turned over to the Communist Chinese within the past year?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I remember that. The British also more or less connived with the idea of turning over certain airplanes of the Chennault Co. to Communist China. I do not know that the Chinese Communists have gotten them yet, because there is still litigation about them, but the Government at Hong Kong seemed to approve the plan.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator aware of the fact that Maj. Gen. David C. Barr, who is a member of the Joint Military Advisory Group on China, reported to the Department of the Army that during the critical year of 1948 no battle was lost by the Chinese Nationalists because of the lack of munitions or equipment, but rather, Barr reported, the military debacle, in his opinion, can be attributed to the world's worst leadership and many other morale-destroying factors leading to the complete loss of the will to fight? Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. TAFT. That is an opinion of a gentleman with which I completely disagree, and with which many other people disagree, including General Wedemeyer, whose report has been rendered. The truth is, of course, and there can be no question about it, that there was a strong pro-Communist, anti-Chiang group in the State Department of the United States. They extended their power into the Commerce Department. They extended their power into the Defense Department. Throughout the whole period of the contest between Chiang and the Communists they were trying to tell the American people, and they backed propaganda to that effect, that the Chinese Communists were merely agrarian reformers, that they were good people, and they represented the people of China. Of course, there never has been an election held in China in which the unfortunate Chinese people could have shown whom they preferred as between two contesting parties, so I have no means of knowing as to that. But the fact is, and I am only trying to make this point, that we are wholly justified in our suspicion of Mr. Acheson's policy, and our suspicion that he may try to end the Korean war by appeasement of Communist China, judging by what the State Department did when he was Assistant Secretary, and by what the State Department did after he became Secretary; for during that period of 5 years the Far Eastern Division of the State Department has been consistently friendly with the Chinese Communists, and assisted them, and hampered Chiang.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Was not the distinguished Senator from Ohio present at a luncheon in the Vandenberg room of this very Capitol when Mr. John Foster Dulles, who was one of Mr. Acheson's chief advisers, and who now is in process of preparing a Japanese peace treaty, spoke to a group of Senators and said that the pro-Communist influence in the State Department prevailed up to the time of the Korean war? Was the Senator present at that luncheon?

Mr. TAFT. I think I remember it. I would not like to quote Mr. Dulles exactly, but that was the general impression I got from his remarks.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. Now I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio if he knows of a single change in the State Department that has erased the pro-Communist personnel?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know of anything except the transfer of John Carter Vincent, I think Minister to Switzerland, to some obscure post.

Mr. JENNER. So this Nation and its foreign policy are still in the hands of the men who have betrayed it in the past.

Mr. TAFT. Before I continue with my statement, I should like to read from the letter of Ambassador Hurley to President Truman, in November 1945. As long ago as that he said:

> While these objectives had the support of the President and the Secretary of State, it is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department. The professional foreign service men sided with the Chinese Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professionals openly advised the Communist armed party

to decline unification of the Chinese Communist army with the National army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

* * * * *

I requested the relief of the career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war. These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department as my supervisors. Some of these same career men whom I relieved have been assigned as advisers to the Supreme Commander in Asia. In such positions most of them have continued to side with the Communist armed party and at times with the imperialist bloc against American policy.

Mr. President, I do not question the fact that there is controversy over the question, but I do not think the over-all fact of a strong pro-Communist influence in the State Department can be disputed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me at that point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Is not the Senator from Ohio aware of the fact that the gentleman who wrote the letter which the Senator just read is the man who went to see Stalin, after which he gave an interview to the press, of which there is a transcript, in which he stated that, in his opinion, the men of the Kremlin had no territorial ambitions in China, and that, after all, Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek had no basic or essential differences; that they were both for a democratic government. The press men asked Hurley, "What do you mean by a democratic government?" and he said, "I mean a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Some of the career diplomats he was criticizing at the time directly contradicted Mr. Hurley's report, and he has succeeded, and I think the Senate should know it, in perverting his position in this whole controversy. The very people he has attacked, even the people he said were Communist sympathizers, told the State Department that the Chinese Communists were being run by Moscow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course, the fact that one may differ at some time with something he said previously is not much proof.

It was President Truman who said of Stalin, "Good old Joe. Joe Stalin is a good fellow. He is a prisoner of the Politburo, but we can trust Joe." President Truman has also changed his posion as to some of the Communist leaders.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the suggestions in regard to equipment which has been turned over to the Chinese Nationalist Government, is the Senator from Ohio familiar with the fact that in the statement by President Truman on United States policy toward China, issued an December 18, 1946, which appears in the so-called China white paper, beginning at page 689, there appears on page 692 of the President's statement the following paragraph which I should like to read so as to familiarize the Senator from Ohio with it:

China agreed to buy all surplus property owned by the United States in China and on 17 Pacific islands and bases, with certain exceptions. Six months of negotiations preceded the agreement finally signed in August. It was imperative that this matter be concluded in the Pacific, as had already been done in Europe, especially in view of the rapid deterioration of the matériel in open storage under tropical conditions and the urgent need for the partial alleviation of the acute distress of the Chinese people which it was hoped this transaction would permit.

This is the significant sentence:

Aircraft, all nondemilitarized combat matériel and fixed installations outside of China were excluded. Thus, no weapons which could be used in fighting a civil war were made available in this agreement.

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to have the Senator supply those figures.

Mr. President, to complete my statement in regard to Mr. Truman's change of mind, let me say that on December 31, 1945, he sent a message to Josef Stalin, saying:

On this anniversary of Your Excellency's birth, I am happy to send you my congratulations and my very best wishes for your health and happiness in the coming year.

On March 15, 1946, President Truman said:

I had never met Mr. Churchill personally until a conference we had with Mr. Stalin. I became very fond of both of them. They are men, and they are leaders in this world today when we need leadership.

On May 31, 1946, when Mr. Truman was asked whether he planned to see Stalin soon, Mr. Truman said he had no immediate plans, but that he would be glad to see him at any time.

On June 11, 1948—as recently as that—Mr. Truman said:

I went to Potsdam in 1945 with the kindliest feelings in the world toward Russia, and we made certain specific agreements. I got well acquainted with Joe Stalin, and I like old Joe. He is a decent fellow, but Joe is a prisoner of the Politburo. He cannot do what he wants to. He makes agreements; and if he would, he would keep them. But the people who run the government are very specific in saying that he cannot keep them.

Mr. President, that bears a little on my general point, because it shows the fact that for years after the obvious character of communism had been made apparent, Mr. Truman still was not converted to any real opposition to communism. That course and position on his part justified, of course, and supported those in the Government and those in the State Department, in particular, who still favored Chinese communism.

Mr. President, coming down to the far eastern policy in more recent years, first of all, the first time I became in any way involved in it was in December 1949. I then made a rather innocent statement, at the end of an interview on foreign policy, that we should hang on to Formosa and should prevent Communist occupation of Formosa, even though it involved the use of our Navy. It seemed to me to be perfectly obvious that inasmuch as throughout the world we had a general policy of the containment of communism, Formosa was a place where we could prevent the spread of communism without any difficulty whatever and substantially without expense, and that of course we would do it. I was met, however, by a blast of criticism from Mr. Acheson and from the President himself. They immediately undertook to deny that we had any interest in Formosa. On January 12, 1950, a little more than a year ago, Mr. Acheson said that the United States could exploit the eventual resentment of the Asian peoples over the aggression of Russia in China only by avoiding foolish adventures, such as intervention on Formosa.

Now the administration has sent a large military mission to Formosa. Certainly intervention in Korea, from a military standpoint, was a much more foolish adventure than intervention on Formosa.

Mr. Acheson then stated his general policy with respect to the Far East. When speaking before the National Press Club at that time, he said the United States was helpless to prevent the dismemberment of China. He made it clear that the State Department's future plans for checking the spread of Soviet influence throughout Asia would depend on the righteous wrath and anger of the Chinese and other nations over Russian encroachment. He was not in favor of doing anything; and, of course, the North Koreans later on were quite prepared to take their chances on the righteous wrath and anger of the other Koreans which might develop some 10 years later.

Mr. Acheson made another curious statement about communism. He said that "to say that the main motive of American policy was to halt the spread of communism was putting the cart before the horse." He said the United States "was interested in stopping communism chiefly because it had become a subtle instrument of Soviet imperialism." Apparently Mr. Acheson had no opposition to communism as such, and did not seem to recognize that communism was a part of the Russian aggressive military policy and that the two were tied together, but at that time his position was that we were interested only in stopping Russian imperialism, not communism.

Secretary Acheson appeared at the time before the Foreign Relations Committee. I quote from a newspaper clipping which appeared at that time. Secretary Acheson was quoted as making the suggestion that we should have an impregnable defense line in the Far East without Formosa. According to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], Secretary Acheson said to the committee that Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines were the American line of security in the western Pacific, and that with bases on this line, our position would be impregnable. He believed then, and presumably he believes now, that we do not need Formosa and that we can permit the Communists to take it over. He said he would not speak for the Chiefs of Staff, although he believed he knew something of their views. He strongly

supported President Truman's stand against sending military forces or military advice to the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa, and said that he, Acheson, alone was responsible for the State Department's confidential guidance message of December 23, 1949, telling its officials abroad to prepare for the loss of Formosa to the Communists.

As I have said, I made my rather innocent statement, but I returned to Washington and found that the State Department had already issued a general instruction to its agents throughout the world that they must condition the American people to the taking over of Formosa by the Chinese Communists.

Secretary Acheson also said several important problems had come to a head since Congress had adjourned 3 months before then. He said that one of them was possible American recognition of Communist China. On this point he reminded Senators that the Communists then controlled all of China except a few isolated areas, but he said that the administration saw no need for haste in recognizing the Chinese Communists. He said American recognition would depend on future events, including assurances that the Chinese Communists would protect the safety of American citizens and would obey international law. He distinctly said that beyond the line laid down—that is, Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines—the United States could not assure the rest of the Far East against attack.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio will permit my inserting, at this point in his remarks, a press dispatch which was released on January 5, 1950, quoting from the December 23, 1949, memorandum, to which the Senator has referred. It quoted the State Department's confidential document as saying that the Island of Formosa had no strategic value. That statement was made despite the fact that in 1945 the same State Department had said in its official bulletins that outside of Singapore, Formosa was the most strategic area in that part of the world.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be very glad to have that inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOKYO.—The United States State Department has notified its attachés that the loss of Formosa, island redoubt of the Chinese Nationalists, to the Communists was to be anticipated.

The Department said the public must be sold on the idea that the island is of no strategic value in order to prevent the loss of prestige at home and broad.

A document containing the Department's instructions on how to erase the "false impressions" of those pro-Nationalists interested in a "save Formosa" drive has been circulated here, it can be disclosed today.

The document was prepared by the State Department's public affairs area policy advisory staff, and was dated December 23. The word was sent to members of the Department and of some other Government offices.

The document said there are "pro-Nationalists (principally in the United States) who consider Formosa a redoubt in which the government could survive, and who tend to create an impression that the United States is delinquent if it fails to 'save Formosa.'"

It said there are groups in the United States "who are inclined to be critical of the United States for failure to act to prevent the loss of the island to the Communists." This is "largely because of a mistaken popular conception of its strategic importance to United States defense in the Pacific," the document added.

"The loss of the island is widely anticipated, and the manner in which civil and military conditions there have deteriorated under the Nationalists adds weight to the expectation," it said.

The fall of Formosa, it continued, would threaten a loss of prestige by the United States at home and abroad "to the extent that we have become committed in the public mind to hold it."

The fall, it continued, also would threaten damage to the morale of other nations, "particularly in the Far East, which are disturbed by Communist gains and fear its possible further advances."

The document said Formosa—politically, geographically, and strategically—is a part of China and "in no way especially distinguished or important.

"Politically and militarily it is a strictly Chinese responsibility," the document said. "It is true that the technical status of the island remains to be determined by the Japanese peace settlement, but the Cairo agreement and Potsdam declaration and (Japanese) surrender terms of September 2, 1945, looked to its return to China, and the United States facilitated its take-over by Chinese troops shortly after VJ-day.

"United States public opinion has concerned itself primarily with the question of the island's strategic importance; there has been an insistent demand from a few sources for military action by the United States, but it has not assumed significant proportions."

The document said all available material should be used "to counter false impressions" that the retention of Formosa would save the Chinese Government, and that its loss would damage seriously the interests of either the United States or of other countries opposing communism.

Without evidencing undue preoccupation with the subject, it continued, emphasize as appropriate any of the following main points:

"Formosa is exclusively the responsibility of the Chinese Government. Formosa has no special military significance."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should also like, Mr. President, if I may be permitted to do so at this point, to insert in the RECORD a letter which I addressed to the Secretary of State on January 3, 1950, requesting that the December 23 memorandum be made available to the Senate. When no reply was received, on January 7, 1950, a letter was addressed by me to the Secretary of State, to which the Secretary replied, over his signature, on January 17, 1950, stating that he would not supply the names of those who drafted the memorandum which set forth that Formosa had no strategic value; nor did he supply the full text of the copy to which I have referred. I ask that the letters of January 3, January 7, and January 17, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 3, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that under date of December 23, or thereabouts, the State Department issued a memorandum to various military attachés and others, indicating that Formosa could not be held for long and to do everything possible to prepare the public for the loss of the island and to stress the fact it was not needed for the strategic defense of the United States.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, I desire to have a copy of this memorandum at the earliest possible date.

With best personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

JANUARY 7, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State, State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I called the State Department this morning to request the names of the committee which had been responsible for drafting the December 23 memorandum advising the State Department personnel that Formosa had no strategic value.

I first attempted to get Mr. Peurifoy in the Personnel Division, but he was out of the city, and talked with Mr. Bryan and made the request of him. He said he had to take it up with higher authority. At about 11:15 this morning, I received a call from Mr. George Kennan who stated both Secretary Acheson and Under Secretary Webb were out of the city. However, he stated that the State Department itself assumed responsibility for any such information sent out and that he felt that he must decline to give me the names of the persons constituting the committee which drafted the document.

I emphasized to him that I felt that as a Member of the Senate of the United States I was entitled to this information and that while there might be some basis for the Department's position to decline to release a document which they themselves had classified, I could see no excuse for not furnishing a Member of Congress the names of such committee.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, January 17, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of January 7 in which you refer to your effort to obtain the names of those responsible for drafting the December 23, 1949, memorandum, and to your conversation with Mr. George F. Kennan who advised you that he felt he could not furnish you with the information.

I fully agree with the position taken by Mr. Kennan that it would be inappropriate to release the names of the officials who participated in the drafting of this paper. I feel that I, as Secretary of State, have responsibility for the work of officials of the Department. Primary responsibility for this particular document, in my opinion, rests with me and secondary responsibility rests with Mr. Howland Sargeant, Acting Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public Affairs.

I hope you will agree with the position I have taken in this matter. The responsibility is mine and I fully accept it.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the significance of this correspondence is that if there is within

the State Department someone who is determining the strategic needs of the country, it is certainly a duplication of what is being done by the Military Establishment. For a year and a half we have been endeavoring to ascertain whether the State Department ever gained any information from any competent military source indicating that the Island of Formosa had no strategic value. Until we can ascertain who drafted the memorandum of December 23, we cannot tell with whom they consulted.

Finally, I would say to the Senator from Ohio that in preparing for the hearings before the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I again addressed a letter to the State Department, and only yesterday I received a reply from the Secretary of State in which he indicates that neither the Wedemeyer report nor the information which had previously been requested would be supplied. I intend to pursue the matter in the sessions of the two committees sitting jointly, because I think it is pertinent, and it is necessary that the American people get the facts, and that an iron curtain no longer be lowered between the activities of the executive branch and the representatives of the people in the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to have those letters inserted. In the President's statement of January 5, 1950, he said:

> Similarly, the United States will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa.

Of course, he has in part reversed that, although his aid is limited, apparently, to purely defensive purposes. Of course, that is what on January 5, 1950, he was saying he would not do. Nevertheless, in his earlier statement of policy, and in the policy he is presently pursuing, he was and is taking a course which is absolutely contrary to that which the United States took in Europe. In Europe we moved in with all our strength. We spent approximately $1,000,000,000 to uphold the anti-Communist Government of Greece against the Greek Communists, yet in China, where we are supporting the Nationalist Government and have recognized the Nationalist Government, the Secretary said in 1950 he would give neither military advice nor assistance and he is aiding today only on a very limited scale.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell me the approximate date upon which we began to aid the Greek Government?

Mr. TAFT. I know that it was in the Eightieth Congress, because it was at a time when I participated in one of the two conferences at the White House which I have ever been asked to attend, and that was because the Republicans were in control of the Eightieth Congress. So I think it must have been about 1947. My guess would be that it was at the beginning of 1947.

Mr. LONG. It would seem, then, that if we were ever going to back the Chinese Nationalist Government against the Communists who were trying to overthrow that government, that would have been the logical time for us to make the attempt.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it would seem to me that if we were going to adopt a policy of giving military aid to the Government of Greece against its Communist aggressors, the question would naturally rise, Why not give it to China? Greece is a good deal closer to Russia than is China. The situation in Greece was exactly as dangerous to us, so far as concerned our getting into a war with Russia, as would be the situation now if we gave aid to the anti-Communist government of China.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, it seems strange that the plan which bears the name of General Marshall was based upon supporting democratic, anti-Communist governments against the aggressions of the Communist government of Russia, yet General Marshall had himself made the recommendation that we should refuse to help the government of Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. TAFT. General Marshall was sent to China with instructions to that effect from the State Department. I only blame General Marshall for the fact that, after he arrived in China and had been there a month, discovering what the situation was, he did not insist that he not be asked to put into effect a policy which could not and should not be carried out. It is not my opinion that General Marshall initiated the policy.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Greek affair occurred in March 1947 and I am sure it must have been in March of that year that President Truman issued his proclamation.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I think it was.

Mr. President, by June 30, 1951, we will have given $440,000,000 in outright grants of ECA aid to Greece, plus the arms aid to Greece—whatever that amounts to. I believe the aid to Greece has been close to $1,000,000,000, and, in the case of Turkey, nearly $500,000,000.

Mr. President, I am only suggesting that, when we consider his background, and his mental attitude, we have no evidence whatever that the Secretary of State has changed his mind. The one thing I would like to see Congress do is to go on record as definitely opposed to any surrender of Formosa, any recognition of the Chinese Communists, or the appeasement policy which may possibly be adopted.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem that it might be preferable, instead of this Nation trying to use our Navy and our airmen in an effort to hold Formosa, simply to send aid and supplies and American advisers to the Government on Formosa, in order that it might have the equipment necessary in order to defend itself, and with which to carry the offensive to the enemy, if necessary?

Mr. TAFT. That is my idea. The assistance should be logistical aid; that is, means of transportation, airplanes, arms—whatever they desire. But so far as troops are concerned, I would not send an American soldier to the mainland of China.

Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. McMAHON addressed the chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not true that what the Senator has suggested is exactly what we are now doing? There certainly has never been the slightest intimation or suggestion that we surrender Formosa. Quite the opposite, it is recognized as an important link in the defense of the free world by the free world. But if, as was suggested by General MacArthur——

Mr. TAFT. Wait a moment. Secretary Acheson issued a memorandum saying that we ought to sanction the taking over of Formosa by the Chinese Communists.

Mr. LEHMAN. Secretary Acheson certainly has not sanctioned the taking over of Formosa by Chinese Communists. He said that the disposition of Formosa should be made by the United Nations and that Formosa belonged to China. He has not even said that for a long time.

Mr. TAFT. It was in December 1949, and in January 1950.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would not the suggestion now made by General MacArthur that the Nationalist forces on Formosa be transported from Formosa to the mainland, denude Formosa of all its defense? Under those circumstances, how could Formosa be defended, in the absence of the garrison which is now on the island, composed of Nationalist soldiers, unless we sent our own troops there to fight?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, General MacArthur said nothing of the kind. He was not going to denude Formosa. All he suggested was that we ought to help the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa make raids to reach the mainland, where they could link up with the guerrillas in South China. All South China today is apparently in a ferment. Communists there are unpopular. They tried to seize grain. There are more than 150,000 guerrillas operating there, with whom Chiang Kai-shek can link up. No one is suggesting the denuding of Formosa through a march into China, at least until it appears it will be a completely successful military operation. General MacArthur did not suggest anything about denuding Formosa. The Senator made up the words, and he implied something which simply was not in General MacArthur's speech.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the proposal was definitely made that the Chinese Nationalists on the island of Formosa go to the mainland to fight, with the logistical support of the United States? If they are going to go to the mainland to fight, they are not going to be on Formosa, and Formosa would be denuded, or at least greatly weakened in its ability to defend itself.

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry to say that to me what the Senator says makes nonsense. So long as there is an army of 500,000 or 600,000 men on Formosa, no one, of course, would suggest leaving the rear exposed. Whatever is done, of course, will be carried out in whatever military way is practical according to the advice of military men, whom we ought to send there, not to advise on the defense of Formosa, but on the possibility of making trouble in South China for the Chinese Communists, which we hope will result in the withdrawal from Korea of divisions which today are advancing and pushing back the American Army, and slaughtering American boys.

Certainly an operation in China would provide a serious diversion from the battle which is now going on in Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the discussion which the Senator from Ohio has been having with the Senator from Connecticut, is the Senator from Ohio familiar with the fact that on June 30 there was released to the press from the White House a statement regarding the use of ground units of the United States forces in Korea? That was on June 30. It was very significant that on the same date on which the first American ground troops were authorized to go into Korea the Government of the Republic of China submitted an aide-mémoire of June 30 offering 33,000 of their best troops in response to the United Nations' request for all possible members to participate against aggression.

The Department of State replied on July 1, 1950. I ask unanimous consent that the White House press release referred to, appearing at page 46 of the Department of State Bulletin, and the offer to the State Department by the Chinese Nationalist Government, appearing on page 47 of the same publication, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a meeting with congressional leaders at the White House this morning, the President, together with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, reviewed the latest developments of the situation in Korea.

The congressional leaders were given a full review of the intensified military activities.

In keeping with the United Nations Security Council's request for support to the Republic of Korea in repelling the North Korean invaders and restoring peace in Korea, the President announced that he had authorized the United States Air Force to conduct missions on specific military targets in Northern Korea, wherever militarily necessary, and had ordered a naval blockade of the entire Korean coast.

General MacArthur has been authorized to use certain supporting ground units.

AIDE-MEMOIRE OF JUNE 30

The Chinese Government will make available for use in South Korea to repel the armed attack of North Korea one army of seasoned troops of approximately 33,000 men suitable for operations in plains or hilly terrain.

These troops carry the best equipment at China's disposal.

For the transportation of these troops, the Chinese Government will provide 20 air transports of the type of C-46 and, if necessary, can give a reasonable amount of air cover. If the troops are to be transported by sea, the Chinese Government can provide a moderate amount of naval escort.

These troops can be ready for embarkation in 5 days.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should also like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he is familiar with the fact that in connection with his response to the National Government of China the Secretary of State, on July 1, issued a statement.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement be placed in the RECORD as to why the Government declined the use of the Chinese Nationalist troops.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In response to the request contained in the Chinese Embassy's Aide-Memoire of June 29, 1950, the appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States have given consideration to the expression of willingness on the part of the Government of the Republic of China to furnish ground forces for service in Korea in support of the United Nations.

The Secretary of State desires to inform His Excellency the Ambassador of the Republic of China of the deep appreciation of the United States Government for this prompt and substantial demonstration of support for the United Nations on the part of the Government of the Republic of China. In light, however, of the threat of invasion of Taiwan by Communist forces from the mainland, a threat repeated in the last day or so by spokesmen for the Chinese Communist regime in Peiping, it is the view of the Government of the United States of America that it would be desirable for representatives of General MacArthur's headquarters to hold discussions with the Chinese military authorities on Taiwan concerning the plans for the defense of the island against invasion prior to any final decision on the wisdom of reducing the defense forces on Taiwan by transfer of troops to Korea. It is understood that General MacArthur's headquarters will be in communication with the appropriate Chinese military authorities on Taiwan with a view to the dispatch from Tokyo of representatives of General MacArthur's headquarters for this purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This is the significant statement: "It would be desirable for representatives of General MacArthur's headquarters to hold discussions with the Chinese military authorities on Taiwan concerning the plans for the defense of the island against invasion prior to any final decision on the wisdom of reducing the defense forces on Taiwan by transfer of troops to Korea. It is understood that General MacArthur's headquarters will be in communication with the appropriate Chinese military authorities on Taiwan with a view to the dispatch from Tokyo of representatives of General MacArthur's headquarters for this purpose."

Yet, Mr. President, when General MacArthur visited Formosa in August of last year there appeared in the New York Times a column written by Mr. James Reston, a very responsible reporter, in which he said, among other things:

Moreover, responsible officials still insist, despite the MacArthur-Harriman statements, that United States officials here, who were trying to minimize the Formosa question, and the very officials in the State Department charged with responsibility for the conduct of far-eastern policy, did not know about the MacArthur visit to Formosa until they had read about it in the newspapers.

So we find that on July 1 the Secretary of State suggests that a mission be sent, and on August 11 the Department started under-cutting General MacArthur when he followed the suggestion of the Secretary of State. They even went to the extent that on August 9 there appeared in the Washington Post an article, the first paragraph of which read as follows:

The United States has assured Britain and several other nations that Gen. Douglas MacArthur's recent visit to Formosa does not foreshadow any change in this country's attitude toward Chiang Kai-shek.

So that at the time General MacArthur was trying to build the morale of the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa, the State Department was still under-cutting both General MacArthur and the Republic of China's forces on Formosa.

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with the Senator.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Ohio. The Senator states that he is not in favor of sending a single American soldier into the land mass of Asia, but is for logistical support, which, I suppose, means warships and airplanes.

Mr. TAFT. No, I do not think so. Logistical support means aid in getting their forces from Formosa to China and help in providing supplies.

Mr. McMAHON. How many airplanes and how many warships would be required? Has the Senator a blueprint?

Mr. TAFT. I am not a military expert. I would say we would send such airplanes and warships as might be necessary to accomplish the purpose.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Chinese Nationalist troops should give the same sterling performance they previously gave when they dropped their guns and ran away, is the Senator of the opinion that we should call quits and abandon them, or does the Senator believe that we should follow them up?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Connecticut simply shows that he has the same unreasoning prejudice against Gen. Chiang Kai-shek that General Marshall has.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. I think it is quite significant to note that those who are now questioning the ability, the desire, and the will of the Chinese Nationalists to fight on the mainland of China in the event they are given the opportunity to do so, when a similar question was raised concerning the Greek Loyalist forces at the time we were aiding Greece in 1947, came up with the recommendation that, despite the fact that the Loyalist Government in Greece was weak, corrupt, and that the army was not properly organized, it would be in our interest to give necessary aid, logistic support, and training, which would make the Greek Army an effective force to destroy the Communist forces within Greece.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is absolutely correct. In the east this administration has followed a policy directly opposite from the one it has pursued in Europe. That is why I am afraid we shall find ourselves tied up with an appeasement agreement which was about ready to be executed last January or February.

Mr. NIXON. Has the Senator noticed that those who at the present time are opposed to sending aid to the Nationalist forces on Formosa were not opposed to sending aid to the Greek forces who were subject to similar criticisms?

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator, entirely. I think he is entirely correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator suggested that there was a plan of appeasement in the United Nations——

Mr. TAFT. I was coming to that. If the Senator does not mind, I would rather develop that and give the whole story.

Mr. FERGUSON. After public opinion became so strong against it, the State Department said, "Well, after all, we do not expect the Chinese to accept a proposition of appeasement."

Mr. TAFT. I remember that. I shall come to that point.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Ohio has said that the Senator from Connecticut is as prejudiced against Gen. Chiang Kai-shek as is General Marshall——

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Connecticut has repeated the rumors as to the Chinese Nationalists giving away our arms and surrendering to the Communists without a fight, and all the rest of it, which are pure propaganda spread by the Chinese Communists and the State Department.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the moving picture I saw of the Communist forces in Peking which were equipped with arms and munitions we had given the Chinese forces illustrates to me that there are "some propagandists" in the State Department, if they could manufacture that one. I am prejudiced, I may say to the Senator from Ohio, after $2,700,000,000 was sent to the government in charge of the whole territory of China.

Mr. TAFT. I deny that the amount was $2,700,000,000. There is no use in arguing the merits of the fight, which has been going on for years, as to what the situation in China was. I hope the committee will develop it. The Senator and I could talk all afternoon without convincing each other of one fact. I think that what is perfectly clear is that from the beginning this administration, or the State Department, wanted the Communists to win. They favored the Communists; they propagandized for the Communists. The Far Eastern Division of the State Department was dominated by pro-Communist sympathies.

Mr. McMAHON. I say that is not so.

Mr. TAFT. Not only that, but General Marshall insisted upon Chiang Kai-shek's taking Communists into his cabinet. That was the policy in 1946. On December 18, 1946, President Truman was asked the question:

> Are we urging the Nationalist Government in China to accept Communists in the Cabinet?

President Truman is quoted as having said:

> It has been our policy right along.

In 1948, on March 11, the New York Times reported from Washington that Secretary of State George C. Marshall at a news conference had said that the United States still favored broadening the base of the Chiang cabinet by including Communists. That was done in spite of what had happened in Czechoslovakia and what had happened to every government which had taken Communists into its cabinet. Wherever Communists were taken into a cabinet the Communists soon dominated the cabinet. Still the President and Secretary of State adhered to the policy. Have they given it up today? Do they still believe what they believed then? Do they still believe it is right?

Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator feel that both he and the Senator from Connecticut are giving a little too much emphasis to Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists? Is it not more important at the moment to do something about the two-hundred-thousand-odd American boys in Korea and the 60,000 casualties which we have suffered?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I should like to get to that point, if I can get away from the intense debate.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Ohio that both last year and the year before, when I was in Formosa, and previously, when I was on the mainland of China, reports were current that the Soviet Union and international Communists were transferring to the Chinese Communist forces some of the lend-lease supplies which we had sent to Russia and which had amounted to $11,000,000,000, so that the story could be built up that all of their equipment had been captured from the Nationalist forces of China and that the Nationalist forces of China were only the supply sergeant for the Chinese Communists. The fact of the matter is that the forces which withdrew from the Chinese mainland withdrew with a great deal of their equipment.

I also invite the Senator's attention to the fact that when the British had to evacuate Dunkerque, and lost all their equipment in doing so, we did not turn our backs on them, but started immediately to send them equipment to replace the equipment which they had lost.

Mr. TAFT. There seems to be some evidence also that some Russian planes shot down in Korea were equipped with British jet engines. However, I do not think it proves necessarily that the British surrendered the engines to them, or were appeasing Chinese Communists.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In connection with the long-standing controversy about the extension of aid, it is clear that about $600,000,000 of the alleged $2,000,000,000 was for assistance in transporting troops, which, of course, was not effective fighting. I think it is also clear that the difficulty with the Chinese was the lack of bullets. They had guns and other weapons. I think the testimony of one man will be accepted by all sides on the subject of Communist casualties. He is Gen. Chu Teh, the leader of the Chinese Communist forces. He is reported to have stated publicly that in the conquest of China there were 1,320,000 Communist casualties, before the bullets of Chinese Nationalists gave out and they surrendered their guns, further bullets being denied by us, according to the plain record. Is it not obvious that if anything like 1,320,000 Communist casualties—or any number—could be inflicted by the guerrillas, it would contribute directly to a solution of the difficulties which our troops are facing in Korea?

Mr. TAFT. There is no question that aggressive action in south China and assistance to guerrillas in fighting the Reds would result in drawing some forces away from the battle line in Korea. That probably would save American lives more than anything else we could do.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I will yield, although I should like to get on with my address.

Mr. NIXON. My comment will be brief, but I believe it is pertinent to the point which the Senator is now discussing.

A great deal of emphasis has been placed, naturally, on the necessity for landing Chinese Nationalist troops on the mainland. However, I think we should bear in mind that even the removal of the present guaranty which our Seventh Fleet is giving to Chinese Communist forces, to the effect that there will be no threat whatever to the mainland of China, would require a diversion of Communist forces from Korea to the south China coast. In other words, we are confronted for the first

time in our military history with a situation in which, being engaged in a war with an enemy, namely, the Chinese Communists in Korea, we are guaranteeing that there will not even be a threat of a diversion. By removing the guaranty, which the Seventh Fleet at the moment is implementing, as a result of the instructions issued at the time the Korean war broke out, the very threat of an invasion would be sufficient to require the stationing along the Chinese coast of troops which would not be engaged in Korea.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator states the case very clearly. The situation is most extraordinary. Here we have an ally, a nation which is a member of the United Nations, the members of which have been called upon by the United Nations to furnish troops in Korea in order to prevent the aggression in Korea, and yet from that ally we will not accept aid, although their enemies are the people who are committing the aggression. It seems to me there can be no logical support for the present position of the administration.

I believe our Government invited the invasion of Korea by the weakness of its policy. Of course, Secretary of State Acheson in January 1950 made it very clear that we would not intervene in Korea under any circumstances, and that we were not interested in defending Korea. Furthermore, we did not arm the South Koreans.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to cover the point I have in mind before I yield again.

Incidentally, if we were trying to hold Korea, if that was our intention, we should have kept our troops in Korea. But, of course, that was not the intention of the administration at the time. At the time we withdrew from Korea, we declared that we would give armed assistance to Korea. The Mutual Assistance Act of 1949 authorized the President to furnish military assistance to South Korea. Assistant Secretary Webb, of the State Department, testified specifically, both before House and Senate committees, that the appropriation they sought was for the purpose of helping the Koreans to deter external aggression. The bill was passed in October 1949. By June 1950, not a single bit of aid had been given, except merely some small arms which had been left behind when we withdrew from Korea.

So far as I can discover, the South Koreans were given no airplanes, no tanks, and no heavy artillery.

Apparently someone in the State Department had changed the policy of giving the South Koreans sufficient arms with which to deter external aggression. The President said later, in his statement about Korea, that the government forces of Korea were armed only "to prevent border raids and preserve internal security." Somebody in the State Department had changed the policy. I understand it was changed because someone was afraid that if the South Koreans had tanks and airplanes they would attack the North Korean Communists. Therefore, we gave them only small arms, which would be swept away if the North Koreans attacked them. It was certainly a weak policy. To what extent it was again the result of a deliberate policy of not antagonizing Chinese communism, it is difficult to say at the moment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator for a question on the subject.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator would like to know exactly what military aid was given to Korea, and to have it placed in the RECORD at this point. We gave them $57,000,000 worth of arms and ammunition and $85,000,000 for supplies and equipment.

Mr. TAFT. No one claims that it was anything more than old small arms which we did not want to take away when our forces left Korea. The only expenditure of money under the 1949 aid act was $200.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator is in error about that. I will give him the facts in a few minutes. If the Senator from Ohio will indulge me, he made reference to Mr. Acheson's invitation—I think he called it an invitation—to the Communists to come into Korea. That has been constantly reiterated, because of a speech which Mr. Acheson made before the Press Club on January 12, 1950. Perhaps the Senator would not object to having in the RECORD exactly the text of what he said. In the course of his remarks he dealt with the question——

Mr. TAFT. No. The Senator can put that speech in the RECORD in his own time. If there are any pertinent excerpts from it, I do not object to having them read at this time.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not intend to read a long screed. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that after defining the defense perimeter the Secretary of State said, as to the other areas of the Pacific, "We cannot guarantee them against aggression. They are going to have to defend themselves, in the first place, and then look to the United Nations."

That is exactly what happened in Korea.

Mr. TAFT. He did not say anything about looking to the United Nations. He made it perfectly clear that we were not coming back.

Let me read what the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is now in the Chamber, said on May 5, only a month before the Korean War. He was asked the following question on the David Lawrence questionnaire:

> Do you think the suggestion that we abandon South Korea is going to be seriously considered?

The Senator from Texas replied:

> I am afraid it is going to be seriously considered because I'm afraid it's going to happen, whether we want it to or not. I'm for Korea. We're trying to help her—we're appropriating money now to help her. But South Korea is cut right across this line—north of it are the Communists, with access to the mainland—and Russia is over there on the mainland. So that whenever she takes a notion she can just overrun Korea, just like she will probably overrun Formosa when she gets ready to do it. I hope not, of course.

The next question was:

> But isn't Korea an essential part of the defense strategy?

The answer of the distinguished Senator from Texas was:

> No. Of course, any position like that is of some strategic importance. But I don't think it is very greatly important. It has been testified before us that Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines make the chain of defense which is absolutely necessary. And, of course, any additional territory along in that area would be that much more, but it's not absolutely essential.

So both the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Secretary of State stated, in effect, to the North Koreans, "We are not going to interfere in South Korea. We have moved out of South Korea. It is indefensible anyway. We are not coming back. We do not give them any arms, and they know that we do not give them any arms."

I say that that was a direct invitation to the North Koreans to move in. It was an invitation to Soviet Russia to believe, as it did, that here was a soft spot where Russia could move in without difficulty. I think the action of the administration brought on the Korean war. If we had taken a definite position as to South Korea, I do not believe there would have been an aggression. If we had simply warned the North Koreans that an attack in force meant an American Army in South Korea, I do not believe there would have been the attack which took place.

For 200 years Russia has been moving forward by going into soft spots. That has been her policy. Wherever she thought she could grab something and get away with it, she has done so. Here was a place which the Secretary of State and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee gave them every reason to consider a soft spot; and that we would not do anything about it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is correct in saying that Russia has moved forward by moving into soft spots. It certainly moved in on a soft spot when it moved in on Chiang Kai-shek in China. He was as soft as mush.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend for a moment?

The Chair admonishes visitors in the galleries that no demonstrations either of approval or disapproval of anything said or done on the floor are permitted under the rules. The Chair asks that the occupants of the galleries abide by the rules of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think it might be well to insert in the RECORD, at this point, a letter addressed to the President of the United States under date of June 22, 1946, by his Ambassador, Edwin W. Pauley, dealing with the situation in Korea, in which Ambassador Pauley very clearly outlined the Communist and Soviet influence in North Korea as of that date, in mid-1946.

Mr. President, I believe that when this document and the Wedemeyer report on Korea are finally made available, they will amply document the fact that the administration had warning for at least 3 years that there was grave danger of the very type of aggression taking place which finally did take place on the 25th day of June of last year.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOKYO, JAPAN, *June 22, 1946.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Following are some observations, conclusions, and recommendations on the Korean situation based upon a first-hand inspection by myself and my staff in Korea. I have also given consideration to interviews with people in our occupation forces in Korea as well as Koreans and members of the Soviet occupation forces in Northern Korea.

Frankly, I am greatly concerned with our position in Korea and believe it is not receiving the attention and consideration it should. While Korea is a small country, and in terms of our total military strength is a small responsibility, it is an ideological battleground upon which our entire success in Asia may depend. It is here where a test will be made of whether a democratic competitive system can be adapted to meet the challenge of a defeated feudalism, or whether some other system, i. e., communism will become stronger.

It is clear from the actions of the Soviets that they have no immediate intention of withdrawing from Korea for the following reasons:

1. They apparently are stalling on taking any joint action with the United States toward setting up a trusteeship, toward forming anything resembling a provisional government, or doing anything that might in any way hamper their entrenching themselves more firmly in Northern Korea.

2. They are propagandizing and promoting a Communist Party and a Soviet type of program which would establish loyalty to Moscow as the highest form of loyalty to Korea. To this end they are riding roughshod over all political factions which might oppose or even question such a philosophy. For example, the streets of Northern Korea are decorated with Soviet propaganda posters. Most of these posters publicize the Soviet Government, and include large pictures of Stalin and Lenin.

Many of the posters read as follows: "Long live the friendship of the Soviet Union and Korea," "The Soviet Government is the highest form of democracy," "We will raise the honor of the Red army still higher," "For the fatherland, for the party, for Stalin," "Long live Stalin, the creator of our victories," "The first teacher of a Red army soldier is his sergeant," "In a strange land a fighter must be more observant and on guard."

From the above, it is clear that the Soviet Government does not intend to allow the United States exclusive use of the word democracy. Democracy means one thing to the Soviets, and quite another to the United States. To us it means, among other things, freedom of speech, assembly, and press. The Soviet interpretation of democracy is expressed in terms of the welfare of the masses.

In considering the effect of Soviet propaganda on the Koreans, it must be remembered that about 70 percent of the present 27,000,000 in Korea are small farmers and fishermen. Only a few have ever voted or even have the right to vote. They have little knowledge of national or international economic affairs, and are easily swayed by golden tongues and promises.

3. Communism in Korea could get off to a better start than practically anywhere else in the world. The Japanese owned the railroads, all of the public utilities including power and light, as well as all of the major industries and natural resources. Therefore, if these are suddenly found to be owned by "the Peoples Committee" (the Communist Party), they will have acquired them without any struggle of any kind or any work in developing them. This is one of the reasons why the United States should not waive its title or claim to Japanese external assets located in Korea until a democratic form of government is assured.

4. The Soviets are taking no substantial amount of capital equipment from Korea, although they may be taking certain stocks and products of current production.

5. They are devoting considerable effort to rejuvenate economic activity in Northern Korea probably directed toward replacing the broken economic ties to Japan with new economic ties to the U. S. S. R.

6. The Soviet Army is obviously ensconcing itself for a long stay. Officers' families are already with them. The army is virtually operating the railroads. Statements by high ranking officers show no indication of any plan of leaving or even a hope of leaving.

The possible Soviet objectives in Korea are as follows:

1. To provide Korea as a puppet state which would make possible a defense in depth in the event that the Soviet Union were attacked from the southeast. I would anticipate the present Soviet thinking would be to deal with Korea as they did with Poland and Yugoslavia, namely, with a puppet government they will make a sovietized trade treaty which will only exploit the Koreans.

2. To provide an encirclement, or one jaw of a pincer against North China and Manchuria (the industrial heart of a strong new China). The other jaw of the pincer would be outer Mongolia (newly sovietized) and Siberia.

3. To provide a similar encirclement or jaw of a pincer against Japan in the event that Japan were built up by some foreign power to use as a base against the U. S. S. R. The other jaw of the pincer would be the Vladivistok Peninsula, Karafuto, and the Kurile Islands.

4. To secure favorable port concessions in the warm-water ports of Ch'ongjin (Seishin) and Hungnam (Konan) and Wonsan, similar to the concessions in the ports of Port Arthur and Dairen.

NOTE.—If civil war continues in Manchuria, the U. S. S. R. might occupy Manchuria on the theory that they must protect their interest in the railroads and be able to communicate between Siberia, Port Arthur, and Dairen.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Soviet Union should be compelled to comply with the Moscow declaration on Korea. Specifically she should be called to task for failure to participate in the formation of a representative provisional government, and for maintaining the split at the thirty-eighth parallel.

Action may be secured in several ways, including—

(a) Raising the issue with the United Nations or the Big Four.

(b) By the United States taking action to withhold concessions which otherwise might be made to the U. S. S. R.

(c) By aggressively pursuing a campaign of propaganda in favor of a united Korea which would make the Soviet obstructionism obvious to the Koreans and to the world.

2. The United States should carry on a propaganda and educational campaign within Korea in order to sell democracy and the four freedoms. It should teach the responsibilities as well as the advantages of democracy.

In the absence of such a campaign, the Koreans will hear pretty largely only of communism which the Soviets preach as the highest form of democracy. Sending American teachers to Korea and Korean students to the United States would aid such a campaign and should be encouraged from a long-range viewpoint. However, no immediate benefits can accrue in time to meet the present crisis.

3. Korea should receive certain needed industrial equipment from Japan as part of reparations removals. Her industrial economy presently is developed for the production of raw and semifinished materials which were required by Japan. She now requires equipment such as machine tools in order to devote the products of her present industry to the needs of her internal economy. This can be provided in one or more ways, including:

(a) Substantiating a claim for damage and cost of Japanese occupation and aggression.

(b) The United States subordinating a portion of its—and possibly other countries also—claim to Korea with or without receiving compensation from the Koreans in the form of future deliveries of raw materials. Since this may have to take the form of disposing of United States property, an act of Congress similar to the Tydings Act on the Philippines may be required.

(c) A more practical manner of bringing this about would be for the United States Representative at the Japanese reparations meetings to pick the psychological time to reduce its demands sufficiently to give Korea what it needs. (Note: The United States would not actually be giving up anything it expects to get or even wants.)

4. The United States should give greater technical assistance to Korea in the reconstruction of her industrial economy. This can be done by:

(a) Sending engineers to Korea to aid in starting operations and training Korean supervisory personnel.

(b) Encouraging Korea to invite participation of American capital which would bring with it managerial know-how.

(c) Encourage training of Korean engineers in American industries and engineering schools, and send American teachers to Korean engineering schools.

You will note that the observations, recommendations, and conclusions contained herein depart from strictly reparations or even economic aspects of the Korean situation. However, the economy of which the reparations question is an integral part is so interwoven with the political and international phases that I took the liberty of extending my remarks into these fields. I do not do so with any intent of usurping anyone else's prerogatives.

I am addressing an identical original of this letter to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, the Secretary of State.

Respectfully,

EDWIN W. PAULEY.

Mr. TAFT. The President, on June 27 in one of those spasmodic actions which are more or less characteristic of this administration, entirely reversed

the American policy which he had previously announced when he moved into Korea after the North Koreans attacked. I had much sympathy with his reversal of position. I stated at that time that—

> The time had to come, sooner or later, when we would give definite notice to the Communists that a move beyond a declared line would result in war. That has been the policy which we have adopted in Europe. Whether the President has chosen the right time or the right place to declare this policy may be open to question. He has information which I do not have.
>
> It seems to me that the new policy is adopted at an unfortunate time, and involves a very difficult military operation indeed—the defense of Korea. I sincerely hope that our Armed Forces may be successful in Korea. I sincerely hope that the policy thus adopted will not lead to war with Russia. In any event, I believe the general principle of the policy is right, and I see no choice except to back up wholeheartedly and with every available resource the men in our Armed Forces who have been moved into Korea.
>
> If we are going to defend Korea, it seems to me that we should have retained our Armed Forces there and should have given, a year ago, the notice which the President has given today. With such a policy, there never would have been such an attack by the North Koreans.

Mr. President, we went into Korea on the theory that the United Nations was going to punish aggression, in order to prevent aggression in the future. I think it was a sound theory. I approve of the general policy of punishing aggression. The difficulty is that we were relying upon a weak reed in the United Nations. The United Nations Charter is so weak, in that it contains a provision for the veto, that as a matter of fact there is no means of preventing aggression. The only reason we happened to secure action in one case for 1 moment was that the Russians were not present. We went in knowing full well that all future action taken by the United Nations would be subject to the Russian veto when the Russians returned to the Security Council.

We went in with the possibility facing us that there might be further aggression, and that then we could not rely on the United Nations. So we went in and took over Korea. When we were almost at the point of occupying the entire country, we were attacked by the Chinese, in November 1950.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. That was the second aggression. I believe that the theory to which I have referred would require, as a matter of moral principle, that we then throw all the forces of the United Nations against the Chinese aggressors, defeat them, and march to Peiping. Unfortunately, that was an impossible policy, for two reasons. The United Nations would not do it because the Russians in the Security Council vetoed the action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Even the General Assembly, which has no power to act, took a long time merely to declare that the Chinese Communists were aggressors, which was obvious from the very moment they moved into Korea.

In the second place, it was a wholly impossible military operation to carry out against a big aggressor the kind of action which we carried out against a little aggressor. So we were sucked into something which was more than we could undertake, and now we face an extremely unfortunate situation. Probably there is no sound solution to it. We must consider what is the best of those which are offered.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wondered whether or not the Senator from Ohio was aware of the fact that, in view of the weakness in the Security Council because of the veto, our own Secretary of State made proposals to the United Nations to fortify the United Nations by action through the Assembly.

Mr. TAFT. I am fully aware of that; but what about the Assembly? Under the United Nations Charter the Assembly has no power whatever. No nation has agreed to abide by a recommendation of the Assembly. No nation has agreed to furnish troops on the call of the Assembly. The Assembly has no power except to debate and express its opinion. I doubt if we would want to transfer permanently the power of the Security Council to the General Assembly. We have one vote in 60 votes in the General Assembly. We certainly would be at the mercy of a great number of nations on any question if we were to turn over the power to that kind of a body. No one has ever proposed any international organization whose decision we would abide by, in which we had 1 vote out of 60.

The General Assembly of the United Nations is a great body. But its influence is the influence of diplomacy. It is not a body to which we can look for any possible force to prevent aggression, which was the main reason for the creation of the United Nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Ohio think that the North Atlantic Pact was an instrumentality established to prevent aggression?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think so. The Atlantic Pact is a military alliance. I think it completely abandons the theory of the United Natıcns. It may be permitted under the United Nations Charter, but it is a military alliance which contains certain members of the United Nations. I think that as a military alliance, kept on a defensive basis, it ought to be a very sound way to prevent aggression against countries which attempt it. But I do not think its set-up is very satisfactory. There is no consultation provided for. There is no way to determine whether an aggression has occurred. If country A is attacked by country B, the other members of the pact are bound to come to the defense of country A, and each one decides for itself whether country A is attacked by country B. The other members are obliged to come to the defense of country A even if the attack is not justified, as I read its provisions. However, all this is rather incidental.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The reason the Senator from Minnesota propounded his question was that I gathered the Senator from Ohio was disappointed because there were no real teeth in the United Nations to repel aggression.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator says the North Atlantic Pact is an instrumentality to prevent aggression; but he voted against the pact.

Mr. TAFT. My vote was cast for the various reasons I set forth. I thought it was a complete abandonment of the theory of the United Nations, that it was a military alliance, that it was the lining up of half the world against the other half of the world, and arming both to the teeth eventually, it would provoke war. Those reasons do not have anything to do with the proper kind of organization to prevent international aggression. I think such an organization could be built up. I have frequently stated the basis on which it could be built up. I favor an amendment to the United Nations Charter to try to eliminate the veto power, and establish a basis of law, and a police force to carry out the law to which we have agreed.

Mr. President, not only would the United Nations not act in Korea, but the United Nations pressed upon us an appeasement peace. What I fear most today is that if Congress does not make clear its opinion, the Secretary of State might do overnight what he did in January 1951. He agreed then to the cease-fire plan approved by the United Nations political committee. That cease-fire plan provided, first, for a truce. Then it provided:

> 3. To permit the carrying out of the General Assembly resolution that Korea should be a unified, independent, democratic, sovereign state with a constitution and a government based on free popular elections, all non-Korean armed forces will be withdrawn, by appropriate stages, from Korea, and appropriate arrangements, in accordance with United Nations principles, will be made for the Korean people to express their own free will in respect to their future government.

The withdrawal of all non-Korean forces from Korea under the conditions existing there, in my opinion, would mean the communization of Korea. The Russians do not care what they do under ground. They do not regard their promises. Our effort in a Korean election of that kind would be completely swamped by Communist machinations. In effect, to agree to that it seems to me is to agree to a Communist-controlled government of Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the same agreement of January 11, the Senator will recall——

Mr. TAFT. I am going on with the rest of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. About the five nations being admitted?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Then even more important, Mr. President, there was contained in the agreement the following:

As soon as the agreement has been reached on a cease-fire, the General Assembly shall set up an appropriate body which shall include representatives of the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the People's Republic of China with a view to the achievement of a settlement, in conformity with existing international obligations and provisions of the United Nations Charter, of far-eastern problems, including among others, those of Formosa and of representation of China in the United Nations.

In January of this year the Secretary of State agreed, and directed Mr. Austin to agree to that cease-firing proposal. He agreed that we would sit down with England, which has been pressing appeasement, with Communist China itself, with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, all three of them urging upon us appeasement peace, and there would be completely excluded from the conference Nationalist China, the recognized Government of China, which has a seat in the Security Council today. That is what our Secretary of State agreed to.

That is equivalent to saying, "We are willing to give up Formosa. We are willing to have Communist China admitted to the United Nations." It was fortunate indeed that Communist Chinese declined to accept that cease-fire proposal. Then the Department of State came out with the naive statement that they agreed to it because they felt all the time that Communist China probably would not accept it, and so it would give us a certain practical advantage with the United Nations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Because of what the State Department did on the 11th of January and what they said after they had agreed to the cease-fire proposal, and instructed the representative of the United States in the United Nations to vote for it, is not the Senator from Ohio of the opinion that we cannot accept the idea that they are not going to consent to appeasement, because we cannot accept their definition of appeasement? Is it not time that Congress, or at least the Senate, said what in its opinion would be appeasement? In view of what was expressed in the agreement of January 11, including the recognition of Red China by the United States—a matter which we have already passed on in the Senate—the recognition that Red China in helping to negotiate the Japanese peace treaty, the surrender of the interests of the Nationalists of China, and of Formosa, and various other items—in view of that, should we not define what we mean by appeasement, instead of letting the Secretary of State use the definition "appeasement" as he sees fit? When he says we are not going to appease, we cannot any longer rely upon that term, in view of the manner in which he expressed himself on January 11.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is entirely correct. It seems to me we ought to go on record against giving up Formosa. We ought to go on record against admitting the Chinese Communists into the United Nations and require the use of the veto to prevent it. I am rather dubious about whether the Congress itself should try to determine affirmative and military policy; but what I am interested in doing is to negative the possibility of an appeasement and settlement being made tomorrow by the President and Secretary of State, which, once made, are practically irrevocable.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not these various things as to what constitute appeasement be political in their nature and not necessarily military?

Mr. TAFT. They are political; surely they are political.

Mr. FERGUSON. The mere fact that they tie into the military aspects does not prevent Congress from speaking on such important matters as to what is to be appeasement so far as America is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator used the term "giving up Formosa." I have heard that term used many times in the debate. It seems to me we should make clear what we mean when we use a term such as that.

Mr. TAFT. I agree. That should be made clear.

Mr. LONG. There are many Senators who would be willing to send great quantities of arms and supplies to Formosa who would not be willing to send American troops there.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is correct.

The world today is roughly divided pretty much along definite lines, between Communist-controlled territory and free territory. When I say "we give up," I do not mean that the United States has Formosa or ever has had it or ought to have it. I simply mean that we would be permitting Communist influences and Communist forces to take it over, so as to extend the line of Communist domination. That is what I am opposed to. When I say "give up Formosa," that is what I mean.

Mr. LONG. It occurs to me that it might be a wise policy on the part of our Government to do everything in our power to arm and strengthen the Chinese on Formosa. However, when it comes to permitting anyone to attack them, it seems to me it should be up to Chiang Kai-shek and his forces on Formosa to prevent attack, after we do all we can—which I think we should do—insofar as concerns supplying groups to advise Chiang Kai-shek, if he would like to have advice.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think that is so.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, our policy about Formosa has definitely changed since the aggression in Korea began. In August of last year a mission was sent to Formosa, for the purpose of consulting with Chiang Kai-shek about his necessities in connection with the defense of that island. I understand that they have agreed, and that under the agreement matériel is included, and that under the agreement the supplies have gone to Formosa. But that has nothing to do with an invasion of China or the mainland of Asia from Formosa, to which island Chiang Kai-shek and his forces were driven.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I recall, when our forces went into Korea the President stated that he would send the Seventh Fleet to protect Formosa and also to effect the neutralization of Formosa. That fleet was sent there with the distinct purpose of simply protecting and defending our flanks in the Korean war. There was no indication that at that time we were making a permanent change of policy regarding Formosa. I understand it is explained that in that respect there was no permanent change of policy regarding Formosa. The mission being sent to Formosa today is said to be sent there solely for the purpose of defense. That is a change, I admit; but there is no statement that the President's feeling about Formosa today is any different from what it was a year ago, so far as United States policy is concerned.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to quote from the President's statement of June 27, 1950, the day after the action in Korea started:

In these circumstances—

That is, the defiance of the orders of the Security Council—

the occupation of Formosa by the Communist forces would be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to the United States forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area.

Mr. TAFT. I think that bears out what I have said, but it does not indicate any change whatever in our policy.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator understand that there was no necessity for our going to Formosa and building up Chiang Kai-shek's forces on Formosa until our security was involved because of the attack on Korea, but that when our security was involved because of that attack, we started to take some action about it?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. By the very statement the President made and the putting of the Seventh Fleet in the waters around Formosa and our declaration that Chiang Kai-shek could not use his troops in any way to interfere with the sending of matériel into China or could not in any way maintain the blockade which he already had to a great extent established, and thereby had prevented the shipment of war matériel into China, the President's order eliminated Chiang Kai-shek's use of that blockade, and thus we permitted various materials to go to the aid of the Communist Chinese and to be used against our own troops in Korea. Is not that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct; that is the effect of lifting the partial blockade which Chiang Kai-shek had established against the Chinese coast.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A little earlier the Senator from Ohio and other Senators pointed out that it was necessary to get a definition of what the administration means by "appeasement." Does not the Senator think that unless we get such a definition, we shall fall into the same difficulty we did in connection with the Yalta Agreement, because in that agreement, which was signed by Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, the following language appears:

> Afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Poland and the other satellite nations now behind the iron curtain certainly are not living out their lives in freedom from fear and want. If we do not get the right kind of definition, we shall be talking about appeasement and meaning one thing by it, but others will mean something else by it, just as when we and when the Soviets talk about democracy, our definition of that word and the Soviet definition of that word are entirely different.

At this point I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio will permit the insertion in the RECORD of the list of American representatives who went to Yalta. The list includes Mr. Alger Hiss.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Release by the White House, February 12, 1945]

REPORT ON CRIMEA CONFERENCE

For the past 8 days, Winston S. Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, and Marshal J. V. Stalin, Chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, have met with the Foreign Secretaries, Chiefs of Staff, and other advisors in the Crimea.

In addition to the three heads of government, the following took part in the Conference:

For the United States of America: Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State; Fleet Adm. William D. Leahy, United States Navy, Chief of Staff to the President; Harry L. Hopkins, special assistant to the President; Justice James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion; General of the Army George C. Marshall, United States Army, Chief of Staff, United States Army; Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations and Commander in Chief, United States Fleet; Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Commanding General, Army Service Forces; Vice Adm. Emory S. Land, War Shipping Administrator; Maj. Gen. L. S. Kuter, United States Army, Staff of Commanding General, United States Army Air Forces; W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador to the U. S. S. R.; H. Freeman Matthews, Director of European Affairs, State Department; Alger Hiss, Deputy Director, Office of Special Political Affairs, Department of State; Charles E. Bohlen, Assistant to the Secretary of State, together with political, military, and technical advisers.

For the United Kingdom: Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; Lord Leathers, Minister of War Transport; Sir A. Clark Kerr, His Majesty's Ambassador at Moscow; Sir Alexander Cadogan, Permanent Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; Sir Edward Bridges, Secretary of the War Cabinet; Field Marshal Sir Alan Brooke, Chief of the Imperial General Staff; Marshal of the Royal Air Force Sir Charles Portal, Chief of the Air Staff; Admiral of the Fleet Sir Andrew Cunningham, First Sea Lord; General Sir Hastings Ismay, Chief of Staff to the Minister of Defense; together with Field Marshal Alexander, Supreme Allied Commander, Mediterranean Theater; Field Marshal Wilson, Head of the British Joint Staff Mission at Washington; Admiral Somerville, Joint Staff Mission at Washington; together with military and diplomatic advisers.

For the Soviet Union: V. M. Molotov, Peoples Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U. S. S. R.; Admiral Kuznetsov, Peoples Commissar for the Navy; Army General Antonov, Deputy Chief of the General Staff of the Red Army; A. Y. Vyshinski, Deputy Peoples Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U. S. S. R.; I. M. Maiski, Deputy Peoples Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the U. S. S. R.; Marshal of Aviation Khudyakov; F. T. Gusev, Ambassador in Great Britain; A. A. Gromyko, Ambassador in United States of America.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I trust that the list will include the name of the representatives of Mr. Henry Stimson, and also will include Mr. Stimson's express aproval of the Yalta agreement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would say that it includes the names of all the representatives who went to Yalta. It is an official State Department list, and the list will speak for itself.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Ohio agree that at the conclusion of hostilities in World War II, we had one of two things to do: Either do what we did do, namely, break up the greatest military machine ever known and bring our men home, or else remain abroad and fight the Soviets and enforce the agreements they subsequently have broken—agreements made at Yalta, Potsdam, and elsewhere.

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree to anything of the kind; no.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall endeavor to convince the Senator, in my own time. I think some education is necessary.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the effect of the dismissal of General MacArthur on the administration's policy is shown by the reaction throughout the Far East and throughout most of the world. The dismissal of General MacArthur is taken as an approval of the Acheson policy and a disapproval of the strong anti-Communist policy of General MacArthur. That may be a misjudgment of the administration, but all persons in the Far East who have been willing to stand up against communism are weakened by that dismissal. They feel that Acheson has triumphed over General MacArthur. Every pro-Communist influence in the Far East rejoices at the dismissal of General MacArthur. All the United Nations members who want us to accept the cease-fire proposal, regard the dismissal of General MacArthur as a step toward acceptance of the cease-fire proposal, which is an appeasement proposal.

That is why I think it is so important that the Congress state clearly its view that that appeasement proposal, the cease-fire proposal, and the measures contained in it are not the policy of the United States and shall not become the policy of the United States.

Again, Mr. President, I point out that while Senators on this floor have sworn that they do not want to give up Formosa, yet at no time since the dismissal of General MacArthur has any official representative of the administration negatived the making of such an agreement.

Mr. President, Shortly after the dismissal of General MacArthur, the President of the United States himself made a speech in which he attempted to prove two equally inconsistent conclusions. One was that we prevented world war III by moving into Korea. The President started the Korean war; he started it without authority, in my opinion. It is his war. He moved in. Regardless of whether he was right or wrong, he started that war. Now he seeks to justify it on the ground that it will prevent world war III. I understand the argument to be that if aggression occurs in the world, the aggressor has to be knocked down and punished. That is the principle, and I agree that it is a sound principle.

So the President says that by moving into Korea and stepping on the first aggression, that action prevented world war III. There might be something in that argument, but he then goes on to say that now, we prevent world war III by not punishing the Chinese aggressor, that we prevent world war III by fighting a soft war against an aggressor, and not really doing anything to him at all, merely waging a kind of stalemate war; that we prevent world war III by permitting a new aggressor to move in, not only against Korean territory—a clear aggression on the part of the Chinese Communists—but also against the United Nations itself.

Surely, if there is anything that could be considered aggression, it is an aggression against the United Nations when it is engaged in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations to prevent aggression. Yet in this instance it is contended we are to prevent world war III by not punishing the aggressor. If there were anything in the President's first argument, that he was preventing world war III by moving into Korea, it is now completely destroyed. The aggressor now knows that if he is strong enough, he does not need to worry; for the United Nations may, in a little weak voice, denounce him as an aggressor, and there it stops. He knows that the veto power will prevent action against an aggressor. He knows that the United Nations itself is not going to punish him, that it is perfectly safe to undertake aggression, because no one is going to bomb his territory. We may succeed in stopping his troops after they have conquered half of Korea, as they have already done, perhaps we will succeed in stopping them completely, but so far as

concerns our doing the aggressors any harm, blockading their coasts, dropping bombs on their cities, or on their communications—no; no; nothing like that. Aggression is rewarded rather than punished.

In short, under the present policy of the administration, they have abandoned every ideal that was asserted as a justification for the Korean war. I agree that they had to do so, because it is impossible to invade China. But certainly we cannot hesitate to finish the war in Korea simply because we fear that Russia might possibly come into the war, and declare we are not going to fight a war to the limit of our ability, whatever it may be, against Communist China. As I see it, the President's proposal was very clearly stated, and all of its defects appear in his speech.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator is forthright and honest in his last statement. In other words, as I understand—and I do not believe I have misinterpreted the Senator—what he has said is that we should go into China, and that, if such action brings Russia into the conflict, then that is where we ought to fight the war.

Mr. TAFT. I did not say anything of the kind, of course; but never mind.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator clarify it? I have been listening to him.

Mr. TAFT. It is in the text of my remarks. I have been using words very carefully. I think the Senator will find in the text exactly what I said, and I do not think anyone can misunderstand what I said.

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the policy proposed by the President today is a Maginot line policy. We are to continue to conduct a war with our hands tied behind our backs. We are to refuse any assistance from the Chinese Nationalists. It is like a football game, in which our team is ordered to kick whenever they reach the 50-yard line. They never can score by any possibility. Sooner or later, a member of the other team is going to catch the ball and run with it through our line for a touchdown.

As I read the President's speech, he suggests that if we do not notice that the Chinese are in Korea, they will after a while go away. His hopes are almost pitiful. If we inflict sufficiently heavy casualties, he says, it "may discourage the Chinese Communists from continuing their attack." If they see the world arming, he says, it "may discourage the Communist rulers from continuing the war in Korea." If they realize, he says, that they cannot defeat us in Korea, except to the extent they have already done so, "then they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression. A peaceful settlement may then be possible." That certainly proposes a stalemate war. It makes a joke of the United Nations' ban against aggression, and encourages aggression everywhere else.

The President himself points out that in China there "stand additional millions of Chinese soldiers." They will have lost nothing except a few men, and manpower in China is cheap. It is ridiculous to say that we are preventing either aggression or world war III by this stalemate war in Korea. The Chinese aggression has captured half of Korea, and it has cowed most of the free world. Half of our effective army is tied up in a position 5,000 miles from home, from which it would be very difficult to rescue it if the Russians started a war. I should think there must be quite a temptation to them to start it, if they really contemplate a third world war, and certainly if they do contemplate it they will start the war when they choose, and not because of any particular bombing of Chinese railroads or any invasion or raiding of the Chinese in South China by Nationalist troops.

As I see it, the plan which is proposed by the President is an impossible plan. The American people will not stand for it. Psychologically, no one will stand for it. We are either going to fight a more aggressive war against China, or else we are going to have an appeasement peace. The choice which this country has is between Acheson and MacArthur. That is the only issue. The issue we have today is as to how we may best finish the Korean war, because sooner or later we must finish it. We cannot continue it indefinitely with thousands of casualties every week in Korea, with thousands of American boys killed and missing, and being wounded or taken prisoner. Sooner or later, psychologically, we are going to have to go one way or the other; and what I fear is that we may go the Acheson way.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My thought is along the line suggested by the Senator from Ohio. I feel that our first duty is to our boys in Korea. Whether we like it or not, "Allies withdraw on both ends of front," according to a headline in today's Washington Evening Star. American boys are dying in Korea at this moment.

Mr. TAFT. It is impossible to retreat without heavy losses.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. I have read the headline, but it tells a story, to me, more than what is contained in the headline. To me it means that boys from the United States are dying, and I think that there is a responsibility. As I have stated before to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senator from Connecticut, it is not so much a question of who is at fault as between the Chinese Communists and Chiang Kai-shek, but we have a duty to those boys who are retreating.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Did the Senator notice that in General MacArthur's speech in Chicago yesterday he said that under the present method of conducting the war, our losses are staggering in proportion to the number of men committed, and would continue to be, under that kind of warfare?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I noticed that, and, of course, 60,000 casualties out of a total fighting force now of about 250,000, as I understand the number to be, according to the last statement I saw, is a very heavy casualty list.

Mr. CASE. I believe the 250,000 may also include some of the other UN troops.

Mr. TAFT. I think I saw a statement to the effect that there were 250,000 American land troops. That is my impression.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. With the unlimited manpower which China has at this particular time, if we decided merely to make a stand in one position and carry on a war, how long, in the Senator's opinion, would the war continue?

Mr. TAFT. It would continue indefinitely, because they have indefinite replacements. I think such a program is not feasible.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. A great deal of concern has been expressed on the floor of the Senate, and probably justifiably so, that we may become involved in a land war on the continent of Asia, a land war in which the greater numbers on the other side might in the end prevail, because of the small numbers we would have on our side. But in what kind of war are we engaged today? Is it a land war? It is a land war, in which the excess troops, that is the available men, on the part of the Chinese Communists, are certainly being used to the greatest possible advantage because, instead of using those areas in which we are strongest, to the fullest extent, and employing our naval power and our air power, we are having to rely primarily on infantry.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. NIXON. We are using our airplanes only for the purpose of tactical bombing. We are not using our Navy for the purpose of a blockade. In other words, we are waging the kind of a war which we should not wage—a land war—in which the only possible advantage is to the Chinese Communist troops.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator. Therefore, I think it was a mistake originally to go into Korea because it meant a land war. There is a possibility that, after all, we may be able to seal off this peninsula, and that is one reason why strategic bombing is necessary. If we destroy all the rail lines from China and through Manchuria into Korea, it will be very difficult for the enemy to bring up equipment, no matter how many men they can get to the front. If we destroy the installations on the Yalu River—the dams which furnish power and light—it will be more difficult for the enemy to organize armies and go down into Korea. We may be able to make Korea more of an island than a peninsula. Against the Russians it would be wholly indefensible, as I understand. But if we adopted the

policy of strategic bombing, it is possible that we would so interfere with the Chinese enemy's communications that they might not be able to defend themselves efficiently, and we might be able to operate without the expenditure of vast numbers of lives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that in the early months of the Korean war the Air Force engaged almost entirely in strategic bombing, and then the hue and cry arose that the airplanes should be more tactically engaged. We destroyed communication lines, blasted them to smithereens, and had complete control over highways and all means of communications. But, despite this fact, in the limited peninsula of Korea, the Chinese hordes moved up continually. In Korea, where we have full naval power, with no resistance by even a canoe, where we have had full air power and full control of the skies, I ask the Senator from Ohio what advantage there would be in trying to deliver the final punch in China?

Mr. TAFT. I am not an expert so far as the military situation is concerned, but I have been told by military authorities that if there is a line at the Yalu River, the enemy can organize all his strength behind it—all his tanks, trucks, and other equipment—and he would have to go only 80 miles to the front lines. He could move the equipment up at night. But we cannot bomb beyond the Yalu River. If we could bomb beyond the Yalu, if we could destroy all the railroads beyond that point and all the railroad centers, it would be impossible for the enemy to bring up all the equipment he would need. It would seriously weaken his armies in a way in which we cannot weaken them so long as they can organize in a complete sanctuary behind the Yalu River.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator has made a strong point. But, in that case, how would we catch up with the Chinese armies in China? Instead of being 80 miles, it would be 8,000 or 9,000 miles from the home base.

Mr. TAFT. I do not want to catch up with the Chinese armies in China. I am only suggesting that we make it as difficult as possible for the Communist troops to get to Korea.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If we made it difficult for them to get to Korea, that still would not stop the war.

Mr. TAFT. General MacArthur said we would have no difficulty, and I hope we would not, in holding a line in the middle of Korea, because as the enemy troops go south their lines get so long that it becomes difficult for them to support their troops. If we want to hold most or all of Korea we must push the enemy's sanctuary well back beyond the Yalu River so that they will not have that base from which to operate without serious handicaps.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How far does the Senator want our troops to go? China is a large country. How far does he want our forces to chase the Chinese troops?

Mr. TAFT. I am not speaking of chasing troops; I am only suggesting that we bomb for the purpose of destroying communications, making it as difficult as possible for the enemy to move over the roads day and night. It is important also to bomb air bases, but I think the important thing is to bomb communications. I understand that among other methods which the Communists used in defeating Chiang was to cut all his communications everywhere. They cut rail lines all over China, and made it almost impossible for Chiang to move his army with any success or efficiency.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the Chinese are able to move up their ammunition and to use their dumps on the other side of the Yalu River, that all their men can be assembled through any transportation means they have, which includes railroads, and then all they have to do is to cross the river and use a short supply line?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we could bomb the ammunition dumps and supply lines on the other side of the river, that would lengthen their lines and make it more difficult to destroy our armies.

Mr. TAFT. That is the formula which has been given to me by military friends, and it seems to me to be convincing.

Mr. FERGUSON. We hear much speculation as to whether Russia will intervene if we cross the Yalu River and destroy ammunition dumps and supply lines; but does not Russia have to realize that if she does start the third world war it will not be fought in Manchuria or China, that it will be fought in the way America feels it should be fought, to destroy the real enemy, namely, the Kremlin? Does not the Senator feel that Russia must realize that?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore, we can do all the speculating we care to, but Russia is not going to start a war until she is satisfied that it is started on her own basis.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. Is it not a fact that the Senator from Minnesota very emphatically made the point which the Senator from California was trying to make? He pointed out that in the early months of the war in Korea we used strategic bombing as well as tactical bombing. The Chinese Communists had not yet entered the war. As a result of using that type of bombing we won a great victory over the North Koreans. In fact, the war would have been over in Korea if the Chinese Communists had not come in. Their troops were being supplied from across the Yalu River. At the present time we are unable to win a military victory in Korea. We are unable to do so because we are restricted in the use of both strategic bombing and naval power.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. That is my view, anyway.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The speed of planes is such that if there are only 75 or 80 miles to be traversed, and we are not permitted to engage in reconnaissance or to bomb the point from which an enemy plane starts, our hands are tied behind our backs. Jet fighters can come from the Yalu River in 12 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. President, I think I have covered the ground as to what I think the policy should be. It is a policy to end the war in Korea. It is not a policy contemplating an American invasion of China. It should include the backing of the Nationalist Government of China against the Communists. It should be a backing of that Government, in my opinion, in whatever it is able to do. It is a question of military strategy as to what the Nationalists can do. I am confident they can make a sufficient diversion in south China, where, I am told, the rural population is up in arms because their food has been confiscated. I am also told that starvation on a large scale has occurred, and a wave of resentment has arisen until it has become a factor which should be used against the Chinese Communists. It seems to me perfectly obvious that we should use the forces of a fellow member of the United Nations in fighting the war against Communist China in which we are now engaged. We should accept their offer of assistance and give them every form of advice and supply support we can possibly give them.

Secondly, I have spoken of bombing communications and airports, and possibly of power installations on the Yalu River in connection with the Yalu Dam. General MacArthur has proposed a complete American blockade of China. Of that I have some doubt. Chiang was conducting a fairly good blockade until we stopped him. Whether it would be wise for the United States to undertake a general blockade should be considered by the committee, and a decision should be reached. Certainly there should be a release of our Nationalist forces and a release of the Nationalist Navy, so that they may at least restore the blockade in which they were formerly engaged.

Mr. President, the danger I see in the speech of the President is that there was not in it one word about not giving up Formosa. There was not one word in it about not recognizing Communist China. There was no negativing of any of the previous policies. I read with a great deal of interest the speech of Secretary Acheson and the speech of General Bradley, both of which apparently were made in anticipation of General MacArthur's speech. I looked in vain to find anything which would prevent them from consistently, if they wished to do so, sitting down with the United Nations and the Chinese Communists and agreeing to the terms of the cease-fire proposal, agreeing to a proposal which would in effect make Korea Communist, agreeing to a proposal which would gradually

surrender Formosa to the Chinese Communists, and agreeing to a proposal which would admit the Chinese Communists to membership in the United Nations and to participation in the Japanese peace treaty.

With respect to the latter, Mr. Dulles indignantly refused the demand of the British that the Chinese Communists sit in on the negotiation of a Japanese peace treaty. Whether such a stand has the full and permanent support of the administration, I do not know. Certainly there is nothing in anything they have said that negatives such possibilities.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be very clear, therefore, that Congress ought to negative them, particularly because of the great danger confronting us that an appeasement policy will be adopted. As I see it, in the long run we have the choice of more aggressive action in Korea, which we hope may bring the war to an end, or the adoption of an appeasement policy. It seems to me that the Nation must choose, in effect, between Secretary Acheson and General MacArthur, so far as their policies in the Far East are concerned.

I have no difficulty whatever in lining myself up with the general principles announced by General MacArthur. I believe that by such principles we may reasonably hope to end the war in Korea. If we are looking to prevent a third world war, there is no way in which it can be prevented by conducting an indefinite stalemate war in Korea. I do not know of anything that would encourage the Russians more and give them time to build up their forces to get ready for a third world war, if that is their intention. Certainly the one thing that may possibly deter a third world war, so far as the Korean war is concerned with it, is the winning of that war. General MacArthur said that the only purpose of entering a war was to win the war. Certainly we ought to try to win that war by every means at our command.

I say we have no justification for an invasion of China. It is an impossible policy. Even if it were possible, it would be a wasting of resources which we may need in a third world war. It is something that cannot be done. However, we should do everything we can to show the people of the world that having entered the war in Korea, we can carry it through and win our objectives.

It has been said that Russia may come into the war. Of course, Russia may come into the war. However, we did not stop our activities in Europe. We inaugurated the air lift. If they had desired to do so they could have started a third world war then. We did not stop our course in Greece. That certainly could have brought in Russia. The ratification of the Atlantic Pact itself could reasonably be said to have invited from Russia the probability of some sort of action toward the starting of a war.

The Secretary of State blithely said that he would arm the western Germans, and let them organize divisions. Of course, he got immediate notice from Russia that if he did it they would start a war. The Secretary of State did not hesitate to say that that was his policy.

Mr. President, that is not the difficulty. The difficulty is that in Europe we are willing at least to take a firm stand. We are willing to do those things within our capacity. I think that sometimes we are willing to go beyond our capacity. But in the Far East, no; we cannot do anything, because our State Department has had a long history of friendship, so to speak, with the Chinese Communists, and we must treat them tenderly, and we must keep the United Nations Committee open, so that there may be an appeasement peace. Our policy in Asia is the reverse of everything that has been adopted by the administration with reference to Europe. I believe the time has come when we should bring an end to that policy, and Congress should declare that in Asia, as in Europe, we shall follow a general policy of containment of communism, to the extent of our ability.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Ohio to the effect that we have a firm policy in Europe. We are not at war in Europe with any country. Certainly we are at peace in Europe. The policy in Asia is the reverse of our policy in Europe.

Mr. TAFT. It works the other way.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Our boys are on the battlefield. In Asia it works the other way.

Mr. TAFT. Probably we do not have a war in Europe because we were firm. Probably we have a war in Asia because we were weak.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Irrespective of any conclusions which may be drawn, I should like to make the point that inasmuch as we are not at war in Europe, I am one of those who firmly believe that justifiable duty would compel us to do everything we can to protect the American boys who are doing the fighting and the dying and who are being wounded this very minute in Korea. I think they deserve as much attention in the form of firm determination of a great government as does Western Europe.

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Ohio realizes, of course, that after the President's dismissal of General MacArthur a great feeling of resentment spread throughout the country, not only because of the action but because of the manner in which it was taken, and that it has presented in the Nation a great cleavage.

Some of the spokesmen for the administration have talked a great deal about the need for national unity. I think most of us agree that in meeting the challenges which may be ahead we do need unity among the American people, and we need unity on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives. However, does not the Senator from Ohio believe that we would have a better chance to achieve unity in the Nation and unity in Congress if the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, would submit his resignation to the President; or, if he should not submit his resignation, if the President removed him and put in his place a man in whom both Republicans and the Democrats could have confidence, so far as the operation of the State Department is concerned?

Mr. TAFT. I certainly do think that today probably it would be the only way in which unity could be achieved. If the President, instead of dismissing MacArthur or recalling him, had sat down with him and with Mr. Acheson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it is entirely possible that, if in fact the administration is against appeasement, there could have been a complete meeting of minds. The difficulty, as I see it, is that so, long as Mr. Acheson is Secretary of State, there can be no agreement on a policy against appeasement. It seems to me that so long as he is there, with the record before us of his views and opinions practically up to the moment, there is not much opportunity to achieve unity. We do not have to agree on whether we are to bomb China, or just what to do in Formosa. We do have to agree that we are not going to make an appeasement peace in the Far East and, thus, in effect, surrender and endanger our whole position in the Philippines, in Japan, and throughout the entire western Pacific.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared on the bill now pending.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As my colleagues know, I am not a farmer, nor do I know in detail the intimate problems of the farm areas in the South and Southwest which have been discussed in connection with the pending migratory labor bill. Nor am I a member of the Agriculture Committee which considered this matter at some length.

I must point out, however, that the question of migratory farm labor or the question of migratory labor in general is a matter in which I have a great interest. It is a matter in which the Labor Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, also has a great interest. It is a matter in which my own State of New York has a great interest.

As is sometimes overlooked or forgotten, my State of New York is a great agricultural State. Although its leading agricultural product is in the dairy field, New York is also a great producer of vegetables and other truck-gardening crops. In this field of farm production the farmers of my State have a great need for seasonal laborers. In harvesting time many thousands of migrant laborers are employed. Some of these are of continental origin, some of Puerto Rican, some have been from the British West Indies, and in recent years some have been

displaced persons. I have received repeated reports especially from Long Island and adjacent areas of great losses suffered by the farmers due to temporary shortages of farm labor.

I have cited all this to indicate my very real basis of interest in the pending legislation.

I have studied the pending measure as closely as I could. On the basis of this study I must associate myself with the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico and with my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota, in their strong criticism of Senate bill 984 in its present form.

I do not question or doubt the need for legislation to authorize arrangements to provide in an orderly and controlled manner a supply of farm labor where and when it is needed to meet the urgent demand of our farmers.

I feel strongly, however, that this legislation must be of a kind, and so devised as to protect and safeguard in every way the wage and employment standards of our own farm workers, migrant and otherwise. Legislation must be so drawn as to give unqualified assurance, with adequate administrative provisions, that potential sources of farm labor in this country will be given every opportunity to fill the need before foreign workers are employed.

When I say in this country, I include Puerto Rico. There is great unemployment in Puerto Rico. There are great numbers of people on that island, which is part of the United States, who are qualified as expert farm laborers. The Federal Government contributes heavily in relief money and other Federal grants-in-aids to assist Puerto Rico to take care of these unemployed farm workers. It would seem to be the height of sound fiscal practice, as well as sound social practice, to bring Puerto Rican workers here to supply the need rather than to bring workers in from Mexico. I mean, of course, no reflection on Mexico or on the necessity of maintaining the closest of neighborly relations with that country. This, however, is not a problem in foreign relations but a problem in agriculture and in labor conditions in our own country, including Puerto Rico.

Because of my feeling on this point I have introduced an amendment which I hope will be favorably considered. I also subscribe to a much broader amendment on this same general subject proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, but if his is not agreed to, I certainly would hope that mine, which is a narrower one would be accepted. There are other provisions in this bill which I hope will be remedied in the course of the consideration of this legislation. A number of the other amendments proposed by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Mexico would greatly improve this legislation.

I have received a number of communications from representative groups in my State urging that I vote against this bill. I hope that vital and necessary improvements will be made in it, which will mitigate the justified opposition to the pending bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is my purpose at this time further to discuss Senate bill 984, which was discussed for some time yesterday afternoon by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The proposed legislation is of such vast importance that as many Senators as possible should listen to the discussion. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Anderson	Hill	Murray
Benton	Humphrey	Neely
Brewster	Hunt	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Ives	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Schoeppel
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Duff	Lehman	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Taft
Ecton	McCarran	Thye
Ellender	McCarthy	Tobey
Ferguson	McClellan	Underwood
Flanders	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Welker
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Malone	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Williams
Hayden	Millikin	Young
Hendrickson	Monroney	
Hennings	Moody	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). A quorum is present.

THE YALTA AGREEMENT AND THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; provided that it is agreed that by doing so I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me inquire how much time the Senator from Indiana wishes to have.

Mr. JENNER. Only 3 or 4 minutes, I believe.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, it is time we looked carefully at the Japanese peace treaty. I should like to know whether General MacArthur was removed primarily because he was Commander in Korea or because he was Supreme Commander in Tokyo and it was important to get him out of the way before the treaty was signed.

My attention was first attracted by letters from men in the Korean war zone, who said, "Don't let them sign any peace treaty that gives southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles to Russia." There was such a note of bitter frustration, almost out of desperation, in the letters that I started to look for the trouble.

I thought I would take a look at John Foster Dulles' speech on the treaty. You remember, Mr. President, that General MacArthur said that our military security rests on the chain of islands that guard the far Pacific perimeter, and—note this—that a single break in that island chain would make it possible for an enemy to break through our whole defense line.

The Kurile Islands are the link that runs from the northern tip of Japan almost to the Aleutians, the island path to Alaska. Mr. Dulles has said:

> The South Sakhalin and Kurile Islands * * * are actually in Russian possession. Any peace-treaty validation of Russia's title should, we suggest, be dependent upon Russia's becoming a party to that treaty.

Here it is: We are to give permanent title to the islands to Russia, provided only she will be nice and come and get it. This is not only setting the table for Stalin; it is drawing up a chair and begging him to be seated, and promising him everything on the table if he will only grace the party with his presence for a moment.

The Kurile Islands are on the direct route over which we would have to ferry planes from Alaska to Japan. They are the base from which the Japanese launched balloons which were carried by the prevailing winds clear to our Pacific coast during the last war.

Why are we so meekly surrendering these Japanese possessions to Russia? Because, says Mr. Dulles, they were allotted to Russia at Yalta. Mr. Dulles proposes to use the Japanese Peace Treaty to turn into law the gifts Mr. Roosevelt personally made of Japanese territory at Yalta.

Mr. President, Yalta has no force in law. It has no justification in foreign policy. It is contrary to all moral principles, all international honor. So we are quietly being seduced into turning Yalta into international law, and General MacArthur is suddenly moved out of Tokyo just before the bond is to be sealed.

Mr. President, Congress must now take over the task General MacArthur was forced to lay down. Congress must watch over the Japanese Peace Treaty and see that it does not become another sell-out to Russia.

I wish to introduce a joint resolution forbidding any agent of the United States Government or any other representative of the United States to the United Nations to sign any document validating and giving the force of international law to any clause in the Yalta agreement.

Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the joint resolution, and I request that it be read and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That no officer of the United States or representative of the United States to the United Nations or to any other international organization, conference, or meeting shall sign any treaty, agreement, or other document which in any way validates or gives the force and effect of law to, or otherwise binds the United States to observe, any clause or provision of the Yalta agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and will be appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) to prohibit the signing by any officer or representative of the United States of any document giving the force of law to any provision of the Yalta agreement, introduced by Mr. JENNER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the State which I have in part the honor of representing was explored and settled by white Europeans in 1540, some 80 years before Plymouth Rock and some few years before Jamestown, Va., or St. Marys City, Md. Under the system prevailing from then until 1868, there was a form of peonage in my State. Even after Abraham Lincoln had done his share and after the American people had acted to the extent of killing their own brothers, fathers, and other relatives in the awful War Between the States, and had liberated the vast numbers of human beings who had been held in slavery, there was peonage in my State. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that the American flag was raised over the old palace of the Spanish governors, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., by General Kearny, of the Missouri troops, who started in 1846 from Independence, Mo., the State represented in part here in the Senate by my friend the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. From that time until now it has been the purpose of the people of my State to be as proud as they can be of the noble past, under different governments, but prouder still of doing their share to contribute to carrying on the Anglo-Saxon ideal and the American concept of government as outlined in the Constitution of the United States.

In 1868, through legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States, New Mexico outlawed peonage. I know whereof I speak. I still remember having seen in my grandmother's home old Navajo Indians who had been peons under that system. I desire to do everything I possibly can for the American farmer, to stabilize his industry and to stabilize his labor. But, Mr. President, the pending measure would bring back the things which Lincoln did away with, and would bring about peonage in my State and in certain other areas of the United States. I do not want that. That is my only reason for being opposed to the provisions contained in Senate bill 984, as reported to the Senate. It is not because I do not want the American farmer to get labor promptly when he needs it.

In times like these, about which the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Connecticut, and other Senators who participated in the earlier debate, were speaking, when the country is confused both domestically and internationally, I, for one, believe that it behooves us, especially those charged with legislative responsibilities, to recall and more than ever to ponder the oath of office which we took when we became Senators. From day to day we read statements in the press by members of the administration, by members of political parties, by members of other legislative or administrative bodies, and even of judicial bodies, pleading for economy, pleading for a return to our way of life, pleading for the protection of American interests and the doing of the things which will preserve our way of life.

Mr. President, I do not happen to be of Anglo-Saxon descent, but in my conscience I believe and accept every iota of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States. I know the philosophy of our political government. I know about Runnymede, and about King John. I know the Anglo-Saxon efforts to obtain liberty. I do not desire to lose any of the principles which are outlined in our Constitution and which pertain to our way of life. It is for that reason that I am opposed to the pending bill. In administering the oath of office of which I speak, the oath which I have taken upon four different occasions at the rostrum of this noble body, representing our ideals and our philosophies, the following question is asked:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter: So help you God?

Each time that question has been propounded to me, as I stood upon the rostrum of the Senate, I have said, with serious intent, "I do." With that oath in mind, I stand before the Senate today with a clear conscience, saying that in my opinion the passage of the pending bill, as reported to the Senate, would violate that oath. Therefore, I oppose it.

It is my purpose to use that oath of office, and certain of the remarks made yesterday by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], in furthering the American way of life, and as my theme in opposing the Ellender bill as reported to the Senate.

It should be strictly understood that I want farm labor to be stabilized, not only for the benefit of labor but also for the benefit of the farmers who employ it. In my opinion the pending bill would operate to the benefit of neither. In the first place, the bill is a haphazard attempt to help the farmer, and, while it is perfectly true that under the pending bill, certain advantages will be gained by the farmers of certain sections of the country who will use some of the imported workers, the American farmers as a whole will be benefited not at all. The farm laborer will be helped in no way whatever.

In my opinion, the legislation proposed would be most detrimental. I should like to invite the attention of my good friend from North Dakota, whose noble heart I know has beat for the things which Americans love, to the fact that in my opinion, the enactment of the proposed legislation would be detrimental to the best interests of the American people, because once we commence to use a type of labor which lives contrary to American standards and contrary to what we think is our way of living, business will be bound to suffer; and farming is a business.

How will any farmer in any State of the Union be better off with a class of laborers who actually come as beggars into the country to compete with men who demand a good breakfast and a good dinner? Farmers still call the noonday meal dinner; it is not luncheon. The farmer likes to send his children to school, and he likes to buy them a pair of shoes now and then. This is a serious question. The farmer himself would be bound to suffer. I never knew of a city or a hamlet in this country that prospered in representing the American way of life when starvation wages were paid to persons who did not understand our way of life.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to one of our agreements with the Republic of Mexico. I wish to bring it to the attention of my good friend the Senator from Louisiana who, I am sure, as chairman of the committee, is acting, in an effort to carry out his responsibility, in the best of faith and with the highest degree of integrity. I should like to bring it to the attention of the Senator from Maine, also, before he leaves.

Several years ago the people of this country became concerned about the hoof-and-mouth disease below the border. There was reason for their concern. The people on this side of the border would have suffered intensely, both economically and otherwise, if that terrible disease had been left uncontrolled. But again, Congress, trying to protect the American way of life, made available millions of dollars. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana if he knows how many millions of dollars were made available for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, it was $120,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That money was made available in order to control the hoof-and-mouth disease, which affects cattle. The taxpayers' dollars were used in an attempt to control that disease. I believe we acted with wisdom, and our friendly neighbor republic has cooperated 100 percent in order to eradicate and control that infectious disease. It was money well spent.

It is my considered opinion, having had first-hand information in dealing with the type of labor proposed to be imported under the terms of the bill, that the effects of the influx of the cheap labor on the social, economic, and political life of our people would be worse and more detrimental, and would do more damage, than could result from the hoof-and-mouth disease. Under this bill we are not dealing with an infected cow; we are dealing with what is sacred to the American way of life. We are dealing with our social structure; we are dealing with our political structure, and for that reason I, for one, cannot in conscience support the bill.

The only effect to be accomplished by the bill would be to undo many of the constructive advances achieved by the great Lincoln, for example, many of the good results which came from the sacrifices of hundreds of thousands of lives in the First and Second World Wars, and the things for which American boys in Korea are dying. They would be destroyed by this piece of proposed legislation. Its only effect will be to sabotage the American way of thinking with reference to American labor. I may be wrong, but I try to be honest about it. My good friend the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] knows that I am supposed to be one of the so-called liberals in this body who likes to feel that he is contributing something to what will be to the advantage of humanity. I, for one, used to think that the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and even the Department of State, were liberal, but I am disappointed with them because they have paid so little attention to the citizenship which those departments represent, and seem to be attempting to bring about a condition in the United States whereby peonage, which has not prevailed in my State since 1868, will again be brought into being.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations held hearings with reference to the Federal Security and the Department of Labor appropriation bill. We heard Mr. Goodwin, of the Employment Service, which is supposed to be established for the purpose of securing employment for American citizens. It is disgusting, Mr. President, notwithstanding the millions of dollars made available for that purpose, how little that agency knows about the availability of American citizens who want to work, even at hard labor, even at stooping jobs. I am disappointed with the Department of Labor in that particular respect. Of course, we can expect anything from the Department of State.

I know there are in the Southwestern States many fine citizens, including farmers, who sincerely believe that they will derive benefits if this bill is enacted. I fear it will be at the expense of human misery.

I want the Senator from New York, the Senator from Rhode Island, and the Senator from Wisconsin to hear this. Some few farmers will receive benefit, but it will be at the expense of human misery. It will be when peonage comes back. It will be when the American way of life is retarded from making progress.

Mr. President, I know the Mexican border. My folks have been living on the border for 400 years. I know how peonage works. I know what happens along the border. The bill will not help the wheat grower in the State of my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. It will not help the wheat grower in the State of my good friend from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. It will not help the farmer in Ohio or in Maine. The bill will help only a small section along the border, where for three Mexican cents a person can come to my State in 5 minutes. That is whom the bill will help. It will not help the American farmer. The farmers, and a few at that, who use the starving and needy people and cheap labor will get the advantage. In the long run that advantage will be dissipated by the disastrous effects of what comes afterward.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In view of the fact that the distinguished Senator says he is disappointed with what the Department of Labor has done, in view of some of the other speeches I have heard made on the floor of the Senate by my great liberal friend from New Mexico, and in view of the praise he gave to Abraham Lincoln, why does he not move over to this side of the aisle and join the Republican Party, the party which has been the friend of the poor man, which has been against peonage, and which is the real party of progress?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will answer the question by saying that I am glad the Senator from North Dakota has finally come back home. Let me invite the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that in the State of North Dakota there are many Indians, as there are elsewhere in the United States. I inquired from Mr. Goodwin, of the employment section of the Department of Labor, what he had done in the way of investigating whether that class of labor was available to the people who needed to be protected under the provisions of the bill. Not a thing had been done, Mr. President. Let me go further than that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am seeking information. The bill adds a new title to the Agricultural Act, does it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Heretofore has there been any legislation of this character presented to the committee?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. We have had some understandings between foreign governments and our country.

Mr. WHERRY. On a treaty basis?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. This is the first time that one particular foreign country has been picked out. The sole reason for it is that there are needy people who would do the work. As a matter of fact, one Senator said yesterday that under the provisions of the bill more wages could be paid to an imported laborer than to an American who lived in the area and was available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I notice that as the bill was originally drawn it included:

> Foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and such countries) or from Hawaii or Puerto Rico.

That section is now confined to the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I am not impugning the motive of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Why was the provision stricken? Why was the arrangement limited to Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will answer the question. Knowing the border as I do, I believe it was stricken because the desire was to confine the bill to peons.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. CHAVEZ. If it included other countries, such as Jamaica, the workers could complain. The workers would certainly go to His Majesty's consul and complain. The starving peons can be dealt with in another way. It was selfishness and greed somewhere.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in answer to the question propounded by my good friend from Nebraska, I will say that the reason why the proposed legislation is necessary is that the Republic of Mexico has refused to allow its citizens to enter into agreements with employers in this country of the kind that now prevail with workers from Jamaica, the Bahamas, and other countries. Without the enactment of the bill, we cannot obtain in a legal manner the Mexican labor we need.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. We have heretofore taken in Mexican labor, have we not?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was done under an agreement. I pointed out previously that an agreement was entered into in 1948. It was renewed in 1949. The agreement will expire on June 30 of this year. Unless the bill is enacted into law, the officials of the Government of Mexico say they will not enter into any agreement with the United States Government for the importation of Mexican labor which continues the present terms and conditions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to my good friend from Nebraska that the point I am trying to make is that American labor is available. I shall prove it to the entire satisfaction of anyone who cares to listen. American labor is available. I made the statement a little while ago that if we could spend $120,000,000 for the protection of American cattle from the hoof and mouth disease in old Mexico, it behooves us to protect American labor. We should protect Indians and our own citizens all over the country. I wish to submit some figures from the statistical departments of our Government, to show such is not being done.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection to Mexicans. I go out among them more than anyone else in the Senate, I believe. However, I still believe that the man in New Mexico, perhaps the father of a boy who died in Korea, should have an opportunity, if he wants it, to get at least some stoop labor.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the position taken by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico relative to the sufficiency of American labor. I have been reading the reports of the hearings of the committee. We have contracts with other countries. We get labor from the Bahamas and from other countries without such legislation; do we not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That labor is obtained in accordance with present law, and that could be done in the case of Mexico if the Mexican Government would agree to continue the agreements which were entered into in 1948 and extended in 1949. However, the Mexican Government refuses to do so unless certain guaranties are made. Such guaranties are incorporated in the bill now being considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Prior to this time the Government had not come into the picture at all, so far as making any guaranties was concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Why is it necessary at this time? We do not not do it with respect to other countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because the Mexican Government insists upon it.

Mr. WHERRY. What do they insist upon that has not been given them in prior contracts?

Mr. ELLENDER. What they insist on, first, is a guaranty by some agency of our Government that there will be full compliance with the contract between the employer and the worker, for example, in guaranteeing wages, guaranteeing transportation, subsistence, and so forth.

Mr. WHERRY. Have we ever experienced any trouble with such importations of labor from other countries?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; we have not.

Mr. WHERRY. For the life of me I cannot see why it is necessary to bring the Government into the picture.

Mr. ELLENDER. The main reason is the need to control the so-called wetback problem, with which I am sure the Senator is conversant. To my way of thinking, the proposed legislation would go a long way in solving the wetback problem.

I should like to ask my distinguished friend from New Mexico a question. Under the program now existing was not the number of Mexican workers requested for employment in New Mexico 17,636 and the number actually contracted for work there 12,978?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask my distinguished friend if the farmers of his State could plant and harvest their crops, and do everything concerned with them without this Mexican labor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from Louisiana thinks he puts me on the spot in that particular respect——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not attempting to put the Senator on the spot at all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not vote on the basis of expediency, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana. It is true that we have imported many workers. Not only is that true, but many who were here illegally, and who are known as wetbacks, were also employed.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill would prohibit employment of wetbacks under this program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But at the same time employers were hiring that class of people, either legally or illegally, an effort was being made to get the people of the eastern section of the United States excited because the Navajos in my State were starving. Many of the people of my State, who have been there for years, have relatives in every military camp throughout the world. The relatives of many citizens of New Mexico have died in Korea. Many of the citizens of my State are unemployed because foreign labor can be hired for from 70 to 80 cents a day. That is the reason, and the only reason.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico, what is it that Mexico is asking for which is not reasonable? Mexico wants her citizens to come to the United States and work, provided they are treated decently.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Provided they receive traveling expenses and sufficient wages so that they can live like decent human beings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Let me say to the Senator that I am for that. But notwithstanding that I am for all that, and notwithstanding the fact that I want to import laborers when we need them, still I say that if American labor is available it is our duty to see that our labor is employed. We have billions of dollars of expenses every year. What is wrong about a poor Indian from the Navajo Reservation, or a citizen of Oklahoma, or of any other State who needs work, having a priority? Of course, if labor were not available here, I would want to import it from Mexico, Jamaica, or elsewhere, but under the conditions outlined by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I am not a member of the committee, but, as I understand, Mexico refuses to enter into such an agreement unless there are certain guaranties.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. In the opinion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, our Government ought to give those guaranties if the labor is to come in at all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. If it comes in at all, I want those guaranties given. But before either Mexicans, Jamaicans, or laborers from any other foreign country are permitted to come in, we should protect American labor. We protect American cattle. I think it is not too much to ask that we protect American labor.

Mr. LANGER. The senior Senator from North Dakota thoroughly agrees with the Senator from New Mexico, and compliments him for putting up this fight.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is one point to which I should like to call attention.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In a moment.

The point to which I wish to call attention is the question of available labor. The wheat grower in North Dakota should have labor to harvest his crops. The beet grower in Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, or Utah should have labor. I am for that. But what is the picture? I ask Senators to try to visualize the situation. I know that one Senator who follows the question very closely is the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Consider the millions of dollars we appropriated last year for unemployment compensation. The amount was $172,000,000. Why did we do that? If no local labor is unemployed, why do we spend $172,000,000 a year of the American taxpayers' money? That tells the story of itself. We spent $172,000,000 for unemployment compensation. Yet it is said that labor is not available. Some employers do not try to obtain American labor. Neither the Department of Labor nor the Indian Bureau, nor the Department of Agriculture tries to get it; and that is my complaint. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has Indians in his State who need employment, and the same thing is true of Indians everywhere. Instead of feeling sorry for the poor Indian and trying to find employment for him, we appropriate money for unemployment compensation. During my short time in Congress I have seen the appropriations for the Indian Bureau go up from $22,000,000 to $56,000,000. Is it not better to give a poor Indian employment than to pay him unemployment compensation? He is human and patriotic.

Senators have seen the picture of the flag being raised at Iwo Jima. A little Indian boy was there. Why should not his father and his brother be able to obtain employment? They are willing to do stoop labor. At Grants and at Bluewater, where carrots are raised, the poor Navajos are doing stoop labor. They are earning money, but they are not held down to 70 or 80 cents a day.

Do Senators know what would happen under the provisions of this bill? Yesterday the Senator from Louisiana stated that a contract will be entered into between the employer and the Mexican laborers who can neither read nor write. They are hungry. They have probably worked most of their lives for 50 cents a day, Mexican. They are coming into competition with our American way of life, and will be dealing, for example, with a farmer who raises 3,000 bales of cotton a year for which he receives 45 cents a pound. One of the greatest characteristics of the American is his spirit of fair play. He likes to meet one at arm's length. But what

chance would that poor Mexican laborer have with a ruthless and greedy employer? How could he attain to the American standard of living?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad indeed that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is in the Chamber. Does the Senator from New Mexico find anything in the pending bill which gives assurance that prevailing rates of wages in the areas in which the work will be performed will be paid?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator know of any way in which the laborers who come from Mexico or elsewhere can be protected in their right to receive wages at the prevailing rates?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If they come in, I want them to come under the conditions suggested by the Senator from New York. But that is not the point I am trying to make now. The point I am trying to make now is that we have millions of laborers in our own country who should be taken care of first.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator, but I am very much concerned about the fact that if lesser wages are paid inevitably that will bring about a breakdown in other wages.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to read from a contract.

Mr. LEHMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The contract is between a man named Bonifacio Ramirez Servin and the Fullerton Mutual Orange Association. Here we have the items. He was charged 10-percent deduction, $3.25. Board, $5.25. Board, $10.50. Advance, $10. He received a check for a total of $3.50. It is wrong that such a thing should be done in America. I think it is indecent that the worker should be treated in that manner.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that a Mexican contract?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of what year?

Mr. CHAVEZ. June 12, 1948.

Mr. ELLENDER. That contract has since been changed. They are now operating under a new contract.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; the next time he may receive $3.75 instead of $3.50.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First I wish to say to the Senator from New York that I shall submit an amendment when amendments to the bill are being considered, which will include provision for employment at prevailing wages in the particular occupation and the particular area. Each of those are important points.

I should also like to point out to the Senator from New Mexico that what he is basically discussing, which is so important, is the over-all migratory farm-labor problem. The importation of Mexican labor is a facet of that problem. It is a part of it. It is a part which was discussed in the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; and I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that the chairman of the committee told us yesterday that that report had not been made available, nor did the committee consider it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee action was taken before the report was made available.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but even after the report had been made the committee did not discuss it or consider it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to observe that what the Senator from New Mexico is pointing out, and very properly, is that insofar as the committee bill is concerned, under the terms of our agreement with the Mexican Government, in the contract certain guaranties will be made to the employees, which are a decided improvement over what they have had heretofore. I do not think anyone can deny that. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has done a great service in that respect.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; he has, and I think he ought to be commended for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But guaranties which are made in contracts made with Mexican laborers in terms of burial expenses, medical care, subsistence, and so forth, are not made to our own American migratory workers. In other words, it is entirely possible to have a surplus of labor in one area of the country and a demand for labor in another area. Yet under the provisions of the bill American migratory workers receive none of the treatment, none of the care provided under the terms of a contract with a Mexican worker. I do not think the bill is a bad bill. I commend the members of the committee for the diligent work they have done in connection with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is an improvement over what has prevailed heretofore.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But as the Senator from New Mexico has pointed out, and as the President's Commission has pointed out, the first task is to make positively sure that every opportunity is given for employment to our own domestic supply of labor under proper working conditions and at an equitable rate of wages. The Indians such, for example, as the Navajos, or any other group, certainly should come within the provisions of any kind of a labor bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Let me refer to some other groups. Possibly some Senators may not agree with me, but I shall try to give the Senate factual information. In 1898 the gods of war landed Schley in Puerto Rico. We do not have to discuss the merits of that matter whatsoever. Puerto Rico is an island of 3,600 square miles, with a population of 2,500,000. I feel they are patriotic people. Notwithstanding their background, and with their history of association with America for only 50 short years, they want to be accepted as American citizens, and this Government took definite action when it passed the Jones law in 1918 and made them citizens.

A few short weeks ago I saw in the Washington Evening Star the picture of an amputee at Walter Reed Hospital. Both legs were gone. His right arm was gone. He was still smiling, however. He was a Puerto Rican. Can Senators of the United States under their oaths say that we do not owe a duty to that boy's mother? Some good people of Baltimore collected money so his mother could make the journey to visit her son in an American military hospital. Are the Puerto Ricans properly protected? Should we import labor when we have labor of that type available? I ask that question in all sincerity and justice.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to draw the Senator's attention to the fact that I have submitted an amendment to this bill which would include the citizens of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, and I very much hope it will be adopted. But I have not received an answer yet with regard to any assurance that prevailing rates of wages will be paid. May I explain to the Senator my particular concern about that? It has been my experience that any breakdown of labor standards usually means that the standards of all the labor within the area sinks to the standards of the lowest paid.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I am raising.

Mr. LEHMAN. Therefore I believe it is extremely important to maintain and to be sure we are maintaining the prevailing rates of wages in any area in which these men will work.

Mr. ELLENDER. I call attention to the provision in section 501, on page 3 of the bill, which obligates the United States "to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation."

As a result of the discussion in Mexico City—and I have the proceedings before me, but I shall not go into detail with respect to them—it was agreed that any contract entered into should contain a guaranty that prevailing wages will be paid. Such a provision is included in the contracts which are now in force. It is an improvement over that contained in the contracts in force in 1948. Yesterday I read this clause from the contract into the RECORD:

4. Payment of wages.

This, as I said, is a provision in the contract which now exists, or that is in force, between the employers in this country and workers who come from Mexico:

The employer shall pay the worker the prevailing wage rate paid to domestic agricultural workers for similar work, and in the manner paid within the area of employment, or the rate specified on the last page of this contract, whichever is the greater.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. It would be well if in practice it would work in that way. But what is referred to as a prevailing wage is an historic prevailing wage.

Mr. ELLENDER. How can the Senator say that, when the language used in the contract is that—

The employer shall pay the worker the prevailing wage paid to domestic agricultural workers—

Not the wage paid to wetbacks, as the Senator indicates.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A domestic worker of necessity would have earned less and would receive less if cotton were selling for 14 cents a pound than if cotton was selling for 45 cents a pound, as it is now. That is the only difference. The language of this proposal is not "prevailing wage of the moment."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In view of the fact that that clause is to be in the contract which is to be entered into between the workers and the employers, I wonder what objection there would be to including it in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Among some of the objections to the inclusion in the bill of the clause to which the Senator from New York has referred is that the contract entered into between the Mexican worker and the employer might have to provide for a larger wage than the prevailing wage, in order to entice the Mexican worker to come into the United States to work and legislative action might be required to change the provisions of the contract in that respect.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the word "entice" is the correct word to be used in that connection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly, when a worker has to travel miles and miles to a new place of employment, even though his travel expenses are paid, nevertheless he has other expenses which reduce his take-home pay.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, all that the poor slave on the Mexican side of the border has to do to get into my State is to get three Mexican centavos and contribute them to Stone & Webster, at the bridge, and then he gets across the line.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Louisiana fears that a limitation such as the one I have suggested would, if included in the bill, prevent the use of additional persuasion to get the Mexicans to enter our country; and I wonder whether the Senator would have any objection to including in the bill the words "at least equal to the prevailing rates of wages." That would care for this point.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I have just pointed out, under the bill our Government will guarantee to the Mexican worker the payment of his transportation as well as the payment of the wages agreed to in the contract. It goes without saying that it would be desirable to have the exact amount fixed in the contract should the question arise as to what is the amount due.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would not the powers of enforcement be strengthened by writing that provision directly into the law?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe so. Some workers may require the payment to them of an amount greater than the prevailing wage. By having the arrangement for the exact wage set forth in the contract itself, it will be an easy matter to determine what the obligation is in the way of payment of wages, if and when the Government of the United States or any agency of the Government has to carry out its guaranty that such wages will be paid.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. First, Mr. President, let me say that what makes me doubtful about the satisfactory working of the proposed legislation is that in one breath the chairman of the committee tells the Senator from New York about prevailing wages, but in the next breath the chairman of the committee says there might be cases calling for the payment of specific amounts. In my opinion, Mr. President, this bill, if enacted, will result in the payment of specific amounts, and nothing more—in other words, the effort will be to get the workers at the cheapest possible rate or for the smallest possible amount.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think we can clear up this point. I recognize that in referring to the contracts, the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out a very significant improvement over the situation of some years ago in our relationships with Mexican labor. In other words, at the present time the idea is that those workers will be paid the prevailing wages, and a provision to that effect is proposed to be included in the contract of employment. It appears to me that it would be an improvement if we included in this proposed legislation a clause to the effect that the Mexican labor transported to the United States for purposes of agricultural employment shall be paid not less than the prevailing wages in the particular area, because, of course, there are area differentials.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator mean that the provision should be that those workers should be paid the present prevailing wage?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I propose that provision be made for the payment of "not less than the present or current prevailing wages"—recognizing the area differentials I wish to emphasize that point.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct; there are those differences.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would not it be preferable to use the words "current prevailing wages"?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say that the result of including the provision just suggested would be to fix minimum wages for agricultural labor, although the Senator knows that Congress has refused to do so on many occasions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this matter does not involve having the Congress fix minimum wages, because the current wage scale would be determined by the law of supply and demand in the particular community.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes in the local area which was concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes in the local area. I am not proposing that we make a national edict that the wage shall be 75 cents an hour everywhere in the country, because, of course, the wage in the sugar-beet areas may be different from the wage in the cotton areas, and so forth. However, it seems to me that the wage paid should be related to the wage scale in the particular area concerned.

I seek the friendly cooperation of the chairman of the committee on this particular point, because I think the provision to which I have referred should be included in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have pointed out, and as the Senator has indicated, the wage rates in different areas are not the same.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it would be proper to let each contract stand on its own provisions, and not require by law an interpretation by a department of Government as to what the prevailing wage is in a potential area. Doubtless when a contract is entered into between a group of workers and a group of employers, they can provide in the contract that the wage shall be a certain amount.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But should not we provide that the wage shall not be less than the current wage for such employment in that area?

Mr. ELLENDER. But then we would be establishing a minimum wage for foreign agricultural labor by law, and, as the Senator knows, the Congress has never been willing to establish a minimum wage for our own United States agricultural labor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; we would then be establishing equity, by placing a plateau under the wages.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, yesterday one of the Senators who favored this measure informed the Senate—and it is in the RECORD—that in many instances some of the foreign laborers would be paid more than the domestic laborers would be paid.

Let me say that heretofore I have introduced a bill by which I intended to cover the matter to which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota have been referring. It was Senate bill 949, and it received some consideration in the committee. I included in that bill the following provision with respect to prevailing wages:

> The Secretary of Labor shall authorize the placement of workers recruited or transported under this act, whether United States citizens or aliens, only after the employer agrees with respect to such workers to pay not less than prevailing wage rates for the crop and area.

The purpose of that provision was to take care of the differential. That is the

way I intended to have this problem taken care of in the measure which I introduced, and which was referred to the committee, but received only scant attention.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not attend all the hearings, although I did take time to read all the printed hearings. I recall that during the discussion of the bill, most of us who were thinking about the bill were thinking in terms of the current wage rates for the particular area and the particular season. Of course there are all kinds of variations in that respect.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question about that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the contracts to which the Senator from Louisiana has been referring make note of those variations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should simply like to see incorporated in the proposed legislation that kind of protective language.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that would improve the bill. There are two ways of handling this matter. I now have pending to this bill some amendments which I think would improve it, and I intend to discuss them in the Senate.

Everyone agrees that there should be legislation, but, to my way of thinking, there is a basic change which would improve the bill, namely, an amendment to compel Government agencies to inform farmers as to available domestic labor. If it is then necessary for them to employ foreign labor, well and good; I should be for it. I am not in favor of that, however, until every effort has been made to give employment to domestic labor; but, if it becomes necessary to use foreign labor, I am for it.

We would then come to the proposition of paying such labor at least the wages prevalent in the particular area of employment, in order to uphold the wage differentials prevalent in different sections of the country. Laborers in California working in the asparagus fields might receive a somewhat different wage, as a regular thing, from that received by the man who is picking pears, or digging potatoes in Idaho, or picking cotton in the South. They would receive rates different from those paid the man who is working in the beet fields of Colorado or Nebraska. I think that is fair, and I believe it would improve the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. When the Senator used the words "available domestic labor," I assume that he includes citizens of Puerto Rico. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. When I referred to available domestic labor, I had in mind American citizens.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have the same thing in mind. I did not want it confined to continental America.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, nor did I. If domestic labor is not available, well and good. However, if the domestic laborers cannot pick oranges, I do not want them. If they can, believe me, Mr. President, I would prefer them as against His Majesty's subjects in Jamaica.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator understands, of course, that we have before us a particular bill, directed toward a particular group of workers. I happen to be a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and a very new member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. But I know that the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor Management, of which I am chairman, is now making a study, a preliminary study, and we intend to go into a much more extensive study of domestic migratory labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall have something to say on that in a few moments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What I am trying to suggest is that we have a particular bill before us, and it is my desire to improve this bill as much as possible. I wish to point out that it is a decided improvement upon anything we have had.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to know that the chairman agrees with me in the view that it is a decided improvement. I have a feeling that we might write into the bill certain protections and extensions of the improvement which would make it equitable to the domestic labor, and not make it inequitable to the domestic labor by including in the bill the standard of Mexican labor. I want to make the differentiation. We have two subjects here, namely, domestic migratory labor and foreign labor. What we are directing our attention to in this bill is foreign labor, and it appears to me that it is our responsibility to write protections into the bill, so that the group of Mexican laborers will be given, first of all, all proper care, subsistence, medical attention, and transportation—everything that they should get as God's good children—and at the same time see to it that our own domestic labor supply is not discriminated against.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I may proceed further, I think I shall conclude presently.

Mr. President, there are in my State many fine, sincere, law-abiding citizens who favor this bill; and I know that they mean what they say about it. I have been receiving telegrams from some of them, and I feel that they think it is a good bill. I have received telegrams from some friends of mine, both personal and political, who favor the passage of the bill in its present form. At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD some of those telegrams from my State, supporting the Ellender bill in its present form, without amendment. I know many of the signers of the telegrams, many of whom are my personal friends.

For instance, I have a telegram from my good friend, "Jim" W. Berry, of Artesia, N. Mex., which reads as follows:

> In interest of farmers of New Mexico, we desire Senate bill 984 passed without any amendments attached. We do not have adequate labor to harvest our crops. With personal regards. Would appreciate your reply.

He is my pal. He is my friend. I think he is wrong, completely wrong, in his conclusions. He is a fine businessman. He has made a great success in the production of raw petroleum and oil. Then, about 10 or 12 years ago, he went into farming in a big way, and he has been most successful. He is a banker. I would not do one thing in the world which I thought would be detrimental to the interests of Jim Berry's farm. But I feel that I understand the situation, and that I know what should be done. Jim Berry would suffer, in my opinion, if the proposed legislation were enacted. He is in favor of the pending bill. I have no doubt as to the sincerity of his purpose, I could not question his motives, but I assure my friend Jim Berry that if this bill is enacted, it will not stabilize our farm labor in the Artesia area, for the reason that the bill provides that it shall be effective only until 1952. That is significant, it tells the story. How is it possible to stabilize labor in the beet fields in one season? How is it possible to stabilize labor in the wheatfields, or in the cornfields, in one season? How can it be done in the case of cotton? True, it will afford temporary advantage during the present season, but it will be for the present season only.

Is that what is desired? Is that the way to help the farmer? How are we to stabilize farm labor through a measure which provides for farm labor for 1 year only? I desire to help the farmer, whether the labor be domestic or foreign. It should be stabilized. But enactment of the pending bill would be of assistance in only one particular area. It would not help the grower of cotton or tobacco in Georgia. It would help those who could cross the border, either the so-called wetbacks or those who might be able to pay three Mexican pennies in order to cross the border. It would not help the potato grower in Maine or Idaho. It would not help the bean grower in the Peninsula of Michigan. In fact, it would help but very few States of the Union. I desire to help the farmers, but I want to help them through the enactment of sound legislation, which will be fair to the farmer, fair to the laborer, and fair to all the American people. I do not want to write a bill in such a way as to subsidize the farmer to the detriment of the consumer.

Mr. President, let me refer to another situation, more or less like that involving the hoof-and-mouth disease. What Senator from any State would now have the Government enter into an agreement with Argentina, irrespective of its political implications, for the importation of corned beef, which would supply the American consumer with beef at a reduced cost? What Senator or what Member of the House would favor that? But we think nothing of importing cheap labor.

That is the point, I believe, which the Senator from Minnesota had in mind,

because it is only common sense that if we import Argentine beef, which is very good, at a cheaper price than that for which the American producer can produce beef, the American consumer will have cheaper steaks and roasts. Even liver is $1.85 a pound now. We could possibly get it from Argentina for 14 or 18 cents. We will permit the American housewife to pay $1.85 a pound for liver, but it is proposed to import cheap labor that will compete with her husband in producing American commodities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For the RECORD I think it would be well to document what the Senator from New Mexico has said about the limits to which labor will be made available and the areas it will serve, and to recite some of the figures. I have here a tabulation from January 1 to December 31, 1950, with reference to the use of foreign labor in agriculture in the United States. The tabulation will be found on page 106 of the committee hearings. I speak only of Mexican labor to which the bill applies.

Arizona received 1,781; Arkansas, 9,527; California, 7,889; Colorado, 812; Idaho, 187.

Kansas asked for 267 but received none.

Kentucky requested 75 but received 74.

Louisiana received 903.

Minnesota requested 35 and received none.

Mississippi received 1,844; Missouri, 929; Montana, 516; Nebraska, 60; New Mexico, 12,978; South Dakota, 175; Texas, 29,105; Utah, none; Washington, none; Wyoming, 641.

Mr. CHAVEZ. New Mexico's figures do not include the many wetbacks who were there illegally.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those included are the legal entrants.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the same time some citizens of my State had to leave the State in order to eke out an existence. Is that what the Senate of the United States wants?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the point the Senator from Minnesota wanted to have brought out. I think a fair and legitimate question to ask is whether in Idaho they could not have recruited 187 domestic workers. That is the number of Mexican workers they received. I would ask if Kentucky could not have recruited 74 domestic workers, or whether Montana could not have recruited 516 domestic workers, or if Nebraska could not have recruited 60 domestic workers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What about the State of Colorado?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There were 812 Mexican workers in the State of Colorado.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I could go to one county and get that many workers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The fact that the State of New Mexico had 12,987 Mexican workers is not indicative of the number of Mexicans who were in the State. There were thousands of wetbacks. That is the reason why many of the citizens, as the Senator pointed out, had to go somewhere else to obtain work. This bill would help prevent such a situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator would be surprised to know how well aware I am of the citizens of the State who prefer to get wetbacks rather than to pay men decent wages.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out, this bill, if enacted, will prohibit the employment of wetbacks under this program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator prefer aliens legally entered, or wetbacks who come in illegally, to citizens of the United States who might want to work?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that under section 503 of the bill, as I pointed out yesterday, the Administrator is charged with seeing to it that no workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the director of State employment security——

Mr. CHAVEZ. And there is an amendment to put it on a national basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me read from section 503:

> SEC. 503. No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the director of State employment security for such area has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At that particular point, why does not the Senator agree to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]?

Mr. ELLENDER. We have not yet reached that point. I expect to consider each amendment on its merits.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I refer to the amendment with reference to prevailing wages in the particular area in which a man is employed.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that efforts have been made in the past to fix minimum wages for agricultural workers. It has never been accomplished on the Senate floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what I have in mind. If we cannot do it for the American citizen, I can imagine what will happen to one who has not even a vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator would want to do it for foreign workers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We want to do it for every American citizen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield, first, to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has an amendment applying to the whole problem of the wetbacks and use of employees. In fact, I have two amendments, one of which is to tighten up what I consider to be the meaning of the bill, and the second one is to permit reasonable entry and inspection of the places of employment of such workers by officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, for the purpose of enabling such officers to ascertain whether any of the workers employed are illegally in the United States. It might not be a bad idea, on the basis of security, to adopt this amendment. I really think it is very important to have immigration and naturalization officers inspect the places of employment or recruitment, so that there may be no influx into the United States of persons who may violate our security regulations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have an amendment on that point.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have been hearing that more imported labor is required, and it may very well be that that is a fact. But there is one thing which rather puzzles me. It is contained in the minority views on the bill, and it reads as follows:

> From 1945 through 1948, we employed a continuously larger hired labor force even through our work requirement (total man-hours) was gradually declining.

Then a table is given for 1946 to 1949, inclusive, showing the days of farm work for each farm worker. It is on a steadily declining basis. In 1946 it was 113 days; in 1949 it was down to 90 working days.

In the face of these figures and the report of the committee, I wondered if any explanation could be given, as to why a large number of workers from Mexico is so urgently required at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me emphasize that a little further. A recent study of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, which is prepared and issued under the supervision of a subcommittee, the chairman of which was the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], declared, along the line suggested by the Senator from New York, that underemployment among the marginal farmers is depriving the Nation of the equivalent of more than 2,500,000 workers. That is the reason why the Senator from New Mexico is concerned. That statement was made by the Senator from Alabama, than whom there is no better Senator when it comes to the soundness of his judgment and conclusions. I wish Senators would consider the statement that underemployment among marginal farmers is depriving the Nation of the equivalent of more than 2,500,000 workers.

The study further pointed out that there were a million and a half rural nonfarm worker families with incomes of $2,000 or less in 1948. Full employment of the workers in the families would add approximately 900,000 workers to the effective labor force. The 2,500,000 underemployed farmers are American citizens who are paying taxes when they work. There cannot be any deductions taken by the Government from workers imported from Jamaica or Mexico. From

the small wages they make Uncle Sam can take $3 on Saturday night. Is that good business?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the term "wetback." I suppose it means a Mexican who comes into the country illegally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. How are we going to prevent his coming into the country under the terms of the pending bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill would not prevent it.

Mr. WHERRY. Would it stop him from swimming across the Rio Grande if we passed the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. There is no provision in the bill under which it would be possible to punish greed. There is a good deal of greed involved. We cannot prevent a man from making a living and a profit out of human misery. Nothing in the bill would punish that type of person for employing a so-called wetback or an illegal entrant. I will tell the Senator that it has happened in my presence. People who are supposed to be outstanding citizens in their communities have told me that they have the least trouble with a wetback. Certainly they do not have as much trouble with him as with a contract worker. They can take care of a wetback. If he complains or rebels or gripes, he is reported to the Immigration Bureau. He is at a disadvantage. There is nothing whatever in the bill which would prevent the dishonest, or the type of person who has been investigated by the Kefauver committee, from doing such a thing. There is nothing in the bill which would punish that type of person.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will concede, will he not, that unless a Mexican national entered this country legally he could not be employed under this program?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is under contract. He could be employed, however.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator concedes, also, does he not, that the proposed legislation does not attempt to treat every phase of the wetback problem?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it should.

Mr. ELLENDER. How?

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I should like to know.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to know that, too. It would involve legislation that should be considered by the Judiciary Committee of this body.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator to say that under the proposed legislation a wetback would be eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. From entering into contracts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. From entering into contracts.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the provisions of the bill prevent a farmer from employing a wetback?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. WHERRY. What would be the penalty if he did?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The penalty is the undermining of the American system.

Mr. WHERRY. How would the enactment of the bill help the situation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the law as it stands wetbacks who are in this country——

Mr. WHERRY. Illegally.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; illegally—may keep on working and may be contracted with.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year our Immigration Service accosted more than 500,000 wetbacks and returned them to Mexico. As I indicated yesterday, I have a bill before the Committee on the Judiciary which would make it an offense for an employer——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Such a provision should be a part of the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The subject is not under the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Committee. It should be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. It is my hope that the bill I introduced will be voted on by the Judiciary Committee at an early date.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why cannot we include such a provision in the pending bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. For the reason that it would encroach upon the prerogatives of another committee. On the other hand the Committee on Agriculture held no hearings on the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I am seeking information. I understood very distinctly that by the provisions of the bill we do not eliminate illegal entrance into the United States, and that regardless of whether we passed the bill we would still be confronted with the same problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are laws on the statute books now which prevent a Mexican from coming in. Yet it seems impossible to stop them from coming in.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Along the lines suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] made the following statement yesterday:

> I wish to state that in order to further assist in connection with the wetback problem, and in conformity with the promise which I made to many members of the Mexican delegation, that I would sponsor a bill to make it a punishable offense for an American employer knowingly to employ an alien illegally in this country.

He further said:

> The way to deal with the wetback problem is to impose certain restrictions on the employment by corporations or individual employers in this country of aliens illegally in the country, when they hire men whom they know to be illegally in the country.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly the answer I have been seeking. Under the proposed legislation there is no provision which would handle the question of wetbacks in any other way than the way in which it is being handled now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Except that it would be illegal to contract them.

Mr. WHERRY. But there is no penalty involved.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say that it is illegal to gamble or to commit murder.

Mr. ELLENDER. Murders are committed every day, even though it is illegal, and in most States punishable by death.

Mr. WHERRY. And we are against sin.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are all against sin.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The point is that if the bill were enacted into law, we would not help the wetback situation at all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not a bit.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not saying how I shall vote on the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In a small way we would legalize the wetback situation.

As I proceed further, I shall give the whole picture of the wetback problem and how it is undermining the vitals of American institutions. Nothing is being done about it, either in the pending bill or by Government agencies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that an amendment will be offered which, to some extent, will rectify the situation. Certainly it will lend a little help in the solution of the problem. The amendment would permit reasonable entry and inspection of the places of employment of such workers by the officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, for the purpose of enabling such officers to ascertain whether any of the workers employed are illegally in the United States. It could go beyond contracts. There are many employment centers on our side of the border and the immigration officers could have constant supervision over the employment centers, to see that wetbacks are not employed.

Mr. WHERRY. Cannot that be done now?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Only at the border. Under the amendment, immigration officers could inspect employment centers all over the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I intend to proceed a little further. As I previously stated, I know the people of my State. I know that they want stabilized labor of every type and kind. That is the type of request which should have been brought before the committee. But no; the proponents of this legislation wanted a bill which would take care of the growing season of 1951 only, and the gathering of the crop.

I have received a telegram from a personal friend of mine, Verner Clayton, of Alamogordo, N. Mex.——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he goes into that subject?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. If the bill is enacted, will Nebraska have an opportunity to get any more sheepherders than we are now getting?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill would not be of any benefit to us in that respect, would it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill is for the benefit of the wetback who crosses the Mexican border.

Mr. ELLENDER. Nebraskans could contract for Mexican labor.

Mr. WHERRY. If the bill were enacted, would it enable us to get any more

sheepherders? We need sheepherders in Nebraska. Would we be enabled to get any more if the bill were passed than we are getting now?

Mr. ELLENDER. They could be obtained.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes. We could get more than we are getting now if we could get them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this again emphasizes the point which I have been trying to make all afternoon. The Senator from Nebraska speaks about sheep. I want to talk about sheep. I wish the Senator from Nebraska would lend me his ear.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just seen the figures as to how many we got last year. It was practically nothing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. About a year ago a young professor from the University of Oklahoma and a professor from the University of South Dakota had quite an idea. Up to the moment, and throughout the lifetime of the country, the cowboy has been a hero; and I do not think it is a bad idea, either. Nevertheless, those two men decided that something should be published about sheep, and the history of sheep raising in continental United States. So they commenced to investigate, from the time of the coming of Coronado to what is now New Mexico in continental United States, in 1540, when the first sheep came here. They covered the bringing of sheep from Scotland and England into Maine, and the migration through the pass into Kentucky and the Northwest Territory. With the history of that industry as a background, they wrote a beautiful book entitled "Shepherds' Empire." It is a documentary book, containing factual information on the history of sheep in continental United States. It tells about the driving of sheep from the State of the Senator from Colorado and from my State to feed the hungry gold miners in California during the gold rush. Sheep were driven from New Mexico and Colorado to feed the people of Sacramento.

The Senator from Nebraska does not need this bill to get all the sheepherders he needs. I can find them in my State, among men who may have sons in Korea, or may have sons buried in the cemetery at Hamm, in Luxemburg, or at Anzio. The Senator does not need this bill. One of the objections I have to it is that we already have that class of labor. Sheep have been herded in my State since 1540. I can provide the Senator all the sheepherders he needs, but he will have to pay them well.

Mr. WHERRY. In Nebraska we always pay our help very well.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would not the Senator say that the only way to stop the wetback problem is by dredging and deepening the channel of the Rio Grande?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have been trying to get a little money——

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is no suggestion for a further project. We want economy. However, it appears that we are not going to stop the wetback problem by any number of amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. What is it going to cost the United States if we pass this bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will be patient with me, I wish to proceed. I wish to tell him about the wetback.

A wetback is called a wetback because he crosses the Rio Grande from the Mexican side to the American side by walking.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought perhaps he swam.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As a matter of fact, he really does not wet his back. At times there is not enough water in that river to wet his feet. But inasmuch as he crosses the river in that manner, he is referred to as a wetback.

After they cross the Rio Grande they scatter all over, by the millions, creating problems in Texas, in my State, in Arizona, and in California. They even go to Trinidad, Walser burg, and Denver, in the State of my friend from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. It is a social problem. It is an economic problem. It is an American problem, and we ought to do something about it, and not feel that the only way we can cure it is by having the Mexican labor work for a very few farmers within continental United States.

Let me say further that if the Senator from Nebraska will be kind enough to remain a little longer, I shall repeat what the archbishop of the Catholic Church at San Antonio, Tex., in the midst of the problem, has to say as to how it affects us. I intend to quote from church authorities who do not belong to the same church as does the good archbishop of San Antonio. I shall quote from the dean of the Law School of the University of North Carolina on this subject. At this time I wish to proceed with the telegrams from my good constituents. It would have been easy for me to have kept quiet. Some of these persons are going to be angry. However, I do not vote on the basis of expediency, political or otherwise. I believe that this bill is un-American, unfair, and prejudicial. It would be disastrous to American labor. It would be disastrous to American institutions. It would be disastrous to every concept that we hold dear.

I invite the attention of Senators to a telegram from another friend of mine, Bob James, of Malaga. It is to the same effect as the telegram from Mr. Berry. I know him personally. He is a fine person.

I am one of those who believe that as a whole the American people are honest. I do not believe that everyone is bad. We have some bad ones now and then, but they are in the great minority. I know that there are millions of honest people in this country, but none more so than Bob James, of Malaga, N. Mex. He sends me a telegram urging me to vote for the Ellender bill. The telegram reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: Sincerely request your support—

And I know that he sincerely requests it—

of original Ellender bill without any amendments. It is practical to use Mexican nationals to harvest our crops the season of 1951. Believing that you will rely on information of your constituents as to labor bills, thanking you for your support.

Your friend,

BOB JAMES.

I know that it is practical to use Mexican labor to harvest our crops. I know also that it is practical to use American citizens to harvest the same crops.

Bob James is a grand person. I wish I could in good conscience comply with his request. He has been my friend when others have gone back on me in my little troubles. Bob James and his family would go all over the prairie to try to help DENNIS CHAVEZ.

I also invite attention to a telegram from Delmar Roberts, president of the New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau. He is a representative of the association which is composed of farmers in my State. He had heard that I had supported some amendments which, as he understood, would emasculate the provisions of this bill. I read his telegram:

Farmers and ranchers in New Mexico—

I think he saw three of them—

vitally interested in passage without amendments of Ellender and Poage labor bills for providing Mexican nationals for farm labor. Am advised you have introduced amendments which will emasculate the provisions of this legislation. Urgently request you reconsider these amendments and push passage as bills are now written. These bills represent many months of work by producers who foot the bill, cast the votes, and carry the load of getting production, and therefore are entitled to your cooperation. Our entire organization of 6,000 members strongly behind this legislation, which is of vital interest in view of huge cotton acreage planted as requested by our defense officials.

That is signed by Mr. Roberts. I know Mr. Roberts. I know the organization he represents. I know their potentials economically and even politically. But I am still voting in accordance with my oath of office.

I assure the Senate and Mr. Roberts and those whom he represents that with me it is not a question of emasculating anything. With me it is a question of protecting American labor first, of protecting the fathers and the sons and the brothers of those who are dying on foreign battlefields first, of protecting American citizens first, and when I say American citizens I include the Indian population of the United States.

Practically every winter the eastern newspapers and other newspapers of the Nation and the magazines are filled with the stories of the mistreatment of the Indians and their suffering because of their economic disadvantages. Yet they are buried in every American military cemetery, and they help raise the American flag on battlefields. Listen to the telegrams of protests from members of associations in my State and elsewhere, but I say to the Senate in all seriousness, I want to protect the American laborer first. After that labor is protected, after American industry is protected, if we have no more American labor available, then and then only will I support legislation importing foreign labor, be it from the country dealt with in this bill or the

lands of His Majesty's subjects throughout the Caribbean or elsewhere.

I want to call attention to what I mean by dying on foreign battlefields. I know that my friend, Mr. Roberts, president of the New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau, will understand. A young man, the son of good friends of mine, from Mr. Roberts' home city of Las Cruces, N. Mex., was reported missing in action in the Korean war. The conflict in Korea is war, and we cannot call it anything else. He was reported missing some weeks ago. He was the son of one of the outstanding families of that fine community. Is he missing in action in vain? We all pray and hope that he may be alive and return to his mother in due time, but contemplate for the moment that he is missing in action in Korea. With all the fervor of my heart I want this to sink in. He is missing in action. He was doing what? He was doing his duty and making an effort to protect the oath of office we all took, and what it represents. He was doing his duty making an effort to protect American ideals, American traditions, the American way of life, the Declaration of Independence, and what it stands for, the Constitution of the United States, and what it stands for. That is why that boy is missing in action, and that is why, irrespective of other considerations, irrespective of desire to make a little more profit, I, for one, will stand on this floor, even though I am the only one to do so, to protest against any action being taken which does not first take care of Uncle Sam's citizens. I was told long ago that charity begins at home. Even in this proposed legislation I want to take care of Uncle Sam's citizens first.

Politically, possibly it would help me more to agree with the mistaken conclusions of the senders of the telegrams and letters from my State. However, I have not cast a vote in this body and I know I never shall, because of political expediency, irrespective of the consequences.

In my opinion, this piece of proposed legislation is detrimental to the best interests of the American people and to the producing farmers themselves because once we commence to use a type of labor that lives contrary to American standards and the American way of life, business—and farming is a business—is bound to suffer. We will suffer economically, we will suffer socially, we will suffer politically.

What has made this country great and what has made it the leader of the world, is carrying out the concepts of the American way of life.

I want to call the Senate's attention to one of our agreements with the Republic of Mexico at the moment. I think I referred to it heretofore in the course of a colloquy. Several years ago the people of this country became concerned over the hoof-and-mouth disease below the border, and there was reason for that concern. The people on this side of the border would have suffered intensely both economically and otherwise if that terrible disease had been left uncontrolled. The Congress of the United States, again trying to protect the American way of life, made available millions and millions of dollars, taxpayers' dollars, to try to control that disease in Old Mexico. I think this country acted with wisdom and that our friendly neighbor Republic has cooperated 100 percent in order to eradicate or control the infection.

Mr. President, it is my considered opinion, having had first hand information in dealing with the type of labor that is proposed to be imported under the proposed legislation, that the effect of such importation on our social, economic and political life will be worse and more detrimental to the American people than all the damage that could be done by the hoof-and-mouth disease. In the proposed legislation we are dealing with human elements and the only thing the bill does as far as those persons are concerned is to undo many constructive things that were done, as for example, by the great Lincoln. Many of the things that were protected by the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives in the first and second world wars, the things that the boys in Korea are dying for, will be destroyed by this piece of legislation.

Mr. President, speaking further in regard to Senate bill 984, which is now being considered by the Senate, let me say that the bill was reported to the Senate on the assumption that there is a crying need for the importation of a large—but an unspecified—number of alien workers to be employed on a few corporate farms in particular regions of the United States. It is claimed that these workers are urgently required in the defense mobilization period which we now are entering. That is the claim; nevertheless, the bill is limited to 1 year in duration. Therefore, Mr. President, I do not see how the enactment of the bill will help to any great extent in the long-range mobilization plan.

An analysis of the demand for enactment of the bill shows that it comes from particular regions which can be clearly defined. The demand for enactment of the bill does not come from the North Atlantic States or from the South Atlantic States or from the middle Western States which are the great breadbasket of our country and are made up of millions of family-type farms which are the bulwark of our democracy and our civilization. On the contrary, the demand for enactment of the bill comes from, and the bill is sponsored by, a few large corporations which are engaged in farming. This bill is not sponsored or requested by the rank and file of the family type farmers.

I said at the outset that the proposed large-scale importation of Mexican workers is desired by only a few corporate farms. Certainly they are few in number, as compared to the total number of farms in the United States. The fact is that of the 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 farms in the United States, there are only 125,000 large farms where the imported workers will possibly find employment; and when they do find employment there, it will be for an average of only 90 days. The 125,000 large corporate farms for which the importation of Mexican labor is requested are the so-called factories in the field.

Those who operate the 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 family-type farms do not want to take advantage of human misery, Mr. President. On the other hand, the comparatively few large corporate farms in the United States are vast agricultural enterprises which are owned by less than 2 percent of the Nation's farm operators. It is on these farms that it is proposed that the imported Mexican laborers be employed. Yet these farms produce only approximately 7 percent of the food and fiber products sold on the American market.

So, Mr. President, let us consider the situation now confronting us. The greatest deliberative body in the world is now concerned with making the requested provision for 125,000 large, corporate-type farms, which produce only approximately 7 percent of the food and fiber products sold on the American market; but in acting on this proposal the Senate would completely ignore, neglect, and forget the 6,000,000 honest-to-goodness farmers who operate in all the States of the Union.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD two telegrams in regard to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegrams will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to know what the telegrams contain.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the telegrams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the telegrams.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Hon. ERNEST MCFARLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strenuously oppose S. 984 and respectively request your support of our stand.

ARIZONA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
E. F. VICKERS, Sr.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

APRIL 24, 1951.

Recent series of articles in the New York Times and other newspapers and magazines

have shown the scandalous conditions under which millions of Mexican immigrants, both legal and illegal, the so-called wetbacks, live in our country. Such conditions jeopardize conditions of all other workers. The Ellender measure is likely to add to these disgraceful conditions. In view of these facts, it should be sent back to committee for further consideration and should go to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in accord with the explicit provisions respecting importation of foreign workers and labor standards contained in Public Law 601, the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act. Evidence is ample that in this critical period of defense mobilization enough of our own citizens can be mustered to handle food and fiber crops if working conditions of minimum decency are offered.

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
G. E. LEIGHTY, *Chairman.*

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning next Monday at 12 o'clock noon, there be a limitation of debate on the pending bill, as follows: On each amendment, 40 minutes, and no amendment to be offered which is not germane; that debate on amendments, motions, and appeals be limited to 40 minutes, the time on any amendment to be equally divided, the time for the amendment to be controlled by the Senator offering the amendment, the time of the opposition to be controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], if he opposes the amendment, and, if not, by the distinguished minority leader; debate on the bill to be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Where do I come in? I should like to ask what is to be done tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. We had not planned to have a session tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thought the Senator wanted to get through with the work of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. We would have a difficult time in getting a quorum. We could not have gotten one this afternoon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the moment, I object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The objective at which the majority leader is aiming is, first, to allow ample time for discussion of the pending bill, which we might very well discuss for some time this evening; second, to provide our colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] with an opportunity to discuss his amendment, which is very basic. As to other amendments, of which there are several, the time will be 20 minutes on each side. I think if we all cooperate and use a little of our time to help out we may be able to get the bill through on Monday night.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The particular point that gave me concern when I objected was that the Senator from Arizona wanted unanimous consent to cover germaneness. I think a bill that would cover wetbacks would be germane, and I wanted to look into the question.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that if he plans to offer an amendment similar to that which was offered by the Senator from Louisiana, I would except it from the reference to germaneness.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Earlier in the session I introduced Senate bill 949, which carries out the philosophy of what I have in mind. I have some amendments which I should like to have considered, at least, which would carry out the provisions of that bill. If I have assurance that those amendments will be considered, I have no objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reserving the right to object, at the moment I am a little skeptical and doubtful as to the wisdom of a unanimous-consent request that would tend to cut off discussion on the floor under a limitation of time. There are some negotiations in process relative to hearings before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. I am very hopeful that the documents and the witnesses requested may be made available to the committees, but if by any chance they are not made available, I would not want to foreclose on the Senate floor an opportunity to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate and of the country. At this time I would object to any agreement that might cut off any other debate on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it appears from the statement of the Senator from California that other matters may be discussed on Monday. Even if there be only a limited number of Senators present, why can we not proceed tomorrow with the discussion?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have told Senators that we would not have a session on Saturday.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not like to work on Saturday, any more than does any other Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Some of us work every day until 8 o'clock in the evening, and Saturday is the only day on which we can clean up our office work. I have told Senators we would not have a session on Saturday.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator from Arizona. It is not advantageous, as a rule, to work on Saturday. I know that we try to clean up our office work on Saturday. It is agreeable to me that the Senate go over until Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, several amendments have been printed, and I intend to discuss them. I have another amendment, which I am sending to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I renew the unanimous-consent request, except that I modify it to germaneness shall not apply so that the provision with respect to any amendment which has been printed and is lying on the table, including the amendment which has just been presented by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, but shall apply to any new amendment to be offered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that the Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that debate upon amendments shall be confined to amendments which are germane, with the exception that all amendments now printed and lying on the table, including the one just offered, shall be considered as germane and shall be excepted from the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It does not apply to the time of meeting or the limitation of debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. The limitation of debate would apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair should observe that it would be well to have the Senator from Arizona restate his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning on Monday next, at 12 o'clock, debate upon all amendments, motions, and appeals, be limited to 40 minutes on each side, to be divided equally between the proponent of an amendment and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], provided he is opposed to the amendment; if not opposed, to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader; provided further, that as to the amendments which have been printed and are lying on the table, including the one just presented by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the germaneness provision shall not apply; provided further that any new amendment to be offered must be germane; provided further, that the limitation of debate upon the bill shall be limited to 2 hours, 1 hour to each side, to be controlled, respectively, by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask what is the amendment just offered as to which the provision with respect to germaneness shall not apply?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"SEC. —. Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation who (1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise; or (2) conceals or harbors, or attempts to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation, any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a

fine not exceeding $2,000 and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it has been called to my attention that I may have made a mistake in referring to 40 minutes to a side. I mean 40 minutes on each amendment, the time to be divided equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes to a side on each amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question. I have 9 or 10 amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator would have charge of the time on each of his amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what I understood. I did not want any other Senator to control the time so far as my amendments were concerned. What about general debate?

Mr. McFARLAND. The time for general debate would be divided between the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why is that, may I ask the Senator—not that I object to either one of them? Why is it divided between the minority leader and the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McFARLAND. To be frank with the Senator, in order that the minority leader may allot some time on amendments with respect to which the 40-minute allowance would not apply.

Mr. WHERRY. To be specifically frank about it, the only way in which the time could be allotted to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on his amendment would be by allotting him time on the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not having heard the Senator from Nebraska express his opinion, or state how he feels about this proposed legislation, but recognizing his intelligence, I still have hope. I anticipate that the right thing may be done. I should like to see the time divided as between the proponents of the bill and the opponents.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am sure that there will be no difficulty in that connection. I have the utmost confidence in the Senator's fairness.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason I have not expressed myself up to this moment is that I have not had an opportunity.

It is perfectly agreeable to the minority leader—and I am sure the minority—if the distinguished majority leader wishes to include in the unanimous-consent agreement a time limit of, say, an hour on a side for the Cordon amendment; but he did not wish to do that because that would be unfair to other Senators who wish time on their amendments. So we worked out an agreement under which I am to be in charge of the time on the bill. I do not care whether I have control of the proponents' time or the opponents' time. I do wish some time for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to discuss his amendment.

Mr. President, we cannot put everything in a unanimous-consent agreement. I want it thoroughly understood that there has been a definite agreement between the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the minority leader relative to the division of time which he controls, so that in the event a situation happens such as that described by the Senator from California, ample time will be made available for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader whether, in making his request, he included the requirement that the discussion be germane to each amendment? With 25 amendments, I can see how we might talk for 2 days, and listen to many speeches which do not relate at all to the importation of foreign labor.

Mr. McFARLAND. That could happen, but I do not believe it will.

Mr. AIKEN. It did happen not very long ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to put the question. That is not a part of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair put the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator in a moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator, if I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona include in his unanimous-consent request the idea of transferring time?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. I meant to do that. There will be 2 hours on the bill, and either the proponents or the opponents may have the privilege of relinquishing any part of the time thus allotted to a proponent of an amendment or to an opponent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to ask whether, with respect to the amendments which I have submitted, I shall have the opportunity of controlling the time?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will I be able to dispense time to any Senator, in order that I may satisfy the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and other Senators?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents will have control of 20 minutes' time on each amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator will have charge of the time on his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not now in order. The question is, Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the amendment is not in order, I shall have to object. I did not have time to get this amendment in before the unanimous-consent request was propounded. The amendment is germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, again reserving the right to object, I know that several Senators wish to speak on the bill, and I know that they wish to discuss amendments. I do not know whether an hour for each side would take care of those Senators. I think we would gain more if we were to proceed for a little while longer with the discussion today, and possibly by 12:30 or 1 o'clock on Monday we shall hear from other Senators, and ascertain how they feel about the matter. Then we can proceed to reach a unanimous-consent agreement.

Personally I do not like unanimous-consent agreements. We have had a great deal of trouble in this body because of unanimous-consent agreements. Some Senator may wish to discuss a bill or an amendment, and find that he has no opportunity because we are tied down by a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have done the best we could to accommodate all Senators. We have consulted with every Senator we could reach.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There was no quorum call.

Mr. McFARLAND. We had a substantial part of a quorum. A quorum is not required for a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate. If we wait until Monday, we shall be here perhaps until Thursday or Friday on this bill, because we shall be discussing other things. With this agreement I feel confident that we can dispose of the bill promptly. I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand. I am always agreeable, and I always get the worst of it by being agreeable. In this particular instance, so far as this bill is concerned, we can proceed with the debate for a little while longer this afternoon—I do not know for how long. Tomorrow we are going to take it easy in our offices. We are not interested in gaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). As a Member of the Senate, the present occupant of the Chair calls for the regular order. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am willing that the Senate meet tomorrow if any Senator wishes to come here and speak, if in that way we can find it possible to reach a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does he yield the floor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I objected to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before the quorum call was ordered I had stated that 125,000 big farms represented only 2 percent of the Nation's farm operators. They produce only approximately 7 percent of the food and fiber products sold on the market. There is grave doubt whether there is any real need by even this fraction of the farmers for the proposed legislation.

Why do I say that? I say it because the President's Commission on Migratory Labor so declares in the findings issued several days after the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the measure. It was only a few days after the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the bill that the President's commission studying this very question made its report. That report was contrary to the recommendation made by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Based on many months of study and hearings throughout the country the President's Commission on Migratory Labor said:

Although our Government is importing large numbers of foreign workers for employment on farms, we are convinced that they are not needed to meet the food requirements of the defense emergency period.

Mr. Roberts in his telegram to me stated that one of the reasons for prompt passage of the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was that it was necessary to meet the requirements of the defense emergency period. But the President's Commission, which has studied the problem, stated differently in its report, which I hold in my hand. It said:

Although our Government is importing large numbers of foreign workers for employment on farms, we are convinced that they are not needed to meet the food requirements of the defense emergency period.

Hence that report is entirely contrary to the conclusions reached by Mr. Roberts of the Farm Bureau Federation in New Mexico.

Mr. President, the President's Commission on Migratory Labor was composed of men distinguished for their impartiality and fine minds. They would not have made such a statement carelessly. They made it only after the evidence they assembled from one end of the country to the other satsfied them that such a statement is an expression of the true facts as to farm labor needs. The Chairman of the Commission came from a Southern State. He is not interested in political expediency. He is not interested in slave profit. His name is Maurice T. Van Hecke. He is dean of the University of North Carolina Law School, a scholar and teacher noted in his profession. North Carolina has produced some very fine Americans, very fine investigators, very fine citizens.

Another member of the Commission was Noble Clark. Who is he? He is the chief of the agricultural experiment station at the University of Wisconsin. Mr. President, would he be interested in farm labor. Would he be impartial? I will let Senators answer that question.

Another member of the Commission was Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, Tex., in the very heart of the wetback problem. Only today I have received a telegram from Archbishop Lucey. It is dated San Antonio, April 27, and reads as follows:

May I sincerely commend your efforts to amend the farm labor measure now under Senate consideration so that it will contain at least some standards of—

Of what?—

of decent working conditions—

Mr. President, I know I could defeat the bill, or that we could properly amend it, if the Senate of the United States would only understand its implications. I continue to read:

so that it will contain at least some standards of decent working conditions and will not encourage a further influx across the border of large numbers of Mexican workers who are not needed. Having long studied the farm-labor situation in this area at first hand—

Not in committee hearings, but dealing with human beings affected with working conditions daily—

at first hand and in recent months as a member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in its Nation-wide investigation I—

Archbishop Lucey, of San Antonio, Tex., speaking—

I firmly believe that the demand for further Mexican workers is not justified. If a small number of alien workers are required, immediate steps should be taken to organize our farm-labor force which in itself should be adequate for our needs.

I wish you success in your noble undertaking.

ARCHBISHOP LUCEY.

When he says:

If a small number of alien workers are required, immediate steps should be taken to organize our farm-labor force which in itself should be adequate for our needs—

He is speaking for the millions of American citizens who are available for farm labor in the United States.

Another member of the Commission was Dr. William Leiserson, former Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board; and still another member was Dr. Peter Odegard, member of the faculty at the University of California and president of the American Political Science Association.

The latter is a scientist at the University of California. California has many problems, thousands of problems connected with migratory workers, whether they be aliens or from the continental United States. This man has no ax to grind. He, as a scientist, studied the problem. He was a member of the Commission that made the report and the comment:

Although our Government is importing large numbers of foreign workers for employment on farms, we are convinced that they are not needed to meet the food requirements of the defense emergency period.

The word of these men, Mr. President, should be given very careful consideration. The Senate can ill afford to disregard the findings and recommendations of such a Commission after its prolonged and painstaking Nation-wide inquiry and analysis. If each of us in this Chamber can find time to read the Commission's report—and I hope each of us will find time—our conclusion will be that there is no real need for the type of legislation now before us.

We have the admission of my good friend, the chairman of the committee, that the Commission's report was not considered, in the first place, because it was not available and, in the second place, for reasons best known to the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder whether the Senator from New Mexico realizes that more than a year was required by the Commission to enable it to make its report. Under those circumstances, how could the committee have considered the whole subject in a few weeks? As I have indicated on several occasions, in order to be in a position to import Mexican labor and to obtain it in time for use in harvesting the big crops which are now being grown, we must act on this bill before June 30.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know and respect my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana. I know his ability and his alert mind, and I know of the fine committee staff he has. It would not have taken that staff an hour and a half to analyze the report and give that information to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, let me say that I recall the time during the reign of James II of England when one of the Scotch dukes was arrested and taken to London, and there he was beheaded. Thereafter his brother, also a Scotch duke, was taken to London, but for the moment he was not beheaded. He was taken before King James. Being a fine Scotchman, that duke was firm in maintaining his convictions. King James said to him, "You have been answering improperly. You forget that I have the power to save your head."

The good Scotch duke, firm man and good citizen that he was, said, "I know that Your Majesty has the power to save my head, but I also know that Your Majesty does not have the inclination to save my head."

Mr. President, I am sure it was not a lack of inclination which caused the committee not to act on the recommendations of the President's Commission. To the contrary, I think the failure of the committee to act on the recommendations of the Commission was due to the laudable desire of the committee to report a measure on this subject. So, possibly unintentionally, the committee neglected to look at the report made by the President's Commission.

The commission found that there are approximately 1,000,000 adult persons who follow the crops from area to area and from State to State, and often do not have a permanent place which they call their home. The average annual earnings of these workers "wandering restlessly over the face of the land" was found to be slightly more than $500 a year. Mr. President, in these days when we are sermonizing to the entire world, in these days when we try to impress on all other countries the benefits of the point 4 program, we find a commission composed of outstanding citizens of our country telling us that 1,000,000 adults within our own country earn only approximately $500 a year, at a time when liver is selling for $1.75 a pound. Should those persons be protected, or do we exercise sound judgment if we forget those 1,000,000 adults and if we import foreign labor because it might be advantageous for the moment for a few farmers?

The commission's report leaves no doubt as to how shocking are the housing, health, and living conditions of these migrants.

Mr. President, the report states that at Fort Collins, Colo., a doctor, who is chairman of the Colorado Governor's Committee on Migrant Labor, testified about conditions in a large farm-labor camp which was built and formerly was operated by the United States Department of Agriculture, but now is under the management of farm employers. I wish to read some of his testimony. Inasmuch as only a few Senators are now present in the Chamber and are listening to what I say, I respectfully call this matter to the attention of our guests who are in the gallery:

I have never been as shocked as when I entered the one-room shacks with old iron bedsteads and thin pads, with one shaded bulb, in which as many as 8 to 10 people sleep, and with an old cook stove, dirt just as thick as you could find it, no toilet facilities, no water facilities. The thing that the camp is proud of is the bank toilets and bank showers, and when I counted up the numbers that were available, when one considers the large number of people that live there in the summer, it's below the lowest possible standard of 30 or 40 years ago, let alone today's standards.

In the commission's report it is stated that when the United States Public Health Service X-rayed the occupants of that camp in 1949, it was found that 115, or 4.2 percent, of the 2,704 migrants examined, showed positive tuberculosis or other pathological conditions.

That situation was found to exist in our progressive America, Mr. President, in the country that is telling the rest of the world how to behave and how to improve its condition and how to obtain better economic advantages for its people.

That is sermonizing. I continue:

The director of this Florida county testified:

"This is an actual observation: A sanitarian reports 180 people living in 60 rooms, with only 1 toilet stool that works."

One hundred and eighty people. I hope if Senators cannot listen to this, they will read my remarks; but, if they do not, I want all the American people to know about the conditions. When the American people know about the conditions, I shall consider myself to have been fully repaid for my humble efforts in trying to set forth a picture of very bad health within the United States. But, at the place where there was but 1 toilet stool which worked, and which was to accommodate 180 persons, conditions have improved, according to the report of the President's Commission, which continues:

This has been corrected somewhat by three additional stools which were added by the time of the last inspection.

We are picking up. The Florida county health director continues:

One of our public-health nurses visited a nursery maintained on a private farm and found 48—I did not say 4, I said 48—infants on 2 double beds.

Infants, Mr. President, who might become human cannon fodder in the protection of our democracy. Should attention be paid to those conditions by the American people, including its representatives in the Congress? There are nevertheless those who become excited about the point 4 program for the underdeveloped areas of the world. Only today, in the Senate Committee on Appropriations, consideration was given to the appropriation of money to be sent abroad for the care of children—a noble, a laudable purpose. But, I ask, what about our own children? What about our own workers? Mr. President, call it isolationism, if you wish, but I, for one, still want to think of, and am proud to think of, the American people. The director of the Florida County Health Department says:

I did not say 4, I said 48—infants on 2 double beds. I might add that two of the babies in that location subsequently died.

About 100,000 of these workers were found to be contract nationals imported legally, as will be done under this bill, from Mexico and the British West Indies. Some 400,000 were found to be illegal immigrants, so-called wetbacks from Mexico. Mr. President, do you observe the proportion? What would happen under the provisions of this bill? Of the total of 500,000, 100,000 were found to have come here legally under contracts with employers in this country, the other 400,000 were found to be illegal immigrants or wetbacks.

The disgraceful condition under which these immigrants seek to eke out their pitiful living has been the subject of many newspaper and magazine articles. The New York Times, in a graphic and deeply-moving series of articles written by Gladwin Hill, published from March 25 to 29, describes the distressing plight of these Mexican immigrants. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] inserted this series in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 9. The articles assert that as many as 1,000,000 Mexican workers have crossed the border illegally within a single year. What this means in misery for the wetbacks is bad enough, but the pitifully low wages they receive over long periods of time make them an economic liability in the areas where they are employed.

To illustrate, I wish to call attention to the headlines of the articles which appeared in the New York Times. The first one, which appeared on March 25, 1951, was headed:

MILLION A YEAR FLEE MEXICO ONLY TO FIND PEONAG HERE

Illegal migration across 1,600-mile border by seasonal—

What kind of labor?—

slave labor depresses Latin and United States levels alike.

That article, together with other articles, was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 9. I have before me one of the series of articles, which appeared in the New York Times on April 26. It was written by the same author, and I wish to call attention to the headline. It will make wonderful reading in a country which is fighting so hard for democracy, a country which would provide everything that is good for every other country, a country which believes in point 4. Listen to this:

Peons net farmer—

That is, the man who believes in the passage of the pending bill in its present form—

Peons net farmer a fabulous profit; illegal migrants from Mexico working rich soil of West a bonanza to exploiters; pay 15 to 25 cents a day.

We talk about the American way of life, about American standards of living. Mr. President, do you think it is doing the American laborer or the American businessman any good to have in this country a human being, whether a native, a citizen of the country, or a foreigner, who receives from 15 to 25 cents a day?

Is not that very condition undermining our way of life? We love to talk and to brag about American standards of living. They are very fine, and we want to keep them that way. But we must have the ability to keep them up, and we shall not do it with slave labor, either domestic or otherwise.

Mr. President, I think I should read a portion of this article. I have read some of the headlines, but they go a little further. Here is another headline:

And many receive food alone, while shelter is a hut, a thatch, or the stars.

Not the 15 or 25 cents, so the article says, but "many receive food alone, while shelter is a hut, a thatch, or the stars."

The stars are the best. Nature provided that shelter. I have seen the huts, and in many instances the average American farmer would not furnish such habitations for his pigs, his horses, or his sheep.

The date line of this article is Brownsville, Tex., March 26, 1951. I read further:

The lower Rio Grande Valley is the heart of the 1,600-mile-wide border belt stretching from Texas to California into which more than 1,000,000 Mexicans annually infiltrate illegally in quest of work.

That has reference to slave work, because they are so poor and poverty-stricken.

Here, amid such towns as Waslaco, Donna, Harlingen, and McAllen are some of the most fertile and productive cotton, citrus, and vegetable lands in the country.

That is true, Mr. President. Much of the spinach, onions, lettuce, citrus fruit, and other food products comes from that productive valley.

The lower Rio Grande comprises principally three counties, Cameron, Hidalgo, and Willacy, with 300,000 population. Their only fractionally cultivated gross area of 3,000 square miles, although constituting only 2 percent of the total area of the State, yields some 15 percent of its farm income.

In this relatively small area, on an average day during last year's harvest peak, according to a careful study by two leading southwestern sociologists, about 100,000 wetbacks were working. A check of 14 farms taken at random by Dr. Lyle Saunders of the University of New Mexico and Dr. Olen Leonard, of Vanderbilt University, disclosed that 93 out of every 100 workers were illegal Mexican aliens.

In lesser concentrations as the distance from the border increases, but still in swarms of thousands, other wetbacks can be found in the harvesting and thinning seasons in the Salt River Valley of Arizona, the Imperial and San Joaquin Valleys of California, and many other sections of the West and South—legally fugitives from justice, but beneficiaries—or victims—of skimpy border protection, grasping farmers and an apathetic public.

How shall I say it—it is a matter of the turning away of the eye of the immigration agent.

Over the whole area there are many farmers and farm associations that because of special circumstances or plan scruples do not use wetbacks—

In many areas the farmer himself does not employ them.

but for the average farmer, such a course means bucking an entrenched cheap-labor system.

That is what it is.

In contrast to visions of affluence, conjured up by the wide disparity in United States and Mexico living standards, the wetback finds himself under a system of wages governed entirely by what the traffic will bear.

That is what will happen if the proposed legislation is passed as reported to the Senate.

Farmers acknowledged to the President's Commission on Migratory Labor last summer that they paid field hands as low as 15 cents an hour.

Human beings with families.

According to the Saunders-Leonard study, the prevailing hourly wage for wetbacks in this valley last year was 25 cents an hour.

So, as between the article and the headlines, I say to the Senator from Louisiana that there is a mistake, because, according to the headlines, it was from 15 to 25 cents a day, and in the heart of the article it is stated as being from 15 to 25 cents an hour.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the commission indicate the period during which the data were gathered? In exactly what year was it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. This was in 1948.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the study took place in 1948, during what period was the wage paid?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The commission did not come into being until the past 2½ or 2 years; so it was within that period.

Mr. ELLENDER. It must have been before that period that the wage was being paid.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was speaking of the time that Dr. Saunders, of the University of New Mexico, and Dr. Leonard, of Vanderbilt University, made their investigation. As I understand, the Saunders report was issued on January 1, 1951.

Mr. ELLENDER. The wages were for what year?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Last summer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Were those wages paid to wetbacks?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I continue reading from the article:

Although cotton was selling at exceptionally high prices—

So it was 1950—

the cotton picking rate in the valley was at its lowest in some time, $1.25 a hundred pounds—

I wish some of the Senators from noncotton producing areas could at some time see the fatiguing stoop work of the cotton picker—

at which, it was calculated, the average picker might earn a maximum of about $26 for a 7-day week—

Twenty-six dollars for 7 days of picking cotton.

Hourly rates like 25 cents do not necessarily indicate the real wage level in a particular situation, because they may be replaced by piecework rates that are less, or by day rates based on a theoretical 8 hours that in practice may stretch out to 10 or 11 hours.

Gross wages, moreover, are often subject to deductions for meals, commissary purchases, and special assessments, such as the common practice of charging workers for binding wire for vegetables, a practice obviously implying either a paring of the nominal wage or profiteering on the wire.

Two cases reported last summer at McAllen were a father, mother, and two children who had worked 4 days for a net of $6.50 and an inexperienced cotton picker who after 3 days' work was told he had just earned the food he had eaten.

That is happening in our democracy, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME GET NO CASH

It is not extraordinary for wetbacks to report having worked for weeks only to be told that there was no cash due them. In such a circumstance the wetback has little scope for argument; the farmer can just turn him into the immigration authorities for deportation.

A few days ago I talked with a wetback named Felix Moreno, who had come into El Centro, Calif., to get help in collecting $47 he said a nearby farmer owed him for 10 days of carrot bundling. He was one of 50 wetbacks in a crew of 65. A typical wetback in many respects, Moreno was 24 years old and had a wife and year-old child back in Mexico.

Last fall he had taken more than a month's Mexican wages to buy a train ticket from Santiago, Guatajuato, 800 miles south of the border. He had walked across the line in the desert and worked intermittently in cotton and vegetables in the 6 months since. In his pocket he had 20 cents.

Aside from wages, the wetback gets nothing. His lodging is seldom better than an irrigation-ditch bank or hut improvised from junk or thatch. The worker-housing situation in Lower Rio Grande Valley ranches was tersely summarized in a report published by the University of Texas last December:

"No housing facilities exist."

Southwestern farmers have two principal explanations for the wholesale resort to labor that is contraband but the employment of which, because of legal technicalities, is not subject to prosecution.

One is that "local labor is not available."

It is true that, under present arrangements, peak harvest labor requirements often exceed the immediate local supply. The University of Texas survey, made by Prof. Eastin Nelson and Prof. Frederic Meyers, found, for instance, that in the Lower Rio Grande Valley seasonal cotton labor needs fluctuated from 5,000 to 125,000 against a permanent total labor force of only 38,000.

However, the same study found that an adequate supply might well be drawn from within the State of Texas if adequate monetary and other considerations were offered.

Observing that "much of the agricultural labor in the valley is performed by illegal entrants from Mexico," and tactfully skirting the question of wages with the notation that they were "low" even in comparison with other parts of Texas, the Nelson-Meyers report continued:

"The valley has an opportunity almost unique in a largely agricultural area of providing steady year-around jobs for a permanent resident labor force * * * (but) no such stable and desirable conditions exist, and the reasons for their lack lie plainly in the instability created by the continuous traffic back and forth across the Rio Grande.

FACILITIES UNNECESSARY

"The living standards which Mexican nationals are willing to tolerate, and the fact that so many of them are only temporary residents, have made it unnecessary for valley farmers to provide housing, sanitary facilities and other nonwage perquisites adequate to retain a permanent resident farm population."

During the last few years while the wetback traffic has been increasing at a rate of 50 percent or more a year, there has been more or less constant farm unemployment in the Southwest.

In the face of purported shortages of labor in Texas, every year around 100,000 residents of the State take to the road, joining the migrant farm labor stream to the States north, west, and east, where lessened wetback competition brings more adequate compensation.

Granting the possible occasional need for foreign labor, there is machinery under the United States-Mexico agreement of 1949 for the legal importation of workers under contract. But the farmers do not like this, because contracting involves minimum wages—ranging currently from 40 cents an hour for Texas to 60 cents for California—and guaranties of housing, insurance, and other conditions that make it far more expensive than wetbacks. Consequently, legal contracting has remained minute in comparison with wetback employment.

Although wetback employment is such an established institution that Rio Grande Valley newspapers refer to it baldly as cheap labor, farmers often argue that any greater labor costs would put them out of business.

CAN BE DONE

There is telling evidence in contradiction of this contention. For virtually every case where a crop is being produced with wetback labor, instances can be found of the same crop's being produced competitively—often in less favorable areas—with legal Mexican contract labor or domestic labor.

At the time farmers in the Lower Rio Grande Valley were paying $1.25 for cotton picking, farmers in California's San Joaquin Valley—300 miles from north of the border—were paying $3—and making impressive profits. Similar differentials customarily exist in citrus and vegetable production, despite California's more costly distance from Eastern markets.

Even within Texas, "at a time when daily wages for cotton chopping (thinning) in the valley were about $2.25," the Nelson-Meyers report said, "in the northeast sandy lands of Texas they were $3, in Corpus Christi and the coast prairie areas they were $4, in the rolling plains $5, and in the high plains $5.25."

The Saunders-Leonard study indicated that valley farmers were able to realize upwards of $5,000,000 extra profit of their cotton crop last summer by their illegal-labor wage rates. This comfortable differential possibly throws light on the fact that during 1949, when the farm income of the State as a whole was declining 8 percent, according to statistics of the State department of agriculture, valley farmers were able to increase their income by 7 percent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article published in the New York Times of March 27, 1951, under the caption: "Peons in the West lowering culture—Illegal migrants from Mexico form vast unassimilable block of population—All standards decline—Health, education, democracy in areas where wetbacks work are deplorable."

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEONS IN THE WEST LOWERING CULTURE—ILLEGAL MIGRANTS FROM MEXICO FORM VAST UNASSIMILABLE BLOCK OF POPULATION—ALL STANDARDS DECLINE—HEALTH, EDUCATION, DEMOCRACY IN AREAS WHERE WETBACKS WORK ARE DEPLORABLE

(This is the third of five articles dealing with the economic and sociological problem of the wetbacks—illegal Mexican immigrants in the Southwestern United States.)

(By Gladwin Hill)

EL PASO, TEX., March 26.—The annual invasion of the United States by more than 1,000,000 illegal Mexican border jumpers, long regarded by some as merely a quaint regional phenomenon of the Southwest, is emerging as a prime factor in some of the worst economic and social conditions in the Nation.

It is a matter of extensive public record that the 3,000,000 Mexican-American citizens of the Southwest are one of the most underprivileged segments of the population, in earnings, health, education, and equality of treatment.

The wetbacks, whose influx in its present proportions is a development of recent years, did not originate these conditions. In the opinion of a large number of expert observers, however, their presence has done much to perpetuate and aggravate them.

"From a cultural standpoint," states Dr. George Sanchez, head of the department of history and philosophy of education at the University of Texas, and probably the foremost student of regional interracial affairs, "the influx of a million or more wetbacks a year transforms the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest from an ethnic group which might be assimilated with reasonable facility into what I call a 'culturally indigestible' peninsula of Mexico."

NULLIFIES INTEGRATION

"The wetback migration tends to nullify processes of social integration going back 300 or 350 years, and I would say at the present time has set the whole assimilation process back at least 20 or 30 years."

It is the Mexican-American citizens whom primarily the wetback cheap-labor invasion deprives of jobs, and, through broad economic pressures, pulls down to its own primitive living standards.

It is the wetbacks, as parties to an informal system of peonage, who inexorably tend to set the level of the far from frictionless relations between the Mexican-Americans and the "Anglos."

"No citizen who wants to live in even a minimum of comfort and decency can compete with the wetback wage scale," Dr. Sanchez and Dr. Lyle Saunders, of the University of New Mexico, said in a recent report of the University of Texas' continuing study of the Spanish-speaking peoples, a project of the Rockefeller Foundation's general education board.

"With an oversupply of cheap unprotected labor always present organization of workers is impossible, individual bargaining is futile.

"There are only two choices: Work for what the wetback works for and live as he lives, or leave the area. Many accept the former alternative. Those who can, choose the second and become displaced persons. Either choice results in undesirable conditions for the individual and social problems for the community."

IN THE WAKE OF POVERTY

"For those who stay and attempt to compete, there is poverty and all the evils associated with it; disease, ignorance, child labor, crime and delinquency, lack of concern with civic affairs, slum conditions, and always the weight of a deadened, passive, apathetic population to be carried on the shoulders of other elements of the community.

"For those who leave, there are similar problems of health, education, welfare, and housing—problems that affect those migrating and those in the communities to which they go."

The second alternative is exemplified in the annual migration of around 100,000 Texans, along with thousands of farm workers resident in other wetback States, to other harvest areas of the Nation in quest of remunerative work.

It is possibly more than coincidence that the number of migrant farm workers who course the Nation annually has been independently estimated at 1,000,000—on the order of a conservative estimate of the number of wetbacks who annually breach the border.

The sources of this migration vary in many cases in direct proportion to the presence of wetbacks. In the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, the heart of "wetbackland," where as many as 100,000 wetbacks may be working at one time during the harvest peak, a recent survey showed that of 15,000 families, 8,000 had hit the migrant trail during a 2-year period.

NOT MERELY AGRICULTURE

The dislocations are not confined to the agricultural field. Wetbacks filter into every occupation from culinary work to the building trades. Practically any labor union in the 1,600-mile border zone from Texas to California can cite local instances of wetback competition in its field.

An analysis of a group of 160 supposedly agrarian wetbacks picked at random from among a summer's deportations by Dr. Saunders disclosed nine bricklayers, seven truck drivers, three miners, two factory workers, two welders, two weavers, a painter, a barber, a blacksmith, a butcher, a shoemaker, and a policeman.

A check of a single residential block in El Paso, Tex., one day last summer turned up three wetbacks doing craft work—a painter, a carpenter, and a carpenter's helper, working at rates from 57 cents an hour down to 37 cents.

In southwest Texas, wetback competition is so strong that even such nationally powerful unions as the teamsters' and the building trades' are only sketchily organized. An organizer for the American Federation of Labor in the area acknowledged sadly that even loyal union members had got in the habit of working on jobs beside wetbacks without protest.

The approximately 1,250,000 Mexican-Americans in Texas comprise one-sixth of the State's population. In many parts of southwest Texas they are predominant in the population.

The retarded assimilation of the Spanish-speaking people, the University of Texas report stated, is "revealed in second and third generation citizens who do not speak or who are not fluent in the language of their country, in poor school attendance records and low educational attainments, in abnormally high concentrations in unskilled occupations, in the persistence of separate, segregated institutions, and in subjective outgroup feelings toward non-Spanish-speaking citizens."

Despite all the problems of assimilation, Dr. Saunders concluded from a recent study of the valley, "it is conceivable that a mutually satisfactory adjustment involving a considerable cultural and perhaps even biological blending of both groups might have been reached had it not been for the continual inflow of large numbers of wetbacks.

"For the wetback embodies most of the elements necessary to reinforce the stereotyped notions of the Anglo through which he sees or fancies he sees undesirable characteristics in the Spanish-speaking group, and tends to assign to all Spanish-speaking people the characteristics he thinks he sees in the wetbacks * * * poor, uneducated, unskilled, underfed and frequently unclean."

DISCRIMINATION RAMPANT

Although the Texas courts have held that Mexican-Americans are white and therefore not subject to the same level of segregation as Negroes, they are still subject to extensive discrimination—both organized, as in certain public-housing projects, and informally. A typical example reported by Dr. Saunders is that where Anglo-American stenographers get between $150 and $250 a month, and average about $167, the standard scale for Mexican-Americans, despite their convenient bilinguality, is $100 to $150.

Although constituting some 16 percent of the population of Texas, Mexican-Americans account for only 2 percent of the enrollment in the State's 4-year colleges and universities.

Consonant conditions obtain, in varying degrees, throughout the Southwest.

Possible illumination of the correlation between the status of the wetback and that of the Mexican-Americans is provided by a comparison of their role in public affairs, in the States of Texas, New Mexico, and California. In all three States, Spanish-speaking populations have been established for more than a century. In New Mexico, the Spanish-speaking people constitute a larger proportion of the over-all population than in the other States—about half—but from a governmental standpoint their concentration is no greater in various areas than in important sections of Texas and California.

In the latter two States, prime termini of the wetback influx, you can search the rosters of State, county, and local legislative and administrative personnel through hundreds of names without encountering one that is Spanish.

In New Mexico, which has only 100 miles of border contiguous to Mexico and where there is relatively little farming to draw wetbacks, for practically every Anglo-American in public office—including the State's representation in Congress—you can find a person of Latin extraction.

COMPARATIVE DEATH RATES

Among the Anglo-American population, the 1946 death rate from diphtheria was 1.81 per 100,000 population; for the Spanish-speaking people, a synonym for Mexican-Americans, it was 6.47; the Anglo-American whooping cough rate was 0.64, the Mexican-American, 5.73; the tuberculosis death rate, 25.4 for Anglo-Americans, 159 for Mexican-Americans.

In San Antonio, the largest city of southwest Texas, the tuberculosis death rate among Anglo-Americans is 40, among Negroes 50 and among Mexican-Americans 150.

General conditions worsen as you progress into the wetback country. In Hidalgo County, one of three that make up the lower Rio Grande Valley, a United States Public Health Service survey of 3,103 resident Spanish-speaking families comprising 16,782 persons disclosed that in 1947-48, 9.8 percent had annual incomes below $500, 41.6 percent below $1,000, 68.3 percent below $1,500, and 82.9 percent below $2,000.

In Hidalgo County in 1949, the infant death rate among Spanish-speaking people was nearly five times that among the non-Spanish speaking. In 1949 Hidalgo and adjacent Cameron County, although containing only one-thirtieth of the State's population, accounted for one-fifteenth of all the State's meningitis, one-twelfth of its typhoid and diphtheria, one-seventh of its dysentery, and one-fifth of its malaria.

EDUCATIONAL DEFICIENCIES

Comparable educational deficiencies characterize the region. The farm-worker migration from Texas customarily starts in the early spring, months before the school year ends, and the workers do not return until fall after the school year has started.

Among families who do not migrate, and who are faced with making livings under the competition of wetback wages, child labor is so common that in some parts of west Texas the public schools remain closed for an extra month while the fall harvest is on. They remain open an extra month at the end of the year, but this evidently is a minor compensatory factor. In the three valley counties, a recent University of Texas study disclosed, in the age bracket 6 to 17, more than 40 percent of the children were absent from school on a given day.

"It seems perfectly plain from the figures that a fairly large percentage of the scholastics belong to the labor force in some degree * * * and that a fairly large percentage of (children above 14) belong regularly to the labor force."

The United States Public Health Service survey of 3,103 Hidalgo County Spanish-speaking families disclosed that 53 percent of their members had no formal schooling, 75 percent had less than 3 years, only 15 percent had from 3 to 6 years, only 1 percent had completed high school, and only 1 out of 1,000 had attended college.

Of those persons over 21, 45 percent had no schooling, only 2 percent had completed high school, and only 2 out of 1,000 had attended college. Sixty-seven percent could not speak English and 39 percent were illiterate even in Spanish. For comparison, the latest available State statistics on education among the over-all population of the same county show that 54.6 percent had completed five grades or more, and that 20.6 percent had completed high school.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The article covers one of the points which I have been stressing throughout my discussion of the pending bill, namely, that the use of peon labor not only affects wages and not only deprives the American citizen of the opportunity of working so that he may feed his family, but it has gone beyond that. It is breaking our way of life. It is breaking our democracy. It is interfering with everything we have stood for in the past one-hundred-and-sixty-seven-odd years. It is not democracy. It is slavery, pure and simple, and all that slavery implies.

Mr. President, I have another article, entitled "Southwest Winks at Wetback Jobs."

It is true, Mr. President. It is as true as that we are standing here. They do wink at the situation. They wink at it because they can get a poor, miserable creature to work for almost nothing. There are that class of people in the world. Thank God there are only a few, but they do exist.

Ethics cast aside as growers accept peonage ideas and bridle at interference.

Federal sanction noted.

It is true, Mr. President. Only a short time ago trucks of farmers were waiting on the American side of the bridge at El Paso, Tex. The immigration officers turned the other way, and the farmers picked up the poor creatures and put them in their trucks to take them to the farms.

Border patrol officers report pressures from Washington to "go easy" in raids.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHWEST WINKS AT WETBACK JOBS—ETHICS CAST ASIDE AS GROWERS ACCEPT PEONAGE IDEA AND BRIDLE AT INTERFERENCE—FEDERAL SANCTION NOTED—BORDER PATROL OFFICERS REPORT PRESSURES FROM WASHINGTON TO "GO EASY" IN RAIDS

(This is the fourth of five articles dealing with the economic and sociological problem of the wetbacks—illegal Mexican immigrants in the Southwestern United States.)

(By Gladwin Hill)

EL PASO, TEX., March 27.—The rise in illegal border-crossing by Mexican wetbacks to a current rate of more than 1,000,000 cases a year has been accompanied by a curious relaxation in ethical standards extending all the way from the farmer-exploiters of this contraband labor to the highest levels of the Federal Government.

Although wetbacks are fugitives from justice, southwestern cotton, citrus, and vegetable growers have come to the fixed view that there is nothing wrong in employing them, harboring them or even in actively recruiting them across the International Boundary.

Further, they have come to feel they have a vested right in the traffic. Any more than the normal token interference with it by the Immigration Service's skimpy border patrol—with less than 900 officers for the 1,600-mile expanse from Texas to the Pacific Ocean—brings an outraged hue and cry from communities thoroughly indoctrinated with the farmers' attitude.

A year ago, in a special drive, border patrol officers were concentrated temporarily along the Rio Grande and in 1 month increased their apprehensions from 16,490 to 24,415.

GESTAPO TACTICS CHARGED

Newspapers of the Lower Rio Grande Valley immediately accused the Immigration Service editorially of "siding with Mexico" and described valley farmers as "justifiably resentful" at having their scheme of things thus disrupted.

A barrage of feature articles followed, describing in emotional verbiage the purported separation of families by the deportation of border jumpers (an exigency specifically exemptied in the immigration laws); and dire conditions allegedly created on the Mexican side of the border by the congestion of deportees (which Mexican officials promptly denied).

The border patrol, long known for its anomalously amicable relations with both the farmers whose fields it periodically raids and the Mexicans it deports, was accused of almost as heinous a roster of outrages as was laid to the Nazi Government in headlines such as: "Says border patrol uses Gestapo methods." * * * "Illegal search and seizure is issue." * * * Valley Legion scores acts of border patrol." * * * "Crime against humanity."

Representative LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., Democrat, of Texas, member of a prominent valley farming family, took the floor in Congress to demand a full-dress investigation of a report that border patrolmen called at a house in Mission and questioned the occupants "without a search warrant."

SOCIAL-SECURITY CARDS ISSUED

Communities have become so accustomed to "wetbackism" that in the leading wetback areas of Texas, Dr. Lyle Saunders, University of New Mexico sociologist, recently reported, after extensive first-hand study of conditions, "almost anyone who needs help of any kind will hire a wetback—farmers, contractors, businessmen, housewives, city governments, county governments, and even the International Boundary Commission." In this Texas does not differ substantially from the wetback areas of Arizona, California, and other Western States.

On the hallowed bureaucratic principle of the left hand's not knowing what the right hand is doing, while the Immigration Service struggles with the wetback influx, the Social Security Administration freely issues cards to wetbacks on which they have little chance of collecting benefits, but which are handy for pseudo-identification. Wetbacks get draft board cards for the same purpose, giving worthless addresses. State employment offices in many places—quasi-Federal agencies—refer wetbacks to employment opportunities right along with citizens.

A leading California labor contractor, asked by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor where he located the wetbacks in which he admittedly trafficked, replied blandly: "From the State Employment Service."

The notion that wetback labor is both proper and indispensable has become so firmly implanted in Southwestern communities that its accompanying evils are taken as a matter of course.

WETBACKS LINKED TO CRIME

The (lower Rio Grande) Valley Express last March quoted District Attorney Jack Ross of Edinburg, Tex., as saying that in the previous year as much as 75 percent of the convictions in certain major crime categories had been against wetbacks, and that since the stepped-up drive against them crime generally had dropped off 50 percent. The newspaper added, without comment, that local

police in several valley cities reported such petty crime as pilfering and drunkenness had dropped sharply.

About the same time the San Benito (Tex.) News reported blandly: "It was quite a week-end in San Benito. Only a few habitual drunks got into jail. The roundup of wetbacks may worry San Benito district farmers and cut down receipts of beer joints, but it is a blessing to local police. 'No petty thefts, few fights, no burglaries, and everything peaceful with most of the wetbacks gone, at least for a time,' is the police view."

Sheriff Robert Ware, of Imperial County, California's leading wetback area, asked by this correspondent if wetbacks constituted any particular law-enforcement problem, said, "No, they don't give us much trouble. They're mostly quiet, law-abiding people who just want work." A few minutes later he acknowledged that of 185 inmates in the county jail, he estimated 25 percent were wetbacks.

The public record offers extensive evidence of tacit or active Federal sanction of the wetback traffic all the way from the border patrol to the White House level.

ARREST TRENDS ANALYZED

Some responsible regional observers have noted a curious inverse correlation between the rate of the border patrol's apprehensions, which vary widely seasonally, and local demands for wetback labor. One way or another, these sources suggest, the border patrol functions less as a law-enforcement agency than a checkvalve, restricting illegal immigration to the level of active public alarm. No corruption of border-patrol officers is implied. It is just, these observers explain, that after apprehension activities have gone so far, as in last year's special Rio Grande campaign, pressures, public and private, build up to dampen the border patrol's ardor.

Some immigration officers deny this, contending that they consistently and conscientiously do as well as they can with skimpy resources to stem the wetback tide, and that fluctuating apprehensions simply reflect fluctuations in the over-all wetback migration rate.

Other officers differ. One after another testified before the President's Commission on Migratory Labor that the border patrol was subject constantly to invisible but emphatic pressure exerted from farm quarters through Washington and relayed through Immigration Service channels, to go easy on the wetback round-up.

This was epitomized in the testimony of the late Grover C. Wilmoth, veteran director of the El Paso immigration district. He said:

"All we need is a go-ahead signal and we can enforce the law 90 to 95 percent. With a little additional men and equipment we could do an efficient enforcement job. It's a disgrace to this country that her laws are openly flouted and evaded. The farmers once were ashamed of using wetbacks. Now they have come to the point where they believe they have a vested right in these illegal workers. They go to their Senators, their Congressmen, the Attorney General, or the President to complain."

It was in Mr. Wilmoth's district, during the 1948 Presidential campaign, that there occurred the notorious "El Paso tea party." The supply of Mexican labor had not been sufficient to satisfy farmers of the area.

As reported by Art Leibson, of the El Paso Times, "When President Truman came to El Paso for a campaign address the problem was laid before him by cotton men and by Texas and New Mexico Congressmen. Soon after his train moved east through Texas there was a meeting of top immigration officials at El Paso." What went on behind the scenes is still a matter of equivocal explanation by immigration officials. What happened openly was that—in outright violation of United States commitments, according to the subsequent protest of the Mexican Government—border-patrol officers turned their backs for 48 hours while some 7,500 "wetbacks" streamed across the river unhindered to fill the farmers' wants.

A similarly questionable incident occurred only a month ago in California. Some ranchers rounded up one-hundred-odd wetbacks some 30 miles north of the border and took them in chartered buses to the immigration station at Calexico. The ranchers and the border patrol were in the midst of a still mysterious proceeding evidently aimed at legitimizing these workers for transportation to ranches in the north, when representatives of the National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L., intervened and protested to the local Mexican consul that the law was being violated. Although the district headquarters of the Immigration Service still contends that the proceeding was in full compliance with regulations, the union's protest had sufficient validity so that the operation was halted and the wetbacks returned to Mexico.

AGREEMENT CALLED A TRAVESTY

The most conspicuous official hypocrisy regarding wetbacks has been that surrounding the United States-Mexico Farm Labor Agreement of 1949, one of the periodical extensions of which is now before Congress. The professed aim of this agreement was to eliminate the wetback traffic by providing for the recruitment of Mexican farm labor below the border and its orderly importation into the United States for maximum work periods of 1 year where real shortages of domestic labor were duly certified by the United States Employment Service.

After 18 months of its operation, however, many close observers feel that the agreement manifestly has worked out as a travesty on this intent.

The agreement opened with a solemn declaration of representatives of the United States State Department and the Mexican Foreign Ministry deploring the wetback traffic of Mexican workers, which has mounted steadily and no appreciable steps have been taken to reinforce the border patrol.

The agreement then offered an incentive to border-jumping by providing the wetbacks should have preference in hiring under the contract system. Such priority was limited to wetbacks in the United States at that time, but this deadline for absolution from law violation has been extended over and over. Last summer the legalization of wetbacks in the United States before July 26 was authorized. When this did not produce enough cheap Mexican labor, the preference was extended to all wetbacks in the country before October 20.

CROSS BORDER IN RITUAL

Of the first 98,000 laborers contracted under the agreement in the fall of 1949, 78,000, by acknowledgment of the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security, were wetbacks who were legalized.

Nominally this legalization process consists of the wetbacks voluntarily surrendering and returning to Mexico for subsequent recruiting.

As it works out in practice, the wetbacks are rounded up in the United States and taken to legalization centers on the border, where as part of their processing they go through the formality of momentarily crossing the Mexican line—a ritual that has become known as walking around the statue.

Of 28,000 Mexican contract laborers now in the United States, virtually all were wetbacks legitimized in this way.

Article 6 of the agreement affirmed that Mexican nationals should not be contracted to work in localities where Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or race. They have been put to work in such localities.

Subsequent articles said Mexican contract labor should be paid the prevailing wage rates for a given area, that this should not be promised on wetback wage scales, and that the contract labor should not displace domestic citizen labor.

These stipulations, if complied with, observers agree, would virtually have precluded contracting since farm wages in key areas of the Southwest are geared to the wetbacks minimal compensation to such a degree that domestic citizen workers by the hundred thousand are frozen out of the market. This was circumstantially corroborated when contract minimums of 40 cents and 60 cents an hour were adopted under the agreement, respectively, for Texas and California, for identical work—reflecting accurately the differing concentrations of wetbacks in the two areas.

The final irony of the agreement was a stipulation that contract workers should not be provided to employers of wetbacks, and that any employer found to have wetbacks should have his contracting privileges withdrawn.

This again, if complied with, virtually would have eliminated key areas of the region, wetback employment is so prevalent.

In one day recently the farm-labor union supplied United States and Mexican officials a list of eight large vegetable ranches in the immediate area of El Centro, Calif., employing wetbacks, the most prominent being the firm of O'Dwyer & Mets, headed by Frank O'Dwyer, brother of William O'Dwyer, United States Ambassador to Mexico. Immigration officers seized 300 wetbacks on that ranch. The union demanded that its contracting right be withdrawn.

Six weeks have elapsed and, as this was written, the regional office of the United States Bureau of Employment Security in San Francisco acknowledged that no action had been taken. It said an inquiry was under way. The first step in the inquiry was a so-called hearing at El Centro of parties in the case.

The hearing was an unannounced private conference on a Sunday night between a lawyer from the Employment Security Bureau and representatives of O'Dwyer & Mets.

When this correspondent sought to interview Mr. O'Dwyer, the latter referred him to Mr. Mets. Asked where Mr. Mets could be seen, Mr. O'Dwyer said, "He's in Washington."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on March 30 the New York Times published an article under the following caption: "Interests conflict on wetback cure—even border police disagree on measures to stem flood of Mexican laborers—Nation's pact is in dispute—unions see a move to cut pay by farmers who oppose United States rule on contracts."

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERESTS CONFLICT ON WETBACK CURE—EVEN BORDER POLICE DISAGREE ON MEASURES TO STEM FLOOD OF MEXICAN LABORERS—NATION'S PACT IS DISPUTED—UNIONS SEE A MOVE TO CUT PAY BY FARMERS WHO OPPOSE UNITED STATES RULE ON CONTRACTS

(This is the last of five articles dealing with the economic and sociological problem of the wetbacks)—Mexican migrant laborers in the southwestern United States.

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, March 2.—Almost every segment of the Nation's population interested

in the wetback problem has a simple straightaway solution for it.

The trouble is that because of conflicting interests, no group's solution is very satisfactory to anyone else.

Even experienced officers of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Services, targets of a mounting barrage of criticism as illegal crossings of the Mexican border have mounted, are in wide disagreement about the most effective measures.

Some contend that simply augmenting the border patrol's present skimpy facilities—with a nucleus of less than 900 men to guard the 1,600 miles from Texas to the Pacific Coast—might largely stem the tide of upward of 1,000,000 Mexicans who annually cross the line to work for minimal wages and who depress both economic and social standards in the Southwest.

Others contend that it would take a large standing army to make the border impregnable, and that the problem should be tackled from another angle.

Most concur that stiffening the present penalties for illegal entry—up to a year's imprisonment for the first offense and 2 years for a repetition—would be useless against the horde of amiable wetbacks who, by their numbers, overwhelm the facilities for apprehension and prosecution.

THE POLITICAL FACTOR IS CITED

Some think that if the immigration laws could be fixed up logically to make it an offense to employ wetbacks, who are technically fugitives from justice, it would eliminate their chances of getting jobs, and along with that the incentive for sneaking into the country.

Here again immigration officers disagree about the political practicality of such proposals. Some think that southwestern farmers, with their vested interest in cheap wetback labor and their influential lobbies, would surely try to scuttle such steps. One immigration officer of exceptionally long experience, however, said: "They wouldn't dare to oppose it, because that would focus public attention on their system."

Members of Congress, whipsawed between the constant farm pressure for alien labor and the obvious need to do something about the wetback traffic, ratified the 1949 agreement between this Nation and Mexico for the importation of Mexicans under contract. A periodical extension of this agreement is now before Congress.

This agreement has not pleased anybody particularly. By providing for preference in job recruiting to wetbacks already in the United States, it has probably acted as an incentive to border-jumping, which has increased at a rapid rate ever since the agreement became effective.

FARMERS DISLIKE THE PACT

Farmers dislike it for many reasons. Requests for labor to be imported have to be filed 60 days in advance. With the principal southwestern crops of cotton, citrus, and vegetables, it is often difficult to predict precisely so far ahead just how many hands are going to be needed, when, and for how long.

Also, minimum wages—ranging from 40 cents an hour in Texas to 60 cents in California—and housing, insurance, transportation, bonds, and other requirements under the contract system, raise the cost of this labor. In some cases, farmers have averred, actually above the cost of domestic citizen labor.

Farmer objections to transportation costs and complications have brought about the virtual scrapping of the original concept of recruiting labor in the interior of Mexico, where there was a dearth of local employment opportunities, in favor of recruitment right at the border through the legalization of wetbacks.

A return to recruiting south of the border is one of the principal proposals in connection with extending the international agreement, now under debate. Another is for resumption of active participation by the United States Government—as during World War II—in the transportation and allocation of the imported labor and in the handling of certain of the moneys involved.

This is objected to as quasisocialism. There is also palpable concern in farm circles that Government management of alien labor would soon extend to allocation of domestic labor. Such a step, it may be noted, might nullify the traditional contention that "domestic labor is not available," a contention that farmers use to justify the employment of alien labor, legal and illegal.

A "SIMPLE CROSSING-CARD SYSTEM"

In contrast to such proposals, influential farm quarters long have been advocating what they habitually refer to as "a simple crossing card system," but which critics call simply legalized "wetbackism."

Under this system, Mexicans would receive border passes to circulate in the United States, confined in theory to areas of farm labor shortages, and to work without any of the burdensome guaranties of minimum wages, housing, insurance, and transportation required under the present contracting system.

Organized labor in the United States, as expressed in repeated declarations particularly of the American Federation of Labor and its affiliates, would approach the problem from the other end.

It contends that the agitation in the United States since World War II about obtaining alien labor generally has been an oblique effort to undercut American workers, predicated on illusory "shortages" of domestic labor. These "shortages" are said to result from a refusal to offer adequate wages.

This contention is at least partially corroborated by a recent study at the University of Texas, previously cited in these articles, which concluded that the labor needs of certain key farm areas could, with adequate inducements, be filled entirely from within the State. This is contrasted to the present situation in which wetbacks pour in by the hundred thousands, while domestic workers leave the State regularly in similar numbers to seek more adequate wages elsewhere.

The National Farm Labor Union, the A. F. of L.'s principal affiliate in the field, contends that domestic-labor shortages should be established by public hearings in the areas in question, instead of by the present unilateral certification by Federal-State employment offices, whose personnel may be subject to local pressure from farmers.

Secondly, the union advocates that the question of what is the prevailing wage for given work in a given area—a critical factor in considerations both of the availability of domestic labor and the terms that should be accorded alien labor—that this wage similarly arrived at in open hearing rather than as now, in the uncertain realm of administrative decisions.

If these two conditions were met, labor maintains, many of the current problems would be dispelled, because underlying them is a simple reluctance to pay adequate wages.

With these conditions met, it is contended, domestic citizen labor would be forthcoming; and even on the condition, quite foreseeable in the current war emergency, that alien labor were needed, a frank approach to wage and cost economics would eliminate the present haggling and complications that attend the contract system.

From labor and independent observers of the "wetback" problem, including educators, economists, sociologists, and welfare and church agencies, the suggestion also has come that the wage chiseling that underlies the wetback influx might be obliterated by applying Federal minimum wages to agriculture, at least in cotton, which is a Government-subsidized crop around which much of the wetback traffic revolves.

Farmers have long contended that minimum wages in agriculture are unworkable. But a minimum wage has long been in effect, under an exceptional Federal law, for the sugar-beet crop.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the time is getting late. I do not know what the Senator from Arizona has in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). The Chair is sure the Senator from Arizona would be perfectly willing to recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know about Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has the Senator concluded his remarks?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I have not quite concluded with my remarks, but I am very tired, and I should like to get away.

THE COST OF LIVING—RELEASES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD two United Press dispatches which have come over the news ticker in the cloakroom within less than an hour of each other. The first one reads:

Rising farm and food prices pushed the average wholesale price index up three-tenths of 1 percent in the week ended last Tuesday, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported.

The index of all commodities stood at 183.6 percent of the base 1929 average—17 percent over the pre-Korea level and 19.2 percent higher than a year ago.

Fuel and chemical prices dipped slightly during the week, and all other commodities were unchanged.

The daily index of sensitive spot market prices rose two-tenths of 1 percent in the 7-day period, with major increases in hog prices—4.7 percent—and sugar prices—3.5 percent. Only barley and flaxseed declined, while steers rose to a new all-time high of $37.875 per hundredweight.

This statement was released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is undoubtedly intended to convince consumers that rising farm prices alone are responsible for the high cost of living today.

I should like to read the other release, which came over the ticker less than an hour after the first one. It reads:

The Agriculture Department reported that the general level of farm prices dropped less than 1 percent during the month ending April 15.

Lower prices for truck crops and dairy products accounted for most of the decline.

It was the second consecutive month in which farm prices declined since a record high was established in February. Last month farm prices recorded a 1-percent drop to halt an upward spiral which started shortly before outbreak of the Korean war.

The April price slump reduced to about 30 percent total price gains for farm products since January 1950. April 15 prices stood at 309 percent of the 1910–14 base period. The record high of February 15, 1951, was 313 percent of the base period.

Meanwhile, the cost of commodities the farmer buys rose about 1½ percent during the month to reach a new high.

The increase was mainly the result of higher wage rates farmers were paying for labor and increases in the cost of some production items such as livestock and seed.

Mr. President, within an hour of each other we have two releases from the same administration, one putting all the blame for the increased cost of living on the farmer, the other one saying that farm prices are declining and that the farmer is paying all-time high prices for what he is buying, thus putting the blame on other factors. The two contradictory releases lead me to wonder whether we can believe any statement at all coming from our Government in relation to the cost of living.

Each of the statements is made up to serve a particular purpose. Between them I suppose they are intended to assure the American people, whether consumers or producers, that the administration is with them. It appears to me to be a very ridiculous proceeding, particularly in view of the fact that the news items came over the ticker less than an hour apart.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, it is understood that I will have the floor on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 30, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of our spirits whose power is unsearchable, whose judgments are a great deep: We quiet our feverish hearts in Thy presence. We would be still and know that Thou art God. As amid the earthquake, wind and fire of this violent world we wait at the week's beginning for Thy still small voice, give us sensitive ears to listen, teachable minds to learn, humble wills to obey.

Here, today, in this Chamber of national deliberation let some revelation of Thy light fall on our darkness, some guidance from Thy wisdom save us in our bewilderment, some power from Thine infinite resource strengthen us in our need. Acknowledging our oneness with all humanity we come as patriots, believing that our America has come to the kingdom for such a time as this. Our Nation's welfare, dear to us, grateful for its best traditions, anxious for its present perilous state, prayerful for its sons who this very hour are fighting in Liberty's cause, we come crying for wisdom in our national leaders, that we may contribute worthily to mankind's abiding peace. We ask it in that name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 27, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement of Friday last, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] continues his address, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate, and without speeches, and without prejudicing the right of the Senator from New Mexico to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, did I understand the distinguished majority leader to request unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business before the Senator from New Mexico begins his address?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I have asked that it be done, without prejudicing the right of the Senator from New Mexico to the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is agreeable to me.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, BALTIMORE (MD.) ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, resolutions dealing with the necessity for reduction of nondefense spending and other vital matters affecting the administration of the Federal Government during these critical days were adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce last week.

Favorably considered on the recommendation of the association's committee on national affairs, of which Frank B. Ober is chairman, the resolutions voice the considered opinion of the representative body of the businessmen of the Baltimore area and will find support, I am sure, among businessmen from all sections of the country.

I send the four resolutions to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolutions presented by Mr. O'CONOR were referred as follows:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, favoring prompt action by the Congress on further recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments;

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, relating to nondefense spending; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments;

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, relating to the Wage Stabilization Board; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, relating to the reactivation of the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3587. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 302).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 303);

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of Philip J. Hincks; with an amendment (Rept. No. 304);

S. 1227. A bill for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 305); and

S. 1254. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Elias Cheliotis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 306).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1412. A bill for the relief of Maija Sisko Erkkila (also known as Maija Sisko Leskinen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1413. A bill to permit the retention of oil, gas, and other mineral rights in lands condemned by the United States for waterway improvement purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 1414. A bill for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; and

S. 1415. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. NIXON):

S. 1416. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and for other enemy violations of the Geneva Convention respecting prisoners of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1417. A bill for the relief of Lefrancois and Chamberland, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

An address discussing foreign policy and domestic administration, delivered by him to the Republican 21 Club of Massachusetts, at Worcester, Mass., on April 28, 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on the subject Export of America's Freedoms, delivered by him and broadcast from Station WGN in Chicago on April 28, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Excerpt from an address by him on the policy of the United States in Asia, delivered before the Pennsylvania Greeters Association, Chapter No. 41, in Washington, Pa., April 28, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Issues Are Global, MacArthur Insists," from the Washington (Pa.) Observer of April 20, 1951, with reference to General MacArthur's address to the Congress on April 19, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Alternatives in Korea," from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 11, 1951, discussing the pronouncements by General MacArthur on the Korean War.

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial entitled "Acheson and MacArthur," published in the Washington Post of April 28, 1951, dealing with the controversy regarding General MacArthur.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article entitled "War in Korea Profitable for United States 'Partners'," written by Larry Rue and published in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of April 22, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Letter addressed by Hon. Harold E. Stassen to the President suggesting reconciliation between the President and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune on the same subject.

By Mr. THYE:

An editorial under the caption "This business of farming—Washington is worried," discussing factors entering into a possible reduced agricultural production, written by Paul C. Johnson and published in the Prairie Farmer of April 21, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article by Joseph P. Lyford regarding the reaction in Italy to the MacArthur incident, published in the Hartford Times.

PRICE CONTROLS AS APPLIED TO LIVESTOCK AND MEAT INDUSTRY—LETTER FROM GOVERNING BOARD OF MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from the governing board of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association. It is a very important letter in view of the order issued by the Price Stabilization Administrator, Mr. Michael DiSalle.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 18, 1951.

Mr. MICHAEL DISALLE,
Price Stabilization Administrator,
Office of Price Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DISALLE: The governing board of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders Association met in the office of its secretary, Mr. J. S. Jones, on Monday, April 16, 1951, and reaffirmed the position taken by its membership, consisting of approximately 2,500 breeders and feeders, assembled in annual meeting at the University of Minnesota on February 2, 1951, relative to price controls as they apply to the livestock and meat industry.

Representatives of the livestock and meat industry do fear inflation. However, they know from experience gained in World War II that price controls do not cure the disease, but only hide its symptoms temporarily. They know that restrictions reduce the supply of meat and increase inflationary pressures. They fully realize that the principal domestic problem confronting the people of America today is that of defending the purchasing power of the dollar. They realize that if this is not done, their savings, savings bonds, and insurance contracts will not be worth much to them in the future.

The answer to this inflationary problem is increased production and a cut-back in purchasing power. The farm people believe that they can increase their production level to a point equal to, or above, that attained during World War II. This can be accomplished through improved cultural methods, increased use of commercial fertilizers, the employment of new varieties of seed, and efficient types of livestock, pasture improvement programs, and by other means. A cutback in purchasing power can be realized if a sound monetary and fiscal policy is adopted by the Federal Government.

There are some people who evidently believe that price controls applied to the livestock and meat industry will tend to curb this vicious inflationary spiral. This is not a fact. The application of controls is definitely inflationary rather than deflationary, because it results in a cut-back in production. Even the threat of controls is resulting in decreased production at a time when we should have all-out production. The application of controls to the livestock and meat industry will also result in the development of "black markets" due, largely, to the fact that livestock cannot be controlled at its source. Whenever we depart from the functioning of the free market, through the application of price controls, the Government will have to assume the responsibility for doing those things that are normally done by price in the free market. The farm people fully believe that if prices are fixed, that move will soon be accompanied by rationing and subsidies.

Perhaps the greatest objection to the price control program is that it typifies the very thing this country is fighting to avoid, namely, the imposition of Government regulations on the free market system, which in the past has made this country great. It is imperative that controls be applied sparingly less the productive energies and the initiative of our people be so dulled that they may never again recover.

Those enaged in the livestock business realize that those sections of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which provide for the imposition of controls will expire on June 30, 1951. Undoubtedly, hearings on this measure will be held sometime within the near future. The members of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association are definitely of the opinion that the price control program that is now being developed can be, and should be, thrown out. They believe that if it were possible to apply effective controls clear across the board, including not only the prices of all commodities, but the wages and salaries of labor as well, it might be the thing to do at this particular time, but they think that we must be realistic and practical and recognize that this cannot be done. Wages have been pretty well "thawed out," as you know, through the recognition of escalator clauses, annual improvement factors, a 10 percent increase after January 15, 1950, and the exemption of Federal, State, and municipal employees.

The livestock and meat industry is definitely in a chaotic situation today. The livestock breeders of the State of Minnesota sincerely believe that the answer to the inflationary problem is increased production, which can be had, and will be had, if the Government maintains a policy of "hands off," and through the curbing of purchasing power by modification of the monetary and fiscal policies of the Federal Government.

Price and wage controls are not the answer to this problem. If our Federal Government insists on continuing its efforts to develop a price and wage control program, the livestock people are very much afraid that production will be cut back at a time when all-out production is needed, and that this country will lose its freedoms in the process.

Very truly yours,

MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION,
J. S. JONES, *Secretary.*

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—STATEMENT BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by former President Herbert Hoover before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency this morning during the consideration by the committee of a measure to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HERBERT HOOVER BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, APRIL 30, 1951

Your committee has requested me to advise you of my views upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I presume this request arises from the original creation of the RFC upon my recommendation and from the investigation into it by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which I was chairman.

1. I believe that the RFC should be liquidated.

2. It should be liquidated by its new Administrator.

3. I believe some facilities for loans in the small-business field should be continued under other organizations.

Starvation for credit in this area cannot have been very great during the last 5 or 6 years. The 5-year average of the number of businesses operating is almost 4,000,000, and the new businesses started have averaged about 400,000 annually. From the number of loans under $100,000 made by the RFC—and assuming they were necessary—the relative figures indicate that probably 99 percent of small businesses managed to finance themselves otherwise.

Be that as it may, the need should be tested out. The Federal Reserve banks are already engaged in guaranteeing loans for defense production. Therefore, I suggest their authority be extended to a 100-percent guaranty (where necessary) of small business loans and to administer them. The Reserve banks should be indemnified by the Government against losses. A small organization should be set up in the Treasury Department to guide this purpose. But such loans should be restricted: (a) they should not exceed $100,000; (b) they must (as the Senate Banking and Currency Committee recommended 2 years ago) be made only where public interest is concerned and not solely in the interest of the borrower.

4. I believe the collateral activities of the RFC should be transferred to appropriate departments where definite responsibility of a Cabinet officer or single-individual administrator can be established. For instance, the

rubber business should be transferred to the Department of Commerce; the tin smelting to the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior; the functions of providing emergency credit for defense activities should be transferred to the Defense Department or to the Director of Defense Mobilization, who already have such authorities.

REASONS FOR THESE RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) Emergency agencies for defense production seem to be already in motion and the RFC is not needed in this field.

(b) If a national emergency in credit should occur, such as a great economic crisis, the Congress, at any time of such need, can quickly create the necessary institution. Of great importance is the fact that in time of emergency, the Government can command the best talent in the country. It can not maintain such talent in other times.

(c) The last time the Congress was considering extension of the authority of the RFC, I recommended (May 30, 1947) that it be retained as an inactive standby institution for 2 or 3 years in a restricted field. Instead it has been most active.

When the RFC was founded in 1932 for the emergency of a national collapse of credit, stringent requirements were set by law as to security, purpose, and the absence of other sources of credit. Since that time, the requirements have been relaxed by legislation passed in January 1935, April 1938, May 1938, and June 1948. As a result, the institution now undertakes to finance, by so-called loans, almost anything, domestic and sometimes even foreign, on most any terms it pleases.

(d) In my view when it enters the nonemergency area of loans in excess of $100,000, its social and economic purpose becomes submerged in support of risky business, and in bailing out creditors on a large scale. It would appear from the Fulbright hearings that the operation of the RFC for the past 4 or 5 years really shows a great loss. I see no reason why the taxpayers' money should be used to subsidize larger peacetime business.

(e) This area of loans in excess of $100,000 is where the great dangers to the Nation have occurred. That loans of this character have led to favoritism and corruption has been demonstrated by the exposures of the Fulbright committee. Corruption in Government is far wider in effect than corruption in private business. Corruption in business affects only the pockets of employers or owners. Corruption in Government affects the pockets of all taxpayers, but far worse, it affects the morals of a people and lowers their respect for government.

(f) The wisdom of the management of the RFC in recent years is seriously challenged by that infallible test of results. These results have been exposed by the Fulbright committee. It is doubtful if wisdom can be maintained in such widespread Government action requiring the utmost good judgment. Under any new administration a large part of the decisions must be delegated. And delegation by bureaucracy cannot always find such skilled and honest men.

(g) It would appear that the test of public interest has been little applied. The public interest in several of the large loans has been questioned by the Fulbright committee. I append some lists of a few samples.

(1) Thirty-nine lesser-sized loans made for hotels, ranging from $9,000 to $1,500,000 in 23 States;

(2) Fourteen loans made to hard- and soft-drink manufacturing distributors;

(3) Eighteen loans to theaters, and bowling alleys, ranging from $17,000 to $1,200,000.

Another list could be made of loans to beauty parlors, pool rooms, and a snake farm.

What public interest there can be in operations of these types of business at the taxpayers' risk is difficult to see.

(h) The institution now has nearly 3,000 employees and a great overhead. The Federal Reserve banks could administer the small-business loans with a minor staff. The Federal Reserve personnel are of high order of character and ability. Also, they understand the loaning of money.

REPORT ON THE RFC BY THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The reports and recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government on the RFC are no doubt familiar to you.

The task force recommendations

The Commission's task force for this examination was set up on the suggestion of Secretary James Forrestal, a member of the Commission. The Secretary recommended that Mr. Paul Brady, of Price Waterhouse & Co., public accountants, be made chairman of this task force. Mr. Grady was a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy handling finance matters. He was supported by an advisory committee of able men.

This task force recommended the liquidation of the RFC and the placing of any necessary lending of this character in the Federal Reserve banks under a system of guaranties. They made recommendations as to disposal of the collateral activities. They made alternative recommendations in case liquidation was not possible. These recommendations called for a most vigorous reorganization with greater safeguards on loans if the institution was to continue.

The Commission's recommendations

The Commission itself made a number of recommendations in respect to this agency.

The Commission did not agree upon liquidation, but the majority of the Commission agreed upon a condemnation of direct lending by the RFC to persons or enterprises, except in national emergencies, saying that it "Opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism * * * it invites political and private pressure or even corruption."

We recommended that Congress review at once the powers of the RFC so as to produce "economy, efficiency, and integrity."

It was further recommended that greater restrictions should be placed on loans.

We also recommended that the normal channels of credit should be used by guaranteed loans "through private or other established agencies."

We recommended the placing of some of the collateral activities in other agencies better able to administer them.

We further recommended that the whole organization be placed in the Treasury Department, with responsibility for its administration vested in the Secretary of the Treasury.

The factual matter and recommendations of the Commission and the task force appear in several places in the Commission's statements. For the convenience of this committee, I offer for the record an assembly of the scattered parts.

Selected loans to distillers, brewers, and bottlers, June 30, 1950

United Distillers of America, Inc.; United Distillers of America, Ltd.; New York, N. Y.: Unpaid loan balance	$331,500.00
James Distillery, Inc., Baltimore, Md.: Unpaid balance	315,000.00
Harvard Brewing Co., Lowell, Mass.: Undisbursed authorized balance	300,000.00
Old Rock Distilling Co., Joplin, Mo.:	
Undisbursed loan balance	29,936.48
Unpaid loan balance	210,063.52
	240,000.00
Morello Winery, Kerman, Calif.: Undisbursed loan balance	$200,000.00
Metz Brewing Co., Omaha, Nebr.: Unpaid loan balance (participating)	178,125.00
General Beverage Co., Inc., Oklahoma City, Okla.: Unpaid loan balance	145,000.00
Coast View Winery, Inc., Fresno, Calif.: Participating unpaid loan balance	117,750.00
Clinton Distilling Co., Clinton Iowa: Unpaid loan balance	114,000.00
Yakima Valley Brewing Co., Selah, Wash.: Unpaid loan balance (participating)	99,562.50
Scottish-American Distillers, Ltd., Peoria, Ill.: Unpaid participating loan balance	94,687.50
Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Fargo, Fargo, N. Dak.: Unpaid loan balance	90,163.04
The Wooden Shoe Brewing Co., Minster, Ohio: Unpaid loan balance (participating)	65,040.00
Sheridan Brewing Co., Sheridan, Wyo.: Unpaid loan balance (participating)	60,000.00

Selected loans to theaters, bars, bowling alleys, and other recreational activities, June 30, 1950

Hal Roach Studios, Inc., California	$1,292,950.00
Gersonde Bros. Recreation, St. Joseph, Mich.: Authorized total	377,212.28
Hunt's Theatres, Inc., Wildwood, N. J.:	
Undisbursed loan balance	150,000.00
Unpaid loan balance	128,773.71
Total	278,773.71
Hollywood Stars, Inc., California	172,600.00
Coast Drive-In Theatres, California	164,669.22
Herndon Stadium, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.: Unpaid loan balance	164,038.46
Collier Enterprises, Inc., Lowell, Mich.: Authorization	144,500.00
Poulsen & Schock Theatres, Anchorage, Alaska: Undisbursed loan balance	100,000.00
Gold Front Bar, Gold Front Theatre, Gold Front Recreation, Cheboygan, Mich.: Undisbursed authorized balance	85,000.00
Varden Park Bowling Club, Jackson, Mich.: Authorized	78,000.00
Plymouth Rock Bar, Detroit, Mich.: Authorized	39,500.00
Plains Theatre, Lockney, Tex.: Authorized	27,500.00
Eloia Theatre, Calvert, Tex.: Amount authorized	25,000.00
Samuel E. Evans (rattlesnake farm), Colfax, Calif.: Authorized	25,000.00
Howes Lanes (bowling), Clarkston, Mich.: Authorized	20,212.23
Poormans Recreation, Buchanan, Mich.: Authorized	20,000.00
Bronson Theatre, Bronson, Mich.: Authorized	17,500.00
Montcalm Bowling Center, Pontiac, Mich.: Authorized	17,000.00

Selected loans to hotels and other hostelries, June 30, 1950

Sax Enterprises, Inc. (refinanced), Miami Beach, Fla., May 19, 1949	$1,500,000.00
Mapes Hotel (25 percent participation), Reno, Nev., Oct. 6, 1949	1,300,000.00

Simburg, Harry and Jennie (Hotel Sorrento), Miami Beach, Fla., Oct. 27, 1949	$1,000,000.00
Civic Hotel Corp. of Odessa, Odessa, Tex., Feb. 27, 1950	650,000.00
Jack Tar Court Hotel, Hot Springs, Ark.: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	565,000.00
Borger Hotel Corp., Borger, Tex., Jan. 30, 1950	413,429.00
The Virgin Isle Hotel, Inc., Thomas, V. I.: Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	400,000.00
Tahoe Biltmore Hotel, Inc., Crystal Bay, Mo.:	
SLP, RFC's portion	45,000.00
2 BPA loans	300,000.00
	345,000.00
The Balsams, Inc., Dixville Notch, N. H.: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	300,000.00
Community Hotel Co., Norman, Okla., approved	300,000.00
Knutson Hotel Corp., Minneapolis, Minn.:	
Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	25,000.00
Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	270,000.00
	295,000.00
Grand Hotel Co., Billings, Mont.: Undisbursed loan balance (participating), June 30, 1950	270,000.00
Bluebeards Castle Hotel Corp., Thomas, V. I.: Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	250,000.00
Muscle Shoals Community Hotel Corp., Sheffield, Ala., Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950, rep	248,798.29
Hereford Community Hotel Corp., Hereford, Tex., July 14, 1949	210,000.00
Carlton Plaza Hotel Co., Detroit, Mich.: Undisbursed authorized loan balance June 30, 1950	200,000.00
Morningstar Hotels, Inc., Thomas, V. I.: Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	165,000.00
Shore Club Lodge, Inc., Boise, Idaho: Unpaid loan balance June 30, 1950	164,500.00
Tower Courts, Dallas, Tex.: Unpaid loan balance (participating), June 30, 1950	158,165.92
Bar Harbor Hotel, Bar Harbor, Maine, Dec. 27, 1949	150,000.00
Independence Community Hotel Co., Independence, Iowa: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	150,000.00
Kennett Hotel Co., Kennett, Mo.: Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	150,000.00
Clinton Community Hotel Corp., Clinton, Ohio: Undisbursed authorized balance (participating), June 30, 1950	125,000.00
Plymouth Hotel Corp., Fort Fairfield, Maine: Amount authorized	125,000.00
Saratoga Hotel Co., Saratoga, Wyo., undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	125,000.00
Henning Hotel Co., Casper, Wyo.: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	122,914.16
Round-Up Lodge, Deming, N. Mex.: Authorized	95,000.00
Titusville Hotel Corp., Titusville, Pa.: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	90,000.00
Richard S. and Ellen H. Butler, trading as The Butlers' Canvasback Inn, Perryville, Md., Feb. 23, 1950	$74,000.00
South Parkway Hotel, Chicago, Ill.: Apr. 6, 1950	60,000.00
Island View Camp, Inc., Pottsboro, Tex	56,000.00
Woolsey C. Coombs, doing business as Casa Blanca Hotel, Apr. 3, 1950	35,000.00
Tower Trailer Park, Inc., Dallas, Tex.: Authorized	35,000.00
Charles Fink Fischer and Vera Fischer, doing business as Sandpaper Inn, Fort Walton, Fla., Jan. 26, 1950	32,000.00
Frontier Motel, Willcox, Ariz.: Amount authorized	26,000.00
Remora Lodge, Inc., Lyndon, Vt.: Amount authorized	16,000.00
Cactus Courts, Carlsbad, N. Mex.:	
Gross amount	22,893.00
RFC share	11,446.00
Mission Trailer Park, Tucson, Ariz.: Amount authorized	10,000.00
Rock Creek Camp, Whitesboro, Tex.: Authorized	9,000.00

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—STATEMENT BY HON. MARRINER S. ECCLES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by Hon. Marriner S. Eccles, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, on April 27, 1951, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which is considering legislation to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MARRINER S. ECCLES, MEMBER, BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CONSIDERING LEGISLATION TO ABOLISH THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here this morning and give my reasons why I feel that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be abolished. I am speaking for myself and not for the Federal Reserve Board. I am speaking as one who has been in Government service for the past 17 years and who, during that entire period, has taken an active part in helping to solve the problems of maintaining economic stability within the framework of our democratic capitalistic society. I have, ever since the termination of the war, viewed with grave misgivings the continuation and expansion of the Government in the field of private lending. There are sound and indisputable reasons why the RFC should be abolished. With your permission I shall present, as briefly and directly as possible, what I consider the most important reasons.

INFLATION AND ITS CONTROL

Throughout the postwar period, and particularly since the Korean invasion, the country has experienced a most serious inflationary development. This was brought about by too much money and credit in the hands of the public relative to the goods and services available in the market. The RFC, instead of liquidating its outstanding credits during this period, added to inflationary pressures by extending its lending activities and those of its affiliate, FNMA. Inflation has greatly depreciated the purchasing power of the dollar, and as a result the cost of living has increased approximately 45 percent since the end of the war. This has been a most serious and unjustified development, and should not have been permitted; this inflation has worked a grave injustice upon large numbers of our people; it has injured most the aged, the pensioners, the widows, and the disabled—the most helpless members of our society. Inflation diminishes our incentives to work, to save, and to plan for the future, and in so doing undermines the very foundations of our free democratic society.

With a rapid increase in defense expenditures immediately confronting us, prevention of further inflation will be difficult. If it is to be avoided, all of us must support fiscal, monetary, and credit measures essential to its control. With full utilization of our manpower and raw materials, it is imperative that the Federal cash budget be maintained on a pay-as-you-go basis. This is necessary to assure the transfer of funds from the civilian economy to the Government to pay for the goods and services that are transferred. Otherwise, more funds will accumulate in the hands of the public than there are goods and services available for the public to buy. Such a condition will lead to further inflation. To prevent such a development, taxes have already been raised and will have to be raised further to keep pace with the increase in defense expenditures.

However, the success of an anti-inflationary program depends on more than a balanced budget. Despite the existence of a substantial budgetary surplus since Korea, a very rapid growth of bank credit has intensified inflationary pressures. As taxes increase, efforts to offset the resulting reduction in incomes give rise to increased demands for all types of credit, thereby tending to minimize the effects of a balanced budget. For this reason, an adequate program of credit restraint is essential to the success of a pay-as-you-go tax program.

Such a program of credit restraints has been developed, including control of consumer credit through regulation W, of real estate mortgage credit through Regulation X, and of business credit through the voluntary credit restraint program provided for in the Defense Production Act of 1950 and under the supervision of the Federal Reserve Board. The need of further legislation to curb the growth of bank credit is being considered. Most important of all, the monetary and fiscal authorities have just recently reached an accord with reference to the management of the public debt that may go far toward curbing bank-credit expansion, providing a balanced budget is maintained. All of the measures so adopted have received endorsement and support in congressional and financial circles, as well as by the general public.

GOVERNMENT LENDING INCONSISTENT WITH ANTI-INFLATIONARY PROGRAM

The Government is obviously very inconsistent when it acts to balance the Federal budget and restrain credit expansion to prevent inflation, while at the same time continuing in force and effect lending activities of Government agencies such as the RFC. There is no logical justification for restricting the flow of good private credit, and at the same time permitting and encouraging the granting of unjustified and unsound loans by Government agencies to the private economy.

We must recognize that the conditions under which the RFC came into existence were very different from those prevailing at the present time. It was established in the depths of the greatest economic depression in our history for the purpose of providing

emergency financial assistance to banks and other financial institutions. Subsequently, its authority was broadened to include loans to nonfinancial business concerns under certain conditions. Because there were many weaknesses in our economic system in the early thirties, no one seriously questioned the need for a temporary Government agency designed to assist the country in an economic emergency which was forcing all financial institutions, as a matter of self-preservation, to liquidate all outstanding credits.

We have long since recognized and corrected many of the weaknesses that brought about our economic collapse in the thirties. We have greatly strengthened our commercial banking system and provided for insurance of bank deposits; we have provided for regulation and supervision of security flotations and the operation of the organized securities exchanges; and the Government has recognized by statute its obligation to assist in the maintenance of maximum employment and has provided extensive social security for a large number of the people. In addition, we have improved our techniques and gained valuable experience in the use of monetary, credit, and fiscal policies for purposes of achieving and maintaining economic stability. For these and other reasons, the necessity for continuing the RFC as an emergency financial institution no longer exists.

The problems confronting the country today are the very opposite of those which confronted the country when the RFC was first established. In our present situation, the operations of the RFC, as well as those of FNMA, in continuing to put additional funds into the spending stream only intensify the already difficult problem of curbing credit expansion. Having long since outlived its usefulness to the economy, the RFC should be abolished without further delay.

NO NEED FOR DIRECT GOVERNMENT FINANCING

There is no real place in a private enterprise economy for direct Government lending to the private economy, any more than there is a place for direct Government ownership of the means of production. Government participation in either activity is socialistic in nature and will, if continued and expanded, weaken and ultimately destroy the private free enterprise system. The Government's function is to regulate and supervise the activities of private enterprise in the public interest, and not to own and operate tax-free financing or production organizations in competition with those that are privately owned and operated and are taxed. We might feel differently about the RFC if our private financing facilities and resources were unable to provide the credit required to utilize as fully as possible the labor and materials available in the economy. But such is not the case at the present time.

There are located throughout the United States more than 14,000 commercial banks, over 600 life-insurance companies, more than 500 mutual savings banks, and nearly 6,000 savings and loan associations. In addition, there are numerous mortgage companies, sales finance companies, industrial loan associations, and other financing institutions. Each and every one of them, operating with funds obtained from private sources and in competition with numerous other institutions, is engaged in extending credit, in accordance with self-surviving and profit motive lending and investment policies, to meet all of the legitimate needs of a private enterprise economy. The very fact that these financing institutions are competitive and derive their earnings from the loans and investments which they make is in itself an assurance that the necessary credit requirements of the economy are being, and will continue to be, met. The combined resources at the disposal of these institutions are enormous; as of December 31, 1950, the commercial banks, life-insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations alone held over $290,000,000,000 of loans, investments, and other assets, and they are adding billions of dollars to these assets every year.

To continue the existence of the RFC in competition with our private financing institutions is completely indefensible if we really believe in our private-enterprise economy. This is because the RFC's only source of funds is the Federal Treasury, while the Treasury's only source of funds is the private economy through tax collections or by borrowing to meet a budgetary deficit. Using these funds to make loans that cannot be secured in a free market means in effect that the RFC is employing funds obtained from the entire public in making questionable loans for the benefit of a select few. It is obviously unfair for the Government to subsidize with credit those business concerns which cannot stand on their own feet, but, nevertheless, are competing for sales and profits with concerns that have to obtain the funds they use in the private market. In other words, privately financed business concerns are called upon to provide indirectly through the Government part of the funds used by their competitors who receive RFC loans.

As the Government does not own the business enterprises which it finances by means of direct or guaranteed loans, any profits from their operations accrue to the private owners. But if the loan eventually proves to be a loss, either in part or in whole, the Government, and ultimately the taxpayer, suffers the amount of such loss. There have been conspicuous examples of borrowers from RFC who made great profits through the use of the taxpayers' money, as well as of borrowers who incurred substantial losses at the expense of the taxpayers. If we are going to be socialistic in some of our economic activities, it had better be by going into business directly where the profits, as well as the losses, accrue to the taxpayer, instead of indirectly through providing unjustified credit where only the losses accrue to the taxpayer. I am vigorously opposed to either form of socialization.

The RFC obtains its funds without cost from the taxpayer and pays no taxes of any kind on its operations, while privately owned and operated financing institutions must raise their capital in the private market and pay in interest and dividends whatever is required. They must also pay their share of local as well as Federal taxes. Quite obviously, a company operating with an abundance of free capital on a tax-free basis during a period of inflation can make its earnings appear to be much better than a careful analysis of the facts would warrant.

Perhaps the argument most frequently heard in support of the RFC's continuance is the aid which it provides to small businesses, which presumably are unable to obtain financial assistance from any other source. However, if we examine the reports of the RFC, we find that, while the number of loans made to small business is large, the dollar volume of such loans is small relative to the total amount of loans granted or outstanding. In other words, the bulk of the funds loaned by RFC have gone to large rather than small businesses. Moreover, it is the considered opinion of experts in the field of small-business financing that what small businesses need primarily is managerial and technical assistance rather than more money. To encourage inefficient utilization of financial resources by small business is wasteful, extravagant, and in the end unproductive. The RFC does not have the specialized facilities required to provide adequate managerial and technical assistance to small business, and it should be left to private enterprise to develop them, as well as to supply whatever capital and credit are needed, especially under present conditions.

RFC LENDING SUBJECT TO POLITICAL PRESSURE

One of the most striking facts brought to light during the recent investigation of the RFC is the extent to which its lending activities have been subject to political influence. The RFC is designated to make or guarantee loans to credit-worthy borrowers who cannot secure credit on reasonable terms from customary sources. Under this arrangement heavy political pressures have been brought to bear by and on behalf of borrowers who expect to benefit from the credit. The problems of a public lending agency, as compared with a private one, are immeasurably increased by such pressures. If only sound and justifiable loans were granted, there would be great criticisms of the RFC by the would-be borrowers and their political representatives. If it does grant questionable loans in response to political requirements, then, as the recent investigation has shown, it will be bitterly criticized by the public. So long as there is a Government lending agency like the RFC there will be great and undeniable demand for unsound and unjustified credit. This will put all Members of Congress under more or less political pressure to assist applicants in receiving such credit. I should think in these circumstances Members of Congress would be the first ones to want to liquidate the RFC and be relieved of the pressures which only add to their responsibilities and can serve no useful public purpose.

Aside from the economic considerations which I have enumerated there are strong collateral reasons for abolishing the RFC. It has already been demonstrated that where a Government agency has wide discretion in loaning large amounts of funds to the voting public, its ethical and moral standards deteriorate over a period of time as a result of inevitable political pressures. This has the unfortunate effect of tending to destroy the confidence of the people in their Government.

CREDIT FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES

In letting defense contracts, priority should be given to those prime contractors or subcontractors who have the necessary skill, productive facilities, and financial resources. However, it may be found necessary, as in World War II, to facilitate defense production by giving some contracts to those who do not have adequate financial resources and cannot obtain them from private financing institutions. In such cases, some Government help may be essential, but it should be provided in the form of a Government guaranty of private credit and not by a direct Government loan. Such guaranties would be most effectively handled under a single program, such as that authorized by the Defense Production Act of 1950. This provides for guaranty of loans by eight agencies engaged in defense activities, using the Federal Reserve banks as fiscal agencies in arranging the guaranties. This is the same as the Regulation V program which was used so effectively in World War II. Under this regulation the Federal Reserve banks and their branches throughout the country gained extensive experience in authorizing guaranties on 8,800 loans, amounting to over $10,000,000,000. The net result of the V-loan operation was a net profit of $24,000,000,000 from the loan guaranty fees charged, after deducting all expenses and losses.

Under the V-loan program, a defense contractor or subcontractor engaged in defense production who is unable to obtain the necessary credit may apply for a guaranteed loan to his local bank or other private financing institution. The local Federal Reserve banks, acting as fiscal agents for those Government agencies which are loan guarantors, review and recommend action to be taken on loan

applications. Upon approval by the guaranteeing agency, the private banks advance the full amount of the loan and a fee is paid covering the guaranteed portion of the loan. The guarantee fee ranges from 10 to 40 percent of the interest rate on the loan, depending upon the percentage of the loan guaranteed. In practically every case the banks carry 10 percent or more of the loan without a guarantee. Not only is the financing decentralized, but the local banks have a real interest in the loan and can be depended upon to give it necessary supervision. The requirement of approval by the guaranteeing agency assures that credit extension is being concentrated in those industries essential to the defense effort.

The existence of the V-loan program to provide esential defense credit makes unnecessary the continued existence of the RFC for this purpose. This is particularly true at a time when heavy inflationary pressures require the diversion of working capital and credit from non-denfense to defense purposes as goods and labor are transferred, rather than try to super-impose defense credit on top of the existing volume of outstanding credit.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the evidence, both from an economic and a political standpoint, strongly supports the view that the liquidation of the RFC is long overdue.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR VANDENBERG BY REV. EDWARD A. THOMPSON

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the eloquent tribute paid to the late great senior Senator from Michigan, Arthur H. Vandenberg, at his funeral services by his pastor and close friend of many years, the Reverend Edward Archibald Thompson, D. D. Dr. Thompson was speaking from the pulpit given by Senator Vandenberg in honor of his mother to the church he and his family had attended for more than 50 years, the First Congregational Church in Grand Rapids.

This was a remarkable appraisal of a remarkable man, Mr. President, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have gathered today to pay tribute to one to whom tribute is due. It is not my purpose to eulogize our beloved fellow citizen. That has already been superbly done. I shall speak more specifically about his interests in the things of the spirit.

The text from which I shall speak contains the words of a motto which stood upon Senator Vandenberg's desk even before he entered into public life and has remained there ever since. "This, too, shall pass." The words are taken from an ancient Arabic or Persian saying, "This, too, shall pass away," which was used through the centuries to remind people that neither great moments of triumph nor sorrow are lasting.

"This, too, shall pass" was a comforting thought to Senator Vandenberg in time of affliction or disappointment. It gave him faith to meet buoyantly the discouraging experiences of life. Again, when he was on the mountain peak of success, victory, and power (as often he was) a glance at this motto had a sobering influence and a leveling effect. Senator Vandenberg was not a fatalist. He lived triumphantly in the unfailing belief that there are eternal values in the spiritual things of life.

In a letter written to a friend 2 months ago he said: "The spiritual values of life come surging to the fore. I have a little prayer meeting all by myself each night. What the whole world needs is more confidence and faith."

This pulpit from which I now speak was the gift of Senator Vandenberg in memory of his mother. The altar and furnishings for the new and yet incomplete chapel were also given by Senator Vandenberg in memory of his mother. This gift represents the financial portion of his second Collier award for distinguished service in the Senate of the United States. In presenting this memorial he said: "I get a great deal of prideful happiness out of this gift to Park Church. It is a source of continuing joy to me that I have been able to make my contribution to the new facilities of this grand old church, which has been so close to my life and to that of my family."

When asked to participate in the service of dedication for our new chapel, he replied on February 8: "I certainly shall be delighted to send you a message for the dedication which will underscore my deep feeling that our America must turn to its spiritual values in greater degree than ever before as we surmount the crisis which surrounds us."

We are greatly saddened in the fact that he will be unable to be with us in person for that dedication 2 weeks hence, but it is sadly fitting that we were able to use the chapel for the first time this morning in his honor.

Senator Vandenberg had a profound belief in immortality. "This, too, shall pass." This body has passed. If this were the final chapter, it would indeed be a dismal day. But death is not an end. It is but a turn in the road of life when we are free from the shackles of the physical—free to grow and to be that which we yearn to be at our best. "Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect" is no idle command. Somehow, somewhere we shall attain unto our highest ideals and noblest aspirations.

There was a time when I wondered why the Great Creator didn't reestablish the life of a great soul like that of our good friend in a young and vigorous body, where the value of accumulated knowledge and vital experiences could be used to great advantage in the progress of mankind. I do not feel that way now. The physical shall pass away. The temporal is seen, but the eternal is unseen. The great God who will not allow any energy to be lost certainly will not allow the crown of His creation to pass into oblivion.

We have faith that this ripe and powerful life shall have a vehicle of expression far more effective and more capable of growth into perfect fellowship with God and with his fellowmen, which is clearly the purpose of life. We mourn the passing of our great leader and friend but we rejoice in the new and greater realm into which he has now entered.

Our Lord's body passed away when He was but a young man, yet He lives today in the lives of millions of men and women the world over who have found life through Him.

Senator Vandenberg was more concerned about the principles of peace and understanding for which he was fighting than he was about his own health. He knew that those principles could not die and he will continue to live increasingly as the truth of his teachings becomes more clear. Let us pay worthy tribute to him today by rededicating our lives to those principles of peace for which he sacrificed so much. May God raise up men of his high vision, broad understanding, and sturdy character to carry forward the work in which he gave his life.

We are asking the choir to sing "Onward, Christian Soldiers" at the conclusion of this service. That triumphant, courageous, marching hymn was one of the Senator's favorites and is so typical of his spirit.

We here give hearty thanks to Almighty God that we have been permitted to have in our midst as a guiding light and an inspiring spirit, this matchless statesman, this wise counselor, this mighty crusader for peace, this patriotic citizen, this loving husband and father, this unfailing friend, this prince among men, Arthur Hendrick Vandenberg.

WELCOME TO REPRESENTATIVES OF THE WORLD ASSEMBLY FOR MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, on the day before my appointment to the Senate, the Members of the Michigan delegation in Congress issued a statement of welcome to the nations of the world which are sending representatives to the World Assembly for the Moral Rearmament of the Nations to be held at the Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, June 1–12, 1951.

I am delighted to make it unanimous by adding my own warm support to this welcome.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further routine business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, It seems to be that we are considering a very important piece of legislation. I have listened with great interest to the arguments presented by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I believe it is very important that Senators be on the floor to listen to the presentation of both sides of the issue, and I am wondering whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico would yield for the purpose of having a quorum call.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to my very good friend from Nebraska that I believe he is correct. There is not a piece of legislation before us which is more important to the American people than the pending bill. For that reason I shall be very glad to yield for a quorum call, provided that I thereby do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, without prejudicing the rights of the Senator from New Mexico, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capehart	Ecton
Anderson	Carlson	Ellender
Bennett	Case	Ferguson
Benton	Chavez	Frear
Brewster	Clements	Fulbright
Bricker	Connally	Gillette
Bridges	Cordon	Green
Butler, Md.	Dirksen	Hayden
Butler, Nebr.	Douglas	Hendrickson
Byrd	Duff	Hennings
Cain	Dworshak	Hickenlooper

Hill	McFarland	Saltonstall
Hoey	McKellar	Schoeppel
Holland	McMahon	Smathers
Humphrey	Malone	Smith, Maine
Hunt	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Ives	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Jenner	Millikin	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	Monroney	Stennis
Johnson, Tex.	Moody	Taft
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Thye
Kefauver	Mundt	Tobey
Kem	Murray	Underwood
Kerr	Neely	Watkins
Kilgore	Nixon	Wherry
Knowland	O'Conor	Wiley
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Williams
Long	Pastore	Young
McCarran	Robertson	
McClellan	Russell	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for 1 minute?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to yield or not to yield, I should like to make a short statement before I proceed. I should like to accommodate all my friends in the Senate. I should like to accommodate each and every Senator who asks me to yield. But in my opinion the bill we are now considering affects basic rights of the American people, and I think we should proceed with it, obtain as much enlightenment on it as possible, and have the Senate pass judgment on the amendments and on the bill itself. Hence, it is my purpose to try to conclude as early as possible. I will, however, yield to any Senator provided he limits himself, as my good friend the Senator from Oklahoma suggests he will, to 1 minute. I shall not yield for speeches of 3 minutes, 5 minutes, or 6 minutes. I shall yield to Senators for insertions in the RECORD with the understanding that I do not thereby lose the floor. I shall yield for any reasonable purpose. I do not think there is anything this body can discuss which is of more importance than the pending bill. Therefore, I do not intend to yield to any Senator to make a speech or to discuss other questions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his statement. I agree with him implicitly that we should focus upon the bill before us, direct our attention to it, amend it and pass it or vote it down. I think the Senator from New Mexico has been very patient during the past 3 or 4 days.

Mr. President, I made a statement to a colleague of mine that I would do everything I could to see that he obtained 10 minutes of time before the bill was taken up today. At the time I made that statement I had completely forgotten that the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico retained the floor when the Senate recessed until today. I helped the Senator from New Mexico obtain the floor, and I wonder if he can possibly make one exception, to permit the Senator to whom I am referring to speak for 10 minutes?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to comply with the request of the good Senator from Nebraska, but I remind him that the other day a Senator also requested 10 minutes to speak, and he spoke for 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator I have in mind would not do anything like that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will guarantee that such a thing will not happen.

Mr. President, I wish to thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who now is leaving the Chamber. On Friday, at the time when the Senate took a recess until today, the Senator from Michigan was presiding, and at that time he recognized me, so that I might have the floor and be able to continue with my presentation of the pending bill when the Senate convened today.

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that length of time, provided it is understood that I shall not lose the floor by so doing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, one of the great, historic, and most cherished documents in our language is the Declaration of Independence. In justification of their determination to create a new government to protect their liberty and freedom, its authors listed their bill of particulars and complaints against the cruel dictatorship of King George III.

One of their complaints reads as follows:

> He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power.

The authors of that declaration, Mr. President, were keenly aware that their liberties could never be secure except as the civil authority, elected by the people, had complete control over the military. Today it is just as important to preserve that principle as it was then to establish it.

Mr. President, at this point I request unanimous consent that there may appear as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "The MacArthur Ouster," which appeared in the April 21, 1951, issue of the magazine America, the National Catholic Weekly Review.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

From almost any angle you look at it, the storm now swirling around General MacArthur is deplorable. What remains of our national unity is in danger of being destroyed by the supercharged lightning flashes of emotion generated by personal and political partisanship. We discern but one hopeful ray in the lightning-riven clouds: if the controversy can be brought under control and carried on calmly on the basis of the issues involved, it may become the last Great Debate on United States foreign policy.

The one Herbert Hoover touched off 6 months ago, apparently settled by the Senate's troops-to-Europe resolution of April 4, dealt largely with our policy for Europe. Our far-eastern policy, or lack of it, was not formally debated in the Senate. The MacArthur incident, for better or worse, has made such a discussion inevitable. We can only hope that it will be productive of a renewed national unity.

Already, as Walter Lippmann observed in the curious case of Senator TAFT, there is confusion as to what General MacArthur meant in his now celebrated letter to Congressman MARTIN. The general, as the columnist pointed out, wanted more than permission to bomb Red China's Manchurian bases and to use the Formosa forces of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese mainland. The general wanted permission to wage all-out war against China. Contending that the global conflict with communism has already begun, the general argued that it could be won by defeating Red China. The way to save Europe, he wrote in effect, is to defeat communism in Asia.

That involves an almost complete reversal of our present policy. The United States and its allies have long since decided to concentrate on Europe while diverting the necessary minimum to prevent a Communist sweep in Asia. The fundamental issue is therefore clear-cut. Shall the United States abandon its present efforts to safeguard Europe and devote its resources chiefly to a full-scale war with Red China?

Those who join General MacArthur in an affirmative answer to this fateful question should not overlook these considerations:

1. If we decide to join the issue in Asia, we shall have to do it alone—our Atlantic allies, the Asian-Arab nations, and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

2. Attacking China in the belief that the U. S. S. R. will not come to her aid is not a calculated risk—it is the wildest sort of gamble.

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the west, will be relatively ineffective in China. If we contemplate using them for atomic bombing, let us reflect that such bombing would have little military value, would infuriate all Asia and might invite Russian retaliation. Thus there is no hope of a short and cheap war.

4. Our long-neglected tactical Air Force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.

5. Even if Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take over an almost defenseless Europe, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. If we tempt Russia into a war for which we are still unprepared offensively, we shall expose our people to destruction, since our home defense system, both military and civil, is pitifully incomplete.

7. As the President emphasized in his address to the Nation on April 11, our present policy is designed to avoid world war III. Though it may fail, it furnishes a hope lacking in the MacArthur approach.

If these considerations are put forcibly to the American people, we believe that the last Great Debate will not be prolonged as its predecessor was, and that our people, finally satisfied that we are on the only course open to us, will then settle down to the supreme task of insuring their security.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much for yielding the minute to me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have been glad to do so. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will remain in the Chamber for a minute or so longer, before he leaves.

Mr. KERR. I will.

GRAIN FOR INDIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield long enough to permit me to read into the RECORD a passage from a letter which I have received? It will not take me more than 1 minute to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well; I yield for that purpose, provided it is understood that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have in my possession a letter which arrived at my desk recently. The letter is dated April 18, 1951, and comes from Delhi, India, from Bishop J. Waskom Pickett. I wish to read only one paragraph of the letter:

> The effect of the long delay in dealing with the wheat bill is really serious. The original proposal evoked gratitude in every Indian heart, and had action been taken immediately it would have blunted all the efforts the Communists are making to create prejudice and hostility against the United States of America. But we have given the Communists opportunity to organize and to hurt us, and they have used it rather cleverly.

Mr. President, I merely say that the delay in congressional action on the bill to aid the Indian people is playing directly into the hands of the Soviet aggressive system of imperialism. I call upon those who are responsible for the progress of the bill for the aid of the people of India to get it quickly on the floor of both Houses of the Congress, so that it may be acted on very soon. I also call upon the people of the United States, in view of the delay which has occurred in the Congress, to take this matter upon themselves. A short time ago we had something called The Friendship Train to take gifts to Western Europe. I call upon the people of this country to take it into their own hands to have friendship grain—g-r-a-i-n—sent to those who are dying of starvation.

Mr. President, it would be well for Congress to stop dealing with military tactics for a moment and to legislate in the field of humanitarian relationships, the field in which the Congress is properly organized to take action.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Frank Buchanan, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have asked my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], to wait a little following his statement in which he referred to the Declaration of Independence. Prior to the time when the Senator from Oklahoma made his statement, I saw a copy of it, and I told him that I would yield 1 minute to him for the purpose of presenting his statement, because I intended to use it in opposing the proposed legislation contained in Senate bill 984. So I wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for making that statement.

Mr. President, the Declaration of Independence had a real purpose. It is a rather short document, but it tells a great deal:

> When in the course of human events—

What were the colonists talking about there? The colonists in America, from Georgia to New Hampshire and Maine, were there referring to the events which were affecting them at the moment. Those colonists were in this country prior to the Declaration of Independence. Many of them not only fought in 1776, but also took part with the soldiers who fought the French at Louisburg, and there forever drove the French, as a political entity, from Canada.

So, Mr. President, we have the immortal words:

> When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

Mr. President, that was in 1776, but we should remember that the political revolution did not begin in that year. So far as the American colonists were concerned, the political revolution began in 1750 or 1760, at least 15 years before the Declaration of Independence was drawn up. Of course, the fighting occurred afterward; but the thinking of John Adams, Samuel Adams, Franklin, Washington, and Jefferson began and continued for a long, long time before the fighting commenced and the Declaration of Independence was drawn up. Mr. President, I love the Declaration of Independence. As a result of that declaration and as a result of the fighting in the Revolutionary War—the actual military operations, which involved considerable loss of life on the part of the American colonists—they formed a new Government and established the Constitution, which today is the law of our land.

Let me read from the preamble of the Constitution, which states its purpose:

> We, the people of the United States—

They were talking about the American people, not about people anywhere else; not the people of a foreign country. Much as I like to agree, and do agree, with what the Senator from Minnesota stated as to the desirability of our being kindly and charitable to others, I still think we owe a duty to the people of the United States. What was the purpose and objective of the founding fathers in drawing up the Constitution, Mr. President? It is stated in the preamble of the Constitution as follows—

> in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice—

In all kindness, I may say to my good friend who is sponsoring this bill that one of the purposes of the Constitution of the United States to "establish justice" is not being fulfilled by a bill which would give a preference to foreign slave labor as against the American laborer, against American citizens. Is the bill designed to establish justice? How will it establish justice when preference is given to an alien over a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, for instance, in the field of labor and employment? Under this bill, as described by the Senator from Louisiana, the alien laborer would have an advantage over the domestic laborer. Does that fulfill the purposes of the Constitution?

Another purpose of the Constitution is to "insure domestic tranquillity." There are millions of Americans throughout the United States who are in need of work; yet some employers are so selfish and greedy that they prefer to employ a starving foreigner to employing an American who may have lost a son fighting for his country in Korea or elsewhere.

Another purpose of the Constitution is "to provide for the common defense." In order to provide for the common defense, it is of course necessary to have money, which must be raised by taxes. Who pays the taxes? The American citizen. Under the provisions of the pending bill an alien who came to this country to engage in the work contemplated would not be required to pay taxes. A poor American laborer who may want work would be prohibited from earning a little money with which to enable him to pay taxes.

A further purpose of the Constitution is to "promote the general welfare." I ask Senators who have been kind enough to listen to my remarks, and our guests in the galleries who are listening to me now, how is the general welfare of the United States to be promoted if slave

labor, peon labor from another country, is preferred over that of our own citizens?

Another purpose of the Constitution is to "secure the blessings of libe.ty."

When I began my speech last Friday, I stated that peonage had been nonexistent in my State since 1868. We do not want it to return. The blessings of liberty cannot be secured on the basis of cheap wages paid to slave labor of the type contemplated by the bill.

The preamble to the Constitution concludes: "and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The Constitution is the law of the land. No matter how charitably inclined we may be, no matter how kind—and we are kindly disposed toward the other peoples of the world, as shown by the fact that we feed hungry peoples of the world—it is unwise and unsound to prevent an American laborer from being employed, even at hard labor, when work is available, and to pass legislation which would give a preference to one particular country as against the other countries of the world.

Yes; the pending bill could be passed within a matter of moments, but I submit it would be an injustice to the American citizen. When I say "the American citizen" let me remind the Senate that the Constitution does not require that an American citizen be of Anglo-Saxon, or Jewish, or Spanish descent. It is a Constitution for all citizens of the United States. That explains one of my objections to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] regarding the citizens of Puerto Rico. Citizens of America include citizens of Puerto Rico; citizens of America include the Indians.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will yield for a comment along the lines of his present discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield. In doing so I desire to propound a question to my good friend from Pennsylvania. Everything being equal, if workers are needed on American farms and in American industries, and if American citizens are available to perform the required work, whom does the Senator think should be employed?

Mr. MARTIN. I, of course, agree fully with the position taken by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that it is our duty first to see that every American is gainfully employed. If the Senator will permit, a very distinguished former Vice President of the United States, Gen. Charles G. Dawes, passed to his reward last week. The Senator will recall that General Dawes had an important part in the negotiations regarding various matters following World War I, and that, among other things, General Dawes made this statement:

> Successful international negotiations must begin with the representatives of each nation having uppermost in mind the interest of their own nations. Along with that there must be the determination to adjust those interests to the common good of all.

But General Dawes, Vice President of the United States, stated that our first consideration should be given to our own nationals.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator. I think that proposition is basic. What citizens are intended to be protected by the oath which we take under the Constitution when we assume office? What citizen is the Constitution designed to protect? It is the American citizen. Last Friday it was stated on the floor of the Senate that we have spent $120,000,000 in the Republic of Mexico to keep the hoof-and-mouth disease away from our border, for the purpose of protecting our cattle industry. We do not buy beef from the Argentine, though by doing so we might provide 40-cent steaks. Why is that? We abstain from the purchase of Argentine beef in order to protect American commerce. Yet, the pending bill would permit the importation of foreign labor, to be used in preference to American labor.

I referred a few moments ago to the Indians. To me, they are Americans. They are good enough to be allowed to die in Korea while wearing the uniform of the United States; they are good enough to serve as soldiers of the Republic and to be buried in France, Belgium, and Italy, but, under the provisions of the pending bill, even though they might want to work as agricultural laborers, they would be prevented from doing so.

I do not question the integrity of the committee, nor of the sponsors of the bill, but I say Senators are mistaken. If this bill were to pass, it would become a cancerous growth upon our body politic. It would interfere with public health, it would interfere with wages, it would interfere with our whole economy. It would bring back a condition which was done away with by Lincoln, namely, that of slavery and peonage. The bill should not pass.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a telegram I have received from Texas. I regret that my good friend the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is not present. I wish all Senators would listen to this telegram. It is from the American GI Forum of Texas Independent Veterans' Organization. I am sure that the junior Senator from Texas knows the person who sent the telegram, which is addressed to me at the United States Senate, from Corpus Christi, Tex., reading as follows:

> American GI Forum Veterans Organization, representing more than 50,000 American veterans of Mexican origin, wish to ask you to continue to fight to exclude foreign workers, especially in Texas. Thousands of veterans—

The ones who faced the music, the ones who would have made the supreme sacrifice, if need be, and the relatives of American boys who were buried not in Texas but abroad—

> Thousands of veterans not able to make a decent living because of low-wage competition by wetbacks and imported labor. Thousands of children of veterans are not able to enjoy good health because veterans and their families are forced to work for starvation wages because of imported labor. Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. Best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

All they ask is just a chance to exist—not to get rich—a chance to find employment so that they may feed their families, to send their children to school, to teach them to adore the flag and to know that their fathers and brothers did not die in vain on foreign fields. In many instances, the kind of persons the writer of the telegram is talking about are relatives of American boys who are buried in foreign cemeteries with their only decoration a white cross. Now a bill is introduced which, if it should pass, would result in foreign labor being brought into the United States. I say it is un-American.

> Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have an opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. Best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

The telegram is from American GI Forum of Texas Independent Veterans' Organization, by Hector P. Garcia, medical doctor, chairman. I am sure my good friend from Texas knows him.

Mr. President, one member of the President's committee was Archbishop Lucey, from the heart of Texas. This is what he says:

> SAN ANTONIO, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
> Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
> *Senate Office Building:*
>
> May I sincerely commend your efforts to amend the farm-labor measure now under Senate consideration so that it will contain at least some standards of decent working conditions and will not encourage a further influx across the border of large numbers of Mexican workers who are not needed. Having long studied the farm-labor situation in this area at first hand and in recent months as a member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in its Nationwide investigation I firmly believe that the demand for further Mexican workers is not justified. If a small number of alien workers are required immediate steps should be taken to organize our farm-labor force which in itself should be adequate for our needs. I wish you success in your noble undertaking.
>
> ARCHBISHOP LUCEY.

The telegrams which I have been reading are from outside my own State. The American Federation of Labor is against the bill. The Railway Labor Executives Association sent a telegram which reads as follows:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1951.*
> Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> We applaud your leadership in seeking to amend the farm-labor bill now before the Senate so that it will contain at least some minimum working standards and so that Mexican workers will not be encouraged to cross the border. We call your attention to the wire we sent to the majority leader, Senator MCFARLAND.
>
> G. E. LEIGHTY,
> *Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association.*

I read a telegram into the RECORD last Friday which came from my State, in which the writer, Mr. Roberts, stated

that his association, the Farm Bureau Federation, represented 8,000 persons. I believe that is correct. But listen to this telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1951.*
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

National Congress of American Indians heartily commend you for your staunch efforts to amend S. 984 so that it will contain guaranties of decent standards and working conditions for domestic farm workers as well as imported. We particularly appreciate your championing the cause of the American Indians in this legislation and hope that you will succeed in getting genuine consideration for them.

JOHN C. RAINER,
Executive Secretary.

Why not, Mr. President? The same Constitution protects the Indian as it does all other Americans. He has earned that protection. Our record and our history indicate our treatment of the Indian from the time he was driven from North Carolina to the South, from the time he was driven from Mississippi and Alabama to Oklahoma, from directly after the gold rush, when, with whip, rifle, and gun, he was sent to what was then supposed to be the desert of southern California, now known as Palm Springs. That was considered to be the worst possible place. It has now been found to be good, and we want to take it away from the Indians.

Approximately 400,000 Indians might be affected by the bill. In my State there is one county which contains a vast number of Navajo Indians, God's people, who are trying to get along under the most terrific handicaps. If aliens are brought into our country as a result of the enactment of the pending bill, the poor Navajo whose son may have helped to raise the flag at Iwo Jima or Okinawa will not have a chance against the imported labor. Is that fair, is it right, is it American? The poor Indians of Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, California, the Klamath Indians and other Indians of Oregon, Washington, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, who are having a hard time, would not have a chance if this bill should pass.

I have here a telegram from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, opposing Senate bill 984. There is also a telegram from Mgsr. L. G. Ligutti, director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Iowa; also a telegram reading, in part, as follows:

We, the undersigned, send you this message of support for the valiant and intelligent fight you are making on the Senate floor to shape the farm labor legislation now being considered into an instrument aimed truly to further the interests of farm workers both domestic and foreign.

I thank the writer for the compliment. Then follows a long list of names.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all these telegrams be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

The A. F. of L. sincerely appreciates the excellent effort that you are making in the Senate to protect the interests of American workers.

S. 984, to provide for the recruitment and importation of Mexican workers for agricultural labor, represents a dangerous threat to our economy. It is a movement to open wide the doors for wholesale importation of Mexican workers at the expense of American farm workers who have traditionally been the most neglected group in our country.

You can depend on the solid support of our free trade-union movement in your gallant effort to defeat the enactment of this vicious legislation.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

National Catholic Rural Life Conference appreciates very highly your Christian efforts to amend S. 984. We must be mindful that human values come first. Taking advantage of needy poor, whether Americans or foreigners, will not sell democracy at home or abroad and will not bring lasting gains to anyone. Justice, charity, fairness always pays.

MSGR. L. G. LIGUTTI,
Director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

CIO strongly backs your vigorous and well-considered fight to amend the farm labor bill in order to provide minimum standards of decency for both domestic and imported farm workers.

NATHAN E. COWAN,
Director, CIO Legislative Department.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned send you this message of support for the valiant and intelligent fight you are making on the Senate floor to shape the farm-labor legislation now being considered into an instrument aimed truly to further the interests of farm workers, both domestic and foreign. Achievement of your objective is of profound social value to the Nation as a whole. We promise you continuing support in your high endeavor.

Ralph W. Amerson, Philadelphia, Pa.; Shirley E. Green, Agricultural Relations Secretary, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches; Elizabeth Christman, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO; Dr. Ira Dereid, Haverford, Pa.; Lee F. Johnson, Executive Vice President, National Housing Conference; Benton J. Stong, National Farmers Union; David C. Williams, Americans for Democratic Action; Gertrude Folks, Zimans National Child Labor Committee; Hoyt S. Haddock, CIO Maritime Committee; H. L. Mitchell, President, National Farm Labor Union, AFL; Paul Sifton, National Legislative Representative, United Automobile Workers, CIO; C. Emerson Smith, Virvinia; Leon B. Schachter, President, Cannery and Farm Workers Union; Richard K. Bennett, New Jersey; Theodore A. Rath, New Jersey; E. A. Mueller, Chicago, Ill.; Marjorie C. Thayer, Virginia; Marjorie Cabot Ware, Massachusetts; Elizabeth S. Magee, General Secretary, National Consumers League; Marion Dornton, Michigan Consumers League; Ambur Arthun Warburton, McLean, Va.; Veniette C. Weil, Massachusetts; Virginia Neel, Washington, D. C.; Alfred C. Bartholomew, Pennsylvania; Elizabeth B. Herring, New York, National Board, YWCA; Cameron P. Hall, New York; Albert H. Cotton, North Carolina, William J. Gibbons.

DENVER, COLO., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Compliments on your fight re Ellender Mexican labor bill. Wrong to subsidize a few large farm operations in limited area. Family farmers eventually are forced to compete with low-income laborers thus brought in.

HARVEY R. SOLBERG,
President, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the following telegram is addressed to me, coming from the border, the area which would possibly benefit by the passage of this bill:

YUMA, ARIZ., *April 29, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following telegram has been sent to Senators CARL HAYDEN and ERNEST MCFARLAND: "Urge all-out fight against Senate bill 984 introduced by Senator Ellender. For sake of entire country please support Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ in his fight against indiscriminate and unlimited importation of Mexican farm labor."

MASON M. WARREN,
Secretary, Yuma Building and Construction Trades Council.

I have another telegram to the same effect from the Arizona State Federation of Labor, which reads as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator from New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following telegrams have been sent to Senators HAYDEN and MCFARLAND, of Arizona: "We strenuously oppose S. 984 and respectfully request your support of our stand."

ARIZONA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
E. F. VICKERS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Mr. President, the next telegram is addressed to me from Norman, Okla., reading as follows:

NORMAN, OKLA., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge passage your amendment Senate bill 984 requiring minimum wage and hiring available local labor.

CLAY L. COCHRAN.
W. N. PEACH.
D. M. OWINGS.
W. H. LECKIE.
PAUL E. NELSON.

The signers of the telegram are professors at the University of Oklahoma. As I said before, I want to do what is fair, and I respect the views of my colleagues who differ with me on the subject.

I will not read what the labor groups have said. I merely wish to invite the attention of Senators to 22 telegrams which I received from labor groups in my State, who are opposed to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The New Mexico State Federation of Labor and affiliate membership is opposed to Senate bill 984, importation of Mexican national laborers. Laborers available in State if fair standard of wages paid. In past years importation of Mexican nationals for farm work has displaced laborers and at a lower wage scale. Supply of laborers in State should be exhausted before any importations take place.

W. S. ROBERTS,
Secretary, New Mexico State Federation of Labor.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The working people of Chaves County are opposed to Senate bill No. 984 which would bring Mexican nationals into the Pecos Valley for cotton harvest at a lower rate of pay than prevailing scale in 1950. Mexicans were brought in and our people walked the streets looking for work. Prevailing rate here was $3 to $4 per hundred. Mexican nationals worked for $1.75 per hundred. We ask that you vote and work against this shameful situation reocurring this year.

JAMES A. PRICE,
President, New Mexico State Federation of Labor.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As the representative of Building Trades and Construction Council of Northern Area of New Mexico, representing 18,000 workers of all crafts, I am urging the defeat of Senate bill No. 984.

THOMAS HILL.

HOBBS, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator from New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The New Mexico State Council of Carpenters with a membership of over 2,000, wish to express our opposition to Senate bill 984 which would allow Mexican nationals to be brought in at a low scale of wages to compete with our American citizens in doing farm work. Last year our citizens who pick cotton at $2 to $3 per hundred had to stand on the sidewalks in town while Mexican nationals got the work for $1.75 per hundred. Your help in behalf of the people of our communities of New Mexico in defeating this legislation will be appreciated. Sincerely yours.

VERNON C. ROBERTS,
Secretary-Treasurer, New Mexico State Council of Carpenters.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Central Labor Union of Albuquerque representing 8,000 members urges you to vote no on Senate bill No. 984. This bill is detrimental to all working people in this State.

J. E. HANDLEY,
Secretary, Central Labor Union.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request you hold fast in your stand against importation of Mexican labor to United States. Thousands of working people in this and other States available for farm work, however, employers would hire cheap foreign labor and starve working citizenry of this country. Advise Senator ANDERSON that working people of New Mexico sent him to Senate to represent the State of New Mexico and its people. His continued support of Senate bill 984 will be a disservice to his State.

Respectfully,

J. W. GARCIA,
President, Santa Fe Central Labor Union.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are greatly opposed to Senate bill numbered 984. We feel we have sufficient labor to do all work in New Mexico providing they are paid current wage scales in order to make it convenient for them to live a normal life. We will appreciate your cooperation against this bill. Our local represents 1,000 members plus their families and relatives.

T. L. LOPEZ,
Financial Secretary, Carpenters Local No. 1353.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request you help in defeating Senate bill 984. Surplus of farm labor available when wages are adequate.

J. B. MCCOY.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you defeat Senate bill No. 984 Mexican importation. 1,500 organized laborers represented.

LENO MARTINEZ,
Agent AFL Local 16.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator:

We of our local union oppose deal S. 984. Supply of labor available if fair standard of wages paid. One hundred and eighty members in our local.

A. M. ESPINOZA,
Painters Local 869.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

Painters Local 823 urge the defeat of S. 984.

F. T. KINSELLA,
Recording and Financial Secretary, Local 823.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senate bill 984 will flood this country with unneeded workers. Our American standard of living will suffer. Electrical Workers Local 611 urges defeat of this bill.

ELMER ZEMKE.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Importation of cheap foreign labor will help to further depress inadequate wage scales in hotel-restaurant crafts. Urge you vote "no" on Senate bill No. 984.

JAMES GIACHELLO,
Business Representative.

HOBBS, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator for New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Common Laborers Local No. 1044, Hobbs, N. Mex., would like to go on record as being opposed to Senate bill 984 which will allow Mexican nationals to be brought in to take the work of our citizens in the cotton-picking season.

We have a membership of some 300 members, many of whom work with their wives and children in picking cotton in the fall of the year. These Mexican people are brought here to work for low wages and destroy our working conditions. They are paid about half what our citizens can work for and we cannot compete with them. Your help in defeating this bill will certainly be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS F. MCDOWELL,
President, Local No. 1044, Hod Carriers and Common Laborers Union.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The working populations of Chaves County and the Pecos Valley ask in the name of decency for you to use your influence and oppose Senate bill 984 which would bring in Mexican nationals for farm work at a lesser wage scale of wages than the prevailing wage. In 1950 farmers used Mexican nationals to harvest cotton at $1.75 per hundred; prevailing wage was $3.50 to $4 per hundred. Several thousand people here oppose the recurrence of exploitation of American citizens.

FRANK MORGAN,
Business Manager, Carpenters Local Union.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local 1245, Eddy County, N. Mex., membership approximately 600, strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do our farm work. Last fall Mexican nationals gathered our cotton for $1.75 per hundred, whereas our scale was from $3 to $4 a hundred, which brought hardships upon our laborers. You can readily see why we are strongly opposed to this bill.

D. S. SIKES,
Financial Secretary and Business Agent, Carpenters Local 1245.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Construction and General Laborers Union, Local 1385, of Eddy County, N. Mex., of approximately 978 members would like to go on record to strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do farm labor. Last fall Mexican nationals were brought into New Mexico

to pick cotton and were paid $1.75 per hundred, whereas our own people's scale is from $3 to $4 per hundred. You can readily see why we are opposed to such policies.

RONALD E. BATEMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Local 1385.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our people of the State of New Mexico and Northwest District Council of Laborers would like to go on record to strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do farm labor. Last fall Mexican nationals were brought into New Mexico to pick cotton and were paid $1.75 per hundred, whereas our own people's scale is from $3 to $4 per hundred. You can readily see why we are opposed to such policies.

RONALD E. BATEMAN,
Business Agent.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Plasterers and cement finishers of local 835 of Eddy County, N. Mex., with approximately 84 members would like to go on record to strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do farm labor. Last fall Mexican nationals were brought into New Mexico to pick cotton and were paid $1.75 per hundred, whereas our own people's scale is from $3 to $4 per hundred. You can readily see why we are opposed to such policies.

L. L. CADELL,
Secretary, Local Union 835.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen State New Mexico firmly oppose Senate bill 984 granting importation of Mexican national laborers until all existing labor supply at fair wages has been exhausted.

A. G. PUGH,
State Legislative Chairman, Brotherhood Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
HON. SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We are opposed to the importation of Mexican laborers in this State until we have exhausted the labor supply at a fair standard of wages. This concerns Senate bill 984.

NORRIS R. PENNY,
Chairman, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, New Mexico State Legislative Committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not wish to read all the messages I have received, but I invite the attention of Senators to what civic organizations in my State have said. They are organizations which have no axes to grind, which are made up of outstanding and fine citizens in my community, as they are in every other community. In my State they represent a fine cross section of what is community life in the entire United States. I read the first one:

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New Mexico congress of parents and teachers urge you amend S. 984 to insure fair and equal treatment of American labor, protect Indian labor and child welfare acts. School attendance law should be applicable to import labor from Mexico. This labor will further burden State health and welfare agencies and because of extremely low wages will lower standard of living and will create serious problem in unemployment.

MRS. KENNETH S. CLARK,
State Legislative Chairman.

I have another telegram, which reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We are opposed to original Senate bill 984 but are in favor of your amendments thereto.

L. G. BOYSE,
Commander, Department of New Mexico, Disabled American Veterans.

The disabled veterans are the boys who faced the music. They are the boys who are not interested in cheap labor. They are the boys who would like to see the kind of government continue for which they were supposed to have fought, in order to preserve our American standard of living.

I have another telegram:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your gallant fight for your amendment on Senate bill 984. We are opposed to the Ellender bill as reported to the Senate.

CELINE DAVIS RAFF,
President, American Legion Auxiliary, No. 82, Benavides Grande.

I have a telegram from Albuquerque:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Ellender bill, Senate 984, not acceptable to many people unless carrying your three proposed amendments. Will be opposed by some in any event. With amendments will probably help solve problems of southern New Mexico during critical periods.

STUART W. ADLER.

I wish the Senator from Illinois had not left the Chamber. I would have liked to tell him how the New Mexico Health Foundation was started and who financed it. Some years ago a great woman served in the House of Representatives. She was Mrs. Ruth Hanna McCormick. She married a Representative, the one whom I succeeded in 1920. During the last years of her life she lived in my State. She was the one whose funds made the foundation possible, so that people living in the country, 150 or 200 miles from a railroad, completely isolated by nature and in every other way, might at least have a nurse in attendance in critical times, such as when a mother was in the throes of childbirth. I wish to pay my respects to the New Mexico Health Foundation and to the great lady who was responsible for organizing it. The telegram is signed by Dr. Adler, the managing director of the foundation.

I have already read a telegram from Archbishop Lucey.

I have another telegram from Albuquerque, N. Mex. It reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose the original Ellender bill S. 984 but we do support your amendments to this bill.

MRS. O. I. LANGSETH, *Chairman,*
Rev. CLARENCE C. PARR, *Pastor,*
Social Action Committee, First Congregational Church.

I am not a member of the Reverend Mr. Parr's church; but he is an American and a fine citizen, who is carrying out the Christian belief in furthering the cause of humanity. That is why he sent the telegram.

I have another telegram, which reads:

CLOVIS, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

Let me endorse your amendments to Senate bill No. 984.

THOMAS H. RAPER,
Pastor, First Methodist Church, Clovis.

I have another telegram:

CLOVIS, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I approve your amendments to Senate bill 984.

Rev. H. H. ALLEN,
Pastor, Trinity Methodist Church.

Rev. W. Carl Clement sends the following telegram:

CLOVIS, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I endorse your amendments to Senate bill No. 984.

Rev. W. CARL CLEMENT.

I have another telegram, which reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New Mexico Chapter, American Association Social Workers, believes passage Senate bill 984 would stifle promotion healthy wage scales this area. Urge you protest passage.

HARRIET HALLETT,
Chairman.

Here is another telegram:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Defeat Senate bill 984; promote New Mexico labor.

MARGARUETE I. CLOSE,
Catholic Charities.

That is the point, Mr. President. Regardless of what may be said in support of this bill, I still prefer American labor. It might be treason to say so, but I still prefer American labor to labor from elsewhere, unless American labor is not available.

I have another telegram, which reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ:

Please protest Senate bill 984; Ellender bill is vital concern in this area.

VIRGIL HAWTHORNE,
Executive Secretary, Bernalillo County Tuberculosis Association.

Do Senators know of that group? In my State there are citizens, men, and

women from every State of the Union. One of our largest industries is rehabilitating people who are afflicted with tuberculosis. They have come there from Kokomo, Ind., from Maine, and from New York. They come from Sparta, New Market, and Fayetteville. They come from Batesville. They come from Baton Rouge and Shreveport, La. That is the kind of group it is. Do Senators think that they would want to have anything done which would handicap them in their efforts to regain their health, by making it easy to import unhealthy aliens?

I have some telegrams from local lodges, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Being much interested in Senate bill No. 984, we wish to express our sincere thanks in behalf of Alianza Hispano-Americana for having opposed the Ellender bill as reported to the Senate and are much in favor of your amendments to said bill.

ALIANZA HISPANO-AMERICAN LODGE 37,
CARPIO M. CHAVEZ, *President.*

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
United States Senator CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Alianza Club, Inc., resolved the endorsement to Senate bill 984 of the amendments of Senator CHAVEZ to said bill. We oppose Senator ELLENDER bill as reported and for a stand in decency and equality the membership of said club endorse the amendment of Senator CHAVEZ.

ALIANZA CLUB,
PAUL SANCHEZ,
President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on Friday last I read a telegram from Mr. Roberts, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. He is a splendid citizen, and represents a fine group. However, he is completely mistaken as to the eventual benefits of the proposed legislation. In the first place, it would not stabilize farm labor. The bill would be in effect for only 1 year. Its proponents want cheap labor during the growing season of 1951. Such legislation would not stabilize farm labor. Labor could be stabilized by means of legislation which would take care of American labor first and which would provide working conditions under which an American could work in keeping with our standards. We love to brag about our standards of living. They are grand, and it is important and necessary that we keep them up. We cannot keep up American standards of living on 70 cents a day. It cannot be done here or elsewhere.

At any rate, the American Farm Bureau Federation, through its President, sent a telegram approving Senate bill 984. Now there comes a telegram from a person who belongs to the same organization. He has not a thousand acres in cotton. He has a little bean farm near Mountainair. He says:

DEAR SENATOR: I notice in radio broadcasts that you are opposing the Ellender bill. Please feel that you have our support in your opposition to this bill.

C. A. NEELY, *President,*
MOUNTAINAIR FARM BUREAU.

He belongs to the same organization as the other men, but he owns an ordinary farm. He represents the 6,000,000 farmers who operate family-sized farms, and not the 125,000 who represent 7 percent of the farming operations.

Another telegram reads:

DEAR SENATOR: We are opposed to Senate bill No. 984. We must find ways to adequately utilize our own labor resources.

That is all there is to it. I repeat that we spent $120,000,000 getting rid of foot and mouth disease in old Mexico, so as not to affect the fine dairy herds in the home State of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], so as not to affect the fine beef cattle in the State of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I think it was money well spent. The Congress would not allow the importation of one pound of Argentine beef, though it is of good quality and the housewife and the consumer could probably obtain steak for 30 or 40 cents a pound if its importation were allowed. Why has Congress taken that position? It has taken it for the protection of American industry. That is a correct position. Our first duty is to the United States; and the sooner we realize it the better. But the pending bill would sidetrack all that is sacred so far as the protection of American labor is concerned. We would be importing cheap labor. How are American laborers going to keep up the American standard of living if they must compete with that class of labor?

Here is a telegram from Herman Dinkle, president of the Stanley Farmers Union. He is opposed to the bill.

So is L. C. Timmons, legislative director of the Moriarity Farmers Union. So is E. C. Green, a member of the Mountainair Farmers Union; also Wayne Smith, of Mountainair, N. Mex.; and Mr. B. C. Berryman, of Corona, N. Mex. Corona is on the Southern Pacific railroad line, on the way from Dalhart, Tex. to El Paso, Tex., across the southeastern portion of New Mexico. It is a beautiful little mountain town. Its citizens are God-fearing people. They are not big farmers. The average farm in that vicinity is a family farm. Those farmers are opposed to the bill.

Here is a telegram from Sam Kendricks, legislative director of the Stanley Farmers Union. He is opposed to the bill. So is W. A. Thomas, of Estancia, N. Mex.; and Herbert R. Parsons, of Mountainair, N. Mex.

Those farmers operate family-sized farms. The messages which I read last Friday were from other types of farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks, the group of telegrams to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I notice in radio broadcasts that you are opposing the Ellender bill. Please feel that you have our support in your opposition to this bill.

C. A. NEELEY,
President, Mountainair Farm Bureau.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are opposed to Senate bill No. 984. We must find ways to adequately utilize our own labor resources.

B. A. KINCHELOE,
President, Torrance County Cooperative Association.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Hon. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Senator CHAVEZ: Your opposition to the Ellender bill will receive full support of the people of this community.

HERMAN DINKLE,
President, Stanley Farmers Union.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable SENATOR: We are glad to know you are opposing Senate bill No. 984. We are against the provision of this bill and hope you continue to oppose it.

L. C. TIMMONS,
Legislative Director, Moriarity Farmers Union.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Continue your opposition to the Ellender bill.

E. C. GREEN,
Member of Mountainair Farmers Union.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington. D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: I am opposed to the provisions of the Ellender bill. Please continue your opposition to this bill.

WAYNE SMITH.

CORONA, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I feel the Ellender bill, No. 984, will be a detriment to our laborers in the State of New Mexico. Please continue with every effort to defeat same.

Sincerely,

B. C. BERRYMAN.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to advise you that we are definitely opposed to Senate bill No. 984. We hope you will continue your fight against this bill.

SAM KENDRICKS,
Legislative Director, Stanley Farmers Union.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am opposed to Senate bill No. 984 as feel we should use what labor we

have in our own country before bringing in others.

W. A. THOMAS.

ESTANCIA, N. MEX.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your stand on Senate bill 984. We are opposed to the entire Ellender bill. May we encourage you to vigorously oppose this type of legislation.

HERBERT R. PARSONS.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think it would be proper at this particular point, in order that there may be a comparison, to ask permission to have printed in the RECORD all the telegrams and letters which I have received in favor of Senate bill 984. I ask unanimous consent to do so, in order that the record may be complete.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Please support the Ellender bill on farm labor without amendments, otherwise the farmers in this section will be seriously crippled.

H. A. DUKE.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Support Ellender bill, No. 984, without amendments. We need labor badly.

H. E. MATHER.

MCDONALD, N. MEX.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Cooperate with Ellender bill without amendments. Situation will be critical concerning labor otherwise.

N. G. HOWRY.

HUMBLE CITY, N. MEX.

DEMING, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We are firmly behind Ellender farm labor bill, S 984, regarding importation of labor. Request your support without amendment or change. It is to New Mexico's benefit just as it is written. We expect your support of this bill.

LUNA COUNTY FARM AND LIVESTOCK BUREAU,
FRANK A. BREDECKO, *President.*

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

I think you should support the Ellender bill without amendments.

BRADY LOWE.

LUBBOCK, TEX.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Do not add amendments to Ellender bill. Help pass it as is.

ERNEST MAHON.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

I personally think you should not attach amendments to Ellender bill. Leave as is. We find that we get good service through Mexican nationals.

J. R. HALE.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

I need extra seasonable help on my farm. Have used Mexican nationals satisfactorily. Support Ellender bill as now written without amendments.

L. G. CAUDILL.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. Senator DENNIS CHAVIZ,
Washington, D. C.:

I have had 3 years' experience in using Mexican nationals. I find it practical and would like to continue as in the past. Please support Ellender bill without amendments.

COMER HUDGENS,
President, Lea County Farm and Labor Bureau.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

I firmly believe that this section of the country should be permitted to contract Mexican nationals as now provided by law. The Ellender bill without amendments is suitable.

SUN ACRE FARMS, INC.,
ROLF A. MOE, *President.*

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

I am well pleased with the contract for Mexican nationals as it is. But the Ellender bill, without amendments, is acceptable.

R. E. WILLINGHAM.

MCDONALD, N. MEX.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We need Ellender bill without any amendments. Mexican labor is nearest available extra help we can get; less expensive transportation.

R. L. SEBRING.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Labor condition critical here. Do not amend Ellender bill. Mexican labor more practical.

L. C. GREEN.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We would like to have Ellender bill 984 without amendments. National labor made satisfactory and closer.

H. L. WADE.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers and ranchers in New Mexico vitally interested in passage, without amendments, of Ellender and Poage labor bills for providing Mexican nationals for farm labor. Am advised you have introduced amendments which will emasculate the provisions of this legislation. Urgently request you reconsider these amendments and push passage of bills as now written. These bills represent many months of work by producers who foot the bill, cast the votes, and carry the load of getting production and therefore are entitled to your cooperation. Our entire organization of 6,000 members strongly behind this legislation which is of vital interest in view of huge cotton acreage planted as requested by our defense officials.

DELMAR ROBERTS,
President, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau.

PORTALES, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers of New Mexico want the Ellender labor bill without your amendments. Urge your support of Ellender labor bill.

W. B. MCALISTER,
Vice President, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau.

ARTESIA, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Hon. Senator CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In interest of farmers of New Mexico we desire Senate bill 984 passed without any amendments attached. We do not have adequate labor to harvest our crops. With personal regards. Would appreciate your reply.

J. W. BERRY.

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

The farmers in this area are requesting that you support the Ellender bill without your 10 amendments. The farmers are really agitated in this district.

VERNER CLAYTON.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Sincerely request your support of original Ellender bill without any amendments. It's practical to use Mexican nationals to harvest our crops the season of 1951. Believing that you will rely on information of your constituents as to labor bills, thanking you for your support, your friend,

BOB JAMES.

MALAGA, N. MEX.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you to support the Ellender bill regarding the use of Mexican nationals for farm labor upon contract basis. There is an inadequate supply of local labor this area. The use of national in the past has saved millions of dollars in crops in this area. Migratory and transit labor has never within the past decade been adequate in this area due to extensive development. This same condition exists in Lea County due to extensive irrigation development there within last 4 years.

Defense projects in this area have absorbed practically all of local labor and farmers and ranchers both are faced with critical shortage. Contract method has worked successfully and we believe it is only method to provide adequate labor in harvest period for this area. We realize and understand your former position in this matter; however, development has been so extensive in area, and shortage of labor is critical. We urge you to support this measure. Farmers and ranchers have contacted me in considerable numbers, urging that you be contacted and situation explained to you. Many of them feel you have prejudged the necessity of this legislation, and I cannot too strongly urge your support of same.

T. T. SANDERS, Jr.,
Democratic County Chairman, Chaves, N. Mex.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Otis Farm and Livestock Bureau requests your support of the original Ellender bill. Farmers of this association will be seriously

hampered in production goal if it is not passed as is.

ORAL NICHOLS,
President, Otis Farm Bureau.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Your support is requested for the original Ellender bill on agricultural labor.

J. C. OGDEN.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We deem it best for us that the Ellender bill, Senate bill No. 984, be passed without amendment and will appreciate your support and withdrawal of the amendments that hamper the importation of Mexican labor. This labor is necessary for us and is one of the best good-will promotions that we have in educating the Mexican labor to better use of our equipment and our method of farming. I have 20 under contract and have found them all to be excellent labor.

R. T. SPENSE.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR: Request you support original Ellender bill. Farmers ask 1,600,000 crop. Imperative Mexican national labor made available during growing season and harvest. A crop grown without harvest is without benefit.

C. F. BEEMAN.

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We want your support on the Ellender bill as originally written. This request is from all farmers in this area as well as the Farm Bureau for your support of the Ellender bill without your 10 amendments.

W. ADD PAINTER,
President, Otero County Farm Bureau.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Carlsbad, N. Mex., April 25, 1951.
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building.
Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ,
House Office Building.
Hon. JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The directors of Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce and numerous farmer-businessmen of the area definitely protest the President's Migratory Labor Commission's recommendation against the importation of labor from Mexico at the important cotton-picking season in the area of southeastern New Mexico and especially Carlsbad. So far as known, the Commission did not meet in New Mexico and did not have opportunity to learn of agricultural conditions on the ground.

Officials of the employment service tell us that there will be insufficient labor even for cotton chopping, to say naught of labor for later cotton picking; hence, we are definitely concerned that should labor from Mexico be stopped that we would be without sufficient physical help to gather the cotton crop when ready for picking.

While Mexican labor brought into the Carlsbad area would be engaged for the several months required for picking cotton, yet there is the decided advantage of moving the labor groups from one area to the other to assist with the needs therefor.

The Mexican labor is brought into this country on contract with the Mexican Government; the labor is screened against undesirable physical and other conditions; the immigration officials exercise jurisdiction over the imported workers and, too, the Mexicans receive the same wage for cotton picking and other farm work as do other persons.

Carlsbad will need imported labor from Mexico and we definitely disagree with the President's Migratory Labor Commission, and trust that the Commission's report will be unacceptable and be disapproved.

Very truly yours,
CARLSBAD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By VICTOR L. MINTER, *Secretary.*

Mr. CHAVEZ. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I received only lately, but which is dated April 14, 1951, addressed to me by Mr. Winston Lovelace, president of the New Mexico Cotton Ginners Association together with a letter to Mr. W. J. Hooten, editor of the El Paso (Tex.) Times, wherein Mr. Lovelace takes issue with the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio, who is a member of the President's Migratory Labor Commission.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW MEXICO COTTON
GINNERS ASSOCIATION,
Loving, N. Mex., April 14, 1951.
Senator DENNIS A. CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In connection with the recent report of the Migratory Labor Commission and interview with the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, in El Paso, and the subsequent publicity given to this interview, I have written the El Paso Times a letter in rebuttal of the position of the Commission that additional labor is not needed by farmers. I enclose copy of this letter to you for your information.

We believe that it is nearly a question of life and death as far as gathering our cotton crop next fall is concerned, to get Braceros another year. We feel sure you will agree with us in this and hope you will do all that you possibly can to push the passage of the bill now before Congress authorizing the importation of Mexican farm laborers.

Thanking you kindly for this and past considerations, I am,

Yours very truly,
WINSTON LOVELACE,
President.

NEW MEXICO COTTON
GINNERS ASSOCIATION,
Loving, N. Mex., April 13, 1951.
Mr. W. J. HOOTEN,
Editor, El Paso Times,
El Paso, Tex.

DEAR MR. HOOTEN: In your issue of April 10 you carried report of an interview with the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio, who is a member of the Migratory Labor Commission. This report was headed "Braceros not needed, prelate says."

As is so often the case when such a Commission makes an investigation, the extremes are played up and apparently the report of this Commission was based on the low extremes rather than on the preponderant average of conditions and is, therefore, of very little value. Actually, there is a great need in New Mexico and elsewhere for more farm labor and especially at harvest time in the cotton fields. Many people say we would still be picking cotton from last year's crop if we had depended on local and migrant United States labor. To make matters worse for the farmer and also for the migrant laborers, a law was passed prohibiting children under 16 years of age to work in the fields during school sessions. This is a good law, but it does deny most migrant families the chance to make money during comparatively short harvesting seasons as they have been accustomed to do. The same conditions kept a lot of local labor out of the fields the past harvest season.

As a consequence, had it not been for the Braceros, the western cotton farmer would have been in a sad shape. Braceros picked about 50 percent of the cotton crop in the Lovington area this past season at wages ranging from $1.25 to $2.25 per hundredweight for snapping and earned $8 to $10 per day. In the Pecos Valley Braceros picked about 60 percent of the crop at wages of $2 to $3 for picking and also for snapping cotton for about the same daily wage and in the Mesilla Valley rates were from $1.75 to $2.50 per hundredweight. Wages in Arizona and California were higher still.

Can anyone say these farm wages are not fair and do not give a living wage? We do not think so, especially in view of the class of labor used. Some local labor is not willing to work for a fair wage. We had a report of one group of pickers leaving a field during the past winter. They were making an average hourly wage of 80 cents, but quit because they didn't like the picking. If that isn't a fair wage, we don't see how the cotton farmer can pay one.

Cotton is not perishable in the sense that fruits and vegetables are, but it will certainly deteriorate if not gathered within a reasonable time after it has opened; otherwise there will be a loss of staple length and a lowering of the grade. There is an economic loss to the whole country when this occurs.

The farmer as a class is being very much maligned from all sides and very unjustly. He is being blamed for the high cost of food and clothing, while the truth of the matter is that the farmer receives only a small part of the retail price, not exceeding 15 percent, for the raw product he markets.

Labor pulled out of the stabilization set-up because they were to be limited to a wage increase of 10 percent. The cotton farmer made a direct contribution of $100 to $150 on every bale of cotton that was produced this year in furtherance of the defense effort. Foreign cotton sold that much higher than our cotton because of actions of our Government. There was a lot of grumbling, to be sure, but the farmer kept right on working and this year is heeding the pleas of the same Government for a big increase in production of cotton that can only result in lower prices for his produce. At the same time they are asking the farmer to produce more, the Government, through lack of planning to get the farmer machinery, fertilizer, insecticides, etc., and hamstringing him on labor by such reports as issued by the Migratory Labor Commission, is certainly not helping much to produce the cotton which is urgently needed. However, the farmer is meeting all these obstacles as he comes to them and is not shirking his duty in production.

The cotton farmer should know what he will need to produce a big crop. He says more labor is one of the things that will be needed. We do not think a commission can travel through the country and hold a few meetings at scattered spots and be qualified to come up with the answers. It seems to us the time is here for everyone to work together to get a job done and to quit sniping at each other. We think the whole cotton industry, from the farmer through the gins,

cottonseed-oil mills, and spinning mills, is more than willing to do this, but they will need the help of more labor, more machinery, more fertilizer, and more insecticides and support of the entire public.

Yours very truly,

NEW MEXICO COTTON GINNERS' ASSOCIATION,
WINSTON LOVELACE, *President.*

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when I concluded my remarks on Friday, I had just called attention to the articles which appeared in the New York Times on several days during the early part of April. I shall proceed from that point.

As recently as the 23d and 24th of this month, the New York Times contained articles by Mr. Gladwin Hill describing the recruiting scenes at Hermosillo, Mexico, where growers from the United States picked out workers whom they wanted to hire under contract. Hermosillo, Mexico, is south of the border from Nogales, Ariz. It is within the state of Sonora, in the Republic of Mexico. The scene was far from pleasant to read about.

Look magazine in its March 27th issue had a picture and text article portraying in unforgettable terms the sad dilemma of these people. In its April 9 issue Time magazine dealt with the problem, and Newsweek in its April 16 issue ran an article about the "Woeful Wetbacks." The Washington Post carried an editorial on April 9 deploring "the influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards." That is one of the issues.

The editorial concluded:

We agree with the Commission that our efforts in the future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

What is wrong with that? Let me say to my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that I inquired from Mr. Goodwin, of the Employment Service, as to the situation in this field. The Employment Service has not even scratched the surface. We appropriated millions of dollars for that particular service. It has not scratched the surface of the resources of American labor. But still they are willing to employ labor from outside, and are anxious to come before the subcommittee which I happen to head, a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, for money to investigate foreign labor. It is about time that they investigated domestic labor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not desire to interfere with the continuity of thought of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, but after the colloquy I had with him on Friday I checked very carefully into the question of wetbacks as well as those who have entered the country legally, but have not departed from Mexico. Therefore it seems to me that they are in this country illegally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. They are exploited, too. On Friday the Senator said that it was his judgment that there are 500,000 wetbacks illegally within the country. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I admit that is a very conservative statement.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means for a liberal Democrat, a New Deal Democrat.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; for a New Deal Democrat that is a very conservative statement. If they were to be counted, they would probably number a million.

Mr. WHERRY. How many are here illegally? I mean how many have been recruited, brought here by contract under existing arrangements with them, and then have not been deported to Mexico when the contract was up?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I could not give the exact figures.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have some idea?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should venture to say the number runs into the thousands.

Mr. WHERRY. The report states that farmers of the Southwest, or whoever employs them, are exploiting these laborers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question about that.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the distinguished Senator a question for my information. How can a farmer exploit a wetback who is not here in compliance with the immigration laws? How can a farmer exploit one who has been admitted under the law, but who remains in this country illegally? Is there not some way that those who were admitted legally, but have not gone back to Mexico, can be checked? Is there not some way that a check can be had on the wetbacks who, as the report said, are being exploited?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There are so many thousands of them all the way from Brownsville, Tex., to the Pacific in California that if the entire force of the Immigration Bureau were used they could not do half a job.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from New Mexico mean that the enforcement of the immigration laws is completely nil so far as handling the wetbacks who are illegally within the United States today is concerned?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from New Mexico permit me to make a statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AIKEN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to state to my distinguished friend from Nebraska that during the hearings we held in Mexico City a statement was made by officials of the Immigration Service, as I recall, that there were an estimated 1,000,000 Mexicans who entered this country illegally in 1950 and——

Mr. WHERRY. They are wetbacks, are they not?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are wetbacks, yes. And that last year 500,000 were apprehended and deported back to Mexico. Many of them reentered the United States illegally again, and probably many of those not apprehended crossed and recrossed the border several times.

Mr. WHERRY. My question is, How are they exploited during the time they are here? Is there not some way by which those who employ that type of labor can have knowledge that such persons are here in violation of the law, or are not cooperating with the immigration laws?

Mr. ELLENDER. This form of illegal entry has been going on for 50 years or more, and it has been aggravated recently, because so many Mexicans want to cross the border into the United States in order to obtain better wages than they get in Mexico. As I have pointed out on two or three occasions, the bill prohibits the employment of a Mexican under this program if he is a wetback. I believe the only way in which the problem can be solved is to enact legislation along the line contained in this bill, as demonstrated in my remarks to the Senate last week.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator point out in the bill any provision which would accomplish what he suggests? Where does the bill provide that it shall be illegal for the wetback to obtain employment as a laborer in this country?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will find on page 2 of the bill the following language:

(1) To recruit such workers (including any such workers temporarily in the United States under legal entry).

Mr. WHERRY. I am referring to those who came into the United States illegally. But I see the Senator from New Mexico wishes to continue his address. Perhaps as he continues he will answer my question: Where in the bill is there a provision which would prevent the hiring of wetbacks?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill provides that no Mexican can be contracted with unless he has legally entered the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator from Louisiana to make the statement that it did.

Mr. ELLENDER. It provides that Mexican labor can be employed in this country provided it comes here legally.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I developed last Friday. The Senator must understand that I want this labor to come into the United States if it is needed. The bill, however, makes provision only for those who come here legally. What is going to be done with those who are now in the United States illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is now against the law, of course, for Mexican labor to come into this country in any other way than provided by law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But they come here anyway.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are laws against murder, but of course murders are perpetrated every day.

Mr. WHERRY. But what is going to be done to prevent the exploiting of laborers who are here illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have previously stated, those who attempt to enter the United States illegally are apprehended

as they try to come across the border. Some five hundred thousand who attempted to cross the border were caught and sent back to Mexico last year. Not a day passes that the immigration authorities do not catch many Mexicans attempting to cross illegally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And such as are here illegally who do not behave, are reported to the immigration authorities by those who employ them, and are returned to Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point. I understand the situation with respect to legal entry of Mexican labor, but I can find no clarification in the bill with respect to Mexican labor which is illegally within the country. It is admitted that more and more of them are coming into the United States; that wetbacks will continue to make the crossing because the enforcement of the immigration laws has completely broken down.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it has not.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean completely, but it has broken down to such a point that there are 500,000 Mexicans illegally in this country.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the estimate of the number who were not apprehended last year.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a great number of persons. It is however, only an estimate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. And such persons are being apprehended every day.

Mr. WHERRY. But probably more are coming in than are being deported.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is possible. But such entry is against the law. It is illegal for persons to enter the United States without complying with the provisions of the law as the wetbacks are doing.

Mr. WHERRY. Of what benefit will it be to prescribe legal requirements with respect to Mexican laborers, and to deport a few who have entered illegally, if wetbacks will continue to come into the United States by the thousands, with respect to whom no provision is being made?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was my purpose to take care of the problem the Senator from Nebraska has in mind by an amendment I have offered to the bill. It was submitted and has been printed over the week end.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the amendment printed and lying on the desk now?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. How is it designated?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is designated "4-27-51—A." It reads as follows:

SEC. —. Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation, who—

(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise; or

(2) conceals or harbors, or attempts to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation, any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens,

shall be guilty of a felony—

That may be a little too severe, but it is necessary to reach them.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a pretty stiff penalty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We must stop the hiring of wetbacks. I continue to read the amendment—

and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

Of course, it must be done knowingly.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is not a fact that the amendment he has just read is almost a verbatim copy of the Senate bill I introduced on April 26, numbered S. 1391?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. I think the Senator from Louisiana had in mind to do exactly what I have in mind to do with my amendment, but I do not believe the Senator's bill does that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I heard it read. I did not check it, but it sounds as if it were the same as the bill I introduced.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, let me say that I did not know that amendment had been submitted, but it seems to me we cannot separate the question of imposing penalties upon those who employ this type of labor and exploit them from the question as to the agreement by means of which more Mexican laborers will be brought into the United States. I do not see why in the agreement that is proposed to be made there is no provision for the imposition of some sort of penalty on the employer who not only hires the labor, but who may also exploit the labor which is in the United States illegally. It seems to me that the purpose of the bill is to deal with the entire subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, let me say that I am in entire agreement with the Senator from Nebraska. The reason why the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry did not go into that matter was that in doing so the committee would invade the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator has just said that in order to make sure that the proper penalty is imposed, we should make such action a felony.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not sure what the penalty should be; but it seems to me that if in connection with the proposed legislation we deal only with laborers who are legally in this country, we do not strike at the root of the problem. It seems to me that we must also take action in regard to those who are here illegally.

Of course I wish it understood that I am in favor of the imported labor if it is needed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me inquire at this point whether I correctly understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that he prefers the imported labor to American labor.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I favor the American agricultural labor if it is available in the United States; but if the need for Mexican labor can be established, I am in favor of importing it. However, I say that in this measure there is nothing which would correct the problem which is at the root of the entire difficulty. It seems to me that unless we take action to prevent the continued exploitation of the so-called wetbacks and others who are illegally in the United States, we are not striking at the real problem which we are trying to solve by means of this measure. Does the Senator agree with me as to that?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that, so far as the wetbacks are concerned.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me state what will happen. If probably millions of such laborers enter this country illegally, the result will be to saturate the labor market or to overload it worse than ever; and in that case the problem the committee is trying to solve will not be solved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me say that unless this bill is enacted into law, it will be impossible for farmers in Arkansas or in Nebraska, let us say, to contract for any of this labor legally.

Mr. WHERRY. That is because the present agreement terminates in June; does it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it terminates on June 30.

In other words, unless this measure is enacted into law, after June 30 there will be no possibility for the farmers in Mississippi, as an example, to obtain labor that is so badly needed for the harvesting of their cotton crop, for it will be impossible for those farmers to make contracts with Mexican laborers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this bill can be passed in 10 minutes. I want it to be passed, but I want it to be passed with dignity. I want it to be passed in such a form that, first, we shall insure that American labor will be protected. If American labor is not available for the agricultural purposes the authors of the bill have in mind, then I shall be perfectly willing to have foreign labor imported. However, if the bill is passed, we wish to be certain that it will solve the problem, at least in part, rather than make it worse. After all, there will be so many Mexican laborers legally in the United States and so many Mexican laborers illegally in the United States; they go together. In acting on this measure, we have to deal both with those who are legally in the United States and those who are illegally in the United States, as migrating Mexican agricultural workers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will yield further, let me say that I know he does not wish to be unfair. I did not interrupt him when he read many of the telegrams which he has received from those who oppose this bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I have had the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but I did not interrupt the Senator in order to correct him every time he read a letter which

incorrectly interpreted provisions of the bill.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to refer the Senator to section 503 of the bill, which contains the following provision:

> No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Director of State Employment Security—

And an amendment is pending which would change those words to "the Secretary of Labor"——

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is a good amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The section continues—

> for such area has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Surely, Mr. President, if the administrator of this measure does his duty American farm workers will be protected.

Mr. WHERRY. If this bill should be enacted would any penalty be imposed upon an employer in case such Mexican laborers who enter this country fail to return to Mexico when their contract of employment is terminated?

Mr. ELLENDER. At the present time such laborers are required to return to Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. But what penalty does the bill provide in case they do not return to Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are supposed to be returned to Mexico in compliance with the law.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that; I realize that it is supposed to be done; but, the fact is that it is not done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean to say that it is not done as to many of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. The greater portion of those who are legally in the United States and are employed under contract, return to Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is true. However, this bill does not contain a penalty provision which will insure that those workers do return to Mexico.

Let me say that I suppose I am not approaching this matter from the angle from which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is approaching it. In other words, in my State there are certain types of cultivation for which Mexican labor is needed. The other day I referred to the herding of sheep, and so forth, for which we need Mexican labor; and of course we also have to depend on such labor in connection with the growing and harvesting of sugar beets, unless machines which will take the place of hand labor are finally developed.

Mr. President, I believe that the need for the labor must be shown; I am in favor of having this matter handled in the way in which it should be handled. The point which arises in my mind is that this bill does not contain provision for the imposition of penalties in case such laborers who are legally in the United States do not return to Mexico following the termination of their contracts of employment.

I also point out that the bill does not provide for a penalty in the case of the wetbacks who illegally enter this country by the hundreds of thousands.

Does the Senator agree with me that if we are to enter into a new treaty or agreement with Mexico in connection with this question, not only should some provision be made with regard to the return to Mexico of those who are legally in the United States, but also some provision should be made in the way of protection against the exploitation of those who are illegally in our country?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think I understand what the Senator has in mind. If we are to enter into a new agreement with Mexico, one which necessitates national legislation, it seems to me that the question of certification should be handled in such a way that it will be national in scope, and will not be handled on the basis of individual States, either in my State or in any other State, for in the latter case there would be 48 different provisions in regard to how such workers should be imported.

If the proposed legislation is so important—and I think it is, and I wish to cooperate and help in connection with it—certainly the treatment should be national in scope, and there should be national certification as to the imported labor and as to the need for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, let me say, as I have already indicated, there are several amendments on that point, and it is possible that one of them will be agreed to. I do not know what the Senate will do in that connection, of course; but, so far as I am concerned, I have no serious objection to having certification made on a national basis.

My distinguished friend from Nebraska has referred to the question of penalties. Mr. President, if the employer were in a position to hold a Mexican laborer it would be an easy matter for the employer to control him. However, there is nothing to stop a Mexican from leaving his employment a day or so after he begins it. He cannot be held in bondage by his employer.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, that is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the employer has no control over his Mexican laborers, why should we impose a penalty upon him? Certainly we should not penalize him for committing an offense over which he has no control.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may propound another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. On page 5 of the bill, beginning in line 1, after the word "but," the following words appear: "notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment."

I remember that it was the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], I believe, who introduced proposed legislation, which I supported, which I think probably was in line with the provision of the bill I have just read.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. At that time I was not acquainted with the fact that there were 500,000 wetbacks in this country. From statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate today, perhaps we had as well used the figure of 1,000,000, because the Senator did not know the number of them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. There are also Mexican laborers who are in the country illegally, who were brought in originally under contract, perhaps. I realize it is impossible physically to hold someone who comes in under contract to work, if he does not want to stay. But somewhere there ought to be authority on the part of the Immigration Service to check on those who are in the United States illegally, including persons who were brought in legally, who have not returned to Mexico, and who are therefore in the country illegally. There ought to be some restraint put upon those persons. There ought to be some restriction placed on the wetbacks who are in the United States, and who now number hundreds of thousands. That is the point about which I am asking.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is merely a matter of enforcing our present laws.

Mr. WHERRY. The legislation is already on the books, is it?

Mr. ELLENDFR. Yes; it is the law, and it prohibits them from coming into the United States. There can be no question about that.

Mr. WHERRY. But the law is not being enforced. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is being enforced.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why do we find 500,000 of them in the country now?

Mr. ELLENDER. Five hundred thousand of them were arrested last year. There is statutory authority to enforce their return to Mexico. The difficulty is due to the fact that there are not a sufficient number of enforcement officers to properly patrol the border between us and Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. Apparently there is not the authority, otherwise there would not be a million wetbacks in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, it is a difficult problem to achieve 100 percent compliance with the law. There can be no question about that.

Mr. WHERRY. We do not know whether the authorities have returned all those who came in legally. I know that applications have come into my office from persons who are in the country illegally, who want an extension of the terms of their employment for a matter of months or even of years, in order that they may remain in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. The evidence produced at the conference held in Mexico City showed there were approximately

30,000 Mexicans in this country at that time who had entered legally, but whose contracts had expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how many of those contract laborers returned to Mexico? Is there not some way by which the number can be checked? It seems to be very simple.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, I understand there are 30,000 of them in the country now.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; persons who entered legally, but whose contracts have expired. These laborers are not wetbacks.

Mr. WHERRY. Then they are in this country illegally.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the pending bill, if the Mexican Government agrees that these Mexicans may be recontracted, it can be done.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the difference between a Mexican laborer who is here illegally, having come in under contract, which has now expired, and a wetback?

Mr. ELLENDER. The wetback swims the river. He comes in illegally, whereas the others come in under contract.

Mr. WHERRY. A Mexican laborer who remains in this country after his contract has expired is as illegally here, is he not, as one who swims the river?

Mr. ELLENDER. In many cases the right to recontract is extended for 2 or 3 weeks, and it may be a month or so before the contract can again be completed.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not complaining of that, but the facts are, nevertheless, that there are those who remain in this country for months and months, and even for years and years, after having been brought into the United States legally, but who are now staying in the country illegally.

Mr. ELLENDER. They were brought in under contract. The contract between the employer and workers from Mexico provides:

> The employer shall, after the expiration of the contract, return the worker to the point of contracting in Mexico, as promptly as possible, except as otherwise provided in article 30 of the International Executive Agreement, but in no event later than 15 days. While waiting for return transportation, the worker shall be furnished subsistence at the expense of the employer.

It is natural to assume that every employer is going to return the Mexican worker as soon as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. But do the employers return them?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Then does the Senator think that none of the labor of this type is exploited in this country?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The question of labor exploitation which was described by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico had reference to the wetbacks. Those Mexicans accept work on almost any terms offered by the employer, because of the fact that they are in this country illegally. I am firmly of the belief that unless this bill is passed, the employer in this country will be unable to contract them, because the Mexican Government has absolutely turned thumbs down on any future contract unless legislation of this character is enacted.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any penalty on the wetback's returning to Mexico? Are the doors of Mexico open to him, after he has once left the country illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. In such a case the Mexican is supposed to be punished by the Mexican Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any fear of that on the part of the returning Mexican?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not believe so, but there is a law in Mexico, enacted 2 years ago, as I recall, which provides very severe penalties in the case of persons who leave Mexico illegally, and who are later returned to Mexico through our immigration authorities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Probably that is why they leave.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the information we received in Mexico was that the Mexican Government does not enforce that law to any great extent.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from New Mexico will permit, as I say, I am in favor of importing what labor we need, provided it is done legally. We must have labor of this kind in Nebraska; but it seems to me that in legalizing the entry of a few thousand laborers who are to be brought in under contract, we still are not reaching the crux of the whole problem. Why cannot the Judiciary and Agriculture Committees get together and bring before the Senate the kind of legislation which is needed, so that it may be dealt with in one bill? I see no reason for dealing with it in separate bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend from Nebraska that in the last Congress an omnibus bill was introduced and referred to the Judiciary Committee that touched on this problem in part, but the bill was not acted upon. The same bill was reintroduced this year. I thought the bill would receive the same treatment that it received in the last session, and for that reason I introduced a separate bill which deals merely with this subject. I hope that bill will be considered by the Judiciary Committee at an early date, and that it will be enacted into law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we are now considering legislation which is supposed to be needed. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry tells us that other legislation is needed to take care of wetbacks. That is agreed. So what is the objection to taking care of them in this bill?

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am asking.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is easy. The Senate has the subject before it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the able Senator whether the wetbacks are not in this country illegally, and whether the immigration authorities do not have full power to deal with any person who is within the United States illegally? We may legislate as much as we desire, but we are never going to enact legislation which will prevent a wetback from swimming across the river into this country and then later swimming back to his own country. The Senator knows that to be a fact, does he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to show the Senator how it actually works out, let me say that many years ago, during prohibition days, I happened to be in a Federal court when Judge Neblett, who died about 4 or 5 months ago, was sentencing a Mexican woman immigrant. She could not speak English, so the judge said to me, "Mr. Chavez, come over here and interpret." Senators know how judges are. He asked the woman, "Have you anything you want to say?" She said, "No." Finally, the judge said he was going to send her to the Federal reformatory for women, at Alderson, W. Va., and he sentenced her to 2 years. After he had imposed sentence, she, speaking to me in Spanish, said, "Will you kindly ask the judge if I can make a little statement?" The judge gave her permission to speak. She said, "I want to thank the judge for being so kind to me, in giving me 2 years, but I would have been more grateful if he had given me 5 years." She said, "I should have preferred to remain in the reformatory for women in West Virginia 5 years, rather than be sent back to Mexico at the end of 2 years." That is the way many of them feel. They want to be able at least to get something to eat, and that is why they are willing to work for 60 or 70 cents a day. It is a pernicious system. But we cannot blame them. They are hungry. Sixty cents a day is a large sum of money in old Mexico.

It is quite a problem throughout the Southwest, as to how to deal with the situation. But we must face it. Senators heard read a telegram from the head of a veterans' organization in Corpus Christi, Tex., a man representing about 50,000 Texas boys of Mexican origin, who complain that they cannot compete with this class of labor. They are unable to feed their families. I ask Senators, do they deserve protection? This situation exists in my State, in the case of people whose ancestors have lived there for generations, perhaps for 400 years, people who now have sons fighting in the United States Army, not the Mexican Army, but the United States Army, the Marine Corps, and the Navy. Because they have to compete with this kind of competition, they have to leave home and family to try to get a piece of work in Nebraska or, possibly, in Wyoming. So the situation is serious. It will not only affect the American way of life unless something is done about it, but it will affect American labor, American standards of living, and American health. How can we look after 500,000 wetbacks, so far as the health laws are concerned? If they can beat the immigration laws, it is easy to beat the health laws. That is very dangerous. It is a problem of the Southwest. I want Senators seriously to consider that fact, and to realize that it is a matter which affects everyone.

I stated a little while ago that we had spent $120,000,000 to combat the foot-and-mouth disease, but we let into the country possibly a million wetbacks, the result of which is worse than the disease which I mentioned.

Mr. President, in its April 9 issue, Time magazine dealt with the problem, and Newsweek, in its April 16 issue, contained an article about the Woeful Wetbacks. The Washington Post carried an editorial on April 9, deploring, "the influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards."

What do we hope for? What do we dream? With world conditions as they are, we tell the rest of the world to help save democracy. We sermonize to the entire world, yet we are willing to undermine democracy by importing labor without proper protection for American labor.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am sympathetic with the Senator's views in connection with this matter, as I think he knows. I should like to have the Senator's view, because he comes from a State where the problem exists.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This is not easy for me. The position I take is probably not even good politics, but it is American, and that is enough.

Mr. CORDON. My question goes to this proposition: The proposed legislation, as reported by the committee, provides for orderly entrance into this country of Mexican nationals for specified periods of time, and under as much control, perhaps, as we can apply, but with the added value to the laborers of their being here legally, and, therefore, being in position to bargain with their employers for a higher rate of wages than they could obtain as fly-by-nights or wetbacks. In the Senator's view, would the enactment of the bill, as reported, in itself have a tendency to lessen the influx of Mexican laborers who come in illegally, and who, because of that fact, are discriminated against in the wage field?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator from Oregon is approaching the subject in the correct way. I do not have any objection at all to making foreign labor available to American farmers. I want to help them, but, in helping them, I want to consider the effects of that assistance on the entire social and political structure. I think the approach suggested is good. The only difficulty is that it does not take care of the problem in the way it is intended it should be handled.

I do not like to have a bill passed which would show preference to any foreigners——

Mr. CORDON. Nor do I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No matter how I feel toward them. I have devoted 16 years to helping them, from the border to Panama City, and all through the Republic of Mexico. I want to get along with them, and I do get along with them. But we may as well make up our minds that any piece of legislation on this subject should at least provide that if only one laborer is available, and he is an American citizen, he should not be discriminated against merely because someone might get an advantage by bringing in labor from the outside.

Mr. CORDON. I am in entire agreement with the Senator from New Mexico in that respect. I am rather inclined to think that the requirement in the bill is about as stringent and strong as we could make it, if we are to expect to get compliance. The thought comes to me that it is humanly impossible for any administrative officer ever to be able honestly to certify that there does not exist in the United States an individual who is available for labor. Would the Senator permit me to embroider that statement a little bit?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. It seems to me there must be a rule of reason somewhere that would permit of an administrative officer making a finding based upon the best evidence obtainable. If we have done that, then until such time as we emerge entirely from this period of emergency and can develop a coordinated program of aid to domestic agricultural labor, so that we may provide it with information as to seasonal opportunities here, there, and yonder over the Nation——

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point.

Mr. CORDON. Until we have done that, it is utterly impossible for us ever to approximate the complete utilization of our domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The Senator from Oregon is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I happen to handle the appropriation bill for Federal Security and the Department of Labor. We appropriate millions of dollars every year for the Employment Bureau in that particular region of Federal activity. A short time ago Mr. Goodwin, in the hearings, justified the item concerning farm labor. Of course, I was interested in the labor proposition, including farm labor, because I knew that this bill was coming up. I read from the testimony of Mr. Goodwin:

> Senator CHAVEZ. Yes. Now to some extent your work is concerned with farm laborers; is it not?
>
> Mr. GOODWIN. That is a very important part of our job.
>
> Senator CHAVEZ. Of course it is important, but what are you doing—what is the agency doing in order to get American labor to those spots? I am talking about American labor now.
>
> Mr. GOODWIN. In the farm program we are putting all of the emphasis we can on the utilization of domestic labor. We are trying to get it transferred from one place to another; that is, where it is available in one place, and needed some place else.
>
> Senator CHAVEZ. What are you doing about the Indians? They can get killed on Okinawa or raise a flag on Iwo Jima, but what are you doing to get them a job on a farm?
>
> Mr. GOODWIN. The Indians?
>
> Senator CHAVEZ. Yes.
>
> Mr. GOODWIN. We have worked out programs with the Indian Service for the use of the Indians.

Here is the agency of the Federal Government which has to do with taking care of unemployment, but it has not investigated that source of supply. It is a large source of supply. There has not been sufficient study. As a matter of fact, there has been complete neglect in connection with investigating the availability of American labor even for farmers.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator recalls, I am sure, the appropriation made last year and the year before for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the purpose of aiding in the placement of Indian labor, particularly agricultural labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. At that time, as I recall, the committee had assurance, after close liaison between the service of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of Labor's employment service, which appeared to me to offer promise, at least, of active effort on the part of both bureaus in that particular field.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only difficulty that I have with the idea is that I do not like to have Indians treated as separate subjects.

Mr. CORDON. Neither do I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I like to see an employment bureau treat an Indian as just another American. If it is necessary for him to work, he should have the opportunity to do so. Our country has become great through hard labor on the part of its citizens. I know the history of the State of North Dakota. I know that in the early days the pioneers who went there had to work very hard. That is all the Indian wants to do. Instead of isolating him, putting him under the control of the Indian Bureau, and letting him be treated as the Indian Bureau desires to treat him, namely, as a ward, he should be treated as a human being, and as any other American is treated. If he cannot earn more than $3 a day, that is too bad; but at least he should be given an opportunity, in the same way that other Americans are given an opportunity. The Indian does not want anyone to feel sorry for him. I do not like charity for an Indian. I want the Indian to be entitled to his rights, pure and simple, and nothing else. If we leave him entirely to the Indian Bureau, the poor Indian will have to turn to the east and say "Allah." I do not like that at all.

Mr. Goodwin, testifying before the Committee on Appropriations, proved conclusively, in my opinion, that much of the farm labor of this country has not been looked into, including Mr. Indian. I do not even like to refer to him as Mr. Indian. I do not like to see an amendment introduced which in effect says, "Be good to the Indian." As an American, he is entitled to everything that any other American is entitled to. We do not want anyone to be sorry for the Indian. We want him to be subject to law. That is what Mr. Indian wants. That is what the Puerto Rican wants. What is the use of adding to the bill an amendment which says, "Take care of and be nice to the Puerto Rican and the Indian"? Give them fair play. Let us say that we will be nice to all Americans, including the Puerto Ricans and

the Indians. That is all we expect of the bill. We are willing to cooperate along the lines suggested by the Senator from Oregon, and what I know are the ideas of my good friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the bill as reported by the committee is enacted, and receiving points are established along the American-Mexican border, would the fact that labor was made available at such points to employers in agriculture along the border, where at the present time the wetback problem is prevalent, aid in combating the problem, by reason of the fact that an employer of a large amount of labor in that area, who did not go to such a center to receive his employees, would, as a result, have a little closer scrutiny by immigration officers than if he had obtained his full quota of employees in the way provided by the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that is another bad feature of the bill. The bill is sectional in its application. I like legislation which affects all States. The only one who would get any advantage from the bill is the employer who is close to the wetback.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further ?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the bill should be amended, as I hope it will be amended, so as to provide an equitable distribution of workers from Mexico, so far as distant areas are concerned, those which are from 500 to 2,500 miles from the Mexican border——

Mr. CHAVEZ. They confront difficulties.

Mr. CORDON. Yes. Would those areas have to any appreciable extent in their employ any natives of Mexico who came in illegally? As I understand, the problem of the wetback exists chiefly along the border.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I presume the Senator from Oregon has been to El Paso, Tex. El Paso is on the border. There are two bridges across the Rio Grande at El Paso. All that is necessary to cross the border is to pay a small fee. I believe it costs three Mexican pennies to cross from the Mexican side to the American side. It takes about 5 minutes to walk across the bridge, from one side of the river to the other. Once the Mexicans have come across the bridge they scatter to other States. In the case of my State, it is a matter of walking about a mile. At one place a wetback does not even have to cross a bridge. He can walk from the Mexican side to New Mexican or Texas territory. The same thing happens in Arizona and in California, and along the Big Bend of the Rio Grande, clear to Brownsville, Tex. Naturally the ones who would get the benefit of the centers would be the men along the border. If a farmer takes his automobile across the bridge it costs him a quarter. It need not cost him anything, because he can make his arrangements at the border. However, if the pear grower at Medford, Oreg., thinks he needs 50 men to pick pears he would have to go from Medford, Oreg., to the Mexican border to make his arrangements. In the case of potatoes or wheat, the same thing would hold true. The grower would have to go perhaps 2,500 miles. So in that respect also the bill is unfair.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. THYE. How would the Senator propose to amend the bill so as to overcome such specific weakness in it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The way to do it is to make the bill applicable nationally in every respect.

Mr. THYE. It is, is it not? How can we specifically legislate to deny a Mexican the right to pay his 3 pennies to walk across the bridge?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We cannot.

Mr. THYE. How does the Senator from New Mexico propose to handle the problem? I would like to have him tell us how he proposes to handle the immigration question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not talking about the immigration question. I am talking about the actual and practical difficulty which confronts a farmer who is 2,000 or 2,500 miles from the border, as compared with the farmer who is close to the border. The one who would get the real advantage would be the man along the border. He could get workers in a hurry and at very little cost.

Mr. THYE. For a number of years the Mexican worker has been employed in the onion fields, the sugar-beet fields, and in other types of stoop labor in which the average citizen of the United States would not engage. It would be immaterial whether such labor were offered to him, because he would not take it. That is also true with respect to potatoes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. THYE. It is true in late June in the harvesting of canning peas, in which there is a great deal of hard work involved in the handling of the green pea vines. It is also true during the summer in the harvesting of sweet corn. It is a slow, hard hand job. The average American worker will not turn to it if he can find any other kind of employment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand.

Mr. THYE. So the fact is that in the North in Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin—I am speaking now only of those States about which I personally know something—one can offer the worker any price he pleases to offer. He can offer 12 cents a bushel to dig potatoes, but he cannot find domestic workers to do the job. He can find Mexican workers.

The same thing is true with respect to harvesting peas and harvesting sweet corn. The sugar-beet work is an all-season job. From the time the sugar beets are planted in the spring they require thinning. The Mexican worker is perfectly willing to do that work and very happy to get the contract for it. The next process is weeding. Following the weeding comes the fall harvest. The beet must be first mechanically pulled, and then the Mexican tops the beet. In other words, he chops the green foliage off the root. All this is tedious work. We cannot find American workers who are willing to accept such work.

That is the question with which we are faced in the United States. Not one of us would discriminate against the American worker. Not one of us is willing to legislate in such a way as to deny an American man or woman the opportunity for a job. But when all is said and done, we have not enough domestic workers to do the work. We must try to provide labor. In World War II we had German prisoners all over the United States doing much of that hand labor. Following the return of the German prisoners, we then had to rely on offshore or imported labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. The Mexican was happy to go to Minnesota and the northern area of the United States to take a job.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course he was.

Mr. THYE. If we can find a way to amend the bill so as to overcome the Senator's fear, I am sure that all of us will join with him. But we cannot legislate to fill all the jobs in the United States which require agricultural workers by calling on domestic labor, because there is not enough domestic labor to do the work. We must have offshore workers to supplement the supply of domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. According to some statements which have been inserted in the record of this discussion here are plenty of Americans willing to do the work. Let me ask the Senator a question. Of course I know that the average American would not want to do stoop labor. He is used to different types of labor. But there are some who, because of necessity, must do it. They are fine Americans. Everything is not rosy with them. The Senator has been Governor of his State, and I am sure that he has looked into many of these questions. Even during my days in the Congress, Indians from Minnesota have told me that they could not find work, even when they wanted to work. We felt sorry for them, and appropriated money to take care of them. Are there not at least some citizens of that type available in Minnesota, who would work if given an opportunity?

Mr. THYE. The Minnesota Indian has always had the opportunity to take a job wherever the job was crying for the man to take it. Minnesota Indians have their own lumber industries. They have their own sawmills. They have a fishery industry. They have their own fresh fish packing activities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And they have beautiful lakes.

Mr. THYE. Indeed they have—more than 10,000 of them. I am advertising a little.

Nevertheless, in spite of all that, last fall, during late October, when we were threatened with a freeze, I received a great number of calls from the northwestern section of Minnesota where potatoes were then being harvested. It was late in the year. The producer was fearful that his potato crop or sugar-beet crop would be damaged by frost, or possibly buried by a snowstorm.

I received a great number of calls from producers in that area begging for the opportunity to set aside a Federal law. Of course, a Federal law cannot be set aside in that manner; but they wanted a certain provision of Federal law set aside so that school children could have the privilege of being excused from school for a few days, to go into the fields and dig potatoes or help to harvest sugar beets. The producer was willing to pay almost any price they might ask, in order to get the job done.

If that situation existed last fall, before the extremely critical manpower shortage which the Korean crisis has brought about as we have remobilized, what may we anticipate the situation to be this fall? Today the defense plants are bidding for workers. Last fall they were not necessarily bidding for workers. That is the only reason why I personally recognize that we must take some action by way of enacting legislation which will permit the importation of offshore workers. I am confident that we are not going to have a sufficient supply of domestic workers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator from Minnesota that there is no intention to oppose all legislation along this line. I believe that legislation is needed, but I do not believe that the bill as reported to the Senate carries out the idea which the Senator from Minnesota has in mind. I know the history of the importation of foreign labor, especially the classes which we are now discussing. During the war they did well and contributed a great deal, not only to farm labor, but also to labor in factories, plants, and railroads.

The Federal Government has now in the Treasury possibly a little more than $3,000,000 in the railroad retirement fund, which was paid in by Mexican workers, aliens. They contributed to the fund. We still have the money in the Treasury. It was deducted from their pay. As a matter of fact, I believe that the Senator from Ohio introduced a bill to help them get their money back. It belongs to them. However, we still have it

As the Senator says, the supply of migratory laborers begins early in the spring, possibly working on asparagus and peas in California. Eventually they finish with potatoes and beets in the northern section of the United States. We want to help those laborers. From the standpoint of humanity, there is no reason why I should object to them obtaining employment. However, I know that the situation is quite difficult, because we are dealing with people who do not think as does the Senator from Minnesota. That is the reason why they work at stoop labor, which the average American will not accept. I do not want to interfere with the idea of the average American by importing very cheap labor to compete with the class of labor which will not stoop to conquer.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not want anyone's necessity to be the basis for the American standard of living.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. Of course, in any community to which these workers go they must be paid the going wage. I realize the situation which the Senator recognizes as existing, in that workers who are illegally in the country are exploited. They do not have the benefit of negotiation. They are not under the supervision of State employment officers or Federal employment officers. When I served as governor of the State, there were many conferences with State officials in an effort to protect the Mexican workers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me point out there that if I felt that labor would be treated everywhere as it is treated by the employment agency in the State of Minnesota, I would be for the bill. There may be some States, perhaps, where some persons do not want the prevailing wage paid either for domestic labor or imported labor.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for the compliment and I may say that the employment office in Minnesota can stand up under the light of public inspection at any time. While I was governor of the State we concerned ourselves with the treatment received by the imported worker, the conditions under which he was compelled to live, and other factors.

My real concern here, of course, is with what we may call the wetbacks, those who come into the United States illegally. Such persons may enter into contracts for less than the going wage in a community. I do not know how we can legislate to bring workers into the United States and at the same time take care of that particular question, except by strengthening our immigration authorities, and increasing their power to patrol and inspect more carefully the border so as to guard against illegal entry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us take one thing at a time. The Senator from Minnesota spoke of the fact that there are many types of work American laborers will not perform.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Let us concede for the sake of the argument that American labor will not be available for certain types of work. Therefore, we must import outside labor. In carrying out that plan, what is there wrong in protecting our own labor first? Charity should begin at home. Why should it be wrong for us to place in the basic law the provision that first priority should go to American labor? We do it with respect to everything else.

Mr. THYE. Does not the law provide that the employment office must certify the need for labor, and if it does not so certify, the area will not receive the labor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; but I have an amendment which will make that compulsory; which recognizes the principle of taking care, for example, of New Mexico cotton first—and I should prefer that New Mexico hides were taken care of first, even before those that come from the State of Minnesota. Let us recognize that principle by a provision we place in the law. As a matter of practice, that would not mean a thing, except that we recognize the principle, because as the Senator from Minnesota said, and I think correctly, in many instances the American laborer will not undertake certain classes of work.

As the Senator knows, there are many Indians in my State. There are many Navajos there. If they are not available, very well, let us import labor from across the border. Many telegrams were sent to me in which the senders agreed with the chairman of the committee. Some telegrams came from Alamogordo, where the Mescalero Apaches live, but I never saw them working in the cotton fields. We appropriate money sometimes to help them. I had that matter in mind so far as labor is concerned.

Mr. President, I should like to proceed now with my statement.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for having yielded and permitted me to take part in the discussion of the question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I had been reading from an editorial in the Washington Post. It concluded with the following words:

> We agree with the Commission that our efforts in the future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

The Los Angeles News and many other newspapers and magazines have published articles and editorials dealing with the problem.

My purpose in referring to the great amount of attention recently given to this question by the press of the Nation is to focus our thinking on the effect of the proposed legislation on the conditions described. I cannot see how this legislation will help remedy these conditions. I fear it will do just the reverse. I am afraid it will aggravate them. Many of the articles make it clear that there are large numbers of unemployed workers in the area into which the wetbacks and legal Mexican immigrants come. These unemployed are rejected by the growers because they prefer the foreign labor which is cheaper for them. Of the half million domestic native migrant workers—I am talking about a half million domestic migrant workers, not foreign migrant workers—a large proportion are descendants of Anglo-Americans from the eastern seaboard who crossed the Appalachians, settled in the once-fertile valleys of the Southwest and later were "tractored off" the land to become "Okies" made famous by John Steinbeck in his Grapes of Wrath. Another large number of these migrants, as I personally know, are Spanish-speaking Americans whose ancestors have been in this country for hundreds of years. Prior to World War II many of the people of my State of New Mexico also followed the crops, going from northern New Mexico into the Rio Grande Valley—into the neighboring States of Colorado and Arizona—obtaining employment to supplement the income they received from their own small farms. During and since World War II

most of these people have found it increasingly difficult to obtain employment in the large commercial farms. So, too, have the American Indians in my State—the Navajos, the Apaches, the Pueblos, and others—found difficulty, as their testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty shows. Some of those Indians appeared before the committees of the Senate and the House and testified in person.

The President's Commission, in its report, gives verification to the statements I have just made. It declares that if our domestic labor supply is recruited and transported from places where there is no employment to areas of labor shortage there will be no need, as I pointed out at the beginning, to import foreign workers for food and fiber production in the present defense emergency. As chairman of a subcommittee on appropriations, I recently conducted hearings on the Labor Department appropriations for the current year. I questioned the Director of Fmployment Security about his handling of this farm-labor supply program. Some of his answers seemed to me something less than satisfactory, especially regarding employment of Puerto Ricans and American Indians. I have read excerpts from that testimony heretofore.

It is not alone, however, in the utilization of our citizens from Puerto Rico and Hawaii and from among our own American Indians that we have failed. There is also a vast reservoir of potential agricultural workers among the Nation's million or more marginal farm families—farm operators whose total value of farm production, including farm products used in the home, did not exceed $1,500 in recent years. A recent study of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, prepared and issued under the supervision of a subcommittee chairmanned by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] declared that the underemployment among these marginal farmers is depriving the Nation of the equivalent of more than 2,500,000 workers. That is, the underemployment of marginal farmers throughout the United States, so the Subcommittee on the Economic Report reported, is depriving the Nation of the equivalent of more than 2,500,000 workers.

That study further pointed out that there are a million and a half rural nonfarm families with family incomes of $2,000 or less in 1948. "Full employment of the workers in these families," the study says, "would add approximately 900,000 workers to the effective labor force."

The legislation we are now considering has nothing in it aimed at improving our methods of developing an adequate agricultural-labor supply from among the millions of underemployed and poverty-ridden families discussed by the Sparkman report. No; it limits itself to the importation of cheap labor from Mexico. This raises a serious question of public policy which the Congress of the United States must face. As the President's Commission put it:

> Shall we continue indefinitely to have low work standards and conditions in agriculture, thus depending on the underprivileged and the unfortunate—
>
> Those who are subject to hunger, starvation, and empty stomachs; and, of course, the purpose of this measure is to deal with that situation—
>
> home and abroad to supply and replenish our seasonal and migratory work force?

Mr. President, should we attempt to ruin one segment of labor—agricultural labor—and try to provide for it an economy quite different from that applying to any other industry in our country? On that point, I read further from the report of the President's Commission:

> Or shall we do in agriculture what we have already done in other sectors of our economy—create honest-to-goodness jobs which will offer a decent living so that domestic workers, without being forced by dire necessity, will be willing to stay in agriculture and become a dependable labor supply? As farm employers want able and willing workers when needed, so do workers want reliable jobs which yield a fair living.

Mr. President, the workers want, and should have, at least a decent American standard of living. Of course, we want labor to be available for the farmer when he needs it, but we also want the labor to have the benefit of our American standards.

I read further from the report of the President's Commission:

> We have long wavered and compromised on the issue of migratory labor in agriculture. We have failed to adopt policies designed to insure an adequate supply of such labor at decent standards of employment.
>
> That is the test.
>
> Actually, we have done worse than that. We have used the institutions of government to procure alien labor willing to work under obsolete and backward conditions and thus to perpetuate those very conditions. This not only entrenches a bad system, it expands it.

At that point in their report, Mr. President, the Commission and its able staff make a statement which I think is of paramount and fundamental importance. That statement is:

> We have not only undermined the standards of employment for migratory farm workers, we have impaired the economic and social position of the family farm operator.

I give the last part of that statement special emphasis; I repeat it:

> We have impaired the economic and social position of the family farm operator.

Before quoting further what the President's Commission says on this crucial question, I remind the Senate that a study of history will show that a major factor in the decline and fall of empires and nations—and that could happen here in the United States, Mr. President—has been the abandonment of family-type farm ownership and operation in favor of the large-scale, absentee-ownership type of operation. Mr. President, I chance to be a member of the Appropriations Committee, and on that committee I happen to serve with the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I wonder whether Senators know that of the 6,500,000 farms in the United States, practically half of them have absentee owners. That is the reason for the concern of some of us, who do not want the small farmer to be further harmed by making him compete with cheap labor.

Mr. President, the little country of Finland is great and able to stand up, even against Russia, because 96 percent of the farms in Finland are owned by those who farm the land. Some of them may have only 1 acre of land; but, like the English, they are able to say, "My castle may be but a hovel, but it is mine." So each of those farmers farms his own land, and does so intensively.

On the other hand, I do not know what would happen as a result of the importation of cheap foreign labor, which is the subject with which the pending measure deals. Perhaps 125,000 of our farms—those owned by large-scale operators—might receive some advantage from such importation; but it seems to me that our small-farm operators would be seriously injured.

I read further from the report of the President's Commission:

> The operator of a family-type farm is a capitalist, but one whose income is derived primarily from his own labor.

Of course, Mr. President, a man who is farming 3 acres, and is raising truck crops—cabbage, radishes, tomatoes, and so forth—which he sells on the market, is a capitalist, even though he depends upon his wife and his children, in addition to himself in growing his crop. In fact, probably his children are unable to have a holiday on Saturday, because they must pull weeds on the farm. However, that man is a capitalist.

I read further from the report:

> In this sense he is also a laborer. He aspires to an income adequate to maintain an American standard of living. He is, therefore, in a poor position to compete with the foreign worker who is willing to accept lower wages, who leaves his family at home, and who makes no demand on his employer or the communities after the crop season's work is done.

Mr. President, I wish to point out to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], that those who will be the recipients of work under this bill, if it is enacted, are more to be pitied than censured. Stern necessity confronts them. Of course, we have heard of church mice and of how poor they are, but I venture the assertion that some of the people dealt with by this bill are poorer than the poorest of church mice. Those people need work very badly. However, in trying to be charitable and kindly toward them, we must not let anything undermine our own economic system. That is the basis of my opposition to this bill. I believe in the hereafter, and I wish to be charitable. I think my record in this body is about as good as that of any other Member of this body, in that particular respect. I have voted without quibbling for the appropriation of billions of dollars to help starving people in Asia and in Europe.

However, I cannot convince myself that I am justified in doing that, if at the same time I neglect American citizens, even when we are dealing with charity.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to consider a telegram which I have received. It comes from the American GI Forum of Texas, an independent veterans' organization, and is signed by Hector P. Garcia, M. D., chairman:

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

American GI Forum Veterans' Organization representing more than 50,000 American veterans of Mexican origin wish to ask you to continue to fight to exclude foreign workers, especially in Texas. Thousands of veterans not able to make decent living because of low-wage competition by wetbacks and imported labor. Thousands of children of veterans are not able to enjoy good health because veterans and their families are forced to work for starvation wages because of imported labor. Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. Best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

What does the President's Commission say? What does the average farmer want? What does the average citizen want, the man who aspires to an income which will be adequate to maintain an American standard of living? He wants his children to be able to go to school, and later to be able to make their own living. American boys who have fought for the flag are entitled to decent treatment, too. The President's Commission, in the report to which I have referred, continues:

Cheap foreign labor is advantageous to the owners of large-scale farms which employ "stoop" labor in great quantities. Such farms are only 2 percent of the Nation's farm units—

As I pointed out earlier—

approximately 125,000, and only a fraction of this small number employs most of the alien farm workers. This cheap labor is in competition with the great group of family-type farms. It is hardly consistent for our Government to encourage a family type of agriculture and at the same time give direct assistance to the operators of large-scale farms in recruiting and employing low-wage foreign workers whose products compete with the family-type farms.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the farm organizations, typified by the National Farmers' Union and certain State branches of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Grange, which genuinely espouse family-type farming as a central policy in agriculture, are not sympathetic to legislation which gives advantage to the corporate, absentee-ownership type of farming. Even in my State, units of the American Farm Bureau Federation have telegraphed me expressing opposition to the committee bill.

Mr. President, if you will look back over the fight on the Farm Security Administration—whose primary objective was to reestablish in family-type farming agricultural workers, tenants, share croppers, and farm operators who had been pushed off the land—you will see what I mean.

Great progress has been made in that respect throughout the United States. Nor is it surprising, Mr. President, to find all of organized labor strongly opposed to this proposed legislation. Industrial labor understandably sees a serious threat to its standards in the flooding into this country of hundreds of thousands of underprivileged alien workers, multitudes of whom, as the Commission report makes clear, remain in this country illegally, even though they came into the country legally. These pools of alien labor willing to accept low wages obviously tend to tear down the standards of all labor, whether agricultural or industrial. Nor is it to be wondered at, that the churches and religious organizations of our country have become aroused at the conditions of this migratory labor which has been recently so tellingly described in the newspaper and magazine articles to which I have referred. These conditions are a scandal to our Nation and are a serious weakness before the world in our Nation's leadership in the fight against our enemies in the Kremlin. So long as they are allowed to continue—and, as I have said several times, the proposed legislation does nothing to remedy them, but will, in my judgment, tend to aggravate them—we as a people cannot stand before other peoples in other nations and maintain that we know so well how to order the affairs of people within our own borders that we may teach the rest of the world how to order its affairs. No, Mr. President, this proposed measure fails completely to face the grave problems with which we are confronted respecting agricultural labor. I introduced a measure, Senate bill 949, which I felt took some steps in the direction of facing those problems. It was not reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee. In truth—if we are to judge by the measure reported by the committee—the objectives my bill sought to achieve were scarcely considered at all by the committee.

So, with the pending committee bill, the best I can do is to offer, and I have offered, a number of amendments in an attempt to accomplish what my bill sought to do. I shall discuss them in due time. I hope I shall be able to persuade a majority of the Members of the Senate to support my amendments, because I honestly believe we will make a major blunder, both for our domestic social and political economy and even in our international relations, if we permit the committee bill to become a law.

In conclusion, I may say that so far as the pending bill is concerned, in its present form, as I stated earlier, without in any way questioning the motives or the sincerity of purpose of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I firmly believe that it represents a backward step. In my opinion it would undo many of the things which were done in the interest of the country by the great Lincoln. In my State it would bring about the return of peonage, which became unlawful in 1868. It would do away with all of the notable and laudable ideals, traditions, and concepts for which America has stood. It would do violence to those things which were in the minds of the founding fathers, particularly as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, and to all the concepts embodied within the preamble of the Constitution which begins, "We, the people of the United States."

The bill is un-American. It would undermine everything for which we have stood, so far as human liberty and American standards are concerned. True, it would benefit a few; but at what expense? At the expense of undermining our economy, at the expense of undermining our health standards, at the expense of bringing about human misery and human exploitation. I trust that the bill in its present form will not pass.

RELATION OF AIR POWER TO THE SAFETY OF THE NATION

Mr. LODGE and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from New Mexico yielded the floor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who wishes to make a routine insertion in the RECORD. Other than that, I do not wish to yield. I have been waiting for quite a while to make this speech. It is not going to take very long, so I would rather not yield for anything other than a routine insertion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that my only purpose in rising was to continue with the discussion on the pending legislation. I have been informed now that an understanding was reached earlier this morning that the Senator from Massachusetts was to make a short address to the Senate on another subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to speak upon a subject other than the one which is pending. I feel justified in doing so, because of its great importance.

I wish to make an urgent plea today for something which involves the safety of our troops in Europe—the tactical air force. Then I wish to speak with reference to air power as a whole in relation to the safety of the Nation.

By way of introduction, let me say that there appears to be almost unanimous agreement that the United States, strategically speaking, is essentially a sea and air power. This does not mean, of course, that we may not be required by circumstances to make an effort on land. But on land we will always need effective allies, whereas in the air and on the sea we can reasonably expect to have a preponderance of strength alone.

Many Americans have assumed through these tense years of the so-called cold war that the United States could rely on its superiority in the mechanical weapons of sea power and air power. We always knew that we could not match the mass armies of Red Russia and her satellites man for man and gun for gun. But even the most unsophisticated lay-

man sensed that war had advanced somewhat beyond the point where the battle decision could be measured solely in terms of numbers of men.

The commanders of our Army assured us this was so and informed us they were building the United States ground forces of the future on the age-old principles of fire power and maneuver, as adapted to the air-atomic age. Our divisions would be designed to exploit the vast superiority of the American Nation in applied mechanics and mass production.

Mr. President, the first ingredient of this kind of military power, of course, is air power. Even the most mobile troops with maximum fire power per pound are still as naked as men in their underwear unless they are certain at the outset that their air forces control the air over their own lines, over the enemy's lines, over his assembly areas, and over the centers of his production.

The assurance of a former Secretary of National Defense that if the Soviets attacked at "4 o'clock we would be ready to strike back at 5" appears, in the light of the facts I propose to submit, as a most cruel misrepresentation.

It is today obvious that the survival of the United States is once more in jeopardy, just 6 years after a million men became casualties to make the United States the strongest power on earth and safe, presumably, from enemy threat for decades to come. Now it is clearly touch and go whether the United States will survive the leadership vacuum it has had since that time.

For the cold, brutal fact is, Mr. President, that the United States does not have air supremacy, air superiority, or anything like it. The staggering fact is that on balance air superiority as well as land superiority lies with the Soviet Union. Let me elucidate that point.

Air power falls into three categories: First. Air defense, which is a nation's ability to defend its homeland—its industrial power—against enemy air attack. The biggest potential source of military power on earth today is the United States industrial plant, and, Mr. President, I am advised that the United States is now, and for some time to come will be, unable to defend it, even against the enemy's presently limited ability to strike with atomic attack.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not care to interrupt the Senator's speech, if he desires to preserve its continuity.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has just mentioned our industrial war potential. Can the Red air force bomb the industrial potential of the United States?

Mr. LODGE. I am so advised. Today we do not have an air defense which is capable of protecting our great industrial centers.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator remember the testimony of General Vandenberg in relation to the resolution which was up for hearing, which had to do with defense bombing, when the distinguished general said that if the combined strategic air command of Russia came over the North Pole, which it could do within 5½ hours, it was his judgment that 70 percent of the Russian planes would get through?

Mr. LODGE. I remember something like that; yes. I shall come in a moment to some of the testimony concerning air power which we heard on the troops-to-Europe question.

Mr. WHERRY. In that connection, does the distinguished Senator recall the statement of General MacArthur before the joint meeting of the two Houses, in which he said that mastery of the air would protect the whole line from eastern Siberia, in Russia, clear down to Singapore? I think the Senator was present at the time the general made that statement. Would the Senator agree that by strategic bombing we could protect a line running from the farthest edge of east Siberia on the Pacific, south to Singapore?

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator say that General MacArthur stated that could be done if we had air mastery?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true. I say that at the present time we do not have mastery of the air.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree. Is it not also true that if we can do that in the Pacific area we can do the same thing in Western Europe, if we have mastery of the air?

Mr. LODGE. I believe a ground army can never begin to operate without air superiority in the place where it is located. But there are things which air power cannot do. I do not undertake to say that air power can do everything the Army or the Navy can do, because I do not entertain that view.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield further, I was not attempting to elicit that answer from the Senator. I am trying to establish that if we have mastery of the air, the first move we should make in defense, not only in the Pacific area but in Western Europe, is to be assured that we can do the same thing to Russia that Russia can do to the war potential of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. It is my opinion that we should have air superiority over the Soviet Union. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall in a moment take up the three types of air power. One is air defense. The second is offensive strategic air power by which we destroy the war-making installations of the enemy, and the third is tactical air power, by which a nation protects its own field forces and harasses the forces of the enemy. I want to discuss all three, which enter into the total concept of air power.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree that certainly when armies are on the ground, we must have tactical air power to protect them, that we have to protect them. Does not the able Senator, in view of the speech he is now making, agree with me that in making a choice in the expenditure of the defense dollar the priority, if we are to choose between arms, should be to make the investment in strategic air power capable of bombing Russia's war potential, in order to destroy it, as the first priority in our defense against an attack on Western Europe?

Mr. LODGE. I believe the strategic air command is the strongest element we have. Our security, and the fact that we have not yet had world war III, is due to the fact that the strategic air force acts as a deterrent. I do not at all challenge the decision to give it priority; not at all.

Mr. WHERRY. I expect to ask a question or two later, but would the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, in light of the need for strategic bombing, agree that if there had to be a choice, the first thing necessary would be to have mastery of the air and the ability to destroy Russia's war potential?

Mr. LODGE. I think we must have mastery of the air, but I do not wish to get into a discussion as to which of the three elements I have mentioned is the most important. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall say what I have to say about tactical aviation, which I think is very necessary at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it well that the Senator from Massachusetts is pointing out the major thesis he is presenting, in which I agree with him. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, I am of the present opinion that we do not have mastery of the air. But if that be true, would it not also be true that if we proceeded with major bombing operations in Manchuria at this time we would open ourselves to the serious danger of air attack which might do tremendous damage not only to our fleet in the Pacific, but to some of our industrial centers on the western coast?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, it is a vital question. It involves the ability to read the minds of the Soviets, which I am unable to do. I do not even know whether we have a sufficient force with which to carry out such an undertaking, or whether we have a large enough strategic Air Force to divide it into different parts. It is certainly a question which we must consider.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that at least before any decision is made to inaugurate the type of preventive war in which the bombing of Manchuria might involve us, we had better know whether we are in a position, so far as our Air Force is concerned, to defend our troops, our Navy, and our industrial centers of the West?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that is unquestionably one of the matters which ought to be gone into when the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services begin their hearings on Thursday. It is an absolutely vital consideration. I have outlined the three types of air power: defense, strategic, and tactical.

It has been clear for some time that while tactical air cannot defeat an enemy on the ground, no ground force can win against hostile tactical air superiority unless it is prepared to mass

tremendous weight of numbers and accept fantastic casualties. Our forces in Korea are massively outnumbered by the Chinese Reds. Yet so far, they have been able not only to hold, but inflict staggering casualties on the Chinese because of our great local air superiority. All this would change overnight, if the Soviet Union threw in its great weight of tactical air power, as the commanders of our forces in Korea have clearly warned.

The most encouraging aspect of the relative position of United States air power versus the Soviet is our ability to deliver an atomic air offensive. The best-qualified observers, and I believe most Senators agree, that the essential reason the Soviets have not dared to gamble on World War III rests with our ability to deliver an atomic attack on their homeland. Yet, I am informed that even our strategic air offensive is far from as formidable as it should be and that each day our relative superiority over the Soviets in this one element of strategic air power diminishes. I am advised that even the B–36, invaluable though it is, will not be an overwhelmingly strategic weapon long. Defense moves too rapidly on the heels of offensive capability to let any nation rest on a stopgap weapon. I understand that we should replace the B–36's as soon as possible with all-jet, high-speed bombers like the Boeing B–52, and the all-jet version of the B–36 and that at the present time insufficient funds are being provided to move quickly to this goal.

I address myself especially today to the question of our tactical air power. The Senate overwhelmingly voted—with my vote among a large majority—approval for sending four additional divisions overseas, provided always, of course, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff certify that sending these divisions is an essential step in strengthening the security of the United States and that the nations of Europe are making their own full and realistic effort. The whole idea of the North Atlantic Treaty is based on the assumption that the troops on the ground will have really adequate tactical air support. Anyone, therefore, who is interested in the welfare of these troops—as most of us are—must be equally interested in seeing to it that an adequate tactical air force is in existence to protect them.

In order to decide how large the tactical air force in Europe ought to be, we must first have an estimate of how big the Soviet tactical air force is. Published figures which are quite generally accepted estimate the Soviet tactical air force at 16,000 to 20,000 planes. Of this total some are needed in other parts of the world and it is probably not too wide of the mark to say that 9,000 Soviet tactical planes are available for attack on the west.

If we assume that the North Atlantic Treaty nations should have at least a 2-to-1 air supremacy to meet the Soviet mass armies, it follows, therefore, that the tactical air force of the North Atlantic Treaty powers should consist of 18,000 planes. This total should not include whatever British or French planes are used in air defense for the protection of places such as London and Paris against bomber attack.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator tell us the basis for his assumption of the ratio of 2 to 1? Is the ratio based upon any military study or information of which the Senator is aware? It strikes me that it is too low a figure, based upon information which we have received in the Committee on Armed Services, as to the power of ground superiority and the antiaircraft power which often goes along with ground superiority.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator that the ratio of 2 to 1 is very conservative. I should like to see it much larger than that. In my present statement I am trying not to be extravagant. I am trying to be very prudent and moderate in what I say. Even when we try to be prudent and moderate, we sometimes arrive at some very startling results.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that he is noted for his understatement. It is well that he engage in understatement. However, I believe it is important that some of us who share his point of view should raise a question now and then as to whether or not he is not understating a case too much. That is why I raised the question about the 2-to-1 ratio. I think it would be a mistake for the American people to assume that all we have to do is to provide an appropriation which would give us a 2-to-1 superiority over the Russian air force. In view of lack of bases from which our Air Force would have to operate, and in view of the kind of attack the Russians would make on Western Europe, I think we had better face the fact that we must increase it beyond a 2-to-1 ratio.

Mr. LODGE. I am not disagreeing with the distinguished Senator, particularly when the ratio is so tremendously against us as it is now. We do not even have a 2-to-1 superiority. In fact, we are laboring under a very substantial inferiority. We have hope of making all the headway we can in order to reach the 2-to-1 point. I believe the Senator will find that the great weight of military opinion is on his side that the ratio should be greater than 2 to 1.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know whether the Senator has covered some of the points I have in mind, but I should like to ask him whether he heard the remarks made by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] on April 26 relative to the need for a tactical air force, not only in the United States, but especially in Western Europe.

Mr. LODGE. I remember it in a general way. I could not quote from it in detail.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the statement was taken from a United Press report. It was to the effect that the delayed start in providing air support for the Atlantic Pact army had created a problem which had become so critical that it was to be placed on the agenda of the British, French, and American conferences to be held shortly. I wondered whether the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts could tell us anything about that. I do not want him to reveal any military information which we are not entitled to have, but I should like to ascertain whether it is true that we have very little tactical air power in Western Europe to protect the army we are about to build there.

Mr. LODGE. I do not believe we have sufficient tactical air power there. I intend to develop the point in my remarks, and give the actual figures as I have been able to get them.

If we assume that the United States would contribute 20 percent of the North Atlantic Treaty tactical air force, that would mean 3,600 planes, or 48 tactical air groups, leaving 13,400 planes to be flown and operated by the other North Atlantic Treaty nations. Bear in mind, of course, that the United States will in all probability supply a substantial number of the planes to be manned and operated by the North Atlantic countries, assuming, always, that these nations make their own full and realistic effort in the air as on the ground. If they do make their full effort, I am advised that a figure of 6,000 planes to be supplied to these countries by the United States is a reasonable estimate considering the state of the plane manufacturing industry in Europe. To the total of 3,600 planes manned by United States personnel must, therefore, be added another 6,000 planes for operational use by the North Atlantic countries, or a rough total of 10,000 planes.

This total does not include the extra planes which are required due to wartime attrition. Nor does it include whatever American tactical planes may be needed in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, I submit that the budget for the coming fiscal year should, therefore, contain figures which will provide 48 tactical air groups of 3,600 manned planes and another 6,000 planes for operation by the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty.

I realize that this is a tremendous figure. It must be at the least about three times as large as the tactical air force which I understand the administration plans to have. But the fact that we may soon have six of our own divisions in Europe leaves us no choice whatever. If we are to have six United States divisions in Europe by the beginning of 1952, then we must have an adequate amount of tactical aviation which can give them a real protective umbrella. To send troops overseas without adequate tactical aviation is just exactly the same as sending them into battle without rifles, tanks, or artillery.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for yielding once again. I appreciate his answers to the questions. I should like to ask a further question. It has come to my attention that the program

of building long-range bombers in this country has already slowed down in order to provide for more construction of tactical planes. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. LODGE. I did not know that. I am advised that there are not sufficient funds for developing the new long-range bombers, but the proposal which I am going to make is that we accelerate the strategic air development, and that we build up the tactical Air Force. I do not want to do one at the expense of the other.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the next question I intended to ask. As I understand the Senator from Massachusetts, in advocating air supremacy, is also in favor of the strategic long-range bombing force.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator would not for a moment detract from building up that arm of the service in order to build up some other branch of the Air Force, would he?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is correct. I am coming to that question in a moment. I am taking up the tactical Air Force first, because the tactical Air Force is the one which is most flagrantly under strength. We still have the advantage over the Russians in the strategic Air Force. While our advantage is gradually disappearing, we still have the advantage. We should profit by the superiority which we possess in strategic Air Force in order to build up in the lines in which we are weak.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator place in the RECORD, if he has it, a statement of the amount of money which would be necessary for the 48 groups which he has just asked for?

Mr. LODGE. I am coming to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator also have figures for a larger force—for 98 groups, 150 groups, and so forth?

Mr. LODGE. I have some figures. I have figures in terms of planes, and in terms of manpower. I have not as many figures in terms of dollars as the Senate will need before it finally makes a decision on this question. However, I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee can obtain the figures in terms of dollars to correspond with the figures which I am stating in terms of planes and men. The Senator from Nebraska is a member of the Appropriations Committee and is interested in this problem. I am sure he will obtain the figures.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the reason I brought up the question. If the Senator prefers, I will wait until he has concluded. I should like to ask not only with respect to the figures but also whether the Senator does not feel that the Appropriations Committee itself, with the advice and consent of other committees, and with all the evidence which can be obtained, should help to determine where the defense dollars should be spent. Is not that what the Senator is now suggesting to the Senator from Nebraska and his colleagues?

Mr. LODGE. I am suggesting to the Senator from Nebraska that the figures which I am submitting show that, on balance, the Soviets have the edge on us in the air. I am suggesting that the Congress should take steps so that we would have the edge on them in the air.

Mr. WHERRY. I commend the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. That must be done in three different departments, namely, strategic, tactical, and air defense. I have stated that the tactical air force needs are the most pressing because that is where we are the weakest.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the answer of the Senator. I am in complete sympathy with the statement which has been made about the determination of the appropriations, and the numbers of Air Force units which should be supplied. I am in complete sympathy with the idea of making such an evaluation for all branches of the military service. I suggest to the distinguished Senator, because he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, which is now sitting with the Armed Services Committee as a joint committee to listen to evidence relative to defense dollars in the Pacific and the recommendations which are to be made, that he acquaint himself with the resolution which was submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. I am not intimately familiar with it.

Mr. WHERRY. I refer to Senate Resolution 132. I should like to read paragraph (7), if the Senator will permit. It is only a few lines long.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to have the Senator read it. I do not want him to make a speech in my time, but I shall be glad to have him read that paragraph and base a question on it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have it in the Senator's remarks because I believe it is very pertinent to the case here, and also to the suggestions being made by the distinguished Senator.

Paragraph (7) is as follows:

(7) Effectiveness of air and sea power as major deterrents to war and decisive weapons for victory if world war comes; comparing the relative cost in manpower, financial, and other resources of maintaining mastery of the air and seas with that of a defense policy based upon ground forces as the decisive factor; and also comparing resources of a potential enemy for ground warfare and vulnerability of such potential enemy's war industrial potential to demolition by air power, as well as the importance of having mastery of the air for defense of United States industrial centers against destruction by such potential enemy.

That is a suggestion for the committee, to help enable it to advise the Congress. Does not the Senator feel that it is very pertinent in determining global defense policy?

Mr. LODGE. There is no doubt that the two committees will have to go into the whole question of air power, sea power, and land power. I hope that those two committees will not be drawn into a theoretical comparison, in absolute terms, as between the three, because if there is one thing that is clear about air power, sea power, and land power, it is that they must be considered specifically with relation to specific situations. There are situations which arise in which we can use only land power, and in which air power and sea power are not only much more expensive, but utterly impossible to use. It is like saying that one prefers meat to potatoes. They are two different things. So I do not think we ought to become involved in the joint committee with discussions of theoretical preferences as between the various services.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator feel that the committee should interest itself in practical solutions?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. With a limited amount of money and manpower, we cannot have superiority in everything. I submit to the Senator that it is necessary to emphasize those things which should come first.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. In that sense should not the Senate be guided by the wisdom——

Mr. LODGE. Let me answer one question before the Senator proceeds to the next. I stated at the beginning of my speech today—and I think I covered that point quite thoroughly—that the United States, strategically speaking, is essentially a sea and air power. I read from my statement:

By way of introduction, let me say that there appears to be almost unanimous agreement that the United States, strategically speaking, is essentially a sea and air power. This does not mean, of course, that we may not be required by circumstances to make an effort on land. But on land we will always need effective allies, whereas in the air and on the sea we can reasonably expect to have a preponderance of strength alone.

This is the point which may have escaped the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is a very good statement. In line with that—and I hope the Senator will be patient for a moment—I am going on the theory that our finances are limited and that the manpower which we have also is limited. Therefore it is very necessary that the Congress be guided by the wisdom and findings of the Armed Services Committee—in this particular case the joint committees. Let me show the Senator what I mean——

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator proceeds to the next point, the fact that our resources in manpower are limited—which indeed they are—argues very strongly for a foreign policy which will give us effective allies, not ineffective allies. I am glad that the Senator brought up the point that we have a shortage in manpower, because I think that must lead directly to the conclusion that we need as many allies as we can get in all theaters of the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I was attempting to make was this: Take, for example, the Air Force. I happen to have the latest figures which I could get as to what it would cost to build a 95-group air force; also a 48-group force, a 120-group force, and a 150-group force. I also have figures as to what it

would cost to maintain them after the first year, in which they are built and placed on the line.

I am not sure that I should release these figures. I suppose the distinguished Senator has already seen them. But I am satisfied that my question is a very pertinent one, because, in view of what it will cost, for example, to build 150 air groups, and that is 100 groups short of what General Spaatz recommended, as the Senator well knows, for obtaining the mastery of the air——

Mr. LODGE. I am going to cover all those questions.

Mr. WHERRY. We have to make a choice of defense dollars. I submit to the Senator that when the recommendations have come before the Appropriations Committee, as he well knows, they have been divided, one-third here, one-third there, and one-third there, and there has been the reasoning, there has been the evidence taken, there have been the decisions made by the committees of the Senate that have made a choice of these defense dollars, and where they shall be spent to accomplish the very thing the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is now recommending to the Senate. That is why I ask the question if the Senator does not feel that in our military development—we cannot be superior in everything—we do not have enough to go around. We have to make the right approach with the money we have, so that our position will be strong enough to be a deterrent, or to stop a war with Russia.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; we have to spend our money in the most effective possible way. That is why I am here today urging a larger air force. I will proceed with my prepared statement, which I think will answer a good many of the questions raised by the Senator from Nebraska. What I was going to say was that it is highly disquieting to hear that we are not building a big enough air force. I hope the appropriate committees will press for action and see to it that we get these 48 tactical air groups, so that our soldiers in Europe will have the protection to which they are entitled. That is the first point we ought to make.

Ever since the end of World War II we have been plagued by lack of foresight and tragic miscalculations. We lacked foresight when we demobilized our Armed Forces and scattered our supplies and equipment to the four winds. We miscalculated tragically at Yalta. We erred grievously in June 1949, I think, when we evacuated Korea and announced to the world that it was no longer essential to our defense. I believe we created the vacuum into which the Communists moved. There was bungling and lack of foresight in many things which led up to the dismissal of General MacArthur, a most distressing and unfortunate event which I believe intelligent leadership could have avoided.

Mr. President, in order to understand our present dangerous situation as regards air power, we should allow our minds to go way back—back, first, to 1945, when the present occupant of the White House took office. At that time we had a power for peace which was unequaled in history and for which we had suffered a million casualties. Today, after 6 years, we seem to have thrown away the power for peace for which these million were killed, wounded, and captured.

We should then go back to those days when there was so much talk about having a balanced force as between land, sea, and air forces—days when the newspapers talked about a so-called rate of exchange in the argument to determine the allocation of funds to land, sea, and air forces—a rate of exchange whereby a certain number of air groups equaled a certain number of divisions which in turn equaled a certain number of ships. This so-called balanced-force idea is the price we pay for not having achieved real unification of our military power.

Mr. President, these figures which I have submitted show that not only are we inferior in hordes of land manpower; we have not even got superiority in the technical arms. Insofar as tactical aviation is concerned, the Soviets actually have air supremacy, in Europe and in Asia, over most of the world's land mass. This must be added to their massive infantry, armor, and artillery. Moreover, I am told that our own domestic air defenses are so feeble as almost to invite attack and that the Soviets have far greater domestic air defenses than we have at the moment. We excel them only in the quality of our long-range bombers and in numbers of atomic bombs. On this single fact our security hangs by a delicate thread.

This condition is not the fault of the American people, in my judgment. Nor is it the fault of the Congress which has always been willing to appropriate more for national defense than has been requested of it. Mr. President, it is clearly the fault of inadequate Executive leadership.

What must we do to get air superiority?

The present over-all objective of 95 groups is not big enough to include the 48 tactical groups of which I speak, and in addition to give us enough strategic aviation and enough air defense for the continental United States. Yet I understand that there is actually a question as to whether the Air Force will get enough out of the presently planned $41,000,000,000 national defense total to furnish even the 95 groups which the Air Force has already been allowed in principle. I understand further that even if the Air Force gets the inadequate funds which it has been promised that it cannot get the whole thing in operating condition in less than a year and a half. That gives you some idea of the jam, which, as a nation, we are in.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his last statement. I think it is highly essential that those figures be known by the Members of the Senate. As I stated before, I feel the place they should come from is the Armed Services Committee; on its recommendation. Does the Senator know what it will cost to build a 150 air force group?

Mr. LODGE. I am coming to that in a moment, if the Senator from Nebraska will bear with me.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to bear with the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I am coming to that in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I know how the Senator feels about information being given publicly, but the appropriation bill has just been handed to me, and I have the estimates for the Air Force apparently for this year. They are not based on a 150 air group, but on a 75 air group. The figures are approximately what the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned in his remarks this afternoon. They are made public. I am for open hearings whenever they can be had, because I believe when the facts and the figures are placed on the table where the people can see them and understand them the Congress will have the backing of the people. I think the information should be made public wherever it can be made public. I was deeply moved when I learned of the vote taken by the two committees a while ago about having the hearings on the global defense policy, in which General MacArthur is to participate, to be closed hearings. But in this particular instance I think there ought to be shown the American people what General Spaatz has recommended, what the Air Force officials have recommended.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will bear with me I am coming to General Spaatz in a moment.

The point I am trying to convey to my able friend from Nebraska is that our objective is not big enough, our proposed rate of attainment is not fast enough, and unless we increase our objective and step up our rate of national achievement we court national disaster.

To be brutally frank—and we must not be anything less—the requirements of our own national security cannot be met with guns-and-butter appropriations. It takes money. I asked General Spaatz, who commanded our wartime air forces in Europe with such great success, in recent hearings on the proposal to send troops to Europe, how many combat air groups would be necessary to carry out our national commitment to help defend America in Western Europe in case of an attack by the Soviet Union. He said the number which we had in World War II, which is 240 groups. Surely General Spaatz qualifies as an authority, since we are talking about the theater of potential air combat which he commanded in history's greatest war so far. But it is my understanding that present officers of the Air Force now on active duty and intimately familiar with new and prospective types of equipment do not place the figure quite that high.

To gain air superiority over the Soviet Union—on which the hope of peace depends—we need therefore not the administration's 95 groups, but, according to reliable authorities, a minimum of 150. Some say that to be certain of our superiority and not leave our destiny to the

fortunes of battle, we should have 175 groups. Certainly 150 groups will get us started off the present dead center of disastrous military inadequacy.

There is no doubt that 150 air groups will cost money, roughly an average of $25,000,000,000 a year while we maintain them at top combat proficiency. But it is quite clear to all of us that survival comes high at a time when the entire free world is faced with the greatest threat of our times. Insofar as manpower is concerned, the figures are interesting. Because of fixed overhead that goes with any military organization, supply requirements and maintenance, as well as combat personnel, the manpower required for Truman's 95 groups is 1,061,000 officers and men. To go to 150 groups, we need add literally little more than the combat crews. We would have an adequate Air Force of 150 groups, so I am told, with 1,400,000 officers and men.

So the necessary increase in expenditures would be much greater, of course, than the increase in the number of men who would be required.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The figures I have received in regard to the cost of 150 air groups is approximately $34,600,000,000 for the first year, and thereafter the amount would decrease to $25,000,000,000 for maintenance, replacements, and so forth.

Before the Senator takes his seat, I hope he will answer the question I asked him first, because I am in favor of this defense measure, and I think we should have it. I should like very much to have the Senator from Massachusetts express his views on the choice which confronts us in regard to the spending of our dollars, and whether he believes that the Armed Services Committee must hold hearings and take evidence on this question and must suggest to us what our global policy should be, so that we can make a proper decision as to the amount of money we shall spend for defense purposes, and in what ways it shall be spent, and the amount of manpower required in backing up the expenditures we make.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a fair question, and I intend to discuss it.

Mr. WHERRY. Furthermore, does not the Senator from Massachusetts believe that the joint hearings which are about to be had by the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations should be open hearings, so that the people of the United States can know the facts about the policy we have in Korea and the facts bearing on the question of what policy we should have in the future?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, when I conclude speaking on this topic, I shall be glad to take up some of the other topics.

Nothing on earth is quite so fatal on so large a scale as insufficient military power to defend yourself. It is cheaper to be strong and avoid war than to pinch pennies and then be engulfed in disaster.

There are many other things which are important in connection with national defense, but at the moment air power is the point of the spear. Senators will not quarrel with my statement that I have never been an extremist about air power. For one thing, I am a strong believer in the vital necessity of land power; that belief comes from prolonged and intimate experience in the Army. In fact, I have constantly demanded a bigger army, and I still fear that the present objective of 18 divisions and 18 regimental combat teams is too small.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield at this point for a question, or does he prefer that I wait until he concludes his remarks?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am glad to yield at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My question is this: The military services have established the figure of 3,500,000 men as representing a balanced force to be divided between the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. If the Senator's suggestion that we have 150 air groups in our Air Force is adopted, does he believe the men required for that increase in the Air Force can be obtained from the total of 3,500,000 men by cutting down on the manpower allotments to the Army and the Navy, and by allotting more men to the Air Force; or does the Senator believe that his suggestion, if adopted, would require an increase in the total size of the Armed Forces; and, if so, approximately how much of an increase?

In this connection I call attention to the fact that although both my colleague and I voted in the negative on the question of establishing a ceiling of 4,000,000 men for the Armed Forces, yet a majority of the Senate voted in favor of establishing that ceiling.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, I voted against the ceiling.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that the increased number of men required by my proposal, which would be approximately 400,000, would certainly be added to the present total of the Armed Forces.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So there would be an additional 400,000 men for the Air Force, to be added to the present total of 3,500,000; and in that way the size of the ground forces would be left at what it is at the present time. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am also advocating an increase in the Army. However, the 400,000 men would be in addition to those we otherwise have authorized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that I have no intention of reopening the debate on the ceiling for the Armed Forces, but I think I should correct an erroneous impression which I believe has been left in the RECORD. The ceiling voted by the Senate on the manpower to be available for the Armed Forces was voted on the basis of the balanced program the administration had set forth for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Those of us who urged that Congress impose a manpower ceiling also urged that when there was an increase in the need for men in all the Armed Forces the military should request an increase in the ceiling. The vote the Senate took on the present ceiling does not mean that we insist on keeping it at 4,000,000. We simply stand for keeping the ceiling at 4,000,000 until the military show that they need more than that. Certainly, I would go along in favoring an increase in the ceiling of 3,450,000, which the military submitted to us, if we provide for 150 air groups.

So the question is not the ceiling, but whether the military should come to us to get permission to increase or raise the ceiling. That is the position we took.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to have that statement on the part of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts is aware of the fact that in the budget which came to us today—probably it came after the Senator from Massachusetts began his presentation—it appears that the Army is to get $20,800,000,000 the Navy, $15,100,000,000; the Air Force, $19,800,000,000; the Office of the Secretary of Defense, $500,000,000; and for proposed legislation relative to the military, in the field of public works, $4,500,000,000—making a total of $60,700,000,000. Does the Senator know what would be added to those figures if we increased the Air Force beyond 95 air groups? In the next year would be in a position, based on our income from productive sources, to expend more money than the amount required for the 95 air groups?

Mr. LODGE. I think we could in the next year; yes. I do not think there is much that can be done in that respect this year, but I think we can make progress in this respect in the next year.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Massachusetts means in 1952, does he?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, is it the position of the Senator from Massachusetts, that if we desire to create a larger Air Force and to have more air groups, we could and we should increase the proposed expenditures of $19,800,000,000 for the Air Force?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and by doing so I think we would get results in from 1½ to 2 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know how we could do that by means of increasing the expenditures for the Air Force and increasing the number of men available to the Air Force?

Mr. LODGE. I understand that for the fiscal year ending in 1952, we could very substantially increase the strength of our Air Force by increasing the appropriations. But we cannot expect to do very much in that respect during the remainder of the present fiscal year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, for the present fiscal year will end in 2 months.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am one of those who voted for the manpower ceiling on the Armed Forces. I voted for it because I thought the Air Force, rather than the

Army, should be increased in size, although as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am perfectly willing to listen to the recommendations of the Armed Services Committee, in order to make sure that we obtain adequate national defense.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator this question: When we must make a choice in the spending of the dollars available for defense purposes—and, of course, the figures which have just been read by the Senator from Michigan give us some idea of what the budget will be if we add to the expenditures needed for military purposes the expenditures proposed for nonmilitary purposes—does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that before we make commitments for the land forces, we should have our Air Force built up to a size at least sufficient to give protection not only at home but abroad, even if for that purpose we have to include the tactical Air Force the Senator from Massachusetts is requesting?

Mr. LODGE. No; the Senator from Nebraska constantly returns to the theme that we cannot do all, and therefore we should do only one. I constantly disagree with him. I think we can do all we need to do for our security if we give up the guns-and-butter approach. Of course, if we insist on a guns-and-butter approach and insist on continuing all the normal activities and all the normal, business-as-usual program, something will have to crack. Certainly this issue is a most fundamental one. It raises the question of whether our objective is sufficiently large and whether we are going to reach it fast enough. Ever since Korea, I have been saying on this floor that we are not getting ready fast enough. I constantly asked the question, "What are we waiting for?" I still am asking that question.

I said we should not have any more politics as usual and business as usual, and in my judgment when we have an army in Korea, as we have had ever since last June, and they are engaged in a life and death struggle, the men constituting that army are entitled to have us make the maximum use of the time that they are buying for us. They are like the boy who put his finger in the dike and prevented the whole countryside from being flooded. They are like General MacArthur's men at Bataan in 1942, who fought that desperate rearguard action—for what? To buy us time, so we could get ready. In 1942 we used the time, and we did get ready. What I am saying today is that we are not using the time, and we are not getting ready fast enough so that we can regain the initiative, so that the arrow of political and diplomatic and military pressure is pointing from us to them, instead of from them to us all the time. That is what I am trying to say to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WHERRY. What I am trying to say to the Senator from Massachusetts is that the old bread-and-gun approach which he is talking about has been the political approach, giving one-third to one service, one-third to another, and one-third to another.

I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for about 9 years. The question comes to us each and every year of providing appropriations and dividing them this, that, and the other way. My feeling is that there has not been the determination which is being suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts this afternoon, that all we do is go along with the recommendations of the unified command, which contemplate so much for the Army, so much for the Navy, and so much for the Air Force. They have agreed, and that is the way the money has been divided, approximately one-third for each. I ask the Senator whether, in order to bring about the preparedness for which he contends—and today he is emphasizing the need of air power—does he not feel that more consideration should be given to the distribution of the defense dollar, that first things be built first, and that the Congress help determine the global policy, and the way in which the money is to be distributed, since it is appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. LODGE. Regarding the importance of the determination of the policy relative to distribution of the defense dollar, I should like to say that the Senator is correct. He is also correct when he infers—he did not quite say it, but he inferred it, and I believe he believes it—that the lack of unification which we have among our armed services compels a great deal of compromise and horse trading, so that none of the services get hurt in their prestige, whereas, if we had real unification, the money would go much more scientifically where it ought to go in the light of military realities. I think those things are true. But I am trying to deal with the system as it is.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Minnesota was on his feet, and I yield first to him, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to commend the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a most able and constructive member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the Senate. I know the Senator is giving us what he considers to be his best judgment, and his considered thought, and I have been impressed with it. In view of the limitation of our military strength, insofar as air power is concerned, and surely, other aspects of it, and particularly in view of the limitation of our strength in tactical air power, which means the air power that covers troop movements and troop deployment, I should like to ask the Senator how he feels we would be able to give effective logistic support to a landing of, let us say, from 300,000 to 600,000, or whatever figure some persons may choose, of the Nationalist troops upon the mainland of China, if we are so short of tactical air power, which I think has already been proved?

Mr. LODGE. That is one of the questions to which I hope we may get an answer at the hearings which are to begin on the 3d day of May. I do not have the answer to it. I hope we shall get it then.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator feels, though, the importance of tactical air power for any amphibious operation, does he not?

Mr. LODGE. I am not pretending to be an expert, I may say to the Senator from Minnesota. I think there is a wide variety of land operations, depending upon the coast, and the strength with which the coast is held, and it is very hard to make a hard and fast theoretical rule as to what is needed and what is not needed, in landing operations. Certainly in some places a great deal more tactical aviation is needed then in others. The question which the Senator asks is a very important one, and I think it is one for which the answer should be obtained at the hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The reason the Senator from Minnesota asked the question is that there has been so much military master minding on the floor of the Senate as to how we can get the complete and total victory which we would like to have in the Asiatic area, and I have been so deeply impressed by the very constructive and pointed remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts as to our weakness in tactical air power, although in the area of strategic air power we do have some strength. I wondered how we can put these two things together, namely, extend the operations of the present war, with such a limitation upon our tactical air power as there is, and at the same time hope to attain a victory.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, whenever it is said that we ought to start an all-out aggressive war against someone, the question to ask is, "With what?" The fact of the matter is that our preparedness has been neglected for so long that we are not now in a position to undertake an all-out, generalized, aggressive war against anyone, in my opinion. I do not know in detail what we have to have in order to regain the initiative and in order to achieve victory, and to organize the peace, but I do know that we are not going to do it without making a major effort in America, and it is my hope that if we do make such a major effort we may be able to avoid a great deal of bloodshed. But I do not think we are ever going to regain the initiative and organize the peace on a guns-and-butter procedure, and that is what we have all—except for those actually in the service—been engaged in for some time now.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question the answer to which I am sure will bring out what I have in mind; what the cost would be for a 150-group Air Force.

Mr. LODGE. It is estimated that it would cost $25,000,000,000 to maintain it, after it is set up.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much it would increase the present budget?

Mr. LODGE. No; I would hesitate to answer that.

Mr. WHERRY. It would increase it $15,000,000,000 more than has been estimated, according to the figures presented by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. What I want to ask the Senator is whether he would be in favor of adding $15,000,000,000 to the present budget estimates, or does he feel that there should be transfers made so as to accomplish the desired result regarding the Air Force, rather than to increase by so large a sum the estimates which have been submitted.

Mr. LODGE. Ideally speaking, I should like to eliminate all the waste in the Federal Government. I should like to eliminate the waste in the military, and I should like to eliminate the waste in all the nonmilitary activities. As one Senator, I have tried to make my contribution to that end, in sponsoring the bill which established the Hoover Commission. I believe there is a great deal of waste, much of it in the Military Establishment we can eliminate, and that we ought to eliminate it. But I do not want to postpone the salvation and the security of the United States until we have a chance to pick through the various items of appropriation and eliminate all the waste. I am for getting some results quickly, even if they do cost a little more than they ought to cost. We must work with the people we have, and we cannot simply be too theoretical about it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not mean to suggest that the Senator from Massachusetts has not answered my question, but the answer does not cover the point I had in mind. I am for building up the Air Force, but does the Senator feel that we should appropriate an additional $15,000,000,000 for a 150-group Air Force, or should the money be transferred from the amount to some other branch of the military service, in order to get the desired results?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

I do not think it should be made at the expense of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. That is where it has been transferred, if it is to be transferred at all.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, I do not want to do that. I have been in favor of 30 divisions right along, but we are not getting anything like that number.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a budget of $75,000,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. It is pretty tough, I know, and I think it will be a good deal tougher as we go along. If we are to be on an in-and-out basis for 5 or 10 years, I think that might ruin America.

Mr. WHERRY. I was simply asking for information.

Mr. LODGE. It is not information; it is an opinion. I believe, with the United States being the kind of a country it is and the American people being the kind of energetic and intense people they are, the sooner we turn the crank and wind this thing up and get it over with, the better. Of course, that means that in 1951, 1952, and 1953, expenses will be much greater. I do not know what is going to happen to this country if we have to engage in this kind of a brawl all the time for the next 10 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what the total budget, the nonmilitary and the military, will be for the next 10 years?

Mr. LODGE. I could not tell the Senator out of my head.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding of the thesis which the Senator from Massachusetts is defending this afternoon that he is telling the American people the time has come, with the world situation so serious, so far as the future security of this country is concerned, when they must resolve to pay whatever price is necessary for total defense to keep our security from the totalitarian threat?

Mr. LODGE. That is the substance, yes. It is made much more pointed and much more bitter by the fact that our troops are in combat. They have been in combat ever since last July. When we have our own flesh and blood in combat, we certainly owe it to them and to ourselves, but especially to them, to leave no stone unturned to regain the initiative so that we can have peace.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to associate myself with the general philosophy of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. I recall that when the budget came to the Congress for the next fiscal year, many of the Members of the Senate were asked by some of our friends of the press what we thought about the budget, so far as military preparation was concerned. I recall that my answer was that we should have a minimum of 5,000,000 men in the Armed Forces and a minimum budget for military preparedness of $80,000,000,000. I want to say a word and then I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. When he talks about mobilizing this country, he realizes that mobilization is more than simply military. There has been a report released which indicates that the present program of military defense has been cut and limited, because of inflation, to the tune of $3,000,000,000 of additional cost. In other words, we are appropriating a certain amount of money for the Air Force, but the price of materials has gone up so drastically that instead of getting a balanced schedule on the basis of dollar appropriations, we are getting fewer materials for the money appropriated. So I make the suggestion that mobilization means more than military mobilization; it means the cracking down which needs to be done by Government and which the Congress did not do when it refused to control speculation on the commodity exchange, and when we permitted scandalous profiteering at the expense of American security.

I simply ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he does not agree with me that the kind of mobilization we need is more than merely military? Do we not need discipline within our own ranks which will permit economic as well as military mobilization?

Mr. LODGE. I certainly agree. I think it means that not only should Congress do its duty, but that we should have courageous and intelligent leadership in the executive branch, which, I regret to say, has not been as evident as I wish it could have been. I have seen studies made by very reputable economists and students of the problem which indicated that we could have a 6,000,000-man mobilization, without a chaotic upheaval in America. If we do that, we must have a control of inflation which is on an entirely different basis from what it is now. The Senator from Minnesota thinks it is the fault of Congress. I am inclined to think that Congress did its duty pretty well, and that we are not having everything we should have in the way of courageous and intelligent administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say that the Senator from Minnesota is not partisan in this matter. I think it is a question of national security.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the administration has been derelict in its anti-inflation program. I have said so publicly and shall continue to say so until the administration and the Congress buckle down to the business of mobilizing at home. The fact of the matter is that both branches of government have been acting on the business-as-usual basis, with just a little extra on the side.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe we can do that. I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his courageous approach, and I join with him, not on the basis of partianship, but as an American. We cannot have this half-hearted effort in military and economic mobilization and have any semblance of security.

Mr. LODGE. That is true. The whole United States is on a terrible spot. We have never before been in a similar situation in our history. We have always been either at war or at peace. We are not at peace today; we are in a state of alert. We are in a limited war in Korea, which has been an extremely dreadful thing, and we find ourselves as a people, all 150,000,000 of us, in the same

boat, confronting a challenge the exact nature and outline of which have not been made clear to us.

I am not criticizing anyone for that. All I am saying is that we shall not get out of this vale of tears through which we are traveling at the moment unless we make a real major effort. We can make a major effort, I think, and still avoid expanding the war into a big one, but we shall not accomplish anything if we drag along in a sort of condition of perpetual military inadequacy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator recalls a recent statement of one of the great men of our time, General Bradley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in which he said he had observed that some 6 or 7 months ago Congress could not get going fast enough, but that recently he had observed a letdown, which, of course, is not the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts. But I think the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff made a very fair observation. In other words, I believe the Congress of the United States, yes, and the administration, are continually pounding into the American people the idea that the limited war in Korea is a matter of buying time. We should be making the most of our time. We are off on some grandiose scheme of where we can win a major operation in some other part of the world, when we should set our house in order before we start to move into other people's property.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is correct. I am not one who take a mild view of the situation. There is an old saying that Congress either goes crazy or goes fishing. That reflects not only on Congress but on human nature.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is time to go fishing.

Mr. AIKEN. The season opens tomorrow in my State.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Vermont advises me that the season opens tomorrow in his State.

In January and February we were told, "Everything is more or less all right." Actually, the situation was just exactly as bad as it was last July, when we were all terribly excited. The only difference was that we had gotten accustomed to it. The situation had not changed; we had changed.

One of the objects I had in mind in making this speech was to try to persuade my colleagues that the situation is still as dangerous as it ever was, if not a little more so, and that we should not be complacent about it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. My question is not by way of criticism of anyone, but is it not true that the Congress has done everything that the Defense Department asked it to do and everything which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think we have passed manpower legislation yet.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not true that we did a little more than they asked? As a matter of fact, they placed the figure at 3,000,000 men, and later they said they wanted three and a half million men, and the Senate voted them 4,000,000 men? Is not that true?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know whether it is correct. I was against any limitation, because we can always control it through our power to appropriate funds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and my colleague. I believe in almost every instance my colleague has voted for a reduction of nondefense expenditures, as they have come before the Senate this year. Is it not the opinion of my colleague that when the Senator from Minnesota talks about economic mobilization and inflation, one of the primary ways of resisting greater inflation is to cut down nondefense Government expenditures, with respect to which there has been very little will on the part of the administration. Is that not a fair statement?

Mr. LODGE. I believe it is a very fair statement indeed. It is utterly unassailable.

Mr. President, I was referring to the fact that I did not believe the increase in air power which I propose should be made at the expense of either the Army or the Navy. I am still in favor of increasing the Army. I am not only in favor of increasing the United States Army, but I supported sending the United States Army overseas, provided always, of course, that our military authorities thought that sending them overseas was an essential step in strengthening the security of the United States. Indeed, it is as a friend of the Army that I urge this increase in tactical aviation and I cannot imagine a professional Army officer who would not agree that it was utterly vital to get command of the air over the Army before the Army could have a chance to function efficiently.

My support of aviation also goes back quite a few years—in fact to my return to the Senate in 1947 when I offered an amendment on the floor of the Senate to provide funds for a 70-group Air Force. The amendment, which was debated all afternoon was defeated. How I now wish that my amendment had prevailed. How immeasurably greater would be our security today if we had ended the summer of 1948 with 70 air groups. What false economy it was to defeat that proposal. Yet at that time some Senators said, in all good faith, that it was a colossal expenditure. I do not see how we can doubt that if we had had 70 air groups at the end of that year we would have held the initiative and would have had the majesty and ascendancy in world diplomacy which might easily have prevented some of the disastrous events from taking place which actually did happen.

Mr. President, we must place this matter of an adequate tactical Air Force second to none in importance. General MacArthur's statement that we are in a global struggle sets it in its proper significance. We must not bungle again on another life-and-death matter. I hope there will be prompt assurance from the administration and the appropriate committees that we will have air power which is able to do the job.

As I said before, our men in Korea are like the boy in the story who put his finger in the dyke and prevented the whole countryside from being flooded. By their courage they are buying us precious time, as General MacArthur's men at Bataan bought us precious time in 1942. We owe it to our men in Korea to use that time, to use it to get ready quickly, to use it to regain the initiative speedily which our lack of leadership threw away in 1945, to use it promptly to establish peace in Korea. If we neglect to build air superiority promptly we break faith with our men in Korea and with our own people.

If there are no questions, I yield the floor.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the moment, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] is not in the Chamber. He has requested that I ask unanimous consent to have the Senate, as in executive session, confirm the nominations of approximately 1,400 graduates of the Naval Academy at Annapolis and graduates of college ROTC courses, so that they may receive their commissions in June. Therefore, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report those nominations, as well as sundry nominations in the Army and in the United States Air Force, and request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Chair.

ECONOMIC SACRIFICES DEMANDED TO FURTHER THE DEFENSE PROGRAM—OPEN VERSUS SECRET HEARINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the pending bill, but before doing so, I wish to make a few brief comments on the able speech delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Once again he has performed a great service on the floor of the Senate by calling the attention of the American people to a matter of great moment, which deeply concerns them. It is very important, Mr. President, in these dark hours that Members of Congress make very clear to the American people that the situation is exceedingly serious so far as the security of our country is concerned, and that the time has come when the American people ought to stop talking so much about sacrificing in

other directions and should start to sacrifice on the economic front. I do not know why politicians are so hesitant about telling the American people what their duty is, for that is a part of the job we have in Congress.

I am very much concerned, as I face the various representations which are made to my office these days, about the fact that it appears to be true that millions of our citizens apparently feel that they can have lots of butter at the sacrifice of guns. The time has come when the American people will have to throw a vast amount of wealth into defense, and do it quickly. Moreover, they will have to pay for it now. They cannot justify leaving a legacy to posterity in the form of a tremendous national debt, economic debility, and inflation. The American people ought to be told that, in order to preserve their freedom, they must snap out of it now, and pay as they have never paid before. I do not know why politicians do not tell them that, if they are to remain a free people, they must proceed with the kind of paying which is going to mean a considerable lowering of the standard of living.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very much impressed with what the Senator from Oregon is saying about the problem. I am wondering what the Senator from Oregon feels, as a member of one of the two committees which are most concerned with giving information to the American public, as to the difficulties with which the public will be faced in forming any sound conclusions in view of the fact that the hearings which are about to be held will be closed hearings.

Mr. MORSE. I had intended to address myself to that subject later in my remarks, but I am perfectly willing to take it up now. In fact, it was one of the points I was leading up to. If the Senator will permit me, I will finish the main point which I was discussing because I use that point as an introduction to my remarks as to the kind of hearings we ought to have on the whole defense program. If the Senator will permit me to finish my major point, I shall reach that question very shortly.

Mr. President, I think we must make it very clear to the American people that they should assume the same attitude of national sacrifice which characterized them on the fateful day of December 7, 1941, when we were shocked into a realization that the safety and security of the Nation were threatened then by the challenge of world fascism. Today they are threatened by the challenge of world communism.

I have made this very clear in my State. The people of Oregon understand my views on this question, and I desire to say from this desk to the people of America today what I have said to the people of my State. We not only must tighten our belts in order to make the economic sacrifices necessary to place this country in a position of security, in support of which the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] pleaded so eloquently on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, but I think we must undertake an all-out, full-scale economic and military mobilization for as long a time as may be necessary, in order to make clear to Russia that we intend to make it inadvisable for her to pursue an aggressive course of action, which I think she is clearly threatening on an ever-widening scale in the world today.

That means that all groups—American farmers, American labor, American businessmen; yes, American consumers generally—must come to attention on this question and make it clear to Members of Congress that they are ready to make the economic sacrifices which are necessary.

There was talk on the floor of the Senate this afternoon as to whether or not we can afford a defense budget of $75,000,000,000, $80,000,000,000, $85,000,000,000, or $90,000,000,000. Mr. President, we cannot afford a defense budget of less than that amount. I believe that within the next 24 months the defense budget will have to be more than that amount in order to provide the defense which is necessary. No one will ever convince me that once the American people have a full understanding of the facts in regard to the defense of their country, they are not going to join those of us who are trying to take positive steps to control the unconscionable greed and selfishness which have come to characterize some economic groups in respect to the defense program.

I served on the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I was shocked at the open defiance which we encountered in connection with some of the business establishments dealing with vital war materials. They are making profits the like of which they have never before made in their history, and yet they want more. I am not going to hold my patience much longer, under the ruling of any committee in regard to keeping things secret. If this continues, the time will come when my obligations as a Member of the Senate will make it necessary, in my opinion, for me to serve notice that I shall not be bound to keep secret information dealing with the practices of some groups who, in my opinion, are guilty of unpatriotic commercialism in connection with the defense program. These are days when we are all in the same boat; and we can all sink together if as a people we do not develop quickly the unity which is necessary to meet the necessities of defense.

Mr. President, unfortunately I did not return to the city until after the meeting this morning. I have not been briefed as yet as to what happened in the joint meeting of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, except to be advised that in the beginning the hearings are to be behind closed doors. It may be that the first meeting or two should be in executive session, though I should like to hear the arguments even on that point. Insofar as the investigation as a whole is concerned, my position is pretty well known among my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. I have taken the position that the general policy should be one of holding open hearings, and having executive sessions only when either a witness, the Defense Department, or the chairman of the committee decides that a particular item for discussion is of such a secret nature that in the interest of the people as a whole it should be discussed in executive session.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCMAHON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Am I to assume from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon that he means that if he had been present this morning and voting he would have voted for the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] for open public hearings? I know that the Senator from Oregon was unavoidably detained.

Mr. MORSE. I would have voted for a motion for open public hearings. I do not know the wording of the particular motion to which the Senator refers, but the Senator from New Hampshire will recall that the other afternoon I met with him and other Members of the minority party on the Armed Services Committee. At that meeting I announced that I felt that there ought to be open hearings, save and except in connection with questions or subject matters with respect to which either the Armed Services Committee, the witness, or the chairman of the committee should decide that the nature of the issue affected the national security and that therefore the hearings ought to be held in executive session.

We then discussed the possibility of some such procedure as this: Instead of taking the time which would be required to clear the room in order to receive the answer to a question which might be considered so secretive in its implications as to call for an executive session, we could simply lay such questions aside until later in the day. Then, we could clear the room once and take up the questions which had been laid aside.

Mr. BRIDGES. In essence, I may say to the Senator that that was the Hickenlooper motion. The Hickenlooper motion was that we proceed with open hearings; and then, when a matter which affected the security of the country became involved, either in the judgment of the witness or in the judgment of the committee, the discussion of that question would be postponed until an executive session of the committee, when the question could be discussed without endangering the national security.

Mr. MORSE. I would add one suggestion to the point I mentioned the other day as the Senator will recall. In my opinion, there ought to be present a representative of the Military Establishment to advise the committee as to whether or not a particular question might involve the security of the Nation so that when action was taken it would be taken on the basis of the advice of the military. For example, if the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "This particular question goes to a matter of such military importance that we do not want it

answered in public because we do not desire to acquaint the Soviet Union with the answer," I would take it for granted—and I do not know of a member of the committee who would not follow such a suggestion—that we would be guided by such advice in the questions asked.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I feel, as I think the great majority of the minority who were present this morning felt very strongly, that there should be open hearings. I should like to see this matter approached not from a partisan viewpoint at all. I think that cloaking it behind the iron curtain in the committee, cloaking it in secret sessions, in view of the situation that has developed, is perhaps one of the worst things we could do at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is a great mistake. Of course, the Senator from New Hampshire knows that this is not the first time the Senator from Oregon has pleaded for open hearings on the floor of the Senate. Since I have been in the Senate I know of no time when the issue has been before the Senate that I have not always supported open hearings. Sometimes I have encountered a little difficulty because of my plea for open hearings; but I happen to be one who believes that in a democracy it is the duty of the tribunals conducting the people's business by way of investigating any matter of concern to them to hold open hearings.

One of the great safeguards of a democracy is the American system of public trial. That is one of our great freedoms. A person cannot be haled into a star-chamber proceeding and given a secret trial. In the old Colonial days prior to the Revolution the people of the Colonies were confronted with star-chamber proceedings. To that they objected vigorously, and the Declaration of Independence mentions that as one of the reasons for declaring independence.

I have been disturbed since I have been in the Senate by the tendency toward secret hearings on the part of the committees of the Senate. I have never voted for one of them. I remember a year and a half or so ago I made quite a fight for an open hearing in the case of a certain investigation. I think time proved me right in that case, and I believe time will prove us right in this case, for we ought to have open hearings on questions which affect the public so vitally as do those to be considered by the two committees sitting jointly.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Oregon, not having been present at the meeting this morning, may not know the procedure that was agreed to by the majority of the committee. I should like to have the Senator know that it was the view of the majority that all testimony which did not involve a secret vital to the Nation and which might not be of immediate advantage to our enemies, should be released as rapidly as it could be transcribed and turned over to the press. However, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that unless we are careful about these things our enemies will obtain very valuable military secrets.

For example, a short time ago I heard a Senator on the floor of the Senate drop a bit of secret information, which when I heard it I realized was classified as "top secret." That Senator unwittingly happened to make a disclosure on the floor of the Senate a short time ago, and I know that at the time I considered it to be a bad mistake. Such matters do slip out during the course of public hearings, even before a person has time to realize that he is disclosing secret information. We had better be careful how we conduct our hearings.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I fully appreciate the concern expressed by the Senator from Louisiana. There is a risk involved. But democracy will be stronger and kept in a healthier condition if we take our chances with such risks and demonstrate to the world that in this country we proceed in open hearings, placing the responsibility on each individual Senator to be very careful about the kind of question he asks in a hearing, and if it may involve a military secret, securing clearance of the question if he is in doubt about it. With a chairman so able as the one who will preside over the meetings of the committee the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is as able a chairman as there is in the Senate I think we will not run much of a risk of disclosing any secret information if we start out in the good old American tradition of open public hearings in conducting the people's business.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make one more comment. In the second place, I am afraid in this case, as in the past, the hearings will be closed in name only, and not in fact. There is not another Senator on this floor who does not become just as irritated as I do by the kind of pressure that is put on us by telephone calls early in the morning or late at night. "Were you in such and such a committee meeting? What happened?" "Well, I am sorry; it was in executive session." But, Mr. President, you and I know that in some way, somehow newspapermen put a lot of the pieces of the puzzle together, and before we know it they have something that somewhat resembles what happened in the committee meeting. They will say, "Senator X did not reply to this question," or "He says 'I will not confirm or deny.' Senator Y says: 'Maybe that happened, but I will not say whether or not it did.'" The newspapermen are exceedingly intelligent. They do not have to be told very much to know a great deal about what happened. That is their business. They follow the committees. They follow the Senators and Representatives. Sometimes it seems to me they can almost read what happened, by muscle tension.

So I say to the Senator from Louisiana, I do not think we are going to have much secrecy by holding executive sessions. I would rather have matters come out at the moment as they really are rather than to have a lot of dope stories printed first, then further enlargements upon them, and then corrections.

I do not know why this story cannot be told in an open hearing to begin with.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In illustration of what the junior Senator from Louisiana had in mind, I refer to the release of the recent correspondence involving the arming of South Korean troops. The junior Senator from Louisiana was alarmed sometime ago to see that the correspondence which was released was complete, in that it told exactly how many rifles, how many machine guns the United States had which could be made available to arm an additional force of South Koreans, or even Chinese Nationalists. It seems to me the least that could have been done when that document was released was to delete the number of the various weapons.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know about the incident. Was the matter presented here on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. LONG. It was released by the Defense Department or by the White House, one or the other. But it seems to me that we should be careful not to give out statistics as to the number of weapons available, and so forth, which may be of value to the enemy.

Mr. MORSE. That is something which does not have anything to do with the question of open hearings. Each member of the committee will be under a very solemn obligation to see to it that he conducts himself in such a way that no secret information will be released.

Mr. LONG. The point the junior Senator from Louisiana has in mind is that in case of a witness testifying about a situation, in connection with which a question might be raised as to the number of guns we have and the number of bombs, and so on, it might be well before such information is given out, or before a release on the subject is given out, that someone in authority pass judgment as to what should or should not be given out, so that military secrets will not be given to the enemy.

Mr. MORSE. Under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Georgia, I am not at all worried about having come out, in the course of open hearing by the two committees, sitting jointly, any information which should not be divulged. The Senator from Georgia will be such an able guardian of the security of our country in that respect that we will not have a worry about any information which has not been carefully scrutinized becoming public during the course of the hearings. However, from

the standpoint of public opinion, which is requisite for the unity of the people of the country, the American people, in my judgment, should have removed from their minds any doubt that they are going to get all the facts about an issue which has simply rocked the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said the other evening in a speech I made at Milwaukee on the general problem involved in the MacArthur issue, namely, that I think for too long this administration, on the claim that it has involved security matters, has kept from the American people a great deal of information which should have been made available to the American people. It seems to me that the thinking of the public would be much clearer if the information had been made available. There is a rising tide of demand on the part of the people that not so much information be kept from them. They feel that they are too much in the dark about what is going on. It seems to me that the average citizen recognizes that he should not be told about matters whose publication would endanger the security of the United States, but, week by week, he is discovering that many things which were kept from him some months ago would have been perfectly safe for him to have, and that he would have understood the situation much better if the information had been made available to him.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I have been greatly disturbed regarding the manner in which the forthcoming hearings should be held. I wish the Senator to know that there seems to be considerable sentiment in the committee—I do not say it is shared by a majority of the committee, but certainly I share it—that the committee can try the system the Senator from Georgia has devised, namely, the giving out of the testimony twice a day, after the necessary precautions have been taken to prevent the disclosure of top-secret information. There seems to be considerable sentiment in the committee that that system can be tried until we can see how it works.

I should like to have the Senator know that that is a tentative approach which some of us have made in an effort to accomplish the dissemination of all the information which we can afford to give out and still protect the top-secret material.

I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has left the Chamber, because, he as well as the Senator from Oregon, will be interested to know that a quite different viewpoint has been expressed today as to what is necessary. I refer to a statement made by the chairman of the Republican policy committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who this morning addressed the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. With the indulgence of the Senator from Oregon, I should like to read a brief item about his statement which has been taken from the news ticker:

WASHINGTON.—Senator TAFT today urged a half-million-man cut in the projected American military forces and a $20,000,000,000 reduction in the mobilization budget, but called for "a more aggressive war in Asia." The present fighting, he said, is "a stalemate war," which the American public, in his opinion, will not tolerate indefinitely. Taft asserted that "a soft war policy" carries danger of ending in "an appeasement peace." Taft asserted his belief that the proposed 3,500,000 strength of the American Armed Forces is "too high" for the economy to support indefinitely.

Mr. President, I simply wished to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to that statement by the influential Senator from Ohio regarding the kind of situation we are in and the remedy he has for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Connecticut will not be at all surprised if I dissociate myself from those observations by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McMAHON. Knowing the Senator from Oregon as I do, I would not be at all surprised at that, but would think it highly unusual if the Senator from Oregon did not do so.

Mr. MORSE. I do so dissociate myself.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me say that the Senate has had two or three experiences, within the last decade, in dealing with what seems to me to be the problem the Senator from Oregon is discussing.

One of them was the very extensive experience of the so-called Truman committee, presided over by the one who now is the President of the United States. That committee conducted a series of investigations while we were in the death throes of the war; and those of us who were members of the committee repeatedly held open, public hearings dealing with all phases of our production program and going into almost all of its details. We found it entirely expedient, when there arose any matters such as those the Senator from Oregon has referred to—material which could be regarded as "classified"—to set aside that procedure. The then presiding genius of that committee, Senator Truman, now President Truman, handled the situation in cooperation with the committee and the counsel, but at the same time gave out the fullest possible information to the American people, information covering 90 percent of all matters dealt with by the committee, which revealed the derelictions of those in authority, which were repeatedly and mercilessly exposed by him, even though they reached into the very purlieus of the White House.

In the second place, we had the Pearl Harbor investigation, presided over by the one who now is Vice President of the United States and the President of the Senate. On both those committees I served; and in the latter case I saw the then Senator BARKLEY, now Vice President BARKLEY, repeatedly handle the difficult and delicate probing into of the activities incident to Pearl Harbor and the diplomatic and military problems associated with Pearl Harbor. He did so with the same finesse, thereby excluding the 5 or 10 percent of the information which should have been kept secret, but at the same time giving to the people generally the 90 percent as it came.

We have had another—and even more recent—illustration of the situation to which the Senator from Oregon has been referring. That occurred a year or more ago when he militantly attacked the executive hearings held by a rather popular and attractive committee which was concerned with the investigation of certain charges. The committee held executive sessions on those matters. The catastrophic results of that policy, so far as it affected some of those who were immediately concerned with it, are still reverberating throughout the Nation. It seems that if they had heeded the warning of the Senator from Oregon a year ago and had taken to heart the results of the experience of the Truman committee and the Pearl Harbor committee which was headed by the present Vice President, Mr. BARKLEY, they would have avoided the difficulties which arose in connection with that committee hearing, and which had the Nation virtually convulsed.

Now we are told that at the hearings which are about to begin, the joint committees will give out the information several hours after it is presented at the hearings. The members of the press, the fourth estate, who are as responsible as are we—and, as a matter of fact, more responsible to the people as regards giving them the news—are particularly concerned. They are told that they will be handed at 2:30 in the afternoon a transcript of what is said at the morning sessions, and that they will be handed at 8:30 in the evening a transcript of what is said at the afternoon sessions of the joint committee hearings. Whether the press can accommodate themselves to that schedule is a serious question. It is doubtful whether that schedule will be very satisfactory. Certainly full and prompt press coverage of the appearance of a group of witnesses before their peers will be a valuable contribution to the maintenance of the Anglo-Saxon system and the attainment of a satisfactory solution in connection with these matters.

The Senator has referred to star-chamber proceedings. Of course, we are not attempting to challenge the intelligence or the integrity of those who are operating in that situation, or their patriotic desire to supply information to the people. However, under modern means of disseminating information, the proposed course presents almost insuperable obstacles to any satisfactory handling of the situation—and I know that is realized by all of us who have witnessed such operations.

It is gratifying that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] himself has indicated some doubt about the proposed procedure and has said that he feels that it is to be tentative.

It is very much to be hoped—and I gather that the Senator from Oregon

concurs and agrees—that further consideration will be given to this matter, so that there may be a fair presentation by the ladies and gentlemen of the press as to why the proposed procedure is not practicable or desirable—with the result that a change will occur, so that although the 5 or 10 percent of the material presented at the hearings which may be said to be top-secret material will be kept secret with the committee and with the executive departments concerned, yet, as the Senator has indicated, meanwhile the customary course will be permitted in the case of the great bulk of the information which will come out in regard to the myriad of matters about which there should be no concealment.

Mr. MORSE. I am always pleased when I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Maine, and on this particular matter we are in complete agreement, and he has expressed my point of view more eloquently than I could express it. I should like to add the additional comment that the cold print of a transcript never tells the whole story, either. After all, one of the reasons for a public hearing or a public trial, in order to make certain that it is going to be a fair trial, is not only that the observation of the public has a check upon the tribunal and upon the witnesses who testified before the tribunal, but it has a great effect on the witnesses, too, in the kind of story they tell, sometimes, when they know they are testifying in the full light of the public, completely observed by the public.

I have seen enough witnesses, under varying circumstances, to cause me to say that the testimony of a witness upon which I shall most reply is the testimony of a witness given in public—not what he may give in an executive session. That is a part of the whole American tradition of a public trial and a public hearing. I understand that even if I had been present it would not have affected the total vote very much this morning, but I am sorry I could not be there to add my vote in support of the public hearing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Oregon to say that he understands this arrangement is but tentative?

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator from Connecticut to say that.

Mr. WHERRY. But does the Senator from Oregon understand that to be so?

Mr. MORSE. That is what is to be tried out.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope it is tentative. I did not know whether the Senator from Oregon had been informed that it is tentative.

Mr. MORSE. I have not had a chance to talk to anyone. I have just returned to the Capitol.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought perhaps the Senator had.

I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator this question: Referring to the adoption of the resolution to determine our defense policy in the Congress—and we have already determined to send four divisions to Europe—does not the Senator feel that in view of the fact that the Senate adopted that resolution, the American people now are more interested than ever before in knowing the facts which surround the entire global defense policy?

Mr. MORSE. I think they are not only more interested, but they are more entitled to know. That is the important thing. They are entitled to know.

Mr. WHERRY. That was my second question.

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion the situation is so serious that we cannot get the kind of response for which I pleaded early in my remarks this afternoon, and the support for the sacrifices which are going to be necessary on the part of the American people, unless they have every fact it is possible to give them.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not the job of Congress to proceed on the road it has already taken, and to place all the facts on the table so that Members of the Congress and all the American people may have the facts before them and may be able to understand them and to give the backing which is needed on the part of the American people to the policy which is finally determined upon?

Mr. MORSE. That is my opinion.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I completely agree with his viewpoint on the subject of open hearings. I had hoped that the approach would be to have the hearings open, except when it is necessary to close them, rather than to have the meeting closed and then try to make some of them open.

I fully agree that the transcripts, after they have been handed to the press, will be susceptible of interpretation, and that witnesses might react differently in answering questions in a public hearing, from the way they would react in closed hearings. I think it is a mistake to hold secret hearings. I hope the Senator from Oregon and all other Senators interested, regardless of the side of the aisle upon which they sit, will see whether it is possible to change the tentative plan in order that open hearings may be had whenever possible. I am satisfied the American people are going to determine the facts as a result of the hearings, and that if the hearings could be open the people would be well satisfied.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that in reporting the hearings there can be no substitute for an opportunity to observe the witnesses. When the interpreters of the hearings, particularly the reporters, write their stories and tell them to the American people, they will have been deprived of something I think they need for accurate reporting, namely, their own opportunity to observe for themselves and to read the testimony in the light of what they see, as well as in the light of what they hear.

Mr. President I have one other little matter upon which I wish to comment for a moment or two before I undertake a very brief prepared speech which I have on the farm-labor bill now pending before the Senate. In view of the mail which I have been receiving recently it occurs to me that I should express myself as a member of the Armed Services Committee. In doing so I am expressing only my personal opinion, but I feel I should state my views with respect to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley. The American people should be told by some one who has had an opportunity to observe General Bradley in a good many committee hearings, both in public and in the executive sessions of our committee, that at least, so far as I am concerned, they have every right to have complete confidence in the great general who is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Speaking only for myself, but on the basis of many opportunities to observe him and test him and check him, I say there is no military officer in this country with stars on his shoulders in whom I have greater confidence than I have in Omar N. Bradley. He is an exceedingly able military man. He is a completely honest witness before our committees, and, in my opinion, it would be constitutionally impossible for Omar N. Bradley ever to express a thought which did not represent his honest judgment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I will yield. Any reflection on Omar N. Bradley by anyone, leaving the impression, as many people seem to have the impression, from the mail which I have been receiving, that he is a military and political figurehead simply cannot be squared with the facts. In this critical hour, in the absence of facts, it is a disservice to shake the confidence of the American people in their Joint Chiefs of Staff, when upon the work of that great body of military men depend the security and the lives of millions of American citizens.

Mr. President, as we go into the hearings which are about to be convened, I desire to be one at least who raises his voice in expressing confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have checked into the speech which General Bradley made in Chicago the other night, and I find that the major views expressed in that speech were already a matter of written record, contained in a magazine article which General Bradley had previously written and published.

I also have in mind the speech General Bradley made in North Carolina some weeks ago in which he forewarned the American people as to the great dangers which confront us. Someone should point out, Mr. President, that the job of the Joint Chiefs of Staff involves the defense of America not only in one segment of the world, but on a global basis, and it also involves a coordinating of the military policy of the Nation with our foreign policy. If they are not coordinated, we shall find ourselves in such a position that our security will be greatly weakened by inconsistencies and irreconcilables which develop in connection with our policies.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Oregon that I have the utmost confidence in General Bradley's integrity of statement regarding military questions and regarding matters which he believes come within the military purview. I have seen no reason to doubt any statement of his at any time, either before a committee or in private conversation.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I completely agree with his observation, and I am glad to have him thus bear out the major thesis of this part of the speech which I am making.

I wish to add, Mr. President, that I know of no group of military men not members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in whom I have any such confidence as that which I have in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am perfectly satisfied, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have never failed to give to the Armed Services Committee full information in answer to questions directed to them, and that their testimony has been completely and wholly reliable.

This afternoon the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] commented on the state of America's air defense, and I think he did well to point out that there is serious question that we have superiority in the air, with the possible exception of strategic bombing, and that we need to move at a terrifically fast rate in order to place the air defenses of the Nation in a position strong enough so that if an all-out war should break out we could protect not only our troops, but the great sources of our industrial war production.

I desire to say, Mr. President, as one whose record shows he has disagreed with the administration in respect to a great many of its policies in Asia, that I started disagreeing with the administration on the floor of the Senate on July 28, 1945, in a major speech regarding the then Korean situation. Following through, step by step, I was in disagreement not only on the evacuation of Korea, but, before that, on the very partition of Korea itself. I was in disagreement with the administration because we did not build our strength in Korea much greater than we did, and I was in fundamental disagreement in January 1950, with the announced policy as to what our front line of defense would be in the Pacific.

There was a long-standing disagreement with the administration with reference to neutralizing the forces of the Nationalist Chinese Government. I have not been one who has held any brief for the leaders of the Nationalist Chinese Government, but, rather, I have been one who has felt that they, more than anyone else, are responsible for the loss of China to the Communists, because they did not put into effect the economic reforms which I think it was their duty to put into effect while, at the same time, they were getting economic aid from the United States.

In spite of those disagreements with the administration on Asiatic policy, Mr. President, I have also been one who has been very much opposed, and still am, to our starting an all-out major engagement on the mainland of China until we are ready to back up any such offense as that. I await the hearings which are about to start for proof that I am wrong.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to ask the Senator if he voted for the 70-group air force several years ago?

Mr. MORSE. I did.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the Senator object to my making an observation?

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection, if no other Senator objects, and if I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I join with the Senator in his statement with respect to General Bradley. I had great confidence in him throughout the last war.

I was impressed by the article in this morning's newspaper regarding the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the 120-group air force. The Senator from Oregon was a member of the committee, and we both supported the 70-group air force. I intend to support any bill coming before the Senate which will give us even greater air power.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we do not know exactly how strong our air power is in comparison with that of other nations.

I was one who regretted the dreadful mistakes made in the demobilization program of 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, during which the fleet was placed in mothballs, where, largely, it still remains. Air bases were closed down; the manufacture of airplanes was stopped until a small loan was made to Glenn Martin to enable him to continue his operations. The Army was demobilized. That is one of the main reasons why we find ourselves in the position in which we are today. As I look back upon those days when I was a member of the Military Affairs Committee, later the Armed Services Committee, and when I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I admire and respect the Senators who tried their best to do their duty when Secretary of Defense Johnson wanted, as I saw it, to carry the curtailment even further.

Mr. President, I congratulate and commend the Senator from Oregon, because I know he did all he could on the Senate floor to keep America strong. I understand, from what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] has said, a speech was made today that we must reduce the size of the military. Very frankly, I think the great weakness of our international policy is the weakness of our armed services, which I hope we shall build up stronger and stronger as the days go by.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina, and I pay him no idle compliment when I say that when he was a member of the Armed Services Committee he was a constant fighter for a stronger defense program for the United States. It was a matter of regret to me that we sometimes did not find ourselves in the majority in support of the program for which the Senator from South Carolina consistently fought.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With reference to the discussion earlier in the day by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and other Senators relative to the air power of the country, the Senator from Oregon, I am sure, has not overlooked the fact that the President of the United States appointed a very able commission to study the question of air power. It was headed by Mr. Finletter, who subsequently became Secretary of the Air Force. The group recommended to the Nation and to Congress that the very minimum which the Nation should have for its security was 70 air groups. I am sure the Senator will recall that during the same year a joint aviation committee was appointed, consisting of representatives of both Houses of Congress. The committee came to the same conclusion, namely, that 70 air groups should be the absolute minimum for the security of this Nation. Yet, the fact of the matter is that the President of the United States, supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, finally determined that we should not have 70 air groups, but 45 air groups.

When the House of Representatives increased the number to 55 groups, the matter came before the Senate. The Senator will recall that during the debate on the appropriation bill I offered an amendment which would have raised the number from 45 groups to the higher figure, so that we could at least get what the House had agreed on. I believe the Senator from Oregon voted for the amendment. A number of Senators now present did so.

In all frankness and fairness, I must say to the Senators who voted against the amendment that between the time the House of Representatives acted on the appropriation bill and the matter came before the conference committee, a group of Senators had gone to the White House, where they were told by the President of the United States that if the number was increased he would freeze the amount so that it would not go above 45 groups. I think the RECORD ought to be absolutely clear that, despite the very able report of the Finletter Commission and the report of the combined congressional committee, the President of the United States, long after the Berlin blockade and long after the threat against Greece and Turkey, determined on his own initiative and on that of his Joint Chiefs of Staff to freeze the air power of this country at 45 groups, and that they did not change their position until the aggression in Korea had occurred.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from California has made this statement for the RECORD. There is no doubt about the fact that the executive branch of the Government has made serious mistakes in the whole defense program. The one he has mentioned is a good example.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield so that we may proceed to the consideration of executive business?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very happy to yield, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES RECEIVED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Richard T. Rives, of Alabama, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Leon McCord, retired.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Marx Leva, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the first nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The legislative clerk will state the second nomination on the Executive Calendar.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—W. STUART SYMINGTON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Stuart Symington to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, very often I have been charged with unduly criticizing the administration about its appointments in the executive departments. I should like to say on the floor of the United States Senate that I think the appointment of W. Stuart Symington is a good one. I am not saying that I agree with everything that is being done in connection with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; but I do wish to say that, as appointments come and go, I hope that those who so freely criticize me as being against many appointments will at least give me credit for forcefully saying what I think.

I am in favor of the nomination of Mr. Symington, and I hope it will be confirmed by the Senate. If we could have more appointments like that of Mr. Symington we would make progress. If there were at the head of the Department of State one who could fill that position as ably as Mr. Symington functions in his office, perhaps we would have more unity in the United States of America. I am in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Symington's nomination.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and on my own behalf, I am happy that the Senator from Nebraska feels as he does about the distinguished gentleman from Missouri who will head the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for as long as it may exist.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to hear the praise that has been given Mr. Stuart Symington's nomination. The President of the United States is being complimented for nominating a man as thoroughly qualified as Mr. Symington, and it is a pleasure to hear such comments, particularly from the other side of the aisle. I personally agree that Mr. Symington is one of the ablest men in or out of government, and the people of the United States are fortunate that he has been prevailed upon to give of his great talents and ability in the public service. I am glad that Mr. Symington is to continue in the service of his country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to supplement my remarks relative to Mr. Symington. I have voted to confirm him every time he has been nominated for office by the administration. I wish to emphasize the fact that I am for him because I think he is a good administrator and has ability, and for no other reason. When I stated that I did not agree with everything that had been done with respect to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I am sure all Senators knew what I meant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is entitled to the floor.

REMOVAL OF GENERAL MacARTHUR—OPEN OR CLOSED HEARINGS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as I was not permitted to make a brief statement while the Senate was in executive session, may I ask the Senator from Oregon if he will be generous enough to yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am certainly glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had hoped, in view of the remarks of other Senators, to have a few words to say this afternoon on the question of open or closed hearings of the committee which is investigating the facts and circumstances surrounding the removal of General MacArthur from his several commands in the Far East. I have a record of the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services, at which the hearings referred to were ordered and arranged. I believe they clearly demonstrate that no partisanship at all was involved in the decisions made. When I, as chairman, was insistent that General MacArthur be given an opportunity to address Congress as well as be heard before the committee, the committee was unanimous in its views that the hearings be conducted in closed session. No other thought was expressed or indicated by any member of the committee at that time. All correspondence with General MacArthur looking to his appearance was carried on in the belief and on the theory that the hearings would be held in executive session.

I do not desire to interrupt the remarks of the Senator from Oregon at this time, if he desires to continue. I shall be glad to defer my statement until tomorrow. I have an appointment for 5 o'clock, but I should like to proceed for approximately 10 minutes, if the Senator would be so generous as to yield to me that much time——

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent, without his losing the floor, to yield to the Senator from Georgia to speak for 10 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I undertook to approach this matter without the slightest idea or tinge of partisanship. The consultations which I had with respect to calling the committee together were had with Republican members of the committee. I did not consult with the White House or with any representative of the administration. I did not confer with General MacArthur or with any of his representatives. I knew that an event had transpired which would stir the emotions of the American people. I believed that the Committee on Armed Services had a very definite responsibility to look into and to make a full inquiry as to the facts and circumstances which surrounded and caused the event. The committee was called together and we discussed the subject. I had no one to protect in the hearings; nor did I have the slightest desire to smear anyone.

When the committee met I stated my views very briefly. I saw to it that every member of the committee present had an opportunity to express himself before I would permit the committee to vote on any motion which was made at that

hearing. Senators who have spoken today about the terrible injustice which has been done the people of the country because of the hearings which are being commenced in executive session had an opportunity to be heard then, with all their eloquence.

As a matter of fact, the first suggestion that the hearings should be held in executive session came from a Republican member of the committee. I shall not call his name. However, the transcript of the hearing bears out the statement that the first member of the committee who suggested that the hearings should be in executive session was a very distinguished leader in the Republican Party. Other members discussed it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Until the last sentence which the Senator spoke I was rather confident that he was referring to me; but I was not quite sure after the last sentence. However, inasmuch as my name was used and inasmuch as I think the Senator was referring to me, I will say very frankly that when we held that hearing I did believe that we should have executive sessions. That was the first day, as I remember it, after the news came out, and before General MacArthur spoke before the Congress.

After the general spoke before the Congress, and when it was perfectly obvious that tremendous interest was aroused, and there was great emotional interest among the people of the country, I, very frankly, changed my mind. I believe that we should have public hearings. I say that very frankly, because I have the utmost respect for the chairman, and I know that he tries to be loyal in carrying out the committee's desire.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for relieving me of any embarrassment in connection with the mention of his name.

This meeting occurred on the 13th of April. I have forgotten the exact date of General MacArthur's address to the Congress. I think it was the 17th, but I am not positive as to that. Today is the 30th day of April. Though I had stated in the press that at the direction of the committee this would be an executive hearing of General MacArthur unless he expressed a desire for it to be held in open session, today, when the two committees met and the vote was had upon this question, that was the first time I knew that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] had changed his opinion.

I was in the position of the leader of a group of men going forth into battle. We had met and agreed upon the plans of the campaign. We advanced toward our objective—the hearings—in accordance with the plans which were formulated. When the firing started I found that my associates, who had advanced so bravely with me, and who had suggested the plans for the contest, had not only deserted the colors, but were arrayed on the side of the enemy. That is why I was so startled today by what transpired in the meeting of the two committees.

Mr. President, here is the record. The distinguished Senator from Massachuetts having made his statement, I can point out that, as appears on page 3, he was the first one who mentioned anything about an executive hearing. He said:

> I sincerely hope that this committee will take the lead, through its chairman, for whom we all have the greatest respect, in doing his utmost to have General MacArthur and the other people whom you have mentioned—

The "you," referring to me—

> come before this committee, either in open session or closed session—personally I would prefer a closed session in the first instance, anyway, until we know where we are heading—to work out what we believe is a proper course for us in Congress to pursue.

Among others who were suggested as witnesses were the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others having knowledge of pertinent facts.

Mr. President, I do not desire to read all the record of the hearing. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who today is so determined that the hearings should all be in open session, stated, when he was asked the specific question whether they should be in open session or executive session:

> I am troubled about that question, Senator BYRD. I think the general's wishes should prevail. If the general wants an executive session because he feels the things he is to discuss would involve the security of the Nation, we should follow his wishes. If, on the other hand, the general said he would like to have part of it in executive session and part of it in public, we ought to follow that.

That was the view expressed by the Senator from Oregon. No Senator made any issue about the hearings being in closed session. Member after Member stressed the fact that the hearings would involve the top secrets of the Nation, secret war plans, secrets relating to lives of the men who are now in Korea, secrets which may mean the difference between life and death to American boys who are even now engaged in mortal combat in Korea. It was stated that such questions would be affected by the documents which would constitute a part of the hearings, and that it would be absolutely necessary, if the committee were determined to get the facts, and not merely to have a hippodrome or circus, that the hearings be in executive session.

I have always believed that the objective of any honest legislative inquiry is to discover the truth. Every Member who has had any considerable experience in dealing with restricted documents knows that the discovery of the truth is greatly complicated, if not completely defeated, by having a part of the hearings in open session and a part in closed session, some of them before the television cameras, with men under tension and likely to ask some question which is predicated or based upon one of the secret documents.

That was the tenor of the statements which were made at the meeting when it was agreed that the hearings should be held in executive session.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I prefer to complete my statement. However, I yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask one question. Does not the Senator feel that we can get the truth in open hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. We cannot get it in the continuity in which we should get it unless we wish to disregard the lives and safety of American soldiers and the future welfare of this Nation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not taking issue with the Senator with regard to any secret information. No one has a corner on that. I am asking about the statement which the Senator made. Does not the Senator feel that we can get the truth in open hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not without endangering the national security.

Mr. WHERRY. I am referring to matters which are not vital to the national security.

Mr. RUSSELL. By having about three hearings—first a hearing in open session, when we shall not have proceeded very far until a question is raised which involves the national security. Someone will say, "That question will have to go over. We cannot discuss that here." Then we go into executive session and hear from the witnesses in executive session. Then we must come back into open session and go over all the testimony again in the light of what was disclosed by the secret documents.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Ordinarily I do not object to yielding, but I should like to complete my statement. I yield one more time.

Mr. WHERRY. I have such high regard for the Senator that I do not want to interfere with his statement. Certainly if any witness who is testifying is asked a question involving national security he will know when the national security is at issue and can very judiciously ask the privilege of not answering such a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will tell me the names of all the witnesses who will appear before the hearing is concluded, I will express an opinion on his statement.

Mr. WHERRY. When we bring before the committee such a man as General MacArthur and dozens of other military men who know what the national security is, I hope that those men—including the Secretary of State—will be smart enough and capable enough not to answer in open session the questions involving the national security.

However, with respect to certain broad questions of national defense policy, and the distribution of the national defense dollar, I believe that the American people will get the truth as they would like

to have it, when the facts are on the table. I believe that in his heart our distinguished chairman knows that open hearings, conducted as he can conduct them, ably as any other Member of this body could conduct them, would result in disclosing the facts, and enable us to get the truth. The truth will enable us to unite the people more quickly than would be the case if we tried to interpret the cold record of a transcript, as we are trying to do here today.

Mr. RUSSELL. So the Senator from Nebraska differs with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. He wants to put the hearings on television and on the radio.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know anything about what the Senator from Ohio wants. I am speaking as the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is entitled to his opinion. I understood that the Republicans had had a policy meeting——

Mr. WHERRY. The Republicans have had no conference on this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said a policy meeting.

Mr. WHERRY. There has been no policy meeting on this question at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Ohio stated that the Republican policy committee had taken the position that the hearings should be open.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator from Ohio called a policy meeting to act on that question, I was not aware of it. He might have done so. I was not at any such meeting. Had one been held, the Senator from Nebraska would have been there. I have been at no meeting called by the Republicans on policy matters such as the distinguished Senator is talking about. In fact, every Republican I have talked to, and every Republican who has spoken today on this floor has completely disassociated himself from any partisan politics in the matter of open hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I suppose they disassociated themselves from partisan politics when they took the position that the hearings ought to be closed until after General MacArthur appeared before the Congress and set the country on fire about this issue, and then they immediately took the position that we ought to have several more doses of it going out all over the country. That changed their minds.

Mr. WHERRY. I think more such doses as General MacArthur gave the American people would be welcomed by them, and the only way they can be given will be in open hearings, and not in closed hearings, after which what is said it will be translated or misinterpreted or garbled so the American people will not understand it.

There is no Senator more fair than is the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to be fair, and I like to be treated fairly.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will be treated fairly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to be treated fairly. I will say that General MacArthur is amply able to speak for Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska is a very able debater, but it will be many a day before he will be able to tie the shoestrings of Douglas MacArthur when it comes to speaking for Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I gave General MacArthur his option of appearing in open or closed hearing. I told him that we had planned to have the hearing in executive meeting, just exactly as the committee voted, unless he expressed a desire to the contrary. And now the Senator from Nebraska says that the general does not know exactly what he ought to do. The Senator says we ought to have open hearings even if the general had not requested open hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have had no consultation with General MacArthur. I do not know what his wishes are. When the Senator from Georgia spoke to me I thought he said the committee would finally make that determination. In fact I am quite sure the Senator said that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure I did not make any such statement at all.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did not privately?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I misunderstood the Senator. I thought the Senator said MacArthur had not responded, and that the Senator would let the committee decide.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I made no such statement, because when I went out of the committee——

Mr. WHERRY. No, I mean to the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I made no such statement.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator says he did not, then I must say I misunderstood him. I am not talking about a meeting. I am talking about a consultation I had with the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I understood him to say that he had submitted the matter to General MacArthur, that he had not heard from him, and that if he did not hear from him he would let the committee decide whether it wanted open or closed hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I made no such statement. This is what I said to General MacArthur. I had a few communications with General MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator had more than I had.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have had none.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I wired him five times, in addition to talking to him about this hearing when he was here. I had a brief moment with him to discuss it with him then. And every telegram I sent to him that mentioned the type of hearing that was to be had mentioned "in executive session." When he finally accepted I wired him to this effect:

In accordance with your suggestion we have fixed hearing for Thursday, May 3, at 10 o'clock. Unless you express desire to the contrary, hearing will be in executive session.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator from Georgia now says that he had no such conversation with me, then I want to say that I misunderstood the Senator. I will accept his word at 100 cents on the dollar.

With respect to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I wish to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1951, what he said on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] had the floor, and at the request of the Senator from Ohio yielded to him. Then the Senator from Ohio stated:

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it was stated yesterday that I advocated television and radio reports of hearings on the MacArthur matter. I advocated nothing of the kind. I advocated public hearings. My personal opinion is that if I were conducting the hearings I would not permit radio and television coverage. No such suggestion was made by the Republican policy committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite confident the Senator from Ohio—I will not say with certainty because men are easily mistaken about what transpires in a hurried conference off the floor of the Senate—but if I mistake not he told me himself that the policy committee had taken that position. But I do know that several representatives of the press came to my office saying they had just had an interview with the Senator from Ohio following a Republican policy committee meeting, and that the members of the committee had taken the position that the hearings should be open. I know that transpired. There cannot be any question about it, because I was in my own office and seated there, where I could not possibly have been mistaken about that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I will not labor the matter any more. I have just read what the Senator from Ohio stated on the floor of the Senate. Of course, the Senator from Georgia has a right to his own personal opinion. I have no knowledge of any action taken by the policy committee on this matter. It is not a partisan question. The way to get at the truth is to have open hearings where the story can be told. I am not advocating any open hearings on matters involving the security of the United States. But, in view of the fact that these issues have been raised, and in view of the fact that the people of the United States now know the recommendations of General MacArthur, I believe it is of interest, and of importance in order to secure the unity of the people, to let General MacArthur testify in open hearings—that portion at least of the testimony which I think would be of interest in the national defense of the country. When it comes to matters of national security, the Senator from Georgia very well knows that the hearings can be held in such a fashion that there will be no violation of any classified information relating to the national security.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that is true. But my experience has led me to know that there are a great many leaks that come out of executive hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the reason I want open hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. But there is a great deal of difference between a leak coming out of the executive session where an unidentified Senator X has made a statement—the press saying he would not permit the use of his name—and to hear the same statement come forward from the lips of General of the Armies MacArthur, or from the Secretary of Defense, or from the Secretary of State. When statements come forth from the lips of these responsible officials in our Government, then they are the basis of action by our enemies, actual and potential. If it were a question of newspaper reports, magazines, radio, and periodicals, in all the statements given out by them, some of them apparently very damaging, they would confuse our enemies to death, because they are very conflicting. But when you have the words falling directly from the lips of the high official, then you are serving notice upon the enemies of the United States. We are not too much concerned when we read an article from Pravda, when an unidentified source makes some statement, but if Joe Stalin goes on the radio and proclaims some policy in Russia, it certainly has a very profound influence upon the policies of this Government and this people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The whole purpose of the hearing is to get at the truth, and to give it to the American people, so they will have confidence in the policies to be enunciated as a result of the hearings and as a result of the discussion.

The Senator speaks about the words of General MacArthur or the Secretary of State or General Marshall. Certainly it is not the intention of anyone, I am confident, to force any witnesses to make, in public, statements which are going to help our enemies. Certainly none of us want that. Certainly none of us who want public hearings would hope these those gentlemen would be put in such a position that they could not at least say "I believe my answer to that would affect public security, and I will not answer that question." Does not the Senator agree that at our meetings no one who advocated public hearings advocated going so far as to force anyone of our public officials to make statements detrimental to the security in public?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would that the light had appeared to the distinguished Senator on the occasion of the meeting of the committee on April 13 when we arranged these hearings, and when he was advocating executive sessions in order to protect the security of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not desire to deny the American people one fact that would cast any light upon this controversy. It is a tragic controversy in its consequences. I am not undertaking to protect the President of the United States, nor General MacArthur. Despite differences in the past, I have no desire to smear the President of the United States. It is far from me to have any intent to smear the General of the Armies, Douglas MacArthur. I want to follow the road that will bring out the facts without injury to this Nation. But I do not believe it can be done—at least, not at the outset of the hearings—when we are dealing with the first matters, which are so vital, by having open hearings.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, speaking in behalf of the minority members of the committee, has requested me to secure certain documents which would be used as a basis for questioning at the hearings. Among them is a copy of the war plans relative to Korea, approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff prior to the outbreak of hostilities on June 25, 1950. I have requested that document from the Department of Defense; but if there is any secret document in this land of ours, it is the war plans; and of course all our war and defense plans are interrelated. Senators must realize what the situation in respect to such disclosures would be, particularly if the hearings were covered by means of both radio and television.

Another of the documents which has been requested is the plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to the policy regarding Formosa in the period from June 1949 to June 1950, together with correspondence and memoranda between the Department of Defense and the Department of State dealing with the subject of Formosa during the same period of time. I have requested that document, Mr. President. However, can it be used in open hearings as the basis for the questioning of witnesses without grave danger to our country?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] ever suggested that those documents be commented on or be made the subject of question in open or public hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the Senator has pointed out, there is not a member of the committee, on either the Democratic side or the Republican side, who does not recognize that, obviously, matters dealing with the national security, matters dealing with security problems, matters dealing with current military operations, cannot be discussed in open committee sessions.

However, I realize that that is not the issue.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I realize that is not the issue, because since that hearing was had, things have occurred to change the minds of many men. If we wish to get the truth, we cannot do so at a public hearing without disclosing the contents of these secret documents.

Yet the Senator from Maine says the contemplated procedure at the hearings would be a star-chamber session, contrary to the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice. He says that would be the result of holding the hearings in closed session.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference between trying a man who is charged with a crime and parading all the Nation's vital secrets before all the eyes of the earth and all the ears of our enemies.

Also included in the documents requested was a Joint Chiefs of Staff document dated on or about January 12, 1951, relative to steps to be taken in regard to the Korean conflict in the event of certain eventualities.

Mr. President, could anything be more vital to the safety of our Nation than preserving the secrecy of a plan of that nature?

Also requested is the exact date, subsequent to January 1, 1948, on which the far-eastern headquarters requested additional troops, and the number of troops requested in each case; also, the dates of the replies from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, showing the number of troops, if any, supplied in conformity with such requests.

In other words, that information would be exposed to all the world, if that document were used in an open hearing, or even if it were used inadvertently in an open hearing after it had been heard or discussed in executive session; and the cost of such disclosure is almost sure to be the lives of thousands of our boys who now are a long way from home, fighting under the American flag.

Mr. President, I have not prepared a statement to present at this time. I was somewhat interested in the remarks that the cold, written record could not convey what would take place at the hearings. I could not reconcile that statement with the position of the Senator from Ohio, who on occasion is considered the leader, or at least one of the leaders, on the other side of the aisle, because if we hold the hearings in public, unless we rent the baseball park, we shall have the hearings in the Senate caucus room, in the Senate Office Building. In that case, what will the American people generally get except the cold, written record? As everyone knows, in that case the only persons who would be able to obtain admittance to that room would be perhaps the wives of Senators or the best friends of Senators. After representatives of the press had been accommodated there, not more than 200 persons could possibly be admitted to that room. The result would be that the American people as a whole would still have to rely on the cold, written record, unless television or radio were used.

Mr. President, I have wished to have the hearing proceed in a thorough, complete, and dignified manner, in an effort to obtain the facts. However, if we are going to have open hearings, I disagree with the Senator from Ohio. In that case we ought not play favorites by simply letting 200 people attend the hearings. If we are going to run the risk of exposing to our enemies the most vital secrets this Nation has, let it be done before the television and before the radio, and not just depend on the

two representatives of Pravda who would attend those hearings to carry the secrets to the Kremlin. Let the news go out generally, because those who oppose our Nation would get the secret information just as completely from the two press representatives who would attend the hearings as they would from the radio and the television, but in the meantime the American people would be denied an opportunity to see the show.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to detain the Senator unduly, inasmuch as he has said he is in a hurry to leave.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is quite all right; I am glad to yield, for I have had to abandon any thought of being able to complete this discussion within a few minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well; I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me.

Would not the Senator from Georgia agree that it would be a great help in getting at the true state of facts, which all of us want to get at, and in working out the decisions from those facts, and would not much of our problem be eliminated, if the President or high officials of the present administration were to request General MacArthur to come into conference with them? Then they could see if, after talking with him face to face across the table, they could work out such policies which would justify the statement, from both General MacArthur and the high officials of the Government, that they were in accord and were working together on policies in relation to the Far East. Would not that eliminate many of the present difficulties and give the people a great deal of confidence? Would it not also eliminate many of our problems, if such a request came from the administration? It could not come from General MacArthur under present circumstances.

Would the Senator care to express an opinion on that subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not sure whether I understand the Senator from Massachusetts——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not blame the Senator at all if he does not understand what I have just said.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know whether the Senator from Massachusetts has adopted the Stassen proposal or whether he wishes to have television and radio coverage of a meeting between President Truman and General MacArthur. I do not care to comment on the Stassen proposal.

I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, unfortunately, I am not able to arrange conferences at the White House in regard to such matters, and the White House has never asked to confer with me on matters of this kind. I know Mr. Stassen made a very cogent and sensational statement about this matter. Everyone "wants in" on this matter, and I am not surprised that Mr. Stassen came out with his proposal.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me that if there could be such a conference man to man, across a table, and if there could be a sufficient meeting of the minds by high officials in the administration and General MacArthur, we could then go forward in a united effort with great understanding and approval by responsible persons holding the various points of view. Much would be gained by such a meeting of minds, and many of our problems in the Congress would be eliminated. I ask the Senator's opinion on that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that, as I have said heretofore, I cannot arrange that; but if the Senator can get up any scheme which will get me out of the necessity of conducting these hearings, a plan which will unify the American people, and which will make it unnecessary for us to go through all this inquiry, he will have my most ardent support. I am the one person who does not expect to gain anything from the MacArthur hearings. I think I am in a game in which I cannot win.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator agree that what we want today is as complete unity and understanding as possible on the part of the leaders of the Government as to the policies with relation to the Far East, so that the people of the United States, the mothers and fathers of the boys who are in Korea, the mothers and fathers of the boys who are in the Army anywhere, will have confidence in the leadership of our armed services, and confidence that we are going forward, not with a difference of opinion, but with an understanding on the part of those who command?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am all with the Senator in seeking unity. That was exactly the point I hand in mind when I called the committee together to make plans for the hearing. It was to get unity in the committee. My desire was that we be united, and not have partisanship in the hearings. For that reason I called the committee together and got all the members to express their views. Then, when the motion was made the second time, by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the motion was, as I read it from the record:

> That the program as outlined by the chairman, which I understand is to invite General MacArthur and others to testify before the committee, be approved, with the understanding that the details and conditions, et cetera, will be in the hands of the chairman.

Mr. President, I did not put that motion just then. In the interest of unity, I undertook to outline what I thought was the proper program for the committee. So I then made this statement:

> I want to make this statement of my views on that. It was my opinion we should invite General Marshall over here, the Secretary of Defense, as the first witness. I think that hearing should be in executive session.
>
> Senator SALTONSTALL. No question about it.

I then proceeded:

> After we go through these hearings, we can have the record combed for security matters rather rapidly, and I think you can always get the evidence out within 24 hours if you desire to take that course, without endangering the matter of security. It is my purpose further—

I was seeking unity, Mr. President—

> In the absence of any contrary action by the committee, to suggest to General MacArthur that his appearance be in executive session, at least the first meeting, but leave it to him in the last analysis if he wishes to appear at a public hearing.

Yes, Mr. President, I am all for unity. I was seeking unity then, and, after that statement was made, the committee approved the motion unanimously, knowing what plans had been made for the hearing of General MacArthur. But then unity ended through no fault of mine.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was that not just about what the Senator told me—"You can leave it to the committee"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not tell the Senator that about General MacArthur, because the Senator from Oregon suggested that General MacArthur have his option, and for that reason, the option was preserved all the way through to General MacArthur as I read from this telegram here; and certainly I would not have undertaken to deceive the Senator, when I had told General MacArthur in the telegram that we would hold an open hearing if he expressed any desire for it.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say that what the Senator has just read confirms, in my judgment, what he told the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Nebraska can get any consolation from that——

Mr. WHERRY. I can get a little.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that I planned to have the hearings in executive session, if the motion carried.

Mr. WHERRY. "Leave it to the committee."

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say a word about leaving it to the committee. We were agreeing on procedures then.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was trying to get unity. He was going to get unity, and he was talking to the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was asking the members of the committee to help him decide what he was to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia agrees, does he not, that we could not hear General Marshall in

executive session and then hear General MacArthur in open session, if that were his expressed desire, but that we either had to hear all the officials in open session, or hear all the officials in closed session. I shall not speak for anyone but myself, but I agree with the Senator that, at the time the committee discussed the matter, there was a feeling that we could not do it that way, but does not the Senator agree that since then it appears that it would be much more difficult to hold the hearings in executive session, and give the people of the country confidence that we were getting at the truth?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is much more difficult, but I apprehended that at the time I made the statement. It so happens that I have been privileged to know General MacArthur quite a while. His magnificent effort in the House was no surprise to me. I know that General MacArthur was a man who had a fine presence, and a magnificent command of the English language. He swept this Nation from one end to the other by his appearance before the Congress. That may have changed the situation in the minds of some Senators because many by reason of what people said, "We want to see more of MacArthur on the television." There may be a greater demand since then for public hearings. But certainly the basic issues involved of protecting the security of the Nation have been in no wise affected merely because General MacArthur made such a magnificent appearance before the Congress, because he made such a magnificent speech at Chicago, and because he will have the opportunity to speak in public anywhere he pleases in the United States. He has spoken; he has given us his program in public, and now the principal thing which remains to this committee is to go into the classified and secret matters which will cast light upon the program which he outlined before the country so eloquently in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is not the issue now the welfare of the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only purpose I seek to serve—the protection of the public interest.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is beyond the matter of personalities, even as to the President and the general, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have sought to keep it that way. I have sought to keep away from personalities in this matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have endeavored to search for the facts, in order that we may have a thorough inquiry. That is the only way we can discover the truth. It cannot be done under klieg lights with secret documents, agreeable as that might be to those who would like to respond to the mail that they have received. I have had a number of letters saying, "If you do not let me see General MacArthur on television when he appears before your committee, I will never be for you again." One dear old lady wrote and said she was bedridden, and because she could not get out, she thought I was cruel to her in not letting her see and hear General MacArthur on the television. I hope the general will appear on television a sufficient number of times to permit all the people to see him and get his views. He is an able man, and they are entitled to have his views. But when we are dealing with secret matters of this nature, it is no time to be putting on a television show from which we cannot exclude agents of our enemies.

Now, after the statement was made that I would suggest to General MacArthur that his appearance be in executive session, the record further shows here that in my effort to be nonpartisan—at that time it had not been agreed that General MacArthur was to address the Congress—and I could read from the RECORD here, showing that I thought some plan should be made, even if the Armed Services Committee had to invite all the Members of Congress to some place where General MacArthur could be heard. That is when I was trying to be fair and trying to be objective and trying to disregard any political considerations. That motion, I may say, was carried unanimously. No one then rose on either side of the aisle to say, "Oh, no, this will never do; the American people must hear all the facts, at an open hearing." That is only the second thought. It all came after the committee had taken action, and after I had moved out in accordance with the unanimous suggestions of my committee, very carefully bringing down to the last scale the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon that we leave to General MacArthur the option as to whether he wanted to appear in open hearings. Then I find that some circumstances have arisen, some events have transpired, some politics have been cooked up, and the views and opinions of men are different.

I felt, Mr. President, in justice to myself and in the attempt I have made to be fair and nonpartisan in the matter, that I should make that statement.

I further wish to offer for the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the telegram which I sent to General MacArthur and a letter which I wrote on April 13, the same date on which we held the meeting, to the Secretary of State, in which I told him he was expected to be present and that there would be an executive session of the committee, carrying out the will of the committee as it had expressed it. I asked him to transmit to General MacArthur a telegram inviting him to appear before the committee. I stated to General MacArthur that the meeting would be in executive session, and tried to get him to fix a date. There was a little difficulty about that. In my efforts to be nonpartisan, and to eschew all politics, I requested the staff of the committee to show this message to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. He approved the communication which stated that the hearings were to be held in executive session. When charges start flying around with regard to the hearings, as they will, I can at least console myself by this record which shows that I made, as best I could, with the light before me, an honest effort to start the hearings on a nonpartisan basis and to keep them that way in order that we might spend our time, energies, and efforts, and whatever talent we might possess, in getting at the facts of the matter, rather than in attempting to make political capital out of any part of it.

I ask unanimous consent that these various communications referring to the nature of the hearings be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 13, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Armed Services Committee has decided by unanimous vote to conduct a full inquiry into the military situation in the Far East and the facts surrounding the relief of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his assignment in that area.

The committee requests that you appear at the first hearing, which will be held on Wednesday, April 18, 1951, at 10:30 a. m., in room 212 Senate Office Building. This will be an executive session of the committee.

The committee would also like to hear the views of General MacArthur at the earliest practicable date following your appearance. The general's first appearance before the committee will also be in executive session. Later sessions will be in accordance with the desires of General MacArthur and the committee.

In view of the foregoing I request that you convey the following message to General MacArthur by the most expeditious means of communication available:

"The Senate Armed Services Committee unanimously requests that you appear before it to give your views on the military situation in the Far East and the circumstances leading up to your relief from your several commands in that area. The committee plans to hear the Secretary of Defense on Wednesday, April 18, and will schedule a subsequent meeting with you to be held at your convenience. This initial meeting will be in executive session. Additionally, the Armed Services Committee has under consideration extending to all members of the Senate and House of Representatives an invitation to an open meeting with you to hear such views as you may care to express. Please inform me as promptly as possible when you will be available to advise with the committee and whether you are agreeable to appearing at a meeting to which all Members of the Congress will have been invited. Personal regards. Signed, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator, chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services."

I should appreciate it very much if you would inform us as to the time when General MacArthur receives the above message and if you would transmit the reply to me upon receipt.

With assurances of esteem, I am
Sincerely yours,

——— ———, *Chairman.*

From CINCFE, Tokyo, Japan, from General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.
To Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.
(Personal for General Marshall.)

Reur DEF 88528 April 14, please give Senator RUSSELL my personal regards and inform him that I am advised resolutions are pending in Congress inviting me to address a joint session as was done in the cases of

General Eisenhower and Clay and others when they first came from abroad and that until action has been taken on such resolutions I would deem it inappropriate to make any other plans. If such resolutions are approved, I would regard it a great honor and distinction to address the Congress in general terms.

APRIL 14, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to thank you for transmitting my previous message to General MacArthur and for sending me the general's reply.

I request that you convey the following message to General MacArthur by the most expeditious means of communication available:

Re your message: Insofar as I am advised, all members of the Senate Armed Services Committee are supporting the resolution for you to address joint meeting of Congress. Suggestion in my wire that committee was considering inviting all Members of the Congress to an open meeting to hear you was made before it became clear that a concurrent resolution might be adopted. Indications are this resolution will be approved on Tuesday the 17th. My first message referred more especially to your appearance before the committee in executive session to discuss with us the matters referred to in that message. We, of course, realize that any invitation extended to you by concurrent congressional resolution will take precedence over committee hearings and understand why you might prefer that your address to the Congress should be in general terms. However, the members of the Armed Services Committee, having definite responsibilities in the field of national defense, wish to discuss with you in executive session matters which might affect security if made public. Please inform me as promptly as possible what dates subsequent to April 18 will be convenient for you to meet with the committee. Regards. Signed RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator, Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services.

I should appreciate it very much if you would inform us as to the time when General MacArthur receives the above message and if you would transmit the reply to me upon receipt.

With assurances of esteem, I am,
Sincerely yours,
——— ———, *Chairman.*

From CINCFE, Tokyo, Japan, signed MacArthur.

To Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.

(Personal for General Marshall.)

Reference your 88565. Please convey to Senator RUSSELL my regards and state that I will be available to appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee at any time after I have addressed the Congress in accordance with the concurrent resolution to that effect.

General of the Army DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
Hotel Waldorf-Astoria,
New York, N. Y.:

The Committee on Armed Services appreciates the desire of millions of our fellow citizens to express their deep sense of gratitude for your outstanding contributions to the welfare and security of our Nation. We are also mindful of the continuing importance of the committee having the benefit of your advice and counsel at the earliest practicable time, as set forth in my previous communications, and in our conversation here last Thursday. We would like to hear you at an executive session to be called at 10:30 a. m., April 30, 1951, in Room 212, Senate Office Building. The delay already occasioned in the scheduling of hearings has caused some criticism in the Congress, and as chairman of the committee I deem it important that you be here on April 30 if this can be accomplished without undue inconvenience to you on account of other commitments which you may have previously made and which you feel it would be inappropriate for you to forego. The Committee on Foreign Relations desires to sit with the Committee on Armed Services during these hearings and this will undoubtedly be arranged. The text of this telegram has not been made public by me or my conferees.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
United States Senator,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

(At 9:48 a. m. General Reber conveyed the following message from General MacArthur for Senator RUSSELL, which was received through Secretary Marshall. General Reber will send the official copy over right away.)

Thank you very much for your courteous message. I had planned to visit my ancestral home in Milwaukee on Friday, going by way of Chicago, and on Monday, April 30, had planned to take Mrs. MacArthur to her old home in Murfreesboro, Tenn., returning thence to New York. This would complete my immediate commitments and I could appear before your committee Wednesday or Thursday of next week if this would be satisfactory. Cordial personal regards.

APRIL 24, 1951.

General of the Army DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y.:

Many thanks for your wire. In accordance with your suggestion we have fixed hearing for Thursday, May 3, at 10 o'clock. Unless you express desire to the contrary hearing will be in executive session.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, United States Senate
Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Georgia know that I am confident, knowing him as I do, that he will give the public the benefit of every fact that can be given in keeping with the security of the United States and the welfare of the country.

I should like to say also, if I may, that I have the utmost confidence in the Senator's fairness. I know he has no other motive than the safety and welfare of our country.

We talk about unity, Mr. President. Unity is a two-way street. We cannot achieve unity by rising on the floor of the Senate and expressing a lack of confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are charged with the planning of the defense of the Nation. When I hear such remarks I become alarmed about what may happen. If we cannot trust those who are charged with the responsibility of planning the fighting in Korea and planning the defense of this Nation, in whom can we place our trust, other than in our Maker? I think it would be well at this time, Mr. President, if we would place a little more trust in Him and do a little bit less talking on the floor, and particularly when such talk tends to raise grave, but completely unwarranted, doubts about competent, trustworthy, experienced, and conscientious men who are performing their duty. I am sure that the people of this Nation will properly construe such remarks to be partisan politics.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona has just made a very highly idealistic type of statement, with which I entirely agree. He has stated that unity is a two-way street. It seems to me that the best thing that can come out of this controversy is a better understanding, a more united understanding, by using both sides of that street, particularly by those who are "in the know."

We have the administration on one side, and—I do not like to say it—somewhere, not quite on the same sidewalk, is General MacArthur, who has been in the Far East for 14 years and who has a great deal of knowledge of the subject. If there could be a greater understanding between those two groups, if unity is a two-way street, it seems to me that the troubles of the Senator from Georgia, for whom we all have the utmost of good wishes and good feeling, and in whom we have the greatest confidence, would be eliminated, as would those of other Senators who are on the committee, and the confidence of the American people would be greatly accelerated if that two-way street were brought a little bit more into the center by both groups. It is still possible. As a Senator on this side of the aisle, I pray equally with the Senator from Arizona that it may be accomplished and that from the hearings will come the truth upon which decisions can be based.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share fervently the last wish expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts, that out of these hearings shall come the truth. That is the only objective I have in mind.

Mr. President, I am one of the few Members of the Senate of the United States who never cared particularly to have the chairmanship of a committee. I accepted the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee when my predecessor, through the vicissitudes of politics, was removed. I felt that I should be shirking a duty if I did not assume the position.

I had no personal interest in conducting any hearings on the MacArthur controversy. I realized then, and shall realize constantly through the hectic days that lie ahead, that there is nothing political that I could gain from it. But I did feel that the Armed Services Committee had a definite responsibility with respect to the question, and I sought to discharge that responsibility. I went about it in as nonpartisan or unpartisan a manner as I knew, and I shall continue to undertake to be absolutely fair in the matter, even though some changes have occurred in others since the date of the meeting to arrange the hearings. I want the American people to get the truth, the whole truth, and I hope it will be nothing but the truth. Certainly I want them to get the truth as to all the facts and circumstances which led up to or which are related to this event. In my opinion, we can better secure it by launching the hearing in executive ses-

sion. If it becomes desirable later to hold open sessions, I shall not oppose it.

But General MacArthur has made his statement before the Congress. We have recently requested secret documents, and I shall request that many more be brought in in order to have all the facts. I have utilized every means at my command, after conferring with experienced representatives of the press, to get the testimony which can go to the people, that which is not affected by secrets which are vital to the security of the Nation, into the hands of the people as rapidly as it can be done. I have arranged for an extra shift of reporters for the committee so that the record can be transcribed almost as rapidly as it is done by the efficient reportorial staff of the Senate.

I have arranged to have a man of rank and experience representing the Defense Department present and to take the record when it is transcribed, together with a representative of the witness, to decide what matters are covered by national security, to eliminate them from the record, and to have another transcript made. Within the past hour and a half I have conferred with representatives of the press in an endeavor to have the testimony released page by page, as soon as the secret matter can be eliminated. There will be no delay in getting the facts to the people. We will get them to the people with a degree of continuity which it would be impossible to achieve if we held open hearings and had to go repeatedly from the caucus room down to the committee room for executive sessions.

I am not undertaking to play politics in this matter. I have set out on a course and I have not deviated from it. I still think it is the proper course. I believe that events will justify the action that has been taken.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to salute the chairman of the committee for the courageous stand he has taken in protecting what I believe to be the vital interests of the Nation. Certainly as a member of the committee, realizing what is transpiring, I, for one, can well understand that he is subjecting himself to a great amount of criticism for doing what in his judgement is vital to protect the very lives of the men who are fighting to save America.

There is no Member of this body whom I have observed to be more sincere and courageous in his point of view, or more independent in fighting against the administration or anyone else when he thought they were wrong. I recall two occasions in the previous Congress when the Senator from Georgia single handedly fought against proposed legislation of the administration, even when it was sponsored by so-called bipartisan groups, because he felt that it was not a course which the Nation should follow. Certainly his record in the past justifies every confidence in him.

I should like to point out also that the Democratic members of the committee who voted solidly with the Senator from Georgia are not members who have been known to follow the line of the Democratic administration. I refer, for example, to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has been known as a man of complete independence. I know he would not support the Senator from Georgia in the position he is taking if he did not have complete confidence in him.

The so-called Kefauver committee has made many disclosures which have been the subject of substantial political capital by those opposing the Democratic administration. The Kefauver committee has never been known to withhold information. Two members of that committee are members of the Committee on Armed Services. I refer to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

Furthermore, there has been much political capital made of the exposures which were made in the State of Mississippi by the Senators from Mississippi. The junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is also among those who believe that we should back the chairman of the committee in protecting the vital secrets of the Nation.

It seems to come with little grace from some members of the committee, who changed their minds—after they had stated that it was important to keep the vital secrets, so that they would not be available to our enemies—now to say that we should throw all these matters out on the table and risk that any one of the witnesses may drop from his lips, although inadvertently, some vital secrets on which the survival of the United States may depend.

Mr. RUSSELL. The high compliment paid to me by the Senator from Louisiana in the early part of his remarks makes me feel very humble.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not like to interrupt the Senator. I believe that the Senator from Louisiana, in making his statement, is entirely out of order when he says that the members of the committee who voted for open hearings want to make available to the world vital secrets. I have served on the Committee on Armed Services and prior to that on the Military Affairs Committee, and also the Commitee on Appropriations, in which we discussed these subjects for years. No member of those committees has disclosed vital secrets.

Mr. LONG. I did not say it or insinuate it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. LONG. I said such things could happen.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator did not insinuate it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand the Senator from Louisiana to make any such charge. He suggested that such a thing could flow from open hearings. I agree with him completely. I shall go ahead with the matter and handle it to the best of my ability, seeking the truth at all times. I shall hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may. Whatever disclosures are not tinged with considerations of national security I shall undertake to make available to the American people at the earliest date.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, let me say that I am not a member of the committee. I would have liked to be a member, but I am not.

I have been in favor of open hearings since I have been a Member of the United States Senate. There is no exception in this instance. The idea of suggesting on the floor of the Senate that people would drop secrets of national security is beside the point. We have just come through a series of hearings, conducted by the Senator from Texas on the subject of foreign relations, which had to do with global policy. When they got to the point where important information was being asked for, the important witnesses knew when not to give the committee information which involved the national security, and everyone sustained them in it.

I am surprised, I am amazed, that this question should take the course it is taking now. After General MacArthur has laid his recommendations on the table, it seems to me the only thing to do is to hold open hearings on the global national defense policy, and appropriations which the people of the country should support. No one is talking about security matters. No one wants to bring them to light. We want them to be secure. Certainly the American people and Members of Congress have the right to know the facts with respect to global defense policy. Testimony can be taken from General MacArthur and other witnesses without jeopardizing the security of the country.

I have had a great deal of admiration for the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and will continue to have it; but I am surprised when he stands on the floor, regardless of what the committee said on April 13, and implies now that we cannot have open hearings. I am not advocating that the hearings be held in the ball park, or that we put on a show. Certainly I think that if we hold open hearings the public will get the truth. The people need the truth. It is only when people get the truth that they are made free. I should like to have open hearings.

Long before the Senator had his communications with General MacArthur there was talk about whether or not the committee would hold open hearings. I said then, and I now repeat, because nothing has changed my mind, that the hearings ought to be open. I do not mean that we should put on a show. I do not want a show, any more than does any other Senator. To my way of thinking—and I have been here for 9 years—the only way we can get the facts is not by secrecy, secret diplomacy, secret meetings, secret commitments, but by placing the facts on the table. I believe that is what the American people want. I believe a demand should rise up from the American people to get the facts. The only way to get them is by open hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can understand the appeal which the Senator's remarks would have, and they would have a greater appeal to me—although they

are not addressed to me personally, if such arguments had been made before the joint committees heard General Eisenhower in executive session, at which time not a single document of the character I have referred to was used. It was merely the taking of testimony. Yet he was heard in executive session. The Senator from Nebraska was present at the hearing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Just a moment, please. His resolution was pending before the committee at that time. The Senator did not take the floor at that time and with great vehemence say we ought to have open hearings for General Eisenhower. It is only when we get to the MacArthur incident that he makes the statement that everything should be held in the open.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not a member of the committee which invited General Eisenhower. If there had been any question raised as to whether or not open or closed hearings should be held, I would have been in favor of holding open hearings just the same.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it is easy for the Senator to make that statement, but I will not engage in debate with him on the point. The fact is that the Senator did not do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not a member of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is not a member of the committee now, yet he is undertaking to advise the committee. He says he hopes that the public will rise up and demand open hearings. When we were engaged in hearing General Eisenhower, when the Senator had his resolution pending, which was of great importance, I did not hear him make any such statement. Of course, not quite the same glamour attached to General Eisenhower.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I want the RECORD to show that charges have been made that there has been a change.

Mr. RUSSELL. The record proves changes have been made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is said that a change has been made. I am not speaking for members of the committee. I am not a member of the committee, as I have stated. I was not on the committee when General Eisenhower was invited here. But when I understood that possibly General MacArthur would be the only witness to appear before the committee my position was that I thought he ought to speak to the American people. I have not changed my position. I think if we had more generals like MacArthur and Eisenhower speaking to the American people we would be a great deal better off. It is proposed to take down many of the things which they say, in a cold record, and then let it become garbled and interpreted by this man, that man, and someone in the National Defense Establishment, who will say, "This can go in, but that must go out." What would we have left? We would not have the facts which the American people want.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we were to follow that argument to a logical conclusion, if one could be reached——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is now becoming personal.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would mean that everything would be in open session, including the secret documents which have been requested.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry the Senator made his last remark, to the effect that if we were to follow what the Senator from Nebraska has said to a logical conclusion, if it were possible——

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not make that statement; and I will leave it to the record.

Mr. WHERRY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. RUSSELL. I said, following this to a logical conclusion, if it could be reached, we would have to have everything in open session.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not see much difference.

Mr. President, the logical conclusion is that the American people want the facts. The only way we can get them is in open hearings. I hope that the distinguished chairman may reflect upon the demand of the American people and the Congress, who are entitled to know the facts, and that the hearings will be open, so that we may get the facts, which mean so much to the security of the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, all the facts will come out in this investigation. I should like to respond to the public clamor as much as would anyone else, but I shall not in any circumstances, whatever the results may be, yield to any demand that a single line of testimony shall come out which will endanger the lives of the lowliest, humblest privates who are risking their lives in behalf of the American people in combat in Korea. We cannot have these hearings in open session without risking not only the lives of those men, but the future security of the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Georgia feel that if some of the documents which have been suppressed for 4 years had been made available to the American people and the American Congress, we would not have risked 60,000 casualties in Korea, with more than 10,000 of them dead? Does not the Senator from Georgia recognize the fact that there has been a consistent policy on the part of the administration to conceal from the Congress and the American people—and we shall document it—information which, if it had been made available to them, might not have resulted in 60,000 casualties?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is certainly on the wrong track if he thinks he can fix on me responsibility for any mistakes made by the administration; but merely because the administration may have made mistakes, I do not intend to compound past mistakes when American lives and the future welfare of the Nation are endangered by holding public hearings on secret documents.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the very able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, that my admiration for him is without limit. It was not in any way diminished by the exceedingly able argument which the Senator from Georgia has just made on the floor of the Senate. I can admire a man very much, as I admire the Senator from Georgia, and not always agree with every conclusion or observation which he makes.

I do not agree with a couple of observations which my friend from Georgia made in the very able argument which he has just presented to the Senate. Perhaps I should say that I would make certain modifications or reservations with respect to his argument.

The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct when he points out that on April 13 the Armed Services Committee held a meeting to which he referred. He is completely correct in stating that the observations which he read from the RECORD were made. In fact, I think the RECORD will show that I seconded the Byrd motion. I shall do whatever I can to make the record complete and full. I believe that at one time, when the observation was made in the committee that it would be left up to the chairman to work out the details in regard to the hearings, we all agreed. My recollection is that my good friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] agreed to that proposal, but made the observation that, of course, it would be with the understanding—I do not quote him exactly, but I quote his meaning—that the chairman would consult with the ranking minority member on the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. The Senator from Georgia said, in effect, that the Senator from California need have no question on that score, that he would always consult with the Senator from New Hampshire with regard to matters of procedure which affected the full committee. We certainly were very much of one mind that that was the way it should be left.

Let me say to my good friend from Georgia that I think there are two factors which need to be considered, in view of the able argument which he has made, and in the light of what has transpired since April 13. I cannot speak for other members of the committee. I can speak only for the junior Senator from Oregon. However, when we discussed this matter on April 13 I certainly had no idea, and I do not believe any other member of the committee had any idea, that the hearing would trans-

form itself into the broad investigation which it has now become. At the time we were discussing this matter on April 13 we were seeking to find out the facts by bringing General MacArthur, General Marshall, and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the committee, to testify as to why the course of action against General MacArthur was taken.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind personal references. I should like to say that the record also shows that it was not indicated that General MacArthur was to be the only witness. The record will show that I stated we ought to have the Secretary of State and others.

Mr. MORSE. I stated that we ought to have the Secretary of State.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California suggested the names of two or three or four persons who he thought should appear.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. In a moment. It was never contemplated that this would be a very limited hearing. I believe that even at that distance, every member of the committee saw that some very broad issues were involved in the hearing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that he is correct. At that hearing the Senator from California suggested the name of General Wedemeyer, who had made a report on both China and Korea. He suggested that General Wedemeyer should be one of the witnesses; also Admiral Radford, who was commander in chief in the Pacific; Admiral Badger, who had formerly commanded in the Far East; and perhaps several others.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. We were not deciding merely to hear General MacArthur and Secretary Marshall.

Mr. MORSE. The junior Senator from Oregon neither said that, nor did he mean to imply it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon stated that the scope of the hearing had broadened.

Mr. MORSE. That is the argument which I now wish to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will forgive me, I am now an hour and 22 minutes late in keeping an engagement with some people whom I assured I would meet at 5 o'clock. I know that the Senator will be fair in his approach to this question. I merely wish to observe that it would have been of great assistance to me in undertaking to maintain the bipartisan complexion of the committee if members who had changed their minds had been generous enough to come to me and show me the courtesy of saying, "I have changed my mind; I think we ought to have another meeting and change our plans." Instead I was out fighting for the committee plan, upon which the members had all agreed, while members of the committee were engaged in changing their minds without apprising me of that fact.

Mr. MORSE. A part of my argument will bear on that subject. I am sure that if the Senator wishes to make comment on it, he will have adequate time to do so tomorrow. I shall be very brief.

Coming back to the argument which I was making, I point out that the when the committee met on April 13, at least it was not my anticipation—and I doubt if it was the anticipation of other members of the committee generally—that the investigation which is now pending would ever develop into the broad scope which now characterizes it. As the record which is on the desk of the Senator from Georgia will show, I am sure, at that time we discussed the possible limitation of the hearings to the Armed Services Committee alone. It was primarily a military matter. As we saw it at that time, it was primarily a matter of going into the question of military policy and MacArthur's relationship to the military policy. It was a question as to looking into the reasons for the President's removal of MacArthur.

Mr. President, a great deal of business of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate has been conducted in executive session. It has never been the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that all committees should hold all meetings in public. The Armed Services Committee particularly has to transact business on a great many matters that require executive sessions.

Occasionally we consider a question involving discipline. It has been my experience in the Armed Services Committee that when we consider such a subject, unless it involves a great question of public policy, we do conduct a public hearing, at least in making preliminary investigation of the facts. When I said in the committee meeting, as I did, and the record quotes me accurately, that I had great doubt about whether the MacArthur hearing should be in public or in executive session, it was because I was not clear in my mind as to what kind of a meeting might develop, because I knew we could not escape the consideration of some security matters, and because I took it for granted that the general would necessarily have to express his position in regard to his administration in Asia, and would have to discuss some secret military matter. So I said I thought we ought to leave the decision to the general.

Mr. President, that was before the general made his address to the joint meeting of the Congress. That address became a challenge of the military and foreign policy of the United States, and, in my opinion, called for a thorough investigation of the charges the general made, because one cannot read the speech which he made before the two Houses of Congress without fully appreciating that he laid down a serious indictment of the foreign and military policy of the United States. It called not only for the assumption of jurisdiction on the part of the Armed Services Committee, but for the assumption of jurisdiction also on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Although I was not present this morning, it is my understanding that the meeting held this morning was a joint meeting of the Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committees.

The whole basis of the hearings has been broadened now into an investigation of foreign and military policy. I take the position, Mr. President, that whenever a committee of the Senate indulges in hearings which become an investigation of great questions of public policy they should be open hearings. That is the position I have always taken in the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment. We have not had a meeting of the committee since April 13. We have not had a meeting since the MacArthur speech before the joint meeting of the Congress.

It is all very well for my good friend the Senator from Georgia to say that we should have come to him and told him that we were troubled about developments and that we ought to have a meeting. I say most respectfully to the Senator from Georgia—and he will reply to this, I am sure, or he will be free to reply to it tomorrow—that in my judgment, after the general's speech to the two Houses of Congress, a meeting of the Armed Services Committee should have been held. We should not be acting now on the basis of the only meeting, that of April 13, prior to the speech of the general, until this morning when there was a joint meeting, apparently, of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, the responsibility cannot be shifted to individual members of the committee. The responsibility is that of the chairman of the committee. My opinion is that after the speech by General MacArthur and all the discussion that has followed, and with public statements appearing in the press on the part of some members of the Armed Services Committee, including the junior Senator from Oregon, the investigation ought to be conducted in public so far as it is possible to conduct it in public. It seems to me the chairman of the committee ought to have gotten us together before, if we are to broaden the hearing body into a combination of the Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committees, to which I have no objection. Apparently the members of the Foreign Relations Committee have voting privileges in the joint meeting, and I have no objection to that. That was a matter which could very well have been discussed by the Armed Services Committee on some date subsequent to April 13 and prior to this morning.

Mr. President, there has been pretty adequate discussion publicly by members of the Armed Services Committee of their views on the controversy. The chairman, who is a brilliant lawyer, has had what we lawyers say is actual notice. He did not walk into the meeting this

morning to discuss for the first time that some members of the Armed Services Committee had doubt as to whether or not we should hold the kind of meeting we talked about on April 13, which no longer is possible, because the nature of the whole hearing has changed. I do not think the chairman of the committee had any doubt of the fact that there was quite a different opinion on the part of several members of the Armed Services Committee from what their opinion was when on April 13 we thought we were going to conduct an investigation by the Armed Services Committee much more limited in scope than it will now be.

The Senator from Georgia said he knew General MacArthur, and he apparently was not surprised at the kind of speech he made, and the serious charges he made. But the junior Senator from Oregon was surprised. He was shocked. He was perfectly satisfied that that speech broadened the base of the whole hearing, and that we are now in an investigation.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon for making the remarks which he has just concluded along the line he has followed, namely, that we face a different situation at the present time. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that this morning in the joint meeting, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I called the specific attention of the chairman and the other members to the fact that this was the first time I had had any opportunity in any way officially to express myself on the question of open or closed hearings. There had never been an effort, so far as I recall, at least never in my presence, to elicit the views of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee as to whether or not the hearings should be open or closed.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is one of the major weaknesses of the position of the Senator from Georgia. He is still proceeding on the assumption that we of the Armed Services Committee are determining the proceeding, and now it is a joint meeting that is to be held.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To that extent I feel that the argument of the Senator from Georgia is not valid. The situation is different, as the Senator from Oregon points out, from what it was at the time of the meeting on the 13th of April. The situation then was nebulous. Then it appeared there might be merely a meeting with an individual officer who was giving information on a certain specific set of circumstances or specific points. I raised the question in the joint committee meeting that there were some extremely broad policies now injected into the situation—as, for instance, the question of the over-all military approach or the question of the participation of this country in the Orient and in other places. I said that no issue had stirred the American people more deeply than this one had in recent days, and that the American people had a right to the fullest possible degree of public testimony, leaving to the very eminent persons who would testify, as well as to the committee itself, the determination of when certain information, if elicited and if given publicly, might immediately affect the security of the United States. When it did we could say, "We will pull the curtain over that particular piece of evidence at this moment, and we shall take it up either later today or tomorrow morning or at a future time in executive session, because the future of the country might be endangered by disclosing that particular evidence."

Not only can the overwhelming bulk of the material be given in public, but the entire theory, up one side and down the other, has been discussed in public. Those who defend the MacArthur theory of defense have discussed it. Those who would blacken the character and the entire historic conduct of General MacArthur in military affairs have been dragging the issue up and down, and they have been secretly "leaking out" information as to what their discussions will be.

I think the entire American people have a right to obtain the fullest degree of public information, and by means of such procedure it can be given while still maintaining the security of the Nation.

I demonstrated my position on that matter in the joint committee, this morning, by making a motion which was voted down; but at least I then demonstrated my position.

In the past several days I have said unofficially to certain newspaper reporters that I thought the hearings in connection with this matter should be open.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Iowa made that motion in the joint committee this morning, did he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Iowa made the motion as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, did he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood that this morning all of us were members of the one joint committee.

Mr. MORSE. But the seat of the Senator from Iowa on the joint committee comes to him because of his membership on the Committee on Foreign Relations, does it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It does.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, as a member of the present joint committee, the Senator from Iowa was recognized by the chairman of the joint committee, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee; and the Senator from Iowa made a motion, and discussion was had on the basis of the motion; and the motion was put to a vote, was it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, we now have a voting joint committee which is presided over by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee—which is quite different from the action taken in the Armed Services Committee on April 13. The record on the desk of the Senator from Georgia will show that at that meeting we discussed the question in terms of keeping the hearings strictly Armed Services hearings with other Members of the Senate, including members of the Foreign Relations Committee—if they cared to do so—participating in the meetings, but they were to be meetings of the Armed Services Committee, were they not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Technically, and using the language of the chairman, if one could carry it to its logical conclusion—which, of course, I think would be far-fetched—the argument made by the Senator from Georgia is about like saying that because the Senator from California is a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Senator from New Hampshire is a member of the Appropriations Committee, if the Appropriations Committee discusses a certain matter and decides at that time that some action should be taken, then, if those Senators go into a meeting of an entirely different committee, they must be bound, in respect to the new committee's action, by some discussion which was had under different circumstances in the Appropriations Committee, of which they are members.

However, the joint committee is a totally new committee. The chairman of the joint committee was elected only this morning, and this morning was the first time that Senators as members of the composite committee have had a chance to act.

So I think the arguments of the Senator from Georgia are not quite valid because the committee is a completely new one.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Iowa because the argument I was making in reply to the Senator from Georgia is that he is using a transcript which, in my opinion, deals with a set of facts and a question of jurisdiction not now relative to the problem before the Senate, for the Senator from Georgia is dealing with a transcript which has to do with the Armed Services Committee and its contemplation of the holding of an entirely different type of hearing from that now proposed.

I am sorry the Senator from Georgia is not now in the Chamber, but I know he will reply to these statements tomorrow, or at least will be free to do so.

Therefore, I say most respectfully to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that I do not think he can escape responsibility, in the matter of holding open hearings, by saying that those of us who are members of the Armed Services Committee should have come to him sometime between April 13 and this morning and should have told him that we had come to the conclusion that open hearings should be held.

First, the nature of the hearings had changed. Second, the entire membership of the committee has changed. It is now a joint committee. I think we also see that it is a matter ab initio, insofar as deciding this matter is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that since the Senator from Georgia has read some of the transcript into the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to page 11 of

the transcript, where some discussion of this subject occurred. I had this to say:

I think what we should all be striving for is as soon as possible to get away from the obvious great division of American public opinion and in the Congress, and try to see if we can get to a place where we can develop a degree of unity again. Consequently, if the Members of Congress were foreclosed now, those who are not members of this committee or of the Foreign Relations Committee, I think we might find a revolt on our hands in the two Houses, which would tend to divide us, rather than unite us. I have no final conclusion on that, but that is at least one thought I have.

In other words, we have here a problem on which all of us were reserving some judgments. However, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, we now have an entirely different situation which grows out of the statement made by General MacArthur on the 19th of this month, almost 1 week—it was 6 days—after the meeting on the 13th; and, in addition—as has already been pointed out this morning, and the Senator has pointed out why he could not be present—the two committees now have met. The Senator from Texas, who happens to be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, moved that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] be made the chairman of the joint committee. Both the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the members of the Armed Services Committee voted unanimously that the Senator from Georgia be the chairman of the joint committee. At that point a new, temporary joint committee was constituted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California permit me to ask him a personal question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from California, after the meeting on April 13, believe the committee would not be meeting again, after the chairman had written some communications, which the transcript will show we agreed should be written, to certain persons in the Department of Defense and in the administration, and after the committee obtained information for us in respect to other questions which we raised in the meeting on April 13? Did the Senator from California really think that we would not be meeting again to consider matters of procedure until we started the hearings?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I will say not. However, in making that statement now, I do not intend to cast any reflection upon the chairman of the committee, let me say, because I have, as does the Senator from Oregon, a very high regard for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia, and he has had many responsibilities and problems, as all of us have had.

However, the fact of the matter is that new events have occurred. For instance, on the 21st of this month there was released—from the White House, presumably—a document dealing with the Wake Island conference, a document which until today I had assumed had been merely a set of notes. Nevertheless, today it turns out that the document was a top-secret document which was not declassified until the last 24 hours. It immediately put all members of the committee, all of us who are seeking to find what the facts are, on notice that apparently the administration, in order to bolster its case, is willing to declassify documents in order to give a one-sided version. At that point I think a great many of us changed our minds as to how the meetings of the two committees might fairly be conducted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I will yield presently to the Senator from Michigan. I promised the Senator from New Hampshire some minutes ago, before the Senator from Michigan rose, that I would yield to him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator from Michigan desire to ask a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have only a few questions I wanted to ask.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The questions are, First, whether the Armed Services Committee, or the two committees sitting jointly this morning, at any time considered the question of the formation of a joint committee of the House and Senate, as proposed by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I may say, first, I was not at the meeting this morning, so I do not know what was discussed there. My recollection is that the resolution of the Senator from Michigan was not discussed at any meeting of the Armed Services Committee at which I was present, with the possible exception that there may have been some very brief references to it, and only in the sense of saying that such a resolution had been submitted. But there was no discussion of it at any time when I was present. Recently there have been but the two meetings of the Armed Services Committee, first, the meeting on April 13; and second, the meeting this morning. I know of no meeting of the Armed Services Committee since April 13, unless there was one the other day in regard to the confirmation of some personnel, and minor details, but not for the purpose of discussing this investigation.

Mr. FERGUSON. My purpose in trying to get this information was to determine whether the resolution which was proposed by the Senator from Michigan on April 10, and whether another resolution which was proposed on the 17th, and which is now lying on the table, and is being held there by the majority, because it is impossible to get an adjournment of the Senate, have been purposely delayed; in other words, whether there is what is known as a parliamentary filibuster against those resolutions. I wondered whether the resolutions were being considered by either of these two committees.

Mr. MORSE. So far as my experience within the committee is concerned, the resolutions have not been discussed at any meeting I have attended, and so far as I know since April 13 there has been no meeting except the one this morning. One short meeting, I understand, was held the other day on personnel matters.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator will yield, that I may, with unanimous consent, ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire is as to whether either the Armed Services Committee, or the two committees, sitting jointly, have passed upon the question of whether they would or might consider a concurrent resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee by the two Houses.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would have to say that so far as I know neither the Armed Services Committee, sitting as the Armed Services Committee, nor the two committees, sitting jointly this morning, ever discussed the resolution. I personally have discussed the subject with other members of the Armed Services Committee, including the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia, but it has never come before either the Armed Services Committee or the two committees sitting jointly.

Mr. FERGUSON. So it has not been as the result of action either by the Armed Services Committee or by the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, that the Senate is not adjourning so as to permit the Senate to vote upon that question. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall conclude by saying that in my opinion the situation is quite a bit different today from what it was on April 13. The nature of the hearing has changed materially. It has transformed itself into an investigation rather than simply a fact-finding hearing to get the facts as to why the break between the President and MacArthur occurred, in regard to its military aspects, which was the subject of discussion on April 13.

The junior Senator from Oregon even entertained some doubt on April 13 as to that kind of hearing, because he could see that it might transform itself into an investigation. But when we come to deal with the investigation of a question of public policy, the junior Senator from Oregon will always, as in the past, stand for open hearings, because I think that, as I said last year, we would then get about as close to the intent of the Constitution of the United States as possible in regard to fair hearings. It has been held many times in court decisions that a fair hearing involves a public hearing.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment. In view of the fact that we now have two committees sitting jointly, I certainly think the situation is entirely different from what it was on April 13, and

that it was quite appropriate that the question be voted on by the two committees, sitting jointly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I think the issue devolves on two approaches to two procedures, one of which was the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] this morning, that we proceed with open hearings, and then hold closed hearings whenever a matter affecting the security of the country was involved. The other was a motion made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to adopt the plan advocated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], namely, that we start with closed hearings, and perhaps decide to hold open hearings later.

I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I have been a member either of the former Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, or its successor, the Armed Services Committee, for 15 years. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee, and formerly the War Department Subcommittee of that committee and the Naval Affairs Subcommitee of that committee, and now I am a member of the Armed Services Subcommittee of that committee.

I have been a member of various other commitees, such as the so-called Truman committee, and others. I have yet to see a procedure followed under which the committee started with closed hearings, and then went into open hearings. I have very often, at least a hundred times, probably several hundred times, known of instances of hearings which began as open hearings, but which became closed hearings when matters came up of a highly secret nature involving the security of the country, and a witness, or the committee chairman, or a member of the committee, would say, "I prefer that this be heard in executive session." That is the procedure which was advocated in the Hickenlooper approach this morning, which I think is the sound procedure.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, to start with an open hearing would establish a policy of procedure. I believe it to be very important to serve notice on the American people that as a matter of policy we are going to conduct our investigations in open hearings. The Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct in warning that, as a matter of national security, there are parts of the hearings which will have to be conducted in executive session. I have always taken the position that, when it is necessary, every loyal and patriotic citizen of America would want the committee to conduct that part of the hearings in secret. But the American people are disturbed, as I find from going about the country, because they do not feel that they are getting the information they ought to receive as to matters of great public policy which concern them so geatly in these days. I hope that at a subsequent meeting of the two committees, sitting jointly, a majority will decide that we should proceed in public hearings.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say before the Senator concludes that the able Senator from Georgia made a very effective talk, and we all have a high admiration for him. One statement he made, however, disturbed me considerably. I refer to the statement in which he intimated that the White House did not discuss with him such problems as those which have arisen. That is a very unfortunate thing for the country, because the able Senator from Georgia is chairman of one of the most powerful committees of this body, the Armed Services Committee, a committee which deals directly with the defense of the Nation, a committee which helps the Congress of the United States to decide its constitutional obligations with regard to raising and supporting armies and navies and providing therefor. I am satisfied that had the President consulted with him, as he might very properly have done, he might not have made the tragic mistake of removing General MacArthur in the manner in which it was done, and without at least calling the general back for consultation.

As the Senator from Oregon knows, there are four classes of security matters, namely, restricted, confidential, secret, and top secret, and I believe that if the White House had consulted with the able Senator from Georgia before it allowed the leak of the Wake Island conference to take place in the way it did, the Senator from Georgia knowing about security matters, would certainly have advised them that they must not release a top-secret document to one individual newspaper to give a one-sided picture of the situation, without making it available to all people by properly declassifying it, and perhaps giving General MacArthur a chance, at least, to look at the memorandum before it was released. It is very unfortunate that the White House does not call upon the judgment, the standing, and the ability of the able Senator from Georgia more than it apparently does. It might keep out of trouble if it would do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall postpone until another time the speech which I rose to give today on the farm-labor problem. Quite innocently, I am afraid I started something on the floor, and it took more time than I had expected. I am gratified that so many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle share my view on this issue. Perhaps the debate will serve some useful purpose.

I yield the floor.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, earlier in the day I discussed the farm-labor bill, and inserted in the RECORD, by unanimous consent, some telegrams sustaining my position. Since that time I have received quite a number of telegrams from Pueblo Indians in my State. There are 17 pueblos in my State, and some of the Indians have sent me telegrams supporting my position that they should be employed before foreign labor is employed. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams be inserted in the RECORD, together with telegrams from individuals and associations in my State and some telegrams from other States relative to the same issue.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZUNI, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator of New Mexico,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Ramah Tribal Council in behalf of the Ramah Navajos want to compliment you on your gallant stand on Senate bill 984. You have our full support on your stand on this bill.

CHAVEZ COHO,
Delegate, Ramah Tribal Council.

ZUNI, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator of New Mexico,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Zuni Tribal Council in behalf of the Zuni Indians want to compliment you on your gallant stand on Senate bill 984. You have our full support on your stand on this bill.

CONRAD LESARLLEY,
Governor, Zuni Pueblo.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

United States Senator CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We members of Isleta Pueblo want to thank you for your gallant fight for your amendments to S. 984. We are opposed to the original Ellender bill.

JUAN REY ABEITA,
Governor, Isleta Pueblo.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

United States Senator CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We members of the All Pueblo Council are in full accord with your amendments to Senate bill 984. We are opposed to Ellender bill as reported to the Senate.

DIEGO ABEITA.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

United States Senator CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We members of the Isleta Pueblo want to commend you on your fight against the Ellender bill as originally reported to the Senate. We are backing you 100 percent on amendments to S. 984.

JOE S. ABEITA,
Ex-Governor, Isleta.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We members of the Three Pueblo Committee appreciate and will never forget the fight you are putting against the original Ellender

bill. We are in full accord with your amendments to S. 984.

PAT TOYA,
Chairman, Three Pueblo Committee, Jemez Pueblo.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I want to thank you for your splendid fight for your amendments to Senate bill No. 984. I am opposed to Ellender bill as reported to the Senate.

ABEL PAISANO,
Former Chairman of All Pueblo Council, Laguna.

TAOS, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We do not favor Senate bill 984 as originally introduced by Senator ELLENDER. It will be detrimental to working people in the Southwest. Bill must be amended to eliminate its bad features. Our standards of wages and living are much higher than Mexican laborers.

ERNEST MARTINEZ,
Manager, Taos Municipal Water and Sewer System.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building, Washington D. C.:

Albuquerque Typographical Union requests your opposition to S. 984; believes objective unnecessary.

OSCAR NYGQUIST,
President
G. T. GRIFFIN,
Secretary.

TAOS, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate, Washington D. C.:

Original Ellender Senate bill 984 very detrimental to laboring people in our State unless amended to eliminate undesirable features. Bill should be defeated.

PASCUAL MARTINEZ,
Chairman, Municipal Water Board.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building, Washington D. C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars, department of New Mexico, urge your support in Senate bill 984 with your amendment. We are not in favor of Senate bill 984 without amendment.

MILES A. METCALFE,
Department Adjutant Quartermaster.

SUPERIOR, WIS., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

We owners of family-sized farms ask you to vote against bill S. 984 being considered in Senate now to import Mexican laborers for large \merican farms in competition with us small farm operators.

KARL SCHIMENEK,
President,
Dairy Farmers Local 293, A. F. of L.
JOHN BANKS,
Representative, Local 293, A. F. of L.

GALVESTON, TEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This council and its affiliated unions urgently request that you use the influence of your great office to actively oppose S. 984 or support amendments to same.

W. N. NEWMAN,
Secretary, Galveston Labor Council.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ:

Urgently object to enactment of bill S. 984. Do support amendment to protect American workers.

W. P. SCHWERTLICH,
Secretary, San Antonio Trades Council.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
April 30, 1951.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the people of Pennsylvania were saddened by the announcement of the death of Representative FRANK BUCHANAN. He served as one of the five Members of the House from Allegheny County, Pa. He was from an industrial district. Prior to serving as a Representative in Congress, during his life he had served as a member of the council of his city, and he also served well as the mayor of the city of McKeesport.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a fine friend. He was greatly interested in our form of Government. He came up the hard way. I wish to express to the people of his district and to his family our great and profound regret at his passing.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 134) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative the two Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative BUCHANAN, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 1, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Oscar B. Ryder, of Virginia, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1957 (reappointment).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Harold C. Stuart, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. George Ellis Armstrong, O16548, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), for appointment as the Surgeon General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lance T. McBee	Lawrence McGlade
Gordon B. Swango	John P. Flynn, Jr.
George H. Elias	Duane A. Swinford
James Sharp II	Edgar A. Monroe
Myron P. Wieczorek	William N. Gustafson
John B. Marshall, Jr.	Stanley B. Voth
Gustave F. Lueddeke, Jr.	John Padach, Jr.
John H. Campbell	Thomas G. Elder
Dwain Wise	Harold V. Deering
Charles C. Ward	Anthony R. DiGiovanni
Robert Wade	Eugene T. Card
Harold L. Mayfield	Hugh D. Argo
William A. Lutnick	Calvin Wall
Owen V. Gallentine	Donald M. Winters
Ernest L. Engelkes	Charles A. Broudy
Ernest R. Doyle, Jr.	Martin Capages
Nicholas M. Seminoff	Beryl B. Sessions
Robert H. Cook	William W. Bryant
Robert J. Craig	Allen L. Phillips
Cloyd V. Hines	Grover S. Stewart, Jr.
Elmer A. Krieg	George M. Dauphine
John C. Boulware	Herschel G. Connell
James W. Luther	Curtis D. Jernigan
Arthur S. Tarkington	Harry B. Stuckey
Marshall S. Campbell	Rex A. Deasy
Victor E. Johnson, Jr.	Robert N. Welch
Dewey F. Durnford, Jr.	Richard G. Gilmore
Noble L. Beck	Dean Caswell
Leroy V. Corbett	Harold R. Foltz
Clyde P. Guy	John B. Mason
Henry A. Checklou	Clifford A. Allison
Leslie L. Davenport	Danny "W" Johnson
Gene Robertson	Murray V. Harlan, Jr.
James P. Bruce	William H. Mulvey
Clyde B. Shropshire	Robert S. Robertson
John D. Cotton	Louis E. Dunning
Taylor H. Wagner	John H. Cavalero
Robert W. Minick	Walter Panchision
Anthony Edwards	Marshall S. Austin
Lud R. Tucker	Chester J. Poppa
William H. Kellogg	Lewis C. Street III
Robert C. Evans	Leo J. Corboy, Jr.
Marion H. Deckard	Glenn L. Ferguson, Jr.
Charles H. Ludden	William J. Long

Lawrence J. Hofmeister	Edd F. Peel
	William G. Joslyn
Joe "B" Henson	Ben C. Porter
Theodore R. Moore	John S. Alexander
Thomas J. Jones	William A. Mazzarella
James R. Weaver	Joe B. Crownover
Clarence H. Pritchett	Dene T. Harp
William L. Walker	Eugene W. Gleason
Thomas O. Weghorst	John E. Quay, Jr.
Floyd H. Butler, Jr.	Francis W. Vaught
Richard H. Bushnell	Paul G. Graham
Douglas D. Petty, Jr.	Manning "T" Jeter, Jr.
Wayne H. Hoereth	Edgar F. Remington
William A. Davis	John E. McVey
Theodore W. Turcotte	John L. Scott
James H. Berge, Jr.	Drury W. Wood, Jr.
James M. Weidner	Elbert F. Price
George W. Caso	Gordon R. Squires
Thomas L. Sullivan	Joseph W. Krewer
Floyd E. Hyatt	John J. Murphy
John E. Halliwill	Robert D. Slay
Charles I. Rice, Jr.	Richard W. Benton
William H. Ness, Jr.	Harold F. Keller
Daniel Greene	Robert L. Parnell, Jr.
Thomas R. Egan	McDonald D. Tweed
Charles E. Street, Jr.	James B. Turner, Jr.
Donald H. Foss	Loren W. Calhoun
Cecil B. LaFayette	William F. Harrell
Earl F. Patrick	Harvey L. Jensen
Kerwin W. Jacobs	Truman Clark
George D. Kew	Vincent J. Marzelo
Don M. Perkins	Thomas H. Nichols, Jr
Thornwell R. Mangum	Louis J. McGowan
James T. Cronin	Joseph A. Nelson
Lawrence C. Norton	Rocco D. Bianchi
Poul F. Pedersen	Robert V. Anderson
Harold L. Haley	William L. Hall
George H. Green, Jr.	Charles H. Watkins, Jr.
Thiri D. Johnson	
Russell A. Davidson	Chester M. Lupushansky
Stuart V. Schuyler	
Ernest E. Poor	Billie L. Fletcher
James L. Dumas	Samuel B. Burnett
Coleman C. Jones	Edgar D. Pitman
Roger C. Lawson	Landon E. Christian
Harry F. Abbott	David M. Bidwell
Jack H. Adam	Harry Hunter, Jr.
John V. Hanes	Donald R. Dempster
James R. Coltrane	Cecil L. Champion, Jr.
Richard H. Fairchild	Eraine M. Patrias
Wilbourn Waller	Joseph DiFrank, Jr.
Eldon C. Stanton	Richard J. Fellingham
Leo R. Jillisky	Walter E. Sparling
Howard Wolf	Paul L. Hitchcock
Arthur F. Shupe	William R. Quinn
Eugene M. Oster	Joseph L. Wosser, Jr.
Wayne R. Johnson	Stanley G. Dunwiddie, Jr.
James R. Jones	
Byron J. Melancon	Jack G. Kelly
Clarence M. Hurst	Elwin M. Jones
Max F. Brumfield	Julian G. Bass, Jr.
Joseph O. Compton, Jr.	Daniel A. Somerville
	Emanuel R. Amann
Patrick D. Boyle	Wallace N. Wood
Arthur W. Latta, Jr.	Dale Gutshall
Fred F. Eubanks, Jr.	Robert B. Lipscombe, Jr.
Adlin P. Daigle	
Francis K. Tomlinson, Jr.	George R. Pillon
	Charles N. Sims, Jr.
George Kuprash	James T. Doswell II
Frank S. Crawford	Reed T. King
Ted J. Foster	George T. Keys
William D. Watson	Jeremiah D. Shanahan
Donald H. Edwards	Paul T. Wiedenkeller
Ray Connelly	Leslie W. Bays
Kenneth G. Hadcock	Leo Gerlach
Nelson E. Brown	Bobby Carter
Harold L. Green	Donald R. Harris, Jr.
Lloyd F. Childers	Roy E. Oliver
James W. Smith	Jerome J. C. Beau
Billie "E" Loos	Edward E. Kaufer
John Browne	Nathan A. Smith
John P. Baden	Eugene V. Pointer
Herman L. Mixson	Eugenous M. Hovatter
William G. Carter	Robert D. Bohn
Gerald C. Armstrong	Ermel D. Bowen
George L. Davis, Jr.	Leo G. Wears
William H. MacCormack	Matthew A. Clary, Jr.
	Lawrence C. Switzer, Jr.
Breen G. Lansford	
Richard P. Greene	John F. LaSpada
William E. Barrineau	William J. Hinson, Jr.
Edward D. Murray	David P. Graf
Walter C. Kirk	Burneal E. Smith
Frank L. Straner	John G. Theros
William K. Dormady	George A. Gibson
Gordon K. Jackson	Russel H. Stoneman
Theodore A. Stawicki	Robert H. Emswiler
Oscar H. Kirsch	Gus Robinson
Wilbur C. Kellogg, Jr.	Herbert E. Mendenhall
Roland R. Miller	Hermann L. Anderson
James W. Shank	Forrest E. Caudle
Norman Vining	Robert W. Bayless
Lloyd J. Engelhardt	Jack Wood
Clement T. Corcoran	Eugene S. Kane, Jr.
Joseph W. Luker	Charles J. Brewer
Thomas A. White	Wesley F. Demmons
Ardath C. Smith	Arnold S. Baker, Jr.
Eugene W. Derrickson	Mark A. Rainer, Jr.
Delmar L. Edwards	Harvey E. Spielman
Keithe W. Costello	Wilmer W. Hixson
Charles W. Abrahams	John W. Collier, Jr.
Howard H. Zagrodzky	Gene M. Hoover
Martin J. Itzin	Maurice A. David
James B. Anderson	James W. Dunning
Earl W. Thompson	Angelo J. Sammartino
James P. Mariades	James F. Williams
Robert W. Hamilton	Gordon H. Keller, Jr.
William C. Airheart	Eugene Millette
Edward L. Walls, Jr.	Hiel L. VanCampen
Frederick A. Murchall	Harry G. Torbett
George H. Dodenhoff	Robert G. Scurrah
Jerome L. Goebel	Howard A. Blancheri
Paul D. King	Leo G. Lewis, Jr.
Donald M. Bloomer	Adolph G. Schwenk
Keith D. Nolan	James Landrum, Jr.
Robert A. Meyer	Samuel Taub, Jr.
Donald R. Judge	Earl K. Vickers, Jr.
Frederick G. Connelly	Emil M. Misura
Jack R. Grey	Lyle B. Matthews, Jr.
Oliver E. Dial	Raymond McArthur
Samuel A. Wallace	Charles S. Wilder
Walter G. Hunter	Joseph B. Harrison
William S. Harris	Standish Green
Edward B. McNeill, Jr.	Arnold P. Smith
Milton B. Cooper	Leo R. Ryan
Louis T. Iglehart, Jr.	Frank P. Stivers, Jr.
John J. Fedor	Loren R. Smith
Gordon B. McPherson	Lee H. Hardee
Paul F. Curtis	Miller M. Blue
John "M" Price	Patrick J. Dayson
Duane W. Skow	Francis E. Finch
Orlin A. P. Hughes	Jack Glenn
Ralph B. Crossman	Melvyn H. Kerr
Edward W. Carmichael	Richard H. Mample
Donald H. Brooks	Charles A. Arneson
Charles D. Mize	William R. Affleck, Jr.
Burton L. Lucas, Jr.	Thomas P. O'Callaghan
William F. Doehler	
James M. Sherwood	Ernest R. Olson
Henry L. Claterbos	Mildridge E. Mangum
Joseph F. Holzbauer	Guy W. Rowlett
Eugene B. Fallon	David W. Graybeal
Thomas E. Gleason	Robert Zeugner
Roy H. Miller	Joseph T. Odenthal
Sumner A. Vale	Theodore D. Hess
Lawrence V. M. Wickham	Thomas J. Horgan, Jr.
	George E. Smith
William P. Cosgrove	William B. Creel
Horton E. Roeder	Willie J. Mixson
Palmer H. Rixey	Arthur R. Dykeman
Carl O. H. Haroldson	Reuben H. Hanson
Frederic A. Hale, Jr.	Hugh M. Steele
William L. McCulloch	Stewart C. Barber
Don H. Blanchard	Parker O. Pettigrew
Robert C. Messman	Samuel L. Eddy, Jr.
Ray N. Joens	Albert W. Snell
James G. Dionisopoulos	Walter L. Hill
	John B. Wilson, Jr.
John W. McNulty, Jr.	Albin L. Lindall, Jr.
James C. Gasser	John L. Hamilton, Jr.
Henry A. Berck	Francis A. Ratchford
Bernard L. Turner	Almarion S. Bailey
Lyle V. Tope	Charles E. Wydner, Jr.
Harold C. Fuson	George B. Woodbury
Richard D. Temple	Leo R. Sonnenberg
Walter L. Persac	Chester V. Farmer
Francis R. Kraince	James E. Pearsall
Lavern J. Oltmer	James W. Campbell
George A. Brigham	Daniel R. Evans
Francis C. Opeka	Robert A. Henry
Raymond W. Mullane	William D. Pomeroy
Paul B. Byrum	Victor Stoyanow
William H. Lanagan, Jr.	Harry G. Robinson, Jr.
	Louis J. Sartor
William M. Smith	Meyer LaBellman
Paul D. LaFond	Frank A. Eldracher, Jr.
Jay V. Poage	Marvin D. Volkert
Ralph E. Brandel	John Ladutko
Ralph E. Lower	Donald McGuire
William F. Koehnlein	Ralph D. Call
Amo F. Judd	Connor W. Hollingsworth
John Craig	
Donald E. Watterson	William J. Beer
Harold E. Savage	Francis J. Murphy
Edwin B. White, Jr.	Howard L. Franklin

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William D. Miears	Adam A. Metz
Robert J. Greenway	Edgar S. Hamilton
William M. Rossiter	Paul Adams
Oscar A. Bosma	Bill L. Parham
John C. Hudock	Gerald L. Pines
Felix L. Ferranto	Henry G. Goare
Alfred T. Coon	Warren L. Mobley
William L. Nolte	Kenneth M. Stayer

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Bill Cunningham, Jasper, Ala., in place of W. D. Leake, retired.

Mildred A. Kimbrel, Trinity, Ala., in place of F. D. Lile, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Lucile G. Jamieson, Dana Point, Calif., in place of D. T. Prenter, resigned.

Elizabeth Lane, Lemoncove, Calif., in place of F. J. Darby, resigned.

Samuel H. Brandt, Robles Del Rio, Calif., in place of W. I. Henry, resigned.

Bessie L. McEver, Santa Rita Park, Calif., in place of W. M. Sargent, resigned.

Mildred A. Hauser, Santa Ynez, Calif., in place of V. E. Mackey, resigned.

COLORADO

George B. Peck, Jr., Estes Park, Colo., in place of J. B. Sella, deceased.

Leslie E. Taylor, Haxtun, Colo., in place of T. C. Crist, deceased.

Kenneth M. Sloan, Hot Sulphur Springs, Colo., in place of M. L. Huffaker, resigned.

Vance E. Neighbors, Longmont, Colo., in place of A. B. Adkisson, retired.

Carleton Hoffmeister, Rifle, Colo., in place of J. M. McLearn, resigned.

GEORGIA

William E. Boatwright, Rayle, Ga., in place of Bessie Boatwright, retired.

IDAHO

James W. Hann, Buhl, Idaho, in place of L. P. Runyon, retired.

ILLINOIS

Richard J. Schnell, Elgin, Ill., in place of Joseph Kreeger, retired.

Clarence G. Sinn, Marissa, Ill., in place of H. J. Young, retired.

Raymond T. Gavin, Maywood, Ill., in place of J. W. Duffy, retired.

Neal W. Boddeker, Niota, Ill., in place of W. T. Steiner, resigned.

INDIANA

Claude B. Holder, Hope, Ind., in place of A. C. Reeves, transferred.

Norman Bretz, Huntingburg, Ind., in place of N. L. A. Koerner, retired.

Paul V. Geiger, Markle, Ind., in place of C. A. Kelsey, transferred.

Frank S. Anderson, Salem, Ind., in place of H. L. Menaugh, retired.

IOWA

Earl E. Grinstead, Danville, Iowa, in place of S. H. Sater, retired.

Eugene E. Stinn, Earling, Iowa, in place of J. J. Langenfeld, resigned.

Charles E. Hinde, Early, Iowa, in place of R. A. Kelley, transferred.
Clarence L. Suer, Otho, Iowa, in place of O. C. Hanson, retired.

KANSAS

Harold E. Kirmer, Spearville, Kans., in place of R. J. Laudick, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Ray A. Brafford, Gray, Ky., in place of R. I. Gray, retired.

MARYLAND

Josephine O. Harding, Berwyn, Md., in place of P. J. Byrne, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ralph R. Wilson, Rockport, Mass., in place of W. D. Powers, retired.
William J. Dowd, South Walpole, Mass., in place of J. J. Easton, retired.

MICHIGAN

Thomas H. Branigan, Auburn, Mich., in place of O. W. Murphy, removed.
Charles E. Wesner, Buchanan, Mich., in place of A. G. Haslett, retired.
J. Donald Van Sickle, Carson City, Mich., in place of W. J. Grace, transferred.
Arthur G. Warlick, Jr., Colon, Mich., in place of H. K. Snook, resigned.
Vernon P. McGuire, Detour, Mich., in place of J. A. McDonald, retired.
Julian J. Zochowski, Newport, Mich., in place of W. W. Francisco, transferred.
Albert C. Johnston, Palmyra, Mich., in place of Ruth Hoffman, transferred.
John S. Miller, Rapid River, Mich., in place of F. T. Cavill, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Marcel E. Novotny, Badger, Minn., in place of O. M. Wammer, transferred.
Leon C. Smith, Granada, Minn., in place of C. H. Hiatt, deceased.
Walter A. Wichelman, Hamburg, Minn., in place of M. B. Scheele, transferred.

MISSOURI

Michael B. Lee., Milan, Mo., in place of S. G. Morehead, resigned.

MONTANA

Roland Keith Taylor, Fairview, Mont., in place of M. H. Johnson, resigned.
Walter J. Maddock, Sunburst, Mont., in place of J. W. Huntsberger, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Wayne Stahl, Cranbury, N. J., in place of J. N. Stonaker, deceased.
Helen B. Cubberley, Deerfield Street, N. J., in place of C. B. Moore, retired.

NEW YORK

John V. Hartigan, Chatham, N. Y., in place of John Hartigan, retired.
Norris F. Patchen, Martville, N. Y., in place of D. W. Mott, transferred.
Anthony M. Cipriano, Mount Morris, N. Y., in place of L. C. Donovan, deceased.
John F. Harrison, Port Jervis, N. Y., in place of T. J. Conmy, retired.
Harry L. Gregory, Roxbury, N. Y., in place of M. H. Fanning, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Samuel L. Davis, West Jefferson, N. C., in place of B. D. Barr, resigned.
Davis Francis Hill, Youngsville, N. C., in place of M. F. Cheatham, retired.

OHIO

Stanley M. Bardon, Grafton, Ohio, in place of T. C. Washington, resigned.
Raphael J. Frangella, North Olmsted, Ohio, in place of M. C. Eldridge, resigned.
Chester R. Ralstin, Otway, Ohio, in place of Frank Koenig, transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Alice M. Farhar, Okeene, Okla., in place of W. G. Baustert, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Stewart S. Young, Duncannon, Pa., in place of W. O. Miller, retired.
Harvey O. Eck, Emmaus, Pa., in place of A. F. Buck, deceased.
Elizabeth M. Murphy, Hokendauqua, Pa., in place of M. S. Porter, retired.
Bertha N. Martin, Intercourse, Pa., in place of C. M. Brubaker, retired.
James L. O'Toole, Sharon, Pa., in place of J. L. Considine, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Francis G. Jurrens, Buffalo Gap, S. Dak., in place of W. J. Nolan, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Carey Spence Nicely, Corryton, Tenn., in place of E. B. Mullins, retired.

TEXAS

Bruce W. Bray, Albany, Tex., in place of P. H. Williams, retired.
Mary E. Russell, Annona, Tex., in place of T. E. Lawson, retired.
Joe L. Shelton, Brownfield, Tex., in place of J. H. Dallas, resigned.
Billy M. Wall, Nacogdoches, Tex., in place of Mary Thomason, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Thomas G. Cunningham, Mount Vernon, Va., in place of E. J. Monroe, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Hugh A. Miller, Granite Falls, Wash., in place of C. R. Monk, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Arthur L. Peters, Frederic, Wis., in place of Victoria St. Angelo, resigned.
Donald L. Bennett, Glen Haven, Wis., in place of E. R. White, transferred.
Edwin R. Barden, Platteville, Wis., in place of H. M. Harms, transferred.
Herman J. Glinski, Stevens Point, Wis., in place of F. A. Hirzy, resigned.
Michael J. Gonring, West Bend, Wis., in place of F. P. O'Meara, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

C. Dudley Miller

To be a dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Peter B. Drez

To be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Frank C. Sammis, Jr.

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Reede M. Ames
Frank E. Dondero
Eileen Foley
Milton W. Skolaut
Jacob Levy
Paul R. Jolly

To be junior assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Joseph N. Salvino

To be senior scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

Herbert E. Stokinger

To be sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

John C. Eason, Jr.

To be senior assistant sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Wallace W. Jonz

To be senior assistant scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Elvio H. Sadun
Edwin J. Robinson, Jr.
Geoffrey M. Jeffery

To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Virginia L. Porter

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Martin Yanishevsky
Henry W. Beard
Richard B. Sherwood
Alfred A. Rosenberg
John A. Scigliano
William M. Hanna

To be junior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Ralph K. Longaker

To be senior assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Ladd N. Loomis

To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Merilys E. Porter

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER AND MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. George Irving Back, O10267, United States Army, for appointment as Chief Signal Officer, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of William M. Murray et al. for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 28, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William M. Murray, which is shown on page 2960, and ending with the name of Gordon C. Russell, which is shown on page 2961.

The nominations of George R. Clammer et al. for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 11, 1951, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of George R. Clammer, which appears on page 3671, and ending with the name of Harry A. Yoder, which is shown on page 3672.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of George Edward Adams et al. for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 11, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of George Edward Adams, which is shown on page 3665, and ending with the name of William Stephen Rooney, which is shown on page 3671.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public

Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be majors, United States Air Force (medical)

Arthur J. Katzberg, O482310.
Gordon H. Rhoades, AO277553.

To be captains, United States Air Force (medical)

Kenneth W. Clement, O1746021.
James F. DeLoach, O1736633.
Robert C. Doherty, AO1906863.
Bernard E. Flaherty, AO1745326.
Robert J. Kurth, AO1766746.

To be captains, United States Air Force (dental)

William H. Book, AO401408.
Henry I. Copeland, Jr., AO966807.
Maurice L. Parrish, AO1775019.
Loren H. Schwarzrock, AO1700871.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (medical)

Charles A. Berry.
Donald P. Ford, AO2213605.
Samuel L. Gabby, Jr., AO2212535.
Billy N. Gray, AO670884.
Thomas M. Holcomb, AO970162.
Ronald W. Krumbach, AO2212400.
John R. Weimer, AO2212322.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (dental)

Ernest M. Baird II, AO1864300.
Clarence M. McCall, Jr., AO1906199.
Owen J. Morrissey, AO1545132.
Edwin W. Owen, AO870020.
Russell J. Salentine, AO1906198.
Vincent A. Segreto, AO966302.

The following-named distinguished officer candidates for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Jack A. Hayes, AO1910602.
Walfred J. Larson, AO591376.
Edward C. Lassiter, AO1910620.
Frank H. Rave, AO1910642.
Pasquale Torraco, AO1910663.
Miles S. Washington, Jr., AO1910672.

The following-named distinguished officer candidate for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 301, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be second lieutenant

Anita M. Bellizzi, AL1910565.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadet for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenant

Lansing G. Scofield.

The following-named person for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenant

George R. Loftis, 532986, USN.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 103, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, in the grades indicated, with dates of ranks to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 105, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by section 2 of Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress:

To be captains, United States Air Force (nurses)

Muriel Ammons, N727562.
Mary E. Anderson, AN727475.
Juliet M. D. Anton, AN802148.
Elena M. Ardoin, AN789745.
Nellie J. Bailey, AN733947.
Alice R. Bakutis, AN752143.
Madeline Barneycastle, AN787666.
Marjorie E. Beakes, AN757386.
Josephine M. Becker, AN730943.
Adeline T. Bell, AN734657.
Mildred A. Bell, AN759776.
Rose M. Bendetti, N722630.
Dorothy M. Berendsen, AN741020.
Helen E. Berman, AN742712.
Eleanor E. Bernick, AN725678.
Una L. Black, AN735065.
Janice M. Blount, AN787292.
Jonita R. Bonham, AN790311.
Edith Brandes, AN798849.
Helen L. Brennan, AN755503.
Helen E. Brown, AN793092.
Elizabeth L. Buzan, AN732918.
Kathrine G. Cahill, AN734232.
Flora G. Carmine, AN728249.
Barbara H. Carson, AN790314.
Mildred E. Castleberry, AN787674.
Maclovia Cavazos, AN779372.
Dorothy J. Christison, AN733166.
E. Lynne Christy, AN725397.
Helen A. Chupka, AN730123.
Margaret S. Clouse, AN736535.
Eleanor B. Cochran, AN775978.
Catherine A. Coffman, AN776283.
Cora E. Conerly, AN735050.
Elizabeth J. Conroy, N720395.
Mary I. Cossey, AN756154.
Opal G. Davis, AN732653.
Charlotte B. Detweiler, AN725963.
Aileen A. Dupont, AN721360.
Ona M. Emigh, AN790577.
Marie O. Eyman, AN760227.
Margaret M. Fallon, AN720332.
Florence F. Fintak, AN730564.
Rose M. Fiorello, AN755411.
Pearl M. Fleming, AN720266.
Ruth M. Foley, AN722543.
Josephine E. Fornara, AN793977.
June H. Freedman, AN737941.
Joyce Godard, AN727209.
Viola Graham, AN759835.
Lillian A. Gravis, AN789580.
Anne M. Gregg, AN 789643.
Matilda D. Grinevich, AN723284.
Angelica L. Gulick, AN790188.
Edith J. Gunning, AN723212.
Karolyna J. Harrison, AN774044.
Grace J. Hayden, AN720038.
Martha J. Hierstein, AN731429.
Emily E. Hilbus, AN775470.
Mary E. Hoadley, AN731391.
Ethel A. Hoefly, AN758457.
Ernestine F. Hohberger, AN788742.
Helen Humphries, AN727378.
Marguerite L. Jernigan, AN726408.
Josephine Jezek, AN787359.
Esther M. Johnson, AN733006.
Margaret E. Johnson, AN768458.
Martha L. Johnson, AN724407.
Frieda E. Keso, AN730435.
Helen M. Kiley, AN751748.
Helen H. King, AN732153.
Vera D. King, AN728149.
Kathryn E. Kovatovich, AN733522.
Alice R. Krieble, AN745257.
Marguerite M. Laetsch, AN752944.
Marion E. Leeper, AN784292.
Dorothy E. Lonergan, AN730554.
Nara M. Luzietti, AN756854.
Mary C. Lynch, AN703953.
Ethel S. Madden AN785083.
Jeanne R. Marquis, AN720020.
Edna S. Mattonen, AN784930.
Blanche A. McCloskey, AN774136.
Marguerite E. McDonald, AN720244.
Margaret E. McKenzie, AN788569.
Mary E. McNamara, AN730121.
Dorothy M. Menge, AN731106.
Pauline T. Michalka, AN734714.
Idabelle Miller, AN788981.
Isabelle A. Miller, AN784638.
Kathryn Miller, AN769934.
Mary V. Miller, AN788564.
Elizabeth S. Moritz, AN797466.
Kathryn A. Moyes, AN771432.
Elizabeth A. Murphy, AN736021.
Sara K. Neese, AN759293.
Myrtle N. Nereson, AN737706.
Annice E. Norred, AN727736.
Cecilia E. Ot nhoff, AN771049.
Dominica B. O'Brien, AN775331.
Mary E. O'Donnell, AN723131.
Suzanne M. Ottoy, AN743720.
Merilys E. Porter, 6787199.
Marbara W. Preston, AN778086.
Violet I. Price, AN723214.
Alice M. Ragin, AN745326.
Anne D. Reams, AN769352.
Margaret E. Remington, AN788713.
Margaret A. Richey, AN734379.
Winifred M. Robinson, AN787269.
Winnie B. Sanders, N726507.
Rose N. Slusher, AN767854.
Elinor V. Smith, AN741293.
Elverene N. Smith, AN760076.
Charlotte M. Stein, AN771554.
Melba G. Stone, AN742768.
Esther E. Taylor, AN727765.
Frances J. Valentine, AN789393.
Mary L. Van Horn, AN797591.
Fanny E. Vlahovich, AN723758.
Mabel L. Wakeland, AN726869.
Gertrude M. Walsh, AN752366.
Patricia I. Ward, AN726012.
Bernice V. Wasilewski, AN760373.
Amy R. Webster, AN726945.
Helen O. Weissbeck, AN732384.
Eleanor Welch, AN723710.
Eva J. Wheeler, AN731466.
Mary L. White, AN797502.
Clara D. Whitley, AN733830.
Elizabeth A. Wright, AN724532.
Jane H. York, AN745254.
Emily E. Zack, AN742490.
Alice E. Zayatz, AN751463.
Mabel M. Zibell, AN790434.

To be captains, United States Air Force (women's medical specialists)

Jack LaRue, AM2271.
Mary M. Laughlin, AM2359.
Dellamae Motley, AR234.
Frances E. Smith, AR2378.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (nurses)

Theresa L. Bell, AN778039.
Thelma L. Dawson, AN794681.
Irene C. Falkenhagen, AN758841.
Katheryne J. Hills, AN790802.
Dorothy H. Janowicz, AN799356.
Evelyn N. Lawrence, AN780190.
Dorothy N. Livingston, AN762821.
Margaret J. Mills, AN770031.
Lyla P. Milroy, AN785781.
Mary M. Mullen, AN753862.
Anna Obletiloff, AN796735.
Mary A. Partin, AN765386.
Jane Saunders, AN765873.
Mary A. Schreiber, AN768785.
Madeline P. Sebasky, AN801369.
Rose M. Shefuo, AN796151.
Lillian M. Soto, AN1865751.
Lillian F. Stone, AN796205.
Hilda E. Velasquez, AN780079.
Hope E. Waite, AN754480.
Zada C. Zarling, AN795695.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (women's medical specialists)

Frances M. Gasson, AR2370.
Jean R. Gates, AM2213207.
Dorothy M. Griffin, AM2240.
Betty F. Hearne, AM2832.
Doris C. Knausz, AM2280.
Julia V. Skellchock, AR1056.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 101, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants, United States Air Force (nurses)

Helen E. Calm, AN792249.
Dorothy M. Horton, AN1906113.
Joan E. Kelley, AN1906106.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Charles D. Anderson	William M. Kottas
Kenneth G. Baker	Frank B. McGehee
Frank E. Bennett	James R. Odom, Jr.
Philip C. Davis, Jr.	Tom M. Skillman
Cyril H. Dingwell	Otis A. Sleep
Joseph J. Gyulavics	Paul E. Snodgress
William B. Johnson	William J. Warren

The following-named person for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be captain, United States Air Force (medical)

Paul Bittick, Jr.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 103, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 105, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by section 2 of Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress:

To be captains, United States Air Force (nurses)

Janice A. Albert, AN787252.
Myrtle R. Brewer, AN765537.
Bernice E. Britton, AN725855.
Etta Chandler, AN760295.
Margaret E. Daniel, AN724676.
Gussie L. Dowell, AN788005.
Geraldine E. Hellen, AN744119.
Margaret M. Kiefer, AN731698.
Lillian M. Kinkela, AN788295.
Lucile C. Slattery, AN759493.
Clare E. Stanton, AN720344.
Margaret Vizard, AN731281.

To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force (nurse)

Genevieve E. Martell, AN800023.

To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force (Women's Medical Specialist)

Janet E. Cook, AM2605.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

John C. Fremont	Robert P. King
Bruce E. Graham	James I. Meeker
Virgil I. Grissom	Dallas K. Stephens
Thomas E. Hadley II	Richard J. Swan
Robert B. Hunter, Jr.	Albert H. Ward, Jr.

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

Edwin Eugene Aldrin, Jr.
William Anderson Allen
Loren Albin Anderson
Robert Douglas Anderson
Walter Julian Bacon II
Willett John Baird, Jr.
John Garland Ballard, Jr.
Daniel Spaulding Barnes
William Thomas Barnett
Arnim Lavelle Brantley
Lou Enlow Bretzke
John Freeman Brown, Jr.
Lewis Christian Buffington, Jr.
Jose Andres Chacon
Donn Fergus Chandler
Clyde Cocke, Jr.
Mathews McCleave Collins
Julius Ronald Conti, Jr.
Peyton Ellsworth Cook
Ralph Cooper
Patrick Joseph Corrigan
John Harrold Craigie
John Walter Croan
Joseph Paul Crocco
John William Cunningham
William Hugh Cuthbertson
Gordon Elmer Danforth
John Charles Mousseau des Islets
Samuel Thomas Dickens
Gerald Edgar Dickson, Jr.
Richard Gerry Dingman
Wayne Manford Dozier
Billy Joe Ellis
Lawrence Lee Eppley, Jr.
Frank Raymond Fischl, Jr.
Frank Reese Forrest
Charles Lynn Galloway
Bruno Antonio Giordano
John Leslie Glossbrenner
John Bennett Gordon, Jr.
Adam Allan Gorski, Jr.
Richard Paul Guidroz
Samuel Murton Guild, Jr.
Richard Alan Haggren
Frederick Jordan Hampton
Daniel Mark Harmon
Harold Edward Headlee
Robert Michael Hechinger
Gerald Keith Hendricks
Frederic Allison Henney, Jr.
Kennith Frank Hite
Franklin Herbert Hodgkins
David Webster Huff
Allan Parker Hunt, Jr.
John Colcock Hutson
Robert Louis Jacobs
Saul Antman Jacobs
Harley Earl Jeans
Loyd Merrill Johnson
Verle LaFayette Johnston
Peter Rowland Kuhn
Barney McCoy Landry, Jr.
Larry James Larsen
Robert Lerner
David Edward Leyshon
Ledyard Long, Jr.
Harold Gene Marsh
Peter Matthews
Anthony Wayne Maynard, Jr.
Robert Franklin McDonald
Donald Albert McGann
Thomas Henry McMullen
Paul Richard Miller
Dain William Milliman, Jr.
William Gregory Moretti, Jr.
Robert Frank Niemann
Alfred Dobson Norton
Robert Earle Olson
John Robert Osborn
Howard Louis Peckham, Jr.
Frank George Penney
Leland Carl Pinkel
Leo Fred Post, Jr.
John Cooper Powell
Jack Lewis Price
Edward Rudolph Prince, Jr.
William Michael Quinn
Irving Butler Reed
Gerald Selah Reeve
Fred Guillermo Reichard
William Lloyd Richardson, Jr.
John Ritchie
David Eaithell Rogers
Donald Henry Roloff
Ernest Guy Rose
William Joseph Ryan
John Alexander Samotis
David Myron Schlatter, Jr.
Seth Ward Scruggs
Philip Sheridan
George Shibata
John Wesley Shine
Harold Dean Shultz
Frank Elliott Sisson II
Carleton Keith Sprague
John Paul Starrett
George Alden Sundlie
Everette Taylor
Stanley Milward Umstead, Jr.
Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg, Jr.
William J. Veurink
Frank Elliott Walker, Jr.
Stephen Watsey
Absalom Theodore Webber, Jr.
Howard Olen Wiles, Jr.
Thomas Humphrey Williams
Charles Russell Witmer, Jr.
James Russell Young, Jr.
Donald David Zurawski

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

John Edwin Allen
Harvey Thomas Bailey
Weldon Ralph Baird
Dickey Lee Baltz
William Oakley Banks
Thomas Augustus Bartenfeld, Jr.
Henry Leigh Baulch
Ralph Russell Baurichter
William John Bell
Victor Cokayne Benjovsky
John Orrin Berga
John Theodore Berrier
Everett Dale Biddle, Jr.
Clement Dixon Billingslea
Paul Russell Birch
Jackson Huffman Bowden
Horace Lane Brame
Robert B. Bregman
Joseph Philip Brenkle
Donald Atwood Brewer
Gerald Allen Brown
Jack Darwin Brown
James Richard Brown
Sidney Pat Burke
Theo Kit Carson
Patrick Joseph Cashman, Jr.
Wallace Gilbert Christner
Vincent Pancrazio Ciamprone
Edward Paul Clark
Donld Conklin Cole
Donald King Cole
Thomas Patrick Conlin
John Watson Cooper
Joseph Patrick Corrigan III
William Patrick Craven
Alvan Macauley Crews
Gerald Thomas Cullen
Joseph Edward Dailey
Walter Millard Drake, Jr.
Charles Bauer Duke, Jr.
Donald Duane Dusch
Ernest Edward Ebrite
Halvor Martin Ekeren
Antonio Manuel Fernandez, Jr.
David Frederick Ferree
Edward Dunne Flynn
William Hammersley Frasca
Joseph Thomas Garofalo, Jr.

Marvin Colgan Gaske
Robert Edwin Genter
Herman Mills Giesen
Ralph James Gilbert
Leo Glenn, Jr.
Frederick Francis Gorschboth
Robert Patterson Gould
James Harris Grady
Fred Brown Graham
Donald Robert Griesmer
Edward Shuldon Guthrie, Jr.
David William Hall
Frank Charles Halstead
John Francis Hanaway
Robert Chester Harding
Harry George Hartman
LeRoy Kenneth Heidbreder
John David Hemenway
Richard Chester Higgins, Jr.
Max Lloyd Hill, Jr.
Joseph Patrick Hillock, Jr.
Raymond Helttula Howard
James Charles Hunt, Jr.
Francis Robert Hunter, Jr.
Calvin William Hurd
James Benson Irwin
Thomas LeRoy Jackson
Carl Charles Jaffurs
David Russell James
Albert William Johnson
Boyd Walker Johnson
Robert Burns Kalisch
Donald Jerome Kay
Jack Ish Kendrick
Kermit Alexander Kirby
Cecil Edward Langmack
Jerome LaPides
Robert Vernon Larson
James Arthur Latham
William Henry Lawton, Jr.
John Hirst Lederle
Mark Eliot Lemelman
Raymond Harry Lessig
William Duexsaint LeStourgeon
Robert Brierley Loughead, Jr.
Edward Miller Lyden
Paul Leslie Maier
Louis Gene Marlow
John Floyd Martin
Paul Brice Martin
Keith Wayne Matson
John Francis McCaffrey
James Edward McCormick
Charles Evans McDonough
James Eugene McGarrah
John Ferries McGrew
Robert Henderson McIntosh
Charles Joe Meadow
John Nicholas Mehelas
Robert Louis Meinhold
Freddie Dan Meredith
Bernard Stanley Morgan, Jr.
Tipton Pryor Mott-Smith
Joseph John Mularz
David Michael Mullaney
James Barber Murphy
Daniel Crawford Murray
Robert Walker Muth
Stanford Nall
David Fenton Neely
William Boyd Nelson
Donald Alfred Nicksay
John Walter Niven
Charles Wolfgang Nyquist
Charles Clark O'Brien
Basil Anthony Ortolivo
Philip Miller Pahl
Robert Dixon Painter
William Joseph Pardee
James Wheeler Parmelee
Erwin Crockett Peake
James Dargan Perky
Benjamin Francis Price
Kenneth Elmer Pruden
Rudolph Walter Pysz
Lawrence Radkowsky
Jack Lloyd Ramey
Raun Jay Rasmussen
Richard Harold Rasmussen
Robert John Rehwaldt
Raymond Walter Reig
Donald Anthony Richitt
Raymond Arthur Robbins
Louis Aubrey Roberts, Jr.
Robert Martin Roberts
William Gordon Rollins
Theodore Chapman Rook
Robert Walker Roy
Anthony Durk Rynties
Kenneth James Schlagheck
John Preston Schuler
Leonard Warren Seagren
Louis Walker Sessions
Thomas Llewellyn Sheets
Thomas Webster Sherman, Jr.
Stewart Mitchell Singer
John George Skidmore
Paul Amos Smith, Jr.
William Morris Smith, Jr.
Frank Alan Stelzer
Perry Lee Stephens
William Griffith Stephenson III
Walter Clarence Stevens, Jr.
David Twogood Stockman
William Rex Thomas, Jr.
Anthony Stearns Thorne
Frederick James Trost
Willard Martin Truesdell
Edward Wingfield Verner
Charles Matthew Waespy
Richard Ambrose Walsh III
Clifford Lloyd Ward
William Alexander Weaver
Oscar Werner Weber
Donald Elliott Westbrook
James Eugene White
Carr Choate Whitener
William Alonzo Williams, Jr.
William Boyd Wilson

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of David E. Allison et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 3, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of David E. Allison, which is shown on page 3195, and ending with the name of Ruth Williams, which is shown on page 3198.

The nominations of Henry H. Adams, Jr., et. al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 17, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Henry H. Adams, Jr., which is shown on page 3985, and ending with the name of Harriett E. Tompkins, which is shown on page 3986.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who art always mindful of our needs, we rejoice that in our days of confusion and perplexity Thou art our guide and counselor; in our periods of trial and tribulation Thou art our refuge and strength; and in our times of loneliness and sorrow Thou art companion and comforter.

We pray that these assurances and the abundance of our blessings may never fill us with a sense of independence and self-complacency or make us supercilious and selfishly indifferent to the desperate struggles of others.

Inspire us with an eager longing to relieve the burdens of all mankind and to dedicate ourselves more earnestly to the glorious task of laying the foundation for a better world.

We thank thee for the Christian life and character of Thy servant who labored here so conscientiously and devotedly in obedience to the demands and responsibilities of his high vocation. Grant unto the broken and sorrowing hearts of the members of his bereaved family the healing touch of Thy divine love and the consolation of Thy grace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 26, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3336) entitled "An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tomorrow to call both the Consent and Private Calendars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE FRANK BUCHANAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is personal. A real man, a real friend, a true servant of democracy, a Representative in the Congress of the United States, passed away on Friday.

You all knew him as a fellow Congressman, FRANK BUCHANAN. I knew him as Frank. His name alone was a tribute to his life and to my enjoyment of his friendship that has been tested through the years.

I must break today a silence of love, for no man tells another through days of association that he loves his friend. Unfortunately, the death of a man breaks that silence, when all the words

in the world are lost in a void, the void of death and the void of loss. We, who remain after our friends depart, call upon memory to acclaim. My memories of FRANK BUCHANAN are as fresh as yesterday's rain.

When such a personal loss occurs, the effect is a lament. But as the hours pass, a narcotic of memory, pleasant and soul-satisfying, disposes the personal hurt and produces a pride for the friendship and the knowing of a friend. Then there is a peace and a joy that follows that would be envied by the world's greatest philosopher.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to trespass upon the time of the House by speaking of my personal feelings, for what I want to do and say here in this presence is a tribute to a fellow Member, and again, once again, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, this is fact.

One dies for his country despite battlefields.

One dies for his country as a Congressman. No glory to men who serve by voice.

Your pardon, Mr. Speaker, for injecting another personal tone. But my friend, Mr. BUCHANAN, who lived in the tradition of America, whose life, cut short by an intense desire to serve honorably and unselfishly in a position as servant to our people of the United States, loaded his heart and mind with responsibilities that ultimately caused his retirement to the world beyond. It is not necessary to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that a sacrifice of this sort is an occurrence among us. There are no words in defense of capabilities, extended as they are by the Members of the Congress. The words of a eulogy never repay the sacrifice of Members and their families for the loss of time and comfort and even the presence of the loved one. Occasions such as this make one realize how truly the word "servant" befits us. As the bell tolls the years of our ages, there will always be men like BUCK BUCHANAN who listen not—all in the interests of the people.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today we mourn the passing of our dear friend, FRANK BUCHANAN, and we are not only reminded of the brevity of life, but we come to a true realization of the work and character of this fine, clean, outstanding man. Coming out of the city of McKeesport, Pa., where it has been aptly said men make iron and steel for a living, there was something ingrained in this man's nature of strength and durability. He was a fine, consistent, conscientious man; a man of high ideals, who believed in his country and in his fellow man, and had the courage to stand and defend those convictions.

Well educated, a graduate of the University of Pittsburgh and of Columbia University, he gave his early life to teaching the young manhood and young womanhood of his community. As he moved on he became mayor of that great city and he exemplified the highest attributes of civic administration and of a conscientious real duty. Then he came here to serve for nearly 6 years. This country is all the better for FRANK BUCHANAN having lived, and to have devoted himself to public service.

I remember distinctly the strong stand he took on the matter of public housing and the like; and, while we did not see eye to eye on many political questions, I knew that deep in his heart was that conscientious realization that he must do something for his community. He did that to the best of his ability.

So today, as we mourn his departure, we all learn how inadequate and futile are words to convey our inmost feelings, but I am sure every Member of this House realizes today that he has lost a fine friend and that this country has been deprived of the services of a real man all too early in life.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of FRANK BUCHANAN, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, was, I know, a profound shock to all of us. To me, it is a matter of deep personal grief. He was my friend.

That this diligent and conscientious worker in our ranks should be stricken down in the prime of his career is, perhaps, a sign of the pressures under which we all labor here in these critical times.

Mr. BUCHANAN was relatively young man, yet already he had served his community, his State, and his country. His record of public service as a high-school teacher, as the mayor of McKeesport, Pa., and as a Member of the Congress had marked him as one for whom the future held great possibilities of leadership in the field of statecraft.

Perhaps his greatest contribution to the legislative annals of our day was made as chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. He was the author of the resolution creating that committee and pursued the investigation with vigor, determination, and yet with fairness. Respecting the constitutional right of all citizens to petition their Government, Mr. BUCHANAN, at the same time, zealously favored the publication of financial reports by all organized groups seeking to influence legislation.

Despite the burdens of this special undertaking, he continued to carry on with his usual energy and industry his duties as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the District of Columbia Committee, and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

His special field of interest lay in economics and political science as attested, not only by his committee service here but by his record as a student and teacher. He was graduated from the University of Pittsburgh in 1925 with the degree of bachelor of science and pursued postgraduate studies at Columbia University.

In McKeesport high schools he taught civics and political science, and in private industry for a time was employed as an economic consultant.

After a 4-year term as mayor of his native city, Mr. BUCHANAN was elected to the Seventy-ninth Congress to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Representative Samuel A. Weiss, who became a judge.

Mr. BUCHANAN served the people of the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania well and faithfully and was rewarded by reelection successively to the Eightieth, Eighty-first, and Eighty-second Congresses.

Always a loyal party member, FRANK BUCHANAN, however, did not permit partisanship to take precedence over the interests of his country. He was a devoted patriot. His support of the Democratic Party sprang from his deep and sincere convictions that its principles best serve the Nation.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to the family of FRANK BUCHANAN, his wife, and his lovely twin daughters, in whom he took such pride.

The members of the Pennsylvania delegation have lost a genuine friend, the people of his district have lost a true servant, and the Nation has lost a fine legislator.

We will all miss him greatly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a poet once said:

> Not a soul beneath the sun
> But what is precious unto one.

Our late friend, FRANK BUCHANAN, was precious unto countless of thousands of persons. His contributions in this House to the welfare of our people were numerous. It is not my purpose to refer to them on this occasion, but his contributions have now become a part of the history of this great body.

During his living and dynamic prayer this morning the Chaplain among other things referred to our "dedicating ourselves to the building of a finer world," and as he uttered these words the immediate response in my mind was, how true they are in their application to the life of our late friend and colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN. His whole life was dedicated to the building of a finer world by helping the individuals who came in contact with him, and then in the building of character as the teacher; his contribution as a public servant locally, in his State and then on the national level by and through his service in this great body.

Truly can it be said that FRANK BUCHANAN symbolized to the noblest extent humanly possible the character and the individual who during his lifetime made every marked contribution in the building of a finer world. I know of no more splendid compliment that can be paid to anyone than by those who knew him, saying that his life was one that contributed toward the building of a finer world.

I join with the delegation from Pennsylvania in their sorrow, because their ranks have lost a great man and a great American. I extend my sympathy to the people of the congressional district that FRANK BUCHANAN represented so zealously and ably during his period of

service in this body. I have lost a personal friend. I particularly extend to Mrs. Buchanan and her two daughters the profound sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself in their bereavement.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard with profound regret of the death of our distinguished colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN.

He was an able, industrious and conscientious Member of Congress. He had a high concept of duty and of fealty to the people he represented. He willingly accepted every opportunity to render public service, however great the obligation incurred. He was chairman of the House Committee on Lobbying Activities in the Eighty-first Congress and a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He was a hard-working member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and his loss on that committee will be keenly felt. He was a man of sound judgment who kept his feet upon the ground and who was always free from emotionalism and hysteria.

The passing of FRANK BUCHANAN brings sorrow not only to the people of the district he represented and where he had been so greatly honored, but also to the Congress where he was held in such high respect and affection. To his devoted wife and daughters I extend my deepest sympathy.

May the Lord bless him and keep him; may He let the light of His countenance shine upon him and gave him peace.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY].

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Speaker, Allegheny County, Pa., will mourn the death of FRANK BUCHANAN. He was a faithful servant of his district and of McKeesport, the city of his birth. He has made a place for himself as a Member of four terms of Congress and he will not be forgotten. He was a man devoted to his work and popular among his associates. His loss will be felt not only in Congress but in western Pennsylvania and our sincere sympathy goes to his bereaved family.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, words are weak on occasions of this kind; they are almost futile when we come to express our feeling on the passing of a beloved Member, and especially a Member who was a very close colleague.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a good friend of mine. We were well acquainted due to the fact that our congressional districts are adjacent. I knew many of the problems that FRANK BUCHANAN had. I realize the great esteem and respect his constituents had for him.

FRANK BUCHANAN had great ability, he was conscientious, sincere, and he was honest. In my opinion, FRANK BUCHANAN was a statesman. And his contributions in the Halls of this Chamber will long be remembered when our words will long be forgotten.

I express the feeling of my family, as well as my own feeling, because we were well acquainted, and we extend to Mrs. Buchanan and her daughters our very profound sympathy in their bereavement. The few words I have said here are said with a feeling of deep sorrow on the loss of our colleague, a man whose friendship had grown through the years and for whom I had great respect and affection.

Our memory of FRANK BUCHANAN will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we have all been deeply shocked to learn of the passing of our colleague from Pennsylvania, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, who was taken from us in the prime of his life.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a fellow alumnus of mine of the University of Pittsburgh. He earned the respect of his neighbors in McKeesport, Pa., when they elected him their mayor in which office he served from 1942 to 1946. When a vacancy in the House of Representatives occurred, he was elected to fill this position at a special election on May 21, 1946. He was consistently reelected to this office for each succeeding Congress.

His ability was recognized by his colleagues here in the House where he served on the Banking and Currency and District of Columbia Committees, and as chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities.

Speaking for myself and for the Pennsylvania Republican delegation from Pennsylvania, I extend our deepest sympathy to the family of our late colleague. In the terrible sorrow of this moment, they can know that their loved one, FRANK BUCHANAN, served well his country and the people of his congressional district.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we do, indeed, mourn the loss of FRANK BUCHANAN. God placed His finger upon him, and he sleeps. We, in this life, worry and fret and struggle as to what happened yesterday, what may happen today, and what the morrow may bring forth. That is not the case now with Frank. He does not worry or struggle, because as we know death, death keeps no calendar.

Frank's achievements were many. I need not dilate upon them. They are easily demonstrable and well known. We do know particularly that he was soft spoken, that he was kind, that he was gentle and wise, and withal intensely human. I know of nobody who was more human than was Frank. We were always struck with his keen sense of justice. He knew, indeed, I am sure, and agreed with the wise man who said that "Justice is the bread of the nation because all the people hunger for it," and Frank saw to it by ways of justice to answer that hunger. We were also struck with his courage. I believe it was Daniel Webster who, in this very Chamber many years ago, said "one man with courage is a majority," and Frank with his courage was a majority. We can very well say that his chair was a throne because it held a king. We are all the better because he has dwelled among us, because he leaves a good name. We might well say to his wife and dear ones that he does leave that cherished good name, and, as the psalmist says, "Better is the fragrance of a good name than the perfume of precious oils."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal loss that I have had the word of the untimely passing of our esteemed colleague, the Honorable FRANK BUCHANAN, and I want to be recorded with those who will mourn his departure as that of an outstanding public servant as well as a warm personal friend.

To me the finest tradition of public service is that we do not have to agree with a fellow-worker in matters of policy to appreciate his sincerity, his splendid character, and his zeal for truth and honor. Certainly anyone who knew FRANK BUCHANAN could not help but attest to his possession of these attributes to a high degree and thereby see in his death the removal from the national scene of one who lived in complete dedication to the requirements of his high office.

The futility of mere words is never so evident as when we try to comfort those who are left to mourn the passing of a loved one. Let us rather commend to the bereaved a continuing faith in the assurance that an all-wise Providence who separates us from those we love on this earthly scene will surely reunite us again in that fairer land where there is no more hurt and sorrow but only lasting peace.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, FRANK BUCHANAN was a fine, noble man. He really served his day and generation—the world is richer for his having lived—to his devoted family my deepest sympathy goes out.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LIND].

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, one of my warmest friends, a Member of this House, has passed away. The death of FRANK BUCHANAN, who represented the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania, has saddened his many friends here. Frank was active in many phases of civic activity and represented with great ability his district in the House of Representatives.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a good husband, a devoted father, and a warm and loyal friend. He has left to his fine family the heritage of a good name and the achievements of a career upon which the people of his district and the State of Pennsylvania can look with pride.

His home town, McKeesport, the State of Pennsylvania, and the Nation have lost in the death of FRANK BUCHANAN a great statesman and a loyal American.

May his loving wife and his fine daughters be consoled by the fact that FRANK BUCHANAN'S life was dedicated to serving his fellow men.

His sincerity of purpose and greatness of character has enriched the lives of all of us who were touched by his fine influence.

To the members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy in their great sorsow and bereavement. A truly great and a truly good man has passed to his final award.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the untimely death of Congressman FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania. It was my privilege to serve with him on both the Banking and Currency Committee and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He was an honest, able, sincere person. He always kept the public interest in mind and was one of the greatest public servants I ever knew. He was admired and respected by his colleagues for his courage, ability, and desire to make this country a better place in which to live. His passing is a great personal loss, as well as a great loss to the country.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, FRANK BUCHANAN was a good friend of mine. We served on the Banking and Currency Committee together for several years and we differed many times on votes and issues. Even so, we were particular friends. I knew I could talk with him about anything and get a straight, honest answer. I enjoyed his company and enjoyed our association. He was a fine American and one of the nicest colleagues that I have ever known. Many times he talked with me about his family and his lovely twin daughters. I know how wrapped up he was in his home life. His passing has been a great blow to me and I know to all of his colleagues. His family can be proud of his memory as we are.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved over the death of my close personal friend, FRANK BUCHANAN. I knew him over a period of years and it has been my pleasure to work with him during his service as a Member of the House of Representatives. Since he was elected to Congress in 1946 he has worked untiringly and indefatigably for the people he represented. He was capable and ambitious. Being from adjoining districts we had many of the same problems and I valued his opinions. His sudden and untimely death, in the prime of life, is a personal loss and I will miss him as will his host of friends, his community and the State of Pennsylvania. He was a kind and devoted husband and father and although words cannot ease the grief now suffered by them, I extend to Mrs. Buchanan and his family my profound sympathy and understanding at their great loss and bereavement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to pay tribute to the memory of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANK BUCHANAN.

Not many days ago he was here among us; a vital force, an influence for good, an indefatigable worker. Today he is gone.

From the beginning of his service in the Seventy-ninth Congress, FRANK BUCHANAN impressed all of his colleagues with his devotion to duty, his sincerity, and his ability. With the years, as he was returned to this body by the people of his district, our respect for him continued to grow.

FRANK BUCHANAN was an ideal legislator because his whole life interest, even before his election to the Congress, lay in public affairs, in economics, in political science.

In college and in postgraduate work, his studies were along these lines and in public service, in his home community as mayor of McKeesport, and on a national scale, here in Washington, he gave practical application to them.

It was typical of the unselfish spirit and the industriousness of this man that he accepted, additional to his regular duties, tasks which made great demands upon his time and his energies. As chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities in the Eighty-first Congress he worked hard and many extra hours to perform a conscientious and not too pleasant job.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee he was painstaking in the study of details of the highly important legislation that came before them.

With all of these heavy responsibilities, FRANK BUCHANAN still continued faithfully to serve the needs of his constituents.

He lived close by the Capitol to be near his work, yet at every opportunity spent time with his fine family.

I am sure all the Members of this House join me in extending condolences to Mrs. Buchanan and her daughters in this hour of grief.

A devoted husband and father, an earnest, energetic, and faithful public servant, FRANK BUCHANAN has gone to answer the last roll call.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, there is inscribed above your honored chair these words from Daniel Webster:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, in FRANK BUCHANAN we have a true picture of those lines that I have just spoken.

Our beloved chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency spoke about Frank's faithful service to that committee. For three and a half years it has been my good fortune to sit side by side with Frank during the long and tedious hearings facing that committee. As our chairman so well stated, I do not know of any individual who was more faithful, who was more alert, who was more anxious to get properly before the committee those facts necessary to develop the important legislation that has come from that committee.

My words are very feeble but they are very sincere when I say that Frank was held in high esteem not only by his colleagues on our side but by those on the other side of the table. We mourn his passing, and I direct to his loved ones my very sincere sympathy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I humbly rise to pay tribute and to say farewell to a friend and colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania.

Only last Thursday, the day before his death, I reported on this floor after contact with a member of his family that his condition was good after the operation the previous day. He died last Friday after a turn for the worse.

FRANK BUCHANAN will be missed by all Members of this House. He had a charming personality and a deep sense of fairness and justice. He will be missed by the liberal Members because of his practical idealism, his ability, and his courage.

Frank was not the glib orator or actor who would appeal to emotions. Never would he sink to the level of a demagogue to ride the wave of hysteria. He was too much of a man for that. He would not sacrifice principle and honor to win the plaudits of the powerful and selfish who dominate the major avenues of public information. He was the teacher type. His appeal was always one of reason. His appeal was to fairness and to intelligence. He will be remembered because of the great service he rendered as chairman of the House Committee to Investigate Lobbying Activities. He worked hard and diligently as head of that committee. Someday when the average American learns the whole truth about what this committee uncovered, the name of FRANK BUCHANAN will win far greater respect and far more recognition than it has won today. I feel sure that the hard work he performed contributed to his early death. It had an adverse effect upon the health of this mild-mannered, earnest, and sincere man.

In his death the people of this country have lost a real champion. He was a type of person with high moral character and integrity so greatly needed in American public life today. He was a real statesman. He was a great humanitarian with a deep sense of honor and human decency. He did not openly boast of his great patriotism or deep Christian principles, but he practiced them in his everyday life and in his

activities as a Member of the House of Representatives. He lighted a torch when he exposed some of the evil and subversive practices which threaten our democratic way of life. He left a challenge to us to carry on. I hope this Congress will do so. I hope it will complete the work which FRANK BUCHANAN so nobly advanced. If this Congress will not act some future Congress will when reason, common sense, and justice emerges from the confusion which the forces of blindness, selfishness, and greed have so successfully spread. His great sacrifice will not be in vain. Time and history will bring honor to FRANK BUCHANAN as it always does to men of such sterling character when truth finally triumphs over deception. He will be remembered for his faith and loyalty to the cause of liberalism and true Americanism.

Little that is said here today will bring comfort to his wife and daughters to whom, in closing, I express my deep feeling of sympathy for the loss of a loving husband and father.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the members of the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities during the last session. I had the great privilege of sitting under the chairmanship of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN therefor, for that lengthy assignment. I shall always consider that as one of the high privileges of my life. He was a fine gentleman.

I think perhaps it may be appropriate for me to mention just two or three incidents of my intimate committee work with FRANK BUCHANAN. I think they illustrate the real character that he had. I always felt refreshed after being in his presence. I always felt I had met a gentleman who was trying to continue to be a gentleman. I always felt that I was glad to sit with him socially because he always had a contribution to make that was worth while. I want to say as a Member of the House that as our colleague Frank has passed on from our midst, a thing about him I realized the most from my daily contact with him, so intimate for many months, was that he was outstandingly conscientious on his job, and it was a challenging job. I had occasion to go to California during the recess of sessions of the committee, and I left word with him as chairman something like this—I said, "If you need my authorization to carry through on something that the rest of the committee want to carry through, why, go ahead and use it." I knew that I would be on the move and that he could not reach me on the phone very conveniently. Twice during the few weeks I was in California he called me long distance. He reached me one morning very, very early, before I left my home in California, at 5 a. m., because it was 3 hours earlier here. He wanted to make sure that I knew what the committee was proposing to do on a certain report. He wished to make sure that I, as a member of the committee, had the opportunity and responsibility of also having a voice in the committee report, regardless of the authority I had extended him.

On another occasion, I said to the chairman: "Frank, I would be pleased to receive the printer's first proof of that report. About what time could I have it tomorrow do you suppose?"

He said, "Clyde, I will be here at my office before 8 o'clock tomorrow morning. Your office is just around the hall. If you want to send over, I will have a copy here at my office at 8 o'clock. I will be here." He was there. He was there too often too early during that very heavy chairmanship of the Select Lobby Committee.

I then discovered that his habit was to get to work about the time most of us were thinking of awakening in the morning.

Frank has passed on ahead of us, not because he tried to spare himself in performing his duty but because he was unsparing of himself in performing his duty. He recognized his moral as well as his legal duty; he did this beyond the call of duty.

Another time, I remember during the committee hearings, the question was under consideration as to whom we should ask the House to cite for contempt of our committee proceedings. Being a lawyer myself and knowing that Frank was not a lawyer, I was greatly inspired by the fact that he was asking us to make sure that in our decision no injustice nor unfairness was being done to any man. This was typical of him. He was anxious to see to it that no man should suffer or be harmed a bit. He had no conscious desire to be unjust or unfair.

I wish to pass this on to you Members. I am sure you will agree with me that Frank was a living example of a desire to be fair, just, kind, helpful. I think it is incumbent upon us as his surviving colleagues to be more fair than ever before; to be more kind and helpful to people because we had a living example of a man in FRANK BUCHANAN.

One more incident: I was a member of the majority members on Select Lobby Committee. I am sure that we on the majority, and the minority also, were very conscious of the fair and square manner in which he presided at those hearings. I had a sense of being able to rely on the fact that Frank had prepared the work of the committee in such a thorough way that we, as members of the committee, could be conscious of the fact that the committee was presided over by him, with a dominant desire on his part to see to it that the minority members could also always have equal opportunity to present their views and have their time for questioning witnesses on the committee.

On one occasion Frank came to me deliberately just before the committee began and he said, "Clyde, I know that BROWN of the committee has important questions to ask the witnesses today. Let us see that he and Mr. HALLECK get all the time they need." This was just like him.

I had the pleasure of sitting with FRANK BUCHANAN the last day he sat in this House. It was the day General MacArthur spoke to the joint meeting recently. He deliberately came and sat down next to me. His first question was, "Clyde how are you getting on with the Un-American Activities Committee job?" I told him it was a challenging but important job, much like the Lobby Committee. I thought then that it was quite startling that a man should get up out of a hospital bed and come to that joint meeting of the House and Senate, a really sick man, and then his first question to me was about a problem of Congress.

While Frank never boasted about his patriotism or his desire to protect our form of government, it was just a part of him to be concerned chiefly with the welfare of the people of our great Nation. He was richly imbued with a patriotic zeal to so serve his Nation as to protect it against false doctrines and selfish people and pressures.

I will never forget, JOHN MCCORMACK, and you probably do not forget either, this incident at the joint meeting: You will remember that just that day a jury here in Washington had found one of the men whom we had asked be cited for contempt, Dr. Rumely, by a unanimous verdict, guilty on all three counts of contempt of Congress. JOHN MCCORMACK, just before General MacArthur spoke, leaned over to FRANK BUCHANAN, who was sitting next to me that day, and said to Frank something like this: "I think that jury verdict, Frank, ought to make you feel mighty happy, because it is a compliment to the fine work you as chairman and your Select Committee on Lobbying did."

Then FRANK BUCHANAN said to me: "Clyde, JOHN MCCORMACK never forgets to say a good word for a Member of our House, regardless of which party he belongs to, does he?"

I express my humble but very sincere words of sympathy to his loyal and bereaved wife, and to his daughters. He was brave and they naturally will be in his memory. I am sure we members of the Select Committee and the staff will never forget that after the work was over Frank, on his own, saw to it that the many volunteer members who helped us brief and coordinate our work, because we had many volunteer workers, and we did not have money enough to do all we intended to, had a very sincere dinner. But it was just like him, out of appreciation for very valuable volunteer work well done, to give these volunteer workers and the staff a bouquet of flowers while they could smell them.

Mr. Speaker, some sage has wisely said that the evil that men do lives after them, but the good is often interred with their bones. But the good that Frank lived in his daily life will not be interred with his bones. The amount of good he did was so great and its sincerity and unselfishness so pure that the good he started on its way through life will live for a very, very long time. Regardless of what religious faith we may have; regardless of the details with which we think through the matter of death and

the life hereafter; regardless of whether we believe in a life hereafter or not, the fact is that the greatest tribute we can give to what FRANK BUCHANAN was and did each day amongst us would be to make our own lives habitually a little more sincere and our attitude toward public service a little more unselfish and generous and with a greater abundance of real service to others our daily watchword and practice. In a very large sense Frank's courtesy, kindness, encouragement and appreciation expressed to me in his lifetime I believe will make me a very much better Congressman.

Now, in closing I wish to relate another incident on the occasion of Frank's last sitting on this floor. He leaned over to me and put his right hand on my left hand and said:

Clyde, thanks for sending me that letter to the hospital. It was better than a large dose of aspirin.

And so I thought that because I have, in these extemporaneous, humble remarks, two or three incidents of my association with FRANK BUCHANAN, I would share with you the text herewith set forth of a letter I sent to him on April 1, 1951. It was this letter to which Frank referred:

APRIL 1, 1951.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
Bethesda Naval Hospital,
Bethesda, Md.

MY DEAR FRANK: I have been missing you hereabouts. Just now I called your office and found that the reason for your smiling face not appearing on the floor and elsewhere during the last couple of weeks—was because you were out there in Bethesda resting up a bit. Good luck to you. You are a prince of a gentleman.

If there is anything in the world I can do for you, let me know; tell your secretaries to let me know. Either my staff or I will be glad to help them.

Cordially yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe in great earnestness to all that has been said here today about FRANK BUCHANAN and his value as a good American, a good Congressman, a good friend, a good husband and father.

There are times when sorrow is genuine and regret is sincere; this is one of those times. We know now how much we need FRANK BUCHANAN and men like him, and how much we shall miss him.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, like all other Members of this body, I was greatly shocked and deeply grieved on learning of the death of my friend, FRANK BUCHANAN. I met Frank when I first came to the Congress. I learned to love him. When the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was organized I had the honor of serving under his leadership. I then learned to admire him as I have admired few men in my lifetime. I have never known a man who had more consistency of purpose, more devotion to duty or a greater capacity for hard work than FRANK BUCHANAN. I know his lovely wife and lovely daughters and I extend to them my deepest sympathy in this hour of their bereavement. This country has lost a fine public servant: I have lost a fine friend.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I know the Nation today grieves over the loss of a capable legislator. FRANK BUCHANAN was a great man because he was a great humanitarian.

I happened to have known FRANK BUCHANAN many years before he came to Congress. He was a school teacher and we had served on education panels many times that were evaluating educational programs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I learned to admire him then and I have always highly respected him since he became a Member of Congress.

I was deeply shocked last Friday night in Pennsylvania when I learned of his death. It was quite a coincidence because early that morning I had been in a little grocery store buying some groceries. The clerk asked: "Do you ever see my friend FRANK BUCHANAN down there in Washington?" I said, "Oh, yes; quite often. He is sick." He said, "Is that so?" He further said: "I had FRANK BUCHANAN in school. He taught me. He was a good teacher and a good friend." He said, "I want to tell you something, Congressman, the reason FRANK BUCHANAN was mayor of the city and then later United States Congressman was because the boys and girls thought there was no one like FRANK BUCHANAN."

So as I humbly stand in the well of the House today paying my last tribute to a great teacher and a good Congressman I, like all of the students who graduated under FRANK BUCHANAN, realize how sorrowfully we mourn his passing.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I first came to know FRANK BUCHANAN intimately when I served with him on the Joint Committee on Housing. We went over the country together and while FRANK BUCHANAN had definite and strong convictions after due study and deliberation about the type of legislation that committee should recommend, he was always eminently fair in his consideration of witnesses and others who desired to be heard before the committee. As a matter of fact, we worked oftentimes late at night because Frank was insistent that everyone who desired to be heard be given that opportunity.

I think that fairly characterizes his service in this body and to the people of America. He desired at all times to hear all sides of a question, and having reached a decision, he was square and firm in his convictions regardless of what the consequences might be to him personally or politically. He was devoted to his country, to his colleagues here in Congress, to his fine wife, and lovely daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that as long as our Nation is able to produce men of the character of FRANK BUCHANAN and the people are able to elect and send men of the type of his convictions to the Congress, our Republic and its future is assured.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES].

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few remarks concerning my good friend FRANK BUCHANAN. This is my third term in Congress and I unhesitatingly say that Frank was one of the finest men I have met in Washington. In character he was very strong, but kind and thoughtful. In temperament, he was of that type which is suited for responsibility in the Congress of the United States and for intelligent and consistent decisions. In disposition, he possessed an evenness of temper and fairness to the other man's view which is rarely excelled in public life; in diligence and industry in the discharge of his duties as Congressman. There are very few men who during their service ever worked harder at their job than Frank. This was shown in the masterful way in which he tackled the job of heading the Lobby Investigating Committee. And may I mention as a most valuable asset of his character was his love and devotion for his family consisting of his attractive wife and two charming daughters, to which our heartfelt sympathy is extended.

In public service, he rose very rapidly in the opinion not only of the Members of Congress, but of the people of the Nation. It was quite unusual for a Member of Congress to have attained the prominence and influence and general all around ability acquired by FRANK BUCHANAN since his entrance into Congress in the latter part of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

A splendid future lay ahead of him and it is most disappointing and very sad that his career should have been cut short, at a time when he was so rapidly developing as a great leader in the proceedings of Congress, and especially of those appertaining to his important Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, so many of FRANK BUCHANAN'S colleagues have told us of his devotion, of his splendid character, and of the far-reaching effects of his life, that I am going to approach the subject today in a different manner. I was thinking of the thoughts that must come to the Speaker as he daily presides over this body of men of whom he is so proud and in whom he is so tremendously interested, as he has told us on many occasions. It must strike him from time to time, as he looks over this group, to wonder which one will the Angel of Death take next from our midst. How many of you would ever have thought, just a few weeks ago, that the strong FRANK BUCHANAN, in the prime of his manhood, with all of his ability, with his apparent fine health and strength would be the next to leave this

body? How many of you hear the call and remember the phrase, "I will come like a thief in the night"? We remember the eternal reward of the good thief hanging on Calvary for a word of sympathy for the dying Christ. "This day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise," was the divine answer to a humble act of charity. When we compare that life with the life of our colleague, closed now, and think of his devotion to the little people of the country, that we heard ever and ever in his remarks on this floor, what a welcome he must have had at his Father's home.

For the spending of one's self for another is the most perfect type of charity, and that was the life of FRANK BUCHANAN.

For us, it might be well to remember those words of the song that once it was my privilege to sing in this room:

Father, be near when my feet are slipping
o'er the brink,
For it may be I am nearer home, nearer
now than I think.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I remember distinctly the first day I saw FRANK BUCHANAN in this Chamber. For some reason, something said concerning Daniel Webster came to my mind. The story is told that when Daniel Webster one day walked along a street, perhaps in this city, passing some workmen, the workmen instinctively turned and looked after him, and one of them remarked, "Surely no man can be as great as he looks."

That saying came to mind when I first saw FRANK BUCHANAN in this Chamber. I said to myself, "Can he be as distinguished as he looks?" Although still a young man, he wore that crown of gray hair with honor and a look of distinction.

I was not favored in knowing him so intimately as some who have preceded me today, not being on any committee with him nor working intimately with him, but I watched his conduct here on the floor. He never rose to speak at his desk nor did he take the well of this House without having something worth while to say, and he said it in a forceful and distinguished way.

I was impressed with what his colleague from his home town in Pennsylvania said a moment ago, and it comes pretty close to me. He said that just a few days ago he talked with one of FRANK BUCHANAN's former students. "He was a great teacher," the former student said.

If I on leaving these halls can have my former students say of me that I kept the trust, the faith that they had in me, as this former student of FRANK BUCHANAN's said of him. I shall be satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a great man, and I mourn his untimely passing.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of profound shock and sorrow that I heard of the passing of my good friend and colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN. When I came to Washington as a freshman Congressman "Buck," as he was most affectionately known, was one of the first persons I met. One of the most valuable things which I shall cherish from my tenure here in Washington is my association with BUCK BUCHANAN. I wish words would permit me to express my feelings in the loss of my personal friend. But as it has been so well said, "Love is something so divine that description would but make it less. It is what you see and what you feel, but cannot express." Mr. Speaker, those are my sentiments at this time. I lost a true and tried personal friend, a God-fearing, God-loving American citizen. I join with my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to his family and loved ones.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I too was shocked and grieved to learn of the death of our colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN. As a member of the House Select Committee on Lobbying of which Mr. BUCHANAN was the distinguished chairman, I came to know him as I never would otherwise have known him and knowing him better I came to respect, admire, and love him.

He was a fair and impartial presiding officer and, while not a lawyer himself, he did have the judicial temperament and was able to guide the committee in its consideration of the important problems facing it with fairness, efficiency, and dispatch.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying it fell to his part to supervise and direct the work of the staff. This involved a vast amount of work on his part and I have no doubt this service of his far beyond the call of duty was one of the things that weakened him so that disease struck him swiftly and fatally. He died a victim of his zeal and determination to acquaint the people of America with the stupendous amounts being spent by big business, by labor, and by other pressure groups seeking to influence legislation. His peculiar contribution to the thinking on this subject was his recognition of and emphasis upon the fact that lobbyists and lobbying tactics are changing and that now the lobbyists are more and more turning to the field of indirect lobbying by which I mean that they are seeking to influence legislation by molding public opinion at the grass roots by propaganda that is often biased and one-sided and slanted so as to seek to identify the welfare of the country with the selfish interests of the particular group or groups they represent. He hammered this home in his questioning of witnesses and in the committee's reports on the result of its studies.

He was deeply hurt by the smear tactics of such cattle as Westbrook Pegler, Dr. Edward A. Rumely, recently convicted of contempt of Congress for his failure to supply information requested by the committee, and William A. Patterson, the Negro Communist. He resented their attacks upon the integrity of the committee, and I have no doubt but that the misrepresentation and vilification to which he was subjected contributed to his untimely death. But he refused to be frightened or turned from his course by the tactics of his critics. He kept his courageous course to the end and with St. Paul he could well say, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, and I kept the faith."

In FRANK BUCHANAN's passing, the State and the Nation have lost an able and conscientious servant and his family a loving husband and father. My sincerest sympathy goes out to his charming wife and his lovely daughters. They may well be proud of the heritage left them by their husband and father.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point, and have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and services of the late FRANK BUCHANAN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, along with so many of my colleagues, I desire to pay a humble word of respect to the memory of our late colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN. This distinguished gentleman joined our ranks in a special election, and since we came from different parts of the country, I had no reason to know him intimately until the election of 1948. During the fall of 1948, I was designated by the chairman of our National Democratic Party to speak in several parts of the country. One of many assignments was in Pennsylvania at McKeesport, which in reality is a part of the great industrial city of Pittsburgh. Upon leaving my home in the deep South, I recall how bright and sunny the day was. Later, as we landed in McKeesport, I was impressed with the cloudy, smoky, muggy weather. Congressman BUCHANAN met me at the airport, and soon we were in his attractive home. Upon meeting his beautiful wife and his intelligent, sweet, twin daughters, the clouds outside soon disappeared.

Spending the evening hours with the Buchanans, I was impressed by the dignity and respect of this ideal home. In this day of increasing disrespect for parental influence and lack of regard for marital bonds, it is inspiring to know of homes like that of the Buchanans.

After a pleasant evening meal, we went along to the political meeting and I was not surprised to observe the high respect in which this hard-working, capable, devoted public servant was held by his fellows. FRANK BUCHANAN, as he was affectionately known by his countless friends, in addition to being capable, was so devoted to his work until he thought little of his health or his personal comforts. In his early days here, he was one of the most impressionable figures among us. His well-developed physique, emphasized by his broad, manly shoulders, with his premature gray hairs, was always distinguishable. Only

in recent months could those of us who were with him daily recognize that all was not well. In spite of his failing health, we were unwilling and unready to believe that his illness would prove fatal. It is hard to realize that one so capable, so devoted, should be called so early to his final reward. Thus it is, however, that oftentimes in life the choicest fruit falls first from the tree. Along this highway of life, this outstanding scholar and statesman had scarcely reached midlife. His burdens were too heavy until in weariness he fell by the wayside into dreamless and eternal sleep.

Only yesterday in a conversation with the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable ROBERT DOUGHTON of North Carolina, we observed that age was not the only important factor in life's journey. This fact is now proven since Congressman BUCHANAN was scarcely half the age of Congressman DOUGHTON, who still enjoys good health and, of course, is one of the outstanding leaders of Congress.

On sad and unexpected occasions like these, words are inadequate. Let us each seek to glean from our experiences with this good and noble man those influences which will make us more dedicated to the high trust we bear.

To his attractive companion in marriage and to his unusually beautiful twin daughters go the prayers and sympathy of each Member of the House.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to subscribe to the sentiments expressed by my colleagues with reference to the outstanding service of our beloved friend FRANK BUCHANAN as a Member of the House. It was my pleasure to be associated with him for several years on the Banking and Currency Committee and I developed the greatest admiration for him as a legislator and public servant. His untimely death brings a sense of great personal sorrow to all of us. Death enables us to see in clearer perspective the standards of service and the ideals exemplified by our departed colleagues. We will remember FRANK BUCHANAN not only for his devotion to legislative duties but for the traits of character which endeared him to us.

I am reminded of Tennyson's expression with reference to Arthur Hallam, his young friend in whose honor he wrote In Memoriam, for FRANK BUCHANAN possessed those qualities which must have appealed so strongly to the great poet:

> I would the great world grew like thee
> Who grewest not alone in power
> And knowledge, but by year and hour
> In reverence and in charity.

We mourn with his family the passing of a truly great American.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, Friday night when I heard Commentator Frank Edwards announce over the radio the passing of FRANK BUCHANAN, Member of this House, I was shocked. I had realized for quite some time that Congressman BUCHANAN was not on the floor of the House, and that I had not seen him and that, as a colleague of his, I greatly missed him. It was not until late last week that I was told he was ill and in the hospital.

I have watched and listened to Congressman BUCHANAN with great interest. FRANK BUCHANAN had every attribute of a gentleman along with intelligence and courage. He analyzed issues, and had the gift of passing on to his colleagues the result of his analysis. He had understanding, and a sympathy with all of the problems that came to his attention.

Congressman BUCHANAN made an outstanding contribution to this Government through the Subcommittee on Lobbying, of which he was the chairman. I have heard the hearings referred to as those which should be read by all of the Members and passed on to their constituents. At all times it appears in these hearings that Congressman BUCHANAN was interested in getting the facts. It may very well be that these hearings will be a living monument to FRANK BUCHANAN.

I wish to share the grief of my colleagues who have expressed themselves on the passing of Congressman BUCHANAN. I sympathize deeply with Mrs Buchanan and her beautiful daughters at this time.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, there was no finer, kindlier, more conscientious man than our colleague FRANK BUCHANAN. He embodied the legendary qualities of the perfect public servant. He was honest, courageous, and able. But beyond those prerequisites he faced his tasks with a high mindedness, a nobleness of purpose, which goes only with statesmanship. When the chips were down he preferred to be right, than to be popular. In these times of national crisis that should be the test. With demagogs to the right of us, and demagogs to the left of us, the country's greatest need is men who through all the clamor can hear, and who have the courage to heed the clear call of duty. FRANK BUCHANAN was that kind of a Congressman. His passing is a grievous loss to the Nation, as well as to us who are his friends. It is the more tragic that he was taken at the full tide of his strength.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I knew the late FRANK BUCHANAN for a relatively short time but I do not believe that I have ever known a more intelligent, sincere and hard-working man. FRANK BUCHANAN was above all always a great humanitarian. He was a humanitarian because he always fought for the little people, those people who have no powerful organized lobby to represent them here in our Nation's Capitol.

FRANK BUCHANAN's formal education at the University of Pittsburgh and Columbia University gave him a thorough understanding of the scientific aspects of economics and government and thus made him one of the most effective spokesmen for liberalism that this House has ever had. Nevertheless, his progressive ideals found their ultimate source in his own personal experience, for FRANK BUCHANAN was of humble origin and had grown up among the tragic economic and social problems which are the unfortunate product of our great industrial centers.

This House will miss him, and the working man and woman all over this country will miss him. A great soldier in the battle against ignorance, poverty, and selfishness has fallen.

May I in closing extend my profound sympathy to Mrs. Buchanan and her daughters in this their hour of deep sorrow.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to have FRANK BUCHANAN as a dear friend. I am experiencing today a genuine feeling of loss and sadness. The sense of bereavement spreads far beyond this Chamber, I know, for FRANK BUCHANAN was a man who made friends easily and often, and kept them.

It was not my lot to serve in committee with our lamented colleague, but I had frequent occasion to discuss with him the business of the House. Invariably, I found him ready to explore every face of a complex problem. He was not given to snap judgments. His constant concern was the public good, and he worked conscientiously to arrive at decisions which his careful reasoning convinced him conformed to the best interests of the people.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a friendly, considerate man, and we who mourn him today will remember him with great affection for these ingratiating qualities. We shall recall, too, that he had great courage and would not deign to compromise with his convictions. It was an intellectual integrity which garnered respect throughout his public career—now ended in midpassage by the Maker's design. This notable gentleman from Pennsylvania never shunned controversy; neither did he court it. When battle lines were drawn, either in committee or on the floor, he was ready to fight for the right, as he saw it, and his own political fate never colored his resolution.

We shall have to continue here without FRANK BUCHANAN, but it will be neither easy nor pleasant. His generous spirit was a balm; his integrity and vigor formed an inspiration. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out today to Mrs. Buchanan and their lovely twin daughters, and to the people of Pennsylvania's Thirty-third District, for whom FRANK BUCHANAN labored so sedulously and well.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned by the unexpected passing of our beloved colleague, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania.

It was my good fortune to know Frank intimately. I had a very sincere regard and warm affection for him, having met him the day he became a Member of this body in the Seventy-ninth Congress as the result of a special election held on May 21, 1946. I soon found that we had many things in common, not only with respect to legislative problems upon which we nearly always agreed but with respect to the social and economic problems which play such a vital part in the lives and welfare of our people in this great country of ours.

He was a real gentleman and always kind and considerate of those with whom he came in contact. I do not ever recall hearing him utter an unkind word on this floor or anywhere else. Such a

tribute can be paid to few men. His attractive personality and disposition endeared him to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I shall always remember FRANK BUCHANAN as an extremely handsome man with a robust physique. He somehow radiated superb health and consequently few of his colleagues could have been aware of the fact that his work here would end so soon.

Perhaps that explains why the news of his passing was such a devastating shock to most of us.

During his tenure in this House, Congressman BUCHANAN rendered valuable service to his constituents and his country. As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and as chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, he was an able and indefatigable worker and will be greatly missed by his colleagues and his host of friends in the Thirty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania and elsewhere. He always championed the cause of the little people, and the record of his achievements shall live on.

I prize very highly my warm friendship with him and shall surely miss him, as will his colleagues in the House. I extend heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife and his lovely twin daughters. The inspiring example of his life is a legacy that they and each of us shall always cherish.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 213).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WALTER, Mr. EBERHARTER, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. FULTON, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. DENNY.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 1, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

409. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the military functions of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, containing proposed appropriations amounting to $57,604,254,390, estimates under proposed legislaton of $4,500,000,000, and proposed provisions affecting said proposed appropriations (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

410. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Cynthia Kirpalani Farr nee Cynthia Dick, file No. A-6053362 CR 28612, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

411. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization dated November 16, 1950, authorizing temporary admission into the United States of Displaced Persons, who upon arrival in possession of appropriate immigration visas, are found to be excludable as persons within the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

412. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

413. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of Operations under the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938, for fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 8 of the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3880. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 385. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 386. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3455. A bill to amend section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, relating to parole of Federal prisoners; with amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 3880. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BENTSEN (by request):

H. R. 3881. A bill to amend section 2 of the Materials Act in order to facilitate the disposal of materials on the public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3882. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease withdrawn or reserved public lands in Alaska for dock, wharf, and landing-site purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3883. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3884. A bill to amend the rules pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America from a staff in a church or public auditorium; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3885. A bill to establish a department of food services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3886. A bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges and the compensation of Members of Congress, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3887. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 3888. A bill to provide honorable discharges to active military inductees and trainees who entered the military service by virtue of a "military order of induction"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 3889. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to limit the taxing and spending powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Security and Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO: Memorial of the State of Michigan, House of Representatives, to enact legislation amending the Federal Income Tax Act with respect to exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTAFF: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, to petition the Secretary of the Interior of the United States to reconsider and abandon the idea of condemning certain lands owned by the State of Florida or one of its agencies in Citrus County, Fla., to be used as a migratory bird refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for a new post office building in the county of Kauai; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, requesting the abolition of certain provisions of the laws of the United States of America invoked by the Social Security Administration as the basis for regulations for withholding information as to the names and other information concerning persons who are recipients of welfare payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, with respect to Federal taxes on gasoline and motor fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any measures to alter the tax status of cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3890. A bill for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 3891. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3892. A bill for the relief of Milton C. Towner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3893. A bill for the relief of Eiko Takano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3894. A bill for the relief of Albert M. Goldberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3895. A bill for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3896. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Wefel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

H. R. 3897. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Yellowstone Metals, Inc., patents in fee to certain lands in Meagher County, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 3898. A bill for the relief of William E. Gillespie, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

256. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Elmo J. Osborne, manager, Texas Power Reserve Electric Cooperative, Inc., Austin Tex., relative to declaring opposition to the policy of the Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration issued September 21, 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture.

257. Also, petition of Leon K. Sterling, Sr., clerk, office of the city and county clerk, Honolulu, T. H., relative to obtaining grants of Federal funds to the counties of the Territory of Hawaii for antidisaster expenditures; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

258. Also, petition of Jose Ma. Araneta, secretary, Tagbilaran, Philippine Islands, relative to requesting the release of $100,000,000 appropriation for the payment of war damage claims in the Philippines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of life and light, our glad hearts thrill at the risen glory of the awakening earth robed in the blooming garb of spring. We are grateful for the mystic wonder of this yearly miracle, as nature climbs to a soul in leaf and flower and the earth showeth Thy handiwork. Together we bow in the hush and joy of Thy presence, pausing in the morning tasks to listen for Thy call sounding in our ears. In the stillness, wilt Thou whisper some word of insight within our souls.

Have mercy upon us for our frantic boasts, our foolish words, and our perverse ways. Save us from small and selfish living in so great a day. In the vision splendid of divine fatherhood and of human brotherhood which knows no frontiers, may we dream our dreams, mold our lives, enact our laws, build our Nation and plan our world, until this shadowed earth which is our home rolls out of the darkness into light, and it is daybreak everywhere. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 30, 1951, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate today and Wednesday.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon, to hear testimony on the postal-rate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request, because I know how important it is to have such matters attended to. However, I wish to point out that the bill which is now the unfinished business of the Senate has been dragging on, day after day after day, and our work on the bill has been handicapped because there have been so many meetings of various Senate committees. One of the principal reasons why the bill which is the unfinished business has not been finally passed upon by the Senate is the handicap caused by the meeting of so many committees and subcommittees of the Senate during the course of the debate on this piece of proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that if I thought the committee meetings were the real reason why more progress has not been made on the bill which is the unfinished business, I would object to the request which has been made. However, I think the real reason has been the speeches which have been made on other matters.

I think we are going to come to the time when objection will have to be made to having committees, with the possible exception of the Appropriations Committee, meet during the sessions of the Senate, if we expect to end the session at any reasonable time this year. I hope we can do so. I concur in what the distinguished minority leader has said; I certainly hope we can make progress on this bill today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to what has been said, I wish to say that I thoroughly agree with what the Senators have stated. However, inasmuch as at this particular time the committee has before it the Deputy Postmaster General, who has been testifying, I have felt obligated to come to the Senate Chamber and make the request, in order that he might be able to continue his testimony. That was the only reason for making the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. RUSSELL, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee considering the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, was authorized to meet in the hearing room of the Appropriations Committee during the session of the Senate today.

CONFERRING OF POWERS OF STANDING COMMITTEES ON THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES SITTING JOINTLY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the purpose of holding joint meetings in accordance with the order of the Senate of April 25, 1951, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations be constituted a committee of the Senate with all the powers conferred upon standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be

permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE BY UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT (H. DOC. NO. 121)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts, adopted by the Court, together with a supplementary report, containing the original report, of the Court's Advisory Committee on Rules for Civil Procedure, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Goodfellow Sunday-school class of the First Baptist Church, San Angelo, Tex., pledging anew, as members, their faith in God and their allegiance to His cause, and calling upon Christians throughout the Nation to join in prayer for uplifting the moral standards of the world; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A communication from the family of former Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, acknowledging with thanks the expression of sympathy from the Senate on the occasion of the death of the former Senator; ordered to lie on the table.

INCREASED SALARIES FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Rhode Island on April 25, 1951, entitled "Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to the passage of Senate bill 355 and House of Representatives bill 244, providing for the elimination of the six lowest-salary grades for postal clerks and carriers and providing for a 17-percent increase in the annual salary of post office employees receiving less than $5,000 annually."

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to the passage of Senate bill No. 355 and House of Representatives bill No. 244, providing for the elimination of the six lowest salary grades for postal clerks and carriers and providing for a 17-percent increase in the annual salary of post office employees receiving less than $5,000 annually

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States Senate bill No. 355 and House of Representatives bill No. 244, which bills provide for the elimination of the six lowest salary grades for postal clerks and carriers and provide for a 17-percent increase in the annual salary of post office employees receiving less than $5,000 annually; and

Whereas the wages of postal employees have continually lagged behind the cost of living for a period of at least 10 years; and

Whereas according to a recent report submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission to the Subcommittee on Postal Service of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the cost of living advanced 78.1 percent from 1939 to November 1950; and

Whereas according to that same report, the average wage of a post office clerk advanced from $2,165 per annum to approximately $3,500 per annum for the same period, reflecting an increase of only some 61.8 percent, or a net loss of 16.3 percent; and

Whereas the cost of living, according to the index, has risen something like 3 or 4 points during the interval between the date of the report and the present time; and

Whereas the newer employees in the postal service, a majority of whom are veterans of World War II, have to work for years at substandard wages to reach a salary level commensurate with the effort and educational standard required for postal duty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations respectfully requests the Congress of the United States of America to enact Senate bill No. 355 and House of Representatives bill No. 244 into law; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he is hereby respectfully requested to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference two resolutions of the Michigan Legislature and a resolution adopted by the State of Michigan House of Representatives.

Senate concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature, adopted April 22, reiterates the position of the Michigan Legislature in support of the St. Lawrence seaway project. As such it reflects similar petitions to Congress from the Michigan Legislature over the past 18 years as well as the prevailing opinion in the State of Michigan that the seaway project was never more urgently needed than now, in the light of world conditions. I may add that the self-liquidating nature of the project as presently proposed has the hearty endorsement of the people in our State.

A second resolution supports demands upon the Veterans' Administration that it provide more adequate facilities for tubercular patients in Michigan. The house resolution memorializes Congress to enact legislation amending the Federal income-tax law with respect to exemptions.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 22

"Concurrent resolution relative to the Great Lakes Tidewater Commission and the St. Lawrence seaway project

"Whereas, in the year 1919, by Public Act 17 and in 1921 by Public Act 138, the legislature created the Great Lakes Tidewater Commission for the purpose of investigating the feasibility of establishing deep-water connections between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, so as to permit passage of seagoing vessels from the Great Lakes to said ocean, which project has since come to be known as the St. Lawrence seaway, and in said acts the legislature authorized the Commission to cooperate with similar agencies of other States to coordinate the efforts of all such States in obtaining the building of the project; and

"Whereas in the decade between 1921 and 1931 the legislature appropriated to said Commission approximately $100,000 to enable it to complete its work and studies and to present its arguments for the approval of this international project, and as a result of the work of the Commission and of similar commissions in other States, the feasibility and value of the project was demonstrated to the Federal Government; and

"Whereas that Commission has repeatedly made reports to the Governor, and the two houses of the legislature have on numerous occasions expressed in sundry concurrent resolutions their desire that the Congress and the members of the Michigan delegation proceed speedily in all steps necessary for the action to be taken by the Federal Government since the project of necessity is international in its nature and its scope, to wit, by Senate Concurrent Resolutions 5 of 1933, 7 of 1933, 1 of 1933, 98 of 1941, 5 of 1947, 13 of 1951, House Concurrent Resolutions 7 of 1935, 5 of 1937, 3 of 1941; and

"Whereas, for 16 of the last 18 years and during the entire period of World War II, the President and the controlling majority of the Congress of the United States have been members of the same political party, and although the project is now entirely within the field of Federal and international relations, the Congress and the President have utterly failed in action and in a realization that the economic and defense needs of this country, even during the period of World War II, and in the present perilous state of international affairs and national emergency, have been jeopardized by the failure to initiate and complete this project; and

"Whereas the present national emergency and the experiences of the last World War have demonstrated beyond a question of doubt, in addition to its basic economic value in the industrial development of the country, the need of the project as an essential in the national defense so that the industrial capacity of this country for defense may be supplied with raw materials; and

"Whereas the legislature of this State, having steadfastly developed and maintained a position of support in relation to this project for the past three decades: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the legislature reiterates its position in support of the St. Lawrence seaway project and requests each member of the Michigan delega-

tion in the Congress, in view of the importance of the project, both to the State and to the national economic and defense needs, to take all steps possible to further the adoption of the project by the Federal Government and to complete by way of treaty or agreement its international authorization; and be it further

"Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be sent to each member of the Michigan delegation and to the majority leaders of Congress.

"Adopted by the senate March 6, 1951.

"FRED I. CHASE,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house April 12, 1951.

"NORMAN C. PHILLEO,
"Clerk of the House of Representatives."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 20

"Concurrent resolution supporting the resolutions of and demands of the Michigan Veterans' Hospital Committee and the various State veterans' conventions, that the Veterans' Administration build a 500-bed tuberculosis hospital in Michigan or provide other adequate facilities to provide proper care to tubercular veteran patients

"Whereas the Michigan Veterans' Hospital Committee composed of the State Service Officers of the United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Marine Corps League and the American Veterans of World War II, have insistently petitioned the Veterans' Administration since January 1949, to reinstate in its hospital-building program a 500-bed hospital for tubercular veterans in this State; and

"Whereas it is a demonstrated fact that it is not in the best interest of the health and morals of the patients whose homes are in Michigan that they be transferred to distant points for treatment; and

"Whereas there are now approximately 338 service-connected and 122 presumptively service-connected tubercular cases scattered throughout our State in State and county hospitals, in addition to 87 patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital in Dearborn, which is not rated as a tuberculosis hospital, making in all approximately 550 veteran tubercular patients whose treatment is a direct obligation of the Veterans' Administration; and in addition there are another 500 non-service-connected tubercular veterans now in various State and county hospitals who are entitled to Veterans' Administration hospitalization under certain conditions; and

"Whereas a very great potential load of veteran tubercular patients is indicated in that Michigan is credited with 788,000 war-service veterans and stands seventh in the country in service admissions from the State; and

"Whereas the Michigan need for beds for tubercular veterans has been pressed repeatedly on congressional committees and on the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and

"Whereas there is not a single Veterans' Administration bed in the State of Michigan for tubercular patients to take care of the active load: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), in vigorous support of the resolutions and demands of the Michigan Veterans' Hospital Committee and the various State veterans' conventions and in view of the impelling necessities of Michigan veterans afflicted with tuberculosis, that the Veterans' Administration build a 500-bed tuberculosis hospital in Michigan as originally planned, so that proper care may be given tubercular veteran patients eligible for treatment by the Veterans' Administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Michigan delegation to the Congress of the United States and to the Veterans' Administration.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1951.

"FRED I. CHASE,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house April 12, 1951.

"NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
"Clerk of the House of Representatives."

To the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 17

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Federal Income Tax Act with respect to exemptions

"Whereas the high cost of living has placed a burden on individuals and families, and in order to bring about a more equitable application of the Federal income tax the exemption to married persons should be $2,500, to single persons $1,000, and the $600 exemption for each dependent, now in the present law, should be retained: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the members of the house of representatives urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Federal Income Tax Act so as to provide exemptions of $2,500 to married persons, $1,000 to single persons, and $600 for each dependent; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress.

"Adopted by the house April 16, 1951.

"NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
"Clerk of the House of Representatives."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1418. A bill for the relief of Santina D'Agostino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1419. A bill to pay an annuity to Richard W. Goodhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1420. A bill for the relief of Pinfang Hsia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1421. A bill for the relief of Masako Sugiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1422. A bill for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to provide burial and hospitalization benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

BURIAL AND HOSPITAL BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that members of the Armed Forces now serving in Korea and others who have been in active service since June 27, 1950, when discharged from service, are technically peacetime veterans and not eligible for hospitalization and burial benefits within the meaning of the Veterans' Administration regulation. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which provides by law for such burial and hospitalization benefits to any person who has served in the active military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 68) to provide burial and hospitalization benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INVESTIGATION OF CRIME AND RELATED PROBLEMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. CASE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 136), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to crime and related problems, including law enforcement, in the District of Columbia; and (2) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3587, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR'S SPEECH BEFORE CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 36)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I venture the expression that in the history of this body, and in the history of this country, no more momentous expression has ever been made, either by Members of this body, by Members of the House of Representatives, or by any speaker before Congress, than was made before the joint meeting of Congress on the 19th

day of last month by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

The speech delivered by him before the joint meeting of Congress has been repeated around the world.

It has created in this country a thinking people, thinking deeply of their own welfare as individuals and as Americans, thinking seriously of their own future, and the future of their country. Indeed, it required such a speech to bring the people of the United States to their feet, so to speak, thinking of the welfare of their Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, delivered on the 19th day of last month, before the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress, be printed as a Senate document. It is under 50 pages, and, therefore, does not require an estimate of cost.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

An article discussing the necessity of confidence in Government officials, written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post May 1, 1951.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "Case for the Seaway," discussing the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, published in the Miami News of March 26, 1951.

By Mr. McMAHON:

Editorials entitled "The Soldier and the Statesman" and The Great Debate," from the April 28, 1951, issue of America, discussing the place of the soldier and the statesman in the Government, and the MacArthur case.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Three tables making comparisons between tax rates and benefits under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Systems.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Four tables giving comparisons between tax rates and benefits under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Systems.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Indiana, together with the opening remarks of Department Commander Jack McIntyre, April 12, 1951.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Resolution adopted by Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, American Legion, of Marion, Ind., regarding the Asiatic policy of the United States.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Editorial entitled "Democracy's Best Seller," regarding Maj. Henry Martyn Robert, author of Robert's Rules of Order.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Article published in the Baltimore Sun regarding decoration of Paul W. Ward by President Auriol of France.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "General MacArthur," discussing the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, published in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal April 14, 1951, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Article entitled "Germany Treated Like Stepchild," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Star of May 1, 1951, referring to the treatment of Germany by other nations.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Article entitled "Secrecy Is Blunderers' Refuge," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star of May 1, 1951, having reference to the impending MacArthur investigation.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by John Nicholas Brown, former Navy Assistant Secretary for Air, and letter from Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, endorsing Senate bill 677, a bill to increase the strength of the Marine Corps and to make the Commandant a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

By Mr. MOODY:

Address on the subject of the free-enterprise system delivered by John S. Coleman, president of the Burroughs Adding Machine Co., at the annual Michigan Congressional Dinner held in Washington, D. C., April 30, 1951.

SUGGESTED REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL TICKET OF 1952

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the ticket which is suggested for the Republican convention of next year by the Hon. Robert R. McCormick, owner and editor of the Chicago Tribune. He has suggested General MacArthur for President and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the RECORD should carry these glad tidings.

PROPOSED ABOLITION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a letter from the Honorable Jesse H. Jones with respect to the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, also an editorial from the New York Times of May 1, and following that my testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 30.

There being no objection, the letter, editorial, and testimony were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOUSTON CHRONICLE,
Houston, Tex., April 10, 1950.

The Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter is in reply to yours of March 6 stating that you would be interested in any views I have with respect to the RFC and its activities in recent years.

My views about the RFC are mixed. I have a great affection for the Corporation to which I devoted 13 years of my life, and have pride in its accomplishments during that period. I have great affection for my associates who shared the responsibility with me, some of whom are still with the Corporation. I also have pride in the confidence which the Congress repeatedly placed in the Corporation while it was under my direction and the regard in which it was held throughout the business and financial world, but am saddened by the way it is now being misused. It was a privilege to work with the Congress in meeting the emergencies that seemed always to be lurking just around the corner.

The Corporation was created an emergency agency when millions of our people were on short rations, when there was no market for farm products and no demand for anything but a square meal. It is hardly necessary to do more than name the date of February 2, 1932, on which the Corporation was organized to bring back the memory of the depths of the depression.

To meet the ever increasing problems the RFC Act was amended many times giving it additional powers. These amendments came in a steady stream soon after the Corporation got started, but always after careful consideration by Congress. Prompting every one of those amendments was a problem of an emergency nature to be met by the extension of RFC's powers.

However, it was always assumed the RFC was doing what private enterprise was not in a position to do, and when the situation was met the Corporation would cease operations. It was never with the thought of creating a Government bank to compete with private enterprise that the RFC was created or maintained. It was always with the idea of doing an emergency job which could be accomplished in no other way.

The depression was over by the late thirties, but the war clouds were gathering and the existence of the RFC with its experienced personnel was a natural to take over war work, in which it did a herculean task. At the war's end, our banking structure having been fully restored and able to provide credit for all legitimate purposes, the RFC should have been placed in liquidation. That it was not is no credit to the Government, for the functions which have heretofore motivated the RFC do not appear to be those that now keep it in operation.

Excuses are found to make loans, and in large amounts, that under no circumstances can be justified. The RFC should not be regarded as a source of easy money, a place where improvident loans may be made for personal or political reasons; a bank of issue for the socialization of the Nation's economy and a spigot where funds flow to those who are classed as acceptable risks because of political expediencies.

As for the future of the RFC, I think it should be given a decent burial, lock, stock, and barrel. I say this first because none of the conditions which prompted the creation of the RFC and the various amendments to its powers exist today; second, Government lending in competition with private business is not a proper function under our free enterprise system; third, because it is being prostituted when making such loans as the Kaiser-Fraser, the Lustron, the Tex-Mass, and the Waltham Watch Co.; fourth, because there is ample credit for all legitimate and justifiable loans.

I mention these foregoing loans because they are the ones that have been greatly publicized. I am not familiar with loans by the Corporation generally, but have no doubt that many of them will work out. I did notice in one of the Corporation's reports, probably at the end of the year, an item carried as loans for consolidation of debt. That sounds very much like loans to pay creditors of the borrower which should not be a function of the Corporation and, I am sure, was never intended by the Congress.

As publicized, the Kaiser-Fraser loan was made to put men to work. The country can absorb only so many automobiles and if Mr. Kaiser does not make them, others in the industry will, and with private funds. If Mr. Kaiser does not employ the men to make automobiles, the industry in that same vicinity will. If he does not use Government money to carry automobiles for his dealers, private money will, at least it will for the more standardized automobiles. There are automobile finance companies throughout the country for just that purpose, but of course they cannot compete with Government funds. Banks are also glad to lend on automobiles because they have learned that people will pay for their automobile.

It is well known that stockholders of the Kaiser-Fraser company have lost heavily on

their investments in the stock of that company. Much of this loss ultimately comes out of the Federal Treasury as tax deductions. But if the automobiles were made by one of the more experienced companies, the Treasury would collect taxes from the stockholders' dividends as well as from the manufacturer on its profits in making the automobiles.

As for the Tex-Mass loan, there is no lack of credit for properly secured loans in the oil and gas industry. Banks and insurance companies are eager for such loans. But it appears that several million dollars of this loan is to be used in making payments on loans now held by large life insurance companies, and a substantial sum to pay banks. Certainly this is not a proper function for the RFC. If the loans are good the insurance companies and banks would want to keep them. If they are bad, they should not be unloaded on the Government.

Again, if a concern as old and experienced as the Waltham Watch Co. could not make a go of its business in such good times as we have been having since the war's end, the Government certainly could not, so why the loan?

When the Government finances business it is competing with private enterprise from which it gets much of its income. When it finances improvident business it takes from the profits of competing business, gets no taxes from the improvident, and loses on its loan.

If the Congress is not willing to liquidate the Corporation, then I suggest that it close its 32 branches and only make loans to business and industry in cooperation with banks and other financial institutions which would make and administer the loans and carry a participation in them of not less than 25 percent for their own account, and I would limit the RFC's participation in any loan to a few hundred thousand dollars.

I doubt that there is a county in the United States in which a bank could not be found to make loans on such a basis in cooperation with the Government. We established that method of lending before I left the Corporation. It worked very well. This procedure would do away with the necessity of the Corporation maintaining 32 large agencies and would greatly reduce its operating expense. It could, if it liked, maintain an agent at each Federal Reserve Bank or branch bank where it now has offices, to help work out loans between banks and borrowers. When I was with the Corporation we were often able to get banks to make loans without our even taking a participation in them simply by calling the bank on the telephone.

A thorough investigation of the making of the Kaiser-Fraser loan, the Tex-Mass loan, the Waltham Watch loan and the Lustron fiasco is clearly indicated. And this might be helpful to the committee in determining its recommendations for the future of the Corporation.

While I do not believe there is any lack of justifiable credit anywhere in the country, as long as the RFC is in the lending business, it will get applications for loans. Some people would prefer to borrow from the RFC rather than from their local banks. Some may feel that they can go to their Congressman or their United States Senator or possibly to the White House and bring political pressure to bear on the Government lending agent. The lending agent may feel that his job is a political one and that to hold it he must go along, or he might even feel that the judgment of men in high places in Government might be better than his, and accordingly approve a loan that should not be made. Without any information on the subject, that must have been the situation with respect to the four loans mentioned.

With the RFC all set for business, it is natural that those in charge of it would rather make loans than not, in order to justify their employment and the continuance of the agency. And some people wanting to borrow money would like to be in a position to say to their bankers, "If you don't let me have the money, I will get it from the RFC."

Money lending is just as much a vocation as any other calling in life, including that of politics and statesmanship. A successful money lender would probably not make much of a success in politics, and the reverse is probably true. Particularly, Members of the Congress or those in the executive branch of the Government should not endeavor to interpret the act for, or otherwise influence, the directors of the RFC in making specific loans.

I have not read the act since leaving the Corporation, but there was a provision in it that required its directors to certify to the appropriateness of the salaries paid by borrowers, and whether in the act or not, we had a rule that we should also approve the appropriateness of lawyers' fees, accountant expenses, et cetera, incident to a loan. We did not allow the borrower to pay commissions.

Proper management of the RFC, if it is to be continued, is vital to the integrity of our Government, but it should be liquidated.

I have made these observations, comments, and suggestions from my long experience with the Corporation, and wish to remind you that where the sugar is you will always find the flies.

Respectfully,

JESSE H. JONES.

[From the New York Times of May 1, 1951]

MR. HOOVER ON THE RFC

Herbert Hoover added his own vigorous arguments yesterday to those of such veteran banking authorities as Jesse Jones and Marriner S. Eccles in advocating the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Hoover's views are highly pertinent to the debate, since it was he who, as President in 1932, fathered the RFC. At that time, however, as Mr. Hoover told the Senate Banking Committee yesterday, the institution was created to assist a temporarily crippled private banking system in protecting the solvency of agriculture, commerce, and industry. Its purely emergency character was reflected in the restrictions with which its lending operations were circumscribed and in the fact that its life span was set at 1 year.

The economic climate which brought the RFC into existence nearly two decades ago has not only ceased to exist; it has been succeeded by a condition that is just the reverse—a condition of chronic inflation. Even in normal times there would be no legitimate excuse for continuing such an institution as the RFC. But in such an atmosphere as that which has prevailed in recent years it becomes a financial, political, and moral liability. Nevertheless, the agency has been perpetuated over the years on one pretext or another and its lending requirements have been liberalized on at least three different occasions. "As a result," said the former President, "the institution now undertakes to finance by so-called loans almost anything, domestic and even sometimes foreign, on most any terms it pleases."

Mr. Hoover's testimony was particularly devastating when it dealt with the argument (the last stronghold of the RFC's defenders) that the departure of the agency would deal a crippling blow to small business. If it is solvent, he said, small business "can get all the credit it needs from private banking services." Where long-term venture capital or credit is required, the answer, he suggested, was not in Government direct loans but in "the mutualization of credit" with, say, Federal Reserve backing. Meanwhile, said he, we should put an end to the fantastic practice of lending to distillers, brewers, theaters, poolrooms (and even snake farms) on the theory that such loans are invested in "the public interest." Where small-business loans are genuinely necessary from the standpoint of the public interest, plans could be worked out so they might be guaranteed by the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Hoover succeeded in showing, taking his testimony as a whole, that so long as there is an institution standing around with public funds to lend and no legitimate function to perform it will not only rush into any credit vacuum that may exist but that sooner or later it will succeed in creating new vacuums, which it will then proceed to fill.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD ON S. 1376 BEFORE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE PROVIDING FOR LIQUIDATION OF RFC

You have heard President Hoover present his views respecting the liquidation of the RFC.

I now want to read you a letter from Mr. Jesse Jones, who perhaps knows as much as anyone else about the operations of the RFC:

PASADENA, CALIF.

DEAR HARRY: I have your letter and your bill—which I approve. I am, of course, shocked at the exposures Senator FULBRIGHT'S committee have brought out and doubt if he has more than scratched the surface. If we cannot have integrity in our Government why sacrifice our boys in Korea and our billions in defense of our country? To me it is beyond understanding, how good men can countenance the things that are going on and I, of course, know we have many fine men in the Congress, but they should stop the graft or acknowledge that right is not worth fighting for.

Your friend,

JESSE JONES.

Then I desire to call to your attention a speech made by Gov. James F. Byrnes at Raleigh, N. C., on March 14, 1951, in which he said:

"The people who are called upon to make sacrifices are not made happy by the disclosure of disloyalty of an employee of the Atomic Energy Commission and by the shocking disclosures before the Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Worse than the loss of money is the loss of confidence in the honesty of men who have occupied responsible positions in government. There is no excuse for the existence of the organization.

"Why should your Government lend public funds to manufacture automobiles and fabricated houses or to build tourist hotels in Florida?

"A man can borrow money from the banks and private investors provided he has character and collateral. If he does not possess them, he should not be loaned your money.

"In March 1945 I expressed this view to President Roosevelt. In his administration the RFC had been wisely administered by Jesse Jones. But President Roosevelt realized the danger. He said it had served its purpose and when peace was restored it should be liquidated. He did not live to liquidate it.

"Because of the war situation, it may be necessary to make loans to a few manufacturers producing weapons of war. But these can be made by Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilizer, who has the confidence of the people. The Congress should promptly enact legislation to liquidate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

So, we have here the testimony of President Hoover, who established the RFC, Mr. Jesse Jones, who administered its affairs for many years, and Governor Byrnes, who has had as close a connection with the Federal

Government as any man living over a long period of years, and his direct quotation from President Roosevelt that it was his intention to liquidate the RFC after the war.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss in any detail the shocking disclosures made by the Fulbright subcommittee. This committee, and especially the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT, deserve the gratitude of the American people. I do want to call attention, however, to this fact: With any agency of the Government with great sums to loan and without standards fixed whereby these loans can be made, it is nearly inevitable over a period of time that political favoritism, if not corruption, will creep into these transactions. The RFC has no standard except the discretion of its officials.

When it was established the RFC performed a most valuable service. It was a depression measure. No such condition exists today. In fact, we are now in a period of the highest plateau of inflation we have ever reached. The history of the RFC shows it did do a good job when needed but, as might have been expected, its access to the financial resources of the United States has been too great a temptation for political camp-followers in periods when it did not have a job to do.

It is my frank opinion that the good of the RFC has been more than offset by revelations of political favoritism, mismanagement, and so forth, which have occasioned a loss of confidence in the administration of our Government, and confidence in our Government is essential to the preservation of our democracy, especially at this time of great national crisis.

The bill pending provides that all funds of the RFC should go to pay on the public debt. We must remember that every dollar the RFC has came from borrowing through the Federal Treasury. It has added to the public debt.

It is my prediction that we are facing a long period of deficit spending, which, in itself, is inflationary and, if continued too long, may impair our solvency. Why should the Federal Government borrow money from some of our citizens to loan it to other citizens except during a period when such action is defensible from a standpoint of the public welfare?

At this time I will not discuss the question of whether the RFC has made money. It borrows from the Federal Treasury at 1⅞ percent, which is the average interest paid by the Federal Government. Since November it has made loans at 5 percent and 4 percent previous to November. With that margin it should make money, but this cannot definitely be determined until the RFC is liquidated. There is an old saying in the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia, "That you cannot measure a snake until it is dead." This applies to the RFC. We cannot take an appraisal made by its own officials as a basis of its financial standing. If these appraisals have been made in the same manner in which some of the loans have been made, they certainly cannot be relied upon.

Functions and programs of the RFC which are at present authorized by existing law and executive and administrative orders roughly may be grouped in four broad categories, as follows:

1. The old line lending programs which are currently active, such as loans to business enterprises and the purchases of their obligations, and loans to meet catastrophies in the event they occur;

2. The old line lending programs which are currently inactive, such as loans to financial institutions including banks and insurance companies; loans to States, municipalities, and other subdivisions and public bodies to finance public projects, and purchase of securities and obligations for the same purpose; loans to drainage, levee, and irrigation districts, loans for marketing agricultural commodities; loans to foreign governments; loans to mortgage companies, and guaranteeing veterans' mortgages and insuring FHA mortgages; and liquidation of World War II activities including the affairs of the Defense Homes Corporation.

3. The servicing of the new defense production loans and civilian defense loans as an agent for other Federal agencies which have primary responsibility in these programs; and

4. The operation of defense plants and activities, such as those now engaged in the production of tin, synthetic rubber, abacá fiber, and aluminum.

Briefly, Senate bill 1376, sponsored by Senators ROBERTSON, BRICKER, KEM, WILLIAMS, FERGUSON and myself, would discontinue RFC activities in the first two categories, and provide for the continuance elsewhere of the activities listed in the second two categories.

OLD LINE RFC LENDING ACTIVITIES

The sponsors of this bill take the position that the old line lending activities of the RFC, currently both active and inactive, under present conditions, and the requirements of the foreseeable future, are nonessential, inflationary, and constitute a a temptation for abuse. And under provisions of the bill these activities and programs would be discontinued immediately upon enactment, and the Secretary of the Treasury would proceed with an orderly liquidation honoring all of the terms of agreements made in connection with all approved loans.

RFC SERVICE TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION LOANS

Primary responsibility for defense production loans, under the Defense Production Act of 1950, lies in the component departments of the National Military Establishment, the Commerce Department, and such other agencies engaged in procurement for the national defense as the President may designate. The RFC has been utilized largely for the servicing of defense production loans under directions set forth in Executive Order 10161. This Executive order could be changed within the provisions of the Defense Production Act without regard for any provision in the RFC Act of 1947. But as a means of precaution against any delay, interruption, or interference with Production Act loans which have been assigned to the RFC, the pending bill provides that the RFC may remain active with respect to Defense Production Act loans for as long as 120 days after the enactment, or until the Secretary of the Treasury or any other agency designated by the President indicates ability to take over action on these loans without delay, interruption, or interference.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE LOANS THROUGH RFC

The Civilian Defense Act provides for loans through the RFC. To date no loans have been made under this authority. Therefore this bill could cause little or no delay, interruption, or interference in connection with civilian defense loans. But the same 120-day provision, under terms of the bill, would apply to RFC lending activities in relation to civilian defense loans which may have been originated by the date of enactment.

ALUMINUM PLANT TRANSFER

An administration bill (S. 312) is now pending before the Senate to transfer the aluminum and magnesium forgings plan to the Department of Defense. Section 6 of this RFC bill (S. 1376) contains language in substantial conformity with the administration bill providing for the transfer of this operation from RFC to the Air Force. This language has been worked out with the assistance and advice of the Bureau of the Budget.

TIN, RUBBER AND FIBER PLANTS

The RFC is at present operating tin, rubber and fiber plants. Section 3 of the pending bill would transfer these operations to the Department of Commerce. The provisions of these transfer to the Commerce Department are modeled after those in section 305 of Senate bill 3936 of the Eighty-first Congress—the Defense Production bill—as it was reported from the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST ABOLISHING RFC

The burden of the criticism of proposals to abolish RFC, as represented by the chairman of the RFC Board, in a letter to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 1, and by a letter from the Defense Mobilization Director to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, dated April 4, was that it would interfere with the defense loan program and disrupt the operations of defense plants now under the supervision of RFC. Senate bill 1376 spells out in specific terms the precautions to be taken to preclude delay or disruption in any of these programs.

Long term and disaster loans

Another argument for continuance of RFC is that it would provide long-term loans for small businesses which have already been turned down by banks and other private-lending institutions, and to provide loans in cases of disaster. This contention appears to be refuted in large degree by figures contained in a table submitted to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments March 23, 1951, along with a letter by the Chairman of the RFC Board. These figures show that business loans of over $100,000 outstanding as of January 31 this year totaled more than $358,000,000 as compared with outstanding loans of $100,000 or less which, as of the same date, totaled $174,000,000. In 1950 RFC made 4,904 business loans of less than $100,000, and of these approximately 3,000 were for less than $25,000. In connection with RFC loans such as these 3,000 the Hoover Commission task force found:

"The majority of the loans now being made by the Corporation are small loans to finance new businesses or the acquisition of existing businesses by new owners. * * * These are important enterprises, but, individually, they are not significant from a national standpoint. The assistance extended by RFC in many of these cases may even have a negative value from the national point of view in that it encourages the continuance of ventures which should be permitted to discontinue, and in that it prevents their owners from going into occupations for which they may be better suited. Any tendency to perpetuate mistaken enterprises will weaken the general economy out of all proportion to the individual gains which it may make."

Catastrophe loans

Ample funds short-of-war catastrophes are provided through the Farm Home Administration, the community facilities program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the President's emergency fund.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

In an effort, as far as possible, to be sure that all of the details incident to such a ramified operation as the RFC have been taken care of in Senate bill 1376, the Senate legislative drafting counsel has prepared answers, representng their best judgment, to a series of questions which either have been, or might be raised. These questions and answers may be summarized as follows:

1. Question. What would be the effect of the bill on old-line loans (exclusive of Defense Production Act loans) made by RFC prior to dissolution upon which there are still disbursements to be made?

Answer. Under the terms of the pending bill it clearly would be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury as liquidator to provide for disbursements legally obligated by the Corporation prior to enactment of the bill.

2. Question. What will happen with respect to servicing old-line RFC loans?

Answer. The servicing of loans in existence prior to enactment would become the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury as liquidator. Actually, in most instances, servicing provisions are included in loan contracts and therefore constitute legal obligation on the part of both parties to the loan. The agent through which the servicing would be performed would be determined administratively by the Secretary of the Treasury as the liquidator. This would be neither a new nor an insurmountable task for the Secretary of the Treasury who previously has used the Bureau of Accounts to liquidate the residual affairs of war agencies. Whereas, RFC now has 35 regional offices, the Bureau of Accounts has 26 similar offices throughout the United States and Territories.

3. Question. What would be the effect upon participation agreements with banks where, prior to dissolution of RFC, the entire amount of the loan has not been disbursed or the bank has not exercised its option to have the RFC participate in the loan?

Answer. The answer to this question is identical to the answer to question No. 1. Agreements entered into prior to dissolution would constitute legal obligation which must be met in all respects.

4. Question. How would this bill affect renewals of loans originally made prior to enactment?

Answer. The Secretary of the Treasury, to achieve orderly liquidation, may allow any obligor to make interim payments on revised schedules, but he is specifically denied the power to extend the maturity date of, or renew any loan made, or other obligation purchased by the RFC, beyond the date provided in the loan contract or other agreement.

5. Question. What would happen to the Defense Production loan program authorized by section 302 of the Defense Production Act of 1950?

Answer. The pending bill provides for uninterrupted continuity of the defense production loan program. The RFC is currently performing certain functions with respect to this program under authority of section 303 of Executive Order 10161, in which the President vested in the RFC functions conferred upon him by section 302 of the Defense Production Act.

In this connection the pending bill provides that the President may at any time transfer this program to the Secretary of Defense, the Federal Reserve Banks, or any existing department, agency, official or corporation of the Government, or to a new agency. Accordingly the President is given wide discretion with respect to the agency which shall administer the program, just as he has under the Defense Production Act. However, if the President does not make provision for the transfer of the program within 120 days after the enactment the program passes to the Secretary of the Treasury, and he may still transfer the program at any time to any agency he sees fit.

6. Question. What would happen to the civil defense loan program, authorized by section 409 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950?

Answer. The pending bill would permit RFC to continue to administer the loans of this program for as long as 120 days after enactment. Thereupon or before, it is indicated if disruption is precluded, the program would pass over to the Secretary of the Treasury who would administer it in accordance with the Civil Defense Act.

7. Question. What disposition would be made of the defense plant operations now conducted by RFC?

Answer. Under terms of the bill the aluminum plant would be transferred to the Air Force in accordance with administration recommendations, and the tin, rubber, and fiber plants would be transferred to the Department of Commerce under provisions similar to those recommended by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee during the Eighty-first Congress.

8. Question. Are there funds available to the President for any other Government agency to make disaster loans such as the RFC now makes?

Answer. There is an emergency fund of $1,000,000 available to the President for use in emergencies affecting the national interest or security without regard to provisions of law regulating expenditures of Government funds and to supplement efforts of State and local governments or other agencies in alleviating hardship or suffering, caused by flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, or other catastrophe.

The Presidential fund is to be succeeded by the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950, authorizing Federal assistance to State and local governments in major disasters.

The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, can make emergency loans for damage to agricultural crops and products.

In addition, the Federal Government, through the Federal Housing Commission, insures banks and other private institutions and loan agencies against certain loans and credit advances for repairing and replacing structures damaged as a result of catastrophes.

9. Question. What happens to personnel of RFC (a) engaged in lending activities, and (b) engaged in rubber, tin, abacá fiber, and aluminum operations?

Answer. Most employees engaged in the lending activities are covered under civil service and therefore would be entitled to reemployment rights granted employees with civil-service status. Such matters as retention of key personnel, etc., for work in connection with the liquidation would be a matter within the administrative decision of the Secretary of the Treasury as liquidator.

10. Question. What would be the effect of enactment of this bill upon court proceedings with the RFC as a party?

Answer. The bill clearly provides that suits, actions, or other proceedings lawfully commenced by or against the Corporation prior to the expiration of its succession shall not abate upon the expiration of its succession.

11. Question. Could any other Government agencies make or authorize the making of loans similar to the old-line loans now made by RFC?

Answer. There are a number of other Federal departments and agencies which can make loans similar to those now being made by RFC, although none of them has quite as broad authorization which RFC has with respect to whom loans may be made. Among these departments and agencies are the Federal Reserve banks, agencies of the Military Establishment, Farmers Home Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, REA, Public Housing Administration, and numerous mixed-ownership corporations, such as Federal land banks, intermediate-credit banks, Production Credit Corporation and associations, banks for cooperatives, FDIC, etc.

12. Question. What happens to proceeds from the RFC liquidation?

Answer. The pending bill permits the Secretary of the Treasury to use the proceeds of liquidation to meet administrative expenses, but congressional supervision of amounts to be allowed will be continued and provisions of the Corporation Control Act would continue to be applicable. Beyond administrative expenses incident to liquidation the proceeds would be applied to the curtailment of the Federal debt.

PERFECTED BILL

It is obvious from this analysis that Senate bill 1376 has been thought out in minute detail and drafted with extreme care. It has been introduced to substitute for Senate bill 1116 introduced at an earlier date.

The drafting has been done by the Senate legislative drafting counsel and it represents the combined judgment of practically all of the lawyers on the counsel's very efficient staff. In addition they have checked out many of the details with the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the RFC itself.

Every effort has been made to protect and preserve the defense-related functions now performed by RFC and to continue them without disruption, interference, or delay. By the same token effort has been made to discontinue the old-line functions of RFC, which were spawned in depression and are not nonessential in inflation, and to liquidate these functions and the RFC as a corporate entity in an orderly fashion honoring all the agreements that have been made.

SUPPORT FOR THE BILL

Unqualified support for the objective of this bill has been given, among others, by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States who originated the RFC as an instrument to combat inflation; by the Honorable Jesse Jones, former Secretary of Commerce, and first administrator of the RFC, who for 8 years directed the tremendous operations of the Corporation without a suggestion of impropriety or scandal, and accomplished magnificently the purposes for which the instrumentality was originated and the Honorable James F. Byrnes, now governor of the great southern State of South Carolina, who probably among all men now living has the richest experience in Federal service, having served for years in both Houses of Congress, as Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and in the executive branch as principal adviser to the President of the United States as Secretary of State.

Mr. Hoover, who has appeared before this committee as a witness in favor of the bill to abolish RFC, recently said as a member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, "I favored the abolition and do yet."

Abolition of RFC was recommended by the task force of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in connection with its report on Federal lending agencies.

The task force for this report was the firm of Price, Waterhouse and Co., certified public accountants who enjoy an international reputation in the field of business analysis. With respect to RFC this task force report said:

USE OF RFC TO AVOID THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCEDURES

"On a number of occasions beginning as early as 1933, RFC's statutory authority to borrow from the Treasury has been used by the Congress as a means of financing various governmental activities while avoiding the ordinary congressional procedures for the appropriation of public funds from the Treasury. * * *

"It is characteristic of such loose financing methods that they lend themselves to abuse and greatly increase the Government's exposure to unnecessary costs and losses."

RFC AS A STAND-BY FACILITY

"It is not in the public interest for the Government to keep an emergency agency alive during nonemergency periods, in the

hope that its existence may mitigate the effects of a future crisis, the date, the nature, the duration, the scope and the magnitude of which are all unpredictable. * * *

"RFC cannot obtain the services of first-rate executive during normal times.

"Outstanding executives who would be willing to service during emergencies would not wish to be bound by the organization forms and by the operating practices developed under nonemergency circumstances by less competent people, or people with less extensive business experience.

"The assignment of functions to an emergency agency to give it something to do and thus to keep its organization from stagnating during a nonemergency period, is not a good public policy.

"The contention that RFC breaks even on profits is based upon the $552,000,000 net profit reported by the Corporation through June 30, 1947, and there may therefore be a fallacy in the related contention that the continued existence of RFC will cost the Government very little.

"The aggregate net profit reported with respect to operations for a period ended June 30, 1947, has not been corrected for a substantial difference between the interest paid to the Treasury by RFC and the corresponding interest cost incurred by the Treasury. The Corporation's accounting records do not distinguish between the various classes of loans insofar as financial net results of activities are concerned. There is no way of knowing whether past loans to business enterprises yielded a profit or a net loss. Furthermore, the business loans which RFC is making at the present time contain a risk factor different from that which characterized its previous lending activities.

"It should not be presumed that the Corporation's present operations can be conducted at no net cost to the Government.

"The majority of the loans now being made by the Corporation are small loans to finance new businesses or the acquisition of existing businesses by new owners * * *. There are important enterprises, but, individually, they are not significant from a national standpoint. The assistance extended by RFC in many of these cases may even have a negative value from the national point of view in that it encourages the continuance of ventures which should be permitted to discontinue, and in that it prevents their owners from going into occupations for which they may be better suited. Any tendency to perpetuate mistaken enterprise will weaken the general economy out of all proportion to the individual gains which it may make."

The full Commission did not go all the way with the recommendation by the task force, but in fact it did recommend, among other things, that "Congress review the power to make direct loans, * * * taking into account the problems of economy, efficiency, and integrity * * *"; and that "The Government should not engage in direct lending where loans can be obtained from private sources on reasonable terms."

Some of the difficulties which beset the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in arriving at a recommendation with respect to abolishing RFC are indicated in the published individual views by Commissioners Dean Acheson, James K. Pollock, and James H. Rowe, Jr., who, among other statements, said: "We have seen no evidence whatever in the material submitted to us to justify the blanket assertion of the Commission that direct lending by the Federal Government '* * * opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals or private enterprises.' "

A NONESSENTIAL CORPORATION

Without going into the recent disclosures by the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator Fulbright, Messrs. Acheson, Pollock, and Rowes to the contrary, the RFC is now a nonessential, inflationary agency indulging in activities detrimental to the public interest.

While the Government is insisting on restricting private credit to curb inflation, the primary purpose of RFC is to make easy money available.

Some idea of the easy money operations in which the RFC is currently engaging and projecting will be obvious from the following summary of vital statistics on the Corporation:

1. RFC loans to business this year are estimated at $623,000,000 and next year the estimate is $692,000,000.

2. Under the RFC Act of 1947, RFC investments, loans, and commitments may total $2,000,000,000 at one time.

3. The RFC is capitalized at $100,000,000, but it is further authorized to issue notes, debentures, bonds, and other such obligations to the Treasury in amounts sufficient to carry out its functions.

4. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, and income, is exempt from all taxation by Federal, State, local, and Territorial governments.

5. It is estimated that RFC loans and investments in the current year will total $369,000,000 and that in the coming fiscal year 1952 they would increase to $941,000,000. Its total assets in the current year are estimated at $944,000,000 and for the next year at more than $1,000,000,000.

6. Its interest-bearing obligations to the Treasury for general purposes this year are estimated at $361,000,000 and for next year the estimate is $441,000,000.

7. Its administrative expenses in the current year are estimated at $20,000,000, and for next year the estimate is $18,250,000.

8. The Chairman of the RFC Board last January 8 told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that "the operations of the Corporation have not cost the taxpayers a single penny." This statement is at variance with the General Accounting Office reports; it is at variance with estimates by United States Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who, in a statement accompanied by Bureau of the Budget charts, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD April 5, 1951, asserted that over the period of its existence RFC losses totaled more than $12,000,000,000; and it is at variance with Hoover Commission task force findings.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Senate bill 1376 protects and preserves all requirements for defense production credit which have been created by Congress to this date.

Virtually every other aspect of the activities and programs of the RFC for emergency purposes are duplicated in other Federal credit facilities—even business loans which may be made through Federal Reserve provisions. And I have no doubt that if and when ordinary business loans are required by an emergency situation, they will be quickly adjusted to fulfill the requirement.

There are nearly a score of Federal credit agencies operating at this time with at least a hundred credit programs under their direction.

LOANING ACTIVITIES BY FEDERAL CREDIT AGENCIES

Authorized to make loans

1. Farm Credit Administration: To provide a complete and coordinated credit system for agriculture by making long-term and short-term credit available to farmers through:

(a) Federal land banks (12): For long terms on first mortgages on farm lands; and to issue farm loan bonds secured thereby (now the banks are a completely farmer-owned co-op system).

(b) Production credit corporations and associations (12 corporations and 500 associations): To provide short-term credit for all types of farm and ranch operations. (One hundred and seventeen associations have paid off all Government capital.)

(c) Banks for cooperatives: To provide a permanent source of credit to farmers' cooperative associations.

2. Farm Home Administration: For mortgage insurance, farm housing, water facilities, flood and disaster, and veterans' assistance.

3. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: To insured banks to facilitate bank mergers or consolidations and to reduce risks or avert threatened loss to the Corporation.

4. Commodity Credit Corporation: For the construction of commercial storage facilities, and to the Secretary of Agriculture for application to the furtherance of soil conservation.

5. Export-Import Bank: To aid in financing and facilitating exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States or any of its territories or insular possessions and foreign countries.

6. Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration: (This agency services loans to cooperatives.)

7. Virgin Islands Corporation: To individuals for industrial, commercial, and agricultural purposes in the Virgin Islands, where such loans are not available from private sources.

8. Housing and Home Finance Agency: To local public bodies for slum clearance and planning; to public or nonprofit private institutions of higher learning for housing and facilities; and for construction in Alaska. (And FNMA insurance.)

9. Federal home-loan banks (11) (Government owns $75,000,000 in stock held by Secretary of Treasury): On homes with special service to veterans.

10. Federal Housing Administration: To finance production of prefabricated houses; and insure loans to purchasers of prefabricated houses, mortgages financing purchases of certain types of publicly constructed houses, insure financial institutions against loss on property improvement loans, to insure mortgages on small family homes, insure mortgages on farm properties, insure mortgages on single-family dwellings, insure mortgages on cooperative housing, insure mortgages on rental projects.

11. Public Housing Administration: To construct and operate low-rent public housing dwellings.

12. Federal Reserve banks: Directly or indirectly to business for periods up to 5 years for working capital, and for not exceeding 90 days on promissory notes secured by direct obligations by the United States, and in unusual and exigent circumstances by discounting notes, drafts, and bills for individuals, partnerships, or corporations.

13. State Department: For the protection of private investments abroad.

14. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: To finance rehabilitation, expansion, and modernization of industrial and agricultural facilities abroad.

15. Rural Electrification Administration: To finance construction of rural electric facilities, and to REA-financed power distributors for relending to individuals for wiring, appliances, and plumbing, and for financing rural telephone lines and providing technical assistance in connection with rural telephone installation.

16. Veterans' Administration: Guaranteed for purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property.

17. Other: Including Indian and reclamation loans.

In a special Federal credit analysis the budget document for fiscal year 1952 states: "Federal credit programs, in the main, are designed to supplement or reinforce private financing"; and that, "Most lending agen-

cies either by law or by administrative policy limit direct loans to cases where the borrowers cannot obtain credit on reasonable terms from private financial institutions." And despite the Government's much-publicized policy of attempting to restrict private credit, the budget document continues with the statement that: "Under loan insurance and guaranty programs, the Government agency shares the risk and thus encourages private financing." In the next paragraph the budget document says: "Total new commitments for all of these types of programs (Federal direct loans and federally insured and guaranteed loans) for fiscal year 1952 are estimated at $13,300,000,000."

The budget document shows that available Federal credit authority in the current fiscal year is estimated at $58,600,000,000 and that more than $44,000,000,000 would be used. It is estimated that total available Federal credit authority next year would increase to $61,500,000,000 and that $49,000,000,000 would be used.

This obviously is one tremendous fountainhead of inflation which is now contributing to commodity shortages and rising prices. Under these conditions there should be no doubt that we can get along without the RFC pipeline to the Treasury of the United States.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12:30 o'clock today, namely, on the calendar day of May 1, debate upon any amendment to the pending bill or any motion, including appeals, which may be pending or which may thereafter be proposed to the said bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided, and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], respectively, and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], respectively; provided, first, that in the event the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or some other Senator designated by him; and second, that after Monday, April 30, 1951, no amendment submitted by a Senator—that is, any amendment that may not already have been submitted—intended to be subsequently proposed by him and ordered to lie on the table which is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the said bill shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or some other Senator designated by him, respectively; provided, however, that during the consideration of any individual amendment or motion either of said Senators may yield to the mover of any such amendment or motion, or to a Senator who is opposed thereto, any portion of such time of 1 hour allotted to him under this paragraph as he may desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader whether he has read the identical agreement heretofore presented?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is the identical agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the identical unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of debate which was presented last Friday, is it?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason why I ask the question of the distinguished majority leader is that I must provide some time for the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] which was requested by him.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is all provided for in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I also wish to be able to grant to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] at least 20 or 30 minutes for an address on the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a long unanimous-consent agreement. However, if the majority leader assures me that such time is provided, I will have no objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Parliamentarian drew up the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not questioning in any way the distinguished majority leader's request for unanimous consent. We had agreed that the minority would have no objection to the unanimous-consent agreement which was proposed last Friday. What I wish to call to the attention of the distinguished majority leader is that if I am to control the opposition time of the debate on the bill, or the opposition time of the debate on any amendment, it was understood by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and also by the majority leader that I could allocate 1 hour, to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on the bill for the presentation of his amendment, and that he could have 20 minutes on his own amendment, and that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] agreed that if I needed more time, he would yield time to the opposition on other amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I say that it was not more than 6 minutes ago that I talked to the majority leader with the idea of trying to get a unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of debate. At that time the majority leader informed me that it was impossible to get such an agreement. I do not know whether he had at that time read the unanimous-consent agreement prepared by the Parliamentarian. I was of the opinion and in the mood of trying to get a unanimous-consent agreement. However, I for one, will not consent to the request until I at least have a chance to investigate how the proposed agreement would actually affect me, no matter how much I desire to agree with the majority leader. Hence, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I said before, I anticipated that some Senator would probably object, but I thought that inasmuch as the Senator from New Mexico wanted me to try to secure an agreement, it was my duty to make the attempt.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that the Senator from Arizona should at least consult me about a unanimous-consent agreement for limitation of debate on the pending bill, and not expect the Senate to accept anything he might consider fair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

LEASING OF CLEVELAND TANK PLANT, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I call attention briefly to another instance of unnecessary waste of the taxpayers' money.

In 1950 the United States Air Force had under its jurisdiction the Schlegel Air Force Base located in Brook Park, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. This property was formerly known as the Cleveland Aircraft Assembly Plant and at the present time is the Cleveland Tank Plant. This property was being retained in stand-by status for possible future operation during a period of national emergency.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order? Will the Senator from Delaware please speak a little louder so we can hear him?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for an observation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to say to the Senator from Nebraska that what he has just referred to goes to prove that the plugs we have in the floor for a loudspeaking system might well be implemented, and then Senators like the Senator from Delaware or perhaps the Senator from Connecticut, who are not equipped with the vocal amplitude of the Senator from Nebraska, could be heard.

Mr. WHERRY. I object to being called a plug.

Mr. WILEY. No; the plug is on the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on April 25, 1950, the Secretary of the Air Force, on the assumption that this property would not be needed in the foreseeable future, negotiated a lease for this property with the National Terminals Corp., of Cleveland, Ohio, for an annual rental of $25,000 per year, or $2,083 a month. The officers signing the lease for the National Terminals Corp. were Mr. A. B. Efroymson, president, and Mr. L. A. Kraus, secretary.

On May 16, 1950, 3 weeks later, National Terminals Corp. executed a standard storage contract with the Commodity Credit Corporation—another Government agency—for the use of this same property, upon which they collected an average of $12,000 per month. As I said before, they leased it for $2,083 a month just 3 weeks before.

In August 1950, following the outbreak of the war in Korea, the lease between the Air Force and National Terminals Corp. was canceled, and the property repossessed by the Army, and on October 27, 1950, the CCC shipments out of these facilities were completed.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, during the 5 months in which it rented the property, paid to the National Terminals Corp. $58,601.65, or an average of about $12,000 per month. This represented a profit to National Terminals of nearly 600 percent, without any investment whatever.

This is not the first instance in which the CCC has resorted to this questionable practice, and there is no reason whatever why, if the Secretary of Agriculture had need of this property, he should not have negotiated direct with the Secretary of the Air Force for its utilization.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 300. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart;

S. 451. An act for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic;

S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek;

S. 568. An act for the relief of George W. Purdy;

S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs;

S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn;

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; and

S. 998. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

THE TASK AHEAD FOR THE CRIME COMMITTEE—DISCUSSION ON THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 29, the American Forum of the Air observed its twenty-third anniversary. Mr. Theodore Granik is the moderator of that program. It is now being sponsored by a Michigan corporation, the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp., of Detroit, Mich., one of the Nation's leading industrial firms.

I believe that firm is to be commended in particular for the stand against communism it has expressed in a series of public-service advertisements. I read from one of its advertisements:

Think what you will lose if communism wins. You won't be able to insure your family's future. You won't be able to pray in your church. You won't be able to argue your brand of politics. You won't be able to work where and how you want to. You won't live as a free man.

Elsewhere it is stated:

Listen for the deceitful words that promise new freedoms but promote slavery.

Freedom is never lost by a single act. It is stolen by innocent-sounding words that breed doubt, suspicion, and dissatisfaction.

Communism thrives on sugar-coated promises with pink centers.

Our country will remain free, only if we listen for the lies, the half truths, and expose them.

Mr. President, that indicates the high standard of public service we may expect from the televised American Forum of the Air and Mr. Granik, under his new sponsor. Mr. Granik's program is well known to Members of the Senate from their participation on it. Last Sunday his program rendered a service which is worthy of recognition by Congress. I feel, therefore, that the Senate should order the printing in the RECORD of the proceedings of the American Forum of the Air for Sunday, April 29, 1951. The title of the discussion is "The Task Ahead for the Crime Committee." Four of the distinguished members of that committee were on the televised program at that time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the proceedings of that program, because I think all Senators should know about it.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR, SUNDAY, APRIL 29, 1951

THE TASK AHEAD FOR THE CRIME COMMITTEE

(Speakers: Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee; Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin; Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Democrat, of Wyoming; Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire. Moderator: Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the American Forum of the Air.)

ANNOUNCER. Good afternoon. It's time again to join the American Forum of the Air and a discussion of the task ahead for the Crime Committee. The topic originally scheduled for today, entitled "What's Ahead—Peace or War?" will be heard at this time next Sunday.

Here today to discuss the task ahead for the Crime Committee is ESTES KEFAUVER, Democratic Senator from Tennessee; Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin; Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Democrat, of Wyoming; and Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire.

This is the American Forum of the Air.

Now here is your moderator, who, 23 years ago today, founded the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. On Tuesday, the Senate Crime Investigating Committee will be filing with the United States Senate its third interim report. This historic document will be of tremendous interest to every law-enforcement official and every citizen of the United States. To give us the history of the committee's work and a look into its future, our distinguished guests, all of whom have performed such a magnificent public service, will discuss the task ahead for the Crime Committee.

Now, Senators, in our studio audience today are several hundred leaders of the Congress, of the Government, and the press. They, like many of our radio and television audience, would like to know what you have found to be the outstanding discoveries by the committee.

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Granik, first let me say how good it is to be with you on the twenty-third anniversary of the American Forum of the Air.

I think the outstanding thing our Crime Committee has found is that crime does operate on a syndicated basis in the United States; that it is much more powerful and sinister and has a more devastating and undesirable economic influence upon the people of our country than anyone had thought; also, that it has political and law-enforcement connections.

I think we have also been heartened by the fact that since the facts have become known, all levels of people and Government officials are going to go after the proper individuals.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator WILEY, do you care to comment on the crime syndicates, to which your earlier report referred?

Senator WILEY. No. But I would just like to give an idea in relation to what is up ahead.

It should be noted that the public should not expect a series of intensive hearings, such as was held in the New York investigation, in the 4 months that are up ahead. The workload of the Congress is so heavy today as to make it practically impossible for us to schedule hearings more than once or twice a month. It is important, of course, that we concentrate the most critical issues of our times on the sound basis of first things first.

I sincerely feel that one of the things that has come out of this investigation so far has been an alerting of the public, a reawakening of the public awareness to the need that they, the public, have a job to do.

Moderator GRANIK. How do you feel about that, Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. I think, Mr. Granik, that perhaps the most noteworthy effect has been the unprecedented public interest that has been aroused in the work that we have been doing. I do not believe that ever in the history of Congress has there been a committee that has received the wholehearted support of the people of the Nation as we have. I think that proves conclusively, Mr. Granik, that the great majority of our people throughout the country want good, clean law enforcement on all levels.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator TOBEY, Senator WILEY referred to future hearings. What cities do you expect to visit?

Senator TOBEY. I cannot say. The committee has not considered that. But we are going to places before we get through.

I would like to make this observation as to the committee: There are three Democrats and two Republicans. That is entirely appropriate because it takes three Democrats to hold down two Republicans any time.

I want to go a little further and say that there are two outstanding results of this investigation. The first is the marvelous invention of television, the miracle invention, which has brought the results of this committee's hearings into millions of homes throughout the country and has given the plain people for the first time the privilege of seeing their Government at work.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you plan to use television in the future?

Senator TOBEY. Yes, and we mean to do that every time.

Let me say that the fellow to my right, the chairman of the committee, is being succeeded by Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland. That is all right by me. But I want to say that I would be guilty of negligence if I did not say to the people of the Nation, that this man, ESTES KEFAUVER, on my right, is a noble Christian gentleman, who deserves the high-

est praise from his country. And I pay him that tribute sincerely.

We are going on, and the greatest thing we can do is to uncover in this country the collusion between the crooked elements of this country and the public officials of the Government—State, city, and national. And we are going to do that, God helping us.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to discuss that collusion, Senator KEFAUVER?

Senator KEFAUVER. Before I do discuss it, I want to say that our committee, I think, has been very fortunate in that we have had no politics and no partisanship whatsoever in our work. I think we all agree that we have gone straight down the middle of the road and have tried to find the facts and to expose them. In that way, we have sought to bring public attention to them so as to provide a basis for legislation.

I think I should mention also that in Rudolph Halley and his associates we have had very excellent teamwork on our staff.

I do think there is still much to be accomplished.

I agree with Senator WILEY that the first thing to do now is to try to press for legislation to stop the use of interstate commerce in the furtherance of organized crime; to try to break it up, reduce it to a lower level, a local level, so that local people can more adequately deal with it.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you believe the committee can and should promote legal action against the racing wire service?

Senator KEFAUVER. Yes.

Of course, that is one of the unfortunate problems we have been holding hearings about, and that is one of the main things we have to get at. That is because, in my opinion, the racing wire service is public enemy No. 1 in the country. I do not refer in that way to all the people who are connected with it necessarily, but it itself is the arterial system of bookmaking all over the Nation. And, of course, that leads to all other kinds of crime and collusion which operate around bookmaking.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you feel such action will conflict with the freedom of the press, Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. No, I do not.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. I do not believe it will conflict with the freedom of the press. It seems to me it is a question of degree.

Incidentally, may I say that we have always had thorough coverage of Congressional investigations by the press. They have also always had thorough coverage by their photographers. We have had radio now for 25 years. Television is just one step further. I cannot understand the difference between having 30,000,000 people in their living rooms looking in on what is happening and having 200 people in a hearing room.

I think it squares with the Constitution, too. I think it is an agency for public service. It really is a great Godsend to this country, in view of the good effects we can have from television for good government.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator, you referred to collusion before. Why is it the committee found corruption among so many law enforcement officials, particularly among sheriffs and policemen?

Senator HUNT. Why is it? Because the human heart is despicable and wicked in all things in its normal state. Men have been guilty of avarice for filthy lucre, and they have sold their souls across this country. Witness New York City alone, where gambler Gross was indicted for paying protection for the calendar year 1950 and paid out $1,000,000. He pleaded not guilty. But 1 week before he was called before the bar, he turned around and pleaded guilty. That is $1,000,000 spent in the great Empire City of New York for police protection of officials in one calendar year.

Just think that over and get mad about it. If you do not, there is something wrong with the American public.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KEFAUVER.

Senator KEFAUVER. Of course, organized crime and big-time crime, as Senator TOBEY says, cannot operate without protection of one kind or another. It may be in the ability to influence votes, but there must be corruption.

I do not think we should give the impression that any large percentage of our public officials or enforcement officers are corrupt or that they have any connections with organized crime, but if there is any amount of corruption in the United States it is too much, whether at a local, State or Federal level.

I do think it should be pointed out that if the people would take more interest in voting for and in backing up their good law enforcement officials so that they in turn would feel that they could be reelected for office and supported for office if they did an honorable job, then, we would have a lot less dishonesty.

Senator TOBEY. Senator KEFAUVER, may I amend your statement?

If the people would take more interest in voting—period. In the last election 50 percent of the registered voters used that prerogative and went to the polls. That is the tragic thing in America.

Senator WILEY. Mr. Chairman.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator WILEY.

Senator WILEY. So that there would be no misunderstanding, I would like to make a point.

First, we being a congressional committee and we being legislators, our primary function is legislation. The only reason why we have any jurisdiction is because crime is interstate, not intrastate alone.

And ancillary to finding the facts, of course, on which to recommend legislation to the Congress, probably another objective is, as has been said so dramatically here by my associates, to arouse the people to the fact that it is their job, not the Congress's job. We can pass a thousand pieces of legislation, but unless there is a rebirth in the minds of the public officials, and especially in our constituents, who must sense that on the local level, in the States, in the cities, that they have got to clean house, the job will never really be done.

The danger is that we have had for the last 15 or 20 years too much of a tendency to "let George do it"; that is, let the Federal Government do it. And I make the point now, as this goes over the air and television, to everyone who wants to see this country remain American in its morality, in its political system and economic system: each one in his community must do what has been said here: exercise his franchise and see to it that good men go into office—good, moral men, as well as men with intelligence.

Moderator GRANIK. What has been the general thinking of the Crime Committee in coping with the problem of infiltration by gangsters into legitimate business?

Senator HUNT, would you care to comment on that?

Senator HUNT. That is getting to be a very serious situation. It is a known fact that in New York they own the controlling stock in one bank. It is a known fact they are getting into utilities all over the country. It is a known fact they are buying into the large distilleries. They are in the real-estate business, they are in the hotel business. And when they get themselves thoroughly situated and in control of legitimate business, they will then utilize in legitimate business the same types of underhanded procedure, the same under-the-table tricks, that they have been using in their nefarious gambling activities.

I think it is a very serious situation.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator TOBEY.

Senator TOBEY. I will not speak on that.

But I will say—and I do not know whether or not the chairman intended to bring it up here—that we have this report coming out on Tuesday. I will say this much, without betraying any secrets; in that report are three or four solar plexus blows, any one of which can make a knockout of the criminal interests of this country. When you see it you will agree with me: Thank God for that report, and when that report comes out, pass the legislation and make it the law of the country.

Moderator GRANIK. What about the role of some of the lawyers and their associations with criminals? Would you care to comment on that, Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. I wouldn't dare to trust myself to comment on that.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. I shall be glad to comment on it:

Mr. Granik, I don't think these hoodlums, these gangsters, these criminals, could exist if it were not for the help they get from the legal profession.

Any attorney defending a crook knows the source of his fee, and, to my way of thinking, when he participates in those ill-gotten gains, and protects a known criminal he is certainly not doing a service to society although he may be getting a good fee.

And I think further than that, Ted, it is high time that the various States should start disbarment proceedings against the attorney who constantly follows that line of practice.

Moderator GRANIK. You are a lawyer, Senator KEFAUVER, do you have any comment on that?

Senator KEFAUVER. I used to be a lawyer; I am just a plain politician now.

Senator WILEY. In just a plain way, did you say?

Senator KEFAUVER. A very humble one.

We have three types of situations. Of course, anyone who is accused of crime has a right to someone to defend him. We recognize that in our committee.

But there is another type of representation where lawyers, we have found, advise criminals about how to operate so as to avoid the law. Of course, that isn't ethical. I agree with Senator HUNT that the bar associations ought to take action on that sort of trouble. We have found a third type as to lawyers and as to some few CPA's and tax experts, where they own part of the enterprises right along with the criminals and gangsters and racketeers. The evidence is known, the bar associations know it, and I think they are going to do something about it. That is one of the particular things that Judge Patterson's Committee of the American Bar Association is looking into.

Moderator GRANIK. Would you tighten the requirements for income-tax reporting by criminals, Senator KEFAUVER?

Senator KEFAUVER. Yes, indeed. There are a good many tax laws. Of course, the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate have primary jurisdiction; but tax law is an integral part of getting at the big-time racketeers.

Moderator GRANIK. How about that, Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. Mr. Chairman, do you want me to touch lightly one of the high lights of the recommendations we are going to make in the report?

Moderator GRANIK. It would be wonderful if you would.

Senator TOBEY. Or would you rather we wouldn't?

Senator KEFAUVER. I don't think we ought to talk about it except in general terms.

Senator TOBEY. I see that some of the correspondents were talking about it today before this meeting.

Senator KEFAUVER. Frankly, it has been very unfortunate that an original galley—an initial draft by our committee was obtained. So I do not think that is fair to the other radio stations and to the press that anything more than a general statement be given at this time.

Senator TOBEY. I may say this: that the committee in its deliberations, and I think in its wisdom and devotion to the job it has to do, has devised some recommendations in the report, particularly bearing on income taxes, that will open your eyes and put a crimp in the style of a good many criminals across the country.

Moderator GRANIK. In a moment we will take questions from the audience.

I see one of our distinguished newspaper reporters, Merriman Smith. Mr. Smith, do you have a question?

Question. Thank you, Ted. All during the hearings there were a number of us in the newspaper business in Washington intrigued by one simple fact—that all the time the Crime Investigating Committee hearings were on the air from New York and Washington it was quite possible to put a bet down with any number of bookies in Washington and also to buy numbers tickets through a number of buildings in town.

I was just wondering what the committee can do to stop that?

Moderator GRANIK. To whom are you directing that?

Question. All of the Senators.

Senator KEFAUVER. Sir, the committee is interested in the interstate aspect of organized crime, where the facilities of interstate commerce are used. If it is purely a local matter, that is the responsibility for the local people to assume. It is not a healthy thing for us to try to ferret out every little criminal activity in every town, because that is a local burden.

Here in Washington we have a House committee investigating, and I think the Senate District of Columbia Committee is going to investigate. I imagine that our very able new chairman, Senator O'CONOR, and the members of the committee will feel that there may be some interstate aspects that this committee should investigate.

But when the facts are exposed, then it's up to the people.

I would suggest, sir, you would give that information to the chief of police of the District of Columbia. If he didn't act, you might give it to one of these congressional committees. You would then be getting somewhere and you would be doing a wonderful job as a citizen.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator HUNT, would you like to comment on that?

Senator HUNT. I would like to make this comment: As usual, so often you can't see the mountains for the foothills. I would like to say to Mr. Smith we have almost exactly 100 cities in the United States having 100,000 people, and it is impossible for the committee to get to every one of them. We did get to 14 of them. I think we did establish the pattern, and I think we have proven to the people what is going on in most large cities. And I can assure you it hasn't been our objective to overlook Washington. Maybe we just haven't gotten around to it yet.

Moderator GRANIK. We will take another question. Go ahead, sir.

Question. Ernest Vaccaro, of Associated Press. I address my question to Senator KEFAUVER, because he is from my home State.

Senator KEFAUVER. We are old friends in Tennessee.

Question. There haven't been public hearings in the home States of members of the committee, as I understand it. I wonder if there are investigations going on in those States by staff investigators.

Senator KEFAUVER. We have tried to get to the focal points of crime, to the nerve centers of crime. I think there are investigations going on, and some have been made in some of the cities that members are from.

But I believe that any fair people in picking out the 14 cities that we should have held our hearings in would have picked the ones that have been picked.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Vaccaro, we have had witnesses before the committee in other cities about conditions in, I believe, some of the States represented by the Members of the Senate on this committee. We have tried to make our selections fairly and in the public interest.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator TOBEY, do you want to comment on that?

Senator TOBEY. I have no particular comment. There are 48 States in the Union. There are five members on the committee. We have covered 12 or 13 of the 48 States. I don't see how we could have done a better job or more complete job in that time. We are not through yet—there are 4 months to come, and if I have my way we are going to go to New England, which would embrace New Hampshire, as part of the New England States. And it is needed up there in the New England States very, very strongly.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. I might say that I, too, have thought of the question the gentleman just asked. But having no need whatsoever for them to go into Wyoming, I didn't think it was advisable.

Moderator GRANIK. We have another question. Go ahead.

Question. I am Joe Gambatese for the McGraw-Hill magazines. My question is addressed to Senator KEFAUVER.

There has been considerable speculation that you may be a candidate for President of the United States.

Senator WILEY. That's no crime.

Question. I wonder if the Senator would like to comment about his political future.

Senator KEFAUVER. If you want a comment, I will do so very briefly, but I think the question ought to be addressed to Senator WILEY and others.

I am not a candidate. I have no interest in it. I think it is far-fetched. Some of the people, in their overenthusiasm, have mentioned me but there is no factual basis for it whatsoever.

Moderator GRANIK. Do we find any endorsement from the Republicans, Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. Well, I should be tempted to take the stump for the Senator, if he ran.

Moderator GRANIK. I think the Senator would like to ask the reporter a question. Would you care to come back, Senator HUNT, and turn the tables?

Senator HUNT. No. I was just going to say with reference to the question, asked about the future of Senator KEFAUVER, if you should put that up to a vote of the committee, I can assure you that it would be a solid vote of approval.

Senator KEFAUVER. You fellows had better watch out, I might change my mind.

Moderator GRANIK. May we have another question? Go ahead, sir.

Senator WILEY. He's just MacArthur; he isn't a candidate.

Moderator GRANIK. Go ahead.

Question. My name is Stephen Andrews and I am Washington correspondent for the North American Newspaper Alliance. My question is directed to Senator TOBEY:

Why aren't some of these hoodlums already behind bars? Senator, you spoke of collusion between criminals and public officials. The committee has been talking now for months, and still the criminals are free. Why haven't you already put some of these men behind the bars and what action do you contemplate taking to make sure some of these people land behind bars?

Senator TOBEY. Here comes the answer, and I hope it will satisfy you.

This committee is an investigatory body charged with demonstrating to the American people that there is crime in interstate commerce, and we have done that. When it comes down to enforcing the convictions of these men, that is entirely up to the district attorneys of the United States Government and the several States, and the law enforcing bodies. That is elementary.

Now already some of these men are up before the court, 13 or 14 of them on contempt charges, which may lead to further imprisonment, after they serve that. Erickson is already serving 2 years in Rykers Island in New York, and before the grand jury gets through in New York, I think they will have brought in a good bill of indictment for several prominent men in New York. I hope and pray so, for they are guilty as hell.

Now, I don't think your question is based upon the facts of the case. You must recognize that we are not an enforcing body or a prosecuting body. We produce the picture. Let the existing agencies pick it up from there and prosecute to the hilt.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator WILEY, do you want to comment on that?

Senator WILEY. Yes. I think the question by the very distinguished newspaperman illustrates clearly how, you might say, ignorant we are in this country in relation to our own Government, with its division of power. We are not in the executive branch or in the administrative branch, as Senator TOBEY said. We are simply in the legislative branch, that is our function. We are not the judicial branch, either.

As a result of this committee, if the people in America could get a yen to study their Constitution and their form of government, and understand that that is the reason this Government is what it is, because of the division of power, they would see that what has happened is that the administrative branch, the enforcing branch, the executive branch of the Government and in the States has fallen down in enforcing the law.

Moderator GRANIK. We have time for one more question. Go ahead.

Question: I am Jerry Green, of the New York Daily News, Ted. I have one question to address to Senator KEFAUVER and Senator TOBEY. That is that more than 20 States have legalized horse-race gambling. What right has the Federal Government to tell citizens of the other States that they can't bet on a horse that is running across the line. For example, I believe there is a track in Senator TOBEY's State, Rockingham, which draws most of its patronage from Boston.

Senator TOBEY. We don't propose to tell them, we have never suggested it and never thought of it. Of course, the State is supreme in passing pari-mutuel legislation. If they want to, that is their business. We never intimated or thought such a thing.

Senator KEFAUVER. As I understand the question, it is a matter of what right we have to keep people in other States from betting on horse races in the States where it is legal.

We have a right to say what can be done in interstate commerce. That is the way we are getting at it.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on the Task Ahead for the Crime Committee. Our speakers have been: Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, Senator LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming, and Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire.

THIRD INTERIM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE (S. REPT. NO. 307)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate

Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit, pursuant to S. Res. 202, Eighty-first Congress, providing for an investigation of gambling and racketeering activities in interstate commerce, the third interim report, and request that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 307, Eighty-second Congress, first session, being a report entitled "Third Interim Report on Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce," which was submitted by the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, pursuant to S. Res. 202, Eighty-first Congress, of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce and 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, how many copies are proposed to be printed, and what is to be the cost? Also, has the resolution been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am advised by Mr. Ives, the Senate printing clerk, that the resolution was taken up with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I understand that a considerable sum will be saved if the resolution is approved now. I believe that the cost for an additional 1,000 copies is $200.27.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the resolution has been approved by the chairman of the committee, I have no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It has been submitted to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee repeat his request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Tennessee restate his request?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The request is for the printing of additional copies of the third interim report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the resolution presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The resolution was brought to me with the statement that it had been submitted to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of publishing the report, but I should like to know whether or not the resolution has been approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is a notation on the resolution that an additional 1,000 copies would cost $200.27.

I am sure the matter has been presented to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. But if it has not been, I will ask his consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I am for the resolution, but I wanted the record to show that the Committee on Rules and Administration had handled the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska object?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I have no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Nebraska has been advised that it has been submitted?

Mr. WHERRY. I have not been. I simply wanted to be sure that the Committee on Rules and Administration had been advised with respect to the resolution. I am for the resolution, as I stated when I rose a moment ago, but I wanted to know that the complete membership of the subcommittee that handled it was at least advised of the request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The matter has been submitted to, and has been approved by, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

COMMENTS ON THIRD INTERIM REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say just a brief word for the record with respect to the 195-page Third Interim Report of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee and with respect to the chairman.

I think that the most eloquent commentary on the historic third report is contained in its own vast and detailed text. Anyone who looks at the report can quickly note that a mountain of labor was involved in its preparation, and in all the long months of research, study, investigation, and hearings which preceded its writing.

It has been my privilege to be associated with the committee, and I look forward to our continuing operations. It is a source of regret to me not to have been able to devote to the committee's tasks all the time they so eminently merited, but my other responsibilities as ranking Republican member of the Foreign Relations and Judiciary Committees have necessarily limited my time.

TRIBUTE TO CHAIRMAN KEFAUVER

We are fortunate, indeed, however, to have had as our chairman since the inception of the committee the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

With the filing of this third interim report my colleague from Tennessee is bowing out as chairman, although he will be serving with us as a member in the remaining months of the special committee's life.

I feel I would be remiss, indeed, if I did not pay tribute at this time to one of the finest jobs of public service that has ever been performed by a committee chairman. I know that my colleagues on the committee join with me in expressing this tribute to him and to the members of his very able staff, including the chief counsel, Mr. Rudolph Halley, who is resigning today following a solid year of labor in the public interest.

I know that I speak for the other members of the committee when I bid Mr. Halley Godspeed in his resumption of private-law practice and in acknowledging our appreciation for the splendid, courteous, efficient, and conscientious way in which he has handled his heavy responsibilities. He has set standards as chief counsel of this committee which have even surpassed his previously high standards in a similar capacity with the Truman World War II investigating committee.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. President, the Senate is fortunate indeed that we have in the very competent senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] our future chairman. We have confidence and faith in the fine job we know he is going to do.

WE HAVE TRIED TO BE FAIR

The final report mentions hundreds of names of communities, individuals, and companies. Intensive effort has been made to make sure that every single reference is fair, justified, and impartial. In no instance have we sought to smear any individual, any business, or any community, either directly or indirectly. If any unfair reference has inadvertently been made, I know that I, for one, certainly regret it, and I am sure that my colleagues do, too, although it is our earnest belief, following very close scrutiny, that we have kept to an absolute minimum any errors. If substantial errors do appear, we shall certainly endeavor to rectify them.

COMMITTEE WORK REQUIRED MUCH OFFICE STAFF AID

Ours was a difficult, complex job, one which absorbs a mountain of energy and time, both of members of the committee and, as recorded on pages 22 and 23 of the report, much energy and time on the part of members of their office staffs, who often had to sacrifice other official duties in the limited time available. But this was a job which had to be done, and which has been done, and done well, during these first 12 months.

I TRUST SUGGESTED BILLS WILL BE ENACTED

It is my earnest hope that the committee's various legislative recommendations will receive the prompt attention of standing committees of the Senate and House. Let not these recommendations languish in a mere report; let us get on with the job of smashing crime and corruption through constructive, fair legislation enacted into law.

MY OWN COMMENTS ON COMMISSION COMPRISED ONLY DISSENT

I do want to say a further word, because the only dissenting word in the entire 195 pages of the report comes in connection with my opposition to one of the committee's recommendations, namely, for the establishment of a Federal Crime Commission.

It was with the deepest of regret that I found it necessary to say any dissenting word at all because all of us on the

committee have prided ourselves on the fact that we have acted with complete unanimity for one entire year. While the recommendation for a crime commission is a significant one, and while my opposition to it is strong, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this lone dissenting instance makes the otherwise unbroken unanimity of the committee stand out all the more clearly. In all of the thousands of policy decisions we have had to make as to witnesses, hearings, questions, reports, and so forth, never once have the three Democrats and two Republicans parted ways. I think that is an inspiring record of unity which well could be a model for the Nation, particularly at this time, when there is so much difference of opinion as to certain matters, and since it is obvious that over-all unity is so important in the face of the present international challenge.

WHY I INTRODUCED WILEY-TOBEY RESOLUTION

I am glad that the committee will be carrying on. As I have previously stated in the Senate, thousands of appeals came to me for the committee's extension and that is why I submitted the Wiley-Tobey resolution, Senate Resolution 129, for such extension. I have in my hand one of the petitions which I received at that time, in the form of a resolution, which had been adopted at the annual meeting of the International Christian Leadership held in Washington on March 31. I am glad to point out this indication of the continuing interest of the people of the country and in particular the interest of the spiritual forces of the Nation—to which, incidentally, reference is well made in the report on page 188. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks and that there be included thereafter the list of the officers and members of the Board of the ICL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, these brief words in relation to the committee, I have felt obligated to make.

I wish to say that in my opinion as we face the challenges of the present, as I see them, they can be set forth in the following questions: First, can we maintain peace? Second, can we maintain the American dollar at its present basis, or must it, through inflation, diminish in value? Third, can we maintain, under the Constitution and the Republic, the American way of life, including the American system of free enterprise, the American system of freedom of worship, freedom of contract, and trial by jury?

Mr. President, one of the great instrumentalities that will help maintain these values is the reawakening in the consciousness of America of the need for the individual to be adequate, to realize that he cannot pass the buck to Washington, but that the job is his, in his local community and in his State, to see to it, first, that the moral law is lived up to; second, that the responsibility of citizens in relation to voting is lived up to; and, third, that public officials who are elected do not come to Washington or to the State capitals to feather their nests, but, rather, to preserve the liberties and the freedoms which are recognized all over the world as the lighthouse of the American way of life. That is the job of all of us.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion this committee has added impetus or given vitality to the response which must be made in the breast of each citizen, in resolving that he will go forth as a crusader to maintain the traditions, the principles, and the freedoms of America.

EXHIBIT 1

The following resolution was adopted at the annual meeting of the International Christian Leadership held in Washington March 31:

"Whereas there is need for greater knowledge and awareness on the part of citizens of the true facts about conditions in the United States, in order that they may more usefully perform their duty as citizens; and

"Whereas the Kefauver crime committee has unearthed conditions not hitherto known to most citizens; and

"Whereas, as a result of these disclosures, there has been a rekindling of civic and Christian responsibility among citizens; and

"Whereas, by reason of the shortness of time, the Kefauver committee has been able to do only a part of the work that clearly should be done; and will not be able appreciably to add to its accomplishments in the 30-day extension voted by the Senate on March 29; and

"Whereas a congressional investigation is the surest instrument for the information and education of the American people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we express to each member of the committee our genuine appreciation for the fine work done and respectfully petition the extension of the committee in order to make a thorough and complete investigation of all serious crimes of every nature, to the end that the Congress may have full knowledge on which to base legislation, and to the end that the American people may have a complete picture of actual conditions.

"EDWARD M. CABANISS,
"President.
"ABRAHAM VEREIDE,
"Executive Director."

INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

President: Lt. Gen. Willard S. Paul.

Vice president and chairman, executive committee: Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

Chairman ICCL: Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS.

Chairman national advisory committee: Nathaniel Leverone.

Vice presidents: Donald C. Stone; Nathan Bushnell, Jr.; O. Harold Folk.

Secretary: Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress.

Treasurer: James G. Gore.

Attorney: Glen E. Weston.

Executive director: Abraham Vereide.

Associate executive director: Robert B. Doing.

Members of the board: Edward W. Allen; Edward Cabaniss; Howard Coonley; James D. Cunningham; Hon. Paul Cunningham, Member of Congress; Hon. Paul B. Dague, Member of Congress; Hon. Clyde Doyle, Member of Congress; Dr. John Evans; Vice Adm. C. S. Freeman; Hon. J. Vaughan Gary, Member of Congress; Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray; Dr. Ernest S. Griffith; Henry Gund; Hon. Brooks Hayes, Member of Congress; Hon. A. S. Herlong, Jr., Member of Congress; John P. Hilbert; Roy C. Ingersoll; Mrs. Aymar Johnson; Chief Judge Marvin Jones; Hon. Walter H. Judd, Member of Congress; Senator Robert S. Kerr; Jesse Loeb; Paul Matthews; Arthur J. Morris; Hon. Norris Poulson, Member of Congress; Hon. J. Percy Priest, Member of Congress; George H. Roberts; William M. Scott; Hon. Katharine St. George, Member of Congress; Harvey Swenson; Dr. J. B. Thompson; Hon. Thor Tollefson, Member of Congress; Edward B. Wilber; Senator Alexander Wiley; Leonard C. Worthington; Edmond F. Wright; R. R. Zimmerman.

Field representatives: Dr. Henry E. Burke, George Eversfield, Yvelin Gardner, Dr. J. Edwin Orr, John W. Young.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. Today the Special Committee on Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce has filed, by its chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] its report on its progress.

At this time I wish to state briefly that the committee in carrying on its work has acted without fear of, or favor to, any man, but has fearlessly and, if I may say so, without egotism approached every matter in the interests of the people of the Nation.

Mr. President, there have been many features of the crime investigation which have disturbed the members of the committee. I wish to speak of three or four of them, in particular.

One has been the organized traffic across the country in the selling of narcotics to school children. In the city of Brooklyn, according to the testimony of District Attorney Miles McDonald, it was found that that traffic was on an organized basis. It is a tragic thing when young children are corrupted by the use of narcotics, with such a terrible, devastating effect on their lives in the years to come, with resultant delinquency, ruined lives, and an impaired basis for family life. It is an indictment of government that such a thing could happen in America.

Also, there have been the numerous cases of law enforcement officers—sheriffs and police officials—who, though they lifted up their hands and swore to obey the laws of the State and the Nation, have sold their birthright for a mess of pottage and have resorted to collusion and conspiracy with gangsters on a money basis. Some of them have broken down in their appearance before the committee and have pleaded guilty. It has been a tragic picture.

Another feature of the report, as will be found, is its reference to the ease with which the gangster interests have evaded the rules which circumscribe you and me and all other citizens in respect to the payment of income taxes to the Federal Government. In that connection, of course, there are definite rules respecting the deductions which can be made from gross revenue before income taxes are computed. The average citizen is very definitely bound by those rules. However, the gangster interests have developed a practice of making deductions for "miscellaneous" from their income from gambling speculations, whereas you and I have to set down the individual items of exemption, and they have to be blanketed in and definitely listed before such deductions can be made from gross revenue for the purposes of figuring income taxes.

So, Mr. President, in that connection we need regulations which have teeth in them. A measure incorporating such regulations will be most timely; and if the one we recommend is enacted into law, it will require the Bureau of Internal Revenue to assess all gangster interests for income taxes on the basis of their gross income without being able to make any deductions for expenses. If such a measure does not have a punch in it and is not a solar plexus blow, I do not know what is. If we adopt that program, it will be most beneficial. I shall have more to say about that matter later on.

Mr. President, today we have, as a result of this crime investigation work, an aroused public opinion the like of which I have never seen before. In my own little office I have receive 15,300 letters from persons in all walks of life—from Catholic priests, Jewish rabbis, Protestant ministers, businesmen, college professors, husbands and wives, college students, even young boys and girls, some of whom have in their humble way sent cash to the committee, with the request that it be used to continue the committee's work. All of them bespeak their earnest interest in having the work continued—at the request of an outraged America. That public interest is a wonderful thing; but if it is only a transient interest, it will be entirely in vain.

However, Mr. President, I believe in my heart that we are on the eve of a great moral awakening in America. Time magazine has received 113,000 letters in that connection, and, as I say, I have received 15,300 letters, and my colleagues have received other letters of a similar tenor. It is evident that a great moral awakening is occurring throughout the Nation.

Thomas Carlyle said, in an essay which he wrote years ago, "The American people is that people which think they can avert fate and postpone doomsday by an act of Congress." That is the blind faith of so many of the American public, Mr. President.

A revived public opinion is now focusing upon those who have prostituted their office for paltry gain; but in America we need something deeper than that. We need a revival in the spiritual qualities, a revival in the souls of men and women, all over the land. That is what will save America, and I believe it is coming. Whether one is a Catholic, a Protestant, a Jew, or a Gentile, let all of us examine ourselves and bring to focus on these matters the great spiritual teachings of the Master of men, so that our America will be a land in which dwelleth righteousness, for all the people to come.

I say now, Mr. President, not only God bless America, but thank God for America.

It has been a great privilege to sit on the committee. I indulge in no exaggeration when I say that the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], a noble Christian gentleman, has done fearlessly and on a nonpartisan basis, a wonderful job for the American people.

So, Mr. President, to each of my associates and to the very able staff of the committee, I pay tribute. I reverently thank God for the privilege of being a humble member of this committee as we have carried on in the interests of the plain people of the United States. God bless America.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in connection with the filing of the third interim report of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. First, I want to acknowledge with deep appreciation the remarks which have been made by my able colleagues, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

We feel that the facts presented in the interim report, largely present the picture of organized crime in interstate commerce across the Nation, as we are able to get it. I have always felt that the purpose, and the only purpose, of an investigating committee is to obtain facts for legislative purposes. Of course, as a byproduct, it has the purpose of arousing public interest, which, of course, is vitally important and necessary.

There may be certain limited fields in which we do not yet have the full picture, but I believe the facts, as we have presented them, are fairly full. It would be possible, of course, to present cumulatively evidence piled on evidence in connection with all the matters mentioned in the report but we have the necessary pattern for legislation.

The condition which we found to exist in the country at this time, as set forth in the report, is worse and more alarming than any of us anticipated. I refer to the organization of well-financed and well-organized gangs throughout the country, with interlocking connections, and of course, with political connections, which are necessary in order to enable them to continue their operations.

In the report, therefore, we have recommended certain legislation of a Federal nature, and we have made certain recommendations to the departments which we think will be very helpful, with reference to fuller participation by the Federal Government in the endeavor to prevent further use of interstate commerce by big-time racketeers. We have also made certain recommendations relative to internal-revenue matters and with reference to other agencies of the Government. I hope we may go forward vigorously with the presentation of legislative recommendations to the various committees, and that the commitees will give them early consideration, in the light of the seriousness of the situation.

I trust that Members of the Congress and the public will not feel, since the life of the committee has been extended for 4 months, that there should be a let-up in the vigorous presentation of the legislative recommendations which are contained in the report. We feel that these recommendations, if enacted into law, will virtually bring to an end the big-time racketeering in interstate commerce, which is the basis of a great deal of the criminality in the country today.

We recognize that the Federal Government has but a limited jurisdiction in this matter, and that the greatest responsibility and the only possible real remedy is with local officials and the actions of local communities.

But we can help more effectively and now is the time for action. The criminal gangs of the country constitute an alarming economic drain on our people, a most sinister political and moral influence upon our people. They are a threat to honest businesses in many parts of the Nation.

The time is at hand for an all-out effort against these criminal activities at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. Of course, none of these will be effective without public support. We now have that support. As the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has said, there has been renewed activity on the part of local communities, as a result, partially at least, of the work of our committee. Many crime commissions have been formed throughout the country. Grand juries have been operating. Corrupt officials have been removed. An increased interest has been shown on the part of the great media for the dissemination of information on criminal conditions throughout the United States, so that I believe that as a result of this investigation to date we will have better law enforcement throughout the Nation, and that we shall have a cleaner and a better America.

Mr. President, the fact that certain officials have done business with racketeers and criminals has been mentioned, and that, of course, is true, because big-time criminal operations, particularly gambling, cannot take place without the acquiescence of law-enforcement officials, at some level. But I think it would be an erroneous impression if anyone should get the idea that we feel that any large number of officials, at any level of government, have connived with or worked with criminal influences. For the most part, throughout Federal, State, and most of the local governments, the great and preponderant majority of our public officials in America are honest, hard working, and loyal persons, who are fulfilling their obligations to the best of their ability in trying to enforce the laws.

I feel that if there has been a substantial dereliction of duty on the part of some officials, it is the result of a lack of public interest and a lack of public backing—that the public has failed to back up the officials when they have rendered good service. Of course, any amount of corruption on the part of public officials is entirely too much, and we are glad to report that real and vigorous efforts are being made to eliminate any corruption which may exist.

Throughout the year's activity on the part of the committee, while we have been dealing with a very delicate job, and while our work has not been pleasant, we have had, in our committee of five, a splendid working organization. It has been free from partisan dispute. We have never had any differences on policy matters, and I could not pay too high a tribute to the part each member

of the committee, aside from its chairman, has played. Each member of the committee—Senators O'CONOR, TOBEY, HUNT, and WILEY—has carried his share of the load and has done his work, and done it well. Early in the life of the committee we determined that we were going to get the facts without regard to political or any other considerations. To the best of our ability, we have tried to do that and I think we have succeeded. This has not been a smear and it has not been a whitewash. We have tackled the rough and difficult situations and we now report the facts. We have had more than 650 witnesses before us and have investigated dozens of situations which have not been presented in committee hearings. I think we have gone straight down the line in presenting the true picture. We have let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. President, it has not been pleasant to present the facts in connection with certain people, either in business or political life, whose names are mentioned in the report; but we have endeavored to present the facts fairly, and to lean over backward in our effort to present the facts without smearing anyone. It is quite possible that in the report of 195 pages an improper adjective may have been used, or that someone may feel that he has been unfairly dealt with in the report. The committee desires to be entirely fair, and if it can be shown that mistakes have been made, the committtee will be only too happy to endeavor to rectify them.

In the performance of its duty, the committee has conducted numerous hearings. Various members of the committee have served as chairman in the conduct of hearings at various times, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] having conducted the hearing in Detroit, and having presided over most of the hearings in New York; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] having presided as chairman at Tampa and at various other places. Each member of the committee has at one time or another acted as chairman. We have tried to be fair in our scrutiny of testimony and in seeking to prevent the unnecessary bandying about of the names of innocent citizens. We adopted rules for the conduct of the committee at our first session to try to insure fair treatment of witnesses. These rules have been scrupulously followed.

Before closing, Mr. President, I take the opportunity to thank the many Members of the Senate who have helped us so much in our inquiry, and to thank the President of the United States for the Executive order allowing us to see certain income-tax returns, and for his full cooperation at all points. I wish especially to thank the Attorney General, the Department of Justice, and various assistant Attorneys General, as well as J. Edgar Hoover, Jim Bennett, and many other persons who have assisted us in every way they could, together with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasury Department, who have cooperated splendidly, and have given us assistance. Harry Anslinger, the excellent head of the Narcotics Bureau, deserves special mention.

In previous reports, as in this report, we have been critical of certain activities of some few persons in the Treasury Department. We have criticized the Treasury Department for not going after racketeers and gangsters more vigorously on some occasions; but, in general, our work together has been pleasant, and I am very happy to say that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of Internal Revenue have taken very affirmative and effective steps to secure the collection of income taxes from racketeers and gangsters, to require their fuller reporting, and to expedite their prosecution for fraud for nonpayment of income tax.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In a moment.

In that connection, Mr. President, the listing of 2,500 racketeers and criminals, which was recommended by our committee and upon which action was taken a few days ago by the Internal Revenue Bureau, will be of tremendous assistance.

Informally, some time back, we recommended and have discussed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue the formation of a special fraud squad which will give special attention to income-tax returns and cases against big-time racketeers so that the handling of cases against them can be expedited both in the investigation and their prosecution. That, I think, will be one of the most effective steps that can be taken not only to secure tax money for the United States, but also to see that those men are brought to justice as expeditiously as possible.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I was wondering why the Treasury Department had not taken more drastic steps to prosecute racketeers prior to the report of the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the distinguished Senator asked that question. The testimony we have taken will comprise approximately 12 volumes, of which the last one has not been printed. We found, as a matter of fact, that the Department has not taken full steps to go after many of the racketeers. They explain that part of the difficulty has been the lack of sufficient staff; that they did not have full information about some criminals until more facts had been brought out; that some changes in the law were needed relative to the keeping of books and records, the violation of which, while now a misdemeanor, they feel should be made a felony. Yet, as the law now stands, they have not used it as they should.

In California and other places racketeers had connections with, and attempted to secure protection from, a few members of the Internal Revenue Bureau. Some of them were prosecuted in New York and in Boston some time back. Those whom we have ferreted out in California have either been dismissed or have been brought before and indicted by a grand jury. I believe there has been a general lack of appreciation of the importance of the matter. There has been indifference in going after these people with sufficient vigor, but I am happy to say that the situation is very much better at this time, and the steps which are being taken are effective.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that some of these activities on the part of employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue were known to the Department officials in Washington, and they had concealed the evidence, sitting tight on the information until it was exposed, and the men involved were not relieved of their jobs or their duties, nor were they prosecuted, until after the facts were made public?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In New York and Boston certain information of this kind was brought out. Some of the persons involved have been prosecuted and some of them have been committed to jail.

In California certain people were being investigated by the intelligence unit of the Department at the time the committee was holding a hearing in California. Some of the facts had not been brought out prior to that time. The Bureau of Internal Revenue criticized us for holding hearings before they had had an opportunity to complete their investigation by the intelligence unit. We felt that for one reason or another the investigation was taking too long and that it should have been finished. The fact was that about 5 or 6 months before that time the former head of the Intelligence Service in the area had retired, and a new man had taken his place who had to be oriented. We felt that in the public interest the facts we had, some of which had been brought out by the California crime committee, should have been presented. That was when we had our executive hearing. Following that time, the Internal Revenue Bureau discharged or suspended some of the persons involved. Some of them have been indicted; some are still under investigation. When we were in California holding public hearings, and also in Washington, we brought the facts of the situation up to date. I think too much time was being taken in the investigation, and we were justified in bringing out the facts when we did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator did a wonderful job in bringing to light improper activities on the part of employees of the Treasury Department. I am wondering if in his investigation he found who in the Treasury Department in Washington was sitting tight on the committee reports and not referring them to the Department of Justice. I know that in one specific instance one of the top officials in a Midwestern office was merely transferred by the Department to another office at a comparable salary, instead of being dismissed or prosecuted. He was not removed from the payroll of the Bureau until after the facts were exposed and an indictment was brought against him. I am wondering who in Washington is giving information to such employees.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it should be said in fairness that during the past few months a great many cases have been filed. Affirmative action is being taken. Throughout the country many fraud cases have been filed by the Treasury De-

partment. I believe that throughout the Department a great many things are being done which will greatly improve the situation. The bad apples, or the particular persons whom we have exposed, have been weeded out. Undoubtedly there are some few others. They too, I hope, will be removed. First, it will be ascertained who they are, and then they will be removed. A great deal of improvement has been brought about. I believe in giving credit for what has been done. I believe it is a mistake to give the impression that there has been a great deal of rottenness or lack of efficiency in the Internal Revenue Bureau. The Intelligence Unit is a career service. Generally throughout the country, as with other Federal departments, the employees are vigorous and hard-working men and women who are trying faithfully to do their jobs. In California we found three or four or five out of a thousand persons employed there who were unworthy to occupy a Government position. Of course, they had a bad effect on the whole agency. I am glad that we have been able to get rid of the bad apples.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I can hardly hear the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I should like to ask one or two questions about the report. It has to do with organized crime in interstate commerce. I refer to the testimony of Ambassador O'Dwyer. Considerable evidence was adduced, was there not, about a great many things in connection with the testimony of the distinguished Ambassador?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. It is covered in the report at considerable length.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator draw any conclusions relative to the testimony?

Mr. KEFAUVER. We drew a conclusion relative to the over-all hearings in New York. I believe the conclusion will be found beginning at page 143. The preceding 25 or 30 pages are devoted to the New York hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just glanced through the report, but I notice that at page 144, in paragraphs 4 and 5, there is this statement:

> 4. Despite Mr. O'Dwyer's frequent public castigations of Tammany Hall, and his acknowledgement that Frank Costello was a sinister influence therein, he has been on terms of intimate friendship with persons who were close friends of Costello. Many of his intimate friends were also close friends of racketeer Joe Adonis. He has appointed friends of both Costello and Adonis to high public office.
>
> 5. During Mr. O'Dwyer's term of office as district attorney of Kings County, between 1940 and 1942, and his occupancy of the mayoralty from 1946 to 1950, neither he nor his appointees took any effective action against the top echelons of the gambling, narcotics, water-front, murder, or bookmaking rackets. In fact, his actions impeded promising investigations of such rackets. His defense of public officials who were derelict in their duties, and his actions in investigations of corruption, and his failure to follow up concrete evidence of organized crime, particularly in the case of Murder, Inc., and the water front, have contributed to the growth of organized crime, racketeering, and gangsterism in New York City.

Are any other recommendations made in the report with reference to the Ambassador?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be necessary to read the preceding 25 pages, which contain a discussion of the facts.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator feel in his own mind that there is a cloud over the Ambassador in his representation of the United States of America in Mexico?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I feel exactly what is stated in the two recommendations.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the Ambassador should continue to represent the United States in Mexico with such a cloud hanging over him?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to my friend that I am not going to pass judgment at this time on the facts that we found in our New York hearings, except as to the conclusions in our report. It is a matter for the immediate determination of the President and of Mr. O'Dwyer.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Senator's last statement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator that as the facts stand now, without further explanation of a great many matters contained in the hearings and summarized in the report, I would not vote for the confirmation of Mr. O'Dwyer if it were submitted to the Senate today.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish unduly to press the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the way I feel.

Mr. WHERRY. What I was trying to get at was, Is the matter to be dropped now, does the Senator recommend further hearings, or has the administration been advised of the cloud which is apparently upon the representative of the United States Government in Mexico.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am certain the administration and most everyone else knows of our report. The matter about Mr. O'Dwyer is still under investigation and inquiry by the grand jury in New York County. Most of the facts which are involved herein are under investigation and consideration. So I think final judgment as to guilt or innocence which the Senator has raised should await final conclusion of the grand-jury investigation being conducted by Mr. Hogan in New York County, by Mr. McDonald in Kings County, and Mr. Saypol, of the United States district court in southern New York.

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely asking questions about the recommendations and about the findings of the committee; that is all. I deeply appreciate the answers of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On the question of guilt, is there not a difference between a recommendation of an investigating committee and a determination by a court of law in the United States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes: that is quite true. It is pointed out definitely in the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not basic in American law that until someone is declared guilty of——

Mr. WHERRY. Oh——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, I know, but I am not playing politics; I am trying to discuss basic American law. Until someone is convicted he is presumed to be innocent. Neither by insinuation nor otherwise should anyone try to take political advantage because an investigating committee of the United States Senate has made some recommendations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to answer the Senator's question. The matter is before the New York grand jury. Other phases of the question are being considered by Mr. Irving Saypol, the distinguished and capable United States district attorney for the southern district of New York. I agree with the Senator from New York, as we have set forth in the report, that until they complete their investigation it is not a matter that can finally be determined or adjudged.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will yield to me once more, the point I am trying to make is that irrespective of the sincerity of purpose—and the noble conclusions, I would say—of an investigating committee, the freedom of an American citizen should be paramount. No insinuation should go out to the entire world that because an investigating committee came to a certain conclusion an American citizen is guilty of a crime. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. We do not say in the conclusion that he is guilty of a crime. We say that judgment as to many of the things should be and must be withheld until the normal courses of court procedure have been pursued.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly want the RECORD to show that the junior Senator from Nebraska is not accusing Ambassador O'Dwyer of what is set forth in the conclusions. I asked whether the Senator had reached any conclusions, and the Senator said he had, and referred to page 144 of the report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator whether, from the conclusions which he had drawn, he felt there was a cloud upon the Ambassador.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The Senator has yielded to me.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My answer was that until these matters have been settled, in the course of judicial proceedings which are now taking place in New York, on the basis of the evidence we now have I would not vote for the confirmation of Mr. O'Dwyer's nomination if it were before us today.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator from Tennessee perfectly. I wish to say to him that I feel that in his mind he has come to that conclusion. I believe that his conclusions are valuable. That is why we understood the investigation. The last line of paragraph 3 reads as follows:

Costello also had relationships with some Republican political leaders.

No one has injected politics into this question in any way, shape, or form. I was only commenting on the report. The report is for the benefit of the Senate and for the people of the United States.

I was particularly interested in the conclusions which were drawn. I think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico called them "noble conclusions." I believe that these three or four paragraphs are noble conclusions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. My question was predicated not upon the innocence or guilt of any individual, but upon the findings and conclusions of the report. The report states that—

His defense of public officials who were derelict in their duties, and his actions in investigations of corruption, and his failure to follow up concrete evidence of organized crime, particularly in the case of Murder, Inc., and the water front, have contributed to the the growth of organized crime, racketeering, and gangsterism in New York City.

I believe that that constitutes a cloud, and that cloud should be removed. I believe that an immediate trial should be had, in order that one who is representing the United States as Ambassador to Mexico may have removed the cloud which is surrounding him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When I said "noble conclusions," I meant every word of it. I agree with the conclusion of the committee that racketeering was going on. But when the Senator from Nebraska asked his question, I could see what he had in mind. I will tell the Senator from Nebraska my conclusions. In speaking about the American Ambassador to Mexico, the Senator from Nebraska said, "We do not have anything against him. We are talking about conclusions."

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me finish.

So far as concerns the Ambassador to Mexico, I am reminded of the story about a trout fisherman in either my State or the State of my good friend from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], who was casting in a mountain stream. Suddenly he pulled out a beautiful mountain trout, sparkling and shimmering. He said, "You poor little fellow. I love you. You are so sweet. I am not going to hurt you. All I am going to do is to gut you."

That is what the Senator from Nebraska had in mind, in my opinion, so far as the Ambassador is concerned.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am trying very briefly to outline the report of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief observation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the work he has done in connection with this investigation. I take it that everything in the report is submitted to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the American people. Certainly we have the right to ask the distinguished Senator questions relative to this report. I do so in good old American fashion. I obtained answers. Whether we are gutting a little fish or a big one, if that is the interpretation the Senator from New Mexico wishes to place upon our action, it is all right with me. I still feel that the question is pertinent. I was seeking the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I got it. He stated that he would not vote at this time to confirm the nomination of Mr. O'Dwyer.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, of course we want full discussion of the subject. I hope we can have time later for a very full discussion of all sections of the report, in order that the subject and recommendations may be considered by the standing committees of the Senate as soon as bills can be prepared and referred to the various committees. I did not wish to take a great deal of time today in interrupting the pending program, but I do hope that the report can be discussed on the floor of the Senate in greater detail as we go on.

I also wish to say that I think we have had a very extraordinary staff in the conduct of this investigation. I wish to pay tribute to the members of the staff.

Our chief counsel, Rudolph Halley, who was associate counsel of the Truman committee, has rendered a great and outstanding service. He conducted most of the hearings throughout the country. His keen mind, courage, and great ability are outstanding.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the Senator will allow me to continue for about 3 minutes. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. George S. Robinson was our original associate counsel. He handled all the hearings in Chicago and conducted the office here for a considerable length of time. Due to his previous experience in the Annenberg wire service case he was of great value to our work. He has now returned to the legal staff of the Air Force in accordance with our previous agreement.

Harold G. Robinson, whom we obtained from the California Crime Commission, was head of the investigative staff of our committee. He is one of the best men in his line of business in the country. He brought the committee many years of experience with the FBI and with the Truman committee. He is now serving as deputy to the attorney general of California.

Alfred Klein, of Philadelphia, has served our committee splendidly as associate counsel and also as director of public relations. He has handled many hearings capably and always uses good judgment.

Downey Rice, associate counsel, has been with our committee throughout its existence. He has had great experience in investigations and trial practice and he ably conducted the hearings at Tampa, New Orleans, and the open hearings in California.

John Burling was one of our able associate counsels who presented the hearings with splendid skill in Detroit and St. Louis.

Joe Nellis, during the time he was an associate counsel, did an outstanding and very able job for the committee in hearings in Cleveland and he conducted an important part of the hearings in New York.

Patrick Kiley did outstanding work for our committee in Florida, New Orleans, Chicago, and elsewhere. His long years of experience and great energy were of tremendous benefit. Mr. Kiley is at present the clerk of the International Claims Commission. He is an outstanding and able investigator.

Mrs. Carmel P. Ebb and Ernest Goldstein have been of excellent assistance in the Washington office.

George Martin, who made an excellent crime reporter for the Scranton Times whom I met during the Judge Johnson investigation many years ago, has served ably as director of information and as a skilled investigator for our committee.

During the early months of its existence the committee was fortunate in being ably assisted by William Garrett, who took leave of absence from General Donovan's law firm in New York to do special work for us. He is an able CPA as well as a most capable lawyer.

Ralph Mills, formerly with the FBI, performed outstanding work for this committee in Florida. He has now been selected head of the new Tampa, Fla., crime commission.

John McCormick came with the committee at its inception and is one of our most able and loyal men. He has now been made Director of Public Safety in Cleveland, Ohio.

William D. Amis, a very competent accountant and tax expert, has rendered splendid service. The committee secured on loan Frank Ahern and Thomas Cahill, of the San Francisco police force. Their work was very excellent. Patrick C. Murray and John J. Murphy assisted the committee as investigators in a most competent way.

I wish to pay high tribute to the office manager, Miss Melba J. Coutsonikas; Mrs. Joyce W. Mack, who edited our reports; and Mrs. Edith M. Knight, chief clerk.

Boris Kostelanetz served ably as associate counsel in New York during the early part of our hearings.

John Elich, who was with the committee for a while in New York ably assisted him.

I wish to acknowledge with much appreciation the loyal and untiring efforts

of the permanent secretarial and clerical staff in the Washington office, consisting of Julia Arnold, Elsie V. Hileman, John E. Hirten, Jr., Mary E. Longland, Freda Lustick, Yvonne G. McDonnell, L. Carl Melton, Mary V. Mitchell, Paul A. Newland, and Lillian L. Sears. Mrs. Agnes Wolf and Mrs. Louise Bowie did excellent service in research and preparation of the report.

The committee was fortunate in being able to secure special services of capable attorneys and investigators in various parts of the country for special work in those places. Among those of the field staff whose names should be mentioned in this respect are David I. Shivitz, James D. Walsh, Louis E. Yavner, Reuben A. Lazarus, Arnold L. Fein, Edward T. Burns, Howard R. Brand, Thomas L. Karsten, Herbert A. Blomquist, Dennis J. O'Shea, John E. Kenny, Martin F. Fay, Lawrence C. Goddard, Thomas E. Myers, George Fickeissen, Herbert Van Brunt and William G. Ruymann.

I am grateful to the Dallas police force for lending us Lt. George Butler, who was a most able police officer and of great assistance to the committee.

For special assignments, the committee secured George White, one of the outstanding narcotic investigators in the country to assist in Missouri, Chicago, and other places. George White is an expert in his field. His assistance was very substantial. The committee is grateful to him and to Mr. Harry Anslinger for lending us his services.

The committee secured the able assistance of John King from the Maritime Commission to assist in the investigation of the water front and the water-front problems in New York.

As chairman of the committee, I acknowledge with much appreciation the great assistance of Judge Morris Ploscowe, of New York City, in the preparation of the last two reports of the committee. Judge Ploscowe is executive director of the American Bar Association Commission on Organized Crime. This commission, headed by Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, has taken an active and helpful interest in the work of our committee.

Assistance of extreme value was given to the committee by the various crime commissions in the country. Outstanding in this regard was Col. Jack Younger and Daniel Sullivan, operating director of the Crime Commission of Greater Miami. Mr. Sullivan supplied the committee with a tremendous amount of basic information. Also outstanding was the assistance of the splendid Chicago Crime Commission, of which Virgil Peterson is director. Mr. Peterson's testimony before this committee and the information which he furnished gave the committee an original Nation-wide pattern of organized crime. Other crime commissions were formed during our hearings which assisted us greatly.

One of the most encouraging things about our work has been the awakened public opinion which is manifest by the formation of crime commissions all over the country and by the vigorous activity of people insisting upon cleaning up in their own sections and upon better law enforcements.

In the report we expressed our thanks to the President of the United States, the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, and to various Federal and State agencies.

In the report the committee makes note of the important part played by the media of communications—newspapers, radio, television, and news reels—in bringing the message of the committee to the people. The press of the country is entitled to additional thanks by virtue of the vast amount of information submitted by the competent crime reporters for many of the leading papers. Ted Link, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Edward Leahy, of the Chicago Daily News; and George Ready, a noted columnist and radio commentator, attended every hearing of the committee and gave the committee many important bits of information, which has been of tremendous assistance. Various papers in sections of the country have crime reporters who are experts upon criminal conditions in their section. These are too numerous to mention, but they cooperated fully and were of great value to us.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a word of thanks to the administrative assistants of various Senators who have worked with the committee throughout our effort. I wish to mention especially Mr. Julius N. Cahn, the right bower of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who attended most of the hearings with us. He has worked hard and with much ability on the report. His services and suggestions have been of very great value.

I wish also to thank Mr. A. J. Bourbon, the administrative assistant to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], my own administrative assistant, and many others.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have not had an opportunity to read carefully the report of his committee. I have glanced hurriedly over the part which has to do with the investigations in Missouri, particularly in the cities of St. Louis and Kansas City. I think the committee has done fine work there, but I hope the Senator will not feel badly when I say that I think the committee has just scratched the surface in disclosing the partnership between politics and crime which has existed in Missouri for some years past.

I should like to ask the Senator——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me answer that by saying that it is not the province of the committee to investigate every little detail, and we have not endeavored to do so in our investigation. If we had tried to get down to every little detail in every small echelon of criminals and public official activity, we could have spent all our time and all our appropriation on an investigation in only one place.

Mr. KEM. I am sure that is true.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In that connection I think I should call the Senator's attention to the fact that after our hearing in New York Governor Dewey named a State crime committee to investigate conditions in New York. Of course, our committee had already revealed a good many conditions. The splendid district attorneys, Mr. Hogan and Mr. McDonald, had made startling revelations. A citizens' committee headed by Spruille Braden, former Assistant Secretary of State, had been working in the field. The New York Legislature set aside $250,000 for the State crime committee, just to make an investigation in the State of New York. I think our total appropriation up to date has been $275,000. So necessarily we were only interested in the over-all picture. I believe that from the legislative viewpoint that is all we were justified in being interested in. We considered only the big over-all interstate transactions. I am sure the Senator understands the reason for that.

Mr. KEM. I do understand that; and I wish it were possible to get similar legislation in Missouri. However, for reasons with which I am sure the Senator from Tennessee is familiar, that seems to be an idle and futile hope. An effort was made to set up a State crime commission to conduct such an investigation in Missouri, but it died a-borning.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In that connection I wish to say that on a voluntary basis in St. Louis and Kansas City, in the last 7 or 8 months crime commissions have been set up, and they are doing a splendid job in those two cities.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate what the Senator said about inability to investigate all the different and devious connections in this partnership between politics and crime. But I should like to ask the Senator particularly whether the attention of his committee has been directed to what many people in our State regard as a mother crime, that is, the theft of the evidence that occurred on May 27, 1947, when 71 persons were under indictment for failing to count the ballots in the election as they were cast, and the ballots constituting the evidence in the case were stolen from the office of the election commissioners in the nighttime, never to have been recovered or seen again?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That was one of the most shocking crimes that I have ever known to be committed, and it is certainly despicable. It was committed on May 27, 1947, and the statute of limitations ran in 3 years. Our committee got started on its first hearing about the 15th of May last year. We did make some inquiry about the ballot theft, but again it was not our province to try to solve and find out who carried out and committed all of the various criminal violations in the country.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Senator agree——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me finish in that connection. If we could have done so, we would, of course, have liked to have found out who stole the ballots. Of course, as the Senator knows, the

FBI was called in immediately afterward. I think the record shows that the FBI used more men and spent more money on that investigation than on any they have ever carried on. There was a Federal grand jury under the direction of Max Goldschein, a most able assistant to the Attorney General, and also a State grand jury, investigating the matter. I certainly agree that it was a very bad criminal offense. But I assume that there again, if we had felt inclined to do so, we could have used all our manpower and spent all our money in trying to find out who stole the ballots.

Mr. KEM. The Senator is familiar with the fact that the hands of the FBI were originally tied in that investigation, and that at the outset the FBI were not permitted to make a full and complete investigation by the Attorney General; is he not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the facts in that connection are not quite those. I believe there was some little delay in the calling in of the FBI pending a determination of whether it was a matter over which they had jurisdiction.

Mr. KEM. Were not the facts these, that the Attorney General——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Just one moment. So that there was maybe a short delay in getting the FBI in; but my understanding is that when once they got in they had the full backing of the Department of Justice, and that they used more manpower and spent more money in that investigation than they have in any other investigation in the history of the FBI.

Mr. KEM. Are not the facts that the FBI was directed by the Attorney General to interview a certain limited number of witnesses; that the FBI then reported to the Attorney General that those witnesses had been interviewed, and that nothing of importance had been developed; that the Attorney General then directed the FBI to close its files? Is not that the history of the original investigation as disclosed by the Ferguson committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, I cannot say. It is not my understanding——

Mr. KEM. Has the Senator had time to read the evidence that was brought to light by the Ferguson committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have in times past, I believe, read that.

Mr. KEM. Are not these facts clearly set out there? Are these facts refuted in any respect?

Mr. KEFAUVER. We have testimony in the record of our committee, but I am not sure about the early history of what took place. I cannot say about that one way or the other. However, the FBI used a great deal of manpower and spent a considerable amount of money on that investigation. In any event the statute of limitations ran on the offense and it was more than 3 years old when our committee got under way.

Mr. KEM. I am inviting the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the early part of the investigation, what might be called the first phase, before a further investigation was forced by the facts that were brought to light by the Ferguson Committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will have to say to the Senator that I do not remember all the details about the early part of the investigation. I cannot say about it one way or the other.

Mr. KEM. Then I would like to ask the Senator whether he can give the people of Missouri any hope that the committee in its new lease on life will have the time and the opportunity to make a further investigation of these conditions in the State of Missouri.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, of course, I will say to the Senator that the statute of limitations ran on this ballot-theft matter before the committee ever got started. It happened in May 1947. Let me say——

Mr. KEM. The Federal statute, yes; but the State statute has not yet run.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that the junior Senator from Tennessee has spent one entire year on this investigation, having hearings mornings, afternoons, and nights, day after day in many instances, and when that was not being done interviewing people, going over investigative files, talking with witnesses. The junior Senator from Tennessee determined that this work should be done and completed by March 31, when I hoped the final report could be filed and the committee could go out of existence. Because the report was not ready until just 2 or 3 days before March 31, that was not possible, and a 30-day extension was granted.

After this afternoon I shall not be the chairman of the committee any longer, because the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], who is very able, and who will utilize the remaining 4 months of the committee's life for the primary public interest, will take over. What will be done during those 4 months, I am, of course, not in a positon to speak. That responsibility will be largely up to the Senator from Maryland. But I should think that first things should be placed first; that the important job now is to try to secure the drafting and the passage of legislation which will have to do with the matter the Senate Crime Committee had to investigate; that is, how the vehicle of interstate commerce is used by criminals in violation of the law of the United States or of the various States. We have made legislative recommendations in that connection. I think the paramount thing now is to get action while the people are interested, and while the facts are new, and while we still have time in the present session of Congress. I, personally, think the committee would make a mistake if it would spend all its 4 months or any great part of its 4 months in getting out on the road investigating again, because the facts are pretty well before us. The committee certainly could not in those 4 months solve many of the Nation's puzzling and unsolved crimes, even if it were proper for it to attempt to do so.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not agree with me that if we are going to put first things first, that there is nothing more important than to guarantee the integrity of the ballot so that the public officials who receive at an election the majority of the votes cast by the duly qualified electors are permitted to take the office to which they have been elected?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I agree very fully with the Senator about that.

Mr. KEM. How are we going to maintain our free institutions, if the ballots are miscounted, and then, when indictments are returned for the crime of miscounting the ballots, the evidence is destroyed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, this strikes directly at our free institutions. I agree fully with the Senator on that. I think the election laws ought to be tightened up, and certainly any case like this ought to be fully investigated. I doubt, however, whether that was exactly in the province or jurisdiction of this committee. Our job was to investigate transactions between the States. I do not know that this was a transaction between States, which was the kind of criminal transaction our committee was charged with investigating.

Mr. KEM. This was a Federal crime, because a Member of Congress was involved in a primary election.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I agree about that, but the interstate angle is just a little tenuous. However, there are committees which have direct jurisdiction of that matter. I believe this is the province of the Subcommittee on Election Frauds. I would agree with the Senator that any recommendations they bring in for the prevention of that sort of thing would certainly be in the public interest, and I would be strongly in favor of them.

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator that there is no interstate angle; but certainly there is a Federal angle, because a Member of Congress is being voted on in an election. If an honest election does not occur, certainly that is something in which the Congress should concern itself.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I grant that the Senator from Missouri is quite correct. However, there are committees which investigate election frauds and are charged with that duty. I think our committee would have been criticized if it had spent all its resources and efforts on that particular matter.

Mr. KEM. I do not wish to be in the position of being captious about the work the committee has done in Missouri, because I think it performed a very valuable public service. I attended some of the hearings the committee held in my State, and they were important and valuable contributions to good citizenship in our State.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We thank the Senator and he was very courteous to us when we were in Kansas City.

Mr. KEM. But I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether this major crime or this mother crime—that is to say, the theft of the ballots on May 27, 1947—is anywhere mentioned in the committee report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It may be, but at least it is not discussed at any length in the report.

Mr. KEM. Where is it mentioned in the committee report?

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a matter of fact, I do not believe it is mentioned in the report.

Mr. KEM. How is it that that mother crime, which has been followed by a long train of other crimes in our State, and has been recognized generally as evidence of a working partnership between politics and crime, is not mentioned in the report?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course we found many terrible crimes in the United States, including election crimes, murders, and other crimes, but I do not believe the Senator will find that they are all mentioned in the report. In it we mention and discuss the transactions we found in interstate commerce where criminals were using interstate commerce in violation of the laws of the Federal Government or of the several States.

Mr. KEM. The Senator spoke of putting first things first. Does not the Senator agree that it is a good deal more important to find out whether integrity of the ballot is being threatened than it is to find out whether bets are being placed on a horse race?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, but of course we must act on and make recommendations concerning the things the committee is charged with doing. After all, the Committee on Privileges and Elections investigates frauds in elections and thefts in that connection. That matter was not in our jurisdiction, because, as the Senator from Missouri has said, it has no interstate feature. We did go into it to a limited extent, in asking the sheriffs and others to do all that they could; but I am sure the Senator from Missouri does not expect our committee to solve the crime when the Federal grand jury and the State grand jury and the FBI could not do so, and particularly when we went there 3½ years after the offense occurred.

Mr. KEM. I fully agree that the committee could not be expected to solve the crime; but I did indulge in the hope that the committee would make some constructive suggestions leading to the avoidance of similar incidents in the future.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was not our duty to make investigations in reference to the election laws of the Federal Government. I do not think one can read the resolution establishing the special committee and find that we were charged with any responsibility in reference to elections.

Mr. KEM. This matter involved more than that; it was a case of conspiracy and of larceny and of breaking into a public office in the night time. Other crimes were committed independently of the election laws, on May 27, 1947.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We have recommended that certain investigative officers be given additional staffs, and that once a year the Attorney General convene a special grand jury for the investigation of big-time interstate crimes and big-time racketeering once a year in the various districts of the United States. We have recommended the enlargement of a special fraud squad that would investigate the type of crime the Senator from Missouri is discussing and would have special jurisdiction of it and would see that the cases are immediately brought before the grand jury.

So I think many of the recommendations which the Senator will find in the report will give him much aid and comfort in connection with the theft of the ballots at Kansas City, which all of us felt to be very heinous and sinister.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he yields the floor?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the committee has done a wonderful job in documenting crime in interstate commerce. Perhaps the question I have in mind is answered in the report, but I have not had time to read it as yet.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Tennessee referred to laxity in the Bureau of Internal Revenue in regard to collecting income taxes from gangsters. I am wondering whether in the opinion of the committee the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice was more or less aggressive in collecting income taxes from gamblers and racketeers than it was in the case of collecting such taxes from the average citizen.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, that is largely the job of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. We found the chief difficulty to be that racketeers and gangsters for the most part simply put on their income-tax return "commissions, $50,000," or "winnings, $75,000," or some such notation, and that they keep no books or records. So it is very difficult to prove just how much money they do make. We found that the misdemeanor law requiring the keeping of books and records for income-tax purposes is not being adequately enforced.

We also believe that in the case of all these tax-law violations, too much time elapses between the commission of the offense and the final prosecution, because such matters must go through approximately 14 steps before they finally reach the trial jury.

We found that an insufficient amount of attention was being given to the collection of income taxes from the big-time racketeers and gangsters, in our opinion. Of course, we felt that the determination of what was being done as to them came within our field of activity, but that the determination of what was being done in the case of other taxpayers did not come within the field of our activity. However, I think it is fair to say that the racketeers and gangsters do not usually file complete books or keep records to an extent at all comparable with those kept by the average businessman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, the Senator from Tennessee knows, and already has stated, that it is now the law that every taxpayer must keep records available for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in the case of his income and his business expenses. I wonder whether the committee found that the Treasury Department is enforcing that law or is calling upon racketeers to keep books to the same extent that books are kept by the average American citizen. Certainly under existing laws the average citizen is called upon to keep such records. I wonder whether the Treasury Department or the Bureau of Internal Revenue have been lax in the case of the failure of such persons to keep books or records.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Frankly, I think the Treasury Department has been lax in bringing prosecutions for violations of the law in regard to the keeping of books. Several cases of that kind were brought; but I think one of them was thrown out of court, so the Bureau or the Department says it got discouraged. Those in charge of such matters say they wish to be able to prosecute such persons for the commission of a felony, rather than a misdemeanor—of course, a violation of the statute regarding the keeping of books and records for income-tax purposes is now a misdemeanor—and also that the language of the statute is not entirely satisfactory. However, I think those prosecutions could have been carried forward to a much greater extent than they have been. The committee was not at all satisfied in this respect.

We wish to recommend to the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that the statute be tightened and that the violation of the statute be made a felony.

Some representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue take the position that books and records filed by racketeers would not be valid anyway, and would not be believed, so there is not much use in insisting that they keep better ones. I do not accept that statement. I think they ought to be required to file them, and that, if they do not file them properly, they should be taken to task for it. I believe it fair to say that in the past sufficient enough attention has not been paid to requiring adequate books, or to the prosecution of gamblers and racketeers. But, in all fairness, I think it also should be said that substantial and very wholesome steps have been taken by the Internal Revenue Department, which I hope will continue. In any event we all now agree, and this includes the Bureau of Internal Revenue, that the law ought to be more vigorously enforced and that it ought to be strengthened.

I yield the floor.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Report on Migrant Labor," which appeared in the April 21, 1951, issue of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON MIGRANT LABOR

"This report," said President Truman on April 7, "makes an impressive contribution

to a subject which should be of serious concern to all of us. It will be useful to Government officials and the general public alike."

The President was referring to the 80,000-word study that his five-man Commission on Migratory Labor (of which Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, was a member) had just concluded. It is easy to agree with him that the report is impressive and that it can be very useful to all concerned with the difficult and complex problems of migrant workers. We can, unfortunately, do little more here than touch on some of the high spots.

The Commission's findings corroborate charges that migrant workers, especially in the Southwest, have been scandalously exploited. It noted, however, that the responsibility rested with a small minority of farms—the 125 thousand farms which amount to 2 percent of the farms of the Nation and produce crops equal to approximately 7 percent of the value of all farm products. Nor are these large-scale, highly mechanized agricultural units—factories on the land—solely responsible for the deplorable condition of migrant labor. Federal and State agencies, including the Farm Placement Division of the United States Employment Service, must share some of the blame.

The Commission insists that farm-labor needs can and ought to be supplied largely by domestic workers. The shortage which is said to exist, and which is used as justification to import foreign farm hands, is to a considerable extent relative. It is a shortage of Americans who are willing to work at the inadequate wage rates and under the substandard conditions which the farm owners offer. The report notes a growing inequity between agricultural and industrial wages. In the 1910–14 period hourly farm-wage rates amounted to two-thirds of factory wages. Today they are little more than a third. If annual earnings are used as a basis of comparison, the inequity is still more pronounced. In 1949, factory workers had annual earnings of $2,600. The figure for farm workers was $500. In addition, the farm worker is often obliged to put up with unsanitary housing, inadequate medical services, and inferior educational opportunities for his children. He is also deprived of most of the special benefits accorded city workers. He has no workmen's compensation, no unemployment insurance, no protection from the Taft-Hartley and Wages and Hours Acts. It is an astonishing fact that foreigners brought to this country by agreement with neighboring governments are better off than many American farm workers.

Among the Commission's recommendations, these are especially noteworthy:

1. Creation of a Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor to coordinate the activities of all groups, public and private, working in the farm-migrant field.

2. Guaranty of the right of farm workers to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining.

3. Extension of minimum-wage laws and unemployment compensation to farm laborers.

4. Insistence on minimum housing standards for all workers hired through the Federal Employment Service.

If past experience can be trusted, the members of the farm bloc in Congress will fight to the bitter end against these and all the other reforms proposed by the Commission. Only the constant pressure of an informed public opinion can force them to subordinate the greed of their powerful constituents to justice and human decency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 1, line 9.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope we can proceed now with the consideration of the pending measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take a few moments on the pending bill. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has stated, as the overriding reason for speedy enactment of Senate bill 984, a need for legislation to validate and implement an agreement made between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Mexico in Mexico City last January.

It is stated that, unless this bill is passed, the Republic of Mexico will not allow the migration of Mexican nationals into the United States for farm work after July 1.

It is stated that the bill must be limited to Mexican farm labor in order to get it enacted into law before July 1.

It is suggested that the recruiting, transportation, housing, and employment of other farm labor, including United States citizens in the continental United States, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii, and including also British subjects from the British West Indies, be postponed and dealt with in other bills, to be considered later by the Labor Committees of each House at some later unspecified dates.

It is stated that American agriculture must have continued importation of Mexican farm workers.

The senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has cited the finding of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor that, with full and proper utilization of United States citizens, further such importation is unnecessary.

In fact, Mr. President, I wish that all persons who are interested in the problem of agricultural labor, including a great many of the farmers themselves, could read the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, because I consider it to be one of the most important and finest jobs of fact-finding which has been done by a presidential commission in a long time. A summary of the report made to the President by his Commission on Migratory Labor was set forth in a release issued by the White House on April 7, 1951, from which I should like to quote one paragraph:

> We have long wavered and compromised on the issue of migratory labor in agriculture. We have failed to adopt policies designed to assure an adequate supply of such labor at decent standards of employment. Actually, we have done worse than that. We have used the institutions of government to procure alien labor willing to work under obsolete and backward conditions, and thus perpetuate those very conditions. Although our Government is importing large numbers of foreign workers for employment on farms, we are convinced that they are not needed to meet the food requirements of the defense emergency period.

That is a very significant statement, Mr. President. As I read the report of the Commission, it makes a very strong case for the premises which it seeks to support, and the entire bill ought to be considered and weighed in the light of the Commission's finding.

I have pointed out that the Senator from New Mexico has cited the findings of this Commission, and I have a number of observations to make about the findings. First, it seems to me that neither the Senate nor the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, and which, under the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, I believe has complete and exclusive jurisdiction over all labor and related immigration matters, was consulted in any way at any time regarding the making of the agreement with Mexico. Therefore it seems to me that we have no responsibility for validating or implementing whatever agreement was made.

By the way, I am not sure that the agreement has actually become a part of the record of this debate as yet. I doubt whether it has been published as a part of this debate. If so, it was inserted in the RECORD at some time when I was not on the floor, and in my research, I have missed finding the actual wording of the agreement.

Second, in my opinion, the necessity for such an agreement and for the continuance of the importation of Mexican labor has not been established in this debate as yet. We have the statement of the President's Commission that there is an adequate supply of United States citizens for farm work, if an effort is made to recruit them. Probably the situation is that in certain areas of the country there is a shortage of farm labor. I am not prepared to say whether in other sections of the United States there is American labor which could be moved into the areas of short-labor supply, but I am impressed by the fact that the President's Commission seems to be of opinion that if we made an efficient use of the labor which we have the supply would be adequate.

On the other hand, I cannot escape the conclusion that in the great Pacific Northwest, in my section of the country, strong representations are made by food processors, such as pea packers and bean packers, and by the fruit raisers, that they are looking askance at the harvest season, because they do not see where they can get the farm labor which they need in order to harvest their crops. Many of them seem to think that this bill is the answer. But I do not think its enactment would result in the Pacific Northwest being supplied with the farm labor it needs, unless there can be adopted some such amendment as that proposed by my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. That amendment, of which I am pleased to be one of the sponsors, will provide us with a port of entry near the shortage of labor supply, such as the port of Portland, Oreg., with the understanding that the Government will transport the workers from whatever foreign country they are being taken, as, for example, in this instance, Mexico, to the port of entry, and that our farmers then will be able to work out with the Government at the point of entry a contract for the use of such workers, under acceptable terms and conditions, in the food-processing plants or in the orchards during the harvest season.

The information which I receive in my office from the growers and processors of my State is to the effect that, unless such a port of entry is provided, and unless the Government makes it possible to get the workers to the port of entry, at Government expense, it will then be a financial impossibility for them to hire the workers and pay the transportation costs from Mexico, for example, which, as is suggested in certain quarters, they would have to pay in order to obtain the foreign labor for a few short weeks in the orchards and in the processing plants of the Pacific Northwest.

That may suggest another subsidy, Mr. President, and I am perfectly willing to place it on that basis. If the imported workers are needed in the Pacific Northwest it is because the domestic labor supply in that section has been interrupted by the defense effort, either by taking workers into the armed services or by taking them at much higher wages into defense plants, with the result that the production of a very much needed food supply is being interfered with by the Government program itself.

Therefore, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Oregon, we may as well face the fact that it is one of the defense costs which must be added up in the ledger. It is not fair or right to require processors or small fruit ranchers to pay transportation costs from Mexico City to Portland, Oreg., in order to hire foreign labor for a few weeks in processing plants, in orchards, or on our farms. That should be taken into account, Mr. President, before we come to a final conclusion on this bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is making a very fine speech on migratory labor, and I am wondering if he will permit me to make a short statement on another phase of the farm problem.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be delighted to yield the time.

Mr. CARLSON. In my State, Mr. President, we have difficulty in regard to the deferment of farm boys who are needed for the operation of farm units. My office has received a large number of letters from farm leaders, from farm owners, and from farm operators whose sons are being called into military service. These operations are large. The farms are mechanically operated. Labor of the migratory type cannot be used on such farms.

Last week I received a letter from Ben Ludy, general manager of Radio Station WIBW at Topeka, Kans., the station which was owned by former Senator Capper. In one of the station's broadcasts some comment was made regarding the deferment of farm labor. The broadcaster wondered if the farmers themselves had any idea on the subject. The response in mail has been terrific, to say the least.

I have with me a number of letters and extracts from letters from farmers showing the need for deferment if farmers are to be successful in meeting the food requirements established by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include extracts from these letters in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts from letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANHATTAN, KANS., *April 21, 1951.*

DEAR ELMER: We have listened to your 7 o'clock news broadcast. We are writing concerning the draft of my boy. I am about 60 years old and have one boy here with me. We are taking care of 437 acres of ground. We have 150 acres of wheat, 125 acres to go to corn, 20 acres of alfalfa, 25 acres of oats, and 30 acres of clover; the rest is pasture. It is impossible for me to handle all of this land if they draft my boy. I have rheumatism in my shoulders and can hardly raise my arms. We have farmed in partnership for 3 or 4 years now. My boy has some machinery. We also have 40 head of cattle and about 20 brood sows. It is impossible to hire help, so this work will just not be done if my boy is drafted. I think farming and raising food is as important as any occupation and should receive a little more consideration.

Sincerely yours.

NORBORNE, MO., *April 20, 1951.*

DEAR SIR: You have just finished your 7 o'clock broadcast in which you said to write you about things on the farm. I will try and tell you what it would mean to us to have all the help taken away from the farm. Now our son had not intended to go to college. He wanted to be a farmer. So as his father is 60 years old, they intended to work a plan whereby in a few years the son by a sort of partnership deal, where the father furnishes the equipment and the son the labor, that the son could earn equipment to farm this place and the father would retire. And the son would be established for the future. Now I ask you isn't that just as important to that boy as a college education is to some other boys, and would it be fair to take him away from this and let some boy go to college that would only be going as a way out. That is not a fair order. We farm 364 acres of good Missouri river-bottom land. We plant some Pioneer corn too. It is a good corn. Last year we raised 14,900 bushels of corn and that's by weight, not guess. Also wheat, oats, and soybeans. Of course last year was a perfect season, but with average season we produce a lot of grain; besides we market over 100 head of fat hogs each year, as well as a few calves. But if they take all the help I will have to quit. I guess everyone will have to put our boys in college and let the food raising go. We will have to hope and pray for peace. Good luck to you.

COURTLAND, KANS., *April 20, 1951.*

Mr. ELMER CURTIS,
WIBW, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: You said to write your problems about the draft and labor shortage to you, so that is what I am doing.

The following is a summary of what we have:

Wheat, 340 acres; corn, 148; alfalfa, 35; grain sorghum, 12; brood sows, 20; dairy cows, 8–10; feeder pigs, 100 or more; chickens, 500.

It will be necessary to sell the stock and quit most of the land if I'm taken. There is not such a thing as skilled labor that you can hire up here.

Yours truly.

MOLINE, KANS, *April 1951.*

DEAR SIR: In regard to your broadcast on farm deferments, I am writing as to our situation.

We have one boy who is 22 years old who will be inducted in the near future.

We farm 750 acres, 120 acres of wheat, 50 acres of oats, and about 30 acres of barley; 35 acres of row crop. Put up 60 acres of mowland. We run about 100 head of cattle a year and some steers. We have all kinds of machinery, including a combine. We do trade work with the neighbors so that all may get along. The father is not able to do much work due to a rupture.

I do not understand how a boy would be more useful in an army suit than at home with this set-up. Especially with no war being fought.

Yours truly.

SALINA, KANS.

DEAR SIR: I thought I would write you a few lines in regard to my boy that is supposed to go to the Army soon.

I had three boys in World War II. There is going to be a big demand for men's help as there was so much wheat died out and so much spring crop could be put out, but without help they will have to leave the ground lay idle.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours truly.

CHANUTE, KANS., *April 20, 1951.*

DEAR SIR: Elmer Curtis has been our 7 o'clock newscaster for years and years. As for our help on the farm, it is gradually vanishing.

The 24-year-old boy at home was classified I–A the first of the year, so he had no choice. He enlisted. The other younger married boy is also in the Reserves. No other choice when the draft board classifies them I–A. What I'd like to know is how do they expect us farmers to increase our crops with less help. And I'm sure not going to hire foreign labor, because Dad and my youngest boy cannot raise, harvest, and care for the crops that these two older boys have been doing.

My older boy at present has over 500 acres rented, over 600 hens producing six cases of eggs a week, 50 head of registered white faces, and 10 sows that will farrow this spring, and yet he's only waiting for the word, and will have to have a sale and go do as they tell him.

Yours respectfully.

RILEY, KANS., *April 21, 1951.*

Mr. ELMER CURTIS.

DEAR SIR: We are farming 346 acres of land and 200 under cultivation and milking 13 cows, forty-some head or other cattle. Only my son, his mother, and myself on the farm, and he is up for induction in the Army in May. I will have to sell my milk cows and some other stock, and cannot farm all of the land. It will have to lay idle if he is taken.

He is serving his country much better on the farm than in the Army. He is at home working all of the time.

Yours truly.

BELOIT, KANS., *April 20, 1951.*

DEAR ELMER: On the 7 a. m. news today you asked for letters about drafting the farm boys. I have been looking for an excuse to blow my top.

We farm 640 acres and have one child—a 20-year-old son. We couldn't get as much work from any two men we could hire—if we could hire any men.

We have 200 acres of wheat, 80 acres of alfalfa and could put out 300 acres of corn, but he is to be inducted into the Army June 1. A plea for deferment for farm work was ignored. My husband, in his fifties, will do well enough to harvest the wheat and put up the hay, etc., so we have no choice but to sprinkle some clover seed on the 300 acres and let it stand.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the

Senator from Oregon in yielding. The problem is a very serious one in my section of the country. The boys are not asking for deferment in order to avoid military service. The serious question is, Can we afford to take these skilled farm boys off the farms at a time when increased farm production is needed? We defer some persons in industry because they are in critical positions; and we must give some consideration to the deferment of farm boys who are needed in farm work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know the type of farm work in Kansas and the need for labor in order to enable that great breadbasket to operate in the interests of the American people and of the world. So far as help from the proposed legislation is concerned, neither the Senator from Kansas nor any other Senator, nor any section of the country, will get one bit of benefit, because the labor needed is the cheapest of labor. Hence, the bill, if enacted, would not help to remove the conditions which the Senator from Kansas has in mind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from New Mexico for their comments in connection with this subject. I should like to say to the Senator from Kansas that I believe there is great need for a reexamination of the entire exemption program in respect to service in the Armed Forces. I say that as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and as one who took a very active part in the debate and discussion of the manpower question, as the Senator knows, I agree with the Senator from Kansas that none of us wants to see any blanket deferment granted to any economic group. That is why I have taken a position against a blanket deferment for college students. I consider it to be a great mistake, and to be very undemocratic, and I know the Senator from Kansas will agree with me that it would be equally undemocratic if there were a blanket deferment for agricultural workers. But, as the Senator has pointed out, the Selective Service Act contemplates, in spirit and intent, provision for deferment in the case of men who, it is found, can render greater service to the defense effort by working in industry, or on the farm, or as students in laboratories, or in some other capacity where their skills and abilities are needed.

I have received a great many inquiries similar to those received by the Senator from Kansas. I say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that I think the Selective Service should give very careful attention to the representations which are being made that not sufficient attention is being given to men in critical agricultural jobs.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I know of no one who has followed this point more closely than has the Senator from Oregon, and I appreciate his remarks on the manpower problem. It is a question of using our men to the best advantage. I am entirely in accord with the Senator's views on the deferment of college students, and I have expressed myself on that subject. I am opposed to any blanket deferment of any group.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, returning to my manuscript, I was making an observation to the effect that the necessity for an agreement with Mexico and for the continuance of the importation of Mexican labor had not as yet, in my opinion, been clearly established in the record of the debate.

We have the statement of the President's Commission that there is an adequate supply of United States citizens for farm work, if an effort is made to recruit them.

We have the statement of the senior Senator from New Mexico that, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee considering Labor Department requests, he has found that the United States Employment Service has not even assembled the facts about the numbers and locations of workers in the United States available for farm labor, much less conducted an all-out recruiting and placement campaign.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may call his attention to a statement from the area wherein this type of labor is supposed to be sought?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I received yesterday and inserted in the RECORD a telegram from the American GI Forum of Texas Independent Veterans' Organization, representing 50,000 American veterans of Mexican origin, reading as follows:

Wish to ask you to continue to fight to exclude foreign workers especially in Texas. Thousands of veterans—

The ones who faced the music, the ones who would have made the supreme sacrifice, if need be, and the relatives of American boys who were buried, not in Texas, but abroad—

Thousands of veterans not able to make a decent living because of low-wage competition by wetbacks and imported labor. Thousands of children of veterans are not able to enjoy good health because veterans and their families are forced to work for starvation wages because of imported labor. Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. Best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

That telegram came from the midst of the area where so-called problem of the wetbacks exists.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for reinforcing the argument I had just completed, namely, that, as contended by the President's Commission, under a proper program of recruitment we would have an adequate labor supply to meet our domestic needs.

Third, let us examine the suggestion that we pass this bill forthwith, without amendment, limited to Mexican labor alone and for the convenience of some large commercial farms along the Mexican border, and that we postpone until some later date action on the vastly greater and more important problem of an over-all defense emergency farm-labor program for United States citizens, including residents of Puerto Rico and Hawaii and British nationals from the British West Indies.

The chairman of the Agriculture Committee has suggested that, because this larger problem is related to industrial employment, it should be handled by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I am somewhat gratified to have this generous and gracious concession on the record as to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It does amount to recognition of the existence and the role of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I will have more to say about this matter before I close.

As a matter of practical reality, the suggestion that the major problem be handled later by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee comes too late in this session.

That suggestion should have been made last January, before the United States-Mexican conference in Mexico City at which the agreement was worked out. It should have been made when this bill was introduced. The bill should have dealt with the whole problem. And the bill should have been referred, not to the Agriculture Committee, which under the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act has no conceivable claim to jurisdiction, but to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee which, under that act, has complete, sole and exclusive jurisdiction in the fields of labor and related immigration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the provisions of the Reorganization Act, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, which deal with the standing committees of the Senate, in respect to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as contained on page 4 of the reprint of the act, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as contained on page 8 of the reprint of the act.

There being no objection, the provisions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(a) Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Agriculture generally.
2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.
3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.
4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.
5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.
6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.
7. Agricultural economics and research.
8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.
9. Dairy industry.
10. Entomology and plant quarantine.
11. Human nutrition and home economics.
12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.
13. Agricultural educational extension services.

14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.
15. Rural electrification.
16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.
17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

* * * * *

(l) Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:
1. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare generally.
2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.
3. Wages and hours of labor.
4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.
5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.
6. Child labor.
7. Labor statistics.
8. Labor standards.
9. School-lunch program.
10. Vocational rehabilitation.
11. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.
12. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.
13. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeths Hospital.
14. Public health and quarantine.
15. Welfare of miners.
16. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.
17. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.
18. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.
19. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were to have jurisdiction over the matter, a representative of the committee should have been sitting in Mexico City at the time the agreement was drawn. We are faced, as is so frequently the case in the Congress, with an accomplished fact. We are being asked to put our stamp of approval on what has already been prepared. If the agreement contains some of the things which I believe it contains, although I have not been privileged to read it, I am sure that a consideration of the proposed provisions of the agreement by someone representing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the time the Mexico City conference was held might well have brought about some changes in its language.

Now, seriously to propose that the major problem of farm labor during the defense emergency be postponed and handled in a separate bill to be referred to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the Senate and by the Labor and Education Committee in the other body would be a great mistake at this late date.

The majority leader was recently quoted in the press as announcing that he planned to do everything he could to bring about an adjournment by August 1. I am willing to take judicial notice of the fact that if now we should put aside consideration of the problem and should hold new hearings and have further discussion before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Labor and Education of the House, we would be doing well to get through with the hearings by August 1.

We are faced with a bill which we must do the best we can to amend on the floor of the Senate, so that it may meet some of the major objections, and then start planning for a long-term legislative program in connection with the whole problem of migratory labor, to be taken up in the next session of Congress. Because the farm-labor market of the country is disjointed I am willing to admit that there is need now for some legislation on the subject. I hope we can get the bill patched up on the floor of the Senate with appropriate amendments, so that it will at least be serviceable for the present harvest season.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Everyone, I believe, is willing to admit that there is necessity for legislation of this type. Those of us who are opposed to the bill as reported to the Senate object only because we feel that, inasmuch as labor is needed we should provide in the bill for the importation of labor, be it from Mexico or elsewhere, only after an adequate investigation has been made as to whether American labor is available. I do not think it is asking too much of the Senate to consider an amendment which would provide for the protection of the American laborer, who is willing to suffer the fatigue of stoop work, to the same extent that protection would be given to a laborer who came from a foreign country. I do not think it is too much to ask of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to be recorded at this point as being in agreement with the Senator from New Mexico in the comments he has made.

Mr. President, the plain legislative and political fact is that this bill is the only bill regarding farm labor that is likely to get to the floors of both Houses in this Congress. Unless it can be broadened to deal with the whole problem, to provide for the recruitment, transportation, housing, placement, and employment of United States citizens, including Puerto Ricans and Hawaiians and British nationals as well as Mexican nationals, the whole farm labor problem is going to be left untouched, except for the Mexican segment thereof. This is the only train that is going through. Unless it is stopped long enough to couple in cars for United States citizens and other nationals they are not going to be treated with the same consideration given Mexican nationals under the bill as it was reported to the Senate. The Republic of Mexico is going to provide more protection for its citizens than the Republic of the United States of America provides for its citizens, and such protection as we do provide will be given, because, in complying with the United States-Mexican agreement, we will have to pay some attention to the wages and conditions offered our own citizens.

Fourth, I want to raise a basic and fundamental issue that affects the rights, powers, and responsibilities of every standing committee of the Senate. To my mind, it is a legislative scandal that, in the first place, the State Department and the Labor Department passed over the Labor Committees of both Houses and chose instead to invite and include in the United States delegation to the Mexico City conference at which the agreement was agreed upon last January only representatives of the Agriculture Committees of both Houses. Second, in my opinion it is a mistake and an outright violation of the words and intent of the LaFollette-Monroney Act to have referred the bill to the Agriculture Committees of both Houses.

With what were the conference and the bill primarly concerned?

With farm labor, of course.

But with farm labor considered as human beings or as an article or commodity of commerce?

That, Mr. President, is the test.

Only if more than 1,500,000 farm workers are considered as a commodity, as human livestock, as work animals, to be imported, deported, housed and treated as animals, can the assignment of such a bill to an Agriculture committee be explained or defended.

Mr. President, were I to follow my inclination as a lawyer, as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I would call for the defeat of this bill or its rereferral to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on this ground alone. But in this case, and all other cases, I try to be practical. We are faced with somewhat of an emergency. We certainly are faced with a time emergency, as I have heretofore stated in these remarks. I do not believe that the time available in this session of the Congress will permit us, if we want to get the crops harvested, to follow the course of action of referring this bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for its consideration. Harvesting the crops is a matter of first importance.

As I have stated, I think there are areas where there is need for some labor from the outside to meet the shortage of domestic labor in order to do the crop processing, the fruit picking, and the harvesting. Therefore, even though I think it means condoning this breach of the LaFollette-Monroney Act, I propose that we work this bill into proper shape by adoption of the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and amendments proposed by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY,] so that the bill as passed will deal with the entire problem of farm labor with fairness to workers and employers.

Mr. President, this morning my attention was called to a series of telegrams which were sent to the majority leader [Mr. MCFARLAND] by the leaders of organized labor and by the leader of the Farmers Union, concerning the farm labor bill now under consideration. I

have been advised that these telegrams have already been considered to a certain extent in this debate. Nevertheless, I should like to have them incorporated in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, because I wish to make a few very brief comments on them. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 24, 1951.—The Railway Labor Executives' Association today appealed to the majority leader of the Senate, Senator ERNEST MACFARLAND, for assistance in opposition to the Ellender bill, S. 984, providing for the importation of Mexican workers to be employed on corporate farms in this country. Telegram of the Railway Labor Executives' Association to Senator MACFARLAND follows:

"The Ellender bill, S. 984, providing importation of Mexican workers to be employed on corporate farms in this country, which is now pending in the Senate, deeply concerns all organized labor. The measure as reported is virtually without standards and constitutes a threat to domestic workers, both agricultural and industrial. It runs directly counter to the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which was issued a few days after the Senate Agriculture Committee reported the measure. The Commission report, based on many months of study and hearings throughout the country by the distinguished and impartial members of that body, raises fundamental questions as to the need for any legislation to import foreign workers. Furthermore, the Ellender bill completely disregards the recent study published by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, showing extensive unemployment and poverty among marginal farm families of the country from among whom large numbers of agricultural workers can be recruited. Recent series of articles in the New York Times and other newspapers and magazines have shown the scandalous conditions under which millions of Mexican immigrants, both legal and illegal, the so-called wetbacks, live in our country. Such conditions jeopardize conditions of all other workers. The Ellender measure is likely to add to these disgraceful conditions. In view of these facts it should be sent back to committee for further consideration and should go to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in accord with the explicit provisions respecting importation of foreign workers and labor standards contained in Public Law 601, the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act. Evidence is ample that in this critical period of defense mobilization enough of our own citizens can be mustered to handle food and fiber crops if working conditions of minimum decency are offered.

"G. E. LEIGHTY,
"Chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Association."

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 26, 1951.—A. F. of L. President William Green today made public the following wire opposing the Ellender bill (S. 984) providing the recruitment and importation of Mexican farm workers. This wire has been sent to Senate Majority Leader MCFARLAND:

"Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
"Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.:

"The American Federation of Labor offers its objections to the enactment of S. 984 to provide for the recruitment and importation of Mexican workers for agricultural labor in the United States, which is now pending before the Senate.

"The bill as reported by the committee does not provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of domestic farm labor, and is contrary to the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which was issued March 26, 1951.

"The report clearly indicates that the importation of foreign farm labor would be to depress still further the wages and working conditions of American farm labor, a group which is worse off economically than any other in our population.

"The A. F. of L. firmly believes that the need for the importation of foreign labor is overemphasized. At the present time there are approximately 150,000 agricultural workers in Puerto Rico unemployed, and there are 190,000 partially employed—working less than 30 hours per week. However, if there is a genuine need for agricultural labor, the Puerto Rican and domestic labor market should be fully utilized before importing foreign labor.

"We strongly urge that S. 984 in its present form be recommitted back to committee with instructions to provide for the recruitment of American workers wherever they are needed, under decent working conditions and adequate wages, before any attempt is made to bring in foreign farm labor.

"WILLIAM GREEN,
"President, American Federation of Labor."

PATTON URGES DEFEAT OF ELLENDER FARM LABOR BILL

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1951.—In a telegram sent today to Senate Majority Leader ERNEST A. MCFARLAND, James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, urged the defeat of the Ellender bill (S. 984) providing for the importation of cheap foreign labor.

The text of the telegram is as follows:

"National Farmers Union believes S. 984 should be defeated. Bringing in cheap foreign labor without setting decent standards and without first trying to recruit tremendous numbers of underemployed American agricultural workers breaks faith with the American people and their ideals. This supply of cheap foreign labor threatens both the family farm as the basic pattern of American agriculture and the hard-earned gains of American labor. This bill violates President Truman's manpower policy declaration of January 17 giving full assurance that full use of domestic manpower resources will be made before bringing in foreign workers. It ignores careful findings of Sparkman committee report on low-income rural families, revealing existence of equivalent of more than 2,500,000 underemployed agricultural workers. Bill was reported out before President's Commission on Migratory Labor gave its report to the President, portraying disgraceful conditions of migrant workers and subservience of many Government officials to pressures of big growers. We urge Senate to reject this bill and consider first legislation for the effective utilization of American workers."

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1951.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In accordance with our conversation of this afternoon, I am sending along some material on farm labor which may be of use to you.

The Ellender bill is a vicious piece of legislation which threatens not only the standards of American workers, but also the family farm as the basic pattern to American agriculture. Ignoring ample evidence showing vast numbers of underutilized American agricultural workers, the proponents of this legislation are intent upon bringing into this country all the cheap foreign labor that they possibly can get. In back of this bill have been the big growers as well as the food processors who have sought to have the definition of agricultural workers broadened so as to include workers in the various food processing industries. Fortunately this latter provision has been eliminated from the Senate bill.

It is significant that no attempt has been made by those crying most loudly for agricultural labor to say that they will offer decent standards of working conditions as an inducement. They much prefer to continue the shocking living and working conditions now existing for migrant agricultural workers, both domestic and foreign. They too often have enjoyed the sympathy and support of the Farm Placement Service in the Department of Labor, a group which generally has responded with amazing alacrity to the demands of the growers. An illustration of this is afforded by the structure and operation of the special farm labor committee to the Farm Placement Service. This committee is composed solely of grower and processor representatives. They have been quick to report great shortages of labor, and they have repeatedly indicated that it will be impossible to harvest the large crops needed in the mobilization period without the importation of farm labor. When it is suggested to them that might they not look toward the underutilized American workers they become angry and say there is no time for social revolution.

The moral issue here is quite clear. These migrant workers have been abused and ignored for many years now, and their conditions have gotten worse rather than better. Recent stories such as those in the New York Times have emphasized how shocking are their living and working conditions.

On the mobilization side the issue seems equally clear. At a time when the Nation is seeking to employ to the fullest capacity its total manpower resources, it is wasteful to ignore this potential pool. Yet the proponents of the Ellender bill propose to do just that.

The Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which I am enclosing, offers abundant evidence to document the misery and abuse which migrant workers know. Practically every page offers illustrations from the field of what is happening in America in 1951. This was a carefully drawn up report and was made by a group of outstanding people. Pages 177 to 185 summarize their recommendations. Yet, the proponents of the Ellender bill were most eager not to hear what was in this report.

Under employment of rural families, a study prepared for the Joint Committee on Economic Report, spells out the extent of the under-utilization of America's farm people. I have marked for your attention pages 3 to 5, 11, 19, and 20. This report concludes that if we were to utilize fully the rural people discussed here, we would achieve the equivalent of adding 2,500,000 workers to our total labor force. The proponents of the Ellender bill made clear at the Senate Agriculture hearings that they had not the slightest interest in utilizing these people. To employ them would mean setting up decent standards for agricultural workers. Like the industrialists of an earlier period, the feudal lords of agriculture much prefer to import cheap foreign labor.

I should emphasize that the issue is not that of opposing the importation of foreign labor. If these people are needed, then certainly we should take steps to bring them in. But we should also make certain that they come under decent standards. And even more important, we must be certain that we have tried to utilize our own neglected rural people. The hostility which many labor groups, church groups, and the Farmers Union have shown to this bill is

based upon a conviction that its advocates are not interested in such prior considerations.

If we can be of any further help to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us. We deeply appreciate your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT ENGLER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I am inserting material in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks, I should like to have printed ir the RECORD a letter which I have received from the president of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation in regard to the problem which is involved in the pending legislation, including a copy of a letter which he addressed to my senior colleague [Mr. CORDON], with copies to the other members of the Oregon delegation, and my reply to his letter.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1951.

Mr. MARSHALL SWEARINGEN,
President, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, Salem, Oreg.

DEAR MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you very much for your letter of February 12, enclosing copy of a letter to Senator CORDON.

I am, indeed, very much interested in having Portland made a point of entry in regard to any program for getting offshore labor. You may be sure that I shall carefully scrutinize any administrative or legislative proposals on this problem with that in mind.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Salem, Oreg., February 12, 1951.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
The United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed letter to Senator CORDON is self-explanatory.

We feel that if this suggestion is sufficiently supported by many groups in the State of Oregon and by some groups in our neighboring States of Washington, Idaho, and the northern part of California, that Portland could be made a port of entry. While this would not solve the entire problem, it would help.

We thought you would be interested in what we are doing on the subject and we encourage you to advise us of your actions.

Yours very truly,

MARSHALL SWEARINGEN,
President.

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
February 12, 1951.

Re offshore labor as it affects the Pacific Northwest problem.

The Honorable GUY CORDON,
The United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: As you know, the general matter of offshore labor is of extreme importance for this coming harvest season. You further are aware of a series of meetings recently held in Washington, D. C. with representatives of the various grower organizations and the Department of Agriculture.

While the general problem has been undertaken with a workmanlike fashion, and we believe the steps on the general problem will lead to proper handling of the problem. None the less it appears that the Pacific Northwest, due to its geographical problems, has become a second cousin as compared to the over-all picture.

We refer to the great area of the South and the East, and even California, and the other States near or bordering on the Mexican boundry. These folks apparently seem quite satisfied with the way the program is going, and are not interested in any payment of transportation beyond the nearest point of entry.

As you know the nearest port of entry for even the Portland area is some 800 miles from San Francisco, and therein lies our suggestion for at least a partial solving of the Northwest problem.

We believe that Portland should immediately be made a port of entry and would like to submit that nearly all of the area which would be served from that point including Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and even the Tulelake portion of California is within the 500-mile limit.

Probably the establishment of Portland as a port of entry would do more to give the Northwest a break than any other move we might make at this time, although other alternate proposals may be made.

We have talked this matter over with Mr. Snyder of the Blue Lake Cannery, some of the folks of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, and we are now contacting the Farm Bureaus of Washington, Idaho, and the labor users in northern California.

We would appreciate your interesting yourself in this matter if you have not already done so, and at the same time advising us what further steps we might take to urge the establishment of Portland as a port of entry.

Yours very truly,

MARSHALL SWEARINGEN, *President.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks another letter which was sent to my senior colleague, with copies to the other members of the Oregon delegation, from Robert K. Norris, of the labor committee of the Rogue Valley Traffic Association and Fruit Growers' League.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 23, 1951.

Senator GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: Thank you for your letter of April 13, relative to the importation of foreign labor, together with copies of the Senate and House bills.

We have gone over both bills, and while in our opinion, some additional Federal funds should be appropriated, and might have to be appropriated in the future, to aid the farmer in carrying the very heavy added financial burden of importing foreign labor, we realize that because of other pressure, these bills are probably about the best that can be obtained at this time.

Medford growers, for example, have put a lot of money in the past years into their labor camp, but are digging up another $10,000 at this time to put the camp in shape for the coming season. Payment of going wages for the foreign labor is fixed and satisfactory, but the three quarter guaranteed working time clause plus board payment for nonwork days, together with transportation costs to and from the border, and a $20 payment per man at the border will run our costs very high.

We are perhaps more fortunate at Medford than most other districts in that barring bad weather, we can give reasonable steady employment to these men for 2 months. Under the 4-month contract we plan to work with peas in eastern Oregon, which tie-in the 6 weeks ahead of Medford. If possible, we will try to help Hood River or Klamath potatoes on the tail end of the season. This combination should work fairly well with a minimum expense for loss of working time.

We do not expect to break even on the allowed $1.75 per day for board. Our total cost for use of the 450 men at Medford for transportation, loss of time, additional board cost, camp maintenance, $20 per man to the Government for recruitment costs and transportation will run to approximately $70,000 over and above normal wage payments. I hope the return for the fruit will warrant this expense.

The set-up in other districts of the State is generally worse than our own. I attended a meeting in Salem last Monday of representatives from different parts of the State, where they are worried about the harvest labor situation. When the picture of added costs above normal wages for this help was given to them, many of them shook their heads and left the meeting. They felt the added costs of qualifying to employ foreign workers would be prohibitive to their farmers.

A part of this would be caused by the required 4-month contract which does not lend itself too well to short peak use of foreign labor. Cherries, hops, beans, and other truck crops, all call for rather large numbers of workers, but only for a 2- or 3-week period. Frequently these crops overlap and all want them at the same time, with large gaps of unemployment between. Loss of time and board payment runs up the cost. Peas in eastern Oregon for a 6-week period ties in pretty well with Medford's 8 weeks. Loss of working time and board payments would not be too severe. Sugar beets also have reasonably long runs in the spring and fall, and can probably qualify.

But there will be such sizable gaps between cherries, the different truck crops, hops and late fruit in Hood River, and potatoes in Klamath, that the farmers are discouraged about the whole deal. They feel that with unemployment pay and board payments for loss of time between jobs, plus going wages and transportation for peak short time usage of foreign labor, the farmer cannot get out with a whole skin. Undoubtedly, most of these farmers will not sign up for foreign labor and will try to get by. As a result there will be a severe labor shortage, particularly in the Willamette Valley and probably in Hood River, and Klamath potatoes. A part of the crop will not be harvested. Looking ahead in 1952, when more men may be under arms and more employed in war industry, unless some help is given these farmers in the way of shorter contract periods, or part payment of subsistance and transportation of foreign labor, you would do as the farmers will do, simply not plant as much acreage and in many cases move to employment in war industry.

If foodstuffs are needed in the future and labor does not become more available, Federal assistance over and above mere recruitment at the growers' expense at the border will have to be given.

We still feel that emergency funds are used to transport labor across country to shipyards and other centers of industry and to subsidize industry in unusual costs of retooling and manufacture of needed goods. Certainly food is also a necessary part of the program and it is reasonable that more help must be given the farmers of the Northwest to help in covering some of their unusual expense, or production will be curtailed as the labor market continues to tighten. The Northwest, we believe, is a bit different from most other sections of the country, in that most of these high producing and specialized crop districts lie many miles to hundreds of miles from large centers of population. Farmers are dependent upon migratory workers, which supply dries up in times of heavy employment in industry.

If it is anticipated that a shortage of migratory labor will be with us for the next

year or two ahead, and if the Department of Agriculture is sincere in their request for greater production of foodstuffs, the present bill should be liberalized to allow for greater aid to Northwest farmers, at this time.

Harvest season is only a few months away. Even only a partial loss of crops this season from lack of labor would materially reduce fall planting and loss of production in 1952. However, the present bills are better than nothing at all, and rather than run the chance of having no bill, you might deem it best to go ahead with the present bills, and consider emergency appropriations as the situation becomes more critical.

Sincerely,

ROBERT K. NORRIS,
Labor Committee Rogue Valley Traffic Association, and Fruit Growers League, Inc.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from Mr. Charles R. Jacobs, editor of the Western Canner and Packer, together with a news release and a brief article dealing with the question, "Where will we get the workers for the 1951 harvest season?"

There being no objection, the letter and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN CANNER AND PACKER,
San Francisco, Calif., April 17, 1951.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed are tear sheets from the April issue of Western Canner and Packer on the article, Where Will We Get the Workers for the 1951 Harvest Season? The material contained in it is the result of carefully conducted questionnaires, personal interviews, and previously published material. Unquestionably, we feel that it accurately reflects the attitude of packers, canners, and farmers, and particularly those in the western regions.

Also enclosed is a photostatic print reproduced from a California newspaper emanating from Associated Press. The divergence of opinion between this press clipping and our article is quite evident and raises considerable doubt in my mind that the Commission is fully aware of the true facts. Certainly the California packer and canner does not feel complacent nor assured that domestic help is going to solve his difficulties without the need for foreign importation. the awareness of this need is just as fully felt by Gov. Earl Warren. Such findings by this Commission appointed by President Truman sound ridiculous and quite devoid of justifiable evidence to western packers.

I would like to invite any comments you might care to make either in justification, condemnation, or in explanation. As a publication, Western Canner and Packer is recognized as an authoritative, impartial trade journal that has been held in respect by the trade since 1905. We are not in the habit of publishing what we can't substantiate. From the standpoint of our readers and the industry we represent we would like evidence the afore-mentioned Commission knows what it is talking about.

Sincerely,

WESTERN CANNER AND PACKER,
CHARLES R. JACOBS, *Editor.*

UNITED STATES DOESN'T NEED FOREIGN FARM HELP, COMMISSION FINDS

WASHINGTON.—A presidential commission has reported this country does not need foreign farm laborers. It urged more efficient use of Americans with better wages and living standards.

In a report Sunday, President Truman's migratory labor commission said there are about 1,000,000 migratory farm workers in this country, half of them from Mexico. Some 80 percent of the Mexican workers, it said, crossed the border illegally. Other foreign workers were brought into agricultural areas to meet local labor shortages.

Th five-man commission, named by Mr. Truman last June 3, said foreign workers depressed wages of competing Americans and brought on serious health situations. It noted that some foreign workers also took nonfarm jobs, lowering the average pay.

Besides, it contended, the domestic labor supply would be adequate to produce all the food needed in the present emergency, if farm pay and living conditions were improved.

The commission proposed Federal aid to States and changes in administration and legislation to solve the problem.

President Truman, commenting on the report said it deserves the careful consideration of all of us—the Congress, the executive agencies, and the general public.

The commission drew a drab picture of the migratory farm workers on the move from one area to another:

"They neither claim the community as a home nor does the community claim them. Local authorities are not insensitive to the misery of migrants, although under present laws of residence, they are almost helpless to deal with it."

The commission recommended:

1. A Federal committee on migratory farm labor to coordinate Federal, State, and private activities relating to such labor.

2. Legislation prohibiting employment of aliens illegally, authorizing the immigration and naturalization service to search farms —but not farm homes—for illegal aliens and providing fines against persons hiring and transportaing illegal aliens.

3. That United States citizens in Puerto Rica and Hawaii be given first call when outside labor is needed.

4. That agricultural workers be given legal assurance of their right to organize by extension of the Taft-Hartley Act to large farms.

5. Grants-in-aid by the Agriculture Department to States for the establishment of labor camps. Development of a rural nonfarm housing program for migrants when they are not traveling to jobs.

6. That social security, public health, and education programs be extended to cover migratory workers, with Federal financial aid to the States and cities.

[From Western Canner and Packer for April 1951]

WHERE WILL WE GET THE WORKERS FOR THE 1951 HARVEST SEASON?—FOOD GROWERS AND PROCESSORS FACE AN EXTREME MANPOWER SHORTAGE IN THE MONTHS AHEAD; INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT ARE STILL SEEKING THE SOLUTION

Faced with a steadily increasing national defense program that is skyrocketing manpower requirements for all industry as well as for the armed services, agriculture, which is already suffering labor shortages, is confronted with an extreme shortage in 1951.

That this condition is readily recognizable is the fact that uneasiness is reflected among the growers, the processors, the canners and packers, and others who, by the nature of their business, will be directly affected. Men close to the problem estimate that for California and Arizona alone, the 1951 harvest season will require at least 35,000 offshore domestics and farm workers. Efforts to evaluate the situation in terms of majority reasoning point to a wide divergence of ideas and opinions depending, apparently, upon how the individual or group is affected.

In a sectional poll of a group of representative packers and canners, in a more or less localized California area, the consensus was this:

A labor shortage possibly even worse than that experienced in World War II.

The shortage will apply to skilled and semiskilled as well as common stoop labor.

The Government should do everything possible to import foreign nationals, such as Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Hawaiians, etc., and should also recognize the necessity for certain types of farm workers and give them draft deferments.

The local communities are doing very little if anything about the situation.

Answers to the question, "What can an individual firm such as yours do?" produces replies that varied from "nothing" to a vague "I don't know," to "we can do little except support local, State, and Federal Government organizations and use labor-saving equipment wherever possible."

Oregon, Washington, and Utah, as well, seem even more vague in the wholehearted support of the use of foreign nationals but they have requested help from Washington, D. C., and appear to be willing to go along with any concrete solution to the problem that might be forthcoming from that source. Statewise and through local communities, they are making determined efforts to develop programs whereby help may be obtained through groups and, particularly, by the use of youth organizations and school children.

In connection with this, one source in the Northwest States, "as you know, one of the real troubles we run into is the unemployment pay and pension question and we are endeavoring to overcome this. However, it is not going to be easy; it looks as though a big crop is coming up this year and our chief difficulty will be to get it off the fields. We would certainly welcome suggestions as to how to get people to work when they do not want to."

ILLINOIS VIEWPOINT

In Illinois, the first meeting of the State placement advisory committee was held in January, together with members of the State Employment Service and the USES regional office. Responsible representatives of general farming felt that if a solution were not evolved there would be a definite decrease in farm production by 1952. Out of that meeting came the agreement that a method should be devised for deferring key men in agricultural positions from military service to some reasonable extent. It was also felt that as more farm workers are taken for military service, farmers, having a comparatively intimate acquaintance of long standing with their county agents, might likely feel that such agents could better handle the job of farm labor recruitment than the employment service. If this were the case, there might be developing pressure to remove agricultural labor procurement from the Employment Service once more and return it to agriculture.

HAWAII POSSIBILITIES

Insofar as Hawaii is concerned, there appears to be no anticipated shortage of harvest labor in 1951 and, according to published figures in December 1950, there were some 17,000 unemployed persons of whom 6,000 are Filipino agricultural workers (80 percent of them aliens). California is eyeing this source with considerable interest and it seems there is a possibility that recruitment of labor in Hawaii for the mainland may be undertaken under official supervision. A survey has been started there with the determination of that possibility as one of its goals. Heretofore, such private recruitment that has been carried on has been unsatisfactory in reported cases.

To send aliens from Hawaii to the mainland, many obstacles must be overcome and

plans to iron out such a procedure are now being studied. However, other thousands may be sent to California without such formalities. These include some 8,600 high school and vocational graduates who will leave school soon. In addition, according to press reports quoting official sources, there are thousands from the last 2 years' graduating classes who have never found employment. These are not included in the officially defined "unemployed" category.

The importance of farm labor in California's agriculture is indicated by the report from the farm placement chief of the State department of employment that at the peak of employment, the total farm work force was estimated at 492,000. California and the Southwest have always needed and used some kind of supplemental labor in the harvesting of crops. Chinese, Indians, Filipinos, Japanese, Hindus, and Mexicans have been used. As one authority puts it, "It is doubtful if our farmers will ever be able to get along without some type of supplemental labor in their harvesting."

MEXICAN PROBLEM

Despite the fact that most farmers, canners and packers unhesitatingly recommend Mexican farm labor, this problem, at present is a burning one and to understand it more fully some past history should be given. In 1942, the sugar-beet industry brought 1,500 Mexican nationals into California under contract for their harvest season and the present Mexican national program is an aftermath of this federally sponsored and financed program. All growers soon realized that larger numbers of such workers were a necessity and California reached its peak in their use in 1946 when 36,000 of them were placed under contract. This number has gradually decreased since the end of World War II as more domestic laborers became available until only 7,000 were working in California this year, most of them in areas close to the Mexican border.

After the close of World War II, Congress discontinued the appropriation of funds for a governmental program. The Farm Placement Service was taken from the Department of Agriculture and placed within the Department of Labor. This meant that the program on a State level was returned to the various departments of employment.

While the program was operated by the Federal Government, the agreements with Mexico and the individual contracts became more and more in favor of the worker. This trend increased after the Department of Labor took over and today, we find a contract which does not contain any semblance of the factor of worker responsibility. A prominent Southwest labor leader explains it thusly:

"Early in 1947, a simple workable agreement was reached by the growers with Mexico covering the placing of agricultural workers under contract with our Immigration Service approving and certifying as to need. It seems this agreement was too simple and workable for governmental efficiency, so in November 1947, a conference was called in El Paso, Tex., attended by Mexican officials, brass from our own Immigration Service, Department of State and United States Employment Service, together with subrepresentatives of the users of foreign labor.

"The users were allowed to meet and to offer suggestions as to details of the proposed agreement but were barred from the actual conference and finally told what the terms and conditions would be, whether they like them or not, even though the user would foot the bill. This attitude has prevailed in all subsequent negotiations and any change does not appear probable."

That this situation does exist is evidenced by the earnest appeals to the Washington departments concerned by men who voice the hope that our Government and Mexico can and will effect an improvement over the present method of obtaining Mexican farm workers this year in the United States. One suggestion is that the recent yearly agreement between Mexico and the United States should be improved, and that our Government should pay the Mexican Government, for each worker sent here, an amount to reimburse Mexico for the recruiting and transportation. The reason for emphasis in regard to Mexican nationals is because of the fact that they have been the most consistent, most readily accessible source that can be recruited in large numbers.

SUGGESTED REMEDY

A special farm labor committee, a 48-man advisory group to farm placement on the Federal level, meeting recently in Washington, D. C., gave considerable time to discussion of the Mexican labor problem and unanimously agreed to a recommendation. It is as follows:

"The present contract under the international executive agreement is completely unsatisfactory, and almost entirely inoperative, and the committee cannot state too strongly its urgent recommendation that the Department of State change its policy of recommendation and negotiation with the Mexican Government to give America agricultural equal status in such negotiation to that accorded political and commercial interests.

"The Mexican Government has consistently demanded conditions in the contract which are in excess of those afforded the Mexican worker in his homeland and better than the domestic worker enjoys in the United States. Even after an agreement has been adopted by both Governments the Mexican Government continually violates the spirit of the agreement.

"This situation, grievous as it has been to many American farmers, has been tolerated for a period of time because while it caused irreparable damage to many producers it did not constitute a serious threat to our national economy. However, we are entering a period of extreme shortages of agricultural manpower which will retard production so that a great many farmers may find themselves unable to provide the food and fiber necessary to meet the demand of our own citizenry, the Armed Forces and the peoples of friendly nations.

"Therefore, the committee recommends that in order to alleviate this serious situation, the Department of State with the aid and advice from the Mexican Labor Committee, make an immediate, realistic, and determined effort * * * to work out a new agreement in which the Mexican workers accept working conditions identical to those afforded the domestic worker and by which both parties will abide. If this is not possible, the American Government is requested to take the necessary steps, either through legislation similar to that now before Congress, or by other means, to make available to the American producers the Mexican Nationals who desire to work in the United States under the same conditions as our domestic farm workers during the present emergency."

Mexico City reports that the Mexican farm workers' attitude toward American farms is so enthusiastic that they are rushing to get over the border into the Untied States for agricultural labor opportunities without waiting for the formalities of any diplomatic decisions. If this news may be accepted, it would seem that the chief current problem is getting the Mexican Government to allow their agricultural workers to leave and the American Government to allow them to arrive.

A complete reversal of ophion are the views voiced by union officials. Their contention is that there is an adequate amount of laborers in the West and Southwest and there will remain adequate harvest workers without necessitating any influx of Mexican Nationals. They further voice the opinion that, in this area, any assumption of a forthcoming labor shortage is highly colored and genuinely inaccurate, and that proper housing would pose a problem if foreign help was admitted. The union attitude is that the general wage scale would be seriously lowered and that importation is neither desired nor needed.

WHAT CALIFORNIA'S DOING

In California, a measure has been introduced establishing an agency quite similar to the California Farm Production Council, which rendered agricultural assistance in World War II. This type of service is designed to assist farmers in providing housing and necessary supplies for farm workers, as well as to expedite the securing of many supplies necessary to maximum crop production which may be increasingly difficult to obtain. Besides surveying available workers who might be introduced from Hawaii, the State is working on a program of assistance to migratory farm workers under the direction of a special committee of 15 appointed by Gov. Earl Warren.

They have submitted a preliminary report in which they have recommended, among other things, that the State: 1. Create a permanent State board to look after the farm labor problems in all its aspects—health, housing, work conditions, etc. 2. Crack down on unscrupulous labor contractors who abuse farm workers. 3. Set up easy loan systems to help migrants buy homes of their own. 4. Tighten up State housing regulations for labor camps so that higher standards of sanitation, health, and water supply are maintained.

It is felt that by making their farm labor housing as livable as possible, by carefully planning their work so that more continuous employment may be offered, and perhaps by cooperating with neighbors in providing more continuous employment for especially desirable year-round help, farmers can offer sufficiently attractive working arrangements that many workers will not seek other types of employment.

This labor shortage gives every indication that it will start in the field and go right through to the warehouse and loading crew with skilled men such as tractor drivers, truck drivers, etc., an equal problem along with common stoop labor. Some sources feel that even though a policy and manpower board may be set up this year, much of its effect will not be reflected until 1952. In any event, in such a situation, the farmer, the canner, and the packer will have to plan his operations carefully to make the best possible use of the help which is available.

NEW INSECTICIDE PLANT

Installation of a new insecticide processing plant and branch office headquaters at Santa Maria, Calif., for the California-Spray Chemical Corporation has been completed, according to Wade Choate, the firm's district manager.

Located on Catalina Avenue, the plant is equipped with a high-capacity dust mill capable of producing up to 6,000 pounds per hour. Other plant facilities include a warehouse and office facilities.

According to Choate, the new plant will process such organics as Vapotone (tepp), Isotox (lindane), Persisto (DDT), Orthene 3D (DDD), Alltox (toxaphene), and Vapophos (parathion). It will provide freshly prepared Ortho dusts and wettable powders to growers in Santa Barbara County and adjacent areas.

STATE APPOINTS BRADEN

Joseph R. Braden, vice president of Richmond-Chase Co., San Jose, Calif., has been appointed by Gov. Earl Warren to the State water pollution control board, to complete the unexpired term of Ralph E. Sanborn, California Packing Corp., San Francisco, who resigned because of ill health.

Braden is a member of the waste disposal committee of Canners League of California, San Francisco, and is president of Santa Clara County Canners Association, a group of 14 canning companies in Santa Clara County organized for the purpose of attacking waste disposal and water-pollution problems.

He also is concerned with direction of the Canners League waste-disposal experimental plant at San Jose, where with USDA's western regional research laboratory, joint pilot-plant studies have been pursued to develop a suitable method of making usable byproducts from fruit and vegetable cannery wastes.

FEEDING CROPS

According to Allen B. Lemmon, chief, bureau of chemistry, California Department of Agriculture, it costs California farmers $1,000,000 each week to feed their crops. Sales of commercial fertilizers reached the record high of 640,000 tons during 1950. A total of 173,858 tons were reported during the last quarter of the year, the largest tonnage ever reported for any 3-month period in California, including 44,513 tons ammonium sulfate, 37,575 tons mixed commercial fertilizers, 22,248 tons ammonium nitrate, and 19,911 tons of normal superphosphate. Agricultural gymsum continued to account for the major portion of the tonnage of agricultural minerals reflecting the large usage of this mineral in the southern part of the San Joaquin Valley where much of the material is mined.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as to the telegrams which have been received from the heads of various labor organizations and from the head of the Farmers' Union, it seems to me that those telegrams bespeak an earnest and understandable anxiety over the legislation now being debated. It stands to reason that any measure whose effect may possibly be to increase the large pools of foreign labor already in this country, particularly from Mexico—about which we have recently been reading in the New York Times, the magazine Look, and other newspapers and magazines—must naturally cause all domestic labor, whether industrial or agricultural, grave fears. For this alien labor comes almost exclusively from underprivileged groups in neighboring foreign countries whose standards of pay and working conditions are far lower than accepted standards in our Nation. The presence of these multitudes of foreign workers, many of them illegally here, cannot fail to be a serious depressant on the standards of domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I help the Senator?

Mr. MORSE. I always appreciate any help I can get.

Mr. CHAVEZ. One who knows the problem, a member of the President's Commission, a religious man who has been dealing with the problem for years, sent me a telegram, which was inserted in the RECORD yesterday, but which I should like to call to the attention of my good friend from Oregon. The telegram reads as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

May I sincerely commend your efforts to amend the farm-labor measure now under Senate consideration so that it will contain at least some standards of decent working conditions and will not encourage a further influx across the border of large numbers of Mexican workers who are not needed. Having long studied the farm-labor situation in this area at first hand and in recent months as a member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in its Nationwide investigation I firmly believe that the demand for further Mexican workers is not justified. If a small number of alien workers are required immediate steps should be taken to organize our farm-labor force which in itself should be adequate for our needs. I wish you success in your noble undertaking.

Archbishop LUCEY.

He is on the ground and sees the problem daily—not in a conference with interested parties in Mexico City, but dealing with hunger and poverty, dealing with bad health, dealing with bad school conditions. He says that such labor is not needed.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Again I thank the Senator from New Mexico for this reinforcing evidence in support of the premise which I have sought to defend in this speech.

Mr. President, before I yielded to the Senator from New Mexico I was speaking of the problems which are created for our domestic labor by bringing into the country large numbers of foreign laborers. I point out that the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor discusses this situation in careful analysis and confirms the fears voiced by these labor leaders whose wires I have read.

We in the Pacific Northwest have a real problem in obtaining adequate farm labor in our peak fruit and other specialty crop harvesting seasons. But the legislation now before us is certainly not designed to help us solve our problem, as my colleague the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has made clear in his testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee and by his introduction with others of a measure very different from that now pending before the Senate.

The latter bill, as reported to the Senate, would quite clearly discriminate against my section of the country. Certainly it would discriminate against my section of the country and the Pacific Northwest unless an amendment such as that submitted by my senior colleague [Mr. CORDON] were adopted, which would establish in that area, say at the port of Portland, a port of entry for migrant workers. The Government would then undertake the responsibility and the obligation of getting the workers to the port of entry, and the farmers of my section would be allowed to make their contracts with the laborers at that point. Charges for the transportation of the workers should start at the point of entry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me emphasize the disadvantage under which the farmer from Oregon will find himself unless such an amendment is accepted. The bill was designed for the purpose of helping only farmers along the Rio Grande and in California along the Mexican border. The reception centers would be there. All a Mexican worker would have to pay would be three Mexican cents tribute to Stone & Webster of El Paso, and he could then cross the border and be available to the farmers of that area. But if the pear grower or the vegetable grower in Oregon, or Washington, or the wheat grower of the Northwest wants labor, he must go clear to the Mexican border before he can get any of those laborers, or deal with them to make a contract. So the bill is sectional in its spirit. I do not like sectional legislation. If we are to help anyone, let us help all.

Mr. MORSE. Again I am indebted to the Senator from New Mexico for his contribution to my discussion of the problem engrossing our attention. I completely agree with him, as I pointed out earlier in my remarks, in his statement that the bill discriminates against the Pacific Northwest and other sections of the country far removed from the Rio Grande. In my opinion the Senator from New Mexico is correct in stating that the effect of the bill, irrespective of its design, would be to produce great labor benefits for the people along the Rio Grande, but no fair benefits to the people of the Pacific Northwest, for example, unless such an amendment were adopted as that offered by my senior colleague, providing for a port of entry, and an obligation on the part of the Government to get the foreign workers there, thus affording an opportunity for contracts to be entered into between the farmers and the workers at the port of entry.

Again, in my opinion, the only justification that can be offered for the kind of involved subsidy, a travel subsidy, is the disjointure in the domestic supply of labor which has been caused by the defense program itself, both because of inductions into the armed services and because of "inductions," if they may be called such, into defense industries. Many of our domestic migrant workers, who usually travel the Pacific Coast from harvest field to harvest field as the harvest season changes, starting at the South and ending up at the Canadian border, are now going in large numbers into defense plants, and, as the farmers in my State tell me in communications I have received from them, that has enhanced their problem of labor shortage.

My position is that the travel expense involved should be considered a part of the cost of the defense program. I do not consider that the farmers of my State, or of Washington, or of the other States of the Pacific Northwest, should be expected to foot the cost of transportation from the Mexican border, as explained by the Senator from New Mexico, to the States of Oregon, Washington, and neighboring States, when the cause for the need of the laborers grows directly out of the defense effort itself.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In my opinion, the amendment proposed to be offered by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is an excellent

one and it would certainly make the proposed legislation much fairer. But if it is adopted, should there not be some limitation on the number of the reception centers provided for, and some definite localities indicated where they should be situated?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator from Oregon indulge me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have delved deeply into this matter. I come from the Mexican border, and am brought into contact with the problem daily. It affects the people in my State intimately. I fully agree with the Senator from Maryland that something definite should be provided. That is why I insist that an adequate investigation be made of the supply of American labor before any foreign labor is allowed to enter. If sufficient labor can be secured in Maryland, New Mexico, and Oregon, let us utilize it. I cannot see how we can be justified in bringing foreign labor to work in this country when there is a sufficient number of American laborers available. I believe we should investigate and ascertain whether a sufficient number of American laborers is available. If a sufficient number is not available, very well, let the necessary number of foreign laborers come into the United States.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has made a very meritorious point. I feel that consideration will have to be given both as to the total number needed, and also as to the location of the ports of entry.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my good friend from the Pacific coast.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Oregon if, as he understands, it was not the intention of his senior colleague in his proposed amendment to be fair with respect to the rights of farmers in every other section of the United States, as well as being fair to the farmers of the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; and I have said in my remarks that the bill in its present form discriminates against everyone except those in close proximity to the Rio Grande. I believe we have to perfect it in such a way that it will be fair to farmers everywhere in the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Then the junior Senator from Oregon agrees, does he not, that his senior colleague has no interest in sectionalism in this question at all, and that his amendment is a complete contradiction of any sectional flavor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It does away with sectionalism.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that my senior colleague is engaged in an Appropriations Committee meeting at the present time and is not present to give his own testimony, but I am sure I can testify for him that the answer to the Senator's question is an emphatic affirmative. By his amendment he has no intention whatsoever of fostering sectionalism, or discrimination in terms of sectionalism.

Mr. CAIN. If Senators generally are trying only to accommodate the reasonable need of farmers throughout the country, every Member of the Senate can find a legitimate value in the Cordon amendment.

Mr. MORSE. That is my opinion.

I am about through, Mr. President. In conclusion, it seems to me the issues involved in this bill are of such a fundamental character, both from the point of view of our national economy and from the point of view of our relations with the countries from which we are importing workers, that the bill must be considered solely from the point of view of the Nation as a whole. I feel that we must assess the problem with careful deliberation and must weigh the evidence and recommendations adduced by the President's Commission. The work of these public-spirited Commission members, of the highest reputation for character and intellectual attainment, should certainly be given very careful consideration before we enact any legislation.

Let me digress long enough to pay a personal compliment and tribute to Professor Van Hecke, formerly Dean Van Hecke. I knew him for many years in law school work. In fact, it was my pleasure to sit at his feet as a student during one summer session. I cannot imagine anyone who could be motivated with finer public spirit, and a devotion to serve the interest of his country without fear or favoritism, than professor Van Hecke. I think he has done his typically fine job as a member of the President's Commission in coming forward with a report which I believe should be studied by every agricultural group in this country.

It is plain that the pending measure does not even nearly approach answering any of the recommendations of the Commission. In fact, I think quite the opposite is true. Consequently, since time does not permit the bill being sent back to committee, I believe it should be amended in major respects on the floor of the Senate if we are to get the workers who are needed in the various sections of the country where there in fact is a short labor supply.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the Senate will give very careful consideration to the amendments which are being proposed to the bill. So far as I am concerned, I trust we will proceed with the consideration of this bill until it is finally disposed of, because if any legislative action is to be taken at this session of Congress it ought to be taken now. Therefore, the junior Senator from Oregon does not favor any postponement of the final consideration of the bill, but he does urge the adoption of the major amendments as recommended by his senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 9, after the word "from" it is proposed to strike out "foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and such countries) or from Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and insert "the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico)."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the committee amendment shall be adopted, will that preclude offering amendments to it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the committee amendment were adopted, that would foreclose the offering of any amendment to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. From the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if that is the case, I submit to the committee amendment my amendment marked "4-25-51-J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and to insert the following:

SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Holland	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	Nixon
Cain	Jenner	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	McCarran	Thye
Ecton	McCarthy	Tobey
Ellender	McClellan	Watkins
Ferguson	McFarland	Wherry
Frear	McKellar	Wiley
Fulbright	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 1, line 9. This amendment, if agreed to, would not be open to amendment unless the vote by which it was agreed to were reconsidered. An amendment proposed as a substitute for the entire section will not be in order until the committee amendments have been disposed of, and when the offering of individual amendments is in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the time the first committee amendment was stated by the clerk I made a parliamentary inquiry, as to whether or not, in the event the committee amendment were agreed to, I could call up individual amendments I had prepared. I was informed that I could not. Do I understand correctly that after all the committee amendments have been disposed of, amendments which I have prepared and which I intended to propose will be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment in the nature of a substitute for section 501 will be in order when the committee amendments have been acted on. However, any amendment to a committee amendment should be offered when the committee amendment is under consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was why I had the amendments printed, and why I stated that I intended to propose them. Do I understand correctly that after the committee amendments have been disposed of, whether approved or disapproved, the amendments I intend to propose will be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will depend on what is embraced in the proposed amendments. If an amendment were confined to the subject matter of a committee amendment, it would be in order, but it would have to be offered while the committee amendment was under consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 1, beginning with line 6, to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And then to continue with the rest of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That carries it beyond the purpose of the committee amendment. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the Senator's amendment is not now in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the moment. It will be in order later, but not at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 5, to insert after "United States," the words "under legal entry";

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, is there a committee amendment on page 3?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment now being considered is on page 2 of the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The amendment was, on page 3, line 15, after the word "for", to strike out "expenses incurred by it in the recruitment and transportation of workers under this title in such amounts, not to exceed $20 per worker, as may be agreed upon by the United States and such employer" and insert "essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed $20 per worker."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

There are several amendments to the amendment lying on the table. The Senator from New Mexico has one.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if I properly understand the parliamentary situation, we are now considering the amendment on page 3, line 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. May I inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether he desires to offer his amendment to change the dollar figure in line 23 of the committee amendment? I take it that such an amendment would be in order at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I intend to offer my amendment H relating to page 3, line 23. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "$20" and insert "$200."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, whether we adopt this amendment or not, it would appear to me that the question is whether the purpose of the bill is to provide agricultural labor for the farmers so as to make it easier for them to produce and make a good profit, or whether we intend the bill to be a measure to aid the country in producing more food and fiber. If it is the latter, as I suppose it to be, we should make labor available to whatever section of the country needs it. I fear that if the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico were adopted farmers far away from the Mexican border would not get labor, because, very obviously, a farmer who had a crop of fruit to pick would not want to pay a transportation expense of $200 to and from the port of entry. So, if the purpose of the bill is to aid in the production and harvesting of crops, we should make the labor available in whatever areas of the country it might be needed.

The senior Senator from Oregon has an amendment which would cover that point.

I am afraid that if we adopted a requirement that the farmer had to pay up to $200, unless that were the average cost for the whole country we would find most of the labor within a couple of hundred miles of the Rio Grande and the Mexican border, and Minnesota, Washington, and Oregon would find themselves quite short. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will explain why his amendment would provide labor at a cheaper cost in various States other than those near the Mexican border.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have been working in this body for many years with the Senator from Vermont, and I have yet to find him wrong. He might reach an incorrect conclusion. I tried to state what I had in mind, and to make myself understood, in connection with the amendment which I have offered, fully agreeing with the remarks of the Senator from Vermont that all farmers should be helped. I have that in mind, and I want to accomplish that purpose, either by what I think might be the best way of doing it, through my

amendment, or possibly by accepting the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I have no pride of authorship. I want to carry out the idea that all farmers in the United States should be helped. Whether by my amendment or by some other amendment, I want to reach that result.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am quite sure the Senator from New Mexico has exactly the same idea in mind that others of us have. I am fearful, however, in this instance, that he is in error in seeking to add this amendment to the bill. I ask him to go back to the beginning of section 502 and notice the first sentence to which the several subparagraphs refer. I read:

SEC. 502. No workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States—

(1) to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts;

(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed $20 per worker.

According to the Senator's amendment and according to the committee amendment, the change, I believe, would result in an obligation on each employer up to $200 for all expenses connected with the transportation of each worker. That would be an obligation which each employer would have to undertake.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. Would not the Senator then agree that this amendment would simply guarantee that the inequity which the Senator has indicated he feels should not exist, must exist?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It must exist. At least it would put the employer on some kind of parity with the man who pays only $20, so far as getting labor is concerned. At least if he was willing to pay that much to get the labor, he would not be handicapped.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to point out to the Senator from New Mexico that the $20 provision in the bill relates to the payment for transportation and subsistence within Mexico. I know the Senator wants to be realistic. The highest figure that such a cost could reach would average around $35 a person. Now the Senator wants to make it $200, which is about six times what the highest average cost could be.

Mr. CORDON. I hope that after careful consideration the Senator from New Mexico will withdraw the amendment. I do not believe it carries out his intention.

Mr. ELLENDER. The provision applies to Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know about that. If that is what it means, very well, but I do not interpret it that way. I do not know of anyone who would be willing to spend $20 for food for this type of labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. The $20 is intended to reimburse the United States Government for the cost of transportation from centers within Mexico to centers within the continental limits of the United States near the border. That is what it would result in, and nothing else.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The item came under discussion during the Senate hearings. A statement was made by Mr. Ernest Falk, manager of the Northwest Horticultural Council, and representing the Northwest Agricultural Labor Association at Yakima, Wash. Perhaps some of the Senators from the Northwest know Mr. Falk. Mr. Magleby, representing the Northwest Agricultural Labor Association, of Walla Walla, Wash., also testified.

Mr. Falk before the committee made this statement which appears at page 83 of the hearings:

Mr. FALK. And we would assure a constant complete utilization of the force. It contemplates that we would pay the expense of transporting them from these various areas when they are once brought to the Northwest.

The CHAIRMAN. To a given place?

Mr. FALK. To a reception center, and we would take it on from there.

The CHAIRMAN. And you would expect someone else, that is, probably the Government, to pay for the transportation from the border to this center wherever it is fixed?

Mr. FALK. We would very much like to have that. In our statement we do make an additional proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, proceed.

This is the significant part of his testimony:

Mr. FALK. If we were required to pick these workers up at reception centers at, or near, the Mexican border it would cost us approximately $50 each way or $100 per man to get them to and from the border, then these moves within the area already referred to, will cost at least $30 per man for transportation and subsistence. Then, Senate bill 984 provides that we reimburse the Government for recruiting expense up to $20 per man.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Mexico would make the figure $200 a man.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me see what was testified. I do not want to starve the laborer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The laborer would not get the money.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The testimony continues:

This would mean that under such a program it would cost us a total of $150 a man in addition to camp costs and food and wage compliance.

Mr. Magleby of the Walla Walla pea growers tells me that in 1948 each of the Mexican nationals they brought in cost them $2.72 per man workday in addition to their wages. They used 540 Mexican nationals.

He then goes into further statistics. I personally prefer the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I am hopeful that the Senator from New Mexico will withdraw his amendment. He could ask unanimous consent later to reoffer his amendment, even after the committee amendment was adopted. I believe it would be helpful to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to expedite the passing of the bill, which I know is important, and with the understanding that, if necessary, I may present the pending amendment at a later time, but also with the hope that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon may be adopted, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico withdraws his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment at page 3, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 2, after "501 (5)", it is proposed to strike out the comma and "an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the cost of returning such worker" and insert "and is apprehended within the United States, an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have a copy of the amendment which the Senator from New Mexico intends to offer to section 501. May I ask the Senator a question with reference to the amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be delighted to answer it, if I can.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I observe that it reads as follows:

On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and insert the following:

"SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized."

It seems to me that it would be rather vague, and difficult of enforcement, unless the Senator should amend it so as to provide that there shall be a finding by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was intended so to provide. One of the objections to the pending measure is that any certification made with reference to labor—in this instance, alien labor—shall be made by local agencies and States.

The purpose of the amendment is to protect domestic labor by making it a national proposition. I should be very glad, because it is what I had in mind, to adopt language providing that the proper agency, which is the Department of Labor, should make certification as to the adequacy or inadequacy of the supply of labor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Inasmuch as the first sentence——

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator that I have another amendment which would take care of what the Senator has in mind. It is amendment D. Will the Senator turn to the bill at page 4?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator does not intend to offer the amendment, does he?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I intend to offer it. I thought it would take care of the situation. However, I think the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming is a good one. I believe that in the amendment to which the Senator refers there should be inserted language specifying that the Secretary of Labor, or an agency which Congress may designate, shall make the certification of adequacy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to make an additional suggestion. Inasmuch as the first sentence of the Senator's amendment refers to the Secretary of Agriculture and authorizes assistance in the production of agricultural commodities and products, as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, it might possibly be the Secretary of Agriculture who should make the finding.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so. The only reason the Secretary of Labor was suggested was that some discussion had been had on the floor, and it was felt that inasmuch as this bill referred to labor as such, farm labor being the type of labor considered, it should come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. My only purpose was to call to his attention what I deemed to be an omission.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Where would the Senator suggest that the new language be inserted, and what would be the new language?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that in line 6, after the word "if" the words "the Secretary shall find that" be inserted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are referring, of course, to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should think so. Perhaps the Senator might want to make it the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to the distinguished Senator that the Secretary of Labor already has the power to do this.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then it should be the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I was about to ask for a little more information along the lines of the amendment which the Senator from Wyoming suggested.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if we can get through with the committee amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think that is what we should do, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for clarifying the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 2.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there no other amendment before the Senate? What amendment is being discussed?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understood that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming was about to leave the Chamber, and that he wished to make a suggestion.

Mr. WHERRY. Was he discussing some amendment which may later be proposed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator from Nebraska, because it was necessary for me to leave the Chamber I merely addressed an inquiry to the Senator from New Mexico with respect to an amendment which he proposes to offer later, and made a suggestion with respect to it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to have my good friend from Wyoming, who knows how to frame correct legal language in legislation, make a notation so that when I am ready to offer my amendment I may have the benefit of his suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 2

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether he expects to offer his substitute. I do not wish to suggest that it be offered, but I happen to have had prepared several copies of the bill showing the amendments intended to be offered by several Senators. On my copy of the bill, with the proposed amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, I have indicated a proposed amendment of section 503. I simply call it to his attention in case he desires to offer it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there are no committee amendments to section 503. We are now dealing with section 502.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the only amendments now in order are committee amendments or amendments to committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 4, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "shall" and insert "may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere" and insert "the Republic of Mexico."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 12, to change the section number from "508" to "507."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 17, after the word "amended", to strike out "horticultural employment, cotton ginning and compression, crushing of oilseeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonable agricultural products."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 21, after the word "employer", to strike out "includes associations or other groups of employers" and insert "shall include an association, or other group, of employers, but only if (A) those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations undertaken by it pursuant to section 502, or (B) the Secretary determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of such obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 508. Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws, to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in section 507, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in such agricultural employment under such conditions and for such time as he, the Attorney General shall specify.

The amendment was agreed to.

The President pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if the Secretary of Labor finds that a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement as to this amendment. It is simple. Either we are willing to treat American labor on an equal basis with foreign labor, or we are not. I wish to take my stand and to make it clear that in any labor legislation we should first concern ourselves with the welfare of our own United States citizens before considering employment opportunities for anyone else.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Appropriations of the Appropriations Committee, I have come to the conclusion that we have not made a

reasonable attempt to recruit domestic farm workers or to pay them decent wages. I am sure that if a national farm labor recruitment program were to be undertaken we would certainly have a sufficient labor force to meet the goals of our agricultural production.

I have been a stanch supporter of fair and reasonable prices for the farmer. Likewise I have fought for fair and reasonable wages for the American worker. The producer should have a reasonable profit. In that respect I am a capitalist. The worker should realize a reasonable income because he is also a capitalist. In our economy the worker and the farmer are dependent upon each other. I feel that all American workers, regardless of whether they are office workers, miners, oil drillers, railroad workers, or Government employees, should have decent standards of living. I cannot allow myself to think that because an individual decides to follow agricultural pursuits he should be regarded as an inferior type of worker. To me the manual laborer is just as important in our society as the white-collar worker.

Given decent wages and conditions, hundreds of thousands of American farm workers would be available. Today there are available in Puerto Rico 50,000 United States farm workers who are good enough to become cannon fodder and to be slaughtered on foreign battlefields; good enough to have their legs amputated and to be at Walter Reed Hospital; good enough to die in Korea; to fight with the marines on Guadalcanal and on Okinawa, but discriminated against by legislation which would import foreign labor to their detriment. I say such discrimination is un-American.

I want Senators to listen to the argument and take sides on the question, so that noses may be counted. I say we should not discriminate against our own people. I prefer an American laborer to any foreign laborer, I care not whence he comes. If an American laborer is available, and it is not desired to give him an opportunity for employment, I want Senators to say so by their votes this afternoon. If they prefer foreign laborers to American laborers, one of whom might even today be receiving a decoration for heroism in Korea, very well, let them say so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the amendment should be adopted and the Secretary should find that there is a sufficient number of workers in Hawaii or Puerto Rico, let us say, what would be the mechanics by which a Nebraska farmer could get a laborer to Nebraska to work on a beet farm there?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have always been extremely resourceful, even in connection with our labor, and I am sure the Secretary of Labor would find some method by which to get such a laborer to Nebraska or elsewhere where his services are needed.

Mr. WHERRY. Would such a laborer have the same opportunity of transportation being furnished him that is extended now to Mexicans under the contracts which are made with them? I am speaking simply of the mechanics.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is my intention that he should have it. He should have the same opportunity. I think American workmen should have a priority. Therein lies the difference between the proponents of the bill and myself.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that in my State laborers are needed in the sugar-beet fields. If the amendment should be adopted, and the Secretary should make a finding that there was plenty of labor in Hawaii, how could the farmer in Nebraska get into contact with the laborer in Hawaii and get him to a Nebraska farm to work in the sugar-beet field?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator from Nebraska, or the Senators from any other States, that if work is made available for American laborers, they will get to the location of the employment somehow, provided starvation wages are not paid. I know no one wants starvation wages to be paid.

Mr. WHERRY. As in the case of any other laborer, he would have to make his own contract.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me go a little further. What is wrong with the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. I did not say there was anything wrong with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not accusing the Senator of having said there was.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to obtain information with respect to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is wrong with it? If we were to say to the Secretary of Agriculture, "Look into the matter of farm labor; we need it," and he found that American labor could not be obtained but that he could get farm labor from Mexico, the provisions of the legislative bill by the Senator from Louisiana would prevail. All I am asking is that we take care of our own American labor, if there is any way to do it. If we can make American labor available, very well. I am against legislation that picks out one country from which to secure labor which might be subjected to exploitation. I do not like "one country legislation," except for our own country, and in that case I want it to apply to the entire country.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether there is now any restriction on citizens of Hawaii coming to this country, or on citizens of Puerto Rico from coming to this country now. My understanding is that they can come in and go out freely.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They certainly can.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So what is the use of the amendment that applies to Puerto Rico and Hawaii? There is no restraint against citizens of Puerto Rico or Hawaii coming into continental United States now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no restraint at all, except that involved in their ability to pay their way. There is no restraint in the matter of buying mink coats, but many people do not have the necessary $8,000. There is no restraint in the matter of boarding an airplane at San Juan, P. R., or Ponce, and coming to the United States, but many people do not have sufficient money to take that journey.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understood the Senator from New Mexico a moment ago—and if I am in error I want to be corrected—he said in answer to the Senator from Nebraska, who asked him how the Nebraska farmer was going to get the imported labor to work for him in his beet fields, that if work was available there was no need to worry, that the workers would find their own way to reach it. What is the need of legislation, if they can come here without restraint, if they can find their own way here? In that case there is no need for the proposed legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think many of them can, but many of them probably cannot.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is, the Senator is proposing to pay their way from Hawaii to the United States?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would pay the expenses of a Puerto Rican or a Hawaiian before I would pay the expenses of one of His Majesty's subjects from Jamaica, yes. If necessary, I would do so. We did so during the war. What is wrong with doing so now?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Without the adoption of the amendment an employer could pay the expenses of a laborer from Hawaii to the United States or from Puerto Rico to the United States. He does not need the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico to do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes, he does.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the point I am trying to have cleared up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I wish to make is that the Government should be made conscious of the fact that there is American labor available, and that it should be utilized, and the Government should be responsible for such utilization. That is why the amendment is necessary.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator now propose to subsidize these workers by paying their transportation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico contends that there is as much need for the amendment to the proposed legislation as there is for the legislation itself. If the Senator from Iowa is correct, and laborers can come in from Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and if they are available for farm work here, and the farmer from Iowa is willing to bring them in, then why pass legislation providing for the importing of thousands and thousands of foreign laborers?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My point is that the proposed legislation is not needed for the people of Puerto Rico and Hawaii. So far as the Mexican situation is concerned, an international question of law is involved. The immigration laws are involved. We must authorize entry under proper restrictions, otherwise we will have the wetback problem again, and illegal entrance and

complete breakdown of the immigration laws. As I understand, the only necessity for the bill is that there be proper compliance with our immigration laws, under certain control conditions, so that persons will come into this country legally and will leave the country legally. That is the only reason for the bill. We do not need it for Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know it is not needed for Hawaii and Puerto Rico, but I still insist that even in dealing with international matters some consideration should be given to our own citizens who may need work.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The employer can go to Hawaii and secure laborers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes, certainly he can; but he will not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator intend that the Government shall subsidize the workers by paying their transportation from Hawaii to the United States? Does the Senator intend that the Government shall pay the expenses?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If it is necessary to subsidize the worker by paying his transportation, yes, and, as proposed in the bill, even to the extent of $20.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The theory of the bill is that there shall be no Government subsidy; that employers shall pay the whole expense.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator that under the theory of the bill there will be a breaking down of American labor. Under the theory of the bill there will be slave labor. We have gotten away from such a thing in New Mexico and Louisiana long, long ago, and it is not coming back.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me make a further point. In our international relations we should treat all foreign countries alike. Our international relations should be as the phrase itself implies—international relations. We should not show preference to any country by leaving it out of the effects of the proposed legislation. It is not right to reach formal agreements with only one country, establishing standards and conditions for the importation of its agricultural workers. In this instance the only reason why one country was picked out was because the available labor in that country was hungry and poor, because need existed there because in that country there was a class of labor which could be employed at starvation wages. However, eventually the use of that labor at such low wages and under such bad living conditions will interfere completely with our economic system, will break down the thing we love to brag about, the American standards, will establish different standards and conditions for imported agricultural workers, and will leave the door wide open for other countries to send their surplus labor into the United States. Therefore, all importations of foreign labor should be made under formal agreements, and then there will be no danger of having international tensions later on.

Last, but not least, I should like to call attention to the fact that in my home State, more American Indians could be recruited if decent working conditions and reasonable wages were made available to them. There are approximately 52,000 Navajos in the States of New Mexico and Arizona. We have perhaps 36,000 Pueblo Indians there. We also have the Mescaleros, the Zunis, and the Apaches. Yesterday I inserted in the RECORD telegrams from the governors of various of the Pueblos who are opposed to the original Ellender bill.

Mr. President, it is not easy for me to oppose the Ellender bill. It would have been much easier for me to keep quiet and thus satisfy a few greedy people in my home State. But I refuse to do that. When many people of my State have to leave New Mexico in order to find work in the sugar-beet fields of Colorado or Wyoming or to herd sheep in Montana, simply because a few greedy, selfish slave drivers would bring in to supplant them at their homes, Mexican labor that is starving to death, I will not agree that that should be done. I would rather lose my seat in the Senate than agree to have that done.

Mr. President, the issue is clear. Let Senators vote on it one way or the other, and let their stand on it be clearly understood. If Senators prefer Argentine beef, to American beef, let them vote for cheap foreign labor, as provided in this bill. If Senators favor the importation of the foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico, when we have spent $120,000,000 to keep that disease away from our borders, let them so vote, but likewise they should vote for the cancer bill, because it affects human beings and the basis of human life and the entire economic system of our country and the things that Lincoln stood for.

Senators who favor the appropriation of funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to eradicate the Mexican fruit fly, should not vote for this bill, because the effect of the bill on health conditions and on labor and on the economic life of our country will be more disastrous than all the damage which can be done by the Mexican fruit fly. Senators who wish to exterminate the foreign boll-weevil should help us exterminate a thing which is much more dangerous and can be much more disastrous. Let us not take advantage of human misery.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have studied the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Mexico. It does not propose to amend the bill in the manner the Senator from New Mexico has just been stating it will. In other words, I cannot understand how his remarks and his charges have any connection at all with a vote against the amendment. I fail to understand how a Senator who votes against the amendment will be expressing opposition to labor opportunities and proper laboring conditions for American citizens. The remarks of the Senator from New Mexico are one thing, but his amendment is quite another.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was stating my opinion. If the amendment does what the Senator from Minnesota says it does, he should have no objection to voting for the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask another question about the mechanics of the amendment. Let us say that the Secretary of Labor finds that there is in Hawaii a surplus of farm labor—to the extent, say, of 20,000 persons; and let us say that ample information is made available in Hawaii in regard to agricultural jobs which are available in the United States; but let us say that none of the 20,000 surplus laborers in Hawaii wish to come to Nebraska to work, but, instead, wish to remain in Hawaii. Let us say that a similar condition is found to exist in Puerto Rico; in other words, despite the fact that those workers, if they come to this country to work, are offered regular American wages, the regular scale of wages, nevertheless they refuse to come. Perhaps I am stating a theoretical case which never will occur, but I am worried about the question of getting the needed labor in Nebraska.

Certainly our farmers are willing to pay the going wage for agricultural labor. I know of no one in Nebraska who is in favor of slave labor. Our people pay the going wage.

Let us say that the Secretary of Labor finds that a surplus of labor exists in Hawaii or in Puerto Rico, but let us assume that those surplus laborers do not take advantage of the opportunity to work in the United States. Will that mean that the amendment, if adopted, will not permit the Government or contractors to make negotiations on an international basis with Mexico to obtain Mexican labor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the amendment means just the reverse. Under the conditions the Senator from Nebraska has outlined, if the surplus workers in Hawaii decide for their own reasons to remain in Hawaii and if the surplus workers in Puerto Rico decide for their own reasons to remain there, even under conditions which are much worse than the conditions under which they would work in the United States, then the Secretary of Labor will certify to that fact, and then contracts such as those the Senator from Nebraska has mentioned can be made, under the provisions of this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mechanically it will be a rather difficult thing to do, will it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the worker does not want to come to the United States, our farmers simply will be unable to have the benefit of his labor.

Mr. WHERRY. However, it would be difficult to have the survey made and to demonstrate the situation in regard to such a labor surplus. In other words, it would seem that that would be a rather difficult job for the Secretary of Labor to perform in the case of Hawaii.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think it is a big job to protect American labor and American industry.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not quarreling about that at all; that is not the reason why I am asking the question.

On the other hand, if a contract is entered into with Mexico on an international basis, the Mexican labor will be brought to the border, and there will be proper distribution, for the Mexican authorities know how to contact those laborers. After all, they have been doing that for many years.

However, let us assume that under the provisions of this amendment, if it is agreed to, it is determined that we do not wish to contract any longer for such labor until we find whether there is a surplus of labor in Hawaii; and suppose we rely upon the Secretary of Labor to make that determination. I wish to know whether, in making that determination, the length of time required to make it or the mechanics involved or any other factor in that connection will result in blocking negotiations with Mexico, if in the final analysis it is determined that there is a surplus of 20,000 laborers in Hawaii.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment will not do that.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I wish to know.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am as anxious as is any other Senator that American farmers shall have the labor they need. All I am asking by the amendment is that we find out whether sufficient labor is already available. If it is not, then let us import it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not troubled about the labor we have in the United States; I am referring to the labor that may be available in Puerto Rico or in Hawaii. If this amendment is adopted, we shall have to determine what the situation is in Puerto Rico and in Hawaii.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Secretary of Labor will have to make that finding and will have to certify as to that situation before we shall be entitled to contract for the importation of Mexican labor. If the Secretary of Labor finds there is a surplus of labor in Puerto Rico or Hawaii, we shall be unable to make such contracts for the importation of Mexican labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. General Hershey sends out his agents, and they have no difficulty whatever in saying, "Come here, Manuel; we are going to ship you to Fort Benning, and later on you will go to Korea." In view of that system, what is wrong with having the Secretary of Labor, for whose Department we appropriate millions of dollars, operate in a similar way in serving an even better purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from New Mexico has a very laudable motive and I believe that we should employ all available American farm labor before we import any. However, I recall that each fall a few thousand Canadians come into Maine to help harvest the potato crop; they come into Maine year after year for that purpose. They are experts at that job. I wonder whether, under the provisions of the Senator's amendment, if it is adopted, those Canadians could be admitted for that purpose, so long as there were Puerto Ricans or Hawaiians who were willing to go to Maine to help harvest potatoes.

Furthermore, would not the amendment call for a formal agreement between the United States and Canada in that connection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. One of my objections to the bill is just that. I wish the agreement and the law might affect Canada as well as Mexico. If it did, I think possibly we would have a little happier situation and possibly a somewhat healthier one, because Canadians could not be treated the way the poor Mexican is treated. He is up against it, I may tell the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The Canadian receives the prevailing wage, under suitable living conditions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. He enjoys better living conditions than the Mexican.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question about that. But I would still hate to have them precluded. They come for a month's time only.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not want them.

Mr. AIKEN. We have to obtain permission. In New England, it is necessary to obtain the approval of the Secretary of Labor and of the Immigration Service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to go even further than the Senator. It happens to be the result of provisions of the bill that Mexico only is affected. I am trying to take care of American citizens, but I would join with the Senator in making the terms of the bill broader, so that they would include Canada.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may point out to the Senator that his amendment includes Canada.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, it includes the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. AIKEN. The Western Hemisphere includes Canada. I was disturbed about the Canadians.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, addressing myself briefly to another line of argument, I may say that about 3 weeks ago, the United States, which is leading the world in an effort to bring about democracy, which sermonizes to the world about democracy and fair play and decent living conditions, and this and that, which is able to appropriate billions of dollars to help other countries, was represented at a meeting here with the so-called Latin-American countries, for the purpose of endeavoring to reach an agreement on military assistance. In view of the present world situation, I agreed with the purposes of that conference, and with what was being attempted. But I wish the time might come when we would have agreements whose purpose would be the uplifting of mankind instead of its destruction. If our country can make an agreement with the Latin-American countries relative to matters which could mean the destruction of human life, why is it necessary that, in dealing with labor, we deal with one nation only? Why? The answer is easy. It is found in the necessities of the human beings across the border. It is necessary for them to eat. It is the old, old story of pelf and greed, which seek to exploit the needy. I repeat, I love the standards of living of the United States. I wish to continue to enjoy them. They are grand. We are endeavoring to carry out the basic concepts of those who dared to write the words, "We, the people of the United States." We are endeavoring to effectuate all the noble purposes of those who signed the Declaration of Independence, of those who, like Thomas Jefferson, dared to think and to believe that all men were created equal, of those who believed in the fundamental tenets of Andrew Jackson, of those who would put into effect the philosophy of Jefferson, of those who believed in the deeds and the words of the humble and meek man who was murdered at Ford's Theater in Washington, a man who did away with human slavery—in a word, those who believe in carrying out the noble purposes of those who are apostles of real Americanism.

Mr. President, I leave the subject there. No motives will be questioned. I am making a statement of my opinion and of how I feel about the matter. I still believe in majority rule, I still believe in this body's deciding for itself. My purpose in discussing the bill and in discussing the amendment is to contribute my opinion for what it may be worth in assisting other Senators finally to come to a definite conclusion as to what they should do. I thank the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a good way to scuttle this bill would be to adopt the pending amendment. To begin with, the Secretary of Labor is now authorized to recruit domestic workers. Under the law he is in a position to recruit Hawaiians, Puerto Ricans, and those who live in the Virgin Islands. When the committee considered this bill, we intended to cover all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, including Canada, Hawaii, and the islands off the eastern coast of our country. During the hearings it was brought out that under the existing law there is a procedure which has been in effect for quite some time in regard to recruiting workers from offshore, such as the residents of the Bahamas and Jamaica, as well as Canadians. The method pursued as to those islands was that the United States Employment Service should certify that within a certain period there was a scarcity of domestic farm labor. After the certification was made, employers could then go to the islands to make individual contracts with the islanders residing in the Bahamas and in Jamaica, and could do the same with Canadians. The plan has worked very well. Employers furnish subsistence and pay the cost of transporting workers from their places of residence to the United States. In most cases they are sent back at their own expense. The contract is signed and executed by the employer under existing laws. There can be no necessity for disturbing that method of dealing with these foreign

workers. As I have said on many occasions, it is necessary to enact the pending measure, because Mexico has refused to enter into agreements similar to those which can be entered into with Canada, Jamaica, the Bahamas, and other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

In other words, with Mexico refusing to continue the program under the law as it now exists, our employers will be precluded after June 30 from contracting for workers in Mexico as has heretofore been the case; therefore, the necessity for enacting this legislation without delay.

My distinguished friend from New Mexico has been pounding along with the argument that domestic workers should be taken care of first. I agree to that. The whole Committee on Agriculture and Forestry agreed to that, and we have placed in the bill a provision, under section 503, which states that—

> No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Director of State Employment Security for such area has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

In other words, it is incumbent on the Administrator first to see to it that there are no domestic laborers in the area, which would include Indians and other Americans, who are able, willing, and qualified to do the work. If he should find there is not sufficient domestic labor, then and only in that event the certification can be made which would permit the importation of Mexican workers. In addition to that, Mr. President, we have heard a great deal about slave wages. But the bill provides that "the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed."

That language simply means that the employees who come from Mexico must be paid at least the prevailing wage as is paid to domestic workers who are employed locally.

Mr. President, this bill authorizes the signing of contracts between American employers and Mexican workers when the latter are brought from within Mexico to the United States. I have read to the Senate on several occasions the provisions of the agreement. Among the provisions which I am sure will be incorporated in future agreements will be the one which is now in the present individual work contract as to the payment of wages, as follows:

> The employer shall pay the worker the prevailing wage rate paid to domestic agricultural workers for similar work and in the manner paid within the area of employment, or the rate specified on the last page of this contract, whichever is the greater.

With reference to the latter clause on wages, specified on the last page of the contract, the wages are agreed to in advance, and the minimum wage rate is determined by employers in the locality, under the auspices of the United States Employment Service, and in all cases the actual wage is written into the contract so that the worker knows what he will receive before he leaves the place on the border.

The bill further provides that it is up to the employee as to whom he works for and what kind of work he will engage in.

As I pointed out in the earlier part of my remarks last week—and I may say this is the fifth day we have been considering this bill—there was a provision in the old contract which forced the employer to furnish a bond for the return of the Mexican laborers he employed. That was not desired by the employer, for the simple reason that there was no way by which the employer could make the worker remain on the farm. If the worker left, the employer could be made not only to forfeit the bond, but also to reimburse the Government for the entire cost of returning the employee to Mexico. It was shown that in many cases where the bond was forfeited, employees had already returned to Mexico, but it was not done in accordance with the Immigration Service regulations. They wanted certification that he had returned, and they wanted evidence of the fact, but in many cases, although letters were presented to show that the employee had returned, the bonds were forfeited nonetheless.

Under the terms of this bill, the United States Government, acting through the Labor Department, the Immigration Service, and the health authorities, will make selection of Mexican employees who are eligible to work in the United States. Those employees are brought to the border and there a contract is entered into voluntarily between the employer and the employees, with the understanding that the Government will guarantee to each worker the performance of the contract insofar as wages and transportation are concerned. That is why it is necessary that authority be granted for an agency of Government to enter into this kind of a program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand the Senator, the function of the Department of Labor is to go to Mexico and recruit employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who makes the contract?

Mr. ELLENDER. The workers and the employers. I do not know that my good friend heard what I said, but before certification can be made, which would be followed by recruitment, two things must be found, namely, that sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified, are not available.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Qualified to labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, that they are not available at the place and time needed to perform the work requested; second, that the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is the period of time as to domestic wages?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under the bill we are now considering, the certification that domestic workers are not available will be made by the director of State employment security. But I desire to state to my good friend that there are two or three amendments which will be presented to change that provision by designating the Secretary of Labor to make the certification, so that certification can be made on a national level.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator pardon me for a moment on that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the chairman of the committee willing to accept such an amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall leave that to the Senate. I am directed by the committee to present its findings, but I will say to my good friend that I shall urge no serious objection. On the contrary, it is my purpose to present to the Senate a press release issued in Mexico by the Mexican Government to the effect that unless a provision of that kind is in the bill, the Mexican Government will not enter into any contracts. In other words, the Mexican Government is desirous that certification of need in this country be established on a national basis rather than on a State basis. The press release reads in part:

> 3. Mexico will not agree to State government agencies assuming any responsibility in connection with the operation of the bracero program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator from Louisiana thinks that some consideration should be given to the state of mind of the Mexican Government. I certainly would recommend for his consideration, before final determination, some of the statements made by American citizens on the same subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. Further to answer the question of my good friend, as I have indicated, two things would have to be determined on a national level should this amendment prevail, as it possibly will.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the Senator would say "Yes."

Mr. WHERRY. Which amendment is going to prevail?

Mr. ELLENDER. An amendment is pending to place certification on a national rather than on a State level. I am sure it would undercut many of the arguments which my good friend has been making for the past few days.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it would improve the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator knew about it right along. He was aware of the fact that the amendments were pending, and he knew my attitude toward them. I pointed out that before any Mexican labor could be recruited, if the amendment pending with reference to placing the certification on a national basis is adopted, the Secretary of Labor would be bound to determine whether or not there was sufficient domestic labor available to do the work. If he found that there was sufficient domestic labor available Mexican labor

could not be recruited. On the other hand, if he found that there was not a sufficient amount of domestic labor available, he would have to take the further step of finding that the employment of such foreign workers would not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When we have records and statistics showing that local labor in the States of Texas and New Mexico is paid $1.75 a day, and Mexican labor is paid $3 a day, what can we expect?

Mr. ELLENDER. My good friend refers to wetbacks. To my knowledge, he has read into the RECORD, at least four times, a telegram from some veterans in Corpus Christi.

Mr. CHAVEZ. From a Catholic archbishop.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; from some veterans.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will look at the telegram again he will see that the veterans discuss wetbacks. It is true that the situation on the Mexican border at times is very unsatisfactory. The so-called wetbacks swim across the Rio Grande. They know they are violating the law. They want to work for an American employer. In many instances the employer hides them out and works them secretly, because he knows the wetback is illegally in the country. Therefore an employee working under such conditions would be willing to work for a bare subsistence.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator were as well acquainted with conditions around the Rio Grande as are the junior Senator from New Mexico and the senior Senator from New Mexico he would not say that the wetbacks swim across the river. Sometimes there is not sufficient water in the river to cover their feet. They simply walk across.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would they then be called drybacks, instead of wetbacks?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Drybacks and wetbacks.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat that the amendment which is now pending is absolutely unnecessary, in that the Department of Labor now has the authority to recruit domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have inquired along that line of the Labor Department, particularly its Employment Service. I may say that I have been closer to the problem of labor and what it is supposed to represent than the average member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have been very close to it, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana. I have helped appropriate millions of dollars which they get for employment. When an inquiry was made of Mr. Goodwin, of the Employment Service, as to what they had done, he answered that they had done very little with reference to finding out about American labor. What does the Senator think we can expect from the Department under such conditions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry that the distinguished Senator has so little respect for the Department of Labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After dealing with them for 10 or 12 years, I have come to that conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think if the Secretary of Labor is empowered to do the things that we propose he should do, he will do his duty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I say that after we have given millions of dollars to investigate unemployment or employment—and Congress does it every year—and they still cannot come before a committee and give us definite information as to what labor is available, why should we not lose a little faith in them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am trying to understand the pending amendment. I should like to ask a question, and perhaps the Senator's answer will help me to understand it. Is it not the purpose of the amendment to provide the same protection and services to American workers, including those from Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and other areas in the Western Hemisphere, as the measure proposes to give exclusively to Mexican workers?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not interpret it that way, for the reason that the bill simply provides a method of importing Mexican labor. Under the law today the Secretary can recruit all the domestic labor that is required. The amendment as now presented does not change the present set-up. As I understand it does not assist domestic labor. It does not assist Puerto Rican or any other labor, but I presume the Senator will call up another of his amendments which in effect provides for a subsidy of domestic labor as well as Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, and other offshore labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from New Mexico were to make such a suggestion, which the Senator in his own mind anticipated, what would be the difference between that and voting for a subsidy on cotton or tobacco?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the Senator's privilege. I am trying to answer the question of my distinguished friend.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to give one answer to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Large groups engaged in agriculture in this country, utilizing offshore labor, do not want any subsidy in connection with their labor. They carry the full expense of bringing in the labor, putting up the bond, and returning the foreign laborers to their own country. They do not want to saddle their business upon the Federal Government. They do not in any way want a subsidy. It is certainly one good reason why no subsidy should be included when a large segment of agriculture which uses foreign labor does not want a subsidy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so indicated to the Senate in my opening remarks. I said relationships which now exist between employers of this country and employees in offshore islands are very satisfactory. The employers and the workers pay all the expenses. The Federal Government is not put to any extra expense at all with respect to the importation of labor by employers on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose we agree that the Federal Government does not pay one penny. Does the Senator think it is fair that the Federal Government should act in that manner? I presume the Senator agrees that that is correct. The Federal Government does not pay one penny. What difference does it make whether the Federal Government pays a part of the expenses in this connection, or whether it pays a subsidy on cotton or something else?

Mr. ELLENDER. That brings me to the next point, and that is that the bill places upon the shoulders of the employers the burden of the payment of practically all the expenses. In other words, under the terms of the bill the recruiting is done within Mexico, at certain points agreed upon by the Mexican Government and the United States Government. The expense of transportation from those points to a point determined upon in the United States will be paid by the employers, up to a maximum of $20 per worker.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. In one moment. The cost of transportation from the point within the United States, where the contracts are entered into by employers, to the place of employment, is to be paid by the employer. The Federal Government pays none of that expense. Under the proposal which will be made, I presume, by my distinguished friend——

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are now discussing taking care of American laborers, and not some amendment which I may propose in the future.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator proposes to have the Federal Government——

Mr. CHAVEZ. What amendment is being discussed at the moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is an amendment to take care of American labor. It has nothing to do with paying a subsidy to any laborers. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The question of subsidies is not involved in the Senator's amendment that is now before us; but I presume that he is going to submit such an amendment a little later.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know. Let us approach one question at a time. Let us discuss whether the Senator wants American labor or Mexican labor, or whether we are going to pay a subsidy to

foreign labor. The amendment now before the Senate deals with the question whether we want American labor or Mexican labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. If my distinguished friend does not intend to follow the pending amendment with his subsidy amendment which has been on the desk for some time, I do not see any point in the pending amendment, for the simple reason that the Secretary of Labor can now recruit domestic workers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I try to deal with each point in turn as it is reached. If the Senator were to accept this amendment, I might feel kindly enough, or pleasantly shocked enough, so that, in order to comply with his wonderful idea of getting labor to the American farmer, I might not even suggest another amendment. However, I do not promise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not want to make the bill unworkable. If the Secretary of Labor can certify that there are 50,000 workers in Hawaii, but he cannot bring them over, the certification might go so far as to say that they could be made available if the employer wanted to send for them. But I do not want the American farmer to be put in that position. I would rather follow the thinking of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that is to let the bill operate solely with respect to the Republic of Mexico. As I have stated, we have been put on notice that we cannot after June 30 recruit workers in Mexico unless a new agreement is reached between our country and Mexico. This bill does nothing but carry out the purposes of the proposed new agreement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have the greatest respect for the ability, loyalty, and patriotism of the Senator from Louisiana. However, let me ask him this question: Has he reached the point in life where he considers it necessary to sacrifice American institutions in order to comply with the wishes of a foreign government?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, to begin with, we are not doing that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason we are proposing to take this action is that we agree——

Mr. ELLENDER. It was the only way by which we could come to terms. I think it was reasonable. Mexico did not try to put anything over on us, nor did we try to put anything over on Mexico. We want to preserve the cordial relationships which now exist.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Mexican Government today has a very serious problem facing it, with respect to the wetback situation. While I was conferring with representatives from Mexico I stated on several occasions that it was my desire to assist them. This legislation is a step in the right direction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana another question. I wish he would read to the Senate any particular clause in the bill which takes care of the wetback problem. Where is there anything in the bill which does so? The Senator is talking about legal entry.

Mr. ELLENDER. On several occasions I have told my distinguished friend that with respect to wetbacks, workers who are here illegally, recontracting is not permitted. We prohibit that in the bill. We say that no contract may be entered into between workers from Mexico and employers in the United States unless the workers have entered the United States legally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They never had a contract. Millions of wetbacks who are now in this country never had a contract; but they are still working.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is in error if he has reference to Mexicans legally in this country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who ever made a contract with a "wetback"?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about Mexicans who have been legally contracted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are greatly in the minority and would be so, even under the provisions of the bill of the Senator from Louisiana. I think I understand and appreciate the fact that he is trying to legalize the importation of foreign labor. But the point which the Senator does not realize is that while he would legalize the importation of Mexican laborers and contracts with Mexican citizens, nothing is done about the million or so who are here illegally, and who are not working under contract.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have pointed out on several occasions during the debate, it is against the law at present for these workers to enter without permits.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly. The passage of more laws and still more laws would not cure the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that if the bill which I introduced a few days ago is considered soon by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, we may be able to correct that evil to a certain extent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senator. He has been most kind and patient with me, and I appreciate it. I am sure that he is just as sincere in his position as I am in mine. But if the wetback question is serious—and I believe the Senator will agree with me that it is serious not only for our country and our economy, but also from the standpoint of the Mexican Government—why can we not take care of it in this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am willing to do so, but I doubt whether the Senate would adopt such a provision without hearings on the subject.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Everyone knows that 1,000,000 workers are here illegally.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has an amendment to propose. No doubt the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope at that time the Senator will be as willing to take care of the situation as he now is.

Mr. ELLENDER. I expect to discuss the Senator's amendment later. At one time I thought that it was along the same lines as the bill which I introduced; but it will not accomplish the purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We might get together.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate now has before it the amendment lettered "J" offerred by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], which has to do with investigation by the Secretary of Labor relative to the question of whether there is a sufficient number of workers in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, before contracts such as provided for by the bill can be entered into. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question similar to that asked by the Senator from Iowa. Is the amendment needed in order to protect American labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, it is not needed.

Mr. WHERRY. They are protected now?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; the Secretary of Labor is already empowered to recruit domestic labor, including labor from our Territorial possessions.

Mr. WHERRY. Then all that is standing in the way of those workers coming to Nebraska farms is the contact to be made to get them there?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, and then, I presume, the payment of transportation.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the transportation? Under the contract provided for in the bill, transportation is actually being paid to bring Mexicans to the border.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The employers in this country will pay for the transportation of Mexican employees to a point within the United States, and from that point to the place of employment, and there is nothing to stop an employer from doing the same with respect to Hawaiians.

Mr. WHERRY. Is any effort being made to accomplish the same purpose in Hawaii that will be accomplished with respect to Mexicans? I do not mean with respect to the Government paying subsidies. How are laborers in Puerto Rico, for example, to be collected and brought here?

Mr. ELLENDER. The way that is done now is that the United States Employment Service, let us say, will certify that in New Jersey 500 workers are needed to pick the pea crop. This certification can be used by the employers there to go to the Bahamas or to go to Puerto Rico and make arrangements for their labor requirements with Puerto Ricans or with Bahamans.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that being done?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. So there is no need for this proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. That is why we have excluded it from the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have made a statement to that effect on many occasions. I am sorry the Senator has not heard it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me I should like to state what is being done about it. The Senator may think they are now doing what he said, but they are not. Mr. Goodman was a witness who ap-

peared before the Committee on Appropriations. I was chairman of the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the Department of Labor. I read:

Senator CHAVEZ. As the chairman of this committee, and as an individual only—and I do not represent the views of the committee—I am not in favor of giving the Department any money to go down and get foreigners to work in the country when we have people like the Indians and local citizens who are around here, and who are drafted, and yet who cannot get a job.

Mr. Goodman answered:

I agree with that, except that I would say that we are doing everything we can with the resources we have.

They are doing everything they can. Perhaps saying the Lord's Prayer, doing good deeds, meaning to do the right thing, but not getting the labor they could get. That was Mr. Goodman's testimony.

Mr. ELLENDER. The question of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska had to do with certification of local needs. Of course, the Senator, I presume, would like to have his amendments providing for subsidization adopted, so that more direct assistance could be rendered by the Employment Service in securing these laborers. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided to make this a self-sustaining program, to make the farmers of the country pay all the expenses, and not saddle the Federal Government with any more expense than necessary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was intended to do that at the expense of domestic labor in favor of cheap labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, it was not. I repeat there was no such intention. I have read section 503 to the Senate many times. I will ask the Senator himself to read it now, and he will see that before certification can be made the Administrator must find that there is no domestic labor available to do the work.

That, Mr. President, is all I desire to present to the Senate at this time. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly on the bill and against the amendment. As the bill first came to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry it would have included, along with Mexico, other countries in the Western Hemisphere. It would have brought within the purview of the control of the Department of Labor agricultural labor coming in not only from Mexico but from the Bahamas, Jamaica, Honduras, Canada, and other areas in the Western Hemisphere nearby the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It referred to foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. It would also have provided that the expense of negotiating the arrangements for bringing in the labor from all those addtional places would be borne by the United States Government under appropriations made for the Department of Labor. It would have provided that the expense of transportation, after the labor was contracted with, would lie upon the United States Government. It would have provided that the expense of subsistence while the labor was on the way to the centers from which it would be distributed and to the farms where it would work, would also be paid by the United States Government. It would have saddled a tremendous amount of expense upon the United States Government which is now being paid by the local agricultural producers of all the States in the United States, except those who rely upon Mexican labor.

In other words, in the case of the States which bring in Canadian labor, as was stated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] a few minutes ago, they make their own arrangements, they furnish their own subsistence for the individuals who come in from Canada to help them. They furnish the housing. They take care of the transportation. The United States Government is at no expense whatsoever.

The same thing is true, Mr. President, with reference to the many thousands of laborers who since World War II and during World War II have been coming in from the Bahamas and from Jamaica, and, for a time, from Honduras. Those laborers come in under arrangements made by our producers. They cannot get that labor without first having obtained certificates from the Department of Labor that no domestic labor is available. In other words, the domestic labor is certainly protected by that feature of the law.

Then they cannot get that labor until they make satisfactory arrangements with the Government of the Bahamas or the Government of Jamaica, or wherever the labor is coming from, to the effect that they are to be well-housed, that their transportation here is to be paid, that their transportation back home is to be paid. They are required to put up bonds to that effect. Likewise that the laborers will be paid the prevailing wage rate in the place where they will work. In other words, under the law as now applicable, no laborers coming into the United States from offshore areas or from Canada can be imposed upon, nor can domestic labor be imposed upon, because the offshore laborers or Canadian laborers cannot be brought in unless there is a shortage of domestic labor, which has already been determined and certified by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. President, the members of the committee coming from all other portions of the United States except that portion where the Mexican labor problem exists, were anxious to help both the Government of Mexico and the citizens of Mexico and the agricultural producers in that portion of the Nation who look cutomarily to Mexican labor to help produce and gather their crops. But we were not willing to do that at the expense of building a tremendous hierarchy, with all the expenses I have just mentioned visited upon the United States Government, with subsidies such as I have mentioned being created for agricultural producers in all other areas of the United States, with extensive transient camps set up in various parts of the Nation, such as have been mentioned in the testimony. We were not willing to do that at the expense of establishing such a tremendous hierarchy, because we felt it was sounder democracy and better government and better agricultural practice to have the system prevailing under the present law continued. Under that system we cannot get one laborer from outside the United States unless there is a shortage here, and we cannot get a single laborer from outside the United States without agreeing to pay him the prevailing wage rates and without taking care of his transportation in both directions and furnishing him with medical care, good housing, and the other things which have been set forth.

We think it is sound Americanism and soundly in the protection of American labor and soundly in the protection of American agriculture to insist, as we did in the committee, that this bill be limited solely to the question of Mexican labor.

Mr. President, what were the reasons why it was felt in the committee that Mexican labor could be brought within the purview of this bill, provided it was confined to Mexican labor, without doing violence to the principles of international comity, without doing violence to agricultural producers elsewhere in the Nation, and without doing violence to agricultural workers who are citizens of the United States?

There are two reasons, one of which has already been mentioned so fully by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that I shall not attempt to repeat it, but shall simply outline it briefly. That reason is that under the system now prevailing, Mexico has felt that instead of having Mexican labor taken from areas in Mexico where there is unemployment and instead of giving the help where it is needed and where it should be given, all too frequently the labor has been recruited from directly across the border, even though at that time those areas were prosperous, needed the labor of the Mexicans who lived there, and afforded an ample field for the employment of the local labor.

So the Mexican Government has insisted—and I think it is entirely within its rights in so insisting, because Mexico is great in expanse, and in many cases the conditions which are to be found in one part of Mexico are not to be found in other parts—that areas in Mexico in which there is unemployment shall be given preferment in the recruitment of laborers to come to the United States. The Mexican Government has given notice that beginning with the middle of this year, unless a law under which they can follow such a system is enacted, they will not favor the continuation of the present system and will not cooperate in its continuance.

I think the Mexican Government is entirely within its rights in taking that position. The members of the committee felt that the Mexicans are completely within their rights in insisting that the law be changed in such a way as to

allow the Mexican economy to be properly considered in connection with this matter, as well as to give proper consideration to our own economy in the sections of the United States where such labor is needed. So the bill is proposed by the committee to be changed in such a way as to meet that situation.

Enactment of the bill as reported by the committee is also badly needed in order to meet the situation which arises because of the fact that Mexico is the only one of our neighbors which lies just across a small river for some 1,500 or 1,800 miles, and across an imaginary line along the rest of the border, which not only can be very easily crossed illegally, but as to which illegal crossings have proved to be extremely frequent. Furthermore, it has been found that such illegal entries are prejudicial to Mexico and also to the welfare of our own people. As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has said, the situation resulting from such illegal entries, when wetbacks, as they are called, illegally enter our country and are employed here, is that they are not paid fair wages, do not receive proper housing or medical attention, and often are so forced down economically that instead of being able to take back to Mexico material and substantial American dollars—which is one of the principal objectives of the exchange of labor—they are lucky to be able to return at all, even though while in the United States perhaps they have had a somewhat improved diet as compared to the one they would have had at home; but otherwise their condition has not been improved in any way.

So the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry thought it was entirely right and fair and decent to make this provision applicable only to Mexican labor for the reasons we have indicated.

Mr. President, I would dislike very much to see this amendment adopted, because it would put all of us who live at a distance from the border in the position of asking the Federal Government to subsidize a practice which we find is entirely acceptable to us and to the neighboring nations with whom we deal. We do not believe in subsidies; we do not want them; we do not ask for them. We think we can make our individual arrangements under the supervision of the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice and the Department of State. We think we can make our arrangements better as we have made them in the past, and without any expense whatever on the part of the Federal Government, and without putting our splendid and independent agricultural industries in the position of asking for and receiving a subsidy for something they are quite able to carry themselves and to do to their own advantage.

Mr. President, the proposal made by the pending amendment is so far reaching in its terms that I think it might be well for me to read into the RECORD a few of the statements made in the testimony at the hearings, so that what is sought to be established by means of the amendment will be crystal clear.

I shall read briefly from several of the statements made by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Creasey, when he appeared before the committee during the course of the hearing.

First, I wish to read a few excerpts having to do with the proposed system of transient camps. The Secretary of Labor made it perfectly clear, through the testimony offered by his assistant—and, incidentally, the answer he gave in direct response to a question which was asked was that his testimony was the testimony of the Department of Labor, and not solely his own testimony—that they want a system of motels or transient camps extending from New England to California, and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico, transient camps at which would be housed these migratory laborers as they travel around. Certainly I do not have to say to the Senate that such a system, instead of simplifying and reducing the travel of migratory agricultural laborers, would make them much more widely traveled persons than they now are, because that would be an open invitation to them to go thousands of miles, whereas today they go perhaps hundreds of miles from one point of work to another.

I read now from page 26 of the hearings:

Senator HOLLAND. Excuse me there. Is what you are talking about there a series of transient camps?

Mr. CREASEY. That is right.

Senator HOLLAND. To house transient migratory labor as it is traveling from one part of the United States to another?

Mr. CREASEY. That is correct.

Senator HOLLAND. How many such camps do you have in mind?

Mr. CREASEY. Frankly we have not gone into it far enough to decide how many there should be. I do not think it would require very many.

Senator HOLLAND. But you are asking for the inclusion of that factor in this legislation?

Mr. CREASEY. That is correct.

I read now from page 27:

Senator HOLLAND. I was anxious to take a practical problem in this field. It is a well-known fact that migratory farm labor that starts out in south Florida in the winter ends up in Connecticut in the tobacco fields in the late summer or early fall. Is it your idea to have a series of tourist camps that would accommodate this migratory labor as it moves from south Florida to Connecticut through the course of the various seasons, extending from winter in Florida to early fall in Connecticut? Is that your idea?

Mr. CREASEY. That is correct.

Let us remember that he was talking, not only about labor which comes to the United States from the Bahamas, Jamaica, and Honduras, but about all migratory farm labor, because the essence of his entire statement was that since it is necessary under this program to have certain provisions made for housing and for the working conditions of the Mexican laborers who leave their homes in Mexico, therefore the same conditions should be established for the hundreds of thousands of migratory agricultural laborers who travel from one end of this country to the other. That is clear from the testimony of Mr. Creasey, who said, in response to my question on that point, "That is correct."

My statement was that what they propose is to have a series of camps extending from Homestead, Fla., on the east coast, to Maine.

I read further from the hearings:

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Creasey, is this testimony your own personal testimony or is it for the Department of Labor?

Mr. CREASEY. Which do you mean?

Senator HOLLAND. The tourist camps.

Mr. CREASEY. That is from the Department of Labor.

So that is the program we have before us, as proposed at this time.

Now let me go a little further. I read now from page 31 of the hearings:

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue one more point. If I understood the witness correctly, and I am going to ask him the specific question as to whether I did, his proposal embodies not only setting up of this series of tourist camps, but also of paying the transportation of domestic workers on a parity with the paying of the transportation of the offshore workers or Indian workers who he brought in from Mexico and other places; is that correct?

Mr. CREASEY. That is correct.

I then asked this question:

In other words, since you have to pay the transportation of a Mexican worker to work in the beet fields in the Midwest all the way from his home in Mexico, there and back, you feel that you should be prepared to pay the transportation of domestic farm laborers in similar amounts?

Mr. Creasey answered:

That is correct.

Mr. President, it ought to be very clear by this time what kind of set-up it is proposed to create, but there are one or two other things I wish to mention. On page 36, in my questioning of Mr. Creasey, I asked the following questions, to which Mr. Creasey gave answer as follows:

Senator HOLLAND. I would like to ask another question to make it clear. Do I understand that one of your principal grounds of opposition to S. 984 as now written is that while it provides for transportation of foreign workers to this country and return to recruitment centers from which they were obtained, which you favor, that you are not willing for the bill to fail to have a similar provision or identical provision with reference to domestic farm labor? Is that it?

Mr. CREASEY. Not identical, but similar. In other words, we say that the offer you make to Mexicans, you should be willing to make to Americans.

Senator HOLLAND. In other words, that the transportation costs to and from the place of labor should be paid by the Government in the case of domestic farm laborers just exactly as in the case of Mexican farm laborers?

Mr. CREASEY. In the same manner and to the same extent, and no more.

Senator HOLLAND. And that in addition to that you favor the setting up of these tourist camps along the lines of migration to house the migrant laborers and their families as they go from place to place?

Mr. CREASEY. We think it is a very desirable thing, Senator.

Mr. President, those of us who come from areas not contiguous to Mexico are

happy to cooperate with the Mexican Government, and to cooperate with the tens of thousands of Mexican citizens who want this outlet for their labor, this chance to enjoy better living standards, with better opportunities for themselves and their families. We likewise want to cooperate with the agricultural industries in that portion of the Nation which naturally looks to that source of labor after the supply of domestic labor is exhausted.

I am not willing to go along with this program if it be enlarged to include all the enormities which I have mentioned, which are shown by the record, which are included within some of the amendments which have been proposed, beginning with the particular amendment which is offered at this time. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] on page 1, line 6.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CORDON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn and that the order for the call of the roll may be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment, of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on official business in a committee meeting.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent, and, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—12

Benton	Ives	Moody
Capehart	Jenner	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Douglas	McMahon	Neely

NAYS—59

Aiken	Hennings	Maybank
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bennett	Hill	Monroney
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case	Kem	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Connally	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Dirksen	Long	Thye
Dworshak	McCarran	Tobey
Ecton	McCarthy	Watkins
Ellender	McClellan	Wherry
Ferguson	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	Malone	Young
Hendrickson	Martin	

NOT VOTING—25

Brewster	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Humphrey	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Flanders	Lehman	Underwood
Frear	Magnuson	Welker
Fulbright	Nixon	
George	O'Conor	

So the amendment of Mr. CHAVEZ was rejected.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST—SENATOR TAFT'S SPEECH BEFORE THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] made very strong pleas for more rapid rearmament of our country. During the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, at my request, he yielded to me, and I read to him a short dispatch which appeared on the Associated Press ticker. It was the report of a speech which had been made by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] before the United States Chamber of Commerce. I did not pursue the matter at the time further than to read the dispatch. I regret that the Senator from Ohio is unavoidably detained and is absent today. I did not pursue the matter further at that time because I thought, after I read the dispatch, that it could not possibly be a correct report of what the Senator from Ohio had said. I today sought to get a transcript of the Senator's remarks, but was unable to do so. However, I find a story by Joseph A. Loftus in today's New York Times which bears out the Associated Press account of the Senator's speech. I believe now that the AP quoted him correctly.

What the Senator proposed to the United States Chamber of Commerce yesterday was that we cut the budget $20,000,000,000, that we cut the Armed Forces 500,000 men, and that we pursue a more aggressive course in Asia; in other words, that we enlarge the war in Asia. I further note that the Senator's audience cheered him at the conclusion of that kind of speech, which leads me to observe that they cannot have truly appraised the situation.

I have rarely seen anything more illogical than the statement made by the senior Senator from Ohio. I know of no Senator who would not like to cut the budget $20,000,000,000, and who does not regret that we are saddled with the tax load with which we are burdened at the present time, and with which we are going to continue to be burdened. I do not know of any Senator who would not wish that our Armed Forces numbered 300,000 men instead of 3,500,000. But I know of no Member of the United States Senate, except the Senator from Ohio, who believes that it is possible to cut the budget $20,000,000,000, and to cut the Armed Forces by 500,000 men, and still carry on an invasion of the Chinese mainland. Yet, in my opinion, that is exactly what the Senator is advocating when he supports the proposals which have been made by General MacArthur for the very soft term—"logistical support." It is time that proposals of that kind cease, if we are to make the American people aware of the kind of situation we confront.

I thought it only right that this statement should be made for the record and the attention of the Senate called to the fact that this kind of proposal has been made by the senior Senator

from Ohio, who in the press of the country has been termed "Mr. Republican." I call upon responsible leaders of the Republican Party to repudiate this kind of statement, which I think is truly a most irrational approach to the problems of our time.

ACQUISITION OR DISPOSAL OF REAL ESTATE BY DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Monday, April 23, the Senate passed Senate bill 285, a bill relating to the acquisition and disposal of real property by the three military services. This bill was unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee and was passed by the Senate without objection. On the same afternoon, the House of Representatives passed House bill 3096, which is identically the same as the bill passed by the Senate with the exception of one word. As passed by the Senate, these agencies are not required to report interservice transfers of real property while under the House bill they are required to report such transfers.

In order to correct this minor difference between the bills as passed by the respective Houses of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider House bill 3096, and I recommend its passage in place of S. 285, already passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The clerk will read the House bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection, but I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what the one word is to which he refers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate passed the bill "excepting" real estate transactions between one branch of the military service and another. The House bill contained the word "including", thus covering such transfers; so that, if a transfer were made from the Army to the Navy, the provision of the bill which requires a report, either to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, alone, or to the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House, would apply to the transaction; whereas under the Senate bill it would not apply to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I asked unanimous consent that the House bill be considered. I understand from the Parliamentarian that it is not a privileged matter, and that I would therefore have to obtain unanimous consent, in order to have the one word changed. In other words, the Senate passed the bill, without objection, and my motion is to pass the House bill, in which there is a difference of one word. There will be no debate on the bill, I hope.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I had in mind was ascertaining whether the Senator had asked unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All I asked was unanimous consent that the Senate pass the House bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. But there is a measure pending before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If unanimous consent should be obtained to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business, I ask such consent. There will be no debate on the bill, so far as I know.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the pending bill to be temporarily laid aside for that purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts by unanimous consent will not affect the present status of the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I wanted to have clear, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if we agree to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Massachusetts to pass the House bill, would we then automatically return to the consideration of the pending measure?

Mr. WHERRY. It is a very simple matter. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has asked unanimous consent to pass a House bill without displacing the pending bill at all. It can be done in 30 seconds.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was not mentioned, and that is what I wanted to ascertain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 3096?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EFFECT OF PRICE ROLL-BACK ON LIVESTOCK YARDS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for perhaps 5 minutes in order that I may invite the attention of the Senate to a situation which is developing in the livestock yards throughout the United States, and more particularly in the South St. Paul livestock yard? It will take only about 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course I am always glad to accede to the wishes of the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] wants to see what will happen to the pending bill and how long it will be before we have a vote on it.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I am in receipt of a number of telegrams from the State of Minnesota as of this date. These telegrams have been sent because of the roll-back in beef prices as promulgated and issued on April 29 by Mr. Michael P. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization. There is one telegram which I received from a gentleman living in the southwestern part of Minnesota, which I should like to read:

Please explain how a farmer is going to feed cattle on the proposed roll-back. If it would include machinery and labor it might work. Many farmers put feeders in at 30 to 40 cents—

That is, they put them into the feed lots at 30 to 40 cents a pound.

Is the farmer supposed to take the whole cut? Please answer at once. Three to five hundred farmers will be at our sale this afternoon. I want to read your answer to them.

This is the reply which I sent within the past hour:

Replying to your telegram I wish to say that I have objected to beef price control program announced by OPS. Questions you raised cannot be answered in any other manner than that farmer is going to suffer the loss. Consumer will lose also as livestock today is going to market unfinished, and ultimately there will be less beef because of this unwise OPS order. I shall continue to protest order.

Mr. President, I received another telegram, from Mr. C. S. Carlson, manager of the Superior Packing Co., St. Paul, in which he says:

We have just sent the following wire to Donald L. Leach, OPS, room 1504, Temporary S Building, Washington, D. C.:

"Regarding the congested conditions in our yards and our inability to relieve the situation account of quotas, will you be good enough to contact and see if you can get a quick answer?"

That is signed by C. S. Carlson.

The Superior Packing Co. yards in St. Paul are so congested that their quotas forbid them to take any more livestock. The same situation is found in South St. Paul, so far as it relates to Armour, Swift, and Cudahy. I called by telephone within the past 30 minutes, and was told that the trucks are lined up for miles waiting to be unloaded.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator permit me a couple of minutes more?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, my only reason for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate is that cattle are coming in droves, which means that they are coming in unfinished, and that the animals are 200 or 300 pounds light of what they would weigh if they were finished. Within 90 days we are going to be short the number of pounds of meat which the animal would have gained had it been brought to the best marketable condition.

If this situation is happening in Minnesota, it is happening likewise in other yards throughout the United States. The consumer is going to be faced with less meat next fall, and rationing will have

to be put into effect. The farmer who paid from 30 to 33 or 34 cents a pound for feeders has been taking a cut of from $2 to $3 a hundred pounds within the past few days. The price of unfinished cattle has gone down from $4 to $5 a hundred pounds.

If the able Senator from New Mexico will permit me to take a few more minutes, I will show what some of the producer's costs are and how they have gone up.

Soybean meal is the only high-protein feed that has gone down in price. It went down from $4.73 to $4.59 a hundred pounds.

Linseed meal is one of the high-protein feed which is fed the feeder cattle to make high quality meat. It has gone up from $4.40 to $4.48 a hundred pounds.

Cottonseed meal has gone up from $4 to $4.89 a hundred pounds.

Tankage has gone up from $6.49 to $7. Tankage is a part of the ration in producing pork.

Gasoline has gone up from 25.8 cents a gallon to 26.3 cents a gallon. Distillates have gone up from 15 9/10 to 15½. The price of farm machinery has risen. A farmer must have machinery in order to produce the feed to grow the livestock.

Fertilizer was priced at $38.60 a ton last fall. On April 1, this year, the same type fertilizer cost $42.20 a ton.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield for that purpose, without denying me the right to continue for a few more minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to let the Senator from Minnesota continue for as long a time as he has something to say.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact, if a roll-back had to be imposed, that if opportunity had been given the feeders to keep the cattle in the feed lots for 60 or 90 days, there would have been an orderly marketing of the cattle which had been placed in the feed lots 60 or 90 days ago?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Nebraska not only knows the livestock feeding business, but he knows it so well and presents the question in such a clear-cut manner that the answer can be only "Yes."

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I hope the roll-back will not go into effect immediately. Of course they have until May 20, when another roll-back will go into effect. What is going to happen is that there will be fewer cattle in the feed lots, the consumer will have to pay higher prices, and there will be a return to the black market.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. THYE. Indeed I do yield. I was afraid the Senator was going to deny me further time. He has been very indulgent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to have the Senator discuss the subject for as long a time as he has anything to say about it.

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are discussing the matter of farm labor.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is discussing the question of roll-backs on farm prices of cattle.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with the Senator from Minnesota. What difference is there between rolling back farm prices on cattle and rolling back farm labor wages? Could the Senator be consistent, and tell me? I am sure he is trying to be consistent. In my opinion, the two subjects are related. I believe that a roll-back is wrong because everything has gone up in price, including the items which the Senator has mentioned. Everything the farmer and producer of cattle must buy has gone up in price within the last few months. It includes farm labor. For that reason I say the pending bill contains a roll-back of American wages. Does the Senator agree? I ask the question in good faith. I say to the Senator that although I respect every Member of the Senate, there is no one of whom I think more highly than the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator. I shall try to answer the question of the very able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico. If we were to deny to an American worker the right to a job by importing a foreign laborer, we would be instigating a roll-back on American labor. I shall do all in my power to guard against the importation of labor so long as domestic labor is available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator contemplate any legislative procedure relative to the roll-back? He is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. THYE. The date of Mr. DiSalle's roll-back order was the 29th of April. Today is the 1st of May. We are now only commencing to get the full effect of the order. Of course, the law will expire——

Mr. WHERRY. In June, I believe.

Mr. THYE. On June 30, as I recall. The subject will be examined as a study is made of the question of the extension or continuance of the authorization under which Mr. DiSalle is operating.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will undertake a serious study of the subject. It seems to me that if such things as roll-backs are to happen, the Senate and the House ought to have something to say. I doubt very much the legality of the directive. The law will terminate in June, and the directive certainly was issued upon the assumption that the law would be extended.

Mr. THYE. The subject would fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I believe. The question was never considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that the Committee on Banking and Currency, would have jurisdiction, but I think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should take some positive action with respect to the roll-back on cattle. It was issued without any notice to the feeders. I think it is a matter that ought to be given very serious consideration by the committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Minnesota has again called the attention of the Senate and the country to a disaster which will inevitably hit the American people by way of a meat famine if the present attitude of the Price Administration continues. They have been warned. The Senator from Nebraska knows they have been warned. The Senator from Minnesota knows they have been warned. Unless they take a realistic attitude toward meat production, we will have a meat famine which will lay in the shade the meat famine we had in the nefarious OPA days. Apparently they have not learned a single lesson since the mistakes of the last war.

They are about to put into effect again the same disastrous and ill-advised practices in connection with meat which proved so bad during OPA days.

I hope pressure will be brought to bear so that the neo-experts in Washington, who go by theory and not by advice from practical people, will finally come around to adopting a realistic approach to the situation. It is as nefarious a roll-back as can be imagined. It is proposed to go into the feed lots of the farmers of America, when they have been filled up with cattle at as high a price as 40 cents a pound, and roll back the price which farmers will have to take for finished cattle, if they feed them out to a point which will be less than they paid for the feeders before they went into the feed lots. The Senator from Minnesota knows that is exactly what is happening today in Minneapolis. It is exactly what is happening in Cedar Rapids, Chicago, Sioux City, and Kansas City.

Mr. WHERRY. And Omaha.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What will happen will be a glut on the market now and a famine in 6 months. The experts, who are getting their theory out of books—and bad theory, at that—had better wake up to what they are doing to the meat situation in the United States.

Mr. THYE. The evidence is definitely clear, when we examine some records on the subject, particularly in the livestock centers, where the cattle are coming in to supply packers such as Swift, Armour, and Cudahy, as well as other packers, such as Superior, from whom I read a telegram. A feeder who last September or October acquired a great many calves as they came in from the western country and put them into his feed lots paid 30 cents, 32 cents, 35 cents, up to 37 cents a pound. The Senator from

Iowa said that some were bought for 40 cents a pound, which would be choice feeders.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have a record of feeder cattle being purchased by people in my State for 40 cents a pound. Of course, they are fairly well along, but they are still 40-cents-a-pound feeders which have been purchased in recent months.

Mr. THYE. I concurred with the Senator from Iowa. I stated the price range for feeder calves last fall. The choice feeders are the ones which cost the feeder 40 cents a pound. Today the livestock market broke in South St. Paul to a varying extent, depending on the quality of beef cattle coming in, between $1 and $2 a hundred. Yesterday it broke from $1 up to $2.50 a hundred. That means that the price of those cattle has gone off from $2 to $4 a hundred. I am now speaking of the choice grade. In the case of the poorer quality unfinished cattle, light cattle went off from $4 to $5 a hundred, and no one was bidding to buy those thin cattle coming into the yards.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason for that is that those are the replacement cattle.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. A feeder who finishes and sells his cattle ordinarily buys replacement cattle. The feeders are scared. They do not know what is going to happen in the future. Therefore the replacement cattle, which ought to go back into the feed lot, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has already said, are a drug on the market.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. They are selling at prices which are not only going to hurt, but in some cases break the men who have put their money into such cattle to carry them over as feeders, so that they may sell them to the farmers of Minnesota and Iowa for the purpose of preparing to produce food for the Nation.

Mr. THYE. An animal will ordinarily gain 2½ pounds a day. Today such animals are coming to market when normally they would not have come to market if it had not been for this unwise OPS order. They would not have come to market for at least 60 or 90 days. That means that if the animal had been kept on the feed lot for that additional time, it would weigh 200 or 300 pounds more. The bone structure of the carcass of the animal would carry that additional weight, and the buyer would not be buying a large percentage of bone. I am getting down to the facts. The result is that steaks, roasts, short ribs, and all the other cuts of beef are less because of the 200 or 300 pounds shortage in the weight of the animal. The simple fact is that within 60 days the housewife will not find in the market the beef which she would have found if those animals had been finished to their normal condition and normal quality, as would have been the case if it had not been for the unwise order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much the rollback is supposed to be when it is completed?

Mr. THYE. The rollback cannot be figured in dollars and cents.

Mr. WHERRY. How much is it per hundred pounds?

Mr. THYE. The fact of the matter is that the rollback is figured in the light of what has happened in South St. Paul and in the Omaha yards within the past 2 days.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the rollback could not be more than $6.96 a hundred, because that would roll the prices back to June 15 prices. I understand that it is planned to roll back prices 6 cents a pound to the farmer. At last they have found a short-cut to rationing, because they are going to reduce the supply severely, and possibly necessitate the rationing of beef by next winter if the roll-back is permitted to stand.

Mr. THYE. A reading of the order of Mr. DiSalle, which I hold in my hand, discloses that it shows specifically and in detail the effects of the roll-back on the producer. But when there is a congested yard and a heavy run, prices go back far beyond what the official rollback actually requires. That is what is happening, not only in South St. Paul, but in Sioux City and in other yards. It will continue to happen, because who can feed livestock in the face of a daily loss on the feed which is placed in the feed lots to feed those animals? The owners must sell them, because every day they feed they are taking a loss. Therefore, cattle are coming to market unfinished.

Mr. AIKEN. A moment ago I stated that prices could not be rolled back more than $6.96 a hundred. I was in error. They cannot roll the ceiling back more than that amount. If they roll the ceiling back that amount, there is no assurance that farm prices will not go back further than that.

Mr. THYE. The ceiling and the official roll-back are not the only factors that are rolling back the prices of beef animals in the markets as of today. A reflex action is being felt on the pork market.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been to the Government agency and have talked this matter over with the administrators. There is a chance that by the time they get through, the maximum roll-back on finished cattle will reach $9 a hundred.

Mr. AIKEN. That is on a particular grade. The average is $6.96.

Mr. WHERRY. There are several grades, and there will be average rollbacks, but we are talking about getting meat for the housewife.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I have it figured out that there can be a maximum roll-back, under the present plan, on the particular grade of cattle which we want to be made into as finished beef, as high as $9 a hundred before they get through. If they do that, there will be many a cattle feeder who will be next to broke. What is worse, as the distinguished Senator has pointed out, there will be no replacement cattle. I should like to ask any Senator who is a cattle feeder if he would purchase replacement cattle to put in the feed lot and feed under these conditions. Who would put them in?

Mr. THYE. He would not be exactly a wise and prudent man if he went into the market today to try to fill up feed lots which were emptied yesterday because of the OPS order.

I should like to read further information as to what the producer is faced with in the cost of his operations.

A two-plow tractor on rubber tires sold in March of 1948 for $1,570. The same identical tractor sold in March 1951, 3 years later, for $2,000.

A three-plow tractor on rubber tires sold in March 1948 for $1,970. On March 1, 1951, the same identical tractor sold for $2,580. Senators can note the increased cost with which the producer is faced.

On top of that, the producer is now beginning to get roll-backs. How is he going to sustain those roll-backs and still continue to face an increased cost in his operations, whether it be in machinery or whether it be in repairs or any other item which he must purchase, in order that he may continue his normal farming operations?

In order that we may take a good look at what the dairy farmer is faced with, let us consider a dairy producer operating in the Twin Cities milk shed area. That is Minneapolis and St. Paul. His milk is sold on the consumers' market. Last month he received for grade A milk 7.8 cents a quart. That is the same quality milk which is consumed in the Washington milk market.

Manufactured milk is the normal quality, grade A being the special quality. For manufactured No. 1 milk, he received 6.9 cents a quart. That is less than 7 cents a quart. Let any Senator ask himself what he paid for a quart of milk this morning, and he will have the answer as to whether the producer is the gentleman who is responsible for the high cost of living, or whether it is someone else.

In closing, let me say that the livestock run on the markets today is telling us all that unfinished beef is going to market. The cattle are light. Ninety days from now those cattle would normally have been in condition to give us the maximum amount of meat per animal. We are going to be short of beef in from 60 to 90 days, and the result will be far more drastic and costly to the consumer than any gains or saving that will be brought about by the OPS roll-back order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Minnesota think that the full impact of this artificial creation of a short-

age of beef will not be felt, however, until a few months later?

Mr. THYE. I would say that a man could sharpen his pencil and carry a pad with him and mark down what is happening in the retail market very closely, wherever he likes to do so, and I think Senators will agree with me that within 60 days he will have great difficulty in finding where much savings to the consumer will have been brought about as a result of the order.

Mr. AIKEN. There may be abnormal marketing before August 1 in order to avoid reduction of prices at that time, but the real shortage in beef is likely to come after that, when there is a smaller number of finished animals to be put on the market, when they will be going direct from the range to the market at 600 or 700 pounds instead of from the feed lot at 1,000 or 1,100 pounds. If such a condition continues sufficiently long the consumer can look forward to meat rationing, or obtaining no meat at all except through undesirable channels.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that the shortage will come about as the result of two things. The actual shortage to which the Senator from Vermont is referring may not come until 6 months from now, but the shortage will come for two reasons. First, because of the fact that the present animals on feed are going to be sold light. They are going to be dumped on the market. That will contribute to the shortage 6 months from now. Secondly, the feeders are not going into the market to buy feeder cattle to put on feed under the present chaotic conditions resulting from the actions of the Price Administration in Washington. Both factors will result in a shortage of meat. By reason of the sale of light animals there will be depletion of the amount of meat which will be available in the future. The farmer who would be a feeder of cattle would be scared to death of bankrupting himself if he should undertake to do that in the present chaotic condition; therefore he is not going to put the same number of cattle into the feed lot that he ordinarily would today, or in the next 3 or 4 months, and that will contribute to the shortage of animals.

Mr. THYE. As the Senator knows so well, one can drive across the good State of Iowa and find a tremendous number of beef calves going into the feed lots in the fall of the year. If one drives through there in the winter or spring one will find the feed lots full of unfinished cattle, that normally remain on feed in July and August and then are marketed. Such cattle are now going to be rushed into the market, because how can a feeder continue to feed the cattle when the cost of his feed is in excess of what he will receive for the cattle? Therefore, he is bound either to move the cattle or take a terrific loss.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The drastic drop in price in the last 3 or 4 days may be very welcome to and probably a sign of success to Mr. DiSalle. I think the Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct, however, in the statement he has made. In a matter of a few months we will be paying through the nose, so to speak; we will be far more short of beef than we have ever been before, and rationing will be in order.

Mr. President, I think the shortage of beef in the past 3 or 4 years has been attributable almost entirely to the disastrous program of OPA during the war and afterward. Even that program, backed up by several billion dollars in subsidies, was unsuccessful. Administratively, I think that by the use of subsidies they can carry on a price-control program much more effectively. Either way, controls on meat are impossible and unwise, as they are trying to do it now, this thing will certainly result in disaster for all concerned.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for yielding the time for this discussion.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment B, which is rather short, and the disposition of which probably will require only a minute or so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "Director of State Employment Security for such area" and insert "Secretary of Labor."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the amendment, except to point out that all the discussion of this bill has indicated that certification ought to be made by the Secretary of Labor, and a statement was made by the chairman of the committee, to the effect that the provisions of the contract would require that it be made by the Secretary of Labor. I do not wish to discuss the amendment, but to urge that certification be by the Secretary of Labor. I hope the chairman of the committee may see fit to accept the amendment, or that the Senate may promptly adopt it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that on the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the committee finally agreed to place the recruitment on a State basis. Since then, the distinguished Senator himself has proposed this amendment, and I have inquired further regarding the matter. I find that in a press release by the Mexican Government, it is said that Mexico will not agree to State government agencies assuming the responsibility. Therefore, I think it would be in line to accept the amendment now suggested.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senator from New Mexico has proposed this amendment. I do not want any statement made, and I do not want any statement to be accepted, which indicates acceptance of the amendment by all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am very much opposed to the amendment, as a member of the committee. I was very much in favor of the provision as it came from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the employment agencies within the States should determine, as a matter of efficiency, the question of labor shortages, in order that action might be taken at a place close to home. I feel that the arguments which were urged within the committee itself, and which resulted in the committee's reporting the bill, providing that the State employment agencies should make the determination, are good.

I am in sympathy with the Senator from New Mexico. I understand his desire. He now takes the position, and I think he has reason for it, that there is some confusion in Mexico about this matter, and that the Mexican Government demands that the Secretary of Labor make the determination. So far as I am concerned, I think we should write the legislation on this subject in the Senate of the United States, and I very much favor the way the bill came from the committee.

If there is not to be a yea-and-nay vote, I wish the RECORD to show that I shall vote against the amendment, because I want to keep the determination in the States, and keep the cold and distant hand of the Secretary of Labor out of the picture, so far as the determination of labor-shortage areas is concerned. I hope the amendment will be defeated. I do not mean to be in opposition to the chairman of the committee, necessarily, nor to the Senator from New Mexico, who has worked hard on this bill, but I disagree with the basis upon which he has proposed this amendment. I shall have to oppose it, so far as my vote is concerned.

I hope the amendment will be rejected and that the terms of the bill will be left as they were when the bill came from the committee as a result of careful committee consideration in its deliberations on this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (putting the question). The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation who—

(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise; or

(2) conceals or harbors, or attempts to conceal or harbor, in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation; or

(3) employs,

any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment, it is with reference to a subject which is covered in an omnibus immigration bill which will be before the Senate within a very short time. It is a subject which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. It seems to me that the amendment should not at this time be adopted as a part of this bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offered the amendment in order to be able to make a statement at this time with reference to the pending bill.

The Senate has taken definite action on my first amendment. When I say "definite action" I mean overwhelming action as to the position which I have taken. The amendment against which the Senate has just voted so overwhelmingly would have protected American labor against Mexican labor. I want that fact understood. But the Senate in its wisdom has the right to determine even that question, and I have no complaint whatsoever.

My Republican friends love to attend Lincoln Day dinners and remember what he stood for. They have knocked down everything he stood for by voting against my amendment.

My Democratic friends, who like to brag about Jefferson, Jackson, yes, and Roosevelt and Truman, have, in my opinion, knocked down everything those men stood for.

I am not criticizing Senators. This body has the right to make a mistake if it wants to. It is one of the basic rights of an American to make a mistake if he wants to. But the Senate has gone on record for cheap labor.

There is not one of us but who had an ancestor who was an immigrant, who tried to get away from a foreign country to escape economic disadvantages or political or religious difficulties. I know the history of the United States. The Senate has made a mistake. Any time this body prefers foreign labor to American labor it is undermining the things fought for in 1776. I know as well as does any Anglo-Saxon the history of this country. I know what Sam Adams and John Adams stood for. I know what Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and other Virginians stood for. They worked to give us a Declaration of Independence and a Constitution, and when they opened the door to immigration, they did not say that citizens of the United States had to come from Sweden, England, Spain, or elsewhere. The basic idea in their minds was their great concept of living standards. Many races and religions have been the beneficiaries of that concept which in my opinion has been knocked down today.

Any time we prefer foreign labor to our own American labor we are interfering with the basic ideas of our Government, especially when such foreign labor is so desperately in need of work, and that, of necessity, it will work for a miserable wage. Remember that none of us has a right to say it was our particular group alone that was intended to be protected by the Constitution. Our ancestors suffered throughout the ages, and the reason why they came to this country was to improve their condition, and try to obtain liberty.

I invite the attention of my good friend the junior Senator from Texas to a telegram I have received from his State. Under the laws and the rules of the State of Texas the Senator was nominated by less than 100 votes to represent that State in this body. Those who took part in that nomination are the ones I want to read about at this time. Their ancestors were at the Alamo. There were Navarros and other Mexicans as well as Americans there, fighting for the very thing we are talking about today.

I received this telegram from a boy in Texas, an American, not a Mexican. He says:

American GI Forum Veterans Organization, representing more than 50,000 American veterans of Mexican origin—

Some of us may have come from Norway; others may have come from Ireland, from Canada, from Scotland, from Wales, or some other country. We may have different ideas, but we carry out the ideal of America. The 50,000 referred to in the telegram are Americans of Mexican origin.

Thousands of veterans are not able to make a decent living because of low-wage competition by the wetbacks and imported labor.

The amendment which I submitted would take care of the wetback situation, which even my friend from Louisiana believes should be taken care of.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that an amendment such as is proposed by the senior Senator from New Mexico is needed in order to prevent the illegal entry of wetbacks?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; the wetbacks and those who come in legally ought to be considered together. If we admit 500,000 legally, and a million of them come across the border illegally, we will not solve the problem.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator's amendment would put teeth into the bill; would it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would do more than that. What about the veterans who did the fighting? Do they deserve to be protected by us? Should we not do something at least to prevent wetbacks from coming in and keeping a veteran from making a living? It is not a question of politics. It is a question of taking care of our own people. I do not care if my amendment gets only seven votes. I still prefer American labor to foreign labor. I prefer American labor to foreign labor irrespective of the fact that we can get foreign labor for 70 cents or 80 cents a day.

Thousands of children—

Children—

Thousands of children of veterans are not able to enjoy good health because veterans and their families are forced to work for starvation wages because of imported labor.

The labor would come in legally under the bill; illegally under the wetback system. Is it not fair, I ask those who believe in Jefferson, those who believe Adams, and those who believe in our way of life, to give American laboring men a chance to exist?

Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have—

They are even begging—

must have opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. The best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

Is that asking too much? The greatest characteristic of an American is not the tendency to brag about this and brag about that, or brag about patriotism or loyalty. The greatest characteristic of an American is fair play. Why can we not be fair with our own? All they want is an opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens.

The Senate has exercised its judgment. The judgment of the Senate will not be questioned by me. I think it was wrong, but it was in accordance with our system. The Senate has overwhelmingly voted against my amendment. In my opinion, it would have protected Americans. I simply wish to make the statement for the record so that my position may be clear, and Senators may realize what they have done. I am disappointed, of course, because I think the Senate took a wrong stand, but the Senate had the right to take the stand. Senators have a right to exercise their own judgment. The Senate has spoken overwhelmingly on a very important amendment.

I now wish to ask that the remainder of the amendments which I had intended to propose be printed in the RECORD, together with my argument on each of them. Then I wish to withdraw the pending amendment and the other amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments are withdrawn. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Do I understand that the amendments to which I have re-

ferred are to be printed in the RECORD at this point together with the accompanying arguments, and that then they are to be withdrawn?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. CHAVEZ and accompanying arguments are as follows:

AMENDMENT 2

On page 2, beginning in line 4 with the word "including", it is proposed to strike out through the word "entry" in line 6 and insert in lieu thereof "not including any workers illegally in the United States."

My interpretation of "including any such workers under legal entry" leaves the door open for the protection of illegals by large-scale growers who want to exploit them. I believe that the Immigration and Naturalization Service has been doing an excellent job in the enforcement of the Immigration laws of the United States, and I have full confidence that they are following the letter of the law. Therefore, instead of using the term "legal entry," I would substitute "including any such workers illegally in the United States." There have been several attempts within the past few sessions of Congress to legalize the so-called wetbacks. I think that my language in this instance is clear and without question as to its proper meaning.

AMENDMENT 3 (A)

On page 2, line 8, after the word "into", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "and of their anticipated employment in."

AMENDMENT 3 (B)

On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 13 through 17 and insert the following:

"(3) To provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers inside or outside the continental United States to such reception centers (or to places of employment in the case of domestic agricultural workers, including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and transportation from such reception centers (or places of employment in the case of such domestic workers) to such recruitment centers after termination of employment."

Transportation costs is one of the prime considerations in recruiting an adequate farm labor supply. Our domestic farm labor force could be better distributed if the farm labor could be transported from one area to another within the United States with mobility. Air transportation costs from Puerto Rico to the mainland and return are in the neighborhood of $120. Farm labor cannot adequately meet this expense if he is to return to Puerto Rico with savings at the end of his period of employment in the United States. Then too, we cannot expect the employer to bear all of this expense since those in the Northwest or Northeast would undoubtedly pay several times the amount that the employer in other parts of the country would have to pay. I have a subsequent amendment which will enable the Secretary of Labor to implement this program.

AMENDMENT 4

On page 3, line 10, after the word "under" it is proposed to insert "section 501 of."

On page 4, beginning with line 10, strike out through the word "available" in line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 503. No workers recruited under section 501 of this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined that (1) sufficient domestic, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, or Virgin Islands workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available and cannot be made available under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section."

On page 4, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall take whatever steps may be necessary and proper to provide an adequate supply of domestic, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, and Virgin Islands agricultural workers in the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, including, among other things, (1) the collection, compilation, and dissemination of information relevant to farm labor, labor-deficit areas, and housing and working conditions; (2) the recruiting, training, and placement of workers; (3) the transportation of, and the furnishing of housing, and health and medical care, and burial services to workers and their families; and (4) the construction, lease, repair, alteration, relocation, expansion, and operation of labor-supply centers, labor camps and homes, child-care centers, and other necessary facilities and services."

There is no doubt in my mind that the Secretary of Labor could do a more efficient job of recruiting and supplying farm labor if he were directed by statute to do so. Only when a person has a definite outline of his duties and responsibilities can he be protected from unjust criticism that he is not properly executing the duties of his office. Provisions of this amendment clearly outline these duties and responsibilities to be executed by the Secretary of Labor and they are in conformity with the recommendations made by interested groups and, in substance, the recommendations of the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor.

I have every reason to believe that this will be a great step forward in the administration of our farm-labor problem.

AMENDMENT 5

After section 509 it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. 510. Notwithstanding any provisions of law conferring similar benefits upon them, American Indians who are recruited for employment as farm workers shall be entitled to the protection and benefits of this act to the same extent and effect as other farm workers."

The protection of the social and economic welfare of the American Indians should be our paramount consideration in any legislation before this body. I have been told by the United States Employment Service that throughout the United States thousands upon thousands of American Indians would be available for farm labor if given decent wages and living conditions. The American Indian dislikes charity as much as any of us. The American Indian is a proud person. He feels that he survived without governmental relief for centuries. Today he is asking an opportunity to regain that self-reliance and economic freedom which he enjoyed for so many centuries. Many of our Indian farm laborers have been treated in such un-American ways by certain employers that I feel we should take special pains to afford them protection.

AMENDMENT 6

At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new sections:

"SEC. —. The Secretary of Labor shall authorize placement of workers recruited or transported under this act, whether United States citizens or aliens, only after the employer agrees with respect to such workers (1) to pay not less than prevailing wage rates set for the crop and area by the National Farm Labor Board pursuant to this act; (2) to pay such workers their wages in legal tender at the end of each week, or at the end of a customary payroll period not exceeding a semimonthly interval; (3) to provide employment for each such worker for not less than 75 percent of workdays (as defined by the Secretary and the employer in conformity with industry practices) falling between the beginning and end of each such worker's employment by such employer; (4) to cause any housing, subsistence, transportation, or other goods or services furnished such workers by the employer to conform to such standards as the Secretary may establish; and (5) to comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws relating to employment, to elect to cover such workers by State or local workmen's compensation laws if such laws permit such election, to obtain insurance to protect such workers in case of occupational accidents or diseases if coverage by compensation laws cannot be obtained, and to pay all expenses for hospital, medicines, and medical attention necessitated by occupational accidents and diseases. Insurance required pursuant to this section shall provide benefits no less favorable than those set out in the following schedule:

Accidental death	$1,000
Loss of—	
Both hands	1,000
Both feet	1,000
Sight of both eyes	1,000
One hand one one foot	1,000
One hand and sight of one eye	1,000
One foot and sight of one eye	1,000
One hand or one foot	500
Sight of one eye	500
Total loss of a digit	50
Partial loss of a digit	25

"SEC. —. The Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to insure himself that employers perform agreements entered into by them under the act; that workers receive the wages due them without any unwarranted deduction therefrom, or restriction upon the expenditure thereof; and that any housing, subsistence, transportation, or other goods or services furnished by employers shall conform to the standards established by the Secretary.

"SEC. —. A National Farm Labor Board, consisting of three representatives of agricultural employers, three representatives of agricultural workers, and three representatives of the general public, shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Secretary of Labor. Such Board shall, after public hearings in particular areas with respect to particular crops, determine the need for agricultural workers in such areas for the production of such crops, and the prevailing hourly, daily, piecework, and other wage rates and other conditions of employment applicable to such crops in such areas. The Board may delegate any of its functions to any of the employees of the Department of Labor. Members of the Board shall be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

"SEC. —. An advisory committee shall be established, composed of representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Security Administration, Department of the Interior, Selective Service, and of such other departments, agencies, and organizations and such individuals as the Secretary of Labor may deem advisable. The committee shall advise the Secretary, upon his request, on housing, health, education, and vocational training, subsistence, and transportation standards and problems, and such other matters in connection with the program as the Secretary may see fit. The members of the committee shall receive no compensation for their services as committee members."

SECTION A

Strange as it may seem to my fellow Members of the Senate, Mexican nationals imported for farm labor under contract are today enjoying better working conditions and

benefits than our own domestic farm workers who are United States citizens.

Realizing that every Senator present is ever conscious of his oath of office, I have every confidence to believe that in this hour of national emergency we are not going to forget the first responsibility imposed on us lawmakers by our beloved Constitution, that the welfare of our own people, yes, the welfare of United States citizens, should be uppermost in all our actions.

Gentlemen, I say that we should never adopt any legislation which would place the foreign worker imported for temporary farm labor on a higher standard than our own workers who are United States citizens.

The amendment which I am offering does not exceed the working conditions and benefits which now exist in our present agreement with Mexico. I have simply duplicated those conditions and benefits in this amendment. Let us not forget our duty to the United States citizen who is a farm laborer.

SECTION B

The creation of a National Farm Labor Board is consistent with the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor. This board is the practical approach to the many arguments on the part of the growers and the workers that they are mistreated by our governmental officials in the matter of regulations, wages, and standards. This Farm Labor Board would conduct hearings throughout the United States, and could render just and equitable decisions on matters involving supply of labor, prevailing wages, and working conditions. It would be composed of nine members, three representing the employer, three representing the agricultural worker and three representing the public interest. I believe that such a board would be the vehicle whereby we would have greater uninterrupted production of our agriculture production. The board would be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Secretary of Labor. It would not duplicate any of the functions now exercised by that department, but would add to and strengthen those functions.

SECTION C

For years various reports, including the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, recently issued, have stressed the imperative need for a concentrated and coordinated attack on the farm labor problem by the various governmental agencies who are directly engaged in improving its unfavorable aspects.

Private enterprise has found the technique of established advisory committees very profitable. Government agencies have on many occasions found interdepartmental boards to be likewise effective, not only in rendering better service but in reducing administrative costs considerably.

I, therefore, propose with the following amendment the creation of an advisory committee that will advise the Secretary of Labor periodically on the best procedures to follow in the solution of this complex problem.

AMENDMENT 7

At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following section:

"SEC. 511. Section 2 (3) of the National Labor Relations-Management Act of 1947 is amended by striking out the following: 'as an agricultural laborer, or'."

The position of agricultural labor today is approximately the same as that of industrial labor prior to World War I. Wages were low; working conditions were worse, and the owners of industry were importing thousands of European workers for exploitation in the mines, mills, and factories. At that time there was no protection for the right of industrial workers to organize and bargain collectively with their employers. The Labor Relations Act makes it possible for industrial workers to bargain with their employers, and today unions perform a great service to both employee and employer.

However, the authors of the original national labor relations law, the Wagner Act, saw fit to exclude from its benefits and responsibilities employees in large scale commercialized agriculture. This exclusion was carried over into the present Labor Management Relation Act.

In presenting this amendment I wish to correct an injustice of long standing and to bring to employees of the 125,000 large scale farms which are in reality "factories in the fields" the benefits of a law which is applied to all other types of workers in America. There are 1,000,000 workers employed on these large-scale farm operations. The large scale farm operators are in competition with our small family size farmers who are the backbone of American agriculture.

AMENDMENT 8

On page 3, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "$20" and insert "$200."

In supplying farm labor necessary for the production of food and fiber crops in the defense emergency one of the prime considerations is the cost of recruitment and transportation. Our domestic labor supply could be better distributed if workers could be transported from one area to another under a cooperative arrangement between the Government and the employers of such workers. S. 984 provides that employers shall pay the Government $20 for each worker imported into the United States. That figure is based on the actual cost of transportation from recruitment centers in Mexico to the port of entry on the Mexican border. What about the employers of such labor in the Pacific Northwest or the sugar-beet fields of Michigan? What about the 150,000 Puerto Rican workers who are available for employment in the continental United States? The actual cost of transportation of Puerto Ricans to New Jersey is about $120 round trip. This provision either means that employers will be subsidized from the Public Treasury or there will be no labor sent to points within a few hundred miles of our southern border. I, therefore, propose an amendment which would require employers to reimburse the Government the actual costs of such transportation and subsistence not to exceed $200.

AMENDMENT 9

On page 7, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "1952" and insert in lieu thereof "1951."

Proponents of this legislation have repeatedly stated that this is primarily an emergency or stop-gap measure to enable our Government to renew its existing agreement with the Republic of Mexico for the importation of Mexican nationals for farm labor.

While this particular measure was being considered by various members of the Senate, the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor was issued. This long overdue study, thorough and practical in its approach to the problem, points very clearly to the need for extensive revision of present policies and administrative procedures to effectively solve this blight of our private enterprise system.

Sound and effective legislation cannot be realized in the short space of time which the proponents of this measure had at their disposal. We know from personal experience that any measure conceived and nurtured in the short span of weeks cannot long solve one of the most pressing national problems.

Congress should immediately begin extensive hearings to solve this farm-labor problem on a permanent and sound basis. Therefore I offer the following amendment to limit the life of this legislation to December 31, 1951.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD several telegrams I have received indicating opposition to the pending bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *May 1, 1951.*

United States Senator CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your amending Ellender bill. We favor establishment better working conditions for all agricultural workers and better organization.

Archbishop EDWIN V. BYRNE.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *May 1, 1951.*

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Care White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Oppose cheap foreign labor. Undermines local labor. Only big boys profit at expense of displaced local Latin-Americans.

Dr. J. A. GARCIA.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 30, 1951.*

Senator CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Lulacs of San Antonio endorse your stand opposing authorization of imported Mexican labor. Texas labor cheapen by importing aliens.

LULAC COUNCIL OF SAN ANTONIO.

TAOS, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We are not in favor of Senate bill 984 as originally introduced. Please endeavor to amend same.

CORONADO PHARMACY.

ESTANCIA, N. MEX.

Senator CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

Dear SENATOR: We are opposed to the Ellender bill. Thank you for your stand on this bill.

J. C. SANCHEZ.

TAOS, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Please endeavor to amend Senate bill 984. Present bill is detrimental to our laboring people in New Mexico.

MARCELINO MARTINEZ.
J. P. RAEL QUESTA.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "M," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) to establish and operate reception centers in the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States: *Provided*, That such reception centers shall be distributed geographically so as to provide, as far as practicable, equality of costs and opportunity of obtaining such workers in the areas where the Secretary finds need therefor to exist.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, first I wish the RECORD to show that my col-

league [Mr. MORSE], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN], the Senators from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. WELKER], and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] associate themselves with me as cosponsors of the amendment.

Mr. President, the hour grows late. I do not believe it is necessary to make an extended statement with respect to the amendment. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has heretofore discussed the matter in some detail. My colleague has also discussed it, as have other Senators. Under the circumstances, I wish to assure my colleagues that I shall take very little time in presenting the amendment to the Senate.

First, I invite attention to statements made by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when he presented the bill for the committee. He indicated that my proposal had been before the committee, but that there was no particular support for it, and therefore the committee did not give it full consideration. I do not quite understand that suggestion, in the light of the hearings themselves.

Let me say that the amendment would provide for the recruitment of Mexican nationals in Mexico and for their transportation to reception centers in the United States, not simply across the border from Mexico, but within the continental United States, at such points as in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor need for such workers shall be shown to exist, and at such points as in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor would serve to equalize the costs of the labor and its availability to American agriculture throughout the 48 States. The number of reception centers is a matter for the sound discretion of the Secretary of Labor. Their location rests within the discretion of the Secretary of Labor.

The reason for the amendment rests in the vast distances within continental United States from any point along the border between the United States and Mexico. It rests in the fact that the need for the proposed legislation arises from the circumstance that, in the present emergency, labor ordinarily available to agriculture in various sections of the United States is not available because it has been drained off by war enterprises. It rests in the fact that industrial wages are higher than agricultural wages. It rests in the fact that the Department of Agriculture, which was created as the representative of agriculture in the United States, and which speaks with authority to agriculture, has called upon agriculture in this year for extraordinary agricultural production. That extraordinary production is an additional call on agricultural labor, which would be insufficient to meet the needs of agriculture even were there no increase in production.

This subject was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I call attention to the fact that the committee had before it, from the Pacific Northwest, Mr. Ernest Falk, manager of the Northwest Horticultural Council, who discussed this very question in detail. In his testimony he indicated that the cost of Mexican labor in the Pacific Northwest to the farmer would be $2 per man per day in excess of the cost of local agricultural labor in the area. Undoubtedly the same ratio would prevail in other areas of the United States. That added cost must be borne by agriculture. Agriculture cannot afford that type of discrimination and continue to produce.

In addition to the statement of Mr. Falk before the committee, Mr. Fred Bailey, legislative consultant of the National Grange, appeared before the committee and called attention time and again to the inequities of the situation which would prevail if under the terms of the bill foreign labor were brought only to the Rio Grande and there had to be taken over by the prospective employers. The total transportation costs to and from the border reception center would be borne by agriculture.

Mr. Bailey advised the committee that it was the policy and position of the Grange that equity should be done in this matter. He suggested the type of thing which is embodied in the amendment which we of the Pacific Northwest present today.

Among other things, Mr. Bailey said to the committee—and I quote from page 53 of the hearings:

> We hope that the committee will weigh carefully our suggestion for the establishment of recruiting centers for foreign workers at a limited number of interior points, with an equitable apportionment of costs.

That statement was made again and again, and I shall not burden the Senate by repeating it.

Mr. Clarence J. McCormick, Under Secretary of Agriculture, appeared before the committee and also went into this subject in detail. He called attention to the increased production requested of the farmers by their Government through the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Oregon has been presenting the case very well. I wonder if he knows that the Labor Department indicated a desire to establish a great many roadside camps for migratory farm labor throughout the country. This led to considerable apprehension on the part of the committee that we would have such a series of tourist camps for migratory labor that they might spend a good deal of the time traveling, if they could be accommodated at cost every 200 or 300 miles. I wonder if the Senator had considered limiting the number of reception centers so that there would be no danger of the Labor Department undertaking to establish an elaborate system of tourist camps for migratory labor all over the United States. I do not think we need more than three or four reception centers. But if we were to provide from six to ten, I think that would safeguard the situation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that it will require some time to complete consideration of the distinguished Senator's amendment. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has stated that he wishes to speak at some length on the amendment. Does the Senator wish to proceed, or would he rather suspend until tomorrow?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the desire of the majority leader. I ask unanimous consent, if we do suspend now, that I may have the floor when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, inasmuch as I have begun my discussion. I assure the Senator that I shall not take very long.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Oregon retaining the floor tomorrow?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to comply with the Senator's request but I think I have cooperated to a great extent by withdrawing my amendments after taking a terrible beating. I do not see why we cannot go along and pass the bill. It is a good bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is under consideration. He is arguing it now. All that the majority leader is asking is that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, and that the Senator from Oregon be permitted to continue the explanation of his amendment. This is not a request for a limitation of debate, or for a vote at a certain time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator's amendment is so good that I would be willing to vote on it now, or continue to work on it. I am for it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think it would require some time, and involve an evening session. Not having given notice of an evening session, I do not feel that we should do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UNITED STATES POLICIES IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make another inquiry. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 25 on April 17, 1951. I had thought that before this time the Senate would have finished consideration of the pending bill and could adjourn so that there could be a morning hour, and the resolution could be considered and acted upon. It would do no good to adjourn until tomorrow unless we would obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on his resolution before 2 o'clock.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], he may be interested in what I am about to say. In order to find out whether it would be possible to dispose of the concurrent resolution before the hour of 2 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 at 2 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I ask what the resolution is?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose the majority leader tells us about it.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is a resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate United States policies in the Far East.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would like to comply with that suggestion, but I remind the Senate that the unfinished business, which is a bill affecting American labor, is important. So I shall object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then I see no purpose in adjourning, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, because without a unanimous-consent agreement I am sure we could not finish consideration of the concurrent resolution in the 2 hours time, and we would only waste the 2 hours. So it will be my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will press for an adjournment at a later time. If there is objection, of course, we cannot proceed.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I had thought we would finish action on the unfinished business on yesterday, or by tonight, and that we could then take up the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan. I was not trying to keep him from having it taken up for consideration. I want the Senator to understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico would withhold his objection. I think the majority leader made the situation plain, and I have no doubt the Senator from New Mexico understood him. Unless the concurrent resolution is brought up by tomorrow and voted upon time will run against it. It was the desire of the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the committees that were to hear the witnesses on the question of our national-defense policy and our policies in the Far East, should be of a bipartisan nature, composed of an equal number of Democrats and Republicans, named from the Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to suggest that I believe we can complete action on the pending bill as well as the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan if we continue in session tonight.

Mr. McFARLAND. We can pursue that tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why pursue it tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Unanimous consent has already been obtained for two committees to proceed. We will see what can be done by tomorrow.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it appears to me that my good friend the majority leader wants to expedite business. We all want to expedite business. There is only one controversial amendment pending in connection with the bill, and that is the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. Why can we not conclude this bill tonight? I am quite sure that the Senator from Louisiana will agree that we should endeavor to complete action on the bill tonight, and then proceed with the other business.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that 30 amendments have been sent to the desk. Only two amendments have been disposed of, and the only amendments which have been withdrawn are those which were submitted by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. If the only amendment to be considered tonight is that of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, of course, we could get through with the bill this evening. But let us not forget that there are 17 more amendments at the desk. I believe the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico had 10 of the 25 amendments that were submitted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, I had 10.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, 30 were submitted. If the Senator from New Mexico has withdrawn his 10, and two have been acted upon, that would leave 18 to be considered, including the one which is now under discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will tell my good friend that the only controversial amendment is that of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from New Mexico. He could have taken time to present each and every one of his amendments. He has cooperated in expediting action upon the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the majority leader feel that it would be agreeable to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow, thus saving an hour in that way, and consider the concurrent resolution until 1 o'clock and then vote on it?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have a committee hearing I must attend in the morning. It has been my experience, furthermore, that we do not gain much by meeting at 11 o'clock.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is not a Senator present who does not understand the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. Why can we not at least vote on that amendment and get through with it. I am sure that would result in limiting the debate on the other amendments. Why can we not do that? Every Senator is for it.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is perfectly willing to have a vote on his amendment this evening and is perfectly willing to cut short his statement so a vote on the amendment can be had soon. However, I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] desires to debate the amendment from the other viewpoint. If that is the case debate will probably continue until some time in the evening. That would be my guess. I am in the hands of the Senate. It is wholly immaterial to me whether the Senate remains in session to discuss the amendment or does not.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The question is simple. The Senator from Louisiana, who is sponsoring the bill, wants the centers, or the concentrations—I call them concentrations because that is what they are; they are not reception centers; they are concentration centers—to be on the Mexican border. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon would provide for such centers elsewhere in addition to those on the Mexican border. So the question is a simple one. If Senators want them to be on the Mexican border only they will vote against the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. If Senators want them to be located throughout the country so they might help, for example, the beet growers in Michigan, and the growers of string beans and tomatoes in the State of my good friend from Delaware, then Senators will vote for the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. If Senators want the concentration centers to be only on the Mexican border, they can vote in line with the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana. If they want them to be located all over the United States, as they should be, they can vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am happy to have this informal discussion going on, without yielding to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for further discussion, so we may reach a decision on this point.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought the Senator was going to yield for the purpose of recessing. I do not think it is fair to Senators to keep them here after 6:30 or 7 o'clock unless I have given notice in advance that we would have a night session. I have not held Senators here until a later hour without giving notice. I sometimes remain myself in order to accommodate Senators who want to make speeches sometimes as late as 7:30 or 8:30 o'clock. We remain in session as long as we have now remained more often than not. But unless notice has been given in advance I do not think it is fair to hold the Senate in session later than this.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first I want to pay tribute to the senior Senator from New Mexico for the fine fight he has made on the bill. I know he perhaps feels discouraged at the reception which his initial amendment received, but I think the vote on that amendment does not measure the true opinion of the Senate on the other amendments which he offered. In particular I regret that he withdrew the amendment providing penalties for violation of the immigration laws in bringing wetbacks into the United States. I think perhaps the penalties which he proposed may have been too severe, since there was provision both for a maximum fine of $2,000 and

for imprisonment for a term not to exceed 5 years. But in the form of alternative penalties of somewhat lesser amount it would seem to me that the amendment would commend itself to the Senate. So, I hope very much that the Senator from New Mexico will reconsider his determination to withdraw the amendment, and will now be willing to offer it so that we may debate and vote upon it tomorrow.

I wish to say that I think the Senator from New Mexico has rendered a public service of the first magnitude, and all of us honor him for the very brave fight he has made during this week. If he will reconsider offering the amendment, with perhaps a slight change in the penalties, it can be voted on tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it would not be in order to offer the amendment at this time, because another amendment is pending. Whatever Senators wish to do about it can be done tomorrow, but it is useless for me to give notice that we are about to end the session for today, if some Senators then attempt to have us remain here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then let me ask unanimous consent to present the amendment and that it lie on the table and be printed. Then, if overnight the Senator from New Mexico decides he would like to sponsor the amendment, which was originally his, I would ask that he be permitted to put his name on the amendment in the morning.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator merely wish to offer the amendment and have it printed and lie on the table?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Oren E. Long, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Ingram M. Stainback, resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NEW REPORTS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard T. Rives, of Alabama, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Richard T. Rives, of Alabama, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the inspiration of all that is beautiful, may our souls in these moments of prayer be kindled with a greater passion for righteousness and justice.

Establish and confirm within us the virtues of integrity and fidelity and may no temptation or sinister influence undermine our character and cause us to break faith with Thee and our fellowmen and our own better self.

We pray that our minds and hearts may be impervious to all those ambitions and aspirations for personal aggrandizement and glory which are alien to the noble ideals and principles of our blessed Lord.

Grant that daily our conduct may authenticate and bear witness to the reality of His spirit and may the day be hastened when His lofty idealism shall become regnant in the life of all mankind.

May Thy name be glorified. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 134):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

KOREAN CASUALTIES

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker: In his address at Soldiers Field in Chicago on Thursday, April 26, General MacArthur referred to the Korean casualties as "staggering." That he should discuss that phase of the war does not surprise me. I was informed in 1946 by a prominent Washington physician, who, during World War II was a medical officer attached to the general's staff throughout the greater part of the Far East campaign, that General MacArthur's chief concern at all times was to reduce and minimize casualties, and that so insistent was he on maintaining that policy that he invariably changed and modified his military tactics that that end might be accomplished.

When the general appears before the congressional committees in the near future he most certainly should be requested to elaborate on this subject. I am sure the committees will be intensely interested and the Congress itself will want the full facts. Although generals may be replaced, human lives cannot. If the objectives we seek to accomplish can be achieved by a modification of State Department policies in Korea and the lives of American soldiers can be spared thereby, it is folly indeed, if not criminal, to pursue our present course. Congress should be apprised of all the facts now.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, Delegate to the United Nations, Warren R. Austin, is so right in his recent statement that "There is no free ride to international security." While I realize that the mentioning of contributions or lack of contributions on the part of our allies in the United Nations is a delicate subject, nevertheless, it is apparent that there must be some "dragging of the feet."

To be sure, many members of the United Nations have other commitments than those in Korea, but none could be more important. Unless and until there

are substantial improvements and greater cooperation among the members of the United Nations, its success cannot be assured. Should a partner in private business neglect or refuse to comply with his part of an agreement or contract, the partnership would fail. We simply cannot afford to allow the United Nations to fail. It seems to me that it is the last hope of world peace. In spite of the ever increasing casualties up to and including this very day, our people have unstintingly made every necessary sacrifice and contribution. Other member nations must do likewise.

In this connection, the Library of Congress has recently furnished me with a statement as to the contributions being made by the several members of the United Nations. I was amazed, as was Delegate Austin, by the revelation that many members of the United Nations are making simply token contributions. Let us further insist that everyone do his part.

The statistics given me by the Library of Congress are as follows:

APPROXIMATE MANPOWER CONTRIBUTION OF COUNTRIES SERVING WITH THE UNITED NATIONS IN KOREA

The New York Times of February 26, 1951, states that the United States has supplied 48 percent of the total strength of the United Nations forces in Korea. The Republic of Korea contributes 43 percent and 13 other countries account for the remaining 9 percent. The estimated combined manpower contributions (all services) of countries with armed forces serving with the United Nations in Korea are as follows:

Australia	1,500
Belgium	900
Canada	2,600
France	1,122
Greece	1,400
Luxembourg	4
Netherlands	700–1,000
New Zealand	1,000
Philippines	1,200
Thailand	1,200
Turkey	5,000
Union of South Africa	400
United Kingdom	22,000
United States	170,000–250,000
Republic of Korea	100,000–300,000

EMPLOYEES OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2976) relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management and that the bill be re-referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

CONDITIONAL RELEASE OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2924) to amend section 4164 of title 18, United States Code, relating to conditional release of Federal prisoners.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MAKING CERTAIN INCREASES IN ANNUITIES OF ANNUITANTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3401) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any Foreign Service officer who has retired before November 13, 1950, on annuity under the provisions of the act of May 24, 1924 (43 Stat. 140), as amended, or under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and who does not come within the purview of section 2 of this act shall have his annuity increased on the first day of the second month following the month in which this act is enacted or on the date such annuity commences, whichever is later, in accordance with the following scale:

(a) By 25 percent or $300, whichever is the lesser, if retirement took place before November 13, 1946;

(b) By 20 percent or $240, whichever is the lesser, if retirement took place on or after November 13, 1946, and before November 13, 1947;

(c) By 15 percent or $180, whichever is the lesser, if retirement took place on or after November 13, 1947, and before November 13, 1948;

(d) By 10 percent or $120, whichever is the lesser, if retirement took place on or after November 13, 1948, and before November 13, 1949; and

(e) By 5 percent or $60, whichever is the lesser, if retirement took place on or after November 13, 1949, and before November 13, 1950: *Provided*, That in no case shall an annuity increased under this act exceed the largest annuity payable under section 821 (a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

SEC. 2. Any Foreign Service officer who has retired before November 13, 1950, and who has elected or may elect to receive a reduced annuity under the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 24, 1924 (43 Stat. 144), as amended, or the provisions of sections 821 and 1112 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1020, 1035), and any widow or other beneficiary of such officer who is receiving or who shall receive a survivorship annuity, shall have the amount of such annuity increased in an amount equal to the percentage differential between the full annuity which the officer would have received prior to the passage of this act if he had elected to take a full annuity and the amount of the increased full annuity provided for in the first section of this act. The increase in annuities provided for in this section shall be effective on the first day of the second month following the month in which this act is enacted or on the effective date such annuities commence, whichever date is later.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF PIPELINES BY THE WINE INDUSTRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2746) to amend section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the act approved February 21, 1950, Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress, is amended by deleting the comma after the word "produced" and inserting in lieu thereof a period; by deleting therefrom the words "or from such storage tanks to the fortification rooms of contiguous wineries"; and by adding thereto the following new sentence: "Fortifying spirits of 160 degrees of proof or more may also be transferred by pipeline from storage tanks in any internal revenue bonded warehouse to the fortification rooms of contiguous wineries."

(b) The amendment effected by subsection (a) hereof shall be effective on the effective date of Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "pipeline" and insert "pipe line."

Page 2, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 and insert:

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall become effective on the thirtieth day following the date of the enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I was much pleased to have the House approve H. R. 2746. This bill will permit the transfer of fortifying spirits of 160 degrees of proof or more by pipeline from storage tanks in any internal-revenue bonded warehouse to the fortification rooms of contiguous wineries.

Section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448 of the Eighty-first Congress, provided that such spirits might be transferred to fortification rooms of contiguous wineries by tank car from registered or fruit distilleries to storage tanks in any internal-revenue bonded warehouse, irrespective of whether or not the warehouse is located on the premises of the producing distiller.

The bill just passed by the House would permit this transfer, to be made by pipeline, of such fortifying spirits from an internal-revenue bonded warehouse to a contiguous winery where such bonded warehouse is not located on the premises of the producing distiller. Obviously, this is a much simpler and economical method of transferring such fortifying spirits which are necessary in making dessert wines.

PAYMENT OF TAX ON VODKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1613) to amend section 2883 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 2883 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the act approved February 21, 1950, Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Transfer of gin and vodka: Gin and vodka of any proof may be transferred in bond by means of pipelines from receiving cisterns in distilleries direct to storage tanks in the internal-revenue bonded warehouse located on the bonded premises where produced, or located contiguous thereto, and be warehoused in such storage tanks. Upon tax payment, gin and vodka of any proof may be transferred by pipeline from receiving cisterns in distilleries, or from storage tanks in internal-revenue bonded warehouses located on or contiguous to the bonded premises of the producing distillery, to a contiguous tax-paid bottling house rectifying plant."

(b) The amendment effected by subsection (a) hereof shall be effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "pipelines" and insert "pipe lines."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "pipeline" and insert "pipe line."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ASSIGNMENT OF CLAIMS ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3692) to facilitate the financing of defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 998, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1029), is amended by striking out all after clause 3 of the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"4. That in the event of any such assignment, the assignee thereof shall file written notice of the assignment together with a true copy of the instrument of assignment with (a) the contracting officer or the head of his department or agency; (b) the surety or sureties upon the bond or bonds, if any, in connection with such contract; and (c) the disbursing officer, if any, designated in such contract to make payment.

"Notwithstanding any law to the contrary governing the validity of assignments, any assignment pursuant to the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended, shall constitute a valid assignment for all purposes.

"In any case in which moneys due or to become due under any contract are or have been assigned pursuant to this section, no liability of any nature of the assignor to the United States or any department or agency thereof, whether arising from or independently of such contract, shall create or impose any liability on the part of the assignee to make restitution, refund, or repayment to the United States of any amount heretofore since July 1, 1950, or hereafter received under the assignment.

"Any contract of the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, or any other department or agency of the United States designated by the President, except, any such contract under which full payment has been made, may, in time of war or national emergency proclaimed by the President (including the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950) or by act or joint resolution of the Congress and until such war or national emergency has been terminated in such manner, provide or be amended without consideration to provide that payments to be made to the assignee of any moneys due or to become due under such contract shall not be subject to reduction or set-off, and if such provision or one to the same general effect has been at any time heretofore or is hereafter included or inserted in any such contract, payments to be made thereafter to an assignee of any moneys due or to become due under such contract, whether during or after such war or emergency, shall not be subject to reduction or set-off for any liability of any nature of the assignor to the United States or any department or agency thereof which arises independently of such contract, or hereafter for any liability of the assignor on account of (1) renegotiation under any renegotiation statute or under any statutory renegotiation article in the contract, (2) fines, (3) penalties (which term does not include amounts which may be collected or withheld from the assignor in accordance with or for failure to comply with the terms of the contract), or (4) taxes, social-security contributions, or the withholding or nonwithholding of taxes or social-security contributions, whether arising from or independently of such contract.

"Except as herein otherwise provided, nothing in this act, as amended, shall be deemed to affect or impair rights or obligations heretofore accrued."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3692) was laid on the table.

REGULATING PARKINC AT POST OFFICE BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2929) to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to prohibit or regulate the use, for the parking or storage of vehicles of any kind, of any property under his custody and control which is owned by the United States for postal purposes and over which the United States has exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. Whoever violates any regulation prescribed by the Postmaster General under authority of this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $25; but no individual shall be liable for violating any such regulation unless at the time of such violation there was posted in a conspicuous place on the property with respect to which such violation occurred a notice calling attention to this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF POST ROUTE MAPS, OPINIONS, AND TRANSCRIPTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 803) to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General may authorize the sale of—

(1) post route and rural delivery maps;

(2) opinions of the Solicitor for the Post Office Department; and

(3) transcripts of hearings before the trial examiners for the Post Office Department;

at such rates as he determines to be fair and reasonable: *Provided*, That such shall not be sold at a price that represents more than the cost thereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR PSYCHOSES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 320) to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability prior to January 1, 1950.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi explain the bill and also tell us whether or not this bill has a unanimous committee report?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, it is unanimously reported by the committee. I am sorry I do not see the ranking minority member, Mrs. ROGERS, present, but if I remember correctly she made the motion to instruct me to use every parliamentary method to get the bill passed. It merely extends the presumptive period for these insane veterans from 1 to 3 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is all it does?

Mr. RANKIN. That is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, Veterans Regulation

No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding after the word "epilepsies;" the following: "psychoses;" and by adding immediately preceding the last proviso the following: "*Provided further*, That as to active service between December 7, 1941, and December 31, 1946, a disease of psychosis developing a 10 percent degree of disability or more prior to January 1, 1950, shall, in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary, be deemed to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7 after "following:" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That a disease of psychosis developing a 10 percent degree of disability or more within 3 years from the date of separation from active service shall, in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary, be deemed to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I do this in order to question the chairman of the committee. I notice that coming out of the gentleman's committee on many occasions is legislation of this type. This bill provides that a psychoneurotic condition will be considered as service-connected if it is established as a 10-percent disability within 3 years after the discharge of the soldier. The committee has done that with tuberculosis and extended the time 3 or possibly 5 years, so that if tuberculosis develops within that time it is presumed to be service-connected.

I am not going to object to this amendment; it is needed, but in making these conditions service-connected you must remember that we have about 130,000 beds in the United States to care for the veterans. More than half of these beds are filled by individuals who have illnesses that are not service-connected. If the Congress makes so many illnesses service-connected then the need will be for more than 200,000 beds. The need for beds and doctors and nurses is most acute in all veterans' hospitals.

I do not know where the dividing line ought to be but a warning signal should be raised as to the need of beds to give proper care to disabled veterans. The present war creates many obligations. The war injuries should have priority. However, you are going to fill your hospitals with people who have a claim on the beds and yet may not be really service-connected. The real acute injury from Korea or Europe may be neglected. You are not going to have enough beds if you continue the program of making all these illnesses service-connected after from 3 to 5 years.

May I ask the chairman this: What is the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. RANKIN. We are doing for these veterans at the end of 3 years just what we did for World War I veterans up to 1925.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I know; that is the tendency.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman that I am afraid he is getting out on a limb, when he talks about applying this to all kinds of illnesses.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We did it with tuberculosis and cancer.

Mr. RANKIN. Tuberculosis; yes, and we ought to take care of those cases.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We did it with cancer.

Mr. RANKIN. Cancer is an incurable disease.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And we did it with heart disease.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am not sure about heart disease.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And other chronic illnesses.

Mr. RANKIN. There are four or five of these chronic diseases. We have gone a long way trying to take care of those diseases. One of them is cancer, which the medical profession has never been able to cope with. Another is tuberculosis, which is not only a fatal disease, but a contagious disease and very dangerous. I want to say to the gentleman from Nebraska that considerable progress is being made today in reducing the fatalities among tubercular cases. Especially is that true in my State of Mississippi where we have led the way in the very treatment that this bill will give these men, and that is the rest treatment.

Another disease is insanity. Many of these boys come home and the fact that the insanity exists is not realized or is kept a secret in the families for probably 2 or 3 years. In the early days of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs we extended that time until January 1, 1925, for World War I veterans, or more than 6 years after the armistice.

We gave them 6 years after the war closed, and here we are giving these boys only 3 years. In other words, we are extremely conservative in order to get any relief at all for these unfortunate boys.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. About half of the beds in the United States for civilian use are filled up by mental patients. We all know that, and it is a sad thing, and I just want to warn your committee, I am not going to object to the amendment, I think it is necessary, but if you continue to make half a dozen of these diseases service connected after 3 to 5 years, then you had better make preparations for some 200,000 beds to take care of the veterans who are going to claim, after 3 or 5 years, service-connected disability because of heart and mental conditions, kidney conditions, tuberculosis, and cancer, and 4 or 5 other diseases which are now in the process of being made service connected. We must provide more beds for the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska that he is unduly alarmed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, I am not alarmed. We are to take care of these veterans but please provide more beds.

Mr. RANKIN. You are going to have to take care of these crazy men either in the homes or in the State institutions or in the veterans' hospitals.

In many of the cases they are presumed to be service connected and under this bill they will have 3 years after the war closes to get the benefits of this bill, and I say that is not an unreasonable proposition.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It will be unreasonable unless the Congress provides more hospital facilities for the proper care of these veterans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Chairman RANKIN and the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for reporting out H. R. 320, as it is highly necessary legislation for World War II veterans who have become afflicted with psychoses, directly or indirectly, by reason of their service in World War II.

This legislation is especially needed in view of the fact that medical science is now engaged in research to find the causes and practical cure for this mental affliction.

Great numbers of veterans, through shell shock, gas, or other forms of mental strain endured during their service, did not realize the seriousness of their affliction, or the damaging impact thereof did not strike them until several years after its inception. Some veterans may have difficulty in proving the service connection of their affliction owing to the above set out circumstances. This bill will give veterans in this category a just protection for medical care and hospitalization on disabilities which are as legitimate as though they were received from an injury that rendered them stricken on the battlefield.

This legislation should be enacted into law.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not want this statement to go in the RECORD without some answer. We are merely giving these men 3 years where we gave the World War I veterans 6 years. This is not going to fill the veterans' hospitals with these insane fellows. They have a right to go there now. It is going to keep many of them out of the hospitals because it will provide them with compensation to live on at home. I do not know that I have ever seen a more just piece of legislation presented to the House, and I trust there will be no opposition to it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3

years after date of separation from active service."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

MORRIS TUTNAUER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of Morris Tutnauer.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MRS. CLARA RAFFLOER DROESSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 896) for the relief of Mrs. Clara Raffloer Droesse.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Mrs. Raffloer Droesse, a natural-born citizen of the United States born in New York, N. Y., on April 30, 1880, who lost her citizenship of the United States by voting in a Bavarian village election against a Communist mayor in 1946, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year from the enactment of this act, before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act.

(b) From and after naturalization under this act, Mrs. Clara Raffloer Droesse shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, Mrs. Clara Raffloer Droesse shall be held and considered to have retained her United States citizenship."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZBIGNIEW JAN DUNIKOWSKI ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 961) for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospera Dunikowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, his wife Karolina Dunikowski and his daughters, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski and Janina Grospera Dunikowski, now residing in New York City, and who entered the United States on a transit visa September 16, 1946, at San Francisco, Calif., port of entry, shall be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct four numbers from the Polish quota of the first year that the same Polish quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "City", strike out the remainder of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct four numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SADAKO KAWAMURA LAWTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton, the wife of Earle Evans Lawton, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War I.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIDNEY YOUNG HUGHES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1103) for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sidney Young Hughes shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABRIELE GILDO FALVO CITRIGNO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1415) for the relief of Gabriele Gildo Falvo Citrigno.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Gabriele Gildo Falvo Citrigno, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Carmen Citrigno, citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY KOLISH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1910) for the relief of Henry Kolish.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Henry Kolish, minor child of Polish nationality now being cared for in Winnipeg, Dominion of Canada, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born son of Wolf Templeman and Mrs. Sophie Templeman, United States citizens residing in Portland, Oreg.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Henry Kolish, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Wolf Templeman, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ETHEL MARTHA QUINN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2284) for the relief of Ethel Martha Quinn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Ethel Martha Quinn, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Ethel Martha Quinn shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 404 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, Ethel Martha Quinn shall be held and considered to have retained her United States citizenship."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANISLAW POBORSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2307) for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws,

Stanislaw Poborski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stanislaw Poborski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuance to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVELYN REICHARDT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3141) for the relief of Evelyn Reichardt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Evelyn Reichardt, the German fiancée of Corp. Stanley H. Stater, a United States citizen now serving in the United States Army, shall be eligible for visa as nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Evelyn Reichardt is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Corporal Stater, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Evelyn Reichardt, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Evelyn Reichardt, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Evelyn Reichardt as of the date of the payment of her required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSARIO GARCIA JIMENO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1469) for the relief of Rosario Garcia Jimeno.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the quota limitations established pursuant to law, the alien Rosario Garcia Jimeno, Manila, Philippine Islands, shall be granted admission to the United States as a quota immigrant for permanent residence, if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon admission of the said Rosario Garcia Jimeno to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Philippine Islands for the first year such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOE TORTOLINI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1791) for the relief of Joe Tortolini.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to discontinue, or to cause to be discontinued, the existing deportation proceedings in the case of the alien Joe Tortolini, Santa Barbara, Calif., and is directed not to institute, or to cause to be instituted, further deportation proceedings in the case of such alien insofar as such further deportation proceedings, if instituted, would be based upon the same grounds as the deportation proceedings required by this act to be discontinued. The said Joe Tortolini shall be permitted to remain in the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "be", strike out "permitted to remain in the United States for permanent residence" and insert "held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LLOYD F. STEWART

The Clerk called the bill (S. 300) for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lloyd F. Stewart (Army serial No. 2858798), of Linton, N. Dak., the sum of $44.83, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for refund of amounts deducted from his Army pay during World War I for application to the purchase of a $50 Third Liberty Loan Bond: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES McGILLIC AND BLOSSOM McGILLIC

The Clerk called the bill (S. 451) for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any statute of limitation or lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, suits may be instituted within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by James McGillic, of Fargo, N. Dak., and Blossom McGillic, of Mandan, N. Dak., upon their claims against the United States for damages to their land and buildings, and to their crops, purporting to have resulted from the construction and maintenance of a dike by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture around such Service's nursery, which adjoins the land of the said James McGillic and Blossom McGillic in Morton County, N. Dak. In any such suit brought pursuant to this act, proceedings shall be had and the liability, if any, of the United States shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of tort claims against the United States: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act does or shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLARD CHEEK AND LOUISE CHEEK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 464) for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500 to Willard Cheek, and the sum of $2,500 to Louise Cheek, both of Melville, La., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of their father, Charlie Cheek, and burial expenses incurred, as a result of an accident involving an Army airplane which occurred at Barksdale Field, Bossier Parish, La., on September 10, 1941, when said Army airplane crashed into a truck in whch the said Charlie Cheek was working: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE W. PURDY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 568) for the relief of George W. Purdy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $810.50 to George W. Purdy, of Oak Bluffs, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for adjustment of retirement pay for the period July 1, 1933, to January 2, 1938, as a retired employee of the former Lighthouse Service of the Coast Guard: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNESTINE BACON JACOBS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 613) for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernestine Bacon Jacobs, wife of Clarence R. Jacobs, an employee of the Displaced Persons Commission, the sum of $345.25 in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of travel expenses incurred by her in transporting herself and ailing son from her husband's overseas post of duty to the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. T. ELLIOTT, INC., AND M. F. QUINN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 768) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and the claim of M. F. Quinn, both of Hampton, Va., against the United States for compensation for damage sustained by said claimants by reason of the injury to their oyster beds, loss of leased oyster bottoms, loss of oysters and clams, in Willoughby Bay, Va., as a result of dredging operations carried on in behalf of the United States in connection with the establishment of aviation shore facilities at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., in the years 1940 and 1941: *Provided*, That suit hereunder shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under title 28, of the Judicial Code, section 1497.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD W. BRITTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 658) for the relief of Harold W. Britton.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PAUL MATELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1443) for the relief of Paul Matelli.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES E. MAULDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1593) for the relief of Charles E. Maulden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury and not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. Charles E. Maulden, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for damages for permanent injuries sustained on April 24, 1943, when driving a bus which collided with a United States Army vehicle near Allenhurst, Ga.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this bill in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH SABOW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1676) for the relief of Elizabeth Sabow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elizabeth Sabow, Takoma Park, Md., the sum of $35,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Elizabeth Sabow against the United States on account of severe personal injuries, resulting in permanent partial disability, sustained by her while she was in the service of the American National Red Cross, in a collision between the vehicle in which she was a passenger and an ambulance convoy of the United States Army on August 1, 1947, on the autobahn between Stuttgart and Heidelberg, in the vicinity of Karlsruhe, Germany: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD M. CHAPMAN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2107) for the relief of Edward M. Chapman, Roland F. Davis, and the Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Edward M. Chapman, Roland P. Davis (former authorized certifying officer of the Federal Public Housing Authority), and the Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York (surety for Roland P. Davis) are hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $1,812.09. Such sum represents the amount paid to the said Edward M. Chapman by the said Roland P. Davis under a written agreement dated September 30, 1944, canceling a lease (HA (4) ph–87) entered into by the said Edward M. Chapman and the Federal Public Housing Authority on May 1, 1944, and renewed on May 29, 1944. Such written agreement was made pursuant to an oral agreement entered into by the said Edward M. Chapman and officials of the Federal Public Housing Authority at the time of the making of such lease. Such oral agreement provided that the said Edward M. Chapman would be reimbursed for expenses he incurred in renovating the leased premises to satisfy the needs of the Federal Public Housing Authority if the option to cancel the lease was exercised by the Authority before such expenses were liquidated. Such oral agreement was held unenforceable and such written agreement and the payment made thereunder were declared void by the Comptroller General. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, including Roland P. Davis, the payment of such sum shall be considered to have been authorized.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAMAR CALLOWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2204) for the relief of Lamar Calloway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lamar Calloway, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of his claim against the United States Government as a result of personal injuries sustained when he was standing on the sidewalk near the intersection of the United States Highway No. 80 when entering Gibsland, La., when an Army truck passing through Gibsland, La., struck him, inflicting personal injuries, on the 13th day of September 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NUMA A. WINSTEAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2207) for the relief of Numa A. Winstead.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Numa A. Winstead, Reidsville, N. C., the sum of $1,069.50. Such sum represents reimbursement for expenditures made by the said Numa A. Winstead for office rent at the rate of $10 a month for the period November 1, 1940, to June 15, 1947, and for telephone charges at the rate of $3.50 a month for the period November 1, 1940, to May 15, 1947, for an office located in Reidsville, N. C., and used by Selective Service Board No. 1 for Rockingham County, N. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EVELYN CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2913) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PEERLESS CASUALTY CO. ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3217) for the relief of the Peerless Casualty Co. and of Charles E. Nelson and Irwin I. Main.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Peerless Casualty Co., a corporation of the State of New Hampshire, the sum of $2,500, and to Charles E. Nelson, 6508 Central Avenue, Hyattsville, Md., and Irwin I. Main, 6828 Roosevelt Avenue, Hyattsville, Md., jointly the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Peerless Casualty Co. and the said Charles E. Nelson and Irwin I. Main against the United States for refund of the amounts which they posted as cash bail bonds in the case of The United States of America against John O. Staples, and which were forfeited by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland on April 30, 1948. Such court, on May 5, 1950, ordered the refund of such amounts to the said Peerless Casualty Co. and the said Charles E. Nelson and Irwin I. Main, but such refund could not be made because such amounts had been covered into the Treasury: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claims settled by the payment of such sums, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALBERT W. LACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill and subsequent bills on the Private Calendar Nos. 209 to 220, inclusive, be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 37]

Barrett	Gamble	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Mass.	Gillette	Nelson
Bolling	Goodwin	O'Neill
Bramblett	Gore	Powell
Breen	Granahan	Prouty
Brehm	Green	Rains
Brooks	Gwinn	Redden
Burdick	Hale	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Harden	Rogers, Fla.
Canfield	Harvey	Sabath
Case	Hinshaw	Secrest
Chatham	Holifield	Sheehan
Chudoff	Irving	Shelley
Colmer	Kee	Sieminski
Corbett	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Kennedy	Sittler
Curtis, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Staggers
Dawson	Klein	Stockman
Denny	Lind	Taylor
Dingell	Machrowicz	Walter
Donohue	Miller, N. Y.	Watts
Eberharter	Morgan	Whitaker
Elliott	Morrison	Widnall
Evins	Murphy	Woodruff
Fulton	Murray, Tenn.	Yorty

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 358 Members have answered to their names; a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3790, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Wednesday, April 25, 1951, there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 16, line 2, strike out "$207,190,000" and insert "$197,000,000 and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is for that Indian amendment. I have no objection to its being taken up ahead of my statement, but I do not want it taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to

return to page 13, line 9, for the purpose of offering an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: Page 13, line 9, after "appropriated" strike out "$2,080,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,109,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the United States is in a very critical situation. Everywhere people are anxious to have large developments in their own territory. Some people in my territory are anxious to do that sort of thing. Frankly, I do not blame them for wanting to have those things, but I do feel that everywhere throughout the land we must realize that we are in a war; we must realize that the United States is at the crossroads; that it cannot continue to have high spending for domestic purposes and at the same time meet the responsibilities that are ours from a military standpoint. Frankly, I do not like the present military situation; I am very much disturbed about it, and I feel that we have got to put every whit of strength and effort into it that we can. I feel that we have got to take cuts in such items as these and that those cuts should be apportioned against the projects that are farthest away from completion and that will yield the least. I think it is perfectly ridiculous in such times as these to start a power project or a reclamation project that cannot be completed within 4 or 5 years. I think that unless the people of the United States generally come to realize that they have got to do without things that they are used to having and get along with less for themselves, be less selfish but more public-spirited, and have more of an appreciation of the serious international situation we are in, that it is going to be exceedingly difficult for the United States to surmount the situation that she is in. I was told the other day by the chairman of the subcommittee, who is present, that he appreciated the tremendous difficulties we are in; that he saw in his own home town, as you and I see in ours, an enormous number of people buying expensive things and borrowing money for that purpose. Let us not be borrowing money for such purposes on behalf of the United States Government. Let us economize and try to cut down every dollar we can everywhere in Government operations so that we may meet our defense obligations. That is what I ask the Members of the Congress to do here. The committee itself has made cuts totaling $16,000,000 in the estimates that were originally sent up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, these cuts, as I stated, were made to the extent of $16,000,000, but I believe that a further cut of $10,000,000 may be made without hurting them a bit. For my own part, I believe they can take off more. A cut of $10,000,000 would be a little less than 5 percent of the total amount the committee has reported. There are projects galore in this situation that can take cuts, as a matter of fact, so that the $10,000,000 could easily be made up. Some of the projects involving large amounts have been cut by the committee only a very small figure. There will be, they tell us, no new projects started. On the other hand, there are a large number of items that are still in the bill, some of which have been cut only a very, very few dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the committee to adopt this amendment and I am going to ask those folks from the reclamation territory to meet the situation as I am going to ask the people in my territory to meet the demands they might make for flood control, for rivers and harbors, and for other things that are not absolutely essential at this time and which can wait for a little while longer. The only way we can possibly work out of this situation is to be willing to make sacrifices ourselves. These projects requiring 10, 12, 20, and 30 million dollars can easily take a 10-percent cut without the slightest bit of harm. The small delay in volume of land coming into irrigation 3 or 4 years hence is not a matter of real seriousness as compared with the desirability of saving every dollar we can save so that we can carry on our national defense.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand the gentleman, he is asking that the $207,000,000 item be cut by $10,000,000, which is only 5 percent; is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. That is true, it is only 5 percent. What I meant was that the whole cut, including the committee cut from the budget estimate, 16 plus 10 million, is only a little bit over 10 percent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As to this item we are cutting now, it amounts to only 5 percent.

Mr. TABER. Only 5 percent up to now. I think the committee ought to very quickly and very readily and without the slightest division march in and make this cut. I hope that it can be done. I hope that the House will be nearly unanimous in making the cut.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York would take from this bill, as he said, $10,000,000. Then on top of it he wants to put in language to take an equivalent of $26,000,000 out of this particular bill. Now, the committee took $16,000,000 out of it, below the budget estimate, and they gave it a good going over. I was admiring the gentleman from New York when he said that he liked the people in Auburn and he would like to back up the people in Auburn. I do not like to say this to be humorous, but I know his part of the country pretty well, there is not very much need for power. And, the same is true about Youngstown, Ohio. I am not discriminating against Auburn, N. Y., and there are no minerals in Youngstown, Ohio. But in the 12 States and one Territory where the Government today, as I told you, is going to spend $66,000,000,000 on national defense, it is necessary that we have power. We passed a bill here last week calling for the expenditure of $6,000,000,000 more for defense. Just stop and think of an expenditure of $66,000,000,000, and we want to cut the heart out of what the Government is going to spend most of the money on, which is minerals and resources. Did you ever hear of anything so foolish? I remember that during the last war we came in with the same cry; that we must stop spending to save money for the Government, and while we stopped projects that should have been completed, every project today is costing twice as much money as it would have cost then had they been completed. We are spending twice as much money today than what the original project was estimated at just because in the Second World War we stopped preparing America. And you are going to do the same thing again. You did not learn any lesson. There is no new project in this bill, not one. Most of the projects are over half or nearly three-quarters completed, and now we are going to let them lay there, and after everything gets higher and higher we will begin to finish them at a great additional cost. Yet, some people call that saving money. I repeat, we are spending $66,000,000,000 to carry on this defense program, and the thing they are hollering about is protecting our resources, making research, and most essential of all, creating more power. I made a statement on the floor of this House 2 years ago that the Interior bill should be placed at $2,000,000,000 and not $700,000,000, which was the figures at that time, to take care of a country that we have been robbing and looting for 200 years. I asked the Secretary of the Interior when he appeared before our committee, how many certificates of necessity he was going to sign, and he said $1,600,000,000 worth. And I said, "How many are on your desk now?" He said something like $400,000,000. Well, that took it up to the figures I cited 2 years ago, and he said I was absolutely right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I think the gentleman spoke about power. Now, why could we not let this power thing rest

until this war is over and appropriate money for our national defense instead?

Mr. KIRWAN. I just said that the most essential thing in the whole program is power. We cannot begin to get enough of it. We are going to spend $66,000,000,000 on this program, and it will be scattered over those 12 States. We could let the power rest if it was for Auburn, N. Y., and Youngstown, Ohio. We could probably cut out half of the power. But when research is going to take up a big part of this $66,000,000,000, and when they have to put up plants, this power is necessary. Otherwise, you are going to waste billions of dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Further, the projects about which the gentleman is talking could never have been developed by private enterprise. We have to have the Government develop them. Those that I know about are over 80 percent complete, and we want to get enough to complete them.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the gentleman from California that private enterprise has accomplished all these things. We never had to have the Government in anything.

Mr. KIRWAN. The Government had to get into power production or you would never have won the Second World War. Where would you have got the power to develop and produce the aluminum for the airplanes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I was rather interested in the question propounded by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. Even former President Herbert Hoover recognized that private enterprise could not build these huge power projects. I have a recollection that the largest dam built in America prior to the construction of Grand Coulee is now called Hoover Dam. If the gentleman is at variance with Mr. Hoover, I would be delighted to hear from him. It is qiute obvious that there is nothing new about the program. It was Teddy Roosevelt who started many of these great power projects. The first preference provision ever written into law for the sale of public power was during the regime of Teddy Roosevelt in 1906.

Mr. KIRWAN. The law will not allow private utilities to build on streams and rivers any more. The only one that can build there is the Government. Billions of kilowatts are going to waste, and the only one that can develop them is the Government. Every kilowatt is needed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman tell us what States will be affected by this amendment?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; I will be happy to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Put them in the RECORD, so we will know what they are.

Mr. KIRWAN. Alaska, Arizona, Nevada, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Texas, North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, and Wyoming.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. There are two parts to the Taber amendment, as I view it. One is a $10,000,000 reduction in the amount specified in the bill. The other is a $16,000,000 deduction on account of the power lines, to eliminate them, which the second part of the amendment carries. Which of those is the harder blow to the war effort?

Mr. KIRWAN. They are both knockout blows. Neither one of them should be in here. Again I say, if we are going to spend $66,000,000,000 to try to win in the present emergency, the most essential thing is power, and here you want to curb it. I do not think Stalin could do the job of sabotaging this bill that this Congress is doing. I toss out that as a challenge.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. There is no one in this House more opposed to the Government competing with private enterprise in the sale of electricity or any other commodity than I, but all of us realize that the Government is supposed to build multiple-purpose projects and hydroelectric power dams, and that private enterprise cannot build them on our public waterways. I shall support any measure to further Government efforts to produce power upon our public waters—the power to be distributed to the consuming public by locally owned and controlled public distributing agencies and private enterprise.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Arkansas, who has been prating here about the TVA for a long time, that TVA does not retail the power, it transmits it and sells it to the cities and municipalities, and they distribute it.

Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, your people are being overcharged $93,000,000 a year for your electricity and if you are ever going to get any relief, you are going to have to get it through public power lines.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman. I yielded practically 2 minutes out of the 5 minutes that I have, and I would like to complete my statement.

Mr. Chairman, I again ask the committee to please not adopt this amendment. I know that every Member in the House is interested in America, and interested in winning this war. But this committee that listens to the evidence and the testimony for 6 weeks, surely they have an idea of what it is all about, and when the budget cut it so much and we cut it $16,000,000 below the budget, we cut every dollar out of this program that it can stand to be cut. I ask you now, with all the sincerity that I can muster, do not attempt to cut another bit out of this portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOVRE to the amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Strike out that portion of the Taber amendment which reads "and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect and admiration for my colleague, the gentleman from New York. Certainly he is to be commended for trying to cut expenses at every turn of the road. If there ever was a time for economy in Government, it is now. If there ever was a time to go on a pay-as-you-go basis, it is now. But on the other hand we must be rational in our approach. If we are just going to hack and slash at random without giving thought to the consequences, we are going to find ourselves in hot water. I have no quarrel with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in trying to save every penny possible. I am with him 100 percent and you will always find me in his corner, but I cannot go along when the cut is in the nature of a penalty and at the expense of the American taxpayer. That is exactly what is wrong with the Taber amendment. I am voicing no objection to the attempt at saving dollars and cents, but I am objection to the form of application.

The Taber amendment reads:

On page 16, line 2, strike out "$207,190,000" and insert "$197,000,000" and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted for the estimates for power and transmission lines.

Let us look at the facts. The budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation for construction and rehabilitation totaled $223,690,000. The committee cut approximately 7 percent of this amount, bringing the figure down to $207,190,000, which is the amount you will find in the bill. This amount includes $24,740,152 for transmission lines, which represents a committee cut of 23 percent from the budget estimate. If the Taber amendment applies only to this part of the program, you have an approximate cut of 83 percent, leaving a balance of

$5,689,608. This drastic cut would scuttle the transmission projects now under contract and actual construction in about a dozen States. This, I say, is penny-wise and pound foolish.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. It will unbalance the entire construction program and plan of the Department, will it not?

Mr. LOVRE. You are definitely right.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the gentleman in pointing out that the worst feature of the Taber amendment is that it would strike out these transmission lines. I oppose the entire amendment.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Is this cut in reclamation or is it a further cut in transmission and power lines?

Mr. LOVRE. This is a cut in power and transmission lines under the Taber amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Does the gentleman consider it tenable?

Mr. LOVRE. No.

Mr. HORAN. Then it goes to the Senate and we have the same procedure that we have had heretofore.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. COX. I would like very much if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] could see his way clear to accept the gentleman's amendment. The acceptance of the amendment would, in my judgment, make certain the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. It would amount to the same thing. It would amount to a saving of $10,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment to my amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the committee is not accepting the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. What is the difference between the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. LOVRE. The cut will be spread across the board and not single out any particular project like power and transmission lines.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman's amendment to the amendment is worth while. Personally, I intend to support it.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVRE. On the other hand, if the Taber amendment applies to all power plants and transmission lines, you have approximately the same result. The amount of $207,190,000 which the committee provided for the Bureau includes $64,059,458 for power plants and transmission lines which represents a 13-percent cut from the budget estimate. If the Taber amendment applies to this part of the program, you have an approximate cut of 36 percent, leaving a balance of $46,913,504. This, too, will scuttle the power plants and transmission lines now under contract and actual construction in about a dozen States. Again, I say, this is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

My amendment leaves the cut at the same figure as the gentleman from New York proposes which is $10,190,000 over and above the committee cut of $16,500,000 but spreads the cut over the entire construction and rehabilitation program of the Bureau of Reclamation instead of applying it solely to transmission lines and power plants or transmission lines whichever is the correct interpretation of the Taber amendment. What could be fairer? If this amendment is adopted, we will then have an approximate cut of 11 percent right across the board for the construction and rehabilitation program under the Bureau of Reclamation.

Before we scuttle these projects by adopting the Taber amendment, remember that each and every one are compatible with and a part of the national defense program and must be viewed in that light. Remember, too, if we want more production from our farms and more farm manpower for the armed services, we must give the remaining farmers the necessary power to carry on. Remember, too, that most of these projects are already under contract and construction at a tremendous cost. Do we want to lose what we have already invested and possible litigation for breach of contract under guise of economy?

I sincerely hope you will support this amendment which cuts the same amount as the Taber amendment—the only difference being that it spreads the cut over the entire program without scuttling the many essential projects now under construction in approximately a dozen States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, our committee, in my opinion, did a conscientious job in reducing the appropriation of the Bureau of Reclamation from $223,690,000 to $207,190,000. We have tried to make real economies in this bill.

As I indicated the other day, we have made a larger cut than any other subcommittee that has brought an appropriation bill to the floor during the present session of the Congress. There are certain items that can be cut, and we have tried to do that, but anyone who is familiar with the necessity for building up the industrial resources of America certainly is aware of the fact that we need more power.

I do not know of anything more ridiculous than to try to cut out the power and generation facilities in the United States at a time when we should get every bit of power we can get in order to extend the industrial capacity of America. It is the industrial capacity of America which is the source of our strength; it is not a case of just having a few soldiers and getting them in uniform; it is our ability to produce materials and weapons of war when the time comes. It is very short-sighted policy to cut out the very weapons that we need in order to make this country strong.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Were the cuts the committee made based on cutting out those projects that have not yet been started?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. A substantial part—and this is the interesting part of it—a substantial part of the cuts made by the Committee stem from the fact that the Government was able to enter into wheeling contracts with private utilities, thereby avoiding the necessity of building these lines. The point is that these lines must be built; we must put generators into the dams in order to get power. Not only that, but my good friend knows that in the Pacific Northwest the faster we get our generating facilities into operation the sooner the Government will get its revenue out of those projects to pay back the cost of the investment. This is just good common business sense.

Mr. HORAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman mentioned four or five States, including the State of Washington, as States against which this reduction of reclamation funds will fall heavily. Is that because we have under way out there the great Columbia Basin project which would be affected by these funds?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct. Not only that, but to show how absurd this amendment is, we are in the process, as the gentleman knows, of putting in the last three generators at Grand Coulee Dam. As offered by the gentleman from New York the amendment would apply to both power and transmission facilities and, of course, it would mean a curtailment of that program. It is absolutely essential that we speed up the power program rather than curtail it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Massachusetts have an opportunity to speak on this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts in due course.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that when these generating facilities are put in, unless we have completed at that time the transmission lines our investment will lie idle and we will not be able to use the power that we could develop?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right; it would be a waste of our resources. It is in the public interest to get the generating facilities into operation so that they can sell power to both private and public utilities, and to do that we must build the transmission lines.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Also let me say to the gentleman from Oregon that the money that we spent in building the Grand Coulee Dam will in a measure be wasted if we adopt this policy of forbidding the building of these lines to carry this power to make it available for use.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a very brief question; it is true, is it not as the gentleman well knows, that when Bonneville was constructed we had this same fight and the transmission facilities were not put in and there was a long period of time that we could not use the power.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right. There is nothing new about what the committee is trying to do.

Let us remember a few fundamental things. The Reclamation Act was passed in 1902, and it was amended in 1906 during the regime of Teddy Roosevelt. In that particular amendment provision was made for the granting of preference in the sale of surplus power from reclamation projects to public bodies and municipalities. In order to carry out that philosophy laid down by the Congress in 1906 it is essential and necessary for the Congress of the United States to build transmission lines from the Government-owned dams to the preferred customers if the private power companies will not build those transmission lines and wheel the power at a fair and reasonable rate.

What has happened here? The committee went through this bill meticulously and in each and every instance where a fair and decent contract could be entered into between the private utilities and the Government at a fair and reasonable rate the committee deleted those lines. What is left in the bill represents funds for transmission lines in those instances where we cannot get the power to preferred customers in any other way. That is the story in a nutshell. I defy anyone on the floor of the House now to say that it is otherwise. There is nothing new about it. The preference act has been amended from time to time and the law adopted in 1906 has been extended to the Department of the Interior to apply to the Southeastern Power, to the Southwestern Power, to the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bonneville power project. It is a basic part of the Flood Control Act of 1944 adopted by the Congress in that year and contained in section 4 of the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, this is carrying out to a great extent the organic law of 1902, as amended by the 1906 act, passed during a Republican administration, is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was not socialistic then, but when we Democrats try to carry out their program, then they hurl the charge of socialism at us.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The charges leveled against these public-power projects are ridiculous, because public-power projects, the construction of these great dams—yes, Hoover Dam; Boulder Dam, as it was known before—all built by the Government—have made possible new private enterprise on an unprecedented scale in America, and it has been the very foundation for our strength. It has made it possible for us during World War II to expand the economy of America to meet unprecedented war needs. As I have repeated on previous occasions, it is a curious fact that the Government had to look to the Tennessee Valley and to the Columbia River Valley to build its greatest industrial enterprises for the defense of America. I refer to the great Oak Ridge plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and the Atomic Energy Commission plant at Hanford, Wash.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is a double-barreled thrust at the Reclamation power and irrigation program. It would neatly and completely sabotage the agreements just made by the Government with the power companies for transmission of Government power.

The language of the amendment purports to reduce the appropriation for construction and rehabilitation in the Bureau of Reclamation section of the bill by $10,190,000. As a matter of fact, the language of the amendment directs that the cut below the budget estimate, which was $223,690,000, shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines.

Therefore, the actual reduction proposed in the amendment would be from $223,690,000 to $197,000,000, or a total reduction in appropriations for power and transmission lines of $26,690,000.

This reduction is the most drastic yet proposed to enable the private power utilities to thwart the public power program of reclamation so essential to the irrigation and other resource development of the West. Without power-generating facilities and transmission lines, great multiple-purpose projects like the Columbia Basin in Washington, the Central Valley in California, the Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado, and the Missouri River Basin project in Montana, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Kansas would not be feasible.

Should the Congress finally approve such drastic reductions, further construction of the irrigation features of these great multiple-purpose projects would be infeasible.

Public power revenues give substantial financial aid to irrigation in each one of the 17 Western States. That is something the private power companies in its grasping drive to kill public power has not done and will not do. The private utilities are out to make money and in many instances does not even give lip service to the vital irrigation developments that are required to give food, feed, and forage in carrying on the defense program to care for the rapidly increasing population in the Western States. California, Oregon, and Washington showed the greatest increases in popula- from 1940 to 1950 of any section of the country. These people must be fed and the transportation facilities across the continent must not be swamped by moving food supplies westward when railroad transportation is required for moving war material.

The amendment is even more drastic than any yet proposed in the drive to throttle the public power program as recommended in the Interior Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1952. Heretofore the private utilities have asserted that it supports the generation of power at reclamation and army dams. Under this amendment, however, construction of power facilities at many reclamation dams would be seriously delayed or stopped altogether, right at the time the energy is needed by farmers, defense plants, and the cities and towns of our Western States.

Here is what would happen in some of the Western States were the Taber amendment to be adopted.

In Arizona and Nevada, the installation of the power plant at Davis Dam and transmission lines to vital defense centers in Arizona would be halted or materially slowed down.

In California the vital Folsom Dam power plant on the American River would be slowed down, if not halted altogether. California, like the other Pacific Coast States, is confronted by a power shortage. Our committee eliminated three controversial transmission lines from the bill and retained three others that will serve the Folsom Dam power plant and important defense in-

stallations in the San Francisco Bay area. More than two-thirds of the cost of the Central Valley project whose irrigation facilities are advancing the great agricultural production in the San Joaquin Valley will be repaid from power revenues produced at Shasta and Keswick Dams, now in operation, and at Folsom Dam when it is completed.

On page 1341 of the hearings on the Interior bill before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, there appears a telegram to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee from Hon. Earl Warren, Governor of California. Governor Warren made a request for appropriations of $44,450,000. He supported every one of the items, including the transmission lines and power plant at Folsom Dam, that the Budget Bureau had recommended. He even urged appropriations for the Delta steam electric plant which was not included in the budget estimate. From the Governor's telegram, it is fair to assume that officially the State of California is supporting the recommendations in the bill before the House and would oppose the crippling Taber amendment.

In Colorado, we are completing the great Colorado-Big Thompson project, primarily a mammoth irrigation development to aid food production in northeastern Colorado. The power plants and transmission lines now being installed would be slowed down, if not halted altogether, by this proposed cut in reclamation funds.

The State of Idaho is becoming power conscious. Adoption of this amendment would be notice to Idaho that the House of Representatives looks with disfavor on public power developments in that State. Construction of Palisades Dam would be pushed back even further by such a declaration.

In Montana, the committee eliminated transmission lines it considered not necessary at this time. However, should the Taber amendment be adopted, vital power production at Hungry Horse and transmission lines that serve the Missouri River basin project in eastern Montana and North Dakota would be crippled.

Nebraska, a great public power State, requires the completion of transmission facilities to bring public power from reclamation projects in Colorado and Wyoming and from Fort Randall Dam, being constructed by the Corps of Engineers on the Missouri River. The amount in Nebraska affected by the Taber amendment is relatively small but the funds required are vital to completion of the system for transmitting public power into Nebraska.

New Mexico and Texas are concerned with extensions of the power system of the Rio Grande reclamation project. This system serves vital defense needs, including agricultural areas.

North and South Dakota have perhaps the most important stake in the transmission systems provided for in the budget estimates and in the Interior bill before the House. Work on the transmission lines in these two States is well under way and the drastic cut in funds proposed by the Taber amendment would seriousl, delay getting public power to preference customers in these two States.

While there are no funds in the bill for extension of public power systems to the great State of Minnesota, there are now pending supplemental estimates that would extend the Missouri River Basin project system to Minnesota. Hampering the public power and transmission system by slashing appropriations will demolish the hopes of Minnesota to get the advantages of public power.

In my home State of Washington we are just completing the greatest hydroelectric power plant in the world. To make this plant fully workable for the great defense industries and increasing population of the Pacific Northwest, the funds provided in the bill are the minimum necessary to expedite the completion of the Grand Coulee power plant of the Columbia Basin project. To cut these minimum requirements would be a blow to public power in the Pacific Northwest, including the Bonneville system that serves Oregon as well as Washington, and would also be a blow to the irrigation development of the Columbia Basin project which is largely financed by surplus power revenues produced at Grand Coulee Dam.

Oregon has no direct appropriation for reclamation power but is vitally concerned because of the dependence of its industrial centers of Portland and elsewhere on Grand Coulee Dam power delivered through the Bonneville system.

Wyoming has seen the first power plant of the Missouri River Basin project at Kortes Dam put into operation, Boysen Dam and power plant in the northern part of Wyoming is nearing completion, and the completion of transmission systems to carry this power to the ranches and industries of Wyoming cannot be delayed without serious disruption of food production, principally through livestock, and to industrial oil production for vital defense purposes.

The effect of this amendment, if approved, would be to completely nullify the work that has been done to get public power to preference customers by using facilities of the private-power companies. In just the last few weeks Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the biggest single utility in the United States, signed a contract with the Interior Department agreeing to transmit reclamation power in California over its own lines to the customers who have preference under the law.

And what did this committee do? It took out of the bill the money that Interior had asked for lines paralleling the company lines. We did the same thing in Montana, where an agreement had been reached with the Montana Power Co. in the last few months taking the money for duplicating lines out of the estimates. Now if the power crowd is not going to play fair and respect these agreements and insists on coming in through the back door with a murderous amendment such as this, then I think instead of reducing Reclamation's appropriation we should increase it so that it can build the lines and operate independently of the power companies. This amendment can only mean that they are not to be trusted, and they do not respect the assurances given this committee during the course of its hearings.

If this amendment is accepted, Interior would be perfectly justified in assuming that the wheeling agreements just executed are mere scraps of paper and it should ask the Senate for restoration of all funds deleted by this Committee, including those for lines paralleling company lines. I would further expect the Department to be back here before this House next year with a completely new program for a power system independent of those of the power companies which are trying to pull the wool over the eyes of your Appropriation Committee and this House of the Congress of the United States.

How badly is the public power program hurt? The figures show it quite clearly:

The budget estimates for power facilities and transmission lines in the Reclamation section of the Interior bill total $73,603,504. The proposed reduction of $26,690,000 would slice more than 35 percent off of the budget estimates for power and transmission lines. It would leave $46,913,504 for these vital purposes.

Should the amendment be interpreted to apply only to transmission facilities, the effect would be even more drastic. The total budget estimates for transmission lines, as submitted to the Congress, are $33,881,313. The Appropriation Subcommittee in the bill before this Committee recommended reductions in specific transmission line estimates of $7,596,000, about evenly divided between the Central Valley project, in California, and the Missouri River Basin project. This is money not required because of the wheeling agreements.

Should the cut below the budget estimate of $26,690,000 be applied to the total budget estimates for transmission lines there would remain $7,191,313 for extending facilities to deliver publicly produced power to defense installations, rural electrification customers, irrigation districts, public utility districts, municipalities, and other preference customers pursuant to law.

Thousands and thousands of rural residents in the Dakotas, Montana, Nebraska, and other States of the Missouri River Basin have been clamoring for extension of Reclamation lines to give power service that could not or would not be supplied by private utilities. At the behest of these good people who have been waiting for public power for many years, this program was recommended. It has been supported by our colleagues from these States, as well as others, and they are entitled to have their constituents get public power service that has been denied them by the private utilities.

As I have stated, the defense program in many sections of the West would be critically hampered by the slow-down of the Reclamation power program through reduced appropriations for power and transmission lines. The defense program to our minds includes irrigated agricultural production.

I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have a booklet here—I call it the white paper of the power monopoly—entitled "You Draw the Line Between Essential and Unnecessary Federal Power Projects" put out by the National Association of Electric Companies. I wish everyone would read it together with my comments on the allegations contained in the booklet. It is as follows:

YOU DRAW THE LINE BETWEEN ESSENTIAL AND UNNECESSARY FEDERAL POWER PROJECTS—ELECTRIC COMPANIES OFFER COUNTERPROPOSALS THAT WILL SAVE AMERICA 80,000 TONS OF SCARCE METALS AND REDUCE FEDERAL SPENDING $173,900,000

WHERE?

Yes, where draw the line between things Government should and should not do?

We believe that a proper function of democratic government is to help people to do those jobs that need doing—and that they cannot do for themselves. If democracy is to endure, however, government must encourage people to do for themselves those things they can and are willing to do. We believe that when government insists on doing jobs that people themselves can do, it is a sign bureaucracy is putting its own interests first, not the people's.

For example, construction of economically sound multiple-purpose dams to promote flood control and reclamation and improve navigation is a proper government function. But even so, government should encourage the people to carry on whatever of these or related activities they can.

Marketing of electric power at large government dams is a case in point.

In appropriation bills now under consideration by Congress, the Department of Interior is asking for money to construct transmission lines which, in many cases, are unnecessary, since electric companies already have the lines and are doing the job. In other cases funds are being asked to build lines in areas where electric companies with a minimum of lines construction can market the power at no cost to taxpayers.

The Department of Interior is also requesting a new spending device—the continuing fund. Continuing funds for Federal power projects are exactly what the name implies—funds continually replenished from proceeds of the sale of Federal power. Once the continuing fund is approved by Congress, it does not need annual reappropriation. Thus, these revenues, meant to liquidate the taxpayers' investment in the power features of multiple-purpose projects would be dissipated to expand Federal power operations.

Seven cases where Federal agencies are asking for funds to do things they need not do are cited in this booklet. In each case electric companies—financed, built, and run by United States citizens—are ready, as they have always been, to do the job at less cost and with the use of fewer scarce metals.

Here are seven sure ways to reduce Federal spending. The electric company plans would save the nation 80,000 tons of Government-rationed metals and the taxpayers $22,700,000 in fiscal year 1952 alone; eventual savings would amount to $173,900,000.

IN THE SOUTHWEST

Background: The Southwestern Power Administration was created within the Department of Interior to market power from flood control-power dams built by the Army Engineers in Arkansas, Louisiana, Kansas, Missouri, Texas, and Oklahoma. In 1946 it asked Congress to authorize an extensive construction program that included steam plants and competitive transmission lines. Congress refused. Since then this agency has been getting Congressional approval of its over-all program on a piecemeal basis. In its 1952 budget request, SWPA is asking for funds to build facilities that will carry it closer to its regional-wide power empire.

Government plan

SWPA this year requests $4,100,000 to carry forward its extensive competitive transmission system. Of this amount, $2,535,000 would be for construction already under way, and $1,565,000 for new construction, primarily in Missouri. SWPA also has been authorized to use a $300,000 self-replenishing continuing fund to attain its objectives of a multi-State power system. This fund would be used to buy steam-generated power and to lease, with option to purchase, vast transmission systems from other Government agencies. SWPA already has obligated its $300,000 continuing fund in the amount of $66,000,000, which it will spend unless stopped by Congress. This is more than twice the $28,000,000 Congress has directly appropriated to SWPA for construction.

Company program

This spending would be unnecessary if the companies in the area were permitted to proceed with their plans. For example, the Empire District Electric Co. of Joplin, Mo., has offered to negotiate a contract with SWPA to transmit Federal power over its lines and to build new lines if needed. Such a contract would carry out all necessary Government obligations and therefore make unnecessary $1,560,600 of the current request and $2,936,250 previously appropriated. If the agency would accept the principle of negotiated contracts, this Federal power spending would be unnecessary.

What you save: Acceptance of the companies' program and abolishment of the continuing fund would mean eventual savings of at least $71,000,000 to taxpayers.

IN THE SOUTHEAST

Background: The Southeastern Power Administration, a new agency of the Department of Interior, is responsible for marketing power from Federal flood-control dams in 10 Southeastern States. SEPA argues that it should build transmission lines from these projects to market centers, instead of using existing facilities or facilities that could be provided by business institutions.

Government plan

SEPA is asking Congress for a total of $4,500,000 for fiscal year 1952. It wants $200,000 for a continuing fund, $300,000 for operation and maintenance, and $4,000,000 for construction of transmission lines. This latter amount would be in addition to $1,850,000 made available in the 1951 Supplemental Appropriation Act for partial construction of a transmission line from the Buggs Island Dam to Langley Field in Virginia. Thus, if all requests are approved, SEPA would have available $5,850,000 for construction in the 1951–52 fiscal years. It would use these funds for lines in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

In addition to 1951 and 1952 funds, SEPA would require $25,720,200 in subsequent years to complete this initial program, or a total of $31,570,000.

Company program

Electric companies in the area have offered to cooperate with Government to market Federal hydroelectric power to all people in the area. If required, they will use their lines to transmit power to customers having preferred claims under Federal statutes. These objectives can be achieved: (1) Without spending tax funds to build and operate a Federal power system, and (2) without a continuing fund. The companies will build any additional lines that might be necessary at no cost to taxpayers.

What you save: By using existing integrated facilities and by building short additional lines, the companies' program would save taxpayers $6,350,000 this year and eventually a total of $31,750,000 on the initial program alone.

IN CALIFORNIA

Background: The Central Valley project is essentially a water development. It was conceived and created for the purpose of irrigating the fertile lands of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. The project was authorized in 1933 by the Legislature of California and in 1937 it was taken over by the Federal Government under an act of Congress. This statute included a provision for the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting the water features of the project. From the very beginning, however, the Bureau of Reclamation has placed primary emphasis on power features, preferring to build its own duplicating power network.

Government plan

For transmission lines, substations, and switchyards in California's Central Valley, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior is asking $5,506,478 in fiscal year 1952. The Bureau estimates these facilities will cost $24,861,293 when completed. The Bureau has already spent enormous sums to begin its own power system in the Central Valley.

Company program

The company serving the area—the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.—has for years demonstrated and proved its ability to provide for the constantly expanding power needs of people in its service area efficiently and at reasonable cost. It constantly demonstrates its ability and willingness to cooperate with the Federal Government and to assume full and complete responsibility for doing its job. On the basis of its demonstrated willingness and ability to fulfill its responsibility, these items are unessential.

What you save: By adopting the company program, Federal spending would be reduced in fiscal 1952 alone by $5,506,478; eventually, $24,861,893.

IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—IOWA, MONTANA

Background: As part of its $306,000,000 Missouri River Basin transmission line program in the Midwest and Western States, the Bureau of Reclamation wants funds to start work next year on certain transmission facilities in Iowa and Montana. According to the Government, a power shortage exists in the Missouri Basin area, and it contends these new facilities are necessary to ease that shortage.

Government plan

Montana: $2,351,450 is requested to start construction of four transmission lines that will cost an estimated $7,630,000 when completed.

Iowa: The Bureau of Reclamation wants to spend $894,400 during the next fiscal year to complete surveys, undertake designs, and issue specifications for several transmission lines and a substation in this general area. The over-all plans for this area would eventually cost $30,589,000.

Company program

The Montana Power Co. is ready to do the whole power transmission job in its area. The company now serves all rural electric cooperatives that could be served by the lines proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The cooperatives are buying power wholesale from the Montana Power Co. at the Bureau of Reclamation rate. Through company-Government agreements already concluded, and through interconnection of company lines with Government plants, an integrated system is now in use for transmission of both public and private power in the area.

Iowa lines proposed by the Bureau would duplicate company lines already in operation, as well as future extensions planned to strengthen company facilities. Companies, cooperatives, and municipalities in Iowa have a long history of working together successfully in achieving power objectives. Existing facilities and those planned will provide ample Missouri River power for all customers, including preference customers of the Government.

What you save:

Montana: The entire $2,351,450 for fiscal 1952 could be saved by accepting the company program. Future savings would be $7,620,000.

Iowa: Most of the $894,400 for fiscal 1952 could be saved and eventually a total of $30,589,000.

IN IDAHO

Background: A great debate is developing here whether the Bureau of Reclamation is primarily interested in sound reclamation to develop southern Idaho, or wants to create an unregulated Government power monopoly. This vast region is served by the Idaho Power Co. Its service area is principally agricultural, and people are economically dependent upon storage and use of water for irrigation and upon continuation of a sound reclamation program.

Government plan

The Bureau of Reclamation wants $1,300,000 to start construction this year of a new 30,000-kilowatt power plant on the west side of the Snake River at American Falls and says the plant is needed to provide more power for the area. Its eventual cost would be $6,600,000.

Company program

The Idaho Power Co. is already providing all present customers and is ready and willing to serve prospective customers with ample power. The Idaho Power Co. already has a 27,000-kilowatt power plant on the east side of the Snake River, at the same location. There is not enough water at American Falls for two plants. The proposed plant would put the company plant out of business. Thus, at a cost of $6,600,000 to taxpayers, the Government plant would add only 4,300 kilowatts of average capacity.

What you save: The company program would reduce Federal spending by $6,600,000. In addition, citizens in the county where the plant would be located would not be burdened with an annual tax loss of $55,000 that is now being paid by the company. This, divided up among the 388 farms in the county, would amount to $140 per farm.

IN COLORADO

Background: The Bureau of Reclamation's Colorado-Big Thompson project will bring Colorado River water through the Continental Divide to the State's eastern plains by means of one of the world's longest tunnels. Power will be produced at project plants. As elsewhere in the country, the Department of the Interior wants to build all the transmission facilities to market power.

Government plan

As part of its power program for the area, the Bureau of Reclamation wants to start construction of a transmission line from Estes to Leyner, plus a substation at Leyner, in fiscal 1952. The total estimated cost of the transmission line is $435,000 and $100,000 is being requested for work in 1952. Although funds are requested for a substation at Leyner, the exact amount for use in 1952 is not known. The total cost for this facility was given a year ago as $300,400. Leyner is located 25 miles from Denver.

Company program

The Public Service Co. of Colorado recommends an alternative program as a result of extensive studies it has made of how best to serve the area. Under this alternative program the Government and the company each would do part of the job. Instead of building the Estes-to-Leyner line mentioned above, the Government would construct a transmission line between Estes and Pole Hill, a switching station at Pole Hill, and an addition at Flairon. The company then would build an 8½-mile line between Valmont and Leyner, and expand its Valmont substation.

What you save: The Government plan calls for spending $735,000. The company's program calls for the expenditure by the company of $440,000, and by the Government of only $405,000. Savings under the company plan, which does the same job, would be $330,000.

IN EASTERN OREGON

Background: The Bonneville Power Administration is the marketing agency for Federal hyrdo projects on the Columbia River in the Northwest. It has already built an extensive transmission-line system. Each and every year it extends its lines so that it is constantly increasing the area within which it operates. This year it is asking for funds to extend its lines further into eastern Oregon with Idaho as its ultimate goal.

Government plan

In northeastern Oregon the Bonneville Power Administration plans to build a transmission line from McNary Dam on the Columbia River to Baker, Oreg., at an ultimate cost of $5,471,000. Of this amount, $1,379,000 has been made available to build the line from McNary Dam as far as La Grande. It wants to transmit power from the dam to what it calls a power shortage area in eastern Oregon. McNary Dam is not yet producing power. For fiscal 1952, the Government wants $54,000 to start surveys on extending the line from La Grande southeast to Baker. Eventual cost of extension facilities would be $2,140,000. No part of either line is under construction.

Company program

The California-Pacific Utilities Co., serving four counties in eastern Oregon has more than doubled its electric lines and tripled its power supply in the past 5 years. The company serves all communities and about 100 percent of all farms in its area.

Although there is a general power shortage in the Northwest, a region dominated by Government power, the California-Pacific Utilities Co. is meeting all needs for power in its own area.

What you save: By rejecting Interior's plan to move eastward in Oregon as clearly unnecessary, Federal spending would be reduced by $5,471,000. When McNary Dam does start producing small amounts of power 2 years hence, it and more besides will be needed in western Oregon and Washington where the country's greatest power shortage exists.

You draw the line.

This booklet cites seven concrete—not theoretical—cases where Federal spending can be cut without interfering with necessary governmental services.

If you believe, as we do, that Government—in cooperation with industry—can cut the Federal budget and lighten the tax load, you should make your beliefs known to the Congress.

Your Congressmen want to hear from you.

COMMENTS ON PAMPHLET, YOU DRAW THE LINE, BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ELECTRIC COMPANIES

The preface of the pamphlet states:

We believe that a proper function of democratic government is to help people do those jobs that need doing—and that they cannot do for themselves. * * * Government must encourage people to do for themselves those things they can and are willing to do.

The NAEC pamphlet apparently limits its definition of people to meaning utility companies only. Federal power legislation has been approved by the Congress for the purpose of helping all kinds of people, not just power companies. This legislation recognizes as people not only consumers generally, but farmers who want adequate power supplies at reasonable rates and workers who want water resources to provide stable and adequate employment. The elected representatives have provided a way for these people to do for themselves those things they can and are willing to do. These consumers, including business and farmers who need adequate power at low cost, have turned to the Federal Government to get it, because they have been unable to get the power companies in times past to meet these needs. They have asked the Federal Government through various legislation to provide power facilities, including high-voltage transmission lines, to supply the farms, the communities, and the industrial developments with adequate supplies of low-cost power.

The Bonneville Act, for example, was not a product of the bureaucrats. It was a product of diverse Northwest interests working through such elected representatives as the late Senator Charles NcNary, of Oregon, and former Senator Homer T. Bone, of Washington.

On page 1 of the NAEC document it says:

Electric companies already have the (transmission) lines and are doing the job.

The companies are not doing the job. Fifteen years ago 90 percent of the farms of the richest and most modern Nation on the earth were without electricity. While 10 percent of our farmers had electrical connections, Germany had 90 percent electrified, Japan had 90 percent, and Italy and France each had 94 percent of their farms electrified. Even today, the rural areas of the United States are still only 86-percent electrified.

This is a national disgrace.

It will continue to be a national disgrace until every one in this country who needs electricity can get electricity at low cost.

The publication also states on page 1 that the "electric companies with a minimum of line construction can market the power at no cost to taxpayers." They say nothing of what the cost to consumers, who are the taxpayers, will be if the companies attain complete monopoly of the hydroelectric power generated in the dams which were built by and for the people. In the

Flood Control Act of 1944 the Congress set forth the guiding principle of the manner in which hydroelectric power from Federal projects would be marketed. That act states that the Government hydroelectric power and energy "shall be marketed in the manner to encourage the most widespread use thereof." To accomplish this objective, the Department of the Interior, which is responsible for marketing the power from projects built by the Corps of Engineers, as well as for projects built by the Department of the Interior, is prosecuting a program of active cooperation with the rural electric cooperatives. Through this means power is delivered to farms and homes, small rural businesses and manufacturing organizations, and small communities and towns. These classes of customers have been surely neglected as to service and have been discriminated against as to rate by the private utility companies through the years of America's greatest development.

It must be understood that the action of the Government in encouraging the most widespread use of electric power is not a grant or a subsidy. The Department of the Interior is marketing electricity at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and at rates which provide not only for meeting cost of operation and maintenance and replacements, but also for amortizing the investment in the Government power operation including interest. For example, in the Southwest area, for every dollar appropriated by the Congress for investment of the generation of hydroelectric power and the transmission thereof in the Southwest, the Southwestern Power Administration is returning $1.76. This is marketing power at no cost to taxpayers and is providing power at the lowest possible cost to those who use it.

The report states that "The electric company plans would save the Nation 80,000 tons of metals and the taxpayers $22,700,000 in fiscal year 1952 alone" with eventual savings of $173,900,000. That is nonsense. In all cases where existing facilities will meet the need for transmission of Federal power at reasonable cost for wheeling, those arrangements have been effectuated. New facilities needed to dispose of additional power will require critical metals whether built privately for the benefit of a few or publicly for the benefit of the many. The cost in dollars and materials will be the same either way, but public construction will bring to preference customers the advantages of low-cost Federal power, at no cost to the taxpayers.

The NAEC pamphlet, in the interest of private power monopoly, suggests seven cases where they would like to see Federal agencies hampered in carrying out Federal power policy. Those seven areas are, first, Southwest; second, Southeast; third, California; fourth, Missouri River basin—Montana; fifth, Idaho; sixth, Colorado; seventh, eastern Oregon.

In that order I refute the claims presented by the utilities relative to the provision of electric facilities in the 1952 appropriations.

IN THE SOUTHWEST

In its specific attack on Southwestern Power Administration, the publication sets forth the statement:

> In 1946 it (SPA) asked Congress to authorize an extensive construction program that included steam plants and competitive transmission lines.

The fact of the matter is that in 1946, Southwestern Power Administration presented to Congress a comprehensive report showing the transmission system and steam generation which would be necessary to market the hydroelectric power generated by Government dams in the Southwest if no other electric generation and transmission facilities were in existence in that area.

The companies themselves refuted their own loud cries about duplicate facilities in June 1949, when an Electric Bond & Share engineer published in that month's Electric Light and Power an article entitled "System Planning for Bulk Power Supply." This article set forth the facilities which would be needed, in addition to the facilities already existing, to market the hydroelectric power generated by the Government flood-control projects in the Southwest. The system set forth by the Electric Bond & Share Co. engineers in that article is even more extensive than the one Southwestern Power Administration told Congress would be necessary if no other generation and transmission facilities existed in this area. Furthermore, the map of proposed Bond & Share transmission system shows hundreds of miles of new high-voltage transmission lines depicting so-called duplication, that twin transmission lines marching across the country side by side to insure dependable service.

Another misstatement appears in the publication, You Draw the Line, in which Southwestern Power Administration's budget for 1952 is broken down into construction under way and new construction. The fact of the matter is that Southwestern Power Administration, recognizing metals should be conserved for the present defense effort, asked for no new construction in its 1952 budget. All of the construction for which funds were asked in the 1952 budget have been approved by Congress in the 1951 budget.

The continuing fund of $300,000, which has been authorized by Congress for Southwestern Power Administration, is primarily for use in emergencies, such as damage to electric lines from wind and ice storms. These repairs cannot wait on year-to-year appropriations. It is also necessary because the Southwestern Power Administration has negotiated mutually advantageous contracts with electric cooperatives and companies in the Southwest to secure the economy and efficiency inherent in integration of hydroelectric and fuel-generated electric power.

The statement, "This fund would be used to buy steam-generated power and to lease, with option to purchase, vast transmission systems from other Government agencies," is an absolute falsehood. In purchasing steam-generated power from the generation and transmission cooperatives referred to here, Southwestern Power Administration is following the same principle of enhancing the value of its hydroelectric power as it uses in its contractual arrangement with private utility companies. Leasing the transmission systems of the generation and transmission cooperatives is not leasing from "other Government agencies" since the cooperatives are owned by private citizens of the United States just as are the private utility companies.

The statement that Southwestern Power Administration is obligated in the amount of $66,000,000 is utterly ridiculous, since Southwestern Power Administration cannot advance its program one degree without first asking and obtaining the consent of the Congress each year.

The publication's statement of the companies' program is entirely misleading, since the Southwestern Power Administration has already negotiated and executed contracts with companies in its area who are willing to negotiate and operate on a fair and square basis to secure the greatest good for the greatest number of people in the matter of power use.

The principle of negotiated contracts, contrary to the statement in You Draw the Line, is satisfactory provided that the negotiated contracts further the greatest good for the greatest number, rather than the greatest grab for the greatest grabbers.

IN THE SOUTHEAST

Southeastern Power Administration is asking Congress for a total of $4,500,000 for fiscal year 1952. It wants $200,000 for continuing fund, $300,000 for operation and maintenance, and $4,000,000 for construction of transmission lines.

The companies claim by using existing integrated facilities and by building short additional lines, the companies' program would save taxpayers $6,350,000 this year and eventually a total of $31,750,000 on the initial program alone. The companies fail to point out that all funds advanced to the Southeastern Power Administration are repaid to the Treasury of the United States together with interest and, therefore, do not cost the taxpayers or the Government anything. These facilities are a business investment on the part of the Government paid for 100 percent by the consumers. Most of the appropriations requested this year was to permit the Southeastern Power Administration to provide service to the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics at Langley Field. The total cost of these facilities was about $7,000,000, the total amount of which would be returned to the Federal Treasury with interest. The statement fails to mention that the Virginia Electric Co. was demanding a connection charge of $4,100,000 to provide service to this Government facility. This payment would have been a direct cost to the taxpayers. Therefore, the program of the Southeastern Power Administra-

tion this year alone has saved the Government $4,100,000, as well as greatly reducing the rates to be paid by the Government for service at Langley Field. The companies are claiming that the Government should use the existing facilities of the companies or that the companies would be willing to build any new transmission lines needed. The companies, of course, will demand just compensation for the use of their facilities. Such payments for use of company facilities would be the same as the payments for the operation, maintenance, and amortization of Government transmission lines. The rate payer will not save any money, because of the offer of the companies, nor will the taxpayer be burdened or unburdened by the offer of the companies. On the contrary, the rate payers are bearing greater burdens. They will not receive the benefits of cheap power. The companies are saying that, if the preference customer is to receive the benefits of the Government power, then they shall have the right to extract their toll.

CALIFORNIA

Contrary to the statement in the paragraph entitled "Background," to the effect that the "Central Valley project is essentially a water development project" and the "Bureau of Reclamation has placed primary emphasis on power features," this project is authorized as a multipurpose project for the purposes of flood control, irrigation, power, domestic water uses, navigation, and miscellaneous purposes. These miscellaneous purposes included salinity repulsion, fish protection, and recreation. Primary emphasis has never been placed on power features. As of the end of fiscal year 1950, June 30, 1950, the investment in power features only was $61,433,934 as compared to a total investment, already made up to that date, of $319,963,130. Of the total ultimate estimated cost of $625,288,900—which includes the American River Folsom Power Development—the estimated investment in power facilities only will be $197,228,930.

The Bureau of Reclamation is not building a duplicating power network. Even with the two new 230-kilovolt lines which the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. rushed into construction after having claimed no new lines were required, the present power network in central and northern California, without the Bureau lines, is incapable of properly carrying the additional power generated at the Shasta and Keswick power plants of the project. It should also be recognized that the company until very recently refused to agree to wheel Federal power over its lines to preference customers of the Government, including power for municipalities, cooperatives, and even Federal establishments of the Army, Navy or Air Forces, as well as other agencies of the Government. Inasmuch as by Federal law and by departmental policy, the Bureau is required to first give preference to such public agencies and cooperatives; second, to sell power at the lowest rates to the ultimate customers consistent with good business practice; third, to encourage widespread use, and, fourth, prevent monopolization, it was necessary that the Government construct a trunk power transmission system to accomplish these requirements.

Irrigation, power, and other facilities of the Central Valley project are being developed in an orderly and logical fashion and to state that the Bureau of Reclamation has placed primary emphasis on power features is contrary to the facts. Actually the majority of the features constructed to date are not power features but features required for control and utilization of the water. These include Friant Dam, Shasta Dam, Tracy pumping plant and all canals and canal works.

With Shasta Dam completed, failure to make use of the power drop, particularly when California desperately needs power, would not only have been inexcusably wasteful but criminally negligent. As of June 30, 1950, the project has return from power revenues to the Treasury approximately $25,500,000 net. In addition the construction has been proceeding as fast as economically feasible to provide water for irrigation which will start on a large scale this year. In addition the project has contributed approximately 8,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours during a period of time when such energy was desperately needed. This hydroelectric energy incidentally has saved fuel consumption equivalent to at least 16,000,000 barrels of oil.

Since the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has now agreed by contract to wheel energy over their lines on terms that the Government can accept as being consistent with Federal law and policy, the immediate need for three of the lines with substations included in the $5,506,478 budget request for fiscal year 1952 became unnecessary. The House Appropriations Committee was accordingly notified and these items were deleted. The remaining lines are considered necessary in any case.

The claims of savings to the public made by the company program are misleading and not true. Even if all the lines were to be omitted from the budget and instead a wheeling contract over Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s lines were arranged, the revenue to the private company from its wheeling charge, which would have to be paid by the Bureau of Reclamation, would on an annual basis approximate the savings claimed. The article very carefully avoids any statement that would show charges must be paid for transmission if Federal lines are not built.

The statements in the bulletin totally ignore the facts that first, expenditures by the Government for power facilities are fully reimbursable; second, the power facilities constructed are only those essential to carrying out the Federal law and policy; and, third, the power facilities constructed are highly beneficial to the people in that they conserve and make available to the people the hydroelectric potentialities which belong to them. Such resources are made available to the people at the lowest cost rather than benefiting a private monopoly at the people's expense by interposing it as a middle man whose primary purpose is to make a profit.

IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—MONTANA

As stated in the paragraph entitled "Background" there has for a long time been a power shortage existing in the Missouri Basin area. The development of the power generation and transmission features of the Missouri Basin project now under way by the Government will bring great economic improvement in the Missouri Basin, particularly to the States of Montana and North and South Dakota. The potentialities of these areas have been greatly neglected, with the result that they are now substandard insofar as power supply and utilization are concerned.

The Congress, in the past several years, has provided the funds for the construction of a number of federally owned transmission lines in order to bring the Federal power supply at low cost to preferred customers. At the same time, the Bureau has been negotiating agreements with the Montana Power Co., as well as other utilities, looking to the possible utilization of spare capacity in existing lines to wheel Federal power to the Government's preferred customers. For a long time the Montana Power Co. would not agree to a reasonable arrangement which justified a wheeling contract; although about a year ago this company suddenly reduced its rates very materially to REA cooperatives only. This is a class of customers entitled to preference from Government systems which has been particularly concerned with obtaining an ample supply of Government power. Recently an agreement was made and contract negotiations completed with the power company for wheeling and leasing arrangements which would permit the Government to use excess capacity in the Montana Power Co. lines rather than construct certain lines previously proposed. While these contracts necessitate paying wheeling charges to the company so that the preferred customer pays not less than and in some cases—at least temporarily—more than if the Government had its own lines, the arrangement does permit, first, early service to preferred customers heretofore not served with Government power; second, more efficient use of existing transmission lines; and, third, saving of immediate capital expenditures by the Government for construction of certain transmission lines. Under this arrangement the company gains by obtaining substantial new revenues for its presently unused transmission capacity. The arrangement will not result in the Government or the ultimate customer making any large saving in the long run, because the wheeling charges which will be paid to the company may ultimately be about equal to the cost of constructing and operating Government-owned lines. The Government reserves the right to terminate the contract if the arrangement proves not to be in the public interest, as would be the case if the wheeling charges exceed the annual costs of

owning and operating alternative Government lines.

The Bureau of Reclamation's request for $2,351,450 for fiscal year 1952 funds to start construction of four transmission lines in Montana was voluntarily reduced as soon as the wheeling and leasing contract was made with the Montana Power Co. The Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda transmission line and the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line were eliminated from the request therefor. A total of only $895,000 is now requested for fiscal year 1952 for transmission lines in Montana. These consist of the Miles City-Yellowtail transmission line, a part of the Bureau's ultimate backbone system which will complete connection of the Yellowtail power plant and Wyoming system with the Fort Peck and Garrison power plants, and the Billings-Yellowtail transmission line which is required to supply construction power for Yellowtail Dam and will later be used to integrate and interconnect the power systems in Montana. The Montana Power Co. does not have lines in existence which would meet the needs served by the requested lines.

IN IDAHO

Here again there are incomplete and incorrect statements which are not borne out by facts.

The bulletin states that the American Falls power plant of the Bureau will be 30,000 kilowatts and the present company plant is 27,000 kilowatts and there is not enough water for both.

The facts in the case are that when the American Falls Dam was constructed in 1925–27 provision was made in the construction of the dam to produce power at a later date. The power company already had a power plant which makes use of the natural head at American Falls but this is only half of the head now available. The Government power plant to be constructed will utilize the full head due to the falls and to the dam constructed above the falls. This head, as stated above, is approximately twice that now being used at the company plant. The result will be that the average annual energy produced at American Falls will be increased from 150,000,000 kilowatt-hours now produced at the company plant to 280,000,000 kilowatt-hours from both the Government plant and the company plant. Therefore, the construction of the American Falls power plant will add about 130,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually of generation at the American Falls site.

The statement is made that there is not enough water for two plants and that the proposed plant would put the company plant out of business. These statements are at variance with the facts. A study indicates that the company plant may still be operated during 8 months of the year and that in 5 of these 8 months there would be enough water to develop the full output of both plants. If it were not for the requirement of providing water for the present company plant, all the water during these months could be used at the proposed plant and the capacity raised to 85,000 kilowatts instead of the total of 57,000 kilowatts for the present proposed plant and the company plant. It is pointed out that over 25 years ago the United States paid the Idaho Power Co. a million dollars for American Falls water rights which will be used in operation of the new plant. This water has been used continuously ever since by the Idaho power plant because the Government had no plant to utilize this water right. Naturally the company is loathe to be deprived of the Government water it has and is using.

The statement is made in the Bulletin that $55,000 a year would be lost in taxes due to the closing down of the company plant. In view of the explanation of the operation of these two plants in the above paragraph, this statement cannot be supported. The construction of the proposed plant will provide, among other things, pumping energy for the North Side pumping division of the Minidoka project which will irrigate 77,650 acres of new land. No estimate has been made as to how much local taxes will be increased but certainly such new taxes will more than offset any decrease in taxes caused by reduced operation of the company's plant.

The development of these new acreages makes it plain that the Bureau of Reclamation is interested in a sound reclamation program in this area despite NAEC misstatements.

IN COLORADO

The statement in the paragraph headed "Background" says that "the Department of the Interior wants to build all the transmission facilities to market power." This has no more basis than previous statements in the bulletin already discussed. The fact that the Government has entered into wheeling arrangements with the Public Service Co. of Colorado when it is in the public good shows that it is not the intent to construct all transmission facilities. Obviously, however, the Government in accordance with law and policy must assure itself that other means of transmission such as wheeling arrangements are more in public interest than direct transmission over Government facilities. The Government has voluntarily changed the request for the Estes-Leyner transmission line and substation following the consummation of the wheeling arrangements originally in the 1952 budget. In technical collaboration with the Public Service Co. of Colorado, it was determined that this line and substation would not be required until about 1957. However, it was jointly agreed that a line from Estes to Polehill was necessary and the Bureau's request includes this. The request for $100,000 for fiscal year 1952 remains unchanged, but the total cost of the presently proposed and needed line will be considerably less than the Estes-Leyner line and substation.

In connection with savings, again, it should be mentioned that payment by the Government to the company for wheeling power will effectually offset any savings realized by the lesser investment on the part of the Government.

IN EASTERN OREGON

First. The statement that "no part of either line—McNary-LaGrande and LaGrande Baker—is under construction" is misleading.

As stated in foregoing paragraphs, right-of-way was first acquired on authorization 9 years ago. Funds for design and materials from McNary to LaGrande have been spent. Construction contract has been awarded.

Second. The statement that the "California Pacific Utilities Co. has more than doubled its electric lines and tripled its power supply in the past 5 years" is misleading.

The company has no adequate power supply of its own. It depends, to a considerable extent, upon the purchase of power from the Idaho Power Co. at Baker. On November 16, 1949, Mr. E. K. Albert, vice president and chief engineer of the California-Oregon Power Co., told a BPA representative that the Idaho Power Co.'s present Baker-LaGrande, 66-kilovolt circuit is loaded to capacity. He stated further that the proposed BPA line from McNary Dam to LaGrande would have to be completed in the near future to supply the company's needs from the Bonneville system at LaGrande.

Adequate transmission from the Idaho Power Co. system to Baker, Oreg., is also inadequate. The company has included in its program construction of a line from Huntington, Oreg., to Baker. This line has not been completed because its right-of-way crosses public lands, and the company has refused to accede to the terms of the permit it requests from the Bureau of Land Management that the unused capacity of such a line would be available for the use by the Federal Government.

Third. Early in April of 1950–51, the Idaho Power Co. and the California Pacific Power Co. opposed the allotment of materials by the Defense Electric Power Administration to the McNary-LaGrande line, on the basis that this will be a wasteful use of such critical materials. On April 16, 1951, after study of the circumstances and justifications for the line, the Defense Electric Power Administration approved the use of materials for this construction, thereby rejecting the power company's objections.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, although I intend to speak on this amendment, on the other hand I think in the interest of saving time, as the debate goes on, probably some of my remarks will be addressed to other amendments that I know are going to come.

I think it is important to remember certain things. One thing, of course, is that all of us in this House, on both sides of the aisle, are for economy in the sense that we want to save money if we can. On the other hand, I think perhaps we have overlooked something in this par-

ticular bill, and it may not apply to other bills, so I mention it here. This bill that we are considering here today is probably one of the few, if not the only bill, we will have that goes right to the heart and soul of everything that tends to make America the great Nation that it is. It also probably is more connected with the defense effort and whether or not in the long run this Nation will survive, than any other bill we are going to consider.

In considering economy, in thinking about saving dollars and cents, I think we also have to give some thought to what there is in this bill and whether or not any real saving can be made. We all know that what makes this country great, of course, is not only the people in this country but basically and fundamentally it is what we have in this country. It is the great natural resources that we have; it is our fields, our plains, our valleys, our rivers; it is the minerals beneath the soil; it is the fuel and liquids and gases; it is all those things. And if we do not have those things and if we do not protect them and if we do not develop our resources, this country is losing probably the elements that tend to make it one of the greatest nations in the world.

You can talk all you want to about these different matters but the fact of the matter is that this bill and the money you are spending this week under this bill has to do with conserving what we have, in building up what we have, and in seeking to make it available not only for the benefit of all the people in peacetime, but also in wartime.

It is intimately tied into our food production and it is intimately tied up to our industrial output. It has to do directly and intimately with the minerals that we have. It has to do with our water supply. It has to do with all those things.

As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has told you many, many times, one of the greatest crimes this country has committed has been what we permitted to happen to our top soil. Our conservation policy that is so important to this country is taken care of in this bill. Our resources, and whether or not we are going to find any and whether or not we need any more—and we all know that foreign sources are rapidly being shut off—are all taken care of and provided for in this bill. Take our great forests. What happened to them? It is the same thing here. Think of the minerals and metals that have to do with wartime and peacetime production. Wars cannot be fought without them; this country cannot be defended without them. They are all in this bill.

When you talk about saving money in some bills, you save money, and there is no harm. But we do not want to try to save money at the expense of resources more valuable than money. We do not want to save money and lose America. Let us remember there are a good many elements of wealth, and it is not only the dollars piled up. There are other types of wealth that are perhaps more important in the long run, and you must remember that every time you whittle down and save dollars in this fashion, at the same time you are whittling down on the resources of America. You are increasing the waste that has been going down our rivers with the topsoil. You are losing part of the strength of America.

It is easy for us to understand how you can save money. A man may have a herd of cattle that is worth a great deal of money, perhaps $1,000,000. He may be faced with a decision as to whether or not he will put up a fence to keep those cattle in. It may cost him $1,000. He does not have to spend the $1,000 if he does not want to, but he may lose $1,000,000 if he does not.

All of us in our private lives perhaps carry insurance, whether it is for merchandise or on our own lives. In going over your personal family budget you can see where you can save $50 or $100 a month, but you do not take the chance because that $50 or $100 a month may in the long run cost you several thousand dollars in loss.

That question applies to this bill. This bill is the insurance of America.

One other point: We in this country like to feel that we perhaps are doing something for the Nation, that we are going to pass on to our children and to other generations something in this Nation. This is the bill that provides those things for America.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I call the gentleman's attention to this fact, and I am sure he knows it, that the particular amendment we are considering now concerns the perpetual resource of the United States, the water. Once the dam is built, it may be good for centuries and centuries.

Mr. FURCOLO. That is right.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Whether or not I agree with the gentleman, I want to make the observation that I do not believe it possible that a more perfect statement in support of the position the gentleman takes could have been made by anyone.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I also want to compliment the gentleman on making a very splendid statement. It is a broad, statesmanlike view he takes. He is building for the future.

So many times we hear some thoughtless person say, "What has posterity done for me that I should do anything for it?" Yet this Republic was founded for the benefit of ourselves and our posterity. That is exactly what the gentleman is saying and I highly commend him for it.

It has been pointed out here that so-called saving at this time on Government power facilities is saving at the spigot and wasting at the bung. I will give an example. Before the Second World War we had begun the building of the Davis Dam, but we stopped in the midst of it. The estimated cost of the dam at that time was about $45,000,000 After the war was over, we continued with the building of the dam, and it is producing power today which will be an important part of our national defense, as the gentleman says. But when we resumed operations in building it, it cost twice the amount of money that was estimated previously. That is what we are up against.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman very much. I think without any question that while we all want to save money, when you want to build houses and the forests are gone, you cannot say you can build houses with dollars. It does not mean anything.

Without fuel gas, and oil the engines of war cannot operate. We can save $10,000,000 on this, but let our tanks be stalled somewhere and that $10,000,000 will not be worth anything, not 10 cents.

All through this bill, wherever you are saving a penny you have to remember that you are also cutting down on sometihng that is basic and essential. Perhaps it does not apply to other bills, but in this bill, whittle away, if you will, but every time you do you are whittling away at something that is the basis of the strength of America. We hope that in deciding not only on this amendment but on all the amendments the Members will have that in mind.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Taber amendment. The remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has just concluded, I agree with entirely. He made an excellent speech, and I am proud of the Member from Massachusetts, even though he does not vote the way I do. But we are in a serious condition in this country, and we ought not to raise any money except for national defense. I cannot agree with the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Washington and the rest of the Members from the Western States who want little old New England to pay all the bills, and I am sympathetic with them, but why can they not, in a day like this when boys are being killed every minute, forget about some power project? Let me tell you a little something about Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman, I believe, made the statement that New England and other sections of the East would be paying the bill, or paying for these power projects. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the power features of these projects must be repaid or amortized, together with the interest, normally over a 40- or 50-year period?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. They are all reimbursable projects, so that this is one item in the bill, among others,

where Uncle Sam is making a very sound investment in the future of our country.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. That money does not come back into the Treasury, but just goes into the reclamation fund. As a practical matter, it never gets there.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In the case of reclamation projects that is true, but Congress appropriates out of the reclamation fund, instead of out of the general receipts of the Treasury.

Mr. TABER. Only partly, I will say.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. Also, they must bear in mind that we pay interest on that money which we appropriate, and the interest nowadays is not put back into the Treasury, as interest.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I did not want to get into the politics of Oregon and Washington and California or Arizona, where we built all these dams, and which are so productive to the welfare of the country. I am not worrying about that at all. They will take care of themselves in California. As a matter of fact, they have about eight more Representatives there than they used to have, because they give them a ham-and-egg program which does not suit the taste of the people of New England. We still eat salt codfish, and I guess we will keep on eating it if we keep on appropriating money like this.

All that the gentleman from New York is doing is to take the money for these power projects and use it for defense to save the lives of the people of this country and of the boys and girls who have to go to war.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to speak about Connecticut and Rhode Island and Massachusetts and about the REA. Of course, the gentleman from Mississippi is inclined to think that the TVA is the greatest thing in the world, but we do not have any rural electrification in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, and yet every farmer up there—at least 98 and some percent—has electric power today. And who made it possible? Private industry did.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. Last night the gentleman and I attended a dinner where someone from New England spoke. He said that in New England when they pray they do not pray the Lord to give us some wealth. They just say, "Show us where it is and we will go and get it."

Mr. NICHOLSON. I want to thank the gentleman for saying that.

Mr. FURCOLO. This bill in effect does a great deal of that. It points out where the resources are.

Mr. RANKIN. I think he meant p-r-e-y.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I have shown what we could do on this REA in New England. I would like to have somebody get up here, whether he comes from California or where he comes from, and show me any commodity in the United States that has not risen in price except power. It is the one thing that these electric companies have furnished the people for less than they were getting 20 years ago.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The TVA brought it down.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, whoever brought it down or whatever happened, it is true.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I appreciate the talk the gentleman is making, but I call his attention to this fact: that the power business is a monopoly. Not only that, but it is a supervised and regulated monopoly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, it is not a monopoly. The Public Utilities Commission in our State gave them the right to operate. They also reserved the right to say what they will pay for power and everything. The electric companies do not have a monopoly, because the gas companies are in competition with them. I do not know what they are in California. I am just talking about where this Nation was propagated and what we expect. We do not expect anybody to give us anything in Massachusetts. We go out and work for it, and we have had these public utilities companies and we have had the gas companies, and we run them, and we do not want the Government to run them for us. But you people out in the West take our money and then hate us.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I just wanted to point out to the gentleman that we in the West work also, and we work hard. We have built a tremendous State, but we cannot get away from the fact that the people who operate the gas and electric companies are monopolies which are supervised and regulated by the Public Utilities Commission. No other business has that privilege, but they do have it, and it is probably for the public welfare.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Can you not tell the people back home that ten or fifteen million dollars from one of these appropriations might help the country in time of need, and you can get along without your electricity for a couple of years more? Can you not do that?

Mr. JOHNSON. Why, certainly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, why do you not do it, then?

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to point this out to you, sir, that our Central Valley project is waiting for completion before it is worth anything. We have got $440,000,000 in it. We want to build the ditches to carry the water into the other watersheds. Until we do that we cannot use any of it, because an injunction preventing the Reclamation Bureau from diverting water at Friant Dam until certain canals have been completed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why do you not wait until this war is over? Let us get one thing settled at a time, and take care of your problems, if you have got them. I do not think you have, because you will get the power dams and you will get the transmission lines, and anything else you want; only, let us wait until we finish up this war.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman think that during this critical period, when we are trying to expand our industrial output, we ought to make every effort to increase our electric-power supply, whether private or public? In our part of the country some of the private utilities are building some dams. The basic problem is that we must expand our power output if we are going to expand industry. Expanding industry, in turn, is essential to the strength of America in peace and war.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mrs. Rosenberg, or whatever her name is, says we need just 3,500,000 recruits. We had 11,000,000, and we had all these places where they could build ships and everything else and we did it and we won. We can do the same thing now with the kind of construction we have got. That is my opinion.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think that the industrial capacity we had during World War II is sufficient to defend America and the free world in a third world war?

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is a kind of a tough question. We can take care of ourselves, if that is what you mean, in the United States. But if we start taking care of England and France and Asia and India and everybody else, I will say we cannot do it. But I do not vote that way. You do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has again expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard more misstatements here today than I have heard on a bill for a long, long time. We all believe in economy at this time; certainly I do. What is proposed in this amendment is not economy; it is waste. You would think from the statements made here that you could win this war without the materials necessary to winning.

When we discuss the question of using electric power in any particular area, we should consider just what that area is producing, and what those products are producing. What are the Western States producing?

They are providing molybdenum ore which goes into the manufacture of steel to harden it. Do not forget that this is a war of steel—hard steel—in which we are now engaged. We have recently discovered uranium deposits in New Mexico.

I assume uranium is needed since so much is being appropriated for atomic-energy projects. Without these minerals produced in the Western States, any war could drag on endlessly.

Operating mine equipment, operating the sawmills that cut our timber into usable form, operating the cotton gins that produce fiber for defense uses—all these things require electric power. They require power which cannot be obtained in that area from any source other than public development.

New Mexico is the land of wide open spaces. Distances are great out there, and water is scarce. We have used electricity to pump the precious water from the earth and grow more cotton, cotton that may provide the soldier with the extra cartridge belt or pack he so desperately needs.

We are using electricity in the mines to produce copper, and I do not think it is necessary to mention how vital copper is to our war effort. It is so vital that we recently offered Chile 3 cents a pound more than our domestic price.

I do not want to waste Federal funds; I do want to save American lives. That brings me to electricity's part in husbanding another vital defense resource—manpower. Rural electrification has made it possible for thousands and thousands of boys who formerly worked on the farms to find employment elsewhere. The work is being done by electricity. Perhaps some of the Members forget that 3 kilowatts can do the equivalent in work of more than 40 men.

The gentlemen from Massachusetts, as well as some other Members, have spoken here today about the Western States. Let me remind the gentleman that, in the case of my State, he and the rest of the people of the United States own 45 percent of it. That is the amount of land in New Mexico owned by the Federal Government. Similar situations prevail in the other Western States.

You probably wonder why we want this electric power? This is the reason. With many of the States in the West owned in greater part by the Federal Government, we are having a difficult time. We have the ranges that supply beef to the people of Massachusetts—and we all love Massachusetts and the people who come from there. But this is not a love feast.

We want to get out of this war; yet this amendment will do more to stifle the war effort in the Western States than anything that has been offered. I sincerely hope it will be voted down.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a rather strange discussion is going on in this country today, and that is whether or not the United States can survive—if you can imagine such a thing. It is difficult for me to understand how we could possibly get into a position politically, economically, geographically, or otherwise, where we have to discuss seriously the question, Can the United States as a government survive? That comes from almost every platform where the speaker is a student of world affairs. That is a danger signal.

Here is a headline that appears in today's paper: "Services want to hire 450,000 more civilians."

Have we gone completely crazy? We have the Grand Coulee Dam, the Hoover Dam, the Parker Dam, Coolidge Dam, and other dams—a dam here, a dam there, a dam somewhere else. I am not kicking about having those dams. I can argue that much water has been flowing through streams and going to waste for probably a million years. That potential power has not been captured. You can argue that you want to start this, that, and the other project in peacetime when there is no emergency, just like a family may start an additional room to the house when there is no emergency; but when the emergency arises you may have to forget the building of the new room and take the child to a hospital and pay the hospital bill, doing without the additional room for a while.

You may have to do without adding to some project where you have spent already $450,000,000 or a billion dollars. I happen to be a member of a certain committee of this House and the other day we tabled for the time being a bill which calls for the direct expenditure of some $788,000,000. Included in that bill was provision for another dam at Bridge Canyon on the Colorado River a few miles below the Grand Canyon National Park. We did not do that with pleasure. I told the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], who is sitting in front of me: "I do not believe you can get that bill through the Congress at the present time, and I do not want the bill to come up here and be turned down by a rather solid vote. I do not think this is the time to build that particular project."

Read carefully the President's message that he sent up here the other day on renewal of the Defense Act. Read his message of yesterday calling for an additional $60,000,000,000 of defense money. Check your potential revenues and show me where you can finance all of these things without going into additional deficit financing, without promoting more inflationary forces, and without further destroying the buying power of the savings of all the people of this country.

The President has asked us for economic stability, he asks for increased production, he says that without these two things we cannot win the war we are in. Of course you cannot. Economic stability means that the Congress of the United States has got to use some sense in making these appropriations. We have got to say to the people of this country that, "You are going to have to do without those things you can get along without at the present time until we finish this other task."

The people of my district know I will vote against an appropriation for my district as quickly as I will vote against an appropriation for any other district. I pledge my soul, body, and mind to cutting these appropriations if they can be cut and I want to repeat here again, if I get a chance I will vote to cut at least $7,000,000,000 from the budget now before us. I am looking for those cuts to be applied to those things we can get along without. And any man who charges me with voting to fix it so the boys on the front cannot get the ammunition and stuff to fight with is just silly, that is all. He may make such charges all he wants to, let the newspapers make that charge all they want to, but it is not going to influence my vote and I shall vote in support of the pending amendment.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to show my personal gratitude and that of my own State for the deep interest which the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], has taken in the far West. I think he has been exceedingly fair and courageous because so few of the items contained in this bill touch his State and his district. He has traveled over the West. He knows the problems of the West, and he is not sectional. I appreciate, too, the leadership of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] which he has displayed on the floor of this House. I felt pretty bad the other day when we were discussing amendments to this bill and realized that we had not given the green light to the control of the beetle blight in the great forests of the intermountain West. If we would only realize what that means to the future, we would never have voted for that cut, because it means the eventual cutting of the water supply of the West. Yet, we sat here and did that the other day. We forget, too, about the halogeton weed, a perfectly vicious, fast-growing weed, that is so very difficult to eradicate and so difficult to distinguish from other weeds of the West, and how it has killed in one afternoon's time hundreds of sheep out West. Yet, we have to depend upon the West for so much of the meat we eat. We do things so carelessly—those amendments to cut should never have passed last week. Of course, we are interested in economy. I am careful how I spend my own money. I come from a family that has lived in America since 1620; they have been careful spenders and they have been high taxpayers of this Nation. But, we must not, because we have prospered in the past, penny pinch the future for our great grandchildren. Some of the arguments on the floor remind me of when I was on the bench. I remember in court that the lawyers who waved the flag and talked about the women and the widows and the orphans never had much of a point to make. Now we could add to the flag and the widows and the women and the orphans, defense, because with the emotions of these subjects we can excuse and camouflage the arguments for false economy so often heard on the floor of this House. I do believe that it would help a great deal if the 435 Members of this House would sojourn in the West for a period of time. Go through that part of the Nation, travel it by automobile, and see the counties that are literally drying up; counties that previously have been productive. I wish, too, that you gentlemen,

especially from the far East and the South, could see the great military installations that have been built in the West, such as we have in Utah between Ogden and Salt Lake City; installations that have brought in thousands of people who have increased our population 41 percent. We do not have enough water for culinary purposes for the homes of the civilians that work in those military establishments, and that water is so necessary. We have gone so far with certain projects and we must continue to build, for we need that water, let alone the power. There must be something for the boys of Korea to come home to. I am surprised that so often Members of Congress have thought of the West as a stepchild. Do you know, I believe that the western Representatives are as interested in Massachusetts and Georgia and Mississippi and Ohio as are the gentlemen representing those particular States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOSONE. In just a moment. We surely realize now that the prosperity of one State is the prosperity of all States; that the prosperity of one section of this country is the prosperity of all sections of this country. In listening to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], you would get the idea that we could turn the floods on and off, have the sun shine today and disappear tomorrow. But man has no such power. We have to control floods and store and regulate water for the benefit of future economy and happiness, not only for the West but for the whole Nation. I am sorry my time is up.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this power question goes much deeper than any local quarrel between the Virginia Power Co. and the user of electricity in that immediate locality. This is the same old fight that has been carried on by the private power interests ever since I have been in Congress to get their hands on the Government's power generated on our navigable streams and their tributaries, at dams built by the Federal Government.

The Roanoke River, on which this dam has been built by the Federal Government at a cost of $68,000,000, has more power in it that is now going to waste than almost any other undeveloped stream in America. This is the beginning of the end of the development of the Roanoke River, if you adopt these amendments. The American people are not going to build these dams and turn the power over to the Power Trust for them to burden the ultimate consumers, including the Federal Government itself, with exorbitant rates. As I have said before, the power business is a public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern every-day life. It must be handled by a monopoly. Any monopoly of a necessity is a public business. Your waterworks, your schools, your roads, your streets are examples. Do you want a private monopoly to control them?

And besides that the water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government, as the Supreme Court of the United States has held in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case. But here we have a private monopoly trying to get its hands on the power generated on a navigable stream by the Government of the United States at a cost of $68,000,000, and then probably burden the people of that area as well as the Government with overcharges for all time to come.

Oh, they say that this project is in Virginia and should be regarded as a local proposition. They seem to forget that this is a Government-owned dam, built on a navigable stream at public expense. When I was fighting the battle here for the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority along with Senator Norris, Members would ask, "Why are JOHN RANKIN and GEORGE NORRIS interested in this proposition? It is over in Alabama, or up in Tennessee."

If we had lost that fight, the chances are that there would be only one dam on the Tennessee River now, the people would be paying from 3 to 10 times the rates they are now paying, and the farmers would be in the dark—even in Virginia. Today, if we did not have these power facilities on the Tennessee and the Columbia Rivers, with their yardsticks pointing in every direction, you would be paying many times as much for your electricity as you are now paying, and the chances are that the average farmer would not see electric light in his home during this generation. And that applies to Virginia, Arkansas, Texas, Ohio, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Iowa, Nebraska, and every other State.

Where were all these private power interests, and their friends, a few years ago when we were waging the battle for rural electrification?

In 1936 the International Power Conference was held in Washington, and the report of that conference shows that at that time Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified, Germany had 90 percent of her farms electrified, France and Italy each had 94 percent of their farms electrified, while the United States had only 10.9 percent of her farms electrified.

Some of you no doubt heard, and probably a few of you read, the statement in the RECORD the other day by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] attacking me, and you heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] make about the same speech today against these power lines he made against creating the TVA, against public power, and against rural electrification years ago. If this House had been full of Tacketts, Tabers, and Keatings back in those days the country would certainly be in the dark, and the farmers would not have got their homes electrified for the next 50 years. I will refer to the Keating amendment later.

At that time Arkansas had 1.2 percent of her farms electrified, or 12 out of every 1,000. In Japan, instead of having 12 farms out of every 1,000 electrified, they would have had 900 of them electrified, and in France or Italy they would have had 940 farms electrified, instead of 12 out of every 1,000.

Today, instead of having 12 farms out of every 1,000 electrified, Arkansas has 826 out of every 1,000 of her farms electrified, or did have on June 30, 1950. By this time, she probably has about 900 out of every 1,000 farms electrified.

This improvement has been brought about by our public power program, through the REA. And, I want to pause to pay my tribute to a man from Arkansas who has done more to help the farmers in that State, and throughout the entire Nation, than almost any other man who has lived in your day and mine. I refer to Clyde Ellis, a former Member of Congress from Arkansas who is now head of the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Power Association.

The State of North Carolina only had 3.2 percent of her farms electrified, or 32 out of every 1,000 in 1934. On June 30th of last year, she had 68.6, or 866 out of every 1,000, instead of 32.

Virginia had 7.6 percent of her farms electrified in 1934, or 76 out of every 1,000. On June 30, 1950, she had 91 percent of her farms electrified, or 910, instead of 76, out of every 1,000. Today I dare say Virginia has 95 percent of her farms electrified as a result of the work of the Rural Electrification Administration.

In 1935, the district I have the honor to represent, comprising 10 counties in northeastern Mississippi, had less than 1 percent of her farms electrified, or less than 10 farms out of every 1,000. Today, every one of those counties get their power through the TVA, and it is distributed to the farmers through the Rural Electrification Administration's cooperative power associations. Instead of having less than 1 percent of the farms electrified in that district, we have between 90 and 95 percent of the farms in that district electrified, or something like 950, instead of 10 out of every 1,000, and we are going to keep up the drive until we electrify them all—reach every farmhouse with a power line that the Government can reach with the draft in times of war, or that the tax collector can find in times of peace. And, I might add, that we are going to carry on this drive for the entire Nation until we electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

It has done more to relieve the drudgery, brighten the homes, protect the health, and raise the standard of living of the American farmer than anything else that has ever been done since the country was discovered.

If we had waited on the private power interests to develop the Tennessee River and the Columbia River and other public power agencies, and provide it to the farmers of the Nation, we would still be back where we were 20 years ago, and the chances are that the average farmer and his wife, who occupy the farm homes of the Nation today, would not live to see those homes electrified.

If the amendments that have been adopted to this bill are approved on roll calls, and sustained by the Senate, it will be the greatest blow the power consumers of this Nation have ever received at the hands of Congress; and believe me you are going to hear from them.

If this Gary amendment on page 2, which would turn the power developed at Buggs Island Dam on the Roanoke River over to the private power interests is approved on a roll call, and sustained by the Senate, it will simply mean turning over a public dam on a navigable stream that it cost the Government $68,000,000 to build to the private power interests, and will slow down, if it does not paralyze, the power development throughout that area, and probably forever seal the doom of future dam constructions on the Roanoke River.

Take this Harris amendment, on page 4, line 1, striking out the money for the power lines for the Southwestern Power Administration. It will paralyze the development in that area and deprive the people throughout that section of the country of the benefits of their own natural resources. And will probably seal the doom of future power development on the navigable streams and their tributaries in that area, including the Arkansas and the Missouri Rivers, and their tributaries.

How any man can support that amendment, I am unable to understand.

The Ford amendment on page 5, line 19, will paralyze the construction of power lines along the Columbia River where those great dams have been built by the Federal Government to develop power that the Supreme Court has said already belongs to the American people, just as does the power on the Roanoke River, and along those streams reached by the Southwestern Power Administration.

The same thing is true of the amendment on page 4, beginning on line 3, which literally wipes out the construction of facilities to supply power to the people within the distribution radius of dams already constructed by the Federal Government.

The amendment on page 16, line 2, reducing that appropriation is designed to prevent the building of power lines to distribute power generated at dams constructed by the Federal Government.

But the worst blow of all probably is the Keating amendment on page 16, line 3, which is designed to prevent the construction of power lines to transmit the power generated at dams constructed by the Federal Government, on navigable streams and their tributaries.

The Government might spend $100,000,000, or more, on the construction of a dam to provide power, navigation, and flood control on one of our navigable streams. Private power interests could slip in and build a few power lines, and, under the Keating amendment, and these other amendments that have been adopted, they could seize that power and plunder the people with exorbitant rates for hundreds of miles around.

We are going to call the roll on these amendments, and if they are adopted they will twinkle the lights in every farm home in America that now gets any electricity at all and in every other home that uses electricity for the purposes for which God Almighty created it.

As I have said time and time again, electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates the more freely it flows; and the more freely it flows the greater are its benefits to mankind.

I never dreamed that I would live to see Congress backtrack and injure the power consumers of America as they have done by adopting these amendments. If they are approved on roll calls tomorrow, I hope the Senate will repudiate every one of them. If they do not do it, this will be an issue in every congressional district in the next campaign. The American people are not going to see their rights taken from them, and the public power in our navigable streams and their tributaries, which constitutes the greatest wealth in America, aside from the soil from which we live, turned over to private interests to exploit them with exorbitant rates.

The year I came to Congress this country was using 37,180,000,000 of kilowatt-hours of electricity. That was before the TVA, the Boulder Dam, the Columbia River, and other public power dams were constructed, and before the Rural Electrification Administration was created. Last year we used 329,028,000,000 of kilowatt-hours, or almost 10 times as much as we used the year I came to Congress. There are 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power now running to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. It could be firmed up to the peak of the average year with 116,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam power, which would raise it to 510,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Add that to what we are already using and it would give us around 900,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year; which would be enough to run every factory, supply every commercial enterprise, electrify every farmhouse and heat every home in America. Yet, Congress is taking it upon itself to paralyze this, the greatest development this Nation has ever seen, by the adoption of these silly amendments that would wreck the finest program ever designed for brightening the homes, relieving the drudgery, and increasing the prosperity of the masses of the American people.

If we had not had these power developments on the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers where our atomic plants are located, the chances are that World War II would still be raging and our casualties would have reached into the millions by this time, if we had been able to continue the conflict.

I feel so deeply on this subject that it is impossible for me to express my disappointment over the adoption of these destructive amendments.

Ever since the days when Senator Norris and I were struggling to strike out all after the enacting clause of the old House bill and insert the Norris-Rankin bill which finally became the law creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, I have carried on this fight to develop the water power in our navigable streams and their tributaries and get it distributed to the American people at rates they could afford to pay.

As everyone knows, I have led the fight for rural electrification from that day to this. Where we had less than 10 percent of our farms electrified 20 years ago, we now have about 90 percent of them electrified and those farmers and their families are enjoying benefits and living on a standard of which they had never dreamed; and remember, this rural electrification program has furnished a market for billions of dollars worth of electric appliances.

If the House approves these vicious amendments, I humbly pray that the Senate will knock them out, and not allow this great program to be paralyzed in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MORRIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, how much time will that give each of us?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MORRIS. How much time would that give those who would like to speak?

Mr. BENDER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman make it 40 minutes, and let those Members each have 5 minutes?

Mr. FURCOLO. I will be glad to amend the request. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments be closed in 40 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean the Taber amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. FURCOLO. All amendments to this paragraph.

Mr. TABER. Oh, I object to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FURCOLO. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Taber amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, why not have a motion to close debate on the Lovre amendment, and then some of the rest of us have amendments we would like to offer to this amendment. The way it is proposed now, that cuts out everybody else from offering an amendment.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in considering a bill of this kind I like to deal with facts and figures, and I am sure that you do also. It seems to me that if we are to carry on the proper kind of defense efforts for our great country we must also remain strong at home. I realize, as all of us do, that if there is any item in this bill where the figures are too high it ought to be reduced. None of us wants to waste money. None of us wants to spend money that is not necessary. But certainly no case has been made, in my judgment, to reduce the amount of this

particular item. I believe that all of the weight of reason and logic is in favor of keeping it as it is.

I would like to give you some figures and facts for your consideration.

Under the President's proposed budget for 1952 there is envisioned the spending of $71,600,000,000. The breakdown of the items is as follows: Military services, forty-one and four-tenths billions; international commitments, seven and five-tenths; interest, five and nine-tenths; veterans, four and nine-tenths; social security, welfare, and health, two and six-tenths billions; natural resources, two and five-tenths; transportation and commerce, one and seven-tenths; finance, commerce, and industry, one and five-tenths; agriculture, one and four-tenths; general government, one and four-tenths; education, labor, and housing, eight-tenths billion.

Percentagewise it is as follows: For military services, 58 percent; international obligations, 10 percent; interest on the national debt, and most of this occurred as a result of World War II, 8 percent; for veterans, 7 percent; for all other governmental purposes, 17 percent. In other words, about 83 percent of our entire budget is for past wars and present military activities.

Now I call your attention to this significant fact: As I said in the beginning, if we are to support our boys on the battlefields, if we are to support our defense effort, we must also remain strong at home and we need not kid ourselves; there just is not any place in the budget where it would be humanly possible to make any big percentage cut, anywhere. These are just cold figures and facts, and here they are before us. So let us not kid ourselves and let us not kid the American public as long as we are carrying on in these dark and dangerous days. The great military budget is such that it just is not possible to cut a big percentage of the whole budget; there just is not any chance anywhere to make any great big dent in it. That does not mean, of course, that we should not cut down any items that are improper; of course not. But let us not approach this matter with a lot of hope that we can make a great big percentage showing of cutting down on the budget, because it cannot be done; it cannot be done as long as we carry on with the tremendous program that we have before us from an international situation level, and I think that if we do start cutting we had better find a better place than this to start on, because when we start here we are cutting, in my judgment, at the very vitals not only of our domestic life but also of our defense efforts.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to obtain recognition ever since my colleague from Massachusetts was lamenting how that area of the country was being abused. He feels that California paying over four billion a year in Federal taxes is getting too much for its money. We know better. I was also interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi, who purports to be willing to tell California what is good for it. I cannot help but recall that the founder of the New York Tribune once looked at the people of New England and said: "Go West, young man." He was very influential; he started them on the trail West. Some of them went through Mississippi and dropped a little cottonseed. Others of them went through Ohio and dropped a little bit of everything. Some of them went through Minnesota and left a few cattle. As the trail extended through the Red River Valley and branched through Iowa, they dropped a little wheat and then a little corn. Some of them became fatigued and stopped; in the vernacular of the trail they pooped out for that generation.

However, we in the West know that everybody is headed west.

I think it would be instructive if some spokesman for New England could tell us how Mr. Horace Greeley would answer the question: Why is it that there are 10,000,000 people in New England who have not been able to make it farther than 2 miles inland in 11 generations on their way west? Could it be that on a few inches of topsoil they are able to make a living through modern-day business on the activities of the West, or do they just want to stay close to old England?

I believe the House is entirely agreed that Government assistance is necessary to generate power on our big streams. Private business cannot interfere with navigable waters without Government consent. There is disagreement on the proper method to distribute power after it is generated. I can agree that in sparsely populated areas either Government money or Government assistance in financing is necessary for power lines. I violently disagree that they are necessary in heavily populated areas or that the Federal Government by subterfuge should interfere with State regulation of power rates. I regret that I disagree with the gentleman from New York who, I understand, is now in the position of having accepted an amendment to his amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota. Whether or not I would have supported the amendment of the gentleman from New York in its original form, I do not have time now to discuss. However, under the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota we cut $10,000,000 from the appropriation and leave it to the discretion of politicians appointed by the administration to say where that money will not be spent. They have the discretion to do what the gentleman from South Dakota does not want them to do. He does not want them to discontinue the construction of power lines in South Dakota, yet he has few votes in that area with which to influence them. His amendment also leaves us in the position that political appointees can make the political decision of not spending $10,000,000 in the development of water for arid areas or flood control and spend it in heavily populated political areas for duplicating power lines. Mr. Chairman, the Congress should express its intent when amendments cutting the construction budget of the Department of the Interior are considered. We should definitely and positively say what construction is to be delayed. The amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota gives discretionary power to that agency of the Government which many of us believe improperly constituted to justify such authority in the national interest. However, even if that were not true and whether or not the administration or the appointees were Republican or Democrat, this is the wrong kind of authority to be delegated to political appointees.

Rather than consider an amendment of this kind, we should consider cutting the appropriation where it is intended to build duplicating power and unnecessary paralleling lines. Under the existing circumstances, I will have to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Department of the Interior has made every effort to enter into contracts with private utility companies to wheel the power from the dams to the preferred customers? If there are lines in here which are being constructed it is because the private power companies either are not in position to build them or they do not want to enter into a fair and reasonable contract. The committee did take out a number of lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The committee took out a number of transmission lines where an agreement could be reached. But the law of the land is clear and it is the established policy of the Government that ever since 1906 the Government has seen to it that the power from Government dams is sold first to the preferred customers and what we are trying to do is to avoid the necessity wherever possible of the Government building these transmission lines if private industry will build them and wheel the power to the preferred customers at a fair rate.

Mr. WERDEL. The gentleman is repeating what he has said before on this particular amendment and it is in part what prompted me to say something.

So far as I am concerned, I do not ever want to delegate the power of my State to determine who are preferred customers to any national political appointee, whether he be Republican or Democrat.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is the gentleman opposed to the preference provision of the law?

Mr. WERDEL. No.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. How are you going to carry it out?

Mr. WERDEL. I believe the gentleman has said that the committee took out all power lines parallel to those of private industry and not needed. That is not literally true. The fact is, the committee still has power facilities in this bill which the Bureau witnesses testified would not be needed if a wheeling contract were entered into. The wheeling contract is in existence and agreed upon.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I did not make the statement that the Committee took out all lines that would necessarily parallel private utility lines. What I said was that the committee took out those lines where an agreement was reached to wheel the power on a fair and reasonable basis with the private utilities. There is in California a line where there is some controversy, where they could not reach an agreement, so the public utility district in northern California rightfully asked that the line be built.

Mr. WERDEL. I understand the gentleman's position to be this, that if there is a wheeling contract in existence at a rate agreed upon between the Bureau and the utility, which is presumably reasonable, that such lines should not be constructed at this time.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Obviously, that is the situation.

Mr. WERDEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I really feel that we are not cutting enough after reading the report of the subcommittee. On page 12 there is this statement:

> Despite the full assurances given by the Secretary, a violation of comity between the Interior Department and the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress, has been committed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The committee hereby requests the Secretary to investigate all facts surrounding this situation and to report promptly his findings thereon together with a report on disciplinary action taken by him, if any, in the premises.

Well, now, if we understand what we read here, and I am sure this report was given to us for our guidance, we know that there is something wrong with this whole operation. Under the circumstances we would make a great mistake in giving them too much to work with.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In response to the gentleman's statement, I think that demonstrates that the committee has tried to do a fair, impartial, and honest job. I would like to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, that I was responsible for the language which he has just read. I believe in criticizing the Bureau when they are not doing a good job, and that is exactly what the committee did with reference to the California-Oregon intertie. But, that does not mean that the other projects are not good and proper.

Mr. BENDER. I was glad to yield to the gentleman, though he took about 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman.

I appreciate the statement which the gentleman has just made, but I listened to a previous statement he made in which he said that the Taber amendment, as amended, would hurt the war effort; that by cutting down this appropriation our boys would suffer and that through some hocus-pocus the war effort would be retarded.

Yesterday, in one of my home-town newspapers of Cleveland the Housing Administrator was complaining about defense houses deteriorating, in fact, going to pot. These houses were built during the last emergency. Now we find a shortage of housing in the Cleveland area due to the fact that these houses were not substantial enough to outlast the emergencies.

When is the new emergency to end, and when are we going to place responsibility for the continuation of the present emergency? When are we going to consider that which is responsible for the present emergency? Who made these tragic deals at Potsdam, Yalta, and Tehran? The leadership of the Democratic administration.

I was recently talking to a Cleveland man who was an officer on board ship. He told me that after the Second World War the boys were waiting to be mustered out, and they wanted to get an ice cream freezer or two on the ship. They wanted to enjoy the last few weeks on board that ship. But they did not get to first base. Then all of a sudden they pulled into port, and their ship was loaded to the gills with costly American supplies, with the finest instruments, radar equipment, and other instruments the names of which I am not conversant with. Carloads of technical equipment was loaded on board this ship. The crew wondered why. Then the crew was ordered to go out to sea and land at another port, and waiting there was a Russian crew to whom this ship was turned over. These American boys had to train the Russian crew, this Communist crowd, in the operation of that ship and all equipment aboard.

We understand there were 686 ships turned over to the Russians by the United States Government, fully equipped, loaded with supplies, with all these things that we now complain there is a shortage of. Now the Roosevelt and Truman crowd complain about the shortages of vital material to conduct a war which this same leadership is responsible for.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. All I have to say is, "Vass you dere, Sharlie?"

Mr. BENDER. No; but I will give the gentleman the name of the gentleman who was there. I know the State Department is now endeavoring to get the Communists to keep the deal they had to turn back the 686 ships without cargo. "Vass you dere, Sharlie" or "Mike"?

I get sick and tired of all these appropriations that are asked for in the name of the war effort. Because of the bum deals our leadership made at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran, and subsequent deals they made with foreign governments, we find ourselves behind the eight ball.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this appropriation is less susceptible, logically and reasonably, to an across-the-board cut than any other, because it provides for a multitude of projects, all independent and separate. As my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] pointed out, if this cut of some $10,000,000 is allowed, it is left entirely within the discretion of the Department of the Interior to decide where the cut will be made, and if precedent is followed in this case, the cuts will be made where it is politically most expedient.

I personally feel that the Central Valley project, in which I am vitally interested, and in which my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL], is also interested, is entirely meritorious. It is nearly complete. In this appropriation a certain amount of money is allocated for completion of the Delta cross-channel, and the completion of the Tracy pumping plant which brings water up from the channel from the Sacramento River, into the Delta-Mendota canal and thence into the Delta-Mendota pool to replace water from the San Joaquin River, which is diverted from its natural course.

Speaking of urgency, and speaking of the possibility of deferment, I do not believe this particular project can be deferred any longer. The water is needed now. The San Joaquin Valley at the present time is suffering from one of four of the worst droughts in 50 years. The water table is going down throughout the valley. Some of the wells on the west side go down 2,000 feet. The cost of such wells runs up to $45,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not also a fact that there is now an injunction against the Reclamation Bureau using the water until certain canals that you mention have been completed?

Mr. HUNTER. The water which is intended to go down to the southern part of the valley from the San Joaquin River cannot be diverted legally until it is replaced by water from the Sacramento. That is not possible until the basic project is complete. In this appropriation there is money for the switchyard at Tracy, for the Shasta-Tracy westside line, also money for the completion of the main canals and for laterals, extending from these main canals.

The water is of no use in the canal unless the laterals are built.

Food and fiber are as necessary to the defense of our country as guns. Cotton, for example, is not only needed for clothing but also for explosives. Cotton is a critical material. It is in short supply. Much of the Nation's cotton is being grown in the San Joaquin Valley. This cannot be done without water. Completion of the Central Valley project of California is therefore necessary at the earliest possible date. To delay its completion would be false economy indeed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three things I wanted to touch on in my limited time. The gentlewoman from Utah spoke a moment ago about serious cuts which were unwise. I was handed this picture which I show you now of many dead sheep on the desert. The gentlewoman spoke of a dangerous weed that has spread over her part of the West. She did not elaborate on its nature but she said that it was destructive to the sheep industry out there. I find this picture, taken from a well-known national magazine, a pictorial magazine, shows that this sheep-killing weed covers an area larger than the State of Nevada. Here is a map showing that area covered by it. It touches on five States, mainly covering the States of Nevada and Utah.

Speaking of appropriating money for national defense, I want to remind the Committee that wool is one of the essentials of the defense program. Must we get most of our wool from Australia? We permit our wool industry and our mutton industry of America to be destroyed, and that is what I feel we have tended to do by an earlier cut in an appropriation which has already passed.

I recall that my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], a little earlier today made mention of a project which I have been sponsoring, the central Arizona project. I want what he said to be properly understood. As ranking minority member on that committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] did say to me, "This is not the time for considering such a project, costing admittedly $788,000,000." He said to the committee, "The project has been indefinitely postponed." Now, I want to set the record straight.

That project involves many elements: some needed now; others can wait. It does involve the building of a power dam on the Colorado River at the Bridge Canyon site and national defense calls for that now. It also involves a reclamation project, which the terms of the bill postpone until after the emergency. There has been fierce opposition to part of that project, and the fiercest opponents to the project want the power dam built on the Colorado River at the Bridge Canyon site; and, in addition to that, they would build some other dams, but no water diverted in Arizona.

They place the building of dams on the ground that power is needed in the Pacific Southwest, and it certainly is. Heaven only knows what we would have done during the Second World War if we had not had the power from Hoover Dam, from Grand Coulee, from the Tennessee Valley, and some of these other plants. We do not know but that we are headed into a third world war. If we do get into a third world war we will need more and more power.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] strikes at the very production of power, or at least its transmission. That is why I object so seriously to the Taber amendment, but especially to the part of it which strikes out the tranmission lines. It is worse than useless to build dams and power plants if we do not have transmission lines. The building of transmission lines is as much a part of the defense program as the building of airplanes and other implements of war; just as much as the building of arsenals for the production of guns, powder, and tanks. I ask you members of the committee to think seriously what is truly involved in defense.

However, I wanted to make that point clear, that my bill, the central Arizona project, of which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] spoke, does provide that no part of the reclamation shall be constructed so long as this emergency exists. We must take that proposition as my bill actually provides it, only that part of the bill, about half the total cost involved, may be built in power dams, transmission lines, and power plants while the war is on. Therefore proper consideration of the central Arizona project, involving $788,000,000, did not necessarily involve postponement of building the dam and the power plants for defense purposes, but by its own terms did delay reclamation and that part for nondefense purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this amendment would be a mistake. It seeks to cut down the ability we have as a government to make disposition of the great pools of hydroelectric power we are developing throughout the country. Those of you who have followed our rearmament program know that one of the great deficiencies we are facing now is hydroelectric power. That is true in almost every area. In the great Columbia River Basin where 40 percent of the potential hydroelectric power of the Nation lies, only 10 percent of it is developed. This cut in the appropriation is an attempt to take away the wheeling of the power in these projects to the points where it can be utilized and put into production.

In the United States we have immense natural deposits which are the salvation of this country. For instance, the great iron ore deposits which we have had. For 2 months my Committee on Public Works has been wrestling with that program, to find sufficient deposits of iron ore so that the great iron ore industry may not collapse in this country. We are asked to appropriate over $500,000,000 in one project now before our Committee on Public Works to make it possible to bring iron ore from Labrador and Quebec. Do you realize that this great natural resource of hydroelectric power is not expendable like iron ore or like coal or like natural gas or like oil?

All of these great natural resources are expendable and we find a dearth in many of them at the present time, but water, hydroelectric power, is one of the greatest resources of the Nation because it goes on forever and forever. As long as water falls and the sun shines, we will have hydro power; and when we once establish one of these great generating facilities like Grand Coulee, or Bonneville, or Hoover Dam, or Shasta, it is an asset in the hands of the people which is almost interminable for centuries without much additional cost. Do you realize that every dollar that is expended in most of these great plants comes back to the Federal Government in a short period of, say, 50 years? Not only the original investment, but with interest.

The other night I observed on the television a news item of the construction of a huge dam in Austria. It was an immense affair, way up in the mountains of Austria. The news broadcaster said it was the greatest project in Austria and was one of 17. Do you know who was paying for it? Uncle Sam.

Do you realize we are spending billions of dollars throughout the world under ECA and the Marshall plan? We are building hydroelectric plants, we are building railroads or digging canals or making docks; we are doing everything almost on earth to advance the economy of the nations around the world and yet here in America we have to plead, and plead, and plead to get even a minimum of expenditures to carry on the development of our own natural resources or for their conservation or for their full utilization. I am sure you realize as has often been said that if we win this war as we won the last, it will depend upon production; and we cannot have production unless we have hydroelectric power. One-third of the aluminum that went into World War II came from the Columbia River area due to the hydroelectric power which was developed on the great Columbia River and its tributaries.

These cuts that were heretofore agreed to by this committee, in the Bonneville Power Administration, in my judgment, were a great mistake. In the extension of my remarks I shall have something to say with reference to this. If there is one place where we should not seek economy, where cuts would be false economy, it is in the development of our natural resources for their full utilization and their conservation, especially great resources such as hydroelectric power which goes on and on forever and is not exhaustible. We must have hydroelectric power if we are to have full production and complete our rearmament program and provide for our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that this Committee made a grievous error in reducing the appropriation in this bill for the Bonneville Power Administration. This agency is one of the most important governmental agencies contributing not only to a healthful peacetime economy, but is of vital importance in the war effort. I want to discuss its contribution to our war efforts as well as our peacetime economy.

Electric power is a prime necessity in carrying out our rearmament program. During World War II approximately a third of the aluminum needed in airplane construction came from the Columbia River area and was supplied by Bonneville power. This operation has the endorsement of private utilities in that area dealing with electric power. The activities of the agency have been carried out with so much efficiency and farsighted planning that it has not only increased its output from year to year but has been able to produce power far beyond the rated capacity of the generators under its control and has marketed the power successfully, resulting in bringing into the Treasury uninterrupted revenues. In fact, Bonneville is far ahead in its amortization schedule returning to the Federal Government its investment with interest.

As was recently reported in the Oregon Voter in its issue of April 14, 1951, energy sales of the Bonneville Power Administration in 1950 amounted to 13,932,372,336 kilowatt-hours. This was 12.7 percent more than the 12,361,921,000 kilowatt-hours of sales reported for 1949. Revenues from the sales amounted to $33,357,855. This was 15.3 percent more than the $28,926,133 booked in 1949.

Average revenue per kilowatt-hour sold was 2.39 mills as against 2.34 mills the year before and a top over-all return of 3.04 mills for the calendar year 1945. Electric energy generated was 13.2 percent greater in amount than was turned out from the two big dams in 1949. The total was 15,160,957,200 kilowatt-hours. Grand Coulee was credited with producing 11,419,277,200 and Bonneville with 3,741,680,000 kilowatt-hours. The Federal system bought 100,285,660 kilowatt-hours from other utility systems. All figures constituted new high percentage records—output, sales, and revenues.

Bonneville sale and revenues

Year	Kilowatt-hours sold	Revenues
1941 and prior years	2,125,231,000	$4,600,658
1942	3,882,769,000	8,877,687
1943	6,921,770,000	16,346,676
1944	8,984,515,000	22,354,054
1945	7,436,359,000	22,626,245
1946	6,397,874,000	16,023,066
1947	9,277,473,000	22,050,897
1948	11,411,832,000	26,253,188
1949	12,361,921,000	28,926,133
1950	13,932,372,000	33,347,855
Total	82,732,116,000	201,406,459

Publicly owned agencies last year took 23.1 percent more power than in 1949—3,017,601,000 kilowatt hours against 2,451,093,000. Public utility districts increased their purchases of the Federal energy 37.4 percent in taking 1,885,195,000 kilowatt-hours. Cooperatives increased their purchases 24 percent in taking 294,541,000 kilowatt-hours. The number of customer public utility districts remained unchanged at 24, while the number of cooperatives increased from 29 to 31. The Seattle and Tacoma municipal systems bought 606,213,000 kilowatt-hours, all but a tiny amount being firm power. This marked an increase of 2 percent for the year.

Private-management utilities bought 2,819,896,000 kilowatt-hours, some of this on interruptible basis, and got 580,710,000 kilowatt-hours of nonfirm power, or a total of 3,490,606,000 kilowatt-hours. Their firm-power purchases marked a decrease of 3 percent.

The aluminum industry bought almost as much Bonneville power as did all power utilities lumped together. It took 6,221,502,000 kilowatt-hours, an increase of 10.2 percent. Other industrial plants took 1,259,967,000 kilowatt-hours, an increase of 45 percent. Bonneville thus sold substantially more power direct to industries than to power systems, the grand total of these sales being 7,481,469,000 kilowatt-hours. The number of aluminum customers remained at 6, while the number of other industrial customers dropped from 15 to 13.

The lowest rate, as would be surmised, was enjoyed by the aluminum companies. It averaged 2.07 mills, duplicating the 1949 average. Private-management utilities paid an average of 2.39 mills per kilowatt-hour for firm power against 2.28 mills in 1949. Average rate charged publicly owned systems was 3.01 mills against 2.87 mills. Public Utility Districts had an average rate of 2.97 mills against 3.02 mills. Cooperatives paid an average of 3.43 mills against 3.40 mills. The Seattle-Tacoma municipal systems paid an average of 2.75 mills for firm power against 2.14 mills, 1949 average. Fourteen smaller municipal systems paid an average of 3.56 mills as against 3.44 mills.

I want again to bring to the attention of the Committee the necessity for allowing the full appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration as reported by the Appropriations Committee. The committee itself made a substantial reduction in the budget estimate and to make a further reduction will not only cripple the operations of this important agency but will result in heavy financial loss to the Government itself in the curtailment of additional revenues from the sale of electric power.

The power situation in the Pacific Northwest continues critical, as has been the case for the past few years. On a normal peacetime basis our best expectations were that it would be 1958 before adequate supplies of firm power would be available to the Pacific Northwest region. That situation has now changed drastically by the imposition of heavy new requirements for power due to the emergency situation that is now facing our country. In times of national emergency every area is called upon to assume its share of the burden of providing for the security of the country as a whole. The Pacific Northwest is assuming its share of this burden but, in doing so, is making our power situation even more critical unless adequate measures are taken immediately to insure that new power supplies will be made available within the shortest possible time.

During the past 6 months the Bonneville Power Administration has committed several hundred thousand kilowatts of additional power solely for defense loads, principally for aluminum, phosphorus, and magnesium. Much of this commitment has been on an interruptible basis and will continue to be on this basis until new power is available from the Hungry Horse project which will come into operation in late 1952. Other projects are under construction to come into operation from 1953 to 1956, but there is need for additional power supplies to be brought into being in the interim period before power can be obtained from these large hydroelectric projects now under construtcion.

The Bonneville Power Administration has been studying ways and means to supply these additional power loads, these means including such expedients as steam plants strategically located, regional interconnections, and cooperation with others for the construction of projects by non-Federal agencies. In the longer range program, several new projects are needed. In the President's budget this year he has recommended that Hells Canyon, Ice Harbor, and The Dalles projects be gotten under way as early as possible in order to provide a balanced program to support the national defense needs, the regional economy, and the essential civilian requirements.

Along with these plans must go an adequate program of transmission line and substation construction in order that the power made available can be delivered where it is needed and when it is needed. The Bonneville program for fiscal year 1952 is planned to provide transmission facilities of sufficient capacity to deliver 1,300,000 kilowatts of new generation that will become available by 1954. In addition, it has become apparent that the system must be strengthened if the heavy power deliveries required by recent commitments are to be met with any degree of reliability. These objectives have been considered in the formulation of the program that has been presented. However, there is every indication that additional acceleration will be needed, as well as other transmission facilities to provide for the movement of new power generated and, if this situation develops, without a doubt the Administration will need additional funds in order that all power commitments can be met.

Since the program as presented is of such great importance to the region, I urge that these requests be granted exactly as outlined. The program actually contains very few projects that are directly in my congressional district. However, it contains many main grid facilities without which my area would be in dire straits from the standpoint

of power supply. Facilities in my area and of direct concern to my area are as follows:

BUDGET ITEM I-1, GRAND COULEE - MIDWAY NO. 3 — BUDGET ITEM I-2, GRAND COULEE-MIDWAY NO. 2, CONDUCTOR CHANGE

The first item is an additional circuit; the second is a change on an existing circuit to provide for greater capacity. These facilities are absolutely necessary to transmit Grand Coulee power to the Portland area and to the coastal area of Oregon. They are extremely necessary because the loss of any one circuit between these two points would result in a system-wide disturbance such as has occurred in the Pacific Northwest a number of times within the past few years.

BUDGET ITEM I-3, GRAND COULEE - COLUMBIA NO. 3—BUDGET ITEM I-4, GRAND COULEE-COLUMBIA NO. 4

Funds requested for these items are to continue the construction of these vitally needed lines necessary to transmit power to the coastal area of Washington below Olympia and to the Portland, Oreg., area: By supporting power supply to the entire coastal area of Oregon and Washington, greater system stability is achieved and greater power service reliability. The No. 4 line will eventually connect with the Columbia-Olympia line and be operated at 287,000 volts to provide needed power capacity.

BUDGET ITEM I-6, COLUMBIA-OLYMPIA

This circuit will provide needed capacity to the coastal Washington area, and, since power flow in part is south from Olympia toward Portland, Oreg., this capacity will insure power service to my district. This circuit alone will carry over 225,000 kilowatts by December 1954.

BUDGET ITEM I-11, M'NARY-BIG EDDY-TROUTDALE—BUDGET ITEM I-12, M'NARY-BIG EDDY-ROSS

These circuits will be 230,000-volt transmission lines that will be needed to transmit power to be generated at McNary Dam into the Vancouver-Portland-Troutdale area. These lines will be particularly important from the standpoint of national defense as well as to the essential civilian economy. One line has been previously authorized; the other is a new line for which authorization is requested this year.

BUDGET ITEM I-17, ROSS-ST. JOHNS CONVERSION

Funds requested are to continue the conversion of the two existing lines between Vancouver, Wash., and St. Johns substation in Portland from 115,000-volt to 230,000-volt operation in order to provide badly needed transmission capacity between these two points. Also included is the installation of two 150,000-kilovolt-ampere transformer banks. It will not only support power service in the Portland area but in the area south of Portland.

The facilities included in this program are absolutely necessary as a part of the main grid system. The lines to integrate the Hungry Horse plant with the main Bonneville system are equally necessary. Also of extreme importance are the lines already authorized for transmitting McNary power to the coastal area of Oregon and the line known as the southwest Oregon loop service line that will be used to provide power to southwest Oregon.

As I mentioned previously, the entire Bonneville program is sound and should be permitted to go forward at the fastest possible pace. Nearly 90 percent of the funds requested for fiscal year 1952 are for previously authorized facilities, only about 10 percent being requested to start new lines and these are planned only where absolutely necessary. As in previous years, something more than 80 percent of the funds requested are for main grid transmission facilities, with only a minor part of the request being for customer service facilities.

I urge support for the operations and maintenance requests of the Bonneville Power Administration. They are requesting $5,500,000 for this purpose this year, which is only a 10-percent increase over the amount allowed them for this purpose in fiscal year 1951. This increase in funds is necessary because of the increase in facilities to be manned, maintained, and operated. It is in line with the increased business responsibilities of the Administration which result from such expansion, and I earnestly urge that they be allowed the full amount so that the grade of service for which the people in the Northwest area pay is afforded them. The Federal Government is fully compensated by the increased revenues from the sale of power. I think that not enough emphasis has been placed on this latter point. The users of power pay for a high standard of service which should be no less than the normal utility standards throughout the country. It is the aim of the Bonneville Power Administration to provide service in accordance with these standards, but they cannot do so unless sufficient funds are granted them. I am also aware that on a unit basis, operation and maintenance expenditures made by the Bonneville Power Administration are no greater, and in most cases less than corresponding expenditures by private utilities throughout the country. I should like to point out that the fact that the Bonneville power rate has been maintained at the same level for the past 10 years, even in the face of drastically increased labor and material costs, is a tribute to the BPA management and clearly demonstrates their ability to wisely manage funds appropriated to them in whatever amount.

Mr. Chairman, there recently appeared in the pubilc press a news item that an embargo was being considered on the construction of new defense plants in the Pacific Northwest because of the shortage of electric power. Such a proposal is without merit and its mere suggestion works a hardship on an area of our country which possesses the greatest pool of hydroelectric power of any locality in the Nation and which has shown the greatest advance in development in water and power resources in the last decade.

While it is true there is a growing need for electric power in the Pacific Northwest, the same condition exists throughout the Nation and there is more potential hydroelectric power in the process of development in that area than in any other area in the country. Furthermore, by the judicious handling of existing power and the utilization of interruptible power for proper allocations, together with the power coming into production from new generators, many new defense plants can receive the power needed for operation. The power shortage is not nearly as critical in this area as in other regions of the Nation. The problem can be met, in addition to the steps I have enumerated, by speeding up the construction for their full utilization of the existing power projects in the area.

The report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission recently released states:

The Columbia River is potentially one of the greatest power-producing streams in the world. Although existing hydroelectric developments in the basin account for about a sixth of the developed hydroelectric power capacity of the United States, they utilize less than 10 percent of the potential water power of the basin.

There are existing in the Columbia River Basin eight Federal hydroelectric plants having a total installed generating capacity of 1,969,000 kilowatts, with Bonneville and Grand Coulee providing the bulk of the capacity, and 41 existing non-Federal hydroelectric utility plants of 2,500 kilowatts or more installed capacity having an aggregate installation of 931,000 kilowatts. Federal plants, therefore, account for two-thirds of the total hydroelectric capacity of 2,900,000 kilowatts in the watershed. The average annual output of the Federal plants, amounting to 13,782,000,000 kilowatt-hours, accounts for 70 percent of the total annual hydroelectric generation of 19,900,000,000 killowatt-hours in the basin. Not included in the above totals are a large number of smaller electric utility plants and electric plants of industrial establishments, which grouped together have a total installed capacity of some 65,000 kilowatts with average annual generation of 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

The total active conservation storage capacity of existing hydroelectric developments in the Columbia River Basin amounts to approximately 9,500,000 acre-feet. The storage capacity in the Grand Coulee Reservoir accounts for more than one-half of this total. In addition to the storage capacities listed in table 1, there are 25 reservoirs providing conservation storage capacity which are not listed because power is not developed at the reservoir sites. These projects provide approximately 5,000,000 acre-feet of active storage capacity, although this storage has been developed primarily in connection with irrigation. When existing storage capacities are compared with the large average runoff in the basin, amounting to about 180,000,000 acre-feet annually during the 50 years 1897-1946, it is apparent that extensive amounts of additional regulatory storage capacity are necessary for the adequate development and utilization of the water resources of the basin.

Hydroelectric power facilities in the Columbia River Basin, including both Federal and non-Federal plants, are operated as part of the region-wide Northwest Power Pool which covers substantially the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, and western Montana. Included in this pool are the generating facilities, both steam and hydro, of the major electric utilities in the region, the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants of the Federal Government, and the transmis-

sion network of the Bonneville Power Administration. Participation in the pool is on a voluntary basis. The pool provides system operation which is practically equivalent to that to be expected under one ownership.

The Department of the Interior, which markets the power from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants and will market the power from future Federal projects in the region, provides the transmission network permitting efficient pool operation. The Department's transmission network consists of 4,050 circuit miles of line and 109 substations with 3,458,000 kilovolt-amperes of transformer capacity. Power produced is transmitted over the system to principal load centers in the region and sold at wholesale to private and public power distributors, large power-using industries, and to military, naval, atomic energy, and other Federal establishments.

The combined peaking capacity of the pool now totals about 4,500,000 kilowatts, of which approximately 90 percent is provided by hydroelectric plants. Recent estimates of loads indicate that a system demand of between 4,500,000 and 5,000,000 kilowatts may be expected by the end of 1950, and a peak demand of from 5,500,000 to 6,000,000 kilowatts is to be anticipated by December 1952. It is evident, therefore, that the need for additional generating capacity in the region is urgent, even though additions for emergency national-defense needs have not been included in the estimate.

In addition to the Department of Interior and Corps of Engineers' activities, the Federal Government is active in the basin through the Rural Electrification Administration. Ninety-seven percent of the farms in the Columbia Basin have electricity, as compared to 33 percent in 1935. The Rural Electrification Administration has been directly responsible for a third of this increase and has indirectly brought about the electrification of an additional 65,000 farms by its stimulating effect on the programs of the basin power companies. The REA has loaned $50,000,000 for the construction of 22,000 miles of distribution lines to serve 52,000 rural consumers.

The electric-power potential of the Columbia River and its tributaries comprises 40 percent of the United States' potential capacity. The river has developable storage capacity of about 100,000,000 acre-feet. The President's Commission reports that 34,000,000-kilowatt capacity of electric generation can be developed in the American part of the Columbia River Basin and has pointed out that less than 10 percent of this has been developed. It is estimated that there are 387 additional sites capable of development in the basin with an installed capacity of approximately 31,000,000 kilowatts, and average annual generation of 149,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Projects are in construction, or authorized for construction, on 21 of these sites, for 9,900,000 kilowatts installed capacity, and 56,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours generation annually. There remain accordingly about 21,000,000 kilowatts capacity for future possible developments, with estimated annual generation of 93,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. These potential developments are widely scattered over the basin, although a large part of the potential capacity is on the main stem of the Columbia and the lower courses of the main tributaries.

Potential hydroelectric power in Columbia River Basin

	Number of projects	Installed capacity	Average annual generation
EXISTING HYDROELECTRIC POWER			
		Kilowatts	*1,000 kilowatt-hours*
Constructed projects:			
Federal	8	1,969,387	13,783,000
Non-Federal	41	930,720	6,134,000
Total	49	2,900,107	19,917,000
UNDEVELOPED HYDROELECTRIC POWER			
Projects under construction:			
Federal	7	2,503,500	16,993,000
Non-Federal	0		
Total	7	2,503,500	16,993,000
Authorized projects:			
Federal	14	7,470,100	39,283,000
Other projects	365	21,395,900	92,749,000
Total undeveloped power	387	31,369,500	149,025,000
Total potential power	436	34,269,607	168,942,000

With the new generators soon to be installed in the Grand Coulee project and with the completion of projects now under construction, such as McNary Dam, Hungry Horse, Chief Joseph, and Albeni Falls, a heavy increase of hydroelectric power will be available in the area. Some of this power will come into production in ample time to be used by new defense plants located in the area.

Three additional projects on the Columbia River which have been authorized would supply 1,700,000 kilowatts more for national defense. These are the Ice Harbor project with an installed capacity of 260,000 kilowatts, Hell's Canyon with a capacity of 900,000 kilowatts, and the Dalles project with installed capacity of 980,000 kilowatts. These three dams alone would produce approximately 40 percent of the kilowatts now required by the national defense program.

Designs and site investigations are complete for both the Ice Harbor and Hell's Conyon projects and are well along toward completion in the Dalles project. If construction should start now generation would begin at Ice Harbor in December 1955, and at Hell's Canyon and The Dalles in 1956.

It should not be overlooked that all of these hydroelectric plants are self-liquidating and the funds received from the sale of electric energy will take care of maintenance and upkeep and retire the investment with interest within a reasonable amortization period while supplying hydroelectric power at the most reasonable rates existing anywhere in the United States. Water power is not expendable. This vast pool of hydroelectric energy in the Columbia River Basin will continue to serve mankind as long as water falls and rivers run.

After the cost of the plants has been amortized the consuming public will reap the benefit of even lower hydroelectric rates. It would require 7,500,000 tons of coal per year to produce the 1,700,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric energy which would be made available by the construction of the Ice Harbor, Hells Canyon, and the Dalles projects. It would take 25,000,000 barrels of oil to produce the same number of kilowatts. While we do not have gas and oil in the Pacific Northwest we do have this invaluable water resource and potential hydroelectric power which will continue to serve the people of the Northwest and the Nation as long as the Nation exists. It certainly would be unwise not to develop this great resource and make the hydroelectric power available to cities, industries, and farmers demanding it. This is particularly true by reason of the fact that ultimately Uncle Sam will be repaid dollar for dollar for the investments, while the country is enjoying the benefits of cheap hydroelectric energy. The importance to the Nation of the development of Columbia River power is apparent when we consider that it has a potential of 34,000,000 kilowatts whereas St. Lawrence on the American side has only a little more than a million kilowatts and the Colorado some 5,000,000 kilowatts.

In years past I have addressed this House many times with regard to the critical situation that has existed in the Pacific Northwest from the standpoint of power supply. Ever since the end of the war extraordinary measures have been necessary in order that the basic requirements of the region could be served, and this condition has resulted, in a great measure, in industrial stagnation in the Pacific Northwest because industries could not expand nor could new industries establish in the region because they could not be promised a continuous supply of electric power so necessary in any kind of endeavor. Each year the Federal agencies responsible for construction and operation of power plants and the transmission system have presented a program of project construction designed to alleviate this condition at some distant future date. Each year the date of this relief became further away. Last year it was pointed out that based on normal peacetime progress, the region would not have sufficient supplies of firm power until 1958, and this prediction was based upon a proposed program of projects to be constructed, some of which were under construction, some of which were authorized, and some of which were only proposed. However the date of this relief has always become further away, primarily because the program so carefully prepared was not followed due either to lack of authorizations or lack of appropriations and by reason of increased requirements for power to meet the needs of the area.

During the past year a new crisis has come upon us—an emergency of almost unprecedented proportions. America's great strength in such an emergency lies in her industrial potential, the key to which is electric power. The requirements of the defense effort are nationally shared by every region in the United States, and thus a major new requirement of electric power has been superimposed on the previous situation that faced the Northwest region.

At the start of World War II, the Northwest had great potential. Both

Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams had been completed and it remained only to install the generating machinery to provide great new quantities of electric power so badly needed in the war effort. The situation is completely different in the present emergency. While several projects are under construction, there is nothing available whereby immediate production of new power can be attained. During the past year three generators were installed at the Grand Coulee plant, and these are the only significant increases that have been made in power supply. Three additional generators can be installed at this plant, and it is proposed to do this during the current calendar year. However, until new storage facilities are available, these last three units will add little to the energy supply, being valuable for peaking purposes only. As against this meager new power supply, additional major demands for power for defense have been made on the region.

Our area has not shirked these demands, but rather much work has been done to explore ways and means by which the Pacific Northwest can contribute its part of the national industrial expansion that is necessary. The Pacific Northwest can contribute its part in this expansion if development of its hydroelectric power resources moves forward rapidly, and a program has been prepared looking to this rapid development of power resources. At the present time there are six power projects under construction in the Pacific Northwest. These are the McNary, Chief Joseph, Albeni Falls, Hungry Horse, Detroit, and Lookout Point projects. It is planned to accelerate construction of these projects to the greatest extent feasible. The first of these, the Hungry Horse project, will begin operations in the late fall of 1952; water storage but no generation will be available about the same time at Albani Falls. McNary and Detroit will begin operations about a year later, followed in 1954 by the Lookout Point project, and Chief Joseph will begin operations, according to present plans, in 1955. Several of these projects will be major power producers, and all of the plants will provide substantial additions to power supplies in the area.

Other producers who work in harmony with the Federal Government have also indicated plans for the construction of additional new power plants in the area. The city of Seattle, the city of Tacoma, the Chelan County PUD, the Pend Oreille County PUD, the California-Oregon Power Co., the Idaho Power Co., the Portland General Electric Co., the Washington Water Power Co., and the Pacific Power & Light Co. all have either under construction or plans for construction various power projects that will increase power supplies by approximately 1,000,000 kilowatts by 1953. All of this power will be absorbed as rapidly as it can be brought into production, and will still leave a major deficit unless the program as now proposed by the Federal agencies is followed.

There are still some further steps that can be taken and should be taken to bolster power supply and particularly to provide the utmost use of power resources of the region.

One expedient which is being studied and would have particular value is the installation of several steam plants strategically located in the Pacific Northwest. The particular virtue of these steam plants is that they can be constructed in a substantially shorter time than major hydroelectric projects; they can be placed at certain points on the systems that would result in decreased power losses and transmission costs. These plants would be used to firm up power now being sold on an interruptible basis, which means that the supply of such power is discontinued to a customer at any time when water supplies are too low for such power to be generated. It is significant that at the present time the Bonneville Power Administration has committed over 300,000 kilowatts of such interruptible power to industries alone, and this figure will increase within the following 2 years to approximately 600,000 kilowatts. It is further significant that all of the power supply to private utilities in my area this year from the Federal system is on an interruptible basis. That situation is dangerous because it means definite curtailment of power use both to industry and other customers if water supplies should become critical in any year. During the current winter season the good Lord has blessed us with ample water supply, so that no difficulty was encountered in supplying all such interruptible loads during this winter, and it is not now anticipated that any such difficulty will occur. If a means were provided to convert this interruptible power to firm power it certainly would be a desirable step to be taken. The use of steam plants for this purpose, even in my area with its great hydroelectric potentials, has its place because the combination of additional generated power with interruptible hydro power can still result in low-cost power and permits the further use of power that might otherwise be wasted. Many plants cannot contract for power on an interruptible basis because their processes are such that they may not be interrupted. This plan should certainly receive further concentrated consideration.

As power supplies are increased, it is also essential that sufficient transmission capacity be provided to transmit this power to the places where it can be used. The funds stricken from the bill we are considering are needed for that purpose. The Bonneville Power Administration's system, which has long served as the backbone grid of the whole Northwest region, is being extended and strengthened by the addition of 10 major high voltage facilities, either under construction or already approved, to be in service by December 1953. The program presented by the Bonneville Power Administration for fiscal year 1952 is in general designed to further this requirement. They have presented a budget for fiscal year 1952 of $69,500,000 for construction, most of which is to move forward the construction of these major circuits already approved. A minor part of it is for the initiation of construction of several other facilities that will be needed no later than 1954 to transmit the power from projects that I have mentioned herein. The Bonneville officials have told me that this is a minimum program in this time of national defense and that further funds may be required to accelerate the construction of these transmission facilities in line with accelerations planned for power producing projects to meet defense program commitments. The budget also provides for some customer service facilities vitally needed for defense industries or essential civilian requirements.

I would like to say a further word about the power requirements of the region based on average year needs and for defense industries. Loads are increasing not only by reason of defense industries but by reason of increased civilian needs resulting from the defense program and the continued high level of economic activity. It is significant that the western group of the Pacific Northwest Power Pool, exclusive of the Bonneville Power Administration, now estimates that their energy requirements for each of the next 3 years will be about 6 percent greater than they estimated last May. Loads of the private utilities and public agency distributors increased from an average of 800,000 kilowatts in 1940–41 to 2,250,000 kilowatts in 1950–51 and they are increasing substantially each year. The population of the Pacific Northwest reached 4,670,000 in 1950, an increase of 33 percent since 1940 compared with a growth in the Nation of 14 percent. In 1950 the average residential and farm consumer purchased more than three times the electric energy that he purchased in 1940, the corresponding increase in the United States being less than twice. It is estimated that the loads of the distributors will increase from the 2,250,000 kilowatts previously mentioned, to 3,150,000 in 1954–55, and to more than 4,000,000 by 1958. These increases do not include the major industrial increases due to the defense program which are expanding much more rapidly. It is estimated that industrial loads will more than double within the next 3 to 4 years, due primarily to defense requirements.

In concluding, I would like to again point out that it is absolutely essential that the program for new power supplies outlined herein and as recommended by the President for the Pacific Northwest region be implemented and gotten under way at the earliest possible time, not only for the well being of the Pacific Northwest region and its people but primarily for the well being of the entire country. I must also point out, as I have before, that this entire program is on a self-sustaining basis. Not one cent of investment in this program will be lost, but will be completely repaid with interest, not to mention the great increase in the national revenue that results from such a program aside from receipts from power sales. During the last war, millions of dollars were spent for industrial expansion, which represented a complete

loss to the country because such plants were constructed on an emergency basis without regard to their future value. This was not the case in the Pacific Northwest, and it will not be now. The program as presented is one based on a solid economic foundation, in addition to being planned to meet the urgent needs of the country.

As I said in the opening of these remarks I most sincerely believe that it is a mistake for this committee to reduce the appropriation recommended by the Appropriation Committee for carrying on the activities of the Bonneville Power Administration. The reduction made in the Committee of the Whole should be restored by the House when the bill is returned to it for action and if this is not done, I feel sure the Senate in its wisdom will restore the full amount recommended by the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be read again.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Mr. LOVRE moves that the pending Taber amendment be amended as follows: Strike out that portion of the language which reads "and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were ayes 75, noes 61.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. LOVRE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 102, noes 91.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Taber amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL to the amendment offered by Mr. TABER by adding the following language: "*Provided, however,* That no cut shall apply to those projects or units which are 50 percent or more completed at the beginning of the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment and all it does to this appropriation bill is to simply say that all projects or units of a project that are more than 50 percent completed by the 1st of July 1952 shall not be affected by this cut. There is nothing unreasonable about this amendment to the Taber amendment. Let me say, frankly, if I have learned one thing in the 10 years I have been on the floor of the House, it is the foolishness of trying to legislate on the floor. I know on my side of the aisle Member after Member has bemoaned on the floor of this House the utter impossibility of coming to the proper type of a conclusion on amendments that affect an entire bill without having given consideration from every detail of the ramifications of the changes they are about to make. Here is an amendment that cuts over $10,000,000 from this bill. Mr. Chairman, I hope I have the attention of the House because, how can you cut $10,000,000 off of a bill when the amendment itself is not even clear enough for you to know or to figure where the cuts will come? Why, under this amendment as you now have it, which I think is worse than it was at the beginning, which was plenty bad, the Department of the Interior could finish any project they wished and take all the money off another project, regardless of what they were, whether it be a power plant or whether it be a dam. Certainly, this House does not want to legislate on that basis. And, why are you legislating that way? I will tell you why you are legislating that way, because you do not know what this amendment will actually accomplish. And why do you not know what this amendment will do? Because you are listening to your own Members on that side of the aisle. And, I respect the Members on both sides. I respect your judgments. I shall be the last one to question the motives of a single Member of this House. Here we have a bill brought in by a committee with a unanimous report. I have searched everywhere to find where I could offer cuts because I am in favor of cuts wherever possible at this critical time. Who is not in favor of curtailing expenses wherever possible?

But here is a committee that I have faith in. No man in this House has more faith than I in the gentlemen who serve us on the minority side on this committee. They have seen the project in my district. They know what we are trying to do. Not one of those men said one word about cutting this bill—not one. That is the subcommittee. So I go back to my original statement: Why do you want to legislate on an appropriation bill by going lower than this committee cut these appropriations?

This is almost impossible to believe, Mr. Chairman. Take the transmission lines and the power projects first. In this bill this committee in its wisdom never cut a nickel off the projects in Alaska. You just voted to cut nearly 10 percent off it. Every Member of this House knows what might happen should we get into a world war in Alaska. This committee never cut a penny off that. These gentlemen, Mr. JENSEN and Mr. FENTON, and every other member of the subcommittee, sat in all the hearings of this subcommittee, and brought in this item. They never cut a nickel off the projects in Nevada. Do you have confidence in those men? Of course you do. Let us name another, in Colorado. They never cut a nickel off the transmission and powerlines. In New Mexico and Texas, not a nickel; and in the State of Washington just a very small amount. That is transmission and power lines combined. I am talking about the committee and their work.

Now let us get down to straight transmission lines. They are important. We have a project. What is the use of finishing the project where I live unless you have a transmission line, where there are no transmission lines? I agree with the gentleman from Washington who said we should not build power lines where private power can and will build them. I agree with the gentleman on the left-hand side that we should not build power lines where the private companies will build them. But let us see that they are built.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Let us take the transmission lines and see what this committee did. If this subcommittee is interested in anything, if this subcommittee examines this bill from any angle thoroughly and completely, it would certainly do so on the transmission lines. They never curtailed a single dime on the transmission lines in Alaska. That is interesting. The transmission lines in Colorado, the transmission lines in New Mexico and Arizona they did not cut. There are two or three other lines that had very, very little cuts. So the committee did a good job on those transmission lines.

Now let us get back to what I started to say in the beginning. Any type of project that this Congress had laid out and planned for and made appropriations for, if that project has gone along, whether it is power or whether it is for irrigation or whether it is a combination makes no difference, it should be completed. The point I make is that as the project begins to work its way through and the plans are completed and there is 50 percent of that project complete, it should be finished.

Let me ask you in all seriousness, who can stand up on the floor of the House and deny the statement that follows, which is that it is no economy to curtail the completion of these projects? You are taking money out of the Treasury, you are wasting money, and you are delaying the finishing of a project that might mean much in the war effort. The project I speak of personally is 60 percent complete. The most foolish thing this Congress could do, the most wasteful program you could adopt as to that project would be to delay its completion. And I say that is true of every project. Any project that is worth the consideration of this Congress, any project that has been given authorization by this Congress, if it is 50 percent complete it should not be delayed. These new projects that you are talking about, every last one of them, will come under the scrutiny and careful consideration of those in high places who determine where scarce and critical materials should be used. The chances for new projects are going to be pretty slim

unless they are really and truly in furtherance of the war effort.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman be able to tell us how many of the projects involved in the $207,000,000 in the bill are 50 percent or more completed? Would the gentleman be able to name those projects, if the list is not too long?

Mr. HILL. I checked on that very thing, and the gentleman would be surprised to know how many there are. But it is impossible at this time for me to give those figures. But there are many, many projects in the West which are more than 40 or 50 to 60 percent completed.

Mr. KEATING. Would it involve more than half of the projects, can the gentleman tell us, if his amendment is adopted?

Mr. HILL. I cannot say the exact number, but I think they are more than half completed. That would be my estimate.

Mr. KEATING. Could the gentleman tell us the stage of completion that the project has reached in his district, which he so ably represents?

Mr. HILL. As I mentioned a while ago it is over 60 percent completed. What we are doing now is putting the finishing touches on it. There are projects in exactly the same situation in other Western States. I would say the larger projects, even the ones in the Northwest, because of the war effort were finished or hurried along during World War II, and a good many of those projects are more than 50 percent completed.

Mr. KEATING. With reference to the project in the gentleman's district, for instance, how long would it take it to complete that project?

Mr. HILL. Of course, the word "complete" has a varied meaning. We are getting water and have been getting water for 2 years, and we are getting power and have been getting that for 3 year. So I would say our whole project should be pretty well completed in 2 years. Nineteen hundred and fifty-three is the date that we set.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LOVRE. Is not the gentleman in favor of completing all the projects that have been begun?

Mr. HILL. There again we hedge. Your project that you are speaking about, first of all, would it be considered as necessary in the war effort.

Mr. LOVRE. That is correct, but is not the gentleman in favor of completing all projects that are under construction regardless of whether they are 50 percent completed or 20 percent completed?

Mr. HILL. Of course we are in favor of completing them, or we would never have voted for the authorization in the first instance. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I appreciate very much what my good friend from Colorado is trying to do. However, I would like to ask the gentleman what he means by a project and by a unit. Some of these projects are of tremendous size and would take years and years to complete. And again a unit may be many different things. Therefore, it is a little difficult to get away from the basic ambiguity that we are up against in trying to define exactly what the amendment would do.

Mr. HILL. I would answer the gentleman by saying that we are on the horns of a dilemma. If you are going to adopt the Taber amendment which knocks off $10,000,000, you had better have my amendment on it, and if you are going to vote against it, which I expect to do, you can certainly vote against my amendment with pleasure. What I am trying to do is to save these projects that you and I know should be completed and the units in these projects, which should be completed just as quickly as possible. No economy whatsoever can be accomplished or will any financial benefit accrue by delaying the completion of irrigation or power producing projects that are more than 50 percent finished.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I trust we are getting to the end of this debate. I shall not take much time. I am vitally interested in this matter. I come from the West, as you all know. In a case like this I have no other recourse than to fall back on the good judgment and wisdom of the committee that has considered this matter. Therefore, I should like to ask the chairman of this subcommittee some questions, and then I shall yield the floor.

May I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if the committee did not cut the funds for the Bureau of Reclamation when that item was before you?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. HORAN. I assume you weighed the matters that were involved in those cuts in the light of what it would do to the projects and the progress we need to have so as to protect the Federal investment?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer the gentleman by saying that under the budget estimate you will note that the total construction figure is lumped into one amount, $207,190,000. We cut the budget estimate from $223,690,000 to $207,190,000. In reaching that lower figure we went over each and every project submitted to the committee through the Bureau of the Budget. We tried to follow a rule of reason, that projects which were pretty well along should receive as much of the money as we could allow in order to complete them. We went over it very meticulously and very carefully.

Mr. HORAN. And where money had been invested and commitments of the people were involved, you tried to protect that situation?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish the gentleman would ask the chairman of this committee this question, if this particular part of the appropriation bill came out with the full approval of the subcommittee.

Mr. HORAN. Do I understand that is the case?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes. In all fairness, I must say that on some matters there were differences of opinion. We do not take formal votes in any sense, but I think I can say that there was general agreement. There are some things in here that I do not like, and there are probably other things that each member of the committee did not like. I would not take it upon myself to speak for the committee and say that each item was concurred in unanimously. There was no minority report, as such, but each member reserved the right to take whatever position he feels best when the bill reaches the floor. We have always had that understanding in the committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. Certainly.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to address a question to the gentleman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. JACKSON]. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], I have been shown some figures, since I addressed my question to the gentleman from Colorado, which would indicate that if his amendment were adopted it would apply in dollar value to something like three-quarters or four-fifths of all the projects. It strikes me that if it would apply to those it might be an undue hardship on the remaining one-fourth or one-fifth, if the gentleman's amendment were adopted.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. To answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] I will put it this way: I cannot answer that question unless I know what the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] will actually do. Of course, that involves logically a definition of "project" and "unit." The amendment does not define these terms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. For myself, I am content to follow the judgment of the subcommittee which has weighed and considered this entire matter.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not true that the Taber amendment will affect the Grand Coulee project, and the Administrator, if it so desires, could cut off transmission lines from the Grand Coulee?

Mr. HORAN. That is absolutely true; there is no question about it.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee, is he not?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The committee goes into detail in the various parts of an appropriation bill.

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. HILL. And the gentleman still makes the statement that he thinks we should go along with it.

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. HILL. That is one item on which I wholeheartedly agree.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offered would cut about 4½ percent off of these projects. Frankly, it could be apportioned equally, and I do not believe a single one of them would be hurt. The Department itself and the Bureau have gone ahead without regard to what the Congress has done so many times that I believe it is time for us to do something about it.

The amendment I offered provides small cuts. On the other hand, if we limit its operation to those that are not 50 percent completed it probably would stop all work upon a lot of them, and I do not know, frankly, just exactly how that would work out.

I have on page 431 of the hearings a table which indicates the percentage of cost, the amount of their operation. The amendment that the gentleman has offered would cut out work entirely upon the Alaska item; it would cut out work upon a great many others, and I would think that they could apportion that $10,000,000 in the Bureau of Reclamation without hurting the general set-up at all; but I am afraid they could not with the proposal that the gentlemen from Colorado has submitted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we discuss in these appropriation bills many things, all of them of weight and importance, but the one essential issue which we are debating here either directly or indirectly in these various appropriation bills, is how to avoid a third world war or, if we must fight, how to win it. That is the vital question directly or indirectly involved in all of these propositions and in the particular amendment before us.

I remember very well, Mr. Chairman, that in the beginning of the Second World War there was a proposal to build one more dam in the Tennessee Valley Authority. The proposition was vigorously opposed by the same interests who are opposing the appropriation provided in this bill. They said it was too much money; it was unnecessary; that we could not complete the dam in time. All these familiar arguments you have heard offered here this afternoon, but fortunately by a narrow margin we went ahead and built that dam. If we had not built that dam, if we had not had available the power produced by that additional dam we could not have produced enough aluminum to have outfitted the vast cloud of airplanes that won the war. No one from that day to this has doubted the advisability, the wisdom, and the prudence of having appropriated the additional money necessary to the construction and operation of that dam.

Mr. Chairman, there are many elements which enter into the winning of a war. One, to which no one gives a great deal of attention, is the matter of food. If a third world war must be fought, we must not only feed our people, our armies, the armies of our Allies but the people of our Allies as we did in the last two wars.

Napoleon once said an army travels on its belly and another great French general also stated that if he was confronted with the alternative of having an army without food or an army without weapons, he would take the army without weapons, because the army without weapons would have a better chance of winning a war than an army without food. The question of the production of food at a reasonable cost is directly involved in this amendment.

Furthermore we must have electric power to meet the needs of our increasingly complex industrial system, in order to take the place of inadequate manpower, in order to provide for the continued prosperity of this country, because electric power invariably produces an increase in our national economy.

Mr. Chairman, the committee cut this bill deeply. Large retrenchments have already been effected. And I think you know my attitude and my record on economy. I have introduced bills to cut more money than were ever introduced before or since in this House. And I agree here that we should cut out every dollar we can, but if we are going to have a war—a war we hope and pray that may never come—but if we do, we are going to need every bit of this power and need it badly.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that any amendments which are offered to cut such appropriations below the reductions already made in this bill, will be voted down. It is a question of lessening our chances of avoiding total war, of weakening national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 82, noes 88.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 110.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 16, line 3, strike out the period and insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely carries out the intent of the committee as repeatedly expressed in the debate on this bill. That intent is that the Government should not construct duplicating transmission lines where private utilities have agreed to wheel power over their lines to Government customers at a reasonable rate. The amendment guarantees that the Bureau of Reclamation will carry out this policy without any doubt. It makes certain that in the expenditure of the appropriations included in this bill the Bureau will follow the will of Congress.

In order to make plain the intent of the committee, allow me to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At page 4203 of the RECORD the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], a member of the committee, said:

The committee has taken the position that you should not construct duplicate transmission lines if the private utilities will wheel the power over existing lines at a reasonable rate.

He further stated:

I want to caution the Members of the House, if they are interested in protecting the public, when these amendments come up tomorrow on the question of transmission lines, just ask yourselves this one question: Have the private utilities made a reasonable offer for wheeling power? The truth is that the various private companies throughout the country have been able to get together and agree on a wheeling rate, a reasonable rate. * * * The committee has no desire to go helter-skelter in building transmission lines all over the country. The provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944, the basic law that the committee is charged with carrying out, will be followed strictly in accordance with the dictates of the Congress of the United States. That means that it is the responsibility of our committee to make sure that the power generated at the dams will be delivered to the preferred customers at fair and reasonable rate.

The gentleman from Washington is to be complimented on his clear and concise statements regarding the policy of Congress on the question of the construction of duplicating transmission

facilities in those areas where the private utilities have made reasonable contracts to wheel Government power. I wish to emphasize that my amendment is in complete harmony with those statements and envisions the implementation of that policy. We recognize, as the gentleman from Washington stated, that—

The committee has no desire to go helter-skelter in building transmission lines all over the country.

However, this amendment will guarantee that the Bureau of Reclamation will be unable to ignore that desire. Past experience with this Bureau demonstrates clearly the desirability of spelling out in detail the limitations on their activities which Congress expects the Bureau to follow.

Again in general debate on Monday last, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] also a member of the Interior subcommittee from this side of the aisle, corroborated the statements by the gentleman from Washington when he stated that—

Every member of the Interior subcommittee of the House and the Senate has for several years taken the position that we should not build duplicating transmission lines with the people's money where there are sufficient transmission lines already in operation.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] also alluded to the granting of appropriations in order to give the Government sufficient bargaining power to bring about a reasonable contract to protect the public interest.

I wish to make it plain that this amendment will not affect the bargaining power which may be given to Government agencies in the way of appropriations, past, present, or future, in the slightest degree. This amendment applies only to those areas where wheeling contracts are in force. The amendment, I should also point out, applies only to the areas where the Bureau of Reclamation has jurisdiction.

Another member of the Interior Subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] reemphasized the position of the subcommittee on the expenditure of funds for duplicating transmission lines. The gentleman from Massachusetts stated, and again I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4286:

Now, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] pointed out, the position of the subcommittee has been in general that they do not want to spend any money where it is not necessary to spend it, and especially where a private concern can take care of the situation all around. * * *

This committee has been very fair in striking out lines where past experience showed that perhaps there was no harm in doing it.

I wholeheartedly support the position of the subcommittee, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I do not question the fairness of the committee.

The chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], also referred to this matter when he said:

The committee is for eliminating a lot of the lines asked for in the budget.

He also referred to what had been done in the way of reaching agreement in the six southwestern States, California and other States for the wheeling of Government power by the private companies. This amendment will guarantee that the Bureau will not take it upon itself to build duplicating lines where such contracts have been consummated.

Our esteemed Speaker took the floor of the House in the debate on this measure as he did last year on this subject and told us of the successful cooperation achieved in his area between private and public power under the operation of wheeling contracts. The Speaker by his words made it clear that he agreed with the policy as enunciated by the members of the committee in the debate on this bill. The Speaker said in part—page 4296:

We did not belong to the crowd that thinks there should be no public power, nor did we belong to the other crowd that does not think there should be any private power. Working togther they could perform a great service to the people of this country.

I also said at that time that we did not intend to use any money to go out and confiscate anybody's property, that where a utility company had a line and they would carry our power at a reasonable rate no lines would be paralleled and none have been paralleled. * *

This is a demonstration in the United States of America where private enterprise and Government can get along together, both of them wanting to be fair and just, and making contracts and living up to them. * * *

* * * But if the time comes when the people who own the lines will not transmit electricity to preferred customers or will not carry the Government power at a reasonable rate, then that would be another story.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will make sure, without any question, that the intent of the committee will be carried out and the will of Congress will be followed in this important matter.

In view of the statements by the chairman and by the members of the committee, I entertain the hope that the committee will accept and not oppose this amendment.

Public power has its proper place in constructing facilities and furnishing service where private power is unable or unwilling to do so. If free enterprise can and will do the job, I believe it should be encouraged. Certainly we should not go out of our way to discourage private power developments, particularly when such discouragement takes the form of putting the Government needlessly into business at the expense of the taxpayers and wage earners throughout the country who must foot the bill. These are sentiments which hold true at any time. Obviously, facing as we do staggering defense expenditures, we must now be more vigilant than ever to pare unnecessary spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York said that they were satisfied to go along with the proposition where there were private lines if the Government would not duplicate them. I cannot agree or go along with all of that because where the Government has millions of dollars invested, and I mean millions of dollars, and where they are entitled to power at all times, and especially since we are going to spend $66,000,000,000 in this effort right now, and no one knows what it will cost before we are through. I am for putting in a power line of the Government where the Government has $50,000,000 already spent on a project. That is what the law said when this flood control act was passed. It is up to the Government to deliver that power to the regular customers. I do not mean the private utility customers, but I mean the Government. Where the Government has spent money in the projects and has its own installations, the lines should be put in. No; I would not want to go along and let a private utility just say, "Serve the Government." I cannot see, where the Government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars, why they should do that. We hear a great deal about the boys laying down their lives, and we see a lot of the camouflage that is being spread all over the Congress. But I can tell you that the Virginia Power & Light Co. has been taking away from the Government of the United States quite a bit of money. You hear talk about saving taxes for the taxpayers. I gave a statement here last week where the Virginia Power & Light has charged the United States Government more than they do in the city of Cleveland, in the State of Ohio, and where they charge them more out in California. Whose money is the Virginia Power & Light Co. taking? Surely it is the taxpayers. They are not taking it away from France or somebody else. It is being taken from the taxpayers, not only the taxpayers of Virginia but the taxpayers of the United States. They are taking that money from them. Where we have $150,000,000 invested, and where we are trying to get a little knowledge scientifically, to keep ahead of Russia, I am not for that kind of saving. Men come out here in this well and say, "Oh, we must save some money for the boys who are laying down their lives." Right over here in Virginia, across the river, where coal is cheap, almost less expensive as it is in Ohio, where we have to ship it 200 miles, they are charging the United States Government more than is being charged in Ohio.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Certainly I am no authority on this, but believe the amendment which I have offered could not in any way apply to any of the Virginia lines.

Mr. KIRWAN. I understand that, but what I am trying to get at is this: I have tried for 4 days in debate on this bill to point this out: Right across the river, where one of the largest wind tunnels of them all is located, it is costing the Government more to purchase the power, because they are charging that much to deliver it there. And they also agreed to sell power to the United States Gov-

ernment for only 1,000 hours out of 7,000. From midnight until 6 in the morning. They only agreed to sell so many kilowatts. That is right across the river, within 50 miles of the Capital of the United States.

Yes, I know there are a couple of small minor lines in this bill out in California, but the three lines in this bill are for Government installations, not private customers. It is for a navy yard, and it is for a camp where these kids they have been talking about laying down their lives are located. Certainly I am for the Government delivering power to their own installations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman does not differ with the philosophy contained in this amendment; that is, to the effect that the transmission lines should not be constructed where the areas are being adequately served by private power companies?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not against private power companies. I am not for the Government taking profits away from private industry. I am for private industry. That is where I received my livelihood until I came to Congress. I would be very ungrateful if I turned against them now. But where the Government has a place like Langley Field, or out in California, I am for the Government delivering its own power as long as the Government has it, and as long as the Government has half a billion dollars invested in those places.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I think the pending amendment once again indicates the difficulty in trying to legislate on the floor of the House. I do not know whether the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is aware of the fact or not that in some of these wheeling contracts there are specific provisions permitting the private power company to turn down the construction of a given line if it is not economically feasible for them to build the line, or for whatever reason they want to give. Of course, in such event it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to build the transmission line.

There is no sense in debating this kind of an amendment to tie the hands of the Government in working out these contracts.

In addition to that, in many areas there are peculiar problems of voltage requirements. The private companies may want to build a 120,000 kilowatt line, but the Government's preferred customer may want a larger line. There are differences that must be worked out in each and every instance.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it seems to me this amendment covers that point in that it only provides that the appropriation shall not be used for the construction of transmission facilities where there is a contract which includes a provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers. In other words, if the contract did not make that adequate provision this amendment would not apply.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course, if they have a contract covering these lines there is no need for this amendment. So I just do not see the point to the gentleman's amendment. It will have the effect of tying the hands of the Government.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Who can say what the gentleman's amendment really means in terms of paralleling of lines. For instance, a line say 50 miles away may parallel a proposed installation by the Government. Is not the amendment confusing and indeterminate as to the point to which it shall be followed and indeterminative on the Government agency?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will not attempt to answer the gentleman at this time other than to say that I think it has the ultimate effect of making it very difficult for a given Government agency in any area to enter into fair and equitable wheeling arrangements.

I hope that under all the circumstances the House will vote this amendment down.

The committee has taken a lot of time to consider each and every transmission line included in the budget. If we had not given fair and careful consideration to these lines the House might have some ground to complain. There is a certain group within the House of Representatives—it is their right, I do not challenge their right—that do not want the Government to build any transmission line regardless of the merit and need for such lines. That is fundamentally what is at issue here today. I am not directing my remarks necessarily to the gentleman from New York—I think the Federal Government should reserve in all instances—and I was careful in my remarks to leave out the Federal Government—in building a transmission line from its own dam to its own facilities. That certainly is a legitimate right that goes with sovereignty. I see no reason why we should hamstring the Federal Government in trying to transport the power from its own power projects to federally operated facilities.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does not the gentleman think, however, that wherever it is possible for private enterprise to do it, if there is any doubt whatever let us resolve it in favor of private enterprise that has always carried the torch of progress in this country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. For myself, I want to resolve all doubt in the public interest. We are not dealing, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, with private enterprise in its true sense because a private utility is a monopoly. Our system of private enterprise is based on competition. The Government cannot get competitive bids to wheel power in a given area. They must bargain and bargain exclusively with one given private utility. I have made that clear. This committee has done a fair and decent job; we have gone through the bill meticulously, and have tried our best to protect the public interest.

Mr. DONDERO. There is a philosophy involved in that: One believes in public power, the other in private power.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No; this law has been established a long time. The law goes back to the days of Teddy Roosevelt and continued through Democratic administrations. It is that the Government must sell the power to its preferred customers. Is the gentleman opposed to that philosophy?

Mr. DONDERO. Wherever private enterprise can do it I think the Government should let them do it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. And let them charge their own rate?

Mr. DONDERO. They do not charge their own rate, because every State in the Union has a rate-making agency.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The State agencies have no jurisdiction over agreements between——

Mr. DONDERO. Then we have the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The Federal Power Commission has no jurisdiction over the fixing of wheeling rates between the Federal Government and private utilities. The gentleman is referring to the wholesaling and the retailing of power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Washington explained this wheeling charge in committee. Several Members have asked me what a wheeling charge is. I endeavored to explain it. Will the gentleman explain the wheeling charge, and what it is?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the wheeling charge varies in given areas.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the wheeling charge?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. A wheeling charge is the fee or the rate which the private utility company will charge to deliver Government power from the bus bar or the dam to the Government's preferred customers.

Mr. STEFAN. It is like a carrying charge?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It is like a common carrier. The carrier in this instance is a transmission line. The sole question that comes up is, What is a fair and reasonable rate to charge for the wheeling or the carrying of that power from the bus bar to the preferred customer? That is the great area within which there is disagreement. The committee has tried to arm Uncle Sam with reasonable and decent bargaining power so that if the private utility will not agree to a reasonable rate then the Government can carry out its long-established policy of carrying the power from the dams to the preferred customers.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say that he believed in private industry constructing these plants where it could be done. The gentleman does not believe that in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway, nor does he believe that in connection with the Niagara plant at Niagara Falls.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will vote down the amendment and carry out what the committee has tried to do in reaching fair and decent agreements.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman heard the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] with respect to the Langley Field proposition, calling attention again to the fact that the private utility had offered to deliver current to Langley Field, but never in excess of a certain number of hours. Can the gentleman tell the committee or does he have any information to indicate whether Buggs Island, the Government-owned project, could supply power to Langley Field for a period of time in excess of that which has been agreed to by the Virginia Electric & Power Co.?

Mr. GARY. There has been more misinformation spread on this floor about the Virginia situation than I have ever heard on any subject. With respect to the refusal of the Virginia Electric & Power Co. to supply the power, they have agreed to supply all of the power that NACA wants at all times. NACA has asked for a 150,000-kilowatt supply for special experiments. Those experiments are not conducted during peak load hours. They are conducted during off-peak hours. The NACA has never requested that amount of power to be supplied to them continuously. The Southeastern Power Administration could only supply a 150,000-kilowatt load for 20 hours a week. That has been determined by scientific survey.

Mr. HARDY. So that if the line were built and reliance were had on Buggs Island power only 20 hours a week of the maximum requirement could be delivered?

Mr. GARY. Exactly, and they could not supply the need of Langley Field, so the Virginia Electric & Power Co. would have to supply the excess.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of submitting to the House at this time some additional information touching the amendment which I offered and was adopted last week striking from the bill $3,400,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration for the construction of certain transmission lines. This project was first proposed as a national-defense measure. We were told that the lines were necessary to supply electricity for the operation of a proposed wind tunnel which the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics plans to construct at Langley Field, Va. I stated when I offered the amendment that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. was ready, willing, and able to supply all of the power which the NACA required, and that it had offered to supply this power for identically the same price that the Southeastern proposes to charge, and, in addition, that it had offered the NACA three alternate proposals, all of which are more favorable to NACA than the Southeastern proposals.

I am happy to report that since the amendment was adopted, although a contract has not actually been executed, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Virginia Electric & Power Co. have reached complete agreement for the furnishing of this power. On April 26, Dr. H. J. E. Reid, Director of Langley Aeronautical Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics addressed the following letter to J. G. Holtzclaw, president of the Virginia Electric & Power Co.:

APRIL 26, 1951.

Mr. J. G. HOLTZCLAW,
President, Virginia Electric & Power Co., Richmond, Va.

Subject: Power supply for 150,000 kilowatt demand.

Reference: Your letter to NACA dated February 15, 1951.

DEAR MR. HOLTZCLAW: At the time your Mr. Lawrence delivered the proposed form of contract, the various changes which you suggested to our previous draft were discussed with members of our staff. We were not in full agreement with the changes which you proposed and we undertook to reword it to meet both your requirements and those of the Government.

The attached form of contract is considered satisfactory to this agency and we would like to have your further comments. We, too, are hopeful that we may reach complete agreement in the very near future in order that the necessary construction plans may proceed without delay.

Sincerely yours,

H. J. E. REID, *Director.*

On April 30, Mr. Holtzclaw replied to Dr. Reid as follows:

APRIL 30, 1951.

Dr. H. J. E. REID,
Director, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Langley Air Force Base, Va.

DEAR DR. REID: We appreciate your letter of April 26, enclosing form of contract for power supply for 150,000-kilowatt demand at Langley Aeronautical Laboratory. We note that the form of contract as submitted is satisfactory to you.

Over the week end, this contract has been reviewed by our engineering and operating staff and we have no changes to suggest. We are, therefore, proceeding to draw up the contract in final form, and Mr. Lawrence will call upon you during the week with signed copies for delivery to you.

Immediately upon execution of the contract, we will proceed with plans for the construction of the third 110,000-volt line to the base, to connect with our double circuit line at Suffolk, in order that this connection may be completed by the time our new 100,000-kilowatt plant near Portsmouth is ready for operation, which is now scheduled for October 1952.

Sincerely yours,

J. G. HOLTZCLAW, *President.*

In my judgment the question of national defense has never been involved in this proposed project. It was merely used by the Southeastern as an excuse for its attempt to encroach upon free enterprise. In view of the above agreement, however, any possible question of the national defense has been eliminated.

The only question now remaining is that of providing a market for the Southeastern's Buggs Island power. The Virginia Electric & Power Co. is ready, willing, and able to enter into a reasonable contract with Southeastern for the wheeling and firming of this power.

On April 6, it wired the Southeastern Power Administration as follows:

BEN W. CREIM,
Administrator, Southeastern Power Administration, Elberton, Ga.:

The secretary's release, dated April 4, quotes you to the effect that agreement has been reached on all major provisions of the contract for Buggs Island power except for the charge which would be made by the company for wheeling to preference customers. As a means to an early settlement of the wheeling-charge problem, the company proposes that the matter of this charge be submitted to the Federal Power Commission, which must give final approval of your wholesale rates, for decision and that both parties accept and abide by its decision. We are sure that you will agree with us that settlement of this issue is vital in the interest of national defense, since a contract between the two parties will make it unnecessary for you to build any transmission lines and will result in the saving of millions of dollars of public funds, vast quantities of critical materials, and the conservation of thousands of man-hours of labor. We will cooperate fully to obtain an early decision.

M. C. SMITH,
Vice President and General Manager, Virginia Electric & Power Co.

The Southeastern Power Administration refused this offer on April 7. Last Friday, April 27, the Virginia Electric & Power Co. again wired the Southeastern Power Administration offering to wheel power to Southeastern's preferred customers at its average transmission

cost with the further suggestion that this cost be determined by a panel of three experts—one to be appointed by Southeastern, one to be appointed by Virginia Electric & Power Co., and the third to be the Chief of the Power Bureau of the Federal Power Commission.

I cannot imagine any fairer proposition that could be made. If the Southeastern Power Administration refuses to accept such a proposition, it proves conclusively to my mind that it is determined to enter the power field in competition with private enterprise, and that the failure to reach an agreement in this matter is the fault of the Southeastern and not of the Virginia Electric & Power Co.

The House has already voted nearly 2 to 1 to strike the transmission lines from the bill. I, therefore, insert this record merely for the information of the Members of the House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I take it from the gentleman's remarks that he would favor my amendment but he feels that it is not strong enough; in other words, that no part of this appropriation should be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, but that the gentleman would feel that it perhaps should go even further and say that no part should be used where the private utilities have evidenced a willingness and readiness to transmit power in that manner. Am I stretching it too far?

Mr. GARY. I am simply asking the Congress to take care of a specific case where there is no question about the fact that the private power company has gone to reasonable limits in trying to reach a satisfactory agreement.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, again I say that I am very, very thankful for what the gentleman from Virginia just informed the Congress took place between the Virginia Electric & Power Co. and the Government, but I again want to tell the gentleman that before it passed the House it came into the Congress last year that they would not give to the United States Government a contract except for 1,000 hours a year. That is in the record. Whatever they are doing now they are doing because the Congress passed a law. The Virginia Electric & Power Co. offered to the United States Government power only for the hours of 12 o'clock midnight to 6 in the morning, and only for 1,000 hours a year. So I am thankful that the gentleman from Virginia says they have seen the light now. But why did they not see it last year? We would never have had that discussion down on the floor then. Why did they not give the United States Government the power it asked and when it wanted it? Oh, they will do it now, sure. They are all rushing in here and saying the Virginia Electric & Power Co. wants to give the United States Government or its representative power when they want it, for as many hours as they want it, and they want to give it a cheap contract, but they would not give it to them a year ago until the United States Government said, "Go ahead and build your own line." That is when they saw the light. There is no misinformation down here in the well given about the Virginia Electric & Power Co. No; she is a champion for high prices. I think it is one of the highest in the United States, despite the fact there is plenty of coal there for very cheap power.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to trespass upon your time briefly to make several observations with regard to the proposed power line from the Buggs Island Dam to Langley Field, Va. There has been considerable discussion about this as well as considerable controversy. The question involved really was whether the Southeastern Power Administration would build this line or whether the Virginia Electric & Power Co. would wheel the power from Buggs Island to Langley Field. It was understood that the Southeastern Power Administration did not wish to build a line if a proper contract could be negotiated with the Virginia Electric & Power Co. as to the wheeling of the Buggs Island Dam power.

Now another question is who is interested in this matter. We, of course, realize that the NACA was interested as to the actual power delivered to Langley Field. But there are other people vitally interested in the wheeling of this power. I have reference to the REA co-ops in Virginia. They have a vital interest, due to the fact that the Congress in its wisdom in enacting the Flood Control Act created certain priorities as to who would receive this power and who would have priority in receiving it. Down in southwest and central Virginia there are a number of rural people who are receiving light and power today because of the REA program. They have an interest in who will get power from the Buggs Island Dam; how they will get it and how much they will pay for the wheeling of it. For that reason I am interested in this particular controversy.

I think for the record in view of what my fine friend and able statesman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has said about a contract being practically entered into, about the delivery of power to Langley Field, we should put in the RECORD and pin point in RECORD exactly what has been said and what the proposition is that is held out to us, as to the wheeling of power from Buggs Island Dam, as well as the price that this power would be wheeled by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. That is why I am trespassing on your time.

It was my understanding that the gentleman from Virginia stated on last Tuesday before this body, and it is to be found in the RECORD of April 24 at page 4282 as follows:

> The Virginia Electric & Power Co. stands ready to wheel the power at the price in effect on any major wheeling and firming Government contract now in effect. Moreover, when the Southeastern refused to accept these generous offers, the Virginia Electric & Power Co. proposed that the question of rates be submitted to the Federal Power Commission, each party agreeing to abiding by the Commission's decision.

Of course, so far as referring to the Federal Power Commission is concerned, we all understand why the SEPC would not agree to that. Almost the very same question has already been determined when they brought up the other question of who would build the Roanoke Rapids Dam. None of us who had a case in court would want to try his case before a judge where the same facts have already adversely been decided. We all know that the Power Commission decided that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. should build this. I am not now quarreling with that decision but am merely pointing out that the FPC has already held that Virginia Electric & Power Co. offer of rates, charges, and so forth, so far as they are concerned, are fair.

In the telegram sent to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] by the president of the Virginia Electric & Power Co., we find the following——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he gets on to that point?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention to the fact that when the REA was created and went to work in Virginia, the State of Virginia had 7.6 percent of her farms electrified and as of the 30th of June last year, as a result of the work of the REA, Virginia had 91 percent of its farms electrified.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman for his observation. A copy of this telegram was sent to me, and to all Members of the Virginia delegation:

> VEPCO had offered to accept the wheeling charges contained in any major contract covering wheeling and firming of power that had so far been approved by the Interior Department—

And further on in the telegram:

> We reaffirm that we will wheel to SPEC's customers for the wheeling charges contained in any major contract covering wheeling and firming of power.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. If the Virginia Electric & Power Co. follows that commitment, can we be assured that Virginia farmers will receive electricity at a proper rate?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes, so that he may answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman for making the request.

In my opinion, if that commitment and if that statement is followed through bona fide, then we can depend upon our farmers being treated fairly. I just want to say I hope there will be no weaseling or vacillating about the matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. But suppose there is, will it be possible to return here at a subsequent time in a subsequent appropriation bill and have that taken care of?

Mr. ABBITT. That of course is entirely possible. And I assume that if it develops that the assurances are not carried out bona fide then steps can be taken to remedy the situation.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to make an observation: that I have supported the Gary amendment on the assurance that the Virginia Power Co. would comply with that commitment made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. I sincerely hope that if they do not comply with it, that the appropriation may be restored in a subsequent appropriation bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. GARY If the Virginia Electric & Power Co. does not live up to its contracts and its commitments, I will personally help the gentleman get any change in the law that is necessary.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

I particularly wanted to comment on what was said by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON]. I want to thank him personally for the clear statement that he wrote in his letter to the Virginia Electric & Power Co., dated April 26, 1951, as well as his keen interest and help in attempting to get the question of charge for wheeling this power settled on a fair basis. I join in his sentiments, and hereby insert his letter of April 26, 1951 to VEPCO in the RECORD at this point, under permission to put it in as extraneous matter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1951.

Mr. J. C. HOLTZCLAW,
President, Virginia Electric & Power Co., Richmond, Va.

DEAR MR. HOLTZCLAW: I have your letter of April 19, 1951. I have delayed answering it until after I could have the benefit of the debate on the floor of the House.

As you have now been advised, the Gary amendment was adopted by a vote of about 2 to 1 and the item for an appropriation to the Southeastern Power Administration for the construction of transmission lines has been eliminated for the time being.

I think it fair that you should know the reasons that impelled me to support this amendment and the conditions under which your position will have my support in the future.

I believe that the Government should not enter any phase of the power business except when necessary to protect the interest of the public. Especially is this true when such entry calls for large expenditures by the Federal Government during a time when the solvency of the Nation is in jeopardy as a result of huge appropriations for military expenditures to protect our very existence.

The application of this rule to the instant case raised two questions:

1. Is the public power line necessary to provide the Government adequate power at proper rates for its operations at Langley Field?

2. Is the public power line necessary to carry out the mandate of law that Virginia rural cooperatives shall have preferential rights to power generated at river developments?

I was induced to believe that such construction is not necessary for either purpose for the following reasons:

1. The statement made by Mr. GARY on the floor on your authority that you "stand ready to wheel the power at the price in effect on any major wheeling and firming Government contract now in effect."

2. That in the event of disagreement on any details of your contract for wheeling this power from Buggs Island, such differences should be submitted to the Federal Power Commission for arbitration.

3. I am also advised that in recent litigations before the Virginia State Corporation Commission involving the application of the Old Dominion Electric Cooperative, your company successfully contended that you could wheel the power from Buggs Island to the load centers of the rural cooperatives at a cheaper price than Old Dominion and that you predicated such contention upon a definite flat "postage stamp" wheeling rate.

I believe that in dealing with the Government and the Virginia cooperatives, there is a clear obligation upon your company to contract with them on the basis of the foregoing commitments.

The cooperatives have insisted to me that once freed of the threat of this Government line, your company will be unwilling to follow through on these commitments and that as a result electrical power at proper rates will be denied to many thousands of Virginia farmers. I sincerely trust that their fears in this regard are unfounded.

Should the Government be unable to obtain from you adequate power at proper rates for its operations at Langley Field, or should the wheeling charged for rural electrification be such as to contravene the provision of law giving preference for that purpose, I would feel impelled to change my position as to the necessity of these lines in a subsequent deficiency appropriation bill this year or the regular bill next year.

I have discussed the provisions of this letter with Messrs. GARY, HARDY, and FUGATE and have been told by them that they are in agreement with the views herein expressed.

With every good wish, I am
Sincerely yours,

BURR P. HARRISON.

(Copies to Hon. Robt. Whitehead, Mr. L. E. Long, Mr. S. A. Tankersley, Mr. D. W. Burruss, Hon. L. H. Hoover, Hon. J. Vaughan Gary, Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr., Hon. Tom B. Fugate.)

There are a number of contracts that have been negotiated by the Department of the Interior which I think cover the situation. The main contention on the part of the REA and the Virginia Electric Power Co. now is whether power from Buggs Island will be wheeled for 1 mill. There are a number of contracts that have been made at the rate or charge of 1 mill. The Ottertail Power Co. of North Dakota and Minnesota is 1 mill. The Northwestern Public Service Co. of South Dakota is 1 mill. The Montana-Dakota Utilities of Montana and North Dakota is 1.069 mills. The Central Electric Cooperative—generation and transmission—of South Dakota is 1 mill. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. of California is 1 mill for 44 kilowatts or above.

Mr. WERDEL. One mill for how great a distance?

Mr. ABBITT. As I understand, for their area.

Mr. WERDEL. Fifty miles?

Mr. ABBITT. Fifty miles, and some of it as far as 400 miles. In view of what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has stated in regard to the contract being negotiated between the NACA and VEPCO there is no reason for the continued controversy on this particular appropriation now under discussion; but there is a vital necessity of getting clear for the record exactly what proposals have been made to the Members of the House and others as to charges to be made as to the wheeling of power from the Buggs Island Dam by VEPCO.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes so that I may ask him a couple of questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understood the chairman of the committee correctly, I understood him to say the Virginia company is demanding a much higher rate or charging a much higher rate than is charged in Ohio and in California for similar service. If that is true, would this proposal which has been submitted by the Virginia Power & Light Co. correct that discrepancy to which the chairman referred?

Mr. ABBITT. I do not know about the new proposal for Langley Field and am not informed fully as to its provisions. I am interested in getting the power wheeled around in the rural areas at a reasonable charge or rate regardless of the contract being made as to Langley.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand, but I do not owe any money to the Virginia Power Co. or any other power company. What I want to clear up in my mind is why the authorities of Government pay the Virginia corporation a much higher rate for a service than those authorities of Government pay to people in other parts of the country for the same service.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what I was talking about a while ago. That is why we are talking about a Government line. There is no other place to get the power, except from a private line. That is why they put the tariff on the Government. That is why we want to build a Government line.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But we have been in Government to make purchases of these things, and if the administrators who do the purchasing are so weak-kneed, are so short of vertebrae that they pay the Virginia company a much higher rate than they pay the companies in Ohio and California for the same service, the trouble is down here in the pur-

chasing department, and not on the floor of this House.

Mr. ABBITT. The gentleman is confused about the situation apparently.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I would like to say that this just is not true, that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. offered the Government a cheaper rate than the Government agency, the Southeastern Power Company, would offer it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. GARY. I have made that statement on the floor time and time again, and it is absolutely true. The NACA is satisfied with it and they have accepted their proposition.

Mr. ABBITT. Let me say to the gentleman that so far as this proposition is concerned that since this project has been started the rate offered by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. has been considerably lessened.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the good of discussion.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, as stated before there are only three ways in which the electric co-ops in Virginia can secure the available power from Buggs Island Dam even though they are in a preferred class: First, their own lines; second, lines built by the SEPA; third, Virginia Electric & Power Co. lines.

The appropriation in question undoubtedly will be kept out of the bill which, for the time being, eliminates the possibility of the SEPA building the line to Langley Field, and this of course is perfectly agreeable, provided a proper contract for wheeling the power can be negotiated with Virginia Electric & Power Co. It is to be noted that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. in their telegram of April 27 to Mr. GARY, copy of which was sent to me and I assume to the other Members of the Virginia delegation in the House, made a further suggestion in speaking of the wheeling cost "that this cost be determined by a panel of three experts—one to be appointed by SEPA, one to be appointed by VEPCO and the third to be the Chief of the Power Bureau of the Federal Power Commission." Suffice it to say that the main Federal Power Commission witness in the Roanoke Rapids case before the Federal Power Commission was the Chief of the Bureau of Power of the Commission and he testified very strongly in favor of VEPCO. In view of this, I can well understand why the SEPA would not desire to have the Chief of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission as one of the arbitrators.

Much discussion has revolved around the charges for wheeling the power from Buggs Island Dam to the various co-ops. This question vitally affects my section of Virginia as well as other sections, and I am very hopeful that a contract can be negotiated between the SEPA and VEPCO or the co-ops and VEPCO for the wheeling of this power at a reasonable rate. I am informed that much negotiation has been going on between SEPA and VEPCO, and for the sake of the RECORD so that there can be no misunderstanding I desire at this point to quote from several letters showing what has taken place.

I received a letter dated March 2, 1951, addressed to the Honorable BURR P. HARRISON, Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., myself, and Hon. THOMAS B. FUGATE from an attorney representing the Old Dominion Cooperative. The purpose of the letter was, among other things, an attempt to bring home to the gentlemen addressed the fact that a charge for wheeling power at a rate of 1 mill had been used by VEPCO in the presentation of its case in opposition to the Old Dominion Electric Cooperative receiving approval at the hands of the State Corporation Commission of Virginia for a proposed loan that had been granted by the REA, and I quote from the letter:

In the Old Dominion proceeding before State corporation commission, Mr. Donald C. Barnes, chairman of its board, testified on June 22, 1950. At volume 11, page 1684 of the transcript will be found the reference to an exhibit which he that day filed. It was designated exhibit 170. This exhibit was a comparison of the costs of the VEPCO proposal of November 1949 and the Old Dominion plan. The VEPCO proposal of November 1949 contemplated that VEPCO should wheel the power from Buggs Island to the load centers of the cooperatives at a reasonable charge. In this exhibit the comparison of costs is based on certain assumptions and on page 2 of the exhibit this assumption is given:

"5. VEPCO would transmit energy purchased by the co-ops from Buggs Island and deliver at delivery points for 1 mill per kilowatt-hour."

Please bear in mind that this was not a proposed delivery to Old Dominion but a delivery to the 11 cooperatives constituting Old Dominion. On page 1, line 16 of the exhibit we find this entry: "Wheeling by VEPCO (line 6) at 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, $161,364." That was for the year 1953. For the year 1958 it was estimated at $243,665. The increase is accounted for by the expected increase in usage.

In other words, in showing what it would cost the cooperatives to buy the Government power and have it wheeled by VEPCO, VEPCO used and assumed a 1-mill wheeling charge as a fair and reasonable sum for wheeling. Mr. Barnes testified that "merely for the purpose of making an analysis I have used an assumed wheeling charge of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour for energy purchased by the co-ops from Buggs Island and transmitted by VEPCO." By using the 1-mill figure, the cost was naturally lower than if a higher figure had been used and the VEPCO offer naturally appeared in a more attractive light. That was the representation made to the Commission. That representation was again repeated on July 17, 1950 (transcript, vol. 13, p. 1822), when VEPCO filed exhibit 170A. The revised exhibit was to correct an inaccuracy in the original exhibit. However, the wheeling charge was left exactly the same. Assumption No. 5 was not changed in any respect and the total wheeling charge was carried at $161,364 for 1953 and $243,665 for 1958, exactly the same as in the original exhibit. Therefore, twice the power company made a comparison of the costs under its proposal with the costs of the Old Dominion proposal and in each instance used a 1-mill wheeling charge as an essential element as the basis of the comparison of costs. If, in fact, the 1-mill wheeling charge was not fair and reasonable, then the power company had no justification for using it and its use constituted a representation calculated to bring about a wrong conclusion and a distortion of the facts.

There was no point in making a comparison unless the essentials on which the comparison was based were related to realities.

On April 26 I received a letter dated April 25, 1951, addressed to the two United States Senators from Virginia and all of the members of the Virginia delegation in the House from the Virginia REA Association and a number of electric cooperatives in Virginia, and I insert at this point the pertinent parts of that letter so that all of the Members of the House might have the benefit of the information contained therein:

RICHMOND, VA., *April 25, 1951.*

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Hon. EDWARD J. ROBESON,
Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR.,
Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY,
Hon. WATKINS M. ABBITT,
Hon. THOS. B. STANLEY,
Hon. CLARENCE G. BURTON,
Hon. BURR P. HARRISON,
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Hon. THOS. B. FUGATE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Virginia REA Association which is composed of all the electric co-operatives in Virginia has been meeting for the last 2 days in Richmond and we have been discussing our power problems.

These cooperatives serve various regions of Virginia, extending from the Eastern Shore to the Cumberland Gap and from Maryland to the North Carolina line. At present they have around 75,000 members. Providing electric service to this many rural people of Virginia distributed over this wide area imposes upon the officials of the cooperatives a very grave responsibility which they deeply feel and are anxious to discharge to the very best of their ability. Our farmers must have adequate service, their power supply must be adequate and their rates must be sufficiently low to enable them to make the best possible use of electric power and thereby efficiently operate their farms.

Since their organization beginning with 1936, the cooperatives have constantly encountered difficulties in securing adequate power at reasonable rates. Most of them at present purchase all of their power, some generate a portion of their power. Generally the cost of purchased power runs around 35 percent of the gross revenue of the cooperatives. This large percentage indicates how vital it is to the cooperatives that the cost of purchased power be reduced to a minimum.

Moreover, regardless of what anyone else may say, the fact is that generally our supply of power has been inadequate and the service has not been satisfactory.

In the Flood Control Act of 1944 Congress authorized the construction of a hydroelectric project at Buggs Island on the Roanoke River. In section 5 of that act Congress directed that preference in the sale of power generated at river developments shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Buggs Island development will come into operation in 1952 and the cooperatives are anxious to avail themselves of the preference rights which Congress has accorded them. This project was developed largely at the insistence of the rural people and over the strenuous opposition of the Virginia Electric & Power Co. Naturally our rural people feel that they should get the advantage of this development and the cooperatives have been and are doing everything in their power to see that this goal is realized.

Much has been said about the cost of Buggs Island power and the information

given at the December 1950 meeting of the Senate Appropriations Committee was that the cost of power of Buggs Island would be 9.1 mills. That figure has been badly misunderstood. That represents, so we are informed, the total cost of the entire construction including flood control, pollution abatement, recreation and stream as well as power development. We are reliably informed that the cost to be allocated to power will only be a portion of the total cost and that the cost per kilowatt hour will be far less than the figure of 9.1 mills and will be less than 6½ mills at the bus bar.

The preference rights which Congress has granted the cooperatives can be of no use whatever to them unless they are able to get the power transmitted from Buggs Island to their load centers. This can be done in only three ways: First, by transmission facilities of the cooperatives themselves; second, by transmission facilities provided by the Government as set forth in the Flood Control Act and third, over the transmission facilities of VEPCO. So far the cooperatives have not been able to secure their own transmission lines, the State Corporation Commission of Virginia having rejected the Old Dominion application. So far VEPCO has refused to transmit or wheel the power to the cooperatives at a reasonable charge. Therefore the only remaining method by which the cooperatives can get this power is through the medium of Government transmission lines.

In December of 1950 Congress appropriated $1,850,000 for the construction of a line from Buggs Island to Langley Field. That line will be so located that from it power can be made available to Mecklenburg Electric Cooperative, Southside Electric Cooperative, Community Electric Cooperative, and Prince George Electric Cooperative. These four cooperatives together have a membership of about 26,000 members.

In making the appropriation Congress proceeded on the assumption that the line in question would be built only if SEPA could not effect a reasonable wheeling arrangement with VEPCO for the transmission of the Government power to be produced at Buggs Island.

Extensive negotiations have taken place between Southeastern Power Administration and VEPCO with reference to the sale of power from Buggs Island and the cooperatives have been informed of the developments. The negotiations reached the point where the only two main differences between SEPA and VEPCO were first, whether SEPA should build any transmission lines from Buggs Island and deliver the power to VEPCO at points some distance from Buggs Island, and two, what fee or charge VEPCO should make SEPA for transmitting or wheeling the power to the preference consumers including the cooperatives.

SEPA insisted upon building limited transmission lines and delivering the power at points other than Buggs Island, while VEPCO insisted on bus bar delivery. VEPCO insisted on a wheeling charge based on zones—1 mill for 50 miles, 2 mills for 50 to 100 miles, 3 mills for a distance of 100 to 150 miles, and 4 mills for a distance of 150 to 200 miles. On the other hand SEPA contended for a flat wheeling charge of 1 mill.

There is good precedent for the 1 mill wheeling charge. This is the very charge which VEPCO used in exhibits 170 and 170A before the State corporation commission in the Old Dominion case showing what it would cost the 11 cooperatives which are Old Dominion members for having Government power wheeled from Buggs Island to their load centers. Eight of these load centers are in a 50-mile radius, 10 of them are in a 50- to 100-mile radius, 19 are in a radius of 100 to 150 miles, and 1 in the radius of 150 to 200 miles. The zoning wheeling proposal of VEPCO would average about 2⅗ mills for the cooperatives.

Also we are informed that recently Pacific Gas & Electric Co. negotiated a contract with the Bureau of Reclamation for the wheeling of power from Shasta Dam in California for distances up to 400 miles at a flat 1-mill wheeling fee.

In view of the deadlock between SEPA and VEPCO over the two major points of differences, the Virginia cooperatives urge SEPA to recede from its position that it build transmission lines from Buggs Island and to make bus bar delivery of the power to VEPCO provided VEPCO would wheel the power to the cooperatives at a flat 1 mill wheeling charge. SEPA agreed and this constituted a major victory for VEPCO which had vigorously opposed building of Government transmission lines. However, VEPCO refused on its part to agree to the 1 mill wheeling fee and the only concession which it would make was a reduction by ½ mill of the wheeling charge in each block, reducing it to ½ mill for the first zone, 1½ mills for the second zone, 2½ mills for the third zone and 3½ mills for the fourth zone. Obviously the purpose of VEPCO in refusing to agree to the flat 1 mill wheeling charge is to make the cost of wheeling so high that the cooperatives cannot avail themselves of Government power, and thereby putting VEPCO in a position to get all of the power on its own terms. At the same time it involved a concession on VEPCO's part of the rate for the wheeling charge for which it contended, but only to the very figure which it used in its presentation to the State corporation commission.

The representatives of the cooperatives hoped that this would constitute a fair compromise of the contending interests and would settle the power controversy in Virginia.

As applied to the cooperatives the effect of VEPCO's last proposal was to reduce the over-all wheeling fee from about 2.35 mills to 1.85 mills. Otherwise stated, its last figure was about double the 1 mill wheeling figure which it used in the Old Dominion case.

Apparently this deadlocked negotiations and there they hang. In view of this refusal of VEPCO to give and take, SEPA has proceeded with the staking of the lines.

We wish to make it crystal clear that the cooperatives are not interested in Government transmission lines except to the extent that the building of such lines or appropriations for the building thereof will make it possible for the cooperatives to get the benefit of Buggs Island power at reasonable wheeling rates for the farmers of Virginia. The cooperatives believe that the only way by which VEPCO can be induced to listen to reason is for the Government to continue the appropriation for the lines from Buggs Island to Langley Field.

We call your attention to the fact that by doubling the 1 mill wheeling charge the cooperatives in 1953 will have to pay about $160,000 more for that 1 year than VEPCO estimated in the exhibit which it filed with the State corporation commission; and taking the expected usage for 1953 the additional cost will be around $240,000 for that year alone. We trust that these figures will convey some idea of the tremendous stake which the cooperatives have in securing a reasonable wheeling arrangement.

Mr. Chairman, if the facts are as stated in these letters we will see that the figure of 1 mill has been used by VEPCO on several occasions in working out its position in matters effecting the cost of wheeling of power from Buggs Island dam to the rural areas. This morning I received another letter dated April 28, 1951 addressed to Messrs. BURR P. HARRISON, PORTER HARDY, JR., THOMAS B. FUGATE, and myself, from the attorney of the REA association in Virginia. Under permission granted, I am inserting the pertinent parts of that letter here:

APRIL 28, 1951.

MESSRS. BURR P. HARRISON, PORTER HARDY, JR., W. M. ABBITT, and THOMAS B. FUGATE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: If you are in doubt as to why the co-ops look with skepticism on the various statements and proposals of VEPCO, we ask that you turn to the RECORD.

In May 1949 in the Roanoke Rapids case (project 2009) Mr. J. G. Holtzclaw, president of the company, testified. He was being pressed on why his company was charging the co-ops a rate of 10 mills per kilowatt hour. He stated: "But for the fact that so large a part of the company's generating plant was built when construction costs were about half what they are now, a 1-cent rate would not be possible." And he further said that the 10 mill (1 cent) rate was "about as low as rates go on a system such as ours with coal at about $10 per ton." That was in May 1949. That was before REA granted Old Dominion the loan of 14 million plus dollars.

When VEPCO found out that REA was seriously considering making the loan, it made the co-ops offers in September, 1949, only 4 months later to sell at a new rate (based on demand plus energy) averaging around 9 mills, or about 10 percent less than in May.

When REA actually made the loan, VEPCO asked it to reconsider the application and deny it, and the basis for its request was a second offer to the co-ops—made September 30, 1949—to sell at the reduced rate until Government river developments began generation, and then to wheel the Government power to the co-ops and sell them what they needed in addition to what they could get from the Government at 7½ mills. This is known as contract 408–Va. But the co-ops stood firm and would not bite.

In December 1949 Old Dominion filed its application for authority to issue its securities for the loan with State corporation commission. VEPCO was permitted to intervene, and did so. It filed its petition to intervene, which was sworn to by its president, Mr. Holtzclaw, on January 23, 1950—only 8 months after his testimony in Washington before the Federal Power Commission. In paragraph 15 of that petition this is what he swore to:

"Moreover, by virtue of recent economies of operation from the new and efficient generating units, VEPCO was able to, and did, offer the electric cooperatives an improved rate schedule that would effect a reduction of approximately 10 percent."

Thus, according to the sworn statements of Mr. Holtzclaw, VEPCO's rates would have to be even higher if it were not for the fact that a large part of its plant was built before the war. But it can afford a substantial rate reduction because so much of its plant was built after the war.

In addition, when it was charging the co-ops 10 mills it was just about cost; in fact, Mr. Holtzclaw also testified in May 1949, on cross-examination, that VEPCO was suffering from the 10-mill rate. But when its other proposals were not accepted it came up with a flat 7½-mill rate offer in April 1950.

With that record staring us in the face, we insist that we are thoroughly justified in being skeptical. All we ask is that you put yourselves in the positions of the co-ops' directors and officers and attorneys, and ask yourselves what you would think if you were in their shoes.

I also insert at this point copy of the telegram from Mr. J. G. Holtzclaw,

president of the Virginia Electric & Power Co., addressed to the Honorable J. VAUGHAN GARY and dated April 27, 1951:

RICHMOND, VA., *April 27, 1951.*

Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You stated on the floor of the House on April 24, at page 4282 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and repeated at page 4291, that VEPCO had offered to accept the wheeling charges contained in any major contract covering wheeling and firming of power that had so far been approved by Interior Department. I understand that Pacific Gas & Electric Co. contract is being urged by electric cooperatives and Rural Electrification Administration as meeting this condition. We have studied the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. contract and find it wholly inapplicable to the SEPA-VEPCO situation because it provides for no firming of Government power with steam generated power without which the Buggs Island high peaking capacity would be of little value and because the Government loads in the California case are highly concentrated, 90 percent of the existing loads being within 50 miles of the Government's delivery point at Tracy, Calif., as compared to the widely scattered Government loads, most of them far removed from Buggs Island, to be served in the VEPCO service area. This Pacific contract is a contract to wheel only. We reaffirm that we will wheel to SEPA's customers for the wheeling charges contained in any major contract covering wheeling and firming of power. Specifically we would accept the wheeling charges in the Montana transmission service contract (Fort Peck), the Colorado contract, the Oklahoma contract or the Texas Power & Light contract. VEPCO is willing to wheel power to SEPA's customers at its average transmission cost. SEPA has rejected VEPCO's suggestion that this cost be determined by the Federal Power Commission. VEPCO reaffirms that offer and makes this further suggestion as a possible means of resolving the matter: That this cost be determined by a panel of three experts—one to be appointed by SEPA, one to be appointed by VEPCO and the third to be the chief of the Power Bureau of the Federal Power Commission. We are sending a copy of this telegram to Mr. Creim as a definite proposal to SEPA.

J. G. HOLTZCLAW,
President, Virginia Electric & Power Co.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, this is the old struggle between public and private ownership. The amendment on the desk is very much in line with my own thinking on the question of public power.

The gentleman from New Mexico a few minutes ago charged me with being in favor of private enterprise except at Niagara, or the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I did not charge that; I did suggest that the gentleman was against public development of the St. Lawrence seaway. I remind the gentleman that Charles Wilson made the statement that it was a good proposition and that he could get the money as quick as that from private enterprise.

The gentleman knows I am very much in favor of development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. DONDERO. Under the basic law of our country the Federal Government claims to own and dominates all navigable water. Wherever it is possible to develop power by the Federal Government I think it should be done because of excessive and increasing demand for power.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Even though that money comes from private industry?

Mr. DONDERO. Where we differ, and where we part company is where the Federal Government attempts after it produces the power to build transmission lines from various projects from the dam or place of generation of electric energy in competition with private investment and private enterprise.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does not that occur in this project all the way through?

Mr. DONDERO. Just a moment, wherever private enterprise, or private ownership cannot or will not transmit the power generated, then and then only, I am in favor of the Federal Government entering that field. If it is possible to have private enterprise develop the power in the St. Lawrence seaway I am and would be for it.

Now, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] mentioned the power at Niagara and the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have heard the gentleman mention it several times; I got most of my information from him.

Mr. DONDERO. It so happens that I heard the testimony on the Niagara power matter and the gentleman has heard the testimony, like myself, in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway. Never before in the history of this Nation has the Federal Government entered the power field at Niagara; every kilowatt of power that has been generated there has been generated by private enterprise with private capital. Under the recent treaty made between Canada and the United States it is provided that the Federal Government should proceed to generate power from the extra water allocated to the United States out of the Niagara River. That is a matter of record.

The gentleman says, and I agree with him, that private enterprise is perfectly willing to generate the power at Niagara. The Niagara-Mohawk Power Co. has offered to invest every dollar necessary to generate whatever power that additional water will produce. That is also a matter of record. The Federal Government would not have to invest a dollar. Why not let private enterprise do it?

Now, in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway, we face an international situation there. I would like to see private enterprise, private investment put in every dollar that is necessary and develop that power. However, there is an international question: water owned by two governments. The St. Lawrence River is the international boundary. I do not know whether or not it is possible to do it through private enterprise.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not see why we cannot do it. Mr. Wilson said it was a good investment, and he could get the money that quick. That is not the only question. It would be a big corporation, and the Government, the Federal Government, would get 45 percent of the income if they declared dividends, and they would declare dividends, and when they did the Government would take another bite of 30 to 50 percent from the stockholders. Is not that a grand investment for the Federal Government? Why do we mess with it?

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman that it would be a good moneymaker for the Federal Government, but because of the international questions involved I do not know that it can be handled by private enterprise.

My good friend from Washington, the able gentleman [Mr. JACKSON], said there would be no competition in the making of a contract with a monopoly.

I want to remind the gentleman that, in my opinion, the greatest monopoly in this country today is big government rather than big business. If it is so desirable that the Government step in and take away from private investment and private enterprise every field where they can go and pay taxes, why not extend that to all the other activities of the American people? But when you do that you bring Russia to America, and the Republic of the United States vanishes. I am opposed to that philosophy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would like to comment on the remarks of my good friend by saying that I am not opposed to business, I am not opposed to big government for a big country like America, nor am I opposed to big business as such. If they do a good job, they have a legitimate place in a free society, which is in keeping with the best of our traditions. The thing I cannot understand on the part of the gentleman's reasoning is this: He says it is all right for the Government to build these dams in given situations, and I refer to the big dams.

Mr. DONDERO. That is because we control the water. Private enterprise cannot do that unless given a license by the Federal Government.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Private utilities throughout America for years and years have had the opportunity to apply for a license to build dams, but they did not see fit to do so until Uncle Sam showed them how to make money by building dams so that they could buy power in order to sell to more and more customers. It is because of their lack of foresight. Was Teddy Roosevelt, were all of the Republican administrations wrong in saying that when we build a Government project the preferred customers, namely the municipalities and the public bodies throughout America, should have preference in buying that power? Is the gentleman opposed to that philosophy?

Mr. DONDERO. I am opposed to the Federal Government making a contract when private enterprise stands ready to

make the same kind of contract with public bodies.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. What kind of a contract? The crux of this issue is whether we are going to have a fair contract at a fair rate in wheeling the power from the dams to the preferred customers. I would like to know whether the gentleman is opposed to the preference provisions of the law?

Mr. DONDERO. I am opposed to the preference provisions of the law unless that same preference is given to private enterprise to serve public bodies which you insist on the Federal Government doing. That is the only difference between us.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I take it that the gentleman then wants a preference clause that is not a preference clause. He wants to put the private utilities on the same basis as the preferred customers in connection with power from Government-owned projects?

Mr. DONDERO. Where the Government produces the power and private enterprise stands ready and willing to distribute that power at a rate fixed by the Government itself, private enterprise should have the right to do it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is the gentleman referring to the wheeling arrangements? I do not understand his statement. He says that where the private utilities or private companies are willing to deliver the power. I do not quite follow him. Does the gentleman say that if the Government cannot get a fair and decent contract with the private utility to wheel its own power from its own dams to its own customers, it cannot go ahead and build transmission lines?

Mr. DONDERO. How could a situation arise that would be otherwise than a fair contract when the Government agency itself controls the rate making or the price to be paid for power?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There is no question of rate making involved. Wheeling contracts do not come within the provisions of the Federal Power Commission. It is not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. The gentleman is referring to the wholesaling and retailing of power which is within the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. I just want to straighten the gentleman out on the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to ask the gentleman from Washington one question. Does the gentleman mean to say to the House and to the country that private enterprise was not willing to wheel that power on transmission lines already constructed just as cheap and just as reasonable as the Government itself could do it?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course, I will say to my good friend from Michigan that we have spent hours and days here debating that very point. That is just exactly it. We have not been able to, in many instances, in case after case, where the private utilities have been unwilling to enter into those agreements. The gentleman has witnessed the colloquy here this afternoon; an unusual situation. Last week we had an offer by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. making a new proposal. Now today, as this debate goes on we hear it made, and I am sure in another 2 months we will have the final contract entered into, if we can keep it going, because this week there is another proposal that is about to be consummated with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The whole point, to answer the gentleman's question, is that many utilities will agree to fair and reasonable wheeling rates, but there are a lot of utility companies that will not do that, and that is why we have item after item in this bill—I do not know whether we will by the time we are through—to build those lines where the private utility companies will not build the lines, and we are trying to give Uncle Sam just sufficient bargaining power to enter into contracts that will provide fair, just, and equitable wheeling rates.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to the gentleman on the general subject of production of power by private utilities versus the Government, that if we are to believe Mr. Burton, chairman of the New York Power Authority, he admitted to our committee that if private enterprise and private investment were relieved from the burden of taxation, they could produce power just as cheap as the Federal Government. Private industry pays taxes and the Federal Government does not. I am opposed to public power when private enterprise can do it.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks and that the pending amendment be reread by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order comes too late. The amendment had been read some several minutes ago.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought they were reading it for the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asked unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi has spoken on the amendment and did not know the subject matter when he heard it read. I sat here attentatively and listened to the gentleman from Virginia talking off the subject of this amendment for some 45 minutes, and then we had the St. Lawrence seaway debate.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the gentleman makes that kind of a statement——

Mr. WERDEL. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is wrong in that statement.

Mr. WERDEL. I am somewhat surprised that this committee does not accept this amendment. Each and all of the members of the committee have said that they do not want to do what this amendment provides that the Bureau of Reclamation cannot do. We are not talking about Virginia or any other subject other than the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. When we talk about duplicating power lines in this amendment we are talking about the West and the State of California, and I mention that because there are other gentlemen in the House from the State of California who should know that would be the subject of the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I pointed out to you in previous remarks the reasons I am opposed to unnecessary power lines. The Central Valley project is a multiple-purpose project. The cost of water depends on what reasonably can be obtained from the sale of power. Here are the facts so far as this amendment is concerned and what it will do. There is a wheeling agreement in California with private industry over an area 200 miles wide and 500 miles long. That agreement was entered into on the 2d day of April after the Bureau of the Budget made a recommendation for power lines. That agreement was made after the hearings closed in the committee. The committee expressed itself as waiting to see whether or not such an agreement was made. That agreement provides that power will be wheeled any place in an area 200 miles wide and 500 miles long for a basic rate of 1 mill a kilowatt-hour. That contract has to be agreed to by the public utilities commission of the State of California. It will look at it in the interests of other power users of that utility company. The bill now provides for short power lines to be built by the Bureau in order that it may serve directly the more favorably situated customers, thus increasing the cost to the utility by increasing the average distance power is to be transported. This subject was considered by both the Bureau and the utility when they signed the agreement providing a reasonable wheeling charge. The Bureau should live up to its contract and not place the utility in the position of increasing its wheeling costs to other outlying Government customers.

Imagine, within 2 weeks after they entered into the agreement, here is the Bureau with lines in the bill, and this committee, opposing this amendment and doing it without any definite statement of purpose.

This is what happens in California. This bill has in it $1,656,478 of money today. It will authorize the eventual expenditure of an estimated $11,000,000. The requested lines are to service areas

within that area embraced by the contract. Less than a month ago, the Bureau and the utility agreed upon a reasonable rate to furnish any lines that it now has or may need to perform the obligations to deliver to Government agencies or preferred customers. The contract binds the utility to deliver even if it requires new construction.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about unnecessary lines because they are duplicated and because an executed contract makes them unnecessary. Yet the committee recommendation without explanation requires using 5,000 tons of steel—three trainloads, 1,000,000 pounds of aluminum, and about 300 tons of copper to create facilities not the equal of those already in existence and available to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, this is at the expense of the water-users in the State of California. The only possible purpose, if you please, is to take power lines from a Government project under the guise of preferred customers and run it to some area in California where some Republican or Democrat may want to go politically. Such definition of preferred customers will kill reclamation. I think the committee had better take another look at its yardstick.

Adoption of this amendment would, for example, prevent the Bureau of Reclamation from constructing the following facilities in the Central Valley project area in California where a power-wheeling service contract has been executed:

Keswick-Shasta Dam area PUD transmission line and substation, 115 kilovolts.

Folsom - Elverta - Sacramento - Folsom loop line and substation, 115 kilovolts.

Elverta-Sacramento switchyards.

Tracy-Livermore-Ames transmission line and substations, 115 kilovolts.

Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio transmission line and substations extension, 69 kilovolts.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, the Keating amendment provides in substance that no money in this bill shall be spent for transmission facilities within an area covered by existing wheeling contracts which make provision for service to Federal installations and preference customers.

The fallacy of this amendment is that the present wheeling contract in California provides only for the wheeling of power over the existing facilities of the utility. There is nothing in the contract that requires the utility to build additional facilities in order to make the wheeling possible.

For instance, this appropriation bill contains a provision for the construction of the Tracy-Livermore-Ames transmission line. Additional facilities will be required to carry this load which serves a defense installation. Because of the low load factor the utility will not build the line unless it is financed by the Government. That is the contract now offered. In other words the Government puts up the money and the utility owns the line. And this line will not be built unless a separate agreement is made. But this amendment will take away any bargaining power the Government might have in getting a contract at a fair rate. The Government under this amendment cannot build the line. Therefor the Government—and necessarily the defense installation—is at the mercy of the utility. That is not fair, and certainly not the result intended by this Congress.

Since the amendment only prohibits the initiation of new transmission facilities it will not interrupt the completion of the west side transmission line in the Central Valley of California, or the Keswick-SPAUD line which is already started. But, there can be no start on the Folsom-Elverta line which is also provided for in this bill. In this instance a connection by the utility costing a million dollars will be necessary. But what assurance does Congress have that the connection will be made? And if it is made it will cost the Government 1 mill per kilowatt to wheel all the power from the Folsom Dam now under construction a distance of 20 miles to an interconnection with the Government's own transmission system. That is too expensive and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Another item provided for in this bill is the Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio transmission line and substations. The existing lines pass over the Government camp and preference customers to be served by these facilities. Only substations are required. But this amendment would prohibit the building of those facilities. The Government will be stuck with a 1 mill rate for serving these customers including its own camp; that is an excessive rate for customers located in the shadow of the Government's own lines. All it will take to serve them is a little line and a substation, but under the terms of this amendment that cannot be done. And it will be costly to the taxpayers because the Government will pay for the unnecessary service rendered by the utility.

The Government should retain the power to construct transmission lines where authorized by Congress. We should not strait-jacket the Government in any such a manner as this. This amendment destroys the bargaining power of the Government, and puts it at the mercy of the utility. If there is a reasonable argument against any of the lines appropriated for in this bill, the argument—and the amendment—should strike at those lines specifically; but a general amendment like this operates equally against all transmission facilities in our State, and in addition ties the hands of the Government in bargaining for the wheeling of power which will require the building of additional facilities as will be the case in most instances.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON of Washington) there were—ayes 87, noes 62.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KEATING and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, nces 73.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil- and moisture-conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, $15,385,000, of which not to exceed $12,883,900 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and not to exceed $1,671,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation, and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided further*, That after December 31, 1951, no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for payment of the cost of operation and maintenance of Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal and appurtenant works to and including Pilot Knob check and wasteway (engineer station 1098) for the purpose of diversion or carriage of water for any water user, district, or association unless and until arrangements, satisfactory to the Secretary, shall have been made for payment annually to the United States of the part of such cost allocable to such water user, district, or association.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 16 beginning with line 10, strike out lines 10 to 24, inclusive, and on page 17 strike out lines 1 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil- and moisture-conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, $15,094,000, of which not to exceed $12,592,900 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and not to exceed $1,671,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept that amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURDOCK to the amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 16, at the end of the amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS insert: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for operation and maintenance of any irrigation works in excess of repayments during the current fiscal year pursuant to law."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is in effect legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore a violation of rule 21.

I make the further point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona to my amendment purports to be a limitation but is in effect an authorization. There is no authorization at the present time for expenditures, from the funds to which the gentleman refers, for operation and maintenance of these certain projects. Therefore, if the gentleman from Arizona offers an amendment which says, "You must not spend more than that amount of money," then it is in effect not a limitation but an authorization for the expenditure of money to that point.

If the Chairman would hear me in language which is not legal, I could perhaps make it very clear in simple language. Suppose the Chairman had in his pocket, as trustee, $100, which was to be applied to the building fund of a church. It was for that purpose. Now, suppose the gentleman from Arizona got up and said "You must not spend more than $50 of that for a new suit for yourself." That is an analogous situation. There is no money authorized to be spent in the bill for the purpose for which the gentleman from Arizona attempts to set a limitation. Therefore, I hold first that this is subject to a point of order; and, of course, should it not be subject to a point of order, I would of course hope that the amendment would not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that has nothing to do with whether it is germane or subject to a point of order.

The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] if he desires to be heard.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do desire to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that this is nothing but a negative limitation on an appropriation. The precedents of the House are replete with decisions holding negative limitations on appropriations to be in order.

If you will look at the wording of the amendment, and that is all that is required in making a parliamentary decision on the matter, it applies solely to this one appropriation under consideration, that for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects. It does not operate beyond the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. No affirmative directions are given by the amendment to anyone, and it does not impose any additional duties on anyone. It in no way changes existing law, and it does not alter, modify, or extend any existing powers.

All the amendment does is to say you cannot spend this appropriation in excess of the amounts which are repaid when the law is complied with. It does not require repayment from anyone—it does require anyone to comply with the law.

The reclamation law is based entirely on the concept of repayment, both of construction costs and costs of annual operation and maintenance. Title 43 of the United States Code has so many provisions requiring repayment of operation and maintenance costs, that I would not know which one to cite first.

All this amendment does is to say that this appropriation, which covers operation and maintenance of all federally built reclamation projects, can be expended in not to exceed the amounts equal to the collections made in compliance with the law.

I maintain that the point of order cannot lie against this language.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] offers an amendment which the clerk has reported to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. The gentleman from California makes a point of order against the amendment for the reasons which he has stated.

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. The Chair has concluded that the amendment is clearly a limitation, negative in character on an appropriation bill. The amendment limits in a negative manner the amount which can be spent only during the fiscal year covered by the bill presently before the Committee.

The device by which the limitation of the amount is determined is the extent to which the law is complied with. It does not add to the requirements of any law; it does not require compliance with any law; all it does is to say that you may spend this appropriation up to the amount that the law requiring repayment is complied with. The amendment therefore is in order and the Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from California.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, if there is one principle underlying the reclamation law it is the principle of repayment of the investment the Government makes in that reclamation project. When we come before you as I have been accustomed to doing for many years asking for authorization and appropriations for reclamation projects I have continually pointed out that the money spent by Uncle Sam in the investment is repayable. There has been a good deal of argument about that and sometimes it is a little hard to impress that fact upon the Members of Congress who do not quite understand as we westerners do the great value and wealth-creating possibilities of reclamation as a national investment.

I would not at any time sanction, countenance, or look Members of Congress in the face and ask for money to be appropriated either to build or to operate a reclamation project unless I felt that the existing law requiring repayment would be complied with. That is all that I am trying to do in this amendment to the Phillips amendment. If there are reclamation projects where operation and maintenance costs have not been repaid, they ought, in fairness to all other reclamation projects and to the cause of reclamation to be required to pay operation and maintenance charges. That repayment should be done within the fiscal year in which the appropriation is made. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Since the matter stated by the gentleman in his amendment is already in the law, and since, presumably, the Government agencies are required to comply with the law, why is the amendment necessary? I cannot understand the purpose of it. Why should the gentleman be putting something in this law that is the law already and has to be complied with?

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman himself knows that the law is not always complied with. This brings the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior and every other agency connected with the handling of this appropriation to task to see that the law is complied with.

Mr. ENGLE. Do I understand the gentleman is merely restating the law in order to emphasize that to be sure the Bureau of Reclamation will have it called to their attention so that they will enforce it.

Mr. MURDOCK. We want it enforced.

Mr. ENGLE. Does the gentleman believe this amendment has any particular adaptation to the Imperial irrigation district in California and, if so, what?

Mr. MURDOCK. It may apply to projects in my own State. I do not know whether the irrigation projects in my own State have paid their operation and maintenance charges. If they have not they ought to do so, and that applies to anything in California or in any other of the 15 western States, in addition to Arizona and California.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with all that, but the gentleman has not answered the question. I asked him whether or not he believes this amendment has any particular application to the Imperial irrigation district in California?

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Imperial irrigation district in California has not paid its operation and maintenance charges, it should be required to do so, and that applies to all the other nearly 300 Federally owned projects in the country.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman still has not answered the question. Does he believe this amendment has any particular application to the Imperial irrigation district in California?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. This amendment, as I understand it, would not be applicable to any district unless they were not repaying the full amount of the Federal money that went into that project.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the committee that I recognize the gentleman's great statesmanship. The people of the United States should appreciate the services of the gentleman of Arizona today. I have always recognized him to be interested in reclamation, as I am. Reclamation is as safe as the Rock of Gibraltar as long as these repayment contracts are held sacred and inviolate. I want to congratulate the gentleman for his amendment. I think it ought to be adopted.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I concur, of course, in the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Arkansas in regard to the great service rendered by the gentleman from Arizona; but I am trying to find out whether or not there is a curve on this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. I asked the gentleman whether or not this amendment had any particular application to the Imperial irrigation district in California. The gentleman has not answered. Now, may I ask: Does the gentleman agree that the Imperial irrigation district has a binding contract with the Federal Government whereunder it has to pay its own maintenance and operation and take care of that without any appropriation at all from the Federal Government?

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot say as to that. I do know they have a contract with the Government which needs amending. I simply maintain that if there are reclamation projects that have not been paying their operation and maintenance costs annually within the fiscal year, they ought to be required to do so and my amendment will make them do so. Of course, that also would apply to the Imperial irrigation district.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the original amendment which I introduced affects the bill at page 16 by taking $291,000 out of each of the two figures in line 14 and striking the last proviso which begins in line 24. It has no further effect on the paragraph.

Several days ago a related amendment was adopted which struck out on page 14, line 20, the words "and treaties." The reason for all this is lengthy and I shall endeavor to shorten it. The gentleman from Arizona, by his apparent unwillingness to answer the questions asked by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], has in effect shown you what the situation is. Under the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, which was reported in House Document 717, Eightieth Congress, the Imperial irrigation district was protected in the right to pay the operation and maintenance cost of the canal and this contract was entered into December 1, 1932, and there is no authorization, and there is no reason for any money to be put in this bill or any other bill as an appropriation to pay the operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal. Later, this was under discussion in the Senate when the Mexico Water Treaty, the United States-Mexican agreement, was under discussion, and by a specific limitation upon that treaty which, as I recall, is reservation C—they were numbered A, B, and C—it was again said that that treaty should in no way abrogate any contract which provided for the payment—and I put it in my own language—by the Imperial irrigation district for the operation and maintenance of the canal. The agreement between the irrigation district and the Federal Government contained the following, and I quote:

> The district shall, at its own cost and without expense to the United States, care for, operate, and maintain the same—

And so forth, which is all part of the agreement. Now, there was an attempt to write into the bill this year, I think due to a misunderstanding, a provision which would have put $291,000 in the bill for operation and maintenance paid for by the Federal Government and, by other wording, to give authorization for that expenditure. I submitted an amendment to strike that out, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], after consultation, was kind enough to accept it without argument. The gentleman and I hoped that this longer argument would not take place.

This does not affect the State of Arizona; it only affects the State of California. The gentleman from Arizona is bypassing his own committee, because when you have an authorization problem it should go before a legislative committee, and he is attempting, acting as a sort of carrier pigeon for the Bureau of Reclamation to add to my amendment what would seem to be a restriction but which is, in effect, an implied authorization for the expenditure of money which is not otherwise authorized. This little matter of a district to pay within a year, of course, we all agree to; there is no argument over that. Last November, the Secretary of the Interior, without a hearing, and acting entirely on his own authority, made a finding, as he called it, that it was for the best interests of the country that these contracts which had been made between the United States and an irrigation district should be set aside and the Bureau should operate this canal itself. That is what the gentleman from Arizona is attempting to put into the bill by indirection and that is what I hope you, Mr. Chairman, and the Members of the Congress will refuse to accept as an amendment, and thus we will simply be adopting the amendment which I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California, whose subcommittee, by the way, is the one which should have this matter before it for consideration, and we would be very glad to present the case to them.

Mr. ENGLE. Do I understand that at the present time there is no authorization for the Bureau of Reclamation to operate the All-American Canal?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Under a contract the Imperial irrigation district expects to pay for it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. This means the American taxpayers do not have to put up a dime?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Does the gentleman interpret this amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona to be an indirect method of getting a foot in the door to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to operate this canal at the expense of the taxpayers generally rather than at the expense of the Imperial irrigation district?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If I did not suspect that, I would see no point whatever in the amendment being offered.

Mr. ENGLE. In other words, the gentleman does not regard this as just pleasantries with existing law being reiterated in an appropriation bill; he sees some devious purpose in it? Is that it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Having just taken out three devious purposes before this one was suggested, I am naturally a little bit suspicious.

Mr. ENGLE. I will be frank to tell the gentleman that I cannot see how the proposed amendment does what the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] thinks it does, but I share some of his suspicions about it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the Imperial irrigation district has agreed in writing that it will take over this project according to the original agreement and live up to the water treaty between the United States and Mexico, and that any time they do not live up to that agreement the Bureau of Reclamation may cancel their contract?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. We have so signed that contract. We have been supported by the Department of State. It was only on November 7, 1950, that Secretary Chapman, without any hearings or any consultation and in violation of article 24 of this contract between the United States and the Imperial district, made this determination:

It is my determination that, within the framework of the foregoing interpretation of article 23 of the treaty, the only method by which the Department of the Interior can assure the necessary ownership, control, and jurisdiction required by the treaty (in connection with water deliveries to Mexico) is through the operation and maintenance by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal from Imperial Dam to and including the Pilot Knob check and wasteway.

We have the money. We are most anxious to assume the responsibility and the cost of operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. These are the questions I want to ask: Who has controlled and operated the Imperial Dam and the first section of the All-American Canal in recent years?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that up to the time of the contract, and up to the time it was supposed to be finished and turned over to Imperial irrigation district, it had been operated as a construction project, as any canal would be operated during construction by the the constructing agency, which was the Bureau. The Department has refused to turn it over.

Mr. MURDOCK. The question is answered. The Bureau of Reclamation has operated this dam and the first section of the canal since it has been ready for use.

Mr. PHILLIPS. During its construction.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is technically still in construction?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. The Bureau will not declare it completed. We want it declared ended, so we can start paying back some money.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is only one question. I have some others.

Mr. PHILLIPS. All right.

Mr. MURDOCK. How much water has the Imperial Diversion Dam diverted into California and carried to the Imperial irrigation district in the past 10 years of record?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I cannot give the gentleman that. Maybe the gentleman can give it for me.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. I can give it myself.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then give it to me.

Mr. MURDOCK. More than 25,000,000 acre-feet of water have been delivered in the past 10 years of record from the Imperial Diversion Dam for use in irrigation in the Imperial Valley. Can the gentleman tell me the total cash crop produced in the Imperial Valley with those 25,000,000 acre-feet of water?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I could, but what has that to do with this? Do not forget that some of that water may have been delivered at the request of the Department of State and some of it I know was delivered in order that constructive use might be made of the water rather than see it wasted.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want this in the RECORD. Not only have 25,000,000 acre-feet of water been delivered to the Imperial irrigation district, but with that 25,000,000 acre-feet during the past 10 years that garden spot has produced more than $760,000,000 worth of cash agricultural products. That is an impressive production record. Surely during those years the district could have paid a large part of its repayment obligation to the Government.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It cost us something to raise it, did it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right, I am talking about the gross production. Has the Imperial irrigation district paid one red cent on its construction cost?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It has been trying to, but we cannot get the Bureau to live up to the contract.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the Imperial irrigation district paid anything on its operational costs during these 10 years?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It was not supposed to. The gentleman is the chairman of the committee, and he knows very well that no irrigation district begins its payments until a certain time after the construction is finished.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now the gentleman is hanging on to a technicality. That project has been completed for more than 10 years.

Mr. PHILLIPS. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. It has been in full operation and the project has not been paying its way and has not been paying its operating cost and it has not been paying on its construction costs. That is the thing the Congress ought to look into. I know about your contract and I will have something to say about that in the extension of my remarks.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is nothing that our people would like better than to have this Congress look into, and you may find some very surprising things. I will say for the benefit of my friend, the gentleman from Arizona, I am afraid the amendment he is offering to my amendment would come back to haunt him, in connection with some Arizona projects much more than it would ever come back to haunt the Imperial irrigation district.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. What conceivable application can this amendment have to the Imperial irrigation district, when the Imperial irrigation district is paying its own maintenance and operation costs?

Mr. PHILLIPS. As I remarked, having just stricken out three somewhat similar provisions, of which it was the very obvious intent to get a foot in the door, I may be a little overly suspicious. We might very well get along without the amendment, but I cannot see that it does any good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment having been voted down still needs some further explanation. It is unfortunate that a matter as important as this cannot be more fully explained. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] very shrewdly guessed that the language of my amendment might have some connection with the Imperial irrigation district. That was not such a shrewd guess, after all, when it is seen that the language on page 17 which was eliminated by the Phillips amendment did pertain specifically to the Imperial irrigation district. It was not that I wanted to be evasive, that I did not name the Imperial irrigation district, but that I wanted it clearly understood that my amendment was general in its nature and applied to all and every one of the Federal reclamation projects requiring them to obey the law and to pay operation and maintenance charges according to law within each fiscal year covered by an appropriation. As I said, out of the nearly 300 Federal reclamation projects in the West, there may be several which have not been paying the operation and maintenance charges but should be held to account to do so.

As I sat here listening to the further debate on my amendment, I have been asked, "Is it true that the Imperial irrigation district has not been paying the cost of operation and maintenance?" One colleague asked, "Is it true that the Imperial irrigation district has not been paying annually for the cost of construction of their facilities by the Bureau of Reclamation?" These two questions, as a matter of fact, I regret to say, must be answered in the affirmative. There may be extenuating circumstances which in all fairness to this great irrigation district should be explained. I want to be fair and truthful, and therefore I will try briefly to explain the situation.

As a matter of fact it is my information from an authoritative source: first, that the Imperial irrigation district has not paid Uncle Sam any part of the cost of building the Imperial Dam and the All-American canal down to the Mexican border, although they have a contract to repay the Government the entire cost in about 40 annual payments. I cannot say concerning any repayments to the Government for the cost of that

part of the All-American canal from Pilot Knob westwardly in California into Imperial Valley. I am discussing here the Imperial diversion dam and that first section of the All-American canal from the diversion dam down through California to Pilot Knob on the Mexican border. Let me repeat, it is my information that the Imperial irrigation district of California has not to date paid a dollar on its construction cost.

I was present in October 1938 when Secretary Ickes opened the gates of the Imperial diversion dam and turned water into the All-American Canal. I understand there was some trouble in the use of the canal for several months, and that it cannot be said to have been usable until about 1940. However, for all intents and purposes it has been completed and it has been in use, virtually full use, for 9 or 10 years of record. The Bureau of Reclamation has operated the dam and canal down to Pilot Knob. It costs money to operate such facilities. It is my understanding that during these 9 or 10 years the Imperial irrigation district has not currently paid these operation and maintenance charges, but instead they have accumulated and been held in abeyance against the time when other repayments will begin. In other words, whatever Uncle Sam has been out annually, say between two hundred or three hundred thousand dollars each year, has been charged against the final account of the Imperial irrigation district. If this is the true situation, and I believe it is, how long is that sort of thing to continue?

Now if this part of the story as I have given it thus far is correct—and I think it is—this does not set well with you nor with me. What may be said to explain this situation? Now, I have had several witnesses in hearings before my committee who have pointed out that the Imperial irrigation district has a contract dating from 1932, in which they agree to pay construction costs on condition and when the works are completed and turned over to the district for control. Although the works are really completed and have been for a long time, they have not been turned over to the control of the Imperial irrigation district. Therefore, under the strict terms of that contract, no payments are technically and legally due to the Government from the Imperial irrigation district.

That is a contract which I have said no Secretary of the Interior should ever have signed, but you will recall the words of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] to the effect that the Imperial irrigation district has been anxious to begin their contract repayments. He means, of course, that they are anxious to have the control of the Imperial Dam and all parts of the All-American Canal turned over to them, and they are appealing to you today and have been appealing for a long time not to appropriate money for the Bureau of Reclamation to operate these facilities but instead, under the terms of their contract, to turn the works over to their control. I vigorously protest that proposal.

I know a contract is a sacred and binding thing. I do want Uncle Sam to make it his practice to keep his word and fulfill his agreement, but also I want to remind you that there have been numerous times in American history when, for the general good of the Nation, the Government had to break a contract or to change it. After the All-American contract was entered into in 1932, this Government made a treaty with Mexico to furnish Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet annually, of which 500,000 acre-feet of water was to be delivered to Mexico through that first section of the All-American Canal. The Californians were very anxious to have a larger amount of water go to Mexico through the All-American Canal. For reasons of their own, they fought the ratification of that treaty bitterly, but the treaty was ratified by the Senate on April 18, 1946, by a vote of 76 yeas, 10 nays, and 10 not voting. From that vote, evidently the United States Senate regarded that treaty with Mexico as very important and eminently fair. Most of us in the West, especially in the Colorado River Basin, regarded the best kind of treaty we could obtain with Mexico as a vital necessity for the protection of the water rights in all the States of the Colorado River Basin.

Naturally, we do not want that treaty to be breeched or abrogated, and naturally we want no one other than the constituted authority of the United States Government to have charge of carrying out the provisions of the treaty. The paramount national interest requires the treaty to be faithfully observed and carried out. I can never view with equanimity the suggestion that the carrying out of the treaty be left in the control of the Imperial irrigation district, as its officials have proposed and insisted upon.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], remarked that any change in the law should be handled by the committee of which I am chairman, and seemed to think I was bypassing my own committee. I do recognize that it is an injustice for the United States Government to hold the Imperial irrigation district strictly and completely for the full repayment of this cost on an expensive canal, now that the Government—in carrying out an international obligation—has commandeered a large portion of its capacity. Indeed, justice to the farmers of the Imperial irrigation district would seem to indicate that there should be a renegotiation of contract and a writing-off of part of the expense by the Government, but accompanied by a steadfast insistence on the part of the United States Government to keep the control of the Imperial diversion dam and the first section of the All-American Canal under control of the United States Government. Meanwhile, this rich and prosperous irrigation district ought to pay its operation and maintenance charges as the law requires of all other districts and certainly the repayments of construction costs have been delayed long enough and ought to be immediately begun.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161-kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whatley 50-kilovolt transmission line and substation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 18, lines 7 to 21, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The language is as follows:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161-kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whatley 50-kilovolt-transmission line and substation.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the point of order made by the gentleman from New York comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is timely. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 100 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $60,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of

law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration," Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, as authorized by law: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except $5,500,000 under the head "General administrative expenses" and $1,000,000 for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General investigations."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas:

Page 19, line 15, strike out "$60,000" and insert "$30,000."

In line 17, strike out "$100" and insert "$50."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment applies to the reclamation section of the bill where $60,000 is appropriated for individuals who may be employed for as much as $100 per day and for as many days as this agency may see fit to employ such individuals for as long as the money lasts.

My amendment strikes out the $60,000 and inserts $30,000. It strikes out $100 per day and inserts $50 per day. Under the general statute authorizing the appropriation, an agency may, if the appropriation bill so provides, pay persons at a per diem rate of the highest salary under civil service, which is $43 or $44 per day. Under my amendment it is an even $50 per day. The act does say that if specifically authorized in the appropriation bill, it may be $100 per day.

I call particular attention to the fact that no qualifications of the individuals are indicated in the bill or in the law. The agency may hire whom they please and for as long as they choose. It seems to me $50 per day, or as much as $600 per week, together with expenses, is a pretty good-sized sum to pay individuals without qualifications or regulations.

It will be claimed, I assume, that these persons are experts in their field, but nothing in the bill indicates such qualifications. In civil service, employment qualifications are required before the people may be employed in any jobs. This is especially true in the higher-bracket positions. So it is possible employees who are especially qualified under civil service will be working with people who may or may not be qualified for the jobs.

Mr. Chairman, this is a case of "a camel getting its nose under the tent," and in a good many places at that. It seems that only recently these agencies have got on to the idea of adding a few hundred thousand dollars to take care of so-called individuals who can work part time at a rate of $2,500 a month and expenses, if the chief of the agency sees fit to provide such employment. The amendment should be adopted. You will not only save at least $30,000, but the principle involved in even more important.

After all, this could be just another way of putting individuals on the payroll without qualification requirements.

If a person is employed for 6 days a week at $100 a day, that is just $600 a week.

Let us cut this item and save $30,000. I realize this seems a small amount compared with the manner in which expenditures are being made these days, but surely the saving of $30,000 without injury to anyone is worth while. I hope the Committee will see fit to sustain me in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we debated this question adequately last week. I call the attention of Members to this matter: Last week we spent 47 minutes on an item just like this. As near as I can figure it, it costs about $27,000 to run the Congress for an hour. So we debated it last week for 47 minutes, and it cost almost $25,000 to debate this question. There was only about $14,000 involved. So we certainly made a saving, whether the engineer is worth what we are offering to pay him or not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman, as chairman of this great committee——

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not say "great."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, I do, and the gentleman is a great Member of this House, and I mean exactly what I say. But he certainly does not measure this legislation which we pass in Congress on the basis of the time that is taken on various amendments?

Mr. KIRWAN. No; I am talking about economy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We can get through now in 7 minutes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; we debated this 47 minutes last week, and after that 47 minutes it did not pass. If it had passed we would have saved $20,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It lacked only two votes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; but it did not pass. But if it had passed, whether the engineers were worth $100 a day or not, we would have saved $20,000 on it, but it cost us $27,000 of debate. That is great economy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I call attention to the fact that there is also a principle involved here along with the question of saving dollars.

Mr. KIRWAN. I understand. The principle was economy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Economy, but still there was a principle involved.

Mr. KIRWAN. It costs us more to debate the principle than we could economize had the amendment carried.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Now you can save $30,000 in 7 minutes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; we should try to save. When an engineer has highly specialized knowledge, if he is not worth $100 a day, he is not worth hiring. I feel just as does the gentleman from Kansas that they should not be hired when they are not needed. But if he is a worthy man and he has some specialized knowledge that the regular employees of the Bureau of Reclamation do not have, then we have to pay what such men are worth. If they can get hold of some man that has particular knowledge that the 1,200 engineers in the Reclamation Service have not, then he is certainly worth $100 a day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think, following the gentleman's line of reasoning, that the legislation should at least qualify these individuals and say what they are supposed to be qualified to do under some requirement such as they have in civil service? People are employed under civil service for much less salary, engineers, or whatever they may be, but at least we know they have some qualification, and we should require some qualification in the case of these experts.

Mr. KIRWAN. If you could qualify them, if the Department could get them from civil service, they would not be hiring engineers at $100 a day.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the time that is wasted on these amendments just makes the Members work a little harder and come a little nearer to earning their money?

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not say that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. It would appear from the position advanced by the gentleman from Kansas that he would rather have two at $50 a day than one at $100 a day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was hoping that this administration would hire people who are worth $50 a day and get qualified men, and I think they could if they tried. That applies to a good many places in Government just as well as it does in this agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON of Washington) there were—ayes 55, noes 50.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the

head "Construction and rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska: Page 21, line 3, after the period, insert "That the reservoir behind Medicine Creek Dam in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska, heretofore known, designated, and referred to as 'Medicine Creek Reservoir,' shall hereafter be designated and referred to as 'Harry Strunk Lake.' Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to under and by the name of 'Medicine Creek Reservoir' shall be held and considered to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of 'Harry Strunk Lake.'"

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions; classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; $22,900,000, of which $3,300,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water-resources investigations: *Provided*, That the share of the Geological Survey in any topographic mapping or water-resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Page 23, line 12, strike out "$22,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,900,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to reduce the appropriation for the Geological Survey by $1,000,000.

The sum carried in the bill is $22,900,000. This is an increase of $4,318,000 over the 1951 appropriation, and the 1951 appropriation was $3,000,000 more than the 1950 figure. At this time when the military program calls for vastly increased spending for defense purposes, all spending by civilian agencies ought to be reduced, if possible.

If they cannot be reduced, then every effort should be made to hold them at current levels and not increase them. Yet this item in the appropriation bill is not reduced. It is not even held at last year's level. It is increased $4,318,000, which is an increase of approximately 24 percent, or one-fourth over last year's appropriation.

Not only does the bill carry an increase of 24 percent over last year, but last year's appropriation carried an increase over the preceding year of $3,000,000, or nearly 20 percent. In the 1950 fiscal year the appropriation for this agency was $15,887,012. It was increased in the 1951 fiscal year to $18,882,000.

In this time when spending should be reduced, it is not being reduced at all in this agency. On the contrary it is increasing year by year, and the increase is growing both in amount and percentagewise. The figures which I have just given you are shown on pages 828 and 829 of part 2 of the hearings. The bill before us proposes to raise it again, this time to $22,900,000.

The work of this agency is divided into seven categories; six of them carry large increases over last year. Only one of the seven is held at last year's figure, and last year all seven of them carried large increases over the year before.

The only category which is not increased in this bill this year is the smallest item of the seven categories, namely, $41,000 for soil and moisture conservation. Topographic surveys and mapping carries an increase of $1,430,000, being increased from seven and a half million to $8,930,000. Geology and mineral resource surveys and mapping carries an increase of $1,710,000. Four other categories, water-resources investigation, classification of lands, supervision of mining and oil and gas leases, and general administration, all carry large increases this year over last year, and every one of them carried substantial increases last year over the year before.

I realize, of course, that the effort to justify this increase, is the claim that it is based on the needs of national defense. It is contended that Alaska needs to be mapped for defense purposes, and that other mapping is necessary for defense purposes, and $1,430,000 increase is provided for that item.

This cut of $1,000,000 can be effected without disturbing the mapping program, if that program is of so much importance that it needs to be carried out in its entirety. There are five other categories carrying increases in this bill, and this reduction of $1,000,000 can be distributed among them if necessary. Frankly, I think it can be distributed over the six categories. The $1,000,000 can be cut off and still leave an increase of $3,318,000 over last year. The $1,000,000 reduction can be made and still leave $6,000,000 over year before last.

I do not think another annual increase for the water-resources investigations is justified. There are many agencies, Federal, State, as well as private, constantly doing work of this nature. Work of a related nature is done by the Army engineers, by various State agencies, by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and a survey of "Water in Industry" was completed in December 1950 by the National Association of Manufacturers, working jointly with the Conservation Foundation. Also related activity is being carried on by the Soil Conservation Agency, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other groups.

Certainly it will be no death blow to the water-resources investigations carried on by that department if its appropriation this year should be held to the same level as last year, because last year's appropriation was $1,344,000 more than the 1950 appropriation, and the amount carried in this bill is a $737,000 increase over last year. If this one item alone should be held at last year's figure, that would very nearly take care of the million-dollar reduction proposed in this amendment.

The Department of the Interior is not a department which has a background of retrenchment or of undertaking to operate on an economical basis. The Department of the Interior was investigated during the last Congress by the Williams subcommittee. The Williams subcommittee had this to say with reference to the method of operation and the constantly increasing expenses of that department:

The Department reports that for the past 5 years it has made a concerted effort to decentralize its operations to the field. In this there has been an attempt to draw a distinction between line operations to be carried on in the field and staff work to be retained in the Washington headquarters. In this decentralization the total employment in the field has increased from 34,752 in January 1944 to 50,769 on the same date in 1949. This represents an increase of 46 percent. During the same period the Washington headquarters staff decreased from 4,490 to 3,614 employees—a reduction of only 20 percent. Even this disproportionate decrease is substantially nullified when we take into account the 2,224 additional employees carrying on a part of the headquarters functions in Denver, Colo.

So that while it would appear that there actually was a decrease in the personel doing headquarters work, as a matter of fact when the 2,224 engaged in that occupation in Denver are added to the number here in Washington, it shows a total of 5,238, which actually is an increase and not a decrease at all. So the amendment which I offer would cut $1,000,000 from the $4,000,000—plus increase which is provided in this bill for the second consecutive year, and would still leave an increase of over $3,000,000 over the sum that was appropriated last year. It will certainly be no death blow to any of these functions if this amendment is adopted, and I ask that it be adopted.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there was not a member of the committee that did not agree that this part of the bill was necessary and essential. I heard the gentleman from Georgia say that it was more than it was last year. I wonder if the military got more money this year than they

had last year. Certainly the estimate for the Geological Survey is more, and they have already transferred $10,000,000 from the defense agency over to this Bureau. That is how essential and necessary it is. It is needed to cooperate with the $66,000,000,000 we are going to spend on national defense. The Army and Navy are forever asking this Bureau for maps and charts, and other groups are hunting for minerals that are essential. What if the increase was for six, eight, or ten million? They got $10,000,000 transferred from the defense agency to this Bureau, and before they are finished they are going to have about $15,000,000 transferred. Why do they want to take $4,000,000 or $3,000,000 or even $1,000,000 out of this appropriation? That is why I am asking you to pay attention to this part of the program.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Did the gentleman listen to the reading of the amendment?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It was not to take out $4,000,000 or $3,000,000, it was to take out $1,000,000.

Mr. KIRWAN. To take out $1,000,000, but I am telling the gentleman they have transferred, $10,000,000 to this agency. That is how badly this agency is needed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman was talking as though the author of the amendment had not considered what figures were in the bill. The gentleman is farther off on the amendment than I am on the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. It does not make much difference whether you ask for a four, three, two, or one million cut.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to agree with my chairman. Dr. Wrather, Director of the Geological Survey, is in my opinion the most able and most honest administrator we have in Government today.

Dr. Wrather has been very economical-minded in his request for funds. They have a great job to do in Alaska, and the geological service has a great job to do in all the fields in that department. We are in favor of rewarding a man like that and giving him what he needs to do a job in these critical times. I have voted for every amendment which was offered here today to cut this bill since the bill has been on the floor, but I cannot vote to cut this agency which I think is very important to the defense of our Nation, and because I know that Dr. Wrather is a great American and would not ask for any more than he needs.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I do not think there is a man in the House who would equip a soldier—whether it is one or two or three million men that we will have in the Army when we get through with it—with guns, then refuse to give him bullets. That is what you are doing here. You are refusing to give ammunition to the Government of the United States and the men who are working in national defense activities by trying to cut this appropriation.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from Georgia, as I know from observing him, is very conscientious. However, I cannot help but call his attention to the fact that the committee I am serving on has had some little difficulty in holding down appropriations because of the survey which was made to increase the district attorneys tremendously in the District of Columbia. I realize that that is somewhat foreign to this subject, but I merely wanted to throw that in because he has made a study of that and a very thorough study and he realizes of course the importance of increasing the number of personnel there. At the same time he has not had the opportunity to go into this as fully as this committee has. This committee, headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], is a very conscientious and sincere committee. I am sure if they could see where they could make reductions without impairing the defense of this country they would have curtailed the expenditure on this particular item.

Therefore, I think it would be very wise for the House to go along with the splendid work that this committee has done as a matter of national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 47, noes 53.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 66, noes 64.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 117 passenger motor vehicles, of which 80 shall be for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations; and payment of compensation and expenses (not to exceed $10,000) of the person appointed by the President to participate as the representative of the United States in the administration of the compact consented to by the act of May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such representative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 23, lines 22 and 23, strike out "of which 80 shall be."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a perfecting amendment to carry out an amendment previously agreed to, limiting the number of motor vehicles that can be purchased.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. Permit the Chair to state that during the consideration of the bill last week the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered four amendments which were considered en bloc, by unanimous consent. One of the amendments had reference to the language in lines 21 and 22 on page 23.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has offered an amendment to make the language conform to the action of the committee in adopting the so-called Williams amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I explain to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that last week the House agreed to an amendment which would limit all automobile purchases to replacements only. This amendment is simply a perfecting amendment to make the language throughout the bill conform to the amendment adopted by the House last week.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available until expended, $1,250,000: *Provided*, That the unused balance of the contract authorization of $15,000,000 granted in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946, under the head "Synthetic liquid fuels," is hereby rescinded.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language contained in line 19, page 25, beginning with the word "*Provided*," and continuing through lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, inclusive, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Page 25, line 19, after the word "expended", strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$3,850,000 of which $2,600,000 is be used for the construction and equipment of an experimental station in or near Morgantown, W. Va., as authorized by act of Congress, Public Law 812, Eighty-first Congress."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment, for in the Eighty-first Congress an authorization

was made for this experimental laboratory. There is located at Morgantown at the present time a small experimental laboratory, one of the first that was erected in the Nation. It has 66 full-time employees, 66 of the best scientists in the Nation plus several part-time employees. The laboratory does not duplicate any other work carried on in the synthetic-fuels research program and consists mainly of basic fundamental research work.

The Bureau of Mines made a survey in 1949 of their whole program and came up with the recommendation that a permanent plant be placed in Morgantown, W. Va. This was recommended to the Bureau of the Budget, and the budget approved it, and it was authorized by the Eighty-first Congress, Public Law 812.

When the Bureau of Mines asked for an appropriation the Bureau of the Budget said "No"; and this is the reason it was cut out: for political expediency alone. And I want to say that Members of this House used their influence to see that this appropriation was cut out even to the detriment of the national safety.

I do not blame the members of this committee because they are only following the dictates of the Bureau of the Budget, but I can say that the Bureau of Mines has stated that the present site is inadequate for the work that is now being carried on and that it is necessary to the present mobilization program. To the Members of the House I would like to say that with our present known oil supplies we have reserves for only 13 years at the present rate of consumption, and that rate is increasing daily. We are running behind 1,000,000 barrels a day. That is the figure of the Bureau of Mines. Ninety-eight percent of our fuel reserves in this Nation are in coal. I would just like to bring this to the attention of the House now. I would like to read headlines from recent newspaper articles: "New Premier of Iran takes over; plans to push foreigners out—Mossadegh is expected to seize British oil firm in few hours"; "Refined pretext—Red envoy visits strife-torn Iran oilfield on vacation."

In time of war or in time of great emergency should our oil supplies to the south be cut off either by submarine or sabotage and with our shortage of oil we would be in a very serious situation. It is our responsibility to see that we have oil. This is a basic, fundamental research station to make liquid fuel from coal. The responsibility can rest on no one's shoulders but those of present Members of Congress. Only history can tell, if we do get into an all-out conflict, whether we are right or wrong; but I believe, weighing it in the balance, we had better be on the right side, because the Bureau of Mines approved this during peacetime and they said when peacetime comes again, it is going to be placed there. If we need it in peacetime, surely we need it in an emergency.

Again I say, let us not be subject to the old saying of the last war, too little, too late.

The synthetic liquid fuels program is an essential one in our present mobilization set-up and I would hate to see history prove that we needed it, and did not have it, and that the responsibility rested upon the Members of this Congress for not supplying it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I make the announcement that the next order of business after disposition of the pending bill will be the wheat-for-India bill.

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. PRIEST (at the request of Mr. COOLEY) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 271) to authorize transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE, of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a resolution to establish a National Commission on Security and Peace. I ask unanimous consent that this may be printed in the RECORD at this point together with a supporting statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND PEACE, INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL REECE

Resolved, That Congress hereby creates and establishes a National Commission on Security and Peace, to examine the soundness, direction, and effectiveness of the foreign policy of the United States, and the military strategy now being employed in support therefor.

The National Commission on Security and Peace shall be charged with recommending to Congress and the President a sound foreign policy, together with an integrated military policy to support it, within the limits of American resources.

The Commission shall be composed of 6 Senators appointed by the Vice President; 6 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker; and 6 members appointed by the President of the United States, representing the Nation at large. The 12 Members appointed from the Congress shall be divided equally between the two major parties; the six members appointed by the President shall include the ex-President of the United States; and such generals of the Army; admirals of the fleet, and the Air Force generals, who are not now performing active service.

Appropriations not exceeding $100,000 are hereby authorized for the necessary expenses of the Commission.

All executive papers, files, and documents pertinent to the Commission's inquiry shall be made available by the several departments and agencies of the Federal establishment upon request of the Chairman.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have suffered 70,000 American casualties in Korea. The purpose of my resolution is to find out where we are headed, both in foreign policy and military program.

The American people demand a definition of foreign policy in terms they can understand. They likewise demand a restatement of our national military policy consonant with the ideals and traditions of constitutional government.

Impeachment of administrative officers would serve no constructive national purpose until the people have before them a clear and understandable statement of both foreign and military policies.

This Nation has contributed more than $30,000,000,000 since the end of World War II in grants, gifts, and loans overseas. This, we were told repeatedly, was the price of peace. American taxpayers gladly paid that price, but peace did not come. Instead, we now face a military budget approaching $60,000,000,000 a year, plus an additional $10,000,000,000 for overseas grants, gifts, and loans.

Our present policy has failed to deter war, it has failed to stop the spread of communism, and the struggle may continue indefinitely, exhausting our economy.

A truly bipartisan foreign policy may be achieved only by honest debate. We have never had such a foreign policy since the end of the World War II, in 1945. Secret diplomacy can never command the patriotic support of the American people. Appeasement of godless communism never will be tolerated by the American citizens.

The publicly stated purpose of American foreign policy since 1945 has been to contain Communist aggression. Since that time the Communist dominion has expanded from 200,000,000 to 800,000,000 population. The people ask openly, "Has American foreign policy been betrayed in high places?"

America's effort was the decisive factor in winning a complete and overwhelming victory for free government in World War II. In that war America furnished 14,000,000 men and $400,000,000,000 in material and supplies.

When victory was achieved, this Nation occupied a position of strength and

world leadership. We were looked to for support, guidance, and inspiration by all of our allies, and there was no nation in a position at that time to challenge the peace, to endanger our security, or to threaten the cause of free government at any time in the foreseeable future. In six short years that position of strength and leadership has been lost. During those 6 years, America has followed a foreign policy whereby Soviet Russia and its Communist satellites have risen to a position of unaccustomed power and strength. That power today despises and seeks to humiliate free government the world around.

The American appeasement and surrender began under Alger Hiss at Yalta, and was reaffirmed at Potsdam. Under this policy, by appeasement or otherwise, we made the following concessions, at Potsdam and elsewhere, without which it would have been impossible for Russia and her satellites to have risen to a position in which she could with impunity ignore and defy the whole morality of international law and freedom:

First. Made agreements, or acquiesced in agreements, which gave to Russia or enabled her to dominate the Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Danzig, Prussia, and all-weather, year-around, seaport of Konigsberg; the central territory of East Germany with its uranium mines and precision-instruments works, Berlin, and Poland; the Balkan states of Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Hungary.

Second. Adoption of Morgenthau plan for reducing Germany to a pastoral state and destroying its industrial capacity and abolishing the whole civil government of Germany.

Third. Agreed for Russia to remove from Germany and Austria for its own use several billions of dollars worth of key industrial plant facilities and machinery together with the scientists, engineers, and technical information for building up war industry. At the same time, we, ourselves, during the past decade, furnished Russia and its satellites, direct and indirect, commercial and governmental, more than $16,000,000,000 more in raw materials, supplies, and equipment without which her war potential would have been delayed many years.

Fourth. Gave Russia 10 snorkel submarines and the snorkel plant at Hamburg as well as the whole snorkel "assembly" line along the Oder and Elbe Rivers together with parts that lay in the satellite plants from which, it is estimated, a fleet of 300 submarines was built which now constitutes Russia's most threatening war arm.

Fifth. After Japan had submitted an offer to surrender on substantially the same terms which were later accepted, negotiated with Russia to enter the war against Japan which then gave it an excuse to sit in on the peace conference as an equal partner without having contributed anything toward victory in the Pacific.

Sixth. In violation of previous commitments, gave all of Manchuria, the industrial part of China, to Russia.

Seventh. In addition, gave Russia, in the East, Outer Mongolia, Sakhalin Islands, Port Arthur, the Kuriles, and Northern Korea which contains most of Korea's water power and industry.

Eighth. Sent to China a mission to negotiate with the Nationalists to force the Communists into the Nationalist Government and, when the Nationalists declined to do so, ceased sending them the support which Congress had authorized, and thus undermined the Nationalist Government, preparing the way for the Communists with Russian support, to take over all China.

Ninth. Failed to arm South Korea or to send it the support authorized by Congress.

Tenth. When Ambassador Hurley sent back from China 11 members of his staff for sympathizing with the Communists, they were assigned positions of greater importance in the State Department, one of them being made head of the Far East Division, and another the assistant for that division.

Eleventh. As the conviction of Alger Hiss, William Remington, Marzani, and the various atomic spies, as well as other Communists, indicates, Communists and their fellow travelers were permitted to insinuate themselves into positions of trust and influence in the State Department, the atomic energy project, and other departments which had a close relationship to defense and foreign affairs.

Today, there is widespread uncertainty about our foreign policy, or lack of confidence that we have a definite foreign policy and an integrated defense program which will enable us to resist the Communist threat and gain a true and lasting peace.

The present continuous state of emergency and threat of war, without a program to bring our effort to a successful conclusion, is exhausting our economy, which, after all, is the one last bulwark not only for our own liberty and security but the cause of free government everywhere. It is essential to the security of our country and the peace of the world that Congress have the full facts of our foreign and military policy, that it may give the American people a program which will be within the limits of our economy, within the terms of the Constitution, and harmonious with our American ideals of peace and freedom under law.

GENERAL MacARTHUR'S INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled by General MacArthur's brazen disregard for the truth when, in his Chicago speech on April 26, he blamed the slaughter of American boys in Korea on a national policy he called unrealistic.

The truth is that the gross incompetence and inefficiency of General MacArthur's intelligence, headed by Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, was directly responsible for the frightful and needless slaughter and horrible death by freezing of thousands of American soldiers in Korea last December. In those 2 weeks in December our casualties were perhaps greater than the total of the previous 5 months of the war in Korea.

I do not know of a single instance in modern military history where a main striking force was ordered to advance in such a spread-out fashion in enemy territory by a command which was so unbelievably ignorant of enemy disposition, striking power, and intentions as was the case last December. The American soldiers were ordered into what amounted literally to a valley of death for thousands of them. Only the courage and superior mechanization of our troops enabled them to avoid a complete annihilation and to fight their way out of the trap. In any case, it was one of the most disastrous military set-backs received by our forces in American history.

The shocking incompetence of MacArthur's intelligence staff first came to light last June when he had no more idea of the North Korean military potential or intentions than we did at home, 6,000 miles away. Later, in the "home for Christmas" offensive, both French and British intelligence warned, on the basis of their information, that the Chinese might strike if our troops approached the Yalu River reservoirs, but MacArthur ignored these warnings.

I have had enough experience with guerrillas behind enemy lines in northern Yugloslavia during World War II to have some idea of what can or cannot be done in this type of campaign. I know that it is possible to infiltrate agents into enemy territory and obtain a reasonable knowledge of enemy build-ups and to calculate the possibility and nature of a sudden offensive.

It is a fact that North Korean agents, and later whole combat guerrilla units, constantly infiltrated into South Korea and kept their command informed of all developments. I know that it would likewise have been possible to send South Korean agents into North Korea to obtain needed information upon which to base our military decisions.

But apparently General MacArthur and Major General Willoughby's intelligence was confined to presumptions and guesses made in the sheltered vantage point of Tokyo rather than field intelligence work. It was their duty to secure proper information and they failed in their duty.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of men in combat is always terrible—but the needless waste of brave men in unsound military moves based on faulty intelligence due to grossest kind of incompetence and stupidity, is more than terrible. Official reports show we have lost over 62,000 Americans killed, wounded, captured and missing in Korea—inasmuch as official reports are always behind time and the total does not include such noncombat injuries as frostbite, it is probable that our actual casualties today exceed 75,000. The horrible thing about this situation is that thousands of these men would be alive today if it had not been for MacArthur's ill-fated drive to the Yalu last December.

It occurs to me that Congress should make a full investigation of MacArthur's conduct of the war, and his colossal military blunder of last December. It also seems to me that special emphasis should be placed on the examination of the inefficiency and incompetence of Major General Willoughby, upon whose intelligence work MacArthur relied, and which makes them jointly responsible for the mistakes of last winter.

It is my understanding that both General MacArthur and Major General Willoughby are free to appear before congressional committees, and that MacArthur has already been scheduled to appear before both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. It seems to me that the following questions should be put to both of them:

First. Why did Willoughby and MacArthur completely underestimate the strength of the North Korean armies last June?

Second. Why did these two officers miscalculate the strength, striking power, and intentions of the Chinese armies when our troops were ordered to advance to the Yalu last December?

Third. Why was the advice of French and British intelligence ignored completely when they warned that the Chinese would attack if our troops were ordered to move to the Yalu?

Fourth. Why did MacArthur throw the flower of the American Army of the Far East into an indefensible and untenable military position during subzero weather with over-extended supply lines and without proper equipment last December?

Fifth. How will it be possible to cut American casualties now being suffered in a limited war by extending the scope of the war into China?

These are some of the questions that I would like to see asked, and I am sure that other Members of Congress share my desire to obtain frank and honest answers to them. We have a right to explanations for the obvious incompetence of General Willoughby's intelligence staff, and I hope that some explanation will soon be forthcoming.

THE REPUBLICANS MUST LEAD THE WAY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, our country is in a grave and serious plight, and every Member of the House is aware of this fact The people back home know it, too. The United States is sliding into financial and economic disunity because of the stupid and arrogant giving, lending, and spending policies of the present administration.

If we are on our way to financial ruin, it is because our country does not have, and has not had for years, responsible or capable leadership.

I say right now that the No. 1 national leader is Dean Acheson, and the No. 2 leader is Harry Truman. I repeat—Acheson is leader No. 1, and Truman is leader No. 2. Acheson's power and control of the President is not confined to the foreign field—he is the No. 1 man on all sides.

It has been demonstrated time and again that the President will not permit any of the capable Democrats in his party, who are aware of his perilous course, to assume positions of leadership or influence. He has gathered around him and been controlled by crack-pot theorists, planners, and schemers who know and think only of how to spend, give, and waste the hard-earned tax dollars of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans must assert themselves. The country demands it. The tremendous acclaim with which the people from all parts of the country received General MacArthur proves that the people have repudiated Acheson and Truman.

It is difficult for the Republicans to assume leadership of foreign affairs because the Secretary of State dominates our foreign Ambassadors and from all indications he dominates General Marshall, the Secretary of National Defense, and General Bradley, the Chief of Staff. But the Republicans can and must do something about the serious domestic situation. I mean the high cost of living and the extravagances of the Truman administration. The people are complaining; they are being hurt.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Republicans in Congress are alive to their responsibility toward our country. The following are five serious problems that they should seek to solve, and should attempt it immediately:

First. The country is spending entirely too much money. In many cases it is disgraceful.

Second. The country is giving away too much money. Most of the activities of the foreign-aid programs must be stopped.

Third. The country is lending too much money. The RFC is an example, and it should be abolished.

Fourth. Every patriotic American favors adequate appropriations for national defense, but every patriotic American is opposed to extravagance and wastefulness, of which there are many shocking examples.

Fifth. The Secretary of the Treasury and other high Government officials complain against inflation but lose sight of the fact that the Government itself causes more inflation than any other five influences or agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I expect within the next few days to seriously discuss on the floor of the House each of the topics that I have just mentioned. It is my hope that the Republican Party will militantly tackle each of these problems. Ours is the greatest country in the world. It made its greatest strides under Republican administrations and while following Republican principles and policies. Our tremendous depressive national debt, our constant fear of destructive war, and our national disunity and lack of confidence are the result of the Roosevelt-Truman New Deal policies.

The people are demanding a change. This is our opportunity. The Republicans must lead the way.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week for 15 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S SPEECH

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have had so many thousands of requests to have the complete marvelous speech delivered by General MacArthur on the floor of the House printed as a separate document. I am introducing a bill that would authorize the Public Printer to publish the necessary number of copies of that speech.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by publishing a resolution adopted by the Houston Post of the American Legion supporting the position of General MacArthur on far eastern military policy calling for an investigation of the State Department and the removal of Secretary Acheson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from Walter R. Mybeck, director, division of public works and supply, State of Indiana.

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. Justice Douglas.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Rocky Mountain News of April 25.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, also to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain correspondence between Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, and the American Medical Association, together with certain excerpts.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances; in one to include extraneous matter, and in the other to include two resolutions passed by the General Court of Massachusetts.

Mr. KING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an excerpt from a radio broadcast.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio broadcast.

Mr. McGRATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include a radio broadcast.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in a Chicago newspaper.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a document entitled "Concerning Communism—A Menace and a Challenge" which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $184.50.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an article appearing in the Washington Post and in the other to include a resolution or statement from the executive committee of the Slovak League of America.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article published by the Polish-American Congress which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $191.34.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous material.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MILLER of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include three editorials appearing in the Buffalo Evening News.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in six instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Danville Commercial News.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the National Home Garden and Food Preservation Program.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MEADER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 day, May 2, 1951, on account of official business.

To Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. COLE of New York, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. LANTAFF, for Tuesday, May 1, 1951, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

414. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting the amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts, pursuant to Public Law 510, Eighty-first Congress (H. Doc. No. 121); to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

415. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 122); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

416. A letter from the Assistant to the President, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the Official Report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year 1950; to the Committee on House Administration.

417. A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the Official Report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1950; to the Committee on House Administration.

418. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to exclude certain teachers, policemen, and firemen in the service of the Panama Canal from the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McCARTHY: Committee on Agriculture. Part 2, minority views on H. R. 3283. A bill to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 326, pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2948. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraud by radio; with amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1026. A bill to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1739. A bill authorizing an annual appropriation to provide more adequate facilities for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease in the Territory of Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2478. A bill to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. S. 271. An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes (Rept. No. 401). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 629. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mabel Monroe Bonds; with amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 630. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Richard James Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 631. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk; without amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 651. A bill to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California; without amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 964. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Percival H. Glenn; without amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1129. A bill to validate a conveyance of certain lands by the Central Pacific Railway Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to the Union Ice Co. and Edward Barbera; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1853. A bill to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2349. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3215. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Eloise White Bear; with amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 3899. A bill to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 3900. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Fifty-second Annual National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in New York, N. Y., from August 26, 1951, through August 31, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 3901. A bill to provide reduced postage on air-mail parcel post sent to members of the Armed Forces of the United States in certain areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3902. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 3903. A bill to place jurisdiction of natural-gas pipelines constructed in part or in whole across public lands, including the forest reserves of the United States, in the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 3904. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the National Assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Savannah, Ga., September 19 to September 21, inclusive, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3905. A bill for the relief of dependents of persons killed in collision of airplanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3906. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to restrict the sale on credit of beverages, except beer and light wines, not consumed on the premises where sold; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 3907. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to widows and children of persons who served in the active military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3908. A bill to provide for the deportation of aliens for violation of Federal marijuana laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3909. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to provide that the awarding of scholarships to American citizens for study in foreign countries shall be based on population; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3910. A bill for the relief of dependents of persons killed in collision of airplanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3911. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 3912. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain local educational agencies for loss of tax revenue caused by Federal acquisition of real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 3913. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a domestic water supply system for the north unit of the Deschutes reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 3914. A bill to provide for the design, development, and construction of an aircraft suitable for local-service airlines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. J. Res. 247. Joint resolution to provide burial and hospitalization benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. Res. 214. Resolution directing the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission, in its organization, in the selection of personnel, and in the conduct of its activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. Res. 215. Resolution expressing it to be the sense of the House of Representatives that Secretary of State Dean Acheson should be removed from office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Res. 216. Resolution authorizing an inquiry by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives into the conduct of military and diplomatic operations in Korea and on the continent of Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to the recent curtailment of metals to industries and businesses in the State of Rhode Island, including such raw materials as aluminum, copper, steel, zinc, and pig iron, and also scrap machinery, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session on April 19, 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to needed commodities from other countries available to the United States at prices which our people and our Government can afford to pay, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session on April 19, 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution memorializing Congress with relation to the passage of Senate bill 355 and House bill 244, providing for the elimination of the six lowest salary grades for postal clerks and carriers and providing for a 17-percent increase in the annual salary of post-office employees receiving less than $5,000 annually, passed by the general assembly at the January session on April 25, 1951; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to temporary sale of water for San Joaquin Valley grasslands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, requesting enactment of House bill 244 and Senate bill 355 into law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, requesting aid and assistance to the States in their efforts to force certain fathers to fulfill their obligations to their children and society by passing House bill 1403; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, requesting passage of House bill 244 and Senate bill 355; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, expressing appreciation for assistance rendered to Hawaii in appropriating funds for study and control of oriental fruitfly pest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 3915. A bill for the relief of Daniel Aloysius Shawhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3916. A bill for the relief of Roderick McLennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3917. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Marcella Mentz Wicks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3918. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Marcella Mentz Wicks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 3919. A bill for the relief of Derek Edmund Creswell Eyres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3920. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gago Santana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3921. A bill for the relief of Polly Anne Caldwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 3922. A bill for the relief of Barbara Ann Koppius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3923. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle A. Segar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3924. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kyoichi Iwasa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 3925. A bill for the relief of Victor Kozlowski (also known as Wiktor Kozlowski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3926. A bill for the relief of Virgine Zartarian (also known as Vergin Zartarian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3927. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Tax Court of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the United States against the Frank M. Hill Machine Co., Inc., of Walpole, Mass.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3928. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Mario Mattera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3929. A bill for the relief of Olildes Vito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

259. By Mr. BRAMER: Petition of members of Post Z, Indiana Division of the Travelers Protective Association of America opposing any Federal increase in gasoline taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

260. Also, petition of members of Post T, Indiana Division of the Travelers Protective Association of America opposing any Federal increase in gasoline taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

261. By Mr. HOPE: Resolution of C. E. Bodenhamer and the Congregation of the Baptist Church of Alden, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation to divert grain and fruit now used for the manufacture of liquor and malt beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

262. Also, resolution of Noel A. Woods and the Congregation of the Baptist Church of Wilmore, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation to divert grain and fruit now used for the manufacture of liquor and malt beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

263. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Benjamin Gibbons, president Universal African Nationalist Movement, Inc., New York City, N. Y., relative to a statement in connection with Senate bill 389; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, whose love is unfailing and whose mercies are new every morning: At this wayside shrine of prayer, hallowed across the long years, we lift up our souls unto Thee:

"We come unto our fathers' God,
Their rock is our salvation;
The eternal arms, their dear abode,
We make our habitation.
We seek Thee as Thy saints have sought
In every generation."

May our adoration and gratitude be so united with our sense of duty and devotion that we may be Thy servants in this desperate time. Forgive us, we beseech Thee, that so often we have fallen short of the mark of our high calling. We have lived in this world and have forgotten that it is Thine, we have received Thy gifts and ignored the giver. Too often we have been selfish and self-centered; have made life minister to our own ends and purposes; have forgotten that those who seek to save their life lose it, while those who surrender it in service and sacrifice find life abundant. Minister to our inward needs this day, we beseech Thee. Grant us faith to crowd out fear, hope to overthrow despair, comfort adequate for sorrow, and strength sufficient for our temptations and our tasks. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 1, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 320. An act to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service;

H. R. 896. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara Raffoer Droesse;

H. R. 961. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospara Dunikowski;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton;

H. R. 1103. An act for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes;

H. R. 1415. An act for the relief of Gabriele Gildo Falvo Citrigno;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Rosario Garcia Jimeno;

H. R. 1593. An act for the relief of Charles E. Maulden;

H. R. 1613. An act to amend section 2883 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Sabow;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Joe Tortolini;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of Henry Kolish;

H. R. 2107. An act for the relief of Edward M. Chapman, Roland P. Davis, and the Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York;

H. R. 2204. An act for the relief of Lamar Calloway;

H. R. 2207. An act for the relief of Numa A. Winstead;

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Ethel Martha Quinn;

H. R. 2746. An act to amend section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 2807. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski;

H. R. 2929. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles;

H. R. 3141. An act for the relief of Evelyn Reichardt;

H. R. 3217. An act for the relief of the Peerless Casualty Co. and of Charles E. Nelson and Irwin I. Main; and

H. R. 3401. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be allowed to transact routine business without debate, and that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] may have the floor thereafter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SURVEY OF OPERATIONS OF GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT PROGRAM

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report based upon a survey of Government procurement since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF DISPLACED PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of Displaced Persons, together with a list furnishing detailed information concerning such displaced persons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Cynthia Kirpalani Farr nee Cynthia Dick from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on August 15, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER FORT PECK PROJECT ACT

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations under the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Deposit

Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

TABLES OF BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 128

"Resolution relative to temporary sale of water for San Joaquin Valley grasslands

"Whereas the diversion of the San Joaquin River at Friant Dam has caused a condition of extreme drought in the San Joaquin Valley grasslands; and

"Whereas thousands of beef cattle now grazing on those lands will be threatened with destruction, if water is not immediately made available to relieve the drought conditions; and

"Whereas this disaster could be averted if arrangements could be made for the sale of water for those lands, on a temporary basis, by the United States Bureau of Reclamation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Commissioner of Reclamation is respectfully urged to arrange for a sale, on a temporary basis, of the water necessary to avert the impending disaster in the San Joaquin Valley grasslands; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Commissioner of Reclamation and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Resolution 52

"Whereas there is now before the Congress of the United States, Senate bill 355 and House bill 244, which bills provide for a salary adjustment for post office employees; and

"Whereas the newer employees in the postal service, a majority of whom are veterans of World War II, have to work for years at substandard wages to reach a salary level commensurate with the effort and educational standard required for postal duty: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the sixty-seventh general assembly, That in view of the present mounting cost of living, that postal employees be provided, insofar as it is practicable with the means to live according to accepted American standards; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States hereby respectfully is memorialized to enact House bill 244 and Senate bill 355 into law; and be it further

"Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of Illinois.

"Adopted by the senate April 25, 1951.

"SHERWOOD DUN,
"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 41

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation providing for a new post office building in the county of Kauai

"Whereas it is essential that the people of Kauai have adequate, modern post office buildings to service their postal needs; and

"Whereas the United States post office at Waimea, county of Kauai, does not now have the necessary facilities to adequately satisfy the post office needs of the people in this area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-sixth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby requested to enact legislation providing for the purchase and remodeling of a building or the construction of a new building for a post office at Waimea, county of Kauai, and appropriating sufficient funds therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Postmaster General, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Conference To Eliminate Daylight Saving Time, Meyersdale, Pa., signed by Eber Cockley, secretary, relating to the spending of corporation excess profits to influence the daylight-saving controversy; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by 75 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the enactment of legislation to place a tax on meat; to the Committee on Finance.

A memorandum in the nature of a petition from the Slovak League of America, prepared at Washington, D. C., relating to the independence of Slovakia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Newspaper Post, No. 144, the American Legion, relating to the removal of the element of partisanship from decisions on foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Quota Club of Monroe, La., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted at a public meeting sponsored by the UNESCO Council, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to send food grain to India; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HUNT (for Mr. KEFAUVER), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 677. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; with amendments (Rept. No. 308).

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of March 1951, and in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FEBRUARY-MARCH 1951, AND PAY, JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1951

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

According to monthly personnel reports for March 1951 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In March numbered—	In February numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February was—	In January was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,364,070	2,307,904	+56,166	$627,557	$669,636	−$42,079
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,213,996	1,208,226	+5,770	331,084	356,881	−25,797
2. National Military Establishment	1,150,074	1,099,678	+50,396	296,473	312,755	−16,282
Within the National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,115	2,080	+35	783	910	−127
Department of the Army	492,670	475,879	+16,791	119,720	127,182	−7,462
Department of the Air Force	229,680	217,241	+12,439	56,995	58,562	−1,567
Department of the Navy	425,609	404,478	+21,131	118,975	126,101	−7,126

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1951, and comparison with February 1951, and pay for February 1951, and comparison with January 1951*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	January	February	Increase	Decrease	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	21,987	19,128		2,859	72,891	73,905	1,014	
Commerce [1] [2]	18,829	17,333		1,496	58,233	58,731	498	
Interior	17,919	16,608		1,311	57,324	57,810	486	
Justice	11,482	10,484		998	29,241	29,644	403	
Labor	2,439	2,284		155	7,585	7,656	71	
Post Office	132,037	129,603		2,434	497,802	497,323		479
State	8,717	7,605		1,112	26,363	26,778	415	
Treasury	30,634	27,203		3,431	89,561	91,428	1,867	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	143	124		19	290	286		4
Bureau of the Budget	270	239		31	526	527	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	18	16		2	69	73	4	
National Security Council [3]	10	9		1	18	19	1	
National Security Resources Board	227	153		74	237	186		51
Council of Economic Advisers	25	22		3	39	46	7	
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	4	4			19	18		1
Emergency agencies (1950-51):								
Defense Production Administration	1	77	76		383	415	32	
Defense Transport Administration	22	41	19		125	166	41	
Economic Stabilization Agency	45	856	811		2,545	4,748	1,803	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	100	138	38		297	442	145	
Office of Defense Mobilization	9	20	11		58	69	11	
President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights					9	7		2
President's Materials Policy Commission		5	5		18	27	9	
Subversive Activities Control Board	11	11			19	20	1	
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	121	138	17		348	355	7	
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,745	1,788	43		5,207	5,239	32	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	9	9			14	14		
Office of the Housing Expediter	93	850		73	2,491	2,472		19
Philippine Alien Property Administration	10	[4] 10			57	[4] 57		
Philippine War Damage Commission	34	24		10	55	55		
War Claims Commission	36	42	6		118	134	16	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	71	67		4	664	671	7	
Atomic Energy Commission	2,308	1,947		361	5,289	5,329	40	
Civil Aeronautics Board	269	230		39	550	544		6
Civil Service Commission	1,251	1,127		154	3,816	3,925	109	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	70	61		9	128	129	1	
Federal Communications Commission	529	459		70	1,214	1,217	3	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	433	371		62	1,063	1,056		7
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	202	176		26	345	356	11	
Federal Power Commission	328	285		43	731	735	4	
Federal Security Agency [5]	[6] 10,760	9,498		1,271	34,844	35,107	263	
Federal Trade Commission	304	264		40	637	673	36	
General Accounting Office	2,591	2,208		383	6,943	6,920		23
General Services Administration	7,952	7,096		856	28,103	28,557	454	
Government Printing Office	2,717	2,390		327	7,326	7,397	71	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,142	4,739		403	14,021	13,846		175
Indian Claims Commission	7	7			11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	886	786		100	2,120	2,144	24	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,693	2,439		254	7,645	7,630		15
National Capital Housing Authority	[6] 95	83		12	325	324		1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	2	2			7	7		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	6	4		2	10	16	6	
National Gallery of Art	90	80		10	324	326	2	
National Labor Relations Board	589	521		68	1,450	1,576	126	
National Mediation Board	62	55		7	120	119		1
National Science Foundation					19	19		
Panama Canal	3,203	3,222	19		20,715	20,349		366
Railroad Retirement Board	695	600		95	2,069	2,081	12	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,548	[4] 1,300		248	3,141	[4] 2,899		242
Securities and Exchange Commission	489	426		63	1,052	1,045		7
Selective Service System	1,600	1,466		134	8,067	8,218	151	
Smithsonian Institution	188	162		26	585	580		5
Soldiers' Home	155	112		43	735	735		
Tariff Commission	105	90		15	210	207		3
Tax Court of the United States	58	61	3		131	127		4
Tennessee Valley Authority	5,278	5,060		218	15,877	16,286	409	
Veterans' Administration	56,350	48,857		7,493	185,997	184,585		1,412
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	356,881	331,084	1,048	26,845	1,208,226	1,213,996	8,593	2,823
Net change, excluding National Military Establishment			25,797				5,770	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [7]	910	783		127	2,080	2,115	35	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	116,133	109,183		6,950	429,318	444,956	15,638	
Outside continental United States	11,049	10,537		512	46,561	47,714	1,153	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	53,298	52,089		1,209	190,721	202,770	12,049	
Outside continental United States	5,264	4,906		358	26,520	26,910	390	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	117,963	111,697		6,256	374,089	394,048	19,959	
Outside continental United States	8,148	7,278		870	30,389	31,561	1,172	
Total, National Military Establishment	312,755	296,473		16,282	1,099,678	1,150,074	50,396	
Net change, National Military Establishment			16,282				50,396	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	669,636	627,557	1,048	43,127	2,307,904	2,364,070	58,989	2,823
Net change, including National Military Establishment			42,079				56,166	

[1] Includes 2,956 employees of the National Production Authority, an increase of 931 over the February figure of 2,025.
[2] March figure is exclusive of 1,150 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[3] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] Estimated.
[5] Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[6] Revised on basis of later information.
[7] Includes 220 employees assigned to Munitions Board Cataloging Agency and 25 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1951, and comparison with February 1951*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	70,582	71,630	1,048	
Commerce [1 2]	54,751	55,154	403	
Interior	50,912	51,456	544	
Justice	28,737	29,123	386	
Labor	7,499	7,568	69	
Post Office	495,957	495,476		481
State	9,620	9,787	167	
Treasury	88,792	90,660	1,868	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	290	286		4
Bureau of the Budget	526	527	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	73	4	
National Security Council [3]	18	19	1	
National Security Resources Board	237	186		51
Council of Economic Advisers	39	46	7	
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	19	18		1
Emergency agencies (1950–51):				
Defense Production Administration	383	415	32	
Defense Transport Administration	125	166	41	
Economic Stabilization Agency	2,545	4,305	1,760	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	297	442	145	
Office of Defense Mobilization	58	69	11	
President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights	9	7		2
President's Materials Policy Commission	18	27	9	
Subversive Activities Control Board	19	20	1	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	125	125		
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,287	1,300	13	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	14	14		
Office of the Housing Expediter	2,464	2,445		19
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	[4] 2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	43	43		
War Claims Commission	105	121	16	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	18	18		
Atomic Energy Commission	5,284	5,324	40	
Civil Aeronautics Board	536	530		6
Civil Service Commission	3,813	3,922	109	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	127	129	2	
Federal Communications Commission	1,188	1,191	3	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,063	1,056		7
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	345	356	11	
Federal Power Commission	731	735	4	
Federal Security Agency [5]	34,507	34,758	251	
Federal Trade Commission	637	673	36	
Independent agencies—Continued				
General Accounting Office	6,943	6,920		23
General Services Administration	28,044	28,484	440	
Government Printing Office	7,326	7,397	71	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,920	13,743		177
Indians Claims Commission	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,120	2,144	24	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,645	7,630		15
National Capital Housing Authority	325	324		1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	7	7		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	10	16	6	
National Gallery of Art	324	326	2	
National Labor Relations Board	1,434	1,559	125	
National Mediation Board	120	119		1
National Science Foundation	19	19		
Panama Canal	625	613		12
Railroad Retirement Board	2,069	2,081	12	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	3,133	[6] 2,891		242
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,052	1,045		7
Selective Service System	7,827	7,981	154	
Smithsonian Institution	577	571		6
Soldiers' Home	735	735		
Tariff Commission	210	207		3
Tax Court of the United States	131	127		4
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,877	16,286	409	
Veterans' Administration	184,524	183,120		1,404
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,148,799	1,154,558	8,225	2,466
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			5,759	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,080	2,115	35	
Department of the Army	429,318	444,956	15,638	
Department of the Air Force	190,721	202,770	12,049	
Department of the Navy	374,089	394,048	19,959	
Total, National Military Establishment	996,208	1,043,889	47,681	
Net increase, National Military Establishment			47,681	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	2,145,007	2,198,447	55,906	2,466
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			53,440	

[1] Includes 2,956 employees of the National Production Authority, an increase of 931 over the February figure of 2,025.
[2] March figure is exclusive of 1,150 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[3] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] Estimated.
[5] Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[6] Estimated.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1951, and comparison with February 1951*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	2,309	2,275		34
Commerce	3,482	3,577	95	
Interior	6,412	6,354		58
Justice	504	521	17	
Labor	86	88	2	
Post Office	1,845	1,847	2	
State	16,743	16,991	248	
Treasury	769	768		1
Emergency agencies (1950–51): Economic Stabilization Agency		43	43	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	223	230	7	
Economic Cooperation Administration	3,920	3,939	19	
Office of the Housing Expediter	27	27		
Philippine Alien Property Administration	55	[1] 55		
Philippine War Damage Commission	12	12		
War Claims Commission	13	13		
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	646	653	7	
Atomic Energy Commission	5	5		
Civil Aeronautics Board	14	14		
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1			1
Federal Communications Commission	26	26		
Federal Security Agency	337	349	12	
General Services Administration	59	73	14	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	101	103	2	
National Labor Relations Board	16	17	1	
Panama Canal	20,090	19,736		354
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8	[1] 8		
Selective Service System	240	237		3
Smithsonian Institution	8	9	1	
Veterans' Administration	1,473	1,465		8
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	59,427	59,438	470	459
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			11	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army	46,561	47,714	1,153	
Department of the Air Force	26,520	26,910	390	
Department of the Navy	30,389	31,561	1,172	
Total, National Military Establishment	103,470	106,185	2,715	
Net increase, National Military Establishment			2,715	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	162,897	165,623	3,185	459
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			2,726	

[1] Estimated.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1951, and comparison with February 1951*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Commerce	1,128	1,188	60	
Interior	2,945	3,225	280	
State	489	443		46
Treasury	8,696	8,982	286	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	128	129	1	
General Services Administration	166	155		11
Panama Canal	1,635	1,600		35
Tennessee Valley Authority	9,024	9,376	352	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	24,211	25,098	979	92
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			887	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	235,524	244,586	9,062	
Outside continental United States	26,191	27,068	877	
National Military Establishment—Continued				
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	108,501	115,296	6,795	
Outside continental United States	19,590	19,877	287	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	253,920	268,360	14,440	
Outside continental United States	23,495	24,449	954	
Total, National Military Establishment	667,221	699,636	32,415	
Net increase, National Military Establishment			32,415	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	691,432	724,734	33,394	92
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			33,302	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to mutual defense assistance program*

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In January was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	$9,248	$7,949	−$1,299	32,469	29,008	−3,461
Commerce Department	1		−1			
State Department	101	110	+9	252	237	−15
Economic Cooperation Administration	8	8		18	15	−3
Office of the Secretary of Defense	19	17	−2	44	44	
Department of the Army	7,734	6,579	−1,155	27,630	24,505	−3,125
Department of the Air Force	533	411	−122	1,293	1,173	−120
Department of the Navy	852	824	−28	3,232	3,034	−198

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government during the month of March increased 56,166, bringing the total to 2,364,070 employees.

This was the ninth consecutive month in which net increases had been reported in both civilian and military agencies.

MILITARY EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIANS

Civilian employment in the Military Establishment increased during the month at the rate of 1,625 a day. The increase during the 31 days of March totaled 50,396. Approximately 28,000 of the increase was in white-collar employees, and 32,000 was in industrial employment.

The post-World-War-II low point in civilian employment by the Military Establishment was reached in March 1950. In the year since that date the number of civilians employed by the Military Establishment has increased by 407,233. This would average (four-fifths of a civilian) nearly a civilian a minute, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for the full 365-day year.

Since inductions started in September 450,000 men have been drafted into the uniformed components of the Military Establishment. (Volunteers, and Reserves and National Guard men who have been called up would be in addition.)

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

The March increase in employment by the civilian agencies totaled 5,770, bringing the civilian agency total to 1,213,996. Approximately 3,000 of this increase was in the new emergency agencies, including an increase of 1,803 in employment by the Economic Stabilization Agency which is now employing 4,348. The nine new emergency agencies in March were employing approximately 30,000. The large users of manpower in this group were the ESA, and the National Production Authority with 2,956.

These figures have been developed in connection with employment reports for the month of March submitted by the 70 agencies of the executive branch to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN) (by request) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 25) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1423. A bill for the relief of Michiko Yamamori Wilder and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1424. A bill for the relief of George A. Sgouroudis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1425. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Okuni Kobayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1426. A bill for the relief of Yoshiyuki Mayeshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1427. A bill for the relief of Dr. Humphrey Warren Richard Fluckinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 320. An act to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service;

H. R. 1613. An act to amend section 2883 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; and

H. R. 2746. An act to amend section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 896. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara Raffoer Droesse;

H. R. 961. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospera Dunikowski;

H. R. 1103. An act for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes;

H. R. 1415. An act for the relief of Gabriele Gildo Falvo Citrigno;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Rosario Garcia Jimeno;

H. R. 1593. An act for the relief of Charles E. Maulden;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Sabow;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Joe Tortolini;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of Henry Kolish;

H. R. 2107. An act for the relief of Edward M. Chapman, Roland P. Davis, and the Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York;

H. R. 2204. An act for the relief of Lamar Calloway;

H. R. 2207. An act for the relief of Numa A. Winstead;

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Ethel Martha Quinn;

H. R. 2807. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski;

H. R. 3141. An act for the relief of Evelyn Reichardt; and

H. R. 3217. An act for the relief of the Peerless Casualty Co. and of Charles E. Nelson and Irwin I. Main; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3401. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton; and

H. R. 2929. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Statement prepared by him with respect to recent beef-roll-back order issued by the Office of Price Stabilization.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Editorial entitled "Keeping Faith With Thrift," published in the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal of Monday, April 16, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Letter from him to Edwin Christianson paying tribute to the Minnesota Farmers Union.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "Parity on Trial," written by Alfred D. Stedman and published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, dealing with farm-price parity.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Letter from Elton Atwater containing various questions to be propounded to General MacArthur.

By Mr. HUNT:

Editorial regarding the obligation of the Nation to veterans, written by R. F. MacPherson, editor of the Wyoming Eagle, and published in the April 20 edition of that newspaper.

By Mr. JENNER:

Article by Jim G. Lucas regarding conditions in the war in Korea, published in the Washington Daily News.

By Mr. JENNER:

Letter from an American officer in Tokyo, Japan, regarding conditions in the war in Korea.

By Mr. JENNER:

Letter from Senor M. Mora Doldan regarding the replacement of General MacArthur.

By Mr. JENNER:

Article entitled "The MacArthur Phenomenon," written by Frank Hanighen and published in Human Events.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "Ship Enhancement," published in the Washington Post of May 2, 1951, regarding enhancement of ship values.

By Mr. BENTON:

Editorial entitled "An Unbalanced Strategy," dealing with the MacArthur case, and one entitled "Senator Vandenberg's Greatness," both published in the May 5, 1951, issue of America (National Catholic Weekly Review).

By Mr. HILL:

Two reprints published by the International Latex Corp., the first in the Washington Post of April 27, 1951, including an editorial entitled "Get the Facts," originally printed in the Christian Science Monitor, and an editorial entitled "General Dawes," originally printed in the Wall Street Journal; the second reprint, published in the New York Times of May 1, 1951, containing an editorial entitled "Van Fleet's Inspiration," from the Washington Post, and an editorial entitled "Today's Global Struggle," from the Christian Science Monitor.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Statement by the Department of Labor regarding the aims and activities of the International Labor Organization toward the improvement of conditions throughout the world.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Editorial entitled "The Last Decoration," written by Judge Kenneth S. Shaw, and published in the Newport Guardian of April 19, 1951, having reference to the replacement of General MacArthur.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article on the subject Premise of Our Global Strategy—Strong Allies, written by James Reston and published in the New York Times on April 29, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Excerpt on Soviet cultural influence in North Korea from the fifth semiannual report of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Address on the subject The MacArthur Week by George E. Sokolsky, broadcast on April 22, 1951, over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Letter from Arthur Bliss Lane regarding the dismissal of General MacArthur, published in the New York Times, April 19, 1951.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Broadcast by Frank Kirkpatrick, on April 16, 1951, in reference to the dismissal of General MacArthur.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Broadcast by Frank Kirkpatrick on April 15, 1951, on United States policy in Asia.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Broadcast by Frank Kirkpatrick from Station WMAW on April 10, 1951, regarding an investigation into disloyalty in the State Department.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes on the subject of the boxcar shortage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. On several occasions I have discussed with the Senate the boxcar situation in the grain belt area of the Middle West.

On previous occasions it has been necessary for me to state that the boxcar situation was most critical, and I urged that constructive steps be taken to bring about relief. It may have been at that time that I seemed somewhat critical of the agencies involved. Today I wish to express my appreciation to some of our agencies for their excellent cooperation.

I am glad to report to the Senate that the boxcar supply generally, particularly in the western territory, is greatly improved.

The Association of American Railroads advises me that as of April 30 they are canceling orders calling for the fleet movement of boxcars to the western roads.

The peak boxcar shortage for this year was in the week of March 3, when the daily shortage averaged 27,244 cars, but during the week ending April 21 the daily boxcar shortage averaged 6,677, of which only 2,575 were in western territory.

During the recent winter months we had an insistent demand from mill and elevator operators in the grain area requesting cars needed to move grain on farms and in storage.

Despite the fact that they suffered two dislocations of car movement because of railroad strikes, the loadings for grain commodities for the first 15 weeks this year exceeded those for any comparable period in history, except that in 1947 grain and grain loadings were 3 percent above the figures for this year.

At present grain is moving currently without a car shortage, and there are no blocked elevators at the moment.

Earlier this year we had nearly 2,000 blocked elevators in the grain area.

We will soon be approaching the wheat harvest season in the grain producing area, and every effort is being made to place cars in that area for the movement of the new crop.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Association of American Railroads, the carriers, and the men who operate and maintain our railroads, are entitled to much credit for the fine way in which they took hold of this difficult problem and met the situation.

OPERATING COSTS AND PROFITS IN MEAT PACKING INDUSTRY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to address the Senate briefly on a resolution which was adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and with respect to several reports made by the committee on the subject of farm price supports and retail food prices.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator request?

Mr. ELLENDER. About a minute on each report. There are three reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been continuing its study of operating costs and profits of meat packers. We have prepared a partial report, which is based on data obtained by the committee from some of the larger packers, as well as smaller packers. I should like to read a summary of the committee's findings:

SUMMARY

Profits in the meat packing industry, although varying widely among the companies reported, have been relatively modest in terms of business profits generally since 1947. For the nine reporting companies, profits on invested capital averaged 6.4 percent in 1950.

Additional installations of labor-saving equipment, resulting in increased efficiency in the use of labor, have in part offset increased wage rates in the 6-year period. Labor costs per dollar of sales in 1950, although higher than in 1947 and 1948, are lower than in 1945 and 1946.

Distribution costs have increased almost steadily, rising from 4.4 to 5.5 percent of sales of 25 percent in the 6-year period.

No distinct trend is evident in the cost of livestock and other purchases as a percentage of sales, although in recent months the sales value of fresh and cured pork appears to be higher in relation to the purchase price of live hogs than in any of the 4 years, 1945 to 1948, inclusive.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the full report be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPERATING COSTS AND PROFITS IN MEAT PACKING

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under the leadership of Chairman ELLENDER is making a continuing study of operating costs and profits in the food-processing industry. Tabulations have just been completed for nine meat-packing companies which process most of the meat animals in the United States.

These tabulations indicate that purchases of livestock (and a small amount of other supplies) account for 75 to 81 percent of the dollar sales of meat packers during the period 1945–50. In 1947, the first full year after price controls were removed, the meat packers paid 81 percent of their sales for livestock and other supplies. In 1949 and 1950 livestock and other purchases accounted for around 78 or 79 percent of the sales dollar which is slightly lower than in 1947 and 1948, and lower than in 1945 and 1946 if subsidy payments made in those years are added to the livestock purchases.

A detailed summary of purchases, manufacturing labor costs, total labor costs, total distribution costs, and net profits for seven companies submitting comparable data under these headings is presented in table 1 below.

Both manufacturing labor and total labor costs dropped as a percentage of sales immediately after price controls were removed, but increased again in 1949. By 1950 labor costs were 10.5 percent of sales, as compared with 9.0 and 9.2 percent in 1947 and 1948.

Distribution costs in both 1949 and 1950 were higher than in any earlier year in the study. This increase in distribution costs appears to be one of the more definite trends indicated by the data.

Net profit, both per dollar of sales and per $100 invested capital for the seven companies in this detailed summary, was lower in 1950 than in any earlier year. (Similar data on profits shown in table 2 below indicate 1949 was the low-profit year when profit data for all nine companies are combined.)

Table 2 is similar to table 1, except that it includes all nine companies reporting and does not show manufacturing labor and distribution costs separately because these details were omitted by two of the reporting meat packers.

The smaller meat packers have consistently made higher profits than the so-called Big Four—Swift, Armour, Wilson, and Cudahy—taken as a group. The larger packers appear to have paid out a larger part of their sales dollars for both purchases of livestock and other supplies and for labor than the smaller packers. The larger packers have more diversified activities, such as vegetable-oil processing and the manufacture of pharmaceutical supplies. This makes direct comparisons of their livestock-processing operations with those of the smaller packers difficult.

Data on beef and pork were reported in sufficient detail by five companies to permit computation of the average sales value per pound and average cost per pound of live weight. These data are shown in table 3. In the case of beef the average cost per pound of live weight has increased in about the same ratio as the average sales value per pound. In early 1951 both the cost per pound of live weight and the sales value per pound of dressed beef was approximately 2¼ times what it was in 1945–46 and fully 50 percent higher than in 1947.

In contrast live hog prices and the sales value of fresh and cured pork have increased less than 60 percent since 1945 and in early 1951 were substantially lower than in 1947. Packers appear to be receiving a higher average price for their fresh and cured pork in 1949, 1950, and especially in 1951 in relation to their average cost per pound of live weight than in earlier years. While the uptrend in prices in late 1950 and early 1951 may explain their higher sales values in relation to live weight costs in 1951, this explanation does not cover the situation in 1949 and the year 1950 as a whole.

TABLE 1.—*Costs and profits as percentage of sales and net profits as percentage of invested capital in meat packing, 1945–50*

Year	Cost of purchases (excluding subsidy)	Manufacturing labor	Total labor	Total distribution	Net profit to sales		Net profit to invested capital
					Before taxes	After taxes	
2 large companies:	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
1945	77.5	9.2	11.8	4.2	1.72	0.75	3.78
1946	76.8	8.8	11.9	4.6	2.21	1.50	7.30
1947	80.5	6.9	9.2	4.0	1.92	1.35	10.41
1948	79.8	6.7	9.3	4.5	1.78	.80	6.91
1949	77.7	7.5	10.3	5.0	1.36	.70	5.02
1950	78.0	7.6	10.5	5.2	1.00	.64	4.61
5 other companies:							
1945	73.6	8.4	11.0	5.0	1.03	.48	(1)
1946	74.3	8.4	11.8	5.3	2.95	1.46	8.78
1947	81.6	6.3	8.5	4.5	1.74	.99	10.60
1948	79.8	6.6	9.0	5.0	2.01	1.14	11.98
1949	77.6	7.4	10.0	6.1	1.04	.58	5.69
1950	76.2	7.6	10.5	6.4	1.33	.73	6.96
7 companies:							
1945	77.0	9.0	11.7	4.4	1.37	.69	(1)
1946	76.2	8.7	11.8	4.8	2.39	1.49	7.61
1947	80.8	6.7	9.0	4.2	1.87	1.26	10.45
1948	79.8	6.7	9.2	4.7	1.85	.96	8.03
1949	77.7	7.5	10.2	5.4	1.27	.67	5.17
1950	77.5	7.6	10.5	5.5	1.19	.67	5.16

[1] Incomplete.

TABLE 2.—*Costs and profits as percentage of sales, and net profits as percentage of invested capital in meat packing, 1945–50*

Year	Cost of purchases (excluding subsidy)	Total labor	Net profit to sales		Net profit to invested capital
			Before taxes	After taxes	
3 large companies:	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1945	75.0	12.1	2.02	.83	4.51
1946	74.7	12.3	2.95	1.76	9.01
1947	80.8	9.6	2.17	1.44	11.52
1948	81.2	9.7	1.00	.49	4.05
1949	79.4	10.5	.85	.43	3.41
1950	78.9	10.7	1.27	.79	6.22
6 other companies:					
1945	75.8	10.9	1.07	.50	(1)
1946	74.5	11.4	3.06	1.55	9.25
1947	81.6	8.4	1.88	1.08	11.26
1948	80.0	8.9	2.08	1.19	12.17
1949	77.9	9.9	1.13	.65	6.06
1950	76.0	10.4	1.36	.76	6.93
9 companies:					
1945	75.1	12.0	1.88	.78	(1)
1946	74.7	12.2	2.97	1.73	9.05
1947	81.0	9.3	2.11	1.37	11.47
1948	80.9	9.5	1.22	.64	5.46
1949	79.1	10.4	.91	.48	3.89
1950	78.4	10.6	1.29	.79	6.35

[1] Incomplete.

TABLE 3.—*Average sales value of fresh and cured meat (including lard), and average cost of livestock per pound live weight, 1945–50*

Year	Average sales value per pound [1]	Average cost of livestock slaughtered [2] per pound of live weight	Average sales value of meat [1] [3]	Average cost per pound of live weight [3]
Beef:	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1945	19.1	11.6	45	50
1946	23.2	12.7	84	55
1947	33.3	17.9	78	77
1948	41.2	22.2	96	96
1949	39.7	21.1	93	91
1950	42.9	23.1	100	100
1951 [4]	49.4	26.3	115	114
Pork:				
1945	19.1	14.2	68	79
1946	22.8	15.8	78	89
1947	36.5	23.8	125	134
1948	37.8	24.3	129	137
1949	32.3	19.7	111	111
1950	29.2	17.7	100	100
1951 [4]	33.9	19.3	116	109

[1] Proportions of total meat sold as fresh and cured may vary by years.
[2] Subsidy payments in 1945 and 1946 have not been deducted from purchase cost.
[3] 1950=100.
[4] Number of weeks vary by companies from 13 to 18, between Nov. 1 and Mar. 3. Averages were computed from totals of all reported by the 5 companies. Averages for this period do not necessarily reflect the results which will be obtained for the whole year.

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS AND THE RETAIL PRICES OF FOOD SINCE WORLD WAR II

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the other study to which I referred was made of the subject of farm price supports and the retail prices of food since World War II. I wish to read only a few paragraphs, which appear on page 6 of the committee's report:

Price support operations on perishable commodities, while yielding substantial benefits to a limited number of producers, increased retail food costs less than half of 1 percent. These price support operations reduced producers' current losses and tend to prevent them from reducing production the following year. The maintenance of adequate production of perishables from year to year encouraged by price protection to the farmer stabilizes both agriculture and consumer prices. Stabilized supplies and prices to the consumer more than offsets the failure to get even greater bargain prices when crops are abnormally large.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full report be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS AND THE RETAIL PRICE OF FOOD SINCE WORLD WAR II

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in its study of recent increases in the retail price of food, has just completed an analysis of the effect of farm price support programs on consumers' food costs.

The committee finds that the substantial stocks of direct food products and feed grains, stimulated by and resulting from price support programs, has been an important influence holding down inflationary increases in retail food prices in recent months. In addition the price support programs, especially those for dairy products and eggs, encouraged producers to maintain their normal breeding herds and flocks when

unsupported market prices would have caused substantial liquidations. Current production of dairy products, eggs, and several other farm commodities was higher in 1950 and is higher today than it would be if there had been no price-support programs following World War II.

The value of direct food products and feed grains under price-support loans or owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation on June 30, 1950, and February 28, 1951, was as follows:

	June 30, 1950	Feb. 28, 1951
Dairy products	$164,878,000	$34,992,000
Eggs, dried	103,290,000	73,615,000
Beans and peas, dry edible	89,653,000	73,714,000
Cottonseed oil	2,556,000	39,000
Potatoes and potato starch	1,160,000	233,000
Peanuts	4,072,000	40,106,000
Rice	4,429,000	3,710,000
Wheat	825,559,000	909,837,000
Corn and other feed grains	1,248,080,000	1,084,026,000
Total food products and feed grains	2,443,677,000	2,220,272,000

The existence of Government food and feed grain stocks in excess of $2,000,000,000 has been a decisive factor in stabilizing the price of these products, preventing many of them from rising to parity level. The release of these stocks as prices reached the loan or resale level increased the total quantity of these products available in the July to February period over those which would have been available in the absence of price-support programs in earlier years.

The continued liquidation of these stocks as prices reach resale levels will keep prices of these commodities from going still higher until the stocks are exhausted. Price rises and pressure on price ceilings in the months ahead will be slowed down by the availability of accumulated stocks totaling over $2,000,000,000 arising from price-support programs. Fully as important, these stocks will supplement current production, making more food available to consumers in the months ahead than would have been possible without the price-support programs.

EARLIER EFFECTS OF PROGRAMS

Committee members have been asked, "Why have food prices increased so sharply since the end of World War II in September 1945? How much have Government price-support programs contributed to the rise in retail food prices since 1945?"

The key facts regarding the increase in food prices relative to other price increases are as follows:

	September 1945	February 1951	Percentage increase
Retail food price index (1935-39=100)	139.4	226.0	61
Farm price index (1910-14=100)	197	313	58
Marketing and processing charges (1935-39=100)	115	174	51
Average hourly earnings of workers in manufacturing	$0.99	$1.56	58
Wholesale price index (1935-39=100)	105.2	183.6	75

Retail-food-price increases since 1945 have been in line with other price increases. Hourly earnings of workers in manufacturing industries increased nearly as much as retail food prices. Wholesale-price increases were even greater, while the prices received by farmers increased somewhat less than food prices. Approximately half of the consumer's dollar for food products goes to food processors and distributors and half to farmers. The increase in marketing margins was almost as great as the increase in farm prices.

These facts suggest that the sharp increase in food prices since 1945 has been a part of a broad inflationary trend rather than the result of farm-price-support programs. Before examining the effects of farm-price-support programs in more detail, two additional bits of information should be noted—first, food supplies per capita have been maintained at an ample level throughout this period. Food supplies per capita in 1950 were 98 percent of those available in 1945 and 112 percent of those available in 1935-39. Second, there was little change in the net imports (imports minus exports) of food supplies. The net imports for 1945 and 1950 were as follows:

Net imports as percent of total food supplies

Year:	
1945	3.3
1950	2.1

Extent of price-support programs

The following data taken from Commodity Credit Corporation and other Department of Agriculture reports indicates price-support operations for farm commodities other than cotton, tobacco, and wool by fiscal years.

[Millions of dollars]

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
CCC loans	160	174	130	1,239	1,495
Increase in inventories				925	1,014
Losses on perishables [1]	(2)	74	90	205	137
Surplus removal expenditures: [3]					
Dairy				2	16
Eggs		11	20	14	13
Fruits			20	10	28
Grain	4			4	3
Peanuts and products				10	5
Tree nuts			1		4
Vegetables	8	27	21	11	5
Total	12	38	62	51	74
Total, CCC losses on perishables and surplus removal expenditures	12	112	152	256	214

[1] Primarily potatoes and eggs.
[2] Data not available.
[3] Primarily purchases for direct distribution to welfare agencies and school-lunch programs, although a part of the expenditures are for diversion to other than usual market uses or for export subsidy. Funds for these operations are made available from custom receipts (sec. 32 of the 1938 AAA Act).

Price-support operations carried out by CCC loans and acquisition of stocks in liquidation of loans have the effect of strengthening prices when the loans are first made, offset by an equal effect in keeping prices from going above the loan or authorized resale level when current supplies become short or inflationary pressures develop as in recent months. From the consumer's point of view, price-support programs for storable products tend to stabilize prices and supplies with increases in some months or years offset by decreases in subsequent periods when the stocks removed from regular market channels are returned to them.

EFFECT OF PRICE SUPPORTS FOR PERISHABLES

Price-support operations involving purchase and diversion of perishable products from regular market channels tend to reduce the temporary overabundant supply of these commodities and increase their market prices without any later compensating advantages. Price-support operations of this type varied from $112,000,000 in 1947 to $256,000,000 in the fiscal year 1950. In general, they were undertaken when the market price of a particular commodity was unusually low for some temporary reason and tended to support prices at more nearly their normal market level (potatoes being the outstanding exception where the price was supported at a level which encouraged increased production).

A rough measure of the importance of these price-support operations on perishables is the amount of money spent on them. The removal from regular market channels of $112,000,000 of perishable products in 1947 probably increased consumers' costs of these products by twenty-five to one hundred million dollars. Consumers probably pay as many or more total dollars for a crop of snap beans 105 percent of normal as for a crop 108 percent of normal. If the Government purchases 3 percent of the crop and distributes it through nonmarket channels, farmers receive as much or more for the remaining crop plus the value of the Government purchases.

On this basis consumers' retail food costs may have been increased by as much as twenty-five to two hundred and fifty million dollars annually from 1946 through 1950 by price supports on perishables. This twenty-five to two hundred and fifty million dollar annual increase in consumers' food costs arising from Government price supports for perishable products compares with a total expenditure at retail for food in those years of fifty to sixty billion dollars. Price-support operations on perishable commodities, while yielding substantial benefits to a limited number of producers, increased retail food costs less than half of 1 percent. These price-support operations reduce producers' current losses and tend to prevent them from reducing production the following year. The maintenance of adequate production of perishables from year to year encouraged by price protection to the farmer stabilizes both agricultural and consumer prices. Stabilized supplies and prices to the consumer more than offsets the failure to get even greater bargain prices when crops are abnormally large.

SUGGESTED RESCINDING OF CEILING PRICE REGULATION 24

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at its meeting this morning the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the promulgation by the Office of Price Stabilization of ceiling price Regulation 24 imposing ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale, to become effective May 9, 1951, has resulted in livestock producers' rushing their cattle to market before they are finished to their best marketable weights; and

Whereas such premature marketing will result in a loss of meat for consumers; and

Whereas the feeders who produce much of the meat supply will suffer severe losses; and

Whereas the announcement of further rollbacks in beef prices will have the effect of continued early marketing of meat animals; and

Whereas such continued early marketing and the resulting reduction in meat production will cause a severe meat famine leading to early rationing in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, That said ceiling price regulation 24 establishing the proposed ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale be rescinded without delay.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY, 1951—TRIBUTE BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 3, the sons and daughters of Poland throughout the world will celebrate Polish Constitution Day, a day as meaningful to the folks of Polish descent as is the Fourth of July to our own people, if not far more so. May 3 arouses particularly reverent interest this year because once more it finds that great land still under the boot of the hateful oppressor.

Yes, another May 3 has come, but Poland is enslaved.

Here in this land, on that day the American Congress, through its Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, will hear from Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The coincidence of these two events cannot but impress all thinking people. I trust that the Voice of America will send throughout the world the twofold story of tomorrow: America's review, her foreign policy, Poland's memory and review of her glorious past, and her prayerful expectation of a brighter tomorrow.

In past years it has been my pleasure to pay tribute to the Polish people in connection with the May 3 anniversary of their battle for freedom. I am happy to do so once again. It is particularly fitting this year because American boys, many of them of Polish descent, are fighting right now in Korea in the common cause of self-determination of people, and for their freedom and independence.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of Polish Constitution Day. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY—1951

May 3 is known throughout the world as Polish Constitution Day. The anniversary commemorates the acceptance of the latest constitution of the latest free Poland.

I use the word "free" after considerable deliberation.

"Free" has been used to describe nations and peoples who are not free, either by their concepts of freedom or by ours. The word has been used without discrimination. The word has often been used without thought.

The word "free" may scarcely be applied to Poland today.

Yet, every loyal Pole—whether he be living under the domination of Communists at home or whether he be in exile, abroad—is undeniably free.

He is free by self-determination.

He is free because he wants to be free.

And so, Americans are eminently right to honor the constitution of a valiant people who refuse to remain enslaved.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION PRECEDED OUR OWN

Many Americans are aware that the first written Polish Constitution antedated the Constitution of the United States by 88 years. In 1701, Poland's national legislature accepted a constitution which greatly influenced our own. That document granted liberty to every Pole as a free citizen. It provided for free education for every Polish child.

The ideal of freedom under constitutional guaranties transcends both the concepts of nationalism and internationalism. In this day, when the crying need is to put first things first, all of us should look to the historic example of the Polish people.

Kosciusko, an internationalist in the finest sense of that term, died in defense of freedom in his native land.

Pulaski, a nationalist in the most inspiring sense of that term, died in defense of freedom far from his home.

Patrick Henry said: "Give me liberty or give me death."

These great Poles, by their deeds, gave substance to Patrick Henry's words. They did what he said.

WE ARE PROUD OF OUR POLISH-DESCENDED CITIZENS

Of the 150,000,000 Americans today, it has been estimated that more than 10,000,000 have Polish blood in their veins. Every fifteenth man, woman, or child you meet can point with pride to Polish ancestry.

Why are Americans of Polish origin valuable as citizens of these United States?

Because they seriously and whole-heartedly share the rights, the duties, the aspirations and the destiny of our own people, of whom they have become a contributing part.

Because they have never ceased to pass on—from mother to daughter, from father to son—their deathless devotion to the ideal of liberty under constitutional government.

During the Civil War, there were only about 30,000 people of origin in the United States. Of these 30,000, 5,000 were in uniform. General Wladimir Krzyzanowski was deemed one of the outstanding strategists of that era.

It is common knowledge in this Republic what these sons of the tradition of freedom did to bring us to victory in World War I and in World War II.

In peace, as in war, Americans of Polish ancestry have helped make this Nation great. From the time of Anthony Sadowski, who settled northern Ohio in the early 1800's and gave the Americanized version of his name to the city of Sandusky, Ohio, to M. S. Szymczak, distinguished member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, people of this noble nationality have added new laurels to the United States. People of Polish origin, as workers, farmers, doctors, lawyers, merchants, scientists educators, artists, industrialists, and men of God have carved a niche of honor in American history.

Because such a people are of us and within us we can fully value and appreciate their culture and their ideals.

POLAND'S DEVOUT CHRISTIANITY

We need men and women whose Christianity is of the heart, rather than of the mouth.

Poland has given us such men and women.

How could these people be other than reverent? Their entire tradition is one of reverence.

The last great Polish king was Jan Sobieski. In 1683 the Turkish invasion had reached as far as Vienna. Messengers were sent to Poland, asking for help. Sobieski and his army of Poles marched to the aid of a stricken Christendom. The morning before the great battle, Sobieski went to a little chapel on Kahlenberg—a hill near Vienna—to pray. The enemy was defeated. But Sobieski never boasted of himself or of his army. This was the message he sent home: "I came. I saw. God conquered."

Today, in this time of present crisis, we Americans rely on the steadfast, enduring faith of our fellow countrymen whose ancestors marched with Sobieski.

Side by side, with the Polish tradition of religion is their tradition of liberty.

POLAND'S NEVER-ENDING STRUGGLE

In 1795, the Poles fought for their freedom. In 1831, the Poles fought for their freedom. In 1846, and again in 1863, the Poles fought for their freedom. In each successive attempt at liberty their losses became greater, their agony more unbearable. The blood of Poland is to be found on a thousand battlefields including the slopes around Copino where General Anders' heroes fell in the common struggle. But Poles have never lost hope in striving for their ideal—liberty. Their poets and their novelists wrote it; their orators spoke it; their composers and musicians sang it; their martyrs died for it.

Chopin, only one—although a great one—of Poland's supercomposers made of liberty a thing sublime in his immortal Etude in C Minor. Liberty lived in its every note. The Russian Czar, forerunner of an even more terrible totalitarianism, shrank in fear at the tones of the grand Etude, saying, "This music is dangerous. It is like guns hidden under beautiful roses."

And well might all oppressors of Poland shrink in fear.

Poland, and that means the people of Poland, will not stop in their fixed resolve to fight and fight and fight until they have true liberty under a true constitutional government.

That is enough to make any tyrants afraid, particularly the Politburo in the Kremlin.

OUR THOUGHTS ON MAY 3

On May 3, Poland's Constitution Day, what should Americans think about in relation to Polish independence?

We should think about the vast debt of gratitude we owe to the Poland of the past and to the American citizens of Polish ancestry who are with us now.

We should think about the fierce flame of liberty that glows even through the iron curtain which surrounds Poland today.

We should tell Polish people everywhere that we sincerely understand them and their noble aspirations.

We should tell Polish people everywhere that hope for liberty still lives.

We should not encourage immediate revolt against their oppressors—a revolt that would all but extinguish them as a people. A few hand arms cannot defeat an army of tanks, jet planes, and atomic bombs.

Our own Nation is fighting communism in Korea. Communism today is basically what czarism was yesterday—Poland's mortal enemy. Poland and the United States stand side by side in the Korean War as we have been allies in World War II, World War I, and in our own war for independence.

Our message to Poland on Poland's Constitution Day is one of assurance of unity of purpose.

It is a message of confidence.

It is a message of prayer and of thanksgiving to our one God or the eventual victory over tyranny which we know will yet be ours.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CORDON obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quorum call, provided his rights to the floor are not jeopardized? This amendment is rather important.

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield under those conditions.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Kilgore
Anderson	Ferguson	Knowland
Bennett	Flanders	Langer
Benton	Frear	Lodge
Brewster	Fulbright	Long
Bricker	Gillette	McCarran
Bridges	Green	McCarthy
Butler, Md.	Hayden	McClellan
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	McFarland
Byrd	Hennings	McKellar
Cain	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Capehart	Hill	Malone
Carlson	Hoey	Martin
Case	Holland	Maybank
Chavez	Humphrey	Millikin
Clements	Hunt	Monroney
Connally	Ives	Moody
Cordon	Jenner	Morse
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Dworshak	Kem	Nixon
Ecton	Kerr	O'Conor

O'Mahoney	Smith, Maine	Watkins
Pastore	Smith, N. J.	Wherry
Robertson	Sparkman	Wiley
Russell	Stennis	Williams
Saltonstall	Thye	Young
Schoeppel	Tobey	
Smathers	Underwood	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. CORDON obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be very happy to yield, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Oregon yielding without losing the floor? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been asked when we may have a call of the calendar. In order that Senators may have proper notice, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next there be a call of the calendar for consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Beginning where?

Mr. McFARLAND. Beginning where the last call ended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the minority leader has just suggested to me that there are very few bills from the first of the calendar to the point at which the last call of the calendar ended, so I will amend my unanimous-consent request by asking that the calendar be called from the beginning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is necessarily absent from the Senate. He is very much interested in the pending amendment to the unfinished business. He supports it, and has joined as a sponsor of the amendment. Because of the fact that he cannot be present during the debate, I have been requested to present his views to the Senate. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the senior Senator from Washington be placed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, last evening the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] made a suggestion to me that my amendment should contain a limitation on the number of reception centers. This would be in line with the philosophy of the bill and with what the proposers of the amendment, if adopted, seek to have done, namely, that at strategic points in the United States where the Secretary of Labor finds a labor-deficit condition, and the resulting necessity of importing agricultural labor, reception centers be located geographically so as to equalize the costs and the availability of the agricultural labor, so far as practicable.

It appears to me that that suggestion has very real merit. I frankly state, Mr. President, that I do not know how many centers should be established. From the available information, however, gleaned from the hearings, and from other sources, it is my view that a maximum of six such centers would be adequate. It may well be that that many will not be needed. I am open to suggestions on the subject if others have information to the contrary. In the absence of such information, however, I now ask that my amendment be modified in the following respect: On line 2, following the words "United States", to insert a comma and the words "not more than six in number", and a comma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has modified his amendment.

Mr. CORDON. The effect of the modification is to direct the Secretary of Labor to establish not more than six reception centers so located geographically as to effect equity in costs of agricultural labor and in availability of agricultural labor to the farming fraternity throughout the United States where the Secretary finds that importation of Mexican labor is necessary during the harvest or crop season.

Mr. President, it would appear to me that no argument could be advanced against the adoption of this amendment. It seeks to do no more than equity to agriculture, when viewed on a national basis.

I suspect that argument may be advanced to the effect that this amendment proposes a Federal subsidy to agriculture.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, let me say that we studied the possibility of having a reception center or receiving center in the Northwest. We recognized that the seasonal labor requirements in the food- and vegetable-growing areas not only in the States of Oregon and Washington, but also in all the other States in the Pacific-coast area, are very great indeed.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield long enough to permit me to do so, I should like to submit an article which I happened to read last evening in the Minneapolis Tribune. The article quotes Mr. Victor Christgau, of the Division of Unemployment Security in Minnesota. The article gives Mr. Christgau's specific statements in regard to what the shortage of labor will be in the State of Minnesota and what the needs will be throughout the various growing and harvesting seasons in that State for the year 1951.

Therefore, Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will permit, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, because it gives excellent information on the very subject we are studying, and about which the senior Senator from Oregon is speaking at this moment.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to have that done.

Mr. THYE. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STATE FARM LABOR TO BE SCARCE, COST MORE"—CHRISTGAU

(By Sam Romer)

Minnesota farmers will pay more for farm labor this summer—and have trouble getting help.

This is the general picture revealed in a State-wide survey conducted last week by the Minnesota Employment and Security Division.

Victor Christgau, division director, said it is difficult to predict how severe the shortage will be later this season—but it already has shown up as the division began active recruiting of workers.

In April 1950, for instance, the division listed 274 single farm hands in excess of demands; this year, the division already is 209 farm hands short. The same situation exists in recruiting man-and-wife teams; the 1951 demand is 96 couples short in April.

Other aspects of the agricultural labor problem are almost as bad.

So-called stoop labor—usually done by transient workers in the sugar beet, pea, and cornfields—is going to be hard to get, employers say.

And detasseling of hybrid corn crops—vitally important to the State's 1952 corn prospects—has seed firms resorting to high-pressure campaigns to get sufficient labor.

Behind the shortage, according to Christgau, is the lure of defense-plant employment with its glamor and overtime wages.

The employment division has moved fast to overcome the shortage, Christgau said. Its 33 local offices are instructed to give farm help requests the same high priority they do defense employment.

More than 375 specially trained employment-security representatives have been alerted to the problem so that one locality's surplus farm labor can be moved immediately to short labor areas.

Increasing mechanization in the fields has helped cut down the number of hired hands needed, Christgau admitted, but mechanization has brought with it new problems.

"The time element in seeding, cultivation, harvesting, and proper care of livestock is so vital," Christgau explained, "that delay in maintenance of equipment can mean disaster."

Wages for permanent farm workers now range up to $125 monthly for single men and up to $175 for couples—about 10 percent higher than last year, Christgau estimated.

Money wages are in addition to board and housing—the latter for couples usually includes a separate house, garden plot, and occasionally some chickens or a pig.

The shortage now is most evident in Minnesota's southern areas although it is expected to spread northward as farm activities there are intensified.

Areas suffering from the shortage in April included Albert Lea, Fairmont, Marshall, Red Wing, Willmar, and the Twin Cities.

The short-lived but dramatic detasseling season is facing its most serious labor problem in years, according to officials of Northrup King & Co., the area's largest producer of hybrid seed corn.

Detasseling is the process by which the corn's pollen-bearing tassel—or stamen—is removed to prevent self-pollenization. Hybrid corn is produced by cross-pollenization and self-pollenization leaves the crop useless for seed corn purposes.

The season begins about the first of July, lasts only 2 weeks, but during this period labor and time are precious. Detasselers work at top speed in their race with nature.

Northrup King has hybrid cornfields in five places—near Shakopee, Howard Lake, Waterville, Lake Crystal, and Eden Prairie. In 1950 they used about 1,500 detasselers, many of whom were high-school boys on vacation.

Because of increased acreage this year, the firm estimates it will need at least 2,000 detasselers, making the annual problem more difficult.

Northrup King officials already have started planning. Not only are they asking last year's detasselers to come back and bring their friends, but they have embarked on a civic-relation program to ease their plight.

Community officials and local editors are being organized by company area superintendents to help publicize the situation. This is supplemented by direct mail appeals to farmers to save the hybrid seed crop.

Firm officials are hopeful about fulfilling their 2,000-man detasseling quota, even though scarcity of permanent farm help means many boys will pass up the detasseling season to take summer-long jobs as farm hands.

"Unless we win this battle," a Northrup King spokesman warned, "Minnesota's corn crop next year will pay the price of defeat."

Stoop-labor employers are less pessimistic although they say the situation is tight, and anything can happen. Most transient workers are Spanish-speaking Texans hired under contract along the Rio Grande and then brought north.

Largest employer of transient labor in Minnesota is American Crystal Sugar Co., which relies on three areas for its sugar beets—around Chaska and around Moorhead-Fargo, and Grand Forks on both sides of the Minnesota-North Dakota border.

An increase in national cotton acreage has complicated the situation by creating greater Texas demand than normal for these workers, but company officials are hopeful that they will bring north about 7,000 of these workers, at somewhat higher wages than last year.

Canning companies—the other major Minnesota employer of transient labor—depend on imported foreign labor, rather than Texan, to produce their pea and corn crops.

Spokesmen are quick to emphasize that they prefer local or American labor, but they say they can't get more than a handful.

Most canning companies, especially large firms like Green Giant Canning Co., LeSueur, and Fairmont Canning Co., Fairmont, work with the United States Employment Service to bring in British West Indians—chiefly Bahamans and Jamaicans.

Between them, they expect to import about 1,700.

"Imported labor is expensive labor," a Green Giant spokesman said, "and we are eager to get rid of the program.

"But the labor situation now is tighter than during World War II, and we must depend on imports to save the crop."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, let me say to the able senior Senator from Oregon that I will support the amendment he is proposing.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement which has been made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota. He is one of the best informed Members of the Congress in the field of agriculture. Whenever he speaks on that subject, I and, I think, all my colleagues who are interested in agriculture listen attentively.

Let me also say that I am glad to have printed in the RECORD and made available to the Senate the article to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred, which quotes the officer of the State of Minnesota who is charged with the duty of aiding agriculture in this particular field. I am sure that if all the officials of the various States of the United States could be heard on this matter, their testimony would be of very great value to the Senate in connection with its consideration of this subject.

After all, Mr. President, all we seek to do by means of this measure, and all we are entitled to do, is to meet an emergency which agriculture itself did not produce. We seek, so far as may be done, to put agriculture on the same level as that on which industry has already been put by Congress in the present mobilization and emergency period with which we are faced.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I was very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Oregon to the effect that the argument might be advanced that his amendment constitutes a subsidy to agriculture. However, I think the question before us is one of whether we shall have food or shall not have food. Now that the defense program has been stepped up so greatly, there is no longer an unemployment situation. Help is difficult to obtain. Those most adversely affected by the scarcity of labor are the vegetable and fruit producers. In that industry, the profits are low, as a rule. As a result, wages naturally have to be lower than in other industries if the producers wish to remain in business. Of course, the so-called stoop labor is the most undersirable of all; and, as a rule, American help can be obtained in that field only when times are extremely bad. Otherwise, most Americans would almost rather starve to death than engage in that kind of work.

So I say the question is one of either getting the labor from Mexico or from some other point outside the United States, or else going without the fruits and vegetables.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He has put his finger exactly on the vital spot in connection with this matter.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the statement the Senator from Oregon is making to the Senate in regard to the farm-labor situation, especially in the field of fruits and vegetables. I still am wondering whether it is possible for the States themselves to handle this situation. I regret sincerely to see the Federal Government go into the field of establishing placement agencies, so to speak, or rest camps, if they may be called that, for the imported foreign labor and the dissemination of such labor from those camps or agencies. It seems to me it would be much better if the States themselves handled this problem.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's suggestion. I, too, regret that this matter cannot be handled in the way the Senator from Kansas suggests. No other Member of the Senate relishes less than I do the intervention of the Federal Government anywhere, in any part of our economy, with reference to any citizen. However, as the late President Cleveland is reputed to have said, sometimes we are faced with a condition, not a theory; and in such case we must act in accordance with the circumstances in which we find ourselves at the moment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to let me proceed a little further in explaining the suggestion which has been made.

The present situation is that most of the States—certainly my own State of Oregon, and certainly the other Pacific Northwest States, and, I assume, all the other States, in fact—maintain officials whose purpose it is to work with agriculture in their respective jurisdictions, not only with respect to improving agriculture itself, but particularly with respect to aiding, insofar as the States can do so, the location of agricultural labor in the areas of the highest or greatest demand, when it becomes absolutely necessary that such labor be on hand at a certain time, almost to the day, or else the crops cannot be harvested.

However, the situation we face today, Mr. President, is not the ordinary one; this is not a case in which we could have proceeded a month ago to locate the needed labor and thus be certain that we would have it when it was needed.

I apprehend that in the State of Kansas this year it may not be quite so easy as it has been in the past—in fact, it may be impossible before the crop year is over—to find the labor which must be found. In years past the necessary labor has been found in the Pacific Northwest. Before the present emergency confronted us, in the Pacific Northwest our people paid whatever transportation costs were necessary in

order to obtain the additional labor which was needed, and that has been done ever since the World War II period.

The Senator from Kansas will recall that in World War II, when the Government was faced with the same situation with which we are faced now—namely, the need for a sharp increase in production, amounting to between 20 and 27 percent in some categories, and the necessity of having the increased production at once, rather than to wait a year or two for it—at that time the Government did exactly what this amendment seeks to have the Government do at this time: The Government established reception centers and found the labor, so that the agricultural production which it demanded could be had.

Following the war period, our people did as the people of the Senator's State of Kansas did; they found their labor. There are agricultural associations for that purpose throughout the Pacific Northwest. The farmers join in a single association to endeavor to get labor which can remain throughout the crop season and be available where needed and when needed. I wish that could be continued.

I do not like the present situation. But my constituents tell me—and the condition is general, I think—that they are face to face with an added deficit at a time when they are also confronted with the necessity of increasing production, thus doubling the hazard to the crops.

The deficit in labor results from the draining of what would otherwise be available labor into industrial enterprises. Not only into the Pacific Northwest, but in other areas, labor is moving into such industrial enterprises. Then, when we add the necessity for additional production, the farmer is flatly up against something he is unable to handle, and which the State is unable to handle for him.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. While the distinguished Senator from Oregon is making a very fine argument and an excellent statement in behalf of labor needed in Oregon—and I am sure his statement is absolutely sound—we can appreciate, too, his feeling with respect to the reception centers, something new in this particular field. I do not like to see a program of reception centers entered upon, because I can see that it might lead to increased numbers of them. If we could somehow get by with the present arrangements, I believe we might be relieved of a burden which we may in the future regret we have undertaken.

I know that large quantities of wheat are raised in the Senator's State, but I remind him that the State of Kansas produces one-fourth of the winter wheat of the Nation, and we have a real harvest problem. But our State employment service and our farm-placement service with the cooperation of the United States Department of Labor, move into the wheat area 30 to 60 days in advance and set up headquarters. We make contact with Canada and with other States of the Nation, and, I presume, with Mexico. We prepare to harvest the crop, which, of course, is one of the crops which must be harvested completely within about 30 days, as in the case of the fruits and vegetables in the Senator's State. We have been able to handle the problem on a State basis. While I was Governor of the State, for 4 years, at a time when we produced large quantities of wheat, we were able to take care of the situation, and I sincerely hope that it will somehow continue to be possible.

I may say to the Senator from Oregon that his modification of the amendment has at least made it more palatable. As it was before, it was open-ended, and I could see no limit to it. I understand the Senator's problem. I know he has one, because the farm situation is a difficult one, and it is especially difficult in connection with the crops which he has mentioned. I desire to be helpful if I can, but I still have certain questions which I hope the Senator may be able to answer for me.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate the frank statement which the Senator has made. I do not know that I can answer his questions. I shall at least try to answer them, and, if I do not know the answers, I shall frankly say so.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I take it for granted the Senator from Oregon has heard some of the debate with reference to putting to work American workers who want employment, or who are out of employment.

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me call to the Senator's attention a situation which existed in my State a number of years ago. In a fruit belt, where there is a rather heavy production of fruits, there is also a steel plant. There are other industrial developments there, as well. In connection with the harvesting of fruit, the farmers in that area went to the State Employment Service, which was combined at the same place with the Federal Service, and told them they needed workers. The employment service said, "Well, we can take care of that very easily. We have about 4,500 persons who are drawing unemployment compensation, so we ought to be able to get the 400 or 500 workers you need out of the 4,500." They told the farmers to bring in their conveyances the following morning, and they would have a group ready for them. The pay was at least $1 an hour, or so many cents a bushel, for the picking of fruit, and a good, able-bodied man could make from $12 to $15 a day, under those circumstances.

When the farmers appeared the next morning to get the help, only two men applied, only two men were ready, and those two men, I know of my own personal knowledge, went out to a farm, worked for an hour, and decided that fruit-harvesting was too hard work, that is was not in their line, anyway; and they left. The farmers did not get a single employee out of the 4,500 who were then drawing unemployment compensation.

In our area we have found that we cannot depend on many of our American laborers. They have been getting so much higher wages in the defense plants, at time and a half for overtime, with double time for Sundays and holidays, and all that sort of thing, that they merely turn up their noses at anything which looks like farm labor. That was one reason why it was necessary, even at the time to which I referred a few moments ago, with 4,500 persons unemployed, for us to get foreigners to come into the State to do our farm work. It was not because of pay conditions, it was not because of living conditions, because, in my State, the farmers have taken good care of their employees. They pay the current scale for agricultural labor, which is treble or quadruple what it used to be, so that there cannot be any complaint on that score. But we simply find the situation to be such that it is impossible to get help, even when people are unemployed and are drawing unemployment compensation. The farmers who sought the workers later explained to us that when they talked to the unemployed workers, they said, "Well, we don't want to go to work for what is offered. We are receiving $100 a month, $25 a week. If we can get our regular employment as carpenters, engineers, or what-not, we will work, but we are not going to do any work on any farms for anyone."

That is the situation with which the farmers of my State are confronted. It costs about $2 a day extra per man, if they have to pay the extra cost for transportation from the Mexican border to their farms and back again. Many times the employees they take to their farms will work only 2 or 3 days, and then leave, though the farmer is still confronted with the obligation he has undertaken, and he will have to pay their return transportation, as well as the transportation which he pays when they come to the farm, when they get through running around. That is why we feel that there ought to be an equalization. I have not heard the Senator's modification of his amendment, but, on the whole, I think it is a sound amendment, and I certainly hope it will be adopted. Will the Senator indicate what his modification is?

Mr. CORDON. The modification is simply a limitation upon the Secretary as to the number of reception centers which he may establish, it being limited to not more than six such centers in the United States.

Mr. WATKINS. That would make it possible to have them centrally located for a group of States; as, for instance, Idaho and Utah, or Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, Utah and Colorado or Wyoming, or certain of the States in that area, would it not?

Mr. CORDON. That is my thought in connection with it. I think the figure represents adequacy. I am not at all certain that the number of reception centers provided for need be established. It is simply my best judgment.

Mr. WATKINS. That would, I think, take care of the situation, although it is not a liberal number. It seems to me that anyone who recognizes the employment problem we now have, with so many of the farm boys in the armed services, should agree to the Senator's proposal. They have been taken into our defense forces. The man who had this help, his sons and others on his farm to help operate it, now sees them taken away; so a double responsibility is cast upon him.

The situation is highly artificial. It is not at all what it was in the period from the end of the war to the time of the outbreak of the Korean war. We must take all the circumstances into consideration in arriving at a solution which will really benefit the farmers. It seems to me that, unless the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is adopted, so far as the intermountain States are concerned, particularly Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, with their beet fields, their orchards, and so forth, we might as well forget this type of employment, for it would be of benefit only to those who are immediately around the border. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Utah. Here, again, we have a Senator who knows agriculture in the area which he represents. What he has presented is the correct situation, to my knowledge, and to the knowledge of all persons who have made any study whatever in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not desire to anticipate what the Senator from Oregon will say in his speech, but can he tell us how much additional cost this amendment would place on the Federal Government?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not have the figures. Of course, any figure presented would be a wild guess, no matter who presented it. The cost to the Federal Government is something which cannot be known at this time because we do not know how many foreign laborers will be imported, or where they will be taken. I want to furnish as much information as I can to the Senator, and I would suggest that in the Pacific Northwest, which is, I think, about as far from the Mexican border as one can get in the United States, at least within the area in which Mexican help heretofore has been used, the experience of the farmers in going to Mexico, securing their labor, and paying the cost of transportation both ways, represented approximately $100 for each laborer. That information, by the way, is in the hearings which the Senator from Louisiana conducted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does that figure include the cost of transportation and subsistence both ways?

Mr. CORDON. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what the administration of the present bill would cost if it were enacted into law?

Mr. CORDON. In my view it will cost more than $100 to get labor where it is needed. I do not know of anything the Federal Government does in competition with private initiative and private industry that does not cost far more than it would cost the people if they did it themselves for themselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the figure which the Senator has suggested merely for transportation and subsistence?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator does not know what the reception centers would cost. I may state to him that during the course of the hearings we received evidence showing that providing stop-over centers where laborers stopped overnight would cost in excess of $70,000 merely to erect them, and without management.

Mr. CORDON. I shall cover that point in my discussion. I do not know what the proposal would cost the Federal Government. I do not know how the Secretary of Labor would go about doing the job. I know how he could do it and how he should do it, and I shall present my views in connection with that point. He should follow the general plan that agriculture follows today. He can pick up the laborers, but he should take none to any area where they are not contracted for in advance under the terms of the bill. Therefore, when the laborers leave the recruitment point or the center at the border, they will be under contract already. Their employers are known in the area. The reception center should represent, in fact, nothing more than a geographical point to determine the limit of Federal financial responsibility in connection with the transportation of the labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that if additional reception centers should be established, the contracts between the employers and the employees would have to be made at the reception centers, and not at the border.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, there is no requirement in the bill, nor will there be if my amendment is adopted, as to the particular reception center where the contract can be made. It can be made at a reception center where the workers are received at the border, as well as anywhere else. In my opinion, that is where the contract should be made. There should not be any importation of foreign labor into the United States to the extent of one individual beyond the number found to be needed, and beyond the number which employers have signified their willingness to accept the responsibility for hiring. All we need is sensible administration of the act.

Mr. President, there is a sound basis for the adoption of my amendment. What we are faced with is a specific need for which a specific remedy is required. There are well-known procedures which agriculture has followed, and which, under this bill, the Department of Labor can and should follow. If that be done, the overhead will be reduced to a minimum, as it has been during the period since World War II, when labor has been able to carry this additional load at distant points; and we shall not be faced with mounting costs.

It is not the purpose, as I understand, to have the Government enter into the establishment of child-care centers, or undertake the socialization of the laborers, or anything of that kind. The Government is to be a recruiting and transportation agent. The farmer is the employer. The laborer imported is seeking work. When he leaves the border, he knows where he is going; he knows what wages he is going to get; he knows who his employers are, and there is no reason for any loss of time or for the building of any great motels, and what have you, here, there, and yonder, to hold labor while the farmers come and look them over as they might look over stock in stock yards. Let the employer discharge his obligation; let him make his contract with its specific obligations. The only thing this amendment will do will be to take off the farmers at points distant from the Mexican border a part of the added cost which Mexican labor will represent in those distant places.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The additional cost to the Government for providing Mexican farm labor to be employed at points in Oregon, Washington, Minnesota, or Illinois would be primarily one of transportation, would it not?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. A reception center does not necessarily mean, as the Senator has stated, the building of motels or accommodations. A reception center would be a point where the employer could perhaps simply meet the train.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And pick up the persons who are to work on his place.

Mr. CORDON. It may well be, if I may interrupt the Senator, that on their trips the employees may never reach that point. They may come to the first point of their employment before they reach the center, and that is where their employer would meet them.

Mr. AIKEN. I think, perhaps, centers could be authorized, one or two in the Pacific Northwest, and perhaps in Utah, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, or possibly other States, to which the Federal Government would pay the cost of transportation from the border. If the purpose of getting Mexican labor is to produce and conserve crops, then, of course, the labor should be supplied wherever the crops are produced and harvested.

Mr. CORDON. Exactly.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not look for any particular additional cost above that of transportation if, as the Senator says, the program is well administered. I do not know how many laborers the North-

west may require. It depends on the weather.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is not a large crop, a large number of laborers will not be required. If there is a large crop, several thousand laborers might be required. I do not know.

Mr. CORDON. The figure has been variously estimated at from 6,000 to 8,000 at the maximum.

Mr. AIKEN. That is assuming a fair, average season?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think it is necessary, simply because the Federal Government designates a point as a center, to go to any great expense in erecting new buildings which might not be needed at all.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the Senator's view.

Mr. AIKEN. The center would be the point to which the Government could legally pay the expenses of the laborer. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is my view. I can see no reason for changing what has been found to be a satisfactory procedure for the handling of the problem from the standpoint of both the employer and the employee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Oregon concedes, however, does he not, that until the employers take over, at the centers, the Mexican laborers who have been sent there, the United States Government must pay for the sustenance of the labobers? The Senator will agree to that, will he not?

Mr. CORDON. There can be no question about that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. That could be handled by the Government's not shipping employees to the areas until it knows that their services will be required. I do not think that agricultural laborers should be sent here, there, and everywhere around the country on the mere possibility that someone might want to hire them. I think it should be known in advance how many are needed and where they are needed.

Mr. CORDON. It would be a terrible mistake if they did not do it that way.

Mr. ELLENDER. According to the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, it is specifically provided that reception centers shall be established "for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States."

In other words, as I read the language, it would be possible for an employer to wait until the workers got to the reception centers and there contract for them. In the meantime, they would be in the hands of the Federal Government, at the expense of the Federal Government.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that that sort of silly administration could be indulged in by the Department of Labor, if it desired to do so. There is absolutely no requirement that it be done that way. There is no reason for its being done that way. The Senator from Oregon is going to indulge in the presumption that the Department of Labor would use common sense in its administration of the proposed act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that in the past few years in the Pacific Northwest, particularly in the Rogue River Valley, farmers have employed Mexican labor in the picking of the crop and in the processing of the crop?

Mr. CORDON. It has been done for many years.

Mr. MORSE. The employers have entered into contracts for the number of men they needed before the men were ever shipped into our State. Is that not correct?

Mr. CORDON. Always; except during World War II.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not reasonable to assume and presume that in the administration of the proposed act such a common-sense procedure will be followed, namely, when, for example, pear growers in the Rogue River Valley certified that they needed 2,000 Mexican laborers to pick the pears and pack the pears, they would notify the Federal officials to that effect, and then enter into an arrangement with them. Thereupon notice would be given to the Federal officials at the border to send to Portland, Oreg., for example, 2,000 or 2,500 Mexican laborers, depending on the number of laborers who would be needed by the farmers to pick the pears. Is it not reasonable to assume that such a common-sense procedure would be followed?

Mr. CORDON. No other procedure would be consonant with reason. It is the settled practice. It is a practice which has been found to be eminently satisfactory. There is no reason in the wide world for changing it.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that all that the senior Senator from Oregon is seeking to do by his amendment is to have certain points of entry designated, and to have the Federal Government assume the cost of transportation to those points of the workers who are required to take care of the harvest needs of the section of the country which needs that type of help?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Is it not true that in the Pacific Northwest a large number of American workers, who were in years gone by available to satisfy the picking season demands, have been drained off in one way or another by the defense effort?

Mr. CORDON. That is the very reason why we are asking that some action be taken which will aid the farmer, not in the sense of helping him make money but to do what needs to be done. If the bill with the amendment should be enacted, it would still cost agriculture in the Pacific Northwest more per man per day than it would cost if the Pacific Northwest could find agricultural labor in its own area. Talk about subsidy. There is no subsidy involved.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I ask one more question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does it not therefore follow that if outside labor is not made available to the Pacific Northwest and to certain other comparable areas in the United States, the farmers of America will be required and forced to curtail their acreage, which would be anything but a contribution to the defense effort?

Mr. CORDON. It must necessarily follow that otherwise the farmer would be subjected to the cost of plowing, harrowing, planting, and tending of his crop through to harvest time and then to a dead loss, with nothing gained.

Mr. CAIN. May I burden the Senator with one additional question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. As the Senator from Washington understands, the senior Senator from Oregon is just as desirous of benefiting, through the pending amendment, the farmers of every region in America as he is the farmers of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. CORDON. Of course, the Senator from Oregon of necessity calls attention to conditions which exist in the area with which he is well acquainted. That the same situation prevails in other areas there can be no doubt. I believe, however—and I wish to be wholly factual—that in some sections, notably on the Atlantic coast, there is now in effect, and will continue to be in effect, special contractual arrangements with labor from the Caribbean area, which satisfy the additional needs of those sections. If that is not the case, then the benefits of this bill should go to that area. It should go to any area where the need is found to exist. If I discuss the Pacific Northwest, I do so solely to indicate by example the conditions which require this sort of temporary emergency legislation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one other intrusion?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does it not follow, if the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Oregon should be adopted, that farmers in every section of the country could benefit from the amendment if the conditions covered in the amendment prevailed in such other areas?

Mr. CORDON. Without question.

Mr. President, I said a minute ago the argument probably would be made that the amendment would set up a subsidy

for agriculture. I wish to dwell on that point for a moment. Let us assume the operation of the bill, with the amendment included. Again I refer to the Pacific Northwest. We may assume a reception center in the Pacific Northwest, and, for the purpose of my example, I will assume it is located in Portland, Oreg., which is reasonably centrally located to the State of Washington, the State of Oregon, and the western portion of Idaho. That reception center would be the geographical point to which the Government would be obligated to pay costs of transportation of incoming workers, and from which it would pay the cost of transportation of returning workers. It would serve little other purpose.

The farmers in the over-all area have long had associations for the purpose of securing migratory labor, and particularly foreign labor. The use of such associations is recognized in the bill, and provision is made for dealing with associations rather than individual farmers, if that is found to be advisable. Such associations now exist. They represent all types of agriculture which find seasonal periods when they need additional labor; and when those periods come they need it immediately. In the fruit area a day will come in the picking of pears when pears must be picked. Two days later there is no need to pick them. They cannot be saved. They must be picked on the day when they are ready to be picked.

The associations have in their membership, groups representing each of the several agricultural industries. There is one in the fruit area, let us say, in the pear area of the Rogue River; another in the bean area in the Willamette Valley; another in the area where peas are planted and harvested by the tens of thousands of acres, in the wheat section of southeastern Washington, northeastern Oregon, and western Idaho; another in the beet area; another in the Hood River apple area, in the Wenatchee country, and so forth. Others are in the intensively cultivated garden areas around Puget Sound.

All those areas are represented in a single association. The necessities are worked out carefully. The timing is worked out. The obligation of the individual employer is determined in advance. It is an obligation to the association; and until the association is satisfied that that obligation will be met, no foreign workers or other workers are brought into the area. All those things are taken care of in advance.

Consequently, in that area, through these associations, there would be in advance definite knowledge as to the number of additional workers needed, where they were to work, for whom they were to work, how long they were to work, and when they would leave one point to go to another. They would follow the seasonal rotation of crops through the Pacific Northwest, beginning within the next 2 months and running through until late fall. That will all be done.

But, Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that those workers will receive the going wage established in the particular area for the work which they do. It is the highest wage in agriculture known in the United States. The foreign worker will receive just what his domestic colleague will receive in the same area for doing the same work.

There will be adequate housing wherever the workers go, because that has been taken care of in the past and is maintained. The difference to the farmer, is that when he employs local domestic labor he does not have to pay costs of transportation. He pays the laborer when the laborer appears on the job, and he pays him until he finishes the job. Then the laborer is on his own. In this case the employer must pay his pro rata share of the cost of transportation from the point of reception to his farm, wherever it may be, and transportation returning. Those additional costs are added to the going wage rates, and represent additional costs to the agriculture of the Pacific Northwest, even under the provisions of my amendment.

So we cannot say that the Government is giving anything to agriculture in the Pacific Northwest—not a thin dime. The Government's necessities have drained the manpower away. The Government now seeks to find a substitute for that manpower, and agriculture says, "I will help to foot the bill, but I cannot foot it all."

If we are to talk about subsidies, let us take a look around the rest of the country. Today we are entering into contracts running into hundreds of millions—yes, billions—of dollars for defense. That defense is valueless unless food is available. So if industrial contracts represent defense, so does the production of food. This is a call predicated on defense. We are entering into contracts throughout the United States. What arrangements do we make? What arrangements have Congress provided authority for making?

First, when we enter into a contract with industry, and industry cannot produce because it does not have the capacity for the additional production, we either build for industry and permit industry to operate the Government equipment and the Government facilities, or we go to the Treasury and furnish the money to industry to build for itself. In the first place, we will lend industry the money. We will give it special allocations so that it can do the job. We will give it sufficient contracts so that it will know that it will get its principal back. In addition to all that, we will give it a special right to amortize the whole of its investment over a period of 5 years. If we are to have private industry, if we are to have freedom in this country, we must do something like that. Faced with that condition, it ill becomes anyone to cry "subsidy" when we seek to help the farmer not to lose quite as much as he otherwise would lose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted that my colleague has made the argument which he has just made, because I think it is a complete answer to the subsidy charge. Yesterday on the floor of the Senate I said, "Call it a subsidy if you wish; it is a vital part of the cost of defense." That is what the transportation cost of the workers really is. It is a part of the defense program. We ought to face it as a defense cost, just as we face as a defense cost the building of a manufacturing plant to manufacture war material. We know that contracts are made with the Government, as the Senator has pointed out, so that the manufacturer will get back within a few short years the entire cost of the plant; and he will still own the plant, by the way. All we are asking for in this bill is the transportation cost, to enable agriculture to provide food for the American people. That food will be wasted if we do not consider this item a part of the defense cost.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate very much the statement of my colleague. I could not agree with him more completely.

It seems to me that there is no basis for opposition to the amendment. Certainly those engaged in agriculture who happen to have the good fortune to be located within a short distance of the Mexican border would not want to say that, because of their location, the Congress of the United States should enact this proposed legislation, which, while it might appear general on its face, as a practical proposition is a special preferment and priority to those who live in the nearby area.

Mr. President, if the amendment should be adopted the farmers in the Pacific Northwest would still pay as much transportation costs for their labor as would the cotton growers of Missouri, Oklahoma, northern Mississippi, northern Louisiana, or elsewhere in that area, because they would still have to meet in their entirety the long overland transportation costs back and forth. Let us while we talk equity do equity.

Mr. President, there are a number of things to which I desired to call attention. I shall in a very few minutes close my argument. I shall not advert to specific allegations which have appeared in the RECORD and to which I would be glad to give specific answers. If they are repeated, however, I may meet them one by one. But it seems to me that this case is so fully met that further argument would be cumulative, reiterative, and of no value to the discussion.

I desire to put into the RECORD at this time, Mr. President, only some of the mileage distances that agriculture itself in the Pacific Northwest would have to bear were it to have a reception point in the city of Portland. In the Seattle area there would be a total of 190 miles one way, running from 160 to 190 depending on location. In eastern Oregon and western Idaho and the great beet-growing area, 400 miles. In the Medford pear area of the Rogue River, 300 miles. In the Pendleton area, where the peas are grown in the tens of thousands of acres, 219 miles. In the Klamath area in southern Oregon, 294 miles. In the Wenatchee area up to 200 or 250 miles.

There are areas in between where the distances would be less. The figures represent one-way mileage which would have to be met in its entirety by the farmers. To add to that the expense of the two-way trip from the Mexican border would create an intolerable burden. Agriculture in the Pacific Northwest is already required to absorb the discrimination that distance from market itself causes—the transportation cost, and the transportation cost east is greater than it is west. There would be that transportation differential in the first place. To that would have to be added a harvesting cost of $2 a day per worker unless a portion of that added load is taken over by the Government as it has absorbed other added costs in other essential industries where additional needs have been found to exist if this country is to prepare to defend itself.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON FARM LABOR BILL, S. 984

On March 12, Senator CAIN, Senator MURRAY, Senator WELKER and I introduced a bill (S. 1106) designed to give the Secretary of Labor authority and funds with which "To facilitate the obtaining of an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes." That bill was much more comprehensive than the bill now before us. It authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to provide minimum assistance for domestic migratory workers. It placed major emphasis on full utilization of the domestic labor force.

This was in sharp contrast to S. 984, which confines itself entirely to importation of foreign workers—and then only from Mexico.

Other Senators have, or will present the shortcomings of the legislation reported by the committee as measured against the overall need for corrective action in the migratory labor field. I, therefore, will not burden the record by repeating their arguments.

I wish to call attention, however, to the fact that this bill, as it came from the committee, would not provide a single iota of help to farmers in the Pacific Northwest, the farmers in the New England States, or to farmers in Montana, the Dakotas, Minnesota, and other States geographically removed from the Mexican border. Mr. President, in my judgment this is strictly a "border State" bill.

The Senator from Oregon, Mr. CORDON, has introduced an amendment designed to correct this feature of S. 984. I had prepared a similar amendment, but decided not to offer it since the Cordon amendment accomplishes the same objective. I, therefore, join the senior Senator from Oregon in urging approval of his recommendation.

Mr. President, unless the Cordon amendment is adopted, I see no reason why any Senator in an agricultural State removed from the Mexican border should support this bill.

I want now to review briefly some of the testimony I presented on this subject to the Senate Agriculture Committee.

We must have sufficient labor in the fields to plant, cultivate, and harvest the coming crops. This is essential, both to the welfare of the individual farmer concerned and to the national defense effort. If the supply of labor from normal sources is inadequate, we must supplement it by obtaining workers elsewhere.

The labor supply, even in normal times, is not uniformly spread across the country. Some areas experience greater difficulty than others in meeting their needs. This is particularly true of that type of labor which has become to be known as stoop labor.

As defense mobilization is accelerated, spot labor shortages will appear. In some cases these will be sectional—in other cases, regional—and in still others, merely State or area shortages. The geographic location of these spot shortages will bear direct relationship to the location of defense industries. It is inevitable that a plant like Boeing Aircraft Co. will draw the majority of its new workers from the communities immediately adjacent to it.

If nature is permitted to take its course some farming communities, some farming valleys, some farming areas will suffer more than others. Left entirely to their own resources and devices, some sections of the country, where farming is the chief occupation, will suffer extraordinary and undue hardship.

The defense mobilization effort, which creates critical farm labor problems on a sectional, regional, or spot basis, is a national effort. It is not only the State of Washington or the Pacific Northwest that is mobilizing for defense—it is the United States of America.

The impact of defense mobilization may be localized. The cost of defense mobilization and the impact of the problems in its wake must be borne by the Nation as a whole.

Any legislation dealing with the farm labor problem must be viewed from a national, rather than a sectional point of view. States bordering on Mexico may not need as much assistance as States like my own—1,500 miles from the border. I am confident, however, that the delegations from Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California will agree with me, that a problem created by a national effort demands equality of treatment as among sister States of the Union.

To pass legislation here in the National Congress which solves the problem of the border States but leaves unsolved the problem of Minnesota, the Dakotas, Montana, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, the New England States, and others would be indefensible in my opinion.

To summarize this portion of my remarks—I think we must augment our domestic farm labor supply with some foreign workers in the coming crop season. Any legislation on the subject should be national—not sectional—in scope and in actual application. Some States, some regions of the country will be harder hit than others. A reasonable part of the additional burden thrown upon farm producers in this area, should be borne by the Nation as a whole. Since transportation of the foreign worker from place of recruitment to place of need represents a significant part of the additional cost, the Federal Government should assume that portion which most nearly represents the defense-created problem.

Now, just a brief comment on the specific problem of Northwest growers. Principal sources of foreign or off-shore workers are Hawaii, Mexico, and Puerto Rico. The distance from these places of need in the Pacific Northwest ranges from 1,500 to 3,000 miles. Cost of transporting workers from these points of recruitment to places of need and return ranges from $100 to $160.

With these figures in mind consider the estimate of need. Best calculations place our Washington, Idaho, Oregon need for out-of-area workers at 7,000–8,000. If even one-half this number comes from off-shore or foreign sources, the additional cost to Pacific Northwest agriculture ranges from $400,000 to $640,000. If all were obtained from out-of-country sources, the cost ranges from $800,000 to $1,200,000.

Not only is this additional cost a burden on the individual growers, it also represents a ball and chain his products must carry into the market place where Northwest crops compete with those grown in border States.

Mr. President, I close by urging, again, adoption of the Cordon amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, since I shall necessarily be absent from the floor for a few moments in attendance of a meeting the Armed Services Committee, I ask unanimous consent that, if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is acted upon before I return, a brief statement by me in support of the Cordon amendment may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL FROM KOREA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to submit the concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Without objection the resolution will be received and read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30), as follows:

Whereas on June 27, 1950, the Security Council of the United Nations recommended by resolution that "Members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area"; and

Whereas on July 7, 1950, the Security Council of the United Nations by resolution requested that the nations supplying forces and other assistance to the Republic of Korea be put under a unified command headed by the United States and also requested the United States to designate the commander of such forces; and

Whereas subsequent events have shown that the members of the United Nations—with a very few exceptions—have been dilatory in carrying out the recommendations of the Security Council of that organization; and

Whereas on February 1, 1951, the General Assembly of the United Nations declared by resolution that Communist China was an aggressor in Korea; and

Whereas the overwhelming proportion of the troops and matériél furnished by United Nations members in response to the Security Council resolution of June 27, 1950, have been furnished by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress:

That, unless, within 30 days of the passage of this resolution the members of the United Nations have given to the commander in chief, United Nations forces in Korea, satisfactory evidence that both troops and matériél, in such proportion to member resources as he, after consultation, shall determine, are promptly forthcoming, the President shall recommend the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Korea to Japan and Formosa; and

That a treaty of peace with Japan should be concluded without delay; and

That the President shall employ the Armed Forces of the United States to the extent necessary to defend the islands of Japan and Formosa against armed attack:

Provided, however, That, if for strategic or other reasons it is decided by the President that the Armed Forces of the United States should remain in Korea, then it is the sense of the Congress—

That the President should order the four divisions of United States troops which are now scheduled to go to Europe be sent to Korea instead and

That the United States representative to the United Nations and representative in the Security Council should be instructed to oppose, and if necessary, veto the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, what is the reason for this concurrent resolution? I favor the MacArthur proposal for winning the war. As General MacArthur so properly stated, the United States at best can only expect a stalemate war in Korea under the policy being followed by President Truman and Secretary Acheson. Victory in Korea is impossible unless the United States takes a much stronger action against Communist China. This should include a bombing of Chinese bases in Manchuria and the use of Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa to open up a guerrilla war on the Chinese mainland. Senators will notice I said—to open up a guerrilla war on the Chinese mainland. I do not want anyone to say that I am advocating the use of United States forces in opening up a front on the Chinese mainland, but for the Chinese Nationalist troops to open up a guerrilla war on the Chinese mainland. Chinese Nationalist troops should also be used in the United Nations Army in Korea.

I do not believe that the bombing of Manchurian bases will necessarily bring Soviet Russia actively into the conflict. Red China already is in it. The opening of a guerrilla war on the mainland would force Red China to divert large numbers of its troops to engage those of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces, who are experienced, trained soldiers, and who have demonstrated in the past their ability to fight the Chinese Communists.

The limited-war concept espoused by the administration bars any victory. The only end to such a limited war can be an appeasement settlement. That can be the only possible way the Korean War can be settled on the basis of the policy now being adopted by this administration.

The only alternatives is fighting forever; a course which means the sacrificing of additional thousands of American boys in a way which the American public should not and will not countenance.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from this week's United States News and World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Averell Harriman, special assistant to Mr. Truman, is credited with having recommended the summary dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur without a hearing or an opportunity to take formal leave of his command. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, concurred in the policy that the President followed.

The United States Joint Chiefs of Staff did agree that recall of General MacArthur probably was necessary, but did not endorse or recommend the method of dismissal, which was without precedent in military procedure. None of the amenities was shown a commander who had given 52 years of service to the Government.

Gen. Omar Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, was asked by the White House to make the speech denying that the group agreed with General MacArthur on military policy in the Far East. That speech was cleared before delivery by Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State.

General MacArthur is unlikely to accept any of the many jobs being offered him in private industry. The general, instead, is expected to express his opinions on some of the developing military and diplomatic issues.

It was in January 1951 that the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff indicated agreement with MacArthur on the military strategy for conducting war in Korea.

With General MacArthur fired, the White House group is getting set to put into effect a number of the recommendations that the general had favored. There is beginning to be doubt concerning the political popularity of a plan that calls for United States troops to move up and down Korea while casualties go on endlessly.

If the armies of Communist China persist in staging offensives in Korea they may become the first armies to get a taste of atomic-artillery shells.

Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, nearly 5 years too late for the effect he expected, is finding that the United States Government is accepting his idea for giving military aid and direction to the forces of Chiang Kai-shek. General Wedemeyer, who was overruled, wanted to bolster Chiang while he still held most of China.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point certain paragraphs which I have marked, which appear in the United States News and World Report Newsgram for May 4, 1951, under the heading "Tomorrow."

There being no objection, the marked paragraphs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Out of the argument, the sound, and excitement, a few facts seem clear:

War in Korea cannot be won by UN under existing rules. Communists, alone, enjoy an opportunity in Korea to try for a real decision.

Rules, explained publicly to the enemy, permit UN forces to move only a few miles above the middle of Korea. The same rules permit Communists to drive United States troops into the sea, if they can. Rules, under which United States troops fight, are influenced by other nations that supply few troops of their own.

Casualties, taken largely by Americans on the UN side, can go on and on. UN troops are permitted to advance a limited number of miles. Then Communists are permitted to build their forces to push the UN back. After that, the UN makes another limited push, then waits to be pushed back.

It all can go on forever unless or until the rules are changed.

Actually, the rules will gradually be changed as MacArthur wanted.

Communist armies will be stopped, cut up. Communists, going back next time, are not likely to be allowed to rebuild their strength unmolested.

Bombing of Chinese bases is nearer than it was. Blockade is likely to be forced. Idea that non-Communists should go on supplying China with 20 to 30 shiploads of supplies a week, plus all that moves through Hong Kong and Macao, so that Communists can be able to fight better, won't always sit well. General MacArthur didn't like that—supplying an enemy with means to kill.

Arming of non-Communist Chinese will be tried, too. That's starting. United States Navy won't always be under orders to shoot non-Communists on Formosa who may want to fight against the Communists who are fighting against Americans.

War, in other words, is very likely to take the course that MacArthur is convinced that it will take, even though President Truman says he objects. Wars, as we've pointed out before, have a habit of expanding, not contracting.

If you want to know something else that's probably coming, it's this:

Someone in United States is going to look around the world. He'll notice that not a Russian is fighting anyplace, although the world is in quite a turmoil.

Then the American will see that Russians provide the guns, the agitators, the arguments for others who do the fighting on their side. He'll notice, too, that Americans do most of the fighting on our side, as well as supplying guns.

The thought will dawn that maybe in the world there are those who are actively on our side, who might be encouraged to see rewards and opportunities for being active non-Communists just as Russia finds plenty of Communists. It may be that peoples, if given the means, if organized, supplied with missions, encouraged, would be as willing to fight Communists as Communists seem willing to fight them. Then American troops might not have the major burden.

It's just something more to think about. Its practical side is found in Formosa and Korea where potential soldiers go to waste. It is much the same story all around the world where Communists are making gains. Russians already are training Germans for war. They would like to train Japanese.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "The War That's Not a War," appearing in the May 5, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report. At the beginning of the article we find the following set forth:

No wonder people are confused about the war in Asia.

United States, helping Chiang's army on Formosa, won't let it fight.

Britain, fighting Chinese Communists, wants to give them Formosa, seat them in the UN, keep up diplomatic friendship.

Allies agree on Korea, disagree on Formosa and other trouble spots. Fighting Communists depends on where the fight is.

Mr. President, the article is three pages in length. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR THAT'S NOT A WAR—MYSTERIES OF FAR EASTERN POLICY DEEPEN

No wonder people are confused about the war in Asia.

United States, helping Chiang's army on Formosa, won't let it fight.

Britain, fighting Chinese Communists, wants to give them Formosa, seat them in the UN, keep up diplomatic friendship.

Allies agree on Korea, disagree on Formosa and other trouble spots. Fighting Communists depends on where the fight is.

Military advisers from United States are to start now to train the men in armies of Chiang Kai-shek on the island of Formosa. Arms, too, are to flow from United States to Chiang's forces. The priorities related to Formosa will be as high as those for arms to Europe.

There are an estimated 600,000 Chinese soldiers, 300,000 of them potential combat soldiers, under Chiang. These soldiers represent a regime that holds membership in the United Nations. Yet the United States Navy is used to make sure that none of the Chinese soldiers on Formosa get to China or go to Korea where other Chinese are waging war on the United Nations. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, emphasized that the

United States Navy will continue to blockade Formosa to keep the Nationalist soldiers bottled up there.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur for a long time has been urging that Americans arm the Chinese Nationalists and that an American military mission train the Chinese for military service. The general was fired, in part, for persisting in a recommendation that is to be partially carried out now that he has been relieved of command.

This is just one of the strange situations that prevail in the Far East, affecting the war that is being fought in Korea at high cost in United States casualties.

War in Korea, President Truman emphasizes, is a United Nations war. A wide appeal is made to UN nations to provide troops. Yet the UN member with the most troops to offer, anxious to provide troops, is denied the right to take part in the war. Instead, while Nationalist China, a UN member, is asking a chance to fight in Korea, Great Britain, another member of the UN, is trying to take away the island on which the Nationalist armies are living.

Not only is it proposed that Formosa be taken from the Nationalist Chinese, who are members of the UN, but that it be turned over to the Communist Chinese, who are at war with the UN. The British want, too, to take away the UN membership from Chiang's forces, who want to fight the Communists, and give that membership to the Communist Chinese, who are fighting the UN. The United States, however, now is planning to start to arm and train the Nationalists so that they can defend their present home, but the Navy is to make sure that the Nationalists don't move and make an effort to fight the Communists.

In Malaya as well as Formosa, British soldiers are being killed in battle by Communists who are largely Chinese. The British Government, however, maintains friendly relations with the Chinese Communist government in China and wants United States to give privileges and territory to that government at a time when it is killing American soldiers also. While the British recognize the Communists, the Communists refuse to recognize or have anything to do diplomatically with the British.

Both United States and Great Britain, fighting these Communist Chinese, are adamant in insisting that Chinese who aren't Communists should not get a chance to fight the Communists. In South Korea, too, are large numbers of young men who are not Communists and who might be armed and trained to fight Communists. Building of a larger army of non-Communist Koreans to fight Communists has been delayed, however, so that more arms could be shipped to Europe to equip armies that might someday have to fight.

It's all very complicated to officials who try to untangle skeins of a war in Asia. Enemies are official friends. Friends who want to help are denied the right to help. Other friends hesitate to help more, yet balk at the idea of letting someone help who wants to help. It is a war, responsible officials point out, in which the enemy has perfect freedom to destroy all your troops and shove you into the sea but in which your side can't punch if the enemy gets groggy and retires back of a mythical line.

American armies, battling a new Communist offensive, can lose ground but are denied the right to gain much if they save themselves and win a battle. They have authority to counter men and weapons at the battle line but cannot strike against the source of men and weapons. For Americans, admittedly, it is a strange and a new kind of war.

DOES UNITED STATES FACE ENDLESS WAR IN KOREA?—FACTS, FIGURES SHOW HIGH COSTS, FEW GAINS

Seesaw war in Korea can go on forever at this rate.

One more in a long string of offensives is under way. At the outset, it looks like the others. They've been costly and indecisive for both sides. Neither has a knockout punch yet.

Facts and figures tell the story. They show casualties and costs in a steady rise, and the end of the fighting is not in sight. The toll is at big-war size now, and still going up. Here are the vital statistics needed to put the Korean war in perspective as it enters its newest stage.

War, entering a new phase, is under way again from the starting line with the score 2 to 2. In 10 months, Korean war has gone through two big retreats by United Nations forces and two major offensives, covering 855 miles of ground gained or lost. Each mile has cost UN forces 275 casualties, and the enemy 950 casualties. More American lives have been lost, more bombs dropped, more military equipment and supplies used up than in the first entire year of World War II following Pearl Harbor. Yet the front lines are about where they were at war's beginning last June—around Korea's 38th parallel.

Mounting casualties, in the buildup of war in Korea to date, total more than a million men killed, wounded, missing or prisoners. In addition, about half a million Korean civilians are dead, wounded, or missing. Biggest troop losses are those of the North Korean Army, with 514,000 casualties in 10 months. The Chinese, in the war only 5 months, have lost about 312,000 casualties. South Korean forces have suffered about 170,000 casualties. United States losses total 61,744, while those of its allies total about 3,300. American casualties, now increasing, have averaged around 200 a day in recent fighting. The recent ratio of UN to Communist losses has been 1 to 12. Over-all ratio is 2 to 7.

War in the air has caused nearly half of the Communist casualties, but very few of the UN losses to date. About a thousand bombing, strafing, and transport missions are being flown daily by United States Air Force, Navy, and Marine planes. Now committed in Korea are three air groups of B–29 bombers, two groups of B–26 bombers, and five groups of United States fighters, mostly jets.

The battle of supply, with the fighting front 7,000 miles from home base, has reached big-war proportions. More than 13,000,000 tons of war supplies and equipment have been transported from United States across the Pacific to Korea, since last June. In addition, 70,000,000 barrels of gasoline, oil, and fuel for jet planes have been carried to the war zone. And more than a million people have been taken to or from Korea, most of them crossing the Pacific at least once.

To support the shooting war for 1 month, for example, hundreds of United States ships now are carrying 1,400,000 tons of ammunitions, weapons, food, clothing, vehicles, and equipment from the United States to Korea. Other fleets of tankers now are carrying 10,000,000 barrels of fuel to Korea monthly. About 100,000 soldiers, airmen, and civilians are carried by ship to or from Korea each month.

Air transport, moreover, must be used to get much of these supplies and replacements to Korea from bases in Japan. From 700 to 900 tons of supplies now are being flown in each day. This has run to as high as 1,300 tons daily, during periods in which all supplies from Japan had to be flown in. Nearly all evacuation of the wounded also is being done by plane, with 121,000 evacuees flown out of Korea to date. Of these, 22,000 have been flown back to the United States. All told, the Air Force is running in Korea the biggest military-support airlift in history.

War's biggest victims, after 10 months of back-and-forth fighting in Korea, turn out to be Korean civilians. Millions of families have been uprooted, made homeless, turned into refugees. Latest figures show at least 165,000 dead, 110,000 seriously wounded, about 200,000 missing. More than 6,300,000 refugees have been counted. Another 3,000,000 are classed as needy. There are 1,437 camps set up for emergency use by evacuees. Other refugee stations have been set up outside Korea. But resettlement, even if war ends, will take years. Thousands of towns, millions of homes and farms are destroyed.

Strength of the UN force after 10 months has grown to about 550,000 men under arms in Korea. Largest forces are American, with more reinforcements now training in Japan. The rest are largely South Koreans, with other UN allies furnishing small forces. Latest available figures of combined land, air, and sea forces in Korea show this strength:

United States, 260,000; South Korean, 250,000; British, 22,000; Turkish, 5,000; Canadian, 2,600; Philippine, 1,200; Thailand, 1,200; French, 1,100; Belgium, 1,000; Greek, 1,000; Dutch, 900; New Zealand, 500; South African, 250; Australian, 1,000. Total, 547,750.

Of that total, somewhat less than half represents front-line ground troops.

Growing enemy strength outclasses the UN force in manpower, but not in equipment. At least 695,000 Communist troops are known to be in the Korean combat area, with an undetermined number held in reserve. Communist air power is expanding rapidly. More than 800 bombers and fighter planes now are available in Manchuria, against about 100 that have been used in past weeks. About 50 airstrips are built or under construction in North Korea. A Soviet submarine force of 80 to 100 vessels also is available now for possible use around Korea. Ground-force weapons, particularly artillery, appear to be more abundant, too. But it is in manpower, not in equipment, that the Communists have the advantage.

An endless war? That's the prospect now unless a political settlement is reached or unless the rules are changed. Under present rules—

UN planes must stay below the Yalu River, cannot prevent the Chinese from sending in unlimited reinforcements.

UN ground forces are under orders to avoid a major offensive of their own, one carrying them much above the thirty-eighth parallel.

UN cannot cut off vital Communist supplies of ammunition, gasoline, and food by bombing supply lines in Manchuria and China.

Communist forces cannot bring in Russian ground troops, Russian submarines, or Soviet-operated air power in quantity without setting off full-scale, unlimited war.

Communist planes cannot bomb UN bases in Japan and Southern Korea without facing sure retaliation and extension of the war by United States bombers striking back at bases in Manchuria.

Under those rules, as top United States military men see it, UN forces cannot be driven out of Korea, can inflict huge casualties, but probably cannot drive China's Communist Army back to Manchuria. But the rules may change. It's up to the Chinese now, with their plans for the new phase of war still uncertain.

WHAT KOREA HAS COST IN MEN (KILLED, WOUNDED, AND MISSING, UP TO START OF PRESENT OFFENSIVE)

United States casualties: Army, 51,497; Marine Corps, 9,071; Navy, 655; Air Force, 531.

All UN casualties: United States, 61,700; South Korean, 170,000; others, 3,300.

Communist casualties: Chinese, 312,000; North Korean, 514,000.

The totals: UN casualties, 235,000; Communist casualties, 826,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, someone might ask, Why withdraw United States forces from Korea unless

the other members of the United Nations come through and furnish the help they have pledged with tongue in cheek?

The answer, so far as I am concerned, is very simple: While American casualties in the bitter fighting in Korea have reached staggering proportions, we have the sorry spectacle of Warren R. Austin, our delegate to the United Nations, begging our Allies to send more men into the conflict which is their war as well as ours. Mr. President, I wish to repeat that this is their war as well as ours. The forces there go under the name of United Nations forces, and the United Nations have as much to say as we do about directing that war, and they are directing it. In fact, they are telling the American commander—they did tell General MacArthur, and now they are telling General Ridgway—what he can do and what he cannot do.

Mr. President, the casualty statistics graphically portray the story of who has waged the war in Koreea. The United States has suffered 61,700 casualties, according to the latest available figures, and they do not take into consideration the casualties which have occurred in Korea during the past 4 or 5 days of the present fierce fighting.

In comparison, the 13 members of the United Nations which claim to be fighting by our side have suffered only 3,300 casualties.

The American losses of life and number of wounded, combined, is 20 times those of all the other nations that President Truman would have us believe are standing shoulder to shoulder with us in the fight against aggression and communism. President Truman and others have made that statement I do not know how many times. They talk about "the members of the United Nations standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States," but there is no basis for such an assertion, because they are not standing shoulder to shoulder with us. In fact, many of them are not even within shooting distance of Korea, and some of them have not made even the first move to give the United States any help whatever in Korea.

More than 10,000 American lives have been lost in what President Truman first called a police action, but now, in the face of these staggering losses, concedes is a war. But the end is not in sight, under the "endless war" which we are told is to remain the policy of the United States under the Truman administration.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "More Aid in Korea Is Asked by Austin." The article appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, April 29, 1951. The subheading of the article is "He tells UN members United States alone is not strong enough to defend the world."

Mr. President, those are not my words, but that is the heading of the article describing the statement made by Warren R. Austin, the United States representative in the United Nations.

I should like to read two short paragraphs from the article—and I wish to point out that I am quoting Mr. Austin, our delegate to the United Nations:

No country has so few men in its armed forces that it cannot contribute some to the common cause.

Mr. Austin means that no nation—not 1 of the 52 United Nations members—has so few men that it cannot contribute some to the common cause.

I read further from the article:

"Many hands make light work" is an old proverb, and there is work for many hands in building collective security for all of us.

Let us not deceive ourselves that we can sit back and let some other person, some other country, provide security for all of us.

We should pay particular attention to this statement:

No nation, not even the United States, is powerful enough to do that alone.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE AID IN KOREA IS ASKED BY AUSTIN—HE TELLS UN MEMBERS UNITED STATES ALONE IS NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO DEFEND THE WORLD

UNITED NATIONS, New York, April 28.—Warren R. Austin warned today that the United States was not powerful enough to provide security for the entire world all by itself and diplomatically echoed the Pentagon's request that more members of the United Nations send troops to Korea.

The chief United States delegate to the United Nations said "that no country had so few men in its armed forces that it could not contribute some to the common cause." United States sources said Mr. Austin had a double-barreled cause in mind: the Korean war, and the plans for earmarking troops of the United Nations for duty against aggression.

For months, United States military men have been conferring in Washington with officials of member governments to try to increase international representation in the United Nations army in Korea. The talks are still going on, and it is reported unofficially ,that they are expected to bring some specific results.

UNITED STATES AVOIDS OUTRIGHT APPEAL

The United States still is avoiding a public appeal for more troops from United Nations members, and Mr. Austin chose his words carefully. But it was one of the few times that a member of the United States delegation had spoken publicly on the importance of increased military contributions to Korea.

Mr. Austin, speaking under the auspices of the United Nations radio in a speech that was carried in at least seven countries based his talk on Benjamin Franklin's warning:

"Unless we all hang together, we most assuredly will hang separately."

The United States delegate said imperialistic schemes for conquest were not put in operation unless there were obvious signs of the victim's weakness. The weakness of the Republic of Korea, he declared, presented an irresistible lure to Communist imperialism.

Fifteen countries have contributed forces to the Korean war, Mr. Austin said, adding that more than 50 had given moral or material support to the United Nations action in Korea.

"But neither moral condemnation nor materials to succor the victim can in themselves deter aggression," he said.

CITES ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

The United States delegates recalled the General Assembly's adoption of the United for Peace resolution, which asked that each member State set aside and maintain in trained readiness troops that could be made available to the United Nations.

"No country has so few men in its armed forces that it cannot contribute some to the common cause," he declared. "'Many hands make light work' is an old proverb, and there is work for many hands in building collective security for all of us.

"Let us not deceive ourselves that we can sit back and let some other person, some other country provide security for all of us. No nation, not even the United States, is powerful enough to do that alone.

"The only thing that will deter a well-armed aggressor from his act is the certain knowledge that, if he makes a move against one of the United Nations, he will surely be confronted by the resistance of all the countries of the world that believe in freedom."

Mr. CAPEHART. So, Mr. President, there we have Mr. Austin's opinion.

In the resolution, Mr. President, we are simply saying that if the other 52 members of the United Nations—as a matter of fact, there are 59 members of the United Nations, but some of them are satellite countries—are not willing to send troops and materials to assist us in Korea, we should get out of Korea.

The United States cannot continue throwing the lives of American boys into a bottomless well of death. If the fight in Korea does not merit the all-out support of the United Nations, which theoretically have allied themselves with us, then it seems to me we should get out of Korea and should end the flow of blood which will continue to run endlessly under the Truman-Acheson plan for prosecution of the war. Barring the bombing of Manchurian bases and an all-out effort to wipe out the enemy in Korea, I believe we should withdraw our troops to Japan and Formosa and should use those islands as the bastions for defense against further encroachment by communism and its advance to the Philippines and our own shores.

Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD, I should like to have printed, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "India Refuses To Take Part in Any Boycott or Blockade of China." The article appeared in the Washington Evening Star for Saturday, April 28, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA REFUSES TO TAKE PART IN ANY BOYCOTT OR BLOCKADE OF CHINA

(By Ernie Hill)

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., April 28.—India has informed the United Nations flatly that it will ignore any economic boycott or naval blockade that the peace organization attempts to throw around Communist China.

India's unequivocal refusal to cooperate with UN efforts to isolate Mao Tse-tung's Communist aggressors comes as a blow to American-sponsored efforts to tighten the Korean war.

India, which borders China on the south, plans to continue all normal trade with Red China and will refuse to vote for the naval blockade plan, delegates have been informed by India.

The boycott and the blockade are two of General MacArthur's recommendations for dealing with Red China. He named them as essential steps along with the use of Chinese Nationalist troops on the mainland and the bombing of Manchurian military targets.

WOULD HAVE LITTLE EFFECT

United Nations delegates point out that an economic boycott will have little force if India's border is left open. Much of the trade that now flows through Hong Kong, it is stated, can be rerouted through India.

India's attitude, it is pointed out, is one of the reasons why it is much easier for General MacArthur to propose a boycott and blockade than it is for the United States to enforce such recommendations.

American delegates, however, plan to press for UN adoption of economic sanctions and perhaps a blockade even though there is general belief that they will be unsuccessful.

RAU WARNING RECALLED

"They will be just about as hollow as declaring Communist China guilty of aggression," said an Asia delegate. "It will be one of those victorious votes in the UN chambers that has no effect whatsoever on China or the war."

Sir Benegal Rau, India's delegate to Lake Success, opposed declaring China guilty of aggression and has stated that his country is unwilling to follow up with any sanctions at all.

Rau's warning of last October that the Chinese Reds would enter the war if the UN forces pressed across the thirty-eighth parallel to the Yalu River has been recalled in the light of Red China's entry into the fighting.

BURMA MAY JOIN INDIA

Rau in January also warned that if Communist China was declared guilty of aggression, it would never stop fighting until that resolution was rescinded by the UN General Assembly.

If Rau's second prediction is as sound as his first, many delegates point out, it is useless for the peace organization to continue with efforts to get a cease-fire and peace truce from the Peiping Government.

Indications here are that Burma probably would follow the Indian lead on sanctions, thereby leaving the entire southern boundary of China open for free trade movements.

Since China's northern and western borders touch Russia, it will mean that the boycott and blockade will be effective only along the eastern seaboard. That, it is generally believed, will not be enough to cripple China seriously.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the article states that the Malayan States will do the same thing, and that it would be outrageous to blockade the Chinese coast.

Mr. President, India is a member of the United Nations. India voted for action against the North Koreans. India voted that the Chinese Reds were aggressors. Yet, India has no stomach for winning the war. India wants our boys to stay in Korea like sitting ducks, I suppose, and be shot down one by one, every day, for I do not know how long.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is not that the same India that now is trying to make a showing that the American people should contribute to her 2,000,000 bushels of wheat?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; it is the same India that now is asking the American people for $300,000,000 worth of wheat.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that at no time has India ever asked us to give her any wheat. India has offered to buy the wheat on credit terms. It is our State Department that proposes to give India the wheat; India has never asked that the wheat be given to her. I merely want to correct that impression.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Then, let me state the question the other way around.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The statement of the Senator from Iowa would indicate that he knows what he is talking about. I should like to ask the Senator whether the proposal is on the same basis as that on which the State Department is now trying to get the American people to give wheat to the people of India.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield so that I may reply?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct. I merely wanted to correct the suggestion that India had come to us soliciting a gift of wheat from the United States. India has come wanting to purchase wheat from the United States. For some mysterious reason, our State Department says, "No; we would not descend to the dirty business of selling grain. We want to give away $200,000,000 or $300,000,000 worth of wheat."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield, that I may address another question to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no reason to doubt the Senator's statement, but if that is the case, I wonder whether the Senator would apologize for the insinuation that India wanted to obtain the wheat for nothing.

Mr. CAPEHART. That has been my understanding. At least it has been stated in the newspapers that they wanted it free.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will permit——

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to be correct in what I understand the fact to be and to make it sure. India may now want the wheat free——

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is, since our own Department voluntarily offered to give it to her free. But, in its inception, in the two approaches which India made to this country in regard to obtaining wheat, both approaches were made on the basis of buying the wheat. They asked for as easy terms as they could get, but at no time, in their original approaches, did they suggest that we give them wheat as a donation. That suggestion came from within the bounty of our own administrative agencies.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the senior Senator from Iowa is correct.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, April 28. It is entitled "Dr. Bunche Opposes Plan for Bombing Manchuria." I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I desire to read the last paragraph, and in doing so I am not taking anything out of context. Dr. Bunche, who is one of our representatives on the United Nations, says:

America must be prepared to wage apparently fruitless holding battles against communism for some time to come.

He said, "America must be prepared to wage apparently fruitless holding battles." What does "fruitless" mean? It means zero, does it not? It means accomplishing nothing, does it not? In my understanding of the term, it means that nothing is accomplished. He says, "fruitless holding battles against communism for some time to come." How long is "some time to come"? Of course, Dr. Bunche is for the so-called Truman-Acheson policy. So why should not other members of the United Nations send troops? Why should they not send materials? Why should we continue to do all the fighting in Korea, or 90 percent of it? If this is a United Nations action, then, if the United Nations is to be successful in years to come, every member of that organization will have to take part in every war in which United Nations forces take part. Why are they holding back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. BUNCHE OPPOSES PLAN FOR BOMBING MANCHURIA

PALO ALTO, CALIF., April 28.—Dr. Ralph Bunche, United Nations diplomat and Nobel prize winner, opposes any action to spread the Korean war—such as bombing Manchuria, as proposed by General MacArthur.

In a news conference the famous Negro diplomat said an attack on China would mean spreading the conflict to all Asia and thence to Europe, but that by confining the war to Korea, the UN has a chance for negotiating a satisfactory and honorable peace without appeasement.

He said America must be prepared to wage apparently fruitless holding battles against communism for some time to come.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Indiana has had to say. Many of us are somewhat confused regarding the relationship of the various nations to the war enterprise in Korea. As I understand, General MacArthur, the former commander in chief of the United Nations, has been recalled and dismissed, because he was unwilling to carry out a policy which was acceptable to the President of the United States. Is that what the Senator from Indiana understands to be the fact?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is my understanding of why General MacArthur was dismissed, because he was insubordinate and failed to carry out the policies of the President of the United States.

Mr. KEM. I should like to put a hypothetical case to the Senator from Indiana. Suppose that, in the integrated

international army of Europe, to which we are contributing troops, the present Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, General Eisenhower, who is an American, is succeeded by a Frenchman, a Belgian, or some other national; and suppose war breaks out, and that the Supreme Allied Commander decides upon a policy which is unacceptable to the prime minister of his country—if he is a Frenchman, let us say it is unacceptable to the Premier of France—would not the Supreme Allied Commander of that integrated international army owe some duty to the people of the United States to make known the policy in which he believes and which he considers to be sound, from the standpoint of a proper and intelligent military operation?

Mr. CAPEHART. There could be no question about it at all.

Mr. KEM. Applying that reasoning to the present case, did not General MacArthur owe some duty to the other nations who have contributed to this military enterprise, however small their contributions might be? Did he not owe them some duty to tell them what he believed to be a sound military policy in Korea?

Mr. CAPEHART. If he was commander in chief of the United Nations forces, in the true sense, I should think that he would owe a certain amount of loyalty to them, and be obligated to give them a certain amount of information, and to treat the troops of other countries the same as those of the United States.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Indiana says "in the true sense." Does the Senator have in mind that General MacArthur was the commander in chief of the United Nations forces in a sense other than a true sense—let us say, in a Pickwickian sense?

Mr. CAPEHART. Unfortunately, more than 90 percent of the troops were American. However, the forces were called the United Nations forces. General MacArthur was taking orders, I presume, through the President of the United States, from the other countries. I presume they were telling the President of the United States, who, in turn, was telling General MacArthur.

Mr. KEM. The fathers and mothers of the Turkish troops and of the Belgian troops and of the English and French troops—if there are any in Korea—are certainly interested in the welfare of their sons who are serving there, as members of the United Nations forces, are they not?

Mr. CAPEHART. I should think so, yes.

Mr. KEM. President Truman, by a resolution of the United Nations, has been authorized to designate the commander of the United Nations forces, has he not?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. Does that carry with it the right to determine the policies which are to be carried out by that commander in chief?

Mr. CAPEHART. I had hoped it did, but I am thoroughly convinced now that it did not. I am convinced that the pressure for the dismissal of General MacArthur came from the British, the French, and our other allies, who have no stomach whatever for the Korean war, and who would like to get out of it. I do not think they were ever in favor of it, in the first place. They want to recognize the Red Chinese. They want to give up Formosa. So we are in the peculiar position of having a United States commander, with 90 percent of the United Nations forces consisting of American troops, who are doing the fighting and doing the dying, taking orders from nations scattered all over the world, nations who are contributing very little, if anything, to the conduct of the war.

Mr. KEM. I agree with what the Senator from Indiana is saying, but does not the Senator also agree with me that it is hardly consistent for the President of the United States to discipline the commander in chief of the United Nations forces for bringing to the attention of the other countries what he, as commander in chief, regards as an unsound military policy in Korea?

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to ask the Senator from Indiana a question, but with his permission, I should like to preface it.

Assuming that I agree that what General MacArthur suggests is the right thing to do, I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana whether it was up to a soldier to disobey political orders, inasmuch as MacArthur was the military general carrying out the orders of the United Nations, but mainly carrying out the orders of the United States of of America? The point I am trying to make is called to my attention by an incident which occurred in the Legislature of the State of Florida.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean disobeying political orders or disobeying military orders?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Political orders or military orders.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not admit that General MacArthur disobeyed any orders.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But suppose he had been a sergeant or a private, and suppose a second lieutenant, a first lieutenant, or a captain gave him an order. I am one of those who believe that General MacArthur is suggesting the proper method, but I do not think it was up to him, a military man, to carry it out in the first instance.

A member of the State Legislature of Florida introduced a resolution to the effect that we should approve everything MacArthur did. I am not talking about the merits; I am simply talking about the resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did the Senator say the resolution was introduced in the Florida State Legislature?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. An ex-sergeant who happened to have seen service in the field—he was not even a second lieutenant—opposed the resolution for the reasons which I suggested in my question to the Senator from Indiana. He said, "Suppose I or a private had done what MacArthur did, no matter how well founded he was in his conclusions, what would have been the result?"

I have not seen the resolution, but I understand that it did not prevail.

Mr. CAPEHART. I can understand the reasoning, but I do not think there is any analogy to my point at all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why?

Mr. CAPEHART. Because General MacArthur was the commander of the United Nations forces.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Militarily.

Mr. CAPEHART. And he was the supreme commander in Japan, having been appointed with the consent of China, England, Russia, France, and the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no disagreement that he might have been correct as to what should have been done. The only difference between the Senator from Indiana and myself is as to my opinion that the decision was not up to General MacArthur.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think there is any question that the President of the United States has a right to relieve any officer at any time he desires to do so, even without cause. The President has relieved General MacArthur. But that does not mean that Members of the Senate and the American people need not be aroused about it, and that we should not debate whether he was right or wrong.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope we shall carry out the general's ideas, but I want it done in a constitutional and lawful way.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not say that anyone is suggesting that it should not be done constitutionally, but as I understand the situation, while the general may be right in his conclusions, he was not in position to say they must be carried out.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The distinguished Senator from Indiana and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico probably know that when an officer in our Armed Forces is commissioned, he signs an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. I do not know that these two Senators agree with the Senator from Washington, who feels very deeply that a military man's chief and fundamental obligation to his country, particularly in a time of crisis, is loyalty to his country, rather than obedience to orders. I raise the question to see whether other Senators may have a reaction to it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KEM. It seems to me that the Senator from Washington has stated a sound abstract principle, but I should like to raise this question: Suppose the commander in chief of the United Nations in the field—let us say he is a Frenchman—receives certain orders from the Premier of France and certain orders from the President of the United

States. Suppose the Premier of France orders him to advance and that the President of the United States orders him to retreat. Which order is he to carry out?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is a very good question. I do not think I know the answer to it, and I do not believe anyone else does.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I recall that in the Senator's very able remarks he made the statement that he wished to see the Chinese Nationalist troops used to open up guerrilla warfare on the Chinese mainland. Does the Senator intend thereby to suggest the use of the air power and sea power of the United States in the opening up of such warfare on the Chinese mainland?

Mr. CAPEHART. If it is necessary to get the Chinese Nationalist troops to the mainland, I certainly would, because the troops we have in Korea were sent there by ship and by airplane. The Turkish troops went over by ship and airplane. The English troops went over by ship and airplane. They did not swim to Korea.

Mr. SMATHERS. Then the Senator's answer is "Yes."

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; unless, of course, they have sufficient ships and airplanes of their own.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator think they have sufficient ships and airplanes?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have reason to believe they have.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in 1948 and 1949, when the Nationalist forces had 1,200,000 men, their fight with the Chinese Reds was not successful? What reason does the Senator now have to think the Chinese Nationalists would be successful with 600,000 men when they were unsuccessful with 1,200,000 men?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not going to criticize them too severely at the moment, because the United Nations so far has been unable to stop the Chinese Reds. So I think we might well look into the mirror before we start criticizing the Chinese Nationalist troops.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not wish my remarks to be interpreted as criticism, but it seems to me it is something to think about. If they were unsuccessful with 1,200,000 men, could they be now too successful with 600,000 men?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think it makes any difference whether they were or were not successful. They are members of the United Nations. They were one of the original founders, and as members of that organization they ought to have a right to fight in a United Nations Army. How we can deny them that right is more than I can understand.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not wish to deny them the right to fight in Korea. As a matter of fact, I was one of six Members of the House who went to see the President last spring to urge him to use them in Korea. But it seems to me there is a difference between using them in Korea and starting an independent war in the southern part of China.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator be willing to recommend to the President that he withdraw our Navy, which is now prohibiting the Chinese Nationalists from going to the mainland of China? If they do have sufficient air strength and sufficient boats, would the Senator be willing to have them go back to the mainland of China?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes. I think that what the Chinese Nationalists determine to do, if they can do it on their own, is a matter which is up to them. I would be in favor of it. But if we use our air and sea power to transport the forces of Chiang Kai-shek to the mainland, and then use our air power to support them thereafter, and assuming, which is a great assumption, that we were able thereby to win victory in Korea, the question then arises, are we then going to withdraw and leave the forces of Chiang Kai-shek up to their necks in China without further air support and sea support?

Mr. CAPEHART. At the moment it is not a question of whether we will transport them. We are denying them, through our Navy, the right as guerrillas to go to the mainland of China and fight. We are not only not helping them, but we are keeping them from crossing to the mainland, even though they have their own transportation facilities. What right have we to do that?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, my information, which is certainly no better than that of the Senator from Indiana, is that the forces of the Nationalist Republic now on Formosa do not contend for a minute that they have sufficient ammunition, air power, or sea power to start a battle in China. As a matter of fact, as I recall the words of the great General MacArthur, we would have to give them logistic support in their movement into the southern part of China.

Mr. CAPEHART. Suppose there is only one of them, and he has a gun and can fight. His country is a member of the United Nations. As a matter of principle, he ought to be permitted to fight. He ought to be permitted to fight in Korea as a part of the United Nations forces. He ought to be permitted the right, as a citizen of China, which is a member of the United Nations, to fight in China, if he can cross to the mainland from Formosa. If he can get across from Formosa with a gun in his hand, he should be permitted to fight. Why should we deny him the right to do it?

Mr. SMATHERS. I take serious issue with the Senator from Indiana that we deny the Chinese any right they may have. Certainly they have the right to go back to China at any time they are able to do so. The question is, Do we take them back, then see them through successfully?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; the President of the United States has the Seventh Fleet there to keep them from going to the mainland of China.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator have any evidence whatever to show that Chiang Kai-shek has asked to be permitted to land his troops on his own, without support from the United States, in order to go into China?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think that within 4 days after Korea was invaded Chiang Kai-shek offered 33,000 soldiers to General MacArthur in Korea, and our Government turned down the offer.

Mr. SMATHERS. The question I should like to ask of the Senator is this. After we got Chiang Kai-shek's forces into southern China with our air power and sea power—and, as the Senator knows, whether one died in the air or on the ground, it is still death—how would we then break relationships with the Communists in China and get out of there?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is a question which I should like the Senator from Florida, the President of the United States, and Mr. Acheson to answer, because we are now at war with Red China.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not know the answer. I asked the question of the Senator from Indiana with the thought that perhaps he could give the answer.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the answer is in my resolution, which I hope the Senator and the Congress will adopt. My resolution says that if the members of the United Nations are not going to join with us in winning the Korean war we will withdraw our Armed Forces from Korea, take them back to Japan and Formosa, and defend those two islands. Furthermore, we will deny the Red Chinese the right to membership in the United Nations, and we will make a peace treaty with Japan.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the Senator has only proposed to submit his resolution. I suppose he will offer it at the proper time.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have already submitted the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. To which committee has it been referred?

Mr. CAPEHART. I assume it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations or to the Committee on Armed Services. I would leave the reference of it to the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Indiana does not think it should be referred to the so-called joint committee, consisting of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, which should study the provisions of the resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am hopeful that it will go to the committees jointly.

Mr. WHERRY. I am wondering whether the Senator should not ask that it be referred to the two committees.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution which I have offered be referred jointly to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reference of the Senate resolution as requested by the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Objection has been made. I ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana if the subject matter of the resolution should not be considered by the two committees.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think so. I am certain the majority leader will agree with us that it should go to the two committees.

Mr. WHERRY. The resolution deals with the global defense policy, and the Senator is asking the committees to study the subject and to make recommendations to the Senate with reference to it: Is that not correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator feel that most of the provisions in his resolution are a subject matter for open hearings?

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. With which all Members of the Senate should be acquainted, whether they are members of the committees or not?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The American people should know what is developed in such hearings, should they not?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think they should.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator feel that that should be done?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know whether the Senator has heard that by vote of the two committees, which was taken at noon, other Senators will not be permitted to attend the hearings?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator means that only members of the two committees may attend?

Mr. WHERRY. Only members of the two committees will be permitted to listen to the testimony of General MacArthur and other witnesses. Does not the Senator feel that in taking such a position the committees are further closing the door on the facts? I am not saying anything disrespectfully about any Senator, but is it not a fact that such action further closes the door on getting out the facts which the Senator from Indiana has been discussing for at least 30 minutes, and in which he and the American people are vitally interested, from the standpoint of the global policy which the administration should pursue?

Mr. CAPEHART. Will they permit us to read the report of the hearings?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hope that they will at least permit us to speak to them after they come out of the committee room.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the Senator from Indiana that I submitted Senate Resolution 132 about a week ago. It also provides an agenda for the two committees to study. I am not in favor of revealing anything that pertains to our national security. The Senator from Indiana has been on committees when such questions were asked of witnesses who were in charge of vital security secrets. I am talking about the provisions of the Senator's resolution. I ask the Senator from Indiana if he does not feel, in order to accomplish his purpose that open hearings should be held, and that the resolution should be referred to the committees sitting jointly and should be considered as part of the agenda. In that way, the committee, after its study, could make its recommendation to the Senate, so that we could pass constructive legislation to help develop a global policy which would be truly bipartisan. In that way the policy would be truly bipartisan. It would be a policy which the American people could understand. How can the American people understand a policy if they must search it out of something which some Defense Department representative has permitted to be released from the cold transcript of the testimony of some witness?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York has been careful to stay out of the controversy prior to the appearance of General MacArthur. However, under the circumstances, the Senator from New York would like to make one comment by way of asking a question of the distinguished Senator from Indiana. Does the Senator from Indiana have any idea whatever that what transpires at the closed hearings will remain secret for any length of time?

Mr. CAPEHART. I know one commentator who will certainly get it.

Mr. IVES. What is the point of having closed hearings?

Mr. CAPEHART. I suppose it is to further agitate and confuse the American people.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana if it is not true—and this is no reflection on any Senator—that in the event closed hearings are held the information will somehow leak out, and that then we would be faced with the difficulty that some commentator would make his own interpretation of the information, which he would have a right to do, but which might be entirely different from the interpretation which could be placed on the evidence by someone listening to it in an open hearing.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the Senator is 100-percent correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Would it not be better to place all the facts on the table?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. Fifty-two nations in the United Nations are giving orders, and reports would have to go to the ambassadors and the staffs of the 52 nations. They would be able to know all about it, but men who are elected to the United States Senate by the people of America are not supposed to know anything about it.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask a question of the Senator, if I may.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he is aware that under the present ruling of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services the news which they desire to make public—that is, the censored news—will have to be paid for by members of the press. There are hundreds of members of the press here anxious to send news to their respective States. Members of the press will be charged a certain amount a page. I do not know exactly what it is, but, I understand it is $1 a page. Therefore, only those newspapers which feel that they can afford to pay for the transcript of censored news will be able to print it.

Mr. CAPEHART. The committees are going to have closed hearings.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. And deny Senators, other than those on the committee, admittance.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yet they are going to sell the testimony which is taken in the closed sessions to the newspapers at a dollar a page.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; and that will be censored testimony. The newspaper editors and the newsmen will not be able to get the testimony unless they buy it from the reporter, who is not a Member of the Senate. Yet the Senator from Indiana will not be permitted to be present to hear what goes on.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean to tell me that they are going to take down the testimony and then sell it to the newspapermen?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is exactly what they are going to do.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then why are they having closed hearings?

Mr. FERGUSON. They are going to censor the testimony before it is given to the newspapermen. They are going to delete that part which in their judgment as Senators, ought not to be made public.

I ask the Senator from Indiana if he is familiar with rule XXXVI of the rules of the Senate, from which it would appear that only the Senate has authority to determine whether or not evidence is to be secret.

I read from rule XXXVI, paragraph 5:

> Whenever, by the request of the Senate or any committee thereof, any documents or papers shall be communicated to the Senate by the President or the head of any department relating to any matter pending in the Senate, the proceedings in regard to which are secret or confidential under the rules, said documents and papers shall be considered as confidential, and shall not be disclosed without leave of the Senate.

Does not the Senator agree that only the Senate can pass upon that question, and that neither the committee nor any individual member of the committee has authority to pass upon it?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct, if the rule means what it says; and I am certain that it does.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has not the Senator been informed that all Senators are to be barred from the committee hearings?

Mr. CAPEHART. I had not heard it until the Senator told me; but I am not surprised at anything in the United States Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has not the Senator been advised that a court reporter or Senate reporter, or four or five of them—whatever number is necessary to take the testimony—will be permitted to be in the room, but that neither the senior Senator from Indiana nor the senior Senator from Michigan will be permitted to hear the testimony? We shall have to take from other Senators their conclusions as to what happened in the committee. Does not the Senator understand that that question has been decided, and that he is excluded?

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not know it. Perhaps I should have, but I did not. I am not a member of either committee. However, as I say, I am not surprised at anything around here. We seem to have given up our responsibility and our constitutional rights as United States Senators, to the administrative branch of the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know of anything in the rules which permits a Senate committee to adopt a resolution forbidding any other Member of the Senate from being present at a hearing?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Indiana seen the editorial in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Unavoidable Secrecy"?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have not, I am sorry to say.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator, with the consent of the Senate, permit me to make a very brief comment on the editorial, which deals with the subject matter of the Senator's comments concerning the secrecy of the hearings?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I yield for that purpose provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to my good friend from Indiana that ordinarily I find myself in general agreement with the editorial policy of the New York Herald Tribune. However, the editorial this morning shows that even editorial writers can suffer lapses from the standard of keen analysis, because here is an editorial which certainly is lacking in keen analysis of the great problems confronting the Senate in respect to these hearings.

As the Senator from Indiana knows, as a member of the Armed Services Committee I am emphatically opposed to conducting the hearings in secret. Here we have an editorial entitled "Unavoidable Secrecy." The concluding paragraph says, speaking of the alleged partisan position of the two sides of the aisle in the Senate:

> But neither side has done more than play football with the real problem. Where issues cannot be fully and openly investigated it would be better to keep the procedure completely secret——

Mr. CAPEHART. Except, of course, for telling the New York Herald Tribune what goes on.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

> Where issues cannot be fully and openly investigated it would be better to keep the procedure completely secret, as the Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy does, leaving the public to rely upon the fairness and judgment of its elected representatives.

If I ever read a fallacy in a comparative argument, that is it, because the Atomic Energy Committee's so-called secret meetings deal with the administration of the atomic energy program. I have heard no Member of the Senate suggest that committees of the Senate should not hold executive sessions on administrative problems dealing with secret matters. But that is not what this hearing is at all. It is not a hearing on an administrative matter. It is a hearing which is an investigation.

Mr. CAPEHART. And on policy.

Mr. MORSE. It is an investigation as to the responsibility of various persons in the Government for mistakes which many believe have been made in the field of foreign policy. When we come to investigate the responsibility of Government officials, be they in the civilian branch of Government or in the military branch of Government, the junior Senator from Oregon wants to reiterate today, as he stated on the floor of the Senate the other day, that we cannot square secret investigations with the democratic procedure of a fair trial under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a citizen of the United States, I can come to only one conclusion, and that is that the committee does not want me to know what is said and what goes on, what the charges are, what the evidence is, and what the conclusions are.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to add a further comment about the editorial, there is not one line in it which shows that the editorial writer recognizes that a part of a hearing may be held in open session, and that when some highly secret matter which affects the security of the Nation becomes involved, it can be laid aside for a subsequent executive session on that point alone. There is no mention of that in the editorial. On the contrary, the editorial writer gives the reader the impression that the only choice is either to have the hearings conducted entirely in secret, or to have them open to the public. He makes a fallacious argument. It is this kind of an emotional argument, that if we hold open hearings, we shall jeopardize the lives of boys in Korea, which I think we must spear in the Senate. Let me tell the Senate that we are going to jeopardize the lives of the American people, including the boys in Korea, if we do not get this problem out into the open, so that the American people may know what the facts are, and so that they may hold Government officials to their responsibility for the mistakes which they have made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator 100 percent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNAVOIDABLE SECRECY

The Senate committee investigation into the relief of MacArthur, which opens tomorrow, is supposed to provide public knowledge and understanding of certain extremely serious issues of civil and military policy. How to conduct such an investigation adequately and honestly without at the same time risking security breaches that could easily cost untold numbers of American lives is one of the most delicate and difficult problems which modern democratic government must confront. And yet it is being treated on all sides with an appalling levity. The committees themselves have decided on closed hearings by an almost straight partisan vote, as if there was nothing save cheap political advantage at stake.

The Republicans, shouting that the people must have the facts, have demanded open hearings. Open hearings would, of course, be a guaranty that none of the really significant facts could possibly be produced—the immediate results on the Korean casualty lists as well as on future national policy would forbid it. Open hearings would effectively shield MacArthur from any serious cross-examination; that would, no doubt, make him a more useful banner for partisan assault on the administration but would add nothing to the popular understanding of national policy.

The Democrats, shouting "military security," have voted to close the doors and issue only screened excerpts from the testimony. Closed doors under this arrangement will not, of course, provide much real security; while they will unquestionably supply opportunity to rig the released material for partisan advantage. And whatever emerges will be assailed by the opposite side as suspect, anyway, so that once more the hearings are likely to yield a maximum of passionate partisan uproar, a minimum illumination of the serious questions under debate and considerable danger of damaging leakage.

It is ironic to find the supporters of MacArthur, who has always kept a singularly close security check-rein over all reports of his own policies and activities, so ardent now for pitiless publicity; and it is unfortunate that the administration which now advocates closed hearings has allowed the arts of political suppression, of the calculated release, of the defensive "top secret" stamp, to grow and flourish so mightily over recent years. That can't be helped. Where the lives of combat soldiers and vital issues of the highest national interests are involved, anything like full disclosure is impossible, and in closing the hearings the Democrats are more nearly right than their opponents.

But neither side has done more than play football with the real problem. Where issues cannot be fully and openly investigated it would be better to keep the procedure completely secret, as the congressional committee on atomic energy does, leaving the public to rely upon the fairness and judgment of its elected representatives.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that following the editorial from the New York Herald Tribune which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] placed in the RECORD, the lead editorial appearing in today's Washington Evening Star entitled "Hazards of Closed Hearings," may be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

HAZARDS OF CLOSED HEARINGS

If one likes to indulge in beguiling assumptions, there is merit, or the appearance of merit, in closing the MacArthur hearings, which begin tomorrow.

The argument is that open hearings would put in jeopardy our national security and the security of our troops in Korea. Senator RUSSELL, who will preside at the hearings, argues this proposition forcefully and with conviction.

There are at least two considerations, however, which tend to support the Republican demand for open hearings.

The first is that the public has become an interested and proper party in this case. With administration consent, if not approval, General MacArthur has taken his complaint to the people, and therefore it will be necessary to satisfy not only a committee of Congress, but the people as well, that he has had a fair opportunity to present his views, and that their acceptance or rejection is based solely on their merits. This may not be easy to do if the people are to receive only a censored version of what the general says to the committee. Many people, certainly, look with suspicion on the administration's candor in such matters. They see that the Wedemeyer report on Korea, a report that has been vindicated by events in all important respects, was suppressed on security grounds for more than 3 years. And yet, now that the report finally has been made public, it is very difficult to see how legitimate security considerations justified its suppression.

The second point has to do with the feasibility of closed hearings. This is a case in which convictions are strong and politics is rampant. Opinions will differ as to what is and what is not a security matter. So it is going to be very difficult if not impossible to prevent "leaks"—leaks which will give the public a garbled and distorted version of what the actual testimony was.

If this is going to happen, it would be much better to let General MacArthur testify publicly, and to close the hearings only when there can be agreement that some security matter is at stake.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With regard to what the Senator from Oregon has just been discussing, the editorial in its reference to the hearings of the Atomic Energy Committee is completely in error, because the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does hold many open hearings.

Mr. MORSE. The hearings on Commissioner Lilienthal were held in the open.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And many more; and hearings should have been more open than they were. We have held many hearings. We go into executive session only when there are matters of vital public security involved. So we hold open hearings and closed hearings.

In connection with the editorial offered for the RECORD by the Senator from Oregon, I should like to call attention to the lead editorial in today's Washington Star. It discusses, on what I think is a very calm plane, the desirability for open hearings. It mentions the dangers that come from mentioning in public things which go to the national security, but it says the committee can go into executive sessions to discuss such matters. That follows the same pattern as did my motion made before the committees sitting jointly the other day to have open hearings, except for those matters involving the national security. I made the motion that the hearings be open. The motion was cavalierly voted down by the committees.

In the hearings in connection with the foreign-aid program to Europe we held open hearings to the greatest possible extent. The same was true in connection with the hearings on the Atlantic Pact. In connection with all the other major issues which have been before us we have held open hearings, except when some subject matter came up in connection with which the witness himself said, "It involves the national security, and is a bit of classified information, and I think I had better testify in executive session."

In such cases we have gone into executive session and then have come back into open session so the public could hear the discussion of matters which do not specifically involve the national security.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me so I may correct the RECORD?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The first question I asked the senior Senator from Indiana was what the committee did. I inadvertently said the committees took action today. I heard about it only today, but the action was taken on May 1. I simply wanted the RECORD to show that.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe the discussion which is taking place on the floor at this time and the question involved are very important. I have been wondering whether a precedent is not being established by holding closed hearings. I am not clamoring to get into the session. But I think that by voting to hold closed sessions a precedent is being established in the Senate and in Congress which might be important in connection with hearings in future sessions.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think there is any question but that the Senator from Kansas is correct.

My position, Mr. President, is that if we are not going to follow General MacArthur's policy to win in Korea; if we are going to maintain a policy of stalemate, remaining there and permitting 2,000 or more American boys to become casualties every week, then if the United Nations members are not going to furnish more troops and materials and do their just share, we ought to withdraw our Army from Korea. I have expressed that thought in the concurrent resolution I have sent to the desk.

Mr. President, I find that Senators are using all sorts of excuses and alibis as to why the other 52 members of the United Nations do not do more. For instance, on the Senate floor on April 26, 1951, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] said, addressing the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]:

I wonder if the Senator will tell us who is doing the sacrificing in Indochina—

We find people who always alibi for other nations—

I wonder if the Senator will tell us who is doing the sacrificing in Indochina, where 150,000 French troops have suffered 37,000 casualties? It is a war against the same communism, against imperialistic, aggressive communism, and the loss of Indochina could be as serious as the loss of Korea.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] remarked:

I understand the British have quite a substantial force in Malaya.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] added:

They have 175,000 troops there.

What I have read is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1951, page 4406, column 1.

Mr. President, let us have the facts. I am going to give the facts. I have the records as of today. They were secured today, and from them I give the breakdown of the British forces in Malaya. In the Malayan battle the U. K. troops, including the air forces, are 25,000; Gurkhas—I do not know what they are—10,000; Malayan natives, 3,000; that is a total of 38,000 troops. The able Senator from Arkansas said he understood there were 175,000 troops there, and I believe the able Senator from Minnesota said 150,000. The truth is that there are 38,000 troops there. However, in addition to that, there is a Malayan police force which corresponds, I assume, to the police force in our cities, of about 15,000.

MEETING OF ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TODAY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have asked the Senator from Indiana to yield for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that the Senator from Indiana will not be jeopardized thereby in his rights to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations be permitted to meet at 3:30 today as to procedural questions which have arisen, on which I do not like to take action without consulting such members of the committees as are available. I should like to obtain unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire, if the Senator will yield for a question: Will this be in any way conferring jurisdiction on the committees?

Mr. RUSSELL. It has nothing whatever to do with that. It is a matter of procedure which, as chairman, I think I could determine, but I wish to consult with members of the committees before I take any action.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has made the unanimous request simply to comply with the Senate rule under which committees are not permitted to meet during the session of the Senate without having obtained consent of the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only reason.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that is the only reason, the Senator from Michigan has no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right object, and I do so only for the purpose of asking my good friend, the Senator from Georgia, a question, there has been some discussion on the floor as to whether Senators other than members of the committees will be excluded from the hearings. I have not seen the transcript of the proceedings. I could not make out from the discussion exactly what action was taken, and whether or not the hearings will be limited with respect to admittance, perhaps only to the members of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations; that no other Senators can be present?

Mr. RUSSELL. If I understood correctly—and I do not have the record before me—that action was taken at the organization meeting, which was held, I believe, on Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So even though it be the desire of one or more of the remaining 96 Senators to attend, they are excluded by committee action?

Mr. RUSSELL. I so understood the action of the committee. If I understand it correctly, it was unanimous action, with the exception of perhaps one member.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, was a motion made to bar any other Senators than those who are members of the Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, there was a motion made.

Mr. FERGUSON. And a vote was taken on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, that is correct. That is my recollection. In fact I know it was, because an amendment was offered to the motion that a certain number be admitted, as had been my original idea, and that amendment lost.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the minutes of the committees sitting jointly there will be a record, I assume, as to how members voted?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, there was no record vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. The vote was merely a voice vote; was it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the chairman announce that the motion had been carried?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not read the transcript of the hearings.

Mr. FERGUSON. But that is what happened, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my recollection of what happened.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have propounded the question before, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I remember very well that the motion was agreed to by unanimous consent in the committee. The chairman asked whether there was objection, and there was no objection. As a matter of fact, I made the motion because I thought there were so many Members of Congress who wished to come—practically all the Members of Congress—that the committee would have to draw the line somewhere, or else would have to admit all 96 Members of the Senate and all 435 Members of the House.

So the motion was made; and the chairman asked whether there was objection, and there was no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not going to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator reserve the right to object?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall reserve the right to object in order to be able to ask a question, if we are going to be technical.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; the Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, under these circumstances, so that I may ask a question, to clarify the situation. A vote was taken, and that vote precludes the attendance of Members of the Senate, other than members of the two committees—at what session? Only the first session, or any session of the joint committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood it would apply to the entire hearings, but I am not sure what the transcript of that meeting will show. I shall be glad to get the transcript and refer to it, because it is not a classified document.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. We would simply like to know what the arrangement is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington reserve the right to object?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I think he has been misinformed. It happens that this morning I read the transcript of the Monday meeting, and that transcript indicates to me that the vote was not unanimous, even though the Senator from Arkansas seems to have thought the vote was unanimous.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not state that the vote was unanimous.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it was unanimous.

Mr. CAIN. I would encourage the Senator from Arkansas to read the transcript, for he will see that it reads otherwise than the way he has stated the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. My recollection is that there was at least one vote to the contrary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if this matter is going to provoke a long discussion, I shall withdraw the request, for I merely wished to inform the Senate that the committees wished to extend this courtesy.

Mr. WHERRY. If we agree to the unanimous-consent request, will the Senator from Georgia remain on the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not wish to remain here indefinitely.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I think the Senator from Georgia is duty bound to clarify what was not clarified in the discussion a little while ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry that I did not hear the discussion. I have encountered quite a few details in connection with the hearings, and they have made it impossible for me to remain on the floor of the Senate at all times.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that.

Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By action of the entire Senate can it contravene a rule which has been laid down by a committee? In other words, notwithstanding committee action to exclude other Members of the Senate, am I correct in understanding that such action can be overruled or undone by the Senate, when acting by means of resolution or motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that by a majority vote of the Senate, any instructions the Senate wishes to give to a committee can be given. The Chair is further advised that the granting of the unanimous-consent request as proposed would not in any manner change the rules of the Senate, but would simply give the consent of the Senate for the holding of the joint committee meeting at 3:30 p. m. this afternoon.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Hearing none, consent is given.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Indiana for yielding this much time to me. I assure him that I could not anticipate in advance the amount of time the discussion would require.

Mr. CAPEHART. I assure the Senator that it has been a pleasure to yield to him.

PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL FROM KOREA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I certainly think the Senator from Indiana is performing a valuable service in presenting to the Senate the figures to which he has referred. However, it occurs to me that in addition to a comparison of the figures, there is some difference in the promises on which the forces of the United States are in Korea and those on which the forces of England are in Malaya and those on which the forces of France are in Indochina. Certainly I do not think any comparison is to be made between England's motive in being in Malaya or the motive of France in being in Indochina, inasmuch as in each instance each of those countries is seeking to preserve a colonial empire in which it has large interests at stake, and our motive in going into Korea, where we do not have any possibility of obtaining any financial benefit.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course the Senator from South Dakota is correct. Malaya is a colony of England. Under the circumstances, it is only natural for England to defend Malaya, just as the United States would defend Hawaii or Puerto Rico. Of course, England is obligated to defend Malaya.

Mr. President, a moment ago I gave the statistics regarding the numbers of troops participating in the so-called Malayan war. There were 38,000, plus about 10,000 police, including regular police, special constables, and auxiliary police. About half of the police are auxiliary police, unpaid, and made up of natives.

My authority for that statement is Mr. Gonzales, of the British desk at the State Department. These are the figures as of today.

The fighting in Malaya is strictly of the guerrilla type. There are somewhat less than 4,000 Communist guerrillas operating throughout Malaya. They are highly organized and well trained. So the British have about 25,000 of their own troops there, or about 40,000 troops all told, trying to catch 4,000 guerrillas. Yet, we are told, that is one of the reasons why the British cannot give us more help in Korea.

French troops are in Indochina. We have heard all sorts of stories about how many French troops are there. Mr. Shaughnessy, at the French desk in the State Department, is our authority for these figures. There are about 60,000 metropolitan Frenchmen in Indochina, in other words, Frenchmen from metropolitan France; about 20,000 North African troops; about 15,000 French Foreign Legion troops, mostly Germans; about 50,000 Indochinese regulars; about 40,000 Indochinese auxiliaries; and about 14,000 of other kinds or types of troops; or a total of approximately 200,000 troops, but only 60,000 of them are from France.

Of course, Mr. President, Indochina is a French possession; France owns it, and France should protect it. What would one think of the United States if Hawaii were attacked and if the United States took no action to protect it? Of course, we would expect to protect it. The situation in Indochina is entirely different from the situation in Korea. We do not own Korea; we do not want any part of Korea. Why should not the 52 other members of the United Nations furnish more troops for Korea than they are furnishing? One provision of my resolution is that if they do not do so within 30 days' time, we should withdraw our troops from Korea.

I hope every Senator will vote for the resolution; and before the vote is taken, I hope the committee to which the resolution is referred will hold hearings on it, and I hope they will be open hearings.

Mr. President, another timely question in regard to the resolution which I have submitted might be as follows: Why not deploy to Korea our troops which are scheduled to be sent to Europe, if the United Nations do not come through by giving the support they have pledged? In other words, if the United Nations members are not willing to send more troops to Korea and to give us more help, then I recommend that we send to Korea the four divisions we are going to send to Europe, because the token assistance furnished by Great Britain, France, and some of our purported allies would make it appear that they have no stomach for the action in Korea.

While Great Britain gives lip support to the battle against communism in Korea, it continues to feather its financial nest by continuing an active trade with Red China, which is the real aggressor in the Korean conflict today, General MacArthur having routed the forces of the North Koreans.

General MacArthur, with the United Nations forces, more than 90 percent of whom were furnished by the United States, routed the North Koreans. The Chinese Communists then came in, and that started a second war.

President Truman would have the American public believe that 59 member UN nations are standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States in this battle. Only 13 members of the United Nations have sent troops. I am advised that one nation has furnished a lone ambulance unit as its contribution. Another, I am advised, has furnished a barge, the value of which in the campaign is questionable, to state it mildly.

So if they are not going to give us any more help than they have given us in the past, I say we ought to withdraw from Korea.

Mr. President, I should like to have made a part of my remarks at this point a statement showing the exact extent of the contributions by member nations of the United Nations forces in Korea. It is a statement by the Department of State, entitled "Status of Offers of Military Assistance to the UN for Korea."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of State—Status of offers of military assistance to the UN for Korea

Country and offer	Status
1. Australia:	
Naval vessels (S/1524, S/1646)	In action.
1 RAAF squadron (S/1530)	Do.
Ground forces (S/1637, S/1664)	Do.
2. Belgium:	
Air transport (S/1620)	Do.
Infantry battalion (S/1787)	Do.
3. Bolivia: 30 officers (S/1618)	Acceptance deferred.
4. Canada:	
3 naval vessels (S/1602)	In action.
1 RCAF squadron (S/1617)	Do.
Ground forces (S/1700)	Do.
Canadian-Pacific Airlines commercial facilities (S/1685).	Do.
10,000-ton dry-cargo vessels	Do.
5. China: 3 infantry divisions and 20 C-47's (S/1562).	Acceptance deferred.
6. Colombia:	
1 frigate	En route.
1,080 ground forces	Accepted.
7. Costa Rica:	
Sea and air bases	Do.
Volunteers (S/1645)	Acceptance deferred.
8. Cuba: 1 infantry company	Accepted.
9. Denmark:	
Hospital ship *Jutlandia* (S/1699).	In Korea.
Motorship *Fella Dan*	Withdrawn.
10. El Salvador: Volunteers if United States will train and equip (S/1692).	Acceptance deferred.
11. Ethiopia: 1,069 ground forces	En route.
12. France:	
1 patrol gunboat (S/1611)	Withdrawn.
Infantry battalion (S/1611)	In action.
13. Greece:	
7 RHAF Dakota transport aircraft (S/1612).	Do.
Ground forces (S/1755)	Do.
14. India: Field ambulance unit (S/1647).	Do.
15. Luxemburg: Infantry company (44 men).	Do.
16. Netherlands:	
1 destroyer (S/1670)	Do.
1 infantry battalion (S/1775)	Do.
17. New Zealand:	
2 frigates (S/1563)	Do.
Combat unit (S/1636)	Do.
18. Norway:	
Merchant ship tonnage (S/1576).	Do.
Field hospital unit	Pending.
19. Panama:	
Contingent volunteers	Acceptance deferred.
Bases for training	Do.
Use of merchant marine	Accepted.
Free use of highways (S/1673)	Do.
Farm hands to supply troops	Pending.
20. Philippines:	
17 Sherman tanks	In Korea.
1 tank destroyer (S/1561)	Do.
Regimental combat team (S/1661).	In action.
21. Sweden: Field hospital unit (S/1615).	Do.
22. Thailand:	
1 infantry combat team (S/1622).	Do.
2 corvettes and navy transport.	In action (one corvette destroyed after grounding).
23. Turkey: 1 infantry combat force (S/1630).	In action.
24. Union of South Africa: 1 fighter squadron (S/1669).	Do.
25. United Kingdom:	
Naval forces (S/1515)	Do.
Ground forces (S/1638, S/1702)	Do.
Air unit	Do.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, another question which might well be asked with respect to my resolution is, Why carry the war to Red China by having guerrillas fight on the mainland? I think a good answer is that if North Korea was an aggressor in its action in invading South Korea last June, then by the same token Red China is an aggressor and the UN action which is directed against the one should also be directed against the other.

It will be remembered that the member countries of the United Nations threw their hats into the air when North

Korea attacked South Korea, and said, "Go get them, go get them, sic 'em." We went in overnight, and we have been furnishing over 90 percent of the troops. Yet, when Red China moved in and became the aggressor, there was an entirely different play on the part of the United Nations members. Do we have two principles that are to be followed, one regarding small nations, such as North Korea, and another for large nations, such as Red China?

The UN General Assembly last February 1 took cognizance of this fact when it formally branded Red China an aggressor, but there the action ceased.

No blockade has been put along the China coast as General MacArthur advocates and as military strategy dictates. No economic blockade has been imposed to keep Red China from getting the raw materials, guns, ammunition, and other supplies which it diverts to its troops in North Korea to use against our own American fighting men. President Truman, in a press conference last November 30, declared that if Red China were declared an aggressor by the United Nations then we would bomb Manchurian bases. I think I ought to repeat that. President Truman, in a press conference last November 30, declared that if Red China were declared an aggressor by the United Nations, then we would bomb Manchurian bases.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I will yield in a moment. The UN declared Red China to be an aggressor, and now the President of the United States says we will not bomb the air bases in Manchuria. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true, however, that, after the President had made the statement of what would happen in case the United Nations branded Red China an aggressor—which was done—an agreement or deal was made with certain members of the United Nations organization in order to get them to vote that Red China was an aggressor, that we would not take action of a certain kind. The Senator from Michigan has no definite information that there was an agreement that the President would not adhere to his statement, but the Senator from Michigan has sufficient information to know that we so watered down the action of branding Red China as an aggressor that it was necessary to do that in order to get a milktoast resolution through—and, by the way, having in mind that it would not be used. The whole intent and purpose of the UN Charter being to stop aggression, after the United Nations had voted Red China to be an aggressor, it became the duty of members of the United Nations to stop the aggression. Instead of that, there was a secret or tentative agreement that it would remain as merely an idle gesture.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the best answer to what the able Senator is saying is an article which appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday, April 12, 1951, written by Walter Winchell. I ask that the article be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

MAC ARTHUR—THE STORY BEHIND THE STORY

The greatest scandal in American history is now out in the open. The scandal is not the dismissal of General MacArthur; it is the foreign policy which made it inevitable. General MacArthur and Secretary Acheson are only symbols in a titanic struggle going on behind the scenes. The forces which caused MacArthur's dismissal are not in Washington. They are in London. The administration, faced with the breakup of the Atlantic Pact by Great Britain unless it appeases Red China, took the step of double appeasement (of both Moscow and London) by firing MacArthur.

These are the facts: Secretary Acheson, as recently as last summer, attempted to honor his secret commitment to Great Britain to recognize Red China and admit her to the United Nations. He is on record as stating we would not veto Red China if she succeeded in getting a majority vote. Great Britain, as Red China's floor leader, attempted to get that majority. As another step, Secretary Acheson initiated a deliberate program to play down the importance of Formosa. Senator KNOWLAND of California produced documentary evidence that Secretary Acheson had secretly instructed all State Department policy makers to minimize the strategic importance of Formosa. In short, the Chinese Nationalist Government, by secret agreement between the United States and Britain, was to be thrown to the wolves. American public opinion stopped this also. MacArthur of course opposed it throughout.

The President and Secretary Acheson, until public opinion reversed them, took the view that since Asia has no industry—that continent would never be a factor in the next war. The Acheson formula called for the virtual abandonment of Asia. It was, of course, heavily supported by those who believe communism can be appeased. The American public did not subscribe to the view. It became impossible for the administration to force its secret agreement through the Senate. After practically declaring Korea could not be defended, the President ordered the troops in when Acheson's appeasement failed again. The same action followed, in Indochina. After refusing arms, the President sent them.

The reason Great Britain is desperate is that Red China is even more so. The whole of South China is in a virtual state of insurrection. Guerrillas, to the extent of more than a million, are in operation on the Chinese mainland. Until Formosa is liquidated, until Chiang's army is out of existence, Red China will always be on the brink of civil war. The Reds realize this so much that they are prepared to vacate south China, if attacked there. Thus, Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek are at the heart of the Far East question, and not Korea. MacArthur favors using him. Acheson's commitments to Great Britain forbid it. As an example, a shipment of rubber is being loaded at Singapore. Destination the Red forces.

MacArthur, contrary to the general impression, is within his rights even as a soldier in defying the President. His oath is to the Constitution and to the men under his command. If he deems the orders of his superiors in conflict with them, he is under a duty to make known his objections. The President, by the same token, has a right to relieve him but he cannot punish. Under the Constitution General MacArthur cannot be dishonorably dismissed from the United States Army for adhering to his oath to the Constitution as he sees it.

It is well that the struggle is at last out in the open. The deadlock of the forces behind the scene was strangling the Nation. Because the truth is that while MacArthur has just been relieved by the President, the United States Senate has long ago dismissed Secretary Acheson for all practical purposes. Acheson is Secretary of State in title only by whim of the President and not by will of the people. Both the Democratic and Republican Senate leaderships have repudiated him. They have put all foreign nations on notice that the Secretary is without power to reach any agreement without their consent. And that consent is not forthcoming.

It is not the struggle between MacArthur and Acheson which is paramount. The first consideration is the welfare of the Nation. Paradoxically, General MacArthur has been relieved but not dismissed with dishonor. Secretary Acheson has been dismissed, practically with dishonor by the United States Senate, but has not been relieved by the President. It is only natural, therefore, that the Nation itself is dividing into two camps.

By purely objective reporting standards, the country has never been so divided since Fort Sumter. All thinking Americans must realize the division within the Nation is far more serious than any personality involved. General MacArthur's removal has its chief meaning in its political repercussions. General Ridgway is an able soldier; he is capable of carrying on the command. But the blocking of the President and Acheson by the Senate has resulted in the stoppage of universal military training and a general desire to limit the personalities of the administration as much as possible. In this, the Congress as a whole reflects the will of the American people. They simply will not trust their sons to State Department policies under Secretary Acheson. Experts call them reversals when leaders contradict themselves in diplomacy. But reporters call them massacres when it happens on the battlefield.

The administration would never have fired MacArthur if left to itself. The mighty pressure necessary to dismiss the general came from the west—and not from the east. It is this simple. London blackmailed the White House with threats of breaking up the Atlantic alliance. The White House caved in. The great struggle between the President and the Senate has reached final show down. It is the Senate's move. In removing General MacArthur, the President has defied the Senate to impeach Secretary Acheson. It is put up or shut up now.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question that the members of the United Nations changed their minds. The UN has declared Red China to be an aggressor. But the President, in carrying out his policy of endless war and stalemate fighting without chance of victory, has chosen to forget this positive stand in favor of a policy where the weakness of our position is apparent to the enemy and one which he can capitalize to effect an advantageous settlement.

Talk about our fighting in Korea indefinitely. Say that some day we shall be able to end the war and shall be able to make a peace treaty. How will it be possible to make a peace treaty on honorable terms; how will it be possible to make a peace treaty not based upon appeasement, when we have already told the Chinese Communists in advance that we will never fight them outside Korea, that we will never bomb them outside

Korea? Under those circumstances, how could we possibly expect to make a decent settlement?

Another question which may well be asked in respect to this resolution is, Why use Nationalist troops? The answer to that question may well be that, although only 13 member UN nations have given troop support in Korea, President Truman has seen fit to reject an offer of help from Nationalist China, one of the original members of the United Nations.

While the United States delegate to the UN even this week was reported as figuratively begging the UN for additional men and supplies, President Truman kept immobile an estimated 600,000 trained Nationalist troops on Formosa.

Why he follows this course of action never has been explained satisfactorily to the American people. Chiang Kai-shek, at the beginning of the Korean campaign, offered 33,000 trained troops to support the American action. This still would have left more than 550,000 Nationalists to protect the comparatively tiny island of Formosa, and these would be protected by the Seventh Fleet, which Truman dispatched there in one of his initial actions after the invasion of South Korea.

It is not necessary for the adequate protection of Formosa to keep all these trained troops there.

The only conclusion which can be drawn is that the Truman-Acheson plan envisions the eventual entire disintegration of the Nationalist China Government and eventual recognition by the United States of Red China, to satisfy the demands of our ally, Great Britain.

I wish to repeat that, Mr. President. The only conclusion which can be drawn is that the Truman-Acheson plan envisions the eventual entire disintegration of the Nationalist China Government and eventual recognition by the United States of Red China, to satisfy the demands of our ally, Great Britain, which nation has very, very few troops fighting in Korea today.

It was after Prime Minister Attlee hurriedly rushed to Washington that President Truman abandoned his plan to bomb Manchurian bases. It was after this same visit from Attlee that the President, in a statement on his conference here with the Prime Minister, indicated he had promised the United States would not use the atom bomb unless England was first advised—and possibly give its permission. Great Britain wants to see Red China given a place in the UN and recognized among nations solely for the purpose of its booming and rapidly building up trade.

An Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Washington Post May 1, 1951, disclosed that Britain has exported goods valued at $3,614,800 to Communist China during each of the past 3 months.

This included an average of $644,000 in iron and steel manufactures, $456,400 in electrical apparatus, $294,000 in chemicals, and $198,800 in ships and aircraft.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that while I was absent from the floor the Senator from Indiana submitted a resolution and made a unanimous-consent request that it be referred to the Committeee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, jointly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] objected. Had I known that the Senator from Arizona was absent I would not have asked unanimous consent.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, President Truman, when he rejected the offer of Nationalist troops made last July, asserted that the use of those troops might bring the Chinese Reds into the conflict.

That reasoning is no longer valid. Red China already is in the conflict. It is the enemy we fight in North Korea, not the armies of the puppet North Koreans who were routed last December.

Another question which might well be asked with reference to this resolution is, Why conclude a Japanese peace treaty as quickly as possible?

The issue of what happens to Formosa is vital in our defenses in the Far East. President Truman repeatedly has asserted that the question of what will be done about Formosa will be settled in the Japanese peace treaty. As a vital link in our perimeter of defense against the spread of communism, the Formosa issue should be settled without delay.

The President has stated, as I said, that the Formosa question should be settled as a part of the Japanese peace treaty. Therefore, it should be settled quickly, and we ought to make a treaty with Japan as quickly as we possibly can do so. We should then permit Japan to rearm to a certain degree, at least, to rearm in order to defend itself, because I am one who is not in favor of wanting American boys to die to defend Japan. I want Japanese soldiers used to do it. If I had had my way about it, when the Korean war broke out, I would have used 100,000, 200,000, or 300,000 Japanese soldiers.

Mr. President, another question which might be asked with reference to the resolution is, Why bar Red China from the United Nations?

I do not know that I need to give any answer to that question. I have not heard any speaker on the floor of the Senate say that Red China should not be barred from membership in the United Nations.

Recognition of Red China would be nothing more nor less than an appeasement or surrender to the forces of communism which we are fighting on a global front. We are actively fighting against the Communists in Korea. We plan on building up military might in Europe as a safeguard against the threat of Communist aggression there. We have furnished billions in economic aid to combat the spread of Communist propaganda and the infiltration of Communist thinking in areas throughout the world.

It would be unthinkable to bow to Red China.

I can think of no one step that would more forcefully demonstrate our weakness in the anticommunism fight or more graphically spell out the fact that billions of American dollars have been wasted.

The Democrats have been wrong on far eastern policy as far back as the Yalta Conference of 1945. The administrations have been guilty of coddling Communists and leftists.

The Communists conquered the China mainland because pro-Communist influence in the State Department undermined Chiang Kai-shek. America thus lost a friend of years' standing and acquired an enemy that today is costing thousands of American lives.

Secretary Acheson, in the face of outraged public criticism, backed by President Truman, continues to oppose stronger action against the Chinese intervention in Korea because he maintains his "soft" attitude on communism. The Dean Acheson who said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss, now turns his back on General MacArthur and refuses to face the threat of communism in Asia as it vitally involves the threat against America.

Our European allies give vocal service and little else to the Korean campaign because they want to appease communism in the Far East in the hopes that this will save their sons in Europe.

Mr. President, as I stated when I began, I stand foursquare on the MacArthur policy. I am opposed to the so-called Truman-Acheson policy. I have stated on the floor of the Senate that any time the troops of any foreign nation kill American boys I am in favor of attacking them, and I still feel that way about it. I still think we should use the Chinese Nationalist troops in Korea. We should use them as guerrilla fighters in southern China. We should bomb the Chinese Communist bases in Manchuria. That is the policy which I favor. I have always been in favor of it. But that is not the policy which is going to be carried out, because the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief, and the Secretary of State, who has charge of our foreign policy, are not going to permit General MacArthur to succeed. At least, they are not going to agree at the moment to do so. If that is their attitude, and I think it is, I say that unless every member of the United Nations does its part and sends men and materials to help our boys fighting in Korea, we should withdraw from Korea. We should move our troops back to Japan and Formosa and should defend Japan and Formosa at any cost, regardless of whether the United Nations joins with us. We should tell our delegate to the United Nations that under no circumstances shall he ever vote to recognize Red China, and under no circumstances should we ever give up the island of Formosa.

I submit, Mr. President, that while I like the MacArthur plan and think it is

the plan which should have been adopted months ago, it was not adopted because England, France, and other allies opposed it, and the administration has opposed it. They are opposed to it today and have adopted, instead, a policy of stalemate, a policy of appeasement, a policy of permitting American boys to be shot down with their hands tied behind them, with no possible chance of winning against the Chinese Communists so long as they are confined to fighting within Korea. I say that the wise policy under those circumstances is to adopt the resolution which I have submitted and to withdraw American troops from South Korea.

FAR EASTERN POLICY—OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I do not take the floor this afternoon for the purpose of discussing which side is correct in the great dispute concerning our foreign policy in the Far East and in the rest of the world. Before we decide the issue, every Senator and Representative should have all the facts before him so that he may form his judgment as a representative of the people of the Republic.

The great commander of the armies in the Far East was discharged from his responsibilities. He appeared before the joint meeting of the two Houses and, based on his knowledge of the Far East, gave in rather specific terms, although I am sure not in so specific terms as he could give, his ideas of policies, his ideas as commander in chief in the east, and as commander of the United Nations forces. I am sure that he has not given all his views.

Prior to the discharge of General MacArthur, the Senator from Michigan, on the 9th day of April, submitted and had referred to the proper committee, which is the Committee on Foreign Relations, a concurrent resolution providing for the appointment of a joint bipartisan committee, consisting of 12 Members of each House, to investigate our far eastern policy. At that time the Senator from Michigan was of the opinion that it was not feasible for General MacArthur to be recalled to the United States to testify before the committee. He felt that the committee should go to the Far East and interview General MacArthur and other persons who have knowledge of the facts. In that way the committee could make its study of our policy in the Far East. The Senator from Michigan did not know that in two days the President of the United States would discharge the commander in chief, and thus require him to return to the United States, because he had no further assignment in the Far East.

General MacArthur returned to the United States and addressed a joint meeting of both Houses. On the recommendation of the caucus of the minority party in Congress, and with the consent and advice of the policy committee, the Senator from Michigan on April 17 presented to the Senate a concurrent resolution, providing for the appointment of a joint bipartisan committee, consisting of 12 Democratic Members and 12 Republican Members, chosen equally from both Houses of Congress, to study the question of our policy in the Far East.

Of necessity, the resolution of the Senator from Michigan was ordered to lie on the table, and it cannot be brought up for action until there is an adjournment of the Senate. Up to this moment the majority has objected to any adjournment, although the majority leader last evening, after conferring with the Senator from Michigan, asked unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the resolution at not later than 2 o'clock today. I am sure that Senators on this side of the aisle were very eager to limit the debate so that we could have had an early vote on the resolution. Objection was made on the Democratic side. To all intents and purposes it was a parliamentary filibuster to prevent the Senate from passing upon the important question of establishing such a joint committee.

Mr. President, it is true that every committee of the Senate is a creature of the Senate, and any committee, if it believes it has jurisdiction of a question, has the power on its own motion to investigate the subject. However, I say that what the Senate of the United States should do is not rely on any committee of its own motion and under its own claim of jurisdiction to investigate the great problem, but should refer the problem to a special committee and have the committee investigate the problem thoroughly and completely.

The President of the United States, on July 19, 1949, when he stood at Soldiers Field, in Chicago, said that the foreign policy of America should not be made by one man, or by any group of men, but that it should be based on the public opinion of the United States. Since that time I have heard on numerous occasions the Secretary of State say the same thing.

Mr. President, if that is to be the doctrine and policy of America, to base our foreign policy on public opinion, how are we to do it if 25 Senators are to keep secret from the people of the United States the vital facts necessary to determine such foreign policy? The Senator from Michigan does not contend that there may be some slight and small evidence which should not be submitted at the present time in an open hearing; but certainly there is not one fact—not one fact, Mr. President—which should not be given to the entire Senate of the United States. Think of it, Mr. President, 26 Senators would determine by a motion in their own committee, that the remaining Members of the Senate are not to be trusted with secrets.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Michigan realizes that such is not the unanimous opinion of the committee. The junior Senator from Louisiana made a motion that at least two additional Members from both sides of the aisle in both Houses should be permitted to attend. However, the majority of the committee seemed to feel that to do so would be imposing too much on the leadership on both sides of the aisle, because other Senators and Representatives might also wish to attend the hearings. Therefore, it might be unfair to ask the leadership in both Houses to designate two Senators and two Representatives from each side of the aisle to attend the hearings. Consequently, the majority of the Members would not agree to the motion.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Louisiana. It was stated earlier on the floor of the Senate that it was not the unanimous opinion of the committee. On questioning by the Senator from Michigan the chairman of the committee announced that the committee had agreed to such a motion. The Senator from Michigan had understood that some members of the committee did not realize that it had been agreed to. However that may be, it is now the policy of the committee, consisting of 25 members, that no other United States Senator may attend the hearings to ascertain the facts, although they are sworn Members of this body.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. CASE. Has the Senator from Michigan heard some pleas for the development on the part of the country of confidence in the administration?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have heard from the housetops that they are asking for unity. But unity sometimes means that one must wholeheartedly adopt the other man's point of view, and that he must not raise his voice in the slightest against it.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator from Michigan regard the decision to hold secret hearings with a limited attendance as a tactic designed to help the development of confidence?

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly it cannot create confidence either on the part of Members of the Senate or on the part of the people of the United States.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Has the able Senator from Michigan any idea that the hearings will be secret, regardless of their supposed status?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has not; but he feels that neither he nor any other Senator should be asked to accept rumors from the Senate committee. If we cannot have the direct evidence and pass upon the truth or falsity of the evidence, we should not be Senators.

Mr. IVES. As the Senator from New York gathers from what the Senator from Michigan says, from the standpoint of the security, the country would be in far greater danger if the hearings were closed than if they were open. Is that the Senator's idea?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that to be so.

Mr. IVES. That is my idea.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that, because I know what will happen.

As I stated earlier, if a newspaper wants the evidence after it has been censored, it can buy a transcript at a price

of about a dollar a page. If the newspaper does not have that much money, or does not feel that it wants to pay that price for it, it will not receive it. Therefore, we shall have in effect censored news. Columnists will draw their own conclusions. They will try to get some evidence from which they can determine, from reliable sources, what is going on in the committee.

Can we develop a foreign policy through public opinion on any such basis as that? Are we to ask other Senators to pass upon these questions on the basis of hearsay, or leaks from the committee? The Senator from Michigan feels that there should be no closed sessions before any group of Senators, no matter how great may be their integrity and position. The entire Senate should pass upon the question.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Secret hearings afford a good method by which to whitewash the mistakes and bungling of the past.

Mr. FERGUSON. Past history, to which very little attention is paid, so indicates. There is no doubt that at least the public could draw that conclusion.

Mr. JENNER. Whitewash is one of the cheapest commodities this administration has, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. There is very little lime in it. It is almost all water. When the Senator from Michigan was a boy, when whitewash was referred to, it meant a mixture of real lime and water—mostly lime, so that it would last.

Mr. President, this is a very serious question. I do not believe there has been a more important question discussed on the floor of the Senate than the one now before us. There is an attempt—illegally, I contend—to hold closed hearings. When the so-called motion of exclusion, creating inferior or second-grade Senators, was adopted, the joint committee was not authorized to act as a joint committee. The action to close the hearings took place on the day before the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] stood upon this floor and asked unanimous consent for the two committees to act jointly. The Senator from Michigan, being in an Appropriations Committee hearing, was not able to be present. He does not recall any unanimous consent to sit as a joint committee. But when the committee adopted the motion regarding closed hearings, it was not authorized to act as a joint committee. However, be that as it may, without challenging the validity of the action, I say that the Senate has the absolute right to determine the question ab initio.

The Senator from Michigan will ask that there be sent to the desk a resolution, to be laid before the Senate. The Senator from Michigan asks the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] who agrees with the Senator from Michigan upon this very important question, if he will not, on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan, send to the desk a resolution in order that we may ask unanimous consent for its present consideration, so that the Senate may vote upon this important question before the doors are locked and the evidence is taken in a secret session to exclude not only the public, to which the Senator from Michigan objects, but also all Senators aside from the 25 Senators referred to.

Think of it. Three States have two representations on the committee. Massachusetts has two Republicans. Georgia has two Democrats. Texas has two Democrats. But the States of most Members of this body have no representation upon the committee. The great State of New York, with its millions of people, is unrepresented upon the committee. Nor will the State of New York be permitted to have its Senators hear what the evidence is, and draw their conclusions from the evidence.

The Senator from Michigan sat upon the bench for almost 14 years. During that service on the bench he did not rely upon what came up from the Commissioner. He wanted to hear and see witnesses. It is just as good as using a lie detector to sit and watch a witness, to determine whether or not he is telling the truth when he is making a certain answer on the witness stand.

Are the witnesses before the joint committee to be sworn? They should be. Every Senator has not only the right, but the duty to be present at the hearings in order that he may know what is going on, so that he may judge for his people in the sovereign State which he represents.

Mr. President, I should like to yield sufficient time so that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] may send to the desk and have read a resolution, upon which the Senate will have an opportunity to vote before the door is locked and the horse is gone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Michigan, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 137) was read as follows:

Resolved, That any Member of the Senate is authorized to attend as an observer any hearing or other meeting, whether executive, or open, held by the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations in accordance with the order of the Senate of April 25, 1951.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] really needs no defense when he is accused of trying to whitewash someone or whitewash any issue. The record of the Senator from Georgia stands out in the United States Senate as high as that of any man who has ever graced this body.

I realize that the Senator from Michigan is an experienced investigator, and wants to get on the investigating committee. Personally I have other things to do, and I am willing to trust the investigation to these 26 Senators—26, if you please—one-third of the membership of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I do not think the speeches which are being made today are doing any good to the country. I do not believe they tend to bring about unity. I do not consider that they are accomplishing anything so far as the defense of the United States is concerned. I do not believe we are considering this question as calmly, deliberately, and coolly as the United States Senate should. I certainly shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the resolution will lie over for 1 day.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I request the Senator from Arizona to withhold his objection until I at least place in the RECORD a letter I have written to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to the Senator placing a letter in the RECORD.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to read the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I will withhold my objection for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. It is in order, is it not, to move to lay aside the unfinished business and consider this resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not under the rule, no.

Mr. WHERRY. May we have advice from the Parliamentarian as to why that cannot be done?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Clause 6 of Rule XIV of the Senate Rules provides that—

> All resolutions shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Mr. WHERRY. If framed in the form of a motion it would be in order, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same rule applies to a motion.

Mr. WHERRY. A motion would have to lie over for 1 day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion would have to lie over under the rule for one legislative day, unless by unanimous consent the rule was set aside.

Mr. WHERRY. That involves then an adjournment, because we recessed until today, and until an adjournment is taken there will be no new legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, even though the hearings begin tomorrow, the only way in the world the matter can be brought up is by unanimous consent, or by forcing an adjournment, if we have enough votes to do so, and take up the matter thereafter? Is that the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator states the parliamentary situation correctly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan asks unanimous consent that, without losing the floor, he may yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to read the letter he wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Utah may proceed.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the letter is dated May 2, 1951, addressed to—

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: This morning by telephone I inquired of you whether or not Senators not on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate would be accorded the usual courtesy and right to be present at the hearings which begin tomorrow before the two committees which will investigate the question of our far-eastern foreign policy. You informed me that the committees had decided by almost unanimous vote that Senators other than those now on the two committees mentioned would not be permitted to attend the hearings.

The decision of the committees to deny the right to other Senators to listen to the proceedings comes as a great shock to me, and I am sure it will to other Senators who have been making their plans to attend. There can be no valid argument that there will be lack of space to allow other Senators to attend. The large caucus room in the Senate Office Building, I understand, is available. The public is excluded, as I understand, and there would be ample room for Senators who would like to attend, as well as Members of the House of Representatives who would also like to be present.

It seems to be the position of the two committees that it would be unsafe for security reasons to permit all Senators to hear the testimony and other evidence presented. I don't know which Senators the committee members have in mind who can't be trusted. I may be one of those—at least the order applies to me as well as the rest—

Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Michigan to continue the reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. The letter continues:

It seems to be the position of the two committees that it would be unsafe for security reasons to permit all Senators to hear the testimony and other evidence presented. I don't know which Senators the committee members have in mind who can't be trusted. I may be one of those—at least the order applies to me as well as the rest, so I have the right to assume I am one of those who, in the opinion of the members of the present committee, can't be trusted with information possibly concerned with the national security. I hardly need remind you and the other members of the two committees that the rest of the Senate has to pass on questions that will arise out of the testimony. Even though they may not hear the testimony, these other Senators certainly will be required to make far-reaching decisions. The people of their States have trusted them at least to make these decisions which in a measure are far more important than the testimony itself will be. It seems to me that the action of the two committees is a serious reflection on the judgment of the peoples of the various States of the Union who have selected by democratic process their representatives in the Senate. It will come as a shock to the peoples of these various States when they learn that their representatives can't be trusted, for security reasons, to hear testimony on matters relating to the national security. They will probably wonder just why it is that the States which have representatives on the two committees have exercised the better choice in the selection of their Senators.

It seems to me the question involved is this: Shall an agency appointed by the Senate itself have the power to deny other members of the principal body the right to participate in the proceedings which that agency may have? After all is said and done, the only reason for having committees in the Senate is to expedite business by dividing up the work incident to the preparation of legislation for floor action. In the event that all Members of the Senate should be interested in any important subject, I know of no rule of law or of the Senate which would possibly give the committee, which is an agency of the Senate, a right to deny the principal full participation in the proceedings of the agency.

After having said this, permit me now to say that as one Senator who is actively interested in the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees as agencies of the Senate, I insist that my State is entitled to be represented at that hearing. Many Utah men are now fighting in Korea. Casualty lists report the wounding and death of Utah men. As a representative of the fathers and mothers, wives and sweethearts, and children of these men who are now fighting, I insist upon exercising the right of my State for its representatives to be present at these meetings.

I sincerely hope that the committees will reverse the position they have taken and extend an invitation to all Senators to be present.

Yours respectfully,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to make one simple observation, because the Senator from Washington is a member of the Armed Services Committee. I was not present on Monday when the decision was reached by the joint committee to exclude Members of the Senate not members of the two committees from the hearings which are to begin tomorrow, and although I am strongly of the opinion that the decision rendered by the joint committee was not the proper one, I am fully and completely convinced that no single member of either of those committees voted for executive sessions because of any desire to whitewash the investigation which is about to begin. I think the question now being raised is both proper and healthy, and I trust that a way will be found to permit every interested Senator to attend the hearings, but I urge my colleagues not to credit bad faith to any of their colleagues who are members of the joint committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I certainly have cast no reflection upon any member of the joint committee.

A question was raised as to what public opinion might be. I say to the public that they should not draw a hasty conclusion, but they should wait and wait and wait before they draw any conclusion. They should assume that every member of the joint committee, which at present consists of 25 Members of this body, will do his duty.

However, Mr. President, to have 25 Senators do their duty is not satisfactory to the people of the various States from which Senators other than those 25 Senators have been elected. That is the question I raise.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. KNOWLAND, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon, who I believe was the first to request that I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Michigan knows of any precedent in the history of the Senate whereby Members of the Senate have been excluded from hearings in connection with an investigation conducted by a Senate committee of which they were not members.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know of only one case which could be considered a precedent, and that was when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] was excluded from the hearings of a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, conducted by Senator Tydings, of Maryland, on the question of subversives in the Government. I have no knowledge that a motion on that subject was carried at that time or that an order on that subject was made. I have heard that the Senator from Wisconsin was excluded, and that at one time the subcommittee considered allowing other persons to remain in the hearings, but that the objections became so strenuous that they, too, were excluded.

So I have no evidence of any exclusions, except for the possibility that the Senator from Wisconsin was excluded from the meetings of the subcommittee referred to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not go into that particular case, but such research as I have been able to make this afternoon produces a finding that there is no precedent whereby a committee by motion has excluded other Members of the Senate from sitting in as observers in any investigation which any Senate committee has conducted.

I wish to say that, in my judgment, it would be a very unfortunate thing if any joint committee were to establish such a precedent at this time. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am now on my way to a meeting of the joint committee, and at that meeting I intend to move that the action which was taken last Monday be rescinded. I did not happen to be there at that time, so I think I am in a rather good position to make such a motion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, and they are most apropos of the matter we are discussing. I hope the other members of the joint committee who have heard parts of the argument on this question will, upon second consideration, vote to rescind the order which excludes all Senators other than the 25 members of the joint committee from attending the hearings and meetings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As one of the members of the Armed Services Committee who did attend the meeting the other day, I should like to say that at the meeting which was held the other day by the combined committees—and I attended the meeting—as the Senator from Michigan knows, a motion was made to have the meetings public in character, except insofar as they deal with certain highly classified information.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That motion was rejected. I happened to vote in favor of holding the meetings in the same way that the hearings were conducted by the combined committees which considered the troops-to-Europe issue, at which hearings, when certain questions were raised, those committees did go into executive session.

Mr. President, a vast amount of information which cannot be classified as being security information in any respect will be produced at the forthcoming hearings. It seemed to a number of us that information which was not classified certainly should be made available to the public.

Both at the meeting held yesterday and at the meeting held on the 13th of last month, when the Armed Services Committee first discussed this matter, I raised the very point which has been raised by the Senator from Utah in his letter which has just been read. I pointed out that I felt there had been a legitimate complaint in the past that Members of the Senate who were not members of the particular committee should not be deprived of such information. I think that is still a good point, both as expressed by the Senator from Michigan and as expressed by the Senator from Utah.

I should like to suggest for the consideration of my colleagues—and let me state that I, too, have to go now to the meeting of the combined committees, where I intend again to raise the point, to see whether the action can be reversed—a reference to page 48 of the Senate manual, where rule XXXVI of the Senate appears.

I think all of us will agree that there are certain documents which, from the point of view of the security of our troops in the field and the security of our Government, should not be made available to the public. However, I do not believe that the Members of the Senate, who have a constitutional obligation in connection with these matters, should be deprived of the information.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me say that I am familiar with the rule. In the same rule there are provisions which constitute reasons why Senators can be trusted, because they can be ousted from the Senate if they disclose secrets which are divulged or disclosed at a closed meeting.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

I should like to read the rule as a suggestion of a possible alternative procedure which might be given consideration. Rule XXXVI reads as follows:

RULE XXXVI. EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

1. When the President of the United States shall meet the Senate in the Senate Chamber for the consideration of executive business, he shall have a seat on the right of the Presiding Officer. When the Senate shall be convened by the President of the United States to any other place, the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Senators shall attend at the place appointed, with the necessary officers of the Senate.

2. When acting upon confidential or executive business, unless the same shall be considered in open executive session, the Senate Chamber shall be cleared of all persons except the Secretary, the Chief Clerk, the principal legislative clerk, the executive clerk, the minute and journal clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Assistant Doorkeeper, and such other officers as the Presiding Officer shall think necessary; and all such officers shall be sworn to secrecy.

3. All confidential communications made by the President of the United States to the Senate shall be by the Senators and the officers of the Senate kept secret; and all treaties which may be laid before the Senate, and all remarks, votes, and proceedings thereon shall also be kept secret, until the Senate shall, by their resolution, take off the injunction of secrecy, or unless the same shall be considered in open executive session.

4. Any Senator or officer of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt.

5. Whenever, by the request of the Senate or any committee thereof, any documents or papers shall be communicated to the Senate by the President or the head of any department relating to any matter pending in the Senate, the proceedings in regard to which are secret or confidential under the rules, said documents and papers shall be considered as confidential, and shall not be disclosed without leave of the Senate.

Mr. President, it seems to me that within that rule there may be a formula whereby each individual Member of the Senate who has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution, and whose obligation is equal to that of the 26 Senators who happen to serve on the combined committees, could and should have the same sources of information and be under the injunction applying to all other Senators, namely, that if he violates that pledge of secrecy, he would have to take the individual consequences.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator's reading the rule. The Senator from Michigan had read the last section of it, indicating that only the Senate of the United States could rule upon the question of whether the taking of evidence should be in a secret session or in an open session. Section 5 of rule XXXVI concludes: "and shall not be disclosed without leave of the Senate."

The Senator from Michigan calls particular attention to the preceding section, which says:

Any Senator or officer of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt.

The Senator from Michigan feels that that is certainly sufficient to deter anyone who the other Senators might suspect would disclose to the public what takes place in executive session.

The mere fact that a Senator is appointed to be a member of the Foreign Relations Committee or the Armed Services Committee, which is usually on the basis of seniority, is no reason why he should be permitted to hear the evidence, and other Senators should not be given that privilege. I do not think that any committee, under the circumstances here presented, should agree to a resolution or a motion to exclude Senators who are not members of the committee and thus prevent their hearing the evidence. They should be admitted to the hearings, in order that they may judge the facts and help formulate the policy. Must Senators who are not members of the committees rely upon hearsay? That is not the purpose of electing a Senator. He is to get the facts on the basis of which he may determine what is best for his country. He must decide important issues upon the floor of the Senate. It is not right that he should have to rely upon other Senators, particularly when he is forbidden to hear the evidence personally.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question in connection with a matter which has been brought out in the course of the debate this afternoon. While I agree completely with what is being attempted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Utah, the final issue is not whether the 96 Senators shall hear the testimony. Is not the final issue whether the hearings shall be open or closed? It seems to me that with all the confusion which exists, and with the numerous interpretations of this and that, the question which is brought forcibly to the attention of the Senate is, Shall we, or shall we not, have open hearings? Why not let the people hear the witnesses? Why not let the Members of the Senate make and interpret their own notes? Why impose censorship? I ask the able Senator, is there any objection?

I do not want to weaken the resolution by an amendment. I may say that I would rather have it as it is, conditions being what they are, than to have no resolution on the subject. But certainly the Senator from Michigan will agree with me that the hearings should be open, that the public should have an opportunity to learn the facts. Is there any objection on the part of the Senator to offering an amendment to the resolution, to require that the committees be directed to conduct open hearings? We could get a test vote on that. I would hope that it might be agreed to, but, even if it were not, we could then vote on the resolution of the Senator from Michigan, which has already been offered.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not want to answer the Senator on the point he has raised, un-

til he has had an opportunity to confer with the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like very much to get the matter before the Senate. I think Members of the Senate should have the right to decide whether the hearings are to be open or closed. The committees, I understand, do not favor open hearings, as shown by a vote, I believe of 13 to 10. In view of the arguments advanced this afternoon by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Utah, I do not believe that the issue is merely one of opening the hearings to as many of the 96 Senators as may desire to attend. Are we to deny them the privilege of cross-examining witnesses?

Why do we not bring the main issue to the floor of the Senate, and allow the Senate to vote it up or vote it down? Let Senators determine by their votes whether the hearings are to be open or closed. For myself, I should like to have an opportunity to vote on that issue. I think it is a vital issue. If the hearings are open, any Senator may attend, and any Representative may attend. The American people may attend. If the hearings are closed, I should then, of course, prefer that every Member of the Senate be permitted to attend, if he so desires, rather than restricting attendance to the membership of two committees.

I wish to be fair about it, and I want the distinguished Senator from Michigan to have an opportunity to consider the matter, but I should like to ask whether he would be willing to modify his resolution. I would ask him to do that. However, I do not want to deny either the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Utah an opportunity of having a vote by the Senate on the question, if they desire. I submit to the distinguished Senator that the issue is perfectly clear. Is is a question whether we shall or shall not have open hearings. In the final analysis, I think we should have open hearings, in order that we may let the people of the country obtain first-hand knowledge of the facts, on the basis of which they may reach their own conc'usions. The facts regarding all the issues should be brought to light and should be made public through open hearings.

I am not now speaking of matters of national security. In the conduct of hearings on the question of troops to Europe, under the so-called Wherry resolution, whenever a question was asked which involved the national security, the witness was treated very politely and was allowed to decline to answer. We stated to the witnesses that we did not want them to say anything which would involve the security of the United States. Such matters were discussed in executive hearings.

But certainly the issue here is whether the hearings shall or shall not be open. I hope the distinguished Senator from Michigan will permit an amendment to his resolution. If he wishes to modify it, that will be perfectly agreeable to me.

I have raised the question because I think it is important. If the hearings begin tomorrow, on a certain basis, does not the Senator from Michigan believe that it would be very difficult later to change the procedure? I submit this is the time to determine the matter.

The majority leader naturally is trying to push along the work of the Senate, and I want to say that in many requests he has been absolutely fair. I wish the majority leader would allow us to have a test vote this afternoon upon two matters, if it is necessary to vote on two matters.

The first would be the question whether the Senate favored closed or open hearings. If the Senate votes against open hearings, then there will be the question whether Senators shall be permitted to attend the closed hearings.

Mr. President, I believe this is the most important issue which has been before the Senate for many years. I hope the distinguished majority leader will reflect upon the matter, will reconsider his position, and that he will in all fairness permit the Senator from Michigan to call up the resolution and have a vote on it this afternoon. This is the opportune time to pass upon the resolution, before the hearings begin tomorrow. If the distinguished Senator from Michigan will permit, I should like to offer an amendment, and have a vote on it also.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. If all 96 of the Senators were to attend the hearings, would each Senator also have a right to question the witnesses?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan would feel that the orderly procedure would be for Senators to submit questions through members of the committees; but I see no reason why, if a vital question should be pertinent, and if no member of the committees desired to put the question, any Senator should not be permitted to propound the question. I think that is very vital. But no Senator would interfere with the orderly procedure of the hearing.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not so sure about that. But the point is that there is a question of accomplishing work which needs to be done, and it would seem to me that if Senators were merely to be spectators who might observe the facial expressions of witnesses, that would be one thing; but if Senators are to be invited to attend and to cross-examine, then the hearings would undoubtedly be extended a great many more days than would be required if the committees were operating in the usual way. The procedure referred to has not been customary in other committees.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York happens to be among those who, over the years, have strongly and consistently supported the so-called bipartisan foreign policy. He has not always agreed with perhaps the majority of the Members on his own side of the aisle in connection with certain questions of foreign policy. The fact remains, however, Mr. President, that in this particular instance we are dealing with something very fundamental in which I dare say the Republicans are unanimous; at least, I do not know of any Republican who would disagree to the resolution as it has now been proposed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and I dare say there would not be much difference among ourselves with respect to the modification proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

It seems to me, Mr. President, speaking, now, primarily to the majority leader, that in the interest of the welfare of the people of the United States, the majority has an obligation to yield to the honest request of the minority. We are requesting that the hearings shall be held in the way indicated, first, by the Senator from Michigan, and I myself prefer the method proposed by the Senator from Nebraska. I can assure the distinguished majority leader that I am not playing politics in what I am saying. The majority leader knows that I have been interested in the bipartisan foreign policy and am still interested in it. But we are not going to have a united America if, when the minority has a legitimate request to make, it is ignored and turned down. That is the point I want to make at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from New York has said. I realize that he has been one of those who have stood by the bipartisan foreign policy.

So far as I am concerned, I shall not be suddenly forced into the position, if I can avoid it, of trying to overthrow the orderly procedure of committees. Committees have always in the past established their own procedure. I am not trying to say whether they are doing the proper thing in regard to not permitting other Senators to attend hearings. So far as I am concerned, it is not a new question. I have frequently made inquiries of committees which were holding executive sessions, and asked if other Senators were permitted to attend, because I wanted to attend, and I have frequently been told that it was not permitted. That is a question to be decided by the committees.

I do not think it would be a good thing for Senators all of a sudden to become excited and say, "We are going to tell the committees how to conduct their business." I think we do far more harm than good when we try, on the floor of the Senate, to lay down rules for a committee at this late hour.

I believe that as nearly as possible the public should be given the benefit of the information brought out at the hearings. I trust to the good judgment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and his committee as to what should be made public and what should not be made public. No Senator has a monopoly on patriotism and desire to serve his country. There is not a Senator on the floor who is more patriotic than is the Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Georgia evidently knows something about what is contained in the records.

He feels that, at least in the first instance, the hearings should be closed.

I am not going to allow a vote to come up on this question all of a sudden, when the Senator is conducting his committee meetings. I do not like to be asked to consent to such procedure, and I do not think I should be placed in that position. It is something unprecedented. Since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have never known a time when there was so much excitement and so much desire to compel a committee to conduct its hearings in a certain manner. There is undue excitement and unnecessary discussion in regard to the question. I think we had better stop and give the subject a little consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona. This is one of the few places in the world where there is freedom of speech, of thought, and of expression. Therefore, during the remarks of the Senator from Michigan, he is glad to have the Senator from Arizona state whether he feels that this is an untimely or an unprecedented procedure. But the Senator from Michigan thinks we must act now or not act at all. What is the use of locking the barn after the horse has gone? The horse might be gone tomorrow morning. What we should do is to act today so that Senators can attend the hearings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the Senator from Arizona that I believe one could concur in everything he has said, and yet take account of the extraordinary circumstances involved.

The first circumstance is the time. The second is the fact that we become the victims of our own rules, because this resolution must lie over for one legislative day. Third, it is an extraordinary circumstance, both in the sense of the public interest involved, and in the nature of the testimony one may expect. So, one can agree with everything the Senator has said under normal circumstances; but allowances should be made.

There is great point in what the Senator from Michigan has said, because for practical purposes we are setting up class A and class B Senators—class A Senators who sit in on the hearings, and class B Senators who have to get their information second-hand.

Mr. FERGUSON. Senators cannot even get the information. The members of the joint committee will be sworn under oath not to divulge what occurred at the hearings. We cannot get the evidence.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would make the final observation that, because of the extraordinary circumstances involved, I think the interposition of what one might call a parliamentary curtain, in this age of curtains, is a pretty disturbing thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has described it as a parliamentary filibuster. I think the Senator from Illinois would give a proper description if he referred to it as an iron curtain behind which we cannot go.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does not the Senator think this is an unprecedented situation, as indicated by the Senator from Illinois and by the majority leader? The majority leader emphasized only the procedure which is now sought, but did not base his remarks on the very critical situation which is facing the country and the world. None of us has ever before faced such a situation in the time of the Member of the Senate with the longest service. Faced as we are by a world-wide emergency, and divided as the country is largely over the questions here at issue, if there ever was a time when all the cards should be placed on the table where all can see them and all can understand them, that time is now. That is why the Senator from New York feels so strongly that the action now advocated by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Nebraska should be taken today.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan wants to say that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has stated one of the issues, namely, that of open hearings. That is not the whole answer to the problem, however.

Let me read from a pamphlet which was placed on my desk today. It is a committee print of the report to the President submitted by Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer in September 1947. It is important to show that two problems are involved. The first problem is the question of open hearings. In open hearings we could have open covenants openly arrived at. Of course some matters may be developed which the Senate would not want to make public. Therefore what the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Michigan are advocating is a step further than open hearings. It concerns the right of the other Senators to know what is given to 25 Senators. Let me read from the Wedemeyer report, to show that it will not be an open hearing. The report was laid on the desk after it was given to the press. It states:

> The portions of this report dealing with China have previously been released, and are not included in it.
>
> Paragraphs which have been deleted for security reasons are indicated by asterisks.

In other words, 25 Members of the Senate know what was deleted, but the other Senators have not the least notion or idea of what has been deleted. Therefore there are two questions involved.

The first question concerns open hearings. The Senator from Michigan wishes to make a motion for open hearings. The second question is important, because every Senator is entitled to know, or, if not, no Senator has the right to know.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that the American people have lost confidence in the so-called bipartisan foreign policy primarily because similar tactics have been followed in the past, when we observed representatives of the State Department, appearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitting highly restricted or classified material, which was available only to the members of the committee, and because subsequently thereto in debates upon the floor of the Senate a Senator who was not a member of the particular committee involved was denied the information, to which he should have been entitled to enable him to reach a conclusion? The present development is merely the logical result of procedures which have been followed in the past in denying Members of the Senate information which they should have before them.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is glad to have the views of the Senator from Idaho, because he thinks they point out what is taking place. Think of it, Members of the Senate. We hear lip service from the other side of the aisle. We hear pleas for bipartisanship. We hear pleas for unpartisan foreign policies. Then we find that they insist upon a majority of 7 to 6. Because of the death of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, the membership is now 14 to 11. They now insist upon starting the hearings with the right of the majority of the committee to vote whether or not other Senators shall hear the facts. More and more Senators are required to take the floor of the Senate to speak for the principles of the Constitution of the United States.

This Republic was founded upon the idea that the men and women of America enjoyed certain unalienable rights. The Constitution provides that the rights of the minority must be respected. The fact that we on this side have but 46 Members and the majority have 50 Members is no reason why, on a basic principle with respect to which the majority are asking bipartisanship, there should be taken away the right of the minority in such an important matter as the one with which we are confronted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Will the Senator yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not want to lose the floor. The Senator from Michigan pleads with the Senator from Arizona to adjourn for 5 minutes this afternoon, so that the Senate may determine the question by a vote. Let us see whether we in the Senate believe in bipartisanship in foreign policy. Oh, yes; the Senator from Michigan submitted a resolution on the 17th of April, and it has been lying on the desk ever since. We cannot vote for a real bipartisan investigation of the question. Today we find on the table another resolution which cannot be voted on because the minority cannot have it considered. Will not the Senator from Arizona have the Senate adjourn for a period of 5 minutes, so that thereafter we may have a quorum call, and then vote on the resolutions? In that way, the representatives of the people of the

United States would speak, rather than a committee.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at the moment. During that period the Senator from Michigan would help prepare another resolution calling for open hearings. He feels two problems are involved. The first concerns open hearings. The public should be entitled to know everything except what would be detrimental to our security. The second point is that if the committee felt that certain things should be kept secret for security reasons, Senators who desired to see them would have an opportunity to see them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Michigan modify his request of the majority leader to provide that the Senate shall adjourn until 4:45, which is an hour certain? I make the suggestion because before we could vote there would have to be a quorum call. Therefore, I ask that the Senate adjourn to an hour certain. I suggest that the Senator from Michigan make the request, and then let the majority leader and the Senator from Michigan discuss it. I believe that the adjournment should be taken to a time certain.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Michigan still think that China attacked Japan and started the late Japanese-Chinese War?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The Senator from Michigan did not think so. The Senator from Michigan in the heat of argument misspoke himself on that question. There was not any doubt in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senator from Michigan had misspoken himself on that question.

Mr. KERR. There is not the least bit of doubt in the Senator's mind that he misspoke himself when he said that China attacked Japan?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator still think that Japan and Russia had a mutual-assistance treaty at that time?

Mr. FERGUSON. They did not, and the Senator from Michigan never said they had a mutual-assistance treaty. They had a treaty.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Did not the Senator from Michigan say that Russia and Japan had a treaty whereby they agreed to assist each other if either were attacked, and that Russia did not live up to her treaty agreements with Japan; and did not he ask the Senator from Connecticut if the Senator from Connecticut thought that Russia would be any more honorable in keeping her treaties now than she was when she violated her treaty with Japan to come in and help Japan when China attacked Japan? Is that not the record?

Mr. FERGUSON. The record is that when Japan attacked the United States it was in violation of the treaty that Russia had with Japan. The Senator from Michigan made it clear in the RECORD, and the RECORD will speak for itself.

Mr. KERR. The RECORD surely will speak for itself, but the Senator from Oklahoma would like to know if the Senator from Michigan still thinks that Russia and Japan had a treaty whereby either agreed to help the other in case one was attacked by another nation at that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has tried many lawsuits. Apparently the Senator from Oklahoma has tried many also. He realizes that some lawyers feel that when the facts are against them they talk about the law, when the law is against them they talk about the facts, and when both the law and the facts are against them they just talk. That is why the Senator from Oklahoma is talking.

He is trying to get the Senator from Michigan off the track. This is one red herring——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Does the Senator want to drag another red herring across the trail?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator intimate that the Senator from Oklahoma has said anything to indicate that he ever thought the Senator from Michigan was on the track on any question? If so, Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma would like the personal privilege of clearing the doubt from the mind of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator think that is a question?

Mr. KERR. Yes. I ask the question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not know what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks, or whether he is even at this moment capable of thinking.

Mr. KERR. Then would the Senator——

Mr. FERGUSON. Judging from what the Senator is saying, there is some doubt about that in the mind of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 4:45 o'clock p. m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield the floor?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will yield, without losing the floor, for a quorum call.

Mr. McFARLAND. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a motion to adjourn?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 5 o'clock p. m. today.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. A motion to adjourn is not debatable. Is not that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Brewster	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	Nixon
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Thye
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Underwood
Flanders	McClellan	Watkins
Frear	McFarland	Wherry
Fulbright	McKellar	Wiley
Gillette	McMahon	Williams
Green	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate adjourn until 5 o'clock today.

Mr. WHERRY. On that motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to know how I am recorded as having voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

At this point, Mr. MUNDT entered the Chamber, and, when his name was called, voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on our side of the aisle we have a great thirst for knowledge at this particular time. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. TOBEY. That is quite correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state that Senators can find out how their votes have been recorded by having a recapitulation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. KEM. Is it not in order for a Senator to inquire from the floor at this time how he is recorded as voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator may do so.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, in the exercise of that privilege, I ask how I am recorded as voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

At this point Mr. WILEY entered the Chamber, and, when his name was called, voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded as——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate Chamber? I cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to inquire how I am recorded as voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a legal, constitutional privilege for a Senator to inquire how he is recorded as voting on a yea-and-nay vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire how I am recorded as voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how am I recorded as voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May we have order, Mr. President, before I ask a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will cease conversation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should know how I voted, but I must be like my Republican friends, for I do not know. So let me inquire how I am recorded as voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I happened to be called out of the Chamber a few minutes ago. When my name was reached during the yea-and-nay vote, I voted; but I was not in the Chamber when the vote was recapitulated. So, Mr. President, I wish to inquire how I am recorded as voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, how am I recorded as voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If in this situation there is a tie vote, what happens to the motion to adjourn?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In that event the motion is disagreed to; it fails.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may we have a recapitulation?

Mr. WHERRY. Now, Mr. President——

At this point Mr. SCHOEPPEL entered the Chamber, and, when his name was called, voted in the affirmative.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under the rules, is there any limt on how long this sort of procedure can continue? Can it continue from now until Monday, if we choose to have it do so?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks a point of order could be made and sustained against this sort of procedure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. After the vote was taken, when the first inquiry was made about how a Senator's vote was recorded, why was the ruling made that any Senator had a right to ask how his vote is recorded? I am wondering what the actual rule is on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order on this question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for a recapitulation of the vote which has been taken on this motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The announcement of the vote has not yet been made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is necessarily absent. If present, she would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 43, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Ferguson	Morse
Bennett	Flanders	Mundt
Brewster	Hendrickson	Nixon
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	Thye
Cain	Knowland	Tobey
Capehart	Langer	Watkins
Carlson	Lodge	Wherry
Case	McCarran	Wiley
Cordon	McCarthy	Williams
Dirksen	Malone	Young
Dworshak	Martin	
Ecton	Millikin	

NAYS—41

Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Monroney
Chavez	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Hunt	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
Gillette	Long	Smathers
Green	McClellan	Sparkman
Hayden	McFarland	Stennis
Hennings	McKellar	Underwood
Hill	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—12

Byrd	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Magnuson	Taft
George	O'Conor	Welker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 43, the nays are 41. The motion is agreed to; and the Senate

stands adjourned until 5 o'clock p. m. today.

(Thereupon, at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., Wednesday, May 2, 1951, the Senate adjourned until 5 o'clock p. m. the same day.)

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 1951

The Senate met at 5 o'clock p. m., under the order previously entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate meets following an adjournment. Morning business will be transacted.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Are there any petitions and memorials?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. No business has been transacted since the Senate convened.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not necessary that any business be transacted following an adjournment in order to have a quorum call. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Brewster	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	Nixon
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Thye
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Underwood
Flanders	McClellan	Watkins
Frear	McFarland	Wherry
Fulbright	McKellar	Wiley
Gillette	McMahon	Williams
Green	Malone	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first order of business is the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Wednesday, May 2. The clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The clerk will read the Journal.

The Chair would like to suggest to Senators that when they rise and wish to be recognized they should address the Chair, and not merely rise and begin speaking. That is the rule of the Senate, and the Chair thinks it is a proper rule. It is constantly violated. The Chair's suggestion has no particular reference to the Senator from Nebraska, except that he happened to be the latest Senator to violate the rule. It is the rule that when a Senator arises he should address the Chair, and that until he is recognized he may not proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for his observation. I happen to have been the Senator who was on his feet just prior to the time the distinguished Vice President made his statement. I agree with him.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator speak a little louder, please.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like very much also, if possible, to have order maintained in the Senate. It is very difficult at times to obtain recognition. I am not blaming the distinguished Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair attempts to preserve order, but frequently he does not receive very much cooperation from Members of the Senate.

The Journal will be read.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Wednesday, May 2, 1951 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951).

During the reading of the Journal,

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Journal be corrected after the words "Friday next", to insert "at the hour of 12 o'clock noon."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator that the reading of the Journal be concluded before a motion is made to correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Journal has been read.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that a correction be made in the Journal, at the point where it refers to the designation of Friday next as the day on which the calendar will be called. I move that at that point, after the words "Friday next", there be inserted the words "at the hour of 12 o'clock noon."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the motion is agreed to, will it mean that we take a recess? I do not quite understand.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; Mr. President, I was merely pointing out that the statement in the Journal in regard to the calling of the calendar on Friday does not specify the hour of the meeting of the Senate on that day. The motion I have made would, if agreed to, make that correction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next order of business is the presentation of petitions and memorials.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot recognize Senators for speeches at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I rise to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Brewster	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	Nixon
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Thye
Ellender	McCarran	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Underwood
Flanders	McClellan	Watkins
Frear	McFarland	Wherry
Fulbright	McKellar	Wiley
Gillette	McMahon	Williams
Green	Malone	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. Are there any petitions or memorials? Reports of committees? Introduction of bills or joint resolutions? Concurrent or other resolutions?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is this the time when a Senate resolution is in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, it is not. It is in order to submit one, but it is not in order to take one up for consideration. Are there concurrent or other resolutions?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is this the time when resolutions on the calendar may be brought up?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. If there are no concurrent or other resolutions the clerk will state the resolution coming over from the previous day.

HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM SENATE BILL 656

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 133), discharging the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate from the further consideration of Senate bill 656, the home-rule bill for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the fact that the momentous question raised by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] must be disposed of between now and 7 o'clock this evening, I am wondering if the distinguished Senator from West Virginia would permit his resolution to go over and let the Senate take up the so-called Ferguson resolution, so that the Senate may vote on it before 7 o'clock.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, with all my heart I wish that I could accommodate my very dearly beloved friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska — the unsurpassable minority

leader. But, to my regret, it is as impossible for me to postpone the discussion of my important home rule resolution as it would be for me to estimate the duration of eternity. Mr. President, I give notice to all concerned that I shall endeavor to complete my remarks within 3 hours.

Let me appeal to both Republican and Democratic Members to redeem their home rule platform pledges. Sixty-four of the 96 Members of this body are under platform promises to provide home rule for the voteless people of the District of Columbia.

In order adequately to present my case, it will be necessary for me to read extensively from testimony taken by the committee of which it is my privilege and pleasure to be chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I cannot yield for anything but a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Since home rule is pledged in both platforms and 64 Senators are in favor of it, does not the Senator feel that we might vote on his resolution immediately?

Mr. NEELY. I might answer that question in the affirmative but for the fact that a few days ago four Republican and two Democratic members of the committee voted against it. So there is no probability that all the Senators on either side of the aisle will vote to redeem their party's platform pledges in favor of home rule. If the Senator from Michigan will guarantee the support of the Kefauver bill by all Republican Senators present tonight I shall gladly agree that the Senate immediately vote, first on the pending resolution and then on the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no way of doing that at this moment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question or for any number of questions he may wish to ask.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think the Senator from West Virginia knows that he must explain his resolution thoroughly, because he is aware that when he gets through I shall explain the other side of the question.

Mr. NEELY. I fully realize that if one should rise from the dead and plead for home rule for the District of Columbia, the able Senator from South Carolina and a number of Republicans would nevertheless oppose it.

Mr. CAPEHART and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. NEELY. I yield to my good friend the Senator from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield only for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is this the beginning of a filibuster?

Mr. NEELY. Far be it from me to engage in anything of that kind. My only purpose is to admonish political covenant-breakers promptly to reform and "bring forth fruits meet for repentance." The very first offering of such fruits should be a home rule law for the District of Columbia.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wonder if I am correct in understanding that the morning hour during which the Senator from West Virginia can discuss his resolution runs only to 7 o'clock this evening?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Which will terminate the Senator's speech on this particular subject?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will answer that when the time arrives. At 7 o'clock the unfinished business, which is the agricultural labor bill, will automatically come before the Senate; but that will not take the Senator from West Virginia off his feet.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The termination of the morning hour does not require a rerecognition of the Senator from West Virginia?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, it does not.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. THYE. I have approximately seven lines in a telegram which I should like to read.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield for the purpost indicated without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from West Virginia yielding to the Senator from Minnesota to read a telegram, without the Senator from West Virginia losing the floor? The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

EFFECT OF ROLL-BACK ON CATTLE PRICES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the telegram which I have before me reads as follows:

SOUTH ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 2, 1951.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,

Senate Office Building:

We are alarmed at the rush of immature and partially finished cattle coming to our market since the issuance of the price-control order. This rush of cattle has reduced our cattle prices as much as four to five dollars a hundredweight. The only result that can follow is a shortage of beef supplies later and reduced production. Steps should be taken to eliminate this roll-back in live cattle prices.

ST. PAUL LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE,
W. P. DOLAN, *Secretary.*

This telegram relates to all the livestock commission firms on the South St. Paul Market.

I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for yielding the time to me in order that I might read this very important telegram. I read it very slowly so that all Senators might know its contents.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA — DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM S. 656

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the distinguished Senator intend to read all the text of his report? I think he said it contained 275 pages.

Mr. NEELY. I do not know just how many pages it will be necessary to read to obtain the desired result.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it will take him several hours.

Mr. NEELY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the Senator intends to read the entire text?

Mr. NEELY. Only the more important sections of it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask my distinguished friend from West Virginia, in connection with his answer to the question asked by the Senator from Illinois, whether the Senator from Oklahoma may have the reassurance that in the event the Senator from West Virginia should think it wise at any point during the reading or the discussion of the report or the evidence that he terminate it or temporarily stop, he would feel free to do so in spite of the colloquy which has just taken place between him and the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NEELY. Of course. If I could be assured by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], my distinguished friend, the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and all other Senators who are opposed to the Kefauver bill that there is no doubt that the resolution would be adopted, I should be glad to discontinue my argument.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may preface my question with a statement congratulating the Senator from West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to congratulate the Senator from West Virginia. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot propound such an inquiry unless the Senator from West Virginia yields to him for that purpose. He has already yielded to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to congratulate the Senator from West Virginia on getting the question of home rule for the District of Columbia before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia has yielded to the Senator from Illinois. He can yield to only one Senator at a time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia if I correctly understand that the committee was divided evenly on the question of approving the Kefauver bill? I mean numerically.

Mr. NEELY. Numerically, it was evenly divided.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Ordinarily the bill would not have been brought before the Senate had not the Senator from West Virginia made his motion to discharge the committee and thus have the Senate itself proceed directly to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Senator from West Virginia has been able to avoid the consequences of a tie vote, and the matter is now before the Senate for consideration?

Mr. NEELY. We can avoid the consequences if we adopt the pending resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia another question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield further?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it my understanding that the District of Columbia enjoyed home rule from 1802 to 1871?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that during that time a mayor and city council were elected by the residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. NEELY. That is also true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that between 1871 and 1874 the District of Columbia occupied the status of a Territory?

Mr. NEELY. For all practical purposes, yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With a governor appointed by the President and with a local council of, I believe, 25 members, together with a nonvoting delegate in the House of Representatives?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In effect, therefore, for three-quarters of a century the citizens of the District of Columbia had the right of self-government.

Mr. NEELY. Yes; as surely as Tabor is among the mountains and Carmel by the sea.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That condition of affairs came to an end in 1874; and for the past three-quarters of a century the voters and citizens of the District of Columbia have been disenfranchised?

Mr. NEELY. Completely. They have no more right to vote than have the unhappy people behind the iron curtain.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is my further understanding correct, that perhaps the occasion for the loss of self-government was the so-called excessive expenditures carried on by Mr. Shepherd—the so-called Boss Shepherd—who was Mayor of the District for a period of time?

Mr. NEELY. That reason has been assigned, but I think it was not the only reason.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the city of New York excessive expenditures were indulged in during the same time by Boss Tweed?

Mr. NEELY. About that time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, the citizens of New York City were not deprived of the right to vote or the right to govern themselves?

Mr. NEELY. Only in the District of Columbia has that outrage ever been perpetrated on American soil.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it correct to say that the residents of the District of Columbia pay approximately $100,000,000 in taxes?

Mr. NEELY. It is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I also correct in my understanding that they alone, of all the residents in comparable communities in the United States, have no right to vote and no share in the determination of how their taxes shall be spent?

Mr. NEELY. The people of the District of Columbia are the only ones in America who are compelled to suffer that injustice and humiliation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my understanding that the citizens of the District of Columbia have no right in the framing of local ordinances?

Mr. NEELY. They have none whatever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or in the framing of building ordinances, for example?

Mr. NEELY. No citizen has the right to vote on any question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do the citizens of the District have any right to participate in the framing of traffic regulations?

Mr. NEELY. They do not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or in the conduct of their police force?

Mr. NEELY. None whatever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or in the conduct of their fire department?

Mr. NEELY. No, sir.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or in the conduct of their schools?

Mr. NEELY. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, is it not true that the citizens of the District of Columbia are completely disenfranchised?

Mr. NEELY. Absolutely.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that if people are deprived of the right to vote and to take part in government their civic consciousness tends to atrophy?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly. That is probably one of the reasons why many have found it profitable to publish in nationally circulated magazines articles alleging that the city of Washington has more crime than any other city of its size in the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in life generally when an organ is not permitted to function it atrophies through disuse?

Mr. NEELY. That has been noted since the days of Hippocrates.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that if a person does not have a chance to exercise his mind, his mind tends to atrophy?

Mr. NEELY. That truth is as old as civilization.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that if a person is not permitted to make choices his moral conscience tends to atrophy?

Mr. NEELY. That has been known since before the birth of Christ.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that we are not only depriving the residents of the District of Columbia of the right to determine how they shall be governed, but that we are depriving them of their right to make decisions, and are diminishing their abilities as human beings?

Mr. NEELY. Unquestionably that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator from West Virginia read any accounts of Washington to the effect that there is about it a state of insipidity and that the intellectual life of the District of Columbia is stale and flat?

Mr. NEELY. Yes. I have read that, and also heard it proclaimed over the radio.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Might that be due to the fact that the citizens of the District of Columbia do not have a chance to discuss public issues and to pass judgment upon them?

Mr. NEELY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am correctly informed, am I not, that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on two occasions served as a Member of the House of Representatives?

Mr. NEELY. The Senator is correct, except that I served five terms in the House instead of two.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On two occasions, but for five terms?

Mr. NEELY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from West Virginia is probably the only man in the United States—and perhaps he may not wish to answer it, so I shall ask the question as a rhetorical question—who has been the clerk of a State house of delegates, mayor of his home city, a Member of the House of Representatives, a Member of the Senate on two occasions, and governor of a State?

Mr. NEELY. This is my fourth term in the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Your fourth term in the Senate.

Mr. NEELY. Yes; and in view of the difficulty of gaining admission to this body I should not want the number of times I have won to be understated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And governor of a great State?

Mr. NEELY. One of the greatest in the world—West Virginia.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to say as to whom he shall yield.

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois until he has completed his questioning. When he has concluded I shall gladly yield to my beloved friend from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the opportunity, which I may get along about 7 o'clock. I wondered if the Senator would yield so that I may make a point of order, because I think the Senator is going much further than yielding for questions. I know my dear friend would not want me to do so.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I yield for a question only.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it not true that in the House of Representatives 2 days out of every month are set aside for the transaction of business affecting the District of Columbia?

Mr. NEELY. That has been true ever since I first became a Member of the House in November 1913.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, is it not true that a large portion of the time of the House of Representatives, which might possibly be devoted to the conduct of national affairs, instead must be devoted to functioning as a board of aldermen for the city of Washington?

Mr. NEELY. Of course. It is also true that much of the time of the Senate is devoted to such trivial matters as that of determining whether rockfish weighing more than 25 pounds, may be sold in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I can yield only to one Senator at a time. When the Senator from Illinois has concluded, I shall gladly yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from West Virginia——

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, let me assure the Senators that they will have ample opportunities to ask questions. I shall gladly yield to all Senators who wish to interrogate me, if they will only ask their questions successively instead of simultaneously.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from West Virginia if in his judgment a very large proportion of the time of both the Senate and House of Representatives is taken up by the transaction of purely local business?

Mr. NEELY. It is, beyond the shadow of a doubt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the persons who are called upon to make those decisions are residents of other localities who wish to work on matters affecting the Nation and matters affecting their States, but who are instead, because of lack of seniority, conscripted to pull an oar in the galley of the affairs of the District of Columbia?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that if the District had home rule a great burden would be taken off the shoulders of both the House of Representatives and the Senate?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly, I think it would increase the Senators' available time for the consideration of other business more than 10 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask if it is not also true that in informal polls which have been taken the residents of the District of Columbia, by very large majorities, have shown their desire to have home rule?

Mr. NEELY. They have, time and again, by overwhelming majorities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask if the party platforms of the two major parties in 1948 included planks pledging those parties to establish home rule for the District of Columbia?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, let me answer the distinguished, able Senator by reading from the party platforms. The Democratic Party first declared itself in favor of this reform in 1892. It has consistently favored it ever since that time. The Republican Party did not follow suit until 1948, when it also declared for home rule for the District of Columbia.

The 1948 Democratic platform contains the following:

> We favor the extension of the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia.

The comparable provision of the 1948 Republican platform is in these words:

> We favor self-government for the residents of the Nation's Capital.

These declarations were repeatedly brought to the attention of the Republican and Democratic members of the District of Columbia Committee during the progress of the hearings on the bill to which the pending resolution refers.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 300. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart;

S. 451. An act for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic;

S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek;

S. 568. An act for the relief of George W. Purdy;

S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs;

S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn;

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General;

S. 998. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3096. An act relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM CONSIDERATION OF S. 656

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 133) providing that the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of S. 656, to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. Has the Senator from Illinois completed his interrogation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, Mr. President, I wish to ask some final questions of the Senator from West Virginia, if I may.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, let me, for the purpose of emphasis, again read the platform declaration of the Republican Party on this important question:

> We favor self-government for the residents of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask if in the Senator's judgment, in view of all this, there is a single, solid, valid argument against giving suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. NEELY. In my judgment, there is no logical argument against it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator believe that it would be perfectly appropriate for us now to proceed forthwith to vote on the issue of suffrage for the people of the District of Columbia, without further delay? I hope that we may obtain a yea-and-nay vote immediately on that question.

Mr. NEELY. Let me make it crystal clear that when the distinguished Senator from Illinois, or any other Senator assures me that we have sufficient votes to adopt the pending resolution, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the able Senator from West Virginia.

Inasmuch as the Senator has discussed both Democratic and Republican platforms, I should like to ask if it is not a fact that for the past 18 years the Democratic Party has been in control of the White House, and for 16 of those 18 years has had control of both the House and the Senate?

Mr. NEELY. That is true. It is also true that after the first inauguration of Abraham Lincoln the Republican Party controlled the Government for more than twice that length of time without even attempting to solve the problem now under consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This is the last time I shall bother the Senator.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator does not need to impose any condition upon himself for the purpose of interrupting me. I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask whether it would be an unfair deduction that we are in the process of a 2-hour filibuster to prevent action on the Ferguson resolution to give the American people an opportunity to hear General MacArthur.

Mr. NEELY. Will someone read the question? I did not hear it all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the reading clerk may read my question to the Senator from West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has asked that the question be read. The reporter will read the question.

The Official Reporter (Gregor MacPherson) read the question as follows:

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask whether it would be an unfair deduction that we are in the process of a 2-hour filibuster to prevent action on the Ferguson resolution to give the American people an opportunity to hear General MacArthur.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, for more than 2 weeks Republican politicians have been using General MacArthur as Barnum and Bailey used their circus. The Grand Old Party's old guard strategists have been parading the general over the country not for the great service he unquestionably rendered the Nation in days gone by, but for the purpose of signally and nationally honoring him for his insubordination to his Commander in Chief and for his defiance of the Secretary of Defense and the Chiefs of Staff whose orders he ought to have obeyed. If anyone subject to General MacArthur's command had disobeyed him and defied him as he has disobeyed and defied his superiors, the offender would have been court-martialed, and shot or imprisoned.

Personally I do not intend to help to prolong the MacArthuritis, emotionalism, hysteria, and nonsense that have swept the Nation from ocean to ocean as a reward for his disobedience and defiance of the Commander in Chief who, at the moment, has more enemies than he deserves.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. NEELY. Not until I have completed my comment.

Mr. President, I learned, as a volunteer private in the Spanish-American War that the first, last, and most important duty of a soldier is to obey unhesitatingly every command he receives from any military authority to which he is subject. Willful disobedience to a military order is a serious offense in time of peace. It is frequently a capital offense in time of war.

If General MacArthur had returned to the United States to receive tribute for his great work in Japan, no one could have gone before me in seeking to pay him any honor that any human heart could have properly desired. If a Roman holiday had been ordained for this great general, for the priceless service he rendered in the Philippine Islands, I should have asked to march in the parade. I would have joined in singing songs of praise for him as I joined in the Army Camp at Chickamauga in '98 in singing such songs for William McKinley, a Republican President to whose call for volunteers I responded immediately after it was issued.

After more than a half a century one of those songs rings in my ears tonight. The opening sentence was:

Oh, the pride of the White House
Is Bill McKinley.

As an enlisted soldier, I respected, honored, and obeyed Commander in Chief Republican President William McKinley, although I did not share his political views. Douglas MacArthur, a great general and soldier, should have obeyed his Commander in Chief, Harry Truman, notwithstanding the general's notorious hostility to the President. If General MacArthur had discharged this plain duty, we should have been spared the unmitigated scourge of idol-worshiping hysteria that has recently paralyzed the Nation and made millions of thoughtful men and women, regardless of politics, color, or creed, hang their heads in shame.

When Scipio in his gilded chariot rode in his greatest triumphal procession through the streets of ancient Rome, he compelled a slave to stand behind him and repeat again and again, "Remember, O great Scipio, thou art but a man." What a blessing it would have been if General MacArthur had followed this prudent example from the moment every radio and television station in the country first became choked with the minutest details of the great warrior's landing in San Francisco until after his frenzied idolaters had sufficiently recovered from their temporary derangement to arise from their knees and begin to think a little less about winning the next election and a great deal more about winning the present war.

Mr. President, for 2 weeks Washington has been deafened with the substance of the command that the heralds proclaimed throughout the streets of Babylon in the days of Nebuchadnezzar 580 years before Christ:

At what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of musick, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar hath set up.

Recently great numbers of the people of Washington have acted as if they had received from an all-powerful modern despot an irresistible command to fall down and worship the disobedient MacArthur in a manner similar to that in which the Babylonian monarch compelled his subjects to worship the image of gold.

Let us cease to deserve the increasingly prevailing opinion that judgment has fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason. Let us begin to act like rational human beings in our thoughts and words and actions concerning General MacArthur. Honor him, of course, both now and in the future, for his outstanding service to his country. But let us stop, once and for all, paying him tribute for his insubordination to the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Nation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Did I correctly understand the Senator at the outset of his last remarks to mean that the appearance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur before the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress was a Barnum and Bailey circus?

Mr. NEELY. I said that the politicians had used the general as Barnum and Bailey used their circus. Let me now add that these self-constituted promoters of Republican victory in 1952 could not have fanned adoration and hysteria to greater heights if the second coming of the Messiah to establish everlasting peace and happiness on earth had been substituted for the homecoming of General MacArthur to divide the Nation at the most critical hour in its history and dramatically advocate the extension of the Korean war to the mainland of China heedless of the manifest probability that this action would precipitate an atomic world-wide conflict, the result of which would be undreamed-of slaughter, devastation, and despair.

Mr. President, it is high time for this ambitious, visionary, reckless general to abandon his efforts to demonstrate that he is what the wicked Manfred proclaimed himself to be in the notable lines:

I am the rider of the wind,
The stirrer of the storm;
The hurricane I left behind
Is yet with lightning warm.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the able majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] talked about control of the Senate. I want to ask the Senator if he does not think that the Democrats lost control of the Senate this afternoon because of absentees, and on account of sickness, and Senators being away on official business?

Mr. NEELY. That is a self-evident truth.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In view of the remarks made on the other side of the aisle intimating, or definitely accusing my good friend from West Virginia of seeking to engage in a filibuster, will he now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, without losing his right to the floor, so the Senator from Oklahoma may make a unanimous-consent request that the Senate accept and approve the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia, and thereby bring the action on the matter to which he addresses himself to an immediate conclusion? Will he yield to the Senator from Oklahoma to make such a unanimous-consent request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the Members on this side of the aisle are just as anxious as they can be to get a vote on the resolution which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia said he was going to explain, but about which he has had very little to say since he started to make his remarks. I think they are ready to vote now, and if the unanimous-consent request is that we take an immediate vote, certainly there is no objection. We would like to do it, and dispose of the matter. I should like to amend that unanimous-consent request. I ask if the majority leader will not permit the Ferguson resolution to

come up, so that we may have a vote on that by 7 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no unanimous-consent request now pending.

Mr. WHERRY. I will make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot make that request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from West Virginia to yield for that purpose.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I refuse to yield for that purpose. But I will yield for the request of the Senator from Oklahoma that we adopt the resolution, if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. KERR. I asked the Senator from West Virginia to yield so that I might make a unanimous-consent request that we vote on his resolution, without the Senator from West Virginia losing the floor thereby.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia cannot yield to any Senator for that purpose except by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest that consent be given. We are for it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, what is the unanimous-consent request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Oklahoma asks the Senator from West Virginia to yield in order that he might make a unanimous-consent request that the resolution, which presumably is under discussion, may be voted upon in the Senate.

Mr. NEELY. No; not to be voted upon but to be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To be adopted; and that the Senator from West Virginia agrees to yield for that purpose provided he does not lose the floor.

Mr. NEELY. That is correct. But the unanimous-consent request must be that the resolution be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no way of knowing whether anything is adopted until there is a vote on it.

Mr. KERR and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom,

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I asked the Senator if he would yield so the Senator from Oklahoma could make a unanimous-consent request. I understood the Senator to say he would if he could do so without losing the floor. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield to me, without losing the floor, so that I can make the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from West Virginia yielding for that purpose, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for another question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield.

Mr. KERR. As I understand the parliamentary situation the resolution sponsored by the Senator from West Virginia became the matter pending before the Senate in due course as a result of the action of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] making the motion he made. May I ask the Senator from West Virginia if he does not feel some sense of gratitude for the workings of the Wherry-go-round whereby as the result of what our great friend from Nebraska did, we now have the opportunity of discussing this resolution, which is of such vital interest to the Senator from West Virginia and so many others?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the eminent Senator from Nebraska, as I have been grateful to him on many other occasions for services he has rendered. If he would rally all, or nearly all, the Senators on his side of the aisle to vote for the resolution to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia from further consideration of the bill, he would thereby place me under an additional obligation to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the eminent Senator from Nebraska for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. It was from the other side of the aisle, the side on which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has his seat, that the objection came to doing what the minority is perfectly willing to have done. There is no objection on this side of the aisle to the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to hold that what the Senator from Nebraska has stated is not a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if we are going to be technical under the rules, then I shall ask the Senator to yield to me for a question.

Mr. NEELY. Very well; I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Did not the objection to the unanimous-consent request come from the Senator's side of the aisle?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have no more control over Members on this side of the aisle than the Senator from Nebraska has over Senators on his side who frequently vote against him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. So did not the Wherry-go-round break down because this time the Senator from Nebraska did not have the power to put the matter across?

Mr. NEELY. I am not informed about the Wherry-go-round. But it is my candid opinion that an average of 4 days a week are lost by this body in riding the Wind-go-round. Senators with more whim than motive get on this fantastic contrivance and ride and ride, and speak and speak to empty seats until the Senate Chamber is filled with a rushing, mighty wind such as was first noted on the day of Pentecost. Unhappily these loquacious statesmen frequently get off at the very place at which they got on.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, that tribute—I refer to the references to wind and whim—was made for the benefit of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator if it is true that the motion before the Senate at this time is a motion to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia from the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Or to bring the bill before the Senate without having the Committee on the District of Columbia act upon it. Therefore, as I see, a motion would not be in order to have the Senate vote on the bill, since it is not before the Senate at this time.

Mr. NEELY. I understood the Senator from Oklahoma to request unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the resolution to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia from further consideration of the bill.

Mr. President please let me improve the opportunity which the momentary silence of the MacArthur interlocutors affords to observe that the platform declarations of both political parties concerning home rule for the District of Columbia have been made a part of the record so that Senators may conveniently refresh their memory relative to their political duty in this important matter.

Several referendums have been held in recent years on the subject of home rule for the District. The votes cast for it have in every case exceeded those cast against it. On some occasions the majorities in favor of home rule were overwheling.

In 1949 the Senate voted in favor of the original Kefauver bill without a single recorded vote against it. But the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and two or three others by voice votes attested their opposition to the measure. Subject to this voice opposition, the Kefauver bill was passed by the Senate unanimously 2 years ago. Unfortunately the bill died in the House committee to which it was referred. The bill to which the pending resolutiton refers is, in every essential particular, identical with the Kefauver bill which the Senate passed 2 years ago.

In order that Senators who are not members of the Committee on the District of Columbia may be better informed about the present bill, I shall read some of the testimony of Dr. George B. Galloway, a distinguished, highly qualified expert in municipal government, who is now the senior American Government specialist of the Legislative Service of the Library of Congress. He

testified before the committee on the twenty-first of last February as follows:

During the Seventy-ninth Congress, I was staff director of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which produced the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

One of the principal recommendations of the La Follette-Monroney committee was self-rule for the District of Columbia. The committee made that recommendation primarily with a view to reducing the workload on Congress that arises from its city-council function.

During the Eightieth Congress I was staff director of the Subcommittee on Home Rule and Reorganization of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. That committee produced the so-called Auchincloss bill, which was favorably reported in the Eightieth Congress by the House District Committee.

During the Eighty-first Congress I had the privilege of serving as technical adviser on this legislation to your own subcommittee.

Two years ago your subcommittee held hearings on an identical bill. I testified at those hearings, and presented a detailed analysis of the so-called Kefauver bill, and a careful comparison of the provisions of the Kefauver and Auchincloss bills.

That testimony will be found, sir, in part 2 of the hearings before this subcommittee held in March of 1949, and I will not detain the committee with a repetition of the testimony, but invite your attention to it, if it interests you.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you want that inserted in the record at this point?

Mr. GALLOWAY. Whatever pleases the committee on that point.

Mr. Chairman, the testimony is available to you in the records of your committee, and in a House committee print which I prepared, which compares the provisions of the two bills.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, in that case it probably is not necessary to set it down in full in this record.

Mr. GALLOWAY. Rather than repeat the testimony which I presented here 2 years ago, Mr. Chairman, I would like, if I may this afternoon, to present a brief summary of the principal arguments which have been made in recent years, both for and against home rule for Washington, as those arguments have been developed by the advocates and the opponents of this legislation.

On the one hand, the advocates of home rule begin by pointing out that it was evidently the intention of the founding fathers that the inhabitants of the Federal City should enjoy a large measure of local self-government, for James Madison, who was one of the chief architects of the Constitution, as you know, informed the people back in 1788 in one of his Federalist essays, and I quote his exact words:

"That the inhabitants of the Federal City," he said, "will have a voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them," and he went on to assure them that "a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages will, of course, be allowed them."

The advocates of home rule go on to point out that these early promises and expectations were soon fulfilled, and from 1802 until 1871 Congress permitted the people of Washington to elect their mayors and town councils in annual elections.

Then, during the territorial period from 1871 to 1874, Congress allowed the people of Washington to elect each year the 25 members of their municipal house of delegates, as well as the nonvoting Delegate to the National House of Representatives, such as Alaska and Hawaii now have. Thus, we see that during the first half of the history of the Federal City, the people of Washington enjoyed a large measure of local self-government.

The proponents of this legislation further point out that the people of Washington are evidently capable of local self-government because they have an occupational acquaintance with public affairs arising from the fact that upward of 20 percent of their members are employed in the Federal Government; moreover, it is alleged, and I think correctly so, that the people of Washington are the best educated of any American city, according to the census figures, in terms of the number of years of schooling which they have completed.

The CHAIRMAN. Doctor, in your opinion, why was that backward step taken? Why were the people deprived of self-government?

Mr. GALLOWAY. In 1874?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GALLOWAY. Well, it so happened, Mr. Chairman, that during the previous territorial regime, which followed not long after the Civil War, that the National Capital City was physically very much down at the heel; the streets were muddy; there were smelly swamps, and great need of many capital improvements.

Under the territorial regime there was a board of public works and a governor, and in order to make up for lost time, the Governor, who was known as Boss Shepherd, and the board of public works, of which he was chairman, launched an ambitious program of public works to improve the physical appearance of the Capital City. They spent over a 4-year period the horrendous sum of $18,000,000, about four millions of which they borrowed from the people.

Finally, the taxpayers of the community protested against this "extravagant" expenditure, and Congress responded to their protests by liquidating the territorial regime and setting up in 1875 on a temporary makeshift basis a commission form of government. The functions which had been performed by the Governor, and the board of public works were transferred to the Board of Commissioners, appointed by the President.

The legislative functions which had been performed by the municipal legislature were transferred to the Congress, and all suffrage rights were suspended. This temporary makeshift scheme was made permanent by the Charter of 1878, but I would point out that the conditions about which the taxpayers complained at that time were conditions brought about by the activity of a governor and a board of public works who had been appointed by the President, and were not the result of the action of the local legislature elected by the people.

Does that answer your question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir; it does.

Mr. GALLOWAY. The advocates of home rule also point out that taxation without representation is incompatible with our American traditions. We pay today, they say, almost $100,000,000 in taxes each year, but the taxpayers have no voice with regard either to the tax rate or as to how their tax money shall be spent.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. On the question of the tax money of the District of Columbia, it is spent, is it not, under the supervision of the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate? And is it not also true that the people who have no connection whatever with the District of Columbia tell its officials how their money shall be spent?

Mr. NEELY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also correct that, not having even a speaking delegate in the Congress, the residents of the District of Columbia do not have a voice, much less a vote, as to how the money they pay in taxes shall be spent?

Mr. NEELY. They are utterly destitute of any right to decide how their tax money shall be spent.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also a fact, I may ask the Senator, that the policemen of the District of Columbia, the employees of the District Building, the judges of the District, and all other officials of the District, are not answerable to the people of the District, but are answerable to the Federal Government?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me ask the Senator whether that does not lead to a situation in which special-interest groups of the District, by lobbying tactics, are able to get special concessions, by reason of the fact that the officials of the District are not answerable to the people of the District?

Mr. NEELY. That is one of the deplorable misfortunes of the present situation.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not further true that it brings about bad government, so far as the whole body of citizens of the District is concerned?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEELY. Proceeding, Mr. Galloway said:

In this connection, I would like to invite your attention to an observation made by former Speaker Champ Clark, who, in his autobiography, My Quarter Century of American Politics, said this about the government of the District of Columbia:

"Two days out of every month the House sits as a common council for the half million citizens of the District of Columbia, who, living under the shadow of the Capitol, have no more voice in their governmental affairs than if they were denizens of the Cannibal Islands. A man who can think of a sadder commentary," said Champ Clark, "on our boasted theory of representative government is possessed of an imagination gorgeous beyond sanity. Yet our fathers precipitated the Revolutionary War for the principle 'no taxation without representation.'"

The advocates of home rule further point out that the people of Washington themselves have recently given proof that they desire local self-government. In unofficial plebiscites held here in recent years, they voted, first, 8 to 1 in favor of local suffrage in 1938, and in 1946 they voted 7 to 3 for it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the able Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not true that, under the proposed program the people of the District of Columbia, by their qualified electors, would be given the right to choose the members of their school board, who have the government and control and supervision of the public schools of the District of Columbia?

Mr. NEELY. That is certainly true.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not also true that, under the present law, citizens of the District have nothing whatever to do with the selection of the members of their school board?

Mr. NEELY. They are entirely excluded from participating in that or any other similar matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not also true that they have nothing to do, by way of selecting the school-board members, with the administration of the public school system which they support by their taxes, and to which they furnish the pupils from the children of their families?

Mr. NEELY. That is unfortunately true.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. NEELY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know of any other area within the continental limits of the United States where the citizenry are reduced to such a situation that they have no voice whatever over the matter of their school system or its control, or the control, through elected officials, of the selection of teachers and others who, for so many hours a day, or for most of the year, have the supervision and training of their children?

Mr. NEELY. There is no other place in the United States where the people suffer such injustice.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I hoped that he would deal with this problem, because it seems to me that the matter of control of the public-school system is something in which citizens should have some say, and perhaps the most abject difficulty under which the citizens of the District of Columbia now try to exist is the complete denial of any voice whatever in connection with their public school structures and systems, or the personnel or the conditions under which their own children are subjected to education under the public-school system of the District.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I further read from Dr. Galloway's testimony:

Three years ago the Washington Post conducted a scientific poll on this question which showed that 70 percent of the people of Washington were in favor of local self-government.

It is further argued that not only do the people here want it but that the Nation at large wants the District to have home rule. A Gallup poll a couple of years ago showed that 77 percent of the people in the Nation at large favored it.

Moreover, many leading newspapers have endorsed it editorially.

They also remind us that President Truman himself endorsed this very bill now before your committee and urged its passage in a letter to the Speaker of the House on July 25, 1949.

One of the principal arguments that is frequently made by the advocates of home rule is that its adoption would relieve Congress of an onerous councilmanic burden which it ought not to have to bear in these times when great issues of peace and reconstruction are pressing for its attention.

As it is, as you know, all District legislation must pass through both Houses of Congress, and there are 28 separate stages in the passage of law through the National Legislature, whereas elsewhere, local policies are made by the single act of a city council.

We know here that it takes an act of Congress to change the names of the streets or to save daylight time or to kill starlings or destroy weeds. It is argued that this state of affairs is not fair to the Congress, nor fair to the people of Washington, whose local needs tend to be neglected.

It is also argued that both of our great national political parties have promised suffrage to the District of Columbia residents. The platforms of your own party have contained home-rule planks, I think, since 1932.

The Democratic platform of 1948 stated: "We favor extension of the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia." The Republican platform, in the same year, contained a similar statement.

The opponents of home rule have cast doubt upon the constitutionality of this legislation. They have questioned the constitutionality, for example, of the provisions of the bill which relate to the handling of legislative proposals of the District Council.

On the other hand, the advocates of the measure would invite your attention to the fact that the constitutionality of this bill has been upheld in written opinions submitted to the District Committees of Congress by the Attorney General of the United States, by House and Senate legislative counsel and that, sir, is a copy of their opinion, and by several eminent constitutional lawyers——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request in order that I may send to the desk an amendment, without the Senator's losing the floor?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I yield, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. I simply wanted to offer a modification of the Watkins amendment. It will not be taken up at this time. I hope the majority leader will not object to my presenting a modification to an amendment already on the desk.

Mr. McFARLAND. The matter is not before the Senate, and it would not be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it would be in order. I am not offering the amendment at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. But it is not in order. The resolution to which the amendment relates is not before the Senate. I do not object to its being printed and lying on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is all that can be done.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not object to that.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield so that I may ask unanimous consent that the resolution which would automatically follow the Senator's resolution may be brought up during the next few minutes?

Mr. NEELY. I am sorry, Mr. President, I cannot yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I continue to read:

and by several eminent constitutional lawyers, including John W. Davis, Edward S. Corwin, and Arthur T. Vanderbilt—

I hope that Senators will note the names of these eminent lawyers who have expressed the opinion that the original Kefauver bill was constitutional.

Mr. President, in my opinion, John W. Davis' superior as a lawyer has never walked this earth.

The CHAIRMAN. Have we not heard that Mr. West, the corporation counsel, and the Commissioners, day before yesterday decided, in effect, that this bill was not constitutional?

Mr. GALLOWAY. I noticed that some question had been raised by the Corporation Counsel. But, in reply, I would invite your attention to an opinion on the issue expressed by that eminent constitutional authority, Prof. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton University who, in his recent book, Understanding the Constitution, has this to say on that very point: "The Constitution does not permit Congress to grant the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote in Federal elections, but there is no constitutional reason why they should not be allowed to elect their own local officials. At the present time, Congress, which has complete governmental powers over the District, spends a day every fortnight it is in session, passing city ordinances and serving as city council. From the viewpoint of both legislative efficiency and justice for the citizens of the District." concludes Professor Corwin, "such a system is indefensible and the demands for a larger measure of home rule are becoming ever more insistent."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I continue to read:

Advocates of home rule further contend that all other American cities enjoy local self-government, and they point out that all the other capital cities of countries outside the iron curtain, except Canberra, Australia, where the situation is unique, also have home rule.

It is further argued by the advocates of this bill that lack of local self-government in the Capital City of the world's greatest democracy, embarrasses the conduct of our foreign relations, and I think that has been brought to your attention already.

I have had the experience myself in recent years, since the late war, of addressing visiting delegations of Japanese and German officials from countries which we are engaged in attempting to democratize, and these officials have expressed amazement when they have learned that here in Washington the residents are not even permitted to vote for their own dog catcher.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

Under the present form of local government—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question is whether or not the Senator will yield, if he does not thereby lose the floor, so that I may ask for a vote on Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, which is now on the calendar, and which will remain there if there is a delay until 7 o'clock. The Senator from Michigan would like a vote on it tonight.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished Senator from Michigan, for whom I have the highest respect, that I should like to accommodate him. But I do not want the minds of Republican Senators to turn to another MacArthur hippodrome. I want them to think about self-government for the people of the Capital of the greatest nation in the world.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 7 o'clock having arrived, the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia goes to the calendar, and the clerk will state the unfinished business, which comes automatically before the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, for the information of Senators on the measure now pending, Senate bill 984, a series of letters, telegrams, news articles, and editorials relating to many of the important issues involved in the bill.

There being no objection, the communications, news articles, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor of February 10, 1951]

LABOR BARRED FROM SECRET PARLEY ON ALIEN WORKERS; SHOCKING "GAG" ASSAILED

Representatives of the labor movement were thoroughly aroused this week over the shocking manner in which officials of the American and Mexican Governments handled negotiations for bringing an army of Mexicans from below the Rio Grande into this country to meet alleged "manpower shortages."

The story of what happened is one of the most extraordinary this paper has ever reported. Here are the high lights:

A fortnight ago leaders of labor learned that an American Government delegation was to meet secretly with officials of the Mexican Government in Mexico City to discuss lowering the bars for an influx of Mexicans into this country.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association, along with the A. F. of L. and CIO, asked the State Department to include labor representatives in the American delegation as observers or consultants, since the decisions reached would vitally affect workers in this country.

An absolute refusal came from the State Department. Whereupon the RLEA sent Frank L. Noakes, research director of the maintenance-of-way employees, down to Mexico City to keep an eye on the parleys. The A. F. of L. sent Ernesto Galarza of the National Farm Labor Union.

In Mexico City Noakes and Galarza recommended to the United States Embassy that at least machinery be set up for a formal exchange of information and proposals between the conferees and the labor representatives, so that the ideas of labor could be considered. Also, they asked that all agreements reached be made public, with no secret or confidential understandings. This fair suggestion was rejected.

Then something even more startling happened. The Mexican Government laid down a "gag rule," forbidding the press or anyone else to discuss the secret conferences for 7 days. Mexico City newspapers were "hopping mad" about the suppression, but were forced to submit.

Even worse, when major Mexican unions called a mass meeting, primarily to welcome Noakes and Galarza, the Government arrested the leaders, releasing them only after they promised to call off the meeting. The government contended such assembly violated its gag order.

"I never dreamed any democratic government would resort to such suppression," Noakes said. "Certainly, any future such conferences should be held in the United States where we still have freedom of the press.

"Also, we are shocked and angry at the action of our own State Department in barring labor from the conferences. You can be sure we are going to protest that action as hard as we can."

Noakes said he received only one assurance—that the Mexico City conferences were confined to the question of importing farm labor and would not take up admission of Mexicans for railroad work at this time. He said he was told rail labor would be consulted if and when the importation of railmen is considered.

Noakes stressed, too, that the railroad labor unions had only two objectives in mind in seeking participation in the parleys—one, "to safeguard standards of their members from being lowered by importation of unnecessary labor, and, two, to see to it that the 'braceros' (Mexican migrants) will not be exploited in this country."

Even though the parleys dealt only with farm workers, "that does not lessen our interest in the problem," Noakes said.

He added that, in his report to the RLEA, he will urge that every possible assistance be given to the National Farm Labor Union in its effort to protect American agricultural workers from destruction of their wage and working standards through importation of unnecessary foreign workers.

NATIONAL FARM LABOR UNION, AFL,
El Centro, Calif., April 30, 1951.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Those of us who are in the field in opposition to the corporation farmers appreciate very much the efforts you are making to stop the Ellender-Poage bill.

With the hope that you may find in them additional facts to combat this bill, I am air mailing you today some photographs taken by my on April 21 in Hermosillo, Mexico.

These photographs show the conditions under which contracting of Mexican "braceros" was being carried out on that date. A detailed report on these conditions is now in the hands of President Mitchell of our union. This report, I am sure, will be available to you. I can add nothing to it at this time.

The Ellender-Poage bill takes these conditions for granted. If it becomes a law, we may expect this inhuman, irresponsible form of contracting to continue.

Neither Senator ELLENDER nor Representative POAGE nor any of the officials of the State and Labor Departments who composed the United States delegation that went to Mexico City last January can plead ignorance of this situation. I was sent to the negotiations that began on January 26, 1951, as a representative of the American Federation of Labor. It was our explicit purpose to show from the record that the conditions of contracting of "braceros" have degenerated to a level of international indecency; and to warn our delegation that these conditions would be repeated this year.

The responsibility for the situation in Hermosillo lies squarely at the door of the members of the United States delegation to the Mexico City negotiations. I am sure that if you make the facts known to the Members of Congress they will no longer sanction by law this nauseating betrayal of the good neighbor spirit.

You may be sure that we are ready to give you ample documented support in your opposition to this bill.

With appreciation, I remain,

ERNESTO GALARZA.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 2, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

National Consumers League at meeting in New York adopted resolution yesterday endorsing efforts to amend Ellender bill to achieve improved standards of working conditions for all migrant workers, both domestic and imported.

ELIZABETH S. MAGEE,
General Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 2, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

The National Farmers Union commends you for your courageous and untiring efforts in the fight to maintain decent standards for agricultural workers. Your actions in fighting the feudal lords of agriculture who refuse to utilize underemployed American labor and who prefer a cheap imported labor supply are encouraging all of us whose faith remains in the family farm and not the factories in the field. You are also showing to the world that the American conscience and sense of fair play are still alive. Keep up the good work.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President of the National Farmers Union.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *May 1, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The board of directors of the New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau meeting at their regular quarterly meeting in Albuquerque May 1 wish to inform you that our organization of over 6,000 family members is strongly in favor of the passage of the Ellender farm-labor bill without amendments. New Mexico farmers and ranchers cannot produce the defense crops they have been urged to plant without an adequate supply of labor. Only source of qualified labor available to us is Mexican nationals. We urge your support in withdrawing amendments and supporting this measure. The board of directors, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau: Henry Mallette, Las Vegas; John Gard, Gladstone Rosco, Fletcher Dexter, Russell Rogers, Artesia; R. C. Morgan, Portales; Andrew Chitwood, Clovis; Cecil Moon, Forrest; W. E. Overton, Yeso; J. C. Johnson, Tularosa; George Cureton, Lordsburg; Clarence Stringer, Berino; G. D. Hatfield, Deming; Floyd Lee, San Mateo; Alex Hare, Bloomfield; W. P. Thorpe, Las Cruces; Delmar Roberts, Berino; W. B. McAlister, Portales; Stephen L. Brock, Roy; Mrs. Frank Schulmeister, Albuquerque; and J. L. Augustine, Jr., Las Cruces.

J. L. AUGUSTINE.

GALLUP, N. MEX., *May 1, 1951.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

We members of the United Mine Workers of America, Local No. 7777, unalterably oppose the Ellender bill to import Mexican labor to the United States. It is only a subterfuge to import slave labor to be exploited for the benefit of a choice few. There is no intent to provide standard wages or decent living conditions. It is a fact that sufficient American labor is available among the Southwest Indians and other people of our country. Reluctance on the part of the labor profiteers to paying a living wage has kept this large labor reservoir of manpower

idle. We respectfully petition you to oppose the Ellender bill.

RUDY COSTILLO,
President.
JERRY MARQUEZ,
Secretary.
BARTOLO BORBON,
Treasurer.
BEN THOMAS,
Financial Secretary.
WILLIAM GRIJALGA,
Assistant Secretary.

TAOS, N. MEX., *May 2, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Canvass of majority of our 175 members reveals opposition to Ellender bill 984 unless your amendment is accepted. Best wishes.

TAOS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
RUTH G. FISH, *Secretary.*

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *May 1, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico,
Washington, D. C.:

We share your views in opposing the bill allowing the importation of Mexican farm labor for seasonal work.

F. E. SWALES,
President, San Antonio Trades Council, A. F. of L.

FRESNO, CALIF., *May 1, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of California's 250,000 underemployed farm workers, the California organization of the National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L., extends deepest appreciation and gratitude for your valiant stand on the floor of the Senate April 27 with reference to foreign farm-labor importation.

W. A. SWEARINGEN,
Fresno Area Representative.

[From Time magazine of April 9, 1951]

IMMIGRATION—THE WETBACKS

For years past, the armies of ragged, hungry men had come from all over Mexico, up the highways and the railroads, on foot under the burning sun. Drawn by the hope of the Yankee dollar, they swarmed to the border by the tens of faceless thousands. They milled briefly amid slinking dogs and neon-lighted stench of Mexicali, and then streamed, furtively and endlessly across the border into California.

Some of them paid smugglers $10 to sneak them over the line in automobile trunks. But most simply walked to the east or west of the International Bridge, jumped across the narrow New River, crawled through holes in a 10-foot wire fence, and scrambled up to United States soil. They were the prey of countless enemies. Robbers had killed some of them. Disease killed many more. Sometimes the unwary died sneaking rides atop 12-foot hay trucks, which sped through 13-foot underpasses on the highways.

Desert trek: The sun killed many, too—although hundreds of them made incredible week-long treks across the barren Mojave Desert, carrying nothing to drink but a gallon jug of water, hiding under cactus by day and walking by night. Harassed immigration officials rounded them up in knots along the roads, in wholesale lots on farms, loaded them into yellow busses and took them back to Mexico. Last year 230,000 were caught in California alone. Most of them hustled back, were often caught again at the same job in the same field on the same day.

Last week the tide of illegal Mexican "wetbacks" flower strongest into California's lush, hot Imperial Valley, where the harvest season was at its height. But they were crossing the Rio Grande into Texas, too; by autumn, immigration men estimate, more than a million wetbacks will have surged across the 2,000-mile border between the Pacific and the Gulf, hunting jobs as the Forty-niners hunted gold.

The phenomenon of the wetbacks is not new, but until World War II, it was not a large one. The war siphoned off agricultural labor, particularly low-paying, exhausting "stoop labor" along the lower Rio Grande, in New Mexico, Arizona, and California. The wetbacks rushed into the vacuum.

More came every year. In 1948 the United States and Mexican Governments tried to channel and control the migration, signed a series of pacts by which Mexico agreed to send labor crews across the border for specific jobs, and that the United States would guarantee them a prevailing wage, housing, and insurance. It was like making international agreements about locusts.

The Mexican migrants rebelled at delays and red tape. United States farmers, by and large, boycotted the agreement too. They had come to consider the wetbacks as a cheap, natural resource, as rightfully theirs as rain or good soil. Forced to choose between lawbreaking or paying legally imported Mexican Nationals a fair wage, many farmers chose, without hesitation, to break the law. After all, wetbacks would work—and are working—for as little as 20 cents an hour, a wage comparable to that skilled labor receives in Mexico. They do not argue, do not agitate, do not complain; if they do, they can always be turned in as border jumpers. Farmers have built good barracks for some, but others live wretchedly, taking shelter in caves or rude lean-tos, cooking in the fields, washing in irrigation ditches.

Last week the illegal wetback labor system did not lack for critics; many a citizen of the States involved not only cried, "Shame" at a condition which savored of slavery, but protested that the low-paid laborers were working the economic ruin of dozens of farming towns. In the Imperial Valley, 34-year-old Hank Hasiwar, organizer for the National Farm Labor Union, was not only agitating among the wetbacks (who, however, cannot become union members) and protesting to Congress, but also trying to unite merchants and businessmen against the system.

But the wetbacks kept coming.

[From the New York Times of April 18, 1951]

MIGRANT LABOR

The report and the recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor contribute much-needed light and guidance on the many problems in this thorny area of American life. Systematically investigating each aspect of migratory labor in this country, the distinguished group appointed by the President has problem to the heart of the many difficulties facing these workers and has reached conclusions worthy of the most serious study by those, including Congress, who have authority to implement these recommendations.

At the nub of the disgraceful conditions surrounding employment of migratory workers in the United States is a complex of factors. The market for farm labor is largely disorganized, employing casual workers who are utilized far from fully. Migrant workers are used for the most part at seasonal peaks of labor needs, as at harvest time, on backbreaking manual jobs. Many of our domestic migrants have great difficulty in finding alternative industrial employment. Migratory workers have failed to achieve the strong unionization which has advanced the interests of other major groups of workers in this country. Social legislation in this country for the most part excludes farm workers from its protection and benefits.

The President's Commission directs its recommendations towards many of these specific problems. It suggests that a Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor be formed to coordinate both governmental and private activity in this field. It urges that domestic workers be used to a maximum extent and that foreign workers be imported only when an actual farm-labor shortage exists. Sweatshop conditions on farms should be fought by requiring licenses for those who move workers across State lines and by having the United States Employment Service gather written descriptions of employment and housing conditions from farmers seeking workers through that agency. These and other important suggestions strike at the roots of the unhealthy conditions now plaguing Americans who are migratory workers. It is high time that effective action be taken to translate those suggestions into legislation and action.

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1951]

PUERTO RICO OFFERS LABOR

SAN JUAN, P. R., March 26.—Labor Commissioner Fernando Sierraberdecia told an Agriculture Subcommittee of the House of Representatives today that Puerto Rico could furnish from 50,000 to 100,000 experienced agricultural workers to the United States for July-to-December work.

The commissioner was one of six witnesses at hearings on use of Puerto Rican labor in the continental United States to help relieve seasonal farm labor shortages. The hearing ended tonight.

Representative W. R. POAGE, Democrat, of Texas, presiding, said the United States already had entered an agreement with Mexico for the hiring of labor. He declared that final congressional action was pending.

Commissioner Sierraberdecia told the committee that the main work of farm laborers on this island is in the sugar industry, with peak employment from January to June. Puerto Rican labor would benefit from a labor pool, he said, by the opportunity to expand their earning periods to 8 or 9 months of the year.

Mr. Sierraberdecia said more than 10,000 laborers had been hired by United States farmers last year, of whom 98 percent had returned after the work was finished.

[From the New York Times of April 23, 1951]

MEN SEEKING UNITED STATES JOBS MILL IN MISERY AT MEXICAN CAMP—DISREGARD OF WORKERS' PRIORITY FOR FARM POSTS IS BLAMED—MANY OF LATTER-DAY BONUS MARCHERS HUNGRY AND ILL

(By Gladwin Hill)

HERMOSILLO, MEXICO, April 22.—A once-beautiful city park, now scarred and poverty-ridden, has become the terminal of a latter-day bonus march of thousands of ragged workers from all parts of Mexico. They are gambling their all on the slim chance of getting into the United States as contract farm laborers.

Their pathetic stampede, marked by hunger, sickness, repeated violence, and several deaths began more than 2 months ago when word filtered across the country that, as in every year since 1947, ranchers and farmers of the far western United States would soon be down. Under an agreement between the governments of the United States and Mexico, these men hire alien workers to compensate for purported shortages of domestic labor.

The recent report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor said that the unavailability of domestic labor was questionable, since the same terms, inducements and guarantees accorded Mexican labor under the agreement had never been proffered to domestic workers.

In the 4 years from 1947, an average of 80,000 Mexicans annually has been imported for terms of 6 months or a year to work on western fruit, vegetable, and cotton farms, principally in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. The quota for this spring's

importations, up to June 30, has been set at 53,000. Three centers for contracting have been designated: Hermosillo, the capital of the State of Sonora, 180 miles south of the Arizona border; and Chihuahua and Monterrey, two other provincial capitals.

Hermosillo was the first contracting center to open. By the time it began operation April 2, about 12,000 workers, some with the traditional sombreros and sarapes, others wearing just tattered overalls, streamed into the city, augmenting its normal population by 20 percent.

They concentrated in the half-mile-square park named for Francisco Madero, Mexico's martyr president, a preserve of majestic palm and other subtropical trees and beautiful flower gardens. They picked this site as the closest encampment spot to the adjacent Casa del Pueblo, the collection of community buildings and a sports park where the recruiting was to take place.

They made their beds on the ground, dug holes around the edge of the park for fireplaces, stripped branches for fuel.

In general the workers, accustomed to wages of about 40 cents a day, had only a few pesos in their pockets. Many had been unemployed for months and subsisted for days on a few tortillas (corn cakes) and coffee.

FIELD KITCHENS SET UP

By March 31, when the communistic Partido Popular held its state convention here, the workers' distress and restiveness had become so evident that party leaders tried to capitalize on it. They staged a barbecue and sent trucks with loudspeakers to carry the encamped workers to it. A day or two before, however, Gov. Ignacio Soto, of Sonora, had established some fields kitchens in the park and alleviated the distress, so that the workers were not beguiled.

The Government also established an emergency dispensary, which has been treating as many as 300 cases a day. Numerous workers have contracted pneumonia and several have died.

The restiveness of the workers revived when a team of United States and Mexican officials opened an improved recruiting center in the Casa del Pueblo. The United States contingent is headed by Oscar C. Harper, a representative of the United States Employment Service, and includes a half-dozen men from the United States Public Health and Immigration and Naturalization Services.

The actual hiring of workers depends on the arrival of United States farmers or their representatives with certifications, originating with regional representatives of the United States Employment Service, attesting local labor shortages and authorizing the hiring of aliens.

Hiring has been slow. On some days, 5,000 to 10,000 of the waiting workers have been called from their bivouacs under the trees and herded in the broiling sun for hours while ranchers selected only 50 or 100 of their number. On some days, there has been no hiring at all.

Disregard by the Mexican officials in charge of this phase of the operation for priorities among the aspirants, some have now been here as much as 10 weeks, caused resentment that has flared up in repeated small riots. In one of them a worker was fatally trampled. The targets in these disturbances have been the small detachment of Mexican soldiers called in early in the proceedings to police the throng.

I watched one such outburst today. The majority of the workers, excluded from today's 327 hirings, watched sullenly as their luckier comrades filed up to be looked over and culled by Benigno Lopez, agent for the Growers Farm Labor Association of Salinas, Calif.

The association, composed of the 60 farmers in the Salinas Valley, is offering 82½ cents an hour, minus $1.75 a day board, for work in the lettuce fields.

The vexation of the left-outers culminated in a brief stone-throwing attack on the soldiers. It was quelled quickly with six arrests.

Of the total of 12,000 workers who swarmed here 2,400 have been hired, mostly by California growers. About 4,000 have given up hope and scattered out of Hermosillo. Some 6,000 are left, camping in Francisco Madero Park.

[From the New York Times of April 24, 1951]

HIRING BRINGS GRIEF TO MEXICAN CITIES—THREE PRINCIPAL TOWNS FACING DISRUPTION AS SEEKERS OF UNITED STATES JOBS POUR IN—DISTURBANCE IS REPORTED—6,000 ARE SAID TO DEMONSTRATE AT MONTERREY—OFFICIAL IN FARM POST PLAN REPLACED

(By Gladwin Hill)

HERMOSILLO, MEXICO, April 23.—This spring's recruiting of Mexican workers for farm labor in the western United States is assuming the proportion of a major governmental headache for Mexico.

Three of the principal cities of northern Mexico designated in the current United States-Mexico labor agreement as recruiting centers have found themselves faced with disruptions and complications of the sort that would attend the protracted encampment of 2,000,000 unemployed in Central Park in New York.

This already has happened in Hermosillo, capital of the State of Sonora, 180 miles south of the Arizona border and the first recruiting center to start operation.

A swarm of some 12,000 jobseekers, equivalent to 20 percent of its normal population, has descended, ragged and hungry, on its Francisco Madero Park to await for weeks on end a chance at being hired by some western fruit, vegetable or cotton rancher certified by the United States Employment Service as unable to obtain domestic citizen labor.

Reports from Monterrey, the capital of the State of Nuevo Leon, to the east, where recruiting has not yet opened, indicate a similar mass descent there. A Monterrey dispatch yesterday said that some 6,000 aspirant workers for the United States had staged a demonstration against the Government.

Similar masses of laborers are reported streaming into Chihuahua, the third designated center. United States officials here said there was no indication when recruiting would be started in those centers. Recruiting under the present agreement must be completed by June 30. It started here April 2.

Although the congregating here has been marked by repeated minor riots and some bloodshed, United States observers have marveled at the workers' patience in comparison with the violence that undoubtedly would have punctuated a similar situation north of the border.

Some laborers have been camping out in the park under the crudest conditions for as long as 10 weeks. They have been lined up in the sun by supervising Mexican soldiery day after day, only to have as few as 50 of their number chosen by United States growers. Out of a throng that has totaled as many as 12,000, only 2,400 have obtained work contracts.

OFFICIAL IS REPLACED

Resentment at haphazard or dishonest management of the selection process forced the Government to recall a representative of the Secretaria de Gobernacion (department of the interior) in charge of this phase of the process, and replace him with another under whom things have been going more smoothly.

This last week-end the throng of workers, now down to some 6,000, was divided at random into groups of 50. These groups are called up one at a time for inspection and selection by the contractors.

They file through a small doorway of the Casa del Pueblo (community center) where an American growers' representative shakes hands with each one and sometimes pats a worker on the shoulder, in ostensible cordiality. Both gestures are calculated to ascertain their strength and fitness as farmhands.

Simultaneously, the agent sizes them up at a glance, summarily rejecting the men who appear too young or too old, too urban or too paunchy for stoop labor, alcoholics and other unpromising candidates.

The chosen ones go through an assembly line where they are photographed, fingerprinted, vaccinated, registered by United States Immigration Service officers, and given physical examinations by United States Public Health Service officers. Finally they are given long contracts to sign.

Until they walk out with their contracts, they have no way of knowing, except by hearsay, who they are going to work for, where, or at what wage. Minimum wages, housing, feeding, transportation and other basic terms of the employment are covered in the international agreement.

The pay scale of contracts the last few days has been around 85 cents an hour minus $1.75 a day board. This hourly rate is approximately twice the daily legal minimum wage for farm work in some parts of Mexico. The contracts are for 6 months, renewable for a second 6 months.

When about 50 have received contracts, they are loaded into a chartered bus for transportation directly to their place of employment. Laborers have been signed recently for lettuce work in California's Salinas Valley, a 30-hour bus trip.

Despite their long encampment here, many of the waiting workers do not understand the contracting mechanics, and roam the streets soliciting jobs from anyone who looks like a "Norte Americano," assuming he is a United States grower here for help who can hire them casually.

In much the same way that the mass of unemployed migrant domestic labor in California's San Joaquin Valley early last year posed stringent local problems, this large influx of unemployed from all parts of Mexico has embarrassed Sonora officials. They regard it as a Federal problem, the brunt of which they have had to bear locally. Nevertheless, they have dealt with it with remarkable facility.

In a pointed effort to disassociate State relief activities from the federally sponsored contracting process, emergency soup kitchens and medical dispensaries set up at Francisco Madero Park to meet the initial distress were transferred, under the direction of José Mendivil, chief of the State labor department, to a large school center a mile and a half away.

FREE MEALS PROVIDED

Here any of the unemployed may obtain one meal a day without red tape. At the peak of the distress, before any contracting started, a staff of 30 was putting out 4,000 meals a day. Now it is down to 1,000 meals a day. All told, Señor Mendivil says, the relief center has served some 140,000 meals.

Pressure on the relief center has eased as thousands of the transients have dispersed—some bent on joining the annual stream of a million or more border-jumpers—and as local private welfare has taken a hand.

The Damas de la Caridad (ladies of charity), a private philanthropic organization, has made assistance to the workers its major project, and merchants and individual citizens have been helping out. A hotel clerk told this correspondent he and a neighbor between them were feeding 40 of the campers.

Many of the job-seekers are unemployed urban workers from as far away as Mexico City, and there is concern in organized labor circles that what Señor Mendivil termed "the obsession of getting a job that pays in dollars" may deplete key labor resources, as well as disrupt local working conditions in the recruiting centers.

As Roberto Romero, a representative from Hermosillo in the State legislature conservatively commented: "There is certain to be much parliamentary discussion of this affair in the coming months."

[From the New York Times of April 26, 1951]

MEXICO BARS MIGRANT RAIL TRAVEL TOWARD NORTH AS THREE CITIES ASK AID—30,000 SEEKING FARM JOBS IN UNITED STATES POSE MAJOR PROBLEM—HIRING OFFICES NOW CLOSED—PLACEMENT AGENTS WARNED

(By William P. Carney)

MEXICO CITY, April 25.—State and municipal authorities in three northern cities of Mexico have appealed to their federal Government here to help them cope with the problem of caring for 30,000 migrant farm laborers who want to work in the United States.

These migrants from many distant agricultural regions swarmed too soon into Monterrey, Chihuahua, and Hermosillo.

The international labor-contracting centers in those places, with the exception of Hermosillo, have not yet been opened.

The Interior Ministry here has ordered all stations of the national railway system to refuse to sell tickets to migrant workers wishing to travel northward toward the United States border. Orders also were issued for the arrest and punishment of native placement agents who are suspected of collecting commissions in advance from both the United States employers and the Mexican laborers before working contracts are signed.

ONLY 2,400 EMPLOYED

After only 2,400 harvest hands were engaged by southern California and Arizona farmers, the office in Hermosillo was closed until additional contracting may be authorized. This left 10,000 disappointed applicants who prefer waiting hopefully in Hermosillo to returning home jobless.

Another 12,000 migrants have converged on Monterrey and 8,000 are in Chihuahua.

With officials in all three cities reporting inadequate facilities for feeding and housing, a steadily increasing number of those are camped in public parks and outlying streets without funds to maintain themselves while awaiting the start of employment contracting.

The native placement agents are held responsible for the premature dumping of a surplus supply of farm labor in the northern cities, forcing local authorities and charitable organizations there to care for them until some obtain contracts and the rest are provided with transportation home.

CERTIFICATION OF NEED AWAITED

Foreign Ministry officials, working closely with the United States Embassy here, said that hiring cannot begin in Monterrey and Chihuahua or be resumed in Hermosillo until the United States Employment Service certifies that domestic laborers are unavailable in specified numbers for the harvesting of the fruit, vegetable, or cotton crops of the employers in the western United States. An Embassy spokesman said most of their employers or their representatives are not expected to begin arriving in the three designated contracting centers before May 1.

It was pointed out that President Truman's Special Commission on Migrant Labor recently reported that sufficient domestic agricultural labor might be obtainable even in the southwestern area of the United States that heretofore has depended heavily on the abundant and easily procured supply of Mexican migrants—including both legal and illegal border crossers.

The Mexican Interior and Foreign Ministries, however, still assume that their cooperation is expected for delivery of all surplus labor their country can spare. They have not yet been notified of any reduction in earlier estimates of labor needs made at a conference here in January of Mexican and United States Government officials. At that time hiring procedures and contract terms were discussed for as many as 300,000 Mexicans believed needed for this year's increased production of cotton and other crops in the United States.

The United States Embassy has indicated that although harvesting of most cotton crops will not begin until August, work in the sugar beet fields will start about a month from now. Texas farmers and ranchers were said to be later than usual in computing the number of Mexican workers they will require because a disastrous freeze in February destroyed much of the citrus fruit and vegetable prospects for this spring in the lower Rio Grande Valley.

The reason why many unemployed Mexican laborers are available for work in the United States is receiving serious study by both Government and unofficial economists as well as by writers on general subjects in the press here. The fact that much higher wages are paid in the United States is not accepted as a full explanation, although it is conceded that the difference between the 6 to 8 cents an hour paid in Mexico and from 40 to 90 cents an hour that can be earned on the other side of the border, lures even many small farmers away from land they have owned since Mexico's expropriation laws broke up the large haciendas.

But many holders of small land grants have joined in communal groups—that often have family connections—to make their crop production more profitable. These groups provide the housing, food, and medical attention that make the better pay in the United States less tempting to their hired help.

INCREASE IN COTTON ACREAGE

President Miguel Alemán has kept pace to date with the great program for irrigation and agricultural development he fixed for his 6-year term of office that expires in 1952. An over-all increase of 10 percent in the cotton acreage planted with the Government's financial assistance is expected to produce a record crop of at least 1,200,000 bales this year. This means steady agricultural expansion that eventually will give more employment and better living standards to native labor.

Nevertheless, the current issue of La Nacion, a weekly publication of the National Action Party, the only important political opposition that the Government Party of the Revolutionary Institutions has, accuses the administration of denying to the local press complete information about "a dismal exodus of Mexican farm workers who accept humiliations to work outside their country because the living standard and working conditions here are intolerable and cry for reform."

This paper says that Mexicans must seek the truth in a United States newspaper and reprints excerpts from the series of articles by Gladwin Hill about Mexican migrant labor that appeared recently in the New York Times.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: In response to your recent request, enclosed is a tabulation of the employment of foreign workers by States for the years 1948, 1949, and 1950. As requested, this tabulation indicates the nationality of the foreign workers.

We trust this is the information desired.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. GOODWIN,
Director.

Employment of foreign workers by State, 1948, 1949, 1950

State	Mexican			British West Indies			Canadians		
	1948	1949	1950	1948	1949	1950	1948	1949	1950
Arizona	3,556	6,323	1,822						
Arkansas	2,088	17,570	9,540						
California	20,789	9,128	9,056						
Colorado		124	812						
Connecticut				1,944	1,416	276	2		
Delaware					35				
Florida				1,283	3,854	4,043			
Idaho	802		387						
Illinois	340			656	50	631			
Indiana				62	455	60			
Iowa						180			
Kansas			30						
Kentucky		87	74						
Louisiana	478	1,342	903		434	116			
Maine							5,515	6,534	7,995
Maryland				78	78	27			
Massachusetts				22			1		
Michigan	955			308	213	255			
Minnesota	573			2,176	1,302	964	1	202	
Mississippi	5,065	1,994	1,844						
Missouri	1,869	3,149	954						
Montana	483	627	516		6				
Nebraska	4		60						
New Hampshire				10	6	12	54		
New Jersey			287	287	281	200			
New Mexico	319	18,937	12,978						
New York				368	619		98		
North Dakota									500
Ohio				70	71				
South Dakota			175						
Tennessee		191							
Texas		51,612	30,270						
Utah	1,162								
Vermont								100	100
Virginia					107	199			
Washington	1,394								
Wisconsin	151			1,085	1,857	1,154			
Wyoming			641						
Total [1]	40,028	111,084	70,062	8,349	10,784	8,317	5,671	6,836	8,605
Workers imported [2]	35,345	[3]19,625	67,421	2,421	1,715	4,425	INA	[4]6,600	[4]8,607

[1] These totals do not include all of the workers who were held under contract the previous year.

[2] Many of these foreign workers were transferred from one employer to another, either within a State or between States, so that they worked at several different jobs.

[3] In addition 87,220 wetbacks were legalized under terms of 1949 executive agreement between United States and Mexico.

[4] Includes workers brought in for New England and New York pulp and lumber operations.

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1951]

CELLER TO PROPOSE HOUSE INQUIRY ON ILLEGAL MIGRATION OF MEXICANS

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of New York, announced yesterday that he would move for an investigation of illicit labor migrations across the Mexican border. He said he would propose an immediate inquiry by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives into the situation disclosed by Gladwin Hill in the New York Times. The committee, of which Mr. CELLER is chairman, has jurisdiction over immigration.

The Representative from Brooklyn acknowledged that "for the longest time" he and his associates had known that migrant Mexican laborers, or wetbacks, crossed the Rio Grande or the border. He expressed astonishment, however, at the extent of the practice, estimated at 1,000,000 illegal entries a year, as disclosed by Mr. Hill.

Mr. CELLER said he was confident his fellow committee members would want to investigate and the inquiry could begin without delay. He will propose the inquiry when he returns to Washington Monday.

LINES UP WITNESSES

Mr. Hill's articles, which will continue through Thursday, may provide sufficient background on the wetbacks, Mr. CELLER said, so that officials concerned may be called immediately as witnesses. Mr. CELLER said the witnesses would include Mr. Hill, the Governors of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, public health officers, representatives of the State Department and representatives of trade groups in cities along the border.

"The revelations by Mr. Gladwin Hill betoken hard work and research, and he and the New York Times are to be highly complimented for showing up the evil of this exploitation of people," Mr. CELLER said. He continued:

"It may be that the immigration service needs many more agents at the border to stop this traffic. I would imagine that the States involved would show vital interest, and endeavor to curb this trek backward and forward across the border.

"In any investigation that I will inaugurate I will ask the governors of the States concerned to show some semblance of interest, but, in any event, these entrenched ranchers, cattle and cotton interests in those States must be made to realize that there is more to the economy of the Nation than their own pocketbooks.

"The cattle interests and the cotton interests apparently are the offenders, and they should be brought to book. There is apparently widespread violation of many laws—immigration laws, labor laws, and civil rights.

"Payment of 15 cents an hour is a violation of the Minimum Wage Act. Conniving to bring "wetbacks" across the border is a violation of the immigration laws. Forcing these unfortunate aliens to live in feudal slavery is a violation of our civil-rights statutes, aside from the fact that it violates every sense of decency and honor.

"The same cattle group do all and sundry to keep out Mexican cattle because of the danger of contagion to American cattle through hoof-and-mouth disease, but they are willing to allow Mexican humans to come in without examination as to health and morals. What of the contagion of trachoma, leprosy, and smallpox?"

[From the New York Times of April 29, 1951]

FADING MANPOWER WORRIES FARMERS—THEY TRY TO OFFSET THE EXODUS TO DEFENSE JOBS, BUT EXPECT PEAK IN CRISIS BY MID-1952

(By William M. Blair)

DECATUR, ILL., April 28.—American farmers, who are being called upon to produce more abundantly to feed and clothe the country during defense mobilization, are freely expressing fears that a manpower crisis is shaping up that may seriously affect their output.

Some farm spokesmen and agricultural leaders, along with Washington officials, say that the rural producers are threatened with a labor shortage far more acute than during even the critical years of World War II. There are, however, conflicting opinions as to when it will strike hardest. But the consensus now is that by the summer of 1952 farmers and consumers will have cause to worry.

In some areas farmers already are much worried. There are increasing reports of cutbacks planned in cultivated areas, reductions of dairy herds, and a slow-down of other key farm operations. In the main, these reports come from sections nearest to industrial centers where agricultural workers are being siphoned off into plants geared to defense production.

GOOD PAY IN INDUSTRY A FACTOR

The big lures are high wages and a 40-hour week. Substantial offers from agriculture, much above last year's farm wages, have failed to stem the exodus from rural jobs.

The armed services draft has hit hard at the farm-labor supply, but not so hard as at industry. Throughout the Midwest—a major source of the raw materials for food—selective-service boards are credited with doing a good job, but farmers believe a clearer delineation of draft regulations for key farm labor is needed.

Farm spokesmen hold that agriculture gets too little consideration in manpower discussions despite many Washington conferences on the subject, and pending legislative measures for the importation of foreign laborers to assist in the harvesting and processing of this year's crops.

The United States Employment Service reports it is stepping up its efforts to obtain needed labor in local areas and to shift available labor from surplus to tight sections. The agency also hopes to abate labor pirates and competition.

A United States Farm Labor Advisory Committee has recommended close cooperation among State and local farm groups, the Selective Service, and agricultural agencies so that the farm labor and skilled workers for the processing services may be maintained at an effective production level. A better distribution of available labor also will be sought.

The Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin, has assured agriculture that farm labor would get a preferential rating along with industrial or defense industries.

A tour of the Midwest, however, discloses that farmers are not so sure they will get preferential treatment despite official Washington's word and the efforts of farm organizations.

If the labor shortages becomes acute, they say that besides a cut in production and a shift in crop production longer working hours will be required. Some farmers, too, may come out of retirement to help, and more and more farmers will pool their efforts, an arrangement that is working well in some areas.

Increased nonfarm employment opportunities have absorbed large numbers of workers normally available for seasonal agricultural workers. Farm output per man-hour increased almost 50 percent above the 1935–39 average, but this has been brought about chiefly through increased use of farm machinery.

The Department of Agriculture is seeking a total farm output 45 percent above pre-World War II levels. Such a harvest would be the greatest in United States history.

EVEN MACHINES ARE NOT ALL

Charles B. Shuman, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, largest State unit of the American Farm Bureau Federation, holds, however that "farm mechanization has greatly increased our ability to produce food, but these wonderful machines will not run by themselves."

Eventually, he believes, the public will start to feel the pinch of a reduced food output if the movement of workers away from the farms is not corrected.

Midwest farmers, especially the corn-hog-cattle and wheat-cattle farmers foresee a great increase in the number of women donning overalls again to help raise agricultural productivity.

Although bills for the greater importation of foreign labor are before Congress, there are strong barriers to alien labor in vast areas of the Midwest. Among the highly commercial grain farmers, for instance, the feeling is that they would be hard to control and would cheapen labor generally.

Another acute point is use of what they believe is basically hand labor on complicated farm machinery. Kirk Fox, editor of Successful Farming here, summed it up this way:

"There is a limit to the number of crop acres a skilled workman can care for in the brief periods suitable for planting and harvest. Untrained workers and workers from other countries cannot operate four-row corn planters or combine harvesters, corn pickers or modern forage machinery."

Midwestern farmers are critical of the House and Senate Agricultural Committees for spending so much time on measures to facilitate the importation of foreign labor. A better policy, they hold, would be a more equitable distribution of domestic migrant labor, and a better utilization of all citizens willing to take farm work as a contribution to the defense effort.

HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF S. 656

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I read further from the testimony of Dr. Galloway:

Under the present form of local government, it is further asserted, the people of Washington have no control over the acts of their city officials. If school facilities are inadequate, if the crime rate is high, if municipal services are unsatisfactory in any respect, the local people can neither discipline nor dismiss the responsible officials.

Moreover, it is pointed out, as has already been observed, that the lack of home rule tends to dull the edge of democracy; that it weakens the citizen's sense of civic responsibility; that their political faculties tend to atrophy through sheer lack of expression.

On this point, I would like to digress a moment, Mr. Chairman, and express a personal opinion. You yourself repeatedly referred during the clinic last week to the alleged apathy of the Washington community on this issue.

With all due deference to you, sir, I beg to submit that a review of the home-rule movement here in the last 4 years reveals widespread and sustained interest and effort in this cause. There are scores of civic and social groups in this community which have discussed and debated this question, passed resolutions on it, and sent their spokesmen to testify at congressional hearings. During the Eightieth Congress, for example, 178 witnesses appeared before the District Committees of the two Houses, and 94 percent of them approved of the home-rule legislation in principle. They represented almost every organization in the city. I submit that the record shows that the people of Washington, far from being apathetic, have worked vigorously and energetically for local self-government.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is true. I cannot be unmindful of the fact that recently we have read accounts of a few American troops withstanding more than 10 times as many Chinese Communist soldiers.

You have one or two powerful organizations here that are not so numerous, but have great influence. The Board of Trade, with the great wealth that is represented in that body, man for man or woman for woman, has a great deal more power than the ordinary citizen. I hope you do not underestimate their strength.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. NEELY. I hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle will not forget that the truth will make them free.

I read further:

Mr. GALLOWAY. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; I am well aware of the opposition to this legislation, which stems in large part from the Washington Board of Trade. The Washington Board of Trade is a coalition of the business and financial interests in this community which has controlled the town for many decades; they are naturally reluctant to see a redistribution of political power in this community which this bill would effect, which would transfer the control of the public affairs of the community from a benevolent oligarchy in the top directorate of the Washington Board of Trade, to the duly elected representatives of the people in the District Council.

At this point the reporter has inserted the word "applause." His statement was made before a crowd in our committee room in the Capitol.

Dr. Galloway continued:

The Board of Trade has employed all the techniques of a social lobby to defeat this legislation. They have given fancy dinner parties in Washington hotels, and clambakes in season down on Chesapeake Bay, and other parties, all well lubricated with Mr. Kronheim's fine liquors. [Laughter.]

I suggest to you, sir, that the influence peddlers at the RFC could pick up a few pointers from the tradesmen at the Washington Board of Trade.

Returning, however, to my impartial analysis of the arguments, the advocates of home rule further argue that if Washington had home rule, the administrative structure of its local government would long ago have been modernized. As a matter of fact, however, it has just "growed" like Topsy, since 1878.

New agencies have been created from time to time, in piecemeal responses to local needs, until today the administrative structure of the District government is a tangled jungle of uncoordinated, duplicating, and overlapping agencies.

I have here a chart which illustrates the present organization of the District government. This chart was made part of your records 2 years ago. Your committee possesses a very large edition of this chart, which has been mounted, and which was displayed on the Senate floor during the debate on the bill on the 31st of May 1949.

It shows what a tangled jungle, as I say, the District government as at present organized is, and how many overlapping lines of control there are.

The opponents of home rule for Washington also allege that under such a system the Federal interests in the National Capital City would not be adequately safeguarded.

On the other hand, the advocates assert that under this bill the Federal interests would be fully safeguarded in four ways: First, through the constant oversight of District affairs that would be maintained by the District Committees of the two Houses; second, through the power of Congress to disapprove District legislation; third, through the constitutional power of the President to veto District bills. Finally, through the undoubted power of the Congress to amend or annul the home-rule charter at any time.

It is also pointed out that this legislation provides that it would become effective only after it had been approved by a majority of the qualified voters in a popular referendum.

This provision is regarded as advantageous by the advocates of home rule as a means of giving the people a voice in the adoption of this change, and as a means of providing that, if they did adopt it, it could never thereafter be asserted that an unpopular form of government had been foisted upon the people of this community against their will.

Another provision of the bill which I ought to mention, which commends itself to the advocates, is that which provides that the voting rights of District residents who maintain legal domiciles in their native States would not be jeopardized by their participation in local District elections. This is a rather unique provision of the bill. It was inspired by a similar provision in the election laws of the neighboring State of Maryland. The main purpose of this provision is to maximize the size and improve the quality of the District electorate. It is estimated that perhaps 100,000 persons, residents of the District of Columbia, who would be qualified to vote in local elections maintain legal domiciles in the States whence they came.

If these persons, of whom I am speaking, resident here but domiciled elsewhere, were disqualified from voting in local District elections, there would be created a dual class of citizenship. There would be the first-class citizens, who reside here, and who will be qualified to vote for District councilmen and for the Board of Education, and there would be the so-called second-class citizens who, unable to vote here, would look to the Congress of the United States for the protection of their interests. This would give rise to the potential possibility of conflict between the Council and the Congress, and might embarrass the conduct of public affairs in the District.

Another provision of the bill which commends itself to its advocates is the proposed qualifications for voting. These are the same qualifications for voting which obtain throughout the United States: American citizenship, at least a year's residence in the District, and the requirement of being 21 years of age or over.

Finally, the bill is advocated by its partisans on the ground that it provides for nonpartisan elections. The purpose of this provision is to prevent the control of local public affairs by either of the great national political organizations and, I might add, that nonpartisan elections are the method of elections that obtains in three-fourths of all the city-manager cities of the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think it pertinent to point out, if I may depart finally from my neutral role as a member of the staff of the Legislative Reference Service, that the Filipinos have gained their independence, Puerto Rico is practically self-governing, Alaska and Hawaii are on the verge of statehood, but the people of Washington are still governed like a British crown colony of the eighteenth century.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the record of your hearings at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "A Plea to Congress," which appeared in the Washington Post for November 30 of last year.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be received.

Mr. President, this editorial is so pertinent that I shall read it to the Senate. I hope every Senator present will lend me his ears. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of November 30, 1950]

A PLEA TO CONGRESS

For a full decade, the Americans who live in the District of Columbia have petitioned Congress, in the patient, orderly, democratic manner prescribed by the Constitution, to grant them the elementary human right of self-government. A careful study of the home-rule problem was made in the Seventy-ninth Congress. A carefully drawn bill embodying the fruits of that study was introduced in the Eightieth Congress but died there without ever being brought to a vote. A similar measure was introduced in the Eighty-first Congress and passed by the Senate; but the House of Representatives has never had a chance to vote upon it. With all the earnestness at our command, we urge the leadership and the Members of the House to seize this chance and to decide the issue now, before the Eighty-first Congress passes into history.

Let us restate very briefly the arguments for home rule. They are grounded at once in considerations of expediency and in considerations of principle. First, the management of District affairs by the Congress of the United States is wasteful and inefficient. It is as imprudent and inappropriate for the Congress to function as a municipal council for this community as it would be for it to attempt to frame local legislation for Baltimore, Md., or Seattle, Wash. Its Members, no matter how conscientious, cannot be genuinely responsive to the wishes and needs of this community because they are not responsible to the community. They can devote time to the problems of their wards in Washington only as they take time from the problems of their constituents at home. Congress was created to serve as a legislature for the Nation; the basic idea of a Federal Union is violated by its management of purely local affairs. From the point of view of the Members of Congress, the management of the District of Columbia is an embarrassment which ordinary common sense should impel them to shed.

The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is present. He has honored me by listening attentively to what I have read from the Washington Post. Its language sounds to me like the words of wisdom which I heard from the lips of the able and most eloquent junior Senator from Illinois in the House of Representatives when I had the honor and pleasure of serving with him in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It was my hope that he would be assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate, and would accept such an assignment. I communicated that hope to him soon after he came here. I have no authority to speak for him, but my guess is that if he were, we would not now be debating this resolution, the purpose of which is to discharge the Senate District Committee from further consideration of this bill.

I repeat for emphasis:

Congress was created to serve as a legislature for the Nation; the basic idea of a Federal Union is violated by its management of purely local affairs. From the point of view of the Members of Congress, the management of the District of Columbia is an embarrassment which ordinary common sense should impel them to shed.

Second, so long as the people of the District of Columbia are tied to the apron strings of Congress, they will not—indeed, they cannot—deal adequately with their own problems. Apathy and neglect are the inevitable offspring of irresponsibility. The normal corrective to maladministration—repudiation at the polls—is not available to Washingtonians. As a result, the deficiencies in the city's school system, in its police protection, in its recreation facilities, in its housing go uncorrected. Dependency is as corrupting to a community as to an individual. It is a lamentable truth that the people of Washington now lack even the spirit to rise in rebellion against a colonial status which ought to seem intolerable to all Americans.

Third, the denial of self-government to the District does injury to the good name of the United States and to the whole structure of American society. The men who planned a model Capital City on the banks of the Potomac had no thought that it would be an enclave ruled like Berlin by the representatives of remote occupying States. They took for granted that a republican form of government would be guaranteed here as elsewhere within the Federal Union. The country as a whole, no less than the District of Columbia itself, must suffer corruption from a continued disregard of its own basic values. The one argument in favor of home rule that should, in the minds of Americans override all others is that continued denial of the right of government by the consent of the governed is deeply and debasingly un-American.

The opportunity to liberate the District of Columbia is readily at hand. The home rule bill can be brought to the floor of the House by a discharge petition which already has nearly the requisite number of signatures—if only a handful of Representatives will sign it at once. It can be brought to the floor if the District Committee which has kept it pigeonholed for so long will only submit it to a democratic test. To let this legislation lapse now would be a tragic waste. It would also be, we think, an act of despotic arrogance. We ask only that the people of Washington be given the fundamental rights of American citizenship.

Mr. President, in my opinion, that editorial was either written, or inspired, by Mr. Philip Graham, the distinguished publisher of the Washington Post. Let me say of him as Eugene Field once said of the great Mr. Dana of the New York Sun:

Here's to you, Mr. Graham. May you live a thousand years.
Just to keep things happy, in this vale of human tears.
And may I live a thousand too—no, a thousand less a day.
For I should not want to be on earth to hear that you had passed away.

The people of Washington owe the Washington Post, and the author of that editorial, a generous vote of thanks.

Mr. President, I wish now to turn from the professional experts in civil government to the recent testimony of some of the distinguished Members of this, the greatest legislative body in the world, in support of Senate bill 656. Let me invite the attention of Members on both sides of the aisle to those who are the sponsors of the resolution. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. President, it is my privilege and honor to be one of the sponsors of the present Kefauver bill.

I shall now read some senatorial testimony in favor of the home rule bill. The outstanding, patriotic Republican Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] testified as follows:

Senator HENDRICKSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: It is a real treat to be back with this committee again, because I really enjoyed my 2 years of service on the District Committee, and I really miss the presence of my old colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. All those you left behind are sorry that you no longer are with us.

Senator HENDRICKSON. Mr. Chairman, my position on the present bill, present home-rule bill, presently before the committee, is well known.

That is the bill to which the resolution before the Senate refers.

In the last session I was one of its cosponsors, and I deemed it a privilege to be one of its cosponsors, and I deem it a privilege again to be sponsoring—cosponsoring—this measure this year.

I am here today to make a very brief statement in support of this bill, in support of the cosponsorship of this bill.

As a member of the District Committee for 2 years, I learned at first hand of the many problems that beset the people of the city of Washington. Although I am not at present a member of the committee, my interest in the affairs of the District has not waned nor will it wane as long as I am a Member of the Senate of the United States.

The doctrine of home rule, it seems to me, is one of the principal supports of our democratic way of life. It is a little hard for me to understand why anyone cannot see that, as it applies to the District of Columbia. It seems to me the citizens of the District of Columbia are no less entitled to elect their representatives than are the millions of other people throughout our land.

I have said many times, and I say again, that it is outrageous that home rule for the District has been made a political football. How much longer are the people, the good people of Washington, going to have to wait to govern themselves? I do not know how long that will be, but I think it is high time that we helped them attain the right to govern themselves, and quickly.

I urge my colleagues on this committee and in the Senate, with all the sincerity I posses, to favorably report this bill out of the committee, to pass it in the Senate, with the least possible delay, and I hope in this committee—I hope it will be reported out with a unanimous vote.

I hope our friends on the other side of the aisle heard me read that statement by one of the outstanding Members on their side.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say on the subject. I could have a lot more to say, because I feel very deeply about this whole situation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I beg the Senator's pardon, I thought he was through.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I am sorry that I am not through.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEELY. I next invite the attention of the Senate to a statement made during the recent hearings on S. 656 by the able former Governor of New York, and now the junior Senator from that great State [Mr. LEHMAN]. He testified as follows:

Senator LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this opportunity of appearing before your committee to express my personal opinion.

I have no prepared statement. In fact, the invitation to appear here came only a short time ago, but there are certain observations that I really deem it a privilege to be permitted to make.

Here we have got a city of a million inhabitants. I do not know the exact order of its size in the constellation of cities in the country, but it certainly is among the first 10 or 12.

It is larger than any city in New York State, with the exception of New York City.

To me, I have never understood why there should be any question with regard to giving the city of Washington self-government.

I have been impressed down here with the fact that Congress is supposed to be responsible for, in the final analysis, the government of the city of Washington.

Under your leadership, Mr. Chairman, representing the Senate of the United States and the Congress, Washington has received a great degree of attention, study, and consideration. But so far as the Congress, as a whole, is concerned, there are only a handful of men who know anything at all either about what the needs of Washington are or what is happening in connection with its administration.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAIN. Senators are finding it difficult to follow the argument being made by the Senator from West Virginia because we are not able to hear him. I wonder if the Senator would speak a bit louder.

Mr. NEELY. I shall gladly do so. Continuing, the Senator from New York said:

As I understand your bill, the bill that is now before you, it provides for the election by the people of Washington of members of a council. * * *

And the creation of the Office of City Manager, and this Council would then, with the sanction of the people, be responsible for the government.

I understand, too, that this form of government could be put into effect only after a referendum of the people of Washington.

The next statement to which I shall refer was made before the Committee on the District of Columbia, at its recent hearings on the bill, by the able junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order. If Senators are in order, the Senator who is speaking can be heard better.

Mr. President, the able junior Senator from Oklahoma testified as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to appear before this committee. I am interested in home rule for the District from two standpoints: The first standpoint is as a result of our study on the reorganization of Congress.

As you know, that was one of our recommendations in our first report that Congress extend to the District the right of home rule.

Of course, the Senator from Oklahoma was referring to the great service which he and Senator La Follette rendered in sponsoring the bill which finally became the Reorganization Act.

I read further from the statement by the junior Senator from Oklahoma:

We extended that as a result of our studies to try to find a way to dispense with some of the extraneous workload that is placed upon the National Congress. We have limited manpower. Our problems have grown a thousandfold over the years since the turn of the century when Congress used to, perhaps, be able to adequately give attention to its own national business and the problems of the District of Columbia, and those nice horse-and-buggy days of 1900 today with world problems and matters of tremendous national and international importance, it seems difficult to block out the valuable time of the National Congress and vote the House and Senate for the consideration of purely local bills.

One of the examples that, I think, point this up most clearly was 2 or 3 years ago, when we had the question of the British loan. It was some billions of dollars involved therein, and involved high international policy.

We had to quit in the middle of that loan so that we could spend a whole afternoon discussing whether rockfish of 10 or 12 inches long could be sold in the District of Columbia, and we spent the whole afternoon on the question of rockfish. That is a rather extreme example of the waste of the National Congress' time in the extraneous duty of running the District of Columbia.

We tied down some of our most valuable Members in serving very patriotically, and without any chance of any recognition in their home district being given, to serving the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not popular back home.

Senator MONRONEY. I have known men to be defeated back home because their opponents have taken the record of how many hundreds of bills Congressman X introduced for the District of Columbia and how few he introduced for the citizens of his own State, which is a matter that would cause some concern.

The Members that serve on it do it at a great sacrifice to their national obligations and to their own State obligations, and I know from personal experience there is no man in the Senate or the House who has that much extra time that he can easily allocate to the difficult job of trying to serve what I say is the city council for the District of Columbia.

I believe that the Congress would be doing itself a great favor in expediting its national problem that the Constitution cut out for it to do if it turned over to the people of the District of Columbia the right of home rule, and, therefore, from that standpoint I certainly urge that this committee favorably consider legislation to that end.

The No. 2 point that I would like to make observation upon is that we believe in democracy everywhere; we are now trying as hard as we can around the world to demonstrate our belief, trust, and faith in the rights of people to self-government.

Communities in Oklahoma of 250 or 500 people are granted municipal rights to run their own business. I cannot see why the National Capital out of all the cities or towns in the United States should not be trusted to be able to run their affairs as a municipal government.

I believe the Constitution and the Federal laws would require some surveillance of this by the Congress and by the President. But I believe it could be on the basis, as I think is proposed in some of the drafts of the bills before you, that those proper safeguards which will properly take care of the Federal interest in the Nation's Capital can easily be provided and safely be provided, and that given the opportunity to have home rule affect their own municipal organization, to handle their own municipal affairs, that this community would not be any different from the tens of thousands of other communities that are seeming to get along all right under home rule.

I feel, as other witnesses have testified, that the community needs that feeling of political responsibility, and if given that opportunity would certainly live up to that standard and, therefore, I can see no reason other than perhaps a difference on the means of approach, of how you accomplish home rule which, of course, would be subject to committee consideration and final action in the Senate and the House.

I certainly think that this committee is to be congratulated on its efforts to bring that about, to pass legislation that will be acceptable to the Senate and to the House, to the end that we can extend democracy to the Nation's Capital.

I appreciate the opportunity of being here, and I want to again congratulate the distinguished chairman on the work which he has so energetically performed and is so energetically performing.

Next, Mr. President, I read from the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has brought out a very interesting point, namely, that Members of the Senate have so many difficult questions confronting them that it is very difficult for even the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, who do their best to keep up with the affairs of the District of Columbia, to keep properly in mind the comparatively minor problems and difficulties of the District of Columbia, because on other committees on which they serve their duties require them to keep up with much graver and much more important problems affecting the entire Nation. I am certain that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, has encountered that problem, has he not?

Mr. NEELY. That problem is constantly before every member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] testified as follows:

I have a prepared statement, Senator NEELY, and I want to adhere to it.

I am happy to appear today in support of the proposed legislation to restore the rights of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege to be, along with yourself and other Senators, a cosponsor of S. 656, just as I was a supporter last year of similar legislation.

The present government of the District of Columbia is an antique curiosity, surviving from more leisurely days, when Washington was still little more than a good-sized village, and when Congress had more time to consider the regulation of starlings and goats.

The commission government, from the first, involved an ironical denial of the fundamental American right of self-government in the capital of the American democracy. Under present conditions, the use of Congress as a local legislature for the District is also an imposition on Congressmen and their constituents.

As the proclaimed champion of democracy in a world of conflict, and also the proclaimed champion of representative government, this country cannot afford the luxury of undemocratic aberrations in its form of government.

So long as we put up with the arbitrary rule of American citizens by persons in whose selection they have no part, we are vulnerable to criticism as being inconsistent and, if I may be equally frank, hypocritical.

It makes no difference how clean the streets of Washington may be or how wide its boulevards or how free from graft, the commission government remains a form of carpetbag rule. That 800,000 American citizens should today be denied the right to decide what local taxes they should pay, and how such taxes are to be expended would, I think, be a cause for astonishment to most of the people of the United States if it were widely known.

May I just digress for a moment: I cannot imagine, in view of my somewhat limited and yet intensive experience as a municipal official and, by the way, our distinguished chairman is likewise a former mayor of a fine city—I cannot imagine what would happen in my home town of Minneapolis, Minn., if one would impose the tax upon us, a local tax, where the representatives of the people in that locality had absolutely nothing to say about it.

First of all, just to get any kind of a tax is a major municipal operation. To think that you can get anyone to pay the tax if it were not imposed by the will of the people through their elected representatives, is something that goes far beyond any experience that I had ever known in municipal government.

I am sure that out in the Midwest, and I am sure that that includes the great western State of West Virginia, that such action of taxation without representation would again stir up a new Boston Tea Party.

From a congressional point of view, it is hardly less important that some of us have to spend, as members of District committees of the two Houses, a very large part of our time on purely local matters, and that all of us share responsibilities for decisions on such matters when they come to the floors of the Congress.

It is absurd that the time of Congressmen, men elected to govern in the Government of the United States of America, and men who have great responsibility to their own constituency from their own districts, it is absurd that that time should be spent on most of the subjects of District legislation.

Now, I believe Senator MONRONEY spoke or testified before this committee, and I know that Senator MONRONEY is one of the outstanding experts in our Congress on the matter of expediting the work of our Congress, and on improving the rules that pertain to the control of congressional legislative matters, and while I did not have a chance to hear the testimony of Senator MONRONEY, I have spoken to him about this, and I know that he feels that one way that we could improve the working of Congress, to expedite its work, particularly on the great issues that affect our country, is to support home rule for the District of Columbia, to get this minutia of detail, the small local ordinances, which ought to be handled by a city council, away from the committees of Congress and from the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House.

These subjects do not affect the national interest in the Capital. The subject which the Congress legislates on, that pertains to the District of Columbia, most of these subjects would be handled in our own constit-

uencies at the level of a city or a town council.

I know that the home rule bill before this committee will remedy both of the existing defects to which I have referred.

Only by such system as is provided in the bill for the adoption of legislative proposals by the city council and their enactment into law in the absence of a congressional or Presidential veto, can Congress and the President be relieved of the present ridiculous responsibility for District legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: Here is a period in human history when our President is beseiged by tremendous problems of worldwide importance, and great problems of domestic importance, this whole picture of wage stabilization, economic stabilization, the whole program of defense mobilization, this vast and intricate problem of our foreign relations.

Then, to think that the President of the United States has got to take time out of his day to act as mayor for the District of Columbia is incredible, utterly incredible.

I also want to point out, Mr. Chairman, one observation which I would like to make. The city of Washington, D. C., is a beautiful city, and its beauty is in its boulevards, its parks, its trees, its buildings, its monuments, its historical settings, the beautiful Potomac, and all, but there is something else, some kind of beauty that this city lacks, and it is the kind of beauty that can even make a coal-mining town or a mining town in Montana, or a little town in the timberlands in Minnesota look very beautiful.

The beauty I refer to is the beauty of community spirit, and if there is anything that Washington, D. C., lacks it is the community spirit, that kind of fellowship that comes from knowing that you are a part of a community where you have something to say about it.

You cannot have pride of ownership and pride of citizenship unless you are a participant and enjoy some of the rights of citizenship, and here in the District, the pride of citizenship participation, the honor of being a first-class citizen, and a first-class Nation in the world, is denied approximately 800,000 people. It is absolutely incredible to assume that the Government employees would dominate this city, as a previous witness said, is beyond the realm of fact; and the Corporation Counsel who testified—I read his testimony only as it was reported by the press—does not represent what I would call from my part of the country a good citizen. He does not represent that kind of citizenship spirit where poeple are jealous of their local rights.

As you know very well, in a community of 500,000, 200,000, or a million, or a community of 10,000, to amend a city charter arouses the interest of every citizen in the community. Why? Because when an amendment of a city charter comes up, it affects the basic rights of every individual in that community.

Here is a city that has been politically sterilized. It actually has been denied the law of the land; these people have been denied an opportunity to even be what you can call in a democratic sense "citizens."

I repeat that a community without a vote is a community without spirit, and citizens without a vote are in essence colonial citizens. They represent what we fought against in this country in 1776.

It does not fundamentally affect my State, but it does affect the regard that the people of my State have for their entire Government, and I know that if I went up and down the highways and byways of my State and said that down in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, that the people who have lived there all their lives, have homes, are taxpayers in that community, have not even as much as the right to vote for a Member of Congress, as well as a local alderman or councilman, they would literally be horrified. Why, that just is not heard of any place except in Washington, and, I might say, in the satellite countries. The only place where you are denied the right to vote are in the countries behind the iron curtain. There, at least, you have the right to vote for the slate that is put out by the Cominform. But here you do not even have the right to vote on anybody's slate.

The only people who have the right to vote in Washington, D. C., are the members of the board of trade, and they can vote for their own officers, and I must say, while I have no right to criticize the board of trade, because I know nothing of its membership except what I have read in the press, I can honestly say that any government, any community that depends for its inspiration and its guidance and its direction upon any private organization, whether it is labor or business or whether it is education or whatever it may be, is a community without any real sense of direction, because the job of government is to work with organizations and to correlate the efforts of these private organizations toward the community's good; and Washington finds itself with many fine private, or what I call semipublic, organizations, labor movements, the board of trade, the PTA, but no place to go.

The only place that they can go is to the Commissioners appointed by the President.

It would seem to me that the least that could be done, if we are going to have government by indirection in the District of Columbia, is to see that they would have a right to vote for the President of the United States, since he is making the appointments.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from West Virginia, if he may do so without losing his right to the floor, yield to the Senator from Oklahoma to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. NEELY. If I can do so without losing the floor I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, what is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARTHY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I now refer to some opinions expressed by great lawyers of the country concerning the constitutionality of the bill. I first read the opinion of Hon. John W. Davis, once a Representative in the Congress of the United States, later this country's Ambassador to Great Britain, once the Democratic nominee for President of the United States, and now, by common consent, one of the great lawyers in the world.

Mr. Davis expressed his opinion on the Auchincloss bill, the predecessor of the present measure. The opinion is dated New York, November 6, 1947, and is as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I regret that the pressure of other matters—

Mr. President, I hope we may have order, because I should like to have the lawyers present hear this argument from a great constitutional lawyer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. NEELY. The opinion is as follows:

I regret that the pressure of other matters has delayed an earlier answer to your letter of October 21. I apologize for this delay. You ask my opinion as to the power of Congress (1) to provide a charter for the government of the District; and (2) to delegate to the District legislative body the right to enact general legislation, or in lieu of enactment to propose general legislation subject to congressional veto. I shall try to keep my answer in brief compass on both topics.

I think there is not the slightest doubt of the power of Congress to erect a governmental corporation for the government of the District in its local affairs. It is unnecessary to cite the ruling cases to this effect as they are contained in the memorandum which your committee has before it.

I do not shrink from using the words "municipal corporation" in this connection. That term has acquired a generic significance and under the classic definition is used to signify a public corporation created by government for political purposes and having subordinate and local powers of legislation and administration. Whatever name is employed, the District corporate would still be a corporation of this character and an agent and instrumentality of Congress within its allotted field.

I also think that Congress cannot delegate to such a corporation the power of legislation in general as distinct from the local field. But this objection is fully met by the arrangement suggested whereby the legislative authority of the District would propose general laws which when reported to Congress would be validated either by the express action of Congress to that effect, or by its implied assent by failure to disapprove within a specified number of session days. This is not to my mind an unconstitutional delegation of power to legislate for the reason that the final decision whether the proposal shall become a law lies in the hands of Congress.

The main future difficulty which I foresee arises from the difficulty of defining "local" as distinguished from "general" laws. There is a wealth of discussion on this subject in the books, and so far as I know, no clear dividing line has been drawn. The leading text writers have stated that State concerns and municipal affairs have never been classified satisfactorily; indeed, the terms "State affairs" and "local affairs" are suggestive rather than precise. The cases recognize that the terms are not fixed quantities, but rather labels to be interpreted by the courts in the light of all the surrounding facts (1 McQuillin on Municipal Corporations, 2d ed., 1940, secs. 148, 194. See also: McBain, The Delegation of Legislative Power to Cities, 32 Political Science Quarterly, 276 (1917); Tooke, Construction and Operation of Municipal Powers, 7 Temple Law Quarterly, 267 (1933)). Many of the decisions turn on the terminology of particular constitutions and statutes and are thus not helpful in laying down a general formula.

I give you by way of illustration of the difficulties which the courts experienced in such matters, the case of *Adler* v. *Deegan* (251 N. Y. 467 (1929)). Here the Constitution of the State of New York in force at that time limited the power of the legislature and stated the powers of cities in the following language:

"Article XII, section 2: The legislature shall not pass any law relating to the property, affairs, or government of cities which shall be special or local either in its terms

or in its effect, but shall act in relation to the property, affairs, or government of any city only by general laws which shall in terms and in effect apply alike to all cities except on message from the governor declaring that an emergency exists and the concurrent action of two-thirds of the members of each house of the legislature.

"Section 3: Every city shall have power to adopt and amend local laws and inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the State, relating to the powers, duties, qualifications, number, mode of selection and removal, terms of office and compensation of all officers and employees of the city, and transaction of its business, the incurring of its obligations, the presentation, ascertainment, and discharge of claims against it, the acquisition, care, management, and use of its streets and property, the wages or salaries, the hours of work of labor, and the protection, welfare, and safety of persons employed by any contractor or subcontractor performing work, labor, or services for it, and the government and regulation of the conduct of its inhabitants, and the protection of their property, safety, and health."

When the question arose how this language bore upon a multiple-dwelling law passed by the legislature and applicable only to New York City, the New York Court of Appeals wrote five opinions in the case, the majority opinion and two concurring opinion, opposed by two dissenting opinions.

How far the draftsmen of your final act can obviate this uncertainty I do not know. Of course, something can be done to lessen the field of doubt. But there will always be an intermediate zone. In such cases I should think the doubt should be resolved by reference of the proposed legislation to Congress.

This may be beside the point of your inquiry. Speaking from past experience and from observation, I heartily commend your effort to relieve an overburdened Congress from the duties properly pertaining to a board of aldermen.

If I can be of any further service, I beg you to command me.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. DAVIS.

Mr. President, in my opinion Mr. Davis has, with his habitually unerring accuracy and felicity, correctly stated the law regarding the constitutionality of the bill which we seek to bring before the Senate by the adoption of the resolution under consideration.

It is my hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle will manifest their friendship for the voiceless, voteless people of the District of Columbia and redeem the solemn platform pledges of their political parties by adopting the pending resolution and later passing the Kefauver home-rule bill.

FAR EASTERN POLICY—OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma congratulates the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for the very able and thorough discussion which he has made on his motion to bring the subject of home rule for the District of Columbia before the Senate of the United States.

The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to discuss for a little while a colloquy which was had between himself and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] earlier today and on a previous day, April 24, 1951.

However, prior to doing so the Senator from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent, without losing his right to the floor upon the completion of the quorum call, to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is the request for the purpose of having a quorum call?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois objects.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

A little while ago the Senator from Michigan was asked by the Senator from Oklahoma if he still thought China attacked Japan and started the late Japanese-Chinese war. The Senator from Michigan replied:

No. The Senator from Michigan did not think so. The Senator from Michigan in the heat of argument misspoke himself on that question.

Continuing, the Senator from Michigan said:

There was not any doubt in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senator from Michigan had misspoken himself on that question.

Mr. President, I must say that I agree at this point with that part of the remarks of the Senator from Michigan. There was not any doubt in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senator from Michigan had misspoken himself, but without the addition of his misspeaking himself being limited to that question.

The Senator from Oklahoma then asked the Senator from Michigan:

There is not the least bit of doubt in the Senator's mind that he misspoke himself when he said that China attacked Japan?

The Senator from Michigan said:

No.

Then the Senator from Oklahoma asked the Senator if he still thought that Japan and Russia had a mutual-assistance treaty at that time. Whereupon the Senator from Michigan said:

They did not, and the Senator from Michigan never said they had a mutual-assistance treaty. They had a treaty.

Mr. President, I acknowledge that the Senator from Michigan is a very able and a very honorable man. However, the Senator from Oklahoma is constrained to believe that the Senator from Michigan was misspeaking himself again. The Senator from Oklahoma is aware of the distinguished record of the Senator from Michigan, both in the Senate of the United States and before he came to the Senate. He is aware that the Senator from Michigan had for many years served as a judge of the superior court in the great State of Michigan. He is aware of the fact that in 1929 the Senator from Michigan had been appointed a circuit-court judge of the circuit court for Wayne County, that he had been elected in 1930, and reelected in 1935 and in 1941.

In view of the Senator's distinguished record on the bench and the record which he has made in this august body, the Senator from Oklahoma is keenly aware of his great judicial temperament and distinguished ability. Therefore, the Senator from Oklahoma was somewhat surprised by the facility with which the distinguished Senator from Michigan was able to misspeak himself. When he said a little while ago that Japan and Russia did not have such a treaty and, further, that the Senator from Michigan never said they had a mutual-assistance treaty, the Senator from Oklahoma was constrained to go back to the record of the previous colloquy, because he seemed to have a distinct recollection that the Senator from Michigan had said at that time that they did have such a treaty. The Senator from Oklahoma had a great question in his mind as to whether the Senator had misspoken himself on the previous occasion, when the Senator from Oklahoma understood him to say that there had been such a treaty, or whether he was misspeaking himself today, when he said that he had not said that such a treaty existed. Therefore, the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1951, at page 4242. The first language I read is from a statement by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]:

But I am saying that the man who now says Russia will not come into the war is the same man who told us that the Chinese would not come into it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MCMAHON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the point the Senator last raised, it has been prophesied here that Russia will come into the war should we bomb the North Korean and Chinese Red munition dumps or supply lines across the Yalu River. The Senator is familiar with the fact that during the Second World War Russia had a similar treaty with Japan in case Japan were attacked in the Far East. China did attack and have a war with Japan, but Russia did not come in. Does the Senator feel that there is any more reason to believe Russia today will keep her treaty with Red China than she kept the treaty which she had with Japan?

I know that the Senator from Michigan is an honorable and a reasonable man. I know there is a great deal of doubt in his mind as to whether or not the Senator from Oklahoma is able to think. However, I must say that if the Senator from Michigan is correct today, when he says he did not say on the previous occasion that Japan and Russia did have a treaty, then perhaps there is some doubt as to whether or not the Senator from Oklahoma can either hear or think.

I recall that a little while ago the distinguished Senator from Michigan said:

The Senator from Michigan does not know what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks—

I can understand that. I think that is a fair and reasonable declaration of the state of mind the Senator from Michigan might have been in. I can understand that he would not claim to be able to know what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks. I can even understand how there might be doubt in the mind of any reasonable man as to whether, in the absence of the Senator

from Oklahoma telling him, the Senator from Michigan would know what the Senator from Oklahoma was thinking. But that was not the conclusion of the sentence by the Senator from Michigan. He went on to state that he did not know whether he—the Senator from Oklahoma—

is even at this moment capable of thinking.

Then the Senator from Michigan said:

Judging from what the Senator is saying, there is some doubt in the mind of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been trying to follow the able Senator from Oklahoma. Is his point that no agreement between Japan and the Soviet Union in the nature of a pact of friendship existed during that period of time? Is that the point which the Senator from Oklahoma is endeavoring to make?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is trying to clear up a little matter of a colloquy between himself and the Senator from Michigan, first, as to what the Senator from Michigan said, and second, as to what the facts were with reference to the subject about which the Senator from Michigan was talking.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But the Senator from Oklahoma is not contending that there was not a mutual pact of friendship between the Soviet Union and Japan, which was finally violated at the time the Russians came into World War II in the Far East, 6 days before the surrender.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma must say that if there was—what kind of a document did the Senator refer to? Was it a friendship pact?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I asked whether the Senator from Oklahoma was contending that there did not exist a pact of friendship between Japan and the Soviet Union which the Soviet Union violated 6 days before the end of the war by marching into Manchuria and declaring war against Japan?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is perfectly aware of the nature of the pact or agreement between the Soviet Union and Japan. He is aware of the date when it was made. He is aware of its contents. He is aware of the date when it was denounced by the Soviet Union, in April of 1945. He is aware that the Soviet Union declared war on Japan on August 8, 1945.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Six days before the end of the war.

Mr. KERR. But the Senator from Oklahoma is equally aware that it was not a mutual assistance pact. The Senator from Oklahoma is aware that it was not even a friendship pact; and the Senator from Oklahoma is aware that it was not, as the Senator from Michigan stated, a treaty similar to the treaty which Russia now has with Communist China.

The Senator from Oklahoma is further aware of the fact that any person who thinks that the agreement between Russia and China today is similar to the agreement between Russia and Japan is either confused or misspeaking himself, or uninformed. It is the purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma to show that clearly for the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not quarreling with the Senator from Oklahoma. I am merely seeking enlightenment. I am trying to follow his discussion. I am interested in any facts which he may develop. Just how would the Senator from Oklahoma designate the Soviet-Japanese pact to which he has referred, assuming that it was not a treaty or alliance or a pact of friendship? What is the Senator's designation?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is of the opinion that at the time it was designated as a neutrality pact; that it was signed at Moscow by Molotov for the Soviets, and Matsuoko for Japan. It was signed on April 13, 1941. By its terms the parties agreed to respect mutually the territorial integrity of the other, and to observe neutrality during any conflict which might engage either party.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator say that the pact had any similarity, or in his opinion was it different from the pact—whether it be a pact of friendship or of mutual understanding, or of neutrality, or whatever term might be applied to it—which the Soviet Union had with Poland? Would the Senator say that the Japanese-Russian Pact was greatly different from the pact which the Soviet Union had with Poland, and which, when it served its purpose, it promptly violated by marching in to attack at least half of Poland at the time the Nazis were moving in from the other side?

I heard the discussion of the Senator from Michigan, and he can speak for himself. I do not pretend to be able to repeat verbatim what he said, but I believe that his point was that the Soviet Union, when it served its purpose, did not hesitate to denounce either the pact of neutrality which it had with Japan or the pact of friendship or neutrality which it had with Poland; and that whenever it would serve its purpose it would violate other agreements or treaties. There was no assurance that merely because Russia had an agreement with China, she would live up to it, any more than she lived up to her agreements with other countries.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is not defending the treaty observances of the Soviet Union. Nor is he unaware of what this RECORD shows with reference to what the Senator from Michigan had to say today, and on the other occasion to which I have referred.

The purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma is to call attention to that RECORD, and to what he believes to be the attack on the part of the Senator from Michigan to put a light on it which is not sustained by what the RECORD itself shows.

The Senator from California has asked the Senator from Oklahoma what he thinks the difference is between the present Russian-Chinese agreement and the one to which we have referred as the Soviet-Japanese neutrality pact of April 13, 1941. The Sino-Soviet pact of 1950 between Red China and Moscow contains these words:

The high contracting parties engage that they shall undertake jointly all necessary measures at their disposal to prevent any repetition of aggression in violation of peace on the part of Japan or any other state which would directly or indirectly unite with Japan in acts of aggression. In the event of one of the contracting parties being subjected to attack by Japan or any state allied with her, thus finding itself in a state of war, the other high contracting party shall immediately render military and other aid with all means at its disposal.

The American Journal of International Law, in the issue of July 1950, makes the following comment on article 1 of the Sino-Soviet treaty, from which I have just quoted:

The Chinese People's Republic is bound, like the eastern European countries, to assist the Soviet Union in case of an attack by any third power allegedly allied with Japan.

I believe that it is very easy to discern the great difference between the provisions of the Sino-Soviet pact and the one between Japan and Russia. The Senator from Oklahoma, therefore, is compelled to the conclusion that when the Senator from Michigan made the statement on the Senate floor in the previous colloquy—

The Senator—

Meaning the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]—

is familiar with the fact that during the Second World War Russia had a similar treaty with Japan in case Japan were attacked in the Far East—

The Senator from Michigan not only misspoke himself, but he gave evidence of the fact that he did not know what he was talking about. And further, when he said:

China did attack and have a war with Japan—

That he was just as much in error, but no more so, than when he made the statement that Russia had a similar treaty with Japan in case Japan were attacked, as Russia now has with Red China.

The Senator from Oklahoma is of the opinion that the Senator from Michigan misspoke himself a little while ago, just as certainly, when he stated that the Senator from Michigan never said that they had a mutual-assistance treaty.

Then a little further along in the colloquy a little while ago the Senator from Michigan stated:

The record is that when Japan attacked the United States it was in violation of the treaty that Russia had with Japan.

Now the Senator from Oklahoma, to the best of his ability, and with due cognizance of the fact that his ability to think has been called in question by the Senator from Michigan, nevertheless,

has been trying to figure out how it was that when Japan attacked the United States it was in violation of the treaty that Russia had with Japan. I have studied the Japanese-Russian neutrality pact, and I have not found anything in it whereby Japan agreed not to attack the United States. I have not found any language in it that bound Russia not to attack the United States. I think the most casual examination of it would disclose to any Senator who had ever seen it, or looked at it, or had the remotest idea of what was in it, that the agreement had to do with the situation that would arise when either Japan or Russia was attacked by another party, and not to a situation that would arise when one of those contracting parties attacked a third party, not a party to their agreement.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mr. NIXON. Then, as the Senator from Oklahoma interprets the pact, was it a violation of the pact for Russia to attack Japan?

Mr. KERR. It certainly was a violation of both the letter and the spirit for one of the parties to attack the other. But it was not a violation of that treaty for Japan to attack the United States. The Senator from Oklahoma is trying to show from the RECORD that the Senator from Michigan is very careless, so it seems to the Senator from Oklahoma, about how he misspeaks himself, about how he is reenforced with the lack of facts when he says on this floor that—

> The Senator from Michigan does not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma is even at this moment capable of thinking.

I want to say that if the test of the Senator from Oklahoma being able to think is being able to keep up either currently or in advance of where the rambling statements of the Senator from Michigan might take him, then the Senator from Oklahoma must confess that he cannot meet that test.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. NIXON. Would the Senator agree with this statement, that the action of the Soviet Union in violating its nonaggression pact with Germany—the so-called Hitler-Stalin pact—its action in violating its pact with Poland, its action in violating its pact with Japan, is some indication of the fact that the Soviet Union might not observe its pact with any nation, including the Communist Government of China, unless it served the interest of the Soviet Union?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma ventures to say that the Soviet Union will never do anything, regardless of its agreement, that it does not think will serve its interests at the time. Certainly he is aware of that fact. He thinks it is one of the dominant facts before the Senate and the world at this time. I must say that when Senators on this floor make misstatements, when they misspeak themselves over and over and over again, that indicates a possibility of disregard of the results of the misspeaking by them.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. NIXON. My question relates to the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Michigan. As I recall the colloquy—not its exact words as the Senator has quoted them, but the effect of the colloquy on those who were listening to it, the point the Senator from Michigan was trying to make was that the contention of the Senator from Oklahoma that a pact of mutual assistance existed between the Communist Government of China and the Soviet Government, was neither proof one way or the other that in the event Communist China was attacked the Soviet Union would intervene; and as I recall, the Senator from Michigan used as an illustration the Soviet Union's violation of its pact with Japan. Would the Senator from Oklahoma not agree, if that is the meaning some of those who heard the colloquy between the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Oklahoma obtained from that colloquy, that that would be a reasonable conclusion?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is unable to say what conclusion the Senator from California might obtain from a colloquy when he is unable to remember at this time what was in it. The Senator from California has just said that he does not know what was in it. Therefore the Senator from Oklahoma is unable to determine what the Senator from California might get from a colloquy which he does not remember. But the Senator from Oklahoma is perfectly aware of what the Senator from Michigan said. He said:

> The Senator is familiar with the fact that during the Second World War Russia had a similar treaty with Japan in case Japan were attacked in the Far East.

Now the Senator from Oklahoma says that the record does not bear that out. The Senator from Oklahoma says that that is in error. Then the Senator from Michigan said:

> China did attack and have a war with Japan.

It is very plain as one reads this statement of the Senator from Michigan that he laid a predicate for what he proposed or indicated would be an illustration of Russia's failure to live up to an agreement. He attempted to lay a predicate by referring to a treaty which did not exist, and then he attempted to show its violation by an act which did not take place.

I must say, Mr. President, that I do not know how a Senator could be any more confused or could go further in misspeaking himself. As I think about it, and as I think about the long and distinguished career of the distinguished Senator from Michigan as a superior court judge in his great State, I am at a loss to understand how one with such distinguished judicial training and temperament could become so heated in an argument on the floor of the Senate about facts with which he was not familiar as to have to admit that he said things that he did not even realize he was saying.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a question.

Mr. CASE. What is the date of the RECORD from which the Senator from Oklahoma is reading; when did the colloquy occur?

Mr. KERR. It appears on page 4242 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, April 24, 1951.

Then, Mr. President, after having set forth an alleged basis which did not exist, and after describing an act which did not take place, the Senator from Michigan then asked for a conclusion, in the following words:

> Does the Senator feel that there is any more reason to believe Russia today will keep her treaty with Red China than she kept the treaty which she had with Japan?

In other words, the Senator from Michigan laid a predicate which did not exist; he related an event which did not take place; and then he asked for an opinion or for a conclusion with reference to a similarity which was either fictional, manufactured, or imagined.

Mr. President, with these facts in mind, I have examined the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan, which provides:

> That a joint bipartisan committee of 24 Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be appointed to gather such data, to conduct such interviews, to take such testimony, and to hold such hearings as it may determine necessary for a complete evaluation of the United States policies in the Far East and their relation to the foreign and military policies of the United States as a whole, and to report on the same to the respective Houses of Congress. The joint committee shall consist of 12 Members of the Senate, including 2 Members of each party from the Committee on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Armed Services,

And so forth. I was curious in regard to the considerations in the mind of the Senator from Michigan when he made that particular designation of the personnel to serve on the proposed joint bipartisan committee. I was aware of the fact that the matter generally referred to in the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan is already before two great committees of the Senate, of which the Armed Services Committee, composed of a group of distinguished and patriotic Senators from both parties, is one. I should like to read to the Senate the names of the members of the Armed Services Committee who now are about to become engaged in a hearing similar to the one the Senator from Michigan wishes to have conducted by the proposed new joint committee which he would have established.

The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the distinguished

junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator whether he, himself, would not feel that it would be worth his time if he could sit in at the hearing and could know what took place back of that closed door?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am sure it would be worth the time of any Senator to sit in there. However, I contemplate the possibility that the world will not cease in its revolutions about its orbit and its journey about the sun, the stars in the firmament will not cease to shine, and Old Glory will not cease to wave yonder in the American heavens if I do not sit in at those hearings; and I must say to the Senator from Minnesota that I contemplate with equal comfort the absence of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I yield for another question.

Mr. THYE. Would not the constituents of the Senator from Oklahoma feel much comforted if they knew that their distinguished Senator had been within the committee room and had heard verbatim the questions asked and the replies given? Would not they say, "Well, our great and distinguished man, whom we sent to Washington, Senator KERR, has sat in that committee; and if Senator KERR tells us that so-and-so were the questions that were asked and so-and-so were the answers that were given, we should be satisfied, for now we know that everything there was all right." Certainly then the Senator's constituents would put out their chests and would say, "We know that everything there was all right because Senator KERR says it was."

On the other hand, if the Senator from Oklahoma has to say to his constituents, in reply to their questions, "No; I cannot answer your questions, because I did not hear the testimony; I cannot say what was said in the committee room; I have read in the press that so-and-so was said, but there is speculation about what the questions and the answers were," then the Senator from Oklahoma will not satisfy his constituents and will not be able to enlighten them and will not be able to allay their fears that something may have been wrong. Is not that about the truth of the matter? That is a long question, I realize, but I wish to ask it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I take pleasure in answering my good friend.

First, I wish to tell the Senator from Minnesota that the good people of Oklahoma will have their chests out and their heads up and their faces smiling, regardless of whether the Senator from Oklahoma sits in as a member of or as an observer at that committee hearing.

Further answering the Senator from Minnesota, let me say that after I have read the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan as best one with limited thought processes may be expected to do, I have searched in vain for any provision in the concurrent resolution whereby I would be permitted to sit in as a member of that committee. As I read the resolution, I find where the Senator from Michigan took care of himself; I find where he made provision that he would be a member of the proposed joint committee. But I wish to say in reply to the question of my good friend that I have a feeling that there is a genuine understanding now between myself and the people of Oklahoma. The Senator from Oklahoma contemplates the possibility that the people of Oklahoma will accept his recitation of facts to them, whether he reads them in a record or tries to quote them from memory. It might even be possible that the Senator from Oklahoma would feel a little more certain, in view of his limited thought processes, as so accurately or forcefully described by the Senator from Michigan, if he were able to have a copy of the proceedings and read it in its entirety. He might feel that he would be giving the people of Oklahoma an even more accurate account of what took place than if he trusted his memory to do so.

Further, in that connection, the Senator from Oklahoma is thinking of a group of distinguished Senators who, under the actions already taken by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, would be shoved aside by the Senator from Michigan. I am thinking about the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. I am thinking about the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. I am thinking about the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I am thinking about the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the distinguished Senator from Missisippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; and if you please, Mr. President, I am thinking with reference to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] being ruthlessly brushed aside by the Senator from Michigan who, I suppose, is of the opinion that in view of his own long and distinguished career as a judge and as a Member of the Senate he would be able to supply the vacancies which would be created by the legislative act, whose principal purpose, so far as I have been able to detect, would be fulfilled, and, I am sure, in the mind of the Senator from Michigan, whose principal virtue would be demonstrated by the fact that the Senator from Michigan had become a member of the committee.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a further question by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. In all seriousness, judging from my mail, if the Senator will indulge me sufficient time to make a brief comment——

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to yield to my friend for a brief comment, if I may have unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor by so doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Minnesota for the purpose of making a brief comment, without the Senator from Oklahoma thereby losing his right to the floor. Is there objection? Hearing no objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for yielding time. In all seriousness, the good people of Minnesota are possibly more worried now than they have ever been at any other time. My mail indicates it; and I know how they feel, because one cannot read that mail without sensing what they feel. They would like to know specifically and at first hand what the answers are to the questions they have in mind. They would like to know what is wrong, if anything, in the Pacific, how we are to correct it, how we are to establish a new policy, how we are to get our feet on bedrock and go forward with some type of prosecution of war efforts and war activities in Korea so as ultimately to bring us to some sort of victory.

I know that the people of Minnesota are greatly concerned. When it was announced that closed hearings would be conducted, one could sense their feelings in the telegrams; he could sense in the telephone calls the fact that they were greatly alarmed that the door was to be closed and that they were not to get all the facts. We know that a report will possibly be prepared by the committee, but, even so, if the doors are closed to the public and if the hearings are conducted in executive session, I know that I have described the way the people are going to feel about it.

I do not criticize because the Armed Services Committee is to hold the hearings. I have all the confidence in the world in the chairman of that committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I have confidence in the other members of the committee. But, from the mere fact that the door is closed, from the fact that the hearing is to be in executive session, I know that the people of Minnesota and, I am certain, the people of Oklahoma and of other States of the Union, are going to have a fear, they are going to have a feeling, that not all the answers have been made known to them. That is my only concern.

If the Senator from Georgia or the Armed Services Committee could have

announced open sessions, then, if questions were asked which were classified, or if the information to be given in response to those questions were classified, it could very easily have been said, "The question cannot be answered, it will be taken care of in executive session." Under such circumstances, I feel sure the public would feel satisfied, even though the testimony were denied them and were taken in executive session, if they had an opportunity to hear the full statements, whether of General MacArthur or of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That is my only criticism of the committee's action.

I am now voicing the sentiment which many people in my State have expressed. It is that there should have been an open hearing. We have conducted many an open legislative hearing in the Senate. The Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has until now served as chairman, conducted open meetings. It was the one thing which reflected credit not only upon the Senate, but especially upon the members of the committee. It certainly gave comfort to the citizens of this land, and the assurance that the Senate and the Government were taking steps to clean up lawlessness and deal with the crime situation throughout the United States.

I need only turn to another committee, the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was chairman, which conducted hearings on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is another committee which in public and in the open assured the American people that their Government was functioning properly and for their protection.

It is for these reasons that I exceedingly regret that the committees sitting jointly, saw fit to order executive sessions, rather than open sessions, in connection with the coming hearing.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding me this time. I have very great admiration for him. I had the good fortune of serving with him while he was Governor of his State, in the Governors' Conference. I know of his ability. I am always very careful not to get in his way, because his tongue can lash a man most viciously. But there comes a time when I shall rise to take a lashing for the sake of principle and for the sake of the fears which are in the breasts of the mothers and fathers and young wives of the servicemen who are in the military forces in Korea. It is for that reason that I desired to voice to the Senator and to other Members of the Senate my feeling that the Senate of the United States is taking the wrong action when it proceeds with the hearings tomorrow in executive session. It should be an open-door proposition.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for his very kind remarks, both about the subjects to which he has addressed himself, and about the Senator from Oklahoma. He is very keenly aware of my high regard for him. I must say that there was one statement made by the distinguished Senator which cut me just a little. If I understood him correctly, he said that the Senator from Oklahoma had a tongue that lashed viciously. I want to say to the Senator that if the Senator from Oklahoma has ever said anything about him that was other than most kindly, I now apologize to him, because I know no kinder, finer soul than the great Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, that phrase, "tongue lashing," is a good old American expression. I tried to pay the Senator a compliment. I was not trying in any way to refer to anything unpleasant about the Senator from Oklahoma. I only wanted to refer to his ability in the use of words. I have never seen him resort to any physical demonstration, but in the use of words he is a giant.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator. I will say that my pugilistic instincts were suppressed in my early youth. There are Members of the Senate who wanted to open a second front in China, but as they failed to open a second front over yonder they have even opened it in the ranks of the Senate. We remember that only a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] could no longer contain himself, and, being unable to get a second front opened in China, he opened a second front in the ranks of the Democratic columns in this body.

The Senator from Oklahoma is glad that he has not been urged from within, or needled from without, to the point where he would make a physical demonstration. He thanks the Senator from Minnesota again. He recognized the compliment which the Senator paid him and appreciated it when the Senator said that the tongue of the Senator from Oklahoma could lash; but the Senator from Oklahoma winced a little when the Senator from Minnesota added the word "viciously."

I should like to say a little more about the statement of my friend. He discussed a number of matters about which there is great concern in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma, but they are not included in the resolution offered by the Senator from Michigan. I have searched it in vain and I find nothing in it regarding the suppression of crime; I find nothing in it about the RFC; I find nothing in it whereby the Senator from Michigan wants to organize a committee to develop unity in the future. As I read the resolution of the Senator from Michigan, he wants to create a committee which will, as he says, bring about a complete evaluation of United States policies in the Far East. I have searched the resolution in vain for language which would say that the hearings before the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee should be open hearings. I searched the resolution in vain for language which would make it possible for the great Senator from Minnesota or the humble Senator from Oklahoma to have an opportunity to attend even as an observer. But I am sure the Senator from Michigan figures that those omissions would be of no concern to one of such transcendent ability with reference to foreign affairs as to think that the neutrality pact was a mutual assistance pact, or who would claim that the late Japanese-Chinese war resulted from an attack by China upon Japan.

Ah, if one of such ability as to have those convictions could sit upon and be a member of the committee, I am sure that in his opinion no other membership would be necessary. But I must say to the Senator from Minnesota that the Senator from Oklahoma has no such opinion of the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Oklahoma thinks that the way to create the most confusion and the least beneficial result would be to replace any one of the Senators on the dual committee that is going to hear the question tomorrow with the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I invite the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the fact that as I read the resolution, it provides for 12 Members of the Senate, 2 Members from each party from three committees of the Senate, and as I figure it out, there might be 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma how long he thinks it would take them to implement lines 11 and 12, which provides that the joint committee so appointed shall select a chairman and a vice chairman. How long does the Senator think it would take?

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the question, and shall try to answer it. I would say, first, however, that I am sure that would constitute no problem to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. One who can conjure up facts that do not exist, or find situations that never occurred, would, if undisturbed or undeterred, have no trouble whatever in selecting both a chairman and a vice chairman. But in view of the fact that other Members of the committee might not be so impressed with the judicial distinction and temperament of the Senator from Michigan as is the Senator from Oklahoma, a situation might arise that reminds the Senator from Oklahoma of the story of a jury composed of women hearing the evidence in a case and retiring to consider their verdict.

It was the first time the judge had ever had a jury made up of women, and it was the first time the women had ever served on a jury. The judge, feeling that he would both expedite the business of his court by getting another case out of the way, and, at the same time, show due respect to the inexperience of the women as jurors, called up what he considered to be a rather simple case wherein the plaintiff, the United States marshal, and three disinterested parties, all told one and the same story, and the defendant told another. After the evidence was in and the arguments had been made, the judge gave instructions to the jury and made it possible for them to retire to the privacy of their jury room to consider their verdict.

The first day came and went and no verdict was reported. The judge brought the jury in and admonished

them not to talk to anyone, and to return the next morning and again take up their deliberations, which they did. And the morning and the evening of the second day came and went, but still no verdict. So the judge again brought them in, admonished them not to discuss the case with anyone, directed them to return on the morrow, and excused them for the night. They returned on the third day, and the morning and the afternoon of the third day passed. The judge called them in and said to them, "Have you arrived at your verdict?"

They said, "No, Your Honor; we have not."

The judge said, "Did you understand the evidence?"

They replied, "Oh, yes; we understood the evidence very well."

The judge asked, "Were my instructions difficult to understand?"

The reply was, "No; we understood the instructions perfectly."

The judge said, "If I may not be considered impertinent, I should like to inquire as to why you have not found a verdict."

One good lady spoke up and said, "Well, Your Honor, we have not gotten around to considering the verdict."

The judge said, "Oh, is that so? If I may question again without being considered impertinent, would you be able to tell me what you have been doing?"

She said, "Certainly, Your Honor. We have been trying to elect a foreman." [Laughter.]

I can see them now, this committee of 24, 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans from the House, and 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans from the Senate, going into executive session to follow out the mandate set forth in the eloquent language of the Senator from Michigan, and attempting to carry out the mandate of lines 11 and 12, on page 2, where it says:

> The joint committee so appointed shall select a chairman and vice chairman.

Mr. President, I do not know whom the Senator from Michigan would sponsor for vice chairman. I must say that I have had no difficulty in my own mind in solving the riddle of who would be the first choice of the Senator from Michigan for the position of chairman of the committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. For a question.

Mr. CASE. In his vast study of the resolution, has the Senator been able to find anything by which the Senator from Michigan would bar other Members of the Senate from attending sessions of the proposed committee, or in any way——

Mr. KERR. No; the Senator from Oklahoma——

Mr. CASE. Or follow the principle apparently being followed by the present committee, which, according to its reported action, would limit attendance at hearings to members of the two committees? As I understand, it is the customary courtesy of the Senate for other Members of the Senate to be permitted to sit in on hearings.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma will not address himself to what is the customary courtesy of the Senate.

Mr. CASE. Will the Senator address himself to answering my question?

Mr. KERR. I shall be delighted to do so if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator from Michigan propose to bar other Senators from attending hearings under the language of his resolution?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, first, I wish to correct an impression of the Senator. I appreciate the Senator's getting into this little discussion. I have a very high regard and esteem for him. However, he is a little bit in error when he refers to what he has described as the vast study made by the Senator from Oklahoma of the resolution. The Senator from Oklahoma has read the resolution.

Mr. CASE. Which the Senator from South Dakota has not. That is why he has asked the question.

Mr. KERR. Fortified with that knowledge and sobered by the responsibility thus placed upon him, the Senator from Oklahoma will endeavor to answer the question. I do not find anything in the language of the resolution which says that the committee would bar other Senators from participating in the hearings of the committee. But I must say that I fail to find any language in it which would make any other Member of the Senate a member of the committee. I must say that I find language which would eliminate 18 of the members of the two committees now hearing the matter. The Senator from Oklahoma would like to be excused from predicting what the committee might do, yonder in some future time, embroiled, as the Senator from Oklahoma can now envision it, in the same spirit of partisan rivalry and antagonism that has been manifested on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Oklahoma would not want to be charged with responsibility in that regard, especially in view of what may or may not be a precedent in the Senate.

What the Senator from Oklahoma contemplates is the possibility that when committees are formed as a result of a resolution by a Member of this body there are times when the author of the resolution creating the committee becomes the chairman of it. The Senator from Oklahoma, in spite of his inability to think clearly at times, as described by the Senator from Michigan, has not failed to be impressed by what seems to be a feeling on the part of the Senator from Michigan that he would make an ideal chairman of the committee.

If such were the case, and such future day had arrived when the matter had been confirmed by the Senate or by the committee, the Senator from Oklahoma contemplates the possibility that some Member might bring up the question of whether or not hearings should be in executive session or open session, and whether other Senators should be permitted to attend or should be excluded.

Of course the Senator from Oklahoma does not know what the Senator from Michigan would say or do. But the Senator from Oklahoma is aware of what he seems to feel would be done as he reads the language of the resolution.

I see by its terms that the Senator from Michigan has excluded all but 12 Members of the Senate from membership on the committee. It may be that he would have a softening of attitude and resurgence of a tolerant feeling, which I must say has been very conspicuous by its absence, insofar as my observations have been able to detect, but such an eventuality could occur. I am convinced it could occur, because anyone with the distinguished judicial record of the Senator from Michigan would certainly be subject to the normal urges and processes and reactions of other human beings. Being such a being myself, I am aware of some that come and go in the mind and heart of man.

I must say that if the Senator from Michigan has any such purpose he failed to give evidence of it in the resolution. The purpose of making himself a member of the committee is not absent. One does not have to search too closely to find it. It is apparent from a thorough reading of the resolution that he intended to have, from the Republican side, only the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] of the Committee on Armed Services; the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] from the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the distinguished Senator—Ah, there I find it. I thought for a moment that perhaps my eyes were not going to be gladdened by the vision of that marvelous name in print: HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan. I knew that if I were diligent and applied myself properly, if I devoted myself to the task and followed out the leads so clearly provided by the language of the resolution, somewhere down the road, somewhere in the list, my ears might be ravished by the dulcet tones of the name as I pronounced it: HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan. There it is, Mr. President.

Ah, and down below it, "KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska."

Yes, Mr. President; I find that the committee would be fortified and appropriately reinforced for all contingencies by the presence on it of the distinguished gentlemen whose names I have read.

But I was amazed and disappointed, and I must say mystified, which might be explained by the accuracy—if it could be established—of the statement of the Senator from Michigan that he did not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma was even capable of thinking. It might be, Mr. President, that my failure to understand some things about this resolution is in reality by reason of that limited thought process—a refusal or inability, even.

I must say that I contemplate that possibility with a great deal of concern. If I were at all impressed by anything the Senator from Michigan could say, I would even be worried. But in view of

what seems to me to be an unlimited capacity on the part of the Senator from Michigan to become overheated in debate or to misspeak himself, I take some slight comfort in the realization of the possibility that he might have been mistaken. Oh, I hope he was, Mr. President. It would be a great disappointment to my wife and family if it were not so. I must say that if I were convinced of it, and if evidence existed to prove it, reluctant though I would be, I would be persuaded to be convinced.

Then I pause in sober thought at the responsibility which would be mine in connection with the people of Oklahoma. Either if the Senator from Oklahoma were disqualified or if, under the thundering logic of the misstatements of the Senator from Michigan, he became convinced that he was, the people of Oklahoma would not be entirely without representation in the Senate, aside from that given them by my distinguished and beloved colleague [Mr. MONRONEY]. Oh, I know that he would go as far as he could to fill the vacuum which would be created if the senior Senator from Oklahoma fell victim to the condition described here so forcibly by the Senator from Michigan. But lest my great colleague spend this night in worry and concern at thus being confronted with the problem which would arise by reason of the loss of his senior colleague, I want to give him the comforting knowledge that the distinguished Senator from Michigan would still be here; and if some question arose as to whether or not a mutual assistance pact existed somewhere, the Senator from Michigan has established a precedent of at least being willing to make a statement about it.

If my junior colleague were concerned about historical facts as to who started the war between Japan and China, I must say that he would not have to spend long hours searching through the dull and small-type pages of some encyclopedia. Oh, no, Mr. President. If, perchance, the distinguished Senator from Michigan had a moment of time that he was not devoting either to creating or implementing or becoming the chairman of some committee, I am sure that if my beloved colleague were to go to him in the proper attitude of humility and with the evident recognition of the transcendent ability of the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Michigan would be glad to inform him as to who started the war between Japan and China.

Of course, I would want to warn my colleague not to give unconditional guaranty for the accuracy of the information he received. But at least he would receive an indication. He at least would have that which he could take away with him. He could then go and spend a little time looking it up, and if it were corroborated either by some instrument or by the encyclopedia or by some recognized history, I would want to assure him that the fact that the statement of the Senator from Michigan was in agreement with it should not be taken by him as a factor to cause doubt in his mind as to the accuracy of that which he found in the encyclopedia.

But as I contemplate this resolution, Mr. President, I can understand the terror which must be piercing the hearts of the Republican colleagues of the Senator from Michigan. I can understand why the Senator from Michigan would not feel that he needed their help. However, he would strike from the proposed committee the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and my beloved colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I have formed a great attachment for the Senator from California. While there may have been some slight element of facetiousness here and there in my remarks thus far, there is none in that statement.

I personally would resent the action of the Senator from Michigan in striking from the roster my good friend from California. I can understand that there are some things he does not know. I will say that I have yet to be persuaded that the Senator from Michigan is so much better informed and so much wiser, even in the light of his distinguished judicial career, that we should follow him blindly and strike from the roster the name of my great friend from California.

Then there is the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the distinguished Senator from the midlands, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, my great friend [Mr. TOBEY]. I hope that this purpose on the part of the Senator from Michigan will not succeed. I have such confidence in the Senators whose names I have mentioned that I am persuaded that with their cooperation with their Democratic colleagues on the two committees, even without the bright and shining light of the presence of the Senator from Michigan, those two committees will be able to meet their responsibilities. They will be able to discharge their duties. They will be able to recognize their patriotic obligations to the Nation and to their constituents. That will bring about a result which we can contemplate with comfort and reassurance, in spite of the tragic absence of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I have just decided to yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to yield to my good friend for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask my distinguished friend from Oklahoma if he does not feel that it would be well, because of the historical importance of the speech he has made tonight and for the benefit of the school children who may read it in the future, for him to correct the RECORD in each case where he has mentioned the Senator from Michigan, and say, "The senior Senator from Michigan," so that school children will know to which Senator he refers; because we now have a distinguished junior Senator from Michigan on the Senator's side of the aisle, and I am sure the Senator would want the RECORD to be clear for the purpose of historical accuracy.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that noble suggestion.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I should like to thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KERR. I am delighted that the Senator from California has furnished this information, for posterity and for the present generation, and in order that there may never be any doubt in the mind of my great friend, the junior Senator from Michigan, as to whether any of the remarks I have made had any reference whatever to him.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Millikin
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bennett	Hill	Moody
Benton	Hoey	Morse
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Md.	Ives	Nixon
Byrd	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Long	Sparkman
Ellender	McCarran	Stennis
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
Frear	McFarland	Underwood
Fulbright	McKellar	Wherry
Gillette	McMahon	Williams
Green	Malone	Young
Hayden	Martin	
Hendrickson	Maybank	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been requested——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is putting the question on the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. On what question is the vote to be taken?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote is to be taken on the motion that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Monroney
Byrd	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Hunt	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
Gillette	Long	Smathers
Green	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McFarland	Sparkman
Hennings	McKellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Underwood

NAYS—40

Aiken	Flanders	Morse
Bennett	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bricker	Ives	Saltonstall
Bridges	Jenner	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cain	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Langer	Thye
Case	Lodge	Tobey
Cordon	McCarran	Wherry
Dirksen	McCarthy	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	Young
Ecton	Martin	
Ferguson	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—14

Butler, Nebr.	George	Taft
Capehart	Kefauver	Watkins
Chavez	Lehman	Welker
Duff	Magnuson	Wiley
Eastland	O'Conor	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 3, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we continue to go forth in the hours of this new day, grant that we may meet all our various experiences and opportunities for service with a pure and steadfast devotion.

We pray that Thou wilt take our confused and groping minds and transform them into centers of light and power as we seek to solve the difficult problems of struggling humanity.

Show us how we may help to cultivate and bring to fruition those finer moral and spiritual aspirations and values which Thou hast planted within the soul of man.

May discouragement, doubt, and defeatism be supplanted by the indomitable and adventurous spirit of courage and hope.

Inspire us with a sincere desire to incarnate and manifest the ideals and principles of the Prince of Peace in whose life we find the clear and commanding revelation of our duty toward Thee and our fellow men.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3096. An act relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 217) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN C. WATTS, of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3576) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the so-called displaced-persons bill?

Mr. WALTER. This is the extension of the first phase of the activity from July 31 to December 31. The entire act does not expire until December 1952. However, this is necessary because of the decisions of the Attorney General holding up the movement of certain of these people who come within the purview of the statute.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a continuance for 6 months; is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. That is right. It is the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the reports I get about the displaced persons they are sending into my section of the country are discouraging, indeed. If that is the kind they are going to bring here, I submit we had better stop it now. I am going to object to the unanimous-consent request to take this bill up at this time. I think it ought to come in under a rule and be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. WALTER. There is a rule.

Mr. RANKIN. The folks we are displacing are the American farmers, with this DiSalle crazy order. Let us look after the American people a while. I object, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today and for 20 minutes on Wednesday, May 9, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

ROLL-BACK IN BEEF PRICES MAY RESULT IN MEAT FAMINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the announced roll-back in beef prices may well result in a meat famine for the American people. The roll-back order of the Office of Price Stabilization is already resulting in a strong movement of unfinished feeder cattle to market. The situation at Sioux City, Iowa, which is one of the largest stock markets in the country, is already reaching alarming proportions. Animals are coming in 200 or 300 pounds light of what they would weigh if they were finished and, in some cases, buyers are compelled to refuse any more deliveries until the situation eases somewhat. Due to unseasonable wet weather, feed lots and country roads are in bad condition and when this situation improves there is likely to be a still stronger flow of cattle to the stockyards. Furthermore, feeders who paid high prices for cattle up to as high as 40

cents a pound shortly before the roll-back announcement stand to suffer a considerable loss.

If this unseasonable marketing of cattle continues, it naturally follows that before long the American people will be short the number of pounds of meat which the animal would have gained had it been fattened and brought to the best condition for market. It should also be said that from now on there are likely to be fewer cattle in the feed lots and the consumer will have to pay higher prices, and there is bound to be a return to the black market. In fact, reports reaching me from northwest Iowa indicate that the black market is already in operation.

It looks like we are headed for the disastrous days of OPA all over again. If the present policy of the OPS is carried out, the meat consumer is going to be faced with less meat within 90 days and rationing may have to follow. Those of us from the meat-producing sections of the country are insisting that the impractical experts in Washington dealing with this problem give way to men of experience who know what they are talking about. It is highly essential that those in charge of the roll-back program immediately adopt a realistic approach to this critical situation before it is too late.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Belcher	Elliott	Morgan
Blatnik	Gillette	Morrison
Brambiett	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Breen	Harden	Murray, Wis.
Brehm	Hardy	Patman
Brocks	Hébert	Powell
Brownson	Hinshaw	Rains
Bush	Hoffman, Ill.	Redden
Chatham	Holifield	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Irving	Rivers
Corbett	Kee	Shelley
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Sittler
Curtis, Mo.	Kennedy	Watts
Dawson	Kersten, Wis.	Whitaker
Devereux	Klein	Whitten
Dingell	Mansfield	Widnall
Donohue	Meader	Wolcott
Dorn	Miller, N. Y.	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3790, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Page 25, line 19, after the word "expended", strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$3,850,000 of which $2,600,000 is to be used for the construction and equipment of an experimental station in or near Morgantown, W. Va., as authorized by act of Congress, Public Law 812, Eighty-first Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, these are times of decision, times of decision in your individual life, in the life of this Nation, and in the life of all mankind. The next year or year and a half will probably prove to be the most momentous in our time if not in the history of all civilization, as to whether we are prepared to meet the emergencies and contingencies that might arise.

Yesterday when the Committee rose, I told the House that we have 13 years of known oil supplies or reserves in the United States. These are the figures given to me by the Bureau of Mines. That is, at the present rate of consumption, and we are increasing that rate of consumption daily. We are spending billions and will spend more billions of dollars for machinery and other mechanized equipment to carry on the warfare, such as tanks, guns, and airplanes. History records that Hitler had one of the mightiest war machines of all times, but at the end of the war a great deal of his machinery was rusting because of lack of oil. He lost millions of men trying to get the oil supplies from the coast of the Black Sea. If we lose the oil supplies from the Near East and if the snorkle submarines of Russia cut off our supply of oil to the south or by sabotage, we are going to be in a precarious position in this Nation unless we have the foresight to be prepared for emergencies which might arise.

Whose responsibility is it to see that we are prepared and that we have the foresight to look into the future? If these conditions do arise and we are cut short, history will record that the responsibility rests right on the shoulders of the present Members of this Congress and no one else. Yesterday after presenting my amendment I talked to legal advisers of the different departments affected and to different Members of the Congress and came to the conclusion, after reviewing the past laws, that my amendment was not necessary.

Going back over the law, the law of 1944 creating the synthetic liquid fuels program, the law of 1946 amending and extending it, in which contract authorizations were given to the Bureau of Mines and also the extension of the 1948 act, the present law, which was extended in 1950.

I quote briefly from that act:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), as amended by the act of March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 79), is further amended by changing the words "eight years" in the first sentence to read "eleven years."

Yesterday my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] struck from the pending bill the provision to turn back the contract obligations. These still rest with the Bureau of Mines, and they have the authority to carry on the work that they contemplate they need because we are in a state of emergency today and they have that authority to go ahead. So after talking to local advisers and different Members of Congress, as I said before, I have come to the conclusion that the present amendment would have no effect and is not necessary at the present time.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. Can the gentleman give us some information as to the relative cost of producing this very essential liquid fuel from coal and shale as compared to ordinary methods of refining it from crude oil?

Mr. STAGGERS. I could not answer the distinguished gentleman's question, but I did hear the Director of the Bureau of Mines say that the present cost is higher under present methods. They are working on the development of methods for refining it at a lower cost.

Mr. GOLDEN. And is it not true that byproducts derived from coal make it a feasible process whereby we can go along with this program and that it should have sufficient appropriations to develop it?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. GOLDEN. And is it not further true that many of these byproducts are essential in the defense program?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is it not true that other countries have far surpassed this country in the production of synthetic fuels?

Mr. STAGGERS. I believe that is true from the information that I have, that we are behind in our research work.

Mr. MARSHALL. And is it not true that committees of this Congress held long hearings and agreed that something ought to be done about it?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true.

Mr. MARSHALL. And is it not also true that some of the people in the executive branch of the Government fail to carry out directives of the Congress? Congress authorizes them to proceed to do the things that should be done for the defense of this country that need doing for future development and conservation of resources. It is time that these directives by the Congress are carried out.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is exactly right, because the Congress authorized that this work be carried on, and this is the direct authorization of the intent of Congress.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I wish to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia to the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from West Virginia finally decided to withdraw his amendment. He has a laudable ambition, of course, and should be complimented in attempting to serve the people of the coal area of West Virginia, but ultimately, if it becomes necessary, that service will be rendered, and I hope he may be in Congress long enough that he can take credit for having helped.

But after his remarks I should like to tell the House of Representatives that we heard this same story that we were running out of oil before World War II and during World War II, that we had only a few years' supply of oil, yet we helped supply our allies throughout the world with petroleum in winning the war and we had plenty of oil at the close of the war.

We have used since the winning of that war more oil in commercial enterprise and for carrying the industry of this country forward than ever before in peacetime, yet today the Nation's reserves of oil are the greatest in the history of our country; there are 30,000,000,000 barrels of oil in our reserves at the present time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I cannot yield now.

In addition to that we have at our door to the south under our good-neighbor policy of trade with South American countries immense production of oil there that can be brought in, and we are bringing in from those countries something like a million barrels of oil a day.

In addition to that, on this continent in Canada there has been developed recently great oil fields. They are in the early stages of development, and now in the State of South Dakota there has been found the southern point they think of that great oil reserve in Canada, and are beginning to produce oil in North Dakota. Oil fields will continue to be found throughout the Nation in the future as in the past.

All we need to do in this country is to see to it that the 27½-percent depletion allowance is left on the statute books and that this Congress continues to give the oil people the incentive to explore and bring in new fields. They will continue to go out and find new oil fields.

The chances are we will have enough oil to run this country for maybe a hundred more years. I have been in contact with people out in the great Northwest and in the Rocky Mountain area and am led to believe that we may yet develop oil fields out there that will rival those great oil fields of Texas.

So what we need to do is go ahead with what we have, to make certain we continue the 27½-percent oil and gas depletion, and continue our research and development service in reference to the conversion of coal.

A start has been made to convert oil shale rock and coal, as the gentleman from West Virginia so well pointed out. I congratulate him on raising this question, although I think it is immature. Seventy-six million dollars have been appropriated and fifty-seven million dollars have been spent for demonstration plants for conversion of rock shale and coal to oil and gas. I am told by the Bureau of Mines that there is a potentiality of 400,000,000,000 of oil reserves in the rock shales of Colorado and the other Rocky Mountain States which can be produced today in competition with oil.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the fact they have demonstration coal plants in existence, for instance one in Louisiana, Mo., that is producing something like 200 barrels of gasoline a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, a question was asked of the gentleman from West Virginia as to whether or not you can convert from real coal to oil on a competitive basis. You cannot do that today. It may take many years before it can be done. I should like to say that instead of the Government sticking its nose under the tent so far as this bill or any bill that follows is concerned for an appropriation of $2,000,000 or $3,000,000, to begin construction of new Government plants, that private enterprise stands ready today under the Defense Production Act if the Government will guarantee loans in connection with the building of these plants, to convert real coal to oil and oil derivatives which will lay the foundation also for the development of all sorts of plastics, chemicals, and so forth.

So private enterprise is ready and will take care of this matter when the need arises.

There is plenty of oil, there is plenty of coal, there is plenty of research and development up to the present time to insure this Congress that it is not necessary to put the Government further into the development of coal conversion. Private enterprise can and will take over the job and do it better and more economically than can the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I make an observation. The committee on both sides has been about as tolerant with reference to time as any committee has ever been in the 11 years I have been in Congress. We are now in the fifth day of debate on this bill and at the moment we are debating a moot subject. The amendment has been withdrawn through the courtesy of our good friend from West Virginia. In all fairness we ought to get on with the business of the House. We have a lot of important legislation pending. I will appreciate the cooperation of Members on both sides in trying to consider the balance of the bill in an orderly, businesslike way.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate, of course, to talk on such a slick subject as oil, but having served for many, many weeks as chairman of a subcommittee in the Eightieth Congress on this subject, I thought I might give a bit of information that may be valuable to all Members. The remarks of the gentleman from Washington, however, are well taken. I am just as eager as he is to continue with the real issues in this bill and to bring it to a vote as early as possible; therefore I shall say nothing further.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there remains on the Clerk's desk three amendments of a perfecting nature to carry out the thought of an amendment adopted by the committee earlier in the consideration of this bill with reference to the purchase of automobiles. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the remaining amendments be considered en bloc at this time so that they can be disposed of without any unnecessary delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

Page 26, lines 8 and 9, strike out the comma and the words "of which 130 shall be."

Page 29, line 10, strike out the comma and the words "of which 19 shall be."

Page 31, line 22, strike out the comma and the words "of which 74 shall be."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451), of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain available until expended, $11,975,000, of which $1,150,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the head "Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania," in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, and $3,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in section 4 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, various facts were developed in our committee this morning in connection with power. We had before the committee the administrators of the Defense Electric Power Administration: Mr. Frank Brower, chief, Power Supply Division; Mr. J. E. Moore, consultant; Mr. Arthur Vieregg, regional engineer, Northwest and Pacific; Mr. H. L. Parllett, regional engineer, Colorado and Southwest; and Mr. Ralph Fackler, regional engineer, Dakotas and Nebraska.

The transcript of the hearing will be available tomorrow morning to any Member, I suppose, who wants to look at it. After these gentlemen had testified for approximately 1 hour, I submitted this question to them: I said, in effect as "I understand your presentation, you, under your jurisdiction, have mapped out plans which will give us the power we need for the defense effort until about 1953 based upon the best information you can get." I said, "That, of course, takes into consideration the plans you have made for constructing certain facilities and for meeting emergencies as best you can under the shortages of materials, and so on." They testified that there was one area not cared for, and that is the Northwest. I asked them why that was not cared for. The substance of the reply was that they needed about $6,000,000 in appropriations. I asked them the status of the appropriations, and they said they did not know.

If you will refer to the language of the committee report on this bill on pages 11 and 12 you will find a few lines which carry quite a story which the Members of this subcommittee are quite familiar with. Now, this little thing that happened this morning has given me considerable light, and what I am going to say may call for some replies here.

I am going to submit the question to the members of the subcommittee, to the Members of the House and the Senate from the State of California and to the Members of the House and the Senate from the States of Oregon and Washington, and I ask: Why is there an absence of cooperation which permits an excess of power produced at the Shasta Dam to be transferred into Northwest territory, into the so-called Bonneville power area, to meet this emergency which has been testified to as existing by the Defense Electric Power Administration? Now that is a tough question, and I am going to let the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. JACKSON], a member of the committee, use his own time to answer that question. I understand there is a powerful rate war involved. I understand there are objections on the part of certain men in the Northwest area who object to their power, or their water in the form of power, being transferred into the California area, or the California people, perhaps, objecting to their water in the form of power being transferred into the Northwest area. This committee report even goes so far as to call upon the Secretary of the Interior to hold meetings and investigate and find out about the insubordination of his junior officials who, it appears, the Committee on Appropriations claims are using funds contrary to the intent of Congress.

The second question I want to submit is this: Is it the intent of this Congress that excess power produced at the Shasta Dam shall not be used in the Northwest area to meet the present defense requirements of this country? If that is the intent of the Committee on Appropriations and this House, I think that is something the people in this country will be interested in. These men testified this morning that there was about $6,000,000 involved here. If that is all that is involved, I could go to my friends and raise $6,000,000 if I endorsed the proposition, and I mean that literally.

I hope that if the members of the subcommittee care to do so they will leave out all the "whifflepoof," put this thing right on the doorstep, and let the American people know whether or not the three of four States involved here are so interested in promoting their individual State welfare that they are willing to go contrary to the Defense Electric Power Administration and defeat the supply of power in the great Northwest needed for the defense effort.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of orderly procedure, I do not believe it is appropriate or proper that we go back and discuss this item, which was included under the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation. I do not believe time will permit a proper and thorough debate on the subject of this time.

May I suggest to my good friend from Michigan that he look into this matter a little more carefully before we start debating the subject.

To answer his first question, let me say that there is not a surplus of power at Shasta Dam for the Bonneville system. Any power that would flow from California to the northwest area would have to come from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. steam plants in the San Francisco area. I think that if my good friend from Michigan will look into this matter he will find that it is a rather complicated subject and is not as simple as it might have appeared from his brief discussion this morning in his committee.

The committee report rather severely chastizes the Bureau of Reclamation for violating a directive given by the House at the last session of Congress. I am sure, knowing my good friend from Michigan, that he would not want to acquiesce in any action by any department of the Government which has violated the directives of the Committee on Appropriations in the expenditure of funds. Last year Congress directed the Bureau of Reclamation not to spend any money on this intertie. As the gentleman will learn from the report, the Bureau of Reclamation violated that directive.

This issue is a far-reaching one, and I know my good friends in California and Oregon want a very careful consideration of the matter before we proceed any further. There is no doubt that there is a lot of engineering merit in this proposal, but it is not so simple that we can dispose of it here in 5 or 10 minutes. I therefore ask, in the interest of orderly procedure, that we continue with the reading of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the trouble is not that the shortage of power at the present time is in the Pacific Northwest, in the Tennessee Valley, and in Nebraska, where we have nothing, practically, but public power, and that the fact that private power has been frozen out has prevented the orderly development of power that we would get with private industry properly planning the situation. Is not that the trouble?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer my good friend that that is not the trouble at all. As a matter of fact, if it had not been for the huge public power projects in the Pacific Northwest, the shortage now would be nothing short of catastrophic. In other words, to illustrate to my good friend from New York, the Portland General Electric Co. receives two-thirds of all the power it sells from the Bonneville Power Administration. The Puget Sound Power & Light Co., in the State of Washington, receives over a third of its power from the Bonneville Power Administration. It was not within the financial capacity of the private utilities of the Pacific Northwest to build such great projects as the Grand Coulee Dam, Bonneville Dam, and the other great structures now under way.

To supplement my statement, I should like to call to the attention of my good friend the fact that the private utilities are building a couple of dams at the present time of a smaller capacity than Bonneville and Grand Coulee. The problem is to develop the great power resources of that area just as fast as possible, so that both public and private bodies may receive the power that they so desperately need.

Mr. TABER. The fact remains that the shortage is in those three areas, and the other places where they have gone ahead with real development do not have it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Sure, we have a shortage because our popula-

tion has increased in the State of Washington by over 40 percent, and California and Oregon have likewise received very substantial increases in population.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing the power question, I wish to call the attention of the House to what promises to be one of the most far-reaching developments of all time, one which, if successful, will do more to revolutionize the world than anything else that has ever occurred, at least in your day and mine. I refer to the development of a process of generating electricity with sun heat, that has been worked out by the Smithsonian Institution, largely through the efforts of Dr. C. G. Abbot, who is now retired.

If you will turn to the Appendix of the RECORD of April 9, you will find the letter from Dr. Abbot which I inserted in the RECORD, describing this new development, by which it is estimated that trillions of horsepower of electricity can be produced in the arid areas of the Southwest, to say nothing of the amount that can be produced in other sections of the country.

Dr. Abbot states in the letter that something like a million horsepower can be generating on a square mile of area in the arid section of New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Nevada, to say nothing of the amount that can be generated in other areas. He says that with a circular mirror 10 feet in diameter, he can generate 2 horsepower of electric energy, and has submitted to me a photograph of the instrument used.

If he can generate 2 horsepower of electric energy in that arid area with a 10-foot mirror, then he can generate from 1 to 1½ horsepower of electric energy with it in States like Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, and Florida, and other areas where the sun shines from 50 to 90 percent of the day, and which are in the same latitude as the arid area to which I referred.

I would like to see the Smithsonian Institution supplied with sufficient funds to demonstrate this project and to show just what it will do. If it is a success, it will mark the turning point in the progress of mankind.

I hear men laugh and scoff when this question is mentioned, just as they laughed and scoffed at Thomas A. Edison when he was working day and night, month after month, year after year, trying to develop the electric light—the incandescent lamp—which brought the greatest change of its kind the world has ever known.

As I said the other day, he illuminated this old earth and made it to mock the starry splendor of the skies. He brought the dawn of a new civilization—the electric age.

Hon. Frederick Perry Fish, in an address on Edison at a dinner given in Mr. Edison's honor in 1922, made this statement:

> How superior was his thought to that of the greatest minds of his time. Sylvanus P. Thomson, a great English electrician, spoke of Mr. Edison's "airy ignorance." He said that any system of lighting, depending upon incandescence, would fail. Sylvanus Thomson said that and proved it, too, by all the rules of the science of the day. President Henry Morton, a famous scientist in this country, said that Edison had done too much really good work to have his name discredited by his talk as to what he thought and hoped and believed he could do with the incandescent lamp. Du Moncel, a famous French scientific man, in 1880, declared that the ideas which Mr. Edison was advancing with reference to the carbon lamp * * * were examples of "American hoaxes," and this at a time when the carbon lamp was burning. Preece, one of the greatest English inventors, said that the subdivision of the electric light, which means getting it to a point where it was useful in small units, was an "ignis fatuus" and "hopeless" work of this man.

I wonder what they would say about it today.

I am going to ask for an amendment to this bill for funds to enable the Smithsonian Institution to put on a demonstration testing out this new development. You probably saw in the paper the other day where President Peron, of Argentina, stated that they were preparing to utilize the process of generating electricity from sun heat. There is a story about it in the Washington Daily News of today. Note that Peron boasts that in 2 years from today they can supply electricity to the entire Republic of Argentina through this process.

The fact is that their scientists have taken up this proposition developed by Dr. Abbot in the Smithsonian Institution and are really stepping ahead in its application, while we delay.

I am informed that Communist Russia has also seized it, and is preparing to generate electricity through this process in the arid areas of Asia. In my opinion, we cannot afford to neglect this proposition and let other countries utilize this great development and step out in front in the generation of electric energy to an extent never dreamed of before.

The cost of this demonstration will be comparatively small, and it may mean the first step in the greatest development of all times. If it is a success, it will mark a new era in the progress of mankind that will last for centuries to come.

We cannot afford to sit idly by and see Argentina, Russia, and other countries capitalize on this development, while we forego the opportunity to enrich our own people by taking the lead in the onward march of modern progress.

I hope my amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago this bill was brought before the House. There has been a great deal of talk pro and con on it. As for me, I want to go along with JOHN TABER, and I will tell you why. When a man comes down here imbued with enthusiasm and attempting to reflect the will of the people, he has a few pet projects of his own. But he is soon sidetracked by some bureaucrat who attempts to sell him on some other project, and who tries to make him push forward a pet project of some department. I know of no better example than one right in my own district when a swivel-chair genius went up there some time ago and said, "You people are all wet. You don't want this floodwall project which is going to guarantee protection to the people of the greater Endicott-Vestal area."

"What you want," he said, "is an expensive system of dam building 50 miles up the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers which will continue on down through another 30 years and by that time there will have been enough floods in our section to wash out the entire area and then nobody will need any flood control."

That is the situation, and I have had my fill of it. From now on when they come forward with dam-building projects for up-State New York, I am going to join forces with JOHN TABER in attempting to cut out all the appropriations fostering the brain children of these bureaucrats.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very splendid statement he is making. I recall that several years ago he introduced legislation into this House to print a noninflationary dollar. I want to ask the gentleman if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and our Republican friends who controlled the Eightieth Congress at that time had gotten behind the gentleman's measure and it had become law, would not we be out of all this inflationary trouble we are having today?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. How did they stand on it down in the gentleman's country?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I may say to the gentleman from New York that we are looking forward to it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In answer to that I would go along with what they wanted. If they wanted these things, I say give the people what they want. If they want flood walls let them have flood walls; but if they do not want dams, do not try to choke it down their throats.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the bill which was introduced was a bill which provided for a noninflationary dollar?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman can conceive of one, it is all right with me. I do not recall that I ever introduced any such bill. I think the gentleman is attempting to sidetrack the issue.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I am not attempting to sidetrack the issue at all. Anyone who is in favor of providing a noninflationary dollar is in favor of protecting the buying power of my savings.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield further, because this issue was injected in here to try to thwart the attempt, however, futile, that I am making of trying to save money. I am for economy. That is the reason I am going along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on this amendment and on the bill. I want to save money for national defense. I say throw

these projects into national defense if you want to save money. If you want to build walls, call them national defense in order to protect the war plants of any district. Let us practice economy and not attempt to becloud the issue here.

In a couple of weeks, I am speaking to a gigantic protest meeting in Chenango County, organized to resist the disastrous dam-building program, made by long-haired intellectuals as a counter proposal to the Hall flood wall plan, designed to protect the Triple Cities for all time.

Dam construction has been shown to be a long drawn out affair, too little and too late to assure the war plants and the homes of our workers of security from floods.

As I have said, this idea has been advanced solely as a diverting measure and poor substitute to the wishes of the people in the Valley of Fair Play.

The "experts" are actually afraid that this practical solution of our local flood problem might be reached and establish the fallacy of the dam building theory.

Actually the Binghamton flood walls stand as a guarantee that more flood walls for the residents and factories of Johnson City, Endicott, Oakdale, Westover, Hooper, Willow Point, Endwell, Union, and all other points in the adjacent areas, on the Susquehanna River are necessary and proper.

I might add that the citizens of Conklin and Kirkwood, just above Binghamton, also want local protection.

At the indignation meeting which is being sponsored by the enemies of dam building, I expect to emphasize my belief that Congress should put off for a hundred years any further construction of the dams in Chenango, Otsego, and Delaware Counties for the sake of the inhabitants of those counties. Adopt the Hall flood wall program, build the walls to protect defense industries of our section and accomplish what we all want to do, keep floods out of the area of our Triple Cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk will read.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I made an improper reference in my statement; I mentioned the wrong name. It was C. G. Abbot, of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies and investigations respecting conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, including related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such studies and investigations; and the performance of other functions related thereto; as authorized by law; $4,046,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 30, line 14, strike out "$4,046,000" and insert "$3,875,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have been on this bill, as the chairman remarked, some 5 days. We have reduced this appropriation up to now by something like $20,000,000. I do not believe we have hurt any agency by any amendment which has been adopted, and I think the action of this House in reducing these appropriation bills to the extent they have been and will be reduced in the future will meet the almost unanimous approval of the people of the United States and save the taxpayers a lot of money.

The amendment which I have offered proposes to cut back investigating funds of the Fish and Wildlife Service by $171,000, and I select that figure because it reduces the appropriation to the sum that they had for expenditure last year, and this proposed amendment merely cuts them back to what they had a year ago. I believe that all of the nonmilitary agencies, almost without exception, ought to be able to get along in this time of great emergency when we are spending so much money for national defense, on the appropriations that they had last year.

I was activated in offering this amendment because of a visit I had the other day from an indignant constituent. He brought me a booklet published by the Wildlife Service in the course of its investigations and researches. That book is put out by this agency. It consists of 150-some pages, and is profusely illustrated with lithograph cuts. It is printed on the best gloss paper that can be found. It is devoted to the touching subject of raccoons in North and Middle America.

Mr. Chairman, raccoons were of some importance formerly to make fur coats for college boys, but since that time has passed and that has gone out of fashion, I do not know of anything more useless than the raccoon. I do not know why this book should ever have been published. Certainly there is no particular scientific reason for going into the formation of the skull of the raccoon. For instances, 20 pages are devoted to pictures showing the difference in the shape of the skull of the raccoon in Alabama from that in Florida and other States. I am wondering whether it was put out for the benefit of coon hunters.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I was wondering if the gentleman would find it possible to quote from that book on the love life of the coons?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot quote from some of the pages of the book without being unparliamentary, and I do not wish to do that.

If this book was put out for the benefit of coon hunters it was a great mistake. In my early life I have known a lot of coon hunters and the best coon hunters I have ever known could not read or write; so it certainly would not do them any good. If you told a coon hunter that a coon was a "Procyon lotor" he would think you just had one swig too many out of that jug of "white mule" that usually goes with all well organized coon hunts.

My friend from Georgia is evidently familiar with this book. This book was gotten up apparently by some bureaucrat who took the trouble to go all the way down to Alabama which was the scene of the thing I am going to try to describe without being unparliamentary.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I should like to correct the gentleman and say that the historical incident occurred on Blackbeards Island in Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Evidently this Government employee went many hundreds of miles from Washington, presumably in one of these 4 500 cars now owned by the Department of the Interior. Perhaps he had a Government chauffeur. A great many of them do.

He went down to watch the love affair of a pair of raccoons in the swamps. He describes it accurately in the book. He describes the intimate details of the love affair, and the ultimate commission of the misdemeanor which in due course of time was calculated to produce another litter of raccoons in the swamps down there. That aroused my curiosity to some extent. I think it is all right to watch wildlife and to watch raccoons. Certainly as a private enterprise nobody is going to object to that. No one can criticise or complain about that except the coons themselves and there is nothing they can do about it. I am not criticizing the man as an individual who watched this misdemeanor. I merely talk about the wasteful expenditure of Government funds.

Some of my constituent's indignation having communicated itself to me, I took the trouble to get some copies of the numerous publications put out by the Wildlife Service in the investigation of our wild life resources. Here they are, and these will tell you what kind of animals they have been investigating. They have written scientific treatises on everything from the Collard lizards to the scissor-tailed fly catcher, including ing skunks, squirrels, woodchucks, magpies, bats, and, believe it or not, there is a scientific treatise of great moment on the compelling subject of the economic status of the English sparrow. I hope you gentlemen will read that. It may help you in considering some of these appropriation bills.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my statement is to bring to your attention the utterly silly, foolish waste of money in every appropriation bill that comes before this Congress. I want to use this illustration as a matter of encouragement to these Members of Congress, a majority of whom have been willing to stand up here in the last few days and vote their convictions on cutting down

these appropriations where they saw it could be done without hurting the Government service. You can take every one of these agencies and find waste. I have been talking about fish and wildlife. You did not know that the sex life of the fish had now come under the jurisdiction of the State Department. I do not know what kind of diplomatic relations have to be carried on to produce more fish, but the fact is in recent hearings before the Committee on Appropriations a great controversy arose, and it was discussed as to whether these machinations between fish should be termed the "love life" of the fish or the "sex life" of the fish. But, it seems that the State Department has an annual appropriation to investigate the habits of the tuna fish. It may be all right; I do not know, but it seems to me if they have to investigate all the habits of all the creatures that God put on the earth, creatures that have been reproducing themselves ever since Noah turned the first two out of the Ark, there is not anything the bureaucrats can do about it. God put them here and God told them what to do about it, and these bureaucrats just cannot change it.

Now, why are we spending the taxpayers money on such utter, ridiculous, foolishness as this? I think this appropriation could be cut drastically. I just ask you to cut it back to size, the same size as it was last year, and I do not think they ought to be rewarded with $171,000 extra money for sending somebody down with a spyglass to Georgia to be a "Peeping Tom" to a pair of raccoons.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. The Fish and Wildlife Service have during the past year shown a stubborn and uncompromising attitude in its relations with sportsmen of Minnesota. Attempts made by Minnesotans to secure consideration of their complaints of discrimination against our State have been ignored or brushed aside.

It is time to analyze a service such as this. Let us serve notice upon this bureau that it cannot secure all the funds it wishes from the Congress without giving an account of its stewardship to the people we represent.

The following news release from the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press of March 11, entitled "'United States Duck Charges Untrue,' Says Moscrip," is an answer to unfair statements made by Dr. Clarence Cotton, assistant to Albert M. Day. Perhaps the Fish and Wildlife Service does need a talking to by this Congress. A cut in its funds is the most respected admonition of all. The article follows:

"UNITED STATES DUCK CHARGES UNTRUE," SAYS MOSCRIP—FIGHT FOR EQUALITY TO GO ON

(By Lytton Taylor)

"Statements by Dr. Clarence Cottam at the North American Wildlife Conference in Milwaukee are not in accordance with the facts," W. S. Moscrip, president of the St. Paul Association of Commerce, declared in a statement Saturday.

The association is engaged in a campaign to end discriminations against Minnesota in duck and goose hunting regulations which are prescribed by the United States Fish and Wildlife service in Washington.

The campaign is supported by the Minnesota Game Protective League, the Ramsey Country Sportsmen's Association, a considerable portion of the State legislature and Minnesota's Senators and Representatives in Congress. During the last week communities throughout the State have been sending the association assurances of support.

Cottam, who is assistant to Albert M. Day, director of the wildlife service, in his paper at Milwaukee singled out Minnesota as the great troublemaker in waterfowl management and called its demands unfair and unreasonable.

The wildlife service for several years has been broadcasting contentions that Minnesota already is taking more than its fair share of ducks, and that consequently it is unreasonable for it to seek correction of inequities.

Moscrip's statement is the sequel to an original protest to Day, Day's reply and a second letter by the association, plus correspondence with Members of Congress, including a declaration by Senator EDWARD J. THYE that "Minnesota's duck hunters are not a greedy group and are entitled to fair and just consideration."

The statement by Moscrip follows:

"The statements of Dr. Clarence Cottam, assistant to Albert M. Day, Director of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, at the North American wildlife conference in Milwaukee, are not in accordance with the facts regarding the number of our wild fowl and fair bag limits and seasons and equitable treatment.

"First and foremost, Minnesota is not asking for big bag limits or long seasons, but only for fair treatment and equality. Minnesota sportsmen resent the discrimination of lesser bag limits and shorter seasons of the neighboring States of North and South Dakota.

"This is particularly a tough condition where South Dakota completely bars Minnesota duck hunters, although residents of South Dakota may freely hunt and fish in Minnesota.

"Further, North Dakota permits only one limit of eight ducks to be taken out of their State by nonresidents and is considering more stringent regulations regarding nonresidents.

"Minnesota, along with North Dakota, raises more ducks than any other State and has a good flight of migrating wild fowl, yet Dr. Cottam says but 20 percent of the ducks are in our Mississippi flyway.

"We question this. Then Dr. Cottam reverses his argument and claims we have a maximum number of hunters and a maximum kill.

"The Fish and Wildlife Service claims a far greater supply of ducks for the Dakotas than Minnesota. Experienced hunters in this area will not agree with this. Our duck hunters who have covered the three States believe available ducks are about on a par in the Dakotas and Minnesota.

"This move for equality of treatment is now backed by over 65,000 sportsmen in Minnesota; has the backing of our Representatives in Washington, and Minnesota's sportsmen will stay in the fight until they have been accorded proper seasons and bag limits."

Day's letter to Moscrip attributes the Minnesota contentions to "some false assumptions." He asserts that to grant equality in hunting bags and seasons to Mississippi flyway States would only mean the unnecessary dragging of the other flyways down to our level.

The Central flyway, beginning at Minnesota's western border, last year had 45 days of hunting and the Pacific flyway 55 days, compared to 35 days here.

To justify this, Day repeats the figures used by Cottam. They credit the Mississippi flyway was 20 percent of the birds, 43 percent of the hunters, and 46 percent of the bill. The Central, according to these figures, has 29 percent of the ducks, but only 18 percent of the gun pressure.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I like the gentleman who preceded me in the well very much. I think he is one of the finest and most intelligent Members of this House. Maybe the gentleman is like MIKE KIRWAN, he probably never shot a gun in his life.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I would just like to observe what has been said for many, many years, that fish is good brain food. There might be some merit in the development of fish.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman. I want to say this. Twenty-six million people in the United States last year bought fishing and hunting licenses. There are only about 12,000,000 who are members of fraternal organizations, but this is the biggest organization, larger than all fraternal organizations put together. It is about the only thing in the United States that is not subsidized by the Government. They turned back more money into the Treasury last year than the Government spent on fish and wildlife. Twenty-six million people throughout this Nation are engaged in that pastime. I do not think there is a community in this country where you will not find during the hunting season men going out into the woods for this wonderful recreation. Yes, there are thousands of them. They are entitled to some consideration. The manufacturers of hunting and fishing equipment constitute one of the biggest industries of this Nation. Think of the 26,000,000 people buying fishing outfits, clothes for hunting, gum boots, hats, and so forth. Look at the industry being supported, such as manufacturing outboard motors, supplying gasoline, making automobiles—some of the biggest businesses in the world. On top of that, we are thinking about cutting $171,000 for these fish and wildlife investigations. This Fish and Wildlife Service is getting in the bill now $1,000,000 below the figure they got this year. Let us look at what the gentleman wants us to cut out of this bill. What have the people up in New England been urging for the past few years?

The late Representative from Massachusetts, if he were here today, would be the first one to defend this organization. Up in his district they used to go out to sea in boats to fish off the Newfoundland coast. Now they see that industry is coming to an end, and they are beginning to urge research. Down on the Gulf they do a lot of protesting also. They want an investigation about the fish in the Gulf of Mexico, and out on the west coast as well. So, that is why the $171,000 was put into this bill. I do not think there is a man or woman on the floor of this House who, if he or she will stop and think, will recall reading that years ago shad were taken out of the Delaware River and sold for a dollar a cart and used for fertilizer. Years ago there were plenty of sturgeon in Lake Erie and today there is probably not one in it. They are coming to an end, and coming to an end fast, like the rest of our resources, because we want to cut this appropriation $171,000 by having somebody come down in the well of this House and telling a funny story.

I am asking you to think seriously of what you are trying to do here today. I again say that in the Pacific they have been calling for years for fishery investigations and studies. They have been calling for research on their fishery resources down in the Gulf and up in New England. And why are we in here today to cut $171,000? Before the emergency committee to which I belong this was listed as an emergency item. They came before that committee, Charles Wilson, Harrison, and the others, asking for more funds in this emergency for fishery activities.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is it not true that the New England area has requested funds for investigation of their fish resources, that California has been asking for an investigation in connection with tuna, and the State of Virginia has been receiving quite a bit of money for an investigation of a fish comparable to herring, whose name I cannot think of at the moment? From my service on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I know that Norfolk and the area around it have a big stake in the fishery resources.

Mr. KIRWAN. Down on the Gulf they have been calling for an investigation of shrimp and the different fish down there. The same is true all over the Nation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Washington has asked for a study of tuna. Is there money in here for the study of tuna?

Mr. KIRWAN. There is money in here for the study of all fish.

Mr. STEFAN. Tuna also?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. Is part of the $171,000 that the committee wants to leave in here for an investigation of how to control vagrant cats?

Mr. KIRWAN. I refer that to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. We nearly lost the tuna fish on the Pacific coast, and tuna is one of the most important sources of food, because we do not know enough about the biology of the tuna, we do not know enough about the love life of the tuna, to know how to protect it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KIRWAN) there were—ayes 69, noes 61.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. SMITH of Virginia.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 84.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the Offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, the Government of the Virgin Islands, including the agricultural station, and of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa; compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46–50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses, and the residence of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; $7,020,000: *Provided*, That the territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph beginning on page 32, line 17, and extending to line 16 on page 33, which language is as follows:

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the Offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, the Government of the Virgin Islands, including the agricultural station, and of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa; compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46–50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses, and the residence of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; $7,020,000: *Provided*, That the territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration.

On the ground that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill and not authorized by law. The entire paragraph is legislation and the only thing that should properly be contained in the paragraph is an appropriation to carry out the functions presently vested in the Office of Territories.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] on the point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct the attention of the Chair to Forty-eighth United States Code, section 62, section 63, section 65 (b), and, in addition, again to Forty-eighth United States Code, section 46, section 47 (b), section 48, section 536, section 539, section 1405 (s), and section 1405 (v).

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman advise the Chair as to the effect of the provisions to which he has referred?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think it might be helpful to the Chair to mention that there may be one or two lines that would be subject to a point of order. But the sections to which I have called the attention of the Chair specifically cover the language in the bill. Forty-eighth United States Code, section 62, provides that the Governor shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum, payable from the Treasury of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to interrupt the gentleman. Did the Chair understand the gentleman from Washington to say that there may be two or three lines within this section or paragraph that would be subject to a point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has, therefore, conceded the point of order. A portion of a paragraph being out of order, the entire paragraph is subject to a point of order; and the Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: Page 32, after line 16, insert:

"Office of Territories, Administration of Territories: For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for expenditure as authorized by law, $7,020,000."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any controversy on the amendment as submitted. I, therefore, ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), including teletype rentals and service; $2,365,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Page 36, line 7, strike out "$2,365,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I think this is another place in this bill where we can make a considerable cut in appropriations and still not impair the services rendered by this Department.

In 1950, before the Interior reorganization plan took effect, the appropriations for the Office of the Secretary amounted to $1,913,781. The next year, for 1951, after the reorganization plan was accepted, the expenses of the Office of the Secretary rose from $1,913,000 to $2,290,000.

This reorganization plan, as a I recall, was intended to promote efficient operation and economy in the handling of matters coming before the Office of the Secretary. We cannot stand many more of these "economy" reorganization plans which increase appropriations and do the opposite of that which was intended. If we continue to do that, pretty soon we are going to "save" ourselves into bankruptcy.

The amendment which I have offered allows the Office of the Secretary more money than he had in 1950 but not quite as much as he had in 1951. He has now come in and asked for an additional $75,000—even over and above the big appropriation given him for 1951, which was $300,000 more than he had for 1950.

Now, the program of the Department presents no important new aspects or workloads, insofar as I am able to determine. I think we should do everything we can to hold the appropriation for this office at least to the level of 1950. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], on yesterday, showed how these so-called economy reorganization plans eventually cost the taxpayers additional money. He showed how—between 1944 and 1949—they attempted to decentralize the operations of the Office of the Secretary to the field. They increased their employees in the field by 16,000 and reduced them in Washington, or headquarters, from 4,490 to 3,614. But in this decentralization process they opened a new Office of the Secretary in Denver, and staffed it with an additional 2,224 employees, making a net gain in the Office of the Secretary of 348 employees, in addition to 16,000 additional in the field as a result of this so-called decentralization plan. Now, all of that adds up to a tremendous additional cost to the taxpayers.

In 1950 the Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, received $36,355 for traveling expenses. Last year—and again this year—the Secretary's office requested $106,664 for traveling expenses, almost three times what it had in 1950. This is but a part of the waste which my amendment seeks to eliminate.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is reasonable. It should be adopted in the interest of economy and common sense.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. Chairman, what I shall say at this time will not do much more good than what I have said during the week we have been debating this bill. However, we will feel embarrassed when they come back to the Congress asking for more money and it will put the Congress in the position of not knowing what the score is.

First, why an increase of $75,000? Mr. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, has to sign certain certificates of necessity involving over a billion dollars. Are we going to give that billion dollars away without any investigation whatever? He has five times the work now that he had at any time before. In connection with every one of these certificates the Secretary of the Interior has got to know what it involves, whether it is in Pennsylvania, in Illinois, or wherever it may be. That $1,600,000,000 has got to be put into circulation. Where is the money coming from to administer this work? Where are the people coming from who are going to make these investigations?

We want to cut out $190,000 below the amount available for this year. If the Secretary were here and you asked him personally how his work next year will compare with this year he would tell you it will be five times greater. Yet we want to cut $365,000 out of this and fix it so that there can be no investigation or analysis of these certificates or anything like that. In other words, if this amendment is agreed to it will force the Government in effect to make a gift of $1,600,000,000 without any investigation.

I hear people scream loud about the Marshall plan and about helping foreign countries, but I see them going down through the tellers here today and all during the past week protesting against spending a few dollars on America. Things have certainly gone a long way. Stop, look, and listen and observe the way you have voted. You were eager about the Marshall plan. I voted for it and I am glad it went into effect. I am not going to yell about patriotism but I do want to spend a few dollars on this country first. That is why I ask you not to cut this. It will not mean anything to me whether you cut every dime out of this bill. There is only a trifling sum in it for Ohio anyway, so it is not a case of logrolling.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Would this not put the Secretary in a very difficult position if we cut him back below the funds he has for this year, when you take into consideration all of the defense activities that have been assigned to the Department of the Interior since a year ago?

Mr. KIRWAN. Over $66,000,000,000 will be appropriated for national defense. The Secretary of the Interior is one of the men who must play a most important part in that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. They call on the Department of the Interior, the Geological Survey, the various power organizations, the Bureau of Mines—various agencies—for assistance and help so far as the other defense agencies of the Government are concerned, is that not true?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what I told the gentleman from Washington. Before this $66,000,000,000 is spent and before the fiscal ends, they will be coming back here for more millions. They are going to show us up for not knowing what we are legislating on or not knowing what we are appropriating for; and that we know very little about the running of the Government. Yes; we march up and down the aisle today and we want to cut a couple of dollars here and there, it will certainly show some of us up. The superior race that we think we are and that great law-making body that we want the rest of the world to think we are, may be put in doubt today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, whatever services are rendered for the Defense Department, there is reimbursement; is that not correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. Just like the gentleman from Washington said, when they want something done it is not all reimbursed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, but the share of the services rendered, as I understand, for the Defense Department is not charged to them.

Mr. KIRWAN. When they have to get some maps or something printed, the Army may pay their portion, yes, and that work in the Department of the Interior has increased considerably.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 59, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 102. Appropriations made in this act shall be available for the purchase of station wagons without such vehicles being considered as passenger motor vehicles.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this section on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington concedes the point of order and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I made a point of order against this paragraph not for the purpose of trying to handicap the Department in its operations. On first reading of the paragraph somebody might get the impression that the Department would be restricted in its operations, if this paragraph were left in the bill. We would not accomplish the purposes of the amendments that were offered by the gentleman from Mississippi taking out of the bill the authority for the purchase of additional passenger automobiles. This paragraph that has been deleted says that station wagons are not to be considered as passenger motor vehicles. If this paragraph had been left in the bill, there would have been no limitation upon the number of station wagons which could have been purchased, and a station wagon, of course, is a passenger vehicle. The Department will not be handicapped in its transportation because they can, under the law, purchase carry-alls, which are trucks with passenger-carrying facilities. In fact, the carry-all, in my opinion, will suit the purposes much better than the station wagon. A carry-all can be bought for possibly anywhere from $300 to $500 less than a station wagon. It is a more practical type of vehicle, the body being mounted on a truck chassis, with heavier springs, heavier constructed, will last longer, and will perform better service. I think this should be an indication not only to this Department but to other departments of Government that this Congress is interested in economy. We do know that we have too many automobiles in the service of the various departments and that these cars are being used indiscriminately. I think that the Government is imposed upon by some of its employees, and I hope that other departments will learn that Congress is not only interested in economy but we are going to insist on economy. We are going to scrutinize more carefully the requests that are made. While some of the objections that are being made here might seem small, I think the principle involved may have a good effect on the employees of this Government and let them know that the people of America are interested in seeing that our tax dollars are wisely spent.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 104. Appropriations in this act available for travel expenses shall be available, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with the work of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned is made.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 104 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and involves additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from New York raises objection to the paragraph because of the use of the language "under regulations prescribed by the Secretary" in lines 18 and 19?

Mr. KEATING. I do object to those words, and feel that that makes the section out of order as it now stands, but I would still press the point of order even with those words eliminated.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I wonder if the gentleman would accept the section if it remains as is except for the elimination of the words "under regulations prescribed by the Secretary."

Mr. KEATING. I feel that even with the elimination of those words it would still involve legislation on an appropriation bill, for exactly the same reasons for which the Chair has held section 102 subject to a point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. It is section 104 with the words I mentioned deleted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 36, line 17, insert the following:

"SEC. 104. Appropriations in this act available for travel expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with the work of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned is made."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it involves legislation on an appropriation bill and is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to invite the attention of the Chair to Thirty-first United States Code, page 551, which reads as follows:

Unless specifically provided by law, no moneys from funds appropriated for any purpose shall be used for the purpose of lodging, feeding, conveying, or furnishing transportation to any conventions or other form of assemblage or gathering to be held in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

Then Fifth United States Code, section 83:

No money appropriated by any act shall be expended * * * for expenses of attendance of any person at any meeting or convention of members of any society or association, unless such fees, dues, or expenses are authorized to be paid by specific appropriations for such purposes or are provided for in express terms in some general appropriation.

The committee merely has carried out the authorizing legislation which leaves to the Committee on Appropriations the determination in that regard.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me the argument advanced by the gentleman from Washington is a negative argument and is not sound. It is stated that these expenditures are not permitted unless expressly authorized by law. That means unless authorized in the proper legislative manner. It does not give authority nor could it, I believe, alter the rules of the House to give authority to legislate on an appropriation bill. Any legislation which would authorize an expenditure of this nature should be taken up as a separate measure. There is nothing in the reference which the gentleman has made which authorizes us in an appropriation bill to take the action which he now seeks to take.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In response to the gentleman from New York, I would like to state that the effect of the committee's action in this particular section 104 is not to add anything that would place an additional burden on the Congress, but it merely implements, rather than adding to something which is authorized by law. I think that is the basic distinction involved.

May I point out to the chairman that while I refer to two sections, the first citation being Thirty-first United States Code, page 551, I think the principal statute in point is Five United States Code, section 83.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has called the attention of the Chair to section 83, title 5 of the United States Code. Permit the Chair to read the language contained in that provision:

No money appropriated by any act shall be expended for membership fees or dues of any officer or employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia, in any society or association or for expenses of attendance of any person at any meeting or convention of members of any society or association unless such fees, dues, or expenses are authorized to be paid by specific appropriations for such purposes or are provided for in express terms in some general appropriation.

The Chair feels that the language which has just been read governs the matter and overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

Does the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] desire to speak on the amendment he has offered?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 109. During the current fiscal year the head of any department or establishment of the Government having funds available for scientific and technical investigations within the scope of the functions of the Department of the Interior may, with the approval of the Secretary, transfer to the Department such sums as may be necessary therefor, which sums so transferred may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein but without their limitations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in section 109 on the ground that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Washington a question.

Why should not the figure in the next section which we are coming to be 1951? There is no contract authority that will not be obligated in the Bonneville section and none that I can find in the index on reclamation, and it would seem that we ought to do that, and not have it run beyond the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer the gentleman from New York by saying it is my understanding there is a proposed hospital in the Virgin Islands which would be adversely affected by the language change suggested by the gentleman from New York. Other than that I understand there would not be any vital objection.

Mr. TABER. Why could we not change it so that we would except that one item because having a lot of this contract authority kicking around apparently is bad practice.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think if the gentleman would offer an amendment to the effect that it would except the item for the Virgin Islands public works, it would be acceptable to the committee and would not work any hardship. At least that is the best information I have available to me at this moment. If the gentleman wishes to offer the amendment, the committee will accept it.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 110. The balances of all contract authorizations heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any of its bureaus or offices, which remain unused on June 30, 1952, are hereby rescinded.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 39, line 1, strike out "1952" and insert "1951"; and at the end of line 2 strike out the period, insert a comma and add: "except a hospital in the Virgin Islands."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think if the gentleman would modify his amendment to read "public works" it would be acceptable. I do not know whether it is hospital or hospitals.

Mr. TABER. I will modify the amendment, then, Mr. Chairman, to read "public works."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 39, line 1, strike out "1952" and insert "1951"; and at the end of line 2 strike out the period, insert a comma and add: "except public works in the Virgin Islands."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 111. Transfers to the Department of the Interior, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, of equipment, material and supplies, excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Department for operations conducted in Territories and island possessions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 111 on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 112. No part of the funds made available by this act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 39 strike out all of section 112.

The CHAIRMAN. The Delegate from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the committee for accepting this amendment. There was every good reason for its adoption, and I say objectively there was not a single reason for enactment of section 112.

The section would set up discriminatory pay practices as among Federal employees. What it says, in effect, is that the cost-of-living allowance shall hereafter be paid in the Territories and possessions of the United States, and elsewhere, only to those persons who were recruited within the States. That is discrimination at its worst. That is colonialism magnified beyond all proper boundaries. If the Federal Government adopts one pay standard for Americans working outside the States and another standard for Americans working alongside them and doing precisely the same jobs, the propaganda machinery of Communist nations will be called into play against us. And we shall have no proper answer. For we shall have been found guilty in the eyes of the world of setting up a minority group merely because of their geographic location.

I do not know why this section is carried in the bill. It is reported or, rather, rumored that similar language may be considered in reference to other appropriation bills still to be acted upon by the House. Every such effort should be defeated.

Section 112, in effect, says that if Sam Smith is hired from New York City to perform a job in Alaska, he shall receive in addition to the base pay for that job a differential of 25 percent in recognition of the higher cost of living there. But if Richard Roe is recruited within Alaska for exactly the same kind of job, he would not receive the differential payment. By some strange process of reasoning it is indicated that living costs will not bear upon him with the same weight as upon Sam Smith. How this could be so remains a baffling puzzle.

As a matter of principle, my amendment should be accepted without argument. We cannot afford to be so mean, to be so inconsiderate, to write into law such a dangerous provision as this.

We have been all through this before. For several years the differential was paid under a voluntary agreement among the executive departments of the Government under the sponsorship of the Civil Service Commission.

In 1948 the administrative practice of paying a differential was written into law in section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1949, as amended by section 104 of the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949. That section, briefly, provided for the payment of additional compensation based on living costs substantially higher than in the District of Columbia to persons stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska. The additional compensation was to be paid in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. Subsequently, on September 16, 1948, the President signed Executive Order 10000, which set forth the system of cost-of-living allowances, payment of post differentials, additional compensation by reason of environment, and so forth. In no case, however, was the application of one kind of differential or a combination of differentials to exceed the 25-percent limit placed by the law.

With reference to Alaska and following the issuance of regulations and findings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Civil Service Commission issued regulations allowing a cost-of-living allowance of 25 percent to Federal employees in Alaska. This determination was made when it was found that living costs in all places in the Territory were at least 25 percent higher than the District of Columbia, and in most places living costs far exceeded that limit.

Back in 1945, and while the voluntary agreement regarding differentials was in effect, a determined effort was made by one agency of Government—to its everlasting shame—to induce the other departments to set up standards which would have had precisely the same effect as section 112. That agency argued that the differential was not a cost-of-living allowance but was a recruitment device. That it was not, and no amount of argument can make it such. It was such a device only insofar as it reflected the need for paying the differential in the Territories in recognition of higher living costs. That effort was beaten, and I had thought and hoped it would never be revived.

Now, what actually happened after the Independent Offices Acts referred to above became law and the Executive order was subsequently issued by the President was that Federal employees receiving the differential actually suffered that which was equivalent to a pay cut.

Prior to the effective date of the Executive order every employee paid income tax on his base salary plus the differential. Likewise, retirement deductions were made from his gross salary. Subsequently, however, although he was compelled to pay income tax on the base salary plus the cost-of-living allowance, retirement deductions were not made from that allowance. That was equivalent to a pay cut. So, I submit that Federal employees in the Territories and possessions have been the only group of Federal employees during the postwar period who have suffered the equivalent of a pay reduction.

Speaking for Alaska, because I am better acquainted with the situation there, let me state, and most emphatically, that if there are any who believe that enactment of section 112 would be an economy move, they are absolutely and positively wrong. Of course, that is obvious on the surface. Alaskans who have been recruited in their homeland and work for the Federal Government do not have access to mysterious sources which would enable them to live for less than their coworkers from elsewhere. They must patronize the same grocery stores, go to the same clothing stores, pay the same fees to the same doctors and pay the same rent as their fellow workers from the States. We have talked much about developing Alaska, inducing more people to go there to live so as to build it up economically. Such discrimination as is proposed by section 112 will not aid in this cause. In this day, for reasons which are apparently sound, the Government pays the transportation costs for the majority of its workers. If section 112 is enacted, Alaskans will have to quit. They cannot—and I state that as a categorical fact with respect to most of them—exist without the differential. Then what will Government do? Well, naturally, it will recruit others to take their places from the States, and they will receive the full differential plus transportation costs. Where is the saving there? It simply does not exist.

It may not be tremendously important, but I can think offhand of the heads of two Interior Department bureaus in Alaska who are Alaskans and who were hired there. If they stayed on their jobs if section 112 should prevail—which they probably would not—they would be in the strange position of having several of their subordinates receive larger salary checks than they.

Now, there is no requirement that the maximum 25 percent differential be paid. It is to be granted only if the cost of living figures reflect its need. If it is ascertained that the cost of living in any particular area or even a particular subregion of a territory is only 16 percent higher, for example, than in the District of Columbia, that is the figure which will be allowed for cost-of-living compensation.

It so happens that in Alaska, Federal employees, whether recruited locally or otherwise, are subjected to living costs which are not compensated for by the cost-of-living allowance. Only last Thursday the Bureau of Labor Statistics released the findings of a survey made this year at the instance of the Senate Armed Services Committee. It was discovered that the cost of living in Fairbanks in February was 47 percent higher than in Seattle. And it was 40 percent higher in Anchorage than in Seattle. Seattle, it should be remembered, was a cheaper city in which to live in February of this year than was Washington, D. C.

If section 112 should prevail we should not only find outright discrimination against territorial residents but varying practices among the departments themselves.

Two appropriation bills have passed the House already with no such section included, namely, the bills for the Treasury and Post Office and Labor and Federal Security. The independent offices appropriation bill was reported out late last week without containing language which is offered in section 112.

We in Alaska are becoming weary of these onslaughts against us. We seek statehood; but we receive no increased measure whatsoever of home rule. We are American citizens. We do not know why our people should command less for their labor than any other Americans. All we ask is justice. And justice will not be afforded by section 112. I have not noted that there has been a proposal that those American citizens in Alaska who will be almost legally designated as second class by such proposed legislation as this would have their income-tax payments to the Federal Government diminished in any measure. They pay the same taxes as do the citizens of any of the States. They ought to have equality of treatment.

I thank you to adopt this amendment.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the committee chairman to explain the meaning of section 110:

> The balances of all contract authorizations heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any of its bureaus or offices, which remain unused on June 30, 1952, are hereby rescinded.

Does that mean that the policy-making committees of the House that have to do with the Department of the Interior, will have to reauthorize all authorizations that have not been used up on the date named.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I assume the gentleman is familiar with the policy followed by the Committee on Appropriations prior to this year. That policy involved the granting to the departments of certain contract authority; in other words, they could contract and obligate the credit of the Government so as to do specific work without having the cash appropriated to them. Subsequently the Congress after the indebtedness had been incurred would appropriate the money for the contractual obligations that had been heretofore incurred.

Starting with this year, that is fiscal year 1952, the policy was adopted by the committee and the Congress to do away with contract authority and appropriate only in cash. This amendment is for the purpose of carrying out the new policy and for no other reason. It does not upset any basic legislation.

Mr. D'EWART. This section states "contract authorization." That is only limited to contract authorization existing; for instance, the 1944 Flood Control Act authorizations would not be affected?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I do not know by what stretch of the imagination it could apply to it.

Mr. D'EWART. It states that all contract authorizations shall be rescinded on a certain date.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes, but that is in the Department of the Interior. The Flood Control Act of 1944, axcept as to the marketing of power, hardly comes within the Department of the Interior.

Mr. D'EWART. The gentleman is in error about that, because the Missouri Basin authorization is largely under the 1944 act.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That may be true, but that is the exception.

Mr. D'EWART. And I wonder if all that authorization, and I believe there is a balance of some $500,000,000 that has not been used, would end under the provisions of this section.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This provision relates only to contract authority involving the appropriation of money. I assume the gentleman is referring to basic legislation authorizing the construction of projects.

Mr. D'EWART. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This has nothing to do with that. All that it relates to is the change in policy which has been agreed to by the Appropriations Committee eliminating contract authority in the appropriation bills.

Mr. D'EWART. However, it does not say "appropriations." It says "authorizations." That is what was disturbing me. I refer to line 24.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the colloquy here certainly will explain it satisfactorily if there is any doubt at all regarding the basic authority on the subject.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would like to ask whether under the amendment previously offered hospitals are excluded from this rescission of authority?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. As the amendment was agreed to here a moment ago, the only exception made was for a hospital or hospitals in the Virgin Islands. It is the understanding of the committee there are no other hospital projects that would be affected by the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. There may be some hospitals. I have one in mind that might be affected and I want to make sure what the language means.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will say to the gentleman that there is no intention by the amendment to impound that. It is my understanding that the Bureau of the Budget has impounded funds under section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Is the gentleman referring to the County Hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex.?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That has not been impounded.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I may be in error.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill beginning with line 13, page 41, reading: "who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States," and just that language. As I understand it both the A. F. of L. and CIO assert this right though as a matter of policy they have refused to exercise it. I think this is a loosely drawn criminal statute written into an appropriation bill.

I also offer a point of order against the same language appearing in line 4 through line 7, page 42. I limit my point of order to that language on those two pages.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair understand the language on page 42 to which the gentleman refers. Will the gentleman be specific as to the language he has in mind?

Mr. YORTY. Starting with the word "or" in line 4 and ending after the words "United States" in line 7.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire section on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes a point of order against the entire section on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order against the entire section merely to eliminate a dismembered provision which would remain after the point of order made by the gentleman from California. My action does not indicate opposition on my part to the philosophy of this provision. This affords an opportunity to restore the entire provision later.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 42, after line 21, insert "No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the bill which is in effect the same amendment I offered to the Labor and Federal Security bill which we considered last week and which was carried decisively.

There is a growing suspicion on the part of the people of this country that Government agencies and departments are in the publicity and propaganda business on a wholesale scale and that we are spending millions and millions of dollars uselessly every year for that purpose.

Last evening I happened to be at a dinner and a Government employee was one of the principal speakers. He pointed out how the Government was directing public thinking in the smaller communities of this country. The thought occurs to me and I wonder why the Government is engaged in the business of directing public thinking. This amendment is merely an effort to stop that practice. It will, if adopted, limit the use of the funds appropriated in this act.

I hope that this great Committee on Appropriations one of these days will give some thought and consideration to the problem of finding out definitely and specifically just how much money we are spending for propaganda and publicity purposes. I may be mistaken, and if I am, I would like to be corrected. It may be that the Eighty-first Congress made some effort to investigate this matter but I find no record of it. However, the Eightieth Congress did go into this matter and I want to refer to part of a report of the special committee investigating the subject of publicity and propaganda—House Report 2474. On page 9 of that report the committee goes on to make this very vital observation, it seems to me. It says:

> During the brief period of its operation your committee was called upon to investigate so many complaints of specific violations it was impossible to give the time and consideration necessary for proposing a solution to the over-all problem. It feels that its investigations and work have briefly outlined a problem which is alarming in its enormity.

Now that is a job of this great Committee on Appropriations, as I see it. Continuing, the report says:

> However, it feels that further intensive study is necessary not only to reveal a more complete picture of this situation but to formulate an effective safeguard against this danger. It feels strongly that further legislation is necessary, but is hesitant, on the basis of its work to date, to make specific recommendations. It recognizes there is a fine line between legitimate information service, and activity on the part of agencies and individuals which is designed to condition the public mind, and cautions that it will take legislation drawn with meticulous care to prevent improper action without infringing on legitimate services or the rights of the individual public official.

I hope that the committee will see fit to accept this amendment. It is merely a restraint upon governmental agencies that have a tendency and a disposition to propagandize every piece of legislation that is in contemplation or every piece of law that it has on the books today.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the debate and consideration of the Interior appropriations bill draws to a close I take this opportunity in behalf of my Iowa colleagues and myself to thank the members of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations, of which I am a Member, for their unanimous approval of the funds provided in this bill for the construction of a high voltage transmission line from Fort Randall Dam to or near Sioux City, Iowa.

My Iowa colleagues, Mr. HOEVEN and Mr. DOLLIVER, were especially helpful by their urgent requests made to officers of the Bureau of Reclamation and to committee members to make future Missouri Valley power easily accessible to the people of Iowa by starting construction of this line in fiscal year 1952, in order to have that power available for use in Iowa when Fort Randall starts generation in 1954 or 1955.

Also, I want to say that Julius Lensch, now president of the REA of

Iowa, came to Washington over two years ago as an official spokesman for a group of REA's in northwest Iowa, at which time he and I called on Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation to complain about the fact that the Bureau's plans at that time did not propose a single transmission line to Iowa at any point. But our neighboring States to the west and northwest were to be covered with a network of lines. Mr. Lensch and the northwest Iowa group of REA officials deserve much credit for it was that day, and not until that day, and after considerable argument, that Mr. Straus finally agreed to include the line to Sioux City, Iowa, in their plans. That day we reminded Mr. Straus in no uncertain terms that the people of Iowa were heavy taxpayers and as such they were entitled to their fair share of the Missouri Valley power.

My colleagues, you know this is one of the few times during my thirteen years in Congress that I have asked the taxpayers of the whole Nation to provide something for my people. Thanks to all of you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for offering this amendment. I think it was in 1946, in a Senate investigation, they called upon the Federal Government to come down and let this committee of the Senate have the information as to public relations, publicity, and propaganda, and what it was costing the Government. It was the Assistant Director of the Budget, Mr. Lawton, who swore before that committee that they had about 25,000 people employed at a cost of about $70,000,000 to the taxpayers. It has been suggested that we try to restrict propaganda, thought control, and unnecessary expense of publicity for various things that the Government is interested in in the various departments. We can do it by adopting this amendment. I am in favor of it. I hope the members will approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. No one can say it is a step in the wrong direction. It is a step in the right direction. The people want the Congress to take over greater control. There is a ground swell of opinion, evidenced by the letters and telegrams that have come to Members of Congress from all sections of the United States, for this great legislative body to take over greater control in the direction of the affairs of this country. This gives us the opportunity to implement the thoughts, the desire, and the wish of the people we represent, the people who are really the Government of the United States. I hope the Members will approve this very worthy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment for very good reasons. In the first place, I happen to be a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which of course has jurisdiction over many of the problems that come under the Department of the Interior.

I want to say that Mr. Mike Straus, who heads the Bureau of Reclamation, which originally was an engineering division of the Department of the Interior, always headed by the greatest engineers in the country, came into public life as a newspaperman. I have a great deal of respect for newspaper people, but Mr. Mike Straus does not practice the ethics usually attributed to newspapermen. He absolutely is a propagandist, with the most vicious tactics that can be employed by any governmental bureaucrat.

Take Mr. Bill Warne. He is an ex-newspaperman and publicist and propagandist. Boke, who handles the great central California project, is nothing but a propagandist. He also practices ethics not usually attributable to what we would call a good publicist or a good newspaperman.

I think this amendment is certainly needed in the Bureau of Reclamation, because if there is any department which absolutely puts out propaganda and lies—emphasis on the lies—it is the Bureau of Reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that the language contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is now the basic law of the land. It is my understanding that there are statutes dealing with this very subject. Naturally, I do not advocate that anyone be permitted to violate these laws, but I see no point in adding language here that is already covered by basic law. I hope the gentleman is not trying to impute to the Department of the Interior some ulterior motive and of violating basic statutes passed by the Congress. I think that under all the circumstances there is absolutely no need for this amendment, inasmuch as it is contained in basic law. I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. An amendment like this, that is loosely drawn, does not mean anything. There is no definition in the amendment as to what a publication is, and there is no definition as to what propaganda is.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. And there is no penalty.

Mr. FOGARTY. They give no specific examples of any kind of what they allege is happening or as to what they want to correct by an amendment like this.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I see no need for it. It is simply surplusage.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 42, after line 21, insert a new section, as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies and school teachers in the Indian Service;

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(f) to law-enforcement officers;

"Provided further, That when any department or agency covered in this bill shall, as a result of the operation of this amendment, reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply and said 80-percent figure shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1952 and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, it will be noted this is a similar amendment to the amendment I offered to the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. It is not identical because of the fact it is necessary to tailor each amendment of this nature to fit the different agencies of Government. So I shall point out the difference between this amendment and the amendment which I offered to the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill.

In this amendment I have exempted school teachers in the Indian Service schools, all nurses, doctors, and other medical personnel, including orderlies in the Indian hospitals, which, of course, is the only kind of hospital this bill applies to. Also I have exempted all law-enforcement officers. In the Park Service there are many law-enforcement officers, such as park rangers and also fish and wildlife game wardens, who are very necessary to protect the property of the parks and enforce the game laws, I have also provided when any department or agency covered in this bill shall as a result of the operation of this amendment reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 percent of the total number on the payroll as of July 1, 1951, this provision shall cease to apply and said 80 percent figure shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1952, and if exceeded at any time during the fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative.

You will note that that gives protection to an agency of Government which may have such a large turn-over that this amendment might detrimentally affect the operation of that agency and hence, after consulting with a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we decided to include this amendment which will act as a safeguard.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to yield to the able gentlelady.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wish merely to commend the gentleman on the wisdom of his amendment and to report to him that no amendment to any bill which has been introduced in this session has received such universal commendation in the Thirteenth District of Illinois. The feeling is that this is an effective, practical, and very possible way of actually cutting appropriations. I would like also to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that many of the Federal employees themselves have pointed out that this is not out of keeping with their own wishes.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentlewoman.

May I say that many Federal employees have called me to say since I introduced the amendment to the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, without giving their names which they dared not do, "We hope your amendment will be adopted, because it will give us a much better chance for promotion, instead of having some political hack come in and get the job which is rightfully ours, and who knows nothing about the job that is to be done."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to yield to my friend, a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HORAN. This will result in getting more of the idle work done instead of wasting it on unnecessary manpower.

Mr. JENSEN. Exactly.

In the Bureau of Reclamation you will notice they request $60,429,151 in this bill for personnel hire in the fiscal year 1952 while the bill provides $207,000,000 for construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Which amounts to almost exactly 30 percent of the total amount in this bill for the construction of irrigation reclamation and hydroelectric plants and related facilities for the Bureau of Reclamation. So you have a 30-percent administrative cost. As you travel throughout the Western States you will hear this request from most of the people in irrigation districts. They ask: "For goodness' sakes, can you not get some of this terrific administrative cost off our backs? They have a project office, a district office, a regional office, and every kind of office force you can imagine piled on our project costs." They have to pay the bill eventually. If this amendment is made law, it will give some relief to those good folks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my good colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman satisfied that this will in no way impair the efficiency of these departments?

Mr. JENSEN. Right. The proof of that is found in what Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller of the General Accounting Office has done. On April 15, 1946, he had 14,994 employees. Mr. Warren put this method into effect, and on April 15, 1946, last April 15, just 5 years later, he had cut that personnel to 6,996. He will tell you, as he told me, that the efficiency of his department has greatly improved during 5 years, that the morale is now high among the employees, because they know if they work and learn the job above them that their chance of getting that job is good. So it is good for the morale, it is good for the efficiency in Government, it is good for our taxpayers, and it is the painless way of reducing the terrific expenses of Federal employees, now in excess of 2,300,000 to the tune of about $9,000,000,000 annually for the American people to pay in burdensome taxes.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the Jensen amendment is entirely impracticable in view of the administrative difficulties involved and in view of several other weaknesses. I do hope that some Members from the West in particular will listen carefully to this analysis of the Jensen amendment. I hope they do not find themselves in the embarrasing position of voting for this. There will probably be a roll call if it passes, and then it will be embarrassing for them to be calling up the Interior Department wanting to know why there is difficulty in their own area. I may add that there will be a lot of roll calls this afternoon in order that everybody may know just exactly where they stand on these very, very important amendments. Some of the more obvious administrative problems involved are:

First. The amount of administrative machinery and paper work involved in administering this restriction would be extremely expensive. Agencies would be forced to control replacements at a central point so as to fix priorities on needs in filling vacancies. In addition they would have to set up a system of reporting daily from field offices and from lower organization units in Washington to a central point and would have to process a large volume of correspondence or other notices authorizing employment. The additional work which would be place upon top officials in making daily determinations as to which positions should be filled would not only be time-consuming and expensive, but would interfere with top-level policy responsibilities which should be exercised by officials at the levels involved. It is conceivable that justifications would need to be received almost daily on every vacancy in order to evaluate the need for filling vacancies. It can readily be seen that a tremendous amount of paper work and administrative analysis and evaluation would be required.

Second. It would be necessary to make a determination as to whether or not a vacancy actually exists or is created in connection with all positions reclassified, reassigned, or initially established. It would not only be difficult to make these determinations, but a great deal of additional workload would be placed upon the administrative machinery of the agencies.

Third. It would complicate the execution of the Veterans' Preference Act since an agency might find itself in a position where it would be unable to employ a veteran otherwise entitled to employment with the agency when less than four vacancies have occurred. It is possible that this situation might even require reduction in force to remove two or three additional employees in order to employ the veteran entitled to reemployment. This situation might also develop in connection with the return of employees with reemployment rights from defense agencies.

I might add there are a lot of men now engaged in or now on active duty in the armed services who have recently been called from their jobs to active duty. This is particularly true in connection with the Bonneville Power and the Reclamation Service where we have a lot of engineers and specialized technicians who are needed in the Defense Establishment.

Additional objections to the amendment are as follows:

First. Because the Jensen amendment is fairly specific and very drastic it is necessary to insert certain specific exemptions. But it does not cover all of the exemptions that should be made in order to protect vital Government activities. It would appear preferable to design legislation which could be applied across the board, since it is very difficult to draw a line in deciding upon which exemption should be provided for.

Second. If an agency desires to take advantage of this legislation, it can be done under the present provision. In view of the general practice throughout the Government of having many more positions classified and authorized than ever can be filled within funds available, it would be possible for such positions to be considered as vacancies as of June 30 and therefore be eligible to be filled any time during the year. As a matter of fact, certain types of clerical and low-grade professional positions are set up using one position description to cover any number of vacancies which can be filled through the AI process.

Third. The problem of policing the system set up by this law would undoubtedly be very expensive since it would require the establishment of position controls and other staffing controls and close policing not only within the agency or department but some type of policing by the General Accounting Office or the Civil Service Commission. Even then it is questionable whether or not such policing could be effective in view of the manner in which this restriction can be circumvented either intentionally or unintentionally.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was only about 10 days ago that the gentleman from Iowa

[Mr. JENSEN] offered this same amendment to the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1952. He made certain exemptions at that time and as of today he is making other exemptions when he claims he is going to exempt the school teachers and I believe the nurses and maybe the doctors in the Indian service.

I found the same trouble in the Public Health Service 10 days ago when he offered the amendment exempting nurses, doctors, and orderlies, but said nothing about exempting the men and women it takes to run a hospital outside of doctors, nurses, and orderlies. There is not a hospital on an Indian reservation or anywhere else in the world that does not have to have help to run elevators, telephones, and what not. They have to have men to buy the food that they eat in the hospital, they have to have men and women to keep the books. But this does not apply to them at all. You are going to reduce that personnel.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman contend that by taking 20 percent of the people who are now employed in any department of Government would be disrupting that agency and the operation and administration of that agency when we know that on July 1 we are going to have at least 2,400,000 on the Federal payroll, costing the taxpayers of America over $9,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1952?

Mr. FOGARTY. I will give the gentleman a very honest and sincere answer to that question. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee that considered this bill. Why did he not cut that in this committee before he came on the floor 20 percent here and there or where he thought they could stand it, and not be hurt, instead of offering a wildcat amendment like he has here this afternoon? That is the answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. JENSEN. How does the gentleman know I did not try to cut?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether the gentleman did or not.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is a member of the committee. Why does he not ask some of the members of the committee to try to cut more than we cut.

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me ask the gentleman this question——

Mr. JENSEN. I voted for every cut here today on this bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Did the gentleman make any attempt to cut this bill 20 percent while he was on the committee?

Mr. JENSEN. Not exactly 20 percent, but I said there was too much personnel and I tried to cut it.

Mr. FOGARTY. How much did the gentleman try to cut it?

Mr. JENSEN. How does the gentleman expect me to answer that question at this time? Be reasonable.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am trying to be reasonable and sincere in this presentation.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me tell the gentleman something. The only thing the gentleman has against this amendment, and the rest of the people that want to pile all these employees on, is that after we put this amendment on all agencies, we are going to save the taxpayers of American at least a billion dollars, and we are going to get rid of a lot of useless, needless Federal employees who are sitting around doing exactly nothing today, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman does not know any more than I do how much this amendment will save. There is no way of knowing. He tacked an amendment on a year ago and he did not know where it was going to lead or who it was going to affect, and as a consequence it was kicked out in conference between the House and the Senate, just because it was not workable. I believe, we, the Members of Congress, have the responsibility of determining, agency by agency, how many personnel shall operate them, and it is our job as members of the subcommittee to go into these agencies as thoroughly as we can and to weed out everyone who we do not believe is doing an essential job. That is our job before we appear before the House. If we have not done that, then we have not done our jobs.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree.

Mr. FOGARTY. And when we appear before the House, we are supposed to come before you with a bill that has weeded out all excess personnel. But, when you have debated this bill for 4 or 5 days, when you had a chance day in and day out to cut every single agency, and then come along and hamstring these agencies downtown by applying an over-all cut like this, I say you are not doing justice to your job as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and you are not being fair to the Members of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. I asked the bureau having charge of the old age and assistance checks how this amendment would affect them. That is an operation of the Government that has a rather low-paid personnel. They have a 36-percent turnover in high employment like we have at the present time. They will have 5,000 vacancies in the next fiscal year, and the only thing that they are doing is keeping records and seeing to it that the aged and the old and the infirm and the permanently disabled in every section of this country are getting their checks on time. And, when you have a 36 percent turnover it means that in the coming year they are going to have 3,800 vacancies there. Can you imagine the biggest life insurance company in the world that would ever accept an amendment like this? It is a monstrosity; it cannot work. They are going to have 3,800 vacancies, and when these people in your State and every other State of the Union are not getting their checks, we can point out who the author of this amendment was and who voted for it.

There is another thing I want to cover. The gentleman told me the other day that the General Accounting Office practically wrote this amendment for him, or a year ago, anyway.

Mr. JENSEN. No; I did not just say that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I mean, that helped the gentleman write it.

Mr. JENSEN. They worked with me 2 weeks to make sure that we had a good amendment that would apply fairly and properly to every agency of the Government.

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me tell you what they had to say before the Senate last year, after the gentleman's amendment was adopted.

Mr. JENSEN. What did Mr. Lindsay Warren say differently just the other day?

Mr. FOGARTY. I have not seen these hearings before.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman read everything he said?

Mr. FOGARTY. They have not been up before a congressional committee yet.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman will not pick out a paragraph and read it, will he?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I am referring to the amendment, and then what they had to say about it. Mr. Weitzel appeared before the Committee on Appropriations in 1951, and Mr. Yates was there also. Mr. Weitzel said:

> Mr. Chairman, I think you will recall my prefacing my statement on chapter X-A, that we in the General Accounting Office still feel—

That is your baby now, the General Accounting Office.

Mr. JENSEN. O. K.

Mr. FOGARTY. Continuing—

> that we in the General Accounting Office still feel that the best way to cut the appropriations is for the committee—

That is you and me and every other member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. But we did not do it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Continuing, Mr. Weitzel said—

> to examine the individual appropriations and make the cuts where they think the cuts can be made.

Now, that is your responsibility, and that is mine, and that is the responsibility of the House. That is the General Accounting Office speaking.

Let me go further. They say:

> To apply it, however, in a measure which will not be enacted until after the beginning of the new fiscal year—

That pertains to 1952 that I am talking about now—

> as section 1114 would do, abruptly, immediately, with respect to one fiscal year would so obviously, it seems to me, make operations extremely difficult, if not impossible, in some agencies where the turn-over is great.

That is exactly what you are doing here today and that is exactly what every one of you will do when you vote for this amendment this afternoon. You are going to put some of these agencies in a strait-jacket. We have the respon-

sibility to determine how much personnel they shall operate with. It is the administrative responsibility of the men and women we are paying down there to run these agencies efficiently. That is what we want. But you are not going to get efficiency out of this operation. It is going to be a more costly operation, and the men who helped the gentleman write this amendment so state.

Mr. JENSEN. No; now, wait. The gentleman is making a lot of statements that cannot be borne out by the facts. Those gentlemen did not help me write the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Did Mr. Yates help the gentleman on this amendment?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is making a lot of wild statements.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Yates said:

If I may add, Mr. Chairman, difficult and expensive to apply administratively.

That is the author of the gentleman's amendment who said that, yet the gentleman is coming up here this afternoon and saying, "We are going to save $1,000,000,000." The gentleman has no more idea than I do how much it is going to save.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, I have.

Mr. FOGARTY. Or how much additional it is going to cost the Federal Government to operate in the next fiscal year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island does not bring out the fact that if any of these bureaus do find themselves in difficulty this coming spring they can come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations affected and state their case. We can then put them under that particular class of exemptions, if we so wish. I think we will be very foolish if we do not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa has any further statements to make at this time, I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. In the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill and also in this bill we exempt the charwomen and the elevator boys, because they come under that first and second CPC provision.

Another thing, we protect the agencies that have a big turn-over by the provision which we inserted in this amendment that when the agency has been reduced to the amount of 20 percent this amendment shall not operate.

Further, since the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] had such a good time on the floor and said, "Why did not we do it in committee?" may I say there is one good reason why. It is because it happens that there were only two Republicans on that committee, and five Democrats. With all honor to the Democrats, and all of them are fine gentlemen who try to do a good job in their way of doing things, what chance have two got against five? We tried, but we could not do it. So we have to do the job that is left undone in committee and try to do it on the floor. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota if that is not correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is absolutely correct. It is unfortunate that we must do on the floor here the job that should be done in committee, but because of certain circumstances it is impossible of being done in that committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman referred to a deficiency appropriation. I assume from that the gentleman from Minnesota favors deficiency appropriations?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota said nothing whatsoever about deficiency appropriations. He said that if any division or bureau of the Government found itself in difficulties it could come before our Committee on Appropriations and state its case and prove it. In that case certainly, I assume, the Committee on Appropriations would do what is right by that bureau.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the majority leader that the Republicans of the Eightieth Congress proved by their actions that they favored deficiencies. I sat on the deficiency appropriations, and in the Eighty-first Congress practically every agency of the Government came before us with a request for a deficiency appropriation to cover the cut that they received in the Eightieth Congress as a result of which cut they could not continue their operations.

Further than that, I want to say something about committees. I think most people in this Chamber will recognize I have had some experience in appropriations and on committees. I regard the explanation that occurred here a few minutes ago about this amendment, as using a cap gun in the committee and a blunderbuss on the floor. They just pull the trigger and shoot everything in sight and do it for the purpose of making a big hit—a big hit with a blunderbuss, but they forget the reaction. They are grabbing every coatrack that comes along to hang their hat on, only to discover that the racks are not securely fastened to the wall and are falling one after another. So it is with their issues. A month ago they blew up a fur coat all out of proportion to the problem involved to a point where everybody in the country thought we owned one. Then it was something else; one committee investigation or another, then the difficulties in Korea, and now we have one Member of the Congress who has so expressed himself as to shake the confidence of the Nation in the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the detriment and the heartache of every mother in this country. I understand, and on pretty good authority, that we are to have roll-call votes here when this playing around with an appropriation bill is finished. There was a time when we did not play politics with appropriations in this Nation. We had some respect, at least, for proper spending to safeguard necessary projects. But I am sorry to confess to the Nation from the floor of Congress that that day has gone. I bid the people of the west to check the roll calls that are to be made in this House in regard to this bill. I bid them to look at the Democratic support that they will receive from the North and the East and from some Members of the South. I beg them to look at it, and I beg them to realize that we as a party are considering the Nation as a complete fabric and that we recognize the danger of having a weakness in any thread for we want our country to be strong for our national defense and desire to do those things for the West that are beneficial to the people of that area. Yes, look at these roll calls, people of the West, I ask you to look at them. I ask you to survey them. I ask you to study them. Then you will realize who it is that seeks to carry this country to the pinnacle which it deserves, as the great Nation that it is, for the benefit of its own preservation and its devotion to mankind.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure of serving on the subcommittee with the gentleman from Iowa for a number of years. I do not know of anybody who is more conscientious in his desire to save Federal money than the gentleman from Iowa, BEN JENSEN, and I say that indeed with no offense. I have given some attention to this matter of personnel. I was the author of the amendment last year which applies throughout the Government which limited the total number of permanent personnel to that existing on September 1, 1950. It provides further that anybody who transfers must come back to the agency from which he transferred at the rate at which he left. The absence of such provisions during the war led to the upgrading in the average Government department of an average of two grades, resulting in the present expenditure of over a billion dollars a year.

It is estimated that my amendment will save an average of around half a billion dollars a year.

The pending amendment I do not believe will save money. While I agree with the gentleman's purpose and his intentions and I can see how many of you have supported it as a protest against the number of Federal Government employees, I do not think it will work. The amendment provides that not more than 25 percent of the vacancies that may arise during the next fiscal year can be filled. One agency may have 10 times as many vacancies as another. Would this amendment give to each fair treatment? Practically every department and agency has a number of unfilled positions; what is to keep them from not employing somebody to one of the presently unfilled positions that they now have? What is to prevent them from doing that? The vacancies may be kept vacant in the lower grades, the service

end of an agency, while those filled may be all supervisory personnel. If they should do that what will happen could be that you retain all supervisory personnel but have no people in the field to do the work. One of our problems in Government is too many areas of supervision and too few people doing field work. One of the other problems is to try to keep agencies from increasing the level of salaries of employees across the Government by increasing grades.

Let me point out some other things. I realize and understand there will be a roll call vote on this amendment. I have done a good deal of work and studied this question in connection with the rider which I offered last year and which is now the law and I will say that we are busy now trying to perfect an amendment on a sound basis to hold stable the present salary levels and to continue to limit the total number of permanent personnel. We are busy on that. Now, I do think that this is something to which we should give our attention, and goodness knows I have put lots of work and study on this problem even though it does not happen to come before my subcommittee.

As to my sincerity on this matter, I may state that my subcommittee is going to bring in the Agricultural bill in a few days, and we have been working on this problem. Let me point out that the rolls of the Department of Agriculture since 1941 have been reduced from 108,000 to much below 65,000. You can do it in the Committee; and I say that is the way to do it, and we are going to bring in a provision which will effect these reductions. If you want to reduce the personnel, do it, but I do not think you will do it with an amendment of this kind. There are too many weaknesses in it. I do not believe this amendment will work. For that reason I am opposing it, and in doing that I want to say that I commend the gentleman from Iowa for the utmost sincerity and for his views, but I feel that I do have an obligation to the House to point out the things that I think would prevent this amendment from bringing about what he seeks.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. This method has worked very successfully in the General Accounting Office, and it worked very successfully during the depression in most of the State governments and in every municipality of any size and in a lot of counties. They talk about paper work; surely it is worth a little to save a billion dollars.

Mr. WHITTEN. There are two ways to limit personnel: One, limit the money; the other, limit the people, and in both instances you must retain the existing average salary levels. That is the straightforward, fair way to do it and not by an amendment such as we have before us in this instance; for under it one agency of the Government might not be hurt, because it could have all the people it needs, but another might be hamstrung.

Mr. JENSEN. Did the gentleman know that I had another provision in this amendment which states that when any agency reduces its personnel to the degree of 20 percent that the amendment will not hold?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say to the gentleman that I think that is a step in the right direction, but it also admits the weakness of the amendment adopted last week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I want to say in all sincerity that I do not believe there is a Member of this House who has done more for the economy of the country than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I think he has given a very logical reason for voting against this amendment. He has been working on this for years while on the Appropriations Committee. I want to say that I agree with him 100 percent. It is not fair to every agency. There are many agencies which have more vacancies than others, and you are not being fair with them.

It also, I believe, will create and encourage inefficiency; because it will encourage some of the agency heads to hold on to inefficient help. That is what you will see if you adopt this amendment. It is also going to do as the gentleman from Mississippi has said, it is going to mean the pirating of labor from one department to another. It will make for unstable conditions instead of the stability we need in every agency in this country.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know of one agency in Government that is not using all the money it had. They have not filled existing vacancies and therefore they do not plan to use all of the money for present year. The head of this agency is a good administrator, but if this amendment applies to his agency he can protect himself against its future operation by filling all these unfilled positions before the 1st of July, so that in the next year he will not be caught under this provision and be unable to do his work. That is from a man who is turning back money to the Treasury.

I am not criticizing anyone who may differ with me. In all frankness, in my judgment, there is one basis only upon which a vote for this amendment might be justified and that would be as a protest against the size of Government rolls, but just as a protest for something that is unworkable is not sufficient reason to me. Instead of just protesting I think we should do something about the problem and on this I believe I have done something about it, and assure you I will continue to try to do something about it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be allotted to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have supported this pending amendment before and I am going to support it again. It has been here in slightly different form several times. It has received substantial support from the membership of the House of Representatives and I think it ought to have this support.

What are the plain facts about the matter? The people of the country know, and we, collectively and individually know, that we have more people on the Federal payroll than we need. The people of the country are demanding that we do something about it and certainly in a time like this when people all over the country are being asked to go under a program of austerity, cutting down on their manpower requirements, cutting off here and cutting off there, the Government and the agencies of the Government should be the first to set the example.

What sort of an operation is it under which the people in the country are to be asked to forego many of the things they would like to have but that employment as usual, spending as usual, must go in the actions of the Federal Government?

It has been said here, two, three or four times that "We are going to have roll calls on these amendments." You are not scaring any of us. I shall be very happy to take my stand with those Members of this body who have the courage to get up here and vote to cut some of these Federal appropriations. Let me say to any of you Members who think you are going to curry favor at this place or that place by voting against these cuts that you may wake up one fine day to find out that the American people have moved 'way beyond you, and that instead of wanting you to shovel out the taxpayers' money to pay for people you do not need on the Federal payroll they are going to say: "You'd better stay at home. We will send somebody down there with courage enough to put a little economy in the Government."

I know that every time you get ready to separate someone from the Federal payroll the folks who want to keep them all on there can find a thousand reasons why you cannot get rid of one. In whatever course of action you undertake in carrying out the philosophy of getting rid of some people on the Federal payroll, those Members who want to keep these bloated payrolls going in perpetuity can find this little thing that is wrong with the program or that little thing that is wrong with the program. As far

as I am concerned I am not going to look for that minor thing here and there that may be subject to a little criticism. I am going to look at the over-all necessities of the situation and I am going to vote accordingly. That is the reason I shall support the Jensen amendment.

Let me say again, if you do not support it then you are putting yourself right smack in the crowd that just wants to keep the Federal payrolls as big as they possibly can be.

The gentleman from Michigan spoke about our playing around with an appropriation bill. Well, if to come in here and save millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is playing around, there, again, I am mighty glad to plead guilty to playing around. In my opinion, it is not playing around. It has to do with the very fabric, fiber, and existence of this Nation. There is no higher responsibility resting on the House of Representatives as we consider these appropriation bills than the one which demands of us that we put our financial house in order. Oh, I realize that when he said he wants the people of certain areas to look at how the Democrats of the North and East and the South are going to vote on this amendment he wants them to check the record. Well, apparently he believes that the votes of the people of America are for sale on the auction block of Federal expenditures and payrolls. If he wants to believe that, let him believe it but, as far as I am concerned, I refuse to believe it, and I am glad that he has seen fit to drag the evil thing right out here by its ears for all to see.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be yielded to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I again say I shall be happy to have the roll called and to see how some of you folks vote who put nice speeches in the papers back home telling your folks you are for economy in Government. You go back home and make speeches to that effect. You say, "Oh, yes, there are too many people on the Federal payroll. I know that we can get along without them down in Washington just as you do get along without people at home." You make those fine statements and those great speeches, but the test comes now on how you are going to vote.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Not at the moment. After I have completed my statement, I will.

Mr. RABAUT. I think the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I never made such a statement in my district in my life.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, then, I am glad to accept the gentleman's correction. Let me add only that he should have been making them back there and he should be carrying them out right here. The gentleman from Michigan also talked about Korea. He brought that in. Well, I do not know whether he has read the Wedemeyer report or not. I have been reading it, and with much interest; a great general, a great military man, commissioned back in 1947 to investigate that situation. He came back with a report that was so prophetic that as of today, as I read it, I marvel at the sagacity and the wisdom and the powers of observation that gave him and those who worked with him the insight into what was going to happen. If the Wedemeyer report had not been suppressed by the political branch of the Government, the people of this country would have been so aroused that our military forces would not have been pulled out of Korea and that area of Asia abandoned. We would not have had Korea, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan. He brought it up; I did not bring it up, and what it had to do with this particular debate, I do not know. But, if he wanted to bring it up, as far as I am concerned, I am ready to meet it head on. I only wish that the Wedemeyer report had not been suppressed, because then the people of this country would have known and we would not be in this situation today. I might even express the hope that General Wedemeyer would have found it in his heart and his conscience and his mind to have spoken out to the American people about what he found out even though the power of suppression was exerted against him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has made reference to the reduction in the personnel of the General Accounting Office, and with all due respect to my friend, Lindsay Warren, whom I admire very much, and who is one of my close, valued friends, I think the facts will show that some of that reduction came about principally by reason of the cessation of the work in connection with the renegotiation of contracts. My friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] referred to the fact that they could come up for a deficiency appropriation. Of course, when I asked him the question whether he favored deficiency appropriations, he realized the position he had placed himself in and naturally tried to remove himself from it.

I wanted to make one additional observation at that time, but the gentleman from Minnesota hastily manifested his disturbed frame of mind when he said he would not yield any more. I wanted to make the observation that if they did come up they faced the antideficiency law, which carries with it the possibility of indictment and, upon conviction, jail.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, but let me finish first. The gentleman from Minnesota thoughtlessly overlooked that important law.

I now yield for a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman was entirely incorrect when he stated that the gentleman from Minnesota had made any——

Mr. McCORMACK. I will take the gentleman's word. Will the gentleman read the RECORD? He will not correct the RECORD, will he?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will leave it exactly as it is. I will challenge the gentleman to get the Clerk to read that RECORD here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Never mind the challenge. Let the gentleman make no corrections and I will make no corrections.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. All right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then we will let the Members draw their own interpretation.

This is one of the most important bills that has come before the Congress, for at least a dozen States of the Union. My dear friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who is one of the Republican leaders, and those who interpret his remarks must keep in mind that he is one of the leaders of the Republican Party in Congress and that he spoke for his party, made some remarks in which he said, "They are not scaring any of us." There are millions of people in those 12 States who are interested in these projects. Those are near and dear to their hopes and aspirations. They concern their future economic outlook. They concern the development of their States and that great section of the country that sends many Members to this body elected as Republicans. I wonder how they are going to feel when they read the RECORD, or if most of the press, which is Republican, gives a fair coverage of the news of the debate today, when they read that the Republican leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], said to those millions of people, "None of you were scaring any of us."

These roll calls are justifiable. I hope there will be a roll call asked on every matter of concern to the people involved in the States that are affected by the cut.

The gentleman from Indiana said the American people "have moved beyond us." I do not know what he meant by that statement, but certainly the people have moved far beyond the Republican leadership in Congress. That has been evident by the election and reelection of the Democratic Party during the past 20 years. There is one thing we Democrats can always rely upon, we can rely upon the Republican leadership in Congress making mistakes. When the gentleman from Indiana cast that aspersion, which it is, upon the people of 12 States of the Union, at least, when he says, "None of them are scaring any of us," I think they are justified in expressing their resentment at the proper time.

I wonder how they feel when they realize that what the gentleman said is that they are coming in here seeking a grab bag in connection with projects that they

think are vital to the best interests of their States and their section.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] made a contribution to the debate when he stated that the people of the States affected should look at the roll calls and see the large percentage of Democrats, north, east, south, and west, who will be voting for their interests, and then compare it with the vote of the members of the Republican Party. They will probably find every few Republicans from the East and the North and the Middle East voting for their interests, but as they look the roll calls over they will find Democrats from those sections voting for their interests, because we view these problems from the national angle, not purely from a sectional angle. The necessary improvement of any section of the country or of any State of the Union inures to the national interest of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENSEN and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 168, noes 146.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

This act may be cited as the "Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952."

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have not spoken on the bill during the 7 or 8 days it has been considered.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to be fair; I modify my request and ask that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean 5 minutes for each gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has already been recognized. The time will be divided three ways.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will take 5 minutes then, and give it to the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has been recognized for 5 minutes already.

If the gentleman from Washington would modify his request to read that all debate on the pending bill close in 10 minutes, five having been allotted to the gentleman from California and five to the gentleman from Nebraska, I think it might possibly be agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is satisfactory.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean there is only 5 minutes for the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Washington?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes each.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington that all debate on the pending bill close in 10 minutes, the time to be allotted as indicated?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, late yesterday afternoon this House after due consideration passed an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] providing in effect that power facilities should not be built by the Bureau of Reclamation whenever there was in existence a contract providing that private industry would wheel that power in the areas where the lines are to be built to perferred customers and Government establishments. That amendment passed.

Sometime during the night a memorandum was prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation attacking that amendment and seeking to influence the passage of the amendment by the House. This morning a gentleman by the name of Mr. Johnson, from the Bureau, took it upon himself to go among the Members of this House to circulate what purported to be the interpretation of the amendment in an effort to defeat it.

Perhaps the gentleman of the Bureau did not know what section 201, title 18 of the United States Code provides; therefore, in the hope that they will read this RECORD I am going to read it:

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon I pointed out to the committee that there were still lines in this bill which the Keating amendment removed that were admitted by the Bureau of Reclamation at the committee hearings not to be necessary if a wheeling agreement were entered into in California. I pointed out to this committee that this agreement was entered into on April 2 after the Bureau of the Budget had made its requests and after the committee had closed its hearings.

The leaflet they put out this morning is a statement of half-truths and half-facts leaving false inferences. They were prepared for the purpose of propagandizing Members of various States. The one for California is unsigned and reads as follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, FISCAL YEAR 1952, PROGRAM OF TRANSMISSION FACILITIES

It is understood that the following amendment was offered by Congressman KEATING of New York:

"On page 16, line 3, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and add '*Provided*, no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by existing wheeling construction which make provision for supplying Federal installations and preference customers.'"

The meaning of this amendment is not entirely clear, but a literal interpretation would appear to prohibit the construction of any transmission facilities upon which actual construction had not started in the field prior to July 1, 1951. This would mean that, although a contractor under a labor-and-material type of contract might have ordered all of the necessary materials, delivery of which had not been received, he could not start construction when materials were delivered; also, it would mean that substations for which equipment has been on order for many months but delivery is not due until after July 1, 1951, could also not be placed in construction. In some cases this will result in transmission lines having been completed, but substation facilities could not be added to make the lines already constructed of any use.

The attached tabulations indicate by States the probable effect on construction of transmission facilities by the proposed amendment:

CALIFORNIA

Project and feature	Budget estimate	Effect of Keating amendment
Central Valley project	$5,556,478	
Shasta-Tracy transmission line (West Side No. 1 and No. 2) (230-kilovolt)	200,000	Not affected.
Keswick-Tracy via Elverta transmission line (115-kilovolt)	1,400,000	Eliminated by committee report.
Keswick-SDAPUD transmission line and substation (115-kilovolt) (13.8-kilovolt)	105,308	Construction prohibited.
Folsom-Elverta-Sacto-Folsom loop and substation (115-kilovolt)	500,000	Do.
Port Chicago-Mare Island transmission line and substation (115-kilovolt)	300,000	Eliminated by committee report.
Tracy-Livermore-Ames transmission line and substation (115-kilovolt)	700,000	Construction prohibited.
Tracy-C. C.-Clayton-Ignacio transmission line and substation (69-kilovolt)	201,170	Do.
Tracy-Patterson-Naval supply transmission line and substation (69-kilovolt)	450,000	Eliminated by committee report.
CVP-BPA interconnection and substation (230-kilovolt)	1,700,000	Do.
Total, California	5,556,478	

I point out this matter so that the committee can take upon itself the duty of investigating these illegal activities which have been going on last night and this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this bill that has been debated vigorously and intelligently, sometimes spiritedly, the last 6 days does affect my district and the 17 Western States. I have been concerned at times about some of the cuts that have been made. I am going to go along with reasonable cuts in the bill. Some of the cuts affect my district but my people want economy. I will go along with the so-called Jensen amendment because I know that Government agencies duplicate their work on many surveys. They do that in my State. I have quarreled with them about that. We had the Reclamation Bureau, the Geodetic Survey, the Army Engineers, Fish and Wildlife all making some surveys, which, of course, are necessary, but it does seem one agency could have made the survey, then we would save some of the taxpayers' money.

I am sorry that the majority leader has seen fit to inject politics into this bill. There should not be any politics. After all, we are all interested in developing the resources of the West. It is not a political issue and his threat to make it so is unfortunate.

I want to ask the committee, especially the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] because he offered an amendment yesterday that would take some $10,000,000 out of the bill, the amendment reading:

> Page 16, line 2, strike out "$207,190,000" and insert "$197,000,000" and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines.

This was later amended by an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] which strikes out that portion of the Taber amendment reading: "and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

I understand from the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] it was his intention that the cut should be made across the board and not be taken from any particular project. I want to ask the gentleman if that was his intention?

Mr. LOVRE. The gentleman is entirely correct and I should like to refer him to my remarks made yesterday appearing at page 4623 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I said:

> I sincerely hope you will support this amendment which cuts the same amount as the Taber amendment—the only difference being that it spreads the cut over the entire program without scuttling the many essential projects now under construction in approximately a dozen States.

That was definitely my intention.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if that was his thought?

Mr. TABER. I accepted the Lovre amendment. My thought was that the cut should be taken first out of such things as were eliminated later by the Congress, such things as would be cut out by the Keating amendment, and then it would be distributed pro rata according to amount allowed among the projects that were approved by the committee appearing on pages 9 and 10 of its report.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That would amount to about a 5-percent cut in the reclamation part of the bill?

Mr. TABER. About 4 percent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. About 4 percent. With that understanding I will go with reluctance along with those amendments.

I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that in the development of the 17 western States, which includes the major resources of this country, we should not cut these appropriation bills to a point where progress will not proceed because those are the great resources we have. They must be developed to meet expanding needs of a growing population. If no war was going on, I would resist these several cuts and beg for more irrigation projects. More for surveys, soil conservation, and worthy projects.

I also would point out to you that we are spending large amounts of money for foreign aid programs. I understand we are spending more money to develop irrigation and public work projects in other parts of the world than we are spending for irrigation in our own country. We should develop our own resources first in order that we may stay strong. New irrigation projects produce new wealth and add food to the growing needs of the world. They bring in added taxes. They must be developed.

Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that the cut here of some $10,000,000 is to be spread across the board and not taken out of any one project, I am reluctantly going along with the cut. I must warn my colleagues that the time has arrived that we must give some attention to the development of our vast resources yet undeveloped. When this war is over we must speed the development of our natural resources.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 2, beginning at line 7, the so-called Gary amendment to the Southeastern Power Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 4, line 1, the so-called Harris amendment to the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 5, line 16, the so-called Ford amendment to the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on page 6, beginning on line 25, on the so-called Pickett amendment to the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 15, beginning on line 10, known as the Wigglesworth amendment to the Bureau of Reclamation investigative funds.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment beginning on page 16, line 2, known as the Taber amendment to the Bureau of Reclamation construction fund.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment beginning on page 16, line 3, known as the Keating amendment to the Bureau of Reclamation with reference to wheeling contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 42, beginning on line 21, known as the Jensen amendment relative to filling vacancies.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 4, line 3, known as the Short amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, strike out lines 7 through 13, inclusive.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 248, nays 149, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—248

Aandahl	Anderson, Calif.	Ayres
Abernethy	Andresen,	Baker
Adair	August H.	Bakewell
Allen, Ill.	Andrews	Barden
Allen, La.	Arends	Bates, Ky.
Andersen,	Armstrong	Bates, Mass.
H. Carl	Auchincloss	Battle

Beall
Beamer
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Bow
Boykin
Bray
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Budge
Buffett
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carlyle
Case
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Crawford
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Deane
DeGraffenried
Denny
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Durham
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elston
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Forrester
Fugate
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Grant
Greenwood
Gross
Gwinn
Hale
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hall,
Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hedrick
Herlong
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Hunter
James
Jarman
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Jones,
Hamilton C.
Jones,
Woodrow W.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kennedy
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Lantaff
Latham
LeCompte
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McMillan
McMullen
McVey
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morton
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Hara
Ostertag
Passman
Patten
Patterson
Philbin
Pickett
Polk
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reams
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Roberts
Robeson
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Sasscer
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson,
Mich.
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Weichel
Werdel
Wharton
Wheeler
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Idaho

NAYS—149

Abbitt
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Beckworth
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Burdick
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooper
Crosser
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dollinger
Dorn
Doughton
Doyle
Eberharter
Engle
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gordon
Granahan
Granger
Green
Gregory
Hagen
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lesinski
Lind
McCarthy
McCormack
McGuire
McKinnon
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Marshall
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
O'Toole
Patman
Perkins
Phillips
Poage
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.
Rhodes
Riley
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Vinson
Welch
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Withrow
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—36

Bramblett
Brooks
Brownson
Chatham
Cole, N. Y.
Coudert
Curtis, Mo.
Dingell
Elliott
Gillette
Gore
Harden
Hébert
Hinshaw
Holifield
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.
Klein
Larcade
Mansfield
Meader
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Powell
Rains
Redden
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Vaughn
Watts
Whitaker
Widnall
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brownson for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Meader for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Redden against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Kee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Reed of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 1, after the comma, strike out "$3,925,000" and insert "$3,375,000."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 173, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—222

Aandahl
Abernethy
Adair
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Bakewell
Barden
Battle
Beall
Beamer
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Bow
Boykin
Bray
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Bryson
Budge
Buffett
Burnside
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carlyle
Case
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Corbett
Cotton
Crawford
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Denny
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Doughton
Durham
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elston
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Ford
Forrester
Fugate
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gavin
George
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Greenwood
Gross
Gwinn
Hale
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hall,
Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hedrick
Herlong
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Hunter
James
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Jones,
Hamilton C.
Jones,
Woodrow W.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kilburn
Lantaff
Latham
LeCompte
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McMillan
McMullen
McVey
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morton
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Hara
Ostertag
Passman
Patterson
Philbin
Phillips
Pickett
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Ribicoff
Riehlman
Robeson
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson,
Mich.
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Weichel
Werdel
Wharton
Wheeler
Whitten
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Idaho

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cox

NAYS—173

Abbitt
Addonizio
Albert
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bentsen
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Crosser
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dollinger
Dorn
Doyle
Eberharter
Engle
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gathings
Gordon
Gossett
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Hagen
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
Kirwan

Kluczynski	O'Brien, Mich.	Sasscer
Lane	O'Konski	Secrest
Lanham	O'Neill	Shelley
Lesinski	O'Toole	Sheppard
Lind	Patman	Sieminski
Lucas	Patten	Smith, Miss.
Lyle	Perkins	Spence
McCarthy	Poage	Staggers
McCormack	Polk	Steed
McGuire	Preston	Stigler
McKinnon	Price	Stockman
Machrowicz	Priest	Sutton
Mack, Ill.	Quinn	Thomas
Mack, Wash.	Rabaut	Thompson, Tex.
Madden	Ramsay	Thornberry
Magee	Rankin	Tollefson
Mahon	Reams	Trimble
Marshall	Reece, Tenn.	Vinson
Miller, Calif.	Regan	Walter
Mills	Rhodes	Welch
Mitchell	Richards	Wickersham
Morgan	Riley	Wier
Morris	Roberts	Willis
Morrison	Rodino	Wilson, Tex.
Moulder	Rogers, Colo.	Withrow
Multer	Rogers, Tex.	Yates
Murdock	Rooney	Yorty
Murphy	Roosevelt	Zablocki
O'Brien, Ill.	Sabath	

NOT VOTING—38

Bates, Mass.	Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Holifield	Powell
Brooks	Irving	Rains
Chatham	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Reed, N. Y.
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Curtis, Mo.	Kennedy	Vaughn
Dingell	Kersten, Wis.	Watts
Dolliver	King	Whitaker
Elliott	Klein	Widnall
Gillette	Larcade	Woodruff
Gore	Mansfield	
Hébert	Murray, Tenn.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Redden against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. King against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Lacade with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. SASSCER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project."

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to ask for a roll call on an amendment that passed unanimously and was accepted by the chairman of the subcommittee?

The SPEAKER. That makes no difference whatever. The gentleman has been here a long time.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 152, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—247

Aandahl	Fisher	Norblad
Abbitt	Ford	Norrell
Abernethy	Forrester	O'Hara
Adair	Fugate	Ostertag
Allen, Calif.	Fulton	Passman
Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Patten
Allen, La.	Gary	Patterson
Andersen, H. Carl	Gavin	Philbin
Anderson, Calif.	George	Phillips
Andresen, August H.	Golden	Pickett
Andrews	Goodwin	Polk
Arends	Gossett	Potter
Armstrong	Graham	Poulson
Auchincloss	Grant	Prouty
Ayres	Greenwood	Redwan
Baker	Gross	Reams
Bakewell	Gwinn	Reece, Tenn.
Barden	Hale	Reed, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Rees, Kans.
Battle	Hall, Leonard W.	Regan
Beall	Halleck	Ribicoff
Beamer	Hand	Richards
Belcher	Harden	Riehlman
Bender	Hardy	Riley
Bennett, Fla.	Harris	Robeson
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Mass.
Bentsen	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Tex.
Berry	Harvey	Sadlak
Betts	Herlong	St. George
Bishop	Herter	Sasscer
Blackney	Heselton	Saylor
Boggs, Del.	Hess	Schwabe
Boggs, La.	Hill	Scott, Hardie
Bolton	Hillings	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Bow	Hoeven	Scrivner
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	Scudder
Brehm	Hoffman, Mich.	Secrest
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Seely-Brown
Brownson	Hunter	Shafer
Bryson	James	Sheehan
Budge	Jenison	Short
Buffett	Jenkins	Sikes
Burleson	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Burton	Johnson	Simpson, Pa.
Busbey	Jonas	Sittler
Bush	Jones, Hamilton C.	Smith, Kans.
Butler	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Miss.
Byrnes, Wis.	Judd	Smith, Va.
Canfield	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Carlyle	Kearney	Springer
Case	Kearns	Stanley
Chenoweth	Keating	Stefan
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Taber
Church	Kilday	Tackett
Clevenger	Lantaff	Talle
Cole, Kans.	Larcade	Taylor
Colmer	Latham	Teague
Corbett	LeCompte	Thompson, Mich.
Cotton	Lovre	Thompson, Tex.
Cox	Lucas	Towe
Crawford	McConnell	Vail
Crumpacker	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Cunningham	McDonough	Van Zandt
Curtis, Nebr.	McGrath	Velde
Dague	McGregor	Vorys
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	McMullen	Walter
DeGraffenried	McVey	Weichel
Denny	Martin, Iowa	Werdel
Devereux	Martin, Mass.	Wharton
D'Ewart	Mason	Wheeler
Dolliver	Meader	Whitten
Dondero	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Donohue	Miller, Md.	Williams, Miss.
Donovan	Miller, Nebr.	Williams, N. Y.
Doughton	Miller, N. Y.	Willis
Durham	Morano	Wilson, Ind.
Eaton	Morton	Wilson, Tex.
Ellsworth	Mumma	Winstead
Elston	Nelson	Wolcott
Fallon	Nicholson	Wolverton
Fellows		Wood, Ga.
Fenton		Wood, Idaho

NAYS—152

Addonizio	Garmatz	Morgan
Albert	Gathings	Morris
Anfuso	Gordon	Morrison
Angell	Granahan	Moulder
Aspinall	Granger	Multer
Bailey	Green	Murdock
Baring	Gregory	Murphy
Barrett	Hagen	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Beckworth	Havenner	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hays, Ark.	O'Neill
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	O'Toole
Bonner	Hedrick	Patman
Bosone	Heffernan	Perkins
Breen	Heller	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Holmes	Preston
Buckley	Horan	Price
Burdick	Howell	Priest
Burnside	Huil	Quinn
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Rabaut
Camp	Jarman	Ramsay
Cannon	Javits	Rankin
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Roberts
Chelf	Karsten, Mo.	Rodino
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Colo.
Clemente	Kennedy	Rogers, Fla.
Combs	Keogh	Rooney
Cooley	Kerr	Roosevelt
Cooper	King	Sabath
Crosser	Kirwan	Shelley
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Dawson	Lane	Sieminski
Deane	Lanham	Spence
Delaney	Lesinski	Staggers
Dempsey	Lind	Steed
Denton	Lyle	Stigler
Dollinger	McCarthy	Stockman
Dorn	McCormack	Sutton
Doyle	McGuire	Thomas
Eberharter	McKinnon	Thornberry
Engle	Machrowicz	Tollefson
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Trimble
Feighan	Mack, Wash.	Welch
Fernandez	Madden	Wickersham
Fine	Magee	Wier
Flood	Mahon	Withrow
Fogarty	Marshall	Yates
Forand	Miller, Calif.	Yorty
Frazier	Mills	Zablocki
Furcolo	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—34

Boykin	Hinshaw	Rains
Bramblett	Holifield	Redden
Brooks	Irving	Reed, N. Y.
Chatham	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Vaughn
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Vinson
Curtis, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Watts
Dingell	Klein	Whitaker
Elliott	Mansfield	Widnall
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff
Gore	Murray, Wis.	
Hébert	Powell	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Bramblett.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Cole of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it does not relate to the merits. What is it?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I just want to say to my friend from New York that it occurred to me that in order to accommodate some Members who would like to leave we might have two more roll calls and finish the balance tomorrow.

In view of the apparent desire of the Members to continue, I withdraw the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 19, strike out "$67,500,000" and insert "$62,000,000."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 225, nays 167, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—225

Aandahl	Davis, Ga.	Jensen
Abbitt	Davis, Wis.	Jonas
Abernethy	Denny	Jones,
Adair	Devereux	Hamilton C.
Allen, Calif.	D'Ewart	Jones,
Allen, Ill.	Dolliver	Woodrow W.
Allen, La.	Dondero	Judd
Andersen,	Donovan	Kean
H. Carl	Doughton	Kearney
Anderson, Calif.	Eaton	Kearns
Andresen,	Elston	Keating
August H.	Fallon	Kennedy
Andrews	Fellows	Kilburn
Arends	Fenton	Kilday
Armstrong	Fisher	Latham
Auchincloss	Ford	LeCompte
Ayres	Forrester	Lind
Bakewell	Fugate	Lovre
Barden	Fulton	Lucas
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	McConnell
Battle	Garmatz	McCulloch
Beall	Gary	McDonough
Beamer	Gathings	McGrath
Belcher	Gavin	McGregor
Bender	George	McMillan
Bennett, Mich.	Golden	McVey
Berry	Goodwin	Martin, Iowa
Betts	Gossett	Martin, Mass.
Bishop	Graham	Mason
Blackney	Grant	Meader
Boggs, Del.	Greenwood	Merrow
Boggs, La.	Gross	Miller, Md.
Bolton	Gwinn	Miller, Nebr.
Bow	Hale	Miller, N. Y.
Boykin	Hall,	Morano
Bray	Edwin Arthur	Morton
Brehm	Hall,	Mumma
Brown, Ohio	Leonard W.	Nelson
Brownson	Halleck	Nicholson
Budge	Hand	O'Hara
Buffett	Harden	Ostertag
Burton	Hardy	Passman
Busbey	Harris	Patten
Bush	Harrison, Va.	Patterson
Butler	Harrison, Wyo.	Phillips
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey	Pickett
Carlyle	Herlong	Potter
Chenoweth	Herter	Poulson
Chiperfield	Heselton	Prouty
Church	Hess	Radwan
Clevenger	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, Kans.	Hillings	Reed, Ill.
Colmer	Hoeven	Rees, Kans.
Corbett	Hoffman, Ill.	Regan
Cotton	Hoffman, Mich.	Ribicoff
Crawford	Hope	Riehlman
Crumpacker	Hunter	Roberts
Cunningham	James	Robeson
Curtis, Nebr.	Jenison	Rogers, Tex.
Dague	Jenkins	Sadlak
St. George	Smith, Va.	Vorys
Sasscer	Smith, Wis.	Vursell
Saylor	Springer	Walter
Schwabe	Stanley	Weichel
Scott, Hardie	Stefan	Werdel
Scott,	Taber	Wharton
Hugh D., Jr.	Tackett	Wheeler
Scrivner	Talle	Wigglesworth
Scudder	Taylor	Williams, Miss.
Secrest	Teague	Williams, N. Y.
Seely-Brown	Thompson,	Wilson, Ind.
Shafer	Mich.	Wilson, Tex.
Sheehan	Thompson, Tex.	Winstead
Short	Towe	Wolcott
Simpson, Ill.	Vail	Wolverton
Simpson, Pa.	Van Pelt	Wood, Ga.
Sittler	Van Zandt	Wood, Idaho
Smith, Kans.	Velde	

NAYS—167

Addonizio	Fogarty	Moulder
Albert	Forand	Multer
Anfuso	Frazier	Murdock
Angell	Furcolo	Murphy
Aspinall	Gordon	Norblad
Bailey	Granahan	Norrell
Baker	Granger	O'Brien, Ill.
Baring	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Barrett	Gregory	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Hagen	O'Toole
Beckworth	Hart	Patman
Bennett, Fla.	Havenner	Perkins
Bentsen	Hays, Ark.	Philbin
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Bolling	Hedrick	Polk
Bonner	Heffernan	Preston
Bosone	Heller	Price
Breen	Holmes	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Horan	Quinn
Bryson	Howell	Rabaut
Buckley	Hull	Ramsay
Burdick	Jackson, Wash.	Rankin
Burleson	Jarman	Reams
Burnside	Javits	Rhodes
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson	Riley
Camp	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Cannon	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Carnahan	Kelly, N. Y.	Rooney
Case	Keogh	Roosevelt
Celler	Kerr	Sabath
Chelf	King	Shelley
Chudoff	Kirwan	Sheppard
Clemente	Kluczynski	Sieminski
Combs	Lane	Sikes
Cooley	Lanham	Smith, Miss.
Cooper	Lantaff	Spence
Crosser	Lesinski	Staggers
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Steed
Dawson	McCarthy	Stigler
Deane	McCormack	Stockman
DeGraffenried	McGuire	Sutton
Delaney	McKinnon	Thomas
Dempsey	McMullen	Thornberry
Denton	Machrowicz	Tollefson
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Trimble
Donohue	Mack, Wash.	Welch
Dorn	Madden	Whitten
Doyle	Mahon	Wickersham
Durham	Marshall	Wier
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Engle	Mills	Withrow
Evins	Mitchell	Yates
Fernandez	Morgan	Yorty
Fine	Morris	Zablocki
Flood	Morrison	

NOT VOTING—41

Bramblett	Hinshaw	Powell
Brooks	Holifield	Rains
Chatham	Irving	Redden
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Coudert	Kee	Richards
Cox	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Curtis, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Mass.
Dingell	Klein	Vaughn
Eberharter	Larcade	Vinson
Elliott	Magee	Watts
Feighan	Mansfield	Whitaker
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Widnall
Gore	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff
Hébert	O'Neill	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Feighan against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Magee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Brooks with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Bramblett.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs of Louisiana). The Clerk will report the next amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 25, strike out "$7,700,000" and insert "$6,900,000, of which $1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture conservation."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 249, nays 148, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—249

Abbitt	Clevenger	Hardy
Abernethy	Cole, Kans.	Harris
Adair	Colmer	Harrison, Va.
Allen, Calif.	Corbett	Harvey
Allen, Ill.	Cotton	Hedrick
Allen, La.	Cox	Herlong
Andersen,	Crawford	Herter
H. Carl	Crumpacker	Heselton
Anderson, Calif.	Cunningham	Hess
Andresen,	Curtis, Nebr.	Hillings
August H.	Dague	Hoeven
Andrews	Davis, Ga.	Hoffman, Ill.
Arends	Davis, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.
Armstrong	DeGraffenried	Hope
Auchincloss	Denny	Hunter
Ayres	Devereux	James
Baker	Dolliver	Jarman
Bakewell	Dondero	Jenison
Barden	Donohue	Jenkins
Bates, Mass.	Donovan	Jensen
Battle	Doughton	Jonas
Beall	Durham	Jones, Ala.
Beamer	Eaton	Jones,
Beckworth	Elston	Hamilton C.
Belcher	Evins	Jones,
Bender	Fallon	Woodrow W.
Bennett, Fla.	Fellows	Judd
Bennett, Mich.	Fenton	Kean
Betts	Fisher	Kearney
Bishop	Ford	Kearns
Blackney	Forrester	Keating
Boggs, Del.	Fugate	Kennedy
Boggs, La.	Fulton	Kilburn
Bolton	Gamble	Kilday
Bow	Garmatz	Lane
Boykin	Gary	Lantaff
Bray	Gathings	Larcade
Brehm	Gavin	Latham
Brown, Ohio	George	LeCompte
Brownson	Golden	Lind
Bryson	Goodwin	Lovre
Buffett	Gossett	Lucas
Burleson	Graham	Lyle
Burton	Grant	McConnell
Busbey	Gross	McCulloch
Bush	Gwinn	McDonough
Butler	Hale	McGregor
Byrnes, Wis.	Hall,	McMillan
Canfield	Edwin Arthur	McMullen
Carlyle	Hall,	McVey
Case	Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa
Chelf	Halleck	Martin, Mass.
Chiperfield	Hand	Mason
Church	Harden	Meader

Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morton
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Hara
Ostertag
Passman
Patterson
Philbin
Phillips
Pickett
Poage
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Robeson
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Sasscer
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Weichel
Wharton
Wheeler
Whitten
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Idaho

NAYS—148

Aandahl
Addonizio
Albert
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Bentsen
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Budge
Burdick
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chenoweth
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Crosser
Dawson
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollinger
Dorn
Doyle
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Engle
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Furcolo
Gordon
Granahan
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gregory
Hagen
Harrison, Wyo.
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Hill
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lanham
Lesinski
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Marshall
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Toole
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rankin
Rhodes
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Spence
Staggers
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Tollefson
Trimble
Welch
Wickersham
Wier
Withrow
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—36

Bramblett
Brooks
Chatham
Cole, N. Y.
Coudert
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Elliott
Gillette
Gore
Hébert
Hinshaw
Holifield
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.
Klein
Mansfield
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
O'Neill
Powell
Rains
Redden
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Vaughn
Vinson
Watts
Whitaker
Widnall
Williams, N. Y.
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr Kee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Bramblett.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 10, after the word "expended", strike out "$5,000,000, of which $4,265,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000, of which $3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 2, strike out "$207,190,000" and insert "$197,000,000."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. On that amendment, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 237, nays 160, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—237

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Barden
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beamer
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Boykin
Bray
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Bryson
Buffett
Burleson
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carlyle
Case
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Crawford
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Denny
Devereux
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Doughton
Durham
Elston
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fugate
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Grant
Gross
Gwinn
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hedrick
Herlong
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
James
Jarman
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Hamilton C.
Jones, Woodrow W.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kennedy
Kilburn
Kilday
Lane
Lantaff
Latham
LeCompte
Lind
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillan
McMullen
McVey
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Morano
Morton
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara
Ostertag
Passman
Patterson
Philbin
Phillips
Pickett
Poage
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Robeson
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Sasscer
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Weichel
Wharton
Wheeler
Whitten
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Idaho

NAYS—160

Aandahl
Addonizio
Albert
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Bakewell
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Budge
Burdick
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Crosser
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollinger
Dorn
Doyle
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Flood
Forand
Frazier
Furcolo
Gordon
Granahan
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gregory
Hagen
Harrison, Wyo.
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Hill
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Hull
Hunter
Jackson, Wash.
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lanham
Lesinski
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Marshall
Miller, Calif.
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
O'Toole
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rankin
Regan
Rhodes
Riley
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Thomas
Tollefson
Trimble
Welch
Werdel
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Withrow
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—36

Bramblett
Brooks
Chatham
Cole, N. Y.
Coudert
Curtis, Mo.
Dingell
Eaton
Elliott
Gillette
Gore
Hébert
Hinshaw
Holifield
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.

Kersten, Wis.	Powell	Vinson
Klein	Rains	Watts
Larcade	Redden	Whitaker
Mansfield	Reed, N. Y.	Widnall
Murray, Tenn.	Rivers	Williams, N. Y.
Murray, Wis.	Vaughn	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Kee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Bramblett.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. WERDEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will record the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 3, strike out the period and insert "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 165, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—226

Abbitt	Bolton	Crawford
Abernethy	Bonner	Crumpacker
Adair	Bow	Cunningham
Allen, Calif.	Boykin	Curtis, Nebr.
Allen, Ill.	Bray	Dague
Allen, La.	Brehm	Davis, Ga.
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Davis, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Brownson	Denny
	Bryson	Devereux
Andrews	Budge	D'Ewart
Arends	Buffett	Dondero
Armstrong	Burleson	Donohue
Auchincloss	Burnside	Donovan
Ayres	Burton	Doughton
Baker	Busbey	Durham
Bakewell	Bush	Ellsworth
Barden	Butler	Elston
Bates, Mass.	Byrnes, Wis.	Fallon
Battle	Canfield	Fellows
Beall	Carlyle	Fenton
Beamer	Chenoweth	Fisher
Belcher	Chiperfield	Ford
Bender	Church	Fugate
Bennett, Fla.	Clevenger	Fulton
Betts	Cole, Kans.	Gamble
Bishop	Colmer	Gary
Blackney	Corbett	Gathings
Boggs, Del.	Cotton	Gavin
Boggs, La.	Cox	George
Golden	McConnell	Scott, Hardie
Goodwin	McCulloch	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gossett	McDonough	
Graham	McGrath	Scrivner
Grant	McGregor	Scudder
Gwinn	McMillan	Secrest
Hale	McMullen	Seely-Brown
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McVey	Shafer
	Martin, Iowa	Sheehan
Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Mass.	Sheppard
	Mason	Short
Hand	Meader	Sikes
Harden	Merrow	Simpson, Ill.
Hardy	Miller, Md.	Simpson, Pa.
Harris	Miller, Nebr.	Sittler
Harrison, Va.	Miller, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.
Harrison, Wyo.	Morano	Smith, Va.
Harvey	Morton	Smith, Wis.
Hedrick	Mumma	Springer
Herlong	Nelson	Stanley
Herter	Nicholson	Stefan
Heselton	Norrell	Taber
Hess	Ostertag	Tackett
Hill	Passman	Taylor
Hillings	Patterson	Teague
Hoffman, Ill.	Philbin	Thompson, Mich.
Hoffman, Mich.	Phillips	
Hope	Pickett	Towe
Hunter	Polk	Vail
James	Potter	Van Pelt
Jarman	Poulson	Van Zandt
Jenison	Prouty	Velde
Jenkins	Radwan	Vorys
Jensen	Reams	Vursell
Jonas	Reece, Tenn.	Walter
Jones, Hamilton C.	Reed, Ill.	Weichel
	Rees, Kans.	Werdel
Jones, Woodrow W.	Regan	Wharton
	Richards	Wheeler
Judd	Riehlman	Wigglesworth
Kean	Robeson	Williams, Miss.
Kearney	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
Kearns	Rogers, Fla.	Wilson, Ind.
Keating	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson, Tex.
Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.	Wolcott
Kilday	Sadlak	Wolverton
Lantaff	St. George	Wood, Ga.
Latham	Saylor	Wood, Idaho
Lucas	Schwabe	

NAYS—165

Aandahl	Fine	Mack, Ill.
Addonizio	Flood	Mack, Wash.
Albert	Fogarty	Madden
Andersen, H. Carl	Forand	Mahon
	Frazier	Marshall
Anfuso	Furcolo	Miller, Calif.
Angell	Garmatz	Mills
Aspinall	Gordon	Mitchell
Bailey	Granahan	Morgan
Baring	Granger	Morris
Barrett	Green	Morrison
Bates, Ky.	Greenwood	Moulder
Beckworth	Gregory	Multer
Bennett, Mich.	Gross	Murdock
Bentsen	Hagen	Norblad
Berry	Hart	O'Brien, Ill.
Blatnik	Havenner	O'Brien, Mich.
Bolling	Hays, Ark.	O'Hara
Bosone	Hays, Ohio	O'Konski
Breen	Heffernan	O'Neill
Brown, Ga.	Heller	O'Toole
Buckley	Hoeven	Patman
Burdick	Holmes	Patten
Byrne, N. Y.	Horan	Perkins
Camp	Howell	Poage
Cannon	Hull	Preston
Carnahan	Jackson, Wash.	Price
Celler	Javits	Priest
Chelf	Johnson	Quinn
Chudoff	Jones, Ala.	Rabaut
Clemente	Jones, Mo.	Ramsay
Combs	Karsten, Mo.	Rankin
Cooley	Kelly, N. Y.	Rhodes
Cooper	Kennedy	Riley
Crosser	Keogh	Roberts
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Rodino
Dawson	King	Rooney
Deane	Kirwan	Roosevelt
DeGraffenried	Kluczynski	Sabath
Delaney	Lane	Sasscer
Dempsey	Lanham	Shelley
Denton	LeCompte	Sieminski
Dollinger	Lesinski	Smith, Miss.
Dolliver	Lind	Spence
Dorn	Lovre	Staggers
Doyle	Lyle	Steed
Eberharter	McCarthy	Stigler
Engle	McCormack	Stockman
Evins	McGuire	Sutton
Feighan	McKinnon	Talle
Fernandez	Machrowicz	Thomas
Thompson, Tex.	Whitten	Yates
Thornberry	Wickersham	Yorty
Tollefson	Wier	Zablocki
Trimble	Winstead	
Welch	Withrow	

NOT VOTING—42

Bramblett	Hébert	Murray, Wis.
Brooks	Hinshaw	Powell
Case	Holifield	Rains
Chatham	Irving	Redden
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Coudert	Kee	Ribicoff
Curtis, Mo.	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Dingell	Kersten, Wis.	Vaughn
Eaton	Klein	Vinson
Elliott	Larcade	Watts
Forrester	Magee	Whitaker
Gillette	Mansfield	Widnall
Gore	Murphy	Williams, N. Y.
Halleck	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Magee against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Kee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Case.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Bramblett.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, after line 21, insert a new section, as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies and school teachers in the Indian Service;

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(f) to law-enforcement officers;

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this bill shall, as a result of the operation of this amendment, reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply and said 80-percent figure shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1952 and if ex-

ceeded at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (interrupting reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the Jensen amendment?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 169, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—224

Aandahl	Crawford	Jarman
Abbitt	Crumpacker	Jenison
Abernethy	Cunningham	Jenkins
Adair	Curtis, Nebr.	Jensen
Allen, Calif.	Dague	Johnson
Allen, Ill.	Davis, Ga.	Jonas
Andersen, H. Carl	Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Woodrow W.
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Judd
Andresen, August H.	Denny	Kean
Andrews	Devereux	Kearney
Angell	D'Ewart	Kearns
Arends	Dolliver	Keating
Armstrong	Dondero	Kennedy
Auchincloss	Donovan	Kilburn
Ayres	Doughton	Kilday
Baker	Ellsworth	Lanham
Bakewell	Elston	Larcade
Barden	Evins	Latham
Bates, Mass.	Fallon	LeCompte
Battle	Fellows	Lovre
Beall	Fenton	McConnell
Bearner	Fisher	McCulloch
Belcher	Ford	McDonough
Bender	Frazier	McGregor
Bennett, Mich.	Fugate	McMillan
Berry	Fulton	McVey
Betts	Gamble	Mack, Wash.
Bishop	Gathings	Martin, Iowa
Blackney	Gavin	Martin, Mass.
Boggs, Del.	George	Mason
Bolton	Golden	Meader
Bow	Goodwin	Merrow
Boykin	Gossett	Miller, Md.
Bray	Graham	Miller, Nebr.
Brehm	Gross	Miller, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Gwinn	Mills
Brownson	Hagen	Morano
Bryson	Hale	Morton
Budge	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mumma
Buffett	Hall, Leonard W.	Nelson
Burleson	Hand	Nicholson
Burton	Harden	Norblad
Busbey	Harris	O'Hara
Bush	Harrison, Va.	Ostertag
Butler	Harrison, Wyo.	Patterson
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey	Phillips
Canfield	Herter	Pickett
Carlyle	Heselton	Potter
Case	Hess	Poulson
Chelf	Hill	Prouty
Chiperfield	Hillings	Radwan
Church	Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.
Clevenger	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rees, Kans.
Colmer	Holmes	Regan
Cooper	Hope	Ribicoff
Corbett	Horan	Richards
Cotton	Hunter	Riehlman
Cox	James	Rogers, Mass.
Crawford	Jarman	Sadlak
Crumpacker	Jenison	St. George
Cunningham	Jenkins	Saylor
Curtis, Nebr.	Jensen	Schwabe
Dague	Johnson	Scott, Hardie
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Woodrow W.	Scrivner
Davis, Wis.	Judd	Scudder
Denny	Kean	Seely-Brown
Devereux	Kearney	Shafer
D'Ewart	Kearns	Sheehan
Dolliver	Keating	Short
Dondero	Kennedy	Simpson, Ill.
Donovan	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Doughton	Kilday	Sittler
Ellsworth	Lanham	Smith, Kans.
Elston	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Evins	Latham	
Fallon	LeCompte	
Fellows	Lovre	
Fenton	McConnell	
Fisher	McCulloch	
Ford	McDonough	
Frazier	McGregor	
Fugate	McMillan	
Fulton	McVey	
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	
Gathings	Martin, Iowa	
Gavin	Martin, Mass.	
George	Mason	
Golden	Meader	
Goodwin	Merrow	
Gossett	Miller, Md.	
Graham	Miller, Nebr.	
Gross	Miller, N. Y.	
Gwinn	Mills	
Hagen	Morano	
Hale	Morton	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mumma	
Hall, Leonard W.	Nelson	
Hand	Nicholson	
Harden	Norblad	
Harris	O'Hara	
Harrison, Va.	Ostertag	
Harrison, Wyo.	Patterson	
Harvey	Phillips	
Herter	Pickett	
Heselton	Potter	
Hess	Poulson	
Hill	Prouty	
Hillings	Radwan	
Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.	
Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.	
Hoffman, Mich.	Rees, Kans.	
Holmes	Regan	
Hope	Ribicoff	
Horan	Richards	
Hunter	Riehlman	
James	Rogers, Mass.	
Jarman	Sadlak	
Jenison	St. George	
Jenkins	Saylor	
Jensen	Schwabe	
Johnson	Scott, Hardie	
Jonas	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	
Jones, Woodrow W.	Scrivner	
Judd	Scudder	
Kean	Seely-Brown	
Kearney	Shafer	
Kearns	Sheehan	
Keating	Short	
Kennedy	Simpson, Ill.	
Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.	
Kilday	Sittler	
Lanham	Smith, Kans.	
Larcade	Smith, Va.	
Latham	Smith, Wis.	Velde
LeCompte	Springer	Vorys
Lovre	Stanley	Vursell
McConnell	Stefan	Weichel
McCulloch	Sutton	Werdel
McDonough	Taber	Wharton
McGregor	Talle	Wheeler
McMillan	Taylor	Wigglesworth
McVey	Teague	Williams, Miss.
Mack, Wash.	Thompson, Mich.	Wilson, Ind.
Martin, Iowa	Tollefson	Wilson, Tex.
Martin, Mass.	Towe	Winstead
Mason	Vail	Wolcott
Meader	Van Pelt	Wolverton
Merrow	Van Zandt	Wood, Ga.
Miller, Md.		Wood, Idaho

NAYS—169

Addonizio	Grant	O'Brien, Mich.
Albert	Green	O'Konski
Allen, La.	Greenwood	O'Neill
Anfuso	Gregory	O'Toole
Aspinall	Hardy	Passman
Bailey	Hart	Patman
Baring	Havenner	Patten
Barrett	Hays, Ark.	Perkins
Bates, Ky.	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Beckworth	Hedrick	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Heffernan	Polk
Bentsen	Heller	Preston
Blatnik	Herlong	Price
Boggs, La.	Howell	Priest
Bolling	Hull	Quinn
Bonner	Jackson, Wash.	Rabaut
Bosone	Javits	Ramsay
Breen	Jones, Ala.	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Reams
Buckley	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rhodes
Burdick	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Burnside	Kelly, N. Y.	Roberts
Byrne, N. Y.	Keogh	Robeson
Camp	Kerr	Rodino
Cannon	Kilday	Rogers, Colo.
Carnahan	King	Rogers, Fla.
Celler	Kirwan	Rooney
Chudoff	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Clemente	Lane	Sabath
Combs	Lantaff	Sasscer
Cooley	Lesinski	Secrest
Crosser	Lind	Shelley
Dawson	Lucas	Sheppard
Deane	Lyle	Sieminski
DeGraffenried	McCarthy	Sikes
Delaney	McCormack	Smith, Miss.
Dempsey	McGrath	Spence
Denton	McGuire	Staggers
Dollinger	McKinnon	Steed
Donohue	McMullen	Stigler
Dorn	Machrowicz	Stockman
Doyle	Mack, Ill.	Tackett
Durham	Madden	Thomas
Eberharter	Magee	Thompson, Tex.
Engle	Mahon	Thornberry
Feighan	Marshall	Trimble
Fernandez	Miller, Calif.	Walter
Fine	Mitchell	Welch
Flood	Morgan	Whitten
Fogarty	Morris	Wickersham
Forand	Morrison	Wier
Furcolo	Moulder	Willis
Garmatz	Multer	Withrow
Gary	Norrell	Yates
Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.	Yorty
Granahan		Zablocki
Granger		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Chenoweth

NOT VOTING—39

Brambiett	Hébert	Powell
Brooks	Hinshaw	Rains
Chatham	Holifield	Redden
Cole, N. Y.	Irving	Reed, N. Y.
Coudert	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Curtis, Mo.	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Dingell	Kelley, Pa.	Vaughn
Eaton	Kersten, Wis.	Vinson
Elliott	Klein	Watts
Forrester	Mansfield	Whitaker
Gillette	Murphy	Widnall
Gore	Murray, Tenn.	Williams, N. Y.
Halleck	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Brambiett.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR'S SPEECH

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the great interest in the speech of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, that it may be ordered printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentlewoman from Massachusetts should refer that to the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill for that purpose, but I had hoped we could get it done by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not like to start doing things like that; it is

very unusual. We do have a Joint Committee on Printing.

The Chair cannot entertain the request.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered.

TELEVISING CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, is the Speaker inclined to recognize Members to address the House for 1 minute at this point?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would advise the gentleman from New York that there is more than an hour of special orders on the calendar, in which the gentleman from New York himself has 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Just as the Speaker says, I have a special order, but I can say what I want to say in 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman desires to take the minute instead, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my special order be canceled.

Mr. Speaker, I am today placing on the Speaker's desk, available for signature by Members, a discharge petition for House Resolution 62—discharge petition No. 3—to provide for televising and broadcasting important debates in the House of Representatives.

The Rules Committee does not now look with favor upon this bill, although it carefully leaves full control over such televising and broadcasting to the Speaker. I am not criticizing the Rules Committee as I can fully appreciate the sincerity of the reservations which members of that committee expressed at the hearing on this bill. It seems to me, however, that the public demand for it is so great—the latest Gallup poll finds that 70 percent of the people want Congress televised—and our need for interesting the people in government so vital considering the world situation—as to require an extension of the public galleries of the House of Representatives to include every living room in the country when important matters are up for debate.

The televised debates of the UN Security Council and the disclosures on links between the underworld and Government officials so forcibly brought out on television by the Senate Crime Investigating Committee have had an impact on our people which cannot be denied. I have no doubt that the march of progress will in due course result in the televising and broadcasting of important House debates—the principal broadcasters have already assured adequate coverage—but if the people want it now it is they who will have to demand it. The discharge petition makes this opportunity available.

The text of the resolution follows:

House Resolution 62

Resolution to amend rule XXXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for televising and broadcasting of sessions of the House of Representatives

Resolved, That the paragraph numbered 3 of rule XXXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"3. Such portion of the gallery of the House of Representatives as may be necessary to accommodate reporters of news to be disseminated by television, radio, wireless, and similar methods of transmission wishing to report debates and proceedings and to broadcast and televise the same, shall be set aside for their use, and reputable reporters thus engaged shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe; and the supervision of such gallery, including the designation of its employees, shall be vested in a standing committee of television and radio reporters, subject to the direction and control of the Speaker; and the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one representative of the National Broadcasting Co., one representative of the American Broadcasting Co., one representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System, one representative of the Mutual Broadcasting System, one representative of the DuMont Television Network, and one representative of the Transradio Press Service, and one representative each of such other radio or television broadcasters as the Speaker may from time to time consider to be appropriate in the interests of the adequate coverage of debates and proceedings in accordance with this paragraph."

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE REPUBLICANS MUST LEAD THE WAY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I made a speech on the floor of the House in which I discussed the financial situation of our country. At that time I cited the great problems of our day arising from the extravagance of the Federal Government despite the threat of war. I made five points in that talk which I might well summarize. These were:

First. In the absence of a continuing determination to economize and the lack of leadership in compelling the hodgepodge of bureaus, departments and agencies to cooperate, the Federal Government is spending entirely too much money. We Republicans with the help of a number of Democrats saved about $30,000,000 today by striking out exorbitant amounts from the appropriations bill.

Second. Too much money and property is being given away.

Third. Too much Federal money, extracted from taxpayers, is being loaned too freely.

Fourth. The Federal Government itself is guilty of creating inflation although it piously preaches against it.

Fifth. Great savings can be made by eliminating wasteful practices in all branches of the military services without impairing any of their effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss my first point. Many a government has been wrecked on the shoals of loose fiscal policies. We can and must remedy this situation.

The President, as head of the executive department of the Government can save more money than any man in the Government and he can spend more money than any man in the Government. In spite of his claims that he wishes to economize he is the most reckless spender of any of our Presidents. A glance at the expenditures made for his personal use will show that he is not thrifty. If President Truman would give up his palatial political yacht he would save hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. Just a few days ago he ordered $881,000 to be set aside to construct a bombproof shelter in connection with the White House which has cost several millions dollars in repairs the past two years. There is a widespread belief that as long as such a large number of pinks and reds are kept in Federal service in Washington there is little danger that the Russians would bomb it.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago Congress set up a new governmental department the purpose of which was to study and limit Government expenses and suggest economies. I refer to the Bureau of the Budget. This bureau was set up in 1921 and its purpose is expressed in its preamble as follows:

> The Bureau, when directed by the President, shall make a detailed study of the departments and establishments for the purpose of enabling the President to determine what changes (with a view of securing greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public service) should be made in (1) the existing organization, activities, and methods of business of such departments or establishments; (2) the appropriations therefore; (3) the assignment of particular activities to a particular services; or (4) the regrouping of services.

The Bureau of the Budget has become absolutely an arm of the Executive in every respect. This Department started with a few employees but today it has a personnel of 505 persons who draw salaries in the amount of $3,059,500 a year and which costs the Government a total of $3,332,231 a year.

But what are we getting for these expenditures? Certainly not economy and efficiency. Even before the Hoover Commission began its tremendous task, we knew there was great waste, duplication, and inefficiency in the conduct of the Government. Then 2 years ago that Commission submitted its reports and proved that the situation was actually much worse than many of us had suspected. With these reports citing so many examples of inefficiency it was hoped the Budget Bureau would finally get down to its job of securing economy and greater efficiency in the conduct of the public service. That the Bureau has not done this job, even with the Hoover reports to guide it, was made clear last fall by the Williams subcommittee investigation of employee utilization in the executive agencies. Overstaffing and waste were still found to be

so bad that the committee was forced to conclude that the executive agencies could do a better job with fewer employees. About 1,000 new employees are added to the rolls every day.

The legislative department of the Government cannot escape its share of the responsibility to practice economy. When our forefathers set up our Government they thought they were making the legislative branch of the Government the most powerful branch, for it is the people's branch. But the Congress, on many occasions, has failed to defend its rights. The executive branch in the past 20 years has invaded the authority and the jurisdiction of Congress in many ways.

Under the Constitution not one single dollar of Federal money can be spent without the sanction of law. And all laws controlling the activities of the Government are passed by Congress. The most important power granted by the Constitution to Congress is the power to control the purse strings. All bills for raising revenue, under the Constitution, must be originated in the House of Representatives. And not one dollar of Federal money can be lawfully spent until after the House and Senate have collected the money and appropriated it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we, the Members of the Congress, the House and the Senate, must do our part. We must be careful with making appropriations. We must be able to say "No." I concede that it is often difficult for the Appropriations Committee of the House to know just what appropriations are necessary. Still, our attitude must be challenging because the executive branch is too often lax.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this matter of cutting down the expenses of Government so that the Government will not spend too much money is a job that must be participated in by all the money-spending functions of the Government. It will not be accomplished unless every tax-spending agency and every person having control over public funds realizes that a public office is a public trust.

When the Republicans were returned to power in the Eightieth Congress in 1946, we were able to balance the budget for the first time since Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected as President in 1932. The Eightieth Congress reduced the national debt by $9,000,000,000, and it cut down Government expenses by about the same amount.

Now let us see in a little more detail how well the Eightieth Congress did in holding down spending, in spite of an uncooperative administration. A comparison of 1948 expenditures with the amounts the President wants to spend in 1952 tells the story. In 1948 the Federal Government cost the American taxpayers $33,800,000,000. Now Mr. Truman wants to charge them $71,600,000,000 for Government in 1952, or a 112-percent increase. It is true that much of the increase is for national defense, but not all of it, by any means. The cost of practically every department and agency is far higher than in 1948, when Government services certainly were adequate.

In 1948 the State Department spent $154,000,000; now they want to spend $302,000,000—just twice as much as in 1948.

The Department of Labor got along with $86,000,000 in 1948, but wants to spend $221,000,000 in 1952—over 150-percent increase.

The Federal Security Agency spent $937,000,000 in 1948; wants $2,154,000,000 in 1952—about 130-percent increase.

Interior Department spending was $350,000,000 in 1948; now asks for $610,000,000—about a 75-percent increase.

The Corps of Engineers spent $384,000,000 on civil works in 1948, and now asks for $629,000,000—an increase of 64 percent.

It cost $13,000,000 to operate the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1948, as compared to $39,000,000 in 1952—just 200 percent more than in 1948.

Agriculture Department programs were operated for $985,000,000 in 1948, and the farmers did well; but in 1952 that Department plans to spend $1,384,000,000, or 40-percent more than in 1948.

That is the picture. What the Republican Eightieth Congress did in holding down spending could be done by the Truman administration in 1952, if it were only inclined to save.

The Federal Government is deep in debt—it owes about $260,000,000,000—that means about $7,000 for every family in the United States. What's more, Uncle Sam does not spend his own money—he spends the people's money—money he takes from them in taxes or borrows from them through the sale of Government bonds. And most important of all right now, is that he needs money to defend this Nation from the threat of Communist aggression, and we should not be giving our money away.

President Truman in the first few days of this session of Congress demanded that the Ways and Means Committee proceed immediately to collect $10,000,000,000 more in taxes. He said in effect that this would be the first bite and that he would want a second bite of six billion one hundred million soon thereafter. The Ways and Means Committee did not scare, but proceeded to look into the matter. It is still looking and will continue to look for some time yet. In the meantime the President through the Secretary of the Treasury has indicated that he can get along on the ten billion. My prediction is that the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress will give him not more than six billion. If I have my way we will hold it down to five billion.

A number of years ago a movement was started in the Ways and Means Committee to cut down on nonessential expenditures. The committee did not press its program and soon thereafter the Congress took it up and set up a committee now known as the Byrd committee. This committee has done fine work in pointing out nonessential expenditures.

We are often asked, "Where are the nonessentials?" The President of the United States, instead of cooperating with the Congress to search out excessive spending and trim this defense budget down to the very essentials of Government, has dared us to find reducible areas in his huge $71,600,000,000 spending program. I, for one, shall be happy to accept that dare. In a series of short speeches which I expect to make in the near future I shall be happy to point out large areas of Federal spending that are not necessary for defense or essential for the normal operations of Government.

And I should be very pleased if the President, who claims to realize the vital need for cutting out the frills and the waste of Government spending, would then join me and other Members on both sides of the aisle in making some real savings. It is imperative that we economize and that we do it now.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 25 minutes.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE LOYALTY PROGRAM

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, nearly every day we read or hear about Communists in the Government service, yet Members of Congress seem to be unable to do anything about it.

On March 21, 1947, President Truman issued an executive order proscribing procedures for the administration of an employee loyalty program in the executive branch of the Government. By that Executive order the President placed the loyalty program under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service Commission designated and appointed Seth W. Richardson as Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, with full authority to administer the employee loyalty program as outlined in the Executive order.

Each year since the Civil Service Commission has appeared before Congress and has asked for and received millions of dollars for the operation of this program.

The effectiveness of the loyalty program, as authorized by the Executive order, was doomed to failure from the very start. The reason should have been obvious to most anyone. Part V, paragraph 1 of the Executive order provided:

> The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person is disloyal to the Government of the United States.

For nearly 4 years Seth W. Richardson operated the Loyalty Review Board and administered a so-called loyalty program with never a determined effort to have those unreasonable and restricted standards amended.

For his adherence to blind authority, Mr. Richardson was elevated to the

chairmanship of the Subversive Activities Control Board, created under the McCarran Act.

On February 12 of this year, in a speech on the floor of the House, I suggested that the Loyalty Review Board demand a change in the standards under which they were forced to operate.

The newspapers of February 14 carried news items to the effect that the Loyalty Review Board, under the guidance of its new chairman, Hiram W. Bingham, by a majority vote, recommended that the standards set out in the executive order be changed from "is disloyal" to "reasonable doubt as to loyalty."

On April 28, 1951, the President amended paragraph 1, part V, of Executive Order No. 9835 to read as follows:

1. The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, there is a reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the person involved to the Government of the United States.

The press release from the White House says that the Executive order was amended on the recommendations of the United States Civil Service Commission. A letter from the chairman of the Civil Service Commission was incorporated in the press release and I would like to insert that letter at this point.

The text of the letter of recommendation from the Commission follows:

APRIL 16, 1951.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Reference is made to the letter dated February 20, 1951, from the honorable Harry B. Mitchell, former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, transmitting a letter dated February 15, 1951, from the Honorable Hiram Bingham, Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, wherein it recites that the Loyalty Review Board adopted a resolution at its meeting on February 13, 1951, directing the Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board to transmit to the Civil Service Commission for submission to the President of the United States a copy of the resolution amending the standard in Executive Order 9835 to read as follows:

"The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, there is a reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the Government of the United States."

The Civil Service Commission is informed that this matter was referred to the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights for consideration. The Civil Service Commission is now informed that the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights has adjourned pending action by the Congress on a proposed enactment to relieve the Members of the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights from the sections of the Criminal Code which prohibit the prosecution of claims against the Government by an employee of the Government.

I am further informed that the matter of relief to the members of the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights is now before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and, in all likelihood, it will be some time before this matter is considered by the Judiciary Committee.

Subsequent to the referral of the matter to the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, Senator HOMER FERGUSON has proposed an amendment to section 9A of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities, 1939," commonly known as the Hatch Act, in the exact language of the resolution adopted by the Loyalty Review Board recommending a change in Executive Order 9835.

Backlogs are being created in the agency and regional loyalty boards due to the increased employment in Government and the high rate of turn-over caused by the establishment of new agencies in the Government and also to the fact that many of the lower boards are looking forward to and are anticipating early action on the resolution of the Loyalty Review Board amending the standard in Executive Order 9835.

The present increased employment and turn-over in Federal service and the apparent effect the wide publicity of the proposed change has had upon the lower boards in delaying the decisions on individual cases, and the unfortunate situation in which the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights finds itself causes me to write and ask you to act upon the recommendation made by the Loyalty Review Board in accordance with part III, section 1c (4) of Executive Order 9835.

The Civil Service Commissioners believe that the best interests of the Government would be served by an immediate change in Executive Order 9835, adopting the standard proposed by the Loyalty Review Board, and so recommends.

I have the honor to be,
Respectfully yours,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, here is an excellent example of the ability of Mr. Hiram W. Bingham, Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, and Mr. Robert Ramspeck, the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, to see within a few weeks what Seth Richardson and the retired Chairman of the Civil Service Commission could not see in nearly 4 years.

Now that a majority of the Loyalty Review Board and the Civil Service Commission have agreed on the necessity of a change in the standards, it should be apparent to them that their first job is to get rid of those members of the Loyalty Review Board who opposed a change in the standards. The people and the Congress will not have confidence in those who favored a program that has proven to be a dismal failure.

If the Civil Service Commission will replace those obstructionists with persons of clean record who will dedicate themselves to the job of ridding the Government of questionable employees, we may see the unearthing of more Remington cases.

Mr. Speaker, the first man who should be dismissed under this amended directive should be John Stewart Service of the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, let us not deceive ourselves about John Stewart Service. It is a waste of time to repeat here all the information that has been brought to light in his case, but his connection with the now infamous Amerasia case is sufficient, in my mind, to raise a doubt as to his loyalty.

Accepting the word of his attorney as true, that there have been five different investigations of Service, the present one makes the sixth. According to the old adage, where there is so much smoke there must be some fire. In any event, I am anxiously awaiting the outcome of the present investigation of Service when the standard of reasonable doubt is applied.

It is a disgrace that the President waited over 4 years before amending his Executive order, because Communists and pro-Communists have been permitted to remain in the employment of the Federal Government. I predict a great exodus of disloyal pro-Communist sympathizers from Government, and John Stewart Service should be fired before he has a chance to resign. Service was one of the names in Senator MCCARTHY's list which the Tydings whitewash committee cleared.

Another question that remains to be answered is what action will the Loyalty Review Board take in those other Remington cases; that is, the cases of employees rated ineligible by the employing agencies under the old standard only to be reversed by the Richardson Board. If there is any doubt in the minds of any Members of Congress as to the actual existence of such cases, here is a list by agencies:

Post Office Department	39
Navy Department	12
Veterans' Administration	7
Department of Labor	2
War Assets Administration	2
Department of the Army	1
Federal Power Commission	1
Department of Commerce	1
Total	65

Sixty-five potential Remingtons. It remains to be seen what Mr. Bingham and Mr. Ramspeck will do about these cases. Unless immediate action is taken on these cases I intend to bring the matter before Congress, at which time I will identify each and every one of the 65.

In conclusion, I want to congratulate Mr. Bingham and Mr. Ramspeck for the wonderful job they have done in the short period of time they have held office.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE BATTLE OVER LOYALTY

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 6, of this year I spoke on the floor of the House on the subject of the Government employee loyalty program. At that time I included an article by Mr. Walter S. Steele that appeared in the March issue of the National Republic. The April issue of that publication contains another article by Mr. Steele entitled "The Battle Over Loyalty." I am going to insert the article at the end of this discourse and I urge every Member of Congress to devote a little time to a reading and study of the subject matter. To me the revelations in the article were astounding.

The amazing situation is presented where members of the Loyalty Review Board are placed in the position of passing on the loyalty of people when the question of loyalty arises out of the fact that the person was affiliated with an organization to which the Loyalty Board member also belonged.

I began to wonder what was the purpose of the Civil Service Commission in appointing persons to the Loyalty Review Board who had a record of affiliation with any questionable organization. I would think that members of the Loy-

alty Review Board should be like Caesar's wife, "free from suspicion."

Finally I decided that the answer should properly come from the Civil Service Commission and I reviewed the reports of the House Committee on Appropriations in an effort to solve my problem.

Here is what I found. One of the Civil Service Commissioners, appearing before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on January 14, 1948, said:

> The Executive order provided that this Board should be made up of not fewer than three employees of the Civil Service Commission. The Commission was given the responsibility of appointing that Board. It realized immediately that that Board was right at the very heart of this whole program and that the program could succeed or fail on the basis of the kind of a Board that we actually appointed.

When I think of the Remington, Hiss, and Coplon cases and when I read the Presidential directives that deny committees of Congress access to the records of the Loyalty Review Board, I reach the inescapable conclusion that the Civil Service Commission never intended to administer a real, honest-to-goodness loyalty program.

Now, they have the effrontery to appear before the House Committee on Appropriations and ask for nearly $9,500,000 to continue this ridiculous and empty show.

Let me give you some figures that clearly demonstrate how the Congress has poured millions of dollars down another Operation Rathole. Remember, these are not my figures, but they are some of the figures presented by the Civil Service Commission to Congress on February 21 of this year to justify their request for nearly $9,500,000. These figures were taken from page 464 of the report:

The Loyalty Review Board has received a total of 315 appeals. It is to be understood that an appeal reaching the Loyalty Review Board can only be on a finding adverse to an employee or applicant. There is no provision in the Loyalty Review Board's regulations for an appeal by the Government. Regardless of how good or bad the decision might be, if it is favorable to an employee or applicant, poor old Uncle Sam is stuck with it.

Of these 315 appeals, 171 were from agency loyalty boards, meaning the appeals were from employees, and the balance of 144 were from regional loyalty boards, meaning the appeals were from applicants for Government positions. Of the 315 appeals, 278 had been adjudicated up to January 6, 1951. Now, colleagues, listen to this. Out of the 278 appeals adjudicated, 145, or more than 52 percent, were reversed. In other words, either agency or regional loyalty boards had found 278 persons disloyal and in some 145 cases they were reversed by the Loyalty Review Board. There we find 145 potential Remingtons.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, how long is it going to take for the Members of Congress to wake up and learn what is going on in the Government agencies? What do we intend to do in such a situation? What can we do? There is but one thing we can do—deny any funds to the Civil Service Commission for the continuance of such a patent and dismal failure as the present loyalty program. Insist that there be a thorough and complete housecleaning of those who, having eyes, see not; and having ears, hear not; and that there be a review and reconsideration of all cases where there has been an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and clearance given by the Civil Service Commission to insure that all the Remingtons are cleaned out of the Federal Government.

THE BATTLE OVER LOYALTY—PART II

(By Walter S. Steele)

That there has been an admitted weakness on the part of the Civil Service Commission in appointments of personnel to the Loyalty Review Board, and that this has been reflected in the inefficiency of the latter in their handling of numbers of cases of loyalty among Government employees in the past, is now demonstrated, if by no other action, in the recent necessary changes at the top of both agencies.

Since our March edition went to press with the first installment of this article, Harry B. Mitchell, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has been replaced by former Congressman Robert P. Ramspeck, of Georgia; and Seth Richardson, Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, mentioned in our last edition, has been replaced by former Senator Hiram Bingham, of Connecticut. Both have been loyal Americans in the past and have indicated by recent statements that they intend to change the methods of operation in their department, to bring them within present-day requirements. Mr. Bingham has stated that he plans to order the dismissal and to prevent the employment of individuals where there is a "reasonable doubt of a person's loyalty," instead of permitting an individual to occupy a post in the Government while the evidence is being sought to sustain the suspicion. No doubt Mr. Bingham has in mind the 700 or more individuals who have been judged disloyal by department boards but, at the same time, cleared by the Loyalty Review Board. Some believe that about 500 of these may be considered "border line," and, if Mr. Bingham's rule were put into operation, these could be dropped under a reasonable-doubt rule.

The fly in the ointment, regarding such procedure, may be the attitude of the President's newly appointed Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, created recently under Executive order. This Commission's Chairman, Admiral Chester Nimitz, recently stated that it is the duty of his Commission, under the President's order, to study procedures and make recommendations in regard to procedure regarding loyalty investigations and decisions, regarding not only Government employees, but outside individuals as well.

It has been charged that, while Admiral Nimitz's loyalty cannot be questioned, and while he served with valor in our armed services, he comes to the new post rather unqualified, and some are dubious about the extent to which he thinks the Government should go in ferreting out and in quelling subversives. It is charged that the Admiral was a regent of the University of California during the 1950 loyalty probes of the faculty and voted against the unseating of the 40 professors who refused to take the non-Communist oath there. It has been further charged that the vote taken in July last was so close that the Admiral's vote broke the tie in favor of the objectors to the loyalty oath. Again on August 25, it is charged the regents reversed themselves by a slim majority and ordered the dismissal of the 40 professors. In this instance the admiral is reported to have been absent, but with having publicly stated that if he had been present to vote, he would have again voted against the dismissal of the professors.

This again brings up the question as to whether one can expect a Commission, chaired by an individual who has outwardly opposed non-Communist oaths, will favor machinery for dismissal of employees of the Government who refuse to be guided by loyalty provisions.

It will be recalled that the Loyalty Review Board, formerly headed by Seth Richardson, now headed by Hiram Bingham, cleared about one-third of the Government employees who appealed from department board rulings. It has also been charged that of the three thousand or more questionable employees who have left the Government service, 2,872 left on their own accord when they learned that the FBI was on their trail, and that only 294 have actually been dismissed, while such individuals as Hiss, Remington, Coplon, and others and a long list of Government scientists were evidently passed over, their Waterloo being congressional committees and finally Federal grand juries, ending in a number of important convictions.

Whether the new Loyalty Review Board chairman will set the house in order, insofar as his division is concerned, remains to be seen, and if he attempts to do so it would appear that personnel changes are much in order. Besides those mentioned in our March edition, members of the Loyalty Review Board who might find it embarrassing to rule in certain instances on individuals who have had left-wing connections, there are others.

On page 478 of Appendix IX of the Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities the name of Meta Glass appears as a member of the American Advisory Committee of Open Road, of which the following explanation is made on page 471:

"While there is no doubt that some of the individuals who sponsored and were associated with the Open Road were primarily interested in promoting the cultural effects of travel to other countries, there is ample evidence of infiltration of the organization by those who have been primarily interested in propaganda favorable to the Soviet Union and the Communist movement of which it is a symbol. Illustrative of the second type of conscious propagandists who have unquestionably influenced the policies of the organization are such fellow-travelers as Frederick V. Field, Mrs. Corliss Lamont, Joseph Barnes, Walter F. Gellhorn, Jerome Davis, Maurice Hindus, Joshua Kunitz, Maxwell S. Stewart, Colston W. Warne, and Goodwin Watson, all of whom have been affiliated with the Open Road." It is assumed that this is Meta Glass of the Loyalty Review Board. If so, this affiliation and association did not deter someone in authority in the Civil Service Commission in appointing Miss Glass to a place on the Loyalty Review Board. Quite the contrary, as she has been steadily engaged in passing on the loyalty of Government employees since the inception of the loyalty program.

Shippen Lewis is the chairman of the Civil Service Commission's Third Regional Loyalty Review Board and, according to a report of the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities of July 21, 1947, page 85, the name of Mrs. Shippen Lewis appeared as a member of the "Continuing Committee of the Congress of American Women." Even though the Attorney General ruled that the Congress of American Women is a Communist organization within the meaning of the Presidential Executive order, the Civil Service Commission has placed Mr. Lewis in a position where he may be required to pass on the loyalty

of a Government employee who has been associated or affiliated with an organization served by his own wife. Is it reasonable to expect Mr. Lewis to hold that an individual is disqualified from holding a Government post because she is associated with an organization with which his own wife has been so prominently identified?

The nefarious activities of the Institute of Pacific Relations and its Red domination were openly exposed to the public during the recent hearings of the Tydings subcommittee on the allegations of Senator McCarthy that the State Department was infested with Communist sympathizers. The Institute was founded in 1925 by Edward C. Carter and is composed of 10 autonomous national councils, one of which is the American Council. The American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations was incorporated in the District of Columbia on February 20, 1939, with the principal office located at 3417 Quebec Street NW. The current telephone book of the city of Washington lists the address of Stephen Brunauer as 3417 Quebec Street NW. Esther Brunauer, presently employed by the State Department, was one of the signers of the articles of incorporation of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. For years Frederick V. Field, recently referred to as the millionaire Communist, a registered agent of Red China and now under indictment, was secretary of the organization. Frank Elbert Midkiff was listed by the Council as a member of the board of trustees from 1940 to 1944 and again in 1949 to 1950. The fact that Mr. Midkiff was a trustee of such a controversial organization over a period of so many years has apparently meant little to someone in the Civil Service Commission, as he was only recently appointed a member of the Loyalty Review Board.

The American League for a Free Palestine was created in response to a call for aid by the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation. A news item appearing in the Washington Post of June 3, 1944, stated that the league was denounced by the Jewish Agency for Palestine. The same item said that the agency also charged that the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation was an unscupulous piece of political charlatanism. However, someone in the Civil Service Commission apparently considered that sponsorship of such an organization qualifies a person for membership on the Loyalty Review Board, for George W. Alger and David P. Barrows, whose names appeared as members of the organizing committee of the American League for a Free Palestine, are members of the Loyalty Review Board.

A Conference on Pan-American Democracy was held on December 10 and 11, 1938, in Washington, D. C., for the announced purpose of establishing the Council for Pan-American Democracy, declared to be Communist and subversive by the Department of Justice, and to send delegates to a Communist-inspired Latin-American Congress of Democracies at Montevideo, March 20–24, 1939.

According to a report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, appendix IX, page 672, sponsors of this conference were such widely known Communist fronters as Louis Adamic, Bruce Bliven, Malcolm Cowley, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Langston Hughes, Max Lerner, Mervyn Rathbone, and Max Yergan. Also appearing among the list of sponsors was Dr. Henry Grattan Doyle. One finds the name of Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle among the members of the Loyalty Review Board. She was sponsor of activities of the Consumers Federation in Washington, D. C., in 1938. Could it be expected that Mrs. Doyle would hold that membership in an organization sponsored by her husband has any bearing on the loyalty of an individual even though the organization has a questionable background?

It might be well also to point to the following members of the Loyalty Review Board: Frank L. McVey, honorary vice president of the National Consumers League; Lotus D. Coffin, who, with Meta Glass, was also listed as connected with Open Road; Mrs. H. Norman Sibley, who husband's record is listed on five different pages in a document issued by a congressional committee exposing un-American activities; Henry L. Shattuck, a member of the Advisory Board of World Federalists, Inc.; Mrs. LaRue Brown, active for a number of years in the organization headed by Ernest Angell, the American Civil Liberties Union; vice president of the National Consumers League and the American Russian Institute; Thomas E. Jones and H. H. Preston, who have allegedly participated in the activities of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

It is difficult to understand why someone in the Civil Service Commission selected such individuals to serve on the Loyalty Review Board. They are not only apparently unqualified for such important work, but they appear to have been guilty of lending their names and prestige to organizations that in some instances have been found questionable by congressional committees investigating radical activities.

Who knows but that the real answer may lie in the files of the Civil Service Commission's Loyalty Review Board, access to which has been denied Members of Congress by Presidential edict. However, the Commission has not been successful in burying all the decisions of the Board. The recent trial and indictment of William Remington, which ended in conviction, brought to light the fact that while a Civil Service Commission Regional Board held Remington to be unfit for Government employment because of questionable loyalty, the decision was reversed by the Commission's Loyalty Review Board, the members of which, in their judicial wisdom, held that Remington was not presently disloyal.

How many more Remington cases may remain buried in the files of the Civil Service Commission's Loyalty Review Board may never be known, but the following appears to be something that if further probed might give the answer to many questions. In a report of hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, on the Department of State appropriation bill for 1949 (pp. 187 and 188), there are listed 108 cases of employees or applicants for positions in the State Department. Case No. 25 refers to a certain individual who while not then employed by the Government was under consideration for a position. The information obtained by the subcommittee was as follows:

"Consideration is still being given this applicant, although he is known to be a Communist Party member, and a recommendation has been made that his brother, who is now employed by the Department, be dismissed for security reasons.

"He has filed application for a position as administrative officer at $8,179 per annum. Investigation of his case was started on April 9, 1947. Another governmental investigative agency advised, on April 13, 1947, that a reliable informant said subject, who is employed by the Civil Service Commission, is a member of the underground Communist group in Washington, D. C. This informant further advised that the subject and his wife paid a social call on December 11, 1945, on a functionary of a Soviet espionage ring in Washington, D. C., and on December 29, 1945, his wife contacted the wife of another Soviet espionage functionary and identified herself by saying her husband was acquainted with the functionary. The informant also advised that a brother of the subject was a member of, and active in, the Jackson Heights, Long Island, branch of the Communist Party in 1944. Further information was obtained to the effect that the subject himself has been a member of the Communist Party.

"Subsequent investigation was conducted and reports were submitted on May 14, 1947, and June 27, 1947, without further evidence being developed. This case is apparently in a pending, inactive status awaiting action concerning his brother."

On February 20, 1950, Senator McCarthy mentioned this case. (Congressional Record, volume 96, part 2, page 1965) as case No. 29. This person, designated one place in the Record as case No. 25 and in another place as case No. 29, evidently tired of waiting for a job in the State Department, allegedly applied for and secured appointment to a position in another department where he is believed to be employed at the present time.

This article is not intended as an attack on either the Civil Service Commission or the Loyalty Review Board, nor should it be construed as a reflection upon the entire personnel of either.

The Civil Service Commission has one of the most important functions to perform of any department of our Government, as for the most part its personnel has been efficient and above reproach, this is particularly true of the investigative division. It has for years done a momentous job, and that effectively.

It was a mistake when its officials, taking on the responsibility of the appointment of the members of the Loyalty Review Board, failed to reach its usual high standard in appointments which had been previously followed in selections for the Civil Service Commission.

Likewise, this is not a blanket condemnation of the personnel of the Loyalty Review Board; there again will be found many with clear records. There are other holes in the loyalty field in our Government, as have come to light over the last few years. The same weaknesses appear in some departmental loyalty boards as pointed out in the Loyalty Review Board, maybe carelessness, maybe the idealism of some of those composing boards, possibly a complex due to past affiliations of some in influence, or could it be political pressure from the top; as examples, the Commerce, the State, and Labor. It is understood that the only department of the Government where not a single employee has been declared ineligible, is the State Department, which if any of the many charges made against it have been even of half truth, is a strange coincident.

This writer will watch with care the filling of some of the vacancies now existing in the Loyalty Review Board, for instance, that of the post left by Angell, in New York. Rumors are that a person of former front affiliation is now under consideration. The writer will also watch the progress of departmental loyalty boards, and they may have something to say later regarding these. His only interest is to see these Commissions and Boards properly manned and functioning.

(Mr. Velde asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a magazine article by Walter S. Steele, entitled "The Battle Over Loyalty.")

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Canfield] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE WEDEMEYER REPORT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked yesterday to read the long suppressed Wedemeyer report and its recommendations concerning Korea.

As one Member of Congress, I feel I have been cheated and defrauded.

The suppression of this important report and the general treatment of the Congress by the executive branch in the development of foreign policy and the upbuilding of our military strength make me wonder if we can survive as a free people.

The people's representatives are continually being denied the truth.

The whole Korean war might have been avoided had the Congress been given the facts. And most certainly we would not now be in the weak military position recently described by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MCMAHON.

Shortly after General MacArthur's ouster, I received a letter from a distinguished pastor in my district, the Rev. George H. Talbott, of the First Presbyterian Church, Passaic, N. J., a purple heart veteran of World War I, who points up so well the bewilderment of our people. Let me read:

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Passaic, N. J., April 21, 1951.

The Honorable GORDON CANFIELD,
Congressman from New Jersey,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GORDON: I am sending you herewith a copy of a letter I am sending to Senator SMITH. He is on the Foreign Relations Committee. I think that Congress ought to take the bit in its teeth and for God's sake, figure out some way to sign up this Korean debacle in the shortest possible time.

Sincerely and with best wishes, I am

GEORGE H. TALBOTT,
Pastor.

APRIL 21, 1951.

The Honorable ALEXANDER SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I am sure I am but one of a constantly growing army of people who are becoming disgusted with shabby internationalism and are sorely tempted to revert to an intolerant isolationism because of the uncertain direction of our foreign policy and the mess the United Nations has made of Korea.

The MacArthur incident merely heightens the narrative. It seems to me in the last week I have met more men who are turning in disgust from political idealism than at any time in my 30 years since I left Princeton University.

The distressing thing about it is they are the people who really count in this world. I hope that as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, you will see that the whole situation is completely sifted.

Of course, I am not an expert on foreign affairs. I simply am a diligent reader and try to keep abreast in the best in international thought but I do feel that unless we wish to have a decided step backward in international idealism, that America better clarify her policy, and that the United Nations better show some backbone.

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. TALBOTT,
Pastor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VINSON, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. JONES of Alabama), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. BRAMBLETT (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS), indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

EXECUTIVE OFFICES APPROPRIATION, 1952

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 220, Rept. No. 417), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, that during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill or any provision contained in said bill are hereby waived.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include copies of letters from constituents.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include some extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material in four instances.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address by Dr. Dale Crowell.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Alf M. Landon.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some extraneous material.

Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial and an article.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding that it exceeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in six instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include some speeches.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have consent in the committee following the gentleman from Virginia, relative to the Fish and Wildlife Service amendment to extend my remarks at that point. I also ask that I may include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. REES of Kansas) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article in relation to Stuart Symington.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3096. An act relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following title:

S. 300. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart;

S. 451. An act for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic;

S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek;

S. 568. An act for the relief of George W. Purdy;

S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs;

S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. P. Quinn;

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; and

S. 998. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.),

under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 3, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

419. A letter from the president, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for the year ending December 31, 1950, under the requirement of section 7 of the act of March 16, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 123); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

420. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the second report pursuant to section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, 81st Cong.), based upon a survey of Government procurement since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

421. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled, "A bill to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands under the administration or control of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

422. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill for the relief of M. Neil Andrews"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

423. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 30, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the coasts of the Great Lakes, harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels, particularly with respect to a harbor of refuge at Port Huron, Mich.; on Black River, Sanilac and St. Clair Counties, Mich., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 25, 1945, and March 5, 1946, respectively; and also a preliminary examination and survey of Black River, Port Huron, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

424. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 23, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Shipyard River, S. C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 20, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 220. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3880, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 616. A bill for the relief of Tomas J. Zafiriadis; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 617. A bill for the relief of Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck and Victoria Tuerck; with amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 895. A bill for the relief of Dr. Giuseppe Mazzone; without amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1233. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vasilia Parselles; with amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl; with amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Antranik Ayanian; without amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2114. A bill for the relief of Joe Lee (also known as Lee Jow); without amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2310. A bill for the relief of Jindrich (Henri) Nosek and Mrs. Zdenka Nosek; with amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2372. A bill for the relief of Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff; with amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2852. A bill for the relief of Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin; with amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2853. A bill for the relief of Shizue Sakurada; without amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2854. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Fumie Maeda; without amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3063. A bill for the relief of Rosina Mouradian; without amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3123. A bill for the relief of Chin Yuen Ling, minor unmarried Chinese child of a United States citizen; without amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3930. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3931. A bill to create the United States Medical Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGEE:

H. R. 3932. A bill to amend subparagraph (a), paragraph I, part I, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more equitable rates of disability and death compensation for disability or death incurred in service on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3933. A bill to amend subparagraph (a), paragraph I, part I, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more equitable rates of disability and death compensation for disability or death incurred in service on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3934. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3935. A bill to provide compensation under the veterans' laws and regulations for a child whose legal adoption by a veteran of World War II was not completed before the service-connected death of such veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 3936. A bill to confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 3937. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3938. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 3939. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3940. A bill to exclude from gross income certain receipts collected for the benefit of the American Red Cross; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORANO:
H. R. 3941. A bill to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
By Mr. FORD:
H. R. 3942. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
By Mr. GOODWIN:
H. R. 3943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mr. HAND:
H. R. 3944. A bill authorizing the prosecution of the work of improvement for purposes of beach erosion control at Atlantic City, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Works.
By Mr. HARRIS:
H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DEANE:
H. Res. 218. Resolution authorizing the Committee on House Administration to increase the telephone and telegraph allowance for Members of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; to the Committee on House Administration.
By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. Res. 219. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the address of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur delivered to the Congress on April 19, 1951; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:
H. R. 3945. A bill for the relief of Cosmo Casati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BECKWORTH:
H. R. 3946. A bill for the relief of Master Sgt. Orval Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ELLSWORTH:
H. R. 3947. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an allotment of certain land to Pauline Acusta Dumont; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
H. R. 3948. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an allotment of certain land to Jasper Palou[illegible]; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
By Mr. GILLETTE:
H. R. 3949. A bill for the relief of Angelo Bosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 3950. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 3951. A bill for the relief of Leon Alex Piechowiak, alias Leon Piechowiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. R. 3952. A bill for the relief of Ivan R. Weld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WHITTEN:
H. R. 3953. A bill for the relief of Chan Toy Har; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

264. By Mr. CANFIELD: Letter from the Honorable Walter T. Margetts, Jr., treasurer of the State of New Jersey, opposing Secretary Snyder's recommendation that the excise tax on distilled spirits be increased from $9 to $12 per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

265. Also, resolution adopted by the New Jersey Highway Users Conference, Trenton, N. J., opposing Secretary of the Treasury Snyder's proposal to double the Federal gasoline tax rate and increase the Federal excise taxes on new automobiles to 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to the white altar of Thy grace in the brightness of this new morning we come, bowing in our ignorance and weakness, praying for strength and wisdom to face with courage the somber specters that stalk the darkened earth.

Through the angry emotions of present days help us to seek not the vindication of our opinions, but the truth that shall make us free. Save us from presumptive pride that feigns an understanding that it does not possess. If we secretly covet the superior gifts of others, if we inwardly rejoice in the failure of others, if we give hospitality to thoughts that debase and degrade, if we are satisfied with anything short of our best, if we have readily and perhaps eagerly believed the worst about others, if we have judged our fellows on flimsy and perhaps false reports; if in any human relationship we have been untrue, unfair, unbrotherly: O Thou, who takest away the sin of the world, forgive us, cleanse us, renew us, restore our souls and lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy Name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 2, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing for a period of 10 days, on official business of the Committee on Armed Services.

On request of Mr. JENNER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. KILGORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which is studying amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL DEPUTY SERGEANT AT ARMS FOR A LIMITED PERIOD

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a paper designating Darrell St. Claire as Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms for a limited period.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1951.

In accordance with authority conferred on me by Senate resolution agreed to December 17, 1889 (Senate Journal 47, 51-1, December 17, 1889), I hereby appoint Darrell St. Claire a Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate for the period from May 3, 1951, to May 7, 1951, to perform in my absence any and all duties required of or devolving upon the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate by law or by the rules or orders of the Senate.

JOSEPH C. DUKE,
Sergeant at Arms,
United States Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other

routine business, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. AIKEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint resolution eulogizing the achievements of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

"Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur brought glory and renown to the military personnel under his command during World War II with distinction and honor to himself and country; and

"Whereas by his efficient administration of postwar Japan, that country is now ready to accept her right place among the other free nations of the world; and

"Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur has fought a distinguished and able fight in Korea with but limited means at his disposal, and has shown himself to be one of the greatest generals of our country; and

"Whereas we learn with sincere regret of his recall from his post of command of all United Nations forces: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That we extend to Gen. Douglas MacArthur our sincere and heartfelt recognition of his leadership and our pride in his accomplishments, our faith in his integrity and our confidence in his loyalty to all who served under his command, and that we voice that faith by acclamation and inscribe this resolution in the acts of the general assembly of 1951; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send to Gen. Douglas MacArthur a certified copy of this resolution and certified copies of this resolution to the members of the congressional delegation of Vermont.

"WALLACE M. FAY,
"Speaker of the house of representatives.
"JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
"President of the senate.

"Approved April 27, 1951.
"LEE E. EMERSON,
"Governor."

RESOLUTIONS OF NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions I have received from the Nebraska Stock Growers Association. These resolutions deal with the necessity for maintaining our economic stability, keeping our Nation strong, and avoiding unnecessary and restrictive regulations on industry, particularly the livestock industry. I agree with the sentiments expressed in these resolutions 100 percent.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred, as follows:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution I

"Declaration of policy and program

"To the fundamental American principles of democracy, as expressed in our two great declarations of American principles—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America—we enthusiastically give our eternal allegiance. Those principles are America. They brought about the development of this country to the greatness that has been hers.

"We abhor all efforts to take from any one of the principles that make our country. We condemn every one and every effort to destroy or injure any one of these principles.

"The current international crisis and the national emergency resulting therefrom is being felt by every individual and every home in the country. This serious problem confronting every American must be met with foresight, with fearlessness, and with sound common sense.

"Our Nation is preparing for a state of total mobilization for war; American boys are giving their lives on the battlefields of Korea. Yet with international diplomatic negotiations in full swing, a stalemate of power politics appears to have been reached which may continue for years to come. Such a situation, if prolonged indefinitely, may tax the strength of this Nation beyond endurance unless a definite long-range policy is established by our Federal Government which will set up a sound and practical goal for which we must strive.

"The productive ability of America under the free-enterprise system in all fields of endeavor stands today as the real bulwark against the aggression threatening our freedom. The American people can maintain this position only so long as the economy of this Nation remains strong. We cannot continue to make other nations strong by programs which will make our Nation weak.

"On the home front we condemn waste and extravagance in our Federal Government; we oppose the principles of price controls, subsidy payments and other governmental regulations not compatible with our American way of life.

"We therefore petition the Congress and the President of the United States to outline a policy and to establish certain definite principles indicating the extent to which this Nation will attempt to control through military influence (I) the protection of this Nation and the hemisphere against aggression; (II) to prevent the growth of communistic influence throughout the world; and (III) a program consistent with the economic stability of the United States over a long period of time.

"We believe this will contribute to the complete support of our citizenship and to the lasting protection of our freedom."

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution II

"Controls

"Whereas this country has, during the past few months, again entered upon a period of governmental controls over civilian life and economy; and

"Whereas the experiences undergone during the similar period of controls throughout the wartime are still fresh in our minds, we now express our beliefs and our position upon these questions injected into our lives by the system of controls; and

"Whereas we know, as we have always known and as experience has demonstrated that the livestock industry is one element of our economy that is not susceptible to Government controls because they are neither practicable nor enforceable. And we further know that such efforts to control will certainly result in disruption of supplies and a disgraceful black-market condition; and

"Whereas we know that not only is it impractical to establish or attempt to enforce ceiling prices on live animals but any effort to follow such a route would inevitably injure and retard production—and increased production is one of the two principal answers to the major question; and

"Whereas the other principal answer is economy in government. To stabilize our economy, unnecessary expenditure of public funds by the Government must be stopped; and

"Whereas foolish regulations, such as the contemplated prohibition of calf slaughter, allocations, and the threat or inspiration of rumors and threats of such regulations must be stopped. Every such regulation or threat is an obstacle to increased production and an influence toward reduced production when the opposite is the desired goal: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association is opposed to Government controls on our industry, as they are not only completely unenforceable but lead to confusion and shortages."

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution III

"Ranch and farm labor

"Whereas it is an obvious fact that the production of livestock is an essential industry because from livestock comes meat, leather, pharmaceutical supplies, and other strategic materials requisite to the success of the vast programs being undertaken by our country and the essential character of our industry must be recognized by the Government just as is every other industry engaged in the production of strategic materials; and

"Whereas the adoption by this country of a program of military training and the mobilization of men for such military service creates a serious question affecting the ability of our industry to produce livestock in quantities required by the Nation; and

"Whereas, although we do not request or expect any special or particular treatment or consideration, we do request and expect treatment of our labor problems on the same basis as is accorded all other strategic industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association respectfully requests the Federal Government, the State, and the Selective Service Board, in its administration of the laws, present and to be adopted, relating to military service, give due consideration to the character of the work being done by men in our industry and that essential keymen be not withdrawn from their important, strategic work for the military service, just as such consideration is given to similar men in other strategic industries."

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF INTERNATIONAL FALLS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution unanimously adopted by the City Council of the City of International Falls, Minn., at its regular meeting on March 19, 1951, urging immediate hearings on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of International Falls and surrounding territory are vitally interested in the St. Lawrence waterway project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of International Falls in regular session assembled, That we urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to call immediate hearings on the Great Lakes St. Lawrence seaway project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to members of said Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—RESOLUTION OF BROWN COUNTY RURAL ELECTRICAL ASSOCIATION, SLEEPY EYE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Brown County Rural Electrical Association, Sleepy Eye, Minn., at its annual meeting on March 8, 1951, in support of the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Brown County Rural Electrical Association is today holding its annual meeting at Sleepy Eye, Minn.; and

Whereas said association represents approximately 2,800 farm families located in Brown County and parts of Nicollet and Sibley Counties, Minn.; and

Whereas we believe that the development of the St. Lawrence waterway will provide a reasonable and economical means of transportation for the Midwest; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence waterway will provide electric power in the northeastern part of the United States: Now, therefore, we delegates to the 1951 annual meeting of the Brown County REA strongly urge our Representatives in Congress and in the Senate to strongly support the plan now proposed for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to every Minnesota Member of Congress and to our two United States Senators.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association, Danube, Minn., at its annual meeting on March 21, 1951, urging the development of the Missouri Valley Authority and the construction of transmission lines.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY RESOLUTION

Whereas the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association is today, March 21, 1951, holding its annual meeting at Danube, Minn.; and

Whereas said association represents approximately 2,200 farm families located in Renville County and parts of Nicollet, Sibley and Chippewa Counties in Minnesota; and

Whereas an ample supply of power at fair prices is essential to the operation and growth of our association; and

Whereas the Federal Government is building dams on the Missouri River and has established the Missouri Valley Authority; and

Whereas it has been proven that an abundance of economical power from said Missouri River can be transmitted to the territory served by the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association; and

Whereas hearings have been held before a House Appropriations Committee to consider the appropriation of funds for the construction of a transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation for approval by the Department of Interior in the territory served by the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we as delegates to the 1951 annual meeting of the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association strongly urge Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota to give their whole-hearted support to the development of the Missouri Valley Authority and to consider construction of transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior into the areas served by our Association; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the Minnesota Congressmen and Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Brown County Rural Electrical Association, Sleepy Eye, Minn., at its annual meeting on March 8, 1951, in support of the Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Brown County Rural Electrical Association is today holding its annual meeting at Sleepy Eye, Minn.; and

Whereas said association represents approximately 2,800 farm families located in Brown County and parts of Nicollet and Sibley Counties, Minn.; and

Whereas an ample supply of power at a fair price is essential to the operation and growth of our association; and

Whereas, because of the tremendous growth in the use of power by members of our association, available sources of power can no longer supply our needs at a fair price; and

Whereas the Federal Government is building dams on the Missouri River and has established the Missouri Valley Authority; and

Whereas it has been proven that abundant and economical power from said Missouri River can be transmitted to the territory served by the Brown County REA; and

Whereas hearings have been held before a House Appropriations Committee to consider the appropriation of funds for the construction of a transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior in the territory served by the Brown County REA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we delegates to the 1951 annual meeting of the Brown County REA strongly urge Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota to give their whole-hearted support to the development of the Missouri Valley Authority and to the construction of transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior into the area served by our association; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the Minnesota Congressmen and Senators.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3297. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 309).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, Thursday, May 3, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 300. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart;

S. 451. An act for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic;

S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek;

S. 568. An act for the relief of George W. Purdy;

S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs;

S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn;

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; and

S. 998. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1428. A bill for the relief of John Tzanavaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1429. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

S. 1430. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Barbourville, Ky.; and

S. 1431. A bill to appropriate funds for flood protection of Pineville, Ky.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Public Roads to designate a transcontinental highway system to be known as the Crozet Superhighway; to the Committee on Public Works.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

A statement prepared by him regarding the fifteenth anniversary of the Public Affairs Committee.

By Mr. WILEY:

An article entitled "Preparedness," written by him and published in the May 1951 issue of the magazine the Reserve Officer, referring to a long-range program for American preparedness.

By Mr. LODGE:

An editorial entitled "A Critical Situation," written by Charles A. Parker and published in the Civil Air Patrol News of April 23, 1951.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

An article entitled "Ships Aiding Russia Mortgaged to United States," written by Helen Delich, and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 29, 1951.

By Mr. ECTON:

An editorial entitled "City Folks and Meat Prices," published in the Bozeman (Mont.) Daily Chronicle of April 27, 1951.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Letter regarding instruction of young people in better citizenship, written by Charles Kress, of Binghamton, N. Y.

I y Mr. KEFAUVER:

An editorial entitled "Why Does Labor Act That Way?" written by Edwin A. Leahy, and published in the April issue of Extension magazine.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF POLAND'S DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION (MAY 3, 1791)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I had intended to read into the RECORD a very brief statement, but in view of the fact that I must return to the hearing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement by me on the occasion of the anniversary of the enactment of Poland's democratic constitution on May 3, 1791.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF POLAND'S DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION (MAY 3, 1791)

On this anniversary of the enactment of Poland's democratic and progressive constitution (May 3, 1791), it is a privilege indeed for me to add my voice to the many who are expressing warm-hearted recognition to Poland's splendid contribution to western Christian civilization.

Today, despite that magnificent record, Poland lies behind the iron curtain and those citizens of Poland behind that curtain and their friends and countrymen on this side of the water look to America as among those free nations who have not forgotten Poland's fate and the history of freedom she represents. We in Massachusetts number proudly among our citizens 53,000 men and women who were born in Poland and many others of direct Polish descent. We know at first hand what Poland and what freedom mean to them.

On this anniversary let us all, as Americans, remember the obligation and the opportunity that are ours—the opportunity and obligation of standing for the right of free men and women to remain free and to enjoy that life and liberty and chance for the pursuit of happiness that have since 1776 been the bond which has held us all together. It is those same ideals of freedom to which the Polish people still aspire and for which they long. Let us on this occasion dedicate ourselves to a ceaseless effort to help restore freedom where it has been lost and keep burning brightly the dream of a better day for those upon whom for a time the darkness of tyranny has descended. Let us hope and work and pray that with our help the people of Poland may again enjoy all those blessings of liberty to which they are so fully entitled.

WORLD MOVEMENT FOR WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—DISCOURSE BY HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII AND ARTICLE FROM AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago a very significant event occurred in the area of international relations in world politics, when His Holiness Pope Pius XII issued a statement to the delegates to the Fourth Congress of the World Movement for World Federal Government on April 6, 1951. In view of the importance of this statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Pope be followed by an article entitled "Pope Pius XII and World Federation" and written by Father Edward E. Conway, appearing in the April 28, 1951, issue of America.

There being no objection, the discourse by the Pope and the article from America were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF DISCOURSE BY HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII DURING AN AUDIENCE WITH DELEGATES TO THE FOURTH CONGRESS OF THE WORLD MOVEMENT FOR WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, APRIL 6, 1951

We are very appreciative of the deference you have displayed by this visit and we take pleasure in addressing you members of the World Movement for World Federal Government. We give you cordial greetings of welcome. Our lively interest in the cause of peace in the midst of a humanity so grievously tormented is well known to you. We have given frequent proof of this interest. That interest, moreover, is inherent in our mission. The maintenance or the reestablishment of peace has always been and always and increasingly will be the object of our constant solicitude. And if, too often, the results have been far from equal to our efforts and our acts, lack of success will never discourage us, so long as peace does not reign in the world. Faithful to the spirit of Christ, the church is striving and working for it with all her strength; she does this by her precepts and her exhortations, by her incessant activities and by her ceaseless prayers.

The church is indeed a power for peace, at least wherever are respected and appreciated at their true value the independence and the mission which the church holds from God, in those areas where no one seeks to make her the docile servant of a political egoism, and where she is not treated as an enemy. The church longs for peace, she strives incessantly for peace, and her heart is ever with those who, like her, desire peace and devote themselves to it. She knows also, and this is her duty, how to distinguish between the true and the false friends of peace.

The church desires peace, and therefore applies herself to the promotion of everything which, within the framework of the divine order, both natural and supernatural, contributes to the assurance of peace. Your movement, gentlemen, dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the church, nor better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate and illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances. It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race in which, for decades past, the peoples have been ruining themselves and draining their resources to no effect. You are of the opinion that this world political organization, in order to be effective, must be federal in form. If by this you understand that it should not be enmeshed in a mechanical unitarism, again you are in harmony with the principles of social and political life so firmly founded and sustained by the church. Indeed, no organization of the world could live if it were not harmonized with the whole complex of natural relations, with that normal organic order which rules the particular relations between men and men and between different peoples. If it does not do that, then, no matter what its structure may be, it will not be able to stand up and endure.

For this reason we are convinced that your first concern should be to establish solidly or to restore these fundamental principles in every field: national and constitutional; economic and social; cultural and moral:

In the national and constitutional fields: At the present time the life of nations is everywhere disintegrated by the blind worship of numerical strength. The citizen is the voter. But, as such, he is in reality nothing but one of the units, the total of which constitutes a majority or a minority, which the shifting of a few votes or even of a single one would suffice to reverse. As far as parties are concerned, he is of importance only for his voting value. No concern is shown for his position and part in his family and his profession.

In the economic and social fields: There is no organic and natural unity amongst producers; a condition that has obtained ever since quantitative utilitarianism, the sole consideration in the matter of net cost, became the one norm determining both the location of production and the distribution of labor, and since the idea of class, which artificially divides men in society, replaced the idea of cooperation within the professional community.

In the cultural and moral fields: Individual liberty, freed from all bonds and all laws, all objective and social values, is in reality only a death-dealing anarchy, especially in the education of the young.

Unless the universal political organization rests upon these indispensable foundations, there is risk of its being infected with the deadly germs of mechanical unitarism. We would like to invite those to reflect on this point, precisely from the federalist viewpoint, who dream of setting up a world parliament. Otherwise they would subject

themselves to the play of those disintegrating forces from which our political and social order has already suffered too much. They would only finish by adding one more legal automaton to the many others which threaten to stifle the nations and to reduce men to the condition of inert instruments.

Just as, therefore, if it is to be true to the spirit of federalism, the future world political organization cannot under any pretext allow itself to be caught up in the play of mechanical unitarism, so also it will enjoy effective authority only insofar as it safeguards and encourages everywhere the life that is proper to a healthy human community, to a society in which all the members cooperate together for the good of the whole humanity.

What a fund of moral steadfastness, intelligent foresight and capacity for adjustment this world authority will have to possess, qualities more than ever necessary in those critical moments when, in the face of malevolence, people of good will must resort to its authority. After all the proofs—trials—of the past and present, would anyone dare to say that the current resources of government and politics are adequate? In truth, it is impossible to solve the problem of a world political organization without being willing to leave the beaten path from time to time, without appealing to the witness of history, to a sane social philosophy, and even to a certain divining of the creative imagination.

There, gentlemen, is a vast field of work, study and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to you our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray God to grant you His light and help in the performance of your task.

[From America of April 28, 1951]

PIUS XII AND WORLD FEDERATION

(By Edward A. Conway, S. J.)

The more I study the April 6 discourse of the Holy Father, in which he gave his approbation to the World Federalist movement, the warmer grows my sense of satisfaction. As I write, I have before me the text of his address in French and two unofficial English translations, neither of which can be considered definitive. I hope that we shall soon have an authorized English version, because the discourse, being the first formal papal pronouncement on world government, has profound significance for all students of world affairs. Scholars will be analyzing and interpreting it for months to come. They should have the authentic thought of the Holy Father to work on.

The original text richly repays detailed study. At the very first reading it was obvious to me that here was more than just another extempore greeting to a group of pilgrims. I thought, as I read, that the Holy Father must have worked over that address as carefully as he did over any of his famed Christmas allocutions. I have since been told that His Holiness confided to one of his auditors afterward that he had stayed up late the night before to complete the text of his discourse, and that previously he had spent many hours in consultation about it. It seems obvious that the Holy Father had determined to make a major-policy pronouncement, and just as obvious that he had determined to use the World Federalist Congress as the occasion for it.

Some of the satisfaction that warms me comes, I confess, from personal considerations. I have been hard pressed at times to defend my presence (with a Catholic bishop) on the National Advisory Board of United World Federalists, Inc. UWF is the largest membership group among the 70 constituent organizations in 27 countries which make up the World Movement for World Federal Government. The unfortunate and, for me, embarrassing fact is that many American Catholics have been turned against world federalism, and specifically against United World Federalists, by the absurd charge that the entire federalist movement is a Communist conspiracy. Almost daily during the past 3 years I have received letters from Catholics—some inquiring, some indignant—about my part in the federalist movement. It would have been much easier for me to answer them if the Holy Father had ever made a clear-cut and quotable statement dealing directly with world federal government. Unfortunately for me and other Catholic federalists, up to April 6, 1951, he had not.

It was always possible, of course, to prove that a Catholic could be a Catholic and a federalist. But it was necessary to string together texts from the Pope's Christmas allocutions—a hint here and a hint there—sufficient, however, to prove to the unprejudiced that "the new world order" desired by the Pope was actually some form of world federal government. But it was an unsatisfactory business at best, complicated and prohibitively time consuming.

I tried another tack some time ago by arguing not from textual but from circumstantial evidence. On November 11, 1948, the Holy Father had addressed 300 members of the European Union of Federalists at Castel Gandolfo. EUF is a federation of European federalist groups, and is closely allined with the World Movement for World Federal Government. The Holy Father told the European federalists that it was "high time" to establish a European union. "Some," he added, "are even asking themselves whether it is not already too late."

My World Federalist friends, I reported, were much encouraged by the Holy Father's partial support:

"Even though the Holy Father, they reason, said nothing explicitly about world federation, his warm approval of European federation will surely give immense impetus to their movement and hasten thereby the larger development they desire."

I added—naively, I know now—that I was inclined to agree with my World Federalist friends. My article ended with the observation:

"American Catholics could make a distinctively Catholic and definitely valuable contribution to the World Federalist movement. It remains to be seen whether the Pope's Armistice Day address will inspire them to do so. At the very least we may expect the more perceptive among them to begin taking an interest in federalism, since it so obviously interests the Pope."

Earlier in the article I had warned the federalists that "Catholics are curiously and often callously indifferent to noninfallible papal pronouncements." But I was totally unprepared for and correspondingly appalled by what followed. Most of "the more perceptive Catholics" remained indifferent to federalism, while the less perceptive began to take what I must call a violent interest in the destruction of the whole movement.

Catholic newspapers reprinted the misrepresentations of Mervin K. Hart's rabidly nationalistic Economic Council Letter, and quoted approvingly from Joseph P. Kamp's We Must Abolish the United States, which asserts that the aims and objectives of the American Federalists add up to treason. Indeed, treasonous, traitorous, and unpatriotic were among the milder epithets hurled at Catholic Federalists by fellow-Catholics. For a time we dismissed these denunciations as being merely what Pius XII called in 1948 the aberrations of an intransigent nationalism which denies or spurns the common bonds linking the nations together.

It was not long, however, before similar attacks came from more responsible Catholic quarters, based only too obviously on the same poisonous sources. Moreover, authorized representatives of respectable Catholic organizations began to appear before State legislatures demanding the repeal of long-standing world-government resolutions. Thanks to this Catholic intervention, some legislatures either repealed or modified them.

United World Federalists, chief beneficiary of this Catholic interest in federalism, and much disturbed by it, asked its most prominent Catholic member to do something about it. He is Thomas H. Mahony, Boston attorney, former president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, now chairman of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs, and for 3 years chairman of the UWF policy committee. Mr. Mahony tried to lift the level of the debate by compiling Parallel Thinking, Catholic and Federalish, Upon the Organization of the World Peace. Under five headings: Disarmament; Security and Preparedness; National Sovereignty and its Limitation; Amendments of the United Nations Charter; A Federated World, he compared Catholic statements from St. Augustine to Pius XII with corresponding UWF proposals. Eschewing all argument, Mr. Mahony simply asked his readers to draw their own reasonable inferences from the comparison. The similarities were sensational.

The booklet was published last September (15 cents, Thomas H. Mahony, 10 State St., Boston 9, Mass.). But it seems to have made little impression in some Catholic communities—Baltimore, for example. Catholic antifederalism reached its apogee there with the appearance of the Baltimore edition of the Catholic Review of February 16, 1951. Under a screaming headline, "Catholics Backing Anti-Federalist Move," the diocesan weekly revealed—it must have had its own revelation—that "almost every Catholic in this archdiocese is expressing support of a resolution * * * up before the Maryland House of Delegates which voices strong objections to the idea of world government as proposed by the Federalists." The Maryland Action Guild, the Knights of Columbus, and the Catholic War Veterans were solidly lined up with the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Daughters of the American Revolution, Children of the American Revolution, the Minute Women of Maryland, and the Daughters of 1812. "The Federalist resolutions," said the Catholic spokesmen, "collided with Catholic patriotic principles." One Louis Carroll, speaking for the Maryland Action Guild, said that World Federalists were most surely moving into the footsteps of Lenin and Stalin (Catholic Review, February 23, 1951, p. 3).

Do you wonder that I, as a World Federalist, felt grateful relief and warm satisfaction when I read these words in the Holy Father's April 6 discourse:

"Your movement [the World Movement for a World Federal Government] dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the Church, or better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate or illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances. It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race."

That solemn approbation should end once and for all the argument as to whether a Catholic can be a Federalist. Whether it inspires Catholics to work actively in the Federalist movement remains, as I remarked once before, to be seen. For my part, I cannot recall a more forthright papal endorsement of any movement, either Catholic, or, as this happens to be, nonsectarian.

Some Catholics, of course, are already saying that the Pope approved only the general ideal of a far in the future world state,

not any concrete program for its proximate realization. None but nationalist diehards would deny that he was talking on April 6 to a definite group with a definite, even though not detailed, program. The Pope implied clearly enough, it seems to me, that the world political organization must be realized as rapidly as possible "if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race"—the current race, not one in the problematical future.

The world federal government which WMWFG proposes and which the Holy Father has endorsed is a strictly limited one. During its Roman congress its fourth, by the way, the movement outlined the powers of that government in its "Declaration to the foreign ministers of the four great powers, to all the governments of the nations, and to the world's war-weary peoples":

"The time has come when the nations and peoples of the world must create an all-inclusive world federal government which can guarantee to each nation security against attack by others. Such a government must have the power—

"1. To prohibit by law the right of nations to use force or the threat of force in international affairs.

"2. To make laws binding upon individuals and national governments prohibiting the construction or possession of armaments beyond that required for internal police purposes, and to administer an agreed schedule for universal disarmament.

"3. To maintain adequate and effective civilian inspection and police forces to assure that the world law affecting armaments is respected.

"4. To bring to trial in world courts any individuals and groups who conspire to build weapons of war in violation of world law."

Catholics who fear that a world state possessing those powers would swallow up their personal liberties overlook the world federalist proviso that—

"All powers not expressly delegated to the world federal government should be reserved to the nations and their peoples, thus leaving each nation its choice of its own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions."

In his Parallel Thinking, Thomas Mahony made it clear that "the proposals do not envisage a superstate in which nations would be merged and lose their identity and domestic autonomy—a unitary state or empire. They contemplate complete autonomy of each nation in its national or domestic field. They merely propose a limitation of the external authority or sovereignty of nations—the right to make war."

Absolute sovereignty, of course, is the motto emblazoned on the banners of the embattled Catholic opponents of world government. I very much fear that a mistaken notion about sovereignty inspires their charge that world federalism is opposed to Catholic patriotic principles. To put it bluntly, I am afraid that they have never accepted that traditional doctrine of the church with which, according to the Holy Father, the world federalist movement is actually in accord. What is that traditional doctrine? Pius XII forcefully defined it in his Christmas message of 1948:

"The Catholic doctrine on the state and civil society has always beeen based on the principle that, in keeping with the will of God, the nations form together a community with a common aim and common duties. Even when the proclamation of this principle and its practical consequences gave rise to violent reactions, the church denied her assent to the erroneous concept of an absolutely autonomous sovereignty divested of all social obligations."

Is it too much to hope that the Holy Father's latest interpretation of that principle and its practical consequence—the ceding to a world government of enough national sovereignty to save the world from catastrophic war—will not give rise to violent reactions? My modest hope is that it will inspire all American Catholics to study this remarkable document. Every one of its paragraphs is pregnant with meaning. Almost every one of its lines reminds one of more extended treatment of the same topic in other papal pronouncements.

I hope, too, that the Holy Father's discourse will arouse new interest in Guido Gonella's A World To Reconstruct. Cardinal Stritch's bishops' committee on the Pope's peace plan published it in 1944 through Bruce of Milwaukee. My esteemed associate, Father LaFarge, predicted at the time (America, September 5, 1944) that the book would produce "wide enlightenment." Would that it had. Signor Gonella, most authoritative interpreter of the mind of Pius XII on the problem of world order, may still be, in Father LaFarge's phrase, "strong medicine." But I question whether, in view of the Pope's recent pronouncement, he still is "much stronger medicine than most people in this country and most of our politicians are prepared to swallow." Is it too much to ask that a revised version of Gonella be published promptly?

In view of the widespread misapprehension that all World Federalists are Communist conspirators, it is unfortunate that in the story on the Pope's April 6 discourse distributed by the NC News Service his concluding remarks were omitted. I add them here to reassure and inspire all Catholic Federalists:

"Therein [solving the problem of a world political organization] lies a vast field of work, study, and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to your our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray God to grant you His light and His help in the performance of your task."

May thousands of American Catholics soon merit that benediction. May theirs be the mission of helping the World Federalists to skirt the pitfalls which His Holiness warned against in his cordial endorsement of their movement.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS AT MEETINGS OF THE ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, since the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee voted this morning to permit Members of the Senate who are not members of the committees to attend the current hearings on national defense policies, which they now have under consideration as a part of their agenda, it is obviously unnecessary for the Senate to take action upon the so-called Watkins-Ferguson resolution, Senate Resolution 137, as originally offered.

However, the junior Senator from Nebraska, speaking, he is sure, on behalf of many Members of the Senate, believes that the question of whether the committees should hold open, public hearings on matters which do not concern vital security subjects should be determined by the Senate. The Senate should make the final determination.

In order that there may be a clear-cut decision on the question, the junior Senator from Nebraska will move that the Senate do now consider Senate Resolution 137. The resolution is the so-called Watkins-Ferguson resolution.

Mr. President, I will be perfectly frank. If the Senate agrees to my motion, I will move that all after the word "Resolved," referring to the admission of Senators to the hearings, be stricken from the resolution, in view of the fact that such permission has now been granted and to insert in lieu thereof provisions directing open, public hearings, except on matters of vital security, as determined by a majority of the committees.

The junior Senator from Nebraska believes that the American people are entitled to direct, first-hand knowledge of the testimony as given by witnesses before the committees.

The country has heard a part of the story. Why should they not hear the rest of the story? The safe, sure way of getting the facts before the people is to permit the press and radio to report the proceedings directly as they occur and to admit as many people to the hearings as the hearing room will accommodate.

Mr. President, I have just come from the first session of the hearings which convened a short time ago. Never before have I had so many newspaper men rush up to me as when I came out of the door of the committee hearing room. They rushed up to me and asked, "What did he say? What did he say?" In the newspapers this evening, Mr. President, this man will be quoted, and that man will be quoted; this man will give his interpretation, and that man will give his interpretation. Either interpretation may be completely different from the intention of the direct testimony. I plead with Members of the Senate to think of what will happen.

I say most respectfully that there is no intention, in asking for hearings to violate any provisions of national security. Men of the caliber of MacArthur, the Secretary of State, and other trusted officials, who will testify before the committees, will not answer any question if the answer involves a violation of the security of the United States. Everyone knows that to be so. The fact has been demonstrated in previous hearings, which were held, for example, on the troops-to-Europe issue, or the so-called Wherry resolution. It has been demonstrated time and time again. Witnesses who were asked such questions, very modestly, humbly, and properly asked that they be permitted to answer such questions in executive session, and that was done. The same procedure could be followed in this case. By and large, the bulk of the testimony should be made public and should be available to the people of the United States.

Policies have been discussed. They have been laid on the table. We should

know whether there is backing for the policies proposed, because the people, through their Congress, are the ones who determine national defense policies. Of course, military questions are left to the military command, as they should be. All questions of national security should be left to them.

I have never had demonstrated to me more clearly than this morning, when I left the hearing room, how the press will try to get every grain of information they can get, to give it to the public. All that can properly be furnished to the public should be furnished to them in the form of direct testimony, reported directly by the press and radio, and only matters of security should be left to the executive session.

As I said, the country has heard a part of the story as it affects the national defense. They should now hear the rest of the story. The safe and sure way of getting the facts before the people is to permit the press and radio to report the proceedings directly as they occur, and to admit as many people to the hearing as the hearing room will accommodate.

Mr. President, I am not asking for a show. I am not asking that the hearings be held in a ball park. I am not asking for a burlesque affair. It was not a burlesque before, and it does not have to be a burlesque now. Under the able chairmanship of one of the finest Members of this body, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is known for his fairness, I will not worry about an open hearing, as he would conduct it, being classified as a burlesque show, or any other kind of show. The hearings will be conducted with respect and dignity. I hope the Senate will take the initiative before it is too late and give the press and the radio an opportunity to report to the public what they can report with respect to the great national defense policies, which the people must help to determine through their representatives in Congress.

It is not unusual to ask for public hearings by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. Both committees deal in matters affecting vitally the national security, and both committees are quite able to distinguish between matters which should be kept secret in the public interest and matters which should be made public in the public interest.

Secrecy in Government procedure is abhorrent to the American way. It is not the American way. Foreign policy and national defense policies of this Republic are, in the last analysis, made by the people. I am not complaining about the character or ability of those who constitute the two committees, or about their trustworthiness. But all the Members of the Senate and House who are duly elected by the people are the ones to form the defense policies of the country. In the United States the people rule; and if the people are to make the right decisions, they must have all the necessary facts to do so.

I say to Members of the Senate, including my good friend the majority leader—and I say this from the bottom of my heart—that it is only in this spirit and with this approach that the junior Senator from Nebraska now moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137, which is the so-called Watkins-Ferguson resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 137) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That any Member of the Senate is authorized to attend as an observer any hearing or other meeting, whether executive or open, held by the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations in accordance with the order of the Senate of April 25, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I intend to offer, which was to be printed and lie on the table——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate must first proceed to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely asking that the amendment which I propose to offer be read at this time, if the present occupant of the Chair will permit it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no disposition to prevent it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that it be read at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert the following:

That the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly to consider matters affecting the national defense, be, and hereby are, directed to hear General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and other witnesses in open, public hearings: *Provided*, That no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may continue for a moment, I neglected to state, as I should have stated, that if my motion is agreed to, it will only temporarily displace the unfinished business. This is the only way such a motion can be made. My understanding is that if the motion is agreed to, when the resolution is disposed of the unfinished business will be the farm-labor bill, or it could be made the unfinished business on motion of the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the Senator's remarks, the Chair suggests that the adoption of the resolution would displace the unfinished business and send it back to the calendar. Another motion would be necessary to take it up again. It would not be merely temporarily displaced.

Mr. WHERRY. If that be the case, not only will the junior Senator from Nebraska support a motion to make the farm-labor bill the unfinished business, but I am satisfied that I speak for many Members on this side of the aisle when I say that they will support it. There is no intention to cause any undue delay in the passage of the farm-labor bill. The demonstration made on the floor of the Senate by many Senators who are in favor of it, including the Senator from Nebraska, certainly is evidence of that fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What will happen to all the amendments to the pending bill which have already been adopted by the Senate if the bill is sent back to the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments which have been agreed to would not be affected.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the status of the bill would remain as it now is, so far as the amendments which have already been adopted are concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct; and the amendment pending would be pending when the consideration of the bill was resumed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have been engaged in consideration of the farm-labor bill for an entire week. This is the eighth day since its consideration was started. We have been deprived of an opportunity to pass the bill largely by speeches on the MacArthur controversy. I do not know how the Senate is going to transact any business if that sort of thing continues.

I take the position that, regardless of what my personal ideas may be, the committees should be permitted to pass upon their own procedures, and decide whether they are to have open hearings or closed hearings. It would certainly be an unusual procedure for us again to put on a show before the public.

The Senator from Nebraska has stated that General MacArthur came before the joint meeting of the Senate and House and discussed certain matters. I presume he told everything that he wanted to tell in open hearings. I presume that at that time he told the things which he thought the public ought to know. The main thing which I want the people to have the benefit of, to as great an extent as possible, is the documentary evidence. However, a part of that is highly secret. A request has been made for the plans of the fighting in Korea. I would be willing to concede, at least for the sake of argument, that General MacArthur would not reveal any secret, but once a question is asked in regard to a secret document, that secret document becomes evidence. Everyone knows that in the trial of cases in court questions are frequently asked for their effect upon the jury.

Mr. President, before passing on the question of taking up the resolution and displacing the farm-labor bill, I feel that we should have a quorum call, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I withhold it for the moment.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following conference report, which was read:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vermont, for agricultural purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising nine hundred forty-two and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vermont, and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of transfer.

"The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the conference report on Senate bill 271 has been approved by the House. That is the bill relating to permission to the Department of Agriculture to transfer the so-called Morgan horse farm at Weybridge, Vt., to the Vermont Agricultural College under certain conditions. I understand that the conference report was approved by the House today. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator from Vermont think that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] ought to have notice that the conference report is being taken up?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon wants notice of it or not.

Mr. McFARLAND. This is a privileged matter, and it can be taken up immediately after the quorum call. I think we ought to have a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Anderson	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Kilgore	Robertson
Carlson	Langer	Schoeppel
Cordon	McFarland	Wherry
Dirksen	McKellar	Williams
Ecton	Martin	
Ellender	Maybank	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will act accordingly.

Mr. NEELY. I ask unanimous consent that the motion be repeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion has been agreed to, that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order. There is no quorum present.

Mr. NEELY. I ask unanimous consent to amend the request so that it will be in conformity with the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot consider a unanimous-consent request when there is no quorum present, and it has been so announced.

After a little delay, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in order to make effective the provisions of the bill it will be necessary to obtain an appropriation from the Vermont Legislature. The legislature will adjourn next week. Therefore, in order that the President may be able to sign the bill before it is too late, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to lay on the table the motion to reconsider made by the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make very brief comment. I merely desire to say that everything I said in the past in opposition to the bill I now say again by way of reference, and theoretically incorporate as a part of my remarks. I recognize that the Senate has spoken. Nevertheless, I think time will prove that the observations I made in opposition to the bill were right.

OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear with reference to the pending motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think it would be setting a very poor precedent if the Senate were to adopt special rules directing committees how they shall hold their hearings every time a hearing is held. I think such matters should be left for determination to the committees themselves. I believe the Senate would regret it in the future if it agreed to the pending motion.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has made the statement that he is certain the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would be able to conduct hearings which would not be a show and would not reveal any secrets. I am glad that he has confidence in the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I hope that he will have sufficient confidence in him to follow his good judgment in regard to what ought to be done with reference to the resolution directing that the committees shall have open hearings, which would be contrary to the majority judgment of the committees.

I have at all times stated, and I am still of the opinion, that every bit of evidence which can be divulged without risk to the security of the United States and without risk to the lives of our boys in Korea should be given to the public. Such has been my position from the very beginning. I think the Senate of the United States is not in the position of making such a determination. The Senate as a whole should not make the decision. The members of the committee know more about the contents of secret documents. Therefore, so far as I am personally concerned, although, as I have said from the very beginning, I am in favor of the public having the benefit of every bit of information which does not risk the security of the United States of America. I believe the question should be left to the committees. As I said, it would be a poor policy to establish a precedent of this kind.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution before the Senate is not for consideration. The question is on the motion to take it up.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, as one of the sponsors of the resolution, wishes to thank the committee, particularly the chairman, for having voted in committee today to permit all Senators to be present at the hearings. I believe at times this morning more Senators who are not members of the committee were present at the hearing than the 25 members who constitute the committee. It showed the great interest felt by Senators. I am satisfied that the testimony convinced every Senator that the problem involved is of great concern to the Nation. I suppose there will be differences of opinion as to whether or not any word was said of a nature which should not be given to the general public.

Mr. President, the sons of our citizens are dying on the battlefields of Korea. At the hearing this morning appeared the Commander in Chief in that area, who was there with the boys. He personally went to the front on many occasions. He testified this morning.

The Senator from Michigan has not taken the floor on the merits of the controversy, but merely on the procedure to be followed. The Senator from Michigan spoke briefly yesterday on the necessity for allowing the Senators to hear the testimony. I also said that I was in favor of holding public hearings. I hope that the hearings will be open. I should like to be corrected if I am wrong, but I understand that no vote was taken by the committee this morning on the question of holding open hearings. I again wish to thank the members of the committee for what they have done today for the United States Senate and for the people of the United States, by allowing Senators to attend the hearings. At first glance the resolution which it is sought to have considered may seem to be moot; but it is not moot.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Did the committee vote this morning to permit only Senators to attend the hearings, or did the committee vote to permit also Members of the House to attend?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that only Senators were permitted. If I am wrong, I should like to be corrected. The Senator from Michigan was not present when the vote was taken.

Mr. President, this is not a moot question. The only way we can get the question parliamentarily before the Senate is by a consideration of the resolution. It is the intention of the Senator from Michigan, in behalf of himself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to modify the resolution, so as to include the language of the amendment which is now on the desk. I should like to point out to the Senate exactly what we would be voting on. The modification provides:

> That the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly to consider matters affecting the national defense, be, and hereby are, directed to hear General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and other witnesses in open, public hearings—

This is the important part of the language—

> *Provided*, That no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings.

Mr. President, they can hold executive hearings on all matters which are secret, or which should be considered in secret because they involve the security of the United States. That is the only question. There is no excuse for a private hearing on anything except matters which would affect the security of the United States. This is an investigation of a question of policy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. I agree that if any question involves the security of the United States, it should be considered in secret. We have lost too many men, and we do not want to lose more by virtue of making public any information which involves the national security.

I hope we can get a vote on this question, and have an assurance from the chairman of the committee that he will call his committee together and place this proposal before them, so that they may do as they did this morning, namely, reverse their ruling and allow hearings under the terms of the modified form of the resolution, depending upon the security of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say, Does the Senator from Michigan know whether or not anything will come out at the hearing which may be in the nature of a military secret?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not know what the committee has in mind bringing out. The Senator from Michigan can only say what he heard this morning. The Senator from Michigan will say at this moment that he did not hear anything which he believes would affect the security of the United States. It might benefit, but I do not think it would be detrimental to the security of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask a further question. Does the Senator believe that the 26 Members of the Senate who are members of the joint committee, and will be listening to all the evidence brought out, would be more competent to pass upon the question when it arises in the committee than the Senate as a whole would be? Which group would be more competent?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not the question before the Senate today. It is proposed to give to the committee authority to pass upon the question of security.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is that after the question has been asked and answered, or before?

Mr. FERGUSON. It will be at the time the question is asked. This problem has been solved in Appropriations Committee hearings and in hearings before other committees. Practically all the witnesses will be military men. If they are not military men they will not know any military secrets.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. They will be able to say whether or not a certain question is prejudicial to the security of the United States.

This procedure has been followed by committees during the entire life of the Senate. During World War I and World War II committees held public hearings. Military witnesses are very careful. They are not going to say anything which is prejudicial. Questions which involve the

security of the United States can be answered in a secret session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does not the Senator know that while various and sundry questions are being asked at a public hearing, with the public listening in, Stalin will have his stool pigeon there, and that when questions are asked and answered Stalin will immediately know what benefits Russia. Is that not true?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the same procedure would apply to these hearings that applies to all other open hearings. I take it for granted that representatives of Tass and other persons who are interested in Russia would be present. Even in the departments there are persons who have been known to give evidence to Russia. Even in the Justice Department, when the FBI reports came through, minutes were taken from them and delivered to Russia. Even in the Defense Department there were persons who mimeographed reports of secret documents.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment. The evidence clearly shows that there was a microfilming machine in Georgetown, where the agents of a foreign government were making microfilms of documents when they were not able to carry packages of them to New York, in order that they might be given to the secret agents of Russia.

We are talking about the public in this great Republic, where public opinion must be a force, and yet it is said that the public is not entitled to open hearings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is not a transgression of the rules of the Senate to inquire about procedure in the other body, am I correctly informed that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House announced yesterday that they propose to have open hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives? If they do, will it not make the Senate seem positively silly?

Mr. FERGUSON. I saw what the Senator has indicated in the press, and I take it to be a fact.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator has described some tragic events where great effort was evidently made to obtain some of the secret information with reference to the security of this country. Is the Senator not aware that what he here and now proposes would make it possible for the information to reach the enemy without his having to go to so much trouble? I wonder if he is seeking to make it easier for him.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator knows that what he says is an absolute falsehood. He knows it. There is no doubt about it. He accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to an enemy, Mr. President.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. I will not yield, Mr. President.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to say this——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators will respect the desire of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not going to say any more to the Senator from Oklahoma, except to tell him this: I am reminded of the farmer who was kicked by a mule. His friends said, "What did you do to the mule?" He replied, "I considered the source." I now consider the source from which that remark came, and I have no further reply to it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was sincere when he requested yesterday that Members of the Senate be permitted to be present at the hearings. One of the first men to appear there was a man who filibustered on this floor last night, using ridicule because he did not have anything to say. He was the first to go into the hearing and sit there. Oh, if the public could have seen his face when the testimony was being given at the hearing, he would have been able to convey to Oklahoma some of the real facts. I am sure that when he lies down in bed he will remember some of the things he said upon the floor of the Senate, ridiculing the general who testified. God gives man a conscience, so that he can repent for wrongs.

Mr. President, I was sincere when I made my request yesterday, and I am sincere today. I yield to no man in patriotism or in the desire to defend America. I know what communism is. I have studied it. The Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Michigan took affirmative action when they proposed the security bill, which other Senators joined them in passing, but which was opposed by some Members of the Senate. That bill was passed in the Senate and in the House over the President's veto.

Yet, it is said that we on this side who want open hearings are traitors to the United States of America!

Mr. President, I never thought the time would come when men's consciences would leave them, and for political benefits they would say things upon this floor in accusation of other Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not rise with any hope that any appeal to reason in this body in the prevailing atmosphere could possibly have any effect. I regretfully express the opinion that the Senate has passed the boundary of reason in these matters. I rise in justice to myself to speak on a question about which I have profound convictions, and in order that the record for the future may be quite clear.

May I be permitted to advert briefly to the question of Senators attending this hearing? I have had certain difficulties in arranging the hearings and in attempting to follow my policy of consulting with all the members of the committee with respect to the details. I encountered a difficulty when the Armed Services Committee in the first instance, as I understood, voted unanimously to conduct the hearings in executive session. Public sentiment was at fever heat after that action was taken.

I do not challenge the right of any person to reverse himself, and I am not undertaking to apply the doctrine of estoppel to any Senator. A Senator has a right to change his views at any time he sees fit. I merely point out some of the difficulties which a Senator who is charged with the responsibility for arranging a hearing on such a highly inflammatory issue encounters.

I went into the meeting of the two committees with a typewritten agenda for the hearings which I desired to submit to the committees. Several of the items were discussed. I reached that point on the agenda where I had written that there was a problem before the committee of determining as to whether or not the committee should accede to the request of Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives that they be permitted to attend the hearings. Before I could proceed with my further suggestion, which is incorporated on that agenda, that as many Members of the Senate be permitted to attend as we could accommodate, discussion broke out in the committee, and by practically unanimous vote it was decided that no Members of the Senate or of the House of Representatives should be admitted. I do not relate these facts as an attempt to apply the doctrine of estoppel to Members of the Senate who desire with the agility of an acrobat in the arena to change their minds. That is fully within their rights. I cite it merely to show the difficulties I have encountered and the state of mind of Senators in the existing hysteria.

Pursuant to the instructions of the committee I told Members of the Senate who were among my best friends that they could not be admitted to the hearings, and I did it under the impression that I was supporting the committee. The committee promptly failed, or many of them, to support me.

This morning I called the committee together before the time for the hearing of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, and suggested to them that the committee change its place of meeting to the caucus room in the Senate Office Building in order that all Members of the Senate might be admitted. I state that, Mr. President, merely for the RECORD, not with any attempt to please any person, not in any attempt to curry favor with any Senator or any other person, but in justice to myself.

Mr. President, though I usually value the good will and the high opinion of my colleagues in this body on both sides of the aisle as much as any man can, I have about reached the stage in these proceedings where I recognize the hopelessness of having anything whatever to

do with respect to my position in connection with these hearings, without giving offense. I always undertake to exercise patience. I was taught in my youth that patience was one of the primary virtues of men. My patience in some matters has been worn a bit threadbare, but that is entirely a personal matter.

Mr. President, there is no question of the right of the Senate of the United States to instruct any committee in this body in any way they see fit. Of course the committee is a servant of the Senate, and the servant cannot be more powerful than the master. I do not challenge the right or the power of the Senate—I do not say the right, for I do doubt the right, but the power of the Senate to instruct a committee of this body to take any action a majority of the Members of this body think should be taken.

I do not challenge the accuracy of the statement so frequently made upon this floor and offered as an excuse by some for reversing their position in various matters, that there is a great clamor on the part of the American people to have these hearings televised and to be put on the radio. Of course it is a fiction to talk about an open hearing if it is to be confined merely to the caucus room in the Senate Office Building. That is a fiction, and it is a political fiction of the worse sort, because few would appear there for the mothers and the fathers of the sons who are fighting in Korea. Precious few of them would be able to get into that room. Members of Senators' families and their best friends would be there; but there would be no room, do not mistake that, for the mothers and fathers of sons who are fighting in Korea. That is the reason given why this unnecessary gamble should be taken, this hazard with those boys' lives who are now fighting in Korea—to permit their parents to attend. It is pure political fiction.

If the Senate sees fit to adopt this extraordinary step of instructing a committee on a matter of this kind, material secrets which would be of assistance to the powers in the Kremlin or those in Peiping would get to those centers of Communist power. That would happen unless the American people are denied this entertainment of a televised hearing. Which is more desirable?

I do not doubt either, Mr. President, that a great deal of political capital can be made out of the positions of Senators with respect to this issue. Where public sentiment is in full swing, and where public clamor is most strident, there is the opportunity for political capital. And it is here in this issue.

Mr. President, I have been disturbed in recent days, and been concerned as I have never been before in my life because of the way Senators take position on affairs of Government, by taking action in response to a quick expression of uninformed desire, when the facts at issue have not been placed before all the people from whom the clamor comes. I believe, Mr. President, that there is an issue in this controversy that has survival considerations more important than are the considerations of our tenure of office and our salaries, which depend upon the length of our stay in this body. There is something here that is more important than the election of the President of the United States in 1952. That is the question of national security, of the lives of American boys. For my part I think that these times are very opportune for Senators who wish to demonstrate the courage of rising above the expedient thing of the moment, of doing that which is right, that which will serve their country. Let the political consequences take care of themselves and do that which is right.

Mr. President, we started these hearings this morning. Of course, we have not proceeded at any great length with them. I think they have been conducted—if I may be pardoned for giving expression to such a statement, in view of the fact that I am chairman of the committee—in an orderly manner. I think there has been a semblance of dignity in the committee room. We have not had the klieg lights; we have not had the radio; but I daresay that more progress was made in the course of the session this morning—delayed as it was and brief as it was—in getting at what should be our objective, namely, the truth and the facts, than would have been made with 4 or 5 days of hearings in a circus atmosphere. There can be no question about that. Orderly procedure, expeditious handling, objective search for the truth, protection of the national security, Mr. President, will be best accomplished in an executive session, with all the great care and devotion to detail with which we have gone forward to see that the facts reach the American people promptly and reach them fully, except for those things which would be helpful to the enemy and would be harmful to the American people, and would be paid for by the blood of our very boys in Korea to whom Senators refer in demanding that the hearings be open.

All the people of the United States are represented in these hearings by the Senators who care to attend—Senators who have been duly selected and sworn as the representatives of the people.

Senators talk about having had open hearings of committees all during all the wars. Mr. President, I was in the Senate all during World War II, and I served on the Committee on Appropriations, to which other Senators have referred, and I served on the Committee on Naval Affairs. There was never a single word of testimony—not one—taken on any item affecting the national defense, much less the national security, which was not taken behind closed doors.

Is our country at war today? Are American boys dying today? The political campaign is approaching. During World War II we did not conduct open hearings on such matters. The same glamor, politically, did not attach to the personalities involved and arouse the emotions of the American people as at the moment, but the same basic requirement of protecting the national interest is present today, even as it was in those times. Should that cause us to surrender to political considerations?

Mr. President, I did not hear the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. When reference is made to shows, I must confess that I am almost a two-ring affair today in trying to attend the committee hearings and also endeavoring to be in the Senate Chamber to make a record which I think it is vital to have made. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska said that I would be able to protect the public interest in open hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I said that I attended the hearings this morning, and I spoke in the highest terms of the Senator from Georgia, whom I deeply respect, and who conducted the hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I said to the Members of the Senate and to the people generally that I knew the Senator from Georgia was so fair and had so much ability that I was sure, regardless of whether the hearings were open or closed, he would conduct them with dignity and with respect, and there would be no burlesque show, and he would conduct the hearings in a fashion which would be a credit to the United States Senate. I mean every word of that, because the Senator from Georgia knows the high regard I have for him and my feelings toward him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's remarks very much, and his high regard for me is one of my cherished possessions. I had not correctly understood what he had said. As I walked on to the floor of the Senate the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] was speaking, and I understood him to say that the Senator from Nebraska had said that I would be able, as chairman of the committee, to protect security matters.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct, but I said I felt sure there would be no burlesque show and it would not be like a ballpark performance, because I knew that the Senator from Georgia had the ability to protect the hearings, even if they were open, so that they would be conducted in a dignified and orderly fashion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement. However, my understanding of his statement was that he said I would be in a position to conduct the hearings in such a way as to protect the public interest and avoid disclosure of damaging plans.

Mr. WHERRY. I said the Senator from Georgia had the ability to protect the meetings so that there would be no burlesque show or no resemblance to a meeting in a ballpark, but that the hearings would be conducted with the dignity and the ability which always characterize the activities of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall yield in a moment, but first let me make one statement.

Dignity—which I have never sought to assume—and ability—of which I have never boasted, but which are attributed to me by the distinguished Senator—and

I appreciate the attribution—are a very poor substitute for security and for saving the lives of American boys.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is one of the points I raised, namely, that because of the ability and knowledge the Senator from Georgia has of military affairs, I was positive there would be no violation of the national security as a result of the questions which were asked and answered in the hearings. I am as sure as I am sure that I am standing here now, that because of the ability of the Senator from Georgia, not a question would be answered which would in any way violate the national security. I have so much faith in the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I am entirely sure of that.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I understood the Senator from Arizona to say in referring to the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska, and that is why I remained on the floor to make this statement, because I refuse to have this responsibility even impliedly saddled upon me by the words of any Senator. Mr. President, I have never shirked any responsibility that it was possible for me to discharge. I do not do so now, but I refuse to accept any such responsibility even if the Senate by a majority vote should seek to impose it upon me. No patriotic man who feels as I do about the importance of protecting the critical secrets of this Nation in this dark hour would assume any such obligation if he knew the nature of the documents and the evidence involved in this hearing. I am here to express by my vote my protest against any action of the Senate which would place any such fearsome and impossible duty upon any Member of this body. The Senate cannot fix any such responsibility by the words or actions of any other Senator. If the national security is endangered, if future disaster should result, the responsibility rests upon those who vote for open hearings and they cannot be cleared of that responsibility by mere words which seek to fix it elsewhere.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, but I must be brief.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not take long. First, I wish to say that I completely approve the position—not an easy one—now being taken by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, who is an ornament to the post he holds as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to address a question to the Senator. Noting that the last clause of the resolution reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That no matters the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open public hearings—

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not true that a majority of such committees has already, upon full deliberation, determined that it would be prejudicial to the security of the United States for them to proceed in open public hearings in the matter now entrusted to them for hearing?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have only a few minutes more to remain on the floor, because I wish at least to get a sandwich and a cup of coffee before the hearings are resumed.

I shall answer the question by saying that, in my opinion, those words are nothing but window dressing or vote bait. No committee chairman can control questions of members which might endanger the national security, much less the answers which will be given by the witnesses who will be on the stand.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has just come through the hearings on the troops-to-Europe issue. We heard from all the Joint Chiefs of Staff and from various other military men. Questions vital to the security of Europe and questions vital to the security of the United States were asked at those hearings. Therefore, I now ask the Senator this question: Does he not feel that those meetings were conducted in such a fashion that there was no violation of the national security, but that in the end the result was to perform a real service which was of help to the people of the country, in enabling them to understand what was involved in the national defense of Western Europe as well as in the defense of the United States of America?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no more analogy could be drawn between those hearings, involving a question of opinion on a political matter, and the hearings now being held, involving war plans, secret documents, and things of the like, than could be drawn between a donkey and a race horse. There is no comparison whatever.

Mr. WHERRY. A question of national security is certainly involved.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has brought that in again.

Mr. President, I shall ask, because time does not permit me to read it, that I be permitted to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this juncture the requests which were submitted to me, and which have been submitted by the Republican members of the committee, for secret documents. I challenge and defy the Senator to point to one secret document which was requested or was brought into play in the hearings on the troops-to-Europe question to which he referred. Not a single secret document was requested or brought before the committee in those hearings. In this instance, a veritable mass of the most intimate documents dealing with the defense has been demanded, and I have requested the Department of Defense to supply them. There cannot be any analogy, there cannot be any comparison. I wish I could read all the requests. I cannot do so, but I want the RECORD to show them.

There being no objection, the requests, in the form of a letter dated April 23, 1951, addressed to the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman, Committee on Armed Services, from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], also four other letters requesting classified documents and other material were ordered to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 25, 1951.

HON. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Senator BRIDGES to me which I believe is self-explanatory.

In preparation for the MacArthur hearings before the combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate, I would appreciate your making available to the committees by Tuesday, May 1, as many of the documents referred to in Senator BRIDGES' letter as can be secured within that time. If you are unable to supply any portion of the material requested, please so inform me.

In additon to the material referred to in items (a) through (f) in Senator BRIDGES' letter I request that you make available to the committees such other documents and information bearing on this same general subject as will assist the committees in their efforts to get a rounded picture of the pertinent factual and documentary data which exist in this field.

In compiling this material the committees request that the security classification of the various documents and items of information be reexamined and downgraded to the maximum extent which you consider consistent with proper security.

I realize that it will not be possible for you or the committees to forecast at this time all of the subjects which may arise during the course of the hearings. As the hearings develop, you may wish to furnish additional compilations and the committees may find it necessary to request additional documents and materials.

In addition to the specific documents referred to above, and the others which I anticipate you will furnish in response to this request, I would like to request that the committees be furnished a copy of such record as may have been made of the Wake Island meeting of last October, which was recently discussed in several newspaper accounts.

I am hopeful that this material can be presented to the committees by a representative of the Department of Defense at an executive meeting to be held Tuesday, May 1. This procedure would assist the committees in understanding the nature of the material submitted and what additional is available.

Sincerely yours.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
April 23, 1951.

The Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: As the ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, I suggest that you have the Defense Establishment make available to the committee within the next few days the following documents:

(a) The Wedemeyer Report submitted to the President under date of September 19, 1947. (This report was submitted at the same time as his report on China, which was published in the so-called China white paper in August of 1949.)

(b) A copy of war plans relating to Korea and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff prior to the outbreak of hostilities on June 25, 1950. This document will give the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to what they believed our demands should be in the event aggression took place against the Republic of Korea.

(c) The minutes of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to the strategic importance of Formosa during the 12 months' period, July 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950, together with correspondence and memos between the Department of Defense and the Department of State, dealing with the subject of Formosa during the same period of time.

(d) Directive issued to the members of the United Nations forces in Korea through the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to Republic of Korea officials being restricted from areas north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

(e) Joint Chiefs of Staff document dated on or about January 12, 1951, relative to steps to be taken in regard to the Korean conflict in the event of certain eventualities.

(f) Exact dates subsequent to January 1, 1948, on which Far East headquarters requested additional troops and the number of troops requested in each case. Also dates of the replies from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, showing the number of troops, if any, supplied in conformity with such requests.

(g) Also any other documents that you consider pertinent to the situation.

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
April 28, 1951.

Hon. RICHARD RUSSELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR DICK: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff together with a copy of his reply to me. I believe that this information is different from that requested by you in your letter to Secretary Marshall. However, will you please add to the information requested in your letter to Secretary Marshall the material requested by me in my letter to General Bradley.

I believe that in your letter to Secretary Marshall you requested the notes of the Wake Island conference which were released to the New York Times a short time ago. The information on Wake Island which I have requested deals with a meeting in the Pentagon Building on Wednesday, October 18, 1950, where the correspondents were given background material relative to the Wake Island conference. This meeting was called by Defense Department officials. Secretary Pace did most, if not all, of the "briefing" though General Bradley attended the meeting.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

APRIL 25, 1951.

Gen. OMAR BRADLEY,
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Pentagon Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL: As a member of the Armed Services Committee and in preparation for the hearings that will start next week I would like to receive as soon as possible the following:

1. The build-up of United Nations forces in Korea by months and by nationalities (including United States forces) from July 1, 1950, to April 1, 1951 (or more current figures, if available) for Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Korean theater of operations.

2. The stenographic or other notes made by the Department of the Army or its public-relations staff dealing with the press conference held in the Pentagon Building Wednesday, October 18, 1950, wherein the correspondents were given background material relative to the Wake Island conference.

3. Copy of communication from Gen. Matthew Ridgway to Gen. Lawton Collins or the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to his views on the use of the troops of the Republic of China as allies in the struggle against Communist aggression in Korea.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter requesting the information you would like to have in preparing for the hearings the Armed Services Committee expects to hold next week.

In order that your request may receive early consideration, I have taken the liberty of passing your letter to Secretary Marshall. I am informed that he has received a request from Senator RUSSELL, the chairman of the committee, for similar information. As much of the information being requested deals with the same matters, it would make our task easier and eliminate many duplications if all the requests could be handled through your chairman. I hope this is entirely agreeable to you.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

OMAR BRADLEY.

MAY 1, 1951.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Will you please request of the Senate Appropriations Committee that they furnish the original copy which will show information supplied as a result of the committee's requests and the carbon copy (showing information deleted by the State or Defense Department) of the committee hearings held on Monday, June 26, and on Tuesday, June 27, 1950, at which time Secretary of State Acheson, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, General Lemnitzer, and others from the State and Defense Departments were present and testified relative to military aid in the Far East and elsewhere.

In addition, we also request that the hearings held in executive session on Monday, August 28, 1950, at which time Admiral R. H. Hillenkoetter testified, also be made available to our combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. This information is pertinent to the inquiry and I think will give the members of the combined committees information not previously available to them.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

MAY 1, 1951.

Hon. RICHARD RUSSELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Will you please request from the State Department the stenographic notes of the conference held in the State Department on October 6, 7, and 8 of 1949 relating to China and far-eastern policy?

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one point other than security. Of course, the Senator knows that I have very great regard for his ability, but the difficulty of controlling the secret nature of these matters is, I think, insuperable. But, in addition to that, does not the Senator think that actually getting at the truth of what the nature is of the difference which has risen, is much more likely to be achieved in executive sessions than in public sessions, aside from the matter of security? Assuming that the Senator is interested, and that the country is interested in getting at the real truth, is it not the Senator's opinion that it is much more likely to achieve that purpose in executive session, because witnesses will be very reluctant to speak about things which are in this field in open session? That is simply human nature. They will not bring themselves to be as frank with the committee as they would if the sessions were closed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there can be no possible question about that. I undertook to emphasize on last Monday that we shall expedite the hearings and reveal the truth if we conduct the hearings in this manner. We can give the American people every fact which can be published without giving aid and comfort to the enemy, whereas, if the hearings are held in such a way that a man must guard every word he utters, if the hearings must be partly in secret and partly in the open, with Senators becoming confused and coming into an open session to ask a question about a secret document which they saw in the closed session, it would obscure the truth, if it did not hide it forever, and risk the lives of American men and the security and safety of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, when I vote upon this question, I wish to make it perfectly clear, so far as I am concerned, that, merely because I am chairman of the committee, I cannot assume responsibility for the protection of the vital interests of the people and of the lives of the sons of American mothers. We have opened the hearings to 96 Senators, representatives of all the people. If we followed the course of permitting the attenance of friends of Senators and the representatives of the press, it would open it up, not only to the representatives of the American people, but to the representatives of Pravda, and the Kremlin. That is the effect of it. It would keep the people from getting the facts and at the same time endanger American lives needlessly.

Mr. President, it might pay political dividends, and there is no question in my mind but that it would, but when it comes to serving the best interests of the country, we would ill serve that interest by open hearings.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the representatives of the Russian press have already asked for a transcript of the hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that is the fact.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as that is concerned, it makes no difference whether the hearings are open or closed, does it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, it certainly does make a difference.

Mr. WHERRY. On matters of security, information would be withheld, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has the votes, I have been informed. He can take the responsibility of opening the hearings to our enemies. I am not endeavoring to escape any responsibility I should seek to fulfill, but I refuse to accept a responsibility forced upon me in this manner and under these circumstances, and for such reasons. I will not do it, though never in my life have I knowingly avoided any responsibility or duty which could fairly attach to me in any public office I have held, from the time I was a member of the General Assembly of Georgia, down to this good hour.

Mr. President, who is the principal figure in this great drama. The General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. I gave General MacArthur every opportunity, if he thought it well to have the hearings in public session to say so, and to have them held in public session, at least so far as he was concerned. General MacArthur has been in the service of his country for 52 years, and has dealt with security matters for that length of time. He may not have exactly the political interest in this question that others have, because he has disavowed politics, though I think he would be nominated by acclamation if the Republican convention were held any time within the next few months, and he might well be, when it is held next summer. General MacArthur says he disavows politics, I do not think that all of the Republican leaders could stop the stampede. He would be nominated; unless he used Sherman's expression when he was about to have the nomination forced upon him, he would be the Republican nominee—and an able candidate he would be. But General MacArthur certainly has as much at stake in this matter as has any Member of the Senate, and he has much more knowledge of what will affect adversely the lives of the men from whom he was torn in Korea, and of the public welfare and the interests of the United States, than all the men who clamor for an open hearing. I submitted it to him. I said, "If you desire a public hearing, we will have it." He evidently did not desire it. To this moment he has expressed no desire. He realizes the value of security, and he is not a politician in the ordinary sense of the word. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not want to leave the impression, does he, that the distinguished general said he would leave it up to the committees?

Mr. RUSSELL. He made no statement to me about it whatever.

Mr. WHERRY. He has been quoted by a member of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not had time to read the newspapers and to keep up with all those developments.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely ask the Senator the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have kept in touch with General MacArthur, through correspondence and telegrams, and he has not so expressed himself, though given an opportunity. I do not believe the general would do a committee of the Congress the discourtesy to tell the newspapers something that he would not tell the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have more regard for him than to think that he would treat a committee of Congress in such manner. I have known General MacArthur for 20 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to leave the impression that General MacArthur has refused to testify in public hearings, or that he himself has made a selection or a choice?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator attempts to cut it a little thinner. I gave him the opportunity. I told him that if he desired to have the hearings in open session, we would have open sessions; but General MacArthur, who understands security values, who is a great patriot, who has been in three wars, did not desire to jeopardize the lives of the men whom he left in Korea.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is the last time I can yield. I am sorry. The hearings are to commence at 2:30, and I have another iron-clad obligation in 15 minutes. I yield this once, and I ask Senators to appreciate the fact that I cannot continue to yield.

Mr. LONG. Unless the Senator from Louisiana got an erroneous impression, the Senator from Georgia today suggested to General MacArthur that if he wanted to have the hearings conducted in open session he could have them in the open, so far as his testimony was concerned. Am I correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think I made that statement to him today. I am not sure that I did. I made the statement at the opening of the hearings, and I may have referred to certain telegrams. I am not sure regarding that, or as to just what I said, but I had in writing given him the opportunity. He is a man who has a vital interest in the issue at stake, for his reputation is involved. There may be Senators who think they can speak for Douglas MacArthur. I have been around these halls for about 18 years, and I have served with many Senators. I have never yet seen a man on this floor who could speak for Douglas MacArthur as Douglas MacArthur can speak for himself. Yet there are a great many people who would speak for him in connection with these hearings.

Mr. President, time forbids that I should proceed much longer. I merely wish by this statement to place the responsibility for any disclosure where the responsibility belongs. We must bear in mind that all the witnesses are not going to be Douglas MacArthur or George Marshall or Omar Bradley or members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. All of them will not know how to protect America's security in the public interest as well as do those men who have spent so many years in the business of protecting the country and the national security.

Mr. President, I repeat, when some persons have shouted about the public interest in open hearings they hope that back of public interest there lies political benefit.

Mr. President, it will be a poor comfort to the mothers and fathers of America whose sons are in Korea to see these hearings on a television set or to hear them on the radio, if as a result of such action they, within a few days, receive a telegram reading, "We regret to inform you that your son has died in action."

Mr. President, I shall vote on this question; I shall leave the session of the committee to do so if the motion is not voted on immediately, because I desire to be on record as voting on this issue.

That vote will cleanse me of the blood of American boys that will be unnecessarily spilled on account of inevitable disclosures. What a poor consolation that will be if I am compelled to see the blood of those American boys on the hands of other Senators. With the perfect conviction that I serve my country's best interests, I shall vote against this motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and the position which has already been taken by a substantial majority of the two committees in expressing their conviction that the hearings, with all their far-flung implications, must, in the protection of the national security, be held in closed session.

Mr. President, in what I shall have to say, there will not be any recriminations, there will not be any charge or the intimation of anything other than patriotism as existing in the heart of any other Senator. But in the very nature of things, I must say that I think the judgment of those who think the hearings should be conducted as open hearings is unwise judgment, unsound judgment, and, besides that, it is judgment which, if it be followed, will make the hearings much longer drawn out. It will not produce a quick development of the facts, secret or otherwise, with reference to many of the separate fields which have to be covered in the inquiry, but it will be a distinct disservice to our people as a whole, and particularly a continuing source of hazard to the security of the approximately quarter of a million American men in Korea who now are fighting for us and for the cause of freemen everywhere.

Mr. President, in a question which I asked of the Senator from Georgia, I have already invited attention to the fact that the last paragraph of the amendment to the resolution lays a predicate for doing the very thing which has already been done by a majority of the two committees, and done, as stated by the Senator from Georgia, and as obviously must have been the case, for the very reason recited in the last paragraph as an adequate reason for keeping the

hearings closed rather than open. The last paragraph reads as follows:

Provided, That no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings.

That ends the quoted part of the resolution.

Mr. President, it is well known to every Senator and, I think, to people generally throughout the United States, that deliberately and after a calm consideration of the whole question, a sizable majority of the two committees, including, it happens, at least one Member who comes from the opposite side of the aisle, has already ruled that, in the judgment of that sizable majority of the two committees, the field to be covered by this investigation necessarily involves matters which could be so prejudicial to the security of the United States, if brought out into the open, that the hearings shall be closed hearings.

If anything more were required to make it appear that the resolution, no matter how well intended, is at most and at best an empty, idle, and vacuous gesture, that fact well appears from the reading of that last paragraph, because it is very clear upon reading it that the Senators offering the resolution do not want to assume the responsibility for untoward incidents which might develop from open hearings upon this grave subject, and which might come in such a way as to jeopardize the security of the United States. Therefore, they have inserted the last paragraph in order to put the responsibility where it belongs, upon a majority of the two committees, and where it has already been exercised by a majority of the two committees—exercised, there can be no doubt in the world, because to permit the hearings to go along in public would present a continued jeopardy to the national security and a continued jeopardy to the welfare and the lives of American boys serving in Korea, as well as the lives of our allies serving there under American command.

Mr. President, let us see what it is that is proposed to be brought out at the hearings. In the first place, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has already placed in the record of the debate a long list of top-secret documents which have been requested by Members of the Senate to be produced in the hearings. Certainly anyone looking at that list knows perfectly well that the secrecy of those documents must be preserved and that the discussion of matters concerning them must remain secret. He knows perfectly well, that in a hearing wherein a large number of top-secret documents of this kind become matters for discussion by witnesses, it is extremely unwise and hazardous to leave it to chance questions by various Senators, operating under the very best of motives, as to whether those questions will themselves be prejudicial to the public interest and destructive of public security.

Mr. President, I shall not go into a discussion of incidents in the past. There have been frequent instances when Senators in good faith have asked questions at hearings which themselves disclosed public secrets of great significance and of great importance. There would be a continuing opportunity and invitation to just that sort of a disclosure and that sort of a situation by having the hearings go on in public, with so many different Senators present, and clothed with authority to ask questions, and having the hearings searched by eyes which certainly might not be friendly, to discover whether questions were asked from time to time in the conduct of the hearings which questions themselves put people who are inimical to us and to our best interests and our best security on notice that there are important secrets in fields which heretofore were, to them, unknown and undisclosed.

Mr. President, what is it that the distinguished General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur, brings to the committee? In the first place, I remind Members of the Senate that before the dramatic appearance of the General of the Army, and as soon as the difficulty arose under which he was relieved by the President of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] stated upon the floor and stated to the press that this was a matter which vitally affected the conduct of the war—regardless of whether we wished to call our Korean engagement by that name—and which required, in his judgment, the presence of the late field commander of our forces in that war to give information to the Committee on Armed Services on the conduct of the war and upon all of its far-flung aspects.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment.

We know that on one subject which will be explored in great detail, namely, the conduct of the war thus far in Korea, the witness will have to add his comment based on his own peculiar knowledge, of the essential details, which are most closely guarded secrets, with reference to such things as the number and disposition of our forces, the units among our forces, the way in which our forces are armed, the way in which our forces have been behaving so far as their morale is concerned, the kind of naval support which has been given, the force in which our Navy is serving on the two coasts of Korea, the kind of air support which is being given, the number of planes and the variety of planes which have been available, and the attempts which have been made to use, and the use that has been made of, new weapons, some of which have been announced and some of which may not have been announced. In short, all of the intimate details of the conduct of what has certainly grown to be a real war, regardless of what we may call it, is within the knowledge of this distinguished witness.

We know perfectly well that at least one of the purposes of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is to ask that an authoritative report upon all of these matters, and many more affecting the conduct of the war, shall be made available to the members of the Committee on Armed Services at this particular hearing.

Mr. President, has there been any prior occasion at all when a field commander of a fighting army, which has been fighting under very great difficulties, has come before a committee clothed, as is General MacArthur, with knowledge of such secrets? I may add that the greatness of the difficulties has not been made any clearer by any other source than by the statements of the General of the Army himself.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate should give very careful thought to the fact that the distinguished field commander is here to give a report and to make available to Senators for their official guidance, as members of the committee, and later for the guidance of all Members of the Senate, facts which they will need in determining the many issues which will come before the Senate for solution.

It is ridiculous to make a report of operations of that scope, importance, and secrecy in the goldfish bowl atmosphere which prevails at an open hearing of a committee of the Senate. I cannot understand where the judgment of Members of the Senate has fled when they ask that such information and such a report, basic as they are to any decision to be made upon the whole question, shall be considered except in well-guarded and closed hearings of the Senate committees which are charged with the duty of conducting such hearings.

Mr. President, let us go to other matters which are equally secret: The number, the units, and the disposition of the enemy forces, both North Korean and Red Chinese; the number, disposition, and state of supply of forces of the potential enemy, Russia, across an artificial line only a few miles away, where at least they must be taken into very serious consideration; the number and disposition of Chiang Kai-shek's forces on Formosa, which the general of the Army feels could properly and beneficially be used in the difficulty in Asia, and their morale, state of organization, and arms. Matters of that kind simply cannot be discussed out in the open.

The general of the Army has already made a dramatic public appearance and a dramatic public report at a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. The Senator from Florida was glad to join in inviting him to make the report. He was glad to applaud him for much of the great work he had done, both as a military man and as a civilian organizer and diplomatic leader in the last 5 years of his important work in Japan.

The Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that that report was certainly public, and that the numerous reports which have been made since, in other appearances by the general of the Army, have certainly also been public. What we have come down to now is the matter of making available to the Members of the Senate who must make recommendations, and upon which recommendations the Senate itself must finally act, all the intimate facts and all the intimate details concerning our own organization and performance in the war,

and the organization and performance of our enemies, both actual and potential, as well as of our potential friends.

Mr. President, other matters of the greatest importance and secrecy must be gone into at such hearings upon the testimony offered by General MacArthur. One of them has to do with Japan. The general has done a tremendous job in Japan. I am very sure that the committee will want to know what the military potential of Japan is. They will want to know what the feeling of the Japanese people is at this time, both as to their morale and as to their attitude toward us, as well as toward those who fight with us and on our side. They will want to know what the economic situation is in that whole part of the Orient, and as to whether it is in our favor or whether it is adverse to our success.

There are so many facets of the information which must be sought and given at this hearing, Mr. President, that it seems to me that it would be an idle and ridiculous thing to instruct the committee to have open hearings, and end with a paragraph which gives the committee the authority to determine that it shall not go ahead with anything that it regards as prejudicial to the security of the United States, when it has already ruled that it thinks the entire hearings are so enmeshed with secret matters which must not be brought out into the open that a closed hearing is required in order to preserve the secrecy of those many issues, many of which are already known, and many of which are probably unknown to us at this time, and will have to be probed by this particular committee.

There is not the slightest indication or intimation that anyone on either of those committees is trying to hide facts which should come to the Senate. All Members of the Senate were invited to attend, and many were present this morning listening.

Furthermore, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that already the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has released two documents which were regarded as of very great importance, the release of one of which had been long sought by many persons interested in it. I refer to the so-called Wedemeyer report, the release of which has been sought for a period of 2 years or more.

Is it an indication of unwillingness to give information which can be safely given that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has very promptly availed himself of the right to demand the production of this document, and then, having seen that most of it can safely be made available at this late hour, has made it available and turned it over to the public, which has eagerly desired for a long time to see it?

In addition, the Senator from Georgia has also asked for the report on the Wake Island conference between the President of the United States and General MacArthur, and has made that report public and available. It certainly has not been available heretofore.

It ought to be rather apparent that the Senator from Georgia is letting the chips fall where they may, because a certain group of people were clamoring for one of these reports. The views of that group were supported by the recitals of one of the reports. Another group finds itself supported in part by disclosures in the other report.

The Senator from Georgia has shown with complete fullness that he wants to be fair, and that he is going to make available to the public those things which can safely be made public knowledge, just as quickly as he can determine that fact.

There is one further thing which I think has not been given sufficient emphasis, and that is the apparent unwillingness of those who sponsor this resolution and the position which lies behind it to attribute to the majority members of the joint committee and to the chairman of the joint committee a complete sense of fairness and justice, and also to attribute that quality to the minority members of the joint committee. It is true, of course, that the minority party has almost equal membership on the committee with the majority party. The minority membership of the two committees which have been directed to hold joint hearings consists of most able and distinguished Senators. Let me recite the names of the Senators from the minority side of the aisle who are members of the Committee on Armed Services, and who, if they saw any departure at all on the part of the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the joint committee, from the path of fairness, justness, and sound Americanism—and I am sure there will be no such departure—would certainly be under obligation of the gravest sort immediately to call attention to any such departure.

Surely the Members of the Senate on the minority side must remember that they have on the Armed Services Committee the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], a former governor of his State; the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], also a former governor of his State——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator- ——

Mr. HOLLAND. I will not yield until I finish this list.

There is also the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]; and the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that here are men who have grown gray in the service of their Nation and in the service of their States. Many of them have served in a military capacity in wars which our Nation has fought. I know that one of these men suffered the loss of a dearly loved son in World War II. Surely, Senators on the minority side of the aisle do not find themselves in the situation of being unwilling to rely upon men such as those whose names I have just read, not only to do the fair thing, but to bring out into the open any departure from rules of fairness, justice, and sound Americanism, if there should be any such departure in the transactions of the joint committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I do not want to be disrespectful in any way. The committee is to reconvene at 2:30. Nearly all these arguments have already been brought forward. I wonder if the Senator would not cooperate and permit us to obtain a vote on the pending motion and on the resolution itself. Unless the Senate acts before the committee reconvenes at 2:30, there will be further delay. I do not say that in any sense of disrespect to the Senator or his right to the floor. If he wishes to make the argument, that is all right, but I am saying to the distinguished Senator that the committee is to reconvene at 2:30. I am perfectly willing to forego any answer to anything that has been said, in order to obtain a vote on the resolution. It ought to be done before 2:30 if it is to be done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Florida will not take much more time by his remarks, but he wants to be clearly on record as to how he feels on this matter. He must ask the Senator to indulge him for a few minutes longer.

Let us go to the membership of the Foreign Relations Committee. At the present time there are five distinguished Members of the minority party on that committee. There is a vacancy which can be filled on an hour's notice, and I understand it will be filled immediately. But considering only the five members already upon that committee from the Republican side of the aisle, I call attention to the names of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]; the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], a former governor of his State; the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], a former governor of his State.

I call to the attention of the Senate in general, and particularly to the attention of the minority Members of the Senate, the fact that they have distinguished representation upon the Foreign Relations Committee. Upon that committee are men who have served their States and their Nation ably. Several of them have served in the Armed Forces. Members of the minority can surely rely with complete certainty upon the soundness of service of those men, and upon their willingness to bring to light any departure from the rules of fairness, sound Americanism, and real patriotism, if there are any departures in those respects on the part of the chairman of the committee—of course, there will be none on his part—or on the part of any other members of the committee.

The Senator from Florida will not read the names of the majority members

of the two committees; but among that group are several former governors as well as several men of great distinction from the judiciary—for example, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], former chief justice of the highest court of his State. Incidentally, he too lost a beloved son during World War II.

Mr. President, Senators simply cannot properly take the position of questioning the patriotism of members of the committee, and the soundness of the procedure to be followed by men of such high quality and character. They have already clearly expressed their view, by a majority vote, to the effect that in justice to the country and its most sacred secrets and most carefully guarded measures, measures which are of great importance to our men now serving in Korea, we cannot subject this hearing to open consideration of all these matters and to the possibility of the defeat of our security by bringing in, even unintentionally, matters which point to a situation on which should be carefully concealed and kept away from public knowledge.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is about to conclude. He feels that the Senate has already shown by its action in this matter that it regards this matter as of the gravest importance to the United States because it has assigned this matter jointly for hearing to two of its most distinguished committees, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, thereby showing that it feels that the subject matters to be gone into by those committees do have a most vital impact upon those matters in our national structure which have to do with national defense and particularly with the conduct of the war now going on in Korea; and they also have to do intimately with the matters of our foreign relations with our allies and with others who are not our allies, and with other nations throughout the earth generally.

Mr. President, that very action shows that the Senate recognizes this matter as being extremely grave and as being of the most vital importance to our Nation in these two great fields.

Mr. President, the question now is whether by the adoption of the proposed resolution the Senate will proceed to place upon the committees the burden of trying to go ahead with open hearings when the committees have already declared that they think that course is unsafe and unsound, and when the committees have already shown by their action that they feel that such a course would not be the safer course, would not be the satisfactory course, would not be the course which gives information most quickly, information which should be given as quickly as possible to our public, and, above all, is not the course which will safeguard the security of our fighting men.

Mr. President, after all, that is the matter of supremest importance. The casualty lists have already struck pretty close to many of us. They have already reached close to the senior Senator from Florida. He knows something about what is going on in 60,000 homes in the United States, where boys from those homes have either given their all or have suffered wounds, so as to have them named as casualties in the war which is now going on.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator that as I listened to General MacArthur this morning I got the distinct feeling that the thing that will determine the security of the boys in Korea more than any other one thing is the making of a right decision by the people of America in their choice between the courses of action suggested. The Senator will remember, I am sure, some of the words which I shall not at this time attempt to repeat, but words the Senator will surely remember, of General MacArthur. He was not this morning speaking, so far as I could detect at any point, with the concern of one who is trying to justify a course of action, but as one who was trying to give information and presenting to the Members who were there listening the importance of making a decision that would affect the security of the boys in Korea. Without the information to make that decision properly how can the boys be given security?

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from South Dakota. Perhaps he was not here when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] made his statement, part of which was that already, since the hearing of this morning, General MacArthur has stated he had to withhold, and felt that it was wise to withhold at a meeting of that kind, facts that are of importance and will have to be given later, but which he feels pertain so vitally to the security of the United States that he could not go into them at that meeting.

The question is this: Shall we go ahead with what does not go beneath the surface, that does not deal with vital questions, shall we skim over everything, and lay aside matters affecting the disposition of our forces, the arming of our forces, the health of our forces, to see that they are supplied with ammunition and other weapons which they can use; the question of the disposition of our naval forces and their numbers engaged, and of our air forces, the question of support which has been accorded to us in this common effort by our allies, who are already in the war, about 20 allies, that is; the question of the organization of those who are our actual enemies, and those who are our potential enemies, and also those who are our potential friends; the question of intimate facts affecting Japan—and we cannot ignore Japan with its eighty or ninety million people who, thanks largely to the service of General MacArthur, are apparently now most friendly disposed to us?

All those matters are so intimate to the whole discussion. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota, that if we carefully evade any reference to them and carefully evade going into any matter which touches them we have very little left.

It is because of that fact that the two commitees have, in their joint judgment, already agreed, by their majority vote, that they do not feel that it is sound to go into this question in open hearing.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I merely wish to ask him, Was it not understood that whatever public hearings might be had, the committees might proceed with executive sessions thereafter, to consider intimate details?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, it was so understood, I will say to the Senator from South Dakota. The very fact that that was the case defers and delays until later hearings getting at the meat in the cocoanut. And I will say to the Senator that if it is important for the Congress of the United States to take action, if it is important for the Congress of the United States to decide what policy, in its judgment, is best, it must have the facts, and not just that skimming of facts which in the judgment of the committee is safe to be exposed at public hearings.

Mr. CASE. I may say very briefly that I understood that following the hearing this morning General MacArthur said there was nothing he said this morning that might not be given to the public. I heard several Members on both sides of the aisle at the hearing say the same thing after the hearing this morning. But it is my considered opinion that many of the things said by MacArthur this morning would have had a terrific impact on the country if the people had heard what he said, and had heard the way he said it. It would affect the security of the boys in Korea.

Mr. HOLLAND. Anything that does not pertain to the security of the country can be made and will be made available to the country, of course, and the Senator knows that. He knows that his side of the aisle is safeguarded by the presence of nearly half of the members of the joint committees as representatives of his side of the aisle, and if there is any disposition to withhold anything which is really so safe that it can be made public knowledge, that it is within the power of the Senators upon that side of the aisle who sit upon the committees to see that public knowledge is had of those matters. So it seems to me so clear that what is sought to be done is to skim off those things which can be made safely available to the public, but hold back the vital information and facts upon which any judgment to be sound must be based.

I say to the Senator that judgment which is sound cannot be based upon the skimmings. In order for a sound judgment to be made, there must be available the whole substance of the facts which show what is our situation over there in the Orient, what is the condition of our Armed Forces and those who compose them, and of those who may be on one side or the other in the future.

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear from the question of the Senator from South Dakota that what he would like to do,

that what those who support the resolution would like to do, is to skim off hurriedly a few facts, which can be made matters of public knowledge, but to hold back the meat upon which solely any sound judgment can be made, and to allow again, the public to have a partial description of what the facts are, and to allow the formation of public judgments, either sound or unsound, without getting the needed knowledge quickly to Senators who represent the various States in the Nation—and I hope that all of us feel that we represent all the people of this Nation.

I say to the Senator that I think he and those who share his feelings are suggesting a completely unsound method of approach, and I believe we have had too much of that unsoundness already. Now we need to get at the very essential meat of the situation which confronts us in Korea; and in order to get at that meat, we have to delve into the secret matters which cannot be disclosed in the open. It will not be possible for sound judgment to be reached in connection with such matters until those vital questions have been probed and until we have the benefit of the mass of information which is in the mind of the great field commander who until so recently was in command of our men in Korea and the mass of information which is in the minds of others who are in part entrusted with representing us in the military field.

Mr. President, I do not agree with those who conclude that in order to appease the popular demand for information now—not information as to the ultimate facts, which cannot be made public, but information as to the facts which can be made public—the procedure in the committee should be a casual, hurried, skimming off of such harmless facts from the total facts to be presented at the hearings.

Mr. President, the people of Florida, who are writing literally thousands of letters to me about this matter, wish us to get at the vital facts, and in that connection they want the benefit of the expressions of those who represent them as to what are the best interests of our Nation and what we can do to achieve a policy which will be sound and will lead to a victorious conclusion of the struggle in Korea. They do not want a prolongation of the whole question by means of having the committee spend days and days in a useless endeavor to skim off the facts which can be made public, and to separate them from the vital facts which cannot be made public, but on the basis of which alone the decisions can be made.

I say to the Senator from South Dakota that what he and those who are associated with him in his position suggest is that instead of coming to a quick conclusion based upon sound knowledge of the vital facts, we prolong this difficult and dangerous situation by skimming off a lot of facts which can be made public and by conducting the hearings as a sort of Roman holiday, from day to day, and postponing until after that time the determination of the real facts which alone—and I repeat that only the discussion of the real facts will make it possible for anyone—whether it be the distinguished Senator from South Dakota or any other Senator on his side of the aisle or any Senator on this side of the aisle, or any other person representing the public, any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House of Representatives—to reach the sound conclusions which are so necessary. Those who take the position the Senator from South Dakota takes would, in effect, have us prolong this whole miserable experience and postpone for a long period into the future, the getting down to the meat of the coconut. However, that is exactly the wrong way to approach this matter, because it is clear as crystal that it is our duty to probe as quickly as possible in order to reach the ultimate facts as promptly as we can, and then to reach sound conclusions on the basis of those facts. Until we have those facts, it will be impossible for us to reach sound conclusions regarding these matters. In connection with the probe that we must make, we must bear in mind that the facts which we must obtain in order to reach a sound judgment are, by their very nature, a part of the intimate secrets of our Nation, secrets which cannot safely be disclosed to the public; for if they were disclosed, they would bring greater danger and greater suffering and greater punishment to those who represent us in Korea.

Nevertheless, there are some who say, "Let us postpone until some distant time, some days or some weeks from now, the time when we shall come to grips with this problem, and in the meantime let us have a lot of sparring on the inconsequential questions which can safely be brought out into the public gaze."

Mr. President, I say that I do not believe Senators who take that position have thought through this matter. Nevertheless, that is the position essentially, which some Senators now take when they say there should be long hearings, open at first—although such Senators recognize that there must be closed hearings eventually and that the serious, grave facts cannot be disclosed in open hearings. However, they would have a long series of open hearings held and spun out at length, and thereafter would have the committees get down to the matters which really count. Mr. President, that is not the proper way to approach this matter.

I think I have expressed what is the only wise position in regard to this issue. The only proper course is for the Senators who are charged with this inquiry to get at the real facts and the secrets as quickly as possible, and they wish to do so under conditions under which they can examine both secret and nonsecret matters with equal ease and dispatch, just as a matter of course; they wish to proceed with the inquiry in such a way that from minute to minute or from question to question they will not have to be worried as to whether a certain question does or does not break the rule of security, which of course all Senators will be trying to observe.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether he agrees with the change of heart that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee have had in regard to allowing all Senators who wish to attend the hearings to do so?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that I am one of those who urged that the joint committees take that action.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask a further question. I have the highest regard for the integrity and understanding of the distinguished Senator from Florida, but I wish to ask whether he would have any objection to having the chairman of committee exercise his own judgment in regard to whether the data being presented must be kept secret, in the interest of the security of the country, and whether the Senator would object to having the proceedings in this case conducted along the lines of the previous proceedings, over the years, so far as I recall, namely, by allowing the public to hear the evidence when the security of the Nation is not involved?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have implicit confidence in the sound judgment as well as the patriotism of the Senator from Georgia. Only a short time ago he advised the Senate that he felt he could not assume the responsibility of conducting the hearings without having them conducted in secret and then making known the matters which could safely be disclosed to the public. He made it very plain that the joint committee had already considered the question and had ruled that in its sound judgment it was not proper or wise to proceed on a hit-or-miss basis in the hope that it would catch every improper question ahead of time and would catch every exposure ahead of time in such a way as to preserve the secrets of our Nation. If the Senator from Nevada had been in the Chamber a short time ago, he would have heard the Senator from Georgia speaking from the depths of a very great conviction, say that he felt that to proceed in any other way—in any way other than in closed hearings—would be unsafe and unsound in this situation. He reminded the Senate that, as a Member of the Senate, he sat upon the Committee on Naval Affairs throughout World War II, and that in every hearing that committee held on matters relating to the conduct of the war or matters having to do with the vital secrets of our Nation, the hearings were always secret.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Of course I understand that the present situation in Korea is still a police action and is not world war III; at least, does not the Senator from Florida understand that to be the interepretation which still is made?

Mr. HOLLAND. Regardless of the name by which it is called, I understand that it is a most bitter adventure. I speak of it as the Korean war. When there have been more than 60,000 casualties among our American boys, I

think it is a colossal tragedy and catastrophe, and I think it is entitled to be called a war; and I regard it as such at this time.

At the same time, I remind the Senator from Nevada that it is completely true that it is still a police action; it is an effort on the part of a large number of nations, in which we have assumed and are taking the largest part, by reason of geographic and other considerations, to prevent the outbreak of a world war and an effort to prevent aggressions from crowding out of existence a tiny republic which we helped create and sponsored and which the United Nations sponsored. In that sense of course it is still a police action. But it is grave enough in its size, and in its implications with respect to thousands of American homes and lives, to be dignified by the name of war. The Senator from Florida will not quarrel with the Senator from Nevada, regardless of what name he applies to it. To the Senator from Florida, it is a serious war, as well as a very grave police action.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, I agree with the Senator from Florida that it is a war. I thoroughly disagree with him, however, if he agrees with the President in his conduct of the war; but I do not hear that subject discussed very much. The war is being conducted in the manner of a football game, so that we cannot break up the huddles, but we must stop them at the scrimmage line. We have worn out the thirty-eighth parallel in going back and forth across it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to comment on that point?

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, the Senator from Florida has not agreed, by any manner of means, with all the decisions of the President of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to hear that.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the next place, the Senator from Florida would not be as interested in these hearings as he is, did he not think they will disclose new facts and give new light upon which sounder decisions can be based. In the next place, he does not feel that it is sound for the Senator from Florida or for the Senator from Nevada to depart from the rule of withholding judgment upon this serious matter, which affects tens of thousands of American lives, until he can get the facts, and he wants the facts to be made available with all possible speed. He is saying to the Senator from Nevada and to those who take the same attitude, that it appears to the Senator from Florida that they are trying to raise a sandstorm of all sorts of inconsequential things, though some of them may be tremendously appealing, and to hold back the opportunity to get at the meat in the coconut, and to find out what the real facts are.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Without discussing whether we can win a war while tying the hands of the Army and facing a terrific enemy, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether, in the hearings, when a question arises which is of public interest, he could trust the judgment of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of General MacArthur on the question of what it is necessary to conceal in the interest of the public safety and the national security, and as to what would be merely a historical review of the situation? Would the Senator from Florida be willing to trust their judgment?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida would be willing to trust those distinguished military officers as far as any human being could be trusted, to safeguard our secrets. But the Senator from Florida calls to the attention of the Senator from Nevada three things: first, that mistakes can be made, and they have been made, by the best trained men we have, and with the best of intentions; second, that questions may be asked which will be completely unwise from the standpoint of maintaining our secrets, and they will be used before there is any chance to stop them.

The Senator from Florida reminds the Senator from Nevada of the old courtroom story about the judge making a lawyer withdraw a question to a witness, which question itself had done tremendous damage; the lawyer, of course, withdrew the question very gladly, only to be reminded by counsel on the other side that he withdrew the question, as an attacker would withdraw a red-hot poker which had already been inserted into the vitals of the person attacked, claiming that he had done no harm, since he had withdrawn it. So the Senator from Florida reminds the Senator from Nevada that even in asking questions there is danger of doing irreparable harm.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I see no danger in asking a question in regard to national security, so long as the question does not convey information affecting the national interest. But I would say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I am very happy the majority of the committee changed its attitude and allowed Senators to attend the hearings at which General MacArthur is to testify. It is the firm conviction of the junior Senator from Nevada that if the people of the United States could have heard the testimony this morning, the party would be over.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida expresses his appreciation to the Senator from Nevada. Before the Senator from Nevada leaves the Chamber, the Senator from Florida desires to state the third point of his answer, which he was prevented from doing by the last question of the Senator from Nevada. The third value which is to be remembered is that much greater speed is possible if a complete investigation of each field which is being investigated can be made at the time it is before the committee, and that it does not make either for a better understanding or for good speed or a quick solution of this matter to have each of the many fields which must be explored only broached in the open hearing, only scraped, if the Senator from Florida may use that term, and then to have all the substance of it relegated to the background, to be held for a period of days or weeks, until the two committees can return to it and the witnesses can be called back, at which time other more important aspects of the question in that field may finally be explored. So, the Senator from Florida feels that the only expeditious way and the only secure way and the only sound way to proceed is as stated by the Senator from Georgia and as determined already by a majority of the two committees sitting jointly, including in that majority at least one Senator who comes from the minority side of the aisle.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then I would say further to the Senator from Florida that the strategy determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the last 9 or 10 months should have been based upon the forethought and the great deliberation the Senator is describing, instead of their coming up to the barrier, after 9 or 10 months of fighting, with nearly 70,000 casualties, and blood and guts strewn all over Korea, back and forth across that little wart on Asia. The strategy should have been settled in meetings of the great Joint Chiefs of Staff, instead of having the football game which is being played in Korea, for the very reason that England and other empire-minded nations want to save some of their areas in the Far East, such as Hong Kong and Indochina. England has recognized Communist China; and the newspapers today state that 120,000 tons of rubber have been sent into Communist China by England within the past 9 months. Of course, we all know what the British have been doing. The junior Senator from Nevada was in Asia. He flew over Korea twice, and he was in Japan and all over China in 1948. At that time it was well known what the British were doing in the way of sending strictly critical supplies from Hong Kong and Shanghai into Communist China.

I venture the guess that, through the Marshall plan, the 16 Marshall plan countries, the 96 trade treaties which certain of them have with iron curtain countries, and as a result of the materials sent to Singapore by them, at least two-thirds of the materials fired back at American boys in Korea was paid for by the taxpayers of America, the fathers and mothers of those boys.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida answers that long, complicated question, I wonder if he would yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I object. I have waited for a long time to get recognition and have been denied it——

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, what I have to present is a matter of ceremonial comment.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not object to that. I thought the Senator from Connecticut wanted to make some comment about the soundness or unsoundness of the resolution. There has been a filibuster going on because we have not been able to obtain a vote by 2:30 o'clock——

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not yield, Mr. President. The Senator from Nebraska is talking about something that is completely false, and he knows it to be false.

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has made a point of order, and the Senator from Florida will take his seat.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Florida be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from Florida be permitted to proceed in order.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut if I may do so without losing my place on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Connecticut without losing his place on the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

(At this point Mr. BENTON called attention to the presence in the galleries of distinguished visitors from foreign countries touring the United States as guests of the Trans-World Airlines, and appropriate remarks were made by him and by the Vice President, which appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I proceed further I should like to ask unanimous consent of the Senate to expunge from the RECORD the single word "false," which I think was inappropriate; and without objection——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the gesture of the distinguished Senator from Florida; and if the word "filibuster" is in any way objectionable I withdraw it. When last night I asked if there was not some way we could proceed to the consideration of the resolution, it was difficult to get cooperation. I deeply appreciate the action of the Senator from Florida, for whom I have the highest regard, and I want to thank him for his friendly gesture.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska and I appreciate his withdrawing the comment which brought on my immoderate statement. Of course, it is completely unnecessary to say that so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned he is not planning anything in the nature of a filibuster, because he expects to conclude shortly, and he is sure the Senator from Nebraska never meant to attribute any marathon speaking ambitions to the Senator from Florida.

I remind the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Florida has sat on the floor of the Senate from January 3 to this moment and has listened to hundreds upon hundreds of hours of speaking on foreign-relations questions and questions with reference to Korea from other Senators, particularly Senators on the other side of the aisle. He believes he has listened to dozens of hours of such speeches by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. He has never expressed any umbrage or fear that the Senator from Nebraska was going to deprive the Senator from Florida of his right to be heard upon the floor. He has never accused the Senator from Nebraska or any other Senator of putting on a filibuster, although he has spent many, many days in listening to the expression of their convictions. Therefore the Senator from Florida was disappointed that the Senator from Nebraska seemed to feel justified in charging the Senator from Florida with doing something that he was not doing. He therefore now appreciates the attitude of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I realize that the Senator from Florida is a very distinguished Senator. His judgment is always respected by other Senators. All of us appreciate his observations. Therefore I could not see why reading the names of the minority members of the committees had anything to do with the facts in the case. Perhaps it was well to emphasize the respect in which we hold them. But I say to the Senator from Florida, really and truly, that we all know who the minority members are. They have a right to their places on the committees. It took the other side a long time to concede it. After the urgency with which I presented my resolution to the Senate I simply could not understand why it was necessary for the distinguished Senator from Florida to read the names, for example. It looked to me as though an effort were being made to continue to talk until after 2:30 o'clock, which would make it very difficult to obtain a vote on the resolution without inconveniencing many Members of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate what the Senator from Nebraska has said. Unfortunately, many people who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will not have the intimate knowledge of the situation which is possessed in such great degree by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. They do not know, for instance——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not need to read the names again.

Mr. HOLLAND. They do not know, for instance, the personnel of the various committees. They do not know the high, distinguished, and honorable records which have been made by the members of the committees. For example, they are not aware that a great many of the members have been governors of their States. The Senator from Florida has a peculiar affection for ex-governors, as the Senator from Nebraska well knows. The Senator from Nebraska knows the background of the members of the committees. He knows which of them have made terrible personal sacrifices, through the loss of members of their own families, in the Armed Forces of our country. The general reading public does not know it. Therefore, the Senator from Florida hopes that the Senator from Nebraska will be patient with his friend from Florida, and will allow him in his own way to conclude the first statement which he should like to make upon the subject of Korea and Asiatic policy, after he has listened for almost endless hours—though he assures the Senator from Nebraska that his remarks have always been most interesting, and that time passed quickly and pleasantly—to the distinguished Senator declaim upon the mistakes which our country has made in Korea, as he feels, and in Asia, as he feels, and as he has shown the depth of his conviction and his willingness to stand upon such convictions.

I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have sometimes agreed with his position, and I do now agree with some of his criticisms. I do not agree with the idea of making a Roman holiday out of a hearing which is designed to probe into the depths of our military policy and strategy and our most closely guarded military secrets about a war which is still going on and is a bigger war today than it has been prior to this time, when we do not know that the end of it is in sight and there are 250,000 American boys over there whose lives and safety depend upon our reaching sound solutions. Therefore I am certainly not in accord with the policy advanced, I think mistakenly, by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I think it is based upon very poor judgment. I think it is exceedingly unwise. However, I know that the Senator has a deep conviction about it, or he would not urge it.

The Senator from Nebraska is seeking to make a Roman holiday out of a hearing in which there must come the time—and apparently the Senator from Nebraska hopes it will come much later than the Senator from Florida hopes it will come—when intimate secrets of our Nation, with respect to our military planning and strategy must be bared to the able and patriotic Senators from both sides of the aisle upon whose shoulders and hearts and consciences lie the heavy responsibility of making sound recommendations.

The Senator from Florida feels that it is unwise to go into the question in such a way. He does not feel that only a few of the most easily discovered and most harmless facts should be brought out over a period of days and that there should be held back for a period of days, or perhaps weeks, the coming to grips with the serious issues. The Senator from Florida has heard the Senator from Nebraska repeatedly, in the course of this spring, and other Senators on that side of the aisle, and this side also, talk about our boys having to fight a war

with one hand tied behind their backs. I remind the Senator from Nebraska that if he forces open hearings he will put the 23 or 25 or 26 Senators—depending on whether or not all of them are present—in the position of having to devote almost all of their time for days or weeks to the vain effort to satisfy the avid curiosity of people who want to hear things but who cannot, when the payoff comes, safely be allowed to hear the real facts in the controversy. The Senator from Nebraska knows that perfectly well.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. The sooner we get the real facts produced in private the sooner decisions can be made. It is such decisions on vital policy which the Senator from Florida eagerly awaits and wants to get to as quickly as possible. He does not like delaying tactics of the kind represented by the resolution, under which the actual bringing in of facts would be suspended for a period of days or perhaps weeks.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no quarrel with the position of the Senator from Florida. He has a perfect right to his convictions. The committees have a perfect right to hold executive or closed sessions. My judgment is that open hearings bring out the facts and bring out the truth. I have just as strong convictions as has the Senator from Florida. I have just been handed a report taken from the news ticker in the cloakroom. It says:

President Truman told a group of foreign newspapermen that if the people of the world can get the truth peace will come automatically.

I suppose the Senator agrees with that statement.

He spoke to the group in the Rose Garden at the White House.

He spoke to a group of newspaper representatives from 14 countries. The statement is emphasized again:

Mr. Truman said he hoped they had seen and found for themselves some things which they can tell their people when they get home.

I emphasize the words "found for themselves some things which they can tell their people." Not something that was skimmed off for them.

Mr. Truman said, "If we can get the truth to the people, peace will come automatically."

That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to get the truth to the people.

I have a right to my convictions. When I say I want open hearings, I want open hearings only in respect to defense policies which the great men who will come to testify agree can be made public. Certainly the Senator does not mean that General MacArthur, General Bradley, or General Collins, for example, or Mr. Acheson, would go before the committees and intentionally violate the espionage laws of our country. Such a contention is completely ridiculous. I am surprised that the distinguished Senator, whose judgment is very highly regarded in the Senate, should even suggest such a thing.

No one is asking for a Roman holiday. All we are asking is that the people of the United States get the facts, and not the skimmed-off facts which come from secret hearings, or statements which may be misinterpreted. When I left the committee hearing this morning literally scores of newspapermen gathered around me and asked, "What did he say?" Already certain statements have been made as to what was said. They represent the skimmed-off portion.

What we want is open hearings on everything which has to do with the defense policy. General MacArthur has placed on the table his proposals. Why can we not have the evidence to support those proposals? Why cannot the people of the country be informed as to what those proposals are? That is all I am asking. I hope the Senator, in his fairness, will not charge me with seeking by the resolution to have a Roman holiday or a big show.

I went through all the hearings in the so-called Connally committee, when the question of troops for Europe was under consideration. While it is true that the hearings were not televised, yet I believe that my mail will substantiate the statement that the people of the country were better informed when we finished than they would have been if they had been carried by television, and much better informed than they would have been if closed hearings had been held.

The trouble has not been with open hearings. The trouble has been with secret hearings. In my opinion, the last two World Wars were caused by secret hearings. I believe that the blood of the boys to whom the Senator has referred would not have been shed on the battlefields of Korea if the Wedemeyer report had not been suppressed for three long years. It has now been made public. We know what is in it. If we had followed the course outlined in his report at that time, the great generals whom the Senator loves, General Ridgway, and General Van Fleet, about whom he spoke so highly the other day, would not even be in Korea today.

All I am asking is that the things which do not need to be suppressed shall not be suppressed. It is the secret agreements—Yalta, Potsdam, and all others of them—which have brought the United States into war. It is secret agreements which are responsible for the bloodshed the Senator has been talking about in his defense of secret hearings. Give us open hearings, and let the people of the country know the facts. Open hearings will result in unity among the people. The people will then support whatever policy is determined upon. But when we try to skim off certain facts and give the people what some persons want them to hear, we get into trouble.

Mr. President, my convictions are just as strong as those of the Senator from Florida. If I have been impatient about obtaining consideration for the resolution, I want the Senator from Florida to forgive me. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Florida now say that he will help me to obtain a vote on this proposal sometime during the day. I think the people have the right to know the facts. Those who believe in opening the hearings think the people should be informed about the things they should know. Those who do not want the people informed want the hearings to be closed.

I am not quarreling with the Senator's position. I am not quarreling with anyone who wants closed hearings. That is all right with me. I simply do not agree with that procedure. I believe that history has substantiated the convictions which I hold as to open hearings. I have no secrets. If I had, someone would find them out anyway. I should like to see anyone keep the newspaper men from finding out what happened today at the hearing. I listened to about an hour of the testimony. I did not hear it all. I will say to the Senator from Florida that every word I heard could have been given in open hearings to the people of the United States. If they had been permitted to hear the testimony, that fact would have done as much to help unify the people as anything we have heard about in hearings since I have been a Member of this body, during the past 9 years. I say that honestly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. There are two comments which I wish to make upon his statement.

First, with reference to the Wedemeyer report, it required the action of the joint committee, through its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], even to get the report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was the first showing, and a very definite showing of the fairness and thoroughness of the committee. One of the first things it asked for was the Wedemeyer report; and as soon as members of the Committee had an opportunity to assure themselves that the question of national security was not involved, they made the report available. It seems to the Senator from Florida that instead of criticizing the functioning of the committee, at least with reference to that report, the Senator from Nebraska ought to be paying warm praise to the committee for having already given earnest evidence of its desire to serve patriotically by making public something which could safely be made public. Time after time during the past 3 years I have heard the Senator yearn for publication of the report.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what resulted in the report being made public. It was the yearning and the speeches which were made to pry it loose.

Mr. HOLLAND. The next thing I wish to comment on is this: The Senator's position voices the attitude that it is a good thing to proceed with those parts of the facts, those crumbs from the table, which can safely be made available to the public, and to hold back the meat of the issue until later. That is exactly where the Senator from Florida thinks the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska is very badly at fault. I do not question

the patriotism of the Senator from Nebraska. However, I believe that the sooner the witnesses can give to committees of the Senate the vital facts without which we cannot intelligently pass upon these questions, the better.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield after a bit; not now.

The Senator from Nebraska may feel that from the wealth of his experience and observations he has amply safe ground upon which to base a permanent judgment. However, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, so far as the devoted members of these two committees are concerned, and, he believes, so far as the sound thinking people of the nation are concerned, they know perfectly well that no skimming of the froth is going to serve any good purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at this time. I allowed the Senator to speak for 10 minutes without ever voicing a question.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has spoken for 3 hours.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to say what I would like to say, I should like to remind him that when any witness, whether it be General Bradley, General MacArthur, some diplomat, or some other person not even yet named as a witness, completes his public statement, if he has knowledge of secret facts, then is the time, if we are to consider his testimony as a cohesive whole, to investigate the things of which he has intimate knowledge. Under the Senator's program that would be impossible.

I remind the Senator—and I hope he will pay attention——

Mr. WHERRY. I am listening.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now before he leaves that point? He is going to another point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make my point, if I may.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has made three points.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's impatience, but I should like to make my point, if I may.

The Senator from Nebraska would like to have one of the generals make his statement in general, without at all disclosing any secrets, but simply voicing his opinion, as to what he thinks the proper policy should be, without being subjected at that very time, at that very hearing, to the necessity of having to answer certain questions from Senators on both sides of the aisle as to what are the facts underlying the decision which he think is wise—the facts as to men, as to matériel, as to experience; the facts as to the attitude of our allies, and as to the attitude of those who may be our allies or may be our enemies in the future. I say to the Senator that it is completely wrong to have the public get the impression that such and such an expression of opinion from a distinguished witness is the ultimate fact, without having available the facts upon which that opinion is based.

The Senator knows that good people do not always agree. I am prepared to admit that the Senator is a very distinguished and highly patriotic American. The Senator, however, does not always agree with the Senator from Georgia on these questions, yet the Senator from Florida feels that the Senator from Georgia is also a distinguished and highly patriotic American. Men's minds differ on vital questions. The Senator from Nebraska proposes to adopt a program under which only those comparatively innocuous things which do not go to the root of any of the problems can come out at the time of the expression of the policy which one of the witnesses feels should be adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to yield until I have finished my statement. I fear that the Senator's impatience sometimes runs away with his manners.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is perfectly courteous and good manners to ask the Senator to yield before finishing a point, or before making three or four more points, or making a speech.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has not finished his point.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was saying—well all right, I will refrain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield when I get through making my point.

My point, Mr. President, is that it is unfair to the public and it is unfair to the witness and it is unfair from every point of view to have a mere expression of opinion on policy go out as the ultimate, unassailable fact of the matter, without having at the same time the opportunity and the chance to delve into and to explore the facts which lie behind that expression of policy and which, by their very existence, determine the wisdom or unwisdom of that policy. The Senator knows perfectly well that the Senator from Florida is correct in that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is because it is so obvious on the face of it that any mere expression of opinion, whether it is General MacArthur's opinion, or Mr. Acheson's opinion, or whosoever's opinion it is, is only an opinion until the facts upon which it is based can be made public. Yet the Senator proposes a program under which opinions become permanent, and the expression of opinions is substituted for the opportunity to explore into what the ultimate facts may be. The Senator from Florida thinks that is a very unwise decision, and a very unwise way to proceed; and he thinks that the members of these two committees have deliberated to good advantage and have brought forth a wise decision, much wiser than that which the quick efforts of those who have presented this resolution would leave us make. He thinks the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is much better qualified than is the Senator from Florida or the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to know what the implications are in investigating these questions, as to their importance to national security, and as to what particular facts need to be explored to determine whether or not an opinion based upon facts is sound or unsound.

The Senator from Georgia and a considerable majority of the committees sitting jointly have come to the conclusion, with which I agree implicitly, that it is unsound and would be unwise to adopt the course which the Senator suggests, and which would leave opinions expressed without giving any chance at all to look for the foundation upon which those opinions are based. The Senator knows that is not good policy, it is not logical, it is not sound, and the Senator even appears to be speechless when confronted with that situation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. In the course of the discussion by the Senator from Nebraska he intimated or stated or alleged that the procedure taking place was one of skimming off what the committees wanted the public to know, and keeping the cream of the information from the public. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the procedure now in effect in the committees whereby every question and every answer is taken down, and subject only to deletions of information by one charged with the responsibility of protecting the security of the United States; that with that exception alone, every question asked and every answer made is immediately given to the press?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida understands that is the practice; and he cannot, to save his life, see why the Senator from Nebraska and others who, like him, support the resolution, are unwilling to have those who best know what is required for the security of this country made the deletions to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further.

Mr. KERR. Then is it not a fact that the only thing being skimmed off is what the ones charged with the direct responsibility for the national security conceive or consider to be information which would be of benefit to the enemy were it published?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. And the obverse of the statement is true. The only matters made available under the program suggested here by the Senator from Nebraska are those things which cannot even be construed as being remotely connected with the national security. The public will get a great deal more information by following the program which has been put into force than by following such a program as that suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, in which he proposes that only those things that can safely be mentioned come out, and that everything else be held back, and that if there is a question about any matter, of course that matter shall be held back.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from

Florida yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if it is quite clear to him why the Wedemeyer report was held secret for 3½ years, and just recently released.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not having seen the secret and expurgated portions of that report, which are shown even now to have been eliminated, the Senator from Florida does not know what the implication of the inclusion of those parts of the report would have been; and he suspects that if it had been released earlier there would have been a great many more items taken out. I judge from the developments now that the time has come when those charged with the preservation of the secrets of our Nation feel that by cutting out only a little, they can make most of the body of the report available. They may have been mistaken in their earlier action. Probably they should have made the report available a long time ago; I do not know about that. But neither the Senator from Kansas—and I say it with all respect—nor the Senator from Florida, is competent to judge that question, because neither of us knows what was in the portions that were eliminated. Neither of us knows what may have been in other portions that would have been of vital benefit to an enemy if it had been released earlier.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator from Kansas does not hold himself out as a military expert, nor is the Senator from Kansas privileged to be a member of the great Foreign Relations Committee or the Armed Services Committee. Sometimes we secure information as to what goes on in those committees second or third hand.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he does not believe that some of the basic matters in the Wedemeyer report, which cannot be construed to be matters of strictly secret information, could well have been brought to the attention of the American people before 3½ years had elapsed? I should also like to ask the Senator, if he will pardon me for asking two questions in one, whether that type of procedure has not led to the public of this great country being distrustful of those who are doing such things?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has asked two questions, first as to whether the Wedemeyer report, or the substance of it, could have been made available earlier. The Senator from Florida is inclined to think it could have been. The Senator from Florida does not, however, nor does the Senator from Kansas, have all the facts upon which he can be perfectly assured that his opinion is correct. I speak now for the Senator from Florida, and I think I can speak for the Senator from Kansas, because neither of us has seen the deleted portions of the report.

As to the other question, I think candor requires me to say that it would have brought good results if the report had been made public earlier.

I do not want to hold back information. Information which can be given out without violating the security needs of the Nation should be given out, of course. I agree that some of these matters have been withheld from the public too long, and when that is done the practice tends to diminish public confidence.

I am trying to have us move swiftly ahead now, in this hearing, as we endeavor to meet the vital problems confronting the Nation.

At this moment the Senator and I are not talking about an academic question; we are talking about 250,000 live American boys. Some of them will not be alive tomorrow night, and more of them will not be alive a month from now. I and those who feel as I do think it is imperative to get to the heart of this question, and that the only way to do so is to let the large group of very fine and very honorable men who are members of the two committees—Senators from both sides of the aisle—follow their own judgment, as it has already been expressed, and quickly reach the very heart of this question, and then make their recommendations to the Senate.

The other method is a sparring method, one which shows, even before the investigation starts, that it would not be the purpose to explore the substantial questions at an early stage of the inquiry, but, instead, that the purpose would be to conduct a sort of Roman holiday in the course of which the 200, 300, or 400 persons who could obtain admittance to the hearing room would be given a chance to see what occurred there, but by which the vital security of the Nation would not best be served and by which the speedy solution of the problems confronting us would not best be served.

I feel with deep conviction that it is tremendously important to the Nation that we move as quickly as possible to the heart of this question. I believe it would not best serve the interests of the Nation if we were to postpone the solution or if we were to have the members of the committee devote their time to mere expressions of opinion, which, after all, are likely to vary widely. It is inevitable that men will differ in their opinions as to what the wise course is. Therefore, the giving of publicity to mere expressions of opinion would simply intensify the dispute and the discussion and the confusion and the lack of harmony prevailing in the Nation, whereas I want with all my heart to have the Senate move as quickly as possible to do away with such confusion and lack of harmony.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does not the Senator from Florida feel that it is a responsibility of those in the Pentagon and those who have access to the secret information to see that certain columnists do not have access to it, when it is withheld from the Senate and the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator means that certain columnists have had information which Senators were not able to obtain, I certainly agree with the Senator. At the same time, I would not at all agree that the most secret matters of the Nation have been disclosed. I remind my friend, the Senator from Kansas, that the atomic-bomb secret was so carefully safeguarded that no one had any notice of the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars had been expended for that purpose and thousands and thousands of persons were working on that task and entire cities had been created and were contributing, by means of the efforts of those who dwelt in them, to studying that problem and to reaching the solution which brought a much speedier end to the war. So I know, as does the Senator from Kansas, that that secret was well safeguarded.

I also know, by reason of having been given, only recently, certain secret facts in connection with the discussion before one of our committees, in secret hearings, of the so-called dispersal program, that there are many other things in which just as good secrecy is being maintained.

So I think the Senator from Kansas errs if he reaches the conclusion that because certain wrong things have been done by letting certain secrets out of the bag, so to speak, on a few occasions, those who are charged with the custody of our most vital secrets have been convicted of being untrue to their trust or of giving everything away. I do not believe that is so. Otherwise I would have to reach the point—and I know the Senator from Kansas feels the same way about the matter—where I did not believe that almost all the men who devote their very lives to the service of our Nation in high military and civil posts wish to serve the Nation truly and well. Most of these men are fine men and are true to their trust. I know perfectly well that because they have been trustworthy many matters which necessarily will be delved into during the hearings are still secret and these secret matters go to the very heart of the solution of the difficult problem which confronts us. I wish to have the committee and the Senate reach that vital stage in this entire matter as quickly as possible.

I believe that sparring and talk and expression of opinion before committees would merely delay our reaching the necessary conclusions. After all, opinions have already been expressed before the joint session of Congress and in various parts of the Nation and more opinions will be expressed.

On the other hand, what we need are the facts. Many of them are not going to be communicable to the public. The distinguished Senator from Kansas, himself a veteran of highly honorable service, knows this is true and knows perfectly well that the sooner we brush away all this fog and the sooner we reach the question of how we can with the greatest possible dispatch and the greatest possible certainty have available to us the facts upon which alone

we can base sound judgment, the better our country will be served.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am sure the Senator missed the point of my question. I asked whether there is a responsibility on the part of those who hold these secrets to see that the information is not disseminated by a few columnists, thus leading the people of the Nation to believe that those columnists have inside information, particularly when some columnists are clever enough at times to obtain just enough secret or inside information to be able to lead the public to believe that they do have a great deal of inside information—all of which leads to a further breaking down of public confidence, as has been the case when the Wedemeyer report has for 3½ years been kept off the list of items available for public information, and only now has been released, thus causing many of the public to raise their eyebrows and ask, "Well, what would you expect?"

Does not the Senator think that is bad?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no quarrel with the Senator from Kansas on that point. However, I think the course followed by the present investigation is best, and I think the different course now advocated by some for the investigation would cause it to have less value, would cause greater delay to occur, and would cause greater public confusion and dissension to occur.

I believe that the members of the two committees that are exploring this question should be allowed to proceed in their own way, in accordance with the method on which they have already determined, and should be allowed to reach the heart of the problem as quickly as possible. That cannot be the case if there is to be a succession of public hearings, at which, first, one man will express his opinion, and then another man will be called in to express a contrary opinion, and then various shades of opinion will be expressed by other witness—all with the result that the issue will simply be beclouded before the time when the actual nuggets of truth are brought before the members of the committee, so that they can base sound recommendations upon a real knowledge of the facts.

I believe that the method proposed to be followed under the resolution is a wrong and an unwise one, and would cause confusion to become worse confounded, and would not result in having us reach speedy, clear, and sound conclusions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

WELCOME TO REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PRESS OF 14 NATIONS OF EUROPE, AFRICA, AND ASIA

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech,

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am grateful to the minority leader for withdrawing his objection, and I am particularly grateful to the Vice President for taking the chair and permitting me to introduce to the Senate some distinguished visitors in the galleries.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], and I have just had lunch with 35 distinguished jonrnalists who are touring the country as guests of the Trans-World Airlines and are completing a trip throughout the United States. I have been acting as host at the luncheon, and I should like to state to the Senate that my guests have outdone the normal courtesy we expect from guests. I should like to call attention to some of the names on the scroll which they so generously and courteously bestowed upon me, in order to show the wide range of countries from which they come. I read the names of Alexandre Breugnot, Dr. Sayed Abouel Naga, Naguib Canaan, Nicholas Nahas. There are many others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire scroll may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the scroll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate:

We, the undersigned representatives of the press of 14 nations of Europe, Africa, and Asia, as members of the Trans-World Airlines flight to the United States of America, express our deepest gratitude for your courtesy and hospitality during our visit to the United States. By your efforts you have helped us gain a first-hand knowledge of how Americans work and live in freedom under a system of democratic free enterprise.

We have learned much from you to tell our readers, and we desire by this scroll to honor your contribution to the spread of truth and understanding among the peoples of the world.

Alexandre Breugnot, Dr. Sayed Abouel Naga, Naguib Canaan, Nicholas Nahas, Donald Edgar, N. H. N. Dixon, Stanley Jackson, Norman Cursley, James L. Manning, Charles Eade, Pierre Marschal, James De Coquet, Sam Cohen, Merry Bromberger, Otto Herr, Oskar Reschke, Harris Bousbourelis, Demetrios Yannoukakis, Coryndon Mandy, S. N. Ghosh, Uenkatseha Naik, Peter O'Curry, Michael G. Rooney, Joseph Haim Heftmann, Gino Ben Amozegh, Giovanni Artieri, Ugo Zatterin, Guglielmo Ceroni, Morais Cahral, Armando Ferreira, Jaime Arias, Toccuato Lura De Tena, Georges Rigassi, Albert Muller, Philippe Casanova.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, from the standpoint of the objectives of the people of the United States to achieve an understanding with the people of other nations, I think no group that has visited this country is more important than is this group of traveling journalists. I congratulate Trans-World Airlines on its leadership and generosity in assembling this group and bringing them on this tour of our country.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] described to us a previous trip organized by Trans-World Airlines on which they took a group of American journalists overseas. This, it seems to me, is far-sighted statesmanship on the part of Mr. Howard Hughes, Mr. Ralph Damon, and Mr. Warren Pierson, the three top executives of TWA.

Mr. President, it further dramatizes the fact that private activity in the field of exchange of persons is being conducted all the time on a scale infinitely more vast than anything sponsored or paid for by the Federal Government. Of the 40,000 or 50,000 foreign students now at our universities and colleges, only a tiny percentage, I venture to suggest only 5 percent, are in any way sponsored or underwritten by the Federal Government. Only recently the Ford Foundation, that great new philanthropy which has almost a 90-percent financial interest in the Ford Motor Co., has given a large grant to the Institute of International Education in New York City so that it may expand its office and open regional offices all over the Nation to do a better job on the private level in the exchange of persons between the nations of the world.

Of all persons who come to visit us, I suggest that these journalists are most important, because they will learn that we have nothing to conceal from them. They will, of course, learn that we have things of which we are not too proud. They will learn that we recognize that there are certain aspects of American life which under our democratic processes we hope to improve, correct, and make progress with in the years to come. We have nothing to hide. They can go back to their countries and write as authorities about us, as persons who have been here and have seen us face to face.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will join me in welcoming them today, and I trust they will be the forerunner of many other such groups, representing not only newspapers and journalists, and all other media of communication, but people from the many and varied walks of life, from industry, labor unions, and other groups overseas, upon whose understanding our friendly relations ultimately depend as we look ahead over the next decade.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for giving me this opportunity to advise the Senate of the presence of these distinguished visitors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Florida will permit, the Chair would like to say a word on behalf of the Senate to express our pleasure at having with us and welcoming to this body these distinguished visitors from 14 nations representing the press. Unfortunately the Chair would advise our friends that they have pretty stiff competition today in the matter of attendance of Senators here and elsewhere. As newspapermen they will appreciate that fact.

We are glad to have you not only in the Senate, but to have you visit the United States, and we hope that your sojourn with us will be profitable to you and to us, mutually, in the dissemination of information and understanding among the peoples of all the countries represented by you and, insofar as possible, the people of the world, concerning the real objectives and purposes of democracy here and throughout the world. We hope that however long you may remain with us, you may continue to enjoy your visit and that you will take home with you valuable information concern-

ing our institutions, and leave us with valuable information concerning yours.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Chair.

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN SENATE BILL 271 AFTER RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be permitted to sign the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes after the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPEN VERSUS CLOSED HEARINGS AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES OF ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had hoped that we could have a vote on this resolution early this afternoon, and that after its disposition those who were still in the Senate Chamber might have availed themselves of the opportunity to participate in the MacArthur hearings. That, however, is not in the cards, and at this hour it appears that the entire afternoon will be devoted to the consideration of the motion to consider the resolution.

I presume that in my time I have erred on the side of anything but brevity, but I think there is still some virtue in the New Testament admonition, "But let your communication be, Yea, yea; nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." So I shall not try to detain the Senate long this afternoon, but I believe there are some things which ought to be disposed of.

First, after having listened for the past 2 hours to the constantly recurring allusion to the question of national security, I am wondering whether it does not at times become a smokescreen and something of a fetish, and that it is entirely overdone. I remember that in the days of World War II I could not get into my office in the House Office Building without having a badge and a pocket card and many other things. Every time one went to one of the agencies of Government, even though he may not have been peculiarly invested with security significance, he had to have a badge, he had to know the "high sign" and the password. It was more difficult than getting into a lodge. I think a great many persons, who take a rather rational and common sense view of the matter, have come to the conclusion that, at least in some respects, it has been highly overdone.

But, Mr. President, first I wish to answer the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which left a rather peculiar implication in my mind, when he said that General MacArthur had been queried as to whether he wanted open or closed hearings. I submit that if General MacArthur had undertaken to pass upon that question, he would have been hoist with his own petard, anyway one may take it.

I am going to address a question to my friend from Oklahoma, and I neither mean to be facetious about it nor to take undue advantage, but I am wondering what my friend from Oklahoma would have said had he been in General MacArthur's position and the committee had queried him, and had said, "Do you want open or closed hearings?" I know what I would have said. I would have said precisely what General MacArthur said, namely, that I would leave it entirely in the hands of the committee. Had he for a moment deviated from the line and indicated that he wanted open hearings, then, of course, everyone at once would have come out of his corner and said, "There it is, there is the ostentation, there is the display spirit in the man. There is his love for grandeur and demonstration. He wants an open hearing. He wants a place where, as in the Colosseum, there will be great multitudes to applaud." That would have been the answer on the part of those who today attack him, had he for one moment said he wanted open hearings.

On the other hand, suppose he had said to the Senator from Georgia, "I should like to have the hearings closed." Then what? Then, of course, the same persons would have said, "There you have it. He wants to testify behind closed doors. He does not have a case. He is not willing in public to ventilate his views and present his convictions for all to hear." He would have been caught either way, had he answered that question. So he gave the proper answer, namely, that it was in the hands of those who summoned him, those who invited him to come to testify. So let there be not comfort in that. I am sure that Senators who were listening this afternoon to the observations by the Senator from Georgia probably had not thought through that matter.

When it comes to the question of secrecy, I remember an occasion when General of the Army Eisenhower, General Marshall, the Secretary of War, and a great many others, were called to testify before a closed hearing of the House Appropriations Committee. I was then a very humble member of that committee. I remember one had to have a special card and a special badge in order to get into the committee room. We sat there, seemingly entranced by the disclosures and revelations. We were privileged to ask many questions. It was not a very good show, to say the least, and I do not know that we learned a great deal from it. But only 2 days later, Time magazine came out with a double-page spread which told more in four paragraphs than was revealed in the course of that entire hearing. There we were, adjured and admonished to maintain secrecy in the interest of national security. I wonder if that is not being overdone.

It seems to me that had we had a little more light in other days, some of the young men whose warm blood is ebbing out on the fields of Korea might still be alive. It is strange that other countries and other peoples get to know so much, while the American people are kept in the dark. When it comes to the question of security, one might think from the discussion heard here this afternoon that the witnesses are a lot of imbeciles. When General MacArthur takes the witness chair, he will be able to evaluate for himself whether a particular answer might jeopardize the security of the country. If a Member of the Senate should ask him the question, "How many troops do you have in Korea, and how are the divisions deployed?" certainly he would make no answer that would jeopardize security. He would be indeed a poor soldier if he did. The man who served as Chief of Staff with such glory and distinction, and who served in many wars, has some sense of values, and so he will be able to answer and still abide by all the obligations and responsibilities which are upon him. If I estimate the situation correctly, he is still amenable to the Espionage Act. Under its provisions and under the other obligations which are imposed upon him, certainly, if he should give aid and comfort to the enemy by any answer he might make, he would be subject to a penalty.

I have not the slightest doubt that General Bradley, General Marshall, General Collins, and all the others will not need General Davis and his censorship to indicate to them what is safe to disclose, when the security of the United States is involved. But let us not make a smoke screen of national security for the purpose of preventing the people of the United States from knowing what is going on.

It has been repeatedly stated here today that open hearings might jeopardize the lives of young men in Korea. Let me answer those who have lifted their voices with that kind of argument by saying that even more lives may be jeopardized by the secretiveness which has marked so much of our policy for a long time, going all the way back to Yalta, in the winter of 1945. Yes, I think we have an acute recollection of the secrecy which was practiced in those days.

For the purposes of the record, I remind Senators that I recall, of course, the long-drawn-out Pearl Harbor hearings. Oh, with what convenience and facility remembrance and recollection had suddenly become an outmoded virtue. As a matter of fact the witnesses could hardly remember facts which seemed to have been seared indelibly in the minds of millions of other people; but, week after week, and week after week, Members of this body, in conjunction with the body in which I served at the other end of the Capitol in those days, sought to adduce the truth in the best way they knew how. They encountered first one stalemate and then another, and, to this good hour, the whole story of all the evil and vile secrecy which was involved in the days before Pearl Harbor has not yet been disclosed for the cold print of the history books, where the people of America may soberly and accurately evaluate exactly what occurred. In my considered judgment, it was the fruition of a design which

makes a pretty definite pattern. If anyone wants to refresh himself about it, the Library of Congress and the files of this body and the files of the body at the other end of the Capitol are replete with documentary evidence as to whether there was a design which finally brought us to that ill-fated day, and which ultimately shunted us into the greatest cataclysm which has ever been visited upon mankind.

We remember the secrecy of that day. We remember, Mr. President, the secrecy that enshrouded the conference at Yalta, from which have come so many evil effects which now challenge not only our best thinking but challenge the destiny of young men and the very treasure of our country. As I go back to it, Mr. President, it is with a sense of dismay that I think of a conference in the Crimean Peninsula in the winter of 1945 in which the conferees thought they might carry out a grand design, but in so doing, in the enfolding darkness and secrecy, they led this country down the course of disaster, and today our young men have to pay the bill with their blood and their lives.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does not the distinguished Senator from Illinois feel that unless some of the secrecy is done away with and the people are given an opportunity to know what is going on, the mistakes of the past can be repeated with even greater detrimental effect on the country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, so. I say to my good friend from Kansas that I was positively dismayed by some of the statements I heard this morning. The genial Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said that we winnow out and finally we get to that which we can safely entrust to the people. Is not that wonderful, Mr. President? The Government reaches into the hearts and firesides of the Nation and takes the choice sons of the families of America and says, "We are going to put you into uniforms, give you some training, and send you to Korea. But you must not know what is going on. It is not safe to trust you or your good father, or your good mother who brought you into this world."

Think of all the nice expressions about the democratic process. The Vice President of the United States, this afternoon, as he addressed himself to the distinguished foreign journalists who graced this body with their presence, used the phrase, "democratic process." Is it the democratic process to conceal? Is it the democratic process to withhold? Is it the democratic process to do those clandestine things in connection with which the people of the United States have an interest because this is their country? It is their sons who have to be offered upon the altar. It is their dollars which must be used to fight the wars of the Republic. Their dollars are good enough; their sons are good enough; but the people are not expected to know what is going on. We can call that the democratic process if we like, but I have another name for it, Mr. President.

I go back to the deceitful and infamous undertaking at Yalta in February of 1945. The masters of secrecy were there, Mr. President. Harry Hopkins was there. I knew him. Alger Hiss was there. If there is any doubt about it, read the story of Yalta by the late Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, whom I knew very well.

I say to my good friend from Kansas that it is wonderful to talk about secrecy and about leaks, when Judy Coplon was in the Department of Justice and Alger Hiss in the Department of State. There was Marzani in the Department of State, who was indicted on 11 counts, found guilty, and sentenced to prison for revealing from the records things which should not have been revealed.

Let those in the executive branch clean their own dunghill before they monitor the morals of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to secrecy. Yes, they were in Crimea doing business at Yalta; and what happened? It is an open story. They gave virtual control of the Chinese Eastern Railroad and the Manchurian Railroad to Marshal Stalin. He can use it now to carry tanks and planes and supplies with which to decimate young Americans in Korea.

That happened at Yalta, Mr. President, behind the dark folds of a secret curtain. We were not to know about it. At the same time many naval bases in the Kurile Islands were given to the Soviets. It was a long time before we found it out. They will be useful now for Red submarines and Soviet aircraft. Our representatives at Yalta gave away the north half of Sakhalin Island. There is some oil there. Russia may bring these hidden riches to the surface, and refine them into that high-octane essence which makes a plane whiz through the sky as a vehicle for a bomb which may yet wipe out lives of many young Americans in Korea. We gave those things to Stalin at Yalta. We gave all those rights to Russia, and they were many. It was done with secrecy, and 6 years later young Americans, with the exuberance of life in every fiber, vein, and pore, now pay the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if the American people and the American Congress were not told by the executive department that there were not secret agreements entered into, and if now we do not find that there were.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, so. I want to say to my friend from Kansas that it was diplomatic secrecy. The theory was once expressed by an eastern professor, as he evaluated the Roosevelt policy, that we had deceived the country. That is a fine philosophy, Mr. President, but I do not subscribe to it. To hear the statements today we would think that Members of the Senate had no confidence in the power of the American people to evaluate. I have plenty of confidence in the people, so I believe that in the interest of unity we serve our country best when we take away the shroud of secrecy and let the light shine in.

If there is something of specific moment in a question that might endanger the security of the country, I would not expect a witness under cross-examination by a Member of the Senate to answer the question. I think it would be his responsibility to say, "This involves an element of security which I do not believe should be disclosed on an occasion of this kind." But what we are interested in particularly, Mr. President, is the whole question of policy, and I believe the American people are entitled to get the facts first hand. As it is, they are to be evaluated and they are to be censored, at least to the extent that censorship will be imposed. Then the screened transcript will be made available to the American people. Perhaps the testimony will not be screened; I do not know; but whatever it is, it will be allegedly a screened transcript.

As we think of this kind of secrecy, Mr. President, I wonder why there was not quite the same interest in the days when the Senate and House were dealing with the Amerasia case. A naval lieutenant here and a greeting-card publisher in New York with a definite leftist record entered into a conspiracy. They took more than 1,700 documents from the State Department to their photostating office in New York City. They took what they wanted from the documents. Some of the documents certainly were marked "classified." How much news was there about it at that time? How many persons lifted up their voices and said, "We must do something about this?" Nothing was done, except that one of them got a $500 fine, as I recall. I draw entirely on memory, because I have not looked at the record for years. I believe two of them were scolded. One of them got off with a substantially heavier fine. No one went to jail. If ever I read facts in a case which involved a clear and distinct violation of the espionage laws, in my judgment the Amerasia case did. How much was made of secrecy at that time? It is only because this seems to be a special occasion that there is so much emphasis placed upon it.

I wish to refer again to Yalta, because I believe that the record must be made, and refreshed from time to time. I had a great affection for a man who formerly graced the Senate. He is a man of brilliance and integrity. He has occupied many positions of influence and importance in the Government. I refer to my old friend Jimmy Byrnes, of South Carolina. He was a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations years ago when I was a member of the House Appropriations Committee. We used to cross sabers at times. I had not only affection for him, but I had a great admiration and respect for his ability. When he came back from Europe he did quite a job in writing contemporary history in his interesting book called Speaking Frankly. At page 41 of the book he mentions a cablegram which was sent from Yalta to the White House, allegedly by Mr. Hopkins to Mr. Byrnes, with respect to still another secret of Yalta, namely, the veto.

At page 41 the former Secretary of State quotes the cablegram:

The President is extremely anxious that no aspect of this question be discussed, even privately.

That is the record, Mr. President. Keep it dark. Do not bring it into the limelight, because people should not know. In the interest of national security, they are not to be trusted with these alleged secrets. I cannot help to recur to the fact that certainly until 9:45 this morning I felt like a class B Senator. Twenty-six Senators were entitled to listen to the testimony, and seventy Members of this body up to that time, certainly under the resolution adopted by the committee, were not entitled to attend the hearings.

It is strange business. I understand that one Member of this body said it would be fatal—fatal, Mr. President—to let the other Senators attend the hearings.

By some strange spiritual alchemy all that was changed this morning at 9:45. At that time a modification was made. Now, instead of only 26, all 96 Senators can attend the hearings. It is a strange business.

I am wondering why such a change of heart took place. There has been much political discussion on the other side of the aisle today. Of course, it has been implied or made to appear that our viewpoint on the matter is a political viewpoint. I wish to say—and I have said it a thousand times in my State—that I am a sort of reluctant Senator. I did not wish to come back, after I had walked out of this man's town in 1949. I was not too anxious to come back, Mr. President. But this much I do know. I have no political skin to protect. I am interested only in my God and in my country. That is all. I will go as far as anyone else in that field.

Mr. President, I think it is a tragic thing when, ever so often, either unwittingly or wittingly, the patriotism of Members of this body is brought into question. I certainly would not question anyone's fidelity to his country, or patriotism, because I cannot imagine that anyone would reach the position of representative of a great sovereign State in the sisterhood of States unless he had long before evidenced a sustained and enduring fidelity to his country which was beyond all question.

It has been said that everyone cannot be admitted to the hearings. Of course, that is true. Everyone cannot be admitted, any more than it is possible to admit all the people who want to buy a ticket to Oklahoma in one of the New York theaters. It is possible to accomodate only as many people as the theater will hold. The point is that the theater is open. If a man will stay in line long enough and take his chance, and perhaps stay up all night and bring his breakfast along, he may be able to get in. It is the chance to get in, and hear what is going on which is important, not whether he actually gets in. I say to my good friend from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] that if the junior Senator from Illinois keeps his position on the floor, he may not get over to the hearings. I hope to be able to do so. It is not important whether I get there; but it is important that I have a chance to get in when I get there, in open competition with all others who would like to get in. That is the important thing.

With respect to open hearings, I affirm and reaffirm that I do not want to say to a father, who has a son in his family about to go into uniform, "By legislative fiat you cannot come in." If limitation of space prevents him from getting in, or perhaps transportation, if he is off in some far corner of the world, that is one thing. At least the opportunity was made available to him.

From time to time over the radio and by means of other forms of communication we have admonished the American people that they must be willing to endure sacrifices in a critical time. We ask them to make sacrifices, but we keep them in the dark. Some time ago when the Secretary of the Treasury was in Paris he was quoted as having said that we must admonish our people to accept a philosophy of austerity. That is all very well. Our people are willing to accept it. But let us say to them, "We will match you in sacrifice. We will play the game. We will be fair. We will let the light shine in so that, as taxpayers, as the fathers or mothers of sons who may be called for military service, you will know, within proper limits, what is going on." That is all I ask. That is the reason why I am in favor of the resolution. I abhor secrecy.

It may be asked, "Well, didn't you serve on committees in the House a long time ago, and didn't you bar people from hearings?" Certainly; but as a matter of fact, if anyone had made the attempt, I am confident he could have gotten into many of the Appropriations Committee hearings.

As I recall, when I was on the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Legislative Branch we fought that issue out for many days. I for one certainly would have gone along with the idea of admitting people to hearings. There was only one reason, after all, why anyone and everyone was not welcome. It was feared that if the general public were admitted they would get an earfull, and then come around the lobby members of the Appropriations Committees for increased appropriations. If that is all the reason that can be cited, it is as good as no reason at all, because a man who serves on that committee and is charged with some responsibility over Government spending is expected to be able to stand up against representations of that kind. That is a rather hollow and pretentious argument.

Mr. President, I desire to be counted upon the side of the people in this argument, because there is nothing I can see to fear. The men who will occupy the witness chair have fine minds. They know what security means, and their answers will be such as to give no comfort or aid to the enemy. Let us treat them as men who have as much interest in the security of the country as has anyone else, and particularly those who are Members of this body.

That is all I have to say on the subject, Mr. President.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have been much interested in the remarks of Senators with reference to the pending motion. I have been even more interested in the remarks of Senators with reference to a vast field of subjects beyond the scope of the motion. I have been much interested in statements from Senators which would seem to express the opinion on their part that the hearings now in progress before the Joint Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate are being suppressed; that the questions and answers are being skimmed off, and that the people are being given only such information as Members of the Senate, or those charged with the responsibility of deleting that which would be of benefit to the enemy, might deem proper.

I am a little surprised at those statements, which amount to accusations against the good faith of the committees now conducting these hearings. It has been made crystal clear by those committees, acting through their chairmen and on their own, that it is their purpose to give to the American people, as fast as it is mechanically possible to disseminate it, every vestige of information obtained in those hearings, save only that which might be of aid and comfort to the enemy.

I have been much interested in the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not catch the last statement, about aiding the enemy. Will the Senator please repeat what he said?

Mr. KERR. I ask the reporter to read it to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not accusing anyone on this side of the aisle of giving aid to the enemy, is he?

Mr. KERR. I must say that if what the Senator has heard, and the question he has asked, together with the reading of the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma would excite his curiosity to the extent that he would listen to the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, this little byplay might be of some service.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I always listen to his remarks. That is the reason I wanted to be sure of what he said.

Mr. KERR. The reporter is about to read it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator does not want to repeat it, it is all right with me.

Mr. KERR. The reporter is about to read it; and if the Senator does not want to listen to it, it is all right with me.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator does not remember it, very well. I doubt if he remembers very much that he says.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that if the Senator desires to have certain remarks read by the Reporter, the Chair will so direct.

Mr. KERR. That is the desire of the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Reporter will read the remarks referred to.

The Official Reporter (Gregor Macpherson) read as follows:

I am a little surprised at those statements, which amount to accusations against the good faith of the committees now conducting these hearings. It has been made crystal clear by those committees, acting through their chairmen and on their own, that it is their purpose to give to the American people, as fast as it is mechanically possible to disseminate it, every vestige of information obtained in those hearings, save only that which might be of aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, that illustrates what has been going on in this debate. The Senator from Nebraska was present in body. I do not know where his mind was. Perhaps that was with his thoughts, and they were far away.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Let me finish this very eloquent dissertation.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly was not in Oklahoma, where the wind blows.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma has not yielded.

Mr. KERR. But after returning, either to complete consciousness of what was going on, or to some semblance of it, he seemed to have an intimation that something had been said here about aiding and abetting the enemy. I would not say that "the wicked flee when no man pursueth." I would not say that, Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator is charging me with aiding the enemy, I am going to make a point of order. That is what I want to know.

Mr. KERR. If and when I charge the Senator with aiding and abetting the enemy, I will invite him to make the point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly will. The Senator will not have to invite me.

Mr. KERR. But until I do, it seems to me that either the Senator from Nebraska is incapable of understanding, or unwilling to understand, what the Senator from Oklahoma says.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator made that charge about the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] earlier in the day, or one similar to it. Believe me, this is the last time the Senator is going to make it when I am on the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am going to refer to that in a few moments, and then I shall let the RECORD speak as to what was said.

It is amazing to me, Mr. President, that Senators make bald statements with reference to events between which and the actual record there is often little, if any, factual connection, and then beat their breasts in defense of accusations which were not made, or in support of contentions which have not been stated and which could not be substantiated.

I started to say, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska had made the statement on the floor—and I want him to listen, and, if I make an error, I invite him to correct it—that he had been present at much of the hearing this morning and that he was certain that nothing had been said there while he was present which could possibly be of any value to the enemy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is incorrect. I never mentioned the words "value to the enemy" or "aid to the enemy."

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator state substantially what he did say, if he may do so without my losing the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, sir; I remember what I said, and I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma what it was. I said I attended the hearing this morning for a comparatively short time. I was not there at the beginning and I had to leave at about 11:30; and I said during the time I was present at the hearing there was nothing General MacArthur said which could not have been disclosed to the American people without endangering the national security. That may not represent the exact words, but it is in substance what I said. I said nothing about giving aid to the enemy, nor did I make any remarks of the kind the Senator uses so frequently.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator; but I must say that when he referred to remarks which might endanger the national security, that seemed to the Senator from Oklahoma to have some relationship to words which would give aid and comfort to the enemy. Certainly they have a similar meaning in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma. In order that there may be no doubt about it I want to read what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said about that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is perfectly agreeable to the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Oklahoma can say anything he wants to about what the Senator from Michigan said. But the Senator from Oklahoma is not contending for one moment, is he, that the Senator from Nebraska is giving aid to the enemy?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am not going to say: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Oklahoma is out of order. He is impugning the good character and patriotism of the junior Senator from Nebraska. I make that point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no power under the rules to pass on that question.

Mr. WHERRY. I make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska makes the point of order that the Senator from Oklahoma is out of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma will take his seat.

Mr. KERR took his seat.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Oklahoma may be permitted to proceed in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware that the Senator from Oklahoma be permitted to proceed in order.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma will proceed in order.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as I said a while ago, if and when the Senator from Oklahoma should choose to impugn the motives or the patriotism of the Senator from Nebraska he will give the Senator due notice and suggest that he make the point of order.

I must say, Mr. President, that I know of no one on this floor against whom I would make such a charge. And among the men on this floor there is none for whose patriotism I have more respect than I do for that of the Senator from Nebraska. Strange as it may seem, Mr. President, and one of the mysteries of my brief experience in this body, I have a great affection for the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That has been mutual, has it not?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would like to answer that it is.

Mr. WHERRY. Go ahead and answer in that way. That is perfectly all right with me. I have no objection.

Mr. KERR. I have some feeling of sadness that the Senator from Nebraska has made the statement in the past tense.

Mr. WHERRY. I will include the future tense. I will include all the tenses.

Mr. KERR. I wonder if the Senator from Nebraska will include the present tense.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

(Laughter in the galleries.)

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that this is a "tense situation," and he asks them to preserve order.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma wants to reinforce the remark of the Vice President, because when it gets to the point where the Senator from Nebraska repeatedly expresses fear of the existence of something for which, so far as the Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, there has been neither thought nor contemplation nor the possibility of substance, then the Senator from Oklahoma must say that it is becoming rather tense—but certainly not on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The other day, after a little debate in the Senate, the press, through some quirk of journalistic or photographic curiosity, asked the Senator from Oklahoma if there were those on the other side of the aisle with whom he would be willing to have his picture made. The

Senator from Oklahoma said there were quite a number, but the number one choice of the Senator from Oklahoma would be his delightful and charming, though occasionally misguided, friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. There has been no departure from that attitude on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma insofar as the Senator from Nebraska is concerned. Let me say to him that under no circumstances will the Senator from Oklahoma cast any reflection upon his high and noble patriotism which the Senator from Oklahoma not only acknowledges, but happily confirms.

Now, if I may refer to what the Senator said, without creating any doubt, I will proceed along the line at which I had thought I had arrived when the Senator made the point of order that took the Senator from Oklahoma off his feet.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan earlier today made this statement:

> The Senator from Michigan does not know what the committee has in mind bringing out. The Senator from Michigan can only say what he heard this morning. The Senator from Michigan will say at this moment that he did not hear anything which he believes would affect the security of the United States.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska had made a statement of somewhat similar import on this floor. With reference to those two statements, the Senator from Oklahoma reminds the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the one charged with making deletions from the testimony given before the committees had a different viewpoint.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not charge anyone in the committee with deleting anything intentionally. When the distinguished Senator from Florida was talking about skimming off the cream, I said to him, "It seems to me that if some person is allowed to make public only what he wants to have published, the cream is skimmed off and all the facts are not made available to the public." What the Senator from Oklahoma has said certainly has no reference to my statement because I have not charged anyone with intentionally deleting any evidence.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma did not say so. He did not say that the Senator from Nebraska said that.

Mr. WHERRY. It certainly is possible of being interpreted in that way. Furthermore, I was present at the committee hearing only a part of the time. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma may be of the opinion that during all the time the general testified he may have made some remarks or some observations which the Senator from Oklahoma feels it would not be in the interest of national security to make public. I want it clearly understood that I was not present all the time, as was the Senator from Oklahoma, apparently, nor was the Senator from Michigan. But I reiterate that during the time I was present there was not anything said by the general which the people of America should not know. It would be well if they could know what he said, and it would not violate national security for it to be made public. That is my opinion.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I should love to yield, but wish to say one more word about the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska. What the Senator from Oklahoma was saying was that the person charged with the responsibility of deleting from the record information which might be adverse to the national security did not agree with the statement of the Senator from Michigan, nor did he agree with the Senator from Nebraska. I understand that a naval commander representing the Joint Chiefs at the hearing is responsible for deleting from the testimony, before it is made available for publication, information which could be of possible value to the enemy or could be of probable damage to the national security. The record shows that a number of deletions were made from the answers of General MacArthur, in which he discussed certain numerical elements of strength and certain probabilities and purposes and programs of our Government and estimates regarding the Soviet Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I have promised to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit me to make a slight correction of the RECORD at this time?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if it is true that the information being presented in the course of the hearing before the committee in the caucus room is available to the press and the public within a very short time after the statements are made in that room, with the exception of matters which may be deleted by a security agent.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for the question. The answer is yes, the information is made available just as quickly as it is mechanically possible to do so.

I shall read to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska a question which was asked this morning of General MacArthur by the chairman of the committee, and General MacArthur's reply:

> The CHAIRMAN. Did the Joint Chiefs ever suggest in addition to the reconnaissance that these bases be attacked?
>
> General MACARTHUR. Not that I know of, Senator; the only order I had was not to attack.

The remainder of the answer General MacArthur gave at that point was deleted, for security reasons.

Mr. President, I became interested in this matter because I sat there during the hearings. I must say that I am aware of my lack of preparation to pass upon the question of just what information might be of value to the enemy or might be adverse to the national security. However, even with that consciousness, I was impressed a number of times with the feeling that certain information contained in the answers given by General MacArthur could not help but be of value to the enemy.

In that regard, Mr. President, let me say that I am advised that this morning the United Press carried a story that Tass, the Soviet news agency, has set up a direct special telephone wire from the United States Capitol to its downtown office. I am advised that never before has that been true in the history of our country. I do not claim to possess sufficient wisdom or ability to be able to analyze and know the reasons for that action, but this question arises in my mind: Is not it possible that Tass thought that certain information which might be available at the hearing would be of such significance or of such value that it should not even be permitted to take the normal routine of transmission, but that special facilities should be installed in order to transmit it—if the information were developed or if it were obtainable—in the quickest manner possible?

Mr. President, I would not be a party to keeping from the people of Oklahoma or from the people of the Nation a scintilla of information which is either of interest to them or is desired by them, unless I was convinced that for their welfare and for the security of my country some part of the information should be kept privileged to the military authorities, who are charged with the responsibility of the national security.

Mr. President, I have been unable to find myself impressed by the impassioned pleas of some Members of the Senate who have indicated that if they are not successful in their purpose, the people of the United States will be kept in darkness. One of my distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle last evening asked me if I did not want the people of Oklahoma to have this information. Mr. President, they are getting it just as quickly as the radio, the teletype, and the telegraph services can take it to them; and for whatever this information is worth, I am constrained to mention the fact that in my opinion they can read and can hear, and every bit of the information with reference to this hearing, aside from that which could damage their security, is being made available to them as quickly as it is humanly and mechanically possible to do so. The committee is charged with that responsibility.

I must say that it was after the committee had seen letters from certain Republican members of the committee, in which some of the most secret documents having to do with our national defense and our national security had been requested, that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], placed those letters in the RECORD. It is beyond my comprehension how men could fail to know that the information requested in those letters would be of the

utmost value to the enemies of our country, and that its publication would be of the greatest and severest damage to our national security.

Mr. President, the distinguished general who now is appearing before the committee has declined to indicate a desire that the hearings be made public, and well he may. He has been given permission by the Commander in Chief to go wherever he wishes to go, in about as convenient and, I may say, as luxurious and as rapid a means of transportation as is available on this earth. If the general has a message for the American people, every television station in the country is available to him, every radio station is available to him.

I must say that he has not hidden his light under a bushel, he has manifested no timidity of expression, no shyness in speaking his views, his recommendations, and his opinions. During such times as he may have been incapacitated or fatigued, I must say that he has had an aide who has shown remarkable facility and efficiency in issuing statements either by or for the general. I doubt whether the sun has set on a weekday since the general was relieved of his command that he has not spoken, and every word that he has uttered, so far as I know, certainly for publication, has been carried by every means of communication available. There has been neither an effort made, nor has there been a lack of effort, to encourage the general to speak his piece and say his words and declare his message around the world. I can understand why he declined to request that the hearings be made public.

Therefore, as I see it, the committee has acted, and by its action it has said that every bit of information brought out in its hearings, except only that which could possibly damage the national security, will be given instant and complete publication. The general has done that heretofore, and he has invited any group across the Nation who wanted him to appear before them to say so. I understand he made a public statement that he was available to go anywhere at any time his strength permitted and the opportunity presented.

In view of the fact that he has declined to indicate that he either wanted or thought there ought to be an open hearing, and in view of the fact that the committee has acted and has taken the position that the national security would be best served by not having an open meeting, and also that all the information, aside from that jeopardizing the national security, be made immediately available, the question comes to the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma. Why the resolution? By its terms, which I must say present contradictions, it provides that "no matters, the publication of which would be prejudicial to the security of the United States, as determined by a majority of such committees, shall be considered in open, public hearings."

The procedure being followed meets both the letter and the spirit of the resolution. That being true, the Senator from Oklahoma asks, Why the resolution? I can see no reason for the resolution other than that, in the opinion of some, it would serve someone else's political welfare. In that regard, I may say that insofar as the political security of those who favor the resolution and those who oppose it are concerned, and aside from the evident damage which I think it would do to the national security, I should like to see it adopted and implemented, and let those who favor it take the responsibility for it. The people of the United States of America are not fooled by these gyrations of the Wherry-go-round.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator can surely trust the people, can he not?

Mr. KERR. Yes, thank God, I can.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why does the Senator not wish to give them the facts?

Mr. KERR. They are getting the facts as fast as they can be gotten, and the Senator from Nebraska knows it.

Mr. President, I now desire to address myself briefly to the accusation made by the Senator from Michigan against the Senator from Oklahoma. The Senator from Michigan, on the floor of the Senate, a little while ago, speaking of the Senator from Oklahoma, said:

> The Senator knows that what he says is an absolute falsehood. He knows it. There is no doubt about it. He accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to the enemy, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I submit that, from the RECORD, that statement is not true.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma wants to be fair. Why does he not insert the first part of the colloquy?

Mr. KERR. I am going to.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does he not put in the RECORD what he, himself, said?

Mr. KERR. I am going to.

Mr. WHERRY. Why did the Senator not do it before he began his references to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma realizes that he is a very junior Senator, and that probably, of all the men on this floor, none is so wise, none is so capable of presenting a matter, as is the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska. But he should not expect the Senator from Oklahoma, in the brief time that he has been here, to have developed the efficiency which the Senator from Nebraska possesses in that regard.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. In just a moment. The Senator from Oklahoma wants to say that he realizes that he often stumbles, but he knows what he is trying to do, and he wishes that he could feel that to be equally true of others on the Senate floor, and he assures the Senator from Nebraska that he is going to do the very best he can in this regard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. He will even enroll in a correspondence course, if the Senator from Nebraska will——

Mr. WHERRY. If I will teach him?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will offer me such a course at a reasonable fee, on the subject of how Senators should present matters they are trying to submit to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to quit stumbling around; just put it all in the RECORD. That is all I want. The Senator knows how to do it. He is an able lawyer, and he knows that many times in the court room things which it is desired the jury should know are put in the record. That is only fair. The Senator said he was going to put the first part of the colloquy into the RECORD, but up to the time the Senator from Nebraska asked him to place it in the RECORD he certainly had not done so. I think it is all right to quote what the Senator from Michigan said. That is the privilege of the Senator from Oklahoma; it is within the province of any Senator. But certainly if the Senator from Oklahoma is going to quote what the Senator from Michigan said, he should also insert what brought about the remark.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as the Senator from Oklahoma said a while ago, he intends to do that. He is in some doubt as to whether the Senator from Nebraska merely wants him to do that, or whether the Senator from Nebraska feels that by insinuation, questioning, and repeating he might throw the Senator from Oklahoma off balance. I want to say to him that so far as it is possible I am going to be like the boy who was asking for a job. A farmer had gotten a little behind with his work and advertised for a boy to help him. A number of boys came and applied for the job. The farmer said, "I am going to tell you boys a story. A while back I heard the hens cackling at the henhouse, and I figured that an owl had been getting some of my chickens, and I went to see if I could get the owl. I eased up as quietly as I could to where the chickens were, and I saw an owl sitting up a little above them, and I knew he was getting ready to swoop down on the chickens. I lifted my trusty old shotgun and fired. Just as I did, lightning struck the barn and set it afire. I rushed into the house and called the fire department and asked them to come out and help put out the fire. The fire department came and neighbors came, and, after a long, hard struggle, we got the fire under control and held the damage down to as small an amount as was possible."

The boys were listening with wide eyes, and one of them said, "Did it burn the chicken house down, too?"

The farmer replied, "Not all of it."

Another boy asked, "Did the fire department get here first, or did the neighbors get here first?"

The farmer replied, "The fire department came first."

There was a little freckle-faced kid there who had not yet said a word.

Then he inquired, "Mister, did you kill the owl?"

The farmer said, "Son, you are hired. You have enough sense to keep your mind on the main business." [Laughter.]

That is what the Senator from Oklahoma is trying to do. I must say he is not interested in watering last year's crop nor in the diversionary tactics of the Senator from Nebraska, although the Senator from Oklahoma does enjoy them. But he wants to keep his mind on the main business of this particular moment, namely, the accusation by the Senator from Michigan that the Senator from Oklahoma is a liar. He wants to refer to the record upon which that accusation was based:

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator has described some tragic events where great effort was evidently made to obtain some of the secret information with reference to the security of this country.

Mr. President, there is nothing in those words that accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to the enemy. Then the Senator from Oklahoma said:

Is the Senator not aware that what he here and now proposes would make it possible for the information to reach the enemy without his having to go to so much trouble?

Mr. President, that is a question; that is not an allegation. That is an inquiry; that is not an accusation.

Then the Senator from Oklahoma said:

I wonder if he is seeking to make it easier for him?

Mr. President, I must say that as I read the RECORD it consists, first, of a statement that did not refer to the Senator from Michigan. Then it consists of a question, and then it consists of the expression of a doubt on the basis of which the Senator from Michigan said:

The Senator knows that what he says is an absolute falsehood. He knows it. There is no doubt about it. He accuses the Senator from Michigan of wanting to give aid and comfort to the enemy, Mr. President.

I then tried to interrupt him to correct the impression, and the Senator said:

I will not yield, Mr. President.

I think I know why the Senator from Michigan said what he did. I do not think he wanted to answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not think he wanted to meet the argument of the Senator from Oklahoma. So he took refuge, first, in an accusation which every Senator knows is in violation of the rules of the Senate, but in view of the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma hopes to live a while and remain in this august body a while, and in view of the fact that basing his judgment on what he has seen he is convinced that there will be many times when the Senator from Michigan will have no answer to a question or no argument to give and will take refuge either in refusing to yield or in saying something which differs from the real situation, the Senator from Oklahoma saw no profit to be had in calling the Senator from Michigan to order.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the resolution under discussion could not possibly be of service to the American people, because they are getting every bit of information they would get if the resolution were adopted and carried out in letter and in spirit; in view of the fact that General MacArthur has the opportunity to say what he wants to say at any time, at any place, and in any manner, and in view of the fact that he himself declined to take the responsibility to do that which the advocates of this resolution seek to do, the Senator from Oklahoma wonders why the resolution is pressed.

Because of the fact that there seems to be doubt in men's minds as to what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks the reason is, I should like to explain. I do not think there is a Senator on the floor who would deliberately injure the welfare of this country or give aid and comfort to an enemy of this country. The Senator from Oklahoma gives every Member of the Senate the same high regard with reference to his patriotism as his feelings are with reference to his own. But the Senator from Oklahoma does not have the same high opinion of the judgment of some of the Members of this body. In the minds of those who would be fair there might be justification for the conclusion by the Senator from Oklahoma that he did not think much of the judgment of the Senator from Michigan. I spent some little time last night, Mr. President, addressing myself to a remark by the Senator from Michigan in which he said:

The Senator from Michigan does not know what the Senator from Oklahoma thinks.

He went on to state that he did not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma was "even at this moment capable of thinking."

Then the Senator from Michigan stated:

Judging from what the Senator is saying, there is some doubt about that in the mind of the Senator from Michigan.

Naturally, Mr. President, for a man to make public issue of his belief that the Senator from Oklahoma is incapable of thinking would create some doubt in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma as to the good judgment of the person entertaining a feeling that would lead him to make such a statement.

I remember also when the Senator from Michigan made the positive statement on the floor that during World War II China had attacked and made war upon Japan. I must say that that did not improve my opinion of his judgment. He made the statement, Mr. President, that at that time Russia had a treaty with Japan similar to the one that Russia now has with China. In view of the fact that there is no basis for the statement, I must say that such positive allegation by the Senator from Michigan caused me to have further doubt as to the quality of his judgment. The fact of the matter is that the agreement he referred to was not what he said it was, and was not entered until 1941, which was many years after the war between Japan and China had started and had been going on, as a result of Japan's making aggressive warfare against China.

I submit that it is not unreasonable, in view of such miscalculations or, as the Senator from Michigan has described them, situations in which he misspoke himself under the heat of argument, that the Senator from Oklahoma cannot develop too high an opinion of the judgment of the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Oklahoma wonders just how much heat it takes to get the Senator from Michigan in a state of mind where he misspeaks himself.

It would seem, Mr. President, that a man might not be safe on the floor of the Senate if he disagreed with the Senator from Michigan and asked him a question. I know that if he ever developed any self-confidence he might really be the exception to the rule. But while few generals get to be statesmen, even fewer statesmen get to be generals.

The Senator from Oklahoma is of the opinion that the entire record of the Senator from Michigan is replete with instances which justify lack of confidence on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma in the judgment of the Senator from Michigan. Some day I hope to review the story of the Howard Hughes inquiry. If and when I have the time to water a few of last year's crops, to which so many of our distinguished colleagues on the other side have devoted so much time, I will show wherein my confidence in the judgment of the senior Senator from Michigan was weakened even then.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like again to make the RECORD clear that all my remarks with reference to the Senator from Michigan, aside from the complimentary remarks which I made with reference to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], have been spoken with reference to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggesting the absence of a quorum so that I may make a short statement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KERR. Without losing the floor and the opportunity to suggest the absence of a quorum, I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator withholds his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have a clipping from today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Drastic Steel Quota Cut Looms for Rail Cars, Other Transport—NPA May Slash July Allocation 35%; Feels Program Unduly Draining Supply." The story goes on to state that the Defense Production Administration was reported to have given preliminary approval to a reduction of 35 percent—more than one-third—in the quantity of steel to be allocated for

freight car production beginning in July.

Mr. President, any such reduction would be ridiculous and short-sighted in the extreme, in my judgment. Without adequate rail transportation, it would be absolutely impossible for this country either to fight a war or rearm to prevent one. The railroads are the backbone of our transportation, and in fact, of our entire economic system. This country simply cannot function without an adequate supply of boxcars.

The news story to which I have referred carries a hint that this reduction in steel for boxcars is being pushed at the instigation of those interested in maintaining production of automobiles at a higher level. If that is the reason, it is certainly a foolish reason. There is today an all-time record number of automobiles in use. On the other hand, the number of boxcars has steadily declined year by year. At the beginning of this year, there were 20,000 fewer boxcars suitable for grain than at the beginning of 1949, 2 years previous.

As the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] reported yesterday, the critical shortage of boxcars in the grain area has temporarily eased up, but we all know it cannot last. We have barely gotten the elevators in the Middle West unblocked, now that a new harvest is about to start. The wheat harvest in Nebraska will start in just about a month. Unless some prompt and effective action is taken, it is absolutely certain that we shall be confronted with another crisis this summer and fall during the harvest season, with elevators blocked and grain lying in the fields because there is no place to put it.

The only solution to the boxcar situation is to construct more boxcars. That will take steel and other material, but there is no more essential industry in this country.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago I submitted Senate Resolution 89, authorizing the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a full and complete study in order to make sure that sufficient materials were available for the production of 120,000 railroad cars during the calendar year 1951, or 10,000 a month. That is the absolute minimum that we need. In fact, even that will not be nearly enough to meet the critical situation we are facing.

Mr. President, I urge in the strongest possible terms that the committee proceed with such an investigation. It is becoming apparent that some of those in the emergency agencies do not realize the seriousness and importance of the railroad problem, and I believe it is time for Congress to take a hand.

I might add, Mr. President, that the other problem on which action should be taken promptly is an increase in the per diem rate. Under present conditions, a railroad which has cars constructed is likely to lose money on them by being forced, in effect, to rent them out to other railroads at the standard per diem rate of $1.75 a day. So long as the per diem rate is so low, it is not surprising that there is a chronic shortage of boxcars.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the clipping from the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRASTIC STEEL QUOTA CUT LOOMS FOR RAIL CARS, OTHER TRANSPORT—NPA MAY SLASH JULY ALLOCATION 35 PERCENT; FEELS PROGRAM UNDULY DRAINING SUPPLY

(By Max Barnes)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The Defense Production Administration was reported today to have given its tentative approval to a ruthless paring of July steel allocations for several special programs, as exclusively revealed in yesterday's Journal of Commerce.

The allocations are being prepared by the National Production Authority.

The freight-car program, it was disclosed, probably will be the hardest hit; it faces a 35 percent reduction from the 308,000 tons of steel allocated for June.

OTHER PROGRAMS AFFECTED

Other big programs, including barges and possibly other transportation items, also are threatened with sharp reductions, according to informed officials. The final decision, however, has not yet been made.

Behind the threatened cuts is the growing belief among Government planners that special programs for defense and defense-supporting industries are taking too big a chunk of the Nation's steel production.

While these programs theoretically will be under the Controlled Materials plan starting July 1, officials said that specific July allocations must be made in routine fashion to assure deliveries. Later, when CMP starts functioning, the CMP allocations will be superimposed on these special program allocations.

The sharp cutback for freight cars has been under consideration for several weeks, but supporters of the program were able to maintain the 10,000-car allocation rate for June.

If the reduction is approved, it will be on the theory that the pinch according to some officials, would be felt only in period of peak transportation demands, such as for moving the grain crops.

The April freight car production is estimated at 8,200 cars and officials anticipated that the May program will be higher with the 10,000-car goal possible in June providing the steel already allocated is delivered on schedule.

Strong pressure for the reduction reportedly has come from automobile manufacturers who will be cut back to 70 percent of their 1950 production rates starting in July. Steel manufacturers also reportedly would favor reductions in special program requirements that would ease the pinch to their longtime customers.

Meanwhile, the Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co., one of the Nation's largest car builders, reported today that it will build 2,667 new freight cars in April for the highest production in 3 years. It estimated that May production will be up, possibly close to 3,000.

Champ Carry, chairman of the board, said in making the announcement that the April production could not have been achieved without the steel allocation program.

The total announced allocation to special programs for June was just under 1.4 million tons of processed steel, but officials admit that total programing runs above the 2 million-ton mark. The May allocation was about 200,000 tons less.

Any cut in the freight-car program is sure to touch off a wave of protest in Congress as well as in the railroad industry. Farm-State Congressmen have been pointing out the dangers of a serious freight car shortage in the grain and cotton belts this year, and have backed the 10,000-a-month car-building program.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

OPEN HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS—RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have a notation before me which I am informed is correct. It comes over the news ticker. It reads as follows:

Senators reported that the committees agreed to suspend questioning of General MacArthur at 6 p. m. today, with no session Friday.

After some discussion, the general said he could return some day next week.

I see no purpose in the Senate working through another night session, when there will be plenty of time to do business tomorrow. If we should call Senators back into the Chamber at this time, it would only interrupt the work of the hearing. Senators are in attendance at the hearing, not here. So I make the motion——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will not the majority leader permit us to get a vote on the motion tonight?

Mr. McFARLAND. In view of the announcement which I have read, I cannot see that it would serve any purpose for the Senate to have a second night session. I have no objection to a vote this afternoon, but I do object to remaining in session for another night. That is what insisting on a vote today would mean.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to interrupt the distinguished majority leader. I realize that, now that he has been recognized, he can make a motion to recess or to adjourn. However, I appeal to the distinguished majority leader. I am sure that the debate on the motion is over. We have debated it for a couple of days. If we could have a vote on this issue we could decide it once and for all. I appeal to the distinguished majority leader to let us have a vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. If it would accomplish anything, it would be different; but I cannot see how we can accomplish anything by having a night session.

So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Langer
Bennett	Ellender	McCarran
Brewster	Frear	McFarland
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Malone
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Martin
Carlson	Hill	Millikin
Case	Hoey	Monroney
Clements	Holland	Neely
Cordon	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kerr	Underwood
Douglas	Kilgore	Wherry

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. IVES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. McCLELLAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a further delay, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIXON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent. If present, the previously listed Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Monroney
Byrd	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
Gillette	Long	Smathers
Green	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McFarland	Sparkman
Hennings	McKellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Underwood

NAYS—39

Aiken	Ecton	Millikin
Bennett	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Kem	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cain	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Lodge	Thye
Case	McCarran	Wherry
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Capehart	George	O'Conor
Chavez	Hunt	Taft
Duff	Jenner	Tobey
Eastland	Lehman	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Welker

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 4, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be captains

Margaret K. Aldrich, ANC, N772113.
Elizabeth R. Perry, ANC, N797300.

To be first lieutenants

Dolores L. Evanson, WMSC, M2810.
Genevieve Lescsak, WMSC, M1125.

To be second lieutenants

Jean C. Altenburger, WAC, L1010260.
Clarissa L. Aping, WAC, L1010279.
Alice M. Barr, WAC, L1010258.
Eva M. Benson, WAC, L1010264.
Frances J. Biddle, WAC, L1010267.
Patricia L. Bouldin, WAC, L1010261.
Barbara J. Brown, WAC, L1010263.
Eva M. Burgess, WAC, L1010255.
Salona Butler, WAC, L1010278.
Helen R. Coplen, WAC, L1010273.
Vivian E. Davis, WAC, L1010276.
Irene S. Ebel, WAC, L1010274.
Irene Evans, WAC, L1010256.
Pola L. Garrett, WAC, L1010238.
Irene S. Gulledge, WAC, L1010244.
Ruth Holland, WAC, L1010233.
Janet A. Jawelak, WAC, L1010237.
Shirley J. Justice, WAC, L1010250.
Esther E. Lenox, WAC, L1010270.
Sonja G. Lunoe, WAC, L1010241.
Kitt M. MacMichael, WAC, L1010245.
Phyllis J. Morsman, WAC, L1010259.
Patricia J. Pomeroy, WAC, L1010272.
Dorothy Sherba, WAC, L1010275.
Jacquelyn R. Sollars, WAC, L1010257.
Barbara J. Wardell, WAC, L1010282.
Helen A. Way, WAC, L1010280.
Martha L. Weeks, WAC, L1010269.
Elizabeth A. Whitaker, WAC, L1010281.
Kathleen I. Wilkes, WAC, L1010234.
Sadie E. Yoshizaki, WAC, L1010236.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Robert M. Griffin, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Alfred E. Montgomery, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Miles, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, who art the source of our material and spiritual blessings, grant that daily we may be strengthened within in order that we may cope victoriously with all circumstances and conditions without no matter how trying and difficult they may be.

We thank Thee for the priceless principles of our democracy, the authority of conscience, the sovereignty of the people, the equality of all men, and many others which we have received as a glorious heritage.

Make us more eager and able to retain these principles and to safeguard them against all enemies whether within or outside the borders of our beloved country.

May our chosen representatives and all our citizens discharge their duties intelligently and faithfully, fill us with desires to widen the horizons of our sympathy and understanding and deepen within the heart of humanity, the spirit of good will and brotherhood.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEN. MATTHEW RIDGWAY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest fighting men we have produced in this age, a man who is filling the biggest single job in our Military Establishment, is still wearing only three stars and he is clearly doing a four-star job. Lt. Gen. Matt Ridgway went to Korea, took a beaten army, regrouped it, reforged its fighting spirit, led it to triumphs which

every American should be and is proud of. Now he is supreme commander of all our vital and far-flung Pacific enterprises. For either he deserves a higher rank, that of full general. I sincerely hope that rank will shortly be forthcoming.

THE JENSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the majority leader is here today as he usually is, at his post.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, accused the gentleman from Minnesota, now addressing the House, of being in a disturbed frame of mind. I believe a reading of the RECORD this morning will show that it was the gentleman from Massachusetts who was disturbed and rightly so. On eight successive roll calls the majority of the Members of the House failed to follow his leadership. In fact, the gentleman from Massachusetts was so disturbed that he repeated twice the allegation that the gentleman from Minnesota had suggested that bureaus inconvenienced by the Jensen amendment should come to the Appropriations Committee for a deficiency.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, may I call attention to my statement on page 4745 of yesterday's RECORD, which reads as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island does not bring out the fact that if any of these bureaus do find themselves in difficulty this coming spring, they can come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations affected and state their case. We can then put them under that particular class of exemptions, if we so wish. I think we will be very foolish if we do not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. Speaker, we will, as the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested yesterday, let the Members draw their own interpretations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] makes the remarks he does today shows that the statement I made yesterday that he was disturbed is correct. I will quote just what the gentleman said:

> Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island does not bring out the fact that if any of these bureaus do find themselves in difficulty this coming spring, they can come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations affected and state their case.

Well, what are they coming before them for except for a deficiency appropriation? We all know that they cannot come before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations unless they are seeking a deficiency appropriation. There is only one construction that can be placed upon that language, and that is that they could not come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations unless it was in connection with a deficiency appropriation.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal from our good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] about the importance of TVA and how the power generated does not cost anybody anything. If you will turn to page 34 of the independent offices appropriation bill, which we will soon consider, in regard to the Tennessee Valley Authority, you will find that this uncalled-for monstrosity costs every taxpayer in the United States plenty to operate. Each year the Federal Government appropriates a few hundreds of millions of dollars for replacement, repair, operation of aircraft, and so forth, for this most inefficient and socialistic agency—the deficit in this bill for this year alone being $236,139,600, which the Government must borrow in order to keep this spendthrift organization in operation. For efficiency and economy, it should be turned over to private enterprise to operate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we are taking care of ourselves in the Tennessee Valley, but the rest of the people are being shut out from these public power projects, as I showed on yesterday. They are all entitled to the benefits of the cheap electricity produced at these Government dams on our navigable streams.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of peace and harmony, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very important announcement by a little Quaker college in Ohio, Wilmington College, for the promotion of a plan that college education may be put within the reach of all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of informing the gentleman——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi is clearly out of order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded, therefore the gentleman cannot proceed under a reservation of objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

BRITISH DISLOYALTY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Great Britain stopped playing games with us. It is incredible that the British Government would permit the sale of 40,400 tons of rubber to Russia since the beginning of the war. But it is absolutely fantastic that the British would sell 120,000 tons of the same rubber to Communist China. This is a time when soldiers of the British Commonwealth in the forces of the United Nations are fighting Communist Chinese alongside of us.

We have always been loyal to our friends, but loyalty is a two-way street and the British have clearly been disloyal to us. They have been giving lip service to the United Nations' decision to fight in Korea, but they are working both sides of the street. For the sake of British trade in Hong Kong, the Labor Government is playing the shabbiest kind of immoral dishonesty and incredible politics. If anything should bring the Labor Party to defeat, this shocking demonstration of duplicity is it.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks which I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am going to include certain material and data regarding the problem of veterans in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. I think the Members will admit that there is a shortage of beds, particularly in the NP and TB hospitals. The Army and Navy and National Defense have requested of the Veterans' Administration beds for men still in service who have NP and TB disabilities. The overcrowding in those hospitals is extremely dangerous. There will be a great many accidents and the men are not getting the proper care due to shortage of personnel.

Also, there must be a military status of the doctors in the veterans' hospitals, otherwise you will have practically no doctors and nurses to take care of the patients, for many already have been drafted for the armed services. It was necessary in World War II to do this.

AID TO INDIA

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor simply to warn the membership of this body not to be caught in the trap that the so-called India wheat bill has set for them. This bill is simply a softening-up process. It simply makes way for other countries that are coming for a hand-out. The advocates of a further, or new ECA thought it best to bring this bill up because of the so-called humanitarian element involved. A vote for this bill will be a vote of confidence in Dean Acheson, and it will be committing us to another little ECA that will be known as the Javits plan, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been doing the thinking and the planning for the group interested in bringing into existence this additional little ECA, that will in the total call for approximately $7,000,000,000.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MEN IN UNIFORM

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received the shock of my life when I learned that certain railroads are discriminating against our boys in uniform. I quote from a letter I received from the mother of a GI:

> Last week my son, a member of the United States Air Force, was coming home on leave before reporting to a port of embarkation base. He was traveling from Chicago to Binghamton. When he and several other members of the Armed Forces started to enter the club car, they were told by the conductor that the car was only for Pullman passengers. Do you know if this is a standard policy of all railroads?
>
> How I wish my son and all other sons of mothers the world over could be turned back from battle zones because they are not Pullman passengers.

Such discrimination is an outrage. A GI should be able to move freely from car to car on any train just like any other citizen. Is this the practice going on all over the country, on our railroads or in other public places? I mean to find out. This form of discrimination against our gallant fighting men had better be stopped before it is too late.

All the more reason why Congress should wake up and pass the Hall free furlough bill now languishing in the hands of a House committee. While railroads discriminate against servicemen who are lucky enough to dig up the money to travel second class, thousands of GIs now dog the dusty, dreary highways of our Nation on their long journeys home during furlough.

I might add, the boys tell me it is increasingly difficult for them to thumb and bum their way home. Does not our country's uniform mean as much to the civilian as it did before? Let us stop this discrimination against our servicemen. If Dean Acheson can ride in a limousine, if the General Staff members ride in Cadillacs and Lincolns, if our generals in the East ride in rickshaws carried by Chinese coolies, why draw the line on our GI's? Let us approve the Hall furlough bill, issue free passes to soldiers who want to visit their homes and forget there was anything like barring men in uniform from club cars or anywhere else in the good old United States of America.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Anderson, Calif.	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Havenner	Passman
Brooks	Hays, Ark.	Patman
Buckley	Hébert	Powell
Burton	Hinshaw	Price
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Rains
Case	Irving	Redden
Chatham	Jarman	Ribicoff
Cole, N. Y.	Jenison	Rivers
Cooley	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Curtis, Mo.	Kee	Shafer
Dawson	Kersten, Wis.	Stockman
DeGraffenried	Klein	Vail
Dingell	Mansfield	Vinson
Evins	Miller, N. Y.	Watts
Fallon	Morrison	Whitaker
Gillette	Moulder	Widnall
Gore	Murdock	Woodruff
Gossett	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 401)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vermont, for agricultural purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising nine hundred forty-two and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vermont, and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of transfer.

"The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) relating to the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted an amendment in lieu thereof. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The provisions of the conference substitute are the same as the provisions adopted by the House, except as explained below:

The measure as it passed the House would have required the deed of conveyance to contain a provision reserving any minerals that might be found to exist, including the right to enter, remove, and extract same, and a provision which would cause the title to the lands to revert to the United States if the property was put to any use other than for the benefit of agriculture.

These provisions have been eliminated in the conference substitute. The conference substitute, however, provides that the real and personal property and research records are to be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture, for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of the transfer. This language will give the Secretary of Agriculture somewhat broader authority and will provide greater flexibility in the negotiations that must be conducted between the Secretary of

Agriculture and officials of the Vermont Agricultural College in connection with the transfer of the properties. It is the belief of the committee that the language of the conference substitute is ample to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the intent of the Congress and to protect fully the interests of the United States.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 220) providing for the waiving of points of order against H. R. 3880, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill or any provision contained in said bill are hereby waived.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later of course, as usual, I shall yield 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from my State [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I am presenting this rule, House Resolution 220. Personally, I am opposed to this rule which provides for the waiver of points of order against legislation which has been inserted in this appropriation bill by the Committee on Appropriations. This rule is unnecessary as far as consideration of the bill itself is concerned. The committee has already agreed on 4 hours of general debate. This resolution, if adopted, will protect those sections which materially alter general legislation already adopted by the Congress which, under the rules of this House, are the direct responsibility of several of the important standing committees of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does this rule waive points of order against amendments?

Mr. SABATH. It waives points of order on the 12 or 14 items of general legislation that are in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I mean amendments offered from the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can answer that question; the answer is "No."

Mr. SABATH. Thirty years ago, as some of you will recall, the legislative committees also had the power to appropriate. This power was taken away from them and made the sole jurisdiction of the great Committee on Appropriations. Now the Committee on Appropriations comes in and insists on usurping the prerogatives of legislative committees.

The tendency in recent years has been to increase the amount of general legislation in appropriation bills. If this door continues to be widened we can say goodbye to the legislative committees and turn over all legislation to the Committee on Appropriations. This is very bad practice. I have always opposed it. As an old Member, one who has been here for many years, who has stood for orderly procedure and tried to protect and defend the rights of the membership, I feel this rule should not be adopted. You Members with years of service on important legislative committees, as well as you younger Members who have assumed responsibilities on these committees, have a vital concern in what transpires here today. By voting to adopt this rule you are abrogating the prestige, the power, the responsibility embodied in the committee on which you serve. I feel certain that if you fully realize the import of this resolution, you will vote "no" and thereby protect your own committee. A vote to defeat the motion on the previous question is only a vote against this usurpation of power by the Committee on Appropriations. It is not a vote against the appropriation bill itself.

Under the pretense of economy or reducing certain appropriations the gentlemen who will speak for the rule will undoubtedly employ their worn-out argument that their motives are in the interest of the taxpayer—that great economies will result from the reduction in certain appropriations—but, unfortunately, this will not be borne out by their votes on the real economy bills which come before this House. Some day I shall call attention to their votes on legislation that will place these gentlemen in a rather embarrassing position. They talk about saving thousands in this measure, but when it comes to legislation that means millions upon millions to their friends in big business they are strangely silent with their economy pleas; they go right down the line for them.

Here are some of the important changes in existing law contained in this appropriation bill which this rule proposes to protect:

On page 24, lines 17 to 19: This provision suspends the advance-planning program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency under Public Law 352, which authorizes $100,000,000 for this program. This proviso limits the total advances for the program from its inception to $27,000,000. This will seriously cripple the housing program at a time when our defense effort creates a greater demand than ever for housing for defense workers.

Page 25, line 17 through line 7, page 26: The limitations embodied in these paragraphs constitute a change in existing law. The Housing Act now provides for 135,000 dwelling units each year to 1954. This proviso limits it to 50,000 units in any 1 year.

Page 30, lines 2 to 6: This proviso virtually suspends section 507 of the Housing Act, which provides administrative funds for the National Capital Housing Authority. The committee allowed $32,800 for maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the act. Present law permits the National Capital Housing Authority to use funds derived from leases, sales, and so forth, under title I for this purpose without limitation.

Page 53, lines 14 to 16: This section amends title III of the National Housing Act by limiting authorizations for administrative expenses for the Federal National Mortgage Association. It cuts the present authorization for administrative purposes by $540,000.

Page 54, lines 3 to 8: This provision rescinds the authorization of funds for prefabricated housing loans. In effect, it terminates the program authorized by section 102 of the Housing Act of 1948.

Page 55, lines 16 to 19: These lines constitute a change in existing law. They amend the Home Loan Act by inserting a limitation of $1,664,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Examiner's Division of the Home Loan Bank Board.

Page 57, lines 11 to 14: This section amends the National Housing Act by cutting authorizations for nonadministrative expenses to $22,320,000.

Page 58, lines 13 to 16: These words change section 303 of the Lanham Act, by limiting authorizations for nonadministrative expenses to $33,000,000.

All of the above involve serious infringement on the responsibilities and duties of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The following two provisions infringe on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Page 45, lines 12 and 18: This limits the number of voyages to be made by subsidized ships flying the American flag, now in operation and/or hereafter contracted for. This is certain to interfere with the proper development and expansion of our American merchant marine; it plays right into the hands of the foreign-registry shipowners, many of whom are American citizens or large corporations.

Page 46, lines 9 to 12: This proviso limits the administrative expenses under our ship-construction program to 5 percent of the total cost of such construction.

There are a number of other provisions of general legislation which I have not touched on which trespass on the jurisdiction of other important legislative committees. Chairman HART, of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; Chairman SPENCE, of the Banking and Currency Committee; and several other chairmen of legislative committees will undoubtedly give you more detailed information concerning the encroachment upon their respective committees if this rule is adopted.

No single appropriation bill in my memory has endeavored to legislate in

so many instances. Again I repeat, this is entirely contrary to the rules of the House. It is a highly dangerous practice to permit the Committee on Appropriations to legislate in appropriation bills. This rule should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I have so many requests for time I shall ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for so much of 30 minutes as he may use.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as our distinguished chairman has said, this rule waives points of order.

Since I have been on the Rules Committee I venture to say that sometime or other every chairman of a standing committee of this House has come before the Committee on Rules and asked that points of order be waived on certain legislation sponsored by their respective committee.

The reason my friend from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] is opposed to this rule is because the main object is to save the taxpayers some money. To some Members this appears to be a crime. The reason the Appropriations Committee came before the Rules Committee asking for a rule waiving points of order was because they want to save the American taxpayers from one and a half to two billion dollars and that committee knew if it did not make the request for a rule waiving points of order against certain language that constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, the Committee on Banking and Currency would continue to demand 25,000 housing units costing $9,000 each or a total of $225,000,000 in order to subsidize low-cost housing at a time when we are probably in the greatest emergency since the War Between the States. It may be even greater. The object of the rule is to defer the building of these subsidized housing units and save a total of $225,000,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not the sole purpose of this rule to usurp the functions of the other standing committees of the House by legislating on an appropriation bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say definitely not. The sole object is to save taxpayers' money at a time when we are taxing the people $55,000,000,000 and, in fact, the Congress is now trying to bleed ten or twelve billion dollars more out of them. So I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] chairman of the subcommittee and to the members of the Appropriations Committee that they have my congratulations for bringing this bill before the House in this manner. Never in all history is it as important to practice economy.

Another group particularly interested in this bill and against waiving points of order is the Maritime Commission. We all know that after the last war our Government, after having paid a million and a half dollars each for thousands of ships, sold approximately one thousand of these ships to American citizens for about one-third of what they cost; in other words about $500,000 apiece. The Government feels now that it might be necessary in the present emergency to charter these ships. Those boats which were sold for $500,000 are now worth approximately two and a half million dollars. The present bill provides that in the event the Government charters these same ships and they are sunk that the Government will pay the owner the amount the Government received for them plus the cost of improvement minus the cost of any depreciation. The owners feel that they should receive the present valuation which is at least four or five times more than they paid the Government. Could anything be more mercenary?

Mr. COX. And plus improvements that are made.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Another reason why the Maritime Commission and the ones who have purchased these boats are objecting to this rule waiving points of order is because it has placed a limitation on subsidies. As you know, the Government is subsidizing these boats that cost the Government one and a half million dollars, later sold to American citizens for a half million dollars, for a certain number of voyages. This limits the subsidized voyages to 1,450. These same ship owners desire that all voyages be subsidized although shipping is enjoying one of its greatest prosperities in history with corresponding high profits. This bill provides $20,000,000 for subsidies. I can understand that because our seamen receive higher wages, because it costs more for their maintenance than the seamen of foreign countries than occasionally in the present emergency that it might be necessary to charter one of the ships for a voyage which would necessarily have to make the run at a loss. The 1,450 subsidized voyages allowed in this bill will take care of these emergencies. The Appropriations Committee, in my opinion, should receive the congratulations of the Members of this House for bringing in a bill designed to save the taxpayers some one and a half billion dollars.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will take the floor in a few minutes and if the Members will listen to what the gentleman has to say they will find complete justification for the action of the Rules Committee in bringing this entire question in here in order that the House might have the opportunity of passing upon the identical question the gentleman has been discussing. In other words, the House is deprived of nothing. These committees that are complaining have been deprived of no rights. Their views may be stressed here with amendments that they have the privilege of offering to the bill. The Rules Committee, in the interest of giving the House an opportunity to effect economy, saw fit to report this rule and they will find justification for that action in the statement that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will make very shortly.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his always sound remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Bills from the Committee on Appropriations are privileged, are they not?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. So if you were to vote down this rule the committee could still call the bill up under the rules of the House; is that not correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The rule is merely designed to waive points of order.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that the will of the majority will decide this issue. When we vote on the previous question the will of the majority is not denied one thing under this rule. If the majority do not want this rule, then, of course, it will be turned down. So, I say the Committee on Rules has not denied the majority membership of this House the right of final determination, because they will have the opportunity of voting the rule up or down.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there has not been an important committee of this House that has not been before the Committee on Rules asking for the waiving of points of order on their bills. The Committee on Appropriations came there and in the judgment of the Committee on Rules made a good case, and the committee reported the bill and ordered to give the House the opportunity to now pass upon the important questions that are dealt with in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. And that is all that is dealt with?

Mr. COX. That is all.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In conclusion I want to say this: Yesterday the House did a great job in regard to cutting down nondefense expenditures. I have repeatedly stated we should also more carefully scrutinize actual military expenditures. Frankly, I think the House can do an even greater job when we come to reading this bill for amendment and that they can cut down this bill many millions of dollars. I refer especially to the TVA, which I have previously mentioned today. This Congress has a great responsibility. Our chief one is to keep the Nation solvent. In my opinion we cannot do so unless we cut every appropriation to the bone and in addition completely eliminate the scores of governmental agencies now in existence which are not needed and which in no way benefit our people—that is, with the exception of those who are on the taxpayers' payroll.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if permitted to do so, I would like to yield to the gentleman the 5 minutes reserved for me.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Georgia relinquishes his time, then it reverts to the gentleman from Texas. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SABATH. I promised the gentleman from Georgia 5 minutes, and if he desires to do that, it is all right with me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois yields 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] for his generosity, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] also.

I do not think there is much room for any heat here. I cannot quibble with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]; we all admire and love him too much to do that. Fundamentally he is right that the Committee on Appropriations ought not to do any legislating, and as a general rule we do not, and the only reason we are here today is purely on account of an emergency, wartime condition, and if that condition did not prevail we would not be here asking you to waive points of order. I hope and pray that you will waive these points of order because this language that we are asking you to waive points of order upon is worth a bare minimum to the taxpayers of this country $750,000,000 over and above the reductions already made in the bill, and I will give the details to you word for word if you will give me the time. That is a very conservative estimate. It can ran much greater than $750,000,000.

We do not like to be placed in the attitude of encroaching so to speak, on the jurisdiction of the great Committee on Banking and Currency on the housing unit item here. We all respect that great committee and its great chairman. They are fine, patriotic men, and they have done a splendid job.

This is what we have done. You passed a bill in 1949 calling for the construction of 810,000 publicly subsidized low-cost housing units, at an individual cost of about $9,000. The President reduced it for this year to 75,000 units. All you could start was 75,000 units, on account of the war, the scarcity of material, the scarcity of manpower, and to hold down inflation.

The committee, after thinking it over, decided that figure should be reduced to 50,000 for the fiscal year 1952: for the same reasons: to hold down inflation, and because of the scarcity of materials and manpower, steel bathtubs and cookstoves.

Why does the Committee on Banking and Currency now come here and say we are trespassing on the jurisdiction of their great committee? Because that committee did what? It legislated authority to the Housing Agency to issue notes and other obligations in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000,000. You did not appropriate it. You do not get to pass on it, and your servant, the Committee on Appropriations, does not get a chance to pass on it. That great legislative committee, whom I admire, wrote into the bill that you go to the Treasury, not to this House, you go direct to the Treasury for $1,500,000,000.

Is that all? No. The Banking and Currency Committee also said that when you build these 810,000 units the taxpayers of the United States shall pay each year in the form of a subsidy what amount of money? $308,000,000. We have no discretion in that appropriation. You do not actually get a chance to decide on the amount and neither does your Committee on Appropriations because the amount required automatically becomes an obligation of the Government. That great committee in effect legislated and appropriated all at one time, and for how long? For 40 years. That is the life of it. It is a debt against the taxpayers of the United States, and they can go into court and obtain a judgment against the Government.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The House passed that bill. The House was "over 21" and knew what it was doing.

Mr. THOMAS. I doubt if the gentleman or most of his committee fully understand it, much as I admire you.

Mr. JAVITS. I am not on that committee, but I understand it, and I think the committee did, and I think the House did.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, we understand it. You dump into the lap of the Committee on Appropriations every year for 40 years a mandate to appropriate $308,000,000 a year. Does not the gentleman think, in all fairness to this House, that it is the duty of this little, humble subcommittee to come in here and point that out to you? All that amounts to for 40 years is approximately $13,000,000,000 of your money.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room for heat. When you go into the Committee of the Whole, if you adopt this rule, you can amend that language. The only purpose of asking for the rule was that one person could knock out that item on a point of order, without giving the other 434 Members a chance to express themselves. They can knock it out, amend it, or change it in any way they want to. When the war is over you can go back and build every one of these units. We are not taking them away from you; we are just saying they ought to be deferred.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Apropos of the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], while the House was "21" when it passed that authorization, at the same time we did not know then that we had to fight communism all over the world and would need our resources for that.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Let me speak for one moment on the maritime question. We have some language in here that applies only to what price the taxpayers are going to be called upon in case of an all-out shooting war to pay for ships that the taxpayers have heretofore bought and paid for 100 percent with your money—your money, now, make no mistake about that—and which the Government sold, as far as replacement value is concerned as of today, at 15 cents on the dollar.

In other words this language will not apply until we get in an all-out, shooting war. There are about a thousand ships involved. The Government is forced to take them back, after they have sold them, for 15 cents on the dollar and then they are sunk. This language says, "All you can get is what you paid for that ship, minus depreciation and charter hire that you have received in the meantime."

You talk about not making any millionaires out of the blood, sweat, and tears of these boys who are fighting and dying for $50 a month. Here is your opportunity. We are just trying to correct a mistake that was made in World War II. Gentlemen, that mistake was—it is almost—I want to use moderate language—I think it is revolting what the Maritime Commission paid for some of those ships after they were requisitioned and used by your Government to supply your troops who are fighting for $50 a month. I am not going to call the names of the ship companies, but I have the names of the ships and their age and what the ship operator paid for them, and I have the figure as to what the taxpayers had to pay back when they were sunk, and in addition to that we have the figures here to show how much they were paid for charter hire, rent, so to speak, before they were sunk.

Incidentally there were 754 of these cargo ships sunk during World War II. Here is one, the *Alcoa Leader*. It was built in 1919. It was sunk on June 30, 1944. That would make the ship about 25 years old when it was sunk. It had been depreciated at the rate of 5 percent for every year for 20 years. So it had been paid for a long time before it was ever sunk. The operator paid $210,000 for it, and the amount paid by the taxpayers was $435,307 when it was sunk. That is for a 25-year-old ship that was depreciated.

That is not all. During the time that the Government used that ship the Government paid him $1,048,000 charter hire.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] yield me 3 minutes? I just want to read two or three more of these figures.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this table of information I have here is prepared by the Maritime Administration. It is just a sample of the information they usually give out. I have never heard of the Maritime Administration giving you their best or their worst. They usually just go down the middle. These are the commission's figures, and not mine.

Here is another ship, the *Tachira*. That ship was built in 1920, it was sunk

on July 12, 1942. The acquisition cost to the owner was $45,600. When it was sunk the taxpayers of the United States paid $256,200 for a ship that was 22 years old, and for which the owner only paid $45,000. That is not all. The Government operated it for only 2 months and paid them an additional $47,800. That is the sum total of the cost for a 21- or 22-year-old ship.

Here is another ship, the *Hon Omu*. That ship was built in 1919. It was sunk on July 5, 1942. That makes the ship 23 years old. The acquisition cost to the owner, according to the Maritime Administration, was $127,000. The Maritime Administration says that when it was sunk the owner received—how much? $768,000. Let us see how much the Government paid in addition to that for charter hire and fees during that time. The Government only chartered it for about 4 months and they paid $129,615 extra beside that $768,000.

Mr. Speaker, all this language does is to seek to prevent that happening again. That great committee is headed by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey. He is a great American, the head of a great committee. Their committee had 5 years to do this, and they have not seen fit to do it. That is their business and not ours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to submit a consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

The appropriation bill should of course, come before the House, and it will come before the House anyway. The only question is whether you are going to vote for a rule waiving points of order. As has been stated repeatedly, this would oust the appropriate standing committees of the House of their jurisdiction. No matter how good you may conceive the legislation in this appropriation bill to be, it is not the way to legislate; it is not a desirable thing to oust legislative committees from their appropriate jurisdiction.

I have very little to say about the housing legislation. The point is that surely you can control the amount of housing to be constructed by the quantum of the appropriation you allow. I do not see why the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency should be done in this bill, although I did not agree with what the Committee on Banking and Currency did in the first place and I did not vote for the housing legislation which I never considered good legislation.

Now, coming to this merchant-marine provision on page 49, we find a particularly striking case. I was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when in the Seventy-ninth Congress we passed the ship sales bill which passed the House almost unanimously. It may very well be that if the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, when it was considering the ship sales bill, had realized the tremendous increase in price that was going to occur, it would have fixed a different formula for the selling price of ships. But we fixed the statutory selling price in good faith. Surely, nobody who bought a war-built ship at the statutory price can be criticized for doing it. You will have in mind that we deliberately fixed a statutory sales price that we thought would move these ships. A provision closely resembling that found in H. R. 3880 was offered as an amendment to the Ship Sales Act and was rejected.

The provision on page 49 of the bill not only is new legislation; it also amends the Constitution of the United States, because the Constitution of the United States provides that property shall not be taken without due process of law. It provides for a fair value to be paid to the owner whose property is involuntarily taken. This is true in war as in peace. Ship owners, like other people, have suffered a great appreciation in the value of their property. You could, of course, pass legislation providing that nobody in the District of Columbia should sell a house for more than he paid for it 5 or 10 years ago, but I do not believe you would want to pass such legislation, and I do not believe the courts would concede the constitutionality of it or give it effect. Why should you confiscate the property of a shipowner more readily than that of a home owner.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield briefly.

Mr. JAVITS. I just want to ask the gentleman whether he does not think that all we are trying to pass on is whether or not the Committee on Appropriations shall be a superlegislative committee over every other committee.

Mr. HALE. Exactly. That will be the effect if you adopt this rule. Not only that but in this case you will, as I say, amend the Constitution of the United States, which the Congress cannot do by ordinary statute even when emanating from a committee having jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this rule subject to amendment before it is voted on?

The SPEAKER. Not if the previous question is ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the previous question is ordered, it is subject to amendment, is it?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois yields for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield? I would like to submit an amendment and ask a question to go along with it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that if he yields to the gentleman from Mississippi to offer an amendment, the gentleman from Mississippi will control an hour.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a plea of guilty by Members of the Committee on Rules and my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee. They have made the same defense that the old colored man made when he was accused of stealing a pair of pants. He said, "If the motive is right, where is the sin? I stole the breeches to be baptised in."

I would be recreant to my trust if I did not protest against this invasion of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the other committees. The parliamentary rules have been built up by experience of mankind, by trial and error, like the common law which Blackstone is the perfection of human reasoning. They are a wise code of rules and those who have served here long are constantly made conscious that they are fundamentally sound. One of the most important of these rules is that no legislation shall be written on an appropriation bill.

The Appropriations Committee does not have to have a rule for the consideration of its bills. These bills come here ordinarily without a rule for their consideration. However, in this case they went before the Rules Committee and got a rule which provides that no points of order may be made against the bill or any provisions of it. Thereby they invaded those committees which had jurisdiction under the rules of the House in reference to legislative provisions incorporated in the bill. Rules prohibiting points of order may sometimes be justified when applied solely to clerical errors or technical objections; but they should not be made to invade the fundamental principles and the fundamental rules of the House.

In order to proceed under orderly processes, we must have legislative committees. The jurisdiction of those committees is as well defined as the jurisdiction of the courts. Those committees have a peculiar knowledge of the subjects that come before them because of the constant hearings and the constant experience with those subjects.

The gentlemen favoring the rule by their debate here miss the fundamental question of violation. They are justifying their action in overriding the legislative committees in a way that makes me feel like saying: "Upon what meat have these our Caesars fed that they have grown so great?" They have not denied that this is a violation of the fundamental rules of the House. They have said, "We did violate them, but we know more than the committees that have jurisdiction over these matters, we know more than the committees that have considered these things; therefore, we substitute our judgment for their judgment."

They have looted our committees today, they will gut yours tomorrow if you establish this principle. Have you any feeling of interest in your committee? Do you want to see the integrity of your committee preserved? Do you want to see it retain its jurisdiction? If you do, you had better vote down this rule.

The legislation here involved is immaterial. The fundamental question is whether you are going to let the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee take over the legislation of the House. If you want to do that you may make an easy life for yourself, but it seems to me it will be a retreat from the duties that are imposed upon you.

I ask the Members to vote down this resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the House created the Appropriations Committee, within the memory of many people now sitting on this floor today, to keep Members of the House out of trouble. I think this is one time when the Appropriations Committee has been diligent by the action it has taken in reference to this bill to keep the Members out of trouble.

We are going to answer, by our vote upon the rule, and I personally hope it will be a vote in favor of the rule, five very simple questions. Those questions are: Do you believe this is an emergency? Do you believe that this is a war? Do you believe that money should be spent for the defense of the United States and that, therefore, all other expenditures of the United States domestically should be reduced as much as possible? Do we believe that the unlimited expenditure of Federal money has a direct effect toward inflation, and, in very simple language, do we believe in economy? Those questions you will answer by yes or no by your vote upon the rule. As long as I have been upon the Committee on Appropriations, which is 5 years, subcommittees have come before the Rules Committee asking for closed rules. I think in the session before last, the Eighty-first Congress, a majority of the Appropriation Subcommittees asked for rules waiving points of order, and it gives me a certain slight amusement to hear the gentleman from Kentucky object to this rule on the ground that it waives points of order when the Committee on Banking and Currency has itself frequently gone before the Committee on Rules and asked for rules waiving points of order.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not at the moment, but I will later. If you wish to discuss jurisdiction, in which I have no particular interest, the Committee on Banking and Currency took jurisdiction from the Committee on Appropriations when it passed the housing bill and bypassed the Committee on Appropriations and gave a blank check upon the taxpayers of the United States for a period of years amounting to about $17,000,000,000. That is a point where jurisdiction was seized by the Banking and Currency Committee and not by us.

We do not want particularly to make legislation; I do not think any Appropriation Subcommittee does, but there are times when a legislative committee does not have time; perhaps, for some reason it has not been able to meet and to do those things which should be done in this bill and which are necessary in the emergency which faces the United States. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, that is going to prevent the Committee on Banking and Currency from meeting and working out some of the things they want or the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries from meeting and working out some of the things it wants, but the fact remains that those committees have not met to do the things that are done in this bill. This is your chance to answer the questions which I asked: Are you for economy? Do you believe that Federal spending increases inflation? Do you believe this is an emergency and do you believe that in wartime we should limit domestic spending and spend for the defense of the country? Those are the questions before us.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART].

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, as my very good friend from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, has stated, there is no reason for heat being employed on this occasion. The proposition involved here is a fundamental one, and that is whether the rules of the House and whether the jurisdiction of the legislative committees of the House are to be suspended by the House or whether encroachments upon those several jurisdictions and violations of those rules are to be condoned by the House.

The only purpose of the rule upon which we are soon to act, the rule which waives points of order on H. R. 3880 is to validate what is admitted to be legislation contained in an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. I do not desire to go into the merits of the legislation, particularly. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] stated that the purpose of the Committee on Appropriations was to get Members of the House out of trouble. If rules of this nature are to be continued, if there is to be a continuous ouster of jurisdiction of legislative committees, then the Committee on Appropriations is going to get the country into trouble, and if the legislative provisions of H. R. 3880 prevail, at least with respect to the operations of the Maritime Commission, our country will be in trouble. The gentleman from Texas fulminated against the prices paid to many people who had bought ships from the Government. Under previous legislation the Maritime Commission was permitted to enter into negotiations with the ship owners on the question of just compensation. Under the previous law and existing law they were permitted to offer larger amounts to those owners than would be permited under the provisions of H. R. 3880. But, the question of just compensation cannot be defined by a legislative body. The Constitution of the United States and the fifth amendment say that everybody shall be given just compensation for private property taken or requisitioned by the Government.

What does the record show? The record shows even in the light of larger sums that were offered by the Government in the negotiations, when the ship owners refused to accept such sums and brought their cases into the courts, the courts in the over-all picture awarded the owners 161 percent of what the Maritime Commission had offered.

You cannot take away the jurisdiction of the courts by a provision of this nature. This not only seeks to oust the legislative committees of their jurisdiction but the courts of the United States of their jurisdiction. If by any chance it should be passed, the courts will repel it as being completely unconstitutional.

The gentleman from Texas never referred at all to another provision in this bill that limits the number of voyages in the fiscal year 1952 that may be authorized by the Maritime Administration to 1,450.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That particular point is not subject to a point of order. It does not come under the rule.

Mr. HART. That is the opinion of the gentleman from California. That may be the reason the gentleman from Texas did not mention it. Nevertheless, there is some doubt as to whether a point of order could be made against that provision because, if enacted into law, it would result in the violation of contracts already existing between the Maritime Administration and the shipowners and operators of the United States.

The Maritime Administrator requested that there be authorized in this appropriation bill sufficient funds for a minimum of 1,523 voyages. Even then it is questionable whether 1,523 voyages would satisfy the contractual commitments of the Maritime Administration.

But arbitrarily and without recognition of the request of the Maritime Administrator, the subcommittee has cut down the number of voyages authorized to 1,450, an increase of 16 over those which are estimated to take place in the fiscal year 1951.

I talked this morning on the telephone with the Administrator of the Maritime Administration, Admiral Cochrane. Admiral Cochrane has been commended by the gentleman from Texas as one of the finest administrators in the history of the country. With that estimate of him I fully agree. Yet, he casts aside completely, and his subcommittee casts aside completely, the recommendation of Admiral Cochrane with reference to the number of voyages that will be required in the interests of the United States and the United States merchant marine in the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous principle, this business of permitting continual and ever greater encroachment upon the legislative committees of the House by the Appropriations Committee. It is a fundamental principle. It is the only real principle involved. I appeal to those Members who do not approve of the continuance of that practice to vote down this rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the few minutes allotted to me I may be able to discus, the rule

which is before us, and perhaps clarify some of the misunderstandings which seemingly are apparent here today.

In the beginning, may I point out that when this bill and the application for this rule were before the Committee on Rules we were advised there were eight provisions in the bill which would be subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriation bill? Of course, under the rules of the House, legislation cannot be made a part of an appropriation bill unless points of order are waived. The waiving of points of order, as provided in this rule, does simply one thing—and I wish to make this very clear—it permits the membership of the House to pass upon each of these eight provisions upon its merits. The rule does not provide these eight provisions shall be enacted into law. Voting for this rule does not approve a single one of these provisions. The rule simply sets aside the right of one individual Member of the House to prevent, by his objection, or by the making of a point of order, the majority of the House of Representatives from working its will on that particular section of the bill.

I have the highest regard and the greatest respect for our legislative committees. In the long years I have served on the Committee on Rules, I have usually opposed the granting of rules carrying a waiver of points of order. Yet I am not unmindful of the fact that every legislative committee of the House, almost without exception, and I dare say without a single exception, has come before the Committee on Rules and requested a waiver of points of order. I am not unmindful of the fact that when the great Committee on Banking and Currency brought in the housing bill, which is dealt with in this appropriation bill, it had been so written as to entirely bypass the Committee on Appropriations, so that the money was appropriated at the very same time the authorization was approved. Therefore, the only way in the world the House of Representatives can pass upon the particular housing question involved in this bill is through the adoption of this rule. Otherwise, we will never have an opportunity to pass upon it.

It is exactly true, as the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky said a few moments ago, the House did approve the legislative bill to which he alluded, and of which mention has been made here, but it is equally true that after the present great conflict developed in Korea, and we realized we might have to fight a war for survival, and his committee brought in another bill for another great housing project and spending program, the House of Representatives voted it down, or rather flatly refused to even consider that legislation. And it has not been brought back to the floor yet. The House of Representatives, like everyone else, certainly should have the right to change its positions and opinions in view of changing conditions. That is all this rule permits. It simply gives to us, the Members of the House of Representatives, the opportunity to determine for ourselves whether certain expenditures for certain purposes should be made, or whether they should be turned down; whether there should now be some restrictions placed on them, whether we should go ahead with these gigantic building programs which were barely approved when we thought we had peace, and perhaps might face a depression; or whether we should suspend that program for the present, at least.

I am sure the members of our different legislative committees who have spoken here today are able men, honest and sincere men. But they can present their points of view on these different sections of the bill to the House, providing we adopt this rule. If they can convince the House their position is right, the House will go along with them and strike such sections from the bill, or amend them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield just for a brief question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield at this time and I will appreciate it if the gentleman will observe the rules of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the members of the different legislative committees who have spoken here today think they are correct in what they have said as to the provisions of this bill, certainly, with all of their ability and great oratorical prowess, they can convince the majority of the House to vote with them; and if the majority of the House desires to place any limitations upon these Government expenditures in view of the great national emergency with which we are now faced, that it is right and proper we should be just a little careful as to how we spend our public moneys, that we ought to postpone some of these great projects which have been authorized in the past for a while, then the House can and will so vote.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I am addressing the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee). The gentleman from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I have not even had an opportunity to ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman cannot contribute anything worth while to this discussion or debate, and I refuse to yield.

Mr. Speaker, the question is whether you want to save at least $750,000,000, at the minimum, and the savings may go to as much as $2,000,000,000, if this rule is adopted, or whether we want to go ahead and spend these vast sums.

If those who oppose this rule can convince us that we should go ahead and spend this money, if they can convince us by logic, the Members of the House, a majority of us, that we should strike out of this bill these provisions, then these provisions can and will be stricken. But unless they can convince the majority of the House that it should have no right to pass upon these special provisions in this bill, then vote "No." All the Committee on Rules is giving in submitting this rule, the right for the House to decide for itself what it wants to do. A vote of "Yes" will give each of us that right. A "No" vote is a vote against permitting the House to work its will on these important questions—a vote against economy, a vote for waste and extravagance—at a time when our country must conserve its strength in the face of great peril.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

STAND BY STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the views of the chairmen of the Committees on Banking and Currency and Merchant Marine. Today their jurisdiction is invaded, and tomorrow the Appropriations Committee will poach on the preserves of Judiciary and next day Foreign Affairs. Precedents have a habit of begetting precedents. Finally the Appropriations Committee becomes the arbiter of our fate—becomes the congressional pooh bah.

It is not a question of economy or otherwise. The vote is for the sanctity of the jurisdiction of standing committees. That is all.

We inveigh against the habit in the other body of placing legislative provisions on our appropriation bills. We cannot complain, if we pass this rule. The other group will say: Before you take the mote out of my eye look to the beam in your own. We become guilty of the abuse against which we usually inveigh.

There were no public hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee. Disinterested witnesses were not heard. Only Government witnesses appeared. Before standing committees both sides of a controversy are heard. In the interest of fairness and orderly procedure vote down this rule.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously interested in the rights and prerogatives of the legislative committees of this body, and I think all Members should be interested in that subject. I have no difference with the Appropriations Committee for the amount of money they bring in to carry out legislative items that have been authorized.

The gentleman from Ohio is very ticklish about the rules of the House and the prerogatives that he enjoys on the floor of this House, but he does not seem to be interested in the prerogatives and rights of the legislative committees of this House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that

the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has said that it is the right of every man to change his mind. I am changing my mind and am going to vote against this rule.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask just one very brief question? Is it not a fact that the Committee on Rules reported out this rule by a vote of 6 to 5?

Mr. BONNER. I so understand.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the legislation carried in this bill there is the directive to the Maritime Board with respect to contracts that have been made, contracts that run for 10 years. These contracts are not made from year to year; they are made over a period of 10 years with shipping companies to provide service just like the railroads provide service between Washington and New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I cannot yield.

I leave to the Members who are constitutional lawyers and know more about contracts than I whether or not the United States Government would not get into serious trouble over these contracts that are worked out, if the provisions in this appropriation bill are adopted?

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have ever raised my voice against a rule. In this case I believe and feel positive I am correct. Therefore I hope the House votes down the rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on a resolution which, in many respects, may seem routine and on which many Members may base their vote on partisan considerations or on the narrow issues relating to the independent offices appropriation bill which House Resolution 220 involves. Much of the debate has centered on those factors. I want to express my own very strong feeling that the basic issue involved in House Resolution 220 is not a matter in which the partisan conflict nor monetary expediency should dictate a choice of position.

The issues involved here are far larger than that. House Resolution 220, by waiving points of order against the legislation written into H. R. 3880, violates a principle upon which the entire legislative organization of Congress is based. It also violates a basic principle of plain common sense. Congress has always recognized that no one Member, nor any small group of Members, can hope to fully understand and cope with the details of the innumerable matters that come before us for action. It was on the basis of that common-sense principle that the committee system was established both in the House and in the Senate. The Committee on Appropriations was established to deal with the allocation of funds for Government activities; it was not established to legislate the details of how the expenditure of funds should be administered and regulated. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was set up to recommend legislative action on administrative and regulative matters pertaining to the maritime affairs of the United States; it does not and should not presume to encroach on the money-spending functions of the Committee on Appropriations. The same considerations apply to every legislative committee established under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, that is not simply a matter of courtesy or formality. It is a dictate of absolute necessity. When the Committee on Appropriations presumes to encroach on the legislative jurisdiction and prerogatives of other committees of the House—as it does in many instances in H. R. 3880—its members cannot possibly have a full understanding of all the factors involved in the legislation they write. I know that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and other members of his subcommittee have stressed the point that all they are trying to do is to save money for the Government in this time of financial strain. I submit that when they write hasty and ill-conceived legislation into any appropriation bill, without full knowledge of the background situation, they open wide the door for the expenditure of much greater amounts of money than they save. In many cases they make inevitable the wastage and loss of sums already spent. You cannot prevent inefficiency when the people laying down the rules are like fish out of water. No Congressman can familiarize himself with all the details of all the vast operations with which this Government concerns itself, any more than a fish can learn to breathe air. No member of the Committee on Appropriations can hope to know as much about any particular legislative matter as the members of the committee which deal with that particular problem every day. When a committee steps out of its own field it can only create chaos, confusion, and cross-purpose. It certainly cannot save money in the long run.

It is true that I am opposed to some of the legislation written into the independent offices appropriation bill. I particularly oppose certain features applying to the work of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of which I am a member. I also oppose the legislation on public housing which has been taken out of the hands of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Some of the legislation introduced into the bill may be sound. Regardless of that fact, I am frank enough to admit that I do not feel capable of passing judgment on all of it. I am also frank enough to say I do not believe the members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee are capable of passing sound judgment on all of it without the advice and studied consideration of members of the separate committees which should have written the legislation.

I appeal to my colleagues in the House to base their vote on this resolution, not on the basis of party but on the basis of partnership in a common effort which is bound to suffer if the dictates of common sense and the rules of organization of this House are discarded. The continual waiving of points of order against legislation in appropriations bills carries an inherent danger which should override any other question in our minds. Now is the time when we should all stand together against that danger. I ask that the rule be refused by vote of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 220, nays 159, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—220

Aandahl	Evins	Meader
Abbitt	Fellows	Merrow
Abernethy	Fenton	Miller, Nebr.
Adair	Fernandez	Mills
Allen, Ill.	Fisher	Morano
Allen, La.	Ford	Morton
Andersen, H. Carl	Forrester	Mumma
Anderson, Calif	Fulton	Nicholson
Andresen, August H.	Gamble	Norblad
Andrews	Gary	Norrell
Angell	Gathings	O'Hara
Arends	Gavin	Passman
Armstrong	George	Patten
Auchincloss	Golden	Patterson
Ayres	Goodwin	Phillips
Baker	Gore	Pickett
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Potter
Bates, Mass.	Graham	Poulson
Battle	Grant	Radwan
Beall	Gross	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Gwinn	Reed, Ill.
Beckworth	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Reed, N. Y.
Belcher	Hall, Leonard W.	Rees, Kans.
Bender	Harden	Regan
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Riehlman
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Mass.
Berry	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Tex.
Betts	Harvey	Sadlak
Bishop	Hays, Ark.	St. George
Blackney	Hedrick	Schwabe
Boggs, Del.	Herlong	Scrivner
Bolton	Herter	Scudder
Bow	Hess	Shafer
Bray	Hill	Sheehan
Brehm	Hillings	Sheppard
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Short
Brownson	Hoffman, Ill.	Sikes
Budge	Hoffman, Mich.	Simpson, Ill.
Buffett	Holmes	Sittler
Burleson	Horan	Smith, Kans.
Busbey	Hunter	Smith, Miss.
Bush	Jackson, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	James	Smith, Wis.
Chenoweth	Jenison	Springer
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Stanley
Church	Jensen	Stefan
Clevenger	Jonas	Sutton
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Mo.	Taber
Colmer	Jones, Hamilton C.	Talle
Cooper	Jones, Woodrow W.	Taylor
Corbett	Kean	Teague
Cotton	Kearns	Thomas
Coudert	Kilburn	Thompson, Mich.
Cox	Kilday	Van Pelt
Crawford	Lantaff	Van Zandt
Crumpacker	Larcade	Vaughn
Cunningham	LeCompte	Velde
Curtis, Nebr.	Lovre	Vorys
Dague	Lyle	Vursell
Davis, Ga.	McConnell	Werdel
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Wharton
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Wheeler
Dempsey	McGregor	Whitten
Denny	McMillan	Wigglesworth
Devereux	McMullen	Williams, Miss.
D'Ewart	McVey	Williams, N. Y.
Dolliver	Mack, Wash.	Willis
Dondero	Mahon	Wilson, Ind.
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Tex.
Eaton	Martin, Mass.	Winstead
Ellsworth	Mason	Wolcott
Elston		Wood, Ga.
Engle		Wood, Idaho

NAYS—159

Addonizio	Green	O'Konski
Allen, Calif.	Greenwood	O'Neill
Anfuso	Hagen	Ostertag
Aspinall	Hale	O'Toole
Bailey	Hand	Perkins
Barden	Hart	Philbin
Baring	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Blatnik	Heffernan	Polk
Boggs, La	Heller	Preston
Bolling	Heselton	Priest
Bonner	Hope	Prouty
Bosone	Howell	Quinn
Boykin	Hull	Rabaut
Breen	Jackson, Wash.	Ramsay
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Rankin
Bryson	Javits	Reams
Burdick	Johnson	Rhodes
Burnside	Jones, Ala.	Ribicoff
Butler	Judd	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Camp	Keating	Roberts
Canfield	Kelley, Pa.	Robeson
Carlyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Carnahan	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Case	Kerr	Rooney
Celler	King	Roosevelt
Chelf	Kirwan	Sabath
Chudoff	Kluczynski	Sasscer
Clemente	Lane	Saylor
Combs	Lanham	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Crosser	Latham	Secrest
Deane	Lesinski	Seely-Brown
Delaney	Lind	Shelley
Denton	Lucas	Spence
Dollinger	McCarthy	Staggers
Donohue	McCormack	Tackett
Donovan	McGrath	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn	McGuire	Thornberry
Doyle	McKinnon	Tollefson
Durham	Machrowicz	Towe
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Trimble
Elliott	Madden	Walter
Feighan	Magee	Weichel
Fine	Marshall	Welch
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Fogarty	Miller, Md.	Wier
Forand	Mitchell	Withrow
Frazier	Morgan	Wolverton
Fugate	Moulder	Yates
Furcolo	Multer	Yorty
Garmatz	Murdock	Zablocki
Gordon	Nelson	
Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.	
Granger	O'Brien, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—54

Albert	Halleck	Patman
Bakewell	Havenner	Powell
Barrett	Hébert	Price
Bramblett	Hinshaw	Rains
Brooks	Holifield	Redden
Buckley	Irving	Rivers
Burton	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Cannon	Kee	Sieminski
Chatham	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Steed
Cooley	Klein	Stigler
Curtis, Mo.	Mansfield	Stockman
Dawson	Miller, N. Y.	Vail
DeGraffenried	Morris	Vinson
Dingell	Morrison	Watts
Fallon	Murphy	Whitaker
Gil'ette	Murray, Tenn.	Widnall
Gregory	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Price against.

Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Havenner against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Burton for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bakewell.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Vail.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSECUTION OF PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, has taken occasion to, from the well of the House, or by the insertion of matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, make reference to certain court proceedings involving Edward Rumely. On several occasions reply has been made to those statements by me, but notwithstanding the fact that the unfairness and injustice, at least in my opinion, of the statements of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been pointed out, he continues a course which begins to have the appearance of a persecution. I do not actually know why Mr. PATMAN follows this course which he certainly must know does not accurately portray the activities of Mr. Rumely.

Mr. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, has long circulated books and statements made by Members of Congress, including some made by your humble servant which tend to support our form of government. Some who evidently do not believe in our form of government, who apparently would, by force or otherwise, change that form of government, have over the years consistently endeavored by false statements to discredit Mr. Rumely which does Mr. Rumely a grave injustice.

Mr. Rumely is an officer of an organization—the Committee for Constitutional Government—which is endeavoring, by printing and distributing speeches, documents, pamphlets, and books, to maintain constitutional government. It is a nonprofit, educational organization.

Mr. Rumely was recently convicted of contempt of Congress because he refused to give a House committee the names of individuals who contirbuted to his activities. In my humble judgment, as long as the publications sent out by an individual or organization are informative, educational, truthful, and tend in no way to encourage subversive activities, their publication and circulation is no concern of the Congress. Efforts which tend to prevent their publication or circulation tend to a denial of a free press, of free speech.

To state the proposition in a different way—as long as no fault can be found with the contents of the publications sent out by the Committee for Constitutional Government, what right has the Congress to insist that it be told who pays for the publication or circulation of these books or documents?

The House Committee on Lobbying, before which Mr. Rumely appeared, apparently confined its inquiries as to lobbying to organizations which advocate constitutional government, or government under the Constitution. It apparently made little, if any, attempt to inquire into the activities of so-called subversive organizations, who financed those organizations, or who was back of them or their purpose.

To state the situation in other language—apparently, the committee was on a "witch hunt" for three organizations which had effectively taught Americanism, was not interested in unpatriotic groups. In my humble judgment it is a sad, sad day when a committee of Congress follows a course which tends to discourage the teaching of Americanism; which by its inaction, encourages those who apparently do not believe in the Constitution, who do not like government under the Constitution as strictly construed. The activities of those who guided the House Committee on Lobbying seem to be a sort of hang-over from the outfits which, not so many years ago, resented any criticism of Communists or of communistic doctrine.

I recently received a letter from the Committee for Constitutional Government which reads as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
New York, N. Y., April, 1951.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Several Members of Congress inquired some time ago whether Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of this committee, had any comment upon charges made in the House on March 7 by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. I did write a reply but inasmuch as Dr. Rumely was to go on trial on a contempt charge, I withheld my letter on advice of his counsel.

I now find that all jurors connected with Dr. Rumely's trial have received a pamphlet, containing charges by Mr. PATMAN similar to those he made March 7.

In my letter, I raised the question whether those charges were made to influence a Washington jury. The fact that the jurors received this pamphlet strengthens that surmise. My letter, as originally written, follows:

"In response to inquiries whether Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of this committee, has any comment upon the charges made in the House on March 7 by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, Dr. Rumely says: 'I will uphold even Mr. PATMAN's right to say anything so long as it is the truth and not libelous. Beyond that, I prefer not to comment.'

"As you doubtless know, Dr. Rumely is scheduled to go on trial before a District of Columbia jury on a charge of contempt of Congress in refusing to comply with a demand by the political majority of the Buchanan lobby committee that he reveal the names of bulk purchasers of this committee's literature. This is no ordinary contempt of Congress case in which defendants have been indicted for not answering questions about Communist affiliations or for refusal to answer on self-incriminatory grounds. Dr. Rumely's forthcoming trial ranks in importance with the trial of Peter Zenger which established in America the legal principle of freedom of the press. For the issue at stake in the Rumely trial is whether a factional majority has the right to compel a publisher to name the purchasers of books, containing views opposed to those of that faction.

"The place and timing, then, of Representative PATMAN's attack upon Dr. Rumely have greater and more sinister significance than the purport of his semipsychopathic

remarks. For Mr. PATMAN spoke in the District of Columbia. Dr. Rumely will be tried by a jury composed of residents in the District of Columbia. What other purpose had Mr. PATMAN than the possibility of prejudicing those who might be called as jurors? That he had a planned purpose is obvious, for his unfounded charges have been picked up by the more radical of the labor press with a unanimity that can scarcely be a coincidence.

"Our examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveals that during the last 7 years, Mr. PATMAN has delivered in the House of Representatives a total of 29 attacks upon Dr. Rumely. Once he worked himself up into such a state that he made three attacks the same legislative day. Should this curious persistence come under examination of a psychiatrist, an expected diagnosis might be megalomania.

"In his 29 diatribes, Mr. PATMAN has termed Dr. Rumely a Fascist, a German spy, a superinternational lobbyist, a traitor to the Nation, a diabolical operator, a despicable character, and an American Judas Iscariot. Although such invective and grave accusation pepper his remarks with what appears to be reckless abandon, Mr. PATMAN has exercised extraordinary caution: not once, so far as we of this committee have been able to discover, has he made his now familiar speech outside the comfortably safe shield of congressional immunity. We doubt that he ever will.

"One gathers from Mr. PATMAN's privileged remarks that he considers Dr. Rumely far beneath association with upright men. This is a reflection that such men as Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Ford, and William E. Borah are unable to return from the grave to refute. With these men and many more of similar uprightness Dr. Rumely has worked in closest association and confidence.

"Mr. PATMAN describes Dr. Rumely as a German spy trying to direct thought control in the United States. Time was when he pronounced Dr. Rumely's work a great service. Before the Committee for Constitutional Government was organized, Dr. Rumely was the organizer and executive secretary of the Committee for the Nation, an organization of businessmen, farm leaders, and economists which was in high favor at the White House before the New Deal went chasing butterflies and socialism. And some of the most appreciative letters written from Congress to the Committee for the Nation came from Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. 'I am reading all the information you send me,' Mr. PATMAN wrote Dr. Rumely's organization. 'You are rendering the Members of Congress and the country a great service.'

"Dr. Rumely and other members of the Committee for the Nation held frequent meetings in Mr. PATMAN's office. Then that committee was fighting for a stable dollar and the principles of the Goldsborough bill and Mr. PATMAN gave all-out support. Today the Committee for Constitutional Government is fighting for the identical dollar stability to which PATMAN at that time gave all-out endorsement, and Dr. Rumely, as executive secretary, is acting in the same capacity as he acted for the Committee for the Nation.

"The 29 diatribes of Mr. PATMAN center around the trial of Dr. Rumely and two partners of the law firm of which the well-known liberal Arthur Garfield Hays was a member on charges of concealing German Government ownership of the New York Evening Mail. The circumstances of the trial and its aftermath help to explain Dr. Rumely's dedication to the cause of upholding constitutional rights.

"Back in 1915, Dr. Rumely bought the Evening Mail and was indebted for some of the purchase money to an American citizen then living in Germany. It was then during World War I, which the United States had not yet entered, that funds from private persons were transmitted to this country through the German Government.

"After the United States became a belligerant, Dr. Rumely reported to the Alien Property Custodian indebtedness to the individual in question. The Government maintained that the money was furnished by the German Government, and Dr. Rumely and his two legal advisers were indicted for conspiracy to violate the Trading With the Enemy Act.

"The trial involved this technical charge. It was long and complex, and a jury found Dr. Rumely and his codefendants guilty. In a subsequent statement, a majority of the jurors declared that 'it was our disposition to give the Government the benefit of whatever doubt existed' and that had they known of evidence that was suppressed at the trial, 'this new evidence would have altered our verdict.'

"The jurors also petitioned to have their verdict set aside. Both the trial judge and the chief prosecutor recommended a pardon. The facts of the case were studied by Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone, later Chief Justice of the United States. Mr. Stone wrote President Coolidge to the effect that in his opinion there was absence of adequate evidence of criminal intent in the case, that the defendants had been gravely prejudiced in their trial and that they were in fact innocent, notwithstanding the judgment of conviction and its affirmance. The President issued unconditional pardons to all three defendants.

"All Dr. Rumely's civil rights were restored, but the two lawyers were still disbarred. Leaders of the Bar Association pressed their case, and the lawyers were reinstated by Chief Justice Cardozo of the New York Court of Appeals, who sensed 'an abiding and reasoned distrust of the verdict.'

"'A pardon may in some conditions be a warning,' said Judge Cardozo, 'as significant as a judgment of reversal that the looms of the law have woven a fabric of injustice. The very case at hand is indeed an apposite illustration. The record makes it plain that the pardon was granted because the President of the United States was advised by his Attorney General that the petitioners were innocent.'

"'But you do not say a person is not guilty because he was pardoned,' Mr. PATMAN insisted in the House, March 7. 'There is no reason to pardon unless guilt is involved.'

"Such reasoning in the face of the Cardozo opinion that the defendants were wrongly convicted belongs with the wonderful nonsense of Alice in Wonderland and Alice Through the Looking Glass. It reflects the logic of the Mad Hatter, the jurisprudence of the Red Queen. 'When I use a word,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.'

"If Mr. PATMAN is right about Dr. Rumely, then the trial judge, the chief prosecutor, the jurors, Chief Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Cardozo of the Supreme Court of the United States were wrong."

Very truly yours,

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
SUMNER GERARD, *Trustee.*

P. S.—I attach hereto an office memorandum that contains the quotation from the court record for April 25, while tampering with the jury—by distributing the WRIGHT PATMAN statement—was under investigation.

Mr. Speaker, that memorandum reads as follows:

MEMORANDUM

APRIL 27, 1951.

The proceedings to investigate the mailing of the WRIGHT PATMAN smear material to all jurors brought out some interesting facts.

On April 25 the judge called the jurors together, found that all had received a copy of the Patman smear booklet. The court clerk had identified a man who attended all the sessions of the Rumely trial as the one who asked how he might get a copy of the names and addresses of all the jurors. Said clerk directed the inquirer to the proper source and later saw the man with a young woman copying the names.

The clerk also identified the man as one with whom he had seen Mr. Hitz, the Government prosecutor, in conversation.

"Mr. HITZ. I remember that and I would like to describe him; maybe you would recognize him from the description. He was short, about 5 feet 6—I don't remember that he was stocky; I would say just small; and he had medium-colored brown hair; he had eyeglasses and he had quite a Jewish cast to his face, and that individual is named Goodman or Goldman, but in any event he is the local lobbyist for Walter Reuther.

"I remember a conversation of that sort or in that place, so that this also might mean something to Mr. Fitzgerald. The conversation concerned the desire of Walter Reuther, in the event the Government should convict in this case, to be allowed to file a brief amicus curiae in the court of appeals in support of the conviction, and in that conversation I said that if they made any effort to do it, I would oppose it. There is a possible party who was there throughout the trial and who I do remember talking to; that might be of some help.

"Mr. BURKINSHAW. May I express an opinion on the record? The girl involved is the reporter for the CIO newspaper."

It seems very likely that this Mr. Goodman is none other than the Leo Goodman, director of the CIO National Housing Committee, who testified before the Buchanan committee and attacked the CCG and its activities, including our sending out franked material.

Louis Little, the first counsel to the Buchanan committee, on his first visit to our offices said, "If you're going to publish a book, Why the Taft-Hartley Law? and if the labor leaders do not like that, why shouldn't they know if their bosses, in a city like Milwaukee, buy that book in quantities and distribute it?"

During the whole proceedings the labor press, directly informed by Buchanan, had carried on, week by week, a bitter campaign, featuring attacks upon us. Frank Edwards, A. F. of L. radio commentator, gave up part of his radio time for Frank Buchanan's libelous attacks upon us, charging that our book sales were a phony sales dodge the night before Dr. Rumely's first appearance before the Buchanan committee. This showed a carefully planned campaign, worked out in advance, centering upon book sales because of the mass distribution of The Road Ahead.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday and Tuesday next, after the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes on each occasion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus,

boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 4 hours, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and half by the majority on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3880, with Mr. CHELF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for 2 hours.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me discuss the high points in the bill for just a few minutes. I respectfully ask the membership to turn to the report of the committee. Our clerks, Mr. Duvall and Mr. Skarin, have worked hard upon this report. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], myself, and other members of the committee have changed and revised, changed again and revised further, and we commend it to you; we think it is complete and that it will give you a lot of meat, particularly the facts and figures in most, if not all, of the big items.

If you will turn to the tabulation in the back of the report you will find two plus items over the 1952 budget estimates. But that is misleading as to the item for the National Capital Housing Authority. The budget left that item out. As well as I remember it was only $32,000 for operating expenses, and the way the budget had set it up was that it would bypass the Congress and use its own funds. Therefore when the committee got a look at its operating expense it changed the budget language and put it back in the hands of the House, as formerly, where the Congress could appropriate the Housing people's own money, so technically it is carried as a plus over the budget when in truth and in fact it is not. In effect, you do not appropriate additional money; you merely give them authority under direction of the Congress to use funds deposited by the Authority into the Treasury.

There is another item in the tabulation which has a plus sign, and the remainder of the 40 or 50 items have minus signs under the budget estimates. The committee after much friendly argument, and I might say that there is not any partisanship on this committee because it deals with independent agencies purely—90 percent of them—boards and commissions on which both parties are represented; therefore we do take a nonpartisan attitude. But as I say we compromised our differences and we went above the budget in allowing $65 a month to about 800 cadet midshipmen in the Merchant Marine School at Kings Point, N. Y. Outside of those items there were no increases.

We think the language in the bill saves many millions of dollars. This bill, of course, is made up of a great many items, some 35 agencies, and some of the agencies consist of two or three parts. Take, for instance, the Housing and Home Finance Agency which is made up of the Office of the Administrator, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Home Loan Bank Board. And while I am mentioning HOLC, let me give you this news, if I may. In 1934, if my memory serves me correctly, the Congress created the old Home Owners Loan Corporation. Mr. Chairman, you are through with it now. We wound it up this year and you will not have to look at it any more I hope. What a grand job they have done. When it is all wound up you will find it has not cost the taxpayers of this country one red cent. On the contrary, it has turned back into the Treasury, after doing this magnificent job, a profit of $15,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition to that, it saved thousands and thousands of homes.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Which is not only valuable from the material angle but also from the spiritual and the governmental angle because family life is the basis of society.

Mr. THOMAS. They did a magnificent job for thousands and thousands of home owners.

Mr. McCORMACK. All under Democratic administrations.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are three big items in the bill. One of them is for the Veterans' Administration. There has been a big reduction from last year amounting to about $1,832,095,000. Appropriations for 1951 amounted to nearly $6,000,000,000 and next year they will be about $4,000,000,000. That comes about in spite of the fact that we are going to put in operation in 1952 10,250 new hospital beds and, incidentally, we grant them 10,895 new employees, more than one new employee to every bed. So we are taking care of our sick veterans. The reduction comes about by virtue of the fact that the training programs are gradually getting lower and lower. We still have a remnant of the 52–20 group, but that will be wound up, too, very soon.

Another big item is the Atomic Energy Commission. They requested about $1,200,000,000. We have required a reduction of nearly $70,000,000 and I think they could stand a little further reduction, but it is a very vital agency and we hope they will economize. The Atomic Energy Commission is made up of grand, patriotic men. They have a difficult job. I do not want to minimize their effort. They are surrounded with secrecy and it may be sometimes that the secrecy detracts from their efficiency rather than adding to it, but, still, they must obey the secrecy rules written into the act. I think they do, by and large, a good job but we do hope they will watch their construction costs. They are spending more money than anybody in the Government for construction outside of the armed services.

The other big item is the Civil Service Commission. Of course, the lion's share of that is for an item, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] well knows, we cannot do very much about. That is the retirement fund for civil-service employees. However, we did reduce that $20,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee brings this bill to the floor with considerable pride in its accomplishments, in which pride the minority concurs, at least in the attempted accomplishment of keeping down the expenses of Government from year to year. As you follow the suggestions of the gentleman from Texas and look at the requests and the cuts which appear in the back of the report you will find we have done what I think should be considered a credible job. I think also I should say that we take considerable pride in our chairman. We have a chairman who has the ability to grasp and to retain in very great detail the figures which are brought before us in the justifications. I doubt if many of you know that this particular subcommittee has the budget requests of 35 agencies of Government, each having a separate objective and, therefore, a separate type of work, and that, in addition to all the material presented to us in the original bound document, we have a supplementary pile of justifications in mimeographed or typed form which would extend that high from the table. It is a very arduous job, it is a job which takes practically all of the time of the Members from the middle of January until we come to the floor of the House with the bill.

It has been a pleasure for me to work on the subcommittee in the 5 years that I have been there; first under the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and now under the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and with the other Members on both sides, minority and majority, and with two very cooperative and able members of the staff, William Duvall and Homer Skarin. I think you should share our entitlement to a certain amount of pride in the results when you compare the figures which we set up for this year in the bill with the requests made by the Bureau of the Budget.

I am, however, more and more firmly convinced as the days go by that this is not the entire comparison we should make, and if we are to do anything about the rising costs of Government and the rising centralization of power, we have to make other comparisons of figures. Therefore, if you were to take the expenditures of the departments and agencies, the costs to the taxpayers for the year 1939, and then take them for the year 1947, if you wish, as I have them on this sheet, and then the requests which those agencies made for fiscal year 1952, and then, of course, the fourth column would be the amount that we have allowed them out of those requests, you would be somewhat concerned as I am somewhat concerned. The Civil Service Commission, of which the gentleman from Texas just spoke and with which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is personally familiar, had an appropriation of $78,000,000 in 1939. In 1947 that had jumped to $236,500,000, and for the current year the Commission asked for $343,000,000, and we allowed them $321,000,000. That is an increase of 339 percent in the 12-year period and an increase in the 5-year period of 45 percent. The Federal Power Commission jumped from $1,900,000 to $3,735,000 and in 5 years to $4,338,600. The recent 5 years is the comparison we should make, because that is the postwar comparison. That is the period in which the present occupant of the White House has been the President of the United States, and he was the postwar President. I have not included in these figures the figures for the war periods except as they might have jumped from prewar to the immediate postwar period.

Next is the Federal Trade Commission which jumped from 2.1 millions to 2.8 between 1937 and 1947 and then jumped a cool million in the last 5 years.

General Services Administration is difficult to figure, because it is a combination of other agencies. I have attempted in this analysis to take those agencies which are now in the General Services Administration and show that those same agencies in 1939 received $480,000,000; in 1947 they had jumped only to $578,000,000, but in the intervening 5 years they have jumped to $1,650,000,000, which is an increase in 5 years of 244 percent. So, you go on down, and if any of you have any special interests I will be very glad to tell you the figures. These are only in our subcommittee bill, and outside of that you have the same thing. Federal Security jumped from $758 million to $928 million and then in 5 years made an enormous jump to $2,154,483,011. Commerce jumped from $239,000,000 in 8 years to $368,000,000, and then doubled to $761,000,000, a 218 percent jump. This does not include the Atomic Energy Commission, and I have not included the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, both of which are defense items.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to explain the item on page 37 regarding strategic and critical materials. Have they been eliminated?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, they were not eliminated. They came up and got the money in advance of this bill. They received from us last year $3,038,548,370. Presently they have on hand $1,623,543,734. We are very sensitive on the subject of strategic material and have never denied them any money.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is a very able member of that subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON. I did not think that they had abandoned the efforts that they are making.

Mr. PHILLIPS. They are not abandoning them. The gentleman need have no concern. We are glad to follow the advice of his subcommittee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I call the gentleman's attention to a proviso that has already been referred to, on page 45 of the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman permit me to finish the thought I was just concluding and then come back to that and answer the question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will be very glad to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Before I am questioned on other matters, my thought is that we have come to a place in the history of the Congress when we must recognize that something more must be done to save the integrity of the dollar, to save the economy of the United States, than just a nominal cut in the requests which come to us from the President through the Bureau of the Budget. As I see it, that can be done only in some three or four ways, other than we are doing now.

The first of those ways obviously is to improve the procedures of government. There is no excuse in the world for asking for 450,000 additional employees, as I read in the paper the other day, until we have exhausted every possibility of improving the procedures of domestic government so the same number of people can do a greater amount of work.

As I remarked, to the surprise of some of my colleagues in the full committee when this was brought up, it so happens that this is a very personal matter with me. For a year and a half in World War I, I was on duty in the Ordnance Department, attempting to change the procedures of that department in such a way that the same number of people could do an increasing amount of work. You see how old-fashioned we were. This year we would have rushed up to the Appropriations Committee and asked for 10,000 additional employees. But we did not know that was the thing to do. We thought then it was the desirable and economic thing to use the same number of people to a greater possible usefulness.

The second thing we can do is being partly done, but it can be carried out more broadly; that is, if this is a war emergency, we should not confine ourselves still to the 40-hour week. Just a 44-hour week would make unnecessary about 5 percent of the people who are currently being asked for.

There is a third thing we can do. I shall offer one amendment, when the bill is read for amendment tomorrow, which will test the desire of the House for economy by lifting out from the Federal Government a complete function, a very minor function, a very simple little function which involves only $150,000, but a function which is a recognized duplication of work presently being done better and more economically in every State of the United States.

Finally, we should say, I think, to all the States of the United States, "We are $257,000,000,000 in the red. Every one of you is boasting that you have money in your treasury." My State has announced to the world that it will finish this fiscal year with $51,000,000 surplus. So there is absolutely no excuse for the States' coming to us, even under normal circumstances, and asking us to pay for things which from time immemorial have been done by the States or have been done by business or have been done by individuals. This is not a normal time. This is an emergency, when the children in the family must assume some of the obligations and the debts and the expenses of the parents, who are so deeply in debt. That, I think, we must put across to our own States first, and we may as well begin now.

Those are things that I do want the House to think about.

Now, may I come back to the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I call the gentleman's attention to the proviso on page 45 of the bill, which limits the payment of operating subsidies to not exceeding 1,450 voyages, including the number of voyages under contracts hereafter awarded.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There has been a great deal of discussion about that. I think there is argument on both sides. The committee feels that that number should not be in excess of the actual number of voyages which will be undertaken, and therefore for which an operating subsidy will be required.

The gentleman will remember that I, myself, was on the floor a year ago in behalf of the inclusion of vessels which had filed applications for voyages, but those applications had not yet been acted upon. I still feel the same way. I am hopeful that before we come to this in the bill an exact figure may be obtainable which will tell us whether or not 1,450 is correct.

That was the figure this committee had to work. The figure of 1,434 voyages were given us as the voyages contemplated during the current fiscal year. The committee raised that to 1,450. If there is a technical point involved that that money may not be used for these not-yet-contracted voyages, then I think we should learn that and make some correction of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I notice on page 1464 of the hearings, pursuant to the request made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] of Admiral Cochran, a table indicating that there

is contemplated an average number of voyages to the number of 1,523 in the fiscal year 1952; and that if applications pending but not included in the fiscal 1952 budget be considered, there would appear to be another 300 voyages in the picture. Does not the gentleman think that the number of voyages provided for in the bill should be increased?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that is a possibility and I think the gentleman's point is worth exploring. All I can say at the moment is that some very distinguished members of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce are presently being quoted with differing figures and we should determine that before tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was interested in the gentleman's statement that there was a situation there to correct and on which he proposed to offer an amendment, but I do not think he specified just what portion of the bill was involved.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was going to indicate that when I offered the amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. At the bottom of page 37 of the report appear two items with a minus sign before them. One is for the Federal court building in the District of Columbia, and the other for the General Accounting Office building. Do I understand from reading those figures that both of those buildings have now been completed and that no further money is needed?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is "Yes." The distinguished gentleman from Michigan has a natural interest in these outstanding public buildings. The authorizations came from the Committee on Public Works, in the session when he served as its chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to join with my colleague on the subcommittee, the ranking member, Mr. PHILLIPS, in paying a well-deserved tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas.

This was the first chance I had to observe the chairman of our subcommittee in action. I was constantly amazed by the experience, the perspicacity, and the complete knowledge and thorough understanding with which the gentleman from Texas attacked the problem before us of obtaining the facts with reference to the justification for appropriations of the 35 agencies appearing before our subcommittee. As the gentleman from California pointed out, the justifications presented to our subcommittee, if laid end to end, would stack up about 5 feet from the floor, and the gentleman from Texas painstakingly and diligently analyzed each of those appropriations so that when testimony was taken, he was thoroughly conversant with the material and able to direct the examination in order that maximum benefit could be derived.

I want also to thank very much the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and Mr. PHILLIPS for their cooperation and friendship in making the difficult job of understanding the appropriations not as difficult and not as complex as it would otherwise have been, and I know that Mr. COUDERT, of New York, and Mr. COTTON, of New Hampshire, who like myself were newcomers to the committee, share my viewpoint on this.

On the whole, there was basic agreement between the members of our subcommittee on the appropriations. There were some differences, and rather sharp differences. I personally disagreed with the other members of the subcommittee on the appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I disagreed with the members of the subcommittee with respect to the appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission for another, and there were other differences, as there are bound to be in an appropriation bill of this size.

For the first time, our subcommittee went into a new question, the question as to whether or not there should be charges and fees made by regulatory agencies of the Government for many of the services which they render to those who come within their jurisdiction. One of the great problems that faces our country is the difficulty of the regulatory commissions to cope with the complexities of our growing industrialized society, to deal with the regulatory problems for which they were created and with which they are confronted. A realistic appraisal of their function requires increased appropriations, because their problems and difficulties grow as our economy grows. As an example I cite the Federal Communications Commission. The Federal Communications Commission grants franchises, licenses, certificates of convenience and necessity, if you will, to all broadcasting stations upon application for such licenses, franchises, and certificates. The Commission undertakes extensive hearings first in connection with a construction permit; secondly on the question as to the allocation of the position of a particular broadcaster in the spectrum of megocycles over which the Federal Communications Commission has control. That is a pretty difficult job and a complicated job, and entails extensive hearings by the Federal Communications Commission. The taxpayers pay every dollar of the charges and of the costs that go into that hearing. The companies pay nothing, other than taxes, and I think it is only fair that in exchange for the franchise that the Government gives the broadcasting company and the protection which the Government affords to such broadcasting company to assure its freedom from interference in the operation of its broadcasting facilities in the particular point of the spectrum which it occupies, that it should pay some of the costs of the hearings. It is perfectly proper that the franchised company make a profit, and there has been much profit making. Such companies should assume a greater share of the costs, because regulation is necessary. I think also that the Government should be able to recapture some of the costs that go into the hearings of the other regulatory agencies. Such fees are appropriate for many of the hearings which take place before the Interstate Commerce Commission. I know that in my home city of Chicago the city requires the owner of every building which operates a passenger elevator to obtain a license for that elevator, and in order to recoup the costs for inspection in such licensing it requires a rather nominal license fee.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is required to inspect locomotives of railroads, safety appliances, signaling systems, various facilities of that type. The Government pays every cent for this operation. In addition to that, much of the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission is involved with hearings on applications for certificates of convenience and necessity for bus lines and other common carriers. The Government assumes the complete cost of such hearings in spite of the fact that here again it grants a franchise which is very valuable to the company making the application, and in the operation of which franchise it is protected from competition.

Each of the Commissioners who appeared before us was asked his opinion as to whether or not it was feasible to charge for a portion of the operations of the agency, and in each event the Commissioner thought that it would be practicable. Not only that, one Commissioner expressed the viewpoint that such a practice would not only be feasible, but would deter and do away with many superfluous applications. Therefore, the subcommittee in its deliberations decided to put a new legislative section into the bill which would permit each of the agencies to appraise its own operations to see whether or not it would be possible to recapture for the Government some of the costs that the Government incurs in connection with this regulation through the establishment of a schedule of fees.

The second point that I would like to discuss is the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission. I have no quarrel with the appropriation as such, but my disagreement with the others on the subcommittee relates to the portion of the report which states that the item of $25,000 for an index of the concentration of wealth has been stricken from the bill. I do not know what effect that statement in the report has. I do not believe it is legally controlling upon the Commission, but I believe that if the Commission disregarded it, it would be criticized, to say the least. I believe it is extremely important, particularly at this time when we are moving into a period of rearmament that we know the direction in which industry is moving in this country. Is there increasing monopoly growth? How much? We know that in the last war, in World War II, the Government concentrated the awarding of the major portion of its

prime contracts in the hands of relatively few big businesses, and I think that the work of the Federal Trade Commission at that time in bringing forward the facts showing the number of contracts that went to big business, the number of contracts that went to small business, the direction in which industry in this country was moving, was a very valuable survey. I think that now as we move into this period of rearmament, as we appropriate billions and billions of dollars which will go into the industrial output, into the industrial building up of this Nation, it is necessary for us to know where that money is going. We must have facts in this Congress if we are to legislate intelligently. The Federal Trade Commission is responsible for presenting us with facts on monopoly growth, and if we refuse to give them funds with which to do our work, we are not only being recreant, but foolhardy. It is necessary for us to be able to determine whether big business is snuffing out competition, to determine whether small business is destined to be excluded entirely from the economy of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, all of us agree that the greatest weapon we have in our fight against an enemy and against communism is the industrial potential of this country. To my mind one of the most vital parts of that industrial potential is the tremendous number of small businesses that are scattered throughout the length and breadth of this Nation. If we find that more and more Government business is being channelled into big business, and that just cannot be avoided, small business will fall by the wayside and, to use a phrase of the Senate Small Business Committee, our pathway will be strewn with their corporate corpses.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I came in touch with this problem that the gentleman is talking about when we drafted the termination of war contracts bill. In the last war out in my area we had the small businesses out there form pools in the city of Stockton and in the city of Sacramento and they would handle the business for 8, 10, or 15 companies. We must take the latent ability, experience, and ingenuity of these small businesses and use it. Some of the small-business men are the smartest businessmen in the country although they do not make the most money.

I want to mention one instance. I was out in Chicago looking into the termination of war contracts in connection with the Ordnance Division out there and I found a little man from St. Paul who started with 40 employees. At the end of the war when we talked to him he was trying to terminate contracts and paying a $12,300,000 income-tax return. So it shows what can be done by small business if it is properly organized and given the right kind of work to do.

Mr. YATES. I agree with what the gentleman has said and I thank him for the statement.

The point I am making, and I plead it with utmost earnestness, is that it is vitally important that we know what the condition of big business and small business is in this country. We must have facts. It is necessary that we be able to trace any concentration of wealth toward monopoly because unless we do that we have no basis upon which to draft legislation in this Congress and we have no basis upon which to protect the small business of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON. I concur heartily in what the gentleman has said. We want to find out if there is a concentration of wealth and we ought to know the tendency and the direction it is going.

Mr. YATES. Of course, we have to have those facts. Here we are appropriating in excess of $6,000,000,000 in the pending bill. Twenty-five thousand dollars is all that will be required to permit the Federal Trade Commission to continue with its study of the concentration of wealth in this country. In my opinion, it would be foolhardy, it would be false economy, if we did not permit that agency to continue that study at this particular time.

Let me cite in support of my point what the Hoover Commission has said on what should be the proper function of the Federal Trade Commission. It is directed right to this particular point:

> In addition, the Federal Trade Commission can and should constitute a reservoir of information on the structure of the economy and of specific industries. This information should be available to the antitrust agencies and to other Government agencies, such as those concerned with defense. By its reports to Congress and the public, the Commission should keep them abreast of changes in the structure of the economy and aware of needed legislative action.

Mr. Chairman, that is an eminently correct statement. Only the Federal Trade Commission can make a survey of this type; there is no other agency in the Government that can undertake it. Every agency in the Government is required to file an annual report, but there is no central agency that I know of, with the exception of the Federal Trade Commission, that can collate this material, that can join it together, so that we in the Congress may be made aware of the direction of business growth in this country.

My other major point of disagreement with the other members of the subcommittee is in connection with the provisions relating to the Public Housing Administration.

Under the terms of the Housing Act of 1949 the Public Housing Administration was given the responsibility of constructing 135,000 units per year. In view of restrictions on building materials, in view of the demands for the use of building materials for defense purposes, the Bureau of the Budget cut that number to 75,000 units. I insist there is no justification in the hearings which warrant a further cut; however, this subcommittee arbitrarily and without reason cut the number of these units to 50,000. What this does, in my opinion, is to upset the schedule for public housing in all cities throughout the country, and every metropolitan community desperately needs housing.

The chairman stated, and I think his statement was accurate as far as it went, that under the Public Housing Act of 1949, in the event that all of the 810,000 are constructed, there might be a maximum contribution demanded of the Federal Government of $320,000,000 per year. That would assume, however, that all of the units provided for under the Housing Act of 1949 were constructed before that maximum guaranty went into effect. That is the maximum amount which the Federal Government would be required to pay under any consideration. But let us look at the facts. The Chairman's statement should be compared with actual facts relating to the Housing Act of 1937 under which the Federal Government also was required to make a similar contribution. Under previous Federal housing acts the actual contributions of the Federal Government were as follows:

Relationship of actual contributions to contract contributions, United States Housing Act program

Fiscal year—	Public Law 412			Public Law 671			Total		
	A/C paid	Contract A/C	Percent	A/C paid	Contract A/C	Percent	A/C paid	Contract A/C	Percent
1940									
1941	$4,747,176	$4,747,176	100.0				$4,747,176	$4,747,176	100.0
1942	9,925,891	11,258,951	88.2				9,925,891	11,258,951	88.2
1943	9,882,882	13,049,252	75.7				9,882,882	13,049,252	75.7
1944	10,129,997	14,436,885	70.2				10,129,997	14,436,885	70.2
1945	8,681,923	14,477,969	60.0	$40,377	$6,615,569	0.6	8,722,300	21,093,538	41.4
1946	7,091,344	14,501,979	48.9	45,391	6,615,569	.7	7,136,735	21,117,548	33.8
1947	5,612,387	14,509,187	38.7	54,243	6,615,569	.8	5,666,630	21,124,756	26.8
1948	3,810,872	14,519,550	26.2	129,533	6,615,569	2.0	[1] 3,940,405	21,135,119	18.6
1949	3,842,417	14,770,515	26.0	452,663	6,615,569	6.8	[1] 4,295,080	21,386,084	20.1
1950	5,839,040	14,855,753	39.3	679,692	6,615,569	10.3	[1] 6,518,732	21,471,322	30.4
1951 (estimate)	6,348,921	14,855,753	42.7	1,151,079	6,615,569	17.4	7,500,000	21,471,322	34.9
Total	75,912,850	145,982,970	52.0	2,552,978	46,308,983	5.5	78,465,828	192,291,953	40.8

[1] Includes retroactive pilot as provided by Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171).

This shows no payment of the maximum contributions, and I hold that these figures are indicative as to what the contributions would be under the Housing Act of 1949. The Bureau of the Budget cut the number of units to 75 000 rather

than 135,000. That in itself cut the amount of contributions from the maximum amount, so that we know that under no possible interpretation would the Federal Government ever be compelled to pay the maximum amount to which the chairman referred in his principal address.

Leaving that point, I would like to ask for clarification of page 58 of the bill, and I should like to have the viewpoint of the chairman on this. Line 16 refers to an amount of $33,000,000 and is a part of a proviso which says:

> That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed $33,000,000.

What does that item refer to? Does it refer to the actual operating expenses of the Public Housing Administration?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from Illinois that this expense is broken down into two parts: administrative and nonadministrative. The administrative expense is that expense that is incurred primarily for salaries and expenses in the District of Columbia. The items that are pointed out on line 16 amounting to $33,000,000 is what we call the nonadministrative expenses. That is all of those operating costs that are incurred in the field, plus interest, and so forth, and so on. We were advised this morning that the figure of $33,000,000, nonadministrative expense, is an error; that it is about $15,000,000 more, making a total of approximately $49,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses. But those are the items covered in that figure.

Mr. YATES. In other words, the items included within this appropriation are the items for direct operations, site inspections, and direct disposition expenses. Certainly it is not intended to include, for instance, amounts necessary for funded expenses.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. What we have done, as the gentleman well knows, since they are spending in 1952 not $33,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses but possibly $49,000,000, the committee has requested them in the future to break that expense down and submit it to the committee so that we can pass judgment on it and in turn submit it to the House for its judgment and consideration. That has not been done in the past.

Mr. YATES. I thank the chairman. I certainly hope that the 25,000 units that were cut from the act by the action of the subcommittee will be restored. I know that as we move into this war period, housing in my own city of Chicago is becoming critically more and more in short supply. The buildings that have been built under section 608 of the housing law have not provided the type of dwellings necessary for the war workers, for those who are employees and laborers in the defense plants. I think it is vitally essential; I think it is fundamental that the housing program should be permitted to continue so that as workers move into defense areas like Chicago there will be some provision made for housing them. Already overcrowded, teeming cities cannot absorb additional workers without more housing accommodations.

I should like to refer the attention of the House to the committee hearings. Look at pages 1769 and the following and read what Rev. Thomas B. Keehn of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, and Rt. Rev. John A. O'Grady of the National Conference of Catholic Charities had to say when they appeared before the subcommittee. They pointed out the dire necessity for continuing the housing program at this critical time. Buildings are getting more and more crowded. They need rehabilitation. Slums are growing. The only thing we can do is keep up with the evergrowing problem. I hope that when we come to a consideration of this point the House will see fit to restore the additional units that are needed.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], a member of the committee.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any group of men in whom I have greater confidence than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and his subcommittee, who have brought this bill before us. I am confident that feeling is generally shared here.

I have just listened, as you have, to an able statement by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I was particularly impressed with him as a new member of this great committee. He talked with wisdom, he showed a soundness and thoroughness and a conscientious approach that anyone could be proud to show. It does not follow that I necessarily agree with all the points that he raised, but I am profoundly impressed with him as one of my colleagues in this House.

I rise to discuss with complete frankness the increase in the amount of money proposed for allocation to the White House offices. I am not going to offer an amendment on this subject, but I do want to focus attention on it. In fiscal 1951 the White House offices received an appropriation of $1,585,000, whereas in fiscal 1952 it is proposed that they receive $1,883,000, an increase of $300,000.

Three hundred thousand dollars is not a lot of money as we think of money and as we appropriate it nowadays, but a $300,000 increase in this item is 20 percent more than was appropriated last year for the same purpose. It provides for 35 additional employees in fiscal 1952, more travel money, and more odds and ends of expenses, where we had hoped to see savings. If you break it down to a per capita basis, it means that this is going to take the tax payments of many persons each year for this one item of increased cost of Government.

The record shows it was passed over by the committee without a great deal of discussion or comment, I presume largely out of respect for the office of President of the United States. I do not quarrel with that. I think it is understandable. But I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the President himself stated in his budget message to Congress:

> In order that our resources can be diverted to meet the demands of national security, strict economy in nondefense spending is required.

I have seen nothing in the justifications to indicate that the increase proposed in this item is dictated by considerations of national security or defense, or that it would even operate to relieve the President of any of the tremendous burden which we know he must personally carry.

In the great effort to achieve economy which the Committee on Appropriations and the House as a whole is making this year, we should not consider the White House staff or the Congress or any other agency of Government as exempt from efforts to economize. Instead, the head of the Government should lead and should set a pattern to hold down costs in every possible way.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GORE. There is much merit to the suggestion of the gentleman from Florida in the opinion of the gentleman from Tennessee, but does not the gentleman realize with what reluctance a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations would recommend cuts in the staff of the office of the President? Is it not on all fours with the institution of cuts in the expenses of the other body by a House committee?

Mr. SIKES. I think I pointed out, as I went along, that I recognize it is difficult for one of us in the House of Representatives to overcome our reluctance to point a finger at an office that we respect as greatly as we respect the office of the President and it is with reluctance that we point a finger at the Senate and say "We find it necessary that we tell you how much money you can use or should use to run your own personal business." While it is difficult for us to do that, we at the same time are not prevented from saying, "We urge in greatest sincerity that you, Mr. President, and you, the Senate, as well as we, the House of Representatives, make every effort that can properly be made to hold down expenses."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman very highly on the observations that he has made. I hope he offers an amendment to trim those added expenses from the President's budget. Certainly he ought to be held to what he had last year and perhaps cut some from that. He has been doing a lot of talking about belt tightening and sacrifices. He should share in it, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if it is agreeable now to the gentleman from Alabama, I will yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG]. I believe the gentleman has consented also to yield 10 minutes to him. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman,

that the gentleman may proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the kindness of the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Alabama in yielding this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have been attempting to make this brief report on my trip to the Far East since my return some 2 weeks ago, when the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, and I returned after visiting Japan, Korea, Formosa, and other points in what I might term a "spirit of bipartisan cooperation." The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I made the trip as individual Congressmen and American citizens. We were privileged to inspect most of our military installations in Japan and to visit the bases, camps, and the fighting front of the Korean war. We made an intense and earnest study of the conditions and problems confronting our commanders, our troops, our sources of supply, and civilian activities in that troubled area of the world.

My distinguished colleague from South Carolina is a veteran of World War II, while I am a veteran of World War I. We hoped that we might find and bring back to our colleagues in the House of Representatives such information and reports as would be helpful to all of us, whether in the majority or in the minority. We hoped to help shape the course of legislation for the defense of the free world. I am happy here to say that no one could have devoted himself more wholeheartedly to this task than the honorable young Member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. I hope that he, too, may soon have time to make a report on his observations.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are agreed on the danger that we face, and with the realization of what is before us there can be no partisanship. I am concerned that in the discussion of foreign affairs there shall be no partisan words. My party has a duty to perform in offering constructive criticism and the majority party has a duty to perform in offering leadership and in accepting constructive criticism when it is due. But we are certainly united in our desire to win this war in Korea as quickly as possible with the loss of as few lives as possible. On that score there can be no debate. There can be differences of opinion in regard to the proper method of winning the war as quickly as possible. We have been hearing some of those differences of opinion. But we are united, whether of the majority or minority, in the spirit of helpfulness to all of the people of our country. I emphasize that because I have been asked why this member of the majority party and I made a trip as individual Congressmen and American citizens without committee authorization and paying our own way. I say to you that we did it for the same reason that any of you would, in order to try to find the answer to some of these grave problems confronting us in the Far East.

I believe my distinguished colleague will back me up in reporting that the Korean engagement has demonstrated the success of the unification of our armed services. There are still many problems to be worked out, of course; but we contacted many of the commanders of our land troops, of the Marines, of our naval forces, and most frequently those commanders who were our hosts on this trip, the Air Force. Everywhere we asked the question in regard to how unification was working. Everywhere we received the same answer, that our armed services are now working as an efficient team. That team is well coordinated in combat as well as in the supplying of ammunition and other materials of war, and in all operations necessary to such an engagement as that in Korea.

There is an unfavorable note, however, and I report it to you frankly. As we talked to the commanders in Japan and then in Korea, we sensed a very grave feeling of unreality. We had the opportunity of talking to General MacArthur, then the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers. Right on the battle line we had the very unique privilege of talking to the commander in Korea, General Ridgway, General Stratemeyer of the Air Force was our host. We talked to many others, I would say 50 of the high-ranking officers of all of the armed services. Not only that, we talked also to the high-ranking commanders and officers of our brave allies, including the British, the general commanding the Turkish troops, the leaders of the French, Canadian, and Australian forces, and so on. We talked to officers and men of most of the United Nations who are fighting with us, even though some of them have only token forces in Korea. Everywhere we reecived the information that there was a feeling of unreality on the part of the troops because of the handicap under which they are fighting this war in that they have not been permitted to attack the bases of enemy supply, their communication and transportation lines. They told us that this was the first war in history where men fighting in the field were denied this primary action necessary to victory.

Let me leave that for just a moment to present this map of the Far East. First I shall mention Formosa, since this island is very much in the minds of our military leaders at the present time. I am sure its strategic importance has been discussed by the distinguished members of our Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees. Formosa lies right in what we might term our line of defense in the Far East which extends from Japan down this chain of islands to Formosa lying off the coast of China, on down through various islands to those of the South Pacific, to Australia, and New Zealand. It is obvious that if that line were broken at any point, all the other points of the line would be jeopardized. That is why General MacArthur in appearing before the Congress emphasized what he considered to be the strategic importance of Formosa. I may say that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], and I sitting before him just a few days before he was relived of his duties, heard him say what he later said to the Congress, except he expressed it to us in more emphatic terms.

General MacArthur said that some of our allies are not united with us on the importance of Formosa, referring doubtless to the fact that the British Government has proposed that it be turned over to the Red Chinese. He said, "Formosa is of such importance that we cannot lose it without jeopardizing Japan, the Philippine Islands, and even Australia." Formosa commands a strategic spot for Indochina and for all of the rest of the Far East. That certainly is true.

Let us then consider what we have on Formosa by way of potential allied strength. Bear in mind that China, meaning, of course, free China—anti-Communist China—is not only our ally, but also a member of the United Nations. Not only is free China a member of the United Nations but it is a permanent member of the Security Council entrusted with the major responsibility for the peace of the entire world. After that tragic march of the Communists down across China beginning about 18 months ago and culminating in the defeat of the troops of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the loyal troops fled to this island of Formosa. There they have been what might be called bottled up, due to policies not fully explained.

When the Korean engagement began the generalissimo and his staff offered to the United Nations a force of 30,000 men. He said, "Let us stand with your troops in the fight for freedom." That offer was refused. Every offer he has made since that time has been refused.

So I wanted to look into the matter of how much strength there might be there available to be utilized in the defense of the free world. I regarded that as important. My colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], could not go to Formosa, but I went there and spent nearly a week. I was shown every courtesy by our American civilian and military authorities, and, of course, by the Chinese Government and its military commanders. It was my happy privilege to have dinner with Generalissimo and Madam Chiang Kai-shek. For several days I rode by plane, in jeeps and trucks, to inspect with my own eyes the strength of the Nationalist Chinese forces on Formosa. I had heard speculation in regard to how much strength there might be there and as to whether or not it would be effective in warfare. I think I can report to you a fairly accurate figure because I checked not only with the staff of the Nationalist Chinese forces but also with members of our very small military mission in Taipei, the capital.

The Nationalist Chinese have 360,000 effective fighting men now on Formosa. It is true that these men would need a great deal of conditioning. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I asked General MacArthur what would be the need before the forces on

Formosa could be utilized. We asked him what would be their needs that must be made available and for which we in the Congress might be responsible. General MacArthur's answer to us was the same as the answer of retired General Chennault and many others we consulted.

First of all, the Chinese Nationalists need equipment. The planes that I inspected on their air fields were those we gave them during the recent war or not later than 1946. The equipment they have is pitifully small because so much has been denied them. For most of one day I was the guest of their naval leaders. I conferred with their admiral and his staff. I inspected nearly all of their ships in harbor. The biggest ships they have are the two destroyers we gave them. They have a lot of little ships. There in the distance was a row of Japanese ships which we captured and which we could turn over to them but which have been denied them.

The free Chinese are ready and eager to accept new equipment, new armament, new ammunition, new airplanes that they must have if they are going to help us in this fight. I was astounded to find that because of an edict—I do not know who issued it—perhaps the Armed Forces Committee would know—on many ships were vacant spaces where guns should be. The biggest naval guns they are allowed to have are 3-inch guns. I wish I knew why. Their commanders could not answer the question. They just smiled when I asked them why. Everywhere I found they were restricted.

They need equipment. Then they need supervision. We must take action pretty soon to equip these forces to fight for freedom, for us and for themselves. But we must not make the mistake that obviously was made and which some of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's military men told me in confidence, of turning the equipment over to them without proper American supervision. They will welcome that supervision. Lots of that equipment we sent them before undeniably was lost to the Communists. Perhaps some of it was even sold to them. But what the free Chinese want is a strong military mission in Formosa, not just a few hundred men, but something perhaps on the order of 1,500. Then let us equip them so that they will be ready to take their place with us.

What then should the plan be? Some would deny the use of these Nationalist troops, they fear that would involve us in a war with Red China. I respectfully call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that we are already at war with Red China. Communist China has by its aggression declared war upon us. Now if we are going to admit the help of the Nationalist Chinese, let us face the fact that we are at war and let us plan accordingly. But let us not—I emphasize not—send out our land troops into the mainland of China. These Nationlists say, "If you give us the equipment and the supervision, we will do the job ourselves without calling upon a single American soldier."

Now, the plan contemplates five things.

First, not an invasion off Formosa, but down at the little island of Hainan, which the Japanese seized early in the recent war and from which they began their excursions northward upon the south part of China. That is exactly the tactics that should now be used, say the military men, American and Chinese, because Hainan is only just a few miles away from the mainland. Furthermore, the southern part of China is filled with guerrillas ready to spring to arms if they can get arms and to help bring the downfall of the Red regime in China. We could help them seize Hainan quite easily now, despite the fact that the Russians within the last few weeks have begun the building of five different military installations on the island. They could not hold Hainan under a devastating attack.

Second, let them make their invasion from there with the help of guerrillas.

Third, and this is tremendously important, we should blockade the entire Chinese coast.

Fourth, we must bomb the enemy bases in Manchuria. Mr. DORN and I asked General Ridgway his opinion. I would not want to quote by name any other military man for obvious reasons, but out of the 50 or more high-ranking officers of all the branches of the service which we queried on the matter, everyone gave the same answer as General Ridgway: "We do not consider it possible to end the Korean war in victory under the handicap of not being able to strike the enemy where he is." One commander went so far as to say we could have prevented the building up of the forces in North Korea, which are now engaged in this offensive, simply by bombing not the Manchurian people, not the people of China, but the enemy military targets. There are five railroad lines coming into Mukden, the capital of Manchuria. There are transportation lines spanning down to the Yalu River. If we could bomb those military strategic targets and then follow up by the bombing of the supply line that comes down the Chinese coast, we would halt the march of the Red Chinese from the mainland into Manchuria and from Manchuria into Korea. What stands in the way of that, I ask you?

Here I turn to a report that was given me by the intelligence officers of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's army and I have excerpts from it. A part of this is my own opinion to go along with it. But I learned that the British Government stands in the way of putting into effect a plan that would permit us to end this Korean war in victory. The British Government has actually furnished the two items necessary either for Communist victory or at best a stalemate. First, they have given assurance that the Red bases and supply lines will not be bombed with their consent. Second, strategic materials needed for the conduct of the war have flown in a steady stream through Hong Kong and into China and Russia. From these intelligence sources, both Chinese and United States, I was informed in Taipei that the Russians are supervising the construction of an atomic bomb plant in northwestern China, and that much of the strategic material needed for this plant came into China through British hands during the last 3 years. Since the war in Korea began, imports of all sorts of implements and material of war, such as transportation equipment, rubber, steel, and other metals, airplane engines and parts and machine tools have poured in a steady stream through British Hong Kong for use by the Chinese Reds or by the Soviet Union itself.

A naval blockade by the United States, with the British helping us, if they will, and any other fighting ships made available by members of the United Nations, is imperative if we are to win the war in Korea. With the cooperation of the British, if they decide to cooperate fully, and by blockading the Chinese coast, by bombing the Chinese military bases and supply lines, and by the use of the Nationalist forces when they are equipped and prepared to join us in the struggle, I say to you, and I measure my words again, Communist China could be quickly defeated and the war in the Far East ended. Soviet Russia would not intervene at the present time. That is the almost unanimous opinion of all the military men we talked to.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman is making an extremely important contribution, for which I am sure he ought to be applauded by all the Members of the House.

The gentleman's reference to the Chinese Nationalist forces landing forces on the mainland of China is extremely interesting. I wonder if the gentleman recalls that in World War II, in order to help the Chinese forces the American Navy did exactly that same thing, which could now be done by the Chinese Nationalists. The project was at that time secret, called "Miss X," under which only a few well-equipped Navy officers were dropped by parachute into the hinterland and on the island of Hainan, which the gentleman mentioned, and there they were able to give advice and material and use certain electronic aids. They were removed from China with comparative ease and with very little loss of life. It was an easy proposition. Does not the gentleman agree it would be easier now, with the light control with which China is held by the Reds, than it was in World War II?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I agree with him entirely.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. May I ask the gentleman one more question: I also have had the privilege of talking with General MacArthur, on two occasions, the last one in September. Did I understand the gentleman correctly that from every officer or GI with whom he talked there was complete disagreement with the idea of a limited war which would prevent us from using the military means at our command to bomb enemy bases across the river?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman that not only was the opinion unanimous, but when you get down to the level of the GI I can assure the gentleman that it is very bitter. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DORN]

and I talked to men who were climbing out of their planes after bombing raids. We talked to five airmen just returned from flying their jet-fighter planes up to the Yalu River. If you want to hear bitter talk, hear them comment on the fact that they must fly up there and wait for the enemy. They cannot attack the enemy base. They watch the Russian-made planes rise to the attack, come across that river from the sanctuary, shoot down our planes and retreat behind the sanctuary where they cannot be pursued.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. May I conclude with this comment: I had exactly the same experience myself, even to the point where some of the GI's would say to me, "Who is this guy Acheson, anyway?" When I undertook to tell them, they would look at me and say, "Well, is he on our side?" I wondered whether the gentleman had some such experience.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I correctly understand that the information secured on Formosa was to the effect that our American officers would have supervision at all times of any action that might be taken by Chiang Kai-shek? Was that what the gentleman found out there?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman that the opinion I gained was that that supervision should be given in immediate training of those troops, in air power particularly, because to my way of thinking air power is of greatest importance in this war.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman spoke of guerrillas on the mainland ready to come to the aid of Chiang Kai-shek's forces. It is my information that throughout the mainland of China, now overrun by the Communists, Chiang Kai-shek is still the symbol of strength, and that if he should be permitted to return to the mainland with any degree of support on our part manifested, millions of Chinese now under Communist domination would rally to his side. Has the gentleman any information on that or any opinion about it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is my opinion that Gen. Chiang Kai-shek is still the symbol of the leadership of free China. I would not want to say that he should remain the leader forever, but at present he has the confidence of his people.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. DORN. May I say to the gentleman. I think he is making a very interesting contribution. I would like to say this, it is true that they have probably 1,500,000 Nationalist guerrillas on the mainland of China. But if we follow our present pro-Socialistic policy, these guerrillas will be liquidated if we have a truce in Korea, and they then will build the atomic bomb plant and in 10 or 15 years they will come back so strong that we cannot do anything about it. That is just plain common sense. There was not one single difference of opinion in the front-line troops and the generals, all the way from private first class to General MacArthur in the Far East—there was not any difference of opinion whatsoever. This is a silly, stupid policy which has been concocted by some people that I wish I were at liberty to tell the committee about.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. It is following a policy of confusion made by confused people.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman, and his observation is correct.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. LANTAFF. I commend the gentleman from Missouri on the excellent and very fair presentation that he has made. With reference to the guerrilla activity on the mainland, is it not true that there are very little if any communications existing now between those groups?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman there are good communications existing. I know of one harbor which they use that the Communists have never seized. As late as 3 days ago I received, through one of their emissaries here in Washington, news directly from the mainland.

Mr. LANTAFF. How many of the guerrilla leaders, if the gentleman knows, are loyal to Chiang Kai-shek, as opposed to him?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot say, but I am sure they are all loyal to the ideal of toppling over the Red regime and winning freedom for their country.

Mr. LANTAFF. The gentleman mentioned that there have been some 30,000 troops offered by Chiang Kai-shek for use in Korea. Is it not true that all military leaders, including General MacArthur, turned down that offer because they did not want to use those troops in Korea and in the hopes that they could subsequently be used to better advantage to go back into China?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know who is entirely responsible for that policy, except to say that those troops were refused by United Nations' directive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I want to compliment the gentleman and thank him for going to the Orient at his own expense and getting this information and presenting it so well to us today. Is this what the gentleman is saying? You are not recommending that we tie ourselves exclusively to Chiang Kai-shek or the Nationalist Government. Rather it is your concern that we get effective help to all the forces opposing our mortal enemy in China. We ought not deny ourselves the benefit of the leader who has the largest following and the most forces under his control. But at the same time, does not the gentleman agree, that we should with imagination and vigor support every single group or force on the mainland of China which is making trouble in the rear of the Communists, seeking to make them fail in their aggressive plans, discrediting them and their whole movement in Asia and diverting some of their strength from Korea where they are killing Americans.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman is exactly correct. Let me summarize the advantages of this plan: It does not require the use of American ground troops on the mainland of China. It would permit the people of free China to regain their homes and liberties. It would save countless lives that will otherwise be lost in this stalemate war in Korea. It would reverse the tide of the Communist aggression and put us on the offensive and the Kremlin on the defensive. I say to you in this closing word, that since there is no substitute for victory, we cannot stop to negotiate with these Red Chinese aggressors. We have to go ahead to victory. In China we find a people who are ready for revolution against Communist aggression. If we win back China, it would give us the first victory over communism since 1945. The courage and strength of freemen in the world are on trial today. I beg that we move quickly to give these freemen the leadership they need.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Some people are saying that if we do the things you have urged it will lead to all-out war with Communist China. Is it not rather a fact that this is the best hope we have of preventing all-out war with China; because if they win in China, they would be able to fight in the Philippines and fight in Japan and fight in Indochina, and then we would be in trouble? Whatever the risks of the proposals which the gentleman has presented, the risks of any other alternative are infinitely greater.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The gentleman from Missouri has very well summarized the question that I originally intended to propound of the gentleman who is making such a fine contribution to the thinking of the Members of the House on this subject. But is not Russia and has not Russia from the very beginning been doing the things for Communist China that the gentleman from Missouri is suggesting that we do for our allies in the Pacific who are in a position to help us and without which the Communists in China never could have risen to the position of power in the Pacific?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman is correct, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I refrained from making any public comment on the Far East because 2 years ago I strongly supported Chiang Kai-shek. I reached the conclusion then that the people of China had lost confidence in him and the will to fight. I would like to ask my friend—he made reference to Hainan, and I am refraining from making statements now because I want always to look at the national interests of our country—the gentleman referred to the island of Hainan. Some several months ago Nationalist China had that island, did they not?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it was captured by the Communists?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many Communists captured the island? Does the gentleman remember?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry; I cannot tell.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not more than twenty or twenty-five thousand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I believe the Nationalist troops were ready to abandon it and move to Formosa.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; they had 130,000 troops there, the Nationalists. I would like to know how many Nationalist troops there were on Hainan and how many Communist troops invaded it and captured it, this island that the gentleman named here.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think I can answer the gentleman from Massachusetts. It had been decided in about December of 1949 by the Nationalist forces in Formosa that they would withdraw from Hainan, but before they could withdraw the first Communist attack came across the little gap of water between the mainland and Hainan, and the generalissimo, so I am advised reliably, did not want to pull out immediately under pressure but withdrew gradually. His men stood off 11 attacks in the process of evacuating. When the twelfth attack came it was accompanied by the infiltration and defection of one Nationalist regiment in Hainan. It was the break-up of that regiment which brought the end.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I want to know how many Nationalist troops there were there.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman has correctly stated, about 130,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many Communists were in the attacking force?

Mr. JUDD. That is hard to say; I do not think there is any reliable information.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I remember the figure it was about 25,000.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think the gentleman can substantiate that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be so, but the number of Communists was considerably less than the number of Nationalists; and the Communists won because the Nationalists had somehow lost the will to fight.

Mr. JUDD. And why should not they after our repeated announcements that they were finished? Originally the Nationalist troops had plenty of will to fight, but we insisted they cease fire instead. Marshall's criticism when he went over there was because they had too much will to fight. He helped destroy their will to fight, although I do not suggest he realized what he was doing. If you will help the Nationalists a little again, especially with moral support, you will find the will to fight will come back almost overnight.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise or to fall to such mundane subjects as this appropriation bill after the interesting remarks of the gentleman from Missouri on the very dramatic subject that he dealt with. Unfortunately, however, we do have to have appropriations and that means appropriation bills, and that means that some of us have to sit here and suffer through them.

Let me say at the outset as a member of this committee that I have enjoyed enormously working with this group of delightful, distinguished, and, high-minded gentlemen who compose its membership on both sides of the aisle; in fact, I may say that in the committee under the genial chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and the able minority member from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the ranking Republican member, there is no aisle.

I am not going to make any attempt to review this enormous budget for 25 or 26 agencies; I want to confine myself to one single point, a point as to which this Congress, can really do something and do something constructive. Anyone who sits in a subcommittee of this character, and I think this subcommittee has the largest budget of any except the armed services which, of course, now dwarfs everything else, must feel as I do. We have had the experience of listening to the budget demands of the sacred cows, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Veterans' Administration, Maritime Commission, and others, all of these sacred agencies vested with the aura of national defense, agencies that come in blithely, happily, uninspected and unsupervised by Congress, lay down their budgets for billions and billions of dollars and expect to have them granted and they generally are. The member who sits there and feels this flood pouring over him is in very much the same position as a man at the foot of Niagara Falls with his mouth wide open. There is nothing you can do about it. There can be no more helpless feeling.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in his remarks made a number of points directed to Members of Congress, members of State legislatures and municipalities as to what each in his particular situation can do to try to save the United States from bankruptcy through unlimited appropriations, which lead to inflation and disaster. Here is one thing that the Members of this House can do and as to which, in my humble judgment, we have all be recreant and derelict in our duty.

All I ask is that we see to it that the committee is properly equipped and staffed to do the job that has to be done and can be done. Mind you, we could not have better men than these gentlemen who serve us as executive secretaries, such as William Duvall. There is not a better or abler man for the job, there is not a better assistant than Mr. Skaren, who works night and day on this bill, as do their associates on the other subcommittees. But, Mr. Chairman, the executive secretaries to these committees are only individuals, one or two of them, and they are not in position to investigate as should be investigated the great agencies over which we have jurisdiction.

Now, what we do, what Members of Congress do, in allowing this Appropriation Committee to face the Executive forces, so to speak, across the table, wholly unequipped, wholly disarmed, is really a dereliction of a fundamental duty; that is, to keep alive and effective the one real constitutional power remaining in our hands through which we can keep control of the Government of the United States and protect our freedom. I refer to the appropriation power. It is the fundamental power, it is the heart of our representative free system of government. We have let it fall into a very sad state, Mr. Chairman, when we let an appropriation subcommittee sit across the table without having had the benefit of a searching and comprehensive investigation of those great agencies all through the year, 12 months of the year, so that when they appear before your subcommittees the members would be armed with reports from reliable experts as to what is going on in those agencies, how efficiently they are operating, how economically, or the reverse, so that we have something to go on.

It is easy enough, perhaps, for men of usual industry and intelligence to deal with smaller agencies with a six or seven billion budget, such as the Federal Trade Commission or the Security Exchange Commission. That amount is without comprehension. That kind of operation can be reduced to a standard, to work loads and all those other criteria. But what about the Atomic Energy Commission that spends $1,200,000,000 operating the greatest industry in the United States, spending billions and billions of dollars in great new construction work? What about the Veterans' Administration that spends five or six billion dollars in every known form of expenditure? What about the Tennessee Valley Authority that runs a great power plant, that runs navigation controls and builds dams, that is now building enormous new facilities?

Who investigates them? Who can come to us and speak as agents of the Congress and say: Here is how your money is being spent. Here is where you can save.

Mr. Chairman, in the Eightieth Congress we did begin to set up such an investigatory staff. I sat on two subcommittees where important agencies, the Veterans' Administration, Maritime Commission and Public Housing, were being considered. We had the benefit of a careful, searching 12 months' investigation right on the ground by experts who came to us and said: Gentlemen, here is the story on these agencies. This is where they are wrong, this is where they are wasting your money and the taxpayers' money. This is what might be done about it.

It gave that committee a chance to go to work. I say, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of this House should seriously consider this proposition. Everyone should insist upon providing this committee with the kind of a staff of experts that can cover all of the big agencies of Government on a 12 months' basis, so that when your subcommittee and your subcommittee members come to meet these great budget requests they will be able to do so with some semblance of intelligence.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Utah.

Mrs. BOSONE. I should like to say that the gentleman from New York has, to my mind, made sense out of his argument today.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOSONE. Is it not true that if we follow the gentleman's suggestion, we would not need these expensive klieg light and other special investigations? Would this not bring the facts 12 months out of the year to the people who should have them? In that way you would get at the real facts and probably save millions of dollars.

Mr. COUDERT. The distinguished gentlewoman said it better than I could. I think that is undoubtedly true. Particularly with the membership of this committee, you would have certainly businesslike and serious approach; kind of a continual year-round investigation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman from New York. I believe he has touched on one of the greatest challenges to the survival of our free economy. Time after time I have contended congressional appropriation committees could save millions through constant surveys of Federal spending agencies by specially trained experts.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations at any time in their endeavor to save the funds of our National Treasury, and to protect the taxpayers; in fact, I am greatly interested in their efforts along that line. I think in considering the legislation that the Committee on Appropriations now offers in this appropriation bill, some of the history of the merchant marine should be reviewed. It so happens when I became a Member of the Congress I was placed on the Merchant Marine Committee of this House, along with other Members who have left that committee and gone to the Committee on Appropriations and various other committees. If we recall the situation we found ourselves in in 1916, it would be interesting to enlarge upon it, but time does not suffice. We found ourselves in a position where we could not transport our troops abroad. We had to appeal to our allies to transport our armies and our supplies across the Atlantic Ocean. I know one man personally who went to France in a British ship, a freighter, sleeping in a hammock. The hammocks were 12 high and 12 deep. The ship had a Chinese crew and five or six British citizens for officers. During the war we built many types of ships and the question of the disposal of the war fleet after the armistice arose and there was a great controversy, and it is said and the record shows that a great scandal occurred. With that history before them the Merchant Marine Committee of the House began hearings on a bill that eventually became the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, declaring that the American flag should still fly on the high seas and at least 50 percent of the commerce of the United States should be carried in American bottoms. That great Virginian, that great American who has gone on to his reward, the Honorable Otis Bland, championed this bill and brought it to perfection; perfection at that time, so the House said and so the Congress said, because it passed the House and passed the Senate and became the law of the land. That bill was to foster and perpetuate the American merchant marine to carry our commerce and for aid and assistance of the national defense. It was recognized at that time that the American merchant marine could not live and could not survive in competition with the types of seagoing vessels that were furnished by foreign nations with cheap labor, with no protection for life at sea, and with no comforts for the men that go down to the sea in ships. In that bill certain provisions were written for the American sailor, for the American man that made his life at sea, to protect and carry on his vocation and to carry on the history that had been written down through the years in brilliant feats of the American Navy and the American-flag ships of commerce. Then we began subsidies and then we began aid to construction. Then we gave aid to competition with foreign ships.

At the approach of the Second World War we had quite a reserve fleet in this Nation. The question arose, Would we help those in Europe who were fighting what we said at that time was the battle of civilization, the battle of Christianity, the battle of freemen to live on the face of this earth, and worship as they pleased and participate in democratic governments, and so forth. This country gave aid to the British Government, and to the French Government. We gave ships and we gave other materials.

Then the German submarine hordes destroyed great numbers of the foreign ships then plying the seas, and this caused the rise in value of the American reserve fleet. We, desiring to keep these ships under the American flag, did sell them very cheaply to the operators, to operators who were willing to venture in business, to operators who were willing to send their vessels into the submarine zones, to operators who were enticed by high freight rates at a peril not only of the vessel but to American sailors.

At that time the Committee on Merchant Marine of this House called the then Administrator of the Maritime Commission, Admiral Land, in executive session and in open session, and questioned him about the sale of these vessels; yes, the sale of these vessels at $5 per ton, and so forth.

I remember the remark Admiral Land made to a question of mine. I said, "It is known, and we know, that eventually we will be drawn into this conflict, yet we are selling ships here at $5 and $6 a ton." He said to me, "Why, they are nothing but old crates." They were 10, 15, 20, and 25 years old. For a substantial purpose, for substantial and far-reaching and lasting commerce, no operator with any vision of business would have bought them and put them in the trade. Only did they purchase them on account of the times and the risks that the ships would incur. The price was cheap but the risk was great.

So we were drawn into the conflict. The conflict was pushed on our shore, on the coast of North Carolina, and on the northern coast. Ships were sunk right off my congressional district day after day. Then we went into the war. The President of the United States or someone in authority called Admiral Land and said, "We must have ships. Get them." What provision of Congress was made to get the ships? We were in an emergency. I am not trying to defend the Maritime Commission of that day; I am thinking that in justice and in fairness the history should be here reviewed. Jerry Land went out and produced the ships. He made some terrible bargains, as we see them today. He made some terrible contracts for ship construction, as the committee saw at that time, and we called him in on the carpet.

Then the war was over. We won this last war just as much through the efforts of the American seaman as we did through any doughboy or any infantry soldier or aviator or anybody else that fought in France or fought in Italy or fought in Africa. The men that carried the supplies on the Murmansk run were continuously under attack, and history will show it. History will show how many vessels and men we lost. We are beginning to forget it.

Then the war was over and we had more ships than we knew what to do with. Nobody was interested in them. Just like the supplies that were left in Europe by the Army and the Navy. Then your Merchant Marine Committee of the House had before them the problem of the preservation of this fleet and the writing of a Ship Sales Act. To the credit of the men who served on that

committee, they labored long and hard. The testimony lasted for months. It was months and months before the bill was written and submitted to the House. The House passed the bill, the Senate passed the bill, and the bill became law—to sell and preserve the American fleet which we had created then for the future protection of the national defense.

At the time we discussed the rule I expressed myself only, and only arose in opposition to the rule because of my interest in the prerogatives and the jurisdiction of the legislative committees. I have a great deal of sympathy with what the gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations are endeavoring to do. This question of fair compensation in the act of 1936, section 902, I think it is, has always provoked and worried me. Nevertheless you gentlemen who are constitutional lawyers will have to decide that question yourselves. I am greatly interested, if possible, in some way to amend that section of the 1936 act, for I do not think—and I cannot get my mind and heart and soul to believe that where we sold these ships at such marked-down prices those who bought the ships should not be willing to make some concession in the resale or charter of these ships to the Government in case of emergency.

It must also be taken into consideration that in this ship subsidy construction program we required the companies to put in certain facilities that are applicable to the national defense and which are not necessary or usable in commerce. That point is overlooked. Other features have to go into the ship that the commercial operator does not desire. So much for that phase of it.

About the investigation that was carried on by the Merchant Marine Committee of the House which I sat on for months. We completely annihilated and routed the old Maritime Commission. We exposed many things that they should never have done, but which at the time I know because of their doing was the emergency that the country was in, at the time that the shortcomings or mis-administration was carried on. That should be taken into consideration in condemning the old members of the board. I think Admiral Jerry Land is a fine American citizen. It worried me and it hurt me at that time to see him so maligned and abused. But yet we did find things which showed the admiral was very negligent in his administration and that his office was very negligent in their administration and that other men connected with the old Maritime Commission were either ignorant or very negligent.

Now we come to the proposals in this bill, not only in the bill itself if it becomes law, but in the report, which the officials of the Maritime Commission advised the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries this morning would be a directive to them in carrying out the provisions that were written in the bill with respect to contract sailings. These contracts that are made by the Maritime Commission are not made for a year. They are long-term contracts—5 and 10 years. They are contracts that a ship operator must prepare himself for; contracts that require him to make scheduled sailings back and forth to European, Pacific and Asiatic ports. There have to be special arrangements made by the transportation company to fulfill the contracts. There are all kinds of considerations and conditions beyond, I expect, the knowledge of the average Member of this House; some of them were surprising to me. As you will see from the report, the committee requests the Maritime Commission as follows: "To distribute the number of voyages equitably among all shipping interests in order that each company may have a fair share of the subsidies provided by the Administration."

Mr. Chairman, that is simply impossible. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] at this point wants to challenge that statement I yield to him.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not desire to challenge the gentleman's statement, but I do desire to make these observations, that this act has tended to develop a monopoly in the shipping industry.

Mr. BONNER. I will answer that in just a minute. You are going to have a monopoly by this very provision.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a minute, now; let me make my observation, then the gentleman can controvert them.

When this act went into effect in 1936 you had 15 or 16 subsidized operators, and it all boiled down to what we now refer to as the Club 13. You have fewer today than you had when it first went into effect, and will as long as the gentleman's great committee fails to amend the Shipping Act of 1936, whereby you give to the shipping interests every conceivable fair advantage at the expense of the taxpayer in the form of 10-year contracts. Now getting back to the gentleman's statement, they are now engaged in the making of those contracts.

Mr. BONNER. The contracts are already made.

Mr. THOMAS. No; wait a minute; they are expiring all the time, are they not?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Just pass it around to somebody else; that is the way to break them.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, there is the answer, pass them around to somebody else. Who can you pass them to? Who has the facilities? Who has the ability? Who owns the ships? Does any Member of this House own a fleet of vessels that they can pass around to you? Or do you know anybody that it can be passed to other than operating people in the shipping industry?

It is true—and I regret that I have not my table with me—that some companies have two and three hundred contract-sailing voyages; but the reason they have got them is because they have the ability and facilities to contract for them. You will notice another company that has only 5, 10, or 25 contracts. The reason they have no more is because they have neither the ships nor the facilities to contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BONNER. I know time is so valuable here this afternoon; nobody seems to be asking for it. I merely wanted to make my position clear and I appreciate the gentleman's efforts.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for his fine words.

Mr. BONNER. I really think the House ought to know something about what the merchant marine is for. Can the gentleman from Texas spare me any time?

Mr. THOMAS. We have already yielded to our distinguished friend 20 minutes on this side. We have only 2 hours and the time is allocated.

Mr. BONNER. Can the gentleman from California yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Our time is committed.

Mr. BONNER. Well, I am through, let it go at that.

I hope the House uses the full time this afternoon because there are many facts that have not been developed, and I do not think it ought to be passed over and let it be said there is not some virtue and value and merit in the merchant marine of this country.

I think it is a slap in the face of the fine gentleman who made a sacrifice to come to Washington, Admiral Cochrane, to take over the maritime affairs and clean up what has been done in the past and show that it can be operated in a commendable manner—as it should be. And I am confident Admiral Cochrane will if given the proper opportunity.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I can let the gentleman have a couple of minutes. When I said our time was committed I meant that the time was allocated. We can give the gentleman time by taking it away from somebody else but we gladly squeeze out 3 minutes for him.

Mr. BONNER. I had understood that all the time was not going to be used.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would the gentleman like 3 minutes?

Mr. BONNER. I would appreciate it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. We yield the gentleman another 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it certainly is not my pleasure to get up here and try to defend what has been done in the past by the Maritime Commission. I am just as critical of them as is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] or anyone in the House, and I know he is honest about that. But there is something to be said in their defense.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is quite a fine gentleman. He is fair, he is one of the most able Members of the House, he is honest, he is rendering a great service to this Nation. I am in favor of economy. I have given a lot of my time in the last 2 months or more pointing out some of the terrible

negligence on the part of the leaders of our national defense. The committee I am a member of, and which I have the honor to head, has certainly pointed out conditions that should be corrected by legislation prepared by the Armed Services Committee of this House, or the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

It was pointed out this morning what these ships were bought and sold for and every word the gentleman said was true. It is revolting. But I want to point to another thing.

Here is a long list of vessels and companies that made claims against the Maritime Commission for losses. First, here is the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. that made a claim for $1,300,000. The Commission offered to settle with them for $776,000, which was refused. The matter went to the courts and the courts awarded them $983,000. Of course, the Government had the expense of the court litigation.

Here is another company with a small claim, only $50,000. The Commission offered $15,000. The courts awarded $25,000.

Here is another case where the company requested $766,000. The Commission offered $72,500. The courts awarded $142,500.

There are some here that are much higher than that. Here is one, for instance, where the company requested $1,498,000. The Commission offered to settle for $400,000. The courts awarded $825,000. They run all the way through on about that percentage basis. The complete table is as follows:

Just compensation cases decided by the courts, Sept. 1, 1950

Vessel	Court citation	Owner's claim	Just compensation determined by WSA	Just compensation determined by court
Alaskan	*American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.* v. *United States*, Southern District of New York, No. A 133-397, decided Jan. 21, 1949; 85 F. Supp. 815 (D. C. N. Y. 1949).	[1] $1,350,000.00	[2] $776,003.00	[3] $983,250.00
Cheerio	*Shain E. Baitary* v. *United States*, eastern district of South Carolina, Civil Action No. 1138, decided Nov. 28, 1944.	14,400.00	11,500.00	14,400.00
Dona Aurora	*De La Rama Steamship Co.* v. *United States*, southern district of New York, No. A 134-158, decided July 27, 1950.	1,960,000.00	[4] 1,333,333.33	2,082,000.00
Elna	*Ramsellus* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 48538, decided May 19, 1950:			
	Value		[5] [6] 147,700.00	[5] 188,025.00
	Charter hire		[7] 49,512.04	[8] 139,138.50
Gene	*Kendall* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 46199, decided Apr. 7, 1947; 108 Ct. Cls. 497 (1947).	50,000.00	15,000.00	25,000.00
Geoanna	*Seven-up Bottling Co.* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 45868, decided Dec. 2, 1946; 107 Ct. Cls. 402 (1946); cert. den. 332 U. S. 757 (1947).	175,000.00	20,000.00	30,000.00
George Washington	*Eastern Steamship Lines* v. *United States*, Circuit Court of Appeals, First Circuit, No. 4366, decided Dec. 31, 1948; 171 F. (2d) 589 (C. C. A., 1st, 1948)	1,739,872.00	667,500.00	1,100,000.00
Governor Cobb	*Trailerships, Inc.* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 45923, decided Apr. 1, 1946; 106 Ct. Cls. 215 (1946)	600,000.00	100,000.00	125,000.00
Houriess	*Wilson* v. *United States*, District Court, Massachusetts, No. 2237, C. A. decided Nov. 12, 1943	12,500.00	4,000.00	4,000.00
International	*Smith-Douglas, Inc.* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 46289, decided Dec. 6, 1948; 81 F. Supp. 215 (1948)	586,592.05	[9] 236,018.78	[10] [11] 290,000.00
MacArthur	*Richard S. Core* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 46796, decided Jan. 5, 1948; 110 Ct. Cls. 66 (1948); 337 U. S. 325 (1949) Commissioner's Report, July 12, 1950 (rehearing).	20,000.00	9,000.00	15,500.00
Maitland No. 1	*Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Nav. Co.* v. *U. S.*, Court of Claims, No. 46435, decided Dec. 6, 1948; 112 Ct. Cls. 240 (1948); 338 U. S. 396 (1949); 116 Ct. Cls. —; 1950 A. M. C. 681	766,128.00	72,500.00	[12] 142,500.00
Mariner	*Charles Zubik* v. *United States*, Western District, Pennsylvania, No. 2815, decided June 22, 1945; 61 F. Supp. 4 (W. D. Penn. 1945).	15,000.00	7,000.00	10,000.00
Mary Kay	*Hugo Menke* v. *United States*, Northern District, California, No. 22447-R, decided July 21, 1943.	17,000.00	6,500.00	6,500.00
Mayflower	*Broadfoot* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 47091, decided Mar. 7, 1949; 113 Ct. Cls. 280 (1949).	300,000.00	12,670.00	30,000.00
Mizpah	*McDonald* v. *United States*, Court of Claims, No. 45876, decided June 5, 1950	435,750.00	116,000.00	175,000.00
N. G. Arfaras	*John E. Green* v. *United States*, Southern District, Florida, No. 818-T, decided July 1945	14,426.00	9,050.00	11,500.00
Norfolk	*United States* v. *Buxton Line*, 165 F. (2d) 993 (C. C. A. 4th 1948)	9,960.00	399.28	4,000.00
Off Duty	*Victor F. Sheronas* v. *United States*, District Court, Delaware, Civil Action No. 367, decided August 1946.	11,500.00	5,000.00	6,000.00
P. Kremasco	*John E. Green* v. *United States*, Southern District, Florida, No. 819-T, decided July 1945	12,168.00	8,195.00	9,500.00
Pacific	*Turkington* v. *United States*, 108 Ct. Cls. 571 (1947)	47,500.00	11,500.00	25,000.00
President Warfield	*Baltimore Steam Packet Co.* v. *U. S.*, 112 Ct. Cls. 469 (1949)	1,934,905.00	525,000.00	990,000.00
Robert Henjes	*Helen K. Henjes* v. *United States*, 115 Ct. Cls. 264 (1950)	91,900.00	51,781.00	60,000.00
State of Delaware	*Wilson Line, Inc.* v. *United States*, 111 Ct. Cls. 764 (1948)	642,068.00	275,000.00	488,400.00
State of Maryland	*Baltimore Steam Packet Co.* v. *United States*, 112 Ct. Cls. 448 (1949)	1,448,000.00	400,000.00	800,000.00
State of Virginia	*Baltimore Steam Packet Co.* v. *United States*, 112 Ct. Cls. 433 (1949)	1,498,000.00	400,000.00	825,000.00
Stella Maris	*Brunson* v. *United States*, Southern District, California, No. 3659, O'C Civil, decided Oct. 30, 1944.	22,000.00	13,500.00	15,000.00
Virginia	*National Bulk Carriers, Inc.* v. *United States*, 169 F. (2d) 943 (C. C. A., 3d 1948)	3,800,000.00	2,100,339.04	3,584,000.00
William C. McTarnahan	*National Bulk Carriers, Inc.* v. *United States*, 82 F. Supp. 495 (D. C. Del. 1949)	2,612,696.04	1,619,591.07	2,273,502.61
Yorktown	*Baltimore Steam Packet Co.* v. *United States*, 112 Ct. Cls. 458 (1949)	1,237,100.00	425,000.00	815,000.00
Zoric	*Robert Capoil* v. *United States*, Eastern District of Louisiana, No. CA 667, decided May 11, 1945.	15,625.00	7,500.00	15,000.00
Total			9,436,092.54	15,282,216.11

[1] $130 per dead-weight ton.
[2] $75 per dead-weight ton.
[3] $95 per dead-weight ton.
[4] No determination made. This figure is based on amount paid on account.
[5] WSA determination was based on a dead weight of 2,082 tons; the court's on a dead weight of 2,507 tons.
[6] $71 per dead-weight ton.
[7] $1.25 per dead-weight ton.
[8] $3 per dead-weight ton.
[9] $54 per dead-weight ton.
[10] The Commissioner found that the value of the vessel as of September 1939 was $88,800 or $18 per dead-weight ton.
[11] $66 per dead-weight ton.
[12] The court originally determined $161,833.72 but on rehearing reduced the amount to $142,500.

NOTE.—The court's determinations in the 31 cases amounted to 161.95 percent of Administrator's determinations.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Is the gentleman able to tell from his memoranda there what court made the award? Was it the Court of Claims or was it another court?

Mr. BONNER. I do not happen to be a lawyer. I am one of the few laymen in this body and I am proud of it. I respect the great ability of the legal fraternity here and I want to see the courts sustained and so forth. The gentleman can examine this himself. The Court of Claims I imagine.

Mr. JONAS. I thought the gentleman might have that knowledge.

Mr. BONNER. I will say, since the gentleman asked me that question, if that provision in this bill becomes law it will be a heyday for the lawyers because I have asked the Commission myself what they would do with respect to contracts already made. You gentlemen who are attorneys know more about contracts than I do. But certainly a contract with the Government is a pretty sacred sort of thing, I would think, stronger than any contract with an individual in all probability. The Government is going to have an awful job getting away from these contracts.

Mr. JONAS. With reference to the gentleman's statement about the possibility of the lawyers having a heyday, as the gentleman probably recalls he and I served on the same committee together and took up this subject matter. If there is to be a heyday, judging from what little knowledge I gained in serving on that committee, by the action of the Maritime Commission it is merely switching the heyday away from the Maritime Commission and putting it in the hands of the legal profession, neither of which appeals to me very much.

Mr. LONNER. The gentleman rendered distinguished service on the committee, and his feelings and my feelings are not so far apart, not at all. I regret and I am sorry that all these things transpired, but I must be charitable and say that some of the charges made against the Maritime Commission, which look so awful now, reflect a picture of the time that the contracts and the transactions were taking place as against another time when the picture is entirely different.

Mr. JONAS. In that respect the gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the committee for the privilege of addressing them, but I must say that when the bill is read for amendment I shall offer an amendment which I hope will meet the approval of the committee and the membership of the House.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GRAIN FOR INDIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am informed, that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] said that an effort was being made to put something over in respect to the bill for grain aid to India—giving India and in the present overhanging famine situation there—and that I was trying to work out some plan of mine for another ECA under the guise of that particular bill.

I think the gentleman gives me much too much credit. I happen to be far down in seniority on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and not at all the master mind he wants to make me out to be. Though, I would like very much to be considered as a leader in respect to this India grain bill. Now the reasons why this bill has not been brought to a vote as yet have not been much discussed on the floor and probably the question would not have been raised today had the gentleman not raised it, but it having been raised, I think it is very worthy of the consideration of the House.

We today hear speeches about how our position has suffered in Asia; that the cause of the free peoples has suffered the most damaging blows in Asia, yet we apparently fail to observe that while the Congress is not taking action on this grain aid to India, we are suffering added serious damage to our position there which might well prove to be irreparable.

What is said to deter certain Members is what Mr. Nehru says about his position between the east and the west. Well, I think we know enough about political life in this House so that we can cut through political situations like that in India and get at the heart of the reason for this measure, and that is that this aid to India must come as a good will gesture from one democracy to another, regardless of who heads it. Let us remember, too, that the measure is now before us as a repayable loan and that India is known for paying her debts.

The riots that have taken place in India recently and the enormous advantage which the Communists take from them is at least in material partly due to the fact that India is not yet getting aid from us in grain, which we have the capability to send them. That is what is proving to be so damaging to our position in the Far East currently.

Let us not forget that there are 600,000,000 people in south and southeast Asia who are not in the Communist column, and two-thirds of those are in India. Yet, so far, we stay our hands from aiding these people contrary to the great democratic and humanitarian traditions of the United States, and at the same time we talk about building up our position in Asia.

Competition is what counts in this world, as well as other factors, and we have competition in respect to giving food aid to India, because the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Russians are moving in where we are leaving a vacuum. They are trying to make their deals with India today, Communist China for 100,000 tons of rice, and Soviet Russia for 1,000,000 tons of wheat. And what kind of deals are they making? We know that people who are desperate for food will make any kind of deals in order to get them food. The Communists will fasten the halter right around the neck of India if we let them. Russia is now trying to tie up all the burlap available in India, and thereby depriving us of one of the most vital materials in the world; and let us ask ourselves whether that is going to do us any good in our own grim struggle against communism.

No; we ought to act on this grain for India bill and it is my deep hope that we will do so now at long last, promptly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to follow my distinguished fellow member of the Merchant Marine Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, because I believe that his experience on that committee, his very fine recollection of the problems that have come before it, will give us as good a basis for judgment as any Member of the House could. I compliment him on his views and I share them.

I would like to say at the outset that I appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. The provision upon which I am going to comment is found on page 45 at line 12 of the bill and is the provision which limits the number of voyages during any one year. In that connection I was very much concerned because I thought the language which was originally proposed almost indicated that the committee did not wish to have additional shipping concerns come under the subsidy program. I submitted language to the gentleman from Texas that might change that apparent indication. He was good enough to include in the proviso which is in the bill one of the phrases which I suggested to him, and I think it does definitely show that it is not the intention that this subsidy program should be limited to those who now have subsidies. However, I also submitted language which would permit an increase in the number of voyages every year to provide voyages for the new people who want to get into the industry. He did not agree on this point. His view was that the new people should be included under the provisions for the total number of voyages. Well, that led us to the situation in which we found ourselves this morning.

Our committee had a meeting, and before it came Mr. Gatov, a member of the Federal Maritime Board and Assistant Administrator under Admiral Cochrane. Mr. Gatov pointed these facts out to us. The shipping operators who are now under the subsidized program have contracts. Most of them, I believe, are 20-year contracts, or 10 years, I have forgotten. Most of them have 3, 4, or 8 years more to run. Under those contracts the operators each agree that they will sail a definite minimum number of voyages during each year, and if they fail to sail those voyages they have broken their contracts.

On the other hand, it is agreed that they may sail a maximum number of voyages, and any number they sail within that maximum the Maritime Administration is bound to pay for. Here is where the squeeze comes. If the operators sail the number of voyages which under their contract they are entitled to sail, they will use up more than the 1,450 voyages which it is proposed to authorize. If they do that, there will obviously be no voyages left for assignment to the other companies which wish to come in.

There are some seven applications, I believe, that are pending for 48 ships that would sail possibly another 400 voyages. Mr. Gatov said that the Administration would not create a deficiency by setting up the voyages for the new operators, and that if the bill stays as it is there will be no new lines started. I am interested in seeing some new lines started. I am more familiar with the Pacific coast situation than any other. I know that the services to China and Japan and the Philippines furnished by two companies have been very valuable in the past few years in carrying the commerce that goes across the Pacific Ocean. I think that we ought to have an expanding merchant marine, and I think there is no question but that this language will stop it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. In that particular field, is it not true that these companies have had to go out there and practically reestablish the business that was completely destroyed during the war?

Mr. ALLEN of California. That is exactly correct. The operators are, in the main, new people. There is another problem that goes with this. Our subsidy program requires that the shipping companies use American labor, which is accustomed to a higher standard of living than foreign labor. It requires that repairs be made in American yards, where the same situation applies to the standards of American shipyard labor. If we do not have our ships running, we do not have our shipyards operating to take care of them.

I was rather astounded to learn the figures from a letter recently received concerning the shipyards on San Francisco Bay. On April 19, 1951, in the three yards which have survived the war, there were 2,250 men employed. A year ago, on July 1, roughly when the Korean incident broke out, there were about 6,600. There has been a decrease of 65.91 percent during that intervening period.

To show what we need in emergency times during World War II, for example, the three yards employed something over 63,000. There has been a 96-plus percent drop-off. If we include the temporary war-industry yards, Kaiser and Marin Ship, and so forth, we now have something like 1 percent of the men working now that we needed during the war period.

I know something about the shortage of ships. Let me give you two or three examples. We had a tramp fleet about 2 years ago consisting of about 1,100 American ships, which was an extraordinary number, but which was required at that time to carry our commerce. During the period of a year it dropped off to about 100. The tramp fleet is not subsidized. It does not survive in foreign competition. At the outset of the Korean war we had about 100 operating. In the nature of things, about half of them were in port and half of them away. We found ourselves with 46 ships available, ready to operate, fully manned and equipped, and available to the military service. It was necessary for us to charter 13 foreign vessels to carry our cargo. The Navy got some Iranian, Greek, Panamanian, Canadian, and British ships to fill the immediate need until we got some of our own ships from the laid-up fleet in operation a few weeks later.

In time of war the passenger ships become troop transports. We now have in operation only three which travel at a speed greater than 22 knots, which is the speed usually attributed to modern enemy submarines. I well remember the personal experience while in the Navy in 1943 of traveling in an old Hog Islander built in 1917 during World War I, traveling at a speed of about 8 knots, unescorted, for 19 days, in waters in which enemy submarines were occasionally operating. Something over 20 of the men aboard were carried in a forward cargo hold, where they had no comforts or conveniences except a temporary stairway installed through the hatch cover, through which there was some ventilation and on which they could reach the open deck. It is not surprising that I should favor the maintenance of a reasonable number of fairly good ships during peacetime in order that they might be available to give reasonable comfort and safety to the men and materials which are carried in them during wartime.

An operating subsidy in the shipping business is not a guaranty of profits. On the contrary, an operator who makes an unreasonable profit finds the excess applied in reduction of the subsidy. Our laws properly require the use of American labor on American ships and that repairs be made in American shipyards. All but a minor part of the subsidy involved is to offset the disparity between the cost of American labor as against foreign labor with regard to the wages, subsistence, repairs and maintenance of the ships that are subsidized.

I hope that the language of the proviso, which is found on page 45 at line 12 of the bill, will be stricken from it by amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also that I may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the course of the debate our friend and colleague the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in talking about his amendment made reference to the love life of a tuna. I know oftentimes when you get into something like that you get into something you do not know very much about. I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] got to talking about something there that, while his intentions were good, is a subject about which he cannot claim to be an expert.

I would like to review the program that our tuna industry on the West Coast has been engaged in during the past 25 or 30 years. We have built an industry out there that has grown to be the largest fishing industry in the entire United States. In the course of the last few years we have had a lot of complications and a lot of troubles in our fishing operations off the coast of South America and Central America to such a degree that a few years ago the American Government and the Government of Costa Rica and several of the South and Central American governments met and discussed some of the fishing operations and fishing problems that our fleet was involved with. It was hoped that some of the very complicated and bitter controversies that were growing out of the fishing operations in the waters down as far south as the Galapagos Islands could be cleared up and settled in a friendly way. As a result of these talks a convention was formed, and out of that there was formed what is called the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. That Commission was ratified by the other body in 1949, and then it set out its preliminary steps in organization. Exploratory work in developing the biological facts about tuna is particularly needed. In our particular fishing industry we do not use the seine operation, but we employ large boats, some as long as this room. They ply 6,000 miles south of California, off the coast of South and Central America. They churn the waters with small bait, and when the tuna arrives to take the bait they catch the tuna with hooks. They do not have much trouble with Latin-American governments so far as actually catching the tuna because they are several hundred miles off the coast. But in order to get bait to chum the tuna with, these boats have to put into the coastal waters of the South and Central American countries. In doing so they often run into complications with these governments. These governments fear our industries might take their natural resources, and, while they do not need them today, in some future time they may want this bait fish, and therefore they resent our American boats coming in. As a result they have set up a high tax on fishing rights in those waters.

Our industry men have negotiated from time to time with these governments, but it has been impossible to arrive at satisfactory long-term agreements. We need a larger scope of coverage—one that can only be encompassed by government-to-government discussions and cooperative explorative methods on the habits of the tuna and the bait fish.

I would like to point out to you that this industry represents a big factor in our economy on the West Coast. Last year, for instance, 11,000,000 cases of tuna were consumed, which represents an average of 3½ cans per man, woman, and child. It represented about $100,000,000 valuation. About $125,000,000 is invested in the industry in the way of canning equipment and boats.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKINNON. I have very limited time, but I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The reason I asked the gentleman to yield to me is because I think there is a distinction which is not being made. What the tuna industry really wants is not necessarily money. They have a very large income. They have been willing to do their own research work. But they have to have certain authority and certain backing from the United States or from some international board before they can do the research that they want to do. That carries out what I said a moment ago on the floor that we have to go out to the States and to private industry and go back to the people and say, "We do not have to pay all that. We can give you help on those things. But why should we put up Federal money when we are $257,000,000,000 in the red to pay for something that you can afford to pay or the State can afford to pay?"

I think that ought to enter into the discussion and Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman has made a very good point and a point that I was going to bring out. Our industry has developed itself independently from its own private funds. We want to keep independent. We do not want Government interference if we can get away from it. The point is that this industry cannot go to the South American governments. We have to have a Government-to-Government approach, and that is why we have asked the State Department to come in and assist us officially in getting this problem worked out. We are not asking for a free ride at all. We can pay our way, but we must have a Government-to-Government approach to get any action.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I have asked the gentleman to yield to me in order that I might emphasize the point that this problem should not be referred to facetiously as one of studying the love life of the tuna fish. There is nothing wrong with studying the love life or sex habits of the tuna fish or the love life or sex habits of halibut as has been done in cooperation with the Canadian Government for almost 30 years. This is an important international problem. It affects a large segment of our population, and affects an industry of which this country may well be proud. It should not be laughed down, as I understand was done yesterday in talking about the love life of racoons. So far as I am concerned, and I know a little about the subject, the State Department very properly negotiated the treaty and formed the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission because without it you folks on the lower west coast of California could not get the bait you must have to fish for the tuna, and you would have a $100,000,000 industry ruined. You will find the following article just written by Charles E. Jackson, general manager of the National Fisheries Institute, Inc., highly interesting:

LOVE LIFE OF TUNA, HALIBUT, AND FROGS?

Efforts are unwittingly being made for political purposes to laugh out of existence the work of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and the Halibut Commission, just as Senator Pat Harrison, by a single speech some twenty-odd years ago, killed research on bullfrogs in the United States for perhaps all time. Meanwhile, frog legs have become an expensive luxury in the United States at prices so high that this valuable food is not available for thousands of people suffering from diabetes who, like other citizens, would like a change in their diet. Had the Fish and Wildlife Service had a reasonable amount of research funds these past years, frog legs might now be available at reasonable cost to diabetic patients. As it is, the supply must come from wild stocks in the southern swamps and from imports from Cuba. Supplies cannot be maintained consistently and the price range is high. Meanwhile, Japan developed a very profitable frog leg industry which employs many people. Senator Pat Harrison's famed ridicule made the news headlines, but destroyed any hope for Federal appropriations for bullfrog research and today the State of Mississippi lacks an industry that might have provided extensive employment for her population and a change in diet for the diabetics of the Nation.

Now the work of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission is threatened by stories going around on Capitol Hill about the love life of the tuna, and a story on the love life of halibut was printed in a Washington newspaper last week.

Nothing is more dangerous to the fishing industry of America than for responsible persons in public life to ridicule our industry by satirical remarks concerning the sex life of fish and shellfish. The existence of the sea-food industry depends upon sex life to the same extent as does the cattle and hog and poultry industries, yet we seldom hear of farmers' appropriations for research being curtailed because the meat, poultry, and even the honeybee industries are dependent on sex life, as indeed are all agriculture crops, not to mention the perpetuation of humanity itself.

The fishing industry resents these love life stories that are told for the purpose of killing Federal appropriations for research. Indeed, the public itself is gradually becoming aware of the fact that mankind must depend more and more on the products of the sea for maintaining the human race. Those nations recognizing this fact by amply providing research facilities for utilizing the extensive protein and mineral resources of the seas and lakes and rivers will still be around, while those nations who laugh off their responsibilities for sea-food research will be in the category of ancient Rome.

Ask your Congressman why he discriminates against the love life of fish, but encourages the love life of cattle and hogs and corn and cotton. Let him know that the fishing industry resents being laughed out of court, to defeat appropriations.

Fifteen years is a long time, but that much time and effort and patience has been expended to bring the work of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission through an international treaty, and even the exigencies of war do not necessitate complete abandonment of 15 years of work that gives such great promise for the utilization and wise conservation of the tuna resources of North and South America.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman makes a very good point.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. As a former executive of the California Division of Fish and Game, I think I know something about the problem that confronts us. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] touched on it when he spoke about it, and the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] touched on it when he spoke about the bait and the so-called lovelife of the sardine, which is used for bait. We nearly lost the sardine industry on the Pacific Coast because we were not familiar enough with the biological facts surrounding the propagation of the fish and because we overfished. We have run into great difficulties. I may say that the State of California spends a great sum of money on this each year. What we need is a greater study of the fishery resources of this country which can be increased only by knowing more about its love life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, in closing I would just like to bring home three points: The first is we do not ask for a specific subsidy; we want to be independent. Second, we need to encourage good relationships with the countries south of the border. This convention will assist in better relations with Latin America and a mutual increase in prosperity for all our peoples. Third, if we are going to study the love life of cattle, hogs, and everything else in this country, certainly there can be nothing wrong in studying the love life of the tuna which also is a very important segment of the American economy.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, about 12 years ago I became interested in the stockpile program for strategic and critical materials. I was amazed to find that we had no law establishing a stockpile. The Military Affairs Committee went about the business of writing a law known on its enactment as Public Law 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. That was the first stockpiling law in our Nation's history. In 1946 we revised that law in the Seventy-ninth Congress as Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which is the present stockpile law.

I have throughout the past 12 years had occasion to study this matter intensively, and I see on the floor here just now men who have worked with me in that field. I refer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON]—I saw him here a moment ago; he is gone now. I have seen several men here this afternoon who have a like interest with mine regarding the welfare and well-being and adequacy of our stockpile of strategic and critical materials. I will say this, that back in 1946 when we wrote Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the gentleman from North Carolina and I had definitely in mind a yardstick, an objective, to give this Nation a little better protection in the matter of strategic and critical materials for any war challenge that might come. I notice also the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] who has always been active with us.

We have watched this program carefully and very diligently throughout all the years. The objective was set in 1946 before we had what we now recognize as a known adversary; but when the Korean war came along we had not achieved over 34 percent of the planned objective of what was originally estimated as our need. When the Korean war came along those needs were also boosted tremendously, so that here even with the added acquisitions of the past year we have still only approximately 40 percent of the stockpile on hand.

I am very pleased with the stepped-up record of the responsible officials of the

Munitions Board and GSA in the matter of the acquisition of stockpiles during the past year. But I was alarmed when I saw in this bill no item for additional funds for stockpiling. I then turned to the hearings and the committee report. I find from the hearings reference to the fact that there is a billion-dollar item in the President's budget message, and also that there is a plan for the Committee on Appropriations to take that matter up later on. May I inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee if that is not the plan?

Mr. THOMAS. First, may I make an observation, then I will answer the question. This subcommittee wants to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] for his careful study and hard work on the stockpiling program. A large part of its success is certainly due to his untiring efforts.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say that at no time in the last 3 years or any other time—if I am in error I wish to be corrected but if my memory serves me correctly—has this committee ever denied one 5-cent piece for the stockpiling of critical material. As a matter of fact, in the fiscal year 1951 here is what this committee granted them in dollars and cents: First, in the 1950 bill we gave them $525,000,000, no reduction, for the stockpiling of critical material. In 1951 they came in with a regular bill requesting $605,000,000, which was granted. There was a supplemental bill for 1951, $598,637,000, then a second supplemental in 1951 for $1,834,000,000, a total for 1951 of $3,038,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman very much. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. The total we have given, the gentleman from Iowa should know, in 1951 alone was $3,038,548,370. The total we have given to date, including both cash and contract, is $4,458,548,370. The total they have on hand, which may interest the gentleman from Iowa, presently is $1,623,543,734.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is not yet expended?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is not yet expended.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. That brings out the information I wanted to have in this discussion.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is not obligated.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California for the information. I think it is highly important to get that before the Nation today in the course of this debate because the absence of any fund for stockpiling of strategic and critical materials in this appropriation bill may be misunderstood. I understand from the hearings that you are going to give the budget item for stockpiling further attention in the near future and I am behind that 100 percent.

This stockpile is the point where we start the adequacy of our defense. This is where we look to get the materials to build modern weapons, and we need more and more modern weapons and we cannot get them unless we have these particular materials. I know there is controversy in private industry about this stockpiling. I know that we were very wise when we placed in Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress that no part of the stockpile material could be taken out of the stockpile without authority from the Congress. It is because there are people who are watching that stockpile with an eye to getting some of it for their needs for civilian production that we have got to be careful. But we cannot have better insurance than this stockpile if we are going to match our strength against a world power at any time in the future. That is my real deep concern in the matter.

I commend the committee and hope they will continue their attention in this field and appreciate their giving me this information. I am looking forward to further developments. I am not going to stop with just this committee because I am going to keep everlastingly on the trail of the Munitions Board—they know it down there, I do not have to acquaint them with the fact I am constantly on their trail—also GSA—to make sure that they do not take their eyes off the real objective—that we may have an adequate national defense stockpile as the protection that we are entitled to have. Our action on these appropriation bills will help guarantee to my son and his buddies who are now fighting in Korea, that we are back of them with the sinews of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have requested these few minutes to make an inquiry with respect to only one or two items in this bill. One of them is with regard to the Government's contribution to the retirement fund of the Civil Service Commission. I notice the appropriation calls for $300,000,000 while the amount requested was $320,000,000. The request has been cut by $20,000,000. I think the membership of the House should know that we really do not save anything by reducing this particular item. The fact remains that the retirement fund lacks about $5,000,000,000 of being actuarily sound. In other words, it would take approximately $5,000,000,000 if the retirement fund were placed on a basis similar to that of life insurance companies.

The other matter I wanted to call attention to is the appropriation for the Comptroller General's Office.

It appears the committee has seen fit to reduce considerably the amount requested by the Office of Comptroller General. In all probability the members of the committee felt they had reasons for doing it, but I just want to say this is one agency of the Government that is an extremely important one, and is efficiently operated and managed. After all, it is the arm of Congress. It is the auditor. It is the watchdog for the Congress. It is headed by a very distinguished and able American, a man who is in my judgment doing an excellent job in his position. This is one agency that I would not want to see crippled in any respect.

In looking at the hearings it would appear that this committee has seen fit to cut down some of the top-flight positions for that office and has also reduced the amount of funds. I would like to have that explained, because I do not want this particular agency crippled in any respect. To reduce its efficiency and its ability to carry on will cost the Government many times in expenditures what might be saved by comparatively small reductions to this agency.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to our distinguished friend from Kansas that the committee shares his point of view exactly 100 percent. It is an agency that is an arm of the Congress. As a matter of fact, they have a tremendous budget, and we reduced them a little less than $500,000, and that reduction has come about by virtue of the fact that they transferred some of their activities to the Post Office Department where heretofore have been in the General Accounting Office. Instead of cutting down the top-flight positions, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, if he will read the report carefully, we did a little legislating, and I hope the House will forgive us, but we increased his top-flight positions by five. He wanted eleven and we gave him five.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate that. This is one agency that is headed by a group of outstanding, efficient men.

Mr. THOMAS. I know the gentleman will agree with us and he will not think we are sinning when we gave him those five.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly not. If the Comptroller General felt he should have more than five in those higher positions, he would favor doing so. He would not ask for them unless they were needed. He would be sure to select capable men qualified under civil service, and as I stated before, expenditures here will mean greater economies in other departments of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman made a fine statement, and we greatly appreciate it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I opposed this rule because I considered that the provisions in this bill, especially as they relate to housing, were manifestly unfair and unjustifiable. No one can deny that there is still a great shortage in housing; but, unfortunately, my Republican friends, especially the leaders, never seem to realize that the ex-servicemen and the people of this Nation are entitled to have a roof over

their heads. I called their attention to it years ago. Unfortunately, they have always more or less opposed housing legislation. In this bill they actually scuttled the laws that we passed in aid of housing, which I greatly regret. Of course, they did that under the pretense that they desire economy and to save money, which is only said on the floor of the House for political reasons and for no other. They have even inveigled some of the Democrats to vote with them to make possible the adoption of some of these outrageous restrictions as to public housing.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I agree with what the gentleman has said. In committee I opposed the provisions of the bill relating to housing. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of the Budget attempted to cut the 10-percent allotment to public housing which had been created by the Public Housing Act of 1949, when it was thought there would be 810,000 housing units started this year. That was the reason for the cut of public housing units from 135,000 to 75,000 by the Bureau of the Budget. I agree with the gentleman, we need more. But certainly this cut is unwarranted.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the gentleman. The other side does not object to using the materials for the construction of plants here and there, many of them unnecessary, but when it comes to housing they always seem to be opposed to it, and I have called their attention to it, that the people will resent it, and they will.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it the contention of the gentleman that only the Federal Government can build houses?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no. You know that I have advocated that private industry should build houses, but, unfortunately, up to a few years ago, they failed because we failed to adopt the legislation, due to the opposition of you gentleman on that side. Had we adopted the laws that were recommended by President Roosevelt 15 and 12 years ago, there would have been no shortage of housing today; but at that time, when we could have built houses for perhaps 50 cents of the dollar value today, you objected; your party is responsible for the great shortage that exists today, where the tenants are being mulcted by the owners of apartment buildings to such an extent that it is really, in many instances, an outrage and a crime.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sorry we did not build the houses then——

Mr. SABATH. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. PHILLIPS. By private ownership; but does not the gentleman think that regulation X is the main impeding restriction we have today?

Mr. SABATH. I would not say that because I have not studied that problem.

All I want to say in conclusion is this: A great deal has been said about the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I say this, that our committee 2 years ago started that investigation. It is due to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], its present chairman, and many of its members, that the old Board, that was altogether too liberal, from my viewpoint, and that I criticized, was eliminated. The new Board is trying to safeguard the rights and interests of our Treasury and our country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, in looking over the report on this appropriation bill, I was somewhat puzzled by one of the recommendations dealing with the estimates of the General Services Administration. In serving as a member of this body it has been my pleasure to work with the Administrator of General Services Administration on several matters and although this agency has not been in operation long I have been impressed with the abilities of the Administrator and the manner in which the activities of the General Services Administration are managed and supervised. I have also familiarized myself somewhat with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended by Public Law 754 of the Eighty-first Congress. As I recall, this legislation was one of the first enactments of the Congress implementing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It merged several semiautonomous bureaus and administrations into the General Services Administration, vesting the complete authority for the management of affairs in the Administrator. As previously indicated, this legislation was consonant with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to eliminate the specific legislative authorities running directly to bureaus or constituent units of organization which, of course, tended to hamper or restrict the authority of the head of an agency to manage his agency's affairs in accordance with his judgment.

The recommendation of the committee to which I allude is contained on page 10 of the report wherein it is stated as follows:

> The committee is of the opinion that it would be helpful to the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and to GSA if funds for the Public Buildings Service were submitted in a separate appropriation paragraph. As pointed out heretofore, this item constitutes nearly 90 percent of the entire operating expense appropriation and consists, to a large degree, of fixed charges. The new appropriation item should include all sums required for the administration and operation of activities under the Public Buildings Service from the Commissioner down, consisting of the rental of space, operation, and maintenance of buildings in and outside the District of Columbia, space acquisition and utilization, and related activities. The committee requests, therefore, that the Bureau of the Budget, with the assistance of GSA, submit this portion of the operating expense item as a separate appropriation paragraph in the 1953 budget.

To me, this appears to be completely incompatible with the intent of Congress in enacting the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and vesting the authority and complete responsibility for the management of the affairs and activities of the General Services Administration within the Administrator. Likewise, this recommendation seems to me to be in conflict with the objectives and legislative concepts as expressed by the Congress in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission and provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act recognize the necessity of eliminating duplicative management and administrative elements of related activities. They permit the responsible administrative official, in this case the Administrator of General Services Administration, to consolidate such unnecessary and overlapping independent activities. An essential ingredient of this facility is the establishment of an appropriation structure which is consonant with this over-all management concept. The relative proportions of funds to be utilized on individual programs under the single general management actually are not significant.

Without reasonable consolidation and without control in the Administrator, budgeting, financing, accounting, and reporting transactions are multiplied in almost geometric proportion. Information recently developed by the Expenditures Committee points up the almost unbelievable amount of paper work required in procurement and related financing and accounting operations at the Detroit Ordnance Arsenal. The proposed change in the appropriation structure of the General Services Administration differs only in degree and not in principle.

The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 provides in section 113 (a) that—

> The head of each executive agency shall establish and maintain systems of accounting and internal control designed to provide: (1) Full disclosure of the financial results of the agency's activities; (2) adequate financial information needed for the agency's management purposes; (3) effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets for which the agency is responsible, including appropriate internal audit; (4) reliable accounting results to serve as the basis for preparation and support of the agency's budget requests, for controlling the execution of its budget, and for providing financial information required by the Bureau of the Budget under section 213 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23); (5) suitable integration of the accounting of the agency with the accounting of the Treasury Department in connection with the central accounting and reporting responsibilities imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury by section 114 of this part.

I had thought that in accordance with the authorities conferred upon the Administrator by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and the legislative intent of the Congress with respect to budget and accounting matters, that this agency's budget has been presented in a manner which reflects reliable financial effects of each and all of its functions and activities. If this is not the case I feel sure the GSA can

and will perform properly under existing appropriations structure.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that this agency is attempting to streamline its budget and accounting operations and plans to make a further appropriation consolidation, subject to the approval of the Appropriations Committee, which will lessen their accounting burden but will at the same time enable and permit them to report to Congress the full disclosure of the financial results of each individual activity of the agency.

Of course, as the Members of this body know, the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 was, in fact, a legislative enactment and sanction of the joint accounting improvement program currently being conducted by the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department. Therefore, it follows that the recommendation as contained in the committee report is in conflict with the joint accounting improvement program.

It is therefore of deep concern to me that the Committee on Appropriations should make a recommendation which tends to revert to the adoption of some of the ills as pointed out by the Hoover Commission which will tend to restrict the flexibility of the Administrator of the General Services Administration in the management of one of the most important agencies of the Government, and would place an added and unnecessary accounting burden on the agency.

The proposed changes in the appropriation structure seem to me to tend toward the kind of condition we found at the Detroit Arsenal. I feel certain that the committee does not intend to promote such a condition. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one or two questions. I believe it was his committee's primary concern to get before it all information covering the related activities of the General Services Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. You have no particular desire to set up a separate paragraph or to transfer jurisdiction of authority to a unit head, do you?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. And you would not want to take any action which would increase the accounting difficulties or the administrative burden?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. If the committee report would carry to that extreme the requirements on General Services you would not insist upon it?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, who has certainly carried a tremendous load and who has done so much constructive work along this line, that of all the things the committee is interested in certainly one is to avoid any increase in administrative expense. You can certainly rely upon us that all we want is a clear-cut picture of all the administrative details. If they can get those details to the committee in any shape, manner, or form we will welcome it. We do not want them to go to any extra trouble. If they can do it without setting up any bookkeeping activities, so much the better from our point of view.

Mr. HARDY. I am deeply grateful to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, so that the House may enjoy the National Polish Day ceremony.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I inquire what time the House will meet tomorrow.

Mr. THOMAS. I will ask unanimous consent later that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to convene tomorrow at 11 a. m.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PRIEST] having assumed the chair, Mr. CHELF, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) entitled "An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51–20.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to special order heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] for 2 hours.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, in the history and development of modern democratic governments, it is usually the constitution of these governments that sets the standards and the rallying points of advancing political and economic freedom.

The Polish tradition of liberty and democracy found brilliant expression in the 3d of May constitution of 1791, the most democratic constitution to have been promulgated in the Old World up to that time. And it was the only constitution received by any nation without bloodshed. This constitution, expressing the genius and the tradition of the Polish people, recognized the equality of all men, proclaimed religious liberty and established by basic law the freedom of thought and speech. This constitution, this charter of human liberty, was adopted in Poland on the very heels of the American and French revolutions. Thus Poland joined with the new American Republic in enshrining in basic law the ideals of human dignity and liberty.

The similiarity between the American Constitution and the Polish Constitution, of Polish liberty and American liberty, was not one of mere coincidence in time. Historic contribution to American independence and to victory in our war of liberation was made by many gallant sons of Poland, whose names are well known in American history, heroes who rushed to these shores as soon as they heard the thrilling call of men to arms in the battle of liberty.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 did not, of course, long endure. The tyrants of Russia, Austria, and Prussia could not tolerate this bold flowering of human spirit. They could not permit, in close proximity to their territory, the spectacle of human dignity, worth, and freedom, this cultivation of the dangerous doctrine of democracy. And so Poland was extinguished as a nation.

Not until 1918, through the intervention of that great President, Woodrow Wilson, was Poland again free. It was President Wilson who then expressed as our American doctrine the position that every people has the inherent right to determine its own national destiny.

Today again the torch of liberty is extinguished in Poland. And yet the name of Poland should bring warmth to the hearts of every lover of freedom throughout the world. Our United States owes a special debt of honor to the Polish people, they whose heroism has kept alive so long the light of freedom in Eastern Europe. It is Poland which was made the reason for opening of World War II. It is Poland which, ironically

enough, we find nevertheless today in the toils of Soviet tyranny and slavery.

There is a tragic injustice in Poland's fate, in view of her glorious record of determination and sacrifice for the cause of liberty throughout the world. But Poland's fate is not unique. In our kind of world there will scarcely be justice for Poland until there is justice for Eastern Europe, justice for all of mankind.

The mask has now been stripped from the face of Communist aggression, and underneath it we find the grim countenance of Soviet imperialism which threatens to engulf not only Europe but eventually all of the world, unless the free people of the world come to an early awakening of the grim truth.

In 1939 Poland had to stand alone and hopelessly outnumbered by the Nazi hordes in its heroic defense of its freedom. The subsequent defeat of Hitler in World War II did not bring relief to stricken Poland. The world was told that Poland would again be free and independent. But the United States had not yet awakened to its responsibilities as a world power and defender of freedom. And so it was that Stalin was able to carry out his diabolical plot against Poland while the rest of the world stood helplessly by and watched a noble, freedom-loving people bludgeoned into submission. The Russian guaranties of free elections and freedom of the press proved to be empty and cynical pledges which they had no intention of fulfilling. Under a brutal campaign of terror, slavery, purges, and tyranny, Poland, a shattered nation, became subjected to Russian generals and Kremlin bureaucrats in Polish uniforms.

The tragic story of Poland is important not only to Poles but to all of the freedom-loving people of the world. It should constantly remind us of two very important lessons. First, it should impress upon our minds the necessity of international cooperation and action through the United Nations to prevent aggression and to protect the independence of small nations. And it should also be an everlasting reminder that when the Russians speak of democracy and promise freedom, they are in reality thinking of tyranny and promising slavery.

But the United Nations, in order to continue to retain the respect of the civilized world, must have a firm determination to act with courage and speed to prevent aggression. It will then again be the hope of mankind and capture the imagination of all peoples, even those living under the iron curtain.

The determination to finally stand up and resist aggression in Korea was a great step forward. It revived a light of hope to the free people of the world. But let us not let them down again, for we may never have another chance.

Now that the future of our own America is so obviously threatened by the menace of Soviet aggression, it is imperative that all Americans be made aware of what Soviet ruthlessness and what the callousness of Red Russian policy really means.

The American people and the world must be told also and clearly what our policy is, and we must firmly stand by it. This is no time for partisanship and no time to seek partisan capital out of a critical world situation. Nero fiddled while Rome burned. And we today are engaging in an old-fashioned partisan battle while our very existence is at stake.

We have no longer any moral or legal grounds to remain bound to the compacts of Yalta and Tehran. Russia has violated them in spirit and in deed.

But there are some among us today who are willing to make political capital out of the Yalta and Tehran agreements and in the same breath advocate a defeatist policy of isolationism; a policy of refusal to help Europe defend itself against communism, a policy which not only brings bleak gloom and despair to those in Poland and other countries beyond the iron curtain in whom there still remains some hope and confidence, but what is most tragic, a policy which cannot help but bring communism closer to our own shores.

And nowhere in the recent policy speeches in the great debate can we yet find any assurance that those who rise against the Russian despot elsewhere can count on our moral and material support. We seem strangely indifferent to the fate of those on the other side of the iron curtain.

I am thoroughly convinced that the people of Poland, in whom the spirit of freedom and liberty has always burned brightly, cannot and will not submit indefinitely to the rule of their Communist oppressors. I am confident that when the opportunity presents itself, the Polish people will throw off the yoke of dictatorship and again seek the freedom and independence which is their right and their ultimate destiny.

One of our best allies in the coming struggle with Soviet Russia, a struggle which appears to be more certain with every passing day, will be those Polish patriots who have so long made their mark upon the pages of the struggle for liberty throughout the world.

Let us proclaim in ringing words that the free portion of mankind will never reconcile itself to the permanent enslavement of those now subjugated by the Communists; that we shall not consider our job done until there is a complete liberation of all the Sovietized people. Let us break down their awful sense of isolation from the democratic world.

And words alone will not be enough. They must be backed by deeds—dramatic, forthright, and unequivocal. Only then shall we come to the great conflict of our era with clean hands and clean consciences. Only then will we capture the powerful, and perhaps decisive, weapon represented by the explosive discontents, by the aspirations for freedom, in the Communist dominated part of the world.

President Truman on April 6, 1945, said:

> We shall refuse to recognize any Government imposed on any nation by the force of any foreign power.

Let us repeat and implement that pledge with a positive and forceful declaration that we shall never rest until true freedom is restored to all freedom-loving people of the world, and until the obscene shadows of Kremlin power and Kremlin ambitions are lifted by the combined might of freemen on both sides of the iron curtain.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman for the scholarly, splendid address he has made, and to join with him in the expressions he has given to the House today. I also want to say that I, too, look forward to the day, as I know the people of America do, when once again there will sound from the radios of Poland the strains of Chopin's Polonaise Militaire proclaiming to the world that Poland is again free.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this day in the annals of history records the great advance of the liberty loving and democratic people of Poland. On May 3, 1791, the Parliament of Poland adopted her famous constitution. This was a milestone on the highway of progress which followed along the same course as that prescribed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; which made America the land of the free, the champion of the oppressed, and a friend of all mankind. On the basis of our constitutional achievements, the world today looks to us for guidance and support.

Over the course of centuries the people of Poland have made progress and their objective has always been to live peacefully with their neighbors, while at home their fundamental desire, premised on a wholesome family life imbued with a religious fervor, was patterned to grow into a nation dedicated to the principle of perpetuating human dignity and the freedom of the citizen. The concept among the people of Poland, which is so deeply ingrained, holds that government is the servant and not the master, and accordingly that the duly chosen representatives of the people must carry out the untrammeled will of the electorate and not impose its autocratic will upon those whom it was intended to serve.

The people of Poland at this time, subjugated as they are by a despised and unfriendly foreign ideology and power, yearn for the day when the yoke of this oppression may be broken and discarded forever and the perverted and godless foe driven beyond its border. The people of Poland walled off behind the iron curtain may be assured that the American people, spurred by the patriotism and exemplary lives of more than 7,000,000 Americans of Polish antecedents, share the hopes and the aspirations of the people of Poland. We want to assure them, Mr. Speaker, on this day commemorating the adoption of the great Polish document of freedom that we have neither forgotten nor abandoned them to the bestiality of communistic dominance and control. No barrier, be it iron curtain or Chinese wall, will ever isolate or divide the people of Poland from their friends in the United

States of America. Every loyal American prays for the day when friendly relations between the Poles and the Americans may be freely and happily resumed, when the communistic hordes will be driven out or destroyed, and the glory that is Poland once again brought into its own. The imprint of the Muscovite horde and the welt of their murderous whiplash will be eradicated and healed, please God at the earliest day.

We in America, like our brethren in Poland, hold fast to the teaching of our Holy Mother the Church, deriving our daily sustenance in our undying faith that Poland's bonds will be broken and that she will rise again along with her sister nations who have been chained and enslaved by the fiends of communism. The spirit of the true Christian like a cuirass will give protection to the faithful people of Poland in their unshaken will as expressed in their daily prayers. Each day as the sun rises they will continue to raise their eyes and their hearts toward Mary the Queen of the Polish Crown, and in her intercession there will be the final assurance of Poland's complete restoration and the resumption of Poland's rightful place in the family of friendly nations.

The periods of persecution which the people of Poland seemingly must endure from time to time tends to temper the spirit which makes them a race which can never be exterminated and which will live forever.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the institution of the constitution of Poland.

After centuries of subjugation and the travail of conquering partitions, Poland emerged from the maelstrom of World War I as an integrated and full-fledged democracy in middle Europe.

Modern Poland and the democratic constitution under which it functioned were a monument to the political genius of Woodrow Wilson.

Modeled closely upon our own scheme of representative government, the Polish Constitution brought order to a people who had cherished and nurtured the hope of liberty with grim determination against seemingly hopeless odds throughout years of desperation.

How bitter, then, must be the hearts of the liberty-loving Poles in viewing today what appears to be the wreckage of their hopes.

The constitution so laboriously brought forth for the governance of free Poland is today prostituted to the manipulations of a puppet government which serves the beck and call of its masters in the Kremlin.

Its guaranties of political, social, and religious freedom are reduced to grimly ironic platitudes in the obscene mouthings of men who neither love Poland nor respect any constitution.

The tragedy which has befallen Poland in the form of her present partition is the more awful because it seemingly was accomplished under the forms and procedures of her democratic constitution.

The world outside the iron curtain knows, however, that the overpowering army of a hostile neighbor is the cause of Poland's plight, and that her constitution is truly suspended under the tyrannical government which rules her soil as a satellite of Soviet Russia.

When our own great charter of Federal Government went into effect, Benjamin Franklin stated that—

> Our Constitution is in actual operation; everything appears to promise it will last, but in this world nothing is certain but death and taxes.

The same appearances of promise attended the inauguration of the Polish Constitution. It was drafted here on our own soil. It was devised and intended to last for perpetuity. But its inherent virtue as an instrument of government was destroyed by venal men who were unworthy of its blessings.

Therein lies the pity and the tragedy of the present woeful state of the Polish Constitution.

Governments—

> Said the founder of Pennsylvania—
>
> like clocks, go from the motion men give them and, as governments are made and moved by men, so by men they are ruined, too. Therefore, governments rather depend upon men than men upon governments.

The successful usurpation of the Government of Poland by men of political immorality leaves her constitution unscathed. The true virtue of Poland is in the body of her people.

When those people shall rise again, as they always have, from the ruins of their nation's conquest, they shall again clothe themselves with the adornments of freedom, justice, and brotherhood under the Polish Constitution.

It is only a matter of time and let us hope it will be soon, when the brave, liberty-loving people of Poland, a deeply religious people, will again regain their freedom and independence.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished dean of the Illinois delegation [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago it was my privilege in this House to speak on the one hundred and sixteenth anniversary of the adoption of the constitution submitted by King Stanislas Augustus II to the Polish Diet; today we recall the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of this event which lives in the minds and the memory of Poles everywhere. This document embodied the dreams of a great leader—dreams of liberty and democracy for a nation and its people following the liberation of struggling Poland from Prussian and Russian despotism. It is significant to note that this constitution was adopted about 15 years after our immortal Constitution became a reality. It was hailed by the Polish Congress of that day as a master document, and it received the unanimous approval of the Diet. Polish nationalism and Polish democracy had at last been achieved in the minds of the leaders of that day. There was joy and exultation throughout the land. The lights of Warsaw blazoned throughout the night; at last they were free.

It was the hope and dream of King Stanislas and his followers that from this constitution would come the stability to discourage the aggressive plans of her powerful neighbors. It sought to establish order under law. It held that reform without order was a tragic waste. This was perhaps its greatest promise to the people of Poland.

With powerful and ruthless dictators firmly entrenched on both sides, the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people were all too soon crushed by the second and third partitions in 1793 and 1795. Then, as always, Poland was the victim of its geographical location. A land of fertile plains, with little natural defensive barriers, it soon succumbed to the rolling hordes of the German Empire and Russia. Frederick William and Catherine the Great sent their armies on a tour of devastation and subjugation once again, and Poland lost her freedom and liberty.

In 1918, during World War I, the fate of Poland and other small nations of Europe, was again uppermost in the minds of our diplomats and those of our allies. It was in 1918 that I introduced a resolution to recognize the Polish regiments who joined others in fighting the Hapsburg autocracy, as part of our allied forces, which sacrificed its all in the fight against the Kaiser and his followers in the hope that through the defeat of Imperial Germany the liberty and freedom that Poland was seeking would become a reality.

Knowing that Germany and Kaiser Wilhelm actually controlled the Austrian Army, I had urged President Wilson not to conclude a separate peace with Austria-Hungary because it would not have brought an earlier end to the war as many believed, nor would it have advanced the interest of self-determination and freedom for Poland and other oppressed peoples of Europe. I was proud indeed that I finally succeeded in convincing President Wilson that we should keep our pledge and assurance to these liberty-loving and freedom-seeking peoples by refusing to negotiate a separate peace with Austria-Hungary.

After the defeat of Germany and Austria-Hungary, I urged, together with Professor Paderewski, Professor Masaryk, and other leaders of small nations, that the United States should demand that autonomy and freedom be given these oppressed nations. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House at that time I was gratified that this was brought about and Poland reunited as a free and independent nation.

In the case of Poland, as in many other instances, history has shown that peace, democracy, and stately order cannot be confined within the borders of any one nation. The peace the people of Poland sought in that day, and the peace the peoples of the world so earnestly pray for today, can only come through a meeting of the minds of leaders in nations the world over. It can never be achieved by wars, bloodshed, slaughter, and devastation. Again, history throughout all the ages has shown that the cruel scars of the hates and enmities engendered by conflict are never healed. Even though treaties are signed providing for the peaceful solution of

problems after war's end, the sores and ugly wounds resulting from these wars suddenly become infected again, and the noble words and efforts of diplomats and statesmen around the peace table become meaningless and the treaties mere scraps of paper.

The great problem facing the world today, as always, is to change the character of dictators whose aggressive designs on weak and struggling nations inevitably result in cataclysms of horror. Difficult as this task might seem, it is not impossible. Here is to be found the basis of American foreign policy today. The United Nations is the one hope of a torn and distressed world to accomplish this end. With all of the set-backs thus far experienced, I feel very strongly that patience and determination will ultimately result in the success of the United Nations in its laudable effort to bring peace and tranquillity among nations, to bring order out of chaos in world affairs, and to end the heartless slaughter and terrible destruction the world is constantly enduring.

Only when real peace is firmly established can the people of Poland and other small nations again enjoy the true freedom, liberty, order, and justice, so clearly outlined in the historic Polish Constitution of 1791. When that day dawns, as I hope and pray it will in the very near future, the people of Poland will again witness the unanimous action of its Diet ordaining and establishing a new constitution worthy of a great people, designed along the same lofty principles of freedom, democracy, and justice for all, laid down so wisely by King Stanislas Augustus II in that eventful year 1781. I earnestly hope and confidently expect when peace becomes a reality that Poland will regain the domain wrested from her and that all her nationals will again be reunited as one in the family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on this anniversary date we recall the great work of this democratic leader as an encouragement and inspiration to the freedom-loving peoples of Poland, reminding them that the struggle for peace is unending; it must go on until its full realization is with us all. Let all who believe that people everywhere are entitled to the freedom and liberty which we enjoy, cooperate and aid in every way so that Poland's aspirations, dreams, and hopes may come true and that once again they will become one of the great nations of the world.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable date in the minds and the hearts of the people of Poland and people of Polish ancestry everywhere in the world. This is the one hundredth and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution—the charter of liberty for the people of Poland.

That great nation has been the victim of much bitter suffering and humiliation since Constitution Day in 1791. Throughout her history she has endured the disaster of military conquest at the hands of more powerful neighbors several times. She is today under the domination of the Soviet Union, and her people today are tasting the bitter dregs of Communist rule.

In company with other countries behind the darkness of the iron curtain, the people of Poland have learned the sorrowful lessons from harsh personal experience that where communism prevails there is no freedom of the body, of the mind, or of the spirit. Her people were among the first to learn that communism is a godless struggle for world dictatorship founded on atheistic materialism.

But even now, as always before when she has been ground under the heel of foreign aggression, Poland may take some measure of comfort in the inspiration of this day on which her constitutional liberties were defined and given effect 160 years ago. The memories of that great event linger on as a basis for the hope and the prayers of Poles for the dignity of freedom and independence.

A nation which produced men with the courage and the will of a Pulaski, a Sobieski, and a Kosciusko is a nation which will never succumb to the lash of the dictatorship of communism or any other atheistic dogma.

It is a nation which is determined to regain its freedom no matter how long freedom must wait.

Not alone Americans of Polish descent but Americans who admire and respect the yearning of mankind everywhere for dignity and freedom share on this day a feeling of fraternity and kinship with the people of Poland whose fight for freedom may have been slowed down by a ruthless police state, but we take comfort in the knowledge that their fight will go on until it is won.

May God speed that great day.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland—May 3, 1791—presents to us the best opportunity for an appraisal of the true meaning of the present tragic plight of Poland.

The following two undisputable facts characterize the present situation:

First. Poland always was and today still remains an essentially western country, a Christian land whose culture, civilization, and attitude were as western in its orientation as those of France, Italy, Spain, and other western European countries.

Second. At the present time, while Poland is subjugated under Communist regime whose Soviet masters are in Moscow, Poland's centuries-old ties with the western culture and with the Christian world have been cut off, against the Nation's will, against its history and tradition, and against its best interest.

Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791, was the best expression of Poland's western way of thinking, Poland's strong intellectual and ideological ties with the cultured west, as opposed to the then, and still now, barbarian east.

It seems needless to prove that what happened in Warsaw, Poland, on that historic day of May 3, 1791, was but a logical result of the Poles' thinking and feeling along the lines of the then undergoing revolutionary changes in France, and, indeed, in these United States.

The powerful wind that was blowing from the west could not fail to reach Poland. The overthrow of the obsolete and tyrannical French monarchy, the ensuing currents of liberation of the human flesh and soul from dictatorial bondage, the actions undertaken by the revolutionary leaders of this country, have as they indeed must have, influenced the thinking and the conduct of the leaders of Poland.

Although Poland's monarchical system and the elective kings that it installed on Poland's throne, were in many ways much more liberal and certainly less dictatorial than most of the monarchical systems at the time prevailing in Europe—it was, nevertheless, true that a majority of Poland's population, especially the peasant class and the inhabitants of that country's towns and cities, were deprived of any influence on the affairs of state, at that time, before adoption of the liberal constitution of 1791. It is also true, however, that no other country in Europe had, at that time, a more democratic system of government based on a limited constituency.

The adoption of the constitution of May 3, 1791, brought Poland into the ranks of the new democracies of the world. Being threatened then—as she was throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—and up to date, unfortunately, by separate or combined efforts of Russia and Germany, regardless of the coloring of the regimes that the two predatory countries might have at their respective helms at any time, Poland has seen fit to enlarge the constituency upon which the Government was based, to give complete equality to all classes of its population, and to make a decisive step on exactly the same way to self-government, that this Nation had chosen under George Washington, assisted by the great son of Poland, Thaddeus Kosciusko.

The numerous provisions of the May 3 constitution include certain basic elements which have retained a lasting value for the Polish nation, as well as a number of valuable, just, and sound decisions.

The greatness of the May 3, 1791, constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system, and that is also the reason why this day marks both the crowning act of regeneration of the spirit of the Polish nation in the second half of the eighteenth century and, also, a testament of the progressive and evolutionary methods with which the Poles entered political life after the temporary downfall of their own state.

In the very forefront of lasting contributions of this constitution we must place the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which sovereignty was also made the primary postulate of

the first constitution of the restored Poland, passed on March 17, 1921. In the 1791 constitution this principle was formulated in the words:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation. Three distinct powers shall compose the Government of the Polish nation, according to the present constitution, viz:

1. Legislative power in the states assembled.

2. Executive power in the King and council of inspection.

3. Judicial power in jurisdiction existing, or to be established.

To any Western European, who had been reared in the French ideas, or even more in the age-old parliamentarianism of Britain, or in the principles which have been natural to the United States from their very beginning, this principle is almost a truism, and something natural in itself. But in Eastern and Central Europe it cuts off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared throughout the centuries in the principle of state, and not national sovereignty.

The philosophy of government discernable throughout this Polish Constitution would lead one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Throughout the May 3 constitution runs a philosophy of humanitarianism and tolerance, such as—

We publish and proclaim a perfect and entire liberty to all people, either who may be newly coming to settle, or those who, having emigrated, would return to their native country; and we declare most solemnly, that any person coming into Poland, from whatever part of the world or returning from abroad, as soon as he sets his foot on the territory of the republic, becomes free and at liberty to exercise his industry, wherever and in whatever manner he pleases, to settle either in towns or villages, to form, and rent lands and houses, on tenures and contracts, for as long a term as may be agreed on; with liberty to remain, or to remove, after having fulfilled the obligations he may have voluntarily entered into.

We find in this Polish Constitution, adopted almost contemporaneously with our own Federal Constitution, rule by majority, secret ballot at public elections, and the language relating to religion that—

The same holy religion commands us to love our neighbors, we, therefore, owe to all people of whatever persuasion, peace in matters of faith, and the protection of government; consequently, we assure, to all persuasions and religions, freedom and liberty, according to the laws of the country, and in all dominions of the republic.

Thus, it was on May 3, in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life.

That is why Poles everywhere since that year on May 3, on the anniversary of the adoption of this liberal constitution, celebrate their national holiday. In observing this day, we are joining Poles all over the world—in establishing spiritual contact with the only country where no celebrations of this national Polish holiday are allowed—namely, in liberated Poland.

Russia and Germany—or Prussia as it was then called—prevented Poland from gaining strength under the new constitution and with the assistance of the then existing Austrian monarchy proceeded to perpetrate the worst crime of the nineteenth century, the occupation and dismemberment of Poland.

The same crime was perpetrated by the same partners—minus Austria, of course—in 1939. And once more, the same crime was perpetrated by the only remaining member of the international criminal gang—Russia, under Stalin this time as in 1939—after the last war in 1945.

It seems improper to sound facetious in discussing problems of such gravity, magnitude and purport, as the problem of Poland. But, one cannot help but feel a little encouraged when one realizes that there is only one member of the international predatory group left—Soviet Russia.

Our President, speaking on behalf of the United States, has stated that—

Our country would not recognize any government imposed on any nation by the forces of any foreign power.

This looking toward a resurrection of a free Poland will find heart in the pledge of the American people.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the Polish National Constitution.

Every loyal son of Poland, whether in the motherland or living beyond its borders, celebrates this anniversary with patriotic pride. Every loyal friend of the brave and freedom-loving Polish people joints in commemorating this day with the hope that the time is not too far distant when Poland will again become a free and independent nation.

Poland, back through the years, has always fought for liberty and freedom whenever its domain has been encroached upon by powerful aggressor nations. In the recent war Poland was the first nation to take a stand, not only against the Panzer divisions of the Nazis but also against the vicious onslaught of the Soviet tyrant. Poland did not submit meekly agains terrific odds as did other nations at the beginning of World War II. As we look back upon the beginning of Hitler's aggression, we remember how Hitler conquered country after country and the world looked with hope that his onslaught would be hampered and delayed. The world will never forget the valiant and brave defense of Warsaw in September of 1939 by the heroic stand of the Polish Army. The heroic Polish people from the beginning of the war battled the invader not only within their own borders but also on every other battle front in Europe until the enemy surrendered. Poland's loss, per capita, was the greatest in human life and with prisoners in murderous concentration camps of any nation in that conflict.

Poland carried through and fought on and was deserving of the highest reward for the victory, but today Poland is not free. She is governed by a communistic regime forced upon her by Soviet Russia. The Polish people are not Communists. They believe in free enterprise and freedom of religion. They are a Christian people. The Polish people have defended Christianity for centuries and will continue to do so until the last vestige of atheistic communism is driven from their country.

Poland has a right to demand the restoration of her eastern boundaries as they were in 1939 and her western boundaries permanently fixed on the Oder-Niesse line. This is territory from which she has been robbed and it must be returned.

The Russian betrayal, as it allowed the Nazi overlords to slaughter the Polish people, will be recorded as history's most barbarous duplicity and treachery.

The discovery of the graves of over 5,000 Polish officers near Katyn on April 12, 1943, reveals a new low in international banditry, the like of which has never been surpassed in world history. Over a year and a half ago I called upon the State Department, International Red Cross, and also in a speech on the floor of Congress, demanded that a special investigation be instituted in order to secure concrete and direct evidence to officially determine the responsibility for the massacre at Katyn. In response to this, both of these departments assured me that every effort would be made to directly place the responsibility for this violation of international law regarding captive soldiers.

I am recalling these facts because it is our duty to keep alive in the minds of free nations everywhere the type of criminal intellect which predominates the brain of the present rulers of the communistic Soviet regime. It is evident now that the democratic and free nations of the world must marshal all their forces to stamp out the spread of dictatorial aggression and not repeat the mistakes that were made after World War I when the isolationists got control of our Government and repudiated Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. Had America, the greatest Nation of the world, accepted its responsibilities 30 years ago, aggression by dictators could have been stopped and World War II would have been avoided.

We must now rally behind the United Nations, and it is my earnest hope and belief that the steps that we have taken in Korea to stop aggression, will be the beginning of the age-old effort to successfully outlaw war. No international organization similar to the strength and power of the United Nations has ever been tried in world history before. Let us hope that we have found a solution.

We must follow through. If we do, Stalin will either be crushed from without or overthrown by his own subjects from within. The gallant Polish nation, which has fought so many defensive wars in times past, will again achieve the in-

dependence, the liberty and the peace to which she is entitled. Until Russia proves by her actions that she is willing to cooperate instead of dominate, the United Nations must be ready and on guard for any surprise attack.

The time has now come when every nation in the world which intends to survive, must know that it cannot make agreements with other nations and discard them. High on the priority list of wrongs to be undone, is to require that Russia withdraw all of her military and civilian forces from Poland and permit that heroic nation to breathe freely again. The same yardstick applies to other nations under the whiplash of tyranny. The democratic nations wanted peace too much when the war was raging with Japan. That was before the atom bomb appeared on the scene. Unfortunate concessions were made to Russia for her help in the Japanese war theater.

The mistakes made at Yalta 6 years ago today in yielding to the Russians must be corrected and rectified. At that time, our military leaders underestimated our strength. We did not know then that the atom bomb was soon to knock Japan into surrender. Yalta and Tehran and the results of the mistakes incident to those conclaves, will be a threat to world peace until the day comes when the Soviet aggressor retreats behind its own border. Russia has broken its promises—agreements made at Yalta and Tehran should be thrown in the wastebasket.

Where slavery by a dictator exists as it does in Poland, or any other nation who wishes to be free, it stands as a threat to freedom everywhere. The communistic dictatorship will be eventually overthrown in Russia and it is our earnest hope that this will come about from a revolution within. Whether from within or from outside force, Soviet dictatorship of democratic countries cannot continue. Our sacrifices to protect freedom throughout the world are costly, but necessary.

A free and independent Poland will rise again so that Polish Constitution day, May 3, can continue to be a reality.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world today, all Poles and all persons of Polish extraction together with all freedom-loving people pause to commemorate the Polish Fourth of July. One hundred and sixty years ago today, the Polish Constitution was adopted, a very definite step toward the recognition of the basic right of all people to a free and democratic way of life.

The history of the Polish people is a glorious one—it is a record of valor unsurpassed, of courage without fear, of honor without blemish. And so it is fitting today that we recall Poland's magnificent heritage, ever present through the years, that we recall that spirit of Poland which never yielded its devotion to an ideal.

It has been said that the true measure of a people's greatness is in its fidelity to its native ideals. If this be true, then the Polish people are without peer, for the record they have achieved in resisting the forces of oppression and tyranny in the face of almost insurmountable odds stands as a splendid example to people of all races and all creeds.

Through the centuries, Poland has had her great leaders—her Pulaski, her Sobieski and her Kosciusko—men of extraordinary courage, character, and capabilities. Yet all the great men of Poland, no matter how varied their spheres of influence or how different their fields of endeavor, have inherited several things in common which gave them their reason for being—their love of God and their religion, their love of country, and their burning desire for its eventual liberation.

The heroic stand of Poland in 1939 in the face of aggression by superior force was an example of courage unparalleled in history. When Poland offered the first resistance to the overwhelming strength of Hitler and the Nazi war machine, she inspired the freedom-loving nations of the world and brought home to them the first realization of the Axis threat to civilization. Had Poland compromised instead of resisting aggression, the whole course of history might have been changed.

Poland's contribution to the success of the allied nations during World War II and the fight of her people to preserve Western civilization as they had on several previous occasions make it incumbent upon us to keep faith with the Polish people now at a time when her long-cherished freedom is once again in chains.

We must continue our efforts to restore Poland to her prewar glory. We are morally obligated to render all possible assistance to Poland in her underground struggle to break the chains of Russian communism by which she is now surrounded and which threaten to engulf all of Europe.

If we of the United Nations go forward in the spirit of the brave people of Poland, who are resisting by every possible means the domination of Communist Russia and her satellites, it is my conviction that we can build a world where intolerance and aggression are only bitter memories of the past and where the ideals of liberty and justice are adhered to by all nations of the world.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of a great historical event that took place in Poland by the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, less than 3 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States.

The lifetime of every nation is marked by certain momentous events. From generation to generation significant anniversaries are observed for the great influence wrought upon the course of history and human relations. The Bastille, the Magna Carta, the Fourth of July have a counterpart in every country.

To the Poles there is one date which for over a century and a half retains the highest, the most honored place, and is cherished by the entire Polish element throughout the world with unparalleled fervor. It is the 3d of May, when they commemorate the adoption of the constitution by the Commonwealth of Poland in 1791, which took place amid general national rejoicing and patriotic enthusiasm. May I quote at this time a part of that constitution:

> Every person, upon coming to this republic from whatsoever parts of the world or one returning to this, the country of his origin, as soon as his foot touches the Polish soil, he is entirely free to indulge in whatsoever enterprise he wishes to enter, in the manner and place of his own choice; that person is free to enter into contact for purchase of property, for work, for rent in whatever manner and for whatever time he himself agrees upon; he is at liberty to settle in the city or in the village; he is free to live in Poland or to return to whatever country he himself chooses after his commitments in Poland which he voluntarily embraced, are duly performed and completed.

This constitution of May 3 abolished restrictions upon the freedom of the individual and gave the Polish nation a democratic form of government. However, due to the aggressiveness of its neighbors, the Polish nation was allowed by a short time in which to enjoy the blessings of its democratic rule. The three powerful neighbors of Poland—Russia, Germany and Austria—were dissatisfied with the reforms introduced in Poland by this constitution. They connived among themselves, and partitioning Poland, put an end to the freedom and democracy of the Polish nation. It was not until much later, that, thanks to the efforts of one of our presidents, Woodrow Wilson, it regained its freedom and independence.

With almost 1,000 years of national existence, Poland ranks among the oldest European nations. Varied was her fortune through the centuries. There was a time when she constituted one of the major powers of Europe, when princes and monarchs sought her favor and aid; but at no time has she sought her neighbors' possessions, or sinned by invading and terrorizing their lands. If she grew territorially, it was not through conquest, but as a result of concord with the adjoining countries who freely desired a permanent union with her. For through alliance with Poland they found the realization of the freedom and personal liberties which no other country offered.

The Poles have a deep, natural love of freedom; it is something so vital in their soul that they fight and die for it wherever it is attacked, or where it is to be gained or ransomed at the cost of wounds and blood. Upon the pages of American history their names are honorably recorded for their contribution to the independence of this country. Kosciusko and Pulaski serve not only as a classic evidence, but shall forever remain revered national heroes of Poland and the United States.

Confronted with tremendously adverse and crucial conditions of the present day, the Polish Nation looks expectantly to the magnanimity and democracy of the United States for assistance in dispelling the yoke of aggression enforced upon her by outside influences, so that she may restore independence and take her place among the free nations of the world.

It is, therefore, just and reasonable to assure the people of Poland on the day of their national holiday that the United States shall not fail to extend them friendly support nor relax in vigilance over the execution of justice. Our great and prosperous republic bears proudly the banner of humane policies. It has drawn universal respect as a decided enemy of injustice and enslavement. It will not, it cannot, add disappointment to the present fate of Poland.

It is impossible today to recall the Constitution of May 3 without comparing the events of the eighteenth century with what has taken place in Poland.

After years of unfortunate appeasement of Germany, during the dark days of September 1939, it was the Polish Nation which first took up arms against the evil forces of violence and aggression. The events of war developed in such a way that many of us subconsciously forget the part that Poland played in World War II. We forget the ideals and the principles, which Poland rose to defend, and which are being fought for today by almost the entire world. We forget that the chief slogan at the outbreak of war was the struggle for individual freedom, the defense of the weaker against the stronger, the struggle for justice above evil.

In the opening days of World War II, President Roosevelt called Poland an inspiration to all nations, because Poland alone dared defy the Germans in their ruthless challenge of those freedoms and democratic liberties championed by Poland.

It was but a short-lived appellation. Poland, that inspiration to all nations, was ignominiously sold down the Soviet river and today it is languishing in the throes of Russian forced slavery.

Today Poland's sons, scattered through the various parts of the globe, dare not place their foot upon Polish soil for fear of unjust reprisals, uncertain of their property and life in the land of their origin because Poland's political life is dominated by secret police and puppet agents of Soviet Russia who control its political life.

The third of May has ceased to be an official Polish national holiday in Poland by decree of the present regime in Poland. But the third of May remains a Polish national holiday in the hearts of all true Poland, and in all centers in the United States where Poles or Americans of Polish extraction live. In numerous Polish national homes, the Polish flag hangs proudly on this day, side by side with the American Stars and Stripes. Thousands of people listen attentively to the voices of the past. They hope that there will again be a Poland which in the spirit of the constitution of May 3 will be independent once more and free from foreign invaders.

On this day, the third of May, the hearts and minds of the American people are as one with the Polish nation, linked by indissoluble bonds of friendship with the United States. For the principles of the 3d of May constitution are in line with the ideals on which the American Nation bases its existence and the realization which America desires for all the people of the world.

So on this day, the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the constitution of the 3d of May of Poland, let us give our Polish friends our most sincere assurance of our moral support; to cheer them; to encourage them in their continued fight for freedom in the full sense of the word. Long live Poland.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the birth of an idea—the idea of modern government based on democratic principles.

In the eighteenth century Poland, extending from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea, was still a large country, the third in size among European states. But she was growing weaker internally, owing to the exhausting war fought in the seventeenth century and the lack of a strong executive. In 1764 Catherine II of Russia imposed on the electors her own candidate, Stanislaus Poniatowski, who was the last king of Poland. He was entirely under the influence of Russia, who did all she could to maintain chaos in the country. An attempt at resistance was made and a military league, the Confederation of Bar, to drive out the Russian troops from Poland, was formed under the leadership of Casimir Pulaski, who later became one of the heroes of the American Revolution. The Confederation broke, and in 1772 the first partition of Poland took place. Prussia annexed Pomorze, that is the Baltic coast, Russia, the eastern provinces, and Austria, the southeastern parts.

Deeply shaken by this disaster, the Polish people started stupendous internal reforms. The first Ministry of Public Education in the world was created in Poland in 1773, the treasury and army were reorganized, and a new constitution was voted on May 3, 1791. That day has since been the Polish national holiday. The constitution of May 3 established the foundations of modern government on democratic principles. At that time only England, France, and Poland had a liberal constitution in Europe, all the other countries being ruled by despotic regimes. The autocrats of Russia and Prussia called the democratic Polish constitution anarchy and annexed further provinces of Poland in 1793. Thereupon General Kosciusko issued a proclamation calling the Polish nation to arms. After a few initial victories Kosciusko was defeated and Poland lost her freedom in 1795.

The partition of Poland—

Says Lord Eversly, the English historian—

although remote and indirect, was the essential cause of the World War. The partition overthrew the European equilibrium and introduced the victory of violence and the principle: Might is right.

Throughout the nineteenth century the Polish Nation never lost hope of regaining independence. During the Napoleonic era, General Dabrowski formed Polish legions to fight on the side of France in Italy. It was then that the song Poland Is Not Yet Lost was composed, later to become the national anthem of reborn Poland. Napoleon intended to reestablish the Polish State and created its nucleus, the Dutchy of Warsaw. After Napoleon's fall the Congress of Vienna in 1815 assigned the major part of Poland to Russia. But the Tsar exercised such tyranny that the Polish Nation rose in 1830 to free itself from Russian bondage. The insurrection was suppressed after a year's war and the last shadow of freedom was taken away from Poland.

In 1863 the Poles rose again. A secret revolutionary government was formed in Warsaw with Romuald Traugutt at its head. But the insurrection was eventually suppressed with great difficulty; tens of thousands of Poles were executed, Traugutt and others were seized and deported to Siberia. Henceforth Poland was treated with the utmost ruthlessness, no efforts being spared to Russify the Polish Nation.

POLAND, TOO, HAD ITS KOREA

One could list the events in Poland from 1863 through the present time, including World War I and World War II.

Suffice it to say that, like the people of Korea, the people of Poland have been split by artificial means which were not successful. The thirty-eighth parallel in Korea is a travesty on the dignity of a courageous people. Let us hope that on this day, we have seen the last of parallels, Curzon lines, and so forth and that one day, even Ireland may be undivided. Covenants may separate people, but the heartbeat in every man, woman, and child makes mockery of covenants not founded on the right of a people to be governed by their consent.

Poland is not yet lost, and in our lifetime, I pray that she will again know freedom, in the true spirit of Woodrow Wilson, her benefactor.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, millions of Poles all over the world celebrate today the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the May 3 constitution of 1791. This historic document was adopted by the freedom-loving people of Poland on May 3, 1791, less than 3 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. The first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a European nation, it resembles our own Constitution in many respects. It recognized the fundamental principle of democracy that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." It guaranteed freedom of religion. It adopted the principle of division of authority among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The Polish people are proud of their constitution. It is an immortal testa-

ment to the political genius of a people who during the past 150 years have enjoyed only two decades of national freedom.

The Polish Constitution is to the Polish people their charter of liberty and is comparable to the Magna Carta for the English and the Declaration of Independence for our own beloved America. It is fitting and proper that the Congress of the United States should set aside a portion of its deliberations on this, the great national feast day of the people of Poland, and pay tribute to the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. The people of America have ever been grateful for the services rendered during the dark days of the Revolution by the brave Polish patriot, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the father of American cavalry, who gave his life for the cause of freedom while leading his troops into action during the Battle of Savannah. Count Pulaski was a tried and trusted friend of our own immortal George Washington, as was Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, who likewise served under Washington.

Today the casualty lists from Korea are full of Polish names of our brave soldiers of Polish descent whose magnificent record of patriotism and sacrifice does honor to our country, as well as to the memory of their gallant ancestors, like Pulaski, Kosciusko, Karge, Krzyanowski, and others, who fought and died for America's noble ideals.

Many thousands of my constituents are of Polish descent. I have known and admired them for many years. I have shared their sorrow when Poland was partitioned by Hitler and Stalin, and I sympathize with them with all my heart, knowing how their families and friends now suffer under the Red yoke.

What I desire to say was well expressed many years ago by George Brandes, who said:

> Old Field Marshal Moltke one day said that, in a book he had read about Poland, he had been most pleased by this sentence: "We do not love Poland as we love Germany or France or England, but as we love freedom"; a very curious remark from the lips of one whom one would not suspect of loving freedom overmuch.
>
> We love Poland as we love freedom. For what is it to love Poland but to love freedom, to have a deep sympathy with misfortune, and to admire courage and enthusiasm? Poland is a symbol—a symbol of all that the best of the human race have loved, and for which they have fought. In Poland the contrasts of human life are found in bold relief; here the cosmos is concentrated as in an essence.
>
> Everywhere in Europe where there has been any fighting, the Poles have taken part in it, on all battlefields, on all the barricades. They have sometimes been mistaken in their views of the enterprises to which they lend their arms; but they believed that they were fighting for the good of humanity; they regarded themselves as the bodyguard of freedom, and still look on everyone that fights for freedom as a brother.
>
> Poland, in the historical development of relations, has become synonymous with our hope or our illusion as to the advance of our age in culture. Its future coincides with the future of civilization.

In paying tribute to those sons and daughters of Poland who died for freedom and Christianity, and those who now continue in the noble tradition of the cross held high by the White Eagle over Poland's martyred soil, I am going to change Dante's inscription over the entrance to the Inferno which reads: "Lasciate ogni speranza voi ch'entrate"—Abandon all hope you who enter here.

To the Poles in Poland and all over the world I say: "Have hope you who now suffer and fight. Have hope that Poland will be freed to be a Christian, free, independent and happy land in a new peaceful world. If there is no hope for you, then there is no hope for the world."

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the May 3 Polish Constitution Day. To all Poles this day has the celebrated meaning of our American Fourth of July.

Because Poland's history goes back more than 1,000 years—a history filled with glory and sacrifice, one asks why have the Poles added such great significance to May 3, 1791? The reasons are many. The signing of the constitution on this day meant the end of the nobility, which at the time was the ruling class of Poland. It meant that the oppressed masses of people were emancipated. This document meant that Poland was to have a constitution modeled after our own Constitution, which was adopted only 2 years earlier, and provided for three separate and equal branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. It meant that the Polish Diet—equivalent to our Congress—was to consist of two chambers: First, the Chamber of Deputies; and, second, the Chamber of Senators, with the King at its head as presiding authority. To the Poles it meant the guaranty of religious toleration; rule by the majority of citizens; secret ballots at public elections; personal security. Poland was no longer to be a government of a few, but a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

This was the substance of the constitution which was approved on May 3, 1791, by the Polish Diet and Stanislaus August Poniatowski, Poland's last King. It was accepted by all Poles as a symbol of democracy and liberty. This document became a guide for Poland's future.

Progressive thinkers throughout Europe hailed it as a significant step in establishing a modern political system. But the recognition of equality of all men, the proclamation of religious liberty promised in the constitution, were more than Russia, Prussia, and Austria could tolerate, so these three neighboring countries attacked Poland with full force on all sides.

Poland fell in 1795 and was partitioned, but the May 3 constitution kept the spark of spirit and hope alive in the Polish people. The constitution brought moral victory for millions of Poles who became infused with a new patriotism and love of liberty. For 127 years, the Polish people thought, planned, and plotted for their national independence. Their struggle for independence never ceased. The Poles tried to free themselves many times through insurrections which failed. Even though all of their uprisings were unsuccessful, and many Poles lost their lives, the cause of freedom was never lost. The May 3 constitution served as a beacon of political freedom and democratic government.

From the role of living in bondage, the people of Poland were restored as a republic in 1918. The dreams of Polish patriots for 127 years were realized. The new government was set up, with a few technical changes, along the lines of the constitution of May 3, 1791. Once again Poland flourished as an independent nation. Her people enjoyed the privilege of democratic living. However, the happy, glowing picture of a free and independent Poland was blotted out by World War II. First, Germany invaded Poland and enslaved its people. Then the Russians took over and made a mockery of freedom and all the principles set forth in the May 3 constitution.

During this second world conflict, the Poles, inspired by the ideals of freedom and love of liberty, fought bravely on all battle fronts—in Africa, England, France, Italy. They fought at Narvik, on the Maginot Line, and at Monte Cassino. Millions of Poles gave their lives so that other people in the world might be free. They fought not only in defense of their own freedom, but also in the defense of the threatened freedom of the whole world. The western democracies assured the Polish nation repeatedly that its great sacrifices will not be in vain, and it will regain independence and freedom. The Polish nation believed in these assurances.

Unfortunately, the victorious end of World War II did not bring the richly deserved and longed-for freedom and independence to the Polish nation. Surely, freedom and independence were earned by the Poles for fulfilling a duty beyond glory. The sacrifices borne by Poland, as our ally, were not surpassed by any nation, yet she was denied her rightful place among the peoples of the world.

For this, the western democracies must bear the responsibility—since the promises given to Poland have not been kept. Regretfully, I must confess that the present administration has been a party to the betrayal of Poland at Yalta and Tehran. It agreed to turn Poland over to the Soviet sphere of interest, to Soviet bondage and complete abandonment by the western democracies.

The Polish nation under the Communist regime knows full well the tyranny of a dictator. I shall enumerate some of the changes which have taken place since the Politburo took over in Poland: the introduction of the Soviet slave-labor system for the workers; the beginning of the collectivization of agriculture; the placing at the head of the regime, and the army, well known and experienced international Communist agents; the speeding up of the Communist indoctrination of the youth; the open fight against the church; the complete economic dependence on the state.

Such is the reward of a once proud nation which was the first to take up

arms in the cause of freedom and independence. Surely, we cannot abandon the hopes and aspirations of a freedom-loving nation. The present sad plight of the Polish people can be traced back to the mistakes made by this administration when, at Yalta and Tehran, the Western Powers left Poland to the fate of Russian domination. Russia, with impunity, violated all her obligations toward Poland, and now ruling over Poland indivisibly, prepares Poles as cannon fodder for the armed clash with western democracies in its endeavors to force communism throughout the entire world. In the name of justice, is it not time for us to rectify the wrongs of Yalta and Tehran by invalidating these pacts of appeasement?

We must be ever mindful, especially on this anniversary, of the promises of our allies concerning the Polish nation, which are, to guarantee a free, strong, and independent Poland. In formulating our policies to eradicate communism, we cannot forget this unfortunate nation which is jailed behind the iron curtain.

The Polish people are not without hope. They are Poles, cheerful, hopeful, idealistic as their forefathers have been, imbued with patriotism and a deep love of freedom. They are mindful of the spirit of their constitution of May 3. Today, the torch of freedom is burning in the hearts of every Pole and with our help and God's blessings they will not rest until the day of emancipation is at hand. Deliverance of Poland from the communistic yoke will once again give the Polish people an opportunity to live in a land of freedom and independence as was the intention of the signers of Poland's historic constitution which was adopted 160 years ago today.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and proud to follow in these exercises my distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] who has just spoken to us so eloquently. I came to Congress with Mr. SADLAK and I know how close to his heart have been the matters of which he has spoken today and how diligently he has pursued them.

Each year we celebrate our Fourth of July with parades, firecrackers, and political speeches at picnics. Because we are a free people, united under one flag, we show our exuberant rejoicing in any fashion we please. But today the Polish people can only sit by their hearths and silently recall the days when they too were free and independent and united, not menaced by the constant threat of a knock on the door at midnight.

Just as the signing of the Declaration of Independence signifies to us the beginning of our determination as a united people to be free from tyranny and foreign rule, so the Polish Constitution Day, May 3, has the same deep meaning for all people of Polish origin, whether at home or abroad.

In 1791, 160 years ago, the Polish king Stanislaus Augustus II presented to the Diet this precious document, setting forth widespread reforms and granting greater individual liberty for all his people. It was adopted by acclamation, and that night lights burned in all the houses as the capital city celebrated the beginning of its newly won freedoms. Unlike surrounding countries, the Poles achieved these rights by peaceful means, without the necessity of revolting against despotic rulers. The Polish people may well be proud of the fact that their liberty was an inherited tradition, the natural evolution of centuries of self-respect and regard for the rights of others.

Poland's enjoyment of its constitution was tragically short-lived since after 2 years the armies of foreign conquerors engulfed it. At one fell swoop, Poland lost its independence, constitution, civil order, and justice which had been carefully cultivated and preserved during four centuries of progress.

But the will to resist was not lost, and through the intervening years of war and slavery, with only brief intervals of peace and independence, the hope of eventual liberation and self-determination has sustained the Polish nation in their fierce resistance to enslavement or resignation to that dire plight.

The history of Poland holds for all freedom-loving peoples a profound moral lesson. Poland's is the tragedy of a rich, fertile country, surrounded by voracious, powerful neighbors, from whom they are protected by no natural barriers.

In this country, we occasionally tend to think that our freedom and our present national strength are exclusively the result of our own unique virtues. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our infant democracy came to maturity in a country with almost unlimited natural resources and wealth, surrounded and protected from hostile countries by thousands of miles of ocean over which no trespasser could attack. So we do well to remember that the desire for liberty is not enough. Independence without the means to defend it is a hollow possession on this earth today.

With each passing day, the obstacles of space and weather are being overcome by human resourcefulness, and with this progress, our natural defenses lose their effectiveness. We can only hope, as we review the inspiring history of Poland under the most bleak and terrible ordeals, that should we ever be reduced to similar circumstances, we would strive with equal heroism and determination for our Nation's eventual freedom and independence as this small nation has done.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States often think of Eastern Europe as a part of the world having little in common with the West; an area where the population is accustomed to despotism and neither knows nor cares for anything else.

This view may or may not be true for some countries in the East. It is certainly not true for Poland. Whereas Russia looks back on a thousand years of despotic regimes, one after another, and the German-Austrian Empire evolved a very elaborate system of absolutism, Poland, between these two powerful neighbors, was one of the first countries in Europe to have a parliament and a bill of rights. True, we do not find in Poland a long-established democratic tradition in the modern western sense. But this is not due to a lack of democratic tendencies among the people as expressed in their institutions. On the contrary, in the sixteenth century, Poland already had a National Diet which controlled the King's power and regarded the unanimity principle as the cornerstone of civil liberties. Every delegate had the "liberum veto" which enabled him to stop the whole legal procedure in much the same way as in the Continental Congress of the 13 American colonies. There was not too little democratic spirit in Poland, rather too much of it. Polish individualism often endangered the interests of the whole country. It led, unfortunately, to the division of the country by its powerful neighbors. At the time when in North America as well as in Western Europe democratic tendencies were being legally consolidated and organized, Poland slipped from the main stream of political development.

For 150 years, Poland ceased to exist as an independent nation. Russia, Germany, and Austria tried vainly to de-Polandize the provinces where it had stood. After the first partition, in spite of the threatening neighbors, the Polish Diet worked for 4 years, without a break, on the project of a constitution which was ratified on May 3, 1791. This was the foundation on which the hope of freedom and further democratic development continued to rest during the dark decades of national oblivion.

It proved to be a hope that even the ruthless methods of suppression of the Germans and Russians failed to extinguish. Polish patriots fled to Western Europe and to the United States. They fought for American, Greek, Italian independence, hoping that by serving the general cause of human freedom, they would eventually help their own country to resume its place among the free nations.

Polish civilization and way of life, though Slavic, has always had its strong and inalienable ties with the West. The Polish people for example, still cling to their Roman Catholic faith despite all efforts to destroy it.

Today in Poland, a new, wholesale effort at Russianization is being made—all the more ruthless, since Poland is now cut off from the Western World. But the people who, between two partitions of their country were able to work for 4 years on a constitution that established the basis for further democratic evolution in Poland, will not yield to terrorism. The Poles have often been disillusioned in their hopes. Nevertheless, they still look to the west, and especially to the United States for inspiration. Here, they see achieved their ideal of independence. If we do not break faith with that nation whose sons have contributed so much to our own country, their hope for a rebirth of freedom will one day be realized.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the Polish leaders, inspired by our war for

independence and the rights and privileges granted to our people under our constitution, promoted a new constitution for the Polish people, under which they obtained the rights they are now being denied. Their constitution was one of the most liberal and democratic documents of its day.

Today, as we again commemorate the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, we are forced to admit that little progress has been made toward helping Poland and the other enslaved nations, to throw off the yoke of their oppressors.

The Polish people have been among the most ardent and courageous fighters for the rights granted to them under the constitution. Their history is replete with stories of their heroic sacrifices for their freedom and independence. And even today, the consecration, endurance, ingenuity and bravery of the Poles in the underground service, is almost unbelievable.

Enemies may conquer their country, but they can not conquer their spirit. These unconquerable people have made themselves the symbol of indomitable national will. If ever a nation, by sacrifice and courage, earned the right to resurrection, it is Poland.

By our economic and financial assistance to the free European countries, we are helping them to rebuild their economies and to strengthen their opposition to communism. By our efforts, with other democratic nations of the world, to prevent the spread of communism in Korea, we are helping tremendously to build up the morale of the enslaved nations, and the nations in danger of enslavement by the Communists.

May the day soon come when the freedom envisioned by the writers of the Polish constitution and for which the people of that nation have so valiantly fought and died, may be an established fact.

It is my fervent hope that through the efforts of the United Nations, it will soon be possible to find a way to restore to Poland and the other nations now behind the iron curtain, their freedom and independence, so that they may again take their places among the democratic nations of the world and enjoy the rights and privileges to which all men are entitled.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I arise before this great body as an American that loves his country and for what stands. My main reason for arising here on this 3d of May is to draw a parallel of what may happen in this country of ours if we are not careful. A review of Poland's history during the time we were fighting for our liberty may, I sincerely hope, will help to bring out the kind of a war we were fighting the last few years and are fighting today. It is not a war of armies but a war of demoralization.

During the crucial last quarter of the eighteenth century, when this great Nation of ours was being born, when the very foundations were being laid for its future might and glory, almost half around the globe a Christian nation was being murdered by its greedy neighbors.

In the course of three consecutive partitions of 1772, 1793, and 1795 the Royal Republic of Poland was first overrun and then completely dismembered and deprived of its independence for 123 years.

Americans question why do we think and talk of these far-off events today? Why do we in the United States of America commemorate the Polish Third of May 1791 Constitution? While in the course of history many nations had lived, flourished and then were crushed by their stronger neighbors, it seems to me that today more than ever we have not only to pause for a short while but we should ponder and seriously reflect on all the circumstances and many cases preceding these fateful events. As strange and even incredible as it may seem, some of the very factors which had largely contributed to Poland's fall, more than one and a half centuries ago, continue to exist and to cast their shadows not merely on the life of single nations but of the whole world including our own United States of America.

There were many reasons why, after over 800 years of existence as one of the pillars of liberty, law, and western civilization in Eastern Europe, Poland was wiped off the map of the old continent. Her intents were like ours—to live in peace. Several generations of historians wrote volumes of scholarly books on the subject searching for and finding many causes of the collapse of the Polish State, despite its great reforms realized in the 3d of May constitution.

Today, however, it is particularly proper and fitting to draw the attention of the public of our country to one of these causes often mentioned, though not always sufficiently emphasized by many historians and political thinkers.

The life of the Polish Nation, ever since the beginning of the fifteenth century, and particularly since its union with the grand duchy of Lithuania in the latter part of the sixteenth century, the whole existence of the Polish Commonwealth was based on political and religious freedom, on national and racial tolerance. For over three centuries its elected kings were not autocratic monarchs but rather chief executives, whose personal rule was restricted, controlled, and checked by statutes of law; royal privileges signed by the king elected by the will of the electors—the gentry—organized in provincial dietines and the central diet called sejm or parliament. This gave considerable measure of personal liberty to a much greater portion of the country's population at that time than in the majority of contemporary European nations.

But the very same traditions of power based on law, of free open debate, of equalitarian democracy and liberty were the source of Poland's weakness, they having been continuously exploited and abused by its expansionist neighbors, particularly by the Czarist then imperial Russia and the militaristic Prussia, as the always willing follower and accomplice of Moscow and St. Petersburg in spoliation of freedom-loving peoples of Eastern Europe.

Before Poland was partitioned in the end of the eighteenth century the Tsarist autocratic Russia true to its deep-rooted centuries-long tradition of subversion, spying, and conquest from within was buying with favors and gold influential personalities, particularly among Polish aristocracy and a few bankrupt ambitious, or irascible individuals among the gentry, to put their personal freedoms to work for the benefit of Russian despots and against the very existence of Poland as an independent state.

One is stricken today with amazement upon finding how little actual military power was used by Russia in the conquest of the eighteenth century Poland and how much effort, skill, and energy was applied by Russia's rulers and their able subordinates to weaken, sap, and destroy its victim from within, before the final blow was delivered from without.

The whole length of the eighteenth century not just one but all Russian despots, particularly Peter the Great, Peter the Third, and Catherine the Second, through their ambassadors in Warsaw, their agents and spies, often recruited among the best families of the nation, progressively and systematically strangled its independence, putting on the royal throne in Warsaw their followers the hated Saxon princes or controlling the whole reign of the last King of Poland, Stanislaus August Poniatowski.

Having expanded in Asia beyond any limits of justifiable needs they turned toward hated and disdained Europe and first of all against Poland as the nearest to Russia's outpost of western civilization. When after his gallant participation in our Revolutionary War Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko organized in 1794, a truly popular uprising against Russian domination of Poland, his troops captured the files of the Czarist Embassy in Warsaw. It was then disclosed that for years some 110 leading personalities in the country had been on the Russian payroll, not counting swarms of lesser officials who drew from the Embassy regular monthly salaries.

Over 160 years have passed since those fateful years but the Russian methods on the international scene have remained true to their basic form. Only the insatiable appetite of Moscow's rulers has since grown immensely. At present they are out not to subjugate a weaker neighbor country, they openly declare that they would not settle for less than the whole world, and the whole human race. Then it was Poland, Lithuania, and Baltic shore, now it is the whole of Asia and Europe, and as their final objective this country of ours. At that time they were buying Saxon kings, aristocrats and other influential personalities; today using the slogans of international communism as a timelier disguse they attack the most crucial segments of our very existence and of our security, that is in our foreign affairs and our atomic secrets.

It is shuddering to think what tremendous results have the Kremlin masters achieved in these two fields since the end of World War II: what immeasurable and invaluable services did they get from the Canadian spies, Hisses, Remingtons, and their influential protectors, from

Fuchses, Golds, Greenglasses, and Coplons of whom we know and from hordes of others we shall never even hear about.

The signally Russian tradition of spying, subversion and boring from within, of sapping the enemy's security has achieved during these few last years the results which must make certain heads in the Kremlin turn with glee and satisfaction. With the Communists and fellow-travelers the world over securely harnessed to the vehicle of the contemporary Russian imperialists, today have accomplished now in the matter of months what had taken scores of years and generations of spies or agents, their predecessors, the Russian Czars in the 18th century.

These, gentlemen, are the few reflections which came to my mind when thinking on the present-day significance of the events that took place at the time when the brave people of Poland were sold out. The Russian communistic mind today is the same as it was then, except that now it is more experienced. We shall always be at war as long as there exists a communistic government. I also want to assure the people of the world that as long as Poles live on this earth their hopes of freedom shall never die.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is Polish Constitution Day. Year after year during my incumbency I have stood in the well of the House to take part in this very appropriate observance. I can recall when Polish Constitution Day was a happier day.

I have been briefed repeatedly on the plight of the Poles by my good friend from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK]. I was briefed on their sufferings during the midst of the war by their great leader, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, when we broke bread under the dome of this very Capitol. I saw Polish soldiers fighting side by side with American soldiers for liberty, overseas, during World War II. I am proud to say that I have thousands and thousands of people of Polish extraction living in my congressional district, builders of America.

What can we do to inspire the liberty-loving people of Poland besides giving lip service on this very important anniversary? For one thing, we can demand the formal repudiation of the infamous Yalta agreement, which sold them down the river.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, May 3 represents a day in history when in 1791, shortly after the first partition of Poland, the Polish Diet issued a constitution which was one of the most advanced documents of its time. Today, around the world, people are commemorating this historical event, except in the home country of Poland, now controlled by Communist Russia.

There is an old Polish saying: "Wherever beats a Polish heart, wherever flows Polish blood, there is Poland."

This old saying tells us much about Poland's history of a fierce and proud people whose country was often invaded and even obliterated from the map, but whose will to live as a free and independent nation could never be crushed. The Polish desire to live a way of life marked by freedom of speech, religion, and of Government has never died.

With the first partition of Poland the Polish patriots went into exile and, though many of them knew they would never again see their homeland, they did not tire of working for a united Poland. They told Poland's story abroad and sought help among other freedom-loving nations to liberate Poland.

In 1939, when Poland was the first country to literally die for her principles of religious and personal freedom, her patriots fled again and joined the Allies. They fought in Western Europe, in Africa, and thousands of them died for their beliefs at Monte Cassino in Italy. Then there is the sad story of the 10,000 Polish officers who fled to the Russians only to be brutally and wantonly massacred by these butchers at Katyn Forest, just outside of Smolensk.

During World War II no allied country suffered the horrors of war as much as Poland. She lost one-fifth of her population, and Warsaw became the most completely destroyed city in Europe. No allied country could boast of a more active or more effective underground. But Poland had much to fight and die for. Polish civilization, though Slavic, always pointed to the west and her finest sons, poets, and patriots sought and looked for help from the western allies. Poland's acceptance of Christianity in the western, Roman Catholic form, opposed all attempts to convert them to Russian orthodoxy.

Then here, in my estimation, enters the great tragedy of Poland. She looked to England and to America for salvation. And what did she receive? The betrayal at Yalta, where the bungled foreign policy of our present administration first manifested itself when, with Alger Hiss as one of our advisers, we divided the countries of our allies, Poland and China, without even consulting them. President Truman, at the Potsdam Conference, instead of repudiating this infamous sell-out, went along with the Russians as he said in his report to the Nation:

> The question of Poland was a most difficult one. Certain compromises about Poland had already been agreed upon at the Crimea (Yalta) Conference. They obviously were binding upon us at Berlin (Potsdam).

What compromises they were—no more government of their choosing; no more freedom of speech; no religious beliefs, except to follow the materialistic beliefs of atheistic Russian communism.

What a sorry spectacle. Poland, a country which offered herself on the altar of freedom, is further punished and deserted by an unrealistic foreign policy which has succeeded in bringing defeat out of victory and bringing us world war III.

So shameful was our foreign policy that it had to be kept a secret for a long time from the American public. Even our Ambassador to Poland, 1944–47, Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, said that he "was not advised by his own Government of the commitments which had been made and were being made with respect to Poland."

Some day we in America will right the wrongs done to Poland and she will rise again, glorious and free, and we, too, will be able to hold our heads high, knowing that justice has prevailed for Poland.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, history shows us that some of the greatest achievements of humanity were produced in times of crisis and stress. When challenged by fate, time and time again mankind has awakened from slumber, stood up, and answered the challenge. At times these achievements did not, for the time being, repel the impending wave of tragedy. At all times, however, they remained in the minds of man, and on the pages of mankind's history, much longer than any temporary misfortune, their presence enriching our heritage and their remembrance offering an inspiring example to be followed through years to come.

It was during a time of stress, when the kingdom of Poland was plagued by need for national unity, for governmental and civil reforms, and beset by greedy neighbors, that its citizens produced one of the remarkable documents of our civilization, the constitution of May 3, 1791. Although this constitution did not bring into the world any startling innovations, since the principles on which it was based were already being put into effect in the New World and on the strife-torn French soil, the peaceful manner in which it was brought into existence, and the manner in which it had survived to this day, were indeed remarkable, and set an example for the world to follow.

One of the very unusual occurrences in the history of mankind, and a factor which we should today bear in mind, is the fact that, through the years which followed the adoption of their famous constitution, the people of Poland remained true to the principles which it embodied. Although their country was partitioned by their greedy neighbors, and although they were subjected, in the course of the century that followed, to constant attempts at forceful russification, they abided by their heritage.

This is an important factor, for it gives us the assurance that the people of Poland, who are today again subjected to oppression, will not surrender their minds and hearts to the Communist teachings but, rather, by continuing their attachment to the principles of their constitution, will play an important part in the global struggle with the forces of communism.

Mr. Speaker, from the time of her national conception, Poland was a part of the Western World. Christianity, which had its roots in Rome, reigned in her lands. Respect for the dignity of man, parliamentary form of government, freedom of religion, and other human liberties, constituted an integral part of her historical heritage from the earliest times.

For that reason, Poland today represents a weak link in the chain of Com-

munist domination. Through this link we will be able, when the day for it arrives, to penetrate Soviet defenses and start a process which will bring about the deterioration of the Communist empire, depriving it of its strength.

Before that day comes, however, we have a primary job on our hands—a job of stopping the Communist forces from spreading their domination over any additional peoples and any additional areas of the world. We have been doing this job. We have thwarted Soviet designs on Greece; we have strengthened Turkey and Iran; we have saved Italy and France from being destroyed from within by the Communists; we have—and will continue to—aid the Nationalist forces of China; and today we are helping to repel Communist aggression in Korea.

This is the first step in our struggle with the Communist forces; to succeed in this endeavor, the free nations of the world have to work together. Our country has provided the leadership and the means for achieving that goal. By giving food to those who need it, and by giving arms to those who want to defend themselves, we have molded the free nations of the world into a unit which is determined to stop Soviet aggression wherever it may strike.

After we succeed in this primary effort and surround the Soviet empire with a wall of steel, we shall turn to those nations which are today under Communist domination and aid those which want to free themselves of the yoke which has been imposed upon them. The success of this second step will depend, in a large part, on the peoples of the nations concerned—nations which want to be free.

But what must these people—the people of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, and of other enslaved nations—do in the meantime? They must keep the principles of freedom and democracy alive in their hearts; they must prevent the indoctrination of their children in the theory and practice of dialectical materialism of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin; they must wait, and prepare themselves for the day on which they will be able to regain their freedom.

Will they wait so long? I do not think so. One cannot measure, however, the suffering of mankind in days, months, or years. It must be measured in terms of the goal for which we are striving. If a free world—a world in which all nations shall determine their destiny in accordance with the just desires of their people; in which freedom of religion, freedom of opinion, and freedom from oppression shall reign; in which peace and liberty, not enslavement, shall be the rule—is worth waiting for, then the suffering and sacrifies which we must undergo today become endurable.

The free nations of the world are determined to achieve that goal. To achieve it, they shall need the help of the people of Poland, and the people of other nations which want to be free. The people of Poland, I am certain, will give us that help. They know what suffering is; they know what enslavement is; but they also know how to survive, and, above all, they shall remain true to their heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I need to go back into history to show that the indomitable spirit of the Polish people will not be killed by their Communist oppressors. The world knows how strong that spirit is. The world remembers how bravely the Poles fought during the last war, not only on their home soil, but in France, in England, and in other areas of the world where democracy fought totalitarianism on the field of battle. The Polish names on the graves on Monte Cassino, on the beaches of Normandy, and wherever freemen fought, tell their own tale.

The sacrifices and the courage of the Polish people in the last war have no parallel in history. Their endurance is almost beyond description. Through the centuries, the people of Poland have endured oppression, enslavement, and the tragedies which wars bring, with the hope that they would some day live in peace and freedom among the nations of the world. History would forever condemn us, if we were to fail to aid them in attaining that goal.

It is for us, the people of America, to rededicate ourselves today to the task of aiding the people of those nations which were our true friends and allies in two world wars, in this dark hour of their need. We must rectify our apparent error in placing faith in the power which later violated our trust and proved to be an international thief. The negotiations which we undertook with that power during and immediately after World War II never attained the status of treaties, since they were never confirmed by our Senate. Since they have been violated by a party to the agreement—Soviet Russia—we should not give these negotiations any further recognition.

Mr. Speaker, in the remembrance of the Polish constitution of May 3, 1791, and in the examples of the invincible courage and will of the Polish people, we should draw inspiration today—just as the people of Poland draw inspiration and courage from them. And we should let the world know our conviction—the conviction that, with God's help, Poland and the rest of the world shall be free.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in rendering tribute to the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the Polish constitution. The 3d of May has been a national holiday in the hearts of the Polish people since the year 1791, when that country gave to the world the most democratic constitution to be found in all Europe. The yoke of foreign aggression to which that country has been subjected at various periods in her history has failed to crush her free spirit. The tragic years of Poland's present bondage will be an inspiration for future generations of Poles to carry on with that indomitable spirit that has brought that country through so many trying situations in the past.

Poland has always fought tyranny and international immorality. She has always supported every expression of international morality, and in that spirit she alined herself with the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms.

What did that Atlantic Charter say? Let me quote three points to which those who signed that charter committed their respective nationals:

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.
2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.
3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

These, in plain language, are the first three points in that charter. The United States was a signator to that pact. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics endorsed these objectives and became a signator on January 1, 1942. The freedom-loving people of Poland accepted this charter as a guaranty that the spiritual rebirth and the principles of freedom to which they had dedicated their lives on May 3, 1791, would be restored to them when the ravages of World War II had reached its end, and the last drop of blood had been spilled. They had earned the right to such expectations. For had they not continued to brave Hitler's power after their country had been desolated? Had they not fought gallantly on when their people were in chains? Had they not made the same sacrifices on the altar of human decency and liberty as the soldiers of other lands including our own fair sons? And finally had they not every right to place their faith and their trust in the intellectual honesty of America, a country which had never broken a vow with another nation in either peace or war?

But what happened? Around the secret peace table at Yalta the noble principles in the Atlantic Charter were forgotten. The freedom-loving people of Poland were locked behind the iron curtain, where they remain today. Never was a greater travesty perpetrated upon the aspiration of any people. The events of those fateful hours at Yalta in the year 1945 constitute the blackest pages in the history of our Republic. For those misdeeds we today bow our heads in shame as we celebrate Poland's national holiday. We pray that in some manner we may atone for the wrongs committed on a people who placed their trust in our honor, who suffered incredible agonies in the belief that some day they would be free.

Today the Polish people stand conquered but not subdued. Their spirit is not crushed. That intense and unquenchable patriotism which they have never failed to manifest in their most tragic hours will live on to the day when they will again throw off the yoke of the oppressor and take their rightful place among the freedom-loving peoples of the world. Poland, I salute you on this one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of your epoch-making constitution—the political and spiritual rebirth of a noble people.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1951, we are privileged to mark and commemorate Polish Constitution Day. One hundred and sixty years ago, shortly after this great Nation gave birth to our present Constitution, Poland adopted a great document granting far-reaching freedom to her people.

Here in this country we are cognizant of the tragedy, unparalleled in universal history, that the Polish Nation is going through. On this day we express our heartfelt sympathy and, at the same time, convey our sincere sentiments as a brotherly nation.

If you can but imagine an enslaved America without the right to celebrate Independence Day on July 4, then you have some idea how the people of Poland feel today. Poland would jubilantly celebrate today if it were possible for her to do so, but Poland cannot rejoice today. Soviet oppression will see to that; but even Communist enslavement and Russia's iron heel cannot prevent the Polish people from a silent and hopeful observance of this great day.

Today there is another Poland—a free Poland which exists, lives, and grows outside of her natural boundaries. Yes, outside of the iron curtain this free Poland is just as strong, physically, morally, and spiritually, as the one which is known for courage, knighthood, and untiring efforts in their pursuit for freedom, liberty, and independence. We cannot overlook the enormous contribution of the great Polish nations in their fight to protect western civilization from being overrun by evil forces all through the history of mankind.

In passing, it is also just and fair to point out the contributions of many sons of Poland to this great Nation of ours, the United States of America. Yes; there was Pulaski, whose monuments and statues adorn many of our parks and public squares in this country. Pulaski made the supreme sacrifice for this country at Savannah, Ga. His contribution was truly symbolic of the Polish desire to fight freedom's battle anywhere on God's earth. There was Kosciusko who, for a time, was adjutant to George Washington. His recommendations to build fortifications at West Point and, further, that a military academy be established there will always be a monument to his memory. The very names of Pulaski and Kosciusko are "watchwords of liberty"; their contributions are indelibly written into the glorious record of American independence.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the valiant people of Poland look to this great Nation of ours for encouragement and support in the hope that through the efforts of the United States of America, a future observance of Polish Constitution Day will be one which the peoples of Poland can join in with all of the citizens of this great Nation who wish her well today.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] such time as he may require.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in these trying days when liberty is being challenged all over the world, and when liberty and freedom are dying all over the world, it is only proper that we pause in our day's reflections and pay tribute to a people and a nation who have done so much to spread and encourage freedom world-wide. We all know in searching our history that when the Constitution of the United States was first launched not only to the people of America but was publicized throughout the world, there were those monarchs in Europe, Asia, and all over the world who laughed and scoffed at the Constitution of the United States. They said it would never work, that it was the work of madmen, that it was just something temporary, that it was something that would soon pass by. However, in this commemoration of Polish Constitution Day, the reason why we should pause in our reflections to pay tribute is that the first people and the first nation in all history that had confidence enough in the Constitution of the United States of America to emulate it was the country of Poland and the people of Poland. Something less than 3 years after the Constitution of the United States of America was adopted, here in a far away land, in a far away continent, a people and a country, the people of Poland and the Nation of Poland, were the first people and the first nation of the world to emulate the Constitution of the United States of America.

The Constitution Day of Poland that we commemorate today is commemorated because they were the first people and the first nation to pattern and model their constitution of freedom and liberty after that of the United States of America. That act, through the ages and since then, has been typical of the love and the ferver and the feeling of Poland for freedom and liberty.

We might come down to more modern times, for instance to the time of World War II. The patriotism and the love for freedom that the people of Poland showed is one that has no match in the annals of history of all mankind. Let us go back, for instance, to September of 1939, when all the world was shaking in its boots, afraid of that madman of Europe, when England got to the point when they sent their great statesman, Neville Chamberlain, over to Munich to meet Adolf Hitler.

Hitler said: "I am going to take this part of Czechoslovakia, I am going to take this part of another country, what are you going to do about it, Mr. Chamberlain?"

Mr. Chamberlain, shaking in his boots, said: "Mr. Hitler, I have my umbrella with me to protect you from the rain. You go ahead and take everything you want, just leave England alone. Let us alone."

Just as Chamberlain was shaking in his boots when he was meeting with Adolf Hitler and all of the rest of the world was trembling at the great force Hitler had assembled in Europe, there was one country and one people who said: "As for you, we care not what you do, but as for us we rather die for our freedom than to live under Nazi slavery."

And alone, with false promises from England, with false promises from France, the little country of Poland, which was not a warring nation, stood up and fought; the first people in all the world with courage enough to stand up and say "No" to Adolf Hitler; the first people to stand up and tell Hitler: "You may take other parts of Europe but as for us, you are not going to take us without a fight."

They fought. For 19 days they stood up with bare bodies against the mightiest military machine the world has ever seen. At that time, you will remember, Adolf Hitler and Joe Stalin were pals. They made a pact. And on the 19th day of September, on the nineteenth day of the war, Hitler and Stalin made an agreement by which Joe Stalin started to march from the east, and Poland, a little country of some 32,000,000 people, was now wedged in between the two madmen of Europe, Joe Stalin on one side and Adolf Hitler on the other side. Still the 32,000,000 Poles did not give up. They fought for exactly 17 days longer. For 36 days Poland alone stood the onslaught of two of the mightiest military leaders and two of the worst and most brutal killers that the world has ever known.

Oh, yes, there are those cynics who say: "What does 36 days of resistance mean?" When you consider the fact that when Hitler started to march westward instead of eastward, he marched through Norway, through Belgium, through Denmark, through Luxemburg, through part of France and was ready to take England in 12 days, it gives you an idea of the bravery and the glory of the 32,000,000 Poles who stood alone. The aid that was promised never arrived. The 2,000 planes that England promised them never saw Polish soil because England did not have that many planes to give when they made the promise.

Did Poland give up? Not at all. In intrigues and escapades that will make some of the most romantic pages of our history if the truth were known these Poles that were now divided by the Russians and by the Germans skipped from one country to another and 6 months after Poland fell 12,000 Polish fliers were flying in the British Royal Air Force and they shot down 1 out of every 5 Nazi planes that were bombing London at that time. The only expeditionary force that the Allies sent to Norway after it was overrun by the Germans overnight was an expedition of impoverished Polish troops that were asked not to take a certain part of Norway. They not only achieved their mission but sent word to London that they needed more supplies and more men, saying that they would drive the Germans out of Norway. But, the only answer was, "Come back to England and save the British people." You will remember that was in the days of Dunkerque. Then they had them marching in the Normandy invasion; they had them marching in Italy and every place. The first defeat that Hitler suffered in Africa he suffered at the hands of a Polish regiment; a regiment of Polish people that skipped from the land of Poland from one country to another until they were regimented into a fighting force. Yes, the first defeat that the Germans suffered in Africa was suffered at the hands of a Polish contingent. And, that is not

all. Take the battle of Monte Cassino, where the Allies were driven back on four different occasions at a heavy loss of American lives. Finally, Gen. Mark Clark assigned troops to General Anders, and together they took Monte Cassino hill. They took it at a great cost of blood.

I remember very well the statement when General Anders went to General Clark in Italy. He said, "General, Poland wants to do its part in this fight for freedom. What can we do for you?" General Clark looked at General Anders, and he said, "General, you have not got any men. How can you fight the enemy?" General Anders looked at General Clark, and he said, "Oh, General, that is where you are wrong. I already have 25,000 Polish boys. You are different from me. You have your reinforcements behind you, General Clark, but I have got my reinforcements ahead of me, and every mile that we march through Italy my army is going to increase." And one by one the Polish boys joined the cause of the Allies. And the general of the Polish Army, General Anders, who started out with a contingent of 25,000 troops in Italy before the war was over had a contingent of 250,000 fighting Polish boys.

Poland has paid a price in this war that no nation has ever paid in the history of all mankind, 8,000,000 dead. Before the war Poland was a land of 32,000,000 people. After the war there were about 24,000,000 left. No people on earth ever paid so high a price for their liberty as did the people of Poland. And what was their reward? Three men going to Yalta, with more vodka in their bellies than brains in their heads, decided that these brave and gallant people shall receive their just reward. And their reward was betrayal by the United States; betrayal by England.

The master mind of that betrayal today sits in the Federal penitentiary. His name is Alger Hiss. He masterminded the betrayal of Poland. So today we find 24,000,000 Polish people living under Communist dictatorship because of the proficient work of a Communist agent working in a high place in the Government of the United States of America. His name is Alger Hiss. The monument that he has erected on behalf of his work is 24,000,000 people in Poland sold under the yoke of Communist slavery. The work of Alger Hiss is one that must be wiped off the history books of the United States of America. As long as the present policy in regard to Poland exists, every liberty-loving American must hang his head in shame until the wrong we have perpetrated against the people of Poland is corrected. We have no right to look for support from liberty-loving people all over the world until we do that. That is why today we find 90 percent of the people of the Slavic race under Communist yokes. They are under the Communist yoke because they look at the betrayal of Poland as an example of the word and honor of allies like Great Britain and the United States. So, in commemorating Polish Constitution Day, let us dedicate our lives and our efforts to redeeming the great wrong that was perpetrated against a gallant and a great people. If we accomplish that and work in that direction, the world will love us, and freedom and honor once again will play the major part in the dealings of the United States of America with other people. Until that time comes I have grave concern for the future of this country and grave concern for the future of liberty and freedom everywhere.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, once again, on this anniversary of the founding of the free Polish Government, I am privileged to address the House, in behalf of a nation and a people, who have greatly and immeasurably contributed to the development of free institutions in this world.

History is replete with the unexcelled sacrifices and evidence of devotion to the cause of liberty of the Polish people. I do not think there is any nation in the world, which has sacrificed more bitterly, more courageously, more unflinchingly that the Polish people.

In connection with my remarks, I desire to refer to a spendid letter recently received from an able advocate of the Polish cause, Mr. K. Stefan Pomierski, of Glen Cove, N. Y. I quote:

> Let us pledge ourselves to the faith that says that the Yalta agreement shall be nullified forthwith, that the Polish-Government-in-exile and at present in London, shall receive immediate diplomatic recognition and that Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, hero of of World War II, be appointed to the general staff of the armies of the Allies. If we do that we shall regain the full confidence of all freedom-loving peoples of the Americas, of Europe, and of Asia.

I believe sincerely that the foregoing brief sentences accurately reflect, not only the sentiments of Polish-Americans, but also the deep feeling of an overwhelming number of Americans of every class, creed, color, and station.

This historic day fills me at once with feelings of anguish and glory—the anguish of one whose heart goes out to the millions of poor souls in Poland, strong in the Christian faith, strong in their allegiance to democracy, who were betrayed in such a merciless, heartless manner at Yalta—glory because of the inspiration which lovers of democracy throughout the world have received from a people whose courage, fortitude, and unflinching spirit in the face of adversity, persecution and even death emphasize and exemplify the noblest qualities of the human soul.

Of course we must stand with the brave, gallant Polish Nation and its unsurpassed people. We must stand with them as they pass through the valley of the shadow of death into the new light of reborn freedom, which already appears on the horizon. We must stand with them in their struggles for independence and liberty, for tolerance, dignity, and justice, for the recapture of their free government and their rights as free men and women.

As I have said so many times, Poland is the test case of our intentions toward human freedom. If we do not come to the assistance of this suffering nation now, if we ruthlessly and mercilessly consign the Polish people to the unspeakable horror of oppression and tyranny, we will be failing to measure up in this generation to the great heritage of American freedom itself.

Let us solemnly resolve on this sacred occasion that not only our hearts, but our assurances of unfailing devotion, practical support, and assistance for their cause go out today from this great tribunal of democracy to the great and noble people of Poland. May the day of their liberation soon be at hand.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today, the 3d of May, marks the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. It is fitting that this great body pay tribute to the Polish people on this, their national holiday, even though the principles laid down in that constitution have gone temporarily into eclipse under the domination of a foreign power. I say temporarily, because the Polish Nation has been under oppression before in its history and has always emerged strong and resolute. The people of Poland are courageous people. That many of us know from our association with the Americans of Polish descent who have contributed so much to the building of this country.

We owe much to them, just as the whole Western World owes much to the Polish Nation which took the brunt of the brutal Nazi attack on that valiant country 12 years ago.

We owe much to the courage and determination of the Polish leaders who contributed to our own struggle for independence—Kosciusko, Sobieski, and Pulaski. Their contribution at the testing time for the infant American cause was incalculable. We owe much to Poland and to the people of Polish blood in our midst.

Today, 160 years after her first Constitution Day, Poland is again waiting for the chance to regain her independence. But commensurate with the bravery and spirit of her people, she is not waiting supinely. The underground which worked so effectively against the Nazi invaders is again carrying on. The flame of independent thought is being kept alive. Let us pay tribute to that unyielding spirit of independence and of unquenchable hope which keeps this flame alive, as we join with the thousands of free Poles all over the Western World who are observing this day.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished Members who spoke here today on their wonderful remarks in behalf of the people of Poland. That tragic sell-out of Poland by the United States and allies should be a lesson to us today that whenever we

surrender principle we have to buy it back in blood as we are now doing in Korea.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point, and have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 50 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion and considerable confusion existing in the minds of many Members of Congress concerning the need for the 16,000 beds which the President eliminated in his budget estimates for the fiscal year 1950.

In his recommendations for the curtailment of approximately 16,000 beds, President Truman asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to recommend specific adjustments in the program. As a result of this request, the Administrator named 24 hospital projects to be canceled outright, and a reduction in the planned capacity of 14 additional hospitals.

It should be borne in mind that the President made this cancellation in the spring of 1949, when the veteran population had not reached its peak, and when there was no thought of a Korean conflict. Today's conditions alter the picture materially. In making his cancellation, the President said in his message:

> I have reviewed the veterans' hospital and domiciliary construction program and find that to continue with the construction of the full number of 90 authorized hospitals will result in a serious overbuilding, in terms of beds needed to meet foreseeable requirements. A reduction in the program will still make it possible to provide for all service-connected patients in every geographical area and will provide an even more liberal allowance of beds for non-service-connected patients than at present.

That statement could not be made today. Unforeseeable circumstances have caused an overcrowding of Veterans' Administration hospitals to a point where good service to the disabled veteran is difficult and in some instances impossible to render. Especially is this so in the case of the neuropsychiatric and tuberculosis facilities, as I will point out later.

As of February 28, 1951, the latest figures which are available from the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, 147 hospitals were in operation, 18 of which were for tubercular patients, 34 for neuropsychiatrics, and 95 were general medical and surgical hospitals. These facilities had a bed capacity of 108,035 patients and were occupied to the extent of 102,319 patients. This is approximately 95 percent of capacity. I am informed that civilian hospitals consider 80-percent capacity to be a safe margin for efficient operation and good service. In the case of our Veterans' Administration hospitals the percentage should be slightly higher, but not over 85 percent. Any increase over this 85 percent, I am told, is reflected in the well-being and treatment of the patients.

To consider the situation fairly, the types of hospitals should be weighed separately. At the present time, 50 percent of all veteran patients are in NP hospitals, 15 percent are in TB hospitals, and the remainder, 34 percent, are in the general medical and surgical hospitals.

The most serious congestion—and it is dangerous overcrowding—occurs in the NP hospitals, which bears, as you will note, over one-half of the entire patient load. There are several cogent reasons for this condition. There are operational difficulties in NP hospitals that are not present in other facilities. First, the patient turn-over is exceedingly slow, as you can realize; the nature of the disability makes long, tedious treatment necessary. Secondly, it is very difficult to staff these hospitals, both from the doctor and the nurse viewpoint. Professional men and women are loath to enter this phase of the profession and few of them stay with it permanently. This makes for a shortage of skilled professionals to service the patients.

Perhaps because I am more familiar with the conditions that exist in my home locality, I would like to cite the situation in the two NP hospitals that service the entire New England area. At Bedford, Mass., which is in my congressional district, is located an NP hospital which has a bed capacity of 1,803 patients. The hospital was planned and built for 1,636 beds, but the demand for hospitalization has become so urgent that space for an additional 167 patients has been made by using recreational and other available rooms for bed space. As of February 28, 1951, Bedford Hospital had a percentage of 100.6 patients in the facility. The manager of the hospital, Dr. Winthrop Adams, is one of the oldest in point of service and best known of the Veterans' Administration professional men. He is greatly respected for his ability and knowledge of his work. He is operating with a staff which is sadly undermanned both as to doctors and nurses. The taking away of recreational space and other rooms in order to make additional bed-space handicaps and prolongs the recovery of patients. In mental hospitals much better progress is made when the patient is contented and happy in his surroundings, and a reduction in recreational facilities is sharply reflected in the patients' progress toward recovery.

In the case of the NP hospital at Northampton, Mass., again we find that it has a patient load running to 98.8 percent of capacity. This hospital was designed and built for 933 beds. At the present time 1,092 beds are occupied. The overload, here again is cared for by the addition of 172 beds in recreation rooms and other space originally not designed for hospital-bed uses.

Recently I received a protest from a committee appointed by the Franklin-Hampshire District No. 2, the American Legion, about the lack of facilities at Northampton Hospital. It was explained to me that the hospital load had been 100 percent full for the past 2 years. The larger number of these patients are veterans of World War I and World War II who have been hospitalized for several years. Incidentally, this hospital serves not only two-thirds of Massachusetts, but all of the States of Vermont, Connecticut, the western part of Rhode Island, Albany and Troy, N. Y. At the present time 50 percent of the bed patients are from the State of Connecticut, and the other 50 percent from various parts of New England. Also, right now there are 23 service-connected cases that are in the State hospital, their care being paid for by the Veterans' Administration. Four of these cases are not only mental but have tuberculosis. There are 168 non-service-connected cases on the waiting list at the present time. Sixty of these patients have been on the waiting list for 6 months. In the Northampton State Hospital, which is only approximately 4 miles from the Veterans' Hospital, there are 62 veteran patients now receiving treatment. Much resentment is being voiced by the families of these veterans, who feel their boys should be cared for in Veterans' Administration facilities.

As I said before, I point to the conditions in these two NP hospitals only because I am more conversant with the detailed facts in my own locality. However, a similar, and in some localities a worse, condition prevails. Just note the percentage of beds occupied in the neuropsychiatric hospitals of the Veterans' Administration listed below. The figures are as of February 28, 1951:

	Operating beds	Percent full
American Lake, Wash	904	89.0
Augusta, Ga	1,300	96.8
Bedford, Mass	1,803	100.6
Canandaigua, N. Y	1,700	96.7
Chillicothe, Ohio	2,116	100.3
Coatesville, Pa	1,953	92.9
Danville, Ill	1,717	99.8
Downey, Ill	2,290	94.4
Fort Custer, Mich	2,067	97.3
Fort Lyon, Colo	853	96.6
Fort Meade, S. Dak	720	94.0
Gulfport, Miss	1,098	97.2
Knoxville, Iowa	1,631	98.0
Lebanon, Pa. (new addition)	652	92.8
Lexington, Ky	1,216	96.1
Lyons, N. J	2,013	98.1
Marion, Ind	1,696	99.5
Montrose, N. Y. (new hospital)	1,349	81.1
Murfreesboro, Tenn	1,307	94.5
Northampton, Mass	1,105	98.8
North Little Rock, Ark	2,095	95.8
Northport, N. Y	2,502	95.0
Palo Alto, Calif	1,443	96.4
Perry Point, Md	1,910	96.8
Roanoke, Va	2,000	94.6
Roseburg, Oreg	670	92.5
St. Cloud, Minn	1,382	97.6
Sheridan, Wyo	754	93.2
Togus, Maine	869	94.2
Tomah, Wis	1,085	94.9
Topeka, Kans	1,575	81.6

	Operating beds	Percent full
Tuscaloosa, Ala	817	94.0
Tuskegee, Ala	2,190	94.2
Waco, Tex	2,040	96.2
Total neuropsychiatric beds	50,793	95.5

It should be noted here, in considering the above table, that of the above total of 50,793 operating NP beds, 2,015 of these are emergency beds which, as I explained above, are beds placed in any space which can be made available and which was not designed primarily for operating beds. The percentage of capacity occupied—95.5 percent—is a dramatic figure when one considers the nature of the disability treated and the effect such overcrowding will have upon patients suffering from mental disabilities.

Conditions in tuberculosis hospitals of the Veterans' Administration are little, if any, better. Here are figures on these hospitals:

	Operating beds	Percent full
Atlanta, Ga	225	98.1
Excelsior Springs, Mo	251	87.3
Fort Bayard, N. Mex	222	87.4
Kerrville, Tex	438	87.4
Livermore, Calif	495	94.5
Memphis, Tenn	300	92.0
Oteen, N. C	1,500	89.8
Outwood, Ky	316	96.2
Rutland Heights, Mass	615	95.8
San Fernando, Calif	441	95.9
Springfield, Mo	477	88.7
Sunmount, N. Y	383	94.8
Tucson, Ariz	405	95.3
Walla Walla, Wash	421	86.9
Waukesha, Wis	256	85.5
Whipple, Ariz	380	79.9
Total TB beds	7,973	91.4

Here again, it should be recalled, that for safe, efficient operation a Veterans' Administration hospital should have no more than 85 percent of its beds occupied.

In the case of the general medical and surgical hospitals, the conditions are better, but not sufficiently so as to make the situation normal. There are a total of 49,269 operating beds, of which 86.5 percent are occupied.

That is the picture of the bed occupancy in our Veterans' Administration hospitals, according to the latest figures obtainable. What the situation will be when the disabled veterans from the Korean conflict flood into the Veterans' Administration facilities is one that gives much pause for thought. The time is not far off when the service hospitals will be turning these disabled veterans over to the Veterans' Administration for treatment and hospitalization. Already casualties in the Korean conflict have risen above the 50,000 mark so far as wounded are concerned. Thousands of these have been brought back to the United States and are being treated in the Army and Navy hospitals. These hospitals no longer will accept large blocks of disabled veterans from the overcrowded Veterans' Administration facilities. An example at hand is that of Walter Reed General Hospital here in Washington, which now has a regulation permitting not more than 10 Veterans' Administration patients at any one time. A similar condition prevails at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, which at one time cared for several hundred Veterans' Administration patients.

The overcrowding, necessarily, has forced a large number of Veterans' Administration patients into civil and State hospitals. Hospitalization and treatment of these veterans is paid for by the Veterans' Administration. However, as everyone knows, our civil and State hospitals are inadequate for civilian needs and repeated requests have been received for relief from the care of these disabled veterans. It is particularly hard upon the disabled veterans, who would much rather receive treatment in a Veterans' Administration facility, and, as I noted in the case of the Northampton Veterans' Administration Hospital, the families of the veterans feel that their boys should be cared for by the Veterans' Administration.

At the end of February 1951 there were 4,209 disabled veterans being hospitalized in State and civil hospitals. There was a total of 3,502 veterans being cared for in other Federal hospitals. This adds up to 7,711 disabled veterans in outside hospitals. Of the number in State and civil hospitals, 1,630 were TB patients, 1,778 were NP cases, while 80 were general medical and surgical cases. This places a real burden upon the non-Veterans' Administration hospitals and in the cases of the NP and TB patients it is fair to point out that these are long-treatment patients, some of whom will require years of hospitalization.

There has been some criticism and inquiry over the classification of veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Because of the manner in which hospital records are kept by the Veterans' Administration, the present hospital load is divided at about 60 percent for non-service-connected veterans and 40 percent for service-connected veterans. However, there is one factor in this question of non-service-connected status that should be borne in mind. The average person looks at the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration showing that approximately 60 percent of the patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals are in the non-service-connected category and expresses astonishment. The fact is that there are many thousands of veterans in hospitals who are listed as non-service-connected but who also had a service-connected disability. They were admitted as non-service-connected cases because the major diagnosis was that of non-service-connected disability. Add to these cases the hundreds of others who are now rated as non-service-connected but will be designated as service-connected after complete adjudication of their claims, and the picture changes materially.

I believe it would be fitting at this point to insert a table showing veterans awaiting admission to hospitals as of February 28, 1951. It is an impressive list, and if conditions continue as they exist today, many of these disabled veterans will never receive the hospitalization they need so badly.

Veterans awaiting admission to hospital

	Total	Tubercular	Neuropsychiatric	General medical and surgical
AS OF 15TH OF MONTH				
1950—February	24,441	2,441	10,367	11,633
March	26,325	2,398	10,747	13,180
April	27,369	2,415	11,272	13,682
May	26,314	2,386	11,232	12,676
June	25,312	2,337	11,462	11,513
July	24,781	2,215	11,787	10,779
August	23,751	2,287	12,242	9,222
September	21,950	2,262	12,378	7,310
October	20,557	2,222	12,095	6,240
November	19,929	2,095	12,013	5,821
December	19,185	2,226	11,860	5,099
1951—January	19,306	2,069	11,753	5,484
February	20,821	2,346	11,852	6,623

There is a situation, however, that affects Veterans' Administration hospitals and their operation more seriously than any other factor. That is the alarming loss of professional and ancillary personnel through the draft and the recall of Reserves to the Armed Forces. From July 27, 1950, to the end of March 1951, the following professional employees of the Veterans' Administration have been lost to the Armed Forces:

	Number employed	Lost to Armed Forces
Staff physicians	3,986	136
Resident physicians	2,255	282
Nurses	13,640	434
Total	20,804	908

In the category of ancillary personnel—attendants, clerks, technicians, and so forth—1,571 employees have been lost to the Armed Forces. Replacements for all of these employees, and especially the professional, are difficult to get. As a result of competition from industry the Veterans' Administration is losing ward attendants at a rather alarming rate, particularly in NP and TB hospitals that are in areas where defense industries have begun to start up.

As you may recall, when the universal military training bill was before the House of Representatives an amendment was offered and adopted, that would exempt professional people of the Veterans' Administration from the draft and from recall to service. However, I am informed that when the bill came to conference this amendment was dropped, and any help from this quarter seems unlikely. About the only hope that I can see, at the present time, is the enactment of my bill, H. R. 2996, which would make these personnel a branch of the military forces of the United States. A similar plan was followed during World War II, and it worked successfully. I hope that it can be done again.

I have talked with a number of persons who are eminently qualified to know of the situation regarding the availability of doctors, nurses, and so forth, who would be necessary to man additional hospitals for the Veterans' Administration. Invariably the answer has been that there would be little difficulty in

finding the quantity and quality of professional men and women if the hospitals are not located in isolated localities.

In closing, I want to stress the great need for more hospitals for the Veterans' Administration, particularly in view of the tremendous potential bed load caused by the Korean conflict. Much of the need exists in TB and NP type facilities, where patient turn-over is slow and where the greater percentage of the cases are service-connected cases. We must not let these veterans down. It is an obligation we must face squarely and promptly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Charles A. Merrill appearing in the Boston Globe, April 29.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he intends to make today and include certain letters.

Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a brief editorial appearing in the April issue of Fortune magazine.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two letters and one newspaper article on the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam project on the Colorado River in Utah.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a clipping from the Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News, relative to CARE.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. THOMAS) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. YATES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $389.50.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material in the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ALLEN of California (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a recent address by Warren R. Austin, United States Representative to the United Nations.

Mr. WHITAKER (at the request of Mr. CHELF) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON] in Committee of the Whole today and include an article by Charles E. Jackson, general manager of the National Fisheres Institute.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 4, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

425. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease for the month of March 1951, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

427. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

428. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the twenty-seventh quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period January 1 through March 31, 1951, pursuant to Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

429. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Dewulf Maquet"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

430. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

431. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a request for authority to make grants for the development and improvement of certain class IV and larger airports as shown in the attached appended list, which projects are included in the current revision of the national airport plan and, which should be undertaken during the fiscal year 1952, pursuant to section 8 of the Federal Airport Act, Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2684. A bill to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida; with amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2889. A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lien selection, and similar rights; without amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOSONE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3795. A bill to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 3954. A bill to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3955. A bill to permit the retention of oil, gas, and other mineral rights in lands condemned by the United States for waterway improvement purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3956. A bill to provide that the period of active service required of any person inducted into the Armed Forces shall be reduced by any period of active service which such person may have performed before such induction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3957. A bill to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3958. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to increase to 120 days the amount of leave which members of the Armed Forces may accumulate; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3959. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3960. A bill to amend section 371 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3961. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to appoint a committee to designate the most appropriate day for National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 221. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies in the conduct of hearings before committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Res. 222. Resolution to provide for an investigation in open hearings of all circumstances relating to the action of the President in relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of his commands in the Far East; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3962. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Becker Gutierrez; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Kurt Karl Otto Walther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Wladysla Bogusz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of George S. Paschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of Marcella Maria Vankeirsbilck, nee Vanootegem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of Franco Berardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of John (Hans-Christian) von Kotze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 3971. A bill for the relief of Esther Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 3972. A bill for the relief of Ziao Fong Hsia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

266. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 21, expressing regret that General Douglas MacArthur was removed as supreme commander of the Far East, and a further reaffirmation of the resolution adopted at the last national convention of the American Legion calling for the removal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson and also expressing regret that President Truman refused to meet with and have an audience with the national commander of the American Legion, Erle Cocke, following Cocke's world tour which included a visit with troops in Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

267. Also, resolution of the Rock County Dental Auxiliary, Rock County, Wis., reaffirming faith in the American, voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, the fountain of all wisdom and goodness: We thank Thee for the gift of sleep when the tangled web of weary striving and confused thought emerges clarified and straightened by the touch of a new day. In the midst of daily toil and ever-pressing tasks, we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts, grateful for the noontide pause at this wayside well of peace and prayer.

Bring all our desires and powers, we beseech Thee, into conformity to Thy will. Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day, with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land but all the continents and the islands of the sea. May our individual lives be as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. We ask it in the name of that One who is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 3, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PROPOSED REVISION OF A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 37)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed revision of a supplemental appropriation, involving an increase of $13,000,000, for the Atomic Energy Commission, fiscal year 1951, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES APPRAISERS STORES, BALTIMORE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., on April 23, 1951, relative to improving conditions at the United States Appraisers Stores in Baltimore.

This is a matter of the utmost importance to the well-being of the great port of Baltimore, particularly at this time when traffic is moving through the port in near-record volume.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 841. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 310); and

S. 1039. A bill to amend the provision of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the composition of boards for the recommendation of rear admirals of the Navy for continuation on the active list, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 311).

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. HUNT), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1244. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Territory of Alaska from certain restrictions upon the making of Federal contributions, and to amend the provisions thereof relating to the taking of oaths by certain civil defense personnel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 312).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, Friday, May 4, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, or passed, as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Stavros S. Niarchos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which was considered and passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to

the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 984, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Address on the subject The Great Alliance of Free Men, delivered by Hon. W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, at the closing banquet of the regional conference sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations, Inc., in Los Angeles, Calif., on April 30, 1951.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Editorial entitled "Secretary Pace's Year," published in the April 7 issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, regarding the first anniversary of Frank Pace, Jr., as Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. KEM:

Letter from Frank W. Ahrens, published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 29, 1951, discussing the replacement of General MacArthur.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, the calendar will be called for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, beginning at the beginning. The Secretary will state the first bill on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile, was announced as first in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 508) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Educational Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health and nursing professions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Illinois object. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 618) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 673) to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska objects. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 41) prohibiting the sale in the District of Columbia of rockfish weighing more than 15 pounds was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

APPOINTMENT OF BERNT BALCHEN AS PERMANENT COLONEL IN REGULAR AIR FORCE

The bill (S. 1220) to authorize the appointment of Bernt Balchen as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Bernt Balchen, AO-426630, United States Air Force Reserve, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Air Force. For the purposes of determining position on promotion list, permanent grade seniority, and eligibility for promotion, the above-named person shall be credited with an amount of service equal to the number of days, months, and years by which his age at the time of his appointment exceeds 25 years and shall be placed on the promotion list immediately below that officer appointed to the permanent grade of colonel on April 2, 1948, who is credited with the same or next greater amount of service.

The service credited to the above-named person at the time of his appointment and his active commissioned service in the Regular Air Force subsequent to his appointment shall be included within the meaning of the term "years' service" as defined in subsection (b) of section 514 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 903; 10 U. S. C. 941b).

EXCHANGE OF WILDLIFE REFUGE LANDS IN MINNESOTA

The bill (S. 467) to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to convey any lands and improvements, or interests therein, of the United States within the Talcot National Wildlife Refuge or the Beltrami Wildlife Management Area to the State of Minnesota in exchange for other lands and improvements, or interests therein, of equal value, which he deems chiefly valuable for migratory bird management purposes.

SEC. 2. Any lands acquired by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to this act, if located within or adjacent to an existing wildlife refuge or reservation, shall immediately become a part of such refuge or reservation and shall be administered under the laws and regulations applicable thereto; and if not so located, may be administered as migratory waterfowl management areas, refuges, reservations, or breeding grounds in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 10, 1934, as amended (60 Stat. 1080), and acts supplementary thereto.

BILL PASSED TO THE FOOT OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 321) to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wonder if we could have an explanation of the bill. If not, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] seems to be in charge of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the bill could go to the foot of the calendar. I am sure an explanation of the bill will be forthcoming during the day.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should be glad to have such course followed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

EXTENSION OF TIME DURING WHICH CLAIM FOR REFUND MAY BE FILED UNDER SECTION 939

The bill (H. R. 2654) to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECONVEYANCE OF LAND IN MACON COUNTY, ALA, TO TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE

The bill (H. R. 2685) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN TRUSTS FROM FILING RETURN REQUIRED BY SECTION 153 (B) OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The bill (H. R. 3196) to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 17, 1951, pp. 3943–3944.)

GRANT OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

CURT EDWARD FRIESE

The bill (S. 1054) for the relief of Curt Edward Friese was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Curt Edward Friese shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. FRANCESCO DRAGO

The bill (S. 1092) for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Francesco Drago shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

FRED E. WEBER

The bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Fred E. Weber was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. J. SCHEUERMAN ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 591) for the relief of R. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAPHET K. ANVIL AND HOWARD A. MONROE

The bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. PATRICK HOSPITAL AND THE WESTERN MONTANA CLINIC

The bill (H. R. 1141) for the relief of St. Patrick Hospital and the Western Montana Clinic was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN CLARK

The bill (H. R. 1235) for the relief of John Clark was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the word "unpaid", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of either of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CARL PARKS

The bill (H. R. 1422) for the relief of Carl Parks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF YOSHIO FUKUNAGA, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 1798) for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDIE DEAN GARNER SCOTT

The bill (H. R. 2175) for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERNARD F. ELMERS

The bill (H. R. 2304) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARCELLE LECOMTE

The bill (H. R. 2714) for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TSUNG HSIEN HSU

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 297) for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Tsung Hsien Hsu, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Lt. Richard Corsa, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEFAN LENARTOWICZ AND HIS WIFE, IRENE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 360) for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the fiscal year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF SIDNEY LOMAX, DECEASED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 536) for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Sidney Lomax, deceased, the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Sidney Lomax, who died as a result of injuries received when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Starkville, Miss., on November 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SADAKO KAWAMURA LAWTON

The bill (S. 550) for the relief of Sadako Kawamura Lawton was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, since the Senate bill was reported and placed on the calendar, a companion House bill, House bill 1101 came to the Senate and is also on the Senate Calendar. The House bill is Calendar No. 287. If the matter is to be considered, the House bill should be taken up in lieu of the Senate bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 550 is indefinitely postponed.

LUIGI PODESTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 879) for the relief of Luigi Podesta, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Luigi Podesta shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. A. C. LUPCHO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 645) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REFERENCE OF CLAIM OF AL PARKER TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 656) to confer jurisdiction upon the United District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "notwithstanding any limitation upon the United States district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon tort claims against the United States which accrue prior to January 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF D. A. MONTGOMERY, DECEASED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 703) for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Code", to insert a colon and *"Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIM OF AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC., ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2782) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any lapse of time or any statute of limitations or any defense of laches, jurisdiction be, and the same hereby is, conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and through it the claims of its subcontractors, against the United States arising out of the performance of a contract dated July 25, 1941, with the Veterans' Administration for the construction of a hospital building at Fort Howard, Md., the work on which contract was completed on or about November 19, 1943: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government.

SEC. 2. Such suit may be instituted in the Court of Claims at any time within 4 months from the approval of this act.

SEC. 3. Private Law 643, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 6, 1950, is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAUDE PIERRE CONNELLY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 291) for the relief of Claude Pierre Connelly, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 4, after the word "laws", to strike out "Claude Pierre" and insert "Claudio Pier", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Claudio Pier Connelly shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Claudio Pier Connelly."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 630) to suspend until December 21, 1952, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 36) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have a request from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CERTAIN CLAIMS OF WILLIAM BERGEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 588) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "injuries", to insert "allegedly", and on page 2, line 7, after the word "Code", to insert a colon and *"Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLEO C. REEVES ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$150" and insert "$123", and in line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$410.10" and insert "$168.10."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. ELEANOR K. SAVIDGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 849) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Henry W. Savidge, deceased, of Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims of said estate against the United States for loss of earnings sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by the said Henry W. Savidge as a result of his having been struck on December 28, 1942, by an Army vehicle in Philadelphia, Pa.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge."

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 50) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is hereby amended by striking out "1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953."

PRICE DIFFERENTIAL MADE IN GOOD FAITH AS DEFENSE TO CHARGE OF PRICE DISCRIMINATION UNDER ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder if I may ask the distinguished majority leader a question. He has been very fine about announcing the program in connection with wheat for India, and with respect to the supplemental appropriation bill and other measures. I am wondering if he has in mind when this bill may be set for consideration and debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have discussed it with the policy committee, and I assure the Senator that it will come up in due time. I cannot say now just when that will be.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the majority leader kindly withhold his objection until I make an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly, I will withhold the objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. The reason for my request is that I may not be here next week when the bill might come up. I desire at this time to make a brief explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, when we were debating last year on this floor Senate bill 1008, the so-called basing-point bill, there was virtually complete unanimity of agreement, so far as I can recall, on the point that the good-faith meeting of the legal price of a competitor should be a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act.

We disagreed about many things in connection with that bill; but on this one thing I do not remember that we had any disagreement.

Even the members of the Federal Trade Commission, who disagreed rather violently about what the law was, were agreed on what it should be, in this one respect at least. The Department of Justice took the same position. Even those who fought the bill most bitterly stated, here on this floor, one after another, that they recognized that the good-faith absorption of freight, or the quoting and selling at delivered prices, to meet the equally low price of a competitor, and without conspiracy or collusion, was not unlawful and should not be unlawful. Then they proceeded to attack the bill then pending before the Senate—S. 1008—on some other ground. They said it went further than merely confirming the right of a seller to meet in good faith the equally low price of a competitor; and, they said, it was because the bill went further than that, in one respect or another, that they were opposed to it.

Today we have before the Senate a bill which simply proposes to write into unequivocal statutory form what the Supreme Court of the United States has said the law is today. The language of this proposed bill is very short. It is completely clear and completely unambiguous. The bill provides that it shall be a complete defense against a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that he was only meeting in good faith the equally low price of a competitor, provided the seller did not know or have reason to know that the price he was meeting was not a lawful price.

When we brought out S. 1008 last year, we were criticized because we were attempting to amend the language in section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. We were told that if all we wanted to do was what we said we were trying to do, we should not change the language of existing law, but should simply add a new section to the law, stating what we wanted to do.

This year, when we have taken the language of the Supreme Court itself, and adapted it to the legislative purpose, and brought in a bill which does not change the language of existing law but merely adds a single, simple, new section, we are criticized because we are grafting something onto the law and not doing a clean job, and we are told that what we should do is go back and rewrite the existing language of section 2 of the Clayton Act.

According to a letter from former Senator Mead, now Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, three members of that Commission have concurred in a report which asks that this bill be amended. The purpose of the amendment sponsored by this group of three Federal Trade Commissioners is to change the present law, to change the Supreme Court's interpretation of the law, and to provide instead that the law shall be interpreted in the way in which the Federal Trade Commission contended it should have been interpreted, in the very case in which the Supreme Court decided against the Trade Commission's contentions.

At the time the bill was introduced, and before it was in print, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made the statement that whenever the Supreme Court handed down a decision unfavorable to big business, an effort was made to change the law; and that whenever the Supreme Court handed down a decision favorable to big business, an effort was made to write that decision into permanent law. The implication, of course, was that the proponents of this bill—or, at least, its sponsors—were serving big business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, what the bill actually proposes to do is to write into law the decision of the Supreme Court in this case. Is that not true?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. That is all it proposes to.

Mr. President, we are now faced with a situation in which the Federal Trade Commission, having lost its case in court, is asking to have the law changed so that it may win its case in Congress; whereas the proponents of the bill are simply seeking to uphold, and render safe from attack, the law as it now stands, and as the Supreme Court has decided the question.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said that—

> Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price cut by a competitor.

The Supreme Court has said, further, that—

> There is, on the other hand, plain language and established practice which permits a seller, through section 2 (b), to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer, without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers.

The highest Court of the land has declared that—

> In a case where a seller sustains the burden of proof placed upon it to establish its defense under section 2 (b), we find no reason to destroy that defense indirectly, merely because it also appears that the beneficiaries of the seller's price reductions may derive a competitive advantage from them or may, in a natural course of events, reduce their own resale prices to their customers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's 5 minutes under the rule has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may complete the statement. It will probably take 2 or 3 minutes more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Supreme Court has pointed out, very clearly, that if the law is to be so construed that a price discrimination, once established, may be held to be a violation of law if the Federal Trade Commission makes a finding that the discrimination may injure competition, regardless of the fact that the discrimination was only made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor, then the defense would have such little, if any, applicability as to be practically meaningless.

The bill, Mr. President, as I have said, borrows from the language of the Supreme Court itself, in the Standard Oil case. It does not change the doctrine laid down in that case. It does not extend that doctrine, nor contract it. It merely reasserts what the Supreme Court, in the Standard Oil case, has declared the law to be; and writes that reassertion into the permanent statute.

When I introduced the bill, Mr. President, I stated that I did not anticipate much controversy over it, because those of us who had sought enactment of S. 1008 can say, with accuracy, that the decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case, and this bill, which would write that decision into permanent law, are exactly in accord with what we said the law was at the time we were pushing for enactment of S. 1008; while, on the other hand, those who opposed the enactment of S. 1008 can say that they held the fort and prevented the enactment of legislation until the Supreme Court had spoken on the question; and they can go along with this bill because it is in complete accord with the Supreme Court's decision.

Perhaps I was overly optimistic, Mr. President, in making that statement; but I still think it is a logical way to look at the matter, and I still cannot see how there can be any substantial controversy over the bill.

Certainly, there can be no reasonable controversy over what the bill does, and therefore the issue is clearly presented, and we should be able to get to a vote in a relatively short time.

The Federal Trade Commission has raised one point which is perhaps worthy of mention. The letter signed by former Senator Mead, now Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, expressed fear that enactment of this bill might in some way shift the burden of proof. Mr. Mead's letter is not very clear about it; but the legal point the letter is attempting to make appears to be this: That when a defense is restricted by an exception clause, it is thereafter sufficient for the person claiming the defense to make a prima facie showing without regard to the exception, after which the adversary must prove the exception in order to defeat the defense.

Of course, that is not the law, and there is no possibility that the proviso in the bill would be construed in that way.

A person claiming a statutory defense has the burden of showing the whole defense. If there is an exception which will void the defense, he must show that he does not come within the exception. To state the proposition another way, the person claiming a statutory defense must establish every essential element of that defense by a preponderance of the evidence, otherwise he has failed to carry the burden of proof.

In connection with the debates last year on Senate bill 1008, I discussed at some length the difference between shifting the burden of proof and shifting the duty of proceeding. I do not think it is necessary to go into that matter again here and now. The important thing is that the burden of proof is on the person claiming a statutory defense to show all the elements of the defense. He must sustain that burden by a preponderance of the evidence, or his claim to the defense will fail. I do not want to argue complex procedural questions, and I do not intend to argue them, because any such argument can only result in befogging the issue now before us. I did feel, however, that I should make this clear and unequivocal statement with respect to the question of shifting the burden of proof. Having made it, I am done with the point; and if anyone of my colleagues wishes to challenge my statement, he can make his own record.

One phony argument which has been used against this bill has been unduly repeated, and I feel I should refer to it briefly.

It has been charged, both directly and by innuendo, that the bill, if enacted, would have an adverse effect on small business, through permitting chain stores to engage in methods of unfair competition with their retail competitors. One critic of the bill has even gone so far, in this direction, as to refer to the bill as a proposal to "legalize the destruction of small business."

Obviously, no such criticism is in any way justified. The bill does not deal in any way with sales at retail. A retailer who cuts the price of an item on his shelves, all the way down to cost, or even below cost, as a loss leader, or otherwise, cannot be said to be guilty of discrimination, because he is offering the same cut price to all his customers, at the same time. It is discrimination at the wholesale or distributing level with which the present law is concerned; and, as has been repeatedly pointed out, the bill now before the Senate does not go beyond what the law is today, as the Supreme Court has interpreted it.

In the report on the bill filed with the Judiciary Committee by the committee on the Clayton Act of the New York State Bar Association's section on antitrust law, there is a paragraph which should be preserved as a part of the legislative history of the bill.

Here is what the committee of the New York State Bar Association said. I shall read it slowly, for there is much meat in it:

> This committee unanimously endorses the objective of the proposed legislation. The Supreme Court * * * has ruled that Congress by the Robinson-Patman Act did not intend to outlaw competition, and the McCarran bill affirms the correctness of that ruling. Congress is subject to strong pressures today from public and private interests seeking protection from competition which hurts. Congress should not retreat from its position that competition is not intended to be painless and that the only alternative to such competitive hurt is a cartel or socialistic economy. Under the Robinson-Patman Act, a business competitor should be entitled to protection against predatory discrimination, but he should not expect to be insured against competition itself.

Mr. President, this bill is a declaration in favor of honorable competition in the field of pricing. There is nothing dishonorable about meeting a competitor's price in order to hold a customer; and the fact that business has the right to do so inevitably redounds to the benefit of the public, regardless of whether the seller absorbs freight charges, or other costs, in order to meet his competition.

I thank the Senate for giving me this opportunity to present my views on the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief observation on the bill. I wish to thank the Senator from Nevada for the explanation and for the analysis of it. I agree with him that there is no reason, so far as I can see, why the bill should not be passed. I compliment the Senator from Nevada on introducing the bill, on considering it in the Judiciary Committee, and on having it placed on the calendar.

I am most gratified by the remarks of the distinguished majority leader that in due course of time this bill will come before the Senate for consideration. I hope for its speedy passage. It will help very much in the situation in which it is intended to be of assistance. Enactment of the bill is badly needed,

especially for the assistance of the small-business men of the Nation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I did not attempt to go into an analysis of the bill at this time. The analysis is to be found in the report on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. Nevertheless, the brief statement the Senator from Nevada has made has given some of the highlights of the bill, of course. I hope every Senator will read the analysis of the bill, so that when it comes before the Senate, its speedy passage will be assured.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

JAN JOSEF WIECKOWSKI AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1229) for the relief of Jan Josef Wieckowski and his wife and daughter, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jan Josef Wieckowski, his wife, Irena, and daughter, Maria, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. OKSANA STEPANOVNA KASENKINA

The bill (H. R. 622) for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANINA WOJCICKA AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 632) for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrej Wojcicki and Stanislaw Wojcicki was considered, ordered to a third reading read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF MATTIE MASHAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,249.45" and insert "$6,244"; and in line 9, after the words "summer of", to strike out "1944" and insert "1942."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. CORAL E. ALLDRITT

The bill (H. R. 664) for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILDEGARD DETTLING AND JUDITH INGEBORG DETTLING

The bill (H. R. 667) for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES A. G. MARTINDALE

The bill (H. R. 714) for the relief of James A. G. Martindale was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NICOLETTA AND GUILIA PONTRELLI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 756) for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the name "Pontrelli", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Nicoletta Pontrelli becoming a public charge."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FREDERICK EDMOND TOMKINS AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 781) for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN YAN CHI GEE

The bill (H. R. 789) for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARGOT KAZERSKI

The bill (H. R. 859) for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST LT. WALTER S. MOE, JR.

The bill (H. R. 887) for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LENA VALSAMIS AND LUCY BALOSA VALSAMIS

The bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATHINA MARY ONASSIS

The bill (H. R. 890) for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY AND VASSILI DENDRAMIS

The bill (H. R. 891) for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUNTER ARNO THELEMANN

The bill (H. R. 898) for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TARO TAKARA

The bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of Taro Takara was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KIMIKO SHIBUYA

The bill (H. R. 1117) for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHIN YOK KONG

The bill (H. R. 1121) for the relief of Chin Yok Kong was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIO PUCCI AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1150) for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti; Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PIETRO GIANNETTINO

The bill (H. R. 1164) for the relief of Pietro Giannettino was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. CHIA LEN LIU

The bill (H. R. 1263) for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACQUELYN SHELTON

The bill (H. R. 1264) for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. FERNAND VAN DEN BRANDEN

The bill (H. R. 1421) for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden is a citizen and legal resident of Belgium. On June 30, 1948, the doctor was injured in a crash with a United States Government vehicle near Buchy. The report of the Department of the Army indicates that the fault was solely that of the driver of the Government vehicle and that Dr. Van Den Branden was seriously injured. He is, at the present time, 60 percent disabled, having been 100 percent disabled for quite some time. The sum awarded the doctor has been approved by the Department of the Army as being a sum reasonable and just under the circumstances. The sum amounts to $13,269.82.

This claimant has no remedy under the Federal Tort Claims Act, as the accident occurred outside the United States; and he has no remedy under the Foreign Claims Act, because he was not an inhabitant of France, the place where the accident occurred.

An identical bill was favorably reported from the committee to the Senate

in the Eighty-first Congress, on December 11, 1950.

The committee believes that the claim is fair, just, and equitable and has recommended favorable action.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1421) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT MEETING OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a unanimous-consent request and also a brief announcement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations are now in joint session. Therefore, first, I ask unanimous consent that they may meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR VOTE ON SENATE RESOLUTION 137

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations are very busy at their joint hearing. The Senator from Nebraska has wished to have the Senate vote on his motion to have the Senate consider Senate Resolution 137. Of course, I would not wish to inconvenience the two committees, which now are in session, any more than is absolutely necessary.

Therefore, for the purpose of arranging for a vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to have the Senate consider the resolution, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 1 o'clock, or as soon thereafter as a quorum may be obtained, the Senate shall proceed to vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska that the Senate consider Senate Resolution 137; and that if the motion is agreed to, thereafter, following the completion of the call of the calendar, the resolution be made the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. I also ask, in that connection, that a quorum call be waived.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to agree to the request, but I feel I cannot do so. I wish to present some remarks to the Senate immediately upon the completion of the call of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. The arrangement I have proposed would not prevent the Senator's doing so. The proposed agreement would simply call for the vote, and nothing more than that; and then the Senator from Nevada could proceed to make his remarks.

Mr. McCARRAN. If that is all that the proposed agreement amounts to, it will be satisfactory.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the majority leader, the Senate is to take a vote on the motion to consider the resolution, and if the motion is agreed to, the resolution will become the unfinished business, after completion of the calendar call, at which time the distinguished Senator from Nevada could make his remarks. Of course, if the motion is not agreed to, that would be another thing; but if it is agreed to, following the call of the calendar the resolution will become the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

T. L. MORROW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. INGEBORG RUTH SATTLER McLAUGHLIN

The bill (H. R. 1438) for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to object to the consideration of this bill, but I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Were both of the preceding bills passed? There was some colloquy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They were passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1438) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES R. KEICHER

The bill (H. R. 1451) for the relief of Charles R. Keicher was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELENA ERBEZ

The bill (H. R. 1475) for the relief of Elena Erbez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUISE LEITZINGER AND HER DAUGHTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1722) for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 14, after the words "of the", to strike out "date of their entry into the United States, upon the payment by them of the required visa and head tax" and insert "date of the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOSE ENCARNACION ORTIZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1823) for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "Upon the enactment of this act" and insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LUCIA ADAMOS

The bill (H. R. 2357) for the relief of Lucia Adamos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONCETTA SANTAGATI GIORDANO

The bill (H. R. 2450) for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERMS OF OFFICE OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

The bill (H. R. 3291) to amend subdivision (a) of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, because of the absence of Senators who might be interested in it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

PLACE OF FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

The bill (H. R. 3292) to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, I make a similar request as to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

TERMS OF OFFICE OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may revert to the two bills, calendar 266 and 267, House bills 3291 and 3292, which were placed at the foot of the calendar while I was called out of the Senate Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 3291?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill provides that when the term of office of a referee in bankruptcy expires the incumbent referee shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed and qualifies.

Under existing law, referees are appointed for a 6-year term. The statute, however, does not contain a saving clause for the continuance in office. In the instances in which the judges empowered to make the appointment of such referees fail to make such appointment promptly, a lapse occurs in the office.

The bill is proposed by the judicial conference of the United States and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3291) to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PLACE OF FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are two bills of the same tenor. Is there objection to the present consideration of H. R. 3292?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill permits the court to fix the place of the holding of the first meeting of creditors in a bankruptcy proceeding. At present there is an apparent inconsistency between two provisions of the Bankruptcy Act providing the place for the holding of the first meeting. The proposed bill resolves the inconsistency.

The bill bears the approval of the judicial conference of the United States and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 3292?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3292) to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRADY FRANKLIN WELCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I send to the desk an amendment, which I should like to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 10, after the word "Division", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Grady Franklin Welch, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $450, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for attorney's fees paid by him, the said Welch, to his attorney of record in the case of United States against Welch, criminal No. 10,200, District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, Norfolk division: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FACILITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT OF THE CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

The bill (S. 24) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under the present law the amount of money which may be expended by the Immigration and Naturalization Service or by the Treasury Department for the operation of the Customs Service for any one facility is $5,000. The limit of expenditure for any facility provided for the joint use of the Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service is $10,000.

This bill increases the limit of expenditure for the use of one of these agencies for any one project from $5,000 to $15,000 and increases the limit of expenditure for any one project for the joint use of these two services from $10,000 to $30,000.

It is the information of the committee that the Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service are seriously hampered in the administration of their work because they cannot acquire adequate facilities under the limitations of the present law because of the very substantial appreciation of land and building materials.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 24) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 817), as amended by the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1091; 19 U. S. C. 68), is further amended by striking from the proviso the figures "$5,000" and "$10,000", and substituting therefor the figures "$15,000" and "$30,000", respectively.

RAFAEL KUBELIK, HIS WIFE LUDNILA KUBELIK, AND THEIR MINOR SON, MARTIN KUBELIK

The bill (S. 275) for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludnila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a husband, wife and minor child, all natives of Czechoslovakia, who entered the United States as visitors in 1950. The husband is the musical director and conductor of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra and the wife is a concert violinist. The husband is a man of positive democratic ideals and principles. The family cannot return to Czechoslovakia for fear of persecution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "wife", to strike out "Ludnila" and insert "Ludmila", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik."

RUTH ALICE CRAWSHAW

The bill (S. 652) for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill? As I understand, the Veterans' Administration lodged an objection to the bill as being a preferential bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill provides for the payment of an amount estimated to be $10,000, to the widow of a former Navy enlisted man. The enlisted man served in the Navy from 1909 until the date of his mysterious disappearance at sea in August 1921. At that time, in accordance with Navy regulations, a board of investigation was convened to inquire into the circumstances surrounding his disappearance. That board made a finding, which was subsequently approved by the Secretary of the Navy, that the enlisted man's death was not incurred in line of duty and was the result of his own misconduct. There was no appeal from this decision except by way of an act of Congress.

Thereafter, the widow made application to the Veterans' Administration for a pension based on her hubsband's naval service. The Veterans' Administration was unable to award her a pension because of the decision of the board of investigation previously noted. Moreover, the Veterans' Administration had no authority to reinvestigate the case.

Several prior bills to alleviate the situation were introduced in various Congresses but no action was taken thereon.

Upon the establishment, in 1947, of the board for the correction of naval records, pursuant to authority contained in section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, an application was filed on behalf of the widow seeking correction of this record. That board, after a hearing and investigation in which all interested parties were represented, overturned the finding of the previous board and concluded that "an injustice is found in subject man's record under applicable standards of naval law, administration, and practice," and ordered that his record be corrected to show that his death did occur in the line of duty and not as a result of his own misconduct.

Thereafter, the Veterans' Administration, upon application, commenced paying the widow a pension based on her husband's honorable naval service. However, under applicable law and regulations the payments could not be made retroactive. This bill provides for a lump-sum payment to the widow for the loss of her pension from date of death of her husband to the date the Veterans' Administration commenced payment following the corrective action taken by the board established by Congress.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 642) for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Administrator of Veterans' Affairs" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury"; in line 4, after the word "pay", to insert "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated"; and on page 2, line 3, after the word "application", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth Alice Crawshaw, the widow of Ralph Everett Crawshaw (XC-687874), a sum equal to the amount which would have been payable to her as death compensation for the period beginning on the date of her original application for such benefits and ending on November 4, 1947, on account of the death of the said Ralph Everett Crawshaw in the naval service of the United States, had the award of such compensation been made effective from the date of such original application: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOOK KAT

The bill (H. R. 2068) for the relief of Sook Kat was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT OF 1947

The bill (S. 945) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1947, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to correct certain inequities in the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1947. It changes existing law in several particulars.

First. It creates a new salary class of "assistants, consultants, and supervisors," with a salary grade below that of principal, but higher than that of teacher. Some personnel in the department were doing work which was above the grade of teacher but below that of principal, and there was no classification for them. This bill would establish such a classification.

Second. It allows the promotion of five librarians and approximately 25 vocational-shop teachers, without the requirement of a master's degree. The reason for this is that the Board has been unable to find or to recruit for such positions personnel who have master's degrees.

Third. It increases the probationary period of service from 1 year to 2 years.

Fourth. It eliminates the requirement that teachers may receive annual increases, after 5 years, only by producing evidence of successful teaching, in the case of a teacher; for outstanding service, in the case of a school officer. The bill would require that the teacher's or officer's work be satisfactory. I understand this will have a good effect on the morale of school teachers.

Fifth. It creates a new position of chief examiner for colored schools. I understand white schools already have a chief examiner.

Sixth. It allows a teacher who on June 30, 1947, held a teaching position requiring a master's degree, or the equivalent of such a degree, but who did not hold such a degree to be continued in his or her position. I understand this affects approximately 260 teachers who have been doing work of higher grade but, because they have no master's degree, would be placed in an inferior position.

I understand all these recommendations meet the approval of the Board of Education, the Board of Commissioners, and the Budget Bureau. The bill is unanimously reported by the members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 945) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That article II, section 1, of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by inserting before "Class 14—Assistant principals in junior high schools" a new class to read as follows:

"Class 13A—Assistants, consultants, and supervisors: A basic salary of $4,330 per year with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,330 per year is reached."

SEC. 2. The third sentence of section 2 of such act, as amended, is amended (a) by striking therefrom "Except as hereinafter provided in this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "After July 1, 1947"; (b) by striking the colon preceding the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and (c) by striking therefrom the first proviso and so much of the second proviso as reads: "*And provided further, however*, That."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out from the proviso the word "year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "2 years."

(b) This section shall take effect on the 1st day of July next following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out from the first sentence thereof the following: ", except as provided in section 2 of this act."

SEC. 5. Paragraphs (e), (f), (g), (h), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), (p), and (ab) of section 6 of such act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(e) Teachers in junior high schools, now assigned to salary class 2, group C, shall be

transferred and assigned to salary class 2, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(f) Teachers in junior high schools, now assigned to salary class 2, group D, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 2, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(g) Teachers in senior high schools, now assigned to salary class 3, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 3, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(h) Teachers in senior high schools, now assigned to salary class 3, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 3, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(k) Teachers in vocational or trade schools shall be transferred and assigned as follows:

"(1) Vocational school teachers now assigned to salary class 5, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 5, group A, of the foregoing schedule;

"(2) Vocational school teachers now assigned to salary class 5, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 5, group A, of the foregoing schedule;

"(3) Vocational school teachers now assigned to salary class 5, group C, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 5, group C, of the foregoing schedule; and

"(4) Vocational school teachers now assigned to salary class 5, group D, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 5, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(l) Research assistants shall be transferred and assigned as follows:

"(1) Research assistants now assigned to salary class 6, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 6, group A, of the foregoing schedule;

"(2) Research assistants now assigned to salary class 6, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 6, group A of the foregoing schedule;

"(3) Research assistants now assigned to salary class 6, group C, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 6, group C, of the foregoing schedule; and

"(4) Research assistants now assigned to salary class 6, group D, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 6, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(m) Instructors in the teachers colleges now assigned to salary class 7, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 7, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(n) Instructors in the teachers colleges now assigned to salary class 7, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 7, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(o) Librarians in the teachers colleges now assigned to salary class 8, group A, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 8, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(p) Librarians in the teachers colleges now assigned to salary class 8, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 8, group C, of the foregoing schedule;

"(ab) Supervisors of penmanship now assigned to salary class 7, group B, shall be transferred and assigned to salary class 7, group C, of the foregoing schedule with the title of instructor in the teachers colleges;".

SEC. 6. Section 7 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. On July 1, 1948, and on the first day of each fiscal year thereafter, if his work is satisfactory, every permanent teacher, school officer, or other employee, shall receive an annual increase in salary within his salary class or position as hereinbefore provided without action of the Board of Education. A program of in-service training under regulations to be formulated by the Board of Education shall be established to promote continuous professional growth among the teachers, school officers, and other employees."

SEC. 7. Section 9 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) Every teacher, librarian, research assistant, and instructor in the teachers colleges in the service of the Board of Education on June 30, 1947, shall be transferred and assigned either to group A or to group C in salary classes 1 to 8, inclusive, in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of this act. Every teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, and instructor in the teachers colleges appointed on or after July 1, 1947, shall be assigned according to eligibility either to group A or to group C if the salary class to which he is appointed be divided into group A and group C. Every teacher, librarian, research assistant, and counselor transferred and assigned on July 1, 1947, to a group A, or appointed to group A on July 1, 1947, or thereafter shall be promoted to group C on the basis of documentary evidence establishing the attainment of a recognized master's degree: *Provided*, That after June 30, 1948, all promotions to group C shall be made on the first day of the month immediately following the date on which documentary evidence is submitted to the Board of Education establishing to the Board's satisfaction the attainment of a recognized master's degree.

"(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this act to the contrary, the Board of Education is authorized to promote school librarians in the service of the Board of Education on permanent tenure on July 1, 1950, to class 4, group C, without requiring such librarians to have a master's degree and to appoint or promote vocational high school shop teachers to class 5, group C, without requiring such teachers to have a master's degree."

SEC. 8. Section 13 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. There shall be appointed by the Board of Education, on the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, a chief examiner for the board of examiners for white schools and and a chief examiner for the board of examiners for colored schools. All members of the respective boards of examiners shall serve without additional compensation."

SEC. 9. Appropriations to carry out, after June 30, 1951, the purposes of sections 2, 4, and 5 of this act, and so much of section 7 of this act as relates to subsection (a) of section 9 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended, are authorized. The appropriations for general administration, general supervision and instruction, and vocational education, George-Barden program, under the caption "Public schools" contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1950, approved June 29, 1949, and in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1951, approved July 18, 1950, are hereby made available for carrying out the purposes of such sections of this act for periods prior to July 1, 1951.

SEC. 10. Sections 2, 4, and 5 of this act, and so much of section 7 of this act as relates to subsection (a) of section 9 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended, shall take effect July 1, 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is so near the hour of 1 o'clock that when the next bill is called I should like to have present the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], who is busy at a hearing, and I suggest at this time the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bricker	Hill	Moody
Bridges	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Md.	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Ives	Nixon
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Clements	Kefauver	Robertson
Connally	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smathers
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
Ferguson	McCarran	Stennis
Flanders	McCarthy	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Underwood
Fulbright	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Martin	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into today, the Senate will proceed to vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137. The Secretary will state the resolution as amended.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the resolution, to which an amendment has been offered, but

which cannot be acted on until the resolution is considered.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 137) authorizing Senators to attend as observers the joint meetings of the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations on the far-eastern policy.

Mr. McFARLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand the unanimous-consent agreement provides that following the vote, even though the motion be agreed to, the Senate will continue the call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. McFARLAND. Senators who are opposed to taking up the resolution would vote "nay" and those who favor taking it up and displacing the farm labor bill would vote "yea," would they not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there a proposed amendment at the desk which would provide for open hearings?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has submitted an amendment, which was heretofore read for the information of the Senate. It is lying on the table.

Mr. FERGUSON. It provides for open hearings, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I understand that after the disposition of the motion, even if it should be determined that the resolution should be taken up, it would be subject to indefinite debate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be subject to any kind of debate which would be appropriate under the rules.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators who favor the motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution will vote "yea"; those who are opposed will vote "nay." The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business, and, if present, they would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are necesarily absent, and, if present, they would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] who is necessarily absent is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who is necessarily absent is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] who is necessarily absent is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—37

Bennett	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Flanders	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Nixon
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Knowland	Tobey
Carlson	Langer	Wherry
Case	Lodge	Wiley
Cordon	McCarran	Williams
Dirksen	McCarthy	Young
Dworshak	Martin	
Ecton	Millikin	

NAYS—41

Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Byrd	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
Gillette	Long	Smathers
Green	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McFarland	Sparkman
Hennings	McKellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Underwood
Hoey	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	George	Neely
Benton	Hunt	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Jenner	Taft
Chavez	Lehman	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker

So Mr. WHERRY's motion was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the vote just taken, of course, defeats the motion to consider the resolution presented by the Senator from Michigan, which was the vehicle upon which we expected to place an amendment providing for open hearings. Someone has asked me if we expect to renew the motion. I simply desire to say that those of us who believe in open hearings have done our level best to get this matter before the Senate. We have failed. My convictions in favor of open hearings are just as strong as they ever have been; in fact, they are stronger, in view of some of the things we have seen happen. I do not believe in drawing an iron curtain over the hearings, except to withhold such information as might affect detrimentally the national security. I will say we have done our best. We have made three or four attempts. What will happen in the future I do not know. The future will have to take care of itself.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe in reply to what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has said, that never in the history of this Republic has a hearing been so fully, completely, and accurately presented to the American people, with security matters deleted, as has been the hearing which is in progress at the present time. It is a great triumph for national security and the saving of the lives of American men who are fighting our battles in Korea.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, in support of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee I should like to offer for insertion in the RECORD at this time the column by Mr. Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of May 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

In view of what appears to be coming in the great inquiry which begins on Thursday we must ask ourselves what is going to happen to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They face the fact that there is now to be published an only somewhat expurgated version of their most secret papers. When they wrote or approved these papers they believed that these papers would not be published—that they would be confidential for themselves, their lawful superiors, and the commanders in the field to whom they issued instructions.

There is no need to guess now about what the publication of these papers is going to prove about the best way to conduct the Korean war. But one does not have to be a prophet to see what the precedent now being set is going to do to the conduct of the United States Government.

We—that is to say the administration and the opposition and everyone else so far as I can see except a few stray dissenters—have accepted the theory that an officer, who disagrees with his orders, may by challenging the integrity of his lawful superiors compel them to open up all their files to the inspection of Congress. According to this theory the congressional investigators are the judges of what shall or shall not be published. What they decide to publish is to be treated as the evidence in a popular debate which is to pass upon the integrity and the competence of the men responsible for the defense of the Nation.

This is the theory which we are about to make into a precedent. It is being done, some say, in the name of the sacred right of the people to know all the facts. They are, I believe, profoundly mistaken. If this theory goes unchallenged, if what is about to be done is accepted as a precedent, as one of the legitimate usages of our constitutional system, the effect will not be to give the people access to the truth. The effect will be to conceal, to disguise, to falsify the truth that is given to the President and to the Congress and to the people.

Once the precedent is set, it will mean that no paper in the files of the Government can be considered truly confidential. Today, the arbiter of what is and of what is not confidential happens to be Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, an able and judicious man. But if Senator RUSSELL can browse around in the papers of the Chiefs of Staff and be the arbiter as to whether they have a right to say that this paper is too secret to be published, then his successors will also be the arbiters.

Senator RUSSELL is a Democrat who will not wish to injure fatally a Democratic administration. But his successor might be one who did wish to do just that, and he might insist, therefore, upon publishing the very documents which Senator RUSSELL has not published. Thus all the Chiefs of Staff, and I might add all other responsible officials, are on notice from here on out that some time or other any document they sign may be published in whole or in part, in its context or out of its context.

What will this do to the Chiefs of Staff? Approximately what it would do to a boy writing to his girl, to a husband writing to his wife, to a businessman writing to his partner, or to Senator TAFT writing to Senator WHERRY, if they felt sure that their letters were going to be published—most probably at the moment when they would cause the maximum embarrassment. Letters written with a knowledge that they may be published will be the kind of letters that are written for publication. They will be phonies in that they will say what will look as well as possible in print. The effect will be to make the formal papers of the Government a false front which does not reveal, which in fact is designed to conceal, the truth. This is already the character of some of the paper work in the Government; it is written with an eye to the headlines which will be used when and if it is published, and what the official really thinks has to be ascertained by calling him on the telephone or asking him to lunch. But this kind of disintegration has not presumably become characteristic as yet of the papers that deal with the issues of life and death, with the military security and the high policy of the United States.

But if this evil precedent is set, that is just what will happen to these papers. They will be written for publication and they will be addressed not to the vital interests of the United States in the long run but to the passions and the prejudices and the ignorance of the moment. The papers will not be worth reading if they are written for publication. In fact they will be worse than useless in that they will not be honest.

Those who think that the right of the people to know can be met by destroying the rules of confidence and publishing anything and everything should ask themselves why they think it right, why they believe it to be part of the very substances of liberty, that some relations shall be privileged and not opened to publicity; the relations of husband and wife, of lawyer and client, of doctor and patient, of priest and his charges. Why do we protect these relationships? Is it not in order to protect our liberties? In Government the relationship between the civil power and the military, between the President and his lawful military advisers, the Joint Chiefs, is as sensitive and as critical as any of the private relations that we protect. On the integrity of the relation between the President and his advisers may depend the life of the Nation. That relation must be destroyed, it will be destroyed, if the privilege of confidence is taken away.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is necessary for the Senator from Oregon to leave the floor in order to attend the hearings of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. I ask unanimous consent at this time to submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to section 504 of Senate bill 984, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and have it printed and lie on the table so that it will be available for being called up on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the call of the calendar will be resumed. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

AFFIRMATION OF FRIENDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FOR ALL THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if, after the call of the calendar is completed, and the unfinished business, Senate bill 984, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, is resumed, it is the intention to proceed with the consideration of that bill, even late into this evening, or to dispense with the consideration of it today—or what are the plans? Several Senators have asked me what the plans are in respect to that bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will leave that to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, aside from the pending amendment, there may be two or three other amendments, but I do not expect it will take very long to consider them. I should like to conclude the consideration of the bill this afternoon if possible. It has now been before the Senate for 9 days.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, submitted by Mr. MCMAHON, and reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The first committee amendment was, on page 2, line 2, after the words "That the", to strike out "Members of this."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution which was unanimously reported to the Senate, and which is sponsored by approximately one-fourth of the membership of this body, reaffirming the friendship of the Senate for the peoples of Russia and for the peoples of the lands over which the Kremlin has control, is a vivid testimonial to what is in the minds and hearts of the American people. I call particular attention to the fact that when this concurrent resolution is adopted by the Senate and by the House of Representatives, as I know it will be, it will be transmitted to the President of the United States for transmission to the Kremlin, so that it may be disseminated to the Russian people.

The Soviet Union has tried, and with a good deal of success, to steal the word "peace" and arrogate it to themselves. Unfortunately, never was a greater fraud perpetrated on the people of the world. The concurrent resolution represents a concrete effort which we are making to demonstrate to the peoples of the world that what the American people want and what the Congress wants above everything else is peace. Of course, Mr. President, we mean a peace in the real sense of the word, a peace with honor and with justice. I believe that the message we are now getting under way to the peoples of the Soviet Union may well result in bringing about a better state of relations between them and the Government of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the remaining committee amendments.

The remaining committee amendments were on page 2, line 2, after the word "Congress", to insert "of the United States"; in line 5, after the word "Union", to strike out "by declaring" and insert "and declares"; in line 9, after the word "of", to strike out "America's" and insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "desire", to insert "of the American people"; in line 13, after the word "people", to insert "and their Government"; in line 19, after the word "between", to strike out "them" and insert "the United States Government", and in line 20, after the word "Government", to insert "and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor", or as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress of the United States reaffirm the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, and declares—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desire of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people and their Government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That, although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences standing between the United States Government and the Soviet Government and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor; and

That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the people of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the Chair). The bill will be passed over.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to present a unanimous-consent agreement at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we not conclude the calendar before that is done?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it will take but a moment or two. It relates to a limitation of debate. Senators are desirous of knowing whether we are going to proceed with the unfinished business, the bill relating to the importation of certain agricultural labor. There are so many Senators engaged in the hearings in the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee that I feel we ought to have a better attendance when the bill is being considered.

In order to expedite consideration of the bill, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12 o'clock on Monday next, debate on any amendment to the unfinished business, or any motion, including appeals, which may be pending or which may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided, and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], respectively, and, in the case of individual amendment or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], respectively; provided, first, that in the event the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or some Senator designated by him; and second, that no amendment which is not now printed and lying on the table—that is, any amendment that may not already have been submitted—may be submitted by a Senator intended subsequently to be proposed by him and ordered to lie on the table which is not germane to the subject matter of the bill shall be received; ordered further, that debate on the question of the final passage of said bill shall be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the requested unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Is it the intention not to have the Senate vote on any amendments at all this afternoon?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; we would not take them up at all today, if the agreement is reached; we would let the bill and the amendments go over until Monday.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that it is the purpose to have the Senate take a recess until Monday, if the unanimous-consent agreement is entered?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; after the speeches for today are completed and after the call of the calendar is concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware withhold his objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am willing to withhold the objection temporarily.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to invite attention——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall withhold the objection temporarily, but I think I shall have to object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; if the Senator from Delaware is going to object——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. In the proposed agreement is there a provision that one hour or one hour and a half may be allowed to each side for debate on the bill? If so, then I could allot time to any Senator on my side of the aisle who wishes to make a speech at that time.

Mr. McFARLAND. The proposed agreement includes such a provision, namely, that 2 hours be allowed, to be divided equally.

Mr. President, in the previous unanimous-consent request there is a provision which I would include in this one, namely, that either of the Senators in charge of the time may yield any part of the time on the bill for discussion of an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall ask the distinguished majority leader to withhold the unanimous-consent request for a few minutes, so as to enable us to see if we can work it out.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I shall do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the majority leader.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we now proceed with the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Arizona has yielded to his colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to invite the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader to the fact that the supplemental appropriation bill is on the calendar. If we can dispose today of all the committee amendments which are not controversial—of course there are one or two amendments which are controversial—I think that would expedite the handling of the public business. I suggest that after the completion of the call of the calendar, if the Senate has no further business to transact at that time, the appropriation bill be considered and acted upon to the extent I have indicated, because it is an important measure in the public interest and should be passed as soon as possible.

Mr. McFARLAND. That would expedite the transaction of the business of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will that mean that that appropriation bill would then displace the agricultural labor bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Temporarily, yes, if that is agreeable; if there is to be no

other business before the Senate this afternoon, I should like to have the agricultural labor bill temporarily laid aside, and have the Senate consider the appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. It would be the Senator's intention to ask unanimous consent to that effect, namely, that the agricultural labor bill be temporarily laid aside. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Exactly.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from Arizona that the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana have made an arrangement which, if accepted as a part of the unanimous-consent agreement, will iron out their problems.

Mr. ELLENDER. The suggestion is to modify the unanimous-consent agreement so as to provide that instead of dividing the time from 12 o'clock, it be divided from 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. And that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be recognized at 12 o'clock.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is no objection, and if it is agreeable to the Senator from Oregon, I would say it is unnecessary to control the time on the bill. However, that part of the proposed agreement can be left as it is.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am willing to modify my request to that extent. I regret very much that we have to do so. However, as I have previously said, in working out unanimous-consent agreements, we have to do the best we can.

I feel that if Congress is going to get away from Washington this summer, we must make faster progress. If Senators who wish to make speeches will make them late in the day, after the Senate concludes its business for the day, I shall be perfectly willing to remain and hear their speeches. If we proceed in that way, we shall expedite matters very much.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hate to make objection. I am not trying to get the floor at 12 o'clock on Monday necessarily; but there are many amendments, and the debate on the bill and on the amendments could consume most of the day. That is why I suggested what I did.

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly. Would it be agreeable to the Senator from Delaware that he have the floor at 12 o'clock and that the limitation on debate begin at 2 o'clock or whenever the Senator from Delaware finishes his speech, whichever is earlier?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; I so modify the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in order that there shall be no mistake, let me state that the proposal now is that the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is to be recognized when the Senate convenes at noon on Monday, and that the time between then and 2 p. m., if the Senator from Delaware wishes to use it, is agreed to be given to him; or, if he does not use all that time, that the limitation on debate begin whenever the Senator from Delaware concludes his speech or at 2 o'clock, whichever is earlier.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has suggested that after we conclude the speeches this afternoon, if it is not then too late, we temporarily lay aside the agricultural labor bill and take up the supplemental appropriations bill, and dispose of the noncontroversial amendments to that bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Some amendments which are to be offered to the bill are to be offered by Members who are not now present.

Mr. McFARLAND. We understand that. The proposal is simply that we dispose of the noncontroversial committee amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I always hesitate a little to agree to such a proposal. I will agree if the majority leader insists. However, the difficulty is to ascertain which amendments are noncontroversial.

I would dislike very much to let an amendment be adopted on the assumption that it was noncontroversial, and then later find that some Senator regarded it as a controversial amendment. So I hate to agree to such a proposal. However, if the majority leader insists, I shall let it go.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the eminent majority leader whether there will be any voting this afternoon on controversial amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is not anticipated that there will be any voting on controversial amendments this afternoon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is this proposal a part of the unanimous-consent agreement which has been under discussion for some time?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then why do not we dispose of one proposal at a time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which has previously been stated, together with the modifications which have been stated?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, are we now discussing the unanimous-consent request of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. I had understood that the unanimous-consent agreement I had proposed had already been agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, it had not been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as modified, which has been submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]? The Chair hears none, and the proposed agreement as modified is adopted.

The unanimous-consent agreement as reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, May 7, 1951, at the hour of 12 noon, Mr. WILLIAMS be entitled to the floor; that beginning at the hour of 2 o'clock on said day, or at the conclusion of Mr. WILLIAMS' address, if prior to said hour, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. WHERRY, respectively, and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. ELLENDER, respectively: *Provided*, (1) That in the event Mr. ELLENDER is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by Mr. WHERRY or some Senator designated by him; and (2) that no amendment not heretofore submitted by a Senator, intended to be subsequently proposed by him, and which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, not germane to the subject matter of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the said bill shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. WHERRY or some Senator designated by him, respectively: *Provided, however*, That during the consideration of any individual amendment or motion, either of said Senators may yield to the mover of any such amendment or motion, or to one who is opposed thereto, any portion of such time of 1 hour allotted to him under this paragraph as he may desire.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we resume the calling of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY OF COAST GUARD TO INCLUDE THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The bill (S. 1025) to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, since the end of the war, the Coast Guard has been maintaining aids to navigation, principally buoys, in the so-called Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, consisting of the Marianas, the Carolines, and the Marshall Islands. Up until now the Coast Guard has been able to maintain those aids to navigation in the Trust Territory even though that area is not specifically mentioned in the statute, by reason of the fact that the islands have been under naval government and thereby meet the requirements of the law.

However, on July 1, 1951, the government of the Trust Territory will be transferred to the Department of the Interior, and it will no longer be under naval government. Hence it is extremely doubtful that the Coast Guard will

have authority to continue to maintain these essential aids to navigation after that date. If the bill is enacted, the authority of the Coast Guard will remain unimpaired after the transfer of the islands to the Interior Department, which, I repeat, will take place on July 1.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Am I correct in understanding that what the Senator is now indicating is to the effect that the Interior Department will have no right or authority whatever which would supersede the authority of the Coast Guard?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Department of the Interior will not perform the function of providing the aids to navigation, and the Coast Guard will be denied the right to exercise the function, so that makes the bill necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 81 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word "possessions", the phrase "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,", so that the sentence will read as follows: "Such aids to navigation other than loran stations shall be established and operated only within the United States, its Territories and possessions, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and at other places where such aids to navigation have been established prior to June 26, 1948."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

LEASING OF SPACE WITHIN AIRPORTS IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 1183) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, under the present law, the Secretary of Commerce is empowered to lease space or property at the airports in Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, for a period not to exceed 10 years. This limitation has made it impossible for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to interest private persons in providing adequate hangar facilities at the two airports. In other words, they cannot make a lease to extend beyond 10 years. The purpose of the bill is to extend the 10-year period and make it possible to have a lease run for 20 years.

The early construction of hangar facilities on the two airports in Alaska is urgent and must be accomplished within the next working season. Since the construction of hangar facilities would require funds in addition to the $17,000,000 already authorized for the airports, the Civil Aeronautics Administrator is unable to provide such facilities, and since the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks are not disposed to sponsor such projects, it is necessary that private persons be interested in constructing the facilities. This bill would encourage that happy consummation. If the Department of Commerce were authorized to grant leases for a period of 20 years, as here proposed, private financing would be attracted. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1183) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," approved May 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 277), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of Commerce is empowered to lease under such conditions as he may deem proper and for such periods as may be desirable (not to exceed 10 years) space or property within or upon the airports for purposes essential or appropriate to the operation of the airports: *Provided*, That real property within or upon the airports may be leased for purposes of erecting structures necessary or incident to the operation of the airports for periods not exceeding 20 years."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

RELIEF OF SUNDRY FORMER STUDENTS OF THE AIR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The bill (S. 1227) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Raymond Pohl, Jr., 505A Magnolia Avenue, Frederick, Md., $83.95; Dan K. Rawlings, 205 Laurel Avenue, Corbin, Ky., $13.10; Harold L. Reed, 201 West Lindell Street, West Frankfort, Ill., $12.20; Marcus A. Sessl, 417 West Pennview Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $8; Robert D. Simmons, 835½ Broadway, New Orleans, La., $23.85; Harry P. Smith, Jr., 3225 Chesapeake Avenue, Hampton, Va., $60.66; Paul E. Smith, 2109 Eoff Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $6.10; Raymond C. Sowko, Glennland Apartments, State College, Pa., $444.40; Clyde C. Spears, 347 Linden Walk, Lexington, Ky., $236.60; Donald E. Spears, 123 West Central Avenue, Belle, W. Va., $212.70; Homer R. Steele, route 1, Fairview, W. Va., $142; John D. Stiles, Wadestown, W. Va., $110.20; George F. Stock, Jr., Hollandale, Miss., $236.95; David A. Stockton, 105 East Seventh Street, box 256, Ritzville, Wash., $179.65; Frank A. Sullivan, 7949 Susquehanna Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $396.80; William K. Sutton, 981 Fincastle Road, Lexington, Ky., $141.25; Floyd Ramsey Tarr, 3729 Marlamont Drive, Weirton, W. Va., $170.05; Hagop H. Terzagian, 217 Myrtle Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., $338.85; Jack Alfred Thalimer, 4518 West Grace Street, Richmond, Va., $226.80; Eugene R. Thomas, 9 South York Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $223.20; Forest G. Thompson, 2201 Frederica Street, Owensboro, Ky., $157.80; Joseph C. Thompson, box 700, O. M. S., Travis AFB, Fairview, Calif., $423.25; Thomas W. Tigertt, box 93, Wilmer, Tex., $583.90; Richard J. Torchia, 630 Dow Avenue, Carnegie, Pa., $229.80; Lee C. Truman, Jr., 2422 Allen Street, Owensboro, Ky., $252.40; Charles B. Upshaw, 394 West Wesley Road NW., Atlanta, Ga., $191; George J. Walters, Jr., 438 South Dallas Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., $435.55; Gilbert Watz, 834 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., $366.45; Arthur J. Weinsten, 501 Manheim Street (22–A), Philadelphia, Pa., $200.10; Robert J. Weiss, 111 West Cherryhill Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $239.25; James Bernard Welborn, 442 Cherry Street, Russellville, Ky., $107.55; Earl M. Williams, box 204, Evarts, Ky., $297.50; Edwin J. Williams, Jr., 1832 Chuckatuck Avenue, Petersburg, Va., $505.60; Charles P. Wilson, Jr., route 1, Walkersville, W. Va., $404.16; and Harold W. Wilson, 205½ Fourth Street, Parkersburg, W. Va., $324.20. The payment of said sums shall be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property as a result of a fire that occurred on June 28, 1948, in the building in which they were quartered at Langley Air Force Base, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BETTY MINORU KAWACHI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 915) for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Betty Minoru Kawachi, the minor child of Mrs. James J. Leatherman, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHILIP J. HINCKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1113) for the relief of Philip J. Hincks, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$152.40", and insert "$150", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Philip J. Hincks, of Middlebury, Vt., the sum of $150. The payment of such sum shall be in full payment of all claims of the said Philip J. Hincks against the United States for reimbursement of money paid for uniforms which were required during his training as a midshipman at the United States Naval Reserve Midshipman's School, Chicago, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATHANASIOS ELIAS CHELIOTIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1254) for the relief of Athanasios Elias Cheliotis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Athanasios Elias Cheliotis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2929) to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Tennessee give us an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LEFAUVER. Mr. President, this bill would make a good compromise between the points of view with reference to the Marine Corps. Section 2 has been rewritten in such a way as not to give the Commandant of the Marine Corps a vote with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but on matters which pertain to the Marine Corps he would have an opportunity of being heard and of filing supporting memoranda for the consideration of the Secretary of Defense.

It then provides four full strength combat divisions for the Marine Corps. The evidence shows that they are needed, and that this fire power can be obtained through the marines more economically than in any other way. The bill, sponsored by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Armed Services. If there are questions, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the eminent junior Senator from Tennessee has stated, the bill fixes the floor under the strength of the Marine Corps at four full combat divisions, with four supporting air wings and allied service troops and organizations. It provides, however, that there shall not be more than 400,000 men in the Marine Corps, and thus fixes a ceiling to the Marine Corps. It is anticipated that 4 full divisions will be supplied, with a total of approximately 300,000 men, so the floor is 300,000 men. The ceiling is 400,000.

The compromise on the second section is that instead of the Commandant of the Marine Corps being a full-fledged member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he is to be a consultant member. The bill was introduced by 44 Members of the United States Senate, and was reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. I very much hope that it may be passed at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I do not quite understand the amendment which is proposed to the bill. Will the Senator explain it a little more fully?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. In its original form, the bill provided that the Commandant of the Marine Corps was to be a full-fledged member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As amended, he is not to be a full-fledged member, but a consultant member, and when matters affecting the Marine Corps come up, if he disagrees with the decision, he is to be privileged to have direct communication with the Secretary of the Navy and the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Oregon, who has left the floor, has offered an amendment to this bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; that was an amendment proposed to the unfinished business, Senate bill 984, the farm-labor bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 2, line 4, to strike out the word "less" and insert "more", and on page 2, line 5, to strike out section 2 and insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all problems before the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On matters in which the Marine Corps may be concerned he shall be permitted to be heard and to file a supporting memorandum for consideration by the Secretary of Defense and the President.

So as to make the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 106 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows: "The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, and the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not more than four hundred thousand."

SEC. 2. The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all problems before the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On matters in which the Marine Corps may be concerned he shall be permitted to be heard and to file a supporting memorandum for consideration by the Secretary of Defense and the President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 133) to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate from the further consideration of S. 656, to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

DIRECTOR OF THE DISTRICT OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

The bill (H. R. 3297) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this measure? Apparently there is no report on it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if an explanation is desired, I may say that I know a little something about the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think there is a report in print, and I respectfully request that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there is a report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is a report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I see a report has now come in. It came in late today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada withhold his objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. I withhold my objection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I, myself, objected to this bill once before, and I spoke to some Senators about it. It has been corrected, insofar as the matter of retirement is concerned. The appointment of one of the members of either the Fire Department or the Metropolitan Police Department as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, as I see it, is necessary at this time, and the bill has been amended to meet all the objections made heretofore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3297) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 2, line 22, after the word "greater", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*And provided further*, That should such member, while serving as Director of the Office of Civil Defense for the District of Columbia, elect to retire under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, he may withdraw the retirement funds deposited in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of such act approved September 1, 1916, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

APPLICATION OF DIVIDENDS ON NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE IN PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill is Calendar 198, House bill 321, which went to the foot of the calendar. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 321) to provide on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill? That is primarily the reason it went to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas, and I shall endeavor to make a brief explanation.

The purpose of the bill is to provide that until and unless the Veterans' Administration has received from an insured a request in writing for payment in cash, any dividend accumulations and unpaid dividends payable after January 1, 1951, shall be applied in payment of premiums becoming due on insurance subsequent to the date of the dividend.

The present law provides that dividends must be paid in cash and may not be used for payment of premiums, except upon a written request of the insured. The bill would substitute automatic application of the dividend as a premium payment for an optional one, unless the Veterans' Administration receives from the insured a request in writing for payment in cash.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 321) to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the call of the calendar.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 984.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in its issue of May 2, the Washington Post printed an editorial entitled "Cheap Farm Labor." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, together with a letter dated May 3, 1951, signed by me and addressed to the editor of the Washington Post, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 2, 1951]

CHEAP FARM LABOR

The Senate is now about ready, after 3 days of debate, to come to a vote on Senator ELLENDER's bill for the recruitment and admission to the United States of Mexican agricultural workers. The bill was framed and studied by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry before the recently issued report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor became available. It ignores, or flouts, the most important recommendations of that Commission. Indeed, Senator ELLENDER's bill, if enacted, would serve merely to perpetuate shocking conditions in the agriculture of the Southwest that do grave injury to American and to Mexican farm laborers alike. Senators CHAVEZ, HUMPHREY, and LEHMAN have rendered valuable service in exposing the evils and inadequacies of this legislation. We hope that the amendments they have urged will prevail.

Senator CHAVEZ' action on the measure merits special commendation. Many of the big growers in his home State of New Mexico want to see it enacted without any changes—because they want the Mexican peons who can be brought in under contract to harvest crops and then sent back where they came from. The justification for bringing them in is that an adequate supply of American farm workers is not available. But the fact is, as the President's Commission made clear, that there are plenty of domestic workers available if the growers would only give them decent wages and decent working conditions. The importation of poverty-stricken Mexican peons in years past has operated to drive down farm wages and to reduce a million American farm workers to a state of homeless, rootless migrancy.

The Mexican Government now insists—altogether properly, in our judgment—that certain minimum conditions be met by the growers for the care of contract workers brought in from Mexico. Equivalent conditions—and priority in consideration—should be given to domestic workers. In addition to this, responsibility for determining whether foreign workers are actually needed should be vested directly in the Secretary of Labor and not left to the discretion of State and regional directors of employment security; the latter are simply too susceptible to the pressure of the big growers. And, finally, there ought to be a stringent prohibition against the employment of so-called wetbacks—Mexicans who come into the country illegally. Without such safeguards, the Ellender bill would serve, as Senator CHAVEZ charged, to bring back the things which Lincoln did away with and to bring about peonage in my State and in certain other areas of the United States.

The demand that such safeguards be included in the bill implies no hostility to Mexican immigrants and no desire to keep American growers from obtaining all the labor they need. But the misery of the Mexicans must no longer be exploited to the disadvantage of themselves and of hungry workers on this side of the border.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1951.

Mr. HERBERT ELLISTON,
Editor, the Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLISTON: An editorial published in the Washington Post May 2, 1951, charged that the bill, S. 984, recommended for enactment by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, "ignores, or flouts, the most important recommendations of that Commission" (the President's Commission on Migratory Labor). I should like to point out that the committee considered this legislation and ordered it reported to the Senate before the report of the Commission was issued. Therefore, I submit that although the legislation may honestly differ from the conclusions of the President's Commission, it does not ignore or flout that Commission's report.

The only purpose of S. 984 is to enable agricultural producers in this country to continue in a legal manner to import needed farm workers from Mexico where it is economically feasible to do so. The Mexican Government has served notice they intend to terminate the present international agreement under which the program is now operating on June 30, 1951, unless the United States Government is authorized to do the actual recruiting of agricultural workers in Mexico, and will guarantee compliance by employers in this country with the indi-

vidual work contract. S. 984 would, therefore, authorize our Government to carry out its part of the tentative agreement reached with Mexico this year on these modifications. If the bill is not enacted, there will be no legal program for importing Mexican workers after June 30, 1951.

The Commission on Migratory Labor took nearly a year to make its study. I am sure you will agree with me that it would be impossible for a committee in Congress to determine the validity and merit of the recommendations of the Commission and have the Congress enact legislation based on the committee's findings by June 30.

The Commission is properly concerned with the welfare of domestic migratory farm workers in this country. However, the extent to which the Federal Government will pay transportation and subsistence costs, prescribe minimum wages, and guarantee certain standards of working conditions, medical services, and housing is a major question of national policy. Establishing such policy is not the purpose of S. 984.

While it is true the bill as reported provided that the director of State employment service shall certify foreign workers are needed, the bill was amended on the floor of the Senate prior to publication of the editorial to provide that the Secretary of Labor shall make such certification.

Statements have been made during debate on the bill, and I believe the same conclusions have been drawn in the Commission's report, that sufficient domestic labor is available for agricultural employment if proper recruitment efforts were to be made. I should like to outline the requirements of the United States Employment Service before it will certify the unavailability of domestic labor.

First, every employer must file an order with a local employment office requesting domestic labor. The local office searches its files for qualified workers, and if unable to recruit the labor on the basis of its records, resorts to other recruitment devices which commonly include use of the press and radio. When the local office has been unsuccessful in its own jurisdiction, it originates a clearance order which will reach every office in the State, before the effort is extended beyond State lines. Each local office attempts to recruit the needed labor.

If there is no labor supply within the State, the State office of the employment service sends the order to adjoining States, where it goes to local offices thought to have a potential supply of labor. Those local offices recruit labor through the use of their own files, and by other recruitment devices.

Should adjoining States be unable to furnish the labor, the order goes to a regional office of the United States Employment Service, which sends the order to other States which may have a potential supply of labor. If the regional office first receiving the order and adjoining regions cannot locate a source of labor supply, the order is transmitted to the Washington headquarters, who transmit the order to distant States which may have a potential labor supply. When these efforts do not produce the needed workers, then certification is made that Mexican and other foreign workers can be imported. Under such a system, I cannot see how available domestic workers fail to be utilized before foreign workers are imported.

Another major problem now being discussed in relation to this legislation is the illegal immigration of Mexican workers, commonly known as wetbacks. The bill prohibits the recruiting of wetbacks under the program authorized by the legislation, which is a change from the present program. Furthermore, it is evident that if we don't have a legal program for importing Mexican workers, the use of wetbacks will be encouraged.

There are many phases of the wetback problem to be considered in recommending Federal action. I have introduced S. 1391 which would provide severe penalties for the employment of illegal emigrants, a matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. There are still other methods proposed for solving the problem, and I suggest that it would be impossible for Congress to consider all of them and enact this legislation by June 30.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this Nation and a substantial part of the world have been stirred and shaken by what has come to be known as "the MacArthur incident." But the word "incident" is far too narrow. This is a matter of tremendous import. It can do no harm for the Members of this body to pause for a short space and consider where the roots of this matter may lie.

This is not merely a case of an Army officer being relieved of duty. This is not merely a case of a difference of opinion between a military commander and civilian authority. It is much broader and much deeper than that. Nor is this a recent development; it goes back a long way—5 or 6 years at least, back to the policy disagreements preceding and following Japan's surrender.

Opposition to General MacArthur, and efforts to discredit him, to get him out of the way, began at that time.

The first and basic attack on General MacArthur was conceived and launched by the Communist Party.

On June 2, 1945, the National Board of the American Communist Party passed a resolution laying the duty upon all party members—and here I use the words of the Communist Party board's resolution—the duty to work "to curb those who seek American imperialist control in the Far East."

In the discussions on the resolution, both before and after it had been passed, the Communists made it clear that General MacArthur was their target. When I speak of "discussions on the resolution," I make that statement on the basis of testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The Communist leaders did not name General MacArthur in their resolution of June 2, 1945; but they made it clear to each other that General MacArthur was their target; and this was soon made clear to the rank and file of the party. Pursuant to that resolution, the Communists launched a vituperative propaganda attack on General MacArthur; and that attack has continued ever since.

From September 14 to September 17, 1945, James S. Allen, formerly the Comintern agent to the Philippines, writing as a foreign editor of the Daily Worker, presented an amalgamation of slanders purportedly obtained through the Communist Huks in the Philippines. In this scurrilous series General MacArthur was presented as the tool of reactionary elements in Asia.

The basis of all Communist criticism was that General MacArthur was not carrying out a revolution in Japan, but was instead working with existing law-enforcement agencies to keep order and reconstruct the country's economy. On September 19, 1945, the Daily Worker referred to him as "the flamboyant general." On September 22, 1945, the Daily Worker declared General MacArthur to be "unfit for the crucially important assignment of shaping the future of Japan."

The Communists were open in their declaration of hostility, charging that he was suppressing the "democratic elements" — meaning themselves — and making Japan "a bulwark against the Soviet Union and the progressive forces in Asia."

Their targets were the emperor and the Zaibatsu, or big business interests; but in that category they placed everyone who was against a revolution in Japan along the lines which Communists call "progressive."

The Communists were intent on a hard peace for Japan, for the obvious reason that such a peace was calculated to drive the Japanese, in despair, into the Communist fold. The Communists therefore reacted violently against General MacArthur's statement on September 17, 1945, that the occupation policy he was executing was proceeding so smoothly that millions of our men would be able to return home, and billions of dollars saved, by the reduction of the occupation forces to 200,000 men within 6 months. The Communist press commended Dean Acheson when he rebuked MacArthur the next day. The Communist press on September 21, 1945, criticized President Truman for not being as firm with General MacArthur as Mr. Acheson, whose rebuke to "the flamboyant general" they warmly commended.

On October 4, the Daily Worker termed MacArthur's role in Japan as "outmoded" and insisted that the allied council, made up of the United States, Soviet Union, Great Britain, and China, administer Japan. Of course, this showed that the Communists, in endeavoring to discredit MacArthur, were trying to put the Soviet Union in a position to disrupt and paralyze the occupation and bring about the same chaos as in Germany.

With the same purpose the Daily Worker assailed the Emperor as the center and backbone of reaction, linking him up with the industrialists whom they called Fascists, and making out that General MacArthur's policy was to support reactionary forces hostile to America. The truth was, of course, the exact opposite: MacArthur was in fact carrying out a policy to rehabilitate Japan along western democratic lines—this, instead of alienating her people by so-called reforms inspired by the Communists and which would have led to a totalitarian form of government.

On September 4, 1945, as a forerunner to this whole attack on MacArthur, Owen Lattimore gave a press interview in which he assailed the Zaibatsu or industrialists. The Daily Worker on September 5 gave Lattimore wide coverage, emphasizing in large type that part of his speech which warned against suppressing the so-called democratic elements in

Japan. The Communist Party immediately undertook an extensive distribution of Lattimore's attack, using their trade unions and civic groups to give it the widest possible currency.

The Communists never gave up on the idea of destroying MacArthur. They regarded him as the chief obstacle to their success in the Far East. The organs of the Cominform such as the Committee for Lasting Peace for People's Democracy announced not long ago that General MacArthur would one day be tried as a war criminal. And on April 9 last—the very day before his dismissal by the President—the Daily Worker came out with a banner lead line saying that the world was demanding his recall.

Mr. President, it is an unhappy fact that during all this period, General MacArthur was being opposed by officials of our own State Department, on much the same grounds as were being advanced by the Communists.

In order to get the proper background, let us review briefly the situation which existed in the summer of 1945, and what took place thereafter.

In the summer of 1945 Japan's defeat was imminent and the Japanese people, asking only that their Emperor be allowed to remain, were suing for peace.

General MacArthur, prepared for trouble if it should arise, took with him to Japan 25 divisions and thousands of service troops. As it turned out, the Japanese did not resist the occupation, because General MacArthur, though he had been fierce in battle, elected to treat the Japanese in defeat with restraint and with humanity. He rejected the advice of those who would have liked to impose a Morgenthau plan on Japan, and thus drive her people into Stalin's arms by harsh treatment. He made use of the Emperor in bringing the country from war to peace. He used the latter's authority and the veneration in which he is held by the Japanese people to pacify the country and lead it along the path to democracy. He was able to perform miracles of reconstruction and rehabilitation, because he enlisted the zealous cooperation of the people by the wise and restrained use of his dictatorial powers.

He meted out just punishment to all criminals and those who committed atrocities. But although urged by Communist sympathizers, short-sighted liberals, and others blinded by hatred and a list for revenge, to play the Communist game by starving and oppressing the Japanese people, he refused to kick the defeated in the teeth. Instead he gave them hope of working their passage into the free world, and thus encouraged their democratic reorientation. He allowed the Japanese to elect a government of their own, thus teaching them self-government. The occupation of Japan under General MacArthur will go down in history as one of the most successful military occupations in history.

General MacArthur, himself, became a symbol of American justice, mercy, good will, respect for the rights of all mankind, and adherence to the democratic principle of equal justice under law.

Had the advice of General MacArthur's opponents and detractors been followed Japan would today be in grave danger of succumbing to the Communists just as, thanks largely to the misguided policy of our State Department, China did succumb.

In China our identification of "democratic" reform with collaboration with the Communists, and our denial of arms aid and political support to the Nationalist Government unless it would share power with the Communists helped the Communists to power, and led directly to the war in Korea.

How great is the contrast between the success of the Japanese occupation and the fiasco of our China policy. Thanks to General MacArthur our former enemy, Japan, is now our friend. Thanks to the State Department, our former ally, China, is now our bitter enemy.

Thanks to General MacArthur, our occupation of Japan constitutes a unique example of the successful administration of a conquered country. This has been strikingly demonstrated since the outbreak of the Korean war, for General MacArthur was able to send his four occupation divisions to Korea without fear of a Japanese revolt, and with no disorder even resulting from the withdrawal of the bulk of our Armed Forces. It has also been shown by the tremendous ovation given General MacArthur at the time of his precipitate dismissal and recall.

The Japanese people, due largely to the fact that General MacArthur's policies have prevailed, have shown that they are ready to act, if we let them, as a bulwark against the expansion of Communist totalitarian tyranny in the Far East. How disastrous would have been the consequences to our security had the Communists and their sympathizers or dupes been successful in thwarting MacArthur. And we have never been told the full story of how nearly they succeeded. We do know, however, that General MacArthur was harassed and his task rendered far more difficult than it should have been by the outside forces.

I have referred to the fact that if the advice of General MacArthur's opponents and detractors had been followed, Japan would today be in grave danger of succumbing to the Communists. That implies, of course, that there is no such danger today; and I want to qualify that implication. I do not believe there would be any grave danger of Communist successes in Japan if General MacArthur had remained there; but I cannot say what the result may be, now that he has been recalled. The recall itself has been interpreted already, in some quarters, as a "go ahead" signal to the Communists in Japan. Furthermore, we cannot accurately evaluate, for the future, the effect of the day-by-day absence from the scene of the one man available to us whose breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding of the Japanese people, and of the history and problems and philosophies not only of Japan but of all Asia, could be counted upon to avoid even the small mistakes which, under the circumstances, might grow or be magnified into disastrous results.

I do not mean to make any pessimistic predictions with regard to Japan, nor imply any criticism of his successor. It may be that General MacArthur's work has been so well done that Japan will remain safe from communism even in his absence. But the fact remains that many in this country feel, not without reason, that our position in Japan, as in all Asia, is less secure since General MacArthur has returned home.

Mr. President, I have said that attacks by officials of our own State Department paralleled the Communist offensive against General MacArthur, back as early as 1945 in that connection. I have already mentioned Owen Lattimore.

Remember that when General MacArthur estimated, in the summer of 1945, that he would require only 200,000 troops to administer Japan, he based his assessment on the Japanese response to the first expression of his policy which called for moderation and peaceful evolution toward a democratic set-up.

The New York Times of September 20, 1945, carried the following report from Washington:

> The State Department revealed today a decision for social and economic revolution in Japan and emphasized that it would be carried out regardless of what might be said about slashing the American army of occupation.
>
> In a statement, Acting Secretary Dean Acheson said that the United States Government, and not the occupation force under Gen. Douglas MacArthur was determining American policy toward Japan.
>
> It was the second statement that Mr. Acheson had made as a result of General MacArthur's prediction that the occupation army would be cut to 200,000 in 6 months because things were working out so well inside Japan.
>
> Mr. Acheson stated today that this Government's Japanese policy would not be changed and that it would be carried out regardless of cost. His words were: "Whatever it takes to carry this out will be used to carry it out."
>
> Mr. Acheson was understood to speak with the support of the War Department as well as the State Department, but there were doubts whether his implied criticisms of General MacArthur were made with the full backing of President Truman.

Mr. Acheson also said, according to the New York Times, that—

> General MacArthur had issued his occupation estimate without consultation with Washington.

This controversy was clear evidence, at that time, and is no less clear today, that the State Department at the highest level had undertaken a course paralleling that of the Communists in pursuing a hard peace, and was denouncing the general who was resisting such a course. As the case turned out, the general was right and the State Department was wrong.

Our occupation force in a short time after the general's estimate was less than 200,000 troops, and MacArthur's occupation proved to be the most successful in history. By 1946 the occupation forces numbered only 150,000; by 1947 they were reduced to 120,000; and in 1948 they were as low as 84,000 because MacArthur had the courage to resist the pressure put on him by the Communists, and by the State Department.

In September of 1946, General MacArthur issued a warning against the danger of communism in Japan. Im-

mediately afterward the State Department, through the voice of John Carter Vincent, then head of the Department's Far Eastern Division, charged that General MacArthur was—listen to this—instituting an anti-Soviet campaign in violation of State Department directives to use Japan "for building a bridge of friendship to the Soviet Union."

In recent weeks, both the Communist press and officials of our own State Department have been criticizing General MacArthur on the broad ground that his policies, if carried out, would lead to world war III.

As I understand, the heart of General MacArthur's recommendations is that if we let fall the only non-American forces resisting communism in all Asia, namely the army of Chiang Kai-shek, and do not aid its guerrilla activities on the Chinese mainland, then the Communist tide will roll on to our Pacific coast and bring us to the brink, not only of world war III, but of disaster.

In taking the position which has been mine since General MacArthur's recall, the position to which I adhere today, I am not slavishly following the general's views, nor am I carried away by the emotionalism of the present situation. My colleagues, I think, know my record on this question. Last year—before we entered Korea—I had declared, in a public address which was carried over the radio, that:

> We cannot afford to mobilize the forces necessary for a crusade to liberate the Chinese people. We must avoid committing too many of our resources on the continent of Asia. Above all, we must avoid being maneuvered into a position where we look like foreign invaders attempting to subjugate an oriental people. But we cannot allow Russia to make an island civilization of the United States of America.
>
> The United States, therefore, should be ready to get behind whatever forces rise to unify China, and should be resolved to do everything possible to help the redemption of China. In the meantime, we should support the one Chinese leader who is willing and able to get into the fight now—General Chiang Kai-shek.

Senators will recall that back in February of 1949 I introduced a bill to provide aid to the Republic of China. Shortly after that bill was introduced, 49 of my colleagues joined me in a letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, pleading for action on that bill, or at least for hearings. Their pleas were ignored.

On July 23, 1949, on the floor of the Senate, I said:

> Events in the Far East have already proved, and are proving daily, that the civil war in China is not a war between Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-tung but a war between democratic forces and world Communism • • • our position in Japan, and in the entire Pacific area, is endangered by this Communist drive. • • • We should immediately give China military aid to help stop the Communist onslaught.

On April 17, 1949, I had said:

> My proposal to aid the Nationalist Government of China is not based on any desire to "do something for China" but is based on the urgent necessity of taking positive action against communism in Asia for the sake of our own enlightened self-interest.

Even earlier—on February 25, 1949—on the floor of the Senate, I said:

> Events in Asia are daily emphasizing the cold, hard truth of the motivating power behind the Chinese Communists. No longer can even the most optimistic believe that the war in China is a mere revolt of an oppressed people. • • •
>
> Secretary Acheson stated to the Congress on March 20, 1947, when it was considering the Greek-Turkish aid program, that such a program was more necessary for Greece than for China at that time because the Greek Government was approaching collapse and it was threatened with defeat by the Communists. Such a time has now come to China. It is no answer to say that it is too late. The state of our future security is in the balance, and we cannot escape our responsibility by thus dismissing the choice with which we are faced.

Continuing—and remember, this was February 25, 1949—I said:

> Flushed with recent victories, the real hand behind the Chinese Communists is making itself known in Asia today. Korea is a powder keg, ready to explode in our face if we are pushed out of China as a force in opposition to communism. Reports already indicate the situation approaches outright war between the southern portion, which we recognize, and the northern or Communist portion, which the Soviets recognize.
>
> Make no mistake, if the Communists are not stopped in China, the next step will be Korea and do not forget that in Korea we still maintain occupation troops and if trouble becomes serious in that country our boys must fight or get out and admit to the world that we are losing our battle for the survival of freedom.

I have recounted these instances so that my colleagues might realize I speak for a principal and from the depths of long conviction; not from any temporary enthusiasm or to serve any personal or political purpose.

Seeing how right General MacArthur proved to be on the question of the method to be followed in administering Japan, and how wrong and how disastrous to us would have been the results if we had followed the recommendations of the State Department, coinciding as they did with the recommendations of the Communist Party, we should give careful consideration to General MacArthur's present advice.

Today the Communists are rejoicing at General MacArthur's dismissal, but in the earlier controversy between the State Department and MacArthur, happily MacArthur prevailed, and he effected a successful occupation of Japan.

Let us hope that the consideration of the episodes to which I have referred may cause us to pause and to heed the advice of General MacArthur when he says that if we give up Formosa and allow the force of Chiang Kai-shek and all the guerrillas and resistance forces in Asia to languish and die, we shall allow the Chinese Communists to consolidate in Asia and overrun the entire Pacific, realizing Stalin's great goal of making that mighty ocean a Red lake. If this happens then indeed we shall be on the brink of world war III; and, what is even more grave, on the brink of our own defeat.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Nevada on the very forceful address he has made. I did not wish to interrupt him in the course of his speech; therefcre, I have waited until now to make these remarks.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for giving us the documentary evidence which he has included in his review of the historic achievements of General MacArthur.

I do not care to detain the Senate, but I desire to say that the Senator might have said for the RECORD, in the course of giving his review of the historical incidents, that in September 1945 the present Secretary of State, who then was Under Secretary of State, directed General MacArthur in regard to certain lines from which he would have to operate from then on, even against his will. At the same time the Under Secretary of State demanded that Russia be given an equal part in a commission government for the islands of Japan. It was because of that fact that when the Senate was confronted with the question of confirming the nomination of Acheson as Under Secretary of State, there developed in the Senate a debate for 2 days on the very matter which has been so forcibly brought to our attention this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

When the vote on the question of confirming the nomination of the then Under Secretary of State was taken—and apparently at that time he had the jurisdiction to say what the policy would be—the nomination was confirmed 69 to 1. That one vote cast in opposition was cast by myself, the junior Senator from Nebraska. For voting in opposition to confirmation of the nomination, I was smeared all over this land. Oh, how the Daily Worker picked on me and has done so ever since. So did a number of other newspapers, saying that my vote on that occasion was an idiotic, unnecessary vote. Yet, Mr. President, it was one of the best votes I have ever cast. I repeat that it was one of the best votes I have ever cast, for it shows of record that at least one Member of the United States Senate had the courage, even though all other Members of the Senate voted in favor of confirmation of the nomination, to vote against it because he believed the nominee was doing his country an injustice. Acheson was then, exactly as the Senator from Nevada has said this afternoon, trying to help the Communists have a part in the government of Japan.

Mr. President, the question of Acheson's confirmation as Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Truman came before the Senate on Tuesday, January 18, 1949. At that time this entire case again was reviewed, and all the arguments on it were made When the vote on the question of confirming his nomination as Secretary of State was concluded, it was found that 83 Senators voted in favor of confirming his nomination and 6 Senators voted against it. Once again the junior Senator from Nebraska cast his vote against the present Secretary of State because in China he had a policy of "let the dust settle"; he had a policy of making enemies out of

our friends; and he was being dominated, if you please, at every turn of the road by influences which have now caused 800,000,000 human beings to be brought into the Russian orbit and more than 12,000,000 square miles of territory to fall under the control of communism.

What is the administration's policy, Mr. President? Who could have done any worse than Dean Acheson has done? I ask you, Mr. President, who could have done any worse than Dean Acheson has done with our foreign policy in China?

Yet he, more than anyone else, I think, has influenced the President of the United States to summarily recall General MacArthur, who has done much for our foreign policy in Asia. In fact, what General MacArthur has done is the only bright spot in all our foreign policy since I have been a Member of the Senate. Yet General MacArthur has been replaced and has been brought back to the United States, even though he has more information and more knowledge of how to operate in the Pacific than does any other living American.

It was a sad day for America, Mr. President, when General MacArthur was summarily recalled by the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, and brought back permanently to the United States.

I wish the RECORD to show that those who have been persecuted and those who have been smeared and those who have had the courage and the fortitude to stand up and speak their convictions, this day are justified. They are justified, not only by the American people, but by the people of Japan and all those whom General MacArthur has helped in administering their government. His administration has helped them on their way back to a point where they can have individual liberty and can assume the dignity of free people.

So I thank the Senator from Nevada very much for the great speech he has made. I appreciate it very much indeed. I only hope his speech will receive so much consideration that the services of this great commander, General MacArthur, will continue to be used in some capacity to help in determining our policies in the Pacific.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India. I request that the amendment, together with an explanation of it, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCARRAN, for himself and other Senators, was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike out all of sections 4, 5, and 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. The assistance authorized by this act shall be made only on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to utilize not in excess of $190,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1952, of the funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 6. The credit terms provided for in section 4 shall include repayment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator of Economic Cooperation and the Government of India), or otherwise, materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources; such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, beryl, raw jute, and cyanite.

The statement by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

We are cautioned daily against emotionalism and hysteria in considering solutions to the problems facing the United States today. This would indeed seem to be good advice. However, I question whether or not it is sincerely given, for we find that when emotionalism and hysteria seem to favor the passage of legislation desired by the administration we are not urged to be cautious in our deliberation. This, of course, brings me to the point on which I wish to speak today: The question of grants or gifts for India. Let me begin by saying first that I am in favor of alleviating hunger, distress, and famine whenever we can, and without respect to persons wherever we can. The natural tendencies of the American people to help distressed people wherever they may be has not become dependent upon political considerations, although we should at all times consider with a certain degree of realism the objects of our charity.

For the past 2 months or so the Congress has received the undeserved abuse of many well-intended, but poorly informed, people with respect to the issue of furnishing grain for India. This abuse, which is so terribly misplaced because of propaganda, should cause the Members of this body concern. Let us make no mistake about it, the situation has not been clearly presented to the American people. The story has been only half told, and I am satisfied that this has been purposeful.

I am not opposed to doing what is right and just with respect to the situation as it confronts us in India. I accept the fact that because of reasons, some of them beyond the control of the Indian Government, there are indeed famine conditions in many parts of India. I will accept the fact also that this country can provide sufficient grain to alleviate some of this famine situation. I will accept the fact that it can be done without depriving our people of necessary food. I must state, however, that this grain is not owned by the Government of the United States. It belongs to private individuals.

I have read in the metropolitan press many letters to the editor, written by persons who have been crying for at least 2 months about the Congress not doing something for the starving people of India. I wonder if these greatly distressed letter-writers have reached into their own pockets in an effort to alleviate these conditions. The grain is available and the means of sending their contribution is available. There are facilities by which any private individual, who is concerned and feels the moral responsibility, may provide to the limit of his ability food for the people of India.

I have also noted that many of the editorial writers of some of our papers have devoted much space to unjustified criticism of Congress. Instead of devoting the time that they have to criticizing the Congress in connection with the proposition that has been presented to the Congress if they had spent an equal amount of time in developing the true facts in respect to this situation, they may not have been quite so critical. In other words, their criticism, I think, is more hysterical than it is logical concern for a solution to the problem.

Let me state again that I do not oppose, and will never oppose, humanitarian help for starving people. Accepting the situation as it is stated with respect to the inadequacy of the Indian food supply, I will support any sound proposition to relieve the situation.

What I am concerned with today is what has been presented to Congress, and the position that the Congress of the United States has been put into in the eyes of the world, even in the eyes of the people in the United States as a result of the clumsy unrealistic handling of this entire situation by our State Department.

The food emergency in India is not new. It has been developing for a period of 9 or 10 months. The Indian Government has appealed to the Government of the United States for its assistance in meeting this famine condition. That is a proper function of the Government. The Indian Government was only discharging its responsibility in approaching the Government of the United States. But from that point is where the crux of the whole intolerable situation lies.

The Indian Government approached the United States with a request for assistance on liberal terms. There is no indication that the Indian Government requested an outright grant, although I will admit that a foreign government would be persuaded to ask for a grant rather than a loan in view of our record of generosity in such requests. The Indian Government, any government, has responsibilities to its people. These responsibilities must be discharged if such governments are to retain the support of their peoples. The failure to adequately discharge such a responsibility must rest with the government charged with that responsibility unless, of course, the responsibility can be successfully shifted or transferred in the eyes of the government's people to some other government.

That is precisely what has happened in this case. With the apparent assistance of our State Department the responsibility of providing food to the Indian people has been successfully shifted from the Indian Government to the Government of the United States, and, in turn, by adroit propaganda to the Congress of the United States.

How has this situation come about? After the Indian Government had made its formal request for economic assistance, our economic bright boys decided that it might be a burden on India to have to buy this wheat, therefore, they set about to provide a means to give the requested assistance. Of course, they had no grain to give, but they did have the power of government to take from the citizens of the United States that which the

citizens of the United States had, unless, of course, the Congress, in its wisdom, should decide otherwise.

So the Congress was presented with a bill to grant the Government of India approximately $200,000,000 to purchase grain. Although the request had come from India in the form of assistance on liberal terms, our State Department presents the issue to Congress and to the people that the only choice we have is an outright gift. Why? Because our economic do-gooders can think only in terms of giving away the United States to everyone anywhere in the world that doesn't have everything that we in the United States possess. It concerns them not that we are carrying a debt burden that has the potential destructiveness equal to that of the sinister power in the Kremlin. So the Congress finds itself presented with a proposition by the executive branch that requires rubber-stamp action or unjustified censure by the people of the country who do not know the facts and are persuaded to judge the case only by the emotional appeal of the professional special interest supporters.

The pending bill provides for the aid on a half grant, half loan basis. Is this a mere concession to force the Congress to act or is it a solution based on the record of India's ability to pay some time in the future? There is no accompanying record to guide the Congress in this determination.

Considering all the factors, I do not see how anyone in his right mind could evaluate the present situation and arrive at a decision to grant any of this aid rather than to provide it on a practical loan basis. The proposed legislation does not provide for a gift to the Indian people. No, quite the contrary. This is a gift of this Government to the Government of India. The people of India must buy the grain from the Indian Government.

When a people establish a government they do it to bring to themselves certain benefits. They give to that government certain assets, and in return that government must use those assets in providing that which is necessary to the sustenance of its people. It is a legitimate objective of government to provide means whereby its people may procure food. No one will question the fact that this responsibility initially belongs to the Government of India.

Before asking or accepting a gift from another government, a gift that in itself is degrading, and let me add here that the Asiatic people have had enough degradation in the past 100 years to last them forever, A government should first assess its own assets to whether or not it can provide the means of payment for food. In this instance, let us look at India's position. She has in gold bullion and short-term dollar assets over $300,000,000.

India—Gold and short-term dollar assets

[Millions of dollars]

1950	Total	Gold	Dollar assets
January	317	247	70
February	317	247	70
March	309	247	62
April	309	247	62
May	307	247	60
June	298	247	51
July	289	247	42
August	298	247	51
September	303	247	56
October	298	247	51
November	305	247	58
December	303	247	56

Source: International Monetary Fund.

She has assets in this country, Government-owned and privately owned by her nationals, which are in excess of $110,000,000.

Estimated assets of India and Indian nationals in the United States

1947:	
Long term	$39,000,000
Short term	65,000,000
Total	104,000,000
As of Dec. 31, 1950:	
Long term	39,000,000
Short term	71,000,000
Total	110,000,000

NOTE.—Source: Office of International Finance, U. S. Treasury Department.

She has little external debt to speak of, in fact, she is a creditor nation. She has sterling balances of approximately $1,750,000,000.

India—Sterling balances

[In billions]

	Rupees [1]	Dollars	Pounds sterling
1945	16.68	3.503	1.251
1946	16.23	3.413	1.219
1947 [2]	15.18	3.188	1.139
1948 [2]	10.25	2.153	.769
1949	8.26	1.735	.619
1950	8.34	1.751	.625

[1] 1 rupee = 1½ shillings.

[2] The reduction noted between the years 1947 to 1948 was the result of:

1. India assumed England's pension obligations.
2. India purchased the war stores on hand in India from England.
3. India gave to Pakistan a portion of the pound sterling balances.

India—Status of sterling debt

[In millions]

	UN blocked by year	Free
1947-48	80	[1] 80
1948-49	60	[2] 140
1949-50	100	[1] 100

[1] Unexpended.

[2] Expended.

Source: ECA Division of Statistics and Reports.

Value of United States trade with India

[Millions of dollars]

1950	United States imports from India (f. o. b.)	United States exports to India (f. o. b.)
January	20.3	13.7
February	17.6	18.3
March	22.7	34.5
April	24.2	14.7
May	17.0	28.8
June	20.2	18.0
July	19.3	14.6
August	19.6	11.0
September	27.8	10.1
October	28.8	13.4
November	25.3	18.1
December	76.9	20.3
Total	319.7	215.5

Source: United States customs data, U. S. Department of Commerce.

And finally, her trade position with the United States is favorable; in fact, during the past year of 1950 she earned approximately $104,000,000 more from the United States than she bought in the United States. This means that for every dollar that she had to spend in the United States she earned in the United States almost $2 in return, and this is direct trade balance and does not include earnings from invisibles.

Given this set of facts, and they are facts, how should one evolve a solution to a problem of purchasing additional grain supplies from the United States? If her trade position is not such that she can meet this payment out of current account, then she should explore the possibility of making such payments out of accrued assets. Of course, our economic boys then will say that this cannot be done, because it may interfere with her ability to carry on her present trade and meet all of her current account obligations. Very well, accepting this thesis for the moment, what would be the next step, then?

India is a member of the sterling bloc. Every dollar that she earns goes into the sterling bank; every dollar that she spends must come out of the sterling bank. Therefore, it seems logical that she would go to her banker and, in this case, England, since England—that is, the Bank of England—is the banker to the sterling area. It should be pointed out that India is one of the better dollar earners in the sterling area. Therefore, it would appear that the bank would look with favor upon a request of one of its better customers.

England owes India $1,750,000,000. These credits were accumulated by India during the past war when India was supplying England with many things that England needed. It seems only logical that India should go first to England for some help in financing the import of additional foodstuffs. I do not mean, of course, for the actual food, for England has none, but rather for help involving transfers of credits. This whole matter is merely one of international finance. However, there is no indication in the record that she has done this, although the gold and dollar position of England, at the present time, thanks to the Marshall plan, is very good. In fact, the gold and dollar assets of England today are nearly $4,000,000,000. To allow India to convert 100 million or so from pound sterling to dollars would certainly not interfere seriously with this asset position.

Failing a solution by utilizing such sources of assistance in meeting this problem, then it would seem to be proper to approach the Government of the United States for assistance. However, such a request would not require the United States furnish this assistance on a grant basis, especially since the applicant for aid is in an extremely solvent position with respect to assets.

Although I find no evidence that every effort has been put forth to solve this problem before coming to the United States, the situation, as we are presented with it today, requires some action. This action cannot be justified on the basis of a grant. We can make a loan to India on favorable terms that will not impose a burden in excess of that which India can bear. The Congress of the United States has certain responsibilities to the people of the United States. Those responsibilities must be discharged first. It seems inconceivable to me that we can properly discharge our responsibilities to the people of the United States by giving, through a grant, this aid as is proposed, thereby imposing additional burdens on our weary taxpayers when India can and should shoulder the responsibility for future payment. This assistance can only be justified on a loan basis.

THE DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement regarding the Defense Minerals Administration, whose establishment was authorized by the Defense Production Act,

which I had prepared for presentation to the Senate today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to take only a few minutes of the Senate's time today to bring to the attention of this body a matter which is seriously impeding our country's defense effort. Over 7 months ago the President signed the Defense Production Act, which authorized, among other things, the establishment of the Defense Minerals Administration. The basic purpose behind the creation of this agency was to increase the supply of essential and critical metals and minerals so necessary to our defense effort. This increased supply of essential materials was to be achieved by aiding the domestic mining industry.

The announcement of this plan brought great hope to the mining industry and increased activity was seen immediately. This increased activity was based solely on the supposition that the Government had a concrete plan for aiding the mining industry. I am sorry to say that that supposition has proven to be erroneous, and instead of stimulating the domestic industry, production has been crippled because no definite Government plan or policy has been forthcoming. Without a policy the miners and producers of strategic metals and minerals cannot work.

They have no foundation on which to base their operations.

Early last December I protested the fact that no policy had been established and that the Defense Minerals Administration was surrounded by a mass of red tape and confusion. I was informed at that time that the agency was in the process of organization and would be ready to go as soon as a sufficient and adequate staff had been acquired. Only a few days ago representatives of the Defense Minerals Administration, in testifying before the full Appropriations Committee, stated that the program had been unable to get under way because they had not as yet procured a sufficient staff. It is inconceivable to me that an agency created to take care of an emergency situation has been unable to acquire a staff after 7 months. I know that many men from industry have been called in to help this agency. While some of them are still there marking time, many of them have quit, complaining that their hands were tied, that there was no program or policy, or that they were just wasting their time and the Government's money because no one seemed to know what they were doing or where they were going.

Since the establishment of the defense minerals program, I have received hundreds of letters from mining men and prospectors throughout the country. Every single letter has complained of the inefficiency and inaction of the Defense Minerals Administration. I am sure that other Senators have had the same experience.

I found it hard to believe that an agency established 7 months could have accomplished nothing. I checked and found, from the Defense Minerals Administration's own records, that since their establishment they have received 1,086 applications for all types of aid. The far greatest percentage of these applications asked for a loan or a loan guaranty as authorized. Only one loan application of the hundreds received has been approved, and that one not too long ago. I repeat, only one loan application has been approved after 7 months of operation.

Again, I wish to emphasize that this agency was created to assist in providing the defense program with a domestic supply of essential raw materials. I can assure you that a shortage still exists. If the Senate is going to authorize further appropriations for the Defense Minerals Administration, we should at least have assurance of some sort that the do-nothing policy of this agency which has existed for 7 months cease immediately and a policy of action be substituted forthwith. This country needs strategic metals and minerals for the defense effort. The Defense Minerals Administration has been given a job to do, the time for organization is over; let us now see action. Too much time and money have already been wasted.

CONTROLS ON LIVESTOCK, AND PRICES OF MEAT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement relative to the operations of the Office of Price Stabilization, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the past several months, I have been in constant touch with Mr. Eric Johnston and Mr. Michael DiSalle, relative to controls on livestock and prices of meat. I was assured both orally and by letter that there were no roll-backs in the prices of beef even contemplated.

A few days ago the Office of Price Stabilization issued Ceiling Price Regulation 24 imposing ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale, to become effective May 9, 1951. This has resulted in livestock producers rushing their cattle to market before they are fattened to their best salable weight. This is resulting directly in a loss of meat for the American people. The feeders who produce much of the meat supply are suffering losses. And, as pointed out by the Agriculture Committee of the Senate, the announcement of further roll-backs in beef prices will have the effect of continued early marketing of meat animals, finally resulting in a meat famine in the United States. Imagine that, a meat famine in the United States. There is plenty of meat in the United States. Yet we are liable to have a meat famine because of the stupid, unthinking, deliberate attempts of the Office of Price Controls to regiment everything they can lay their hands on. The Senate Agriculture Committee has presented a resolution to this body, urging that the Ceiling Price Regulation 24 establishing the proposed ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale be rescinded at once. I am in full accord with this resolution.

The senior Senator from Nebraska has suggested that Congress take a good look at the manner in which the Office of Price Controls has exercised its authority before voting an extension of its life. Title IV of the Defense Production Act expires on June 30.

If the action taken with respect to beef prices is a sample of what to expect from Mr. DiSalle's temple of economic knowledge, then I say title IV of the Defense Production Act is in for an overhauling.

The order issued by Mr. DiSalle with respect to beef prices subjects the meat industry to unfair discrimination which no other industry suffers.

This is not price control—it is confiscation and regimentation. What kind of regimen is this? The definition of regimen as given in Webster's dictionary is "a systematic course of diet." How systematic can we get? Are we to have a group of lofty economists telling us what we can eat, what we can wear, and what kind of leather we are to have on our shoes? A systematic course of diet. It will be so systematic that we will have no meat in our diets at all. Or if we are able to get meat it will be on the black market. Already the prices of meat at the grocery stores are rocketing and they will continue to rocket under the new orders. You know Great Britain has a systematic course of diet. What is the amount of meat a British citizen can buy in any one week? You know as well as I do what that amount is. It is about 8 ounces of meat per week. Is that to happen in the United States? Are we to follow Britain in everything we do?

I cannot think of a better way to force a drastic reduction in the supply of beef for consumers. The beef supply is dependent upon the operations of cattle feeders, and those in the feeding business are in a position quite similar to any manufacturer. They must compute their costs carefully before engaging in feeding operations. They don't purchase cattle for fattening in the feed lot unless they know that they can ultimately resell the livestock at a price sufficient to cover costs. This roll-back is going to mean heavy loss to every cattle feeder who bought livestock during the winter.

Most livestock farmers do not believe in price controls on livestock, but they will accept them in a cooperative spirit if they are convinced that the ceilings are worked out on a fair and equitable basis. But the arbitrary action taken by the Office of Price Stabilization is deliberately designed to thrust a financial loss on them. They are not going to continue feeding operations under these circumstances, and I for one, don't blame them one little iota.

Increased production is the only answer to defense problems facing this country. This is just as true in the meat industry as in anything else.

The livestock industry feels, as do 20 other agricultural organizations which make up the agricultural field, that price controls are a cover-up for inflation. The controls don't get at the source of inflation. They cause fear, indecision, confusion, black markets, and bring about a decrease in production. Controls of this nature have no part in a program to control inflation. I would like to see a program of production, and a fiscal policy on the part of the Government which would involve a pay-as-you-go tax program and control of too easy credit. These are the things which get at the source of inflation. The nebular hypothesis espoused by the brain boys are giving us socialistic lines. They ask "Why is the meat industry so worried about our controls. We have eliminated competition and have fixed it so everybody gets a profit?" American industry has always been based on competition. If we eliminate competition what then?

This is not in line with our American way of thinking. Competition is a good, healthy thing for America, and I, for one, am interested in America—not what people across the seas are thinking. They would like to see socialism in America. I don't. Must we come to the Government for every favor to keep us in business? This is a question which is now constantly on the lips of every manufacturer, every meat packer, every cattle feeder, and every housewife in America today.

The Office of Price Stabilization counters with the statement that, if these controls are not followed to the letter, tighter enforcement will ensue. What does that lead us to? A police type of state, that's what. Finally, it would lead to Government ownership and organization.

You know, there was a roll-back on the price of tallow and hides some time back. This was designed to reduce the price of livestock. The price was rolled back to 30 cents per pound. Now the domestic price is 30 cents, as compared with the world price of 50 cents. We produce about 80 percent of the cattle hides which we consume. We have had to depend on offshore buying for 20 percent of our requirements for the last few years. Since the roll-back to 30 cents in the domestic market, naturally, the world producers are not looking to us for hides. In order to get the other 20 percent of our

requirements, tax money will have to be spent to buy the 50-cent hides which will be sold to domestic tanners at 30 cents a pound. The taxpayer absorbs the difference. Domestic production is further discouraged. Production abroad is subsidized by the very people whose production is being discouraged. Where does it all end?

Therefore, this body should immediately take steps to investigate the operations of the Office of Price Stabilization, as suggested by the Agriculture Committee. If we are to extend the life of this agency—and nothing is more immortal than a Government agency once it has been born—then a full-scale overhauling is in order. The roll-back regulation on beef should definitely be rescinded at once.

AIR SAFETY BOARD—EDITORIALS BY BOB SIBLEY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, one of the most able and well-informed aviation editors in the country is Bob Sibley, of the Boston Traveler.

I hold in my hand two columns written by Mr. Sibley, both containing items concerning the question of an independent air safety board. One of these items appears in Mr. Sibley's column under date of February 28, and carries the subhead "Safety board." The other item appears in Mr. Sibley's column of March 6, and has no subheading, being the leading item in the column.

Because of the great importance of this matter, Mr. President, and the very substantial interest in it by many Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that these two portions of columns by Mr. Sibley may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Traveler of February 28, 1951]

SAFETY BOARD

(By Bob Sibley)

Directors of the Aero Club of New England have gone on record as favoring legislation, pending in Congress, for reestablishment of an independent air safety board. The directors said they found special significance in testimony given before congressional committee hearings by David L. Behncke, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, who asserted the present Safety Bureau is under the thumb of other agencies. Behncke also testified: "Surely an air safety investigating body which is placed in a position of investigating itself cannot hope to do the job as impartially or as effectively as an independent air safety board."

[From the Boston Traveler of March 6, 1951]

SAFETY BUREAU REPORT ON FATAL AIR CRASH LEAVES MUCH UNSAID

(By Bob Sibley)

Those who believe there is need for an independent air safety board to replace the present Safety Bureau of the Civil Aeronautics Board might take a close look at the CAB report on Northwest Airlines' Minneapolis crash of March 7, 1950, recently issued.

The accident took place when the plane hit a flagpole during an attempt to land in blowing snow conditions.

The CAB says that "the probable cause of this accident was the attempt to complete a landing approach by visual means during which time visual reference to the ground was lost."

This is conjecture, neither pilot having survived to contribute any information to support this conclusion.

A completely independent air safety board might have outlined additional possibilities such as:

"The pilots may have been led astray by the CAA's Instrument Landing System, since the flagpole which slashed a wing was 650 feet to the left of the centerline of the runway, and 128 feet below the glide path."

But the CAB report neatly exonerates ILS, by assuming that the pilot was not using this beam-landing device.

An independent air safety board might also have reasoned:

"If the airport had been equipped with ground-controlled-approach radar, the pilots could have been warned of their danger long before they had progressed 650 feet to the left and 128 feet too low."

But the CAB report, willing to guess in some matters but not in others, does not touch on such points. It reminds us of Washington testimony of David L. Behncke, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, who told a congressional committee:

"The present Safety Bureau is under the direct thumb of the rule maker and rate fixer—the Civil Aeronautics Board—and indirectly under the thumb of the rule implementer and enforcers, the Civil Aeronautics Administration."

CENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF THE ICE-CREAM INDUSTRY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the centennial of the founding of the ice-cream industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Even in this fast-moving age, 100 years is a long time. And when an industry has rounded out a century of progress and of service to the Nation, it is a matter worthy of note, and an occasion for congratulations to all concerned.

The ice-cream industry is observing this year the centennial of its founding. I believe a recital of certain facts about its origin and development would be both pertinent and of general interest.

I take pardonable pride in the fact that the first wholesale plant began in the State of Maryland. One hundred years ago, Jacob Fussell, a milk dealer located at 180 Exeter Street in Baltimore found that by contracting with the farmers for their milk he had incurred a problem and an obligation, for in the flush season in 1851 Mr. Fussell found himself with a surplus of milk and cream. His fluid-milk customers could not absorb it. He turned to the old recipes for ice cream and began operating the first wholesale plant in the world.

Actually, ice cream was not a new product. Recipes for it had been known in Europe for hundreds of years before Fussell's first enterprise. The story of ice cream from that day on is really an inspiring story of the development of America. In Europe and the other nations of the world a few small retail manufacturers produced on rare occasions sherbets and ice cream. Actually, these were made by caterers on special order. The cost was high and the distribution was limited to the privileged few but this country, with its technological know-how and mass-production methods and distribution soon made ice cream America's favorite, available to everyone in all walks of life.

Jacob Fussell's business venture spread, and soon he established a wholesale plant in Washington, D. C., in Boston, and later in New York City. The rapid growth of the industry from the turn of the century to now is reflected in the fact that in 1899, 5,000,000 gallons of ice cream were produced. In the last half century, the ice-cream industry has increased its production more than 100 times.

Recognition should be given to the ice cream manufacturers, the specialists and dairy manufacturers, the makers of equipment and machinery, and the many suppliers who have aided in the progress of the industry.

Nor can we overlook the research workers, whose basic studies have uncovered the splendid nutritive value of ice cream and have enabled the ice cream industry to say that "It is not only good, but it is good for you."

During World War II ice cream came into its own when the Interagency Council on Nutrition of the Federal Government classified it in group 4 of the seven basic foods. This important program of good nutrition is still in effect.

Reference has been made to the pleasure the industry has given millions of all ages and all walks of life. Let me also stress its economic importance. Few of us realize that the entire dairy industry is greater than the steel industry. Probably a smaller number know that the products of the ice cream industry now approximate a billion and a half dollars annualy at retail.

While offering employment to thousands, and while helping to raise the dietary levels of the Nation, the ice cream manufacturers have created a great market for the American farmer. This is true not only of the dairy farmer. The ice cream industry uses more than 10,000,000,000 pounds of milk equivalent each year to get their cream and important milk solids. In addition, all the other phases of agriculture, the farmers raising sugar beets and sugarcane, are affected; the fruit and nut growers who furnish the ice cream industry about 200,000,000 pounds of fruit and nuts each year, all feel the impact of this important industry in their market places.

The lesson from Jacob Fussell's operation that the ice cream industry can utilize milk products during the flush season when production is high is still economically sound. Through its operation today, the ice cream industry is known as the balance wheel of the dairy economy for the simple reason that most of its purchases of cream and milk solids is made during the surplus season, thus providing stable markets for the dairy farmer.

EMBARGO ON SHIPMENTS OF WAR MATERIALS TO RED CHINA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the imposition of an embargo on shipments of war materials to Red China.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Formal action yesterday by the United States in requesting that all United Nations members at once impose an embargo on shipments of war materials to Red China, is a positive move in the right direction which will have the unanimous support of Members of this body and of loyal Americans.

It is distinctly in line with efforts which have been under way in the Senate, for some 8 months. Such action likewise is thoroughly in accord with the spirit and the text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, which I introduced in this body on February 19. The resolution urged the State Department to exhaust every effort to impress upon the free-nation members of the UN that not only was such trade of strategic materials with our enemies inconsistent with every

concept of allied unity and mutual assistance but that it was indefensible on moral grounds as well.

Some have sought to justify the flow of international trade which has been built up over the years, on the ground that the very lifeblood of the economy of foreign nations is involved. Some difficulty was experienced even here in our own country in alerting and convincing the responsible authorities as to the dangers inherent in policies which permitted enemy countries to obtain highly strategic war materials which they later could use against our own troops and the fighting forces of our allies.

However, as can be clearly shown, the current trade activities between some of the nations allied with us in Western Europe and the common foe in the Far East, do not represent merely a continuation of normal trade activities. Indeed, figures at hand indicate all too clearly that some of the very nations which have been giving support to the United Nations forces in the Korean hostilities, have taken advantage of the situation to capitalize on opportunities to supply badly needed war materials to Red China in amounts far exceeding even the most liberal estimates of what constitutes normal trade.

When trade figures which are in the possession of our Subcommitee on Export Controls and Policies reflect increase of 500 percent and more in the shipments of rubber, for instance; and when increases as high as 2,200 percent are registered with regard to shipments of other strategic materials, conditions have reached the point where it would seem not only desirable, but absolutely vital, that our Government ask on which side of the fight these nations are.

It is incumbent upon us, in justice to our own fighting men who have suffered so horribly from Communist aggression in Korea, to have made plain to the world whether countries who are trading so heavily in materials which were aiding the war against our troops are more interested in combating communism and bringing peace to the world or in fattening their coffers through this diabolical perversion of international trade.

It is shocking that Great Britain has sent such huge supplies of strategic materials and products to Communist areas where it could be assumed that these materials would be used against the nations of the west either in Korea, or in preparation for future aggression elsewhere.

Our Nation must continue to insist that the British Government give official recognition to the damage they have done and are doing by their policy of not only "business as usual" but business on a greatly expanded basis, at the expense of the lives and the interests of their allies and of the United Nations.

SUSPENSION OF APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT OF ATTORNEY BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report an original joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and I request its immediate consideration. It is a unanimous report of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of Robert T. Murphy as an attorney on a temporary basis to assist the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284, of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business:

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Arthur L. Jennings be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Oren E. Long, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 7, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

Ware Adams, of Georgia.
John M. Allison, of Nebraska.
Charles F. Baldwin, of Maryland.
Donald F. Bigelow, of Minnesota.
Sidney H. Browne, of New Jersey.
Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.
John Davies, Jr., of Virginia.
Owen L. Dawson, of Illinois.
Charles E. Dickerson, Jr., of New York.
Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia.
C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky.
Walton C. Ferris, of Wisconsin.
Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania.
Norris S. Haselton, of New Jersey.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
George Lewis Jones, Jr., of Maryland.
Cecil B. Lyon, of New York.
Paul O. Nyhus, of Wisconsin.
Edward Page, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Donald W. Smith, of the District of Columbia.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.
Francis Bowden Stevens, of New York.
Tyler Thompson, of New York.
William C. Trimble, of Maryland.
Walter N. Walmsley, Jr., of Maryland.
Joe D. Walstrom, of Missouri.
Miss Frances E. Willis, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

William K. Ailshie, of Idaho.
Frederic P. Bartlett, of New York.
Burton Y. Berry, of Indiana.
Clarence E. Birgfeld, of the District of Columbia.
Ralph J. Blake, of Oregon.
Ralph A. Boernstein, of the District of Columbia.
Niles W. Bond, of Massachusetts.
Elmer H. Bourgerie, of Maryland.
Aaron S. Brown, of Michigan.
Robert Y. Brown, of Alabama.
Prescott Childs, of Massachusetts.
Claude Courand, of Texas.
Cabot Coville, of California.
Howard Elting, Jr., of Illinois.
Jerome T. Gaspard, of Virginia.
Eugene A. Gilmore, Jr., of Nebraska.
Bernard Gufler, of Washington.
Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky.
Theodore J. Hadraba, of Nebraska.
John J. Haggerty, of Virginia.
John N. Hamlin, of Oregon.
Parker T. Hart, of Massachusetts.
James E. Henderson, of California.
L. Randolph Higgs, of Mississippi.
John A. Hopkins, of Iowa.
Morris N. Hughes, of Illinois.
Fred W. Jandrey, of Wisconsin.
Perry N. Jester, of Virginia.
Howard P. Jones, of New York.
Erwin P. Keeler, of Indiana.
William L. Kilcoin, of the District of Columbia.
Bertel E. Kuniholm, of Massachusetts.
Rufus H. Lane, Jr., of Virginia.
Patrick Mallon, of Ohio.
Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.
Edward D. McLaughlin, of Arkansas.
Robert B. Memminger, of South Carolina.
George A. Morgan, of the District of Columbia.
John H. Morgan, of Massachusetts.
Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Newbegin, of Massachusetts.
William C. Ockey, of California.
Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., of New York.
Troy L. Perkins, of Kentucky.
C. Montagu Pigott, of California.
Paul J. Reveley, of Connecticut.
Arthur R. Ringwalt, of Nebraska.
Andreas G. Ronhovde, of Montana.
Albert W. Scott, of Missouri.
Charles Nelson Spinks, of California.
Robert B. Streeper, of Ohio.
E. Paul Tenney, of Washington.
Charles W. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.
Sheldon Thomas, of New York.
Frederik van den Arend, of North Carolina.
Woodruff Wallner, of New York.
Milton K. Wells, of Oklahoma.
Clifton R. Wharton, of Massachusetts.
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

William C. Affeld, Jr., of Minnesota.
H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
Edward Anderson, of Florida.
Leonard Lee Bacon, of New York.
N. Spencer Barnes, of California.
James D. Bell, of New Mexico.
Carl Breuer, of New York.
Willard O. Brown, of Texas.
Glen W. Bruner, of Colorado.
John H. Burns, of Oklahoma.
Frank P. Butler, of New Jersey.
Donald B. Calder, of New York.
Turner C. Cameron, Jr., of Alabama.
Robert J. Cavanaugh, of Illinois.
V. Lansing Collins, Jr., of New York
Harry Conover, of New Jersey.
Austin B. Cox, of New York.
Robert C. Creel, of New York.
Glion Curtis, Jr., of Missouri.
Philip M. Davenport, of Maryland.
Joseph L. Dougherty, of Iowa.
Perry Ellis, of California.
Robert B. Elwood, of Iowa.
Frederick E. Farnsworth, of Colorado.
Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.
Paul E. Geier, of Ohio.
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of Illinois.
Richard E. Gnade, of Pennsylvania.
Bartley P. Gordon, of Massachusetts.
Caspar D. Green, of Ohio.
Robert Grinnell, of New York.
Claude H. Hall, Jr., of Maryland.
Wesley C. Haraldson, of Virginia.
Walter W. Hoffmann, of California.
John B. Holt, of Maine.
Richard S. Huestis, of New York.
Hartwell Johnson, of South Carolina.
Sidney K. Lafoon, of Virginia.
Frederick P. Latimer, Jr., of Connecticut.
Raymond G. Leddy, of New York.
F. Ridgway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania.
Walter J. Linthicum, of Maryland.
Raymond E. Lisle, of New York.
Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York.
David H. McKillop, of Massachusetts.
John M. McSweeney, of Massachusetts.
John Gordon Mein, of Kentucky.
Robert G. Miner, of Maryland.
H. Gordon Minnigerode, of the District of Columbia.
Charles H. Owsley, of the District of Columbia.
Paul Paddock, of Iowa.
J. Hall Paxton, of Virginia.
Kennett F. Potter, of Missouri.
Henry C. Ramsey, of California.
Halleck L. Rose, of Nebraska.
Edward J. Rowell, of California.
Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., of Texas.
M. Robert Rutherford, of Montana.
William Langdon Sands, of Florida.
Richard M. Service, of the District of Columbia.
Harold Sims, of Tennessee.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
Henry W. Spielman, of Oklahoma.
Paul J. Sturm, of Connecticut.
Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Murat W. Williams, of Virginia.
David G. Wilson, Jr., of Oregon.
William Witman 2d, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Robert J. Dorr, of California.
David I. Ferber, of Arizona.
Deane R. Hinton, of Illinois.
Oscar C. Holder, of Louisiana.
Walter C. Isenberg, Jr., of Wisconsin.
Leslie W. Johnson, of Minnesota.
Weldon Litsey, of Wyoming.
Henry L. Pitts, Jr., of New York.
Edward F. Rivinus, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Randolph Roberts, of Virginia.
Robert Rossow, Jr., of Indiana.
Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota.
Edward L. Waggoner, of Ohio.
Fred E. Waller, of Michigan.
Meredith Weatherby, of Texas.
Charles H. Whitaker, of Rhode Island.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Robert W. Adams, of Texas.
Robert G. Bailey, of New Jersey.
Milton Barall, of New York.
Taylor G. Belcher, of New York.
Donald C. Bergus, of Indiana.
Robert O. Blake, of California.
Thomas D. Bowie, of Minnesota.
John W. Bowling, of Oklahoma.
Robert A. Brand, of Connecticut.
Howard Brandon, of Georgia.
Gray Bream, of Wyoming.
Clarence T. Breaux, of Louisiana.
William L. Brewster, of Texas.
Lewis D. Brown, of New York.
Miss Lora C. Bryning, of Washington.
Rolland H. Bushner, of Oklahoma.
Wilbur P. Chase, of Ohio.
Keld Christensen, of Iowa.
Charles Philip Clock, of California.
A. John Cope, Jr., of Utah.
Robert F. Corrigan, of Ohio.
Roy T. Davis, Jr., of Maryland.
Alexander J. Davit, of Pennsylvania.
Juan de Zengotita, of Pennsylvania.
Dwight Dickinson, of New Jersey.
Donald P. Downs, of Nevada.
Thomas J. Duffield, Jr., of Massachusetts.
L. Milner Dunn, of Utah.
William J. Ford, of New Hampshire.
Martin F. Herz, of New York.
William P. Hudson, of North Carolina.
Alfred le S. Jenkins, of Georgia.
Joseph J. Jova, of New York.
William C. Lakeland, of New York.
Samuel Owen Lane, of California.
Armistead M. Lee, of Virginia.
Scott Lyon, of Ohio.
George Hubert Maness, of Oklahoma.
Oliver M. Marcy, of Massachusetts.
David E. Mark, of New York.
Edward N. McCully, of Texas.
Thomas W. McElhiney, of Maryland.
Thomas D. McKiernan, of Massachusetts.
Cleveland B. McKnight, of Georgia.
Lee E. Metcalf, of Texas.
Joseph J. Montllor, of New York.
Robert W. Moore, of Iowa.
Andrew E. Olson, of Washington.
Clinton L. Olson, of California.
W. Paul O'Neill, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Alexander L. Peaslee, of Ohio.
Norman K. Pratt, of Pennsylvania.
Lubert O. Sanderhoff, of California.
Rufus Z. Smith, of Illinois.
Herbert D. Spivack, of New York.
Wells Stabler, of the District of Columbia.
Charles G. Stefan, of California.
Gerald Stryker, of Connecticut.
John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.
John L. Topping, of New York.
Temple Wanamaker, of Washington.
H. André Weismann, of New York.
Jackson W. Wilson, of Texas.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Theo C. Adams, of Texas.
Thomas W. Ainsworth, of New Hampshire.
Willard Allan, of Colorado.
Arthur B. Allen, of the District of Columbia.
James F. Amory, of Virginia.
John C. Amott, of New Jersey.
Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., of Massachusetts.
John Campbell Ausland, of Pennsylvania.
Philip Axelrod, of Delaware.
Robert A. Aylward, of Massachusetts.
William M. Bates, of Missouri.
Robert M. Berry, of Massachusetts.
Slator C. Blackiston, Jr., of North Carolina.
James J. Blake, of New York.
Vincent R. Boening, of Michigan.
Howard L. Boorman, of California.
William D. Brewer, of Connecticut.
Robert C. Brewster, of Nebraska.
William B. Buffum, of New York.
Miss Patricia M. Byrne, of Ohio.
Stuart B. Campbell, Jr., of Virginia.
William C. Canup, of Michigan.
Frank E. Cash Jr., of Minnesota.
Ralph G. Clark, of New York.
S. Wilson Clark, of California.
Stephen A. Comiskey, of Colorado.
Thomas J. Corcoran, of New York.
Henry L. Coster, of California.
Richard H. Courtenaye, of California.
William D. Craig, of California.
David C. Cuthell, of Connecticut.
Philip M. Dale, Jr., of New York.
Nathaniel Davis, of New Jersey.
Robert D. Davis, of Oklahoma.
John M. Dennis, of Pennsylvania.
Frank J. Devine, of New York.
John B. Dexter, of Maryland.
William B. Dunn, of Texas.
Samuel D. Eaton, of New York.
Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania.
Richard A. Ericson, Jr., of Minnesota.
Richard T. Ewing, of Maryland.
John M. Farrior, of North Carolina.
John W. Fisher, of Montana.
Wayne W. Fisher, of Iowa.
Benjamin A. Fleck, of Pennsylvania.
Robert C. Foulon, of Illinois.
A. Eugene Frank, of Illinois.
James A. Garvey, of California.
John N. Gatch, Jr., of Ohio.
Scott George, of Kentucky.
Howard C. Goldsmith, of California.
Herbert Gordon, of New York.
John G. Gossett, of Oklahoma.
Philip C. Habib, of California.
Philip E. Haring, of Pennsylvania.
Gregory Henderson, of Massachusetts.
Robert S. Henderson, of New Jersey.
Converse Hettinger, of Wisconsin.
John H. Holdridge, of California.
Walter P. Houk, of California.
Paul R. Hughes, of California.
Vernon V. Hukee, of Minnesota.
Edward C. Ingraham, Jr., of New York.
Richard G. Johnson, of New York.
Howard D. Jones, of Oklahoma.
Ralph A. Jones, of Pennsylvania.
Harold G. Josif, of Ohio.
Abbott Judd, of Rhode Island.
Warren A. Kelsey, of Massachusetts.
Jack T. Kilgore, of Indiana.
Richard H. Lamb, of Washington.
James F. Leonard, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Edward T. Long, of Illinois.
Matthew J. Looram, Jr., of New York.
Roye L. Lowry, of Washington.
John E. MacDonald, of New Hampshire.
Robert J. MacQuaid, of Pennsylvania.
Frank E. Maestrone, of Connecticut.
Francis N. Magliozzi, of Massachusetts.
Philip W. Manhard, of California.
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusetts.
Richard M. McCarthy, of Iowa.
Glenn R. McCarty, Jr., of Iowa.
Stephen H. McClintic, of Maryland.
James H. McFarland, Jr., of Michigan.
Joseph F. McFarland, of New Jersey.
John B. McGrath, of Rhode Island.
Ralph J. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.
Paul M. Miller, of Maryland.
Robert E. Moberly, of Idaho.
James D. Moffett, of Minnesota.
Thomas H. Murfin, of Washington.
John L. Murphy, of Oklahoma.
William Nesselhof, Jr., of Missouri.
Cleo A. Noel, Jr., of Missouri.
Richard B. Parker, of Kansas.
John M. Perry, of Massachusetts.
Chris G. Petrow, of Massachusetts.
Robert M. Phillips, of California.
Paul O. Proehl, of Illinois.
Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr., of California.
John B. Root, of New York.
Robert W. Ross, of California.
James R. Ruchti, of Wisconsin.
Samuel O. Ruff, of North Carolina.
John A. Sabini, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Corey B. Sanderson, of Idaho.
Dwight E. Scarbrough, of Minnesota.
Robert Simpson, of New York.
Michel F. Smith, of Texas.

Karl E. Sommerlatte, of Florida.
C. Melvin Sonne, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
G. Alonzo Stanford, of Michigan.
Kenedon P. Steins, of Pennsylvania.
Harrison M. Symmes, Jr., of North Carolina.
Herbert B. Thompson, of California.
John M. Thompson, Jr., of Florida.
Edward J. Thrasher, of New York.
Edward J. Trost, of New York.
Gordon C. Tullock, of Illinois.
Francis T. Underhill, Jr., of New Jersey.
Viron P. Vaky, of Texas.
Philip H. Valdes, of New York.
George S. Vest, of Virginia.
Theodore A. Wahl, of New York.
John Patrick Walsh, of Illinois.
Milton C. Walstrom, of Hawaii.
Herbert E. Weiner, of New York.
Arthur D. Weininger, of New York.
William H. Witt, of South Carolina.
Chalmers B. Wood, of the District of Columbia.
Robert C. Wysong, of Indiana.
Elmer E. Yelton, of Virginia.
John B. Young, of New Jersey.
Robert W. Zimmermann, of Minnesota.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Joe Barnes Harrison, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia, vice Henry O. Camp, deceased.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

I nominate the following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Thomas Elwood Aaron
David Manker Abshire
Bruce Allen Ackerson
Albert Bayliss Akers
Joseph Albenda
Herbert Hugh Albritton
Richard Crawford Allen
Don Charles Anker
Eric Ferdinand Antila
Carl Franklin Arnold
Floy Lauren Ashley
Edward Breed Atkeson
Ralph Lee Auer
Bruce Barton Bailey
Merton Juel Bangerter
Ransom Edward Barber
William Chauncey Barott
James Thomas Barron
Philip Charles Barth, Jr.
Harold Anthony Barton
Frank Myer Bashore
Robert Edmond Bauers
Peter Anthony Beczkiewicz
Aaron David Bernstein
David Anderson Betts
George Anthony Bicher, Jr.
James Donald Bick
David Leroy Bills
Elmer Havens Birdseye
James Gowen Boatner
John Joseph Bohan, Jr.
John McGee Bohen
William James Bradley, Jr.
Richard Clay Breakiron
James Sereno Brett
Patrick Matthew Brian
Norman James Brown
Charles Edwin Bryant
Richard Joseph Buck
John Wendell Buckstead
John Robertson Byers
Charles Draper William Canham II
Gerald Joseph Carlson
David Allene Carroll
David Giles Carter
Lewis Marquardt Casbon
Robert William Chapman
Theodore John Charney
James Alden Check
Joseph William Clarke II
Ryburn Glover Clay, Jr.
Joseph Gordon Clemons, Jr.
Roland Eugene Cooper
Sanders Ashford Cortner, Jr.
Albert Crescenzo Costanzo
Paul Allin Coughlin
John Hartley Cousins
Jimmie Stewart Cox
Francis Washington Craig
Lawrence Pope Crocker
William Edward Crouch, Jr.
Charles Arthur Crowe
J. Godfrey Crowe
Philip Archinard Cuny
John David Daigh
Michael McQuatters Davis
Richard Backer Dawson
Allen Matthew Robert Dean
Anthony Joseph Delano
Frederick Lockwood Denman
William Lawrence Depew
Thomas Barnett DeRamus, Jr.
John Thomas Derrick
Otto Carl Doerflinger, Jr.
John Joseph Dorton
Laurance Condon Dosh
Juan Francisco Doval
Lee Edward Duke
Norman Eugene Dunlap
William Carl Edler
Bruce Erland Elmblad
Alan Clare Esser
Henry Cotheal Evans, Jr.
Charles Boal Ewing, Jr.
Joseph Lewis Fant III
William Dwight Farrington
George Charles Filchak
Robert Elliot Fitch
Robert William Flanagan
Joseph Vincent Fleming
John Daniel Foldberg
Redmond Vincent Forrester, Jr.
Peter John Foss
John Bernard Foster
Thomas George Foster III
Alan Arthur Frick
Hugh Stephen Galligan
George Henry Gardee
John Hillman Gardiner
Rodney Bruce Gilbertson
Charles Rolland Gildart, Jr.
William Leneas Givens II
George Massie Gividen, Jr.
Chandler Goodnow
John Alexander Graham III
Seldon Bain Graham, Jr.
Clinton Edwin Granger, Jr.
John Walter Granicher
Myles Standish Grant
Theodore William Griesinger, Jr.
William Everitt Grugin
James Talbot Guyer
Philip Haines Gwynn
Frank Edmund Hamilton
Eben Nathaniel Handy, Jr.
George Davis Hardesty, Jr.
George Lawrence Harman
Richard Lee Harris
Barry McKnight Harriss
Thomas Ure Harrold
Edward Patrick Hartnett III
Thomas Hubert Hastings
John Phillip Haumersen
John Vaughn Hemmler, Jr.
John Allen Hemphill
Kenneth Guynn Herring
Roy Jacob Herte, Jr.
John Peter Hill
Paul Richard Hilty, Jr.
John Hinton, Jr.
Jonathan Lane Holman, Jr.
John Ferguson Hook
John Randolph Hook
Thomas Bernard Horgan
Robert Arthur Howes
Joseph Wood Hutchinson, Jr.
Robert Allison Hyatt
Jerry Shannon Ingram
Frederick French Irving
Robert Michael Isaac
Thomas Zadock James
Guy Earlecort Jester, Jr.
Dean DeLaine Johnson
Harlan Warren Johnson
Kermit Douglas Johnson
Maynard Benjamin Johnson
Robert Lloyd Johnson
Russell Leroy Johnson
Walter Henry Johnson
Lincoln Griffin Jones
Norman Dean Jorstad
Donald Joseph Kasun
James Addison Keeley
Earl Loyd Keesling
Lawrence Michael Kelly
James Richard Kintz
Walter Albert Klein
Charles Leland Knapp
Albert Ray Knight, Jr.
Joseph William Knittle, Jr.
Michael Kovalsky
Marvin Joseph Krupinsky
Joseph Delta Lafleur, Jr.
Donald James Leehey, Jr.
John Joseph Leffler
William Lyman Lemnitzer
John Broadus Lewis
Alan Arthur Lichtenberg
Robert Bruce Lins
Harry Warner Lombard
William Charles Louisell, Jr.
Joseph Albert Luger
Edward Page Lukert, Jr.
Samuel Ayer Lutterloh
Patrick Hugh Lynch
Robert Eulass Macklin
William Andrew Malouche
Edward Murphy Markham III
Jack Wayne Martin
Louis Brooks Martin
Robert Lee Massenburg
Edward Eli Matney
Glenn Edward McChristian
Richard Carlyle McClure
Neil Oliver McCray
Lynn Maynard McCrum
Richard Rougier McCullough
James William McDonald
Robert Heyburn McIlwain
Charles Crawford McIntosh
Charles Brannon McLean, Jr.
Richard Philip McLean
George Allen Meighen
Edward Charles Meyer
Louis Guy Michael, Jr.
Rex Douglas Michel
Ronald Hugh Milam
Robert William Milburn
Fred Richard Miller
Stuart Livingston Miller
Walter Bernard Miller, Jr.
Wayne Dickson Miller
Lawrence Lester Mintz
John Little Moffat
William Sidney Monsos
Newton Bedford Morgan, Jr.
John Joseph Moroney, Jr.
Edward John Mueller, Jr.
Dean Duane Mulder
Frank Ager Mullens
Daniel James Myers
Edwin Thompson Nance, Jr.
Paul Eugene Niedringhaus, Jr.
Cecil Ward Nist, Jr.
Donald James Norton
John Bernard Norvell
Thomas Christian Odderstol, Jr.
Desmond O'Keefe, Jr.
Robert Orlikoff
George William Orton
Henry Charles Otten
Garland Logan Owens
William Gladstone Owens, Jr.
Everette Sanford Parkins
Norton Lacy Parks
Hugh Heflin Pattillo
Robert James Pazderka
Donald Dean Peifer
Ernest Dishman Peixotto
Edouard Albert Peloquin
Karl William Peltz

Elmer Dean Pendleton, Jr.
Richard Arney Perry
Edward Compston Peter II
Charles Davis Phillips
James Holden Phillips, Jr.
James Richard Pitts
Robert Allan Prehn
George Peter Psihas
Charles Cowdry Pursley
Robert Allen Rachek
Joseph Wyndham Rawlings
Philip Neill Reed
George McKinley Reid, Jr.
Andrew Cunningham Remson, Jr.
Joseph Peter Rice
William Rowland Richardson
Kenneth Volkert Riley, Jr.
Delmar Lawrence Ring
George Gardner Ritter
Ronald Arthur Roberge
Lew Sidney Robinson
Roscoe Robinson, Jr.
Frederick Gore Rockwell, Jr.
James Mitchell Rockwell.
Ronald Joe Rogers
John Lawton Ross
Herbert Roth, Jr.
Christian Foltz Rupp III
Walter Brown Russell, Jr.
Richard Louis Ryan
Derrick William Samuelson
Raymond Francis Sargent, Jr.
Freddie Gene Sartin
Charles Joseph Satuloff
S. Arthur Scalise
Max Burton Scheider
George Peter Scheuerlein
William Ferdinand Scheumann, Jr.
William Wallace Schooley, Jr.
Joseph Francis Schuman
Donald Ray Schwartz
Richard Alfred Schwarz
John Eugene Schweizer
Stanley Stuart Scott
James Roe Semmens
Leonard Paul Shapiro
Daniel Gorman Sharp
Donald Thomas Sheridan
Stan Roger Sheridan
Francis Joseph Sheriff
Aaron Sherman
John Early Shillingburg
Michael John Simpson, Jr.
Robert Ingalls Simpson, Jr.
Guerdon Sterling Sines
Joseph Lee Sites
Donald Lovett Smith
Gorman Curtis Smith
Joseph St. Clair Smith
Howard Wayne Snyder
Melvin Claude Snyder, Jr.
Robert William Snyder
William Spence, Jr.
John Jay Stahl, Jr.
George Willis Stannard
Howard Merritt Steele, Jr.
Walter Richard Steidl
Wallace Chace Steiger, Jr.
Floyd Gilbert Stephenson
Francis Adelbert St. Mary
William Kenneth Stockdale
Louis John Storck
Thomas Anthony Stumm
Paul Dilwyn Summers, Jr.
Richard Anthony Szymczyk
Duane Ray Tague
John May Tatum, Jr.
Roland Dean Tausch
Malcom Brandt Tennant
Edgar Cornell Thomas, Jr.
William Neal Thomas
Dudley Thompson
Peter Louis Thorsen
Raymond Lawrence Toole, Jr.
Lowell Emmett Torseth
William Edward Vandenberg
Edwin Van Keuren, Jr.
Donald Augustus Van Matre
Frank Paul Vellella
Herman Joseph Vetort
Gustave Villaret III
Robert DeWitt Vincent
Robert Hartness Volk
Douglas Frederick Wainer
Francis Joseph Waldman, Jr.
Charles Jenkins Walker
Charles Nathan Wallens
Russell Fleming Walthour
Thomas Joseph Wanko, Jr.
John Duke Ward
Daniel Hurlburt Wardrop
John Richard Wasson
Robert Earl Welch
Richard Marshall Wells
Alexander Mulqueen Weyand
Howard Cameron Williams
Edward Martin Willis
Franklin Loeb Wilson
Francis Edward Winfield
Francis Lally Winner
Thomas Roger Woodley
William Brooks Woodson
Robert George Yerks
Edward Lauriston Zuver
Bernard Zwerling

I nominate the following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualifications:

Kie Oldham Doty
William Frederick Lackman, Jr.
James Myrick Lowerre
William Fulton Magill III
Edward Allen Partain
Walter Carper Phillips, Jr.
Bruce Harry Robertson

I nominate the following-named individual for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 2, 1951, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong., subject to graduation from the United States Naval Academy and subsequent discharge therefrom:

Robert Adam Renneman

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

PARAGRAPH 1. The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Except as otherwise indicated, all officers have been found physically qualified for promotion. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. Those indicated by the symbol (*) are subject both to physical and professional examinations required by law due to circumstances which have prevented such examinations (Clarence LeR. Anderson, missing in action, and Alexander M. Boysen, prisoner of war).

To be lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Alan Beresford Todd, O42088.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

×Robert Scurry Anderson, O22268.
×Joe Morris Blumberg, O29332.
×Clarence Raymond Brown, O24320.
Oliver Russell Buesing, O41775.
Leo Joseph Butler, O22267.
Richard Ray Cameron, O21717.
Joseph Thomas Caples, O21034.
Alonzo Bee Christie, Jr., O21723.
Martin Andrew Compton, O21038.
Robert McAllister Davis, O21454.
Herbert Downing Edger, O21452.
×Fred James Fielding, O21460.
Harold Winfield Glascock, Jr., O30854.
Frank Whitton Govern, O21031.
×Edwin Wayne Hakala, O21456.
Robert Sexton Higdon, O21459.
Tyron Ehrhart Huber, O56808.
×Forrest Edgar Hull, O21045.
Arthur Thomas Jones, O21678.
William Theodore Lane, O21714.
Homan Elfred Leech, O21679.
×Doss Owen Lynn, O21722.
Jackson Franklin Morehead, O21449.
×Myles Patton Moursund, O22269.
Leon Joseph Numainville, O21002.
×Thomas Earl Patton, Jr., O21674.
Edwin Joseph Pulaski, O41779.
×Francis Wilson Regnier, O22699.
Richard Wampler Satterthwaite, O51176.
×Charles Daniel Shields, O41776.
Philip Jack Smith, O21719.
Julius John Snyder, O21036.
Walter Dudley Spearman, O30848.
Frank Gordon Stephens, O21044.
×Alfred Pembroke Thom 3d, O21032.
Oscar Elliott Ursin, O21687.
×Henry Clay Vedder, O20999.
×John Henry Voegtly, O21450.
Edwin Sharp Wallace, O30859.
×Oswald Massena Weaver, O30861.
John James Young, O51172.

To be majors, Medical Corps

James Archibald Bell, O26452.
Joseph Reese Blair, O52007.
Alfred Sjouke Blauw, O26962.
×John James Brennan, O31150.
Donald Campbell, O31122.
William Wallace Cox, O43178.
William Ward Currence, O26446.
Jon Price Evans, O52010.
Raymond Joseph Getz, O26450.
Christian Gronbeck, Jr., O26470.
Milton Henry Hollander, O31102.
Charles John Hornisher, O26461.
Harry Aloysius Horstman, Jr., O26459.
Robert Samuel Jordan, Jr., O26460.
Avery Parsons King, O26449.
George Fairless Lull, Jr., O31114.
Frank Wisner Lynn, O26448.
Jules John McNerney, O26453.
Richard Francis Mulholland, O31124.
×Joseph John Nannarello, O56843.
Watson Edward Neiman, O31072.
×John Francis Pfeffer, O26468.
×Raoul Constantine Psaki, Jr., O26467.
×Harold Elton Ratcliffe, O56840.
×Frank Bradway Rogers, O26466.
Richard Coffman Shrum, O26447.
Arnot Crawford Sine, O41364.
Nathaniel Roscoe Spencer, O26944.
John Worthington Sumner, Jr., O31133.
John Henry Tenery, O43172.
Urban Linus Throm 2d, O26465.
John Keay Wallace 2d, O31131.
×Maurice Burton Winstead, O43163.

To be captains, Medical Corps

William Arved Abele, O57912.
Arthur Walker Adams, O58047.
Joseph Allison, O58105.
×Ellsworth Chapman Alvord, Jr., O58207.
*Clarence LeRoy Anderson, O61069.
Saul Baer Appel, O58113.
×Benjamin Lester Archer, O59576.
Clifton Wallace Arrington, O58032.
Alexander Woodson Ashford, O61183.
Marshall Beale Atkinson, O58208.
×Frank Herbert Austin, O57904.
Robert Evanston Baird, O58087.
Robert Hershey Baker, O58098.
Davis Aloysius Baltz, O58106.
Harry Banoff, O58027.
George Randolph Barnes, Jr., O57999.
Marcus Richard Beck, O60043.
William Robert Beisel, O59560.
James Carroll Bell, O58111.
James Seymour Berger, O58080.
Stephen Joseph Berte, O60132.
Robert Harold Bickford, O57996.
Frederick Charles Biehusen, O58038.
Edward Otto Bierman, O58045.
Leland Merle Bitner, O59570.
Richard Kekuni Blaisdell, O59710.
Hu Al Blake, O58708.
Alan Irving Blumberg, O58054.
Heath Douglas Bourdon, O60764.
John George Boutselis, O58030.
*Alexander Marius Boysen, O59612.
Carl Otto Brackebusch, O59561.

William Roy Breg, Jr., O58003.
Anthony Leonard Brittis, O60042.
Arnold Jason Brody, O58099.
Donald George William Brooking, O59601.
×David Phillips Buchanan, O59563.
Charles Edward Buck, O58007.
×Edward Louis Buescher, O60050.
Charles Edwin Butterworth, Jr., O59617.
John Mostier Cahill, O58067.
Harold George Carstensen, O60061.
Irvin Walters Cavedo, Jr., O59557.
Gerald Aiken Champlin, O60046.
×Bruce Frederick Chandler, O59613.
John Frederick Christianson, O62914.
Norman Jensen Cole, O58028.
Richard King Cole, Jr., O59599.
Warren James Collins, O59564.
Joseph Vincent Conroy, Jr., O59707.
William John Conroy, O59614.
Morton Charles Creditor, O58050.
William Francis Crepps, O59629.
Charles Brandon Crow, Jr., O58037.
John Bankhead Crow, O59623.
Arthur Jackson Crumbley, Jr., O58004.
Hugh Paul Curtis, O58048.
×Arthur Newton Dadirrian, O59708.
Paul Worthen Dale, O58044.
Crowell Turner Daniel, Jr., O59693.
Roswell George Daniels, O60058.
Albert James Davis, Jr., O59556.
William Jesse Dean, O59606.
Frank Ross De Luca, O58066.
Stephen Henri Deschamps, O57913.
Robert Lind Devine, O57903.
Arthur Calvin Dietrick, O59578.
John Hammill Draheim, O60034.
Richard Howard DuPree, O60759.
John Emery Egdahl, O61948.
James Paul Elkins, O58059.
Franklin Harold Epstein, O58062.
×Robert Andrew Etherington, O59583.
Paige Bill Follo, O58086.
Richard Myron Fox, O58043.
John William Frye, O58083.
Robert Dale Gamble, O59694.
Donald Hall Giesler, O58093.
Gordon Earl Gifford, O59546.
Robert Grout Gildersleeve, O58031.
Joseph Lang Girardeau, O59637.
Donald Henry Glew, Jr., O59550.
Norman Goldstein, O58104.
Arthur Goldwyn, O58063.
Clifford Peter Goplerud, O59700.
John Newton Gordon, O59695.
Fay Burton Graves, O57558.
Stuart Graves, Jr., O58068.
Leon David Graybill, O59567.
Lloyd Jefferson Gregory, Jr., O58100.
Paul Frederick Guerin, O57954.
Ben David Hall, O58065.
×Robert Joseph Hall, O59628.
William Henry Hall, O60133.
George Belgrove Hamilton, O60143.
James Francis Hammill, O59543.
Charles Walcott Hanford, O58096.
Walter White Hannah, O58053.
Joseph Lawrence Hannon, O59553.
Frederick Lee Harcourt, O61945.
William Henry Harper, Jr., O60130.
Ira Barnett Harrison, O59603.
Russell Connell Harrison, O61081.
Moses McCoy Hartman, 59705.
Charles Leroy Hedberg, O59566.
Armand Elkin Hendee, O59596.
×Thomas Love Hendrix, O58206.
Donald Lavern Howie, O60756.
Robert Franklin Hufner, O58110.
David James Hughes, O58005.
×Robert Davidson Hume, Jr., O61067.
Samuel Wynne Hunter, O58085.
Harry Frederick Hurd, O59587.
Robert Wheary Irvin, Jr., O59555.
×William Harry Isham, O59610.
Lawrence Monroe Jackson, Jr., O59443.
Herbert Jerome Jacobs, O59686.
×Park Chalmers Jeans, Jr., O59600.
Francis Wheatley Jeffords, O57910.
Robert Travis Jensen, O60761.
Winston Charles Jesseman, O60060.
Kenneth Eugene Johnson, O57748.
Lester Dean Johnson, Jr., O58060.
Merlin Hubert Johnson, O58092.
×Richard Greene Johnson, O58253.
Edward Harold Johnston, O59536.
Blackburn Smith Joslin, O58041.
×Albert Jacob Kanter, O59575.
John Stephen Kelly, O57997.
Cecil Harry Kimball, O59593.
Donald Everett King, O58768.
Robert Reese Koefoot, O58000.
Charles Haden Lasley, O57998.
Joseph Anthony Latteri, O61949.
James Maitland Lauderdale, O59552.
John Kline Leach, O58088.
×Evan Larson Lewis, O58205.
Arthur Fulton Lincoln, O60033.
William Paul Lochte, O58769.
Charles Leo Lynch, O57911.
Donald Ray Lyon, O59634.
Richard Edward McGovern, O59573.
John Rockwell McLelland, O57741.
×Campbell Arthur McNicol, O58052.
James Wallace Mankin, O58089.
Robert Anthony Markelz, O58069.
Roscoe Edward Mason, O59618.
×William Charles Matousek, O59579.
Carter Lee Meadows, O59632.
Charles Hymerick Meeks, O58108.
John Jacob Meyerdierks, O58039.
Joe Elias Mitchell, O57958.
John Arthur Moncrief, O59697.
Charles Allan Moore, O59584.
×Charles Herbert Moore, O59701.
William Alexander Moore, O57415.
×Robert William Moseley, O59559.
Thomas Henry Moseley, O59554.
Robert Harlan Moser, O59597.
Arthur Anthony Murray, O59590.
Joseph Raymond Newton, O58064.
Robert Floyd Newton, O58095.
John Allen Norman, O57957.
Edward Taylor O'Dell, O57960.
×Richard Eugene Ogborn, O58209.
John William O'Grady, O57908.
Lawrence Joseph Oot, O59598.
Edwin Lowell Overholt, O60030.
Kenneth Norwood Owens, O59586.
×John Harold Painter, O59551.
John Majure Palmer, O58029.
Paul William Palmer, O60097.
Charles Council Parker, O60055.
Alois Peczenik, O61181.
Francis James Peisel, O59621.
Vol Keeney Philips, O59709.
William Greeley Phippen, O59581.
Charles Calvin Pixley, O57841.
Donald G. Pocock, O59622.
Raymond Ernest Ponath, O57071.
Warren Ellsworth Porter, O58046.
James Richard Prest, Jr., O59565.
×Walter Stauffer Price, O61182.
×Robert Walter Puckett, O57749.
Gordon Keith Pyles, O59585.
Robert Keith Rawers, O59547.
Wallace James Redner, Jr., O58767.
×Robert Ward Regan, O59574.
Eric Reiss, O62915.
Robert George Richards, O60054.
Roberto Carlos Rodriguez, O59706.
Harold Rosegay, O58766.
×Joel Leonard Roth, O60139.
Samuel Morris Rothermel, O59588.
Joseph August Roy, O58090.
William David Sanderson, O59620.
James Howard Sands, O58112.
×William John Sayer, O60031.
William Renold Schillhammer, Jr., O63453.
×Lionel Abbott Schwartz, O57955.
John Edwin Scott, O59568.
Wilson Radcliff Scott, O57070.
Lee Sherwood Serfas, O61184.
John Hays Sharp, O59619.
×Jacques Lawrence Sherman, Jr., O59541.
Robert Leonard Sherman, O60062.
Alvin Sholk, O59630.
Paul Eugene Sieber, O58707.
Robert Andrew Simenson, O58101.
Fred Harshman Slager, O60069.
Charles Burnett Smith, O58042.
Robert Warren Spaulding, O58033.
Harry Franklin Sproat, O57416.
Lee Arnold Steele, O59582.
Robert John Steinborg, O59635.
Donald James Summerson, O60747.
Frank Louis Swift, O59542.
Yiwen Yves Tang, O58026.
Arthur Abbott Terrill, O59554.
×Paul Erhard Teschan, O59604.
×Miles Evered Thomas, O58107.
Ralph Gomer Thomas, O58084.
Willis Herbert Thornburg, O58097.
David Michael Tormey, O59609.
William Waters Tucker, O58051.
×Jasper Leon Van Avery, Jr., O59703.
Francis Leonard Van Veen, O57739.
Molloy George Veal, Jr., O59560.
Richard Aloysius Walsh, O61187.
Richard Alpheus Ward, O60070.
David Wesley Wardell, O59602.
Donald Riegel Watkins, O57907.
Richard Elvin Weeks, O60066.
William Holmes Weingarten, O59605.
Herschel James Wells, O57956.
×Dick Davis Wetzel, O58091.
Glenn Richard Weygandt, O58094.
David Craig White, O60763.
William Herman Whitmore, Jr., O59558.
Fred Crump Williams, O57906.
Dean Flewellyn Winn, Jr., O57959.
×Walter McIlhaney Wolfe, O57740.
William Henry Wright, O59580.
Vladimir Antonovich Yaholkovsky, O57905.

To be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps

Hugh Davis Avary, O30838.
William Preston Barnes, Jr., O21048.
Clare Thomas Budge, O21050.
Ernest Joseph Fedor, O38657.
John Eugene Finnegan, O20971.
Thomas James Hagen, O20967.
Onas Lee Johns, O29323.
Thayne Foster McManis, O21047.
Maurice Alexander Meador, O30835.
James Shira Pegg, O20966.
Charles Kenneth Reger, O20962.
William Brooks Simms, O20968.

To be major, dental corps

Perry Wilson Bascom, O25171.
James Blake Bunnell, Jr., O31074.
John Lloyd Campbell, O38863.
×Fred James Farrar, O56838.
John Edward Jordan, O38859.
Herbert Bonell Laffitte, O43150.
Norbert Steve Lang, O31062.
Raymond Aloysius Mahr, O43157.
Edmund Severn Olsen, Jr., O31071
Clare William Sauser, O26444.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Dale Carl Bowers, O57751.
Walter Zimri Brown, O57752.
Robert Duncan Buchanan, O57842.
×Sebastian Joseph Campagna, O57845.
Raymond Charles Clark, O61072.
Robert Joseph Fanning, O57572.
Ralph Warren Flinchbaugh, O61071.
Paul Mertins Cowan, O57914.
Frederick Albert Helig, O58115.
Kenneth William Hughes, O57846.
Carter Hamilton Lewis, Jr., O57915.
Roderick Latimer Lister, O57753.
Richard John Maloney, O57574.
Jack Douglas Pigford, O57843.
Harry Charles Robertson, O60746.

To be lieutenant colonel, Veterinary Corps

×Richard George Yule, O18948.

PAR. 2. The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Charles Thomas Burch, O63060.
Charles Augustus Hagman, Jr., O63291.
Louis William Kranyak, O063296.
Douglas Alexander Mollison, O62213.
Gene Dale Moore, O63280.
Charles Glen Noice, Jr., O63303.
Malcolm Kaye Rhine, O63306.
James William Ryan, O63070.

Walter Thayer Ride, Jr., O63290.
Joseph Dominick Spinelli, O63488.
James Edwin Stacy, O63285.
Comfort Kent Starr, O63292.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Oren E. Long, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-gracious God, our Father, may this moment of worship inspire us with a more filial trust in Thee and a more fraternal attitude toward all mankind.

Grant that we may be lovers of righteousness, walking humbly before Thee and seeking earnestly to do Thy will more perfectly.

In the sphere of human relationships may we always act like Christian brothers and neighbors, manifesting the spirit of good will and encouragement and extending the hand of helpfulness to all who are bearing heavy burdens.

Daily we are bringing unto Thee the difficult problems of our own country and the desperate needs of a world torn asunder and riven by the storms of hatred and war.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, and all who legislate in the affairs of government may be endowed with wisdom and courage as they strive to find the way to a just and an enduring peace.

In Christ's name we penitently offer our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on yesterday, he did on today, May 4, 1951, sign the following enrolled bill:

S. 271. An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Abbitt	Granahan	Miller, N. Y.
Anfuso	Granger	Morano
Armstrong	Green	Morrison
Bakewell	Gregory	Murphy
Baring	Halleck	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett	Harrison, Va.	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Hébert	Nelson
Brooks	Heffernan	Patman
Buckley	Heller	Philbin
Byrne, N. Y.	Herlong	Powell
Case	Hinshaw	Price
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Reams
Chatham	Holifield	Redden
Chelf	Irving	Ribicoff
Chudoff	Jackson, Wash.	Roosevelt
Cole, N. Y.	James	Sasscer
Combs	Javits	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Curtis, Mo.	Kearney	Sieminski
Dawson	Kee	Taylor
DeGraffenried	Kelly, N. Y.	Vail
Dingell	Kersten, Wis.	Vinson
Dollinger	Kirwan	Watts
Doyle	Klein	Whitaker
Elston	Kluczynski	Widnall
Fine	Latham	Wood, Idaho
Fugate	McGuire	Woodruff
Gavin	McKinnon	
Gillette	Mansfield	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 42) which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3880, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] had 20 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] had 51 minutes remaining.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, as one of the freshman members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices it has been a privilege to serve through the past months under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], than whom there could be no finer or more able chairman, and to have the benefit of the guidance and assistance of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], ranking member on my own side of the committee, and to associate with the other members of this very able subcommittee.

During the hours of general debate, Mr. Chairman, there were brought out before this House many of the details of this rather complicated bill involving thirty-five-odd independent agencies of the Government. I should like to call the attention of the Committee to a few of the comparatively minor points which at the same time are rather significant as indicating the problems we are up against and showing the membership and the people how far we have gone along the line of Government expenditures and what our real problems are.

If you study the thirty-five-odd departments with which our committee has been dealing during these months of intensive hearings, you will find some significant facts. For instance, you will find that the requests authorized by the Bureau of the Budget for the item of travel alone in these 35 departments total some $16,600,000. Incidentally, that amount of money would build 27 B–29's or 83 Patton tanks. You will find that the combined requests approved by the Bureau of the Budget for these 35 departments for communication expense—telegraph and telephone—totaled some $8,300,000 plus. That money for telephone and telegraph charges and for communications would have constructed 14 B–29's or 41 Patton tanks.

The combined request for printing and binding of these departments, many of them comparatively small regulatory bureaus of the Government, total over $5,000,000, which would construct 9 B–29's or 26 Patton tanks. I merely mention these facts to show how these comparatively trivial items mount as you go through the long list.

It is interesting to note also that almost every one of these bureaus and departments is expending a good deal of energy and a great deal of money in the matter of research and fact finding, and almost without exception they come in and suggest that this research and fact finding must be redoubled because of the war effort; that it is necessary to have at the disposal of the military and other branches of the Government, including special war-emergency agencies, all of their data. The Tariff Commission, for instance, is engaged in a vast campaign of fact finding and research. The Federal Power Commission insists on more money in order that it may make more research and place at the disposal of the Government agencies more information regarding power, and so on down the line through almost every one of these agencies, and so these charges pile up.

Mr. Chairman, a further instance—much was said about housing here yesterday. In connection with the Federal Housing Administration you will find that the sum of over one and a half million dollars, comparatively small perhaps,

was spent in contracts with the Bureau of Standards and various institutions in many research projects. We find in that program sixty-odd projects, such as Long-Range Effect of Weather on Full-Sized Wood Frame Construction, Studies of Household Sewage Disposal, Timber Research, Ventilation Measurements, Determination of Snow Loads on Building Construction, Termite Experience in the Gulf States, Crawl Space Investigation, Fire Resistance on Wood Frame Dwellings, and so on, for 60 projects, winding up with a final one, Survey of Housing Research. Our subcommittee reduced housing research by about $350,000. I insist it should be all cut out during the present emergency.

There is another straw in the wind showing into how many channels our money is going. You will remember that the General Services Administration, which comes under the purview of this subcommittee, was the result of a reorganization plan along the lines of the Hoover recommendation. You are doubtless familiar with the fact that not so long ago we consolidated the Public Works Administration, the Bureau of Community Facilities, the Public Buildings Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Federal Supply, the Office of Contract Settlement, National Archives, and the War Assets Administration into this one general agency. After they had consolidated these agencies it was discovered that the combined employees of the old agencies aggregated 29,562, while the employees of the new agency aggregated 29,702—an increase of 140 as a result of this consolidation.

Now, it is interesting to see, as we approach the General Services Administration, how that branch has grown. It is charged, as you know, with the furnishing of space and the purchase of supplies for much of the governmental activity. It is interesting to note that at the beginning of the present war emergency governmental agencies under the administration of the General Services were occupying in the District of Columbia over 43,000,000 square feet of floor space, and outside of the District of Columbia almost 59,000,000 square feet of floor space, or a total of approximately 102,000,000 square feet. And that, mind you, does not include all the floor space occupied, for instance, in those buildings where more than half the building is occupied by a United States post office, or the floor space in buildings on governmental reservations. So, if you count it all and remember that the population of the United States is approximately 150,000,000 people, you will see that our governmental machine is occupying in floor space practically 1 square foot for every living man, woman, and child in this country. Furthermore, that space is not so well utilized. We know that floor space in private industry is highly necessary. We know that floor space in private industry is utilized to its full capacity, because they work in shifts through long hours, but as long as we continue, Mr. Chairman, the 40-hour Government week during this emergency you have this vast amount of floor space utilized only a portion of the time.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot, as we found in this subcommittee, draw a strict line of demarcation between those expenditures which are military and those which are nonmilitary. The Atomic Energy Commission, the TVA, and several of the other agencies are just as necessary and just as much a part of our military activity as any of the agencies covered by the Subcommittee on the Armed Services. On the other hand, in between we have a group of agencies such as the Civil Service and the General Services Administration that insist they require more money this year because they are a necessary part of the war effort. Even when we heard the Battle Monuments Commission, a representative of that Commission solemnly admonished our committee that we must proceed with full speed to erect battle monuments in Europe, because if we fail to do so it will be interpreted by the European countries as a lack of faith on our part, and indicating our belief that they are about to be invaded. It seemed to me that their morale would be strengthened more by a few more bombers than by battle monuments. However, that shows what we have been up against with nearly every department.

Two more matters I would like to call your attention to briefly as indicative of the sacred cows we have to deal with. One has to do with the loyalty program of the Civil Service Commission. The loyalty program has now become a watchword, but the testimony indicated that they have nearly finished the screening of those now employed by the Government, and from now on the problem is simply those applicants we are about to hire. For that purpose it seems hardly necessary to increase, in the field of the Civil Service Commission loyalty program, the number of boards from 708 to 1,222. It seems hardly necessary to create new regional and appeal boards in a huge program, whereby a person who is turned away from Government employment because his loyalty is in question, can go on from appeal to appeal until he reaches the final board here in Washington. Another subject is the safety program of the Interstate Commerce Commission, on which I will have something to say later under the 5-minute rule when an amendment will be offered. In connection with all these agencies it becomes more and more necessary, as stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] yesterday, that after 28 solid days of hearings, your subcommittee should not bid them good-by until next year, but that some way be provided so that we can keep in touch with how the taxpayers' money is spent in each and every one of them.

I am proud of the fact that, in spite of all these difficulties, and after allowing increases to the Atomic Energy Commission and other war agencies under our jurisdiction, our subcommittee has been able to report this bill with an over-all reduction of 11 percent less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. If the legislation contained in our committee bill is approved by the House, an even greater amount will be saved the taxpayers.

May I say in closing that the clash between the legislative committees and the Committee on Appropriations on the matter of these provisions is not a new dispute. Every legislative committee is, to a certain extent, a special pleader for the groups and activities in its jurisdiction. The great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has struggled for years to build up the American merchant marine, and it is natural that it should view with hostility legislation in our bill which seems to limit its efforts. The Committee on Banking and Currency fought wholeheartedly for public housing and, naturally, opposes any limitation on that activity. Let me say, however, with all the emphasis at my command, that nothing in this bill permanently injures our merchant marine or abandons our public housing. Its provisions merely slow up these programs during the coming year of emergency, holding them in abeyance rather than placing any permanent limit upon them or changing our policy with regard to them. The only way this can be done is through the temporary expedient of legislation in an appropriation bill. The people of this country want these various programs restrained, if I read my mail correctly, and insist that we do so.

Mr. Chairman, the one thing we must do in this Eighty-second Congress is to hold up expenditures that are not absolutely essential and give everything we have to national defense. This your subcommittee is doing in this appropriation bill, and I hope we shall receive the support of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take this time to proceed out of order, but I think it is important enough to me and to the State I represent to make these few remarks, for today is Independence Day in the State of Rhode Island. One hundred and seventy-five years ago today the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island severed its allegiance to the Crown of Great Britain. Rhode Island declared its independence of Great Britain 2 months before the famous Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776.

The people of Rhode Island contributed greatly to the success of the Revolution of 1776. Rhode Island supplied the first commander of our continental Navy, Esek Hopkins, and at the same time contributed to George Washington one of his greatest generals, Nathaniel Greene. The boys in Rhode Island before 1776 caused the first rift with Great Britain by sinking the British sloop *Liberty* in Newport in 1769. A few years later the first blood that was shed by any of the Original Colonies against Great Britain was shed by the boys of Rhode Island, when they burned the

British sloop *Gaspee* off Gaspee Plateau in the waters of Rhode Island. So Rhode Island takes great pride on its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary today, in having taken the lead in the Original Thirteen Colonies to throw off the yoke of a foreign power. We have heard of the cry "No taxation without representation," but steps in that direction had been taken by the Legislature of Rhode Island back in 1773, several years before July 4, 1776.

So those of us who come from Rhode Island, who were born in Rhode Island, have always taken great pride in the independent leadership of Rhode Island; in the constitution and the charter upon which Rhode Island was built; and in the memory of Roger Williams. We, in Rhode Island, established the first democratic form of government in the Thirteen Colonies by granting religious liberty to every person residing in that great little State.

Today, while we commemorate our one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, the name of Rhode Island and the name of Ireland seem synonymous to me. I bring to your attention this morning, in these few minutes, that there are many of us in Rhode Island who are equally interested in the independence of Ireland. We in Rhode Island will never forget that in the Indian War, the King Philip war of the early 1600's, when we needed help the only country in the world that sent supplies and medicine was Ireland. For 800 years Ireland has been persecuted and dominated by the same foreign power as was Rhode Island. It was only in 1919 that Great Britain allowed all the people of Ireland to vote, and, by an overwhelming majority of 80 percent, they declared their desire for their independence of Great Britain. But they have been refused that independence. There is still an imaginary line dividing the people of Ireland today, despite the will of this great majority of the people of that little country which has given so much in the way of fighting men to the independence of our own country, even before the days of the Revolution and down through all the wars in which we have fought to the present day. So it is with that background that I speak to you this afternoon. I introduced a resolution a year ago which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is a very simple resolution. A similar resolution was passed by the House of Representatives in 1919 by the tremendous vote of 216 to 45. Hearings were held on my resolution in the Committee on Foreign Affairs a year ago. Although there was no opposition, the committee did not have an opportunity to take action before the end of the session. I introduced the same resolution again in January of this year. I since appeared before the committee on the resolution. I sincerely hope that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will soon find it possible for the members of that committee to vote on the resolution and permit it to come before the House of Representatives. By so doing the membership of this body will have an opportunity to vote on this very simple resolution which states that the House of Representatives believes that Ireland should be undivided and united.

It is only a simple resolution and one which I think will meet with the overwhelming approval of all of the people of our country. As one who comes from a State like Rhode Island, and who appreciates the part that the men and women who came from Ireland played in the Revolution in order to secure for us the independence that we now enjoy and who have played a great part in making this country the greatest democratic country in the world, I hope that this resolution will be considered by the House. I do not think this is a solution which is impossible of achievement. I have no dislike for Great Britain as a foreign power. I bear her no malice. But I think by passing a resolution of this kind it will help and enable Great Britain to adjust this problem. I am sure in the cause of international freedom and peace in the future, the unification of Ireland can be accomplished if we can forcefully direct it to their attention. I am sure that in their own diplomatic way they will ultimately do the right thing. They have not been doing the right thing in regard to Ireland for the past six or seven hundred years. But I think they will want to do the right thing, and if we pass this resolution it will help to correct a wrong which was created by the division of the Irish nation and will bring to a realization the hopes and dreams and prayers of 90 percent of the people of that great country, Ireland.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution introduced by the gentleman from Rhode Island simply asks for the carrying out of the fundamental policy of our country throughout its entire constitutional history, of a people being united no matter where they are throughout the world and to have the oportunity of expressing their will in the forming of their own government, and achieving the aspirations of the people at home. I appeared with the gentleman from Rhode Island in support of his resolution as did many other Members. I join with the gentleman in urging the Committee on Foreign Affairs to bring it to a vote. I have a strong feeling of confidence that the votes are there, and if reported out of committee, I will bring it up just as soon as it is possible to do so under the rules of the House.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the majority leader for his contribution. I sincerely hope the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will give the membership of the House an opportunity to vote on this resolution. Favorable action by the House this year, the 175th anniversary of the independence of Rhode Island, would not only make me happy, but would make the majority of the people of Rhode Island happy as well as millions of men and women of Irish descent all over the world.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 16 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Appropriations Committee made a very modest cut in the funds for the Public Housing Administration. The committee made a cut of from $16,000,000 to $12,788,000.

I have in my possession a document indicating there is a pressure group trying to discredit the action of the Committee on Appropriations in making this very modest cut for the housing program. The Members of this House have a right to know what the public housers are doing in attempting to pressure this Congress on this matter. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I want to read for the benefit of the membership from a letter which is dated April 30, 1951:

NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1951.

Memorandum to all local housing authorities.

A WEEK END SPECIAL BUT NO BARGAIN

Public low-rent housing has been dealt a low blow by the House Committee on Appropriations which has just reported the independent offices appropriation bill. Public low-rent housing starts have been limited to 50,000 in the fiscal year 1952 (which begins next July), but hold your hat—it is limited to the same number each year thereafter. If anything in addition is to be requested, it is necessary to go to Congress and obtain authority to build.

What does it mean? It means that unless you are actually in construction on your local program you might just as well sit back and wait for the years to pass until your number comes up.

But there is no reason on earth why the people of the country should take the recommendations of the House Committee on Appropriations as the answer. The House of Representatives must pass on this recommendation, and the Senate committee as well as the Senate itself must act. The House Committee on Appropriations has consistently recommended against appropriating adequate funds for any of the social gains made during the last two decades. It also would put a stop to the Voice of America and other international gains for democracy. Housing, in being taken by the throat and choked to death, is in distinguished company.

Actual administrative appropriations for the Public Housing Administration have been cut by committee recommendation from approximately $16,000,000 to $12,788,000. That, of course, means a substantial reduction in force by PHA—approximately 300 people. What is obvious is that many of the most efficient people will obtain better jobs in defense agencies, or will be caught in the reduction in force. It is a tragic, but not irretrievable picture.

If you want your housing program to go ahead you will get in touch immediately with your Congressman, asking that restrictions on public low-rent housing to 50,000 units a year be defeated. A fair restriction for the coming fiscal year would be 75,000 units, and after that the events of the world and the requirement of defense should govern. You will also wish to get in touch immediately with your Senators. Most important, of course, are members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, namely, Democrats: McKellar, of Tennessee; Hayden, of Arizona; Russell, of Georgia; McCarran, of Nevada; O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Chavez, of New Mexico; Maybank, of South Carolina; Ellender, of Louisiana; Hill, of Alabama; Kilgore, of West Virginia; and McClellan, of Arkansas; Republicans: Bridges, of New Hampshire; Ferguson, of Michigan; Wherry, of Nebraska; Cordon, of Oregon; Saltonstall, of

Massachusetts; Young, of North Dakota; Knowland, of California; Thye, of Minnesota; Ecton, of Montana; and McCarthy, of Wisconsin. But please remember that every Senate vote, every House vote, every voice that has the courage to speak for public low-rent housing is of vital importance.

This situation is so serious that it requires no elaboration from me. Your complete program is at stake. Congress will believe in a decent housing program if your community tells your Representative what the people from your community believe. Otherwise, they will take as representative of the public will, that which is poured out each week by the real-estate lobby.

LEE F. JOHNSON,
Executive Vice President.

What is the National Housing Conference—the group that is sending out this letter? The Nation magazine, issue of May 15, 1948, states that the National Public Housing Conference is an organization, with headquarters in Washington, which sponsors the public-housing movement in the United States. After the passage of the 1949 public-housing bill the organization took the word "Public" out of its name, but it is still the same old organization.

Some of the leaders in this organization have been and are Leon Keyserling, economic adviser to the President; Catherine Bauer, of Harvard University; Charles Abrams, former counsel to the New York City Housing Authority.

It might be interesting for the Committee to know that Miss Laurine A. Winlack, who was formerly the secretary to the signer of this letter, Mr. Lee Johnson, with the National Public Housing Conference, was appointed to the Federal Public Housing Administration after the passage of the 1949 Public Housing Act, and is now the Assistant Director of Personnel for the Federal Public Housing Administration. I do not know how much of her time Miss Winlack spends with this outside lobby organization, but her loyalties to it seem to be extreme.

Where does the National Housing Conference get its money for lobbying to advance public-housing legislation and expansion in this country? Here is a letter from the Tacoma Public Housing Authority, Tacoma, Wash., which indicates that they were attempting to get money from contractors of Federal public housing of $500 and $250 a "shot" to advance the program. I also understand that they try to get money from architects who get large fees for designing public housing. I understand they also get money from some of the so-called charitable trusts and from some of the "do-gooder" organizations.

Let me read this letter from the housing authority of the city of Tacoma apparently sent to all contractors. The contractor's name is deleted from this letter for obvious reasons. This was sent out in October 1945. It reads:

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE
CITY OF TACOMA,
Tacoma, Wash., October —, 1945.

(A contractor—name deleted.)

GENTLEMEN: Some time ago I wrote to you asking for a contribution in support of the National Public Housing Conference. The letter was written at a time when we were all very busy with war work and it might be that you have overlooked it.

I am taking the liberty of writing again now because under the leadership of the National Public Housing Conference the postwar public housing program is rapidly assuming its final form and it is therefore urgently necessary to draw together the people in our region who want to participate in the program.

The omnibus housing bill sponsored by Senators Wagner and ELLENDER providing for postwar housing developments on a large scale, both public and private, is now under consideration in the United States Senate. The material for the bill was prepared by the National Public Housing Conference and that is why I, as the Northwest regional committee member of the conference, ask you now for your support.

The postwar program of the 32 housing authorities in this region will be affected by the bill now in Congress and these local authorities are all anxious to see it pass.

Contributions in support of the conference have already been received from a number of firms which constructed the Nation's public war housing. Those firms whose total contracts were less than $500,000 gave from $250 to $500 while those whose contracts were more than $500,000 made $500 contributions. These contributions are deductible for income tax purposes. A copy of the program of the National Public Housing Conference is enclosed.

I would very much appreciate it if you would reply to my letter because we are forming a regional organization and it would be most helpful to know how you feel about the problem.

Cordially yours,

JOHN SCHLARB, JR.,
Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Tacoma, Legislative Committee Member, National Public Housing Conference.

You will note that this letter is addressed to the local housing authorities. This is where another group lobbying for public housing comes in, Mr. Chairman. All the public housing authorities, as I understand it, pay dues to the National Association of Housing Officials and many of the high Federal officials also belong to the National Association of Housing Officials. As an example of the type of activity carried on by the National Association of Housing Officials, I have a document here indicating that they are attempting to infiltrate the minds of the children in our local school systems to propagandize for the public housing program—quoted from the report Public Relations Tips:

The schools, with their natural three-way audience of teachers, children, and parents, provide an important means of acquainting the community with the story of public housing.

It is the proper function of the local authority to interest citizens groups in approaching the schools and asking that they undertake to teach housing. * * *

Once this phase of the job is achieved, the next area in which a local housing authority may have to perform emerges: coping with the students themselves. A citizens agency can take on some of this burden but the major portion must rest with the local authority. The many complicated phases of public housing make it necessary that a person who has direct contact with the operation should have the responsibility of explaining the subject to students.

It is important not to neglect the private and parochial schools in developing the program. The relations that usually exist between various working citizen groups should provide entree via, for instance, parochial organizations to these nonpublic schools.

Mr. Chairman, from the evidence it appears to me that the committee ought to make a much greater cut in the appropriations for public housing.

An example of my findings is this clipping from the Pittsburgh Press of April 2, 1950, which quotes the Public Housing Authority Director as stating that they have no rules against a Communist woman worker living in the Arlington Heights Federal public-housing project in Pittsburgh:

Meanwhile officials of the Pittsburgh Housing Authority made it clear the Communist charges won't affect Mrs. Nuss's tenancy in the Arlington Heights project.

The Housing Authority said it has no rule under which a Communist may be evicted or barred from a project.

Relief authorities said she was the only one of the 291 western Pennsylvanians named as Communists to be found on the assistance rolls in Allegheny County.

Another example, Mr. Chairman, is these clippings from the Scranton Tribune, Scranton, Pa., April 25, 1951, just the last few days showing how frantic the public-housing officials from Washington and Scranton are in trying to drum up applications for people to get into a public-housing project they are trying to finish in Scranton. Now at the same time, they are having a hard time filling this project, they are propagandizing both in Scranton and in Washington to get more public housing there and in other parts of the country. To me this just does not make sense.

Now, here is a letter from the housing authority manager of the Edison Courts project virtually ordering the tenants to vote "yes" on the referendum.

It reads as follows:

EDISON COURTS MANAGEMENT OFFICE,
June 26, 1950.

SPECIAL BULLETIN

To All Tenants of Edison Courts:

Tomorrow, June 27, is voting day. Tomorrow we either win or lose more public housing in Miami. If you appreciate what public housing did for you (and is still doing) when you needed housing so badly, then go to the polls tomorrow, Tuesday, the 27th, and vote "yes."

Every tenant in this project will be expected to vote "yes" tomorrow. The polls are open from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., located in Edison High School auditorium, Northwest Second Avenue and Sixty-first Street.

If you need transportation contact our office.

V. M. KIMBREW,
Housing Manager.

Mr. Chairman, if we continue to give the Public Housing Administration these large sums of money we are just giving them money to propagandize against the wishes of the local citizens of this country and I will give you a concrete example. It was proposed by the Public Housing Administration to build 900 public housing apartments in Roanoke, Va. The citizens of Roanoke in a referendum have decided by a vote of nearly 3 to 1 that they do not want these 900 public housing units to come into Roanoke. I understand, however, that the Public Housing Administration is going right

ahead to try to force these public housing projects down the throats of the citizens of Roanoke, Va. Now, I remember from the debate when the public housing bill was on the floor here that it was said that these things were not going to be forced into communities against the wishes of the local citizens and here is exactly what they are doing in the case of Roanoke and I understand that it is happening in a number of other instances.

I have here in my hand a copy of the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. There is hardly a word mentioned in this whole publication about communism. It is a called a Socialist State and if you will notice it is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This document was printed by the American-Russian Institute of New York City, from an authentic English translation provided by the Russian Information Bulletin right here in Washington—the official information bulletin of the Soviet Government. I want to read to you a little bit from article VI out of the 146 articles in this document. "Article VI—The land, and"—I will delete some of the extraneous material—"the bulk of the dwelling houses in the cities and the industrial localities are state property." That is just an excerpt from article VI that shows that public housing certainly is a part of the Russian Communist program.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was interested in what the gentleman told us about the notice that was sent to the tenants in that housing project. Does not the gentleman agree that if this condition continues, and the Congress does not put a stop to it, it will not be very long until those tenants will be either evicted or have their rents raised if they do not vote, or if they do not vote right?

Mr. JENSEN. That will inevitably follow, like night follows day, just as it has in every Nation on this earth, which for long followed the socialistic route we have been traveling for many, many years.

Here is an article from the Miami Herald of February 4, 1951, relating to public housing. I will take two lines from this article which will suffice. This is what the Supreme Court of the State of Florida said according to that newspaper:

> The people of this country have a right to undertake socialistic experiments like this when done as the law requires.

Ladies and gentleman, think that one over.

The Appropriations Committee is confronted in the statements of many of the proponents of these schemes and in some of our own opinions with what amounts to virtually a draft against the Appropriations Committees. If we are going to stop these raids on the Treasury, we are going to have to stop the substantive legislation.

I cannot help mentioning at this time then the so-called Defense Production Act and the so-called amendments to the Defense Production Act introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], H. R. 3871. Now, Mr. Chairman, these bills set up a program of economic controls for America. This is not a defense-production bill, it is an economic-control bill. This bill more tightly sets up a program which could bring about a police state in our country. We are getting a sample now in the treatment in other industries, increasing evidence is showing up that these programs cannot fail to turn out to the detriment of the American war effort and the American system in general.

Some of you may remember that in the debate on the Defense Production Act last fall it was pointed out many of the dangerous parallels between that bill and the so-called Spence bill which was introduced a couple of years before. Some of you may recall that the President of the United States sent Mr. Paul Porter up to the Congress in the summer of 1948, pressing to get through a so-called standby economic control program. The Congress rejected these programs. Now here we are adopting programs and implementing programs far worse than those the Congress rejected at that time, without evidence that they will assist in the war effort or the health and economy of this country. Some people say the American system is resilient. It is resilient, Mr. Chairman. But how long can it stand the attacks such as it is undergoing at the present time. I am not impugning the motives of a fine man like Mr. Charles Wilson. We all know, however, that drafting of this legislation, the setting up of these policies, are done sometimes by annoymous staffs of the executive offices and the executive departments. If we pass H. R. 3871, and continue the Defense Production Act, so-called, if we continue to put the American economic system out of gear, we are going to have to hire hundreds of thousands of snoopers and adjusters and expediters to be chasing the people all over the country trying to correct the very evils which that same controlled system has produced. I call on the members of this committee, Mr. Chairman, to assist your Appropriations Committee and yourselves by scrutinizing most carefully this type of substantive legislation in the future so that we may be protected against the onslaught of those in our country who wish to set up a system here while perhaps not loyal to Russia, certianly does not conform to the principles of the American constitutional system. After all it is not enough just to have the forms of economic freedom without the substance. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not enough. We not only want to avoid the police state under Russian domination, we want to avoid the police state under domestic domination as well, right here in America.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Aside from the political implications that the gentleman has brought out, in my district at least, and I think in others, there are private builders extremely anxious to build but unable to build because of certain restrictive regulations. There is no need for public housing because the private builders in most areas will build.

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly right. Facts are about all the Federal home building program has accomplished, is to raise the cost of homes sky high for not only our veterans but for everyone in America who would like to have reasonable rent, as well as those who would like to own and pay for a home of their own in less than 40 years.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to refute the statements that have just been made by the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman from Iowa has talked about this housing program as being the pride of the so-called do-gooders. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, this Nation needs do-gooders, this Nation was built upon a moral principle; it was built upon the fact that this is a Government of the people, by the people, and for all of the people, and it is predicated upon the efforts of so-called do-gooders that this Nation has attained the status that it has attained today. I think the gentleman should not judge all parts of the Nation by his home in Iowa. He should know the conditions that pertain in parts of the country other than the State of Iowa. He ought to visit the city of Chicago and the city of New York and other cities throughout this country, and see how many of our people live. In the Committee on Appropriations this morning he made a plea for soil conservation. I subscribe to that plea. I think we ought to have soil conservation, but as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, the most important natural resource that this Nation has is the men, women, and children that make up this Nation. The public housing program was initiated for the purpose of giving hope, of resurrecting the hundreds of thousands of people who are doomed to a blighted life in the slums of the metropolitan communities of this country, and offering them a decent place to live. Occasionally you hear the majority leader rise in this well and talk about the family life of this Nation as being its foundation.

I agree 100 percent with what the majority leader has said. That is one of the reasons that we enacted the housing program in 1949, to help the family life of this Nation. The gentleman from Iowa was as much opposed, and bitterly opposed, to the housing program at the time the bill was passed, as he is today.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask the gentleman the same question I asked his colleague from Chicago yesterday: Does the gentleman contend that the Federal Government should build all the housing, or that it is the only agency to build the housing?

Mr. YATES. May I say to the gentleman that the Housing Act itself, for

which I voted, did not intend that all the housing be built by the Government. All of us want privately built housing. I want it. I want as much housing as we can get. Public housing under the spirit and under the language of that act, as I remember it, was to occupy a 10-percent place in the housing starts of this Nation. The reason for the Bureau of the Budget's cutting the number of public housing starts from 135,000 to 75,000 was that the number of starts for all housing in this Nation, private as well as public, was anticipated to be 810,000. Therefore, the Bureau of the Budget cut these starts for public housing to 75,000. I think the action of our subcommittee in cutting it to 50,000 was entirely unwarranted. There is no evidence at all to justify it. I certainly hope that this House will not reduce it further, but will restore the units cut.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WERDEL. Does the gentleman know that in the last election the people of California voted that no public housing should go into our counties or cities without the local people voting for it?

Mr. YATES. Sure; it is perfectly proper for the State of California to do that. However, the State of Illinois did not do that. As a matter of fact, we need housing of this type in the State of Illinois. I agree that if a State does as California did it is entirely within its rights. Certainly, however, my State of Illinois, which did not so vote, should not be crippled because of the action you have taken in California.

Mr. WERDEL. It is generally accepted that the people of California voted that way because they did not want another government agency such as the Federal Government putting up the money and inducing matching funds to create a residential area in the county which under State law has voting powers to bond the other people of the area for everything from recreation district to mosquito-control districts, and everything else.

Mr. YATES. I am sure the people of the State of Illinois do not like many of the things for which we appropriate money for the State of California. Nevertheless, our National Government is a Federal Union, one government, and as far as I am concerned, it should be handled on a nonsectional basis.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I read a very interesting news item in the paper this morning. It covered a very small space, but to me it was one of the most interesting pieces of news I read in this morning's paper. It was an item from Taipeh, Formosa, by the Associated Press. It reads as follows:

> The Chinese general who, by defecting to the Reds, turned Communist troops loose into South China has been shot on Peiping's orders, the China Union Press said yesterday.
>
> The reported victim is Gen. Chen Ming-jen. As a Nationalist general he inflicted on the Communists in 1947 one of the bloodiest defeats the Reds suffered in the civil war.
>
> That was at Szepingkai, north of Mukden in Manchuria. Later he was sent to the fortress city of Changsha in central China. He handed the city and its garrison over to the Communists without a shot being fired.

I remember about 18 months ago when the Red Chinese were outside of Nanking, which is the northern capital of China, reliable testimony was given that the Nationalist troops had lost the will to fight. I could hardly believe it at that time, but unfortunately later developments have confirmed that fact. My observations at that time were in connection with the Nationalist generals, so-called war lords, who made deals with the Communists and became Communist with their armies. It was only a matter of time when Mao and his group in control of Communist China, after they had used them, would liquidate them. Anyone who has followed the tactics of the Communists knows they will make any deal as long as it will help them, then they will break it when convenience prompts them to break it, and when doing so will be to their advantage. Publicly at that time I expressed the opinion that after they had used these generals who had been generals in the Nationalist Army and had made deals and with their armies became Communists, and after they had consolidated themselves sufficiently they would liquidate them—and in Communist language that means kill them.

This item seems to be the first piece of evidence which I have seen confirming that fact. If he has not been killed, why it is only a matter of time when he and his type, the other generals in the Nationalist Army who made deals with the Red Chinese Communists, in my opinion, will be liquidated. I have no sympathy for them. They made their deal, and they should have known what to expect when the time came for the Red Chinese to go ahead and do it. But this also brings to mind unfortunate things. We had furnished the Nationalist Army with over a billion dollars' worth of equipment, tanks, guns, ammunition, rifles, and other equipment of war, all of which was very usable over there. Unfortunately when these Chinese warlords in the Nationalist Army made deals—mind you they were not defeated and they did not surrender, they made deals and became Communists, and became a part of the Communist Red army of China—they carried over with them the equipment that we had given to the Nationalist Army of China in order to fight the Communists. We all know that a great part of that equipment has been used in North Korea against our own troops and the troops of the United Nations.

When I saw this news item, it brought back to my mind yesterday the incident of months ago, and the opinions that I had expressed on that occasion, because I had investigated the Communists 16 years ago and had obtained definite evidence as to their viewpoint and hypocrisy and their tactics of using any means to obtain their ends. I knew that they would use anybody, even those who were opposed to them, and after using them and after consolidating their position, they would go through what is politely known in Communist language, as the process of liquidation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that they not only used the Nationalist Government of China, but that they used the United States Government?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, you are wrong.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Truman was making deals with them, and was permitting our money and equipment to be used by them.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are always making reckless statements, and rash statements.

Mr. BENDER. Of course my statements are neither rash or reckless. I am referring to Potsdam, Yalta and Tehran. A rebuke from the gentleman is a caress.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. That is absolutely true. You were on our committee when we investigated surplus property being given to the Communists. We were implementing the Communists 3 years ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. Have I yielded any further to the gentleman to make a rash statement?

Mr. BENDER. I thought you had yielded.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yielded for a question and not for a statement. The gentleman, as usual, makes rash statements.

Mr. BENDER. I object to that sort of thing because I am talking by the book and you know I am.

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply say that the gentleman, as usual, makes rash statements. Apparently my friend does not like to have me make the observation about a Nationalist general or war lord who made a deal with the Communists of China and he and his army became Communists and took over that American equipment which we furnished them. I do not know why anybody should feel very much disturbed that any Member should stand in the well of the House and call attention to that on this occasion. Apparently the gentleman from Ohio is very much disturbed.

Mr. BENDER. I certainly am with all of this double-talk.

Mr. McCORMACK. This simply shows what has happened in the case of this man, if it is true, and if it is not true, undoubtedly it will happen and it will happen, in my opinion, in the case of other war lords who made similar deals. The process of liquidation will be employed by the Red Chinese Communists against them. The important thing that comes to my mind is that we furnished over a billion dollars' worth of war equipment and this general, with the other Nationalist generals who made deals with the Red Communists and became part of the Red Communists of China, took with them to the Red Communists the military and other war equipment that we had given to them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is so amazing. Where is the rib now?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to compliment the gentleman on the accuracy and the truthfulness of his statements and only want to call his attention to the fact that we through the State Department have been making deals with these treacherous people.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will go into that some other day. I am talking about this news item which the gentleman from Michigan himself admits is a very interesting one. Time passes. Eighteen months ago they made the deal; those who should have fought for their country made the deals and became Red Chinese Communists, and with those deals went a greater part of the equipment that we had given to the Nationalist forces with which to fight the Red Chinese.

Mr. BENDER. What about the deals at Yalta?

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, just a minute. The gentleman from New York has asked me to yield. I do not wish any argument about that.

Mr. KEATING. Do I understand from the gentleman's remarks that he is opposed to the present policy which has been belatedly adopted by the Secretary of State to send a mission to Formosa to help equip and to help train these anti-Communist forces?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's understanding is incorrect.

Mr. KEATING. I am simply asking the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; the gentleman's understanding is incorrect. As I said yesterday, I was one of the strongest supporters of Chiang Kai-shek until about 2 years ago. I do not want the inference to be drawn from that that I have necessarily been against him because I have never made a public statement since. Frankly—I will make it now—I felt that the best thing that could have happened for Chiang a year and a half or more ago would have been for Chiang Kai-shek to divorce himself completely and let new faces come in, let new leaders come in, in whom the people would have confidence.

I say that in no criticism; it is my opinion, and I stated it to friends of mine in private conversation who were not Americans.

The only purpose I had in my remarks, with the exception of the latter observation I made which I still think is somewhat applicable, was to call attention that those Nationalist generals who were traitors to their country 18 months ago are now paying the price which they ought to have known would be exacted from them.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because I want to agree with my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the majority leader, in his statement and in his position as to what does happen and what should happen to those who betray the cause they are presumed to support. Certainly the treatment which has been given to those Chinese generals that the gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned for the betrayal of the cause for which they were presumed to fight is only justice even though it be delayed. I am wondering whether or not it might be wise for the American people to give thought to that which is done to traitors in other countries. I am wondering if the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts does not give us cause to pause and reflect as to that which some of those who spoke for America, our country, yours and mine, did at Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta?

Mr. BENDER. And Potsdam.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, and Potsdam too, as one gentleman suggested, in direct conflict with the solemn pledges and promises that we had made to certain allies who were fighting the cause of freedom against the powers of oppression.

I am wondering when and how we are to judge those who representing this free country of ours and the free peoples of the world, went into China and contrary to the directions and the instructions of the Congress of the United States insisted that no arms be turned over to the Nationalist forces of China unless they agreed to accept into their bosom and into their government these so-called agrarian reformers who later turned out to be the Communist forces of China which have dealt death to American boys on the battlefields of Korea.

Oh, I say to you, that the gentleman has spoken more wisely than he thought when he suggested that all those who betray the cause they are supposed to represent should be meted out just punishment. I also want to agree, if I may, with the statement the gentleman made at the conclusion of his remarks when he said that he had lost faith in Chiang Kai-shek, and that whenever a people lose faith and confidence in their leaders, it is time for those leaders to resign and retire from public office.

In the name of the God I worship and revere, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he should practice here in America that which he preaches for others abroad, and that he should promptly join with some of us who are insisting that those public officials here in our own country, in whom the people have lost faith, and in whom this Congress has lost faith, resign and let men take their places in whom the American people can have some confidence—confidence not only in their judgment, but also confidence in their patriotism and their loyalty to the cause of freedom for which your sons and mine are today fighting and dying on the bloody battlefields of Korea.

Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, it is indeed time we give serious thought to what we shall say and do about those within our own ranks who have betrayed the cause of human freedom; and I hope that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] knowing he is an honorable man and means exactly what he says, will join with those of us who are demanding that we have a new Secretary of State, and that we be given new and trustworthy leadership in our national affairs. God knows we need it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may keep in mind that we are discussing the independent offices appropriation bill, I now yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we are about to begin to read the independent offices appropriation bill for amendment. The committee has in most instances performed a very good job. They have brought a bill in here which has cut $746,000,000 directly and has placed limitations upon expenditures of other varieties which will save probably as much more, perhaps a very large amount beyond that.

That we need to save money is beyond contradiction. From time to time we have people coming to us complaining because the veterans are not properly taken care of. The Veterans' Administration always has the same answer, the Congress of the United States did not appropriate sufficient money. I want to call your attention today to the reason why we do not have the funds provided for the Veterans' Administration to properly take care of the veterans. It is not at all because of the size of the appropriation. The case I am going to call attention to is one single case which can be duplicated many, many times.

As an example of the unbelievable waste in our Government, I want to read to the House a letter that I have from Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. I offer it not as singular to the Veterans' Administration, but as typical of the entire governmental operation as now constituted:

AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 21, 1951.*

HON. JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: This will acknowledge your letter of April 5, 1951, concerning the new Veterans' Administration hospitals located at Beckley and Clarksburg, W. Va.

The Beckley Hospital was accepted from the contractors on October . 1950, and the

Clarksburg Hospital was accepted on October 24, 1950. Since the date of acceptance of these two hospitals the following employees have been on duty month by month as follows:

	Beckley	Clarksburg
Oct. 31, 1950	71	51
Nov. 30, 1950	144	113
Dec. 31, 1950	162	134
Jan. 31, 1951	160	144
Feb. 28, 1951	163	176
Mar. 31, 1951	181	195

The hospital at Beckley, W. Va., was opened and accepted its first patient on March 1, 1951, and the Clarksburg Hospital accepted its first patient on March 12, 1951. It was impossible to open these two hospitals earlier because of our inability to recruit the necessary professional staff.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, JR.,
Administrator.

The significance of this letter lies in the fact that people were loaded onto the payrolls of both hospitals 6 months before there was even a patient admitted or a physician available to care for them.

The Government's waste for wages would run into $375,000 and for other expenses—heat and so forth—about $125,000, so that a full $500,000, or one-half million dollars, was wasted by this ridiculously poor management.

Obviously, it take a few employees and a few weeks to prepare a hospital facility for operation, but these numbers of employees in these two hospitals and the elapsed time approach the fantastic.

I offer this to the House as a typical way in which the present administration deliberately pursues a policy that dribbles millions upon millions of dollars away annually, because that policy is based on the three greatest enemies of good government I know of—inefficiency, patronage, and lust for political power.

For the American people to support this administration in power in the expectation of ever achieving order, economy, and efficient government, is like sending a 6-year-old boy to the well with a soup strainer to bring back water. It is completely hopeless.

The only hope the American people have until this administration is thrown out of office is the Congress. If we fail the people, we will deserve to be thrown out at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in a war; there is no use kidding ourselves about that. Government is going to cost us at the very least from sixty-three to sixty-five billion dollars in the next fiscal year. It may cost what the President's budget estimated, that is, the estimate accompanying his budget message, $71,000,000,000, although I doubt an approach to that figure. But even so, the only way that money can be raised outside of borrowing it is by a terrific increase in taxes. I do not know how we can stop this foolish waste of the people's money, but I do feel that it is my duty wherever I can and in every possible way to call attention to the reason why they are not taking care of the veterans the way they ought to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman's remarks are timely. I want to add to them by saying that the subcommittee has had two serious problems along the lines to which the gentleman refers. The first problem is the fact that the census of veterans, upon which the Veterans' Administration apparently is constructing hospitals, is a prewar census. There has been a movement of veterans westward, yet the hospitals are still being built in the parts of the country where the veterans previously lived, that is, not in a proper geographical proportion.

The other, which is more important, and which the gentleman will understand, is that many of the beds are occupied by non-service-connected veterans That was not too serious after World War I. After World War II, however, with the increase in the number of veterans, it became very serious. If we have additional veterans as a result of the present conflict, we could back into socialized medicine without realizing that that is what we are doing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wonder if the gentleman could give us any light along this line: Suppose you were starting up a new industrial plant. Naturally you would have a small, skeleton organization, to which you would add the operating crew. Have we any examples before us where we could use the experience in other hospitals to check with these two that have been cited, for instance?

Mr. TABER. I will not name any hospitals at the present time beyond the two, because I do not have the answers on them yet, but frankly I understand that this is not an isolated case of mismanagement and overloading of payrolls in advance of the opening of the hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that insofar as the doctors are concerned there is a shortage of doctors in the Veterans' Administration. The armed services have taken over 400 doctors. This leaves the Veterans' Administration very short. It does take time to build up a hospital.

May I call the attention of the gentleman also to a fact that I think he does not always realize, that many of the veterans who are hospitalized may not be hospitalized service-connectedly for the disability for which they are hospitalized, but those same men have a service-connected disability, and I do not think anyone wants to bar those men from the hospitals. It is particularly important to hospitalize the NP's and the TB's in order to give them proper care and give them service-connection. Many cases are service-connected after the men are in the hospitals. The gentleman has been greatly interested I know in the care of the VA veterans, and that the VA medical service should be second to none.

Mr. TABER. But the gentlewoman from Massachusetts must remember that in order to take care of the veterans who are sick and disabled we must have efficient management, and do away with such things as piling up a force of 300 a month, average, for 4 or 5 or 6 months where there is nothing for them to do to amount to anything, and where four or five could take care of the job easily enough. Those are the things that get me.

I recognize, and everyone must recognize, that a great many of the veterans who are hospitalized, who are not rated as service-connected, are borderline cases, where it would not take very much to establish service connection. I think we all must recognize that. But the Congress has very liberally provided for the veterans. We should not allow mismanagement and a lack of any kind of efficiency to be covered up just because there are veterans that need hospitalization. We should give them the hospitalization and give us efficient management that will prevent the waste that has been going on. I am afraid that it has been going on more and more in the last 2 or 3 years. I hope we can put a stop to that sort of approach to things.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, a new veterans' hospital was opened in my home city, Saginaw, Mich., just a few months ago. Personally, I should like to have the subcommittee in charge of this work make an inquiry and get a comparative statement showing what has happened in numerous hospitals that have been opened in the last 24 or 48 months.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, this thing has come to me just recently.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, for about 10 days I have been carrying around an article, reading and re-reading one paragraph which to me is just about as shocking as anything I have ever seen in public print. We all know there is a great struggle for political power going on in this country. Some of the Republican leaders have had their appetite for power so whetted that in my judgment they are going to lengths which are endangering the security of the United States. This particular article is written by one of the men who has become a leading spokesman of the Republican point of view, Mr. Raymond Moley. This is what he said. I think you all should listen very carefully to it:

> But there are perils that lie before the jubilant Republicans. In this controversy General MacArthur must manage his cause with consummate skill. No one in years has so commanded the attention of the country. Because of that, the danger of saying or doing the wrong thing is very great. Republican leaders must also exercise great

care or their present advantage will disappear.

Their advantage is that if Asiatic affairs do not turn out well they can say that their prescription should have been followed.

Now, I come to the language which is shocking to me:

Their danger lies—

Listen to that—

Their danger lies in the chance—and it is more than a chance—that the Truman course will result in peace in Korea and a rehabilitated Japan.

Mr. Chairman, when a political party gets to the point that it sees a danger in the possibility that a policy limiting a war will succeed, and that our casualties may be lessened and that we may not have to fight a more widespread conflict—when they see a danger to their political party in a situation like that, and go so far as to admit in the public print that they see a danger in it, then I tell you there exists a dangerous temptation on their part not to cooperate in trying to limit the war, but to try to sabotage the policy which might succeed in limiting our casualties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, there are two features of H. R. 3880 at which I intend to direct my attack during the minutes allotted to me. I use the word "attack" advisedly because these two pieces of legislation—and it is legislation in an appropriation bill—are prime examples of how deep a hole we can dig for ourselves when we do not know what we are doing. Make no mistake about it, if this bill passes with these ill-advised riders attached we will find ourselves in a hole dug by the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations and into which the House seems to be prepared to jump blindly.

I am a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I have served on that committee since shortly after taking my seat in the House in January of last year. Since long before that, through personal experiences and my background in labor affairs in San Francisco, I have had a pretty thorough grounding in maritime matters. In addition, I serve on the Porter Hardy subcommittee of the House Committee on Executive Expenditures which made a thorough study and a very comprehensive report on the operations of the old Maritime Commission. The two items in this bill with which I am now concerned involve matters about which I feel that I know something. They both concern the operations of the Maritime Administration and the United States merchant marine, and indirectly the welfare of the whole maritime industry and the safety of the United States. Specifically, the two provisions are that beginning on line 12, page 45, of H. R. 3880, which would limit the number of voyages for which operating-differential subsidies could be paid to 1950, and the proviso beginning on line 12, of page 42, which would limit the amount which the United States could pay to the domestic owner of a vessel purchased under the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to the statutory sales price of the vessel in 1946, as depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements. That limitation would apply in the event of requisition or purhase of the vessel by the United States Government.

Before discussing the practical reasons why the House would be acting unwisely in accepting these provisions I want to talk about another pertinent point. A great many distinguished Members of the House have taken the floor to dwell on the mistakes made by the old Maritime Commission in administering similar matters dealing with ship subsidies, ship sales, and so forth. Now, I would be the last man to say that they are not absolutely right about that. I know as well as, or perhaps better than, some of these distinguished gentlemen that everything was not rosy with the things that the Maritime Commission did.

The report of the Porter Hardy subcommittee certainly did not gloss over the facts that have been related here. But, remember that this is the old Maritime Commission about which we are speaking. Congress and the administration have taken steps to do something about that situation, if you will remember. The Maritime Commission has been swept out and we have placed a new group of people in charge. Since the reorganization of the Maritime Commission into the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration in the spring of 1950 I have heard no such smelly reports about activities over there. If there have been any I would like to hear about them.

We have as Chairman of the Maritime Board and of the Maritime Administration a gentleman who has served with great distinction in the United States Navy and has excited the great admiration of all those Members of Congress who have had opportunity to observe the way he works. I refer to Vice Admiral Edward L. Cochrane. He has also earned the confidence of the maritime industry people by his impartial attitude. Serving as members of the Board and assistants to the Chairman of the Maritime Administration are Mr. Al Gatov, of San Francisco, whom I know well and in whom I have great confidence, and Mr. Robert Williams, of Baltimore, who has a most distinguished reputation, particularly in the field of maritime law.

These men have been placed in their present positions with the clear understanding that it is the intent of Congress that they clean out the mess which they found. They have done a remarkable job of doing just that in the few months they have had the responsibility. To place malicious restrictions on their manner of administrating their responsibilities now, when no just cause has been shown, would be in the nature of tying their hands behind their backs and taking a slap at their faces. The good old American sense of fair play alone should prevent our doing that. Not one Member of this House, either in committee hearings or on the floor, has shown any reason why we should not place the same confidence in the present Maritime Board and Maritime Administration as we do in other agencies of Government. Let us not hang them without giving them a fair trial.

In speaking to the House yesterday I attacked the rule under which this bill was brought to the floor, waiving points of order against the legislation which it contained. I based my opposition to the rule on the ground that legislation by the Appropriations Committee was liable to be hasty and ill-conceived, would, because of treading on other committee's jurisdictions, create chaos and confusion, and would probably cost the Government and the country more money in the long run than it would save. Let me point out how the two provisos of which I speak fit that description exactly.

The United States Government provides operating-differential subsidies to operators of certain subsidized vessels under rigidly prescribed rules laid down by Congress. Subsidies were originally and are now being provided to promote American flag shipping and to build up our own merchant marine. They are provided to help American shipping companies meet the competition of foreign operators while still maintaining the higher costs made necessary by our American standard of living. I need not justify the principle here. Anyone who recognizes the value of availability of domestic shipping to the country in time of emergency realizes the need for subsidies if we are to have an American merchant marine on the seas. The expressed intent of Congress is that we should have at least 50 percent of American shipping carried in American vessels. The aim of the subsidy program is to expand the merchant marine to promote realization of that goal. At the time of the Korean emergency we were carrying only 35 percent of our own shipping and fast going down hill. The effect of the proposed restriction will be to make us go down hill a little faster. If this proviso is enacted the Maritime Administration will not even be able to meet its present commitments and firm contracts if the maximum number of voyages under existing contracts are sailed. The Government will be forced, in effect, to go back on its written obligations. It certainly will have no opportunity to assist in expanding American merchant marine operations through the device of operating-differential subsidies.

Presently existing contracts would permit a maximum of 1,550 voyages in fiscal 1952. Two contracts which have been approved, but for which formal negotiations have not yet been completed, would raise this total to 1,610. This without even taking into consideration the 48 pending applications for 442 additional voyages. Admiral Cochrane submitted as his best estimate for the number of volages for which subsidies would be required in fiscal 1952 under present commitments, without considering the pending applications, a total of 1,523. The committee has seen fit, on the basis of conjecture and possibility, to reduce this to 1,450—not even sufficient to take care of contractual obligations, let alone

to permit any expansion. How in the name of all that is holy can this country hope to revitalize a sorely needed merchant marine when that type of thinking is allowed to dictate policy is more than I can say.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, has made quite a point of his intention to eliminate the monopoly which has existed under the present operation of the operating-differential subsidy program. He has commented on the fact that the so-called Club 13 shipping operators are the only ones who now enjoy the subsidies. He has inserted a provision in the committee report requesting the Maritime Administration to distribute the funds provided among all shipping interests so that each company may have a fair share of the subsidies. I am afraid that Admiral Cochrane's training in the Navy did not include the instruction in tight-rope walking which would be necessary for him to comply with that instruction and still live up to existing contractual obligations. The effect of the 1,450 voyage limitation will be to freeze subsidies more tightly than ever to Club 13. The limitation kisses goodby forever to the possibility of broadening the coverage of subsidies to encourage more American operators to enter into competition with the foreign shipping interests who are the real monopolists to be feared. And remember, Mr. Speaker, we are facing a war which will require every ship we can get—and we will not get them from foreigners at bargain prices if we get them at all.

On July 10 and on September 8 of last year, as well as on numerous other occasions, I have addressed the House on the grave difficulties we will be in if our shipping is not brought to and kept in a condition where it can provide the needed transport for our troops in time of emergency. We have done practically nothing since that time, despite Korea, to promote that aim. Our State Department indeed, seems bent on building up the merchant marine of every country but our own. The Gordon Gray report, fortunately pigeonholed, followed the State Department line, and now we find a congressional subcommittee doing its best to go along. Incidentally, this is one of the few instances of congressional agreement with State Department policy I have observed in a long time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have time to go into all of the reasons why this voyage-limitation proviso should be deleted from the bill before us. Any member of the Merchant Marine Committee can give interested members more information on the further reasons why the limitation is not logically conceived. I hope that my remarks thus far will give some of my colleagues pause for thought and move them to oppose the proviso.

I shall now discuss the question of limitation of the purchase price which the Government may pay in future in requisitioning ships purchased by private operators under the terms of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. Firstly, may I point out that those ships were sold with no strings attached at the time of sale. They are unconditionally the property of the present owners. Secondly, they were sold under the provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946—an act of Congress—approved by this and the other body by overwhelming votes.

The Constitution of the United States provides guarantees that "just compensation" be paid the owner of any property taken by the Government. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, section 902, specifically provides in the case of ship purchases that "the owner thereof shall be paid just compensation" for the property taken. The Supreme Court of the United States has very recently held that the statutory standard in the 1936 act is coterminous with the constitutional provision. Now, bearing in mind that even Congress cannot legislate ex post facto flaws in the property holder's title to the ships concerned, and further bearing in mind that Congress cannot pass constitutional amendments in an appropriation bill, I cannot understand how any intelligent Member of this House can reasonably expect anything but confusion and expense to the Government if the proviso on line 12 and the following lines of page 49 of H. R. 3880 is enacted into law. We have what amounts to a prior opinion by the Supreme Court that the owners will be upheld in their demands for a fair market price at the present time for the ships they own. We have the long record submitted by my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], in yesterday's debate, showing how the courts have upheld shipowners in a series of claims against the Maritime Commission for a fair price for ships requisitioned by the War Shipping Administration. If the Maritime Administration, or any emergency wartime agency which may come into being, is forced by Congress to limit requisition prices of vessels according to the terms of this proviso we are simply asking for a long chain of expensive litigation in which the inevitable result will be that the Government is forced to pay a fair market price, and in addition, the costs of the litigation. I sincerely trust that my colleagues in the House have too much good sense to let that happen.

The second of the points I mentioned in introducing this question was to point out that the ships concerned were originally purchased by their present owners under the terms of an act of Congress. It turned out to be a very good thing for the purchasers in most cases. But remember that at the time of purchase the purchaser was also taking a risk. The ship market was exceedingly depressed. At war's end prospects for profitable shipping were none too bright. Congress took those factors, and the additional factor of the desire to keep our American merchant marine afloat, into consideration in passing the Ship Sales Act. It may be that the maladministration of the old Maritime Commission contributed to the very low prices at which some operators purchased ships. In any event, the courts will not permit us to take a backward glance now, in the light of conditions as they exist today, and penalize those who purchased ships in a depressed market—even if they purchased them at give-away prices.

I am as reluctant as anyone to see profiteering of any sort at the expense of the Government. I am now sitting on the Bonner subcommittee of the Executive Expenditures Committee which is attempting to probe and prevent that very type of operation. However, if Congress wishes to insure that the Government does not have to pay a higher price for a ship than it originally sold it for, the proper procedure is to start from today and enact a new Ship Sales Act affecting future sales. The matter should be referred to the Merchant Marine Committee, and after proper study that committee should recommend amendments to the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Clauses could then be inserted in future sales contracts which will legally bind the purchaser to resell to the Government at cost less depreciation. I, as one member of the committee would certainly look with favor on that procedure. I cannot, however, approve the tactics which the present proviso attempts to put into operation.

In this connection I might point out that purchasers of these ships have built up an entire business around the vessels. They have committed large amounts of additional capital. If the ships are requisitioned from under them now or at some future time they will be faced with the problem of eventual replacement. It certainly would be unfair to enterprising concerns who entered into operations at a depressed time to deprive them of the enhancement of values which have resulted. It would be more than unfair to the United States, which needs shipping so badly, to drive out of business those very enterprising operators who are attempting to keep our merchant marine alive.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have clearly shown some of the consequences which will result if these two provisos are bludgeoned through this Congress. The voyage limitation provision will only serve to drive American ships off of essential foreign-trade routes and force American shippers to pay fancy foreign ship rates for delivering our goods. The ship requisition price ceiling will cause untold expense and endless litigation with no money saved. The Appropriations Committee in recommending amounts of money to be appropriated has adequately protected the legitimate interest of the Government and Congress, and has reached the limit of its proper function in that regard. Let us allow the administrative agencies and the proper congressional committees to perform their share of the job until it has been conclusively shown that they cannot do so.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] to close debate.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], a question with reference to prefabricated housing. I notice in the report, on page 14, you state that the uncommitted lending authority in the sum of $10,500,000 will be recaptured. You

also stated that the committee requested the Administrator to refrain from committing the Government to further loans prior to the enactment of this bill. I wish to state that the Knox Corp. in my district has been quite successful and has done more building, especially in the prefabricated field, than anybody else, paying off the loans as they mature, making good profits for themselves, and satisfying their customers.

In the course of the defense-mobilization program, we have urgent needs for prefabricated housing or housing components. For example, the H-bomb plant construction in the Savannah River area will require upward of 35,000 construction workers. Obviously, the construction of these large defense installations creates an extreme shortage of construction workers in the area, while, at the same time, they have urgent needs for housing. Prefabricated houses can be of particular assistance in meeting defense housing needs in such cases, because of the speed with which they can be furnished, the fact that skilled site labor is minimized, and the ease of controlling, without time-consuming and costly on-site inspection, the quality of basic structural work on the houses. They can be erected at the site with savings of up to 80 percent of on-site construction labor required for the conventional construction of housing entirely at the site. Also, while a high percentage of the labor required for conventional house construction is skilled labor, a high percentage of the labor required for the erection of prefabricated houses on the site may be semi-skilled or unskilled. This is also true of the labor requirements in the plant of the prefabricated-house manufacturer.

Knox Corp. has made an application and it is in process now for $1,750,000. I would like to know if that application and some other applications will be affected. It is my understanding that the committee did not intend its request to refrain from making new loans to apply to additional loans to these existing borrowers, and that the chairman has so advised Mr. Foley.

Mr. THOMAS. The language in the report applies only to the unexpended, unobligated balance of $10,500,000, and it does not apply to the thirty-seven or thirty-eight million dollars which they now have. With reference to the gentleman's area, which is seriously affected by the impact of the Atomic Energy Commission, he and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] have been talking about that and we have been talking with Mr. Foley. Mr. Foley assures us that he will work it out to take care of that situation. You can depend upon 100 percent cooperation from this committee.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the chairman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the White House Office, including not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at such per diem rates for individuals as the President may specify, and other personal services without regard to the provisions of law regulating the employment and compensation of persons in the Government service; and travel and official entertainment expenses of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $1,883,615.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 2, line 17, strike out "$1,883,615" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,425,254."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complex about this amendment; it simply restores the amount to that which was appropriated last year, with an approximate 10 percent cut.

I do not believe I can improve upon the statement made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], yesterday, when he called attention to this subject. He said in part on page 4311 of the RECORD:

The $300,000 increase in this item is 20 percent more than was appropriated last year for the same purpose. It provides for 35 additional employees in fiscal 1952, more travel money, and more odds and ends of expenses, where we had hoped to see savings. If you break it down to a per capita basis, it means that this is going to take the tax payments of many persons each year for this one item of increased cost of government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read into the RECORD a statement made by President Truman himself on February 21, 1951, in a speech at a breakfast meeting of Masonic leaders in Washington, D. C. Listen to what President Truman said:

Everybody, I don't care who he is or what his condition or what his position is—from the President of the United States to the laborer who digs in the trench—must make some sacrifice in order that the whole country may be mobilized.

Now, if the President means what he says and says what he means there could be no objection to knocking off this $300,000 that has been added this year, with an approximate 10-percent cut.

Is it too much to expect the President of the United States to set the pace for economy, sacrifice and belt-tightening about which he preaches at every opportunity?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, revise and extend my remarks, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred and twelve Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is doubtful whether anyone opposed to the policies of the State Department, more particularly to the policies and statements of Secretary of State Acheson could, without mentioning him by name, have made a more logical and forceful plea for his resignation than did the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] when he spoke just a few moments ago. What his purpose may have been I, of course, have no way of knowing. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] made three points. First: That the Communists are and always have been deceitful and treacherous, brutal and vicious, that one who deals with them does so at his peril. Second: That it had been a waste of money and futile to extend aid to the Chinese Nationalists. Third: That new leaders were needed on the world front. He pointed out by the reading of a short newspaper article what happend to those who dealt with Communists. He gave us a story of the Nationalist Chinese general who had gone over to and assisted the Communists at one time, and then later was by them recently executed. Death was the reward of the Chinese Nationalists' general who yielded to the pleas of the Communists, the same Communists whose occupation of Manchuria was aided by the policies of Acheson and the mission of General Marshall.

I do not know what lesson he wanted us to draw from that, but the only thought I could get out of it was that a man or a country which dealt with the Communists on any subject was certain to be betrayed. Why the gentleman who is the majority leader should have mentioned that at this time unless—unless he, too, is convinced that we should get rid of Acheson, I cannot understand, for if any department in this Government has gone along with the Communists it is the State Department. There is no evidence that Mr. Acheson is a Communist, but practically every major move that he has made since the fighting in World War II ended has resulted in a benefit to the Communist cause, and it matters not at all what the man's intentions may have been, not when we now weigh the results of his efforts. We know about that place which is paved with good intentions. No one should suggest that the Secretary of State should be consigned to that region. But after he had demonstrated and after it has been pointed out by the majority leader what happens to those individuals—and of course, the same rule applies on a national scale—after that has been brought to our attention so clearly as it was, so forcefully as it was just now, is there any reason why the Secretary of State should continue in office unless he has some purpose to further aid British trade even though by so doing the result is the sacrificing of American lives or to further the Communist cause?

Sure the Communists are not to be trusted. Sure, they will stab you in the back if opportunity offers—that appeared to be the conclusion reached by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. But the President, whom the gentleman has so well served has ridiculed and condemned efforts to oust Communists from the executive department. There has been more than one

Communist serving Reds in the State Department, covered up and kept there by this administration. Do not misunderstand me, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has had no part in that. This administration, the internationalists, and the one worlders took us into the UN and there—their keep paid for by us—sit and argue and vote against us and our interests and welfare. And the British and our State Department would strengthen the hands of the Commies by taking in and giving to another Communist group a seat and a vote in the UN.

It is my hope the British and the State Department will heed the advice of the majority leader.

It is unfortunate the President did not long ago discover the true character of the Communists, that Dean Acheson did not—that he has not—turned his back on them and all their works. Having failed to do that he should resign.

Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] went on to tell us what we had furnished Chiang Kai-shek and how futile our efforts had been. He might well have added that others to whom we have furnished billions of dollars and in whose interests we have sacrificed almost a million young Americans likewise are not to be trusted—that they will desert and forsake us when it will serve their interests.

Some of us were here during World War II and we recall that when this country was shipping scrap iron to Japan how we protested and how bill after bill was filed with the Clerk calling for the ending of that program, but those bills were consigned to a pigeonhole. Eventually that scrap iron came back to kill our men who were fighting as we were then told for the security of this Nation.

The same aiding of our enemies by our allies we know is happening again. A gentleman in the other body the other night on the radio said it was foolish to charge that Britain was trading with our enemy, yet as we read the press we learn that in the British Parliament itself they are quarreling over that very same policy. We know it to be the fact that they are aiding the fighting men of other nations, those who are fighting against our men. How long are we to continue that sort of thing? It is my hope that some who are discovering the duplicity and true character of the Communists will also become aware that some we still regard as friendly nations are not wholeheartedly standing with us—that they are abusing our confidence and using the aid we extend to them to our injury.

I wish the gentleman had gone a little further, had gone beyond the newspaper story he was reading and pointed out how today some of these other nations that are supposed to be with us in the United Nations, that are supposed to be supporting our men, have been aiding day after day our enemy. The gentleman then concluded his remarks with the statement that new leaders might be needed in some other nations. How dire is that need for new leaders right here at home. Millions are demanding the impeachment of Mr. Truman, insisting upon the ousting of Acheson.

Rightly or wrongly our people have lost confidence in this administration. The proof of that is found in letters, postal cards, telephone calls and messages that come to us day after day and from those who call at our offices. They want no more of this administration. They want no more of the Secretary of State. Permit me to express my thanks to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for so clearly pointing out the folly of dealing with or trusting the Communists, of the futility of dissipating our natural resources and wasting our manpower to further the ambitions of other nations—the crying need for new leaders in other nations as well as in this administration here at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and on the paragraph close in 8 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let me call to the attention of the Committee a few facts about the administrative funds for the President in the running of his official office. I have inquired around among the membership of the House and I can find no Member on the floor—if there is one on the House floor at this time then I stand corrected—who has been here or who can remember the time when the House has ever cut the White House fund.

There is a good reason for that. The President must run his immediate office and he ought to be the judge as to how much help he needs and so forth. When we send an appropriation over to the President calling for funds to run the House of Representatives and to run the offices of the Members of this House, the President does not cut those funds. There is a good reason for that rule.

Mr. Chairman, there is an appropriation here for $1,883,615 for the President to run his Executive offices for the fiscal year 1952. An amendment has been offered to reduce that figure to $1,425,000, a reduction of 25 percent. Think of that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There are $300,000 additional here for the office of the President. We are talking about economy, is that not true, and the President is calling upon the people of this country for sacrifice and economy. Now we are increasing by $300,000 the spending on the Executive's office.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the gentleman, and I say this kindly, that this is for the specific purpose of staffing the President's office. What the gentleman has in mind is something different and we will get to that soon. That is for upkeep of the Executive Mansion and grounds. This has nothing in the world to do with maintenance. This is for salary for his official family. He only has 293 employees. That is what it is for.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, does not the gentleman think the President ought to practice some economy along with the rest of the country?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, but let him be the judge as to what he ought to have. He could say to us, "You have three or four people in your office; you ought to cut one of them out." Are you not a better judge as to how much office help you need than he is? You would be saying to him, if you tell him to reduce his office staff, that you know more about how to run his office than he does. It is comity between the two bodies. Let us leave this alone, please.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Texas if Congress passes a bill cutting the appropriation for my office, I will accept it and I will cut.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Congress does that, you can bet your bottom dollar that the President will never say yea nor nay, and that is just the point. I hope the gentleman will not press his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Why does he have to have an increase of $300,000? I find no substantial reason for it.

Mr. THOMAS. He has an increase of 38 employees during this war emergency. Does that not make sense?

Mr. GROSS. Not to me.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am convinced that this would be a major blunder for the advocates of economy to commit. I believe that the item should be left undisturbed, and I hope that those of us who have been going along in an endeavor to save money will not fall for this amendment but will join with the gentleman from Texas in an endeavor to vote it down.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. Those remarks are just in keeping with his good, common horse sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Texas said that it had not been customary for us to look into the expenses of the White House staff, he meant that one item. He did not refer to the emergency fund nor to other items. It has been the custom in the committee, and probably a proper custom, that we do not go into the details of the White House staff. I take this time to point out here something which I pointed out in the committee; while the President has been in the White House since 1947 the cost of the staff has risen from $452,000 a year to $1,883,615. That is not the only item. The item of care of the White House grounds has risen in that time from $150,000 to $315,000 for next year, which is on the basis of $350,000 for a full year. The other items which come with the White House request are for the Council

of Economic Advisers, the budget, and the renovation of the White House. When you come to this item you will vote for it or you will vote against it, and I am not at the moment either speaking for or against it, but I am calling attention to the fact that the President made an earnest appeal for economy to the Congress, but in the only five items in the budget which come directly under his jurisdiction, there was not one dollar cut from any one of those five items, and I felt, as some people on the floor probably feel, that if it had only been a matter of psychology it would have been better for a man in such high position asking economy of the country and of the Congress to have set an example by cutting the five items that come out from his own immediate office.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to be clear. Do I understand that the previous Chief Executive ran this same service for these hundreds of thousands of dollars less than the present President?

Mr. PHILLIPS. He ran them for that much less, but he had help from other agencies of Government which were not charged against the White House, and I prefer the present system to the system of borrowing people from other agencies and not showing them on the White House budget. I would prefer this system to the system of the previous Presidents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that you know exactly what is going on.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 31, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

For the care, maintenance, repair, and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the Executive Mansion Grounds, and traveling expenses, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, $315,600.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question or two concerning this appropriation. It reads in part:

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, and traveling expenses.

Can the chairman tell me something about what this money is to be expended for, in view of the fact that the White House is now being completely rebuilt and refurnished? What is this item all about?

Mr. THOMAS. This is for the fiscal year 1952, which, as the gentleman well knows, will not start until July 1. The President and his family move back into the White House December 1. There is an increase of 30 percent in floor space in the new building compared with the old building. The increase is for an additional amount of electricity and the other supplies and materials necessary. It is just to maintain and operate the White House.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you have traveling expenses here?

Mr. THOMAS. There is an item in there which has been in the bill for years and years. Last year not a dime was spent for travel, and they told us that they will not spend a dime this year. The only one that travels is the head usher. He one time traveled to New York. They just asked that the language be left in the bill, and since it did not cost anything we left it in there.

Mr. GROSS. I then ask the chairman of the subcommittee why the committee did not strike out the language providing for travel expenses.

Mr. THOMAS. They said a situation might arise where they would have to travel. The last time such a situation arose was in 1950, and it cost $41.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. This does not include anything for the repair or remodeling of the White House?

Mr. THOMAS. No; that is a separate item.

Mr. GROSS. This is an increase, then, over last year's appropriation?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; because there is 30 percent more floor space. We must bear in mind also that these Federal employees under the Ramspeck bill get a slight increase in pay every year. When you do not allow even one employee for 1952 over and above what you had for 1951 you still have a dollar increase without a single increase in the number of jobs.

Mr. GROSS. I can say to the gentleman that I think Truman can make some changes in personnel over at the White House and improve the efficiency of that place.

Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer an amendment to this section of the bill, but in view of the almost solid opposition of the Democrats to my first economy amendment I have no alternative but to desist.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman very much.

The Clerk read as follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, including employment of aliens; purchase of land and interests in land; services authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of not to exceed 300 passenger motor vehicles, of which 229 shall be for replacement only; purchase, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed $8,000); official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $5,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; and payment of obligations incurred under prior year contract authorizations; $1,140,017,750, together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1951, of prior year appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission, of which amounts $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended; from which appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee (except such officers and employees whose compensation is fixed by law, and scientific and technical personnel) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, if such act were applicable to such position, at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used—

(A) to start any new construction project for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year;

(B) to start any new construction project the currently estimated cost of which exceeds the estimated cost included therefor in such budget; or

(C) to continue any community facility construction project whenever the currently estimated cost thereof exceeds the estimated cost included therefor in such budget;

unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such construction project or its continuation and a detailed explanation thereof is submitted forthwith by the Director to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; the limitations contained in this proviso shall not apply to any construction project the total estimated cost of which does not exceed $500,000; and, as used herein, the term "construction project" includes the purchase, alteration, or improvement of buildings, and the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates: *Provided further*, That whenever the current estimate to complete any construction project (except community facilities) exceeds by 15 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget or the estimated cost of a construction project covered by clause (A) of the foregoing proviso which has been approved by the Director, the Commission shall forthwith submit a detailed explanation thereof to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: *Provided further*, That the two foregoing provisos shall have no application with respect to technical and production facilities (1) if the Commission certifies to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that immediate construction or immediate continuation of construction is necessary to the national defense and security, and (2) if the Director agrees that such certification is justified: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE: On page 6, line 6, strike out "$1,140,017,750" and insert "$1,139,932,750."

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment involves a cut of $85,000. I offer it to bring to your attention how very difficult it is for Members of the Congress to intelligently vote on matters such as the appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. In the report issued by the committee, page 5, they call to the attention of the House a small but typical example of uncontrolled spending in connection with the construction of a hospital for the care of dogs and other animals at Los Alamos, N. Mex. During last year's hearings it was stated the cost of the hospital should have been $59,000, but instead it cost $85,000. If you will refer to the hearings and the discussion between the members of the committee and the people who appeared in behalf of the bill, you will be informed that the committee expressed considerable opposition and doubt about the proposed construction of a dog sanitarium at Los Alamos. However, the Commission, notwithstanding opposition of the committee, did construct the hospital at a cost of $85,000. They had a few dogs there, and later—so the hearings go—rented it to a veterinarian for $150 a month. That is disgusting and ridiculous. There are hundreds and thousands of young Americans who served their country and who are standing in line to get into a hospital. Notwithstanding our love and affection for dogs and cats, is it not ridiculous that a commission, whose actions are so secret that they cannot even explain to the Members of Congress, should spend $85,000 for a cat and dog hospital.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that the place where they kept these animals for experimental purposes in the developing of the atomic bomb?

Mr. LYLE. The record does not disclose that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not possible that this appropriation of $85,000 would contribute to the war effort by keeping up the morale of those who own the dogs and cats? You see, they worry about them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that it is my understanding that these animals were kept there for experimental purposes in the development of atomic energy and the atomic bomb.

Mr. LYLE. The record does not say that. The committee does not assure me that that is correct. I inquired about it. Of course it is a small item, but it is a ridiculous thing for the Congress to permit administrative agencies to spend money recklessly and without regard for the welfare of the nation, and the will of the Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not defending this proposition at all, but that is my understanding. Of course they could not use human beings. You would not expect them to do that. It is my understanding they used these animals for experimental purposes to test the effect of this atomic bomb and atomic energy. They were using these dogs and kept them at this place for that purpose while they were developing the atomic bomb which stopped the war in Japan, eventually.

Mr. LYLE. The record does not say that. And the members of the committee cannot verify it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is a great deal more to it than appears on the surface. While certainly I am not going to take up the time of the House for a lengthy discussion, the entire record in the hearings and also the attention of the gentleman from Texas should be pointed to page 7, to the three indented paragraphs which were put in specifically to prevent a repetition of this. In the western part of the country—and I would have supposed in Texas—a veterinarian is often the health officer who has jurisdiction over the health and the purity of the food, and especially of the milk supply and water supply and matters of that kind. While I certainly am not making any defense whatever for the expenditure of $85,000 as opposed to $59,000—and I personally thought the $59,000 was more than was necessary, we have prevented the repetition in the next year of that. The reason this was necessary to begin with was in order that the Atomic Energy Commission might get a competent veterinarian there to take care of the health of the people as well as the health of their dogs and without some funds of this kind it would have been very difficult, as I can assure the gentleman from Texas, I had something to do with the veterinarian situation in California.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to withdraw my amendment. I offered it to call the situation to your attention.

I call this item to your attention because we must act more intelligently and we must make more of an effort if we are to have proper administration of the funds of the people.

Mr. PHILLIPS. With that I am in complete accord.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I object to the withdrawal of the amendment.

Mr. LYLE. I am perfectly willing that the committee should vote on the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I am supporting the amendment is because the explanation which has been given is not at all satisfactory to me. Now, why was the $59,000 authorized in the first place by the Committee on Appropriations? That is the question I would like to have answered, and I will yield to the gentleman from California if he wants to answer it or yield to the gentleman from Texas. I ask, Why was the $59,000 authorized in the first place? What justification was made to spend $59,000 by the Atomic Energy Commission for a dog hospital?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield for an answer to the question.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to our distinguished friend from Michigan that this matter was submitted in last year's budget, and the committee frowned upon it and said we did not think it should be started.

They started off on the basis that it was a part of the medical program, that they were going to do some experimentation, but that was more wishful thinking than anything else, and the committee frowned upon it.

We did not tell them in the report not to do it, but we assumed that they would not do it, because we asked them in so many words in the hearings not to do it, and we did make a reduction. This is just one of these instances, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] has pointed out in his very forthright statement, where there was a case of bad judgment. The committee is standing here and we will, all the members of our subcommittee, will say on this floor that we think the agency has been very lax in the past in its expenditure of construction funds, and we have urged them to be more careful. As a result of that urging, we have cut them this year, even though it is a national defense project, by nearly $70,000,000, and if they do not show a decided improvement next year, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that your committee will recommend to cut them several times $70,000,000 next year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That explanation is still insufficient as far as I am concerned, but I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is just a little bit erroneous to call it only a dog hospital; it is more than that, and, as I remarked before, it is necessary that there should be a service of that kind. Also, it would be extremely difficult, as the gentleman from Michigan well knows, to get a competent veterinarian unless he had facilities with which to work.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On that I would ask the gentleman from California what he means by "competent veterinarian"?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I mean the veterinary supply in the United States is very short, especially in the western part of the United States. We do not have even enough veterinary hospitals.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I live in a little city of 100,000 people, and that city does not have any need for a veterinarian to look after the food habits and water supply of the people or take care of food poisoning.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In what way is this item for the dog hospital connected with the national defense effort? If the Committee could point that out it might be different.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to our friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and our friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], that it is just exactly that much—none.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us encourage them then, by eliminating that amount from the appropriation. One of the best ways I know to discourage people from spending money is not to give it to them.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it the gentleman's intention to urge the Committee to resist or accept this amendment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know whether it is going to resist the amendment, but I am going to insist that we cut the appropriation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It looks like to me somebody is going to the dog hospital here.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope that our friend will permit the gentleman from Texas to withdraw his amendment. We have cut this agency $70,000,000. We are going to ride herd on them in the future.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We are going to ride herd on them now by this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on the paragraph close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is recognized.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, this little canine incident points up, I think, very sharply the point that I undertook to make here yesterday during general debate, to wit, that your Appropriations Committee is wholly unable because of lack of staff and equipment to do the job for which it is intended. Had there been a staff of committee experts assigned to the job of inspecting and supervising the operations of this Atomic Energy Commission, this hospital incident would not have arisen, and we would not be confronted with this ridiculous situation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to agree thoroughly and completely in the statement which the gentleman has just made. As the gentleman knows, it was the gentleman from Tennessee who last year conducted the interrogation on this item. Stringent objection was expressed at that time to the construction of this veterinary hospital. The committee expressed objection in the report but did not specifically say that it should not be built. We did make a substantial reduction; and, as has been the custom of long standing, the comity between this agency and the committee was expected on my part, at least, to carry through and have the reductions we made apply to this specific item. The fact that the Commission did not do so, I think, is a black mark against the Commission. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly that the committee, every subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, needs a thorough technical staff to dig in and do some cutting on individual items.

Mr. COUDERT. In other words, to prevent a repetition of this sort of an incident. Let me ask the gentleman, who is the second ranking member on the majority side, whether, as a matter of fact, in the preparation of this year's budget, there was any comprehensive investigation ordered of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. GORE. By the staff of the committee?

Mr. COUDERT. Yes.

Mr. GORE. Not as far as I know.

Mr. COUDERT. That is my understanding as well. So actually we were compelled to confront this budget request without anything more than the recollection individual Members had of last year's hearing and the evidence brought before them by the agents of the Commission, the interested party.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. If the pending amendment prevails this afternoon it will be an object lesson to the Atomic Energy Commission and every other agency of the Federal Government; it will also be helpful to every subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COUDERT. It will restore in some very small measure the loss of respect for the Congress that some agencies demonstrate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. What does the Atomic Energy Commission say it needs this institution for?

Mr. COUDERT. I think the gentleman from California explained that. It is necessary to provide some facilities for the canine population in new towns developed for the purpose of atomic energy. It is hard to say it may not be necessary. My objection to this thing, as a matter of fact, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, is that they did it without authority and against the express wish of the subcommittee. I further understand that since this incident there have been some changes in AEC management in respect to this matter.

Mr. RANKIN. If you had turned the Atomic Energy Commission over to this Committee and it did not furnish any better information than they have done to date, we never would have had the atomic bomb.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. This is in no way connected with the defense effort of our country.

Mr. COUDERT. Only in the sense that every construction of a new community needed by such as the Atomic Energy Commission is a necessary job in the interest of national defense. Where you would draw the line, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Caroline [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to defend this one way or the other. As far as I am concerned, all Government agencies make some mistakes. I do not know all the details about this dog hospital. I have been to Los Alamos on different occasions trying to inform myself on plant operations and to see what they were accomplishing. I do know if this is part of a research program. We do carry on research with animals on radiation effect. I do know we must be very careful as to the toxic material at that plant which, of course, necessarily has to be tested to protect plant personnel. I have not all the details, but I assure the members of the committee that I will secure them because I am just as much for economy so far as the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned as anybody.

I do not think we can at this time and at this hour create confusion about what the Atomic Energy Commission has done and the security it has placed in the minds of individual Americans today in this country and around the world by playing this item up as a major error. I do think they have at times made mistakes. Not only the Appropriations Committee goes over these funds very carefully, but a committee over on the other side, the joint committee, takes the budget and goes over it item by item and we make a study of it carefully. There have been many suggestions made by our committee to the Commission. There have been some things they wanted to do but they have not been able to do because of the action the committee took.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. First I want to compliment the committee because they caught it. I did not catch it myself. Secondly, we cannot afford to penalize the Atomic Energy Commission unnecessarily. I think we can better afford to discuss money and where it has been spent than we can afford to tolerate strikes against the Government in the building of atomic energy plants. If the country can afford that kind of a luxury, it certainly can afford to discuss the money that is being spent.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman knows well that I do not condone strikes against the Federal Government; I am not trying to defend them. I am here on the basis of not creating confusion in the

minds of the American people that this operation is not doing a good job for the security of the United States and the world. I know the facts. You may call it a waste of funds, and I will be glad to go to bat to oppose anything that is unwise and I have done that ever since I have been a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman is an able Member of this House.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In experimenting with these dogs they probably saved the lives of many of the men employed in this atomic energy plant.

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know the details about that, but if you know anything about biology, bacteriology, or pharmacology you have to have something to experiment on before you reach the human being, and that has been historically true in basic and fundamental research.

Mr. RANKIN. When Walter Reed was trying to get funds to put on the demonstration to show what was causing yellow fever, he was attacked from every side, yet his experiment eliminated both yellow fever and malaria. I am not taking sides in this argument, but I want to know whether or not these men have spent this money unreasonably. If they have done it to experiment to save human life I say the expenditure is reasonable and justifiable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did I understand the gentleman to say he is a member of the Atomic Energy Co.nmission?

Mr. DURHAM. Of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell us how many dogs or animals were used in this experiment?

Mr. DURHAM. No; I do not know. I know that they are used for radiation research, not only there but at other places in the operation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I think it is fair to say that this is primarily a veterinarian hospital for the care of the pets of the people who live in Los Alamos. In another installation the Atomic Energy Commission is carrying on extensive experimentation with animal life with respect to radiation.

Mr. DURHAM. If this is a particular situation to take care of the dogs in the local community, that is a different situation, but you must remember this is one of the most isolated communities in the entire operations.

LOS ALAMOS VETERINARY HOSPITAL

History: A veterinary hospital was established during World War II at Los Alamos, N. Mex., by the Manhattan Engineer District for the purpose of providing veterinary care for the horses of the mounted security patrol and for certain experimental animals involved in classified projects conducted by the Los Alamos Laboratory. Care of pets belonging to residents was an incidental operation of importance to the maintenance of normal community at this abnormal location. The hospital was located in a temporary building, which was surrounded by expansion of the maintenance facilities for the Los Alamos Laboratory as a result of the growth of the project.

In the spring of 1949 the relocation of the Los Alamos Veterinary Hospital became essential, because of the over-all regrouping of the work in the general maintenance area. Consideration was given to moving the existing building. This was overruled by the contract operator, the University of California, and the area manager for the Atomic Energy Commission on the grounds that the existing building was unsanitary and did not provide adequate facilities for additional experimental work which the laboratory desired to conduct in the veterinary hospital.

Original presentation to Congress: A request for $59,000 for a replacement for the Los Alamos Veterinary Hospital was made of the Congress in the fiscal year 1951 budget of the Atomic Energy Commission. This estimate was based on construction costs as of the time that budget was prepared. That was spring, 1949. The actual estimate called for the following:

Building of 3,000 square feet	$42,000
Runs and kennels	8,000
Plans, contingencies, and construction inspection	9,000
Total	59,000

The justification presented was based primarily on the veterinary needs of the mounted security patrol, hospital services for the laboratory and its medical center, involving such items as pregnancy tests, and finally normal community services for pets of residents. Although there was some discussion about this project in the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee, the report of that committee contained no reference to the project.

Actual construction: The Los Alamos Veterinary Hospital has been replaced by a new concrete-block structure which provides 3,500 square feet of floor space. The design was reviewed by a special three-man architectural review board at Los Alamos to insure maximum economical construction. The new building was constructed during 1951. Although construction costs had risen substantially since the original estimate was made, the costs were as follows:

Building of 3,500 square feet	$38,824
Equipment and utilities	5,035
Runs and kennels	9,594
Roads and parking area	5,710
Architect-engineering	5,950
Total	65,119

Actual use: The Los Alamos Veterinary Hospital has been used in the last fiscal year, as follows:

	Percent
1. Treatment of small animals (household pets) for residents on a fee basis	48
2. Los Alamos scientific laboratory services, Los Alamos Medical Center services; health safety studies	25
3. Public health and sanitation (includes inspection of meat and dairy products, and impounding of stray animals)	18
4. Treatment of 15 horses for mounted security patrol and other services	9
Total service	100

Item 3 above refers primarily to health and community services subsidized at least in part by the State of New Mexico and Los Alamos County. In this regard, the fact that the veterinary hospital is one of four stations in district No. 1 in the New Mexico department of health and a cooperating station with the United States Public Health Service. Services performed include inspection of slaughter houses, dairies, and milk pasteurizing plants serving Los Alamos. Insufficient county funds result in deficits in these services which are being met by the Atomic Energy Commission until the county can assume the full load.

Method of operation: Discussions about the project with the House Appropriations Committee during its hearings on the fiscal year 1952 budget for the Atomic Energy Commission involved the additional problem of operation of the veterinary hospital. A private contractor was obtained by the Atomic Energy Commission on the advice of American Animal Hospital Association, Evanston, Ill.; Colorado A. & M. College, Fort Collins, Colo.; Tredwell & Goldstein, management engineers, New York, N. Y.

The contract is based on a formula calling for full maintenance plus 10 percent of that portion of the estimated dollar business of the hospital attributable to private practice. This has resulted in a rental of $1,800 per year, renegotiable at the end of this fiscal year to reflect operating experience. Direct operation would not permit retention of State and county subsidies to offset operating expenses.

Summary: The Los Alamos Veterinary Hospital performs a necessary service to the Los Alamos community of over 10,000 persons and, in addition, provides experimental and routine services to the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and its security forces. All these services are an integral part of the Los Alamos operation. Replacement of the wartime-built hospital was essential as a part of the program to develop a permanent atomic-energy research and development facility at Los Alamos. Private contractor operation appears to be in the best dollar interest of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $28,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; travel expenses of examiners acting under the direction of the Commission, and expenses of examinations and investigations held in Washington and elsewhere; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed $65,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; and not to exceed $5,000 for actuarial services by contract, with regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; $18,050,000: *Provided*, That no details from any executive department or independent establishment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere to the Commission's central office in Washington or to any of its regional offices shall be made during the current fiscal year, but this shall not affect the making of details for service as members of the boards of examiners outside the immediate offices of the Commission in Washington or of the regional directors, nor shall it affect the making of details of persons qualified to serve as expert examiners on special subjects: *Provided further*, That the Civil Service Commission shall have power in case of emergency to transfer or detail any of its employees to or from its office or field force: *Provided further*, That members of the Loyalty Review Board in Washington and of the regional loyalty boards in the field may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, and while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in section 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment for part-time or intermittent service as a member of the Loyalty Review Board or a regional loyalty board in the Civil Service Commission: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $520,000 of this appropriation shall be availabe for travel expenses.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 9, line 20, strike out "$18,050,000" and insert "$17,000,000."

Mr. TABER. The amount allowed over-all last year for the Civil Service Commission was $16,511,913. The basis of the request for an increase was largely additional placements, $1,500,000. Let me tell you how many new placements they were expecting. The number of placements they estimate for this current fiscal year is 1,136,000. The number they estimate for the fiscal year 1952 is 1,141,000, or an increase of 5,000, less than half of 1 percent.

I have been allowing them about $500,000 increase to take care of that extra 5,000 placements. I think I am being liberal. Frankly, they claim that the turn-over rate in 1952 in Government establishments will be 36 percent, but the committee investigated on how things were going and the present rate of turn-over, according to the committee's report, and I am reading right out of it, is at the rate of 2.3 percent monthly, or 27.6 percent. With that percentage of increase in turn-over, I cannot see any justification for going beyond $17,000,000, which I have suggested here. Frankly, I would like to go back to $16,500,000, which was given last year, but to take care of 5,000 extra placements it seems to me absolutely ridiculous to go to $1,500,000 extra.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will go down here and go through some of these bureaus and look right carefully to see if he can find an old-line American, I think he will come to the conclusion he might as well cut out this whole Civil Service Commission. I think it has become a farce and a failure.

Mr. TABER. I think the adoption of this amendment is going to have a wholesome effect, indicating that the Congress expects them to do a decent job on the ones they place. You know as well as I do that $500,000 will take care of 5,000 extra placements. I am allowing them a lot of money because of this war situation. I would cut it back to last year's figure if I could, if it were not for that.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted, and that we can save $1,050,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on the entire paragraph close in 7 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let me respectfully call your attention to a few figures. Your committee has cut the budget estimate, which was $23,000,000, by practically $5,000,000. That is a pretty substantial decrease. As the matter now stands, your committee gave them approximately $1,500,000 more than they had last year, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York seeks to put them right back where they were last year. Let us see what the facts are.

There is no one any more anxious to save the taxpayers some money than this committee, but at the same time we do not want to hamper them too severely. Now, we know that the agencies of Government are hiring by the month thousands upon thousands of new employees. The bulk of this money is for the loyalty program. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to get mixed up with that loyalty program. If there is any change in it, let us make it stronger, let us not weaken it. The budget estimate for the loyalty program for this year was $7,700,000, and we cut it back to about $4,700,000. We cut it about 40 percent. That is about as far as you can safely go. The agencies are going to make 72 percent of the placements. While they are making that many against 54 percent last year, we flatter ourselves because your committee urged them to do it. We think it is the cheapest way, as an emergency matter to let the agencies make their own placements. They know whom they need better than anybody else, and we can save that overhead expense. That is a feather in the Civil Service Commission's hat. Of course, they have to make checks on many of those placements. They have to have employees to do that work. By and large, this agency has received one of the severest cuts of any agency in the Government. They made last year 483,000 loyalty checks, and their estimate this year provides for the making of 1,250,000 checks.

I respectfully say to my friend from New York, whom we all love and admire, that we have cut this pretty badly, and we do not want to hurt them and the gentleman does not want to hurt them. I do not like to disagree with the gentleman. Does he not think we have really gone far enough? The gentleman may recall that his subcommittee went back a second time and cut another million and a half when they found out that the President had, to some extent, amended this loyalty program and taken the load off. We went back and cut it an additional million and a half. Now we have cut it pretty close to the bone. Let us not make any mistakes.

Mr. TABER. At the same time, they have had a loyalty program down there, and on top of that the turn-over that they estimate is only 5,000.

Mr. THOMAS. They estimate that the turn-over will be 36 percent in the entire Government service. We have based our cut on the fact that we hope it will be but 27 or 28 percent. If we have missed our guess, we are going to have to give them a couple of million dollars more, under these figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, we on the subcommittee agreed with our good chairman in reporting this item and none of us intended to take issue with him in regard to this matter, but now that it has arisen, I do want to call the attention of the Committe of the Whole a little more to this loyalty program of the Civil Service Commission. They testified before us, as you will find in the hearings, that they have practically completed the sifting of the present employees of Government. All they have to do now is to check new applicants. They check these by going around to the FBI and the Committee on Un-American

Activities, and various other groups, and checking to see if there is anything on record against an applicant. At present they have 708 loyalty boards throughout the country and they intend to increase that number to 1,222. They want 348 inspectors to handle these boards. They want 14 or more regional boards of appeal. Much of this machinery is set up, not for the purpose of testing the loyalty of the applicants, but to give the applicants a chance to appeal if they are not given employment. My point is that the time has come when, if there is any doubt about a person's loyalty, we should simply refuse to give him a job and not spend a lot of money investigating him further. On that point you will note in the press, and I am quoting:

Last week the President tightened up the loyalty standards for Government jobs by making it possible to dismiss or refuse to hire an employee for reasonable doubt of loyalty, instead of requiring reasonable evidence of disloyalty.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. This disloyalty commission ought to be separated from the Civil Service Commission. If you will check the folks who are on the payroll you will probably find a number of disloyal people on it, and then you will agree that it should be separated.

Mr. COTTON. As a matter of fact the Civil Service Commission probably must do some of this work. We appreciate that fact, but I would respectfully insist that the time has come when we must not confuse Uncle Sam, the fountainhead of our sovereignty, with Uncle Sam, the employer. If we are suspicious about any applicant, let us not hire him, and let us not set up a vast, complicated, expensive system of appeal so that he can dispute that question with us. If there is any doubt it should be resolved in favor of the Government. For that reason I feel that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York could be passed without any harm to our loyalty program.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi about these loyalty boards. I recall the case of George Shaw Wheeler, who was passed by three loyalty boards and within 2 years after that he repudiated his country where he had received his education and went over to the Russians.

Mr. RANKIN. And became a "red herring."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 93, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including $1,100,000 for capital for loans pursuant to section 14 of said act; rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Travel Expense Act of 1949; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriation and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; $6,195,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with international agencies for the use of their transportation and other facilities for the transfer of persons as provided in section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, and with United States governmental agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this act.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 13, line 20, after the semicolon strike out "$6,195,000" and insert "$8,260,000."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore to the five agencies of the Government administering the displaced-persons program the approximate amount that was returned to the Treasury of the United States last year because of the inability of the Displaced Persons Commission to fully carry out its program, particularly with regard to the German expellees. The operation was very materially interfered with by virtue of the fact that much of the shipping that was being utilized was diverted from the Atlantic to transport the Turkish and Greek troops to Korea. In addition to that, the Attorney General had placed an interpretation on the Internal Security Act that made it impossible for many people who had been merely casual members of the Nazi organization to qualify for admission to the United States.

In considering this appropriation it is important to bear in mind the fact that there are two phases of this program, one dealing with IRO displaced persons and the second with expellees, the expellees being persons of German ethnic origin. That program has just about started. The various civic and church groups in the United States have assurances for many of these people, over 40,000 of whom are or will soon be processed for resettlement in the United States.

I should like to call your attention to the figures that cannot be disputed: Of the money appropriated, $1,100,000 under the law is needed for loans to defray inland transportation, as authorized by the statute; $4,375,000 is the cost of ocean transportation of German expellees at $125 a person. In that connection I would like to call your attention to the fact that the IRO displaced persons were transported by the International Refugee Organization. That organization has nothing to do with the transportation of these German expellees. Seven hundred thousand dollars is required to liquidate the program which expires on June 30, 1952. That leaves just $20,000 with which to conduct this operation for the next fiscal year; and that, quite obviously, is impossible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that funds from such an agency as the Displaced Persons Commission, that these funds have been used to further the war effort in Korea?

Mr. WALTER. No; what I said was that the shipping that was being used to bring these people to the United States was diverted so that there are people authorized to enter this country but awaiting transportation. They have not been transported due to the fact that the vessels were used to transport the Greek and Turkish troops to Korea. These people have been waiting for the opportunity to come to the places that have been provided for them by the American sponsors.

If it is the purpose of this committee to do something to prevent the carrying out of this program designed to take care of these German expellees, it seems to me that the decent way to do it is to offer an amendment to the Displaced Persons Act and eliminate that part of the program. But the insistence in both bodies that something be done to relieve the suffering of these Germans was so great that they were included in this program, and that phase of the program cannot be carried out with this appropriation.

It might be interesting to know that the D. P. Commissioners are not typical bureaucrats. One of them is a former labor union official; another was connected with welfare work in New York; and the third was the head of Catholic welfare in New York. These people do not know how to pad appropriations. They came in with a request that was honest and accurate; and, as I said before, because of the conditions prevailing last year they turned back one million and three-quarters dollars to the Treasury of the United States.

All we are seeking by this amendment is to have that money restored.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and on the entire section close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we all love our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. He is a great American, he is a great legislator, he is worth his weight in gold not only to his great district and State but the Nation.

It is not the purpose of the committee to change the act in the slightest. During the year 1951 that commission brought into the United States 163,000 and by their own words and estimate they will bring in during 1952 63,000 persons, 35,000 of whom are of the German ethnology. We have gone into this carefully and it is the considered judgment of your committee it is not going to hurt them one iota.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We have enough suffering among our old people in this country instead of trying to bring more of this riff-raff into the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in performing the duties imposed by the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 151), the Ship Act of 1910, as amended (46 U. S. C. 484-487), the International Radiotelegraphic Convention (45 Stat. pt. 2, p. 2760), Executive Order 3513, dated July 9, 1921, as amended under date of June 30, 1934, relating to applications for submarine cable licenses, and the radiotelegraphy provisions of the Convention for Promoting Safety of Life at Sea (50 Stat. 1121), including newspapers (not to exceed $175), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repair to buildings (not to exceed $17,500) purchase of not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $6,575,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cox: On page 15, line 5, strike out "$6,575,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000,000."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, in this money-saving business that is going on, there is a certain degree of purging which gives added virtue to the operation. Here is an agency that should have the attention of the Congress. While it is not one of the larger agencies of the Government it has been because of its mischievous behavior one of the most dangerous, an aggregation which with few exceptions has been for the past 15 or 16 years made up of pinks and reds and it has operated in a manner comparable with what would be expected of hired agents of Moscow.

I call attention to the voluminous report made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Hobbs, on the Amerasia case. If you will turn to that report and analyze it, you will come to the conclusion that there must have existed in the Communications Commission a Communist cell in order for Amerasia to have obtained the highly secret documents it got from that source.

I call your attention to the fact that the Commission, operating as an aggregation of leftists with knowledge of who composed the group making the application, granted a license to the Metropolitan Broadca ting Co. That corporation—the stockholders and others interested in it—consisted in the main of admitted Communists. In the group you will find Morris Rodman, Samuel Rodman, and Samuel Rodman's wife, all stockholders, and upon an occasion when called before the Committee on Un-American Activities declined to answer whether or not they were or had been Communists. Rose Anderson and her husband, John Anderson, were well-known Communists and were stockholders of WQQW. You will find a great many others, including Jane Keeney and Philip Keeney, both Communist spies for Russia.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, making its report on this broadcasting corporation, said:

1. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. was granted licenses by the Federal Communications Commission without any effort being made by the Commission to determine the extent of communistic influence in the corporation.

2. The wife of a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission is vice president of a Communist-front organization of which one of the officers of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is president.

3. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is an outlet for third-party and communistic propaganda.

4. Two stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. have been associated with a convicted espionage subject.

5. Known Communists are stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., as well as contributors to the Communist Party.

6. Numerous Communist-front organizations are represented through the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

7. Numerous Government employees who in some instances hold responsible positions have placed not only themselves in jeopardy but the Government they represent as well through their association in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

8 A former employee of the Federal Communications Commission is general manager of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., and he has told other persons that he engineered the granting of the licenses by the Commission.

9. Through the interlocking directorates or organizations represented among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., it is definitely indicated that the third-party movement is Communist-inspired and Communist-dominated.

10. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., because it is a Karl Marx study club, has presented possibilities that its members through the strategic positions they occupy in the Federal Government will become sources of information for foreign agents.

The Commission, I repeat, knew that this was a Communist enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, this corporation has a staff of 94 employees in its legal department here in Washington, 65 of which are lawyers. If you should go down to the Commission and take a look and not know that you were in Washington, you would think that you were in Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, this FCC legal department has for years controlled the Commission. They present all matters to the Commission and hold hearings and examinations, and if those of you who have had any experience with the Commission are acquainted with the manner it has dealt with the broadcasters of this country you should know that the Commission rather than operate in an endeavor to develop broadcasting, has sought to dominate, to control, and to terrorize the communication operators everywhere. They have no possible need for this army of Red lawyers that they employ in its Washington office. It has an army of employees out in the field that it does not need.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Would the gentleman agree to a substitute just to knock out the entire appropriation? If this is going to be a Communist set-up inside of the Federal Government, we ought to stop the appropriation now until they clean house and fumigate. I am not willing to appropriate a single dollar for them until they do clean house.

Mr. COX. At the head of the Commission at the present time is Mr. Wayne Coy. He, who now heads the Commission, was, prior to his appointment, radio director of radio station WINX, owned and operated by Eugene Meyer and the Washington Post. In 1948, after Coy had become Chairman of the Commission, Eugene Meyer and the Washington Post were permitted to purchase from the Columbia Broadcasting Co. 55 percent of the stock of radio station WTOP, consisting of 11,400 shares. The Commission permitted him to purchase it without any hearing on the matter. Not only was the Post allowed by Coy to buy control of the Washington CBS outlet but they subsequently got 60 percent or control of WTOP-FM frequency, and likewise 60 percent of the stock or control of WTOP-TV television. So it is evident that Mr. Meyer's interest in behalf of Mr. Coy's becoming Chairman of the Commission has paid off. The Post pretty well dominates the Commission.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is through the use of the operation of the purse strings that the Congress can stamp its influence upon what is going on in and around Washington, and that is what the Congress has been endeavoring to do for the past 2 weeks, and what you are doing, in my judgment, is received by the people of the country with almost unanimous approval. This Commission's appropriation should be cut, and a cut of $500,000 is not excessive. As a matter of fact, of all the agencies of the Government, this

is the one about which Congress should busy itself in the interest of purging and set up in its stead a new agency that will be imbued with the love of its own country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I have listened with great interest to the gentleman's discussion of the activities of the Federal Communications Commission. I was wondering whether it is the gentleman's opinion that the activities of the present chairman are merely unethical or illegal.

Mr. COX. I think he is at least evidencing a loyalty to his old master.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the Cox amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, the substitute amendment, and all amendments to this section close in 3 minutes, with 5 minutes allotted to the gentleman from Mississippi and the three remaining minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Cox: On page 15, line 5, strike out "$6,575,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, what is the use of sending our boys to die by the tens of thousands, ostensibly fighting communism abroad, while our own administration promotes communism at home?

Take the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. It shows that this outfit is literally honeycombed with Communist or fellow travelers. When we took up the Hiss case here and exposed Alger Hiss, it was called a red herring.

Are we going to permit these Reds to destroy our Government at home, while sacrificing our boys by the tens of thousands to defend it abroad? We have just been through the most useless war in history. Our boys won the fight, in the air, on the ocean, and on the ground. Hiss and his crowd trumped up this so-called Yalta agreement, also the Charter of the so-called United Nations, and turned the victory over to the worst enemy mankind ever saw.

Now, while they are sending our boys to die in Korea, without consulting Congress, to keep Communists on the Federal payroll is the most ridiculous thing I have ever known.

That is not the only agency that ought to be investigated. I for one will not sit here and see the boys I represent die in Korea while these Reds destroy our Government at home.

They dictated that order wiping out segregation in the Armed Forces. It is not doing the Negroes any good, but it has done more to injure the morale of our Armed Forces than anything else that has ever occurred. If we are going to represent the American people, here is a good time to start. Let us clean house and fumigate every department of this Government. If you do not do it, the American people will do it next year.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman referred to records in a certain case being impounded at the White House. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when an effort was being made to investigate the Federal Communications Commission and the committee handling the matter was working in conjunction with the representatives of the Army and representatives of the Navy, the White House, then presided over by President Roosevelt, intervened and threatened to court martial the Navy, threatened to court martial the Army, and effort was made to prosecute the chairman of the committee, and had all files in the Bureau of the Budget, the Army and the Navy Departments, and the offices of the Federal Communications Commission, touching the question under investigation, transported to the White House where they were impounded, and, insofar as I know, there they still are.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir; and there is a man sitting right before me at this moment whose integrity cannot be questioned, whom Mr. Bullitt told that President Roosevelt told him that he kept this man Niles, whose real name is Neyhus, in the White House as his contact with the Communists. He is today chief of staff down there and is virtually running the show. I am telling you our people are demanding that we clean house and fumigate in every agency, as the Bible says, "from the watchman's tower to the fence of the city."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult at all times to oppose my friend from Georgia [Mr. Cox], one of the many able, fine men in this House. He certainly offered a very moderate amendment compared with our equally lovable and inimitable friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. Certainly all of us who have served here lo these many years with him love him and admire him and respect him all the way down the line, but certainly the gentleman from Mississippi has forgotten what the Federal Communications Commission does. I know the gentleman would not want to cut out the regulatory powers of that agency which holds down our long-distance and telephone rates, nor would he want to cut out the regulatory powers of that agency that holds down the Western Union and all the rest of the telegraph rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I certainly would not want Alger Hiss in charge of it, and unless we clean house and fumigate, we had better abolish it for the time being and get a new one.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman. I am going to comment on the present personnel of the Commission. I could not agree with that, so far as my friend, Commissioner Bob Jones is concerned, who served in this House for 10 years. He is no more a Communist than this table is. He is a loyal American, and the same applies to Wayne Coy, the able Chairman, and to other members of the Commission.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. COX. I have asked the gentleman to yield now because I want to give my testimony to the fine character of Bob Jones. But can the gentleman name another man on that Commission of the same character and integrity?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. Sterling and Mr. Walker.

We had some gentleman there in the beginning—not last year, but several years ago—and we know who we are talking about, and I am not going to call his name, and perhaps the gentleman from Georgia is right about it, but he is gone, and I hope we do not have any more like him.

Gentlemen, you have 1,085 applications pending there for commercial radios and police stations and cities and truck operators and ship operators and so forth. They have a tremendous load. They are going to have exactly 1,289 employees this year. The year before that there were 1,389, and we cut them by 100 employees. For 1952 we have held them to 1,289, which is the number they are authorized to have right now. Yet they have a greater increase in workload. I again say the gentleman from Georgia made a more modest cut. His cut of $575,000 would amount to about 80 to 90 employees. But the gentleman from Mississippi wants to cut it all out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. You just hold until they clean house, and then we can pass another appropriation bill to take care of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood-control surveys: For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission as authorized by section 4 of the act of June 28, 1938 (33 U. S. C. 701j), and similar provisions in subsequent acts, including contract stenographic reporting services, $314,700.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 15, line 21, strike out "$314,700" and insert "$200,000."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the flood-control survey activities of the Federal Power Commission to $200,000. In my opinion, this activity furnishes a perfect example of a type of work that may be very valuable in peacetime, no doubt is, when we can conduct preliminary surveys and studies with something other than borrowed money, but in a time of grave fiscal emergency these activities simply cannot be justified.

I never realized what the functions of the Federal Power Commission were in this field until I studied into it a little. These surveys which the Federal Power Commission conducts for the Corps of Engineers have nothing to do with construction that is already under way where insufficient planning might cause grave errors in judgment in engineering or in buying supplies; they merely pertain to investigations on which the Corps of Engineers may or may not at some future time decide to undertake construction. Furthermore, the construction by the Corps of Engineers in turn, in my judgment, should be sharply curtailed and confined to essential projects which it would be unwise economy or detrimental to our defense effort to cut.

Their investigations for future construction projects surely must be examined with the closest scrutiny and every effort made to reduce them to the barest minimum possible. Certainly preliminary surveys for investigations which may never be made are an inexcusable luxury at the present time, as the able chairman of the subcommittee pointed out in his remarks during the hearing.

At this point, I must not let the opportunity pass to pay my respects to the chairman of this subcommittee for his very able conduct of these hearings. After telling the witnesses, as he did many others at other points in the record, that they were his friends and that he was delighted to have them before him, he proceeded to take them apart and reveal with convincing clarity the weaknesses of their case in a very able manner. As he pointed out, these studies are very beneficial in peacetime, but during the present emergency—and I am virtually quoting the words of the able and distinguished gentleman from Texas: "During the present emergency they ought to be put aside until world conditions improve sufficiently to permit their resumption."

I hope that the experienced and agile subcommittee chairman who voiced those sentiments and who says in his report that during this period of emergency and high taxes it is suggested that the Commission curtail some of its studies in connection with power and flood control which do not have specific projects in mind, I hope that in the light of those statements the subcommittee chairman will not with too great vigor oppose this amendment, because if he opposes it with the characteristic ardor and energy for which he is so well known, it might not carry; whereas if he would simply leave it to us without too much opposition, then it might have a reasonable chance of passing.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the purpose of this amendment is merely to reduce the amount which would be appropriated to the Federal Power Commission from $314,700 to $200,000?

Mr. KEATING. That is right, for this one specific item of flood-control surveys.

Mr. HARRIS. Am I correctly informed that the amount of money made available here to the Federal Power Commission is for the purpose of carrying out the responsibility of the Commission when they are called upon by the Corps of Engineers or other sources to give their opinion and recommendation on projects which may be under consideration in view of the fact that the Federal Power Commission does have the responsibility and jurisdiction for rates on the power that will come from the projects?

Mr. KEATING. I think that is a fair statement, and my thought is that the study of all of these projects has to do with projects to be built at an indefinite time in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will yield, but just let me finish that thought. As I understand, these investigations have to do with these projects in the future, and my point is that in these times, in wartime, not only this Commission should be curtailed in the amount of work it does, but also that the Corps of Engineers themselves ought not to go far into the future in planning a lot of projects which are not now justified.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman knows the Corps of Engineers does not have very much planning money for future projects.

Mr. KEATING. They have some.

Mr. HARRIS. It is very little. Of course, we cannot tell until the civil functions appropriation bill comes to the floor, but it is generally conceded from the experience we had last year that very little planning money for new projects will be authorized or provided for by the Congress. This money, as I understand it, is for the purpose of the Federal Power Commission carrying out its responsibility under the law to comply with requests made by the Corps of Engineers. If I am wrong about it, I would like to be corrected, because I think the gentleman has a point here. If they are for future projects, away off in the future, new projects, I think the gentleman's amendment is appropriate, but if it is going to enhance the activities and the responsibilities of the Federal Power Commission on present projects that will apply to our national defense program, I think we better go slow before we approve the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman so far as any truly defense projects are concerned, but I do not understand that the work which the Federal Power Commission does has anything to do with the projects now under way. It is the planning of future projects to be undertaken many years hence. That is my understanding.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. If the Corps of Engineers is cut on future projects, then they will not need to ask the Power Commission for this extra help because their program is cut. They will not, therefore, have to call upon the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like for a member of the committee to correct me if I am not accurate in this statement. Suppose a group of people out here in county X comes to the conclusion that floods occurring on some river or stream in that county are damaging their crops considerably, they can start a movement and call for a flood-control survey for that particular area. Then, if authorized, and if money is provided, the Army engineers go into the community and make a survey.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Corps of Engineers goes in there and makes a survey. They go into great detail to determine whether or not the annual damage caused by the floods is greater than would be the annual carrying charge of the improvement that might be made to prevent the flood. It might not have a thing in the world to do with the Federal Power Commission. It simply has to do with flood control in a given area. If they go ahead and make their surveys, there are meetings held in the community. A half dozen small cities or towns might be involved. At the conclusion a report is made recommending that each of the communities donate so much land and provide so much work and they can make a contribution to doing that particular job. If that is not what is done by these surveys I would like to have some member of the committee prove to me that the statement is not correct.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask the gentleman if cutting this down will stop the Federal agency from going into Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut to study things that have already been studied a half dozen times or if it will not at least curtail their activities?

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that the reduction as suggested by the amendment would do what my friend from Massachusetts has in mind if the gentleman after voting for it, as I am very confident he will, would couple that with a letter to the Federal Power Commission objecting to their using any of the funds for that purpose.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I shall certainly do that.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Here is what I have in mind: It is to be presumed some investigation is made as to whether it is propitious to vote the amount of money that is in this report for the Commission. The gentleman's amendment is asking to cut down the amount. I am sympathetic with the amendment, except I would like to have an answer to this question: If we deduct from the total that is provided in the budget the amount called for in the amendment, what assurance have we that what is left is sufficient to carry on the functions of the office? And, furthermore, do we not run into the same thing over and over again, they will simply keep on functioning and carrying on, then come back 6 or 7 months later with a deficiency request?

Mr. KEATING. Of course, they should not do that. I may say to the gentleman that this figure is not picked out of thin air. I have discussed it with some members of the Appropriations Committee and I feel confident that at least some of them will support the amendment. The Federal Power Commission asked for some $5,300 more than they had last year for flood-control surveys and the subcommittee cut them back and allowed them the same amount as last year. My feeling, however, is that this is peculiarly an activity where we should go further in reductions than the Appropriations Committee has gone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, my point is this: If the amount is deducted from the sum total, is the gentleman convinced or satisfied that whatever is left is sufficient for this Commission to function in an orderly and proper manner for the benefit of the people of this country?

Mr. KEATING. I am satisfied that the amount left is sufficient for them to function in this field of surveys in the manner in which they should function in wartime when it is imperative that we curtail nondefense, nonessential spending.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The amount left could only apply to those projects which control or have some relation to the subject of power. It does not apply to flood control as flood control, because that is taken care of by the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. KEATING. I believe the gentleman is correct in that respect, but I am not positive on that point.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on the entire section close in 8 minutes, with 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Federal Power Commission is doing one of the greatest services of any commission connected with this Government. Nobody has ever accused anyone connected with the Federal Power Commission of even being tinged with communism.

The Commission does not handle flood control. This item is with reference to power surveys. Let me say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], who talks about prospective projects. He has one right in his own area, the St. Lawrence project. The dam is going to be one of the greatest power dams in America, if and when it is completed. And, you mark what I tell you, if the Keating amendment prevails and survives the righteousness reaction in the Senate, then the power trust can rush in where the Government is building the dam that will probably cost $200,000,000, we will say, and they can build a few lines out from it and then say, "You people in New York and other States in that area cannot build a line here because you will be paralleling a line we have already built," which lines were built for the purpose of preventing you people from enjoying the benefits of this great development of the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I want to join with the gentleman in expressing regret that this amendment has been offered. I am convinced that the Federal Power Commission is a clean, wholesome set-up and it is doing a clean and effective job. The amount is trivial, and I do not want to vote against the gentleman; I want to vote with him. I wish he could see his way clear to let this matter go and to withdraw his amendment, for I cannot agree that the appropriation should be reduced.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Congress can afford to give the Communications Commission, with all the record read by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], $6,575,000 to conduct their propaganda, surely you can appropriate the small amount of $314,700 for the Federal Power Commission, which is rendering one of the greatest services of any agency of this Government. It has saved this country billions of dollars, I will say, in the last few years, and it ought not to be disturbed in this way. I hope the House will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I want to say to the gentleman from Georgia and to the gentleman from Mississippi that I am in no way attacking this agency. I happen to think that this is not the appropriate place to settle the question of personnel in these agencies, but I do want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the small one hundred odd thousand dollars involved in this amendment would not be sufficient to survey the St. Lawrence project by any means. The gentleman certainly cannot contend that, and if it would, I will say to the gentleman, I think the St. Lawrence project or any other project in these times has got to take its share of cuts which we must make in nondefense and nonessential spending.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought that was the gentleman's attitude yesterday when he lined up with the power trust in putting over the Keating amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi, and I think he will agree with me, that none of the meager funds here involved would apply to the St. Lawrence seaway at all; neither would they apply to any future project. But, as I understand, for instance, out in the Northwest, at a multipurpose dam, they have been called upon recently to install two or three additional generating units for the purpose of aluminum production. Before those units can be installed, the Federal Power Commission has to make a survey of it. That is the purpose of these funds. I think if the gentleman knew the purpose of this, he would not have offered this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. This is to get information on this question. After hearing the debate on yesterday and the debate today, I submit that this is one subject on which we cannot get too much information. You can depend on what the members of the Federal Power Commission tell you. They will give you accurate information, just as well as the Army engineers. So I do not want to see this great agency disturbed that is rendering such wonderful service to the American people at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will not accept the amendment

offered by my good friend from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I cannot improve upon the gentleman's language, that he read a while ago, because our able clerks, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the rest of us wrote it. So we will have to admit it was good language. This is what we said in that language, and we indicated our thoughts translated into money. We said to the Federal Power Commission, "Forget your broad, general studies. Confine your efforts and your dollar expenditures to these projects you are going to need in the near future for the war effort."

In truth and in fact, in 1951 the Federal Power Commission had $314,700 for flood-control purposes. We call it flood control, but actually it is not flood control. That is the job of the Corps of Engineers. That is an ancillary matter. It is the power that goes with the flood control. They had $351,000 before the Taber reduction, which left them with $314,700, and perhaps this little subcommittee had something to do with that reduction last year. I think they call it the Taber amendment effecting reductions of $550,000,000. Under that reduction this item was allowed $314,700, which was a cut of some $35,000 to $37,000, a 10-percent cut.

Suppose it develops here that you have certain very urgently needed national defense power projects. You have only $314,700 to get in there and do this work. This is not a lump-sum appropriation that can be used throughout the Federal Power Commission in all its ramifications of gas, pipelines, and electric studies. This is an earmarked fund. If they do not spend it according to the directions of the committee, namely, pinpoint it to the immediate national defense projects, then it has to go back to the Treasury.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that on pages 679 and 680 of the committee hearings the gentleman himself strongly suggested to the Commission witnesses that most of the studies under this item might well be deferred until the emergency is over?

Mr. THOMAS. Exactly, and we so wrote it in the report. That is exactly our point of view. It makes sense, does it not? Let us now tear this up too much here. This fund will go back to the Treasury if it is not used.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 78, noes 51.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. KEATING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 91, noes 64.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including contract stenographic reporting services, and not to exceed $700 for newspapers, $4,136,400: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein for the Federal Trade Commission shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time, and I do not intend to use the full 5 minutes, to ask the chairman of my subcommittee a question on the wording of the report. On page 8 of the report the subcommittee has apparently recommended elimination of the item described as index of concentration; the amount is $25,000. Knowing the interest of the chairman of my subcommittee of the antimonopoly work that is undertaken by the Federal Trade Commission and his knowledge that the Commission does good work, I ask the chairman of my subcommittee whether that language is intended as a directive to the Federal Trade Commission not to undertake that index of concentration.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. YATES. I thought it was the understanding that if they had sufficient funds they could do this.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a different proposition.

Mr. YATES. Suppose they have sufficient funds with which to undertake such an index of the concentration of wealth. You do not mean to imply by your previous answer that the index should not be undertaken by the Commission, do you?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is correct. If they can do that work without increasing the appropriation, we see no objection to them doing that work.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 16, line 1, strike out "$4,136,400" and insert "$3,891,695."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if I may make this request without its being taken out of the gentleman's time, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on the section close in 8 minutes, the remaining 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would not the gentleman wait until the gentleman from New York has had an opportunity to explain his amendment so we may have some idea of what it amounts to and how important it is?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has asked unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I object at this time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, with 5 minutes to be given to the gentleman from New York and 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved for the committee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. This amendment simply reduces the item appropriated for the Federal Trade Commission to the amount granted for the fiscal year 1951.

This Commission has done many fine things and has in many respects a splendid record. I would hate to have any inference drawn as a result of the offering of this amendment or the one before it that it is in any way an attack on the agency as such. If we were going to do that, we ought to go about it in some different manner. But certain agencies other than the Federal Trade Commission are more directly concerned with defense activities. They have managed to re-aline their work, or the emphasis of their efforts, to do the extra amount of work without increasing their budget estimates, and I think that principle ought to be followed here. I believe this could be done without curtailing their contribution to the defense effort or the enforcement of our antimonopoly laws one iota.

I happen to be a member of the Judiciary subcommittee on the study of monopoly power. I know that there are concentrations of power in this country which should be investigated, but I do not believe that to give to the Federal Trade Commission the same amount they had last year could in any way be said to curtail or cripple them in their efforts.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will if I have time after this specific point.

Mr. Chairman, there is some interesting evidence in this record on page 148 and following pages. There are 10 people—I hope the Members will get this—there are 10 people in the accounting division auditing travel vouchers and the other purchases of the Commission. The travel allowance for the Commission for 1951 was $144,000; supplies and materials, $31,000; and equipment, $16,000. In other words, the total of those items was $191,000.

There were 10 full-time employees vouchering the slips for and handling $191,000. The salaries paid these 10 people, figuring on the Government average of $3,600 a year, would amount to $36,000; in other words, this agency was paying approximately one-fifth of the total amount for handling these vouchers. I submit that any private concern that would conduct its business that way would go out of business overnight with that kind of overhead.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. TABER. In other words, if they would put business methods into their

operations, they would not need so much help.

Mr. KEATING. That is it exactly; and in addition to these 10 people there are 35 people in the services and supplies section, a portion of whose duty is to buy the supplies, equipment, and furniture. So these 10 people do not even have the responsibility of buying the equipment; they merely do paper work after the material has been purchased.

Now, turning to the library, there are five people in the library doing as this distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said, "watching records"—five people to watch the records.

Each floor has a messenger. There is a total of six of those for the Commission.

These are just a few illustrations of the waste of manpower in this agency and are illustrative of the reason why it is not going to curtail their activities in the slightest degree, many of which are most commendable, if we give them the same amount that they had last year. There is no reason for us in these times to be allowing an agency like the Federal Trade Commission, meritorious as it may be, a larger amount for the following fiscal year than they had for the last fiscal year.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. As I understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment, he intends to cut down on the amount of paper work done by the agency and does not intend this cut should apply to the antimonopoly work of the Commission itself?

Mr. KEATING. I may say to the gentleman that, of course, it is not in our power here in Congress to designate just where the reduction must be reflected. I agree with the gentleman if he means that the Commission in applying such cut shall apply it to the overstaffing in the agency and to some of the things which I specifically mentioned, many others of which are in the record, and not to the basic work in which they are engaged, in many respects in which they have done a commendable job.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the old-line agencies of Government. It serves the people of the United States. There is not anything partisan in its activities.

If you will refresh your recollection this subcommittee gave them a cut in 1950, which was resisted very strongly on the floor of the House because this agency serves all of the people. It is a deterrent to big business gobbling up little business. The general over-all effect is most wholesome for the people of the entire country.

We cut them again in 1951 and again the House offered a good deal of resistance, or, rather, some Members did. It will be recalled that last year the House amended section 7 of the Clayton Act and passed the so-called Antimerger Act. This House and the other body placed specific duties and burdens on the Commission this year to prevent further business concentration.

They came in with an estimate of $500,000 to do that work. Do you know what this subcommittee did? We have them a cut of 33⅓ percent in this item. The Agency claimed it could not possibly perform their duties with that big a cut. We hoped and thought they could. Now our distinguished friend from New York [Mr. KEATING] says he would cut out not only $255,600 but he cuts out that amount and virtually another $244,000 for this antimonopoly work.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It so happens that I favored the act to which the gentleman has referred and I voted for that bill. I believe it should be enforced.

Mr. THOMAS. I think everyone on the floor was of the same opinion.

Mr. KEATING. Oh, no; there was a clear division on that vote. I will say to the gentleman that this amendment is not directed at the enforcement of that section. The amendment is an over-all cut in the total amount.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman has cut out that new money for antimonopoly work. The committee for the last 2 years has cut this Agency. I am serious about that. We have cut them substantially. We cut them in 1950 and again in 1951.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 73, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Operating expenses: For necessary expenses of the General Services Administration not otherwise provided for, including: Repair and improvement of public buildings and grounds under the control of the General Services Administration; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; demolition of buildings; furnishings and equipment; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $750 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; processing and determining net renegotiation rebates; liquidation of activities under the act to promote the defense of the United States (55 Stat. 31); and preparation of guides and other finding aids to records of the Second World War; $109,551,680.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Page 17, line 22, after the word "agencies", insert "within the District of Columbia."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I first want to pay my respects to the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and also the ranking member of the minority side, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], for their fair and courteous manner in which they have treated the Members of the Committee of the Whole during this discussion. I want to also pay my respects to Commissioner Burt Reynolds, of the General Services Administration, as I know of no one in the Federal Government who in my opinion is working any harder to save the taxpayers money and get dollar return for dollar spent as Commissioner Reynolds.

However, I do want to call to the committe's attention line 22, which possibly has been an oversight either on the part of the General Services Administration or the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I note in line 21 that the term "District of Columbia" is used, but in line 22 the term "moving Government agencies" is used which certainly is very broad in its interpretation. I am of the firm conviction that the legislation as it is written is not carrying the intent of the Congress. My amendment is in line 22 after the word "agencies" insert "within the District of Columbia."

The intent of this amendment is to make certain that by the passage of this bill we are not granting permission to any agency to put into effect the policy or program known as the dispersal bill, which has been before the Public Works Committee for some time and has been defeated in the subcommittee of the full Committee of Public Works. My amendment, if accepted, would give assurance that it was the intent of this Congress that at least in this legislation none of the money would be used for the moving of Government agencies or portions thereof out of the District of Columbia and would prevent authorization for the construction of highways and new buildings as recommended in the bills known as dispersal bills.

I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the ranking member on this side, and it is my understanding they are in accord with this amendment which certainly is another example of their fairness and intention of carrying forward the views as expressed by the Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment. It was not an oversight by any means. The language has been carried in that exact form year in and year out, but for the defense of the committee let it be said that the committee has refused appropriations on two or three occasions dealing with the moving of agencies outside the District of Columbia for the simple reason that we thought it ought to be passed on by other committees, because the committees had time to do it and we did not want to assume that responsibility. There is no money in this bill for any big mass movements like it has been suggested in the past, and therefore we see no harm in accepting the amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We also accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Page 18, line 9, strike out "$109,551,680" and insert in lieu thereof "$109,000,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the chairman and the members of the subcommittee which brought in this independent offices appropriations bill for 1952 deserve the thanks of this Congress and of the taxpayers of America for the task they have performed in reducing this bill far below the budget estimates presented, and for rescission of contract authorizations and other savings.

As the record shows, budget estimates have been reduced by approximately $666,000,000, and other savings effected by the subcommittee bring the total savings under this bill to approximately $747,000,000, or approximately three-fourths of a billion dollars.

I want to express to them my sincere appreciation for the fine results they have accomplished. I shall certainly support them today and hereafter, if the occasion arises, in holding these reductions.

I hope that the subcommittee will not object to an effort to further increase these savings and to further reduce Government spending where it is possible that such reductions can be made without seriously upsetting important governmental activities.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I should like to thank our distinguished friend from Georgia for the nice compliment he has paid the committee. That is the first kind of word we have heard in such a long time that we are just going to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the acquisition of land and improvements thereon adjacent to the site of the United States Post Office, Chicago, Ill., the alteration and renovation of such improvements, and the construction of auxiliary and appurtenant structures, ramps, and roadways for the expansion of post-office facilities, pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended (40 U. S. C. 341), $8,768,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Will the chairman of the committee inform me somewhat as to this item for the post office in Chicago?

Mr. THOMAS. This is an item for which the Budget Bureau sent up an urgent request. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] spoke to us about it. As the gentleman well knows, he is chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. They said they needed this, that it would save the taxpayers in the long run many thousands of dollars and provide much-needed facilities and space. We felt that in the face of that request it was the thing to do.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is the gentleman absolutely certain that this is necessary at this time?

Mr. THOMAS. We were unanimously of that opinion when those representations were made to us. I think it is the right thing to do. It will save some money in the long run.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expenses, general supply fund: For expenses necessary for operation of the general supply fund (except those authorized by law to be charged to said fund), including the purchase of four passenger motor vehicles, $16,426,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Page 23, line 6, strike out $16,426,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, after having noticed how generous the committee was to my good friend from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], I, too, am going to join in paying my compliments and tributes to the committee, which has already worked so successfully and so diligently to save almost a billion dollars for the taxpayers.

The amendment I have offered would strike $1,426,000 from the amount given by the committee to the Federal supply service. This is offered with the knowledge that $4,061,200 of this amount is a legitimate and needed expenditure for warehouse expansion, leaving the sum of $12,364,200 to be expended as overhead in the handling of these Government supplies. This means that the committee contemplates about an 8 percent overhead in the handling of these Government supplies as compared with 7.2 percent in 1950 and 7.1 percent in 1951.

My amendment would permit an overhead of approximately 7.3 percent in handling an expected $150,000,000 in supplies, as opposed to the committee's 8.3 percent; my 7.3 percent still being a larger percentage or a larger proportion than their overhead amounted to in 1950 and 1951.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished committee chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. It is very difficult to make a comparison and analyze what they had in 1950 and 1951 for the simple reason that in the last 12 months the surcharge has been removed. Heretofore they have been charging 10 percent on all common-use items—and that is all this is. But now you make a direct appropriation and they are going to increase their sales 63 percent. But, you know, the kind words of the gentleman from Mississippi are so pleasing to the House, plus what we have learned the House may do, that we are going to accept your persuasive words, and I ask that the Clerk read.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the chairman and appreciate the committee's kindness.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add my little word of commendation to what has heretofore been said to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] the chairman of this subcommittee. I want to add, in addition to having done a good job on this bill, he is displaying a great deal of wisdom in the conduct of it on the floor of the House. I had intended to say what I had to say on this subject when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] was talking on his amendment, but it was passed on so quickly that I did not get an opportunity.

I want to call the attention of the Committee to one thing about General Services. An effort has been made to have a large dispersal program here to build a lot of new buildings for Government employees. There has been some talk about a lot of rentals here in the District, and for office space for Federal employees. I call the attention of the committee, and I hope they will try to get something done about it, to the tremendous waste of Government space now being used for the storage of dead files. I understand there are thousands and thousands and thousands of feet of good office space being used now for the purpose of storing dead files, which under the law ought to be destroyed and which they are just not getting around to destroying. I want to cite as an example, which I verified yesterday, in the city of Alexandria, my home town. The Alexandria torpedo plant was built during the First World War. Up to a year ago they used it for the manufacture of torpedoes. That building cost several millions of dollars. It is a four-story, steel and concrete constructed building, covering a block and a half of ground. What are they using that building for now? The Army and Navy are using that building to store files. Here it is right here in the shadow of Washington, or within 7 miles of the Capitol, a building that would house many hundreds of employees, and they are using it for dead storage. I called up to find out what they are doing down there. My information was that they are doing something with those files, and there are 200 employees of the War Department and 200 employees of the Navy Department, making 400 employees stationed there.

What I want to ask this committee is: Where you have these files which do not have to be referred to every day, and which perhaps ought not to be destroyed, why could they not be put in some cheaply constructed building, like a quonset building, and put a guard there and thus save space and save all these salaries? Those are the kind of things that some of us here are getting

so worried about and which we are going to try to do something about in these appropriation bills.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska because I know he would be very anxious to correct such a situation as that.

Mr. STEFAN. In the Pentagon Building, I understand there are thousands of feet of floor space taken up by flower shops and bakeries and book stores and so on which could be used for office space for employees. Why cannot that whole situation be gone over, and if there is a shortage of space, eliminate those things which are unnecessary and which have nothing to do with national defense?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Nebraska is one of the most economy-minded members of the Committee on Appropriations and I throw his question right back at him and say I hope you will do something about it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Representatives from the National Archives appeared before the subcommittee and they told us they were very much aware of the problem the gentleman is raising. They are now undertaking to do exactly what the gentleman is advocating by centralizing in storehouses that are not expensive many of the old records. Also, they are now experimenting with the possibility of using microfilm so that many of the records can be stored in much, much smaller space.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is fine when they get around to it.

Mr. YATES. They are doing that now and we are pushing it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would like the committee to inquire as to this four-story building which covers a block and a half, which could be used to house many hundreds of employees, and I ask the Appropriations Committee to do something about it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to see if we can agree on a limitation of debate, and I hope this will not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this entire section end at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Virginia who brought up the question of space. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Public Works hearing testimony and discussion on requests that come before the committee. It seems that we are getting around now, even though world conditions are very disturbing, to being a little more interested in some of the practical things here at home on the domestic front.

"We need more space" is the cry we hear from Government agencies to our committee, and the cry that Members of Congress generally hear: "More space, for more storage, for more files, and for more thousands of people that are being employed in government." If we can do something about that and get this space, if we have to have these added employees in the Government we shall be accomplishing some real economy and putting some sort of efficiency into the Government here in the District of Columbia; in fact, I think that if the various committees held a tighter string on the amount of publications that are put out and the money the Government pays out for printing generally, we could effect a considerable saving, because you have got to have some space somewhere for a great deal of this stuff that remains here in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, about the only effort I have seen to destroying any files—old files no longer needed, or whether they are old or not but just useless, I might say facetiously—was a few months ago when it was stated in the other body and supported by affidavits of Government employees, that they had been employed to go into the State Department and strip that Department of certain files throughout that entire organization which might reflect some communistic leaning of employees. However, I do not think that has left enough space to be worth while.

Mr. Chairman, the main thing I want to say, and very seriously, is that I have never been quite so much encouraged with the possibility of economy in government as I have been within the last 2 or 3 weeks as these appropriation bills come to the floor of the House.

The members of this committee and particularly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and I say this very seriously, has increased his stature and showed himself to be a real patriot in the way he has handled this bill in the interest of economy for our Government, always respected for his effort and ability he grows with service; and that goes for the other members of the committee.

The reduction of these appropriations is encouraging to the economy-minded Members of this Congress. It is the best evidence of economy I have observed in the 8 years that I have been a Member of this body. The facts are that this body seems to have got religion. The religion of economy, and I bid you Godspeed and promise my hearty cooperation in this session of the Congress.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois the State Department may need much additional storage space; it seems they have employed a new type of stenographer, a girl who makes notes automatically without instructions.

Mr. VURSELL. You have made a contribution to my thinking. I had not intended to speak about that. you refer to the silent and secluded stenographer at Wake Island. Maybe I better use the words planted and directed by Mr. Jessup of the State Department.

Those from Washington who arranged this conference doubtless were surprised at her initiative in taking notes on the conference.

This good girl apparently just landed on Wake Island; she hardly knew how she got there; she just happened to go over to that conference where there was not going to be any stenographic work done. She just happened to get in behind that slatted door adjoining the conference, and then according to her training she just thought she ought to take down what happened. Then after she took it down she just happened to be coming back with them from the conference, and she thought she ought to turn her stenographic notes over to her boss. What a coincidence. And who brought her to Wake Island? Philip Jessup, Assistant Secretary of State, of the Acheson-Lattimore-John Service crowd, that piloted our foreign policy to the left for the benefit of those poor northern Chinese agrarian patriots who have since turned out to be hard Communists like the Russians that are giving us so much trouble in the Far East today and murdering some of our good American boys.

General MacArthur was informed there would be no stenographic record made before he entered the conference. If the President and Mr. Jessup had a stenographer to record the conference, General MacArthur wanted to have a stenographer from his office for his own protection.

On assurances he entered the conference without keeping a record. He entered in fearless good faith, and the American people will not soon forget those who were responsible for the hidden stenographer behind the slatted door.

It is likely facts about this incident will be further developed when the State Department appropriation bill is brought before the House.

Maybe we will find out more about her inspiration to make this contribution to history.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, before the Korean war began, executive branch departments and agencies of the Federal Government occupied a quarter of a billion square feet of office space throughout the entire United States.

Our Government has been spending more than $100,000,000 for civilian office rentals and utilities in addition to some $90,000,000 for military department rental and utility charges. When our Federal budget was set up last year for the period from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, our Federal payrolls were figured on a yearly base of $6,700,000,000. By the end of September, however, they were up to an annual figure of $7,500,000,000. On the figures we now have,

it is clear that we shall be spending for payrolls of Federal employees in civilian employment an amount greater than we spent during any year of World War II, more than $8,300,000,000. Three months after we got into Korea, we were hiring for Federal civilian jobs more than 1,000 new people every day.

Do we need a real Government paring-down, pruning process, cutting away or do we not? The figures speak for themselves. Nobody is killing himself working for the Federal Government, and the reason Federal employment is attracting so many people is that the pay is good, the chance to keep a job permanently is always there, no matter how temporary it may sound, and nobody seems to be keeping close tab on the actual amount of work anybody gets done.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Annual contributions: For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1410), $10,000,000: *Provided*, That except for payments required on contracts entered into prior to April 18, 1940, no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment to any public housing agency for expenditure in connection with any low-rent housing project, unless the public housing agency shall have adopted regulations prohibiting as a tenant of any such project by rental or occupancy any person other than a citizen of the United States, but such prohibition shall not be applicable in the case of a family of any serviceman or the family of any veteran who has been discharged (other than dishonorably) from, or the family and any serviceman who died in, the Armed Forces of the United States within 4 years prior to the date of application for admission to such housing: *Provided further*, That all expenditures of this appropriation shall be subject to audit and final settlement by the Comptroller General of the United States under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1952 the commencement of construction of in excess of 50,000 dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 50,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1952, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Public Housing Administration shall not, after the date of approval of this act, authorize the construction of any projects initiated before or after March 1, 1949, in any locality in which such projects have been or may hereafter be rejected by the governing body of the locality or by public vote, unless such projects have been subsequently approved by the same procedure through which such rejection was expressed.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSSETT: Page 25, line 22, strike out the word "fifty" and insert "five."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and even though the rule was adopted, points of order are still applicable to amendments that may be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. However, a proposition in a general appropriation bill proposing to change existing law, but permitted to remain, through the adoption of a resolution waiving points of order, may be perfected by germane amendments. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is germane and, therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into any extended discussion of the philosophy of the Public Housing Act. The Congress has authorized a public-housing program.

These 50,000 units are authorized by the act as amended in 1949; however, it seems to me that in this particular fiscal year we ought to defer the commencement of any projects that are not necessary or that interfere in any way with the defense effort. In the calendar year 1950 private industry in this country built 1,350,000 units. Under credit restrictions, because of shortage of materials and the necessity for channeling materials into the war effort, private building has been restricted rather substantially. It is estimated that during the calendar year 1952 no more than 800,000 units of privately constructed dwellings will be built in this country.

I made some inquiry of the public-housing officials to find out if this amendment would disrupt any existing contracts and I was told it would not. It will not interfere in any way with procedural orders—I think they call them proceed orders—now in effect, it will not impair any contracts now existing, it will have nothing whatever to do with the business for the fiscal year 1951; it will have nothing to do with the business for the fiscal year 1953. It simply means that while we have a shortage of material and while we are curtailing free enterprise and the private construction industry of this country, we should not begin any more of these public housing units. We should restrict at least the new units to be authorized.

We do not completely eliminate them by this amendment, although complete elimination I think would be desirable and would not have hurt anybody anywhere. We still leave 5,000 of these public-housing units in case there might be some spot somewhere that it would be practical and desirable to build them and where the construction might be justifiable during this peak year or what we hope to be the peak year in our war effort.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Is it not a fact that because of the national emergency and the great demand for many scarce materials a business concern engaged in private enterprise cannot build any sort of structure costing more than $5,000 unless they get a special permit?

Mr. GOSSETT. Well, I am not familiar with all the restrictions. I think the gentleman is correct and I know there are many buildings that cannot be constructed at all. So, the purpose of this amendment is just to restrict for 1 year a program which, in my humble judgment, was without justification in the beginning. I say this does not go to the merits of the Public Building Act. It simply permits private industry to get more of these scarce materials and at the same time, incidentally, saves a lot of money. I wish you folks would read the hearings on this particular bill. Some gentlemen on the committee brought out the fact that each one of these dwelling units is going to cost the Government in subsidies $25 per month per family, and over the life of the project will cost the Government at least $12,000 in subsidies; subsidies, mind you, per unit. Now, such a program certainly can be suspended for a short 12 months in the interest of private industry and the private construction program of this country and in the interest of the war effort, and that is all we seek to do with this amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I ask the gentleman if his amendment should not also be included in line 3 on the following page where the same figure is given?

Mr. GOSSETT. No. That figure does not pertain to the fiscal year 1952 but to subsequent fiscal years. I examined that very carefully.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto and all debate on the entire section close in 15 minutes, with the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SABATH. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto and all debate on the entire section close in 45 minutes, the last 4 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] has expired.

(Mr. TABER and Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. GOSSETT.)

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I of course appreciate the courtesy and consideration of my colleagues in yielding me further time. I had just about concluded.

The thing I wanted to impress upon my colleagues here is that this is an emergency period. We are told by all the leaders in our Government, military and civilian, that the year 1952 is to be the year in which shortages will pinch and regulations will hurt most, the year in which we must make our greatest effort in the defense program. This

being true, and since we are having to restrict private building, we certainly ought not to initiate any new public-housing construction.

This amendment does not interfere with any contracts heretofore made. It does not interfere with any so-called proceed orders, and it has nothing to do with what may happen in succeeding years. It simply states that during this particular fiscal year we will not begin in excess of 5,000 new public-housing units, since the material is badly needed in the construction of homes by private industry and in the war effort generally.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am in perfect accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman and its objectives. There is one question that bothers me, however, and that is why we should even go to the extent of permitting 5,000 new constructions.

Mr. GOSSETT. It occurred to me that I could be mistaken about some of the conclusions and statements I have made and that even some of the information given me could be wrong, and there might be a contract or two that had been overlooked or there might be some particular area in which one of these projects would be justified. I thought that we perhaps should leave 5,000 in the program just as a cushion against error. That is the purpose of leaving the 5,000 in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, there is little I can say in the brief period allotted me which would stem the tide I have seen developing in this House. I feel that I am swimming upstream, and that whatever few words I have to say will not be given much weight. However, I would be remiss in my duty and my obligation to my people and the people of every metropolitan community in this country which is faced with more and more industry coming in, with additional facilities being developed, and which is finding itself with inadequate housing to house the working people who must man these plants, if I did not make this statement.

Two years ago we passed the Public Housing Act of 1949. The theory behind the passage of that act was that private enterprise either could or would not take care of the workers for whom this type of housing was intended. Those workers are still with us; their number is growing. The problem of housing the people who now live in slums and giving them a chance to have some decent surroundings in which to live is very much with us. The fact is that we are not yet in all-out mobilization. We are in semimobilization, if you will, and, I hope we will never undertake that, that war will not come. The fact that we are still in a semimobilization period still permits us to make up the deficiencies in housing that are necessary to be made in every metropolitan community. I hope that you from the rural areas and you from the South and the Midwest who do not have the problems that we in the crowded, teeming metropolises have, will consider sympathetically our situation before you do vote in favor of this amendment.

This is of vital importance to those of us who live in metropolitan communities. The people must have roofs over their heads. Our slum neighborhoods are bursting at the seams. I agree that the way to get housing is with private housing and public housing both. This program will only occupy 10 percent of all the housing construction that will take place in the country less than 10 percent, as a matter of fact, if the amendment adopted by the subcommittee prevails. In effect, what this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas does is to gut the bill completely and take away the last ray of hope for every person who lives in the crowded slums and cities like Chicago. I certainly hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I must disagree with my good friend from Illinois who just addressed you. I take these 2 minutes to remind the House of three things which may clear up some of the misconceptions. The first is, of course, what I think we must all realize, but I have had some questions which indicate there is some doubt in some people's minds. The proposed amendment does not in any way, shape or manner touch slum clearance. It leaves that subject entirely alone. It only has to do with the so-called Federal public housing program.

In the second place it is a temporary suspension of this program. I disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, that it guts the whole program forever. It simply attempts to do what I think the people of this country want us to do, if I can read my mail correctly, and that is to suspend for the time being these expenditures in order that we may devote all the resources we have to our national defense.

My third point is that in the course of our hearings the administrators of this program testified to our committee that they were not really, during this time of crisis, engaging in public, low-cost housing program, and that they were actually emphasizing defense housing and building houses and units where it was necessary for defense workers. That is a horse of a different color from low-cost housing. If we are going to provide quarters for defense workers who are perfectly capable of paying and paying all that it is worth, it should be done by this Congress under a Defense Housing Act, and not through the backdoor of public housing.

This is a temporary suspension and is not actually depriving the people who need lowcost housing in this country of very much during this time of emergency. I hope the House will stand behind us because if you want to do a real job for economy and for national defense, here is where we can do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, it is nothing unusual to see some of the gentlemen from Texas, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and others who are part and parcel of the unholy alliance, together with nearly all of the Republicans, in opposition to the needs of the workers of America for homes and shelter. I fully appreciate that there is no shortage of homes on the farms of the country, in the West, or in the South, in the agricultural and cotton sections, but there is a shortage of housing in the manufacturing sections of the Nation whose workers must produce and do produce the essential needs for our defense. Without these workers we could not proceed with our program of national defense; consequently, I think the gentleman ought to realize that everyone ought to be fair with those who produce our needs to a greater degree than is being shown here today.

I regret that this amendment has been offered, because I believe that the entire amendment as proposed by the committee should be eliminated and should be stricken out. I never dreamed that anyone would have the courage to offer the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to reduce housing from 150,000 units to 5,000 for the entire Nation. Why, 5,000 new dwellings would not take care of the twentieth part of the need of these homeless people. It seems all right to these gentlemen to appropriate billions upon billions for the steel trust, but not a dollar for homes for the needy people of this country.

Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who has consistently opposed all public-housing legislation, will again tell you about the cost of this program over a 40-year period instead of what we appropriate from year to year to meet the needs of workers for homes. He and others on the left, and I repeat on the left, never point out the volume of unnecessary appropriations for agriculture, or the huge amounts appropriated for the steel combine and the industrialists engaged in the production of war materials, involving, not millions, but billions, each year. Surely these profiteers are comfortably housed: they are not in need of these homes, nor are any of them homeless as are the workers who actually produce our preparedness needs, so often credited to the industrialists by the gentleman above referred to.

I notice there are about 12 Republicans seeking time to speak on this amendment which actually nullifies the previous action of this House and destroys the housing program. I would like to know what their explanation will be to the people at home and to the country if they have the courage to take the floor and do so. Of course, their party is bent on destroying the building industry, the lumber industry, and others who provide the materials for the construction of these homes. Their ill-advised actions today will be reflected in the not too distant future on the entire economy of this great land of ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to yield his time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there has been any subject that has provoked quite as much controversy in this House in recent years as the act authorizing the expenditure of something like $16,000,000,000 for the purpose of building low-rent housing.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sorry; I cannot yield now.

Mr. SABATH. You do not mean that there is anything in this bill that goes over $16,000,000,000, do you?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Now that I have more or less involuntarily yielded to the gentleman from Illinois I might say that the act under which the authority is found for this, of which this is a part, 1949, when it was passed called for the expenditure of $16,000,000,000—and this is part of it. I might also say that because of the statements made by the gentleman from Illinois that the 5,000 units proposed in the amendment by the gentleman from Texas would not take care of, he said, the twentieth part of the needs of the country. If that be so, then there is something very remiss in the administration of this law, because since the act was passed in June 1949 there have been only 14 projects with only 1,000 units constructed up to now, going on 2 years from the time this act was passed wherein we find the authority for this appropriation. The Public Housing Administration has completed 1,000 units. Let me say that that 1,000 units was, nothing to the contrary notwithstanding, units which had been processed under the 1937 act which were in abeyance from some time in 1939 until 1949, and the 1949 act reactivated that program. Under that program 1,000 units in 2 years have been built. So, without fear of successful contradiction I can say that there has not been one unit built under the 1949 act. So when the gentleman from Texas authorizes 5,000 units he provides under the present program, as has been demonstrated, for 5 years of construction. That will afford ample opportunity, of course, to review it because the Congress itself can add to it if the need for it develops and if we have sufficient materials to do the job.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I just want to add this to what has been said by my distinguished colleague from the Ninth District of Illinois. He made quite an emotional appeal about housing, but he failed to give you the full picture. He failed to say that for some time last passed the housing projects under this housing bill that we are debating here was a football for practically 2 years. The matter was kicked about until finally the sanitary district, by a majority vote, consented to give them a piece of property on which to build a new housing project. It was promptly thrown into the courts with a view of determining the constitutionality of the act and to test whether or not that could be carried out. May I add parenthetically that every trustee who voted for giving that land for the housing project in the last general election was defeated. So the people in my section have had an opportunity to express themselves, indirectly at least, as to whether they are in favor of this housing project or not. That is something my good friend left out, probably inadvertently, but the gentleman ought to know about it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we have before this Congress a defense housing bill passed by the other body, now pending in the Committee on Banking and Currency. We also have a Defense Production Act on which we will start hearings next Tuesday. It would seem to me that the sensible thing to do would be to adjust this program to defense needs so that we can take this all into consideration at one time, the availability of materials, the inflationary aspects, and so forth. I think I can give reasonable assurance that if the pending amendment is adopted the Committee on Banking and Currency will take the matter up and consider it in these two bills which I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me may be given to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, like others who have preceded me here today, I should like to congratulate the subcommittee on the splendid work it has done in making substantial reductions in this bill in committee. I am not putting out this platitude with the hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] may be accepted, but I think the committee is due that little word of approbation.

It is regrettable that the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee saw fit to inject sectional matters into this debate. Let me say to the gentleman that there is no sectional matter in this effort to preserve our young Republic from the inevitable catastrophe that will follow if we do not become realistic and realize the road we are traveling.

The question here is a realistic one, whether we can afford to embark upon this program, as laudable as it may seem to some Members of Congress, of furnishing public housing when, at the same time, we know as realistic people, that we are engaged in a fight against communism throughout the world, when we are faced with these enormous military appropriations that we are going to have to vote in order to preserve the Republic.

I could make no better argument in favor of this amendment than was made by the distinguished, the affable, and the able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] on yesterday. As the gentleman on that occasion pointed out, a bill has been brought in here and passed that would bypass the Appropriations Committee and the Congress itself to carry out this public housing program. He further pointed out—and I wish I had the time to read it—that the committee's cut of 25,000 units would save $750,000,000. If that be true, and if we can afford to make that cut, then the cut proposed by the distinguished gentleman's colleague, also from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], would save approximately one and one-half billion dollars more, or a total of two and a quarter billion dollars.

In light of the testimony that was adduced here by the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] a moment ago that there have only been a thousand of these units built, then how can you afford to vote against this amendment authorizing 5,000 units?

Mr. Chairman, in the moment I have left I should like to touch upon another phase of this matter. The House has evidenced a splendid spirit of patriotism and realism in the matter of these appropriations. In every bill that has come up the committees have cut the budget and then the House has further cut it. With all due respect, and with no desire to cast aspersions or raise questions, I want to point out that all of this splendid work of this body can be nullified in another body if that body so sees fit. Therefore it is going to be incumbent upon this House to watch the progress of this bill through the other end of the Capitol and be on the alert when the committee of conference meets and the conference reports come back here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to close debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will not concur in the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]. Let me briefly review the facts. In 1949 this House authorized the construction of 810,000 low-cost subsidized housing units that would cost approximately $9,000 per unit. The gentleman from Mississippi was 100 percent correct in his analysis of how these units were to be financed. When they are all completed they will cost you, the taxpayers, all of us, $308,000,000 per year for 40 years. That is a debt against the United States, and this House and the Committee on Appropriations will not have one say. The only thing you can do is to appropriate the money, but that is not the point now. That program called for the construction of those units over a period of 6 years, namely, 135,000 per year. Thirty thousand of those units are under construction right at this very minute. Of course, it takes time to buy the land, draw the plans, to go through the various local machineries in every community, and therefore the program was some time delayed in getting into operation, through no fault of any human being. You just cannot go into two or three hundred different cities and towns of this country and buy land, pick sites, and get

a reasonable price on them without taking from 12 to 15 months. The President this year, recognizing the war effort and the scarcity of material and manpower, bath tubs and cook stoves, as I mentioned yesterday, and the inflationary pressure that was attendant upon the program, directed the Public Housing Administration not to make 135,000 starts this year, but 75,000. Your committee—and I am being just as honest with you as a human being can be—anticipated a similar move on the floor and in order to protect the committee and do it in a more or less orderly fashion we came up with the idea that perhaps under the circumstances a cut of 25,000 more would be in order and therefore we brought in that recommendation to you, and you were kind enough to vote for a rule, for which we are very grateful. But, after all, if the Chief Executive does not want to start a single house, and we were to leave him that authority for 135,000 houses, he would not have to start one. I do not know what his plans will be even if we cut the authorization down to 50,000. Certainly 5,000 units are too few. I hope the committee will consider its action carefully. I do not have any ax to grind either way, but I ask you to weigh the question carefully and go along with the committee. We think we have done a fine job in reducing it as presented by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 110, noes 41.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administrative expenses: For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, $9,540,000, to be merged with and expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title IV of this act.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 26, line 16, strike out "$9,540,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the House action, and in order to make the appropriations for administrative expenses consistent, the committee wishes to reduce the administrative expenses from $9,540,000 to $5,000,000. We think that is consistent with the action of the House.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In view of the previous action of the House, that is necessary and acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

General expenses: For expenses necessary in performing the functions vested by law in the Commission (49 U. S. C. 1–24, 301–327, 901–923, 1001–1022), except those otherwise specifically provided for in this act, and for general administration, including not to exceed $5,000 for the employment of special counsel; contract stenographic reporting services; newspapers (not to exceed $200); and purchase of 19 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $9,069,870: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COTTON: On page 27, line 7, strike out "$9,069,870" and insert "$8,569,870."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the money apportioned to the Interstate Commerce Commission for use in their so-called motor carriers' highway safety program. They came before our subcommittee asking for an increase in personnel and in appropriations. One of the main features upon which they base their request for an increase is their so-called safety program in the motor carriers division. The committee reduced that 15 percent, but it still left a substantial increase.

By their own evidence there are 172,000 carriers under their jurisdiction. They are at the present time inspecting only about 22,000 of these, and only one-sixth of this number each year. This increase by their own evidence would enable them to reach only a few more. It would require an army of Federal operatives to really police the highways. This department duplicates the work of the State police in many States of the Union. In spite of the attractiveness of the term "safety program," if there is anything to this theory that we should suspend nonessential activities during this emergency, there is no sense in giving them that additional money for 1951–52 to increase an activity which will not reach any appreciable number and which duplicates the work of the States.

Therefore, I offer this amendment to reduce that amount during this emergency.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, yesterday when I spoke on the floor, I said an amendment would be offered to test the theory that we face a need for economy and that one of the best ways to do would be to strike out not 10 percent in a budget request, but to take out of any agency a function which is a complete duplication of something done by the States or by another agency of Government. This is the amendment to which I referred, and the details supporting it will be found on pages 290 and 291 of the hearings. I hope the amendment will carry.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat hesitant to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire. He served on the committee and has worked as hard if not harder than any man on the committee. This is the first time we have had the pleasure of his attendance on this subcommittee, even though he has been a Member of the House a number of years. He has brought much balance to the committee and a lot of good, common sense. However, I hope he does not push his amendment too hard.

Let me explain the facts to you. In the first place, this is a lump-sum appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission. There is no agency in the Government that has been cut as severely in proportion during the last 3 years as the Interstate Commerce Commission has been cut. They have fewer people now than they had 15 or 20 years ago. They have four or five big divisions there. They have these evaluation sections. They have the ratemaking sections. We have virtually eliminated them, because they were just studying and studying and studying. Here is one of the big divisions—the Division of Motor Carriers. Last year they only had 753 employees and this year they only ask for 743. Lo and behold we cut them 15 percent under that. That gives them less employees than they have had in the last 10 or 15 years or longer, and even perhaps since the division was organized.

For instance, here is the Division of Certification and the Division of Complaints and the Legal and Enforcement Division and the Safety Division. Here is the Division of Certification where they have a backlog of 6 months' work. It has now reached the point where if a motor carrier in your district wants to extend his certificate or get it changed in the slightest degree he has to wait from 6 to 7 and maybe even 8 months to get it done. That backlog concerns the operating people. That is the thing that our people in our districts are concerned with. When a man has filed an application here to extend his license he has to wait maybe 8 or 9 months. I think my good friend the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is on the right track as he usually is. The Federal Government cannot patrol the highways in New Hampshire, Texas, Louisiana, and California, and all the other States. If we tried that we would have to have 5,000 employees. The committee took the position that that is State business rather than the business of the Federal Government. So what did we do? On this item of inspection we cut them $315,000. That is the cut we made on this one item alone. We can go too far with this Commission and we will hurt them badly. After all, motor transportation is a very vital part of our transportation system. I agree with the gentleman from New Hampshire that we cannot police the highways. The Fed-

eral Government cannot do that and they should not do it. We really gave them a good cut and the probabilities are that we will give them another this year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly for a question?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], it goes only to two items, the one for $157,000 marked "Safety," the one for $1,800,000, the field employees. It does not go to some of those the gentleman fears might be touched. It makes only $2,000,000. So he is only cutting that amount less than 25 percent.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman knows as well as I that this is a lump-sum appropriation in which you do not earmark where the money would be expended but merely rely upon the good judgment of the commissioners to apply the cut in those instances where in their judgment it will hurt least.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired, all time under the agreement has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 87, noes 81.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and equipment: For construction and equipment at laboratories and research stations of the committee, to remain available until expended, $18,350,000, of which $11,700,000 shall be available for payments under contracts entered into pursuant to the contract authority heretofore granted under this head.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS as a committee amendment: Page 29, strike out lines 11 through 16 and insert the following:

"Construction and equipment: For construction and equipment at laboratories and research stations of the committee, to remain available until expended $11,700,000, which shall be available for payments under contracts entered into pursuant to the contract authority heretofore granted under this head."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the Committee offers that amendment at the suggestion of the Committee on the Armed Services. Heretofore the Committee has urged that grand committee to take over NACA and legislate for them. For 20 years that job has been more or less forced upon the Committee on Appropriations. This year they wanted considerable construction. You know we cut the request for new projects exactly 50 percent. The Armed Services Committee suggested that we strike out $6,650,000 more and therefore that is the amendment I have offered. It reduces the appropriation by $6,500,000.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I might say for the benefit of the membership that this authorization will come to the floor of the House at some future time.

Mr. THOMAS. I might say to my distinguished friend from North Carolina as well as to our distinguished friend from Georgia that if they are going to take this up I hope they do not cut the ground out from under us and bring an authorization in here within 30 days.

Mr. DURHAM. Speaking of the $6,000,000 unauthorized, we expect to authorize at least a reasonable sum for them that they can justify. Certainly we are not going to authorize anything they cannot justify.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Committee amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution: For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts; for the administration, and for the construction and maintenance, of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, Canal Zone, under the provisions of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration of a national air museum as authorized by the act of August 12, 1946 (20 U. S. C. 77); including not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; $2,391,200.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 32, line 8, strike out "$12,391,200" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "including $100,000 for extended studies on solar radiation to include determination of the practicability of utilizing solar energy for the production of power, $2,491,200."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would provide funds for the Smithsonian Institution to construct a pilot plant to demonstrate what can be done with this process of generating electricity from sun heat, which has been developed by Dr. C. G. Abbot and his associates in the Smithsonian Institution. It is now being seized upon by Russia, and also by Argentina, in their efforts to take the lead in what may prove to be one of the greatest developments of its kind the world has ever known.

I inserted Dr. Abbot's statement in the Appendix of the RECORD on April 9, at page A1898, in which he said that in the arid areas of Arizona, New Mexico, California, and Nevada, they could generate trillions of horsepower of electrical energy. Dr. Abbot told me that they could generate, with one mirror 10 feet in diameter, two horsepower of electricity in that arid area, and in other areas throughout the country where they have probably 75 to 90 percent as much clear sunshine as they have there, they could generate probably from 1 to 1½ horsepower with one of those large mirrors. That would mean around three-fourths of a million horsepower or more to a square mile in States such as Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and others in that latitude, to say nothing of the amount that could be produced in other sections of the country.

I call attention to the fact that the other day President Peron, of Argentina, made the statement that in 2 years from today the entire Republic of Argentina would be electrified by a similar process of generating electricity, or, as he expressed it, "with atomic energy, produced by sun heat." He is merely taking the process that has been developed down here in the Smithsonian Institution by Dr. Abbot and his coworkers, and using it for that purpose.

I am informed that Communist Russia is now using this process, and that she is constructing facilities to generate an unlimited amount of electricity in the arid areas of Asia.

I realize that this is the day economy is being demanded; but I am only asking that $100,000 be entrusted to one of the finest agencies of the Government to construct a pilot plant and put on this demonstration. If it is successful, it will mean the turning point in the history of mankind, and will furnish us with a supply of electricity the like of which the world has never known.

I put in the RECORD yesterday, and I hope you will all read it, a statement showing what certain great scientists of the world said about Thomas A. Edison when he was working day in and day out, month in and month out, yes, year in and year out, trying to develop the electric light, the incandescent lamp. One of them called it "ignis fatuus," another called it "airy ignorance," another referred to Edison's ideas as "American hoaxes" and said it would be "hopeless" to try to divide it into small units, even if he could produce it. When one of them made one of these critical statements, which was published all over the world, Edison had already put on his demonstration by illuminating the first large building in New York. Today, through the efforts of that great man, this old earth has been so illuminated as to mock the starry splendor of the skies. He brought the dawn of a new civilization, the electric age.

Now, these scientists, such as Dr. Abbot, are going one step further and developing a process of generating electricity with sun heat, which, if successful, will mean more to the progress of the world than anything else of its kind that has ever been proposed.

All I am asking is that we provide this small amount to conduct this demonstration, in order that we may not sit idly by and let other countries, such as

Russia, or Argentina, take the advantage of what our scientists have developed and take the lead in the onward march of progress. This is an American program, and I trust there will be no opposition to the amendment.

I realize this is a new proposition, and that many of you feel that it should be referred to a committee for thorough investigation before any money is appropriated for this purpose. But time is running out, and other countries are threatening to take the lead.

If the House does not adopt this amendment, I expect to introduce a bill to push this program to the fullest extent and get referred to the proper committee for immediate consideration.

My purpose in offering this amendment at this time to increase the Smithsonian's 1952 appropriation by $100,000 is to permit this famous scientific institution to extend its studies of solar radiation to include this test to determine the feasibility of utilizing solar energy for the production of electric power.

The sun supplies to the dry southwestern areas of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and California alone, many thousands of times as much heat energy as is now used for all purposes in the whole United States, to say nothing of the amount it supplies to the rest of the country. The utilization of only a small portion of this energy would add an almost unlimited primary national resource to the wealth of the Nation. It is of supreme importance to explore the possibilities of converting into useful work this inexhaustible supply of solar energy. Dr. Abbot, retired Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and his associates have devoted much time to this subject. Using the experience of Dr. Abbot, and others, as a beginning, it is proposed, through the use of a pilot plant, designed in conformity with the best engineering advice, to determine what success can be achieved in directly producing electric power with heat from the sun.

As I pointed out, it is reported that this problem is already being developed in Soviet Russia, and in the Argentine. I look for Australia to be using it soon to enrich the arid areas of that great country. It should no longer be neglected in this country. The sun is our greatest source of power. All heat comes from the sun. When we burn coal, wood, oil, or other fuel, we merely release the heat stored there by the sun in the years gone by or in the ages past.

Sunlight costs nothing, and no specific danger attends its use. Every possibility of extending its utilization must be explored. The expenditure of this comparatively small sum of money can well be the beginning of a new era in the United States, and throughout the world.

We cannot afford to wait.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending amendment and the entire section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS.]

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we cannot fall out with our distinguished friend from Mississippi for offering this amendment. He is forward looking, no question about that. What the possibilities hold in this field I do not know.

But here are the facts, and certainly the facts do not warrant an additional hundred thousand dollars on it this year. For 60 long years—think about that, 60 long years—the Smithsonian Institution has been doing this work. They have two laboratories, one in Chile and one on Table Mountain in California, and they sought $75,000 for a third laboratory in the 1952 estimates. The gentleman wants us to kick that $75,000 up to $100,000 which the committee denied.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Those laboratories the gentleman refers to are not what I am referring to here. This is the process of generating electricity with sun heat under the program developed by Dr. C. B. Abbot. I have talked to the head of the Smithsonian Institution about these other laboratories, but they are absolutely separate and distinct entirely.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, they never presented any budget estimate; they did not make any justification for it; they did not make any request for it. All they want to do is to continue the work they have been doing for 60 long years.

And, much to my surprise, when we went into it in great detail last year, we found from a practical layman's point of view there was nothing that we could put our hands on of any great value. Of course, the Department of Agriculture does some similar work. The Smithsonian Institution's justification is predicated on two points—one, the measurement of the intensity of the sun's radiation to determine variations in the solar constant. Now, they have been working on that for 60 years, and we hope they will come up with an answer soon. We wanted to know when they would finish that experimentation and we could not get anything definite from them. Then there is the investigation of the effects of various types of radiation on the growth and development of plants, and I expect the Department of Agriculture spends a lot of money on that, too. This year we have given 18 jobs to those fine scientists. They are fine men—good scientists. Some of them have been working on it for about 35 years. The administrative cost alone for the program is $102,000. I hope that the committee will reject the amendment and perhaps next year, if they want to go into this field, if they will come in and make a good statement, we will probably be able to do something for them. We are pretty scientific-minded, too, just like the gentleman from Mississippi, and if they will come up with a program and lay it on the line, it is possible we will recommend, along with the gentleman from Mississippi, that it be granted.

Mr. RANKIN. A year from now Peron of Argentina can show you that he has already demonstrated just what these people are asking permission to demonstrate for us and what Russia is getting ready to do in Asia.

Mr. THOMAS. They have been working on it for 60 years. We are providing in this bill nearly $1,200,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission and they are perhaps working on these projects also. They have about 15 or 18 laboratories scattered throughout the country.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman confuses this with the other laboratory experiments that they have been making in California. This is entirely different.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Subversive Activities Control Board, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, $235,000.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: On page 33, strike out lines 7 through 12.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this Subversive Activities Control Board is chairmanned by a man by the name of Seth Richardson. Mr. Richardson was Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board for nearly 4 years and it was under his chairmanship that we were unable to get rid of some of the Communists in Government. The reason we could not get rid of them was principally because of the standards set up by the President in his directive of March 21, 1947, which reads as follows:

> The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States.

It was on that little word "is" that the Loyalty Review Board reversed the loyalty agency in the Department of Commerce on William Remington and in cases of many other agencies of Government. All during his 4 years of service as Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board he did nothing whatever to have the President's Executive order amended so that the Loyalty Review Board could be effective. But, I am happy to report to the House, that under the new Chairman, Mr. Hiram Bingham, who immediately saw the difficulty of operating under that directive, at the first meeting of the Loyalty Review Board after he took office, offered a resolution that was passed asking that the standard be amended to read as follows:

> The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, there is reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the person involved to the Government of the United States.

He sent the resolution adopted by the Loyalty Review Board to Mr. Robert Ramspeck, the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Ramspeck served many years with distinction and honor as a Member of the House of Representatives, and is a man whom we all respect for his service and integrity. Mr. Ramspeck in turn sent the resolution to the White House with his endorsement and recommendation. Last week the President approved their request and put it into effect.

If Mr. Richardson, who had been Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board for nearly 4 years, and who has recently been appointed by the President to the chairmanship of the Subversive Activities Control Board, had been as diligent as Mr. Bingham, he could have had this amendment adopted. Evidently he did not see fit to do that. Because by his record, Mr. Richardson was responsible for not only being a party to keeping these subversives in Government, but blindly adhering to the language of President Truman's standard, he was what we commonly refer to as "kicked upstairs," to be made Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I am also sorry to report that one of the other members the President appointed to this Board is a former Member of this House. He served in the Seventy-eighth Congress, in which many of us served. He is Mr. Charles LaFollette, of Indiana. I am sorry to have to admit that he ran on the Republican ticket. He seldom, if ever, voted with the Republicans. Mr. La Follette opposed the House Committee on Un-American Activities in every possible way he could. He voted against making it a standing committee. He voted against every penny of appropriations for it.

I have checked the voting record of Mr. La Follette during the time he served in the House of Representatives with that of former Representative Vito Marcantonio, of New York. Mr. Marcantonio was long recognized as the spokesman for the Communist Party in the United States Congress. It was no surprise to me to find how closely the voting records of these two men paralleled each other. Mr. La Follette's record completely disqualifies him for service on any board that is supposed to fight communism, let alone the Subversive Activities Control Board. It looks to me as though the President, in another of his moods, thought he would appoint the least qualified people he could find to serve as members of the new Board. I say this because he opposed the McCarran Act which set up this Board and the Congress passed it over his veto. If this was the case he certainly succeeded.

My object in offering this amendment today to strike out the entire appropriation for this Board is very simple. I do not think we as loyal Americans should appropriate one cent toward the Subversive Activities Control Board until the President is willing to appoint men who can be confirmed by the Senate, men who have a record of loyalty to our Government in ridding it of subversives. Certainly none of the men on this Board at the present time have any record to their credit along that line. The Senate would be justified in refusing to confirm the members of the Subversive Activities Control Board as it is now constituted. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I think this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I hope my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, will withdraw this amendment. It is really dangerous. I do not know whether you like the chairman of the Board or not, but in my book Seth Richardson is doing an outstanding job. He is a patriotic American. In my book he is good.

Do you know what he is doing? He is trying the entire Communist Party now. If he gets a favorable decision, of course he will have to start with the district courts, then he will have to go to the appellate courts, and then the Communists will take him to the Supreme Court. If he wins that, then each one of the little parent organizations and everyone who is a member of the Communist Party will have to come in and be subject to trial or explanation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am sure the gentleman, my good friend from Texas, realizes that neither Mr. Seth Richardson nor any other member of this Board has yet been approved by the Senate. It is very doubtful if any of them ever will be approved by the Senate. If I had to pass on it, I would say they will not be approved by the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. That is not our prerogative, and if it were my prerogative I would approve Seth Richardson. He is a good man, in my book. When a man goes down the line to fight the Communist Party from the lowest courts to the highest court, and does a good job, make no mistake about it, he is a pretty able trial lawyer. He wanted $620,000; and, frankly, I do not know of a man who came before that subcommittee with any more frankness and honesty. He said, "Gentlemen, if they knock me out of court I will not need this money, but if I stay in court I have to have more." We said, "You certainly ought to know that in a few months and we will give you $235,000." So we cut his appropriation by 65 percent. Let us not hamstring this prosecution of the Communist Party. I know the gentleman does not want to do that. The duty is his by act of Congress, and the chances if the gentleman were here at that time he would have voted for it. I know you would not have voted against it if you had been here. I forget what the vote was in the House, but if you will look up the record, I will bet that there are very few Members sitting here who voted against that act. And that is what the gentleman is doing here.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think you will agree that there has been no Member of this House who has fought communism harder over the years than I have.

Mr. THOMAS. And the gentleman is to be commended and we are all agreed on that.

Mr. BUSBEY. Further, I am sure the gentleman realizes that this Board at the present time is inoperative. They are not going to be able to do anything at all until they get confirmed.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is in error about that. Let us not give the Communists another 6 or 7 months' lease on life by striking out this appropriation, because you will just be wiping out the Board. How are those people going to work over there. They are filing briefs every day. You will be proud of them, I think. They are going to do a good job.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the member to which our good friend the gentleman from Illinois alluded cooperating with Mr. Richardson, the Chairman, in bringing about the desired end that you have mentioned?

Mr. THOMAS. To be perfectly frank about it, the only member of that Board who appeared before our committee the three times that they have been there is Mr. Richardson. He did not say anything about any lack of cooperation and we naturally assumed that he was getting it. I am being frank in making a complete disclosure to you.

Mr. DONDERO. I confess to the gentleman from Texas that it makes it very difficult for anybody to vote against the gentleman's amendment if the chairman of that committee is trying to put an end to the Communist Party in this country.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think there is any doubt about that, I will say to my good friend the gentleman from Michigan. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw his amendment because I know he does not want to do anything that is going to help the Communists because he has fought them too long and too hard.

Mr. BUSBEY. I certainly do not, and I want the President to appoint some people to this Board who have an interest in fighting the Communists. This Board does not have any interest in fighting the Communists and nobody can prove that they do.

Mr. THOMAS. I am going to disagree with the gentleman. I think the members of the subcommittee will tell you that Mr. Richardson is doing a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including purchase (not to exceed two) and hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft; the purchase (not to exceed 190, of which 164 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $236,139,600 to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 34, line 8, strike out "$236,139,600" and insert "$224,139,600."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? And I hope this will not be taken out of his time, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this entire subject matter and all debate on the amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman agree to 15 minutes?

Mr COUDERT. I object at this time to any limitation of time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman agree to 15 minutes outside of his 5 minutes? We have to limit this some time and we might as well try to come to an agreement now.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for the genial and very persuasive gentleman from Texas, but at the same time I hope he will bear with me and perhaps when I am through I may persuade him to accept my amendment and the gentleman from Tennessee; who knows?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment for the simple reason that if you must have sacred cows, at least there should be a measure of equality of treatment; democracy should be practiced, so to speak, amongst the sacred cows themselves.

This amendment would further reduce the appropriation request of the Tennessee Valley Authority by $12,000,000. The initial request was $248,000,000; corporate funds are some $108,000,000, making a total of $358,000,000 to be available to TVA for 1952.

The committee reduced the new appropriation request to the very limited tune of five measly percentage points, to wit, $12,000,000 on $248,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, this House had before it the other day the Interior bill, which carried a substantial number of items relating to power development and transmission; and, if my memory serves me correctly, the net result of the action of the House was to cut down the requested appropriations for power in the Interior bill by 15 to 17 percent; and yet this bill stands here before you with a measly cut of five insignificant percentage points.

Let us take another sacred cow; in our independent offices bill the committee had before it the Atomic Energy Commission. Surely there is no more sacred cow than that, and yet this committee and the Committee of the Whole has always passed on it and accepted it, cut the new money request of the Atomic Energy Commission by nearly 9 percent, almost twice what the subcommittee offered to the House, or the Committee of the Whole on TVA.

I have simply sought by this amendment to double the cut, to make it 10 percent. Bear in mind that you will be begged to beat this amendment on the ground of defense, that TVA needs all this new power in the next 2 or 3 years for defense and defense only. There are two answers to that: First, even accepting the figures of the TVA Commissioners, the total power to be used in 1954 by Federal agencies is not over 33 percent and for the great industrial corporations it is some thirty-odd percent, leaving a balance of some 30 or 40 percent for normal use of the residents of the district. That leaves a cushion, assuming the very worst that happens and a greatly expanded need for defense, there is still a 40 percent cushion to fall back on.

No. 2: With great difficulty we got from the witnesses at the hearing a Federal Power Commission estimate of what the power situation would be in the entire Southeast early in 1954 based upon projected plants, further power construction and development; and there, if you will look at page 618 of the record, I believe it is, you will see the statement wherein the Federal Power Commission says that in 1954, including all the various systems with which the TVA system is connected, the combined reserve may be as much as 15 percent. That means that if the Power Commission's estimate is sound and all of this construction work is completed there will still be a margin of unneeded power of 15 percent.

Mr. Chairman, can there be any doubt that the TVA can take this further additional reduction consistent with the reductions imposed upon the other Federal public power projects and upon the Atomic Energy Commission itself?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope this is not taken out of the gentleman's time but I would like to see if we can reach an agreement on limiting debate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that excluding the time of the gentlemen from Tennessee, all debate on this amendment, this section, and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York, for whom I have the highest regard, makes a persuasive argument; however, there are certain facts to which I think the House is entitled before reaching a decision on this amendment.

He asks why TVA should not be cut by a percentage similar to that applied to the Atomic Energy Commission. There is a very, very good reason. The Atomic Energy Commission comes in with a request for two very large new plants and other small installations for which they do not even have the blueprints. Their estimate could be no more than a guess. On the other hand, the TVA comes in with a very large construction program already under way.

Bear in mind that the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] made the statement in the well of the House today that TVA was as much a national defense agency as the military agencies.

Two of these large TVA power plants now under way were requested by the Atomic Energy Commission, and do not forget that you can build a factory or plant much quicker than you can build a power-producing project. A third plant is to be built largely for the Air Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, a very large project.

Let me give you this figure, which will open your eyes, and I am talking to this side of the aisle because I know if all of you vote for this amendment it will be adopted; you have a majority here this afternoon. But you would be taking on a very serious responsibility in doing so because 98.2 percent of the TVA budget this year is for power facilities directly and immediately connected with the national defense. Of the $248,000,000 requested, to which the gentleman from New York referred, $241,000,000 are for power facilities, for chemicals, for atomic energy, for air development and for ammunition and arsenals. We—that is, our subcommittee—made a reduction of $12,000,000, to which I gave my consent, not willingly but in reaching an agreement within the committee. I think that is all we can possibly afford to do. Now, the gentleman proposes that we cut an additional $12,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, how can you cut $24,000,000 out of the building of dams and steam plants when construction costs are going up and up and up all the time?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In the report is this line:

The $248,000,000 to be used primarily for the acquisition of assets.

Will the gentleman explain what that includes?

Mr. GORE. That is a term commonly used in accounting, whether in private or public business, where you use money to build additional plants.

Mr. DONDERO. Does it mean buying out plants held by private companies?

Mr. GORE. Oh, no; 98.2 percent of this is for power facilities. It is not for buying surrounding utilities at all. This is for the construction of dams, for the installation of hydroelectric units in existing dams, for the construction of a steam plant for Oak Ridge, and for

Paducah, Ky., where an atomic energy plan is now being rushed to completion. The Atomic Energy Commission came before us requesting this of TVA. They said to us they were far more confident of building the atomic energy plant on time than they were of getting power on time. They went to the private power industry and finally persuaded the power industry to build a plant to furnish one-half of the electrical energy needed there. But they had to turn to TVA, they had to turn to this Congress, to provide the other half.

You are taking on serious responsibility in making an unreasonable cut.

I have served with the gentleman from Iowa on this committee. He knows I have not held back in making whatever cuts this agency might reasonably stand. He knows also that this committee under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas is as strong for economy as any committee of this Congress. As a matter of fact, last year we made by far the greatest cut that was made by any subcommittee and we will have that record this time. But we do undertake to be reasonable and recognize, too, the necessities of national life.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

(Mr. REECE of Tennessee and Mr. SUTTON asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. BAKER.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the action of my colleagues from Tennessee in yielding additional time to me. I am a Republican. I represent a district which has never sent a Democrat to Congress, although it came too close to it the last time to suit me.

The great portion of the original TVA is in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say this to the gentleman from Tennessee that his distinguished predecessor, Hon. J. Will Taylor, who represented the district the gentleman now represents, was the only member from Tennessee who voted with me on the Norris-Rankin bill to create the Tennessee Valley Authority the first time it came before the House.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman. The people of east Tennessee know of the great service rendered by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I wish to say that the gentleman is quite in error in referring to the gentleman's immediate predecessor. There has been no Representative from that district in Tennessee more able or more distinguished than is my colleague from the second district, and the second district has never had a greater champion of the TVA than has my colleague.

Mr. RANKIN. I was paying a tribute to his distinguished predecessor.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I voted for the establishment of the Tennesee Valley Authority.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman. This is not an argument between public power and private power. The only power we have in Tennessee is TVA power, and I am telling you we are out of electric energy; I know what I am talking about. I am not only an attorney with considerable background and experience but I am connected with various businesses, including coal and timber. I know that you cannot start an industry today in east Tennessee that requires electric energy because of Oak Ridge and Alcoa. Those big plants which won World War II consume all the TVA power. Oak Ridge is in the district that I represent and so is Alcoa, the plant of the great Aluminum Co. of America. Every Member of this House knows, certainly, that without aluminum we could not have won the war and that we cannot win this one without it, and we are placing our hopes and prayers that the atomic bomb being produced at Oak Ridge with TVA electricity will prevent, as it is preventing now, Red Russia from attacking the mainland of the United States of America.

There is no doubt in my mind that the only deterring influence to Joe Stalin is the atom bomb being made in the district I represent and in the great Northwest. I give you my word to the best of my knowledge as a new Member of this House that they are out of electricity down there. That is right. It is all contracted for. They have to go out and build steam plants and dams to carry out the great war effort being made in the Second District and in our great southland and throughout Tennessee.

The board of directors and personnel of the TVA are high-class men. They are career men. I am saying this though I doubt that 1 percent of them voted for me. I doubt it seriously.

I beg and plead with my friends on this side of the aisle not to just reach in and grab $12,000,000 out of here. It has already been reduced $12,000,000. You do not know what that twelve million may do. It may result in causing world war III to start much, much quicker. I feel that from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Originally there were some frills in the TVA. Those frills have now been eliminated, and TVA has become an efficient, businesslike organization that is operating to accomplish the purposes the gentleman from Tennessee has so ably described.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman. There is no doubt in my mind that TVA is being properly and efficiently administered. As I said a while ago, these men are career men. The dams are all around where I live, and the steam plants. The finest way in the world and the cheapest way to make electricity is combination hydroelectric and coal-consuming steam plants. A great deal of this money is to go to the coal-consuming steam plants, one of which, as I understand from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] was not even requested by the TVA, which is the steam plant to produce electric energy at the great atomic bomb plant at Paducah, Ky.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, may I first emphasize what the gentleman from Tennessee has just stated, that this is not a controversy between private and public power. The question presented by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is whether or not the Tennessee Valley Authority can go about their construction work without impairment.

To construct an electric plant requires planning, years of planning. For instance, the construction of the generating facilities themselves requires from 2 to 3 years.

On February 12 of this year the Administrator of the Defense Power Administration reported on a survey of the United States to determine whether or not there was adequate electric energy available to this country. In an enclosure in a letter of that date to Mr. Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the National Production Authority, Mr. McManus, the Administrator of the Defense Power Administration, and former president of the Georgia Power Co., had this to say:

> The serious and dangerous condition being faced during 1952, when numerous large defense establishments are expected to come into operation, is indicated in the attached table summarizing the load-capacity balance in the major power systems of the various regions of the country from June 1951 to December 1953.

He then lists critical areas where there is power shortages.

In that category he lists the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, in the very limited time available on this amendment, I cannot hope to do more than to further emphasize some of the points presented by those who have preceded me. I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I would like further to emphasize the fact that the question of public or private power is not presented for consideration here. That issue was decided years ago. The only power facilities in that entire area now are those provided by the Tennessee Valley Authority. I submit the important question to be considered today on the amendment now pending is that of national defense. Ninety-eight percent of all the funds provided under this budget estimate for the Tennessee Valley Authority is for national defense. Bear in mind it takes about 3 years to provide these vital and necessary facilities. The great atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., needs this additional power and the new atomic energy plant at Paducah, Ky., which is just across the Tennessee-Kentucky line and very close to the district which I have the honor to represent, needs this power. The Atomic

Energy Commission was the one that requested this power to be provided. The entire amount provided in this bill is vitally necessary for national defense, and the pending amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish there were no prejudice injected into this debate. I regret that the private power interests seem to insist upon amendments being offered at this particular time, or at any time against TVA.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. No, I will not yield. Ever since I have been here, since the Eightieth Congress, the gentleman from New York, who has sponsored this amendment to cripple the TVA has continued to fight the TVA time and time again and at every opportunity. Yet we know that it was a Republican, the late Wendell Willkie, who went down there and sold out the Commonwealth and Southern Utilities to the Government. Since that time, only the Government in that section owns and operates power-production facilities. It is necessary in our section, in order to have sufficient light and power to grow and to make normal progress, to look to the Federal Government—the only source of electric power there. As has already been mentioned, we know of the great Air Engineering and Development Center located in my district. This great research center has only been established there for a short time. Wind tunnels are being built there, and airplanes of hypersonic speeds, that is planes that go faster than even supersonic speeds, are being tested there. Such research and development requires more and more power. In this instance, TVA power is most definitely for national defense. The care for power for Oak Ridge has been made so, in the limited time, I will not go into that feature of the TVA.

But may I say further, that the presence in the Tennessee Valley region of the great Alcoa plant—the largest aluminum plant in the world—is also not just a happy coincidence. That plant—which is producing the aluminum for our aircraft and for other vital instruments of defense—was put there because of the abundance of water power so magnificently harnessed by the TVA.

It is my sincere and earnest hope that we will prevent the curtailing of one of our major defense projects and the TVA. I ask that we do this in the same spirit and for the same reason that I have many times in the past spoke for and supported the building up of our defenses into a more impregnable fortress—for giving our Air Force the planes it needs and requires—for giving the Army the tanks and guns it needs—for giving our Navy the ships and planes it needs. There is no difference—I could not vote to cut our Air Force in face of the present threat. I cannot fail to raise my voice against an effort to curtail and hamstring and inhibit the TVA at this time.

As I have indicated, we are not emphasizing at this time the great consumption of power for private industry or for rural electrification and for the people on the farms. Those who live in the TVA section of the country and those who visit there know the great progress which we are making.

The TVA—through all of its years of highly successfull operation and through all of the years during which bitter opposition has failed to prevent its normal and natural expansion—has been one of the greatest examples in our history of a definite husbanding of the resources of our great country. Certainly, such an effort is economy in the truest sense of the word.

To think of preventing the further husbanding of the vast resources of water power which lie within the Tennessee Valley would be not only false economy but downright destructiveness.

I am bitterly opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I trust that all Representatives will rise up and vote the amendment down—and I most certainly, in the strongest voice I possess, urge such action in the interest of our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, the Tennessee Valley Authority is a very important Government agency to all of the Southeast, and I might say for the purpose of national defense there is no more important agency existing in our country. I might say that advisedly because it is furnishing the electric power to carry on the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge. It is furnishing the electric power to carry on the work of the great aluminum company at Alcoa. That company, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] said, furnished a great portion of the aluminum used in the construction of our airplanes during the last war. Every manufacturing plant in east Tennessee, and almost all throughout the South, receives its power from this great agency. It is doing a tremendous work. In my own district during the last war some 25 or 30 great manufacturing plants converted their facilities in order to manufacture materials for the national defense. We are now making guns at Chattanooga, and the electric energy which is used to construct those guns comes from the TVA. I sincerely hope that you gentlemen in your discretion will vote down this amendment which will curtail the efforts of this great agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time for the purpose of using it if necessary for any questions which might have come up. Before doing that, I want to make a brief statement.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot be accused of emotionalism. I have been friendly to TVA. We are talking about the money needed to be spent by this agency between July 1 of this year and June 30 of next year.

Some people would have us believe that this was figured so carefully and with so sharp a pencil that 5 percent would throw it out of balance, that plants were going to be constructed at such time and progress so accurately on schedule that they will be finished on time. I cannot believe that. There is more than this amount of money in the budget for fertilizer sales alone. There is approximately half this amount of money in there for little things like dredging, and for a chemical plant.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am going to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] first by previous agreement. With that statement on my part I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the thing that gets me is that they say this is always brought up with prejudice. I bring things up only on their merits, and I do not believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] does it in any other way.

Let me analyze a couple of things here. Instead of the Federal agencies using 98 percent of the power, the justifications in the hearings established that they used 33.2 percent; municipalities and cooperatives used 38 percent, and industrial users 28. On top of that, to show you what a serious situation there is down there, I have in front of me on page 618 of the hearings where Mr. Clapp, the manager of the outfit says the surplus in that territory will be 15 percent.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield. Does the gentleman mean that Mr. Clapp was not right in his statement on page 618?

Mr. WHITTEN. I merely wanted to ask the question of the gentleman whether or not costs of operations in private enterprise have not increased instead of decreased?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if I can add anything to what has been said. This agency has been authorized for a good many years; it is not a question of whether you like it or whether you do not like it; that period was passed long ago. Now we are putting many national defense plants in that area. Here is a big plant over in Paducah. When you get through with it there is no telling what it will cost you, perhaps a billion dollars. There is the one in South Carolina, but that is a little out of range. There is no telling what that one will cost, but look at the situation over here at Tullahoma. They are putting in an installation there that will cost about $158 million. You must supply these installations with power, and there is not enough power there now to do the job; that is the important thing.

We had better give them this money. Construction costs are not going down; they are going up. Now is not the time to disturb things. What has been done in the past has been done; whether you like it or not it is a fact; and whether you like it or not it is too late to change the location of those plants. This body was not asked its opinion on where to locate them; they did not have any say-

so in that. Some experts did it, and they came to the conclusion that these were the best and most economical spots in the country to build these plants. We must have power, and you know you cannot operate them without power, and you know that you have not the power there now. These estimates were made 4, or 5—maybe 3 months ago. The probabilities are that you do not have enough money in the bill as it is to do the job that will have to be done before you get through with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired under the agreement.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 71, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For necessary expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, in carrying out the functions pursuant to all laws for which the Administration is charged with admistering, including purchase of 74 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); maintenance and operation of farms; recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained by the Veterans' Administration; expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration except burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended; aid to State or Territorial homes in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888, as amended (24 U. S. C. 134), for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitals or domiciliary care; not to exceed $6,000 for newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $45,300 for the preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educational information and descriptive material, including the purchase or rental of equipment; $875,163,335, of which $656,518,760 shall be available only for medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, and from which allotments and transfers may be made to the Federal Security Agency (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of 70 persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home, or for the purchase of any hospital or home; and not more than $6,888,000 of this appropriation may be used to repair, alter, improve, or provide facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and the purchase of materials.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and the other members of the committee for authorizing the payment of $800,000 for prosthetic research. If the Members will attend an exhibition in the Caucus Room on the 10th of May they will learn that no money has ever been expended for a better purpose. These boys have a much better chance of getting around with this assistance.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and I introduced the original bill. I know how much interest he has in this matter. He has done great service to disabled veterans and also civilians. I inserted in the RECORD of yesterday, page 4838, a résumé of the situation insofar as veterans need of hospitalization and hospital beds are concerned. I hope the Members will read that because it will be very enlightening.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentlewoman has a great heart and is very persuasive when it comes to promoting the welfare of wounded veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman and also the whole committee. I know of their deep interest in the veterans.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. They have done a tremendously fine job for veterans and every Member of the House is deeply indebted to them. We appreciate their great work.

(Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on Thursday, May 10, at 10:30, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, there will be a demonstration of new artificial arms and legs. It will be carried out by amputees of the Second World War and the Korean campaign, and all Members of Congress are cordially invited to attend.

This demonstration is particularly interesting to those who have been close to the program for forwarding the development of artificial limbs. Back in 1943 and 1944, when the amputees from the World War II battle fronts began to pour into our hospitals, it became obvious that the artificial arms and legs that were being offered were crude and primitive. The advance since then is nothing short of remarkable. The Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration set out to develop, along scientific lines, improved prostheses, and the results of their labor will be demonstrated on Thursday next.

The demonstration is being held in connection with a conference and symposium on the week of May 7 to 11 by the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs at the National Academy of Science Building here in Washington. It is sponsored by the Advisory Committee on Prosthetics to the Veterans' Administration, of which Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts and I are the congressional members. This advisory committee was created by General Hawley, formerly Surgeon General of the Veterans' Administration, and the chairman is Col. Robert S. Allen, noted commentator and author, who lost an arm while serving on the staff of Gen. George S. Patton in Europe.

The research work is now being carried on by the National Research Council's Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs, headed by Gen. F. S. Strong, Jr. The improvement made in artificial limbs from 1944 until the present time is astonishing and can only be fully measured and appreciated by those who knew the state of the artificial-limb industry prior to that time. I shall discuss this further at a later date.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the veterans' section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines: For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with the act of July 1, 1948 (50 U. S. C. App. 1991-1996), for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, $1,100,000.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we had a demonstration here a few minutes ago that has been a little unusual during the past week. An amendment was offered from the Republican side of the House that did not prevail. I do not remember any other amendment being offered by the Republicans in the last 2 weeks that failed of passage.

I also noticed, Mr. Chairman, that the Democratic Members of the House this afternoon all voted against the amendment to strike some money from the funds of the TVA. I also noticed, Mr. Chairman, that two Members from Tennessee in the Republican Party voted against the amendment, but on every other amendment that has been offered in the past week or two they voted to cut the funds. However, they changed their minds when it came to TVA. I want the Members to realize some of these facts. I think it is important. Now TVA does not mean anything to me in Pittsburgh. I have an area that is very much interested in coal development and some people from the coal areas are a little timid about voting for electrical development and electric power. But I think it is for the good of the country to vote for TVA and that is why I did it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will recall, perhaps, if he was on the floor earlier this afternoon, that I offered an amendment to cut the appropriation for the President, and received only one Democratic vote from the north, south, east, and west.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is exactly what I am saying. The Democrats here believe in wisely spending money.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. In furtherance of what the gentleman has said, I think he will find that every Democratic Member of the House from the north voted to defeat the TVA amendment as well.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is the point I wanted to make, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois. Even though it sometimes happens they may be criticized a little bit, they believe in voting what is for the best interest of the country as a whole, and that is the reason the northern and eastern Democrats voted for the TVA.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I claim the privilege of speaking in behalf of the people and the representatives of the people who depend upon TVA, and TVA alone, for their electrical energy, to say "thank you" and thank every Member who supported us in this fight regardless where you come from. TVA is not a partisan matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I want to say that the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GORE, is entitled to a lot of credit for the victory registered this afternoon.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has brought up a moot question on whether we voted as Republicans or Democrats. But, there is one thing I found out in my short term of office down here, that you gentlemen on the Democratic side certainly know how to spend money.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree that we know how to spend it wisely.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to enter into a lengthy discussion of veterans' affairs at this time. I merely want to thank the Members of the House for their support of veterans' legislation we have been able to get before you for passage.

As you know, I have been the chairman of the Veterans' Committee for almost 20 years, and during that time I have seen as much of the aftermath of war as any other man who has ever served in Congress, at least during your day and mine.

We have done our best to take care of the disabled veterans, and at the same time hold down the cost of administration as much as possible. We have just passed a bill which constitutes a milestone in the history of veterans' legislation. That is H. R. 1, known as the Servicemen's Insurance Act of 1951, which has now become law, and provides automatic insurance to the men who die in the service during the present conflict.

In my opinion, it is one of the greatest pieces of veterans' legislation ever passed by Congress.

It gives automatic uniform protection from June 27, 1950, forward to all members of our Armed Forces. This automatic insurance in the amount of $10,000 which is provided to the servicemen without cost to them will save countless millions of dollars in administrative expenses and, in addition, will be a great source of comfort, as well as assistance, to those families who suffer the great misfortune to lose one or more of their loved ones in the Armed Forces during the present conflict.

The Comptroller General has estimated that had this law been in effect during the period 1940 to 1949 something like $578,000,000 would have been saved to the taxpayers of this country, and the veterans would have been better protected.

I am including in my remarks an explanation of this public law, since I am sure that all Members of the Congress are vitally interested in this subject.

The matter referred to follows:

GRATUITOUS INDEMNITY FOR SERVICEMEN (PUBLIC LAW 23, 82D CONG., 1ST SESS. (H. R. 1))

ANALYSIS

1. Provides a free indemnity to survivors of all persons who died in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950, in the amount of $10,000, without cost to service personnel.

2. Protection covers period of active service and periods following call or order to active service or final induction and 120 days after separation from active service.

3. If person is disabled in service to such an extent as to make him uninsurable according to Veterans' Administration standards for a normal NSLI protection he may obtain nonparticipating national service life insurance after separation from service and where the disability is total a waiver of premiums may be granted.

4. Any person in active service having a World War I or II policy may continue it in force or surrender a permanent plan policy for cash and subsequently reinstate it or be granted a new policy on the same plan and in the same amount without a showing of good health after separation from service. Provision is also made for the waiver of the total premium on term policies for individuals in this category and for waiver of the pure insurance risk portion of the premium on permanent policies while the individual is returned to service. Section 12 specifically provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to cancel or restrict in any way rights under insurance contracts issued on or prior to the date of this enactment.

5. Beneficiaries of the indemnity are limited to members of immediate family.

6. Maximum indemnity is payable in monthly installments of $92.90 each over a 10-year period.

7. Indemnity is exempt from claims of creditors and from taxation.

8. Within 120 days after discharge (during which time the veteran is covered by gratuitous indemnity) he may apply for, without medical examination, a national service life insurance 5-year level-premium term policy up to $10,000 which he may maintain as a veteran by the payment of premiums. The premium is based upon the Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality with interest at 2¼ percent per annum. In the future, except as noted in paragraph 4 above, all NSLI policies will be issued on this table. The insurance will be nonparticipating, which means that no dividends will be payable. The only plan on which this insurance will be issued will be the 5-year level-premium term plan. Annuities will be based up the annuity table for 1949 and interest at 2¼ percent per annum.

Premium rates under new national service life insurance per $1,000

Age at issue:	
18	$0.20
19	.21
20	.21
21	.22
22	.23
23	.24
24	.25
25	.26
26	.27
27	.28
28	.29
29	.31
30	.32
31	.34
32	.36
33	.38
34	.40
35	.43
36	.45
37	.48
38	.51
39	.54
40	.58
41	.62
42	.67
43	.71
44	.76
45	.82
46	.88
47	.95
48	1.02
49	1.10
50	1.19
51	1.28
52	1.38
53	1.49
54	1.61
55	1.75
56	1.89
57	2.04
58	2.21
59	2.40
60	2.60
61	2.82
62	3.05
63	3.31
64	3.59
65	3.90
66	4.23
67	4.59
68	4.98
69	5.41
70	5.87

ANALYSIS OF THE ACT BY SECTIONS

Part I. Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951

Section 1 provides that part I may be cited as the "Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951."

Section 2 provides that on and after June 27, 1950, except as otherwise provided, any person in the active service of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including the National Guard under the conditions hereinafter noted, shall be automatically insured, without cost to the person, against death in active service in the amount of $10,000. Also included in this coverage are cadets and midshipment of the United States Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies, and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and Coast and Geodetic Survey while engaged in specified types of duty. In addition, servicemen called for active service for a period exceeding 30 days will be covered after separation from the service for a period of 120 days. This additional protection would not be available to a man who spends a few days each month in active-duty training as a part of some local Reserve unit.

The indemnity applies, as of June 27, 1950, to persons, including volunteers for enlistment and reservists called to active duty,

who were or shall be provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance or for entry upon active duty and who died or shall die as the result of disability incurred while en route to such place and within 120 days after such incurrence. Similar coverage is extended to selectees who, in response to an order to report for induction and after reporting to a local draft board, died or dies as the result of disability incurred while en route from such draft board to a designated induction station and within 120 days after such incurrence. In all such cases, the death shall be deemed to have occurred in active service for the purposes of part I.

Section 3 directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay their indemnity, upon certification of the death by the Secretary of the service department concerned, to the surviving spouse, child or children, parent, brother, or sister. Unless designated otherwise, the term "parent" would include only the mother and father who last bore that relationship to the insured. This limits the beneficiaries to the survivors in the immediate family of the insured. Beneficiaries within these classes may be named by the insured. If the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries do not survive the insured, or if none has been designated, the indemnity is payable to the first eligible class of beneficiaries according to the order set forth above, and in equal shares if the class is composed of more than one person. Any installments not paid to a beneficiary during such beneficiary's lifetime are payable to the named contingent beneficiary, if any; otherwise, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries within the permitted class next entitled to priority. No payments may be made to the estate of any deceased person.

Section 4. The indemnity is payable in equal monthly installments of 120 in number, with interest at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum. This will amount to $92.90 per month for a 10-year period in cases in which the maximum indemnity is payable.

Section 5 limits the total liability of the Government to $10,000 in any case where an indemnified person also has Government insurance in force. Thus, if a man in the service had $5,000 of national service life insurance in force at the time of his death on or after June 27, 1950, the beneficiary would receive $5,000 national service life insurance and $5,000 gratuitous indemnity.

Provision is made that any person in the active service who has national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance on a permanent plan in force may surrender such policy and receive its cash surrender value. Within 120 days after separation from active service, and without medical examination, he may upon written application be granted permanent-type insurance on the same plan but not in excess of the amount surrendered, or he may reinstate such surrendered insurance upon payment of the required reserve and the premium for the current month.

While no rights of reinstatement under existing contracts of insurance will be impaired or denied by reason of enactment of the bill, the National Service Life Insurance Act and regulations issued thereunder provide presently that insurance surrendered for cash may not be reinstated nor may the person in such case be granted new insurance in any amount in excess of the difference between the amount of insurance surrendered and $10,000. Accordingly, section 5 is designed, among other things, to preserve the right of those who surrender their policy for cash to continue their insurance upon separation from service and to be eligible for full indemnity benefits while in service.

Rights under existing 5-year level-premium term insurance policies of reinstatement, conversion, or renewal are likewise not impaired by the provisions of the bill. However, in certain instances the 5-year term period will expire while insureds are in the active service and under conditions which would make it difficult or impossible for them to reinstate, renew, or convert their insurance prior to the expiration of the term. In order to preserve the rights of policyholders in such cases who have not applied for waiver of premiums authorized under section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, provision is made that any person in the active service having United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance on the 5-year level-premium term plan, the term of which expires while such person is in active service after the date of its enactment, shall, upon application made within 120 days after separation from service, payment of premiums and evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator, be granted an equivalent amount of insurance on the 5-year level-premium term plan at the premium rate for his then attained age.

Section 6 authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of part I. He presently has such authority under the National Service Life Insurance Act with reference to the amendments of that act proposed under part II of the bill.

Section 7 authorizes appropriations for the payment of liabilities under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

Section 8 provides that any person guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or desertion, or who, because of conscientious objections, refuses to perform service in the land or naval forces of the United States, shall forfeit all rights to an indemnity under the act; also, that no benefit shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment, except when inflicted by an enemy of the United States. However, the section contains a proviso which makes is clear that restoration to active duty after commission of any such offense shall restore all rights to an indemnity.

Section 9 makes applicable to part I the provisions of Public Laws 262 and 844 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, and section 15, Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, which among other things, would exempt the indemnity from taxation and claims of creditors; provide for the payment of benefits to minors and incompetents, with or without guardians; regulate the recognition and fees of attorneys and agents; and provide penalties for fraud. Provision is also made in this section that all or any part of the beneficiary's interest may be assigned to any person in the permitted classes when all other such persons having contingent rights of equal or greater priority join in the assignment.

Part II. Insurance Act of 1951

Section 10 adds four new sections, sections 619, 620, 621, and 622, to the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 619 prohibits the issuance of United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance to any person after its enactment except as provided in sections 5 and 10 of the bill. In addition, it is provided that the Government, after the end of the second calendar month following the date of enactment, shall no longer pay the premiums on any policies under the acts specified in this section. This largely applies in the case of aviation cadets and midshipmen at Annapolis. It was felt desirable that a specific provision be made that no further premiums on insurance be paid by the Government, inasmuch as all persons within the purview of these acts will be covered by the automatic free indemnity. They will, of course, have the privilege of continuing such insurance by the payment of premiums, if they desire.

Section 620 provides for the issuance of insurance under the National Service Life Insurance Act of so-called "H" insurance (health insurance) to those men who, by reason of service-connected disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree, would be uninsurable according to standards established by the Administrator. It is further provided in this section that application for such insurance must be made within 1 year from the date the service connection is determined to exist by the Veterans' Administration. This, it will be seen, is a very liberal provision for any service-connected disabled veteran to obtain insurance. The insurance issued, in accordance with prevailing practice, would be of a nonparticipating character. In addition, those individuals who are disabled on their way to report for induction or for active military duty will be entitled to the same sort of insurance. The authorization for a new table of mortality will result in substantially lower premium rates, thus providing additional benefits to disabled veterans concerned. Where the disability is total a waiver of premiums may be granted.

Section 621 provides the basis for new post-service insurance for which veterans in the future will be eligible to apply within 120 days from their discharge from service. As previously indicated, this insurance will be of a nonparticipating type and the premiums will be based on the Commissioners 1941 Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality, with interest at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum. Annuity settlements will be calculated on the Annuity Table for 1949 and interest at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum.

Section 622 provides an alternative from section 5 and permits those persons who have a World War I or World War II policy a measure of relief if they are called to active service. Under the terms of this section any person who is in the active service for a continuous period in excess of 30 days shall be entitled to a waiver of the entire premium on a 5-year level-premium term policy and that portion of any permanent insurance premium which represents the cost of pure insurance. Liability for payment of insurance which matures while waiver of premiums is in force will be borne by the appropriation.

Section 11 provides coverage for a limited group of World War II cases not eligible for benefits under section 602 (n) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, because of the forfeiture provisions contained in section 612 of said act, where the serviceman had authorized in writing a deduction from his pay for national service life insurance, and was subsequently court-martialed, thus forfeiting his rights to insurance. In certain cases, persons who deserted were later restored to active duty and killed in action believing that their insurance was in force. It is believed that restoration to active service should include restoration of rights to insurance.

Section 12 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to cancel or restrict in any way any rights under insurance contracts issued on or prior to the date of its enactment. In the absence of this specific provision from the bill would not preclude renewal of term insurance if otherwise authorized, or future reinstatement or conversion of policies which have lapsed before or after the enactment of the bill. However, should the question arise as a result of improper interpretation by any Government agency, it is believed that the courts would sustain the position that contract rights cannot be affected by subsequent legislation. In any event, section 12 will remove any doubt as to such matters.

Section 13 states that part II may be cited as the "Insurance Act of 1951."

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL DEFENSE

For expenses necessary to enable the President, through such officers or agencies of the Government as he may designate, and without regard to such provisions of law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation and employment of persons in the Government service as he may specify, to provide in his discretion for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year, $12,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Eighty-second Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GATHINGS: Page 51, line 22, strike out "$12,500,000 and insert "$5,000,000."

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I would not come in here at this late hour in the day and offer this amendment if I did not strongly feel that it was meritorious and worthy of your consideration and support.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have a substitute amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman, and I want to offer it, although I want to do it whichever way the gentleman from Arkansas wishes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman permit me to conclude my remarks first?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. This committee has done a marvelous job in cutting out many nonessential items and generally practiced economy on this appropriation. May I say to the Members that you are not cutting this item at all, you are raising it 25 percent, and there is no justification for it. As a matter of fact, there were two appropriations made covering fiscal 1951 for emergency funds for the President of the United States. One was for $1,000,000, carried in the regular independent offices appropriation bill last year. The other was for $10,000,000, and was brought in in the Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1951. It is that $10,000,000 item that I attempt to cut here. The $10,600,000 has been raised by the committee to $12,500,000. It may be necessary to have some funds available for that purpose, because some of it was used for defense; $2,100,000 was used for the Civilian Defense Agency. It is necessary for the President of the United States to have some emergency funds. I do not want you to confuse this with the defense funds that are set up for use by the armed services. There is $190,000,000 in the armed services defense emergency fund, which is an adequate sum available for any purpose directly affecting the war effort.

Here are the facts I should like to cite to you. Out of that $10,000,000 appropriated for this purpose during the current year, $3,238,000 was spent up to January 25, 1951, leaving $6,762,000. My amendment would cut this item to $5,000,000. My amendment provides more funds than is being used for this current fiscal year. Although I am not a penny pincher, I believe in economy. I have been voting for economy in the operation of this Government consistently. This is an item in which we can get a measure of economy by cutting down this fund, and it would not in any way cripple the effective operation of the executive branch of the Government. This Congress is open for business practically all year long and stands ready to provide funds in the regular manner for essential needs.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GATHINGS: On page 51, line 22, strike out "$12,500,000: *Provided*," and insert "$1,000,000: *Provided*, That any unexpended balance of this fund on June 30, 1951, may be carried forward and expended in fiscal 1952; and *Provided further*."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the two amendments are not very far apart, and it could be that I may be giving a little more money than the gentleman from Arkansas, although I do not believe so. I think the amount is about the same. I am hoping that this is a little better way to give it, and if the House will hear me I will try to explain.

We have been giving the President $1,000,000 in an emergency fund for a good many years. That was a fund for specific emergencies, for the ravages of floods and fires and insect scourges. Last year we transferred that fund to the control of the Housing Administrator. That disaster fund still exists, but elsewhere. The President under my amendment would still have $1,000,000 to use as he sees fit. In addition, there is now an emergency fund in the hands of the military.

The President last year asked for $10,000,000 in addition to that, and used it for matters which I think are questionable as emergencies. Our subcommittee has repeatedly challenged the definition of emergency in the use of this money. For example, what is there of an emergency nature in $100,000 additional for export control, which should have come up to the proper appropriations subcommittee? What is there of an emergency nature in $813,000 for improving the bomb shelter at the White House or in $68,000 for making a small bomb protection in some of its offices, when that should have come out of the $5,400,000 which this Congress appropriated for White House repairs? Why was it necessary to finance several commissions out of that fund, when the requests could have come to Congress, the Congress being in session, and the money secured? And so on down.

On March 21 of this year there was remaining in the President's emergency fund, so-called, $4,700,000. My amendment would make whatever is left of that fund still usable in the fiscal year 1952, which it would not be under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas. Thus we are putting into the President's hands $1,000,000 for emergencies which, remember now, in the future will be in addition to the money he had in the past for locusts, grasshoppers, floods, fires, or that kind of emergency. I offer the amendment because I think this is a good way to handle it.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the distinguished Representative from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a matter of fact, we were in session practically 10 months last year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We were in session almost all the time.

Mr. GATHINGS. And in 1949 we were in session for the whole year, with the exception of 75 days.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. We were in session when this money could have been requested of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is one item in the bill on which our subcommittee was not able to arrive at any common agreement. Therefore, the majority, in an effort to arrive at some agreement, just arbitrarily reduced the budget estimate of $25,000,000 down to $12,500,000. As I have said a hundred times in the subcommittee, in connection with an appropriation of this kind, it does not matter to me who is the President or what party he belongs to. The President of the United States has to have an emergency fund in order to efficiently carry out his duties. In days gone by, of course, we gave him a million dollars a year, which was in truth and in fact a civil fund. But this is a war fund. That is all it is for. The civil fund has been transferred over to the Office of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to take care of floods, and things like that.

But this is for a different purpose. Think about it. The budget estimate was for $25,000,000, and the committee—and in all fairness I will say the majority did it, and not the minority—reduced it to $12,500,000. Who in this body is capable of saying what is going to happen 30 days from now, or 40 days from now, or 60 days from now, or 9 or 10 months from now, so far as this war is concerned? Do you know what we did in World War II? We gave the President over $600,000,000 for his emergency fund.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that there are $50,000,000 in the budget for the emergency fund for the Armed Forces?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir; and I presume by the question that the gentleman means the President would have control of that. That may be true, and it may not be true. But certainly the

armed services have the function, which is peculiar to themselves, and the White House has a function. I do not think you gentlemen want to save the taxpayers' money any more than we do, or I do. But it seems to me as if this might be a dangerous spot to do it, because we could all be embarrassed by this action.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman did a splendid job. I read the hearings and the questions that you asked. You probed into this thing thoroughly, and I congratulate the gentleman. He brought out this fact, too, in his questioning: That there are two separate and distinct funds. There was $190,000,000 provided in 1951 for the armed services, which is an emergency fund. Is that not correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. This fund here, which is provided for 1951, was set up for these various purposes, like building the bomb shelter and the like.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. We have received a budget here for national defense for how much? Sixty-one billion dollars. There will not be a handful of people in the House who are going to vote against that appropriation. Let us be honest with ourselves. We are not going to do that, are we? Here are $12,500,000 as against $61,000,000,000 that the President is going to have to administer, and we are quibbling about it, are we not? Gentlemen, are we not being just a little bit small about it? Let us search our consciences and ask ourselves whether we are not being just a little bit small about the matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think we are being small about it at all. Simply because we made a lot of multibillion dollar or multimillion dollar mistakes in the past does not entitle us to make them again.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know whether we have made any mistake in this emergency fund. Can you point to anything immoral or dishonest or wrong in the use of it?

Mr. GROSS. It was a mistake to give any President $600,000,000 at any time.

Mr. THOMAS. I am going to disagree with the gentleman on that. Had the President been a member of the gentleman's political party, as I have told my good friend, JOHN PHILLIPS, of California, than whom there is no finer gentleman, I would still say the President needs that emergency fund. Why the Governor of California has an emergency fund even in peacetime.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to suggest to my beloved chairman that the Republican members of this subcommittee stood unanimously with the majority in refusing to tamper with the President's appropriations for the conduct of his great office and of the White House. I am sure the chairmar will remember that.

On the question of this emergency fund it was not a partisan matter on the part of the minority members of the subcommittee; it was not a matter of who was President. But $25,000,000 was asked for. The majority of the committee wanted to give half of it, $12,500,000. You know we are always in an emergency, next year it will be a little more and the year after that still more until finally Congress will be relinquishing the last power which Congress has, that of holding the purse strings and controlling appropriations. That is why we felt it was a matter of principle with no reference whatsoever to the present occupant of the White House. That is why we want to keep to the precedent of $1,000,000 in that fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS) there were—ayes 111, noes 87.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PHILLIPS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 124, noes 90.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PHILLIPS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 127, noes 82.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, allow me to make a brief statement. I had hoped we would be out of here fully an hour ago. We were advised that there were no further major amendments. The membership is entitled to talk, of course, and there has not been too much, but there has been a little more than we anticipated. If there is to be any more, we might as well rise and finish the bill Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was perfectly willing to have the Committee rise at 5 o'clock, but having run to this late hour and several Members having missed their planes and trains, I think we ought to finish the bill tonight.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public Housing Administration: Of the amounts available by or pursuant to law for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law including funds appropriated by title I of this act, not to exceed $12,780,000, shall be available for such expenses, including purchase of not to exceed 7 passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects or for administrative expenses of the Administration not in excess of the amount authorized by the Congress: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed $33,000,000: *Provided further*, That funds made available by the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2035) shall be available for necessary expenses, including administrative expenses, of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the act of May 19, 1949 (Public Law 65).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 57, line 19, strike out "$12,780,000" and insert "$8,240,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a bookkeeping amendment that becomes necessary in view of the action taken by the House a while ago on the housing item.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act, including the government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual-leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during the calendar year 1951 and unused at the close of business on June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States: *And provided further*, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: Beginning on page 61, line 17, strike out everything down to the period in line 5 on page 62, and renumber the sections.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment to strike out section 601 of the independent offices appropriation bill, because I believe it is inconsistent with the policies which are required to be followed due to the national emergency.

This section provides that none of the funds of any department or agency of the Government shall be used to pay for annual leave which Federal employees accumulate during calendar year 1951 and is unused at the close of business on June 30, 1952. The provision is almost identical with a similar provision which was included in the General Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1951. This so-called leave rider has proved to be unworkable, discriminatory, and inconsistent with the action which was taken in connection with leave during the previous national emergency.

If it were possible to object to this section on the ground it is subject to a point of order, I would do so. However, since points of order cannot be raised to provisions included in this bill, I believe that the Members should support an amendment striking out this section. This section is legislation on an Appropriations Act. The subject matter contained therein is presently under consideration by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Congressman TOM MURRAY, the distinguished chairman of our committee, has appointed a subcommittee to consider H. R. 245, a bill introduced by me to repeal the leave rider on the General Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1951. The committee is engaged in active consideration of this matter, and it has received favorable reports from the Bureau of the Budget, Civil Service Commission, Department of National Defense, and Central Intelligence Agency.

It is ridiculous, in my judgment, to give consideration to a provision of this nature at this time when the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has this matter under active study. I know of no agency of Government or employee or veterans' organization which does not oppose this section in the independent offices bill and has not opposed the same section in the General Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1951.

As a matter of fact, the enactment of such a rider would actually impede our national defense activities. The Bureau of the Budget has pointed out to our committee that some departments and agencies, particularly those whose functions are related to the national defense, require their employees to work more than 40 hours per week. In addition, these departments and agencies have adopted the practice of restricting the leave privileges of their employees. On the other hand, other agencies of Government have allowed their employees to take leave as it is earned. For this reason the enactment of the leave rider last year discouraged the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities. The discriminatory nature of this provision is obvious.

During World War II the opposite policy was adopted from that expressed in the leave rider. This policy was to allow Federal employees to accumulate 90 days' annual leave instead of the present restriction of 60 days' annual leave. This policy recognized the fact that Federal employees would not be able in many instances to use their leave as they earned it.

While it is true that annual leave is not designed as a measure of protection for those Federal employees who are separated from the Federal service, nevertheless, it is the only protection which is afforded them in the way of unemployment insurance at the present time.

I cannot believe the Congress would agree to a provision such as this leave rider when the facts show clearly that its actual operation is a deterrent to our defense activities.

Under date of March 12, 1951, the Department of the Air Force representing the Secretary of Defense submitted a favorable report with respect to repealing this section of the General Appropriations Act, 1951. It stated:

> Therefore, whether leave is granted in keeping with the provisions of this section, or denied in the interest of accomplishing the assigned mission, this section will apparently continue to prove detrimental to effective operation of the Department of Defense under emergency conditions.

This provision discriminates against the hard-working, conscientious employee and favors the clock watcher, the type of employee who zealously guards all of his rights and prerogatives, the individual who insists on taking his current leave as it becomes due, whether or not it is to the best interest of the Government or the agency in which he is employed.

The good man, the conscientious man, will sacrifice his leave for the good of the service, and many of them are doing it.

Let us not penalize loyalty to the job; and that is just what you are doing.

I urge the Members to support my amendment to relieve this condition affecting Federal employees whose high morale is needed more at this time than at any other time in the history of our country.

May I say that in the reports on the bill to strike the present leave rider the Air Force, acting for the Defense Department, comes out very strenuously against the rider and therefore against this, as does the Central Intelligence Agency, whose report says in part:

> A recent survey of the leave situation of CIA personnel has disclosed that a total of 167,088 hours or 20,886 days of leave earned in calendar year 1950 by our employees remained unused as of February 1951. If this leave must be taken prior to June 30, 1951, or be forfeited by the employees, it will place a severe burden on the Agency at a time when the maximum production possible is required of each employee.

Under normal conditions, the present leave rider is a good thing, but in days of emergency it works to the detriment of the Government and to the detriment of its employees.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and the entire section close in 8 minutes, to be divided equally between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] and the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota. [Mr WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, this is my first effort to take the floor on this piece of legislation. In all of this legislation I think this is a most unfair provision. In all of the appropriation bills for the agencies of Government you have been putting very strict limitations upon the employment in those agencies. You have been cutting them down to what is termed the bone, which means that services will be expected to operate in many of these agencies with a lesser personnel. The net result will be that during this emergency and during this time of crisis that the Government faces when help will be badly needed, and as has been mentioned here today, with some of these agencies 6 months behind in their work and with further limitations and restrictions on employment in many of these agencies of Government that the Government will not be able to get the service from these agencies which it should get. Until this emergency is over, many of the employees of these Government agencies may be required to forsake the leave which it is recognized they are entitled to by law, because the head of the agency will find it impossible to let certain key employees go on their annual leave before 1952 by virtue of this law. I speak reservedly now. I think most of the Members of the House recognize that in the first five grades of governmental employment we face a situation which is not a very happy one, insofar as the wage returns to our Government employees is concerned. In this hour and in this time of restricting Government expenditures as much as possible, we are going to say to these employees, "If you do not get your leave before 1952, whatever the emergency might be and whatever the need for your services might be, you are going to lose your annual leave. I think this question could better be resolved by the legislation which is now pending in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from California prevails.

I hope you do not take this advantage of employees who are willingly offering their services and who are willing to follow through orders to continue on the job and forego their annual leave until a later date, only to find perhaps that the leave will be taken from them. I think it is a very unfair method of treating these employees who are being requested to forego their leave and then to find it taken away from them.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, section 601 of H. R. 3880 will require that all Federal employees who receive 26 days annual leave use this entire amount during fiscal 1952 or forfeit the unused portion. A similar provision appeared in the omnibus appropriation measure considered by this House last year.

Following its enactment, we have now had an opportunity to observe during the past year the effect of this provision on Federal employees and the results of the restriction on the operations of various Federal agencies.

All of us are aware of the tremendous speed-up in the activity of Federal Government agencies as a result of the present international situation. Difficulty in recruiting personnel combined with the rapidly increasing workload has required many supervisors to refuse their employees the 26 days annual leave permitted by law during fiscal 1951. The result is that many of these workers are approaching the end of the current fiscal year with the prospect of forfeiting at least several days of the 26 allowed. This is particularly true in those agencies most closely identified with the present vital defense effort. It should be emphasized that approximately 50 percent of all Federal employees are today contributing to the defense effort as employees of "defense" agencies and that their services are absolutely indispensable to the success of this effort. In some instances, the spirit of devotion exhibited by the employees has resulted in their failure to request the 26 days permitted in order to accomplish the work at hand. For this they are now and if section 601 is enacted, will continue to incur a penalty for such devotion to their jobs.

The inequity developing from this position is further emphasized by the fact that employees working in agencies whose normal workload continues as heretofore, can afford to have their workers take the full 26 days leave during the designated 12-month period. Agencies, on the other hand, which cannot afford such a policy because of their spiraling workload must penalize their faithful employees by requiring them to lose completely the unused portion of their annual leave.

There is currently pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of this body a bill to repeal section 1212 of Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, which section is identical with that under consideration today. It is certainly appropriate that the committee charged with the cognizance of compensation for Federal employees, including their annual and sick-leave benefits under the official rules of this House, should be given an opportunity to consider fully the legislation before it and to report thereon before this body takes final action on the proposal contained in section 601 of H. R. 3880.

Furthermore, the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the early days of this session appointed a special subcommittee on Federal civilian manpower and employee utilization. Included in the scope of the committee's work is a study of the necessity for revising current annual-leave laws of Federal employees. The work of this subcommittee is progressing. It would be highly inappropriate for this body to enact section 601 of the present bill without first having received the benefit of the considered judgment of the special subcommittee charged with this responsibility.

In this connection it is significant to note that a similar investigation is currently under way by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate.

It is my considered opinion that favorable action on section 601 of H. R. 3880 should be deferred until the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has had an opportunity to present a complete report.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is the way, is it not, that these people whose leave accrues at $3,000 a year defer taking the leave until later on when they are earning more money and then maybe get paid for the leave at five or six thousand dollars a year?

Mr. THOMAS. The rule is that when the leave accrues they get the highest pay and it is possible that many of them accrued their leave when they were getting two or three thousand dollars a year, and then got paid for it at the rate of five or six thousand dollars a year. The gentleman is right.

Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the language, and not a comma, nor the crossing of a "t," nor the dotting of an "i" has been changed from the bill which we passed last year. It does not apply to anything except annual leave. It does not apply to sick leave. All it says is that the purpose of annual leave is to refresh the employee by giving him rest and a little respite from his duties so that when he takes that annual leave he will come back to the job refreshed and do a better job. This amendment merely says if you do not take your leave, you cannot get paid cash for it. The Bureau of the Budget last year said that this will result in the saving of $95,000,000 a year as a minimum. It seems to me that this year it would amount to more than that, perhaps $125,000,000. There is nothing wrong with this. It cures an abuse which has happened in some of the higher brackets. It does not take 5 minutes of their annual leave away from them, it does not take their 26 days' annual leave, nor their 15 days' sick leave, but it requires them to take it.

The provision says that if you do not take it you cannot get paid for it. As you know, a good many agencies now are paying overtime. It is not going to hurt anybody; some of them can double up and get some overtime while the remainder take their annual leave.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Does the gentleman believe that where in the interests of the Government it was necessary to keep these people working that you discriminate against them under the provisions of this bill? They then cannot be recompensed for the leave they lose, nor can they take it at any other time. That is the crux of the whole situation. You are against the good employee, but the fellow who wants to take his leave and insists on his right is the man who benefits under the gentleman's provision.

Mr. THOMAS. The law gives each Federal employee in the civil service 26 days annual leave, and you cannot take it away from him; under the law he is entitled to it. This provision does not take it away from him; it merely says he cannot get paid for it. A lot of people voluntarily accumulated leave during the war—60 and 90 days—and many of them with the idea that when they left the Government service they would get paid for that in cash and a promotion with it.

I hope the amendment is voted down. This is a good, sensible provision which has worked this year and it has not hurt anybody. The legislative committee has not done anything to try to undermine it in the slightest.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 602. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 63, after line 12, "No part of any appropriation contained in this act or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and I shall not take any more time than enough to remind you that this amendment has been adopted by the House in two previous

bills. It ought to be in this one as well, and I trust you will support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 63, after line 12, insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to all employees in veterans' medical facilities;

"(e) to employees in the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics who are certified by the head of the agency, in writing, as being directly employed on matters essential to the National Defense effort;

"(f) to employees of the General Accounting Office;

"(g) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this bill shall, as a result of the operation of this amendment reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply and said 80 percent figure shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1952 and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it places on additional duty upon several of the agencies involved and is, therefore, subject to a point of order. For instance, this language is used: "to employees in the Committee for Aeronautics who are certified by the head of the agency."

Now, that is placing an additional duty on the head of that agency, extra duties and extra authority on him, therefore it is subject to a point of order. Also it says: "in writing, as being directly employed on matters essential to the national defense."

He has got to make a decision there as to what is national defense. He has to make a decision as to what is an essentiality. Therefore, that is placing an additional duty beyond the scope that is proper at this point and, therefore, it is subject to a point of order. I suggest that the point of order go to the entire paragraph. It should be stricken in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] desire to be heard?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 63, after line 12, insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to all employees in veterans' medical facilities;

"(e) to the Atomic Energy Commission;

"(f) to employees of the General Accounting Office;

"(g) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this bill shall, as a result of the operation of this amendment reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply and said 80 percent figure shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1952 and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a similar but not an identical amendment to the amendment which I offered to the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill and to the Interior Department appropriation bill, both of which were adopted by the House.

There is, however, a little difference in this amendment because of the fact that each amendment must be tailored to fit the agencies to which the amendment applies. You will notice in this amendment we exempt all employees of the veterans' medical facilities, which means the doctors, nurses, everybody that administers to the sick and disabled veteran. Also we exempt the Atomic Energy Commission in toto for obvious reasons, and the employees of the General Accounting Office. The reason we exempt the latter is because of the wonderful showing the Honorable Lindsay Warren, Comptroller, has already made in reducing the number of employees in that agency during the past 5 years by approximately 50 percent.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I asked the gentleman to yield because on page 1476 of the hearings there is a statement from Mr. Frank Yates, Mr. Lindsay Warren's first assistant in which he says that they practice what they preach, that in April 1946 the number of employees was 14,904, while on March 9 of this year the number of employees was 7,970. It is done by this sort of an amendment.

If you will turn to page 1132 of the hearings where the Home Loan Bank Board is before the committee you will find that the head of that organization says that they apply what is in effect in the Jensen amendment to their agency and he stated further:

We have not had any difficulty. As a matter of fact, the benefits from greater efficiency are cumulative. Rather than being a handicap or hardship, they are helpful, because every time you cut out one operation in one place, its effect shows up throughout your operation.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto and all debate on the entire bill close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with what the gentleman has in mind. He is trying to relieve some padding, we will call it, in the agencies. I think myself we have too many employees, and this little subcommittee has done its best to cut them down. You do not need this amendment for the independent offices, I say to my colleagues in good faith. We have worked hard on this bill. We have trimmed in a good many instances perhaps as close to the bone as you could possibly trim. I know the general situation prevailing in a good many agencies, but I do not think that you can pass this bill and fasten it onto the independent offices without seriously hurting these agencies. We have watched them carefully for the last 3 years. In 1950 we gave them a severe cut; in 1951 we gave them a severe cut, and now you know what we have done. Let me point out one thing further. We have gone into this matter throughout the different agencies as well as the independent offices time and time and time again. When you get above grade 8 under the classified civil service, the turn-over is very, very small; they just do not quit. Below that you have a turn-over of from 25 to 36 percent. That is terrible; think about that, 25 to 36 percent of your people quitting every year. That means you have to train others to take their places, and you lose the time and the 30 days and the pay that goes with it, sometimes 60 or 90 days. Look at the terrible loss that the taxpayers sustain by virtue of that turn-over. It runs into millions of dollars every year. Your turn-over is in your working folks below the grade of 8. You take your 9's, 10's, 11's, 12's, and so forth, every time you find one that resigned I will point out 250 that do not resign. So, you are going down to the working level, to the stenographers and the clerks who are actually doing the work. You are not affecting the big supervisory positions, do not fool yourselves about that. Gentlemen, this amendment is not needed in the independent offices bill. It will do far more harm than good. I hope you reject it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 138, noes 94.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I demand two separate votes, one on the Gossett amendment, on page 25, line 22, and the other on the amendment with reference to the President's emergency fund, page 51, line 22.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 22, after the words "in excess of", strike out the word "fifty" and insert "five."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 113, not voting 139, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—181

Aandahl	Bishop	Clevenger
Abbitt	Blackney	Cole, Kans.
Abernethy	Boggs, Del.	Colmer
Adair	Bolton	Cooley
Allen, Calif.	Bonner	Cotton
Allen, La.	Bow	Cox
Andersen, H. Carl	Boykin	Crawford
	Brehm	Crumpacker
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Curtis, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Bryson	Dague
	Buffett	Davis, Ga.
Auchincloss	Burleson	Davis, Wis.
Ayres	Burton	Dempsey
Bates, Mass.	Busbey	Denny
Beall	Bush	D'Ewart
Beamer	Butler	Dolliver
Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.	Dondero
Bender	Carlyle	Durham
Bennett, Fla.	Chenoweth	Ellsworth
Berry	Chiperfield	Fellows
Betts	Church	Fenton
Fernandez	Lovre	Schwabe
Fisher	Lucas	Scrivner
Ford	Lyle	Scudder
Fugate	McConnell	Shafer
Gamble	McCulloch	Sheehan
Gary	McDonough	Short
Gathings	McGregor	Sikes
George	McMillan	Simpson, Ill.
Goodwin	McVey	Simpson, Pa.
Gossett	Mack, Wash.	Sittler
Graham	Mahon	Smith, Kans.
Gross	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Miss.
Gwinn	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Hale	Meader	Smith, Wis.
Harden	Merrow	Springer
Harris	Mills	Stanley
Harrison, Wyo.	Morton	Stefan
Harvey	Mumma	Taber
Herlong	Nicholson	Tackett
Herter	Norrell	Talle
Hess	O'Hara	Teague
Hill	Ostertag	Thompson, Mich.
Hoeven	Patten	
Hope	Phillips	Thompson, Tex.
Horan	Pickett	Thornberry
Hunter	Poage	Van Zandt
Jackson, Calif.	Potter	Vaughn
Jarman	Poulson	Velde
Jenison	Prouty	Vorys
Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.	Vursell
Jensen	Reed, Ill.	Weichel
Jonas	Rees, Kans.	Wharton
Jones, Hamilton C.	Richards	Wheeler
	Riehlman	Wigglesworth
Jones, Woodrow W	Riley	Williams, Miss.
	Rivers	Williams, N. Y.
Keating	Rogers, Fla.	Willis
Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson, Tex.
Kilday	Rogers, Tex.	Winstead
Lantaff	St. George	Wolcott
LeCompte	Sasscer	Wood, Ga.

NAYS—113

Albert	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Preston
Andrews		Priest
Angell	Hardy	Quinn
Aspinall	Hart	Rabaut
Bailey	Hays, Ark.	Rains
Baker	Hays, Ohio	Rankin
Battle	Hedrick	Rhodes
Bentsen	Heselton	Roberts
Blatnik	Holmes	Robeson
Boggs, La.	Hull	Rogers, Colo.
Bosone	Jones, Ala.	Sabath
Breen	Karsten, Mo.	Saylor
Brown, Ga.	Kean	Scott, Hardie
Burdick	Kelley, Pa.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Burnside	Kennedy	
Canfield	Kerr	Secrest
Cannon	King	Seely-Brown
Carnahan	Lane	Shelley
Clemente	Lanham	Sieminski
Cooper	Lesinski	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Lind	Staggers
Deane	McCarthy	Steed
Delaney	McCormack	Stigler
Denton	McGrath	Sutton
Donohue	Mack, Ill.	Thomas
Dorn	Madden	Tollefson
Doyle	Magee	Trimble
Eberharter	Marshall	Walter
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Engle	Mitchell	Whitten
Evins	Morgan	Wickersham
Feighan	Morris	Wier
Fogarty	Moulder	Withrow
Forand	Murdock	Wolverton
Frazier	O'Brien, Ill.	Yates
Furcolo	O'Brien, Mich.	Yorty
Gordon	O'Konski	Zablocki
Gore	O'Toole	
Grant	Polk	

NOT VOTING—139

Addonizio	Case	Fallon
Allen, Ill.	Celler	Fine
Anfuso	Chatham	Flood
Arends	Chelf	Forrester
Armstrong	Chudoff	Fulton
Bakewell	Cole, N. Y.	Garmatz
Barden	Combs	Gavin
Baring	Corbett	Gillette
Barrett	Coudert	Golden
Bates, Ky.	Crosser	Granahan
Beckworth	Cunningham	Granger
Bennett, Mich.	Curtis, Mo.	Green
Bolling	Dawson	Greenwood
Bramblett	DeGraffenried	Gregory
Bray	Devereux	Hagen
Brooks	Dingell	Hall, Leonard W.
Brownson	Dollinger	
Buckley	Donovan	Halleck
Budge	Doughton	Hand
Byrne, N. Y.	Eaton	Harrison, Va.
Camp	Elston	Havenner
Hébert	Latham	Radwan
Heffernan	McGuire	Ramsay
Heller	McKinnon	Reams
Hillings	McMullen	Redden
Hinshaw	Machrowicz	Reed, N. Y.
Hoffman, Ill.	Mansfield	Regan
Hoffman, Mich.	Mason	Ribicoff
Holifield	Miller, Md.	Rodino
Howell	Miller, Nebr.	Rooney
Irving	Miller, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Jackson, Wash.	Morano	Sadlak
James	Morrison	Sheppard
Javits	Multer	Stockman
Johnson	Murphy	Taylor
Jones, Mo.	Murray, Tenn.	Towe
Judd	Murray, Wis.	Vail
Kearney	Nelson	Van Pelt
Kearns	Norblad	Vinson
Kee	O'Neill	Watts
Kelly, N. Y.	Passman	Werdel
Keogh	Patman	Whitaker
Kersten, Wis.	Patterson	Widnall
Kirwan	Perkins	Wilson, Ind.
Klein	Philbin	Wood, Idaho
Kluczynski	Powell	Woodruff
Larcade	Price	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Devereux for, with Mr. Javits against.
Mr. James for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.
Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Combs against.
Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Murphy against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Jackson of Washington against.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. deGraffenried against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Passman against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Granger against.
Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Heffernan against.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Patman against.
Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Price against.
Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.
Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Havenner against.
Mr. Harrison of Virginia for, with Mr. Sadlak against.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Fine against.
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Rodino against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Addonizio against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Rooney against.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Heller against.
Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Brownson for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. McKinnon against.
Mr. Wood of Idaho for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Vail for, with Mr. Dollinger against.
Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Multer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Redden with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Budge.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Case.
Mr. Howell with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Irving with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Green with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. McGuire with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Bakewell.

Messrs. BATTLE, ANGELL, BURDICK, and HARDIE SCOTT changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 22, strike out "$12,500,000 provided" and insert "$1,000,000: *Provided*, That any unexpended balance in this fund on June 30, 1951, may be carried forward and expended in fiscal year 1952: *And provided further*."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 161, nays 128, not voting 144, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—161

Aandahl	Ford	Pickett
Abbitt	Gamble	Potter
Adair	Gathings	Poulson
Allen, Calif.	George	Prouty
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Reece, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Reed, Ill.
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Richards
Auchincloss	Gwinn	Riehlman
Ayres	Hale	Riley
Baker	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Rivers
Bates, Mass.	Harden	Rogers, Mass.
Beall	Harrison, Wyo.	St. George
Beamer	Harvey	Saylor
Belcher	Herlong	Schwabe
Bender	Herter	Scott, Hardie
Bennett, Fla.	Heselton	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Berry	Hess	Scrivner
Betts	Hill	Scudder
Bishop	Hoeven	Seely-Brown
Blackney	Holmes	Shafer
Boggs, Del.	Hope	Sheehan
Bolton	Horan	Short
Bow	Hunter	Simpson, Ill.
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Sittler
Bryson	Jenison	Smith, Kans.
Buffett	Jenkins	Smith, Miss.
Burleson	Jensen	Smith, Va.
Burton	Jonas	Smith, Wis.
Busbey	Jones, Woodrow W.	Springer
Bush	Kean	Stanley
Butler	Keating	Stefan
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilburn	Taber
Canfield	LeCompte	Talle
Carlyle	Lovre	Thompson, Mich.
Chenoweth	McConnell	Tollefson
Chiperfield	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Church	McDonough	Vaughn
Clevenger	McGregor	Velde
Cole, Kans.	McVey	Vorys
Cotton	Mack, Wash.	Vursell
Crawford	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Crumpacker	Martin, Mass.	Werdel
Curtis, Nebr.	Meader	Wharton
Dague	Merrow	Wheeler
Davis, Ga.	Morton	Wigglesworth
Davis, Wis.	Mumma	Williams, Miss.
Denny	Nicholson	Williams, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Norblad	Wilson, Tex.
Dolliver	O'Hara	Winstead
Dondero	O'Konski	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Ostertag	Wolverton
Fellows	Patten	Wood, Ga.
Fenton	Phillips	

NAYS—128

Abernethy	Angell	Bentsen
Albert	Aspinall	Blatnik
Allen, La.	Bailey	Bonner
Andrews	Battle	Bosone
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Polk
Breen	Hedrick	Preston
Brown, Ga.	Hull	Priest
Burdick	Jones, Ala.	Quinn
Burnside	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rabaut
Cannon	Karsten, Mo.	Rains
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Rankin
Clemente	Kennedy	Rhodes
Colmer	Kerr	Roberts
Cooley	Kilday	Robeson
Cooper	King	Rogers, Colo.
Cox	Lane	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Rogers, Tex.
Deane	Lantaff	Sabath
Delaney	Lesinski	Sasscer
Dempsey	Lind	Secrest
Denton	Lucas	Shelley
Donohue	Lyle	Sieminski
Dorn	McCarthy	Sikes
Doyle	McCormack	Spence
Durham	McGrath	Staggers
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Steed
Elliott	Madden	Stigler
Evins	Magee	Sutton
Feighan	Mahon	Tackett
Fernandez	Marshall	Thomas
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, Tex.
Forand	Mills	Thornberry
Frazier	Mitchell	Trimble
Fugate	Morgan	Walter
Furcolo	Morris	Welch
Gary	Moulder	Whitten
Gordon	Murdock	Wickersham
Gore	Norrell	Wier
Grant	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Hardy	O'Brien, Mich.	Withrow
Harris	O'Toole	Yates
Hart	Poage	Yorty
Hays, Ark.		Zablocki

NOT VOTING—144

Addonizio	Fulton	Machrowicz
Allen, Ill.	Garmatz	Mansfield
Anfuso	Gavin	Mason
Arends	Gillette	Miller, Md.
Armstrong	Golden	Miller, Nebr.
Bakewell	Gossett	Miller, N. Y.
Barden	Granahan	Morano
Baring	Granger	Morrison
Barrett	Green	Multer
Bates, Ky.	Greenwood	Murphy
Beckworth	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Hagen	Murray, Wis.
Boggs, La.	Hall, Leonard W.	Nelson
Bolling	Halleck	O'Neill
Bramblett	Hand	Passman
Bray	Harrison, Va.	Patman
Brooks	Havenner	Patterson
Brownson	Hébert	Perkins
Buckley	Heffernan	Philbin
Budge	Heller	Powell
Byrne, N. Y.	Hillings	Price
Camp	Hinshaw	Radwan
Case	Hoffman, Ill.	Ramsay
Celler	Hoffman, Mich.	Reams
Chatham	Holifield	Redden
Cheif	Howell	Reed, N. Y.
Chudoff	Irving	Rees, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Regan
Combs	James	Ribicoff
Corbett	Javits	Rodino
Coudert	Johnson	Rooney
Crosser	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Cunningham	Judd	Sadlak
Curtis, Mo.	Kearney	Sheppard
Dawson	Kearns	Stockman
DeGraffenried	Kee	Taylor
Devereux	Kelly, N. Y	Teague
Dingell	Keogh	Towe
Dollinger	Kersten, Wis.	Vail
Donovan	Kirwan	Van Pelt
Doughton	Klein	Vinson
Eaton	Kluczynski	Watts
Elston	Larcade	Whitaker
Engle	Latham	Widnall
Fallon	McGuire	Wilson, Ind.
Fine	McKinnon	Wood, Idaho
Flood	McMillan	Woodruff
Fogarty	McMullen	
Forrester		

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Barrett against.
Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Green against.
Mr. Brownson for, with Mr. Granahan against.
Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Chudoff against.
Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. McKinnon against.
Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Granger against.
Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Rodino against.
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Howell against.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Addonizio against.
Mr. Devereux for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. O'Neill against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Havenner against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Baring against.
Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Price against.
Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Irving against.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.
Mr. James for, with Mr. Rooney against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Holifield against.
Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.
Mr. Vail for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.
Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Passman against.
Mr. Harrison of Virginia for, with Mr. Patman against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. deGraffenried against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Javits.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Golden.
Mr. McGuire with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Case of New Jersey.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Wood of Idaho.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Bakewell.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE SOVIET PROPAGANDA MACHINE

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the long arm of the Soviet propaganda machine, fighting a battle for the allegiance of men all over the world, has reached into Mississippi with its web of lies and tissue of falsehoods. An otherwise obscure case of a Negro condemned to death for rape, with his sentence confirmed time and time again after the most exhaustive legal reviews by State and Federal courts, has been blown up as an international propaganda weapon of communism.

The case of Willie Magee has received every possible consideration in our courts to provide assurance that no injustice has been done the humblest citizen or the constitutional guaranty of a fair and impartial trial. Mississippians can well be proud of restraint which has been displayed in this case by the officials of our courts and our law-enforcement agencies.

The world-wide Communist conspiracy, however, has seized upon the case to fan the flames of race hatred in every corner of the world. It has been used to stir up distrust and fear of the United States among the colored populations of the earth whom the men in the Kremlin would like to make slaves of communism.

The arm and instrument of the Communist Party in this attack upon the American constitutional system has been the Civil Rights Congress. Even before this organization was officially branded as subversive in 1947 by the Attorney General of the United States it had been recognized as the legal weapon of Communism in this country.

There is no need to review here the long list of efforts which have been made by the Communist attorneys affiliated with this organization to stir up civil strife and actual rioting and insurrection. Representatives of the Civil Rights Congress in Mississippi deliberately sought by the worst type of provocation to become the victims of personal violence and through it to instigate race riots over the entire country. Only the fine judicial temperament and careful foresight of our Governor, Fielding L. Wright, thwarted these plans.

Governor Wright's handling of this case in Mississippi has been a fine example for other State executives over the country faced with this Communist provocation. States and local governments over the Nation must exercise their responsibilities in like manner if these subversive efforts are to be choked off at their sources.

The activities of the Civil Rights Congress in the Magee case are a further example of how Communists have made use of the civil rights agitation to further their treasonable ends. Those elements who have blindly fallen in line with so much of the so-called civil-rights propaganda have become the unwitting tools of the enemies of our country as they seek to tear down the foundations of American strength throughout the world.

The people of Mississippi have been pleased to learn that a representative of the Voice of America has been sent to our State to gather the true facts about the Magee case to be used in answering Communist propaganda. America has no reason to be apologetic about the degree of civil rights afforded our citizens.

The freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of press, the right of petition and the right of trial by jury guaranteed in our constitution, plus the innumerable other rights of free American citizens give the people of our country individual liberty to a far greater degree than it is enjoyed by the citizens of any other nation.

Let American counterpropaganda emphasize these positive freedoms which we do enjoy. American liberty can still be a beacon light for the enslaved peoples of the world.

Mr. Speaker, as a supplement to my remarks, I include a summary of the activities of the Civil Rights Congress since it was declared subversive by the Attorney General:

CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS (ACTIVITIES SINCE DECEMBER 1947)

The Civil Rights Congress was the subject of a report issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities (Rept. No. 1115), dated September 2, 1947, in which the organization was cited as having been formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. In this report, the Civil Rights Congress was characterized as being "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (pp. 2 and 19). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the Civil Rights Congress and its various State and local subdivisions as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

The files of the committee contain numerous clippings from newspapers concerning the activities of the organization during the year 1948. It was reported in an article datelined Philadelphia, January 29, which appeared in the Daily Worker for January 30, 1948 (p. 3), that pickets led by the Civil Rights Congress "marched in front of immigration headquarters here today in a noontime demonstration against deportation proceedings * * * the Government has started against Claudia Jones, Michael J. Obermeier, Charles P. Doyle, John Santo, Alexander Bittleman, and Raul Martinez."

It was reported in the Daily Worker of March 5, 1948, that the Civil Rights Congress had announced that a cavalcade "will converge on Washington on Monday from New York and Cleveland. * * * The demonstrators will join the continuous protest vigil at the Justice Department Building against the threatened deportations and detention without bail of Communist and trade-union leaders on Ellis Island" (p. 2).

On April 10, 1948, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 12, 1948 (p. 5), a Bill of Rights defense conference was held under auspices of the Civil Rights Congress and the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" in report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; the organization was cited as a Communist-dominated front in the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated June 25, 1942; it was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. At this conference, the action program called for a drive against an anti-Communist bill proposing the registration of Communist-front organizations and the Department of Justice's deportation drive. A wire was sent to President Truman demand the pardon of Leon Josephson, Communist attorney.

The New York Times of July 22, 1948, carried an article in which it was stated that the Civil Rights Congress, "which furnished bail for the Communist leaders arrested by Federal authorities, moved yesterday to plan a new program for the defense of 'all labor, liberal and radical, and new party organizations.'" This announcement followed a meeting called to discuss financial problems involved in the legal defense of the indicted Communists.

Articles pertaining to the National People's Lobby, sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress, held in Washington, D. C., August 5, 1948, appeared in the Daily Worker, issues of July 28, 1948 (p. 2); July 30, 1948 (p. 3); August 2, 1948 (pp. 2 and 11); and August 6, 1948 (pp. 3 and 11). The following were the demands of the National People's Lobby, as shown in the Daily Worker of July 28, 1948 (p. 2): "Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law; No 'new look' Mundt bill; repeal of the 'loyalty' order; complete end of Jim Crow in the Armed Forces; outlawing of the KKK; dismissal of indictments against the Communists; an anti-poll-tax and anti-lynch law; a permanent FEPC; an end of Jim Crow in Government departments." It was reported in the Daily Worker of August 6, 1948, that the group found "after a day's tour of the Capitol, that neither the White House nor Congress leaders were interested in a program for the people's needs" and that "angered by a refusal from the White House to meet the spokesman for the People's Lobby, more than 5,000 delegates picketed the White House for more than an hour and a half."

It was reported in the Worker of August 22, 1949 (p. 4), that the "Civil Rights Congress has undertaken full responsibility for organizing and conducting the trial and other phases of the defense of the 12 indicted leaders of the Communist Party." As shown in this same source, the Civil Rights Congress announced the launching of a campaign to raise $250,000 for this purpose.

A photograph of a picket line before the Federal Building in Foley Square appeared in the Daily Worker of September 22, 1948 (p. 1). The demonstration, a protest of the

indictment of the 12 Communist Party leaders, was sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress.

A press release issued by the Civil Rights Congress, dated October 4, 1948, contains the information that the organization was opening a drive among trade-unions to secure signatures to petitions addressed to President Truman and Attorney General Clark urging dismissal of Federal indictments against the 12 Communist leaders.

It was reported in the Worker of October 17, 1948 (p. 2), that the Washington Civil Right Congress had scheduled a mass meeting for October 24 as a protest against indictments against the Communist leaders. An article concerning this meeting appeared in the Washington Post of October 25, 1948 (p. 2), in which it was stated that all three branches of the Federal Government were accused of campaigning against civil liberties last night at the Civil Rights Night sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress of Washington.

The files of the committee contain an undated leaflet, The Thought Police Are on the Prowl, which was issued by the Civil Rights Congress, which gives the information that in addition to aiding the fight of the Reverend Richard Morford, director of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, and the 18 executive board members of the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee, CRC, is conducting the entire legal defense of George Marshall; Gerhart Eisler, German Communist; Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the American Communist Party; and Leon Josephson, New Jersey attorney and member of the Communist Party. In its fight against the President's loyalty order, CRC is supporting the defense of Carl Marzani, former State Department employee.

An article concerning the Civil Rights Congress written by Elizabeth G. Flynn appeared in the Worker of July 4, 1948, section 3, page 7 (southern edition), under the title "Forging a Shield for the People's Fighters." The author, a prominent member of the Communist Party, states that the duties of the Civil Rights Congress are "to provide bail and legal defense for all political and labor prisoners, to fight for the status of political prisoners, and to care for the families of political prisoners." She adds: "But even more important than all this is the over-all responsibility to build a mass movement now around these cases." The author states that the Civil Rights Congress "is also cooperating with the Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born in fighting a revival of the 'deportation deliriums' of 1920." (See pp. 1 and 2 in reference to the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.) A number of Federal and local cases in which the Civil Rights Congress is active are listed in the article.

The files of the committee contain a leaflet, Freedom Crusade, issued by the Civil Rights Congress, in which a national civil-rights legislative conference for January 17, 1949, and a people's freedom crusade for January 18, 1949, are announced. It was reported in the Worker of January 23, 1949 (p. 5) that the freedom crusaders made demands for the "freedom of the 12 Communist leaders and the end of lynching, warmongering, and Taft-Hartley law." It was reported in the Daily Worker of January 18, 1949 (p. 2) that the resolution adopted by the delegates to the national legislative conference "urged the quashing of the indictments against the 12 Communist leaders and demanded the withdrawal of the President's loyalty order." A group of the freedom crusaders urged the Department of Justice to drop its indictments of the 12 Communist leaders on trial; the group also called upon the Justice Department and administration to "halt its deportation deliriums, check its loyalty-order programs, call in its attorneys now carrying on witch hunts through grand-jury investigations."

According to the Daily Worker of March 10, 1949 (p. 3), 40 labor leaders, through the New York Civil Rights Congress, demanded that the McMullen bill be killed. "The bill would bar from civil-service jobs any worker who 'organizes or helps to organize or becomes a member of the Communist Party.'"

In an article datelined Detroit, April 3, which appeared in the Daily Worker of April 4, 1949 (p. 2), it was reported that a "program of defense for the national Communist leaders now on trial in New York was mapped at a State civil rights conference held here * * * to commemorate 14 years of activity by the Michigan Civil Rights Congress and its predecessors." Reference to a State-wide conference for civil rights and in defense of the 12 Communist leaders to be held in New York City on June 25, 1949, appeared in the Daily Worker of May 24, 1949 (p. 4).

According to the New York Times of May 23, 1949 (p. 4), the Civil Rights Congress, which posted the $23,000 bail that Gerhart Eisler forfeited by his flight, announced that it was conducting a new fund appeal to make good the loss. In this article, William L. Patterson, executive secretary of the organization, is quoted as saying: "News of Eisler's release will spur the campaign. Anti-Fascists everywhere will help cap the victory in this case and make good the loss."

A Bill of Rights conference was held at the Henry Hudson Hotel, New York City, July 16–17, 1949; the conference was initiated by the Civil Rights Congress. As shown in the New York Times of July 18, 1949 (p. 13), the "20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the Presidential loyalty order * * * deportation for political belief, lynching, and the Taft-Hartley Act, among others. The conference also called for an end to investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal activities." It was reported in the Daily Worker of July 18, 1949 (pp. 2 and 9) that a resolution in defense of freedom adopted by the delegates called for the "repeal of legislation such as the Feinberg law in New York and the Ober law in Maryland. It asked that the proposed Wood-Ferguson bill be stopped. * * * It demanded that the FBI be prevented from continuing as a * * * gestapolike agency. * * * The resolution urged the defeat of the Hobbs concentration camp bill."

An advertisement of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress appeared in the Daily Worker of October 3, 1948 (p. 5). It was stated in this source that the bail for leaders of the Communist Party was provided by the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress. According to this source, in 1947, $20,000 was used by the Civil Rights Congress for bail funds; in 1948, $82,000 was used for bail funds; and in the first 9 months of 1949, $100,000 was used.

The Civil Rights Congress sponsored a crusade to defend the Bill of Rights, a demonstration held in Washington, D. C., on October 27, 1949, as shown in the Daily Worker of October 26, 1949 (p. 3). "The crusade will demand that President Truman and Attorney General McGrath act to grant immediate, reasonable bail to the 11 Communist leaders."

A report of a 3-day meeting of the national executive board of the Civil Rights Congress appeared in the Daily Worker of June 14, 1950 (p. 8). According to this source, "the two major campaigns outline called for defense of minority political groups, particularly the Communist Party, and defense of the Negro people, concentrating on winning the freedom of some 21 Negroes now under threat of the electric chair, including the Trenton six, the Martinsville seven, and Willie McGee. The campaign will urge the immediate, unconditional release of Eugene Dennis; freeing of the 11 Communist leaders tried at Foley Square; obtaining their right to travel and speak freely everywhere."

In a Hands Off Korea rally which was held in Madison Square Garden, June 28, 1950, it was reported that "the names of President Truman and General MacArthur were booed." The rally was sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress and "editorially promoted by the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker" (from the Washington Star of June 29, 1950).

In August 1950, the Civil Rights Congress "called on all labor, Negro, and fraternal organizations to write to Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, demanding that the Justice Department withdraw its request for cancellation of the bail for the leaders of the Communist Party," as reported in the Daily Worker of August 31, 1950 (p. 8).

A statement demanding "the defeat of the McCarran-Mundt-Ferguson police-state type legislation" was circulated by the Philadelphia Civil Rights Congress, according to the Daily Worker of September 8, 1950 (p. 9), in which the names of several signers of the statement appeared.

In September 1950, the Civil Rights Congress announced that its legal department had published a penny folder entitled "What To Do When Arrested" and described the leaflet as a "valuable document on workers' legal rights (that) can save many innocent persons from frameups by Fascist-minded cops or FBI men." (Sunday Worker, September 24, 1950, p. 7.)

The Civil Rights Congress "protested the continued prison persecution of Carl Marzani," former State Department employee convicted of making false statements in denying Communist affiliation. (Daily Worker, September 29, 1950, p. 4.)

In an article date-lined Prague, which appeared in the Washington Post of October 10, 1950 (p. 2), it was reported that William Patterson, national executive secretary of the American Civil Rights Congress, "today called the United States Government a 'criminal Government.'" According to the article, he gave his views at a news conference, at which he said: "American imperialism is on a war drive which cannot stop because of its fear of economic collapse. * * * It is a very great pleasure for me to see the eastern (Communist) republics preparing for any eventuality."

On October 13, 1950, it was reported in the Daily Worker that "plans for a Nation-wide action in Washington next month to demand repeal of the McCarran Act were discussed yesterday at an emergency conference held under auspices of the New York State Civil Rights Congress. The action is planned to coincide with the reconvening of Congress" (p. 9).

As shown in the Daily Worker of December 12, 1950 (p. 9), a national emergency fund to help conduct the legal and mass campaign against the twin evils, the McCarran Act and the Smith Act was announced by the Civil Rights Congress. William L. Patterson, executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress, is quoted in this article as follows: "The Civil Rights Congress has assumed the reponsibility for the conduct of the mass campaigns to reverse the Smith Act convictions of the 11 Communist leaders, the defense of the victims of the McCarran law, and the lawyers for the Communists. This responsibility—in addition to CRC's regular case load, which includes the fight for freedom for Willie McGee, the Trenton Six, and the Martinsville Seven—made it imperative for us to make this appeal."

Announcement of a trade union conference on Defense of Labor's Rights to be held on February 17 in the Hotel Diplomat appeared in the Daily Worker of January 29, 1951 (p. 4); the conference was held under auspices of the Labor Advisory Committee of the Civil Rights Congress, as shown in

this source. It was reported that the Labor Advisory Committee of the Civil Rights Congress had been formed to serve as a coordinating body on the defense of individual unionists who are the victims of political persecution or racial discrimination. According to the article, this committee has been active in the fight against contempt indictments of labor leaders, the drive to save the Martinsville, Va., Seven, and the fight against the so-called loyalty screenings now taking place on the waterfront. It was reported in the Daily Worker of February 23, 1951 (p. 5), that a pledge of support of the campaign to save Willie McGee was adopted at an organizing conference of the Labor Advisory Committee of the Civil Rights Congress (p. 4). An article entitled "CRC in New Move To Save McGee's Life" appeared in the Worker of January 28, 1951 (p. 7). The article contains a review of the work of attorneys of the Civil Rights Congress in the case.

It was reported in the Daily Worker of March 5, 1951 (p. 5), that William L. Patterson, executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress, was a speaker at a rally held in New York University, at which he called for mass action to save Willie McGee from execution. In his speech, he denounced the indictment of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois for refusing to register the "American Peace Center, which he headed, as a foreign agency * * * as 'an act of terror, one of the greatest crimes committed against the Negro in America.'"

In the Daily Worker of February 21, 1951 (p. 4), reference is made to the Civil Rights Congress as having led the campaign to save the Martinsville seven.

It is noted that Governor Battle was quoted as having said of the Martinsville seven that they received fair trials and that most of the protests against the executions were Communist inspired in the Washington Star of February 4, 1951 (p. A–3).

The Daily Worker of August 31, 1950 (p. 9), reported that William L. Patterson, executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress, was cited for contempt in the House of Representatives by a vote of 238 to 106. The citation apparently grew out of Mr. Patterson's failure to produce records of the Civil Rights Congress, demanded by the House Lobbying Investigating Committee (as reported in the Washington Star of August 3, 1950, p. 17); it was reported in the same article that Mr. Patterson also refused to tell the committee whether he is now or ever was a Communist. Reference to the charge against Mr. Patterson also appeared in the Daily Worker of January 2, 1951 (p. 2); it was stated that he was scheduled to go on trial, his indictment having grown out of a House Lobby Committee hearing last August 30.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the acting majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on Monday will be consideration of H. R. 3576, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. The time under the rule is 1 hour.

Following that will be consideration of the bill H. R. 2084, from the Ways and Means Committee. The time allowed under that rule is 2 hours.

On Tuesday there will be general debate on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

I have been authorized by the majority leader to state that it has been agreed with the minority leader that because of primaries in Indiana and New Jersey, and elections perhaps in Baltimore and in Ohio, on Tuesday, any roll calls that may come up on the first 2 days of next week will go over until Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the understanding.

Mr. PRIEST. On Wednesday the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and, of course, consideration of that bill will continue until completed.

We also have scheduled for consideration H. R. 3791, the India emergency food relief bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have had a good many inquiries from both Democrats and Republicans alike as to when the State Department appropriation bill is coming up for consideration. I understand it is all marked up and has been delayed. Can the gentleman give us any information on that?

Mr. PRIEST. I do not have any information on that at this time.

POWERS OF APPOINTMENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to put the House on notice that there is a very great probability of having a roll call on the bill H. R. 2084, which refers to taxes and power of appointment. It is a bill on which a minority report has been filed. It is a bill of very great importance. I thought it would be proper at this time to make that statement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But if a roll call is necessary it will go over until Wednesday.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I understand that, but I thought it might be well to make that statement at this time.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1771, the Polish Parliament accepted a constitution which is one of the earliest of its kind, emphasizing the idea of human dignity and liberty and laying the basis for democratic development in the country. This constitution had been set up under the utmost difficulties, at a time not dissimilar to the present one. Russia, Prussia and Austria had incorporated parts of Poland into their own territories and were still debating further encroachments. Within the next 20 years, Poland as a free nation, was to disappear from the map—the people were to become Russian or German nationals. Polish culture, and even the Polish language was to be erased and replaced by the cultures and the languages of the powerful neighbors.

In those darkest days of Polish history, the National Diet proclaimed the constitution of May 3, which laid the groundwork for all future democratic evolution. Throughout the centuries there has been evidence of the democratic tendencies of the Polish people. Four hundred years ago, while most of the European countries were absolutist monarchies Poland had a parliament set up to reduce the King's powers. And even after the partitions, in 1836, Polish patriots belonging to the right as well as to the left, drew up an interesting manifesto of the democratic society. No matter how heavy the burden of foreign oppressions, the Poles continued to look forward to freedom and independence and tried to plan the future of the nation in a democratic way.

This would never have been possible, had this proud people not had the conviction that no foreign ruler would ever succeed in destroying their patriotism, tradition and culture and their determination to live in their own house according to their own principles. All attempts of the eastern and western aggressors to de-polonize the country failed. Poland has little in common with Russia and Germany and, through the centuries, has vehemently resisted the political and cultural influence of these neighbors.

Polish culture, though a hundred percent Slavic, is western in its essence. The Poles have often been called the westerners among the Slavs. Indeed, Warsaw reminds one much more of Paris than of Berlin or Moscow in its way of life. Polish people have little understanding of Russian or German mass-mindedness. They have always exalted the worth and rights of individuals and have looked to the West where they found the materialization of their individualist and democratic ideals. Every phase of Polish life, history, and culture can be called individualistic.

After the partition of Poland, throughout the nineteenth century, many of Poland's intellectual leaders, artists, and patriots were compelled or chose to live abroad. Most of them fled to France where they found the freedom of speech that was denied to them in their own country. Mickiewicz, Chopin, and many others sought refuge in France and created there truly Polish works of art, without being obliged to make concessions to a foreign tyrant. On almost every battlefield where the idea of freedom fought the old forms of tyranny, Polish soldiers participated.

Many of these political émigrés came to the New World. Tadeusz Kosciusko, the most famous one, fought in General Washington's army and returned afterward to Poland where he led the revolutionary army against the czar. Earlier, Casimir Pulaski had taken part in the American Revolution and fallen at the siege of Savannah. One of Poland's best-known writers, Henryk Sienkiewicz, author of Quo Vadis, came to the Western Hemisphere because he could no longer bear to look at the fate of his country. This voyage gave him new hopes and he

returned to Europe to write on Poland with an optimism he had not had before.

In Western Europe, and especially in North America, these Polish patriots saw the fulfillment of their hopes: A new way of life, free from foreign oppressors, but free also from the class distinctions which remained within their country.

Throughout its long history, Poland has remained faithful to the Roman Catholic Church. That Roman Church has always been a bulwark against Russia and Germany. Patriots ready to risk their lives for their country, gathered round the church and found solace and assistance in their faith. To them, Catholic Poland was a reality, distinct from both east and west, their religion afforded them the most reliable way for remaining faithful to themselves, to their country and to their tradition.

After centuries of foreign rule, Poland became independent in 1919. It was not easy for a country which had ceased to exist as a free nation one hundred and fifty years before, to find its way in the modern times. Poland had not had—like other peoples—the opportunity to practice democracy in the nineteenth century. It had to achieve what other nations had developed in centuries within two decades. Under such circumstances, some mistakes were unavoidable. Nevertheless, considering the short time the Poles had, from 1919 to 1939, to try to adjust their country to modern political life, they made considerable progress; there would have been more if World War II had not crushed Poland once more. There is hardly another nation that suffered more from that conflict. German and Russian Armies crossed and recrossed Polish territory, destroying everything in their path. Though Poland was too weak to resist effectively German and Russian aggression, the people fought as long as they could. Poland is perhaps the only country in Europe that had no collaboration with the enemy. The Nazis did not find traitors among the Poles ready to do their bidding; and the activity of the Polish underground army belongs to the most heroic pages of modern history. At the same time, Polish troops fought almost everywhere with the Allied Armies against the German aggressors. Indeed, Poland contributed more to the common cause, sacrificed more, proportionately, for freedom and democracy than any other European nation.

Unfortunately, these proud and patriotic people reaped a cruel and bitter reward for their efforts. Once again Poland must endure the rule of a foreign oppressor. But the people of Poland have not given up hope. They look to the west, especially to the United States, their traditional ally. Today, on the anniversary of the first step that Poland took toward democracy, it is fitting that the United States recall its close ties with the Polish people. They are engaged in the same struggle against tyranny and oppression in the world. They know that the triumph of liberty will also be Poland's triumph. Over 100,000 good and loyal Americans of Polish ancestry from Luzerne County, Pa., join with me in these sentiments.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McGUIRE and Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) for May 3 and 4 on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

HOW THE MAGAZINE THE NATION IS SERVING COMMUNISM

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress and the people of the country two most important magazine articles. The first, titled "The Nation Censors a Letter of Criticism," is from the March 19, 1951, issue of the New Leader. The second, titled "The Liberals Who Have Not Learned," is from the April 1951 issue of Commentary.

Both of these articles concern the well-known magazine the Nation, which is published in New York. I am placing the articles in the RECORD because they provide strong confirmation of a feeling that many of us have had for a long time—namely, that the Nation is knowingly serving the cause of communism. The writers of both articles state that under the guise of being a journal of liberal opinion, the Nation is in many respects a propaganda agent of the Kremlin, especially in the key field of foreign policy.

The nature of the source of these criticisms of the Nation should be emphasized. The New Leader is a widely known Socialist magazine, and Clement Greenberg, author of the article about the Nation, was art editor of the Nation from 1943 to 1949. The magazine Commentary is published by the American Jewish Committee, and the author of its piece is Granville Hicks, an ex-Communist and a one-time editor of the Communist magazine New Masses.

Greenberg points out that the column in the Nation by its foreign editor, J. Alvarez del Vayo, follows "a line which invariably parallels that of Soviet propaganda" and that del Vayo "has defended every step in Soviet policy and, just as unfailingly, criticized or evaded every argument and step opposed to that policy. The evidence furnished by his own words would show that his column has become a medium through which arguments remarkably like those which the Stalin regime itself advances are transmitted in a more plausible form to the American public."

The article in Commentary by Hicks analyzes in particular the special eighty-fifth anniversary issue of the Nation, published December 16, 1950. Hicks says "there is a pro-Soviet bias in enough of the 25 articles to color the entire issue" and that "we have here in the anniversary issue of the Nation views of Russia so biased that, if they were widely held, they would seriously weaken this country either in the maintenance of peace or the waging of war."

According to Hicks' analysis of an article by Freda Kirchwey, editor and publisher of the Nation, this is her view of the world today—"a Russia riding the wave of inevitable revolution opposed by a United States that has lost its democratic beliefs and processes." An article by del Vayo, says Hicks, claims that "the threat to peace comes primarily from the United States, the hope for peace primarily from Russia." Hicks finds finds that the Nation in much of its editorial content "serves today as an apologist for Soviet Russia."

There is one additional fact to which attention should be called. Several scores of well-known persons are listed in the anniversary issue of the Nation as senders of congratulations, as sponsors, or as contributors of articles.

Among the dupes—to use a term that gives them the benefit of every possible doubt—is President Truman, who sent a message of hearty congratulations and the "hope that its"—the Nation's—"voice will be lifted for many years to come in behalf of the causes in which it believes." Another is Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, who praised the Nation for "its long record of devotion to considered and forceful expression of independent progressive thinking." Still another is Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, who said he is "glad we have such publications as the Nation."

Among the others are Eleanor Roosevelt, Trygve Lie, James G. Patton, president of the Farmers Union; Benjamin V. Cohen, Marshall Field, Thomas Mann, Owen Lattimore, Prime Minister Nehru, Archibald MacLeish, Sir Benegal Rau, Frank P. Graham, William Green, David E. Lilienthal, Thurman Arnold, Francis Biddle, Harold Ickes, and Alan Barth, editorial writer for the Washington Post.

[From the New Leader of May 19, 1951]

THE NATION CENSORS

A PREFACE BY THE EDITORS

The New Leader publishes below two letters from the noted art critic, Clement Greenberg, which we believe deserve to be fully publicized. The first of these is addressed to the editors of the New Leader, and accompanied the second, and basic, communication, which was originally dispatched to the editors of the Nation.

Mr. Greenberg's letter to the Nation consists, as the reader will soon discover, of a criticism of the Nation's foreign editor, J. Alvarez del Vayo, who Mr. Greenberg suggests has been consistently following the Soviet line. By something more than indirection, it is also a criticism of the Nation on the same grounds. The editor of that magazine, however, refused to publish Mr. Greenberg's letter, whereupon Mr. Greenberg requested space in the New Leader.

We agreed to his request for three reasons:

1. We believe strongly, and have consistently practiced the belief that a magazine which espouses liberal democratic principles is duty-bound to act as a forum for the dissemination of responsible opinion on issues of the day, irrespective of whether such opinion coincides with the editorial policy of the publication involved. Certainly, if there is frequently editorial or other justification for refusing to publish controversial articles—whose selection is, after all, purely an editorial prerogative—there is, on the other hand, absolutely no justification for refusing to publish a letter to the editor, provided it is couched in appropriate language and deals with serious subject matter. Since the Nation has campaigned, for many years,

against censorship in all its forms, we cannot understand why it should itself now indulge in this form of censorship.

2. We believe, further, that the issues raised by Mr. Greenberg are of utmost significance both to liberals and to Americans in general, and therefore merit fullest publicity. If Mr. Greenberg is wrong, it is up to those whom he accuses to prove him wrong by challenging him in the full light of public debate.

3. Finally, we publish this correspondence because the reputation and the name of its author demand that he be heard. Clement Greenberg was the Nation's art critic for 6 years, from 1943 to 1949, and has been a frequent contributor to the Nation for nearly a decade. Mr. Greenberg is therefore no stranger either to the Nation or to the ideals for which it claims to stand.

In an effort to elicit the Nation's opinion on this whole matter, we sent its editors a formal note extending to them "the opportunity to reply to Mr. Greenberg, in the pages of the New Leader, at your earliest convenience." The New Leader added, "We place no limitations upon the amount of space you may wish to devote to such a reply." (The Editors.)

A LETTER OF CRITICISM

FEBRUARY 21, 1951.

The EDITORS OF THE NEW LEADER.

DEAR SIRS: The letter below was addressed to the Nation but refused publication in its correspondence columns by the editor, Freda Kirchwey. I have been a steady contributor to the Nation over the last 8 or 9 years, and was its regular art critic between 1943 and 1949. Accordingly, I feel that I have a certain real stake in its welfare. And I also feel that the making public of my letter will be of benefit to the magazine.

My thanks are due the New Leader for giving me the hospitality of its pages for the sake of initiating an open and unprejudiced discussion of an issue that should be of concern to all genuine liberals in this country.

CLEMENT GREENBERG.

FEBRUARY 7, 1951.

The EDITORS OF THE NATION.

DEAR SIRS: I find it shocking that any part of your—and our—magazine should consistently act as a vehicle through which the interests of a particular state power are expressed. It makes no difference which state power: the scandal lies in the fact of the commitment, and that the Nation should thereby betray its claim to be a journal of independent and principled opinion. The operation of J. Alvarez del Vayo's column along a line which invariably parallels that of Soviet propaganda is something that I protest against as both a reader and a contributor. He presents the point of view of the Soviet Union with a regularity that is quite out of place in a liberal periodical.

Since he began writing in the Nation about a decade ago, Mr. del Vayo has defended every step in Soviet policy and, just as unfailingly, criticized or evaded every argument and step opposed to that policy. There are journalists equally consistent in their support of the same or another state power, but they write for organs that more or less declare their editorial adherence to the cause of the power in question; those who read these organs are not invited to do so under false claims. It is not the same in the case of the Nation, which takes pride in asserting its independence.

I would not be shocked if Mr. del Vayo appeared to be just a sympathizer of Soviet policy; but the evidence furnished by his own words would show that his column has become a medium through which arguments remarkably like those which the Stalin regime itself advances are transmitted in a more plausible form to the American public. Disingenuously, and with an abundance of circumlocution and a show of openmindedness designed to render those arguments more persuasive, he has managed to give the Soviet Union the right at every point in its differences with the Western Powers. To be sure, Mr. del Vayo says, Russia is not always blameless, yet somehow he always calls upon the West to take the first step—and make the first concession—to assure peace. Thus, in the 85th anniversary issue of the Nation, that of December 16, Mr. del Vayo, not pausing to write a general survey piece as most of the other contributors do, hurries out the issue of Germany, that prize which is the most immediate goal of Russian longing. After 2,000 words or so of speciously objective review and analysis, he produces a solution straight out of the Soviet Foreign Ministry; unify Germany politically—for a divided Germany is a greater menace to Moscow than a unified one, and a quartered one an even greater. Yet Mr. del Vayo is well aware of why the west is afraid to permit the unification of Germany at this time; so well aware that, apparently, he cannot take the chance of even mentioning the fact that the west is afraid.

An instance of how closely Mr. del Vayo's views at any given moment correspond with those of the Soviet publicists was given several months ago (the date can be verified by your files) when he warned of the dire economic consequences to this country of a prolongation of the cold war, adding that Russia was better able to stand up to the economic strain because of the lower living standard of its population (he used, characteristically, a much more indirect expression than "low standard of living," as if afraid that such a blunt phrase might offend someone). A few days later (the date can be verified by consulting the files of the New York Times) the Soviet press stated the same warning in about the same terms—though apparently, according to the Times' story, it left out any mention of standards of living. Curiously enough, Mr. del Vayo, as well as the Soviet press, appears to have dropped this tactic of persuasion immediately afterward.

Another instance—and I select it not because it is an extreme one but because it is typical and recent—is of Mr. del Vayo's column of December 9. There he implies that the United States refusal to recognize the Communist regime in China and admit it to the United Nations brought about the present crisis in Korea, as if this were sufficient excuse for a state to throw its armies into battle. Nor should we mistake Mr. del Vayo's revolutionary ardor for primitive violence, or ignore the sources in revolutionary tradition of Chinese defiance, as if revolution justified everything. Though he refers constantly to the injustice of withholding Formosa from the Peiping regime, Mr. del Vayo has not once considered the American side of the case, which, in the context of two powers jockeying for position under the threat of war, has certainly a great deal more moral warrant than the invasion of South Korea by the North Koreans, for which he has not yet had any words of condemnation. He seldom allows that our Government has its justified fears and suspicions of Russia, though he is ever ready to point out how much reason we give the latter for being suspicious of us—with the insinuation, repeated time and again, that the allaying of that suspicion is the chief task of world diplomacy.

In the same column he complains that Sir Gladwyn Jebb's speech in the United Nations pledging Britain's support of American policy in Asia "compounded the confusion by appearing to deny the differences of opinion among the United States, Britain, and France upon which the hope of compromise had been built." The "compromise" would have been largely in the Chinese Communists' favor, and Sir Gladwyn's speech was an attempt to heal the possible split in the common front of the western states upon which the U. S. S. R. at present places its main hope of having its own way cheaply. The "confusion," that is, was Soviet Russia's, not the UN's.

Some time ago, in another column, Mr. del Vayo referred to the Socialist "feud" against the U. S. S. R. In view of how the Communist parties abroad behave, and have behaved, toward the Socialists, and of what the Soviet Government did to Polish Socialists Erlich and Alter, and in view moreover of what is now happening to Socialists in Eastern Europe, this is like talking of the Jewish feud against Hitler.

I could multiply such instances of special and specious pleading on behalf of the U. S. S. R. by the Nation's foreign editor, but I would have to go far beyond the limits of a letter. I do not want to be misunderstood, however; I am not concerned here to discuss where the right lies in the differences between east and west. I abhor the Stalin regime and cannot see why one is obligated to consider both sides of the question any more in its case than in Hitler's, but still I do not protest here and now against the fact that it is Soviet Russia's cause in particular that Mr. del Vayo upholds. I protest simply against the fact that the Nation permits its columns to be used for the consistent expression of any point of view indistinguishable from that of a given state power. The Nation has the right to side with the Stalin regime when it holds itself compelled to by principle (though it does it so often that that constitutes another, if lesser, scandal), but not to put its pages at the regular disposal of one whose words consistently echo the interests of that regime; nor has it the right to make that person its foreign editor.

CLEMENT GREENBERG.

[From Commentary of April 1951]

THE LIBERALS WHO HAVEN'T LEARNED WHY THE SOVIET ILLUSION STILL LINGERS

(By Granville Hicks)

Last December the Nation celebrated its 85th birthday by publishing an outsize of the sort that has become almost obligatory for such occasions. Many prominent persons, including the President of the United States and a variety of politicians, labor leaders, and publicists, furnished congratulatory messages, and more than 50 men and women—college presidents, authors, clergymen, and so on—were listed as sponsors. Labor and philanthropic organizations, business firms, and individuals took advertising in which to express their good wishes to the magazine. When one examines the contents, however, one wonders what is being celebrated and who is doing the celebrating. For the issue, which is devoted to the problem of negotiating peace with Russia, may well serve in its total effect—however high-minded the intention and in spite of various articles that take a contrary position—as a piece of special pleading. There is a pro-Soviet bias in enough of the 25 articles to color the entire issue.

The existence at this moment of our history of pro-Russian sentiment among persons who call themselves liberals presents an interesting problem, which I intend to discuss. But first I had better explain and substantiate my charge of bias. The question is not whether peace should be negotiated or not. I myself am far from agreeing with those Americans who take it for granted that war with Russia is inevitable and oppose negotiation under any circumstances or on any terms. Nor is the question whether critics of our foreign policy have the right to speak out. Of course they do. The question is whether the account of the Russian-American situation given in the Nation corresponds to the facts or is distorted by preconceptions. I believe that we have

here in the anniversary issue of the Nation views of Russia and of America so biased that, if they were widely held, they would seriously weaken this country either in the maintenance of peace or the waging of war.

The point cannot be proven without some tedious summaries and restatements, but let us get on with the chore. We can begin appropriately with the article by the Nation's editor, Freda Kirchwey. Speaking of Korea, she says: "That the North's attack was an 'aggression' is disputed only by Communists and their backers. It was an aggression because the thirty-eighth parallel, agreed upon by the occupying powers, was also recognized de facto by both Korean regimes. It was an accepted boundary, crossed by the northern army in force." With its quotation marks around "aggression" and its legalistic terminology, this is scarcely a forthright statement. Even so, the next word, inevitably, is "but." "But to say this and nothing more is again to blur meanings. For the attack was more than an aggression; it was also an act of civil war and revolution."

It turns out that in Miss Kirchwey's mind any Russian aggression is an act of revolution. "The important fact," she writes, "is that, whatever Russia's ultimate purposes may be, its interests are promoted rather than interfered with by revolutionary change. With no stake in the survival of free enterprise, it can consolidate its power in the very process of satisfying the most urgent social and economic desires of the majority. Those who get hurt are the few, especially in countries like Korea, with primitive standards of living and of political action."

Doubtless there is some truth in this: Communism continues to appeal to the exploited and oppressed, those to whom any change seems likely to be beneficial, and it has often introduced reforms, particularly in the ownership of land, that have in fact benefited large numbers of people. But Russia does not rely on the democratic support of the majority to consolidate its power, nor do such reforms for long survive the appetite for absolute power of the Soviet bureaucracy. It is concerned neither with economic security nor with any of the more fundamental freedoms, but with its own domination, relying wholly on force, as currently in Czechoslovakia, liquidating not only the leaders of the bourgeoisie but also those Communists who are not entirely subservient to Moscow. Its agents, its spies, even its generals—as in Poland and Hungary—take over the country its revolution has conquered, and proceed to loot the economy, depress the standard of living, render impotent the trade union movement, and prohibit all economic and social protest. To say none of this, to talk as if Russian expansion were principally a matter of satisfying the most urgent social and economic desires of the majority, is to give a false picture.

Yet Miss Kirchwey suggests that Russia, whatever its faults, is on the side of revolution, while the United States, it is equally clear to her, is actually or potentially on the side of reaction, and is concerned exclusively with the dogma of "free enterprise." Hence she views with suspicion any such American act as that involved in the intervention in Korea. She admits, as we have seen, that the invasion of South Korea was an act of aggression. She also admits that the prompt action taken by the United States and the United Nations raised the prestige of both. But she has her misgivings, which she places in the mouths of "many leaders of non-Communist countries": "They realized that a precedent might be in the making which could later be used to justify UN sanctions in case of rebellion—described as Russian-inspired—against a colonial power or an oppressive national regime." Again one can see that this might possibly be a danger in some speculative future, but it was certainly not the real and present danger that loomed so large last June, and about which one might have expected Miss Kirchwey to be properly anxious. The UN might conceivably be used to suppress a righteous colonial revolt—many things are conceivable. But Russia did in fact launch North Korea into an aggressive war.

Miss Kirchwey has a series of imperatives: "We must accept revolution as the dominant, inescapable fact of our time. * * * We must become, and quickly, the new sponsor of revolution, helping the peoples of the world to win all that communism promises or provides—plus liberty. * * * We must, if we are to seize a chance which may, indeed, be the last, rediscover our democratic beliefs, lost somewhere in the compromises of these years of shifting expediencies." That is the way Miss Kirchwey sees the world: a Russia riding the wave of inevitable revolution, opposed by a United States that has lost its democratic beliefs and processes.

J. Alvarez del Vayo, the Nation's foreign editor, is also a habitual skeptic so far as American policy is concerned. I remember an article that he wrote from Paris last summer, soon after the invasion of South Korea. Quoting "very intelligent observers" and other "authorities on international affairs," he first dwelt on the inefficiency and corruption of the Government of South Korea and then referred to "grave doubts about the wisdom of America's 'letting itself be maneuvered into an untenable position' or 'allowing itself to be bled white in Korea,' two favorite expressions." The moral was clear: South Korea couldn't be saved, and it wasn't worth saving, anyhow. Somehow or other, the question of the North Korean regime—its inefficiency, its corruption, its bloody despotism—never was raised.

In the anniversary issue Mr. del Vayo employs a similar logic in talking about Germany. He argues, first, that the west is at least as much responsible as Russia for the German situation: "The fact is the Potsdam agreement was whittled away, bit by bit, by both sides; the initial breaches cannot be attributed solely to the Russians." He then points out that rearming Germany is dangerous business; the prospect of a rearmed Germany allied with the west may precipitate rather than prevent Russian attack. And, because of Russia's pacific intentions, rearming is unnecessary: "The problem of Germany would appear hopeless but for certain indications that Russia wants to find a solution." In other words, the threat to peace comes primarily from the United States, the hope for peace primarily from Russia.

Carolus, the Nation's pseudonymous correspondent in West Germany, tries even harder than del Vayo to frighten his readers. "Viewed in this light," he writes, "the question fails to remain as naive or simple as Washington would make it seem: 'Is Europe to become Bolshevized and Russianized?' No, indeed. Moscow has forced Washington to consider another choice: 'Shall the European Continent be dominated tomorrow by Russia or Germany?' To vanquish Russia—according to the formula proposed by General McCloy—would only mean handing Europe over to the Germans."

That these same arguments are currently being set forth by the West German Communist Party does not, of course, invalidate them. No one can feel comfortable about the rearming of Germany. But surely, if one looks at the facts, Carolus and del Vayo grossly exaggerate the danger of the present German militaristic threat, and, what is more important, they flagrantly minimize the present danger of Russian aggression. Del Vayo barely mentions the armed police forces in East Germany, and refers to "the supposed threat of Russian invasion." That the threat may be real is a possibility he and Carolus do not discuss.

One more article must be mentioned—"The War of Ideas," by Isaac Deutscher, a London journalist and the author of a controversial biography of Stalin. After quoting Sorel on the French revolution, Deutscher asks, "Must the world now learn to see in the Russian revolution also only a conqueror?" It is a surprising question for anyone to be asking in this period of history, and even more astonishing is Deutscher's reply in the negative. "Another decade or two of industrialization and education," he blandly says, "should give the Russian people so high a standard of living and so strong a sense of independence that they will have no use for Beria's concentration camps and spies, for Pravda's byzantine language, and for an iron curtain." (How often one heard such words a decade or two ago.) "Democratic freedoms," Deutscher writes, "must of course be defended against the encroachments of Stalinism. But"—again the word is inevitable—"is not democracy imperceptibly being undermined and destroyed in its own name?"

Mr. Deutscher's logic is not always easy to follow, but I think he is saying something like this: Russia is currently a despotism, which is a bad thing, but the germ of revolutionary truth is in Russia just the same, and it will operate if the country is left in peace. On the other hand, the United States cannot organize itself to resist Russia without destroying democracy and allying itself with "international counterrevolution." He concludes: "It is the supreme duty of statesmen and leaders to explore every possible avenue toward a negotiated settlement." Now, if our statesmen entered upon negotiations with Russia with the assumptions in mind that I have just described, can anyone seriously doubt that the result would be appeasement and a great upsurge of Russian aggression?

The articles I have been discussing are not only significant in themselves; they are also significant in their relation to other articles that are not open to the same objections. What Andrew Roth and Rayford Logan, for example, have to say about colonialism seems reasonable enough, but in the context set by the above articles it has the effect of adding one more item to a bill of indictment against the democracies. A Mexican journalist, Jesus Silva Herzog, writes a diatribe against war—"no international war has been good for any people"—that would merely seem old-fashioned and irrelevant if one read it elsewhere, but here becomes an argument for appeasement. James Warburg's criticisms of our containment policy, Vera Micheles Dean's plea for a bloc of neutral powers, even Grenville Clark's discussion of world government—all these acquire, in this setting, implications that are probably not what the authors had in mind. There is nothing sinister or subversive about this, and perhaps the editors did not consciously plan the effect they have achieved, but there it is, and it is a natural consequence of the bias I have described.

The general line of this bias is in the direction of giving the Soviet Union the benefit of almost every doubt, and the United States the benefit of very little doubt at all. Pro-Soviet liberalism seems to most of us a contradiction in terms, but it is a fact. And it is a fact with a history that makes it understandable. However paradoxical it appears, the magazine that calls itself "America's leading liberal weekly since 1865," however noble its intention, in some sense serves today as an apologist for Soviet Russia. To some extent, no doubt, this is a matter of individual viewpoints, but it is also a product of tendencies that have existed in American liberalism for many years.

The Nation has indeed been a liberal weekly since the end of the Civil War, but it has represented several different varieties of liberalism: it was one thing under Edwin

Lawrence Godkin and another under Oswald Garrison Villard; it has become still another under Freda Kirchwey. Mr. Godkin's Nation need not much concern us. It could claim to be liberal, for Godkin was a disciple of John Stuart Mill and more intransigent than his master, but its brand of utilitarian, laissez-faire liberalism has never exerted much influence in this country, and Godkin, for all his brilliance and courage, had argued himself into a lonesome little corner before his death in 1902.

The Nation of Oswald Garrison Villard, however, is very much to the point. Mr. Villard took over in 1918, when the magazine had been moribund for a dozen years. Since he was an alert journalist and at the moment—largely because of his disapproval of American participation in World War I—a come-outer, a rebel, he opened the magazine to all those who quarreled with the status quo. In the midst of the hysteria that followed the armistice, when so much of the artificially induced hatred and fear of Germany and the Germans was released in a great witch hunt, when Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer was arresting thousands of "Reds," when the State Legislature of New York was expelling its duly elected Socialist members, when every strike was a Bolsheviki uprising, the Nation became a great bulwark not merely of liberalism but of liberty itself.

Lewis Gannett, writing 10 years ago in the more reminiscent and considerably less solemn issue with which the magazine observed its seventy-fifth birthday, told what Villard's Nation was like:

"I doubt that there was ever such another journalistic heaven as was The Nation in the early postwar years. I came back from France that autumn of 1919 with one ambition in all the world: to land a job on Villard's Nation. I knew what I wanted, and was blissful when I got it: half-time at first, and small pay.

"Those were rousing days on Vesey Street. Every week's issue was a new adventure. The country was still in a state of war shock: it was blockading Germans, seeing Reds under every bed, crushing strikes in the name of freedom. And yet there was a breeze of hope in the air, a stirring all around the world. * * * And there was exhilaration in fighting the whole wicked world.

"Was there ever a day when the American press did quite as much lying? Even the crusading New York World waited until after the steel strike was crushed to tell a little truth about it; we on The Nation had fresh news, not printed in the big papers, almost every week. The Times and the other papers were killing off Lenin and Trotsky and crushing the Russian Revolution three times a week; we had our own reports * * *. It is almost impossible to believe today that a world could ever have seemed so full of hope—or so full of such sinister machinations as The Nation was privileged to expose, week after week."

There is further testimony, not as to the Nation but as to the mood of the postwar years, in the introduction that John Dos Passos wrote for the Modern Library edition of his Three Soldiers. That was a bitter book, and everyone had commented on its bitterness, but Dos Passos, looking back in 1932, knew that it was a hopeful book as well, that hope was what underlay its bitterness, and he wrote of the spring of 1919:

"Any spring is a time of overturn, but then Lenin was alive, the Seattle general strike had seemed the beginning of the flood instead of the beginning of the ebb, Americans in Paris were groggy with theater and painting and music; Picasso was to rebuild the eye, Stravinski was cramming the Russian steppes into our ears, currents of energy seemed breaking out everywhere as young guys climbed out of their uniforms, imperial America was all shiny with the new idea of ritz, in every direction the countries of the world stretched out starving and angry, ready for anything turbulent and new, whenever you went to the movies you saw Charlie Chaplin."

That was what it was like in the years after the First World War. Academic communities were particularly susceptible to the mood of hopeful indignation, and at Harvard even an undergraduate from a respectable Republican, middle-class family, an undergraduate who had to keep his eye mostly on the problem of financing his education, found that he was not immune. I joined the Harvard Liberal Club, and during 1 year—I think it was 1921-22, my junior year—I ate lunch daily at the clubhouse. The president that year was an energetic fellow, and when he discovered that a prominent liberal was about to visit Cambridge or Boston, he offered him the hospitality of the clubhouse. They came, and they talked, two or three or four every week, and there were always some of us to listen. We listened to anarchists, Communists, socialists, single taxers, pacifists, to people who proposed to save the world by birth control or prison reform or workers' education or vegetarianism, to advocates of the Plumb plan, friends of Sacco and Vanzetti, foes of the Versailles Treaty, to admirers of Ramsay MacDonald, disciples of Mahatma Gandhi, enemies of Benito Mussolini. And as if that wasn't enough, I used to go to the Ford Hall forum on Sunday evenings and listen to the same kind of people—often, of course, the same people.

The theory of the president of the Liberal Club was that the members would be interested in hearing any kind of dissenter—anybody who was against the status quo. Not that we were incorrigibly serious-minded; on the contrary, we were, from the point of view of the young Communists of a decade or so later, frivolous dilettantes. But we did feel that the status quo was dreadfully, excitingly wrong, while at the same time we had no doubt that all the multifarious wrongness could be remedied if people of good will would work a little harder at it. That the reforms proposed and the systems expounded were more often than not irreconcilable we had sense enough to realize, but we regarded the will as more important than the scheme, and we felt that somehow the best features of all the proposals could be combined, when the time was ripe, in one flawless formula for utopia.

It was some years later that I came across Ralph Waldo Emerson's account of the Convention of Friends of Universal Reform held at the Chardon Street chapel in Boston in 1840: "Madmen, madwomen, men with beards, Dunkers, Muggletonians, Come-outers, Groaners, Agrarians, Seventh-day Baptists, Quakers, Abolitionists, Calvinists, Unitarians, and Philosophers—all came successively to the top and seized their moment, if not their hour, wherein to chide, or pray, or preach, or protest."

In memory the 1920's seem to have been one grand, prolonged Chardon Street chapel convention of the fellowship of the enemies of the status quo. A few years after graduation from Harvard, when I was teaching at a college in western Massachusetts, I again saw the fellowship in action. There was a Sunday evening forum in town, and Scott Nearing came to praise Russia, John Haynes Holmes to denounce war, Norman Thomas to urge the next step toward socialism, Roger Baldwin to protest the latest outrage against civil liberty. We listened—instructors, students, and a handful of townspeople—and whether we agreed or not we had the comfortable feeling that all these eloquent advocates were on our side.

What we meant by the status quo included a lot more than politics and economics. Our quarrel was with the Philistines—the Babbitts, as Sinclair Lewis had taught us to call them—and anyone who would smite them was our ally. H. L. Mencken, with his constant and diverting warfare against the booboisie, was rather more of a hero in our eyes than, say, Robert La Follette, for whom most of us had voted in 1924. We sympathized with the sober-sided pacifism of Devere Allen and Kirby Page, and we admired Powers Hapgood for casting his lot with the coal miners, but we got more excited about Judge Lindsey's views on companionate marriage and Bertrand Russell's program for sexual freedom. In 1921 Harold Stearns and 30 inquirers had published Civilization in the United States, which differed chiefly in its verbosity from the legendary volume on snakes in Ireland, and there were several similar collective analyses, including two that came out of the Nation—Our Changing Morality (1924) and These United States (1925). We welcomed them all.

Just as remarkable as the vociferousness of dissent was the inarticulateness of conservatism. There was plenty of flag-waving, plenty of bragging, plenty of abuse for the knockers, in the Saturday Evening Post, the American, and other popular magazines, but criticisms of the status quo were seldom squarely met. I remember how diligently the director of our local forum sought for a conservative who would debate on capitalism or the national administration or any similar topic. Finally a publicist for one of the large manufacturers of electrical equipment consented to debate with Norman Thomas on public ownership of electric power. Obviously he was accustomed to entertaining Rotarians, Kiwanians, and the members of women's clubs with a pleasant little chat on the wonders of electricity, and hadn't known what he was letting himself in for. As soon as the main speeches had been finished, and before there could be rebuttal or questions, he announced that he had to catch a train and fled through the hall, with Mr. Thomas following him to the door and hurling statistics after him. Wiser proponents of the status quo let prosperity speak for itself, and it spoke loudly enough to drown out the talk about Teapot Dome, dollar diplomacy in Central America, the suppression of strikes, the rise of the Ku Klux Klan, the ineptness of Calvin Coolidge, and other unpleasant aspects of the twenties.

The dissenters were in a curious position. Along what might be called the cultural front they were winning constant victories, not merely in art and letters but also in morals. A fundamental sociological change had taken place, the rise to a new level of productivity and the shift to urbanism, and to a great extent the dissenters were merely calling attention to the implications of that change. And people were willing to listen because the time was ripe and also because they felt secure in their economic and political institutions. So the liberals were hapy, because of their victories but perhaps also in part because of their defeats—because they could attack economic and political abuses to their heart's content without having to, or being able to, do anything.

It was the heyday of the liberal weeklies. The New Republic had been founded in 1914 as a critical journal devoted to progressive democracy. Mr. Villard took over the Nation in 1918. (The Freeman, founded in 1920, lasted only 4 years, perhaps because it was more austere than the others, perhaps because it was less adequately subsidized.) Neither the Nation nor the New Republic had a large circulation in the twenties, but they were influential, and they deserved to be, for they were vigorous, well-written, exciting magazines. Bliven of the New Republic was a lively journalist, and Villard was a master hand at a jeremiad. Frank R. Kent, one of the wisest of political reporters, wrote for both magazines. Other good journalists were staff members or regular contributors, and there was always a newspaperman somewhere or other to produce a story on a strike or a political scandal or a lynching that the

newspapers wouldn't touch. And the back of the book, either book, was likely to be even better than the front. The Van Dorens ran the Nation's book pages, with Joseph Wood Krutch as drama critic and a frequent contributor of literary pieces, and Lovett, Littell, and Wilson successively edited the book section of the New Republic. Anyone was likely to turn up as a book reviewer, from H. L. Mencken to T. S. Eliot, from E. M. Forster to Mike Gold; there were entertaining "middle" pieces on all kinds of topics; and the poems were by the good poets.

Although the New Republic never paid well and the Nation paid badly, they constantly published first-rate work both by people who were well known and by people who were going to be. Among writers in those days almost the only conservatives were the strictly commercial writers, and most of them weren't conservative in any philosophical sense, they were merely smug. If you weren't smug, you were glad, even proud, to write for the Nation and the New Republic. The magazines were, in short, the principal organs of the united front of the dissenting intellectuals, the fellowship of the enemies of the status quo, and they profited enormously from that fact.

That united front, of course, was shattered by the impact of the great depression, but even before 1929 it had failed in its most significant test—the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Never had there been such unanimity of liberal opinion or such vehemence in its expression. Never, for that matter, had the liberals been more demonstrably in the right. Yet they were impotent. The issue was the status quo, and not only politicians and judges and college presidents but large numbers of ordinary and ordinarily inert citizens were determined to show the troublemakers who was boss. It is the anguish of helplessness one hears in Heywood Broun's columns, and hears echoed in John Dos Passos' outcry in the Big Money: "All Right We Are Two Nations."

The Sacco-Vanzetti case was important in another way: it brought the Communists into action as part of the united front. The alliance was not altogether happy, and the Communists were accused of attempting to dominate the Sacco-Vanzetti defense, of using the case for their own ends, and of following tactics that endangered the lives of the two anarchists. Even, however, when they granted that there was truth in these accusations, the liberal intellectuals continued to regard the Communists as inevitable, though sometimes uncomfortable, allies—as the more respectable reformers at the Chardon Street Chapel may have regarded the Groaners and the men with beards.

The whole problem of communism was one that the fellowship of the enemies of the status quo didn't have to face up to in the twenties, and didn't. So far as Russia was concerned, most liberals wished the revolution well, and some were enthusiastic. If necessary, they could find easy ways to straddle: Communism was all right for Russia—but if, however, Russian shortcomings could be admitted, the enemies of the status quo—except for a handful of orthodox Socialists, especially European Socialists who had had some experience with Bolsheviks—took it for granted that Russia was on their side, simply because the defenders of the status quo feared and hated Russia with peculiar intensity.

American Communists, not very numerous and constantly preoccupied in this decade with factional battles, profited from the tolerance of Russia and the general tolerance of all forms of dissent. The Communists scorned—and in this period openly scorned—time-serving reformers and wishy-washy liberals, but the reformers and liberals could not scorn them and did not want to. Uncouth and dogmatic the Communists might be, but their opposition to the status quo was their ticket of admission to the united front. When the New Masses was founded in 1926, with a subsidy from the Garland Fund, it included on its executive board John Dos Passos, Paxton Hibben, Freda Kirchwey, James Rorty, and Rex Stout, and listed among its contributing editors Sherwood Anderson, Van Wyck Brooks, Stuart Chase, Waldo Frank, Lewis Mumford, Eugene O'Neill, Elmer Rice, Carl Sandburg, Upton Sinclair, and Edmund Wilson. Most of these people must have believed that the New Masses was going to be another organ of the united front, as the old Masses had in fact been. Actually, of course, the Communists controlled it, and it was purely an instrument of Communist propaganda, but, nevertheless, many of the liberal names remained on the masthead for a number of years.

All this reveals a naivete hard to credit at the present time, but even if the non-Communists had been considerably more alert than they were, the Communists would have been the beneficiaries of the disintegration of the liberal front that came in the early years of the depression. Day by day, as unemployment grew, it became apparent that something had to be done. We all know what was done: Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President, and he and his advisers, with the consent of a terrified Congress, introduced a variety of hastily contrived and often self-contradictory schemes, which saved the country. But in 1932 it was not apparent that Roosevelt had either the will or the ability to save the country, and that is how it happened that 52 artists and writers signed a manifesto supporting the Communist candidate for President, William Z. Foster.

I have suggested that the liberalism of the twenties was undiscriminating and sometimes even silly, and its disintegration under the impact of the depression does point to the existence of serious weaknesses. But it had its good qualities, too, its hopefulness and its generosity of spirit, and its influence proved to be far stronger than most people would have guessed in the early thirties. After all, the New Deal was largely built out of the ideas of the dissenters and reformers of the preceding decade.

Many liberals of the twenties moved into the ranks of the New Deal, where they functioned more or less fruitfully. Many others, however, as I have said, were convinced that nothing less than drastic economic and social change would suffice, and these intransigents, with a few exceptions, turned to the Communists for leadership. "Nobody in the world," said Lincoln Steffens, who was one of the 52 signers of the Foster-Ford manifesto, "proposes anything basic and real except the Communists." Edmund Wilson, who in 1931 had urged American radicals and progressives to take communism away from the Communists—"and take it without ambiguities or reservations, asserting emphatically that their ultimate goal is the ownership of the means of production by the government and an industrial rather than a regional representation"—was willing by 1932 to take the Communists along with communism, and he, too, signed the Foster statement. John Dos Passos, also a signer, warned liberal intellectuals that the class war had begun, and organized committees to aid the Communist victims in that struggle.

That part of the story is familiar enough, and there is no need of going into it here. The point is simply that the united front against the status quo had collapsed because the status quo had collapsed, and the question was no longer what you were against but what you were for. The Communists knew, had always known, what they were for, whereas no one else—or so it seemed to many besides Lincoln Steffens—did. Moreover, the Communists were doing something, and doing it with passion, violence, and complete self-sacrifice. They were fanatics, and fanaticism was what the desperateness of the times seemed to call for.

The incompatibility of liberalism, in any of the many meanings of the term, and communism need not be argued. The Communists, in their more candid moments, have always boasted of it, and the liberal intellectuals who embraced communism in the early 1930's were quite consciously repudiating liberalism. They were finished with liberalism as an attitude—"To hell with the open minds," Steffens wrote Ella Winter—and they were finished with liberalism as a program of progress through reform. They were talking now in terms of drastic, radical change and of clear-cut, violent alternatives. Even John Chamberlain, whose fellow-traveling was distant and brief, wrote a book called Farewell to Reform. "The situation," he wrote, "looked upon with intelligence and considered as a long-range proposition, can lead to but one of two personal conclusions: it can make one either a cynic or a revolutionist."[1]

The old fellowship of the enemies of the status quo had been destroyed. From the point of view of those who had caught a revolutionary vision, particularly but not merely the Communists and their fellow-travelers, an individual was not automatically an ally because he was against the Government or the capitalist system. The important question was what he proposed to do about capitalism, and if his proposals differed from yours, he was more to be reviled than a Union Club full of Wall Street bankers.

Such a situation at least promised a clarification, and if it had endured, perhaps a new liberalism would have defined itself but history took a new turn and another united front came into existence, this time a united front against fascism. At home the New Deal had made revolution, at least for the time being, both impossible and unnecessary, and in any case capitalism as practiced in New Deal America seemed highly preferable to fascism. If, therefore, the Communists had adhered to revolutionary principles, they would have lost much of their liberal following. But they didn't: the exigencies of Soviet foreign policy sent them spinning through the united front into the people's front and the democratic front. Within the new fellowship of the enemies of fascism there was all the excitement of the 20's and an even more bustling activity.

If it is easy to forget the substantial virtues of the liberalism of the 20's it is almost impossible to remember the values of the anti-Fascist united front. Even the simple fact that the Communists and the fellow-travelers and the liberals were right in opposing fascism has been obscured by the silly, when not vicious, talk about premature anti-Fascists. As for the seriousness, the industry, and the self-sacrifice of many of the anti-Fascists, they are recalled, often enough, only with embarrassment. Yet it is true that for a few years the majority of American radicals, progressives, liberals were working together and working effectively.

We prefer to forget that united front because it was contrived and used by the Communists and therefore fell apart at the moment that Molotov and Ribbentrop touched their pens to a piece of paper. Its major dogma had been the absolute wickedness of Germany; its minor, less emphasized but never forgotten assumption was the benevolence of Russia. Now opposites met, in the miraculous operation of the dialectic, and the result was not synthesis but chaos.

---

[1] My own experience and involvement with the Communists is described in the essay, Communism and the American Intellectuals, in the book, Whose Revolution? edited by I. D. Talmadge.

The question of the benevolence of Russia was crucial all through the period of the anti-Fascist front. The Communists, after 1935, said less and less about the necessity for a revolution on the Russian model; socialism was still the ultimate goal, but it was to be achieved in some vague future and under the aegis of Jefferson and Lincoln rather than Marx and Lenin. What mattered, the Communists said, was Russia's firm stand on our side, the anti-Fascist side. More and more intellectuals, however, were skeptical about Russia's benevolence, and called attention to the purges that followed the assassination of Serge Kirov, the mockery of the trials, the slaughter of the old Bolsheviks, the growing adulation of Stalin. Many of these critics found in Trotskyism a way of reconciling, for a time at least, intransigence and disillusionment. But for the majority, prior to August 23, 1939, the thought of Russia's anti-Fascist role was enough to stifle doubts. As Louis Fischer and Vincent Sheean confessed after the pact, it even persuaded persons who were in Russia and could see what was happening to tell less than the truth.

Both the Nation and the New Republic had ridden the tide of the new united front, though both were affected by the growing dissatisfaction with Stalin's Russia and the Nation had its anti-Stalinist enclave. After the pact both magazines opened their pages as never before to critics of Russia. A new alliance of anti-Fascists, anti-Communist liberals began to take shape, but it was inevitably submerged by the problems of the war, which took on a new urgency after the fall of France. And then history played another trick, making Russia not merely "our" ally but the official ally of the United States, and one saw how persistent had been the faith in Russia among the united fronters. From 1941 to 1945, when criticism of our ally was bad manners, the old belief in Russia as a special case grew stronger and stronger. How, as various writers repeatedly asked in the Nation and the New Republic, could we regard communism as a failure when we saw how bravely the Russians fought at Stalingrad?

Thus pro-Soviet liberalism was given vitality enough to survive in the difficult atmosphere of the postwar years. There are, I suppose, three elements in the present pro-Soviet compound: the Communists, both party members and close fellow travelers; leftist liberals; and a sprinkling of deluded pacifists. Of the pacifists one can say simply, they are mistaken. For the Communists a case can be made but not in the terms they currently use, nor is it likely to convince many Americans since it rests on the assumption that Soviet imperialism is the chosen instrument of world revolution and on a willingness to equate what goes on in Russia with socialism. If the pro-Soviet front has any strength in America today, it is because there are still liberals who provide the verbal cloak of "social betterment" that hides the nakedness of the brutal revolutionary totalitarianism that is the Communist aim.

That the front still does have some strength, in spite of Soviet aggression, was demonstrated by Henry Wallace's campaign for the presidency and by the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace held in New York 2 years ago. As one read the list of sponsors of the conference, one recognized the names of many of the faithful, but in addition to the faithful and in addition to those who might properly be described as gulls, there were the pro-Soviet liberals, dozens of them.

How many blows the pro-Soviet liberals have withstood—the trials, the pact, what happened in Czechoslovakia, what happened in Yugoslavia, what happened in Korea. They have been forced to yield ground; they no longer try to maintain that the Soviet Union is a utopia; they do not deny the existence of Russian aggression; they do not pretend to believe that Tito is the Wall Street agent the Cominform says he is; they usually refer with contempt to the American Communist Party. And yet Russia remains for them on the right, the revolutionary (progressive) side. The mistakes and shortcomings of the United States are pitilessly analyzed in the anniversary issue, as is customary in the Nation the year round, but Russia's faults and offenses, if they are not ignored or explained away, are made to seem of secondary importance in view of her revolutionary (progressive) role.

The pro-Soviet liberals are probably not altogether happy about their present position, but when I try to imagine what they have to say to and for themselves, I can guess where they find comfort and strength. "At least," they must say, "we do not belong to the reactionary front. We are not engaged in persecuting government employees and school teachers and radio actresses, nor are we clamoring for atomic war. We have not enlisted under the banner of Senator McCARTHY."

This defense has an air of plausibility, but, when one looks at it carefully, it is a further demonstration of how little the pro-Soviet liberals have learned. Certainly some (actually not many) of the ex-Communists and ex-fellow travelers, as well as a lot of other people, seem to assume that nothing matters but the defeat of communism and that all anti-Communists are their friends, but if the past two decades teach any lesson, it is that the wrongness of one extreme does not prove the rightness of the other. The pro-Soviet liberals are confirmed in their cause because they are against persecution, heresy hunting, and atomic warfare. In 1919 they—or, if they are under 50, their ideological ancestors—denounced A. Mitchell Palmer and opposed Allied intervention in Russia. How, they ask, can they be wrong in denouncing Senator McCARTHY and opposing preventive war? The answer is that on these scores they aren't wrong, but that doesn't make them right about much else.

The twenties asked what a man was against, not what he was for, and for the twenties that was a natural attitude. It was not an attitude, however, that encouraged discrimination. One was vaguely favorable to half-understood systems and schemes because they were opposed to the status quo, and it was in this sense that the liberals of the twenties were for Russia. The events of the past 20 years, however, have shown most people the need for more careful distinctions. We have seen how vulnerable the status quo is, and have learned the irresponsibility of its wholesale condemnation. For that matter, we have learned how vulnerable civilization is, how arduous the struggle to preserve it may be. And we have learned—many of us in its own sorry school—that communism is not just another scheme, another idea. It is one of the real absolutes of our time, perhaps the only absolute, and by its nature, by virtue of what it has made of itself, it permits of no neutrality. The liquidation of neutrals is one of its specialties.

To call communism an absolute is, I realize, to invite an absolute anticommunism, and the absolutists do exist and grow more numerous. That, however, is one of the chances that have to be taken in these constricted times. At least the assumptions of the absolute anti-Communists are in the open and can be openly examined and openly fought, whereas the assumptions of the pro-Soviet liberals are concealed—often, one suspects, from such liberals themselves. Self-deception, as I have been trying to say, is nothing new in the history of American liberalism, but today, when it serves so well the purposse of those for whom deception is a basic strategy, and when it effects such a profound corruption of thought and culture, it is a luxury we cannot afford.

The Nation, of course, is not of a single piece; by no means all of its political articles represent the pro-Soviet liberal point of view, and its book section is something else altogether. In its basic editorial policies, however, it tends to speak for a small segment of liberalism—small but not insignificant. One looks back with regret to the time when the Nation spoke for all the liberals and was a better magazine than it is today, but we cannot hold the Nation responsible for the fragmentation of liberalism. It happened, and we have to deal with the situation as best we can. The Nation—and, unhappily, it is not alone in this respect among progressive organs and organizations—has preserved what was weakest and blindest in the old liberalism, and has carried over attitudes that once were merely irresponsible but now are dangerous.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the New Leader and an article by Granville Hicks entitled "The Liberals Who Haven't Learned.")

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include certain editorials.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith an address by Brig. Gen. G. S. Malloy.

Mr. McGUIRE (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. CRUMPACKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement and testimony of Thomas Stack at hearings on railroad retirement bills.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some resolutions adopted by the Cattlemen's Association of Nebraska.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. McGRATH) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and

include a statement by Sterling F. Staudenmire.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an address by the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from Mr. John T. Jones, director of Labor's Nonpartisan League.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BROWNSON (at the request of Mr. HARVEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include an editorial.

Mr. SHEEHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include in one his own statement before a committee and in the other a clipping.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 7, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

432. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain franchises enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico, pursuant to section 38 of the act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 964), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

433. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $238,843 for civil functions, Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers (H. Doc. No. 124); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

434. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

435. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

436. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3973. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 422. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 3973. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3974. A bill to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to maritime functions of the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3975. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 3976. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 3977. A bill to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions, receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3978. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3979. A bill to define the enrolled Indians of California as an identifiable group of American Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3980. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H. R. 3981. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3982. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution directing the President to roll back prices generally to the levels prevailing during the period from May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORRIS: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Oklahoma memorializing the Congress of the United States to aid and assist the States in their efforts to force certain fathers to fulfill their obligations to their children and society by passing H. R. 1403, more commonly known as the Steed bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Oklahoma requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal those parts of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939 which require State welfare plans to prohibit inspection of records and data by taxpayers and the public; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, relative to an act passed by the State of Maryland, authorizing the State of Maryland to enter into compacts with other States, possessions or Territories of the United States or with the District of Columbia, for mutual helpfulness in meeting any civil defense emergency or any other disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 3983. A bill for the relief of the Clemmer Construction Co., Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3984. A bill for the relief of the Downing Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3985. A bill for the relief of Hai Soon Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3986. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hai Soon Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3987. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hudes Aida Goldberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3988. A bill for the relief of Peter Blewett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 3989. A bill for the relief of Ivo Markulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3990. A bill for the relief of Paul Frkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

268. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of Members of Post N, Travelers Protective Association, opposing Federal increase in gasoline taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

269. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of American citizens of Greenwich, Conn., having no objection to paying a fair share of the cost of protecting our Nation and our American way of life, but opposing all nonessential expenditures. Also expressing resentment to an increase in income taxes while business profits of cooperatives and mutual corporations are exempted from Federal income taxes. Urging enactment of legislation to tax the untaxed prior to increasing personal income taxes again; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

270. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dr. Warren T. Brown, president of the Texas Society for Mental Health, Austin, Tex., relative to the President's budget to Congress involving a cut in mental health funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

271. Also, petition of Charles C. Swanson, clerk, Minneapolis, Minn., relative to opposing location of United States Air Force Base at Wold-Chamberlain Field; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of David J. Stone, R. N., and others, favoring H. R. 911 and S. 661, to authorize commissions in the military services of nursing for qualified graduate male nurses; to the Committee on Armed Services.

273. Also, proposal of H. E. Harris & Co. (Boston, Mass.) protesting any increase in third and fourth class postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

274. Also, proposals of Everett (Mass.) Motor Sales and Service Co.; Moye Chevrolet Co., Inc. (Newton, Mass.); Granite Chevrolet Co., Inc. (Quincy, Mass.); and Massachusetts State Automobile Dealers Association protesting increase in automotive excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, the strength of our weakness, the refuge of our weariness, the Good Shepherd of our waywardness: As we front the clamant duties of this new week we come beseeching that Thou wilt steady our spirits with the realization of untapped power available to servants of Thy will, if only they go quietly and confidently about their appointed tasks. As those into whose unworthy hands has been placed the crying needs of stricken humanity, may the thoughts of our minds and the sympathies of our hearts and the words of our lips and the decisions of our deliberations be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer.

Save us from a cynical pessimism by the radiant belief that this evil time is not the end of history, nor is Thy hand shortened that it cannot save. Knowing that out of the travail of many a violent age a great birth has come, by Thy providence keep our faith steady lest for the lack of it we lose what Thou dost intend in this prophetic day. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 4, 1951, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARRAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing for the next 10 days, on official business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to hold hearings this afternoon and on subsequent days in order to make some progress on the consideration of amendments to the Defense Production Act, which are now before the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object. I have no objection to permitting the committee to meet this afternoon, and I would have no objection to similar requests being made from day to day, but I do not think we should agree to a request covering an indefinite period.

Mr. MAYBANK. Very well. I make my request for this afternoon only. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Sawyer are to appear before the committee this afternoon. I ask that the committee be authorized to meet this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 38)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $3,672,000, for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of March 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FRANCHISES ENACTED BY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of franchises enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GRANTS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN CLASS IV AND LARGER AIRPORTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, requesting, pursuant to law, authority to make grants for the development and improvement of certain class IV and larger airports, which, in his opinion, should be undertaken during the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LAWS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twenty-seventh quarterly report on contract settlement, for the period January 1 through March 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 40

"Concurrent resolution extending appreciation to Congress of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for splendid assistance rendered to Hawaii in appropriating funds for study and control of oriental fruitfly pest

"Whereas the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, did request the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the study and control of the oriental fruitfly pest in Hawaii through House Concurrent Resolution No. 34; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, United States Department of Agriculture, did initiate a major project

on this subject in cooperation with other agencies in 1949 with appropriations authorized by the Congress in H. R. 3997; and

"Whereas the results accomplished to date by this cooperative project have resulted in a material reduction in oriental fruitfly populations in Hawaii and has developed information on its control which will be of continuing value for Hawaii and the mainland United States, should these pests gain entry there: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-sixth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the people of Hawaii wish to extend their appreciation to the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, for the splendid assistance which has been rendered the Territory of Hawaii in meeting this problem and the excellent manner in which it has been executed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, and, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor, at Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the location of a United States Air Force Base at Wold-Chamberlain Field; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the members of the Baptist Church of Chiles, Kans., relating to the diversion of grains and fruits now used for the manufacture of all distilled beverages to the manufacture of food and food products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Universal African Nationalist Movement, Inc., New York, N. Y., signed by Benjamin Gibbons, president, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 389, to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1433. A bill for the relief of Malica Macesich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1434. A bill for the relief of Michele Mario Paolo Magaudda; and

S. 1435. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Kurth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1436. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1437. A bill for the relief of Maiku Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina (for Mr. MCCARRAN (by request)):

S. 1438. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 1439. A bill to amend title VI of the Espionage Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 1440. A bill to exclude certain teachers, policemen, and firemen in the service of the Panama Canal from the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945; and

S. 1441. A bill to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1442. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Dewulf Maquet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1443. A bill for the relief of Rev. Thomas K. Seawall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS RELATING TO MILITARY SITUATION IN FAR EAST

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 138), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That 2,000 additional copies of part 1 and of each subsequent part of the joint hearings held before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, relative to the Military Situation in the Far East, be printed for the use of said committees.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—AMENDMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SUSPENSION OF APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT OF ATTORNEY BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—MOTION TO RECONSIDER VOTE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote on the passage of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

Addresses delivered by him and by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado at the celebration of the third anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel, at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on May 6, 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

A statement prepared by him and two editorials from the Milwaukee Journal regarding increases in natural gas rates imposed on the people of Wisconsin.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Editorial entitled "MacArthur Before Congress," written by Rolland Peters, editor of the Pratt (Kans.) Daily Tribune.

By Mr. HOEY:

Essay entitled "Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped," by George Kosciusko Weaver, winner of second prize in contest conducted by the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped.

By Mr. HILL:

Editorial entitled "Good Beginning," from the Washington Post of May 7, 1951, relating to the appearance of General MacArthur before the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations.

By Mr. NEELY (for Mr. CHAVEZ):

Editorial entitled "What About Slave Labor in United States?" published in the United Mine Workers Journal of April 1, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

An editorial entitled "The MacArthur Ouster," from the April 21, 1951, issue of America, and an editorial entitled "No End in Sight?" from the April 27, 1951, issue of the Commonweal.

By Mr. BENTON:

An article entitled "Basic Issues Obscured," written by Mr. Hansen W. Baldwin and published in the New York Times of Monday, May 7, 1951; an editorial entitled "The Basic Disagreements," published in the New York Times of May 5, 1951; and an editorial entitled "Who Is the Enemy?" published in the Washington Post of May 7, 1951, dealing with the MacArthur controversy.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Letter from Mrs. Sallie Steele Taylor emphasizing the power of faith in solving the problems of the United States.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Articles relating to the appearance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur before Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, the first entitled "MacArthur and the True Picture," by David Lawrence, the second entitled "Shows No Signs of Fading Away," by Constantine Brown, both published in the Washington Star, May 7, 1951.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Sermon entitled "Lazarus at America's Gate," delivered by Rev. Leland Stark, rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, April 29, 1951, with reference to the proposal to ship wheat to India.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Editorial reprinted from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun, paying tribute to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Essay on the subject Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped, by Miss Sylvia Doyle, Colorado winner in the essay contest, the subject being Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped.

CONDUCT OF OFFICE OF COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Friday, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is entitled to the floor, and he is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not thereby lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are quite a number of committee hearings in progress, and the Senate has already granted permission that they may continue. So I think there is no point in continuing the quorum call, unless some Senator insists upon it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, so that the Senator from Delaware may proceed. As I understand, he intends to use all the time until 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to speak at this time on conditions existing in the office of the collector of internal revenue in St. Louis, Mo., and especially the conduct of the collector, James Finnegan.

Several weeks ago I called to the attention of the Senate the deplorable conditions existing in certain offices of the collectors of internal revenue and suggested that the Secretary of the Treasury should take prompt corrective action.

The Kefauver committee in their recent report likewise denounced the Treasury Department for their laxity in enforcing the tax laws against the racketeers and criminals and called for more aggressive steps. So far such positive steps as are necessary have not been taken.

Today I shall discuss conditions which have been allowed to exist in the tax collection district of St. Louis, Mo., while under the management of James P. Finnegan as collector.

Complaints against Mr. Finnegan, the collector in this office, were first reported to J. Edgar Hoover in April 1950, and beginning on May 3, 1950, an investigation was started.

In March 1951 complaints charging political protection in that office were called to the attention of Federal Judge George H. Moore by Robert L. Sharp, a former revenue agent in that district.

As a result of Mr. Sharp's complaint, Federal Judge Moore ordered the grand jury in St. Louis to investigate these charges, and both the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Department of Justice in Washington were requested to cooperate in the investigation.

This grand jury investigation resulted in a few indictments of certain taxpayers, but the report of the grand jury exonerated Collector Finnegan and his office of any improprieties.

Subsequent to that investigation, on April 4, 1951, Collector Finnegan resigned and, according to the press reports, the President accepted his resignation with extreme reluctance.

I have read the evidence which was presented to the grand jury, and I find that neither the Department of Justice nor the Treasury Department submitted to the grand jury the evidence which at that time was in their files and evidence which if presented would have represented serious charges against James P. Finnegan.

On April 11, 1951, I directed a letter to John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, in whose Department were the reports from this investigation referred to above. I congratulated him upon his removal of Mr. Finnegan, but at the same time I urged that he go further and publicly outline the reasons behind Mr. Finnegan's removal, and then I asked him to state what further action his Department contemplated.

To this letter I received a reply from Mr. Snyder dated April 21, 1951, stating that Collector Finnegan's resignation was purely voluntary and that there was nothing wrong in that office.

I disagree completely with both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that there is nothing wrong in that office, and in view of the fact that Judge Moore has again requested the grand jury in St. Louis to reexamine this case I shall for the benefit of that grand jury and for the information of the United States Senate and the American people review some of the damaging evidence contained in the files which at this moment are in the possession of either the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice here in Washington.

The information which I am about to give to the Senate is documented in those files, and if the grand jury in St. Louis has any difficulty in obtaining those files, I shall be only too glad to forward to them the file numbers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. For the RECORD, and also for my own information, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the prosecutor in St. Louis called upon the Department of Justice in Washington to help present the evidence to the grand jury?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true and both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department sent their representatives to St. Louis. I read a transcript of what they were supposed to have presented, and it makes no mention whatever of any improprieties on the part of James P. Finnegan.

Mr. WHERRY. So the allegations were not presented to the grand jury; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator blame the departments here rather than the district attorney?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know. I have not been able to determine whether the information went to the district attorney in St. Louis and he withheld it at that point, or whether it was withheld in Washington. The report does show that the information was in Washington during the months of January and February of this year. In fact, it was common knowledge throughout the latter part of last year. This information was in the possession of the departments at that time, and it was stopped somewhere down the line between the departments and the grand jury.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it in the possession of the Department of Justice in Washington?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I traced it into the possession of the Treasury Department. Whether the Treasury Department turned it over to the Department of Justice and the Department of Justice froze it, I cannot say. However, it did go to the Treasury Department in Washington with an accompanying letter addressed to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Schoeneman.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Department of Justice try the cases for the Bureau of Internal Revenue?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; they are transferred over to the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice sent its representatives to St. Louis to work with the district attorney in that area.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the evidence available at that time, when those designated from the Department of Justice went to St. Louis to help present this matter to the grand jury?

Mr. WILLIAMS. All the evidence I shall give today was documented and on record in Washington prior to that time.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For continuity I shall discuss the conditions in that office in two phases:

First. I shall discuss how James P. Finnegan, while serving as collector of internal revenue, collected as attorney fees substantial payments from corporations who were obtaining financial assistance from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government agencies.

Second. I shall discuss how James P. Finnegan, while serving as collector of internal revenue, formed an insurance partnership with John Martin Brodsky, of St. Louis, and then furnished to Mr. Brodsky a list of taxpayers who were in tax difficulty as prospective insurance customers with the understanding that he would get a cut of the premiums.

The first letter I wish to read from these files is dated June 5, 1950. It is written on the stationery of Walter H. Wolfner, St. Louis. It is addressed to James P. Finnegan, St. Louis, Mo., and reads as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 5, 1950.*

Mr. JAMES P. FINNEGAN,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR JIM: This letter is to certify that the checks I paid you in the sum of $6,875 in 1948 was one-half of the amount I received from the St. Louis Browns for arranging a loan for that company, after the sale of the club fell through.

This amount was paid to you as attorney fees, as both Mr. Richard Muckerman and the writer both felt you were entitled to same for the time and effort in behalf of the St. Louis Browns, put in by you.

Best regards,

WALTER H. S. WOLFNER.

The first paragraph of this letter refers to a payment of $6,875 to James P. Finnegan for his time and effort in obtaining a loan for the St. Louis Browns, while in the second paragraph the writer

indicates that this payment was endorsed and approved by Mr. Richard Muckerman.

$350,000 LOAN (RFC GUARANTEE) REL INVESTMENT CO. (OWNERS OF THE ST. LOUIS BROWNS)

To ascertain to which loan this letter might have reference, I checked with the RFC and other agencies and found that there were two loans to the baseball group in that city. The first loan of $350,000 was to the Rel Investment Co., St. Louis, Mo., of which company Richard Muckerman was the principal stockholder. This company owns the St. Louis Browns. They obtained the loan of $350,000 on June 6, 1946, through the Manufacturers Trust Co. of St. Louis. This loan was arranged under a blanket participation agreement with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which is in effect an RFC guarantee.

As collateral the bank reported 155,368 shares of the American League Baseball Co. of St. Louis common stock; a $125,000 first mortgage secured by the property at 520 DeBaliviere Avenue (Winter Garden); and 2,000 shares of City Ice & Fuel Co. common stock.

The officers of the Rel Investment Co. were Richard C. Muckerman, president; Richard I. C. Muckerman, vice president; and Anthony C. Ernst, secretary; with the principal stockholder reported as being Richard C. Muckerman.

$350,000 LOAN (RFC GUARANTEE) DODIER REALTY & INVESTMENT CO. (OWNERS OF ST. LOUIS BALL PARK)

The second loan to the baseball group in St. Louis was a $350,000 loan to the Dodier Realty & Investment Co., owners of the Sportmen's Park—the park used by both the St. Louis Browns and the St. Louis Cardinals.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I prefer to finish this statement, and then I will yield.

This loan, dated October 1, 1946, was arranged through the Tower Grove Bank & Trust Co., of St. Louis, under a blanket participation agreement—or guaranty—with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As collateral the bank reported the loan to be secured by a first mortgage on property known as the Sportsmen's Park.

The officers of this company were James V. Dunbar, president; John E. Curby, vice president; and Marcella Whittington, secretary.

I checked with the officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation here in Washington and was advised that on February 11, 1949, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was relieved of their responsibility on the first loan, and later on June 8, 1950, the agency received a letter from the Tower Grove Bank & Trust Co., relieving them of their responsibility in the second loan.

Unquestionably these are the loans to which the letter had reference and to which the payment of $6,875 was made to James P. Finnegan while serving as collector of internal revenue for his time and effort in assisting that group to arrange the loans.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator kindly state when Mr. Finnegan was appointed internal-revenue collector?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand it was in 1944; but anyway, at the time this transaction took place he was serving as internal-revenue collector.

Mr. McFARLAND. At the time these loans were made?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. But does the Senator know whether applications for loans were made before his appointment to be internal-revenue collector?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say if they were I would be even more suspicious. If the applications for loans had been lying around for several years, and if they were approved after Mr. Finnegan became internal-revenue collector, I would be even more suspicious. The record shows when the loans were made in 1946. I might say that I have had a most difficult time even obtaining this information from the RFC. Apparently the RFC did not know these companies represented baseball groups at all. When I asked the RFC if they had any record of loans made to the St. Louis Browns or to any baseball groups, the answer came back repeatedly "No," until finally, after much difficulty, I was able to identify the loans. If the Senator from Arizona can cooperate to help me identify further loans, I should be glad to have him do so. As he suggests, there might be other loans which this group had received prior to this time and about which we do not even now know.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not trying to challenge the Senator's figures.

Mr. WILLIAMS. These are not my figures. They are the figures of the agency downtown.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand, the Senator does not have any direct proof as to what this attorney's fee was paid for and in connection with what loan it was paid.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator wants to know if I know whether James P. Finnegan got on the train, came to Washington, and went to the RFC, the answer is "No." According to the records of the RFC, these companies secured the loans. Mr. Finnegan was paid $6,875 fee, as his half, for his cooperation in the securing of the loans. That is merely a statement of the facts from the record. The Senator can determine the matter for himself. As majority leader I think he will be interested enough to determine the facts not only in connection with this case, but in connection with all the cases, and help us secure the facts. I have certain limited time only.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want to make it plain that the Senator does not need to be talking about me in connection with determining a fact. The Senator has not determined it to be a fact that the money was paid to Mr. Finnegan for services rendered before he became collector of internal revenue or afterward.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona does not know what he is talking about. Let us read the letter from Mr. Finnegan, of which I have a copy.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will say the Senator from Delaware does not know what he is talking about——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. McFARLAND. If he says that that letter shows——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator says that letter shows——

Mr. WILLIAMS. May we determine who has the floor? I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona indefinitely; and I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for an extra hour, in order that I may yield to Members of the Senate to enable them to ask questions or make statements to any extent they desire.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I object to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I may have an extension of time by unanimous consent, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona the full hour of extra time that may be given me, if he wishes to discuss the subject at any length. I am now handicapped by reason of the time limit imposed upon me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an extra hour of time, so I may yield that extra time to the Senator from Arizona, or such time as he may want to make a statement.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will speak on my own time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just a moment. I should like to refer back to the letter. The letter addressed to James Finnegan says:

> This letter is to certify that the check I paid you in the sum of $6,875 in 1948 was one-half of the amount I received from the St. Louis Browns for arranging a loan for that company.

The loan was in effect during the period, 1946–50. Senators can check the records to find out whether Mr. Finnegan when he came here called on the chairman of the Democratic National Committee or the President of the United States. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. In order to complete the record, will the Senator permit me to invite his attention to title XVIII, section 281 of the United States Statutes prohibiting any United States employee from receiving compensation for services when involving controversy or other matter in which the United States is a party, and also to title XVIII, section 283 of the Statutes of the United States, which prohibits an employee of the United States from prosecuting or aiding in a presentation or support of such a claim or matter?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have been so advised; and I thank the Senator from Missouri for putting that in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. KEM. I ask unanimous consent that the sections in full be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sections were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE 18, SECTION 281—COMPENSATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, OFFICERS, AND OTHERS IN MATTERS AFFECTING THE GOVERNMENT

Whoever, being a Member of or Delegate to Congress, or a Resident Commissioner, either before or after he has qualified, or the head of a department, or other officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, directly or indirectly receives or agrees to receive, any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered, either by himself or another, in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter in which the United States is a party or directly or indirectly interested, before any department, agency, court martial, officer, or any civil, military, or naval commission, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both; and shall be incapable of holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

Retired officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, while not on active duty, shall not by reason of their status as such be subject to the provisions of this section. Nothing herein shall be construed to allow any retired officer to represent any person in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in whose service he holds a retired status.

TITLE 18, SECTION 283—OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES INTERESTED IN CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, or of the Senate or House of Representatives, acts as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States, or aids or assists in the prosecution or support of any such claim otherwise than in the proper discharge of his official duties, or receives any gratuity, or any share of or interest in any such claim in consideration of assistance in the prosecution of such claim, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Retired officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, while not on active duty, shall not by reason of their status as such be subject to the provisions of this section. Nothing herein shall be construed to allow any such retired officer within 2 years next after his retirement to act as agent or attorney for prosecuting or assisting in the prosecution of any claim against the United States involving the department in whose service he holds a retired status, or to allow any such retired officer to act as agent or attorney for prosecuting or assisting in the prosecution of any claim against the United States involving any subject matter with which he was directly connected while he was in an active-duty status.

This section shall not apply to any person because of his membership in the National Guard of the District of Columbia nor to any person specially excepted by enactment of Congress.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Do I understand correctly from the Senator's statement that two loans of $350,000 each were made to the baseball club in St. Louis?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. One loan was made to the Rel Investment Co., listed as the owner of the St. Louis Browns, which had an RFC guaranty. The other loan was made to the Dodier Realty & Investment Co., the owners of the St. Louis ball park, and which was put up as collateral. In both loans they had an RFC guaranty.

Mr. CARLSON. It was always my contention, at least my thought, that Congress created the RFC to be of assistance to small-business men and those in need. I like baseball, but I certainly cannot conceive of the RFC investing $700,000 in a baseball team and park.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In recent weeks we have been finding a great many things in connection with the RFC that many of us cannot understand.

The second letter is dated May 23, 1946. It is on Hotel Warwick stationery, and it reads as follows:

WARWICK OPERATING CO.,
St. Louis, Mo.

GENTLEMEN: I acknowledge receipt of certificate No. 44 of the capital stock of the Warwick Operating Co. for 250 shares, issued in the name of Eve K. Finnegan—

I may say that is Mr. Finnegan's wife—

which stock was received by me as collateral security for the services hereinafter set forth.

For all of the services heretofore rendered by me in assembling all of the stock of said Warwick Operating Co. for acquisition by Saul Lichtenfeld and his associates, I am to be paid the sum of $5,000.

In addition to the above, I have agreed with him to aid him to rehabilitate the Warwick Hotel property as a first-class-hotel project; and for the 2 years to aid him in all legal matters appertaining thereto.

Upon receipt of payment for such services so to be rendered by me, during said period, to wit, an additional sum of $30,000, or if one-third of the net profits of said Warwick Operating Co. during said period shall be greater than said sums so to be received and paid to me, then I am to receive in addition the difference between the sum of $35,000 and one-third of the net profits thereof, upon receipt of which I shall cause to be surrendered said certificate No. 44 for 250 shares of stock, for cancellation.

JAMES P. FINNEGAN.

The second letter which I have just inserted is one dated May 23, 1946, signed by James P. Finnegan, addressed to the Warwick Operating Co., St. Louis, Mo. In this Mr. Finnegan acknowledges receipt of certificate No. 44, representing 250 shares of capital stock of the Warwick Operating Co., owners of Warwick Hotel, St. Louis, issued in the name of Eva K. Finnegan, his wife. The letter states that the 250 shares of stock are held as collateral security for $35,000 to be paid later for services which he had rendered Saul Lichtenfeld and his associates in obtaining control of the Warwick Operating Co. and for his future assistance in aiding that company in their legal work involved in rehabilitating the Warwick Hotel.

This letter indicates a minimum payment of $35,000, with a possible bonus of an additional $5,000 if the earnings justified.

I have checked the records to determine what assistance Mr. Finnegan, who, while serving as collector of internal revenue in St. Louis, might have rendered this corporation to merit this rather substantial payment.

I found that the Warwick Hotel was operated by the Coast Guard during the war years between January 1, 1943, and June 30, 1946, at an annual rental of $22,809. It is significant that Mr. Finnegan's arrangements with the Warwick Operating Co., owners of the hotel, were made May 23, 1946, 7 days before the hotel's release from the Coast Guard. It is indicated that prior to that time he had rendered the company services which were worth $5,000.

Following its release from the Coast Guard claims were filed by the management against the Government for damages to the hotel by the Coast Guard. I was advised that all such claims against the Coast Guard following the war were automatically referred to the Treasury Department for settlement. This is the same Department of the Government for which Mr. Finnegan was then working as collector of internal revenue.

This placed Mr. Finnegan as working on both sides of the fence—an employee of the Treasury Department while, at the same time, representing a client as attorney in a claim against the Treasury Department.

The records show that while claims were filed in excess of $100,000, a subsequent settlement of approximately $40,000 was made to the hotel operators by the Treasury Department.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator permit me to state for the RECORD at this point another citation from a United States statute?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. KEM. Title 18, section 434, of the United States Statutes prohibits an agent of any company or partnership who is interested in its pecuniary profits from acting as an officer of the United States in the transaction of business with the United States. The section in full is as follows:

TITLE 18, SECTION 434—INTERESTED PERSONS ACTING AS GOVERNMENT AGENTS

Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, or of any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his contribution.

Mr. President, the third loan to which I am referring by which Mr. Finnegan profited while serving as Collector of Internal Revenue was for $565,000, and was made by the RFC to the American Lithofold Corp., of St. Louis, Mo. The American Lithofold Corp. is affiliated with the American Carbon Paper Co., of Chicago, Ill.

On November 19, 1948, the American Lithofold Corp. signed an application with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan of $548,219.50.

On January 13, 1949, following an investigation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Supervisory Committee submitted an adverse report, following which the Directors of the Reconstruction

Finance Corporation unanimously disapproved the loan.

During the subsequent weeks an application was refiled twice, and each time it was unanimously disapproved and rejected.

The reasons for declining are listed by the Board as follows:

First. Unbalanced financial condition with disproportionate total indebtedness as compared to net worth.

Second. Past record of net profit has not demonstrated applicant's ability to service a loan in the amount requested.

Third. Too much of loan proceeds being used to pay existing indebtedness.

The reasons were unanimously agreed to by the rejection committee on three different occasions.

On March 3, 1949, the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation suddenly reversed themselves and granted the corporation an immediate loan of $80,000 against the corporation's machinery, and reopened the case for consideration of the full request.

It is to be noted that no additional assets were pledged as collateral for this loan, other than those offered on the previous occasions, and it is also to be noted that the same machinery upon which the additional $80,000 was loaned on that date was already mortgaged to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in excess of its valuation.

Subsequently, on July 6, 1949, the loan was increased to $465,000, and on November 14, 1949, an additional $100,000 was loaned to the same corporation, bringing the total loan up to $565,000.

The records of the RFC show that during the interval between the rejection and the approval of the loan, there had been no change in the company's financial status; on the contrary, they were still losing money, and were doing so faster than ever before in their history.

On March 17, 1949, 14 days after the loan was granted by the RFC, there was held a special meeting of the board of directors of the American Lithofold Corp. I quote from the minutes of that meeting:

> Motion was made by R. J. Blauner and seconded by A. M. Bridell that J. P. Finnegan be appointed company administrative legal adviser.
>
> Motion unanimously carried.
>
> The president submitted to the board a copy of the resolution of the RFC dated March 3, 1949, with reference to an additional loan in the amount of $80,000 to be secured as stated in the resolution.

That was 14 days after the loan was approved or granted, although the same loan to the same corporation had previously been rejected by the RFC on three different occasions.

The minutes of this meeting show that Mr. R. J. Blauner, vice president and general manager, talked on long distance with R. A. Blauner, the company's Washington representative, and reported that after being fully informed, Mr. R. A. Blauner approved of their action.

On April 14, 1949, 4 weeks later, stock certificate No. 86, representing 120 shares of American Lithofold stock, was transferred from R. A. Blauner, the president of the corporation, to Mrs. J. B. Finnegan, wife of Collector Finnegan.

Mr. Finnegan then negotiated a $12,000 collateral loan from the Tower Grove Bank & Trust Co., St. Louis, with himself indicated as the principal debtor, and with R. J. Blauner and W. F. Leschen, the endorsers; and Mrs. Finnegan's 120 shares of stock were pledged as collateral to secure this loan. Mr. Finnegan upon receipt of the proceeds of this loan of $12,000, claims that he forthwith transmitted such amount to Mr. R. A. Blauner, the transferor of the said 120 shares of stock and an officer of this corporation.

At that point, if we stop there, it would appear that the 120 shares of stock, par value $12,000, which had been turned over to Mrs. Finnegan, were paid for by her husband, James Finnegan, with the proceeds of this loan. But payments on this bank loan were made, not by Mr. Finnegan, but by the American Lithofold Corp. in monthly installments of $1,000, plus interest, notwithstanding the fact that the company was neither maker nor endorser of this note.

Beginning May 2, 1949, the month after the loan was negotiated, nine monthly payments aggregating $9,253.84 were made by the American Lithofold Corp. on this note, of which $9,000 was toward the principal and the remainder toward the interest. The accounting treatment of these payments was such that the legal expense of the American Lithofold Corp. was charged $4,626.91, or one-half of the total, and the legal expense of the American Carbon Paper Co., an allied company, was charged with a similar $4,626.93, since the latter company had reimbursed American Lithofold Corp. for its one-half of the total payments.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD several letters relating to these payments. They confirm the fact that these payments were for attorney's fees.

There are four letters which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the letters are very long.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, they are not long.

Mr. LANGER. Then why not read the letters at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator is speaking under a time limitation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. However, I think I have sufficient time to read them, and I think it better that they be read. The first is an interoffice memorandum, reading as follows:

> AMERICAN LITHOFOLD CORP.,
> *St. Louis, Mo., May 4, 1949.*
>
> From: H. W. Stanhope.
> To: R. J. Blauner.
>
> We were instructed to pay Tower Grove Bank & Trust Co. $1,028.36 to cover James J. Finnegan's note which was due on May 2 in the sum of $1,000 plus $28.36 interest. You were to give us the method of handling this cash outlay.
>
> Will you please advise how this matter should be handled.
>
> Yours very truly,
> H. W. STANHOPE,
> *Controller.*

The second one is signed by James P. Finnegan. It is a letter dated June 10, 1949, written on his stationery, and addressed to the American Lithofold Corp., St. Louis, Mo. It will be noted that this company was paying $1,000 a month on Mr. Finnegan's note, with half of this being charged to the American Carbon Paper Co. The letter reads:

> GENTLEMEN: This letter will serve as a bill for $500 for the month of May and $500 for the month of June for my legal services in advising and counseling during the said months of May and June.

Another memorandum exchanged between the American Lithofold Corp. and the American Carbon Paper Co. is dated June 14, 1949. It is a memorandum from the American Lithofold Corp to the American Carbon Paper Co. to show that these two charges were exchanged between the two corporations. It reads:

> We billed you $500 to cover J. P. Finnegan's services for the months of May and June, inasmuch as the amounts were paid by us.
>
> Attached hereto is a statement covering the charge from Mr. Finnegan.

I shall read another letter dated July 8, 1949. It is addressed to Mr. James P. Finnegan, St. Louis, Mo., and reads:

> DEAR MR. FINNEGAN: We would appreciate your sending us a statement covering services rendered for the month of July 1949.
>
> Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.
>
> Yours very truly,
> AMERICAN LITHOFOLD CORP.,
> H. W. STANHOPE,
> *Controller.*

When Mr. Finnegan's income-tax returns were examined the auditors made the following notation under the heading "Business expenses":

> It is found that the taxpayer properly included in his gross income those amounts received from clients as reimbursement for certain of the above-mentioned business expenses.
>
> This was particularly true in the subsequent year 1949 when $9,737.35 received from the American Lithofold Corp. as reimbursement for expenses was duly included in taxpayers gross income.

As further evidence that these payments were for services rendered, I quote the following paragraph contained in a special agent's report dated July 12, 1950:

> Beginning on May 2, 1949, the American Lithofold Co. issued its check for $1,000 each month payable to the Tower Grove Bank and Trust Co. to be applied on the loan in the name of James P. Finnegan. The $1,000 was allocated $500 to legal expense and $500 to American Carbon Co., which company charged $500 each month to legal expense. This was continued through March 1950. For May and June 1949 Mr. Finnegan submitted invoices in the form of letters for legal services to American Lithofold Corp. and American Carbon Paper Co. for $1,000 each. After that date, the files show that no further invoices were received by the companies, although Mr. Homer S. Stanhope, comptroller of the American Lithofold Co., requested them of Mr. Finnegan. No reply to these requests are contained in the files of American Lithofold Corp., although Mr. Stanhope stated that Mr. Finnegan orally stated to him on several occasions that there would be no more invoices submitted since there was a general misunderstanding con-

cerning his fees and that the two invoices already submitted should be withdrawn from the files since they were submitted in error. The documentary evidence in the files of American Lithofold Corp., copies of which have been made a part of the report of the internal-revenue agents, show that thereafter Mr. Stanhope addressed memorandums on several occasions to Mr. R. J. Blauner requesting advice as to how the monthly payments of $1,000 to the bank should be handled. The files show no replies from Mr. Blauner to these memorandums. Mr. Stanhope stated that each time he approached Mr. Blauner on the matter he was told that he (Blauner) and Mr. Finnegan had not reached a final decision as to Mr. Finnegan's attorney fees or as to the amount of stock which he would purchase. Mr. Stanhope stated that in the absence of an explanation from Mr. Blauner as to how the payments should be handled, he continued to handle them in the same manner as for the first 2 months; that is, $500 each month was charged to legal expense and $500 was charged to American Carbon Paper Corp., which company in turn charged the amounts to its legal expense.

This exchange of letters and excerpts from the corporation's minutes all substantiate the fact that Mr. Finnegan, while serving as collector of internal revenue in the city of St. Louis, was employed as an attorney by the American Lithofold Corp., of St. Louis, which company, after his employment, negotiated a substantial loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator know whether, during this period, Mr. Finnegan reported to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the income which he was receiving from the American Lithofold Corp. and the American Carbon Paper Co., or either?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, I have just read a paragraph taken from the agent's report, and I shall read it again at this point:

> This was particularly true in the subsequent year 1949 when $9,737.35 received from the American Lithofold Corp. as reimbursement for expenses was duly included in taxpayers' gross income.

Mr. KEM. As I understand, a Government employee, such as an internal-revenue officer, is required under the law to report to the Commissioner any revenue received by him other than his salary, and to report it upon its receipt, is he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that is the law.

Mr. KEM. I call the Senator's attention to title 26, section 4046, of the United States Statutes, which provides:

> TITLE 26, SECTION 4046—STATEMENT OF FEES, CHARGES, AND ALLOWANCES
>
> Every internal revenue officer, whose payment, charges, salary, or compensation are composed, wholly or in part, of fees, commissions, allowances, or rewards, from whatever source derived, shall be required to render to the Commissioner, under regulations to be approved by the Secretary, a statement under oath setting forth the entire amount of such fees, commissions, emoluments, or rewards of whatever nature, or from whatever source received, during the time for which said statement is rendered; and any false statement knowingly and willfully rendered under the requirements of this section, or regulations established in accordance therewith, shall be deemed willful perjury and punished in the manner provided by law for the crime of perjury. And any neglect or omission to render such statement when required shall be punished by a fine of not less than $200, nor more than $500, in the discretion of the court.

My question to the Senator is whether the records show that upon receipt of this income from the American Lithofold Corp. or the American Carbon Paper Co., the collector, Mr. Finnegan, reported it immediately, or within a reasonable time, to the Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know, but, in the absence of information to the contrary, I am willing to assume that he did, until it is shown that he did not. I have not checked that.

Mr. President, at this point I may say that the Senator from Arizona, who is not presently on the floor, raised a question as to when Mr. Finnegan was appointed. I have rechecked the records and find that Mr. Finnegan was appointed at least sometime prior to 1944. That is as far back as I have the available records. It was in April of this year, when his resignation was accepted, with extreme reluctance, by the President. He was serving as collector of internal revenue, during the time he was employed by these companies.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, does the Senator know whether the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was aware that Mr. Finnegan was receiving this additional compensation at the time it was received?

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as I know, he did not; but I do know that it was reported to J. Edgar Hoover in April 1950. Following the investigation at that time, the results were forwarded to the Treasury Department with an accompanying letter addressed to Mr. Schoeneman, and either Mr. Shoeneman received it or he should make a check in his own office to determine who intercepted the letter. The letter came to Washington with accompanying reports and has been in his files for at least 3 months.

Mr. President, it is important that the dates which I have previously outlined relative to the transactions be remembered because, after the investigation was started, Mr. Finnegan and the American Lithofold Corp. attempted to dissociate themselves. I want to read the record of what happened after the investigation was started. On May 3, 1950, special investigators arrived in St. Louis, Mo.

On May 4, 1950, these agents interviewed Collector Finnegan in his office and advised him——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator states that special investigators arrived in St. Louis. Were those investigators from the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think they were from the Treasury Department. Their reports are classified as intelligence reports. I am not sufficiently familiar with the inner workings to tell whether they were from the intelligence squad of the Treasury Department or the intelligence squad of the FBI. My understanding is that they were working in conjunction with each other

Mr. KEM. At any rate, they were investigators acting on behalf of the United States, were they?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, and they were working under the intelligence squad.

On May 3, 1950, special investigators arrived in St. Louis, Mo.

On May 4, 1950, these agents interviewed Collector Finnegan in his office and advised him that they had been assigned to conduct an investigation of reported irregularities in his office. The general nature of the charges was discussed with the collector at that time.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was called to the telephone for a moment while the Senator from Delaware continued with his discourse. As the Senator may or may not know, the city to which he refers and the former collector about whom he is now talking to the Senate are in the State which I have the honor to represent as junior Senator together with my distinguished colleague [Mr. KEM]. The Senator from Delaware has not thus far transmitted to me any of the information the benefit of which he has been giving the Senate; and I do not know whether the Senator knows that Mr. Finnegan, the former collector, resigned within the past month or so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. He resigned, if I recall correctly, on April 4, effective on the 14th or 15th day of April. According to press reports, he persuaded the President to accept his resignation. The Secretary of the Treasury said the resignation was purely voluntary. It was approximately 4 months after the report to which I am referring, was filed with the Departments in Washington and after the grand jury had passed upon the question, at which time he was exonerated. But the grand jury did not have the benefit of any of the information we have here today.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that Federal Judge Moore, within the past week, charged the grand jury to make a further investigation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am aware of that fact. I think Federal Judge Moore is really trying to get to the bottom of the matter. I think he tried, previously. I understand the grand jury is winding up its business this week. The judge lectured the grand jury for its failure to uncover conditions which he had understood existed. He was not satisfied with their report, and he told them to go back and do the job over. It is important to remember that this material was not presented by the Treasury Department or the Justice Department to the grand jury. Unquestionably the grand jury should have had the benefit of all information in connection with the question.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. From what is the Senator reading? What are the sources of his material?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The material is documented in files which are now in possession of either the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice and has been for some time. The page number and the file number in each case are available. I shall be glad to make the information available to the Senator from Missouri if he cares to examine it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Just for the record, may I ask the Senator if he is a member of the Senate Committee on Finance?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am.

Mr. KEM. This information has been developed by the Senator in the course of his official duties as a member of that committee, has it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Partly. I had been questioning some of the practices in the Treasury Department before I became a member of the Finance Committee.

Mr. KEM. The Finance Committee has to do with matters connected with the Bureau of Internal Revenue; has it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Since my able friend the senior Senator from Missouri has developed the point to which he has just adverted, may I ask the able Senator from Delaware whether the Senate Finance Committee has taken any action or whether any action is now pending relating to any of the matters contained in the material which the Senator is now reading?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senate Finance Committee has been studying it, and a House committee has asked for $50,000 to conduct an investigation. Since the House committee is in the process of investigating the question, the Senate Finance Committee felt that it would not be wise to staff two committees, both investigating the same question. For that reason, the Finance Committee of the Senate has not asked for a special investigatory staff, and I do not think it will; not because it does not have any interest in the question, but because there is no use duplicating the investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Reverting to the Senator's statement in which three dates—May 3, May 4, and May 5—were mentioned, will the Senator briefly again state what happened on those three dates?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As a result of the report to J. Edgar Hoover, special agents of the intelligence squad arrived in St. Louis on May 3, 1950. On May 4, they went to Mr. Finnegan's office and advised him that he was under investigation.

On the following day, May 5, a special meeting of the board of directors of the American Lithofold Corp. was hastily called at the office of the corporation, 500 Bittner Street, St. Louis, Mo. I shall now reveal the process they went through in trying to unscramble and dissociate themselves from the question of the payment of money.

Directors present at that meeting were R. J. Blauner, James P. Finnegan, W. F. Leschen, and Joseph H. Husgen—Mr. William F. Leschen acting as chairman. A waiver of notice of the time, place, and purpose of this meeting was signed by all of the directors of the corporation and attached to the minutes. As of special interest I shall quote the seventh paragraph of the minutes of that hasty meeting on May 5, 1950:

> Motion was made by Wm. F. Leschen and seconded, that we approve payments to Jas. P. Finnegan in the sum of $1,500 for the year 1949, and that the balance of the expense, viz, $3,126.91, which makes up the total expenditures to the Tower Grove Bank & Trust Co. less American Lithofold Corp.'s charges to the American Carbon Paper Corp. in the year 1949, to be charged to the liability account of R. J. Blauner covering patents.

Both Mr. Finnegan and the corporation had included the previous amounts in their tax returns.

On June 12, 1950, another special meeting of the directors of the American Lithofold Corp. was held in the office of the corporation, 500 Bittner Street, St. Louis, Mo.

Directors present were R. J. Blauner, James P. Finnegan, and Joseph H. Husgen. A waiver of notice of the time, place, and purpose of this meeting was signed by these three directors. Mr. R. J. Blauner acted as chairman of that meeting. I quote from the minutes of that meeting:

> On motion made by Mr. Joseph H. Husgen, duly seconded and unanimously carried, the board corrected the minutes of its meeting of May 5, 1950, by substituting for the seventh paragraph thereof the following:
>
> "On motion duly made by Mr. Joseph H. Husgen, duly seconded and unanimously carried, the board approved payments to the Tower Grove Bank in the total amount of $9,253.84, of this amount $4,626.93 being charged to the account of American Carbon Paper Corp., and $4,626.91 being charged to the liability account of Mr. R. J. Blauner, covering patents.
>
> "On motion duly made by Mr. Joseph Husgen, seconded and unanimously carried, the board further approved the payment of $1,500 to Mr. James P. Finnegan as full compensation for his services rendered during the year 1949."
>
> There being no further business, meeting was adjourned.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I should first like to finish with this particular part of the statement. Then I shall be happy to yield.

On June 13, 1950—1 month and 8 days after the investigation started—by the meeting of the board of directors of the American Lithofold Corp. the certificate in the name of Mrs. Finnegan for 120 shares of stock was canceled on the stock books of the corporation and new certificates issued as follows:

Shares to American Carbon Paper Co	60
Shares to R. J. Blauner	60
Total shares	120

Amended tax returns were filed by the corporations in line with the changes outlined above.

In other words, Mr. President, between May 5, 1950, and June 13, 1950, 1 month and 8 days after the investigation had started, they were unscrambling previous actions and returning payments which had been made for legal services to Mr. Finnegan, while he was serving as collector of internal revenue and during which time a loan of $565,000 was arranged from the RFC. Remember this loan had previously been rejected three times prior to the time that they had employed Mr. Finnegan as attorney.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator whether the records of the corporation show any reason why they took a more modest view of the value of Mr. Finnegan's services after the arrival of the special investigators in St. Louis?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; the records do not show any reason. However, it is rather significant that they began to change their viewpoint 24 hours after they learned that investigators were in St. Louis investigating the case. I think the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. KEM. Does the record show that any refund was made of the additional compensation received by Mr. Finnegan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Apparently so, because both companies filed amended tax returns. They had previously deducted the payments made to Mr. Finnegan. Four thousand six hundred dollars had been deducted by each corporation. After they found out about the investigation the companies filed amended tax returns.

Mr. KEM. Do the records show whether the amended returns were accepted by the Commissioner without comment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They do not show either way. I do not know.

Mr. KEM. The records do not show that any special report was made by Mr. Finnegan on the additional compensation he had received?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. The record shows that Mr. Finnegan had already paid a tax on the $9,250. The corporations filed amended returns and paid the tax. If the matter should stand in that way, Mr. Finnegan would be entitled to a refund. Whether he has filed an application for a refund, I do not know. If we are to assume that the procedure is correct, then certainly he is entitled to a refund.

Mr. KEM. Was the money, which was received by the American Lithofold Corp., as a result of the change in the minutes, accounted for as income by the American Lithofold Corp.?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of the 120 shares of stock which Mrs. Finnegan had held in her name, 60 shares were transferred to the American Carbon Paper Co., which was an associated company. The money which had been paid to the American Lithofold Corp., and the money which had previously been deducted as being attorney fees, was called payment for this stock. The stock was taken for payment. The other 60 shares were turned over to R. J. Blauner, who apparently put his own money into the company. That money would be counted as income during the next year. If their right to unscramble is recognized after the investigation was started they apparently did a good job rather hurriedly. They started less than 24 hours after the investigation was inaugurated. Therefore, it should not have taken them long to unscramble it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, there has been a grand jury investigation made of the subject matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Certain people were indicted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The only indictments which were returned were indictments against a few taxpayers.

Mr. LANGER. Was Mr. W. F. Leschen indicted?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I think I am correct in saying that his name was not on the list of the persons who were indicted. I think I know what the Senator from North Dakota has in mind. I can say that to my knowledge none of the persons whose names are on the list was indicted by the grand jury. Neither was any of the evidence pertaining to them presented to the grand jury. Of course, it must be remembered that these cases took place some time ago. Most of them are in process of being paid off. In most of them substantial payments have been made, and there is not too much due and outstanding at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield further.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that under the laws of the United States Mr. Leschen, Mr. Blauner, and Mr. Husgen would be guilty of conspiracy to commit a crime in connection with Mr. Finnegan? Why would not they or the corporations be subject to indictment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not being an attorney, I cannot answer the question. All I can do is state my understanding of the law. The evidence should have been presented to any grand jury which was investigating the cases in St. Louis. There is no excuse for not presenting the evidence to the grand jury, so that the grand jury could have been in a position to take the action which they felt was necessary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Delaware does not have to be a lawyer to know that when two or more persons gather together to conspire together to commit a crime they are all guilty. I do not think it is fair to take in only the collector of internal revenue. I think all of them should be taken in together. All the corporations and the officials ought to be taken in together, including the persons whose names I have mentioned, because they are just as guilty as Mr. Finnegan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator that I am not trying to pass judgment against anyone. I am merely making a statement of the facts from the records. I think the evidence should be presented to the grand jury, which is in session in St. Louis, under Judge Moore. I think it is up to the grand jury to determine who should be indicted. I know that if I did not have my own opinion in the matter I would not be presenting the facts on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Why does not a subcommittee of the Senator's committee subpena the various persons and make the investigation itself?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think it is necessary, because the investigation has been made. If we were to subpena the witnesses, we would merely investigate the investigators to see whether or not they made a proper investigation, and we would find out the same things. The investigation has been made and it is now time for action. Why should a Senate committee or any other committee investigate what has been investigated already? The only criticism is that the results of the thorough investigation which has been made have not been submitted to the proper authority. If it is submitted to the proper authority I think it would take care of itself.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator believe that if Mr. Finnegan were guilty in this case similar cases might be discovered?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the grand jury should go into the full operations of Mr. Finnegan.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator say that his committee or a subcommittee of his committee should not do it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Our subcommittee could go into it, but, after all, a committee of the Senate could not prosecute. The prosecution must be handled by the Department of Justice. The material is now available in the Department of Justice. If the Department of Justice does not prosecute, I do not know what good a committee could do, except to expose the facts to the American people, and that is exactly what I am doing here today. It is inexcusable that the material has not been presented to the grand jury before.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator know whether or not the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency investigating the RFC has had the various loans involved here under consideration?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I could not say. I do not know. I am not a member of the committee. I do know that Mr. Finnegan's name was brought into the investigation being conducted by the Committee on Banking and Currency in relation to another loan, with the particulars of which I am not familiar.

Mr. BRICKER. That is true; but I do not think that any of the loans referred to have been investigated by the committee. I think they should be the subject of an investigation by the committee. I remember, with the Senator from Delaware, trying to find the facts pertaining to the loan made to the St. Louis Browns Holding Co. We could not find out anything about it because the facts had been very cleverly covered up by the use of certain names in the application.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know that the Senator from Ohio and I worked for some time on the matter, and we kept getting a negative answer until we reminded certain people downtown of the exact name of the company. I was a little surprised to find that the RFC had loaned money to these two corporations, one of which owned the ball park in St. Louis and the other of which owned the St. Louis Browns, and yet they did not even known the type of collateral. They did not even know that the two corporations were connected with the baseball industry. We had to document the complete case before the record could be located.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Delaware agree with the Senator from Ohio that it is a proper subject of investigation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio that it is the job of the subcommittee to have pitiless publicity in this matter. The very fact that there is an investigation will compel the grand jury to act.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the grand jury under Federal Judge Moore will act once this information has been made available.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. May I inquire of the Senator to what investigation he is referring? Where did the documents which he is submitting to the Senate come from?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The documents to which I have referred up to this point are documents on which I have been working for several weeks. That part of the investigation to which I am coming now represents material which we obtained through the subcommittee from the Treasury Department. I refer to the subcommittee of which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman.

Mr. GEORGE. My recollection was that that subcommittee was appointed to investigate certain particular matters. This matter has never been brought to the attention of the full committee, and no report has been made to the full committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, the subcommittee is investigating conditions in New York City.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not like to be embarrassed by documents which were submitted to a subcommittee going into the RECORD, when the subcommittee is carrying on a legitimate investigation into one or two other matters. The information may have been submitted to the subcommittee as confidential. I do not know. I am at a disadvantage. Of course I would not expect the Senator to abuse any privilege which he enjoys by virtue of his membership on the subcommittee. However, until the subject is brought to the attention of the full committee, obviously the committee itself can know nothing about it. I have never heard of this case at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Georgia, that I am speaking here today on conditions in St. Louis. That subcommittee to which he refers is investigating conditions in New York and will report in due course.

Mr. GEORGE. The information may have been in the files of the subcommittee, but no report has been made to the full committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. The full committee has never considered the subject. The Senator from Georgia has attended a few of the meetings of the subcommittee. So far as receiving confidential information is concerned, I have previously said, and I now repeat, that I will never recognize any information from any department downtown as confidential information when it conceals a crime. If any department thinks it is going to classify material and handicap us and prevent us from discussing it on the floor of the Senate merely by placing it on a confidential list, it had better not send any of such information down to the Capitol.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection to the Senator presenting anything to the Senate which he feels he ought to present on his own responsibility. But with respect to a matter which came to a subcommittee, if the information is confidential, it should be brought to the attention of the full committee before it is spread before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think it will be found that there is any discussion of tax returns in this case.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Georgia will find that this does not involve confidential matters, except as the Treasury Department was trying to protect Mr. Finnegan.

The Senator from Georgia will remember that in either June or July of last year, at a time when I was not a member of his committee, I addressed a letter to him as chairman of the Finance Committee, pointing out that I had been advised on the basis of reliable information that there were conditions in the internal-revenue office in New York, and in other internal-revenue offices conditions which I felt should not be allowed to exist. I do not believe that any action was taken.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes. I appointed a subcommittee to investigate the New York office; but I did not appoint any subcommittee to investigate this particular matter. I am now hearing the first of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say, in connection with the St. Louis matter, that I am presenting it as an individual Senator. I am not speaking as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to make that clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have made no reference to the New York investigation which is now under way by our committee. No reference will be made to the New York investigation until the report has been made to the full committee.

So far as the information in the St. Louis case is concerned, practically all that information came through my office, as the result of a private investigation; and I am reporting, as a Member of the Senate today, on the St. Louis case only.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection to that, and would raise none. I know none of the parties, and know none of the facts. However, if the information came to the subcommittee as a confidential report of any kind, until the subject is brought before the full committee I do not think it ought to be laid before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the Senator will find much that is confidential. The names on this list as borrowers have been published by the RFC.

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But they have not been identified with Mr. Finnegan. The grand jury is meeting in St. Louis today. It will not be in session much longer and this evidence should be presented to that grand jury.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know about that. I presume that is a matter which relates to the Department of Justice or some agency in the Department of Justice. The Treasury Department has no direct authority to present anything to a grand jury, except through the officials of the Department of Justice.

I am not complaining about what the Senator has to say. I have no possible objection to statements made on his own responsibility as a Senator. But since reference is made to the Finance Committee, and since I have never appointed a subcommittee to make an investigation of this subject—or if any has been made, no report has been made to the full committee—I am simply saying that I do not believe that any of this testimony which might have come to the subcommittee as confidential information should be taken up on the floor of the Senate until it is laid before the full committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say that there is nothing confidential about it. The subcommittee was investigating the New York office. In routine fashion I asked three different gentlemen from the Treasury Department if there was anything wrong in St. Louis. I knew that we had this information about St. Louis.

All three representatives of the Treasury Department denied that there was anything in St. Louis that gave them any concern. They denied before our committee that there was anything wrong. This information was not brought before us until after I identified the file numbers, which I received from a certain confidential private source. Then we got the files, and the information was finally confirmed. One almost has to know the particular case before he can obtain access to the files.

I am very much disappointed with the lack of cooperation of the Treasury Department. The Senator is correct in stating that there has been no official investigation of this subject by the committee. I am making this report on my own responsibility as a Senator, and I accept responsibility for what I am placing in the RECORD today. I am making no reference whatever to anything which the committee has done in investigating the New York situation.

Mr. GEORGE. I simply wanted to be clear, because I had not heard of any matter of this kind so far as the New York investigation is concerned. Perhaps a corollary investigation of some sort arose as a result of the work of the Kefauver committee. I understand that a subcommittee was appointed to look into the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. The committee is at work, and there will be a report. However, no report has been made yet, and there is nothing whatever in this report which even refers to the New York situation.

Mr. President, I shall now discuss the second phase of operations in that office whereby James P. Finnegan, while serving as collector of internal revenue, formed an insurance partnership with John Martin Brodsky, of St. Louis, and then furnished Mr. Brodsky with a list of taxpayers who were in tax difficulties as prospective insurance customers with the understanding that he would get a "cut" of the premiums.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to insert in the RECORD at this point a reference to the United States statutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. KEM. Title 18, section 1905, of the United States statutes, prohibits a United States officer from disclosing information he receives in an official capacity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. I ask unanimous consent that the section in full be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE 18, SECTION 1905. DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION GENERALLY

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, publishes, divulges, discloses, or makes known in any manner or to any extent not authorized by law any information coming to him in the course of his employment or official duties or by reason of any examination or investigation made by, or return, report, or record made to or filed with, such department or agency or officer or employee thereof, which information concerns or relates to the trade secrets, processes, operations, style of work, or apparatus, or to the identity, confidential statistical data, amount or source of any income, profits, losses, or expenditures of any person, firm, partnership, corporation, or association; or permits any income return or copy thereof or any book containing any abstract or par-

ticulars thereof to be seen or examined by any person except as provided by law; shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and shall be removed from office or employment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this phase of the report relates to allegations against Collector of Internal Revenue James P. Finnegan, of the first collection district of Missouri, to the effect that Mr. Finnegan was adjusting tax matters for individuals who were in tax difficulties provided they purchased insurance from J. M. Brodsky with whom Collector Finnegan was affiliated.

These allegations were made to Director J. Edgar Hoover by Mr. X in April 1950. Mr. Hoover's informant charged that Collector James P. Finnegan was a silent partner of John Martin Brodsky and that he was furnishing Mr. Brodsky with the names of persons facing tax difficulties, and that these taxpayers obtained tax adjustments from the collector provided they purchased insurance from the Brodsky agency.

That John Martin Brodsky had the names of several persons who were involved in tax difficulties with the Bureau of Internal Revenue is admitted by Mr. Brodsky and is further established by the statements of Richard V. Clark, Jr., an insurance broker associated with the Aetna Casualty Insurance Co. of St. Louis, Don Kelly, general manager of the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. of St. Louis, and Walter Heuerman, a salesman for the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. of St. Louis.

Mr. Brodsky contacted at least some of these persons whose names were supplied by Finnegan for insurance, and in each instance he represented, or left the inference, that he was a partner with Finnegan. He represented that they would be permitted by the collector to pay their tax deficiencies in deferred payments. The Valley Steel Products Co., Harrison Lumber Co., and Missouri Paper Stock Co. or their officers, actually had large tax assessments outstanding and they were paying the assessments by deferred payments. It is possible, of course, as Mr. Finnegan claims, that Mr. Brodsky got his information about these particular taxpayers from someone other than Collector Finnegan; however, nothing was found to support that possibility, and all the evidence is to the contrary. In fact, Mr. Brodsky reluctantly testified that he had received the names of these persons from Mr. Finnegan personally.

Whether Mr. Finnegan actually participated in the insurance commissions of Brodsky as a silent partner or if he received the funds from Brodsky as attorney's fees appears to make little difference. The method used in obtaining the commissions or attorney's fees is, to say the least, highly unethical.

At this point I would like to read the usual whitewash that can be found in practically every investigation report which relates to one of the protégés of the Pendergast political machine or to one of the favorites of the "fairhaired" boys in Washington.

It is probable that Mr. Finnegan saw no particular impropriety in permitting taxpayers to defer the liquidation of their tax obligations (which is entirely proper per se) and to furnish Brodsky with the names of such taxpayers in order that he could contact them for insurance, for which services Finnegan was to get a cut—whether as commissions or attorney's fees.

The memorandum attached to this report went on and pointed out how Mr. Finnegan's association with Brodsky, whether as attorney or as silent partner, had resulted in unfavorable speculation by outsiders, and that he was therefore vulnerable to criticism. They also pointed out that if the facts which had been developed in the investigation should become published, undoubtedly the public would interpret the entire matter in its worst light—a mild form of "shakedown."

In this same memorandum it was pointed out how Mr. Finnegan was considering resigning as soon as he could "induce" the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States to accept his resignation. The memorandum was concluded with the thought that if Mr. Finnegan would resign the resentment in certain circles against the collector for being involved with Mr. Brodsky might subside and public criticism of the collector's office might be avoided.

I shall now review the evidence as contained in these files supporting the charges placed against Mr. Finnegan by the unnamed informant to J. Edgar Hoover in April 1950.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. As I read the statement from the report to which the Senator has just referred:

It is probable that Mr. Finnegan saw no particular impropriety in permitting taxpayers to defer the liquidation of their tax obligations (which is entirely proper per se) and to furnish Brodsky with the names of such taxpayers in order that he could contact them for insurance, for which services Finnegan was to get a cut—whether as commissions or attorney's fees.

Does the Senator understand from that, that the official appintment by the Government to investigate this case was reporting that there was no impropriety in that conduct, or merely that Mr. Finnegan saw no impropriety in it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I take it, he reported that Mr. Finnegan saw no particular impropriety in it.

Mr. KEM. Did he proceed to invite the attention of the one to whom he made the report to the fact that there was a Federal statute prohibiting the giving of information received by a public official while in an official capacity?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; he did not go into that.

Mr. KEM. Did he recommend prosecution?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He merely made his report. I do not think he made any final recommendation.

Mr. KEM. So the inference was that if Mr. Finnegan saw no impropriety in it there could be none?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The inference I gather from reading that, and the substance of the next two paragraphs which follow thereafter, is that if Mr. Finnegan would resign perhaps the public would forget it, and public criticism might be avoided.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I promise him I shall be very brief.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. How did the FBI get into the picture? Why did the FBI investigate this case?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The complaint made by the original informant was sent to the FBI, which in turn advised the Treasury Department, and, as a result thereof, the investigation followed. That was in April 1950, about 6 or 8 months before I again became a member of the Finance Committee or any subcommittee thereof.

Mr. WHERRY. I see.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall now refer to a statement by Richard V. Clark, Jr., which is found in this report.

Mr. Richard V. Clark, Jr., an insurance broker associated with the Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., of St. Louis, was interviewed on December 5 and again on December 13, 1950, and in these interviews he furnished the following information:

Sometime during the latter part of June 1949, Mr. Brodsky called upon him and inquired if Clark would associate himself with Brodsky in the sale of insurance, since he, Brodsky, had little experience in writing general insurance. Mr. Brodsky told him that the collector of internal revenue, Mr. Finnegan, would furnish the names of persons who were in tax difficulties as prospects to whom insurance might be sold. Mr. Brodsky proposed that the commissions earned on insurance thus sold would be divided—one-third to Finnegan, one-third to Clark, and one-third to Brodsky.

Mr. Brodsky claimed that Mr. Finnegan had furnished him with the names of people to be contacted for insurance, among which were the Food Center of St. Louis, Inc., Valley Steel Products Co., Robert Baskowitz, Harrison Lumber Co., and Missouri Paper Stock Co., all of St. Louis. Mr. Clark said he agreed to the arrangement proposed by Brodsky, and on June 28, 1949, he and Brodsky visited Mr. A. J. Molasky, president of the Food Center of St. Louis, Inc. Clark said that after introducing himself to Mr. Molasky, he introduced Brodsky, who remarked to Mr. Molasky: "Remember, Mr. Finnegan called you about me." Mr. Clark does not recall what reply, if any, Mr. Molasky made, except to tell them that they should contact his son, Stanley, to discuss the company's insurance problems, since his son was handling this phase of the business. This suggestion, Clark said, was followed, and a few days later Mr. Stanley Molasky authorized them to make a survey of the company's insurance requirements. The survey resulted in the company's insurance business being taken from its regular brokers and placed in the hands of Brodsky's agency. It perhaps should be pointed out at this time that the company's regular insurance brokers were Mr. Joseph Weingart, Sr., and Mr. Joseph Sperrer—the latter being the father of the treasurer of Food Center of St. Louis, Inc. The commissions earned on this insurance amounted to approximately $16,000,

of which $3,000 was to be paid to Sylvia Molasky, who was a licensed insurance agent and a daughter of the president of Food Center of St. Louis, Inc. The balance of $23,000, Clark said, was to be divided three ways under the arrangement, or approximately $7,500 each to Finnegan, Clark, and Brodsky. Mr. Clark claims, however, that he received only $780.

Mr. Clark said he knew that Mr. Finnegan was receiving money from Mr. Brodsky, presumably under his understanding with Brodsky, because Brodsky told him he was paying Mr. Finnegan $500 a month, against which the commissions due Mr. Finnegan would be charged. Clark said that he saw some of the checks Brodsky issued to Finnegan, some payable to Mrs. Finnegan, and some to his son, James P. Finnegan, Jr. Moreover, Clark said that in one instance he personally delivered to Mr. Finnegan's wife about Christmas time, 1949, a $1,000 check made payable to Mrs. Eva Finnegan, together with a Christmas gift of a bed jacket to Mrs. Finnegan from Brodsky.

On one occasion—sometime during July 1949—while he was in the office of Dudmar Insurance Agency, Clark said, Mr. Finnegan called several times by long distance telephone from Washington, D. C., requesting that Brodsky send him money, since he—Finnegan—contemplated a trip to Florida. Mr. Brodsky was at the time attempting to sell a life insurance policy to an officer of the Valley Steel Products Co., and in his telephone calls Mr. Finnegan was anxious to know if the applicant had passed the medical examination. Mr. Brodsky, Clark said, contacted Mr. Don Kelly, General Agent of the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., requesting an advance on the expected commission to be earned on the said policy. Mr. Clark believed that on this occasion, Brodsky asked Don Kelly to send Mr. Finnegan $750. It is shown hereinafter that the Valley Steel Products Co. and its officers were in tax difficulties.

Although the terms of the contract between Brodsky and Clark to the effect that Clark's share would be one-third of the commissions earned were oral, Mr. Brodsky at various times has repeated those terms to Mr. Clark's father and Mr. Oliver Blase. Clark said in this connection that he is firmly convinced that Mr. Finnegan is a partner of Mr. Brodsky, just as Brodsky represented to him. He cited two reasons: (1) it would be impossible for a person as inexperienced as Brodsky to obtain large insurance accounts such as the Food Center of St. Louis, Inc., without the aid of someone like Mr. Finnegan through his official position; and (2) Finnegan's interest in the commission resulting from a $30,000 life insurance policy which Brodsky placed with the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. The facts regarding this are brought out through statements by Don Kelly and Walter Heuermann.

Mr. President, to save time, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a statement of an interview with Mr. Oliver Blase and a statement of an interview with Mr. Don Kelly, both of whom gave their understanding of the agreement to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. OLIVER BLASE

Mr. Oliver Blase, who operates the Oliver Blase Agency and who is affiliated with the Aetna Life Insurance Co. and the Aetna Casualty and Surety Co., of St. Louis, when interviewed on December 5, 1950, said that Mr. Richard V. Clark, Jr., has desk space in his office; that he recalls Mr. Brodsky visiting Mr. Clark at which time Mr. Brodsky related in the presence of Blase that he had an arrangement with Mr. Finnegan to obtain the names of people to whom insurance could be sold. He also heard Mr. Brodsky tell Mr. Clark that the commissions earned on insurance thus sold would be divided—one-third each to Clark, Finnegan, and Brodsky—provided that Mr. Clark would agree to help him in the sale of the insurance. On several occasions he heard Mr. Brodsky reiterate that he had an arrangement with Mr. Finnegan whereby the latter would furnish Brodsky with the names of persons who were in tax difficulties. Mr. Blase recalled that during the month of December 1949, Brodsky requested Mr. Blase to give him an advance on commissions on the Food Center of St. Louis, Inc., account. Mr. Brodsky explained that he needed this money immediately because Mr. Finnegan was demanding his share. When Mr. Blase refused, Brodsky requested that the former have a check made payable to Mr. Finnegan for $250 and charge it to Brodsky's commission account. Mr. Blase said he refused to do this because Mr. Finnegan is not licensed as an insurance broker and therefore not entitled to commissions. On December 31, 1949, Mr. Blase did advance $2,500 to Mr. Brodsky. On that same day Brodsky issued a check for $1,000 to Mrs. Eva Finnegan.

STATEMENT OF DON KELLY

Mr. Don Kelly, general manager, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., of St. Louis, when interviewed, stated in substance, as follows:

During June or July 1949, Mr. Brodsky visited his office and explained to him that quite a few local business firms were finding it difficult to pay taxes assessed against them by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and that Mr. Finnegan had arranged with the firms to allow them to pay the assessments over a period of time. Mr. Brodsky further told Kelly that Mr. Finnegan had furnished him with the names of these firms, and that he [Brodsky] desired to sell the officers of these firms some life insurance, which sales should not be difficult in view of the favors granted them by Mr. Finnegan. Mr. Brodsky requested that Mr. Kelly send one of his salesmen with him to contact the officers of these firms. Mr. Kelly asked for the names of the firms, but Brodsky told him that at the time he had the names of only two firms; namely, the Harrison Lumber Co. and the Valley Steel Products Co., but that the assessments against these two firms were so large that it would be to the advantage of the firms' officers to buy life insurance rather than to have the Collector of Internal Revenue demand immediate payment of the taxes they owed.

Mr. Kelly said he did not relish the idea of doing business with Mr. Brodsky, but his firm's attorney pointed out that, since Mr. Brodsky had a broker's license, he could not refuse his business without making himself liable to a possible suit for damages. He accordingly assigned Walter Heuerman, a salesman for the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., to accompany Brodsky.

Mr. Heuerman later reported to Mr. Kelly that the officers at the Harrison Lumber Co. refused to buy any insurance, but that a George B. Fleischman [now deceased], of the Valley Steel Products Co., had agreed to purchase life insurance. Although neither Mr. Kelly nor Mr. Heuerman knew about it, tax assessments totaling more than a million dollars had been made against the partners of the Valley Steel Products Co. and the Harrison Lumber Co.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to read for the record a statement regarding an interview with John Martin Brodsky, the other gentleman involved in this partnership:

Mr. John Martin Brodsky was interviewed on January 11, 1951, in the presence of his attorney, Abraham Lowenhaupt, regarding his own income-tax affairs for the years 1948 and 1949, as well as his connection with Collector Finnegan. He was first asked regarding the identity of the persons who received the $1,703 which had been shown by him as a deduction for attorney's fees on his 1949 income-tax return. He replied that $1,700 was paid to Collector James P. Finnegan, who represented him in the capacity of attorney. He was asked to explain just what legal services Mr. Finnegan had rendered, and Brodsky replied that it was in connection with his various divorce matters and his insurance business. He was advised that Mr. Finnegan's name did not appear as an attorney of record on any of the legal documents in his divorce actions and Mr. Brodsky remarked that although Mr. Finnegan had not publicly represented him, he frequently consulted with Mr. Finnegan about his divorce affairs.

Wher Brodsky was asked to make some allocation between Mr. Finnegan's services on the divorce matters and insurance business, he claims the $1,700 during the year 1949 would be allocated to services rendered in connection with the insurance business. He admitted that of the $1,700 paid to Mr. Finnegan, there were two checks, one for $500 and the other for $1,000—both payable to Mrs. Eva Finnegan—and that the balance, $200, was paid in currency. His explanation as to why the two checks were made payable to Mr. Finnegan's wife, rather than to Mr. Finnegan himself, was that Mr. Finnegan was out of town at the time and wanted the money deposited in his bank account to cover any checks he might draw.

Mr. Brodsky further stated that the checks issued to Mr. Finnegan and his son in 1950 were also for legal fees; but he could not furnish any allocation of their payment between legal fees for business and for personal matters. He explained that the reason why some of the checks were made payable to Finnegan's son was that on occasions Mr. Finnegan was out of town and needed money deposited to his bank accounts to cover checks he might write.

Regarding the legal services that Mr. Finnegan is claimed to have rendered, Mr. Brodsky said, and Mr. Finnegan confirmed the act, that Mr. Finnegan did not submit any invoices or bills to Brodsky. Mr. Brodsky said that all payments to Mr. Finnegan were "by oral, mutual agreement."

Regarding his attempt to sell a life-insurance policy to the Valley Steel Products Co. on the life of Philipp Muennig, Mr. Brodsky said that he first contacted the president of the firm, Mr. Fleischman, who could not pass the re-

quired physical examination. It was later decided, according to Mr. Brodsky, that the company would obtain a policy through Brodsky on the life of Philipp Muennig, an employee of the steel company. The premium on the policy was $23,886.37. The finances of the company were such that it was necessary for the company to borrow $22,400 to pay the premium. However, when the medical examination developed that Mr. Muennig was also not a good risk, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. returned the premium to Philipp Muennig. Mr. Brodsky asked the insurance company to write two checks—one for $22,400, and the other for the difference, $1,486.37.

Mr. Brodsky admitted that he deposited the $1,486.37 check in a bank account at the Mutual Bank and Trust Co. As pointed out hereinbefore, Valley Steel Products Co. charged the amount of $1,486.37 to attorney's fees, although Brodsky is not an attorney.

Brodsky was asked who had furnished him with the names of persons involved in tax difficulties, who were contacted for the purpose of selling them insurance. He hesitated, then replied that he did not obtain the names from Collector Finnegan, but possibly from someone else in the collector's office. When he was pressed for the name of the individual, he suddenly added: "I would not like to give any more information as to the collector's office." At this point during the interview, Mr. Brodsky turned to his attorney, and a whispered consultation was held, after which the attorney remarked that he saw no reason why his client should not tell us the truth about the matter. Mr. Brodsky thereupon said: "Any information I got as to my clients came from Mr. Finnegan. I was given the names by Finnegan personally."

Mr. Brodsky stated further, in reply to our inquiries, that Mr. Finnegan had furnished him with the names of Food Center of St. Louis, Inc., Harrison Lumber Co., Valley Steel Products Co., Missouri Paper Products Co., and Robert Baskowitz.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. There is one point in the statement of Mr. Brodsky that I do not quite understand. The statement, as read by the Senator, is:

> His explanation as to why the two checks were made payable to Mr. Finnegan's wife, rather than to Mr. Finnegan himself, was that Mr. Finnegan was out of town at the time and wanted the money deposited in his bank account to cover any checks he might draw.

If the intention was to deposit the money in Mr. Finnegan's account, the check or checks could have been drawn to Mr. Finnegan and could have been so deposited, could they not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In their report the agents pointed that out, and stated that they did not see why he went through that formality.

NAMES OF FIRMS WITH TAX ASSESSMENTS FURNISHED TO MR. BRODSKY BY FINNEGAN

The records of the collector of internal revenue disclose that in June and July 1949, the firms named by Mr. Brodsky, as having been furnished by Collector Finnegan, had, except the Food Center of St. Louis, Inc., large additional tax assessments against them or their officers, and that, except in one instance, deferred payments were being made. An analysis of the additional assessments and payments appearing on the records of the collector of internal revenue against Lester Crancer and George B. Fleischman, partners in the firm of Valley Steel Products Co.; John W. and Clifford P. Harrison, partners in the firm of Harrison Lumber Co.; Missouri Paper Stock Co. and Samuel E. Mendelson, its president, and Robert Baskowitz, discloses the following with respect to the tax assessments and the amounts due as of June 30, 1949, about which time Brodsky gave these names to Mr. Clark and some of them to Mr. Kelly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the list printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Assessment date	Amount assessed	Amount paid to June 30, 1949	Balance due June 30, 1949	Date of final payment
Lester Crancer	Feb. 10, 1949	$466,691.61	$327,308.99	$139,382.62	Aug. 1, 1950.
George B. Fleischman	do	467,812.62	327,680.99	140,131.63	Do.
John W. Harrison	Apr. 21, 1949	74,426.26	8,493.64	65,932.62	$34,702.47 still due.
Clifford F. Harrison	do	45,770.30		45,770.30	$12,832.65 still due.
Missouri Paper Stock Co.	Feb. 4, 1949	55,636.16	36,922.23	18,693.93	$9,190.60 still due.
Samuel E. Mendelson	Dec. 31, 1948	52,536.38	10,000.00	42,536.38	$41,036.38 still due.
Robert Baskowitz	July 8, 1949	8,315.57			July 13, 1949.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question, or does the Senator have the time to yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask a question in order to get at the root of the matter. As I understand, the names furnished by Mr. Finnegan, the tax collector, were the names of individuals or of firms who were having tax difficulties.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. Finnegan turned those names over to the insurance agent who wrote insurance either for those companies or for certain persons in those companies. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. What was the purpose of doing that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. According to the report, it was so that Mr. Finnegan could "get his cut" of the commissions earned.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, out of the insurance premiums?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, out of the insurance premiums thus earned. The assessments against officials of the Valley Steel Products Co. aggregated around $900,000, and I will follow through on that particular transaction, because that is the company to which we have just referred, as having bought the $30,000 life insurance policy, with a paid-up premium of $23,866.37, and to which neither the official nor the employee qualified or passed a physical examination, so that the refund was made in two separate checks, one to the company, and one to Brodsky. We shall trace that particular transaction through.

COLLECTOR FINNEGAN GETS A CADILLAC

In 1949, at the time the insurance partnership alliance between James P. Finnegan and J. Martin Brodsky was formed the records show that Lester Crancer and George B. Fleischman, partners in the firm of Valley Steel Products Co., owed taxes amounting to $466,691.61 and $467,812.62, respectively.

According to the evidence above the names of these taxpayers were given to Brodsky by Finnegan as prospects, and they were subsequently approached for insurance business. Following this conference George B. Fleischman, now deceased, of the Valley Steel Products Co., agreed to purchase a $30,000 life insurance policy from the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., through Mr. Brodsky. This was a single-premium policy and the premium involved was $23,866.37. The Valley Steel Products Co., whose partners owed over $900,000 in taxes, had to borrow the money to pay for this premium.

After a physical examination revealed that Mr. Fleischman had a heart murmur which made him ineligible for insurance, the firm decided to take out life insurance on Philipp Muennig, an employee.

Philipp Muennig failed to pass the physical examination, and on August 5, 1949, the premium was refunded by the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., issuing its check, No. 4022, for $23,886.37, payable to Philipp Muennig. Mr. Brodsky came to the office that day and requested that the refund be made in two checks—one for $22,400, payable to Philipp Muennig, and the other for $1,486.37, payable to Brodsky. Mr. Kelly, the general manager of the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., of St. Louis, told Brodsky that he would prepare two checks as requested, but that both checks would be made payable to Philipp Muennig. This was done, and the company's checks, Nos. 4927 and 4928, for $22,400 and $1,486.37, respectively, were issued on August 5, 1949, payable to Philipp Muennig.

The records of the Mutual Bank & Trust Co. disclose that on August 5, 1949, the Dudmar Insurance agency opened a checking account at that bank. The opening deposit to this new account was made on August 5, 1949, the same date, and consisted of one check in the amount of $1,486.37. The records of Dudmar Insurance agency disclose this receipt as being from the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., and the amount is the same as the amount of the check issued by the insurance company to Philipp Muennig, as I said before. Valley Steel Products Co. charged the amount of $1,486.37 to attorney's fees.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to ask, who was the Dudmar Insurance Co.?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was the name of the insurance company, apparently, which was formed by Mr. Brodsky and Mr. Finnegan.

Mr. KEM. That was the name of their partnership, is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I assume so.

For the time being we will leave this $1,486.37 in the Mutual Bank & Trust Co. and go back 3 weeks to July 14, 1949, to examine a personal transaction of Mr. Finnegan involving the purchase of a new Cadillac by trading his 1949 Dodge and agreeing to pay the $1,017.11 difference.

On that same date the records of the Mutual Bank & Trust Co. of St. Louis disclose that James P. Finnegan borrowed $500 on note No. 1089 at 6 percent interest for 30 days and $500 on note No. 1090 at 6 percent interest for 60 days, both secured by the endorsement of J. Martin Brodsky.

In tracing the disposition of the funds represented by the two notes it was learned that Mr. Finnegan was issued cashier's check No. 240726 in the amount of $992.50, discount value of notes, from the bank, which check was deposited in his personal bank account at the Mississippi Valley Trust Co. on that same day, July 14, 1949.

As previously stated, it was on that date that Mr. Finnegan drew his personal check for $1,017.11 on the Mississippi Valley Trust Co., which check was used in the purchase of his new Cadillac.

An examination of the records of the Dudmar Insurance agency, in whose name, on August 5, 1949, had been deposited the $1,486.37 received from the Valley Steel Products Co., discloses this interesting information:

First. On August 10, 1949, a check in the amount of $500 was drawn against this account payable to the Mutual Bank & Trust Co., which check was used to pay off the $500 note No. 1089 of James P. Finnegan.

Second. Further examination shows that on September 2, 1949, a check in the amount of $686.37 was drawn payable to cash. This check was used to pay off the other $500 note, No. 1090, of James P. Finnegan and the remaining $186.37 was retained by Mr. Brodsky.

Apparently this $186.37 retained by Mr. Brodsky was to offset the $193.11 insurance premium on Mr. Finnegan's new Cadillac which had been paid by Mr. Brodsky.

The $300 remaining in this account from the original $1,486.37 collected from the Valley Steel Products Co. was accounted for in check dated August 15, 1949, which sum was paid to Mr. Finnegan for an unexplained trip to Columbia, Mo.

A brief summary of this case shows that the Valley Steel Products Co. whose officers owed nearly $1,000,000 in back taxes were given lenient terms for payment of their accounts. In return, $1,486.11, charged on the company's books as attorney fees, was subsequently deposited in the bank and used by Mr. Finnegan to pay for a new Cadillac and a trip to Columbia, Mo.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did those items balance the account—that is, the amount applied to the Cadillac, the amount of the insurance, and the $300 said to have been used for an unexplained trip to Columbia, Mo.? In other words, did those items total exactly $1,486.37?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. The sum cleared out the account.

The insurance partnership between Mr. Finnegan and Mr. Brodsky was in effect during most of 1949 and 1950. According to the records during this period Mr. Finnegan collected as his part, including the Cadillac, $6,193.11 either as actual cash payments or constructive receipt.

A breakdown:

By currency and checks	$4,700.00
Bank loans paid	1,000.00
Columbia, Mo., trip paid	300.00
Insurance premium paid	193.11
Total	6,193.11

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the President received Mr. Finnegan's resignation with reluctance, or with regret?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, he accepted it with extreme reluctance. According to Mr. Finnegan, the President was persuaded to accept it, and, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, it was purely voluntary, and there was nothing wrong in St. Louis so far as he was concerned. At the same time, all of this was documented and could have been found in the Treasury files in Washington. At the time Mr. Snyder directed a letter to me about 10 days ago, in which he said that Mr. Finnegan's resignation was purely voluntary, he reiterated that there was nothing wrong in St. Louis.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will permit, I should like to say that he has made a very valuable contribution in bringing these facts to the attention of the Senate. I know that what he has done will be appreciated by the good citizens of my State.

I ask the Senator whether he will permit me to insert at this point in his remarks a copy of a letter which I wrote under date of April 27, 1951, to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the new chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, suggesting that the committee devote some additional time to an investigation of conditions in the State of Missouri?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Missouri insert the letter, and I agree with him that some additional time should be devoted within the near future to an investigation not only of the collector's office in St. Louis but also to the other situation to which he refers.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask that the letter to which I have referred be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 27, 1951.

Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR: I congratulate you heartily on your selection as the new chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. You and your colleagues have my best wishes for continued success in this important undertaking.

I hope that during the additional 4 months granted your committee to continue its investigation of crime, you will see fit to investigate further the situation in the State of Missouri.

You are familiar with the fact that during visits to Kansas City and St. Louis, the committee, under the able chairmanship of Senator KEFAUVER, found evidence of collusion between the criminal element and certain State and local officials. The results of the investigation led the committee to report, among other things: "In Missouri, one can perceive a more than passing connection between Governor Smith's appointment of two members to the Kansas City police board who favored a wide-open town and Binaggio's support during the election."

Since these revelations, many Missourians, from all ranks of life and both Democrats and Republicans have expressed their conviction that the committee scarcely scratched the surface in Missouri. It is felt that many salient facts in connection with what has become known as Pendergastism in Kansas City and Shenkerism in St. Louis have not been brought to light. I join them in urging that the committee take whatever time is necessary to unearth all the facts concerning the unholy alliance between crime and politics that exists in our State.

Missourians were particularly disappointed that the committee failed to shed any new light on the theft, on May 27, 1947, of the ballots making up the evidence of the notorious vote frauds in the primary election of 1946 in Kansas City. This was an act of outrageous violence which struck at the very roots of our free institutions. It struck at the very foundations of law and order. To this day, nearly 4 years later, this crime has gone unwhipped of justice.

When no arrests were made for this wicked crime it was widely interpreted as evidence of a new, efficient working partnership between crime and politics. This successful attack upon the rights of the people provided an incentive for more—and more—crime. Twenty-one unsolved murders followed in rapid succession, climaxed by the bloody killings last year of Charles Binaggio and Charles Gargotta.

Many Missourians have been at a loss to understand why the law-enforcement agencies of the Government, with all their trained investigators, and with the benefit of modern, scientific equipment, cannot apprehend those guilty of the theft of the ballots. It is disturbing to know that this crime is still in the file marked "unsolved."

I know you agree that honest, fair elections and clean government, free from the taint of criminal corruption, are considerations that rise far above mere partisan or factional politics.

Should you and your colleagues decide, as I hope you will, to make a full and complete investigation of the theft of the ballots and the situation generally in Missouri, I shall be very glad to cooperate in every way I can.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. KEM.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I object to that. I should like to have as many Senators as possible present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I again ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into the question is on agreeing to the amendment relating to the establishment of reception centers offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], for himself and other Senators, as a substitute for lines 7 to 12, inclusive, on page 2 of Senate bill 984, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement the time for debate is equally divided between the proponent, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the opponent, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], with 20 minutes allotted to each side. The Chair is therefore required to recognize the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I make inquiry of the Senator from Louisiana with respect to the division of time? Do I understand that the proponent has 20 minutes allotted to him at this time, and that he must use the time now or not at all?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 20 miuntes on his amendment, and the Senator from Louisiana has 20 minutes in opposition to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I am perfectly willing to submit the amendment at this time. On the other hand, the Senator from Louisiana may bring up some points which I may feel should be responded to. I had hoped that we might have a division of time by which the Senator from Louisiana would be able to make a presentation of his viewpoint and I might have an opportunity to respond, if I felt it was necessary to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my understanding that the Senator from Oregon need not use all of his time at once. He may use 5 minutes, 10 minutes, or 15 minutes at this time, if he wishes to do so. I am perfectly willing to cut 5 or 10 minutes off my time.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as he may desire to take.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Louisiana for permitting me to make a few comments at this time. The subcommittee on Armed Services of the Committee on Appropriations should now be hearing testimony with reference to the fourth supplemental appropriations bill. Inasmuch as I am the chairman of the subcommittee, I must go to the hearing as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I wish to say that my experience in the State of Wyoming and my knowledge of conditions existing throughout the Rocky Mountain West, where wool is produced and sugar is produced, indicate to me that there is a shortage of the type of labor which is available for work upon farms and ranches.

The conditions of employment througout the West are such that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain workers to go on the ranges to herd sheep. It is very difficult to find workers to be employed in the beet fields. I am very much afraid that the bill, as it was reported by the committee, without amendment, would not provide the labor which we need. In the past Mexican labor has been used almost continuously. It was highly necessary during the war that arrangements be made with the Government of Mexico whereby such workers would be available in our agricultural enterprises.

I feel that the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Oregon is highly essential if we are to maintain the production which we ought to have. Wool production is, of course, very necessary in the United States. The growing of sheep has diminished considerably during the past several years, chiefly because of the lack of labor competent and willing to do the work. Consequently we should now take no chances at all, but should draft the bill in such form as to guarantee that Mexican labor will be available.

The office of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] communicated with me this morning and asked me to insert in the RECORD a letter which was received by the Senator from New Mexico from Mr. J. B. Wilson, secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. The letter is dated May 1, 1951. I should like to read it into the RECORD:

WYOMING WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
McKinley, Wyo., May 1, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I was interested in reading the debate on the foreign labor bill in the Senate on April 26 and 27 and noticed that on the 27th, in speaking to Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, you indicated that plenty of sheep herders could be supplied from your State.

As you undoubtedly know, Wyoming has been for many years using a lot of sheep herders from the good State of New Mexico. These herders have in the main proved satisfactory and many of them come to Wyoming in the spring to lamb the sheep and stay during the summer and return to New Mexico when the lambs are delivered in the fall and the sheep men are reducing their flocks due to the sale and shipment of lambs and aged ewes. Many families have been coming to Wyoming for a good many years.

The citizens of New Mexico, who herd sheep in Wyoming, are paid the same scale of wages as are any other herders and, as I have said before, have usually been quite satisfactory.

However, there seems to be a scarcity of experienced herders in New Mexico at this time, as growers who talk to me advise that they find difficulty in getting enough experienced herders from your State.

I am advised by wool growers in our State that the help they are getting for lambing is the most inefficient. Of course, they recruit this help from the local Employment Service offices and they also report a shortage of herders. Most of them would welcome the opportunity of getting some experienced herders from your State and if you can tell us where we might secure some experienced herders, I am sure the wool growers of our State will be most grateful.

Up to say 10 or 15 years ago we had no difficulty in securing most of our needs for herders from the State of New Mexico because the herders that had herded here the previous year would recruit additional herders and we usually had a fairly good supply of herders from your State, but in recent years it has been impossible to secure enough herders from New Mexico and I think it will be found that our State pays wages as high as any State and the majority of our people do use herders from the State of New Mexico and if you can tell us where we can secure any experienced herders, we will appreciate it.

Thanking you in advance and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
J. B. WILSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. President, I concur in what Mr. Wilson says. I know that the wool growers of Wyoming would be very happy to receive sheep herders from New Mexico, and would be very glad to afford them satisfactory employment and pay them good wages. If they do come from New Mexico we shall be very happy to have them. But my judgment is that we should not be forced to depend solely upon that source of supply, but should have the aid which would be provided by the Cordon amendment, to make the supply of Mexican labor more available.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator would be interested in a newspaper article dated April 26 on the farm-labor shortages in New Mexico. Maurice F. Miera, executive director of the State Employment Security Commission, stated that we would have a shortage of 24,000 farm laborers in New Mexico during the cotton-picking season. He pointed out that the demand for seasonal farm workers in the State will reach a postwar peak of 37,850 during the 1951 harvest, and that cotton picking alone would demand 36,000 workers in late October and early November.

Max R. Salazar, State director for the New Mexico Employment Service, stated that while he had made arrangements with agencies in other States to try to bring in laborers, the shortages which cannot be met by domestic workers would have to be met by importing foreign workers, preferably Mexican farm laborers.

I ask the Senator if he believes that with a shortage of that size in a small State such as New Mexico, there is much chance of Wyoming getting additional help from New Mexico?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The information which the Senator affords the Senate is most persuasive.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator from Wyoming permit me to ask unanimous consent to place the whole of this brief article in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to have it inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, or at this point.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article with reference to farm-labor shortages in New Mexico be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my point is that the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is greatly needed, but it should be amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. I sincerely hope that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will accept the amendment which has been proposed.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for permitting me to make my statement at this time.

EXHIBIT A

FARM LABOR SHORTAGES SEEN IN NEW MEXICO

ALBUQUERQUE, April 26.—Maurice F. Miera, executive director of the State employment security commission, today forecast a shortage of 24,000 farm workers in New Mexico during the cotton-picking season.

Miera said the forecast was the result of a recent analysis of farm-labor requirements prepared by the farm placement division of the State employment service.

The executive director said the demand for seasonal farm workers in the State will reach a postwar peak of 37,850 during the 1951 harvest.

Cotton picking alone will demand 36,000 workers in late October and early November.

Max R. Salazar, State director for the New Mexico Employment Service, reported that agreements have meen made with other State employment services to direct surplus workers into the State to help alleviate the shortage.

Salazar said that shortages which cannot be met by domestic workers will be certified as requiring foreign workers, probably Mexican farm laborers.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for the purpose of making an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, during the course of the debate on the farm-labor bill reference was made to the testimony of representatives of the United States Employment Service before the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee which was given several weeks ago. In that connection, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I should like to have placed in the RECORD at this point the complete testimony of Mr. Goodwin, Director of the United States Employment Service, so that the RECORD may be complete, particularly as it relates to utilization of the American domestic labor supply, the use of American Indians, and the use of Puerto Ricans insofar as agricultural employment is concerned.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM LABORERS

Senator CHAVEZ. Yes. Now to some extent your work is concerned with farm laborers, is it not?

Mr. GOODWIN. That is a very important part of our job.

Senator CHAVEZ. Of course it is important, but what are you going—what is the agency doing in order to get American labor to those spots? I am talking about American labor now.

Mr. GOODWIN. In the farm program we are putting all of the emphasis we can on the utilization of domestic labor. We are trying to get it transferred from one place to another; that is, where it is available in one place, and needed some place else.

PLACEMENT OF INDIAN LABOR

Senator CHAVEZ. What are you doing about the Indians? They can get killed on Okinawa or raise a flag on Iwo Jima, but what are you doing to get them a job on a farm?

Mr. GOODWIN. The Indians?

Senator CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. GOODWIN. We have worked out programs with the Indian Service for the use of the Indians.

Senator CHAVEZ. What do you do with the Indian himself, not the Indian Service—that is another Bureau in Washington.

Mr. GOODWIN. I know that we have placed many of the Indians on farm work.

Senator CHAVEZ. We have possibly 90,000 Indians in my State, and they are good enough to be killed in Korea, but you prefer to get some Jamaica Negroes or Mexican laborers rather than putting some of those Indians to work. What are you doing as far as American labor is concerned, sir?

Mr. GOODWIN. We have placed many of those Indians; many of them from your State.

Senator CHAVEZ. I don't want the Indian Service to be the determining factor. What do you do about going to the reservations, and getting those Indians a job, such as picking parsley or celery or whatever it may be, in California or Oregon?

Mr. GOODWIN. We have sent people to those reservations, and we have recruited the Indians and placed them on farm work.

PUERTO RICAN LABOR

Senator CHAVEZ. What about the Puerto Ricans? I just saw a picture of a boy the other day at Walter Reed Hospital with two legs gone and a right arm gone. What are you doing about his brother, who may need a job?

Mr. DODSON. As I think you know, Puerto Ricans were not used in World War II.

Senator CHAVEZ. Why? They were used at Guadalcanal.

Mr. GOODWIN. I know, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. General del Valle was at Guadalcanal and he was at Iwo Jima and at Okinawa. There is not a single American military cemetery anywhere that does not have some Puerto Ricans. Why were they not used for labor? Is that the policy of the Department?

Mr. GOODWIN. I don't know, Mr. Chairman. I think it was a policy of discrimination, and I think it showed up in many places.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE EXTENDED TO PUERTO RICO

We didn't have the Employment Service extended to Puerto Rico until a few months ago.

Senator CHAVEZ. I know, because the Department would prefer to get Jamaican Negroes who would complain to His Majesty's consul in New Jersey.

Mr. GOODWIN. We favored the extension of the program to Puerto Rico a long time ago.

Senator CHAVEZ. Why have you not done it? Why have you not talked to Senator Knowland or to me about that proposition? Do you not think that, if they are good enough to die for their country, they are good enough to be given work?

Mr. GOODWIN. I absolutely agree with you.

Senator CHAVEZ. What have you done about it?

Mr. GOODWIN. We have been doing everything we can to increase the use of them in the past years.

Senator CHAVEZ. Would you rather get a Mexican laborer from across the border for 60 cents a day than to pay a boy who might have a brother who was killed in the war and pay him sound wages in the United States? Is that not the picture?

Mr. GOODWIN. That is not right, so far as this problem—so far as our attitude toward this problem is concerned. We have been working to get a greater use of them.

I cannot give you the answers to all of these questions as far as World War II is concerned, because I was not in charge of the program then.

UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN LABOR

Senator CHAVEZ. As the chairman of this committee, and as an individual only—and I do not represent the views of the committee—I am not in favor of giving the Department any money to go down and get foreigners to work in the country when we have people like the Indians and local citizens who are around here, and who are drafted, and yet who cannot get a job, while some foreigners are brought into the country to work.

Mr. GOODWIN. I agree with that, except that I would say that we are doing everything we can with the resources we have. Now there was a great deal more done on some phases of this problem in World War II. At that time Congress was appropriating about $30,000,000 a year for that purpose; that is, transportation costs, housing costs, and medical costs. That was all wiped out at the end of the war, and the problem was turned over to the United States Employment Service, and we were expected to do many of the same things without any additional funds.

Senator CHAVEZ. Well, how did you get the Jamaicans or the Panamanians? How did you get them here? That costs money, too, you know.

Mr. GOODWIN. They, because of the conditions that exist in those countries, Mr. Chairman, are willing to come under conditions that our domestic laborers would not—

Senator CHAVEZ. Are we working for the other countries, or are we working for the American citizens? What is this Government for?

Mr. GOODWIN. We are working for the American citizens, of course.

PUERTO RICAN EMPLOYMENT OFFICE

Senator KNOWLAND. How long have you had the Puerto Rican Employment Office?

Mr. GOODWIN. That legislation was passed late in the last session, Senator, and the enabling legislation in Puerto Rico was passed within recent weeks. You might say that it is just now getting under way. The Federal legislation only made it possible. Then they had to pass enabling legislation in Puerto Rico in order to operate, just like the States.

Senator CHAVEZ. I know that the basic legislation for the country is the constitution of the country, am I right?

Mr. GOODWIN. That is right.

Senator CHAVEZ. All right. They are citizens. They had possibly 50,000 in the First World War. In the last war they had a little better than 90,000.

Mr. GOODWIN. Who?

Senator CHAVEZ. The Puerto Ricans. Why should not they be subject to the law of the land, which is the constitution?

Mr. GOODWIN. They should be—and we have done everything that we can to promote their use.

Senator CHAVEZ. You tell us that because some people would work under conditions that they would not work under, you allowed them to come into the country?

Mr. GOODWIN. You asked me why some of the British West Indians and some others came in.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is right. They will go to Delaware and they will go to New Jersey, and if they don't like it there they will go down and complain to His Majesty's consul about it, while the Puerto Rican takes it on the chin.

Mr. GOODWIN. The employers have paid to bring in some of the foreign workers. You mentioned, for instance, the eastern coast, Mr. Chairman. There have been no Mexicans used in that area.

Part of the problem involved here is distance. There has been resistance to the use of Puerto Ricans, for instance, when you get to the western part of the country, because of the transportation.

Senator CHAVEZ. That might be the personal element; that might be the individual element. But I am talking about the Department. What are you doing about it, as a representative of Uncle Sam's Government? I am not complaining about an individual who might not want Puerto Ricans because they are so far away, but I am talking about the policy of the Department, in trying to employ American citizens.

WORK STANDARDS OF PUERTO RICAN LABOR

Mr. GOODWIN. The policy has been one of promoting the use of American citizens which, of course, includes Puerto Ricans. We, on our initiative, entered into a policy and understanding with the Puerto Rican government, soon after this problem came back under our responsibility.

Senator CHAVEZ. But why should you have an understanding with the Puerto Rican government? The Puerto Rican government is like California or New Mexico or Texas. What is the difference?

Mr. GOODWIN. Let me explain, Mr. Chairman. The Puerto Rican government passed a law which said that no one could come down there and recruit Puerto Ricans except under the supervision of the Department of Labor of Puerto Rico. Then they said that in order to recruit they had to hire them under a contract, and they stipulated what the conditions of that contract would be.

Now, that does not mean that the individual Puerto Ricans cannot themselves voluntarily migrate to the United States and get employment—they can. But most of them are unable to do it because they do not have the financial resources. Most of them on farm work get to that farm work by recruitment of employers. Those employers go down there, they advance the transportation, they make the arrangements.

Now, in order to do that, the government of Puerto Rico is insisting that they be brought in and worked under conditions of a contract. That contract goes beyond, in its requirements, what the workers on the mainland of this country normally get in agricultural employment, not what workers in this country should get, but it does go beyond what workers in agricultural work do, as a matter of fact, normally get.

Senator CHAVEZ. Normal pay?

Mr. GOODWIN. I had in mind such things as the requirement of the payment of insurance and a minimum guaranty of a certain amount of employment during the period of the contract; stipulations of that kind. In that respect, Mr. Chairman, they are not the same as workers on the mainland.

Senator CHAVEZ. In other words, Puerto Rico is insisting that they be given what we brag about, American standards of living; is that it? That is, the Puerto Rican government, through law, says, "You recruit workers in this country, but under certain conditions of employment"?

Mr. GOODWIN. That is right, sir. May I add one other point?

Senator CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. GOODWIN. One of the limitations on the use of them is that the Puerto Rican government, when they are recruited under these conditions, which I have mentioned, has taken the position that they do not want them used in the South. They feel that there has been discrimination there, and they have taken a stand against their use there, which restricts the area in which you can get them used.

Senator CHAVEZ. Puerto Rico has insisted on that?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. Is that part of the basic law, or have they tried to arrive at an understanding on that point?

Mr. GOODWIN. I don't think that is in the law, Senator. The law gives the Department of Labor of Puerto Rico broad authority to set up regulations and control their use. They have taken that position in relation to the use of them.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is very interesting, because I know of a lot of Puerto Ricans who are buying sugarcane and land in Louisiana and in Florida, yet they will not let their own people, Puerto Ricans, come to work on the farms in, for instance, Florida.

I know of the Sierous family, in Florida, which owns quite a little land, and who are in the banking business, but mainly in the sugarcane business. Senator KNOWLAND, you would be surprised at how many Puerto Ricans have gone into both Florida and Louisiana.

LABOR STANDARDS IN PUERTO RICO

Senator KNOWLAND. How do these standards that the Puerto Rican government has set up compare with their own minimum labor standards for agricultural labor in Puerto Rico?

Mr. GOODWIN. They have some of them, Senator KNOWLAND. I don't know offhand about all of them. Puerto Rico has extended its unemployment insurance law, for instance, to some farm workers, which we have not done.

Senator CHAVEZ. But the pay is different?

Mr. GOODWIN. That is right.

Senator CHAVEZ. When we passed the minimum-wage law, it did not apply to the Puerto Rican laborers.

Mr. GOODWIN. They have gone further in social legislation in some areas than they can easily sustain with their economy. Some of the things they are asking we cannot do. If you would like, I would be glad to furnish for the record a statement on that situation.

Senator KNOWLAND. I think it might be interesting, in view of the discussion here, to have an analysis of the situation.

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes.

(The information requested is as follows:)

"UTILIZATION OF PUERTO RICANS IN AGRICULTURE ON THE MAINLAND

"In 1946 only 200 Puerto Ricans migrated to the mainland for employment; in 1947, 875, and in 1948, 3,500. It was during 1948 that the United States Employment Service first began transmitting orders for laborers to Puerto Rico. The following is a table showing employment of Puerto Ricans in agriculture by States during 1949 and 1950:

	1949	1950
New Jersey	3,152	4,500
New York	982	1,275
Pennsylvania	176	1,116
Michigan	186	[1] 5,500
Washington	400	200
Minnesota	35	500
Delaware	175	50
Ohio	100	1,100
Wisconsin		200
Total	5,180	14,241

[1] Only 900 remained through season.

"The above figures include transfer of workers from one State to another and do not include uncontracted Puerto Rican workers migrated on their own volition. Records of transport companies show that approximately 4,700 different Puerto Ricans came to the United States for employment during 1949. During 1950 approximately 13,500 Puerto Ricans were contracted for agricultural employment on the mainland and in addition, 3,000 workers migrated to New Jersey without contract and 500 were utilized in Florida without benefit of contract.

"In addition to the foregoing estimates, many Puerto Ricans returned to the mainland without contracts to work for employers for whom they had previously worked under contract.

"On December 5, 1947, the Puerto Rican government passed legislation regarding the migration to the United States and other countries. This act includes the following statement:

"'The government of Puerto Rico neither encourages nor discourages the migration of Puerto Rican workmen to the United States or any foreign country.'

"Based upon the authority granted in the afore-mentioned act, the government of Puerto Rico has required that agricultural workers migrating to the mainland migrate under a contract. This contract essentially provides the guaranty of 160 hours of work in each 4-week period. Provision by the employer for subsistence to the workers while in transit and prior to employment. The contract provides for the payment to Puerto Rican workers of the minimum prevailing hourly rate or the prevailing piece rates, whichever is greater. It provides that the worker may not be required to work in excess of 8 hours in any one day or 48 in any calendar week. It further provides for the coverage, by the employer, of the employee under the workmen's compensation laws of the State in which the employee is working. This compensation coverage provides for the employer to assume liability for the same risks and in the same amounts as is afforded to industrial workers covered by the workmen's compensation laws of the State of employment.

"The contract further provides that the employees shall not be subject to discrimination by the employer as regards housing facilities or in any other regard because of race, color, creed, etc. The contract provides

that the employer, without cost to the employee, shall provide adequate hygienic housing facilities. The employer is obligated to provide three adequate meals per day at a cost to the employee not in excess of $1.50 per day. However, the employer may provide cooking and eating facilities and the employee will prepare his own meals. The contract provides for a minimum employment of 12 weeks and if it is necessary to terminate the work agreement other than due to an act of God, such as hurricanes, tornadoes, fires, or floods, the employer will be responsible for finding another employer willing to assume the obligations of the contract or return the worker to Puerto Rico at the employer's expense.

"The contract also provides withholding of 5 cents per hour or 9 percent of piecework earnings of the employee to be paid as a bonus to the employee upon completion of the contract.

"The employer is obligated to procure and maintain in effect a performance bond in form and amount satisfactory to the commissioner of labor of Puerto Rico.

"The contract provisions summarized above reflect benefits available to Puerto Rican agricultural workers while employed in Puerto Rico.

"On April 5, 1941, the Puerto Rican government approved a minimum wage and hour law which applies to agriculture as well as industry.

"Under the Sugar Act, minimum wage rates are determined annually. This determination includes wage increases based upon the average price of raw sugar prevailing in the immediately preceding 2-week period. This act also provides that overtime shall be paid at double the applicable minimum hourly rate for persons employed in more than 8 hours in any 24-hour period. It also provides that piecework rates shall not be less than the applicable daily or hourly rate. In addition, the producer is required to furnish the laborer, without charge, perquisites customarily furnished by him such as a dwelling, garden plot, pasture lot, and medical services. Attached is a copy of wage rates, sugarcane, Puerto Rico, 1951, developed pursuant to the Sugar Act of 1948.

"Due to the fact that Puerto Rico is 90 percent agricultural, the minimum age requirements for employment have been applied to agricultural employment as well as industrial employment. Puerto Rico's minimum-age requirements are 16 during school hours and 14 outside of school hours. In addition, workmen's compensation benefits have been granted agricultural workers. Few States on the mainland have coverage of agricult ural workers. The State of Ohio and Puerto Rico provide compulsory coverage for agriculture for employers of three or more. Hawaii's coverage is for all agricultural workers, coverage in Connecticut (for three or more), in New Jersey and in Vermont (for employers of eight or more). In New Jersey, however, farmers are not required to insure.

"PUERTO RICAN LABOR

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"The United States Employment Service will consider Puerto Rico as a supply source of domestic labor and will extend, through its national office, clearance orders to the Puerto Rican Department of Labor, after clearance has been made in the State and region of demand, and thereafter in interregional clearance if labor demands of the employer have not been satisfied. If an employer states a preference for Puerto Rican labor and the State agency determines that labor is not available within the State, or adjoining States, the order may be extended by the national office to Puerto Rico.

"Authority for the recruitment of Puerto Rican workers will be granted by the commissioner of labor of Puerto Rico, only after the United States Employment Service has furnished information to the commissioner of labor that the supply of available labor to the State of demand is not sufficient to meet the requirements of the employer.

"Orders received from employers who specifically request foreign workers shall be processed only after positive effort is made by the local office to encourage the employer to use Puerto Rican labor. Therefore, local office personnel will point out to employers that Puerto Ricans shall be considered for employment prior to any consideration of the use of foreign labor.

"Any exception to this policy will be determined by the national office on the merits of each individual case and the commissioner of labor of Puerto Rico shall be informed of the findings in such cases.

"Approved this 10th day of February 1949.

"——— ———,

"Commissioner of Labor of Puerto Rico.

"ROBERT C. GOODWIN,

"Director, Bureau of Employment Security.

"RECRUITMENT OF PUERTO RICAN WORKERS

"1. When an employer places an order with a local office of the United States Employment Service system, every effort will be made to recruit workers locally. In the event that workers cannot be found locally in accordance with United States Employment Service policies and standards, the order, with the permission and cooperation of the employer will be extended to other offices through normal clearance procedures.

"2. In the event that workers cannot be so obtained, the employer will be told then that workers in a wide range of agricultural skills and occupations may be found in Puerto Rico. The local office will explain to the employer that Puerto Rican labor shall be considered for employment prior to any consideration of the use of foreign labor, and a definite effort shall be made to encourage the employer to use this source of labor supply.

"3. The national office shall furnish to field offices information concerning the attributes and qualities of Puerto Rican workers, including experience records, personal characteristics, and any other information deemed pertinent and necessary as conditions of employment.

"4. Should the employer agree to employ Puerto Rican workers, the order will be directed through channels to the national office for clearance to the New York office of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor. A copy of such order shall be forwarded by the United States Employment Service to the Veterans Employment Service in Puerto Rico for informational purposes.

"5. If an employer states a preference for Puerto Rican labor and the State employment service in the area of demand determines that labor is not available within the State or adjoining States, the order may be extended by the national office to the New York office of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor.

"6. The Puerto Rican Department of Labor shall notify the United States Employment Service within 5 days from receipt thereof, of the acceptance or rejection of the order, such notification to be made by telegram direct to the Farm Placement Service, United States Employment Service.

"7. The Puerto Rican Department of Labor will designate the point or points of recruitment within Puerto Rico at which workers will be contracted and will assume responsibility for determining the eligibility of workers to be contracted.

"8. The Puerto Rican Department of Labor will attempt to limit the selection of Puerto Rican workers to those who have an established agricultural experience background, and preference in selection should be given to those who are regularly employed in farm work and who are primarily interested in seasonal employment on the mainland during the off season in Puerto Rican agriculture. Each employer or his duly designated representative shall be responsible for conducting positive recruitment in order to assure that capable workers have been screened and selected.

"9. Upon confirmation of acceptance of an order, the Puerto Rican Department of Labor shall notify the employer of the time and place of contracting and any other necessary arrangements incident to the recruitment.

"10. Orders received by the national office requesting foreign workers shall be accompanied by a statement of the State agency establishing that the employer has been offered Puerto Rican labor, and supporting information that the employment of Puerto Rican labor will cause undue hardship to the employer.

"11. Exceptions to this procedure to be used in the employment of Puerto Rican workers shall be determined by the national office on the merits of each individual case, and the commissioner of labor of Puerto Rico shall be informed of the findings in such cases.

"Approved this 19th day of February 1949.

"——— ———,

"Commissioner of Labor of Puerto Rico.

"ROBERT C. GOODWIN,

"Director, Bureau of Employment Security."

SUGAR ACTS

Senator CHAVEZ. I wish you would furnish for the record, if you can, the Sugar Act, which fixes the standards for Puerto Rican labor. As a general rule, it is the Sugar Act that controls.

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes.

(The information requested is as follows:)

[Reprinted from Federal Register of December 29, 1950]

"UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION—WAGE RATES; SUGARCANE; PUERTO RICO; 1951

"TITLE 7, AGRICULTURE; SUBCHAPTER VIII, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION (SUGAR BRANCH), DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; SUBCHAPTER H—DETERMINATION OF WAGE RATES (SUGAR DETERMINATION 867.3); PART 867, SUGARCANE, PUERTO RICO

"Calendar year 1951

"Pursuant to the provisions of section 301 (c) (1) of the Sugar Act of 1948 (herein referred to as "act"), after investigation, and consideration of the evidence obtained at the public hearing held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on October 5 and 6, 1950, the following determination is hereby issued:

"SEC. 867.3. Fair and reasonable wage rates for persons employed in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugarcane in Puerto Rico during the calendar year 1951— (a) Requirements: The requirements of section 301 (c) (1) of the act shall be deemed to have been met with respect to the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugarcane in Puerto Rico for the calendar year 1951 if the producer complies with the following:

"(1) Wage rates: All persons employed on the farm in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugarcane shall have been paid in full for such work and shall have been paid wages in cash therefor at rates as agreed upon between the producer and the laborer but, after the date of issuance of this determination, not less than the following:

"(i) Day rates (a) basic rates: The basic day rate for the first 8 hours of work performed in any 24-hour period (except that for ditch diggers, ditch cleaners, or field floaders in class E, herein below, the applicable day rate shall be the first 7 hours of work

performed in any 24-hour period) shall be as follows:

Class of work	Basic rates per day	
	Farms other than interior farms	Interior farms [1]
A. All kinds of work not classified below	$1.50	$1.40
B. Operators of mechanical equipment, such as tractors, trucks, tractor plows	2.35	2.20
CLASSIFIED NONHARVEST OPERATIONS		
C. Cartmen in cultivation work	1.60	1.50
D. Plow steersmen and operators of irrigation pumps, and all work connected with mixing and applying chemical weed killers	1.80	1.65
E. Ditch diggers, ditch cleaners, field flooders (per 7-hour day) [2]	1.80	1.65
CLASSIFIED HARVEST OPERATIONS		
F. Cartmen in harvest work	2.00	1.80
G. Sugarcane cutters (for grinding or planting), seed cutters, crane operators, dumpers	1.80	1.65
H. Portable track handlers, railroad or portable track car loaders	2.00	2.00
I. Crane cart or truck loaders	1.80	1.80

[1] Interior farms shall be deemed to be those farms which were classified as interior farms for the calendar year 1949.

[2] Field flooders shall be deemed to be workers who set up or remove banks in drainage ditches when used for flooding sugarcane fields.

"(b) Wage increases: For each 10 cents or fraction thereof that the price of raw sugar (duty-paid basis, delivered) averages more than $3.80 per 100 pounds, but not more than $7 per 100 pounds for the 2-week period immediately preceding the 2-week period during which the work is performed, a wage increase of 4.5 cents per day above the rate prescribed under subdivision (i) (a) of this subparagraph shall be paid for each day of work during such 2-week period: *Provided*, That the average price of raw sugar prevailing during the period from December 7 through December 20, 1950, shall determine the amount of wage increase effective during the work period January 1 through January 3, 1951, and thereafter the amount of wage increases in successive 2-week work periods shall be determined by the average price of raw sugar prevailing in the immediately preceding 2-week period. The 2-week average price of raw sugar (duty-paid basis, delivered) shall be determined by taking the simple average of the daily spot quotations of 96° raw sugar of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange (domestic contract) converted to 100 pounds and adjusted to a duty-paid basis, delivered, by adding to each daily quotation the United States duty prevailing on Cuban raw sugar on that day, except that, if the Director of the Sugar Branch determines that for any 2-week period such average price does not reflect the true market value of raw sugar, because of inadequate volume or other factors the Director may designate the average price to be effective under this determination.

"(ii) Hourly rates: Where persons are employed on an hourly basis for a period not in excess of 8 hours (7 hours in class E) in any 24-hour period, the hourly rate shall be determined by dividing the applicable day rate provided in subdivision (i) of this subparagraph by 8 (by 7 in class E).

"(iii) Overtime: Persons employed for more than 8 hours (or 7 hours under Class E) in any 24-hour period shall be paid for the overtime work at a rate double the applicable hourly rate provided in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph.

"(iv) Piecework rates: If work is performed on a piecework basis, the average earnings for the time involved on each separate unit of work for which a piecework rate is agreed upon shall be not less than the applicable daily or hourly rate provided in subdivisions (i), (ii), and (iii) of this subparagraph.

"(2) Perquisites: In addition to the foregoing, the producer shall furnish to the laborer without charge the perquisites customarily furnished by him such as a dwelling, garden plot, pasture lot, and medical services.

"(b) Subterfuge: The producer shall not reduce the wage rates to laborers below those determined herein through any subterfuge or device whatsoever.

"(c) Claim for unpaid wages: Any person who believes he has not been paid in accordance with this determination may file a wage claim with the Caribbean Area Office, Production and Marketing Administration, San Juan, P. R., against the producer on whose farm the work was performed. Such claim must be filed within 2 years from the date the work with respect to which the claim is made was performed. Detailed instructions and wage-claim forms are available at that office. Upon receipt of a wage claim the Caribbean Area Office shall thereupon notify the producer against whom the claim is made concerning the representation made by the laborer and, after making such investigation as it deems necessary, shall notify the producer and laborer in writing of its recommendation for settlement of the claim. If the recommendation of the area office is not acceptable, either party may file an appeal with the Director of the Sugar Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C. Such appeal shall be filed within 15 days after receipt of the recommended settlement from the area office; otherwise such recommended settlement will be applied in making payments under the act. If a claim is appealed to the Director of the Sugar Branch, his decision shall be binding on all parties insofar as payments under the act are concerned.

"STATEMENT OF BASES AND CONSIDERATIONS

"(a) General: The foregoing determination provides fair and reasonable wage rates which a producer must pay as a minimum for work performed by persons employed on the farm in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugarcane in Puerto Rico during the calendar year 1951, as one of the conditions for payment under the act. In this statement the foregoing determination, as well as determinations for prior years, will be referred to as 'wage determination', identified by the calendar year for which effective.

"(b) Requirements of the act and standards employed: In determining fair and reasonable wage rates it is required under the act that a public hearing be held, that investigations be made, and that consideration be given to (1) the standards formerly established by the Secretary under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and (2) the differences in conditions among various sugar-producing areas.

"A public hearing was held in San Juan, P. R., on October 5 and 6, 1950, at which interested persons presented testimony with respect to fair and reasonable wage rates for the calendar year 1951. In addition, investigations have been made of the conditions affecting wage rates in Puerto Rico. In this determination consideration has been given to testimony presented at the hearing and to information resulting from investigations. The primary factors which have been considered are (1) prices of sugar and byproducts; (2) income from sugarcane; (3) cost of production; (4) cost of living; and (5) relationship of labor cost to total cost. Other economic influences also have been considered.

"(c) Background: Determinations of fair and reasonable wage rates for Puerto Rico have been issued each year since 1938. The first wage determination increased wage rates over those that had prevailed during 1937 and immediately preceding years. The relationship of wages to income of producers was generally maintained, however, in the same ratio as had existed theretofore in the collective bargaining agreements negotiated between producers and laborers. In the 1938 wage determination the basic wage rate for the least skilled workers was $1 per 8-hour day. This rate was increased to $1.30 in 1942 and $1.50 in 1943. Commensurate increases were made in the rates for workers of higher skills during those years and in 1944. Subsequent to 1944 basic wage rates have remained unchanged.

"In 1940, when increases in raw sugar prices were anticipated, there was incorporated in the wage determination a provision for wage increases over and above basic wage rates when the price of raw sugar exceeded a stated price. While details of the wage increment plan changed in subsequent years, the wage determinations in all years except for a portion of 1943 have included a wage-price escalator scale. In the 1948 wage determination the wage escalator scale provided that increases of 4.5 cents per day above the basic day wage rates shall be paid for each 10 cents, or fraction thereof, increase in the 2-week average price of raw sugar above $3.80 per 100 pounds. This scale was maintained in the 1949 and 1950 wage determinations.

"In the 1938 wage determination basic daily wage rates were established for various classes of workers grouped according to relative skills. In subsequent years revisions have been made in the classification and grouping of jobs as a result of changes in production methods. In all years since 1938 a differential in rates has been provided for farms delivering sugarcane to certain mills in the interior region of the island.

"(d) 1951 wage determination: The basic wage rates and the wage-price escalator scale of the 1951 wage determination continue unchanged from those in effect in the 1950 wage determination.

"An examination of factors customarily considered in wage determinations, in the light of conditions likely to prevail during 1951, indicates a reasonable basis for continuing the basic wage rates and wage-price escalator scale of the 1950 wage determination.

"In making this determination the Department had available data with respect to the costs, returns, and profits of the Puerto Rico sugar industry. These data show that the maintenance of the 1950 scale of wage rates for 1951 will not prejudice the ability of producers to pay such wages. Since the wage increments of the escalator scale are geared to changes in the market prices of sugar, wage rates in 1951 will be responsive to income changes which result from sugar prices. Thus, the relationship of wage rates to sugar prices should remain about the same as in previous years.

"The latest available information on living costs of workers in Puerto Rico indicates that costs of food and clothing were about the same as for the comparable period in 1949. However, more recent reports for the continental United States indicate advances in living costs. Similar increases probably will occur in the living costs of Puerto Rican workers. During recent years workers have received a relatively favorable real wage, as compared with 1943-44, and with moderate increases in living costs, this position should be maintained.

"At the public hearing a substantial amount of testimony pertained to changes in production methods which result in displacement of workers or anticipated loss of work opportunities. Representatives of producers recommended a reduction in the wage

rates for certain classes of workers while labor-union representatives recommended increases in wage rates and, in some cases, recommended a prohibition of the use of particular labor-saving practices. While consideration has been given to this testimony and to the recommendations made in connection therewith, in view of the analysis set forth above the recommendations on wage rates have not been adopted. The prohibition against the use of any production method is not within the scope of wage determinations.

"As in previous wage determinations, in addition to cash wages the workers must be furnished without charge customary perquisites such as a habitable house, medical attention, and similar items.

"On the basis of the analysis of all factors customaril, considered in wage determinations, it is indicated that the wages provided in this determination are fair and reasonable.

"Accordingly, I hereby find and conclude that the foregoing wage determination will effectuate the wage provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948. (Sec. 403, 61 Stat. 932; 7 U. S. C., sup. 1153. Interprets or applies sec. 301, 61 Stat. 929; 7 U. S. C. sup. 1131.)

"Issued this 26th day of December 1950.

"CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
"Secretary of Agriculture."

PUERTO RICAN LABOR CONTRACTS

Mr. GOODWIN. If I may, Senator, I would like to add this: In 1946, according to the best estimates we could get, there were 200 Puerto Ricans brought in under contractual arrangements.

In 1947 there were about 875 that were brought in. We got the program in 1948. We stepped it up some in 1948 when we brought in about 3,500.

In 1949 it went to about 4,000. These are the Puerto Ricans under contract, now, not counting those that came in under their own steam.

Senator CHAVEZ. The ones under contract come in and work, say, for 4 or 5 or 6 months and then go back?

Mr. GOODWIN. That is right, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is part of their contract?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is, that they are to be returned?

Mr. GOODWIN. That is right—although, if they choose not to return, there is no compulsion. There is an incentive, in terms of transportation costs, that is held out. The money is available for them.

Senator CHAVEZ. What is the record on that? Do they go back?

Mr. GOODWIN. Most of them do. The places where there has been a significant percentage of them stay is where they are located close to centers, such as New York, where there are fairly large groups, and they may have relatives, and are inclined to stay.

The agricultural employment season in Puerto Rico and in the United States dovetail very well. You can use the farm workers of Puerto Rico in the United States during the Puerto Rican off season. Many of them do not like the winter climate here. The majority of farm workers prefer to go back after they have worked through the summer months.

Senator CHAVEZ. What I have in mind is this: The United States is contributing millions and millions of dollars in different ways to Puerto Rico. If they can help themselves by working, it will save us quite a little. If we can, we should use the Puerto Ricans and the Indians.

PLACEMENT OF INDIANS

Now, we spend a lot of money for our Indians. I have seen the amount grow, during my short time in Congress, from $22,000,000 a year to $56,000,000 a year. We should try to get the Indians in my State and elsewhere to earn—and they want to earn—the American dollar very much. So, why not use them instead of someone else?

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am not prepared to give you offhand the figures that are involved in the placement of Indians, but we have done a lot of it. I would like to submit to you a statement of how much we have done on the placement of Indians.

Senator CHAVEZ. You take even in New York, right outside of Buffalo, there are, I think, 14 square miles of Indian reservation, and there is nothing but a bunch of beggars around there. Also, there are reservations around Rochester and other places. Those folks are entitled to decency, at least to work.

Mr. GOODWIN. That is right; everyone is entitled to work.

EMPLOYMENT OF NAVAJO INDIANS

Mr. KEENAN. Last year for the first time on the Navajo Reservation in the Southwest, every available Navajo who would take farm work was given a farm job. We used them as far north as Idaho.

Senator CHAVEZ. The Navajos form a potential of at least 30,000 employees.

Mr. KEENAN. We went in there and recruited them, any everyone who accepted employment was given employment. They were used up as far as Idaho. Every one of them who would take a job was given a job. Arrangements are being made this year for the same thing, and we expect to get even more. One of the problems there is that some of them did not want to leave the reservation, but we did use most of them last year.

Senator CHAVEZ. We tried to move some people from Arkansas and the marginal area there in the early days of the New Deal. People don't like to leave their homes. That is only natural, but they do like to work and to earn money. They want to be self-sufficient, instead of accepting the handouts of the Indian Bureau.

EMPLOYMENT OF OTHER INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. GOODWIN. We also placed a large number from the reservations up in the Dakotas—both North and South Dakota.

I would like to submit a statement on that.

Senator CHAVEZ. I wish you would, because that is one of the bad areas. The situation in the Dakotas is possibly worse than in New Mexico, California, or Arizona. In California they are getting a nice deal. They are being accepted, they go to public school, Senator, as you know, they are just Jim Jones or John Doe, and it is working out fine. But the Dakotas are really a bad area.

(The information requested is as follows:)

"EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICAN INDIANS IN AGRICULTURE

"The policy of the United States Employment Service in governing the placement of American Indians in employment is no different than that applying to other domestic workers. In other words, it calls for the full utilization of available and qualified domestic labor supplies before going elsewhere in search of workers to fill labor requirements.

"Methods used in recruiting Indian workers are much the same as used for other workers. It is frequently necessary, however, to expend far greater effort in recruiting Indian workers since they may be hampered by language difficulties (one reservation has only approximately 20 percent who speak English) tied to tribal custom and ceremony, live in relatively remote places, cannot be reached by telephone or telegraph, and are often unskilled.

"Efforts by the United States Employment Service and State affiliated service to recruit and utilize Indians in agriculture began in the early 1940's prior to the transfer of the Farm Placement Service to the United States Department of Agriculture in January 1943. Upon return of the Farm Placement Service to the Department of Labor in 1948, efforts to place and utilize Indians in agriculture as well as other work were substantially increased. A practical program with these objectives is now in effect nationally and, as a result, in 1950, 31,280 placements of Indians in agriculture were made—an increase of 20 to 25 percent over 1949. These placements were the result of organized recruitment on the reservations. Many others were placed who left their reservations voluntarily. Since records in local employment offices do not distinguish an Indian from any other applicant, the exact number of these placements is unknown.

"In addition, large segments of the Indian population are either self-employed, engaged in construction and railroad maintenance, military depots, or other industrial work. Progress has also been made in placing graduates of Indian schools in immediate employment, one State agency reporting 100 percent placements for 1950.

"At the present time there is a demand for 13,150 Indians in Arizona and 3 surrounding States for agriculture and railroad employment with a supply available for off-reservation work of only 11,250. The Navajo-Hopi Reservation at Window Rock cannot supply the demand for Indian labor in the South Central and Mountain States. Railroads and agriculture offer the majority of jobs."

NUMBER OF PUERTO RICANS RECRUITED IN 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite finish.

In 1950 we brought in approximately 13,500 Puerto Ricans and we are hoping that that number will be considerably increased this season.

Senator KNOWLAND. Do you mean 13,500 under contract?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes, sir. This is just on farm work. We estimate that there were another 3,500 at least, who came in under their own steam to take farm employment.

* * * *

DECREASE IN PERSONNEL

Senator KNOWLAND. Should not there be some curtailment in the personnel in the unemployment compensation phase of your work, with practical maximum employment in the country, with employment getting to the point where we have practically a rock bottom unemployable group left on the unemployment rolls? It would seem to me that at least that phase should drop off considerably. Have you any figures to show how much it is dropping off?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes. The $6,361,000 reserve that was taken by the Bureau of the Budget under section 1214 of the Appropriations Act of last year was for that reason. I mean that there had been a dropping off in unemployment insurance claims.

Senator KNOWLAND. Was that done for that reason or because of the action taken by Congress?

Mr. GOODWIN. That was the justification, the drop in the case load.

As you recall, the Congress made the cut on a general basis, and then requested that it be applied by the Bureau of the Budget, which in turn decided that that much could be taken off on the unemployment insurance program.

Senator KNOWLAND. You were, therefore, not hurt in your appropriation on the unemployment phase of your program by the action of Congress last year?

Mr. GOODWIN. No; we are not contending that we were.

Now, my only point on this is that one slash was taken and we are recommending a further slash here. There are some phases of unemployment insurance, however, that do not go down in this kind of a period. I give some attention to that in my statement, and try to analyze what we are up against on that.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Senator CHAVEZ. You are talking about the possibility of a supplemental request, notwithstanding the fact that you will be allowed 367 new employees and $954,250 out of funds that you did not get from the Department, but out of Presidential funds? Will you explain that? You are contemplating an expansion of activities for 1951 to be financed out of allotments for expenses of defense production by the Executive Office of the President?

Mr. GOODWIN. Is that the appropriation that is before the House Deficiency Committee, sir?

Senator CHAVEZ. Yes. This is the House report. It indicates that that amount will be transferred to your agency. That is shown on page 136 on the hearings before the subcommittee of the House.

Mr. GOODWIN. That relates to the departmental appropriation. What I was referring to here was the grants to the States.

You see, we have two distinct and different appropriations.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES

Senator CHAVEZ. I know, but you have not mentioned that you are getting this, outside of what you are asking for here. You did not mention this insertion on page 136 of the House hearings. You are to get in addition practically $1,000,000 to take care of 367 additional employees.

Mr. GOODWIN. That was defense needs requested by us, and part was approved by the Bureau of the Budget for departmental funds. The whole matter has been placed in doubt by the action of the House Appropriations Committee.

Senator CHAVEZ. Yes; I know; but what we would like to get is a complete picture. If you need these 367 more employees, why don't you tell us about it? You do not tell us that you want something else, and you do not tell us that that something else may come from some other agency of the Federal Government. I think if you did you would get along better.

Mr. GOODWIN. That is what we felt we needed for the supplemental funds.

Senator CHAVEZ. Why do you not tell us that, instead of having it covered up elsewhere? Why do you not tell us that you need 367 additional people?

Mr. KEENAN. Mr. Goodwin was speaking of the State grants. This is our Federal budget. We had not started to talk about that. We had two kinds of funds—the money that we have for State grants and then our own Federal budget. We have not talked about our own Federal budget.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is right. Possibly I was a little ahead of you.

Mr. GOODWIN. If it is satisfactory to the committee, I will proceed and then come back and cover this later?

Senator CHAVEZ. Go ahead, sir. You might elaborate a little further on with regard to Senator KNOWLAND's question; that is, if employment keeps on the increase—and the chances are that it will—why should you not reduce instead of increasing your expenses—including the Federal aid to the States?

Mr. GOODWIN. That is a very good question. I have an analysis of that in my statement; and if it is satisfactory to you, I will present that, and then we can get at the rest of it by questions.

Senator KNOWLAND. As long as we get the information.

INCREASE IN STATE SALARY RATES

Mr. GOODWIN. I should like to comment on the effect of State salary rates on our total needs. When we appeared before you in connection with the 1951 request, we were using in our estimate an average State salary rate of $2,810 per year. By July 1, 1950, when we made our first allotment to the State, it had increased to $2,887. Contemplating further increases, we estimated an average annual rate of $3,003 in our 1952 request. Our estimate was too conservative, however, because the rate is now over $3,100.

Primarily, the increases are due to the continued reductions in the unemployment-insurance claims workload. To a large extent, this job is done by people in the lower pay grades, and when they are laid off in substantial numbers, as has been the case during most of 1951, the average salary rate rises sharply. Several States have also made general increases in their salaries, and this, too, increases the average annual rate.

To point out the over-all effect of increases in State average annual salaries, our 1952 request would be smaller by approximately $8,000,000 if the salary rate used were the same as the $2,810 rate we used in our request to you for fiscal year 1951.

In developing our estimates for the States' budget, we have combined estimated workloads for the principal employment-security functions and the time factor, or length of time necessary to do a single unit of work. This result, together with costs of State administration and nonpersonal services is converted to the activities you see in our request. With one minor exception, our time factors are no larger than in 1951, and in several cases they are less. The estimate for the cost of nonpersonal services—an area which is greatly influenced by rising prices—is approximately the same as for 1951 and somewhat under current rates of expenditures.

1952 REQUEST FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTIVITIES

For all unemployment insurance activities, our request for 1952 totals $73,006,800, a decrease of $8,960,000 from 1951. This request reflects a continuation of the workload trends that developed in 1951 but on a more modest basis.

Claims activity will continue to decline, but not as sharply as in 1951; and tax-collecting activities will increase.

Let me briefly explain the request by activity:

TAX COLLECTING AND AUDITING

The first activity is tax collecting and auditing. This covers such things as determining which employers are covered under the unemployment insurance laws, determining the tax rate, collecting the taxes, and auditing employer accounts. We are requesting $22,183,300 for this activity, an increase of $745,900 from 1951.

Senator KNOWLAND. Are not some of those functions carried on by the States

Mr. GOODWIN. All of them are, but the Federal Government finances them. What I am talking about now, Senator, is all administered by the States.

Senator CHAVEZ. The grants are made by the Federal Government to the individual States?

Mr. GOODWIN. These are the grants. I understood that what the committee wanted, was not just plus or minus figures, but rather, some basic material, as justification.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is right.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE WORKLOAD

Mr. GOODWIN. In terms of workload, the request includes 6,200,000 tax returns to be processed and 820,000 determinations of employers' liability under the State unemployment insurance laws.

These workloads do not normally fluctuate materially from year to year. They reflect the general improvement in the economy, and are the minimum necessary for the States to carry out their obligations under State laws.

MAINTENANCE OF WAGE RECORDS

Closely akin to this activity is the next one, which covers maintenance of wage records. This consists of processing the employers' reports of the workers' earnings and establishing an individual file record of such earnings. Our request for this activity is $6,636,900, to cover the processing of an estimated 158,000,000 individual wage records for 1952, which are expected as a result of high levels of defense and civilian employment.

1952 AMOUNT FOR PROCESSING OF CLAIMS

The next four activities, namely, initial claims taking, claims processing, continued claims taking, and benefit payment processing, are all very closely related. They involve the taking of the claim, the determination of the amount to be paid, the actual payment of the claim, the necessary record keeping, and the fraud prevention and detection activities. Our estimate for these activities totals $40,838,600, which is a decrease of $9,015,700 from 1951.

PAYMENTS OUT OF UNEMPLOYMENT RESERVES

Senator KNOWLAND. I wonder if we can insert in this record, even though it may be in the House record, just what the claims have been on these unemployment reserves, say, for the past 10-year period?

Mr. GOODWIN. On the reserves, sir?

Senator KNOWLAND. The payments out to unemployed people.

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes.

Senator KNOWLAND. So that we can see the volume of work that is being handled throughout the country.

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes; we will be glad to furnish that for the record. That would be the amount of money paid out of these funds?

Senator KNOWLAND. And the number of claims, because that certainly should have some relationship to the number of people employed in processing those claims.

From the point of view of the collection of taxes, and so forth, and the auditing of accounts, I can see how that job is a more or less continuous job and would not fluctuate too much, but, in the paying-out process, there certainly should be a considerable fluctuation between a high point of unemployment and a low point of unemployment.

Mr. GOODWIN. That is right. The first part, however, is the part that so many people forget, about unemployment insurance, and that is that you have this regular cost of collecting taxes and keeping the wage records.

Senator CHAVEZ. That goes on.

Mr. GOODWIN. And even in periods like this, it goes up.

Senator KNOWLAND. Why is there more employment?

Mr. KEENAN. Because there are more employers from whom to collect taxes.

Mr. GOODWIN. That is right. It is related to the number of employers.

I have some figures here on how it ran, a comparison for the period July to December of 1949 with July to December of 1950, in your State, Mr. Chairman, if you would like that.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is fine. But there will be plenty of time to get the information in the record, if you will give it to us, say, for a 10-year period, a comparative study.

Mr. GOODWIN. I can do that for all States, and put it in the record.

Senator CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, friend, and neighbor, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

S. 984 proposes to supply agricultural workers from Mexico, not from Hawaii, not from Canada, not from any other country in the Western Hemisphere—from Mexico only.

S. 984 would establish reception centers "at or near the places of actual entry

of such workers into the continental United States." That means, Mr. President, reception centers in California, Texas, and perhaps Gulf cities in Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida.

S. 984 requires an employer to pay the total transportation cost of the workers he may hire to and from those reception centers. It is a long way and many dollars from the Mexican border to the State of Washington. It is many miles from the Gulf Coast to Idaho and Montana.

Washington State is so far from the Mexican border that the cost involved in paying the total cost of the workers' transportation to and from the border is prohibitive. When these workers get into our area it will be necessary to move them to three or four different localities during the season; these localities may be 200 to 300 miles apart. For example, the first big need for this type of labor in our area is in sugar beet thinning in Idaho or western Montana in April and May. During June and July many of these workers can be moved to the green pea harvest area in eastern Oregon and Washington, at least 250 miles from the beet area. Then in August they would be moved to the Puget Sound area, northwest Washington, or to the Willamette Valley and Medford in Oregon to harvest soft fruits, beans, peas, and other vegetables. Then they would be needed in late September and October in the apple harvest in the Hood River, Oreg., area, the Yakima Valley and Wenatchee-Okanogan area of Washington, or in the potato harvest of central Oregon and Washington.

If employers were required to pick these workers up at reception centers at or near, the Mexican border, it would cost them approximately $50 each way, or $100 a man, to get them to and from the border. Then these moves within the area already referred to would cost at least $30 a man for transportation and subsistence. Also, Senate bill 984 provides that employers reimburse the Government for recruiting expense up to $20 a man.

This would mean that under such a program, it would cost an employer a total of $150 a man in addition to camp costs and food and wage compliance.

The growers of Oregon, Washington, and western Idaho cannot afford these additional increased costs of $2 per man-day for Mexican Nationals over and above the cost of domestic labor.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is not sectionalism; it favors no one area over another. Neither he nor I seek a special privilege for the growers in our northwestern States. Simple justice, plain equity, demand that farm labor employers in every section of the country—New England, the Dakotas, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota—receive equal treatment with their southern or midwestern neighbors and friends.

The amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon simply gives to the Secretary of Labor the necessary discretion to locate these Mexican labor reception centers at points equidistant from all areas where supplemental farm labor is needed.

I encourage my colleagues to exercise their American sense of fair play and accept this amendment which has been so ably offered by the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I reserve the time remaining to me, and yield the floor so the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] may speak.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon the bill would be changed in four major ways.

In its present form the bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall establish, at or near the border between the United States and Mexico, reception centers to which Mexican labor would be brought from the interior of Mexico. At the reception center the worker would enter into a contract with American employers for temporary employment in the United States. The pending amendment would make it possible for the Secretary of Labor to establish these centers at interior points in the United States, away from the Mexican border.

The first objection to the amendment is that it would change the basis of the bill from one attempting to implement the present method of importing Mexican labor, to one of meeting an emergency. The program contemplated by the pending bill would continue to make Mexican workers available in those areas of the country where it is economically feasible for private employers to hire them; whereas if the pending amendment were adopted it would change the purpose of the bill by making its goal the placing of Mexican laborers at Government expense at any point in the United States where an emergency shortage of labor existed.

Secondly, the amendment changes the policy of the Federal Government with respect to the subsidization of farm labor. The bill is designed to carry out the agreement reached with Mexico at a minimum cost to the Federal Government by continuing the present practice of employers paying practically all the costs. The bill provides that the employer would reimburse the Federal Government up to $20 per worker for expenses incurred in providing transportation and subsistence for Mexican workers. This maximum reimbursement is expected to cover practically all such costs in bringing Mexican workers from the interior of Mexico to reception centers in the United States at or near the border. If reception centers are established in the United States other than at points at or near the border, it becomes apparent that all additional transportation and subsistence costs will be paid by the Federal Government. This involves substantial subsidization by the Federal Government of farm labor in the United States. Such subsidization has been made in the past only during World War II, and not during peacetime or partial mobilization periods. Therefore, adoption of the amendment involves a major change in policy of our Government.

Thirdly, the effect of the amendment on the legislation would result in discrimination against domestic workers and workers from foreign countries other than Mexico. The bill as reported requires that the employer pay practically all of the costs of importing Mexican workers. Before he can import them, it must be certified that domestic workers are not available, and that such importation would not adversely affect their wages and working conditions. However, if the amendment is adopted, it will mean that the Federal Government will be paying for the transportation and subsistence of Mexican workers to any point in the United States, while no subsidization will be offered for any domestic workers, or any worker from a foreign country other than the Republic of Mexico. Again, the question must be answered if the amendment is adopted as to why the same method should not be applied to Canadians, to Jamaicans, to Hawaiians, to Puerto Ricans as well as domestic workers.

Finally the amendment will increase the cost of the program tremendously. The bill is designed to have the employers pay practically all costs for transportation and subsistence in importing workers from Mexico. The legislation also authorizes the Federal Government to establish reception centers at or near the border, to receive workers from Mexico, and to house them during the negotiations for contracting. The establishment and maintenance of these reception centers will be the main expense of the Government in this program. The establishment of reception centers at other points in the United States will mean, first, that practically all the transportation and subsistence costs incurred in the United States will be paid by the Federal Government, and second, the Federal Government will, of course, have to pay for the additional reception centers. The Department of Labor has not estimated what the cost of establishing and maintaining these reception centers will be. It has estimated that construction of an overnight rest camp will cost $70,000, and it is reasonable to assume that the reception centers will cost many times that amount. The reception centers authorized by the bill at or near the border will undoubtedly be used on a full-year basis. If reception centers are established wherever an emergency farm labor shortage occurs, they may be used for one season only, and complete utilization from year to year will not be possible.

Mr. President, as I explained to the Senate 10 days ago, when the bill was first considered, the labor is recruited in Mexico under the auspices of our Government, at centers to be agreed upon by Mexico. The workers are then taken from those centers and brought to reception centers established at or near the border within the United States. At the centers in the United States, employers enter contracts with the Mexican laborers. The expense of transportation and subsistence of the laborers between the center established in Mexico and the one established on the border is paid by the United States Government, but each employer is required to reimburse the Federal Govern-

ment up to an amount not exceeding $20 per worker for such expenses. Thus the legislation is designed to provide that the employers of these workers will pay as much of the total cost of the program as possible.

If the amendment is adopted, it can readily be seen that the result will be that instead of the employers paying the entire expense, the Federal Government will be called upon to subsidize the employers of farm labor. In other words, if the centers are established, let us say, in Seattle, in St. Louis, and in Denver—in fact, at any point away from the border—the Federal Government will be called upon to pay every cent of the transportation from the interior of Mexico to those established centers, less the sum of $20.

Mr. President, if we are to undertake a program of that character, we ought to make it apply not only to Mexican labor, but to all forms of foreign as well as domestic labor that may be needed to maintain American agricultural production.

Today we have in force an agreement whereby employers in the United States go into Mexico, hire Mexican labor, pay all of the expenses in connection with obtaining such labor, and in that way obtain a great many agricultural workers. The Mexican Government, however, does not desire to continue that agreement. Therefore, in order that we shall be able to carry out a tentative new agreement between the United States and Mexico, it is necessary that this bill be enacted.

As I pointed out a moment ago, if we should adopt the amendment, there will be discrimination against foreign laborers from countries other than Mexico and against our own domestic farm labor. Why should not we have a plan providing that if there is a national emergency in farm labor, the Government will pay for the transportation not only of foreign farm labor, but also of domestic farm labor? I believe such alternative must be considered in connection with the problem raised by the amendment.

Mr. President, I repeat a statement I have made previously, namely, that in the future a time may come when it will be necessary—because of the existence of an emergency, and in order to obtain the labor needed not only on the farms, but also in industry—to enact legislation similar to that which was in effect during World War II. It will be recalled that during World War II we had in effect a plan whereby our Government financed the transportation, subsistence, and other expenses not only with respect to relocating farm labor, but also, with respect to relocating industrial labor. That cost the taxpayers of the United States in excess of $30,000,000 a year during World War II. I do not believe this bill should now be placed in that category. I contend that we are not yet in an emergency which would require the Congress to enact a bill making it possible to transport labor from one place to another.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the purpose of this bill is merely to carry out a proposed agreement which has been entered into between our Government and the Mexican Government, without which we would be unable to obtain any Mexican labor legally. As I have pointed out, employers in the United States have been obtaining Mexican labor under the terms of an agreement which became effective August 1, 1949. The Mexican Government has given us notice that it will no longer agree to contracts made under those terms, and that in order for Mexican labor to be imported into the United States, it will be necessary for that to be done in accordance with the tentative agreement reached the first part of this year. I believe the bill will authorize our Government to carry out its part of that agreement in the best way possible but the pending amendment would embark our Government on a totally different type of farm labor program from that contemplated by the basic legislation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Surely the Senator from Louisiana is not contending, is he, that in the past several months the farm labor situation has not become more acute by virtue of the recruitment of labor in areas in the West, particularly for employment in munitions plants, in atomic energy installations, and in airplane factories?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not contending that at all, Mr. President. The point I am trying to make is that when our committee considered the bill, it was considered, not in the light of an emergency bill, but simply as a bill to provide ways and means by which Mexican labor could be brought into our country for use on our farms. In other words, if this bill should not be enacted, we would not be able to contract for Mexican workers legally as we have in the past.

As the law now stands, contracts are entered into by employers in the United States with employees in Mexico, without any subsidies or guaranties by our Government. However, the Mexican Government has now refused to continue this program unless it is done under terms and conditions outlined in an agreement which was entered into between the United States and Mexico in January of this year. As I have stated, the purpose of this bill is to carry out that phase of the agreement.

Mr. President, during the course of the hearings, we tried to obtain from the Department of Labor and from other sources information as to what the cost of the program would be. However, we could not obtain any information as to how much it would cost to establish a reception center. The Department did estimate that it would cost $70,000 to construct an overnight rest stop and undoubtedly a reception center would cost many times that amount.

As I stated before the committee, if the time comes in the near future when we have an emergency condition which makes it necessary for us to bring into our country not only Mexicon labor but other foreign farm labor, and also to provide for the transportation of domestic farm labor, that problem should be considered then as a whole. However, let us not pass, at this time, a bill which would be grossly discriminatory against domestic workers and foreign workers from countries other than Mexico by adoption of the pending amendment. If the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is adopted, it will mean that the Government of the United States will have to pay the entire cost, less $20, of transporting Mexican workers from the interior of Mexico all the way to Portland, Oreg., if the laborers are to be employed there, or to other points in the United States. Again I repeat, that would change the purpose and policy of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator from Louisiana has given any thought to the possibility of increasing the $20 minimum fee. Twenty dollars does not cover very much, anyway, even in the case of the cost of transportation to the reception centers originally proposed. Would not it be possible to increase the $20 minimum?

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the $20 fee is to cover the cost of transportation and subsistence in Mexico.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Personally I would much prefer, if the Congress feels that way, to provide that employers whose farms are at a considerable distance from the border shall receive some sort of rebate. I am not advocating that; but I would prefer it to the establishment of the proposed centers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The question I ask of the Senator from Louisiana is this: If the Cordon amendment should be adopted, would not it be within the realm of fair play and reasonableness to suggest a moderate increase in the minimum sum which an employer would be required to pay?

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the $20 payment, as I have said, is to pay for the actual expenses within Mexico. Certainly the Senator from Minnesota would not want to pay a greater amount than that actually needed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I would.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not. Why should we make a farmer who lives on the border pay a considerably larger amount than the cost of transporting the laborer from, let us say, the interior of Mexico to the point on the border where the employer's farm is located?

I understand that my distinguished friend intends, by means of his amendment, to make the payment equitable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Thirty-five dollars was the amount suggested by me.

Mr. ELLENDER. But in the amendment of the Senator from Oregon we find this provision: "*Provided*, That such reception centers shall be distributed geographically so as to provide, as far as practicable, equality of costs and opportunity of obtaining such workers in the

areas where the Secretary finds need therefor to exist."

If we could work out a method which would take care of the transportation from a point within Mexico to a point within the United States, I would much prefer that approach to the establishment of centers throughout the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry that my time has expired, and I am unable to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 3 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. I yield 1 minute to my friend, the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, although this type of labor is not particularly attractive in my immediate section of the United States, nevertheless it is attractive in various other sections. I feel that it is a good thing to obtain this supply of labor if it can be obtained without undue cost. I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is a proper one. I think it should be adopted.

However, I also would go along with a commensurate increase in the total overall transportation cost, the payment of which might be provided for in the bill, in order to equalize the costs of transportation to the various areas of the United States.

Mr. President, I believe that the time allotted to me has expired. I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding this time to me.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in his argument today, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana repeated, as I understood him, the matters he presented in his original argument before the Senate. They were answered by me in my argument of the other day.

Let me say that there is no reason for any cost for maintaining beyond the Mexican border any reception center for any laborer. All the Secretary of Labor need do is to determine the points to which the laborers come and from which they return, with expenses prepaid by the American Government. The remainder is all taken care of exactly as it is today. It is solely a matter of good administrative judgment on the part of the Secretary of Labor, and I think we can indulge the hope that we will have that sort of administration, and that the result will be equity as between agricultural areas in the several States of the United States in which there is a critical labor shortage which cannot be met domestically. If there is no shortage, there is no call for the foreign labor. If there is a shortage, there should be equity in its supply and in the cost of providing it. I yield the remainder of my time to the chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of the hour which I would have on the bill itself, I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope that this amendment will not be adopted, because its adoption would mean that many of us from that section of the Nation which does not use Mexican labor, but whose people are very anxious, by supporting this bill, to help both agriculture and the Mexicans in the area where Mexican labor is available, would be left in a position where we could not possibly support it. There are three reasons for saying that that is the case, and I should like to give those reasons for the record.

I note that there are very few Members of the Senate present, but, since I shall have to oppose this bill if this amendment is adopted, and since a great many other Senators are in the same position, I think it only fair to state for the record just why we oppose this amendment so vigorously.

The first reason is that the adoption of this amendment would discriminate completely against users of agricultural labor which comes from foreign sources other than Mexico, such as the Bahamas, Jamaica, Canada, and the like. We have not asked to be included in this bill. We do not want to be included in this bill. We, in Florida, ourselves are paying the expenses or bringing in needed agricultural labor from the Bahamas and from Jamaica. We do not want to be subsidized, neither do we want to be regimented, and we therefore have not asked to be included within this bill.

The practice which has been built up is thoroughly satisfactory. It does not cost the United States Government a cent. It is not inimical to domestic labor, because there cannot be brought into the United States a single alien without first getting a certificate of the need for additional labor, over and beyond what domestic sources can supply. But if this amendment should be placed in the bill we would be in the position of having to see Federal funds expended in very large amounts, for instance, for transportation from such places of entry as Brownsville or El Paso, Tex., clear across an area of more than 2,000 miles to the fields of the Northwest, and for housing and subsistence at various places on the way. We feel that for the Government to pay those expenses and at the same time to pay not 1 dime for the importation of labor from the Bahamas and Jamaica and the transportation of those laborers from Miami, the port of entry, to Connecticut, or wherever they may be used, is an obvious discrimination against the users of those forms of alien agricultural labor in all the eastern area of the Nation. That is the first reason for our being opposed to this amendment, and we think that it is a perfectly sound reason.

Our second reason for opposing it is that the adoption of this amendment would be highly discriminatory as against domestic labor. I hope that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota will listen to this point, because I think it is valid and, in my opinion, there is no way in the world to meet it. If this amendment should be adopted without further change, the bill would be highly discriminatory as against domestic agricultural labor, because it would pay the transportation, subsistence, and housing of laborers coming in from Mexico, for distances of from 2,000 to 2,500 miles across areas of the United States and back, at the expense of the United States Government, without offering to do anything of the sort for domestic labor at similarly distant points, because domestic labor, if they wanted to go to the same places as, for example, the fields in Oregon or Washington, would have to pay their own expenses.

I realize there are certain practical difficulties involved in this problem, and I am quite agreeable to providing the expenses of maintaining a system under which the Federal Government may, agreeably to the Mexican Government, get labor in Mexico at places where there is unemployment, transport such labor into the United States, and make it equally available to all; but I would not be willing, and I do not believe any other Senator understanding the situation would be willing, to vote for a system under which there would be paid transportation within the United States for 2,500 miles in each direction of labor brought in from Mexico, in order that they might work in fields, let us say, in Washington, Idaho, or Oregon—and I have nothing but the friendliest feelings for all those good States—and at the same time no effort whatever would be made to reimburse the travel or other expense of domestic laborers who might have equally as great a desire to see that interesting part of the country and to work there for a few months in the summer or fall as would the Mexicans. There simply is no equity toward our own people in such a program.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment. Let me make my third point; after which I shall yield.

The adoption of this amendment would mean a very great degree of discrimination against domestic agricultural labor in the United States, and there would be no way in the world to prevent it.

The third point, Mr. President, and the reason why I would object to the amendment, is that it is a big entering wedge for what is the most grandiose scheme I have ever heard advanced for setting up a hierarchy the like of which I have not heard suggested elsewhere, the establishing of motels, transient camps, and tourist camps from the Canadian border to the Gulf, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, as testified to before the committee by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Robert T. Creasey. At an earlier time in the debate I placed in the RECORD his testimony. The amendment propose to furnish such entertainment to Mexican labor, scattered all over the country.

The fact that it involves more than one or two or three centers was never better illustrated than by the statement

a few moments ago of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who made it very clear that there would be required at least three centers of distribution in Washington State because of the necessity of supplying additional areas in his State at different times in the year. We realize that if we adopt this amendment and pass the bill we shall be giving an invitation, laying out the plush carpet for the creation of this grandiose scheme of multiple units of transient centers, tourist camps, and motels, manned at public expense, and with public agents to operate them for agricultural labor going up and down the country, though it may be confined to Mexican labor for the moment. Surely, with that kind of scheme it would be wholly impossible to exclude the implication that we would also have to be entertaining domestic agricultural labor very soon and it would not be many months before we would have to do it.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator speaks of discrimination. Is it not a fact that every provision in this bill is a discrimination in favor of foreign labor, that every provision in it is a discrimination predicated upon the sole proposition that we do not have sufficient domestic labor, that we must get foreign labor, and that we cannot get it from the usual source, Mexico, except in the way provided in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The Senator is not correct. There is no discrimination in favor of Canadian labor; there is no discrimination in favor of Bahaman labor; there is no discrimination in favor of Jamaican labor; there is no discrimination in the bill in favor of any of the users of all those classes of labor, which means farmers in most of the eastern areas of the United States.

I have heard not one word from the farming interests of the eastern section of the United States by way of suggestion that they want any sort of a subsidy or any sort of a hierachy established and maintained for their advantage. To the contrary, they say they want to and they insist upon handling their problem themselves, and at their own expense. The only reason for the bringing of Mexican labor into the picture is that under the practices which have existed, the very areas in Mexico which did not need to export their laborers have been the ones whose laborers have been exported; instead of going into the areas remote from the border, where there was unemployment and where the Mexican Government wanted the labor to come from, the labor has been drained away from the very home areas where it was most needed.

The Senator also knows that in the case of Bahama labor and Jamaica labor we do not have, as in the case of Mexico, a border more than 2,000 miles long over any portion of which a man could pass, regardless of the most efficient border inspection service.

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator say that the section of the bill which provides subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses, not exceeding $150 for burial expenses in any one case, would be discriminatory? Would the Senator say that a provision guaranteeing wages is a provision available to all domestic workers?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; but I will say to the Senator that there is not a provision in the bill which allows this Mexican labor to be used for a dime more or less than is to be paid for domestic labor, nor is there anything in the bill which provides for other than transportation across the border to the edge of our country. The farmer has to pay the transportation and carry the whole burden from that moment forward just as in the case of domestic labor—no more and no less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] for himself and other Senators, as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Benton	Hickenlooper	Moody
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Hoey	Neely
Bridges	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Ecton	Lodge	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
Flanders	McClellan	Underwood
Fulbright	McFarland	Wherry
George	McKellar	Williams
Gillette	McMahon	Young
Green	Maybank	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. ELLENDER and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

I wish also to announce that if present, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and

voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31

Bennett	Ferguson	Moody
Benton	Flanders	Morse
Bridges	Hendrickson	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Cain	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Case	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Douglas	Langer	Tobey
Duff	McCarthy	Young
Dworshak	McMahon	
Ecton	Millikin	

NAYS—43

Anderson	Holland	Nixon
Brewster	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Byrd	Kefauver	Robertson
Carlson	Kem	Russell
Clements	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Knowland	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lodge	Stennis
George	Long	Taft
Gillette	McClellan	Underwood
Green	McFarland	Wherry
Hennings	McKellar	Williams
Hill	Maybank	
Hoey	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken	Hunt	Murray
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smathers
Capehart	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Chavez	McCarran	Watkins
Dirksen	Magnuson	Welker
Eastland	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Martin	
Hayden	Mundt	

So, the amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. CORDON on behalf of himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Section 8 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 144) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation who—

"(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or

"(2) conceals or harbors, or attempts to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation,

any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, or any person who shall employ any alien when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a parliamentary inquiry at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with respect to amendments offered by Members of the Senate, it is my understanding that if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is in agreement with the proponent of an amendment, then the junior Senator from Nebraska has control over the time of the opposition; but if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana opposes the amendment, the Senator from Louisiana has control of the time. I thought that ought to be made plain, because Senators are asking me for time in which to speak. With respect to the particular amendment now under consideration I understand the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will be in control of the opposition time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska is correct in his understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the present situation concerning penalties for illegal immigration is approximately as follows: First, the importation and concealment of aliens illegally brought into the country is already made a crime—Eighth United States Code, section 144—but the present law fails to fix a penalty for concealment. The penalty is instead only fixed for importation.

The McCarran bill, S. 716, which is now before the Committee on the Judicary, fixes a penalty for both, that is, a penalty both for importation and for concealment.

The Ellender bill, S. 1391, introduced by the eminent chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, adds a penalty for the employment as well as for the importation and concealment of illegal immigrants.

The amendment which I have offered is substantially the bill already offered by the eminent Senator from Louisiana, but with a reduction in the severity of the penalty, to either a fine of $2,000 or 1 year's imprisonment, instead of 5 years, or both. This amendment, very frankly, is virtually identical, therefore, with the separate bill already proposed by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, the report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor and the articles in the New York Times by Mr. Gladwin Hill have shown pretty clearly that we are dealing with a very large problem. The committee and Mr. Hill state that each year there are probably from 500,000 to 1,000,000 Mexicans who illegally enter this country.

It is interesting that during the last year no less than 500,000 who illegally entered this country were turned back and sent back into Mexico by our immigration authorities. No one knows how many more, after they had crossed the Rio Grande or came across the desert, were able to remain here for a long period of time. There are probably hundreds of thousands now in the country who have illegally entered.

This results in a displacement of American citizens who are not able to get jobs which they otherwise would be able to get, and it worsens the condition of American farm laborers by the cheap labor competition with the so-called wetbacks. For instance, I am informed that in the lower Rio Grande Valley the average hourly rate for the wetbacks is somewhere around 25 cents an hour, or half the rate normally paid to domestic farm labor. The difference in wages is, I believe, less in Arizona and New Mexico, but in the Imperial Valley of California the wetback laborers also receive appreciably less than the domestic labor.

These large numbers of Mexicans who come across the border illegally and without protection, create poor health and housing conditions in the agricultural labor camps in the Southwestern States, and serious community conditions have resulted.

The wetback labor is used for so-called "stoop" labor, for the picking of cotton and garden vegetables, where bending and handwork is required, and where there is a natural desire to keep farm labor costs down.

Unless we put some real teeth into our attempt to prevent the illegal entry of wetbacks we shall find, I believe, that the very excellent provisions which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has provided for handling the traffic legally will be largely noneffective. Without some penalties I fear that efforts to halt the influx of wetbacks will fail.

I am informed that the number of immigrants who come into this country legally from Mexico can be reckoned in the tens of thousands, but that the entrants who come in here illegally can be reckoned in the hundreds of thousands each year. Therefore we need to put teeth into the measure before us.

The question then arises as to whether we should do this in an amendment to the bill now under consideration or in a separate bill. I now see the eminent chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the floor. I want to repeat to him, therefore, what I have previously said to the body as a whole, namely, that my amendment is nothing but the Ellender bill, S. 1391, with the penalties slightly modified. The question then is whether the penalties should be inserted in the bill before us rather than be dealt with as a separate measure and left to the Committee on the Judiciary.

If this problem is worth attacking at all, it is worth attacking now. And in-

stead of postponing action until later when we get out a general immigration bill, possibly at the end of the farm season, with hundreds of thousands of Mexicans illegally brought across the border in the meantime, it would seem to me to be highly desirable that we should tackle this issue now before the farm season is too far advanced.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is really the heart of the effort to curb the illegal importation of wetbacks. It fixes a penalty not too severe in amount—either a fine or imprisonment, or both—for those who illegally import labor, who conceal, or who either knowingly hire, or if they ignorantly hire do not try to find out whether or not the importation of the labor is illegal.

I hope very much that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be willing to accept the amendment because, very frankly, it is his idea. I withdrew my amendment lettered "A," which was not as good as his amendment. I hope that he will not disown his own child here on the floor of the Senate on the ground that it has been born prematurely. So I wait with great pleasure the response of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, who, I think, is going to father his own child.

I feel embarrassed, Mr. President, at trying to pretend that I am the father of this child, because I am not. The child has been begotten, conceived, and brought forth, by the senior Senator from Louisiana, and I am now sure that he is going to own his child, and step proudly forward to claim his right of legal paternity. We need penalties to halt the employment of wetbacks, and I hope, the Senator will support this, which is really his own amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Illinois for the compliment paid me. I desire to say that the bill to which he referred, Senate bill 1391, was introduced by me on April 26. I believe that by the enactment of such a law we will go far toward eliminating the wetback problem which is now so vexing to our Government and to the Mexican Government.

I am not personally opposing the amendment. As the distinguished Senator from Illinois has stated, the amendment follows verbatim the bill I introduced some time ago, with the exception of the penalty clause. The reason we did not incorporate the amendment in the bill was because of lack of jurisdiction in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary was considering in an omnibus bill practically the same language which is incorporated in the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I had occasion to talk to my good friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the chairman of the Judiciary Committee; and he gave me assurance that his committee would at an early date consider my bill, which, as I have said, is practically identical to the pending amendment. I am very hopeful that the Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on the bill and will report it separately from the omnibus bill.

I have made a study of the wetback problem; I spent considerable time in preparing my bill which, as I have said, is almost identical to the pending amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the amendment; but I feel that I should call the Senate's attention to the fact that our committee has made no study of this important amendment, and that it is a matter which probably should be studied by the Judiciary Committee.

Having brought those points to the attention of the Senate, I leave the question to the Senate to decide.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator from Louisiana going to support this amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall, but not on behalf of the committee. As I have said, I wish to make it perfectly clear that our committee held no hearings at all in regard to the amendment; and further, that I have the assurance of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] that the question will be considered soon by his committee, the Committee on the Judiciary. I feel that I should bring these matters to the attention of the Senate; and then the Senators could use their own judgment and discretion in deciding whether to vote for or against the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Last week, when the provisions dealing with the so-called wetbacks were under discussion, I was interested in providing penalties, as no doubt the Senator will recall.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I recall that very well.

Mr. WHERRY. I then understood the Senator from Louisiana to say that that was not the proper time to take up that question, but that the Judiciary Committee should examine it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and I say that now.

Mr. WHERRY. I also understood the Senator from Louisiana to say at that time that in his opinion the adoption of such an amendment might jeopardize the passage of the bill in the House of Representatives, and that therefore he felt it should not be offered now.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe there is much merit in penalty legislation. However, the Senator from Louisiana left me under the impression that the proper thing for us to do now is to pass this bill without such an amendment, and later take up the question of penalties, as affecting immigration, in connection with a bill on that subject which will be reported by the Judiciary Committee.

I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will recall that he said to me that the adoption of the amendment might jeopardize the passage of the bill in the House of Representatives. Is not that what the Senator from Louisiana said to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. It may be true.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know whether adoption of the amendment would actually jeopardize the passage of this bill in the House of Representatives; but certainly it seems to me that it is because of the assurance of the Senator from Louisiana that the wetback problem should be handled separately, in connection with a measure to be reported by the Judiciary Committee, that the wetback problem is not now being handled by the Senate in connection with the pending bill; and I understood the Senator from Louisiana to advise his colleagues not to include such a provision in the farm-labor bill, but to include it later in another measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just stated, Mr. President, I personally shall not oppose the amendment, because it is almost identical to a bill I have introduced.

I am of the belief now, as I was when I introduced my bill on April 26, that such a provision will go far toward solving the wetback problem. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the eminent Senator from Louisiana inform me whether I was correct in my understanding that he drew a distinction between his opinions as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and his opinions as an individual Member of the Senate? I understood the Senator from Louisiana to say that as chairman of the committee he does not favor the amendment, but that statement seemed to me to indicate that possibly as an individual the Senator from Louisiana is in favor of applying penalties to something which already is illegal.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly I do not wish, as chairman of the committee, to bind any member of the committee in connection with his vote on this amendment; I would not attempt to influence any Senator's vote either for or against the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not a fact that the chairman of the committee feels as he does because this matter involves a question of jurisdiction as between two committees?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is entirely correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. In other words, I understand that the position of the Senator from Louisiana is that his committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, does not wish to act on a matter which the Committee on the Judiciary should study, and that therefore

the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had steered away from this matter because, as I understood the Senator from Louisiana to say, the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over immigration matters.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I wanted to make that very plain to the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say that if a bill on this subject comes before the Senate from the Judiciary Committee, I intend to vote for it. I think I would just as soon vote for the pending amendment; but if I did so, I would feel that perhaps I had done the Judiciary Committee an injustice, if I voted in favor of including in an agricultural bill a provision which would amend the Immigration Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Louisiana favors the pending amendment, should not a Senator who opposes the amendment control the time in opposition to it, so as then to be able to yield time to other Senators who wish to oppose it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am in a rather peculiar position, because as chairman of the committee I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. However, the Senator from Louisiana is going to vote for the amendment; is he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, because it is practically identical to my own bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that all time to be allowed the Senators opposing the amendment has been allotted to the Senator from Louisiana, who favors the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I wish to abide by the rules.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] whether he is for or against the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Wait. Let the Senator answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 12 minutes remaining which, under the order previously entered, he controls in the event he does not favor the amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. The opposition may control the time so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will have charge of the remaining time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota desire any opposition time?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not wish any opposition time. I wanted to make a comment, and to give my reasons for saying that the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, could not in good grace, and in consideration of the Judiciary Committee, accept this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should be glad to yield to the Senator but I should like to ask the Senator to withhold his request until I see whether there is any one other Senator who desires opposition time on the amendment. We have but 12 minutes left. Does any Senator desire to speak in opposition to this amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to obtain some of the opposition time, myself.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I think the opposition should try to clarify the point as to whether the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry acted favorably on the proposed amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the Senator from Minnesota against the amendment?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Nebraska is now becoming technical.

Mr. WHERRY. It is necessary for me to know that, before I can yield any time. If the Senator from Minnesota is for the amendment, why does he not ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois to yield time? I would love to accommodate the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the minority leader has wasted more time than I would have taken, had he yielded to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Under the circumstances, I am unable to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND rose.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator from Florida in opposition?

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest that the Senate proceed to a vote.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is no other Senator who wishes to speak, I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I hesitate somewhat to make the comment I am about to make, because I do not in any way want to jeopardize his amendment. I intend to vote for his amendment, but I think it is most appropriate, while we are considering his amendment, to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the junior Senator from Oregon has on the desk an amendment identified as amendment C, most of the language of which was also taken from the bill already introduced in the Senate on April 17 by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], Senate bill 1391. There is, however, a difference which I think is rather important between the amendment of the Senator from Illinois and that of the Senator from Oregon. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois includes penalties. Although I am going to vote for his amendment, I recognize that it involves some question as to possible jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. But I see no basis for any question of jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee in respect to the amendment of the junior Senator from Oregon, because all my amendment seeks to do is to provide that no benefits of this act shall accrue to any prospective employer who is employing an alien and who has reasonable grounds to know that he is an alien. I read the language of the amendment. It proposes on page 5, line 5, after the word "employment" to insert the following: "*Provided*, That no workers shall be made available under this title to, nor shall any workers made available under this title be permitted to remain in the employ of, any employer who has in his employ any alien, when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or so suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States."

There is no penalty against an employer, nor is he characterized as being guilty of any crime. The amendment provides simply an inhibition or an injunction against an employer so that he cannot get any employees under this bill if he has on his payroll aliens who have come into the United States illegally.

Certainly we ought to pass a bill which provides for such administrative discretion on the part of the administrators. We certainly have a right to take a course of action which will not encourage farmers, if they already have wetbacks in their employ, to try to get Mexican labor in addition to the wetbacks.

I may say to my good friend from Louisiana the fact is that some of us in the Senate, particularly in view of the defeat of the amendment of my senior colleague [Mr. CORDON], fear that what we have here, for the most part, is a bill which is going to accrue principally to the benefit of employers along the tier of States in the southern area of the United States, and which, therefore, discriminates against those in other sections as my senior colleague pointed out in his argument in support of his amendment.

I think that if we are to be expected to go along with this bill, we at least ought to have some assurance that the bill contains some provision which will prevent the employment of migrant alien labor by employers who are already hiring aliens who are illegally in the United States. I think it is the least we could do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I may say to my friend from Illinois, I shall vote for his amendment, but if his amendment fails, I serve notice now that I shall oppose the entire bill, because I simply cannot see any basis of objection either to his amendment or to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield some time to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. No one has requested any opposition time. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. THYE. I think 2 minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 3 or 4 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, speaking now as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, at the time I asked to be recognized, the question I wanted to discuss and to endeavor to clarify was that none of us in the committee would have objected to this type of provision in the bill, except that we recognized it was an amendment to the Immigration Act, and therefore it should rightly come under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, and to be considered by it. It was for that reason that, in the consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the bill, and particularly its drafting of it, this particular question was not included as a part of the bill.

None of us have the feeling that wetbacks should be admitted, and certainly no one should be benefited by employing along the border of aliens or wetbacks, as they are called. So I say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that while his amendment is in proper form, if we could have the Judiciary Committee give us assurance that it would not demand that the bill be rereferred to their committee because of the amendment, the committee could then take the necessary time to study this subject before this type of bill were enacted by the Senate and House.

This is the seventh day of May, and we should try to clarify this question by having the bill passed as soon as possible in order that the employer who seeks the type of labor that he would be allowed to employ under this measure may be given such assurance as to enable him to plan on offshore labor to meet his labor needs as he proceeds with the cultivation of his crops and their harvesting, which will come within a very few weeks.

I may say that as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have no objection to the amendment, but I think the amendment is offered to the wrong bill. I think it ought to be proposed as an amendment to the Immigration Act, rather than as an amendment to the agriculture bill.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield to me time for the purpose of yielding, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield additional time; but I wanted to ask a question. Is the penalty provided for in the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois the same penalty suggested by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is not. The bill which I introduced makes the penalty fine and imprisonment. The amendment makes it fine or imprisonment.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the Senator's penalty is a stiffer penalty?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield another 2 minutes, or more if necessary, to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am wondering how the Senator from Minnesota would feel if we should adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and add to it the penalty provisions suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It would go to line 17 on page 2 and provide that "any employer who shall fail to report such information," and so forth, the language to be added as additional language to the Moorse amendment. I believe the conferees could then work it out.

Recognizing that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry wants to work it out, I think the Senate might safely leave it in that situation. I do not know how to work it out between groups, but if the Senator from Oregon should feel tempted to offer his amendment and add to it the penalty provisions in the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, a great many of us might vote for it as a substitute who otherwise would vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, and thus find ourselves in a jurisdictional problem which we do not desire to have to solve.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I yield all the time I have remaining to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield a minute to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and then I shall yield a minute to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am in total agreement with the desire of the Senator from Illinois. I feel, however, that his amendment is too far-reaching in that it would affect the whole field of immigration, and it has not been studied by the appropriate committee. I am endeavoring, therefore, with the collaboration and understanding of the Senator from Illinois, who is very helpful as we work toward our objective, to modify his proposed amendment so as to confine it to alien persons coming in under the law and persons employing or harboring such alien persons. I believe that with very few changes in wording this modification can be effected, and, unless there be objection, we shall continue in our effort.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, whatever time is remaining I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am rather embarrassed to make a suggestion that would interfere with the floor strategy of the Senator from Illinois. I was going to let his amendment come to a vote, and then I was going to offer my amendment. As I look at the situation, I think we could get an amendment which would deal with any employer who is guilty of knowingly hiring wetbacks, without getting into the field of penalties at all. We would simply stop the operation of the bill as to him, leaving to the Judiciary Committee, from a study of the criminal laws, whatever penalty they may wish to impose. That is my present thinking. I shall await action on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and I shall vote for it. If it is not agreed to, I shall offer my amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, with the very valuable help of the senior Senator from Florida we may have a solution of this difficulty, first, to confine to the agricultural-labor bill the amendment which I have proposed, and not have it extend to the general immigration laws; and, second, by some changes in wording which we have written out and which are not yet in perfect form. It is not intended to be any invasion of the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, but merely an intent to implement the farm-labor bill itself. I have taken the wording of the Senator from Florida, which is satisfactory. If the clerk can read these amendments I shall send them to the desk.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am wondering if it would be within the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement if further unanimous consent were asked to pass over this amendment for 10 or 15 minutes so that it might be considered later and in the meantime we could proceed with something else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous-consent requests are always in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be laid aside for 15 minutes so that the Senators interested in the amendment may get it into the best possible form.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not mean to disturb the time arrangement in any way.

Mr. WHERRY. If the request is agreed to we would still have at least 5 minutes' time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I might want to grant at least 5 minutes time to any opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order to yield 5 minutes additional time of what is remaining, additional request must be made.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know that any Senator will want the time. I do not know that any Senator wants to oppose the suggested amendment. I think that perhaps there will not be. I only ask that the request be so modified.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may I so modify my request, that at the end of the period, when we again take up the question, the distinguished majority leader may have 5 minutes and the Senator from Illinois may have 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the time we have for the purpose of refining the amendment of the Senator

from Illinois the Senate might be able to take up my amendment, being amendment lettered A, dated April 26, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 23, to strike out the word "and";

On page 4, line 9, to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and";

On page 4, between lines 9 and 10, to insert the following:

(4) to permit reasonable entry and inspection of the places of employment of such workers by officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for the purpose of enabling such officers to ascertain whether any of the workers employed by such employer are illegally in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, directing my remarks to the purpose and the intention of this amendment, which is within the context, the philosophy, and the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and also of the proposed or suggested amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], these three amendments—the Douglas amendment, the Morse amendment, and the one which I am offering are all directed toward tightening the law with respect to wetbacks. These amendments are stated in the sequence of their effectiveness, namely, the Douglas amendment, with its more stringent provisions, is what I believe to be the heart and core of the corrective legislation. The Morse amendment is within the confines of the employment and recruitment service of agricultural labor and would furnish remedial action where there has been any employment of laborers who have illegally entered or who illegally remain in the United States.

My amendment is designed simply to permit the officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to be able to go into the places of employment where wetbacks may possibly be employed. In other words, the amendment would permit officers of the United States Government who are charged under the immigration laws with the enforcement of those laws not only to investigate at the recruitment centers, at the placement centers, but to go into a large field of operation and to make any necessary checks in the employment areas. I believe, Mr. President, it would be helpful.

I am not saying that it is the answer to the wetback problem. I think it is only fair to say that there has been some cooperation from those of us who desire to tighten up the bill, which represents the heart and core of the migratory problem as it affects Mexican workers. This is the most difficult aspect of the proposed legislation. So I make my position clear. I shall vote for the Douglas amendment. If the Douglas amendment shall be defeated, I shall vote for the Morse amendment. My reason is that both amendments are directed to the particular objective of controlling wetbacks.

I also ask my colleagues to support my amendment, because it is a fundamental part of the administrative enforcement of existing legislation as it pertains to the control of wetbacks.

Nothing more need be said about the subject except that the problem has been given the attention of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor. In that connection I read the first recommendation of the Commission, as set forth at page 88 of the report:

We recommend that—

(1) The Immigration and Naturalization Service be strengthened by (a) clear statutory authority to enter places of employment to determine if illegal aliens are employed.

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to augment and to put into effect the first recommendation in chapter IV of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor. The Douglas amendment follows through on the second recommendation.

I do not know the attitude of the chairman of the committee about the amendment. May I inquire, at this time, how he feels about it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be opposed to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in that case I shall save some of my time to use after the chairman of the committee has made his persuasive argument. I yield the floor at this time, hoping to get the response of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THE PRESIDENT'S BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 or 6 minutes to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to yield up to 8 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 8, will be President Truman's birthday. It is also, by coincidence, the sixth anniversary of the President's proclamation—less than a month after he had assumed his present high office—announcing the unconditional surrender of Germany.

During the 6 years since Germany surrendered, the President of the United States has had to make many fateful decisions. These have included the decision to use the atomic bomb, which was a decision aimed at shortening the war against Japan; and the proclamation of the Truman doctrine, which, with the support it received in Congress, served to protect the independence of Greece and Turkey and to help check the sweep of communism to the Mediterranean.

The President has proposed and courageously fought for such farsighted measures as the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact, which have received the overwhelming support of the people of the country. Had it not been for his vision, courage, and leadership in initiating such necessary steps, we could now be isolated in a Communist-dominated world, if not, indeed, engaged in a war—yes, Mr. President—with the odds against us.

During the 6 years, because he has had the courage to fight for what he believes to be right, President Truman has been subjected to almost unparalleled abuse, both political and personal. Two abusive pieces have appeared in magazines of national circulation within the past few weeks. I am glad today to invite the attention of Senators to a magazine article of a different sort. It is the story of Harry Truman and his father, which was told for the first time in the March issue of Parents' magazine. The article was written by Bela Kornitzer, author, historian, and former member of the Hungarian cabinet, who escaped from his country when the Nazis invaded it, and is now living in the United States.

President Truman granted Mr. Kornitzer an interview about his father, and members of the President's family also cooperated in providing material. The President later corrected the manuscript in his own hand, and a copy of the manuscript, with his revisions, has been presented to the Library of Congress.

The result is a warm, human, and moving story of the President's origins and of the home into which he was born on May 8, 1884, and in which he was reared. I hope that all Senators will read the article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOLD FOR THE FIRST TIME—THE STORY OF TRUMAN—HOW TRUMAN'S FATHER INFLUENCED HIS SON AND ENCOURAGED MANY TRAITS WHICH ACCOUNT FOR HIS EMINENCE—MUCH HAS BEEN WRITTEN ABOUT THE MOTHERS OF PRESIDENTS—THIS ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A FAMOUS SON AND HIS FATHER

(By Bela Kornitzer)

The regular Thursday afternoon press conference in the office of Harry S. Truman was over. Eben Ayers, White House assistant secretary, turned to the President.

"Mr. President, this is Bela Kornitzer. He's the man who's going out to Independence to see your family."

Mr. Truman grinned and put out his hand for a firm handshake. He was delighted to meet me, he said. I would certainly find some grand folks out there in Independence. He wished me luck.

With that Presidential blessing, I started out on a journey into history—an attempt to piece together, from the members of the Truman family and from those neighbors still living who remembered him, the story and character of Harry Truman and his father, John Anderson Truman, farmer and trader of Independence and Grandview, Mo.

When I presented my White House letter of introduction to Vivian Truman, the President's brother, in his office in Kansas City where he is district director of the Missouri Federal Housing Administration, he read the note carefully and then looked at me questioningly.

"I don't quite understand," he said. "Why do you want to know about father? He was not a national figure. Why are you interested in him?"

I explained that in Hungary I had written a book on notable fathers and sons; that I had been surprised to find so much written here about Franklin Roosevelt and his mother, Sara Delano Roosevelt, and about Harry Truman and his mother, Martha Ellen Truman, and so little about James Roosevelt

and John Truman—fathers. My book had been based on the fact that in the Old World, at least, fathers traditionally played a dominant role in family life. In this country, on the other hand, fathers seemed overshadowed. I wanted to set the balance a little more equally—and how better than to write about Harry Truman, President of the United States, and his father?

Sitting there, it wasn't difficult to note a marked resemblance between Vivian Truman and his brother.

"One thing you could always say about father," Vivian Truman said. "He taught us not to fear work. Harry worked hard as a boy—he did his full share of milking the cows, hauling fodder to the cattle, and feeding the pigs, just as father and I did. If Harry has courage to face the grave problems he does today, he gets that straight from father."

Two years younger than the President, Vivian operated the Truman farm in Grandview from 1915—when his father died—until 1934. In contrast to the President, whose movements are sharp and quick, Vivian still has the slow, deliberate action and pace of the farmer.

"Now, let's see," he said. "I'm afraid we can't get much done now, with the pile of work I've got in front of me today. Suppose you come back tomorrow at this time. I'll have my sister, Mary Jane, and cousin, Ralph Truman, here and we'll try to see what help we can give you."

I was at the door when he said, "By the way, Mr. Kornitzer—don't expect too much. We Trumans are pretty plain people."

When I arrived the next afternoon, I found Vivian Truman seated at a conference table in his office with a tall, powerfully built, silver-haired man who bore about his eyes and mouth a striking resemblance both to Vivian and Harry Truman. His military bearing was obvious as he rose to shake hands.

"This is Gen. Ralph Truman—Maj. Gen. Ralph Truman, retired, to give you his full title," Vivian said. "Ralph is a first cousin to Harry and me. And I think you ought to know that he's a veteran of four wars." Vivian ticked them off on his fingers—"Spanish-American, Philippine Insurrection and the First and Second World Wars." The general took my hand in a grip which made it ache. "Well, now, I don't know that we ought to go into that," he said mildly. "I understand you're interested in the President's father, Mr. Kornitzer. Of course, I knew him well—he was my uncle John, my father's younger brother."

Vivian Truman took out a billfold and extracted from it a small yellowed photograph of a young man with a thin, sensitive face, heavy lidded eyes, a sharply chiseled nose, and dark hair carefully slicked down across a high forehead and brushed back above his ears.

"That's the most precious photograph we have of father," said Vivian. He and the general both studied it for a few moments, and then the general said, "You know, Vivian, come to think of it, that's Margaret's face. She's the absolute image of her grandfather."

At this moment the door opened and Miss Mary Jane Truman arrived, a little breathless and apologetic for being late. The President's sister is a slender, energetic woman, dressed in black and wearing black gloves, her eyes quick and alert behind metal-rimmed glasses.

"We were just commenting on how much Margaret takes after father," Vivian said. "You don't realize it until you look at this picture."

Miss Mary Jane, after a moment's study, nodded in agreement. "It's more than taking after him in looks only," she said. "Do you remember how father loved to sing? He had a fine, pleasant voice, and he had a musical ear, too. I can still see him standing behind Harry and me, while we were playing a duet on the piano, humming along in perfect tune. And you'd always have some idea where he was during the day, out in the barn or in the field, because you'd hear him singing."

This love of music was shared by John Truman's son, Harry. His piano teacher still treasures a clipping from the local paper which reviews with enthusiastic praise a piano recital by Harry Truman, age 14, and predicts that the young pianist will achieve fame and fortune in the field of music.

The general said: "Uncle John loved the farm. You know, until he was 39, he'd done nothing but farming, first in Lamar and then in Grandview. But in 1890—father was 39 then—Harry reached his sixth birthday and was ready to go to school. Uncle John began thinking about that and decided he had to move to Independence, where schooling was available. He had to give up farming and find something else to do in Independence. So he became a trader in livestock."

"That was a hard decision for father to make," Vivian Truman added, "because essentially farming was his life. And before too many years passed, he returned to it. You know, the family originally came from Kentucky—my grandfather, Anderson Shipp, was a farmer too—and father was always a man of the soil. We were all raised around here—this was our domain—the farm and the land. To be a good farmer in Missouri—that's tops. That's the finest thing you can say about a man. And that's what father was—a first-rate farmer. He knew livestock; he knew horses and he knew mules. He could tell their age simply by glancing at them—never had to examine their teeth. And that explains, of course, how he happened to go into trading. It was making practical use of his knowledge as a farmer who knew livestock and knew their value."

Mary Jane Truman said: "Father would never have left the farm, even for a little while, if it weren't for his children. As a girl, I remember how proud he was of the prizes and ribbons his livestock won at the county fairs. But he had us and our schooling to worry about—not only Harry, who was 6 then, but Vivian and me."

The general said: "Now, about this livestock trading. I think I've read almost everything that's been written on the Truman family, and in all those thousands of words, I've found only a sentence or two about the President's father. That usually boils down to a rather condescending characterization of Uncle John as a 'horse and mule trader.' People just don't understand when they talk like that," he said. "In the first place, he dealt not only in mules and horses; he dealt in all livestock—cattle, hogs, goats, horses, and mules. Even the mule-trading aspect of it was very important. The mule was the automobile of those days and a good team of mules sometimes brought a price equal to that of a small automobile today. One thousand dollars for a team of mules was not infrequent. Your trader was a substantial figure in the community and played an important part in the economic life of the community."

"Let's go back a bit and get a clearer picture of those years," said Vivian Truman. He took a pad of paper and with a pencil began jotting down dates.

"We can begin with some data about the family which you might find interesting. The first Truman we know of was a John de Tremaen, who lived in Normandy, about 1257. The first Truman to settle in this country was Joseph Truman, who came from Nottingham, England, to New London, Conn., in 1666. I'm told that there was a Sir among our British ancestors—Sir Benjamin Trueman—who lived in London about 1750. I don't know.

"Father was born December 5, 1851, on a farm near Holmes Park, Mo. His parents, Anderson Shipp, whom I've mentioned before, and Mary Jane Holmes—Mary Jane here was named after her—came there from Kentucky 5 years earlier.

"Father was a bachelor until he was 31." Vivian opened a drawer and pulled out a thin volume entitled "History of Jackson County, Mo." "This was published in 1881," Vivian went on, "the year father married Martha Ellen Young. She was the daughter of a neighboring farmer and stockdealer, Solomon Young."

Both the Truman and the Young families settled in the vicinity of each other near Grandview, but with a history of radically different activities. John's father had stuck to the farm. Martha's father had become a stock trader, a transcontinental shipper, and a prosperous man.

Instead of settling down with either of their families, or even in their vicinity, John and Martha Truman moved to Lamar, 115 miles south of Independence, and the seat of Barton County, where John had built Martha a house. It was here, in 1884, that Harry, later to become the thirty-second President of the United States, was born.

"This old history speaks of Grandfather Anderson Shipp Truman," Vivian continued, "and then it goes on to say this about father—remember, this came out just before father married." He read aloud, "John A. Truman resides with his father and manages the farm; he is an industrious and energetic young man and one that bids fair to make a success in life."

Miss Mary Jane remarked in a thoughtful voice, "Those were rather prophetic words. Father was a happy man—he enjoyed every moment of his family life, and he was happy when he went into politics in later years. Of course, it would have been wonderful if he could have lived to see Harry go to Washington. I sometimes wonder," she said, "what father would have said had he been told what fate had in store for one of his children."

"Well," said Vivian, "he was certainly happy in his children. And he knew Harry had ability. He liked the way he never had an idle moment after he got out of high school—if he wasn't working as an usher in a movie house, he was working as a timekeeper on the Santa Fe, or at some other job, but always industrious. And you know how delighted he was when Harry saved up enough money from these jobs to buy a whole set of an encyclopedia and not only that but a set of Shakespeare."

"That was Harry," said Miss Mary Jane, nodding. "He was very interested in books from the start, in facts of all kind, and especially in history and government. He could never get enough of that kind of reading."

Vivian Truman studied his notes. "To get back to where we were—father and mother lived in the house in Lamar where Harry was born for only 2 years or so, and then they moved to a farm 30 miles from Independence, in Cass County. I was born there.

"The next year, 1887, we moved to the Young farm, the farm of mother's folks, near Grandview, and it was there Mary Jane was born.

"That was the year father first became active in politics. He was 36 then. He never sought public office, you know, but he was always interested in civic life and particularly in Democratic Party affairs. Cleveland was his idol. And when President Cleveland visited Kansas City that year, father was a member of the delegation which welcomed him."

"That's right," spoke up Miss Mary Jane. "I remember father telling us how he rode a big gray saddle horse in front of the reviewing stand, with President Cleveland standing there, big as life, and everyone cheering."

"This brings us," said Vivian, "to 1890, when Harry was 6 years old and we moved to Independence, so Harry could start school. We lived in Independence for the next 10 or 11 years—until 1901—with father making

his living as a stock dealer. Then we moved back to the Young farm, but father still kept his hand in Democratic politics. In 1908, he was very active in the campaign and ended up a county delegate to the Missouri State Democratic Convention in Joplin. Two years later he became an elections judge in Grandview precinct."

"That reminds me of something very interesting," broke in General Truman. "Come to think of it, wasn't Harry's first political experience the time he served as clerk to Uncle John when he took on that elections judge job? I'm pretty sure it was."

Vivian nodded. "Yes; about this time Harry was followed pretty closely in father's footsteps. In 1912, father was appointed road supervisor in the area around Grandview. And 2 years later, his story ends. He died in 1914, just before the war broke out. After his death, Harry was appointed in his place as road supervisor, and he left that position, as you know, to enlist in the Army. From then on," said Vivian, pushing his little pad to one side, and sitting back in his chair, "from then on, I guess Harry's history is pretty well known."

Miss Mary Jane put a gloved hand on the table. "It is very strange," she said, slowly. "You attempt to sum up a man's life, and you have facts and statistics and dates—and yet, you don't have the man himself. Father was a greatly loved man. Those who remember him remember him as a man of honor, whose word was good, and who was thoroughly loyal to his family and his friends. I don't suppose you can find anything awfully exciting in his life. He lived with his family until he was 30—as you see; a good son and a dutiful one. And when he married, later in life than most men of those days, he became as good and dutiful a husband and father as he was a son."

"Well, sir," Vivian Truman said, "I think we've exhausted what we can tell you."

I thanked them each, and added that when I was at the White House, the President's press secretary had suggested I might also speak with some of John Truman's contemporaries, whom I could find in Grandview and Independence.

Vivian nodded. "That should be helpful," he said. "Some of father's old friends might have more to give you."

"By the way," remarked General Truman, speaking to Vivian, "what about Grace? She'd certainly have quite a bit to say if I got her on the telephone and persuaded her." He turned to me, "Grace Summer is my sister and she was terribly fond of her Uncle John. You can find her in Dallas. She's a retired school teacher."

"I think that is a fine idea," said Miss Mary Jane. "The general and Grace, you see, were orphaned as children and father took Grace into our home—she was about 10 or 11 then—and that was even before any of us were born. Grace, you might say, was a big sister to us."

On the wall of the living room in Dallas, Tex., in the home of Mrs. Grace Summer, hangs a copy of the Presidential proclamation, stating Germany's unconditional surrender on May 8, 1945.

"That's an interesting memento," Mrs. Summer said. "May 8 is Harry's birthday." She added, "He sent me that as a surprise. Harry is like Uncle John in that he loves surprises and never forgets his family."

She was seated in an easy chair and she had just put down a copy of a current biography of Harry Truman.

"I began reading this after the general telephoned me," she said. "We see Harry differently than he usually appears in books. I thought I might find something about Uncle John that might help refresh my memory, but in this book, at least, there's not much about him. In fact, I haven't read much about him anywhere.

"The first memory I have of him is as he took me by the hand and we went into the chicken coop to gather eggs from under the hens. They were making a frightful rumpus, and I thought he was so brave. I really don't know what would have happened to me if it hadn't been for him—taking me into his home, and raising me with all the love he gave his own children.

"And he loved children—there wasn't anything he wouldn't give up to spend time with us. He liked to tell us stories. I remember his voice—very soft—and how well he could sing.

"He taught me to ride a horse. Of course, almost everyone rode in those days, but I think Uncle John had the finest horse in town. He taught Harry, Vivian, and Mary Jane to ride when they grew old enough."

She smiled reminiscently. "Good heavens," she said, looking at the proclamation on the wall. "I remember Harry when he was this high——" She put out her hand. "He was such a tiny fellow and always so earnest in everything he did. And he always looked so studious because he was wearing glasses when he was only 12.

"Uncle John, as far as I remember, never wore glasses. He was not a big man—thin, rather small with fine features, good-humored and, I'm afraid, a little quick-tempered. But he always got over that just as quickly as it happened. He was a handsome man, I'd say, and particularly painstaking about his clothes.

"He went to church regularly—he was a Baptist, but he was liberal in religion. I recall him saying often, 'Don't think that only Baptists have free access to heaven.'

"Yet he had a powerful faith in God, and a powerful faith in what a man could accomplish by courage and determination. He had no use for a coward. He raised his children to have faith in themselves and their potentialities, and never, never, to give up.

"That," she said, "is what he gave Harry, of course. That confidence in himself, that spirit of never-say-die.

"The last time I saw Uncle John was about 2 years before he died. We were living in Bomarton, and he came there. We were terribly thrilled, I remember. We looked on it as a real occasion—an important visitor was coming. He brought us all gifts, particularly sacks of candy and nuts for the children. He'd never forget them."

When I reached Independence, Federal Judge Henry A. Bundschu, a classmate of Vivian Truman, gave a party. He had invited John Truman's friends—the youngest in his 80's, the oldest in his 90's—"Uncle" Reese Alexander, Henry Rummell, Sam Woodson, Olney and Harvey Burrus, Henry P. Chiles, Charles Kemper. Also present were Roger Serman, mayor of Independence, and Ethel and Nellie Noland, cousins of Harry Truman.

"I remember John Truman as a small man, quiet, with a face wrinkled by weather and sun, with crow's feet and a hint of a smile around his eyes," Judge Bundschu said. "He was quick-tempered. There was one incident, I'm told, in which John Truman became so enraged with a lawyer who accused him of misrepresenting facts that he was ready to take his fists to him."

"John was a good trader," said "Uncle" Reese Alexander, 93. "I can still remember when he moved to Independence and bought a two-story house on Crysler Street. He had a large back yard there and he filled it with horses, cattle, goats, and other livestock. That's where he dealt. A mighty good trader, John Truman. Yes, sir. Very stubborn, but on the square.

"All of us used to envy the Truman boys because of that collection of horses and goats and cattle John kept in back of the house. When he wasn't dealing in livestock, he was always working around the barn."

"I had another reason for envying the Truman boys," said Henry Rummell, a harnessmaker. "John Truman once came into my shop with two brown goats. He wanted me to make a harness for them so Harry and Vivian could use them to pull their cart when they went out hunting walnuts. I never remember anybody else asking for a goat harness in the 44 years I've been in business."

"I remember that harness," said Henry P. Chiles. "And I also recollect Mr. Truman's smile. I remember him building a decorative iron fence that went all the way around his property."

Olney Burrus, who had been John Truman's lawyer, said, "He was something of an inventor, you know. He was pretty ingenious that way. So far as I know, John was the first man to drill a gas well in this part of the country. His Crysler Street place was the site of a natural-gas well and next to it was a small storage tank to hold the gas which was piped to the house for fuel, and also to the Gleason house about 200 feet away. That well was more than 300 feet deep. John had the foresight to develop it.

"I recall the very first day John came to see me to talk about an automatic railroad switch he had invented. At that time all railroad switches were thrown by hand. John wanted advice. The Missouri Pacific had offered him $2,000 a year in royalties for it. That was on the basis of $1 a switch, and they wanted 2,000 of them.

"The Chicago & Alton line, in competition, offered him $2,500. This was John's big deal, though, and he set a price—$2 a switch, on the basis of 2,500 a year. That meant $5,000 a year. But the best offer he could get was still for only half of that.

"In the long run both lines rejected his price. Later the Missouri Pacific used an improved version of the invention and John, under the patent law, was unable to establish further claim to it."

Olney Burrus, an old man, shook his head. "I suppose there's a moral for you. Maybe you'd say that if Harry S. Truman is stubborn, he gets it from his father."

Henry Rummell, the harnessmaker, touched me on the arm.

"Something you ought to know," he said. "I'm a Republican. Been one all my life. And I'm the only man who ever defeated Harry Truman at the polls. Back in 1924. He was running for reelection as county judge, and I licked him. But Harry wasn't put out. Next day in front of the courthouse, he came up to me, shook hands, and said, 'Henry, no hard feelings. It was a fair fight.'"

Mayor Serman said, "When I was 7 years old, I had measles, and I was quarantined. But John Truman, I remember, dropped in, paying no attention to the yellow sign, and brought me some candy to cheer me up. I was in bed in a dark room with the blinds drawn, and he said to me jokingly, 'You're going to get better, Roger, and you're going to grow up and be mayor some day.'"

In Washington, at the White House, President Truman was reminiscing. "Yes," he said, "it was all interesting—these stories about his father." Some he had not heard himself. For example, the yarn about John Truman's invention of a railroad switch. He never had known about that. But, in the main, it was true that his father was essentially a man of the soil, who believed in the virtues and decencies of life, and delighted in the love of his family. He could still remember his father's voice, raised clear and strong, in Chistmas carols. Then there was the time his father gave him a Shetland pony—a beautiful animal—and he had gotten on it, and no sooner was he on it, than the pony reared and he was thrown. His father was really disappointed in him then. John Truman had been an excellent horseman. He rode a horse as though he were a part of it.

Mr. Truman rose, walked slowly to the side of his desk and stood there, knuckles pressed against the desk top, and went on to say

that those were really hard days. He remembered sitting in a saddle all night, riding alongside his father as they took a herd of cattle from Independence to the Kansas City stockyards for shipment. His father worked hard. What was it they had said of him in that old history of Jackson County, Mo.? "John A. Truman resides with his father and manages the farm; he is an industrious and energetic young man and one who bids fair to make a success in life." Industrious and energetic. That was true. His father was diligent, he worked hard, he had his ups and downs. And, with it all, I could see the President was deeply moved as he added that his father was the happiest man he ever knew.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in my Jackson Day dinner speech at New Haven I said that historians would do justice to President Truman even if present-day newspapers do not. In my 18 months in the Senate I am proud to attest to the high courage and intellectual quality of his major decisions and policies. He had the courage to fight for the big steps forward in the field of our foreign policy, just as he now has the courage to recall General MacArthur. I remember several so-called tough votes which I cast in support of his policies in the space of a few weeks last summer, when I was a candidate for office.

President Truman had the courage to stand up and veto a bill giving free and perpetual medical service to Spanish-American War veterans, and only three of us in the Senate supported him. He stood firm against the Spanish loan, as originally presented. He resisted the pressures of postal clerks, when they sought special privileges and bonuses not granted to other veteran postal and Federal workers.

The decision in these cases, which were not supported by too many Members of the Senate who were candidates for office last November, typify the President's courage and character. Of all men, we in the Senate should appreciate and value the qualities which won him election to the United States Senate, to the Vice Presidency, and, finally, to the Presidency. I am proud in my small way to do him honor on the eve of his sixty-seventh birthday.

CONDUCT OF HEARINGS BEFORE ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague [Mr. ELLENDER] yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have a few minutes left. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana wish?

Mr. LONG. One minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as one of the members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services who have supported the chairman, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in insisting that the hearings on the MacArthur affair be in closed session, releasing all possible information to the public, I was pleased to see that several of the newspapers have realized the importance of keeping the vital secrets of the Nation from falling into the hands of the enemy.

Again today, with the testimony of General Marshall, we saw the most compelling reasons why the hearings must be behind closed doors. I will say for our chairman that he has made every effort to see that every bit of information that could safely be released to the American people was released, so that they might have as much understanding as possible of this issue.

I was pleased to see in the Washington Post of today a very admirable editorial giving what I believe to be due credit to the chairman of the committee for the manner in which he has conducted the hearings up to this time. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the Senator from Louisiana has fully expressed my sentiments on this question. It so happens that earlier in the day I placed in the RECORD the editorial to which he refers.

Mr. LONG. That being the case, I shall not ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I withdraw my request.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 136) allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 321. An act to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of B. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe;

H. R. 622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina;

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrzej Wojcicki, and Stanislaw Wojcicki;

H. R. 664. An act for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt;

H. R. 667. An act for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling;

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins;

H. R. 789. An act for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee;

H. R. 859. An act for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski;

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of First Lieutenant Walter S. Moe, Jr.;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Taro Takara;

H. R. 1121. An act for the relief of Chin Yok Kong;

H. R. 1117. An act for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya;

H. R. 1141. An act for the relief of Saint Patrick Hospital and The Western Montana Clinic;

H. R. 1150. An act for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti, Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of Pietro Giannettino;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu;

H. R. 1264. An act for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden;

H. R. 1422. An act for the relief of Carl Parks;

H. R. 1438. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Charles R. Keicher;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Elena Erbez;

H. R. 1798. An act for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of Sook Kat;

H. R. 2175. An act for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott;

H. R. 2304. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers;

H. R. 2357. An act for the relief of Lucia Adamos;

H. R. 2450. An act for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano;

H. R. 2654. An act to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 2714. An act for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte;

H. R. 3196. An act to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3291. An act to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; and

H. R. 3292. An act to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that the 15 minutes allowed by unanimous consent to give the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] an opportunity to reframe their amendment have now elapsed. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Illinois is retaining the language "by reasonable inquiry"? If so, I wish to ask him to interpret that language. We do not have wetbacks in Maine, but a great many of our friends come over from Canada. They work both in the potato fields and in the woods. What is the meaning of "reasonable inquiry"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not a judge, or the son of a judge, or the grandson of a judge. These matters would be left primarily to judicial interpretation. The language would mean, however, that an employer would be expected to check up on the legality of entry of the aliens whom he employed, and should not accept them sight unseen without making some effort to determine whether or not their papers are in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. How is he to know that a certain employee is not a native? Would a birth certificate be required? I suppose conditions are different in the South, but up in Maine a great many of us speak the same language. What is the employer supposed to do?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Immigration and Naturalization Service would be expected to issue cards to those who are legal entrants, and the employer could at least ask to see a man's card. If he did not ask to see the man's card, this would be one circumstance in which he would fail to make "reasonable inquiry."

Mr. BREWSTER. If he is a native, of course, he will not have a card.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that.

Mr. BREWSTER. When a native of Maine goes to Illinois, he has no card to show that he is a native of Maine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is supposed to be freedom of migration within the country—and fortunately there is.

This provision, of course, applies only to aliens. It is not intended to establish a registration system for persons who are citizens of the United States. However, those who are legal entrants are supposed to carry with them some document to indicate that they are legal entrants. It would be proper to ask a man whether or not he was an immigrant. If so, he could be asked to show his card.

Mr. BREWSTER. If he says that he is not an immigrant, what is the employer supposed to do? Is he supposed to investigate his birth certificate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is certainly no obligation to investigate his birth certificate or to ascertain whether he has paid a poll tax or property tax or whether he is upon any voting roll or not. There is certainly no such obligation. But if all the circumstances of appearance and language and lack of identification card and failure to furnish any evidence of residence give rise to a question as to legality of entry, the employer should make some further inquiry.

Mr. President, I should like to modify my amendment by striking out lines 1 and 2 on page 1; by striking out the figure "8", in line 3; beginning in line 3, after the word "person", striking out all down to and including line 2 on page 2, and inserting in lieu thereof in line 3, page 1, after the word "person", the words "who shall employ"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "any", by inserting the word "Mexican"; by striking the words "including an alien crewman", in line 3, on page 2; in line 7, on page 2, after the word "aliens", by striking out "or any person who shall employ any alien"; and on page 2, line 11, after the word "employed", by inserting the word "such."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may the clerk read the amendment as proposed to be modified by the distinguished Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified by the Senator from Illinois, will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Any person who shall employ any Mexican alien, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed such an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The modified amendment, in line 3 on page 2, contains the language "any Mexican alien." Therefore the problem of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] would be taken care of, would it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. We believe that this provision is good enough to apply to any alien; but we are restricting its application solely to Mexican nationals.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that all that portion of the original amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator which would have extended to other fields of immigration and immigrants than Mexican nationals coming into the United States for agricultural labor purposes has been stricken from the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. And it is the purpose of the Senator, in his modified amendment, to restrict the modified amendment wholly to the field covered by the pending measure?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. However, the penalty is retained in exactly the same words and to exactly the same degree of punishment as was stated in his original amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with that understanding I wish to say that I hope very strongly that the Senate will adopt the amendment, as modified.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator has solved the problem so far as we who live on the Canadian border are concerned. However, this suggestion is a little reminiscent of our former legislation excluding aliens of certain nationalities. Has the Senator given consideration to that question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Maine that I should like to have these provisions apply to all illegal entrants of whatever nationality, but when that was proposed it was said it would interfere with the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary which was framing a general revision of the immigration law. Therefore we have confined the application of this amendment to employment of that type of labor covered in the agricultural labor measure now before us. In other words, it is an attempt to confine the penalty to violations with respect to the type of labor covered in the measure before us, and not to broaden it out to amend the general immigration law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe I have 5 minutes remaining. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maine so he may ask questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois address himself to the question as to whether or not this in any way suggests a parallel to our exclusion act with respect to Asiatics, which has aroused so much controversy because of discrimination against certain groups. To what extent is it likely to give affront?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Maine that the measure before us provides for no exclusion whatsoever of Mexican labor. It sets up procedures for bringing in Mexican labor under a treaty with Mexico, and then it states that if these procedures are not followed, and if Mexicans are brought into the United States illegally, certain penalties shall be inflicted upon those who knowingly, or with reasonable grounds to believe them illegal entrants, employ this Mexican labor, or who do not endeavor reasonably to inform themselves as to the legality of the entry of these workers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the Senator from Illinois believe the Mexicans would feel that their aliens are being discriminated against in that aliens coming into this country illegally from other countries are free from the penalties provided in this amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think so. I think that would be straining at a gnat. The penalties here imposed will be upon farm operators of this country who breach the terms of this section. Of course, the Committee on the Judiciary has a similar measure under consideration with respect to revision of the general immigration laws, as well as the separate Ellender bill, S. 1391, and that matter can be dealt with by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I will need only 1 minute. The provision in question cannot be regarded as an exclusion provision, because the Mexican Government has asked for this type of protection; therefore, the Mexican Government should be satisfied.

Mr. President, I should like to say that I hope the chairman of the committee will realize that the term "Mexican alien" is used in the provision. I personally had thought that the term "Mexican national" would be better. If the amendment, as modified, is adopted, I hope that when the bill goes to conference the chairman will keep in mind that we are dealing with persons with respect to whom an attempt is being made to bring them into the United States by the proposed legislation, and that perhaps a change can be made in regard to the use of the word "alien."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, regardless of whether we designate the person to be a Mexican national, a Mexican citizen, or a Mexican subject, one who comes into the United States under the proposed legislation is here as a Mexican alien; and if brought in illegally, the person who brings him in would be subject to the penalty provided in the measure. Is that not correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is correct, and I am happy to support the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. If I have any more time under my control, I should be glad to yield it back and have a vote on the amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The question now recurs to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], which had previously been under consideration, but action on which, under the unanimous-consent agreement, was deferred so the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, as modified, could be considered. The Senator from Minnesota now has the floor, and has 6 minutes of time remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield the floor so the Senator from Louisiana may make any statement in opposition to my amendment he may wish to make.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think we are now going far afield from the wetback problem with which we are trying to deal. I yield to no Member in the Senate in my efforts to try to enact legislation to prevent wetbacks from coming into the United States. I realize we have before us a problem which if not settled soon may strain the cordial relationship which now exists between ourselves and the Mexican Government. The pending question, I believe, is one that should be dealt with by the Committee on the Judiciary. I entertain the same view with respect to the amendment which was just adopted. But since I was the author of a bill which sought to carry out the same purpose, I was placed in the position where I could not deny my own bill.

Under the law as it now exists, and under the Constitution, an immigration official must obtain a warrant before he can go into a farmer's home to find out whether an alien is harbored there. What is now proposed to be enacted into law would permit entry by an immigration official at almost any time. I believe it would be rather dangerous for us to agree to such an important amendment as this, one which denies the privacy of a man's home, an amendment which would permit an official to enter private premises at almost any time of day in searching for wetbacks or other aliens. I believe, Mr. President, that by adopting the amendment we have just agreed to, we have taken adequate steps toward solving the wetback problem.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator speaks of an official going into someone's home. Is there anything in the amendment that indicates that a right would be given to an official to enter anyone's home?

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not hear the Senator. Will he please repeat his question?

Mr. CORDON. I do not understand that the amendment makes any such provision. I understood, however, the Senator from Louisiana said it would permit an official to go into a man's home at almost any time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume a farmer employed four or five persons who were lodged in the farmer's home. When I worked in the wheat fields of North Dakota back in 1912 and 1913 I slept in the barn. Under our law and our Constitution, before an official could enter such premises to make an investigation or to make an arrest, he would have to obtain a warrant.

Mr. CORDON. The language of the amendment is "to permit reasonable entry and inspection of the places of employment." Does that not mean that the "places of employment" would be the farms?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be the house, if a man was working in the house.

By the adoption of the Douglas amendment we have imposed fines and imprisonment in case an employer employs a wetback or an alien who is illegally in the United States. I can well conceive that if the pending amendment is adopted, the immigration officials will be permitted, under the conditions set forth in the amendment, to go into a man's home and make a search without having a search warrant, although the law now requires that a search warrant be first obtained. I think to permit a search to be made without having a search warrant would be going too far, Mr. President. So far as I am concerned, I believe the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator yield several minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. How much time have I left, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico as much time as he requires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, following the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I merely wish to say, that a great many persons are worried considerably about this proposal. In the case of some employers, there have been repeated complaints that officials of the Immigration Service have gone too far in visiting the fields and making inquiries of the workers there and asking them to present their credentials for entrance into the United States. Mr. President, we do not have a white-card system in our country, although I have tried rather hard to have enacted a bill providing for one. We do not require workers who perhaps are working in the cotton fields to stop work in order to satisfy some official who wonders whether they are properly in the United States.

I am anxious to have the Congress enact legislation which will strike at the wetback situation and will stop the illegal entry of such persons into our country; but I think it would be all wrong for officials of the Immigration Service to be allowed to go into the fields and demand of the workers there, "Show us evidence that you are properly in the United States at this time." If we were to permit that to be done, I think we would destroy a great deal of the usefulness of the imported labor.

If the Government has evidence that a certain person is improperly in the United States, undoubtedly the Government has a perfect right to act in such a case. Under the terms of the amendment we have just adopted, those who employ such persons can be properly punished.

However, I think it would not be best, in attempting to have harmonious relations and proper conditions established, to permit a horde of investigators to go into the fields and demand from the workers there evidence that they are properly in this country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from New Mexico have any objection to

adding to the amendment just adopted the amendment I now have pending?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, for I think the Senator's amendment accomplishes all that it is necessary to accomplish in this field. I think the amendment of the Senator from Oregon goes beyond the amendment of the Senator from Illinois; and so far as I am concerned, I should like to see the Senate adopt the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

In my opinion, the pending amendment is a bad one. I base that statement on the fact that time and time again I have received hundreds of complaints from farmers who say that the immigration officials go along the highways, not to pick up wetbacks who may be on the highways, but to go to individual farms and bother the workers in the fields there, hour after hour, all day long. That is what I should like to strike at.

So I shall be glad to support the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, which I originally stated I should be glad to support. I think his amendment, coupled with the fine amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, would give us all we need in this field.

I really am worried about the pending amendment, I wish to to say.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], if I may do so—and I also call this matter to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]—that there be a little negotiation on the floor, in view of the fact that I took the language of my amendment from the bill which the Senator from Louisiana has pending before the Judiciary Committee.

Therefore, I wonder whether my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, will consider withdrawing his amendment and substituting my amendment for it, with the understanding that we can add my amendment to the amendment which has just been adopted, and then stop with that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was hopeful that the Senator from Oregon would propose his amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota; and I would hope that we would adopt his substitute, and then add it to the bill which is to go to conference. If we would do that, I think we would solve this entire problem.

Mr. MORSE. I would rather have that suggestion come from the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course the Senator from Oregon has a right to propose it if he wishes to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; but I would rather not negotiate from that end first.

Mr. ANDERSON. Very well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that I am almost persuaded and convinced—"almost thou persuadest me"—of the validity of the argument advanced by the Senator from Oregon. However, I wish to remonstrate for a moment with my friend, the Senator from New Mexico, because I am somewhat disturbed about the importance that is attached to my amendment.

The President's Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture, which spent a great deal of time investigating this problem—much more time, I may say, than any Member of the Senate has; and I think I am not unkind in making that statement—feels that my amendment is a rather modest, meek, mild proposal. On page 87 of the report of the President's Commission, the proposal in the amendment which has just been adopted—that of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—is referred to as one which goes so far that the Commission is not sure that it should be adopted. The proposal in the amendment of the Senator from Oregon was considered by the Commission as the second most stringent proposal. However, the proposal I have advanced was unanimously acclaimed as being filled with light, hope, and charity.

Of course during this debate, certain fears and doubts have been expressed. However, let me read from the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture:

> Statutory clarification on the above points will aid in taking action against the conveyors and receivers of the wetback. These clarifications of the statute, together with increased funds and personnel for enforcement, are possibly all that are needed to deal effectively with the smuggler and the intermediary. But this will not be enough. Something more needs to be done to discourage the employment of wetbacks and to take the profit out of it. It was repeatedly suggested to the Commission that it recommend making the employment of a wetback a crime.

That is what we have just done.

I read further:

> This suggestion has merit since, if the risk involved in employing wetbacks were increased, the traffic would soon diminish. In addition to making employment of an illegal alien unlawful, much would be accomplished by taking the profit out of such employment. It seems likely that if farm employers had to maintain a decent standard of minimum wages, irrespective of the nationality of the worker to whom the wages are paid, the advantages of wetback employment would disappear.

Then in the report the President's Commission goes on to point out the following:

> The attack on the problem will have to be manifold. The wetback traffic has reached such proportions in volume and in consequent chaos, it should not be neglected any longer. The techniques to be employed may be of various types but we believe the basic approaches are encompassed in our recommendations.

The headline at that point in the report is "Recommendations;" and I continue to read:

> RECOMMENDATIONS
>
> We recommend that—
>
> (1) The Immigration and Naturalization Service be stregnthened by (a) clear statutory authority to enter places of employment to determine if illegal aliens are employed.

Mr. President, I make note of the fact that out of all the approaches dealt with in the Commission's report on the wetback problem, this was considered to be the first approach—not the final and conclusive approach, but the first one. The approach we have taken on the floor of the Senate, which was logical for purposes of debate and argument, was to take the most extreme proposal first—namely, to make the employment of such persons a crime—which has been done by the amendment of my able friend, the Senator from Illinois. Next, it is proposed that we take the approach of restricting the use of such labor. That approach is covered by the amendment of my friend, the Senator from Oregon, which I shall support. Third, we might take the obvious approach of permitting the immigration officials to go into places of employment where the wetbacks might be found, and to provide those officials with the tools with which they could make proper enforcement of these provisions.

That does not mean that we should authorize a horde of immigration officials to run about the country interrogating workers in the fields. The Congress would not authorize that to be done; in fact, Congress could prevent such a thing by placing sufficient restrictions on the appropriations. Of course, that is a method by which the Congress has been able to control such situations very well.

Perhaps it would be well to provide further restrictions. On the other hand, I wish to say that it does not do much good to say that the employment of wetbacks is a crime if we do not make it possible for the proper officials to determine whether wetbacks are actually employed.

So I propose that we permit the proper officials to determine whether wetbacks are being employed. However, it is not my proposal that such officials be permitted to go into the farmer's parlor to make such inquiries. Let us not misunderstand my proposal, Mr. President. My amendment would not permit the officials making such investigations to determine whether the wetbacks were being invited to share the Sunday dinner with the farmer and his family, but my amendment would permit the officials to go into the camps and centers of employment to find out whether wetbacks were there.

So I do not propose to withdraw my amendment. I prefer to go down fighting, rather than to withdraw an amendment which I consider to be as important to this bill as a police department is important to the enforcement of a city ordinance. In other words, I believe it would be as fallacious to withdraw this amendment as it would be to withdraw from a displaced persons bill the provisions regarding the functioning of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in that connection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator to allow me time on my side of the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, I was using my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Minnesota was using the time of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, Mr. President; I still have approximately 5 minutes of my own time left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; but the Senator from Louisiana

had the floor, and had yielded to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sorry. I ask that the time I have used just now be charged to my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

The Senator from Louisiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I indicated a while ago, we have gone far toward making an effort to settle the wetback problem. Question has been raised several times with respect to the so-called Morse amendment. Personally and as chairman of the committee, I have no objection to the Morse amendment, for the simple reason that it is not only desirable, but, under the present agreement between our Government and the Mexican Government, there is this provision:

> 23. Permission to contract workers under this agreement shall not be granted to those employers who continue to use Mexican workers who are illegally in the United States.

So since that provision is already in the agreement between the United States and Mexico, I can see no harm in incorporating it into the law itself.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator would yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request that, in view of the great interest which has been manifested in the Morse amendment, the vote on the amendment which I have offered be temporarily withheld, that the Morse amendment may be now considered and voted upon, so that we clear the decks on that particular amendment, and then revert to the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would be very glad to do that, because I am for the Morse amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am, too; and I am glad to cooperate with the Senator from New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside for the moment, that the Senate proceed to consider the Morse amendment, and that, at the conclusion of debate on the Morse amendment, we revert to the Humphrey amendment which is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the modification made in the Douglas amendment, I desire to modify my amendment C in line 5, before the word "alien", to insert "Mexican", and, in line 8, before the word "alien", to insert "Mexican." I have no further argument to make in support of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 5, after the word "employment", it is proposed to insert: "*Provided*, That no workers shall be made available under this title to, nor shall any workers made available under this title be permitted to remain in the employ of, any employer who has in his employ any Mexican alien when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such Mexican alien is not lawfully within the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as modified.

GENERAL MARSHALL AND THE DATE DECEMBER 7, 1941

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon will yield me 2 or 3 minutes for a brief statement.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I would like to read into the RECORD a brief excerpt from a book by Arthur Upham Pope entitled "Maxim Litvinov." The reason for my wishing to put this in the RECORD today is that the two committees, sitting jointly, are now examining General Marshall. His memory was not too good this morning. It recalled to my mind the fact that his memory was faulty concerning the events on the morning of December 7, and the night before. In order to refresh his memory, I now read from a purported part of a diary in this book by Arthur Upham Pope, to the effect that Marshall was meeting Litvinov on the morning of December 7. I quote from page 473:

> On the morning of Sunday, December 7, Litvinov's plane arrived at Bolling Field, Washington, D. C. He was received by Brig. Gen. Phillip R. Fementhal, former military attaché in Moscow, now chief of the supply mission to the Soviet Union, by General Marshall and Admiral King, among other officers and officials.

I called Bolling Field to see whether that was the day on which Litvinov's plane arrived, and whether there was any record of General Marshall's having met him, in order that we might better refresh the general's memory.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator mind stating the year? He said December 7, omitting the year.

Mr. McCARTHY. 1941. In other words, it was on Pearl Harbor day. I called Bolling Field, and was told it is the practice to destroy such records after 1 year's time, and that it was impossible to give me that information. However, my office talked to one of the young men who was at Bolling Field at the time, and he said that, while he could not recall the exact date, he recalled that a plane landed with a number of Russians on or about that date. I think this might be of some interest to the committees which are now examining General Marshall. They might want to use it to refresh the general's memory.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously made, the Senate now reverts to the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I want to say that I am not too much worried about what happens to this amendment. I am not going to fall out with my good friend from Minnesota about the amendment. I simply say to him that I have had opportunity personally to investigate case after case in which the Immigration Service has used this sort of club to whip employers whom they did not like, and to go along with employers whom they did like. A short time ago I pointed out that when Mr. Wilmoth was in charge of the El Paso office of the Immigration Service—and I am not going to cast any kind of aspersion on him, because he is dead, he regularly went around in the fields, checking up on certain employees and employers, as to whom he had not received a report for a long time. The man in charge of the San Antonio office never worried about any of those things at all. One group of people could bring in all the wetbacks they wanted, more than were ever brought into my State, and more than were ever brought into the State of Arizona, and nearly as many as were brought into California. There was no check-up whatever in those areas, but one individual officer in a particular area was using that discretion.

If we have a law against narcotics, I do not expect that a narcotics officer will come to my house, or to the house of any other Member of the Senate, to say, "I want to search your house today, to see whether you are violating the law." If he has any evidence that I am violating it, let him make it known.

I think I have gone a long way in trying to support the amendments which have been adopted here today. I do not think the farmers of my State like either the Douglas amendment or the Morse amendment; but I consider them to be reasonable amendments, and I am glad to support them. But I see, from my experience with the administration of laws of this kind on the border, that I do not like the pending amendment, because under it a man, in the uniform of the Immigration Service with a pistol on his hip and a big badge on his coat, could go around and inquire as to the legality of the entrance of anyone, including Mexican nationals who are legally here under contract, brought in under certification of the Department of Labor. The alien laborers become scared at that sort of thing and say, "We are going home; we do not know what this officer wants to start, but we are not going to be arrested."

I think the amendment goes too far. If the immigration officers know there has been a violation, they ought to find out about it. They ought to be able to search it out. But they do not need the

language of this amendment to enable them to act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wanted to ask the Senator whether he felt that the phraseology, "permit reasonable entry," was in anyway clarified. I sense some of the fears which the Senator from New Mexico expresses, in that the foreign workers are justifiably concerned. I want the Senator to know that it is not the intent of the Senator from Minnesota to have any type of gestapo method employed against these people. It was merely my intent to try to expedite or to facilitate the enforcement of the law regarding the wetback.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am not trying to criticize what the Senator said. All I am saying is that I think it might be well to take the new authority granted by the Douglas amendment and the authority granted by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and see if those two amendments do not give us all the administration we need with respect to wetbacks. I believe they do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first, I want to congratulate——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield whatever time the Senator from New Mexico needs to complete any interrogation or comments he may wish to make.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Under the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, could the officers go in at any time of the day or night?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no restriction whatever on them.

Mr. LANGER. They could go in at midnight and ask anything they wanted to ask?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so. I know how the Senator from North Dakota is always sympathetic to the cause of labor, but I think he would agree with me that we have to proceed more or less slowly in these matters. We have already made a great step forward in the bill. I commend the spirit of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Illinois in trying to work out this question. I commend the Senator from Oregon for not opposing the amendment or pleading with the Senator from Illinois to withdraw his amendment. I know troubles can come to the program, and I want to say to the Senator from Minnesota that if it does not work out properly, both he and I, God willing, will be in the Senate a year from now, and I shall lend support to him if it has not worked out well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New Mexico on his fair-mindedness, and to ask whether the Senator from Minnesota is not correct in his fear that at present immigration officers may lack legal authority to enter farms and ranches or other enclosed land to inspect or search for aliens who have entered illegally. They now have authority to enter private property if they have a warrant, or without a warrant if a deportable alien is on the property and is likely to escape, but I do not think it is equally within their authority to enter farms and ranches to hunt for aliens who have entered the country illegally. That is the fear that is in my mind.

Mr. ANDERSON. What has happened in regard to searches is what has so incensed farmers along the border. The immigration officers do not have the authority to search, but that does not prevent them in the slightest from making searches. Farmers protest. I should like to have the subject treated on the basis suggested by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Oregon. If that does not work, we shall have to try something else. I am not asking the Senator from Minnesota to withdraw his amendment. I am going to be compelled to vote against it, because it can hurt what I think is otherwise a good program. My desire is to have wetbacks prevented from working within the United States. There are many employers—Senators know of many of them—who try to work out their problems decently with fair wages, and I think they should have a chance to have a bill that will work properly.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. In my opinion, we shall never get the wetback problem solved along the border if we handcuff the persons charged with the duty of doing the job. If they cannot go where the wetbacks are and determine who they are and how many there are, there will be no enforcement of the law. Very often we provide penalties that are too heavy, so that the law is not enforced. This amendment gives to the employers who desire to take advantage of a special privilege granted them along the border the right to do so. That is where the wetback problem is found. They must agree, if they are going to take labor from across the border, that they will permit the officers of the United States to determine the question. It is a sound provision, in my opinion, and I shall support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt. The Chair will ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to be recorded as voting in favor of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the word "already" and insert in lieu thereof the word "legally."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I was almost persuaded that the Senator from Minnesota had a better amendment than I had, and I have almost persuaded him that I have a better amendment than he has. We are trying only to straighten out a provision which might be misinterpreted. I believe the adoption of my amendment would help greatly in the proper administration of the law. I know the hour is late, and I do not care to discuss the amendment in great detail. I think everyone is familiar with the problem that is posed. I hope the chairman of the committee will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if I were to choose, I should prefer the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota because it conforms more to the amendment adopted by the committee. I hope that is agreeable to my distinguished friend.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I shall modify my amendment to conform to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLENDER. To that I have no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are being so kind to one another that it reminds me of Alphonse and Gaston, or whoever the duo were. There is a difference between the two amendments. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota would check on those persons who illegally entered the United States, who had gained illegal entrance, strictly at the entrance points.

The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico not only checks them on illegal entrance, but checks on those who illegally remain. I say his is a more inclusive amendment. It only goes to prove that there is no substitute for legislative experience. I saw only the edges of the proposition, and the Senator from New Mexico saw the entire picture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I absolutely cannot resist that kind of temptation. I insist upon the original language of my amendment. I shall not take the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. I ask the chairman of the committee if he will take my amendment to conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], as modified.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, Mr. President, not as modified. I left my amendment as it was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico did not modify his amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in that situation I cannot agree to take the amendment to conference. The question was thoroughly discussed in Mexico City, and what we are trying to accomplish is: if there are some Mexicans who have legally entered the United States, but whose contract has expired, to make provision whereby they can be recontracted. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would permit

that being done, whereas, if we adopted the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, it would be necessary for all Mexicans whose contracts had expired to go back to Mexico, and reenter before they could be recontracted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand, then, that it is because of contractual obligations to Mexico that the Senator prefers the Humphrey amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then, Mr. President, I modify my amendment, and will use the language contained in the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator realizes, does he not, that he is taking the language which is less comprehensive.

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that, but I also realize that the Senator from Louisiana went to Mexico when some of the others of us refused to go, and worked hard, and accomplished as fine a result as has been accomplished in this field in a long time.

I wish to commend him for saying that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is preferable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment, as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 22, after the word "in", it is proposed to insert the following: "by virtue of legal entry."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "O," of April 25, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The legislative clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract American workers for such employment at terms and conditions of employment comparable to those offered to foreign workers."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the language of the amendment is self-expressive and self-defining. It provides that reasonable efforts shall be made to attract American workers, at terms and conditions of employment comparable to those offered to foreign workers. In essence, this is the crux of the bill. As has been pointed out by the Senator from New Mexico, the measure which is being sponsored by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is a decided advance. I have indicated again and again to the chairman of the committee that I feel it is a substantial advance in the field of our relationships with Mexico on the whole subject of migratory labor.

However, Mr. President, I am sure that all of us are justly concerned about the standards of employment and working conditions of our own domestic labor supply. As has been pointed out today and on other days during the debate on the pending bill, certain of its provisions in some instances would give the Mexican worker advantages far beyond those granted to domestic workers. I would not deny such advantages to the Mexican worker. I think he ought to have them. I think we are dealing with a great humanitarian service. We are trying to lift his standard of living and his standard of working conditions. However, I feel that as we do such things for the Mexican workers we should provide the same advantages to our own workers. Likewise, I think that before the Secretary of Labor or anyone else makes certification for the importation of foreign labor we ought to be certain that the source of American labor has been fully exhausted, at least to the point where domestic workers could meet the employment requirement.

So I say the amendment is fundamentally expressing the will of the Senate, which I think it is fair to describe as not wishing to discriminate against domestic workers.

There is, of course, no such thing as an absolute shortage of manpower. Shortages of manpower are relative to the terms and conditions of employment offered. It may surprise Members of this body to learn that the report of the President's Commission makes the fact extremely clear that domestic workers are offered less advantageous terms and conditions of employment than are offered to foreign workers. I wish to emphasize that fact. Despite all the hue and cry which is being made about the working conditions of the foreign workers—and they are bad—the fact is that the working conditions of domestic migratory workers in terms of employment are even more sad and despairing than those of the foreign workers. Mexicans are guaranteed minimum employment. The Mexican contract guarantees employment for 75 percent of the contract period, which frequently is 6 months. The Puerto Rican contracts guarantee 160 hours of employment in each 4-week period. The employment guarantee for workers from the British West Indies is in terms of minimum earnings. They are guaranteed minimum earnings of $25 in each 2-week period.

The striking finding of the President's Commission, from the 12 hearings, which were held across the country, is that domestic workers are not characteristically offered such employment guarantees. In only one instance did the Commission receive testimony indicating that the terms and conditions of employment offered to foreign and Puerto Rican workers were offered to domestic workers, though in two or three other instances it did find contracts offered to domestic workers in less advantageous terms. The most important of the differences in terms and conditions of employment is the employment guarantee.

Mr. President, I shall not burden the RECORD with an extended discussion of the subject, because my friend, the chairman of the committee, is thoroughly familiar with the facts on the migratory labor problem. Everyone who has participated in the debate is in essence a student of the problem. At least he has spent some time and effort to dig out the facts.

If adopted, my amendment would provide, first, that reasonable efforts shall be made to attract American workers. In other words, we shall not legislate a discriminatory pattern against American workers who are available for the job. Secondly, employment shall be at terms and conditions of employment comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Mr. President, I submit that no one would want to give to people who were imported into the country better working conditions than are given to our own American citizens, who are taxpayers of our country, who are called upon to defend our country, who exercise their duties of citizenship, and who perform their duties of community work and community leadership.

In other words, the amendment would make crystal clear to millions of people in America that as we legislate to alleviate employment conditions for foreign workers we do not legislate against our own brothers and sisters and our fellow citizen in the continental limits of the United States of America. We would give to our American citizens at least equal treatment with foreign workers. We would be giving a written guaranty to the American worker that he would be given as fair and equitable treatment in terms of employment and working conditions as are extended to the worker who is imported from Mexico. He would be given an opportunity to fill the job. If he cannot fill the job we will go to a foreign country—in this instance to Mexico—to find laborers who can fill it. I believe it is a patently fair request of Congress. It certainly seems eminently fair in terms of our domestic labor supply.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Would it mean, for example, that a farmer in Minnesota would have to give a guaranty to a migratory laborer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it does not mean that at all. I may say to my friend from North Dakota, that first of all it means that before anyone in Minnesota, South Dakota, or North Dakota could import any Mexican laborer every reasonable effort shall have been made to find the necessary labor supply in our own States. I think no one would deny that it should be done. Secondly, it means that the American worker at least ought to get as much pay, as good housing, and as good medical treatment as is supplied to a foreign worker who is imported into the country.

Mr. LANGER. Would it have to be in writing?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it would merely establish a number of standards.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, it says much, but it does not mean anything?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it means something.

Mr. LANGER. What does it mean?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It means that every means must be exhausted to find out whether or not there is available a domestic labor supply. Secondly, the American worker shall not be compelled to work under conditions less favorable than those under which a Mexican worker labors. The amendment can be given meaning in terms of medical care, type of employment, length of employment, wages, hours of work, housing, and all the other factors entering into the employment of foreign migratory workers.

Mr. LANGER. Let us take Mr. X, who is a farmer. He wants to employ some Mexican laborers in his sugar-beet fields. What must he do in order to get American labor? Must he advertise in newspapers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He would go to his employment office. Perhaps he would go to his newspaper. His major source of supply would be through the farm placement service of his State employment agency.

Mr. LANGER. If he finds all the American labor he needs to work in his sugar-beet fields, must he make some sort of a written contract with his workers, saying, for example, that the workers shall have 160 hours of work?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be a good thing to do. However, it is not mandatory.

Mr. LANGER. It is not mandatory?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. It is an effort to establish a standard. It is an effort to provide that before contracts can be let in an area, such as in Minnesota or North Dakota, first of all the Secretary of Labor shall declare that there a labor shortage exists. It means that there must be examination within that area to determine whether there is a domestic labor supply. Then it says to the prospective employer that at least the American worker has the right to expect conditions of employment which are as favorable as those given to the foreign worker.

Mr. LANGER. Under the Senator's amendment would the American worker get what he expects?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That I cannot say. I will say to my friend from North Dakota that if the American people got from the laws of the land what they expected, we would have fewer complaints.

Mr. LANGER. Under the Senator's amendment would the American worker get what he expects?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is not guaranteed it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I dislike to oppose my distinguished friend from Minnesota again, but I believe that Senators realize that it is to the advantage of the American farmer to hire local help if he can get it, because he does not have to pay the expenses of transportation and other expenses which must be paid in the case of a Mexican worker.

Sometime ago during this debate it was stated that under the terms of the bill efforts would not be made to obtain the services of all available domestic labor. I wish to point out to my good friend from North Dakota the provisions in section 503 of the bill:

> No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Director of State Employment Security for such area has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

I believe that domestic workers are protected by that language. If we should adopt the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota it would mean that before the Secretary of Labor could certify that a Mexican worker is needed it would have to be shown that a domestic worker was offered everything offered to the Mexican worker—that is, his transportation, subsistence, housing, insurance against occupational risks, and everything of that kind. If the Senate is desirous of destroying this measure, it can simply adopt the pending amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not true that in the discussion of the bill in the committee we tried to make it advantageous to use domestic labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly.

Mr. ANDERSON. We wanted it to cost more for an employer to use foreign labor. He must provide insurance, housing, transportation, and other expenses. So he would try to use domestic labor. Would not this amendment destroy the very purpose we tried to accomplish? Would it not destroy the differential?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know that the Senator would care to comment, but the first part of the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota reads:

> And (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract American workers for such employment—

Then follows language which makes the provision unworkable, namely—

> at terms and conditions of employment comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

The American worker would have to be offered transportation to a border point. He would have to be given subsistence, burial expenses, and other allowances. This amendment would take him completely out from under the workmen's compensation laws and social security laws. I believe that we would be doing a great injustice to domestic workers by adopting this amendment, which would require that they be given the same privileges as are given foreign workers. Therefore it would be made just as attractive and advantageous to an employer to employ a foreign worker or a man from Mexico.

I know that the Senator from Minnesota is interested in the American workingman. I hope he will see that there is a very decided advantage to the American workingman in having a situation in which it costs more to bring in a worker from Mexico, because of the extra expense involved. Under such conditions the employer will try to use domestic workers, as he should do.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I tried to point out a moment ago. I am glad to have the distinguished Senator from New Mexico bring out that point.

The only reason why the Mexican worker is being given all these extras is that the Mexican Government is insisting upon it for its own nationals. As the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has pointed out, the bill would make it more expensive for an American employer to hire Mexicans. Therefore, his inclination would be to employ domestic labor in preference to foreign labor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the Mexican Government has been most vigilant in its attention to the needs of its own nationals. The Mexican Government insists on certain protections being written into the law for the benefit of its own people. What the junior Senator from Minnesota is attempting to say—possibly with not too much clarity—is that if the Mexican Government can get our delegation to agree to protect the nationals of Mexico, I think we ought to do a little toward protecting the nationals of the United States.

Perhaps my language in this amendment is too stringent, too restrictive, or too comprehensive. I am open to suggestions as to any modification which would tend in any way to make it more palatable or acceptable.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I believe that the language which is now in the bill, and to which I have referred on many occasions on this floor, is sufficient to protect domestic workers. As I have pointed out many times, the Secretary of Labor, who is to administer the law, must make two determinations. First, he must determine that there is not sufficient domestic labor available; and secondly, that the wages paid to the Mexican labor will not in any manner affect the wages paid domestic workers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On that point I think we can come to some agreement.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me that that language is sufficient protection. I grant to my good friend from Minnesota that we may have gone a little far in agreeing to what the Mexican Government was demanding. However, the Mexican Government has had some experience in the past; and from that experience have come these new ideas as to how the contract should be formulated.

I may state to my good friend that there is nothing to prevent an American worker from asking for the same terms and conditions as are given to Mexican laborers. The Senator understands that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The only reason why we have incorporated such a provision in this bill is that that is the only way by which we can obtain these workers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make a suggestion which may reconcile the apparent differences between the Senator from Minnesota on the one hand and the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from New Mexico on the other.

The objections by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from New Mexico seem to be addressed to the words "and conditions of employment comparable to those offered to foreign workers" in line 4 of the amendment. The Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from New Mexico are afraid that this language might be used to require the meeting of transportation costs of domestic workers, sickness costs, and so forth.

If we were to strike the words "and conditions of employment" and substitute the phrase "of wages and hours," the language would then read:

> And (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract American workers for such employment at terms of wages and hours comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

That would eliminate the need for meeting transportation costs, health payments, and so forth, and would merely mean that an employer could not import foreign workers unless domestic workers received equal wages and did not work longer hours.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. That could mean that an employer would have to guarantee the domestic worker work for at least three-fourths of the time covered by the contract whether he worked or not. In other words, suppose the employer employs him for 2 months. Whether the employee works or not, the employer would have to guarantee him three-fourths of the time at whatever pay is agreed on. That was one of the conditions we had to agree to in the agreement made with the Mexican Government, for the reason that the Mexican workers come from afar, spend a good deal of time on the way, and an agreement had to be made that if the contract was, let us say, for 4 months, the workers would be guaranteed at least 3 months of employment; otherwise, it would not pay them to come here. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, it would be necessary to extend the same conditions to the domestic worker, which would be most costly.

I believe the domestic worker is thoroughly protected under section 503 of the bill, which I have read time and again. I repeat, it is to the advantage of the employer to hire local labor because it is cheaper in the long run. I repeat what the Senator from New Mexico said a moment ago, that all the conditions which are imposed with respect to the employment of Mexican labor make the costs so high that it discourages an American employer from employing a Mexican rather than an American worker.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator refers to the possibility of local labor being able to fulfill employment needs. As a matter of fact, the supply of migrant domestic workers is not always adequate locally. There is a group of domestic labor which travels from one side of the country to the other, and at times it would be necessary to go very far away, to the other side of the Nation, to obtain employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I had a talk with Mr. Don Larin of the Farm Placement Service of the United States Employment Service. I am sure the Senator knows him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I asked him to write me a memorandum as to what efforts were made to determine that domestic workers were not available. This is what he wrote:

> Statements have been made during this debate that sufficient domestic labor is available for agricultural employment if proper recruitment efforts were to be made. The requirements of the United States Employment Service, before it will certify to the unavailability of domestic labor, are specific. These indicate very clearly the efforts involved before any certification for the importation of foreign labor will be made.

Listen to this:

> First, every employer must file an order with a local employment office requesting domestic labor. The local office searches its files for qualified workers, and if unable to recruit the labor on the basis of its records, resorts to other recruitment devices which commonly include use of the press and radio.
>
> When the local office has been unsuccessful in its own jurisdiction, it originates a clearance order which will reach every office in the State before the effort is extended beyond State lines. Each local office attempts to recruit the needed labor.
>
> If there is no labor supply within the State, the State office of the employment service sends the order to adjoining States, where it goes to local offices thought to have a potential supply of labor. Those local offices recruit labor through the use of their own files and by other recruitment devices.
>
> Should adjoining States be unable to furnish the labor, the order goes to a regional office of the United States Employment Service, which sends the order to other States which may have a potential supply of labor.
>
> If the regional office first receiving the order and adjoining regions cannot locate a source of labor supply the order is transmitted to the Washington headquarters, who transmit the order to distant States which may have a potential labor supply.
>
> In every instance recruitment effort is made to secure domestic workers who are qualified and available and willing to accept employment offered.

It strikes me that if the employment service goes through all that procedure or any similar to it, there ought to be sufficient protection to domestic labor. Added to the argument I submitted a while ago, it should be plain that domestic workers will have first preference.

As I have stated, I believe that the committee has provided sufficient protection for domestic workers, and, I repeat, the only reason why we have imposed other restrictions, for instance, such as those relating to insurance against occupational risks, lodging and transportation, and other matters, is because it is the only way by which we can obtain Mexican labor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In my effort to be an honest broker and adjust the differences between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Louisiana, I wonder if the following modifying language might not be acceptable to the chairman of the committee, namely, after the word "at" in line 4, to have the remainder of the line read: "wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers."

This would remove any requirement for a minimum guaranty of employment. It would provide merely that the hourly rate, the standard hours per week, would be comparable to those guaranteed to foreign labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would the Senator's amendment then read?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would then read:

> Reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

This would remove the question of the guaranty, it would remove the transportation payments, it would remove the health payments, it would remove the requirements for lodging. But it would provide that domestic workers could not be worked more hours a week or at lower wages an hour than apply to foreign workers.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my distinguished friend that I do not have any objection to the language he has suggested, if it is agreeable to my good friend from Minnesota. It strikes me that it is already covered in the bill, so in my opinion it would be duplication, but if it will satisfy the Senator from Minnesota, I have no objection to the amendment as modified by the language suggested by the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. In anouncing that he will be satisfied with the modified wording, the Senator from Louisiana does not propose to enlarge the requirements placed upon the individual farmer in any way, does he?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, the Senator does not propose to substitute new and required activities by the farmer for the activities now performed by the employment service?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It would simply provide that the domestic worker is offered the same minimum wages and standard hours of work as is given the Mexican under the individual work contract.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And wages per hour.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am more than happy to accept the modification proposed by the Senator from Illinois. I think it clarifies and details what is the intent of the Senator from Louisiana. I want that clarification. I want that detailed outlining, because if

there is one field of employment where all the skulduggery in the world has ever been worked, it is in this field of labor supply in the vast stretches of our land. I merely want to see the people of our own Nation given a fair chance to make a living. I am surprised to find that the Government of Mexico can extort from us more protection for their people than we give to our own people. I am glad we have this amendment perfected. I merely wanted to say a word for citizens of the United States, and at the same time pay tribute to the Republic of Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract American workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of employment——

Mr. DOUGLAS. It should read "standard hours of work."

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. "Standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], as modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one moment. Is the word "American" changed to "domestic"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from Illinois changed the word "American" to "domestic."

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the copy I have the word "American" had been eliminated, and the word "domestic" had been inserted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the way it ought to be.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It should read "domestic" workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator further modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I further modify the amendment by striking out the word "American" and substituting the word "domestic."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified accordingly. Without objection, the amendment, as modified, is agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment 4-27-51—B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike the semicolon and add the following: "to be employed at a wage no less than the current prevailing wage rate for the crop and area."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not believe the amendment needs any explanation. It is almost within the text or pattern of the amendment the Senate has just adopted. But I understand the Senator from Louisiana to have said that the workers are protected by the agreement made with the Republic of Mexico. Again, since that is in the agreements which are based on the negotiation at Mexico City, I am merely one of those who would like to see it spelled out in statutory law.

So the purpose, which is self-evident, is that farm workers, both domestic and foreign, are to be employed at wages not less than those prevailing in the area for the particular crop. In this connection we are not talking about factory labor or skilled labor, but we are talking about the prevailing rate of wages paid for labor on a particular crop in a particular area. The amendment is very specific and clear; it merely provides that there shall be equality as between foreign and domestic farm workers, in respect to the wage rate; and in respect to the foreign farm workers, the amendment relates only to Mexican farm workers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, again I hesitate to take issue with my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota. However, as I pointed out during the debate a few days ago, the contract which at the present time is entered into between the employer and the Mexican laborer provides for the payment of the prevailing wage as a minimum wage. It often happens that the wage is fixed in the contract itself; that is, it is written into the contract.

I fear that if the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is adopted, it will mean that a great deal of red tape will be involved in connection with determining what that rate is and in determining the extent of the area which must be taken into consideration in fixing the wage rate.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, I wish to ask a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well; I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would not it be almost impossible to determine what the wage should be? In a given community tractor drivers might be receiving a very high wage, whereas workers in other types of farm work might be working under quite different wage scales. So it seems to me it would be almost impossible to determine the average wage.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not say it would be impossible to determine it, but that determination would entail a great deal of red tape.

At the present time a canvass is made in a locality to determine what the prevailing wage is for farm workers. After that is determined, it is certified by the United States Employment Service as the prevailing wage, and that wage is written into the contract itself, as a rule.

I say it is important for us to pursue the method which is now in effect, for the reason that under the terms of this bill the United States government, acting through the Department of Labor, will guarantee payment of that wage to the employee. Since payment will be guaranteed and since the contract will be entered into between the employee and the employer, it will be an easy matter to determine what amount is due the Mexican worker from the employer; and therefore, in case of controversy, the amount due the worker will be known then and there, by means of the terms of the contract itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recognize that the Senator has made a very clear explanation of the contractual relationships which exist between the employer and the employee. I also recognize that under the terms of the agreement with the Republic of Mexico, the Government of the United States has taken on certain obligations for the fulfillment of the contract. However, as yet I have not seen a copy of the over-all printed agreement. Has the Senator put one into the RECORD?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I have not yet done so, but I intend to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure it will be placed in the RECORD before the end of this debate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Government of the United States assumes the obligation of seeing that the prevailing wages are paid under the contractual relationships, in accordance with the law of the land—which will be respected by all law-abiding citizens—it will be just that much easier for law-abiding citizens to make contracts that are to be fulfilled on the basis of the prevailing wage. In other words, the Senator from Louisiana is predicating his case on the contractual relationship between the employer and the employee; but what I am predicating my case on, in terms of the wage standards for a particular crop area and for a particular crop, is statutory law.

I am just foolish enough to believe that statutory law is more impressive and is more likely to be lived up to, or is likely to be lived up to a little better, than a contractual relationship between a Mexican employee who is a farm worker and an American employer.

I gather that there is very little difference, if any, between our objectives, because I know that the Senator from Louisiana wishes to have included in this measure every bit of protection which possibly can be included in it for the Mexican worker as well as for the American worker and the American employer. Since there is so little difference between our objectives, I submit to the Senator from Louisiana the fact that if such a provision is enacted into law, it will be a better guaranty of a sounder wage structure in a particular area and for a particular crop than will the precarious type of contract which may be reached between an employer and an employee who is a Mexican national.

I wish the Senator would give this very serious consideration, because this has a great effect upon the American domestic labor market, and has a great effect upon the individual worker who comes into our country from beyond our borders.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am convinced that the committee had that very argument in mind when we considered this bill. I repeat what I have often said, that under section 503, I am satisfied that the domestic worker is amply protected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Florida as much time as he desires.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not care to speak on this matter at length, but I do think that the adoption of this amendment would bring an additional trouble-making factor into the picture. I hope that the Senator from Minnesota will follow me carefully on this. I call to his attention the fact that it is not in the place where he proposes to put this amendment, but in section 503, on page 4, that this particular objective is cared for; and it is cared for in a much more adequate way and in a much clearer way than would be done through this amendment. I call his attention to the fact that section 503 provides that—

No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the director of State employment security for such area—

This has been changed, of course, as to the officer who makes the determination—

has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

However, I think that, if placed in the bill at the place where the Senator's amendment is proposed to place it, there will be brought into the bill an entirely new concept; that is, the definition of "areas," a word which is not at all defined in the bill, whereas the section from which I have read, section 503, makes it very clear that it is the very time and place where the work is to be performed that governs.

I am not familiar with the Mexican labor problem, but I am familiar with the use of Bahaman and Jamaican labor, and if the Senator will bear with me, I should like to give him this fact, which I am sure applies in greater or less degree in other areas of the country. We have on the east coast of Florida certain areas, for instance, the Miami vicinity, where labor brought in from the Bahamas, which is employed on our farms, has to be paid more money than would be paid 25 or 50 miles away from there, because it competes very definitely with the very highly paid labor which works in the tourist resorts, whereas, if it were 40 or 50 miles away from those tourist centers, in a place that very conceivably might be held by the Labor Department to be the same area, there is a different situation entirely and a different scale of pay. It is for that reason that I think the wording already included in the bill, in section 503, is much the more acceptable, because it provides that it is the rate of pay at the time and place where the work is to be performed that shall govern and I think it is much better cared for there.

I call to the attention of the Senator and of the Senate the fact that we have repeatedly had trouble from administrators of these labor measures, in the definition of "area." We have had it under the Wages and Hours Act. The Senator from Florida brought, as he understands, the first litigation which was brought under the "area of production" regulation, a regulation which was put out by the wage-and-hour department; and the Senator will remember that that term "area of production" has been in conflict and confusion ever since the act was passed.

Only recently the Senator from Florida has had a similar experience. We have a branch of the Department of Labor—with which the Senator from Florida is not finding fault at this time, but is simply using as an illustration—in connection with the determination of what are the standard rates paid to journeymen carpenters in a certain area, and the Department has included within the area not only the highly urbanized area of Miami but for many miles up the coast, so as to bring about a result which is not at all in accord with the facts, that the same standards are applied in a small community, 50 or 75 miles away, as those which apply in to urban area.

The Senator from Florida hopes that no double standard will be written into the bill in this way, but that instead, the very words, which have been approved of by the officials who have drawn this bill, will be left to fix the standard against which this particular bill will be measured.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me how many Mexicans are fighting in Korea?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not able to say. I may say that I am not familiar with the Mexican problem, and I may remind the Senator that I have repeatedly said in the course of this debate that the average foreign worker employed in the eastern part of the United States, and the governments representing the workers who come in—that is, workers from the Bahamas and from Jamaica—as is known to the Senator from Florida, and, as he understands, also, with respect to those who come in from Canada, though this is not known to him personally, they prefer not to have any regulation or control, because the farmers are paying the cost themselves, and they are working along in complete unity with each other, and they prefer to have that type of handling, so I am not able to answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but it seems to me that our farm boys are being taken and sent to Korea, after which the Department of Labor certifies that there is a labor shortage in the United States, and, therefore, Mexicans are brought in to take the places of the farm boys who are fighting in Korea. As a matter of fact, the Mexicans have no quota—at least, they are filling no quota in the United Nations in Korea, at all. I ask my friend whether that is not true.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not able to state as of this time, but during the period of World War II, at which time the Senator from Florida was at the head of the administration of selective service in his own State of Florida, the matter was left to the local selective-service boards to exempt agricultural laborers on the basis of whether they were needed by the Nation to remain in production; and I may say to the Senator that it is the understanding of the Senator from Florida that this measure helps to hold up the hands not only of our boys who are fighting in Korea, but of our Armed Forces wherever they are, and of our Allies, who are looking to us for heavier food production, to make it very sure that there will not be a deficiency of workmen on the farm.

In conclusion, because I intended to be heard only briefly, I want to remind every Senator that the local labor is always most satisfactory and cheapest in the long run, which is easiest to work with, which speaks the same language as the employer. There is a particularly personal and friendly relation as a rule which applies on the farm, which is not expected in industrial relations, between employer and employee, and it is simply idle to talk about bringing in these outside people, unless there is a real need for them, and, even though I think it is hardly needed, there is a safeguard provided by the law itself, that there must be a certificate from a branch of the United States Government entrusted with the responsibility of looking into it, that, at the time and place—at the very time and place, and for that particular crop, because conditions may vary with different crops even in the same place and at the same time, that there is a shortage of labor, and that the shortage must be supplied from and furnished by a source outside the Nation.

I hope the Senator will not insist upon his amendment, because I sincerely feel that to do so would bring a dual standard into the act, which will make for greater confusion and difficulty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator would accept the word "place" instead of the word "area." I recognized the difficulty that we have had under the "area" definition, or a definition of what is known as an "economic or employment area."

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida feels that, if the amendment is to be used, it should be used exactly in the same words as it appears in section 503; but, if so used, he thinks there would not be any improvement of the act, because it is section 503 which is applicable to this particular provision. If the Senator wants to restate those words and put the language in the amendment——

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida would then have no objection; but he calls attention to the fact that it then becomes duplication and reiteration, and it is meaningless, though, after all, that is much preferable to having confusion, and to having two terms in the bill which might and very probably

would be construed as meaning different things, or be construed by different administrative employees as meaning different things. So the Senator from Florida hopes that his friend, the Senator from Minnesota, will not insist upon his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the language of section 503, to which he refers, and which particularly affects the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. The language says:

> The employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

In other words, the language there means that the wages and working conditions of domestic workers shall not be pushed down. The language of the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota takes into consideration the fact that there are certain established prevailing wages in a community; that there are some people who pay less than the prevailing wage in the community, and there are always some who are getting very rich at the expense of someone else. The language of the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota says that no contracts may be arrived at or entered into which do not at least pay the prevailing wage for a particular group, in a particular place. I think that is a very important provision, because I do not think we ought to permit contracts with foreign labor to implement the downward pressures on domestic labor standards in a particular area.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that, though I have no experience with Mexican labor, I have learned from actual experience with imported labor and our domestic labor that there is no fixed standard, but that the standard tends to change from time to time during the season. If the price for citrus fruit goes up very heavily, the workers find it out and insist on having a little greater share for their labor. If the prices of vegetables in the Lake Okeechobee area go up, the same thing takes place. From week to week there will be variations in a particular season and place. So, it seems to the Senator from Florida that it is a much sounder course to leave in the act the wording which is already there.

I may say that while I have been speaking, the Senator from Louisiana has handed me an individual work contract which I understand he will insert in the RECORD. I notice that it is in two languages, both English and Spanish. He may want to insert it only in its English version. Section 4 deals with the payment of wages. I have not had a chance to read it, but, with the approval of the Senator from Minnesota, I shall read it into the RECORD. This is a provision incorporated in the actual contract:

> 4. Payment of wages. The employer shall pay the worker the prevailing wage rate paid to domestic agricultural workers for similar work and in the manner paid within the area of employment, or the rate specified on the last page of this contract, whichever is the greater. Where higher wages are paid for specialized tasks, such as the operation of vehicles or machinery, Mexican workers shall be paid such wages while assigned to such tasks.

That is an excerpt taken from the contract existing between the Mexican Government and the American Government and to be made applicable to individual Mexican employees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does that apply to every single contract that may be entered into?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is enforceable by the United States Department of Labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the present situation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. It can be modified if both Governments agree to it, but I am satisfied that the Mexican Government will insist on writing into the new contract the same provisions that were contained in the former contract. I want to say to the Senator that during the hearings in Mexico City we went over parts of the proposed contract, and they insisted on putting into the new contract the same clause.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota is likewise insistent, since there is an opportunity for a quick exit from the agreement, since there is an opportunity for modification, that in this proposed legislation, which will soon become law, we write the requirement of prevailing wages for the crop and in the area or the place involved, because it is perfectly obvious that this is not at the present time stamped, sealed, and delivered; it is still in the stage of negotiation. There is still an opportunity for some modification or change.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator realizes that if in the future the terms of the contract on this point are modified by agreement between the two countries, we shall have to change the law. I am insisting that we not incorporate the provisions of the contract into the law. Let the contract be handled in the same manner as it has been handled in the past.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the Senator from Louisiana must feel that I am being a little bit stubborn on these issues, and I think I owe him an explanation. If there has ever been one area of American employment which has been subjected to a complete exposé in the past year or two, it has been in the field of domestic and foreign labor in American agriculture. I have read in Look mazazine an exposé that should make every American ashamed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was on the wetback problem, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I have read in the New York Times and in newspapers on the West Coast articles which have exposed things that have been going on in the San Joaquin Valley. The President's Commission on Migratory Labor has given us a great deal of information. The Senator from Minnesota has put up this little effort today for a reason. I digress to say that it does not primarily affect my own State. Everyone knows that the bulk of the migratory labor does not go to the family-size farm. It does not go to Grandpa and Grandma who are raising a few cattle and chickens, and trying to make a living on a small farm. Migratory labor goes to the big fruit and vegetable farms, the big commercial farms, which are a repudiation of the family-size farms. They go to commercial farming areas in the Imperial Valley in California, and in other places.

So, Mr. President, I am a little bit suspicious. I cannot believe that it is all so lovely when I know that the migratory workers who come into our country, and also our own migratory workers, will have the most miserable working conditions. They live under the worst conditions. Without reference to my home State, in which there is a very decent standard of living and where we take good care of persons who work on the farms, and in the factories, the junior Senator from Minnesota just happens to feel that after all the exposé that has been made about traffic in human misery, I owe it to my conscience and to the Congress to try to put up a little struggle to make this bill a better one. When I see the words "prevailing wages in a particular crop and a particular area," I say to myself, "What can be wrong about that? If it is in the contract, let us put it into the law, because it is already patently clear that it may not be in the contract." There are some very shrewd operators in this country when it comes to making a quick and fancy dollar off someone's labor. The junior Senator from Minnesota wants to make sure that the operators who have never been an honor to American agriculture, but are exploiters of the soil and exploiters of humanity, will not be given a chance to exploit with congressional sanction. I am suspicious of those people; I make no bones about that. I think their record up to this time condemns them as having trafficked in human misery.

Mr. President, I want to pay my compliments to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who made a brilliant fight on the floor with reference to the whole problem. He went further than I have gone. I say the bill is an improvement over what we had, and for that reason I commend the chairman of the committee. But when there has been a record of trafficking in humankind, when there has been a record as bad as that which we have had in terms of migratory labor, the Congress cannot be too careful.

I have other amendments. I shall not call them up, because I recognize the fact that many of them will not be agreed to, and I do not want to engage in a fruitless search for an extra vote just to have another chance to make another 10- or 15-minute talk on an amendment. But, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Management and Relationships—and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had a perfect right to go into it, so far as it applied to Mexican workers—I know the migratory labor supply needs to be checked thoroughly, not only in terms of the law, but in terms of conscience, in terms of fair play for fellow Americans.

So, Mr. President, I relieve the tension of my friends and associates by saying that I shall not bring up any more amendments. I have several more at hand. I merely want to say that they were discussed in my minority views. I think they make sense. I hope the Secretary of Labor will administer the law on the basis of some examination of the need; and I commend the reading of the minority views to the Senators who are going to cast their vote on this important bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator be agreeable to inserting in place of the word "area" the words "at the time and place where the work is to be performed"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I accept that modification. I wish to thank the Senator from Florida. I think it is very appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may the amendment as modified be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike out the semicolon, and add the following: "to be employed at a wage no less than the current prevailing rate for the crop at the time and place where the work is to be performed."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Florida, who has been a great help in making this a better bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the words of the Senator. So far as Florida is concerned, there is not a single Mexican laborer, so far as he knows, that comes there. But we want the bill to be a sound one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With the legal talent and the fine spirit of justice and fair play possessed by the Senator from Florida and my friend the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Illinois, who have worked to make this bill a better bill, along with the firm but temperate judgment and resistance, at times, of the Senator from Louisiana, who has had the responsibility for the bill, and with my pushing and shoving, I think we have done fairly well, and I want to thank my friends.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, after that eulogy, may the clerk again read the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I meant to commend the Senator from Nebraska, too; I really did.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Everyone has now been commending. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield time to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I merely ask that the amendment be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will again state the amendment, as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike the semicolon and add the following: "to be employed at a wage no less than the current prevailing wage rate for the crop at the time and place where the work is to be performed."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to take at this time 1 minute of the time allotted to me on the bill itself. I am entitled to do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, are we to vote on the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. First I desire to say, on behalf of the committe, that I shall oppose the amendment as modified. As I tried to indicate a moment ago, the contracts entered into between employers in our country and employees from Mexico requires that the prevailing wage shall be paid as a minimum. Furthermore, it often happens that in most cases the actual wage is fixed in the contracts themselves. When it comes to an interpretation of a contract in order to determine how much liability exists as between an employer and a worker, all that is necessary is to consult the contract. It is not necessary to go into questions which must be determined by public hearings.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to reject the amendment for the further reason that if in the future it should be necessary in any way to modify the present contract, particularly with reference to wages, it would be necessary to amend the law itself so as to permit future agreements to be entered into between our Government and the Government of Mexico. I plead with Senators not to attempt to write parts of the individual work contract into law.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any more time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In the past, the provisions of contracts have been followed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. In other words, the manner of obtaining Mexican labor was by contract, the terms of which are agreed upon by our Government and the Mexican Government. All the terms and conditions were written into the contracts.

Mr. WHERRY. The advice of the Secretary of Labor was obtained in the writing of the contracts, was it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, but the reason for the offering of the amendment of my friend from Minnesota is an effort to protect our domestic labor.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. But I say that we have already done so under section 503.

Mr. WHERRY. If section 503 does it, why is it necessary to adopt the pending amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not necessary to do so.

That is why I am asking the Senate not to adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, as modified.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before the bill is finally passed, as I assume it will be, on behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of an amendment which he had intended to offer if he had been present, as well as a statement which he had prepared pertaining to the proposed amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from New York and an explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT INTENDED TO BE PROPOSED BY MR. LEHMAN TO THE BILL (S. 984) TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

On page 2, after the comma in line 2, insert the words "or from Puerto Rico or Hawaii."

On page 3, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "in amounts not to exceed $20 per worker."

On page 4, line 24, after the word "Mexico", insert the words "in the case of workers from Mexico."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON HIS AMENDMENT TO EXTEND THE FARM LABOR BILL TO COVER AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM PUERTO RICO AND HAWAII

The amendment which I had intended to propose had I been present in the Senate when amendments to the Farm Labor bill were being considered is designed to make sure that the many thousands of agricultural workers who are recruited and brought from Puerto Rico and Hawaii to work in the fields of the continental United States in seasonal agricultural work receive the same protection as that provided by the bill in the case of workers recruited in and brought from the Republic of Mexico. This is necessary in order to protect the wages and living standards of these workers. It is also essential to protect the wages and living conditions of local workers and to prevent unfair competitive disadvantages against the employers of such local workers.

What are the effects of my amendment? The first is that a field of useful employment will be opened up to the very large numbers of unemployed, particularly in Puerto Rico. As I pointed out in my statement to the Senate on April 27:

"There is great unemployment in Puerto Rico. There are great numbers of people on that island, which is part of the United States, who are qualified as expert farm laborers. The Federal Government contributes heavily in relief money and other Federal grants-in-aid to assist Puerto Rico to take care of these unemployed farm workers. It would seem to be the height of sound fiscal practice, as well as sound social practice, to bring Puerto Rican workers here to supply the need rather than to bring workers in from Mexico. I mean, of course, no reflection on Mexico or on the necessity of maintaining the closest of neighborly relations with that country. This, however, is not a problem in foreign relations, but a problem in agriculture and in labor conditions in our own country, including Puerto Rico."

If my amendment is agreed to, agricultural workers from Puerto Rico and Hawaii will have the benefit of the reception centers to

be established within the continental United States where they could be housed while arrangements are being made for their employment in the continental United States. Costs of transportation for these workers to these reception centers and from the centers back to their homes upon the termination of their employment would be paid by the Government, with the employer reimbursing the Government for part of such cost. Subsistence, emergency medical care and burial expense, during the period of time when they are being transported to reception centers and while at the centers would also be provided.

Of particular importance, in my opinion, is the provision under which these workers would receive assistance in negotiation for contracts for agricultural employment. They would not have to rely as they frequently do at the present time, on their own individual bargaining, but would have the assistance of the appropriate governmental agencies, just as would Mexican workers under the provisions of the bill. The Government would be required to guarantee that Puerto Rican and Hawaiian workers receive the wages and transportation to which they are entitled under their contracts of employment.

There is need for this amendment, it seems to me, because the conditions of employment of these workers in agricultural employment in the United States are in most respects similar to those under which Mexican workers are employed under the provisions of the bill. In fact, there is special need to make sure that these workers are protected since they, unlike the Mexican workers, are citizens of the United States and consideration of their welfare should come first.

I should like to point out that the effect of my amendment is limited to agricultural workers recruited from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has an amendment which would extend this bill to farm workers in the continental United States as well. While I agree with the Senator from New Mexico in the objective he seeks to accomplish—namely, to assure decent working conditions to all our migratory farm workers, domestic as well as foreign—my own amendment has a more modest purpose. Whatever one may think our policy should be when it comes to legislating fair labor standards for farm workers—and I believe that sooner or later we will have to come to grips with this problem, just as we have in the case of workers employed in our interstate industries and commerce—few can deny, I believe, that workers who come from Puerto Rico and Hawaii to work in our fields and help us harvest our crops, should have the same protection that would be extended by this bill to Mexican workers who are brought into the United States for the same purpose.

The amendment is of particular interest to employers of agricultural labor in the State which I represent, and in other sections of the East and far West. In my opinion, it is a very necessary one, and I strongly urge the Senate to agree to its adoption.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a group of letters addressed to him and one letter addressed to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], as well as one article from the Albuquerque Journal of May 3, relating to the debate on Senate bill 984.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW MEXICO STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Santa Fe, N. Mex., May 5, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator from New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of letters sent to New Mexico Representatives DEMPSEY and FERNANDEZ.

You have our wires stating our thinking and position on Senate bill 984. Would you please give study to this letter as it gives more detail of our thinking in this matter.

We will appreciate your assistance and passage of favorable amendments to Senate bill 984 and House bill 3283, the Poage bill, which will secure employment for American citizens before the importation of aliens is resorted to.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. ROBERTS,
Secretary-Treasurer, New Mexico State Federation of Labor.

MAY 5, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The affiliate members of the New Mexico State Federation of Labor, A. F. of L., are opposed to Senate bill No. 984, introduced by Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and H. R. No. 3283, the Poage bill, in their original form.

Our information is that amendments have been made to these bills to permit employment of American citizens instead of Mexican nationals on farm jobs at fair wages and conditions of employment.

We would appreciate your study, consideration, and vote in favor of the amendments which will call for exhausting the supply of labor we have in our country at fair wages and conditions of employment before any importation of labor from outside the continental limits is called for.

Our investigation in the States of New Mexico and Texas reveals that there is a large supply of farm labor available if the above-mentioned conditions are met. Also our investigation shows that these people imported are exploited by the imposition of low wages, high cost of commissary supplies, poor housing conditions, and limitations of work. And further, many of these people leave the farms illegally and infiltrate into other crafts, trade, and industries throughout the United States, which is injurious to the welfare of the laboring people in the United States of America.

We suggest that a complete survey be made in all the urban and rural districts in all States, and laboring people in these districts be contacted through sources available and a program be submitted to them by the farmers calling for fair wages and conditions of employment in the agricultural industry and provisions be made to make these workers mobile for transfer from district to district, State to State when needed.

The immobile seasonable farm worker has become a blight on the State, county, and cities in the Southwest—living in squalor and deplorable conditions injurious to the health, moral, and general welfare of our communities.

This worker is the forgotten citizen. Importation of aliens is not the solution to the problem. This is a notice to other countries that in our own country there are not sufficient people who will degrade themselves to work for such wages and under such conditions of employment. However, our Government believes or knows that our neighbors to the south will be glad to accept substandard wages and our farmers are glad to offer these conditions. And our Government is a party to this exploitation.

It is evident with farm prices set, a better standard of wages can be absorbed into farm production cost, the same as in any other enterprise, and thus remedy this situation.

The New Mexico Employment Security Commission reports employment on the increase. However, thousands of workers are registered for employment for suitable work in this State and millions of others throughout the United States of America.

Thanking you for any assistance given in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. S. ROBERTS,
Secretary-Treasurer, New Mexico State Federation of Labor.

LOVING, N. MEX., *April 10, 1951.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Herewith you will find enclosed several clippings of statements made by the Honorable President of our land, Mr. Truman.

Senator, just a few words to urge that you oppose the importation of farm laborers, for the reason that they come and work for lower wages and, furthermore, are a constant threat to the natives. The worst part of it is that the farmers treat them like the lowest possible type of people.

I have read many contracts signed by some of these workers wherein they are promised all kinds of facilities, all of which are false. There have been cases where they have been given water from the Pecos River which you know is very salty. And the most they have slept in on wintry days is the harvesting sacks which is all they possess. Also, among the immigration agents there are many who are cruel to these poor people.

Well, Senator, if you want the names of those farmers, I will be happy to send them at the moment you so request. And this is the time to do something to correct this situation, for it is now rumored here in the Pecos Valley that they are again seeking foreign workers because they are willing to work for less money. This was told to me on the 9th of April by a planter.

Awaiting your reply, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MARCELINO HERNANDEZ.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
April 28, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Allow me to congratulate you on your vigorous opposition to the importation of temporary farm laborers from Mexico.

It is impossible to improve the lot of the large segment of Spanish-speaking Americans who make their livelihood from farm labor as long as these temporary workers are allowed to be exploited.

I have seen the viciousness of such a practice in New Mexico and Texas. It takes its worst form in the cotton fields. The contracts spoken about are absolutely meaningless. The employers and their supervisors cheat these illiterate people at the scales and at the pay table. In the case of the large farms you speak of, charge accounts for food are padded and exorbitant prices charged for food.

I will be ready to give of my time and effort when you come up for reelection in 1952.

Sincerely yours,

VICENTE T. XIMENES, *Economist.*

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Any citizen, deeply concerned with the necessity of seeing to it that our own citizens are given first opportunity for employment prior to bringing in nationals of other countries, could do no other than approve and applaud your battle on the wetback issue.

I congratulate you with all my heart and hope you win.

Sincerely,
PAUL A. STRACHAN, *President.*

EASTERN SUFFOLK COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Greenport, N. Y., April 19, 1951.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: On April 9, in response to a recent inquiry I made of Commander Edelstein pertaining to farm labor, he wrote giving me the present status of certain farm-labor measures now before the Congress, also enclosing copies of the Chavez-Yorty and Ellender-Poage bills and copy of your letter dated March 15 to Senator CHAVEZ.

Today we had a meeting of our board of directors at which time we carefully considered the Chavez and Ellender bills and other data which Commander Edelstein so considerately sent along. Without exception or dissention, we fully subscribe to all of your recommendations set forth in your letter of March 15 to Senator CHAVEZ. We strongly favor the Chavez bill and just as strongly oppose the Ellender bill. It appears, even on the first reading, that Senator CHAVEZ thoroughly understands the subject matter not only from the employers' angle but also from the employees'—equal protection is afforded to all concerned.

During World War II we established two camps. In one we housed migrant labor from the South and in the other, Jamaicans and other West Indian British subjects. One year, in this camp, we housed Mexicans. Since the war we have continued to house southern migrants in the one camp and DP's or Puerto Ricans in the other camp. At all times we have satisfactorily met all Federal, State, and local regulations pertinent to migrant or foreign workers. I might add that the records will show that the Eastern Suffolk Cooperative enjoys the finest reputation of any similar organization in the State of New York.

Speaking from experience, the Chavez bill incorporates all of the provisions and regulations to which we were subject during World War II, to which we are accustomed and in which we find no hardship or objection. We have always paid our migrant and foreign workers the prevailing wage rates established in our community and will continue to do so in the future.

On behalf of the entire membership of the Eastern Suffolk Cooperative, I urge you, in no uncertain terms, to do everything in your power to insure the passage of the Chavez bill and the defeat of the Ellender bill.

I thank you for your kind and considerate cooperation and assistance.

Yours very sincerely,
JOHN LASPIA,
Member, Board of Directors.

[From the Albuquerque Journal of May 3, 1951]

IN THE CAPITAL

(By Mel Mencher)

FOREIGN MIGRATORY LABOR BAN PLAN INTERESTS STATE

SANTA FE, May 2.—The report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which recommended a ban on the use of foreign labor until all American agricultural resources are tapped, has brought several outspoken responses from New Mexico sources, who are watching with keen interest the final form of a bill now being considered by Congress. It probably will be broader than the Commission recommended.

The cotton-growing areas in the State have attacked the Commission proposal as impractical and unrealistic. But union officials and the Catholic Church in this area have applauded the findings.

The Commission found that about 1,000,000 persons make up the migratory farm labor force in this country. Of this number, some 400,000 are Mexican nationals who have entered this country illegally to obtain farm work. Usually called wetbacks because many of them swim or wade through the Rio Grande to reach the United States, this large labor battalion was the source of the Commission's major objections.

The Commission concluded that these laborers are depressing the wage scale of American workers who are without jobs or forced to take low-paying work in order to meet the competition of the wetbacks. One Commission member, Archbishop Robert Lucey, of San Antonio, said an immediate decision is necessary since agricultural work is shot through with unemployment.

But officials in Eddy and Chaves Counties don't agree. They feel the cotton crops in New Mexico will rot on the ground unless the gates are opened to Mexican labor. The chairman of the Chaves County Farm Bureau's labor committee, E. K. Patterson, said:

"I don't know what we will do if we don't get Mexican workers into Chaves County. There aren't enough machines, and local and migrant labor is entirely inadequate."

Agreeing with this stand was the Eddy County farm agent, Dallas Rierson, who said that farmers in his area would be up against it unless the Mexican nationals are permitted to work in the region.

The problem of foreign labor is fairly recent. Until the war years changed manpower conditions in the country, migratory farm workers from the Midwest were used to harvest crops in areas that had seasonal work. But with the coming of the draft and higher wages in war industries, workers left the migratory labor force. To fill in this vacuum, southwestern farmers began importing Mexican nationals who in turn were pushed into migratory work by economic conditions in Mexico.

This tide started northward in 1942 and 1943. Nothing much was done to halt the wholesale illegal entry of Mexican nationals. This use of Mexican national labor continued during the war. At the war's end, when most people expected it to stop as workers returned to their prewar jobs, the wetback tide still continued.

New Mexico got its share, and it is still getting it. The late Federal district judge in New Mexico, Colin Neblett, described the early tide as a "bad situation." He said the 60 to 90 wetbacks he had in court every month probably represented only 10 percent of the number that actually crossed into the State. Neblett said the farmers told him that "they'll lose their crops unless they can hire these men."

Neblett's successor, Judge Carl Hatch, has inherited what he described recently as a "pitiful situation."

"The men need the work and the farmers claim they need the men," he said. He described the problem as "peculiar and difficult," and added that there "doesn't seem to be any progress in changing the situation."

For some reason, and Hatch said he had no idea of the cause, there have been far less wetbacks in his court so far this year as compared with similar periods in 1950. In March of this year arrests totaled 26. A year ago in March 81 were arrested and sentenced to the usual 30 days at the Federal prison farm near El Paso.

Abe Jones, the assistant State labor commissioner, has some criticisms of the use of wetbacks. He says that the State labor office is never consulted about the need for farm workers. Requests are made only to the Federal Employment Commission. This takes the problem out of the State's hands, and it also does not allow the State to exercise any control over hiring and working conditions.

He has in his files several complaints relayed to the State office from the Mexican consul that Mexican workers were arrested in this State and shipped back to Mexico before they were paid for their work. Jones says his office cannot do anything about collecting.

The President's Commission also found that in October some 150,000 children under 15 were engaged in migratory work. School population figures for this State in that month are considerably under the attendance totals for January and February, despite the existence in New Mexico of compulsory school laws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for the very able way in which has has steered the bill and for the gracious manner in which he has accepted amendments. If he were of a different disposition, he might have resented some of the amendments which were offered. He has received them in a very gracious spirit. I believe the result is largely due to his fine work, and I wish to express my appreciation of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, because he has expressed exactly what I feel with reference to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe I am in control of the time in opposition to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota said that he desired every Senator to read the minority views on the bill. I ask every farmer in the Northwest to read the minority views. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the minority views to accompany Senate bill 984 were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS TO ACCOMPANY S. 984
(S. REPT. No. 214)

This bill, S. 984, was favorably reported by the committee, after hearings, but before the issuance of the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor on April 7, 1951.

The President's Commission was created in June 1950 to inquire, among other matters, into—

(a) social, economic, health, and educational conditions among migratory workers, both alien and domestic, in the United States;

(b) problems created by the migration of workers, for temporary employment, into the United States, pursuant to the immigration laws or otherwise;

(c) whether sufficient numbers of local and migratory workers can be obtained from domestic sources to meet agricultural labor needs and, if not, the extent to which the temporary employment of foreign workers may be required to supplement the domestic labor supply.

The Commission held 12 public hearings in Brownsville, Tex.; El Paso, Tex.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; Fort Collins, Colo.; Memphis, Tenn.; Saginaw, Mich.; Trenton, N. J.; West Palm Beach, Fla.; and two in Washington, D. C. The hearings comprised 26 volumes available to the public. The published report of the Commission comes to 168 pages.

The findings of the Commission bear directly upon the legislation under consideration.

There is no doubt but that it would be far preferable had the members of the committee and the Senate had opportunity to study the report of the Commission before voting and considering this bill.

The reason given for proceeding on this bill at this time is the urgency to enact legislation to enable importation of Mexican agricultural workers beyond June 31, 1951.

The minority, after considering this bill in the light of the Commission's report, believes that the problem of migratory labor is an interrelated one, and affects workers within the United States and in other countries as well. It should be studied in its broad ramifications and comprehensively rather than by piecemeal legislation such as this. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare through i's Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, and in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act, has now begun such a study with a view to legislation. The interests of the United States and of American workers would be best protected were the Congress to approach the problem of migratory labor in such a perspective. We would far prefer, therefore, to have this bill delayed until the Congress is prepared to consider and enact comprehensive manpower legislation.

Within the limits of S. 984 and its limited objectives, the minority, in the light of the Commission report, has certain modifications and amendments to present which are presented here in topical form.

The fundamental legislative assumption behind this bill is that an agricultural labor shortage exists which requires the immediate importation of foreign labor for its relief. The majority in describing the background of the legislation under consideration observes that—

"Throughout World War II and since the termination of hostilities, it has been necessary to import agricultural workers from foreign countries in order to assist in the production of adequate supplies of food and fiber for domestic consumption in the United States and for export."

The report of the President's Commission bears this out, but the startling finding of the Commission in this matter is: "From 1945 through 1948, we employed a continuously larger hired labor force even though our work requirement (total man-hours) was gradually declining. In other words, we have been using more workers to achieve the same or slightly less work, and have thereby been reducing the work contribution per worker. This fact is strikingly reflected in the amount of employment received per hired farm worker:

	"Days of farm work per farm worker
"1946	113
1947	106
1948	104
1949	90"

The Commission comments, "The migratory worker gets so little work that for him employment is only incidental to unemployment."

It is the view of the President's Commission that the human resource in agriculture is used extravagantly. However, the Commission recognizes that more efficient utilization of agricultural labor will take time, that it cannot be expected to occur in a few weeks or months. Accordingly, it makes divergent recommendations with respect to the importation of foreign workers, one recommendation for the short-run and one recommendation for the long-run. For 1951, it recommends that "No special measures be adopted to increase the number of alien contract laborers beyond the number admitted in 1950." For the long-run it recommends that "Future efforts be directed toward supplying agricultural labor needs with our own workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor."

The finding of the President's Commission with respect to the underutilization of agricultural manpower corroborates the research of the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report which published its findings in a joint committee print, Underemployment of Rural Families, February 2, 1951. The staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report was concerned with farm workers as a whole rather than primarily migrant workers. Through analysis of five groups of low-income farm workers it reached the conclusion:

"If the workers in these five groups of rural families could be employed at jobs where they would produce as much as the average worker on the medium-sized commercial family farm or the average rural nonfarm worker, the production and output of rural people would be increased 20 to 25 percent. This is the equivalent of adding 2,500,000 workers to the total labor force."

If there is any justification to the bill, therefore, it is to meet an immediate, temporary need. Considered in the restricted terms in which its sponsor put forward the bill, certain further changes may be made in S. 984 to incorporate certain of the findings of the President's Commission. It is believed that proposed changes might usefully be considered against four broad criteria:

(1) That the Mexican importation program be carried out in such a manner as to minimize detriment to American workers.

(2) That devises be strengthened for assuring that both parties to the individual work contract—employer and employee—will live up to their agreements.

(3) That more effective measures be taken to meet the wetback problem.

(4) That the cost to the public of the Mexican importation program be kept to a minimum.

With respect to the first proposition, certain further changes in S. 984 suggest themselves. Section 503 of the committee bill provides that foreign workers may be made available where the Director of State Employment Security for the area of use has determined and certified that willing, able, and qualified domestic workers are not available for employment at the time and place needed.

In substituting the director of State employment for the United States Secretary of Labor, S. 984 makes an abrupt departure from past immigration policy. Under section 3 of the 1917 immigration law contract laborers are not admissible to the United States except under discretionary powers granted the Commissioner General of Immigration with the approval of the Secretary of Labor. In our view, it would be a step backward to change this and to call for certification by the State director of employment. In our American economy we have a national market. This is true of labor in the same way it is true of automobiles and radios. To propose State determination labor shortage is the same as to propose State autonomy in tariff matters. A labor shortage must be determined from a national perspective.

In order that all interested groups may have the opportunity of effectively expressing their views as to the need for foreign workers, it is proposed that the Secretary of Labor hold public hearings in areas of alleged labor shortage. In this way he may receive the advice of all interested parties.

Inasmuch as a labor supply is necessarily determined in terms of the attractiveness or unattractiveness of the employment offer, it is clearly impossible to know whether or not a shortage of domestic workers exists until domestic workers have been offered the terms and conditions of employment extended to foreign workers. It might at first be thought that domestic workers customarily were offered terms and conditions of employment comparable to those offered foreign and offshore workers. The findings of the President's Commission in this matter is quite the opposite. The Commission observes: "* * * employers, as a rule, refuse to extend to * * * [domestic migratory workers] the guaranties they give to alien workers whom they import under contract. These include guaranties of employment, workmen's compensation, medical care, standards of sanitation, and payment of the cost of transportation."

We believe further protection should be given domestic workers under the Mexican importation program by adding the requirement, before certifying the need for foreign workers, that reasonable efforts will have been made to secure American workers for the employment. This further emphasizes the important role of the Farm Placement Service of the United States Employment Service in assisting workers to find employment.

S. 984 exempts workers brought in under its provisions from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act.

The bill amends the Internal Revenue Code so as to exclude the service performed by such workers from the contribution provisions of the law as well as from the benefit provisions of the insurance program under the Social Security Act. Both the employer and the employee are exempted from the social-security tax.

Under the amendments to the Social Security Act, enacted by the Congress in 1950, a limited group of "regularly employed" agricultural workers were brought in under the insurance provisions effective January 1, 1951. In order for an agricultural worker and his employer to become subject to the insurance contributions, an individual must work for one employer for at least 60 days each out of two consecutive quarters, before any of his agricultural work becomes subject to the contribution provisions of the insurance program. In most cases, it will be necessary for an individual to work 6 to 8 months for one agricultural employer before any of his agricultural work will be subject to contribu-

tions under the insurance program. Due to the relatively short period of time that Mexican contract workers work for a single employer, very few of them will meet the stringent requirements of the new law and consequently very few of them and their employers will be subject to the social-security contributions. It is estimated that not more than 3,000 to 5,000 Mexican workers would become subject to the social-security provisions under the terms of the proposed program and, of course, if all of the Mexican agricultural labor brought into this country return to Mexico within about 5 or 6 months, there would be none of the Mexican nationals who would become subject to the contribution provisions of the insurance program.

But it is still true that the exclusion of Mexican workers from the insurance program could result in the hiring of such workers in preference to American workers since their employers would have the competitive advantage of not paying social-security contributions and it appears to be undesirable to give employers, as a matter of general congressional policy, a financial incentive to hiring foreign labor as against hiring domestic labor.

The major issue, therefore, that is raised by the provision exempting Mexican nationals from the social-security provisions of the law is a matter of fundamental principle and national policy. Since its enactment in 1935, the insurance program under the Social Security Act has covered individuals in specific types of jobs in the United States without regard to the nationality of the individual. It should be noted that social-insurance systems in a number of foreign countries, including Mexico, do not discriminate against American nationals performing services in covered employment. The principle of nondiscrimination as between the United States nationals and the nations of other countries has been advocated and endorsed by the International Labor Organization, by numerous representatives of social-security institutions of various countries, and by the Inter-American Committee on Social Security. A change in this policy which would establish the principle of exclusion because of nationality may eventually result in more harm than good because of the possibility of criticism arising against the United States for discrimination in the application of its social laws. Such criticism would not be in the long-run interest of the United States in world affairs.

One of the reasons given for supporting the exemption in the proposed bill is that the employee should not be required to pay the payroll tax if he is not going to become eligible for any social-security benefits. This difficulty can be overcome by the employer paying the employee contribution as well as his own, without deducting the employee contribution from the employee's wages. This policy is permitted under the present law.

It should be pointed out that many Mexican nationals are already covered under the insurance program and will continue to be covered under the insurance program in the future. Mexican nationals who come to the United States for employment and work in jobs covered under the insurance system have been covered under the program since it first began in 1937. Many Mexican nationals employed in the manufacturing industry, canning, service trades, and domestic service are now contributing to the insurance system. The exemption of one group of Mexican workers while retaining coverage for other groups of Mexican workers would introduce undesirable discrimination. If the employment is rendered within the United States the present law provides for contributions being paid on such service and benefits being paid to Mexican nationals and their families even though they may be residing in Mexico. At the present time the Social Security Administration is making payments to Mexican nationals residing in Mexico based upon the employment contributions made for service under the law.

If, despite these various considerations, the Congress is of the opinion that some special arrangements should be made on behalf of Mexican nationals brought into the United States for short-term employment, it is suggested that consideration be given to the desirability of transferring the contributions made on behalf of the Mexican contract workers to the Mexican Social Insurance Institute. Such an arrangement would be consistent with a sound policy of international cooperation of nondiscrimination of nationals to other countries and eliminate any contention of giving an incentive to employment of foreign nationals to the detriment of domestic labor.

Before embarking upon a policy which may have far-reaching implications and adverse effects upon the insurance program and upon our foreign policy, it is recommended that the exemption provision in the bill be deleted pending the final determination of a long-run policy in keeping with the principles upon which our social-insurance program has been based in the past.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation," S. 984 exempts employers of Mexican workers from posting bond to guarantee departure of these workers. It is understandable how the committee recommended this step. It received much testimony on the expense and the frequent unfairness to employers of the bond requirement. Employers testified before the committee that under the existing provision of the law they were required to post bond to guarantee departure of the worker, yet they did not have it within their power to hold the worker to employment. If the worker took it in mind to walk off some night, there was no way that they could stop him.

Important as this factor is in determining policy on this question, certain other considerations need to be taken into account. While it is true that the employer does not have the power to compel the worker to remain in his employment, the President's Commission found that there tended to be correlation over a period of years in the rate of desertions from employers. The Commission found that—

"Desertions from individual contracting employers range from as low as 4 percent to as high as 50 percent. Moreover, it is noted that there is a tendency for those employers having a high desertion rate in 1 year also to have a high desertion rate the next. We interpret this to mean that desertions from contract vary with individual management and working conditions. Where these are good, the desertions are low."

While such correlation could not be taken to explain each individual desertion, the evidence of continuing high desertion rates from some employers and continuing low desertion rates from other employers is so striking, that a relationship between desertion and working conditions would seem inescapable. Accordingly, we are of the view that while it is appropriate to recognize that no employer has it wholly within his power to guarantee contract workers remaining in employment, that he does, however, have a measure of control in this respect.

In discussion of the Mexican contract, it is useful briefly to note practice with respect to the bond requirement for other foreign workers and for Mexican workers in earlier years. On this point, the President's Commission observes:

"These bonds, for British West Indians, have been as high as $500 per head. For Mexicans, the bond is now $25 per head. For Bahamians, it is $50; for Jamaicans, $100. In 1950, the bond for Mexicans was set at $50, but under pressure from employers, the amount was reduced to $25."

If the bond provision for Mexican workers were altogether removed, the present inequity in the differing sizes of these bond requirements would be further heightened.

Before considering abandonment of the bond requirement, it is appropriate to examine the thinking which led to the enactment of the provision originally. The 1917 immigration law was concerned with protecting the standards and conditions of work for American workers from the competition of cheaper immigrant labor. It, therefore, flatly prohibited admission of contract labor, but to provide for unusual or emergency situations granted discretionary authority to the Commissioner General of Immigration with the approval of the Secretary of Labor for temporary admission of such labor. In order to regulate and control the temporary admission of otherwise inadmissible aliens, the act called for the exaction of bonds. Inasmuch as we are today still vitally concerned with the protection of the standards for American workers, we believe that when exception is made and emergency importation of contract labor permitted that it should be accompanied by regulatory and controlling devices. We are, therefore, convinced that it would be unwise to abandon this protection to American workers.

In order to assure effective and satisfactory contract operations, it is fundamental that both parties to a contract live up to the obligations assumed. One of the complaints of the Government of Mexico has been the unsatisfactoriness of measures taken in the past to assure that United States employers will live up to the terms of the individual work contract. Accordingly, it will be noted that S. 984 provides that the United States Government guarantee "performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation." We are of the view that this provision should be broadened to include other payments due under such contracts. Similarly, it is felt appropriate to ask the Government of Mexico to take such measures as it deems appropriate to assure that workers coming to the United States under this program, will honor their obligations under the contract.

In order to assure more satisfactory performance on the part of both parties to the individual work contracts, we believe that the grievance machinery should be materially strengthened. The President's Commission found that—

"The lack of an appropriate way of resolving employer-worker differences is one of the main reasons for a large proportion of Mexican nationals returning home before the completion of their contracts or simply deserting or skipping their contracts."

Existing conciliation machinery is not adequate. The President's Commission observes:

"Complaints alleging violation of the individual work contract may be initiated in three ways: Officially by the United States Employment Service or privately by either worker or employer. If an officially initiated complaint is not adjusted, the Mexican consulate is called in for a joint investigation. Complaints from workers may be received by the United States Employment Service or submitted through the appropriate Mexican consulate. Complaints by employers are received by the United States Employment Service. On all types of complaints the Mexican consulate may be called in for joint investigation and determination.

"As a matter of practice, we find that while employers may refer some complaints to the United States Employment Service, workers' complaint are ordinarily referred initially to the Mexican consulate. Let it be borne in mind that this conciliation procedure is

contained in the international agreement (in English, which the typical Mexican worker cannot read) but is incorporated only by reference in the individual work contract (where the Spanish-reading Mexican worker finds out in Spanish that there is a conciliation procedure available to him if he could read English)."

In 1950, the United States Employment Service had nine inspectors detailed to handle grievances under the Mexican program. This number has recently been increased to 15, but this still seems altogether inadequate. We again quote the report of the President's Commission:

"For the farm employer or association of farm employers, the conciliation provision may be somewhat more adequate than it is for the foreign workers with a language handicap in a strange land. To expect the Mexican contract worker to locate one of the nine United States Employment Service inspectors or to relay his complaint to them through the State employment service is to expect more than is within his capability. Consequently, if he can get in touch with the Mexican consulate, that is about the best he can do. This cumbersome and complicated procedure, involving several Government agencies in general and none in particular, encourages desertion in place of making a complaint because every complaint has the potentiality of being lost or ignored."

Accordingly, we recommended that the United States Employment Service expand its conciliation service.

We believe that S. 984 does not go far enough in meeting the serious social, economic, and security problem represented by the influx of hundreds of thousands of wetbacks over our southern border. The committee comments on "the great economic and social problems" which the wetbacks represent.

The concern of the committee with the wetback problem is fully shared by the President's Commission. The one difference between the two groups could be said to relate to the estimate concerning the magnitude of the recent "invasion," which the committee puts at 1,000,000. The President's Commission is more conservative in its estimate of the number of wetbacks. The Commission uses the figure of half a million.

The committee explicitly comments on the inadequacy of present measures to deal with the wetback problem. Its concern is reflected in the important amendment to section 501 of the bill prohibiting recruitment of wetbacks. Possibly through oversight, the comparable amendment to section 504 has not been made, so that as the bill currently stands it is inconsistent on this vital point. It is accordingly proposed that 504 be amended in the manner of 501. The term "vital" is used deliberately, for it is the view of the President's Commission that one of the most important factors in the recent acceleration of the wetback traffic is the legalization of illegals. It comments:

"The latest and probably worst stage in this erosion of immigration law was when, under the authority of the ninth proviso, Mexican wetbacks were legalized and placed under contract. The ninth proviso allows the temporary admission and return of otherwise inadmissible aliens—under rules and conditions. * * * In the contracting of wetbacks, we see the abandonment of the concept that the ninth proviso authority is limited to admission. A wetback is not admitted; he is already here, unlawfully. We have thus reached a point where we place a premium upon violation of the immigration law."

Prohibition of the legalization of workers illegally in the United States, while most important to the solution of the wetback problem, is not enough to meet the dimensions of the current "invasion." The President's Commission suggests other valuable steps which may be taken. It recommends that legislation be enacted making it unlawful to employ aliens illegally in the United States. It recommends that the Immigration and Naturalization Service be given clear statutory authority to enter places of employment to determine if illegal aliens are employed. We are of the view that these recommendations of the President's Commission are of utmost importance.

The fourth criterion which we proposed as guide to the measures to be included in a Mexican importation program is that the cost of the program to the public be kept to a minimum. We view as unrealistic the figure of $20 to cover the round-trip cost of transportation of workers between recruitment centers in Mexico and reception centers in the United States as well as their subsistence during this period. In this connection, it is pertinent to bear in mind that it would be highly unusual if workers were hired by United States employers directly upon their arrival at the reception centers. Therefore, subsistence needs to be considered not only during the period of travel but for the period that they spend at the reception center awaiting employment.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

APPENDIX A. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON MIGRATORY LABOR

I. FEDERAL COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

We recommend that—

(1) There be established a Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor, to be appointed by and responsible to the President.

(2) The committee be composed of three public members and one member from each of the following agencies: Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, Department of State, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Federal Security Agency.

(3) The public members be appointed by the President. One public member should serve full time as chairman and the other two on a part-time basis. The Government representatives should be appointed by the President on the nomination of the heads of the respective agencies. The committee should have authority, within the limits of its appropriation, to establish such advisory committees as it deems necessary.

(4) The Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor have the authority and responsibility, with adequate staff and funds to assist, coordinate, and stimulate the various agencies of the Government in their activities and policies relating to migratory farm labor, including such investigations and publications as will contribute to an understanding of migratory farm-labor problems, and to recommend to the President, from time to time, such changes in administration and legislation as may be required to facilitate improvements in the policies of the Government relating to migratory farm labor. The committee should undertake such specific responsibilities as are assigned to it in the recommendations set forth in this report and as may be assigned to it by the President.

In general, however, the committee should have no administrative or operating responsibilities; these should remain within the respective established agencies and departments.

(5) Similar agencies be established in the various States. The responsibilities and the activities of the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor and those of the agencies established in the States should be complementary and not competitive. The State agencies should be encouraged to carry forward those programs in behalf of migratory farm workers which, by their nature, fall within the responsibility of individual States. The Federal Committee will have major concern with interstate, national, and international activities. But at all times there should be close consultation between the Federal and State agencies and a two-way flow of information, suggestions, and effective cooperation.

II. MIGRATORY FARM LABOR IN EMERGENCY

Our investigations of the present farm labor problem and our analysis of this country's experience during the years of World War II and since, point to certain conclusions which to us seem inescapable in the present emergency. We therefore recommend that—

(1) First reliance be placed on using our domestic labor force more effectively.

(2) No special measures be adopted to increase the number of alien contract laborers beyond the number admitted in 1950.

(3) To meet any supplemental needs for agricultural labor that may develop, preference be given to citizens of the offshore possessions of the United States, such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

(4) Future efforts be directed toward supplying agricultural labor needs with our own workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

III. ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

We recommend that—

(1) Foreign labor importation and contracting be under the terms of intergovernmental agreements which should clearly state the conditions and standards of employment under which the foreign workers are to be employed. These should be substantially the same for all countries. No employer, employer's representative or association of employers, or labor contractor should be permitted to contract directly with foreign workers for employment in the United States. This is not intended to preclude employer participation in the selection of qualified workers when all other requirements of legal importation are fulfilled.

(2) The United States-Mexican intergovernmental agreement be in terms that will promote immigration law enforcement. The Department of State should negotiate with the Government of Mexico such a workable international agreement as will assure its operation as the exclusive channel for the importation of Mexican nationals under contract, free from the competition of illegal migration.

(3) Administration of foreign labor recruiting, contracting, transporting, and agreements be made the direct responsibility of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This should be the principal contracting agency, and private employers should secure their foreign workers exclusively from the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(4) The Farm Placement Service of the United States Employment Service certify to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and to the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor when and if labor requirements cannot be filled from domestic sources and the numbers of additional workers needed. On alien contract labor, the United States Employment Service and the various State employment services should be advised by the tripartite advisory council provided for in the Wagner-Peyser Act, or by tripartite subcommittees of the council. However, no certification of shortage of domestic labor should be made unless and until continental domestic labor has been offered the same terms and conditions of employment as are offered to foreign workers. After certifying the need for foreign workers, the United States Employment Service should have no administrative responsibilities in connection with any foreign labor program.

(5) In accordance with the policies of the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm La-

bor, the Immigration and Naturalization Service arrange, subject to the terms of the intergovernmental agreements then in force, for the importation of the number of qualified foreign agricultural workers certified as needed by the United States Employment Service, and transport them to appropriate reception and contracting centers in the United States.

(6) The Immigration and Naturalization Service deliver the imported workers to the farm employers who have submitted the necessary applications and bonds, and who have signed individual work agreements. Employment should be under the general supervision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. An adequate procedure for investigating and resolving complaints and disputes originating from either party should be negotiated in the international agreements and should be incorporated in the standard work contracts. The Immigration and Naturalization Service should be authorized to terminate any contract of employment and remove the workers, and to refuse to furnish foreign workers to any employer or association of employers when there has been repeated or willful violation of previous agreements, or where there is reasonable doubt that the terms of the current agreement are being observed. The Immigration and Naturalization Service should, in the discharge of its obligations, receive such assistance from the United States Employment Service as it may request.

(7) Puerto Rico and Hawaii, as possessions of the United States, be recognized as part of the domestic labor supply, and workers from these Territories be accorded preference over foreign labor in such employment as they are willing and suited to fill.

(8) Where a government-to-government agreement provides for the payment of the prevailing wage to foreign contract workers, this wage be ascertained by public authority after a hearing. The policies, procedure, and responsibilities involved should be determined by the Federal Committee on migratory Farm Labor.

IV. THE WETBACK INVASION—ILLEGAL ALIEN LABOR IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

We recommend that—

(1) The Immigration and Naturalization Service be strengthened by (a) clear statutory authority to enter places of employment to determine if illegal aliens are employed, (b) clear statutory penalties for harboring, concealing, or transporting illegal aliens, and (c) increased appropriations for personnel and equipment.

(2) Legislation be enacted making it unlawful to employ aliens illegally in the United States, the sanctions to be (a) removal by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of all legally imported labor from any place of employment on which any illegal alien is found employed; (b) fine and imprisonment; (c) restraining orders and injunctions; and (d) prohibiting the shipment in interstate commerce of any product on which illegal alien labor has worked.

(3) Legalization for employment purposes of aliens illegally in the United States be discontinued and forbidden. This is not intended to interfere with handling of hardship cases as authorized by present immigration laws.

(4) The Department of State seek the active cooperation of the Government of Mexico in a program for eliminating the illegal migration of Mexican workers into the United States by (a) the strict enforcement of the Mexican emigration laws, (b) preventing the concentration, in areas close to the border, of surplus supplies of Mexican labor, and (c) refraining from attempt to obtain legalization for employment in the United States of Mexican workers illegally in this country.

V. HOW MIGRATORY WORKERS FIND EMPLOYMENT

We recommend that—

(1) Federation legislation be enacted to prohibit interstate recruitment of farm labor by crew leaders, labor contractors, employers, employers' agents, and other private recruiting agents except when such agents are licensed by the Department of Labor. The Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor should develop appropriate standards for regulating and licensing such private agents.

(2) States enact legislation and establish enforcement machinery to regulate and license labor contractors, crew leaders, and other private recruiting agents operating intrastate, such legislation to include private solicitors or recruiters operating on a fee or nonfee basis, either part time or year round. The standards of regulation should at least equal those established by the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor. The recommendations of the Governor's Committee of California suggest the form and content of such State legislation.

(3) The United States Employment Service and the State employment services adopt a policy of refusing to refer workers to crew leaders, labor contractors, or private recruiting agents for employment.

(4) The United States Employment Service adopts regulations and administrative procedures to safeguard interstate recruiting and transporting of workers, by providing that—

(a) Terms of employment be reduced to writing, such written terms to contain a provision for the adjustment of grievances.

(b) Housing and transportation arrangements available to workers meet the minimum standards established by the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor.

(c) State employment services shall not recruit farm workers outside their States or assist in bringing farm workers in from other States unless the United States Employment Service is assured that the State does not have the necessary labor available within its own borders.

(5) Neither the United States Employment Service nor State employment services join with employers, employers' associations, or other private recruiting agents in mass advertising for interstate recruitment.

(6) In order to achieve better utilization of the national domestic farm-labor supply, States having legislation restricting recruitment of workers for out-of-State employment (emigrant agent laws) undertake repeal of such legislation.

(7) The Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor establish transportation standards of safety and comfort (including in-transit rest camps). States should be guided by the transportation standards of the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor as minimum conditions to govern intrastate transportation of migratory farm workers.

(8) The United States Employment Service and the State employment services be advised on farm-labor questions by the tripartite advisory councils as provided for in the Wagner-Peyser Act or by tripartite subcommittees of the councils.

VI. EMPLOYMENT MANAGEMENT AND LABOR RELATIONS

We recommend that—

(1) The Agricultural Extension Service, through its Federal office and in those States where migratory labor has significant proportions, make instruction in farm-labor management and labor relations available to farm employers and to farm employees. The Agricultural Extension Services should also make available advice and counsel for the organizing of farm-employer associations similar to those sponsored during World War II, which associations should have the purpose of pooling their joint labor needs to promote orderly recruiting, better employer-worker relations, and more continuous employment.

(2) The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 be amended to extend coverage to employees on farms having a specified minimum employment.

VII. EMPLOYMENT, WAGES, AND INCOMES

We recommend that—

(1) The Congress enact minimum-wage legislation to cover farm laborers, including migratory laborers.

(2) State legislatures give serious consideration to the protection of agricultural workers, including migratory farm workers, by minimum-wage legislation.

(3) Federal and State unemployment compensation legislation be enacted to cover agricultural labor.

(4) Because present unemployment compensation legislation is not adapted to meeting the unemployment problems of most migratory farm workers, the Federal Social Security Act be amended to provide matching grants to States for general assistance on the condition that no needy person be denied assistance because of lack of legal residence status.

VIII. HOUSING

We recommend that—

(1) The United States Employment Service not recruit and refer out-of-State agricultural workers and the Immigration and Naturalization Service not import foreign workers (pursuant to certifications of labor shortage) unless and until:

(a) The State in which the workers are to be employed has established minimum housing standards for such workers together with a centralized agency for administration and enforcement of such minimum standards on the basis of periodic inspections. These State housing standards, in their terms and in administration, should not be less than the Federal standards hereinafter provided.

(b) The employer or association of employers has been certified as having available housing, which at recent inspection has been found to comply with minimum standards for housing then in force in that State.

(2) Federal minimum standards covering all types of on-job housing for migratory workers moving in interstate or foreign commerce be established and promulgated by the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor. These standards, administered through a State license system, should govern site, shelter, space, lighting, sanitation, cooking equipment, and other facilities relating to maintenance of health and decency.

(3) Any State employment service requesting aid of the United States Employment Service in procuring out-of-State workers submit, with such request, a statement that the housing being offered meets the Federal standards.

(4) The Agricultural Extension Service in those States using appreciable numbers of migratory workers undertake an educational program for growers concerning design, materials, and lay-out of housing for farm labor.

(5) The Department of Agriculture be empowered to extend grants-in-aid to States for labor camps in areas of large and sustained seasonal labor demand provided the States agree to construct and operate such camps under standards promulgated by the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor. Since such projects are to be constructed and operated for the principal purpose of housing agricultural workers and their families, preference of occupancy should be given to those engaged in seasonal agricultural work. Costs should be defrayed by charges to occupants.

(6) When housing is deficient in areas where there is large seasonal employment of migratory farm workers, but where the seasonal labor need is of short duration, the Department of Agriculture establish transit camp sites without individual housing. These camp sites should be equipped with

water, sanitary facilities including showers, laundry, and cooking arrangements. They should be adequately supervised.

(7) The Department of Agriculture be authorized, and supplied with the necessary funds, to extend carefully supervised credit in modest amounts to assist migratory farm workers to acquire or to construct homes in areas where agriculture is in need of a considerable number of seasonal workers during the crop season.

(8) States be encouraged to enact State housing codes establishing minimum health and sanitation standards for housing in unincorporated areas.

(9) The Public Housing Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency develop a rural nonfarm housing program to include housing needs of migrants in their home-base situation.

IX. HEALTH, WELFARE, AND SAFETY

We recommend that—

(1) In amending the Social Security Act to provide matching grants to States for general assistance (as we recommended in chapter 7), provision be made to include medical care on a matching-grant basis for recipients of public assistance on the condition that no person be denied medical care because of the lack of legal residence status.

(2) The Public Health Service Act be amended to provide, under the supervision of the Surgeon General, matching grants to States, to conduct health programs among migratory farm laborers to deal particularly with such diseases as tuberculosis, venereal disease, diarrhea, enteritis, and dysentery, and to conduct health clinics for migratory farm workers.

(3) The United States Employment Service make no interstate referrals of migratory farm workers unless the representative of the State requesting the labor shall give evidence in writing that neither the State nor the counties concerned will deny medical care on the grounds of nonresidence, and that migratory workers will be admitted to local hospitals on essentially the same basis as residents of the local community.

(4) The Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor and the appropriate State agencies undertake studies looking toward the extension of safety and workmen's compensation legislation to farm workers.

(5) The Federal Social Security Act be amended to include migratory farm workers as well as other agricultural workers not now covered under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

X. CHILD LABOR

We recommend that—

(1) The 1949 child-labor amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act be retained and vigorously enforced.

(2) The Fair Labor Standards Act be further amended to restrict the employment of children under 14 years of age on farms outside of school hours.

(3) State child-labor laws be brought to a level at least equal to the present Fair Labor Standards Act and made fully applicable to agriculture.

(4) The child-labor provisions of the Sugar Act be vigorously enforced.

XI. EDUCATION

We recommend that—

(1) The Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor, through the cooperation of public and private agencies, including the United States Office of Education, State educational agencies, the National Education Association, universities, and the American Council on Education, develop a plan which will provide an adequate program of education for migratory workers and their children. This may include Federal grants-in-aid to the States.

(2) The Agricultural Extension Services, in fuller discharge of their statutory obligations to the entire farm population, provide educational assistance to agricultural laborers, especially migratory workers, to enable these people to increase their skills and efficiency in agriculture and to improve their personal welfare. The extension services should also give instructions to both farm employers and farm workers on their respective obligations and rights, as well as the opportunities for constructive joint planning in their respective roles as employers and employees.

The Agricultural Extension Services should expand their home-demonstration work to supply the families of farm workers, particularly migratory farm workers, instruction in nutrition, homemaking, infant care, sanitation, and similar subjects.

In substance, the Commission recommends that the Agricultural Extension Services assume the same responsibility for improving the welfare of farm workers as for helping farm operators.

(3) The Federal Government, in accordance with the long-standing policy that agricultural extension work is a joint responsibility of the Federal Government and the several States, share in the cost of the proposed educational program for farm workers and their families.

APPENDIX B. EXCERPT FROM UNDEREMPLOYMENT OF RURAL FAMILIES

MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

Some underemployed farm families leave their farms during the harvest season and supplement their farm incomes by picking cotton, fruit, potatoes, tomatoes, or other crops; others forsake their farms entirely and attempt to make a living by following the crop harvest. Through years of varying economic conditions relatively permanent groups of workers have developed who meet the peak-season labor needs in various parts of the country. These are principally but not exclusively from farm sources. They have developed rather definite paths of movement from the winter work areas in Florida, south Texas, Arizona, and southern California to summer harvest areas in the north.

The number of people in this migratory work force has varied with crop conditions, prices of farm products, displacement by mechanization, and the general level of nonagricultural employment. It has also changed with the opportunity to go into urban occupations. According to a Nationwide survey made in 1949, there were slightly more than 1,000,000 people over 14 years of age in this work force at that time.[1] This number includes several hundred thousand workers from across the Mexican border who compete with domestic labor for the work that is available.

Farm people who go into the migratory labor force do so from lack of better opportunity and then merely change to another and less secure type of underemployment. According to the survey previously mentioned, the average number of days of employment for migratory workers over the country in 1949 was 101, 70 days in farm work and 31 more in nonfarm employment.

Three factor enter into this underemployment. First, a period of several slack months when there is little seasonal employment to be found. Second, irregular and intermittent employment during the harvest season. Some harvests are oversupplied with workers, others last for such a brief period that the amount of work obtained by a worker is small. The third factor is too large a supply of workers for the amount of work available. Migratory workers compete with local seasonal and yearround workers for employment. The latter, too, then suffer from underemployment; during 1949 they had a total of 120 days' employment of which 91 days were in farm work and 29 nonfarm jobs.[2]

The earnings from the 101 days of farm work which the migratory workers obtained in 1949 amounted to an average of $514.[3] The value of housing, transportation, and other perquisites amounts to $36 more.[3] At an average of two workers per family, total family incomes averaged $1,028 cash or $1,100 with perquisites. This amount had to feed, clothe, shelter, and educate a family of four.

Underemployment and low earnings are not the only problems among migratory farm workers. Poor housing, lack of sanitation and medical care, child labor, and educational retardation of the children, all tend to make them a disadvantaged group. They have little voice either in community, State, or national affairs and are unable to make effective demands to relieve their situation.

Although they are most essential to meet peak season demands for gathering in the national food supply, they are explicitly excluded from national legislation which protects and advances the rights of workers. Their position is the most precarious of any in our economy. They have no definable job rights and are so far removed from the employer group that they are unable to obtain redress for grievances.

Rather than hire seasonal and migratory workers directly and individually, it is a widespread practice among farm employers to hire in crews through labor contractors, crew chiefs, or labor recruiters. In many areas it is virtually impossible for a worker to obtain a job directly from the farm employer. As a consequence of these practices, a farm worker has to pay heavily from his already-too-low earnings for the privilege of getting work to do.

Mr. LANGFR. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the President's Commission held 12 public hearings. Where were the hearings held? They were held in Brownsville, Tex.; El Paso, Tex.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; Fort Collins, Colo.; Memphis, Tenn.; Saginaw, Mich.; Trenton, N. J.; West Palm Beach, Fla.; and two hearings were held in Washington, D. C. Not one hearing was held in the Middle West or other agricultural regions.

A few days ago there was published a list of the casualties in Korea. It gave the number of casualties suffered by the various countries who have boys fighting in Korea. Not one boy came from Mexico. Not one casualty was suffered by Mexico. A few moments ago the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said that during World War II the Selective Service Act was in effect in Florida. Under the act boys in Florida were inducted into the service. How does it work today?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. How does it work today? A county in the State of Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, or Florida, or in any other State, says, "We want so many men." Therefore in any agricultural county so many men must be sent into the service. They

[1] Migratory Farm Workers in 1949, Louis J. Ducoff, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1950.

[2] Migratory Farm Workers in 1949, Louis Ducoff, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1949.

[3] Perquisites Furnished Hired Farm Workers, Barbara B. Reagan, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 19[illegible].

have taken away the boys. In some sections of my State, as well as in the adjoining States, including Minnesota, insufficient help was available. The first boy in the family had already died in World War II. They then took the last boy and hired man. Now they come along and say, "We will continue taking the boys. When there is not enough labor available to do the work the Department of Labor will certify that you can get some men from Mexico."

I for one will not vote for a bill that says we are going to send our boys to die in Korea while the Republic of Mexico sends workers to the United States to take the place of our own farm boys and our city boys. Such foreign laborers are sent all over the Middle West, where I am intimately acquainted with the facts, where they draw wages, and the Senator from Minnesota says he wants to be sure that their wages are going to be high enough.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota says that the reports show that all over the country there has been a terrible situation relative to migratory labor. Let me tell the Senator from Minnesota that I have lived in North Dakota. I am intimately acquainted in his own State of Minnesota, in Montana, South Dakota, and other farm States. I can give him name after name of men who came to those States as migratory laborers and who remained there and made a great success in farming and business. Today they are among the outstanding farmers and businessmen of those States.

I can readily see, by looking at the minority report, that, of course, the committee went to some of the large cities. It was pleasant to go to Phoenix, Los Angeles, and Portland, Oreg. It was nice to go to some of the other places in the wintertime. I note that the committee went to West Palm Beach, Fla., and that it held a couple of meetings in Washington. It was pleasant to go there. But I notice that they did not go to any little cities. They did not go to New Ulm, Minn. They did not go to Moorhead, Minn. They did not go to Jackson, Minn. They did not go to any city in North Dakota. They did not go to Kansas, New Jersey, Nebraska, South Dakota, or Missouri. Yet an overwhelming amount of the sugar-beet labor which comes from Mexico is going to some of the very States which I have named.

So, Mr. President, I for one decline to vote for a bill of this character, under which able-bodied, healthy boys from Mexico, a country which is not helping us in the United Nations, are sent to the United States to be employed at high wages and to take the place of farm boys and city boys who are fighting to save the Republic of Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 984) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE V—AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

"SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to recruit such workers (including any such workers temporarily in the United States under legal entry);

"(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States;

"(3) to provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

"(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding $150 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers;

"(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such workers being free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligible employers being free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers);

"(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation.

"SEC. 502. No workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States—

"(1) to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts;

"(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amount not to exceed $20 per worker; and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (5) and is apprehended within the United States, an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the place of employment to such reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers.

"SEC. 503. No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor for such area has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

"SEC. 504. Workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws (or if already in, by virtue of legal entry and otherwise eligible for admission to, the United States may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, be permitted to remain therein) for such time and under such conditions as may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment: *Provided*, That no workers shall be made available under this title to, nor shall any workers made available under this title be permitted to remain in the employ of, any employer who has in his employ any Mexican alien when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such Mexican alien is not lawfully within the United States.

"SEC. 505. (a) Section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"'(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.'

"(b) Section 1426 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"'(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.'

"(c) Workers recruited under the provisions of this title shall not be subject to the head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C., sec. 132).

"SEC. 506. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies; and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic agricultural labor force, to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

"SEC. 507. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'agricultural employment' includes services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

"(2) The term 'employer' shall include an association, or other group, of employers, but only if (A) those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations undertaken by it pursuant to section 502, or (B) the Secretary determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of such obligations.

"SEC. 508. Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws, to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in section 507, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in such agricultural employment under such conditions and for such time as he, the Attorney General, may specify.

"SEC. 509. Any person who shall employ any Mexican alien not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States

under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed such an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

"SEC. 510. No workers will be made available under this title for employment after December 31, 1952."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MACARTHUR HEARING—LETTER FROM SECRETARY ACHESON TO SENATOR KNOWLAND

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated April 26, 1951, which I received from Secretary of State Dean Acheson in response to a letter which I had addressed to him asking for certain information relative to the inquiry now under way.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 26, 1951.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of April 17, 1951, in which you request that a copy of the Wedemeyer report on Korea of September 19, 1947, as well as certain other documents be made available.

As you may recall, the Korean section of the Wedemeyer report, which was read by you on a confidential basis on August 24, 1950, deals only with the situation existing in Korea in 1947 and is not an integral part of his report on China. Since the preparation of that report the situation in Korea has undergone a fundamental change, the military occupation in being at the time of General Wedemeyer's visit having given way to a sovereign Korean Government established on the basis of elections held in accordance with procedures laid down by the United Nations and under the observation of a United Nations Commission.

Last fall, I informed the Appropriations Committee that I had discussed with the President the request of the committee for a copy of General Wedemeyer's 1947 report on Korea and that the President had instructed me to communicate that it was his view that the declassification of the report in question would be contrary to the national interest.

The special guidance paper No. 28 of December 23, 1949, which you have seen and has been shown confidentially to members of the Appropriations Committee does not, as you know, purport to make foreign policy with reference to Formosa. It is a document which described informational policies and public attitudes with reference to Formosa at that time. The limited purpose of the guidance paper was thoroughly understood and appreciated by all officers to whom it was sent.

The clear purpose of this document was to protect the interests of the United States by avoiding declarations in our information output abroad at the time which would enable the U. S. S. R. and other anti-United States propaganda agencies to attack or deride the United States should Formosa actually fall, and to avoid making statements as to the significance of Formosa which would make any subsequent action by the United States to prevent the fall of Formosa appear, in the eyes of foreign countries, as a manifestation of United States power politics. The document did not call for any organized campaign, as has been charged, to prove that Formosa was of no strategic value, nor did it state that a decision had been made to write off Formosa. No such decision was ever made. On the contrary, the clear policy of the Government for more than 2 years has been to deny Formosa to the Communists.

This document was prepared because our public affairs officers recognized that Formosa represented a definite information problem for our overseas information program. It was based on existing policy decisions and took into account various intelligence reports and other basic data.

These guidances are prepared regularly on all major aspects of United States foreign policy in order that the international information program, including the Voice of America, will constitute a thoroughly coordinated arm of our foreign policy. The provision of such guidance has been strongly insisted upon by the Advisory Commission on International Information, which was established by the Smith-Mundt Act.

Information guidances of this nature, which keep pace with changing conditions, must be classified, since to make them public would have a decidedly adverse effect upon our foreign policy and upon the information program itself. Revelation of the detailed methods by which the United States conducts its foreign-information program would be of great assistance to the Soviets, not only in advising them of what our information techniques are, but also in permitting an information directive, if unclassified, to be used for extensive counterpropaganda.

The question has already been raised in this case why a particular document must be kept confidential whose content already, in a large part, has been made public. As explained in conversations with you prior to this, the disclosure of an official analysis of foreign public opinion and the disclosure of official attitudes recommended to be taken with reference to it, could be used far more effectively by Soviet propaganda than the partial, unofficial disclosure by the American press. In addition, this is an instance, like many others, where classified information, which became public without official endorsement, cannot be used as effectively as propaganda against the United States as would be the case if it were officially confirmed.

I must emphasize again that this document was not a formulation of political policy, but a development of information policy essential to a coordinated foreign-information program. As such it has been superseded in the light of events.

As to its preparation, you will recall that I stated to the Appropriations Committee that I considered it unwise and contrary to the public interest to indicate which officers in the Department participated, other than to state that 10 different officers in 4 offices within the Department participated in the drafting and clearing of this document. It must be recognized that papers of this kind are always the result of a give-and-take of views among the various persons on the working level. If the names of the people who participated in drafting documents were to be made public, the inevitable tendency would be for each to keep a careful record of his precise contribution or attitude on any controversial subject. A department in which officers on the working level are busily engaged in making records against one another would, of course, not function as efficiently as one in which the principle of effective responsibility of the top officials is recognized.

With respect to the other classified documents which you request, I am sure you will understand, in view of the pending hearings by the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, that it is necessary for the Department to await the request of the chairman for any classified documents of this nature. At such time the Department will give careful consideration to any such request.

I am sending a copy of your letter and my reply to Senator RUSSELL for his information.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3587, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, this is the so-called third supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In this bill there are appropriations for the Voice of America and for several defense items. Is not that true?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that there will be considerable debate on the bill? Several Senators have asked me if I felt that we could conclude consideration of the bill in 1 day. I wonder what the judgment of the Senator is.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can see no reason why it cannot be concluded tomorrow without difficulty. There are some disagreements, but the amendments which have been submitted are comparatively minor, so far as the printed amendments are concerned. I have heard of no desire for extended debate. I think the bill can be promptly disposed of. I wanted to make it the unfinished business with the idea that we would proceed the first thing tomorrow to read the bill for amendment.

I now ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the request?

Mr. HAYDEN. The usual request, that the committee amendments be first considered before amendments offered from the floor are considered.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the source and inspiration of everything that is high and holy we pray that we may be more keenly aware of Thy presence and power as we enter upon this new week.

Grant unto us that strength and serenity, that faith and fortitude of mind and heart which we need as we accept the challenge of imperishable ideals and principles.

We pray that we may be a united people and have a clearer vision and appreciation of the multiplied power which we shall experience through our union in service for our beloved country.

Make us tireless in our efforts and unrelenting in our hope of the coming of that day when justice and righteousness and peace shall be established upon the earth.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord whose supreme purpose and greatest joy was to do Thy holy will. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 4, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 321. An act to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of R. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe;

H. R. 622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina;

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrej Wojcicki, and Stanislaw Wojcicki;

H. R. 664. An act for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt;

H. R. 667. An act for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling;

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins;

H. R. 789. An act for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee;

H. R. 859. An act for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski;

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr.;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Taro Takara;

H. R. 1117. An act for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya;

H. R. 1121. An act for the relief of Chin Yok Kong;

H. R. 1141. An act for the relief of St. Patrick Hospital and the Western Montana Clinic;

H. R. 1150. An act for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti, Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of Pietro Giannettino;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu;

H. R. 1264. An act for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden;

H. R. 1422. An act for the relief of Carl Parks;

H. R. 1438. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Charles R. Keicher;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Elena Erbez;

H. R. 1798. An act for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of Sook Kat;

H. R. 2175. An act for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott;

H. R. 2304. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers;

H. R. 2357. An act for the relief of Lucia Adamos;

H. R. 2450. An act for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano;

H. R. 2654. An act to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 2714. An act for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte;

H. R. 3196. An act to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3291. An act to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 3292. An act to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; and

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery;

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke;

H. R. 1424. An act for the relief of T. L. Morrow;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter;

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz;

H. R. 2782. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States; and

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 24. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, as amended;

S. 275. An act for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik;

S. 291. An act for the relief of Claudio Pier Connelly;

S. 297. An act for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu;

S. 360. An act for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene;

S. 467. An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota;

S. 536. An act for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw;

S. 677. An act to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

S. 879. An act for the relief of Luigi Podesta;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi;

S. 945. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

S. 1025. An act to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

S. 1054. An act for the relief of Curt Edward Friese;

S. 1092. An act for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago;

S. 1109. An act for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch;

S. 1113. An act for the relief of Philip J. Hincks;

S. 1183. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended;

S. 1220. An act to authorize the appointment of Bernt Balchen as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force;

S. 1227. An act for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps;

S. 1229. An act for the relief of Jan Joseph Wieckowski and his wife and daughter;

S. 1254. An act for the relief of Athanasios Elias Cheliotis;

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; and

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 7, 1951.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Desiring to be away from my office for several days, I hereby designate Mr. H. H. Morris, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III, of the House.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency, during the consideration of the bill H. R. 3871, be permitted to sit while the House is in session in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, again I would call the attention of the Members to the demonstration that will be held in the Old House Office caucus room on Thursday of this week. The purpose of this demonstration is to display to the Members and the public the latest artificial arms and legs.

The development of these devices has been carried out by the National Research Council over a period of years. The funds for its operation were authorized in a bill presented by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, who has done such extraordinary work in behalf of the amputee veterans.

The demonstration will be made by amputees of the Second World War and the Korean campaign. While there are some 20,000 amputees as a result of World Wars I and II and the Korean campaign, in the civilian population of the Nation there are at least 12 times that number. Through legislation sponsored by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and me and adopted by the Congress, the civilian population receives the benefit of the scientific developments in artificial limbs made by the National Research Council. The advances made have been most remarkable, as I pointed out the other day, and I hope to have more to say about this before Thursday.

UNITED NATIONS EMBARGO ON ARMS TO RED CHINA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution urging the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action with respect to placing an arms embargo against Communist China and for other purposes.

The American proposal to have the United Nations General Assembly recommend that an arms embargo be clamped down on Red China should have the united endorsement of all member nations of the United Nations.

Under the proposal, the Assembly would call upon all members not to send arms, ammunition or war-potential materials to Red China and that steps be taken to prevent nullification of the embargo, and that a special committee to receive periodical reports from the member states and to take such other measures aimed at making the program as effective as possible.

My resolution further recites that Communist China has long since been banned as an aggressor by an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations; and that more than a dozen member nations are participating directly with the United States in the heroic military action against the common enemy in Korea.

The resolution further provides that no soldier fighting under the flag of the United Nations should be the target of a bullet, a bomb, or a tank manufactured in the free world or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from a free world.

One of our representatives in the United Nations has expressed the view that in his judgment an Assembly-declared embargo, besides helping to strengthen and tighten up present shipping bans, would serve as further proof of the United Nations unity against aggression. This same representative further expressed the view that it was hard to see how any member of the United Nations who supports United Nations action in Korea could reasonably object to a determination by the United Nations that no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world.

It is my opinion that our boys who are fighting in Korea should not be killed and murdered with arms, guns and tanks coming from members of the United Nations for whom these soldiers are fighting. This resolution will be a great force in upholding the hands of the American representatives in the General Assembly of the United Nations to bring about action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of war materials from any of the United Nations, and this Congress should not hesitate for one moment to pass this resolution unanimously which might bring about the banning of shipping war materials to Communist China.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DAGUE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE OPS ROLL-BACK ON BEEF IS WRONG

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call attention to the recent order of the Office of Price Stabilization directing that the price of live cattle be rolled back or reduced by 10 percent from the level of April 29, and a further roll-back of 9 percent this fall.

This order, in my opinion, will result in less and not more meat for the American public. The order is discriminatory, unfair, and unworkable. It is directed against a segment of American people who are doing everything they can to produce food and more food for the people of this Nation. This order does not even stabilize prices where they are, but rolls them back, which is not done to any other segment of industry or business.

Mr. DiSalle admits that the present order will not presently result in cheaper prices of meat for the consumer, but the forced reduction against the producer will go to the larger processors of meat.

Certainly a roll-back is not stabilization. What we really need is more and more production. This order is bound to mean less production of meat.

You will observe the order provides that those engaged in the processing of meat are allowed to slaughter 90 percent of the amount processed a year ago. Why there should be reduction rather than increase is something that goes unexplained.

This order will discourage farmers and stockmen from finishing cattle for beef, which again will result in a further scarcity of the beef supply. So the order will not accomplish the purpose for which the Office of Price Stabilization has claimed for it.

This order does not even allow farmers 85 percent of profits made last year as permitted in business and industry. If the roll-back means a loss, you take it and that is all there is to it.

The order will create all kinds of confusion. Confusion in grading, which is an important factor and most difficult to administer. This alone will make various differences in the sale price of livestock on the market. The order will cause further confusion for the reason that livestock men who, by reason of the kind of business in which they are engaged, are required to operate on a long-range program will become discouraged on account of the uncertainty in the months ahead.

I think the Members of this House will be interested in knowing that while one agency of Government issues an order that will curb production, another agency is presently giving consideration to the encouragement of importation of livestock from foreign countries. It also goes so far as to suggest a subsidy program for the livestock business. That is one thing the livestock business does not want.

I should also add according to figures submitted by the Department of Agriculture, less than 5 percent of the income goes for meat, and beef is only a part of that segment of food.

I agree livestock prices are high, but the method by which the Office of Price Stabilization attempts to deal with the situation is unworkable, socialistic and wrong. It will not accomplish the purpose for which it is claimed to be designed. Why penalize one group against the other? The thing we should do is to encourage every farmer and every livestock man in this country to produce all the food possible, and not follow a socialistic program that will do irreparable harm not only to one of the most important industries in this country, but to the individual farmer who cannot stand the loss.

Mr. Speaker, this order is not a stabilization order. It does not stabilize at present prices. If it did that, there would not be quite so much complaint. This is a directive that reduces the price of the property of the farmers of this country without regard to its real value, and a further order for another reduction regardless of the loss that may be sustained. It just will not work.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ROLL-BACK ON THE PRICE OF MEAT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] refer to the meat price roll-back. I would like to commend Mr. DiSalle, the OPS Administrator, for that roll-back.

I think the provision of the Defense Production Act, which deals with food prices, is discriminatory—it is a provision which holds a roof over the price of food while leaving the Administrator free under the act to regulate everything else which goes into the cost of living of the moderate income family.

Meat prices were frozen with beef according to my best recollection at 130 percent of parity. Farm representatives say that parity is the standard they want for Government protection. I would like to tell the gentleman from Kansas this——

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. No; not at this time. I have only 1 minute and the gentleman was not interrupted in his time.

Meat consumption has increased tremendously in this country because wages have gone up and that is good for farmers and consumers alike, but the American consumers can strike too and can refuse to buy meat, just as those who raise cattle may refuse to ship it to market as we are told they may, and it may have to come to just that. This would be most unfortunate for the raisers, the consumers, and the country generally. And I hope very much it does not happen. But the provisions of the Defense Production Act on this subject need to be revised and the present OPS order on beef needs to be supported.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

BEEF CATTLE PRICE ROLL-BACK

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the average laboring man today can buy 1.5 pounds of beef, with the proceeds from 1 hour's work, while in 1929 he could only secure 1.2 pounds of beef for the same hour's work. In 1929 he could in 1 hour earn the equivalent of 1.3 pounds of bacon, while today that hour will give to him 2.3 pounds of bacon. The wage earner today is far better off than he was then. I think, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has well stated, this proposed roll back will result in the production of less, not more, beef. Production is the only answer to a scarcity of any commodity. After all, it makes no difference to the consumer if he sees the price of meat put down on the trays in the butcher shop a dime or so, if there is no meat in that particular tray which is for sale.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE MEAT SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as one who claims to be both a producer and a consumer, though not so much of the latter as of the former, permit me to call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the threat that he just made that the consumers in New York might go on strike if there was not a roll-back on the price of meat, and ask him, "What are they going to eat if they do go on strike?" And to call his attention to the position of the farmers—and I do not hold with subsidies and all this business of giving one group, then another, the taxpayers' money. I would rather go back to the old law of supply and demand—less Government regulation and mismanagement.

Permit me to direct his attention to the fact that owning a little piece of land and having a cow and some pigs a farmer or your humble servant can get along pretty well—that at least the farmer can eat—but I do not know how you who live in the city of New York on the pavements are going to grow cattle or hogs or raise food.

Mr. JAVITS. I would remind the gentleman that George Bernard Shaw lived to be well over 90 years old and he ate nothing but vegetables.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but the farmer grows the vegetables. Will your people plant or sow seed in the cracks in the sidewalks or pavements or will you grow your vegetables in window boxes or the parks?

Do you intend to follow the old saying "and they kept the pigs in the parlor," "the cow in the kitchen"?

Are we not all just a little dependent upon each other—but is not the farmer living on mother earth just a little more independent than the rest of us?

PRICE CONTROL ON MEAT

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps we are paying too much attention to the remarks of the gentleman from New York, Mr. JAVITS, concerning the roll-back of prices on live cattle. However, the gentleman from New York is very much in error in his praise of the order and its effect on consumers. As one who comes from a cattle country, I am not here to defend the high price of cattle. Cattle prices, like many other prices, have been too high. However, Ceiling Price Regulation No. 23, rolling back prices on live cattle, is like burning down the barn to get rid of the rats. Its ultimate result will be less meat at higher prices. Doubtless the intentions of Price Stabilizer DiSalle are good, but his methods are exceedingly bad. For example, he might have rolled back and fixed the price on meat in the butcher shop, which would have accomplished his purpose with less disastrous results. He might even have rolled back the price on live cattle and made it effective as of the date of his order. The order issued, however, rolls back prices first on May 20, then a second roll-back on August 1, then a third roll-back on October 1, with no ceiling on veal or calves. As a result, perhaps a million head of cattle will be marketed prematurely before the May 20 deadline, and the public will lose at least 300,000,000 pounds of beef. More premature marketing will take place before the August 1 deadline, and still more before the October 1 deadline. Calves will be sent to the butcher before they have produced any substantial amount of beef. Let me remind the gentleman from New York that there was a time during World War II when his great city of New York was practically without beef. Under the existing order, within 10 months his great city, and many other cities, will probably be without beef. Most of the beef that will be left under this order after a few months will be in the black market. The feed lots of the country are already being emptied, and the ranges of the country will largely be emptied within a few months. Production, not scarcity, is what the country needs. If we are going to roll the price back on one item of food, we should roll the prices back correspondingly on all items, and it should be done as of the date of the orders, and not at some future date. These lessons should have been well learned from experiences with OPA during World War II. I hope there were no political considerations back of Mr. DiSalle's order. If there were, he is doomed in the long run to be sadly disappointed. In the long run, the consumer, as well as the cattle raiser, will suffer under Ceiling Price Regulation No. 23.

DEDUCTION IN TAX RETURNS OF STATE GASOLINE TAXES

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 136) allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amendment: Page 2, line 15, strike out "December 31, 1949" and insert "December 31, 1950."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is merely a change in the date.

Mr. KING. That is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED GUSTUS JOHNSON

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a former Member of this body, the Honorable Fred Gustus Johnson, who served with distinction in the Seventy-first Congress. Mr. Johnson was elected on the Republican ticket, and represented the old Nebraska fifth district. As a Congressman, he established a fine record in support of sound Americanism and in support of agriculture.

Fred G. Johnson was born on a farm near Dorchester, Saline County, Nebr., October 16, 1876. He attended country school and was graduated from the law department of the University of Nebraska and admitted to the bar in 1903. In addition to his law practice he also engaged in agricultural pursuits. He first became active in politics by serving in the State legislature. Later he served as a member of the State house of representatives, the State senate, and was Lieutenant Governor of Nebraska in 1923 and 1924. In 1945 he was elected judge of the county court of Adams County, Nebr., and served in that capacity until the date of his death. Judge Johnson died last Monday, April 30, at the age of 74.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for every Member who served here with Judge Johnson in expressing our deep sorrow at his passing. We extend to his family our deepest sympathy.

COMMUNISM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I sometimes am astounded at the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] when he goes off on the Communist line, as he did in defending the Communist raid on Peekskill, N. Y., or when he inserted that stuff in the RECORD the other day supporting that Communist order wiping out segregation in our Armed Forces. When that crazy order was issued, I said it was the greatest victory that Stalin had won since Yalta.

Now he comes along and attempts to read the riot act to the farmers of this country because they protest against these crazy DiSalle orders that would simply grind into the dust the farmers who produce the raw materials to feed and clothe the world.

DiSalle and his gang have already plundered the cotton farmers of my State of Mississippi of $200,000,000 on this year's cotton crop, if they make the 2,000,000 bales requested by the administration. He is simply stomping on the farmers of this country all over the South, the West, and the Middle West.

Let me tell you what is going to happen. You cannot force those farmers to feed you at their expense, and you might as well understand it.

They are Americans, and they are going to demand that they be treated as Americans.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 207 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3576) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a quorum to hear this debate. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. If they are going to continue to bring these so-called displaced persons in here and impose them onto the American people the Congress ought to debate this issue in the open. We ought to know what is going on. Many of these people are doing more harm than good, at least many of the ones that were brought into the South, and I would like to see this question openly debated.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum for the time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3576) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Abbitt	Gary	Miller, Nebr.
Adair	Gathings	Morano
Anfuso	Gavin	Morgan
Armstrong	Gillette	Morrison
Ayres	Gordon	Murray, Wis.
Baker	Gore	O'Brien, Mich
Barden	Granahan	O'Neill
Baring	Green	Passman
Barrett	Gwinn	Patman
Beall	Hall,	Patterson
Bramblett	Leonard W.	Philbin
Bray	Halleck	Phillips
Brehm	Hand	Powell
Brownson	Hart	Price
Buckley	Havenner	Redden
Burton	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Canfield	Heller	Robeson
Carlyle	Herter	Rogers, Mass.
Chatham	Hoffman, Ill.	Roosevelt
Chelf	Holifield	Scott, Hardie
Chudoff	Hunter	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Irving	Smith, Miss.
Combs	Jackson, Wash.	Smith, Va.
Corbett	Jenison	Stanley
Coudert	Judd	Sutton
Cunningham	Kearney	Taylor
Curtis, Mo.	Kearns	Towe
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, N. Y.	Vail
Dawson	Kennedy	Van Pelt
Denton	Kersten, Wis.	Vaughn
Dingell	Klein	Velde
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Vinson
Donohue	Lane	Vorys
Eaton	Latham	Watts
Fallon	McConnell	Weichel
Fine	McCulloch	Wharton
Flood	McGrath	Whitaker
Fogarty	McKinnon	Willis
Fulton	Mack, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Furcolo	Madden	Woodruff
Gamble	Magee	
Garmatz	Miller, Md.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ten Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3576) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3576, with Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, all this bill does is to extend for a period of 6 months the operation of the Displaced Persons Act. The bill was reported without a dissenting vote from the Committee on the Judiciary. There was wholehearted approval among members of that committee for the extension of the life of this act.

There have been actually admitted under the Displaced Persons Act as of March 15, 247,000 displaced persons. I believe as of May 31 the number admitted was 251,000. There is a total permissible number of 341,000. Six months are needed to conclude the program and the process completely and admit the balance. We ask, therefore, that the operation of the act be extended to December 31, 1951, from July 1, 1951.

Practically all of the displaced persons who have been admitted have been integrated into the economy of the Nation, and I am quite confident they will become useful and effective citizens. There is very elaborate screening of every applicant for admission under the DP act.

First, the DP's are screened by the State Department, then by Central Intelligence, then by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, then by the DP Commission, in most instances by the FBI, and then the Army has made complete dossiers on every one of the DP's. So with all these agencies combining to screen the DP's, if anyone gets through I assure you that he must be worthy of immigration status.

About 40 percent of all those who have applied have been for some reason or other rejected. That is a rather large number of rejections, but the rejections were for reasons which are in the best interest of the country. To give you an idea how effective the screening is, of the 247,000 that were admitted as of March 15 only three have been deported. There were only three actual cases where conduct of the DP warranted deportation. Two of the three became public charges and, therefore, were in violation of the immigration code and subjected themselves to deportation. The third committed a crime after admission. There are 34 outstanding warrants of deportation, but those cases have yet to be tried. But taking it all in all I would say, and I am sure you will agree with me, that because of the careful screening there has been no danger whatsoever of the entrance of subversives or of those who would operate against the welfare of the country.

Why do we ask for an extension of 6 months? There have been certain unforeseen delays in the carrying out of the program. Nobody in particular is responsible. Among the delays are the following: One concerns the interpretation placed upon the Internal Security Act which was passed by the last Congress. You may remember that act contained certain language which was in controversy. The Attorney General took the position that any DP who at any time had been a member of any totalitarian party in his life—Fascist, Communist, or Nazi—was inadmissible. The Attorney General said any connection, no matter how remote, would be sufficient to bar the applicant.

Many worthy men and women, when they were young, had joined various Nazi, Fascist, and Communist youth movements in totalitarian countries. They were too young to resist. I am quite sure that had they been older, on mature reflection, they might not have joined, but they were children. Others, in order to get food and to procure ration cards, were compelled to become members of these obnoxious parties. Still others were conscripted in the armies. All those acts on their part were in most cases involuntary. To clear up doubts we passed an amendment to the Internal Security Act which provides that the act of joining these organizations must have been voluntary acts, and the joining in order to eat and live or while in childhood is no bar. Now, also, we require an affidavit of good faith. But as a result of that prior interpretation by the Department of Justice and the subsequent amendment delays were caused in the DP processing.

Secondly, there has been lack of ships to bring over the DP's. Some of the ships requisitioned by the Army for the transportation of troops have been previously used to transport DP's. They were requisitioned for the transportation of Greek and Turkish soldiers and matériel to the theater of combat operations in Korea.

Thirdly, there was considerable disruption of operations in the DP camps in Germany. The United States Army took over possession of a number of the camps and camp installations, because of our troop reinforcements in Europe, and the DP's were compelled to go elsewhere. Well, that also resulted in considerable delay in the processing of the applications. There was no central place where the files were kept, where dossiers were located, and the DP Commission and others having jurisdiction had great difficulty in laying their hands on the records and the individuals. Both were scattered. There were several other factors that caused more delay. We are now asking that 6 months' more time be granted to enable the DP Commission to complete its work.

There has been a general growing demand for the DP's in this country. For example, the Southern Power Co. wants 400 loggers. One midwest State has requested 400 farmers. One western company has asked for 350 hard-rock miners. A glove-manufacturing company has asked for 100 glove makers. A midcentral State industrial council has asked for 350 construction workers. Certain central States want 350 foundry workers. There has been a general demand for tool and die makers, for tailors, machinists, and the DP Commission is endeavoring to supply this demand as best it may. There is a great and growing demand for farm labor, and of the 60,000 visas left to be filled approximately 27 percent thereof are for farm workers.

The DP Commission is selecting that type of worker most needed in this country and I think they are doing a good job, and for that reason we petition you that you grant an additional 6 months to complete this program, after which there will be no request for more DP's, no request for additional appropriations. We will put the word "finis" on the DP program.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. How far behind are they now? The gentleman says they are about 300,000 behind.

Mr. CELLER. No. The gentleman is in error. They have actually processed as of March 15, 247,000. There is a total of 341,000 permitted. Now, between March 15 and to date they have processed additional numbers. I would say roughly that there are over 50,000 left to be considered plus some in the so-called pipeline of processing.

Finally I offer unstinted praise to the members of the DP Commission, Messrs. Gilson, Rosenfeld, and O'Connor, and the predecessor of Mr. Gilson, Mr. Caruse, for a work well performed.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, in 1947 I was a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] as chairman, which went over to look into the DP situation and came back with a report which I think, with some humility, was the beginning of the profound congressional interest in trying to work out that problem. We got into it because the International Refugee Organization was to receive an appropriation from the Congress of well over $70,000,000 as the United States contribution to the solution of the DP problem, and because in connection with the occupation of Germany after World War II certain obligations were undertaken by us in an authoritative way through our occupation commander, and otherwise with respect to the disposition of the displaced persons in Europe.

We found in 1947 that here was an outstanding fine reservoir of man and womanpower which ought to be utilized for the benefit of our country. After very, very thorough debate and thorough investigation this Congress and this House not only passed the DP bill in 1948 but also subsequently, reflecting its views as to the character of the problem and the way it was handled, increased by well over 100,000, the number of displaced persons permitted to come into the United States. What we are being asked to do now is to complete the program and it is very desirable from both a foreign policy and financial point of view that it be completed.

First, from the foreign policy point of view, there are few programs that reflect as much credit on the United States in terms of the leadership of the free peoples of Europe and of the world since World War II in view of the grave injustices of slave labor camps and similar outrages on the peoples of Europe by the Nazis which resulted in bringing into being the DP's. That was a very grave problem which required leadership, which the United States gave. It was United States leadership that made possible the resettlement, really, of all the DP's because it was clear from the beginning that nothing could be done unless the United States led, and the United States did lead. What we are being asked to do now is to consummate the program which we earlier undertook.

As to the financial side, we have supported our part of the IRO, and if the IRO must go on we probably will continue to support our part of it with the millions of dollars which it takes. We have a pretty good opportunity now if we extend this program to complete the evacuation of the displaced persons' camps. The displaced persons' camps are due to be pretty well wound up by October or at the latest December this year. This extension will go far to help to do it. Otherwise we may find ourselves with a continuation of IRO and the necessity for more appropriations on that score.

Another thing I would like to emphasize is that there is no question of groups involved; the act is seeking to take care of those who will be most useful to the United States on the grounds of skill and character. I might tell the House, as a matter of parenthetical interest that there were originally a great many Jewish-displaced persons, as everybody knows, some 22 percent of the total, but the great majority of these were happily resettled in Israel, where they are doing a very constructive job. We are dealing here in this extension not with groups but with people who are going to be useful to the economy and the future of the United States.

I certainly think on those three grounds, the continuance and the consummation of the DP policy which we adopted in 1948, which led to the international solution of the problem, a financial saving, and a very important financial saving, if we move to wind up the DP camps now, and the fact that we are getting people who are very desirable for the future of the United States, this particular measure ought to pass.

I should like to take 1 minute to make a personal reference, because obviously this bill is going to be opposed very strongly by the gentleman who made a bitter personal attack on me just a little while ago on the floor.

I have said once before in answering what I considered to be a vicious attack on Americans of the Jewish faith by the same gentleman that I would not move to strike out what he said, because I believe that every once in a while one has the chance to feel that despite the fact that one is only a single Member of 435 Members he can do something useful here. One of the things I think I can do that will be very useful is to let these hate denunciations stand as monuments to what can happen in this country if free Americans will permit themselves to be scared by the kind of denunciation which is made here by this particular Member. I will not permit myself to be scared nor, I assure you, will I suffer a heart attack, as one of my colleagues from New York did, I understand, long before I was here, in a similar situation.

As I say, I will not permit myself to be silenced by terms of opprobrium which may be hurled at the things I do and the reasons I do them. I should like to stand a little bit on the record.

I should like to tell the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], incidentally, that I have a bill before his committee, a bill needed in fairness to the provisions the law has made to encourage home ownership by veterans. I hope very much the gentleman will demonstrate the Americanism he preaches by giving a full and fair hearing on the subject matter of the bill regardless of the fact that I introduced it.

Let us just take a look at my record and his. The record will show, I believe, that in foreign affairs matters the gentleman from Mississippi voted contrary to the way I did, and very much the same way that a certain gentleman from New York voted who was here up to this Congress, who was charged with following what he calls the Communist line. That is a very strange identity of voting.

I might say to the gentleman that when it comes to serving my country and going back to where I belong, I happen to belong on the east side of New York, and I go back there very frequently, and I like it very much.

In addition, may I say to the gentleman that the gentleman had promoted a multi-billion-dollar pension bill in this House estimated to cost well over $100,000,000,000, which was defeated, which would have started a precedent that could have bankrupted the United States and done exactly one of the greatest acts that the Communists want, to hand this country over to them. After this defeat a perfectly reasonable and proper veterans' pension measure did pass, replacing the one promoted by the gentleman.

May I say that the gentleman from Mississippi opposed the European recovery program and the mutual defense assistance program, the defeat of which millions of Americans believe, as I do, would have turned Europe over to the Communists.

I do not make personal attacks in the House and I am not going to start now and this matter is ended as far as I am concerned. I am only saying these things because of the personal attack that has been made on me and because I think everybody in this House admires some spirit. I think I have a little bit of spirit. May I say I think everyone in the House serves his country as sincerely and with as deep conviction as he knows how, and I say that, although I doubt that the gentleman from Mississippi would say that about me—I say that about him—I think he is sincerely trying to serve his country and all I ask is that regardless of what the gentleman from Mississippi thinks or says about me, I am only solicitous about the fact that the other 433 Members shall feel that in my way and with deep sincerity and out of love for my country, for

which in World War II I was perfectly willing to give up my life, I am serving my country for its best interests.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

AMERICANISM VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is unusual to hear some unsung hero get up in this House and boast about how he has offered his life for his country. It certainly was most amusing to hear the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] especially about the votes he has cast on what I consider to be the most rank Communist program that has ever been proposed.

One of the most dangerous movements I can think of is this DiSalle program to step on the farmers of this country and literally grind them into the dust. But the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] just now undertook to compare my record with that of Mr. Marcantonio. Why, he voted with Marcantonio ten times as often as I did. Marcantonio sometimes got right and voted with us Americans on a few issues. But everybody knows that when it came to communism, Marcantonio and I were as far apart as two human beings could get.

Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] brands as communistic my bill to take care of the old veterans of World War I and my votes against the so-called Marshall plan to give untold billions of dollars to foreign countries, at least some of which is now being used to kill our boys in Korea.

You know, and I know, that America is financing both sides of this war, as a rule, through this so-called Marshall plan—the Bevin plan, if you please. This money is coming out of the pockets of our overburdened taxpayers including our old World War I veterans, whose pension bill he brands as communism. He boasts about helping to kill that bill to provide pensions for the old World War I veterans. I hope the old World War I veterans will read that. I want them to read it. My sympathies go out to the men who really made the sacrifices, fighting for this country and not the ones who come on the floor of the House and boast about what they have done. Look at the boys—look at the old men of World War I, many of whom are unable to make a living. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] wants to send this money to Europe, Asia, Africa, Israel, and Japan, and let those old veterans go to the poorhouse.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois; yes, sir.

Mr. BUSBEY. Do you know of anyone in this House of Representatives who has been fighting communism longer and more violently over the last 30 years than I have?

Mr. RANKIN. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. BUSBEY. Well, I voted against the Marshall plan and I was not voting for communism. I was voting against communism when I voted against the Marshall plan and the Greek-Turkish loan and all the rest of these give-away programs.

Mr. RANKIN. But that Marshall plan costs us forty or fifty billion dollars, and they are still demanding more, and yet the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] calls it communism when we attempt to take care of our old veterans who fought in the First World War. I am getting darned tired of these fellows whining every time you mention the racial issue, and then getting up here and attacking the white people of the South, and trying to stir up trouble between the whites and Negroes throughout the Southern States. That is what you are doing, and that is what this crazy statement that the gentleman inserted in the RECORD the other day meant. He does not care a tinker's dam about the Negroes. He is just following the communist line which is bending every effort to stir up race trouble in this country, and especially in the South; and that is exactly what this antisegregation order is doing.

It is doing the Negroes, as well as the whites, infinite harm.

They levied quotas based on population in Mississippi and then took the white boys to do the fighting, and did not allow any exemptions to the cotton farmers who are now stepped on through this crazy DiSalle program, robbing the State of Mississippi of $200,000,000 a year on its cotton crop; robbing the farmers of Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and every other State on the meat products and chickens and other things they produce.

Yet not one of you has said a word about what is the real trouble. You are inflating the currency of this country just as fast as it can be done. There is $27,180,000,000 in circulation, compared to about $5,000,000,000 in normal times. Not a thing has been done to check that inflation. A gang of Wall Street bankers reap the benefits. They eat the beef. They do not produce it. They are using that money to finance operations all over the world, and when you get down to investigating the racketeering that is going on through this Marshall plan you will make the post office selling in Mississippi look like a Sunday-school picnic in comparison.

When you find what these long-nosed grafters have done to the American people in dealing out this Marshall plan money and robbing us in order to feather their own nests, there is going to be such a rising tide of resentment among the American people as this country has not seen for many a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a few minutes of the time of the House to discuss rather briefly the reaction and repercussions of the Displaced Persons Act upon my community. I voted for this measure rather reluctantly and I want to say the effect has not been good. The people who have come to my district under authority of this act, the refugees who were brought in there, were brought in in good faith and they were given every opportunity to make good citizens of themselves. They have not done that. Most of them have stayed only long enough to take off for parts unknown and we do not know where they are today.

I know some of you will say those folks did not get a fair shake; they did not get the kind of a spot in the community that they wanted. But I say to you that those folks were given good homes and every opportunity to make good citizens. They simply took off and did not stay to carry out their obligations. Many of them frankly said to their sponsors, "I had no intention of doing anything other than I am doing now, that is to beat it. I just used you as a tool to get in here."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. That has been the situation in my district also.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. That has been the situation in my district exactly. Plenty of them came there as farmers and stayed but a month or two. The good people of my State built homes for them and went to great expense to get them settled on a farm. Then they went off and left. Some of them came there as farmers who did not know a mule from a horse. I understand some of them are out preaching various kinds if ideologies. I think this bill certainly bears looking into before we admit anyone into this country.

Mr. HARVEY. I want to agree heartily with what the gentleman has had to say, because I know that is true. We set this up and permitted the United Nations organization, the IRO, to select these people. They were selected, I am sure, without the same standards of citizenship that we would expect of our own people. I think that the IRO, either unwittingly or intentionally, has been used as a tool to further the interests of people who came here particularly with the idea of carrying on the same subversive activities that they were trained to do before they came here.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for the committee to consider for a moment who are these DP's; they are the people who were with force taken from their countries because they possessed special skills and placed in slave labor camps for the purpose of assisting the Nazi war machine. They are the people who, because their countries have been taken over by the Communists, are afraid to return to their countries. These are the remaining thousands of the slave laborers who were not sent home after the camps were liberated.

I think you might be interested in view of the fact that the gentleman from Indiana spoke about how unsatisfactory the program was in his State to permit me to read to you a communication that came from Gov. Henry F. Schricker. He reports this:

For the most part the DP's are industrious and capable of performing the tasks they came to undertake. There has been very little criticism of the caliber of the DP's even though there have been a few cases of maladjustment.

He winds up his report by stating:

The DP's that have arrived in Indiana have been absorbed without a ripple on the surface of our economic and social life, and there is no question but that more of them can likewise be received to the advantage of the State.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. May I inquire of the gentleman the date of the communication?

Mr. WALTER. It does not appear here, but this communication came after the investigation that was conducted by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization in 1949; so my guess is that this letter was received sometime in October of 1949.

Mr. HARVEY. I may say to the gentleman that I have a very high regard for Governor Schricker, and what I say, of course, is in contradiction to what the Governor has said. But I still sincerely believe in the developments that have happened since the gentleman received that communication certainly bear out the opinion in my district that I voiced here on the floor of the House.

Mr. WALTER. Our attention, of course, is always directed to the so-called atrocity cases. The gentleman from Ohio stated that the experience in his State was the same.

Gov. Frank J. Lausche has formulated his answer to the subcommittee inquiry, as follows. I quote him:

Not a single word of complaint or dissatisfaction has reached me against the displaced persons who have come to our State.

That is the experience in Ohio; that is the experience in most of the States of the Union. There have, of course, been cases where people have attempted to exploit these unfortunate victims of persecution. There were instances where in the State of Mississippi, I believe it was, the DP commission found it necessary to resettle a large number of people because an attempt was being made to pay them substandard wages in those cases.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I might say as to the statement of Governor Lausche that no complaints have come to him, that he has heard of no dissatisfaction, that he did not ask me, and he did not come down in my section. But what I said I know about, and I know it has been very unsatisfactory to the people who brought them over; and I know of people who spent a lot of time and money on them. A very glaring case was one where the DP's went away in the night without any appreciation, and they were later located hooking up with a little group of like-minded people.

As I understand the purpose of this bill is to extend this act for 6 months; and I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to say that there would be no further extension asked after that.

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, in that connection I would like to state to the gentleman from Ohio that it is my purpose to offer an amendment at the appropriate time which reads:

No such immigration visa shall be issued to eligible displaced persons or eligible displaced orphans unless the Commission initiated selection or processing of such person on or before July 31, 1951.

We are offering that amendment for the reason that unless the time within which visas can be processed is fixed, then conceivably there will be processing after a certain date which might give reason to insist on an extension of the program.

Mr. JENKINS. Then the number the gentleman is talking about will not be increased?

Mr. WALTER. Oh, no. There is no increase in the number.

Mr. JENKINS. Or in the limitations now fixed?

Mr. WALTER. No. We are fixing the time within which processing must be instituted.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman made a statement a moment ago that he certainly would not have made if he had known the facts.

Mr. WALTER. I am not given to making statements without knowing facts.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman does not know the facts this time because those displaced persons in Mississippi were given places out on the farm where other people were working, but because they did not want to work they ran away and, as the gentleman from Ohio said, went back to the cell.

Mr. WALTER. Oh, no.

Mr. RANKIN. They were treated like other people down there. Some of them kicked because their cattle were not given to them free of charge.

Mr. WALTER. They lived in a state of semipeonage and are now operating a village in which they are manufacturing large quantities of furniture, thereby increasing the wealth of the State of Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. They are not doing anything of the kind.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the genlteman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. The purpose of this bill is to extend the processing so that the great organization that has been established can complete a work 80 or 90 percent of which has already been completed?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. FELLOWS. Is it not also true that under the gentleman's amendment it will close as of the latter part of this year and that the only reason for this bill at all is because there are some 35,000 to be admitted?

Mr. WALTER. There are approximately 60,000 cases involving those that somebody in the United States has requested be permitted to come to their home where they will be provided a job, they will be provided a home, without displacing an American.

Let us see who is concerned about this. At the beginning of the program, the Jewish welfare organizations were well equipped to move. They had money, they had a splendid functioning organization and they moved immediately. The Catholic welfare organization was similarly situated. But the Protestant group had no experience in this field, with the result that we are concerned principally with 60,000, most of whom have assurances from either the National Lutheran Council or the Church World Services. Those assurances have already been given and but for the fact, as the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has pointed out, that there were these delays that were not anticipated, this program would have been completed by now. But who could have foreseen when we fixed the time limit on this act that the ships that were being used to transport these people would be diverted for the transportation of the Turkish and Greek armies to Korea? Who could have foreseen that the United States would have embarked on a great military program which contemplated the use of these facilities in Germany, thereby separating these people and making it more difficult to get word to them that their cases had been processed? But I think the best proof that we are not getting the type of people that some Members of this body talk about is the fact that there have only been 3 deportations in 251,000 cases of people brought to the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman has made some very serious remarks which reflect on the integrity and the reputation of the good people of the State of Mississippi.

Mr. WALTER. I certainly did not intend to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, certainly they reflect on the people of Mississippi, and I do hope that the gentleman will elaborate on those remarks, gives us dates, gives us names and places, and the proof that these people have been mistreated in Mississippi, if he has any such proof to offer.

Mr. WALTER. Res ipsa loquitur.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The only dissatisfaction I ever heard of any Mississippian was of the DP who refused to work.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in order to clarify this situation, as I understand the purpose of this bill it relates solely to the matter of the extension of the present bill to December 31, 1951. The Displaced Persons Commission appeared before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary. Three gentlemen seated with me on the minority side here have heard their report. In our judgment they have done splendid work. There has not been any chance to complete this work. They need this extension, and if granted they have assured us that they will complete the work in good time.

Mr. Chairman, I would be derelict if I were not to mention at this time the splendid work done by our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FRANK FELLOWS], who back in 1948 spent many, many hours on the preparation of the original bill. That bill has since been amended. Great work also has been done by my other colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. I, too, have contributed a small part. We are anxious to see this work done. We are not dealing with isolated instances of defection on the part of a small number of those who have come; we are dealing with a great major body that is seeking to complete the work, dealing with people who may yet be in camps, to reduce the expense, and bring to quick fruition and completion this very valuable work that needs to be done.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I did not get quite a clear answer from the other gentleman. He said something about there would be another recanvas or between now and the end of July there was going to be some resurvey, or something of that kind. What I am interested in is this: Does this legislation, when it terminates in 6 months, terminate everybody who is eligible or thinks he is eligible to come in?

Mr. GRAHAM. It does, in my understanding.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time because I feel very strongly on this legislation. I regret very much that some very, very strong remarks have been made during this debate and before it commenced, remarks which are not germane to the issue.

Let me say first of all that I do not believe there is any Member of this House who more violently abhors communism than I do. I fought 2 years against the Communists after I finished my service in the United States Army in World War I, when the Communists first tried to override Europe. I have devoted practically all my life to fighting Communists in this country. I am a Member of this House only because of that issue. I defeated a gentleman who was in this House for 16 years, with whom the gentleman from Mississippi often fought and debated, only because I thought he was too close to the Marcantonio line. So what I say I hope will not be constructed as being said by one who favors communism.

I should like to clarify some things that probably are not clear in the minds of some of you.

Let me reassure you by telling you first some of the things this bill does not do.

First. It does not increase, by one, the numbers of displaced persons originally authorized by the 1950 act to be admitted to this country.

Second. It does not extend the life of the Displaced Persons Commission since it continues until August 31, 1952, under the present law.

Third. It does not extend the date line for eligibility in any case, and does not extend eligibility to any new individuals or groups of individuals.

Fourth. It does not change the high standards and requirements which the displaced persons must meet to be allowed entry to this country.

It does do what some of the Members have asked about it; does end once and for all the displaced-persons program on December 31, 1951.

What the bill merely does is to give 6 more months to the Commission to complete one phase of its job already authorized by Congress and already well on its way to completion.

Why was not the job complete? It has already been mentioned here. Some of the reasons are very good ones.

The United States Army's transfer of camps and resettlement centers, resignations of key personnel in Europe because of war jitters, interpretations of section 22 of the Internal Security Act, administrative delays due to the 1950 amendments, shipping problems because of military needs in Korea—these were the main delaying factors.

Let me say something about what the Displaced Persons Act has accomplished to date. At the time it was adopted there were some serious doubts expressed by many in and out of Congress as to what the entry of this over quarter million people would do to our national economy, and as to the type of people that we would get under the act.

Well, 3 years have passed, or will soon. Our national economy has not suffered a bit by their entry and the noteworthy thing is that these new immigrants have proven to be very industrious, law-abiding, loyal, and fitting well into the pattern of our democracy.

Actually, this should not be surprising. These refugees were homeless and without a country because of their fervent love of liberty and democracy; they were and still are thoroughly screened by numerous agencies, the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Public Health Service, the IRO, and the Displaced Persons Commission personnel. They are really the best material available in the entire world for good American citizenship, because they have lost their country, because of their fervent love of American democracy as we know it.

Much has been said here and in the Senate as to the morale of the European nations. The displaced-persons program has been one of the most vital and effective programs in our foreign policy. It has given the peoples of Europe positive proof that United States is still the haven and hope of all freedom-loving and persecuted people of the world. The displaced person soon after arriving here tells his friends and relatives in Europe of the real America and disproves the calumnies spread about us by our enemies. It has done more to spread good will than any other phase of our national-defense program. And at the same time it has strengthened and invigorated our domestic economy and national defense.

It would be tragic and unexplainable if we were at this moment to drop the program when it is nearing completion and disappoint those to whom we have assured a helping hand.

I sincerely hope this bill will get an overwhelming vote of support in this House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit idly by here without making some observation as to my experience with this act. I voted for it 2 years ago. I intend to vote for it again today. I do that because of the experience I have had in the State of Minnesota. We have a very diversified set-up into which we can fit almost any type of worker. When this first started in Minnesota, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] says, there were a number of organizations which were all set and ready to pick up their part of the placement of these people assigned to the various parts of Minnesota. In my district, and I represent both an industrial, as well as an agricultural area, I have heard of no complaints in the last year and a half regarding this program in the State of Minnesota. It is true, of course, that you can find those spots on which you can lay a great deal of emphasis and place a great deal of condemnation on the whole program. That happened in my district. I had some of the unions in my district, which is highly organized, have a feeling of a little fear that some of these displaced persons, and many of them have very artful trades, many of them are very experienced tradesmen, as I was saying some of the unions had a little fear that these skilled tradesmen would enter into competition with them. Some of them did drift down into the industrial area of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth seeking employment in trades where the return was greater of course and where they could be absorbed. But that is all that there was. I think in the city of Minneapolis we have at least 90 to 150 of these displaced persons now working in the trades. Some of them are very excellent bricklayers and carpenters and so forth, and they have turned out very fine. I have not had a complaint in the trade-union movement about the question of these people moving in and displacing our American workers. That has all died out. I want to again say I support this bill because it will at least give the program the finishing touches so that we can complete the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

SHORTAGE OF SHIPS

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak very briefly upon an issue which is collateral to the issue before the committee at this time. One of the reasons given for requiring the extension of time provided for in this bill is that it is found that there is a shortage of shipping in which to transport some of these displaced persons. The shipping required in this sort of movement is not of unusual amount. The shipping which was expected to be available was taken for the movement of troops and suplies to Korea. I call attention to the fact that the Korean military operation, as a military operation, does not aproach the size of an all-out engagement. I point to these two facts to indicate to the House that the shipping which we presently have which is immediately available does not go beyond what we use for normal, current, peacetime needs. A few days ago the House considered the appropriation bill for the independent offices. In that bill there were provisions designed to limit and possibly cut down the amount of American shipping in operation during the next few months. There were other provisions which will make it more difficult to get American capital into the shipping business. Possibly there should have been more debate upon the subject, but it was not an opportune time to talk upon such a subject late on last Friday afternoon. I call the situation to the attention of the House now in the hope that when the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on some future occasion comes before you urging some assistance to the American merchant marine, you will bear in mind this additional bit of evidence that American-flag shipping is operating in short supply for any emergency situation, and that it takes time to get additional ships in operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I feel that any objections which anyone might have had to this bill have been thoroughly obviated by the excellent explanations which we have had of the bill, particularly that of my esteemed and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GRAHAM]. I am happy to be able to support the bill and would like to point out to the House that by far the greater percentage of the persons involved in this bill are in three groups. First, those Polish war veterans who fought so gallantly for the allies during World War II, second, the Greek refugees. The Greeks, too, have been of notable and gallant assistance to the free nations in the Korean War.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that of the 18,000 brave soldiers that comprised General Anders' army but about 3,000 have been processed, due largely to the fact that the Internal Security Act was interpreted in the manner in which it was. Unless the act is extended, these people, all of whom have friends and relatives in the United States who indicated a desire to have them, will not be able to leave England where they have been given refuge.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman. That Polish group of fighting allies of ours in World War II was part of my particular concern in this bill.

The third great group affected in this bill are the Baltic refugees. Recently I had an opportunity to attend a large gathering of about a thousand Lithuanian Americans in my city. As I visited with them and heard their point of view, I thought to myself: anyone who had an opportunity to see these Americans—some here a long time and some more recent Americans—ought to have no doubt of the quality of their Americanism, which is of the highest. The displaced persons' program has strengthened our Nation and made us better able to reach the minds of the people in the lands beyond the seas.

I am anxious to see their families made whole, the missing members restored to them, the necessary steps taken to complete this program, and I am very glad to support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I feel I would be inconsistent in my position if I did not support this legislation. As I view the situation now, some 2 years ago we passed the parent bill, and any repercussions that we might have received from that or any dangers that might be lurking in this legislation were all disposed of then.

The bill before the House today is a matter that is incidental to that legislation. It is simply here for winding up a job that was originally undertaken some 2 years ago. Therefore I cannot see the consistency of any argument now that points out the dangers that we might run into after we have operated under this plan for nearly 2 years. I think we should follow the suggestions made here and wind up this particular legislation in a way that will avoid the most confusion and bring about the greatest good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], the author of the original displaced persons bill.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I have some memories about displaced persons. In 1948 the original bill was passed. That was the bill I introduced. It had to do with some 205,000 or possibly 220,000 people. The reason It was sold to me or that I was able to undertake sponsorship of that bill was largely because it was a quota proposition. Every person who came in under this bill or who has come in under this bill is a quota immigrant. That means that if we had not had this legislation the same number would likely have come in in any event.

Many objections have been voiced here. Those objections should have been voiced at the time the original bill was before the House. There is not the slightest reason I can think of why this particular measure should not be passed in order that this whole affair be settled and settled finally.

I want to say this about these men who are operating under this act: I think they have done a job that time here does not permit me sufficiently to praise. It is a fine organization. It has done even better than I had hoped it could do. When we speak about certain displaced persons not being all they should be, what would you expect out of 247,000 persons who would have come to America in place of these? These people have been screened five times more efficiently than would have been the case if the bill had not been passed.

When you talk about displaced persons, my district was not at all enthusiastic about it. I had very few people who would be intimately affected by this bill or any displaced persons bill. My people I do not think wanted it at all, but the fact was that it was a program that could be sold to any thinking person.

So this measure that is before us here should become a law. There is no valid objection that I can think of that can be raised now; objection should have been interposed last year, the year before, or in 1948, when I stood on this floor for two full days and struggled with it.

I shall vote for this extension of time wholeheartedly.

Mr REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I shall not need more than 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill. My only purpose in asking for any time at all on this measure it to pay a well-merited tribute to Messrs. Rosenfeld, O'Connor, and Gibson, the three men who comprise the Displaced Persons Commission.

It has been what I considered my duty from time to time to be critical of this, that, or the other bureaucrat or governmental department. It seems to me, however, that the Displaced Persons Commission in their administration of this law has set a very high standard which might well be emulated by other agencies of government. When a group of administrators do a job such as they have done, I feel they should be given the united support of Members of Congress and accorded the recognition which they have richly earned by their painstaking, able and energetic efforts to carry out in every detail the intent of Congress as expressed in this legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) During the three and one-half fiscal years beginning July 1, 1948, and ending December 31, 1951, eligible displaced persons and eligible displaced orphans and persons defined in subdivisions (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b) of this section seeking to enter the United States as immigrants may be issued immigration visas without regard to quota limitations for those years as provided by subsection (c) of this section: *Provided*, That not more than 341,000 such visas shall be issued under this act, as amended, including such visas heretofore issued under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to procure the cooperation of other nations, particularly the members of the International Refugee Organization, in the solution of the displaced persons problem by their accepting for resettlement a relative number of displaced persons, and to expedite the closing of the camps and terminate the emergency."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 2, after line 4, insert "*Provided, further*, That no such immigration visa shall be issued to eligible displaced persons or eligible displaced orphans unless the Commission initiated the selection or processing of such person on or before July 31, 1951."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make it abundantly clear that it is the intention, the firm intention, of the Congress to terminate this program at the end of this year. This amendment will make it impossible for the Commission to receive any applications or assurances, or to initiate the processes which ultimately result in the issuance of the visa after July 31, 1951.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. And is it not a fact that the Commission itself has requested that this be done in order that the Commission may be able to finish the program and they are anxious to bring it to completion?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; that is the fact.

LET'S SAVE AMERICA FOR AMERICANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while you are searching the records that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] called for, I want you to go back and search the records of the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, and find how many times he voted against funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities when that committee was exposing the enemies within our gates; and how often he voted against citing those enemies of our country for contempt of Congress, when they refused to answer questions concerning their loyalty.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] went on to try to tell you that these displaced persons established an industrial community in Mississippi. He is the only man I ever heard of who has seen or heard of such a community. Some of these displaced persons that they placed on the farms got mad because they were requested to pay for the cows they had bought. They thought they ought to be given those cows.

Some more of them turned in a complaint about the hard work they were required to do. They were not working any harder than the other people in the community—not as hard. The farmers, whites, Negroes and all, were out in the fields at work. They had to work to make a crop. But these displaced persons turned in a complaint, and someone was sent down to make an investigation. The grass was about 6 inches high in their fields, the sun was shining beautifully, everybody else in the community was out in the field working. These investigators got to looking around for these fellows and found them at home asleep in the middle of the afternoon. That is the kind of work they were doing.

Why do you want to get around our immigration laws? If you want to bring in people here, why not bring in people from those countries that settled this continent in the beginning? Why get around it, by all this subterfuge, and bring in people who are not going to do this country any good? There is no telling the number of them who have been slipped in here.

Look at the spies they have convicted, and I want the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to call the roll and pronounce the names of them some day, spies who were in here stealing our atomic secrets and taking them to our avowed enemies.

This is still America; and the American people are looking to us to protect it and keep it American. You talk about this crowd of bureaucrats you have to pass on this. It makes me think of the time they caught a horse thief out in the Southwest. When they went to try him they got 12 of his cohorts on that jury. The jury brought in a verdict that read as follows: "We, the jury, find the man who stole the horse not guilty."

There is one thing about this MacArthur row that is doing good. It is at least waking the American people up as to who is trying to run this Government, and who is trying to wreck it. When General MacArthur came in here I was reminded of what a Negro preacher down at home said about his congregation. "Lord," he said, "whenever I gits my congregation on shoutin' ground, all I has to do is to stand up in the pulpit and holler."

I said that all General MacArthur had to do was to stand up on that rostrum and "holler" and he would be applauded from one end of the country to the other, because of the danger the average American sees in the trend of things, of people who pretend to be representing us on the Federal payroll, bringing into this country people who are dedicated to its destruction.

The American people are getting tired of seeing their boys sacrificed in useless wars on foreign soil. We have just gone through the most useless war in history—World War II. Our boys won the fight on land, in the air, and on the ocean. Then we had Alger Hiss. By the way, I wonder if we got Mr. JAVITS' vote to cite Alger Hiss who had his gang on the payroll? Some of them are still on the payroll in high places. They sold us out at Yalta, turned the victory over to the worst enemy our Christian civilization has ever known, and then set up the so-called United Nations—that Tower of Babel that is out to destroy this Government. You talk about calling on that bunch up there to do anything. I would only call on them to do one thing, and that would be to fold up and get out of here. The quicker we get out of it the better off we are going to be.

You do not have to wait until the next elections. The people are going to take you on in the primaries, if you have one. They are going to ask you some questions. It is going to be like the parrot and the preacher down in Pennsylvania, and I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania remembers this one.

The preacher had a pet parrot that he had taught to say some very beautiful things, quote a little Scripture and probably a few words of the Lord's Prayer. One night some drunken boys got hold of him, took him down the street, and swapped him for a parrot owned by a man who ran a speakeasy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. This man had one that looked just like the preacher's parrot. When the preacher came out the next morning, his parrot was cursing a blue streak. He thought his bird had fallen from grace. He commenced trying to coax him back to the path of righteousness. The more he talked the worse the old bird got. Finally the preacher lost his temper and jerked the bird's cage off the rack and began to swing it over and over amidst a lot of noise and racket, until finally the bird ceased squawking entirely. He threw the cage down and the old bird toppled over apparently dead. Then he saw what a foolish thing he had done. He began to get repentant. He went and got a bucket of water and poured it on him, and almost immediately he began to show signs of life. He would stretch his wings and neck and legs, and finally he got up, staggered across the cage a time or two, shook the water off himself, looked up and saw the preacher standing there high and dry. He said, "Where in the h—— was you at during the storm?"

The American people are going to ask you next summer where you "were at" when this country was being destroyed from within.

Let us go back to fundamentals and save America for the Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have no stories to tell; I wish I had, some like the gentleman from Mississippi. I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, for the silent applause.

I was against bringing in these displaced persons in the beginning, because we had some in our community. The result was not encouraging. One case was where a farmer, or one supposed to be farmer, was brought in—he and his wife and a couple of children—and our kindly local farmer let him have the use of a cow until when one day the displaced person went to town and found that we were on a 40-hour week in this country, that is, factory workers were. Then he asked the farmer to take care of the cow, milk the cow and keep the milk cool while he was away from Friday until he came back Monday. That was just one incident, perhaps not typical. Having so much respect for my colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], I am forced to read and give consideration to their views before voting on the bill.

We do not need to weep for these people from abroad who are not just all they ought to be but who come in under this legislation. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, having received permission earlier today in the House, I will quote an article which tells something about the scandalous years in Washington these days, adding to it a little bit of something about the influence of the White House in letting the so-called Capone gangsters out of jail.

KNOW THE TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, because, over the years, I have repeatedly and vigorously, in plain understandable words, called attention to the lack of common honesty, of political morality of the Truman administration, I have taken a great deal of bitter unjustifiable criticism. Some of my Republican friends have thought and have told me that it would be better to say less, not quite so often oppose so-called New Deal—more recently Fair Deal—policies.

New Deal pink- and red-tinged columnists and radio commentators who apparently have no confidence, no faith whatever in the principles enunciated in our Constitution, who would disregard natural laws and who apparently insist that we, as a Nation, are so weak that we are dependent upon other nations—first one, then another, for our continued national existence and the welfare of our people, have time and again, especially in election years, done their utmost to convince the people of the district that I was unworthy of their support because I was anti-New Deal. That these smear artists have failed in their campaigns of hate and vituperation is due, not to any special merit possessed by me but to the good sense and sound judgment of the people of the district who not only are able to read, but are fully competent to use their own common sense and good judgment to see through the fallacies of a program which called upon the Federal Government—a Government which has not a dollar of its own except what it takes out of the taxpayers pocket—to give the people all those things which they do not have either through lack of opportunity or lack of energy to earn for themselves.

It is therefore encouraging to know that more and more people are learning just how unreliable and lacking in good faith and common decency the present administration has become.

In Look magazine of May 22 next there will appear an article by Fletcher Knebel and Jack Wilson of Look's Washington bureau. That article is captioned, according to the advance sheets received yesterday—Sunday, May 6, a good day for repentance and confession—"The scandalous years."

This article makes very brief reference to some of the activities of the Truman administration.

Among other statements, it makes reference to the activities of one Paul Dillon, Harry Truman's friend who, according to his own testimony, given before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, bragged—and I use the word advisedly—of his friendship with Mr. Truman. Among other things, Dillon testified that he twice managed Mr. Truman's campaign when he was a candidate for Senator. Dillon did not tell how the primary nomination was stolen by the Pendergast-Truman machine from Jack Cochran, long a member of the House—an honored, patriotic Democrat, respected by every Member of the House who knew him. Nor does this article tell, though Dillon did, that he was always welcome at the White House, needed no advance announcement of his intentions to visit Mr. Truman and that in aiding in procuring a parole for the four Chicago gangsters he used his influence with the parole board. Nor does the article tell that Dillon testified that he received $10,000 for his services. Nor does the article mention that Dillon, at one time, found it expedient to go to another State where he remained for several years in order to avoid inquiry in his home State into his conduct as an attorney.

This article from the Look does state that the wires pulled by the four gangsters—Louis Campagna, Paul Ricci, Philip D'Andrea and Charles (Cherry Nose) Gioe—can be traced through Dillon and Hughes to the White House and the Justice Department.

The article refers to Maury Hughes, of Dallas, boyhood friend of the then Attorney General, Tom Clark, who received $15,000 for his efforts in the case. A small fee, by the way, when the results achieved by Hughes are considered.

The article, being brief, fails to mention the fact that before these four gangsters could be paroled it was necessary to obtain the dismissal of a still-pending indictment against them by contacting the Justice Department and Tom Clark, then Attorney General.

The indictment pending in New York was dismissed, and then the parole was granted. Hughes testified that a man unknown to him handed him $1,000 in Chicago as a retainer in the case and that later a stranger in the city of New York gave him 14 additional $1,000 bills for his services in connection with the case. The committee investigating these paroles was unable to learn the identity of the gentleman who paid Mr. Hughes nor the identity of those who contributed the funds necessary to settle the tax case against Louie Campagna.

The Chicago attorney for Campagna testified that individuals came into his office, laid money—thousands of dollars—on the desk without identifying themselves, merely stating that it was "for Louie." All efforts of the committee to inquire into the income-tax returns of these gangsters were stymied by Washington, where the necessary approval of President Truman could not be obtained. Only the President can make income returns available to such committees of inquiry, prosecutors, courts, and so forth. Thus, the committee never was able to uncover the facts in connection with this crooked deal.

The whole deal smells to high heaven.

Because this article to be published in Look tells a part—but not all—of the story of The Scandalous Years in Washington since the Truman administration came to power, with the permission of the House, I will read it. But, first, permit me to read from the article, A Calendar of Political Morals. I read:

A CALENDAR OF POLITICAL MORALS

1945

April: On F. D. R. funeral train, Pauley talks about oil.

May: President Truman begins pardoning Pendergast ballot thieves. Vaughan maneuvers Chicago friend abroad on perfume business. Dillon, ex-Truman campaign manager, asks prison transfer for mobsters.

June: Vaughan's friend brings back $53,405 in perfume. Freezers sent to Vaughan, Connelly, Vardaman, and Mrs. Truman. Messall, ex-Truman secretary, help black-market firm get corn.

July: Vaughan clears perfume executives for priority space to Europe. Maragon tries to smuggle in perfume.

August: Mobsters get prison transfers.

September: Truman frees Indiana gambler.

1945–46

October: Truman pardons Schenck.

November: Vaughan and Pauley help Maragon onto United States Greece mission.

December: Truman pays Pendergast Club dues. Freezer put in White House.

January: More gift freezers arrive. Truman names Pauley to Navy post, exploding oil scandal. Ickes resigns.

February: California housing official collects from Federal employees.

March: Maragon, fired from mission, gives Democrats $300 donation.

April: Iowa gambler wins liquor permit, as known gamblers find doors open to liquor business.

August: Pendergast and Binaggio forces steal Kansas City primary for Truman candidate.

November: Vaughan [illegible] Agriculture Department [illegible] Truman.

1947

March: Gambler Erickson gives $2,500 to Truman campaign. Commerce Department officer involved in export-license scandal.

April: Cleveland's Democratic leader is a lawyer in race wire-service deal.

May: Internal Revenue Department lets Capone mobsters get by without disclosing all sources of income. Kansas City grand jury finds Truman forces stole primary election. Vote-fraud evidence taken from Jackson County courthouse.

August: Four Capone gangsters paroled through Washington influence.

September: Graham, Pauley, 800 other Federal employees in commodity market as Truman denounces speculators.

October: Vaughn helps race track get scarce building materials.

November: Truman frees Curley from jail.

1948

April: Democratic leader seeks to halt Youngstown, Ohio, racketeer's deportation. Reno revenue collector helps gambler with tax return.

July: Vaughn obtains another passport for perfume executive-friend.

September: Erickson's lieutenant heads Truman treasury in Miami. Binaggio raises campaign fund from gamblers. Postal official starts stamp racket scheme. Bilks Joe Adonis.

October: Youngstown party boss, friend of rackets, dies with $125,000 in cash box.

November: Edward Prichard, administration protégé, stuffs Kentucky ballot box.

December: Senate committee hits influence racket in export licenses.

1949

March: Murder of Wolf Riman, Kansas City slot-machine operator, liquor distributor, and deputy sheriff.

May: RFC lends money to business concern in which Florida sheriff, gamblers' friend, has large interest. The company then promptly goes bankrupt. James Hunt peddles his influence in Washington at a fee of 5 percent. Two top Army officers make use of their Washington influence.

September: RFC enmeshed in Lustron Corp. manipulations with $37,500,000 of taxpayers' money. Binaggio helps arrange dinner honoring National Chairman Boyle.

October: RFC official resigns to work with RFC-active law firm. RFC lends money to Reno gambling hotel.

1950

February: Stamp racket explodes, postal official confesses.

April: Binaggio and Gargotta slain in Kansas City Democratic Club. Maragon convicted of perjury. Truman salutes crime committee, pardons Curley.

July: Boyle's introduction used in attempt to work RFC deal for group with criminal records.

September: Shenker, gamblers' lawyer, named to Democratic finance group. O'Dwyer becomes Ambassador to Mexico, escapes police scandal. White House stenographer received $9,500 "RFC" mink coat.

October: Kefauver committee bares link between underworld and Chicago politicians.

November: California Crime Commission reports tax deals with racketeers.

December: Truman commutes Prichard's sentence.

1951

January: Postal official sentenced for stamp scheme.

February: James Hunt is indicted. Internal Revenue Commissioner fires San Francisco deputies. Mississippi Democrat ousted in Government job-selling racket.

March: Kefauver committee attacks favored treatment for gamblers by Internal Revenue Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, I now read the article:

[From Look of May 29, 1951]

THE SCANDALOUS YEARS

(By Fletcher Knebel and Jack Wilson, Look's Washington bureau [1])

(Washington's political scandals, breeding on friendships, favoritism and frauds, have made shocking news, quickly forgotten. The record stamps these as years of immorality, corruption—the shameful era of Pendergastism in Washington.)

President Truman: "My people are honorable—all of them."

Political morality in Washington has sunk to the lowest depth in a quarter of a century:

Four members of the White House staff have been implicated in undercover deals since April, 1945.

Two friends of the White House have been convicted of fraud, a third indicted.

Fourteen high Federal officials have been exposed tugging at the golden skein of influence.

Nine members of the administration family have accepted valuable gifts, including a mink coat.

Ten Federal agencies have been tangled in shadowy manipulations.

Almost 900 Federal employees have been caught trying to improve their private fortunes through their positions on the public payroll.

Out from the Nation's Capital, the twisted threads of influence stretch through the land, pulled taut by recipients of Government loans, by local political bosses and by powers of the underworld.

Here—for the first time—is the 6-year story of the underbelly of the Truman administration. This is the documented day-by-day history of Pendergastism in Washington, as now spread on the record by congressional investigating committees.

The story begins on Sunday, April 15, 1945, on the special train bearing President Truman back from the funeral of Franklin D. Roosevelt at Hyde Park.

As the train rolled southward, the new administration went to work. In a rear car, Edwin W. Pauley, rich California oil promoter and treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, talked with Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. As Ickes reported it later, Pauley wanted him to block Federal plans to take away the oil-rich tidelands from the States. That night, Ickes wrote in his diary: "This is the rawest proposition that has ever been made to me. I don't intend to smear my record on oil at this stage of the game."

THE QUALITY OF MERCY IS STRAINED

When the conversation was made public, Pauley claimed Ickes misquoted him. He admitted they had talked of oil.

In Washington a few days later after the funeral, President Truman appointed Pauley United States representative on the Allied Reparations Commission with the rank of Ambassador.

President Truman began issuing pardons to fellow workers in the Pendergast machine before he had been in office a month. Sixty-three had been convicted of vote fraud in the 1936 elections in Jackson County, Mo., home county of President Truman and Boss Tom Pendergast. Beginning with James G. Gildea on May 5, President Truman pardoned 15 ballot thieves within a year, restoring their civil rights and clearing them for future political activity. The White House did not make any announcement concerning the pardons.

On May 19, Paul Dillon, St. Louis campaign manager for Mr. Truman's Senate race and ex-errand boy for Tom Pendergast, went to Washington. He wanted Paul (The Waiter) Ricca and Louis (Little New York) Campagna, two notorious Chicago Capone mobsters serving 10-year prison terms, transferred from Atlanta penitentiary to Leavenworth. Leavenworth was closer to the Chicago mob's base of operations. Dillon says he "discussed politics" with Frank Loveland, assistant director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Loveland said a transfer was not possible immediately, but suggested it might be proper sometime in the future. Ricca and Campagna were transferred that summer despite objections of the Atlanta warden.

Other Federal prisoners received favors directly from the White House. James J. Gavin, partner in the Greyhound gambling joint in Jeffersonville, Ind., was serving a 5-year term for dodging income taxes on horse-race winnings. James Gavin's brother, Willie, tossed $1,000 into the Democratic national campaign fund. Then he visited William M. Boyle, Jr., Mr. Truman's former secretary who was assistant to National Democratic Chairman Robert Hannegan. Boyle said he'd do what he could. Others also developed an interest and asked the Justice Department to give the case careful consideration.

Harry E. (Cueball) Whitney, a Pendergast wheel horse and World War I Battery D mate of the President, talked to White House Secretary Matthew Connelly about Gavin. On September 13, President Truman quietly commuted Gavin's prison sentence. A week later, 4 months before he was eligible for parole, Gavin was free. Attorney General Tom C. Clark said he had been a "good prisoner" and that a large number of respected persons had requested that he be released.

The following month, the President pardoned Joseph M. Schenck, another heavy contributor to the party chest. The movie magnate had served 1 year of a 3-year term for income-tax evasion.

Another pattern of influence began to develop before Harry Truman had been President 3 weeks: Brig. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, an old Missouri field artillery pal of the President since 1918 and now his military aide, started operating.

Like many businessmen, David A. Bennett, president of Albert Verley & Co., a Chicago perfume concern, wanted to go to Europe. Unlike most, he knew Vaughan. On May 1, 1945, on White House stationery, Vaughan wrote a letter saying Bennett was "entitled to the courtesies of American officials abroad." The war was still being fought, but Bennett got the priority he needed to fly to Europe and back. When he returned June 6, he declared two satchels of perfume, valued by customs authorities at $53,405.

The day Bennett landed in New York, a frozen-food unit was shipped to Vaughan's home as a gift. Another was sent to Mrs. Truman at Independence, Mo. A third went to Matthew Connelly and a fourth to Capt. James K. Vardaman, the President's naval aide, now a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

THE SAGA OF A LOVABLE GUY

When news of the gift freezers leaked out, Vaughan said they were factory rejects. The manufacturer indignantly denied this. Bennett had paid $300 apiece for them.

[1] Look's Washington team spent weeks digging this report out of the present administration's grim record. Both Fletcher Knebel and Jack Wilson have been Washington correspondents since before this era of scandal began. Knebel, born in Dayton and Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Miami (Ohio) University, has been a newspaperman since 1934, covering the Capital since 1937. Wilson, graduate of the University of Minnesota, has been a reporter since 1935 in Minneapolis, joining Look's Washington bureau in 1944.

A second Verley company delegation took off in high-priority airplane space for Europe July 14. It included John F. Maragon, former Kansas City bootblack whom Vaughan called a lovable guy.

Landing in New York July 31, Maragon had an argument with customs officials over a package he was carrying. Maragon said it contained champagne and he waved a White House pass at the inspectors. They opened the bundle anyway—and found two tins of perfume oil worth about $2,300.

Three days after this smuggling attempt, Vaughan wrote a note to the State Departmen asking that Maragon again be allowed to go to Europe on perfume business. Vaughan told the Passport Bureau that "the President is personally interested in Maragon's trip to Italy." Maragon gained special permission to travel without a military permit and to ship, by air, 348 pounds of perfume oil.

FRIENDS OF THE WHITE HOUSE FAMILY BEGAN WINNING FAVORS IMMEDIATELY

In November, Maragon was back at the White House with his hand out. He wanted a State Department job with the American election commission to Greece. Vaughan got it for him; $5,600 a year plus $15 a day for expenses. Maragon continued to draw $1,000 a month and expenses from the Verley company. Pauley helped by writing Henry F. Grady, head of the mission, that "Johnny Maragon * * * is not only a good friend of mine but also of the President's."

While Maragon was in Greece, in December 1945, Bennett shipped a fifth freezer, a $520 model, to Vaughan, who installed it in the White House staff restaurant.

Maragon was a diplomat for 4 months. The State Department fired him February 28, 1946. Grady said Maragon "was making himself a nuisance." But Maragon wasn't angry. One of his first acts when he returned to Washington was to buy $300 worth of tickets to the Democratic Jackson Day dinner. He charged them to the Verley company. A few weeks later, Vaughan was helping Maragon and Bennett rush passports for another trip.

About this time, Victor R. Messall, who, like Vaughan, was a former secretary of Mr. Truman's in the Senate, was trying to make his Missouri friendships pay off. David G. Lubben, of New York, sought an OPA sugar quota for his firm, which was operated in connection with Frank Livorsi, a convicted narcotics peddler. Some of the firm's employees regarded Frank Costello, underworld premier, as their real boss. Lubben later testified he paid Messall $1,000 to try to get an OPA sugar quota. Messall denied this but admitted one of his employees had tried to get Lubben some additional corn. Messall said he "probably signed the letter" concerning additional corn allocations, but contended it was written by the employee and he could not recall the circumstances.

As 1945 ended, any doubts that Pendergastism had moved to Washington were dispelled. President Truman wrote to Jim Pendergast, Boss Tom's nephew and heir, on December 7:

"Dear Jim: I am enclosing you check for $6 in payment of my Jackson Democratic club dues. I hope the outfit is still going good. Sincerely yours, Harry."

The new year brought more of the same. On January 17, Bennett shipped a sixth freezer gift, another $520 model, to Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson, now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. A seventh freezer went to Director of Reconversion John W. Snyder, now Secretary of the Treasury. Snyder rejected the gift.

THE "OLD CURMUDGEON" ERUPTS

The raw deal that worried Ickes at the start of the new administration burst into public view that January. President Truman nominated Pauley to be Under Secretary of the Navy. The Under Secretary administers the Navy's oil reserves. Pauley was a private oil operator. The Senate noted the coincidence and ordered hearings.

Ickes cut loose and told about the proposition Pauley had made on the funeral train. The "Old Curmudgeon" also said Pauley earlier had offered to tap California oilmen for $300,000 in the 1944 campaign if the administration would forget about tidelands.

Ickes said that before he testified he talked with Mr. Truman, who told him: "Tell the truth, but be as gentle as you can with Ed."

President Truman defended Pauley's reputation as unscathed, but the Senate refused support and the nomination was withdrawn. Ickes, quitting the Cabinet in a flaming rage, dared Attorney General Clark to set a grand jury on Pauley. The challenge was ignored.

The "courthouse gang" ethics of high officials in Washington were contagious. In February 1946, John A. Arvin, Los Angeles and San Diego area Federal housing manager, hit 50 Federal workers for $25 Jackson Day dinner tickets. The money went into the 1946 campaign fund despite the Hatch Act.

Arvin used a Government Cadillac and collected $1,190 for repairs in 1 year. He operated a camp stocked with Government blankets and cots. His shotguns were cleaned by housing employees on Government time.

In April, Deputy Commissioner Stewart Berkshire of the Federal Alcohol Tax Unit, overruled his own field office and issued a Federal liquor license to Lew Farrell, a Des Moines, Iowa, gambler with a gun-toting record. There is a law that is supposed to bar such men from the liquor business.

In star-chamber sessions, closed to the public, the ATU had granted scores of liquor licenses to known hoodlums and mobsters. Joe Fusco, a beer trader and friend of Al Capone in Chicago's roaring twenties, has fared so well since the war that he now controls a vast liquor business and has hired several ATU agents away from the Government.

The President went out to vote in the Kansas City primary in August 1946. He was determined to lick Representative Roger Slaughter, an anti-Fair Dealer, and nominate Enos Axtell for Congress. Mr. Truman was photographed with Boss Jim Pendergast, but it was Boss Charles Binaggio who delivered the bacon.

Binaggio, racketeer, gambler, ex-bootlegger, threw in with Pendergast to nominate Axtell. Former Missouri Attorney General Roy McKittrick later said that Binaggio in that election not only voted them from the grave but "from England and France."

Slaughter was buried under the avalanche of phony ballots. The steal was so obvious that Attorney General Tom Clark finally heard the screams of the Kansas City Star and let the FBI investigate.

The FBI later admitted to a Senate committee that the investigation ordered by Clark was limited to a review of evidence developed by the Star. He carefully refrained from ordering a thorough inquiry. Clark is now an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

In the fall of 1946, Vaughan and Maragon were guests of honor at a brewery party in Milwaukee. There, Maragon met Milton H. Polland, a friend of Vaughan's.

Polland's nephew, Harold Ross, was in trouble. Ross' Allied Molasses Co. of Plainfield, N. J., had been cut off from its molasses sources for violating control orders. Ross hired Maragon to straighten things out.

VAUGHAN AND MORE VAUGHAN

Vaughan also tried to help. He telephoned Herbert C. Hathorn, molasses chief in the Agriculture Department. Vaughan opened the conversation by informing Hathorn, "We Democrats have to stick together," and closed it by threatening to have Hathorn fired if he didn't approve molasses for Allied.

Vaughan later claimed to have no memory of the affair. Hathorn and his superior, Joseph T. Elvove, remembered it clearly.

After losing the 1946 election to the Republicans, the Democratic National Committee began a high pressure drive to recoup in 1948. Jefferson-Jackson dinners, $100 a plate, were routine. At Miami Beach's Roney Plaza, the price was $250. Ten tickets were bought for Frank Erickson, the recently jailed New York gambler, by Abe Allenberg, his aide in Miami. Erickson, Allenberg and assorted pals attended the dinner.

George L. Killion, the national treasurer of the party, sent Allenberg a nice note: "Dear Mr. Allenberg: We are grateful to you for participating in the Miami Jefferson Jubilee dinner. Your assistance proved of material help to the Democratic Party in preparing for its 1948 Presidential campaign."

Meanwhile a new racket burgeoned on the Potomac. On March 27, 1947, Peter Lektrich, a licensing officer for the Commerce Department's Office of International Trade, validated an export license for 100,000 pounds of scarce steel pipe. He did it to oblige a friend, Robert M. Mistrough. Mistrough was one of the new crop of export "expediters" dealing in illicit licenses. Lektrich told a Senate committee he had hoped to go into business with Mistrough. He was fired from the Commerce Department. At present, he works for the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Faked export permits sold for as high as $10,000. The Commerce Department regarded the situation with apathy until, a year later, pressure from Congress forced action.

In April, 1947, 23-year-old Edward McBride bought the $2,300,000-a-year horserace wire empire, Continental Press Service. Continental Press distributes racing results all over the country. It's the glue that holds the organized underworld together.

Young McBride was advised in the negotiations by the law office of Miller & Hornbeck in Cleveland. His father, Arthur B. (Mickey) McBride, is a good friend of Ray T. Miller, one of the law partners and Democratic chairman of Cuyahoga County and Cleveland's Democratic boss.

Mickey McBride has been associated in Florida real-estate transactions with "Big Al" Polizzi, "reformed" bootlegger and slot-machine operator. McBride is also friendly with the three Angersola brothers, alias King, one of whom, John, has a long string of notations on police blotters.

Ray Miller led the Ohio delegation to Philadelphia in 1948 and held it in line for Truman. When the President spoke in Cleveland in the 1948 campaign, Miller acted as major domo.

TAX HOCUS-POCUS

Chicago gangsters Tony Accardo and Jake (Greasy Thumb) Guzik, chief legatees of the old Capone mob, sent in a partnership Federal tax return in the spring of 1947. It included an item of $130,000 listed as "other income."

Confronted with the mysterious $130,000, the Bureau of Internal Revenue sent an agent, Ned Klein, to investigate. He reported that the partners refused to divulge the source of this income. He urged further inquiry. But Accardo and Guzik escaped without any embarrassing talk about the $130,000.

That same spring month in 1947, the Kansas City vote-fraud case literally blew up.

Although Attorney General Clark and the President had failed to order a complete investigation of the 1946 piracy at the polls, a Jackson County grand jury did its own sleuthing. On May 27, the grand jury reported that Representative Slaughter had been "deprived of the nomination by fraudulent miscount of votes and by other types of fraud." The grand jury indicted 71 persons.

Anticipating the report, Pendergast and gangster-boss Binaggio had accumulated a fund of $35,000 to defend their minions. A few hours after the grand jury reported, thugs blew open the vault at the Jackson County courthouse and made off with the ballots impounded there. President Truman was sleeping in the Muehlebach Hotel, two blocks away.

Disappearance of the ballots scuttled the case. President Truman and Attorney General Clark promised to investigate. A Senate committee started to look into the affair, but the administration choked it off. Three years later, the statute of limitations took effect.

Now the scene shifts back to Chicago. On August 13, 1947, four of the old Capone crowd walked out of Federal prison because they knew the right people. The four were Louis Campagna, Paul Ricca, Philip D'Andrea, and Charles (Cherry Nose) Gioe. The wires they pulled can be traced to the White House and the Justice Department.

On the Federal parole board were B. J. Monkiewicz and Fred S. Rogers, both appointed a few months earlier by Attorney General Clark. Rogers came from Bonham, Tex.

The lawyers in the case included President Truman's old St. Louis campaign manager, Paul Dillon, and Maury Hughes, of Dallas, boyhood friend of Attorney General Clark. Hughes got $10,000 for his efforts in the case.

Some fantastic angles of the case were never cleared up. The Treasury, for instance, settled a $670,000 income-tax lien against Ricca and Campagna for $128,000. Nobody seemed to know why.

Another Potomac-side scandal, one of the worst in the history of latter-day Pendergastism, was blooming in September 1947.

SOME 800 PUBLIC SERVANTS TOTALED $213,000,000 IN COMMODITY GAMBLING—OF GRAIN AND MEN

President Truman warned that "grain prices should not be subject to the greed of speculators who gamble on what may lie ahead in our commodity markets." More than 800 officials and employees of his administration during 1946 and 1947 had speculative transactions totaling $213,000,000 in the commodity markets.

The fever infected even the White House staff. A heavy plunger was Brig. Gen. Wallace H. Graham, the President's physician. On September 17, 1947, Graham had a grain investment of at least $22,500. He first explained that he didn't know his broker had put him in the grain market. He said his account was closed out 2 days after the President, on October 5, publicly denounced speculators.

The explanation was as glib—and as accurate—as General Vaughan's statement that his freezer was a factory reject. Before a Senate committee, Graham admitted his account had not been closed until December 18.

Ed Pauley, an assistant in the office of the Secretary of the Army at the time, was also deep in the speculations. Pauley admitted he was in the market to the extent of $932,703 during the years the administration was scouring the farm lands for grain for Europe.

An Oklahoma Democrat and former chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, conceded that he was playing the market. His wife was trading in cotton futures.

Speculators included diplomats, Pentagon officers, Federal bureau officials, and civil-service employees. House committee members who investigated said they could not prove that any of the eight-hundred-and-odd Government people traded on inside knowledge in their market dealings, but many of the transactions looked suspicious.

HERE'S VAUGHAN—AGAIN

A woman in the Commerce Department admitted that, on September 8, she told a friend the details of the order, to be issued September 10, permitting larger exports of lard. The friend was employed by the Institute of Shortening Manufacturers. Lard prices climbed 9 cents after the order came out.

While White House General Graham was playing the markets, White House General Vaughan was improving the race-track situation. In October 1947, William Helis walked into Vaughan's office to discuss a race-track problem. According to testimony before the Kefauver crime committee, Helis had business tie-ups with Frank Costello and "Dandy Phil" Kastel, the gambling moguls.

Helis persuaded Vaughan to introduce Eugene Mori and Samuel P. Orlando to Frank Creedon, the Federal Housing Expediter. Mori and Orlando had bought Tanforan race track, near San Francisco, but could not get a Federal permit to construct buildings there.

Creedon's legal staff told the trackmen their case looked hopeless because of the critical housing shortage and restrictions on building materials. A little later, Tighe Woods became Expediter and the Housing Administration began grinding out a permit for use of $150,000 worth of materials at Tanforan. The process took time. General Vaughan called Woods and told him "some friends of mine are interested in this." He said he wanted to be sure Woods would not be prejudiced because Tanforan was a race track. Vaughan called Woods a second time, asked for more speed. The construction permit was issued the next day. Woods defended the permit as perfectly legal.

Helis contributed about $4,000 to the Democratic Party for the 1948 election. Vaughan handled the contribution.

As 1947 dwindled, Truman again was active in behalf of his friends. He freed Mayor James M. Curley of Boston and Donald Wakefield Smith, former member of the National Labor Relations Board, from the Federal penitentiary.

Curley and Smith, both Democrats, had been convicted of mail fraud in a $60,000 deal to swing war contracts to clients. While in jail, Curley had continued to collect $20,000 as Boston's mayor. He acknowledged the President's graciousness by rigging a howling demonstration when Mr. Truman visited Boston in the 1948 campaign.

A FRUGAL MAN

In Ohio the administration came to the aid of another underprivileged character with the right connections. In the spring of 1948, a bill in Congress to stay the deportation of Frank Cammerata was introduced by the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee and a friend of Mr. Truman's.

Cammerata, a major figure in the Youngstown underworld dominated by the Licavoli mob, was married to Pete Licavoli's sister and ran the slot-machine industry in Youngstown through the sufferance of Johnny Vitullo, the local Democratic chief. When Vitullo died of a heart attack in October 1948, his safe-deposit box disgorged $125,000 in cash.

With a lengthy police record stretching over 17 years, Cammerata had been picked up on a fur-robbery charge and was to be ejected from the country as an undesirable alien. Following introduction of the bill, Cammerata was released from Ellis Island.

It was during April, too, that Pat Mooney, deputy collector of internal revenue at Reno, Nev., admitted that he had been making out income-tax returns for San Francisco gambler Elmer (Bones) Remmer. Mooney, besides his job as Federal tax collector, managed the Mountain City Consolidated Copper Co. of Nevada (not to be confused with the reputable Mountain City Copper Co.). The California Crime Commission said Mooney's concern had not produced a ton of ore in 13 years of operation. All but one of its officers were Federal officials. Investors included gangsters, racketeers, and hoodlums. The crime commission reported that the only important tax-fraud prosecution in Nevada in recent years involved a man who refused to buy Mountain City Consolidated stock.

MOONEY IS SNAGGED

A California abortionist who was being pressed for payment of $50,000 in overdue income taxes gave Mooney $5,000. Mooney said it was an investment in the mining company. Mooney later resigned. He was indicted last March by a grand jury that charged him with conspiracy to defraud the Government.

Meanwhile, Vaughan was helping Bennett, the perfume man, arrange another trip to Europe. Bennett wanted to get into the British zone of Germany. The Army said he couldn't. Vaughan got the State Department to say he could. It was one of eight times that Vaughan arranged special favors for Bennett or his employees.

As the 1948 campaign approached, alliances with the underworld were cemented. Abe Allenberg, Frank Erickson's lieutenant, was named Miami treasurer of the Truman campaign committee. In Kansas City, Charles Binaggio began raising a $150,000 campaign fund from his racket cronies in behalf of President Truman and Forrest Smith, Democratic candidate for governor. Binaggio offered Roy McKittrick, one of Smith's primary opponents, $50,000 to withdraw but was turned down.

The President was rocketing around the country "giving 'em h——" when Harold F. (Dusty) Ambrose, a $10,000-a-year special assistant to Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson, decided Washington's moral climate was about right for a Ponzi deal. Ambrose was on the Federal payroll despite disclosures that he sold a private newsletter to postmasters, trading on his position in the Department.

His new scheme involved getting well-heeled suckers to invest in special commemorative stamps, to be sold at a profit to stamp collectors. His big selling point was his inside position in the Post Office Department.

ADONIS GETS TAKEN

First, he hooked Joe Adonis, overlord of New Jersey gambling and associate of Costello and Erickson, for $105,000. Adonis expected nothing but profit from an association with an administration insider. But instead of buying stamps, Ambrose simply paid "dividends" to early investors, using money from later arrivals. Months later, when Ambrose could no longer pay off, the scheme was exposed. In 1951, he was convicted and sentenced to 2 to 7 years in prison.

The President's 1948 victory over Gov. Thomas E. Dewey was so emphatic he did not need the assistance of Edward F. Prichard, Jr., the 33-year-old boy genius of the administration who stuffed a Kentucky ballot box with 254 forged Democratic votes.

Prichard was a former aide of Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson while Vinson was filling high postwar positions in the administration. He also had been a protégé of Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter and was a former counsel for the Democratic National Committee. His mistake was bragging about the ballot forging. He was convicted, but Mr. Truman commuted the 2-year sentence 5 months after Prichard began to serve it.

President Truman was inaugurated on January 20, 1949. Two months later, on March 29, gangsters' guns barked in Kansas City. Wolf Riman, the slot-machine boss, was killed shortly after he acquired exclusive rights to distribute a popular brand of whisky.

The Alcohol Tax Unit in Washington had given Riman a Federal liquor license despite

his known underworld operations. He had friends in the right places. One of them was Sheriff J. A. Purdome of Jackson County.

Purdome was the sheriff who supplied the watchmen who weren't there when the vote-fraud ballots were blasted out of the courthouse vault 2 years earlier. When Riman was killed, he was about to step into his automobile fitted with red lights and a police siren. Purdome had made him a deputy sheriff and let him use the deputy's badge while overseeing his slot-machine and juke-box enterprises.

Two months later, another sheriff showed up in the panorama of corruption. Sheriff Walter Clark was the political boss of Broward County, Fla., the gambling mecca outside Miami.

Frank Costello, Frank Erickson, Joe Adonis, and Mert Wertheimer were the big names in Broward County gambling. The gamblers acknowledged Sheriff Clark's hospitality with appropriate "campaign contributions." Clark's salary was $7,500 a year, but he owned a beautiful home, a $35,000 share in a garage business, a 200-acre farm, and miscellaneous real property. His income included about $16,000 a year from a concern dealing in slot machines, juke boxes, and bolita, the Cuban version of the numbers racket.

Sheriff Clark also was one of the largest stockholders in the Ribbonwriter Corp., devoted to the manufacture of a typewriter gadget. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Government's lending arm, loaned Ribbonwriter $300,000 against the recommendations of its own review committee.

TAXPAYERS' MILLIONS GIVEN COMPANIES HAVING INSIDE TRACK TO RIGHT PEOPLE

Three months after it got the RFC money, Ribbonwriter went bankrupt. The receivers found less than $100 cash in the till.

In May 1949, another of General Vaughan's friends, James V. Hunt, the 5-percenter, was swimming free style in the flood waters of influence.

Sitting in Hunt's office, Maj. Gen. Alden H. Waitt, Chief of the Army Chemical Corps, dictated a memorandum for Vaughan to hand to the President. It demonstrated that Waitt was the only man qualified to be Chief of the Chemical Corps for the coming term. Hunt was trying to get a Chemical Corps contract for one of his paying clients, Deering-Milliken Research Trust of Greenwich, Conn. General Waitt was doing his best to help. As he told one of his officers, Deering-Milliken had "influence in the White House that might prove valuable." Valuable to Waitt. When the facts came out, he resigned from the Army.

Another of Hunt's helpful friends, Maj. Gen. Herman Feldman, the Quartermaster General, supplied the "fixmaster" with inside information about the Army's purchasing plans. Feldman kept his job but received a public reprimand.

HORATIO ALGER IN WASHINGTON

In the summer of 1949, the RFC became tangled in one of the era's most odorous messes. The RFC had loaned a total of $37,500,000 of the taxpayers' money to the Lustron Corp of Columbus, a prefab housing concern.

Among the RFC examiners when the first portion of the loan was approved was E. Merl Young. A one-time Kansas City grocery clerk, Young had arrived in Washington in 1940 when his wife, Lauretta, started working for Senator Truman. Victor Messall, the Senator's secretary, got him a Government job as a $1,080-a-year messenger.

Later, Young examined loans for the RFC and in 1948 went to work for Lustron, quickly rising to an $18,000 vice presidency. Simultaneously, he held a $10,000 job with the F. L. Jacobs Co., of Detroit, a $3,000,000 RFC borrower.

Young was a close friend of RFC Director Walter L. Dunham. Dunham took a particular interest in the Lustron loan, and in September 1949 decided on an RFC survey to find out why Lustron was going broke. He consulted his friend, James C. Windham, assistant to George E. Allen, White House jokesmith, when Allen was an RFC Director.

After the F. L. Jacobs Co. had negotiated its $3,000,000 loan, Windham had left the RFC to become its treasurer. Now Windham knew just the man to make Dunham's survey—Rex Jacobs, president of the Jacobs Co.

Jacobs knew all the ins and outs of the RFC. Among his close friends was Donald Dawson, the President's personnel assistant and former RFC official. A Senate investigating committee reported evidence that Dawson stil swings a lot of weight within the Corporation. His wife is in charge of all RFC files.

The Dawsons spent rent-free Miami Beach vacations in $30-a-day rooms of the RFC-financed Saxony Hotel, headed by George D. Sax, Chicago punchboard king and a heavy Democratic contributor. The Saxony and two Miami-area hotel concerns obtained RFC loans backed by Charles Murray, Senate administrative assistant. James Murray made $21,000 as an attorney representing these same hotels in their successful efforts with the RFC.

ONCE OVER LIGHTLY

Assigned to the Lustron survey, Jacobs whipped through the huge corporation in 2 days. He reported, among other things, that Lustron was spending too much to haul its prefab houses from factory to customer. He overlooked the fact that for 6 months Lustron had been paying $44,800 a month rent on 40 truck tractors that it never received. These tractors were leased to Lustron by Commercial Home Equipment Corp., which had been created specifically for that purpose.

The attorney for Commercial Home was Joseph E. Casey, former Democatic Congressman from Massachusetts. Casey had netted $250,000 on resale of ships purchased from the United States Maritime Commission. Casey had close business ties with the Washington law firm of Goodwin, Rosenbaum, Meacham & Bailen, which handled many RFC deals. Joseph Rosenbaum, principal partner in the law firm, had a business association with Rex Jacobs.

To complete the circle, there was Paul O. Buckley. He was a director of Commerical Home. He also was a director of Lustron. He had business connections with Joseph Rosenbaum's brother, Frank. Finally, Buckley was connected with Barium Steel Corp., a company affiliated with Central Iron & Steel Co., which received $6,300,000 in RFC loans in the summer of 1949.

Only one RFC examiner did not object to the Central Iron loan. The exception was Hubert B. Steele. Steele's daughter, Virginia, once was Merl Young's secretary and later worked for Rosenbaum's law firm. A month after Central Iron got its loan, Steele quit RFC and went to work for Rosenbaum, whose firm represented Barium Steel. The day he went to work, Steele was given $5,000. Rosenbaum said it was 4 months' salary in advance.

Rosenbaum gratefully "loaned" Merl Young money to buy a house and to get Mrs. Young, by now a White House stenographer, a $9,500 mink coat. Mrs. Young selected a natural royal pastel mink at a New York furrier's. Details of the loans were intricate and vague.

While the RFC whirligig was spinning, the Democratic faithful gathered in Kansas City on September 29, 1949, at a testimonial dinner for William Boyle, new chairman of the national committee.

"HIGH FINANCE" IN RENO

Charles Binaggio, the gangster-politician, was on the arrangements committee. He and his wife, niece of Kansas City racketeer Tano Lacoco, sat near Boyle and President Truman.

Ten days later, the gangster-Democratic entente was underlined again. On October 9, the RFC approved a loan of $1,300,000 to the Mapes Hotel in Reno. The hotel's gambling concession had been leased to Lou Wertheimer, brother of Mert, the big-league dice-and-cards man from Detroit. Mert operated in Chicago, in Reno, and in Sheriff Clark's Broward County domain. Lou was better known on the west coast.

Harley Hise, then RFC Chairman, said he could not see anything wrong with lending public money to finance a gambling spot. Gambling is legal in Nevada, he said.

On the night of April 6, 1950, Binaggio and his assistant thug, Charles Gargotta, were shot to death in the Democratic clubhouse, 716 Truman Road, Kansas City. The bodies were found lying beneath a picture of President Truman.

They had been murdered, it appeared, shortly after returning to the club from the State Line gambling house from which they were netting $2,000 a month each through tolerance of the administration they had helped.

The White House lost another ally that month. John Maragon was convicted of lying to a Senate committee about his bank account and his Verley income. He got 8 months to 2 years.

The Senate Crime Committee, headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, swung into action after Binaggio and Maragon had been removed from circulation. President Truman applauded the committee's objectives and granted a full pardon to former Mayor James M. Curley of Boston, whom he had released from prison in 1947.

While the Kefauver committee was stirring the bushes in July 1950, Leo B. Parker, of Kansas City, showed up at the RFC, introduced by Democratic National Chairman Boyle.

Parker's client, Starrett Television Corp. wanted to buy the Aireon Manufacturing Corp. in Kansas City, Kans. RFC owned Aireon after foreclosing on a $1,500,000 loan to the juke-box factory. Boyle's introduction was enough for the RFC directors. They didn't even bother to ask for a Dun & Bradstreet report on Parker's clients.

But before the sale could be completed, inquisitive Senators dug into the deal. They found that Jacob Freidus, owner of Starrett, and his father-in-law, Sam Aaron, were under indictment. They had neglected to pay $218,000 in income taxes to the Government from which Freidus was trying to buy a juke-box plant. They were convicted last November. It also developed that Larry Knobl, Starrett vice president, had been in Federal prison for toying with the bankruptcy laws.

It was a busy time in Washington. Over at Democratic headquarters they were reaping funds for the 1950 Congressional elections. In September, Chairman Boyle appointed a new member of the finance committee. He was Morris A. Shenker, Democratic powerhouse from St. Louis. Shenker knew where to raise money; he had tapped the gamblers.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS SCREAMED

Boyle, an old Pendergast man himself, voiced no objection to Shenker. But Shenker declined the appointment to the finance committee on September 12, after members of the Kefauver committee screamed in public.

John H. Hendren, former Missouri Democratic chairman, gave this sworn testimony on September 29, 1950:

That, in the 1948 campaign, Shenker and William Molasky met Hendren at the Mayfair Hotel in St. Louis. Molasky, veteran of an income-tax conviction, operated a horse-race wire monopoly to St. Louis bookies. He gave the Democratic Party $2,000.

In return, all he asked was that the Democratic candidate for governor, Forrest Smith, if elected, would put his man on the police board. Who? "I believe his first choice was Mr. Shenker," said Hendren.

Hendren said he was fairly sure Forrest Smith, if elected, would not consider Shenker, because, said Hendren, Shenker had a large criminal practice in St. Louis.

Shenker was attorney for assorted witnesses before the Kefauver committee. Among them were William P. Brown, part owner of Molasky's race wire service; James J. Carroll, St. Louis betting commissioner; John Mooney, a bookie, and Joe Uvanni, a comeback bettor.

September 1950 was also the month that President Truman lifted New York's Mayor William O'Dwyer off the hottest spot of his career. The President appointed O'Dwyer Ambassador to Mexico and gave him a chance to walk out on the New York police investigation.

The inquiry, which O'Dwyer labeled a witch hunt, broke open September 15, 3 days before the mayor was confirmed as ambassador. That was the day the police grabbed Harry Gross, Brooklyn superbookie. Within a couple of months, 110 of New York's finest retired in the face of a grand-jury study of bribery and corruption.

Mayor O'Dwyer, who once visited the home of Frank Costello, underworld kingpin, had handed out city jobs to good friends of the racket world. The aroma from his administration became pungent indeed when James J. Moran, his old political pal and O'Dwyer-made New York water commissioner, was indicted for perjury this spring.

"THE WORLD'S RICHEST COP"

In October, the Kefauver committee committed a political faux pas by exposing the alliance between Chicago's Democratic barons and the underworld. The exposure wrecked the reelection chances of Senator Scott Lucas, administration leader in the Senate.

But the Cook County Democratic leaders had carried their tolerance for the rackets too far. They had endorsed former Police Captain Dan A. (Tubbo) Gilbert, then a special investigator for the State's attorney, for sheriff. Gilbert was tagged by the Kefauver committee as "the world's richest cop." Shortly before the election, he admitted he had piled up $360,000 while serving the people. His explanation that the profits came from grain speculation raised the committee's eyebrows.

The voters responded by licking both Lucas and Gilbert. Lucas today blames his defeat on Kefauver.

A week after the election, the California Crime Commission's final report exposed a tie-up between Federal Internal Revenue agents and west coast crooks. Up to that time, incredible dealings between tax agents and hoodlums had gone on under the nose of George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Schoeneman is a former executive assistant of President Truman.

The crime commission said William D. Malloy, deputy in charge of the Salinas office of Internal Revenue, had tagged Anna B. (Tugboat Annie) Schultz for $500. Annie operated a Salinas bordello and was under investigation for tax fraud. After getting $500, the commission said, Malloy wrote Annie on Treasury Department stationery, demanding another $75.

The commission also said Ernest M. (Mike) Schino, chief field deputy of the Federal Revenue Bureau in San Francisco, was associated in the Safety Step Sales Co. with Dorothy A. McCreedy, who also operated a string of call houses.

RELATED CLEAN UP

Internal Revenue officials said the whole mess was under investigation by the Bureau long before the California Crime Commission or the Kefauver committee approached it. Then the Bureau fired Malloy and Schino. Schino was indicted along with Patrick Mooney, former deputy collector at Reno, Nev., on a charge of conspiring to defraud the Government.

The new year opened badly for the White House circle. General Vaughan's friend, James Hunt, was indicted after 5 years of peddling his influence around the Capital.

Spring blossomed along the Potomac with charges that Mississippi Democrats were selling Federal jobs. The charge embarrassed Boyle to the extent of ousting the Mississippi acting Democratic national committeeman, Clarence E. Hood.

It was 6 years since Ed Pauley talked of oil on the train heading into Washington from President Roosevelt's funeral. The moral climate had not improved.

Investigation after investigation has continued to turn up shocking cases of hidden corruption and misuse of influence. Thousands of official pages of testimony have placed on the record this 6-year history of cronyism in our times. How deep does this corruption run?

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Paragraph (3) of subsection (f) of section 2 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) has assurances submitted in his behalf for admission to the United States for permanent residence with a father or mother by adoption, or for permanent residence with a near relative or with a person who is a citizen of the United States or an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or is seeking to enter the United States to come to a public or private agency approved by the Commission, and such relative, person, or agency gives assurances, satisfactory to the Commission, that adoption or guardianship proceedings will be initiated with respect to such alien;".

SEC. 3. Section 5 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Quota nationality for the purposes of this act shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 160–161; 8 U. S. C. 212) and no eligible displaced person shall be issued an immigration visa if he is known or believed by the consular officer to be subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws, with the exception of the contract labor clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136), and that part of the said act which excludes from the United States persons whose ticket or passage is paid by another or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly; and all eligible displaced persons, eligible displaced orphans and orphans under section 2 (f) shall be exempt from paying visa fees and head taxes."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3576) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 207, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be compelled to demand a roll call on this bill. I understand there is an agreement that if a roll call is demanded, the vote will be put over to Wednesday. I have no objection to that, but if we are to vote on the bill now, I am going to have to force a roll call.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the information given to the House by the gentleman from Mississippi, and in accordance with the understanding that exists between the leadership, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration, and final action on this bill, be postponed to Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

POWERS OF APPOINTMENT BILL OF 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2084) relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate and gift tax purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE: Page 2, after the period in line 2, insert "Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means. It is a technical bill and I am not in a position to discuss it with the House. Therefore, I yield 5 minutes to

the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] to explain the bill.

TREATMENT OF POWERS OF APPOINTMENT FOR ESTATE- AND GIFT-TAX PURPOSES

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2084 amends sections 811 (f) and 1000 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code, the provisions of the Federal estate- and gift-tax statutes dealing with property over which an individual has a donated power of appointment, that is, a power of appointment derived from another person. Those provisions of the code were enacted as part of the Revenue Act of 1942, which was approved October 21, 1942.

The 1942 act made a complete change in the treatment of powers of appointment under the estate- and gift-tax laws. The amendments so enacted caused widespread dissatisfaction, and lawyers throughout the country who are familiar with the drafting of wills and trust instruments and the administration of decedents' estates complained to the Treasury Department and Members of Congress about their illogical and inequitable results and about the fact that many of their provisions are difficult to understand. Those lawyers have urged that the 1942 amendments be replaced by statutes which will produce more equitable results and which will be more easily understood by the average lawyer, banker, or property owner.

It is my understanding that representatives of the Treasury Department agree that the 1942 statutes now in force are unsatisfactory and should be replaced by simpler, more understandable statutes, which will eliminate some of their inequities and absurdities. It is my further understanding that the Treasury representatives would agree that the changes in the law which were made in 1942 probably will not produce revenue substantially greater than that which was produced by the statutes in force prior to 1942.

Congress has recognized that the 1942 statutes are not satisfactory and, with the approval of the Treasury Department, it has granted successive extensions of the effective date of those statutes as applied to unexercised powers created prior to the 1942 act and of the time allowed for releasing such powers without incurring liability for estate tax or gift tax. The latest extension was granted by House Joint Resolution 480, approved June 27, 1950, which extended the time to June 30, 1951. In its report on House Joint Resolution 480, this committee stated that in its opinion no further extension should be granted; that it was believed that the studies on the matter had been completed, and that the matter of revision of the statutes could be taken up by the committee at the appropriate time. In view of that statement, it is important that this bill be enacted promptly, in order that the statutory revision may become effective by June 30 of this year.

H. R. 2084 is designed to simplify the estate and gift tax statutes dealing with powers of appointment and to remove some of their inequities. The bill has been approved by a committee of the American Bar Association, which has worked on the question continuously since shortly after the 1942 act was passed. That committee has considered the views of lawyers throughout the country and has held many conferences with representatives of the Treasury Department during the past 8 years in an effort to reach an agreement on a satisfactory substitute for the 1942 statutes. Although that committee was unable to reach a complete agreement with the Treasury Department, it has succeeded in reaching an agreement with the Treasury representatives on many provisions which are incorporated in the bill, and the bill contains provisions which were included, contrary to the wishes of some members of the American Bar Association, in an effort to meet the views of the Treasury Department. The bill has been approved also by a committee of the American Bankers Association, which has worked on the question for several years and has conferred with representatives of the Treasury Department.

A summary of the main provisions of the bill is set forth below. In this summary I shall refer to pre-1942 powers, meaning those created on or before October 21, 1942, and to future powers, meaning those created after that date.

PRE-1942 POWERS

H. R. 2084 would subject to estate tax in the State of a decedent property over which he has a power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, only if the power is a general power and is exercised by the decedent by will or by a deed of a testamentary character. The gift tax would apply on the exercise of such a power. A general power is defined as an unlimited, unrestricted power which is exercisable by the decedent in favor of himself, his estate, or his creditors. An unlimited, unrestricted power is one which the holder of the power, acting alone, can exercise as he sees fit, without having to answer to anyone else.

The bill provides that a power to consume, invade, or appropriate property for the benefit of the holder of the power which is limited by an ascertainable standard relating to the health, education, support, or maintenance of the holder shall not be deemed a general power of appointment. For example, a power to use principal of a trust fund in case of sickness or some other emergency would not be a general power, but a power to use principal for comfort or happiness would not be limited by an ascertainable standard and would be a general power.

The 1942 law now in force provides that the tax shall apply whether the power is exercised or not, and even though the power cannot be exercised so as to benefit the holder, if the power can be exercised in favor of persons who do not fall within certain exempt classes specified in the statute. However, the present law allows the holder of a pre-1942 power to release the power at any time prior to July 1, 1951, without incurring liability for gift tax or estate tax, and provides that the estate tax shall not apply if the holder dies before that date without exercising the power.

Prior to the 1942 act the estate-tax law did not apply to an unexercised power of appointment, and prior to 1942 many people created powers of appointment in favor of others, relying on the fact that such a power would not cause the property to be taxed in the estate of the holder unless he should exercise the power and thus take command over the property. It would be objectionable retroactive taxation if the tax should be made to apply to unexercised powers created before the passage of the first statute which taxes unexercised powers.

Moreover, in many instances, the holder of the power dies without learning of its existence. Large property owners in cities throughout the country have their wills reviewed frequently by lawyers who are familiar with the taxing statutes and they usually know of the existence of any powers of appointment given to them. Since 1942, those having knowledge of the existence of general powers given to them prior to 1942 have followed the practice of cutting them down to exempt powers. However, many small property owners throughout the country do not have access to expert legal advice on such questions and they would be penalized unjustly if their estates should be made to bear a higher estate tax because of the retroactive application of the taxing statutes.

The present statute, as interpreted by the Treasury Department, allows holders of pre-1942 powers to cut them down to exempt powers prior to July 1, 1951, without incurring liability for estate tax or gift tax. Therefore, a statute which would tax unexercised powers created before 1942 cannot be regarded as a revenue measure. A provision taxing such powers would operate solely as a trap for the unwary and should not be included in the amending statute.

H. R. 2084 incorporates into the statute the provisions of the present estate and gift tax regulations permitting the release or cutting down of pre-1942 powers to exempt powers without liability for gift tax or estate tax.

FUTURE POWERS

The principal difference between the treatment of pre-1942 powers and future powers in H. R. 2084 is that in the case of a future power the estate tax would apply on the death of the holder of the power whether it is exercised or not, and the gift tax would apply on the release as well as the exercise of the power. As in the case of pre-1942 powers, the estate and gift taxes would apply only if the power is a general power as explained above.

The only justification for taxing as property of a decedent property over which he has as unexercised power of appointment received from someone else is that the power may be exercised so as to benefit the decedent, and accordingly may be regarded as equivalent to ownership of the property. If through the exercise of the power the decedent may not benefit himself or his estate, there is no justification for taxing the property as his, regardless of how broad the class of persons may be in whose favor the power may be exercised.

The present law taxes the power where it may be exercised by the holder either alone or in conjunction with any other

person. H. R. 2084 would apply the tax only where the power is exercisable by the holder alone. There may be justification for taxing in a decedent's estate property which the decedent himself transferred during lifetime reserving a power to alter, amend, or revoke with the consent of another person, because the decedent chose to create the power in that manner. However, where the holder of the power does not participate in its creation but derives it from someone else, the property should be treated as his property only if he has the unfettered right to exercise the power and if he is not required to obtain the consent of another person to its exercise.

The bill provides that the mere failure of the holder to exercise a power during the period allowed for its exercise, so that it expires or lapses during the life of the holder, shall not be treated as a transfer of the property. The present statutes, as construed by the Treasury Department, treat such failure to exercise the power as a transfer at the time the power lapses. For example, if a decedent by his will should give his widow the income for life from a trust fund and the power to withdraw $5,000 a year from principal and the power over each year's $5,000 would expire at the end of the year, the widow would not under H. R. 2084 be deemed to make a transfer of $5,000 when she failed to exercise the power in any year. The estate tax would apply only to the amount over which the power existed after death. But under the Treasury Department's interpretation of the present statute, each year that she failed to exercise the power she would be regarded as making a gift of a remainder interest in $5,000, and on her death, each year's $5,000 would be taxable in her estate as if she had made a transfer of that amount reserving income to herself for life.

H. R. 2084 contains a provision, which I understand has the approval of the Treasury Department, that a disclaimer or renunciation of a power shall not be treated as a transfer of the property. The mere failure to exercise a power so that it lapses during the lifetime of the holder should be treated in the same way as a disclaimer or a renunciation.

The bill contains other provisions which I understand meet with the approval of the Treasury Department. Provision is made that if a power which is not otherwise taxable is exercised in such manner as to create another power which can result in continuing the property in trust during the lives of persons who were not born at the time the first power was created, the first power shall thereby become a taxable power and shall cause the property to be subject to estate tax or gift tax at the time it is exercised. Finally, the amendments are made effective as of the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1942, so that they will apply to the estates of decedents dying after October 21, 1942, and to gifts made on or after January 1, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as the gentleman has said, is a technical bill. It was introduced by me at the request of a committee appointed by the American Bar Association some 4 years ago to study the effect upon the taxpayers of this country of an amendment to the gift and estate tax law which was passed by the Congress in 1942. This amendment which was passed in 1942 was too drastic. It was more drastic than the Committee on Ways and Means realized and immediately upon its passage we found we had upset estates which had been created even before income tax, estate or gift taxes had ever been adopted in this country. So in the 8 years which have intervened, each year we have passed a law extending the effective date of the act of 1942. The last extension was passed last year and terminates on June 30 of this year. In the meantime we have asked the Treasury staff, and this committee appointed by the American Bar Association to study the matter and make their recommendations. They have made their recommendations. This is the bill we have before us today. It provides definitions of powers of appointment and prescribes the various effects of certain classes of appointments, general appointments and special. This bill comes to you with almost unanimous approval of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The permanent solution which your committee has worked out for the powers of appointment problem has been attacked in a minority report signed by three members of the committee. Although this minority report agrees that the provisions of the 1942 amendments dealing with powers of appointment were too strict and should be liberalized, the report starts with an attack on all powers of appointment. It asserts that tax avoidance has been the chief factor in their increased use. The report attempts to support this position by a quotation from W. Barton Leach, professor of property law at the Harvard Law School. For this reason I would like to use Professor Leach's words in explaining that powers of appointment are not mere tax-avoidance schemes, but are a legitimate and intelligent method of property disposition which this Congress has no right to penalize. Professor Leach said in the Harvard Law Review for April 1939:

> Powers, and particularly special powers, are efficient as devices for causing family funds to be devoted to the uses of the family in such a way that the more needy are provided for at the expense of the less needy. Where a man leaves a widow and children, or a daughter and grandchildren, a life estate with a special power of appointment enables him at once to preserve the fund from dissipation or loss and to cause the fund to be distributed among the remaindermen in accordance with the judgment of the life tenant exercised at her death on the basis of the needs then apparent. By the use of a power it is made possible to have the ultimate distribution governed wisely by the shifts of fortune of the family members that occur during the life of the life tenant, rather than predetermined in fixed shares as of the testator's death.
>
> Moreover, although powers appear in many wills involving large estates, they are most needed and are becoming increasingly used in estates of moderate size. If the Federal estate tax is so expanded as to hit more powers of appointment in the expectation that this will merely be a further tax upon the very opulent, I predict that it will soon be discovered that we have produced another instance of striking the lower- and middle-income groups with brickbats aimed at the rich. Take an example. If a man has a wife and four children and a million dollars to distribute among them, he can prudently create a life estate in the wife and a rigid remainder to the four children equally. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars apiece is pretty certain to be adequate provision for each child; so the rigid remainder does no harm. But suppose his estate is $100,000 or less. One-fourth of that amount will not be adequate to the needs of a crippled son or a daughter whose husband has proved worthless. In such a case it is of the greatest importance that the property should be allocated at the death of the mother to such children and in such proportions as need dictates. A power of appointment in the mother is absolutely vital—and a tax on special powers would penalize it handsomely.

I am confused as to what the minority report is driving at in its general attack on powers of appointment. It points out that a father may leave property in trust to pay the income to his son for life and to his grandchildren until 21 years after the son's death, and thus postpone a second estate tax for over a century. But that has nothing to do with this bill. It has always been possible under our estate tax, and it will continue to be possible whether or not this bill is enacted, because it is possible without the use of a power of appointment. Apparently the minority report objects to the same result being achieved through the us of a power of appointment. And apparently the minority report does not object to this same result being achieved even through the use of a power of appointment, provided the power is a power in the son to appoint among the grandchildren as he chooses. This type of special power is not taxed even under the 1942 amendments, and the minority report agrees that the 1942 amendments should be liberalized, and not made more strict. If it is the position of the minority report that such a power should be taxable if the son has the power to take the property for himself at any time during his own lifetime, then there is no disagreement with H. R. 2084 in this example with regard to future powers, because this bill would levy an estate tax at the death of the son holding such a power in the case of a power created after 1942.

The minority report charges that H. R. 2084 would "restore" or "reinstate" a loophole closed by the 1942 act, since the bill provides that a general power of appointment created before the 1942 act shall not be subject to estate tax unless it is exercised. In fact, the distinction between powers of appointment created prior to the Revenue Act of 1942 and powers created since that date has been in our estate tax law continuously since 1942. The Revenue Act of 1942 itself provided that a general power created on or before October 21, 1942, could be released before January 1, 1943, without estate or gift tax, and that if the holder of such a power died before January 1, 1943, without exercising the power there would be no estate tax. Since the Revenue Act of 1942, Congress has extended that distinction between preexisting powers and future powers on 10 different

occasions, so that no decedent dying before July 1 of this year will be subject to estate tax by reason of holding an unexercised general power of appointment at his death if that power was created on or before October 21, 1942. Therefore it is not correct to say that H. R. 2084 would "restore" or "reinstate" a distinction in favor of preexisting, unexercised general powers. That distinction is in our estate tax law today. H. R. 2084 would make the distinction a permanent provision of the estate tax.

Congress has long recognized the need for making a distinction between a general power of appointment created before the 1942 act, with the expectation that there would be no estate tax on the holder of the power unless he exercised it, and a general power created after the 1942 act in the knowledge that such powers are taxable to the donee whether or not exercised. If it were not for the fact that Congress felt that a problem existed with respect to these preexisting powers, it would not have been necessary to defer application of the 1942 legislation to them for 9 years. Your committee's reports during this period have specifically stated that the extensions were necessary because of the need for additional time to study possible changes in the 1942 legislation, particularly in connection with preexisting powers. Now your committee has reached the conclusion that tax-free release of these old general powers need no longer be permitted after the end of June of this year, but that, if they are retained, their holders should not be subjected to estate tax unless they exercise the powers.

The reasons for this treatment of preexisting general powers in your committee's bill are very simple. Since the holders of these powers have been free to release them since 1942 without subjecting themselves to estate or gift tax, and since they are still free to release them tax-free before July of this year, a decision by Congress to subject them to estate tax after July, whether exercised or not, would merely mean that practically all the persons who hold these old general powers, and know that they hold them, would release them tax-free before July 1. The result would be that Congress would be placed in the position of levying an estate tax with the full knowledge that persons with competent tax counsel would avoid it and that only the uninformed would pay. For example an unlimited power to invade has never been considered a power of appointment under the usual concepts of property law, yet it is considered a general power of appointment for estate tax purposes. We would be taxing the holders of these old powers to invade, who do not even realize that they have powers of appointment because they do not realize there is a difference between the property law definition of a power of appointment and the broader definition under our estate tax law. Your committee does not believe that a tax law should be framed to catch the ignorant with the full knowledge that the tax-conscious will not be affected

The minority report objects to the definition of taxable future powers in H. R. 2084, and it cites four estate-tax cases under the pre-1942 law which it says were lost by the Government under the same definition of taxable powers which is proposed in this bill. In the first place, the Government won one of the four cases cited—the case of *Kendrick* v. *Commissioner* (34 B. T. A. 1040). Two of the remaining cases do not illustrate results which would obtain under H. R. 2084, with your committee's amendments to the bill, because they were based on different definitions of taxable powers. The case of *Hepburn* v. *Commissioner* (37 B. T. A. 459) is cited in the minority report as an example of a power which was held not to be a general power in 1938 because it could be exercised only with the approval of disinterested trustees. Surely the writers of the minority report are aware that, under the committee's amendment to H. R. 2084, a future power of appointment held jointly with disinterested trustees is not exempted. The definition of taxable future powers in the amended bill specifically make such a joint power taxable if it can be exercised by the donee in his own favor, in favor of his creditors, in favor of his estate, or in favor of the creditors of his estate. The case of *Helmholz* v. *Commissioner* (28 B. T. A. 165) is cited as a case where it was held that a power was not a general power because it could not be exercised in favor of a business corporation. This is not a full explanation of the Helmholz case, since the Board of Tax Appeals also said that the exercise of the power was limited to persons other than the grantee. However, if the Helmholz decision by the Board of Tax Appeals was based solely on the fact that the grantee could not appoint to a business corporation, the opposite result would be reached under the definition of future taxable powers in H. R. 2084. This case was not decided, as the minority report states, under a definition of a general power in the regulations which is the same as the definition contained in H. R. 2084. The definition in the regulations to which the minority report refers was not adopted until 1937—4 years after the Helmholz case. Under your committee's bill a future power will be taxable as a general power if the holder may exercise it in his own favor or in favor of his estate or creditors, regardless of the fact that others, either individually or as a class, are excluded from the group of potential appointees.

The fourth case cited in the minority report as a horrible example, the case of *Leser* v. *Burnet* (46 F. (2d) 756), merely holds that in determining whether or not a power is exercisable in favor of the donee's creditors it is necessary to look to the applicable State law and determine whether, in fact, the power could be exercised in favor of creditors. This is certainly a sensible principle and would undoubtedly be followed by the courts in interpreting any powers-of-appointment statute Congress might enact. This does not mean that the language of a power must conform to what the State defines as a general power. It merely means that, in applying the definition of a general power in the Federal statute, it is necessary to determine the practical effect under State law of the particular language used in creating the power.

Instead of defining a taxable power of appointment as a power which is exercisable in favor of the individual possessing the power, his estate, his creditors, or the creditors of his estate, the minority report suggests broadening the definition to include any power to appoint which is not limited to a restricted class. Your committee gave full consideration to this proposal and rejected it as impractical. We were not able to find anyone who could tell us what was meant by a restricted class. And, incidentally, the minority report does not attempt to define the term. It was the feeling of your committee that it would be undesirable to insert an undefined term like restricted class in the estate-tax law with no clear idea as to what it means. Use of such a term would be an invitation to years of costly litigation while the courts guessed at what Congress might have meant by it. As far as making the estate tax more strict, this suggestion in the minority report would have very little significance, since, under any conceivable definition of the term "restricted class," the exempt class would include practically anyone the grantor of the power would normally be interested in including in the class of potential appointees.

The only other specific objection the minority report makes to the treatment of future powers of appointment under H. R. 2084 is that the bill does not levy an estate or gift tax on the holder of a power of appointment where the power expires or lapses during his lifetime. In other words, the minority report objects because the bill does not require a person to pay a gift tax on property when he loses a power over it. For example, if A has a general power of appointment over the remainder interest in property during the life of B, the income beneficiary, the minority report would argue that, if B dies before A has exercised his power, then A has made a gift of the property. In such a case the property goes to the persons the grantor of the power has designated, not to persons A has picked, and the power has lapsed because of B's death, not because of any act on the part of A. Your committee could not see any logic to the contention that the lapse of the power in such a case should be deemed to be a taxable gift by A.

The case of the lapse of a power arises most frequently where a widow is given a life interest in the income from her husband's property and is also given a power to take as much as $5,000, for example, from the corpus of her husband's estate in any year in which she considers this necessary. If the widow does, in fact, draw down $5,000 of the corpus each year and keep it until her death or give it away, she is, of course, subject to estate or gift tax on such amounts. However, if she does not exercise her right to invade the corpus of

her husband's estate, the minority report would argue that she has made a gift of $5,000 each year. Furthermore, even though the annual amount is small, it is not saved from gift tax by the $3,000 annual exclusion per donee, because the gift tax does not provide any exclusion for gifts of future interests, no matter how small. And, as if this were not enough, under the position taken in the minority report, the widow's estate would also be subject to estate tax on each $5,000 annual amount which she failed to take during her lifetime—on the reasoning that, by not taking the money, she made a gift intended to take effect at her death. Your committee could not countenance these weird results which follow from adopting the far-fetched interpretation that a lapse of a power is a gift by the person who held the power. Therefore, we have provided that a mere lapse of a power of appointment during life is not an exercise of the power.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, I believe, has explained the content and purpose of the bill, which is made in order by this rule, to the satisfaction of the House. The bill was reported by the practically unanimous vote of members of the Committee on Ways and Means, as only three members signed the minority report and when the measure was presented to the Committee on Rules and a request made for a rule, the rule was granted by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules. It appears to me this is very badly needed remedial legislation, which has been well drawn by the great Committee on Ways and Means after a long period of careful study and consideration. The rule should be adopted and the bill should be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with what the gentleman from Ohio said with respect to the adoption of the measure which will be debated. Of course, I have no intention of trying to defeat the rule, but I certainly think there are some valid objections to the bill as reported out by the committee. The minority report has been prepared and printed and the measure is of great importance, I think, to a very small segment of the taxpaying public of this country in that it will be a windfall for those people in the matter of taxes and will indirectly affect every other person in the country who has to pay taxes because the tax burden will not be evenly distributed if this measure becomes law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe the gentleman from Ohio has stated the fact correctly when he stated that the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means were unanimous in support of this bill and when he stated the fact that the Committee on Rules was unanimous in reporting the rule. Of course, the value or lack of value in the bill itself is a matter of opinion.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just wanted to make my position clear.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We understand the gentleman's position, because he was one of three members of the Ways and Means Committee who signed a minority report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2084) relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate and gift tax purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2084, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 2084, represents an earnest effort on the part of the Committee on Ways and Means to deal with, solve, and dispose of finally a very perplexing problem.

As was stated by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], author of the bill, this question has been before our committee several times each year for about 10 years. We were unable to arrive at anything in the way of legislation for more than temporary action because we were awaiting a study and report by the American Bar Association. That report has now been received. The Ways and Means Committee has received all the information that is necessary to pass on it intelligently and, I hope, to reach a satisfactory conclusion. It is true that this bill does not have the unanimous report of the Committee on Ways and Means, but it does have the support of a considerable majority. As far as I know, there are only three or four members of the committee who are not in sympathy with it and do not favor the enactment of this legislation.

I feel that it has been given careful study. The committee has been looking into it carefully and I am satisfied, if it is enacted into law, it will solve and dispose of a problem which has been giving us so much concern over a number of years. I am supporting the bill because I believe it is necessary, important, and desirable legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], author of the bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, as I stated when I addressed the House during the consideration of the rule, this bill is recommended by the tax committee of the American Bar Association. Also, they have consulted with the legal staff of the Treasury Department. The staff representing the Treasury and the committee representing the Bar Association have agreed on every point in the bill except one. You will notice in the report that there are several committee amendments. Those committee amendments were recommended by the Treasury staff and agreed to by the Bar Association staff and committee. There was only one point upon which they did not agree.

As I also told you before, this bill relates to the law on gift taxes and estate taxes as it applies to what are known as powers of appointments in deeds or wills. This bill more clearly defines powers of appointment; it more clearly defines general powers of appointment and the various special powers.

The reason this is needed was because in communities all over the United States in many of which there was no high-powered technical special tax lawyer, and old-fashioned good lawyers had not kept up particularly with the various laws we had passed and changes in laws affecting technicalities of estate and gift taxation, this was to fix it up so they could look at it and at a glance know what they were doing.

I wish to take up this one point in which three or four members of the committee did not agree with us and in which the Treasury staff did not agree with us. Let us take a power of appointment which allows a widow or some person to encroach upon the corpus of an estate, that is, spend a part of the principal of the estate; and I will illustrate: Suppose that one particular citizen who has an estate of three or four hundred thousand dollars, who has a large family, and who has some misgiving in his mind as to whether or not his wife could manage his estate; so he makes a will and gives his wife for her lifetime the entire income from his estate, with the property at her death to go to his children; suppose he makes a condition in his power of appointment to her that she may encroach upon the corpus of that estate as much as $10,000 in any year. He hesitates to say she must spend that $10,000 for clothing, or food; maybe he wants her to use it if she thinks she needs it for any purpose, and therefore he just leaves it blank, but just says she may in any year encroach to the extent of $10,000. Maybe he had in mind that we might have a depression, and that his estate, being invested in corporation stock, might produce no income, so he provided this way for her to have an income; maybe that is what he had in his mind, so he gives her the right to draw on the estate to the extent of $10,000 a year in any year. Suppose she lives 15 years after his death, but during that time lived frugally and did no touch a penny of the principal of the estate. Under the law as it exists at the present time, unless we pass this bill, if she should die and not take a cent of that money, the Bureau of Internal Revenue could come in and say: "Oh, yes, you had the right to get it," and they could take that 15 years times $10,000—that is $150,000—and add it to her estate and make her estate pay estate taxes on it, yet she had never gotten a penny of it. We have many cases like that. It has never been the intention,

I contend, and as the great majority of our committee contends, to tax that kind of a proposition. That is why we want to cure this.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. On what theory is that basis sustained that they charge that up to her estate, although she never received a dollar of it?

Mr. CAMP. On the theory she had the right to it, therefore it was a power of appointment to herself—on the theory you have to tax an estate through every hand it passes.

Mr. DONDERO. If that theory were sustained a person could be taxed for that which he never received?

Mr. CAMP. That is exactly the point, and that is why this bill is here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Taking the case the gentleman has cited, at the time the husband makes the transfer it was within his estate?

Mr. CAMP. Yes; and it was taxed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It was taxed?

Mr. CAMP. Through his estate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Through his estate?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then at the time of the mother's death this is somewhat recaptured so far as the theory of the law is concerned?

Mr. CAMP. It will be taxed again.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Thrown in as a part of her estate. It pays a double inheritance tax as far as the estate is concerned?

Mr. CAMP. That is the way I see it, and that is the way the majority of our committee sees it.

The gentlemen who are opposing this contend that this makes a loophole. They contend that an estate has passed through her hands for 15 years and should be taxed again. I say to you that her living 15 years has kept the property out of the hands of the remaindermen, for 15 years and they will hold the property just that much shorter, and that the property can then be taxed again under the Federal estate tax.

Mr. DONDERO. Does this not result in one thing—that is, putting a penalty on frugality?

Mr. CAMP. That is true, it simply puts a penalty on frugality.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I should argue this point any further. The committee has almost unanimously agreed to this bill. It is the solution and the clarification necessary to the power of appointment provisions of the Revenue Act of 1942. If there are any questions, I will try to answer them to the best of my ability.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. How did this situation arise so that it required the correction of the Congress? Was it because the internal revenue people began taxing this potential right of the woman to take this money?

Mr. CAMP. It is because in the act of 1942 these powers of appointment were not clearly defined. These are what they call invasion powers under which the holders of the powers can encroach on the estate. The definition as given by the Treasury would have taxed these people. We never allowed that to go into effect, however, as I believe our Chairman [Mr. DOUGHTON] has explained. We immediately postponed the operative date of the law during these 8 years to give people a chance to change their wills and to clarify the status of these estates. Now this bill will completely clarify the law along the line which the Committee on Ways and Means believes to be necessary. It should be enacted without delay.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen who have already spoken, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] especially, have explained this bill so thoroughly and answered questions with such clarity that there is not very much one can say now in greater support of the bill. We are dealing with one of the most vital subjects in the realm of property that we have. Men work, struggle, and sacrifice for what? Well, usually they have some loved ones, his family, and perhaps there is a bequest to take care of his relatives and friends, and perhaps others who had been retainers of his or who have performed some great service, or to educate some people. I have tried to explain this legislation as clearly as I could, and I do not know as I can add very much to what has already been said.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 2084 is to bring clarity, simplicity, and equity out of the confused and irrational tax treatment presently accorded powers of appointment under our Federal estate-tax laws. This remedial and corrective legislation which involves no revenue loss is long overdue and I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] in urging that H. R. 2084 be enacted by the Congress with all possible dispatch.

The need for this legislation arises as the result of the unsatisfactory amendments relating to the taxation of powers of appointment by the Revenue Act of 1942. For 25 years prior to this act only an exercised general power of appointment was subject to the Federal estate tax. If the power of appointment was a special power, that is a power to appoint or dispose of property only among a limited class of persons, then the property subject to this limited or special power was not taxable. Let me pause at this point to explain in lay language what we mean by a power of appointment. A power of appointment is the legal terminology for a power or right given to a person by someone else to dispose of property either by will or by an inter vivos transfer. For example, a husband may by his will leave his property to his wife in trust for her life and at the same time provide in his will that she shall have a power to designate to whom the property shall go upon her death. In this case the wife is said to have a power of appointment because she can appoint or designate the person or persons to whom the property shall go on her death. In the case I have cited the wife is known as the donee of the power of appointment and it is always the donee's death that raises the question of whether another estate tax will be imposed upon the same property in the donee's estate. It should be borne in mind, of course, that the property subject to the power of appointment in the donee's estate has already been taxed once in the husband's estate, and this legislation deals only with the question of the circumstances under which the property will be taxed again in the donee's estate.

As I stated, for 25 years the only type of power of appointment which was taxed in the donee's estate was a general power, that is a power to select or appoint the property to anyone. In addition the donee of the power had to actually exercise this power and the property had to pass as the result of the exercise of the power. A power in the donee to appoint to only a limited class of people was never taxed in the donee's estate whether or not the power was exercised.

The 1942 Revenue Act changed the entire concept of taxing property subject to powers of appointment and as the result of this act and as the result of subsequent Treasury regulations, this field of taxation was thrown into a chaotic and wholly unsatisfactory state. Briefly stated, the 1942 act which applied to both powers already in existence as well as to future powers—that is, powers created after the passage of the act—made taxable a power of appointment whether it was general or special and whether it was exercised or not and without regard to any questions of whether the property passed as the result of the exercise of the power. The 1942 act provided that if a decedent "has at the time of his death a power of appointment," the property is taxable in his estate and the term "power of appointment" includes all powers except two: First, power to appoint among a class of persons which includes no one but the decedent's spouse, the spouse of the creator of the power, descendants of the decedent or his spouse, descendants of the creator of the power or his spouse, spouses of such descendants and charities; and, second, powers to appoint among a restricted class by a person who has no other interest in the property.

The first exception permits only powers of appointment within the family to be excluded from the estate tax and the second of the exceptions applies to what is commonly known as fiduciary powers. Unless the power of appointment is within these two classes the property is subject to another estate tax in the donee's estate. Moreover, not only did the 1942 act itself change the type of power of appointment which was subject to the estate tax but under subsequent Treasury regulations many ordinary powers of trustees were, or might be, construed to be powers of appointment subject to another estate tax con-

trary to the understanding of the entire legal profession for many years. Because the 1942 amendments were clearly inequitable the Congress has provided each year since that time for the tax-free release of powers of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, the effective date of the Revenue Act of 1942. This was done in order to permit holders of previously created powers to adjust their affairs in the light of the 1942 act.

H. R. 2084 is not however an extension of time under which holders of pre-1942 powers may release them without incurring any tax liability, but it is at long last a solution to this problem. The bill is divided into two parts. The first part in effect restores the law as it existed prior to the 1942 act for those powers which were created on or before October 21, 1942. In other words, as to those powers which were created prior to the Revenue Act of 1942 only the exercise of a general power of appointment will be subject to tax. The second part of the bill deals with powers created after the passage of the 1942 act. As to these powers the bill subjects to estate tax a general power of appointment whether or not the power is exercised and subjects to gift tax the exercise or release of such power. The bill defines a general power of appointment as a power which is exercisable in favor of the decedent, his estate, his creditors, or creditors of his estate. This includes a general beneficial power to appoint by will and also certain rights in the donee to consume principal.

The committee's amendment to the definition of a general power retains the provision of the bill that a power must be exercisable in favor of the decedent, his estate, his creditors, or the creditors of his estate to be a general power. While the words "unlimited, unrestricted" have been eliminated from the definition by the committee amendment, the definition provides that, if certain limitations or restrictions are present, a power is not a general power even though exercisable by the decedent in his own favor. A power to consume principal which is limited by an ascertainable standard relating to the holder's health, education, support, or maintenance is not considered a general power. In the case of powers created on or before October 21, 1942, a power is not considered a general power if it is a joint power; that is not exercisable by the holder except with the consent or joinder of another person or persons.

A full discussion of the specific provisions of this remedial legislation is contained in the committee report. I do not feel therefore it is necessary for me to elaborate further. The basic objective of this legislation is to make the tax laws applicable to powers of appointment as clear cut and equitable as possible. H. R. 2084 achieves this objective.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members do not get the impression that this is merely a matter of simplification of the estate laws. It is a very complicated matter which is quite difficult to understand. I might also say at the outset I am certain there are some members of the minority who do not approve of all of the portions of the bill as presented to the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Because there apparently is some little confusion on the subject, I would like to state that as one of the members of the minority I do not agree wholeheartedly with the bill as presented or as reported, although I do want to say I do think something should be done and done soon by the committee to clarify the indefiniteness of the present status of these powers of appointment. I do not agree with the solution of this question as presented to the House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, because the matter is rather complicated and because I want to be very careful in making any statement regarding the effect of the bill, and being fortified also after listening to the statements already made in support of the bill, which I do not believe to be accurate, I have a prepared statement. I am sure nobody can take any exception to the technical aspects and to the effects of this measure as I will now present them to you.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. Much as I regret having to disagree with the gentlemen from Georgia, I am unable to support a measure which reopens a monstrous loophole in the estate tax law. That should be the title of this bill: "A bill to reopen a loophole."

Any Member of the House who votes for this bill will be voting in favor of tax exemption for the very wealthy. No ordinary citizen, no laboring or professional man, no person with a fortune of less than $120,000 will receive any benefit from this bill. The benefits will go solely to a few thousand very wealthy families.

This bill is being offered at a time when we know that many billions of new taxes are necessary. We are going to have to take a heavier toll upon the pay envelope of the wage earner and upon the interest coupon of the widow. Certainly, this is no time to approve any new tax exemption for the wealthy. I hope there is a roll call vote on this bill so that every citizen who has to pay higher taxes this year will know how his Congressman voted on this outrageous measure.

The committee report says that this bill simplifies the tax treatment of powers of appointment. Exemptions always simplify. What this bill does in fact is to exempt many powers of appointment from tax, encourage tax avoidance, and reopen a loophole which Congress closed in 1942.

Let me explain that a power of appointment is a right to designate the persons who shall take property. Ordinarily, where a person is given a power of appointment over property, he is also given the income from the property. A typical example of a power of appointment is the case where a father leaves a million dollars in trust to his son for life—that is, leaves property in trust so that his son shall have the right to the income for life—and also provides that at the son's death the property shall go to whomever the son designates in his will. This is in substance the equivalent of total ownership.

In 1942 Congress amended the estate tax law to treat the holder of a power of appointment as though he were the owner of the property. Those who saw their favorite loophole being closed pictured the 1942 amendments as a radical innovation. Actually, however, this was not true, for about 25 of the States, beginning with New York in 1897, had taxed property upon the death of the holder of a power of appointment.

When we change the tax laws, as we did in 1942, we usually make the change immediately effective. However, influential tax lawyers and their rich clients were able to prevent the 1942 changes from becoming immediately effective. They were able to get a grace period in which to dodge the tax collector. They have now had 9 years in which to dodge. However, this unprecedented tax relief has only made them more greedy. They are now using the grace period, which they were influential in obtaining, as an argument for reopening the pre-1942 loophole. In effect, they are now saying that so many of them have now dodged the tax collector that it is now unfair to tax those who have not dodged.

Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible to go back and tax those who have been able to escape taxes since 1942 by giving up their powers of appointment. I wish it were possible to go back and make the 1942 amendments immediately effective. But I am not willing to agree that, merely because we have been tardy in putting a reform into effect, we should now scrap the reform entirely.

There is absolutely no consideration of fairness which justifies the broad tax relief offered by this bill.

What we did in 1942 was to discard a ridiculous statute which treated two kinds of practical ownership differently for estate and gift tax purposes. One kind of ownership resulted in tax, while the other kind, which was equally valuable, escaped tax. The 1942 amendment provided, in effect, that if a person wished to continue to enjoy the blessing of practical ownership he would have to pay tax. On the other hand, if a person wished to escape tax, he would have to give up his practical ownership within the grace period which was allowed. Many persons have already made their choice. Those who support this bill want to have their cake and to eat it; they want to hold on to the blessing of practical ownership and, at the same time, escape the burden of taxation. To give them this double benefit would be a serious breach of faith with the greater number who, taking Congress at its word in 1942, have already made their choice and given up their valuable powers of appointment.

It is claimed that the 1942 amendments were retroactive in effect. On the contrary, their effect has been postponed for 9 years. A less retroactive statute could hardly be imagined.

It is asserted that the pre-1942 loophole should be reopened because it is impracticable to review the wills and trust agreements which were already in force in 1942. However, as I have noted, this legislation affects only a few thousand of the wealthiest families. The wills and trust agreements of this same group of families had to be thoroughly reviewed in 1948 in connection with the $250,000,000 estate-splitting melon which the 1948 Revenue Act distributed among them. Although the 1948 will-drafting job was much more difficult than anything which will have to be done in connection with powers of appointment, no complaint was then registered. Apparently the task is less distasteful where a multi-million-dollar melon is being split than where a loophole is being closed.

I hope that each Member will carefully examine the minority report before he votes upon this bill. The example shown on page 7 of the minority report illustrates that, under this bill, powers of appointment might be used to exempt a large fortune from estate tax for about 100 years. The tax avoided by a single large estate might amount to millions of dollars.

Last year the Secretary of the Treasury told the Ways and Means Committee that about one-half of the property of wealthy families is being tied up in trust so that it will escape estate tax for perhaps a century. He recommended that legislation be adopted to close this loophole. Instead of closing the loophole, this bill opens it wider. In closing, let me repeat that no Member should vote for this bill to restore a tax exemption for the wealthy unless he is prepared to explain that action to the vast group of wage earners and other citizens who are being asked to shoulder heavier tax burdens at this time.

One final point, Mr. Chairman—I have been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for nearly 8 years. During that time hearings have been held on many tax proposals pending before the committee. At many of these hearings there have been representatives of the section of taxation of the American Bar Association.

The testimony given by the representatives of the Bar Association has been singularly uniform in one important respect. Unlike representatives of other organizations appearing before the Committee on Ways and Means, most of whom at some time or other recommend something in the best interest of all people of the country, I challenge anyone to give me an instance in which the American Bar Association has ever made a recommendation in the field of Federal taxation that was of general application and benefit to any substantial number of the American public.

On the contrary, the recommendations at the public hearings and the legislation sponsored by the American Bar Association, of which H. R. 2084 is a typical example, invariably seek some tax relief or special privilege for a very limited group of taxpayers.

Indeed the performance has been so consistent in tone as to suggest that the name of the American Bar Association may actually have been used to further the best interest of the clients of the attorneys who represent the American Bar Association on tax matters.

Mr. Chairman, attorneys are officers of the court and as such they have an obligation of public service. When the lawyer leaves the court room and seeks to make his will felt upon the legislative process, it would seem not too unreasonable to expect him occasionally to demonstrate his interest in the public welfare and not exclusively on behalf of the clients whom he happens to have on retainers. I think it is high time that the tax section of the American Bar Association awaken to the manner in which the name of the American Bar Association, an organization ostensibly dedicated to advancement of the public good, is being exploited for private interest.

The American Bar Association has both the opportunity and the obligation of public service in the field of Federal taxation and now it is time that it started living up to its challenge.

On this point allow me to quote an eminent member of the bar, Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of the Harvard Law School, who in a speech to the tax section of the American Bar Association on September 18, 1950, said in part:

> I do not for the moment mean that the tax lawyer should not work for his client, help him minimize his taxes, and fight hard for him when necessary. * * * What I am saying is that I hope that tax lawyers will keep their perspective. They should sell their services to their clients. I hope they do, but not their souls.
>
> * * * The tax section has a great public responsibility which it is not yet fully meeting. In times when taxes must be high, it is most important that they should be fair and nondiscriminatory, that they should not be full of loopholes and special privileges. Yet right now, in the midst of a real shooting war, we are apparently about to enact a new tax law which contains some gross, almost crude, inequities. Where has the voice of the tax section been on these matters?

Mr. Chairman, this House should not encourage the tax lawyers in their present practices by enactment of H. R. 2084. The bill should be defeated.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Did the Treasury Department file a written report on this proposed amendment?

Mr. EBERHARTER. As indicated in my talk, I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE], this matter has been before the committee every year for 9 years. We have never been able to arrive at any conclusion. But finally after discussing it a couple of days somebody made a motion and the recommendation of the American Bar Association was adopted. The Treasury Department is opposed to it. They did not file any written letter against the proposal, but I know that they are opposed to the measure in its present form.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. Does the gentleman know that the Treasury Department staff agreed with the American Bar Association in each and every point in this bill except the one point and that was the one regarding invasion of trust?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No, sir. The gentleman is confused about another measure that was being discussed at about that time. The Treasury Department is certainly definitely opposed to widening what should be a general trust, the general power of appointment through a special power of appointment; in other words, you are going to call it a special power of appointment. It practically amounts to a general power of appointment. If a man is a great granddaddy at the age of 60, he can designate life estates to his son and to his grandson, with the trust resting finally in the great grandson and the son, the grandson and the great grandson will never pay any estate tax. The gentleman from Georgia cannot deny that.

Mr. CAMP. We have 3 or 4 committee amendments which we reached agreement on after conference between the Treasury staff and the committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. There may be agreement on some features of the bill.

Mr. CAMP. That is what I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE] said, we cannot go along with that portion of the bill. I take it he means the section creating new loopholes for trusts if this bill becomes law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the gentleman will permit me to make this statement, every tax lawyer in the country would immediately advise his client, having a considerable net worth after payment of all expenses and all taxes and all State taxes and everything else, to draw up one of these trust agreements and he would never have to pay any taxes for many, many a generation. That is the effect of this bill. I do not think the gentleman from Georgia appreciates that. He does not want that to happen. If I give away something and give them a right to do with it what they want, is that not the same practically as ownership of the property?

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. The gentleman says this opens loopholes. Why the act of 1942 has never yet taken any effect. We have kept it from taking effect every year, as temporary legislation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is right.

Mr. CAMP. This is not opening any loopholes at all; it is not opening anything.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The House passed this bill in 1942 closing this outrageous loophole and making it immediately effective. The committee on the other side reported it out in that form but on the floor of the other body an

amendment was offered to give them a grace period of 2 months. Now, for 9 years we have been allowing them to get away with this outrageous loophole whereby anybody that has a large net worth was putting it in a trust so that they would not have to pay estate taxes, so the net result is that the ordinary businessman and the working man and woman would have his personal-income taxes raised, and the wealthy would not have to pay as much in estate taxes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Was not that very argument that the gentleman is now using, the very criticism he is now making and the very objections he is now raising considered by our committee at length, and after due consideration of all the criticism and objections, after full and lengthy discussion, they were voted down by a majority of our committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina he will remember that at the time the vote was taken there was a very small attendance at the committee meeting. There were quite a number of absentees when the vote was taken.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee will forgive me if I return momentarily to the pending bill which I support. I think the RECORD should be complete.

It has been my good fortune to have received at the hands of one of the most eminent members of the bar of the State of New York, William J. O'Shea, a memorandum which is intended to be a reply to the minority views filed in connection with the pending bill. I have read it carefully and have adopted those views as my own, as follows:

A REPLY TO THE MINORITY REPORT ON H. R. 2084 RELATING TO POWERS OF APPOINTMENT

The minority report makes the following main arguments against H. R. 2084:

First, the bill will encourage tax avoidance and cause serious loss in revenue;

Second, the tax on pre-1942 powers should not be confined to those which are exercised;

Third, the tax on future powers should not be confined to general powers;

Fourth, the lapsing during lifetime of a power to invade principal should be treated as a taxable transfer.

The Treasury representatives urged also before the Ways and Means Committee that a power should be considered a taxable power if exercisable in conjunction with any other person. However, they are apparently satisfied with the amendment which was made in committee under which a power is taxable if it is exercisable by the holder either alone or in conjunction with a person not having a substantial adverse interest, but is exempt if exercisable by the holder only in conjunction with a person having a substantial adverse interest.

I shall comment on the minority views in the above order.

1. THE EFFECT OF THE BILL ON THE REVENUE FROM ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

The fallacy of the argument of the minority is that it is made to appear that if certain powers of appointment are made taxable and others are made exempt, property owners will continue to create powers of the taxable character, thus producing more revenue. As lawyers can testify who have drafted many wills and trust instruments since the enactment of the 1942 act, property owners seldom create powers which would result in causing the property to be taxed in the estate of the donee. If certain powers are made taxable and others are exempted, property owners in the vast majority of cases will create only those which are exempt. If all powers are made taxable, they will discontinue the use of powers and will resort to rigid dispositions of property with life estates and fixed remainders. This is undesirable, as is so ably pointed out by Professor Leach in his dissent—Fifty-second Harvard Law Review, page 961, to an article by Professor Griswold, Fifty-second Harvard Law Review, page 929—urging the amendments which were enacted in 1942 .

It is true, as the minority report says, that if property is left outright by each decedent, the estate tax will be greater than if each decedent leaves property in trust during the maximum permissible period. But that question is not related in any way to powers of appointment; it goes merely to the question whether the Federal estate tax should be abandoned and should be replaced by an inheritance tax patterned after the English system, which imposes a tax on property at the end of each generation of beneficial enjoyment. Such a tax was advocated by President Roosevelt around 1935 and was rejected by Congress.

The minority report, in its conclusion on page 8, makes an argument which is patently erroneous when it attempts to make it appear that recent amendments to the estate- and gift-tax laws have caused such a large loss in revenue that those taxes are no longer income-producing measures. Thus the statement is made that in 1939 and 1940 the yield of those taxes amounted to about 7 percent of the total internal revenue collections, while their current yield is little more than 1 percent. The truth is that the revenue from estate and gift taxes at the present time is at least as much and probably more than it was in 1939 and 1940. However, the total revenue from all sources in 1939 and 1940 was less than $10,000,000,000, while today it is around $50,000,000,000. What the report fails to say is that if the estate and gift taxes today should take 100 percent of all property given away during lifetime and all property left at death, the yield probably would be less than 7 percent of the total revenue yield. With the exception of the marital deduction provisions, enacted in 1948—which serve largely to postpone the tax—there has been no recent amendment to the estate- and gift-tax laws which has had any substantial adverse effect on the revenue from those taxes.

It is a recognized fact today that estate and gift taxes are not important revenue producers. They are looked upon by some as instrumentalities of social reform, useful for the purpose of breaking up large estates. On the other hand, advocates of sound revenue laws feel that their revenue yield is insufficient to justify their destructive effect and that they should be abandoned by the Federal Government.

2. THE ARGUMENT AGAINST TAXING PRE-1942 GENERAL POWERS ONLY IF EXERCISED

It is surprising that the Treasury representatives should return to the attack on the treatment of pre-1942 powers in H. R. 2084. They reported to Mr. Stam that they would abandon their objections to the treatment of those powers and would agree that such powers should be taxed only if exercised. Apparently they intended to indicate such agreement only if the bar association committee would agree to the Treasury proposals on other features of the bill.

The argument of the bar association committee against taxing unexercised pre-1942 powers is that when such powers were created the tax applied only where they were exercised, and that it would be unjust retroactive taxation to apply the tax where such powers are not exercised. The committee pointed out that those having knowledge of the existence of such powers could release them or cut them down to nongeneral powers, but that in many instances the donee of such a power dies without learning of its existence and that even where the donee knows of the existence of such power, if he does not have access to expert legal advice, he may not know that he can escape the tax by cutting down the power to an exempt power. Therefore, the committee said, the taxation of unexercised pre-1942 general powers would operate solely as a trap for the unwary. The committee pointed further to the difficulty of reviewing all wills and inter vivos trust instruments executed prior to 1942 in an effort to ascertain the existence of general powers.

The minority report attempts to refute this argument by pointing out that the Federal estate-tax law was first enacted in 1916, the tax was made to apply to property over which a decedent had a reserved power of appointment created prior to 1916. However, it is unsound to draw an analogy between a reserved power and a power derived from someone else. If a property owner has created a trust reserving to himself a power of revocation, he necessarily knows of the existence of the power, and the estate tax will apply at his death only if he chooses to retain the power. That is not always true of a donated power. Instances are frequently found where a donee of a power dies without learning that he has the power. Moreover, under the laws of some States, the right to release a donated power in whole or in part is open to question.

The minority report makes the further argument that it would be unfair to holders of pre-1942 powers who have already released them in whole or in part, if the statute is now changed so as to apply the tax only to an exercised pre-1942 power. It is doubtful that anyone

would have a right to complain of such change.

Those who have released or cut down pre-1942 powers have invariably done so pursuant to legal advice. In the case of each extension period allowed for releasing powers, lawyers have known that the period would not expire until a certain specified date. Before the expiration date, an extension has been granted. It has been the practice of all lawyers with whom I am familiar to point out to their clients that it is not necessary to make a decision on the release of a power until the expiration of the extension period. In my own experience, clients have said that they do not intend to exercise the power in favor of persons other than those within the exempt class of spouses, descendants, and charities, and that regardless of the extension period, they wished to proceed with a partial release. Others have executed complete or partial releases and have deposited them in escrow with their lawyers with instructions that they are to be delivered if no further extension is granted, but that they are to be retained if the grace period is extended. No one has a right to complain if he has taken a step which was unnecessary.

Moreover, the privilege of cutting down a general power to a nongeneral power during the extension period gives a positive advantage to the donee of the power. Under H. R. 2084, if the holder retains a general power, he may not exercise it without incurring tax. But if during the grace period he has cut down the power to a nongeneral power, H. R. 2084 makes it clear that he may proceed to exercise the power without incurring the tax. It is difficult to see how the new bill can be said to discriminate against those who have released pre-1942 powers.

3. THE OBJECTIONS TO THE TREATMENT OF FUTURE POWERS

The minority report objects strongly to the treatment of future powers in H. R. 2084. However, the report is careful to avoid stating what the differences are between H. R. 2084 and the Treasury proposals on the treatment of such powers. The differences are that H. R. 2084 would tax an exercised or unexercised power created after October 21, 1942, only if it is a beneficial power, that is, one which may be exercised in favor of the holder, his estate or his creditors; while the Treasury would tax an exercised or an unexercised power which is exercisable in favor of the holder, his creditors, or his estate or in favor of anyone falling outside of a restricted class, which is defined as a "class not unreasonably large."

The mere statement of the view that a power which may not benefit the holder should be considered a taxable power is its own refutation. The only justification for taxing in the estate of the donee property over which he has a power is that the power is so broad that it is equivalent to ownership of the property. Regardless of how broad the class of persons may be in whose favor a power may be exercised, if it may not be exercised so as to benefit the donee, there is no justification for treating the power as equivalent to ownership of the property.

Moreover, it will require years of litigation to determine what is a "restricted class" or a "class not unreasonably large." On the other hand, if the tax is confined to powers which are exercisable in favor of the holder, his estate, or his creditors, there can be no doubt about what powers are taxable and what are exempt.

The minority report attempts to muddy the water by pointing to decisions of the Board of Tax Appeals and lower courts under the pre-1942 law showing confusion on the definition of a general power. But even under the pre-1942 law, those decisions are no longer applicable, because it was held in *Morgan* v. *Commissioner* (309 U. S. 78 (1940)), that a power was a general power if it could be exercised in favor of the holder, his creditors, or his estate. Moreover, H. R. 2084 says in specific language that such powers are taxable.

Example 1 beginning at the bottom of page 5 of the minority report and statements in the last paragraph on page 7 make it appear that a power which may be exercised by a decedent in favor of anyone except his creditors would be an exempt power under H. R. 2084. This is not true. If the power may be exercised in favor of the decedent or his estate or his creditors, it is a taxable power; if it may not be so exercised, it is a nontaxable power, and no sound reason can be given why it should be considered a taxable power. The definition of a taxable power in H. R. 2084 is so plain that the efforts of the minority report to confuse the question cannot succeed.

4. THE TREATMENT OF A POWER TO INVADE PRINCIPAL WHICH LAPSES DURING LIFETIME

The minority report objects to the provisions of H. R. 2084 to the effect that if a power to invade or consume principal lapses during the lifetime of the holder, the mere failure to exercise the power is not to be considered a transfer of property for estate- and gift-tax purposes.

This provision is aimed at a situation where a husband, for example, leaves property in trust to pay income to his wife for life and gives the wife the noncumulative power to take $5,000, or some other small amount, each year from principal. The Treasury Department takes the position under the present statute that each year that the wife fails to exercise her power to take $5,000 from principal, she make a transfer of $5,000 reserving income to herself for life. The result is that the gift tax applies each year to a remainder interest in $5,000 which is a future interest to which the $3,000 gift-tax exclusion is not applicable—and that on her death the estate tax will apply to $5,000 multiplied by the number of years during which she has failed to exercise the power. It seems unjust to say that the gift and estate taxes should apply merely because the wife has chosen not to take an amount from principal and has permitted her power to lapse each year. Under H. R. 2084, if at the time of her death the wife has the right to take an amount from principal, the estate tax will apply to that amount; it is only the amount over which the power has lapsed during lifetime that the provision is applicable.

The minority report gives a few extreme examples of situations where this provision would deprive the Government of revenue to which it is entitled. The committee of the American Bar Association offered to compromise on this point by providing in the bill that the lapsing of a power during lifetime should not be considered a transfer if the power is limited to a small amount of say $10,000 a year or to a specified percentage of the trust fund of say 10 percent.

It is significant to note that, as shown by the minority report, the Treasury Department does not contend that the estate tax should apply to any pre-1942 power except a general power and that the Treasury appears to be in agreement with the provisions of H. R. 2084 which make the amendments applicable to estates of all decedents dying after October 21, 1942.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman from New York made an inquiry from the Department of Internal Revenue as to whether they favor this bill? If he has, he would find that they are opposed to this bill.

Mr. KEOGH. Is the gentleman asking me or telling me what I have done?

Mr. SABATH. I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. KEOGH. That has been fully explained in the debate on the bill, but unfortunately we have got a little away from it at the moment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield.

Mr. COX. Has not the gentleman investigated sufficiently to state that the morals of the case are with the bill?

Mr. KEOGH. A vast majority of the committee felt so.

Mr. SABATH. In the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I have just listened with astonishment to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] who is a member, of course, of the bar, and I assume a distinguished member. He has attacked one of the most honorable professions of this country, the American Bar Association. They have studied this problem over a long period of time, and they are men of conspicuous ability and integrity, men who have been leaders in their profession throughout the years. The legal profession, when you get right down to the basic facts, is the one profession that has a stabilizing influence on the laws affecting the property of the people in this country. This is not a new kind of attack wherever the distribution of property is involved. You notice how frequently they bring in the question of labor and that this is a bill to help the rich. This is just a bill to do equal and equitable justice, and that is all. The Committee on Ways and Means is a committee that has been in operation now for many years. Without casting any reflection on any other committee of the

House, I know of no committee that devotes more time and looks deeper into all the intricacies of legislation and tries to pass sound legislation that the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

IN THESE DAYS OF GREAT UNCERTAINTY THE REPUBLICAN PARTY MUST LEAD THE WAY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I made a short speech in which I attempted to show that the Government is spending entirely too much money. At that time I said that at a later date I would attempt to show that the Government is giving away entirely too much money. That is what I shall attempt to do at this time.

In the Presidential campaign of 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt erupted frequently and violently against what he said were the extravagances of the Hoover administration. He promised to make great savings. He said then that "many governments have been wrecked on the shoals of loose fiscal policies." But just as soon as he took office he commenced to follow a course of extravagance that has characterized the New Deal and the Roosevelt family ever since—and has thrown upon the people a national debt far beyond anything that the wildest spender ever imagined. He also gave us a wizard hitherto unknown whose name was Harry Hopkins. This man said that the people "were too damned dumb" to know what was best for them and he tried to prove it. He gave to the country a political formula that has made him immortal. It is simple and easy to remember and difficult to forget, but terribly expensive. He said, "Tax, tax, tax; spend, spend, spend; elect, elect, elect." He proved the infallibility of this alluring formula, but he proved it at a terrific expense to the American people. His program of wasteful extravagance ran our national debt from less than twenty billion to more than $260,000,000,000 and our national budget from less than five billions a year to about fifty billions in peacetime.

Mr. Chairman, millions upon millions of this money was given away in the most shameful orgy of extravagant, dishonest, and unwise spending. WPA, PWA, NYA, and AAA and others of the numerous alphabetically designated agencies reeked with inefficient, dishonest, and wasteful activities. All this is now reflected in the colossal national debt.

WPA alone cost the taxpayers $10,500,000,000 and other similar work relief programs, including NYA, cost another billion and a half. The CCC cost almost $3,000,000,000 more. Another $9,500,000,000 has been paid out in the form of public assistance. Other billions have been given States and localities for public works projects, some providing enduring benefit but others of doubtful value. Many more billions have been given to the Nation's farmers who in the 1930's were paid for not growing crops.

In the postwar period, $16,000,000,000 have been spent for education, training, and other readjustment benefits of veterans. This does not include compensation and pensions or insurance refunds or hospital and medical care. While many veterans have received long-term benefits from these payments, most veterans agree that some of the funds have been wasted.

Now, more than ever, it is necessary to crack down on the recreational courses, fly-by-night schools, fraudulent training courses, exorbitant tuition rates, and excessive subsistence payments that have been made under various training programs.

Mr. Chairman, except for the war years about one-third of all our tax money has been going to these "gimme" agencies. The total would run into many billions. A great proportion was given with no chance for any profitable return. And much of it was given as subsidies and bonuses which were doubtful of merit, and have proved to be of only temporary value. Most of these handouts would in no way contribute to our military advantage at this time when the war clouds are gathering.

Mr. Chairman, the most expensive "gimme" program ever initiated by any country, yes, probably by all countries combined, has been our various foreign-aid programs. Lend-lease, European Recovery Act, military aid, foreign rehabilitation programs, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, displaced persons, and numerous other programs have cost us many billions.

The contributions we have made to Russia would, if repaid, reduce our national debt by about twelve billions.

The aid that we have given Great Britain must have been forgotten by the British, by Dean Acheson, and Harry Truman when recently they gave ear to Britain's wish to have Red China admitted into the United Nations. The debt that Britain owes us was forgotten when Acheson and Truman gratified Britain by removing General MacArthur, which conduct on their part has been condemned by the tremendous ovations given General MacArthur by about 95 percent of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, a fair-minded committee of Congressmen actuated only by a desire to clean out these terribly expensive "gimme" activities could easily save our country $3,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year.

The European-aid program and the aid programs for all foreign countries have served their purpose but have been very expensive. Many persons who are familiar with the work of these organizations are now taking the position that all these economic-aid programs should be abandoned in the near future. They claim 3 months would be enough time to close up all these expensive programs. Some of these programs have been in operation for several years, and together have cost the United States $28,000,000,000 since July 1, 1945. This money was spent largely for two purposes, rehabilitation and preventing the spread of communism. The rehabilitation in some countries might work to our advantage, but much of it is now benefiting Soviet Russia. And while communism has been stayed in some countries, it still flourishes in many countries into which large sums of American money and suppies have been sent.

The President's budget for 1952 proposes to give away $16,600,000,000 of tax-collected dollars, $9,600,000,000 of this he expects to give away in this country and $7,000,000,000 in foreign countries. We do not know where he expects to spend the $7,000,000,000 that goes into foreign countries. It is likely that much of it will be wasted. We do know what he expects to do with the $9,600,000,000 to be spent in this country, and that very little, if any, of it will be spent for national defense purposes. And we do know that much of it can and should be eliminated during the present emergency.

The $600,000,000, for example, that the administration proposes to grant to the States for the construction of buildings, roads, and civil airports would encourage the type of construction that competes most directly with the defense effort for materials and manpower, and would be inflationary. More than $1,000,000,000 is planned in grants and aids for education, training, and health, including a new program of Federal aid to education. Congress has failed to approve that program in past years. Granting that many of these programs are meritorious, this certainly is not the time for increased expenditures in fields unrelated to defense.

Many of the business services provided by the Government should be made self-sustaining by charging their cost to the users rather than to the taxpayers. Probably the best example is the postal service in which equitable rate adjustments are now needed to offset increased costs.

Tax experts have estimated that a thorough reappraisal of huge Federal programs of aids, subsidies, and special services could yield savings of $3,000,000,000 during fiscal 1952. They say that this would go far toward restoring local responsibility and removing the Federal-aid programs that have resulted from the grant-in-aid system which has been increasing in cost every year of the postwar period.

Mr. Chairman, everybody loves Santa Claus, but a person with the give-away disposition of Santa Claus would hardly qualify as Secretary of the United States Treasury. The Roosevelt and Truman administrations prove this sad fact. There is an old adage in human affairs that has proved to be infallible. It is that a man badly in debt should be just toward his creditors before he is too generous toward others. As it is in human affairs so it is in national affairs. We should pay up before we pay out.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio,

for making a very sensible and very important statement on the floor of the House. I think he can rest assured his colleagues from the State of Ohio will support him in the stand he has taken for economy in the Federal Government and for a realistic approach to the problems which confront us.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman very much. I am glad to think that my colleagues from Ohio will support my views. I shall be proud if that is the case for Ohio has a very capable congressional delegation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to note the administration's manifestation of agreement with General MacArthur on at least one important point, that Formosa must be saved from falling into the hands of the Chinese Reds. It is now announced that this conclusion was reached some time ago and a decision then made to dispatch a mission to assist in training and equipping the anti-Communist forces to resist attack. More recently, it has been decided to increase materially the size and strength of this mission.

Then last week, and surely belatedly, there was another development directly attributable to the pressures arising from the MacArthur incident when we proposed to the United Nations an embargo on arms shipments to our common enemies. What a commentary on the state of international morals that it should ever be necessary for us to take such a step.

It is to be hoped that other suggestions advanced by this peculiarly well-informed military leader will likewise be considered on their merits. If sound, their adoption should be expedited, as have these two significant moves, without veto simply because of the source of the recommendations.

While it is possible that the Chinese Communists, faced with stubborn resistance by United Nations forces, will fold up and silently steal away, that seems extremely unlikely. Almost equally unexpected would be any move evidencing willingness on their part to terminate their aggression on any terms which would be acceptable to us and which would not constitute complete betrayal of our announced objectives and pursuit of a fatal appeasement policy. There is no one of us who would not gratefully surrender any claim to accurate prophecy in exchange for the blessings of peace achieved through either of these channels, but we cannot fly in the face of all the available evidence.

In addition to these two remote possibilities, there are, of course, the alternatives of our complete withdrawal from Korea or our commitment to an indefinitely prolonged "limited" or "stalemate" type of warfare unprecedented in United States history and foreign to all our traditions, as well as entailing endless bloodshed and sacrifices and involving the concession that all our young men now in or on their way to Korea are expendable.

Barring the two remote possibilities outlined and rejecting the two other alternatives as unacceptable, we face, it seems to me, the inescapable conclusion that, sooner or later, several more, if not all of the MacArthur recommendations will have to be adopted in order to attempt to bring the Korean War to a close either by a convincing military victory or by forcing a settlement on just and honorable terms which will not simply furnish a standing invitation to the aggressors to strike elsewhere.

My plea is for a prompt and open-minded reconsideration by those in authority of the other proposals advanced by an experienced and resourceful military commander whose distinguished career entitles his views to respectful attention. Prompt it must be because precious lives depend upon the outcome and because, if the suggestions are sound, the quicker they are adopted the more likely that they will narrow, rather than enlarge the area of conflict and conversely, the longer their implementation is delayed, the greater is the likelihood of deeper involvement.

Thus, without criticism of those who made the final decisions, the soundness of many of which I confess that I shared at the time, it now appears clear by hindsight at least that had less restrictive conditions been imposed on the operations of our Far East Command, the hordes of Communist Chinese would never have entered the Korean conflict or would have been deterred at the outset from any such full scale operations as they have conducted. If the factual situations are similar, let us not make substantially the same mistake twice.

On the other side, self-restraint should be exercised by those of us who have been critical of the failure on the part of the administration to adopt any affirmative policy directed to the termination of the war. We must be careful not to prejudice the chances of acceptance of additional suggestions similar to the Formosa training and equipment program and the enforcement of an arms embargo against shipments to the enemy through premature and ill-advised taunts of "We told you so" or "We knew you would have come to that."

We are not dealing with any exact science. No one can be expected to have all the answers. If the administration has been woefully weak and tragically slow in the past to formulate policy, that is just ground for criticism, but let that debate take place a year hence.

The important thing now is for both sides to strive mightily to subordinate political advantage to the Nation's welfare. Admittedly that is difficult, especially for those in public life whose very calling steeps them in partisanship. Let it be remembered, however, that it is harder for those with whom the tide of popular favor is running to be asked not to press too strongly the advantage which is theirs, than it is for those whose popular esteem is at a low ebb to give consideration to a modification in their views to meet changed conditions.

No political labels attach to war, death, wounds, and suffering. Republican young men and Democrat young men are engaging the enemy, shoulder to shoulder in far-off Korea. Democrat loved ones and Republican loved ones here at home, worried and concerned, entertain a common hope and utter a common prayer for early, honorable, and lasting peace.

Let no false pride of authorship, no stubborn adherence to policies now demonstrably unrealistic, no professional or political jealousies among those in authority so blind our vision or unbalance our judgment that we allow ourselves to be deflected from choosing with speed, soundness, and definiteness the course best suited to serve the long-range interests of our country and then pursuing that course with fidelity and determination.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York. I envy him the statesmanlike manner in which he has analyzed our international situation that has been brought about by certain occurrences; it was a magnificent analysis of the thing and we ought to follow through along that line.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, on the 4th day of this month my colleague from California [Mr. YORTY] made some remarks in the RECORD to which I believe a reply is necessary. I direct your attention to his remarks as they appear on page 4878 and recall to your minds that among other things he said that Mr. Raymond Moley had become a leading spokesman of the Republican Party. He then paid particular attention to a paragraph in one of Mr. Moley's news releases in which Mr. Moley pointed out that one of the greatest dangers to the Republican Party was peace in Korea. On that subject he quoted as follows:

> Their danger—
>
> That is the Republicans—
>
> lies in the chance, and it is more than a chance, that the Truman course will result in peace in Korea and rehabilitation of Japan.

This tactic by the gentleman from California reminds us of a similar tactic when President Truman called a well-known newspaper columnist an s. o. b. The American people were thus induced to believe that that columnist was reporting to them as the enemy of the President and his administration. That columnist could then appear to oppose

our present administration and still support its appointed incompetence, perverts, and demagogues in their sale of socialist and gimmie philosophies to the American people. The gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] has deliberately deceived the American people. He has told them that a man who came into political existence and became nationally known in the newspaper field as a New Dealer is now the spokesman for the Republican Party. I certainly want it understood, Mr. Chairman, that neither Mr. Raymond Moley or any other newspaperman speaks for me. Nor do I believe any individual columnist or newspaper speaks for other men who oppose this administration. However, if Mr. Raymond Moley is opposed to the present minority group demagogues in the White House and the present administration who have stolen the political machinery of the great Democrat Party from its national level to the local precincts and who are now using it for their own political power and financial advantage, then Mr. Moley and I speak together each for ourselves on that subject.

My colleague from California is now in his first session as a Member of Congress. Even though he has heretofore served 6 years as a member of the California Legislature, it might be helpful to this House and to the gentleman from California if we point out the dangers incident to the publicity techniques in modern demagoguery.

I, myself, served in the California Legislature from 1943 to 1946. That was at the end of Governor Olson's administration when Communist agitation first became bold and widespread in California. It was about 5 years after the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] voted "yes" in the California Legislature on a resolution granting a full pardon to Tom Mooney. Tom Mooney had been convicted of bombing women and children in a San Francisco preparedness parade during the First World War. He was the martyr to stimulate Communist agitation in those years. Of course, that vote was the gentleman's own business. The press gave publicity to the vote as news. Editorial comment by the press was the business of the press. They were not necessarily the spokesman for the gentleman from California. If a Communist mouthpiece at that time in California, favorably reported the gentleman's action it did not necessarily mark the gentleman as a Communist. When the Western Worker advertised on May 24, 1937, that the gentleman from California was the speaker at a Los Angeles mass meeting of a committee for freedom of Mooney and Billings, they were not necessarily speaking for the gentleman. The gentleman spoke for himself at the meeting. The fact that the Communist Western Worker expressed an editorial policy similar in views to those expressed by the gentleman at the meeting did show that to that extent they supported the gentleman, but again the Western Worker was speaking for itself.

The same can be said for publications by the Open Forum and Epic News who on May 1 and February 1, respectively, in 1937 as left-wing newspapers advised their readers that the gentleman favored repeal of the California criminal syndicalism law and that the gentleman was to speak at an ultra left-wing school on February 4 of that year. Such papers were not speaking for the gentleman, unless the gentleman felt bound as a public official by left-wing-controlled press as Russians are bound by Tass. On July 19, 1937, when the Communist Western Worker advertised that the gentleman was the chief speaker for the American League Against War and Fascism and pointed out that the speech would be on the first anniversary of civil war in Spain on the topic American Responsibility Toward Maintenance of Spanish Democracy the paper spoke for itself. It is true that the paper probably expressed an area of agreement between the views of the gentleman and those of the paper. It spoke for itself.

Perhaps the same should be said in connection with the report in the Communist Western Worker in an issue for July 26, 1937. At that time they announced that the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] was the speaker for Workers Alliance, a Communist-dominated group of agitators. The Western Worker pointed out that the gentleman addressed the meeting before the agitators marched on WPA buildings, supervisors, and the city hall of Los Angeles. There again, the paper may have expressed agreement of view with the gentleman. It may have supported him, but what the gentleman said at the meeting that may have induced the mob to march in threatening manner on the city and county officials of Los Angeles, he said himself.

It would appear that a person of such extensive speaking experience as that of the gentleman should know that a free press and its writers do not speak for any political party in our free country. When the gentleman addressed the Youth Forum on October 19, 1937, at the First Unitarian Church he spoke for himself. When the Communist Western Worker announced on October 21, 1937, that the gentleman was on the executive committee of the California Committee of 100 for Political Unity, it was merely publicizing what purported to be a fact. The gentleman could have denied it then or he can deny it now. The point is, the gentleman either failed to speak for himself and deny the fact then or he can speak for himself now.

When the Communist Western Worker announced on October 25, 1937, that the gentleman was a sponsor of a petition to place a proposition for a unicameral legislature before the people of California at the next election and when in that issue they informed the Communist readers that the gentleman initiated the Little Wagner Act in the California Legislature for that year, they again were stating what was presumably a fact. It was news. They did not speak for the gentleman, unless he wanted them to. At that time, he could have remained silent or he could have spoken for himself and denied the truth of the purported facts. At the present time, he is still privileged to speak for himself on those subjects.

At still another time, at 8 p. m. on December 17, 1937, at the Philharmonic Auditorium under the auspices of the Southern California Committee for Freedom of Mooney and Billings, the gentleman spoke for himself on what he believed important issues before the people of California, the liberation of the martyrs convicted of bombing patriotic Americans, including women and children, in the First World War. So also when the gentleman addressed the convention of the Labor Nonpartisan League of California on December 11, 1937, at its convention in San Francisco, he spoke for himself. In any of these meetings, if the gentleman's remarks were intended to induce innocent listeners to contribute hard-earned money to demagogues masquerading as leaders of the working classes for the liberation of Mooney and Billings, he spoke for himself on important issues and techniques for political freedom.

On January 1, 1938, when the gentleman was quoted as follows:

> Los Angeles Assemblyman YORTY • • • has joined the progressive chorus hailing the transformation of the Western Worker into a daily paper on January 1. The labor point of view which includes the point of view of both organized and unorganized workers is something very rarely presented accurately by ordinary commercial papers. • • • I therefore congratulate the Western Worker upon its move to become a daily paper on January 1.

The paper quoting the gentleman was publicizing the purported fact. It did not speak for the gentleman. It quoted him. The gentleman was free then to speak for himself and deny that he felt the Communist Western Worker should be read by more people and at regular daily intervals.

It is also true that when the Communist Peoples World endorsed and sponsored the gentleman for the Los Angeles City Council for the Twelfth District on the front page of its May 2, 1939, edition, it did not say that the gentleman was a Communist, nor did it tell its readers that it spoke for the gentleman. It just gave the gentleman its support for reasons best known to the Communist paper. The gentleman was free at that time to speak for himself just as he is at the present time.

It is, of course, possible that the readers of the Peoples World assumed that the gentleman was a Communist. If those readers believed in a Russian-type controlled press speaking as Tass, they were probably justified in assuming that the gentleman's thinking was controlled by the expressions of the Peoples World. It is also true that the readers of other newspapers of California made assumptions in regard to the gentleman. Those assumptions were to some extent governed by editorial comments of the truly free press. If they spoke out against the gentleman, it was in opposition to his views. They, of course, were not the spokesman for him. If some of the free press and some of us in public life at that time in California doubted the gentleman's patriotic intentions and were wrong in that regard, it was because of faulty inferences drawn from what the gentleman did say or failed to say for

himself as his own spokesman. The gentleman can well understand that if newspapers and informed people, realizing the techniques in deception and demagoguery of the Communist leadership and press, knew that the gentleman had the opportunity to speak for himself and failed to, they would probably draw inferences against the gentleman. Those same people might have thought it peculiar that the gentleman would head a legislative committee to investigate communism less than a year after the Communist Peoples World had endorsed him for the City Council of Los Angeles. Those same people would wonder how the gentleman, a few months after such activities by himself and endorsements by Communist papers, believing in the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, could possibly become a captain in military intelligence even if the inferences to be drawn were faulty and the gentleman were a patriotic American. He must well understand that other patriots were concerned when he chose military intelligence as a war effort. I must admit that I am presently concerned when the gentleman supports the proposition that anything marked secret by some military officer closes the door to investigation by civilian officials of Government including the circumstances under which the gentleman became a captain in military intelligence. Perhaps, the answer is that someone in Washington issued an order that Russia was our ally and anyone believed to be pro-Russian with Communist inclinations was to be trusted as our friend. If such orders did exist, the gentleman can understand in his great loyalty to America that the origination of such orders should be investigated. To preclude that investigation because the person who issued the order had the power to mark it secret is an admission by this Congress that it is not to be trusted or fit to act and the American people are not fit to be free.

I am well aware as are many other people in California that in its November 5, 1942, issue in column 5 on page 2 the Peoples World called the gentleman a Red baiter. However, it is still true that the Peoples World was speaking for itself and was not the spokesman for the gentleman unless he wanted it to be. The patriots of California were doubtful because they believed that the Communist Party has its controlled press and that in California the Peoples World was its Tass. The patriots knowing the deceptions, half-truths, false statements and studied demagogery of communism, wondered then and many still wonder whether the Peoples World was not in fact speaking for the gentleman. The question to them was whether a deliberate attempt was being made by the Communist Party to give the able, clever and tricky gentleman from California sheep's clothing by branding him anti-Communist. It is true they did not call him an s. o. b., but they did call him a Red baiter and the technique is the same. Here again the gentleman could have spoken for himself.

There were other newspapers who have favored the gentleman with publicity. On June 7, 1949, the Los Angeles Examiner pointed out that the gentleman opposed the California loyalty bills. In their comments as in those of the Peoples World on the same day and later on the 27th day of June 1949, the paper spoke for itself. I am sure the gentleman does not take the position that the Los Angeles Examiner is his spokesman on political issues.

Perhaps the gentleman believes that some of the items mentioned by me are too old in a growing and changing democracy which by its Constitution binds this Congress to guarantee to the people a Republican form of government. I do not want to be unfair to the gentleman from the standpoint of dates. I hold here in my hand a more current expression by the Daily Peoples World. It is an editorial from the August 4, 1949, issue of the Communist Daily Peoples World. That, of course, is not yet 2 years old. The editorial is by Steve Murdock, staff writer for the Daily Peoples World. The title of the editorial is "YORTY Ushers in Day of Social Democrats." The article points out:

> His chummy relationships with the Despols are a good key to the smart, dapper little character. Because smart he is, and very adept at this business of making a true champion of the people.
>
> Take his voting records. He's the best example at large today of the fact that a legislator cannot be evaluated entirely by his voting record.

I assure the gentleman that I do not assume that either Steve Murdock or the Daily Peoples World is the spokesman for the gentleman. They complain that the gentleman supports totalitarian social democracy in California and is its leader reaching for leadership that should be totalitarian communism. The gentleman is and should be his own spokesman. He was privileged as a member of the California Legislature when the editorial was written to speak for himself or to refrain from speaking. He is privileged now as a Member of this body, constitutionally obligated to guarantee republican government, to speak out or to refrain from speaking. It is the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] and he alone who can say in a loud voice that it is not true that he is desiring to be a legislative spokesman for social democracy in California. He can say positively that he does not believe in socialism in any form whether it be military socialism or that creeping form requiring the delegation of powers of the legislature to the executive branch and the amendment of our Constitution by demagogic redefinition of words and phrases.

To be sure, I will admit with the gentleman that Steve Murdock may have been expressing the resentment of the Communist Daily Peoples World for the gentleman who sold them out in order to go his own way as a demagogic leader seeking power through deception. I am not concerned with their attitude nor am I concerned with the gentleman's military record. I am concerned with the gentleman's past record in public life and his present record so that I may determine where to place confidence. Even though the Communist Daily Peoples World is not the gentleman's spokesman, it has told its readers in effect that the gentleman's voting record is excellent from a Communist point of view but that the gentleman needs to be watched because he is a social democrat. I, therefore, caution the gentleman that when he makes remarks on the floor that some opportunity-seeking publicity expert is the spokesman either for myself or any other Member of this House, he is treading on hallowed ground. I am not only disturbed about the gentleman's remarks on the 4th of this month in that they warn me of deceptive techniques but I am concerned about other statements made by him which are apparently designed for political purposes and only state part of the truth. In particular, I refer to those remarks of his on the 10th of April of this year, which were remarks extended in the RECORD without oral statement on the floor 2 days after he issued a news release to the people of California falsely presenting the position that I had taken on the preceding April 3 in connection with the bill providing for amendments to the draft law and universal military training.

I, of course, expect Communists to be two-faced half of the time and half-faced the rest of the time. However, I accept the gentleman as a colleague, and as an honorable Member of this House. I therefore assume that he was either speaking for someone else as he stated Mr. Moley was or had not read my remarks before he prepared his own.

His remarks on April 10 are false when he says that I said "that our Armed Services Committee is furthering some kind of a plot." In closing my remarks, I pleaded "that our splendid committee on Armed Services convene forthwith and summon our top military leaders for a thorough-going and exhaustive examination of the policies which they are now pursuing." It is clear from my remarks that I referred to the policies being pursued by our present General Staff.

His remarks are half true and deceptive when he says that I am opposed to universal military training. In my remarks on April 3, I positively said that I was in favor of universal military training under the jurisdiction of our State Governors in peacetime. I suggested that we approach the subject through Title 32 of the United States Code where provision is made for the National Guard. I did oppose centralization of military manpower in Washington during peacetime.

When I made my remarks on April 3, I expected socialist thinkers to attempt to slander myself or to question how I came into possession of political documents marked classified by military socialists. I expected that technique rather than a willingness to discuss the authenticity of the instruments with which I documented my remarks. I also expected and still expect our Committee on Armed Services to investigate the extent to which civilian control of our military establishment is being lost.

The gentleman from California who by his voting record is a good Communist in the opinion of the Daily People's World, but who is not to be trusted in the opinion of that paper because he has emerged as the legislative spokesman for social democracy in California,

has by the record of this House at the end of 4 months' service emerged as the smear artist, using the expert techniques of totalitarian demagogues. His news releases of falsehoods 2 days before he would even extend his remarks is part of that technique. Careful reading of his remarks as set forth in the Appendix of the RECORD, commencing on page A1900, will disclose that while hiding behind a military service record, he patriotically asserts that because Joseph Stalin as head of one military socialist state, is opposed to its growth in this country unless he is top dog, no Member of Congress should publicly oppose the growth of military socialism in our General Staff.

The rest of his remarks of April 10 are apparently lengthy because he believes the short phrase "nonconstructive criticism" is outmoded and worn out for propaganda purposes. Assuming as I do that the gentleman prepared his own remarks without reading mine, I want to point out to him that my remarks were long and documented so that I might constructively indicate to the House the dangers to individual liberty occasioned by large centralized peacetime armies. I also constructively indicated that if we believed universal military training necessary, as I do, the proper road to follow to guarantee liberty was to leave peacetime control of military manpower at the State level. I not only indicated to the gentleman from California and this House the road on which you would not find liberty, but I pointed to the trail that we should follow, indicating its direction and markers.

In this regard, I will ask the gentleman from California to assume with me that in the history of the world there was a nation of great strength, Christian theology, self-reliance, and wealth. That a group of demagogues plotted together seeking pennies and the powers of junior commissars for themselves, with resulting titles purporting distinction. About 20 years of such demagoguery destroyed the country's self-reliance, consumed and threw away its accumulated wealth, and then sought to control the Frankensteins it had created by political bribery programs through an Oberkommando military brain and military courts. I will ask him to assume that the followers of these demagogs became so numerous in number that hundreds of them died each day and appeared before a celestial court.

I will ask him to assume that on one such day he, too, left this world and appeared before that court. As he faced the court, he saw inscribed on the walls the laws by which men should live if they are to have either free government or salvation. There would be "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods." He would hear the Defense Counsel point out that there is something charitable and Godlike and therefore Christian about socialism. However, he would hear the court say that Christian men must believe in family responsibility, thrift, and family life. That Christian men are to live according to law and order. That public officials in free government are bound to define new equitable rights arising because of changing economy and social conditions. They are bound to define those rights into law so that they can be enforced in local courts by poor men. He will hear the court say that it is no defense to arbitrarily seek political power by coveting your neighbor's goods through pressure groups called unions and political parties as a demagogue leading a mob.

Yes, he will hear the court say that it is no defense to contend that you were opposing communism when you willfully destroyed the security and self-reliance of family life by arbitrarily taking another man's property even though you used only economic and political force. The court will say that each of those actions taken by men bound in life and death under a Christian oath of office is an expression of uncontrolled passions and as such is damnable.

I will ask the gentleman from California to assume with me that he, like me, is human, and that for some reason he, too, received an adverse judgment by the court. That he left with the group on a pathway across the great divide under instructions to take the fork of the trail that led to hell. That through inadvertence or inability to see the signs, he and his colleagues took the wrong trail. That they eventually came to a high wall with a beautiful gate and when they sought admittance a gentleman with a long beard approached them and identified himself as St. Peter. He asked them where they were going, to which the gentleman from California and his colleagues replied that they were on their way to hell. Whereupon St. Peter told them that they were going in the wrong direction. That he had spent eons of time back of the walls. That he had talked with those residing there and that he knew hell was not in that direction.

Now I admit with the gentleman from California that whether or not St. Peter's remarks were constructive in the gentleman's mind would depend upon how big a rush he and his colleagues were in to get to hell. However, I also submit that in the mind of an innocent bystander peeking through the gate and seeing the gentleman's long tail under St. Peter's wings, and thus really knowing the gentleman was on his road to hell, the remarks of St. Peter would appear to be constructive.

I will also ask the gentleman to assume that—if St. Peter said—"many, many years ago we had a bunch of fakers here in heaven who sought power and prestige and who were damned to a place called hell, which the Creator had prepared for them. When they left under guard they went in that direction." If he indicated the direction, pointed out the mileposts and landmarks, I submit to the gentleman from California that St. Peter's remarks would be constructive advice in determining in which direction the gentleman and his colleagues might find hell.

Now, of course, the gentleman and his associates might loiter about the big gate, muttering about the reactionary ideas of God and His improper decision in regard to the facts and statement of the law. In that event, a button would be pushed calling forth Lucifer and his long-tailed guard to remove the gentleman and his colleagues under regimented military law for the purpose of just scorching his tail and singeing his feathers for a few thousand years.

Now I submit to the gentleman that in the Creator's nature of things that, too, might be constructive in the eyes of the innocent bystander who had carried his cross on earth and watch the gentleman and his colleagues depart in the indicated direction of hell. But in the mind of the gentleman and his colleagues, it might be destructive.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot take my seat without commenting about the standard socialistic smear tactic of this administration in its effort to build socialistic powers while crying "Beware of communism." We saw that in the campaigns of last year, when the uniform technique throughout the Nation was the identifying of opponents of socialism and this administration with our past colleague from New York, Mr. Marcantonio, because he found it necessary to vote with those stalwarts on a few occasions.

The same technique was that used by the gentleman from California in his remarks on April 10, when he sought to slander me by showing that Joe Stalin and his local Communists also opposed military Socialists. We, of course, are aware that a large segment of our people can be deceived by political chicanery and slanted news releases. That is particularly true if the demagoguery is cloaked with some official title indicating that the demagog has been elected by free people.

I want to indicate to the House certain existing conditions developed and practiced by the demagogues of this administration while crying "Wolf!"

First, this administration believes in the tactic of deceiving large segments of our people through slanted news releases, fear campaigns, and false reports. Communism supports those tactics. The gentleman from California used those tactics.

This Congress has delegated a large part of its power to be exercised by godless nonelected officials. This administration demands further power. Communism supports those demands. The gentleman from California supports those demands.

Our Chief Executive has surrounded himself with incompetent and corrupt advisers so that he cannot perform our delegated duties. Our Chief Executive defends his action. Communism supports those tactics. The gentleman from California defends those tactics.

We have locked up some traitors, but the big brain is yet unknown. This administration defended those traitors, covers up all evidence that might indicate the big brain. Communism is reputed to control that brain. The gentleman from California supports the administration's tactics and seeks to whitewash by smear.

The per capita portion of our national debt now exceeds the total assessed valuation of some counties. This is the result of the political bribery of our last

two Chief Executives. This bankruptcy is communism's greatest weapon against America. The gentleman from California supports all such bankrupting programs.

With each session of Congress we further oppress and depress our citizens. That is the purpose of this administration. That is the purpose of communism. The gentleman from California supports this administration.

We are exhausting our natural resources to buy disrespect abroad. Our President demands this self-abuse. This is part of communism's program for our destruction. The gentleman from California supports this destruction.

We have closed down our strategic metal industry and placed control of our stockpiles under our Secretary of Defense. This administration created that condition. The gentleman from California raises no objection.

We now find that we will either expand the national debt or apply ruinous taxation. Our President demands it. It is communism's program. The gentleman from California supports it.

We are destroying the self-reliance of Christian families by political bribery programs. This is the final purpose of communism. The program is supported by the gentleman from California.

We pay tribute to Russia and her satellites in an effort to buy friendship. Communism seeks the expansion of such expenditures. The gentleman from California raises no objection.

We allow leaders of enslaved groups to destroy law and order if they can turn over some votes. This is the political strength of our President. This is part of communism's program. It is supported by the gentleman from California.

We owe allegiance to a written Constitution which we here in this House are under oath bound to support. Yet we have two men on the Supreme Court bench appointed by this administration who say they are not bound by stare decisis. They would amend our Constitution by redefinition of words and phrases. Communism supports this tactic. The gentleman from California raises no objection.

We stumble along through public lies and self-deception. Our President supports this tactic. Communism supports it. By his remarks the gentleman from California supports it.

Spokesmen for this administration say American citizens cannot understand foreign policy and their Congressmen cannot understand reciprocal trade discussions. This is part of communistic philosophy. The gentleman from California raises no objection.

Our Commander in Chief sent our sons to die in Korea while permitting rubber, tin, copper, and steel to go to the factories of Russia and her satellites, including Communist China. Communism supports this program. The gentleman from California supports it.

Rather than admit past mistakes and set out on an honorable course, our President seeks military centralization to control his demagogues. This is at least socialism. The gentleman from California raises no objection and has assumed to be the spokesman in support of that program.

During the past 20 years, politicians of this administration have forced 12,000,000 American Christian families under autocratic control of trustees above and beyond the law. Communism supports this tactic. The tactic is socialistic. The gentleman from California supports it.

Since the last war, huge wage differentials have been forced into workingmen's automobiles, washing machines, shoes, clothing, and other articles as political pay-offs by this administration. Communism supports that tactic. It is a device leading only to socialism. The gentleman from California supports that tactic.

These nonelected labor bosses riding as Cossacks through the Halls of our Congress, dictating policy against the welfare of the American workingman, through political pressure force their personal desires upon our Government. Our President supports these men and their tactics. Communism supports these tactics. These tactics will lead to socialism. The gentleman from California supports these Cossacks.

Some Rasputin through pending military legislation demands this Congress subject the American people to autocratic powers to be exercised in war or peace so that Frankensteins may be controlled under military law. Our President supports this tactic. It is a communistic tactic. It is the tactic of totalitarian socialism. The gentleman from California supports the legislation.

Our Government permits so-called allies and associates of the United Nations to deliver lethal weapons to China to murder our sons. This is for the advantage of communism. The gentleman from California supports the policy.

Our Government ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent free China from attacking Red ports where these lethal weapons were being landed and to prevent free China from seizing such ships and cargoes. The gentleman from California supports these orders.

When our policemen went to Korea, our President ordered the Seventh Fleet to protect Red China from attack by Chiang Kai-shek's forces. Red troops were thereby released to kill our sons in North Korea. The gentleman from California supports that policy.

Our Air Force is ordered not to destroy Red arsenals in Manchuria from which men and weapons flow to North Korea to kill our sons. Communism supports this policy. The gentleman from California supports it.

We make no demands on other members of the United Nations for anything other than good wishes. Communism is seated on the United Nations. It supports that policy. The gentleman from California supports that policy.

Our Government permits other members of the United Nations to make money by sale of military goods to others seated on the United Nations whose effort is to kill our sons. This, of course, is the policy of communism. The gentleman from California raises no objections.

A few weeks ago our administration wined and dined General Wu at the Waldorf-Astoria, while as a representative of Communist China he blasphemed our boys, our Government, and our country before the United Nations. General Wu was the past chief of staff of the commanding officer of the Red armies in North Korea. This was our President's banquet for the benefit of communism. The gentleman from California raised no objection.

Since our policemen arrived in Korea without the consent of this Congress, other members of the United Nations have run out on us. Our President raised no objection The action only aided communism. The gentleman from California is silent.

Our faithless friend and foreign enemy, Joe Stalin, received everything he wanted at Tehran and Yalta. Gifts to him were all secret because the American people are not fit to be free. Our administration participated in this chicanery. Communism received all it demanded. The gentleman from California supports the result.

Having achieved victory with the largest Navy, Air Force, and most powerful Army in the history of the world, we were secretly forced to only counterpunch against another man in high place through political demagoguery. Our present administration issued the orders. Communism gained. The free world lost. The gentleman from California is silent.

We urged the people of Yugoslavia to fight the Hitler-Stalin alliance. We then turned them over to the Comintern agent, Tito. Since then he has shot down American fliers, executed Mihailovitch, imprisoned Archbishop Stepinac, locked up American citizens for whom our Government did not plead. We then gave Tito more than $400,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. We bought his contempt and the contempt of the world. Surely, this involves subversives in our administration. It aided communism. The gentleman from California was silent.

By the Atlantic Charter we made promises to Poland, only to turn our back on her. After her destruction, we loaded millions on her Communist enslavers through UNRRA and the Export-Import Bank. Communism received the only benefit. The gentleman from California is silent.

Donald Hiss, the brother of Alger Hiss, is still a partner in the law firm which has been Dean Acheson's since 1922. Donald Hiss was also identified as the head of a Communist cell carrying on treason activities for communism against our people. He has received fees for that law firm handling claims for Poland against the United States. Such claims require an exercise of the discretion of our Secretary of State. Fees for that claim and similar claims by that law firm against the United States and paid indirectly by United States taxpayers total over $450,000. Our President refuses to discharge Dean Acheson. The administration does not try Donald Hiss for perjury. Communism supports these tactics. The gentleman from California rushes to the support of the administration.

At least a million of the citizens of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania had rights under the Atlantic Charter but are now in Siberian slave labor camps. Our Government stopped our Armies west of Berlin. Communism made demands. Our Government granted them. The gentleman from California is silent.

Our Government told Chiang Kai-shek to keep up the good fight and he would get back everything stolen from China. We sold him out and our friends in South China through a pro-Communist group in our State Department. Communism received all its demands. The gentleman from California was silent.

Free China kept 1,500,000 Japs off the necks of our soldiers. We then said they were Fascist, reactionary, corrupt, and praised the Communist-agricultural reformers, armed and trained by Russia to the knowledge of our Government. They are now liquidating our Chinese friends. Our State Department cooperated. Communism received the only benefit. The gentleman from California is silent.

We refused to take Chiang Kai-shek's offer of assistance in the fight for Korea because Red China might be induced to fight. For months now Red China has been killing our sons. Red China is in the fight by their own decision. Yet we still refuse the aid of Chiang Kai-shek. Our State Department issued the orders. Communism receives the only benefit. The gentleman from California supports the policy.

We have deserted American citizens in Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia. We turned over thousands of Russian escapees to certain death in Russia. We turned over thousands of prisoners of war to enslavery or death in Russia. Yet on the basis that previous Presidents of the United States have sent our soldiers and Marines to protect American lives and property, this administration seeking more executive power now claims the right to send whole divisions into police action without the consent of this Congress. This is the trail to socialism. The gentleman from California is silent.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose all of these policies, but, like Joe Stalin, I also oppose socialism for the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would only repeat for the benefit of the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] that on these subjects neither Mr. Raymond Moley nor any other person speaks for me. I believe I express the views of many others who oppose the totalitarian demands of our administration. I only hope that the gentleman realizes that the way to liberty may require us to cross or come in contact with the paths of socialism and communism. I think we should avoid their tactics in this House and their policies. If we do not, the number of our constituents may grow as they chant the quotation of Sidney and Beatrice Webb "It is true that liberty is precious—so precious that it must be rationed."

I say to the gentleman from California in all sincerity that if he believes the best interests of our country demand socialism because our people were not fit to be free, he should say so boldly on the floor of the House so that we can debate the subject and carry the information to our people through honest news releases. It is the will of the people that will determine our destiny, and politicians, like lovers, should speak for themselves.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the gentleman could not wait 30 minutes and then have all the time he wants to take, because we have an important bill under consideration, and I think I will be constrained to object to the gentleman's speaking out of order.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There have been two speeches on that side out of order.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] is recognized for 10 minutes to speak out of order.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take up the time of this House. I do not blame the gentleman who was about to object. I would rather that this sort of debate, or whatever you might call it, would have taken place at a different time when a bill of this nature was not under consideration, because obviously it is not in order. But having been attacked in a very personal way, I think you will all understand I would want to say something about the attack made by the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

I will say that I do not blame him for being very disturbed toward me. I had occasion to answer some arguments that he placed in the RECORD not long ago, and he notified me at that time that I should come to the floor of the House, that he was going to answer me. I sat here with the documents to support my case for about 3 days. On one occasion he had the floor and he did not see fit to answer me. I do not think he will want to answer me now relative to his particular activities at that time.

As far as devotion to this Government is concerned, I might say, as one who headed the first official State committee ever created in the United States to investigate communism, I think my record on fighting communism will probably stand up with that of anybody in the United States. I was chairman of the California committee clear back in the days of Martin Dies, when most people thought that the things we were saying about the Communists were very crazy. Time has proved us right.

I might call attention to the fact that the report I wrote on world communism in 1940 was reprinted by the California Legislature in 1950 and redistributed because they thought it had enough merit that it should be widely circulated.

In addition to that, I do not know where the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] was during the war, but I know that I was a combat intelligence officer and spent 2 years in New Guinea, where I had a great deal to do with classified documents of the United States Government. As a matter of fact, at one time I was a code and cipher officer, which is our most secret branch of the service, as you all know. Therefore, like all intelligence officers, having been thoroughly investigated by all security agencies of the Government, including the FBI and Army Intelligence, before being entrusted with classified information, I would like to ask the gentleman what he was doing while I was in New Guinea performing my duties.

That brings me to the point that is the reason for his attack upon me. Before coming back here to the Congress last year, I received a telegram. It was very interesting—especially to one who had made a study of Communist techniques.

It advised me that a Southern California Peace Council had been formed, and that the purpose of this council was to fight the universal military training program which it said is now called the Guderian plan. It pointed out that one of our national magazines has mentioned a plan developed by Heinz Guderian. This turned out, in fact, to be a study of not only the German technique but also an analysis of what he thought were our mistakes in the last war. The document was in the hands of our military people. It was only natural that we would want to ask our enemies whom we had captured to tell us what they thought we had done that was wrong so we would not make those mistakes again. The analysis was prepared for the historical division by Heinz Guderian—one of Hitler's chiefs of staff, I think his last one. It was a classified document circulated among our military people purely and simply as an educational proposition. For obvious reasons it was not made public, at least, until the gentleman from California obtained a copy of it—how I do not know. When the Communists learned of the document they seized upon the fact that we had asked Guderian to make the study in order to develop their technique of calling universal military training the "Heinz Guderian plan." This is psychological warfare. It is psychological warfare because they knew that if they could associate in the public mind the words "Heinz Guderian" with universal military training they could prejudice the public against universal military training and weaken our determination to stay strong. Just by this association of ideas, if successful, they would have created opposition to universal military training in the mind of any American who came to think of it as the Heinz Guderian plan. So it was a very nefarious scheme and one that immediately attracted my attention. I personally, and with another gentleman, went over

to the Southern California Peace Council office to see what kind of an office it was, being very certain that it was another one of the Communist phony peace councils. I found there on the door nothing but a piece of paper that said "Southern California Peace Council." They had not even opened up for business, yet they were sending out this propaganda.

The telegram was followed in a day or two by a letter which I have here and which I placed in the RECORD some time ago. In this the traitors went even further by attacking our American military leaders and, of course, again emphasizing that universal military training was in fact the Heinz Guderian plan. I felt that they would most certainly adopt this technique in other parts of the United States in their effort to defeat universal military training. So on three occasions I inserted in the RECORD of this House articles dealing with this particular subject, and showing that at a meeting in Los Angeles of this very council which was called for the purpose of discussing the Heinz Guderian plan, as they call it, they would not even let a reporter from one of our daily newspapers take notes; they ushered him out.

We all know, of course, that the Communists are not opposed to universal military training except in the United States or the free nations. We all know that they have universal military service in Russia and behind the iron curtain. But I felt there was a danger that some people might be misled by this particular Communist scheme and by the petitions they started circulating asking people to sign them and send them to their Congressmen, telling the Congressmen to vote against the Heinz Guderian plan.

As the situation developed these organizations did begin to spread out. With that background and having pointed out to the Congress three times the nature of this insidious Communist scheme you can imagine how surprised I was when the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] inserted in the RECORD a long speech divulging the contents of secret or classified documents—I do not know where he got them—which documents were supposed to support his argument that universal military service was based on the Heinz Guderian plan. He did exactly what I had warned on three occasions the Communists were trying to do. I was shocked to find that a representative of the Republican Party would be so misled as to insert in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most vicious attack on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and an attack on universal military training based upon the argument that the Communists used, that it was the Heinz Guderian plan.

I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that George Washington himself espoused universal military service for the reason that he did not believe in a large permanent standing army. But there is another angle to this. I fought under the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States and I think we have some of the finest military leaders in the world. I do not see how any soldier can maintain his morale in the field if he does not think he is fighting under competent men whose leadership is competent and whose program will bring about victory for his own country. I know how I would have felt had I been convinced that the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the United States was not composed of competent military leaders.

I was in General MacArthur's command. Most of you know that we were not, during a great part of the war, a very important command. I admit that very frankly. We were in the Southwest Pacific. We were based mainly in Australia and in New Guinea. We sat in New Guinea a long time. We could not move forward rapidly because we did not have the supplies and men. It was not thought by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that we should have the amount of men and material that we felt we needed because they thought the main job was to defeat the Nazis in Europe, and then take care of Japan. I will confess that while I was perspiring in New Guinea for what seemed an eternity, I sometimes wondered if they were not wrong about that. I thought they should give us a little bit more to fight back with in the Pacific.

You must remember in this connection that at that time the commander in chief of the Pacific Ocean area was Admiral Nimitz and under his command in the South Pacific was Admiral Halsey. They were doing a tremendous job of trying to cut right straight across the Pacific toward Japan. And as it turned out, after I came home, and my perspective improved, I realized that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Marshall, and those who were directing our war effort had, as a matter of fact, used a wise over-all strategy. The proof of that is the fact that Japan collapsed shortly after Germany was knocked out of the war. I say that because I think it is important that we maintain confidence in our Joint Chiefs of Staff and in our military people. I think their integrity is actually beyond reproach. Yet, the gentleman from California when he attacked the universal military service, and called it the Heinz Guderian plan, also made a vicious attack on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, the title of his speech on that occasion was "Our Growing Prussian Staff" and on page 3224 of our RECORD he stated:

> Before I take my seat this afternoon I intend to present documents and evidence which I am confident will induce other Members of the House to agree with me in my assertion that we have the Hitlerian general staff in operation today.

Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of a subversive attack upon the military leaders of the United States I felt it was my duty to answer. Especially I felt it was my duty to do so because I had pointed out on three prior occasions that it was exactly the technique of the Communists in the United States. We expect them to use such technique and to spread such malicious propaganda. We are sorry and surprised when a Member of the House falls victim to Communist propaganda and puts it in our RECORD so that Communists all over the world can quote—not some Communist—but can quote a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, quote him as saying that we are trying to put the Prussian plan into operation in the United States, that we are adopting the Heinz Guderian plan and that we already have a Prussian general staff.

In addition to that, I also felt it was extremely unwise for the gentleman to take it upon himself to declassify military documents. He said in his talk that he was using classified documents. I have never been able to find out why he felt he was competent to declassify those documents and put them in the RECORD. I tell you, based upon my experience as an intelligence officer and as one who worked with codes and ciphers, that it is an extremely dangerous thing for an unauthorized person to do. It is an extremely dangerous thing for even an intelligence officer to do unless he is dealing with documents with which he is thoroughly familiar and which he has been properly authorized to declassify. The proof of this is the fact that in our own Senate hearings, some of the material that is now being released as proper for declassification at this time is first changed around so that the order of it does not coincide with the code or cipher messages when they were transmitted. How is a layman, or even an intelligence officer, who has not worked with the documents to know what form those documents were transmitted in? A violation of security rules is an extremely dangerous thing when you consider that every radio message most likely is intercepted by our enemy, the same as we try to take down every one of theirs. It is extremely dangerous when you realize that secret ciphers can be broken. Breaking a cipher is only a matter of time, and anything that the enemy can get their hands on that shows him the form of the message will shorten that time considerably and perhaps make it possible for him to break a later cipher in a shorter time. So far as a code is concerned, it is a most vulnerable means of communication if the enemy gets his hands on any of it, because a code is based, as you know, upon a set system of words or letters, so once an enemy gets the key or has some of the words, he may break every message. I sat on New Guinea and read the Japanese mail. That is how we got Yamamoto and I was surprised and chagrined when it was disclosed after the war that we broke the Japanese code. It was a secret that we most certainly should have kept, and when I was sent home under the rotation plan it was one of the two most important secrets that we did not talk about. We were cautioned not to. But somewhat later that information came out. I am sorry it came out, because our enemies in the future will be a little more chary about their codes and our opportunity of breaking

them will be a little bit less. Yet, here we have a gentleman, whose service record I do not know anything about, I do not know whether he knows anything about codes or ciphers, who takes it upon himself to prove that we are Prussianizing this country by adopting the Heinz Guderian plan purporting to prove it by inserting classified documents in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think that is a danger to the security of the United States, and I so pointed out in my remarks about the gentleman's speech. I did say, and I repeat, that the gentleman is a fine, loyal American. I am sorry that he allowed someone to mislead him. I know he thought he was going to get great national publicity as the spokesman for those who wanted to defeat universal military training, as the spokesman for those who would like to have some people believe, and I think for political purposes, that we are trying to Prussianize the United States.

I do not believe for a minute that the Joint Chiefs of Staff of this Nation are men who would Prussianize the United States. I think they are devoted to democracy. I think their responsibility in this day and age is almost beyond our ability to comprehend especially when you consider that these Joint Chiefs must be prepared to fight not only probable enemies, but every possible combination of possible enemies, when you consider that they must be able to repel any kind of an attack, that they must be able to retaliate against any kind of an attack, that they must be able to deploy our forces in any kind of weather, in any kind of climate, in any place in the world, and that they must plan to do all this in consonance with the economic welfare of the United States—in other words, how much we can afford at any one time. They must also constantly try to make a difficult calculated guess as to when we might have to use any force that we raise. All of this sort of thing casts responsibility on them that few of us would want. I think they are discharging that responsibility with honor to their country and to themselves, and I resent deeply these rash and irresponsible attacks on the Joint Chiefs of Staff such as was made by the gentleman from California. I do not blame him for not wanting me to point these things out. I am sorry to have to do so. But if he makes a similar attack upon me in the future I will not fail to answer him, and to explain the real reason for his venomous distortion of my record—his insidiously clever and studied distortion of it. He has stooped very low. I am, of course, flattered by his attention, but as far as I am concerned personalities mean nothing. I am interested in the security of the United States. I do not think laymen or unauthorized persons should put secret classified documents in the RECORD. I do not think a Congressman should call our Joint Chiefs Prussian. I do not think a Congressman should call our proposed universal military training plan the Heinz Guderian plan, thereby earning the plaudits of the Communists all over the world and causing them to shout with glee over the success of their subversive propaganda.

I regret that the gentleman saw fit to ask for time in which to attack me personally and to precipitate this debate. I am sorry he has compelled me to tell you why he did so.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as read for amendment.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Powers of Appointment Act of 1951."

SEC. 2. Estate Tax—Powers of Appointment.

(a) Section 811 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to powers of appointment) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Powers of Appointment:

"(1) Property with respect to which Decedent exercises a general power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942: To the extent of any property with respect to which a general power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, is exercised by the decedent (1) by will or (2) by a disposition which is of such nature that if it were a transfer of property owned by the decedent, such property would be includible in the decedent's gross estate under subsection (c); but the failure to exercise such a power shall not be deemed an exercise thereof.

"If before July 1, 1951, or within the time limited by paragraph (2) of section 403 (d) of the Revenue Act of 1942, as amended, in cases to which such paragraph is applicable, a general power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, shall have been partially released so that it is no longer a general power of appointment, the subsequent exercise of such power shall not be deemed to be the exercise of a general power of appointment.

"(2) Powers created after October 21, 1942: To the extent of any property with respect to which the decedent has at the time of his death a general power of appointment created after October 21, 1942, or with respect to which the decedent has at any time exercised or released such a power of appointment by a disposition which is of such nature that if it were a transfer of property owned by the decedent, such property would be includible in the decedent's gross estate under subsection (c); but if such a power lapses during the life of the individual posssessing the power, the failure to exercise such power shall not be deemed an exercise or a release of the power. A disclaimer or renunciation of such power of appointment shall not be deemed a release of such power.

"For the purposes of this paragraph (2) the power of appointment shall be considered to exist on the date of the decedent's death even though the exercise of the power is subject to a precedent giving of notice or even though the exercise of the power takes effect only on the expiration of a stated period after its exercise, whether or not on or before the date of the decedent's death notice has been given or the power has been exercised.

"(3) Definition. For the purposes of this subsection the term 'general power of appointment' means only an unlimited, unrestricted power which is exercisable in favor of the decedent, his estate, his creditors, or the creditors of his estate.

"If the decedent is legally accountable for the exercise or nonexercise of a power, such power shall not be deemed a general power of appointment. A power which is exercisable by the decedent only in conjunction with another person shall not be deemed a general power of appointment. A power to consume, invade, or appropriate property for the benefit of the decedent which is limited by an ascertainable standard relating to the health, education, support or maintenance of the decedent shall not be deemed a general power of appointment.

"(4) Creation of another power in certain cases. To the extent of any property with respect to which the decedent (1) by will or (2) by a disposition which is of such nature that if it were a transfer of property owned by the decedent, such property would be includible in the decedent's gross estate under subsection (c), exercises a power of appointment created after October 21, 1942, by creating another power of appointment which under the applicable local law can be validly exercised so as to postpone the vesting of any estate or interest in such property, or suspend the absolute ownership or power of alienation of such property, for a period ascertainable without regard to the date of the creation of the first power."

(b) Date of creation of power: For the purposes of this section a power of appointment created by a will executed on or before October 21, 1942, shall be considered a power created on or before such date if the person executing such will dies before July 1, 1949, without having republished such will, by codicil or otherwise, after October 21, 1942.

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be effective as if made by section 403 of the Revenue Act of 1942 on the date of its enactment (applicable with respect to estates of decedents dying after October 21, 1942).

SEC. 3. Gift Tax—Powers of Appointment

(a) Section 1000 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to powers of appointment) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Powers of Appointment:

"(1) Exercise of general power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942: An exercise of a general power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, shall be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power; but the failure to exercise such a power shall not be deemed an exercise thereof.

"If before July 1, 1951, or within the time limited by paragraph (2) of section 452 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1942, as amended, in cases to which such paragraph is applicable, a general power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, shall have been partially released so that it is no longer a general power of appointment, the subsequent exercise of such power shall not be deemed to be the exercise of a general power of appointment.

"(2) Powers created after October 21, 1942: The exercise or release of a general power of appointment created after October 21, 1942, shall be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power; but if such a power lapses during the life of the individual possessing the power, the failure to exercise such power shall not be deemed an exercise or a release of the power. A disclaimer or renunciation of such a power of appointment shall not be deemed a release of such power.

"(3) Definition: For the purposes of this subsection the term 'general power of appointment' means only an unlimited, unrestricted power which is exercisable in favor of the individual possessing the power, his estate, his creditors, or the creditors of his estate.

"If the individual possessing a power is legally accountable for the exercise of nonexercise of the power, such power shall not be deemed a general power of appointment. A power which is exercisable by an individual possessing it only in conjunction with another person shall not be deemed a general power of appointment. A power to consume,

invade, or appropriate property for the benefit of the individual possessing the power which is limited by an ascertainable standard relating to the health, education, support, or maintenance of such individual shall not be deemed a general power of appointment.

"(4) Creation of another power in certain cases: If a power of appointment created after October 21, 1942, is exercised by creating another power of appointment which under the applicable local law can be validly exercised so as to postpone the vesting of any estate or interest in the property which was subject to the first power, or suspend the absolute ownership or power of alienation of such property, for a period ascertainable without regard to the date of the creation of the first power, such exercise of the first power shall, to the extent of the property subject to the second power, be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power."

(b) Date of creation of power. For the purposes of this section a power of appointment created by a will executed on or before October 21, 1942, shall be considered a power created on or before such date if the person executing such will dies before July 1, 1949, without having republished such will, by codicil or otherwise, after October 21, 1942.

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be effective as if made by section 452 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1942 on the date of its enactment (applicable with respect to gifts made in the calendar year 1943 and succeeding calendar years).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 20, strike out all of subsection (3) and insert the following:

"(3) Definition of general power of appointment: For the purposes of this subsection the term 'general power of appointment' means a power which is exercisable in favor of the decedent, his estate, his creditors, or the creditors of his estate; except that—

"(A) A power to consume, invade, or appropriate property for the benefit of the decedent which is limited by an ascertainable standard relating to the health, education, support, or maintenance of the decedent shall not be deemed a general power of appointment.

"(B) A power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, which is exercisable by the decedent only in conjunction with another person shall not be deemed a general power of appointment.

"(C) In the case of a power of appointment created after October 21, 1942, which is exercisable by the decedent only in conjunction with another person—

"(i) if the power is not exercisable by the decedent except in conjunction with the creator of the power—such power shall not be deemed a general power of appointment.

"(ii) if the power is not exercisable by the decedent except in conjunction with a person having a substantial interest in the property, subject to the power, which is adverse to exercise of the power in favor of the decedent—such power shall not be deemed a general power of appointment. For the purposes of this clause a person who, after the death of the decedent, may be possessed of a power of appointment (with respect to the property subject to the decedent's power) which he may exercise in his own favor shall be deemed as having an interest in the property and such interest shall be deemed adverse to such exercise of the decedent's power.

"(iii) if (after the application of clauses (i) and (ii) the power is a general power of appointment and is exercisable in favor of such other person—such power shall be deemed a general power of appointment only in respect of a fractional part of the property subject to such power, such part to be determined by dividing the value of such property by the number of such persons (including the decedent) in favor of whom such power is exercisable.

"For the purposes of clauses (ii) and (iii) a power shall be deemed to be exercisable in favor of a person if it is exercisable in favor of such person, his estate, his creditors, or the creditors of his estate."

Page 6, line 13, insert quotation marks at the beginning of the line.

Page 8, line 20, strike out all of subsection (3) and insert the following:

"(3) Definition of general power of appointment: For the purposes of this subsection the term 'general power of appointment' means a power which is exercisable in favor of the individual possessing the power (hereafter in this paragraph referred to as the 'possessor'), his estate, his creditors, or the creditors of his estate; except that—

"(A) A power to consume, invade, or appropriate property for the benefit of the possessor which is limited by an ascertainable standard relating to the health, education, support, or maintenance of the possessor shall not be deemed a general power of appointment.

"(B) A power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, which is exercisable by the possessor only in conjunction with another person shall not be deemed a general power of appointment.

"(C) In the case of a power of appointment created after October 21, 1942, which is exercisable by the possessor only in conjunction with another person—

"(i) if the power is not exercisable by the possessor except in conjunction with the creator of the power—such power shall not be deemed a general power of appointment;

"(ii) if the power is not exercisable by the possessor except in conjunction with a person having a substantial interest, in the property subject to the power, which is adverse to exercise of the power in favor of the possessor—such power shall not be deemed a general power of appointment. For the purposes of this clause a person who, after the death of the possessor, may be possessed of a power of appointment (with respect to the property subject to the possessor's power) which he may exercise in his own favor shall be deemed as having an interest in the property and such interest shall be deemed adverse to such exercise of the possessor's power;

"(iii) if (after the application of clauses (i) and (ii)) the power is a general power of appointment and is exercisable in favor of such other person—such power shall be deemed a general power of appointment only in respect of a fractional part of the property subject to such power, such part to be determined by dividing the value of such property by the number of such persons (including the possessor) in favor of whom such power is exercisable.

"For the purposes of clauses (ii) and (iii) a power shall be deemed to be exercisable in favor of a person if it is exercisable in favor of such person, his estate, his creditors, or the creditors of his estate."

Mr. CAMP (interrupting the reading of the committee amendments). Mr. Chairman, since the committee amendments are published in the majority report, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the committee amendments be dispensed with and that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rose.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2084) relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate and gift tax purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 206, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDFORD, MASS., HIGH SCHOOL BAND

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, when a group of individuals through industry, perseverance, and skill and motivated by high patriotic purpose is able to achieve the highest distinction in a given field, it is certainly worthy of notice and commendation. The high-school band, of Medford, Mass., the largest city in my congressional district, is on a concert tour and is today in Washington, when the Nation's Capital will have an opportunity to hear this splendid 100-piece band under the supervision of Ralph I. Schoonmaker, director. This band was organized in 1930 and after the first 4 years began to win top ratings in high-school contests and now holds a first division rating in all State and sectional contests and is the first school band in New England. They played at the New York World's Fair in 1939 and at the international music festival in Montreal in 1946. The current tour is sponsored by Medford Band Parents' Association under the direction of Albert W. Wiltshire, chairman. During the tour the band gave a concert in New York when these accomplished young musicians were given the thrill of playing under the magical baton of the celebrated conductor, Edwin Franko Goldman, and they expect to play tonight at the Walter Reed Hospital to entertain the wounded veterans.

Accompanying the band are a number of the high-school teachers and parents. As evidence of the honor deemed appropriate to be bestowed upon the high-school band by the people back home in Medford, it is noteworthy that the mayor of Medford, Hon. Frederick T. McDer-

mott left his busy desk in city hall to accompany this musical organization of which all the people of Medford are so justly proud. I am sure my colleagues will join in the pride I feel at the signal accomplishments of these young people who are going to play so important a part in the making of the greater America which is to be.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Tablet.

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RIBICOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a message by Frazar B. Wilde.

Mr. REAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one to include an article referring to world war III.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a message from Col. T. H. Barden.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on last Friday on the veterans' legislation, and also on the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to include extraneous matter in each one.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and in each include appropriate material.

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the bill H. R. 2084 and include a description of the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 321. An act to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of B. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe;

H. R. 622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina.

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrzej Wojcicki, and Stanislaw Wojcicki;

H. R. 664. An act for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt;

H. R. 667. An act for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling;

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins;

H. R. 789. An act for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee;

H. R. 859. An act for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski;

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr.;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Taro Takara;

H. R. 1117. An act for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya;

H. R. 1121. An act for the relief of Chin Yok Kong;

H. R. 1141. An act for the relief of St. Patrick Hospital and the Western Montana Clinic;

H. R. 1150. An act for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti, Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of Pietro Giannettino;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu;

H. R. 1264. An act for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden;

H. R. 1422. An act for the relief of Carl Parks;

H. R. 1438. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Charles R. Keicher;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Elena Erbez;

H. R. 1798. An act for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased;

H. R. 2668. An act for the relief of Sook Kat;

H. R. 2175. An act for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott;

H. R. 2304. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers;

H. R. 2357. An act for the relief of Lucia Adamos;

H. R. 2450. An act for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano;

H. R. 2654. An act to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 2714. An act for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte;

H. R. 3196. An act to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3291. An act to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; and

H. R. 3292. An act to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members of the Eighty-second Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

JOHN C. WATTS, Sixth District, Kentucky.

CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL, Eleventh District, Missouri.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

437. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its wholly owned subsidiary Federal National Mortgage Association for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 125); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

439. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement of

research work being performed under contracts or cooperative agreements, showing the names of the agencies cooperating and the amounts expended thereon, pursuant to the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946, Public Law 733; to the Committee on Agriculture.

439. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting at the request of Governor Stainback of Hawaii, a certified copy of joint resolution 2, requesting the enactment of legislation requiring Federal departments to withhold Territorial taxes upon compensation on the same basis as Territorial departments and political subdivisions of the Territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

440. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

441. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prisons Industries, Inc., United States Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1950, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934 (18 U. S. C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3991. A bill relating to the annual adjustment of the basic pay of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 3992. A bill to grant pensions to certain veterans of the War With Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition who served less than 70 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 3993. A bill to provide for the issuance of bonds of the United States in compensation for certain annual leave accumulated by Government officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3994. A bill to amend the definition of "agriculture" as contained in section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3995. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain land and improvements at Pass Christian, Miss.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 3996. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations to provide that malignant tumors developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 5 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3997. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3998. A bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3999. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4000. A bill to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level premium term insurance for successive 5-year periods; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution urging the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action with respect to placing an arms embargo on Communist China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of Massachusetts Legislature in favor of the passage of legislation revising the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for Congress to enact legislation to authorize the waiving of certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts favoring passage of legislation revising the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts favoring enactment of legislation to authorize the waiving of certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to enacting legislation authorizing organization of a Hawaii Territorial Guard prior to the Hawaii National Guard being called into active Federal service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4001. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel Magtalis Geronimo and Dr. Rita Villaroman Geronimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4002. A bill for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 4003. A bill for the relief of L. E. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

275. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress in favor of the passage of legislation revising the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

276. Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to enact legislation to authorize the waiving of certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

277. By Mr. LANTAFF: Concurrent resolution by the Senate of the State of Florida, requesting the Congress of the United States to disregard house memorial No. 15 adopted by the Florida Legislature in 1943, and house concurrent resolution No. 10 adopted by the 1945 legislature, and senate memorial No. 282 adopted by the 1949 legislature, thus rescinding, recalling and revoking the aforesaid memorials from the State of Florida for the convening of a constitutional convention, as provided by article V of the Constitution of the United States of America, the subject matter of said memorials being to initiate and adopt an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, whereby the United States of America might participate in a limited world federal government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Leland Stark, rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God our Heavenly Father, from whose bountiful hand has come every good gift, we thank Thee that Thou hast given us this good land for our heritage, and we pray Thee that, ever mindful of Thy favor, we may show forth our thankfulness to Thee by an eagerness to know and to do Thy will.

To that end give us the grace to acknowledge that in this time of crisis and uncertainty we need the help of Thy guidance. Give us the spirit of humility that, honestly confessing the inadequacy of our human wisdom and power, we may boldly ask for that supplement of divine wisdom and power which Thou alone canst give.

And so with confidence in Thy help we now commit ourselves and our Nation into Thy gracious keeping, beseeching Thee that Thou wouldst be pleased to use us as instruments of Thy will for the welfare of Thy people everywhere.

These things we pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 7, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 5, 1951:

S. 300. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart; and

S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek.

On May 7, 1951:

S. 271. An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes; and

S. 451. An act for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic.

On May 8, 1951:

S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn; and

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2084) relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate- and gift-tax purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Benton	Hennings	Moody
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Taft
Ecton	Long	Thye
Ellender	McCarthy	Tobey
Ferguson	McClellan	Underwood
Flanders	McFarland	Welker
Frear	McKellar	Wherry
Fulbright	McMahon	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Young
Green	Maybank	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESERVATION OF ADDITIONAL LAND FOR SUMMIT LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION, NEV.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON COOPERATIVE RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperative research work, for the fiscal year 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Public Housing Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its wholly owned subsidiary, Federal National Mortgage Association, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Resolution 49

"Whereas early this morning President Truman announced the discharge of General Douglas MacArthur from all of his military commands; and

"Whereas General MacArthur has long been a symbol of the determination of the free peoples of the world to resist totalitarian aggression and has been looked to with hope by the freedom loving peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the shocking action of the President leaves our fighting men stranded in Korea without benefit of the leadership of General MacArthur, and further leaves the people of our Nation in a greater state of confusion and with further lack of knowledge as to true conditions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois*, That we express our unqualified confidence in General MacArthur and vigorously condemn the irresponsible and capricious action of the President in summarily discharging him from his command and that we further condemn such action without an opportunity to General MacArthur and others of his command to inform the people of our Nation of the true condition of affairs in Korea and the Far East; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we further criticize and condemn the policies of the present administration of the United States for withholding information, if any exists, to justify this action.

"Adopted by the senate April 11, 1951.

"WALLACE THOMPSON,
"President pro tempore of the Senate.
"EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 174

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to disregard House Memorial No. 15, adopted by the Florida Legislature in 1943, and House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, adopted by the 1945 legislature, and Senate Memorial No. 282, adopted by the 1949 legislature, thus rescinding, recalling, and revoking the aforesaid memorials from the State of Florida for the convening of a constitutional convention as provided by article V of the Constitution of the United States of America, the subject matter of said memorials being to initiate and adopt an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, whereby the United States of America might participate in a limited world federal government

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Florida, desiring to officially record itself by

a two-thirds vote of the members of both senate and house thereof, by this resolution, declares that the legislative memorial passed and adopted by former Legislatures of the State of Florida, to wit: Memorial No. 15 of the 1943 legislature, House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 of the 1945 legislature, and Memorial No. 282 of the 1949 legislature, should no longer be permitted to stand in their purport, operation, and effect, in proposing from the State of Florida, the calling of a Federal constitutional convention by the Congress of the United States of America, to amend the Constitution of the United States of America to provide for authority for participation by the United States of America in a limited world federal government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the House of Representatives concurring):

"(1) That any and all applications heretofore made to the Congress of the United States of America, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States of America, to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America, to enable the participation of the United States of America in a world federal government, as provided by Memorial No. 15 of the 1943 legislature, House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 of the 1945 legislature, and Memorial No. 282 of the 1949 legislature, be, each and all of them, and the same are hereby recalled, revoked, and rescinded, and the State of Florida withdraws any and all applications for the call of the constitutional convention heretofore emanating from it or adopted by its legislature and heretofore transmitted to the Congress of the United States of America; be it further

"Resolved:

"(1) That the secretary of state of the State of Florida is hereby directed to certify under the great seal of the State of Florida and promptly transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America as the law may require.

"(2) That a copy of this resolution shall also be transmitted to the governor of each of the several States of the United States of America with the request that the said governor transmit copies thereof to the respective legislative bodies of his State in the manner and form provided by law.

"(3) That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America.

"(4) That this resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage by a two-thirds vote of the members of each body of the Legislature of the State of Florida."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Memorial 2

"Memorial of the Congress of the United States to rescind Florida Senate Memorial 282 of 1949, relating to a constitutional convention for purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States so that a limited world federal government be created by amendment to the United Nations Charter, or by a world constitutional convention

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully asked to ignore the previous Florida Senate Memorial 282 of 1949, relating to a petition for a constitutional convention for purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States so that the United States could participate in a limited world federal government with authority to prevent war; as the Legislature of the State of Florida has rescinded and withdrawn this previous petition."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to ratify and confirm Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1949

"Whereas, by Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1949, the Maui County Waterworks Board was included under the definition of 'municipality'; and

"Whereas it is desirable that said act as amended should be ratified and confirmed: Now, therefore, be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is requested through the Delegate in Congress from Hawaii to enact legislation ratifying and confirming the provisions of said Act 291, and to that end that said Congress is hereby requested and urged, through said delegate, to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"'An act to ratify and confirm Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1949, which included Maui County Waterworks Board under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935

"*'Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1949, which amended section 6081 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, as amended, to include Maui County Waterworks Board under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds under the Revenue Bond Act of 1935, is hereby ratified and confirmed, and revenue bonds may be issued by said Maui County Waterworks Board under and pursuant to the provisions of the Revenue Bond Act of 1935, as amended, without approval of the President of the United States and without the incurring of an indebtedness within the meaning of the Hawaiian Organic Act, and the Revenue Bond Act of 1935 as so amended shall constitute full authority for the issuance of said bonds without reference to and independent of the Hawaiian Organic Act.'

"SEC. 2. That duly certified copies of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate in Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 23d day of April A. D. 1951.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 44

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation authorizing organization of a Hawaii Territorial Guard prior to the Hawaii National Guard being called into active Federal service

"Whereas the National Defense Act prohibits the organization within the Territory of Hawaii of military forces other than the Hawaii National Guard except while the Hawaii National Guard or any part thereof is in active Federal service; and

"Whereas no part of the Hawaii National Guard is now in active Federal service; and

"Whereas the Hawaii National Guard may be called or ordered into active Federal service at any time, leaving the Territory without any organization capable of carrying out the Territorial mission of the Hawaii National Guard; and

"Whereas the laws of the Territory of Hawaii permit the organization of the Hawaii Territorial Guard upon obtaining the prior consent of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the Hawaii Territorial Guard be organized as soon as possible on a volunteer basis, without pay: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to amend the National Defense Act so as to permit the organization of the Hawaii Territorial Guard on a volunteer basis, without pay, prior to a call or order of the Hawaii National Guard into active Federal service: Now, therefore, be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation requiring Federal departments to withhold Territorial taxes upon compensation on the same basis as Territorial departments and political subdivisions of the Territory.

"Whereas under chapter 98 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, as amended, the laws of the Territory of Hawaii impose a tax of 2 percent on compensation received by civilian employees for the services performed within the Territory; and

"Whereas the revenues under said laws from this tax on compensation constitute approximately 12¾ percent of all tax revenues of the Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions; and

"Whereas, pursuant to said tax laws, the Territory and its political subdivisions and all private employers having a place of business within the Territory, are required to withhold this tax from said compensation paid to employees for services performed within the Territory; and

"Whereas by judicial decision, in *Yerinan v. Territory* (130 F. 2d 786) and *Borthwick v. Veatch* (172 F. 2d 226, certiorari denied 337 U. S. 916), the legality of this tax as applied to United States employees has been sustained and said tax has been held to be in conformity with the following acts of Congress, to wit, the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939, 53 Statutes at Large 575, chapter 59, section 4 (5 USCA 84a), and the Buck Act, 54 Statutes at Large 1059, chapter 787, reenacted by 61 Statutes at Large 641, chapter 389 (4 USCA 105–110); and

"Whereas under its present laws the United States does not require the withholding of this tax from its employees within the Territory; and

"Whereas the various United States governmental departments, particularly the Armed Forces, employ many thousands of civilian workers in the Territory; and

"Whereas the wages and salaries of the employees of the United States are not subject to garnishment by a State or Territory; and

"Whereas few of the said United States employees own property within the Territory which can be attached to satisfy their Territorial tax obligations; and

"Whereas these factors make Territorial tax evasion among United States employees an easy process, due to the lack of any practical means available to the Territory to enforce payment of this tax by Federal employees; and

"Whereas as a result of this situation, a large number of United States employees have consistently, openly, and flagrantly defied the laws of the Territory in relation to collection of this tax; and

"Whereas the number of delinquent tax accounts under this tax on file in the office of the Territorial tax commissioner exceeds 50,000 among employees of the United States alone; and

"Whereas the amount of delinquent taxes owed to the Territory by United States employees alone exceeds $3,280,000, and is increasing at the rate of $400,000 to $500,000 annually; and

"Whereas the tax in question is not in any way discriminatory against employees of the United States, as all employees within the Territory are obligated to pay the same tax at the same rate, regardless of the identity of their employers; and

"Whereas as exemplified in the Federal income tax law, withholding from salaries and wages is a desirable means of applying tax levies to salaried employees and wage earners; and

"Whereas the place where an employee works is the only practicable place for tax withholding; and

"Whereas the Territory's tax is levied according to the place where the employee works, and while it is recognized that certain United States employees in the Territory may be subject to taxation by the States of their domiciles, as well as by the Territory, such States of their domiciles can eliminate such double taxation, as is provided, for example, in the laws of the Territory, which exempt from taxation income of domiciliaries of the Territory when subject to taxation elsewhere; and

"Whereas if the United States should choose to withhold the 2 percent Territorial tax from the compensation paid to its employees within the Territory, the additional burden on the United States would be a light one, as the tax in question is a flat 2 percent of the compensation paid, and no further computation is necessary, as is the case with withholding of United States income taxes, which are graduated in rate, and influenced by numbers of dependents, etc., a task which the Territory and all States cheerfully perform on behalf of the United States; and

"Whereas many conscientious United States employees, who are now required to file and pay this 2 percent tax to the Territory individually, have expressed a desire that the United States withhold this tax from their compensation; and

"Whereas the Territory is confident that the United States has no desire or intention of fostering and encouraging wholesale defiance of Territorial tax laws, which results from the present situation; Now, therefore, be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested and urged to enact legislation which will require the various departments of the Federal Government to withhold and pay over to the tax commissioner of the Territory of Hawaii territorial taxes imposed on compensation for services of civilians performed in Hawaii, on the same basis as the departments and political subdivisions of the Territory, it being understood, of course, that the United States would be subject to neither penalties, interest nor other liability for failure to comply with any of such provisions.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 6th day of April A. D. 1951.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

An act of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House bill 589

"An act authorizing the State of Maryland to enter into compacts with other States, possessions, or Territories of the United States or with the District of Columbia, for mutual helpfulness in meeting any civil defense emergency or other disaster

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has enacted the procedure for granting its consent to civil defense compacts by an act entitled "Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950" (Public Law 920, 81st Cong., 2d sess., approved January 12, 1951); and

"Whereas the State of Maryland contemplates entering into civil defense compacts with other States, possessions, and Territories of the United States and with the District of Columbia, substantially in the form following:

"'Interstate Civil Defense and Disaster Compact

"'The contracting States solemnly agree:

"'ARTICLE 1. The purpose of this compact is to provide mutual aid among the States in meeting any emergency or disaster from enemy attack or other cause (natural or otherwise) including sabotage and subversive acts and direct attacks by bombs, shellfire, and atomic, radiological, chemical, bacteriological means, and other weapons. The prompt, full, and effective utilization of the resources of the respective States, including such resources as may be available from the United States Government or any other source, are essential to the safety, care, and welfare of the people thereof in the event of enemy action or other emergency, and any other resources, including personnel, equipment, or supplies, shall be incorporated into a plan or plans of mutual aid to be developed among the civil defense agencies or similar bodies of the States that are parties hereto. The directors of civil defense of all party States shall constitute a committee to formulate plans and take all necessary steps for the implementation of this compact.

"'ART. 2. It shall be the duty of each party State to formulate civil defense plans and programs for application within such State. There shall be frequent consultation between the representatives of the States and with the United States Government and the free exchange of information and plans, including inventories of any materials and equipment available for civil defense. In carrying out such civil defense plans and programs the party States shall so far as possible provide and follow uniform standards, practices, and rules and regulations including:

"'(a) Insignia, arm bands, and any other distinctive articles to designate and distinguish the different civil defense services;

"'(b) Black-outs and practice black-outs, air-raid drills, mobilization of civil defense forces, and other tests and exercises;

"'(c) Warnings and signals for drills or attacks and the mechanical devices to be used in connection therewith;

"'(d) The effective screening or extinguishing of all lights and lighting devices and appliances;

"'(e) Shutting off water mains, gas mains, electric power connections, and the suspension of all other utility services;

"'(f) All materials or equipment used or to be used for civil defense purposes in order to assure that such materials and equipment will be easily and freely interchangeable when used in or by any other party State;

"'(g) The conduct of civilians and the movement and cessation of movement of pedestrians and vehicular traffic, prior, during, and subsequent to drills or attacks;

"'(h) The safety of public meetings or gatherings; and

"'(i) Mobile support units.

"'ART. 3. Any party State requested to render mutual aid shall take such action as is necessary to provide and make available the resources covered by this compact in accordance with the terms hereof: *Provided*, That it is understood that the State rendering aid may withhold resources to the extent necessary to provide reasonable protection for such State. Each party State shall extend to the civil defense forces of any other party State, while operating within its State limits under the terms and conditions of this compact, the same powers (except that of arrest unless specifically authorized by the receiving State), duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as are extended to the civil defense forces of such State. Civil defense forces will continue under the command and control of their regular leaders but the organizational units will come under the operational control of the civil defense authorities of the State receiving assistance.

"'ART. 4. Whenever any person holds a license, certificate, or other permit issued by any State evidencing the meeting of qualifications for professional, mechanical, or other skills, such person may render aid involving such skill in any party State to meet an emergency or disaster and such State shall give due recognition to such license, certificate, or other permit as if issued in the State in which aid is rendered.

"'ART. 5. No party State or its officers or employees rendering aid in another State pursuant to this compact shall be liable on account of any act or omission in good faith on the part of such forces while so engaged, or on account of the maintenance or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith.

"'ART. 6. Inasmuch as it is probable that the pattern and detail of the machinery for mutual aid among two or more States may differ from that appropriate among other States party hereto, this instrument contains elements of a broad base common to all States, and nothing herein contained shall preclude any State from entering into supplementary agreements with another State or States. Such supplementary agreements may comprehend, but shall not be limited to, provisions for evacuation and reception of injured and other persons, and the exchange of medical, fire, police, public utility, reconnaisance, welfare, transportation and communications personnel, equipment, and supplies.

"'ART. 7. Each party State shall provide for the payment of compensation and death benefits to injured members of the civil defense forces of that State and the representatives of deceased members of such forces in case such members sustain injuries or are killed while rendering aid pursuant to this compact, in the same manner and on the same terms as if the injury or death were sustained within such State.

"'ART. 8. Any party State rendering aid in another State pursuant to this compact shall be reimbursed by the party State receiving such aid for any loss or damage to, or expense incurred in the operation of any equipment answering a request for aid, and for the cost incurred in connection with such requests: *Provided*, That any aiding party State may assume in whole or in part such loss, damage, expense, or other cost, or may loan such equipment or donate such services to the receiving party State without

charge or cost; and provided further that any two or more party States may enter into supplementary agreements establishing a different allocation of costs as among those States. The United States Government may relieve the party State receiving aid from any liability and reimburse the party State supplying civil-defense forces for the compensation paid to and the transportation, subsistence, and maintenance expenses of such forces during the time of the rendition of such aid or assistance outside the State and may also pay fair and reasonable compensation for the use or utilization of the supplies, materials, equipment, or facilities so utilized or consumed.

"'ART. 9. Plans for the orderly evacuation and reception of the civilian population as the result of an emergency or disaster shall be worked out from time to time between representatives of the party States and the various local civil defense areas thereof. Such plans shall include the manner of transporting such evacuees, the number of evacuees to be received in different areas, the manner in which food, clothing, housing, and medical care will be provided, the registration of the evacuees, the providing of facilities for the notification of relatives or friends and the forwarding of such evacuees to other areas or the bringing in of additional materials, supplies, and all other relevant factors. Such plans shall provide that the party State receiving evacuees shall be reimbursed generally for the out-of-pocket expenses incurred in receiving and caring for such evacuees, for expenditures for transportation, food, clothing, medicines, and medical care, and like items. Such expenditures shall be reimbursed by the party State of which the evacuees are residents, or by the United States Government under plans approved by it. After the termination of the emergency or disaster the party State of which the evacuees are resident shall assume the responsibility for the ultimate support or repatriation of such evacuees.

"'ART. 10. This compact shall be available to any State, possession, or Territory of the United States, and the District of Columbia. The term "State" may also include any neighboring foreign country or province or state thereof.

"'ART. 11. The committee established pursuant to article 1 of this compact may request the Civil Defense Agency of the United States Government to act as an informational and coordinating body under this compact, and representatives of such agency of the United States Government may attend meetings of such committee.

"'ART. 12. This compact shall become operative immediately upon its ratification by any State as between it and any other State or States so ratifying and shall be subject to approval by Congress unless prior congressional approval has been given. Duly authenticated copies of this compact and of such supplementary agreements as may be entered into shall, at the time of their approval, be deposited with each of the party States and with the Civil Defense Agency and other appropriate agencies of the United States Government.

"'ART. 13. This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each party State until the legislature or the Governor of such party State takes action to withdraw therefrom. Such action shall not be effective until 30 days after notice thereof has been sent by the Governor of the party State desiring to withdraw to the Governors of all other party States.

"'ART. 14. This compact shall be construed to effectuate the purposes stated in article 1 hereof. If any provision of this compact is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby': Now, therefore,

"SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland*, That the Governor is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into and execute, on behalf of the State of Maryland, such civil-defense compacts with other States, possessions or Territories of the United States or with the District of Columbia, substantially in the form hereinbefore set forth, provided that the board of public works, with the concurrence of the director of civil defense, may approve alterations of the terms, provisions, and conditions of the aforesaid proposed civil-defense compact so long as said alterations are in substantial compliance with the terms, provisions, and conditions hereinbefore set forth and when the Governor, in the exercise of the power as aforesaid, enters into and executes a civil defense compact on behalf of the State of Maryland, said compact is hereby approved and ratified and every paragraph, clause, provision, matter, and thing in the said compact contained shall be obligatory on this State and the citizens thereof, and shall be forever faithfully and inviolably observed, and kept by the government of this State and all of its citizens according to the true intent and meaning of the said compact.

"SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the secretary of state is authorized and directed to prepare and transmit duly authenticated copies of such compacts and of this act to the Governor of each State entering into such compacts, the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Council of State Governments.

"SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That if any clause, sentence, paragraph, or section of this subtitle shall, for any reason, be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be unconstitutional and invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or section thereof so found unconstitutional and invalid.

"SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That this act is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health and safety, and having been passed by a yea-and-nay vote, supported by three-fifths of all of the members elected to each of the two Houses of the General Assembly of Maryland, the same shall take effect from the date of its passage.

"Approved April 13, 1951.

"THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
"Governor."

A resolution adopted by the officers and directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Hawaii, relating to the care of persons afflicted with Hansen's disease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Episcopal Church in the diocese of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide emergency food relief to India; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted at a May Day meeting of the Socialist Workers Party, New York, N. Y., relating to emergency aid to India; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Two resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing Congress in favor of the passage of legislation revising the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress a bill, House Resolution 2816, for the revision of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, known and cited as the Immigration and Nationality Act, the purport of which is to revise the immigration, naturalization, and nationality laws in entirety, thereby modernizing their applicability to immigration and nationalization, with special reference to unused quotas of immigrant visas, which should truly be enacted in the light of modern events and trends so that the countries that need it most will be given paramount consideration: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact into law the proposed legislation contained in said House Resolution 2816; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted April 25, 1951.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence April 30, 1951.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Attest:

[SEAL] "EDWARD J. CRONIN,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to authorize the waiving of certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States

"Whereas there is pending before the Congress a bill to authorize the waiving of certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States, printed as Senate No. 809: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, as soon as possible, the bill hereinabove mentioned; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted April 25, 1951.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

"In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 30, 1951.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

"A true copy.

"Attest:

[SEAL] "EDWARD J. CRONIN,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

IMPROVEMENT OF UPPER RIVER HARBOR, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF MINNEAPOLIS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution urging continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis, Minn., which was adopted by the Minneapolis (Minn.) City Council on April 27, 1951.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION URGING CONTINUATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR UPPER RIVER HARBOR AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That Congress be urged to continue to appropriate sufficient funds, as requested by the United States Corps of Engineers, for the continuance of the extension of the 9-foot channel to the north city limits of Minneapolis; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and that a copy be sent to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; the Honorable ALBEN BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States; the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House; and each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

TRANSMISSION LINES AT GARRISON, N. DAK., AND FORT RANDALL, S. DAK.—RESOLUTION OF MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the Midland Cooperative Wholesale on March 26, 27, and 28, 1951, in Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the construction of transmission lines from Garrison, N. Dak., and Fort Randall, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER LINES FROM GARRISON AND FORT RANDALL

Be it resolved, That we, the delegates at this twenty-fifth annual meeting of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, hereby ask the Members of Congress from Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota to give their support to proposed appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of building high-voltage transmission lines to carry power from the dams now being built at Garrison, N. Dak., and Fort Randall, S. Dak., to the REA cooperatives in the eastern part of the Dakotas, western Minnesota, and northwestern Iowa; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Members of Congress from the States mentioned above.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—RESOLUTION OF MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the Midland Cooperative Wholesale on March 26, 27, and 28, 1951, in Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Whereas the future welfare of industry and agriculture in this section of the United States would be greatly promoted by the building of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, and

Whereas great need exists at the present time for development of our means of transportation via the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates at this twenty-fifth annual meeting of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, representing some 250,000 families of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa, do hereby urge that the Congress of the United States give prompt approval to the legislation now pending, which would provide for immediate action, together with Canada, on the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all members of Congress representing Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

ELECTRIC POWER DEVELOPMENT IN NORTHWEST—RESOLUTION OF MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Midland Cooperative Wholesale, at their twenty-fifth annual meeting on March 26, 27, and 28, 1951, in Minneapolis, Minn., relating to electric power development in the Northwest.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRIC POWER DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHWEST

Whereas it is of vital interest to the farmers of the Midwest that adequate facilities for the processing of phosphate and the manufacture of fertilizer at the lowest possible cost be developed as soon as possible; and

Whereas Midland Cooperative Wholesale and its member associations, together with other cooperatives, now have an interest in extensive and valuable deposits of phosphate rock in Idaho; and

Whereas the processing of these deposits awaits only the coming of low-cost power to that area of Idaho; and

Whereas proposals are now being considered for the construction of new power facilities on the Columbia and Snake Rivers in Oregon and Idaho which, if constructed, will provide the low-cost power necessary for this purpose: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates at the twenty-fifth annual meeting of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, representing 250,000 families in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa, hereby urge an early decision to construct the needed facilities for power production; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 35. A bill to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations; adversely (Rept. No. 313).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; with amendments (Rept. No. 314); and

S. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; with amendments (Rept. No. 315).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1444. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1445. A bill for the relief of Cecilia T. Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1446. A bill for the relief of Olga Ilynikh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1447. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to school district No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1448. A bill for the relief of Robert William Lauber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1449. A bill to authorize the use of funds, heretofore appropriated, for the construction of a road in Pine County, Minn., to provide access for Indian children to public-school facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1450. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1451. A bill to amend the act of September 23, 1950, relating to the construction of school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2084) relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate and gift tax purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sixty-two postmasters.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

Statement by him entitled "Poland's Constitution Day," prepared for delivery in the Senate.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Address delivered by him on April 19, 1951, in Washington, D. C., to the National Society Magna Charta Dames.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Debate on the subject What's Ahead: Peace or War? between Senator KERR and Senator CAIN, broadcast on April 6, 1951, on the American Forum of the Air.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address discussing crime and its prevention, delivered by him at the Citizens' Union banquet, New York, N. Y., May 7, 1951.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

An article entitled "China Reds Have Not Shot Wad," written by Constantine Brown, and an article entitled "United States Surrendered Independence," written by David Lawrence, both published in the Washington Star of May 8, 1951, having reference to the war in Korea.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

Essay by Miss Mary Ann Owen, of Bridgeton, N. J., entitled "Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped," winner of first place in the national Employ the Physically Handicapped essay contest.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SPEECH ON MAY 7, 1951

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a short statement?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the President is quoted in a speech last night as saying:

> Remember this. If we do have another world war it will be an atomic war. We could expect many atomic bombs to be dropped on American cities.

If this situation exists the President is quite right in telling the American people the stark, ugly truth. But his fear of atomic retaliation is somewhat belated.

Did he give thought to this last June when by a spur-of-the-moment decision, and without consulting the Congress, he ordered American troops into war in Korea? It was then that he invited the horrors of atomic retaliation. I thought at the time it was a poor way to preserve the peace. I think so now. I objected to the President loosing this war on his own—in violation of the Constitution.

We have been in a war for nearly 11 months. The threat of atomic retaliation exists. What we, the people, ask of Mr. Truman is: What is your plan to end this war?

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

TOM HEFLIN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a couple of minutes?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. On the 22d day of April 1951 there passed away in Lafayette, Ala., J. Thomas Heflin, formerly a Member of the United States House of Representatives and of the United States Senate.

Tom Heflin, as he was familiarly known, was admitted to the bar of Alabama in 1893, and after serving in the legislature of his State and as secretary of state, he was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1904. He served in that body for 16 years until 1920 when he was elected to the United States Senate where he served until 1931.

Tom Heflin was a powerful man physically, and an orator of the old school. Generally he spoke without a prepared text, and he was a master of the English language. Former Senator George Wharton Pepper, of Pennsylvania, himself a fine lawyer and scholar, stated on one occasion that he listened for hours as Senator Heflin would address the Senate, in an effort to detect an error in his English, but was never successful.

Tom Heflin had a most pleasing personality and was one of the finest story tellers ever to sit in either House of Congress. To point up a debate his tales were not only apropos but were told in such a fashion that he would have his colleagues overcome with laughter and the gallery applauding to the echo.

A tribute to Senator Heflin is particularly appropriate at this time because in 1914 he introduced in the House of Representatives a measure to make the second Sunday in May Mother's Day, and the then Representative Heflin got Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas, to introduce a similar one in the Senate. The measure passed both Houses and was signed by President Wilson on May 8, 1914. So the celebration of Mother's Day next Sunday will be due largely to the efforts of our old friend Tom Heflin.

Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to make this statement, because of the long friendship that existed between him and me. We served in the House together. We served in the Senate together. He was one of the most delightful of men and one of the best Senators in this body.

Mr. President, I take the greatest pleasure in making this statement.

THE LATE SENATOR VANDENBERG—EDITORIAL TRIBUTE IN THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 20 paying tribute to the great departed statesman from Michigan, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR VANDENBERG

No American of his day symbolized so well as Arthur Vandenberg his country's response to the world's demand for leadership. None played so crucial a part in building a bridge from isolationism to internationalism.

Essentially a pragmatist, he typified American adaptability, a capacity to learn and to grow. Skilled in the art of reconciling differences in order to get action, he devised practical and popular compromises. Converted from sturdy midwestern provincialism, he understood what was needed to convert others.

As ranking member in 1945 of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he could have followed the course of Henry Cabot Lodge in 1920. If he had, enough Republicans might have followed him to repeat with the United Nations the tragic story of America's refusals to join the League of Nations. But Arthur Vandenberg did not believe in defying facts.

It was a dramatic moment when he arose in the Senate 7 months before the end of the war to chart his new course:

"The fraternity of war must be made the fraternity of peace. * * * Our oceans no longer protect our ramparts. * * * No nation can immunize itself hereafter against these disasters by reliance upon itself alone."

From then on the former reporter from Grand Rapids loomed as a world statesman. He did not slavishly accept every project put forward by the majority leaders. But, having accepted the basic concept of internationalism, he did not try to block the practical application of the policy. He did not forego criticism, but aimed it toward perfecting and making politically acceptable the necessary instruments of policy. His hand was visible not only in UN but in reshaping the Truman doctrine, in the Marshall plan, and in the Atlantic Pact.

His work stands as a lasting example of an intelligent American's response to events.

COMMITTEE DRAFT OF THE NEW JERSEY REPUBLICAN PLATFORM FOR CURRENT YEAR

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on yesterday, in my capacity as a delegate member of the Republican State convention of New Jersey, I received a committee draft of the Republican platform for the current year. Because it presents a record of rich accomplishment and serves as a guide to future attainments of major importance to the people of my State, its careful study by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle could serve a very useful purpose. That it may be available for such study, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD and that my remarks in respect thereto be incorporated in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WITHOUT PRECEDENT—EDITORIAL FROM NEWARK NEWS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the Newark Sunday News of May 6 there appeared an editorial which very clearly described the dilemma in which free government finds itself in its honest effort to fully enlighten its people as it meets its obligations to other nations. I hope that this editorial will be the subject of careful study by every single Member of this body, and to that end, I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITHOUT PRECEDENT

On the steps of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, opening the 1951 Festival of Britain, the Archbishop of Canterbury uttered a sentence that provides an almost perfect text for the Senate hearings at Washington on far eastern policies. The archbishop said: "We must not frustrate the future."

Korea, with its casualties, its limitations, its sense of stalemate, General MacArthur cites as an example of complete frustration, both now and for the visible future, unless a wider decision is sought. But the whole world is suffering from the dreadful frustration of the results of World War II. To risk a third general war, in which the United States might find itself without allies, except for Chiang Kai-shek, appears to President Truman to put to hazard our national survival and the fruits of western civiliza-

tion. This could mean lethal frustration of the future of mankind.

Such are the basic, opposing points of view being brought out at the Senate hearings. When Woodrow Wilson argued for open covenants reached through open negotiation, he was denounced as an impractical theorist. Now, there is the spectacle of the most powerful government among the free countries, pausing in the midst of fateful undertakings to determine, in public hearings, whether its foreign policies are sound, whether its concept of world leadership is valid.

There is no precedent for such a hearing, which involves publication of current documents, paraphrased in haste to protect invaluable secret codes; disclosure of strategic studies of enormous interest to potential enemies; statements of fact and opinion bound to reveal the scope and effectiveness of American and allied intelligence; open estimates of the intentions and armed strength of the Soviet Union and much other critical information.

Under normal procedure, which was followed up to and through World War II, such information would not be made available to the public until a war had been won, diplomatic and strategic objectives attained, events had run their course. Such information, often even then not disclosed in full, is the material of published official reports and memoirs. Such publications are of historical, rather than of current, interest.

But in the Senate hearings the raw materials of history are being exposed while history is still being written. It is being debated how and where and under what circumstances Americans should die while Americans are, in fact, dying in Korea. It is being debated whether American lives and resources should be put to further hazard in the Far East, while one of the most distinguished of American soldiers, General Eisenhower, is attempting to speed up and expand the defenses of Western Europe.

General MacArthur believes now, as he believed when he was in command in the Pacific in World War II, that the United States can fight a global war. That was not the opinion of Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill and their combined Chiefs of Staff. They made Hitler the first order of business, Hirohito the second. Mr. Truman and his Joint Chiefs of Staff have a similar viewpoint today.

It is for this reason, which is a sound reason, that the authorities at Washington do not wish to expand the war in the Far East, with the danger of Soviet intervention, while the defenses of Western Europe are in no condition to offer more than token resistance to a Soviet advance toward the shores of the Atlantic. That is the crux of the differences between General MacArthur and the President.

The appeal, as General MacArthur himself recognizes, is to public opinion. The political overtones are obvious. A generation ago, at the time of World War I, American and English liberals argued for democratic control of foreign policies—a project that was deemed unacceptable. It is here now, spreading in waves of emotion and excitement, from the caucus room at Washington, where the Senate hearings are being held. It is an experiment that will have a fateful outcome, however the issue is decided where it will be decided—at the Presidential election of 1952.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter II—Legislative branch," on page 3, after line 21, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr., son, and Barbara Vandenberg Bailey and Elizabeth Vandenberg Pfeiffer, daughters, of Arthur H. Vandenberg, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 2, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

For an additional amount for "Furniture and repairs," $17,878.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

SENATE RESTAURANTS

For repairs, improvements, furnishings, equipment, labor and materials, and all necessary incidental expenses, to provide additional restaurant facilities in the Senate Office Building, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WORKING CAPITAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For an additional amount for "Working capital and congressional printing and binding," $1,200,000: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for the printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register in accordance with the act approved July 26, 1935 (44 U. S. C. 301-310), is increased from "$475,000" to "$675,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Department of Justice—Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and expenses," on page 7, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$6,147,000" and insert "$5,872,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal prison system—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," on page 7, line 16, after the word "Prisons", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$449,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce," on page 9, after line 5, to strike out:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses," $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Treasury Department—Coast Guard," on page 10, after line 17, to strike out:

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses," $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department—(Out of the postal revenues)—Postal operations," on page 11, line 7, after the word "operations", to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V," on page 12, after line 9, to insert:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Grants for surveys and school construction

For an additional amount for "Grants for surveys and school construction," to remain available until expended, $50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of Education determines to be necessary shall be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities: *Provided*, That appropriations and contract authorizations heretofore granted under this head shall also be available to enable the Commissioner to provide school facilities pursuant to sections 203 and 204 of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815).

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma desired to offer an amendment to this item. If the amendment is adopted, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma be permitted to offer an amendment at a later time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are simply passing over the amendment temporarily. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VI—Department of Agriculture," on page 13, after line 2, to insert:

CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS

FOREST PEST CONTROL ACT

For an additional amount for "Forest Pest Control Act," $345,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service—Forest development roads and trails," on page 13, line 10, after the word "trails", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$5,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VII—Department of the Interior," on page 14, after line 4, to insert:

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction," $350,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Territories and island possessions—Construction, Alaska Railroad," on page 14, line 12, after the word "Railroad", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VIII—Independent

offices," on page 15, after line 7, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, only for the payment of terminal leave is changed from "$2,000,000" to "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Commerce—Maritime activities—Vessel operations revolving fund," on page 17, after line 20, to strike out:

No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bare boat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment to this paragraph which I should like to submit at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, in line 4, after the word "provisions" and the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude payment of an amount for any vessel or the use thereof in any case in which such amount shall have been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be just compensation therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is offered to the text of the bill which is proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment, and therefore the vote on the Senator's amendment would come before the vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this an amendment to language which would be stricken out by the committee amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is.

Mr. President, let me ask the chairman of the committee whether he wishes to pass over this amendment and return to it later. I understand there will be considerable discussion of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not understand there would be much discussion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that the committee's position is based on an opinion of the legislative counsel to the effect that the paragraph would be unconstitutional. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a letter from the legislative counsel in regard to a suggestion which would remove that objection, put the paragraph in perfect shape, and also go along with ideas of the Comptroller General.

With the adoption of the amendment I have just offered, I wonder whether the result would be to have the committee amendment taken to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. The thought was that by striking out the entire paragraph the provision would go to conference; and then if the House of Representatives had a suggestion such as the one the Senator from Delaware has made, we might consider it in conference. However, the committee has not passed upon the subject matter of the Senator's amendment, and therefore I would not be inclined to accept it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the paragraph proposed to be stricken out by the committee amendment, as I understand, would, in the opinion of the legislative counsel, in effect, attempt to restrict the courts, which of course Congress cannot do.

However, the amendment I propose provides the following:

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude the payment of an amount for any vessel or the use thereof in any case in which such amount shall have been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be just compensation therefor.

In other words, by adopting my amendment we would remove the inference that Congress is trying to prejudge a case which goes to court.

It was the opinion of the legislative counsel that the amendment would put the former order back into effect and at the same time would pass on to the Maritime Commission an expression of the intent of Congress, whereas if we simply struck the House language from the bill, we might not express the congressional intent in connection with the committee proposal.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will examine the record, I think he will find that more than a constitutional question is involved; certain practical questions, such as the foreign ownership of ships, are also involved. If a ship has passed into foreign ownership, of course Congress has no further jurisdiction over it, and the owners would obtain whatever benefits they derived by the purchase price paid at the time of sale, whereas the House provision seeks to deprive American citizens of an advantage. For example, suppose a group of Americans organized a corporation under the laws of Panama, and suppose a ship was transferred to Panamanian registry, and thus could not be touched by the United States authorities because it was foreign owned. Yet the ownership actually might be in a group of American citizens who owned the stock of the corporation.

So the proposal adopted by the House, as the committee considered it, was unjust to American citizens in a business sense, although not necessarily raising a question as to their constitutional rights, yet that question also was raised in the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I would agree with the Senator from Arizona on almost all subjects in this connection except that of ship sales. I think it is recognized that ships are always sold by the Government in a period of ship surpluses, following a war, and at that time are sold at greatly reduced prices, and that ships are requisitioned by the Government in a time of war or emergency, and at such times the ships have inflated values. If the Government is going to requisition ships in periods of high prices, and later is going to sell them back to the original owners at bargain prices, the ship companies will continue to make tremendous profits. I stated for the RECORD the other day a case in which a ship was sold for as little as $17,000.

I am perfectly willing to have the Government pay for a ship it subsequently requisitions, following a sale to private owners, what the ship cost the private owners, plus what the new owners have spent on the ship; but I do not think the Government should buy at an inflated price of several million dollars a ship which previously was sold by it as surplus at a very low price. The Comptroller General has called attention to this matter again and again.

I have, from Mr. Warren, a letter which I shall include in the RECORD, in which he points how that happens after a war and how it should be safeguarded against. Unless something is done by Congress to give the Maritime Commission a statement of the congressional intent in this matter, I think the same thing will happen at the next session of Congress.

However, the adoption of my amendment would not preclude a ship company, if it was not satisfied with what the Government was offering, from going to court and establishing its just claim; and if it could establish its claim, there would be nothing wrong with having the adjudicated amount paid.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator's amendment is to be adopted, it will be necessary for the Senate to reverse the committee and to adopt the House language, will it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; but I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that the proper procedure is to offer this amendment first to the House provision, and, if it is adopted, then have the vote taken on the question of adoption of the committee amendment proposing to strike out the House provision with my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. If the Senator will yield further, let me say that if that is done, the Senator's amendment will be offered to the House language as it came to the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator's amendment apply to foreign sales of vessels?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it does not.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I should like to ask this question: Why does the Senator wish to discriminate as between a sale made by a foreign owner and a sale made by an American owner?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no discrimination, so far as that is concerned, Mr. President. The fact that we have given some ships to foreign countries is not something we can change; we cannot take back those vessels unless we go to war about them.

If we are going to consider the feature of discrimination, I grant that there is discrimination today, for if an American citizen goes to his Government and says, "You should furnish me with food and clothes free of charge because you are furnishing them free of charge to citizens of many foreign countries," his own Government will laugh at him; our Government will not furnish those things to its own citizens, even though it is furnishing them to citizens of foreign countries. Any American citizen may come to the Government and say, "You should furnish me bread, wheat, and clothing free of charge, because you are furnishing them to people all over the world free of charge. Why do you discriminate against me, an American citizen?" From the standpoint of the foreign-aid program, everything which has been done by the Congress for the past 10 years has been a discrimination against the American citizens.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that point, but will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In the side-slips which are before us, there is set forth the testimony presented by witnesses. On page 40, the testimony of former Senator Ball, who appeared as a witness, is set forth, and I read from it:

> Permit me to list briefly the very cogent arguments against this rider and the objectives it seeks to reach:
>
> 1. The rider would discriminate against American citizens who purchased ships from the Government in favor of foreign purchasers. That is true because, while this restriction might apply to the American purchaser, there is no way under which it could be applied to the foreigner who bought ships under the 1946 act.

First, let me ask the Senator whether he agrees with that statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would agree with it to the extent that I think the Congress made a terrible mistake in 1946 when it gave these ships to foreign countries. Pursuing the thought further, every country which is a friend of America was discriminated against, in favor of Russia, because Russia has American ships today for which she has never paid a dime. By the same token, if we go further, we should give ships free to all foreign countries and give ships free to American companies. In fact, if we had enough money, we perhaps should give everything we promise free to everybody.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree completely with the statement of the Senator. I think he will remember that the junior Senator from Nebraska tried to prevent the sale of tankers, which we finally gave away, during that very period. But the point now is this: Inasmuch as they have been given away, we require a foreigner to sell his ship in the open market; but we require of an American citizen, even though a ship was practically given or donated to him, that he sell it back at the price he paid for it. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it is not correct. We do not require the foreigner to sell his ship in the open market, because we cannot require the foreigner to do anything—period. But the provision of the House bill does say he shall not buy the ships from American companies at inflated and exorbitant prices.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. But it is the interpretation of the witnesses, and it is my interpretation, that it would permit the foreigner, who has already obtained a ship, to sell it in the open market for whatever it will bring. Yet this language would prevent the American citizen from doing the same thing. The Senator from Delaware may have any opinion he wants, but, regardless of how the ships were obtained—and I was opposed to giving them away in the first place, yet they have been given away—does the Senator want to write legislation which restricts an American citizen and discriminates against him, as compared to the foreign citizen who has already purchased a ship, or who has received it as a gratuity, and who may sell it in the open market for whatever the ship will bring?

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me make a suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. This is in truth and in fact a legislative matter. It ought to be passed upon by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, both of the House and of the Senate. That is the way to legislate. The House provision actually changes the law. That was the basic reason for the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee striking the language from the bill, as we felt we were not qualified to pass upon the question. We would much prefer to have the legislative committee handle it.

If, when the bill goes to conference, we cannot persuade the House to follow that course, we shall at least have the advantage of having placed in the RECORD the language suggested by the Senator from Delaware. But, in all good conscience, I do not feel that I can agree that the action taken by the committee should be reversed, because, in truth and in fact, the provision of the House bill stricken out by the committee is legislation, which ought to be handled by a legislative committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated May 4, 1951, signed by the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, addressed to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 4, 1951.

Hon. ALBERT THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of today requests my comments on the following provision carried in the appropriation for maritime activities of the Department of Commerce on pages 49 and 50 of the independent offices appropriation bill, 1952, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations:

"No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions."

An identical provision was included in the third supplemental appropriation bill, 1951, H. R. 3587, as passed by the House, but was stricken from the bill when reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. That provision was submitted by the Maritime Administrator at the request of your subcommittee in order to apply to all cases of vessels sold by the United States, and later reacquired by the Government, the principles of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, limiting the amount to be paid by the United States through purchase or requisition for vessels on which a construction-differential subsidy was paid. I am aware that the provisions of section 802 require the limitation on the price to be paid by the United States in event of reacquisitions to be written into contracts executed by the former Maritime Commission, whereas many of the vessels to which the presently proposed limitation might apply were acquired from the Government without such provisions in the contracts. Thus, the present limitation represents a belated attempt to remedy what I have felt was a basic defect in the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Notwithstanding the potential legal and constitutional questions which might be raised, it is a laudable effort to conserve the taxpayers' funds in a field where past history has shown that the interests of the Government have suffered in transactions involving the disposal of ships by the Government at depressed prices and the later payment by the Government for acquisition, charter, or loss of the same vessels at much higher prices.

Times does not permit the ascertainment of the aggregate amounts involved in such cases. Certain of those cases were referred to by you on the floor of the House yesterday. Others have been the subject of reports to the Congress by the General Accounting Office incident to its examinations of the accounts and records of the former Maritime Commission.

The following two cases are representative of what has happened in the past and what will happen again unless some limitation can be established on the amounts to be paid by the Government upon reacquisition of vessels previously disposed of by it.

"The first company purchased 23 vessels built by the Government during 1919, 1920, and 1921, at an estimated cost to the Government of $41,421,000. The company's cost of acquisition was $1,570,000. The book value of the vessels at December 31, 1941, was $982,000, and the former Maritime Commission's estimated world market value at December 31, 1938, was $2,170,000. The Commission chartered all these vessels for varying periods during World War II and paid effective bareboat charter hire of $7,162,000. Ten of the vessels were sunk, and for those 10 vessels the owner received insurance of approximately $4,910,000, most of which was paid by the Government. Two of the vessels were requisitioned for title in 1945 for $640,000. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $1,570,000, was $12,712,000."

Following World War II, the same company bought 26 vessels, most of which were built in 1944. The cost to the Government was $74,835,000, of which $3,434,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $24,720,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,056,000, leaving a net recovery to the Government of $23,664,000.

The second company acquired nine vessels built in 1919 and 1920, at a cost to the Government of $13,739,000. Those vessels cost the company $529,000. Their book value at December 31, 1941, was $343,000, and the former Maritime Commission's world market value December 31, 1938, was $755,000. All nine vessels were chartered to the Government during World War II and effective bareboat charter hire of $1,707,000 was paid by the Government. In addition, the owner collected insurance of $2,852,000, most of which was paid by the Government, for five of the vessels which were sunk, and $789,000 for two of the vessels requisitioned for title by the Government in 1944 and 1945. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $529,000, was $5,348,000.

This second company after World War II bought seven vessels built in 1944 and 1945, at a cost to the Government of $32,034,000, of which $10,276,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $7,513,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,797,000, leaving a net recovery by the Government of $5,716,000.

It should be emphasized that the foregoing cases are not isolated ones. However, they should be sufficient to indicate that the Government, which inevitably sells its vessels in a buyer's market and buys them in a seller's market, needs every legitimate means to minimize the resulting financial disadvantages.

Naturally, representatives of those interests which would be affected by the operation of the proposed limitation have argued strongly against it. They have raised doubts in the minds of conscientious legislators who have expressed these doubts in debate. It is fully recognized that the provision, while binding on the Maritime Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the General Accounting Office, would be open to construction in court actions. Concerning the constitutional point of just compensation, I can only restate the traditional position of the General Accounting Office—and to my mind the only sound position that can be taken by the Office—that it does not exist to question the constitutionality, but to carry out faithfully the mandates of legislation enacted by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to read for the benefit of Senators two paragraphs of this letter, which point out the condition to which Mr. Warren calls attention and which he is trying to prevent happening again. He says:

The following two cases are representative of what has happened in the past and what will happen again unless some limitation can be established on the amounts to be paid by the Government upon reaquisition of vessels previously disposed of by it.

He cites two examples:

The first company purchased 23 vessels built by the Government during 1919, 1920, and 1921, at an estimated cost to the Government of $41,421,000. The company's cost of acquisition was $1,570,000. The book value of the vessels at December 31, 1941, was $982,000, and the former Maritime Commission's estimated world market value at December 31, 1938, was $2,170,000. The Commission chartered all these vessels for varying periods during World War II and paid effective bareboat charter hire of $7,162,000. Ten of the vessels were sunk, and for those 10 vessels the owner received insurance of approximately $4,910,000, most of which was paid by the Government. Two of the vessels were requisitioned for title in 1945 for $640,000. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $1,570,000, was $12,712,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no doubt at all that the Comptroller General is correct in that statement, but the point is, it is a matter which ought to be handled by a legislative committee in order that all the equities may be fully developed. It is not a matter which should be acted on precipitately by the House Committee on Appropriations and again by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and then by the respective Houses themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is a legislative body, and I think it very appropriate that we should act on it at this time.

Mr. Warren continued, in reference to this same company which, during World War II, received $12,712,000 for ships for which it had paid $1,570,000, when it purchased them from the Government:

Following World War II, the same company bought 26 vessels, most of which were built in 1944. The cost to the Government was $74,835,000, of which $3,434,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $24,720,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,056,000, leaving a net recovery to the Government of $23,664,000.

What is attempted to be done through this measure is to prevent that same company, now, at a time when the country is confronted with a wartime need for these ships, from selling them back to the Government at a price inflated many times more than what the company paid. We retain the ships through the emergency and then sell them as surplus back to the company. An attempt is made to break that up by the provision in the House bill which the committee proposes to strike out.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with what the Senator is attempting to do, and I would like to see it done, but I want to say that, really, what he is doing, is not for the future. What he is doing is to add a legislative rider, which in effect is an attempt to enact ex post facto legislation, going back 5 years, and writing a condition in the sale of a vessel, which the Congress refused to write.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I was here when we voted on it. I was against giving away these ships. But the condition was not written into the law at the time. We are now asked to pass legislation which would actually place in the law retroactively a condition with respect to the sale of the vessels. There is no condition with respect to the vessels which were sold to foreigners. What is actually being attempted now is to require an American who bought a ship to sell it back to the Government at the original sales price plus the cost of improvements. It is impossible to compel a foreigner to do that. He cannot be brought into court, or be compelled to comply with this provision of the bill. It would actually represent a discrimination against American shipowners, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In answer to that, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska as I said before, everything which has been done by the Congress during the last few years has been a discrimination against American citizens.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I agree with that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have given free goods to countries throughout the world, and charged it to the American people.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no argument about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. American citizens are not only paying for what we give

to the rest of the world, but for what is given away here, under legislation, which has been enacted to hold down prices. The Government is going out into world markets and buying at inflated prices, which are higher than those it could buy for in the American market. Surely there is discrimination against the American citizens. For some unknown reason, there has been a theory that an American citizen is the last fellow we are supposed to recognize.

What we are getting here is discrimination against shipowners. They are not told that they have to sell the ships, they are merely told that if they do they will not be given an excessive wartime price, as they could be if this provision were not included in the bill. The Government, confronted as it is with a war emergency, must have ships, even if it has to pay $10,000,000, $15,000,000, or $20,000,000 apiece for them. I do not think any company should have the right to take advantage of their own government in a wartime period. My reason for offering this amendment is, we are advised that, if it is not included, the House provision would be interpreted by the legislative counsel as unconstitutional, and would therefore have to be stricken out. I feel that the amendment which I have offered should be adopted and taken to conference, to see whether we cannot work out something there which will be along this line.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in complete accord with the suggested procedure. In fact, I raised the question a moment ago. We have a perfect right to do it. I agree with the argument of the Senator, but I add that when these vessels were sold it was without conditions. They were sold as clean as a ribbon. That is what happened over the protest of many Members of the Senate. That is when we gave the vessels away.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In November of last year we gave some away, and we are still giving them away.

Mr. WHERRY. Not with my agreement. We are now writing ex post facto a provision which should have been in the conditional sale of the vessels themselves. If a foreigner desires to sell a vessel which he received gratuitously, or nearly so, he does not have to do the same thing the American has to do. I understand what the Senator means, and there is a great deal of merit in his statement. I should like to make the foreigners do just what is required of Americans; but that cannot be accomplished, because we cannot get them into court.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator to a certain point, but we are perfectly within our rights in passing legislation today which would prohibit taking these ships back at wartime inflated prices. I think we can stop the purchase by our Government of these ships at inflated prices. If the Government buys them at inflated prices, the time will come when it will be selling them back at lower prices. Many persons have to give up some of their freedom in wartime. In my opinion the ship companies do not have any great reason to complain. We are taking away the privileges of the boys whom we draft into the services.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to make a suggestion. Why not accept the amendment and take it to conference? It has been debated a number of times, and we have suffered a number of times because of the very situation which now exists.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I understand the proposal of the Senator from Delaware is that the Senate agree to the action taken by the House, so far as it goes, and then add a provision to it. My thought is that the Senate disagrees to the House provision. We will have the proposal to take to conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it can be worked out from a parliamentary standpoint, the provision could be taken to conference. I am willing to try to work it out.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the amendment being offered as a substitute for the House provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was advised to offer the amendment as an amendment to the House language.

Mr. WHERRY. Then we would have the House language agreed to, and the only thing is——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would it be better to offer this amendment and let the Senate vote on the committee amendment separately? Can that be done so that all this material can be in the conference?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Oregon has a suggestion that he wishes to make at this time, I ask unanimous consent that we pass over the amendment temporarily, and see whether the paragraph can be rewritten and couched in different language.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I suggest leaving the House language stricken and substitute for it the provision which the Senator from Delaware has rewritten, to provide the legal effect of what he has in mind in his amendment, that no ship shall be taken except by seizure, the compensation to be determined by a court. That is exactly what is being done. Then both provisions would be in the conference and a determination could be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would it be in order to offer the substance of my amendment in place of the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the point I want to be sure about is that the House language would still remain in the bill so that we would have the entire subject matter in conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, the House language will be in conference automatically, no matter what the Senate does. If I offer my amendment in substitution for the House language and it is agreed to, both provisions will be in conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then the procedure would be to agree to the committee amendment and add thereto the text now proposed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment, which I understand would be stricken; but I am offering it with the understanding that I am not disapproving the committee amendment, but in order to get all the subject matter before the conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the print of the bill which will go to conference the House language will be stricken and the language of the Senator's amendment will appear in italics.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator is now offering his amendment as a substitute?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In addition to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IX—Department of Defense—Civil functions, Department of the the Army—Corps of Engineers," on page 19, in line 14, in the subhead, to strike out "Niagara Power Development" and insert "Niagara Redevelopment Remedial Works Investigation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading "Chapter X—Funds appropriated to the President—International children's welfare work", on page 20, line 7, after the word "work", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000."

THE MacARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, since last Thursday, when General MacArthur began his testimony before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, I imagine few Senators have had an opportunity to visit their States and talk to their constituents.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I imagine the Senator is going to speak on a subject other than the appropriation bill. Can the Senator advise us how long he may speak?

Mr. BENTON. About 45 minutes, unless there are questions and interruptions.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I have just returned from a visit of a few days in Connecticut, where I have had an opportunity to talk to several hundred of my constituents. The one thing which impressed me most in connection with my visit was the intense interest evidenced by citizens, in all walks of life, in the so-called MacArthur issue. Everyone wants to know, what does all this mean? Where are we going? What is the nature of the MacArthur conflict which has occasioned such dissension among the country's political leaders?

Last night, in Middletown, Conn., where I spoke to the chamber of commerce, I was preceded by a talented quartette from Wesleyan University. The crowd applauded when the toastmaster asked the quartette to sing Old Soldiers Never Die. At my first mention of General MacArthur's name the crowd applauded General MacArthur. At the end of my talk, the largely Republican audience seemed grateful to me for the care and candor with which I had addressed them. They complimented me by rising as they applauded, and I discovered from that reaction I think, one thing that is now wanted by our constituents. They ask for a frank and fearless facing up by their Senators, as rapidly as we can, to grave issues which are currently being presented in the testimony before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees.

On the basis of the spontaneous reaction of the Chamber of Commerce of Middletown, I decided today—out of my own background in the field of foreign policy, without any consultation with anyone in any Government department and without any guidance or suggestion from anyone in Government—I decided to talk about General MacArthur and his testimony. I do not think his testimony has yet been discussed at any length whatever on the floor of the Senate.

General MacArthur's recommendations involve the future of every citizen of our country, and, indeed, of all citizens of all free countries. Our constituents, judging by my 4 days of observations in Connecticut, hope that we will weigh each side of the argument carefully and dispassionately. They hope that we will be able to bring to our consideration the cold objectivity of a coin dealer, who weighs his gold coin gently, while inspecting both sides of it to check and study it for value, age, and intrinsic worth.

I have attended two sessions of the hearings, the opening one last Thursday and the other that of this morning. Mr. President, it seems to me that the hearings are being conducted most remarkably by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Indeed, the Senators who are present seem to view themselves somewhat in the role of judges—surely seem to be approaching the grave questions posed with every effort at impartiality.

I wish that all our citizens could themselves do what they seem to expect from us Senators. Of course, the hearings have not been concluded. There is still a great deal of testimony to be heard. Perhaps by the end of the hearings I may not still feel we have set such good examples.

As I walked to the hearing today with a member of one of the committees which are hearing the testimony he expressed surprise that I should be willing to speak on General MacArthur's testimony before the remainder of the evidence has been given. But I have read carefully the testimony given by General MacArthur as well as yesterday's testimony by General Marshall, our Secretary of Defense, with whom I served in the Department of State. And may I interrupt myself to comment that surely General Marshall is one of the noblest leaders we have ever had, and certainly his patriotism and loyalty are, and always have been, beyond reproach.

As I read the 4 days of testimony it seemed to me that the basic outline is beginning to form, and to form clearly. I at least feel that I have now heard enough to see how the basic issues will develop and how sharply drawn they will be.

We can see the importance of this testimony from President Truman's repeated warnings that if we pursued the actions recommended by General MacArthur we would run the risk of involvement in all-out war with Red China, and thus enhance the risk of involvement in war with Russia. Last evening President Truman tried to take the debate out of the realm of politics once and for all, when he said:

> A lot of people are looking at this debate as if it were just a political fight. But the stakes are a lot more important than the outcome of an election. The thing that is at stake in this debate may be atomic war.

President Truman continued:

> Our foreign policy is not a political issue. It is a matter of life and death. It is a matter of the future of mankind.

I wish the President could have been with me in Middletown last evening, to see and hear for himself how an audience can put politics aside when it sits down and listens attentively to a serious discussion of the various great issues which are at stake in General MacArthur's recommendations. These are not political to the general; they should not be to the Congress or the public.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator has referred to some comments which were made by President Truman last evening at the civil-defense conference in Washington that this is no time for politics. I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that at the meeting last evening the speakers included the President; the Vice President; the House majority leader, John McCormack; the Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn; and the Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin. Mr. President, I fail to read in the list the name of any speaker who reflected the minority viewpoint. Does the Senator from Connecticut think that the way to insure bipartisan support for mobilization on the home front is to hold meetings of men and women who are charged with the responsibility of supervising our program of civil defense, without having anyone present the minority viewpoint?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, may I ask what the name of the organization was to which the Senator from Idaho referred?

Mr. DWORSHAK. According to the Washington Post the group consisted of a thousand civil-defense conference delegates. Presumably they came from every State of the Union. The conference was held in Washington.

Mr. BENTON. I do not know who arranged the program. Who invited the speaker? At any rate, the question of the Senator is not germane to my discussion of General MacArthur's testimony.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I was trying to stress the fact that if we are to have bipartisanship, whether it be in military affairs or in the mobilization of the civil-defense program at home, and if we are to have the support of all the people, certainly it would be advisable at a meeting such as the one held last evening to have speakers who also reflect the minority viewpoint. The Senator from Idaho has pointed out that speakers last evening included the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of Labor. Certainly it is not necessary to point out that each one of them is a Democrat. No representative from the minority group was present. I ask the Senator from Connecticut whether that is an exemplification of the true spirit of bipartisanship.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, there is no lack of publicity for the minority viewpoint. General MacArthur's testimony has had no lack of publicity in the Nation's press. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has no lack of publicity in the press. When an effort is being made to bolster the morale of the civil-defense conference delegates, and to arouse them to the responsibilities which have been put on them, it hardly seems to me to be suitable to say to them, "You are now going to be subjected to a political debate." They did not come to Washington to hear politics.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further. I do not think the Senator's questioning is germane to the subject of my discussion, which relates to the testimony of General MacArthur.

Mr. BENTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following be inserted in the RECORD following the colloquy about 3 hours ago between the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and myself:

I have just been told that Governor Warren is to be the main speaker today at the civilian-defense meeting here in Washington. I understand also that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], for the Senate, and Representatives VINSON, SHORT, CANNON, TABER, MARTIN, RAYBURN, and MCCORMACK, for the House, were invited. This information was handed to me during the course of the afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, no one knows why for certain, but indeed it now seems that fortune and fate have decided we Americans shall rocket from one crisis to another. General Marshall in his testimony this morning brought out most eloquently and clearly, in recalling to our minds incident after incident, the crises through which we have been rocketing since the end of World War II.

Indeed, we Americans have been living in a time of crisis since the early thirties. In the forties we jumped from a chasm of depression into war. Past the midcentury mark today, our constituents are asking whether we face the thunder once again, and they are wondering, deep within their hearts—what next?

As a Nation, we are greatly upset by much of what has happened in the past 20 years. Our national temper is wearing thin as this nervous world teeters uncertainly between a second world peace and a third world war. One cannot be too critical of the American people if they verge on anger and impatience. The virtue of patience has seldom been a characteristic of ours, although this virtue is what we need today more than ever before.

Mr. President, I do not believe the American people have as yet begun to appreciate the strain which will be placed on their patience and fortitude by events that still lie ahead. We must prepare ourselves for this.

In our three centuries of isolation we have thought of war as an absolute thing. Either we were in it all the way up to the hilt, or we were out of it. That, I fear, was a kind of romantic view of war, and I fear that it is the view which General MacArthur still tends to take. Yet today, as General Marshall's testimony this morning so clearly brought out, we are and have been in a period of relative war, a half war, cold war, or limited war, in which the fighting is only one aspect of our over-all world problem. Economic operations, propaganda operations, diplomatic operations, pressure negotiations, yielding here, fighting there if necessary—these are the penalties of world leadership which we now face. Britain knew them, including the limited wars, when she found herself in the role of world leadership in the nineteenth century.

This morning in his testimony General Marshall pointed out that the Korean war is now in its 10th month, and he reminded the committee that the Berlin airlift went through 15 months, many of them months of high uncertainty. He pointed out that our operations in Greece extended over an 18-month period. Incidentally, I agree with his judgment on the fighting in Greece: our firm action in Greece and the way we handled the over-all situation could readily account for what General Marshall termed the greatest defeat communism has yet suffered, namely, the defection of Yugoslavia.

In last Saturday's New York Times Anne O'Hare McCormick put it this way:

> It seems cold-blooded to speak of a battle which has cost so much American life as an engagement in a diplomatic war. Yet in essence this is what it is—a political position in a deadly and decisive political war. If holding this position can prevent a military conflict on a world scale, a risk no more or no less calculable than the one MacArthur advises, it will be worth what it costs, for the thousands of men who will die will have saved the lives of millions.

So wrote one of the most talented and penetrating observers of the conduct of our foreign policy.

Mr. President, I hope I do not need to suggest to my colleagues the potential difficulty faced by a man in politics when he tries to speak frankly about a great national hero. Perhaps that is why many have been reluctant to speak up about General MacArthur. Our national heroes are deep-rooted in our emotions and many of our fellow citizens like to think that they can do no wrong. My correspondence shows this, and I am sure that that is true of the correspondence of all other Senators. I have received approximately 2,000 letters about General MacArthur, and, roughly, 1,700 warmly support him and often in almost idolatrous language.

Hanson Baldwin, New York Times military analyst, speaks of the emotional involvement of the letters which reach him. He does this in the same piece—that of yesterday morning—in which he points out the following:

> General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's testimony before Congress last week produced few facts that were not already known, and again tended—largely because of the general's own statements—to confuse the man and the issues and to obscure logic by emotion.
>
> This was, perhaps, inevitable—given the manner of man that General MacArthur is. Accustomed to sweeping generalities and exalted phrases, he rarely speaks in precise terms or in exact definitions; he issues edicts.

This, Mr. President, from one of our most famous military analysts and students of military men and affairs.

This morning in his testimony General Marshall, in response to a question from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as to why General Eisenhower has been treated differently by the Defense Department than General MacArthur, pointed out very quietly that the two men are two very different kinds of men.

However, Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that the smart politician has tended in recent weeks to leave the criticism of our great current military hero to the writers of the New York Times. But may I say this further at the outset? I feel General MacArthur deserves the handclapping and the applause. He has served his country well for 52 years as a great soldier. He is and has been a brilliant American warrior, than whom few have been greater. In my own fashion I want to salute him today on the floor of the Senate upon his military retirement. But in the wind-up of his brilliant military career he has willed this Nation 52 years of noble service and a vast domestic argument. It is an argument which reaches down to every one of our constituents at home.

Actually, the basic conflict behind the argument has existed for some time, though the average man in the street has not been aware of it. President Truman dramatized this division of thought for all to see when he fired MacArthur. Incidentally, last Thursday when I was at the hearing, General MacArthur, when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] referred to his "dismissal," corrected him by the substitution of the word "recall."

I not only supported President Truman in the decision to recall General MacArthur, but I had telephoned him the day before the public announcement, not knowing that it was coming, and had urged him to such a move.

Underlying President Truman's decision are three issues which are coming in for a great deal of public discussion. One is whether any general on active duty has the right to go over the head of his Commander in Chief in an appeal to the public. General Marshall testified yesterday that General MacArthur disobeyed instructions in so doing.

Under article 2 of the Constitution the President of the United States is established clearly as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and, of course, General MacArthur unequivocally acknowledges this.

The second issue is whether we shall allow our generals in the field to move in on the vital issues which affect the over-all global strategy of our foreign policy, or whether this critical function of our democracy shall be left in civilian hands under the President of the United States, who is responsible under the Constitution.

The third, and most important, of the issues is whether General MacArthur is right when he pushes for what many fear may quickly prove to be an all-out war against China, which might precipitously involve us in full-scale world war III in direct conflict with Russia and her Communist satellites.

I should like now briefly to examine these three issues and see what some of the implications of each may be. This presentation may not seem too brief, Mr. President, but after reading the 100,000 words of General MacArthur's testimony I have done the best I can to condense my views on these three main points at issue.

The first and second are so kindred that I shall discuss them together.

No President in the history of our democracy has ever endeared himself to the public by firing an idolized general; but many popular generals have been fired, and I personally hope they will continue to be fired when they push for too much authority and responsibility.

One danger here—and there are those who do not think it is too remote—is that if we allow military men to grow and expand at the expense of the civilian authority, we enhance the possible and ultimate threat of military dictatorship in America.

I do not want to exaggerate that threat, for I know that the overwhelming majority of my fellow citizens share my views, and do not propose to live under a military tyrant, regardless of how much of an idol he may be. Yet we must not shut our eyes to the world-wide growing power of military leaders, including its growth here in America. In this time of world-wide crisis of unknown duration, we must adhere as never before to our faith in the civilian authority and in the office of the President of the United States. It is our patriotic duty to support that office when it is threatened by any man in uniform. We do not propose to tolerate any Caesar or proconsul in our America, or even the shadow of one no bigger than a man's hand on the distant horizon.

Our Declaration of Independence charged the King of England with affecting "to render the military independent of and superior to the civilian power."

The second resolve and declaration of the Continental Congress, on June 12, 1776, proclaimed that "in all cases the military should be under strict subordination to and governed by the civil power." This was written into the Bill of Rights and the constitutions of many States.

Andrew Jackson, President and ex-general, pledged in his first inaugural talk on March 4, 1829, that he would never "disregard that salutary lesson which teaches the military shall be held subordinate to the civil power." This theme has been the backbone of our democracy. This theme has given us freedom and it has given us the laughter and delight in freedom which few nations in the world share with us in history or today.

President James K. Polk tried to get rid of Gen. Winfield Scott during the Mexican War. President Abraham Lincoln dismissed Gen. George McClellan and also rebuked Generals John C. Fremont and David Hunter during the Civil War. Senators may recall that Generals Fremont and McClellan were the darlings of their day.

Mr. President, I do not mean by this background to say that I believe that General MacArthur felt he was insubordinate. His testimony last Thursday seemed convincing when he said that in his 52 years as a soldier he had never disobeyed an order. I think he believed that, even though it seemed to me this testimony was contradicted by General Marshall yesterday. General Marshall was referring only to his public statements, and perhaps General MacArthur was referring only to military orders. General MacArthur pointed out, also, that he had often been in disagreement with orders he had obeyed, and, of course, quite naturally and quite rightly, as thinking subordinates should be.

Yet manifestly General MacArthur has not only been in profound disagreement with President Truman's policies, but he has been trying to take some positive action to change them.

He attests that he had no advance warning of his recall, yet surely in Japan he acted over a period of many weeks like a man who wanted to be recalled, and surely since his return to the United States he has acted like a man who seems glad that he was recalled. His letters to the Veterans of Foreign Wars on March 25, 1951, and to the Republican minority leader of the House of Representatives, JOSEPH MARTIN, on March 29, are examples of the lengths to which he was going in order to promote his own policy regardless of the President's responsibility for the over-all conduct of our foreign policy. Yes, it seems to me General MacArthur gave the President very little choice.

General Marshall yesterday testified that General MacArthur's action in regard to the memorandum which had been sent him outlining the proposal which was being explored for a proposed settlement, and for proposed negotiations with the North Koreans and the Chinese Communist government—his action in taking this offer into his own hands actually jeopardized the chances of coming to agreement with our allies and to a possible truce with the Chinese Communists.

Yes, I think that most impartial observers would agree that President Truman's hand was forced, and that he had to act.

Many feel the matter was handled ineptly. General MacArthur has testified that President Truman endangered national security by the sudden and abrupt nature of the transfer of authority to General Ridgway, 350 miles away in Korea. We have already learned from the succeeding testimony of Secretary Marshall that that transfer of authority did not go through as planned and scheduled in Washington. There was even a mechanical breakdown.

A most interesting angle to General MacArthur's testimony is that again and again he would disclaim knowledge of issues and questions vital to the conduct of our foreign policy—questions dealing with Europe—when he said, in effect, "You had better ask General Eisenhower about them"; questions dealing with production and military potential here and in Russia; and with other crucial facts which must be weighed in the formulation of our global political and military policy.

Mr. President, I should like to read three questions posed to General MacArthur by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] in his brilliant and searching inquiry of the general. I now ask unanimous consent that excerpts covering Senator MCMAHON's questioning, as published in the United States News and World Report, may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENTON. Here is one of many highly significant and illuminating questions which my brilliant colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut, asked General MacArthur:

Senator MCMAHON. Western Europe, however, has that capacity, has it not, General?

General MACARTHUR. Senator, as I said, I have not made a study of this matter.

In response to a further question asked by my colleague from Connecticut, General MacArthur said:

General MACARTHUR. Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area. My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I don't pretend to be the authority now on these things.

When I was the Chief of Staff, 20 years ago, that was my problem, and I would have answered it. The Chiefs of Staff or others here are the ones to answer that query, not me.

A third question by the senior Senator from Connecticut:

Senator MCMAHON. I mean the attempt to weld together a military alliance to keep the peace such as we have attempted to do in the North Atlantic Pact?

General MACARTHUR. I have only a superficial knowledge of the North Atlantic Pact, Senator. I am not prepared to discuss it in any way, shape, or manner.

Mr. President, we have diplomatic representation—with which I worked intimately during my days as assistant Secretary of State—with every country allied with us in the Korean war and in the United Nations. Our Ambassadors and our diplomatic posts constantly relay intelligence to our Government. This is a two-way exchange not only with our allies and with neutral nations, but even with those who border the Communist dominion or are behind the iron walls. This information is digested daily in Washington, and indeed, in all the capitals of the world. The President of the United States, confers daily and hourly with his top advisers, who include representatives of both major parties. There are midnight sessions and early morning sessions. Conferences go on around the clock. Our foreign policy is born in these conferences. Our important decisions stem from them. They are then relayed to our generals in various parts of the world who then are supposed to carry out orders as directed by the civilian agencies of our democracy. This is the pattern, and not the other way around. It is the right pattern.

Let me conclude my discussion on the first two issues, which have received so much discussion in the press—whether General MacArthur was insubordinate and disobeyed orders, and where the responsibility for the formulation of foreign policy must rest—by quoting one of our great Chiefs of Staff of the United States Army, who I am sure Senators will agree was one of our greatest chiefs of staff, who said:

The national strategy of any war—that is the selection of national objectives and the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in attaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war—are decisions that must be made by the head of the State, acting in conformity with the expressed will of the Congress. No single departmental head, no matter what his function or title, could or should be responsible for the formula-

tion of such decisions. For example, in every war the United States has waged, the national objective to be attained has involved the Army in land attacks against areas held by the enemy. In every instance missions have been prescribed for the Navy that had in view the assisting and facilitating of the Army's efforts. Yet in no case could these missions and objectives have been properly prescribed by the Secretaries of War and Navy acting in unison or by a single super-secretary acting for both. The issues involved were so far-reaching in their effects, and so vital to the life of the Nation that this phase of coordinating Army and Navy effort could not be delegated by the Commander in Chief to any subordinate authority. Any such attempt would not constitute delegation, but rather abdication.

Mr. President, the man who wrote that was our great soldier, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in his annual report as Chief of Staff in 1932. It will be seen that I think General MacArthur was right in 1932, and is wrong in 1951.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; I am happy to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Connecticut does not maintain, does he, that there is any testimony in the record at any spot that General MacArthur violated any of his military directives?

Mr. BENTON. No, I do not so maintain. In fact, I think General MacArthur brought out very clearly that he had not violated any of his military directives. General MacArthur testified under oath that he had obeyed military orders all his life, even when he had disagreed with them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Connecticut, if he will pardon a brief interruption, that I had rather hoped that the two committees which were charged by the Senate with hearing this matter, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, would continue the hearings and that we might have all the facts gathered by those two bodies before we again precipitated debate on the floor of the Senate in regard to the MacArthur matter. If, however, it is to be precipitated, then I assume it will have to be carried on from both points of view, because there are two very definite points of view regarding it. However, that choice rests in other hands.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the Senator from California was not on the floor at the beginning of my remarks, when I made my explanation—which may have been an inadequate one—in regard to why I decided today was a proper time for me to express these views. If I were a member of either of the two committees holding the hearings, and were acting in the kind of role which I have observed many members of the two committees have taken upon themselves, and for which I congratulate the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the membership of both committees, I might take the view just expressed by the Senator from California, at least up to the present. I commend to him a reading of my earlier remarks, as they will appear in the RECORD, although I am far from sure, in view of the comment the Senator from California has just made, that he will agree with them.

Mr. President, let me now turn to the third issue which I shall now discuss. In recent months General MacArthur may have persuaded himself that it was his patriotic duty aggressively to advocate his policies, publicly as well as privately. Assuredly he himself planned no direct refusal to carry out a military order, in line with the inquiry a moment ago of the Senator from California; and surely General MacArthur planned no overthrow of civilian authority.

The first two issues I have been discussing are important, I think, principally from the standpoint of looking ahead to a cloudy and uncertain future. However, as applied to General MacArthur, I do not think the first two issues I have been discussing are paramount. The paramount issue today is the third issue, the intrinsic merits of the arguments on both sides. I hope that my comments in the balance of this talk may be of some help at least to some members of the public in following the basic argument and in getting a better perspective on it.

Mr. President, the MacArthur-Taft position, if I correctly understand it, is that a larger war should be fought now in order to put an end to the Korean war, and that it is thereby hoped the ultimate sacrifices will be fewer and the immediate risks minimized.

For weeks the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] argued his reluctance to send American troops to fend off a Soviet attack in Europe, but the other day on the floor of the Senate he said that this country must not be stopped from adopting the MacArthur far eastern program by any possibility that the Russians may come into the war. On one hand, the Senator from Ohio implies that we should abandon Europe. He may not say that in so many words, but to my mind that view is implicit in some of his speeches.

On the other hand, the Senator from Ohio now seems to be advocating that we risk the sacrifice of the flower of our Nation on the hammer and scythe of Red China, risking all-out war in Asia. Even more surprising, last week the Senator from Ohio appealed to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at its meeting in Washington, by demanding a $20,000,000,000 cut in our military expenditures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. BENTON. I am happy to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was not a companion part of that statement of the Senator from Ohio his statement that there could be a reduction of 500,000 men in our Armed Forces?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, the Senator from Minnesota is correct, from 3,500,000 to 3,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And did not the Senator from Ohio at the same time also ask that a more aggressive policy be followed in the Far East?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, that is the view of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That statement amounts to advocating a reduction of the Armed Forces of the United States to 3,000,000 men, and a reduction of $20,000,000,000 in our military budget, and a more aggressive policy in the Far East. As one pundit said, "No other general can make that statement."

It appears that that is an economical and at the same time a most attractive way to wage an all-out military operation.

Mr. BENTON. I think it is particularly attractive to the Chamber of Commerce—to promise its members a $20,000,000,000 reduction in our military expenditures.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, Mr. President; I am happy to yield.

Mr. CAIN. Let me say to my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, that unfortunately I entered the Chamber after he had begun his very able address. The question I wish to ask him is this: Is the Senator from Connecticut offering his views concerning the position which is maintained by Gen. Douglas MacArthur or is the Senator offering his views in regard to the position which he assumes the Senator from Ohio is maintaining?

Mr. BENTON. My comments in regard to the Senator from Ohio were an aside, Mr. President; the subject of my remarks to day is the testimony given last week by General MacArthur. I wish to offer my views in regard to that testimony.

Mr. CAIN. Then the Senator from Connecticut, was not directing his main effort to the Senator from Ohio. Is that correct?

Mr. BENTON. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BENTON. Although my references to the Senator from Ohio were a momentary aside, I think it is manifest that when General MacArthur receives such distinguished support, it is not irrelevant to mention that support to enhance the significance of General MacArthur's testimony.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am certain that the Senator from Connecticut, will refer to a good many others who hold General MacArthur in high regard.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington had been on the floor to hear the earlier part of my remarks, he would have heard me say that I am very proud to number myself among those who hold General MacArthur in very high regard as one of our great soldiers and great military strategists and one of our great Chiefs of Staff and one of our great, patriotic fellow Americans.

Mr. President, we must constantly remind ourselves that this is not our fight alone. It is true that we have suffered 65,000 causalties. However, General MacArthur in his testimony on Thursday did not speak with horror of our casualties alone. He spoke of the 1,000,000 casualties of all nations.

We must always remember that our position in Korea and in Asia could be infinitely worse if we were deprived of allies. It would be a great error, Mr. President, for any nation arrogantly to overemphasize its own strength while playing down the potential strength of

its allies, or of its enemy in the field, or its enemy potentially in the field.

Our allies—the United Nations—want to confine the Korean conflict to Korea. That is the wish of our own Government, and let us pray there is at least a chance, perhaps a good chance, that we may yet confine the war to Korea and end it there, as General Marshall eloquently expressed the hope this morning. We confined and extinguished a not too dissimilar war in Greece. We can pray that the example of Greece is hopeful, even though I agree with General MacArthur that the example is not a parallel. We can pray that the time will come when the Communist leaders of China will believe General Ridgway's warning of last Friday, that the cost and sacrifice and destruction of their armies is too high a price to pay for a continuation of the Korean conflict.

I am sure that the attitude of our allies was in the mind of the General of the Army, Omar N. Bradley, surely one of our most distinguished, one of our greatest soldiers, when, in Chicago, on April 17, he warned;

> Any recommended course of action which would enlarge the present war is contrary to our best interests, and by jeopardizing world peace, ultimately would threaten our security.

So said General Bradley, our present Chief of Staff.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I take it from the colloquies between the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and the distinguished Senator from California, that the Senator from Connecticut holds it to be the course of wisdom that members of the two committees, sitting jointly, should refrain from commenting on this controversy until the testimony has been completed, and until the hearings have been concluded. Is that correct?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, what I meant to say was that, in walking from the Senate Office Building to the Senate Chamber with a distinguished member of the committee, when he told me that was his plan, I understood and sympathized with him. I cannot answer the Senator from New Jersey in the affirmative. I think if I were a member of one of the two committees I might take the attitude that I wanted to wait for more evidence. I do not, however, believe that in any sense it is incumbent upon members of the two committees to abstain from stating their views. I feel that any member should feel perfectly free to use his own judgment as to when his views begin to crytallize. As he develops views which can help the American people understand this unfolding drama and get a better comprehension of what lies beneath these great issues, he should feel perfectly free to express them.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey is quite in accord that a member of either of the committees should withhold comment until the evidence is completed. It is very difficult for me to distinguish, however, between a member of one of the two committees and a Member of the House or a Member of the Senate at large. If it is right for a member of either of the two committees, sitting jointly, to withhold comment and to withhold judgment until the country has had the whole case, then, by the same token, it seems to me that it is the duty of a Senator to withhold comment on this issue until all the facts are before the Senate.

Mr. BENTON. I deeply appreciate the Senator's comment. Mr. President, the truth is, I had not previously weighed the possibility of the members of the committees, or even all Senators, withholding comment until all the facts are before the Senate. No one had suggested such a course to me. I had not heard it discussed on the floor of the Senate.

May I suggest, however, that the hearings may extend on into the indefinite future? I was present when General MacArthur testified the first day, and he gave every evidence of a man who expected that the taking of his testimony would be finished on that one day; yet he was called back a second day and a third day. We had General Marshall yesterday, we have him today, and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], referred this morning to the forthcoming testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Whom does that mean? It may mean all the Joint Chiefs, for aught I know. To what point these hearings may go, perhaps extending week after week, I do not know, and at what point the committee would feel released from any such self-imposed restraint as that suggested by the Senator from New Jersey, I do not know. I should be happy, if it would not violate a confidence, if the Senator from New Jersey would inform me whether there has been an understanding among the membership of the two committees that no member of either committee is to say anything about the issues until all the facts are before the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, unfortunately the Senator from New Jersey does not have the privilege of being a member of either of the two committees, so he is unable to inform the Senator from Connecticut in that respect.

Mr. BENTON. I thought perhaps from the Senator's questioning he had some information on the subject. Perhaps the senior Senator from New Jersey can answer my question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I just came in at this moment, and heard the statement of the Senator from Connecticut. As a member of the committee, I am able to say that there is no agreement of any kind relative to members of the committees making statements. There is no such understanding.

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to have the point cleared up, Mr. President, because many newspaper stories, editorials, and columnists are dealing daily with this subject, and in my 4 days recently spent in Connecticut, I was asked about nothing else by my constituents. I feel that I would be in a very difficult and unusual position if I said to my constituents, "I cannot talk about this subject until the facts are all before the people." They would, I think, with perfect justice, say to me, "Give us your present tentative views, even if they are not final views." That is what I was attempting to do today, though I commented, as the junior Senator from New Jersey heard when he was seated on the floor as acting minority leader, that I was not sure I would be making these comments at this exact time were I a member of the committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, while I submit a question to my distinguished senior colleague?

Mr. BENTON. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey whether he does not agree that it would be the course of wisdom not only for members of the two committees, meeting jointly, who are now sitting in judgment on the evidence, but also for the entire membership of the Senate to withhold serious comment on the matters at issue until all the evidence in the case has been laid before the two committees?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may answer my distinguished colleague by saying that it has been my purpose not to make any comments, as I sit in judgment, so to speak, to hear all the testimony. I do not want to prejudge any case, but I am not sure that we could adopt any rule which would bind everyone. There has been much talk back and forth, and I assume there will be further discussion on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the senior Senator from New Jersey feel that there is any difference between a Member of the Senate, in this respect, and a member of one of the two committees, sitting jointly? Is it not true that, for the purpose of the hearing, the Senate is now virtually sitting, by permission of the two committees, as a committee of the whole, in fact, even though not technically?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say to my friend, I think each Member of the Senate will have to decide that for himself. I have stated my own position. As a member of one of the two committees, I feel that I shall probably have to make some finding on this matter, and I should not commit myself before hand or try to prejudge the case.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I regret to say I am unable to hear the Senator. May I ask the Senator to kindly repeat his reply? I could not hear him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. What I said was that, so far as I was concerned, as a member of one of the two committees, I felt I should refrain from any public comments on the matter until we had heard all the evidence and had formed our conclusions. I feel that the committee will probably be called upon for its conclusions, and I do not want to

prejudge the case at this time. But whether that is to apply to any other Senator, I cannot say. It seems to me it must be left to the conscience of each Member of the Senate to determine whether he wants to participate in the debate at this stage of the proceedings, and whether he is humanly able to resist commenting on a matter so vitally important to the whole world as this is. My distinguished colleague is correct. I think we should not prejudge the case before hearing all the facts. On the floor of the Senate I have heard definite misstatements made—for example, statements purporting to quote General MacArthur, which were totally erroneous. After hearing the testimony of General MacArthur, I knew that certain statements attributed to him were erroneous. As Members of the Senate, we must be very careful not to make statements which would prejudge the case, and which would prejudge the minds of the people of the country, to whom we have a great responsibility. Whether we are able humanly to refrain from comment is another question, but, I regret exceedingly to say, I think that the things which have been said on the floor of the Senate by certain Members totally misrepresented the position of General MacArthur.

I think, also, that there have been misrepresentations, to a certain extent, of the position of General MacArthur. So I propose to refrain from comment until I know what I am talking about. I think that is a wise rule for anyone to follow.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I should like to comment on what the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey has just said. I am wholly in accord, of course, with his desire for the utmost accuracy in all statements made on the floor of the Senate, and I shall be profoundly grateful to any Member of the Senate who corrects anything I may have to say today from the standpoint of accuracy of quotations or references to anything said by either General MacArthur or General Marshall. However, I think those who agree with the senior Senator from New Jersey and who want to wait for all the evidence to be in are likely to sterilize themselves for the rest of their lives, because young graduate students of Princeton University will be writing documents contributing new facts about this case many years from today. Even to wait until all the witnesses have been heard would tend to immobilize and sterilize the Members of the Senate on these great and crucial issues over a long period of time, a period throughout which our constituents and the American public will be rightly wanting our judgment and our views, even though tentative, or even though merely current views based on what has thus far unfolded in this controversy and great debate.

I now yield to the junior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would not the Senator concede that any comment made on the floor of the Senate at this time is made on the basis of partial facts, not all the facts?

Mr. BENTON. I not only concede that, but I concede it every day of the year as to every comment made on the floor of the Senate, and I concede it every day as to every column ever published in any newspaper in the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does not the Senator think that as to any issue so basic and important as is this one, we should not comment before we know even half the facts?

Mr. BENTON. After General MacArthur has indicated that, so far as he knows, his testimony has been concluded, after three full days of testimony, and after every newspaper and editorial writer has commented on the testimony over the week end——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is why I have no doubt that General MacArthur will be back for three more days of testimony.

Mr. BENTON. After 2 days of General Marshall's testimony, I think each one of us is amply entitled to form current judgment on what has transpired so far, though that judgment, I agree with the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey, must be subject to review and alteration in line with President Truman's own plea that we withhold judgment or be prepared to change our judgment as further facts are developed. But General Marshall, within the past 2 days, has given some of us more information on some subjects than many of us have had over a period of many months.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is clearly a matter of opinion, and that is the very reason why the junior Senator from New Jersey was prompted to enter the colloquy, because, so far as I am concerned, I want to hear from the Joint Chiefs of Staff before I base any opinion on the testimony of either General MacArthur or General Marshall.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I very much respect the opinion of the junior Senator from New Jersey, and I respect his apparent feeling that there may be an ethical question involved. I feel that we have been overwhelmed with information since last Thursday, and information against a long background, including General MacArthur's speech to the Congress, long prior to last Thursday. Provided a Senator is prepared to change his judgment in line with new information as it is advanced, I, for one, speaking personally, would hope that my colleagues would feel perfectly free to express themselves on the great issues now confronting us as soon as their views were sufficiently crystallized.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, all Senators, presumably, are facing the same problem, and it must be a matter for individual determination. It is a little difficult to suggest that everyone should withhold judgment until all the facts are in. On the other hand, a proper regard for our own reputation for mature judgment will be affected by the desire to avoid what may lead us up a blind alley.

Personally, I took the position that we should reserve judgment, I will not say until all the evidence is in, because, as the Senator properly points out, that may be a long time, but at least until there is a somewhat more comprehensive presentation such as the Senator from New Jersey has suggested, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and many others concerned. The point which I think many Senators are facing involves the various radio programs and the columns of commentators. It seems to me a Senator may render a somewhat useful service by presenting the viewpoint of General Marshall or of General MacArthur, that is, that General MacArthur has testified to certain facts, and General Marshall has made certain statements. Such statements would not involve anything more than proper information to the radio-devouring public.

I have a great deal of sympathy with the position of the Senator from Connecticut, that if we suspend all discussion until the whole matter is completed it will present a difficult situation. Everyone except ourselves certainly is discussing the question. There must be restraint and circumspection and an endeavor to eliminate the personalities that all too often seem to obtrude on the policies that concern us.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the comment of the Senator from Maine. It gives me a chance to present an illustration. Many, many weeks ago I accepted an appearance on a radio program at half past 10 tonight, called The Capitol Cloakroom. If I could not make any comments I would be in a very strange position when asked questions as to what General MacArthur said and what General Marshall said. I would be, I think, in an unsound position, after spending considerable time reading the testimony, if I said, "I do not know; I have no views."

Further, I might suggest that it may be that some other Members of the Senate may not be speaking today because they may not have been willing to devote their week end to reading all the testimony.

I hope the Senator from Maine will agree with how I am handling my review today. I am trying to handle it with restraint and without any emotion whatsoever.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to Senator No. 96, the new and distinguished junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator. Is it not true that while no Senator at this point may make a final judgment on the merits of the various points brought out by General MacArthur, General Marshall, and other witnesses, the principal reason why the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, disagreed with General MacArthur was their desire not to add to the present risk of precipitating a third world war? Is not that the principal reason they disagreed with him?

Mr. BENTON. That is the kind of question on which I would rather wait and hear additional evidence, because I do not know whether that is wholly

right. I know it is at least one of the principal reasons, no doubt about that, and very possibly the overwhelmingly preponderant reason. According to General Marshall's testimony, the risk of a greatly enlarged war was one of the things on which disagreement occurred with General MacArthur in the field. General MacArthur thought the best way to win the Korean war in a hurry was to move ahead on an expanded war. The Chiefs of Staff feared this would involve a grave military risk of precipitating a still more general war. I think that difference of opinion is clear from the testimony so far.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. MOODY. That is perfectly clear. I did not mean to be drawing an inference as to who was correct. I was pointing out that that was a factor in the judgment of the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. BENTON. There is no doubt that it was a major factor—perhaps by far the major factor.

Mr. MOODY. I am wondering if the Senator does not also agree to what has been made clear already in the testimony, that General MacArthur's judgment was that the Chinese Reds would not come into the war and his later testimony was to the effect that he now believes the Russians will not come into the war if Red bases are bombed across the Yalu River.

Mr. BENTON. There, again, is the kind of question in connection with which I am sympathetic with the junior Senator from New Jersey. The newspaper reports up to this time would indicate that the junior Senator from Michigan is wholly correct. It could be that future evidence will prove him incorrect. On that point I think we might well suspend judgment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine understood the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] to say that the position of the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General Marshall was in contradiction to the position of General MacArthur, as a result of their desire to avoid a third world war. Is it, therefore, implied that those of us who support General MacArthur's position do not desire to avoid a third world war?

Mr. BENTON. There has been no such implication at all.

Mr. MOODY. Certainly I made no such implication.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe the statement should be clarified.

Mr. BENTON. No such thing was implied, because General MacArthur's testimony shows that his goal was the same as that of the administration, to bring the Korean war to a suitable and honorable close. It is wholly a question of judgment as to which policies would give us the best chance of doing this and of avoiding a third world war.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the nearer we come to agreeing that all of us desire to avoid a third world war, the better off we will be. If we would only proceed from that predicate, namely, that everyone is concerned and desirous of avoiding a third world war, and proceed with what we believe would most quickly and most cheaply achieve it——

Mr. BENTON. I did not interpret the question of the junior Senator from Michigan as did the Senator from Maine. I assume that he, along with me, feels our policy is a matter of judgment, argued by men with different backgrounds and information as to which course is most likely to present the greatest rewards with the least risk.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to say to the Senator from Maine that I had no intention of impugning anyone's motive. I merely wished to point out that General MacArthur, magnificent soldier though he is, nevertheless had decided, as I understand, that it was not likely that the Chinese Reds would enter the war. I was merely pointing out, by way of questioning—and I assume the Senator heard my questioning—that the fact that General MacArthur had made such an estimate and arrived at such a judgment would naturally be considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President when they were faced with the necessity of deciding whether to take his advice or to override his advice. I certainly did not mean to impugn anyone's motives, certainly not those of General MacArthur, who has served our country so well, particularly in pacifying and stabilizing the Far East.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The junior Senator from Connecticut indicated that perhaps the Joint Chiefs of Staff considered that when General MacArthur was wrong in one respect, namely, at Wake Island, in his view that the Chinese Communists would not come into the war, that of itself is an indication that he would possibly be wrong in many other respects. I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether he is familiar with the fact that on the 11th day of September, the Secretary of State, who had the benefit of intelligence reports, not as a field commander, but through his sources of information in the capitals of the world, said that it would be silly—I have already inserted his exact words in the RECORD—that it would be silly, in effect, for anyone to think that the Chinese Reds or the Russians would come into the war. Is the Senator from Connecticut familiar with that fact?

Mr. BENTON. I am not familiar with it, but I am sufficiently familiar with the laws of logic to know that a man can be wrong the first time and right the next 5 or 6 or 10 times, or perhaps the next 100 times. Even though General MacArthur may have been incorrect—providing that all the evidence shows that he was incorrect in his guess on the intervention of the Chinese Communists—that in itself would not necessarily prove that he would be wrong in his next estimate of a strategic or military question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Because if that were true, the same rule could be applied to the Secretary of State, and it could be shown that he was wrong in saying that China would not come into the war. I am wondering whether the Senator from Connecticut knows whether there was any responsible public official, either military or in the State Department, who insisted or stood out for the proposition that Red China would come into the war.

Mr. BENTON. My recollection, Mr. President, is that the statements of the State Department were to the effect that it would be madness on the part of Red China to come into the war. They were based on the presumption that it would be a tragic blunder on the part of the Chinese Government and people to do so. That is my recollection. I may say, however, that I think every Member of the Senate at one time or another—and I am blanketing in General MacArthur and Secretary of State Acheson—have made mistakes in judgment. The fact that they have made mistakes in judgment does not necessarily imply that the sequence of judgments which follow are equally incorrect.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan until he has concluded his questioning.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Connecticut know of anything that America could have done, with our allies, prior to Red China's coming into the war which would not have brought her into the war?

Mr. BENTON. That we could have done with our allies?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; anything that we could have done while fighting in Korea which would have kept Red China out of the war. Was anything advocated along that line?

Mr. BENTON. That kind of question is exceedingly difficult to answer, particularly when we are so close to the problem with which we are now being faced. I think most historians will agree that there were many things which perhaps might have been done between 1918 and 1941 which might have kept Japan from attacking Pearl Harbor. I believe historians will be arguing the question of the Senator from Michigan for many decades to come. It would be presumptuous for the Senator from Connecticut to hazard a guess on the question, particularly when we have before us only the current testimony which is being presented, without benefit of much more evidence, including all of that which is locked in the files of the Politburo and in the foreign office at Peiping.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is asking the question because we are now considering whether or not Russia will come into the

war because of what we might do. This question is necessarily related to the contention in some quarters at least, that there was something which America did in the field, or something which General MacArthur, as a commander in the field, did, actually to bring Red China into the war.

Mr. BENTON. I know of no such incident.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. BENTON. I know of no such charge. No doubt all of us might have done something to minimize the risks and thus perchance have kept China out of the war. However, what those things might have been, I do not know.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has indicated that he has read the record and that which is admitted is in the record up to the present time. Would this be a fair conclusion from the record? If we do anything effective in winning the war, we are running the risk of Russia coming into the war; and if we do only those things which will indicate that we are not going to win the war, it will be those things which will keep Red Russia out of the war?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I will comment on the question of the Senator from Michigan, and then, if he will pardon me, I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

That question, again, like the previous question, is a question to which there is no answer. It is one of those "iffy" questions, to which none of us has an answer. What we can do and should do is a question of judgment, based upon incoming information. Our goal is to assemble our ablest men to render judgment as to the acts by which the risk of war becomes greatest. That question, of course, seems to lie at the heart of the controversy now centering about General MacArthur's views.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe the Senator is aware of the fact that at the time the decision was made by this Government to go north of the thirty-eighth parallel, there was every indication that there were Chinese troops massed along the Yalu River in Manchuria. As to whether or not those troops would be sent in, that would probably have been purely a matter of reading the minds of the Communist rulers of China, would it not?

Mr. BENTON. Again, this question, at the beginning of it and also at the conclusion of it, falls into the category of questions which were under discussion between the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and myself. I believe that as the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other witnesses come along, more light may be shed on questions of this kind. I have avoided this kind of question in my remarks today, and do not feel well prepared to discuss any such except to say that so far the evidence seems to indicate that the Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, when the Secretary of State said that he doubted that the Chinese Communists would come in, and when we were further advised that General MacArthur doubted that the Chinese Communists would come in, many of us would have been willing to go along with that judgment. When the Chinese Communists came in we felt, in good faith, that under the circumstances the right thing was done by our Government.

On the other hand, some of our allies felt that if we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, and particularly if we advanced to the Yalu River, the Chinese Communists would undoubtedly come in because of our pursuit of the enemy to the borders of China. Possibly those people might have felt that they were not second-guessing, but that their first guess was right, and that we should not have gone to the Manchurian border in the first place.

Mr. BENTON. I think that is a penetrating observation and a very real contribution to this discussion.

This morning in the hearing the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] asked General Marshall whether there was any man in the military service with greater experience in the Far East than General MacArthur. General Marshall answered "No." The Senator from New Hampshire then asked whether there was anyone in our diplomatic corps, among our foreign diplomats, with greater experience in the Far East than General MacArthur. At first General Marshall said he did not know, and then he stated that perhaps there was no one.

I venture to say that a great many who have served in our diplomatic corps have far more experience—if we judge experience merely by years of tenure—in the Far East than has General MacArthur. When I was in Italy last June I met our consul general in Palermo, Mr. David C. Berger, who spent 20 years in China alone.

But further in line with the question of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I suggest that our allies, and more particularly England and France, are not without experience in the Far East, and between them can boast an experience which antedates even General MacArthur's 24 years of overseas experience.

Our allies have been virtually unanimous in their position in opposition to General MacArthur's current recommendations. I do not know how nearly unanimous they were in opposition to our going to the Yalu River. Perhaps they were divided on that question. However, many of them opposed it aggressively.

Implicit in the Senator from Louisiana's question is this: Shall we wholly disregard the experience and judgment of our allies. Are we going to abandon our allies or are we going to make circumstances easier for them to go ahead and abandon us? Do we feel that our allies are of so little potential value to us that we should turn our backs on their seasoned judgment in the face of unnumbered crises yet to come, of which we now have no knowledge, in this long and unending struggle we are going to be up against for peace and security?

I should like to go still further. Let us suppose for a moment that all our allies are wrong and that General MacArthur is right. I should like to pursue that line of discussion for a moment. Yes, let us assume that they are wrong. Would we not be well advised, as each of us often does in his private, family, and personal associations when he is dealing with persons who are of great consequence and importance to him, and when he thinks they are wrong, would we not be well advised to give them some time? Perhaps with time they can determine that they are wrong and that General MacArthur is right. Each of our allies has its own internal differences and dissensions. The question for us is whether we shall now, by following the road of MacArthur, which they conceive to be the road of far greater risk, begin to hammer home a great potential wedge between our allies and ourselves.

Mr. President, in line with the last question of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I feel that even if our allies turn out to be wrong on the Yalu question, and even if they turn out to be wrong on the issues brought up by General MacArthur, they must be listened to, and they must be given time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator would agree with me that as we listen to our allies and reason with them, the more they talk the more they should be willing to put up. There is an old American saying, "Put up or shut up." If our allies want to advise and consult, and take a major hand in the Korean episode, they should give us more help than they are giving us.

Mr. BENTON. I agree wholly that they should give more help in Korea, and I was the first Member of this body to demand on the floor of the Senate that troops of other countries be sent to Korea to join our troops. I made an issue of it. I seem to recall that the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who is now in the Chamber, joined with me on that day in bringing up that issue for the first time on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield. I hope I shall not get any more "iffy" questions.

Mr. FERGUSON. I try to be fair with questions. There are certain things which disturb me, and I like to get all the information I can.

We were talking about conferences with our allies. I have a series of questions which I should like to ask in that connection.

My first question is whether or not we consulted the other nations of the world, and particularly those which we anticipated would come into the war with us in Korea, prior to the 25th of June. Did we have any real conference with them then, as to the risks we were assuming, as to the capacity of North Korea, and as to the possibility that Communist China might come in? Was there any consultation on those questions?

Mr. BENTON. Again, that is the type of question which I have tried to avoid in my comments, because I think it is overwhelmingly probable that important evidence dealing with that question will be brought out in the hearings now being conducted. Any evidence I might have on that question would be partial.

I should like to ask my colleagues in the Senate to allow me to finish my comments, although I am glad to be interrupted on any point of fact, or any point which seems germane to the comments I shall make on the floor today. At the conclusion of my presentation, if my colleagues have questions on which I can shed any light, I shall be glad to do my best.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall try to get a little closer to the last remark of the Senator, which related to consultation, and the fears of our allies in this matter.

Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether he believes that the Board of Trade of England rather than the real military men in England, have been dictating British policy, and whether it might not be well if our Joint Chiefs of Staff work this matter out with the military men of England rather than the Board of Trade, through the Foreign Minister. I ask this because of my suspicion that it is the dictates of the Board of Trade which result in the making of timid decisions, let us say, in the Far East, respecting trade with Communist China, and the blockade, and the various other things that might be discussed. I ask the Senator whether he thinks we have used all our efforts in a free discussion with the British, and particularly with the military men and the Admiralty of Britain, as to what we might do in the Far East to win the victory. Does the Senator have an answer to that question?

Mr. BENTON. I am sure there are many things we could have done and should have done better to control trade with the Communists. I hope the current hearings and testimony will bring out for full discussion many avenues out of which we shall discover any steps which ought still to be taken. No one deplores more than I do the trade of the British, as recently disclosed by the shipment of 120,000 tons of rubber, I think it was, into the Soviet area. But if the Senator from Michigan was present at the hearing this morning—I know he was there for a part of the morning, for I saw him there——

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was present.

Mr. BENTON. He heard Secretary Marshall's story about the careful negotiation with the 13 countries respecting the proposed offer to be worked out and made through the United Nations looking toward a possible negotiation with Red China and North Korea for a settlement in Korea. That one story, that one incident, presented by Secretary Marshall this morning, which will be reported in the newspapers this evening, would seem to me to bear out what I believe to be the fact, that we have negotiated closely and intimately with our allies, perhaps more closely and intimately than ever before in our history.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason the Senator from Michigan asked the question—and the hearings are published in the newspapers, and so this is one of the facts that will be made known—is that General MacArthur had no direct connection whatever with any of the allies. He has indicated that his own military reports had been altered to meet the political situation. I am wondering whether we are not paying too much attention to the political situation and not getting down to the military situation, because we are at war.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, as brought out previously in the colloquy on the floor, the areas referred to by the Senator from Michigan are areas under study by the committee now holding hearings, and with respect to many of them it is my hope much testimony will be brought forward to shed light on some of the questions which trouble the Senator from Michigan, and which trouble us all. I do not know how much direct contact our allies have had with General MacArthur. As General Marshall pointed out this morning, he was the agent of President Truman, and the allies have ample contact with the President. But I think that even when our allies are wrong, if we want to keep them as close allies we must be sympathetic with their own dissensions and difficulties, and we cannot and must not at this time take precipitous, unilateral action on these crucial and difficult questions. If we follow this course we can give our allies greater confidence in our leadership and in the dominance of the civilian leadership of our Government.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland with the comment which I address to the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], that barring interruptions, I think perhaps I shall be able to conclude in 15 or 20 minutes. I make that statement in case the Senator from Nebraska is still interested in the amount of time I shall consume.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for so advising me. I asked the question because Senators who wish to be present when the appropriation bill is being considered have asked me how long the Senator would speak.

Mr. BENTON. I did not expect there would be so many interruptions. I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the question I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut goes to the amount of discussion which has gone into the relationships between this Nation and our allies. Over the period of years we have given them many billions of dollars. We have coordinated all our efforts with theirs. We have given very richly of our youth. Is there any idea in the mind of the Senator from Connecticut that the least little bit of friction would cause us to lose them? Could we not sit down and counsel with them? Maybe they could do wrong.

Mr. BENTON. Of course, they could do wrong and they do do wrong, and there is an enormous daily output of communication between us and our allies, not only through the State Department, but, as the Senator knows, through many other departments of Government and through countless private agencies. However, I do not think the issue raised by General MacArthur is in any sense a minor question or a question of "the least little bit of friction." The question is of the highest strategic and military import. It is a question upon which our very lives depend. It is the kind of question which could cause disunity and friction and great loss of confidence overseas in that civilian dominance in our Government to which we have always been committed.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. On the other hand, a policy of appeasement could have the same effect on the people of the world who would like to join with us to put down this threat of communism.

Mr. BENTON. I have not heard anyone suggest a policy of appeasement. Secretary Marshall has attested to the fact that General MacArthur was wrong in his feeling that Secretary Marshall or somebody else overruled the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the question of Formosa and on the question of—as Secretary Marshall put it—allowing Red China "to shoot its way into the United Nations."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That has not been true all through our history in this situation, however; that has only recently been the policy.

Mr. BENTON. It was not so long ago that the Communist Chinese armies overran and took over China.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is true; but there was the initiation of a policy which would have given Formosa to the Red Chinese. Is not that correct?

Mr. BENTON. No; I do not think that is at all correct, although, of course, again I do not claim to have all the background, and it may be that in the hearings evidence which will shed further light on that matter will be brought out.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thought that was part and parcel of the cease-fire arrangement which was proposed and which we were asked to ratify.

Mr. BENTON. I believe that is incorrect. I do not believe that by offering to negotiate we ever reached any such decision.

However, there is no doubt that responsible leaders of countries all over the world do hope to negotiate some kind of settlement with Communist China to put an end to the fighting in Korea. A negotiated settlement—which can, I agree, be smeared by the use of the word "appeasement"—is not necessarily appeasement. A negotiated settlement at some future time is quite legitimately a goal of national policy.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not have any idea of attempting to smear anything or anyone; but, judging by the

tenor of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut, I have the very definite impression that he believes that unless we are always giving either of our treasure or of our young men, we are not going to get along with our allies. The day is coming when we will have to have a show-down to see whether they are really our allies. We cannot always travel the one-way street of giving away everything.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland is of course correct that we cannot give away everything, and we do not intend to, but in my judgment the day of his so-called show-down is not here, and I trust it never comes in the spirit in which he makes his comment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the able Senator from Connecticut feel that what we need is a definition of the word "appeasement" in the same way that we needed a definition of the word "democracy" as the able Senator from Connecticut, who formerly was with the State Department, will have in mind, when the representatives of our Government sat down at Yalta and talked about a "democratic" way of life for certain peoples. Yet, by the Russian definition of "democracy," the entire nation of Poland is now behind the iron curtain, and by the same definition of "democracy," other countries—Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary—are definitely behind the iron curtain. So unless we have a clear definition of these terms, the Soviet view of "democracy" is so different from ours that we fall into a trap, and, in fact, betray the liberties of hundreds of millions of people. Does not the Senator from Connecticut agree that we do need some definitions?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I think the able Senator from California, who has been in a profession which centers around dealing with words has touched in his brief expression on one of the most important questions of our day. The Russians have successfully prostituted and bastardized the great words for the expression of which men have fought and died in struggling for freedom over the centuries. The Russians have corrupted these words and have twisted their meaning beyond recognition. The Russians use the word "democracy" when they mean tyranny. They say "freedom" when they mean slavery. I thus concur in the spirit of the comment just made by the Senator from California.

Let me add, however, regarding the word "appeasement"—and I agree with the Senator from California in regard to the need for a definition of that word—that one of our present risks is that this great word "appeasement" may be used in efforts to destroy a policy which may be sound in connection with projected negotiation and settlement. I was in London in 1938, 30 days before Munich. I talked at length with Lord Vansittart, and others high in the councils of the Conservative government.

At that time the word "appeasement" was a wonderful word which had widespread appeal. It appealed to everyone, because in many ways all of us are appeasers; we must be appeasers to live; we appease our wives, our children, our relatives, our partners, our associates in the Senate, with one little compromise or another, as our way of adjusting ourselves to them, or of persuading them to adjust themselves to us. The word "appeasement" was such a marvelous word in 1938 that it was used at that time by the British Government to sell a policy, to wit, Munich, which was a bad and an unsound policy. Yes, most unhappily that great word played an important role in selling the Munich policy to the people of the world. When the Munich policy was recognized for what it was—this great word lost its previous meaning and suddenly acquired a completely different meaning—an ominous meaning, a sinister meaning.

I fear that now this great pre-1938 word may be used in its new sense of abdication or surrender, and used to prevent us from looking ahead toward what should constantly be our goal, a negotiated settlement to put an end to the war in Korea. We cannot set up as national policy the conquest of China or of Russia; we must seek a negotiated settlement. That must be our hope; that is the hope of peace. Winston Churchill said in effect, "Get strong and then negotiate." Let us see to it that the word "appeasement" is not used to hamstring and handicap that hope.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Connecticut that I think he is quite correct when he says that we do need some definitions. However, let us consider a very small case, perhaps, one which deals, not with nations, but with individuals. If either the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from California happened to be traveling in one of the iron curtain countries, and if we were picked up by the secret police, in the way Mr. Vogeler was picked up by the secret police and held, we might be prepared to enter into negotiations to turn over to those who had seized us our automobile or perhaps our house or our apartment, if we had one in that area and if we were faced with that type of situation; but I do not think the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from California would be prepared to turn over to them his wife or his daughter. So I think that is a very basic difference.

I say to the Senator from Connecticut that when we talk about considering laying on the conference table the liberties of 8,000,000 free Chinese on Formosa, I think that is appeasement. We have done such things in the past. We have been responsible in no small part for betraying the liberties of the people of Poland. We have contributed to the passing behind the iron curtain of 400,000,000 Chinese. There are still 8,000,000 free Chinese on the Island of Formosa. I say that when the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously recommend to the Government of the United States that in the negotiations for any cease-fire arrangement, Formosa and the recognition of Red China to membership in the United Nations should not even be subject to discussion, I think they are entitled to have the wholehearted support of the Government and the people of the United States.

When someone at a higher echelon says, "While we do not favor turning Formosa over to the Chinese Communists and while we do not personally favor the admission of Red China to the United Nations, we will throw those subjects on the table for negotiation," I say we are preparing for appeasement, because when we prepare to go into a conference as we did at Lake Success on January 11, when it was agreed that the countries which would be on the negotiating committee would be the Soviet Union, Communist China, Great Britain, the United States, and one other power—so that we knew in advance that we would be in the minority, inasmuch as the Soviet Union and Great Britain and the other power have publicly declared that Communist China should be seated in the United Nations and that Formosa should go to Red China—we go into the conference, I presume, prepared to abide by the results, and knowing when we enter the conference that we will be outvoted.

I may say to the Senator from Connecticut, we have not yet had the opportunity, in the two committees, fully to explore just what was in the minds of General Marshall and the Government of the United States, but there is a very strong indication that even though they maintained that our representative would vote "no," we were prepared to accept the decision of a packed jury, a jury which we knew was packed. I say that that gives a very strong indication of possible appeasement.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the comments of the Senator from California regarding Formosa are those which are germane to my talk today about General MacArthur. On this, to the best of my present judgment, I unequivocally agree with the implications of his comments, that the 8,000,000 free Chinese should not be used as pawns in a settlement. However, I may say that sometimes a man takes his wife along, even when he is not prepared to give her away.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. In all probability, it is impossible to have a conference with the Red Chinese authorities, without the subject of Formosa coming up for discussion. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the New York Times of January 12, it is stated that when the United States representative had voted for this proposal to negotiate the question of the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and the question of Formosa,

the following appeared in the article by Mr. Walter Sullivan, from Lake Success:

United States circles indicated an expectation that the Chinese Communists would reject the plan presented today, and implied that American support had been given with this expectation in mind.

I may say to the Senator from Connecticut, I think that our great Government falls into a very sorry state when we enter into a general arrangement, apparently not in good faith, in the hope that it will be turned down. I do not think that is the way for a great nation to give leadership in the world. I say to the Senator from Connecticut, with deep feeling on the subject—because, as one Member on this side of the aisle, I have supported the North Atlantic Pact, the arms implementation bill, the ECA, and the United Nations—that, with all we have done for the world in the way of loans and grants and military assistance, and in the guarantee of the American people under the North Atlantic Pact that we shall resist aggression, I think it shows lack of leadership in the State Department of the United States, that we should now find that we are wringing our hands, wondering whether our allies will stand with us in this desperate hour. I think that that is enough to cause every American citizen and every Member of Congress of the United States to wonder where the leadership of the State Department of the United States is taking us. I venture the opinion, I may say to the able Senator—and I had not intended to discuss these matters, except as he has opened the subject—that so far as the strategic defenses of the United States are concerned in the great far eastern area, we would be better served by following the advice on strategic affairs by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, than we would by following the advice of Dean Acheson. I doubt very much whether we shall be able to get a degree of national unity, either in the Congress or throughout the Nation, so long as Dean Acheson remains as Secretary of State.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is, the Senator from Connecticut has the floor, and may yield only for a question.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am sorry if I have unwittingly violated the regular order. I join with the Senator from California in looking forward to evidence which may be adduced from the forthcoming testimony on the several questions upon which he has touched. Further, I congratulate him for many constructive efforts in the field of our foreign policy.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that one aspect of the question asked by the Senator from California should not be accepted. I refer to the statement that this Nation contributed or aided in the downfall of the Kuomintang government. This government contributed to the support of the Chinese Nationalists although undoubtedly it could have done more. It would seem to the junior Senator from Louisiana that those who have voted against the ECA program, those who have voted against arms implementation, and those who have voted against the North Atlantic Pact and the Greek and Turkish aid programs, should not be the ones to criticize the Secretary of State for not doing more along that line with respect to China, inasmuch as they opposed everything in the way of helping foreign powers to resist communism. Although more could have been done to help the Chinese Government, we must recognize that a lot was done—that about $2,000,000,000 worth of military aid was given—notwithstanding which an army of 3,000,000 Nationalist Chinese, I understand, was defeated by an army of 1,500,000 Communists.

Mr. BENTON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his observations. I may say further in reply to the Senator from California, it is the first time I have heard it intimated that Dean Acheson controls the French Government, the British Government, and the many other allied governments who are in strong opposition to General MacArthur's proposals. It is not General MacArthur against Dean Acheson. That is a gross over-simplification. It is worse than that, I have been in the process of showing that our allies unanimously oppose the current recommendations of General MacArthur's. That is a matter of record. Not only do our allies oppose them, but President Truman and all his top advisers oppose them, as well.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Was it not a situation wherein the Commander in Chief had to choose between a theater commander and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, rather than between the theater commander and the State Department?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; and I think that has been fully brought out already by the evidence.

Mr. KERR. Was it not a case wherein, as the distinguished Secretary of Defense said yesterday, it was the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense and the Commander in Chief, on the one hand, supporting one position, with a theater commander, on the other hand, supporting an opposite or antagonistic position?

Mr. BENTON. The Senator from Oklahoma is wholly right.

Mr. KERR. Was it not really a situation wherein—if the expression may be used and not be subject to being criticized as an oversimplification—the tail was trying to wag the dog, instead of being in harmony with the movement and direction and objective of the dog?

Mr. BENTON. I hesitate to accept that particular metaphor. I feel that General MacArthur may have felt so moved by his enormous responsibility that he felt compelled to try to make known his viewpoint and to sell it not only to his associates in Washington but to the American people. If he was the tail, he was an unintentional tail, and he was one with a tremendous wag.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I may suggest, it seems to me the question which is bothering the American people is not whether Dean Acheson is controlling the Foreign Office of the British Government or the Foreign Office of the French Government: The question which is bothering the American people is, Is the British Foreign Office controlling Dean Acheson?

Mr. BENTON. In answer to the Senator from South Dakota I may suggest, again, as I have said before, if our allies are right and we are wrong in opposing General MacArthur, we should listen to them. If they are wrong in opposing General MacArthur's policies, we should still listen to them. If the Senator is suggesting that the top leaders of our Government only agree with our allies because they are under their domination, I would still say we should listen to them. I may say Dean Acheson is acting strangely if he is under domination by the British; we cut off ECA aid to Britain not long ago.

Mr. President, if we cannot learn to work with our allies, we shall risk losing the great potential asset for which we have been fighting and around which all our foreign policy has been geared since the war, namely, the asset of potential collective action and security, the hope of a strong United Nations and of a United States which is not isolated arrogantly in its own alleged strength.

I congratulate General MacArthur for the definiteness of his opinion and for his courage in speaking up against many of the men who have identified themselves with him—when, for example, he stood up and spoke up for the united action in which we participated in Korea.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE. Did the Senator note the observation by General MacArthur that this matter is a two-way street and that our alliance and our aid to the British should mean as much to them as their potential aid might mean to us?

Mr. BENTON. Yes. Of course I cannot take any exception to that goal. I wish there were more British troops in Korea, although we must recall that Britain has a force not dissimilar to our own in southeast Asia.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to associate himself with the Senator from Connecticut in his feeling that our allies should be more vigorous in their cooperation; but, even so, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut if it is not a fact that every would-be world conqueror in starting out on his project, realizing that much of the world will be against him, first seeks to divide those he would conquer before he attempts his efforts of conquest, which he confines to only a small part of the world at a time?

Mr. BENTON. It is the classical and standard maneuver of politics and military strategy.

Mr. KERR. Is it not very apparent that one of the prime purposes of the men of the Kremlin at this time is to divide the rest of the world and drive a wedge between the United States on the one hand and its allies on the other, in an effort to conquer the world?

Mr. BENTON. It is the major objective of much of the U. S. S. R. propaganda output. It is what they seek every minute of every day in their propaganda output to every country in the world—to drive a wedge between us and that particular country.

Mr. KERR. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut that even though we are not fully satisfied with the contribution which our allies are making, our best interest can be served and our security best guarded by our continued effort to develop the alliance and the collective cooperation, rather than to do that which would either promote or encourage the success of our enemy to divide us from our allies?

Mr. BENTON. I would answer that question, of course, as the Senator from Oklahoma well knows, with an unequivocal "Yes." Although our allies do not contribute as much as we like to expect from them, I remind my colleagues in the Senate that there have been some representatives in Congress from New England who have accused other sections of the United States of not contributing as much as New England expected for the welfare of our own Nation. Sometimes equality of contribution is not quickly attained.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that observation. Will he yield for one further question?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KERR. Some time last year, as I recall, the distinguished former Prime Minister of England, Mr. Churchill, made a speech, in which he said that in his opinion the element which had prevented Russia from moving in Europe on her program of conquest was her knowledge that the United States had a stockpile of atomic bombs and a strategic air force with which to deliver those bombs against the Soviet Union.

Mr. BENTON. As I recall, that was Mr. Churchill's statement.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the bases from which those bombers would take off are, in the main, either within the areas of our European allies, or in areas controlled by them?

Mr. BENTON. That is right.

Mr. KERR. Is not that one of the greatest elements of strength, not only in the position of the United Nations in the allied effort, but also in the purpose of this country to maintain itself so that it can either prevent aggression by Communist Russia, or meet it and defeat it if it is forced upon us?

Mr. BENTON. That is true, Mr. President. Further in seeking such strength, I think the attitude of other peoples of the world toward us is much more important than most of us in the United States realize. Suppose we followed General MacArthur's recommendations, which might lead to the bombing of the coastal cities of China. Those gutted cities might not help us much, indeed, General Marshall pointed out in his testimony this morning that we would not have done much to weaken China if we bombed her cities to the ground. But what might this, recipitous bombing do to our chance to win the good will and understanding of the Chinese people? Our objective in dealing with China is to drive a wedge between the Chinese people and the Red Communist rulers of China—just as the U. S. S. R. objective is to drive a wedge between us and our allies.

General MacArthur himself, in his historic speech to the Congress, led off by pointing out that the Chinese people are not particularly interested in any ideology that may be involved. All they want, he said, is a little bit more food, a little bit more shelter, or a little bit more clothing.

General Mao said something which very pointedly shows the value of good will. I refer to his description of guerrillas. I think it is worth repeating, because one of General MacArthur's proposals is to provide the logistics—that nice word—to Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa so that he might at his discretion land raiding forces on the mainland of China. What would he then find there? A friendly and antagonistic populace or a helpful one?

General Mao has described guerrillas in this manner:

> Guerrillas are like fish and the people are the water in which they swim. When the water is warm and friendly, the fish multiply.

General Mao's comment on guerrillas, I submit to the Senate, is a vivid way to show the potential importance of the good will of the Chinese people if we are at any future time to find ourselves involved in a desperate military action in China. We must set our actions to try to win that good will.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I should like to insert an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, entitled "Going It Alone," and I further ask unanimous consent to insert Thomas L. Stokes' brilliantly written column entitled "General MacArthur and the U. N.," which concludes with two paragraphs of one word each—"Alone? Hardly."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 2 and 3.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, as I interpret General MacArthur's policy from his testimony, he divides it into six steps: to bomb Manchuria, to reconnoiter China by air and possibly to bomb the Chinese coast, to intensify and perfect our economic boycott on China, to impose a naval blockade on the Chinese coast, to send reinforcements to Korea, and to give logistic support to Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa troops, while we insure at the same time Formosa's freedom from Chinese domination.

There has been, of course, a great deal of discussion about what Russia would do if we followed General MacArthur's program. In his speech before Congress General MacArthur dismissed Russia's centuries-old concern with the fate and destiny of China with the single phrase that he does not think "the Soviet will necessarily mesh its actions with our moves."

General MacArthur further feels that, regardless of its treaty with China, if Russia wishes to attack us she will attack anyway, and only when she is ready. Perhaps he is right, though I cannot believe the Politburo would run counter to its own dogma and doctrine and prove so monolithic, so lacking in capacity to respond to the force of events or the opportunities created by them. Indeed, General MacArthur praised the flexibility of the Soviet military leaders and said they would not follow any "A, B, C—June July, August—formula." In other words, they are opportunists, and will go to war, or not, as expedient, depending on unfolding events.

Mr. President, this further fact is often discussed, and there is rather wide difference of opinion about it because our incoming intelligence is so sketchy with respect to the Politburo. But, is it not reasonable to assume that the Soviet leaders may be divided on the timing of a projected war, even if not divided on its advisability? If they are divided, there is every incentive to us to act in such ways as to support those who are holding back.

Today, each month, each week, of postponement may prove to be a victory, particularly so because we are growing stronger all the time. Mr. Wilson testified to that effect unequivocally before the Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday morning. In his judgment we are, in contrast to the Soviet Union, growing stronger at a proportionately far more rapid rate. With postponement we can hope that the forces in the Russian hierarchy which favor still further postponement, or which oppose the war wholly, may win out.

Mr. President, I should like to tell a very brief story, because it illuminates this point and clarifies it. Perhaps some Senators will remember this story when they have forgotten other points which I have tried to make. I used this story on a radio forum with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] a few weeks ago. When I had concluded telling the story, he made its point clear for the audience when he said, "You mean patience? You mean we need patience?" I told the story to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] the other day. I hope he will bear with me as I repeat it.

The story concerns an oriental despot, who, in medieval times, sentenced one of his favorite courtiers to death. The courtier prostrated himself at the feet of the despot and pleaded, "O king, before you kill me, will you give me just 30 days? Send me to jail for only 30 days, O king, and I shall teach your favorite ass to talk."

The despot felt he had nothing to lose and finally he agreed. He sent the courtier off to jail. He sent his favorite milk-white ass to the courtier.

The courtier was not without friends, and these friends came to the jail and said to him, "Now, what is your idea? What are you trying to prove with your

suggestion that you may teach the king's ass to talk?"

The courtier replied, "Well, you know, in the next 30 days many things may happen. In the first place, the king may die. In the next place, I may die. In the third place, there is just a bare chance that ass may learn how to talk."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BENTON. I had not concluded. I have only a few more observations to make. I interrupted them to tell a story, which I hope will not be without value in North Dakota.

Mr. President, not having any definite knowledge of what Russia's ultimate or immediate reaction may be, I can only continue to assume, as all our Allies assume, that we do not know what Russia will do. In the absence of final knowledge I feel it is urgent that for the present we act with caution.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield for a question. I shall try to preserve the regular order.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. We took a calculated risk when we went into Korea in mid-June, at which time we had no strength. Why would it be wrong to take such a risk now when we do have strength? The Senator has said we do have strength.

Mr. BENTON. It is a question always in such matters of the degree of risk in contrast to the degree of strength. In the judgment not only of our Allies but most of our officers of Government who have the responsibility of making decisions, the risk proposed by General MacArthur is infinitely greater, and our strength is not proportionately greater.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The choice which the President made in June involved a grave risk. We had everything to lose. We did not even have a——

Mr. BENTON. I could not differ more than with the implications of the Senator's questions. Further, the decision which the President made in June was not a decision primarily about Korea.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It was a decision to put down aggression wherever aggression reared its head. It has reared its head in Red China. Yet there is no attempt being made to put it down. Why is not such an attempt being made?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, again I would like to differ with the Senator, and most profoundly. The decision which was made in Korea is wholly different from any possible decision in Red China. The two are not parallel cases at all. The decision in Korea which was made by the President and his advisers was a decision affecting the United Nations. He had the choice of implementing the United Nations and attempting to make it an effective, strong, and forceful instrument for collective security, or to permit a situation to develop in which it would become probable that we, the American people, would abandon it as a major instrument of policy. In my judgment, if we had not acted as we did on Korea, the United Nations would have been relegated into a kind of polite form of debating society, and not so polite, principally serving as a platform for the propaganda attacks of Russian communism.

Mr. KERR and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. BENTON. I saw the Senator from California rise first. I shall yield to him for a question. Does the Senator wish to ask me a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, while not disagreeing with him in what might have happened had we not entered Korea, if he does not feel, however, that the inherent risks of ultimate involvement of the Chinese Communists, or even of the Soviet Union, were involved on the 25th, 26th, and 27th of June to as great an extent as they are involved today?

Mr. BENTON. Of course, I have no definite knowledge on that question any more than has the Senator from California. But my answer is that I think the risk of immediate involvement with Russia was less on the 25th of June. Furthermore, here I would accept General MacArthur's guess on the Russians: If they were prepared for an all-out war on June 25 it would have come very shortly, whether we intervened in Korea or not. I do not think the same thing applies today, to China, where their stake is bigger and with whom they have a widely publicized mutual assistance treaty.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe that this Government was on ample notice, in the letter to the President from Ambassador Pauley, who had been in North Korea, and in the Wedemeyer report, that the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists were tied in very closely with the North Korean regime; and did not that fact in itself at least put us on notice that when we did become involved on the 25th, 26th, and 27th of June, we at least should be doing so with our eyes open to the fact that either Communist China or the Soviet Union might intervene? The Senator certainly does not believe that we took that calculated risk without having those facts in mind, does he?

Mr. BENTON. I agree that the minute the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, the risk became greater than it was the day before. Or shall I merely say that it was more easy for all of us to see that the risk was greater than it was the day before? The march of the North Koreans into South Korea made it more clear for the whole world to see that the risk of ultimate and complete involvement with Russia was even greater than many had hoped it was.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator miss the point? The implication was not that the day after the invasion took place we knew that there was a risk involved. The question of the Senator from California was this: Did not this Government have ample warning, in the Pauley report, in the Wedemeyer report, in the reports of the Central Intelligence Agency, and in other information transmitted from the American Ambassador in Korea, which put this Government on ample notice that a build-up was taking place in North Korea with the possible objective of trying to overcome the Republic of Korea, not after the 25th, 26th, and 27th of June, but prior to that time?

Mr. BENTON. I cannot presume that the notice was ample. I do not know. In retrospect it might now seem that we should have read the signs better. Surely at the time there were few among us, to my knowledge, who regarded such notice as ample or adequate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that if he has not had the opportunity of reading the statement of Ambassador Muccio prior to the outbreak of hostilities, and the statements which were made on the floor of the Senate, together with statements which were made by responsible agents of this Government, I hope he will take the time to read them, because I think they can be amply documented to show that we were placed on notice that that was one of the great danger spots of the world.

Mr. BENTON. I agree that we were on notice that Korea was a danger spot. General Wedemeyer's report, recently released, again bears this out. But we are today on notice, with plenty of evidence, that Iran is a danger spot, and that many other areas of the world are acute and sensitive danger spots.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that we went into Korea to stop aggression, and that in doing so we went in as a part of the United Nations?

Mr. BENTON. That is, of course, wholly true. I have gone further and said that the reason we went in was to make of the United Nations an effective instrument for collective security, for ourselves and other free nations.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that we went there having been provoked by the naked, raw aggression of North Korea?

Mr. BENTON. There is no question about it.

Mr. KERR. Are there not certain differences in the proposal today for us to expend the war by attacking Red China? First, in doing so, would we not be taking the responsibility of provoking an all-out struggle with Red China?

Mr. BENTON. I think there is something to General MacArthur's point. I think that if we were sure it was in our interest to make the deliberate choice that we would attack China because the Chinese Communist armies coming down into Korea had been our provocation, this would be adequate rationale. We do not use this rationale, because we

think it is not in our interest. Moreover, I do not believe that the Chinese people would necessarily follow this argument or understand it. I have previously pointed out the importance, if we are to be more deeply involved with China, of doing so only along such lines, and after such events that we can clearly and manifestly show that we are moving with greatest reluctance, and not on our own initiative and responsibility.

Mr. KERR. If we did so at this time on our own initiative, would we not be doing it as a single nation, and not as a part of the United Nations?

Mr. BENTON. There is the very great responsibility that that might turn out to be true; or, if not as a single nation, with few allies.

Mr. KERR. Would we not be doing it with the full knowledge that the Soviet Union has a mutual assistance pact with Red China whereby she is committed to join Red China in a mutual assistance effort in the event that Red China is thus attacked?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; and the Soviet Union does not break the pacts it makes when it is in its interest not to break them. It only breaks pacts when it feels that it is in its interest to do so. The Soviet Union might readily decide that it is in its interest not to break this particular pact, to demonstrate to its satellites that the Soviet Union is prepared to stand by its pacts with them.

In answer to the previous question of the Senator from Oklahoma, which I did not answer fully and clearly, if we were to follow General MacArthur's policy we would, of course, move individually, with such allies as came with us, and not as the United Nations.

Mr. KERR. If we did that, and an all-out struggle resulted, either between us and China or between us on the one hand and China and Russia on the other, would we not have provoked that which, above all things, every element of our effort is directed to avoid?

Mr. BENTON. That is the grave risk we run. The probability rate is too high.

Let me read what the distinguished analyst Walter Lippmann says, because it bears on this subject. That is what he recently wrote with respect to what he calls General MacArthur's assumptions. Walter Lippmann said:

> This is a remarkable series of assumptions to make. If the general is right in his estimates and calculations as he gave them to Congress, then this would be the cheapest and easiest victory over a great power in the history of warfare. No wonder Senator TAFT is enchanted with the prospect of a big victory with such a little war.

Mr. Lippmann warns, however that—

> Great victories can never be won cheaply, but only by sweat, blood, and tears. The great wars which must be waged in order to win great victories should not be begun in the illusion or under the pretense that they are little and easy wars.

Mr. President, my comments by now have very clearly indicated that I feel that we cannot at this great hour of crisis be swayed from the prime consideration of those factors best designed to guarantee our national security and the security of the free world. No emotional appeal by any leader, no matter how great or heroic he may be, must be allowed to sway us. We cannot now afford to risk sacrificing the arsenal of Europe on the altar of an Asiatic venture which may still prove not to be imperative. If we must go to war again on a world scale, let us try to do it under circumstances and at a time more favorable to us.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It is also true, is it not, that although we would attribute a great amount of balance and judgment to our enemies, they are in some respects subject to some of the same emotions which might sway the people of this Nation? The fact has been that although many wars have occurred for logical reasons, the history of wars shows that a great number of wars have occurred not only when there were reasons for going to war, but because specific incidents occurred.

I understand that oftentimes it is almost insignificant. For example, many people can hardly recall what the incident was that touched off World War I—which was an assassination in the Balkans.

Mr. BENTON. I believe most historians agree that if it had not been the Sarajevo incident, it would have been some other incident. What the Senator from Louisiana implies about the future is correct. We do not now know as yet whether the forces that are now unleashed cannot be controlled. That their control may become less possible if we follow General MacArthur's recommendations is the judgment of leading students of this problem all over the world.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator would agree, however, would he not, that history shows that there have been wars occurring by reason of provocation one way or the other that might never have occurred if they had not been provoked, or if one side or the other had had a little more balance at the time certain things erupted.

Mr. BENTON. Even on questions like those, Mr. President, the big, decisive factor on whether to postpone action is your judgment of whether you become relatively weaker and thus put yourself in a less advantageous position. This is why I have referred to Mr. Charles Wilson's testimony of yesterday morning before the Banking and Currency Committee. There is every indication anything we can do to delay or postpone will prove advantageous to us. I, of course, agree there is no certainty even on that. I am only suggesting that such evidence as we have seems to be that we shall grow stronger in relation to the U. S. S. R. with each passing week as our great production efforts go into high gear.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Wilson was sometime ago quoted as saying that, of course, it is far better not to have a war than to win one. I am sure the Senator will agree with that statement.

Mr. BENTON. I agree. But I again urge, on the strength of the questions of the Senator from Louisiana, the policy of proceeding with caution and patience, and that these two qualities are sometimes more noble than heroics, and they are more urgent too when life and freedom are at stake. I think it often takes more "guts" to prevent a war than it does to start one. Any fool knows how to start a war. But often it takes the wisdom, courage, and patience of a prophet and a philosopher to refuse to do those things which may precipitate one.

Let us now hope and pray and work for the peace that most of us hope can still be won.

I would commend to the Senate, and particularly to my friends on the other side of the aisle, that remarkable book just published by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, former ECA Administrator. In this book we have almost a blueprint of policies through which we can wage and can hope to win the peace.

Among the questions by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] which I have inserted in the RECORD, are many relating to whether the defense of the free world need to be global. It is the view of our leaders that these defenses must be global if we are to beat off the global strategy and organized world conspiracy of the Communist movement. The attack in Korea last June, in my opinion, was not an isolated effort. It may yet prove to be only a calculated diversion on the Communist timetable, albeit an important and strategic one. We must thus determine our reaction and weigh our steps according to the world-wide necessities and according to the available forces and available allies, both present and potential, in all the various theaters of the world struggle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point three paragraphs from General Marshall's testimony published in last night's Washington Evening Star, which bears so appropriately on this subject.

There being no objection, the paragraphs referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTION OF JUDGMENT

This fundamental divergence is one of judgment as to the proper course of action to be followed by the United States. This divergence arises from the inherent difference between the position of a field commander, whose mission is limited to a particular area and a particular antagonist, and the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President, who are responsible for the total security of the United States, and who, to achieve and maintain this security, must weigh our interests and objectives in one part of the globe with those in other areas of the world so as to attain the best over-all balance.

It is their responsibility to determine where the main threat to our security lies, where we must fight holding actions, and where and how we must gain time to grow stronger. On the other hand, the responsibilities and the courses of action assigned to a theater commander necessarily apply to his own immediate area of responsibility.

It is completely understandable and, in fact, at times commendable that a theater commander should become so wholly

wrapped up in his own aims and responsibilities that some of the directives received by him from higher authority are not those that he would have written for himself. There is nothing new about this sort of thing in our military history. What is new, and what has brought about the necessity for General MacArthur's removal, is the wholly unprecedented situation of a local theater commander publicly expressing his displeasure at and his disagreement with the foreign and military policy of the United States.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, at this point I call the attention of the Senate to a remarkable article written by James Reston, which was published in the New York Times last Sunday. The article is headed "The great debate is marked by many paradoxes."

I ask unanimous consent that this illuminating analysis of General MacArthur's testimony may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in conclusion I point out that no one who has followed this controversy has yet stressed the surprising degree of agreement between the general's views and those of the administration. He wants to meet and repel Communist aggression wherever it occurs. That is the Truman doctrine—the policy of containment. He wants to defend Europe and does not follow the doctrines of Hoover and TAFT. He wants to accomplish these things without risking a third world war unnecessarily. He specifically disavows a preventive war. He applauds the wisdom of the original decision to move in defense of Korea. Certainly, as I pointed out, this decision represented the greatest advance in world law and collective security in the history of man on this troubled planet.

General MacArthur does not want the United States or the United Nations to get mired down in a land war on continental China. In fact, he wants to exert only enough force to force the Chinese to withdraw from Korea. He is not after the conquest of China. He seems to believe that the United States should help the people of Asia to win not only toward national independence but toward basic economic reforms which will improve their standards of living. These are administration policies.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I understand the general's policy to be that we would strike at concentrations of troops in the north and cut them down before they could move southward and shoot our troops.

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In his testimony he disavowed land war on the continent of Asia.

Mr. BENTON. Yes. As I interpret the purpose underlying his recommendations it is to end the Korean war and to achieve the original objectives as set forth by the United Nations at the time we decided to resist the invasion by the North Koreans.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. He wanted to end it by effectively breaking up the concentrations of troops in the sanctuaries in North Korea by the use of the means of war at hand. There are sanctuaries in North Korea that he was not allowed to bomb.

Mr. BENTON. He wants to start a bigger war on a wider scale with the hope and expectation that with less risk and less ultimate loss we may now end the war in Korea.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Did not General MacArthur say that he wanted to bomb objectives in Korea itself, and that he was denied that right?

Mr. BENTON. In Manchuria.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No, sir; in Korea itself, 35 miles south of the Manchurian border; and that he was denied that right.

Mr. BENTON. I do not recall that particular incident.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. He said so; and the name of the town was Racin.

Mr. BENTON. The principle seems very similar. He has of course wanted to bomb what he called the privileged sanctuaries in Manchuria and has been prohibited from doing so.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As I understood his testimony, General MacArthur did not want to bomb sanctuaries; he wanted to fight a war with the war potential he had in Korea, and he was not permitted to do so.

Mr. BENTON. That is not the big issue of the recommendations of General MacArthur today. I have summarized those recommendations.

Mr. President, I again suggest further that there is an enormous range of agreement between General MacArthur's testimony and what are admittedly the administration's policies. Indeed, I even submit that General MacArthur's basic views are far closer to those of the administration than they are to Mr. Hoover's "Gibraltar" or to the "citadel" of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. General MacArthur's disagreements with the administration are confined to questions of how we should effectuate our aims in just one sector of the world, but his half-dozen major recommendations in that area can involve world-wide repercussions. He frankly admits that, and concedes that he does not have the responsibility for controlling those repercussions and does not even have the information to enable him to estimate them more than superficially. Again and again he emphasized that he spoke as a theater commander and from his perspective as a theater commander.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, after I conclude. I wish to speak for only 1 or 2 minutes more.

Mr. President, all these matters and their potential repercussions involve military considerations and global considerations for which General MacArthur disclaims both knowledge and responsibility. Of course, President Truman cannot disclaim that responsibility, nor can the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Let me suggest that one of the gravest phases of the MacArthur-Taft attack against the Truman administration is that their attack undermines the morale, the morality, and the integrity of the United Nations action in Korea, and gives fuel to the Soviet propagandists who call us warmongers. It helps further the Soviet strategy of isolating the United States from its allies in the free world, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. That is why the successful handling of these grave problems calls for our leadership and for the leadership of the United Nations.

It remains true today, as it was last June, that the future and security of the free world depend upon unity and upon concerted strength. We cannot possibly serve those ends by following General MacArthur's recommendations in the Far East. As much as I admire General MacArthur as a soldier, I must regretfully state today my conclusion that I am in no way prepared to accept his leadership in the formulation of our global strategy and the over-all conduct of our foreign policy, upon which our peace and security depend.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a remarkable article by Mr. Arthur Krock, published in last Sunday's New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed at the conclusion of Senator BENTON's remarks.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut this question: Is he aware of the fact that General MacArthur testified that when the Chinese Communists were pouring across the Yalu River bridges, he, General MacArthur, issued an order that our planes bomb the bridges, to protect the American and other United Nations forces, but that order was countermanded from Washington? Does the Senator from Connecticut approve that sort of thing?

Mr. BENTON. I gather that the Senator's question is the same kind of question as the one propounded a moment ago by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. I regret to say that I do not have in mind the facts as suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin, and I do not recall the circumstances existing at that time. I assume that it was the Joint Chiefs of Staff which issued any instructions at that time to General MacArthur. That is the kind of question that is going to be explored in the future testimony before the committees at their joint meeting. The Joint Chiefs of Staff do not always have to be right; General MacArthur does not always have to be right. If that was the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at that time, I

suppose they were acting on the basis of the best information they then had.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Today, the Senator from Connecticut has been giving advice—either good or bad—in regard to what our military action should be in Korea, so I assume he has given that subject a great deal of thought. I think the people of his State would like to have him answer a question in that connection. General MacArthur has stated that he tried to protect the lives of American boys by bombing the bridges across the Yalu River, which was the port of entry of the Chinese Communists, but that order was countermanded from Washington on the theory, apparently that if we bombed the bridges and kept the Chinese Communists on their side of the river, we might make them mad.

I wonder whether the Senator from Connecticut, being somewhat of an expert, as I gather from his speech today, will tell us whether he does or does not approve of someone in Washington countermanding the orders of the military commander in the field?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I hope nothing I have said today has given anyone the impression that I think I am an expert on military matters. I went through 4 years of military school and ended up as a private; and I served as a private in the First World War. I do not pretend to be in any sense an expert on these military questions.

I do like to think that I have some competence in the field of foreign policy, in which I have worked for years, and, of course, grave political considerations are intimately wrapped up with today's discussion. My talk today has been from the political aspect more than the military aspect.

In the second place, and this I have perhaps emphasized even more, I feel that all of us who serve here in the Senate can and must speak with authority on the historical and constitutional operations of our Government under civilian authority.

In the third place, I do not think it takes a military expert to prefer the judgments of the civilian authority and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the judgments of a theater commander in the field, in regard to certain types of key and crucial decisions.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. As 96 Senators, we shall decide, I assume, whether we approve the judgment of General MacArthur or whether we intend to follow the appeasement policies as enunciated today by General Marshall. We must make that decision. Of course, I know I cannot force the Senator from Connecticut to answer this question; but in view of the fact that he has been advising the Senate today, I should like to know whether he would approve General MacArthur's order to bomb the bridges across the Yalu River, so as to keep the Communists on their side of the river, instead of having them come over the river and kill American boys, or whether the Senator from Connecticut approves the countermanding of that order either by General Marshall or by the State Department or by someone else. I also call the Senator's attention to the fact that General MacArthur said that, after very vigorous protests to Washington, they officially allowed the original order to stand regarding the bombing of those bridges.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I have today tried to avoid in my comments a discussion of many important questions upon which further evidence is expected to be offered as the testimony unfolds. It seems to me that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, if they issued to General MacArthur the order which forbade him to bomb those bridges, must have been acting on information and knowledge which perhaps also affected our world-wide position and not merely our position in Korea. We have had at all times, as I have pointed out in my remarks today, the problem of cooperating with the United Nations, of acting within the United Nations, of taking the views of our allies into account, of trying to bring our allies to an even greater extent into the action with us. We know that many considerations must have been involved for the Joint Chiefs, but we do not yet know the extent to which they may have influenced the decisions to which the Senator from Wisconsin refers. It is an area to be explored, as indicated this morning by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], when the Joint Chiefs of Staff themselves appear before the committees.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I suggest that the Senator from Wisconsin ask these questions then, and upon the replies made, perhaps the others of us will be better able to pass judgment. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Senators have already asked those questions. For the Senator's benefit, they asked Douglas MacArthur what orders he had issued to protect his troops when the Chinese Communists started to pour across the Yalu River. He said, "I ordered the bridges bombed." He then testified further that the order had been countermanded. From the Senator's answer, I understand that he feels that had MacArthur been allowed to bomb the bridges and thus save the lives of our men, it might have affected adversely the administration's over-all global policy.

I have no desire to ask the Senator any further questions.

Mr. BENTON. I do not know what was determinative or influential regarding the issuance of the order to General MacArthur, but I know that in the waging of any war there is an ebb and flow of correctness of decision, and that no general who ever lived was so great that he did not make mistakes. Further, I suppose no Joint Chiefs of Staff ever functioned which did not make mistakes. But I am willing to stand on the premise that we have established the Joint Chiefs of Staff in order to exercise their judgment on the basis of over-all information of many kinds which flows in from all over the world, the kind of information which does not go to any local theater commander, and that this method of operating our Military Establishment is geared under the civilian authority which must control our Government—an authority which I do not propose to abdicate or to see lightly tossed aside.

I yield the floor.

(The article previously referred to is as follows:)

MACARTHUR'S TESTIMONY A SERIES OF CHALLENGES—THEY ARE AIMED AT TRUMAN PERSONALLY AND AT MANY IMPORTANT FEATURES OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY—BASIC DIFFERENCES DEFINED

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 5.—In hours of questioning by Senators this week, General MacArthur challenged the President personally and Mr. Truman's foreign policy as expressed in the limitations on military action in the Far East; also the validity of all the reasons given for these limitations. The specific challenges were too numerous even to list here, but some important items were:

1. The President and General MacArthur differ fundamentally on how to end Communist aggression against the Republic of South Korea, the core of the dispute centering on what military measures to take against the Communist Government of China.

2. Under prodding by Senator KEFAUVER, General MacArthur took the extreme position of declaring that officers on active service, including those in his own command, who feel that the full truth is vital to the public interest and is not being given by their civil or military superiors should have full freedom to assert it publicly.

3. When armed force is employed in a situation the area commander's exercise of authority in the political and economic as well as the military field should not be limited in any way by the superior civil power except by relieving him.

THE DUBIOUS PRIZE OF HONG KONG

4. The Chinese Communists would not find it to their advantage to take Hong Kong from the British now because of the flow of strategic materials that come to them through that port. If or when the Peiping government attains its ends in Asia, however, it will promptly seize Hong Kong.

5. We do not need Formosa for occupation, for bases, or much of anything else. But if we permit it to fall into unfriendly hands, the Pacific will be lost, and Alaska and the Pacific coast will be actively threatened.

6. In trying to buy time with the limitations imposed on United Nations military action in the Far East, we are not buying time; we are sacrificing our youth to no effective purpose (and presumably Soviet Russia can make as good use of time as we can).

7. This is inertia * * * there is no policy; there is nothing. I tell you, no plan or anything.

8. Soviet Russia is in no position to provide the supply line it would need to intervene in a war in the Far East; also the stakes are not large enough for Soviet Russia to become engaged there. The general agreed he may be wrong, as he was in his belief that the Chinese Communists would not intervene in Korea. But our own intervention there exposed us to risks which, against the world threat of communism, must be taken.

CAN'T SAY LET WAR GO ON

9. We are in war in Korea, and, when you are in a war, you can't just say, "Let that war go on indefinitely while I prepare for some other war," unless you pay for it by the thousands and thousands of American boys.

10. The method used by the President in dismissing General MacArthur was without

precedent and undoubtedly the interest of the United States was jeopardized by such a summary mode of turning over great responsibilities which involve the security of our country.

11. In saying that "no segment of American society should be so gagged that the truth and the full truth shall not be brought out," General MacArthur said he was not—as Senator MCMAHON suggested—proposing that there be a "national referendum" on how to "conduct the strategy of defending America." But he said it remains a fact in this country that the voters hold a referendum on an Administration every four years.

12. He would not bomb Soviet sources of supply to the Chinese Red armies because that is not a casus belli under international law. Also, the general has no evidence that Russians have entered the Korean war directly in any way.

Some of these points made by General MacArthur, who presented a positive policy in sharp contrast to the administration's negative one, though he espoused a much more militant, global version of the Truman doctrine than its author ever has are best amplified by the following citations from his testimony:

On the function of area commanders

"The general definition which for many decades has been accepted was that war was the ultimate process of politics; that, when all other political means failed, you then go to force; and, when you do that, the balance of control, the balance of concept, the main interest involved, the minute you reach the killing stage, is the control of the military. A theatre commander, in any campaign, is not merely limited to the handling of his troops; he commands that whole area politically, economically and militarily. You have got to trust [him] at that stage of the game when politics fail and the military takes over; you must trust the military, or otherwise you will have the system that the Soviet once employed of the political commissar who would run the military as well as the politics of the country."

On the immediate objective of the United Nations in the Far East

"As far as the United Nations in Korea is concerned, it is limited to Korea. They are trying to clear Korea. I don't understand that in any decisions or discussions that have arisen we are trying to do more than stop the Chinese from aggression in Korea. I believe when we do that we have to put sufficient military force upon them to do it. I do not believe we can put that sufficient military force upon them if we limit ourselves to the inhibitions we do now, just in the area of Korea. I believe the minute that we put those pressures on them that the Red Chinese, if they have any sensibilities of discretion at all, would enter into a cease-fire parley."

On publicizing differences with higher authority

"I have always felt * * * that any Member of Congress is entitled, within security provisions, to any information that he asks for. When Representative MARTIN, of Massachusetts, wrote and asked my opinion, I immediately replied. It made so little impression upon me, I will say, that later on when somebody said a great deal of commotion had been raised by that letter, I had to consult my files to see what the letter was. * * *

"It was merely a routine communication such as I turn out by the hundreds. I did not have the faintest idea whether Mr. MARTIN would make the letter public. * * * I would not have the slightest objections to any officer in my command stating his honest views on any subject in any way he wished."

It is manifestly impossible in this space to do more than deal with the high lights of a lengthy examination in which General MacArthur asserted that at least one statement by the President was tommyrot, and called for no United Nations dealings with Communist China and an ultimatum to Peiping—the consequences of which, if necessary, the United States should be willing to face alone, and could successfully, without landing ground troops in China or bringing Russia into what would then be a global war.

EXHIBIT 1

Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I have many questions, and I will make no apology for the time that I take because we are here discussing the survival of our Nation, which means the future of civilization itself.

General, we are faced, are we not, with a global problem in the ambitions of Communist Russia?

General MACARTHUR. Faced with what, Senator?

Senator MCMAHON. A global problem.

General MACARTHUR. Unquestionably.

Senator MCMAHON. You have given that problem a great deal of thought, I assume? Don't you hear me, General?

General MACARTHUR. Yes. Yes; I have, sir.

Senator MCMAHON. And, therefore——

General MACARTHUR. With particular attention, of course, to my own theater.

Senator MCMAHON. Pardon me?

General MACARTHUR. With particular attention, of course, to my own theater. My responsibilities are in my own theater.

Senator MCMAHON. That is correct. As you have said on three or four occasions today, you are a theater commander.

General MACARTHUR. I was.

Senator MCMAHON. I accept the amendment.

I believe you said to Senator JOHNSON that as a theater commander you had made no determination in your own mind on either universal military service or concerning the amount of troops or number of troops that we should have for our global defense.

General MACARTHUR. That is correct. That problem did not fall within my responsibilities or authorities.

Senator MCMAHON. I take it, therefore, General, that you have not clearly formulated in your own mind—I do not say this critically because you were a theater commander—but you have not formulated in your own mind how we are going to put on a global defense if Russia decides to make global war upon us.

General MACARTHUR. I have my own views, Senator, but they are not authoritative views, and I would not care to discuss them. Because I understand I am here to discuss my own theater. There are other authorities that have all those responsibilities and authority. They are not mine, and I therefore would not superficially inject myself into those discussions.

Senator RUSSELL. It is necessary for the Chair to make an announcement. I have just been advised a quorum call is in progress in the Senate preceding a vote on a motion to recess. I wish to make that announcement for those here who might be interested in voting on the motion to recess.

Senator KNOWLAND. Maybe we could pair up here.

Senator FULBRIGHT. What does the Chair wish to do?

Senator SPARKMAN. Maybe we can all pair.

Senator RUSSELL. It might be we can work out pairs. We may have the Sergeant at Arms over after us.

Senator WILEY. If they do not get a quorum, they can recess.

Senator LONG. Would it not be possible for members to be put on that quorum and simply pair these? That has been done occasionally.

Senator RUSSELL. That has been done on occasion but no debate follows this quorum call. A motion to recess is, of course, not debatable. I assume that they will proceed until they get a quorum.

Senator WILEY. Wait until the Sergeant at Arms comes.

Senator RUSSELL. I am perfectly willing to proceed. I do not want to rush anyone. I do not desire to interrupt these hearings. I want everyone to have a full opportunity to express themselves by questions.

I may decide it is necessary to go over if the vote comes on the motion to recess, and will turn the hearings over to the Senator from Texas.

Senator CONNALLY. We got permission to sit during the Senate meetings.

Senator RUSSELL. Everyone seems to be in mind to proceed.

Senator MCMAHON. General, we are not operating under any resolution here, we are here inquiring as to the effects it will have on our country and our defense if we follow the recommendations which you made in your speech to Congress and have repeated here today.

I take it, General, that you believe that what we do in following out your recommendations will not necessarily bring the Soviets into the war. Is that your position?

General MACARTHUR. That is my belief.

Senator MCMAHON. Suppose, General, you are wrong about that. You could be wrong about it, couldn't you?

General MACARTHUR. Most assuredly.

Senator MCMAHON. You did not believe at one time that the Communists of China, Red China, would come into the conflict in Korea.

General MACARTHUR. I doubted it.

Senator MCMAHON. They did. You now doubt that the Soviets——

General MACARTHUR. In that I was, however, supported by practically everybody. The American Government through its Secretary of State, through its Central Intelligence Agency, who were the best-informed authorities, presented that fact.

Senator MCMAHON. In other words, everybody that had to do with it turned out to be wrong.

General MACARTHUR. Practically, although, Senator, I think everybody realized that that risk was involved. When we first entered Korea that was inherent to it and it was a calculated risk that was taken.

Senator MCMAHON. And now of course we can't all agree that there is a possibility that the Soviets will come in if we adopt the recommendations that you propose to carry out.

General MACARTHUR. There is that possibility, but there is the certainty as against that, Senator, that if you don't carry out those recommendations, you are going to lose Americans by the thousands every month.

You are going to lose such a basis that it may endanger the entire preparedness program.

If you keep on losing men at the rate you do now for an indefinite time, you may find the entire preparedness program will come up against such obstacles as might endanger it.

I believe that what you argue are possibilities. They are possibilities. Everyone will admit that, but what I am arguing against is a certainty.

There is no question about the war being in Korea. There is a great question whether the war would extend someplace else.

You have got a war on your hands, and you can't just say, "Let that war go on indefinitely while I prepare for some other war," unless you pay for it by the thousands and thousands and thousands of American boys.

Now that is the responsibility of those who make this decision, and it is a responsibility.

As far as I am concerned, I repeat I wouldn't want it on my shoulders.

Your policy as you enunciated there, Senator, means——

Senator McMAHON. I haven't enunciated it yet. I am simply asking for information as to your views. You see, General, what I want to find out from you is this: That if you happen to be wrong this time and we go into all-out war, I want to find out how you propose in your own mind to defend the American Nation against that war.

General MACARTHUR. That doesn't happen to be my responsibility, Senator. My responsibilities were in the Pacific, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the various agencies of this Government are working day and night for an over-all solution to the global problem.

Now I am not familiar with their studies. I haven't gone into it. I have been desperately occupied over on the other side of the world, and to discuss in detail things that I haven't even superficially touched doesn't contribute in any way, shape, or manner to the information of this committee or anybody else.

Senator McMAHON. General, I think you make the point very well that I want to make; that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief has to look at this thing on a global basis and a global defense.

You as a theater commander by your own statement have not made that kind of a study, and yet you advise us to push forward with a course of action that may involve us in that global conflict.

General MACARTHUR. Everything that is involved in international relationships, Senator, amounts to a gamble, risk. You have to take risks.

Senator McMAHON. I couldn't agree with you more.

General MACARTHUR. What I faced in the Pacific wasn't something that was speculative in the future. It's right now. What are you going to do to stop the slaughter in Korea? Are you going to let it go on? Does your global plan for defense of this United States against war consist of permitting war indefinitely to go on in the Pacific? What is your plan or what is the other plan to stop the war there in the Pacific?

It is there. There is no sophistry of talk when you see thousands of battle casualties every month; you can't talk those off that there is no war. There is a savage war there.

If you are not going to bring the war to a decisive conclusion, what does the preparedness mean? You are faced with a fact in Asia.

You are speculating about what takes place in the rest of the global parts of the world. I assume that the plans that are being made are to meet the contingencies that may arise Otherwise the whole force of the United States would be poured into Korea.

Senator McMAHON. General, the purpose of this hearing certainly is not for any Senator and certainly not one who is so ill-equipped as I am, to argue this question with you at this time.

My purpose is to try to develop information that will be helpful to me in reaching my final conclusions on the matter. General, are you aware of what our atomic preparedness situation is today?

General MACARTHUR. Only in a very general way, sir.

Senator McMAHON. I am not asking you for numbers, but do you know the numbers in our stockpile?

General MACARTHUR. I do not. I have no more information on that than the average officer would have. It's confined to a very select circle. You know.

Senator McMAHON. Have you ever asked about that? Have you ever asked for information on it, General?

General MACARTHUR. On the atomic thing?

Senator McMAHON. Yes.

General MACARTHUR. I have discussed it, but I have never attempted to pry into matters which I regarded as beyond my own authority.

Senator McMAHON. In the course of your conduct of your duties in the Far East, as a theater commander, did you ever make inquiry of the Joint Chiefs of Staff about our atomic situation?

General MACARTHUR. I have made inquiries as to what might be the potentialities and possibilities of the use of the atomic bomb in my own theater. I know what that is.

Senator McMAHON. Have you at any time advocated the use of the atomic bomb in your theater?

General MACARTHUR. Of the atomic bomb?

Senator McMAHON. Yes.

General MACARTHUR. The limit of——

Senator McMAHON. Pardon me?

General MACARTHUR. The limit of what I did was to ask for information as to whether there were any plans to use the atomic bomb in the Far East.

Senator McMAHON. Did you recommend its use?

General MACARTHUR. I did not. As I understand it, the use of the atomic bomb has, by fiat and order, been limited to the decision of the President of the United States.

Senator McMAHON. That is true. Of course, I wondered whether you made any recommendations.

General MACARTHUR. Why should I, Senator?

Senator McMAHON. I am not asking you why; I am just asking whether you did, and you answered that you did not.

General, are you familiar with the fact that we held some tests out in Nevada a few months ago which were known as the Nevada tests?

General MACARTHUR. I am aware of that.

Senator McMAHON. Are you familiar with the results of those tests?

General MACARTHUR. Only in a very general way.

[Deleted.]

Senator McMAHON. Do you think or have you any intelligence, any access to intelligence reports about Russian potentialities in the building of atomic weapons?

General MACARTHUR. Very little.

Senator McMAHON. Does that little give you an estimate as to how many they possess today?

General MACARTHUR. No, sir.

Senator McMAHON. Have you sought to get that information?

General MACARTHUR. Not at all.

Senator McMAHON. If you will precipitate—the question is withdrawn.

If, by following your recommendations, a conflict is precipitated with Soviet Russia, be it in the European theater or the United States itself, or in the Far East, you have made no study as to the kind of damage that they could do to our forces in Korea and our general situation in the Far East with their atomic weapons; is that correct?

General MACARTHUR. I don't believe for a minute from my general knowledge of the situation that the enemy has the potential or the inclination to use his limited atomic weapons in such an area as Korea or China.

Senator McMAHON. You said this morning, General, that you did not believe that the Russians could land in Japan if we kept control of the sea around Japan, and in the air. Was I correct?

General MACARTHUR. Not quite, Senator. I said that they couldn't overrun Japan; that they would be limited to isolated efforts.

Senator McMAHON. Well, when I said take Japan, I meant take it effectively into their control, as I understood it, and you said it would be impossible.

General MACARTHUR. With that explanation, I agree. As long as we hold command of the sea and of the air, no potential enemy can launch an amphibious force against us with any hope of success.

As long as we maintain sea and air control of the ports of Asia, from Vladivostok all the way down to Singapore, they can't successfully launch an effort against us. As long as we maintain that, the enemy would have grave difficulty in overrunning anything in our littoral island line of defense.

Senator McMAHON. Have we sufficient planes and ships, in your opinion, in the Far East today to maintain that kind of a defense, if the Russians should precipitate themselves into this battle?

General MACARTHUR. I believe they are available.

Senator McMAHON. Are they in the Far East today?

General MACARTHUR. I couldn't tell you, Senator, what the enemy would launch against us. It is speculative. I gave my best estimate of that this morning. We have certain reserves, and I am sure that if the enemy attacked in overwhelming force that we could get our reserves there in time to combat them. I believe sincerely that we have the air resource to beat off such an attack, and the Navy resource is unquestioned.

Senator McMAHON. If they should precipitate that attack in the Far East, would the Russians—I take it, with the forces that they have in the Far East at this time, that we would have to take some of our Reserves from the continental United States and send them over?

General MACARTHUR. It would depend upon the force with which the enemy attacked.

Senator McMAHON. You said this morning that they had [deleted] thousand planes there, I believe.

General MACARTHUR. Some estimates were made. My own estimate was that they could maintain about half that at the start, and that their strength would diminish rapidly from wear and tear; but I believe that they are too far from their bases in continental Russia to keep up a magnified pressure. They have not got the potential to bring the gasoline; they have not got the potential to bring a great many things over.

I also said that I thought from the disposition of the Russian forces in Siberia that they were defensive positions.

Senator McMAHON. Has your intelligence advised you of any message from the Russians as to what they intend to do if we bomb in Manchuria?

General MACARTHUR. None whatsoever. If such information exists, it has never come to me. If such information exists, I am sure it would have been sent to me.

Senator McMAHON. General, are you aware of the kind of civilian defense we have in the United States today?

General MACARTHUR. Only in a general way, Senator.

Senator McMAHON. You know it is very sketchy.

General MACARTHUR. I would assume so.

Senator McMAHON. Have you thought about the possibility——

General MACARTHUR. For that matter, I am quite sure it is sketchy in every country in the world.

Senator McMAHON. Have you thought about the possibility of the Russians' launching a surreptitious attack on the United States and its vital production centers through atomic sabotage?

General MACARTHUR. In a general way only. Once again that isn't my theater of responsibility, Senator.

Senator McMAHON. I understand that, General. I am just trying to introduce a few of the considerations that the Joint Chiefs

of Staff and their Commander in Chief, I presume, must have in mind in determining what kind of action should be taken in any specific theater.

General MACARTHUR. That is quite correct, Senator; I have no doubt they do. But I have just read what the opinion was of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on January 12, which was to follow in general the same concepts that I have.

If they have changed, that is something else again. I wasn't informed of it, but at that time they agreed with my concepts.

Senator MCMAHON. And, of course, General that recommendation of January 12—and I do not assert it as a fact at this time, the Joint Chiefs will have to explain that themselves—but there is certainly the possibility that that concurrence, if you wish to call it that, was based upon the contingency of a forced evacuation of Korea.

That possibility existed, didn't it, General?

General MACARTHUR. That possibility exists, yes, sir. What you are driving at, as I get it, Senator, is our enunciating the risks that come if the Soviets should attack. All I can say is that those risks should have been discounted when we entered the war in Korea.

Nothing new has developed to change it. Those responsibilities of those who sent our troops into Korea were just as great at that time as they are now. The risks were just as great then as they are now.

That was a considered action taken by the Government of the United States. I didn't have a thing to do with it. This was a policy that was given me.

Now, those risks that you are enunciating now are the risks that were involved in the original decision. They were taken by the United States.

Now, the United States has committed itself there. All I am advocating is how we can accomplish our purpose or extricate ourselves from the difficulties that have been involved.

Senator MCMAHON. And now, General, before it is too late, I want to examine the risks of the course which you wish to pursue because if the risks are so great as to prejudice the existence of this Nation, then it is time we stopped and weighed those risks until we get into a position to rebut them and to meet them.

General MACARTHUR. You assume, of course, that relatively your strength is going up much more than the enemy's. That is a doubtful assumption, Senator.

Senator MCMAHON. Well, General, if that is not true on the short-term basis, then it will come, I am sure, as news to everybody in the United States Senate, because if there is one thing we have been proceeding on it is—and our mobilizer in chief said the other day that until 1953 without an attack, and we will be so strong that they can't attack us, because by that time we will have the planes, we will have the bombs, amounts that we haven't got today, we will have the men in uniform, and we may be in shape to meet this attack, which we are not in shape to meet today.

General MACARTHUR. And in 2 years what will be your casualty rate of American boys in Korea?

Senator MCMAHON. And, General, I ask you what our casualty rate will be in Washington, D. C., if they put on an attack—an atomic attack—and I had better change it from Washington, lest I be thinking about myself, to New York or the other cities of the United States, to say nothing of the American boys who are going to die in the air and sea in this logistical sort of support of the forces into China.

General MACARTHUR. All those risks, I repeat, were inherent in the decision of the United States to go into Korea.

Senator MCMAHON. General, I am not saying that they were not. What I am trying to say that now is the time, it would seem to me, to stop, look, and listen and see where we are before we plunge into a course that may take us over the precipice before we are ready.

General MACARTHUR. What is your plan then to end Korea?

Senator MCMAHON. I would like to quote to you your language on going into Korea, which was very beautifully written, and I think it ought to be in the record:

"The decision of President Truman on June 27 lighted into flame a lamp of hope throughout Asia that was burning dimly toward extinction. It marked for the Far East the focal and turning point in this area struggling for freedom. It swept aside in one great monumental stroke all of the hypocrisy and the sophistry which has confused and deluded so many people distant from the actual scene.

General, do you regard the threat to us and our national survival——

General MACARTHUR. The quotation that you read, Senator, is quite true. It did restore at one stroke the enormous prestige of the United States. It confirmed the people of the Far East that we were not going to let them slide into slavery, that we were determined that we were going to meet aggression on every front that it showed itself, that we were not going to confine ourselves and say we will defend in this sector but all the other sectors globally we will let go.

It was the enunciation which was the very antithesis of defeatism, which has been so pronounced that we could not meet aggression except in one area of the world. It meant that we, if the enemy was going to encroach in two areas, we would meet him on two areas; in three areas, we would meet him on three areas; that he was just as divided as we were; that if we could not defend wherever he aggressed or started to attack, you admit before the conflict that you are going to be defeated.

This is global, as you said yourself, this is a global proposition, and you can't let one-half of the world slide into slavery and just confine yourself to defending the other. You have got to hold every place.

Now, in the Far East there was a tremendous belief that we were not going to defend the Far East, and when we moved in to defend Korea, it gave an enormous uplift throughout that entire section of the world.

If there is anything that I have said that led you to believe that I was critical of the decision to defend Korea, I would correct it immediately.

Senator MCMAHON. No, General, I just thought that was such a fine statement.

General MACARTHUR. The only thing I am trying to do, Senator, is to settle the thing in Korea to bring it to a decisive end. I believe it can be brought to a decisive end without the calamity of a third world war. I believe if you let it go on indefinitely in Korea, you invite a third world war. I believe the chances of the terrible conflict that you so rightly dread—and all the rest of us dread with you—would be much more probable if we practice appeasement in one area even though we resist to our capacity all along the line.

That is all I am saying. I am saying it with the acute consciousness of the dreadful slaughter that is going on in Korea today. If it is possible to bring it to a successful and an honorable end, I believe we should take the chance of doing so.

Now in all the discussions today there has been no proposal that has been made here as to how to end the Korean problem satisfactorily and honorably.

I believe in the method, as I have enunciated, and on January 12, the Chiefs of Staff believed so, too.

Now, they may have changed, and shifted. I do not know.

Senator MCMAHON. We will find out.

General MACARTHUR. They will speak for themselves.

Senator MCMAHON. We will find out.

General MACARTHUR. But I still am of that opinion; and I shrink—I shrink, with a horror that I cannot express in words, at this continuous slaughter of men in Korea.

The battle casualties in Korea today probably have passed the million-man mark. Our own casualties, American casualties, have passed 65,000. The Koreans have lost about 140,000. Our losses, on our side, are a quarter of a million men. I am not talking of the civilian populations, who must have lost many, many, many times that.

The enemy probably has lost 750,000 casualties. There are 145,000 of them that are now in our prison bull pens, prisoners, so they might be excepted from that figure because they live; but a million men in less than 11 months of fighting, in less than 11 months of this conflict, have already gone, and it grows more savage every day.

I just cannot brush that off as a Korean skirmish. I believe that is something of such tremendous importance that it must be solved, and it cannot be solved by the nebulous process of saying, give us time, and we will be prepared; or we will be in a better shape 2 years from now—which is argumentative.

I don't know whether we will or not; and neither do you, because you do not know, and none of us know, the capacity of the enemy.

He may build faster than we do. I couldn't tell you.

I don't know that, you are gambling on chances; but I say there is no chance in Korea, because it is a fact—you have lost a million men now. You will lose more than a million if you go on another year; if you go on until 1953, you will lose another million.

What are you trying to protect?

The war in Korea has already almost destroyed that nation of 20,000,000 people.

I have never seen such devastation.

I have seen, I guess, as much blood and disaster as any living man, and it just curdled my stomach, the last time I was there. After I looked at that wreckage and those thousands of women and children and everything, I vomited.

Now, are you going to let that go on, by any sophistry of reasoning, or possibilities? They may be there, but this is a certainty.

What are you going to do? Once more, I repeat the question, What is the policy in Korea?

If you go on indefinitely, you are perpetuating a slaughter such as I have never heard of in the history of mankind.

Now, what I am trying to do is to find some reasonable and honorable way to stop that slaughter. It is not to conquer this country, or China, or anything else.

It is to bring this thing to an honorable end.

If you go on, you are going to destroy not only the casualties that I speak of, which are military, but you are going to destroy that people.

Now, I just cannot bring myself to analyze it with that shrewdness of legal capacity that you enunciate in your argument, which is an argument, to let it by.

Your entire drift has been not to do anything, just keep on fighting, losing and bleeding there; and I think we should make some extraordinary effort to bring it to an end.

Senator MCMAHON. I am not going to characterize your proposition. I do not expect that you are going to characterize my position.

I will take care of that, myself.

Now, I would like to know this, General: Is there any atomic or plane-building capacity in the Chinese mainland that you know of?

General MACARTHUR. None that I know of. The backwardness of industrial development in China precludes even the concept of such an intricate potential.

Senator MCMAHON. Then, General——

General MACARTHUR. They may have some of the natural resources that go into the manufacture of them, of the bombs, I couldn't tell you about that; but, it will never be done in our day. Never, in our day, will atomic weapons be turned out of China.

They cannot turn out the ordinary weapons. They do not have the instrumentalities to turn out airplanes, big ships, big guns, many of the other attributes of modern warfare.

Senator MCMAHON. Western Europe, however, has that capacity, has it not, General?

General MACARTHUR. Senator, as I said, I have not made a study of this matter.

I suppose it has, but I don't know.

Senator MCMAHON. You would not deny that the capacity, both atomic and the production of planes, of Western Europe, combined with Soviet Russia, would outproduce the United States of America—you would not deny that, would you?

General MACARTHUR. Not at all, and any inference from your question that I don't advocate the fullest protection and assistance to Western Europe is quite fallacious, Senator. What I advocate is that we defend every place, and I say that we have the capacity to do it.

If you say that we haven't, you admit defeat. If the enemy has that capacity and is divided on all these fronts, we should be able to meet it.

Senator MCMAHON. General, I do not admit defeat. I am thinking, if this war has to be fought, about the total and complete victory. I do not want to blind myself, and speaking for myself, General, with a devotion for my country that I will match against yours or any man's, I am only speaking about a proposition which I believe is sound, and I know that you will give me credit for believing in that which I think, the same as I certainly give you that credit.

Now, General, do you think that we are ready to withstand the Russian attack in Western Europe today?

General MACARTHUR. Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area. My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I don't pretend to be the authority now on these things.

When I was Chief of Staff 20 years ago, that was my problem, and I would have answered it. The Chiefs of Staff or others here are the ones to answer that query, not me.

Senator MCMAHON. And so, General, you concede, it seems to me, by that statement, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, having access to global intelligence, having made global plans for our defense, may have in that information, and because of that information, made decisions contrary to your recommendations which could be sound.

General MACARTHUR. They didn't on January 12, Senator. They had all the information available at that time, and they made the study and their recommendations were as I read you this morning, which coincided with my own, that if you apply that type of sanction in the Far East, you will bring this conflict to an end, that there is a strong possibility that that would be the result.

Senator MCMAHON. General, in September of 1950 did you have any intelligence that the Chinese were going to come in if we went to the Yalu?

General MACARTHUR. I had no concrete information; no, sir.

Senator MCMAHON. Had you been advised by any of your intelligence officers to that effect?

General MACARTHUR. On September 15?

Senator MCMAHON. In September, any time in September?

General MACARTHUR. I don't recall it, Senator. That the enemy was shifting his forces northward, I knew thoroughly. That he was massing forces along the Yalu I understood, but he was at that time advertising to the world that such Chinese as went in were individuals and volunteers. He specifically proclaimed that China was not involved in that struggle.

Senator MCMAHON. General, when you went down to Formosa, you made an estimate of the effective troops that they could supply, did you not?

General MACARTHUR. I beg your pardon, Senator?

Senator MCMAHON. When you went down to Formosa you made an estimate of the number of effective troops that Chiang could supply?

General MACARTHUR. That the Nationalist Chinese had on Formosa?

Senator MCMAHON. That's right.

General MACARTHUR. They had about a half million; yes, sir.

Senator MCMAHON. How many at that time did you think were effective?

General MACARTHUR. I think that the caliber of the personnel was good. Their equipment, as I explained this morning, was spotty. I think they're the same caliber of troops that we are fighting now in North Korea. I believe they could be brought to the same degree of efficiency, and I think those troops are good troops.

Senator MCMAHON. In the report that you made on your visit to Formosa, did you state how many effective troops Chiang Kai-shek had, in your opinion?

General MACARTHUR. I couldn't tell you, Senator. The report that we made was made by a mission that I sent down there under General Fox.

Senator MCMAHON. How many did General Fox report could be effectively mounted and used?

General MACARTHUR. They all could be if they were properly equipped and trained. How many were available at that time I really couldn't tell you.

Senator MCMAHON. When the suggestion was made, General, that Chiang's troops be brought up to Korea soon after the outbreak of the hostilities in Korea, you made a finding as to their effectiveness at that time, did you not?

General MACARTHUR. I recommended that they should not be brought up to Korea at that time, that Formosa itself was threatened.

Senator MCMAHON. You went so far as to say that they would be an albatross around our neck for months.

General MACARTHUR. That is correct. They were lacking in artillery, they were lacking in many of the necessities. We were at that time fighting in the Pusan beachhead, and untrained troops, only partially equipped, would have been of little effectiveness.

However, the main reason that I wished those troops held on Formosa was to defend Formosa, and when the Chinese troops that were threatening Formosa moved north to attack us in Korea, I recommended that the wraps be taken off of the Nationalist troops.

Senator MCMAHON. That was based upon the fact that the Chinese Communist effectives had been moved north on the Yalu, and they did not have anything on the mainland of China with which to carry on the attack on Formosa?

General MACARTHUR. Nothing that would seriously threaten Formosa, correct.

Senator MCMAHON. Now who reported that to you, General, your own intelligence or CIA?

General MACARTHUR. I couldn't tell you. It came from various sources, largely from the Chinese Nationalists themselves who reported the movement of the Communist troops.

Senator MCMAHON. And did they report to you that there were not sufficient effectives left in the south to carry on the raid on Formosa which you feared at the time that the Yalu troops were down in south China?

General MACARTHUR. There was no such report to me. That was my own estimate of the situation on the strengths and relative positions of the various forces.

Senator MCMAHON. When did the CIA leave Korea, General?

General MACARTHUR. When did the what?

Senator MCMAHON. The CIA, the Central Intelligence Agency operatives leave Korea?

General MACARTHUR. I couldn't tell you. The Central Intelligence Agency doesn't operate under me at all.

Senator MCMAHON. Were they directed to leave Korea after the Inchon landing by your command?

General MACARTHUR. I don't know what you are talking about, Senator.

Senator MCMAHON. General, I understood that the Central Intelligence agents disappeared from Korea after the Inchon operation, that very brilliant operation which you directed.

General MACARTHUR. The Central Intelligence agents, Senator, are not under me. As far as I know they never were in Korea. They may have been, but it is not an agency that functions under me. It functions under the Central Intelligence controls here.

Senator MCMAHON. You regard your information on China as today being much more extensive than it was 2 or 3 years ago, do you not?

General MACARTHUR. I don't know what you mean by that.

Senator MCMAHON. General, do you think today that you are better informed about the internal situation in China, the general situation in China, than you were 3 years ago?

General MACARTHUR. I thought I was pretty well informed at both times, Senator.

Senator MCMAHON. You think you were?

General MACARTHUR. Yes.

Senator MCMAHON. Well, I quote from the March 8, 1948, report to the Honorable CHARLES A. EATON, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives, in answer to the request that was made by the House committee to you for your opinion on things in the Far East, and you said, if I have a correct copy of it, "China, as you perhaps know, is a theater of the United States Navy, controlled outside the scope of my existing authority. I have no representatives there, and apart from general background knowledge, such detailed information as has been made available to me has been derived largely by indirection. Exhaustive investigations of the Chinese situation have been made by responsible United States officials, but these studies are not within my channel of information or command, and in consequence I am not adequately familiar therewith. I have furthermore not had the opportunity to visit China for many years."

You have not, of course, had an opportunity to go there since this time, General?

General MACARTHUR. No, sir.

Senator MCMAHON. "With this background, you will readily perceive I am not in a position to render authoritative advice with reference to the myriad of details on which a definitive policy for this particular must necessarily rest."

General MACARTHUR. That is all correct.

Senator MCMAHON. "The Chinese problem is part of a global situation which should be considered in its entirety in the orientation of American policy. Fragmentary decisions in disconnected sectors of the world will not bring an integrated solution."

Senator WILEY. What is the date of that?

Senator MCMAHON. I quote from the letter of the general's, dated March 3, 1948.

You also said, General, "In the determination of our global policy care must, of course,

be exercised to avoid commitment of our resources beyond what we can safely spare; the sapping of our national strength to the point of jeopardy to our own security and the overburdening of our people beyond their capacity to maintain a standard of life consistent with the energies with which they are naturally endowed."

I will be glad to submit for the record the whole letter.

You remember that letter, of course, General? You referred to it earlier today.

General MACARTHUR. The basic conditions have completely changed since that letter was written, Senator. The war has been precipitated in Korea, and to attempt to apply the rationale of what existed at the time and what exists today is quite fantastic.

Senator MCMAHON. General, do you believe in the concept of collective security?

General MACARTHUR. What do you mean by "collective security?"

Senator MCMAHON. Do you believe in the concept of collective security upon which our foreign policy is based?

General MACARTHUR. What do you mean by "collective security?"

Senator MCMAHON. I mean the attempt to weld together a military alliance to keep the peace such as we have attempted to do in the North Atlantic Pact.

General MACARTHUR. I have only a superficial knowledge of the North Atlantic Pact, Senator. I am not prepared to discuss it in any way, shape, or manner.

Senator MCMAHON. Neither its provisions nor its implementation?

General MACARTHUR. I have only the ordinary knowledge that any officer would have on it. You have experts on that. General Eisenhower and others have appeared before you very recently with all the intimate knowledge that comes from the authority and responsibility he has.

Senator RUSSELL. Gentlemen.

Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have one more question.

Senator RUSSELL. Under the order heretofore, on motion, and in addition, under the information conferred by the Sergeant at Arms, he has been instructed to bring the Senators to the floor.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, might I ask this question before we leave: Is it understood that when we resume, whenever it may be, next week, or otherwise, that we will start where we left off here, so that those of us who came in at the tail end of this committee table, will not get on the tail end again?

Senator RUSSELL. I might say to the Senator from California that I have not forgotten the time when I was in that position on the committees.

General MACARTHUR. Senator, do you think you could clear me in another day? If you do, I will try to get down from New York tomorrow.

Senator RUSSELL. General, that is a matter wholly beyond my control. I do not know. I have no idea on earth what course the questions will take. I should be very happy if you could testify tomorrow. I will endeavor to do so, but I have no control over it.

Rather than make such assurance, I would prefer that you come back next week.

Senator WILEY. Let us try, at least we can get that out of the way tomorrow, and then come back for rebuttal, the rebuttal that Senator MORSE has in mind.

Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear what the last proposal was.

Senator RUSSELL. The general inquired of me as to whether or not I thought that the committee could finish with him if he came back tomorrow. I have stated that I could not answer that question. I have no idea as to what might develop in the course of this testimony.

Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Chairman, as I have told you, I looked at the clock, and I saw it was past 6 o'clock, but I have a great many more questions which I propose to address to the general, and I might add I have no apology for it at all, for the length of time that I take on this hearing.

Senator RUSSELL. I did not ask the Senator to apologize.

Senator MCMAHON. I realize that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I was not directing that remark to the chairman, I was putting it in the record.

I certainly want to apologize to the chairman if he thinks I was directing it to him.

Senator RUSSELL. I just want to have the record show that the chairman is not rushing you.

HEARINGS OF FRIDAY, MAY 4

Senator RUSSELL. The committee will come to order.

* * * * *

When the committee recessed on yesterday, I believe that Senator MCMAHON was questioning.

Senator MCMAHON. Since yesterday I have been giving this thing some thought and——

Senator RUSSELL. Will the Senator spare me a moment? I would like to read into the record for the benefit of the committee a letter I wrote to the Defense Establishment with respect to their method of combing the testimony for secret data. I addressed it to the General Counsel of the Department of Defense because he had been sent up to confer with me when I requested that some representative discuss some proper procedure for handling secret documents and evidence of a classified nature.

"DEAR MR. LARKIN: This letter will furnish guidance for the personnel charged with examining the transcript of testimony taken before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees for the purpose of indicating material which, for security reasons, should not be made public.

"The sole criterion for making a deletion from the original stenographic transcript will be whether the publication of the material would be harmful to the national interest because of security considerations. It is recognized that in addition to strictly military security, the corollary consideration of policy security insofar as our relationships and negotiations with other nations are concerned may be a factor in some instances.

"For this reason it may be desirable that the officer acting for the Department of Defense consult with an appropriate representative from the Department of State or other departments or agencies with a view toward having a qualified individual available to assist in passing upon questions where other than strictly military security is involved.

"It is requested that personnel examining the transcript be particularly diligent in their efforts to confine themselves to strictly security matters, and to refrain from deleting from the transcript to be made public matters which have no significance from the point of view of national security. Specifically, the fact that portions of the testimony might be critical of, or embarrassing to, individuals or their staffs, is not a consideration in this instance."

I wanted the committee to be advised of the directions that were given.

Senator MCMAHON?

Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday, I have a long series of questions, but I want to reserve them, after I ask 10 or 12 more, for some future time. I want the committee to know I did not want to monopolize the time of the committee, but we have a very important task here and the General is peculiarly equipped to give us at this time now his views.

Senator RUSSELL. I know the other gentlemen of the committee will appreciate that statement.

Testimony of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, accompanied by Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney—resumed

Senator MCMAHON. General, yesterday you said that the drive in November was a reconnaissance in force; is that correct? Do you remember your testimony of yesterday?

General MACARTHUR. That is correct, yes, sir.

Senator MCMAHON. As I recollect it, General, last November you issued a communique in which you said that this was the end-of-the-war offensive which would bring the boys home by Christmas.

General MACARTHUR. That was my hope.

Senator MCMAHON. Did you anticipate that you could get them home by Christmas with a reconnaissance in force?

General MACARTHUR. The reconnaissance would have developed the strength of the enemy. If it was not sufficient to resist us, it would have been an all-out assault and, as I explained in my communique, it would have undoubtedly destroyed the last remnants of the North Korean forces.

Where a reconnaissance in force—the line between a reconnaissance in force and an assault attack is a rather nebulous one and depends upon circumstances. What starts out as a reconnaissance in force might well result in a full-scale assault so far as your forces are concerned.

Senator MCMAHON. Was there any difference in opinion between you and the Joint Chiefs relative to how far you would go toward the Yalu in that advance?

General MACARTHUR. The movements, all tactical and strategic movements that I made, had the prior knowledge and approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Senator MCMAHON. Was there any recommendation by the Joint Chiefs that it would have been wise in their opinion to stop about 5 miles this side of the Yalu on a defensible ridge?

General MACARTHUR. The Joint Chiefs of Staff believed that it would be probably advisable, based upon the considerations at that time, to occupy the North of Korea with South Korean forces. They were adverse to having other nationals there. But the tactical conditions were such that South Koreans were not able to do so.

Senator MCMAHON. Yesterday, General, I pursued a line of questioning concerning the global implications of your proposals, and you informed me that, being a theater commander, you had not taken those into consideration. Now——

General MACARTHUR. One minute, Senator. That is not exactly what I said, if you will let me interrupt you. I said—I intended to convey the idea that the theater commander was only concerned in global studies insofar as his own theater was concerned to coordinate the demands of his own theater with the global problem; a general knowledge of the global problem, of course, is necessary, by all theater commanders.

Senator MCMAHON. General, on page 207 of the testimony you stated in answer to my question as to whether or not we were ready to withstand the Russian attack in Western Europe today:

"General MACARTHUR. Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area. My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I don't pretend to be the authority now on those things. When I was the Chief of Staff 20 years ago, that was my problem and I would have answered it. The Chiefs of Staff or others here are the ones to answer that query, not me."

Senator MCMAHON. Now General, the reason I went into that question was for two reasons.

First, this committee, of course, has a very grave duty of weighing all factors in the defense of this country. We are not confined

to a theater of operations. We are called upon to implement an over-all strategy.

I asked you about it, General, because in your speech to the Congress you stated as follows:

"The issues are global and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector oblivious to those of another is to court disaster for the whole."

General MACARTHUR. Correct.

Senator MCMAHON. Now, General, you are aware, I am sure, of the mechanics that this Government has set up for carrying out this business of weighing these interlocking factors, in other words, our global defense as a whole.

You are aware of that. You are aware that in 1949 the Congress of the United States passed what is known as the National Security Act. In this act—and I will not take the time of the committee to read it, but I think perhaps it should be inserted. Mr. Chairman, at least the pertinent portions of the act should be inserted at this point in the record——

Senator RUSSELL. Is that the act of 1947?

Senator MCMAHON. This is the act; it is entitled, "Coordination for National Security." I haven't got the date of the act, Mr. Chairman, but it is the act setting up the National Security Agency which provides that the membership of the Council, the National Security Council, should be the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the NSRB.

That is the body that has been set up by this Congress to coordinate our total global strategy.

General, I take it from what you said yesterday that you have a high opinion of the members, the present members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General MACARTHUR. I have.

Senator MCMAHON. And the present Secretary of Defense.

General MACARTHUR. I have.

Senator MCMAHON. You recognize them as patriotic gentlemen of capability in their fields.

General MACARTHUR. Unquestionably.

Senator MCMAHON. Now, General, assuming for the sake of discussion that subsequent testimony brings out real differences between you and the Joint Chiefs on how far our far-eastern strategy can best promote our global strategy, and assuming this difference of viewpoint, would you then be prepared to admit that the Joint Chiefs' judgment is better than yours and that the American people would be well advised to follow the judgment of the Joint Chiefs?

General MACARTHUR. The authorities and the responsibilities of the Joint Chiefs are laid down and prescribed by law. Their position in the niche of American governmental procedure is entirely in accordance with the statutes.

Whether I should agree with it or should not agree with it is not pertinent to the actions of the Government of the United States.

As a theater commander I had my own responsibilities and I made my own recommendations, and would again. If they disagreed with those of higher authority, the question of the judgment of that higher authority is not within my hands, and I would not attempt to pass judgment upon it.

That is a matter for public opinion. I therefore would not attempt to answer such a hypothetical question as you put up, that if I were a theater commander and the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their superior authority gave me a directive which I disagreed with, I still would implement it to the very best of my ability.

Senator MCMAHON. General, there are some fundamental basic differences between the Government and yourself as to the wisdom of the best course to pursue in the East; that is true?

General MACARTHUR. Naturally.

Senator MCMAHON. Do you consider, General, that it comes within the province of a theater commander to register publicly with persons in political life, or out of it for that matter, his differences of opinion while he is still in active charge of the theater?

General MACARTHUR. I believe the theater commander has the responsibility of registering his views as he might see fit, if they are honest views and not in contradiction to any implementing directives that he may have received.

I do not believe the implications of your question, that any segment of American society shall be so gagged that the truth and the full truth shall not be brought out.

I believe it is in the interest, the public interest, that diverse opinions on any controversial issue shall be fully aired.

I understand completely that the totalitarian and the Soviet method is entirely in contradiction to that, that they do muzzle certain segments of society. I do not believe that is the American way.

And if your question is intended to mean that I would be subservient to and not register within the proper processes my opinions, I would refute it at once.

Otherwise you do not get what is the foundation of the very liberty that we breathe, that the people are entitled to have the facts, that the judgment of the Government itself is subject to their opinion and to their control; and in order to exercise that, they are entitled to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, Senator.

Senator MCMAHON. Now, let's assume, General, that one of your subordinate generals in the theater of your command had felt as you feel. He, too, is a military man and he, too, is subordinate to his higher command.

Do I take it that you would defend the right of a brigadier general on your staff to give his opinions as to the policy that was proceeding or that was being proceeded with by the Government of the United States.

General MACARTHUR. I wouldn't have a brigadier general or anyone else on my staff that didn't freely and frankly give me his opinions in contradiction to my own. The very value of a subordinate is the freedom with which he expresses his initiative.

I have frequently had officers under my command, not only in my staff, but in my command, that disagreed with me completely and I listened to them and on occasions they have convinced me that I was wrong and they were right. That, I believe, is fundamental.

Senator MCMAHON. Now, General, we are not talking about the same thing, I don't think. I fully agree with you that it would be a poor commander, a poor executive of any kind, who insisted on having "yes men" around him and wouldn't listen to what they had to say.

However, General, that isn't quite what I am talking about. I assume that you had the right and exercised it at any and all times to bring any views that you might have to the attention of your superior officers.

Do you wish the question read?

General MACARTHUR. I didn't get your——

Senator MCMAHON. Read the question, Mr. Reporter.

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

General MACARTHUR. Naturally.

Senator MCMAHON. And you were never restricted in any way in bringing those recommendations or thoughts that you might have on any matter to the attention of your superiors, the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General MACARTHUR. No restrictions whatsoever.

Senator MCMAHON. You see, General, what I was raising was the question of the advisability, if not the propriety of any subordinate military officer to take his differences of opinion, on a governmental policy, when he is in the military command, and chain of command, to people in political life.

General MACARTHUR. I do not know what you mean by "people in political life," Senator.

Senator MCMAHON. We have your answer, General, in the letter to Mr. MARTIN.

General MACARTHUR. It seems to me that the American people are entitled to certain basic facts, when it involves the lives of their sons, and perhaps, the future of our country.

I do not believe in the gag rule, if that is what you are talking about.

I am free to confess I do not quite follow what you are driving at, or how it appertains to this particular investigation.

Senator MCMAHON. General, you are not going to, by that statement, without a mild dissent from me, place in this record that I am in favor of what you choose to denominate as "the gag rule."

I am not an expert on military affairs. I was merely of the opinion, and always have been, from what I did know, that every officer and every man in the United States Army reported to his superiors, and fought out his differences with his superiors.

Now, General, you have stated that the issue that faces this Nation is global in nature.

As I see it, there are three questions, fundamentally, in global strategy:

Who is overwhelmingly the main enemy, in your opinion?

Senator SALTONSTALL. What was that question?

Senator MCMAHON. Who is overwhelmingly the main enemy—that we have to take into cognizance—take into consideration?

General MACARTHUR. Communism, in my opinion.

Senator MCMAHON. When you talk about communism, do you mean as evidenced in Red China, or the Kremlin?

General MACARTHUR. I mean all over the world, including the interior of many of the fine democratic countries of the world.

Senator MCMAHON. General, where is the source and brains of this conspiracy?

General MACARTHUR. How would I know?

Senator MCMAHON. Would you think that the Kremlin was the place that might be the loci?

General MACARTHUR. I might say that it is one of the loci.

Senator MCMAHON. Would you say it was one of the main loci, the main place?

General MACARTHUR. I think the world public opinion would so locate it.

Senator MCMAHON. Pardon me?

General MACARTHUR. I say, I should think that the world public opinion would so locate it.

Senator MCMAHON. You would not differ from that opinion, General?

General, if we were to fight a victorious war with China, will you tell this committee how the strength of the Soviet Union, the armed strength of the Soviet Union would be impaired; that is, assuming she does not come into the war?

General MACARTHUR. Will you repeat the question, please?

Senator WILEY. Why haven't we this loudspeaking system turned on, Mr. Chairman?

Senator RUSSELL. Because of the fact that the change was made from the Armed Services' room here without time for the committee or the chairman of the committee to get the operators of this system who had been cleared in security matters.

(The question pending was read to the witness by the reporter.)

General MACARTHUR. As I have said so frequently, Senator, our purpose, as I see it in the Korean war, is to force China to stop her aggression in North Korea. It does not necessarily mean the overwhelming of China;

it simply means that sufficient pressure be brought upon her to make her stop killing our boys by the thousands in Korea.

Just how that might impinge with reference to the Soviet forces is purely speculative.

Senator MCMAHON. Well, General, you make a pretty good speculation if Russia does not come in, and we do go into China in a limited way for the further extension of a now limited war, it wouldn't impair the 175 divisions that the Soviets are reputed to have, or the 16,000 operational aircraft, nor her stockpile and growing stockpile of atomic weapons, is that not true?

General MACARTHUR. If you mean to say, as you yourself said yesterday, calling attention to the alliance between the Soviet and China, that the diminution of China's potential power doesn't diminish the total power of communism throughout the world, why, that would be fallacious, Senator.

Senator MCMAHON. I asked, General, about its diminution of their military striking power, and I listed their aircraft, their atomic weapons, and their 175 divisions. It is obvious that we agree they are our main enemy—that the Soviet Union is.

General MACARTHUR. I didn't agree to it.

Senator MCMAHON. You do not agree?

General MACARTHUR. I said that communism throughout the world was our main enemy.

Senator MCMAHON. I see.

General MACARTHUR. It is your argument to confine it to one section of the world.

Senator MCMAHON. I see.

And you have the feeling that if we take over China, that we will have made——

General MACARTHUR. I didn't say we would ever take over China, Senator. I said to the contrary yesterday, that we had no objectives in China proper, except to put sufficient force on China so that she would stop her depredation in North Korea.

Senator MCMAHON. General, as I take it, you have no opinion to give us as to when we will be best prepared for a war that would include the Soviet Union, if one had to come?

General MACARTHUR. Such studies as that, Senator, are made by higher authority than my own. They are available, I am sure, to you.

Senator MCMAHON. And, as a former Chief of Staff of the Army, you realize that those higher authorities have to take into account many factors which a theater commander cannot take into account?

General MACARTHUR. Unquestionably.

Senator MCMAHON. What are some of those factors, General?

General MACARTHUR. Some of those factors are the general resources that would be available to us and our allies; the strengths that would be available to the enemy, the disposition of the forces; the general political atmosphere that prevails, the controversial questions that might arise between the governments, and many other things which, of course, would be much beyond any sector commander's responsibility.

Senator MCMAHON. That is very helpful, General, and those are the factors which you assumed that these men whom you believe to be competent have weighed, and must weigh, in relation to our global policy and our global defense.

General MACARTHUR. That is not only their responsibility, Senator, but it is their authority.

Senator MCMAHON. And, General——

General MACARTHUR. It is inherent in their command position.

Senator MCMAHON. If they show up here and say that they have weighed all of those factors, and they believe that the policy which we are pursuing in the east is the correct one, I assume that you would agree with them inasmuch as you have not studied those factors which will influence the opinion of these competent men?

General MACARTHUR. Any decisions they'd make, Senator, are like all other human decisions. They have to pass before the high court of public opinion.

The fact that any group in authority, in carrying out its responsibilities make decisions, that when they make that decision every man accepts it as an infallibly correct one is absurd.

Senator MCMAHON. General, I hope I am a democrat, with a small "d" as well as a large one. I say I hope I am a democrat with a small "d" as well as a large one, but I wonder if the logical extension of your last observation does not mean that we should take a national poll of referendum on how we should conduct the strategy of defending America. You do not wish to be put in that position, General, do you?

General MACARTHUR. Not at all, Senator. Every military man is subject to assignment. If he doesn't perform his duties satisfactorily, he is subject to removal. If an administration doesn't conduct its processes satisfactorily, every 4 years we have a referendum.

Our system of government is based upon that. If you mean that I would in contradiction to that purely democratic method, would accept a Soviet method of placing every issue that comes up before a vote of every member of the citizenship, I would of course not agree.

There is a great difference between pure democracy and a republican form of representative government. The latter is what we're operating under.

Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Chairman, I still have my juncture in mind, if the chairman will just indulge me for a couple of minutes more.

General, your recommendations for our operations in China would still be a limited war. We would not commit American ground forces to the operation in China under any circumstances, as I understand it.

General MACARTHUR. I would not advise it, no, sir. That is of course with the general limitation of the contingencies of campaign.

I believe it would be a master folly to contemplate the use of United States ground troops in China. I do not believe it would be necessary.

I believe, as I explained several times yesterday, that the application of the, if you want to call it, limited pressures would be quite sufficient to bring Red China to a reasonable attitude to gather around a peace conference table to end this savage slaughter.

Senator MCMAHON. General, of course we have had undisputed command of the air in Korea, and those northern Chinese troops keep pouring down into North Korea.

General MACARTHUR. The reason, Senator, that the air has not been more successful in stopping that pouring down is because they don't have the latitude of operation to hit deeper than the Yalu.

You understand the Yalu is only two or three days' march from the front line, and it gives the air a very limited opportunity, especially when you would have a couple of days of obscure weather where the air couldn't hit, you could get troops down from the Yalu to the front line without being subjected to any air attack, but if the air could go where they are assembling, could go to the foundation roots where these armies are being assembled to be thrown at us, they could destroy them.

At least they could so decimate them that their efficacy when they reached the front lines would be most materially decreased.

The Air has done a magnificent job in Korea. Under the limitations placed upon it, it has been far in excess of any anticipation that I had.

Senator MCMAHON. General, I haven't had an opportunity to review the testimony of yesterday except very hastily, but I saw one of the newspapers had a headline that you said yesterday that we would go it alone if necessary. I am sure, General, that you do not underrate the importance of having our allies with us.

General MACARTHUR. Senator, I am not responsible for what the papers say, but in answer to your question I would say indubitably it is advantageous for us to have all of the allies that we can get and procure.

The great difficulty in the contributions that are being made, they're not in commensurate strength with what we put in. The forces we have in Korea are only token forces from everybody except the South Koreans and ourselves.

We have plenty of allies, but the numbers of them do not contribute in the same generous and noble way in which we do.

Senator MCMAHON. Thank you, General. And they should put up more. These allies do have many assets which we must think about in any global struggle.

General MACARTHUR. Unquestionably, Senator, and no one is more fixed in the hope that we can protect them.

Senator MCMAHON. General, you said one thing in your speech—and I will now come to an end—which interested me very much. You said many things that interested me, but this in particular I thought was interesting. You said, and I quote you:

"What the people strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, and a little firmer roof over their heads and the realization of the normal nationalist urge for political freedom."

I thought, General, that that was a very cogent analysis of the yearnings of the people of the world.

Have you, General—I will not take the time, I will try to do it later, but I will suggest the question—have you thought out, and could you give us the benefit of your wisdom as to a program that we can adopt in this country in taking the initiative against the Communist menace which is built upon the existence of the conditions which you described?

General MACARTHUR. I think, Senator, that the United States has already contributed with a degree of generosity, nobility, and the breadth of character which is unique in the annals of the world, along just the lines that you are suggesting.

Senator MCMAHON. That, General, means—I am very happy to hear you say that. That means, of course, that you see some sense in the point 4 program.

General MACARTHUR. Senator, I am not going to discuss any details that I am not familiar with.

Senator MCMAHON. I see.

General MACARTHUR. I know no more about the point 4 program than what I have read in the papers. My observations were based upon my own experiences in the Far East.

Senator MCMAHON. And those experiences in the Far East have led you to the opinion—those experiences in the Far East have brought you to the opinion that it is this kind of a physical condition of the people which has made the inroads of this worldwide conspiracy possible?

General MACARTHUR. It has helped it enormously, beyond doubt.

Senator MCMAHON. General, I would like now—and this is my closing observation—I would like now to read into the record a statement that was made by you when you were Chief of Staff in the year 1932, and I quote:

"The national strategy of any war, that is, the selection of national objectives and the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in obtaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war, are decisions that must be made by the head of state, acting in conformity with

the expressed will of the Government. No single departmental head, no matter what his particular function or title, could or should be responsible for the formulation of such decisions.

"For example, in every war the United States has waged, the national objective to be obtained has involved the Army in land attacks against areas held by the enemy. In every instance missions have been prescribed for the Navy that had in view the assisting and facilitating of the Army efforts. Yet in no case could these missions and objectives have been properly prescribed by the Secretaries of War and Navy acting in unison, or by a single super-secretary acting for both. The issues involved are so far-reaching in their effect and so vital in the life of the Nation that this phase of coordinating Army and Navy efforts should not be delegated by the Commander in Chief to any subordinate authority. Any such attempt would not constitute delegation but rather abdication."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General MACARTHUR. As I look back, Senator, upon my rather youthful days then, I am surprised and amazed how wise I was.

Senator MCMAHON. Thank you.

EXHIBIT 2

GOING IT ALONE

The President rose to the occasion last night in his defense of a limited war in Korea fought by the United Nations. His task was to show that this strategy is superior to General MacArthur's—a broadened war in the Far East fought by the United States and Chiang Kai-shek in alliance. The President, in our opinion, demolished the case in behalf of that kind of nationalistic war. When he said the MacArthur policy would unite the Chinese people behind their Communist rulers, he spoke in words that both history and common sense attest.

As in other countries, communism, it is reported, is on the defensive in China, but the way to strengthen Peiping's hold on China is the very intervention that General MacArthur proposes. Leave aside the impossibility of limiting support for Chiang. The mere fact that this country was actively alined with Chiang would evoke an intense anti-Americanism throughout China. The Chinese are notoriously antiforeign, anyway. They celebrate a round dozen days of humiliation at the hands of foreign invaders or interventionists.

Not only that. After so many years of incessant warfare, they must blanch at the prospect of more and yet more American bombs hurled into their country. More American than Soviet armament is still being fired at our American boys in Korea—American armament that was originally conveyed to the Communists by surrendering Nationalists. It was conveyed in such quantity that the Communists called Chiang Kai-shek, during the high point of the surrenders, their supply sergeant. Yet General MacArthur is proposing, and the administration has given way in part to him, to restore Chiang to that role. It must be bitter tea to the Chinese farmer as he tries to plow his war-soaked fields in intervals of oppression and extortion. If Communist China is as weakened as General MacArthur says, why interfere with the disintegration, and give the Communists a rallying point in American intervention?

It is the past help to the Communist supply sergeant that should have been pondered before new help was sent. It is this past help, and the tribulations of our boys in Korea arising from its impact, that should be pondered before we loose hot words as well as criticism upon our allies for supplying our enemies with strategic materials. Our allies are struggling to their feet after two gruelling contests in a generation with a world aggressor. Their full recovery is inhibited by the partition of Europe. In the old days the industrial west traded with the agricultural east in a system which gave Europe a high standard of living. The division has shattered this system, and an all-out blockade in the Far East would deal Western Europe another blow at its economy which it will certainly not sustain as an ally of the blockaders. Western Europe would suffer far more than a self-contained China (when not Russian-contained) from a complete blockade, and so, incidentally, would Japan and every other Asian country. Moreover, Western Europe, seeing the diversion of American naval power, would see their military security jeopardized as well as their economic security.

The President took for granted a knowledge of some of these repercussions of the MacArthur policy. He concentrated mainly upon the assertion of his belief in the policy of going along with the United Nations. He rested his case upon a common policy with our allies. "We cannot go it alone in Asia," he declared, "and go it in company in Europe." He is abundantly right. If there were a break in Asia, there would be a break in Europe, and Europe's bases and industrial resources would then be denied to American arms. To be sure, a coalition policy in waging a limited war in Korea requires patience. But any other policy would, as the President said, be playing the Kremlin game, which is "to drive a wedge between us and the other free nations," as well as to see us get bogged down in Asia.

EXHIBIT 3

GENERAL MACARTHUR AND THE UN—FAILURE TO MENTION UNITED NATIONS SEEN AS CLUE TO CURRENT DISPUTE; CAN UNITED STATES GO IT ALONE?

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Sometimes a simple clue will open up a seemingly complex mystery.

As, for instance, the failure of Gen. Douglas MacArthur even to mention the United Nations in his recent speech to Congress.

And now, reinforcing this clue, his colloquy with the 83-year-old Senator GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, which lights up, like a star shell, the whole mass of testimony before the combined Senate Armed Services-Foreign Relations Committees relating to Korea and Far East policy.

Senator GREEN wanted to know if the United States wouldn't be going along without the other United Nations, if we adopted the general's program for lending support to Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's troops to invade China and for bombarding Chinese coast cities and establishing a blockade. The general said he could not testify about the United Nations. When asked about his own "expectations," he replied:

"My hope would be, of course, that the United Nations would see the wisdom and utility of that course, but if they did not, I still believe that the interest of the United States being the predominant one in Korea, would require our action."

"Alone?" asked the Senator.

"Alone, if necessary," the general replied. "If the other nations of the world haven't got enough sense to see where appeasement leads after the appeasement which led to the Second World War in Europe, if they can't see exactly the road that they are following in Asia, why then, we had better protect ourselves and go it alone."

Alone? In the hard and cruel sort of world today. Alone?

The general, certainly a great military strategist, here seems to reveal a lack of understanding of over-all political considerations, of the essential meaning of the United Nations, itself, which is the reason for our being in Korea, and of the world-wide calculations upon which our policy necessarily must be based if we are to win a world-wide struggle. These include the adherence and support of friends and allies without whose help we could not possibly sustain ourselves.

This common front, which from time to time may require policy adjustments and compromises, is the very essence of collective security. Nor does that mean "appeasement," a word bandied around too loosely of late.

It is not necessary for a general in the field to understand all of this to win battles, and General MacArthur has won battles. But, by the same token, a general who can win battles is not thereby qualified to set himself up to direct policy which must, perforce, go far beyond the area in which he operates. That is what General MacArthur sought to do, and still is assuming to do, without portfolio, so to speak.

The policy-making job is the function of the civilian government which must operate on all fronts in such a world-wide contest as that in which we are engaged. It must take account of the needs and requirements of those fronts, including the political, and meet them in the manner best adapted to the whole problem at hand.

Unwittingly, the general himself has confessed publicly to the indictment upon which he was removed and has, simultaneously, offered the final, clinching argument for supremacy of the civilian government over the military. That not only has been our tradition, but in sustaining it, in the past, Presidents have had to confront military figures as popular in their day as the general is in this, and weather the same sort of public uproar.

In other similar episodes in the past, too, there have been Members of Congress who joined in the procession and the outcry to promote political interests, and congressional committees investigating, and efforts to give Congress the reins. But always, in the end, this all has passed.

Now, as to practical considerations of today. What would happen under the MacArthur "go it alone" policy to the stability and energy we have helped to pump into the United Nations so that it stood up and met the first open challenge of aggression? To the friendships we have so carefully built up through the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact which, at the same time, have brought economic and military strength to our side? And what would be the effect on the people of China, with whom we always have been friends, if the United States should "go it alone" in all-out war on their teeming cities?

Alone?

Hardly.

EXHIBIT 4

GREAT DEBATE IS MARKED BY MANY PARADOXES—MACARTHUR IMPRESSES MANY OF HIS FOES AND RAISES QUESTIONS FOR FRIENDS

(By James Reston)

The element of paradox kept coming into his [General MacArthur's] argument as the hours went along, and this element disturbed many of his most faithful supporters. For example:

1. The general said it was the responsibility of the administration to decide last year on whether Communist China was going to intervene in the Korean war. A theater commander, such as himself, had only limited opportunities to make an estimate of any such decision, he testified. Yet he did not hesitate to base his proposal for the bombardment of Manchuria on his own estimate that the Russians would not intervene—an estimate not shared by the administration.

2. The general proposed a strategy in the Far East which he conceded might bring about a major war—though he guessed that

it would not—but at the same time he conceded that global strategy was not his responsibility, that he did not know the details of United States or allied preparedness, of Soviet strength in Europe, of the Soviet atomic bomb stockpile, or even of our own atomic development.

NO ATTACK ON RUSSIA

3. It was imperative, the general said, that once you get into a war, you destroy the enemy's capacity to make war upon you, but he shied away on various occasions from any suggestions that we should attack the Soviet Union, which is the source of the enemy's effective war-making capacity.

4. He bitterly criticized the administration's limited war policy in Korea, yet he proposed a limited war of his own: No United States land battles in Asia, no attacks on the Soviet supply routes, and so forth. Nor did he explain what he would do if by attacking Manchuria the war were merely pushed deeper into Asia, with Soviet territory instead of Chinese territory being used as the Communists' privileged sanctuary.

5. Communism, he said, was the enemy, but he refused yesterday to identify the Soviet Union as the center of that world conspiracy. Indeed, he based a great part of his argument on the thesis that, while the Soviet Union and Red China were in a limited partnership for the present, the center and decisive enemy in Korea was the Peiping regime.

6. The center of the Soviet industrial strength, he testified, was in European Russia, and it was important to have bases from which that strength could, if necessary, be attacked. Indeed, allies, he agreed, were useful, but he outlined a policy for the Far East which he agreed was opposed by all our principal allies.

7. Moreover, one of his main complaints, shared by the whole committee, was that the allies were not doing enough to help us in Korea. Yet he insisted that if we expanded the war in the Far East, our allies would go along just as they did when the Korean War broke out. Leadership was what they needed, he observed.

8. Finally, though he has repeatedly testified in the past that the President and only the President could make great decisions of policy involving the military, he rested his argument on the thesis that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were in substantial agreement with him—though they disagreed on bombing Manchuria and did not pass judgment on the political questions involved in the President's decision to oppose the MacArthur strategy.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in RECORD at this point a column by Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, published in the current Newsweek. General Eichelberger was the top deputy to General MacArthur in Japan from the day the occupation of Japan started in 1945 until 1948. Now retired, he has since been an Army consultant on far eastern problems.

General Eichelberger, as commander of the military government unit in Japan, implemented General MacArthur's policies in Japan for 3 years. He was commander of the Eighth Army in the Far East for 4 years, after a brilliant record as a combat general during World War II.

In World War I he was chief of intelligence to General Graves in Russia. He has spent 9 years in Japan, China, Siberia, and elsewhere in the Far East, and was chief of G–2 on China here in Washington for 4 years. By experience and judgment, General Eichelberger qualifies as one of the leading American authorities on the Orient, and I feel, therefore, that his views in this column are pertinent to the great debate now in progress over the best method of bringing the Korean war to a close and averting a new general war.

There being no objection, the article from Newsweek was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE BOMB MANCHURIA?—VIEW OF A TOP AUTHORITY

(By Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, U. S. Army, retired)

(The most immediate point in the great debate on American policy in the Far East is whether the United States should bomb Communist bases in Manchuria. Newsweek here presents the views of a top authority. General Eichelberger was formerly second-in-command to Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Japan.)

Since the Chinese intervention in Korea last fall, it has been my fixed conviction that Mao Tse-tung must have received certain promises from Stalin before committing his troops against the United Nations in Korea. In the last analysis, Mao was entering an undeclared war against the United States. It is hard to believe that he would have taken such a step unless assured of Russian support should the conflict be broadened beyond Korea.

We don't know what commitments the Soviets have made to Mao, but we do know that they are in a position to give the Chinese support—disguised or otherwise—with air power, with submarines, and with troops. And we do know that the treaty of mutual support between China and Russia can be invoked to provide a legal basis for such support. So far, however, the Russians seem to have been reluctant to supply much aid to the Chinese, except for the Soviet-built planes which dart across the Yalu and back again. The Chinese ground forces apparently have little or no Soviet equipment. But the appearance of Russian tanks in the ground fighting could make a great difference and the intervention of Red planes over the battlefield and of Red submarines against our supply lines could be decisive.

What action on our part would bring about Russian intervention? It is my belief that bombing the Red bases in the "privileged sanctuary" of Manchuria would cause the Soviets to enter the war in Korea and that this would also probably herald the beginning of the third world war. Certainly preparations are being made, not only for defending Manchurian bases, but also for putting a Red air force in Korea. This is proved by the construction and improvement of airfields all over Northern Korea.

What would be the effect of Soviet air intervention only (leaving out of consideration the submarines and ground forces)? First, take the lads doing the fighting. No doubt they resent the fact that we are not able to bomb across the Yalu and hit the enemy where he comes from. But, at the same time, these lads have been spared being bombed and strafed as they fight against superior numbers. Since December our battle losses have been consistently lower than those of the enemy with consequent improvement in all ranks in immediate battle contact. All this might be reversed if the enemy had air support.

Second, take the effect of Soviet intervention against our own privileged sanctuary—Japan. Throughout the Korean War the Japanese have realized all too well that we have been fighting their fight across the Sea of Japan. They have natural fears inspired by the presence of powerful Red forces on the island of Sakhalin and on the Asiatic mainland. Most Japanese now hope for an early peace treaty, including the right of rearming ground forces for the defense of their own shores. The Japanese need time, above all, to build their defenses on land and to coordinate them with the air and sea defenses which we will provide.

Third, take the matter of time itself. Is it on our side? A few days ago it was my privilege to visit the plant where the world's fastest global bomber is made. I left with the hope that we can hold off the third world war by every legitimate means until that assembly line and a hundred others can produce the war material which will deter the gentlemen of the Kremlin from total war or spell defeat for them if they force war upon us.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE AND PASSAGE OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

During the delivery of Mr. BENTON's speech,

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request, but before doing so I ask that the proceedings now taking place in the Senate may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following the speech of the able Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, last Friday the Senate passed on the calendar call Senate Joint Resolution 50, a joint resolution to provide for the continuation of authority for regulation of exports. This resolution merely extends present authority to control exports from June 30, 1951, to June 30, 1953.

I may say that the joint resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and was passed unanimously by the Senate.

An identical measure was passed by the House as House Joint Resolution 197 on April 17 and was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency during the time that committee was preparing to report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 50.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 197 and that House Joint Resolution 197 be considered and passed by the Senate. I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the action by which it passed Senate Joint Resolution 50 and that Senate Joint Resolution 50 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from South Carolina if the joint resolution to which he now refers is the one concerning which the distinguished Senator from Kansas spoke to me the other day?

Mr. MAYBANK. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Banking and Currency will be discharged from

further consideration of House Joint Resolution 197.

Without objection, the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 50 was passed will be reconsidered.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 197) to provide for the continuation of authority for regulation of exports was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 50 is indefinitely postponed.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that certain routine nominations in the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, which have been unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee, totaling 1,563 officers, may be confirmed and the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOHN KEE, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 136) allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma, I asked that the item on page 12, Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, be temporarily passed over. If agreeable to the Senate, we could recur to that amendment now, and if the Senator from Oklahoma has any amendment to offer to it he could offer it and get it out of the way.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Arizona, I desire to call up an amendment to the committee amendment on page 12, after line 9. The amendment to the amendment is offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, for himself, and on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Arizona, I understand, requests that a certain amendment on page 12 be considered. I should like to be heard on that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the amendment to the amendment first be read by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 12, line 15, it is proposed by Mr. KERR to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, for himself and other Senators.

Mr. WELKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECRETARY MARSHALL'S TESTIMONY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this morning I attended the hearings before the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, sitting jointly, and heard, I think, the most intelligent and the most intelligible examination of a witness that I have ever had the pleasure of hearing. The examination was conducted by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I think the questions which he asked point up the issue with which we are faced, better, perhaps, than anything else that has been heard. Rather than having the questions and answers buried in the hearings, they should be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the questions asked by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the answers made by Secretary Marshall.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator GEORGE, do you desire to conduct your examination now?

Senator GEORGE. I am not going to ask a lot of questions, but I will ask the general some questions. I think it will take 15 or 20 or 25 minutes maybe, but if you are going to quit for the day——

Chairman RUSSELL. I am trying to ascertain the pleasure of the committee. You are next in order.

Chairman CONNALLY. I think we could run on for a half hour until 1 o'clock.

Senator GEORGE. I have no business on the floor, but a conference.

Senator FULBRIGHT. We ran until 1 yesterday.

Chairman RUSSELL. Suppose we proceed and see how far we get here.

Senator GEORGE. Is Senator BRIDGES finished?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator GEORGE. General Marshall, you went in as Secretary of Defense in September, but may I ask if there is in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, your Department, any estimate of the number of troops that would be required of us in Korea after the decision or when the decision was made that we would go into Korea to repel the invasion of Southern Korea by the North Koreans?

Secretary MARSHALL. Senator, there are successive messages in response to General MacArthur's recommendations as to the number of divisions they would have to have, and that would be increased if the situation changes.

Senator GEORGE. I meant at the time we decided to go in, general.

Secretary MARSHALL. I don't know about that, sir; I will have to look it up.

Senator GEORGE. If there is an estimate there of the troops that would be required, and if it meets with the pleasure of the chairman and the committee, I would be glad for you to direct me where I can get it.

Secretary MARSHALL. I will find out about that, sir.

Senator GEORGE. In your Department. Yes, sir.

Was there also an estimate furnished the President at the time of our ability to adequately support the troops that we were committing in Korea, both in manpower and matériel of war? Could you say whether that estimate was made, and if so, I would be very glad if you could get that for us.

Secretary MARSHALL. I will endeavor to get that, Senator, but I might say, Senator, those questions might be answered very directly by the Chiefs of Staff, who have all the data and are cognizant of what exists and what does not.

Senator GEORGE. Yes. But, of course, I know that the estimate may have varied from time to time, but I am speaking now of the entry into Korea.

Secretary MARSHALL. You are talking about the initial estimates.

Senator GEORGE. What did you say?

Secretary MARSHALL. You are talking about the initial estimates.

Senator GEORGE. The initial estimates; yes, sir; and not only of the number of troops then required, but an estimate of our ability and capacity to adequately support those troops by additional manpower and implements of war.

Secretary MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator GEORGE. General, you referred to the time that you visited China. That was in 1945, was it not?

Secretary MARSHALL. I arrived in China a few days before Christmas, 1945; yes, sir.

Senator GEORGE. You were there almost a year?

Secretary MARSHALL. I was there until the following January, a year later, January 1947, with the exception of a period, I think, of 5 weeks, in March and April of 1946.

Senator GEORGE. Now, General, did you not come back with a rather definite impression that in order to successfully organize or reorganize the Chinese Nationalist Government, it would be necessary to bring about a coalition of the Communists with the Nationalist group in power?

Secretary MARSHALL. Would you state the first part of your question again please, Senator?

Chairman RUSSELL. The reporter I think has it right there where he can read it back.

(The reporter read back the last question.)

Secretary MARSHALL. First, Senator, I will have to turn to the word "coalition." I

went over, very hurriedly of course, and in studying the various policy directives, public statements from this Government and the conditions over there, I came to the conclusion very early that two things had to happen.

One was that there should be a normal democratic form of government, that is with the minority as well as the majority actions and representations in whatever legislative group they had.

The use of the word "coalition" as relating to cabinet coalition was another matter because I gradually reached the feeling that it was practically impossible for the Nationalist Government cabinet appointees to work in any degree of harmony, as a matter of fact to work other than with great bitterness constantly of any other members of that cabinet group that came from the Communist Party.

The temporizing proposal involved there by their own initiative, that is the Kuomintang government, the Communist group and this minority party group was sort of an over-all council wherein the dominant party, the only party really that had any representation in the legislative assembly, was to have 40 members and all the other groups combined were to have 40, but its action could be vetoed by the Generalissimo, and that veto could only be overridden by a two-thirds vote, which meant that defections would have to be from his own group before he could be countered in his action by veto.

Now that was the only approach to a coalition, it seemed to me, that had any possibility of working. They would have a long way to go even legislatively because the bitternesses were so great, they were founded on so many years of contest and also the resistance of those that were members of the government by a long period of years of exclusive authority had become great to the point it was seemingly almost impossible to cut their power. So when you speak of coalition, I would feel that you have to define between that and a two-party government and a three-party government, anyway members of the legislative assembly which represented other parties, which was not the case at the time I was there, because the ruling action in China at that time was the group, the top-level group, which included military leaders, civil authorities and others which actually made the laws themselves, and that was the equivalent under their particular form of a national committee here, the Generalissimo deriving his authority from being chairman of that national committee. That overrode everything else.

The great problem was how you could reduce these animosities, this complete distrust on both sides.

There was in between various minor groups, notably the Democratic League I believe they called it, which lined up with the Communists, and the Young China Party, a democratic scientific group I think you could call it, which didn't step to either side, and all of those minor groups represented a very small following, but the tops were intelligent men.

Now the problem, to go back to your word, is a coalition, and the actual situation was one where the bitternesses were so extreme that any normal coalition such as we conceive the word was an impractical proposition in my opinion.

However, in their own political consultative conference, their PCC as they called it, they themselves shortly after my arrival when their meeting was finally held, had created an organization in which all had agreed, there had been the signatures and the approval of the Generalissimo, to a procedure which involved a coalition cabinet, and that was one of the most serious factors in trying to reach any basis of action.

You were confronted with a force on one side of about 3,000,000, military power, and a force on the other side of something between a million and a million and a half, of which about 400,000 were pretty well trained troops in the way of organization.

Those were in the field against each other, and to set up a political agreement in the midst of that of course presented an extraordinarily difficult proposition.

They had decided themselves, that is the Generalissimo, with an open statement in 1937 and finally up to a meeting, meetings which started back in 1944 which Mr. Hurley participated in, and finally Mao Tse-tung himself participated in, that the matters should be settled by political negotiation to bring a cessation to the fighting.

They finally had this meeting and this PCC conference and came out with a form, with the structure of a government and immediately the fight broke out as to the good faith of the parties in setting up the number of delegates to the proposed constitutional convention which was to have met on May 5, 1946.

I myself did not enter into the political phase of the matter. My job was first to create an armistice so there would be no active fighting during the period of the meetings, the political meetings, and later at the resolution of this PCC I was to act as an adviser in the integration and demobilization of the military forces, Communists' and Government.

From that time onward it was a development of inability to produce any agreements between the two forces, political groups, the Communists and the Government which did not involve such extreme suspicions on both sides that a coalition cabinet to my mind was just out of the question. But they had involved themselves in that in their political convention. What I had understood from the start was, particularly as to the desire of the United States Government, was a two-party system.

Of course there might be other parties too, but their legislature would have included a minority group as well as a majority group. Therefore it would have been purely a majority group without any other representation.

Does that answer the question, Senator GEORGE?

Senator GEORGE. My recollection, General, when you came back, was that you stated to the committee that you had endeavored to bring about, perhaps coalition isn't exactly the right term, but to bring about some integration of the Communists and the anti-Communist groups, and I had the very definite impression that you had recognized the very great difficulties involved but that you came back with the view that the only hope of China, long-run view of it, was to bring about an integration of the Communists with the Nationalist force.

Secretary MARSHALL. Those were the instructions that I went to China with in the beginning.

Senator GEORGE. But on you those were more or less your directives, but I thought you came back with that view.

Secretary MARSHALL. When I came back I was hard put to find a long-view conclusion in the matter because of the failing structure of the Kuomintang and the determination, organization, and discipline of the Communist group and their undoubted advice and possible support that would occur later from the Soviet Government.

Senator GEORGE. Let me ask you one or two questions more.

As I understand your position, your view is that in Korea we have three choices. You spoke of the three choices, and the No. 1 choice was the recommendation as made to this committee by General MacArthur.

I would like to ask you this direct question: If you were assured that Soviet Russia would not come into the action in Korea, the war in Korea, would you be disposed to favor the recommendation made by General MacArthur in the hope that it might bring a speedy determination of the war in Korea?

If you will just let me elaborate for just one or two sentences.

The Red Chinese are already in; I feel there would be no dispute about that point. Whether they are in to the utmost of their capacity to wage war ultimately, they probably are in to the extent that they are presently able to wage war. They are already in, therefore. And if you were assured that the Soviet Russia forces would not be thrown into that war, would you be disposed to favor the recommendation of General MacArthur that we follow planes into Manchuria and bomb the military set-ups that were there being formed for troops and for attack purposes on our troops in Korea?

Secretary MARSHALL. Once the Chinese Communist troops had appeared in force in Manchuria, and if, from a hypothetical point of view, there was no danger whatever of a Soviet intervention, I would say that certainly the bombing you mention would start almost immediately.

Senator GEORGE. I apprehended that you would say that.

Secretary MARSHALL. I beg your pardon?

Senator GEORGE. I say I apprehended that you, as a great soldier, would conclude that, because it seems to me it would have to be concluded.

Now, then, General, that brings me to this question——

Secretary MARSHALL. Senator, will you let me amplify a little here?

Senator GEORGE. Yes.

Secretary MARSHALL. When you say the Soviet would not intervene, I have to include in that the consideration of whether you are talking about a direct intervention, or, we will say, as to air power, furnishing these people all sorts of matériel and strength in other matters in connection with it. They can do so much sub rosa that can be very harmful. The question then is: Will it be so harmful as to make a less profitable procedure? But I would say, if you can say that we are certain and know beyond a doubt that the Soviet government is not going to intervene, I think we would use our naval power, and we would use our air power very freely. The restrictions would be, I would say, not to use those powers, if avoidable, in a way that claimed a great many innocent victims and left a bitterness that we would be 50 years in overcoming. But I certainly would feel that once the Communist Chinese forces are in Korea in large measure, you would go after the communications, would go after their air installations, and we would do what we could along the coast of China to weaken their hand.

Senator GEORGE. General, there is absolutely no finality in dealing with any international problems, as I think you will agree. I know you will recall when even your recommendations for European aid were advanced, that there were some people who were so timorous they felt like that might involve us in war with Russia.

I never felt so, but there were others who did and who were better informed about conditions than I was.

Secretary MARSHALL. This was the possibility and yet against that there was the very decided probability, in my opinion, that Western Europe was going communistic.

Senator GEORGE. I agree that there was a responsibility——

Secretary MARSHALL. We either had to allow them to go communistic or do something.

Senator GEORGE. That was a possibility in the minds of a great many well-informed people. A lot of people in this country were skeptical about our direct assistance to Greece and Turkey.

We talk a lot about calculated risks. We took them. We regarded that as unavoidable. I think the decision was wise. And on down through to the very present effort to build up the North Atlantic Treaty group.

I am quite sure you will agree that we talked again with Greece about calculated risks. There was nothing absolutely sure about what the Russian or Communist reaction would be to our efforts in that regard.

So it seems to me that when you are dealing with this matter in Korea, you have to consider, of course, whether there is a risk of spreading the war, but it doesn't seem to me that we are required to be certain that to bomb the military set-ups as they are being organized across the boundary from our own troops that we have to know absolutely that Soviet Russia will not come in.

Secretary MARSHALL. You will never know absolutely, of course, Senator.

Senator GEORGE. You can't know.

Secretary MARSHALL. But I would like to expand a little bit on your development there of the idea that some things are unavoidable, I would say. If we don't do them, we lose definitely, and we know that. That would be the European recovery program.

Now, to step up to another issue, we had to meet, there was the question of Greece. It was quite apparent to us that unless we did something Greece would go wholly communistic, and that meant probably Italy would, and Turkey was then in a serious predicament.

In a sense, we had no choice but to let the thing go or try to save it.

Take the Berlin blockade. There were many that advocated that we breach the Russian set-up and go through their territory with an armed convoy.

We didn't do that. We took the airlift, which was expensive, complicated, and extreme, but we managed to get through without the break.

There was another way to do the thing and we did it that way; whereas, we might have put our trains on the road and shot back the Soviet obstruction and undoubtedly would have promoted a general conflict.

Now, when we come to Korea, you have a question of conducting the operation under the possibilities and we feel to a certain extent the probabilities. * * * Up to the present time what we think has happened to the troops from their air, their air bases and in Manchuria, has not had a significant effect.

We might easily be forced into action and are prepared to take that action, but it is avoidable up to the present time. It may not be avoidable beginning tomorrow, but it is avoidable at the present time, and we have to relate that to the opinion of many other countries, many other peoples that are involved in this same struggle.

Some things are avoidable and the others are almost an abject surrender.

Senator GEORGE. General, I want to ask you this: When the Red Chinese came in in force in late October, early November—I do not recall the exact time—was not that a very definite danger, actual disaster almost, to our troops?

Secretary MARSHALL. It threatened to be.

Senate GEORGE. It threatened to be so.

Secretary MARSHALL. Threatened to be disastrous in its results.

Senator GEORGE. Now then, if the Red Chinese should get an air force themselves and come with air, would we be any more justified in going over the boundary line and destroying their lines of communication, breaking up their military formations, than we would have been to have taken that same action after they came over in November in large forces?

Secretary MARSHALL. Senator GEORGE——

Senator GEORGE. I am assuming that the Red Chinese do it, not the Soviets; I am not speaking of someone else.

Secretary MARSHALL. I know. * * * Up to the present time, the reaction so far as our troops are concerned on the ground, has been that they have not suffered in a direct way and have not suffered seriously in an indirect way, from the fact that these air bases exist in Manchuria, and that we have not bombed them out of commission.

There was a brief period there when this Communist movement into Korea was under way when their air activity threatened to be serious. Its most serious effect was not the destruction it did at that time, but it was having its decided effect on the morale of our aviators who could not strike back because of the immediate retirement of their fast planes behind the Yalu River.

But no material harm was being done to our armies on the ground, none to our ships whatsoever, and to our stores and our communications; so we did not have a demanding action there where we had no choice in the matter. We may have no choice, as I say tomorrow. * * * However, there has been a choice up to that moment—up to this moment—as to whether or not we engage in these other measures, and that choice has been very materially influenced by the large majority of our allies in the United Nations, and that is a very important factor.

Senator GEORGE. I do not question the importance of it. I am not so sure that it should be absolutely controlling on us when the lives of our own troops are at stake.

* * * * *

Senator GEORGE. Yes, sir; I understand.

Now, I am getting to this, General, in the face of your very strong admonition that we should not do anything, and very properly, very proper admonition, to destroy the morale of our troops, that no one should do it.

I am not speaking only of General MacArthur, and I am not reciting it for the purpose of affecting the morale of our troops, I assure you; but nevertheless, we went into Korea, did we not, about the 27th of June 1950?

Secretary MARSHALL. I think about that date.

Senator GEORGE. About that date.

Secretary MARSHALL. The invasion was the 25th.

Senator GEORGE. And up to now our casualties are what, General?

Secretary MARSHALL. I think 10,000 killed.

Senator GEORGE. Are there not more than that, General?

Secretary MARSHALL. I beg pardon?

Senator GEORGE. More than that, is it not?

Secretary MARSHALL. No, I think it is 10,000 killed at the present time, and missing and wounded 50,000.

Senator GEORGE. Missing and wounded 50,000?

Secretary MARSHALL. I think that is right.

Senator GEORGE. Well, I am speaking of combat casualties.

Secretary MARSHALL. That is what I am talking about, combat casualties.

Senator GEORGE. And it includes prisoners of war and missing in action, and the wounded as well as the dead, and I am assuming that General MacArthur's statement to us must have been in the neighborhood of being correct, when he said when he left Korea that our casualties had reached 65,000. I do not mean reported casualties, I mean casualties.

Secretary MARSHALL. Well, that would be a difference in what I have said of 5,000.

Senator GEORGE. Yes, sir.

Secretary MARSHALL. And I will have the figures as they are correctly up to date tomorrow morning.

Senator GEORGE. Whatever it is, it is considerable.

Now, those casualties have been accumulated since June or the 1st of July, practically, of 1950.

Now, going on another ten months, or any X months, certainly means that a continued build-up of casualties would result, in the American forces or the United Nations forces, would it not?

Secretary MARSHALL. Yes, sir; but——

Senator GEORGE. That is unavoidable, of course.

Secretary MARSHALL. May I finish the answer?

Senator GEORGE. Yes, sir.

Secretary MARSHALL. But if matters go on, as they have in the past 2 or 3 months, the percentage would not apply, because they are going on at a greatly reduced rate.

What occurred in July and August mounted up the casualties very high on account of missing, who are counted as casualties, and they were cut off here and there in very large numbers, and the casualties during the fall were heavy for us to endure.

The casualties fortunately, beginning in about the 1st of February, have been greatly reduced, and we have reasonable hope that they will continue at that greatly reduced rate. So, if you say since, from July to the present date, they have been sixty or sixty-five thousand, I do not think you would be justified in taking the same proportion.

Senator GEORGE. Well, that may be true, and I certainly hope it is.

Secretary MARSHALL. Well, that has a great bearing on what we endure, what we can undertake, and what we can maintain.

Senator GEORGE. And at the same time they might be in greater proportion.

Secretary MARSHALL. That is always possible.

Senator GEORGE. That is always one of the military possibilities. When we speak about assuming risks that is involved.

Secretary MARSHALL. That is involved, but also the type of campaign is involved very decidedly.

Senator GEORGE. Type of campaign, yes, sir.

Secretary MARSHALL. And we are trying to conduct it on the basis of not paying.

Senator GEORGE. What I am trying to get at, General, is this: Without regard to the use of any of the Generalissimo's troops down on Formosa, and wholly aside from the question of whether they are going to—the wraps are going to be taken off there and leave them free to infiltrate as they may on the mainland of China, as a matter of sound military strategy, of common sense, as a nonmilitary man, such as I am, must exercise, if the commander in the field knows his troops are being cut down through a period, and if he believes that through the use of his air power he can prevent these build-ups across a boundary line, whether a river or imaginary line, and interrupt their supplies, do you see that there is anything other that he can do except that of recommending that course of action, and insist upon it to his superior officers, if he believes that thereby he can shorten the war, terminate it, or shorten it, certainly?

Secretary MARSHALL. Well, that is a perfectly proper recommendation from any military commander.

Senator GEORGE. Yes.

Now, then, as to whether or not Soviet Russia would come in, do you not think it likely that if Soviet Russia is going to directly intervene or indirectly intervene by furnishing planes and more implements of war, that she had already made that decision in any event?

Secretary MARSHALL. That has been the view of some of our officials. It is a question almost of guesswork.

And also there is this factor to be considered: A certain incident develops issues that go beyond the control of the Government itself, becomes committed. An example of that is that the Soviets and the Japanese fought actions in Manchuria that involved,

I think, three or four divisions. That was not even considered a war and was practically—I don't suppose it was reported to the people of either country, certainly not to the Soviet people at all.

Now, with us it is a little different. Even if it is a squad involved, the whole country takes issue with that matter, and the demand to do something becomes almost imperative. So that is some of the fear we have had in connection with this thing, this situation. And when it comes to just how the Soviets will act, that's guesswork.

Senator GEORGE. Of course, I agree it is entirely speculative, General. But what I am trying to ask of you is this: That if the probabilities, and strong probabilities, are that whatever decision Soviet Russia finally follows has already been made in Korea, is there not sound reason in saying that our Air Force should be used to prevent military build-ups aimed at our own troops across the northern boundary line of Korea?

Secretary MARSHALL. Senator, that is generally a hypothetical question, and there are——

Senator GEORGE. It is pretty real.

Secretary MARSHALL. I beg pardon?

Senator GEORGE. It is pretty real in Korea, if there are only 65,000 dead, wounded, and missing.

Secretary MARSHALL. I will say in regard to that, the casualties, the casualty list is just as tragic to those responsible for the operations——

Senator GEORGE. That is correct.

Secretary MARSHALL. As they are to anybody else, and when we have to see them every day and check them every day, that is the first question we ask. It is a very agonizing business.

But you are surrounding your question with factors that make it too hypothetical to get a concrete answer. I have said before, and I repeat again, * * * that we do not feel up to the present time that the action against the supply bases materially affects the campaign to a degree that makes it advisable to accept the hazards of what occurs next.

Now, as to basing our action on what we think is the Soviet procedure in the direction of their affairs, I don't think we can very well do that because it is speculative.

Senator GEORGE. I agree with you, General, but——

Secretary MARSHALL. It is what has been our critical complication from the very start.

Senator GEORGE. I agree with, and don't you also agree that nations have fallen in many wars in an unrealistic effort to walk around them?

Secretary MARSHALL. I imagine. I don't think offhand of the various occasions, but certainly they have occurred. But you could have had a lack of realistic appreciation of what was happening in connection with our Berlin blockade before we got it established. Others thought we should go right in and smash our way through. We were not being realistic. That word was used in the criticism of what we were aiming to do. I think we were realistic, and I think we avoided a tragic consequence.

Senator GEORGE. I have no word of criticism to offer on that point.

Secretary MARSHALL. I am talking about the realistic approach, Senator.

Senator GEORGE. Yes.

Secretary MARSHALL. And you have referred to my being a soldier, which I was. But every reaction of a soldier is to hit back, counter immediately and destroy the enemy, all the enemy's possibilities for build up of his strength and execution of his plans. But here is a case where we have a great many other factors we have to consider, and I think they are very important considerations.

Senator GEORGE. I grant you that, General. I am not overlooking or leaving out of mind the other factors—our allies, their viewpoints, and all of that. But I am speaking of the Korean thing directly and almost only at this moment.

I think you would agree, would you not, that it is pretty hard to win the purely defensive war in a narrow area like the Korean Peninsula, particularly if your enemy may immunize himself from your shot by merely going across the river and there rebuilding his forces?

Secretary MARSHALL. I would answer that reference to past history, by saying it is very difficult to win on a defensive basis. It is very reckless when you are under strength to plunge in on an aggressive offensive procedure. There have been some notable defensive campaigns in history which have ended in an offensive and decisive action.

I will say notably one was the peninsula campaign under Wellington. He endured for quite a period of time. His campaign was measured in years, largely, almost entirely for long periods on the defensive. Of course, Torres Vedras lines are famous in history. In the end he really played a leading part in the complete upset of the Napoleonic regime. He had to start on a defensive basis, he had no other choice. We have had to start on a defensive basis because we have really no other choice.

However, we are discussing one phase where we have a choice, which is the use of our air power and our naval power. And I think in regard to them I am just repeating myself time and again on the same issue.

Senator GEORGE. Yes, I understand. I don't care to occasion that, General.

I have no further questions, and I thank you very much.

Chairman RUSSELL. In view of the time, I assume we had best recess here now, and if there is no objection we will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon at 1:10 p. m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a. m. Wednesday, May 9, 1951.)

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a little over a year ago I brought to the attention of the Senate the names of a number of individuals whom I considered dangercus to the Nation. I should like to make an interim report on one of those individuals as of today.

At that time I pointed out that one Esther Caukins Brunauer, who was holding a top job in the State Department. I pointed out that the evidence showed that her husband had been a memoer of the Communist Party and was active therein, that she belonged to a number of Communist-front organizations, and that she was one of Alger Hiss' assistants at San Francisco.

Incidentally, her assistance to Hiss has since been denied by her, but on page 419 of this State Department publication we find that Brunauer was one of the assistants of Hiss. Before proceeding on the report on this case, Mr. President, I should like to read very, very briefly from a few questions and answers in the record at the time of the hearings before the unlamented Tydings committee.

Senator HICKENLOOPER was interrogating Mrs. Brunauer:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I believe you testified that your husband some years ago was in fact a Communist, but after a short time in this country he ceased his association with the Communist Party.

Incidentally, I may say that her husband at that time was one of the explosives experts working with the Navy, holding a top job handling topmost secrets. He had been cleared in 1945 for the Manhattan project, and he had been cleared also for the Bikini bomb test.

Mrs. BRUNAUER. Yes—his association with the Communist movement. He was never a member of the Communist Party.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. You make the positive statement that he never was a member of the Communist Party in this country?

Mrs. BRUNAUER. I make that statement; yes, sir.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I do not want to be unfair about this question, but I believe in those years of which you are making this very positive statement now you were not even acquainted with him, so I assume you make your statement based upon what he has told you.

Mrs. BRUNAUER. I make that statement based upon what he has told me, and in the first years that he was in Washington, when he occasionally saw some individuals whom he had known previously, his connections were just as I have stated, as a member of the Young Workers League. The Young Workers League was organized and run by the Communist Party. There is no attempt to deny that my husband for a short time supported the Communist ideals.

Later Senator HICKENLOOPER asked Mrs. Brunauer:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Did the Communist Party or the Hungarian delegation to UNESCO visit you or your husband or your home a few years ago on his way from Mexico?

Mrs. BRUNAUER. He called on my husband and I would be glad to give you what I know of that, if you wish, or, if you prefer, it can wait until my husband comes before you.

The husband was there, but he was never put on the stand.

Mr. President, at the time I gave the case of Mrs. Brunauer to the committee I asked the committee to hear me in executive session with respect to Stephen Brunauer. I pointed to the kind of work he was doing, and I explained to the chairman that I could not discuss in public the evidence which we had against him without endangering our security. The committee refused to hear the evidence. Since that time much damage has been done, before the Navy finally took action. For example, his very good friend, Noel Field, a known Communist and espionage agent, spent night after night with Stephen Brunauer, who had access to all the top secrets in the explosives section of our Navy. Field then left the country, and has since disappeared behind the iron curtain, taking with him all the information which his friend Brunauer had given him. The Navy finally took action. The action by the Navy was not based upon the evidence which we had last year. At least the action was not based solely on such evidence. What forced the Navy to take action was that it appeared during the atomic-spy investigations that Stephen Brunauer was involved. The Navy rightly suspended him and gave him 30 days in which to answer charges. His wife, Esther Brunauer, was suspended from her job in the State Department, where she had access to top-secret material.

Incidentally, as a member of UNESCO she has been able to travel rather freely to other capitals of the world. The evidence shows contacts in those capitals with members of Communist delegations.

Tremendous pressure is now being applied by the State Department to the Navy to reinstate Stephen Brunauer. Let me give Senators the argument which is being made in that respect. The argument which is being advanced by the State Department is this. They say, "Yes, we admit that he is involved with agents of the Kremlin. However, if he is discharged he is such an outstanding man in explosives he will leave this country and undoubtedly disappear behind the iron curtain and work for the Soviet. "For that reason," they say, "put him back in top secret work in this country and we will put him under close surveillance." They also say that when this is done Esther Brunauer will be put back in the State Department with access to top-secret material again.

Mr. President, I believe the subject should be brought to the attention of the Senate so that we shall be able to watch developments in the case. How much damage was done since Noel Field, who acted as a courier, left the country and disappeared behind the iron curtain cannot be known. How many American boys have died or will die because of this man's having access to top secrets, no one knows. I do want everyone to know that even though it is conceded now by the group in the State Department—and by that I mean the Acheson group—that he is dangerous and that he is or was involved with agents of the Kremlin, and even though it is known that he was a member of the party, there is this tremendous pressure being exerted to reinstate him in his job.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief statement. Two amendments were made to the bill, one of which was an amendment offered in committee by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], relative to the expiration of the act, which amendment was accepted by the conferees; the other, an amendment relative to the removal of the tariff on cordage or binder twine, I believe it is called. That amendment was offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the distingushed Senator said "binder twine." It related, not to binder twine, but to baler twine.

Mr. GEORGE. I should have said baler twine.

Mr. THYE. Binder twine is exempted, and it was our endeavor to exempt baler twine in the same manner that binder twine is now exempted.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct. I merely wish to say that the latter amendment was rejected by the House conferees, who presented in support of their action a statement that they had already agreed to give certain interested parties a hearing on a bill embodying this particular amendment. The hearings had been scheduled, or would be scheduled in the immediate future, and they expected to finish their work on the bill and to act upon it at a very early date. They thought it would be completed within the next 30 days. That amendment was therefore eliminated. Those were the only two amendments to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I was called from the Senate Chamber for a moment to answer a telephone call. The Senator, I take it, is speaking of a baler-twine amendment, on which the Members of the House had promised to conduct hearings; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], was, I think, the sponsor or one of the cosponsors of the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. He was a cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. WHERRY. Is the conference report satisfactory to those Senators?

Mr. GEORGE. I may say that on this amendment the House found itself in a position where its own conferees had promised to conduct hearings and had notified parties to that effect. They would naturally be embarrassed if the amendment were acted on without their having lived up to that promise. So they said they would conduct hearings on the bill and would act on it within the next few days.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Will it be necessary for the Senate committee to hold hearings, or may we have the assurance of the able chairman now that he would recommend that the Senate act on the amendment in the form of a bill, in order that we might have it ready by the time the House acted on the same question?

Mr. GEORGE. I can give this assurance to the Senator, that inasmuch as the House is to have hearings, at which all the interested parties are to be heard, we would not duplicate the hearings in the Senate, but would act upon the bill as soon as it came to the Senate, assuming that the House passed the bill.

Mr. THYE. I thank the chairman for that explanation.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to have this explanation by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I know there is intense interest in the baler-twine amendment, and that it is of vital interest to the people of the Middle West. I trust the hearings will be held in the House, and that we may have speedy action.

Mr. GEORGE. We had that assurance. We also had assurance that even the members of the conference were not opposing the amendment for lack of merit, but they had made this definite promise, and it seemed only fair that they give everyone who desired to be heard an opportunity to testify on it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who is attempting to represent constituents who are interested vitally in this subject, I think it is very fair that the matter be handled in that way, because what they wanted was an opportunity to be heard. If their case is not a good one, that would be another matter; they will at least have had an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. GEORGE. It was so understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment beginning in line 10, page 12.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement prepared by the senior Senator from Washington in support of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators to the item having relation to the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Several other Senators are interested in the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. I wonder whether he would be willing to let the amendment go over until tomorrow. If so, we could proceed with other amendments this afternoon. It is my understanding that the Senate will recess at 5 o'clock.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would be glad to do so, with the understanding that he will have an opportunity tomorrow to have the amendment acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I understand correctly that the distinguished Senator from Arizona has indicated that the bill will be taken up tomorrow?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 12, beginning in line 10, and the amendment to it proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], for himself and other Senators, will be passed over.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma that the statement of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be printed in the RECORD at this point?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON, IN SUPPORT OF ADDITIONAL $100,000,000 TO CARRY OUT THE PURPOSES OF PUBLIC LAW 815—KERR AMENDMENT TO 1951 THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

The Federal Government has a particular responsibility to certain school districts throughout the country. The Congress recognized this responsibility and gave effect to it by enacting last year the so-called school construction and school operation and maintenance bills.

The legislation we enacted contained usable yardsticks to measure the extent of Federal responsibility in each of those school districts where Federal activity within or near its boundaries contributes to the district's financial problems. When the bills, which became Public Laws 815 and 874, were before the Congress, carefully computed cost estimates were presented by the executive branch. At the time we authorized expenditure of Federal funds for school construction and operation and maintenance, the Congress, therefore, knew the approximate yearly cost of its action.

Comes now the time when we must appropriate funds to implement the program we approved last year. In my judgment, we would be less than fair with over 1,000 school districts in this country if we now fudge on them by appropriating less than the amount required to meet their legitimate minimum expectations.

I have a special interest in this question for two reasons: First, the State of Washington has more school districts affected by Federal activity than any State in the Union except Texas and, collectively, those districts are entitled to more Federal assistance under Public Law 815 than any State with the exception of California. Second, I sponsored one of the first bills introduced in the Senate to provide Federal assistance for schools overburdened by Federal activity. Many of the provisions of that bill were later incorporated in legislation on school construction passed by the Senate—legislation on which I was a cosponsor.

Sixty-four school districts in the State of Washington have applied for assistance under Public Law 815, the school-construction bill. It is probable that others will apply and will be found eligible for some help. Collectively the Washington State school districts applying for assistance are entitled to approximately $33,000,000 of Federal aid.

Their applications, however, represent projects with a total construction cost of about $29,000,000. To finance these projects, the Federal responsibility—as determined by the yardstick incorporated in Public Law 815—is approximately $19,000,000. The remaining $10,000,000 will come from local sources.

Nation-wide school districts affected in a significant degree by Federal activity are entitled to $322,000,000 Federal aid. Projects already proposed by these districts affected represent a Federal responsibility of over $182,000,000. In addition to this, there is immediate need for construction of school facilities on Federal property estimated to cost $51,000,000, and need for temporary school facilities costing $7,000,000. The total immediate requirement is approximately $240,000,000 Nation-wide.

If we visualize this sum—$240,000,000—as an entry on the liability side of the ledger, and funds to meet it as entries on the debit side, we get the following picture.

Last year Congress appropriated $46,500,000 for school construction. The regular 1953 budget sent up by the President contains a request for $50,000,000. A special deficiency recommendation has been presented to us asking for another $50,000,000. This gives us a proposed $146,500,000 with which to meet a $240,000,000 Federal responsibility to school districts seriously affected by Federal activity.

Mr. President, the school districts of which we are speaking were led to believe that Congress would meet in full the obligation it undertook when it passed Public Law 815. Their confidence in our good faith will be sorely shaken if we now try to settle a $240,000,000 Federal responsibility with a $146,500,000 appropriation.

If the appropriation for school construction is left at the $50,000,000 level recommended by the committee, only 10 schools in the State of Washington will receive the support to which they are entitled. By increasing the amount to the $100,000,000 figure as recommended by the senior Senator from Oklahoma an additional 26 schools will be reached. Even then, some districts in the State of Washington entitled to Federal assistance will have to wait another year.

Every Member of the Senate has stated at one time or another his conviction that schools of America are a keystone in the democratic system. At one time or another, every member of this committee has confirmed his belief in a great principle enunciated by Thomas Jefferson—namely, that we achieve and maintain liberty through literacy.

Literacy today means far more than the ability to read and write. It means the ability to understand the great economic, political, and social problems with which we and the world are confronted.

Mr. President, it costs money to maintain liberty—it costs money to achieve an acceptable level of literacy. I urge favorable action on the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I ask there be incorporated as part of my remarks a tabulation showing the Washington State school district that would participate in a $50,000,000 appropriation, and those additional schools that would be reached by the adoption of the Kerr amendment.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

A deficiency appropriation of $50,000,000 is required to make partial allotments to applicants with a tentative priority rating between 75 and 92. Applications on file at the United States Office of Education March 12, 1951, show the following schools from this State to be in this priority group:

1. Renton.
2. Mukilteo.
3. Bremerton.
4. Central Kitsap.
5. Consolidated No. 20, Oak Harbor.
6. Othello.
7. Pasco district, No. 1.
8. Bridgeport district, No. 75.
9. Ephrata district, No. 165.
10. Grant County.

These schools have filed construction projects requesting $2,896,216 in Federal funds.

An increase in this deficiency appropriation to $100,000,000 will be sufficient to make partial allotments to additional applicants with a tentative priority rating between 40 and 75. Applications on file at the United States Office of Education March 12, 1951, show the following schools from this State to be in this priority group:

1. North Kitsap.
2. Franklin Pierce.
3. Kent.
4. Lake Washington.
5. Grandview.
6. Edmonds.
7. Issaquah.
8. Highland (Seattle).
9. Yakima County (Sunnyside).
10. Cape Flattery.
11. Bellevue.
12. Hockinson (Brush Prairie).
13. Granger.
14. Port Townsend.
15. Lacey.
16. Brainbridge Island, No. 303.
17. Steilacoom.
18. Wapate.
19. Head.
20. Shoreline.
21. Auburn.
22. River View.
23. Mercer Island.
24. South Kitsap, No. 402.
25. Coupeville.
26. Bethel, No. 403.

These schools have filed construction projects requesting a total of $7,091,209 in Federal funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 20, line 7, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 8, after the word "work", the committee proposes to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000", so as to read:

To enable the President, during the fiscal year 1951, to carry out the provisions of title V of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 209), relating to international children's welfare work, $7,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XI—Funds Appropriated to the President—Expenses of Defense Production," on page 20, line 12, after the word "production", to strike out "$33,029,000" and insert "$27,331,895"; on page 21, line 6, after the word "available", to insert "by transfer or otherwise", and in line 9, after the word "law", to strike out: "*Provided further*, That the appropriation 'Expenses of Defense Production, may be increased by

transfer of not to exceed $1,834,000 of funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 to the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and the General Services Administration for the purpose of carrying out the duties and responsibilities assigned to these agencies under provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Federal Civil Defense Administration—Operations", on page 22, line 3, after the word "security", to insert "security guard services;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 22, line 5, after the word "functions", to strike out "$1,750,000: *Provided*, That $110,000 shall be available for providing civil defense communications systems pursuant to subsection (c) of section 201 of said act", and insert "$74,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is amendment C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 5, after "functions", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "including entertainment expenses not to exceed $2,000 in connection with such meetings."

On page 22, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$74,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the amendment is in two parts. The first part of the amendment deals with the entertainment fund. As Members of the Senate know, in a number of branches of the executive department of the Government funds are provided for the entertainment of official visitors from foreign countries who come here on business in the normal course of events. Sometimes such funds are buried, where they are not understood.

When this question was raised with me I felt that it was far better to deal with the situation in the open, so that it would be thoroughly understood. When it is necessary to entertain official visitors coming from Great Britain or other countries to confer with our civil-defense authorities, why should the expense of their entertainment be an out-of-pocket cost to the Administrator? I do not believe that it should be. I do not believe that it is customary for the President or for the State Department to handle official entertainment in that manner. The amount requested seems to be very nominal, and I think in equity it should be appropriated.

The important feature of this particular amendment is on page 22, line 8, to strike out "$74,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

This item is primarily for training and education, and for research and development. I have had a memorandum prepared by the Civil Defense Organization on Research and Development. They ask for an additional $700,000, without going into detail, they need an additional $287,000 for training and education, which is a vital function now just getting under way.

With respect to research and development, the funds must be available now if we are to get the answers badly needed from the continental tests contemplated for next year. In those tests typical American city structures will be subjected to blasts under actual attack conditions. The answers which will be secured will clarify planning and recommendations for shelter strengthening.

I do not feel that it is necessary to go into too much detail. We all know that we are now living in the atomic age. We know that there is a great deal of information which is not yet available to us. It is public knowledge that certain tests have been conducted in the past, and undoubtedly there will be other tests in the future. It seems to me, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to be necessary and desirable to make this appropriation in order that the Civil Defense Organization may obtain the information which it feels it must have adequately to safeguard the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as this matter must go to conference anyway, it seems to me that whether the amount is $74,000,000 or $75,000,000 is a question which must finally be disposed of between the two Houses. Therefore, I am inclined to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to both parts of the amendment. The committee went into this matter thoroughly. If the work of the committee is all to go for nothing, we might just as well quit. I believe that at least we ought to have an opportunity to be heard.

So far as I know, there is only one agency of the United States which has entertainment funds made available to it, and that is the State Department. I think we are embarking upon a dangerous precedent when, in connection with a matter of this character and of this gravity, we turn aside to provide entertainment funds for anyone. Either the civil defense effort is necessary or it is not. Either we are in dire danger or we are not. If we are, we need every dollar that we can rake and scrape for real civil defense. I can see no reason for allowing $2,000 to the Civil Defense Agency for entertainment between now and the 30th of June. I think it is a bad mistake to begin that sort of thing, either in this bill or at any other time.

So far as the $74,000,000 item is concerned, Mr. President, it is broken down on page 5 of the committee report. A reasonably thorough examination was made at the time by the committee. When that item came to us the figure in the bill was $1,750,000. There was then a provision of $110,000 for defense communications systems. It has been increased to $74,000,000.

Mr. President, it is not as though this were all the money appropriated for this purpose. This is a third supplemental appropriation. It is an appropriation for funds to be expended, or necessary for expenditure, between now and the 30th of June of this year. That is a little more than a month and a half away. In the interim we will go thoroughly into these matters with respect to an annual appropriation for the period beginning on the 1st day of July and continuing for the next fiscal year. I hope that we shall have an opportunity on this side of the Capitol to go more thoroughly into these matters, and that we shall have the advantage of the work now being done by the House on the annual bill.

The figure which the Senate committee has reported is predicated on the proposition that it is mainly necessary in connection with commitments which could be made under contract authority, were the House willing to operate on that basis. It represents, in the majority, $40,000,000 for medical supplies. The testimony with respect to that item was that the present facilities for manufacture are not adequate, and that additional manufacturing facilities could not be guaranteed unless orders were placed for sufficient supplies to justify the additional capital outlay. That represents $40,000,000 of the $74,000,000.

On page 5 of the committee report there is a breakdown. I shall not go into it in detail. Senators can read it for themselves. If there are any questions with respect to any of the items, I shall be happy to explain them so far as I can.

I feel that the committee, after the investigation it made, placed sound figures in the bill. Particularly in view of the shortness of time before the end of the fiscal year, my view is that the committee's figures ought to be upheld by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, while I cannot agree with the Senator from Oregon regarding the proposal for an entertainment allowance, I do not want the debate to revolve around a relatively small item. I think, however, the facts will show that other agencies of the Government, perhaps in a hidden manner, have funds for such purposes, so that there will not be an out-of-pocket expense to the administrator.

I wanted to raise the question on the floor of the Senate. It can perhaps more properly be discussed at the time of consideration of the regular appropriation bill.

So I ask, Mr. President, that my amendment lettered "C" be modified by striking out lines 1 to 3 dealing with the entertainment expense, and that the amendment lettered "C" be solely limited to the increase from $74,000,000 to $75,000,000 for the purpose of increasing the amount for training and education, and also for the purpose of research and development, which the Civil Defense Administration feels is vitally necessary to

be added to the items already set up by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. I ask the Senator from California to refer to page 5 of the report and to the table there. Does he understand that the estimate for training and education which originally came to the Congress was for only $787,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. For which the committee allowed $500,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; and the agency feels that the $787,000 is essential for the purposes as I have outlined them.

Mr. CORDON. But the Senator has asked for a million dollars.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. For research and development, for which, on the table, the Senator will find there is no allocation in the Senate bill, the Civil Defense Administration originally requested $3,875,000. They are now asking $700,000.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator feel that the $200,000 above the amount necessary for training and education would be of any value in this short time remaining up to June 30, 1951?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, for the reasons that the Civil Defense Administration pointed out. There has been a delay in getting this program moving along, and they have a very strong belief that in this particular field the funds are both necessary and desirable.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I reiterate my position. I think the moneys that are made available are adequate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. CORDON. I have concluded. I shall be happy to yield the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask recognition in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator from California advise me as to the amendments which he has suggested?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. The pending amendment, I may say, is amendment lettered "C," as modified, which provides that, on page 22, line 8, "$74,000,000" be stricken out and "$75,000,000" be inserted.

I also have an amendment lettered "D" which deals with the shelter program.

Mr. McMAHON. May I ask if it is the disposition of the chairman of the subcommittee to take the amendments to conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have indicated that the sum of money we are taking to conference is $74,000,000; and I would just as soon take $75,000,000 to conference, and then it can be determined by the conferees what shall be done.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the Senator's attitude toward the protective facilities of $75,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is entirely another amendment, which we do not have under consideration at this time. The budget estimate was for $250,000,000. The House allowed $80,000,000. We struck it out entirely in the committee. The Senator from California desires to insert $25,000,000. Again that is a matter for conference. On the whole, $80,000,000 is in conference.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator disposed to accept the $25,000,000 provided for by the amendment lettered "D"?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot see any advantage in doing that, because the $80,000,000 is in conference. It is just a matter whether we have a difference between $25,000,000 and $80,000,000 or $80,000,000 and nothing.

Mr. McMAHON. I think it might be some indication to the conferees, though, if the Senate were to adopt the figure of $25,000,000. Is that not true? Would it not be somewhat persuasive, I will ask the Senator, if the Senate was to go on record for the amendment of the Senator from California providing $25,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not heard the Senator's argument. Up to now it merely appears to me that it would all be in conference anyway.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to add my very earnest request addressed to the chairman of the Senate committee and to other members of the committee, to allow the item of $25,000,000 also to go to conference. A very able, distinguished, and conscientious citizen of my own State is serving as Civil Defense Administrator. He has given a great amount of study and effort to this work. He has run, as Senators well know, into public apathy which is most discouraging. He is doing his best to get things started in a creditable manner, and in a manner which at least will point the way toward greater safety and security in this field, insofar as it can be accomplished.

Mr. President, as to the pending amendment on which the Senator from California has already spoken, I think he has made it abundantly clear that the omission of this additional $1,000,000 would be a distinct reduction of the program, a program in a very vital field, having to do with education. Governor Caldwell, the Civilian Defense Administrator, himself, has been to Britain with some of his staff members, and has examined what the British are doing. He reports this amount as being the absolute minimum to get this work started physically and administratively, in training both civilians and technical persons for the assumption of their heavy duties and responsibilities in the event the Nation needs them. Surely they are thinking that this program is a real insurance for the Nation.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] may yield in this matter. While it is true that the item will be in conference anyway, it seems to me that it would add materially to the giving of the impression that the Senate feels that the civilian defense effort is in earnest, and that it is a required effort, an effort that ought to be sustained—after all, the Congress provided for it not the Administrator—if we promptly place in the bill the amounts proposed in the amendments offered by the Senator from California, of which I am happy to say I joined him in submitting.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the second amendment, but since the question has been raised, and we are dealing with the entire problem, I wish to say a word briefly in regard to the item of $25,000,000 for the shelter program. The $25,000,000 is requested for protective facilities as a bare minimum. A number of agencies have their plans ready to proceed with a shelter program. I desire to make very clear that Congress is not minimizing the need for an effective civil defense organization, that the Congress is conversant with the great need, and that as rapidly as funds may be needed for use in all these fields, including the shelter program, they will be made available.

One of the most damaging things that has happened, I believe, to the civil-defense program, is the impression which has become prevalent in the various State legislatures—and I think about two thirds of them are in session now—that in the Nation's Capital, where we have far more information than State legislatures have respecting the international picture, the Congress apparently is not interested in proceeding with this very minimum program. I believe it has tended to throw a wet blanket upon them and has tended to make them say, "If the Senate of the United States does not see the necessity for a shelter program, why should we proceed to bear the expense of undertaking such programs?" Of course, no one is wise enough to know, and no one can possibly have a crystal ball which will enable him to know, whether we shall ever need a shelter program. I think we all prayerfully hope we shall never need one. However, by the same token, no Member of the Senate today can say that next week or next month or next year this program will not be desperately needed.

I do not wish to attempt to assess responsibility, because perhaps the public and the Congress and the various States and the civil defense authorities themselves all must share the responsibility. However, I believe we have been lagging too much in carrying out an effective civil-defense program; and I think there is a calculated risk which I, as one Member of the Senate and as a Member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, do not feel we should undertake.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut be gracious enough to yield to me for one more comment?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; if it is a short one. I wish to proceed for about 6 or 7 minutes to state my position for the RECORD, so that it may be perfectly clear

and history will show how I feel at this time in regard to this matter.

I yield now to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator very much for yielding to me. My remarks will be brief.

First, Mr. President, with reference to having this civil-defense item in a supplemental appropriation bill, I call attention to the fact that the committee amendment already provides that the amounts appropriated in this particular part of the appropriation bill shall remain available until June 30, 1952. In other words, it appears very clearly that we are providing the basis for a program which will continue not only during this fiscal year but also during the next fiscal year.

With reference to the shelter program, which is the larger one, I also call attention to the fact that the appropriations to be made for that purpose are not for expenditure or for commitment during the remainder of this year, but the appropriations for the shelter program are to remain available until they are expended, and in the appropriation there is a specific ban against contracting over and above the sum actually appropriated, which seems to me to be a very minimum amount for this most important objective.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, civil defense is an indispensable part of our total strategy for world peace. In two world wars the industrial output of America's workers and factories has meant the difference between victory and defeat. Stalin knows that he cannot achieve global conquest without knocking out our industrial plants and our cities. A smoothly operating and effectively functioning civil-defense program, if ready in time, will put the Kremlin and the rest of the world on notice that we are prepared to absorb any punishment which Stalin can deal out, and that we will maintain the capacity to deal devastating retaliatory blows. If the Soviet dictators understand this, they will understand also that a sneak attack cannot hope to paralyze us beyond recovery. Contrariwise, a lack of adequate civil-defense appropriations and preparations will be an open invitation to aggression. Therefore, Mr. President, civil defense is the cheapest kind of peace insurance.

However, civil defense is war insurance, as well. If, despite our massive preparations against war, Stalin nonetheless strikes, our capacity to win will depend overwhelmingly on our ability to minimize and absorb punishment and to come back in spite of it.

I trust that no Member of the Senate doubts Russia's ability to drop a number of atomic bombs upon American citizens now, today. With all the solemnity at my command, I wish—in my capacity as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—to assure the Senate that the Soviets are stockpiling real atomic bombs in an ever-increasing number. No one who has had access to the evidence can believe otherwise. This is a matter of fact, not a matter of opinion. Stalin does have atomic weapons in his arsenal, and his stockpile is growing.

It is also a fact that Stalin has the means of delivering these weapons to targets within our country. In these days of long-range bombers, the Atlantic and the Pacific no longer furnish our cities with immunity against devastation. As President Truman so correctly pointed out last night:

> No matter how good our air defense may be, or how big an air force we build, a determined attack by the Soviet Union could drop bombs upon this country. Our Air Force experts say planes would get through, however good our defense may be.

Mr. President, it is sobering to remember that during World War II, the British Air Force—for all its valor and efficiency—intercepted no more than 8 percent of Hitler's bombers. In turn, the Luftwaffe rarely destroyed more than 4 percent of the allied bombing fleets. Just a few weeks ago Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg testified that our Air Force will score a real success if it is able to destroy from 20 percent to 30 percent of an attacking force. In other words, we shall be extremely lucky if only 7 out of every 10 planes dispatched by the Kremlin reach their targets. Let us remember that the Soviet planes will be carrying, not 500 pounds or 1,000 pounds of TNT, but weapons of mass destruction.

Against this background, then—with the indisputable knowledge that the Kremlin has atomic weapons and the ability to deliver them in a grand-slam assault upon Chicago or Seattle or Detroit or New York or Washington—it is now proposed that we cut drastically our civil defense appropriations. I find it difficult to imagine any course better designed to court a great tragedy.

A year and a half ago, when it was still the fashion to describe demands for a civil-defense program as what might be called scare-mongering, we of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a series of hearings on the problems of civil defense against atomic attack. The distinguished Senators and Members of the House who joined in conducting that inquiry, along with those of our colleagues who participated in the subsequent civil-defense hearings of the Armed Services Committee, became aware of how much time and money and skill are needed to create a civil-defense program that will give us more than an illusion of security. Those Senators and Representatives became acquainted also with the public's urgent and rightful demand for the greatest possible speed in readying our civil defenses.

I take it that this same sense of urgency was shared by the Eighty-first Congress when it passed, with but one dissenting vote, Public Law 920, the Civil Defense Act of 1950. In this act it is declared that—

> It is the policy and intent of Congress to provide a plan of civil defense for the protection of life and property in the United States from attack.

That policy cannot now be carried out if the Civil Defense Administration is expected to operate without sufficient funds.

The Civil Defense Administrator, Governor Caldwell, who has previously distinguished himself both for his services in the House of Representatives and as an outstanding Governor of Florida, yields to no man in his solicitude for the taxpayers' dollar. All of us who know Governor Caldwell are well aware of his outstanding administrative talents. Together with his associates in the Civil Defense Administration, he has spent many weeks in preparing his budget. He knows the difference between false economy and real economy, and he knows, above all, that a dollar falsely saved now may mean a life needlessly lost later on.

We of this body have voted billions of dollars for our Defense Establishment, and rightfully so. Yet all these vast sums may prove of no avail if an attack finds our cities unprepared. An atomic attack against an unprepared America will be an irrevocable disaster. When bombs are falling, it will be too late to lament past inaction.

What happens in the future will depend upon what we do here now. Our responsibility in this matter cannot be evaded, and the American people will have every right to judge us harshly if we fail them now.

Mr. President, I say we must play fair with the people in the Civil Defense Administration by giving them sufficient funds with which to carry on this supremely important mission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have a suggestion regarding the amendment offered by the Senator from California, lettered "C," which I have discussed with the Senator. He has now modified the amendment, so that the only item under consideration is line 4 of the amendment, which proposes to increase the amount from $74,000,000 to $75,000,000. My suggestion—and it is a suggestion rather than a motion—is this: I was present in the committee when this amount was determined. We went over the various items making up the total of $74,000,000. We acted in accordance with the knowledge we had and to the best of our ability. We know that the most important thing is to get medical supplies and to provide the money for matching fire-fighting services. We adjusted the other amounts to the best of our ability. Rather than increase the amount from $74,000,000 to $75,000,000, my suggestion is that the breakdown of the committee's report be printed in the RECORD, and that the amount requested for engineering services be reduced by $640,000, and the amount for executive direction be reduced by $250,000.

I suggest the reduction because we are already approaching the end of the fiscal year, and it has been quite a long time since these amounts were calculated. The amount for research was increased to the figure suggested by the Senator from California, namely, $500,000. The committee allowed nothing for that item. It was recommended that the amount for welfare be increased from $500,000 to $890,000, which was the amount allowed by the House, so that those two figures would reduce the two items by $890,000, and would increase the other two items

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

by $890,000, instead of adding $1,000,000 to the bill. I hope that my suggestion may be acceptable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I was listening to the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] within the past hour. Of course, all of us will agree that there is need for proper security. The amount of money which is being allocated will not even start the kind of protection about which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut was talking. That is the point. It is one of the big things in the hearings.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. WHERRY. I know the Senator from Michigan wants to call up his amendment. I should like, however, to call attention to the fact that the administrator of this program, Mr. Caldwell, when asked the following question by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made this reply:

Senator FERGUSON. What plans would you make if you could get all the money you needed on this thing?

Mr. CALDWELL. Senator, a full civil-defense program of ultimate capacity would cost $300,000,000,000. This would include relocation.

I do not wish to throw cold water on any of the ideas which are being advanced, but certainly, as a member of the committee, I may say that when that was stated to me, I thought Members of the Senate should get the idea that, whether we appropriate $25,000,000 or $50,000,000, or whatever sum may be appropriated, we should not lead the American people to believe that we were going to have shelters which would protect them against a strategic bombing force, such as the one about which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut was speaking.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts will yield for a very brief observation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will yield; but I should like to say, first, to the Senator from Nebraska, that we are not now talking about the shelter amendment of the Senator from California; we are talking about his other amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to my dear colleague, I understood Senators were talking about all three of the amendments. They particularly discussed the one but a moment ago, when I raised the question, they said, "Well, only one has been offered, but we are talking about all three amendments."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have been privileged to meet the former Governor of Florida, Mr. Caldwell, and from my contacts with him I do not hesitate to say he is a distinguished and honorable gentleman. So I regard the statement made by him as being fair.

Mr. WHERRY. I would say it is not an excessive statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He has been very frank in his approach to the Appropriations Committee. I feel that the suggestion which has been made is a fair solution until the first of July, and that the Governor's purpose can be accomplished without increasing the specific amount by a million dollars.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I cannot categorically say that the proposed redistribution would not work. I have great confidence in Governor Caldwell and in Mr. Wadsworth, his assistant. They are faced with a difficult problem. They are dealing with a new field. In the first place, we have not had to face the problem of civil defense the way it had to be faced in Europe, where the people actually came under bombardment. Heretofore neither in Europe nor in this country have the people been faced with the possibility of an atomic attack. Whatever is done, as the able Senator from Nebraska pointed out, will not give everyone protection. That is generally admitted. By the same token, in order to give absolute security to the Nation by radar defense it would cost many times more than is now being spent. To assure absolute air protection would require many times the number of air groups we have today. Even then we probably would not have absolutely protection.

But the other extreme is to do nothing in connection with the program. I do not believe that is the answer to the problem. There must be some rule of reason. The people need to gather information and get started on the program. The States must be encouraged to consider the whole problem.

It does not seem to me to be out of line to appropriate $25,000,000. It may ultimately end in a substantial saving in American lives.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was one of those who took the initiative in asking for civil defense. I have heard the testimony regarding a radar screen. I have voted for it every time proposed legislation has come up in connection with it. Certainly I am in favor of a strategic air force. I simply wanted to point out what I did in my statement because the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut indicated that if we can have this appropriation we will receive protection. That is what I understood him to say. Then I remembered the position of the committee and what a tremendous task would be involved and what the total cost would be. I think the people ought to know that $25,000,000 is only a drop in the bucket as compared with the total amount which may be required.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The able Senator from Massachusetts stated that there might be some redistribution of the funds. We cannot take $500,000 from the fire-fighting item or from engineering, and redistribute it. I would not set up my judgment against that of the Senator from Massachusetts. He may be right, and I may be wrong. Representatives of the civil-defense organization came to my office and stated that they believed this amount to be the absolute minimum, and that in the best interests of the job which they had taken the obligation to carry out, they needed a million dollars for this item and $25,000,000 under the protective facilities item.

I mentioned a short time ago that the additional training and education item amounted to $287,000, and that the additional research and development item amounted to $700,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate lay aside temporarily the pending amendment in order that I may offer an amendment on page 4, line 3, to provide for an additional amount of $5,000 for expenses of the majority policy committee and $5,000 for the minority policy committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Reserving the right to object, how many employees are presently on the payroll of the committees?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot tell the Senator exactly. There are 11 on the minority committee. I will ask the majority leader how many are on the majority committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ascertain whether this is necessary. It has not been brought before the full committee, and we are trying to save expenses. The amendment would increase the amount now being spent by $10,000. Before passing on it, I should like to look into it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection to the Senator's looking into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, there is a meeting of the Democratic steering committee at 5 o'clock this evening. Unless some Senator wants to place something in the RECORD, I should like the Senate to take a recess at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I withhold the request, Mr. President.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE KEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will read.

The resolution (H. Res. 223) was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 8, 1951.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN KEE, a Representative from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection

therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 139) was read, and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN KEE, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have known JOHN KEE since 1915. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1930, and served continuously therein since that time. His service on the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which he was chairman at the time of his death, was also practically continuous.

JOHN KEE was a very fine AMerican, whom I was proud to know. Association with him was an uplifting factor at all times in the consideration of governmental affairs. His death is a definite loss to the State of West Virginia, and as well, Mr. President, to the United States. Although for the past 10 years JOHN KEE suffered a serious physical handicap, yet he worked assiduously to perform faithfully his duties, up to the time he died. Such men as he are especially needed in the presence of such perilous conditions as those which now exist throughout the world. I mourn his loss and extend my sympathy to his family.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I worked very closely with Judge KEE during my days in the State Department. His loss will be particularly mourned by the Foreign Service of the United States, in which he was deeply interested, and to which he had devoted his best efforts, in connection with the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. I associate myself in the sorrow and regret expressed by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my colleagues with respect to the death of Representative KEE. Certainly his passing is a great loss to his State and to the Nation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, Judge KEE was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, I was associated with him on many occasions. He was a man of high character, splendid attainments, and charming personality. I deeply grieve his passing. His State and the Nation have suffered a distinct loss in his death. I pay my respects to him, and lay upon his tomb the flowers of remembrance and regret.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints the two Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late distinguished Representative from West Virginia, JOHN KEE, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 9, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Rosina F. Bachhuber
Sybil A. Grant
Mylrdred E. Jones
Rosalie W. Martin
Virginia K. Peterson
Mildred A. Robertson
Eleanor J. Sowers
Gladys M. Sperrie
Ethel A. Weyant

MEDICAL CORPS

Gioconda R. Saraniero

SUPPLY CORPS

Bessie Hagopian
Arlene M. Sheehan

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. LeRoy P. Hunt, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps effective from the date of his retirement.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Jared Allen Walker et al. for promotion in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 26, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Jared Allen Walker, which is shown on page 4428, and ending with the name of William Eugene Dye, which is shown on page 4429.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

John C. LeDoux
Robert H. Miller
Robert A. Litke

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of James L. Beam et al. for appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 24, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of James L. Beam, which appears on page 4278, and ending with the name of Cullen C. Zimmerman, which is shown on page 4280.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that daily we may aspire and strive to live on the plane of high personal morality and do all in our power to lift and lead suffering and struggling humanity into nobler ways of living.

Show us how we may combat and conquer those evils of hatred and prejudice and ill will in our own hearts and in the social order that hinder and frustrate the glorious purposes which Thou hast for us and all mankind.

May we continue to pray fervently and labor earnestly for the dawning of that brighter day when every selfish passion and every thought of personal aggrandizement shall be silenced and the hearts of men shall go out to one another in the spirit of good will.

Help us to believe that there are no problems, individual or social, national or international, so dark and terrible which men and nations cannot solve if they only will to solve them and only will to cultivate and manifest the finer spirit of brotherhood and justice and peace.

We thank Thee for the Christian life and character of Thy servant who walked in and out among us and who sought to serve his generation according to Thy divine will. May we rejoice in the glad assurance that his spirit now dwells in heavenly blessedness, forever with the Lord. We are sending unto the members of his bereaved family our love and sympathy through the God of all consolation.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

By unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was considered as read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 984. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 24. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 275. An act for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 291. An act for the relief of Claudio Pier Connelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 297. An act for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 360. An act for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 467. An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 536. An act for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 652. An act for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 677. An act to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 879. An act for the relief of Luigi Podesta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 915. An act for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 945. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1025. An act to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1054. An act for the relief of Curt Edward Friese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1092. An act for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1109. An act for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1113. An act for the relief of Philip J. Hincks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1183. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1220. An act to authorize the appointment of Bernt Balchen as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1229. An act for the relief of Jan Joseph Wieckowski and his wife and daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1254. An act for the relief of Athanasios Elias Cheliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 136. An act allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the customer.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. IRVING (at the request of Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. MAGEE, from May 10 to May 18, on account of official business.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN KEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 223).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN KEE, a Representative from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the passing of our dear friend and colleague the Honorable JOHN KEE. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the beloved dean of our West Virginia delegation died just a few short moments ago. He was stricken while presiding over the committee.

We console ourselves, knowing he died as he wished, on the job, in the service of the State and Nation he loved so well. Because of his service, his loss is a sad day for the people of West Virginia and of the Nation.

It has been my high privilege to know, esteem, and love JOHN KEE for many years. Our friendship extended more than 40 years. Our paths first crossed as young lawyers. I knew him when he served with distinction in the State Senate of West Virginia. We came to Congress together on March 4, 1933. We have been through many battles together. He was always motivated by great humanitarian principles. Only yesterday we discussed the proposal for sending aid and succor to the starving peoples of India. He was greatly concerned with the suffering in that country.

JOHN KEE was honorable. He was able. He was a fine, outstanding man.

We do not know why JOHN KEE died. We know not why he lived. His birth, life, and death are to us wrapped in a cloak of mystery, as is the life cycle of us all. Yet we know that death is not all. We know from the word of God and from our faith in that word that he has only departed to a better world, where he enjoys life eternal. Let us hope that we may all live so that when our time comes to leave this earth we may be able, like our departed friend, to wrap the mantle of our couch about us and lie down to pleasant dreams.

It is difficult for me to control my feelings as I speak of this great loss. My heart goes out to his devoted wife and children. We will all miss him. God bless him. He was a great and able man.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, a great American and a great orator one time said at the bier of his brother:

> On the night of death hope sees a star,
> And listening, love hears the rustle of a wing.

I have always thought that the beauty of that statement would have been even more beautiful if the speaker had changed one word and said, "On the night of death faith sees a star and listening love hears the rustle of a wing."

On this morning of death our faith, too, sees a star after the departure of a great man who had great faith in his country and its institutions and in his God. Judge KEE taught us much about what real faith means.

I came to the Congress with Judge KEE. During our first term I began to know him, to admire him, and to love him, and through every succeeding year that affection and admiration grew.

Judge KEE was an humble man. As you know, humility goes with true greatness.

He was a man of indomitable courage, though all did not realize it because of his quiet way. Judge KEE's motto was honesty in all dealings with his fellowman. In addition to that, he was a great lawyer, but his legal light was carried under a bushel; only those of us who served with him for so many years on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House knew the full extent of his legal knowledge. He was not the kind of man who delighted in exhibitionism on the floor of the House of Representatives, but those who sat with him through the long hours at the council table of our committee year in and year out knew of the depth of his learning.

This morning the Foreign Affairs Committee was in session and Judge KEE was sitting at its head as its chairman, as he had for so many years. We had just passed resolution very close to his heart—a resolution known as the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution, which extended to the people of Russia—the people, not the Government, of Russia—a friendly hand, and gave notice to the

peoples of the world that, though nations are arrayed against nations, yet the heart and hand of friendship of the American people went out to the Russian people, as well as all the other oppressed peoples of the earth.

Just after that resolution was passed our beloved chairman got up, put his hand on my shoulder, and said, "DICK, will you take the chair?" He walked out, took only a few steps into another office, and slumped into the arms of friends, and so a noble man passed away. He died with his boots on, and, had he been able to choose, I do not think he would have chosen any other way. Only yesterday I talked with his son, who is a dear friend of mine and who has many of the gentle and learned characteristics of his father. I tried to persuade him to get his father to go away in the hope that he might recover his health. He said, "I have taken that up with father, and do you know what he told me? He said, 'Jimmy, I'd die quickly if I did not carry on. When I go I want to go in harness'."

So a great man has passed on. We admired him and we will cherish his memory; we valued his guidance, and we will continue to value it though he is gone.

May the Great Master console his devoted wife and family and wipe away their tears in the memory that their loved one fought a great fight to the end of his earthly day and now reaps the reward of a clean, unselfish life.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK].

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a terrible day for me; it will be for every West Virginian who knew Judge KEE as I knew him. We loved him; the people of West Virginia admired his ability, admired his sincerity, his honesty; and I want to assure you that we shall miss him greatly in our State.

I have known Judge KEE practically all my life. As a small boy, I remember that he, as a young man, was buying rights-of-way for the Virginian Railroad that was being constructed through our section. They selected Mr. KEE, as everybody knew him in those days, to buy the right-of-way for the Virginian Railroad because of his unusual ability, because he had a knack of attracting people and making friends; in other words, he could contact the farmers and the country people there and they knew they would get a fair deal.

That was my first acquaintance with him. I have known him since then on and off for the rest of his life. I knew him as a State senator, I knew him as a very able attorney in our State. When a client would get Judge KEE to represent him, everybody would say: "He will not have very much trouble. He has a real lawyer." Everyone felt that way about Judge KEE. They felt that he was a brilliant and outstanding attorney.

Judge KEE came to Congress in May 1932, some 18 years ago. At that time the people of West Virginia missed him tremendously. Many people looked upon him as the most outstanding lawyer in that section of the country. Although he was missed there, he has done an excellent job here in Washington and the people of my State are extremely proud of the record he has made here as a Representative and they were particularly proud of the fact he became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It is sad to know that a real American, a real gentleman, a valuable man to his country and to his State, has to become disabled and grow old. But that is something we all have to face.

Judge KEE was greatly devoted to his family and to his many friends in West Virginia. He loved his constituents. He admired people and enjoyed the associations of his friends and neighbors. He had a fine sense of humor and a keen perspective of life. Always gentle and kind, he loved to assist his friends in any way he could. Judge KEE was a religious man, and we shall all miss his guiding influence greatly. Our country has lost a valuable citizen.

I extend to the family of Judge KEE my most heartfelt sympathy. I am sure every Member of this House who knew Judge KEE will join with me in extending sympathy to his family and to the people of West Virginia.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in mourning the passing of our dear friend and colleague, we pause to pay tribute to the memory of a great man. The suddenness of his death, with its direct effect on each and every one of us, and with the recollections that we have of this noble-minded gentleman, make it difficult for us to express our feelings and our thoughts.

I was seated in my office just prior to coming to the House Chamber when I received the sad news of the passing of JOHN KEE. Many great men and women have served in this body and, with the help and the guidance of God, after we have left here many others will continue to serve our country for countless generations to come. I think I can say without exaggeration that during the constitutional history of our country covering a period of 160 years or more there has been no Member who was elected and who came into this Chamber who performed his duties in a more sincere, in a more devoted and in a more able manner than did our late friend. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] said, and properly so, that JOHN KEE "died with his boots on." While performing his duties as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning, in the line of active duty as a legislator, the sudden attack came that resulted in practically his immediate death. I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] that the probabilities are that JOHN KEE died as he would liked to have died as the gentleman from South Carolina so aptly expressed in his own words "in the harness." This is a moment of sadness; not only a moment but an event of sadness for all of us. But, in evaluating the life of this great man we can all learn a constructive message therefrom: Born in West Virginia in 1874, taking the journey of life just as all of us have in our own way, but taking it constructively, as a friend of his neighbor, as a legislator in his own State government, as a lawyer, as a legislator in the Congress of the United States, as a human being with a heart, a man who believed in the two greatest commandments of all, love of God and love of neighbor; the second one so frequently overlooked and only given lip service by those who say they believe. JOHN KEE has left his imprint not only upon the minds of all of those who knew him but his favorable imprint upon the pages of the history of our country. Occupying one of the most responsible positions that a man could occupy under our form of Government, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and during one of the most trying periods, not only in the history of our country but in the history of the world, he responded to the tasks that devolved upon him as chairman of that great committee and rendered outstanding service in the national interest of our country and of our people. His life is an example for each and everyone of us to follow, not only Americans, but all other persons throughout the world; the example of using and utilizing the God-given gift that the human race has had bestowed upon it of the power to think, of possessing the means whereby we can think and reason and resolve our thoughts and reasoning into a will and to exercise that will for good, the good of our neighbor, the good of our State, and the good of our Nation.

A poet once referred to nobility of character, and another poet to God's noblemen. I think there was no man who during his life more clearly and effectively as a human being symbolized nobility of character, and who is more entitled to be included among that class known as God's noblemen, than our late friend, JOHN KEE.

His passing leaves a void which it is going to be difficult to fill, not only from the angle of his character and his associations with us but from the angle of his sincerity and integrity and his ability, as well as his devotion to duty as a legislator. Starting as a boy, taking the journey of life that he has, with the record that is his now and for all time, the people of West Virginia may well feel proud that JOHN KEE was a son of that great State. The people of the United States can be proud that JOHN KEE lived, that JOHN KEE served in this body, because the contributions of JOHN KEE as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and as a Member of this House were of inestimable value to the best interests and the national interests of our country. He died seeking peace on earth.

His journey on earth is ended, but the results of his contribution shall live on forever.

To Mrs. Kee and her loved ones I extend my profound sympathy. I extend my deep sympathy to the West Virginia delegation in the House. I also extend my deep sympathy not only to the people of JOHN KEE's congressional district but to the people of the entire State of West

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Virginia. In the passing of JOHN KEE, I have lost a dear and valued friend.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad hour for all of us in the Eighty-second Congress. One of our beloved colleagues has been stricken while in the performance of his duties.

Here in Congress we come to know intimately each Member, we evaluate his merit, his ability, and his worth. JOHN KEE was known to all of us as a man of great ability, a man devoted to the service of his State and his country, a kind and generous man, one who wished to make his country a little better for his having lived in it.

I know in recent years he has been tried as few men have been tried, because he was in a position where he had to make momentous decisions, decisions of vital importance to the country and the world. That unquestionably tired him tremendously. It sapped his strength and hastened his death. It can truthfully be said, that he died in the service of his country just as surely as if he had fallen on the field of battle.

We mourn the death of a beloved colleague. The world is better for his having lived. We do well to pay our little tribute to the deceased statesman. I join with the great State of West Virginia in deploring the loss of a valued public servant and a Christian gentleman and a real American. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, a member of Mr. KEE's committee.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I find it very hard to express the feelings of myself and our colleagues on the committee at this moment. I loved JOHN KEE—he was my dear friend. He was a pure-souled man. He stepped in a moment from time into eternity, which is a fine way to go—he was ready to go. We sat side by side on the committee for many years and I do not recall once that we had a disagreement which amounted to anything except superficially in the matter of opinion. He leaves behind him an honored name. His family can be proud of his memory. His State and country and this great body can be proud of the service he rendered. I simply want to lay beside his dear body this wreath of my profound personal affection and my tremendous sense of loss.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a gentle man has gone to his reward. As has been brought out by those who have preceded me, JOHN KEE, chairman of our committee, died in the saddle in the performance of his duty. JOHN KEE was living on borrowed time, because in talking to Admiral Calver this morning I was informed that he had a heart condition from which very few men recovered and which he had carried for the past 10 years. There was no more gentle, no more conscientious, and no fairer man than Judge KEE, and we on the committee are going to miss him and miss him greatly. Judge KEE was not only an honor and an asset to his district, he was something worth while which the State of West Virginia gave to the Nation. He in turn worked not only for his district and his State and his Nation but for world peace with everything he possessed. Judge KEE cannot be replaced very easily but in laying down his life within the past hour he laid down his life in a good cause because he was working and striving and doing his utmost in behalf of the people whom he represented. Judge KEE has not died but has just passed from one room into another. He is now in the House of his Father.

To Mrs. Kee and her family I extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of distress. He was a good husband, a good father, a good man.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], a member of Mr. KEE's committee.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, to us who have served with Judge KEE on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have felt the warmth of his gentleness and sensed the strength of his soul, the word that came to us but a few moments after he left his chair and walked through the door into the other room could not be other than a great shock. We knew he had walked for years upon the threshold, but somehow we felt he would not have to go beyond. But with his accustomed gentle courtesy he gave over the chair and went into the "next room." He has gone with the kind of faith that we all need, a faith that is not a passive thing, a mere believing or waiting, but a faith which is an active thing, a positive striving and achievement, a faith that is a brave endeavor and a splendid enterprise, a faith that is a bird that feels the light and sings when the dawn is still dark. He heard the music of the song and went quietly into the "other room." We are left here knowing that without him for a moment the world must be darker for us, and yet we know that because of him our world is a better place in which to live, so great his talent for friendship, so wonderful his capacity for kindness. So few today have time for kindness. The Judge was dispensing it wherever he went; in whatever direction he set his feet radiated the beauty of his soul.

I know so well that no words of mine will bring surcease to his wife and his dear ones in these first hours of devastation. Yet I would share with them and with all to whom the judge has been companion, friend, counselor, and fellow Member of this great body words from the Ancient Wisdom of the Aryans:

Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;
Never was time it was not: end and beginning are dreams;
Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit forever;
Death hath not touched it all, dead though the house of it seems.

Nay, but as one who layeth
His worn-out robes away,
And, taking new ones, sayeth:
"These will I wear today!"
So putteth by the spirit
Lightly its robe of flesh,
And passeth to inherit
A residence afresh.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Death has come to JOHN KEE as it must come to all men. The Lord in His omnipotent wisdom has chosen to extinguish that flash, that transitory flash that we choose to call life. He has taken JOHN KEE's eternal soul and placed it in the eternity that was prepared for him years ago. We who continue in this vale of tears will miss the friendship of JOHN KEE, but he has left to each and every one of us a legacy, a legacy of thoughtfulness, a legacy of kindness, a legacy of devotion to duty, a legacy to show respect for God and respect for man.

We who have served with John are richer by his presence, by his thoughtfulness; we learned what it meant to be considerate of each other. His devotion to his country, his devotion to his duties in this House will long be remembered by all of us who had the happiness and privilege of serving with him.

Death is such a final thing that it is almost impossible for us adequately to express to his family the feelings we have for them in their hour of sorrow, but at the same time we realize that they, too, are much richer than the ordinary mortal by reason of their associations with and their intimate feelings and their intimate regard for one who was a dear father and a dear husband.

The Members of this House, the employees of the House, the people of the Nation, the people of the State have suffered a great loss.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there will be forever etched upon my memory the final minutes in the life of JOHN KEE. As I watched him this morning while he presided over our committee, he seemed a bit flushed, and then I saw him lean over and speak to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. John got up, Mr. RICHARDS took the chair, and our beloved chairman walked out of our lives. As he walked his step was uncertain. Obviously, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] recognized his distress, for he, too, stepped up and assisted him into his office. In a few minutes he was gone from us.

There was something about this man that is difficult to describe. When I first went on this great committee I was down at the end of the table and JOHN KEE was in the middle of the table on the opposite side. With the passing of time, the elimination of Members by death and elections, JOHN KEE finally took his place as chairman of the committee.

I have never known a man who was more gentle, more kind, or more considerate than our beloved chairman. I ex-

pect that I have disagreed with him more than any other member of the committee, but in disagreement with him there was no lack of respect; we could disagree without being disagreeable. He treated me with the greatest consideration, and when we talked about it, as we did, he would so often say: "Well, this is in the great American tradition." And now he is gone and he has achieved that peace which passeth all understanding. If we could hear his voice as it comes down to us from the celestial at this moment I am sure he would be saying to each and every one of us: "Carry on! Carry on! Carry on!"

A great American has left us. His imprint on this body will last for a long time.

Nothing that I can say will match the effort that he made in his lifetime for his community, his State, and his Nation. Well done thou good and faithful servant.

To his family, his friends, his State, and to his party, my deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, 1 hour ago in his office upstairs next to the Foreign Affairs Committee room, with his loyal assistant, Mr. Boyd Crawford and myself at his side, Judge JOHN KEE passed on to his reward.

I have been a member of this Committee on Foreign Affairs for some 3 years and during most of that time I served under the able chairmanship of Judge KEE. I can truthfully say that I have never been associated with a harder working man, a more conscientious, or a fairer individual than our beloved friend who has just passed away.

Judge KEE was presiding this morning over the consideration of some very vital legislation—vital to the welfare and the future of this country. I was near Judge KEE and facing him in the committee so when he tapped our colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] on the shoulder and asked him to preside I felt called upon to assist the judge to his room next door. Boyd and I helped him lie down on the couch. We tried to make his comfortable. Boyd called the doctor and we talked a couple of minutes. Judge KEE's mind was perfectly clear. Within a few minutes after presiding over our committee he had left us without suffering any pain.

Judge KEE died in the Capitol, on the job, which is the way he wanted to go. All of us knew it was bound to come very soon because we realized some time ago he could have lived much longer if he had forgotten his duties, if he had taken a much-deserved vacation, but that is not the way he wanted it. Judge KEE died doing his duty and our country is better for his life and for his services.

I join with Mr. KEE's family in mourning his loss because he was a wonderful man, a wonderful father and husband, a great citizen, an outstanding Member of Congress, an able chairman, and a fine American.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, the parting of friends is always sad and the sudden passing of Judge KEE, who has lived 6 years beyond the promise of 3 score and 10 pained me exceedingly because I had formed a deep-seated admiration for him, both as a Christian citizen and as a sound legislator. I know something of the high hopes he had in the field of foreign affairs, a subject that rested very near his heart. He talked often to me about the point 4 program and asked me to get up twice here and speak about it. It was a thing that had been very much on his mind recently. He was worried about it yesterday, as well as a few days before that. He said, "The hands of the people of India are stretched out to us. This is on my mind; I cannot get it off my mind." He said, "They are dying in large numbers over there." The expressions of sadness that he enunciated these recent days are quite in contrast to the life of spreading cheer that we usually associate with JOHN KEE. As he passed among the people in his district, he spread cheer and the people were happy. Judge KEE was known as one of the best storytellers in our State. He was known on this floor as a man who made people brighter. I will never forget young and old have told me that just because he passed their way, they were happier Judge KEE wanted to die when he was working for his country and for the principles that he held dear.

In the sorrow of our parting, when the activity of his human life has ceased, and when our hearts and minds endeavor to fill the void that his going has left in our lives, we can best realize his worth. The need for him each individual soul amongst us had, and his value to the House of Representatives, of which he was so able a defender and whose doctrines he so luminously expounded is keenly felt by all of us today. Judge KEE was extremely sincere and conscientious in all relations of life. I think I can see the honest indignation with which the soul would be stirred by the very shadow of sham or pretense. He had an adament and unappeasable detestation for "him with the two faces," or for him of the fawning ways, or for the cowardly character devoid of courage of his convictions. We read therein the well nigh perfect manhood, scorning all pettiness and subterfuge, and strong and fearless in right doing. The various contributions by this honorable deceased to the promotion, by wise legislation, of the best interest of all America at once stamp him a broadminded and original thinker. In the presence of this death, let us realize our obligation to make safe and secure the Government of the people which has been committed to our keeping; let us realize that it can thrive and grow only in an atmosphere of popular devotion and unselfish attachment; and above all, let us ever remember the lessons and admonitions that flow from the useful life which we today memorialize.

Judge KEE was a man that loved to give service; a man that could have lived many years longer, but he chose to do his work admirably well, and he gave his life just as a soldier gives it. He took all the burdens of this time that we are living in as his burdens, as all of us so readily remember. May we never forget and may we conscientiously carry out the type of life that he lived so exemplary, and may his family rest assured that they had a father and a husband who lived a life well for his country, and may the good Lord give peace to his soul. In closing I would like to give a poem that JOHN KEE wrote in his last days which shows with what triumphant faith he met the sunset of life:

FAITH

When the end comes and I am called from here
To join this silent army of the dead,
Will I receive the summons without fear
And face the unknown future without dread?
What is life that I should care to live?
And what is death that I should fear to die?
Is life, life earthly, all that fate can give?
And should regrets go with each hour gone by?

The autumn comes, and, lo! the dead leaves fall
To lie unheeded on the cold damp earth;
Perhaps the playthings of the winds, they're all
Blown from where the sunshine gave them birth;
But somewhere, sometimes, they will rest, and then
Return unto the earth, from thence ere long
To spring triumphant into life again,
As wildflowers bright and sweet as poet song.

And so, when I am called, I'll go and trust
My soul without a fear to Death's embrace;
For death is but an autumn wind—a gust
That coldly blows an instant, then my place
Is vacant here; but somewhere, in some other clime—
Some other world unseen of mortal eye—
I'll live again; and thence throughout all time
Life will be mine—a soul can never die.

—*John Kee.*

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as one of the newest members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I was privileged to serve with Judge KEE for a very short time, but in that short time I learned to love him and to respect him, and I am sure my life has been enriched by that service.

I join my colleagues in this tribute to him today and in extending to his family my deepest sympathy. May God grant his family, and most particularly Mrs. Kee, the grace to carry this cross. May God take care of him and see that the peace he endeavored to secure for us and for our children will be gained by his endeavors.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, Judge KEE was a good man. In him were combined all the decent human instincts. He was a symbol of humility. It was a great privilege to serve under him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

He loved his colleagues, and he wanted them to share the opportunity of service to the Nation, to the Congress, and the committee.

I recall that after I had been a Member of this House but 6 months, Judge KEE sent for me one day and handed me a major piece of legislation, the international claims bill, saying: "Young man, will you do me a favor by putting your name on this bill and carrying it through hearings and through the House to passage." I realized that it was an unusual thing to give a young Member, a neophyte, that opportunity. He was doing me a great favor. Yet he thanked me for accepting the opportunity conferred by him.

I do not know how long I will be privileged to serve in this House, but I do not think any piece of legislation will ever be so indelibly stamped on my mind as House Concurrent Resolution 57, the McMahon-Ribicoff friendship resolution, that had just been favorably approved by our committee before his passing. Judge KEE had as great an interest in that piece of legislation as I. After it was introduced he sent for me and said the following words, which exemplified the philosophy of life he wanted for this Nation:

"You know, the goal of the United States, our Nation, should always be a goal of peace. As day by day we are involved with short-term matters of foreign policy too little attention is being paid to the long-range point of view, which should prove to the world that the great masses of the people of every Nation desire brotherhood, freedom, and peace." He said, "This resolution of friendship aims toward that goal. You will have my utmost cooperation. I look to the day when the House and the Senate will pass this legislation."

This resolution was the last order of business of the Committee on Foreign Affairs before Judge KEE left the table. I sincerely hope this measure, in a small way, will indicate part of the faith of Judge KEE, as mentioned by the gentleman from South Carolina.

JOHN KEE was a friendly man. Never by word or other indication was there ever any question with him of race, color, creed, or religion. There were no dividing lines in his mind anywhere in the entire universe for any peoples of the world. Judge KEE wanted friendship for all the peoples of the world so that mankind could live in peace and harmony. So, too, did his life go along in peace and harmony.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my sincere condolences to Mrs. Kee and his family.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity probably has been given to me to know JOHN KEE longer than nearly any Member of this House. I was here when he came to the Congress 13 or 20 years ago. He came from a district which almost adjoins mine. In other words, his district comes down nearly to the Ohio River and my district runs along the Ohio River. We had one thing in common. All of you have served with him as a Member of Congress, but I knew him as a lawyer, as a brother lawyer. I want to say to you who are lawyers that JOHN KEE was a good lawyer. His ability in that respect had been proven by the clientele which he enjoyed. He had had some international connections as a lawyer. His district was a mountain district and he was just as strong with his people as the mountains themselves and yet he was just as peaceful and gentle as the little streams that trickle all down through his mountain country. He was a man who had the respect of the courageous mountaineers of his district and he loved the men from the mountains and they respected him. So I want to leave the thought with you that JOHN KEE was no ordinary man. While he had the respect of the men because he was a man's man he also because of this courteous and kindly disposition had the respect of the women and children. I knew JOHN KEE as a man and as a Congressman and as a lawyer. I say again JOHN KEE was a big lawyer. He represented big clients. He represented the very heart of that great mountain State. About 10 years ago he commenced to show signs of having heart trouble. He and I were working on a project that was to be located up in the mountains. It was the Bluestone Dam. His wife was anxious about him when he was required to go down to the Government buildings here in Washington. She indicated her anxiety by requesting me to help him if he would be required to climb difficult steps. I followed her instructions and John and I went down together and ascended the long steps together without any serious results.

So my friends back in the hills and hollows of West Virginia when they hear of the death of JOHN KEE today and for some time to come they will say as I am saying now, "JOHN KEE, mountain man, one of our own who went to the top because of his strength when he needed to be strong and because of his gentleness when he needed to be gentle and because of his industry and knowledge at all times.

They will never forget him because they have for years recognized his ability and fine character. They will tell future generations of his virtues and fine qualities and they will be proud that they had known him. To his relatives I extend my profound sympathy.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, a great man has passed on. I join with his family in their bereavement in this sad moment. He was a sincere, honest, family man. He was devoted to his Nation. He was a gentle, honest, chivalrous, clean-minded, God-fearing man who believed in man, the masterpiece of God's creation, the finest of all fine things in this world. He believed in God the infinite Architect of the Universe and the Compassionate Ruler of Destiny. My life has been made better by my association with JOHN KEE. His friendship has meant a lot to me. He has passed on beyond the shadows where someday all of us will be called.

I would like to give a part of a poem which I believe exemplifies the spirit and typifies the life of this man better than any words I might say. The name of the poem is Myself:

I have to live with myself, and so
I want to be fit for myself to know;
I want to be able as the days go by
Always to look myself in the eye.
I don't want to stand with the setting sun
And hate myself for things I've done.
I want to go out with my head erect;
I want to deserve every man's respect.

The State of West Virginia and the Nation will miss the great influence of JOHN KEE.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the sudden and untimely passing of our beloved colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. KEE, the House of Representatives loses one of its most able, conscientious, and hard-working Members.

As chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs it was his task to carry a heavy load. A load heavier than is the lot of many of us. Judge KEE in his long, effective, and rich life never stepped aside from his path of service. He carried on to the very end. We who knew him well are sure this is just as he would have had it.

Judge KEE was a great committee chairman, always fair and considerate, and in his quiet way he was effective.

I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, a noble character, a warm-hearted friend. I join with my colleagues in extending to the members of his family our deepest sympathy.

Of Judge KEE it can well be said, "mission accomplished," for death to him is merely a benediction to a great life and an invocation to a glorious immortality.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I heard Dr. John R. Mott say one time that the greatest biography that had ever been written was a short sentence referring to Jesus: "He went about doing good."

If that could be said of the greatest and best who walked the earth, what finer aspiration could any of us have?

I have an idea when all of the obituaries have been written and tributes paid there will be this emphasis upon goodness in the life of a man who was also great, who was also able, who was also outstanding. I have an idea too that the family will rejoice in these things we have said of him.

Mention has been made of his "gentleness." We use the word glibly sometimes, when we refer to the "the gentleman from this State or that State," but when he was recognized it could truthfully be said, "the gentle person from West Virginia has the floor."

As one of the junior members of his committee I wish to add this tribute. Dumas Malone one of the recent biographers of Jefferson tells us that Jefferson believed that goodness lies at the heart of things, at the center of the universe. Judge KEE had that faith. I think it is appropriate in the counsels of statecraft that this recognition of standards of rectitude be made, and that even on a solemn occasion like this we recognize the stern necessity for maintaining them.

This is the second such experience I have had as a Member of the House in the 8 years I have been here, to see a beloved chairman of my committee pass on very dramatically.

When our dear friend Henry Steagall died, I remember Sam Hobbs said here that the Angel of Death had seized the muscles of his tired heart. Judge KEE's heart and brain had grown tired in the service of his State and his Nation.

To be sure, Mr. Speaker, I am happy that reference is made to his ability as a lawyer and as a statesman. I read a book recently that mentioned him—almost casually I came upon it—some notable professional service he had rendered West Virginia. We recognize that he was really a great lawyer and a great legislator, but I believe that he will be recalled more often for the contribution of goodness and kindness that this world so sorely needs.

When a friend of ours passes on we are again reminded that our investment in the other world continues to pile up; so, in closing, I recall the words that were said of Douglas Malloch by his friend Emerson Hough with whom he had ridden the woods and plains:

> To all eternity he binds us;
> He links the planet and the star.
> He rides ahead; the trail he finds us,
> And where he is and where we are
> Will never seem again so far.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I too, served under Judge KEE as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and it has been said so truly by our colleague from Missouri, that he was a great chairman. He was a great chairman because he had the true essence and heart of a lawyer. He was completely judicious. May I say, because this is the time to speak of personal experiences, that my great feeling about Judge KEE was the workmanlike quality he understood so well. We can all learn from him that there is no magic road to greatness of leadership, that it is a lot of very hard work. We have had sessions in the Foreign Affairs Committee in the past many times that went far into the night, engaged in drafting meticulously individual pieces of legislation. I shall never forget the picture of Judge KEE at those sessions chiseling and perfecting every word, helping others with their amendments, doing his utmost in workmanship, stone by stone, the polishing and cleaning which makes us what we are, the great legislative body of the greatest country on earth.

I hope very much that his own family will look on him not only in terms of the father, the husband, the warm, human, gentle being who has been so beautifully described here today, but also as the workman knowing his magnificent art, working at it constantly and, while even as we all know so sadly today, until the very moment of death itself.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the grief in our hearts this day is overwhelming, especially in the hearts of those of us who were near the side of our beloved and esteemed chairman, Judge JOHN KEE, when he passed away. Were it within our province and had we known—those of us present in the room as the Judge walked into his office—that he was leaving the meeting for the last time, we would have called after him: "Not just now, Judge; not just now."

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a friend, a counselor, a leader—a leader our Nation can ill afford to lose in these troubled times.

Our beloved chairman, Judge KEE—soft-spoken, humble, gentle, and kind—was a man of great heart and of sterling faith. He was of strong will in the defense of his country. His determination in matters of principle was immovable. Unselfishly devoted to his duties, he gave untiringly of his efforts.

Although short were the years of my acquaintance with Judge KEE, they have exerted a deep impression, and left an indelible influence, on me. I shall continue to look upon Judge KEE as my mentor.

To the family of Judge KEE, to his beloved wife, to his many, many friends I wish to express my sincere sympathy. There is little that can further be said to ease their grief. His peaceful passing was in keeping with his peaceful life. Let us be consoled in the thought that the good Lord has chosen him to be numbered among His very own.

Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord, and may perpetual light shine upon him.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am a part of all the people I have known and met. That part of Judge KEE I want most to retain is his utter inability to understand the meanness and littleness of so many people around him. He was completely incapable of understanding that mankind was not good and that his purpose was not to glorify God. If those who knew Judge KEE and respected him could but grasp that part of his great life, that is, his belief in the goodness of humanity, then they will have been immeasurably benefited.

Mr. Speaker, in these terrible times perhaps it can be said that only the dead shall be happy, but certainly it may be said that if we are to solve and meet the problems that are ours, we must do it out of the experience of the dead.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate the beautiful tributes which have been paid to a great man. I believe that each Member of this body would wish for himself similar tributes when he, too, is called to final accounting.

As the giants among our midst depart, Mr. Speaker, I have felt that even in the sadness of it all, the shock of it all, it is one method of God revealing His mysterious ways, because as we sit here and contemplate the loss of a courageous, honorable, able, gentle soul we also recognize the frailty of human beings, and we turn to the eternal truths which must, after all, be the beacon light of all men.

Possibly the lesson in all of this is that if men in their mad rush for material gain, which is about to plunge the world into the worst type of blood letting and hatred, they would hesitate and turn to God more frequently and ask Him for guidance. Then, certainly, we would find the answer to the problems of this troubled world.

Judge KEE was a courageous man, a gentle man; he devoted his life to the noblest cause of all, the cause of understanding, the cause of peace. What a parliament could be convened in the heavens above as we contemplate the great men who have left our midst only in recent days—Senator Vandenberg in the other body and now JOHN KEE here. I am certain that this man, this courageous man who gave his life for the cause of peace, has found peace.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when I came to serve in the House of Representatives in 1943 I became acquainted with Judge JOHN KEE, and over the succeeding years I was acquainted with him as I am with many Members of the House, not closely, but from day to day I would see him in the Chambers and speak to him and I was always impressed with his kindliness and his courtesy and his Christlike spirit. At the beginning of this year I was assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in the few months that I have had the privilege of serving on this committee I really got to know JOHN KEE and to know the sterling qualities of his leadership, his wisdom, his consideration for the younger members on the committee, and his kindness at all times. It has been a great experience, one of the greatest experiences of my life, to know him. It has been a great experience for me to serve on this committee. I have been impressed with the earnestness of the members of the committee in the consideration of the tremendously important subjects with which we have to deal. I think a great deal of that earnestness and that courtesy between the members and that appreciation of the other member's viewpoint, although it may be different from your own, comes from the leadership which this committee has had under men like Dr. EATON, of New Jersey, and JOHN KEE, of West Virginia. And I pay this tribute to Dr. EATON and I pay this tribute to our late colleague,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

JOHN KEE, because I believe they are men of great similarity; they are men who are learned in the ways of godliness and who have contributed, in their span of service in this body, in great and inestimable ways by setting examples of patience and kindness and consideration and by always being objective and understanding of those who have different viewpoints. It has been a great privilege for me to know JOHN KEE better. I extend to his family and to his loved ones my deepest sympathy, and in my small way I want to say that in giving JOHN KEE to the Nation they have given a real statesman, a man whose examples we may all try to follow.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, only a few minutes ago I learned of the sudden and untimely passing of Judge JOHN KEE. This is a profund shock to all who knew and loved him. We have lost a kind, understanding, and helpful friend.

For several years it has been my privilege to serve on the House Foreign Affairs Committee under the able leadership of our late beloved chairman. Over these years I grew to know Judge KEE and became increasingly impressed with his fairness, his patience, and his understanding in the handling of the momentous issues which were before our committee. Under his chairmanship and leadership measures of great importance not only to our own country but to the world were enacted into law. Chairman KEE was an untiring worker, a man of great courage and a profound statesman.

I value his friendship greatly and I count it a privilege to have had the opportunity of knowing him and of working with him. During his many years of service in this House he established a distinguished and an enduring record. In his passing the Nation has sustained a tremendous loss.

I extend to his family and to his loved ones my heartfelt sympathy in these very difficult hours.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, not only the people of his native State of West Virginia, but the whole Nation will be shocked to learn of the sudden passing of our colleague and my very personal friend, JOHN KEE, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

This body and this country has lost a distinguished servant and a man of particular attainments in his chosen field—international relations.

In his more than 20 years of service in the Halls of Congress, he has achieved an enviable record. Charged with the responsibility of implementing our foreign policies, he gave unstintingly of his time and his labors in behalf of our country and in his death he leaves a well-defined path of action that we, his colleagues, could well follow.

Congressman KEE was born at Glenville, Gilmer County, W. Va., in 1874, in the district I now have the honor to represent. He later moved to Bluefield, W. Va., where he established an outstanding record as a member of the bar. He served his State in its legislature as a member of the senate, with distinction prior to his election to the Congress.

Congressman KEE was real and entirely void of sham. He was never touched by the pomp of power and never lured from the realities of human fellowship. He served his Nation, his State, and his district well. His service in the Congress is especially valuable in these days of conflicting emotions and difficult problems and in his going I have lost a personal friend and the Nation has lost a distinguished conscientious Member of Congress.

If he had any faults they have long since been washed away in the changing sands. I am sure his many virtues are already inscribed on tablets of gold.

I wish to express to his wife and children my profound sympathy in the loss of a devoted husband and father.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest grief and profound shock that I learned of the sudden death of my chairman, JOHN KEE, Representative of the Fifth West Virginia District. His passing is an irreparable loss to all who knew him.

As a Member of this body, he lived up to its highest and best traditions. In the performance of his duties he brought the mature wisdom of an understanding heart, a mind enriched with a knowledge of government and a full rounded experience in legislative procedure. He guarded zealously the integrity and prerogatives of the Congress and his committee.

During his tenure as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee I never saw him lose his head. He was always fair, loyal, wise, and helpful in all he said and did. It was indeed a great privilege to serve under him.

Although in ill health, he felt it was his duty to carry on his pressing work as chairman. He died in harness and gave his life for his country just as a soldier on the battlefield.

Judge, as he was affectionately known by his friends, was a great public servant, a true American, and a friend of all who knew him. He was quiet and unassuming in his manner but stood firm as a rock for the principles which he believed were for the betterment of our country.

I join with my colleagues in extending my sympathy to his family. We will miss his human qualities which endeared him to us all.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of JOHN KEE this House has suffered a great loss. The country has given up a splendid servant who truly served his day and generation. His was a good and kindly soul, one of the finest and most patriotic men it has ever been my privilege to know. He was a statesman of the first order.

With his loved ones we shall miss him always. To his family goes my deepest sympathy.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and services of the late JOHN KEE.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked at the passing of the beloved chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning. It has been my privilege and honor to have been a member of this great committee during my tenure of office in this great body.

Judge KEE was a good and kindly man who was never touched by the pomp of power. His gentle smile expressed the goodness and sincerity of his heart. I do not believe I have met or been associated with a man of finer character. Truly, he was one of God's noblemen, whose vision, integrity, and talents were worthy of any man.

In Judge KEE the Nation has lost a strong man and a devoted servant. All of us have lost a dear friend. A truly great man has passed to his reward. But in doing so he has left for us an inspiring example of unselfish public service worthy of our emulation, and the memory of a noble friendship.

Words at a time like this are hard to find and one gropes blindly; however, in closing, I wish to extend to his widow and family my deepest and sincerest sympathy.

May God be gracious to his family and to the people whom he served.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during my many years' service here, I have had the honor and pleasure of serving with approximately 3,400 Members, many of whom endeared themselves to me in many ways. I do not recall anybody, however, for whom I had a more genuine affection than I had for JOHN KEE.

With the passing of Mr. KEE this House has lost one of its most useful Members and the Nation one of its most distinguished citizens. A true, intelligent, patriotic friend of the commonalty has reached the journey's end freighted with the affection of an ever-expanding myriad of discriminating friends. Those of us who had served with him here for almost 20 years will unite in applauding the many generous tributes that we hear at this hour concerning his far-flung life, unsullied character, and transcendent public service.

After a good basic education, our friend was very successful in the practice of law, which led him quite naturally to 4 years in the senate of his State as a further preparation for the onerous and important duties of a member and chairman of the committee over which he presided with a singular degree of dignity, grace, and efficiency. As the problems of the world increased with the problems of the United States in relation to other countries, the importance of his committee and its burdens increased many fold, and, as its chairman, Mr. KEE bore the greater part of the load. He did not shirk the responsibility of his exalted position, but shouldered it

gladly, because he was a selfless man with an eye single to welfare of country. I cannot help but feel, Mr. Speaker, that his inordinate devotion to duty hastened his lamented end.

If our departed friend could have his way there would be no laudatory mention of him today in this Chamber, which has broad and penetrating experience graced, as I have said, for well nigh 20 years. He would say in his gentle fashion that his passing, after a legal and legislative career which won him the admiration, respect and affection of countless numbers, was not of any special moment and required no comment. But we can take advantage of him now and say that which is in our hearts.

Although this honorable deceased had lived several years beyond the Psalmist's promise of three score and ten, yet, judging by his superior accomplishments and unusual activity up to a short while ago, we had reason to confidently expect him to remain with us much longer. His passing at this time is indeed a special loss, because, obviously, we do very much need the services of one equipped as he was by temperament and experience in the important field of international relations and diplomacy.

Mr. KEE was my friend. I ever had a most wholesome respect for his human attributes. I shall very much miss him, as one of the great and lasting friendships of my life, while his impress will live in the legislation of the last 20 years, and his influence will go down the corridor of the years as an inspiration to those less gifted but who aspire to the Himalayan heights he attained. It will be a long time before we again have here a man so able and yet so unassuming and humane. If I may employ a figure, I would say of him: He was a lighthouse from which shone the beams that guided great fleets to safe harbor.

Let us not forget the loved and loving members of the family of this good man in their hour of greatest sorrow. May they derive much comfort from the priceless legacy that is theirs.

Verily, the life of JOHN KEE was one of true American manhood, worthy of emulation by all who love patriotism, righteousness, and truth.

May he rest in the peace he has so well earned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sympathy to the family of our departed colleague.

I was honored to serve as a junior member under his able leadership of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Since my election to this House, I have been continually impressed with his broad knowledge and deep understanding of the great issues of foreign policy which have confronted our country in recent years. To these issues he brought his talents to marshal the facts with logic and clarity and yet he always kept to the fore the human elements involved. He was not only a great lawyer, a renowned legislator, but a man guided by gentle kindness, guided by love and respect for his fellow human beings.

I know that he will be sadly missed by his many friends in his home State of West Virginia, and by his friends here in Washington, but, in addition, his experienced guidance and his qualities of leadership will be missed by his country which he served so well.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sincere regret on the passing of our beloved chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Judge JOHN KEE. He was a fine gentleman, a fine American, and a fine friend. His loss will be felt throughout the world. A friend of Democracy has passed on.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day, indeed, for everyone who knew Judge KEE. As evidenced by the expressions of Members of this House, he had a particular place in the affections of those with whom he had been associated. He generated a confidence felt by those who had any sort of contact with him, by reason of his quiet assurances, his devotion to duty, and his devotion to the principles for which he stood.

This occasion should remind all of us of the beauty of life. I suppose it is only human nature that we seldom realize or can fully appreciate the goodness and purity of the lives of others until they are no longer with us. It is our nature also to withhold approbation from the living. It seems we never quite get around to it when the ears can hear and the hearts respond. It is not known to any of us whether Judge KEE can hear the words of appreciation and can know the heaviness of hearts caused by his passing, but the things of which we can be reminded at this time is to remember especially that we here in this Congress need the personal considerateness always exemplified by JOHN KEE, the appreciation of which but few probably expressed to him during his life. We should also be reminded of the certainty of death and that our stay here on this earth is by the sufferance of the Almighty God and that with life's privileges go responsibilities.

The greatest thing thing we can do immediately is to extend the deepest sympathy to the family of Judge KEE and to remember them through the days of their deep sorrow, asking that the three of his closest beloved ones receive condolence from Him, a source greater than any mortal can possibly provide.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a poetic eulogy to our departed friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN KEE:

JOHN KEE

J-OHN KEE, a great and good man, has passed on—
O-ver the Great Divide, yea, he has gone—
H-appily, calmly, he's resting at ease,
N-ow, 'neath the shade of tranquillity's trees.

K-ind 'n his manner, and pure in his life—
E-arnestly loved by his children and wife—
E-very acquaintance of his was his friend—

A-nd all of them bemoan his tragic end.

G-raciously, he performed every great task,
O-n him laid, and never once did he ask
O-f his coworkers to be relieved from
D-oing the job, until he was called home.

G-od called him home, so that he could in peace
R-est from his labors which seemed to increase—
E-very year, undismayed by his advanced
A-ge, with his duties he still seemed entranced.

T-ruly, the Nation, indeed, lost a great
M-an, when JOHN KEE from his post stepped aside;
A-nd, laying down life's unbearable weight,
N-obly, he, in the arms of his friends, died.

G-reatly grieved are all his kinsmen and friends—
O-f those in Congress, on whom much depends,
N-one were more needed, perhaps, than was he—
E-very true Congressman will miss JOHN KEE.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House has lost a genuine friend in the passing of West Virginia's distinguished son, JOHN KEE. If ever a Member had a sincere and continuing interest in the individual viewpoints and problems of his colleagues, it was this sterling Christian gentleman.

Even as did his predecessor, the late beloved Sol Bloom, of New York, Judge KEE died on active duty, in the service of the Nation. It has been truly said that this was as our good friend would have had it. He was an accomplished poet, and his poetry revealed his solid faith. We, who were privileged to serve with him and to take strength from his splendid example, knew that he was not unready when the summons came and his spirit was released. If there were even a tinge of regret at departing, we know JOHN KEE harbored it only because he felt there was so much more he should do for his Nation, and for the family to which he was so touchingly devoted.

Here was a man of integrity and sense of responsibility—a public servant without peer. Our friend had true humility. He had no sense of self-importance, although it was his task to preside over the great Committee on Foreign Affairs during a time of many trials. He regarded himself only as a servant of his Nation, his State, and the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia.

JOHN KEE was gentle. He was understanding. He was deferential. He was compassionate. His uncommon attribute, however, was that he could combine his Christian forbearance with an unassailable courage. He was a man of great legal scholarship, and one who held a mastery of philosophic reasoning. When the processes of his methodical judgment led him to what he determined to be the right, no special pleading, no political consideration could deflect him. Yet he sought out every viewpoint, and the thinking behind each one, for he strove for the well-informed decision.

JOHN KEE will be missed as few who have been taken from this House have been missed. Our heartfelt condolences go out to Mrs. Kee and their daughter and son, with the hope that the blow may be softened a little by the realization that a humble, God-fearing man has been called to his undoubted reward.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with the membership of this House today in paying tribute to a fine statesman, Hon. JOHN KEE, whose death comes as a great shock to all of us. I know of his outstanding qualities and abilities and of the great contributions he has made with respect to foreign policy legislation during these critical times.

As chairman of the important House Committee on Foreign Affairs he well served his country and people. Only an

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

hour ago he was valiantly performing his duties at a meeting of his great committee. His health had not been good for quite some time and undoubtedly the strain of his heavy responsibilities precipitated his death.

His life, his fine personality and character were, indeed, an inspiration to his colleagues in the House. I wish to express my deep regret at the loss of this great and distinguished American and to his family I give my sincere sympathy in their sad hour of bereavement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral Mr. EATON, Mr. RICHARDS, Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. CHIPERFIELD, Mr. VORYS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HEDRICK, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. BATTLE, Mr. RAMSAY, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BURNSIDE, Mr. CHATHAM, and Mr. STAGGERS.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 9, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

442. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation" was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KENNEDY: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3957. A bill to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLMES: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 253. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 643. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham; with amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2363. A bill for the relief of Emil Sbarbori; with amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2453. A bill for the relief of John R. Harris; with amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4004. A bill relative to holding terms of the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 4005. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands situated in the State of Oregon"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4006. A bill to provide for the design, development, and construction of prototype aircraft suitable to the needs of local-service airlines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4007. A bill to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 4008. A bill to authorize the use of funds, heretofore appropriated, for the construction of a road in Pine County, Minn., to provide access for Indian children to public-school facilities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4009. A bill to provide for payment of compensation for periods of separation from the Government service in the case of certain persons restored to duty because of procedural defects in processing their removals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida requesting Congress to disregard house memorial No. 15 adopted by the Florida Legislature in 1943, and house concurrent resolution No. 10 adopted by the 1945 legislature, and senate memorial No. 282 adopted by the 1949 legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida requesting that Congress rescind their senate memorial No. 282 of 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to authorize the waiving of certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the passage of legislation revising the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relating to the struggle to deprive the Texas school children of their rightful heritage, and commending the Texas patriot, Allen Duckworth, for his masterful, informative, and enlightening exposé of this dastardly deed through the nine articles entitled "The Big Grab"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4010. A bill for the relief of William Grant Braden, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 4011. A bill for the relief of Darwin Deen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 4012. A bill for the relief of George Nicholas Louizos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 4013. A bill for the relief of Arvids Kulitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

278. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, T. H., relative to requesting Federal assistance for the treatment of Hansen's disease among persons living in the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in this temple of freedom we bow at the altar of prayer which our fathers set up at the Nation's birth. We pause now so that before we speak we may listen. In so turbulent a time, with its tumult and shouting, for our souls' sake we must find the quiet places, the still waters, the green pastures if our jaded and frayed spirits are to be restored. We would here be reminded that the very justice and social welfare we are commissioned as public servants to preserve, promote, and protect is rooted and grounded in Thy sovereignty and the verities of Thy eternal kingdom. Against the debasing idolatry of the god-state which, instead of altars of prayer, rears prisons of the mind and

heart, we have pledged our moral and material might. In this global contest between light and darkness make us increasingly the kind of a nation; make us as individuals the kind of persons which Thou canst use as the instruments of Thy purpose for all mankind. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 8, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 197) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and it was signed by the Vice President.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader if it would be agreeable to him for me to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] be permitted to resign from the Finance Committee of the Senate and be assigned to membership on the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think it would be better to wait until the list of assignments is completed. I understand the list has not been completed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I spoke to the Parliamentarian, who advised me that under what was understood to be the action of the majority there is a vacancy on the Foreign Relations Committee which is open to the minority and it is not contemplated that it will be assigned by the majority. So, the reassignment of members within the minority side could be accomplished in this way without reference to the rearrangement which will be necessary in the case of some of the other committees.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the action proposed.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is essential that this action be taken immediately, as the Committee on Foreign Relations is sitting with the Armed Services Committee conducting hearings, and General Marshall at the present moment is testifying. So I think the status of the Senator should be determined.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows nothing about the committee arrangements. The question is, Is there objection to the assignment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to the vacancy on the Committee on Foreign Relations and his relief from membership on the Finance Committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to transact what we know as routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITION

Mr. FLANDERS presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Joint Resolution 38

Joint resolution eulogizing the achievements of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur brought glory and renown to the military personnel under his command during World War II with distinction and honor to himself and country; and

Whereas by his efficient administration of postwar Japan, that country is now ready to accept her right place among the other free nations of the world; and

Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur has fought a distinguished and able fight in Korea with but limited means at his disposal, and has shown himself to be one of the greatest generals of our country; and

Whereas we learn with sincere regret of his recall from his post of command of all United Nations forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That we extend to Gen. Douglas MacArthur our sincere and heartfelt recognition of his leadership and our pride in his accomplishments, our faith in his integrity and our confidence in his loyalty to all who served under his command, and that we voice that faith by acclamation and inscribe this resolution in the acts of the general assembly of 1951; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of State be instructed to send to Gen. Douglas MacArthur a certified copy of this resolution and certified copies of this resolution to the Members of the congressional delegation of Vermont.

WALLACE M. FAY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

Approved, April 27, 1951.

LEE E. EMERSON,
Governor.

DEFENSE EXPENDITURES—RESOLUTION OF ST. CROIX RIVER IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION, HUDSON, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received today from George M. R. Smart, secretary of the St. Croix River Improvement Association, at Hudson, Wis., a resolution which had been adopted by the membership at a recent meeting of that association concerning patriotic bolstering of the home front in the face of the Korean peril. I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Whom It May Concern:

Whereas many of our young men are fighting and being killed in Korea and many others are in training for military service in this national emergency; and

Whereas our every energy and our tax dollars should go toward increased production and defense effort to back these young men; and

Whereas (1) selfish groups are interfering with our defense production, (2) inflation is uncurbed and insiduously stealing away our very substance, (3) our tax dollars are being largely diverted into channels other than defense purposes and being actually squandered, and (4) there are instances of corrupt officials and gangsters who are undermining our way of life and our very Government; and

Whereas all these things are cruel, heartless, traitorous betrayal, not only for our boys in service but of our very Nation: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we voice to all in authority our deepest horror and disapproval of these betrayals and demand of those in authority that inflation be curbed, that expenditures for other than defense needs be strictly limited to the barest necessities, that our Government be cleansed of criminal influences so that we have honesty and morality in our Government; be it further

Resolved, That we, as individuals, dedicate ourselves for the better performance of our patriotic duties as citizens, so that our Government may again be, as Lincoln phrased it, "of the people, by the people and for the people."

ST. CROIX RIVER ASSOCIATION.

RESOLUTION OF NEW ENGLAND CATHOLIC STUDENTS PEACE FEDERATION, MANCHESTER, N. H.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the New England Catholic Students Peace Federation at their fifteenth annual convention held on April 7, 1951, at St. Anselm's College, Manchester, N. H., relating to national and international affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the members of this federation pledge themselves to work against television programs which favor laxity of morals, particularly those programs which would be harmful to children.

Resolved, That the Peace Federation go on record as being opposed to the draft of 18-year-olds until all other available sources of manpower have been drafted.

Resolved, That the Peace Federation go on record as being opposed to the drafting of women.

Resolved, That the Peace Federation go on record as being in favor of the inclusion of Spain, Turkey, and Greece in any plan for European defense.

Resolved, That the Peace Federation go on record as being in favor of an immediate peace treaty for Japan.

Resolved, That the United States should continue to equip Chiang Kai-shek's forces for use against the Reds.

NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES—LETTER FROM THE BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD following my remarks a letter from the Boston Chamber of Commerce dated May 7 which realistically sets forth their point of view concerning nonessential expenditures, and in which they reiterate the policies they themselves set forth last year; namely, "that the Boston

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Chamber of Commerce would refrain from supporting any effort to increase Federal appropriations or to resist Federal appropriation cuts, irrespective of any apparent local advantage to be derived from such efforts."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Boston, Mass., May 7, 1951.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: With appropriation bills now before the two branches, we are writing this informal letter to express our views. We believe that they are fairly representative of business sentiment in this State.

First, we want you to know that we realize the difficulties which you as a Congressman experience in your action on issues relating to public expenditures and taxation.

On the one hand, you receive stern admonitions from your constituents to "cut to the bone" and to work for a balanced budget.

Then, often from the same source, you receive strong protests against even the smallest economies. And everyone objects to new or increased taxes affecting him.

Last year we expressly stated to the Massachusetts delegation that the Boston Chamber of Commerce would refrain from supporting any effort to increase Federal appropriations or to resist Federal appropriation cuts, irrespective of any apparent local advantage to be derived from such efforts.

We reiterate this statement of policy this year, because we believe that it is needed more now than ever before. It is our intention to attempt to enlist the cooperation of other business organizations to do the same.

We believe that an admirable program has been offered to Congress in the recently filed report of the House-Senate Economic Committee. It presents a blueprint for an effective attack on inflation which we heartily endorse. We are confident that you will make every effort to implement the recommendations in this report.

As we understand the essentials of this report, they cluster around these three major issues:

1. Increased taxes, including higher business and corporation levies.

2. Closer scrutiny of all Federal appropriations to eliminate all nonessential expenditures, both military and nondefense.

3. Expanding production to keep production of goods in line with increased spending.

Our only quarrel with these issues is in the order of the first two. We feel strongly that top priority should be given to closer scrutiny of appropriations and elimination of nonessentials, and that action toward increased taxes should be made secondary.

Our economy cannot in the face of necessities for defense afford the luxury of expanding social services, nor of totally unnecessary economic crutches. Not only should proposals to increase expenditures for such purposes be rejected but even the continuance of existing levels of expenditure should be scrutinized most carefully and critically.

We are encouraged by the cuts already reflected in reports of the Appropriations Committee, and even more by the cuts effected through floor amendments, no matter how small. But there still is too much flesh on the frame.

As for increased taxes, we have no doubt that the business world, no less than the individual taxpayer, is reconciled to and will willingly assume the burden of higher taxes if satisfied that the elimination of nonessential expenditures has first been accomplished.

No thinking person can fail to realize that inflation from this point on may well represent a more serious threat to our economy than foreign aggression. There is increasing evidence that citizens across the country are awakening to this fact, and are going to be very critical of any failure on the part of their Representatives to recognize it, and will heartily endorse any action intelligently designed to fight it, even though the immediate effect may appear to be adverse to their personal interests.

In the strongest possible terms we urge upon you that, as to every vote you record, you apply the tests outlined in the House-Senate Economic Committee report, and measure your action against the objectives there developed.

Yours very truly,
WILLIAM J. SPEERS, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on National Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 1230. A bill to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort; with an amendment (Rept. No. 316).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 831. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide for designated representatives thereunder of certain veterans' organizations; without amendment (Rept. No. 318).

FEDERAL WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES, 1950—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 317)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I submit a report relating to Federal Wildlife Conservation Activities, 1950, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed, with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, without objection, printed as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1452. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1453. A bill for the relief of Constantios Georgios Samonas;

S. 1454. A bill for the relief of Walter Koelz; and

S. 1455. A bill for the relief of Markos M. Pericolaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1456. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for the comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin to provide for additional hydroelectric-power development; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1457. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Juanita Elsie Runnels Gallaher; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1458. A bill for the relief of Joe W. Wimberly; and

S. 1459. A bill for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1460. A bill for the relief of Isaac H. Shohet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1461. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Nikoloas Mavrodontis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1462. A bill for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution relating to the compensation of employees of the House and Senate Press, Periodical, and Radio Galleries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1452) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. AIKEN), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

The measure, approved and supported by the American Library Association, will help the States to overcome a national shortage of libraries by providing library service to the millions of farm and rural families and others without such service.

The bill provides a basic grant to each State of $40,000 a year for 5 years with additional funds available under a variable matching formula based on rural population and per capita income. The cost of the program, not to exceed seven and one-half million dollars per year, will depend on how rapidly the States move to improve and extend library service.

The funds under the bill will be used by State library agencies for the development and promotion of State plans for demonstrating the value of library facilities and the extension of library service primarily in rural areas. The bill leaves the administration of the funds for the program entirely in the hands of State and local officials.

In spite of its importance to democracy the public library, like the public school, has been neglected. The Senate in twice

approving Federal aid to education has recognized the national crisis that exists in our public schools. The Senate by approving a bill similar to that being introduced today has also recognized the need for public library service throughout the Nation as an aid to education.

Thirty-three million people in the Nation are without library service. Ninety percent of these live on farms and in small communities. An additional 35,000,000 have inadequate library service.

In only 11 States and the District of Columbia is public-library service available to as many as 85 percent of the people. More than 600 counties in the United States—roughly one out of five—are without any public library. Less than one-third of our 3,070 counties have county-wide library service.

The urgent need for strengthening our schools and library service is once again proven by the high rate of rejection of men under Selective Service for educational deficiencies.

We are experiencing again the same waste of manpower demonstrated in the last war through failure to gear our education system to meet the rising requirements of national security. Since Korea over 250,000 men have been rejected under Selective Service for educational deficiencies. That is the equivalent of 14 infantry divisions—three and one-half times as many divisions as the United States has committed to Europe. This is a loss too serious to disregard.

A recent 6 months' survey by the New York Times reveals the extent that the quality of public education is suffering by virtue of the great financial hardship under which our public schools are struggling. The survey shows that 3,500,000 rural boys and girls are receiving an inferior education due to overcrowded classrooms, shortages of well-trained teachers, inadequate courses of study, double sessions and part-time instruction. The greater the deterioration in the quality of public-school instruction, the greater must be the reliance upon the public library.

Library service complements and supplements the work of our schools by carrying the school into the home. Schools cannot serve their maximum usefulness without adequate libraries to provide home reading and other educational materials. The public library extends the educational process for the adult who may find that his schooling of 10 or 20 years ago is inadequate in meeting today's problems. This bill provides the cheapest and most effective way I know for bringing within the reach of every citizen the tools for continuous education.

Never in our history have the people had greater need for knowledge upon which to base their opinions and build their decisions. With the many grave problems facing our Nation today our national welfare demands that the ordinary citizen be able to get books, newspapers, and other sources of knowledge about the world he lives in.

The tasks of peace are the most difficult ever to challenge the genius of a nation. A highly trained, fully informed citizenry is essential to the defense of our freedom, the preservation of our country, and the building of lasting peace.

PATENT IN FEE TO JUANITA ELSIE RUNNELS GALLAHER

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the issuance of a patent in fee to Juanita Elsie Runnels Gallaher to lands allotted to her on the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me in reference to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1457) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Juanita Elsie Runnels Gallaher, introduced by Mr. Cain, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. Cain is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Mrs. Gallaher is of three-eighths Indian blood and married to a white man. Mr. and Mrs. Gallaher have been married for 17 years and have six children. Mr. Gallaher is engaged in logging and forestry work and in the operation of a sawmill and is dependent on his own work for the support of himself and family. Mrs. Gallaher advises that before her marriage she was employed as a bookkeeper and was treasurer of a lumber company for 1 year. Since her marriage her only occupation has been that of a housewife; that her husband is well able to care for herself and their family of six children. Mrs. Gallaher also advises that she has never been dependent on the Indian Bureau for any assistance. Mrs. Gallaher is desirous of obtaining a patent-in-fee to her land in order that the timber thereon may be available to her husband who owns a sawmill.

Mrs. Gallaher further advises that she will not sell her allotment nor the timber situated thereon to the tribal council for the reason the Indian Bureau, through its tribal council, will not pay a fair value for same and besides they will deduct a 10-percent commission for negotiating such sale, furthermore she and her husband are equipped to saw their own timber and are fully capable of handling their own affairs.

Much has been said by the Indian Bureau and by the committees and Members of Congress concerning the releasing from Federal supervision the various Indian tribes and individual members thereof, also the willingness and ability of the tribes and their individual members to dispense with Federal supervision and aid. In view of the fact that this individual member is willing and able to dispense with Federal supervision, she should be permitted to do so. Also in view of the declaration of the Department of the Interior officials, Federal supervision should not be enlarged, but diminished, wherever and whenever possible. I also submit the declaration of th House Committee on Appropriations in its report (H. Rept. No. 339, 82d Cong.) dated April 20, 1951, as follows: "The committee feels that increasing emphasis must be placed on active, tangible progress toward the assimilation of the Indians into the general population. Unless this is done the Indians will inevitably continue in their dependent status and will never be able fully to enjoy the privileges and opportunities of American citizenship."

The enactment of this bill will permit Mrs. Gallaher to use her land to the best advantage to herself and family and would at least release that much land from under the supervision of the Indian Bureau, place said land on the tax rolls and the occupants thereon would take their places in their community with other citizens, Indian or non-Indian, who are contributing their share of responsibility to the local community, the State of Washington, and the Nation.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. BENTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

A radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington—Program No. 40," broadcast by him on May 7, 1951.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Address on the subject The Opportunity for Christian Leadership in the World Today, delivered by the Ambassador from Australia, Hon. Norman J. O. Makin, in the Vandenberg room, Senate Restaurant, March 29, 1951.

By Mr. HILL:

Letter entitled "The MacArthur Case in Light of Marshall's Grand Strategy," written by Dr. Clanton W. Williams to Lt. Richard McDonald Payne, published in the Tuscaloosa News of May 5, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "A Ghastly Mistake," published in the May 2, 1951, edition of the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., referring to the delay in publication of the report on conditions in Korea by Lieutenant General Wedemeyer.

By Mr. KERR:

Article entitled "Seven Great Decisions" written by Ralph McGill and published in the Atlanta Constitution of May 6, 1951.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Editorial entitled "Tribute to the Marines," published in the New York Times of May 6, 1951.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

A letter regarding conditions in the United States and in the world, written by Lloyd O. Coulter, of Fitzwilliam Depot, N. H.

Article entitled "Truman Warning Taken Lightly," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Star of May 9, 1951, referring to the threat of a war with Russia.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

An article entitled "Shall We Have Allies or Face Reds Alone?" written by Carroll Binder and published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of May 6, 1951.

An editorial entitled "Korean Policy Doesn't Add Up to Appeasement," published in the Minneapolis Tribune of May 8, 1951.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further routine matters, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 22, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$74,000,000" and insert $75,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. The Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Armed Services are in session at the present moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN KOREA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, either prior to the conclusion of the hearings before the joint committee of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, or during those hearings, it is hoped that the investigation now taking place will hew to the line with sufficient vigor to provide the American public will clear-cut, consistent and conget answers to the following three questions which now plague the public generally. There are other questions which should also be answered as a result of these hearings, but it is important to our war effort and to the morale of both the free world and the United States that we get answer to the following three questions: (1) Who put us into the Korean War and by what legal authority? (2) What were the terms defining our military mission in Korea at the time the fighting began? (3) How are our military leaders and the America. public to know when the job in Korea is done and the war is over? In other words, what is our war target in Korea?

One of the amazing and at the same time terribly disturbing features of our war in Korea is the great confusion which seems to exist over the method by which the United States became involved in the war and the legal basis upon which the President of the United States, acting on his own authority and without a declaration of war by Congress, could plunge us into what has already become the fourth most costly war in our Nation's history. A careful study of the constitutional powers of the President as well as the charter of the United Nations tends to make it more difficult rather than easier to understand and accept some of the public explanations of our high Government officials in this connection. About the only fact that stands out incontrovertibly is the fact that the war in Korea was never declared by the Congress of the United States and that whatever the legal basis may be for our involvement in that conflict, it was not by any action whatsoever of the American Congress.

In times past, some American Presidents have involved the fighting forces of this country in minor skirmishing abroad or in short-lived small wars by executive action. Up to now, however, these have always been justified as a military venture ordered by the President in defense of either the lives or property of America or in fulfillment of treaty obligations which had been entered into by this country through constitutional processes. It appears that neither of these justifications is applicable to the war in Korea in which we were involved by the action of President Truman last June.

It might be helpful for all of us as we look ahead to the future and try to determine an optimum program for bringing an early and victorious end to the war in which we are now so bloodily involved if we were to review objectively and dispassionately the actual steps and the legal circumstances, if any, by which we were involved in this war by Presidential action. That is to be my purpose here this afternoon. In studying the chronology of the conflict and our entrance into it, some very interesting evidence is available.

A CHRONOLOGY OF THE CONFLICT

After the Communist armies of North Korea violated the peace of that unhappy peninsula by striking south below the thirty-eighth parallel, an interesting, an intruging, and a somewhat mystifying series of developments ensued, and can be traced in the record. The first resolution adopted on June 25, 1950, by the Security Council called for the immediate cessation of hostilities; it called upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the thirty-eighth parallel; it requested the United Nations Commission in Korea (a) to communicate its fully considered recommendations on the situation with the least possible delay; (b) to observe the withdrawal of the North Korean troops to the thirty-eighth parallel; and (c) to keep the Security Council informed on the execution of this resolution. This resolution also called upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities. Mr. President, a little later on I shall have something to say about the manner in which members of the United Nations have flagrantly violated their obligation to refrain from giving assistance to North Korean authorities. But at this point I simply desire to suggest that nowhere in that resolution can I find any mention whatsoever of any request for the sending of military assistonce to the South Korea forces. Nowhere in this resolution can I find any mention of a request for the sending of military assistance to the South Korean forces.

However, on June 27 the President in a statement to the public in this country announced that he had ordered the United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops, cover and support. He stated he had also ordered the Seventh Fleet to Formosa to neutralize the status of the Chinese National forces on that island. Finally the President instructed Ambassador Warren R. Austin, as a representative of the United States to the Security Council, to report the steps which he had taken to the Security Council.

At the time of the President's report to the Security Council on June 27 the United States representative also tabled a resolution calling for effective and immediate steps to secure peace and security and recommend that members of the U. N. furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area. The United States representative then read President Truman's statement on his action to the members of the Council. It was after hearing the President's statement, after hearing the President's report on the military intervention which the President had already ordered on behalf of the United States Government, that the Council adopted the resolution as presented by our representatives at the United Nations. Thus, it is uncontrovertibly clear from the chronology of events at the United Nations, that the action of President Truman in ordering troops into Korea preceded the adoption of the resolution by the Security Council of the United Nations. It was an action taken by the President, acting for himself as Chief Executive of the United States, and it was not taken in pursuance of a resolution which had previously been adopted. The UN resolution, as a matter of fact, was adopted in support of an action already undertaken at the order of the President.

The next step in this chronology of apparent confusion and actual conflict in Korea is the memorandum issued by the State Department on July 3, 1950, in which the State Department attempted to justify the reasons for the President ordering American troops into conflict in Korea. The State Department's contention in that memorandum of July 3 was to the effect that under traditional international law and under article 39 of the United Nations Charter and the resolution pursuant thereto the President was authorized to use American Armed Forces in an effort to repel the armed aggression against the Republic of Korea. Consequently, at this point, it seems to me it is pertinent to take a look at article 39. This article says:

> The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace or breach of the peace or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42 to maintain or restore international peace and authority.

It next becomes necessary, therefore, for any citizen trying to determine the legal basis upon which our troops were sent into the fighting in Korea carefully to examine articles 41 and 42. Article 41 empowers the Security Council to decide what measures not involved in the use of armed forces are to be employed to give effect to its decision, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. The measures set out in article 41 are complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. It should be emphasized at this point that nothing in article 41 refers to the use of armed forces or authorizes their use.

The next step in any search to find the legal, the constitutional, or the treaty basis for the Presidential order involving

American troops in a war in Korea is to examine article 42. We find that article 42 says:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockades, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of United Nations.

It is important to note here that article 42 reads that it may take action as proposed in article 42. There are no mandatory commitments. There are no compulsions. There are no obligations upon any individual member of the United Nations or the members of the United Nations collectively to take such action. A nation may, if it so desires, but it is not required to do so. It appears, therefor, to be a matter left entirely to the independent judgment and decision of each of the members of the United Nations, acting in accordance with their established constitutional and war-making procedures.

Let us next examine article 43 of the United Nations Charter. Article 43 provides:

(1) All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. (2) Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. (3) The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They should be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be—

Let me emphasize this, Mr. President—

subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Thus, it is clear, Mr. President, that article 43 was intended by the drafters of the United Nations Charter to provide the legal, the international, and the treaty basis by which member nations of the United Nations were to be bound to use their armed forces in putting down breaches of the peace wherever and whenever they occur. Unfortunately for the world, however, and most unfortunately for the United States, the agreement or agreements referred to in article 43 have never been ratified by the Congress of the United States. I submit, sir, that it is about time that someone during this debate pointed out that historic and basic fact.

On December 7, 1945, Secretary of State Acheson was testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on article 43 of the Charter. His testimony can be found on page 23 of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's hearings on House bill 4618 and Senate bill 1580, on Friday, December 7, 1945, provided any Member of the Senate can find a copy of the hearings. It required 3 days for me to find a copy of them. Fortunately I served on the House Foreign Affairs Committee at that time, and I recalled having a bound copy of the hearings submitted to me, so I was able to locate one. However, for some strange reason, the hearings have become an extremely scarce commodity in the Halls of Congress. In these hearings we find some very significant facts which might well be considered by those who are considering the issues involved in this debate. Testimony from the printed record to which I have referred is as follows:

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Chairman, does that mean the Security Council names the number and amounts of troops and equipment we shall furnish, the Security Council?

Mr. ACHESON. No. It means that we must work out with the Security Council a special agreement or special agreements in which we develop the number of troops, the location, the degree of readiness, and so forth; and that when we have done that and when you gentlemen have approved it, then and only then are we bound to furnish that contingent of troops to the Security Council; and the President is not authorized to furnish any more than you have approved of in that agreement.

Mr. President, when we find ourselves involved in a bloody war without an authorizing action by Congress or a declaration of war, it seems to me someone should go back to the records involved in the treaty and in the United Nations' obligations to determine under what authority, if any, the President was acting at the time. So I am quoting now from these exceedingly-hard-to-get hearings of the record which was made at the time when the authority of the President was being discussed while steps were being taken to implement the proposed legislation in 1945.

Mrs. Douglas, of Illinois, then picked up the colloquy. She said:

This then would be in the nature of a police force which the President could make available automatically, but he would be unable to go beyond that with the unlimited force which Congress would still have to pass upon for unlimited war?

Mr. ACHESON. Yes. Beyond the amount which you have agreed in the special agreement, and the President is not given authority to furnish any additional troops, and whatever happens after that is determined by the ordinary constitutional relations between the Congress and the President.

Mr. President, there is some unheralded testimony of Secretary of State Acheson to which it seems to me we should devote some attention at this crucial stage in the fourth bloodiest war in American history, a war which up to this late hour has never been declared by the Congress in fulfillment of its authority as a constitutional branch of the Government of the United States. Let us examine this curious chain of events a little further, Mr. President, because, for some reason or other, very little light has been shed on it in the course of the discussions which have taken place thus far in this debate.

Let us refer to pages 25 and 26 of the same hard-to-get hearings and see the answer which Secretary Acheson gave in answer to a question which was asked by the late Representative Kee, who so unfortunately passed from our midst only yesterday:

Mr. KEE. I would like to clear up a question that is in my mind in respect to section 6 (United Nations Participation Act) that authorizes the President to negotiate special agreements with reference to providing troops, and so forth, and the Armed Forces to be provided. The President has negotiated this agreement with the Council, as I understand this, without consulting or submitting the matter to Congress. If it becomes necessary in the course of an emergency, he can proceed to supply the forces agreed upon before submitting the agreement to Congress for action; is that correct?

Mr. ACHESON. This is an important question of Judge Kee, and may I state his question and my answer so that it will be quite clear here? The Judge asks whether the language beginning on line 19 of page 5, which says the President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of the Charter means that the President may provide these forces prior to the time when any special agreement has been approved by the Congress.

Mr. President, let us listen to the answer of the Secretary of State to that repeated question. I now quote the Secretary of State in the official hearings, the hearings which have so largely disappeared, the hearings which are so hard to find, the hearings which provided the legislative background and the history of our acceptance of the United Nations Participation Act in 1945. I now quote the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson. Here is what he said:

The answer to that question is "No," that the President may not do that, that such special agreements refer to the special agreements which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress, so that until the special agreement has been negotiated and approved by the Congress, it has no force and effect.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is a little hard for us to get the meaning of article 42, Mr. Secretary. Will you explain what this is?

Mr. ACHESON. Article 42 says—Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41—now those are the measures short of armed forces—would be inadequate or prove to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security, and such action may include demonstrations, blockades, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations. Now that is the article under which the international organization puts into effect the police forces which are made available to it under article 43, and the only reason that the President is permitted to make these forces available, after the special agreement has been approved is to carry out the provisions of article 42, to which we are committed by our ratification of the Charter.

Mr. RYTER. That may mean actual fighting, may it not?

Mr. ACHESON. Yes, it may.

Mr. FLOOD. It is also true, is it not, Mr. Secretary, that these occurrences come up only in the case of the breach of the peace or threatened breach of the peace?

Mr. ACHESON. That is correct.

Let us now pursue these interesting clues a little further. What I have just read was the testimony of Secretary of State Acheson at the time the hearings were held on the legislation providing

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for our participation in the United Nations. In this connection it is also interesting to note the statement of Sir Gladwyn Jebb, United Kingdom representative to the United Nations which can be found on page 54 of House Report No. 2495 dated July 11, 1950, entitled "Background Information on Korea." Here we find the corroborated evidence. Here is what Gladwyn Jebb said, in part:

Had the Charter become fully into force and had the agreement provided for in Korea in article 43 of the Charter been concluded, we should, of course, have proceeded differently and the action to be taken by the Security Council to repel the armed attack would no doubt have been founded on article 42 As it is, however, we can naturally only act under article 39, which enabled the Security Council to recommend what measures should be taken to restore international peace and security.

Thus, it appears, Mr. President, that the relationships of the United Nations with regard to the United States in the first stages of the war in Korea were something like those existing between a man and a bulldog he might have happened to own. In substance, the United Nations said "Sic 'em" to Uncle Sam and away we went to war. We are now engaged in a bloody war with well over 60,000 casualties. It is a war which has become America's responsibility to win or to lose. It is a war which has never been declared by Congress through any of our constitutional processes and it is by all odds the most costly and the bloodiest undeclared war in our American history. For better or for worse, America was involved in it by the unilateral action of the President acting without consultation with Congress and without its authorization. This is a warning sign which clearly demonstrates what can happen in this closely knit and tempestuous world if we are to accept as permanent and standing operating procedure the dictum that the President can rightfully involve this country in a shooting war to which we are not committed by treaty obligations, which is of major size and of long endurance, and on which he has neither consulted with Congress nor asked it to declare war in accordance with our ancient and honorable constitutional procedures.

OUR TREATY OBLIGATIONS TO U. N.

However, Mr. President, let us examine further into the clear records of this country's relationships to the United Nations and the obligations and undertakings to which we are committed by our associations with this noble effort to provide world peace through collective security. In fairness, let us determine whether perchance there is an "out" for the President through some vague and nebulous commitment which we undertook as a member of the United Nations. The United Nations Participation Act, approved on December 20, 1945, specifically stated that no troops were to be supplied for armed intervention by the members of the United Nations or by the United Nations itself until those treaties had been negotiated and accepted by the respective constitutional processes of the participating countries.

I believe it important for Senators who have not recently taken the time to read the complete House report of the Seventy-ninth Congress (Rept. No. 1383, dated December 12, 1945) and the Senate report, No. 717, of the same Congress, to restudy the legal and treaty obligations involved. Both of these reports are available, and both of them set out the important point that the international agreements which would have the effect of treaty obligations were to be approved by the Congress of the United States.

For example, a specific quotation from page 7 of House Report No. 1383 says:

The bill, by providing that the Congress shall approve any such agreement or agreements as may be negotiated, insures that the Congress will have full opportunity to pass upon the terms and provisions thereof.

Mr. President, the position which was set forth in these two committee reports is supported and substantiated over and over again in the debate on the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate at the time the U. N. Participation Act was approved in 1945, and any Member of the Senate may find it by a careful and diligent search of the record. Any member of the press, any radio commentator can find the facts as they appear in the printed record, if he cares to take the time to go to the source material, instead of relying upon the misinterpretations of those who would slant history in the direction of their own interests.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 9, page 12267, Chairman Sol Bloom, who was then at the head of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, reiterated and amplified this point very clearly. Let me quote the exact words used by Chairman Sol Bloom in presenting the legislation referred to for the approval of the House of Representatives, because it provides the legislative history and legal background upon which our subsequent activities necessarily must rest. It is the definite and binding legislation leading to the acceptance of the United Nations Participation Act by that important branch of the Congress. Congressman Bloom said:

The position of the Congress is fully protected by the requirement that the military agreement to preserve the peace must be passed upon by Congress before it becomes effective. Also, the obligation of the United States to make forces available to the Security Council does not become effective until a special agreement has been passed upon by Congress.

In view of the curious and calamitous fact that some 300,000 American boys are now fighting in a deadly conflict in far off Korea, let me repeat this significant statement from the record of the U. N. participation legislation:

The obligation of the United States to make forces available to the Security Council does not become effective until a special agreement has been passed upon by Congress.

As yet no spokesman for the administration has been able, and none will be able, to point to such a special agreement as ever having been authorized by Congress. By the usurpation of Executive authority, the administration simply jumped that stage of the orderly procedure entirely. No agreement has yet been forthcoming, none has been submitted, and none has been improved. The President blandly ignored that factual situation.

That seems to indicate in clear and understandable language that at the time the Communists crossed the thirty-eighth parallel the United States had no treaty obligation and no commitment under the United Nations requiring it to send American boys into war at the request of the Security Council. The Security Council could say "Sic 'em" to our "American dog," but it could not compel us to go to war, and we had no obligation binding us to do so.

It also seems to demonstrate with dramatic clarity that when such troops were sent into war by order of the President they entered that war as American forces. It is the primary purport of my address to try to clear up the confusion which is confounding America as to what is the status of the American boys in Korea. It is too late now to get them out by any easy effort. It is too late now to say the President should first have consulted the Congress, too late to say the President could have called in a concert of like-minded free nations in the United Nations, at Lake Success, and could have said to them, "We will send our boys into Korea to help throw the Communists back beyond the thirty-eighth parallel, provided you join us in an effort commensurate with your strength."

It is too late now to look backward and see how much wiser the President would have been, or Ambassador Austin, had they said at Lake Success on that day in June, "We will put some men into the fray. We will help throw the forces of communism back beyond the thirty-eighth parallel, provided those associated with us in this conviction and in this enterprise will agree not to send any supplies to the enemy, will agree to help blockade the ports, will agree to help make this an earnest and sincere effort to force the Communists back beyond the thirty-eighth parallel, without needlessly and forlornly and hopelessly sacrificing thousands of American lives."

But it is not too late for the American people to find out how this war began, not too late to dissipate the fog of confusion as to who should give the orders to the American troops in Korea, and whose present responsibility it is. It is for that purpose that I have undertaken the research from the record to bring out by the facts of the case, the constitutional provisions, and the treaty obligations, the exact status of American troops in Korea today.

Mr. President, the absence of such a special agreement also seems to point out that when President Truman ordered American boys into the war in Korea, they entered that war as American forces, under the command of American officers, at the order of an American President, free to follow whatever military tactics were deemed best by American officers and American leaders to protect the lives of these American boys and to make this American venture a success.

Mr. President, let us continue this analysis a little further. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 26, 1945, at which time the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 was being debated on the floor of the Senate, we find complete confirmation of this understanding and this legal status in the statements by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the late Senator Vandenberg. A reading of the debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 8, pages 10964 through 10974, makes that strikingly clear.

Mr. President, permit me to quote from the RECORD, volume 91, part 8, pages 10967 and 10968, Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, stated:

> These contracts must be submitted to Congress. When the agreements are made with the Security Council, they must come back here—
>
> Meaning to the Congress of the United States—
>
> Senators will have an opportunity to debate them, to offer amendments, to qualify them, etc. As to declaring war, that is not a question which is involved here at all. These forces are not exacted to make war. They are exacted as peace forces, to undertake to preserve peaceful nations against aggression and attack. If we wish to go to war, we can still go to war by declaring war and making use of our entire Armed Forces. I do not suppose we would hesitate to do it if we felt that the national interest required or demanded it.

Those were the words of the senior Senator from Texas in 1945. That was the prospectus which was sold to the Senate, and through which Congress approved the Participation Act of 1945. It was presented to us in good faith by men of high standing, and it was with that in mind that the Senate voted for participation.

Mr. President, to this late hour, these agreements referred to by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and in the debates of the House of Representatives, as well as in the reports of the two committees, have not been completed, and they have not been approved by Congress. It is important to keep this in mind as we study the steps by which we became involved in the war in Korea.

It is not difficult to ascertain who is responsible for the bloody slaughter in Korea. It is significant that the predictions made at the time the United Nations Participation Act was approved by the House and by the Senate have dismally failed to materialize. Those predictions that Congress would have a chance to act have disappeared, and by many Americans have been completely forgotten. Many writers and speakers who pontificate about the war in Korea do not even refer to the basis and the process by which we became involved in it. But everyone agrees that we are at war. But we are not at war because of legal compulsions and treaty obligations assumed by the passage of the Participation Act which made this country a member of the United Nations. We are at war by proclamation of President Truman of the United States.

It would seem to follow inevitably, therefore, that the United States has the authority, the power, and the responsibility to set the pattern for this war, to determine what tactics can bring it to the earliest and most honorable conclusion, and to decide what methods are best designed to protect the lives of the American boys who figure so overwhelmingly in the total number of non-Asiatic troops engaged in this gruesome conflict.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question in connection with his reference to a proclamation of the President declaring war. As I recall, the document which was read in the Senate on the day our troops went into combat in Korea was a press release which had previously been issued from the White House. Is that the proclamation to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. MUNDT. It is. The word "proclamation" is subject, I suppose, to many definitions and modifications. I had in mind no official significance in using the word "proclamation." We are at war by action of President Truman, who issued a press release or a proclamation advising the country as to what he had done, after he had done it, and advising the Security Council of what he had done, after he had done it, because the President's action was taken prior to the resolution adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. KEM. The point I have in mind, if the Senator will bear with me, is that apparently the President did not see fit formally to advise the Senate or the House of the action he had taken, but there was read in the Senate by former Senator Lucas, then the majority leader, a copy of the statement or release which had been issued by the White House to the press. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. The Senate, once great and powerful in the field of foreign relations, learned of it by reading about it in the morning newspapers. That is correct. It is also most regrettable.

As further evidence, Mr. President, of the statement that the United States has the authority to set the pattern of the war, I call attention to a speech delivered by Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy United States Representative to the United Nations, which can be found on page 1143 of "Decade of American Foreign Policy," prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by the staff of the committee and the Department of State.

I am endeavoring to document the record clearly, because it discusses a series of events which have thus far been largely overlooked in the debate. Therefore I am carefully identifying the sources of the evidence I cite.

I hesitate to fill the RECORD with all these specific references and page numbers, but I do so in the hope that students, editors, radio broadcasters, and columnists in America, and, I trust, Senators and Representatives, will go back to the factual background to study the records, the provisions, the statements, and treaty obligations which have brought us to this serious situation in Korea, because if we cannot learn from mistakes such as those we have been making in the past, to guard against even more colossal disasters in the future, I see little hope for the preservation of freedom in our Republic.

I shall now quote from the speech of Herschel V. Johnson. In that speech he told the United Nations:

> Until those agreements (referring to the agreements specified in art. 43) have been concluded and put into force, the Security Council will be unable to fulfill its responsibilities as the Enforcement Agent of the United Nations. Chapter 7 of the Charter, insofar as it relates to military measures, will remain inoperative.

When he said that, he had not figured on the impetuosity of President Truman. He figured that from the standpoint of constitutional and congressional action, the measures would remain inoperative.

In view of these facts from the provisions of the United Nations Charter, from the debate and understandings by which we became a member of the United Nations in the Participation Act, and through a careful study of the constitutional powers of the President in this country to involve our forces in a foreign war for reasons other than those of protecting the life and property of American citizens or of fulfilling our American treaty obligations, Mr. President, I again suggest that the joint committees holding hearings on the Korean War should give the American public a clear cut consistent answer to the question, "How actually, did America get involved in the Korean War and on what legal basis are we waging that bloody conflict?"

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that when the present war in Korea started, the President did not call it a war, but called it a police action? Does the Senator from South Dakota know whether or not a change has been effected, and the police action is now referred to as a war?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. The President of the United States, in the message in which he attempted to justify the removal of General MacArthur, referred to the Korean situation as a war more than 20 times.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was that the first time the reference was changed from a "police action" to a "war?"

Mr. MUNDT. General MacArthur testified before the committees sitting jointly that from the day he had entered Korea with his troops he understood the action to be a war, because his boys were being shot up pretty badly in a major military venture in Korea. No one in Korea has ever referred to it as anything but a war. In the political temples of America an attempt has been made to masquerade it as a police action. I believe the President of the United States now agrees that it is a war, and a very big and bloody one.

Mr. FERGUSON. According to the ordinary and, I think, universal definition, a police action is one in which a force is used to execute a judgment of a court in the application of established

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

law. It that not what a police action ordinarily is?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there any attempt here to apply an established law in the concrete case of aggression by North Koreans?

Mr. MUNDT. Not that I know of.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it not come under the definition of a force which is used without reference to previously enacted law? For example, in the Korean situation force was arbitrarily used, and it was an act of violence which created the war. Therefore, under all previous international definitions of war and police action, it is a war, not a police action, is it not?

Mr. MUNDT. I believe that is unquestionably true. The truth of it is highlighted by the fact that at least 12 hours before the Security Council adopted a resolution requesting military intervention on the part of the free world the President of the United States had already ordered American boys into the war. I do not believe there is any longer a question in the mind of anyone about our being in a war. The question we must now answer is, How are we to get out of it successfully, and intact? We must ask ourselves the question, How are we to make the sacrifices worth while, and who will assume the responsibility for the direction of the war?

Mr. President, the ceaseless passing of the buck between Lake Success and Washington must stop. The passing of the buck between No. 10 Downing Street and 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue must stop. Someone must assume the responsibility now for seeing to it that the war is successfully concluded. I submit that the "someone" must be the person who put us in the war to begin with by Executive action.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to my colleague from the great State of South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am wondering if my very able senior colleague could tell us whether, since the entry into the conflict of the Red Chinese, he has noted any difference in the expressions emanating from the White House or the State Department with regard to whether or not the action in Korea is a war.

Mr. MUNDT. Oh, yes; I think that perhaps was one of the factors which helped them change their terminology. On the other hand, it may be that someone found a dictionary in the White House containing a definition of war which states that when casualties pass the 60,000 mark a police action becomes a war. I do not know what it was that caused the change, but they do now call it a war.

Mr. CASE. I am sure my colleague recalls that immediately following the entry of the Red Chinese into the war General of the Army Douglas MacArthur reported that a new situation existed as a result of the entry of the Red Chinese, and called for certain decisions. Has the Senator from South Dakota noted any decision in the political field, or is he aware of any particular change in the military authority accorded to the command in Korea, since the Red Chinese entered the war?

Mr. MUNDT. No; but I am aware that in the radio talk which the President made to the country after his summary dismissal of MacArthur he called attention to the fact that we were in a war. What he originally tried to describe as a police action has become a war. However he has never requested authority, as Commander in Chief and as President of the United States, to proceed as though we were in a war. He has never come to Congress for further authority or concurrence.

Mr. CASE. Is the Senator saying that, although on the other side of the conflict there have been thrown into the balance the Red Chinese forces, no major decisions, either of a political or military character, have been made by the administration to counter the forces thrown in on the other side?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct, except from the standpoint of General MacArthur, who did present a program, which, of course, was rejected.

Mr. CASE. That is the tragedy of the situation.

Mr. MUNDT. It certainly is, because not only did the administration reject it, but, as I shall point out presently, it has failed to put anything into the vacuum which was created when it rejected the MacArthur program.

Mr. President, we come next to the legislation which in 1949 amended the United Nations Participation Act of 1945.

I am sure that even though commentators may ignore and editorial writers may be oblivious to the recorded facts in the case, historians, at least, will wish to find out what preceded the events of 1951. So I wish further to document this up-to-now almost completely ignored record of the situation.

The amending legislation was approved in October 1949. The amending legislation provided for the possibility of the United States assigning 1,000 noncombatant troops to the United Nations for their use in various United Nations missions.

The amendments adopted to the United Nations Participation Act of 1949 specifically provided "that they should not involve the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter." The limitations were specific; they were definite; they were clear. The legislation authorized the President to detail a total of not more than 1,000 noncombatant to a mission at any one time.

Mr. President, let me repeat that statement. I recall that when we were discussing the troops-to-Europe issue we were asked time and time again to rely upon assurances made on the floor of the Senate by members of the committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations. We were asked to rely upon assurances of the President of the United States, of the Secretary of State, and of some Army general. I wish to point out, if nothing else, that unless Americans continue to insist that they rely for their freedom on constitutional law and upon adherence to that law, they may quickly go down the drain of dictatorship, which has ruined the lives of so many other peoples all over the world.

Mr. President, we were told some wonderful things in the debates. No one will stand on the floor and deny that the things we were told have not come to pass, that the things we were told have been refuted by history, and that the things we were told have been drowned in the blood bath of the Korean war. Therefore I wish to recall some of the things we were told.

The legislation contained some very specific limitations. They were specific; they were definite; they were clear; they were understandable. Even a radio commentator, running madly for a microphone, should take time to read them before he tries to tell the American people the facts in the Korean situation. Every editorial writer and columnist should read them. The legislation authorized the President to detail a total of not more than 1,000 noncombatant troops to a mission at any one time. To those who would argue that the President has not been exercising authority and prerogatives in the field of foreign policy and in his war-making capacity which are beyond the constitutional provisions and the powers of Congress, let me point out that today as we meet here on the floor of the United States Senate we have already had 10 times as many American boys killed in Korea as the President was authorized by legislation in 1949 to assign to the United Nations for noncombatant purposes. Our total casualties in Korea this sad day in May are more than 60 times the total authorization extended to the President by the Congress through any legislation on our statute books or by any commitments to the United Nations. The number of American casualties is today 60 times the number which the President was ever authorized to send out to do anything for the United Nations, under any circumstances whatsoever. Moreover, the authorization in 1949 specifically stated that such troops could be used only as noncombatant troops.

The records of Congress are eloquently silent with respect to any further legislation on the subject, any additional agreements, or any additional understandings. If we are in a war or a police action in Korea, we are there because the President put us in without a single additional authorization from Congress or a single additional mandatory provision by the United Nations, except for the power to send not to exceed 1,000 noncombatant troops under the aegis of the United Nations, as a mission for a peaceful purpose.

Mr. President, there is also some very interesting and informative testimony completely ignored up to now, on the use of American troops which is to be found in the hearings held on H. R. 3085, H. R. 4497, H. R. 4708 before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 10, 11, 12, and 13 of 1949. As a matter of fact, on page 17 of those hearings, Mr. Ernest A. Gross, who is the present adviser to Ambassador Warren Austin at the United Nations and who was then

and had been for a long time a highly placed counsel on the State Department, and who served as Assistant Secretary of State, testified, on page 17 of the hearings:

Because of the fact that under the Constitution, American military personnel cannot be made available to foreign powers or foreign organizations except by authority of law, it has been necessary, instead of detailing the personnel to the United Nations for service to keep them within American control.

"To keep them within American control" means that Americans can decide what hazards we must undertake because of the failure of a blockade or the failure of air support. Mr. Gross says—and I repeat—

Because of the fact that under the Constitution, American military personnel cannot be made available to foreign powers or foreign organizations except by authority of law—

As an astute lawyer he knew that no such authority of law had ever been granted by Congress—

it has been necessary, instead of detailing the personnel to the United Nations for service to keep them within American control.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not in line with that philosophy that the United Nations made the President of the United States the agent of the United Nations, and that the full and complete control of military operations in Korea is under the United States?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not that what the testimony in the MacArthur-Truman hearings shows?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct. Furthermore, in a few minutes I shall read from a heretofore unpublished letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, admitting that fact 100 percent, and setting it before the American public for the first time, so far as I know.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that be true, can the Senator tell the Senate why it is necessary to take to the United Nations various matters which affect military activities alone? I cite one instance, the so-called principle of hot pursuit. If an enemy fighter comes across the Yalu River and fires upon an American bomber and our fighters get word of it and rise to attack, if the Chinese plane or the North Korean plane—whichever it may be—turns tail and goes across the Yalu, we cannot pursue it at all. That is by virtue of the demand of the United Nations. If that be true, would the Senator say that America has complete control of the military strategy and military operations in Korea?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct. Presently I shall quote no less an authority than the Secretary of State, in a letter which he signed very recently, to that effect. I point out that the trick testimony from certain sources which is being publicized in the newspapers, and the clever concealments, are designed to confuse the American public into believing that the American military command does not have authority to make decisions. It seems to me that the deception should be exposed so that every mother of an American lad in Korea may know, for better or worse, that what happens in Korea happens only because of a decision made in the White House, the Pentagon, or the State Department in Washington.

The testimony of Secretary Acheson will be startlingly revealing in that connection. Before quoting the testimony, let me say that with the statement of Mr. Ernest A. Gross in mind it cannot be reasonably argued that the tactics which determine success or failure of our American forces in Korea are to be determined, diluted, or directed by the United Nations rather than to be definitely an American responsibility. That is a clever scheme to fool the American people. The United Nations know full well that they have no authority and no responsibility; and so do the officials of the American Government. Sir Gladwyn Jebb was very eloquent on the subject.

Thus I believe it important, Mr. President, that the joint committee in its meetings and its investigation determine definitely what actually was the definition of the mission undertaken by our forces in Korea under the Presidential order last June and what their present mission is supposed to be.

I believe, sir, it is also the responsibility of the joint committee, and above all the responsibility of President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and the Chiefs of Staff to let Americans know exactly what the job is that we have undertaken in Korea and what must be achieved in order to bring an end to this costly war. Since this venture in war seems to be clearly an American responsibility and an activity instigated by the President of the United States without consultation with Congress, it is neither a candid nor an adequate answer to the American public at this time to say that the determination of what is to be done in Korea is a responsibility of the United Nations. There is no legal basis for such a statement. Indeed, Mr. President, we should be grateful for the support which some of the members of United Nations, more especially the Republic of Turkey, have given to our forces in this war.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it from what the Senator is saying that he is having some difficulty in knowing what we are trying to accomplish in Korea.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly am.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that if he and other Senators have difficulty in understanding the situation, those whom we desire to have as our allies must be having great difficulty, and the American people and the people of our allies must be having great difficulty, in knowing what is our mission today in Korea? If they do not know it, it is almost certain that the enemy does not know what our mission is. How can we expect, by war, to exert our will—which is the purpose of war—on an enemy by accomplishing a certain mission if we do not tell our allies and our own people, and even the enemy, what our purpose is in Korea?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Michigan makes an exceedingly important point, because for war to be ended in anything less than complete and unconditional surrender, both the one who is winning the war and the one who is losing it has to have some idea as to the target; in this case, they do not.

Let me ask the Senator from Michigan a question, because I respect his judgment very much. I have said I have great difficulty in finding out what is supposed to be the purpose, the objective, the terminal point, the target goal, and outline of the war in Korea. The Senator from Michigan, along with the Senator from South Dakota, has heard much of the testimony in committees, and has heard much of the debate on the floor of the Senate. Has the Senator from Michigan yet heard any Senator rise in his place and say, "This is why we are fighting in Korea; this is what we must do; when we have achieved this, the war is over; the war is done"? Has any Member of the Senate said that in this Chamber during the whole debate?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan knows of no such statement. There has been floating about the idea that if the North Koreans and the Red Chinese will cease their aggression, the war will end. But the second order of the United Nations was to create a united, independent, and free Korea, and to bring peace to the area. It now seems that our military mission is not to bring about a united, free, independent Korea, but that result is to be achieved by some political negotiation rather than by the military operation.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is exactly correct. I again want to emphasize the very pertinent point made by the Senator from Michigan, which is that if America does not know what the war is being fought to achieve, if Americans do not know what is to be done in Korea in order to see that the war is satisfactorily concluded, if Americans have had no target outline presented to them, it is small wonder that our associates in the war, the 13 or 14 countries which have contributed some few troops, are confused and distressed and disturbed, and that there are disagreements among them because of the fact that no singleness of purpose has ever been outlined for them, as it has not been outlined for us.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could it be that the reason why America and/or the United Nations—if it is claimed, as it is claimed, that this is a United Nations war—have not definitely stated what their purpose is in Korea, is that there is a policy of appeasement in the air? Following the psychological-warfare statement issued by the commander in chief in the field, General MacArthur, we have heard much about a proposal which it is said

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the President of the United States intended to make, which might lead us to believe that sooner or later appeasement approaches would be made. In other words, the definite purpose cannot be set forth because if it is, then we must hew to the line of principle whereas, if it is left floating about, those in authority can then appease and make a compromise even to the extent of permitting, as has been suggested, Red China to shoot her way into a permanent seat in the United Nations, on the Security Council, and to take over Formosa.

If the real purpose of our intervention in Korea were announced, it might not be possible to accomplish the appeasement which some persons seem to think may be brought about. Oh, I understand that the word "appeasement" is not in the administration's language, and they tell us that they are not going to appease; but after all, in order to know whether we are appeasing, is it not necessary to know what the administration means by appeasement, and what Russia means by appeasement? The American people would like to understand what is meant by appeasement?

Mr. MUNDT. I think that certainly is true. To me one of the dangers of appeasement has always been that it not only tends to encourage and fortify the enemy and to give him false illusions about his grandeur and his probable success in war, but appeasement is a device of the devil for dividing allies in any conflict, because appeasement has this much in common with economy: A person always wants to appease with the other fellow's assets; he always wants to appease with the other fellow's interests, as he always wants to economize with the other man's projects and the other man's undertakings. So, as we have this atmosphere of appeasement, the British, understandingly, want to appease in such a way that their trade interests in Hong Kong are protected. The countries of Asia, whose troops are fighting in Korea, in but very small numbers—but there are some—want to appease in such a way as to keep the maximum number of people in Asia happy and contented. The Republic of Turkey wants to appease in such a way as to make sure that the greatest damage is done to Russia, because Russia is a great, threatening force, and the breath of the great Russian bear is hot on the neck of the Turk in the Dardanelles. So appeasement is a device for creating misunderstanding and confusion among allies.

As the Senator from Michigan has correctly stated, in this war we have only the choice of appeasement or victory. The American public is never going to stand permanently for a cruel stalemate of a 2, or 4, or 6, or 10-year war in Korea, where American boys are traded one for three against Chinese soldiers in the death march of disaster.

So eventually it is going to have to be resolved in the direction of appeasement, which is a polysyllabic way of pronouncing defeat, or else it is going to have to be resolved in some kind of a victory. To obtain victory we have to have a target, we have to have a terminal point. Not only we and our soldiers and our constituents back home who are providing the sinews of war, but our associates in the conflict must know the design of the battle and the definition of the target if we are ever going to have victory in a conflict of this magnitude.

Mr. President, I have said that since we are in this war by a curious extralegal Presidential device, and consequently are calling upon other countries voluntarily to contribute soldiers and sailors and equipment to aid in this effort, we should be thankful for the assistance we have gotten from Canada, from Turkey, and from Great Britain, even though we are regretful that that assistance has been so meager and so small. But none of them is mandatorily committed to do anything in a venture of this kind, because in the United Nations Charter as of now, there is no mandatory provision by means of which any of them can correctly be called upon to supply troops and equipment.

Mr. President, I submit that we should also be equally candid and emphatic and honest, however, in registering our bitter protest against the fact that some of the members of the United Nations associated with us in this conflict, in what they consider a common effort, have given us so meagerly of troops and equipment and supplies which are essential to bringing the conflict to a victorious conclusion. Those who have joined us have in large part joined us to but a very small degree.

I submit that we should be ever more bitter and even more resentful and certainly much more articulate, however, in expressing our dismay and our disappointment over the fact that some of the members of the United Nations have actually been shipping to the Communist enemy war supplies of such character and in such amounts and of such value that, in fact, the shipment of those supplies may very well far exceed in importance the very modest contributions of military forces which the same countries have made available to the free side of this bloody conflict.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be very happy to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from South Dakota feel that the very important debate now occurring in the Senate on the question of far-eastern policy is already bearing fruit when we see announced from Lake Success, as of yesterday's date line, that both Britain and France are now of the opinion that they should at least cease sending war materials and matériel to the enemy? Even though they are not convinced that they should do so immediately, it is indicated that they want to have a meeting next Monday at which they will consider the desires of the United States of America, which has in this bloody war in Korea approximately 350,000 troops, as compared to the Allies' 20,000. At the same time, the enemy has been receiving from certain of the Allies aid and comfort—in fact, direct aid—by way of shipments of rubber, medical supplies, and other things which can be used in the war against the allied troops. Now Britain and France are about to see that they have been wrong in their decisions in that respect. So the debate occurring in the Senate has forcibly brought this matter not only to the attention of the American people but has brought it up for discussion on the floor of the House of Commons, where it is being debated by the British. The debate is necessary in order that everyone may know what has been going on. We shall obtain results—although perhaps they will be delayed—when we put before the free peoples of the world the principles of truth and justice for which we stand.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think there is at least some small reason for hope in that connection. I concur completely in the Senator's observation that the testimony of General MacArthur on last Thursday, Friday, and Saturday is almost solely responsible for the degree of change of face that has occurred in Britain on that subject. But, Mr. President, how utterly unrealistic our country and the British are in the approach to the problem of an economic blockade, when diplomats in striped pants and tall black hats at Lake Success can say, "Next Monday afternoon"—after a few more nights of cocktail parties and a few more days of ball games at the Yankee Stadium—"Next Monday afternoon we shall settle down to discussing whether or not it might be wise to stop sending gasoline and locomotives and electronic equipment and the actual implements of war to the Communist army which is now engaged in shooting American boys."

Mr. President, perhaps "next Monday afternoon" is a date on a diplomat's calendar; I do not know. However, instead of saying "Next Monday afternoon," they should say "One thousand American casualties hence"—because it is very likely that 1,000 additional American casualties will occur between now and next Monday afternoon—"we shall take up this matter at Lake Success."

I agree completely that the mere adoption of resolutions and of statements in regard to inhibitions and in regard to reducing the size of the exports of supplies to the enemy is not the answer. Instead, there should be a completely effective economic blockade which will keep from the enemy not only the legal importations by the Communists, but also the shipments they seek to secure illegally, by means of profiteers operating on the high seas.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from South Dakota agree that in the case of any nation or any citizen or subject of a nation which furnishes aid and comfort and, particularly, ammunition to the enemy, the blood of all soldiers who are killed by that means is upon the shoulders of that nation or that individual citizen or subject because of the furnishing of the materials which are used to kill those soldiers?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has put the matter exceedingly well. I imagine that today in Great Britain, under the shadow of Big Ben, in the House of Commons, there must be many a Socialist politician of that great country who is uneasy about the fact that his policies are resulting not only in providing the ammunition and the equipment and the supplies by means of which the Communists are shooting American boys, but also are providing the supplies with which the Communists are shooting British boys, to the extent that the British Government has provided assistance in Korea by way of troops.

The basic fallacy of socialism, in my opinion, is demonstrated by the unconscionable policy of the Socialist government in Britain toward Korea, because the basis of socialism is the concept of materialism. Apparently all the politicians in Great Britain think about, when they insist on sending to the Communists war supplies to be used to kill both British boys and American boys, is the materialistic concept by which the Socialists operate. In the minds of the Socialists, material things are the only ones that count; the only things that count with them are food and clothing and wages and houses. Socialism entirely lacks the spirit and the breath of freedom and of liberty and of independence. Who could imagine, Mr. President, a Churchill insisting that for a few, paltry, blood-stained dollars, his government would supply to Hitler, during World War II, the supplies to be shot back at the people of Great Britain and to kill their sons in battle? That is one of the many sad dividends of a country which has worshipped before the great god gold, and has come to the acceptance of the purely materialistic concept of national socialism. As that materialistic concept under Hitler destroyed the conscience of Germany, it is now apparently destroying the conscience of Great Britain.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator recall at any time in history when a nation has been at war that such nation itself has permitted trade in war materials with the enemy? Does the Senator know of any such time?

Mr. MUNDT. I know of none, unless it is with the possible exception of Russia, which I think at times has done so. I think the Communists of Russia, like the Socialists of Britain, are so completely married to the concept of materialism that, for a few extra ounces of gold, as a possible profit, they might even be willing to engage in that kind of pagan practice.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator considers it to be a real pagan practice, does he not?

Mr. MUNDT. It is a real pagan practice, one which would never be undertaken by a freedom-loving government or a government which placed ideals and Christianity above the profits which might be made by that kind of profligate trade.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, those who would engage in such traffic would be void of any principle, would they not?

Mr. MUNDT. Entirely void. It would be a pure political manipulation by power-hungry politicians worshiping at the pagan shine of materialistic national socialism or communism.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota mentioned a few paltry dollars. The truth of it is that the 120,000 tons of rubber, at 70 cents a pound represents $168,000,000, and that is not small change, is it?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to stand corrected. In the Senator's State and mine that is big change; there is no question about that. I used the word "paltry" in an attempt to voice my displeasure over the idea that any dollar was worth the life of a freedom-loving soldier fighting against communism, and that any profit they might make would be paltry compared to the human sacrifice they would bring to their sons and to ours.

Let us consider the question of how much is involved, for it would seem that this has played an important and considerable part in the debate this afternoon. I have in mind, for example, the bizarre fact that the British socialistic and materialistic government issued a report as recently as only last month—to be exact, April 30—pointing out that within the past 3 months $3,614,800 worth of supplies had been shipped to Communist China. That is big money. Those supplies are shipped to a fighting enemy of the United States, a fighting enemy of every remaining free country in the world, including Great Britain. Sir Hartley William Shawcross, a state Socialist in politics, a materialist in concept, president of the board of trade in Great Britain, gave this figure when asked in the House of Commons, on April 30, what strategic materials his country was sending to China.

Listed among the exports shipped to Communist China within the past 3 months by Sir Hartley William Shawcross are such items as iron, steel, vehicles, including locomotives, aircraft, electrical goods, and chemicals; all highly utilitarian from the standpoint of killing American boys on the Korean Peninsula, some of it undoubtedly used to kill British boys who though in small numbers to be sure, are fighting there courageously by the side of American boys. The British soldiers have had the rug pulled out from under them by a materialistic group of politicians under the banners of state Socialists in Great Britain, by an insistence upon supplying to the enemy of their sons the weapons with which to kill their boys, in order that a few pounds of profit might come to the British Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In these discussions we may at times lose sight of the civilians in Korea for whose liberty and freedom we are fighting and who are most seriously affected by the accordion movement of troops across the thirty-eighth parallel and back. Is it not true that on the floor of the Senate we must ever be conscious of the welfare and the lives of the people of South Korea who are to all effects in this war with us, who are not soldiers, but who are civilians, helping to feed and supply us? Must we not be conscious not only of the 65,000 soldiers we have lost, and those of our allies, but of the civilian population, of whom the number now on the casualty lists aggregate, I think, 1,000,000 souls.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. If we are to continue the fight in Korea for 2 or 5 or 10 or 20 years—and this accordion type of conflict may well eventuate into that long a war—because, we recall that China has had guerrilla wars lasting for almost half a century—if we are to become committed to that kind of warfare, I fear that the people of Korea, who, after all, are the folks for whom this war was initiated and begun, will practically have become extinct and entirely eliminated.

We are talking about the shipments of supplies by Great Britain and by other United Nations countries direct to the Communists in China. Mr. President, in my opinion, it is difficult to know honestly whether the Government of Great Britain has been more derelict in authorizing and permitting the shipments of such war supplies, to accrue to the fighting forces of a wicked fighting enemy of America, and of the fighting forces of other nations who have voluntarily and willingly placed themselves at the side of our American boys in Korea, and at the side of the South Korean Army—it is hard for me to know whether the Britons have been more derelict in their duty by shipping those supplies to those places, or whether President Truman and Secretary Acheson and the American Government have been more derelict in not insisting more emphatically that Great Britain fulfill her commitments, undertaken by article 41 of the United Nations Charter, to stop sending such types of supplies.

Britain, America, and the other United Nations countries are committed under article 41 to withhold the shipment of economic supplies to a country which has breached the peace. They are not committed to the sending of troops. But, going beyond our commitment in sending troops, we find ourselves confronted by the fact that the British failed to measure up to their commitment not to send shipments of war supplies, and our Government has been grossly derelict, as I shall presently prove from the record, in not even asking the United Nations to measure up to their commitments under article 41.

While rushing into the war beyond our treaty commitments and without the authorization of Congress, we have not even had the kind of sterling leadership in America to insist that, having done so, that, as a measure of good faith, the other countries should immediately fulfill their commitments under article 41. They have failed to do it. We have failed to insist upon it. Our leadership has been woefully lacking and has not measured up to the courage expected by the boys in Korea, who are fighting for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a principle we seem to be unable to provide leadership to support here at home.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator could give the Senate the last date upon which America has, under her export controls, allowed shipments or reshipments of strategic materials into China?

Mr. MUNDT. I am unable to do that. If there is a "last date," which I fear there is not, but if there is, it is comparatively recent. But yesterday, as short a time ago as that, I was told, on what appeared to be good authority, that American vessels, some of them reregistered with South American registrations, were still conveying articles of war to the Chinese Communist troops through Hong Kong and other Chinese ports. So, if the traffic has been completely terminated, I shall be gratified, but I certainly am unable to provide a date when it has been finally and completely ended. However, in all fairness, I may say that we have done a rather good job in exercising certain export controls in recent weeks, to diminish the amount of supplies going from this country to Communist China.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that every possible ounce of effort should be exerted by the American Government and every American citizen to see that we, first of all, stop the shipment of supplies which can be of aid to the enemy, and that we then must exert every possible ounce of effort and every possible ounce of persuasion upon those who are our allies, to cause them to see the justice and right of prohibiting the shipment to China of supplies which may be used to destroy not only the Allies, and our own soldiers, but the civilians in Korea? Does not the Senator feel that until that is done we have not done our full share in this war effort?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly agree with the Senator; and if it can be done legally and properly, I think our Government should take steps to deny the right to fly the American flag to any merchant ship guilty of shipping supplies to the Communists in China, and, if necessary, to deny access to American ports, in the normal course of trade, to merchantmen of the world who insist on leaving any of our ports to take supplies to Red China which may be used in killing American boys, because, in my opinion, we cannot play with the business of making war. It is serious. Sixty-five thousand casualties already have eventuated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire recently received a letter from the mother of a boy who was killed in Korea. She enclosed two clippings in the letter, one of which contained the headline, "120,000 tons of rubber sent to Communist China," or to Russia. The other clipping, taken some 2 or 3 months ago from a newspaper, told of shipments of goods from our own country to Communist China. Then the lady asked a very pertinent, searching question as to what our Government was doing about it, specifically, what action it had taken with reference to our so-called allies in this conflict, and demanding of me to know what I proposed to do about forcing the administration to take some action in connection with our allies.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator might have answered the first part of the letter by sending her a blank piece of paper, because the administration has done very little in that direction.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is correct. But it bears out the point of the Senator from South Dakota, that when our men are dying by the thousands, and when soldiers of our allies, though in much smaller numbers, are also dying, it is indeed difficult to understand how the administration can consistently justify its position. I think the Senator from South Dakota is making a great and important contribution in bringing out the facts.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire very much. I think it should be emphasized over and over again that any member of the United Nations which permits any of its nationals to send any war supplies to Communist China or to Red Korea does so in violation of the spirit and intent of section 41 of the United Nations Charter.

We hear a lot of stuff these days, Mr. President, to the effect that we cannot protect American boys with airplanes, that we cannot do this, that, or the other thing because someone in the United Nations might not like it. I wish we had somewhere in the executive department leadership, who, in a thundering tone would tell the world at Lake Success that the United States does not like it when its associates violate article 41 of the United Nations Charter by sending war supplies which are used to kill American boys. I do not think we should be eternally pushed around even by our friends. Someone should, long ago, have given articulate expression to the hopes and aspirations of America and to our not liking it when our associates and allies provide the war supplies to kill our boys in distant, dismal, and demoralized Korea.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suppose the Senator follows the hearings being conducted by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. I noticed in the testimony of Secretary Marshall yesterday that he qualified the actions which the United States could or should take by citing the objection of our allies. In telling why the Government could not follow General MacArthur's recommendations, he gave two principal reasons. One was that it might bring about a war with Russia. But the principal reason which he seemed to come back to all the time was that our allies failed to approve such action.

Mr. MUNDT. I noticed that as I read the press dispatches relating to the hearing, and it led me to say what I said a few minutes ago, that I think Uncle Sam should have some feeling about the matter. He is not a wooden Indian in front of a cigar store; he is a very important human gentleman in the international body politic. It is too bad that there is not in the executive department somewhere a voice that would say at Lake Success, "The feelings of our people are pretty badly ruffled when you violate article 41 by sending war supplies to the enemy to be used to kill off our boys, and then telling us that we cannot use our troops in a certain fashion." In other words, we must have some leadership, or the war can become increasingly worse.

I am sorry to say that I could not attend the hearings yesterday morning, but as I read the newspapers I must confess that I was more mystified by the large amount of testimony deleted by the censor than I was informed by the small amount of testimony that remained.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from South Dakota is making a very excellent, forceful, and effective case against the shipment of war supplies or strategic materials to Communist China. May I ask him if he heard the recommendations of General MacArthur for bringing to a successful conclusion the Korean War? If those recommendations were carried out, it would automatically solve the problem of which the Senator is speaking today, would it not?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct, because one of the recommendations was the economic blockade of China.

Mr. President, I am wondering what conceivable justification the British can give for helping to feed the flames of world war III by supplying the implements of war to the fighting Chinese Communists, who have already caused a total of more than 60,000 American casualties. I wonder what conceivable reason they give their people and the listening audience at Lake Success for shipping war supplies to help the Chinese bring about what already have become well over 60,000 American casualties—perhaps more than 65,000. What justification can our own Government give for not more energetically and realistically and promptly insisting that the British fulfill their commitments under article 41 of the United Nations Charter?

I hope the hearings which are now being help in secret by the two committees in joint session will continue until answers to those questions are made clear, and that they may be made available through the Pentagon and State Department censorship so that the American people can read them in the press.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator asks what our Government is doing about it. One of the things it is doing is to supply a gag for responsible persons in our country, such as General MacArthur, to

prevent them from speaking out and telling the American people the truth and making known to them and to the world what is going on.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. Let me pursue it a little bit further lest some hasty advocate of the administration's position tries to say that the administration has been vigorously trying to stop the shipment of war supplies to our enemy. Let me read a news dispatch from the Wire Services, dated at Lake Success, May 2, 1951, just a few short days ago, long after General MacArthur had been fired, long after the great new Chinese offensive had gotten under way, long after American casualties had reached the 60,000 mark. Let me read that terribly disturbing dateline again—May 2, 1951. I read:

The United States decided tonight to propose to the 13 member nations at tomorrow's meeting that an embargo be placed on shipments of all war materials to Communist China.

Note the date. After 60,000 American casualties had been suffered, after we had had the terrific experiences and sacrifices in Korea, on May 2 the United States at Lake Success decided to propose the consideration of an embargo on the war supplies being sent to our enemies which are being used to kill American boys, and which supplies had contributed so largely to the amalgamation of the casualty list, which has now reached the staggering figure of 60,000.

The United States proposal is in the nature of a strategic embargo and would specifically ban the shipment of atomic materials, instruments of war, munitions, and weapons.

Not an entire economic blockade. They do not wish to ship atomic bombs, and they do not wish to ship any uranium. Perhaps bazookas. It is only a strategic list. I read further:

The United States decision to ask for the embargo is a step along the road suggested by General MacArthur in his speech before Congress on April 19.

Mr. President, what kind of national leadership do we have today which is skidding us down the bloody path toward disaster, and when we must wait until May 2 to propose an embargo? The embargo is not even an actuality. Let me read further. I quote from the newspapers of May 3. It is an Associated Press dispatch under a London dateline. The heading is rather interesting. It says:

Attlee Says Red China Gets British Goods "In Accord With America."

I think Attlee told the truth. I think Attlee told the truth, because it was on the following day that it was decided by American authorities to request that an embargo be placed upon the shipment of supplies. Let me read further:

LONDON, May 3.—Prime Minister Attlee declared today Britain is now exporting strategic materials to Red China only "in accord with America."

Interesting, is it not? Very interesting. Very factual. They fire General MacArthur because he protested against being put in a position of commanding troops who are forced to die because they are shot by supplies shipped in by allies in accord with the attitude of his own Government in Washington. Mr. President, those are the facts taken from the record.

I submit that the committees sitting jointly, before they cease their investigation, make positive that the investigation does not become the biggest, bloodiest whitewash in history by failing to discover who it was in our American Government, so derelict in his duty that it was not in last August or September, instead of on May 2, that an attempt was made to try to bring about an embargo of shipments of war supplies being used in killing American boys.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The condition referred to by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota of our Government and our allies shipping war materials and equipment to Communist China, which is engaged in active war with the United States of America and in which our American boys are being killed, is different from the famous story, and the facts surrounding the story, of our Government's supplying scrap iron and steel to Japan prior to Pearl Harbor, which steel and scrap iron came back to us in the bodies of American boys. At least in that instance the scrap iron and steel was not shipped when an actual war was going on. Although we thought there might be a war, or probably would be one some day, still there was no actual conflict under way. Therefore the present situation is doubly bad, is it not?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. Bad as it was to ship scrap iron and steel and oil to Japan at a time when everyone was worrying about the possibility of war breaking out with Japan, and when Japan was brutally pushing around China, who was to become our most important ally in Asia, and still would be our most important ally in Asia if we had had proper State Department policy and had supported the right kind of government in China, we are now actually shipping supplies or permitting them to be shipped by our allies in accord with our judgment and diplomatic processes during an actual war and when our boys are being killed beyond the 60,000-casualty mark.

I should like to quote again from the Associated Press report of May 3:

"It is a question of degree," Mr. Attlee told the House of Commons, "as to how much is strategic. This matter has been done in accord with America."

Mr. President, I emphasize it so that it will not appear that it is a typographical error. The statement was made on May 3, Mr. President. The statement stand uncriticized, unchallenged, and unrefuted by any responsible American official that the bloody traffic in arms through Hong Kong was in accord with President Truman, in accord with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in accord with Secretary of State Acheson, and in accord with every responsible American official in the executive departments, because only the executive departments have the power to voice disapproval of that kind of infamous procedure.

Mr. President, I believe the American public should know that much. The committee should bring back a full report to the public as to who is responsible for the situation, and who makes the Korean war not only an undeclared war but a war which is unsupported at home by those who should be leading it to a successful conclusion.

Mr. President, I may point out that the British exports to Red China top £1,000,000 a month, according to an article which comes out of London under date of April 30.

According to another article, dated at London on May 2, the British have sent 120,000 tons of rubber to Red China, and have also sent 40,000 tons of rubber to the Soviets. They want to make sure that the Communists get enough rubber to fight a war.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON While we are discussing the quantity of rubber, I should like to mention the fact that 120,000 tons of rubber is one-sixth of the rubber which is used in the United States in 1 year. It becomes an important item when we consider the fact that we have millions of automobiles.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, it must be true that the reason Americans cannot get a spare tire on a new car is because the spare tire is being shipped to the Communist overlords in China for the purpose of aiding their efforts in the killing of American boys.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Because one-sixth, in my curbstone arithmetic, just about adds up to the spare tire which Americans are being denied when they buy a new car. I may point out finally, in connection with an economic blockade, that on May 7 a report appeared in the press that the United States had formally proposed that the United Nations impose a stringent arms embargo against Red China. Mr. President, May 7 was the day before yesterday. Now we have the record in its horrific entirety. May 7 was the day before yesterday. We learn that on May 7 the United Nations reported that the "United States yesterday formally proposed the United Nations impose a stringent arms embargo against Red China."

That does not say that the United Nations agreed to do it. That still is no decision. That is the first step of leadership—that we propose it and suggest it. I submit that that is a terrific indictment of a group of individuals who have involved us in this bloody war. They have exercised exactly no leadership at all in stopping the war shipments to Red China until the day before yesterday—until more than 60,000 American boys had become war casualties.

Mr. President, it is certainly time to put an end to the confusion existing today with regard to the war in Korea. It

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

should be made clear to all that our military forces fighting in Korea are fighting as Americans under the command of American military leaders and at the direction of the President of the United States, engaging in a war in which he put them without consultation with Congress or without a declaration of war, and without any treaty commitments which might have put us in by other constitutional processes. This means that the determination must be made by those who put us in this war, and by those charged with the responsibility of directing our forces in time of war, concerning our objectives in the war. They must tell us what the war is about, how it is to end, what we must do, and what kind of sacrifices must still be made by the hundreds of thousands of American boys in Korea before they can lay down their guns and come home knowing that the war has been successfully concluded.

The President, acting as our Commander in Chief, has recently removed Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his command in Korea. The President told the country that he did this because he did not agree with General MacArthur's strategy for bringing the war to an early and victorious conclusion. That makes it as clear as the path to the country schoolhouse, Mr. President, that President Truman now has the responsibility of telling this country what his concept of the American position in Korea actually is. What is the job which he wishes our fighting boys to complete before those who are left can return to their homeland?

What is the Truman target in this war? Since the President has disdainfully discarded the MacArthur recommendations, what does he now propose to substitute as the proper method for putting an honorable end to this awful war of attrition which for so many months has been killing so many American boys on a battlefield so far removed from American shores?

Mr. President, we hear much from administration spokesmen to the effect that these are not decisions which are to be made by President Truman and our American Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is hinted, and sometimes said, that we must canvass the members of the United Nations in order to determine what our war target is to be. It is suggested that we poll the free countries of the world as to whether we can bomb Communist sanctuaries from which are sent against American boys the devasting, bloodletting, death-producing juggernauts of steel and flame which are repeatedly being thrown against our forces in Korea.

Let there be no more confusion on this point. President Truman, his Secretary of State, and his Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot escape the responsibility of filling in the void in our war strategy created by the dismissal of General MacArthur and the violation of his battle strategy.

President Truman and this administration cannot escape the responsibility of proclaiming our objectives in this conflict. They cannot escape the responsibility of formulating plans designed to put an early and honorable and enduring end to the deadly processes by which American casualty lists come back from Korea at a present rate of more than 200 a day.

President Truman and his administration cannot and must not be permitted to say that this is solely a United Nations enterprise. It cannot and must not be left to the United Nations to determine the terms under which our brave American boys are going to die, and the degree of hazards to which they are to be subjected. This is a fact which appears to be recognized by our present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, although the Secretary seems to be very reluctant and timid about proclaiming that recognition so that it can be clearly understood by the general public. However, I am deeply indebted to my newest colleague in Congress from South Dakota, Representative E. Y. BERRY, from the Second District of our State, for having produced some specific information on the nature of the Korean war as Secretary Acheson describes it in his correspondence with a Member of Congress.

In answer to some questions suggested to him by Representative E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, Secretary of State Acheson, on April 17, 1951, just a few short days ago, wrote as follows:

> The commanding general of the forces placed under the unified command reports to the President of the United States through the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Therefore, it follows that any military action taken by the unified command is taken in the same manner as military action taken by the United States. In the event the United Nations should disapprove actions of the United States Government in its capacity as the unified command, presumably the United Nations could revoke the authority of the United States Government to act as the unified command. However, such action would not affect the relation of the United States forces and the United States command.
>
> The United States forces supporting the Security Council resolutions are commanded by the Commander in Chief of the United States Forces in the Far East (CINCFE). This officer is not an agent of the Security Council. The Security Council has no force of its own, and therefore, it has not designated any commander of such a force. It has recommended that members of the United Nations render assistance to repel the attack and restore peace in the area, that members make forces and assistance available to a unified command under the United States, and that the United States designate the commander of such forces. No action has been taken which has transformed the United States forces into United Nations forces, and the United States forces have, as well as other forces participating in the effort, retained their identity.
>
> The resolutions passed by the United Nations under which military action is being taken in Korea contain broad directives. No United Nations resolution attempts to give to the unified command instructions as to how military action is to be carried out or to place any limitation on military action taken in Korea to accomplish the objective of the Security Council resolutions to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in that area.

That gives us, in the words of the Secretary of State, a clear-cut statement that the United Nations have no authority to limit, dilute, restrict, or direct the military action being taken under the command of the United States commander in the field, and decided upon by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I continue to quote from the Acheson letter of April 17, 1951:

> Thus, the commanding general of the forces made available to the unified command is free within the framework of directives from the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff to make the necessary decisions to carry forward the military phase of the United Nations action without further Security Council decisions.

That letter was signed by Dean Acheson on April 17, 1951, and written to Representative E. Y. BERRY, of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that it is now clearly—and in my opinion somewhat startlingly, and above all, very belatedly—apparent that this forthright statement by Secretary Acheson, that "the commanding general of the forces made available to the unified command is free within the framework of directives from the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff to make the necessary decisions to carry forward the military phases of the United Nations action without further Security Council decisions" makes clear our position in Korea, and throws a curious light on the incidents leading to the President's dismissal of General MacArthur.

Clearly, it must be a strange process of administrative reasoning or Presidential guesswork which would argue that because Gen. Douglas MacArthur found himself in conflict with some of the restraints and restrictions proposed by the United Nations on his plans of battle and his campaign strategy, he should be removed from a post of responsibility in which he was responsible solely to the United States. It is indeed curious that such proposed restraints, restrictions and inhibitions suggested by a United Nations Security Council, which has no responsibility in the conflict, and no authority to direct it, should lead to the dismissal of a great American general who was able to state categorically before a joint meeting of the House and Senate of the United States Congress that his plan of battle had the unanimous support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Of primary importance, however, Mr. President, is the fact that this letter from Secretary of State Acheson of April 17 confirms completely the thesis I have been discussing this afternoon, and confirms the conclusions I have drawn from a research made from the beginning of the United Nations Charter and the Participation Act, and tracing its whole course of progress through the Congress. The Acheson letter makes doubly clear the fact that the war in Korea has become an American responsibility and that American leadership must be exercised courageously, intelligently, effectively, and promptly, in order to bring the war to an early and honorable conclusion.

I have tried to discuss the factual record from the various provisions contained in the United Nations Charter and the Participation Act, by which we became a member of the United Nations, together with the amending legislation of 1949; I have endeavored to cite the authority of those most responsible for

presenting the commitments undertaken by the United States to their Congress at the time we were becoming a member of that international organization; I have tried to present this evidence as dispassionately and objectively as I can, quoting from the record.

In my opinion there has been too much emotion and not sufficient serious study and research of the facts involved in the process by which we have become involved in the Korean war. In spite of all that, Mr. President, some speakers of the opposition have gone so far and have even succumbed to such hyperbolic hysterics as to suggest that the Republican Party is the war party of America, because many Republican spokesmen have been insisting that the Truman administration take America into its confidence and define the target, the objectives, and the terms of completion of the heartbreaking war in which they now have us involved in Korea.

As one who was born at the turn of the century, Mr. President, and who has seen three wars come in his lifetime—each of which was under the administration of a Democratic President—it certainly comes as strange information to me to hear that the present conflict is supposed to be a Republican war, or that we have a war party in America called the Republican Party. Every Democratic President since the turn of the century has inherited an America which has been at peace, but held power long enough to find this country involved in a bloody conflict. There are no exceptions to that rule except that President Truman came in just as World War II was being concluded. Therefore the suggestion that the Republican Party, which has certainly not led this country into any war since the turn of the century, is a war party seems to qualify those who make that statement for the award of "The Greatest Misrepresentation of the Century."

I suggest those who would preach the thesis that the Republican Party is a war party might well enter their claims in the annual contest of the famed Burlington Liars Contest. At least, their efforts there might win them some national awards, for to try to speak against the trend of history, and to say that a party which since the turn of the century has not involved us in a war, is the war party, and that the Democratic Party is the peace party, which since 1900 has never failed to get us into every war that was around, seems to me is too big a story to expect Americans to assimilate, even with all the governmental propaganda available to the President.

It has not been my purpose in this address, Mr. President, to attack the President or to assess to him sole blame for the Korean war. It has been my effort to try to eliminate the confusion still existing in the minds of some Americans as to whether the direction of this war is the responsibility of Mr. Truman, Mr. Acheson, and the Pentagon, or the responsibility of the United Nations. We have the letter of Secretary Acheson in the RECORD on that point now. We have the record of the facts, for better or for worse, to their credit or to their discredit. The White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon have a war they must run and a war they must win or lose, because of their capacity or incapacity to provide world leadership to get the job done successfully. Theirs is now the full responsibility to provide the needed leadership.

Mr. President, it has been my purpose to try to put together at one point in the RECORD, where students of history could find it, an irrefutable recording of the facts which were conducive to our involvement in this conflict. Among explorers and woodsmen there is an old maxim that when one is bewildered, confused, and lost, an essential to finding one's way back to familiar territories is to pause for a while in an effort to determine the steps by which the individual lost his bearings and his sense of direction. It is for that reason, it seems to me, important that Americans generally should be told how we got into the Korean conflict, and that they be told why we are there and what we must do to get out of it successfully and honorably.

For that reason I have suggested that the joint committee has a responsibility to Congress and the people which it dare not dodge or duck, to bring out clear-cut answers to these impelling questions. We are not concerned about the personalities involved. It is of no great moment at the time whether General MacArthur was unfairly dealt with by an impetuous President. The important thing is what is going to happen in the future to our country, now that we are in this dangerous war which can so easily spread to an international conflict, unless it is quickly snuffed out at its source. The committees, which are still the creatures of the Senate, have the responsibility, sir, to bring back the answers to the question: "Who has delayed so long the effort to put up an economic blockade? Who has failed so dismally to give the kind of protection those kids deserve in Korea from imports of war supplies from other nations of the world, delivered in accordance with the approval of the executive department of this Government? Who in America failed to provide the leadership required to provide our fighting lads with that protection? What is the target we have before us now in Korea, Mr. President?" I believe that honest answers to questions like these and many others which could be raised will be helpful in uniting America at a time when we need unity. I think the answers to these questions are indispensable to uniting America behind a policy designed to bring order, peace, and security out of the cataclysmic chaos prevailing in the Korean conflict and its hopeless lack of direction at the present time and the general confusion which leads men to disagree as to what responsibility lies where for the conduct of the war. Sixty thousand American casualties, Mr. President, should be a high enough price to pay before the blueprints are prepared which will let our fighting forces in Korea know what must be done to produce the victory enabling them to put down their guns and return to their loved ones at home.

On occasion, we hear from administrative spokesman, Mr. President, suggestions that no additional steps should be taken to reinforce American boys in Korea by the fighting forces of free China or by air power or by economic sanction or by a naval blockade of our fighting enemy, or even by shutting off the flow of British war supplies to the Chinese Reds. Those who would support an endless war of attrition would justify that forlorn formula of futility by saying that to do otherwise might be to extend the war. Mr. President, it appears to many Americans that our country's participation in the Korean war has already extended too far, that it has expanded too much, and that it has expended too freely of the most priceless possession of this country—the blood of our American youth.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I heard the very distinguished Senator from South Dakota refer to the necessity of a blockade of the Chinese coast and to the volume of rubber which the British have shipped to Communist China.

While the Senator was speaking, the very able and distinguished Senator from Kansas also referred to the rubber which has been shipped by the British to Communist China.

That recalled to my mind a statement made by Mr. Hadlock, of the Rubber Division, in testifying before a subcommittee of one of the Senate committees which was endeavoring to ascertain why the price of rubber in the United States has skyrocketed. In that hearing we also were endeavoring to find a way by which we could assist the small-business men of the United States, who had had their rubber allocations so drastically cut.

I wish to read one or two paragraphs of Mr. Hadlock's testimony before the subcommittee:

> Now in September 1949 there was an international monetary discussion here, at which time the mandatory requirements for the use of GR–S synthetic rubber was ordered cut. The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State and others sat in on that conference. It was to enable the British and other countries that had natural rubber colonies or who were producing it directly in their own countries, to ship more natural rubber to this country—
>
> Referring to the United States—
>
> in order to get more dollars to help their economies which were also being aided by the Marshall plan.

I have read that representatives of our Government sat down with representatives of the British Government and agreed to reduce the production of synthetic rubber in the United States in order that additional natural rubber might be shipped to the United States. We know that Britain and Holland control almost all the natural rubber which is produced in the world, and we are dependent upon them to ship natural rubber to us. So representatives of the United States Government sat down with representatives of the British Government and agreed upon a reduction in the production of synthetic rubber in the United States in order that increased imports of natural rubber might be made

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to the United States. At the same time, however, the British were making plans to ship, and were shipping, natural rubber to Communist China; and at the same time the price of rubber in the United States rose from 12 cents a pound to 15 to 17 cents a pound, and even to as high as 90 cents a pound.

Mr. President, in view of this situation and in view of the testimony—which is in the record—by officials of our Government, it seems to me that we need to go much further than merely investigate the Korean situation. I believe we need to go to the very heart of our own affairs here in the United States, to determine whether we have been a tool of some other country or whether we have been a prudent administrator of the affairs of the United States, to the best advantage of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very interesting and informative contribution, which I am very glad to have in the RECORD.

As a consequence of that highly fallacious and unwise policy, I think probably the only things that grow faster than the rubber prices that Americans have to pay are the casualty lists which are coming back to us from Korea. Both grow out of the same decision to let the British ship war supplies to Korea.

(At this point Mr. MUNDT yielded to Mr. BENTON to announce a meeting tonight in the Library of Congress of the United States National Commission for UNESCO. Mr. BENTON's remarks and the subsequent colloquy appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. MUNDT's speech.)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Referring to a discussion the Senator had in regard to the shipment by Britain and her colonial dependencies, of rubber to China and to the iron-curtain areas, did the Senator notice a dispatch from Reuters in regard to this matter the day before yesterday, and published in the local newspapers?

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure whether I noticed a Reuters' identification line on the story.

Mr. BRICKER. It was a dispatch to the effect that when Prime Minister Attlee was pressed in the House of Commons in regard to the program of Britain in selling rubber to those who might be enemies or who are enemies not only of the United States but also of Great Britain, he, in justification for his program and for having Britain carry out that program, said that it had been cleared and approved by the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Oh, yes. Before the Senator was able to leave his committee in order to be here, I quoted, from another source, an Associated Press dispatch, so that we have it confirmed now by two great international wire services, that Prime Minister Attlee told the House of Commons that this program of exportation of critical supplies to Communist China had the approval of America.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from South Dakota agree with the Senator from Ohio that, even though Mr. Larson denied that he had any knowledge of any approval of anything of the kind and denied that there was any such approval, the inquiry ought to be pursued in the State Department, to ascertain the exact extent of our approval of the program?

Mr. MUNDT. As I said earlier, I think one of the great responsibilities which the two committees have to the country is to pursue that question down to the foundation, and to ascertain who it is in this country, first, who was responsible for making that accord, and, second, for withholding until yesterday afternoon the decision to ask the United Nations Security Council to establish an economic blockade, since article 41 of the United Nations Charter insists that that be done at the time there is a breach of the peace. Someone near the top in the American Government is grossly derelict in his duty.

Mr. BRICKER. I apologize for going over ground which had already been covered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate having our attention called to the dispatch by Reuters, because I quoted from the Associated Press.

Mr. BRICKER. This is from Reuters, the responsible British news agency.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from South Dakota a few moments ago to express the hope that the two Senate committees which are now sitting jointly to examine into the Korean question would, in discharging their obligation, remain in session until they had uncovered and made available to the Senate, to the Congress, and to the American people, every fact surrounding each and every one of the many questions which the Senator from South Dakota has so properly laid before the Senate this afternoon?

Mr. MUNDT. That is exactly the hope which I expressed.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington happens to be a member of the Armed Services Committee——

Mr. MUNDT. And a very distinguished member.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator. As a member of that committee, and because I have been so privileged as to be able thus far to attend the hearings and to listen to every word of the testimony which has been offered since the hearings began a few days ago, I have become convinced, and I feel it to be true, that the two committees appreciate and recognize their obligation, and that they have no intention of becoming preoccupied with any other question whatever until they are in a position to provide the American Nation with facts concerning Korea and its future, from which our Nation may make a reasonable determination so far as a decision with respect to the future is concerned.

Mr. MUNDT. That is certainly gratifying information, I know, to the entire Senate and to the entire country. Surely, we cannot proceed much further with a war which was originated under circumstances of secrecy and concealment, without constitutional processes or respect for treaty obligations—a war which has been unsupported by the present administration, except in a military sense, through gross failure to insist on economic blockades and the protection of our boys from being shot up, first by American supplies, and then by the supplies of our friends, and which at this late hour still keeps much of America in a swirl of confusion as to who is responsible for the conduct of the war. The Senator's committee has a high responsibility to report a blueprint of victory which all Americans can understand. I am gratified to have this expression from the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California, another very distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee, who is now participating in the two-committee hearings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Directing attention again to the Senator's very able remarks relative to the necessity of embargoes on the shipment of strategic materials, the Senator has very clearly outlined that the war in Korea started on the 25th day of June last year, and that the United Nations took action on the 26th and 27th of June. It seems to me that it was at that point, rather than in September or October, that the Government should have been prepared to insist on a full embargo, not merely an embargo against the shipment of arms and munitions, but the shipment of other strategic materials, which can be quite as valuable to an enemy as actual munitions of war.

I call the Senator's attention also to the fact that it was not until October of last year that this Government itself began to put an economic embargo upon shipments to Communist China; so that a great deal of valuable materials to help the Chinese economy were shipped in American ships and from American funds, materials helpful to sustaining the Communist economy and thereby making them better able to conduct the war against us and our United Nations allies. I certainly join with the Senator from South Dakota when he states that it is a rather shocking thing that on May 2, after the United Nations had acted, after, back in February, they had declared Red China the aggressor, after they had constituted committees presumably to go into this matter very promptly——

Mr. MUNDT. And after there had been 65,000 casualties among the American troops in Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On May 2, almost 10½ months after the outbreak of hostilities, they should finally get around to the point of putting embargoes on a limited quantity of what were presumably munitions of war, in order to deceive the American people, and in order to deceive the people of the free world into believing that some worth-while action was

being taken. As a matter of fact, what they should be striving for is an all-out embargo, which would put so much economic pressure on Communist China that the regime would collapse. But the proposal which our Government has made is, in the judgment of the Senator from California, a rather empty gesture. I doubt whether any atomic materials, guns, or ships of war are being sent to Red China at this late date, so it is rather an empty gesture, and I believe it leaves wide open the shipment of other materials which will sustain the economy of the Communist Government of China.

Mr. MUNDT. I share completely the expressions made by the distinguished Senator from California, and, as an old college history teacher, I cannot but believe that when the pages of history are written by cool, dispassionate men and scholars of the future they are going to have to record the activities of the present administration with regard to the war in Korea as among the most disgraceful and shocking pages of all American history. When, from the last part of June 1950 until the 7th of May 1951, they permitted, without violent and effective protest, the shipment of supplies of war, through friendly hands, to the enemy, for use in destroying the manhood of this country and jeopardizing world peace, American leadership in the White House and the State Department hit an all-time low. This administration must stand condemned before all history for that kind of shocking dereliction of responsibility and duty.

Mr. WILEY, Mr. NIXON, and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield first to my good friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. As I listened to the comments of the distinguished Senator it seemed to me that another matter of significance was brought out by the facts which he developed. Because it was initiated by the United Nations, this is primarily a United Nations war. Certainly, as the result of the lessons of the past 12 months, the members of the United Nations, or those members of the United Nations at least who consider themselves to be free nations, must realize that if they are ever again to make war they cannot make it on the pattern now being followed, but there must be brought into the concept of war the very things which General MacArthur has stressed as being most necessary; namely, the four great concepts of permitting the taking of steps necessary to counter the attack, such as blockading the enemy, and so forth.

It seems to me that there must be, on a consultative basis in the United Nations, a complete understanding of what is going to be done by that body, as an effective international organization, to bring about peace. I am sure the Senator will agree that apparently the instrumentalities of the United Nations failed, in that there was no one to give direction and advice in applying the lessons of war which all history has taught and which General MacArthur exemplified in his testimony.

Mr. MUNDT. I very much appreciate that contribution from a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Surely we should learn something from experience. Actually, what happened to Uncle Sam in this bloody experience, it seems to me, is a good deal as though the teacher of a country school should select three boys of junior grade to go out to the playground to stop the depredations of a bully. Let us imagine that Uncle Sam was one of those three boys. What happened was that Uncle Sam attacked the bully, one of his playmates held his coat, and the other beat him over the head with a club. That is the type of thing that is going on. We have been deserted by some and attacked by others, all of whom belong to the United Nations. Some are deserting entirely the common objective; others, acting for profit and guided by the godless concepts of materialism have furnished materials to Red China and Red Korea to be used by the Communists against our young men in Korea.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. Would the Senator agree that the final action in connection with placing an embargo on goods to Communist China was 65,000 casualties too late?

Mr. MUNDT. Exactly; and by the time it is considered at Lake Success on Monday it may be more than 66,000 casualties too late, since that delay will be measured by another thousand American casualties.

Mr. NIXON. Now that the American Government has asked the United Nations to place an embargo on shipments of arms, as my colleague from California has well pointed out, it may well be a token gesture at this point, since it might not cover strategic materials; and so far as action is concerned, it will require debate in the United Nations before such action can be taken.

I wonder if the Senator noted, in that connection, that one of our former colleagues in the House, a member of the Democratic Party, Representative KENNEDY of Massachusetts, in order to meet that particular problem, today introduced into the House of Representatives a bill which would not only prohibit the shipment of arms and strategic materials from the United States to Red China, but would prohibit the shipment of arms and strategic materials to any nation which was shipping such arms and materials to Red China.

Mr. MUNDT. I did not know of that, but I am highly gratified that it has happened. I do not see why there should be a difference between Republicans and Democrats on a question of this kind. I do not know of any partisan criterion that is used when the Government recruits boys to ship overseas. It does not say that only Republicans can fight or only Democrats can fight. I think it is an all-American effort, and I cannot understand why Democrats in the Senate, the House, or anywhere else, will rise to defend a program permitting the shipment of supplies which will get into the hands of our enemy. If they do not rise to defend it, I do not see why they do not rise to attack it, because silence is acquiescence in the crime, and all the protestations of all the Republicans in the land cannot stop that kind of infamy if our Democratic brethren, out of mistaken loyalty to an administration, refuse to join us in our protest. I cannot understand why there is a failure to join those of us who are trying to stop that sort of attack on American boys. I cannot understand the Democratic silence on this point of permitting British supplies to kill our American sons in Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would not the Senator agree that insofar as the United Nations is concerned, with its concepts of collective security, what we are faced with in this trade with Red China is trading with the enemy?

Mr. MUNDT. Exactly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not just as important that we not only prevent the shipment to Red China of strategic materials, and, of course, war materials, but that we stop the shipment of anything which would help to stabilize Red China's economy or help it to build its economy, so long as it is an aggressor in Korea?

Mr. MUNDT. I agree entirely. I can think of nothing so utterly stupid as trying to determine how much octane there should be in a gallon of gasoline before it can be safely shipped to China, for example.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not also important that a complete blockade, either economic or naval, if necessary, be imposed to prevent Red China from shipping materials from her ports, because do they not have the opportunity of selling certain materials for dollars or for British pounds which they then can use either for revolutionary purposes as a part of the international conspiracy of communism, or for the purpose of buying supplies in other areas of the world? So, if we are really going to go about it in the way that is required, should we not make sure that nothing we can prevent goes into Communist China and nothing that can be prevented come out of it?

Mr. MUNDT. Most assuredly, because nothing should me done to strengthen the enemy against our own country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I cannot see how the United Nations can possibly impose an embargo under the terms of the Charter. There is an essential weakness in the Charter which prevents any such action. Under article 41 the Security Council might do that, but Russia will veto any action taken by the Security Council. Under article 10, all that the General Assembly can do is to make recommendations. So far as I can see, no member of the United Nations has agreed to abide by a single recommendation of the General Assembly. They have agreed to follow the Security Council. It seems to me that we should

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

recognize the inherent weakness in the United Nations Charter, and realize that until the Charter is amended it is a wholly futile weapon. Recommendations are made, and we may hope that members who are friendly to us may follow them, but I can see no obligation on their part to follow any action taken by the United Nations.

Mr. MUNDT. As I pointed out earlier, because of some of the very difficulties which the Senator has mentioned the war in Korea is being fought under the aegis of the United States, with the assistance of some of our allies, rather than under the aegis of the United Nations. I read a letter from Secretary Acheson pointing out that decisions are to be made by our Government without restrictions by participating countries. There is nothing in the Charter, it is true, which implements any phase of the war in Korea, because the agreements have never been ratified. However, there is no reason why participating countries cannot cooperate. There are 13 or 14 nations whose sons are involved in the war, who are serving as agents for the United Nations in this conflict because implementation has not been provided, and who could, with American leadership, insist upon the kind of blockades of which the Senator from California has been speaking.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps, to some extent; but I notice that the free countries have announced that they are not going to assume any such obligations. I do not think they are violating any obligations of the Charter in taking that position.

Mr. MUNDT. Judging the future by the past I very much doubt that the British will, of their own volition, refuse to trade with Red China. But the Senator from California discussed, as did General MacArthur, the possibility of an economic blockade which it is perfectly possible to promote and to establish through international cooperation. That would stop such shipments, whether Nehru or Attlee or someone else wanted to ship supplies into China. A blockade could do the job. In fact, before our Navy stopped it by order of President Truman, the Navy of Free China was doing at least a materially successful job of maintaining an economic blockade of Red China.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In connection with the question asked by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], there also appears this language in article 12 of the Charter:

> While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.

I assume that the Security Council is exercising some of its functions under the present Charter. Therefore the General Assembly could not, under article 10, even make a recommendation regarding the subject. Is that not the interpretation of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that we must become realistic in dealing with a conflict like the present one. If anyone proposes that we can take action in defense of our troops only if Russia approves, we had better call the whole thing off. We must face up to the realities. We have a war on our hands. We are not confronted with a theory. We have some allies, who are willing to cooperate with us, provided we show some leadership in getting cohesive and effective action.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the State Department and the General Assembly of the United Nations now take the position that if an action is proposed in the Security Council and it is vetoed, it no longer is before the Security Council, and the provisions of article 12 do not apply. The Security Council did take original action, when it called on nations to go to the assistance of South Korea. In any event, I did not intend to imply that we should not apply to the General Assembly, or that they should not make the recommendations which the Senator suggests, or that we should not call upon our Allies to apply the recommendations. I merely wished to call attention to the fact that we got into Korea on the theory that the United Nations was a body which exercised some legal power, but that it does not have such legal power any more. Therefore, we are largely in the position of having to go it alone, with the assistance of such nations as will come to our assistance.

Mr. MUNDT. Not only that, but, regarding the Korean war, 12 hours in advance of the exercise of a power which it was thought the United Nations possessed, and before it was apparently discovered that it did not have such power, we jumped the gun by 12 hours on the action of the United Nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask a few questions, if I may. I am wondering whether or not the somewhat belated announcement by England and France that they are now sympathetic toward a program of economic sanctions may not have been brought about by the agitation which has developed within the past 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. MUNDT. I should say that it was the direct result of statements of one Douglas MacArthur, lately a general in the United States Army.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am wondering whether or not the Senator's attention has been called to what I think will be the uncensored report of General Marshall's statement in yesterday's hearing to the effect that the report that England and France would support sanctions insured a majority vote in the body which was dealing with the subject. Did the Senator note the comment?

Mr. MUNDT. No; I did not. I did not have a chance to hear the General's testimony yesterday. I have read the uncensored portions in the press.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a very illuminating commentary on where the leadership in the situation actually resides? Does it not show that the leadership resides not in the Untied States, which has been fighting the battle and furnishing 95 percent of the outside aid and suffering 95 percent of the casualties, but in the two countries which have certainly been doing a very minimum along that line; and that if once they had made up their minds all the rest of the countries would follow?

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question in the world that the leadership in this controversy has been surrendered, so far as Washington is concerned, and turned over to someone else, some place, who is directing the destiny of the American boys who are now locked in battle in Korea.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator examined the extent to which the present proposal applies to an embargo on exports, as distinct from an embargo on goods in transit?

Mr. MUNDT. No; I have not.

Mr. BREWSTER. If, as I have understood, it applies only to exports, each country may very well say, "We will embargo our exports," and it would have no application to the vast volume of goods which is flowing through Hong Kong. As the British have gone to great pains to point out, very little of the material is going to China from England, but is going from many other countries through Hong Kong. Unless there were an application of the embargo to traffic in transit, it would be even more meaningless than the limitation upon strategic materials which has been discussed.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the Senator is quite correct. Transshipment of supplies to Red China is equally injurious, regardless of their origin. I believe that is what the Senator from California had in mind when he was discussing the necessity of an economic blockade and its implementation. Otherwise, we would be confronted with merely pious statements of self-restraint on the part of countries, who would not do anything effective.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator familiar with the testimony given today before the combined committees to the effect that it was brought out that the total number of U. N. forces which are assisting us in the collective security action in Korea is approximately 30,000, and that the figure is 3,000 less than the 33,000 troops which Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, representing a member of the United Nations, offered to supply to the United Nations to resist aggression 5 days after the aggression had taken place? In other words, on the 9th day of May we have approximately 3,000 fewer troops of all the United Nations put together than the Republic of China offered to the United Nations 5 days after the June 25, 1950, aggression took place.

Mr. MUNDT. That is certainly a startling statistic. It should also be mentioned that the Republic of China

did not propose to tell us how to run the war if they made the troops available.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I congratulate the Senator on what he has brought out. Earlier he elicited from me the comment that because of the current discussion, it should be apparent to the members of the United Nations and to the people of this country how inadequate the United Nations machinery is to meet the challenges of communism. One of the questions I suggested this morning seems to me very clear. It is Russia's plan to use her stooges wherever she can, so that she will not only wear down American troops and wear down those who oppose the stooges, but wear down the stooges themselves. Thus, in North Korea, if MacArthur's testimony is correct, the total casualties amount to 2,000,000, and the country is laid waste. Her policy may be to wear down the stooges so as to make it easier for her to take over those countries. That is what she tried in Greece. It may be what she will try with her other stooges.

It seems to me that the United Nations must evaluate, from a realistic standpoint, what the real challenge is. The antidote to the challenge is to see to it, if we are to have any more United Nations conflicts or if we are to jump into any more messes which the United Nations is going to project onto the world stage, that the machinery is made adequate, so that the embargo about which the Senator has been speaking, and every other action which is necessary, as MacArthur said, to meet force with force, shall be put into effect, so that the outcome will be victory.

The Senator is doing a wonderful job in bringing to the attention not only of Senators, but of others who read the RECORD, the fact that the United Nations machinery is inadequate to meet any challenge which the Communists throw at the United Nations.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator for that very helpful contribution.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I have only about 3 or 4 minutes remaining, of what I took the floor today to discuss and then I shall be glad to bring this rather lengthy discourse to a conclusion. I have now detained the Senate much longer than I had desired or planned, but I have thought it best to yield to all Senators who asked me to yield. Consequently some very helpful colloquy and discussion has been interpolated into my remarks. However, I do not wish to detain the Senate all afternoon. Nevertheless, I shall not decline to yield, and will yield as I am asked to yield. I want this argument to be explored from every angle, but express the hope that before too long I may relinquish the floor.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

I do not believe that the Senator from South Dakota was able to be present during all the testimony of General Marshall this morning. I should like to call his attention to some testimony and then ask him a question.

General Marshall testified this morning to the effect that if and when an all-out, damaging air attack were launched upon American forces by the Chinese Air Force, then we could do the thing which General MacArthur has long been recommending.

He also admitted under cross-examination that we knew that the Chinese Reds were building up a vast amount of air power, presumably beyond the Yalu River. In that connection he also admitted that as of now we are conducting no reconnaissance, so that we do not know where the enemy air strength is concentrated.

The Senator knows that we cannot merely send our bombers out and say, "Hit the enemy and destroy him." We can do so only after we have had careful air reconnaissance. The present directive says that we will retaliate when the enemy starts killing too many of our men, but that we will not find out ahead of time where the enemy strength is centered. Does not the Senator agree that that means that for a period of days, or even weeks, our retaliation against the Chinese Air Force will be ineffective, resulting in the slaughter of vast numbers of American boys; and that, in effect, what we are doing is preparing for another planned Pearl Harbor, this time in Korea?

Mr. MUNDT. It certainly seems to me that after the enemy has delivered a devastating attack on our concentrations of forces it is a pretty late time to begin reconnaissance to try to determine where we should perhaps get ready to attack him. I believe General MacArthur is correct when he says that it is a reckless waste of American lives to fight a war on that basis. I should say that that would be placing upon the breast of an American soldier the cheapest price tag that has ever been placed on an American uniform.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask two additional questions, and then I shall not impose further on the Senator.

Yesterday General Marshall was discussing the possibility of Russia entering the war. He was asked then by one of the Senators whether the danger of Russian intervention was real or not. He said that it would become real if Russia felt imperiled in her development of world-wide communism. Today he elaborated on that subject and stated that he felt that there was danger of Russia coming in. I believe he used the words "imminent danger." I cannot say, but that was the purport of what he was saying. He was saying that there was imminent danger of Russia coming in if it appeared that Red China was going to lose. The purport of his testimony was that we should do nothing which might even raise the possibility of Russian intervention.

I ask the Senator whether I am correct in this interpretation of the general's testimony: What he is saying to the American people, in effect, is, No. 1, that we will do nothing which might possibly cause Communist Russia to come in; and, No. 2, Communist Russia will come in if there is any danger of Communist China losing. Therefore, the function of the United States, and our strategy, should be to prevent Red China from losing, so as not to antagonize Russia.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator has correctly quoted the general, that would seem to be the logical conclusion. It is an incredibly hard statement to believe, if that is what the general actually said; but I presume the Senator has quoted him correctly. If Marshall says that the greatest danger of involving Russia in war is to have Red China and North Korea lose, it would seem, to follow that statement to its logical conclusion, that we should surrender tomorrow, because no one wants war with Russia. On that basis, it would have been better to have surrendered last June, before we lost 65,000 American boys. It may be that, on afterthought, the general will explain and revise that statement, as he explained yesterday's statement on afterthought today. On the basis on which the Senator has quoted the general, his statement would seem to lead to that conclusion.

Mr. McCARTHY. One further question. I think the Senator was present when Gen. Douglas MacArthur testified that when the Chinese Communists started to pour across the Yalu River bridges, he ordered the Air Force to bomb the Korean half of the bridges—in other words, to bomb half way across the river. General MacArthur testified, as will be recalled, that his order issued at the height of the battle, when our command was perhaps threatened more than at any other time during the Korean campaign, was countermanded in Washington.

Neither the Senator from South Dakota nor the Senator from Wisconsin, nor anyone else knows how many American boys died because of the countermanding of that order. General MacArthur stated that later, after he protested very vigorously, he was told, "All right; go ahead and put your order back in effect." But during the time that the order stood canceled by our State Department, or General Marshall, or whoever did it, we know that vast numbers of Chinese Communists were flowing across the Yalu River, and we know that vast numbers of American boys were dying. We know also that a sizable number died because of the countermanding of that order.

Does the Senator agree that during any other period of history, under any other administration we ever had, undoubtedly someone would hang for having countermanded such an order and signed the death warrant of American boys?

Mr. MUNDT. As I was saying earlier in my discourse, I believe that one of the very sacred obligations of the joint committee is to disclose the whole sordid series of mismanagements and misadventures which have so vividly marked the conduct of American foreign relations from the first of June last year, when we were at peace, to the first of June ahead of us, when we shall have suffered more than 65,000 American

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

casualties in this bewildering and confusing bloody vortex in Korea into which we have been sucked by the Presidential order.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. In our determined efforts to bring the Korean war to a successful conclusion, can the able Senator from South Dakota think of a cheaper or more logical way to minimize and decrease the future flow and shedding of American and allied blood in Korea, than by having the free nations of the United Nations impose upon our chief enemy, Red China, a total and effective naval blockade?

Mr. MUNDT. I could not agree with the Senator more. That is the way in which victory can be pursued almost with no additional loss of American life. The only valid argument against it that I can conceive of is the highly improbable one or illogical one the Senator from Wisconsin just suggested, that if actually the war policy of Truman, Acheson, and Marshall is to conduct a conflict in which we can be sure we do not win, because if we win it Russia might not like it, and if Russia does not like it she might attack us—if that is the real strategy of the administration, we can see that is the reason as to why there is not an economic blockade. But if we want to win the war and save American lives it seems to me an economic blockade is the first step and the cheapest and best step we can possibly take toward ending the war in Korea.

Mr. CAIN. Has the Senator not just said that unless we find an effective method for preventing both our enemies and our friends from providing our chief present-day enemy, Red China, with the instruments of war, American and allied blood will continue to flow in even greater volume, because of our unwillingness to keep our chief enemy from continuing to send to Korea those war supplies that result in death for freed men?

Mr. MUNDT. Not only that, but even the most casual students of Chinese history must appreciate that if we become involved in the type of interminable war so typical in China, it may be a quarter of a century—we should not be talking about a war that ends in the next 6 months or the next 3 years—we may become involved in a conflict lasting for a quarter of a century if, conceivably, it would not inflame and incite the world to world war III long before that. Wars are no novelty in China. She has constantly been involved in wars of one type or another for many, many years.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from South Dakota has considerable knowledge concerning the domestic and internal situation of China. Can the Senator from South Dakota point out to me a single other large nation which could be so effectively blockaded as China?

Mr. MUNDT. There is none. The reason is that China is in its infancy industrially. It is largely living in a loin-cloth economy. It is largely without a transportation system. It is largely without any contact whatsoever today with the outside world except through Hong Kong and a few Chinese ports through which are poured the war supplies. It has a few railroad systems running north to Russia, but being fed by overstrained Russian connecting links. That rail system could easily be disrupted and the flow of war matériel to the Red Chinese troops in Korea stopped if Acheson, Truman, and Marshall would permit the bombing of the supply lines. China's great open-armed approach to the war supplies of the world is through the British port of Hong Kong, and if we blockade that and a few other minor ports, we would go far toward stopping the Chinese war effort by depriving China of the wherewithal to fight. That is even more important than bombing the rail system north of the Yalu.

Mr. CAIN. What the Senator has said, if I understand him correctly, is that there is reason to believe that Red China could be forced to capitulate if an effective and total naval blockade were imposed and maintained for a considerable length of time.

Mr. MUNDT. I thoroughly believe that.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, General MacArthur proposed a military strategy designed to put an end to the ceaseless and steadily expanding expenditure of American life and treasure in Korea. President Truman rejected that plan and reprimanded the architect of the plan by removing him from his command. It is now imperative, therefore, that the President step into that void and tell Americans what his, the President's, war plan actually is.

So far as I know, no responsible American, Republican or Democrat, in any type of position, is recommending that we extend the war into areas not presently engaged in the fighting. Nor do I know of any responsible American suggesting that we send land forces into China, or that we extend our battle front beyond the boundaries of Korea. But this business of "extending and expanding war," Mr. President, is not entirely an American decision. The Communists are now and have for some time been expanding the war into a steadily increasing circle of American homes by stepping up the rate at which they are producing American casualties.

The Communists have for some time, and are now extending the war by rearming and resupplying additional hundreds of thousands of Chinese Communists to force their way by brute strength and evil cunning farther and farther into our defense lines below the thirty-eighth parallel. Certainly, there is nothing in the futile and forlorn formula of an endless and bloodletting war of attrition which can give this country any promise that in its most vital and significant aspects the Korean war is not now being "expanded" or "extended."

Consequently, Mr. President, I express the further hope of many Americans, I am sure, that the three questions listed at the outset of my address, and that the other questions which have evolved out of the colloquy which has taken place during the more than three hours of discussion on this subject this afternoon be answered specifically and categorically, along with all other pertinent questions, before the hearings and investigations are concluded by the committees sitting jointly.

I approve and applaud the statement of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] made on the floor this afternoon, that, speaking as members of the committee, they will permit nothing to interfere with their duty and their obligation to make those facts clear to all concerned. It is important that we have the whole truth.

There is an old axiom, Mr. President, that it is easier to get into a war than it is to get out of one intact. We are in the Korean war, Mr. President, like it or not. We are in this bloody conflict whether we are in it through legal processes or not. More than 60,000 American casualties have resulted from the fact that we are in this war. What all honest and honorable Americans want today, therefore, is that we find a way to get out of this Korean war honorably and decently and successfully, and on a basis that the terrific price we have already paid will not be a sacrifice completely made in vain.

Since the only man in this country, General MacArthur, who has dared to present a plan of action and a campaign strategy for giving meaning to these sacrifices and for providing hope for an early and successful end of the war to those now fighting it in the bloody front-line trenches, has been removed from his command, Mr. President, let us insist as Americans, that those who vetoed the plan of MacArthur, and those who vented their spleen and their displeasure by removing him from office, now present to our country an alternative blueprint for success and security.

It is too late to quarrel effectively now with those who, because of a vindictive attitude, or for some other reason more or less laudable than that, have kicked from his command the man who offered a blueprint for victory. But now that they have booted him out, those who wear the boot have a responsibility to make clear what they propose by way of a substitute for that proposal.

When that plan comes, Mr. President, let it be nobly drawn and proudly presented to the public. Let it not be the creature of secrecy or the child of concealment. In the days to come let there be as little censorship by the State Department and the Pentagon as is really unavoidable in the testimony now being given in the course of the hearings being held by the two committees.

Mr. President, let me say that it has troubled me, of late, to see that the activities of the censors at those hearings have been expanding and to see that the quantity of the reports made available to the public has been diminishing more and more each day during the testimony of General Marshall. I am not prepared to say, and I do not say today, that the censors there are going beyond the realm of what they should rightfully do in the performance of their duty in acting as censors of the committee and in deleting the parts of the testimony which they think the public should not have. Perhaps all that the

censors are doing there is done for security reasons. Nevertheless, I have been disturbed at the gaps which increasingly are appearing in the testimony because of the expanding activities of the censors, and the decreasing amount of the testimony which is being made available to the public.

I hope that from now on the two committees will insist that the activities of the censors be restricted as much as is possible, commensurate with the maintenance of adequate security, and that the public will obtain from the hearings all the information which it is possible to be made public without violating the necessary security, so that the public may obtain the facts in connection with that testimony, because even if 25 Members of the Senate know the facts, that knowledge on their part will not constitute an adequate basis on which to have evolved a policy which will be conducive to victory and informative to the country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of fairness—for I know the Senator from South Dakota himself is not a member of either of the two committees which are conducting the hearings, and perhaps he is not familiar with the procedure which has been adopted by the committees in connection with the matter of censorship—let me say that the man who is going over the testimony happens to be Vice Adm. Arthur Davis.

Mr. MUNDT. Does he have any assistance?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Vice Admiral Davis is a very able man, and he is doing the job personally. So it is not a question of having a man in a lower echelon constantly have to talk with headquarters.

Mr. MUNDT. I understand that a representative of the State Department also has been serving as a censor. Is that correct? If I am incorrect in that regard, I wish to be corrected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to complete my first statement, if the Senator will permit me to do so, and then I shall reply to the Senator's question.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Vice Admiral Davis went there at the invitation of the chairman of the joint meeting of the committees and at the invitation of the joint committees because they themselves did not have the necessary facilities in that connection. Of course, I am sure the Senator from South Dakota would not want to have disclosed any information or material which would be of value to the enemy from a security point.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In addition to that, the able chairman of the joint committees, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I wish to pay him a tribute today, because I think he is doing a very fair and a very conscientious job to get the facts and to let the chips fall where they may—appointed a subcommittee of the full committees, consisting of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the senior Senator from California, to check on anything that is deleted; and if either of them has any question, he is authorized to take up that matter with Vice Admiral Davis, as we have done on several occasions. As a result, in some cases we have secured the release of the material as it was testified to; and in other cases we agreed that the exact language of the TWX should not be released, but that it could be paraphrased and in that way the full information should be given out, and that was done very promptly.

So I wanted the Senator from South Dakota to know—inasmuch as he has mentioned the censor—that the censor is not there by means of having representatives of the Department of Defense insist that he be there, but he is there at the invitation of the joint committees.

I agree with the Senator that in the past few days apparently there have been more deletions than occurred in the earlier period, but I also think it is only fair to say that in some instances General Marshall has been dealing with material as to which there may be a legitimate reason for a little higher classification. However, the entire testimony will be read in that connection, and is now being read, to see whether perhaps either in paraphrased form or in a different form any information which can safely and properly be presented to the country, and will not be beneficial to the enemy, can be released.

I thought that in all fairness the Senator from South Dakota would not mind if I made this brief explanation.

In answer to the Senator's question, let me say that it is true that Admiral Davis has there a representative of the State Department. Until the last day or so, at least, there was only one minor deletion of material in the record at the suggestion of the State Department. Let me say to the Senator that both the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and I looked over the material, and both of us agreed that that one sentence should be deleted, and that the deletion of it was not detrimental to the over-all understanding of the problem.

I know that the able Senator from South Dakota is very factual, not only in connection with the present matter, but always; but it occurred to me that perhaps this was a bit of information on which he did not have the entire background, and that it might be helpful to the RECORD if I were to make this statement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am very happy to have that statement in the RECORD, so that everyone may know how the so-called censorship is being handled. Of course, I did not assume for a moment that the Department of Defense or the State Department could clamp censorship on congressional committees without having some kind of arrangement made by the committees; and I am glad to have that arrangement stated in the RECORD.

I am glad to know that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] have set up procedures by means of which any material which originally is censored must be brought to their attention for restudy and for further consideration. I am glad to be advised that frequently in the past what has been censored has subsequently been rephrased and finally made available to the public, as a result of such restudy or reconsideration. I think this information on that point will help clear up the confusion in the mind of the public as to why certain statements made by General MacArthur were finally published only after 2 or 3 or 4 days' delay, and why certain statements made by General Marshall were deleted on one day, but were issued 2 or 3 days later. It also will help explain why some statements by both men have been completely censored.

Although censorship in America is always distasteful, I think all of us recognize that some material should not be made available to the public, because anything which is made available to the public in America is also made available to the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also wish to say that in my experience both in the service and in the Senate of the United States, it has been my opportunity to meet many men in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and I wish to pay a very high tribute to the job which Vice Admiral Davis has done up to this time. It seems to me that what he is trying to do, at the request of the able chairman of the joint committees, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is to make available the maximum amount of information and to delete the very minimum which it is necessary to delete for the protection of the security of the United States.

I have discussed the matter with Admiral Davis on several occasions. Personally, I am satisfied that up to the present moment, as we talk at this time, Vice Admiral Davis has been using the rule of reason, and has been taking a very broad-gauged view of the situation, and is striving to make as much information as possible available, rather than striving to delete as much information as possible. It seemed to me that in fairness to Vice Admiral Davis, that statement should be made at this time.

I think it is very helpful to have an officer of such high rank given that assignment, so that he can make the decisions on the spot. The responsibility he has is heavy enough, in deciding on the spot what material should be deleted, without having to talk to 14 other persons in reaching the necessary decisions.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I think the performance of that task should be expedited.

I am happy to know of the high caliber of the officer who is charged with that responsibility. Certainly I do not wish to cast any reflection upon him. However, I have viewed with alarm, as I know the Senator from California has, the fact that the material deleted by the censor seems to be increasing as the hearings proceed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Of course, no Member of the Senate wishes to have security risks taken; but it was my suggestion that the committees have the testimony rephrased when a security matter was reached, so that the public might know the facts without at the same time endangering the security of the country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I yield, although I should like very much to conclude my statement as quickly as possible. It will take me only a few minutes to conclude it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

I wish to say to the very distinguished Senator from South Dakota that I have heard his entire statement, and I believe he has performed a great service not only to himself, but to the Senate and to the country as a whole. He has enlightened the people of the United States who have an opportunity to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and who also have an opportunity to read the comments which are made editorially, as well as to hear the information the news commentators give to the public by means of the radio. The Senator from South Dakota has done an excellent job this afternoon, Mr. President; and I wish to be one of the Members of the Senate to commend him for it.

I also wish to comment on the remarks made by the able senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I have sat through all the hearings which are being conducted by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, sitting jointly, and I wish to join with the able Senator from California his commendation of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I have been privileged to attend many hearings, and I think the chairman, the Senator from Georgia, is making an excellent record as chairman, in an unbiased, impartial, nonpartisan manner.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Again, I wish to commend the very able presentation by the senior Senator from South Dakota of the problem with which the Nation is now faced.

Mr. MUNDT. I desire to express my sincere appreciation to my friend and neighbor, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], for his comments, and I should also like to associate myself with what he has said about the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is sitting as chairman of the two-committee hearing. I have sat in on the MacArthur testimony, as well as some of the testimony of the other witnesses. I have had a prevailing confidence in the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for many years, and I have seen nothing occurring in that committee room which in any way has shaken my confidence in him. The hearings are in good hands, and I am sure he would be the first to say he wants the assistance and the counsel of the rest of us as to what it is we would like to have produced from the hearings.

Senators on those two committees are not trying General MacArthur or General Marshall. What is on trial is the future and the fate of America, and I am sure that is what the Senator from Georgia has in mind. So I have tried to suggest a few things which might direct the inquiry to the heart-yearning of America, and toward its salvation, to get it out of the category of personalities, and out of the category of security information which must be deleted by censorship, into the category of those facts and factors which we, as freedom-loving, self-governing citizens must have, in order to make correct decisions in the perilous years ahead.

I also desire to express to the Senator from Minnesota my sincere appreciation for his thoughtful and courteous remarks concerning my speech. I may say I have spent over 3 weeks in research and study, trying to bring together in one place for the record the facts and records in this connection. I have tried to make my presentation dispassionately and objectively, in order to avoid the controversial and cantankerous things which so frequently creep into a discussion of this kind, and to hew to the line, to the facts, and to the record, to the end that reason may prevail, instead of emotion, in discussing these important matters.

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that when the plan is produced by those who have the responsibility for producing it—that is, the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon—when they shall have set up a plan to take the place of the MacArthur program which they have scuttled, the plan should fly proudly on the banners of America. Let us have a war target, and a program we can understand. Let it be one which, when raised to the standards, will inspire American boys to fight for its achievement, and so they will know that, when they have attained it, their job will be completed. When such a plan is presented and justified and found to be tenable, let all Americans, regardless of partisanship or personal conviction, join in a mighty effort to bring an early and effective conclusion to the war in Korea.

Mr. President, we need unity of purpose in this country, but before there can be unity of purpose, someone has to propose the purpose behind which it is sought to bring the unity required to carry it forward to a successful conclusion. We wait hungrily for someone to proclaim such a purpose, so we can build the unity we need.

Finally, I may suggest to my colleagues in the Senate that we should have learned something in these last few weeks and months, that we are pretty sorry Senators indeed if we have learned nothing from the experience in Korea. If we are at all open-minded we should have learned the ageless lesson that legislative bodies have historically been better defense lines against the steps to war than have the executive departments of any government at any time in history.

We should have learned, further, that we in the Congress should seek to recapture some of the powers in the war-making field which we have been surrendering to the Executive. I believe we have been warned that, rather than surrender further to the urgings and the persuasive arguments of those who would transfer the responsibilities of Congress to the Executive, we should recapture those powers for the legislative branch, which historically has been the one best bastion and defense for peace.

Let us make it clear, so that all may understand, exactly what our commitments are in the area of collective security, in connection with the United Nations, and in connection with our other treaty obligations, and let it be made crystal clear the part the Congress is to play in implementing those commitments and in supporting every safeguard which can help prevent a war.

Finally, Mr. President, let America strive to show a little leadership, too, in devising and supporting programs designed to lead the world back to an era of peace, rather than concentrating our efforts exclusively as it seems we do, in trying to meet the challenges of a situation which, if unchanged and unchecked, seems to be leading inevitably to a third world war.

Mr. President, I should like to hear someone in high place, in connection with certain of the testimony before the two committees which are sitting jointly, or in some other forum of the world, give our people some hope for peace, instead of all these melancholy and gloomy predictions and pontifications from our leaders, talking about the inevitability of war with Russia, talking about the fact that we are getting ready for a war to come 2 years from now, 3 years from now, or 4 years from now, with a complete paucity of leadership in the matter of setting up a program of any kind devised to lead the world down the highway of peace.

I hope we can provide that kind of leadership. I think those who listened to the great heart-rending appeal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to outlaw war and his plea to set up a world moving in the direction of peace will realize how important it is that there spring up from somewhere in America leadership which can do more than appease, more than surrender, and more even than lead an army in a victorious war. We need leadership with the vision, the capacity, and the determination to call together strong men of many nations, to sit down to study the business of peace, to draw up the outlines along which men may move for the restoration of peace, and for the preservation of the peace which is then restored. We hear nothing of that any more from our leaders, who merely talk about war. Most sincerely Senators, we need to move in the direction of peace.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. It might be helpful to the Senate and for the RECORD, if the Senator from South Dakota would now spell out General MacArthur's program, to which he subscribes, for the abolition of war.

Mr. MUNDT. The general's program for the abolition of war insofar as he set it out was made available in the RECORD, in response to an interrogatory presented by the senior Senator from Connecti-

cut. As he will recall, it was a rather lengthy and elaborate postulation. Certainly I cannot presume to quote from memory a program as detailed and lengthy as the one he presented in response to that question from the Senator. But I share with the Senator the desire to make it available as generally as possible to all Americans.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. A program which was so forthright and so direct as to win the Senator's enthusiastic approval must have had at least one main thesis which General MacArthur advanced in the exchange between the Senator from Connecticut and himself which stands out in the Senator's mind. I should appreciate it if the Senator would give us the benefit of the statement of that main thesis.

Mr. MUNDT. That would be as impossible as it would be to expect the Senator from South Dakota to pick out the main points of significance in Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. It stands as a gem, in my opinion, which should be made available to everyone in the United States. It will be memorized by schoolboys throughout the ages. I cannot recite one single line or paragraph or idea to the detriment of the rest of the statement.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to say that the situation and the events of history have demonstrated to the Senator from Connecticut the imperative necessity for the United States to adopt that kind of a world program which would appeal to the peoples of the world and force a discontinuance of the present situation. I am frank to say to the Senator from South Dakota that, although I listened with the utmost attention to the remarks made by General MacArthur, there was not a single, solitary concrete proposal that would appeal to a person of reason as leading toward the abolition of war. If there is such a proposal in the record, I ask the Senator from South Dakota to submit it to me.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say that the Senator from South Dakota does not now or at any time in the future expect to follow the orders of the genial Senator from Connecticut. The Senator from Connecticut is perfectly able to get the statement and put it into the RECORD under his own motive power.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that I wish he would not adopt that attitude, because what we are talking about in this colloquy is something which rises above party, above partisanship. It is of the most extreme importance to the human race.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree a hundred percent with that statement.

Mr. McMAHON. I did not rise to make the observation which I made in order to embarrass the Senator, but simply in order that we might try to advance along the road intelligently by examining the proposals which have been made and which may be reasonably designed to accomplish the objective. I can say to the Senator from South Dakota that, much as I appreciate General MacArthur's sincere and heartfelt statement about the situation in which we find ourselves, and much as I appreciate his declaration of the necessity for the abolition of war, I am hopeful that General MacArthur, the Senator from South Dakota, or anyone else in this body or outside of it, can produce more of a solution for the problem than the general was prepared to submit to us as disclosed by the record. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that it just is not in the record; there is no plan which General MacArthur has stated for the abolition of war.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator disagrees with the present speaker concerning the significance of what General MacArthur said on the subject of war, let me point out, first of all, that what the Senator from South Dakota referred to originally was the terrific indictment of war by General MacArthur and the necessity of outlawing it. I believe even the Senator from Connecticut will concede that it was a very emphatic and persuasive statement. I am speaking of his indictment of war and his plea that it should be outlawed. What the Senator from Connecticut is commenting on, as I understand, is that General MacArthur did not paint the complete picture of what he would do to bring about the outlawing of war.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. It was not a plan; it was merely a statement. I do not think we can find in the record any statement by General MacArthur as to any concrete steps we could take toward the accomplishment of the abolition of war which he so fervently desires, together with the Senator from South Dakota, and myself. I thought it would be a contribution to the debate to point out that we should not build our speeches or our proposals upon the basis of a personality when there are no facts in the record to sustain the claims being made.

Mr. MUNDT. I have no criticism of the Senator from Connecticut commenting on the contribution made by General MacArthur in any way he feels impelled to do so by his conscience and his judgment. I simply disagree with the Senator. He and I heard the same testimony. I disagree that it was devoid of any suggestions of a program toward permanent peace. I think such suggestions are to be found throughout the testimony, sometimes directly and sometimes by implication. Of course he did not unfold a specific program of details to be pursued, but throughout his 3 days of testimony he many times made suggestions which would, if followed, move us up the slopes to permanent peace and bring to an end our present war.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator would render a great service to his country if he would get those statements and implications from General MacArthur's testimony and submit them for the record. If the Senator from South Dakota will do so and will do me the courtesy of letting me know when he is going to do it, I assure him that I shall be on the floor publicly to thank him, at least for myself, for a labor of love which could have such fine results, when and if the Senator can produce the statements.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say, in response to the very intriguing invitation of the Senator from Connecticut, that if the Senator from South Dakota finds after the hearings are published the general's statements are as incomprehensible to the public generally as they are incomprehensible to the Senator from Connecticut, he may make the research which he suggests.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I have been very much interested in the colloquy between the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Connecticut. The objective in which the American people are principally interested is how to end the grim and bloody war in which we are now engaged. General MacArthur, in his testimony, presented a definite, specific, easily understood plan which he says he thinks offers a reasonable chance to end the Korean war within a reasonably short time. It seems to me that we had better not get off on another issue to talk about another general objective so devoutly to be desired—that of ending all war for all time. We should direct our attention to ending the war in which we are now engaged, a war which, as the Senator from South Dakota has so convincingly pointed out, was ordered by the President of the United States contrary to the Constitution, and without constitutional authority to do so.

I believe that is the way to approach the problem. Those who are unwilling to accept General MacArthur's solution, and do not think it is the plan that should be adopted, should present another plan and lay it on the table beside the MacArthur plan. The committees, the Congress, and, finally, the American people can then weigh both plans in the balance and decide which should be adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to conclude, if I may, by saying, as I started to say before the last colloquy developed with the Senator from Connecticut, that I believe all Americans, not only those in the executive department—although, of course, there the responsibility falls first—had better spend a little time in prayerfully planning for the possibility of a permanent peace, and the advisability of developing, evolving, and utilizing American leadership in high places which can bring the world to its senses and help start activities in the direction of such a peace.

In the final analysis, it is not going to make too much difference whether we fight Russia in June of 1951, in July of 1952, in August of 1953, or in September of 1954. If the best answer the statesmen and diplomats of the world can find is inevitable atomic war with Russia, there is an abysmal failure of international statesmanship.

When we hear nothing from high places which provides for the utilization of some great international machinery or conference or movement or

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

program leading the world to peace, perpetual and permanent, I say all of us, quite regardless of party, should devote a time, effort, and careful study to trying to figure out the proper answer to the problem of outlawing war and preserving peace.

In other words, Mr. President, while we fight the war in which we are involved, while we prepare for what may be the last and bloodiest war of all, let us spend some time also in planning and preparing and praying for the possibility of a permanent and enduring peace.

EXHIBIT 1

BRITISH SEND 120,000 TONS OF RUBBER TO RED CHINA—SHIPMENTS IN NINE WAR MONTHS STIR COMMONS UPROAR; 40,400 TO SOVIET

LONDON, May 2.—The Colonial Office today disclosed that British Malaya sold 120,000 tons of rubber to Communist China and 40,400 tons to Soviet Russia in the 9 months ended in March—all since the outbreak of the Korean War.

Angry words on the handling of this strategic material bounced about Parliament. The sales to Red China had increased heavily since United Nations forces undertook to stop Communist aggression in Korea. During all 1949, Malaya sent only 27,500 tons to China.

Conservative Leader Winston Churchill and Defense Minister Emanuel Shinwell tangled in Commons.

SOME QUESTIONS PARRIED

The storm apparently caught Shinwell by surprise. He ducked and parried some of the questions hurled at him from the Conservative benches.

"Don't you know anything about it at all?" Churchill demanded.

Shinwell snapped back: "I know more about it than you do."

Conservative members shouted "Resign!" They continued the hubbub even after the Speaker called for the next business.

The rubber-shipment figures were given by T. F. Cook, under secretary of the Colonial Office, in reply to a question. A. G. Bottomley, Secretary for Overseas Trade, reported that no steps were taken by the recent rubber conference in Rome to prevent the export of rubber to the Communist sphere.

WAR IN CRITICAL PHASE

The storm in Commons was touched off after Shinwell reported that the fighting in Korea "has entered a new and possibly critical phase." He said British casualties from the new push by the Chinese Communists totaled 48 dead, 223 wounded, and 803 missing.

Independent Raymond Blackburn charged that, between January and March, Britain "supplied the Chinese with thousands of tons of steel, with locomotives, ships, and aircraft."

"Is is not high time we ceased to supply the people against whom our boys are fighting in Korea?" he asked.

Declaring Blackburn's statement inaccurate, Shinwell said:

"For several months we have placed an embargo on exports of strategic materials to China. We have done everything possible to prevent strategic materials from reaching China which could be deployed against our forces."

Conservative L. D. Gammans asked whether Shinwell could assure Parliament that no rubber whatever is being exported from British territory to China at the moment.

Shinwell said it was "quite impossible" for him to say what private exporters may be doing.

"Surely we must not pretend that this is anybody else's responsibility except the Government's," interjected Anthony Eden, the deputy Conservative leader.

Eden asked whether Shinwell would consider publishing on Thursday a complete list of the commodities barred from delivery to China.

Shinwell said the question should "be addressed to the appropriate minister." Presumably he meant President Sir Hartley Shawcross of the Board of Trade, which issues export licenses.

MEETING OF UNITED STATES NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

During the delivery of Mr. MUNDT's speech,

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have promised to yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], in order that he may make an announcement. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota. It will take me only a few minutes to make the announcement, and I am most grateful to the Senator for this opportunity to make it. I think this announcement will be of interest to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Dakota, because of his personal friendship with our guests who are in Washington today in connection with the meeting which I wish to announce at this time.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a meeting which is to be held tonight in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress. All Members of Congress have been invited to attend by the United States National Commission for UNESCO, which is sponsoring the meeting. As a member of that Commission and of its executive committee, I cordially invite each Member of the Senate, and urge all Senators to accept the invitation and be present at the meeting.

A distinguished panel of the Commission will discuss the topic, The Minds of Men in a World of Crisis. Certainly that topic is a most interesting one today.

Three speakers will start the discussion. One of them is Mr. Norman Cousins, one of the country's most distinguished editors and editorial writers. He is a guest of mine here today, in the gallery. He is editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, and is a resident of Norwalk, Conn. Mr. Cousins has only recently returned from an important trip to India and the East, on behalf of the State Department. The second speaker will be Mr. Harold Fisher, director of the Hoover Library at Palo Alto, Calif.; and the third speaker will be Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, dean of the Union Theological Seminary, in New York, and not only one of America's most distinguished theologians and scholars, but one of its most eloquent.

Mr. President, this is the first time the UNESCO National Commission has asked the Members of Congress to participate in its deliberations. This body is one of the great forces in the intellectual world today. Its members include heads of great universities, scientists, representatives of leading private organizations, and Government officials.

The meeting will begin at 8 p. m., in the Coolidge Auditorium. I hope that many Members of the Senate will find time to take advantage of this opportunity to meet the distinguished members of the United States National Commission for UNESCO and to join with them in the discussion.

Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for his courtesy to me in this connection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have been glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

I wish to associate myself with the invitation which has been extended by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut. I think the meeting will be a very important one, and I think we shall have a good program. It seems to me that all of us need to know more about the great potentials of UNESCO and the fine work it already has done under the leadership of a very distinguished citizen of a republic to the south of us, Mexico.

So I hope all Members of the Senate will attend the meeting and will bring their wives with them, for I believe they are invited, also. I think we shall enjoy hearing a discussion of the problems of peace in this era when we have to discuss so much the problems of war.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, let me say that the purposes and objectives of UNESCO, on a multilateral basis, through the United Nations, and with the cooperation of all nations, are the same as those of the Smith-Mundt Act, of which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was the sponsor in the House of Representatives, and to the passage of which he gave such outstanding leadership.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut very much.

VOTE BY SENATOR CONNALLY TO HAVE OPEN HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in his broadcast of May 4, Fulton Lewis, Jr., commented at some length on what he said was my failure to vote that same day on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to take up a resolution for open hearings on the MacArthur affair.

The RECORD shows, of course, that that statement is palpably false—though it is no further from the truth than most of the other things Lewis says.

However, in order to give Lewis a chance to correct himself, I sent him, on May 7, a telegram calling attention to the fact that I did vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, and voted against it. Lewis saw fit to ignore this telegram; so I now ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 7, 1951.

Mr. FULTON LEWIS, JR.,
Mutual Broadcasting System,
Washington, D. C.:

In reference to your statement on your broadcast Friday night, May 4, that I did not vote on Wherry motion to consider opening MacArthur hearings to the public, I call your attention to page 4852 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date which shows that I did vote against Wherry motion.

TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the yea-and-nay vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, as it appears on page 4852 of the RECORD of May 4. I call attention to the fact that my name is included on the list of Senators who voted "nay."

There being no objection, the vote was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 41, as follows:

Yeas, 37: Bennett, Brewster, Bricker, Bridges, Butler of Maryland, Butler of Nebraska, Cain, Carlson, Case, Cordon, Dirksen, Dworshak, Ecton, Ferguson, Flanders, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, Ives, Kem, Knowland, Langer, Lodge, McCarran, McCarthy, Martin, Millikin, Morse, Mundt, Nixon, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Smith of New Jersey, Tobey, Wherry, Wiley, Williams, Young.

Nays, 41: Anderson, Byrd, Clements, Connally, Douglas, Ellender, Frear, Fulbright, Gillette, Green, Hayden, Hennings, Hill, Hoey, Holland, Humphrey, Johnson of Colorado, Johnson of Texas, Johnston of South Carlina, Kefauver, Kerr, Kilgore, Long, McClellan, McFarland, McKellar, McMahon, Maybank, Monroney, Moody, Murray, O'Conor, O'Mahoney, Pastore, Robertson, Russell, Smathers, Smith of North Carolina, Sparkman, Stennis, Underwood.

Not voting, 18: Aiken, Benton, Capehart, Chavez, Duff, Eastland, George, Hunt, Jenner, Lehman, Magnuson, Malone, Neely, Smith of Maine, Taft, Thye, Watkins, Welker.

So Mr. WHERRY's motion was rejected.

KOREA: RESPONSIBILITY FOR CERTAIN SITUATIONS AND CONDITIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for nearly 4 hours I have listened to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. He said he was going to give us the irrefutable record. I have been interested in what he said, but I am even more interested in what the distinguished Senator did not say. He said that the Republican Party is not the war party. By inference he said that the Democrats were the war party and that the Republicans were not. Mr. President, I appeal to the record—and I speak as a Republican—to show that both the Democratic Party and that some of the Republican Party are nearly equally to blame for the mess we are in.

Several times my distinguished friend referred to Dean Acheson. Who in Heaven's name gave us Dean Acheson? Where did he come from? I hold in my hand the record. Under our Constitution, he could not be our Secretary of State if he had not been confirmed by the Senate. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate who was present at the time the confirmation of Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State came up was acquainted with Mr. Acheson's record. It was a record on which some of us said he should not be confirmed. Who are the Republicans who gave us Mr. Acheson? I have before me the vote which was taken. I read from the RECORD of January 18, 1949, first session, Eighty-first Congress. This is the Mr. Acheson who the Republicans cry got us into Korea and into this mess. Here are the Republicans who voted for his confirmation:

Aiken, Baldwin, Brewster, Bricker, Butler of Nebraska, Cain, Cordon, Donnell, Ecton, Ferguson, Flanders, Gurney, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, Ives, Kem, Lodge, McCarthy, Malone, Martin, Millikin, Morse, Mundt, Reed, Saltonstall, Smith of Maine, Smith of New Jersey, Taft, Thye, Tobey, Vandenberg, Wiley, Williams, and Young.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time. I know that my distinguished friend can explain the vote, but he can make his explanation in his own time. I wish to give the names of the distinguished Republicans who voted against the confirmation. They are: BRIDGES, CAPEHART, JENNER, KNOWLAND, WHERRY, and LANGER.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LANGER. So, Mr. President, that is the record. Every Republican Senator who was in this body at that time, except the six Senators whom I have mentioned, voted to make Mr. Acheson Secretary of State of the United States.

This afternoon the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said that the United Nations machinery is entirely inadequate to deal with the situation. It may surprise Senators on the floor who were not here at that time, to realize that every Republican, except two, voted for the United Nations Charter. The Senator from Minnesota, Henrik Shipstead, who is no longer a Senator, and myself the senior Senator from North Dakota, were the only two Senators who voted against the Charter. They knew, as all Senators do, that the Charter cannot be amended. They knew that under article 25 the members of the United Nations agreed—and the United States agreed to it the moment the Charter was ratified by the Senate—to carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter, no matter what the decision might be. That is what they voted for. That is what they agreed to. That is what our country is now stuck with.

The other day the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] criticized another Senator by saying that hindsight was better than foresight. I call attention to the fact that every Senator who voted for the United Nations Charter was warned about the veto power.

Today everyone in this country who is informed knows that it was not Russia who got the veto power into the United Nations Charter. It was the United States and Great Britain, as the record shows. As I have said, Senators were warned as to exactly what they were getting into when they voted for the United Nations Charter. On the 28th day of July 1945, at the time we voted on the question, I said, among other things:

I would unhesitatingly vote for the Charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a permanent peace. But in spite of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the Charter—and, make sure, we are going to implement it—will mean perpetuating the war. I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription, and all that which goes with war.

Mr. President, we are in it. We have had perpetual war practically from the day we adopted that charter.

Then the Atlantic Pact came along. By that time some of the Republicans had become a little better educated. The Eightieth Congress was controlled by the Republicans. There was Republican control in the House and in the Senate. The people of the country had said, "We do not want the Democrats to control the Congress. We are going to put the Republicans in charge."

What is the record? The Republicans dominated the Foreign Relations Committee, which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] mentioned at least five times today. In the Foreign Relations Committee, dominated by the Republicans, for 2 years every single vote on important foreign policy was unanimous. Everything that a Democratic President wanted on foreign policy, without a single exception, was voted for by every single Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Now some Republicans who were for this bipartisan foreign policy have the consummate gall to rise and say that the Democrats are the war party; and some Democrats have the consummate gall to rise and charge the Republicans with being the war party when, as a matter of fact, both the Democratic Party and a faction of the Republican Party of which I was not one, working hand in glove, got us into this situation together, under the so-called bipartisan policy. But it is true that the Democrats are to blame for Cairo, Tehran, Potsdam, and Yalta, which primarily has gotten us into this trouble.

We come now to the Atlantic Pact, which was mentioned by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. Only 13 Senators voted against it. They were the Senator from Oregon [Mr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

CORDON], former Senator Donnell, of Missouri, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the senior Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. Two Democrats voted against it, namely, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and former Senator Taylor, of Idaho. Only 11 Republicans, less than one-fourth of the Republicans in the Senate at that time, voted against it.

Let me take up a very simple matter, one which the smallest child can understand. Was any resolution ever submitted at any time by any Senator among the Republican membership on the Foreign Relations Committee to stop the shipment of arms, about which Republicans are now yelling to high heaven? One can search the record in vain.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to make a correction in the statement which the Senator has just made.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to have the correction made after I get through.

Let us take another matter which is very simple. I refer to the question of Western Germany. General MacArthur says that Western Germany is absolutely essential. Omar Bradley said the same thing. Yet the record shows that the Republican Party, as such, has done absolutely nothing, aside from the great fight made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], not as a leader of the Republican Party but as an individual. The Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER] and two or three other Senators joined in an effort to see to it that the Germans received the kind of treatment which would make them friends of the United States and not enemies. The entire denazification program, affecting some 3,000,000 German people, hundreds of thousands of them being relatives of Germans in this country, was put over without a single protest on the floor, except from perhaps half a dozen of us Republicans. In that effort we were joined by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], a Democrat, the only Democrat who tried to help.

Months after the war was over an American of German extraction could not write to his father or mother. Months after the war was over a German in this country could not send money to his starving relatives in Germany.

Finally, with the help of my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] we got the displaced persons law amended so as to add section 13, under which 54,000 German or Austrian people could be brought over.

What did the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and his crowd do? How many displaced persons came over? Exactly 6—not 6,000, not 600, but 6.

So I say that it comes with ill grace today to have any Senator rise and blame either one side or the other—the State Department, the administration, was almost solely to blame.

I remember well the Connally resolution. Just as many Republicans as Democrats voted for the Connally resolution, in proportion to membership. What did the Connally resolution mean? It meant that the overwhelming majority of those who would make up the second front would be American boys. Out of 116,000 casualties, roughly 81,000 were American boys.

The record does not show, Mr. President, that the Republicans fought the Connally resolution upon the floor of the Senate—only a few of us were fighting that battle.

We come now to the simple little proposition of the selling of the German Embassy in Washington. General Eisenhower was in Germany a few weeks ago trying to get the Germans to join the Western Powers, saying to the Germans, "You are going to be a nation in a short time. We are going to have peace in a short time." Yet at the very time when General Eisenhower was telling the German people they were going to have their own nation and their own Embassy in Washington again, the Attorney General of the United States was advertising for sale in the Wall Street Journal, on the 19th day of January last, the German Embassy on Massachusetts Avenue in this city. A couple of days ago it was sold. Some of us protested the sale. We could not get our resolution reported by the committee. We succeeded in persuading the Attorney General to reject some of the offers for the Embassy. The best offer was $101,000. We succeeding in getting a man from Baltimore, the home of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], who is now on the Senate floor, to offer $64,000 more, making the figure $165,000 for that property. So I earned my salary for 4 years just there.

Mr. President, I wish to say in conclusion that there have been 60,000 American casualties in Korea. There is no doubt of that fact, and it is likely that there will be many more. In the opinion of the Senator from North Dakota, the bipartisan faction of Republicans in Congress are nearly as much to blame as the Democrats for the situation.

I now yield to my good friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] who said that I made a statement which should be corrected.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Senator from North Dakota to say that no effort had been made by legislative action to stop the shipment of war materials to Russia and the satellites and to Communist China.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. KEM. I think the Senator from North Dakota will recall numerous efforts made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Missouri to amend the Foreign Economic Assistance Act—the so-called Marshall plan law—from time to time so that Marshall-plan aid would be denied to countries that were shipping materials of war to Russia, to the satellites, and to Communist China.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend I remember that very well, indeed, and I joined with him at that particular time in getting the Economic Assistance Act amended, but I had absolutely no luck.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that the Senate, in the last session, adopted an amendment to the appropriation bill designed to accomplish that purpose?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. And that the House declined to concur, with the result that in conference the amendment was watered down so that the National Security Council was directed to stop this traffic if it felt it interfered with the national security. Is it not true that the National Security Council has done nothing whatever about it?

Mr. LANGER. That is absolutely true.

Mr. KEM. So is it not fair to say that an effort has been made in the Senate, with some success, so far as the Senate is concerned, to stop this nefarious traffic?

Mr. LANGER. I will say that quite an effort was made by some of us on the Republican side, in which we were joined by some Members on the Democratic side to stop it. The point I make is that neither the Republican nor the Democratic policy committees have adopted that as a matter of policy, have ever made it a part of their program during all the time these goods have been shipped to foreign countries.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely: On page 26, between lines 20 and 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or

commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administator of the Economic Cooperation Administration any article or commodity of the nature or class described.

"(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed."

On page 26, line 21, strike out "SEC. 1302" and insert "SEC. 1303."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] I now send to the desk the amendment to the unfinished business (H. R. 3587), the third supplemental appropriation bill, which is now being handled on the floor by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I ask that the amendment may be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, this amendment provides that no economic or financial assistance shall be provided out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance—other than military assistance—to foreign countries, to any country which continues to sell war materials to Russia and her satellites, including Red China.

On April 19, 1950, more than a year ago, I presented to the Senate evidence in detail showing that Marshall-plan countries were making large shipments of war materials to Russia and her satellites. This evidence has never been contradicted. So far as I know my statements have never been denied. These shipments are continuing to the present day.

When the Marshall plan authorization bill was before the Senate last year I offered an amendment to automatically shut off aid to countries which continued to ship war materials to the Reds. The Senate saw fit to reject this amendment. The objection was raised at that time that "it would interfere in the internal affairs of other countries." The argument, as I understand it, was that although the money of American taxpayers was going into these countries, the American Congress should not undertake to say how it should be spent.

When the supplemental appropriations bill came before the Senate last fall, I joined the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] in submitting a similar amendment, providing for an automatic termination of our economic aid to those countries which persisted in selling war materials to the Reds. The Senate adopted this amendment.

At this point, President Truman intervened. He sent a personal plea to the joint conference committee urging that the amendment not be included in the final bill. As a result, the amendment was watered down in the conference committee. As finally approved, the law, section 1304, Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress, provides that economic aid is to be shut off to any country if the United States National Security Council finds that such country is carrying on trade with the Reds "contrary to the security interests of the United States."

The present membership of the National Security Council is as follows:

Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, Chairman.

Alben W. Barkley, Vice President of the United States.

Dean G. Acheson, Secretary of State.

George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense.

W. Stuart Symington, a former Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, was a member of the National Security Council prior to his appointment as Administrator of the RFC.

Here is the situation in a nutshell: We are at war with North Korea and Red China. We are giving war materials to the Marshall-plan countries. These Marshall-plan countries in turn are selling identical materials to Russia and Red China.

So far as I have been able to find out, all the United States National Security Council has done is to consider, discuss, and negotiate. Not once have our gifts been suspended to any one of the Marshall-plan countries because it was shipping war materials to the Communists.

On March 9, 1951, I addressed a letter on this subject to President Truman, urging that the National Security Council act on this vital matter without further delay. I have yet to receive a reply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of my letter to the President.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 9, 1951.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs. Kem and I have just returned from one of our occasional visits to Walter Reed Hospital, and, as always, we came away with heavy hearts at the sight of boys, some of them from Missouri, whose bodies and lives have been mangled in Korea.

I am writing you in your capacity as Chairman of the National Security Council of the United States. As you know, under section 1304 of Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 27, 1950, no economic or financial assistance is to be provided by the United States to any foreign country whose trade with Russia or its satellites, including Red China, is found by the United States National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States.

Since this law went into effect, it has been repeatedly disclosed that several Marshall-plan countries are making large shipments of war-useful items to Russia and to Red China. British trade with Red China has been particularly active through her crown colony, Hong Kong, in such items as rubber and copper.

Department of Commerce officials advised my office this morning that $329,912.80 worth of machine tools were sold to Russia by Britain during January 1951 alone. Although Marshall-plan aid to Britain was suspended on January 1, 1951, goods and services are still reaching Britain through funds previously made available.

Britain is not the only offender. Belgium and France are also selling war-useful goods, including iron and steel, to the Reds. Large quantities of iron and steel have been sent to France and Belgium under the Marshall plan as a gift from the people of the United States.

Western European countries are selling equipment necessary to make A-bombs to Russia and her satellites.

On February 23, 1951, we were told in the press that ECA-aided factories in Italy were speeding products for Russia and that a Soviet economic party was in Genoa attempting to expedite deliveries of electric cranes and thermal power stations from two factories, which have been aided under the Marshall plan to the tune of $1,625,000.

Despite the seriousness of this situation, a staff member of the National Security Council advised my office this morning that the whole subject is being kept under review. The significant fact is that not once has Marshall-plan aid been terminated to any offending country, pursuant to Public Law 843.

For my part, I am against sending so much as a thimble or a hairpin as a gift from American people to any country which persists in sending war materials to the Reds, now slaughtering our boys in Korea.

I hope you will agree that this is a shocking business, that it is contrary to the security interests of the United States. I plead with you to see that the National Security Council acts on this vital matter without further delay.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. KEM.

Mr. KEM. Why has not the President complied with the intent of the Congress as expressed in the act of September 27, 1950?

Surely none will deny, at this juncture of our affairs, that the flood of war materials to Russia and Red China is contrary to the security interests of the United States.

On May 2, 1951, the British Colonial Office disclosed that British Malaya sold 120,000 tons of rubber to Communist China and 40,400 tons to Soviet Russia in the 9 months ending in March—all since the outbreak of the war in Korea. Everyone knows that rubber is vital in the business of war. Our Government has taken steps to restrict sharply the use of rubber in civilian products in this country.

Secretary of Defense Marshall, during his testimony on May 7—just the other day—before the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, declared:

> Our own Government is engaged in a complete economic blockage (of Red China), but we have not been able to bring that about with the other nations, except to a limited extent.

The British continue to send shipload after shipload for the use of the Communist war machine that is striving to drive our boys into the sea. Only last night, a United Press dispatch dated May 8, from Singapore, informed us that British Malaya shipped 9,569 tons of rubber to Russia and Communist China last month. Hong Kong received 5,046 tons,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and some of this may have found its way into Communist China.

According to an Associated Press dispatch from London dated April 30, 1951, Britain has exported goods worth $3,614,800 to Communist China during the past 3 months. Sir Hartley Shawcross, then president of the British Board of Trade, listed the following among the exports: Iron and steel manufactures, $644,000; electrical goods and apparatus, $456,400; and chemicals, drugs, dyes, and colors, $294,000. Some of the same items have been furnished by the United States to Britain under the Marshall plan.

During his testimony before the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations just a few days ago, General MacArthur spoke darkly of the "flow of strategic materials" to Red China "which has been going on so extensively since the Korean war started." He said:

> I think that the port of Hong Kong is now a means by which great quantities of materials, strategic and otherwise, pour through into Red China.

General MacArthur had with him a report dated March 29, 1951, from the American Consul General at Hong Kong, as to the strategic materials which had gone through Hong Kong and reached the Red Chinese during 3 weeks alone.

General MacArthur described the list of strategic materials as "very compendious." He said:

> It consists of many chemicals: Ammonium chloride, sulfate, arsenic acid, and so on—a whole page of those.
>
> Instruments and accessories: Electric meters, wires, various apparatus of that sort.
>
> Radio parts: Radio sets, telephone sets, transformers, wire recorders.
>
> Under machinery and fuels: Ball and roller bearings, drills, and electric drills, electric motors, hammers, metal tools, spanners, pliers, and so on.
>
> Minerals: Asphalt, asbestos, coal tar.
>
> Medicines of various sorts.
>
> Metals: Aluminum scrap, ingots, bars, brass plates, bars, copper wire, iron plates, iron nails, high-speed steel, lead sheets, ingots, silicon steel sheets, steel bars, welding rods, zinc sheets, and so on.
>
> Miscellaneous: Boiler materials, cameras, cement, fertilizers.
>
> Laboratory equipment: Microscopes, rubber, rubber accelerators.
>
> Petroleums: Diesel oils, fuel oils, gasoline, grease, kerosene, lubricants, paraffins, and so on.

After General MacArthur had finished reading from the list of strategic materials which had gone from Hong Kong to Red China, the following colloquy occurred between him and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]:

> Senator KNOWLAND. General, that, I think, would be sufficient at this time. I would like to ask your judgment as a professional soldier for more than fifty years and as the responsible commander in the Far East, whether it is your judgment that such material would have been of substantial assistance to the Communist force opposing our troops and the other United Nations troops in Korea, and to some extent almost as valuable as actual munitions of war.
>
> General MACARTHUR. There is no question about it, especially petroleum, gasoline, and things of that sort. It it the very essence of the movement of an Army and armed troops.

Mr. President, the British are not the only offenders, not by any means. According to the latest information available at the Department of Commerce, the following additional countries are carrying on a lucrative war trade with the Reds: Austria, France, Western Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark, Belgium-Luxemburg, Italy, and Sweden.

All are Marshall Plan countries. The American people send to all of them, as gifts, many of the same items which they, in turn, are selling to the Russians and to Red China.

During the first nine months of 1950, Austria sold the following items to the Reds: iron and steel manufactures, $10,797,000; pig iron, iron and steel scrap, $1,273,000.

During the same period France exported the following items to Russia and her satellites: steel-mill products, hot-rolled sheets and plates, $1,744,000; lead and alloys, $709,000; ball bearings, conveying equipment, and so forth, $1,023,000; machine tools and parts, $1,776,000.

Western Germany exported to the Soviet bloc iron and steel scrap, $5,522,000; copper, $283,000; steel bars and shapes, $3,800,000; machine tools, $5,634,000.

The Netherlands: Tin and manufactures, $5,242,000; machinery and appliances, electrotechnical material, $2,821,000.

Denmark: Machinery and apparatus, except electrical, $2,289,000; vehicles and transportation equipment, $1,784,000.

Belgium-Luxemburg: Iron, cast-iron, steel and manufactures, $3,117,000; copper, alloys and manufactures, $5,659,000, of which $3,003,000 went to the U. S. S. R.; electrical machinery, appliances, apparatus, and parts, $4,509,000.

And so it goes.

We give iron and steel to Belgium; Belgium sells the same items to the Reds. Does that make sense? It does not in my book. It did not make sense 10 months ago, and it does not make sense now.

Italy, one of the worst offenders, sold to the Reds machinery, apparatus, and parts, $18,863,000; scientific instruments and parts, $346,000.

Sweden: Malleable iron and steel, and products, $9,703,000; electrical machinery and apparatus, $6,912,000; other machinery and apparatus, $16,475,000.

According to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, the Soviet Union and its satellites received almost twice as much machinery from Western European countries last year as in 1948. In other words, Mr. President, the exportation of materials from Western Europe to the Soviet Union and the satellite countries was increased 100 percent in 1949, as compared with 1948.

In 1950, according to the United Nations Commission, 10 Western European powers shipped $269,000,000 worth of engineering products to iron-curtain countries.

The survey found that Britain had replaced Germany as the chief supplier of machinery products to the Reds, shipping $70,800,000 worth in 1950. Meanwhile, United States machinery exports to the Reds virtually ceased.

Mr. President, one could go on indefinitely, piling case on case. I shall not ask the Senate to listen to further statistics. Suffice it to say that the proof is ample and undisputed that the Reds are being armed through our allies. There can be no doubt on the record that many American boys in Korea have been struck down by weapons provided, in whole or in part, through our so-called friends in Western Europe.

It has been nearly 11 months since the President ordered our Armed Forces into Korea. The United States has supplied 90 percent of the troops in the United Nations' war there, and our boys have suffered 90 percent of the casualties. If our allies are not willing to do their share of the fighting, surely the least they should do is to stop giving aid and comfort to the enemy. We have dilly-dallied too long. The time for thumb-twiddling has passed.

This is a tragic situation. There are now in the Government many men who have seen honorable service in combat in the armed services of the United States. How can anyone who has seen American blood spilled in battle tolerate the outrageous practices just described continuing unchecked, month after month? This is beyond my powers of comprehension.

But facts are facts. The President has not acted. It is up to the Congress now. Let it not be said that Congress is guilty of a callous disregard of the welfare and safety of our brave, outnumbered men in Korea.

I yield the floor.

UNITY IN REPUBLICAN RANKS—PROTECTION OF MILITARY SECRETS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have been greatly impressed this afternoon by some speeches on the floor. I was especially impressed by the magnificent plea for unity made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I do not know which branch of the Republican leadership he sought unity for or with. As I understood the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, he placed in nomination the name of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the next President of the United States. I do not know how much unity there is in the ranks of those on his side of the aisle in favor of such a program. I do not know whether the Senator from South Dakota seeks to unify his party behind the late President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, who would retire our military forces from around the world and retreat to our own shores. I do not know whether he seeks to unite his party behind those who believe with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that we should write, on the floor of the Senate, the specifications of what our military leaders should do, and in what areas, and what they should not do; or whether the Senator from South Dakota seeks to unify them between those of his party who support the recommendations of the late distinguished and, I think, immortal Vandenberg, of Michigan, and the distinguished commander of our forces in Europe, General Eisenhower.

Just as I was about to feel that the plea of the Senator from South Dakota

for unity might have some effect upon Senators, I was amazed to see the distinguished Senator from North Dakota rise to take a position of declining to unify with the Senator from South Dakota. In fact, I rather enjoyed the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota, because, as I understand, he was reading the obituaries of many of those on his side of the aisle. I must say that I was quite surprised, but I was as greatly entertained. Further, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota said that General Marshall and the administration should write a blueprint of victory which all Americans can read. That is in line with the headline I note in the Evening Star of this afternoon, "GOP demands Marshall clarify plan to end war." I quote further:

Republicans were demanding a clearer answer to the question of how the administration expects to end the Korean War.

Mr. President, the strategy of modern warfare operates something like a contest on the gridiron. A successful offense always keeps the opposition guessing—whether it is a general moving armies or the quarterback calling signals. Mr. President, you know how it is at a football game. The fans are simply bursting with curiosity as they watch the quarterback huddle with his team, and the opposing players would give anything to know in advance just what to expect from the men whose task it is to carry the ball.

The football team of the great University of Oklahoma has won world-wide recognition and fame by reason of their amazingly successful offenses. Those offenses have been built on deception, surprise, and power. Mr. President, the opposing teams wring their hands and wrack their brains trying to figure out what the next move of those quarterbacks, handling that amazingly deceptive split-T formation might be And it is the same way in warfare, Mr. President.

Surprise and deception are the weapons of the attacker, and the defender relies on intelligence operations and shrewd forecasts to place him in the best blocking position. These elements often mean the difference between victory and defeat. That is why it is so vitally necessary to protect our military secrets. That is why the Senate committee hearings are not wide open to the world. We must be certain that not one word of valuable information which would endanger the security of our fighting forces and the Nation should be dropped to the enemy.

General MacArthur has told the world what he would do to bring the war in Korea to a successful termination. That information has little value to our enemies, because General MacArthur's policies are not the program of the United States and the United Nations. However, Mr. President, it is a far different situation with General Marshall. What our Secretary of Defense thinks, knows, and plans is of supreme and vital importance to the enemy, and this information must be guarded as zealously as is possible insofar as its disclosure in any way that might make it available to the enemy is concerned. That is why so much of his testimony had to be deleted from the record of the hearings.

What can sane men be thinking of who say, "We demand that Marshall clarify plans to end the war in Korea. We are going to demand more detailed information from General Marshall as to what those war plans are, as to what the blueprint for victory in Korea is."

Mr. President, if General Marshall were a prisoner of Russia, the Russians would cross-examine him; they might even torture him to wring that information from him. I believe Secretary Marshall, magnificent patriot that he is, would endure torture or even death before he would give that information to the enemy. But what can he do, Mr. President, when United States Senators cross-examine, browbeat, and threaten him, trying to force him to divulge to the world that same information? Oh, political ambition, what crimes are committed in thy name.

However, Mr. President, I must say that if the enemy were as unable to understand the information, if given, as are many of those who cross-examine the Secretary of Defense, it would not hurt too much.

I am reminded of the story of a group of industrial pioneers who, in the early days in Oklahoma, built a great industrial empire. As the years passed, one of the partners died. He had two sons who came on, and, of course, inherited an interest in the business. One day the local manager at one of the plants in western Oklahoma called the general manager at Oklahoma City and said to him, "The two sons of your deceased partner are here, and they have demanded that I show them the books of our company. What shall I do?"

That great old general manager said to him, "Show them the books, of course. Let these men see the books. In the first place, they are stockholders and are entitled to see them."

Then he added, "In the second place, they will not know any more about them after they have examined them than they did before."

I am aware of the application of that story to many who cross-examined the Secretary of Defense. But no such situation prevails with reference to our enemies, who are watching and listening carefully to every word that comes out of those committee-room doors.

Again referring to football, Mr. President, I have seen but one team in my life which followed the policy of open strategy openly arrived at which has been advocated here by some Senators. It was a Negro team with a fullback who was 6 feet 4 inches tall and who weighed approximately 240 pounds. He called the signals, ran the team, and carried the ball most of the time. He never put his team into a huddle; he just lined them up and announced the plays to both teams and to the world. For example, he would say, "This is my play: I am going around right end. Give me the ball." And he would do so. As soon as that play was executed he would not waste any time in a huddle, his team immediately going back into formation, and he would say, again, so that all on either side, or anyone else, if they listened, could hear, "This is my play: I am going over left tackle. Give me the ball." He was big enough and powerful enough to do that and get away with it.

I wish our country were strong enough to operate on that basis, Mr. President. Obviously, however, our war strategy, our plans, our strength, and our weakness must not be advertised to our enemies. On the other hand, Mr. President, we must have confidence in the ability and good faith of our military experts. For my part, I thank God that the security of this Nation is being guarded by a grand old soldier like General Marshall and by the distinguished group of Chiefs of Staff that are gathered around him.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit for 5 minutes while the Senate is in session.

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, does the Senator anticipate that the business which would be taken up can be disposed of in 5 minutes?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], to the committee amendment on page 22, beginning in line 5, to increase the amount stated in line 8 to $75,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Nebr	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C
Duff	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lodge	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ecton	McCarthy	Thye
Ellender	McClellan	Tobey
Ferguson	McFarland	Underwood
Flanders	McKellar	Welker
Frear	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
George	Martin	Young
Gillette	Maybank	
Green	Millikin	

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

THE TORQUAY AGREEMENTS

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, we are slowly destroying the economic system of this country. We are doing it through several channels.

DESTRUCTION OF OUR CURRENCY BASE

First, we have destroyed the foundation for our currency system through the removal of the metal base for our currency.

DESTRUCTION OF FLOOR UNDER WAGES AND INVESTMENTS

Second, free trade by the division of the markets of the United States with the nations of the earth on a one-economic-world basis through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended.

DESTRUCTION THROUGH TAXATION

Third, the legalized imposition of income and other taxes to the point of diminishing returns, when it has become necessary to sell bonds and indulge in deficit financing each year to keep the economy afloat.

SUBSIDIES FROM ALL TAXPAYERS

Fourth, subsidies to take the place of the tariffs and import fees, coming from the taxpayers of America.

DESTROYING SOURCES OF NEW CAPITAL

Fifth, the Securities and Exchange Commission making it impossible to sell stock in an enterprise unless the engineers and hand-raised economists of the Securities and Exchange Commission say that the enterprise will make money.

FREE TRADE VERSUS WAGES AND INVESTMENTS

Mr. President, first considering the free-trade program of the administration, today's Journal of Commerce, May 9, 1951, carries on its front page the headline: "Extensive Tariff Slashes Made by the United States, 17 Nations in the Torquay Agreements."

The floor under American wages and investments is further lowered in the haphazard tariff- and import-fee slashes made by the State Department at Torquay, England, without regard to the "fair and reasonable" competition principle.

HIGH LIGHTS OF TORQUAY SLASHES

The high lights of the Torquay Conference agreement are coming out at a very opportune time in that the Senate Finance Committee has just reported a bill which would extend for 2 years more the authority of the Secretary of State, under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, further to select the industries that are to be sacrificed on the altar of one economic world, and the industries that are to be preserved.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF EXECUTIVE'S AUTHORITY OVER WORKERS AND INVESTORS

The economy of the Nation is to be placed in the hands of a thoroughly discredited Secretary of State for an additional 2 years—under the Senate bill—so that he may repeat, if he so desires, the Torquay Conference, which has just been concluded.

THE STERLING BLOC REFUSES TO RELINQUISH EMPIRE PREFERENTIAL RATES

On page 29 of the Journal of Commerce in the continuation of the dispatch about which I spoke of as appearing on the first page, referring to the conclusions and the effect of the Torquay Conference, is a paragraph which is very significant. It is as follows:

> Attempts to conclude trade agreements with Australia, Cuba, India, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom failed.

They retain their famous Empire preferential rates, while falling heir to all of the benefits of the Torquay Conference through the most-favored-nation clause.

It may be of interest to the Senate to know that the British Empire—the sterling bloc—have previously made agreements with this country which they rendered ineffective on their part almost immediately after agreeing to such tariff reductions, by resorting to quotas, embargoes, specifications, and manipulation of their money systems, to defeat the objective of the agreements.

For example, we found after investigation that specifications were laid down on automobiles that could be shipped into a certain country—Bermuda, I think, an English possession. It appeared reasonable enough to have these specifications laid down. Because of the shortage of road money, small cars would be preferable, but it was soon realized that only an English car met the specifications. That is only one instance out of many.

After defeating, by means of such subterfuges, the announced objective of the trade treaties that the sterling bloc countries have entered into, they now refuse to go into any more agreements; but under the most-favored-nation clause, every agreement the United States makes with other nations in lowering and reducing tariffs and import fees is immediately available to all other nations including the countries of the sterling bloc—the British Empire.

AN EMERGENCY ECONOMY

Mr. President, we have established an emergency economy. The Torquay conference provides that that approximately 3,000 products can be shipped into the United States under the lowered tariffs.

We say we want peace, but our national economy could not survive 60 days if we had peace, Mr. President.

The entire economic structure of the United States would crumble under a peace economy simply because we must resort to deficit financing—taxpayers' money from the United States Treasury to keep our economy afloat.

We have built up a deficit financing economy over the past 18 years—when we are unable to continue on some pretext to keep the economy going through subsidies or contracts, then the products of the slave labor will wreck our economy by pouring into our country, unchecked in competition with our workers and investors. We have reached a point where even if we had peace—the peace which all of us say we want—we could not live under it.

BILL TO EXTEND SECRETARY OF STATE AUTHORITY

Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee has reported unanimously the bill extending for two more years the authority of the Secretary of State to select the industries to survive and the industries and investments that are to be sacrificed upon the alter of our economic world.

SENATE MUST VOTE

Mr. President, the Senate is to vote on the bill. If we are willing to extend the authority of the Secretary of State's control of the regulation of foreign commerce and the resulting control of the national economy for two more years, that will mark the final abandonment of the workingmen and the investors of our Nation.

UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE-NATIONAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

We find the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Manufacturers Association on record as favoring free trade.

They mainly represent organizations, individuals, corporations, and partnerships in our country, large enough to establish plants in foreign countries to supply the products needed in those foreign areas, not only the markets which the so-called reciprocal trade program was supposed to secure for the businessman of the United States, but through free trade displace the American workers and investors of this Nation through sweat-shop labor imports. The Marshall plan—with $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 a year going to Europe—was also supposed to create markets for the businessmen of our country.

So through the free trade program the large business organizations of the United States establish their plants in those foreign countries and not only supply the markets of those areas, which are

financed by the American taxpayers, but then ship the products of low-cost labor of Asia and Europe into this country. We are simply transferring American jobs to foreign soil.

THREE THOUSAND PRODUCTS—INCREASED IMPORTS

Mr. President, a preliminary analysis of the report issued today by the State Department on the Torquay conference shows that tariffs on approximately 360 commodities and commodity groups—commodity groups meaning the numbers of the paragraphs used in listing the groups in the Trade Agreement Act of 1934—amounting to approximately 3,000 different products, have been either substantially reduced or have been bound against any increase, regardless of any injury to American industry, American workingmen, and American investors.

SENATE SHOULD TAKE NOTICE

So, Mr. President, it behooves the Members of the Senate to read the newspaper reports about that conference, even if they never analyze and digest them.

The 2-inch-thick report which came out yesterday simply lists those reductions. All Senators should examine the entire report, to see for themselves whether they think our Nation can live in peace—the peace that every Member of the Senate says he wants, while under the cover of war and so-called emergencies, the administration authorities are pulling the rug right out from under the small-business men and the workers and investors of the United States of America.

LUCKILY BILL DELAYED

Mr. President, I hope all Members of the Senate will analyze the results of the Torquay conference.

I am very glad that the bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for another 2 years has been delayed until the results of the Torquay conference are available.

The bill is reported with amendments, one amendment the so-called peril point. The peril-point amendment, Mr. President, requires the President of the United States to write Congress a letter, provided he disregards the Tariff Commission warning that any such rate would injure an industry.

Mr. President, how much trouble do you think it would be for the present President of the United States to write a letter to Congress? Perhaps now he is running out of people to whom he can write letters. All the President would need to do would be to write to the Congress a letter telling Congress what a great job he is doing on the "one economic world" tradition the administration has established.

Then we have a broadened escape clause amendment. The President may invoke that clause if he cares to do so. It is to be noted that the word "must" is not included in the bill; but the President may invoke the clause. Of course, since the administration has made clear for the last 18 years that its objective is to divide the markets of the United States with the nations of the rest of the world, I leave it to the President of the Senate to judge for himself whether any escape clause—whether a part of the bill or whether written in by the State Department—will ever be invoked.

Mr. President, in due course I shall discuss the other four points I make in connection with my statement that the administration is destroying the economy of the United States.

Again I wish to say that there is no use saying that Mr. Roosevelt was responsible for "free trade" in the United States and the division of the United States markets with the rest of the world and the "one economic world" theory, and there is no use saying that Mr. Truman has continued it, because the Senate of the United States must vote to approve it. It is the United States Senate that is to blame for its initial approval of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—for each of its 2- or 3-year extensions—and will be responsible if a 2-year extension of an irresponsible Secretary of State's authority over the lives of the workers and investors of this Nation is voted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point excerpts from a dispatch to the Wall Street Journal relative to the effect of the Torquay agreements.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam has agreed on a new "horse-trade."

The United States will cut tariffs on a sizable chunk of our imports from all countries—heavily.

In return, nine countries will reduce their tariffs on United States goods—modestly. Six others agreed to minor concessions.

It figures out this way:

The United States will cut tariffs from 25 percent to 50 percent on a tenth of all the goods on which we now charge import duties.

In return, the United States will get tariff cuts from the 15 foreign countries on less than one-twentieth of United States exports. Most of these cuts will be trivial.

THIRTY-COUNTRY CONFAB

That in a nutshell is the result of the 30-country tariff conference just ended at Torquay, England, after 8 months of discussions.

One conference paradox: The United States tariff talks with Britain broke down—because the British were unwilling to make any important concessions to U.S. Yet Britain will be one of the big gainers from United States tariff cuts.

"That's because the cuts we give to one country, we automatically give to every country, even to those countries that won't cooperate," says one official.

Another conference paradox: 16 countries at Torquay announced they were raising some of their tariffs. France, for example, said she was raising duties on 38 types of goods.

Theoretically, these 16 countries made new tariff cuts to make up for the ones they raised. Mostly, though, the concessions they renounced were greater than the new cuts they offered in exchange.

* * * * *

Then there are cuts on cocoa and chocolate, on Italian matches, on tanning extract, French garters, drawing ink, Korean iodine, lampblack, white lead, mica, German razors, telescopes, swords, and sewing machines—to say nothing of Swedish taximeters, German pistols and revolvers, Turkish licorice, Brazilian plywood, Canadian cream, French post cards, Norwegian fish cakes and acetic acids. Musical instruments, and radios and television are included too, along with a host of other goods, important and trivial.

Many American businessmen are going to be worried by these tariff cuts. There are 50 percent lower duties on many types of clocks and clock movements and parts, for example.

American canners won't be happy about the 40-percent cut which United States diplomats promise on imported canned salmon.

EARTHENWARE AND FILBERTS

American makers may be miffed by the lowered rates in store for Italian earthenware.

American nut growers—who have been complaining about tariffs being too low—won't be happy that United States negotiators promised not to raise duties on imported filberts. American fig, grape, and raisin growers will be bothered about the new low rates on these imported fruits.

American manufacturers are going to be bothered by growing competition from West German exporters. A key to what's coming shows up in the United States tariff cuts won by German negotiators:

The Germans argued for and won lowered United States duties on china, chinaware, drawing instruments, clocks, and on wool yarns and a wide variety of toys. Harmonica tariffs were slashed in half; camera duties a quarter. Duties on some coal-tar chemicals were cut in half. A wide range of German machinery will also get in cheaper.

* * * * *

Officials here say it's not certain when these new tariff rates will take effect. Some will start in June. Others will be put into effect gradually between June and November this year as the conference countries ratify the Torquay agreements. Each of the 147 separate Torquay agreements will go into effect 1 month after the countries concerned ratify.

The United States doesn't have to ratify its agreements. That has already been taken care of by Congress in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which permits the President to raise or lower tariffs at will, within certain limits.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the bill for a 2-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreement Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—not only should be defeated but Congress should substitute the Senate bill 931 providing for fixing tariffs and import fees on a basis of fair and reasonable competition for it.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe that we are considering my amendment "C," as modified. It was modified to strike out the first three lines, so that the amendment now reads, "On page 22, line 8, strike out '$74,000,000' and insert '$75,000,000'."

As I explained yesterday, this amount is made up of $287,000 for training and education in the civil-defense set-up, and $713,000 for research and development. The civil-defense authorities believe that this amount is essential.

As to the research-development phase, considering the atomic situation, they plan at an early date, on a continental basis, to test certain building materials

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

so as to determine what the effects would be on the typical type of construction which we find in the American cities. This appropriation would expedite that program.

As I pointed out yesterday, no one can categorically say that precisely this $1,000,000 additional is essential, and that they could not get along with $980,000 or some lesser or some greater amount, but in charge of the program are former Governor Caldwell, of Florida, who, I believe, is an able administrator, and Mr. Wadsworth, the son of a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, both of whom are men of high caliber who have taken upon themselves a tough job. Under those circumstances, and speaking as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I personally believe that this money would be well spent, if it were made available to them.

I think there is involved a calculated risk which, in the uncertain international situation which we now face, I personally would not want to take, if we failed to go ahead with the program as rapidly as we should.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator from California tell us where the shelters are to be constructed?

Mr. KNOWLAND. This particular item is not the shelter item. It appears on page 22, line 8, and if the Senator will look at the committee report, on page 5, he will find a breakdown of the committee's recommendation of $74,000,000. The only change which this would provide would be that the amount for training and education would be raised from the $500,000, which the committee allowed, to $787,000, which was the estimate, and it would provide, for research and development, $713,000. That is where it would go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], to the committee amendment, on page 22, line 8, to strike out "$74,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer my amendment lettered "A," which I asked to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That financial contributions under the authority of subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 may be made with respect to civil defense programs or projects initiated by the States on or after January 12, 1951, notwithstanding the fact that State funds therefor were obligated or expended prior to approval by the Administrator, if such programs or projects have been approved by the Administrator subsequent to that date."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there was testimony in the committee hearings relative to this matter, as to how far back it might be possible to go in matching funds. Counsel for the Administrator felt that they could definitely go back to January 12, which was the day when the law itself became effective.

The reason for the amendment is that a considerable number of the States have moved ahead with their civil-defense programs. It did not seem equitable that they should be penalized in matching funds for the specified equipment provided in subsection (i) of the act. If they were, the States which delayed action in order to see what, if anything, the Federal Government might do, would be the beneficiaries, while the States which had moved ahead would be penalized for having moved ahead. This amendment merely makes it clear that the Administrator is authorized to go back to January 12, provided the various States meet fully the specifications which the Administrator will outline. There are no funds involved in amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was on page 22, to strike out lines 9 to 20, inclusive, as follows:

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That of this amount $75,000,000 shall be available only for shelters and other protective facilities: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall not approve any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to call up my final amendment, lettered "D," dated May 1, 1951, on page 22. My amendment proposes to substitute for the language the committee recommends be stricken out the following:

PROTECTIVE FACILITIES

For financial contributions to the States for shelters and other protective facilities pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, 1950, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall not approve any program or project for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limits of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this is an important subject. I do not intend to take a great deal of the Senate's time, because the reason for the proposal I make can be stated very quickly.

The bill, as it came from the Appropriations Committee, provided no funds for this shelter program. It is quite true that no one should vote for the amendment with the conception that it would afford the American people adequate protection against atomic attack, because the fact of the matter is that the testimony shows that the cost of a program which would give a reasonable degree of adequacy of protection in the shelter development would exceed $300,000,000,000, which appears to be out of any reasonable hope of being reached in either the near or distant future. However, the facts indicate that the various States have been making some studies. Some work has been done on the program. In probably two-thirds of the States of the Union their legislatures are now in session.

We passed a bill which gave indication that there would be funds for shelter development. I must say in all frankness this would be only a drop in the bucket for any adequate shelter program. I personally think that a great deal of additional study needs to be made as to what, for example, might be done in strengthening basements of office buildings or of warehouses, to see whether it is possible to make use of existing facilities, or so to construct them or perhaps reinforce them as to make them suitable as shelters.

My only viewpoint is that the Congress of the United States should not throw a wet blanket over the shelter-development program, because certainly, in the event of an atomic attack a heavy responsibility will rest upon all Government officials, the executive branch and the legislative branch of the Government as well. This seems to me, at least, to furnish a sufficient amount of funds to go ahead with the program and do some experimenting in this field.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the Senator from California has given a great deal of thought and study to this subject. I ask him if he looks upon his amendment as a stepping stone toward a huge appropriation by the Federal Government for shelter programs for the Nation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would express my personal view to the Senator in this way, that I do not think anyone can give a categorical answer to just what the development of shelters should be. Certainly the testimony before the committee has indicated that it would require a fantastic amount of money to provide what is now considered to be any reasonable protection for the American people. I think the testimony indicates that more than $300,000,000,000 would be needed. That certainly does not seem within our reach in even the distant future. But I believe that with the amount which has been suggested, we could at least take the matter to conference and make whatever explanations

are necessary if called upon to do so, and we might develop a program, whereby, instead of providing the large centers which many persons are now thinking of, perhaps existing types of buildings and facilities could be used, after being reinforced. I think that would be a far more practical viewpoint of the situation, expressing merely my personal view of the matter.

Mr. BRIDGES. Who is going to determine where the money will be used? There are 48 States, and in every State there are probably persons living in certain cities and communities who feel that they are a possible atomic-bomb target.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My understanding of the law—and the Senator can correct me if I am mistaken—is that the basic law itself indicates that there are certain so-called defense areas. The Administrator, of course, has some discretionary authority, as he should have, and I assume that in the areas where the people feel they would be priority targets, they would make application to the Administrator, and then the Administrator, in working out the number of applications made, based on the priority target data which he would have available, would provide the funds on a matching basis. That is my understanding of the way it would operate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is an emergency appropriation, of course, for the next month and 20 days.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know whether there has yet been worked out the kind of shelter which is appropriate and which could be standardized? Would it not be better to study the question in the over-all 1952 appropriation bill so that we may arrive at a standard? Would not that be beneficial?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I do not know what the answer to the shelter program is. This amount, of course, does not have to be spent, under the terms of the bill, in this fiscal year.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But time is passing; the sands of time may be pretty well running out. We were put on notice in September of 1949 that the Soviet Union had exploded its first atomic weapon. I think it is a matter of public information that since that time Russia has been stockpiling X number of weapons. What that X may be is perhaps subject to some dispute. But it seems to me that every day that passes and every week that passes may be lost time which can never be regained. I would not want to see the program halt until the regular appropriation bill comes before us, and possibly lose 3 months which could never be recovered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are there any appropriations under the current deficiency bill that can be used for studying the program?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I understand there are funds which can be used for studying the program, but there are no funds which could be used for the actual matching where the States or localities have already put up funds to enable them to do some experimenting in this field.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that a complete program has not really been brought forth? The excuse is given that the States, since they have not been provided the funds, have not passed upon the program. But is not this going to be a Federal program, so that the matching, if done, will have to be done so as to satisfy the Federal authorities as to the kind of shelters and as to the places where they shall be built?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Federal authorities will have to establish certain specifications, and, quite properly, they will do so. But we are apt to be in a hopeless type of deadlock if the States say, "We will not go ahead because the Federal Congress has shown no interest in this shelter development"; and then we say, "We will not do anything until the States have gone ahead." We may find ourselves still arguing the point between the States and the Federal Government after the first atomic weapon has fallen upon the United States. That is a responsibility which I personally and as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, do not want to assume. No man is wise enough to say with certainty that tomorrow or a week from today or a month from today, or next year, this country may not be involved in hostilities with a first-class power. We all hope that will not happen, but certainly it seems to me that we have delayed too long in moving ahead with some kind of a sensible civil-defense program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator about starting forward with a sensible civil-defense program. The thing that scares me is that Governor Caldwell tells the Appropriations Committee that it will cost $300,000,000,000 for a full civil-defense shelter program. It involves such a tremendous amount of money that I do not think we have any comprehension of how much it means. While I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to study the best processes, I do not want to take any step that will lead the communities, the States, or the people to believe that the Federal Government is ready to start any $300,000,000,000 program which might, on top of everything else, ruin the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully agree with the Senator from New Hampshire, who has served as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and who, I think, as much as any Senator on the floor, has been alert to the dangers which could face us from overseas, both in world war III and in the so-called cold war through which we are now going.

I would not want anything I have said on the floor today to be interpreted as indicating that we should go ahead with any $300,000,000,000, $200,000,000,000, or $100,000,000,000 program. I think we must learn how to make use of some of the existing structures in our large cities, perhaps using basements and subbasements, as I previously stated, and possibly making provision for emergency exits from them. But it does seem to me that we should encourage the States and the Federal Government cooperatively to go ahead and try to work out some sensible program which the national economy can support.

While it is true that Mr. Caldwell and other persons testified to what I think is a very fantastic sum, I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire, though he is probably more familiar with the subject than I am, that if, for instance, it were proposed to make the radar defense and Air Force defense of the country so perfect that an absolute guaranty could be given that not a single enemy plane would get across the radar network, or, if they got across, would be shot down 100 percent by the Air Force, we would get a fantastic figure for the Air Force which might run into $200,000,000,000 or $300,000,000,000.

Therefore, as a practical matter we must draw a line of balance between what we should do as a matter of common sense and what the economy of the United States can afford. Weighing them together both in our military expenditures and in our civil defense expenditures I think we will have to find a rule of reason.

Therefore, I advocate this amount without any intention that it be considered a precedent for any such figure as has been mentioned by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is not the Senator's idea, as the author of the amendment, that it is to be considered as a prelude to any Federal appropriations for the actual construction of shelters? In other words, he does not look on it as the beginning or the prelude, or whatever it might be called, for Federal appropriations for the actual construction of shelters, whether the cost be $1, or $300,000,000,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from New Hampshire that as the author of the amendment I can give him the categorical answer that I certainly do not consider it to be an endorsement or a first step in any such program as mentioned in the $300,000,000,000 testimony before the committee. I would say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I would assume that with the $25,000,000 which would be provided, with some matching from the States, the States could perhaps start to develop some alternative types of shelters which would not entail that kind of vast expenditure, which I do not believe to be practical under all the circumstances.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the statement of facts which the Senator from California has presented, what he proposes is to be done within 2 months before the close of the present fiscal year.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Does not the Senator feel that whatever is done should be first considered by the full committee which is in charge of the matter?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to my good friend from Tennessee, who has for many years served as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and for whom I have very high regard, that my only reason for not wishing to wait is because, as a matter of fact, as he well knows, sometimes as between the House and the Senate the regular appropriation bills become tied up. I am sure that within his memory, and certainly within my much shorter memory, appropriation bills have gone far beyond the beginning of the fiscal year before being passed. Time may be a very important element I would not wish to say that even a month or 2 months might not be of tremendous importance at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe that an expenditure of such an enormous sum of money should be put into this bill. This is the third supplemental bill. We have had four appropriation bills along this line this year for defense purposes. Is it not too much to ask that the Senate should vote for it at this time? I am surprised that the Senator should want to vote for it himself.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say most respectfully to my colleague from Tennessee that I think it is unfortunate that the appropriation was not included in an earlier bill. I believe we have delayed too long. I hope with all my heart, as I know every other Member of the Senate does, that we may never have to put a single American in a shelter or any kind. I hope we may avoid a war. But we know that the one potential aggressor in the world today has the atomic weapon and that he has been stockpiling atomic weapons for 2 years. We have a very inflammatory situation in Korea. There are possibilities that overnight the situation may spread out. It seems to me that under the conditions in which the world now finds itself we should not delay even for a few months. They may be very important months.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that the House provided $80,000,000 for this item. Five million dollars of it was for so-called organizational equipment. In the Senate committee we made the figure $74,000,000. The appropriation for organizational equipment and other items has been increased to $75,000,000 by the Senator's previous amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The House appropriated $75,000,000 as a Federal contribution for building shelters. The Senate committee voted nothing for that purpose, but it was understood that the item of $75,000,000 for shelters and the item of $74,000,000 in the preceding paragraph which has now been raised to $75,000,000, would both go to conference. Therefore, it is possible to have up to $75,000,000 for organizational equipment, research, educational facilities, fire-fighting equipment, and other purposes, and $75,000,000 for building shelters.

The House in its report says:

> Sufficient information is available to enable a start to be made on a survey of existing facilities and where possible to strengthen them to serve as shelter areas.

The report goes on to say:

> When accurate standards for the construction of shelters are available, it can be implemented by additional appropriations. Up to the time of hearings no requests for cooperative improvement of facilities have been received.

If the amendment of the Senator from California prevails there will be a base of $25,000,000 available for Federal contribution for shelters, and a top of $75,000,000. If the Senator's amendment does not prevail there will be a top of $75,000,000 and a base of zero. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that is substantially correct. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has served as governor of his State and is familiar with the fact that many of our State legislatures meet biennially, that now legislatures are meeting in a number of States. When we come to the time of the regular appropriation bill being acted on, a good many of the legislatures will have adjourned. The Senate of the United States has the respect of the country. At least I hope and believe it has. If members of State legislatures believe that United States Senators who are more familiar with the grave dangers facing the country, feel that the program is not sufficiently important to make any appropriation for it, it may throw a wet blanket on the program in the various States. To me it would be a very damaging thing to do.

I have no personal interest in the matter. I have discussed it with Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Wadsworth. I happened to have the privilege on a number of occasions to see both Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and I went to the Nevada tests. I do have some appreciation, as I know other Senators have, too, of the tremendous force with which we are dealing. I most sincerely hope that Senators will at least show that they are sufficiently interested in the subject to give the program a start, and at least take the matter to conference, where, if any doubt should develop, it could be discussed with Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator has mentioned the fact that I served as Governor of my State. I was Governor during the war years. It has always seemed to me that the responsibility of the Federal Government was for guns, tanks, airplanes, ships, and so forth. The primary responsibility for civilian defense must be in the people themselves, at home in the States. The primary start must be made by the people at home. The Federal Government can and must contribute certain things, such as fire-fighting organizations, and that sort of thing. So far as shelters from atom-bomb blasts are concerned, we cannot get 100-percent protection, no matter what we do.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator at that point that I happen to have had some brief experience with civil defense before I went into the Army in World War II. I served as chairman of the Oakland Chapter of the American Red Cross, where we coordinated our efforts in civil defense. As the Senator realizes, however, the great factor which we have today which we did not have in World War II is the atomic weapon. We now know that the potential aggressor in the world has that weapon; and while we hope to be superior in this field, each day that passes, each month that passes, he is building up his stockpile. In order to encourage the States and the localities to move ahead on a program, and in order that we may not dampen their interest in what may be a very crucial thing in the defense of our country, I strongly recommend this appropriation.

Mr. President, I think I have said all I care to say on the subject. I submit the question to the Senate. I am ready for a vote.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In view of the amendment offered by the able Senator from California, I recognize that there is a definite need for research. There is a definite need to commence a program. We know that we could not in any sense give all the cities in every area of the United States adequate protection. However, we must be prepared to protect the strategic centers. If an atomic bomb should unfortunately strike one of our great war plants, it might wipe out all the skilled workers, all the mechanics, and all the tool makers. We might suffer a very drastic loss if a great war plant should be struck and we should lose all the mechanics, tool makers, and designers concentrated in that particular city or in that plant area. For that reason I believe that we must get under way with some type of study, research and planning which will protect our great industrial centers, where some of our most important war plants might be located. It is for that reason that I see a necessity for supporting the amendment offered by the able Senator from California.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I was called from the Chamber for a few minutes. I did not understand why the Senator, in offering his amendment, designed it so as to eliminate the item of $5,000,000 which the House proposed for communications.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I discussed that matter with Mr. Wadsworth and Governor Caldwell, and my information from them was that they felt that the funds which they otherwise have would be adequate, and that with regard to that feature, they could await the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask one further question. With respect to States whose legislatures are not in session, and in which there are strategic targets, will

they be foreclosed from receiving any allotments under this provision? The language limits the applications for funds to the amount of this appropriation, and to such shelters and protective facilities as can be completed within the limits of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match the contributions hereunder. Will States in which the legislatures are not in session find themselves without any protection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say frankly to the Senator that that is a situation which we would have regardless of what the amount might be. Some of the States may have been slower than others in moving ahead. Some may not have their legislatures in session for another year. However, I know of no other way to proceed. If a State has gone ahead individually and has set up its civil defense program, if it has a national defense area which might be a strategic target, and if it makes an application to the Administrator under the basic act, the Administrator must make allocations depending upon the applications.

Mr. CASE. So far as I can see, there would be nothing to prevent a State from calling a special session of its legislature. As a matter of practical operation, I am wondering if a State which had a strategic war plant and which wanted to take advantage of the provisions of the law, could not call a special session of the legislature. Would there be anything in the operating procedure which would prevent it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; but as the author of the amendment, I should hope that in any State where there was a strategic target area, the Administrator would very broadly conceive his duties, so far as he is allowed to do so under the law, so that the governor could be notified to make a prompt request, for example, which would be considered along with the others. I should hope that it would be possible to work out a solution to cover the situation mentioned by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the statement the Senator has made as a part of the consideration of this amendment, because two States come to my mind where there are strategic targets, and where the legislatures will not normally be in session before 1953.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the author of the amendment, I would certainly hope, and recommend, if there is any equitable arrangement that can be worked out by the Administrator, that he will try to meet that problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, which is referred to in this amendment. It was approved January 12, 1951. It is Public Law 920, of the Eighty-first Congress.

This particular amendment would cut to one-third the amount appropriated by the House language for the particular subject covered by this amendment. The House language provided $75,000,000 for this particular subject. This amendment would provide $25,000,000. It is tied in, of course, with the provision of protective facilities, pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. I think the record should show just exactly what subsection (i) provides, because it is very clear to me that it would not permit any program whatsoever, which was far-reaching, extensive, or wasteful to get under way.

While I am speaking of wastefulness, let me say that the Administrator who will handle this activity, Governor Caldwell, is as far from being wasteful as any person we could think of. He is Scotch in every sense of the word. I think he was chosen, among other reasons, for the reason that he is economical and prudent in the expenditure of public funds entrusted to him.

I read that part of subsection (i) which covers this particular activity: "*Provided further*, That financial contributions to the States for shelters and other protective facilities shall be determined by taking the amount of funds appropriated or available to the Administrator for such facilities in each fiscal year and apportioning same among the States in the ratio which the urban population of the critical target areas (as determined by the Administrator, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense) in each State, at the time of the determination, bears to the total urban population of the critical target areas of all of the States: *Provided further*, That the amounts authorized to be contributed by the Administrator to each State for such shelters and protective facilities shall be equally matched by such State from any source it determines is consistent with its laws and, if not matched within a reasonable time, the Administrator may reallocate same to other States on the formula outlined above: *Provided further*, That the value of any land contributed by any State or political subdivision thereof shall be excluded from the computation of the State share: *Provided further*, That the amounts paid to any State under this subsection shall be expended solely in carrying out the purposes set forth herein and in accordance with State civil defense programs or projects approved by the Administrator."

That means that the $25,000,000 would be available in case any State should decide to go ahead promptly in the furnishing of protective facilities at one of the extremely critical target areas, as determined by the Administrator, based upon the advice of the Secretary of Defense. It would mean that the Federal Government, and particularly the Civil Defense Administrator, would not be left helpless and without funds, to pay our part of that particular program, as already outlined in the bill, and which we have entrusted to the Civilian Defense Administrator to carry out.

I do not need to tell the Senate that $25,000,000 will not go far; but it would go a much shorter distance under the provisions of this bill, because the Administrator could not, if he wanted to, allocate it all to one State or to one project, or to one city. He is required to divide it in proportion to the urban population in all of the critical target areas as determined by the Administrator, based on the advice of the Secretary of Defense. That would mean, Mr. President, that in the event the city of New York, the city of San Francisco, the city of Detroit, the city of Chicago, or some other highly critical target area should want to furnish shelter for its most precious records or facilities or for personnel which it felt was most important to be safeguarded, or for any other reason which it felt necessary in order for it to continue to function in case of disaster to put up its own money and a site, because the site would have to be furnished in addition to the local 50 percent of the money, that the Administrator, within the small range which we would give him—that is, that State's part of the appropriation of $25,000,000—could match funds put up by the local or State agencies.

It seems to me the question is whether we meant what we said when we passed the act, and whether we meant what we said when we called in the very fine administrator, who was not asking for any public assignment at all, and his assistant, who happens to be from the other party, who was not asking for any public assignment, to ask them in a bipartisan way to seek to carry out this act which we passed for their guidance and for the safeguarding of the country.

Mr. President, realizing that many legislatures are in session, and that others can be called into session if there is any critical need in any State which does not now have its legislature in session, it seems to me that the least that the Congress can do, operating in good faith and standing back of the commitment which we have made and the offer we have made to the States under this particular subsection of the act which we passed, is to make available some funds out of which the Administrator can proceed to carry out that objective.

In closing, I want to remind the Senate that we have done somewhat the same thing by providing funds with which to build a shelter in this city, in connection with the White House. I am sure that was done in a bipartisan way, just as this program is bipartisan, because it was realized that there was a need, federally speaking, for the making of a shelter at that spot that would be proof against atomic attack.

If any of our great States, or cities, at the critical places which will have to be determined under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, find that something is as critical to them as is this small project in this city, reaching nearly to a million dollars in the District of Columbia, I think we should not withhold the helping hand we have extended to them by the passage of the act, by the inclusion of this particular provision.

I remind Senators again in closing that this is merely one-third of the amount sought to be appropriated and included in the House bill, and it seems to me the Senate should adopt the amendment, and show that we regard this as a serious subject matter, in which we want efforts of the States and cities to protect themselves and their critical installations and personnel to have the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

degree of Federal help which we have heretofore offered them.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, it is necessary to get to the bottom of these requests. Those who appeared on behalf of the Government simply had not themselves the information necessary to present to the committee. I have never seen any request for an appropriation before the Appropriations Committee since I have been a member of it with less information to support it than did this one. I will say for the Administrator, the former Governor of Florida, that he was frank in saying that they did not know what they were going to do with the money; that the committee would have to trust him as to how they spent it. He said that not only to the committee orally, but it appears in his justification. It is all that appears in the justification.

There are three pages which under our practice are supposed to go with every justification for an appropriation. On one of them there is supposed to be set forth the matter by projects, what the money is to be spent for. On another is supposed to be set forth the amount of personnel and the rates of pay, who they are, what they are, what particular type and class of work they do. The last page has to do with the items of expense. All three pages in connection with this request are blank.

Mr. President, the committee, as I followed it, did the only thing it could do in this case, unless the Congress is prepared to write a blank check to Mr. Caldwell for $25,000,000. There is no information as to how the money will be spent. He does not have the information. He has frankly said that studies need to be made that have not yet been made; that engineering examinations will have to be made which have not yet been made; that determinations will have to be made as to what is going to be built in the way of shelters, which determinations have not yet been made; that decisions will have to be made as to whether there will be shelters as such, or additions to existing buildings, decision which have not yet been made.

Mr. President, the committee recommended in connection with the bill what it thought were adequate funds for the Administrator to go forward and make his studies; have the preliminary work done, prepare for deliveries in the stockpile field for those things which could be secured in connection with the necessities that would arise in the case of bombing attack.

The committee provided as much funds as can now be used for the purchase of firefighting equipment to be distributed throughout the United States. That money is to be matched. I think I can speak for those who voted, as I did, against this item. We took the $1,750,000 appropriation of the House, which we felt should be increased in order that the organizational, the engineering effort, the research effort necessary if we are going to get any results from this program, might be carried forward. We deleted the money the House made available for shelters, for it was clear the money could not now be spent or pledged. Under the strict language of the law, Mr. President, at the present time there could be no grant of any of these funds to any State until the State has had its program approved by the Administrator, and until such approval was also met with sufficient money to pay dollar for dollar the money that might be granted by the Federal Government.

The same section (i) provides that if any other State which might have been a recipient of funds does not have the money and does not furnish it within a reasonable time, together with the necessary plans, and so forth, that the funds which might otherwise go to that State will be reallocated to provident States that have taken the required action.

Many of the State legislatures already have adjourned. What Mr. Caldwell will deem a reasonable time before he makes a reallocation with reference to the States, which have not finished this job—none of them has finished it—and which have not made their preparations, I do not know. If the State legislatures feel that they should not reconvene until they have before them a program on which they can act intelligently, then it might be the full period of time before the next meetings of the legislatures, which, of course, now are 2 years away.

In that event, will the money lie idle in the meantime? Shall we have made an appropriation without having a use for it?

Mr. President, I think the committee fully understands the dangers which confront the Nation in case of war. I believe the committee wishes to do everything it can do to give every possible protection to the civilian population. However, I take it that it is the duty of the committee to try to determine that those who are charged with the expenditure of funds will get a dollar's worth of value for each dollar they expend.

In this case the committee followed the practice it has always followed, namely, when application is made to it for the appropriation of funds, and when those who apply for the appropriation say, "We do not have our plans made, we do not have the engineering plans made, we do not know what we shall do with the money when it is appropriated; but give it to us, and we assure you we will do the best we can with it," then we do not recommend its appropriation, Mr. President.

If the situation were that this money could be used to advantage without any plans and if we could reasonably say that the result would be beneficial, I would say let us give them the $25,000,000 or even give them the staggering sum of $250,000,000, which would be ten times what they request. However, Mr. President, they could not use the $250,000,000 wisely; they could not use the $75,000,000 wisely; they could not use this lesser amount wisely. They must complete their studies and must know what they are doing before we can wisely provide them with these funds.

If we made the appropriations in the present circumstances, if we were to furnish the funds before the public servants were prepared to spend them intelligently, we would invite the type of hurry which would result in nothing being accomplished.

In my opinion, the best service we can render the people of the United States is to make this appropriation only if, as, and when those who are charged with the obligation of spending the funds have plans which the Congress itself can look at and can say that at least the plans have been reasonably worked out and are reasonably suited to carry out the purpose the Congress has in mind when it makes the appropriation.

So, Mr. President, I oppose the appropriation at this time.

I now call attention to what the Administrator himself has said in his justification of estimate. In it he sets forth the objectives of the program, and he very frankly says:

> The engineering profession is not yet able to provide Federal Civil Defense Administration with accurate criteria and standards for the construction of shelters. This is true of every country of which knowledge is available. Thus it is impossible to make an intelligent estimate of per capita cost.
>
> The multiplicity of types of buildings in critical target cities of the United States makes it impossible to set forth clear and comprehensive instructions for modifying or strengthening them to serve as shelter areas. No rule of thumb can apply to more than a very small percentage of buildings in the average American city. In most cases each building will have to be surveyed separately to ascertain what steps must be taken to convert it into an adequate shelter.
>
> A number of reasons make it doubtful that an extended program of new shelter construction—particularly for the single purpose of shelter—should be undertaken. Among these are lack of space in congested city areas, lack of time, and shortage of materials and manpower.

Mr. President, at this point I interpolate that here is a clear statement that the Administrator and those under him do not know even yet what kind of shelter should be built.

I continue the quotation, and I underscore and emphasize this part of it:

> Primary emphasis, therefore, must be placed on determining the types of buildings now feasible as shelters or within which shelter areas could be built. An amount has been included in the operations appropriation for surveys of structures in each of the critical target cities.

Mr. President, we have provided engineering funds in our recommended amount of $75,000,000. We have tried to get this program under way. We have tried to say to the Administrator, in the recommendation, "Get this job done insofar as planning is concerned. Determine what you are going to use the money for, before you divide it among the States. Let the States themselves know what they must do in order to get the money and in order to get adequate value for the money that is spent."

I continue the quotation:

> Also, there will be certain congested areas in critical target cities where adequate modification of existing structures will not be feasible. In these areas a limited program of new construction may be the only means of protecting the people. Research and test projects now being conducted—

I repeat it, Mr. President—

> Research and test projects now being conducted will give us more definite answers to

the problems posed by factors Nos. 2 and 3. Until then this Administration will not be able to spell out in every detail the exact purposes for which the needed sum will be spent, nor the exact date by which it may be obligated.

Mr. President, I say that until those data are available your committee cannot make an exact recommendation behind which it can stand, as I see it.

I now read the final statement in the justification of estimate:

Therefore, to activate a shelter program, certain funds must be allocated to this Administration without particularizing their use; but with the assurance of the Administrator that they will be expended only on projects in accordance with criteria and standards developed through research and test projects.

Mr. President, permit me to say that I have no doubt that the Administrator will do the best job he can do. I was very favorably impressed with the Administrator's honesty and integrity and his desire to make every dollar go as far as it can go; but I was not impressed with the case he could make under the existing circumstances. He did not make the kind of case which would justify our appropriating the money for a capital investment in safety, when the same amount of money, if withheld for a little while, might result in securing 10 times the value to the people of the United States.

Let us remember that this money will be spent only in target areas, in so many target cities in the United States. The money will not be spent in the smaller places or in the county seats and villages. The money will not be spent in the smaller cities; it will not be spent in many of the large cities. The money will be spent in the selected critical areas which the Army says might be targets. Before the money is spent there, let us be sure that it will do what we want it to do.

Let us spend all the money we need to spend now to educate the populace. Let us do everything we can do to help them prepare themselves; but let us not divide this money among the States, as a grant, when we have no information that the States themselves are prepared to expend it in intelligent safety protection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator has made a very persuasive statement. Let me inquire whether the Administrator gave the committee any idea of when the reports will be available from the engineers who are making the studies.

Mr. CORDON. None; he did not know.

Mr. CASE. Is it not obvious that the Congress will have before it within a reasonable time many additional or supplemental appropriation bills by means of which funds can be provided if the Administrator does come forward with some sound and specific recommendations?

Mr. CORDON. Of course, in connection with the regular appropriation bill which will be before us, for the fiscal year 1952, which will begin as of July 1 of this year, we shall have another opportunity to pass on this matter. The Administrator will have had a further opportunity to go over his entire problem and present it again, as far as that is concerned.

I say again that, as one member of the committee, I want to forward this program as rapidly as it can be done, and done intelligently. I do not want to waste money and, perhaps as a result, instead of increasing and building up enthusiasm and intelligent effort cause despondence and, in the end, utter waste.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to the statement which the Senator from Oregon has read from the justification, namely, that within the knowledge of the Administrator, none of these funds may be obligated now. This is a supplemental bill. It is a bill providing funds in the nature of a deficiency for this fiscal year, and it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations acted wisely in applying the rule that no appropriations should be made for the remainder of this fiscal year which the evidence does not show has to be spent during this year or has to be obligated. This money cannot be spent during this fiscal year, it cannot even be obligated, in all probability, and therefore it should not be allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment, proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on page 22, line 9. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. Is the committee amendment the amendment on page 22, to strike out lines 9 to 20, inclusive?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated:

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Defense Procurement Fund," on page 23, line 5, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 13, to strike out:

CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY FUND

For the "Civil Defense Emergency Fund," $100,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That said fund shall be available only in the event of a proclamation of a state of civil defense emergency as provided by section 301 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.) and shall be expended in accordance with the powers vested in the President and the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration by title III of said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XII—Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments", on page 24, line 9, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 25, and", and in line 11, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$1,999,045", and insert "$3,103,881."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XIII—General Provisions", on page 25, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that concludes all the committee amendments, except one, which was passed over. In view of the lateness of the hour, I think we had better arrange to take that amendment up tomorrow morning. I should now like to offer an amendment comprising two items. The amendment is offered at the request of the House of Representatives.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

For payment to Vera D. Buchanan, widow of Frank Buchanan, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500.

For payment to Maude F. Kee, widow of John Kee, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia, $12,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment passed over is on page 12, relative to the Federal Security Agency, Office of Education. We should like to have that go over until tomorrow, and take it up then. Action on it will complete the committee amendments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RESERVATION WITH RESPECT TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CONCERNING CERTAIN STATISTICS OF WAGES AND HOURS OF WORK—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has received a message from the President of the United States recommending an understanding to the convention (No. 63) adopted by the International Labor Conference held at Geneva June 2–22, 1938, concerning the statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture. The Chair is informed that the State Department has no objection to the removal of the ban of secrecy on the reservation to the convention. Therefore, in accordance with the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Chair lays before the Senate the understanding, Executive H, Eighty-second Congress, first session, just referred to, and without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the reservation together with the President's message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

On January 17, 1949, I transmitted to the Senate a convention (No. 63) concerning the statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-fourth session, Geneva, June 2–22, 1938. In my message transmitting the convention I requested that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification thereof, subject to an understanding that the convention shall apply only to the continental United States.

As a result of a reappraisal of the situation in regard to the territorial application of the convention, I now request that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification subject only to the understanding that the convention shall not apply to the Canal Zone until such time as extended thereto by proclamation of the President of the United States of America.

For the information of the Senate I transmit herewith the report of the Secretary of State with respect to this matter, together with a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1951.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Copy of letter from the Secretary of Labor.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

POSTMASTER AT TEXARKANA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur L. Jennings to be postmaster at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that this nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

OTHER POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 10, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 9 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

PATENT OFFICE

Arthur W. Crocker, of Maryland, to the position of Examiner in Chief on the Board of Appeals of the United States Patent Office.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, O5264, Army of the United States (major general, United States Army), for appointment as commander in chief, Far East, with the rank of general and as General in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 9 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Bill Cunningham, Jasper.
Mildred A. Kimbrel, Trinity.

COLORADO

George B. Peck, Jr., Estes Park.
Leslie E. Taylor, Hextun.
Kenneth M. Sloan, Hot Sulphur Springs.
Vance E. Neighbors, Longmont.
Carleton Hoffmeister, Rifle.

GEORGIA

William E. Boatwright, Rayle.

IDAHO

James W. Hann, Buhl.
Wyatt Dale Vining, Jerome.

ILLINOIS

Thomas Lester Webster, Apple River.
Louis F. Weller, Canton.
John J. O'Neill, Champaign.
Richard J. Schnell, Elgin.
Mary H. Landers, Grand Tower.
Clarence G. Sinn, Marissa.
Raymond T. Gavin, Maywood.
Neal W. Boddeker, Niota.
Guy H. Wharton, Nokomis.
Claybourne L. Hannan, Olmsted.
Grady O'Hair, Paris.
Robert E. Weaver, St. Joseph.
Guy Edlin, Sheffield.
John Eden Lee, Tamaroa.
Charles W. Thoele, Teutopolis.

IOWA

Earl E. Grinstead, Danville.
Eugene E. Stinn, Earling.
Charles E. Hinde, Early.
Clarence L. Suer, Otho.

KANSAS

Harold E. Kirmer, Spearville.

KENTUCKY

Ray A. Brafford, Gray.

MARYLAND

Josephine O. Harding, Berwyn.

MISSOURI

Michael B. Lee, Milan.

MONTANA

Roland Keith Taylor, Fairview.
Walter J. Maddock, Sunburst.

NEW YORK

William J. McGraw, De Witt.
John L. Hull, Findley Lake.
Robert L. Caves, North Rose.
William E. Fritts, Ovid.
Francis L. Jones, Penfield.
Leola P. Wagner, Silver Springs.

NORTH CAROLINA

Samuel L. Davis, West Jefferson.
Davis Francis Hill, Youngsville.

NORTH DAKOTA

Donald C. Fraser, Fargo.

OHIO

Stanley M. Bardon, Grafton.
Raphael J. Frangella, North Olmstead.
Chester R. Ralstin, Otway.

OKLAHOMA

Alice M. Farhar, Okeene.

PENNSYLVANIA

James A. Barkley, Latrobe.
Willis P. Kiehl, Mayport.
Wilbur A. Rehmyer, New Freedom.
Russell K. Detwiler, Creland.
Paul C. Klapp, Watsontown.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Willard F. Martin, Pukwana.

TENNESSEE

Carey Spence Nicely, Corryton.

TEXAS

Bruce W. Bray, Albany.
Mary E. Russell, Annona.
Joe L. Shelton, Brownfield.
Billy M. Wall, Nacogdoches.

VIRGINIA

Thomas G. Cunningham, Mount Vernon.

WISCONSIN

Marion C. Steinkraus, Abrams.
Frank J. Alberts, Berlin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, our Father, we rejoice that in our moments of prayer we may bring unto Thee our deepest longings and unburden ourselves to Thy listening ear and understanding heart.

Grant that we may be filled with a passionate yearning for a better and more brotherly world, a world in which all of man's God-given resources and energies shall be devoted and dedicated to Thy glory and the glorious task of developing and enriching the life of humanity.

Inspire us with an alertness and an insight that discerns and a willingness that gladly accepts the many opportunities for noble service which are continually coming to us.

We pray that the time may be hastened when the spirit of the Prince of Peace shall become regnant in the life of men and nations everywhere.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 139):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN KEE, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) entitled "An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper."

EMPLOYEES IN THE OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 224) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective May 1, 1951, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional basic compensation per annum to the following employees in the office of the majority leader:

1. Assistant clerk, at the rate of $200.
2. Stenographer, at the rate of $200.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAPANESE TRADE FAIR AT SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 253) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a formal resolution which has been passed on many occasions, and simply applies to imports to be exhibited at trade fairs. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. The joint resolution was introduced for the purpose of permitting the importation of goods to this country assigned to a corporate entity in the city of Seattle for the purpose of being shown at the Japanese Trade Fair from June 17 to July 3. It is the orthodox resolution that has been adopted many times, and was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, to be held at Seattle, Wash., from June 17 to July 3, 1951, inclusive, by the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the said trade fair, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said trade fair to sell within the area of the trade fair any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said trade fair under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1524).

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill (H. R. 3576) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 38, noes 5.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 63, answered "present" 1, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—312

Aandahl	Davis, Tenn.	Johnson
Adair	Davis, Wis.	Jonas
Addonizio	Dawson	Jones, Ala.
Albert	Deane	Jones, Mo.
Allen, Calif.	DeGraffenried	Jones,
Allen, Ill.	Delaney	Hamilton C.
Andersen,	Dempsey	Judd
H. Carl	Denny	Karsten, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Denton	Kean
Andresen,	Devereaux	Kearney
August H.	D'Ewart	Keating
Anfuso	Dollinger	Kelley, Pa.
Angell	Dolliver	Kelly, N.Y.
Arends	Donovan	Keogh
Aspinall	Doughton	Kerr
Auchincloss	Doyle	Kilburn
Ayres	Durham	Kilday
Bailey	Eaton	King
Baker	Eberharter	Kirwan
Bakewell	Elliott	Klein
Barrett	Ellsworth	Kluczynski
Bates, Ky.	Engle	Lane
Bates, Mass.	Evins	Lantaff
Battle	Feighan	Larcade
Beall	Fellows	LeCompte
Beamer	Fenton	Lesinski
Beckworth	Fernandez	Lind
Belcher	Fine	Lovre
Bender	Flood	Lucas
Bennett, Fla.	Forand	Lyle
Bennett, Mich.	Ford	McCarthy
Bentsen	Frazier	McConnell
Berry	Fugate	McCormack
Blackney	Fulton	McDonough
Blatnik	Furcolo	McGrath
Boggs, Del.	Gamble	McGuire
Boggs, La.	Garmatz	McKinnon
Bolling	Gary	McMillan
Bolton	George	McMullen
Bonner	Golden	McVey
Bosone	Goodwin	Machrowicz
Bow	Gore	Mack, Ill.
Boykin	Graham	Mack, Wash.
Bramblett	Granahan	Magee
Bray	Granger	Mahon
Breen	Green	Mansfield
Brehm	Greenwood	Marshall
Brownson	Gross	Martin, Iowa
Budge	Hagen	Martin, Mass.
Burdick	Hale	Mason
Burnside	Hall,	Meader
Burton	Edwin Arthur	Merrow
Bush	Halleck	Miller, Md.
Butler	Hand	Miller, Nebr.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hardy	Miller, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Wyo.	Mitchell
Camp	Hart	Morano
Canfield	Havenner	Morgan
Cannon	Hays, Ohio	Morris
Carnahan	Heffernan	Morton
Case	Heller	Multer
Celler	Herlong	Mumma
Chatham	Herter	Murdock
Chelf	Heselton	Murphy
Chenoweth	Hill	Nelson
Chiperfield	Hillings	Norblad
Chudoff	Hinshaw	O'Brien, Ill.
Church	Hoeven	O'Brien, Mich.
Clemente	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara
Cole, Kans.	Holifield	O'Konski
Combs	Holmes	O'Neill
Cooley	Hope	Ostertag
Corbett	Horan	O'Toole
Cotton	Howell	Patten
Coudert	Hull	Patterson
Crosser	Hunter	Perkins
Crumpacker	Jackson, Calif.	Phillips
Cunningham	James	Poage
Curtis, Mo.	Jarman	Polk
Curtis, Nebr.	Javits	Potter
Dague	Jensen	Poulson
Priest	Saylor	Tollefson
Prouty	Scott,	Towe
Quinn	Hugh D., Jr.	Trimble
Rabaut	Scudder	Van Pelt
Radwan	Seely-Brown	Van Zandt
Rains	Shafer	Vaughn
Ramsay	Sheehan	Vorys
Reams	Shelley	Vursell
Reece, Tenn.	Sheppard	Walter
Reed, Ill.	Sieminski	Watts
Rees, Kans.	Sikes	Welch
Rhodes	Simpson, Ill.	Werdel
Ribicoff	Simpson, Pa.	Wharton
Richards	Sittler	Wickersham
Riehlman	Smith, Wis.	Widnall
Roberts	Spence	Wier
Rodino	Springer	Wigglesworth
Rogers, Colo.	Staggers	Williams, N. Y.
Rogers, Mass.	Stefan	Willis
Rooney	Stigler	Wilson, Tex.
Roosevelt	Stockman	Withrow
Sabath	Talle	Yates
Sadlak	Thomas	Yorty
St. George	Thompson, Tex.	Zablocki
Sasscer	Thornberry	

NAYS—63

Abernethy	Grant	Rogers, Fla.
Allen, La.	Harden	Schwabe
Andrews	Harrison, Va.	Scrivner
Betts	Harvey	Secrest
Bishop	Hess	Smith, Kans.
Brooks	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Miss.
Brown, Ga.	Jenkins	Smith, Va.
Brown, Ohio	Jones,	Stanley
Bryson	Woodrow W.	Steed
Buffett	Lanham	Taber
Burleson	McCulloch	Tackett
Clevenger	McGregor	Teague
Colmer	Mills	Vail
Cooper	Murray, Tenn.	Weichel
Crawford	Nicholson	Wheeler
Davis, Ga.	Norrell	Whitten
Dondero	Pickett	Williams, Miss.
Elston	Preston	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Rankin	Winstead
Forrester	Redden	Wood, Idaho
Gathings	Regan	
Gossett	Riley	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Harris

NOT VOTING—56

Abbitt	Hays, Ark.	Rivers
Armstrong	Hébert	Robeson
Barden	Hedrick	Rogers, Tex.
Baring	Irving	Scott, Hardie
Buckley	Jackson, Wash.	Short
Busbey	Jenison	Sutton
Carlyle	Kearns	Taylor
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Thompson,
Cox	Kersten, Wis.	Mich.
Dingell	Latham	Velde
Donohue	Madden	Vinson
Dorn	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Fallon	Morrison	Wolcott
Fogarty	Moulder	Wolverton
Gavin	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Ga.
Gillette	Passman	Woodruff
Gordon	Patman	
Gregory	Philbin	
Gwinn	Powell	
Hall,	Price	
Leonard W.	Reed, N. Y.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Price for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Wolverton for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Short.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Philbin with Miss Thompson of Michigan.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is unavoidably detained and cannot be present today. Had he been present he would have voted "aye." I voted "no." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present," as I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENDING CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue throughout today, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and myself, and that at least the first paragraph of the bill be read before the Committee rises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would not like to leave in the minds of the membership that we do not intend to go along with the bill today if we can; I would like the Members to understand that if we can continue with the reading of the bill it is our intention to do so, provided all requests for time under general debate can be taken care of.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One further point, if the gentleman from Mississippi will permit: It is understood that the general debate shall be confined to things having to do with the bill and with agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct, too.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request under those unusual circumstances?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope as many as can will listen to the opening discussion of this bill, because I think it comes up at a time when we certainly should give every consideration to the problems which we try to meet through the Department of Agriculture.

I would like to preface my remarks by paying tribute to my colleagues on this committee. The gentleman from Oklahoma, BILL STIGLER, and the gentleman from Kentucky, JOE BATES, are two of the outstanding members of this House. They are vitally interested in agriculture and are able, sincere and above all, courageous and independent. The Republican members, the gentleman from Minnesota, CARL ANDERSEN, and the gentleman from Washington, WALT HORAN, are numbered among the leaders on the Republican side of the House of Representatives. We have joined in our efforts to do a good job in handling this problem of recommending to you this chapter on agriltural appropriations. In our work we have had the services of a fine administrative secretary, Ross Pope, serving his second year with our committee, and one of the ablest men in his field.

This bill includes direct annual appropriations of $720,157,433, loan funds for the Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration of $251,250,000 and administrative expense authorizations for the corporations of the Department of $18,954,000. The amount recommended for direct appropriation is $52,745,260 less than funds available for 1951 and $99,848,113 less than the estimates for 1942. The loan funds authorized are $193,250,000 less than amounts available for 1951 and $10,750,000 below the 1952 estimates, and administrative expense limitations are $1,530,000 below the authorizations for 1951 and $5,200,000 under the estimates for 1952.

In view of the fact that we are again in a period of defense prepardedness, it seems appropriate to compare the appriations and personnel provided for herein with those for the period just prior to World War II. The appropriations for the Department for each of the 3 years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount provided in 1941 was $1,543,000,000, more than twice the amount of $720,157,433 recommended in the 1952 bill.

This comparison has particular significance when it is realized that the 1952 funds cover many new activities such as the school-lunch program, the rural-telephone program, the farm-housing program, and the Research and Marketing Act, which were not in existence in 1941. It is also impressive in view of the increase of from 100 to 200 percent in the cost of most of the items required by the Department, the fact that legislation has increased salaries nearly 50 percent, and the fact that much of the work for which funds were made available during the last war by transfer from defense appropriations is being performed by the Department during the current emergency within its regular funds.

You will not find a comparable record in all the governmental departments. We are proud of that record. However, in my judgment the committee bill might well have provided more funds in some places and I am sure other individual Members have individual views with regard to some items.

In one short year, our subcommittee and the Department of Agriculture has had its problems completely reversed. One year ago we were troubled with surpluses, what to do with them, and how should they be handled so as not to start our Nation on the downward spiral of inflation, agriculture pulling everything down with it as happened before. At that time, in speaking of the Commodity Credit operations, I stated that these surpluses could be a blessing in time of peace and a lifesaver in time of war.

We deplore the tragedy of war but we are thankful for the supplies of many commodities we have had on hand. Except for such supplies we would have been many times worse off than we are. Today with regard to most commodities we have the greatest production in history. Yet, with the increased demand we find we need even more. Today we are facing real war with threats of an even larger one. Millions of our boys are in the service and millions more are to follow.

This Congress will support military appropriations almost without question, even though many times questions should be raised as to whether a large part of the funds really reach the objective. I would like to point out that we are also dependent upon agricultural production to feed those troops, to provide food, clothing, and shelter for our civilian population, and, yes, for use in our foreign policy.

Farmers have been requested to greatly expand their production. This expanded production calls for increases in 1951 over 1950 of 10,000,000 acres of cotton—54-percent increase—5,600,000 acres of corn, 3,000,000 acres of wheat, and 300,000 acres of rice. Every evidence indicates that the farmer is responding wholeheartedly to this situation and is doing everything possible to assure abundant food supplies for the future. This committee is proud to be dealing with a segment of our economy which is making this significant contribution to the defense effort.

The committee is concerned somewhat, however, lest this patriotic effort result in serious damage to the position of the average farmer throughout the country. The farmer is not only depleting the fertility of the soil as a result of such intensive cultivation, but is also endangering the selling price of his commodities through the large expansion in production which in a short time might result in surpluses.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In connection with the statement just made that we are asking the farmers to grow 3,000,000 acres more of food, will the gentleman explain to the House or to the committee the increase of $38,000,000 for the removal of surplus agricultural products?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no such increase in the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Over 1951 there is.

Mr. WHITTEN. Section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides that 30 percent of the import duties are set aside for the handling of surplus commodities and to promote new uses thereof. The figure the gentleman refers to is an estimate of how much the 30 percent of the import duties on commodities coming into this country will be.

Mr. DONDERO. It is confusing and deceiving to read.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is confusing, but it is an estimate of what 30 percent of the import duties will be in a given year, and it varies from year to year. That, too, is one of the problems we face.

Mr. Chairman, there is no pride of authorship here. I do not own the Department of Agriculture and I think my handling of this bill through the years has indicated that the Department does not own me. But I have worked for about 8 years on this committee, and this year we worked about 4 months on this bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. We are proud of the record that that Department—and our committee has had a small part in it—has made in holding down public expenditures and certainly we need to hold them down. As pointed out earlier, for the 3 years preceding the last war the general appropriations for the Department of Agriculture were in excess of a billion dollars. In 1941 the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture were $1,500,000,000. In this bill we have less than half that amount, $720,000,000.

I have seen this House in the last few weeks vote for economy measures many times. I, too, am for economy; but I want to point out to you that we have an economical bill here today. If you will check the records of this Department in the last 10 years you will find that the personnel has been reduced from 108,000 to 70,000. I may say to you also that the funds we recommend in this bill, notwithstanding the problems agriculture is faced with, provide for a further reduction of about 4,000 people in the Department, and 6,000 persons connected with the county committees, who are not considered as Federal employees.

The point that I desire to make to you at this time is you have a bill before you that the committee, acting in its best judgment after months and months of hearings, has produced wherein we have gone as far as we can afford to go under present conditions. We have a serious task in this country if we are to have increased production. Let us look at what the farmers are called upon to do in regard to meeting national defense problems as compared with other segments of our economy. In regard to the basic commodities, the farmer is assured 90 percent of parity. I would like to point out that parity never was and never has been a definition of a fair price. Parity was created by the Congress in an effort to set a floor under

Digitized by the Internet Archive

certain basic commodities so that the bottom would not fall out of those prices. Ninety percent of parity is similar to the 75-cent minium wage, which is not accepted by labor as being a fair wage but as the floor. Average wages in this country run about $1.25.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Congress should know that most of the agricultural activities are exempted from the provisions of the 75-cent minimum. I think the gentleman is unfair in regard to his statement about labor.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the gentleman misunderstood me, or I hope he did, because certainly this is not an attack on the gentleman's views at all. I merely say that the minimum wage is not the average wage, but is a floor, and that 90 percent of parity for farm production is very similar to it. The average wage runs about $1.25, and if the price of agricultural products were on a comparative basis, it would be substantially above parity.

Now, in regard to this increase in commodities: For whose benefit are we increasing the supply of cotton, the supply of corn, the supply of wheat, the supply of rice? These huge quantities of these commodities that the farmers are being called upon to build up if the present emergency should end tomorrow—and God knows we hope that peace will soon be here—would be a depressing influence on the price of every commodity that would be involved, and yet we ask the farmers under those conditions to do that, and I am proud to say that in their patriotism, so far as we can find out, they are going the whole way in their efforts to meet these production demands, despite difficulties.

Did you ever try to run a dairy when you had about half enough labor, or to increase your cotton acreage when most of your boys had gone into the service and when you could not get an adequate number of tractors and other things that it takes to operate a farm? It is hard to keep production at the present level, much less increase it.

I just finished hearings a few weeks ago on a special committee dealing with the national defense production. Do you know how we handled this problem for industry? We provide for Government loans to enlarge the operation of factories. We provide that the factory can depreciate in 5 years the entire initial cost. We provide firm contracts where the Government takes at cost, plus a reasonable profit, the output of such a factory. This is no complaint at that, but it is to point out to you the differences that exist between what we call on the various segments of our economy to do.

Now you may say that this increased production is for the farmer's benefit. I tried to show you that he is not guaranteed under the price control law even the cost of production. The Price Control Administrator can fix the price without regard to cost under the law. Parity is fixed without regard to what it may have cost him. No; this increase that we are asking the farmer to make is largely for the benefit of the consumers of this Nation; you and me. The farmer is going to grow enough of these commodities for his own use, but we are the ones that are dependent upon the amount that is over and beyond what the farmer grows to meet his own need. We all have an interest in the Department of Agriculture. You may say that the Department of Agriculture is for the benefit of the farmers, and goodness knows that they do render to the farmer real benefits. But the prime benefits there, the major benefits, go to the consuming public which is dependent upon the amount of agricultural production.

The committee is proud of American agriculture and of the farmer. We are proud of the work that has been done by the Department of Agriculture and the benefits of which flow through the farmer to the Nation. We know the complaint that is made of the high cost of many things, including farm products. A study, however, shows that the amount paid to the farmer out of the average income has not increased anything like proportionately to increases that have gone to transportation and processing and handling of farmers' products after they leave the farmers' hands. It once was that about all the farmer had to have to farm was the land, a few buildings, a few animals, and inexpensive farm equipment. In fact in 1907 on a survey in New York State it was found that about 74 percent of the farmers' investment was the land, and only 26 percent improvements. The cost of making the crop was reasonable and in fact it would have taken the farmer approximately 9½ years for the expense of operations to equal his investment in the farm. That picture has now changed and farming has become a much more hazardous occupation notwithstanding increased rates for the farm products. In a survey in the same area in 1947 it was found that the farm investment was only 45 percent land and 55 percent improvements and that the cost of operations would equal the value of the farm in a little over 2 years. In other words, now a farmer can lose his farm at least three or four times as quickly as back in 1907. In the period 1907 to 1947 the income on the farm increased nine times. But the expense of operation increased 14 times. These facts are mentioned not to justify any needless expenditure on the part of the Department of Agriculture. But there are many things that are done by the Department of Agriculture which are vital to all.

What part does the Department of Agriculture play in connection with farming in this country? If the cattle that we have in this country today were the kind that our forefathers had more than 50 years ago, we would not have half as much meat as we now have. If the dairy animals of this country were the kind we had 50 years ago we would not have half as much milk and butter as we now have. If the poultry were the same as we had about 50 years ago, we would not have half the egg production. These things are accepted and taken for granted even by the farmer, but if you will check behind it you will find that the year-by-year research on the part of the Department of Agriculture is behind most of this improvement. Much research has been carried forward by private people, but most of the improvement is due to the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

From time to time we have brought into this country insects and diseases from foreign countries. We have to have an Inspection Service to control the imports and to inspect planes and ships and other things that come in here. The record showed last year that one out of every four inspected brought in something that would have been harmful to the supplies of the various commodities we have in this country, and would have wrecked the farmers that were engaged in farming that particular type of product. It would also have wrecked the rest of us who are dependent upon the production of those farmers.

We have seen what this thing will do in regard to the hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico, where it literally destroyed hundreds of thousands of animals. We have had two or three outbreaks of it in this country.

Many years ago we had the barberry bush which was brought in here from Japan, I believe. We have had a constant effort to try to eradicate it since, because various types of wheat rust live on this barberry bush. Today we are losing millions and millions of dollars of wheat production because of rust which lives in these barberry bushes.

We have case after case where it is a continuing fight by the Department of Agriculture to maintain production. Next year we are asking the farmers and the Department to promote it. We are asking them to increase their output.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says with regard to agricultural research, as I feel our fundamental problems in agriculture are going to be solved on that basis. Does the gentleman feel that adequate funds are being appropriated here for agricultural research as such?

Mr. WHITTEN. Sometimes I wonder if there is enough money in the world to do all the things that need to be done, and I would have to say that about research. However, I would ask all of you, before you vote to reduce this bill further, to compare the figures in the bill with last year, with 10 years ago, and with any bill that has passed before you in this Congress. We have made reductions throughout this bill, some with regard to research.

With so many men being called into the Armed Forces and others into other defense work, we feel that there will to some extent be a shortage of trained personnel to carry on the basic research. In addition, a considerable part of research in the Department has to do with promoting new markets and seeking outlets for agricultural products. At a time like this, when there is a demand for everything the farmer grows, we feel that some of this work can be curtailed. Why seek outlets for surpluses you do

not have? It is along that line that we have made an average of about a 10-percent reduction in research funds. It does not come from any lack of confidence and belief in research.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN: I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question that the word "research" is a very popular word. We believe in it also. However, many of the items on research were some of the most difficult for the subcommittee to justify.

Mr. WHITTEN. They certainly are. I would like to take this occasion to say, after counseling with my friend, the gentleman from the State of Washington, a member of the subcommittee, the report does state that the committee intended the funds for the expansion of outlets be reduced by 50 percent. We do feel that a greater part of the reduction should be placed on the expansion of outlets due to these changed conditions, but we do feel that the Department should have some latitude in applying reductions to all projects under the appropriation within the total amount recommended.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would the gentleman explain the meaning of the language in the bill where it says, "Research on strategic and critical materials"? What is meant by that? Does that mean materials for war purposes, or does it mean critical foodstufis?

Mr. WHITTEN. In effect it means research for war purposes. In that connection we are carrying on most of this research at the request of the Munitions Board. We are carrying on certain rubber research projects and other projects like tanning, which is so essential to curing leather. We have lost our chestnut trees which used to be used for that purpose, and it is absolutely necessary to find some other source of material. We are also carrying on some research with regard to vegetable oils which are important to the military. Another project has to do with cordage, to work out some substitute for hemp.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman, in the course of his very interesting presentation, deal with the subject of conservation and use of agricultural land resources to which $256,500 is provided from this point of view. I have read a good deal, including a very interesting editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a paper in the farm area, about the fact that these conservation payments need not be made and the farmers will take care of their own problems if their income permits, and as their interests require.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will be glad to discuss that subject when we come to it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. On pages 50 and 51 are set forth the amounts of the notes which are authorized to be canceled, which are given by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury. The total of those notes, as the result of the International Wheat Agreement, and under the Commodity Credit Corporation generally, amounts to approximately $500,000,000. Is it a fair statement to say that that represents the losses in the Commodity Credit Corporation during the last year?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; that has given this committee a great deal of trouble. Unfortunately, one of the handiest tills in the Government is the Commodity Credit Corporation. Every time you want somebody to move in and handle something about which they have nothing to do, you say, "Let the Commodity Credit Corporation handle it and we will repay them." That was true of the consumers' subsidies during the war, and it has been true of many things. The Commodity Credit Corporation, for instance, has nothing in the world to do with the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, but administratively they were assigned the task of being the paymaster and meeting the obligations. The International Wheat Agreement, in my opinion, never has been an agricultural program. As to whether it is wise or unwise in connection with our foreign policy, each man can draw his own conclusion. But under the International Wheat Agreement we sell to foreign countries a great deal of wheat far below what it costs us to get it. That is what this money represents. The International Wheat Agreement was not voted on in the House. It was an agreement that was approved by the other body, but that is not a Commodity Credit Corportion operation. This wheat did not come from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks at all. They were directed to go out and buy the wheat and supply it for this International Wheat Agreement.

Mr. KEATING. Seventy-six million dollars of the amount I have spoken of is represented by that?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate of course what the gentleman says, but I do think, from the point of view of the taxpayers, that we ought to know what the actual amount is that they are being saddled with, and what the reason for it is.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have always gone to extreme lengths to set up the different operations separately so that that could be easily seen. I have done it for a number of reasons. There have been some complaints about its actual operation, but certainly they should not be saddled with this, where they are the administrative officers of the Government under some law that we have passed.

Mr. KEATING. Under this wheat agreement is it a fair statement to say that they purchased the wheat at a certain figure and then sold it at a lesser figure, and that the $76,000,000 represents the difference?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, but if they are permitted under the law to sell the wheat for what it is worth, they would make a considerable profit. However, they are bound by the international wheat agreement and the directions of Congress. If they were permitted to buy the wheat and resell it under the conditions we have had prevailing the last year, they would have made an enormous profit.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that. On the other item of $426,000,000, can the gentleman tell us what amount of that would be fairly attributable to losses as a result of the farm price-support program?

Mr. WHITTEN. I believe I would like to cover that as I come to it in my statement.

Mr. KEATING. I have two or three other questions. Would the gentleman prefer me to wait?

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me go ahead, if you will, and if I do not cover it in my general statement, I will take the time to do it.

We have many activities in the Department of Agriculture. For instance, we have the Rural Electrification Administration, under which the Government provides for Government loans to local cooperatives. This agency has one of the finest records you will find anywhere in the world. About 86 percent of the farmers today have electricity. That electricity and the lines which go to the farmers' houses is being paid for with interest. Less than three-tenths of 1 percent of those borrowers are as much as 30 days in arrears in repayment. Today, when those of us in our cities and those of us in Congress are dependent upon productivity and the production of farms, a big share of the production we are going to get comes from the fact that we have electricity on the farms. It works in connection with the dairy farming. It works in connection with poultry. It works in connection with many, many phases of agriculture.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. We had 86.3 percent of the farms of this country electrified on June 30, last. Today it is about 90 percent.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to have the gentleman's figures.

Through the Farmers Home Administration we have made it possible for many small farmers to become farm owners, whereby they could make a real contribution not only to the well-being of their families and its contribution to society as good citizens, but have enabled them to add to the national production of food, fiber, and clothing. The record of repayment here is excellent and collections exceed expenditures for each year we are now collecting more than we pay out.

We have provided for the Farm Credit Administration, which has kept a healthy credit structure and which has made it possible for farms to continue to operate in time when there was hardly any way for them to continue otherwise. This credit structure has had its effect upon interest rates and loan terms. It also has not lost any money for the Government, and now is largely farmer-owned with the notes of such farm credit

structure finding a ready market without any Government guaranty whatsoever.

It has proven so successful that it is operating now on a level that I think all of you can be justifiably proud of.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. I was impressed with what the gentleman said about the Farmers' Home Administration, and I note in the report that the committee has made a rather drastic reduction, but they say they do not believe this will impair the program. I, too, with the chairman, have been greatly impressed with the work of the Farmers' Home Administration under the capable leadership of Mr. Lasseter. Knowing that this program spreads out all over the country, I wonder if the gentleman would discuss a little more in detail that program.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the gentleman gets to that may I ask him a question?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice that the committee provides $100,000,000 for rural electrification, for the fiscal year beginning July 1. How much did the Rural Electrification Administration ask for?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Rural Electrification Administration asked for the $100,000,000; however, we followed the plan we have had in the past of permitting them to use additional money if that should be exhausted. The Budget, however, sent down a recommendation that the committee abolish the present formula of distribution which each State is entitled to certain amounts of whatever funds are made available. The committee could not see that at all. Certainly the formula was put in there so that all States would have an opportunity to share in the funds of this organization; and that being true we kept the formula, and in view of keeping the formula they will have the same formula they have today.

I will ask, Mr. Chairman, not to be interrupted for a few minutes in order that I may complete my presentation; then I shall be pleased to answer any questions as best I may.

With regard to the Farmers' Home Administration, the question has been raised here about reductions in the appropriation. Notwithstanding the fact that I have tried to point out the absolute essentiality of agriculture and agricultural production, we did recognize that in this time with a debt of $270,000,000,000 that we should make further reductions where possible, and we have tried to do that. There are many figures in here that we would like to have seen larger, based on the importance of the work. But first things must come first, and your committee has in my judgment made every cut that we could justify in view of the over-all demands upon this large segment of our economy at this time.

We have various control programs which have to be carried on in the Department of Agriculture. Periodically we have outbreaks of pink bollworm in the cotton areas of the South, and now, when the production of cotton is so essential, it is absolutely imperative that we do the best we can to keep down this pest. I am proud to say that in connection with that control program the people of the States have supplied nine-tenths of the funds and the Federal Government has only paid out one-tenth of the cost. We have control programs for the outbreak of other pests in connection with our forests; we have got to give attention to controlling those pests or our supply of lumber will get shorter and shorter. The same thing with regard to the grasshoppers in the West where migrations threaten to destroy field crops in that area. All this comes under this great Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

Questions have been asked here with regard to the operation of the soil-conservation program. You know, in times like this when taxes are high and debts are high and the demand for the tax dollar is so great, when the demands on the farmer himself are so tremendous because he has a shortage of labor and a shortage of capital, the natural thing is to let things go by the board. There are lots of farmers who feel that it is no longer essential to give any attention to soil conservation. However, if you check the records of this country, you will find you did not have one-tenth the attention paid to restoring and preserving the soil resources of this country until we started a Federal program. I could give you the figures to show that we have built millions and millions of terraces through this program; we have millions and millions and millions of ditches constructed through this program; we have many, many thousands of water pools in the pastures of this country built under this program; we could carry that further and show that about one-fifth of your livestock today is in existence because you made it possible to have more livestock on the pastures of this country.

But what I will tell you goes further than that. Because of this program and the publicity incident to it and the activities of those engaged in it, it has led the private individual to do the same thing on his own farm, which represents eight or ten times the amount of work done under this program.

I want to tell you something else, and I am as serious as I know how to be. To those who would condemn the soil conservation programs I would point out that practically every country that is in dire straits today has behind it a wasted soil. They have little on which to build in the way of natural resources. And as further evidence that our Nation recognizes its strength must rest upon its soil and natural resources we have through the ECA required many of these countries to spend hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of counterpart funds in soil conservation and reforestation and for other similar projects, the purpose of which is to bring back the soil so that people can have food, clothing, and shelter, and having those can begin to restore the standard of living and well-being of their nation. The last census disclosed that we have had an increase of approximately 19,000,000 people in 10 years. Thirty or forty years from now you can easily see that the needs of our own population are going to be greatly expanded. Whether we maintain our high standard of living depends largely upon whether or not we have given proper attention to our soil, which means that we must plow back into it a reasonable part of that which we take from it. That is what a factory would do, that is what any kind of plant would do—set aside a share of its earnings for the purpose of maintaining its plant on a sound basis. This we must do with regard to our soil.

In this bill we provide $256,500,000 for ACP payments. This is exactly the amount that was carried in the appropriation bill last year after the Presidential reduction. We are well aware that an announcement was made last year of a $285,000,000 program. In the opinion of the committee this was an absolute commitment on the part of the Government. It is a debt that is owed to the extent that farmers have carried out their part. It is believed, however, by a majority of the committee, from the experience of last year's reduced amount that the amount in this bill may meet the Government's obligation under the commitment made last year in the announced program. However, the committee is of the opinion that since this announcement was made that constitutes a firm obligation, and if the present appropriation should not be sufficient to carry out the Government's contract on which the farmers have acted that they be authorized to draw on the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay off any obligations connected with last year's announcement. In other words it is hoped that this reduction can be made without in any way failing to carry out the Government's part in any program that has been performed. But in the event we be in error about that we want it clearly understood that the committee recommendations are that this commitment be fully carried out because it is a direct obligation of the Government. The farmers have to put up their share of the cost which is practically the same as the Government's and in addition have given their labor, all on announcement of the Congress in the appropriation bill of last year.

The announcement carried in the bill for next year's program is fixed at $225,000,000. Quite frankly this is less than I would prefer for this program but the committee in its joint judgment has yielded to the pressures for governmental expenditures to be reduced. Numerous farm organizations have requested reductions in this program. Speaking for myself and several other members of the committee I feel that instead of reducing expenditures for soil conservation we could well spend time in studying the present programs to see if we cannot obtain greater conservation of our natural resources. With regard to the Soil Conservation Service the committee has not made any reduction but has gone along with the budget figure.

The reason for that is that under the recent reorganization act additional duties will be required of the Soil Conservation Service, and in addition there are close to 200 new districts which have been organized and which must be supplied with technical assistants from the over-all appropriation. It means that the personnel will have to be spread a little thinner and those of us who believe in real soil conservation are not too happy about this fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am just as disturbed as anybody here about the financial situation of this country. With a debt of $270,000,000,000 it is hard to conceive of any plan or program which will pull us out, any workable program where we can ever handle that kind of a debt in a proper way. But I know that if there is any way of handling it, it is going to be based upon maintaining our soil fertility and the productive capacity of this great Nation of ours. You may say, "Well, do not point out China, Italy and these other countries to me; we are not going to let our country go down to where they let theirs go down insofar as productive capacity is concerned." But if you will check the record of this great Nation of ours, you will find that we have wasted more soil in a shorter period of time than either one of those countries.

I could talk on and on about this program. Let me say that in spite of the demands that are being made on agriculture, in spite of the fact that the Department has been assigned the task of helping to get this increased production, your subcommittee has reduced the appropriations by approximately 12 percent. We are willing to stand by those reductions because they came after careful study and months of hearings; they came from a committee that has given real thought and real effort to trying to determine what we should do in view of all the conditions facing us. But, if you reduce it still further I do not believe you can justify it, and I say that you are taking a real chance. Perhaps we are taking one in reducing it as much as we have.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to ask this question at this point, because I am in complete accord with what the gentleman says about soil conservation upon which the future of this country depends. But, I want him to make it abundantly clear, on page 32 of the report, that soil conservation, the top item on the page, is Soil Conservation Service, and that when the item under PMA for the conservation and use of agricultural land uses is referred to as soil conservation, that is not the essential soil conservation, but the other one is. There is a discussion, as you know, at the present time, about that subject.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. The gentleman raises a question there, and I get lots of telephone calls from people asking about one when they mean the other. But, the language which the gentleman from California uses as to which is essential and which is not, is a matter of judgment. To me they are one and the same insofar as the objective is concerned. Soil Conservation Service provides the technical planning for the farmer. The Production and Marketing Administration provides Federal contributions toward the cost of soil conservation practices. I say that planning is no good without practices. It follows that practices are little good without planning. So, they are part and parcel of the soil conservation program of the Government, and I think they are both essential. I think that is borne out by the record, because when the production payment contribution was drastically curtailed a few years ago, we found that it was reflected in soil conservation work.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I think the gentleman has made a very fine statement about the problem involved in soil conservation, and I thank him for it. I wonder if he would go one step further, and that is that no farmer would be given the benefit under any other farm program unless he did practice soil conservation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, of course, my saying so would not make it so.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know that I should go that far. I will say this, in regard to the Farmers' Home Administration and various other activities of the Government. It has been the effort of our committee to insist that they do fully utilize these great services. The point that we frequently overlook here is that these conservation activities are the generating forces that are responsible for about nine-tenths of soil-conservation work, and it is carried on by the people in this country without going through the conservation program.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of the fact that in his exhaustive and informative report, he does not comment on the item in line 13, on page 35, would the gentleman explain to the House just how the amount proposed to be appropriated there compares to last year's appropriation? Your report is silent on that item. Would you give us the information?

Mr. WHITTEN. That provides for payments to sugar producers as provided under the Sugar Act of 1948.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. May I say that I find on page 15 a paragraph giving the details of that.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I notice on page 26 of the bill under the heading "Cooperative range management" the committee has recommended $700,000 to be expended, but includes a proviso that undoubtedly is legislation that the funds should not be spent unless they were matched either by the State or some public body or private individual.

I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the fact that no person, no permitee, on a public range has any right. He is there only by sufferance, by lease. I am just wondering what the committee had in mind as to what public body and what individuals are going to match this fund in order to have the Government protect and improve its own property.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the gentleman's question and his problem. The story on this range improvement item is this:

The Federal Government owns the land. They lease it to the individual cattle or sheep grower for a fee. The folks who have run their cattle on there have insisted that the Government ought to—they call it "reseed," but in my country they call it "planting forage." I have never seen any obligation on the part of the farmer to plant forage. The Forest Service would like to do it, and they have always insisted on it. However, there is some merit to the fact that you could run more livestock in some instances if you did plant this forage crop.

The Forest Service, to my mind, has not been entirely fair with the committee. They have been collecting these grazing fees and paying them into the Treasury. From time to time I have asked them if it would not be wise to change the law so that they could retain some of those grazing fees for the purpose of reseeding. They have discussed that with me, as to whether we should change the law. About a year ago it developed that they have been doing it for 40 years, and the Comptroller General has ruled they have been doing it illegally. A bill was passed through the Congress to pay the States where the funds have been wrongfully withheld by the Forest Service. These States get 25 percent of the proceeds from the cattle running on the ranges, and they have gotten some of the benefits from having planted this forage on the ranges. The Budget approved a payment to those States of the amount of money which has been withheld and which might have been paid. We can either pay the States the amount of money they did not get from the 25 percent, or we can recognize it as an obligation and let them use it as matched funds.

The committee has advocated for several years, and has asked the legislative committee to pass legislation to set this up on a cooperative basis, so that we can have some yardstick to say how important this is. If the Federal Government pays it all it is hard to find a place in the country that does not want the work done. But if it could be put on a cooperative basis, then we could have some guide as to the merit of it, since they put up funds locally, that is a pretty good sign that there is something to it. It is along that line that we feel the States, and if not the States, the man who is running this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cattle there should share this responsibility of planting feedstuffs on the ranges. We cannot vouch for the accuracy of our opinion, but that is our opinion and those are the facts upon which it is based.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman. I think there is some reason for that, but to answer the gentleman's statement that he never heard of a landlord reseeding his pasture and furnishing feed, of course if he did not do that he would not have any pasture to rent. If there were no feed on the range, of course he would not be able to rent the range. That is the answer to the gentleman's statement. If there is no grass on the range, of course nobody would rent the pasture.

Mr. WHITTEN. I believe I used the word "obligation." I said I could not see where there is any obligation here. But I do think perhaps it is to the interest of the landlord and the man who is running his cattle there to work out a cooperative basis for providing this feed. That is what the committee is trying to do. The gentleman is correct; this is subject to a point of order. Of course, if the point of order is made to the last half, I would have to make a point of order against the first half of the provision.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Would it not be better for the Government to charge enough rent for the land so that it would have the funds with which to reseed the area?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, if we get into this question of fees, that is perhaps true. Another way to work it out may be to have a smaller fee and let him do his own reseeding. In other words, there are a hundred ways to handle it. This happens to be the way the committee thought would probably be the best because it provides for joint contributions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the renter of the range could have it for a long enough period of time, then it would be worth his while, and if the fee is made low enough, to go ahead and reseed the range.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no reason why they could not reach that agreement.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say I think the subcommittee has done a remarkably fine piece of work on a very difficult bill. I would like to ask a question with reference to the development of the amount the committee has inserted in the bill for administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have studied the hearings and the data in the hearings, as well as the latest report of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I realize how difficult it is to arrive at any figure, since the information is not current. But I do not know from the report itself how it is that even though the committee felt $5,200,000 should be cut from the budget estimate, how it was they arrived at $15,000,000, for instance, in contrast to $13,000,000 or $14,000,000. I wonder if the gentleman could give us some information on that?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman has had a great deal of experience in the Congress, and he certainly does not expect me to say that these figures are inviolate. Of course, I cannot say that, and there is no way to say that it should not be $14,999,999. It is an approximation based upon the testimony and the volume of business which the Commodity Credit Corporation has. As to how much of that money should be spent, it depends upon the volume of work which they will have. But, as I have pointed out, we are actually demanding that the farmers double their production in many places. If we should have peace, almost overnight we will have many, many commodities in trouble, and we will have to look to the Commodity Credit Corporation for help. I think it would be very unwise to needlessly hamstring the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Further, this is not an appropriation, it is a limit and they should not spend a dime beyond that which is necessary to carry on the operations of the corporation.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. The point I had in mind, I would like to leave clear in the RECORD. I am addressing myself to this particular phase of the Commodity Credit Corporation operation, but I did develop hastily, and I hope I can develop it more thoroughly during the debate, the sharp decrease in holdings which the gentleman called to the attention of the committee several times. We have now, I think, some 15 items where there is a reduction from some six and a half million pounds from June 30, 1950, to 2,600,000 at the end of March. That is better than a 60-percent reduction. I wonder whether the committee was able to get any information as to the amount of reduction which could reflect itself in terms of elimination of storage costs and of personnel supervising the commodities, and so forth.

Mr. WHITTEN. All I can say in connection with that is that to move out a commodity does not end the work. Frequently the work starts when you move the commodity out as against when you hold it year after year. However, it is just a matter of trying to judge what limitation you should have in view of all the conditions. Within the $15,000,000 they should not spend $10,000,000 unless it is absolutely necessary. But I do not want to say that we have hamstrung them when we are dependent on the farmers to get production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question on the very thing he is discussing. We have a program under PMA and Commodity Credit Corporation encouraging the production of certain commodities through the removal of acreage quotas. We also have a situation where on those very commodities the Commodity Credit Corporation has an excess, as far as that particular commodity is concerned, the 1948 and 1949 crops, with the 1950 crop coming into their hands, more or less. In the 1950 crop we have a great quantity of off-grade products, tons of that commodity, which do not qualify under the Commodity Credit Corporation loan, which off-grade commodity is so much off grade that it is now proposed that the farmers destroy that off-grade quantity, but it is certainly in fine physical form for preservation for food. I have had long discussions, as late as this very morning, with the head of the grain division and the Production Marketing Administration, Mr. Kruse and Mr. Hill, and as of 10:30 or 11 o'clock this morning they told me emphatically that they know of no way that that food now on hand in the hands of the farmers can be preserved and protected from absolutely throwing it away, although we are seeking great increases of production of that particular thing.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly it would be tragic at this time to waste any food. On the other hand, you can see from the questions which have been asked today what kind of problem we would have setting up a Government program to invest Government money in off-grade grains and similar things. But there should be some program worked out to assist those farmers to put that into feed for animals or something of that kind. I think the Department ought to lend its full facilities in trying to work out some program to take care of that. I do not know of anything that can be done here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman agrees with what I have proposed this very day.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has mentioned the fact that they should not spend all their money if it is not necessary. Does the gentleman know of any agency in the Department of Agriculture, outside of the Commodity Exchange Authority, that does not spend all the money allocated to it?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Farmers' Home Administration will turn back about $800,000. They are carrying quite a number of vacant places on their staff. They found they could get by without them. There are several cases in the Department of Agriculture in which the Bureau of the Budget has withdrawn authority to spend money in connection with control programs. So there are examples. I say, be it to the credit of the Department, since such examples are unusual.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we should have more of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the Committee in referring to a subject which was taken up here only within the last week or 10

days, but in my view it is of sufficient importance that it ought to be further considered. When the Interior Department appropriation bill was before the House it contained a section providing that with respect to the salary or wage differential paid Federal employees in the Territories and possessions of the United States, that differential payment should no longer be made to persons recruited within the Territories and possessions but should go only to those who are hired within what is termed the continental United States. I very sincerely believe that that section ought to be deleted from the bill now before us as it was deleted from the Interior Department appropriation bill. It is identified as section 407 on page 55 of the present bill. Mr. Chairman, I believe the section is wrong as a matter of principle. I know it would cost the Government more money, not less. I say this because the differential today is based upon the cost of living in these areas outside the 48 States.

If an Alaskan, for example, finds himself after the enactment of this bill receiving 25 percent less pay for doing the same job as someone sitting at the desk next to him, who is recruited from the States, he is going to be obliged to quit that job and seek work elsewhere. He will not be able to live on his salary. What will be the consequence of that? What will happen is that someone will be recruited in the States to take his place. The Government will pay transportation costs for that new employee. There is no way of telling whether he will be satisfied with the living conditions in the particular Territory to which he is sent, whether he will like it there. He may quit and return to the States, and in turn someone else will have to be hired. Very obviously it is going to cost the Government more money.

I had hoped that this differential problem had been settled. In Alaska, of which I can speak with more knowledge, of course, there was a varying practice among the several departments of the Government prior to 1943 relating to the payment of a salary or wage differential. There was no unanimity of opinion whatever as to whether it was being paid with respect to the higher cost of living which might be found or whether it was in effect a recruitment device.

In 1943 the several departments of the Government, under, should I say, the sponsorship of the Civil Service Commission, reached an agreement to pay a differential of 25 percent in recognition of the higher cost of living. In 1948 that was written into law, in a section which appeared in the independent offices appropriation bill of that year, as amended. That law required the payment of the differential to be made under the terms of an Executive order to be promulgated by the President. I think it was in August or September of 1948 that the President issued Executive Order 10,000. Since that time the differential has been paid under the terms of that Executive order, as administered by the Civil Service Commission.

It ought to be emphasized that the differential in Alaska, and I am sure the same statement can be made with reference to Hawaii and Puerto Rico, ever since then has been based upon a higher cost of living in those Territories. Comparison is made between the Territories or the possessions and Washington, D. C. The Civil Service Commission is obligated under the terms of the Executive order to inquire from time to time into the cost of living in a particular area in which the differential is being paid, to see if it is at least 25 percent higher than in the District of Columbia.

The Independent Offices Act referred to prohibits the payment of a differential higher than 25 percent over the District of Columbia. That does not mean to say that a lesser differential cannot be paid. Not only can it be paid, but the Civil Service Commission is required to pay it, if the surveys of living costs reflect a cost of living higher than in the District of Columbia, but not reaching the 25 percent maximum. If the surveys indicate that the living costs are 7 percent higher, then the differential shall be 7 percent, and so on, between no differential at all, and 25 percent.

In reference to Alaska, we have some very recent figures which ought to have a bearing on this whole matter. Last fall a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee went north and subsequently the Department of Labor was asked to make a survey of living costs at Anchorage and Fairbanks, where most of the military work is being carried on at this time. Only last week were the results of that survey released, and that report shows that in February 1951 the cost of living in Anchorage, Alaska, was 40 percent higher than in Seattle, Washington. In Fairbanks it was 47 percent higher than in Seattle. In February 1951 the cost of living in Seattle was somewhat less than in Washington, D. C.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that under the terms of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1948 and the Executive order which followed from that act, every proper safeguard has been set up so that the Government shall not pay a higher differential than is warranted. A splendid illustration was given by the Department of the Interior to me only last week, as to how the enactment of that section of the appropriation bill would have cost the Government more money. In American Samoa and the Trust Territory the administration is being transferred, or has been transferred from the Navy Department to the Department of the Interior. It is intended that many of the employees shall be those who previously were with the Navy. If they are discharged there those people would receive 25 percent less than those recruited from the States. What is going to happen? Naturally they will come over to the United States for discharge and will be released from the Navy in the States and then will be recruited here and go back to American Samoa or the Trust Territory and the Government will be required to pay that tremendous additional cost of transportation.

Even more important, in my judgment far more important, is the fact that the enactment of section 407 in this bill now before us would be a discrimination, no less, against American citizens. It has been the announced policy of our Government to build up our Territories as rapidly as possible and to do everything we can to get people there who will want to stay there. That is especially true in Alaska. The enactment of this provision would militate against that policy and there would be discouragement to those who are citizens of the Territory and at the same time toward American citizens. I have not noted any proposal that those who are residents of a Territory pay less income tax. The proposal has only run the other way.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I hope to offer one or more amendments in respect to this section and I hope one of those amendments will be adopted.

I should like to include with my remarks a very excellent statement on this general situation which was written especially in connection with the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, but which applies in many ways to this bill. This was written by Mr. J. T. Petrich, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees local at Juneau, Alaska:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
LOCAL NO. 251,
Juneau, Alaska, May 1, 1951.

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAMSPECK: Section 112 of H. R. 3790, Interior Department appropriation bill, which was reported to the House April 20, proposes that the cost-of-living allowance be limited to persons recruited in continental United States, and that it be denied to resident Alaskans.

Juneau Local No. 251, NFFE, strongly protests this proposal for the following reasons:

1. It is grossly unfair to resident Alaskans.
2. It will seriously interfere with efficient operation of all Federal agencies in Alaska.
3. It will increase the cost of operation of Federal agencies in Alaska.
4. It will seriously hamper the defense effort in this critical area.

1. It is grossly unfair to resident Alaskans:

Denial of the cost-of-living allowance to resident Alaskans implies that there is a difference in living habits and living costs between them and employees recruited in the States. This is not true in Alaska. Both groups shop in the same stores, eat the same kinds of food, live under the same housing conditions, buy the same kinds of clothing, and participate in the same types of recreational activities outside the office. There is no discernible difference between the two groups. This is not surprising, since the great majority of Federal employees hired as Alaska residents, came from continental United States and received their education there.

Under the proposal in section 112, two equally competent stenographers could be working at the same grade, living together, and sharing expenses. If one had waited State-side until offered employment in Alaska by a Federal agency, she would have been brought to the Territory at Federal expense and would receive a 25-percent cost-of-living allowance. If the other girl had been an Alaska resident or had paid her own way to Alaska seeking employment, she would not receive the cost-of-living allowance. Such a situation would be manifestly unfair, and would without doubt, impel the latter to seek employment with a firm whose policy was to treat all employees with equal justice.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN LIBRARIES

The cost-of-living allowance is designed to offset the higher cost of living in Alaska in comparison with those in Washington, D. C., up to a 25-percent maximum. All realistic cost-of-living studies made during the last 10 years have demonstrated that the cost of living in southeastern Alaska (the least expensive section) is at least 25 percent above that in Washington, D. C. In more isolated parts of the Territory the difference increases to 40 percent, or above. These conclusions were recognized as valid by the Civil Service Commission when, following the instruction in E. O. 10,000, it established the Alaska cost-of-living allowance at the maximum, 25 percent.

It must also be pointed out that the 25-percent-cost-of-living allowance in Alaska is subject to both Federal and Territorial income taxes, and is consequently reduced to an actual allowance of less than 20 percent.

Obviously, there is no reasonable basis for such discriminatory action.

2. It will seriously interfere with efficient operation of all Federal agencies in Alaska.

A policy such as is contemplated by section 112 will cause a complete breakdown of employee morale and will immeasureably complicate recruiting problems which are already serious.

We shall find employees with equal skill, working side by side at the same grade of position, one receiving 25 percent more income than the other. We shall find supervisors receiving smaller salaries than those working under them. Such situations will prove intolerable and will result in dissatisfied workers and immediate loss to the Federal Government of many experienced and capable employees.

If the cost-of-living allowance is eliminated for employees recruited in Alaska, there will be a general exodus from the Federal agencies of employees affected. The following data from Interior Department agencies in Alaska indicate how widespread and serious such an exodus could be which would apply percentagewise to other Federal agencies in Alaska:

Agency	Total regular employees	Recruited state-side	Recruited Alaska	
				Percent
Office of Indian Affairs	882	330	552	60
Fish and Wildlife Service	154	59	95	62
Alaska Public Works	21	17	4	19
Alaska Road Commission	231	166	65	28
Bureau of Mines				25
Bureau of Reclamation				37

These percentages will rise with the opening of the summer season, during which the programs of most agencies expand sharply and employ large numbers of resident Alaskans. The loss of employees who were recruited in Alaska, plus the inability of the Federal agencies to secure new local employees in competition with other industry, will more than cripple them. In many instances they will simply be unable to function until new employees can be recruited from State-side and trained.

Salaries of Federal employees in Alaska even including the 25 percent cost-of-living allowance, are lower than salaries in private industry. For example, an inexperienced graduate engineer working for a Federal agency can be paid $1.86 per hour (GS-5). If he has worked summers and gained some experience he can be started at $2.30 per hour (GS-7). This same college graduate can work for a contractor on one of the road jobs in interior Alaska as driver of a pick-up truck and receive a minimum of $2.87 per hour. Drivers of larger trucks receive a minimum of $3.32 per hour. Also, employees for private contractors work many more hours per week than are permitted Federal employees, and at overtime rates, increasing the disparity between the earnings.

Wages for clerical employees under the Alaska merit system are at higher rates than for Federal employees on comparable work.

A GS-4 clerk-stenographer in the Federal service starts at $1.75 per hour including the 25 percent cost-of-living allowance. A Territorial employee in a comparable position under the merit system starts at $1.88 per hour in southeastern Alaska, and at $2.06 per hour in interior Alaska.

At the present time, many Federal employees are staying on their jobs because they are looking forward to a general increase in salaries, which have lagged far behind the increase in living costs. Should section 112 remain in H. R. 3790, and also be made a part of other appropriation acts, it will mean that such employees will promptly seek other employment where wages are more attractive. Furthermore, should the prohibition against filling more than 25 percent of vacancies be retained in the law, the situation will be hopeless.

3. It will increase the cost of operation of Federal agencies in Alaska.

As pointed out above, eliminating the cost-of-living allowance for resident Alaskans will without question, result in an exodus of resident Alaskans from the Federal service because (a) they realize the utter unfairness of it, and (b) job opportunities outside the Federal service at equal or better pay are plentiful. Such an exodus of resident Alaskans will increase costs as follows:

(a) Recruiting replacements: Replacements will have to be obtained State-side. The Federal Government pays the cost of transporting a new employee and his dependents and their household goods from the point of hire in the States to the job in Alaska. This may cost $2,000 or more for an employee with a family. In addition, each such employee is guaranteed return transportation if he remains on the job for a specified period of 1 to 3 years. These costs are saved when resident Alaskans are hired.

(b) Training: All new employees replacing resident Alaskans will have to be trained. On most jobs it will be from several months to 2 years before they can be as proficient as employees they have replaced.

(c) Turn-over: A high percentage of employees from the States return to the States as soon as their 1- to 3-year contract is fulfilled because they dislike the weather, isolation, hardships, or for some other reason. Many leave even before their contracts are fulfilled. The result will be a higher rate of turn-over which in turn results in additional expense for recruitment and training. Turn-over even under present conditions has been as high as 100 percent per year. Adoption of section 112 will increase it substantially. Federal agencies have therefore recruited locally whenever qualified applicants were available.

4. It will hamper the defense effort in this critical area.

Classified civilian employees are key personnel in many Federal agencies providing services essential for defense. Examples of such essential services include construction and maintenance of key roads and highways, docks, airfields, and other facilities, and fire protection of wild land and military facilities. Action such as contemplated in section 112 will completely disrupt those agencies and severely damage the defense program. It should be borne in mind that the field working season is short, lasting only a few months. It is therefore doubly important that administrative hindrances like the provisions contained in section 112 should not prevail.

In summary, all who are acquainted with the facts as they actually exist clearly recognize the fallacy of a policy that would deprive resident Alaskans of the cost-of-living allowance. From the standpoint of good administration, it is completely indefensible to have two different compensation schedules for competent employees, doing the same work equally well, and living according to the same standards. Furthermore, it is manifestly in the best interests of the Federal Government to continue the cost-of-living allowance in Alaska to all Federal personnel, whether recruited in Alaska or State-side. In view thereof section 112 should, therefore, be eliminated.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. PETRICH,
President.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I think practically everyone understands the peculiar position of a member of the Committee on Appropriations. It is the nature of our Government that we have legislative committees to pass on general policy as regards the running of this Nation, and in this case the general policy that involves the operation of the Department of Agriculture. Those policies are turned over to the administration to administer. Our work comes the following year, after a policy has been inaugurated, to review the work of the Department with regard to whether or not the policy as written by Congress and by the legislative committees has been carried out.

My colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will be the next speaker on the minority side. He is the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I trust you will give him good attention because his talk will be to the point of the welfare of the American farmer.

We have had the pleasure of cooperating with the Committee on Agriculture in the House. They have conferred with us and we with them on many things we find in the bill and in the administration of the Department of Agriculture. I think we have made constructive progress in that.

Several things have come up already that show the need of the House Committee on Agriculture or the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to look into. One of those is the matter of the administration and the various fee charges and usages of our ranges in the United States. I trust that our subcommittee will be assisted with a policy that can be administered in the light of known facts and help to guide us in our future deliberations on the work in the Department of Agriculture.

The matter of wage differentials has come up with regard to our insular possessions and our Territories. Certainly there are many things that should be looked into by the proper committee of the House of Representatives. Of course, you will always run into the fact that legislation that has been passed by this House is going to involve us in many ways, in considering ways and means to hold down expenses. One of the glar-

ing things that the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and all members of the Committee on Appropriations ran into is the effect on the budget of the United States of the strict application of the 40-hour week. It catapults your appropriations and budgets for the various departments. It is unfortunate that in some categories where it would not be unfair and where it would be truly honest that some exceptions were not made in the application of that law. All of us who study these budgets have run into that. Of course, the wage differentials that affect our Territories and our possessions are affected by climate and by transportation and by many things. I hope that out of the debate today and tomorrow we will have found many reasons for further consideration of constructive, honest legislation which will verify or modify the existing legislation along that line.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Can the gentleman tell us how many witnesses the committee heard on the question of payment of wage differentials in the Territories?

Mr. HORAN. I think if you will look at the hearings you will find that that was discussed with the departments which were administering the laws which affect the Territories and insular possessions. I agree with the delegate from Hawaii that this ought to be looked into, but I also want to confirm the attitude and the statement of our subcommittee chairman that he hopes that the committees involved here will pay immediate attention to this and study the facts in the case.

When we report a bill we in effect are reporting to the Congress on how well the policies enacted by various committees have worked out, and to that extent it is a progress report. We are trying to point out some facts that we think ought to be brought to the attention of the Congress.

There is one other item in the bill that has disturbed me, and that is the matter of what might, in many ways, be fairly termed our agricultural intelligence service. We spent a lot of money on intelligence services and practically all of our departments have something that approximates intelligence services. In the Department of Agriculture one of the most important groups is one that I would say is an intelligence service within the Department of Agriculture, and I refer to the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. They ferret out very essential information from many difficult sources around the world. If you will turn to page 19 of the report you will find that the subcommittee saw fit to include this service among those which were not cut below the budget. We did that because in the language following the title on page 19 you will find that we reviewed the good work of the Foreign Agricultural Service, and on the basis of our studies and the evaluation of their good work we did not make a cut in the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. Earlier in the report, however, you will find a discussion of the Research and Marketing Act funds. I suppose you are familiar with the Research and Marketing Act funds; they are based upon a bill which was passed some 5 or 6 years ago by this Congress, reported out by the Committee on Agriculture, which were designed to cut down the costs, and the distance, and if possible to improve the quality, the shape, and the form of agricultural products between the farm to the consumer's table. Studies since then have pointed out some glaring things; they have pointed out the cost of transporting agricultural products from the farm to the table. A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture reported about a year ago that 50 percent of the consumer's dollar was attributable to deductions from that consumer's dollar, in New York City, to charges levied east of the Hudson River; and yet some people blame the farmer for all of the high costs of living. Research in marketing methods and distribution was suggested, and the House passed a bill which provided certain funds for research in these fields.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has referred to intelligence.

Mr. HORAN. I am going to get to that in just a minute.

Mr. STEFAN. If the membership of the committee will look through the various hearings on appropriations for the various agencies of Government they will find items of expense for intelligence. Most of that, however, is not intelligence, as the public really knows it; I think that is a misnomer. Most of it is a matter of evaluation.

Mr. HORAN. I appreciate that. The men in OFAR evaluate agricultural information from many sources abroad and make it available at home.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, regarding that Hudson River proposition, I recently received a letter with reference to the high cost of living to the consumers in New York. It has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that if the farmer gave away every bit of food and received not one cent for it, it would still cost the people of New York 76 to 80 percent of what they have been paying for the things that are brought from the farm.

Mr. HORAN. The biggest part of his food dollar is for things he cannot eat.

Mr. STEFAN. In reference to foreign countries, may I say that I just received a bulletin from ECA, Bulletin No. 2216—I think every member of the gentleman's committee should get a copy of it because it is available to them—which is an announcement by the ECA they are spending $325,000 to buy fertilizer from the Russians to ship to the Philippine Islands for the rehabilitation program in the Philippines. Part of that is the $15,000,000 which ECA took from Europe and transferred over to the Philippines, a very worthy program. But I was amazed that they are going to spend a quarter of a million dollars to buy fertilizer from the Russians in the Russian zone of Germany to ship to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HORAN. There again the subcommittee on appropriations that handles ECA funds will bring out a bill one of these days which will give all of you Members who have definite opinions on that sort of thing an opportunity to express yourselves and to work the will of the Congress in modifying certain of those things.

When the bill covering research and marketing funds went to the other body, certain modifications were made in it and in its first years of operations the Research and Marketing Act funds became almost a treasury grab bag on the part of the States. I was a member of the subcommittee when we reviewed the work and the allotments so far as research and marketing funds were concerned. We were disturbed and we dug into the matter. We had the Research and Marketing Administrator before us five or six times. We have done an enormous amount of work on that fund since then trying, as we saw it, to make the administration of it be confined to what the Committee on Agriculture especially of the House of Representatives had in mind when the Congress passed the original bill. Why, they had expanded certain of our bureaus in the Department of Agriculture almost twice. People who were under civil service were by this transfer of funds from the grab bag appropriation used to expand operations under the one phrase in the bill that they should make use of existing agencies. This disturbed us and we have called for repeated revisions and modifications of the act. With the Department we have reviewed the language of the act and I want to say that we have made great improvement. I am more satisfied with the act than I was, although I am not completely satisfied yet. We are transferring entirely too many funds from an appropriation made under the guise of research in marketing.

Now to get back to this foreign agricultural service which this committee thinks highly of. In the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is a group of men who have the respect of all of the industries with whom they come in contact. They are the intelligence service I spoke of; their knowledge and evaluations are much sought after by our domestic producers. They are called commodity specialists. Many of them have lived abroad for years and make periodic trips back home to talk to those producers who are interested to know what is going on in other countries and what the impact of production or lack of production in other countries might be. They provide much intimate knowledge of foreign markets. They are paid for not by the appropriation labeled "Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations," where they should be paid for; they are paid for by a transfer of funds from Research and Marketing Act appropriations. It is not right and it should be corrected.

The committee, in the report, included language which the circumstances of the day appear to indicate to us to be warranted. The very able speech of our subcommittee chairman, I think, outlines the reasons for many of the statements in this bill. He told you, as he began his speech this afternoon—and I think

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

he outlined the work of the Department and our work on the subcommittee very well—that the times had changed since last year. Last year we faced the possibility of a surplus and this year we face the possibility, we face the actual circumstance, of shortages in many particulars. So we felt that in some of these lines of activity, in view of the manpower shortage and the need of dedicating all of our time and all of the Nation's funds directly to the war effort, that we could make certain reductions in certain of these items. The committee did make a reduction in the item from which this commodity specialists service is paid. The committee said, in the report, that in some fields these Research and Marketing Act expenditures could be reduced by 50 percent. The chairman has already said that he feels that that 50 percent, the exact amount, should not be in the report. But now, what did the Department of Agriculture do? Well, if you serve as I do on the Committee on Appropriations, you will quite often find that when a bureau does not like a cut, they find out who you, John Jones, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, are, and who some people in the bureaus are that you might be friendly with and might believe in.

It so happens I know quite a number of men in the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. So do other Members of the subcommittee. We believe in their work: Tobacco, cotton, fruits and vegetables and livestock and other fields of work. We believe that they are providing a very, very valuable service to our American producers at a time when this world is pretty topsy-turvy. Some of our areas with a great historic background as exporters of certain commodities are anxious to regain those foreign markets, that because of soft or hard currencies or other problems have been lost. We are fervently hoping that sometime we will be able to regain those markets.

Therefore we want to know from day to day and month to month what the conditions are in these other countries where these men have operated for years. But somebody down in the Department of Agriculture hit upon the reduction which we had indicated in the report and applied it against one of the most valuable bureaus in the whole Department of Agriculture, and they gave the committee report as the excuse for doing it. I want to tell you that the committee report itself refutes the effort to do away with an outstanding phase of the work of the Department of Agriculture's Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. I have here in my hand a report that was sent to us by courtesy of the Budget Director, who, incidentally, is a very valuable man, and one who has worked very well with this committee and helped us all he could. It was sent to our committee at our request and it outlines who will, specifically, be cut or removed by the arbitrary act of someone in the United States Department of Agriculture.

It is their interpretation. It is the interpretation of somebody down in the Department of Agriculture. Under no circumstances should we allow these commodity specialists to be severed from the Government payroll, especially at this time. Their pay should come from the direct budget item for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. The Department should look for other and more appropriate places to make economies in this hour when savings should be had.

I do feel that it is wrong for the Department of Agriculture to hit at a reduction in an essential function when real cuts can be made judiciously and without hurting anyone; certainly it would help the American taxpayer. I should like to see the Department of Agriculture come up here and display some of the cooperation this subcommittee has always made available to them. We five men on this subcommittee represent you down at the Department of Agriculture. We have tried to get along with the Secretary and the members of that Department; but somebody knew what he was doing when he tried to destroy the intelligence service of the American farmer, under the guise that we have asked for it. We did not.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to lend my bit of appreciation to this committee, as I do to all committees who work hard and diligently, especially the Committee on Appropriations. The fact that I may take exception at this time to a specific item in the bill does not lessen my degree of appreciation for the services rendered to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I rather expect that some of you may be getting just a little bit tired of hearing me talk to you about the spruce-bark-beetle infestation in the national forests of Colorado, Wyoming, and a small segment of eastern Utah. However, in bringing this problem to your attention, I do so more as an adviser to you, my colleagues, than as the Representative of that congressional district which I have the honor to represent. The property in question is a vast forest area which comprises a large segment of the national-forest lands of the United States and represents approximately 8 percent of the total national-forest properties of the Nation. The correct protection of these Federal properties is as much a responsibility of each Member of this honorable body as it is of mine.

Sixty percent of the total area of my district, which in its total size is almost as large as the entire State of New York, is owned by the Federal Government and belongs to all the people of the United States. This area comprises almost 18,000,000 acres of land. It is the combined responsibility of Congress—and by that I mean the responsibility of each individual Member—to see to it that this property is well cared for.

Along with the responsibility of representing the people and the private interests of my district to the best of my ability, I have the added responsibility of calling to the attention of each Member of this body the present condition of federally owned property situate within my district. I consider that when I have advised the Members of Congress to the best of my ability, then my responsibility for the care of such federally owned property of the United States is of the same degree as that of each and every one of you, my colleagues.

I was born in the East, in the great State of Ohio. To be more specific, I was born within the boundaries of that congressional district so ably represented by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN. I think that I can understand the attitude of some Members of Congress as to these federally owned properties which many of them have never had the pleasure of seeing. However, I can assure each and every one of you that these federally owned properties are valuable and that at some time in the not too distant future greater attention will be paid to these values by the Nation than has been paid in the past—and most certainly more attention than is being paid at present.

My forebears came to this great country of ours in the early days of its history. They have successively and successfully pioneered in Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio before moving to the far West. All too often they have seen the natural resources wasted or destroyed because of the greed or lack of interest on the part of the people developing the areas in which they lived. I would not be true to my obligation to each one of you if I did not bring home to you as forcefully as I can the situation which exists in a large area of the national forests in my district.

A good husbandman cares for his property. He protects it at all times with the sole purpose in mind of having the ultimate amount of usage from the particular property concerned. One does not wait idly by for the barn to burn down if he sees the first spark of fire which starts the conflagration. Neither does one wait for the ravages of an epidemic to wear itself out by natural processes if there is anything he can do to stem its tide.

The national forest lands in my district consist of approximately 9,500,000 acres, of which 3,700,000 acres are comprised of commercial timber equaling at this time in the neighborhood of 16,000,000,000 board feet of salable lumber of the undetermined value, at today's estimates, of something near $100,000,000. Of this amount there are approximately 8,000,000,000 board feet of Englemann spruce and 4,800,000,000 board feet of lodgepole pine—both of which varieties of timber are valuable primarily for wood pulp but also to a limited extent for mining and construction usages.

In the late 1930's western Colorado was visited by winds far beyond the normal velocities usually found in that part of the Nation. Many of our forests suffered heavily, especially the White River Forest located in the northwestern part of the State. A few years after the winds which damaged and felled large amounts of timber, it was noticed that there was more than the normal population of an insect called the spruce bark beetle. Normally the population of this pest is kept under control by varying low winter temperatures or by the woodpecker population living in these particular areas. However, normal condi-

tions did not exist after this heavy destruction to the timber and the beetle has increased in population far beyond normal conditions or for that matter beyond what was expected by Forest Service officials.

The migration of the beetles following their increased numbers was northeastward through the White River National Forest. It was thought that the wind currents which carried the migrating beetles would continue in their usual movements and that the damage would be contained in 2 of Colorado's 12 national forests, with some damage likely in southern Wyoming. However, after the White River National Forest was almost completely destroyed and the damage to the Routt National Forest was most severe, then the migrations of the beetles changed and they continued not only northeasterly but also eastward, southeastward, and southward into new areas.

Until sometime in 1949 there was no known practical way of killing this particular beetle. However, in that year research scientists within the Agriculture Department discovered a combination of orthodichlorobenzene and fuel oil which was feasible of application and destructive of the beetle.

Accordingly, a year ago the Forest Service came before Congress and asked for an appropriation to start the campaign to contain or control the beetle infestation within these nationally owned forests. Because of the shortness of time permitted for planning, the program proposed was not too well considered and it was suggested that more than likely a 2-year campaign treating a little over one-half million trees last year and a litle larger amount this year might stop the infestation. Two millions of dollars were appropriated by a Congress alive to its responsibilities. During the summer and fall of 1950 almost 800,000 trees were sprayed, at an average cost of $2.26 per tree, which cost was just a little bit more than one-half of what the Forest Service advised would be the cost per tree. However, after a more inclusive survey made in 1950 by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine it has been found that the infestation is greater than first thought and that it will take from 4 to 6 years to contain or control the infestation with a total estimated expenditure in the neighborhood of $12,000,000 to $13,000,000, rather than the original $6,000,000 first proposed. Here again I wish to be absolutely honest with you, my colleagues, and advise you that there is no absolute certainty that the proposed program will be absolutely successful. However, in other areas of our national forests similar campaigns proposed by the Forest Service have been carried out at approximately the cost suggested during the first 2 years of the projects. I am advised that all of these programs have resulted in ultimate successes far beyond expectations.

The committee report on the bill now under discussion carries no reference to the request of the Forest Service for the $3,400,000 which was originally included within the budget estimate. The reason for lack of reference in this report is that the committee in its report on the last deficiency appropriation bill brought before this body made the following statement relative to a request for a supplemental appropriation for this project:

> The committee does not feel that additional appropriations for control of Englemann spruce bark beetle are justified in view of the present admission of the high cost of the program, particularly in relation to the value of the timber involved, and because it is doubtful that the project can ever be successfully completed. It is of the opinion that no further work should be done on this project.

In other words, the committee by its statement endeavored to foreclose any further consideration of this program. This was done even though $2,000,000 of Federal moneys have already been invested in this enterprise.

Some of you may ask the question, Why is not the spraying done from the air rather than having the necessity of applying the mixture directly to the bark on the trunk of the tree? In answer, I wish to advise that spraying from the air is effective only where the insects feed on the leaves or outer surfaces of the branches which can be reached by an insecticide distributed from the air. These spruce bark beetles spend their life in the tree and do their feeding underneath the bark and it is impossible to reach them by aerial spraying. The insecticide must be applied in sufficient volume directly to the bark, underneath which the beetles are found, in order that it may penetrate to a sufficient depth to kill them. This bark treatment is the method currently in use for practically all bark-beetle projects.

It has been publicized recently that last winter's cold weather in Colorado killed a great part of the beetle population. While it is true that the Black Hills or pine bark beetles in the Ponderosa pine areas on the east slope of the mountains in Colorado were largely killed by the cold, yet this is not true in the western part of Colorado where we have the infestation of the spruce beetle. Almost all of the beetles alive in the tree at the beginning of winter journey to the lower part of the tree and hibernate either at the ground level or immediately above the ground level. They do this, of course, to get the protection that the coverage of snow affords during the cold weather. The usual depth of snow in the areas concerned is between 5 and 8 feet during the coldest part of the winter period. Only a very small percentage of the beetles residing in the bark, which was covered by snow, have been killed by cold temperatures according to latest advice from the Forest Service. However, with the beetles having gone to the base of the trees for protection from the cold, if it is possible to move into the affected areas immediately following the melting of the snows and before the coming of warm weather with its attendant migration of the winged beetles to other areas, it will be that much easier to spray the trees this year than last. In other words, there should be less area per tree to spray.

Questions have been raised as to the value of the timber in question and it has been pointed out that the receipts of all timbers sold from the Colorado national forests does not yet amount to a million dollars. I believe that this is true. On the other hand, there is a greatly expanded market at the present time for this kind of timber and there is presently being sent to Wisconsin alone in the neighborhood of 50,000 cords per annum. It would appear from present indications that the construction of a paper pulp mill in western Colorado in the very near future will be a certainty. Because of the present scarcity of wood pulp and because of the particular adaptability of wood pulp produced from spruce timbers for defense purposes, the construction of such a mill will be made a defense project and will not only bring additional moneys to the Treasury of the United States but also will help in the over-all defense effort. If the prices bid last year by the company interested in the proposed mill are allowed to stand and the project is carried on for a minimum of 20 years, there will be returned to the United States Treasury from this project alone approximately 16 millions of dollars, which is several million dollars more than the ultimate cost of this whole control project. At the same time the containment or control of the beetle infestation in the forests concerned will provide for the future sales of usable timber for the years to come, and will also protect vast watersheds, extensive grazing areas and unlimited recreational resources.

Also the question of State participation has been brought into the picture. Here again permit me to say—these are federally owned lands and the State jurisdiction over the same is limited to certain police-control responsibilities. As I understand it, we have never expected the States to put up any money to protect the national forest timber resources from insects, disease, fire, or any other destructive agents. On the contrary, under section 2 of the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 the Government is spending something over nine millions of dollars a year in cooperation with the States in the protection of State forests as well as privately owned forest lands. The proposal for State contribution for this project would be a complete reversal of existing policy and practice.

Some one may say that after all the protection of the watershed should be of some value to the State of Colorado. Here again I wish to call to your attention the fact that between 70 and 80 percent of the water arising in the Colorado River Basin watershed comes from my district; and, that stands of Englemann spruce cover 2 percent of that particular watershed area. It should be noted here that 20 percent of the 80 percent of Colorado's contribution to the Colorado River watershed comes from the Englemann spruce populated areas. Most of these waters are allowed to flow down the Colorado River and are used by lower basin States. Sedimentation recently carried by the Colorado River is filling up Lake Meade all too rapidly. With the destruction of the Engiemann spruce forests of the upper Colorado River watershed and with the consequent more rapid melting of snows more erosion will be the result. This can only mean more sedimentation carried by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

rushing waters during the spring runoff which will mean an increased amount of silt flowing into the great reservoir at Hoover Dam which also is an investment of the people of the United States.

Certain Colorado counties, in which the proceeds of certain sales of timber and grazing facilities are received, profit to a limited extent. However, the entire benefits to the counties of my district from such proceeds, which go to schools and roads, amount to about $161,900, and for counties of the whole State to about $217,000. In the event of forest fires, the likelihood of which is enhanced, of course, by dead timber still standing or fallen, it is up to the local communities to make up the greater part of the fighting force to combat such fires. The value to the Federal Government alone in having a reservoir of people ready and willing to step in and protect these resources belonging to the Federal Government more than compensates for any dollar values that may flow especially to the residents of Colorado.

Then there are other values which must be considered, particularly those in reference to recreational advantages. It is estimated that in 1950 more than one-half million people visited the national forest areas of western Colorado. These visits were made for the purpose of finding rest, recreation, fishing, hunting, and so forth, in these great vastnesses of our Nation. By far the greater number of these people were from States other than Colorado.

Also my district holds unlimited mineral resources still to be developed, not only for the economy of Colorado but for the welfare of the entire Nation. Many of these mineral resources are located in close proximity to standing spruce timber. In the development of such mining properties spruce timber is used extensively. The nearness of such timber sometimes determines the feasibility of carrying on the mine operation. With a loss of this valued resource, an additional handicap would be placed upon the mining industry of Colorado.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to your attention the size of the area involved. It is approximately one-fourth of the total area of the district I represent. The area of the timberland already destroyed is approximately the size of the State of Rhode Island. The area of the land on which the standing timber may ultimately be destroyed is twice the size of the State of Delaware. These resources belong to the people of the United States. These resources are involved directly with the economic welfare of the whole Nation. The saving of such resources, if possible, is most worthwhile. The writing off of them without further consideration is, in my opinion, the most ill considered of any possible course of action. I ask simply that each one of you resolve in your own mind the values here considered and then make your decision just as if it were property of your own on some tract of land owned by you individually; or a piece of stock owned by you and now reposing safely in the bank deposit vault; or a part, even though minor, of other investments which you may possess. If these timber resources are permitted to be destroyed, from three to four generations will suffer before they can be replaced. It is not our property alone that is involved. It is that of our posterity as well.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman agree that it is just as important to complete this project in Colorado to save this great natural resource as it is to complete some of the dams in the West for the development and protection of other resources?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is absolutely correct; there is no doubt about it. This is property which belongs to the people of the Nation and it should be protected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to refer to the national forests of which the gentleman speaks. It happens that in the State of West Virginia we have two national forests. A certain percentage of the proceeds from the sale of timber from those forests goes to the local school and road districts, the remaining 75 percent goes into the Treasury. West Virginia last year paid into the Treasury better than nearly a million dollars in net earnings for the Government. What is the situation in the gentleman's State?

Mr. ASPINALL. I may say that up to the present time perhaps the sale of timber alone would not support the care that has been given to our lands, but the grazing fees would help in this respect.

Mr. BAILEY. If that timber is adequately protected, in a matter of a few years it will be more than paying its way.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. The figure I gave, the expenditure of $13,000,000 which is considered necessary to stop this infestation, means not only the collection of some $20,000,000 within the next 20 years from the sale of woodpulp timber alone but it also means the sale of other timber as well and other assets of these forests belonging to the Government.

Mr. BAILEY. It appears to me it is a long-range program that is not going to cost the Government anything if we can make those paying propositions. That is the objective?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is the objective. It simply means an investment of money of the United States in property belonging to the United States in order to protect the investment which we have there. That is all there is to it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER].

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, after extensive hearings the House Appropriation Subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture with the approval of the full Committee on House Appropriations brings this bill for the next fiscal year to the floor. The hearings were not as extensive as they were last year because of our being in a national emergency. Notwithstanding this, there were some agencies which asked for increased funds, but in most instances their requests were denied.

The product of our efforts is not all one would desire if we were living in normal times, but in view of the international situation, our committee reduced appropriations wherever we thought possible and attempted to put first things first. In view of the many obstacles we had to face, I consider the measure as one where the pattern was cut to the cloth instead of vice versa.

I cannot let this opportunity go by without paying tribute to the other members of our subcommittee. Working on this great committee with the distinguished gentlemen who compose it has been a source of great satisfaction to me. Our chairman, the Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, again demonstrated the qualifications of leadership which a chairman should have. He was at all times fair but critical when the occasion demanded.

A new Democratic member came to our committee this year, who is deeply interested in agriculture and has a broad viewpoint as to the important part agriculture plays in our national economy. He is Mr. JOE BATES, of Kentucky. He made many suggestions which were timely and wholesome. The other two members of our committee consist of Messrs. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, and HORAN, of Washington. Both are Republicans but in our discussions, deliberations, and conclusions there was at no time any partisanship displayed. As long as the problems of agriculture are approached from such a high level, the farmers of our Nation need have no fear as to their future. It was a genuine pleasure to work with all of these gentlemen.

No report would be complete without praising our executive clerk, Mr. Ross Pope. In our efforts to write a fair and equitable bill, I found him a tower of strength and most helpful.

The following summary sets forth the committee action with respect to the amounts in the bill:

Summary of the bill

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (as reduced under sec. 1214)	Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
Direct annual appropriations:					
Title I—Regular activities	$772,500,700	$786,605,546	$719,707,433	−$52,793,267	−$66,898,113
Title II—Special activities	399,000	33,400,000	450,000	51,000	−32,950,000
Total direct annual appropriations	772,899,700	820,005,546	720,157,433	−52,742,267	−99,848,113
Loan authorizations	444,500,000	262,000,000	261,250,000	−193,250,000	−10,750,000
Administrative expense limitations	20,484,000	24,154,000	18,954,000	−1,530,000	−5,200,000

I would like to call special attention to the comparison of appropriations during World War II and what they are now.

In our report we said:

The appropriations for the Department for each of the 3 years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount provided in 1941 was $1,543,000,000, more than twice the amount of $720,157,433 recommended in the 1952 bill. During this same period, the Department has reduced its personnel by nearly 40,000 from 108,000 in 1941 to less than 70,000 in 1951.

We said further:

This comparison has particular significance when it is realized that the 1952 funds cover many new activities such as the school-lunch program, the rural-telephone program, the farm-housing program, and the Research and Marketing Act, which were not in existence in 1941.

I would like to point out that never before in the history of our existence has the productive ability of American agriculture assumed the importance it has during recent months.

The American farmer has been called upon to expand his production which involves increases in 1951 over 1950 of 10,000,000 acres of cotton—54 percent increase—5,600,000 acres of corn, 3,000,000 acres of wheat, and 300,000 acres of rice. Judging the future by the past, I feel sure that the American farmer will respond to the demands made upon him, but we should not expect him to do it alone.

The farmer does not receive the same treatment as other segments of our economy. Congress has passed legislation permitting defense production funds to be loaned to industry to establish plants, and provision is being made for them to amortize completely the cost of these facilities in a short period of time. However, no provision is made to compensate the farmer for depreciation on his farm and for loss in fertility of his soil. Expansion in industry is being underwritten to a large extent by firm defense contracts of the Federal Government. Yet, the only guaranty being offered the farmer is the percentage of parity—which is not a guaranty of profit. As a matter of fact, parity does not even take cost of production into consideration.

Since the beginning of time, man has required food and clothing for survival. People can live without any of the other luxuries and so-called necessities, but without food for subsistence and fiber for protection from the elements, people perish. This is an elementary principle but one which too many of our people are inclined to forget when they think about our farm economy.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that every time there is any change in economic conditions, whether the change be for the better or worse makes no difference, some of our metropolitan newspapers launch an attack on the American farmers. If there is a slump, they loudly proclaim that the farmer is getting too much for his products. If there is inflation, they shout that the farmer is the cause of it.

In times of food shortages, they say that it is the farmer's fault because he is not producing enough. If a surplus of farm products develops, they cry even louder.

As I said, some of our large city newspapers this year have carried a variety of comment regarding agricultural subjects ranging from the soil conservation program to the high retail price for meat—and it is always the farmer who gets the blame.

One newspaper made much of the budget items for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Reference was made constantly to the so-called losses, but I saw no mention made of any of the profits or returns of money to the Treasury by the Corporation. For example, they had plenty to say about a reported loss of some $91,600,000 on buying up and disposing of fourteen food commodities in the first 5 months of the current fiscal year—but I have seen no mention in any newspaper of the disposal of $1,720,000,000 worth of commodities by the Corporation from July 1, 1950, through November 30, 1950. Over $142,000,000 worth of these commodities were sold to Government agencies and relief agencies for export. Over $892,000,000 worth of these commodities were sold to commercial exporters and into domestic channels. Over $37,000,000 worth was donated to schools, institutions, foreign relief agencies and to American Indians.

From 1933 through November 30, 1950, according to the information given me, the Commodity Credit Corporation sustained a net realized loss of $763,000,000 on all of its price-support operations, or approximately 5 cents per dollar invested in loans and purchases of commodities. If the loss on potato operations of $428,000,000 is eliminated—and the American farmer certainly cannot honestly and fairly be charged with this fiasco—then the net cost of price-support operations per dollar invested is reduced to 2.3 cents.

Mark well that figure—the net cost of price-support operations has been less than 2½ percent. Is not this a very small price to pay for the stabilization of our basic economy—our agricultural economy? It is axiomatic that the rest of the Nation lives off the farmer. In America, about 20 percent of our people are engaged in farming—the lowest ratio for any Nation in the world which does not depend upon imports of foodstuffs and fiber for clothing.

And what does all this mean to the four out of five of our people who work in the factories and offices and live in the cities? Simply this—that they are dependent upon the farmer not only as a producer of food and fiber for clothing, but as a consumer of the goods and services they manufacture, distribute, and sell.

The approximately $2 per person that the price-support program has cost since 1933 has meant much to our economy. A recent survey by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicated that the income of American farmers would have been reduced by $5,250,000,000 if there had been no price support for the 1948 and 1949 crops of cotton, corn, and wheat. What a blow that would have been to the nonfarmers who manufacture, distribute, and sell goods and services to our farmers.

I remember reading one editorial in February of this year where one of the Washington newspapers came forth with an editorial proposal that the soil-conservation program be discontinued and the farmers "turned out into the cold world." By so doing, says this editorial:

It would save $285,000,000 annually, enough to buy about 600 medium tanks.

I am wondering if they have not been so blinded by their own prejudices as to think that the tanks are more essential to our survival than the very soil from which we gain our sustenance?

I wonder if the men and women who write these editorials have any comprehension or understanding of the value of our soil-conservation program. I wonder if they realize that despite our most valiant efforts, millions of tons of precious topsoil are blowing and washing away from our farms. I wonder if they know what that means to them in terms of steaks and bread and milk and potatoes. I cannot bring myself to the thought that they do—else they would not pen such words.

History records that once great and fertile fields are now arid wastelands because the soil was not conserved. Portions of the Nile Valley in Egypt, which once fed millions of people are now worthless deserts and generations that once thrived on their bounty are now without issue. Bands and tribes—even whole races—of people have disappeared because their soil became so depleted as to deny efforts to produce the food and fiber of life.

The plain and simple truth, Mr. Chairman, is that we need more—not less—soil conservation. Our population, like that of other Nations, is increasing at a rapid rate. Census officials estimate that we have grown by something like one and one-half million souls since the count was made just last year. It is very likely that within 50 years we will have to produce enough to feed and clothe 200,000,000 American citizens within our borders.

And who has the greatest stake in the productivity of America's farms? The men, women, and children who live in the cities throughout the land. For that reason alone, if for no other, every urban dweller in the land should lend active support to the agricultural program of this Nation which is designed to produce more and more foodstuffs and fiber at less and less cost, effort, and acreage. The abundant life we seek to perpetuate and expand is more dependent upon agriculture than any other factor in our economy.

We would all do well to keep in mind the admonition of the great American orator who said:

Level our cities and they will spring up again; destroy our farms and grass will grow in the main streets of America.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize this thought, to those who are opposed to parity or equality of opportunity for the American farmers. In this troubled world today with the lone exception of the United States, the countries whose economies are largely agricultural are all well ahead of those whose economies are mainly industrial. Who,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

then, can with conscience oppose a program designed to foster and promote agricultural enterprise in the United States?

In February of this year, the Secretary of Agriculture released a statement about our farm economy. I was greatly impressed with the statement and it is my hope that many who might not have read it before will take the time to acquaint themselves with this most important subject. I commend it to all and particularly to those who would do harm to the future welfare and security of our people by their attacks on the farm program and the American farmer.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the United States of America is about to lose valuable property because Congress does not act. This property cannot be replaced. Unless immediate steps are taken to preserve this property the United States will suffer irreparable losses.

Along the Continental Divide from Wyoming to New Mexico and parts of Utah is a great forest. The United States Government owns this forest. This forest has been infected with the Engelmann spruce beetle. This deadly insect is rapidly destroying the forest. This destruction has many disastrous results.

Unless this Congress takes immediate steps to wipe out the beetle killer of timber we will have dead forests. Forest fires will start easily and the timber will be destroyed. The watersheds of the area will not have protection that nature provided. The water flow will no longer be regulated, with the result that there will be increased flood hazards, and recreational value of the forest destroyed.

This Nation, therefore, will suffer for shortage of pulpwood, the manufacture of paper containers, and other needed items. This industry will no longer flourish.

We in the United States have learned to preserve our natural resources. Why should we, at this time, abandon this policy? The failure to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out this program is a departure from the accepted policies of the past.

Therefore, I urge you that immediate steps be taken to preserve this property and prohibit its destruction.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that my reply to the argument just advanced may appear at the same place in the RECORD. If we could run the House of Representatives on the basis of accommodations to our friends, certainly this item of the bark beetle or the spruce beetle in Colorado would be in this bill. Many other things would be in this bill if we could run it that way. But, in order that the record may be straight, the situation in regard to the spruce-bark beetle in Colorado is this: The Forestry Department last year requested an appropriation of $2,800,000 to get rid of the spruce-bark beetle in an area in Colorado that is equal to the size of several of your New England States. Each tree has to have special treatment from top to bottom. You have to go into those areas and treat all of those trees. They estimated that you would have to treat 725,000 trees to do the job. There were many questions involved that did not seem to hold water with me and I opposed it and kept it out, but it was put in in the other body. This was handled, incidentally, by the deficiency subcommittee. Two million dollars was included in this deficiency bill of last year. Instead of treating 725,000 trees, which they said would do the job, they treated 850,000. This year they come back to the views substantially I had last year and now they say instead of taking $2,000,000 and treating 850,000 trees, it will take $13,000,000 and we have got to treat 67,000,000 trees. They said last year, "Why, this timber is worth about thirty or forty million dollars." Now they say it is worth $90,000,000. Do you know that the record in Colorado shows that for 10 years they have only sold $700,000 worth of spruce timber? Now, it is true that we have said that if you want to do this work out there that we think you ought to work it out on a cooperative basis. Maybe it is a little hard to work out the details, but if you had a cooperative basis, as we have advocated it, it would give us a yardstick to determine the value of many things on which it is hard for us to estimate the value. If the local people would put up their fair share of the money, it would give us a pretty good basis for determination.

As for the spruce bud beetle in Washington and Oregon, the local people do put up half of the cost. In those circumstances, however, the timber has proven value; it is bringing in money. The treatment can be done by airplanes. It is in the buds of the spruce where you can reach it by spray. But, as to the Colorado situation, as I see it, the only sound basis in the world that we can do it on would be as an accommodation to our two good friends from that State. In the other body sometimes they add money for that purpose, figuring the House of Representatives would take it out, but we never have operated on that basis, and as much as we think of them, we just cannot see that there is any basis for appropriating this sum here.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does the gentleman know of any instance where the State has contributed to the building up of Federal property?

Mr. WHITTEN. In Washington and Oregon, in the present spruce bud-worm areas, the local people of the State are contributing approximatcly 50 percent of the cost.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, it is inconsistent, as far as Government property is concerned, that the people ought to build that property up.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I do not know that there is any obligation on the part of the State to build up Federal property. On the other hand, if the Federal Government wants to let Federal property go down, for the State to insist that the Federal Government should spend $13,000,000 would indicate that the State had an interest in it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman think that the Federal Government has an interest in the maintenance of the watershed?

Mr. WHITTEN. It does, and we should exercise reasonable care and make reasonable effort to try to protect it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman realize that if these trees are not protected, that it will kill them, and result in forest fires?

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman know how long you have had that pest out there?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No; I do not know.

Mr. WHITTEN. You will find that it has existed for quite a long time, and that last year the forestry department thought there were only 725,000 trees that needed treatment. Be that as it may, under present conditions, I cannot see the soundness of this program of spending $13,000,000 to protect this area when only a little over $700,000 has been received for all spruce timber for 10 years.

Questions have been raised about another matter in this bill which has to do with this 25-percent differential. I think perhaps this answer should be made.

I was instrumental in putting this provision in the bill, because I learned the Department in several instances was requiring agencies of the Department of Agriculture to pay resident citizens of the Territories 25 percent more than resident citizens of the United States get for the same work. In other words, in Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or Guam, or many of these other places, native citizens are entitled to equal treatment with the citizens of the United States—do not misunderstand me about that—but the Department requires various agencies to pay to the man who lives there and does the same work the fellow in the same job here does, be it in the post office, be it as an assistant farm agent—in those areas, though he was a native citizen already there, he got 25 percent more than the man in the United States got for doing the same job. In my estimation, you cannot justify that. Equal treatment, yes. Special treatment, no. I put it in this bill because I wanted to make a protest against such a practice.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Was it not the purpose of that provision in the basic law to encourage experts from the mainland to go to the Territories to render a service which could not be rendered by the people who lived in the Territories?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding of it. Of course, the provision of the bill does not prohibit what the gentleman mentions there. If you have to send someone out, there is no protest made about it, because of the travel and

the expense incident to having to go to another country. But here it just says, "Pay the resident citizens of those areas like you pay the resident citizens of the United States for the same work." We think the provisions of the bill were sound.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I desire to address the committee at greater length on this subject and shall do so at a later time, but may I ask the gentleman if in the course of the committee's inquiry it determined the origin of this policy, and also the proportion of Federal employees in the Territory of Hawaii that are in the employ of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am going to say this, that while this is a bill that my subcommittee happens to have charge of, this is not a case of picking out agriculture. We contemplate bringing in a bill of general application. Doubtless this provision will have consideration when we get to writing the bill of general application. Certainly they should be treated alike across the board.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Does not the gentleman feel it would be extremely unfair to the employees of the Department of Agriculture, who number less than 200, to be dealt with on this basis, whereas there are something like 24,000 that are dealt with on the other basis?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am just assuring the gentleman that this provision will be in the bill of general application which will follow.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansan [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, at the very beginning of what I have to say I desire to express my appreciation of the fine work this subcommittee has done on the agricultural appropriation bill. We have come to expect a good job on this bill under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the other able members of his committee. While there may be items in the bill with which I am not in entire accord, I am happy to say that I think the committee has done a splendid job.

I want to talk for a little while about a matter which is of vital concern to agriculture and is as well of interest and concern to every man, woman, and child in this country.

I refer to the order recently issued by the OPS putting a ceiling price on beef cattle and beef. This order, while it might, in the beginning, more directly affect the producers of beef cattle, will in the end seriously affect every consumer of beef in this country. It will result in less beef being available for consumption. It will result in a maldistribution of whatever beef is available and finally, if continued for any length of time, will inevitably bring about meat rationing. In other words, if this order is continued we are going to go through exactly the same process we went through during World War II in connection with the distribution of beef and other meats and those experiences, as everyone knows, were very unhappy ones.

Initially the fault with this order is that it puts a roll-back into effect.

It may be difficult to enforce price ceilings, where you freeze the price at an existing level, but everyone will acknowledge that it is much more difficult to carry out a price-ceiling order which involves a roll-back. Furthermore, such an order cannot be carried out without doing a tremendous injustice to everyone who is carrying an inventory.

In the case of beef cattle, the price of which is admittedly high, there has been authority to impose price ceilings ever since last September. The price of beef cattle in September was approximately the same as it was during the May-June period. A ceiling could have been put on at that time which would have maintained those prices. No roll-back would have been necessary. Producers, in my opinion, would not have complained. A ceiling on beef cattle imposed any time before the middle of November would have frozen prices at a pre-Korean level.

The roll-back order now about to go into effect provides that on the 20th of May there shall be a price ceiling put into effect which is approximately 10 percent on an average below the present prices. The order goes down to the wholesale and retail levels. It will not for the present, and perhaps never, result in a single cent of reduction in the price that the housewife pays. Everything included in this 10-percent roll-back which was put into effect initially is going to be absorbed by the distributors of meat.

The order further provides that on the first day of August there will be a further rollback of 4½ percent, and on the first day of October a further 4½ percent rollback. It is of course the hope of the Administrator of the OPS that these last rollbacks will be reflected to the housewives in their purchases of meat. No one knows whether this will or will not be true. In the very beginning I think we ought to understand what it is that has brought about the high price of beef. We talk about meat prices being high, but the fact is that outside of beef and lamb—and lamb is a special product consumed by comparatively few people—the price of meat is not high. Hog prices are not even up to parity. The price of poultry is not high. The price of eggs is not high. Neither are up to parity. The people of this country who think that beef prices are too high can secure in poultry and eggs a high quality protein food equivalent to beef, as far as food value goes, although perhaps not so acceptable as far as taste and flavor are concerned. Pound for pound they can obtain eggs for about one-third the cost they are paying for beefsteak. If they want pork they can get it for about half the cost they are paying for beefsteak. So that the price of meat, poultry, and eggs—with the exception of beef and lamb—is not high. Beef is high because there is a tremendous demand, especially for the better cuts. It is simply a case where the beef producers of this country, although they have increased production, have not been able to produce as much as the people of this country demand and want to consume. The only way to bring down prices is more production.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I will yield later if I have time. I want to develop this point first, if you please.

In the case of other scarce commodities, in order to induce increased production, we are letting prices do the job. We are not rolling back the price of scarce materials or minerals. We are letting the price go up. The price of those things has gone up tremendously since the beginning of the war and increased prices have brought increased supplies. We need to expand our labor force, but we are not trying to get expansion by rolling back wages. We are letting wages go up. Yet in the case of beef it seems to be the idea that you can get more beef by lowering the price that the producer receives for his product.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The price of rubber, because of international bungling, a part of it the responsibility of our own administration, has risen from around 25 or 30 cents up to as high as 80 cents a pound in the last year or 18 months.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. Of course, that is an illustration where scarce materials have risen greatly in price and we are not trying to meet that situation by rolling back the price and telling the people who are producing it that they are going to have to take less for it.

This roll-back order, in my opinion, and in the opinion of everyone I have talked to who knows anything about the livestock business, will result in less livestock going to market. It means less meat, it means maldistribution of the meat we have and in the end it means rationing in order to distribute the decreased amount fairly.

Let me call attention to some of the provisions of the order itself, because they make it certain that the price received by the producer will be reduced even more than the schedule in the order itself.

Under this order meat is divided into different grades, and the price is fixed which the packer can receive for each grade. The price that he pays to the producer is based upon the grades which have been fixed under the order, such as Prime Choice, Good Commercial, Utility, and Cutters and Canners. The price differential between Utility and Commercial is $5.50 per 100 pounds. That beef has to be graded by someone who goes into the packing house, looks at a carcass and decides whether it is Utility or Commercial. I am told by those who know that it is a very difficult matter for even an experienced grader to make a choice between Commercial and Good, or between Utility and Commercial; and yet if a grader goes into a packing house and looks at a long row of carcasses and decides that this one is Utility rather than Commercial, it means $5.50 difference per 100 pounds in

Digitized by the University of Wisconsin Libraries

the price. That would be bad enough if we had experienced graders, but in order to procure men to grade this meat, they have had to go out and hire about 600 new inexperienced graders, and it will be they who decide whether the carcass and the animal which it represents belongs in one grade or another.

You can imagine the effect this will have on the packer buyers, because if they guess wrong when they buy an animal, it means that the packer is going to lose $55 on a 1,000-pound animal, and we can all guess what the reaction of that packer buyer is going to be; instead of taking a chance by buying it as Commercial, he is going to call it Utility. So, in addition to the low ceiling price that has been placed on the product under this roll-back order, the farmer is going to be confronted with the fact that his animal is likely to be downgraded in order that the packer may be sure that some incompetent grader in a packing plant does not make a mistake and grade a Good carcass as Commercial or a Commercial carcass as Utility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is there a difference of 5½ cents a pound between Commercial and Utility?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; and the differential between Commercial and Good is $4.20 per hundred.

Another thing about the order to which I want to bring your attention is that under the order each slaughterer is given a quota. If the packer does not keep within the price range in purchasing his livestock he loses his slaughter quota; in other words, he goes out of business. The slaughter quota which has been given packers for the first month that this order is in operation is 90 percent of what it was a year ago. There are more cattle in the country than there were a year ago, yet the slaughterers are given a quota of only 90 percent of what they had last year. I do not know whether that is a confession on the part of those who are administering the law that it is going to reduce the quantity of beef going onto the market or not. It does mean that the amount of beef that can be slaughtered in this country under the first month of operation will be 90 percent of what was slaughtered during a similar period last year. In other words, for the first month we are going to have that much less beef.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That will produce a scarcity of meat?

Mr. HOPE. It will.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am of the opinion that those who perceived this plan have an idea that this 90 percent quota will hold back animals and prevent them rushing into the market in fear of market competition or reduction. Of course, that is a fallacy if that is their theory. May I ask the gentleman, Does this plan of setting the price not throw into the whole scheme a conglomeration of market hazards and price hazards by reason of this process that the producer of beef does not face at the present time or under an open price?

Mr. HOPE. That is true. The beef producer always faces plenty of hazards. He is prepared to meet those hazards, but this imposes additional hazards that he does not have to meet naturally, and, to that extent it will discourage production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And as the gentleman has well pointed out, it throws directly into the market place a hazard of $55 on a thousand pounds of meat which is enough to destroy any basic food commodity industry.

Mr. HOPE. There is no question about that. Let me point out also that if all cattle were produced and kept on the same farm until they went to the slaughter house that would be one thing. But most of the cattle business is not done that way. Cattle are produced on a ranch, they are then sold to a feeder or to a cattleman who carries them on grass or roughness for a year or so. They may change hands several times before going to the packing house. The fallacy of this order is that the man who has bought cattle before the order at the high prices he has had to pay to get them in order to stay in business is bound to take a loss. There is no way he can escape it. His inventory has been reduced by an average of 10 percent immediately. If he holds them until August it will be reduced 4½ percent more and if he holds them until October it will be 4½ percent more. How can a man stay in business when he knows the longer he stays in business the greater his loss will be?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes, and may I say that the gentleman is making a splendid statement. His vast knowledge of agriculture gives him the background necessary for the good statement he has made. We know that a cattle feeder goes into the market and buys a 700-pound steer, perhaps. He pays thirty-five or forty dollars a hundred, or he did last January or February. He has $240 invested in that steer before he puts a bushel of corn or any care whatsoever into it. This order comes out and takes away from that feeder anywhere from $30 to $50 of his capital investment and, together with that, it gives to that particular feeder the feeling of uncertainty in the future. He does not know what he is going to do, whether he should continue in business, or what not. The roll-back order will certainly result in less meat, than in more meat, for the consumers.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman certainly has stated that fact in a very effective way, and the situation he has described applies to thousands and hundreds of thousands of beef producers throughout the country.

Let me just give you a typical example which was given me by a cattle producer in my own State just a couple of days ago. He told me he had purchased within the last 3 weeks at existing prices 100 head of heifers in Texas to bring to his ranch in Kansas. They weighed about 500 pounds. He paid 37 cents a pound which was the going price for that weight cattle at that time. He would bring them to Kansas and run them on pasture during the summer and sell them in October, normally. I do not know what he will do now. He paid 37 cents a pound, so he has invested $185 each in those cattle, and without going into detail—he will have $230 invested in each of those cattle next October if he keeps them. This includes freight, pasture charges, interest, selling charges and loss through death and other causes. They are grass cattle; they will grade Commercial, and the price ceiling at Kansas City on those cattle next October will be 26 cents a pound. Assuming they gained 200 pounds—and that will be a good gain on grass—his cost at that time would be 33 cents a pound. But, under the roll-back he will sell them for 26 cents a pound, lost 7 cents a pound or $49 per head on each of those animals. How long can a cattleman stay in business under those conditions. Does this look like a good way to increase the supply of beef for the American people?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico [Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN.]

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Chairman, I beg to call the attention of the committee to the significance which section 407 of the bill under discussion will have for the citizens whom I represent.

Of course they are citizens of the United States; all 2,200,000 of them. A certain number of them serve the Federal Government. Some of those who serve the Federal Government in Puerto Rico were born in Puerto Rico and were always residents of Puerto Rico. Others were born in the States, and became residents of the island before they became Federal employees. Others became residents while federally employed.

The fact is that, with very few exceptions, Federal jobs in Puerto Rico are as permanent as in the mainland and require permanent residence in the island. The Federal Government operates in Puerto Rico the same as in any State.

The mainlanders who serve the Federal Government in Puerto Rico were residents of Puerto Rico before they became Federal employees or have later become residents of Puerto Rico in order to serve the Federal Government. In either case they are residents of Puerto Rico; they may become legal residents of Puerto Rico after 1 year's residence in the island. Together with them there are many other Federal employees, citizens of the United States, born in Puerto Rico, permanent residents of Puerto Rico. The only difference is that the latter were born in Puerto Rico, as I was, as were the 75,000 who served in the Second World War, as were the boys of

the Sixty-fifth Regiment now fighting in Korea.

Puerto Rico is a community of United States citizens, whether they were born in the island, as most were, or in the mainland, as many were. Section 407 will have the following effect:

An American citizen in a Federal job will get a certain salary if he was a former resident of Puerto Rico. Another American citizen on the same job will get a 25 percent higher salary if he was a resident of the mainland before his appointment.

I agree that if you change your residence from the mainland to the island you have traveling expenses and you have extra expenses for a month or two while you become adjusted.

But the same is true if you change residence from the island to the mainland. I do not see the latter situation taken care of by section 407. And there are Federal workers from the island who are transferred to the mainland now and then, although not as many as those transferred from the mainland to the island.

It would not be logical to hold that the only reason for a higher pay in the offshore areas is to take care only of the temporary extra expenses of some who move from the mainland to offshore areas. If that were the only consideration, the extra pay could be traveling expenses and a per diem for a month or two—for such time as would naturally be needed for adjustment to new surroundings. But there is no limit of time for extra pay in this bill. It can go on for the lifetime of the employee—up to retirement. And it does not apply to a transfer from California to Washington, D. C., or from Washington, D. C., to say Colorado. Certainly there are adjustment expenses there, too.

The reason for the extra pay, as I understand it, is that the cost of living, at comparable standards, has been found to be higher in the offshore areas than in the mainland. I maintain that if this is true it holds equally whether your name is Smith or Martinez.

The result of section 407 would then be that Martinez is supposed to hold to a low standard of living while Smith is to have a higher standard of living, although they hold equal jobs and do equal work.

Mr. Chairman, such a situation would be wrong and unfair. It is self-evident that the average person maintains such standard of living as his income permits; that the average person aspires ever to improve his standard of living. The salary anybody should receive for his toil should be the result of merit and ability and devotion to his work. Therefore, it should not be determined on the basis of place of birth and former residence.

I am not saying whether a differential should be paid or should not be paid in the offshore areas. I would say that it should be paid if the cost of living, at a comparable level, is higher in the offshore areas. Should this question be decided in the affirmative, as it is decided under section 407, then the rule should be applied equally to those born and those employed where their job is and to those who came over from another location to hold a job at the same place.

The Puerto Rican-born person and the mainland-born resident of Puerto Rico must meet the same tests to become Federal employees as does the mainlander who is transferred from the continent to the island. They are entitled to the same standard of living. Consequently they are entitled to equal compensation.

Of course there are many persons in Puerto Rico now living at low levels because they are unemployed or underemployed. There are many, too, who live at high levels—as high as in any comparable mainland community. The goal should be for all United States citizens in Puerto Rico to live at standards comparable to those of the mainland. The goal should not be to mold the undesirable low levels of the unfortunate into frozen standards for all residents, while nonresidents may enjoy a higher standard.

I believe that to determine whether an extra pay in the offshore areas is justified or not is one question; to make salary discriminations between former residents and newcomers is another question.

If it were found that the cost of living at comparable standards does not justify the payment of an extra compensation, such compensation should not be paid to any.

But if it is justified, let it be paid to all, regardless of place of birth or former residence. A loaf of bread costs every bit as much to a person who got his job in Puerto Rico as it does to a person recruited on the mainland and shipped over.

With section 407 we risk the creation of a most undesirable situation, one which might lead the people of Puerto Rico to conclude rightly that they have become the victims of discrimination.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to add a brief statement to what has been said with regard to the Office of Price Stabilization order to roll back the price of meat by 10 percent at this time, and 9 percent later on.

The thing that causes me to make a further statement on this subject matter is because of comments and statements in the local newspapers by people who are not familiar with the problem and who are casting reflection upon a group of substantial and responsible citizens who ask nothing from the Government in the way of hand-outs and who want to contribute to the welfare of our country. Some of the statements would have you believe that livestock producers would threaten a sit-down strike. Farmers and livestock men do not go on strike. So far as I know, no group of farmers have suggested such thing.

I want to point out briefly some of the inconsistencies with regard to this problem. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has just made a good statement on this subject matter. We are told on the one hand there is a scarcity of beef. I remind you that beef is the only item under this order. Beef is meat from cattle. It is estimated that less than 5 percent of living expenditures goes for meat and less than half of it is spent for beef that is bought at the butcher shop or in the grocery store. Of course, the price of beef is extremely high. It comes about because of more beef being bought now than ever before.

If the Office of Price Stabilization had issued an order putting a ceiling price on beef or livestock as of the date the order was issued, it would not be so bad, but here is a case where a Government order or directive says in substance that property you owned on April 1 or April 20 is worth 10 percent less on May 20, whether you like it or not, and that later this summer by order of the Government, the price of your product will be reduced by at least 9 percent more. Not only that, but the confusion that will come about and the uncertainty that will result will even create further reduction in price. I know of no other industry or business where the Government has taken this kind of action.

Furthermore, under the order the slaughtering of beef is limited to not more than 90 percent of the amount slaughtered a year ago. So you are going to have less beef, and according to the order, at lower prices. Mr. DiSalle says there is a shortage of beef, and yet he says you can have not more than 90 percent of what you got a year ago.

While I am interested in all of those engaged in the livestock business, I am especially concerned with regard to the smaller operator, the farmer who raises a crop and feeds that crop to his livestock in order to fatten them and put them on the market, and expects a market price for his cattle. This order is certainly unfair to such person. The farmer I described not only loses his feed but a year's work in his farm operations. It is the way by which he markets his crop. He is the fellow who is going to get hurt. He is the backbone of this country. There are hundreds of thousands of them. Even the threat of a roll-back is going to injure them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the production were required because of a scarcity of some material, we would have a different situation. We might cut down the production of automobiles because of a scarcity of steel, or you might cut down some in building industry because of scarcity of materials needed in the war effort. Instead of having more of the product you have less, because the person who buys this livestock for the purpose of feeding it is not going to increase the weight of that animal by 200 or 300 pounds as he would otherwise do. He is going to sell that animal at a lesser weight and therefore we will lose that much beef.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Courtesy of Michigan Libraries

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished member of this subcommittee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The last point the gentleman brought out is especially pertinent. The gentleman has fed steers in his time, and he would be nothing other than foolish if he had a hundred head on hand at this time and was faced with what is in view today, if he did not try to decide in his own mind the question, "Had I better try to unload while the unloading is good?" Unfortunately, each of the steers he does sell early will be lightweight, at least 200 pounds on an average. That is, it could have produced 200 pounds of additional beef for the consumer had it gone to maturity. This will result in hundreds of millions of pounds of beef lost to the consumer which would not have occurred if the OPS had kept its hands off and given to our cattle feeders the opportunity to feed out the cattle to prime condition.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And the quality of the beef will not be as good.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska who comes from a great agricultural area.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course the President has the power of price control, under the Defense Production Act of 1950, title IV.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. To bolster up your argument of what is happening to the feeder of live cattle, I call attention to one or two sentences of that act, which also confirms what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, told us a while ago regarding the loss with which the feeder is confronted as a result of the roll-back order. I do not know whether the administration is violating the intent of the act or not, but I call your attention to section 401, title IV, of the Price and Wage Stabilization Act, which reads:

> That the purpose of the act is to prevent inflation and other things; also to stabilize the cost of living for workers and other consumers and the cost of production for farmers.

We do not get anything near the cost of production. The purpose of the act is to give cost of production to the farmer, and this roll-back order violates the intent of the Defense Production Act, in my opinion. I believe the arguments of two or three hundred representative farmers who are in town today urging some revision of this act should be heeded, because we are going to have to extend this act. This act expires June 30, and the Committee on Banking and Currency will come here soon asking for an extension of this act. I think we should have something to say about that when that matter comes up for extension, but I do believe that every Member from a farming district should read this act. I think you should read this language. I should like to get some opinion as to whether or not Mr. DiSalle is violating the intent of the act which is stated:

> The purpose of the act is to give the farmers cost of production.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad the gentleman from Nebraska has made a very important observation. I am sure Congress intended that livestock producers should have cost of production of their commodities.

As I said a while ago, beef prices are high. This is not the way to deal with this very important commodity, a commodity that is a part of the food supply of the Nation.

The OPS order is not the way to deal with this problem. The farmer should be given a chance to produce more and more food of all kinds and not be hampered by rules and regulations that make his prospects for production even more uncertain than they are.

There are many elements that enter into it other than those we have been talking about, including weather conditions, loss by disease, and other things.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. In connection with this subject I do not think we should pass it by without pointing out that under the price control law the Price Control Administrator does not have to take into consideration cost of production; that under the parity formula the cost of production does not enter into it. But there is one man who has got to take into consideration the cost of production, and that is the man who is growing the beef, the farmer; he has to do it or go into bankruptcy. I have said repeatedly that the Government might just as well recognize that the farmer has got to take it into consideration even though they are not required to do it under either of the laws we have referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

To ignore the basic laws of farming or any other kind of work even though the laws of Congress permit them to be ignored, is very short-sighted and can only lead to reduced production, to rationing, and to less and less at higher and higher prices.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with what the gentleman from Mississippi has said, but I do not see how he can differ with me in the interpretation of the purpose of this price-control act which is stated to be to stabilize the cost of living for workers and for consumers and the cost of production for farmers and businessmen.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska that perhaps I did not use the right word; it may be that I should have said that it may not require him to do it; certainly he has not based any ruling that he had made on the cost of production, whether required or not, and it is a question of what is the right thing to do under the circumstances.

Mr. STEFAN. And one thing that the farmer cannot ignore is the cost of production.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that the problem of the New England farmer is not being solved in general by the present over-all agricultural policy of this country; and my purpose in rising at this time is not to be destructive in my criticism, but rather in hopes of bringing a constructive suggestion to your committee.

After two decades of well-meant spending, agriculture still operates under programs that are obviously temporary expedients; so I say as we try to work out a permanent agricultural program; as we look to the future, let us first analyze some of the permanent advances we have made in the past. To list a few: Hybrid corn, improved crop varieties, better fertilizing, better spraying, artificial insemination, quick freezing, improved power and machinery, and so forth, and may I call to your attention that all of these permanent advances in agriculture have one common characteristic, they have been won by scientific research. The amounts of money which we have spent thus far in agricultural research are piddling compared with the amounts of money which we have spent for the support of agricultural products. The amounts of money which we have spent for agricultural research are nothing when compared with the amounts of money we have spent for research on instruments of destruction.

I believe it will be cheaper for the taxpayer, it would be more profitable for the farmers everywhere, it would be more beneficial for consumers everywhere, if we approached the problem of agriculture, both from the point of view of the producer and consumer, with the same scientific approach we have used for the development of the atomic bomb. Now is the time to make available for research the largest sums of research money that science can use.

I want to search for new crops to prevent surplus production and to provide new goods for human use. I want to look for new uses for the crops which we presently are growing. I want to look for new ways to utilize existing surpluses. I want to look for new ways to cut the cost of production and to make our agricultural abundance available to more and more people at lower costs and I say to you with all sincerity that not only the farmer but everybody benefits from the permanent advances of science.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, this bill is of great importance to us who live in Montana where we have extensive forests. The Farm Credit Administration, the Farmers Home and Soil Conservation Service, the Research and Rural Electrification are all immensely important to us. But I want to address my remarks particularly to one provision in the bill. I do not see how it can legally work and I would like to have particularly the attention of the committee so that I may make my argument and see if they do not agree with me. I refer to page 26, lines 18 to 25, which reads as follows:

Provided, That hereafter no part of the appropriation for "Cooperative range improvements" shall be expended in any national forest until funds or other contributions at least equal to such expenditures are made available by States or other local public or private sources, except that claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the purposes of this section.

I do not believe that provision can be carried out under present law. It is my understanding that at the proper time a point of order will be made against this provision on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said that if a point of order is made against it he will ask that the whole paragraph be stricken. I hope he does not do that because the paragraph is impossible to carry out under present law.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say that I would have to do that because the appropriation is made strictly contingent one upon the other and that is the feeling of the committee. This is no threat. The two parts go together.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to have the gentleman follow my argument because he has given us something that if left in the bill in the way it is, we cannot get the appropriation for range improvement. I think he will agree with me when he hears what I have to say.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the language is prohibitive and the intent is not possible within the law.

Section 12 of Public Law 478, Eighty-first Congress, reads as follows:

Of the moneys received from grazing fees by the Treasury from each national forest during each fiscal year there shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress an amount equivalent to 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and goats and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such national forest during the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins, which appropriated amount shall be available until expended on such national forests, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for (1) artificial revegetation, including the collection or purchase of necessary seed; (2) construction and maintenance of drift or division fences and stock-watering places, bridges, corrals, driveways, or other necessary range improvements; (3) control of range-destroying rodents; or (4) eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds, in order to protect or improve the future productivity of the range.

You will note that the 2 cents for sheep and 10 cents for cattle per animal-month can be spent, when appropriated for four purposes. There is no requirement for matching funds such as proposed in the pending bill.

It is proposed here that the matching be done by State or other local public or private sources. There is some question as to whether States could legally appropriate funds for this purpose. Also, the State legislatures have concluded their sessions and there would be no possibility of getting funds for this fiscal year from that source. Private funds possibly could be obtained, but by the time this bill becomes law it will be a difficult source of matching funds for the coming fiscal year.

Evidently in recognition of this situation, the provision is made that claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the purposes of this section.

The act of December 29, 1950, makes certain sums available to the States with this provision:

Such sums shall be expended by such States in accordance with the terms of the acts of May 28, 1908, and March 1, 1911, as amended.

The portion of these acts with which we are concerned reads as follows:

Twenty-five percent of all moneys received during any fiscal year from each national forest shall be paid, at the end of such year, by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such national forest is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which such national forest is situated.

In other words the money made available to the States under the Act of December 29, 1950, is earmarked for a specific purpose, to wit: "for the benefit of the public schools and public roads," and therefore cannot be used as proposed in lines 23 through 25 on page 26.

In other words, the money is earmarked for this particular purpose and cannot be used for any other. Therefore, without the Congress changing the act, the funds cannot be used for matching.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman from Montana, I think, is eminently correct in what he has to say about this particular section. I do not think it will work, but in addition to that the act of December 29, 1950, is an act which was passed out of our committee, as I think the gentleman will remember, which involves $1,350,000 which the Forestry Service illegally diverted from funds due to the counties for the support of the public schools and the public roads. We passed a bill last session, as the gentleman will remember, involving 15 States, all of which had been illegally and improperly deprived of these funds. Now the appropriation subcommittee comes along and says: "Well, you can use that $1,350,000 to match $700,000 which we put in this bill, which is patently legislation on an appropriation bill, and at the same time deprives these counties of the moneys to which they are entitled and was illegally taken away from them and diverted from the uses which the law says the money should be put.

Mr. D'EWART. The law we wrote stated this money was to be paid to the States for use on public schools and roads. Now the Committee on Appropriations says, without changing the act we have passed, that we will use it to match funds on the national forests. That cannot be done without changing the act we passed here in Congress. Neither can those funds be taken out of the State treasuries without additional appropriations by the States, and their legislatures cannot make these appropriations because they are not in session.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman has built up a pretty good case as to the difficulties under which this provision would put certain States and the entire program. I would suggest to him that when we read the bill for amendment, rather than making a point of order against that provision, that he offer an amendment to strike out that provision, and I would be glad personally to accept such an amendment.

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to hear what the gentleman, a member of the committee has had to say, but striking this last clause which relates to the Act of December 29, 1950 will not give these people the money, $1,350,000, of which they were illegally deprived. I should like to know whether or not the committee would be willing then to permit us to have that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is asking for too much at this time. I think I have conceded plenty.

Mr. ENGLE. By conceding what has been conceded the gentleman has conceded what has been conceded to be illegal and subject to a point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman realizes that the chairman of the subcommittee has stated that if a point of order is made to that provision in this paragraph he will insist on the point of order against the entire paragraph, which is his right. I am just trying to show the gentleman a way to accomplish his purpose without losing the $700,000 that now is in the bill.

Mr. D'EWART. This $700,000 was paid by the stockmen for the purpose of range improvement at the rate specified in the law. I do not think the committee wants to refuse the money for that purpose. I doubt if the committee want to refuse the use of the money for the purpose for which it was collected. Striking the whole provision out of the bill will lose that money for the improvement of the ranges that was paid in by the stockmen for that purpose. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman that we should have an opportunity to match these funds, and the forest users would quite likely like to match them, but the Forest Service has usually taken the position that it does

not want private funds spent on national forests because it might institute what is known as a vested interest. It has discouraged that.

We do not want to lose the original $700,000. We hope some way, as suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota, can be worked out so we can save this money. It cannot be saved as it is written in the bill, because it is illegal, and it cannot be saved if the whole provision is stricken out. We hope we can get together on a solution.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I concur completely in the remarks of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, with regard to section 407 of the bill as reported by the committee.

It seems to me most unfortunate that the committee has chosen this method for dealing with the problem of the difference in the cost of living in the States and in the Territories and possessions. I am confident that if the members of the committee had given this subject more thorough consideration they would have concluded that the incorporation of this provision in the bill is not only unwise but extremely unfair to the employees of the Department of Agriculture.

The question with which we are dealing is not principally that of whether or not the differential should be paid but the basis upon which it should be paid. The chairman of the committee has suggested that this subject should be dealt with by general law. But there already is general law by which this subject can be dealt with. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] pointed this out earlier in this debate. He told you of the provision incorporated in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1948 under which payment of the differential must be based on differences in cost of living.

The differential that was paid in Hawaii was reduced from 25 percent to 20 percent something less than a year ago under the provisions of this law.

I do not know whether the members of the committee realize that not long ago a subcommittee of the other body visited the Territory of Alaska and found differences in the cost of living there so much greater than in the States and of such vital importance to the problem of compensating people in the national-defense work that they have asked for an immediate survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the cost of living in that Territory. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has since requested funds to carry out such a survey in both the Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii. It has just completed a survey in Puerto Rico and in the District of Columbia. I do not think it is appropriate to deal with this general subject of compensation in the Territories and possessions until we have the facts which that survey will provide. I hope therefore the Congress, in the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, which is now in the other body, will provide adequate funds to carry out this survey. Then we will have the facts with which to carry out the general law for the application of the principle of paying a differential in outlying areas.

What does this section do to the Territory of Hawaii? We had in Hawaii on January 1 this year a total of 21,836 civilian employees on the Federal payroll. The number now is probably nearer 25,000. Of that number 184—only 184—are on the payroll of the Department of Agriculture.

What would this amendment do? This amendment would say to those employees who are residents of Hawaii, "You do not get the differential, but if you are a resident of the States, you will get the differential." Obviously it is unfair. The Federal Government learned, soon after the policy of paying the differential was introduced, that you cannot as a practical matter pay one man 25 percent more than another when they are doing exactly the same work, just because one of them comes from the States and the other one comes from Hawaii. That sort of thing discourages people from establishing citizenship in Hawaii.

There are too many people there who would like to make Hawaii their home, but do not do so because they want to have voting representation in the Congress. They know that when they have a Congressman here who is voting in the House, or a Senator who votes in the other body they are in an infinitely better position to protect themselves than when they are represented only by Delegates, or a Resident Commissioner who do not have the right to vote.

You know this business of not having the right to vote is like breathing fresh air—it is something you do not miss until you do not have it.

I want to point this out also. This whole program of paying a differential was calculated to draw people to those areas for defense purposes. It is something which was originated by the Federal Government and not by the people in the Territories and insular possessions. Today we need 500 to 1,000 new mechanics at Pearl Harbor. Most of the men who were drawn there during World War II having these special skills have gone. The Navy has been advertising as far east as Boston to draw men to Hawaii. And here it is proposed to break down by this amendment the whole system by which such men were originally induced to go to Pearl Harbor.

This is colonialism—that is what it is. You should not pay one scale of wages to the people from the States, and another scale of wages to people in the outlying areas.

It is wrong in principle.

It is unfair.

It is destructive of efficiency in the Federal service. I do not think there is anything about it which is justified.

I appeal to the members of the committee to do as the subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation did, and accept the amendment of the delegate from Alaska that the section be withdrawn.

I want to point out that in the committee report reference is made only to the situation in Puerto Rico. I think the decision on this question should be ruled by principle, but do believe all the facts pertinent to its application should be given consideration. There is nothing in the report or in the hearings about Hawaii and Alaska. I think the same principle should apply to all Territories and possessions, but the conditions in all of those areas are very different. I understand that in Alaska the cost of living is 40 or 50 percent above what it is in Seattle. The situation we have in Hawaii is somewhat different. It should be evident from that this question need further consideration before action is taken on it.

I hope therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the members of the subcommittee will accept the amendment which the delegate from Alaska will offer at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the delegate from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of making a few observations on the question before us. Although I recognize and regret exceedingly that most of these gentlemen who are interested in agriculture and the prosperity and welfare of our farmers have not at all times unfortunately voted for anything that might be in the interest of the consumer or the people who make it possible for them to dispose of their great crops and everything they produce.

For 10 years the farm organizations have fought for a parity program for agriculture. Before I proceed I want to say that I shall again, as I have consistently done for 45 years, vote for appropriations in aid for our farmers, because if my side would not do so, the farmer would have to look to God alone for help. But I do not see why they do not try to help themselves by supporting those who are with them and who have guided them to their present prosperity.

As I started to say, Mr. Chairman, for 10 years the farm organizations have fought for a parity program for agriculture. Unfortunately for the consumers, a number of farm products are away above parity, such as cotton and wool, while meats are above the support price.

Though 90 percent of the American people are pleading for price controls, the representatives of the livestock growers, the feeders, and the packers are here in force endeavoring to nullify the order of Price Control Administrator DiSalle which will roll back all meat prices from the farm to the consumer table, which to my mind should have been done 6 months or more ago. I realized what would happen, and it has happened. The prices of all foodstuffs and the necessities of life have gone sky high.

They seem to be reinforced by Mr. Wilson, Defense Production Administrator, who appears to be rather indifferent to the plight of the masses, but who has, so far as I have been able to observe, played into the hands of these profiteers.

In his testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee yesterday, he called himself a reluctant witness. Instead of fighting for the program of the administration, he permits the opposition to play with his weak and qualified statements in support of an official order of one branch of his agency. He stated: "We hope to use these controls only during the period while we are expanding production," and that he "hoped in a couple of years we will be able to remove controls, which are, after all, a comparative hardship—only comparative."

It might be well to ask Mr. Wilson and his Republican friends just who suffers the hardship resulting from these controls in a great emergency? Does he give any thought to the masses who labor to produce the materials of defense, who, after a hard days' work come home to a scant table devoid of the one food item that gives him strength to labor and toil? No. His mind is apparently centered on one factor—profits and more profits for big business, big agriculture, big dealers in meats and other necessary foodstuffs. It is high time, gentlemen, that we consider the plight of the human element first, instead of basing all our actions on the dollar profit of those selfishly and greedily enhancing their ill-gotten gains in all crises.

At some later date I will point out the fallacy of the position Mr. Wilson has taken. Today, however, I wish especially to call attention to the fact that all those trying to destroy and nullify the order which will bring some relief to the consumer have made greater profits in 1950, and are continuing to add to those profits in the first quarter of 1951, than they ever made before. While Mr. Wilson hesitates to go all out for this order before the committee, he shows no "reluctance" for a moment in handing over to these giant interests, not millions but billions, to build plants and expand their facilities to add more millions to their profits.

I have tried to obtain figures on the profits of the so-called feeders but as I do not have the correct ones, I shall not attempt to quote them, but I know their profits have been tremendous.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman speaks of these statistics put out by the Department of Agriculture. They show that the average laboring man today in Chicago or for that matter anywhere else, can buy more meat today with an hour's work than he could back in 1929. Certainly the gentleman knows that the average wage of the workingman has gone up two or three times since 1929. Can he not see the viewpoint of the farmers who today, like myself, in order to get additional help, the only help we can secure back on that farm in Minnesota this spring, is at the rate of a dollar an hour for a man 55 years of age, rather than a monthly wage of $150 a month, which we paid last year. I am just asking the gentleman to look at our side of the picture.

Mr. SABATH. I am; that is the reason I have at all times voted to aid the farmer, because when the farmer is prosperous, when he makes money he is able to buy things for his family; he is able to buy machinery and spend money which creates business and employment; I recognize that, and I have been criticized in my district frequently for supporting the agricultural program. Unfortunately, however, the consumer notwithstanding the gentleman's statement, is not in the position he says. Today very few average wage earners can afford to buy real cuts of meat; they cannot even afford to buy the cheaper cuts; consequently the statement the gentleman makes is not justified by the facts. I know many people in my city who are in that situation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The only thing is that I am quoting statistics as gathered by the Department of Agriculture; it is not my statement.

Mr. SABATH. I know that labor has received increases, but they have not accumulated the wealth the farmers have, and I do not begrudge it to them. I remember when farms were being foreclosed. That is not the case today. I am told that in many communities farmers have accumulated so much money under the Democratic administration that even the banks in their localities will not accept any more deposits because they have too much money on hand now belonging to the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the increase in wages. In that connection may I say that I admit there has been an increase in wages from time to time, but you know and I know that the industries have not suffered. The fact is these men who have received some increase have produced tremendous wealth for industry, they have aided our industries in making millions upon millions of dollars; in fact, the industries, notwithstanding the increase in wages, have made greater profits and have greater surpluses than ever before in the history of the United States. Of course, some people feel that they have made too much and that they can very easily increase the wages of their workers by a greater percentage than they have and still make millions in profits.

I am of the opinion, in view of conditions and the prosperity which was brought to the farmers of this country due to the aid of our Government, that this fact should be appreciated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The aid of our Government and under the leadership of the Democratic Party.

Mr. SABATH. I am just coming to that, and I thank our majority leader for calling attention to it.

Mr. Chairman, when you consider the financial condition of the farmer, the livestock raiser and the feeder today, and compare it with the plight they were in in 1933 when the Democratic Party took over a financially unsound economy, it is difficult to understand the failure of the farmers of our country to appreciate the improvement that has come to them. Many of them are still being led astray by the Republican Party and its leaders who have never done anything for them. The Democratic Party has done more for the farmer, assisting in the solution of his problems during adverse periods, than all of the controlled Wall Street parties in all history. Every section of our country, including the cotton- and peanut-growing States, has been well taken care of by this Democratic administration, and yet we find some of the representatives from the cotton- and peanut-growing States lining up with the Republicans as part of the coalition which is now endeavoring to scuttle the farm program of this administration.

Many of you here will remember, and it is an historical fact, that in 1932, under the Hoover Republican administration, wheat was selling at 38 cents a bushel, corn at 32 cents, cotton at 6½ cents a pound and peanuts were 1½ cents a pound. Farmers were staggering under a mortgage load almost unbearable, with interest rates so outrageously high they were scandalous, and foreclosures so general they had to call out the State police in many sections to prevent bloodshed. The mortgage bankers and Wall Street was squeezing the last drop of blood out of the American farmer, while the Republican administration sat placidly by acquiescing by its inaction in the plundering and destruction of this solid core of our economy. It was this Democratic administration that came to the rescue of the farmer in that dark hour. It was the Roosevelt administration that launched the first constructive program of aid and assistance to the tiller of the soil.

It is also rather significant that in the last full year of the Hoover Republican administration there was appropriated for the Department of Agriculture less than $300,000,000.

With the advent of the present Democratic administration in 1933 under our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, there was launched the greatest program of aid and assistance to the farmer this or any other country ever experienced. The Roosevelt administration set up the following comprehensive program to improve the lot of agriculture:

First. A credit program.

Second. A program of research to expand production.

Third. A production and marketing administration.

Fourth. A rural electrification program, which today provides 85 percent of our farm homes with electric light and power.

Fifth. An extension service to better the health, education and recreation facilities in farm areas.

Sixth. A program of loans for farm home construction.

Seventh. A comprehensive forestry program.

Eighth. A soil conservation and flood-control program.

This all took money. When we appropriated the huge sums necessary, I well remember how my Republican colleagues shouted this would bankrupt the Nation.

In the years 1939, 1940, 1941, appropriations for agriculture exceeded the billion mark each year, reaching $1.5 billions in the latter year. It was in 1917 that Congress adopted the first billion-dollar budget for the operation of the entire Government. What a hew and cry was raised by my Republican colleagues at that time. And yet, today, I dare say there is not a Member on this floor who would challenge the wisdom of the expenditures made for agriculture during the years 1939, 1940, 1941, all of which exceeded the total Government budget in 1917.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is claiming so much credit for the Democrats, but will the gentleman also take credit for the high prices the consumers must pay toward the national debt?

Mr. SABATH. I am fully aware of the high prices that the consumer pays, and that is mostly because of the high profits exacted by big business on everything the wage earner must buy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Congress of the United States, this very body, refused to give the President powers, in particular when the President sought the power to regulate gambling of any food on the commodity markets, and the greater portion of the Republican Members, or practically all of them, voted to deny that power to the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Who controls the Congress?

Mr. McCORMACK. Never mind.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. You are in control.

Mr. McCORMACK. You have your responsibility. Are you not a Member of the House?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is a Democratic administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are you not a Member of the House? You have your individual responsibility.

Mr. SABATH. I am only inclined to bring home facts and I do not want to hurt any present Member, because I think the present Members on the Republican side will commence to realize that it is their duty to cooperate with us, who believe in bringing down the high cost of living, and that they will not follow those who are trying every day in the week and every week in the month and every month in the year to increase prices. This Democratic administration has tried to control that, but unfortunately in the last few years you gentlemen on that side—I do not mean all of you—I mean those reactionaries that control the Republican Party, have inveigled some of the Democrats to join hands and bring about an unholy alliance, and in that way, though the Democrats have a paper majority, your coalition is in the saddle, and you showed it only a few days ago when you really scuttled the bill and the appropriations for a department that is vitally concerned with the proper conduct and efficient administration of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman that the Republican Party generally does believe in saving money for the taxpayers and wage earners. In that respect I do agree with the gentleman. However, I feel that in view of the remarks that the majority leader made, it should be pointed out that the amendment to the Defense Production Act to which he called attention, regarding gambling in the commodity markets, was introduced and offered by a Democrat, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and was passed in a Democratic Congress, and therefore certainly cannot be laid at the door of the Republican Party, which seems to be the effort. Whenever there is any legislation in a Democratic Congress which does not seem to appeal to the gentlemen, then they say it is the fault of the Republicans for passing it.

Mr. SABATH. I do not like to charge the Republicans with all of their offenses and shortcomings. I am calling attention to only a few of them. There are so many that I would be obliged to use the entire time only for that purpose, and I do not desire to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], whom I like very much and admire, is very adroit. He is elected by the people of his district, as is every one of us, without regard to party, to be a Member of this body. The gentleman from New York, and all of us, have the responsibility in our own right to vote for the best interests of the country and the best interests of the people. The gentleman from New York ought to know now, if he did not know then, that that vote was directly against the best interests of the people, to permit gambling in food on the commodity exchanges of the country. Each and every one of those who voted for that amendment, no matter who offered it, have their responsibility, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. KEATING. If the gentleman will yield so that I may reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, may I say that I agree with the majority leader as to the responsibility of the individual Members of Congress. It so happens that on this particular issue I believe I voted the same way the gentleman from Massachusetts did. The thing I am objecting to is trying to throw at the door of the Republican Party the responsibility for not passing legislation or for passing legislation in a Democratic Congress. It just does not make sense.

Mr. SABATH. I know it does not make sense when the Republicans wean over a few reactionary Democrats and control nearly every proposition that is brought into this House. We are helpless. The Democratic majority in the House is helpless now, due to the coalition that exists. I presume in a short space of time that coalition will be broken up. If not, there may be another coalition; namely, the progressive, liberal-minded Republicans—and I know many of them dislike to be driven as they are today against their will to vote for measures they do not believe in—will join the honest, sincere, liberal, and progressive Democrats. Then, perhaps, we will put an end to the reactionary crowd that now is in control.

As to the question of gambling, the gentleman from Illinois started the fight against the stock exchange in 1929 and also against gambling on the other exchanges. I succeeded in bringing about some relief, though not the relief I sought. Nevertheless, I hope that gambling on these exchanges will be shortly restricted so as to protect legitimate American business and American industry, and the consumers of our country.

Let me call attention, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, to the enviable position of the American farmer today—all accomplished under the Democratic administration of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I find this a rather difficult atmosphere to proceed in. I happen to represent one of the greatest agricultural districts in the United States, as well as one of the greatest agricultural States in the United States, and, incidentally one of the greatest manufacturing States.

I am concerned in the beef problem, not so much as to the prices because no honest man can stand here and promise you that beef prices will be less, but I am interested, to sum this matter up very briefly, that the laboring man may have some beef to eat. I was a member of the House Committee on Agriculture for some 8 years. I fought with might and main against the imposition of those controls in the Second World War. But I want to say I had a delegation last week from a company that brings feeder cattle in from Montana and western Nebraska to my State for feeding. Many of the men want to cancel their order for feeders. Obviously the farmer does not want to put them on his farm and take a markdown of 10 percent on them right away and then have another 4½ percent taken from his gains in August and another 4½ percent in October. Heaven knows what Mike DiSalle will decide to do in the meantime in addition to that. So this company was hard put to it and many of these feeder cattle, young Angus and young Herefords, if that means anything to the city people, which have a frame to hang a real beef carcass on, are going to the slaughterhouse for a quick loss. Because they shrink rapidly many of those men who ship them cannot keep them and maintain them for a long time, and they have to move them.

I had a packer here on Monday a week ago who has a business of about four millions of dollars a year. He is one of those little packers that the gentleman from Chicago expressed an interest in some years heretofore. He has a ceiling imposed on all of his beef products. He

can only go so far in the market for cattle and then he has to stop. I have the biggest little market of livestock—it is not so little, either—it is bigger than some whole States. As I was saying I have the biggest little market of cattle and hogs at Archbold, Ohio. They also have a packing house. That man sat outside here on Monday morning to see me because he is up against this ceiling and he cannot mark his products up, and he has to mark his inventory down. He had doubled his hog-killing capacity but get no quota to use it. I do not think anyone, should inflation get worse in the United States, can promise that beef will be cheaper, but what I would like to be sure of is that we have some beef to eat. I predicted during the Second World War that we would have a black market, and that is exactly what happened. I voted against it. No man has ever heard me stand in the well of this House and ask any subsidy or any handout or any wet-nursing for agriculture in the State of Ohio from the Federal Government. We were spreading lime and practicing crop rotation and soil conservation before most of the Members of this House were born. We are still practicing it. We did not need to be told that. I think perhaps they may have gotten the idea from the State of Ohio and probably Lancaster County up here in Pennsylvania, got the idea from us about the necessity of taking care of the land.

Last Monday when these men bid as high as they could in auctions in my district for cattle buyers from as far east as New Jersey or New York, and these vital areas where maldistribution, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], spoke about, is already taking place, they bought these cattle at a price over the ceiling which our local packer could pay. You are going to lose the blood and the hides and the pharmaceutical byproducts and most of those things when they go out in the orchard or some old barn or shed to slaughter the cattle. That is what you are going to lose; you will eat uninspected beef. You are going to send millions of these cattle to the market light in weight and 200 or 300 pounds per carcass will be lost. When they put this on before, I had 228 Herefords on my farm in 1943, and had raised nearly 400 hogs, or something over 350 that year, as I remember. But they took every single man off of the farms and left my brother, who was 55 years of age, on a farm of that size without any help. They are beginning to strip the farms again. They are beginning to strip the Ohio farms and the farms in Illinois and Indiana and Iowa of men now. I have asked the Secretary of State, when he comes before our Appropriations Committee, if Mexico is a member of the United Nations, and he says, "Yes." And then I have said, "Why must I help provide a haven for young Mexicans of military age while we strip many of our farms of the last available man and send them to Korea, this police action, as you call it?"

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am mindful of the fact that the gentleman is a member of the subcommittee handling State Department funds. I do not want to divert him, but can the gentleman tell us this afternoon perhaps when that bill is going to be brought before the House?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I do not have the slightest guess.

Mr. CANFIELD. Has the bill been marked up?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Not at all. It has not been taken up.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wonder why.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I do not know, but I am intrigued by one thing, and that is that 90 percent slaughter order. Perhaps I have the answer to it, because I remember a gentleman who came to us with all sincerity and said that in 1944 we should reserve a certain percentage of the steers for breeding purposes. Some of you Members from the Corn Belt know that you do not increase the number of beef or pork or chickens with steers and barrows and capons. That may be the reason for that 90 percent killing order.

I am telling you that the black market will start that, rather soon.

You may not notice this for 4 or 5 months but these cattle you are driving to quick slaughter now are the meat of next January, February, and March, after the corn in the Corn Belt has been put into them. Do not let them kid you when you go downtown and buy a slice of prime ribs of beef for $2.50. They are not prime ribs of beef at all. They are just good cow beef. Most of them are commercial grades. They are not prime ribs of beef at all, just commercial United States Good grades.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I want to address the House this afternoon on just one matter.

My State of Idaho is almost 500 miles long and attains a width of over 300 miles. My district, the northern half of the State, is 360 miles long from north to south. Seventy-five percent of it is taken up by Government land. Most of the Government land in my district is within national forests, mountainous, and much of it covered with very valuable standing timber. Very little of it is taken up in farming. Most of it is subject to just two crops, white pine trees mainly, and metal mining. So those two subjects are of course very close to me in my representation of that district.

We have the largest stand of white pine in the world in my district. Most of it is Government owned. We have had an infestation in that district for some years of the white pine blister rust which, unless eradicated, will destroy millions of dollars' worth of Government owned timber.

I have no doubt that many of the Members have taken trips out to the West at different times and all that I have spoken to have been unanimous in their enthusiasm about our pine-clad hills and slopes and valleys. I think it is the most beautiful place in the world.

Other farmers have to look after their crops. They have to provide the seed. They have to see that the seed is planted. Frequently they have to spray the crop, if it is fruit. They have to look after it in many, many ways, as well as harvest it later. God is our farmer. God planted the trees, and as long as civilization has not interfered too much the crop does pretty well under the divine leadership of the Almighty. He is able to provide the rain. He is able to provide the sunlight, the minerals, and substances in the soil that only can grow a tree. But when civilization comes in some of these infestations are brought in along with the march of progress and civilization. This white-pine blister rust is one of them. White pine, of all the American trees, I think perhaps yields the best crop. It is the highest-priced timber we have in the West. Those of you who are acquainted with it will know that it is straight in grain and possesses very few knots. It is a grade of timber which is highly desirable.

We have had for many years in the West a program of eradication of blister rust, a spore-borne disease which goes through a second phase of its existence on gooseberry bushes and barberry bushes and a few other things. The manner of getting rid of its has been to pull out the ribes, the barberry and such; but in the last 3 years a spray has been found which is better, cheaper, quicker, and more effective than the ordinary method of pulling out the ribes. I have been a Forest Service physician for 46 years and have taken care of many hernias and broken legs where these service workers were pulling out ribes on the mountainside, where the bush gave way too rapidly and he would fall head over heels probably a hundred feet, roll down the hillside with a resulting hernia. I have seen hundreds of those cases. I can appreciate the fact that with the spray which is used at the present time in killing those spore-carrying berries and shrubs that it is a very sane and sensible way to take care of it.

There is an appropriation in this agriculture bill to protect this valuable Government-owned timber. It has not been cut down a great deal, about $100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to concur in what my neighbor from Idaho is saying about the need for protecting these very valuable stands of white pine, particularly in the Panhandle of Idaho. It is possible for us to protect our own resources there even though our neighbor, Canada, is not doing so, if we will keep the host plants for these spores eradicated by spraying. I trust that the committee and the House will abide by the decision of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations in this particular item.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Washington. As I said, the committee cut down the proposed appropriation only $100,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why did they cut $100,000 out of a meritorious thing like this?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I do not know; I cannot say.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Has anybody said why they should?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. No, not that I have heard.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. STIGLER. I call the gentleman's attention to page 10 of the report wherein the committee states:

> It is believed that further consolidations of field offices and reductions in supervisory levels in the white-pine blister-rust program will permit the absorption of the reduction without any curtailment of program.

I wish to call your further attention to the fact that this particular project was reduced less than any other one project. We found in our hearings that this particular agency had more supervisors than workers; therefore the cut.

Mr. HORAN. I believe there were some four or five levels of supervision between Washington and the work. I concur with the committee. Because I believe in the project is no excuse for its not being run efficiently, and I believe this was oversupervised. At least we are placing the burden upon those who have this project in hand now.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I agree with the members of the committee. I am very much in favor of cutting down appropriations when it can be done without sacrificing the service, and I go along with the committee in its cutting $100,000, but I want to see it left at that if possible.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on the Hit Parade program some months ago there was a song called the September Song, some of the words of which were "It is a long time from May to September."

I frankly think Mr. DiSalle is going to conclude that the words of that song have some truth in them. This order of his goes into effect in May, but the full effect will come along in September. Between now and September the consumers of America cannot look to Mr. DiSalle for any relief. He does not even pretend that this first roll-back order will benefit the consumers of America. It is definitely done to increase the profits of the processors and handlers of beef cattle. There is not any mistake about that. Yet, somehow or other, the public seems to be under the impression that Mr. DiSalle is going to give them some immediate relief on the price of beef cattle. That just is not true.

After giving to the processors and handlers some additional profits, he comes along and takes 9 cents a pound out of the hide of every beef cattle that goes to the market. That comes out of the pockets of the producers.

I want to say to the committee that I have not definitely made up my mind about the feasibility of the order which Mr. DiSalle has issued and the others which he contemplates issuing. We had him before the House Committee on Agriculture for several long hours, including an all-day session on Monday, and I must say to the membership of the House that he spoke frankly and forthrightly and with a great degree of sincerity. I believe he gave the committee the full benefit of all the information that was then and there available to him. But actually he made out a woefully weak case in his effort to justify the issuance of these orders. He did not have information which the committee deemed pertinent, but he at least admitted he did not have the information there and has assured us he would provide us with the facts and figures.

When I asked him the question what margin of profit he had left for the producers of beef cattle he was utterly at a loss and he had no answer. I said, "Mr. DiSalle, you say that this order deals with margins and you are now before the committee admitting that you do not know what margin you left for the farmer." I pointed out to him that we had been told he had actually left no margin of profit for the producer. Then we asked him who would receive the benefit from this roll-back in prices, what part would go to the processor and what part to the handler, and he was unable to give us the breakdown. But we do know it will not go to the consumer. The consumers should know that and they should know it well.

I am under the impression that the processors and packers of this country are now doing pretty well on the profits they are presently receiving. On Monday night I was invited to attend a meeting of beef cattlemen. There they had a great panel of well-informed persons. They threw the meeting open to the press, and there are a lot of smart men and women representing the press of this country. They were asking very positive, definite, and pertinent questions and I think I can say frankly that they did not get frank and forthright answers and that the beef cattlemen were likewise woefully weak in justifying their opposition to Mr. DiSalle's order.

I do not mean to say that the beef cattle industry cannot show by facts and figures that they are justified in their opposition to the order, but I am frank to say that they failed to show it Monday night at that meeting. I am sure that the Committee on Agriculture is anxious to have all the information we can possibly obtain that will aid our Committee and the Members of Congress in making up our minds what we should do about a continuation of this authority when we are called upon to extend it. I am satisfied that this meat order is going to result in less meat and I am definitely of the opinion that it will result in black market operations of greater magnitude than we have ever known before.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in those last two statements he has made.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. I do not think Mr. DiSalle will contend that this order is calculated to increase the production of beef. Then, if it is not going to increase the production of beef and is only going to result in a lower price, certainly by lowering the price you increase the consumer demand and the people will eat more beef; the demand will be greater, and then the question comes up where is the additional beef coming from to meet this additional demand.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. In the discussion with Mr. DiSalle, was the matter brought up in regard to the black markets and what its effect would be on the medicinal parts of the beef?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think that was, but perhaps you and I and other Members of this House know more about that than Mr. DiSalle does.

Mrs. BOLTON. We have had experiences already, like the shortages in hides.

Mr. COOLEY. You will lose the by-products and you may actually peril the lives of the people of this country by taking beef cattle out into the back yards and butchering them under unsanitary conditions. I think perhaps this is the most important order that Mr. DiSalle will issue during his stay in office. I am not certain that it is ill-advised, but I do want to say that we want the Secretary of Agriculture to come before the committee, and I want to know how he feels about it. He is the head agricultural man in this country. We have economists and experts in that Department, and I want to know whether he approved it or disapproved it. Then we can act in the light of such information as he may be able to furnish.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. The gentleman heard Mr. DiSalle say that the reason for having to roll these prices back is because the farmers would not sell the live animals to the packers at a price at which they could make a profit on slaughtering them. What I am wondering is, how does Mr. DiSalle think he can force the farmers to sell at a price below what the packers are now offering?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think Mr. DiSalle can do that and I do not think anybody else can do it, and that is the reason I think black markets will flourish world without end, with all of its evil effects.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to know how you are going to roll back these prices without rolling back wages.

Mr. COOLEY. That is it. When you start to roll back prices somebody is

going to get hurt. And who is going to get hurt in this? We know that the farmer is going to get hurt, that is all. It is being rolled back for the one purpose of adding to the profits of the nonfarmer group, the handlers and the processors. If the farmer is going to get hurt, how much is he going to get hurt? If his profits are too enormous, then certainly Mr. DiSalle is justified in bringing profits within reason, but I do want to know that there is profit enough left to constitute some incentive to producers to stay in business.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the chairman of our committee remember that Mr. DiSalle hoped that the consumer might get one-tenth of the benefit, but he had no guaranty that he would, and that was all the hope that he held out for the consumer on this May 20 ruling?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct. If the public knew the truth they could understand why we are distressed and disturbed about this order which vitally affects such a large segment of our population. It is well enough to stand here and talk about the evils of inflation. I think that our Committee on Agriculture is just as disturbed about the possible evils of inflation as any other committee in the House. At the same time, that committee is in a position to get information which I think might be of value to the Members of the House when we come to vote upon this program in the future. So I want to say to the Members that we are approaching the matter impartially and with the one idea of trying to find out the true situation. We will have the cattle industry come before our committee and accord them an opportunity to present their views fully on this important matter, which vitally affects the welfare and future of their business. We will try to arrange for the Secretary of Agriculture to express his views publicly concerning this matter about which he and his associates should certainly be well advised. We, of course, must realize that Mr. DiSalle has a very difficult job. He will probably issue no order which will be universally popular. In all probability all of his orders will be very unpopular with those who feel that they are being placed at a disadvantage or are being forced to change their prices or methods of doing business. If it becomes necessary or desirable to have Mr. DiSalle to return to the committee for the purpose of further discussion of the matter we shall, of course, be glad to afford him an opportunity to do so. In the meantime, I hope that producers will submit reasons, sound arguments, and facts and figures to support their contentions and complaints rather than to file numerous protests without any effort to prove or substantiate or to in any way justify their opposition.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon the very able and fair chairman of the subcommittee replied to a question I asked as to the method used by the committee in reaching its recommendation of $15,000,000 for administrative expenses for the Commodity Credit Corporation. I should add that the committee is to be commended for having reduced the amount requested from $20,200,000 to $15,000,000. The chairman of the subcommittee stated in effect that there could be no definite certainty as to exactly what amount was necessary.

Many of my colleagues know that I have been studying the operation of this particular agency for a good many months. From time to time I have reported the facts I have been able to develop and have expressed my very real concern as to whether certain of its operations were in any sense of the word satisfactory or justifiable.

Since the committee report and hearings became available I have tried to examine the evidence pertinent to the point of the amount to be appropriated for this purpose. I have also studied as carefully as I could this agency's report of financial condition and operations as of March 31, 1951, which was made public on Monday. By tomorrow I hope to be able to complete certain comparisons as to the operation of this agency during the last few years with a view to arriving at a figure which I believe should be seriously considered by us as the amount to be provided in this item.

I recognize that this is a limitation or a ceiling. But I think we would all agree that Congress has an obligation itself to place as realistic a limitation as is humanly possible, particularly when we know that another subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is now working on a budget item which apparently will be in the neighborhood of $60,000,000,000. I submit that wherever we can insure that no unnecessary expenditures will be made by the Federal Government through any of its agencies, it is our clear duty to do that.

At this time, and because so much of the information available to us is in the form of quite complex statistics, I want to make readily accessible to all Members for the RECORD of tomorrow some of the basic data that I have been able to develop.

First, the question has arisen as to the accumulated losses during this current fiscal year on the purchase and disposition of certain of these commodities. I have taken from the March 31 report the figures for inventory in pounds and in dollars on butter, cheese, dried milk, dried eggs, and Irish potatoes. On these five items alone, the decrease since June 30, 1950, in pounds, amount to 505,689,832. The decrease in dollars is $182,982,065.84. The loss on disposition totals $203,845,928.12.

Then, may I point out, and this is extremely significant in terms of arriving at a reasonable amount for these operations, that during this 9-month period the total amount of the carrying charges for these five items is $9,723,301.15. This is certainly money that is gone forever, and largely paid for the storage of these five commodities.

Incidentally, it may be of interest to note that during this same period, the Government purchased 282,584,120 pounds of shelled peanuts, sold 282,580,560 pounds and that the loss on disposition amounted to $11,244,022.37.

The details as to these facts are as follows:

	Inventory			
	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951
	Pounds	*Pounds*		
Butter	161,649,213	9,955,226	$90,452,285.29	$6,245,681.17
Cheese	58,902,053	7,145	19,706,623.64	2,480.03
Milk, dried	362,831,819	94,170,819	45,718,460.06	12,399,771.96
Eggs, dried	93,918,525	67,569,688	103,290,365.96	66,528,135.95
Potatoes, Irish		9,900		19,980.00
Total	677,401,610	171,711,778	268,167,734.95	85,195,609.11

	Purchases, fiscal year through Mar. 31, 1951	Sales, fiscal year through Mar. 31, 1951	Loss on disposition	Carrying charges, fiscal year to Mar. 31, 1951
	Pounds	*Pounds*		
Butter	44,893,269	134,186,965	$40,317,665.59	$2,205,789.96
Cheese	64,968,575	98,054,201	24,044,954.26	1,944,487.47
Milk, dried	121,746,279	273,448,028	36,938,604.79	3,130,512.95
Eggs, dried	25,227,545	18,611,230	60,527,328.38	1,972,389.25
Potatoes, Irish	40,838,998	38,338,742	42,017,375.10	470,121.52
Total	297,674,666	562,649,186	203,845,928.12	9,723,301.15

Operations on peanuts (shelled), fiscal 1951 to Mar. 31, 1951

Purchased	pounds	282,584,120
Sold	do	282,580,560
Loss on sales		$11,244,022.37

Members of the committee frequently pointed out during the course of the hearings that it was simply unrealistic, in view of the situation which confronts us, not to recognize that there is no real likelihood whatever that this agency will have to pay in fiscal 1952 for the cost of storing anything like the amount of these commodities, as was the case in the last fiscal year. In this connection, I have made a comparison of the amounts of inventories of a number of commodities on hand June 30, 1950, and

on hand March 31, 1951. First, I have compared 16 commodities which are listed by pounds. This data is as follows:

Comparison of inventories of various commodities under the CCC program

	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951
	Pounds	*Pounds*
Rice	68,996,200	28,332,600
Butter	161,649,213	9,955,226
Cheese	58,902,033	7,145
Milk, dried	362,931,819	94,170,819
Potato starch	9,712,682	2,779,505
Wool	454,752	29,663
Beans, dry edible	968,710,200	731,319,400
Cottonseed oil:		
Crude	7,229,760	262,225
Refined	10,071,372	195
Cottonseed meal	145,308,076	1,223,579
Cottonseed linters	60,818,158	22,224,422
Eggs, dried	93,918,525	67,568,688
Grain sorghum	4,127,422,400	1,439,230,300
Rosin	384,685,817	162,468,602
Peas, dry edible	91,225,500	44,532,700
Seeds, hay and pasture	5,760,500	489,413
Total	6,561,211,062	2,604,681,205

This is a decrease in inventories of 60.3 percent over the beginning of the fiscal year.

Next, I have made an additional comparison of the inventories of seven other commodities on these two dates. They show the same definite trend toward the liquidation of these inventories, and are as follows:

Additional comparison of inventories of commodities under CCC

	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951
Cotton (bales)	3,413,635	86,813
Cottonseed (tons)	211,178	2,941
Flaxseed (bushels)	13,373,583	5,117,761
Turpentine (gallons)	2,586,765	500,000
Oats (bushels)	12,108,620	9,997,233
Rye (do)	514,624	364,274
Soybeans (do)	53,017	1,093

Also, I want to call attention to a very significant tabulation appearing in the committee hearings at page 68. This, I submit, offers a graphic illustration of the extremely rapid increase in the corporate administrative expense limitations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in contrast to the progressive reduction of such limitations for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Production Credit Corporation, and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation and the relatively moderate recent increase in the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.

I am convinced that the amount provided can and should be further reduced. At this moment I am not prepared to offer any suggestion as to the amount other than to express my opinion, based upon my study of the facts up to this time, that it can be substantial without any real possibility of injury to the sound activities of the Corporation. I shall complete my study of the facts before we meet tomorrow and hope to be recognized to offer a specific amendment. In the meantime I hope that the presentation of these facts will be helpful to all who are interested in making certain that we eliminate from every appropriation or authorization every penny that is not fully justified.

TABLE 6.—*Appropriations, reappropriations, and loan authorizations, fiscal years 1932–49, and budget estimates, 1950*

CORPORATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATIONS

[Millions of dollars]

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	Budget estimates, 1950
Commodity Credit Corporation	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.5	0.7	2.0	2.3	3.5	4.4	5.4	7.2	8.9	8.8	8.5	8.1	12.0
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	----	----	----	----	----	----	15.0	18.0	9.5	7.0	8.5	9.0	8.2	8.2	6.5	4.1	2.5	1.8	1.5
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.6	1.1	1.3	1.4
Production Credit Corporation	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.3
Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	.3	.2	.2	.1
Total, corporate administrative expense limitations	----	----	----	----	----	----	15.5	18.7	11.5	9.3	12.0	13.4	13.6	15.4	15.4	16.4	13.7	12.7	16.3

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, there are two points I want to discuss very briefly. One has to do with the operation of the general program of the Production and Marketing Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the other is the subject of meat supply on which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] just spoke.

As we all know, the Commodity Credit Corporation goes out and purchases great quantities of commodities. Some commodities are at times stored over a long period of time. They are subject to great deterioration. The time comes when the Commodity Credit Corporation must either sell or lose goods. If the Commodity Credit Corporation sells those goods without a loss, it must sell them at the time the market will absorb them, otherwise they must cut the price, which starts great trouble in the markets through the Commodity Credit Corporation's inventories competing with the curernt inventories of farmers and dealers who have goods to sell of like kind.

I am going to use a specific case. The Commodity Credit Corporation buys great quantities of dry beans. They are stored in California, New Mexico, Colorado, Nebraska, Michigan, New York State, and other places. The most difficult storage conditions are in New York State, Nebraska, and Michigan, where the weather conditions are against the storing of such commodities.

The 1948 crop was substantially purchased; the 1949 crop was substantially purchased, and the 1950 crop is here to deal with. In some areas like Michigan the 1950 crops had terrific weather conditions to deal with, and many of the beans are of a very, very poor quality. At the time the grower of the beans, the dirt farmer, the man who performs the stoop labor—s-t-o-o-p labor, and I spell that out because one of the newspapers picked that up as "astute labor"—the man who performs the stoop labor did not get 10 cents per hour wage on his bean crop of last year because lots of those beans have been sold for as low as 2½ cents per pound against a Commodity Credit Corporation support price of 7 or more cents per pound for good beans. But many of the beans were of such poor quality they did not qualify for Commodity Credit Corporation loans.

I understand there are something like 1,100,000 bags of 100 pounds each of poor quality beans still on hand. They are in competition more or less with the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is selling 1948 and 1949 so-called high quality beans.

Here is a case where a great group of farmers cannot qualify with a commodity which they have because of the low quality of the beans. They have no market because the market is absorbed presently by the Commodity Credit Corporation in selling its better quality 1948 and 1949 beans. I spent 3 hours of discussion with the spokesman for the farmers and others yesterday and today, the last conference ending just a few minutes ago. The farmers face the situation where from 500,000 to a million bags of beans are going to be thrown away at a time when the Commodity Credit Corporation has removed all acreage quotas and is asking that more beans be produced. I submitted to Mr. Kruse and other men, and Mr. Hill, of the PMA, this question today:

I said, "Are these Government agencies, the State Department, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the PMA, the Treasury Department, the department of the White House, and the department of the Congress, going to sit here and let a million bags of beans be thrown into the ditch?"

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not hear the gentleman's statement clearly. Who is it that is throwing away the beans?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The farmers who have these low-quality beans, which beans cannot qualify for Commodity Credit loans, since we are now moving into the hot weather, due to the poor quality of the beans and their spoilage, they must be destroyed. The point I was trying to make is that the PMA and the Commodity Credit Corporation and the State Department ought to go along with a situation or plan whereby these

beans are processed and put in a can and thus be preserved for food. There is such a thing as canning something before it goes completely haywire, and thus save it for human consumption.

Mr. COOLEY. You mean the beans are not of the quality which would qualify them for a loan and therefore there is no way to give the farmers any protection?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right. There is no way that the farmers can collect a penny on them, and there is no way that those beans can be preserved for human consumption unless they are processed before the hot weather spoils them.

May I say to the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Agriculture that we have worked on this proposition since last November and today I asked Mr. Hill and Mr. Kruse, "Will you just answer one simple question? Will you say to me whether or not anything is to be done?" I said, "I am going to see my people in my district on Friday of this week, and I want to take them a message." Mr. Kruse replied, in effect, "You can tell them that as of 11 o'clock this morning nothing effective has been done and we see nothing in sight to be done."

Mr. COOLEY. Did the gentleman suggest to them anything which might be done?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to know just what it is that the gentleman thinks should be done.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I suggested two things to them. I said, "If you do not have the authority at the present time in any of these Government agencies to pick up these beans and process them, and thus preserve them, why do you not tell the respective committees of the Congress which have the authority to do this, so that we can take the necessary steps to save these beans for human consumption at this time?" I said, "I do not want to be a party to a proposition where a million bags of good food will be destroyed because the Government agencies do not take care of them. I do not want to be a party to that. I do not think you should want to be a party to it." I said, "If you do not have the authority at the present time, tell us so that we can give you the authority, provided that is the will of the Congress, to give you the authority." I said, "Whatever is done has to be done within the next 30 days, because I know something about these beans, and I know what is going to happen to them through spoilage."

I said, "Whether it is 100,000 bags or a million bags, and the figures indicate it may be a large part of 1,150,000 bags, and that is the best figure I can get from the local chairmen of the county PMA committees and elevator and bean people; those beans should be saved."

That was one suggestion. Another suggestion I made was this, which I am not too enthusiastic about, because of the time element. I said, "The State Department went before the committee and recommended, in connection with the deal with India, which involves wheat, that there be 20,000 tons of beans put into the package." They advocated that wheat and beans and sorghum grains might be put into the package. I said, "You may claim that the 20,000 tons of beans the State Department is talking about is another 20,000 tons of those good beans held by CCC of the 1948–49 crop." I said if CCC takes up the 20,000-ton slack that does not do these farmers with low-quality beans any good. The low-quality beans should have been processed, the good ones canned, and bad ones eliminated.

The last recommendation with respect to amending the India wheat bill, the time limit is involved, and you may not be able to implement it fast enough to prevent those beans from spoiling due to hot weather.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the beans will have to be processed at an early date.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Or they will not be good for human consumption?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right. These facts were all made known to all of these agencies as early as last November, and I have been working on it ever since.

Mr. COOLEY. If they are not fit for human consumption, would they be good for cattle feed?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You could feed a few of them to cattle or hogs but for instance I have the figures here. They show 1,150,000 bags. I said, "Let us suppose you used 650,000 bags to feed livestock, you will still have a half million bags left. What are you going to do with those?"

Mr. Kruse says "We haven't anything in mind." I am not criticizing him. I am just stating the facts.

Mr. COOLEY. I just wondered if the gentleman pointed out any program under which they would be authorized to take over the beans or incur losses.

Mr. CRAWFORD. At the present time the only authority that I know that they possibly have is to use them in connection with the so-called give-away food-export program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Was the gentleman encouraged to believe that they would make an effort to try to find some human use for these beans?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was not encouraged and that is the reason I asked them the question. I said, "What can I tell my people next Friday morning?" Mr. Kruse said in effect "You will have to tell them that as of 11 o'clock this morning nothing is in sight to be done." I do not think there is anything that they plan to do. I do not think they have any concerted thought in mind to do anything about it. It is simply a part of this general Commodity Credit Corporation and PMA over-all program.

Now may I use the last minute or so to clear this matter up. That is on the subject that our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], was speaking about. I attended that livestock meeting and I sat there and listened carefully, because I have been attending similar meetings in this city for 35 years this coming July. I have seen them come and go. I know something about agriculture. When the question was submitted, "What does it cost to produce a beef animal," you might as well say, "What does it cost to produce a pound of pecans; what does it cost to produce a bale of cotton; what does it cost to produce a pound of peanuts?"

That question is not answerable because of this: You have got millions of producers, millions of individual institutions in the form of these farms. It is not an organized industry as far as production is concerned. I raised the question. I said, "As a feeder, you know your costs." Of course as a feeder he knows his costs. As a packer he knows his costs, but when you drop from the packer to the farmer, that is where you stop on known costs, unless you meet some particular individual grower who carries an elaborate cost system on his farm. And this you do not find on small farms. You cannot give an answer as to the exact cost of producing a beef animal any more than you can answer what is the exact cost of producing a bale of cotton. I spent many years in intricate cost accounting and I know something about cost accounting. I was sorry I could not get up on that panel and talk for those fellows and answer some of those questions. We might as well be fair about all this. I do not blame the newspapermen for asking the questions for their constituents, but they are not fair questions. They were not fair questions, considering the situation that existed. Of course they did not get a clear answer to the questions.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is in a position right now to tell you what it costs to produce a pound of cotton or a ton of peanuts or a ton of burley tobacco?

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does it cost you to produce?

Mr. COOLEY. If I were engaged in the beef-cattle business I might know; but what I would point out to you is that if these cattlemen cannot point out what it costs to produce a pound of beef, then how on earth can they contradict Mr. DiSalle because DiSalle says he can tell what it costs?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask the gentleman a question: Do you operate a farm?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. I operate a farm.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What do you produce on your farm?

Mr. COOLEY. But I am not a cost accountant.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Wait a minute; what do you produce?

Mr. COOLEY. That has not anything to do with it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It has a great deal to do with it. If the gentleman raises cotton I doubt if he knows what it costs him to raise a pound of cotton; or a pound of tobacco, or of peanuts.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not on a panel either to have to answer questions. As a

matter of fact I raise cotton, peanuts, cows, calves, and other things.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I decline to yield any further. If there is any farmer on this floor who knows his costs, hold up your hand. No hands are held up.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there any man in the House who is not able to ask for BAE figures?

Mr. CRAWFORD. BAE figures are arbitrary.

Mr. COOLEY. Why not abolish BAE?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Abolish BAE? BAE does not know anything about my costs. BAE does not know what it costs my brother to run his dairy farm; they know nothing about what it costs my sister who runs a big ranch; they know nothing about my personal farm costs out here on a farm 20 minutes away from this building. They have a set of figures which they publish as an average. These figures of BAE are useful as a guide. Suppose you are manufacturing automobiles; you know your costs, otherwise you do not stay in business. Suppose you are manufacturing clothing; you know your costs. But you, a farmer, running your farm as farms are run in this country, unless you happen to have someone on your farm who is trained in cost accounting, you do not know your costs of producing anything on that farm, and any cost record of that farm if it is doing diversified farming is based on arbitrary allocation of costs. I will leave that up to any professional cost accountant in this country; it is an arbitrary cost; it is not an exact cost. Those questions down there the other night could not be answered directly. If you want to rely on arbitrary and general average costs of producing meat, then take the BAE cost figures and don't ask the individual farmer for his cost figures. Finally, let me say this, I am not going to vote for the extension of the price control act. It is political skulduggery and a fallacy which some want to impose on our people. The proposed way of meeting prices on meat and other commodities is a political sham and a joke pulled on the American people to make them believe that the politicians will protect their prices and their costs. It is a shame and disgrace that this Congress should do such a thing; and, of course, the meat program will reduce your supply of meat.

There are two things that have not been discussed at all in this whole thing: The Government agencies will induce the calling of speculative loans in this country. Beef moves on credit. The Federal Reserve Board under the instructions of the President has passed the word to the Clearing House Association; they in turn have passed the word to their individual bank members to call and discontinue speculative loans. The pressure is on to cut the prices through the contraction of credit; and, of course, the man carrying an inventory of beef, whether farmer, feeder, or packer, or some man in between is going to close out his inventories, and you will have short meat supplies.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He made a statement about feeders and said they could make accurate calculations with regard to costs.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; do you know why?

Mr. COOLEY. How about the breeders and the original producers, say, down there. They would not be forced to operate without a profit under this order. It is the feeder that is being squeezed to death, if I understand the situation. Now, if the feeders were subjected to collateral questions or unfair questions by the press the other night I was not conscious of it. I thought they were propounding very accurate and correct questions.

But I want to say that the reason I made the remarks here was that I felt that the feeders, even those were woefully weak in resisting the order. But we want to furnish them an opportunity and a forum in the House committee where they can come in and be asked fair questions and be allowed to give fair answers, and upon all that information then we can make up our minds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is a means of fair discussion; and I hope that occurs, but it is not fair, for instance, where the question was asked the other night, "How are we going to get meat at a reasonable price?" What does the word "reasonable" mean as it rolls around in the mind of the person asking it? That question, under the conditions governing, was unfair, I do not care who the man was that asked it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCVEY].

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Chairman, we who sit in the Halls of Congress today have the honor and the responsibility of serving our country during one of the most critical periods in history. Our national debt stands at approximately $255,000,000,000. Our President has proposed a budget for the next fiscal year in excess of seventy-one billions.

Congress is being asked to pass upon expenditures the total of which staggers the imagination. Therein lies, however, a great opportunity for Members of Congress to evaluate the merits of each proposal in relation to our national needs and to discriminate between what is necessary and those items which appear annually more or less as a matter of habit. It is absolutely essential that all nondefense expenditures be cut to a bare minimum consistent with the operation of an efficient government. All measures that can await a return to normal conditions should be appraised in terms of tax burdens already imposed and those that will be added in order to meet an ever-expanding defense program.

Some of the appropriations for executive departments have been passed already; another is under consideration today. Up to this time we have certainly made a poor showing, and one which the taxpayers back home are not going to appreciate. The Congress has approved the Department of Labor and the Federal Security appropriations bill, H. R. 3709, for the year 1952. The committee recommended an appropriation of $2,051,937,140 for that agency, a reduction of a little better than 1 percent from the appropriation voted a year ago. Amendments shaved those figures slightly.

The committee reporting for the Interior Department did better but not good enough, in my opinion. Today we have before us another appropriation bill. Amendments providing for reductions from the amounts set up by the committee will be offered. It is my feeling that every amendment of this character which is wisely conceived should be approved. No one realizes better than I that this is not the most intelligent way to determine what these appropriations should be. But any appropriations committee which has not made material reductions from expenditures last year can expect such treatment. We have spoken for economy in government in and out of the Halls of Congress. It is high time that we begin to practice what we preach. Our people back home are not going to think kindly of those who acclaim their devotion to economy in government and vote another way on the floor of this House.

Let us look at increases in expenditures in some of our executive departments over a period of years:

Agency	1940	1949	1950
Department of Commerce	$75,116,535	$602,000,000	$863,082,852
Department of Interior	71,385,280	485,000,000	568,435,344
Department of Justice	30,813,162	126,000,000	131,290,804
Department of State	20,254,403	317,000,000	361,226,112
Department of Agriculture	1,409,315,301	----------	1,301,305,326

Much of the expense of the Federal Government has come about through a multiplication of bureaus. Mr. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller of the Currency, is authority for the statement:

Congress can set up a bureau for the edification of "three blind mice" or for the rehabilitation of Humpty Dumpty, and within a year those who head the bureaus can come in with glowing accounts of their work.

Warren is the watchdog of the Treasury, and in speaking before a congressional inquiry he said:

The present setup is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies with attendant extravagance. It is an ideal system for tax eaters. This unsegregated, sprawling crop of Government functions and functionaries cannot do the job the taxpayers are

paying for unless someone makes only one or two bureaus where dozens grew before.

The Federal per capita tax load jumped from $14.43 annually in 1932 to $263.99 in 1948. In 1932 the Federal Government took only 21.9 percent of the tax dollar, whereas the share today is just a little under 75 percent. The tax collector takes today, in round figures, 1 dollar out of every 4 earned—25 cents for State and local governments and 75 cents for the National Government.

This money is used to finance an array of activities so vast that they defy enumeration. The services of the Federal Government are performed by an army of more than two and one-quarter million civilian employees. The Civil Service Bureau reports 10,994 employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Census Bureau gives the Indian population at the figure 333,969. That is, we have 1 Federal employee for every 30 Indians. Additional employees were added to the Federal payroll at the rate of 2,000 per day during the months of January and February of this year. Civilian employment increased 56,166 during the month of March, of which 28,000 were white-collar employees.

A review of the budgets for the four peacetime years—1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949—reveals that the expenditures during those four peacetime years were 177 billion dollars, or 10 billions more than were spent during 152 fiscal years beginning with the inauguration of George Washington in 1789 and ending with the start of rearmament for World War II in 1940.

This brief statement of expenditures on the part of the National Government is recited for the purpose of revealing the immensity of the problem we are analyzing. An awareness of the extent of the tax load the average individual carries is difficult to reach unless one has an adequate understanding of the total burden.

Now, who pays these taxes? For authority on this subject, we shall cite the President of the United States. In presenting his budget for the last fiscal year, the President stated that the Federal-tax dollar would be derived from the following sources of revenue:

Direct taxation on individuals	$0.43
Direct taxation on corporations	.28
Excise taxes (sales tax)	.19
Custom duties	.08
New taxes	.02
Total	1.00

Who pays individual taxes amounting to 43 cents of each dollar collected? Everyone who pays an income tax. Who pays sales taxes on theater seats, perfumes, jewelry, tobacco, and hundreds of other items which amount to 19 cents of every dollar collected? The public in general. Who pays custom duties in the end? They are a part of the increased cost of every item we buy which has passed through a custom house. Now, there is left corporation taxes which account for 28 cents of each dollar collected and new taxes amounting to 2 cents of each dollar. Those who buy the manufactured article and the men in the factory with the sweat of their brow meet the cost of corporate taxes, and the remaining new taxes we will, also, meet in one form or another; that can be depended upon.

These crushing burdens of taxation, if permitted to continue unchecked, will eventually undermine the stability of our country. In speaking on this subject, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, says:

> Taxes may conceivably bankrupt America and do exactly what the Communists want done to undermine American stability. Before there is a resort to force—

Says Senator ROBERTSON—

> we may expect an all-out communistic effort to wreck the democracies of the world financially.

Herbert Hoover said:

> Along this road of spending, the Government either takes over, which is socialism, or dictates institutional and economic life, which is fascism.

Let us quote from Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland:

> The only possible way to avoid serious damage to our fiscal structure and possible complete collapse is to cut Government spending drastically.

Members of this Chamber have been quite vociferous at times in regard to the cutting of expenditures. It is time now to begin to practice what we preach. Let us cut the fat out of payrolls. Excessive civilian employment is the key to extravagance and inefficiency. The time to act is while these appropriations are being submitted to the Congress. I have not voted for most of the appropriation bills submitted thus far, and I shall continue to vote against them until I see a more serious attempt to economize in Government expenditures.

Let us not have politics as usual when we are dealing with the solvency of a Nation and a people overburdened with taxation. Let us not permit the baneful prophecies of Lenin to come true when he said:

> America will sometime spend itself into destruction.

And again when he said:

> The best way to promote a bloodless revolution is for the currency of a nation to commit suicide.

The destiny of our republic is in our hands as we vote these appropriations day by day. Let us support every amendment to this bill that is wisely conceived and productive of the results we are pledged to achieve.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of discussion of this piece of legislation today and the suggestion of rolling back prices, and price control.

I do want to compliment this Committee on Agricultural Appropriations on making a very substantial reduction in this bill. I furthermore want to commend them on the wisdom through the years they have acquired to be able to decide what is best in legislation for the encouragement of agriculture at the lowest possible cost to the Government. I think the country is fortunate in having men so devoted to their work and so well experienced in this subject as those who have brought this bill to the House, and I say this most sincerely.

I have always been interested in agriculture, having owned and operated farms most of my life, and I have been glad to note that the Congress of the United States has been able to initiate policies that has encouraged agriculture to develop to its high state of efficiency and production that we have in this country now.

Far be it from me or the Members of this Congress to take away the things that are necessary for greater production in agriculture in these critical times. Agriculture is actually the basis, the foundation of the economy of this country. We must never lose sight of that. Agriculture is manpowered and womanpowered by a group of millions of people who work longer hours and are willing to take more gambles on weather and prices than any other group of citizens in the United States today. They work, of course, for profit, but also for their love of their work. They work longer hours, earlier in the morning and later in the nighttime, with less complaining as to profits or pay than any other group of people.

I want to commend the committee on bringing in here a very adequate appropriation for the continued expansion and extension of rural electrification, for the farms of the people of America. I have always supported adequate appropriations for REA and will continue until light and power is available for all farm families that want it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I recall several times in the past 6 or 8 years when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has come to me and urged me as a member of the subcommittee to do whatever could be done toward seeing to it that rural electrification became a reality, become completed, as soon as possible. I want to back up the gentleman on what he has just said as exhibiting his interest in that one thing which has meant so much to the farmers of the Midwest, in fact, all the farmers of America.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman is very kind, and I thank him sincerely. And may I say I know of no one in the Congress who has rendered a greater service to the farmers of the Nation than has the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

As I understand it, the committee has brought in a modest appropriation of $100,000,000 for rural electrification. That was the amount requested by the President in his budget. The committee has in fact doubled the amount requested in the budget. The committee has provided that REA can draw, when the

Director can show need, another $100,000,000, so that they can enter into contracts when necessary for extensions as the money is needed and save money in the hope of beating the inflation gun and carry on this work.

I am also interested in the fact, and want to commend the committee on appropriating for soil conservation in this bill for technical and administrative services of roughly about $56,000,000. I think something like $276,000,000 was appropriated for soil conservation under the PMA, of which about 10 percent of that goes for administration in Washington, and down to the level of the county committeemen of the PMA.

That is money which is not wasted. It is money well invested. We need greater production in this country today as a break against inflation. The Government wants greater production on the part of the farmers. The farmer is willing to go out and answer that call and he will do the best he can, profits or not. It is up to the Congress to see that farmers get a square deal when you talk about these rollbacks, whether it is rollbacks for the beef farmer, or of farmers anywhere along the line. The farmer will respond to the call of the Government for greater production. It is the responsibility of Congress in the future, as it has been in the past, to protect the great agricultural industry of this country. When we get the facts as the debate unfolds in the weeks ahead, this Congress in my judgment will protect this basic industry so necessary to the continued prosperity of the country and so necessary for the continued power to defend this country against the world, if that is necessary.

In my judgment you cannot get greater production of beef if you penalize the farmer and take care of everyone else on up to the butcher shop in New York and Chicago, and penalize none of them, but take it all out on the farmers who must produce this material wealth from the very beginning.

The price paid the farmer for his products when they leave the farm has little effect on high prices and the present inflation. Inflation is caused mainly by cost beginning with transportation and high wages for everyone who handles his products till they reach the merchant's shelf and are bought by the consumer.

The present proposed rollback of beef prices will not restrict the wage of anyone who handles the beef from the farmer. It will not take a penny away from the packer or the butcher who sells the meat. It only penalizes the farmer-producer.

You cannot get greater production of beef by rolling back the price the farmer gets which in many instance will cause him to operate at a loss. He will lose his incentive to produce. You will get less beef and put the black market operators back in business.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it is very possible that the orders issued do help the packers and processors, at least the big ones. It happens that in my district some of the little ones are being put out of business very rapidly by this order. If they are black-marketing it is going to be something, the like of which we have never seen. Some of the very finest of my small processors are just going to be finished in another month or two. Instead of making a little margin they are four or five thousand dollars in the hole every month and they cannot go on like that. They will have to shut down. Then what happens? Black-marketing and hides buried because they cannot be sold, and no hides going into the market, no byproducts available for medicinal purposes. We should bear in mind especially that we are using the byproducts of beef more and more in this field. I want to add my voice in protest to those that have gone out from the well of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I have another little matter that I want to bring before you because it is of quite another character. That is the contribution that our agricultural people make to some of the terrific problems with which other countries are faced. We have a point 4 agreement with Iran. Iran, I want to remind you, is right on the edge of some very serious trouble for you and me. Early in April those working in the point 4 program were notified by Iran that the locust problem was such that the locusts might absolutely ruin 130,000 acres of wheat, pistachio nuts, and various kinds of foodstuffs. They SOS'ed to the State Department and then what happened? The most thrillingly dramatic thing that you could possibly imagine.

Things began to move. Mrs. Shipley at the passport office had every single passport and every other necessary arrangement made within 24 hours. All the men got their inoculations within 24 hours.

The State Department made a contract with the United States Overseas Airlines for the flights and spraying operations. The Iranian Government agreed to fuel the spraying planes and feed and house the pilots and mechanics. The Department of Agriculture supplied the technical men. William R. Mabee, entomologist and pioneer in the use of planes for applying insecticides to field crops for the control of insects, directed the technical phases of the project. The new insecticide, aldrin, was flown to the Idlewild Airport from Denver. Two ounces of this mixed in solvent is enough to kill locusts covering an acre of ground.

They got those little planes rigged up inside of 6 days. In no time at all they were out all over this 130,000 acres. There were 2,000 acres where the eggs were. Those locusts, if they had gotten started, would not only have eaten up the 130,000 acres below the thirtieth parallel, but they would have continued right on up and destroyed practically every single bit of the food production areas in Iran. Because we had a perfectly fine agricultural man doing grasshopper extermination in our country from the air, we could send him over there almost overnight. He took a corps of experts with him, and the necessary pilots went over. I think that is a very thrilling story, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree with the gentlewoman that that is a very thrilling story, but who knows about it?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am telling you so that it will get out.

Mr. CANFIELD. The House did not know anything about it until today, and I wonder if the people of Iran know the details of that over there.

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh, yes; the people of Iran know about it well. There is no question about that. My hope is that the Members of this House will take the trouble to read this little discussion and will feel that perhaps there is great value in some of the things that point 4 makes possible through the various departments of our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the housewife is deeply concerned about high prices. In the mobilization effort the Government is attempting to solve the problem of inflation, not only for the benefit of the consumer, but also to save tremendous sums in the purchase of war material. Price control is one of the methods suggested to solve this problem. In order to arrive at a correct solution, those agencies fixing the regulations with respect to commodity prices must understand the problems of the producers. Unless we completely change our form of government and have absolute government ownership or operation of industry, the producer must be placed in a position which permits him to continue his business.

The cattle business is operated by a comparatively small group of people. It is a business about which there is lack of understanding and knowledge. This was disclosed recently when the Office of Price Stabilization issued a roll-back order on the price of beef and placed the entire cost of the roll-back upon the cattle producers. I have received a number of letters from cattlemen at home, and I want to quote to you from these letters. Each includes facts concerning operation of the roll-back order with respect to his case, which would apply to the industry as a whole. The reading of these letters brings one inevitably to two conclusions: First, the roll-back order will impose a great loss upon the cattlemen; second, it will result in less beef for the consumer.

Excerpts from letters regarding price roll-back:

Cattle have been assessed for taxation based on the higher prices. Also a large number of cattle, including most of the 1951 calf crop, have been contracted for fall delivery at prices based on market prices of the past 90 days.

While the roll-back has disrupted the cattle industry and placed it in a state of confusion, there is little indication that the consumers will benefit in the future. More and more beef will end up in black markets which meat will cost the consumer more money than through regular channels.

My two sons and myself have over 400 head of Hereford cattle. Over 300 head of these are yearling calves most of which have been bought last fall, balance are cows and calves. We have been following the deferred feeding plan for several years. These calves are wintered well, put on grass May 1 and put in feed lot about August 1 for about 90 to 100 days on ground ear corn and protein feed.

No doubt you saw the order starting May 20 the roll-back will take off 10 percent, August 1, 4½ percent and October 1, 4½ percent, a total of 18 percent.

I wonder if that outfit in Washington thinks that we farmers and feeders will risk our corn, feed, and labor when we know we will get 18 to 20 percent less for our cattle when fattened? I note that the United States Department of Agriculture has asked the roll-back on live animals or cattle be abolished.

The entire bunch of cattle would average around $250 a head. So you can see what an investment they represent. The calves purchased last fall cost from 34 cents to 37 cents a pound. With the roll-back they would sell around 30 cents. So you can see what the roll-back would do to us. If these orders are put through we will have meat shortages, rationing, and black market and heavy losses to us farmers. They will discourage feeding and cripple the cattle industry and shorten the customer of meat. Labor is asking increase in wages and getting it and here roll-back on cattle prices against the farmer.

I doubt if my opinion with respect to livestock is of much value, but from the size of my notes at the bank covering my livestock operation I feel that I am justified in suggesting to you that the situation in the industry is indeed serious. I have a small herd of 40 stock cows and 120 head of yearling steers and heifers that are now enjoying our good Kansas grass. I would like to leave them all there and watch the yearlings grow into feeders that I can finish into good beef, but in view of what has occurred in Washington I am sure you can appreciate that that sort of a program entails too much risk to a fellow who is operating entirely on borrowed capital. I have no ideas as to how to curb inflation, but if increased production is one of the ways to bring about a decrease, the 19 percent roll-back in cattle prices certainly is not the answer. This is going to cause heavy losses and be a crippling blow to the food-production effort.

I am one of hundreds who have stocked their pastures with high-priced cattle that we have had to pay for, and now know that if this unfair roll-back is enforced, we will probably lose money as well as the use of our grass for this season. We have already lost our wheat crop and if our cattle, also, lost money, we have little prospect for the year 1951. Our labor, feed, repairs, gasoline, and everything that we are forced to buy has gone up continually and is still going higher.

First, let me say that I think that finished cattle prices are too high. Second, the cattle-production cycle in Kansas is about 14 months, not 6, as the price regulator would have the public think. Third, if price ceilings were going to be used on cattle they are 6 months late.

Perhaps a question best sets up the situation. Suppose that you purchased 100 head of choice calves 400 to 600 pounds during the last 6 months. They would have cost $38 to $40 per 100. They are not ready to be slaughtered, and won't be until they are grazed this summer and then fed 90 days. This is the proven best practice in your State. How would you handle these cattle to keep from losing $7 to $10 per 100? Finished cattle that are nearly ready can be sold and the owner is O. K. But I would like to have your answer to the calves bought last fall and so far this year. This farmer that usually handles and feeds cattle buys them on an open, free, competitive market, as he has done for years. It's his farm program, his living and existence. Then he lives in a country where he can be put into 2 to 5 years poverty by a Government order. Why doesn't the Government roll back labor prices to last June levels? Labor prices have gone up as sharply as have beef prices. Farm machinery has gone up 10 to 20 percent since the Korean war. Why not roll it back?

We are going to be taking heavy losses on our beef production if the present plans are carried out. One, our beef producing plan, is a 1-year plan—our cattle were bought costing from $35 to $40 per hundredweight, now we have them on Kansas blue stem grass where they will pasture until October 1, then we put them in the dry lot, to be fed corn and they will go to market in December and January. By that time DiSalle says we shall take an 18-percent reduction, or about one-fifth loss—which would bust most of the cattle feeders in Kansas.

I admit, and you will too, that cattle are up to a point of ceiling control being necessary, but there should be a period where the feeders will be allowed to market their cattle at a fair margin of profit and still have a shirt on their backs. I honestly believe that if the order goes through as it is now written that 70 percent production cut-back in our community of feeding will result and that figure may be conservative. My father-in-law feeds around 1,000 cattle a year and his lots will be empty just as soon as these runs are over. Right now he has but 150 head that he is feeding and he intends to clean them out completely by May 30. Now he is by no means the largest feeder in our community, but it will give you an idea of just how serious this thing can become. Now here in Denton we can buy the processed ham for $1.30 per pound, yet we sent that same hog into St. Joe for killing and received but $20 per hundred or 20 cents per pound.

In my judgment the price roll-back on beef is not only discriminatory, but in direct violation of the law and the basic philosophy of price stabilization. Yesterday I questioned Charles Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, about this situation. I want to quote to you my questions and Mr. Wilson's replies:

Mr. COLE. What is your conception of the responsibility of these agencies (Office of Price Stabilization, Wage Stabilization, etc.) with respect to the economy of the country, with respect to stabilization as against the freezing of prices and wages?

Mr. WILSON. Well, "freeze," I think, is an unfortunate term. Stabilization is the concept we have of their operation.

Mr. COLE. Does stabilization mean, therefore, as though we were on a scale and attempting to keep all the economy balanced?

Mr. WILSON. Well, yes, take into consideration all the factors and try to balance up, yes, that is right.

Mr. COLE. Then that means, does it not, that each segment of the economy still may maintain a profit system and may have a profit in its operation?

Mr. WILSON. I hope so.

Mr. COLE. Do you say that advisedly, you hope so?

Mr. WILSON. Yes. I will say I believe so. I believe it does. I do not believe we want to eliminate that.

Mr. COLE. As you envision your responsibility, it is then that you shall maintain with the economy, an operation so that each individual business—not each individual, let us say class of business, shall operate at a profit.

Mr. WILSON. That is right. Because what good would it do us to expend our national wealth at the rate we are expending it and come out of the period broke? I think we ought to envisage coming out of it with a strong economy, I hope.

Mr. COLE. I agree. In connection with CPR 22: I am not going to question you in detail about it, but I am using it as an overall question of the philosophy of the operation of your office.

The price regulation (CPR 22) is to assist manufacturers in connection with the roll-back of prices in the manufacturing of commodities.

This regulation provides that there shall be a roll-back, but in connection therewith a manufacturer may take into consideration his increased costs. That is based upon the philosophy that you have now.

But, Mr. WILSON, there was a roll-back order not long ago, issued by Mr. DiSalle, where the producers of meat were required to take a roll-back without any consideration whatsoever of their cost. They were charged, first, last, and always with that roll-back, without the slightest consideration of their increased costs.

This is contrary to your announced policy that prices should be "stabilized," not frozen. It is contrary to your announced policy that each class of business shall operate at a profit.

Mr. Chairman, the livestock industry does not want to be guaranteed a profit. It is perhaps the most competitive and independent business in the country today. They do insist, however, that they are entitled to fair treatment and that they are being discriminated against. They only ask that they be treated in the same manner accorded other groups. The roll-back order on the price of beef has caused, and will cause, thousands of head of cattle to be sold before they are fattened. Thus, the housewife will be faced with a shortage of beef, and the object of price control will be defeated.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, within the last week, it has been brought out that Great Britain, and other countries, have been furnishing Communist China with rubber and other articles useful in war since China entered the war against United Nations forces in Korea.

The disclosure that 120,000 tons of raw rubber was shipped from Malaya to Red China in the 9 months ending in March has resulted in sharp and angry debate in the British Parliament.

Because of the fact that American casualties in Korea have reached a total of over sixty thousand, such trade between Communist China and foreign countries is clearly a matter of grave concern to all Americans.

The Congress of the United States must in conscience take action that will condemn and forbid any further shipment of materials, useful in war, to Communist China directly, or indirectly through Hong Kong, either by this country or by any other member of the United Nations whose military forces are now engaged in combat in Korea against the common enemy.

Natural rubber has been probably the most important material Red China has received from Great Britain, or from any other country, but it has not been the only war material the Chinese Reds have been receiving.

During 1950, Hong Kong received over 49,000 tons of rubber from Malaya, about twice as much as she received in the previous year. China, in 1950, received over 43,000 tons of rubber, five and one-half times as much as she got in 1949.

The increased importance of Hong Kong as a gateway for goods to China is common knowledge, and trade figures prove it. While between 1949 and last year, total exports from Hong Kong to all countries increased some 60 percent, exports from Hong Kong to Red China increased some 150 percent—from $585,000,000 to $1,461,000,000.

In his testimony before the Senate committees last Thursday, General MacArthur, using a report of the American Consul General at Hong Kong as a basis, showed that about forty million dollars' worth of materials, including such strategic goods as railroad equipment, steel products, ties, and petroleum, entered China through Hong Kong in a period of 3 weeks, earlier this year.

The increase in shipments of rubber from Malaya to China either directly or indirectly was apparent in the February 1951 figures. These showed that in February over 10,000 tons of rubber were shipped to China and over 4,800 tons to Hong Kong.

Yet, in February, the British Minister of Colonial Affairs, in replying to criticisms of these shipments, said simply:

> It has not been decided that there should be general sanctions on all trade against Soviet Russia, China, and other countries behind the iron curtain. We are carrying on normal trade.

Since that time, on April 9, the British imposed controls on Malayan rubber exports, but, as the British periodical, the Economist, stated, "There is no way yet of telling how effective such controls will be."

From what Prime Minister Attlee has said in the past few days, we cannot expect Red China to be shut off completely from Malayan rubber. In his words to the House of Commons on May 3, "there cannot be an absolute prohibition to see that no rubber whatsoever gets to China."

There is strong reason to believe that the trade of the British and others is helping the Chinese Communists with other essential war goods than rubber. A censure motion filed in Parliament against the British Labor Government on May 4 accused the Government of having authorized or permitted not only the rubber shipments of 120,000 tons between July 1950 and March 1951, but also the shipment to China of 3,400 tons of iron and steel and manufactures thereof, $149,600 worth of vehicles, and other strategic materials, including electrical goods and apparatus and other machinery between January and March of this year.

In exchange for the goods useful in war, Red China has been careful about what she has exported. Hong Kong statistics show that the Chinese, while denying the western nations tin, antimony, and tungsten in any appreciable amounts, have been letting outside nations have increasing amounts of nonessentials, like tea and nuts, in exchange for the war materials they want.

In regard to United States exports, there has been in effect since last December, through controls of export licenses, an embargo on all shipments to Red China. While this has resulted in virtually a complete stoppage of United States exports to China, we have not banned exports to Hong Kong, as evidenced in the $1,500,000 worth of United States exports to that colony during January and February of this year.

Last Thursday, United Nations American Delegate Ernest Gross proposed an arms embargo against Communist China by the member countries of the United Nations.

And according to yesterday's newspapers the formal resolution to this end, introduced by the United States delegate yesterday at Lake Success will receive the backing of England and France.

Certainly this step is to be applauded. It does not in my opinion, however, go far enough. Certainly Hong Kong cannot be ignored as a vital source of Red China's war-making goods. Nor, as far as can be found out, does the resolution provide for any penalties for violation.

The final successful passage of such a resolution in the United Nations is only a possibility at best moreover, and there is certain to be powerful opposition to it.

And I do not think the Congress of the United States can stand by and wait for developments in the United Nations any more than our military forces in Korea can wait for such developments.

Consequently, as a positive attempt to ban all shipments of war goods to China and to Hong Kong either by the United States or any foreign country, I have today introduced a bill providing for an embargo on the shipment of all war material, within the limits of national security, from the United States to Communist China or to Hong Kong.

The bill makes it unlawful, punishable by a fine of $50,000 or imprisonment up to 5 years, or both, to export any war material from the United States to Communist China or Hong Kong unless, before such exportation, the President shall determine such exportation would be to the advantage of the security of the United States. It further provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall prepare and publish in the Federal Register and keep current a list of all articles, materials, and supplies the importation of which by Communist China would enhance its war-making potential.

The bill also attempts to curtail exportation of war materials to Communist China or Hong Kong from any foreign country by prohibiting American economic or financial assistance, except assistance granted under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, to any foreign country which exports, or permits to be exported, such war materials to China or Hong Kong, unless before such exportation, the President of the United States shall determine that such exportation would be to the advantage of the collective security of all of the United Nations engaged in military and naval operations in and around Korea.

This bill also provides for a monthly report, based on official estimates, to be made by the State and Commerce Departments to the Congress on the origin, transshipment, quantities, and types of all such war materials entering Communist China and Hong Kong during the preceding month.

I hope that this House will take speedy and favorable action on this bill. I believe that its passage would prove to the world, that while Americans may have different ideas as to United States policy in the Far East, all of us are united in our determination to stop the "trade in blood" that has been going on.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes; the Democratic administration has been responsible for all this rubber going to China while we have always used three-quarters of it; and the reason for it is that they have upped the price. That is the truth, is it not?

Mr. KENNEDY. I may say to my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts that I was talking about shipments from Malaya, which is under British control, either directly to China or through Hong Kong.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is just what I am saying. We have stopped the exportation of anything to China, and England has upped it three or four times as much.

Mr. KENNEDY. Exactly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am trying to point out to my friend from Massachusetts that this trade has been going on not only in rubber but in other valuable war materials; and the purpose of these remarks that I am making is to bring attention to a bill which I introduced today to try not only to restrict American trade through Hong Kong of possible strategic material but also to stop the shipment by any foreign country of any strategic material directly to China or through Hong Kong. That is the purpose of my remarks, and I am glad that my colleague from Massachusetts is heartily in favor of it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is right; I am glad the gentleman is bringing that out.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, may I take this time to advise

the Members of Congress of a matter of vital importance to them and to their disabled constituents by reminding the membership that on tomorrow morning in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building at 10 o'clock there will be an exhibition of prosthetic appliances—arms and legs—by the men who have been working with them for some years. The men wearing the legs and arms will all be veterans of World War II and the Korean war. The membership, I know, will be amazed at what has been accomplished in a short time. This exhibition and demonstration will be put on by the National Research Advisory Committee that has done a great job. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and myself have been greatly interested in this and we extend an invitation to all Members to attend and to the public. The public will be greatly interested because they later can buy arms and legs similar to those exhibited. Members will not regret seeing this great exhibition but, on the contrary, will be highly pleased at what has been done for those who have been wounded by the guns of war, the matériel of destruction. My colleagues in appropriating for prosthetic appliance research should be happy that the money has been so effectively spent.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to line 6, page 1, of the bill.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES DEMONSTRATION

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and I have several times in the last 2 weeks called the attention of the Members to the demonstration to be held in the Old House Office caucus room on Thursday of this week, May 10. It is a demonstration of the latest types of artificial arms and legs, and will be carried on by amputee veterans of the Second World War and of the Korean campaign.

This demonstration should prove of particular interest when it is known that until 1944 virtually no improvements had been made in artificial limbs since probably the Civil War. The appliances were crude and primitive, and in many cases the wearer was subjected to cruel pain in being fitted with them. The full extent of the lack of development or improvement in artificial limbs was not realized until the thousands of veterans of World War II began streaming into our hospitals in this country needing replacements for their lost arms and legs. It was then discovered how impoverished we were to provide these young men with devices which would be of real assistance to them, rather than something hanging uselessly on them.

In the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee was authorized by resolution to make a study of aid to the physically handicapped. I had the honor to be chairman of it in both instances. This committee made an exhaustive study of physical handicaps resulting from injury, war, and disease. The best professional people in their fields appeared before the committee, as did the handicapped themselves. I regret that at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress the matter was dropped and no legislation resulted. We did feel, however, that we had succeeded in directing public attention to our failure to provide proper treatment and training for the handicapped, particularly in cases of cerebral palsy and rheumatic heart, to the lack of employment opportunities for those with physical disabilities, and to the need for utilizing the knowledge we had obtained toward a positive program of assistance for our physically handicapped citizens.

In the course of its studies the committee looked into the special problems of the amputee, both civilian and military. We learned then how little had been done in the field of artificial limbs and what crude instruments were available. It was nothing short of pathetic to see our veterans appear before the committee attempting to make use of the prostheses which were then in vogue. This applied, as well, to the civilian amputee, many of whom appeared before the committee. Sensing that something was wrong in the manufacture of artificial arms and legs, the committee asked the Justice Department to make an investigation to determine whether there was a violation of the law. As a result of that investigation, the Department cited a number of artificial limb manufacturers, and they were subsequently convicted of violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Then the committee asked the Federal Trade Commission to call the manufacturers together for the purpose of drawing up a code of fair trade practices for the limb industry. I am glad to say that such a code was devised and has since been in effect. Following this, the Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration began strenuous efforts in research and development, looking to the improvement of surgery, which is most important, as well as prostheses.

It was at this time that the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs was set up by Executive order in the National Research Council. Excellent work has been done by the Committee, particularly in conjunction with several manufacturing concerns, scientific laboratories, and colleges whose help was enlisted. Through a bill initiated by Congresswoman ROGERS, the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs has been receiving funds each year and its work has been carried steadily forward. About the same time General Hawley established an Advisory Committee to the Veterans' Administration on artificial arms and legs for veterans. This committee is still functioning under the able chairmanship of Col. Robert S. Allen, noted newspaper commentator and author. Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS and I are the members from the Congress. Excellent work has been done by the Advisory Committee in connection with the Veterans' Administration, and we are proud of the progress that has been made in the improvement of devices and services for amputee veterans. The Advisory Committee was instrumental in having the findings and development of Government research in the field of prostheses made available to the civilian population. While there are over 20,000 amputees resulting from the two World Wars and the Korean campaign, it is estimated that there are close to 300,000 amputees in the civilian population. It is plain, therefore, how important it is that this great number of civilian amputees should have the benefits of scientific advances which have been made at the taxpayers' expense. Happily, it is the case today.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no undertaking so productive of good results as these committees. I feel confident that with continued efforts and the same energy and intelligence that produced the remarkable change in artificial appliances we can look forward to even better prostheses than we have today. I have recited this brief history in order that the Members who visit the demonstration may be fully appreciative of what has been done and the difficulties encountered in bringing about correction of the conditions which prevailed prior to 1944.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too concur in the gentleman's statement. I went out to Forest Glen, Md., a few weeks ago and saw a preliminary exhibition. It is the most amazing thing I have ever seen, and I hope tomorrow morning there will be a real turnout of the Members to see what our Government, particularly this research laboratory, the only one of its kind in the world, is doing to help these amputees.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. They have done remarkable work.

GEN. ALBERT C. WEDEMEYER: SOLDIER, STATESMAN, CITIZEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with real regret that I read in the press of the request for retirement by Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, commanding general of the Sixth Army with headquarters at San Francisco. It is with a sense of deep personal loss that I view the request of General Wedemeyer because I feel that he has been one of the country's outstanding military tacticians and I know that in his retirement we will greatly miss him. His knowledge of Germany and China, in particular, have been of tremendous value to us, and his knowledge of the Far East and the world in general, based on his duties both in and outside of the country, will leave a void difficult to fill. I do not know what has prompted General Wedemeyer's decision to request retirement, but I do know that the Congress of the United States holds him in high esteem and has for him and his abilities the greatest possible respect. It is my hope that General Wedemeyer when he retires from the Army will be available for further public service because there are too few of his ability and his integrity. We need him more than ever in the extremely difficult times which confront us today. I feel personally the loss which General Wedemeyer's retirement will bring, but I hope fervently that his great talents will be put to use for the benefit of the United States of America which he has served so long, so faithfully, and so well.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask that my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I further ask that I may insert as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Boston Daily Globe, a very fine article regarding a bill introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] entitled "Nurses Are Needed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WHY WE NEED ALLIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an address recently made by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The following is the text of President Truman's address before a dinner of the Civil Defense Conference, Washington, D. C., May 7, 1951:)

WHY WE NEED ALLIES

This conference is being held to consider one of the most important tasks facing our country. The lives of many millions of our fellow citizens may depend on the development of a strong civil defense. The threat of atomic warfare is one which we must face, no matter how much we dislike it. We can never afford to forget that the terrible destruction of cities, and of civilization as we know it, is a real possibility.

There are two things our country must do in the face of this awesome and terrible possibility. One of them is to look to our civil defense. So long as there is any chance at all that atomic bombs may fall on our cities, we cannot gamble on being caught unprepared. And let's not fool ourselves; there is such a chance. We must prepare for it.

The other thing we must do is to try to prevent atomic war from coming. That is what I have been working for ever since I became President. That is what our foreign policy is all about. The foreign policy of the United States is based on an effort to attain world peace. Every action we have taken has had this aim.

We are right in the midst of a big debate on foreign policy. A lot of people are looking at this debate as if it were just a political fight. But the stakes are a lot more important than the outcome of an election. The thing that is at stake in this debate may be atomic war. Our foreign policy is not a political issue. It is a matter of life and death. It is a matter of the future of mankind.

These two things—civil defense and foreign policy—are what I will talk about tonight. As you see, they are closely tied together. And they are both concerned with a form of warfare which is more destructive than anything the world has ever known before.

CIVIL DEFENSE AGAINST ATOMIC BOMBS

Our civil-defense problem starts with a few basic facts. Because there was an atomic explosion in the Soviet Union in 1949, we must act on the assumption that they do have atomic bombs. They have planes that could drop atomic bombs upon our cities. No matter how good our air defense may be, or how big an air force we build, a determined air attack by the Soviet Union could drop bombs upon this country. Our Air Force experts say planes would get through, however good our defenses may be.

The purpose of atomic attacks would be to strike a death blow at our cities; to burn out our centers of production; and to create panic among our people. There is no complete protection against an atomic-bomb attack. But there is a lot we can do to reduce the number of deaths and injuries and to check panic.

We must organize ourselves—in every city, factory, office, and home. Civil defense is a responsibility which begins with the individual, and is shared with the city, the State, and the Nation.

We have two immediate jobs. One is to teach all our people how to protect themselves in the event of enemy attack. The other is to organize and train millions of volunteers as active members of the United States Civil Defense Corps.

The question we are putting up to you men and women at this conference is: How can we do these jobs as quickly and as efficiently as possible? We need your help in getting our fellow citizens to realize that this is a very serious business. So long as we face the threat of an atomic attack on the United States, we have got to build a strong civil-defense organization. But even with such an organization, our losses in an atomic war, if we should have one, would be terrible. Whole cities would be casualties. Cleveland or Chicago, Seattle or New York, or any of our other great cities might be destroyed. Even with such losses, frightful as they would be, I think this country would survive and would win an atomic war. But even if we win, an atomic war would be a disaster.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

The best defense against atomic bombing is to prevent the outbreak of another world war and achieve a real peace. We must bend all our energy to the job of keeping our free way of life, and to doing it without another war. We can have peace only if we have justice and fair dealing among nations. The United Nations is the best means we have for deciding what is right and what is wrong between nations. It is a great attempt to make the moral judgment of mankind effective in international affairs. Nothing is more important if mankind is to overcome the barbarian doctrine that might makes right.

Our best chance of keeping the peace and staying free is for nations that believe in freedom to stick together and to build their strength together. This is what we call collective security. We have been trying since the last war was over and even before to build a system of collective security among all those countries that really believe in the principles of the United States. I think we have made a lot of progress. I know that some people have become impatient with our efforts to establish collective security, because we have not yet succeeded in attaining world peace. But we are on the right road.

There are cynics who scorn the United Nations, who are indifferent to the need for cooperation among the free peoples. They do not understand that our best hope for peace is to bind together the nations that are striving for peace and to increase their strength to stop aggression. The United Nations is being severely tested today because of the Korean conflict. The fighting there is requiring great sacrifices. In a time of crisis, there is a tendency to look for some easy way out regardless of the consequences. But we must not be misled. We must not lose sight of the world picture and the critical importance of the United Nations if we are to reach a permanent solution.

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION IN THE FAR EAST

Communist aggression in Korea is part of the world-wide strategy of the Kremlin to destroy freedom. It has shown men all over the world that Communist imperialism may strike anywhere, any time. The defense of Korea is part of the world-wide effort of all the free nations to maintain freedom. It has shown free men that if they stand together, and pool their strength, Communist aggression cannot succeed. The firm stand of the United Nations in Korea has checked the advance of Communist imperialism throughout Asia. It is using up the military resources of the Chinese Communists to such an extent that they are not able to carry out the designs of Communist imperialism against the independence of other Asian countries. And the people of those countries who have been resisting Communist aggression have now been given new hope and new courage.

The Communist assault in Indochina has been checked by the free people of Indochina with the help of the French. In Malaya, the British are holding firm against Communist guerrilla attacks. In the Philippines, in Burma, and in other places in Asia, Communist-led guerrillas are being blocked.

The fight against aggression in Korea has also dealt a heavy blow to the Kremlin conspiracy outside of Asia. It has brought new hope and courage to freemen in Europe, and in the Middle East, who face the Soviet menace across their frontiers. The fight against Communist aggression in the Far East is the fight against Communist aggression in the west as well.

The struggle in Korea is a long and hard one. But it can be won—and our policy is designed to win it.

The Chinese rulers are losing large numbers of their soldiers. As these losses increase it will become clearer and clearer to them that aggression does not pay. They can have peace when they give up their aggression and stop the fighting.

Meanwhile, the strength of all the free nations is growing. The Soviet plan of world conquest is becoming more and more impossible to achieve. If we stick to our guns, and continue to punish the aggressors, we can end the aggression in Korea and restore peace.

FOREIGN POLICY AND WORLD PEACE

We have been urged to take measures which would spread the fighting in the Far East. We have been told that this would bring the Korean conflict to a speedy conclusion; that it would save the lives of our troops. In my judgment, this is not true. I believe we have a better chance of stopping the aggression in Korea, at a smaller cost in the lives of our troops and those of our allies, by following our present course. Let me tell you that I have studied this question for a long time. It is not a question that can be decided in the light of Korea alone. It does not affect the Far East alone. It is not a local question. It affects Korea and Japan, and the security of our troops in those places. But it also reaches Europe, and the future of the North Atlantic Treaty, and the security of free people there and everywhere else in the world. It is a decision that affects the future of the United Nations and the future of the whole world.

I have refused to extend the area of the conflict in the Far East, under the circumstances which now prevail, and I am going to tell you exactly why. I have refused first on military grounds. The best military advice I have been able to obtain—the best collective military advice in this country—is that this course of action would not lead to a quick and easy solution of the Korean conflict.

On the contrary, it could very well lead to a much bigger and much longer war. Such a war would not reduce our casualties in the Far East. It would increase them enormously. Such a war would expose our troops to devastating air and submarine attacks. It would seriously endanger Japan and the Philippines. It would unite the Chinese people behind their Communist rulers.

Furthermore, a deep involvement on our part in a war in China, whatever the outcome there, would have critical military consequences in Europe. There is nothing that would give the Kremlin greater satisfaction than to see our resources committed to an all-out struggle in Asia, leaving Europe exposed to the Soviet armies.

These are some of the military dangers.

Moreover, there are other dangers. The Kremlin is trying, and has been trying for a long time, to drive a wedge between us and the other free nations. It wants to see us isolated. It wants to see us distrusted. It wants to see us feared and hated by our allies. Our allies agree with us in the course we are following. They do not believe that we should take the initiative to widen the conflict in the Far East. If the United States were to widen the conflict, we might well have to go it alone.

If we go it alone in Asia, we may destroy the unity of the free nations against aggression. Our European allies are nearer to Russia than we are. They are in far greater danger. If we act without regard to the danger that faces them, they may act without regard to the dangers that we face. Going it alone brought the world to the disaster of World War II. We cannot go it alone in Asia and go it in company in Europe. The whole idea of going it alone is the opposite of everything we have stood for and worked for since World War II. In this way, going it alone in Asia might wreck the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty, and the whole system of collective security we are helping to set up.

That would be a tremendous Soviet victory. We do not intend to fall into that trap. I do not propose to strip this country of its allies in the face of the Soviet danger. The path of collective security is our only sure defense against the dangers that threaten us. Moreover, it is the path to peace in Korea, to peace in the world.

We are determined to do our utmost to limit the war in Korea. We will not take any action which might place upon us the responsibility for initiating a general war. But if the aggressor takes further action which threatens the security of the United Nations forces in Korea, we will counter that action.

I repeat: I am convinced that the course we are now following in Korea is achieving the most for peace—and at the least cost in American lives. All of us wish that no Americans had to fight and die. But by fighting on a limited scale now, we may be able to prevent a third world war later on.

Remember this. If we do have another world war, it will be an atomic war. We could expect many atomic bombs to be dropped on American cities. And a single one of them could cause many times more casualties than we have suffered in all the fighting in Korea. I do not want to be responsible for bringing that about.

TENSION BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Some people do not understand how the free world can ever win this long struggle, without fighting a third world war. These people overlook the inner weaknesses of the Soviet dictatorship. They forget that the free world is stronger—stronger in determination, stronger in its staying power, stronger in its human resources—than any system of slavery.

The Kremlin's system of terror, which appears to be its main strength, is one of its greatest weaknesses. Dictatorships are based on fear. They cannot give their people happiness and peace. They have nothing to offer except aggression and slavery.

As the aggressive tactics of the Kremlin are checked by the collective defenses of the free world, the futility of the whole Communist program is becoming more and more apparent to the people under Soviet control. We can already see this process at work. In China, the failure of the Korean adventure is weakening the hold of the Communist government. Wholesale arrests and executions are taking place. In the same way, the pressure of the police state is increasing in the other satellite countries. Yugoslavia has thrown off the Kremlin yoke. Every day refugees flee across the border from the iron-curtain countries into the free countries of Europe.

There are growing signs of internal tension and unrest behind the iron curtain.

OUR GOAL OF PEACE

We must remember that the peoples under the Soviet rule of terror are not only our friends, but our silent allies. They are the victims of a terrible tyranny. We do not hate them. We have had friendly relations with them in the past; we can have such friendship again.

As the free nations build their strength and unity, this fact will compel a change in the Soviet drive for power and conquest. The Soviet rulers are faced with the growing strength of the free world, the increasing cost of aggression, and the increasing difficulty of driving their people to greater and greater hardships. They will be forced by these pressures from within and without to give up aggression. It will then be possible to make progress with a program for international control and reduction of armaments and for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Our programs of economic aid and technical assistance, and our campaign of truth, not only strengthen the free peoples; they weaken the dictatorships. They remind the victims of tyranny that a better world lies outside their prison. They build up the hope of freedom everywhere.

Everything we do to strengthen the free world; every dollar we spend for assistance to other free nations; every effort we make to resist aggression in Korea, and around the world, brings closer the day of genuine peace.

We are not engaged in a struggle without end. We are engaged in a struggle which has the definite goal of peace. Peace under law is the victory we seek. To achieve this goal we must work together, steadfastly and patiently. We must not be led astray. The real issue is wheher we stand alone, or whether we stand and work with the other free peoples of the world.

I am confident that the American people will not yield either to impatience or defeatism. I am sure that our courage and wisdom are equal to the great test we are now undergoing. And I believe that with all of our resources, our human energies, and our common sense, we shall be successful in the great objective of defending freedom and bringing peace to the world.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 1 minute.

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION—FIRST REPORT—RECORD AND FORECAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, since my last report to the people of my district we have begun to see better the extent of the emergency which we are facing in our country, the nature of the Communist threat to our national security and to the peace and security of the world and the direction in which we must go to attain a climate of peace.

FOREIGN POLICY

This is the major field in which the American people are being faced with difficult decisions. Our country made great strides through the bipartisan foreign policy in winning World War II and in the establishment of the United Nations, the European Recovery Program, the Atlantic Pact, the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, and in the defense of Greece and Turkey against communism. It is unfortunate that the circumstances of recalling General MacArthur, considered by the country an outstandingly successful commander and administrator of World War II, should have created an atmosphere so conducive to partisan strife. On one point we must be clear. The President has the power and the responsibility to act as Commander in Chief—that is the essence of civilian control over the military—and to conduct foreign affairs. The Cabinet is the President's; his responsibility is to the Congress and the people. It is my deep hope, and it shall be my constant effort to see, that the divisions which have been created by the recall of General MacArthur shall be bridged and that we shall be enabled again to go forward in broad areas of bipartisan cooperation on our foreign policy.

General MacArthur has properly been afforded every opportunity to tell his full

story to the people and the Congress. The airing of our whole Far East policy will turn out to be a distinct gain for the American people, as many of our people had seemed to be discouraged by the continuance of the conflict against the Communists in Korea because they did not recognize the objectives involved.

FAR EAST

I am supporting fully our fight against aggression in Korea as a test to show that aggressors will be resisted by force and therefore vital to the maintenance of peace and freedom in the world. I have advocated and continue to advocate a Pacific Pact for self-help and mutual cooperation in the Far East, a Far East recovery program for economic reconstruction and development which I consider to be of equal importance, and the conclusion of a treaty of peace with Japan.

It has appeared to me impractical to consider undertaking an invasion—as distinguished from guerrilla activities—of China's mainland with our furnishing the air and sea power to back up the Chinese Nationalist troops considering our present military means and at the very time when we are putting on a great defense mobilization effort. On the other hand, I am firmly against appeasement of Communist China by admitting it to the United Nations or by giving it control of Formosa. Formosa must be maintained as a bastion.

I joined in sponsoring a resolution—House Resolution 77—which passed the House of Representatives on January 19 to get the United Nations to declare Communist China the aggressor in Korea, and this resolution subsequently passed the United Nations.

The weaknesses in our Far East policy have been in the economic and ideological fields. It is the conditions of life of the 600,000,000 people in south and southeast Asia, outside of Communist China, which will determine whether we can keep them on the side of free institutions and of free peoples.

GRAIN FOR INDIA

It is because I believe so much depends on improving standards of living in Asia that I have been one of the most active in the fight to provide 2,000,000 tons of food grains to relieve the imminent threat of famine in India. I initiated this effort on December 26, 1950, and subsequently joined in putting together the India aid bill itself.

EUROPE

The defense of Free Europe continues to be of paramount immediate importance to our national security. Free Europe's industrial resources—55,000,000 tons of steel production per year, for example—and the skill of her 275,000,000 people is so great that it remains the Communists' No. 1 target and of the greatest value to them in their effort to subject us and the rest of the world to communism. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Atlantic Pact—whose forces are commanded by General Eisenhower, is the most formidable force the Communists have to face. The Atlantic Pact and the Mutual Defense Assistance Program have given Western Europe the will to defeat communism. I would like to see Greece and Turkey included and the program extended to the eastern Mediterranean to include Israel and other states willing to join; also by the acceptance of and on terms assuring their peoples of freedom—to be specified by the united action of all the Atlantic Pact countries—to include forces of Spain and, if possible, Yugoslavia, too, in an all-European integrated defense establishment.

We are in effect now, due to the state of our military preparations, engaged in a holding action against aggression in Asia while we prepare to discourage it completely in Europe. Our own and European defense preparations should be such that within the next year or two we should no longer be faced with this dilemma.

GERMANY

Western Germany has continued as a special problem. Progress on integration of the European economy has been made with Western Germany, particularly in the approval of the Schuman plan for pooling the coal and steel resources of Western Europe; also on integrated European defense. But the infiltration of former Nazis into outstanding positions in government, business, and society continues; a trend shown to be so dangerous in recent German (lower Saxony) and Austrian (presidential) elections. In addition, revelations of a Senate committee just released show shocking violations of law and policy in the continuing and heavy deliveries of strategic and war-making materials behind the iron curtain from Western Germany. For these reasons I reintroduced my resolution (H. Res. 115) calling for an investigation into the United States occupation policies in Germany.

ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Low standards of living and economic insecurity throughout the world are seedbeds for communism. We must in parallel to our defense preparations undertake to do all we can to better the standards of living of the free peoples, particularly in the underdeveloped areas of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Americas. In most of these areas the standard of living is so low that the average per capita income of the individual is less than $100 per year as compared with about $1,700 per capita per annum for the United States. We have just been given a blueprint of what can be done in economic reconstruction by the report of the President's Advisory Board on International Development headed by Nelson Rockefeller. I have supported and will continue to support these recommendations as an essential arm of our fight against communism. It is for this reason, too, that I supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (H. R. 1612), to extend this law for three years, and thereby to facilitate greater world trade.

THE PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

Those who really want peace and are not taken in by Communist "peace petitions" intended to sap our will to resist communism know that we may have to fight more than one small war as we are now fighting in Korea to teach the Communist aggressors that aggression does not pay, in order to get peace. They know that peace calls also for condemning aggression and the embargo of goods an aggressor could use for war—measures the United Nations is taking. We must strive in every way to get greater participation by the other free peoples in these efforts to punish aggressors. The fighting forces contributed notably by Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Turkey, the Philippines, Siam, Puerto Rico, and others to the Korean struggle are yet not nearly great enough. We must see that the military capabilities for cooperation in the defense of freedom by the other free peoples are greatly increased, and that their cooperation in other measures to resist and punish the Communist aggressors is assured.

We must resist all blandishments for a preventive war either against China or the U. S. S. R. Such action would put us in a bad moral position with the hundreds of millions of peoples in the world whom we wish to win over to our side, and would lead inevitably to World War III and the atomic, near destruction of the civilized world which such a war would bring on.

There is real hope for peace through strength, through broadcasting the truth about our policies, and through effective economic reconstruction and development. It lies in making the free peoples so successful and so strong that the satellites, including Communist China, will begin to be attracted away from the Soviet Union, will begin to follow the example of Yugoslavia and thus break the Communist threat. At that point, negotiation regarding the atom bomb, reduction of armaments, world trade, world communications, and a United Nations empowered to keep the peace under law without arbitrary vetoes are likely to prove feasible and fruitful.

DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

From the very first I contended that unified control required a Defense Mobilizer with powers analogous to the War Production Board in World War II. Unification has been achieved under Charles E. Wilson with price, production, and materials allocation controls under administrators subject to his general direction.

Labor should have full representation in every phase of the mobilization effort. Without vigorous and effective workers of high morale well organized in successful trade unions led by labor statesmen it would be difficult indeed to make a success of the defense mobilization effort or to maintain that labor-management cooperation and that industrial peace so essential to success.

INFLATION CONTROL

Failure to curb inflation could destroy our national morale and our national defense capability. Inflationary forces

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

were running wild until January when the price-freeze order was first put into effect by the Office of Price Stabilization. Price rises have been somewhat tempered since but prices are still so high as to imperil the standard of living of every moderate income family.

Immediately after Congress reconvened on January 3, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 4 demanding that the President impose price controls. Subsequently and on January 27 the price freeze went into effect but the major deficiency in this price freeze which is undermining the whole inflation control program is its inability to deal adequately with food prices. Food costs constitute 40 percent of the normal family's budget, yet food prices have risen almost 5 percent since December 15, 1950, while farm prices average 25 percent higher than they were in June 1950, when the action in Korea started. The reason for this is the provision in the Defense Production Act, a provision which I strongly opposed, preventing food prices from being controlled before they reach 100 percent of parity. As a result a whole list of important foods like bread, grains, corn, citrus fruits, and butter are free to go up, while a list of foods already high in price like beef, wool, and cotton are controlled, but at the high prices.

Announcement has recently been made of roll-backs up to 10 percent by fall on beef. Already we are hearing threats of "farmer's strikes" and "black markets," though beef would still be selling one-third over the parity the farmer has always contended for. The Defense Production Act provision on agricultural prices must be amended.

There has been much talk of wage stabilization and holding wages to a 10 percent rise over January 1950, but obviously this is asking more than any worker or employee can agree to. With prices, and especially food prices continuing to rise and with an apparent lack of power to control them, wage stabilization properly will hinge upon effective price stabilization.

Price controls are only a means for giving our economic system the opportunity by increased production, credit control, adequate taxation and economy in Government expenditures to exercise basic restraint over inflation. It is for this reason that I took a deep interest in the struggle on credit control between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury. The policy decision made as a result has brought about slightly higher interest rates for Government bonds, but has tended to restrict credit and to curb inflation.

E BONDS EXTENDED

The privilege to retain United States Savings E bonds—acquired by many citizens under payroll savings plans—beyond their 10-year due dates, generally from 1951 to 1955, for another 10 years at rates of interest equivalent to those previously earned, was recently enacted into law. This type of security is a patriotic investment and a fine provision for a rainy day.

RENT CONTROL

Despite the fact that we have a rent control law in New York State I have fought for and supported tighter Federal rent controls. This is essential to curb inflation in the country generally which would certainly be very harmful to the people of New York. New York State rent control is not as good as the people in our district would like it, particularly in the possibility it allows to landlords of rent increases based on a fixed rate of return—4 percent plus 2 percent depreciation—on the assessed value of their property. But I am convinced that New York State rent control still represents greater protection than the people of New York could get under the present or any Federal-rent control law likely to be enacted this year.

It is easier for landlords to get more and greater rent increases under the Federal rent control law than under the New York law yet there will be another hard fight to get even this inadequate Federal rent-control law extended beyond June 30. The amendment which I sponsored requiring as a condition of any rent increases that landlords give all services to tenants they gave as of the rent freeze date continues in the Federal and New York State rent control laws and is responsible for blocking many improper rent increases. My congressional rent clinics continue to function every week throughout our district under the chairmanship of Hyman W. Sobell, Esq., and staffed by volunteer lawyers rendering an outstanding public service in rent problems without charge.

MILITARY SERVICE

Extensions of the draft have been voted by both the House and Senate and the final terms of the law are becoming fairly clear. The draft will probably be extended to July 1, 1955, and the age limit be reduced to 18½ years, but no draftee may be sent for overseas duty until he attains 19 years of age. The term of service will be 24 months. The law will contemplate that a plan for universal military training will be submitted to the Congress, but the Congress will have the right to accept or reject it so the question of whether we will have universal military training is still to be decided; special recognition will be given to inactive and volunteer reserves recalled to duty and the bill will probably call for their release from duty in 17 months. In any community the drafting of those under 19 is not to be permitted until the 19 to 26 age group has been exhausted.

Provisions for students assure an opportunity for those under 20 and still in high school to be deferred until graduation. For college students the deferment to the end of the academic year in which called is retained, but the President may allow added deferment for those continuing the type of studies considered to be in the national interest. The scholarship tests recently inaugurated by the Selective Service Administrator will be a guide to local draft boards in deferring students beyond the required deferment period.

A signal victory against discrimination and segregation was achieved in the House. By a concerted effort in which I took an active part we were able to defeat a proposal which would have enforced segregation on the grounds of color in the services. This represents the culmination of a fight which I have waged since 1948 against segregation in the armed services.

The Congress also passed a new Renegotiation Act enabling the United States Government to recapture from any Government contractor excessive profits gained out of the defense effort. I also helped to obtain for servicemen on leave the same reduced rail fares which they enjoyed during World War II. There also became law a provision for the admission of alien wives and minor children of our troops serving abroad free of any quota restrictions.

BUDGET AND TAXES

The President's budget contemplates appropriations of about $71,600,000,000 for the next fiscal year. Our people appear persuaded to a pay-as-we-go basis for defense mobilization. This attitude will enable our children to develop the country further without an even greater load of debt. The national debt at $254,727,000,000 is $1,656 per capita—at the time of Pearl Harbor it was $458.

But a pay-as-we-go basis will call for increased taxes. The President suggested an increase of personal income taxes to raise $4,000,000,000, an increase of 8 percentage points on corporate income taxes to raise $3,000,000,000 and an increase up to 50 percent of excise taxes on liquor, transportation, films, leather goods, amusements, and so forth, to raise $3,000,000,000 for a total of $10,000,000,000. He has also proposed that tax loopholes, among which are stated to be oil and gas depletion allowances, gift taxes, capital-gains taxes, and joint returns for husbands and wives, be closed in an effort to raise additional revenue.

Considerable effort is being made by business interests to get a general sales tax. This I have opposed as a regressive tax bearing heavily on those with moderate incomes. It is for the same reason that I opposed the New York City sales tax increase of from 2 percent to 3 percent, and have also opposed taxes on such nonluxury items as baby powder, handbags, and cosmetics.

We must increase taxes, but we should do so on the basis of capacity to pay, looking for increased revenue, first to excess profits from defense mobilization, corporate and personal, then to the recent heavier corporate profits, then to more taxes on luxuries and finally to the broad base of excise taxes and general income-tax increases, but being careful not to increase the already difficult situation of the people of moderate income. Taxes to be wise must be selective, too. For this reason I have introduced legislation to grant the same $600 additional exemption from tax for the physically handicapped as we give to the blind and to exempt the first $2,000 of income from pensions received by former Government

employees and the disability payments to those disabled in Government service.

We must cut the cost of Government where we can do so without material injury to our society or the defense mobilization effort. I have supported and will support cuts in new public construction like rivers and harbors, agricultural price supports, and overhead costs. I do not and shall not support cuts to deprive us of the full development of our power or other material resources, of needed housing, of medical research, public health, or to deprive veterans of disability or other necessary benefits.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGING

Those over 65 now constitute 7.5 percent of our population; and due to great progress in the medical sciences and in living conditions by 1975 will probably constitute about 15 percent of the population. A citizen who has given his best years to helping build our country is entitled to our solicitude in his later years. Social security payments, payable after 65 years of age, average between 60 and $80 per month for individuals, and for families between $100 and $150 per month. This is inadequate considering present costs of living. In addition, the social security system covers only those who pay in and their immediate families; it does not cover almost one-half of the American people. These must depend on State and local old-age assistance if they do not have savings.

I am applying myself to finding means, first, for extending to our older citizens greater opportunity for employment and, second, to seeing how we can provide for their economic security by a combination of private and public effort.

GOVERNMENT AND CRIME—SENATE CRIME INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

The revelations of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Crime in Interstate Commerce with Senator KEFAUVER, as chairman, and Senator TOBEY, as senior minority member, following on the heels of the investigations of the RFC, five percenters, and ship sales, have shocked the country. The moral tone in government in many quarters appears to have deteriorated seriously.

Connections between public officials and underworld influences shown in the New York City hearings undermine the confidence of the citizen in government. Establishment of moral standards as recommended by Senators FULBRIGHT and DOUGLAS is one excellent approach.

In 1950, with House Resolution 641, I began my one-man campaign to determine why so many Americans do not vote, confident that if the great majority of our people are alert to government and participate in it, we shall have better and more decent government. My campaign was based upon the fact that on the average only 40 percent of the eligible voters participate in congressional elections and 50 percent in Presidential elections. This campaign is getting cooperation from States, municipalities, civic, business, labor, and fraternal organizations. I have recently introduced H. R. 3399, the Voters' Information Act of 1951, which would permit information on officeholders to be posted in post offices.

In the same effort I introduced House Resolution 62 on January 12 authorizing televising and broadcasting of important debates in the House of Representatives. The country was so aroused about the revelations of the Senate Crime Committee on the links between the underworld and politics because it saw and heard what went on. I believe the country should have the opportunity to see and hear what goes on in the Congress, and I shall continue to fight for this measure.

VETERANS

As we undertake defense mobilization it is more important than ever that our veterans know that we propose to discharge fully our responsibilities to them. National Service Life Insurance has been succeeded by free $10,000 life insurance for those in the armed services. Veterans holding NSLI policies may continue to enjoy their benefits. If recalled to active duty they will get the benefit of free coverage while they are on duty and can resume the NSLI policies when discharged and returned to civilian life.

I have introduced H. R. 1014 entitling the veteran to use his full $7,500 VA home-loan rights even though he has previously used the home-loan privilege in part. This is essential to take care of veterans who have had to change homes due to larger families or for other proper reasons.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In connection with the continuing concern about subversives and other disloyal elements in our country, I have again offered House Concurrent Resolution 56, my proposal to establish a joint committee of the House and Senate on national and international movements with full powers of investigation and with rules of procedure to protect the constitutional rights of individuals.

To deal with evidences of discrimination and segregation on grounds of race, creed, color, and national origin and to preserve equality of opportunity for higher education, I introduced H. R. 3347 to deprive institutions of higher education—other than denominational institutions—practicing such discrimination and segregation of Federal payments in any form through veterans' educational benefits under the GI bill or otherwise. In addition, I continue to be the sponsor of FEPC legislation—H. R. 2092.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The continuing curtailment of mail service is still attributed to an effort to economize in the post office—a saving of $80,000,000 per annum is claimed. It is true that the post office deficit exceeds $500,000,000 per annum and must be reduced but this can be done by appropriate rate increases, particularly for newspapers, periodicals, and other bulk mail now not paying its fair share of the postal cost and by organizational economies.

Postal and other governmental employees dependent upon Congress for justice in their pay scales should have increases commensurate with the increased cost of living. People should not be deceived by the relatively few high bracket salaries in Government. The great bulk of Government employees get low salaries and have a hard time getting along today.

In an effort to encourage the merit system in the post office I have offered H. R. 3398 to make promotions to supervisory positions on a merit basis.

Other threats to the civil-service system continue like the freeze on permanent appointments or promotions, the efforts to reduce annual and sick leave, and opposition to retirement after 30 years of service. Government service should be made an attractive outlet for the best efforts of those employed under it, and they should be encouraged to give outstanding service.

ISRAEL

Israel's problem of absorbing the added emergency immigration of 600,000 Jews from Eastern Europe, the Near East, and North Africa will urgently require the assistance of the United States. This comes after the most heroic effort by the Israeli people themselves—who have already taken in almost 600,000, including 190,000 DP's since 1947—living as they are under the most complete austerity and after scraping the bottom of the barrel for contributions in the United States and other countries. A bill seeking a grant of $150,000,000 of assistance from the United States to Israel has been introduced by Mr. MCCORMACK, the majority leader, and Mr. MARTIN, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and by a distinguished bipartisan group in the Senate led by Senators DOUGLAS and TAFT. I have worked diligently in its behalf and will continue to do so.

Israel is of the utmost importance to the national security of the United States in the Middle East both as an industrial workshop and the possessor of a most effective military force dedicated to fight against Communists or anyone else threatening that area's security and independence. Israel is truly a bastion of the free peoples in the Middle East.

IRELAND

Efforts continue to get the House of Representatives to declare it as the sense of the Congress that all Ireland should be unified. Thousands of citizens directly and through their organizations are participating. The current session of Congress is a renewed opportunity for raising this issue and for cooperating with others of my colleagues to help the Irish people realize their legitimate aspirations for unification.

PUERTO RICO

The national interests of the United States require that the people of Puerto Rico shall have full opportunity for self-government and for economic and cultural improvement. They vote June 4 on a constitution and as I pledged on the Enabling Act before the Congress, I shall do everything I can to see that the Puerto Rican people have a full and fair opportunity to express and to realize their own desires.

IMMIGRATION AND DP'S

The Displaced Persons Act was due to expire on July 1, 1951, and of the over

300,000 DP's who were to be admitted over 40,000 were unlikely to be admitted by the expiration date. The House has passed an extension of the act to December 31, 1951, to accommodate those who would otherwise be stranded.

We need a whole new immigration policy for our country cognizant of the availability of skilled and useful immigrants in Europe and elsewhere, and of our need for them to make our country even stronger in the face of the challenges before us. We are still operating under an outmoded immigration quota policy, limiting immigration to about 154,000 a year of which only about half is used. Our law gives large quotas to Great Britain and other countries which do not use them, while allowing small quotas to Greece, Italy, Poland, and other countries making prospective immigrants from there wait 5 or 10 years for a visa. Even with the DP law and nonquota immigrants we have only taken in 205,000 a year for permanent residence on the average from 1948 to 1950. The law provides that housing and jobs shall be shown to be available for new immigrants when they apply for their visas. Within the confines of these principles our immigration policy should be broadened.

A very important aid to immigration was the recent amendment to the Internal Security Act (McCarran bill) which took effect March 28, permitting those who are neither Communists nor Facists or other totalitarians but who involuntarily had some connection with such organizations under coercion, to become eligible for immigration to the United States, an eligibility which had been denied to them heretofore by this law.

OTHER ESSENTIAL ISSUES

At the very opening of the Congress an effort was made to reassert the power of the Rules Committee which can in effect block legislation from coming up for debate and vote. I opposed the grant of this power and supported the so-called 21-day rule which broke this power in the last Congress. We lost this time, but I shall join with others of my colleagues in trying again. The way the bill to aid India with grain in its famine situation was delayed is one example of why this question is so important.

I introduced again my National Youth Assistance Bill to provide $50,000,000 to aid youth programs in States and municipalities and by voluntary organizations like Youth Aid, Inc., which functions in our district. I revised my bill in line with the recommendations of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth recently held and the new problems of youth arising under the defense mobilization program.

I continued also my work in seeking to bring about modernization of the Republican Party. It is fundamental to the success of our constutional society that both great parties be equally modern and have equal appeal to the people.

CONCLUSION

Our Nation finds itself at the crossroads of world leadership. There are those who counsel retreat to a Western Hemisphere "Gibraltar," but the facts of the air and atomic age make this a counsel of fear, not of security. Our security is to be found in accepting the world leadership which by virtue of our moral and physical resources we have the responsibility to accept. I am confident that we wish to, and that we can, lead the world to a new birth of freedom, prosperity and security encompassing more of mankind than ever before and therefore deserving greater success than has ever been granted to any people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from a report on subversive activities, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $600.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include a letter.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. HART) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and to include in one an editorial appearing in the Boston Post on May 5 and in the other an editorial appearing in the Boston Post on May 7.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper columns written by him.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances and include in one an article from the Argonaut and in the other a letter sent by 72 Members of Congress to the special assistant to the President on foreign affairs dated July 31, 1950, some 10 months ago, to which no adequate answer has been received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. BROWNSON) was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial from the Port Jervis Union-Gazette.

Mr. BROWNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter published in the Indianapolis Star on May 5, 1951.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made this afternoon and include certain statistical information.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a few remarks by a former Member of the House, Hon. Lloyd Thurston, and a few paragraphs from the annual minutes and reports of the Spanish-American War Veterans Encampment.

Mr. WOODRUFF (at the request of Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain editorials.

Mr. ARMSTRONG and Mr. BAKEWELL (at the request of Mr. CURTIS of Missouri) were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by James Reston appearing in the New York Times of May 9.

Mr. KILBURN and Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) were given permission to extend their remarks and include editorials and other matter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address recently made by him.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. KLEIN), for an indefinite period, due to illness in the family.

To Mr. GORDON, for May 9, 10, and 11, due to illness in the family.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 8, 1951, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 321. An act to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of R. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe;

H. R. 622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina;

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrzej Wojcicki, and Stanislaw Wojcicki;

H. R. 664. Ar act for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt;

H. R. 667. An act for the relief of Hildegard Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling;

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins;

H. R. 789. An act for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee;

H. R. 859. An act for the admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski;

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr.;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Taro Takara;

H. R. 1117. An act for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya;

H. R. 1121. An act for the relief of Chin Yok Kong;

H. R. 1141. An act for the relief of St. Patrick Hospital and the Western Montana Clinic;

H. R. 1150. An act for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti, Giuseppe Omati, Vincenzo Andreani, Lambruno Sarzanini, and Alessandro Costa;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of Pietro Giannettino;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu;

H. R. 1264. An act for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden;

H. R. 1422. An act for the relief of Carl Parks;

H. R. 1438. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Charles R. Keicher;

H. R. 147.. An act for the relief of Elena Erbez;

H. R. 1798. An act for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of Sook Kat;

H. R. 2175. An act for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott;

H. R. 2304. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers;

H. R. 2357. An act for the relief of Lucia Adamos;

H. R. 2450. An act for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano;

H. R. 2654. An act to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 2714. An act for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte;

H. R. 3196. An act to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3291. An act to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; and

H. R. 3292. An act to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 10, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

443. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Public Housing Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 128); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

444. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $77,400 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 129); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 3336. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 108. An act to amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 458. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGAN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1221. A bill to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3041. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 4014. A bill to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 4015. A bill to amend section 811 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to transfers in contemplation of or taking effect at death); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4016. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide for the retirement of certain disabled former members of the uniformed services who served on active duty during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4017. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of bulls with intent to use such bulls for bullfighting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4018. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal building at Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4019. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, to adjust the salaries of officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4020. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide harbor and terminal facilities in cases where such facilities are not privately available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 4021. A bill to amend the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4022. A bill authorizing an appropriation to aid in constructing a public sewerage system in Bedford, Mass., and connecting such system with the Bedford Veterans' Administration Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 4023. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4024. A bill to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4025. A bill to provide for the review of certain orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and giving the United States courts of appeals jurisdiction on review to enjoin, set aside, or suspend such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4026. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4027. A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4028. A bill to prohibit economic or financial assistance, other than assistance granted pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, to foreign countries which permit the exportation of strategic war materials to Communist China or Hong Kong, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4029. A bill to create a Federal Civilian Retirement Administration and to transfer thereto the functions of the Civil Service Commission pertaining to civil-service

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

retirement activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4030. A bill to appropriate funds to enable the Smithsonian Institution to extend its studies of solar radiation to include determination of the practicability of utilizing solar energy for the production of power; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4031. A bill to prohibit enforced savings of income of American citizens by the Government through compulsory payroll deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4032. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 4033. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday of August of each year as Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 225. Resolution authorizing the transferring of certain property to the Milwaukee County Historical Society; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial, of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to a moratorium on Federal income tax payments for persons in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4034. A bill for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREEN:

H. R. 4035. A bill for the relief of Donald I. Hamrock, Robert N. Lensch, Russell E. Ryan, and Helen P. Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4036. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Dewulf Maquet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4037. A bill for the relief of M. Neil Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Alexandros Chronakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Chris Reszke Birk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4040. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Gail Mackiernan, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 4041. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dimitri Alexandrovich Afonsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4042. A bill for the relief of Silvino da Conceicao Catula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 4043. A bill for the relief of Carlos Tannoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 4044. A bill for the relief of Marcus Kanaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

279. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of General Court of Massachusetts in favor of waiving certain requirements of the naturalization laws in the case of persons whose sons or daughters have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

280. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of the passage of legislation revising the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and love who, in the miracle of springtime, covers the earth with a tapestry of beauty; who art the source of our being and the goal of our striving: Hallowed be Thy name. At Thy word man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor, until the evening.

We would keep within the grasp of Thy firm hand the threads of this day's words and deeds that we may not mar the fair design of what Thou wouldst do for us and through us. Apart from Thee these feverish days are but tangled tragedy, sound, and fury signifying nothing, devoid of meaning, dignity, and beauty. But in Thy radiance trivial rounds become sacraments and even bitterness and disappointment and failure are transfigured and redeemed.

In these demanding days, as Thy servants here face perplexing issues of state, may the strength of each be as the strength of ten because our hearts are pure. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 9, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 9, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 568) for the relief of George W. Purdy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3576. An act to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 206

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Florida State Legislature does hereby make application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purposes of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall not apply during hostilities while the United States is in a state of war declared by Congress and shall be subject to the further

qualification that in the event of a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

"SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect"; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—RESOLUTION OF NEWSPAPER POST, NO. 144, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by Newspaper Post, No. 144, the American Legion, Maryland, dealing with procedures for development of American foreign policy.

The author of the resolution, Past Commander Ralph J. Sybert, is a capable newspaperman of long and excellent experience in the field of political and governmental affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 718. A bill to authorize the lease and purchase by the United States of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 319).

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT RELATING TO PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 293)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], members of the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit our minority views on the bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor, and request that they be printed as part 2 of Report No. 293.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority views will be received and, without objection, printed as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1463. A bill to enable the States to make more adequate provision for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1464. A bill for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1465. A bill for the relief of Rosi Mandel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1466. A bill for the relief of Fred J. Buhlmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. IVES, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950; considered and passed.

(See the remarks of Mr. GEORGE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3576. An act to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Oscar B. Ryder, of Virginia, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

An address delivered by him before the Presbyterian Historical Society of the Upper Ohio Valley, meeting in Bethel Presbyterian Church, near Pittsburgh, Pa., on its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, May 7, 1951.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Address delivered by Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel April 26, 1951, at the annual dinner of the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association regarding the necessity for a continuous fight on inflation.

By Mr. MOODY:

An address on the subject Threat to Our Free Press in Today's World, delivered by Marquis Childs at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., on May 4, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Address on the subject A Report on New England, by Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., president, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., of Stamford, Conn., and president of the New England Council, at the annual New England congressional dinner, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 30, 1951.

Article from the New York Times magazine of May 6, entitled "Echo of the Voice," referring to the Voice of America.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address on the subject What Are We Building? by Paul E. Raymond, at the laying of the cornerstone of the Christian Education Building of Tourist Church, Interdenominational, at Daytona Beach, Fla., March 11, 1951.

Editorial entitled "General MacArthur's Case," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on April 20, 1951.

By Mr. CASE:

Statement containing the words of Hail, South Dakota, the official song of the State.

By Mr. BYRD:

Editorial entitled "Effect of MacArthur," from the May 10, 1951, issue of the Wall Street Journal, written by W. H. Grimes, the editor, with reference to the effect of General MacArthur on the foreign policy of the United States.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorials and articles concerning the report of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, and the crime problem in the United States.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Article by George Sokolsky published in the Washington Times-Herald May 10, 1951, dealing with the report by Miss Vernice Anderson of a conversation between President Truman and General MacArthur at their Wake Island conference.

Article entitled "Another 'Pearl Harbor Inquiry'," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star of May 10, 1951.

Article entitled "Ex-Head Asserts CIA Reports Should Have Gone to MacArthur," published in the Washington Star of May 10, 1951, dealing with an interview with Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter regarding reports of the Central Intelligence Agency on conditions in Korea.

Article entitled "MacArthur Knows Asiatic Mind," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Star of May 10, dealing with the actions of General MacArthur in the war in Korea.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Essay by Margaret Ann Dilfer on Equal Opportunity and Employment for the Physically Handicapped.

WINSTON CHURCHILL'S DEMAND FOR ENDING OF BRITISH RUBBER SHIPMENTS TO RED CHINA

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have noticed on the ticker a reference to a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

statement by Winston Churchill, Britain's great wartime Prime Minister wherein he expresses some positive sentiments and convictions which have long been held by me. I ask unanimous consent that the excerpt from the ticker be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH RUBBER

LONDON.—Winston Churchill demanded today an immediate halt of all British rubber shipments to Red China.

He told the House of Commons during a debate on export of strategic materials to the Chinese Reds that the Labor Government's policy on rubber and other matters involving Peiping is impairing British-American relations.

"We should stop at once—abruptly, permanently, and decisively—exports of rubber to China," he said.

QUESTIONS AS TO KOREA AND AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the people of Maryland, along with the citizens of the other great States of the Union, are demanding that their Government adopt a foreign policy which makes sense. Daily by mail, by telegram, by telephone, and by personal visits, the residents of my State are insisting that the junior Senator from Maryland give them clear, concise, straightforward answers as to why the foreign policy in force is being directed in such a weird manner.

Frankly, I cannot answer those questions. I am at a loss to understand the intent and purposes of the present foreign policy of the United States. Today, therefore, I am bringing a few of these fundamental questions to the attention of my much wiser and more experienced colleagues. I know that there are a number of distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle who are closely associated with the persons who are directing America's foreign policy. I am sure that if they know what is behind the fantastic gyrations now evident in our foreign policy, they will speak up and give us the answers. I will go even further and say humbly that I consider it their duty to do so. Up to now I must admit that I have not heard any plausible explanation given.

Before I continue further in my brief remarks I should like to assure the Senate that the people of Maryland are asking for objective serious answers to their questions. They deplore the turn some of the debate has taken recently. They are disturbed over the name calling and the language being used. They are angered by the selfish partisan attitude of some.

In this respect I might remind my auditors that the junior Senator from Maryland comes from a State that has a large majority of its voters registered as Democrats.

So, to the people of my State, this is not an issue to be scrabbled and twisted for political advantage. It is a matter of life and death to their sons, husbands, and sweethearts. It is a matter of life and death to their country.

I shall state a few of the questions, but before doing so Mr. President, may I ask the indulgence of the Senate that I be not interrupted until I have finished these few remarks? Since they will be couched in the form of questions, I am asking any Senators who care to answer them to wait until I have finished, since my queries are all interrelated.

Mr. President, on June 1, 1950, at a press conference, President Truman spoke about peace. The Baltimore Sun of the next day carried an account of the Chief Executive's memorable statement. The headlines read:

Truman says he does not expect war—asserts permanent peace is nearer now than in last 5 years.

The article is written by Joseph H. Short, who is now, as Senators know, the President's press-relations man. The article reads:

WASHINGTON, June 1.—President Truman said today he does not expect war.

In fact, the Chief Executive told his weekly news conference the world is closer now to permanent peace than at any time during the last 5 years.

These cheerful Presidential comments were made on a recent public-opinion poll indicating that a majority of the American people expect war within the next 5 years.

Mr. Truman said he does not agree with that opinion at all, adding that he is doing everything possible to prevent any war of any kind.

WORKING THROUGH U. N.

The United States, the President continued, is working through the United Nations for a permanent peace, which he said is nearer realization than at any time in 5 years.

Mr. Truman's impromptu remarks came only a few hours after—

1. His request to Congress for $1,222,500,000 for military aid to friendly nations during the fiscal year beginning next month.

2. A statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee by Louis A. Johnson, Defense Secretary, that the President was solidly behind a 3-year extension of the draft law.

STRENGTH ESSENTIAL

At the news conference the Chief Executive did not explain away the seeming contradiction between his comments on peace and his appeals to Congress, but on many previous occasions he has stated his belief that an essential ingredient to peace is the military strength of the United States and its allies.

In this case Mr. Truman appeared on the verge of saying more on the subject when he was interrupted with a question concerning the impending expiration of Presidential powers to suspend the import tax on copper.

A moment or two later, when other reporters returned him to the larger subject, he referred them to speeches made on his recent nonpolitical tour to Grand Coulee Dam, especially one made at Laramie, Wyo., on May 9.

LONG TASK AHEAD

He said he thought he had made it plain at Laramie, in the University of Wyoming auditorium, that he anticipated the achievement of peace.

"All our international policies, taken together," the President declared at Laramie, "form a program designed to strengthen and unite the free world in its resistance to the spread of communism.

"They are aimed at banding the free countries together in a great demonstration that the free way of life is more rewarding to the individual than any form of tyranny, old or new.

"I say again that we have a long task ahead. It may be many years before we can be sure that communism is no longer a threat, that our goals of stability and peace have been attained."

THREE-FOURTHS PRODUCTION

"But those goals are clearly within our reach. The non-Communist nations together have two-thirds of the world's people and three-fourths of the world's productive power.

"And we have much more than mere quantity or mere strength. We have the greatest attraction of all—human freedom. Our system of life satisfies the most fundamental desire of man—the opportunity to be his own master.

"We can have faith that with these qualities, and the help of the Almighty, we will attain a just and lasting peace throughout the world."

MORE SPECIFIC ON THREAT

Although the President indicated that he was saying the same thing today as on previous occasions, he certainly was more specific about the absence of a threat of war. The question which prompted his comments referred to war within 5 years but Mr. Truman's reply was general and without any time limitation.

On May 4, at another news conference, he had declared himself as not alarmed over the world situation, adding that prospects were brighter than in 1946, which he set down as the lowest point of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

On June 27 at 12 noon, just 26 days later, President Truman ordered our Armed Forces into Korea to fight a war that is costing us 1,400 casualties a week.

Mr. President, the people of Maryland demand to know what kind of a foreign policy the Government of the United States is following that can bring about such a tragedy?

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that President Truman in his press interview spoke of permanent peace. The Baltimore Sun is recognized as one of the leading newspapers in the State of Maryland. I do not believe the Sun would deliberately misquote the President of the United States. I do not believe its reporters are so grossly inaccurate that the President's statements were distorted out of meaning.

I do not recall that the President has ever denied he said we were closer to permanent peace than we had been in the past 5 years.

What does it mean when the Chief Executive of our country in one breath tells us we have peace in our grasp and then plunges us into war with his next order?

The people of Maryland want that question answered. I think it is a fair question. I think it is an important one.

Here is another question: What kind of a foreign policy are we pursuing that calls for taking our troops out of Korea one day and on another day rushing them back into the same place without consulting the Congress or the American people?

What kind of foreign policy is it that keeps our Seventh Fleet busy giving our Ground Forces tactical assistance while the same fleet is being used to neutralize the Chinese troops on Formosa that could take the pressure off our own troops?

The junior Senator from Maryland has been listening carefully to the debates on the Senate floor and has heard

it said time and time again that this country is pledged to fight aggression at any place in the world where it rears its ugly head.

Let us remember that that was the basic argument for sending our troops to Europe. Aggression threatened, it was said. We must rush to meet it. We must not let it spread.

I thought that was plausible. I have never been against sending troops to Europe. Certainly I voted to uphold the Constitution and to retain the war-making powers in the hands of Congress, but I also voted to send four divisions to Europe, and I will vote to send more if the need is shown.

However, the people of Maryland want to know what kind of a foreign policy it is that rushes troops to meet a threatened aggression in Europe while it is providing a sanctuary for aggressors on the Korean peninsula.

Let me read a short excerpt from the censored transcript of the hearings now being held before the Joint Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations:

General MACARTHUR. As soon as we realized that the Chinese were moving across the Yalu in force as national entities, I ordered the bridge across the Yalu bombed from the Korean side, half-way to the stream. That order was countermanded from Washington, and it was only when I protested violently that I was allowed to continue my original directive.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, are the forces in Korea at the present time permitted to bomb half of the bridge from the center of the river over to North Korea?

General MACARTHUR. When I left they were; yes, sir; and I was bombing them.

The CHAIRMAN. Those people have had some good experience in pinpoint bombing, I assume.

General MACARTHUR. The original order, General Whitney just recalled to me, directed me to confine the bombing along the Yalu River to 5 miles within North Korea, from the Yalu border—from the border of North Korea 5 miles inland, I was not permitted to bomb. That was changed, as I say, when, on my recommendation.

Mr. President, what kind of a foreign policy is it that tells one of our generals conducting a war that he cannot even bomb the enemy if they move 5 miles into the territory the general has been ordered to defend?

What kind of a foreign policy is it that orders our generals not to bomb supply depots and supply lines from which the enemy is drawing the strength with which to kill our American boys?

What are we doing in Korea anyway? Are we fighting a war or playing a macabre game?

Finally, what kind of a foreign policy is it that orders our generals to move our troops up and down a tiny peninsula 10,000 miles away from home while thousands upon thousands of American soldiers are butchered?

What kind of a foreign policy is it that has brought such hopeless misery down upon us?

Mr. President, I have tried to be objective because I know that the people of my State would not have me be otherwise. Knowing them as I do, I am confident their only desire is that the Senate, after debate and in conjunction with the House of Representatives, formulate a foreign policy that will correct some of the incongruities so abundantly apparent in the policy we have been pursuing.

I stand ready at this time of uncertainty and great peril to our Nation to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the formulation of such a policy to the best of my ability.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the Senator from Maryland give the date when the President issued the statement that "We are nearer peace than at any time in the last 5 years?"

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That statement was issued on June 1, 1950.

Mr. MARTIN. When did American troops go into Korea?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. They went into Korea on June 27, 1950, just 26 days later.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the Senator realize that intelligence information as to the movement of troops of nations which might be in opposition to the United States is information which should have come from our State Department, and the President should have known of the dangers in Korea when he issued his famous peace statement?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am advised that at that time there were in the hands of the President of the United States intelligence reports which would have indicated to the contrary of what he stated.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Should not that information have been given to the people of the United States, so that they would not have been taken with such terrible surprise when we were attacked in Korea?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I would have thought so, but apparently the President decided to the contrary, if he had the information.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has made a very able presentation and has asked some important questions which should be answered. I am not in a position to answer them, but there should be in the State Department or in the Department of Defense officials who can answer those questions, and the American people have a right to have them answered.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am completely satisfied that the people of my State and, I think, all the people of our great Nation, want to know the answers to those questions; and I know that, with the answers to those questions, they want laid down a more definite and distinct foreign policy which the Congress and the people can follow.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, is it not true that it is impossible to have a policy for the conduct of a military campaign unless the country carrying on the campaign has a plan of procedure which all understand and with which all are in accord?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes, I certainly think that it would be an absolute ingredient of the conduct of any war that the people have sufficient information of the policies and plan of procedure to enable them to be solidly behind the effort and to keep solidly behind it.

Mr. MARTIN. A moment ago the Senator from Maryland compared the situation in Korea to a football game. Of course there are some great football teams in Maryland. If a football player was making a punt and if the coach or someone else in authority prevented the ends on the team from covering the kick, the results would not be very satisfactory, would they?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is perfectly true. A somewhat similar policy is now being followed in Korea, I am sorry to say.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Maryland deserves great credit for propounding the questions set forth in his remarks, and I hope that someone in the State Department or in the Department of Defense will answer them for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment on page 12, beginning in line 10, striking out in line 15 the numerals "50,000,000", and inserting "$100,000,000."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Millikin
Anderson	Green	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Moody
Benton	Hendrickson	Morse
Brewster	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Humphrey	Pastore
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Duff	Lodge	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Taft
Eastland	McCarthy	Thye
Ecton	McClellan	Tobey
Ellender	McFarland	Underwood
Ferguson	McKellar	Welker
Flanders	McMahon	Wherry
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY] have been appointed members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of Hon. John Kee, late a Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia, and are, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, because of the inadaquate appropriations to meet the needs of schools, under the terms of Public Law 815, enacted by the Congress on September 23, 1950, the Office of Education had to establish a priority system in the allotment of the insufficient funds to meet the applications submitted to them by school districts throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, the Congress authorized a program whereby the Federal Government would participate in the construction of school buildings in areas in which the scholastic population had been increased by reason of the expansion of defense industry or operation in the immediate area. When Congress did that, it recognized a basic responsibility of Government. It held out to those charged with the responsibility of operating the schools in such areas the indication, in fact, Mr. President, the positive assurance, that it would participate in the required expansion of the school facilities in the respective areas.

The present school year is drawing to a close. Another school year will begin in the fall. Those charged with operation of the districts wherein increased numbers of youth are to have their opportunity for an education must know not only what the assistance available to them will be, but they certainly are entitled to have the children in their districts assured that reasonable provision will be made for school plans and school equipment which will give them the opportunity for the kind of education the American people want their youth to have.

Mr. President, in the last appropriation by the Congress $46,500,000 was made available, but of this amount $15,000,000 was reserved to construct school facilities on military reservations. The remaining $31,000,000 was sufficient to make only partial allotments to 70 schools in the United States.

Mr. President, hundreds of school districts in the United States are immobilized in varying degrees by reason of the inadequacy of school buildings and school equipment. They are awaiting the provision of the necessary funds by local school districts and the Federal Government. When we authorized the program, Mr. President, we said that the Federal Government would meet its responsibilities in that regard. It is doing so, but on the installment plan. It seems that the spirit of the orders of those who are charged with the reduction of credit, by which they are shortening the time for the completion of the installment payments, is not being followed out by those who have the responsibility for carrying out the program. In this instance the installments, instead of being accelerated and speeded up, are being slowed down, and they have now almost stopped.

Mr. President, the Federal Government should not take the attitude that it will compel the youth of our country who are affected by the program to suffer the penalty of inadequate educational facilities, while waiting for the Government to make up its mind as to when it will meet the responsibility which exists and which it has recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Oklahoma in the amendment which he has submitted. However, I do not believe it goes far enough to meet the needs. I should like to say that, as I understand, the provision will affect only the small number of school districts in the country that reach the priority status which has been established by the Department of Education.

If the rules permitted, I would ask that this proposal be increased to meet the real needs of a very acute situation.

Mr. President, in this field of education the Federal Government has a responsibility. It is just as great a responsibility as the furnishing of uniforms for soldiers. The problem, as it affects my State, is that many acres of land have been taken off the county tax rolls. In my State every county which has within it a large military or defense operation and whose population has been greatly increased has raised its tax rate to the maximum limit permitted by the State constitution. Three years would be required under the constitution of Kentucky, to amend it in order to meet the new obligation.

Mr. President, 10 Kentucky school districts had applications on file with the Office of Education on March 12, 1951, under Public Law 815. The applications disclose that there has been an increase of 3,400 pupils in the 10 districts since the 1938–39 school year, and that there are at present 8,578 unhoused school children, children for whom adequate school housing is not available, in those areas.

Although these 10 districts have an estimated entitlement of $2,160,429 under Public Law 815, they have asked the Federal Government for only $1,773,164 and have proposed to supply themselves $946,362 in local funds to provide this needed school housing.

These 10 districts are outside of the Paducah-MacCracken County Atomic project area. In the atomic project area itself, where there are 11 city and county school districts, it is estimated that additional classroom space for an influx of 6,665 children will be required during the period of construction of the atomic plant. Temporary facilities will suffice for an estimated 3,030 of these children, but permanent classroom space must be provided for the remaining 3,625, since it is estimated that number will become permanent residents, requiring permanent facilities.

School systems in the atomic project area already have felt the impact of the steadily increasing activity at the atomic plant site. Employment at the site began in large numbers this spring and the affected districts will be unable to qualify for the current year. By fall the shortage of schoolroom space will be acute.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that all of the twenty-odd affected Kentucky school districts are doing their utmost to care for their new pupils. School boards, in all but one of these districts, have levied the constitutional maximum tax—$1.50 per hundred dollar property valuation—for school purposes. The tax rate in the other district is $1.45, only 5 cents under the maximum.

Mr. KERR. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for having brought to the attention of the Senate the details of the specific problem as it exists in his State. He asks whether the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators who have been so kind as to join him would not still leave much of the Government's responsibilities unmet and uncared for. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that unless the money is appropriated in the deficiency bill it will be impossible to get any relief for next year's school term, although the pupil load in the defense areas created by the Government is constantly growing greater?

Mr. KERR. That is exactly correct. The schools are bulging, and their needs are growing greater all the time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the bill which authorizes the expenditures was drawn up as a result of a whole summer's study by one of the finest subcommitees of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House. The members of the subcommittee visited the localities. They examined the school plants. They considered the student load. They saw

the unhealthy and dangerous fire traps which pupils were using at the various defense installations.

After a thorough and complete study, a report was made, and the authorization was voted. Congress determined that it should not be a part of the Government's policy to short-change the children of the defense workers who are brought into an area to do a patriotic job by providing for such children less than a half day of school, under dangerous firetrap conditions, in unhealthy surroundings, and faced with completely inadequate facilities to handle the school requirements. Congress accepted the obligation by the passage of the authorization legislation. It is up to us now to take action about it. It will not help the students to put off for a year the beginning of the construction of the schools.

Mr. KERR. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. KERR. I shall yield in a moment. First, I wish to say that if we were discussing food for soldiers, Congress would not hesitate to provide it as it was needed. If it were housing, Mr. President, we would not hesitate to provide it as it was currently needed; it would be unfair not to respond. It is nearly as unfair an imposition on school children to say to them, "While you are in your first, second, third, or eighth grade, you are going to be permitted to have the opportunity to attend school only half the time, because the great United States Government, while it has recognized its primary responsibility to help provide an educational plant to take care of you, is busy elsewhere."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma how much the Bureau of the Budget recommended.

Mr. KERR. It recommended $50,000,000, which is the amount carried in the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. How much is the Senator asking for?

Mr. KERR. $100,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, together with several other Senators, and we attempt to justify appropriations. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator whether he has in his possession any new evidence which was not presented to the Bureau of the Budget or to the Committee on Appropriations. As to the responsibility of the Government in that respect, I agree with the Senator, but granting that everything the Senator from Oklahoma has said is true with respect to the authorization, the item was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, the presentation was made by the Bureau of the Budget on the basis of $50,000,000, and that is the amount which the Committee on Appropriations has allowed. The evidence which was submitted to the committee was up-to-the-minute evidence, because it came to the Senate committee after the House had passed the bill. The House had not considered the item at all.

The item was covered in a recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The Bureau of the Budget looked over the entire situation, and recommended to Congress that the amount be fixed at $50,000,000; and the President agrees with the figure, because the Budget Bureau is his agency.

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. KERR. I should first like to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to review my question. I am sure the Senator will agree about the procedure, but does he have any new evidence which was not presented to the Bureau of the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, bearing in mind that the Committee on Appropriations handled the matter about 2 or 3 days ago?

Mr. KERR. I do not know whether I have any new evidence which the very effective Committee on Appropriations did not have before it. However, I have evidence which I think is compelling and persuasive and which I will now give to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it evidence in addition to evidence presented by the Bureau of the Budget? That is what I am asking about.

Mr. KERR. I assume this particular evidence was submitted to the committee. I do not know whether I have any evidence other than the evidence which was considered by the committee. I would remind the Senator from Nebraska that although he says the Bureau of the Budget recommended not more than $50,000,000, I take the position that what they said may be interpreted as meaning that they recommended not less than $50,000,000. As I understand, they recommended $50,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me correct the Senator's statement. The Budget Bureau recommended an appropriation of $50,000,000.

Mr. KERR. That is what I understood.

Mr. WHERRY. That was based upon evidence submitted by the Federal Security Administration.

Mr. KERR. In his remarks the Senator from Nebraska stated that the Budget Bureau recommended not more than $50,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the amount which the Budget Bureau recommended. The Senate committee could have reduced it, but the Senate committee allowed exactly what the Budget Bureau recommended, in which the President concurred.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is aware of that fact. I am also aware of the fact that the Appropriations Committee could have——

Mr. WHERRY. It could have cut it down.

Mr. KERR. It could have reported a bill containing a larger amount.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no. How could the Appropriation Committee of the Senate——

Mr. KERR. I have answered the question of the Senator from Nebraska, and I should like now to proceed with my discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will allow me to answer that one question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. The Senator has asked me a question. If he will permit me to answer it, I shall be glad to yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR. The money already appropriated has taken care of approximately 70 schools in the Nation. The $50,000,000 which the Appropriations Committee has included in the pending bill would take care of between 95 and 100 more such schools. The additional $50,000,000 called for by the amendment which I and other Senators are sponsoring would take care of an additional 227 schools in approximately 36 States. I recognize the forcefulness of what was said by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD]——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think I have certain information which was not presented to the Budget Bureau, and which shows the additional need.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, after I have finished with respect to this particular item.

The request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that the amendment be changed from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000 would be more than justified, Mr. President, because if Congress accepts the pending amendment, making the amount $100,000,000 instead of $50,000,000, there will still be nearly half of the school districts in the United States where the enrollment is substantially increased by the presence of the children of defense workers, whose requirements will not be met even by the adoption of the amendment calling for $100,000,000. So this amendment does not seek to go beyond reasonable objectives. It is in reality a halfway measure.

Were it not for my feeling that the Senate conferees would not be able to keep more than $100,000,000 in the bill, I would happily join with the Senator from Kentucky and ask that the amount be made $150,000,000. However, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has indicated a feeling that there might be a possibility of keeping in the bill most of the $100,000,000 if the Senate were to approve that amount. For that reason I have felt that the wise thing to do was to follow through on that basis.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I think I can give some new evidence.

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I offer this in the form of new information, or information on a new subject, since the committee passed on this question.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Even after the $50,000,000 is applied under the formula now in effect, we shall still have schools which have from 50 to 60 percent of their student body coming from families directly connected with Federal activities, who will still not be able to come within the formula and receive any of this relief. That is particularly true with respect to certain recent developments.

Consider the case of Biloxi, Miss., where Keesler Field is located. A new expansion program has just been authorized and started, calling for the expenditure of $36,000,000, which will bring that Air Force base up to a population of 64,000. It is situated entirely within the city of Biloxi. The expansion program will make more than 40 percent of that area federally owned and controlled.

There are now 625 family units on the base, and 720 others are in the process of construction. It is estimated that there will be more than 500 new children coming into that district alone within the next year, because of the present construction. As I say, the area is more than 40 percent federally owned and controlled.

That is new evidence which applies particularly to the question of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. The situation which he has described in his State is not an isolated example, but an example of a general condition.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the senior Senator from Oklahoma in this amendment. As a former governor of my State I am somewhat familiar with the school problems in our defense areas. We have elementary schools in Wichita, Kans., which are operating both forenoon and afternoon shifts, and consideration is now being given to three shifts a day in some of Wichita's elementary schools.

Someone may say, "Why do not the local communities begin construction of the buildings needed for the increased enrollment?" The fact is that we have a legal tax-levy limit in our State for issuance of bonds for school construction. The city of Wichita has levied the maximum limit for construction of school buildings and school purposes generally. Not only that, but many communities have gone to the tax commission and have received authority to exceed the legal limit by 25 percent. This is the maximum that can be secured without further legislative enactment.

The situation is serious not only in Wichita, but in several other defense areas. I mention only Kansas. I am sure that the same situation prevails in other States. I believe that the Congress owes a duty to the communities where defense production has been expanded beyond the reasonable degree of expansion which might have been anticipated in the normal growth of a city or community. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the Senate will seriously study this amendment. Even if the amendment is adopted, we shall be doing our duty only partially; but, at least, it is a step in the right direction.

The situation is serious, and I sincerely hope that some consideration will be given to the communities, which are doing everything within their legal limits. If they were not doing their full duty I would not be pleading for this money; but they are, and they must have Federal assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement from the Federal Security Agency giving a list of the school districts in Kansas which prior to March 12, 1951, submitted applications under Public Law 815 for assistance in constructing school facilities.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DIVISION OF STATE AND LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

KANSAS

List of school districts which prior to March 12, 1951, submitted applications under Public Law 815 for assistance in constructing school facilities

School districts for which funds are being reserved on a priority basis, pending final action upon the application: Application No. 5[1] common school district No. 178, Planeview-Wichita, Sedgwick County, Federal funds reserved, $172,734.

School districts which have submitted applications for assistance and for which no funds can be reserved at this time:

1. Board of Education of the city of Junction City.
2. Common school district No. 127 (Mulvane).
3. Common school district (Derby).
4. Common school district No. 120 (Wichita).
6. Wichita school district No. 1.
7. Common school district No. 122 (Andover).
8. Common school district No. 27 (Wichita).
9. Board of Education of the city of Leavenworth.
10. Roseland school district No. 92 (Kansas City).
11. School district No. 124 (Wichita).
12. De Soto rural high school district No. 3.
13. Common school district No. 31 (De Soto).
14. Common school district joint 33 (Clearwater).

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I appreciate his calling attention again to the fact that this is not a program in which the Federal Government pays the full cost of the additional buildings. It pays only a percentage of it. It is a program in which the local districts themselves are carrying their full proportionate part of the cost, both with reference to the construction of the buildings and the supplying of the equipment and the payment of operating costs of the institutions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not discuss the merits of the question, because I was one of those who helped to pass the original act. Does the Senator know how much money has already been appropriated for grants under the original act?

Mr. KERR. Under the act to which this appropriation is related, the original appropriation was $46,500,000. Of that appropriation $15,000,000 was reserved for the construction of school facilities on military reservations, and the remaining $31,500,000 was sufficient to provide a part of the cost of buildings in only 72 of the 800, 900, or 1,000 districts in the Nation where the need exists, and for which authorization was made by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator about the allocation of the original appropriation, which now totals $49,500,000. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, however, regardless of the breakdown, how much has been obligated as of March 31, 1951. That was the testimony which was presented by the Budget Bureau. How much of the $49,500,000 has actually been obligated?

Mr. KERR. I cannot answer that question. I have very reliable information respecting this matter, and if the Senator really wants that information I will get it for him.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have it.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to get it and put it in the RECORD. But when I have done so, when it is done, it will not change the fact that as of this moment only 70 schools have a sufficiently high priority rating for their needs even to be considered for the moneys made available by the previous appropriation, which I am informed was $46,000,000, but, as the Senator from Nebraska says, is $49,500,000—and that can be correct. The other 700, or nearly 1,000 schools, Mr. President, are not even eligible under the priority formula established by the Office of Education to have their applications considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no question about the merits of the case. But the question is how much money should be appropriated in this supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. KERR. In answer to that question——

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish.

Mr. KERR. Let me answer the Senator's question, and then I will let him finish. I do not believe the United States Government should discriminate between the youth of the Nation, all of whom have been found under the law to be equally entitled to have an opportunity for an education. The Senator says the law was justified. He says the need should be met. When the need of 70 out of a larger group, all of whom are equally eligible, is met, it dramatizes the fact. Mr. President, that the other 800 or 900 school districts are being discriminated against. But then when, as is proposed to be done by appropriation of $50,000,000 reported by the committee, provision

[1] Includes projects on which final approval has been given.

is made for an additional 92 school districts, the fact is redramatized that the 700 or 800 others not covered are discriminated against.

I thank the Senator for saying that the program should have been enacted when it was enacted, that it is equitable, and that money should be provided for it, and I wish he would join with me and other Senators who would like to see the Government itself made responsible to all these youths who are before it with equal eligibility and equal claim under the law.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator now yield for a question, please?

Mr. KERR. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator answer the question.

Mr. KERR. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not ask the Senator to make a speech. Anybody can make a speech, during which he wraps the flag around the school system. I have done it myself. But will the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that all the applications made to the Office of Education up to March 31 total only $1,306,000?

The second question——

Mr. KERR. Let me answer them one at a time.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask the Senator two questions, and he can make two answers.

Mr. KERR. No; I have a one-track mind and a narrow-gage roadbed, and I will answer them one at a time. I told the Senator from Nebraska a while ago that I did not know how many had been approved.

Mr. WHERRY. That is an answer to the question.

Mr. KERR. I told the Senator further——

Mr. WHERRY. That answers the question.

Mr. KERR. I am going to make a remark about it. Furthermore, regardless of how many of them had not been accepted and approved, only 72 of them could be accepted and approved within the original appropriation, because when that was done the original appropriation would be exhausted.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield now for the other question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what amount has actually been expended of the $49,500,000, as shown by the testimony presented within the last few days, ending March 31, 1951? How much money has actually been spent?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I will again answer that question by telling my good friend that I do not know. If he derives any joy out of having me repeatedly acknowledge my ignorance with reference to a detail of this program, I will stand here and acknowledge it over and over and over again.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has answered the question. Will he yield further?

Mr. KERR. But we still get back to the same proposition, that when about——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. One moment—that when about 7 or 8 percent of those for whom the authorization was made are taken care of, there will be no money left of the original appropriation to take care of the other 90 or 95 percent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD rose.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KERR. I will tell the Senator I am going to take this slower. I will yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and let the Senator from Nebraska rest a little, and then I will come back to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, is it not true that in a good many school districts, although the Federal Security Agency has granted them entitlement under Public Law 815 for the construction of school facilities, those school districts are not receiving the entitlement which has been granted, and they have been notified to that effect?

Mr. KERR. I understand that is absolutely correct, and they have been so notified because the original appropriation does not contain sufficient money to enable the Office of Education to proceed as it would like to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have in my hand a telegram from the superintendent of schools at the location of Fort Knox, in which he says that approximately 25 percent of the pupils in the Elizabethtown schools have parents working at Fort Knox. The Federal Security Agency has granted them an entitlement of $195,762, but notified them that because of insufficient funds it will not pay the application.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for calling attention to the telegram. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram may be inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegram is as follows:

ELIZABETHTOWN, KY., *May 8, 1951.*

Hon. TOM UNDERWOOD,
United States Senate:

Federal Security Agency has granted entitlement of $195,762 under Public Law 815 for construction school facilities, Elizabethtown city schools. However, because of insufficient funds, Security Agency will not pay this obligation. Approximately 25 percent of Elizabethtown school pupils have parents working at Fort Knox, and this overloads our schools. It is our hope you can support deficiency appropriation sufficient to guarantee payment of our entitlement. Kindest regards.

H. C. TAYLOR,
Superintendent,
Elizabethtown City Schools.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator on the merits of the case, but inasmuch as $49,500,000 has been appropriated, and only $220,000 spent, and inasmuch as this is an emergency appropriation granting $50,000,000 more, which is all that the Bureau of the Budget asks, which gives the agency $99,500,000, none of which, outside of the $220,000 has been spent, I ask if the proper procedure would not be for the Senator or anyone else desiring larger appropriations to come before the committees of both the House and the Senate and ask for additional authorization?

I might say to the distinguished Senator that already the agency is going to ask for $50,000,000 more money in connection with the regular appropriation bill. What I am trying to get over to the Senator from Oklahoma is that even though we all agree respecting the merits of this matter, there should be orderly procedure. Apparently, the money that has already been allocated to the Office of Education cannot possibly be spent. We are now considering a supplemental appropriation bill which only came before us within the last few days. The regular appropriation bill will be before us shortly, and if the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma then wants to increase the authorization on the basis of the merits of the case, I ask him if he does not believe that to be the proper place to make his case and secure the proper increase for which he is asking.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have never seen him more generously and generally in accord with the merits of a proposal or any more tenacious in his efforts to prevent anything being done about it.

Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska, wherein he asks for orderly procedure. Just a few days ago he called me to order on the Senate floor because he imagined or thought that I was out of order, and after he and I discussed the matter privately but completely, it was very apparent to my good friend that I had not been out of order. I and other Senators are following a certain procedure in an effort to meet a situation which the Senator from Nebraska is effusively complimentary of by saying he admits that it has merit. If the procedure we seek to invoke lacks in not being so orderly as my good friend would like to have it, I hope the lack can be made up for by the fact that the merits of the amendment are so great.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KERR. I should like to make a further observation first.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska asked me if I did not know that this agency will return with a request for another $50,000,000 in connection with the regular appropriation bill. Of course, I know that. The authorization was made either a year or two years ago, and the thousands

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of school districts over the Nation, with the tens of thousands of school children, are hampered; they are afflicted with creeping paralysis until this program is adequately implemented.

Mr. President, I am reminded of a story.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he tells the story?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I simply must tell this story; I cannot fail to take advantage of this opportunity. I am reminded of a good Irish lady who went to Pat, her husband, on a Saturday morning, and said to him, "Sure, Pat, would you give me a dollar?"

He said, "Oh, go along with you, Bridget. You have asked me for a dollar every day this week."

"Sure, and I have, Pat," she said, "but up to now you ain't given it to me."

Certainly this agency is going to come back and ask for $50,000,000—the same $50,000,000 that should have been given to it after the authorization was made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am going to ask a question, if I can get the Senator's answer without having him make a speech.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the Senator that I shall answer the question for his benefit and I shall make the speech for my own benefit.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought possibly the Senator would make the speech for the benefit of the voters throughout the country.

Mr. KERR. I must say that if I did, it would not establish a precedent in this great institution.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not raising any question about precedent. I think the Senator knows the answers to almost everything.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator; I think he does, too.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator answer this question: The President recommended $50,000,000——

Mr. KERR. Is that a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Fifty million dollars——

Mr. KERR. Is that a question, too?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not through asking the question. I want the Senator to get this through his head——

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska, in that regard, that even one who seeks to teach something to a dog has to know more than the dog knows.

Mr. WHERRY. That is why I am waiting to see whether the Senator understands what I am attempting to ask him.

Mr. KERR. Suppose the Senator from Nebraska carries the experiment one step further by asking the question and then he will see whether I can understand it.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the question first, and then the Senator can make any answer he wishes to make.

Mr. KERR. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. No. 1, the President recommended $50,000,000. No. 2, the Bureau of the Budget recommended $50,000,000. No. 3, the Appropriations Committee has recommended $50,000,000.

In the beginning, I asked whether aside from the recommendation of the Budget Bureau, there is any evidence, for this emergency appropriation, which would indicate that the Senate should increase the amount beyond $50,000,000. I have heard all the arguments the Senator has made about increasing the appropriation; but the facts are that the Office of Education has spent only $227,000 out of $49,500,000, and the $50,000,000 in question is to be appropriated for the need between now and June 30 of this year.

Inasmuch as the House of Representatives has not had any evidence at all about this matter which it could consider, it is recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee that $50,000,000 be appropriated for the emergency. In the interest of orderly procedure, and in the absence of any new evidence, does not the Senator feel that any further justification should be handled in the way that such agencies are expected to handle it? Already this agency is requesting $50,000,000 for next year. If that request is handled in that way, then if this requested appropriation is made, we would have total appropriations of approximately $150,000,000, and all of that would be justified. Up to this moment I am suggesting exactly what the President of the United States has recommended.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to dispatch a riding page to the White House to tell the President of the United States that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has wrapped the mantle of the President's recommendation around his shoulders and now is making a fight to implement it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right; and, Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please; I am not yielding to him now. He has asked me five different questions. I would not wish to say anything unkind; but, after all, if I have given to the Senator from Nebraska some evidence and some things which I have a little difficulty getting through my head, I must say that the Senator from Nebraska has given me some cause to believe that he has difficulty getting some things through his head, because I have answered several times the question in regard to new evidence and the situation as to how much money has actually been spent. I say again to the Senator that the situation is disclosed by the telegram which has been given to me by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. His constituent advises him in the same way that my constituents have been advising me, as follows:

> Security Agency has granted entitlements of considerable sums of money for construction purposes under Public Law 815. However, because of insufficient funds, Security Agency cannot implement these entitlements or pay this money out.

Mr. President, I do not believe the United States Senate is going to shackle its feet with a formula of orderly procedure, as referred to by the Senator from Nebraska, and thereby chain itself and tie its hands and prevent itself from meeting this need for the school children of the Nation, this need which was recognized by the Congress many months ago in the authorization, and is recognized by the Congress in part by means of a previous appropriation, as well as by means of the appropriation provided for in the pending bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he went before the Appropriations Committee to present this need.

Mr. KERR. The answer to that question is "Yes." We went to the Bureau of the Budget; we went to the Appropriations Committee; and we went nearly everywhere else. I must say that, after as orderly procedure as I know how to follow, having failed to secure what we need and what we are entitled to under Public Law 815, we now, in just as orderly procedure, come to the Senate and ask the Senate to provide the funds.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the Senator another question, which is this: Is not what has happened in this case something like the case of a man who, in writing his will, disposes of about two or three times as much property as he has? Have not the Federal Security Agency and the Office of Education notified school districts all over the Nation that they have entitlements which amount to two or three times as much as what those agencies have spent? Although those agencies have not spent all the funds they have, they have notified county school superintendents that they have entitlements which are far beyond what has been granted.

Mr. KERR. That is correct. The Office of Education itself asked the Bureau of the Budget to recommend the appropriation of $100,000,000.

I wish to say this about the example my friend, the Senator from Kentucky, has used: He asked me whether this situation is somewhat like that of a man who makes a will by which he makes bequests amounting to three or four times as much as he has in his estate. Let me say that this situation not only is like that case, but in order to make the illustration entirely analogous, he who made the will and aroused the hopes of his heirs thereby, not only would have to make provision to give away three or four times as much as he had, but then he would have to refuse to die, so that none of the heirs would get anything.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that on page 563 of the hearings on the third supplemental appropriation bill there is found the request which was made for this item.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that information.

Mr. President, I believe that on the basis of equity, on the basis of the Government's meeting a responsibility which exists and which it has acknowledged and written into law, on the basis of taking care of a program which is a vital, indispensable part of the defense effort, and in order that the Government may not be guilty of discriminating against one group within a large classification of school children who are as much entitled to have their needs met as those whose needs are already being met, the Senate should accept the amendment which I and other Senators have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have such startling facts before me with reference to recent developments within school districts in my State, which I feel sure are typical of those in areas elsewhere, that I am going to take a few moments to call them to the attention of the Senate. After the $50,000,000 which is included in the committee amendment is applied, under the present formula, there will still be school districts, from 50 to 60 percent of whose student bodies come from Federal activities, which will not come within the province of the $50,000,000 formula which is to be applied.

I mentioned a while ago, in my question, the situation at Biloxi, Miss., where there will soon be Air Force personnel of 64,000 located entirely within the corporate limits of that small city. What is proposed to be done about the children of the Air Force personnel? Let me state what the local people have done. Of the money received in local taxes which they are permitted to spend under the law, they have spent every dime. They have taken in as many of those children as they possibly can. Their school buildings are overcrowded. The situation affects not only the city of Biloxi itself but the surrounding towns. There is not adequate space. Between now and the next school session there will be an expansion program, with the addition of 720 family units on the base, which units are in process of construction, and which will result in more children to provide for. As I have said, the local authorities in that little city and the surrounding towns and cities have done all they can do with their limited facilities. What are we to do about those children?

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask the Senator from Nebraska, What does he propose that we do for these extra children?

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator gone before the Bureau of the Budget to present his case?

Mr. STENNIS. I have not. These additional facts have developed recently, in part, because of the great expansion of Keesler Field at Biloxi and also the shipbuilding activities at Pascagoula, which is the next town along the coast. In the other direction there has also been an expansion of Government facilities, which has mushroomed this problem within the past few weeks and months.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator appear before the Appropriations Committee to present those facts?

Mr. STENNIS. I talked to individual members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and it may be that I filed a statement regarding it. I did not appear before the committee in person.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has asked me what to do about it.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. There are similar situations within my own State, but I want to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he does not feel that, inasmuch as the Bureau of the Budget, in this emergency bill, has recommended $50,000,000 with which to carry the Department over until June 30, its recommendation is reasonable? It has recommended $50,000,000. I am not sure that this would take care of Mississippi; it may. The Budget Bureau asks for contract authority, or for money with which to operate until June 30, in the sum of $50,000,000. That is the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, which means that it is the recommendation of the President of the United States.

I shall answer the Senator in this way: If Mississippi is not within that group, certainly if I were the Senator I should go to the Appropriations Committee, because the general bill is now being considered in both the House and Senate committees. I have already indicated that the Budget is asking for $50,000,000 additional. I would certainly see that the towns in Mississippi were included and were taken care of.

If I were the Senator and felt that the amount asked was not sufficient, I would ask for more. If the Senator were a member of the committee, and if the Bureau of the Budget came forward and said, "All we need is $50,000,000 to enable us to operate until June 30," would not the Senator support that request? Would he not feel that the administration, which is charged with responsibility, had given the matter sufficient study, and that if the emergency bill carried $50,000,000, then a justification should be presented for any further authorization desired, the appropriations to be made as needed?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not think the Bureau of the Budget has said that $50,000,000 is all that is needed in order to meet the present emergency condition. If it did say so, it is grossly in error in its facts; does not know the subject with which it is trying to deal, and does not know the facts with which we are presently confronted in the congested areas.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not believe I said what the Senator has suggested. If I did, I did not mean to say it. I said the Budget Bureau had recommended that $50,000,000 be appropriated to take care of the needs until the end of the fiscal year. I am not speaking for the Budget Bureau, but I do not for one moment mean to say that they have not recognized, and will not recognize that additional money will be required for additional facilities. All I am saying is that they recommended $50,000,000 for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. STENNIS. It is not a matter of trying to blame someone, or to blame the Budget Bureau. It is a matter of providing the means with which to take care of the children. Everyone knows that school buildings cannot simply be thrown together by a special process of construction, and completed overnight, after the new fiscal year begins, and still be ready for school in September. This is a practical matter. If the need for the money exists, the thing to do is to place the authorization in the first appropriation bill which comes along, and, if the need does not exist, then it is not entitled to further consideration.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi, first, whether it does not seem to him to be reasonable that one who has disagreed with the President and his Budget Bureau so often as has the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, should not be too upset to find that the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Oklahoma disagree with it once?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi one more question.

Mr. WHERRY. What was the answer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi one more question. Does he think that the fact that the additional money sought by this amendment, if provided by the Congress on the basis of the formula established by the Department of Education, would be spent in from 36 to 40 States, but that Nebraska does not happen to be one of them——

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know?

Mr. KERR. Would account for the fact that the Senator from Nebraska is so anxious to follow the President and the Budget Director at this time, instead of supporting and meeting of the need which is so apparent and so acute in so many places within the United States?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we come back to the question of what we are to do about taking care of the children beginning with the school year in September of this year. It matters not

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

which budget contains the provision, nor in which bill the figures are actually inserted. The question is, Is the need present, and shall we meet it?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, who has done his level best to justify all appropriations of public money——

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And as one who is going along with the Budget Bureau in its recommendation of $50,000,000 for this purpose, granting to be true everything which has been said by the Senator, for whose honor and integrity I have a high regard, as he well knows, how can we justify more than the amount recommended by the committee? The Senator from Oklahoma merely takes out of the air $50,000,000 more. Here comes another request, "Give them another $50,000,000"; and then another $50,000,000. It is just like an auction.

I ask the Senator whether it is not necessary to justify the appropriation. I submit to the fairness and the integrity of the distinguished Senator that we are guided by the recommendations of the Budget Bureau as to the justification of such claims as are made. The pending bill is only an emergency measure, which will apply until June 30. Within that time limit we have granted the full amount recommended by the Budget Bureau to the Congress. That has nothing to do with the merits of the case or with the additional appropriations which might be needed, not only in Mississippi, but in many other places in the United States, when the proper time arrives.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the fairness of the Senator. When the formula was applied to the $50,000,000 figure which the committee put into the bill, many persons, including myself, realized the inadequacy of the $50,000,000, and felt that it would not meet the conditions which I have been describing, and conditions in the towns surrounding Biloxi are just as severe and acute, even more so. We have realized the seriousness of the situation, and appreciate that $50,000,000 will not bring about a solution to the problem.

Mr. WHERRY. There is not anything in the RECORD, so far as I know, which indicates how the money is to be distributed by States. The first I learned of it was contained in the very political statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma, that 36 States are going to receive so much money. Nebraska was not included.

The formula was prepared by the Office of Education, was it not?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Budget Bureau recommended $50,000,000. Maybe the Bureau was wrong in its recommendation.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not complaining of the formula. There is simply a question of there not being sufficient money to meet the conditions which I have been trying to describe.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is it the position of the Senator from Mississippi that if the increase of $50,000,000 which is the subject matter of the pending amendment is granted, it will go into the construction of schools? Does the Senator know whether it will go for construction purposes, or for preliminary surveys? Obviously, if it is for surveys it will not be of much help in point of time. Additional military installations have recently been located in my State and they are placing further burdens upon some of the municipalities. As a result, additional educational facilities are needed. The ability to levy additional taxes to provide the necessary funds has been extremely curtailed, and as a result, if the additional amount requested in the amendment is to be utilized within defense areas, after proper scrutiny I think it is a matter with which we must deal realistically. I am sure that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Kansas is entirely correct. I am informed by the clerk of the committee that the money will go for construction if the appropriation be made. It does not involve surveys or anything else that will extend the time or commit the Federal Government to further appropriations.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am very glad to know that, because I feel that there is a legal responsibility upon local areas to make the proper surveys.

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily agree with the Senator on that point. The local conditions with which I am familiar have been met in that respect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have a list of the States and cities involved?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has such a list.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if it will be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me say that this is not a State problem. It is a question of what is going to be done with reference to the education of the additional children in cases where the local facilities and capacity have already been fully exhausted. No school district will receive any money under the formula until the facts show that the local authorities have met all the conditions and that a real emergency exists.

I have mentioned Biloxi, but the problem is equally as great at Pascagoula, and at Moss Point, a few miles from Biloxi, where other Federal activities on the Mississippi Gulf coast are centered. As an indication of what can be expected from the shipyards, which now employ 1,200 workers, most of whom have families, there will be 2,000 employed by September and 3,500 by next January. The shipyard which I have in mind might be called a war shipyard, at which a great number of ships were built during World War II. It afterwards became largely inactive until the occurrence of this new emergency. It will employ 3,500 workers by next January, as compared with 1,200 workers at this time.

What is to be done about the children, in view of the fact that the local facilities are already used to full capacity? The families will overflow into Pascagoula and Moss Point, only a few miles away. Both towns house many of the families from the Air Force base. On the other side of Biloxi is the city of Gulfport, at which hundreds of Air Force personnel reside. Many Air Force families reside in the town of Ocean Springs. Under the $50,000,000 deficiency appropriation, I am advised that not a single one of the schools in this area will receive 10 cents in benefits. That is why I am urging the matter over and over again. In the face of the facts I have outlined, according to the present formula, under the $50,000,000 figure, not one single town or school district will be permitted to have one dime, in spite of the fact that the number of workers will be increased from 1,200 to 3,500 by next January.

I shall not take up any further time of the Senate, Mr. President, but I ask unanimous consent that my prepared remarks be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. STENNIS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

We are concerned in this appropriation with one of the incidental but direct and very vital costs of the defense effort. When Public Law 815 was devised last year to provide a measure of relief to school facilities in areas which were overloaded with students brought in by Federal activities, there was no suggestion that the present difficulties stemming from the Korean situation would have to be faced. Not even last September, when the law was finally enacted, was there any idea that such an accelerated program of mobilization would be engaged in as we have witnessed in the last few months.

So great has been the need, which the defense effort has occasioned since that time, that the initial appropriation for aid in school construction under the terms of that act for this fiscal year—the sum of $46,500,000, of which $15,000,000 was earmarked for school facilities on military reservations—was adequate to touch only the most critical areas. This money was sufficient to assist only 70 schools and did not begin to relieve the hardships of some of the areas originally contemplated to be aided when Public Law 815 was originally designed. It is my understanding that the $50,000,000 which has been reported by the committee will enable another 97 schools to qualify for assistance. I am advised that under the priority system established by the Office of Education this will enable schools with an index of 75 and above to qualify. This means that some schools with as much

as 50 or 60 percent of their student body coming from families directly connected with Federal activities will still not be able to come in for a share of relief. These conditions will, of course, become even more critical as the defense program gets up a full head of steam. As a matter of fact, we shall not have the main blow hit us until the schools open again next fall. It is this situation which makes the issue such an urgent one. Unless we take action now to begin to provide for the next term, when the hardest blow will fall, it will be entirely too late to do anything about it.

I can speak with authority only for the affected areas of my own State in connection with this appropriation, but within those areas the problem has been compounded to such an extent that it is absolutely beyond the capacities of the localities to meet the demands of the situation. Within a very small geographical area both one of the largest Air Force bases and one of the largest shipyards in the country are now moving into rapid expansion. At Biloxi a $36,000,000 expansion program at Keesler Air Force Base will mean that within the next few months some 64,000 Air Force personnel will be stationed there. This base is entirely within the corporate limits of the city of Biloxi and is located entirely within one school district. It and other federally owned property comprise 40 percent of the total area of Biloxi. There are now some 629 family units on the base, and 720 others are in the process of construction. It is estimated that there will be 500 more children of school age in Biloxi next year than there were this year. Already an old frame building built in 1898 and proviously abandoned has been put back into use as a school building, even though it is unsafe and is a firetrap of the most dangerous kind. Yet under the appropriations made available so far and presently contemplated, Biloxi will not receive a red cent under the present index of need.

This may be accounted for to some extent by the fact that Biloxi has attempted to meet its own problems out of its own resources. Since the coming of Keesler Field in World War II, the city has spent almost a half-million dollars to expand the school facilities. The millage for the support of schools has been doubled, and is now at the maximum allowed by law. The problem is just too big for the local community to meet with its own resources.

The problem is duplicated at Pascagoula and Moss Point, a few miles from Biloxi, where much of the industrial activity on the Mississippi Gulf Coast is centered. As an indication of what can be expected there, the shipyards, which now employ 1,200 workers, most of whom have families, will have 2,000 employed by September and 3,500 by next January. Their families overflow from the limited housing facilities in Pascagoula into Moss Point, only 3 miles away. Both towns also house many of the families from Keesler Air Force Base. On the other side of Biloxi is the city of Gulfport, where hundreds of other Air Force personnel live. Also close by is the town of Ocean Springs, where many Air Force families reside. Yet under the $50,000,000 deficiency appropriation, I am advised that not a single one of the above schools will receive any benefit.

This is not a question of taking $50,000,000 and reducing the proportion by which these schools will benefit. It is simply a matter of getting a larger appropriation or nothing. Under the present index the schools in the area which I have described will receive absolutely no help from the $50,000,000 appropriation. I shall not quarrel here with the system which has been devised to determine which schools will share in the funds, but you cannot tell me that a serious condition does not exist down there on the Mississippi Gulf coast, where hundreds of boys and girls just will not and cannot be housed unless some assistance is forthcoming at this time. The answer does not lie in the appropriation for next year either, for the need exists now to meet the emergency which will become so acute by next fall. There is the further consideration that applications which have not yet been considered must be taken into account in determining where next year's funds will go.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my feeling with respect to the responsibility which I conceive the Federal Government to have concerning the housing of the children in these affected areas, and I am a very stanch and firm believer in the idea that local units of government should make every effort to meet their own problems before turning to the National Government. But the situation which we see on the Mississippi coast and which exists in so many other areas of the country is one created entirely by the Federal Government and one which will exist only at the sufferance of the Federal Government. The only way in which the local communities can solve the problem is to issue bonds, and I might say here that virtually every school system affected in Mississippi, has already done that very thing, but those people, as much as they want to do their part, cannot continue indefinitely to issue bonds to be paid off in 20 years or more, when the need for which the bonds were issued may evaporate in a period of 2 or 3 years. Those communities are already heavily saddled with an indebtedness incurred for the construction of school facilities, and it is just too much to ask them to construct more. They are making a sacrifice in another respect, too, for they who have been paying taxes and paying off bonds for years to build up a creditable school system for their children now find their facilities being crowded to such an extent that their children are not getting the benefit of adequate instruction. Such intolerably crowded conditions are not fair to any who have to patronize such schools.

If there has ever been an appropriation before the Congress that represented a sound investment not just in the immediate defense effort but in the improvement of educational facilities for many years to come, then this is it. By increasing this appropriation to $100,000,000 we shall provide relief for some of the most critical defense areas in the country—areas which are badly crippled and which can receive absolutely no relief under the original deficiency appropriation. This amendment will afford assistance to 227 different schools in 37 States. The need is real and urgent. I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator also include the table to which reference has been made?

Mr. STENNIS. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky if the table was prepared by the Office of Education?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is in the hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no record here, and I am a member of the committee, and I wondered if the towns were included in the record of the hearings. I should like very much to have the Senator insert the list in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I make that request.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

List of schools showing total applications by States submitted to U. S. Office of Education under provisions of Public Law 815 and the number of schools with a priority of 40 to 75

State	Applications	
	Total number	Number with priority 40 to 75
Alabama	17	4
Arizona	28	9
Arkansas	18	9
California	58	24
Colorado	12	3
Connecticut	10	1
Florida	8	2
Georgia	24	11
Idaho	7	3
Illinois	22	8
Indiana	4	0
Iowa	9	2
Kansas	14	2
Kentucky	10	2
Louisiana	13	2
Maine	11	5
Maryland	8	4
Michigan	34	15
Massachusetts	3	0
Minnesota	12	0
Mississippi	8	4
Missouri	21	8
Montana	16	4
Nebraska	11	0
Nevada	5	0
New Hampshire	4	0
New Jersey	6	1
New Mexico	12	3
New York	8	4
North Carolina	8	0
North Dakota	6	2
Ohio	25	10
Oklahoma	22	7
Oregon	21	4
Pennsylvania	9	3
Rhode Island	3	2
South Dakota	3	0
South Carolina	5	1
Tennessee	17	5
Texas	72	24
Utah	6	2
Vermont	1	0
Virginia	17	3
Washington	64	26
Wisconsin	2	0
Wyoming	2	1

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. The request before the committee called for $50,000,000. The committee felt that the necessities were in favor of the application for the funds, and it allowed them in the sum of $50,000,000.

Again, Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that this matter was before the Deficiency Appropriations Committee. In this instance it was the full committee, although but a few members were able to attend because of other business of the Senate. This particular request came first to the Senate. It has not been considered by the House. It has not even been thoroughly considered by the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee which handled the regular appropriation bill. Due

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to the press of time and due to the fact that the matter came before our committee in the first instance, prior to consideration of it by the House, I very frankly say that the full consideration which would have been ordinarily given to it as a regular appropriation item could not be given to it. Even so, the committee did make a reasonably close examination into the justification. It was satisfied that there was a sound basis for the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, the action of the Bureau of the Budget is not sacrosanct. The Bureau is a recommending agency. It speaks for the President of the United States. It has been my experience during several years on the Committee on Appropriations that the Bureau of the Budget is never particularly niggardly in its requests for public funds. Generally, during the years that I have been acquainted with appropriations, Congress has found it necessary to reduce the figures, sometimes most drastically, which were presented by the Bureau of the Budget. Consequently, if we are to consider the matter on the basis of the practice indulged in by the Bureau of the Budget we could be pardoned without doing serious injury to logic, if we thought that the recommended figure could be accepted as a maximum. However, that matter was not before the committee. We went into the question on its merits.

We are dealing with a new act, which implements an established practice of the Government. Under the old Lanham Act and under the war powers granted during the war the Government aided school districts in areas where there had been a heavy influx of defense workers, with a resultant heavy increase in school enrollment beyond the ability of the districts to financially meet the new burden. The act was the first formal action by Congress in support of that principle. That the principle is sound I believe no one will question. It is founded not only in sound reason, but in necessity. Its application by the agency began this year. Heretofore it was handled by the Bureau of Community Facilities in the Federal Works Agency.

Under the terms of the law certain findings must be made by the Federal Security Agency before it is warranted in expending any funds. Such findings have been in progress since the bill was passed and implemented with the original $3,000,000 for survey purposes. However, the findings are not complete. It will be years before there are adequate data on the whole subject as it relates to the United States. The Agency has adopted an arbitrary scale of priorities—arbitrary in the figures used, but exactly in accord with the requirements of the law. It has under the law and under its own rules applied such funds as are available to the schools of highest priority. The priority is in exact ratio to the percentage of children in the schools whose parents work for the Federal Government or live on federally owned nontaxed lands.

Of necessity it has taken some time to gather the information. The information is based upon certain knowledge of the Federal lands involved or Federal installations involved. It has been based upon certain knowledge as to the number of children who will be added to the several school facilities in the areas.

The Agency very frankly says that most of its present data are preliminary. The exact wording reads:

> One further point should be emphasized. The priority indexes on which the classification discussed—

That is the classification which has been presented to the Senate—

> above were based were set after preliminary review of a majority of the applications.

I will reread the sentence:

> The priority indexes on which the classification discussed above were based were set after preliminary review of a majority of the applications.

I read further:

> The priority position of any project may change as a result of a detailed review of the submission of additional data by the school districts. Thus it should be clear that the above-stated priority data are tentative and that the estimates indicating need tend to understate rather than overstate the actual needs.

Mr. President, I am in entire accord with the last sentence. The data involved probably are an understatement of the needs under the law. However, the point I wish to make is that there is not now available to the Security Agency the necessary information on which to allocate funds now on hand.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator read a statement. May I inquire what the date of the statement was?

Mr. CORDON. The statement from which I was reading was the one which was presented to the committee 2 weeks ago.

Mr. STENNIS. As of what date did it speak?

Mr. CORDON. I cannot say. It was presented to the committee as representing the current situation.

Mr. WHERRY. April 18.

Mr. STENNIS. It does not expressly state that it is speaking as of the date it was presented, does it?

Mr. CORDON. It does not.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am not trying to be technical. If the Senator will yield for an observation, I should like to say that surveys have been made and applications have been filed, as to which proof is available, which would readily absorb the $100,000,000 requested in the present formula, without changing it one iota.

Mr. CORDON. The statement of the Senator again emphasizes the vice of trying to legislate on the floor of the Senate. I have no doubt that the Senator has received the information which he has presented to me, because when he says he has received it, it imparts absolute verity to me. However if we are to have orderly procedure in the Senate and if we are to have some kind of logical consideration of problems which come before the Senate, we shall have to follow the policy and program of the Senate of submitting such matters to the committees which are set up to consider them.

In this instance I have read the statement of the agency. The statement was presented to the committee, and the committee acted on it. No other statement has been presented to the committee. That the agency is proceeding with the work, I do not doubt. It should be. Unquestionably it has moved farther ahead than it had when the matter was before the committee. I hope it has. I am sure it has. But, Mr. President, there is now before the Senate a request of the agency for $50,000,000, which has been allowed. There is another bill pending in the House, which contains another recommendation of $50,000,000.

That other bill has yet to be considered by the committee. I know that it is impossible that there could be a commitment by the agency of $46,000,000 plus $50,000,000 or $96,000,000 before the next bill is before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which will take the time for an orderly examination into the whole question. The question here is, Shall we legislate on the basis of impulse and emotion, or shall we legislate after careful consideration?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. I hasten to say that I appreciate the fine work of the Senator from Oregon on the Committee on Appropriations. I have had the honor of serving with him on one of the subcommittees, and I know of his very fine and conscientious work. I feel that he is entirely in sympathy with the acute problem which is presented here.

With reference to meeting the need, I ask the Senator if it is not true that the money will have to be provided either through a bill such as this, a supplemental appropriation bill, or in the regular general appropriation bill for the fiscal year. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. CORDON. Either one of those, or a supplemental bill thereafter. It would have to be provided by appropriation. There are at least two other bills which will come before us.

Mr. STENNIS. As a practical matter, last year the appropriation bill did not become law until the last day of December, or perhaps the early days of this year.

Mr. CORDON. No; that is not correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Were we not in session until January 1 of this year on the general appropriation bill?

Mr. CORDON. As I recall, the appropriation bill was finished in September. I am not certain as to the time. Whatever the time was, the bill was held up interminably, and represents an exception in that field.

Mr. STENNIS. At any rate, the point is that the general appropriation bill will not become law at least until the school session of 1951–52 is already in progress.

Mr. CORDON. I cannot agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I have yielded to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks about the information which I have received. I think I can vouch on the floor of the Senate for the fact that the need which has developed in the past few weeks is so urgent that there is no doubt that the application of even the strict formula would absorb the entire $50,000,000, which would be far from meeting the actual needs. Time is of the essence.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, first I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for his generous remarks. I have worked with him, and I feel for him what he has said he feels for me, both with respect to his honor and his judgment.

However, Mr. President, I wish to reach the point which he has mentioned in this way: The item of $50,000,000 which will be available under this bill if the committee report is accepted and adopted will still have to go through the House committee after we act, because it is a new item. In the meantime we shall be considering the bill which comes over from the House. The money in the third deficiency bill will unquestionably be made available about the first of June. That is about as soon as we can hope for. Then there will be a period of 30 days, in which allocations will be made. While I have not been able to put my finger on the item in the hearings, I specifically recall the testimony that of the 600 or 700 applications, only a handful has had the examination necessary, including consideration of plans and specifications, which is necessary in the construction field in order to entitle the applicants to a grant.

I appreciate the feeling of the Senator from Mississippi. During World War II we had a similar situation in my own State, and we had to scratch to try to find some means by which to educate these children. I want that done. But I am trying to say that adding this money without careful consideration will not advance the program one iota. It will go forward as rapidly after careful and thorough consideration and full report as it would if we were to act here on impulse and emotion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not the purpose of the Appropriations Committee to complete action on the appropriation bills during the month of July, if it can possibly be done? Is not that always the aim?

Mr. CORDON. There is no reason that I can see now why they should not be finished to a great extent by the end of June, and all of them by the end of July.

Mr. TAFT. The appropriations for the various agencies will be in separate bills and not in an omnibus bill, as was the case last year.

Mr. CORDON. They will be in a series of separate bills.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not also true, so far as the beginning of the school session is concerned, that this money is for construction, and that constructions of schools not even planned as yet certainly will not be completed during the year 1951, and possibly not during the year 1952?

Mr. CORDON. Of necessity it will take some time. It all depends, of course, upon the nature of the construction. That is a matter to be determined by the State and not by the Federal Government. The Federal Government will pass only upon sufficiency; the State upon the matter of the identity of the construction and the speed with which it is finished.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to ask a question on that very point. Does not this program contemplate construction which will be in the nature of annexes, additions to existing school buildings, renovation of abandoned school buildings, or construction of anything that can be put to practical use? Is not that a part of the plan? Therefore, 90-day renovation or construction would be entirely possible and probable in some cases.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator that all the types of acquisition, reconditioning, and construction which he has mentioned are contemplated in the act. The decision rests with the local authorities in every instance. The only requisite with reference to the Federal Government is approval of the character and type of the construction, to determine that it is adequate for the purpose.

Mr. President, I shall not burden the Senate for long. I wish to discuss one other matter——

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. It is my understanding that the construction will be undertaken, under the $50,000,000 appropriation recommended by the committee, on a priority basis. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. So that those communities which have the highest priority and the greatest need will be served by the $50,000,000 proposed by the committee.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. Is it not also true that the funds which will be carried in the regular appropriation bill will appear in the bill for the independent offices, which bill already has passed the House of Representatives, or is just about ready to pass?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. The appropriation will not be held up this year, as the general appropriation bill was held up last year, by reason of the fact that everything was contained in a single bill.

Mr. CORDON. Let me interrupt the Senator to correct the RECORD. The appropriation in the bill coming over from the House will be in the labor and Federal security bill, and not in the independent offices bill. However, that bill has been reported on the other side.

Will the Senator state his second question?

Mr. CASE. The second question was this: The appropriation in that case being handled in a separate and independent bill, it will not be held up waiting for late military estimates, such as those in the general appropriation bill of last year.

Mr. CORDON. There will be no question about that, I think. In the orderly procedure it will be one of the earliest bills on which we shall take action.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that under the language of both the bill and the amendment, the amounts appropriated will be held for this purpose until expended?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. As I understand, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] asked the Senator from Oregon whether or not the $50,000,000 reported by the committee would take care, under the formula, of the districts which had the greatest need. I understood the Senator from Oregon to reply in the affirmative.

Mr. CORDON. The greatest priority, not the greatest need. Need does not enter into the picture at all.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator mean that the moneys being appropriated are not being appropriated to meet a need?

Mr. CORDON. No question of need is involved.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator mean that the need does not exist?

Mr. CORDON. Need not appear; and the Government does not inquire into the question.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the school children in the districts which do not have sufficient priority to receive any benefit from the $50,000,000 proposed to be appropriated in the bill have just as great a need for the opportunity for education as do children in those districts which happen to have priority?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the question answers itself. Every child has the same need for education, rich or poor, wherever he may be, in the North, East, South, or West. There is no question there to answer.

Mr. KERR. Then does not the Senator feel that those in districts other than the ones taken care of by the bill are just as much entitled to have their needs met as those who are in districts taken care of in the bill as reported to the Senate by the committee?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon has not discussed that matter at all. He answered a question as to where

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the money would be applied; and the law itself makes that provision. The Senator from Oregon only happened to vote for it.

Mr. President, I want to make this perfectly clear. My interest is in the school child. I want to see that the school child gets his break. I am inclined to believe that we made a mistake when we passed the act, so far as that is concerned. I think we should have had need as a part of our yardstick. It is not that. The yardstick is percentage of children of one class as compared to all. That percentage is applied and the money is available, even though the district itself might be endowed with funds enough so that it could educate the children without even having recourse to taxes.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator taking the position that the money should be made available for one class and not for another which has an equal need?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon has not taken any such position, and from nothing that he said could it be implied that he has.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for another question, and I hope it is more to the point than the last one was.

Mr. KERR. Does the fact that the schools in the State of Oregon get upward of three-quarters of a million dollars under the $50,000,000 as contained in the bill reported by the committee and would receive less than $100,000 additional from the additional amount proposed by the committee amendment, have anything to do with the Senator's position with reference to making appropriation for one class and denying it to another?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I want to say that that is the same implication that was contained in a question asked a while ago, and in my opinion it is contemptible. The Senator from Oregon does not know what will come to the State of Oregon under the $50,000,000 contained in the committee amendment nor what would come to the State of Oregon under the $50,000,000 that the Senator from Oklahoma wants to add to that, except that the Senator from Oklahoma sent the Senator from Oregon a statement indicating that some additional districts would come in, undoubtedly with the thought that he would get a vote for them.

I yield no further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon refuses to yield. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I think we can maintain this debate where it ought to be—on a factual and logical basis. I still have the belief——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a point of personal privilege.

Mr. CORDON. I refuse to yield.

Mr. KERR. A point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator refuses to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I still believe that this debate can be carried on on a sound and logical and impersonal basis. I hope to remain there. I want to give notice, however, Mr. President, that when charges, whether couched in questions or otherwise, are directed at my integrity, I shall answer them, and I shall not hesitate about doing it. I shall not direct them to another. I concede to my colleagues high purpose in the service of the Government. I hope that we may have the same concession from them.

Mr. President, getting back to this matter, there is one provision in the law that I think has not been given appropriate consideration. That is section 203 of the act. I hope I may have the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. His colleague is not present at the moment. I believe this is of some importance to the Senator, who spoke about this matter, and to all my colleagues who are present on the floor or who may be on the floor later, and who have this problem—the lack of adequate facilities for taking care of the heavy influx of school children due to the temporary dislocations of the war.

Section 203, Mr. President, has to do with those situations where the Federal activities involved will be temporary, as distinguished from settled and permanent operations. In those instances the applicable law is as follows—and I want to read section 203 into the RECORD at this time:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of section 202, whenever the Commissioner determines that part or all of the attendance with respect to which any local educational agency is entitled to receive payment under such section will be of temporary duration only, such agency shall not be entitled to receive such payment with respect to the attendance so determined to be of temporary duration only. Instead, the Commissioner shall make available to such agency such temporary school facilities as may be necessary to take care of such attendance; except that he may, where the local educational agency gives assurance that adequate school facilities will be provided to take care of such attendance, pay (on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title) to such agency for use in constructing school facilities an amount equal to the amount which he estimates would be necessary to make available such temporary facilities.

Mr. President, I want to carry my thought a little further for the benefit of those who have this tragic situation of heavy influx of school children for temporary facilities. I am of the opinion, Mr. President, that the present law is inadequate to reach conditions which arise under section 203 because in those instances, irrespective of what the State might be able to do by changing its laws, by increasing its ceilings for expenditure and so forth, it simply cannot meet the conditions that arise almost overnight and before any action of any kind in the legislative field could be taken, and it finds itself as we found ourselves in my own State in World War II, with a heavy influx of children and no possibility of handling their education necessities; when we were compelled to appeal to the Government, did appeal, and did receive some relief. That was true in other sections of the Nation.

It is my thought, Mr. President, that we need amendatory legislation that will give to the Security Agency the power in those cases where this influx is temporary, and without prior notice, and when there is no other way in which this educational necessity can be met, discretion to vary the priorities to reach even the 30 percent or the 25 percent, and I believe that when that is done, a part of the determination should rest upon the financial need of the district itself to pay the bill. If we can get that done, we can write humanity as well as logic into this measure.

That matter should have further consideration, Mr. President. It can receive adequate consideration by the appropriate committee at the proper time. I believe that even though we are compelled to request the indulgence of the Senate to write legislation into an appropriation bill, the Senate should agree to do so, in accordance with the rule.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to state my understanding of the purpose of this amendment. I understand that the purpose is that in an area where there is a sudden influx of children of school age, because of the necessary emergency increase of Federal Government activities in that area, the Federal Commissioner of Education can meet such temporary need without receiving help from the local community, insofar as the need is temporary and insofar as meeting the need is necessary because of the emergency. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not that the purpose of this provision? It will not require any local contribution at all, will it?

Mr. CORDON. I am not quite sure that I follow the Senator, if he is referring to section 203.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am referring to section 203, which I have before me. As I read it, its purpose is to provide for meeting a sudden need for school facilities in an area where the activities of the Federal Government have increased or have developed very quickly and may be only temporary.

Mr. CORDON. Yes; that is the purpose. However, neither that section nor any part of this bill gives the Administrator authority to consider the financial stringency which may rest on a given district, although that district may have a much smaller increase, percentagewise, in the children of school age who come there because of the activities of the Federal Government in connection with the war emergency than some other district has; but it may be in such a financial condition that its situation is far worse, with the result that some children of school age will not be able to get proper educational opportunities. That is a matter which I think should receive early attention.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the statement the Senator from Oregon has just made.

I wish the record to show that personally I am anxious to assist in any way I can to correct the situation which is causing difficulty in my State and, I am sure, in other States. I believe that the way now proposed is the only available way by which the Senate can act immediately in regard to this matter.

I am indebted to the Senator from Oregon not only for his splendid statement but also for the able manner in which he has proceeded in regard to this matter as a whole.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from Kansas.

If the method now proposed, Mr. President, were the only one by which we could provide these funds, I should support the amendment. But there is an orderly way by means of which we can make these funds available, and it should be followed.

I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment, on page 12, beginning in line 10, striking out in line 15 the numerals "$50,000,000" and inserting "$100,000,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words in regard to this item. It has come to the Senate Appropriations Committee with a recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has stated, in practically all instances of which I am aware the Bureau of the Budget considers such matters adequately and fairly. I have never known the Bureau of the Budget—except in a few instances which are so rare that I could not name them if I were asked to—to err on the low side in recommending appropriations in connection with such matters. It is very rare for the Bureau of the Budget to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Are not these funds to be administered by the Office of Education? Once the Bureau of the Budget makes its recommendation as to what it regards as the proper amount of the appropriation, the Office of Education is not able to appear before the Appropriations Committee and recommend any other amount, is it, until the Bureau of the Budget changes the amount it recommends? Is not that the practical application of the law?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly that is the way the matter works out. The answer to the Senator's question appears on page 563 of the hearings, from which I now read:

> Dr. LINDMAN. Our request was for $100,000,000. Fifty million dollars was allowed by the Budget Bureau.
>
> Senator HAYDEN. You are here justifying that?
>
> Dr. LINDMAN. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Under the practice, the Office of Education is permitted to justify before the Appropriations Committee only an amount up to $50,000,000, under those circumstances; is he not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I do not know that that is required by law, but certainly it is required by Executive order.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the record which has been stated shows that of the appropriations made to date, namely, $49,500,000, as of the end of March—or a little over 1 month ago—there had been obligated only $1,306,600, and there had been expended only $224,729. So of course there is a considerable leeway in connection with the funds currently appropriated.

If we now add $50,000,000 to those funds, certainly it would seem to me that would be sufficient during the interim period to enable the agency to continue its work.

I do not challenge the merit of this proposal, which would necessitate the use of funds in excess of the appropriation in cases where the need is great; but I believe this agency will have sufficient funds if in this supplemental appropriation bill we provide the $50,000,000, which then will be available in addition to the unexpended and unobligated balances.

I should like to make a further point which to some extent has been lost sight of, I believe. It is that the amendment proposed on page 12 is to the committee amendment reading in part as follows:

> FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY
>
> OFFICE OF EDUCATION
>
> *Grants for surveys and school construction*
>
> For an additional amount for "Grants for surveys and school construction," to remain available until expended, $50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of Education determines to be necessary shall be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities.

In other words, so far as I know, that language would provide the President of the United States with rather blanket power to determine how the funds should be distributed. Unless those who anticipate what they will receive for certain projects in their State or for certain areas in their State, by means of that provision, if it is made, have been foreadvised by the President or by the Commissioner of Education, predicated upon what he knows or believes the President will do, I do not know how such persons are able to say what their States or such areas in their States will receive.

I have been rather surprised to find that attempts have been made to determine the amounts of money which will go to particular States in that connection. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question in that connection, if I may do so.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Oklahoma whatever time he requires to answer my question. Let me say to him that the committee amendment provides that the Commissioner of Education shall determine what amounts are necessary to "be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities."

I have heard many rumors, I may say to the Senator, as to what certain States will receive, provided the additional $50,000,000 is appropriated. I wonder how the Senator from Oklahoma has been able to look into a crystal ball and has obtained that information, when the legislation in connection with this matter has not even been enacted.

Mr. KERR. In response to the question of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I must say that I was impressed by the fact that, so far, most of what has been stated in the debate on the floor has been stated by Senators who come from States which will not receive any of the additional $50,000,000, if it is made available.

Mr. BRIDGES. How does the Senator know they will not receive any of it?

Mr. KERR. Because I have been furnished information——

Mr. BRIDGES. By whom?

Mr. KERR. By distinguished school administrators who have been providing me and other Senators with this information. They have furnished me information as to what amounts are necessary to be appropriated in order to implement this program with reference to the schools which are eligible under the authorization bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is predicated on two unknown factors, is it not?

Mr. KERR. It is predicated upon the application of the formula as arrived at and applied by the Office of Education.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it not also predicated on whether the President should designate the area to which they applied as a critical area, based upon considerations of national defense?

Mr. KERR. It is based on the practice with reference to the designation of an area, and the formula for determining eligibility, now in force, as it has been provided by the Office of Education. As the Senator knows, the law provides that, before a school district may become eligible for one dollar of Federal funds, it must have exhausted all the funds which it can appropriate for itself from local sources of revenue, and that, subject to correction, though I am convinced I am substantially correct, in the the over-all picture, as I understand, the practice has been followed that the local districts have furnished about one-third of the cost of additional construction, the Federal Government having furnished the other two-thirds. However, in certain instances, the Federal Government has furnished all the cost, because the particular local district had exhausted its own revenue from local sources.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has answered my question as to whether he obtained this information by looking into a crystal ball. But I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether his information is not certainly of an informal nature, and is derived from informal sources, rather than being official and based on a factual agreement as to how the money shall be spent.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct in his statement that the information has been informally compiled and informally secured. But the Senator from Oklahoma assures the Senator from New Hampshire that, to the very best of his ability, he has secured accurate information and applicable information.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it would be to the advantage of the Senate if this information were made available.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator like to have the information showing what is available to each of the States, on the basis of this formula?

Mr. BRIDGES. The point I was endeavoring to make in my remarks is that it should have been submitted to the Appropriations Committee, in order that we might have had the picture before us. I am glad to get it from the Senator even in an informal way, but the Appropriations Committee should have had this information, if it was available. The Senator from Oklahoma, by his very aggressive interest in this project, has succeeded in acquiring these figures to his own satisfaction. Whether the members of the committee would place credence in them, after having had an opportunity to question those who presented the facts and figures, may be very much open to question. My point is that when we are required to resort to an informal presentation, on the floor, of figures gathered by a United States Senator, on his own initiative, without their having been referred to a committee, the measure under consideration being a supplemental bill—there is certainly an added reason why we should back the committee and keep the sum at $50,000,000, rather than increase it to $100,000,000.

There may be a reason, when the evidence is all in the record, for providing more funds in the next bill. I think there is an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to provide funds, when, by our defense activities, we have so expanded the problem in a community that an unusual, undue, and almost impossible hardship will be placed on the community if it is required to provide the school facilities to which all American children are entitled.

The Appropriations Committee of the Senate listened to the evidence. It had before it the requests of the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget is an arm of the executive branch of the Government. We assume that the President approved the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. The committee, after hearing all the evidence, decided that the Bureau of the Budget was right, and it recommended $50,000,000 in full, in this case. The committee did that, recognizing that the appropriations for this item had previously been $49,500,000, and that, as of March 31, 1951, only $1,306,600 had been obligated, and but $227,729 spent. With that amount of leeway, plus the $50,000,000 provided in this bill, it would seem as if, in this supplemental bill, and in the interim period, we had provided enough to enable them to go ahead and to meet the most urgent needs of the program.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Under the authorization law, did not the districts have until April 6 to file applications?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not remember the exact date. I think the Senator is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. KERR. The small amount which may have been allocated since that date, in view of the information to which the Senator is referring, is due to the lateness in starting on the part of the Office of Education, with respect to processing the applications after the cut-off date, rather than to any shortage in the amount of money applied for under the law; is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is probably correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator mentioned the amount recommended by the Director of the Budget, and stated that the committee appropriated the full amount. If we should go beyond the recommendation of the Director of the Budget, and lift the ceiling, we would be going beyond the amount which the administration, through the Director of the Budget, believed could properly be spent in the period for which the funds are appropriated; would we not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is our assumption, and it is the only assumption upon which we can proceed, because that is what we are told in connection with all appropriations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we were to go beyond that, we should then be going beyond the justifications, at least as submitted by the Director of the Budget, even though the agency making the request might itself feel that it could spend more; but we would be going beyond the balanced needs of the administration; would we not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. As the Senator knows, we had a brief discussion a while ago about the Bureau of the Budget and about the Office of Education, which handles the money in the item under discussion. We discussed the possibility of the Office of Education being cut off, once the Budget Bureau had fixed this figure. This is a little unusual, but I have direct information from the Office of Education as to the status of the surveys, which subject came up a moment ago. I am told that all those surveys are completed, that there are 750 applications now on file, and that this money can be allocated within a matter of a few days. From the nature of the construction, I think it is certainly true that it would be spent within a matter of a few months, a great deal of it on renovating old buildings and in erecting annexes to existing buildings.

I appreciate very much the fairness of the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from New Hampshire, all three of whom spoke at length. They all admit the need. I wish to point out again, if I may, that time is of the essence in this matter, in view of the problem which exists by reason of the emergency. The need is admitted, and the reasonableness of the figure is admitted. So I submit to the Senator from New Hampshire that there is no reason for delaying this matter any further. It is urgent that the amendment be put into the bill.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Mississippi and to the Senator from Oklahoma that in the Appropriation Committee hearing it was brought out that on March 12, 1951, a total of 697 school districts had made applications for Federal assistance for the construction of school facilities under section 202 of Public Law 815. Of this number, 528 districts had submitted 915 construction projects, requesting $180,000,000 of Federal funds, and had pledged approximately $98,000,000 in local funds.

My point is that apparently the Bureau of the Budget had all this information in its hands before it agreed upon the request for $50,000,000.

May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the later figures he has change the figures I quoted to any appreciable extent?

Mr. KERR. The figures stated by the Senator are accurate, I believe. I think there is another figure which we might take into account. On the same date there had either been contemplated for approval or approved $51,000,000 worth of construction on military reservations which, under the law, are first taken care of. So, that being the case, to some extent that figure would influence the amount which would be available for districts other than those on military reservations.

In further answer to the Senator's question, the figures given by the Senator from Oklahoma were of a later date than March 12.

Mr. WHERRY (and other Senators). Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The "yeas" seem to have it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. KERR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Gillette
Anderson	Cordon	Green
Bennett	Dirksen	Hayden
Benton	Douglas	Hendrickson
Brewster	Duff	Hennings
Bricker	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Bridges	Eastland	Hill
Butler, Md.	Ecton	Hoey
Butler, Nebr.	Ellender	Holland
Byrd	Ferguson	Humphrey
Cain	Flanders	Johnson, Colo.
Carlson	Frear	Johnson, Tex.
Case	Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.
Clements	George	Kefauver

Kem	Millikin	Smathers
Kerr	Monroney	Smith, N. J.
Knowland	Moody	Smith, N. C.
Langer	Morse	Sparkman
Lodge	Mundt	Stennis
Long	Murray	Taft
McCarthy	Nixon	Thye
McClellan	O'Conor	Tobey
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Underwood
McKellar	Pastore	Welker
McMahon	Robertson	Wherry
Malone	Russell	Wiley
Martin	Saltonstall	Williams
Maybank	Schoeppel	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on behalf of himself and other Senators to the committee amendment on page 12, line 10.

Mr. KERR and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on May 1, 1951, when I was absent from the Senate, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] attacked a statement which I made before the United States Chamber of Commerce on April 30, claiming it was illogical and irrational and had other unpleasant features, and that it was inconsistent with my support of General MacArthur's program for releasing the Chinese Nationalist troops to assist in the war against the Chinese Communists.

In order that there may be no doubt about what I said, I ask that there be incorporated as part of my remarks the address which I made to the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce on April 30, 1951, at the Statler Hotel. It seems to have annoyed the Senator from Connecticut that the audience should have cheered me at the conclusion of the speech, but I am quite willing to stand by everything I said at that time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator TAFT. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, it is always a great pleasure to come to the meetings of the United States Chamber of Commerce. It certainly is by far the greatest representative body of businessmen in the world today. Of course, among them I find differences on questions of political importance, varying all the way from one side to the other. I even find on matters of legislative policy a certain amount of differences among the members of the chamber of commerce. There are those, as in other fields of life, who are for outright battle and those who are for appeasement and those who are for moderate courses. I have found, I think, that when we get questions of controls, they become fairly unanimous. [Laughter.] When we get to taxation, they are practically unanimous in a little different way. They are all in favor of balancing the budget, and of course of bearing their fair share of taxation, but there is a particular application to their own industry, or their own position, of which they are very much concerned and which they think is against the public interest. [Laughter.]

I have about come to the same conclusion as General Hancock on the subject of the tariff, that taxation is perhaps a local and personal issue.

I find one other phase of almost unanimous agreement, and that is on questions of labor policy.

In any event, I have had tremendous pleasure in dealing with the representatives of the chamber. Like many of the so-called lobbying organizations, their representatives are as much concerned, I find, in the public interest as they are in their own selfish interests. [Applause.] That particular kind of legislative or lobbying organization, if you want to call it that, is of particularly great value to those of us in Congress. It is impossible for us to know the facts. Those arguments must be presented to us, as arguments in court are presented to a judge, in the most concise manner and with the most effective argument in order that we can judge and reach a correct conclusion on the public issues before us.

To the questions of foreign policy I certainly do not claim to be an expert. People have accused me of moving into foreign policy. The fact is that foreign policy moved in on me. [Laughter.] There is no issue before this Congress that is not dictated by considerations of foreign policy, no domestic issue that is not finally determined by such issues. We have had a tremendous excitement because of the resentment among the people against the dismissal of General MacArthur, and of course far-eastern policy has arisen therefore into tremendous importance and one of pressing importance because of the war, and yet I think we must realize that after all Korea is only one phase of a very much larger problem that we face today.

That problem is produced by the threat of Russian aggression. Perhaps the first time since the days of the early Republic when we faced the whole force of the British Empire, a small Nation along the Atlantic coast, perhaps the first time since, there is a serious threat to the liberty of the people of the United States. As your representative has said, liberty is not only the key to domestic policy, but it is also the key of foreign policy. The liberty of the people of the United States must be the aim of foreign policy, not any general hope. Of course we wish to raise the standards of the world and everything else, but our considerations of foreign policy particularly when we come to the question of war must be determined solely by the desire and the determination to secure the liberty of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Peace is almost as great an aim but after all, we have gone to war to protect our liberty in the past, and we will in the future. But certainly also, it seems to me we should never risk war except to protect the liberty of the people of this country, for war itself can destroy our liberty at home, and the outcome of war may easily destroy the liberty of our people from abroad.

The Russian threat today is great because of the narrowing of the world, because the air force can fly now from Russia to the United States, because they have the atomic bomb, because they are able to do great damage to this country in a way in which even Mr. Hitler never had the opportunity of doing. It is because it is linked up with the aggressive force of communism itself, which undertakes to infiltrate successfully with propaganda and actual personal infiltration into foreign governments and create a fifth column to support the military aggression.

Why we are there I don't want to discuss today. It is my own opinion that the policy of this Government from the days beginning at Tehran and Yalta, from the attitude of mind which apparently thought that if you gave Mr. Stalin everything he wanted he would turn out to be an angel, to the attitude of mind which accepted communism as, after all, just another form of democracy—according to Henry Wallace, a little better than our form of democracy, perhaps—I think that that attitude of mind succeeded in building up this Russian threat. [Applause.]

I think it put Russia in control in central Europe, in Prague and Vienna, and in Berlin, where they need not have been, to dominate central Europe and threaten the security of Western Europe, and therefore of the United States. It put Russia into Manchuria, from which they were able to arm the Chinese Communists and support the movement which finally has given a completely Communist domination on the continent of Asia, working down toward even the southeast section of that continent.

However we got there, we are there today, and we have the problem of deciding how we meet that threat.

On the general principles of that decision, I don't think that there is any tremendous difference of opinion. I think it is clear, and I think the generally accepted proposal by all parties and practically all elements of the population of this country is that we oppose the spread of communism at every point where it can be opposed and by every means within our capacity to oppose it. I think we have adopted those policies, and we have supported other nations, with economic aid, in order that they may achieve the prosperity that will prevent the spread of communism within those countries.

We have given arms aid to various nations where we think that there is a threat, a direct threat of Russian aggression. We have sent our troops to some places. We have undertaken in the Atlantic Pact to go to war if Russia attacks certain parts of the world.

Those general policies, I think, are not particularly disputed today. The great differences of opinion have arisen in the application of those policies.

First of all, I think we must consider the necessary limitations on the ability of the United States to carry out the program. We can only undertake those things within our ability, and, after all, we only have 6 percent of the population of the world, less than half of the total production. And, powerful as we are, great as is our production, there is a limit to our capacity.

I have felt very strongly, myself, that if we go beyond that limit, we may stretch our efforts to a point where they will fail. It seems to me that the one thing we have to fear in the long run—I have no fear about our ability to defend the United States, even though it might be damaged. The only thing which may wreck this country is what has wrecked many other countries: the fact that we assume more than we can possibly do. Germany is in ruins today because Hitler thought that he could conquer the world. Japan is in ruins because they thought that they could conquer the Far East. There isn't anything which can destroy this country except going further than we are able to go considering our ability.

My principal criticism of the administration is that there does not seem to be anybody who has, so to speak, put together the various phases of this program, who has considered all of its implications, who has considered where it is going or even exactly what it shall be.

I think today what we need more than anything else is a definite program of foresightedness, looking ahead 2 or 3 or 4 years to see what we can do, and then decide among those things offered to us what is within our proper capacity.

It nearly all depends upon our military effort. That is the tremendous strain upon the economy of the United States. I do not think that aid to foreign countries will be too great a strain. Aid to foreign countries, of course, imposes some additional burden, and there may be a great difference as to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

just what that aid shall be and where. And yet, when you get down to dollars and cents, it is a small item compared to the total effort that we have.

It is easiest to measure by the number of men in the Armed Forces of the United States. What is the program? And what is it going to be 12 months from now?

Before the Korean war we were told by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that 1,500,000 men were approximately sufficient to provide an adequate defense for the people of the United States. We were told that they would not think of recommending $20,000,000,000 for Armed Forces, and they ought to be dismissed if they asked for $30,000,000,000.

Then came the Korean war. Of course, that was a revelation. It showed that the Russians were not averse to using their satellite troops at least for direct military attack. At least it woke the people up, but it did not create a substantially different situation.

The fact that they were able to use satellite troops, I do not think proves one way or the other whether they are prepared to start a third world war and use their own troops in that effort. Nevertheless, it naturally drew attention to the matter. And after that attack, within a month or so, we were asked for 2,100,000 men. Then we got back here in December and the program presented to us was for 2,700,000 men. Within 30 days, when we came back in January, it was 3,500,000 men. And there, for the moment, it rests, although I do not think that necessarily that presents the limit of what may be asked.

Of course, that factor determines all of the other important things, and it determines the draft and it determines whether we have to take 18-year-old boys, or 18½, or 19, and whether we have to take men for 21 months, 24 months, 27 months for continuous service. And it means that, even at the 3,500,000 figure, that every boy in this country is going to have to give 2 years of full military service in order to provide the Armed Forces that are now requested.

Of course, it determines the amount of expense, and it determines the amount of taxes. It determines, therefore, the severity and the character of the controls which have to be imposed.

Those are the main questions before Congress.

The Korean war has no great bearing on that total question, because out of these 3,500,000 men we are using 350,000 altogether, probably, in the Korean War, and we are told that that is all we have to use.

So that this is a much broader question. This is a question of what is necessary to meet the Russian threat.

I say it is very difficult to get anyone who will sit down and tell you what this is going to cost for the next 2 or 3 years. As far as I can judge, and I admit I am more or less guessing on it, 3,500,000 men will cost $35,000,000,000 a year continuously, just to maintain them and for travel and for the operations of the force and replace clothes and perhaps ordinary arms.

In addition to that, however, apparently for 3 years we are going to have to spend nearly $20,000,000,000 a year more on equipment of all kinds, heavy equipment, ships, airplanes, heavy artillery, in order to reach the point which we think is necessary.

The total is in the neighborhood of $55,000,000,000 for our Armed Forces alone. We add about $5,000,000,000 for arms to Europe, and I say that is not, after all, a determining factor. There is about $25,000,000,000 for domestic purposes, which includes some war purposes, merchant marine, atomic energy, and various other things which are directly related to defense. The total of about $85,000,000,000 is reached.

If you add to that $15,000,000,000, or a little more, $18,000,000,000 for State and local purposes, that is $100,000,000,000, and that is one-third of our total national product. It is pretty close to 40 percent of our national income.

Personally, I do not think that we can stand that without very serious results. I have felt that the 3,500,000 figure is too high, or else that the expense of maintaining 3,500,000 ought to be substantially reduced. I have suggested 3,000,000 men and a total budget of about $65,000,000,000 instead of $85,000,000,000, or $70,000,000,000 instead of $85,000,000,000, as being closer to the limit. I do not know what it is. In any event, we have certainly reached the limit in this proposed program.

The results, if we overdo it, may be exceedingly fatal to the economy of the United States. I think it means inflation, and it means, of course, higher taxes, to begin with. We would have to add about $25,000,000,000 a year to the taxes. And when you consider that that is the whole yield today of personal incomes—in the last analysis it comes out of personal incomes—you can see what a tremendous additional burden that means.

My opinion is that even if you balance the budget at that figure, you cannot avoid inflation. I do not believe the Government can take one-third of the national product, even if you balance the budget, without inflation. The taxes are going to be so heavy, in my opinion, they will be passed on, as most taxes can be passed on, into the price of goods, and you will have approximately the same result, even if you balance the budget. You have inflation, and the depreciation of the value of the dollar, and you face certainly a loss of morale in this country. You face deep resentment, and you face all kinds of labor troubles, and you face, I think, the severest types of controls; and those controls, in my opinion, are almost certain to collapse with all of the resulting illegality, if we try to impose them in time of peace.

We have probably the failure of that very production which is our great strength, and which must be the defense of the free world for all nations, if a war with Russia shall arrive.

Of course, if actually you undertook to say to the military, "Now, we want 100-percent protection," they would rightly and could rightly recommend probably $150,000,000,000 worth of military expense. We spent one-half of our national product during the war on the Federal Government. It is an impossible situation. If you do that you eliminate all freedom at home, the very thing that you are trying to protect, and you set up a garrison state and you defeat your own ends.

As I say, you threaten the very production of the United States, and so you must select, or someone must select what it is that you choose to do. And that has been the basis of the differences that have arisen, in Congress and throughout the world. Can we cover everything that you want to do in Europe and everything that we want to do in Asia? Obviously we cannot. We have to select.

My own feeling has been very strongly that we ought to devote our prime attention to the complete control of the sea and air throughout the world. It seems obvious to me from the expense figures that that is something within our financial capacity. If we can maintain the alliance with England which I think is most important to do, certainly we can dominate three-fourths of the earth's surface; and the control of sea and air is not an abandonment of the land. Far from that it gives the ability to aid every island nation throughout the world—the Japanese, the Philippines, Great Britain, and furthermore it gives us a direct threat throughout all of the continent of Europe and the continent of Asia, the direct threat of direct bombing and the use of the atomic bomb and Mr. Churchill says that that threat is what has deterred Russia from starting a third world war today. I have no doubt that he is largely right in that conclusion.

It gives us the power to aid the land forces that may be fighting on our side and it enables us to land troops and it protects our sea lanes and communication with all of the raw materials that we need.

It gives us a defense, if we can build an Air Force sufficient to dominate the air over this country and over the oceans that surround this country, and over even the enemy country. It gives us then the time in which to develop whatever other forces may be necessary if we reach all-out war.

What we face is not war. It is still peace. It may be an uneasy peace and yet it is a peace which is different from war, one, because the people are not prepared to surrender everything, and, two, because it may last for 10 or 20 years and we have to make a permanent adjustment for that condition. We face a condition we never have faced before, and in that condition I think we ought to be able to set up a permanent condition in which we can maintain our production and the liberty of the people of this country.

I think in the sea and air, we can succeed in giving ourselves the choice as to what to do if a war starts, if it does start. I can't find anybody who can tell me what a third world war is going to look like. Whatever else it looks like, it is not going to look like the Second World War or the First World War. I don't think today we ought to decide exactly where or how we are going to fight that war finally. Certainly no nation can build up a military force sufficient to go to war tomorrow at full strength without destroying their complete domestic economy.

So what we have to decide, it seems to me, is that in control of sea and air throughout the world we give ourselves the protection that we need. That doesn't mean that you don't need a land army. Of course you need a land army, and you need a land army to defend this country and defend Alaska and to send to these various island bases. And the defense of Japan is no cinch. Unless we devote ourselves without stint to the control of the sea and air in the Far East, we may have great difficulty in defending Japan. We have to certainly solve the Russian submarine menace if we want complete control of the sea. We will need land troops in Japan, which is a vulnerable position, and in fact the Russians today are within gunshot of the Japanese northern islands, due to their action in taking over various islands that are perhaps part of the Kurile Islands and perhaps are not.

We need land troops for the occupation of many bases and we need land troops to land on the continent wherever we think that we can get away with it.

As I see it, this whole question is a question of capacity, and the reason that I oppose an all-out commitment to Europe and insisted on a limitation of the commitment to Europe is because that kind of an operation not only is dangerous, and you face a tremendous superiority of men, but you also face a tremendous expense.

There is a little war in Korea, a small nation, and yet it took all of the then capacity of the American Army to fight it. Suppose you go to Europe with six divisions? Why in the Second World War we had 60 divisions, and a land operation is capable of perfectly indefinite expansion, and the addition of billions of dollars to your budget if you are going to undertake actually to fight that land war as one of your major purposes in the defense of the United States.

And so in the Far East again we have the question of what our capacity is. I think today—and I don't blame the President particularly for his action, except that I think he did it without authority and should have had authority from Congress before he did it—but nevertheless I think the movement into Korea was a mistake. We committed

American land troops to the continent of Asia, and it is just about as dangerous to do that as it is to commit them to the Continent of Europe in any considerable number. [Applause.]

Of course, we moved in under the highest motives, on the theory that the United Nations called for the suppression of war by joining together to hit the first aggressor. It is a perfectly sound theory which I certainly would support. The difficulty about our action on that theory, as opposed to the defense of the United States, is that the United Nations was a weak reed upon which to rely. [Applause.] The only reason we got their authority to move into Korea was that the Russians were boycotting the Security Council at that moment and were not there to veto the action.

We moved in, and we should have seen at least that in a second aggression they would be there and they would veto the action, which they promptly did as soon as the Chinese Communists attacked.

As a matter of fact, when we went into the Atlantic Pact and adopted this military program we, for all practical purposes, abandoned the United Nations, except as an important diplomatic body through which peace may be worked out perhaps—an organization that can discuss the questions and which certainly I would be in favor of continuing; but as a means of stopping aggression, which was the main purpose of the United Nations Charter, it has proved to be a complete failure because of the veto power, and we have to simply disregard it in our military dispositions hereafter.

At any rate, we got into Korea, and there we were, and when the Chinese attacked we found ourselves in a second war, in a second aggression, and on that aggression the United Nations refuse to take action. Here was an aggression infinitely more serious than the aggression of North Korea, and here was a great nation attacking not only Korea itself but also the United Nations' army which was engaged in preventing and punishing aggression, and certainly to say that we are holding them today is a ridiculous provision, because the purpose of their aggression has largely been accomplished. They have already captured half of Korea, and they have already killed thousands of United Nations' troops. The United Nations have entirely abandoned their theory, so that, as far as the moral justification for the Korean War in the beginning is concerned, it has been wiped out. We have abandoned that moral justification.

If we were going to go through with it we would have to march to the capital of China and punish the Communist Chinese, and, of course, that clearly everyone recognizes is beyond our capacity. Therefore, that particular basis for the proceeding has completely failed.

We find ourselves at war in Korea. I must admit that there is no satisfactory outcome or no certain outcome or successful outcome in prospect in that war. The immediate issue before us here in Congress, it seems to me in Washington, is between the different proposals that are presented for that war.

The present policy of the administration as expressed by the President the other day, and as expressed by General Bradley and Secretary Acheson, is a stalemate war with no possibility of bringing the war to a conclusion. Certainly there is no plan to bring it to a conclusion. As I read the President's speech, our Army is to be bound exactly like a football team with orders that whenever they reach the middle of the field they are to kick. Well, of course, they never can score, and sooner or later someone on the other side is going to catch the ball and run through our line for a touchdown. [Applause.]

The President's hopes are almost pitiful. He said apparently that if you don't notice that the Chinese are there, maybe they will go away. [Applause.] His speech is full of "maybe's," and he admits that there is a war with the Chinese Communists but he says if we hold them for a while maybe they will stop. He says if we kill a lot of them maybe they will go away. Although he says that there are millions of them back in China all ready to come in, and he admits that they don't care what manpower losses they have.

It seems to me that the policy is one which cannot possibly be continued indefinitely. As I say, the whole moral justification for the thing has stopped. I don't understand even Secretary Acheson this morning when he said that there must be an end to the fighting, and there must be concrete measure against the renewal of the attack, and there must be an abandonment by the enemy of his attempt to conquer the Republic of Korea. In other words, all he says is that we must defend South Korea, and he is no longer interested in North Korea, and we are going to let the Chinese Communists get away with that aggression.

As far as preventing the war, the President in his speech says that we prevented world war III by moving in against the first aggressor to break the peace since the Second World War. And then he says, "Now we prevent world war III by not punishing the aggressor when the aggressor is bigger." He says that now we prevent world war III by fighting a soft little war with the Chinese Communists, and not really doing anything about it.

I cannot imagine anything that more encourages aggression than that attitude because here is an aggressor who is not to be punished, whose towns are not even to be bombed, and even those who oppose him in his own country are not to be supported. It is perfectly safe apparently for a big aggressor to go right ahead and aggress without the slightest idea of punishment, and the turning over to him of whatever he can actually secure by force of arms. That is the proposal as I see it, of the President today.

The second policy is one in which I have a feeling that the American people cannot and will not stand for, an indefinite stalemate war. The boys are being killed and wounded by the thousands every week and I do not see how you can indefinitely continue the present situation. So I felt very strongly that it either is going one way or the other. Either it is going the way that MacArthur has recommended, that we at least try that program of ending the Korean War or else it is going the way which Secretary Acheson at least in the past has espoused, and which he has not yet in any speech repudiated, and which the President has not repudiated—an appeasement peace, a peace which I think I am justified in suspecting, so to speak. I think it is more important that the Congress negative the possibility of such a peace, because from the beginning there has been a strong sympathy in the administration with the Chinese Communists. Secretary Marshall went to China to try to force Chiang Kai-shek to take the Communists into his cabinet. That was the announced policy of the Government in 1946 and in 1948 despite the fact that in Czechoslovakia we saw what happens when you take Communists into your cabinet. There was a constant sympathy in the State Department for the Communists and they were represented as merely agrarian reformers. Then a year ago only Secretary Acheson sent out a memorandum saying that the American people must be conditioned for taking over of Formosa by the Chinese Communists. Here was a place where, if you were going to follow the very basic principles of our foreign policy to contain communism where you could contain communism, we certainly should have defended Formosa to the end because it is a perfectly easy operation for us to do. [Applause.]

At that time Mr. Acheson was in favor of surrendering Formosa, and that policy was urged the day of General MacArthur's dismissal by the British Government on this country, and it has not been repudiated by the administration.

Then, finally, we came to the acceptance of this cease-fire proposal, which was only this January, in which it was proposed that in order to accomplish the purpose, etc., all non-Korean Army forces will be withdrawn from Korea by appropriate stages and appropriate arrangements in accordance with United Nations principles for Korean people to express their own free will with respect to their future government. Certainly by the time the forces are out if that election isn't dominated by Communist method I will be very much surprised. It seems to me to be a surrender to the principle of a Communist-dominated Korea. More than that, a cease-fire proposal to which the State Department agrees, or to which it made Mr. Austin agree, said: "As soon as the agreement has been reached on a cease-fire, the General Assembly shall set up an appropriate body which shall include representatives of the governments of the United Kingdom, the British"—who want this settlement—"the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the People's Republic of China"—four of them, three of them against one. We shut out the Nationalist government of China, although they are the recognized representatives of China in the United Nations today and the government that we represent. Four of them to sit down in conformity with existing obligations, etc., to discuss problems, including, among others, those of Formosa and of representation of China in the United Nations.

Certainly that is a clear step toward the surrender of Formosa and the admission of China to the United Nations as a reward for the aggression which they have undertaken.

That cease-fire proposal we agreed to. It didn't go into force because the Chinese Communists turned it down. The State Department naively suggested they only agreed to it because they thought the Communists might turn it down, and they wanted the strategic advantage with the United Nations. [Laughter.]

What I am afraid of—what I have been fearful of—is that a reversion to this proposal is still in the wind; it is still there. In my opinion, if that is done, if that settlement is made, if we surrender Formosa, turn it over to the United Nations to turn over to China, it is going to so weaken our whole position in the Far East that it will be almost impossible to hold on to Japan and hold on even to the Philippine Islands, both of which are subject today to strong Communist infiltration, as well as Communist military attack.

So I have felt that the third policy at least should be tried, that is, the policy of General MacArthur, in substance:

Number one, the use of Chiang's troops in Formosa or China or anywhere else they can be useful. [Applause]. Nationalist China is a member of the United Nations. They have been called upon by the United Nations to furnish troops against Communist China, against the North Koreans. They volunteered to do so, and we rejected their aid. There was some sense in it when the Chinese Communists were not in Korea, because naturally if they had gone in it might well have brought the Chinese Communists in. Now they are in. From that moment the policy of holding back and neutralizing Formosa makes complete nonsense as far as I can see. [Applause.]

It seems to be generally agreed that all south China is in a ferment, that all of the rural population is up in arms against the Communists today because of the treatment

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

they have received, that you have 100,000 guerrilla troops operating in different places in south China with whom the Chiang government is in contact and can be in more contact if permitted, that we can create at least a diversion in south China that will withdraw Chinese arms from Korea and relieve the tremendous pressure, which today is forcing back the forces of the United Nations. [Applause.]

The troops can be used in Korea, but I can't understand the principle upon which we refuse to use them. It is said that in some way it is going to bring Russia into the war. Why would it bring Russia into the war? Here is a civil contest in China, just exactly like Greece. We intervened in Greece although that might have brought Russia into a third world war. We supported the anti-Communist forces in Greece against the Communist forces in Greece. We sent money and arms and everything but men into Greece to do that. There is no reason that I can see why we can't send money and men into Formosa in order that they may operate freely and remove the neutralization which has been imposed upon them by the forces of the United States. [Applause.]

In the second place, you have the bombing of communications, which of course is a military matter which is absolutely necessary. It is only restrained by political considerations. The only argument urged today is that it will bring Russia into the war. We have taken a lot of chances on Russia's coming into the war. When we undertook the airlift in Berlin it would have been a very simple occasion that could have brought a third world war. When we moved into Greece we certainly undertook that danger. When we set up the Atlantic Pact, an obvious alliance that we are going to arm 11 nations surrounding Russia all the way around from Turkey to Norway, certainly that was an aggressive move which Russia could have used as an excuse for undertaking a third world war if they wished to do so. The arming of Germany, which in fact we threatened to do—the Secretary of State announced that we were going to arm Western Germany—produced such a tremendous protest from Russia and such a threat of aggression that we finally backed down on that particular proposal. I think the Russians may bring a third world war if they see something like invasion of Russia, but certainly the bombing of Manchurian bases or the use of Chiang's troops is nothing that threatens even remotely any invasion of Russian territory. [Applause.]

The third proposal of General MacArthur is a blockade of Communist China. I have somewhat more doubt about that. I haven't had an opportunity to study the matter or the complications that may develop, but certainly it seems to me if we release Chiang, he had a pretty good blockade operating before we tied him up in Formosa. Before that, he was very effectively stopping a good deal of the materials that were going into Communist China to arm the Chinese armies against the American Armies, and I think certainly such a blockade could be tried perhaps before we tried it ourselves.

As I see it, the difficulty with the proposed Truman policy, as I said, is that it cannot go on forever. So I believe the choice in the end must be between the former Acheson policy, which may or may not be abandoned, and the MacArthur policy. I am very much concerned that unless Congress expresses clearly its definite opinion in opposition to the Acheson policy, we will wake up some morning and find that policy already adopted in the face of the overwhelming disapproval of the American people and of the Congress itself. [Applause.]

Most of the Democratic Senators have expressed their opposition to any surrender of Formosa. Some of them have expressed their approval of the bombing of China, but certainly nobody in a responsible position in the administration has said one word which negatives the possibility of our accepting again the cease fire proposal which we once accepted, which is still urged by the British, which is still urged by the United Nations, and which, therefore, is constantly a pressure upon the action of the administration. Certainly it is in sympathy with the thoughts and the prejudices of the present administration.

So, I think it is very necessary myself that we make clear what our position is on that question. I think it is desirable that we adopt a more aggressive attitude in China. That doesn't mean any invasion of China. Invasion of China is morally justified, but it is something we can't do. The measures which are proposed are measures to enable us to win the war in Korea, and by at least expelling the Chinese from Korea, defeating the purpose of their aggression. I think in the long run even that is not a very effective weapon. At least it will restore the position of the United States in the Far East. At least it will be some discouragement to aggression. The present policy, if long continued, seems to me simply ties our Army up. It creates a condition in which the Russians have full time to prepare their own forces without losing or using a single man. It shows the world that, after all, aggression pays and cannot be seriously prevented.

It seems to me that nothing could lead so much in the long run to a third world war as the indefinite continuance of a stalemate war in the Republic of Korea.

[The audience arose and applauded.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall read the portion of the speech to which the Senator from Connecticut made reference in order to show clearly and exactly what I did say. It consists of one page, and reads:

This is a question of what is necessary to meet the Russian threat.

I say it is very difficult to get anyone who will sit down and tell you what this is going to cost for the next 2 or 3 years. As far as I can judge, and I admit I am more or less guessing on it, 3,500,000 men will cost $25,000,000,000 a year continuously, just to maintain them and for travel and for the operations of the force and replace clothes and perhaps ordinary arms.

In addition to that, however, apparently for 3 years we are going to have to spend nearly $20,000,000,000 a year more on equipment of all kinds, heavy equipment, ships, airplanes, heavy artillery, in order to reach the point which we think is necessary.

The total is in the neighborhood of $55,000,000,000 for our Armed Forces alone. We add about $5,000,000,000 for arms to Europe, and I say that is not, after all, a determining factor. There is about $25,000,000,000 for domestic purposes, which includes some war purposes, merchant marine, atomic energy, and various other things which are directly related to defense. The total of about $85,000,000,000 is reached.

If you add to that $15,000,000,000, or a little more, $18,000,000,000 for State and local purposes, that is $100,000,000,000, and that is one-third of our total national product. It is pretty close to 40 percent of our national income.

Personally, I do not think that we can stand that without very serious results. I have felt that the 3,500,000 figure is too high, or else that the expense of maintaining 3,500,000 ought to be substantially reduced. I have suggested 3,000,000 men and a total budget of about $65,000,000,000 instead of $85,000,000,000, or $70,000,000,000 instead of $85,000,000,000, as being closer to the limit. I do not know what it is. In any event, we have certainly reached the limit in this proposed program.

The results, if we overdo it, may be exceedingly fatal to the economy of the United States. I think it means inflation, and it means, of course, higher taxes, to begin with. We would have to add about $25,000,000,000 a year to the taxes. And when you consider that that is the whole yield today of personal incomes—in the last analysis it comes out of personal incomes—you can see what a tremendous additional burden that means.

My opinion is that even if you balance the budget at that figure, you cannot avoid inflation. I do not believe the Government can take one-third of the national product, even if you balance the budget, without inflation. The taxes are going to be so heavy, in my opinion, they will be passed on, as most taxes can be passed on, into the price of goods, and you will have approximately the same result, even if you balance the budget. You have inflation and the depreciation of the value of the dollar, and you face certainly a loss of morale in this country. You face deep resentment, and you face all kinds of labor troubles, and you face, I think, the severest types of controls; and those controls, in my opinion, are almost certain to collapse with all of the resulting illegality, if we try to impose them in times of peace.

It will be seen that I was discussing the question as to the total economic capacity of the United States to maintain indefinitely a mobilization such as that now proposed. I criticized the administration for not stating clearly what the program was, and estimated that if all of the things proposed were put into effect, we would be spending at the rate of approximately eighty-five billion a year. I stated that, in my opinion, sixty-five or seventy billion dollars of Federal expenditures were closer to the economic capacity of the country than eighty-five billion. The latter figure would require taxes of more than one-third our total national product, and about 40 percent of the national income. I stated that I thought this would bring about hardship, inflation, and confusion even if taxes were levied to cover the entire amount.

I was encouraged that afternoon by the President's message which came to Congress just after my speech was made. I notice that the President does not contemplate the expenditure of eighty-five billion a year, but reaffirms his estimate of January that the actual expenditures in fiscal 1952 will be only in the neighborhood of $70,000,000,000. He estimates that the Army will spend fifteen and one-half billion, the Navy eleven billion, and the Air Force twelve and one-half billion, or a total of $39,000,000,000, which is approximately the estimate which he made in January. I hope the President is right, although if the figures given by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnson are accepted, it is difficult to see how he can be right. I question whether his figure on expenditures is more than a guess. In any event, he seems to be much closer to me than he is to the Senator from Connecticut.

The argument of the Senator from Connecticut was taken up by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in questions to General MacArthur, and by the editor of the Washington Star, who seems to think that in some way my suggestion is inconsistent with a more intensified war in Korea. Of course there is no relation between them, and there

is no inconsistency whatever. The use of Chinese Nationalist troops now immobilized by administration policy requires a sum which is almost negligible in terms of the preparation we are making against Russia in Europe and throughout the world in terms of the figures which I have been discussing. As a general proposition, it is far cheaper to make use of the assistance of our allies in a war, even if we have to give supplies and logistical support than it is to provide more American soldiers. Furthermore it saves the lives of many American boys.

I wish that distinguished Senators and the editor of the Star would try to do a little thinking on their own and analyze the economic situation of this country and come to their own conclusion. In my opinion, it is vitally important that we do not bankrupt ourselves in the vital project we are undertaking. I did suggest that we try three million men instead of three and one-half million men. I have suggested elsewhere that with 3,000,000 men we ought to be able to get at least the same 24 divisions into the front line as now proposed with three and one-half million men. Incidentally, this is more than the Joint Chiefs of Staff requested in December 1950, when they had all the facts before them that they have now. I have suggested that there is a large waste of personnel in the Armed Forces, and that we ought to be able to put as many men into the fighting fronts as we are now planning with very many fewer men in uniform. The Senator from Connecticut and the editor of the Star have apparently reached the state of mind in which a proposal to accomplish our purposes by spending wisely and thus spending less, is called a contradiction in terms.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. Unfortunately I was detained, and reached the Chamber in time to hear only the latter part of the Senator's remarks. He may have said some things which may affect the questions which I shall ask.

I should like to ask the Senator if he still approves the suggestion for the logistical support of the Chinese Nationalists in a landing in China.

Mr. TAFT. I think I would approve that. I must say that the important thing, it seems to me, is to say, "Yes, Mr. Chiang, Mr. Nationalist Government; we will use the troops you offer us in the Korean War, and we will use them as our military authorities think they can be best used, whether in Korea or in South China." We are a long way from China, but so far as my information is concerned, it would be a very simple proposition today for Chiang to link up with the guerrillas in South China and conduct a war which at least would divert from Korea many thousands of Chinese soldiers who are now killing American troops.

Mr. McMAHON. Then, as I understand, the Senator has not retreated from his proposal, which is the acceptance of General MacArthur's advice for enlarged military operations in the East.

Mr. TAFT. I have not departed from my idea that we should do everything we can to win the war in Korea, by every move we can take except the invasion of China by American soldiers. I think that is beyond our capacity. I think we have justification for it, but I think it is an impossible operation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator would agree with me, would he not, that that calls for considerably enlarged military operations in the East? Does the Senator believe——

Mr. TAFT. I think it would require supplies. I do not know how many more American men it would require. I should think it would require fewer American men in the East. In the long run, it would be easier to fight the Chinese Communists with Chinese Nationalist troops than with American troops, to say nothing of the saving of life which we could accomplish by that method.

Mr. McMAHON. The difference between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Connecticut is that the Senator from Connecticut does not believe that it is in the best interest of the security of the United States to engage in enlarged operations in the East, which undoubtedly is the plan of the Soviet Union, if we are foolish enough to fall for it.

Mr. TAFT. We have fallen for it. This administration put us into a war in the East. We are fighting a war in the East. American boys are dying because of the war in which we are involved. I am interested only in winning that war as soon and as cheaply as possible.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I agree that today we are fighting a limited engagement in the East.

Mr. TAFT. It does not look limited to those who are being killed and wounded, I may say to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will finish his question.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Connecticut was not asking a question; he was making a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator from Ohio will agree with me that it would perhaps be best if I were recognized in my own right, because the difficulty of carrying on this debate, limited as I am, apparently, by the Senator from Ohio in the asking of questions, is not consonant with the presentation of what I regard as the fallacies of the case of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator from Connecticut asking a question or not?

Mr. McMAHON. I am asking the Senator if he does not agree with the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I agree with the opinion. I am through. I made this statement in answer to a statement which the Senator from Connecticut made on the floor of the Senate when I was not present, in which he attacked the statement which I made as inconsistent, and in which he misrepresented that statement. I rose only for the purpose of placing in the RECORD a denial of the statements made by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. I regret very much if I have misrepresented the position of the Senator from Ohio on any matter, and I certainly would be most regretful if I misrepresented his position on this issue, which is one of the great issues of our time. I distinctly remember that I came into the Senate Chamber from the lobby and read to the Senate the ticker announcement by the Associated Press, which reported that the Senator from Ohio had spoken to the chamber of commerce and had advocated three things: One, a cut in the budget of $20,000,000,000; two, a reduction in the Armed Forces of 500,000 men; three, enlarged operations of a military nature in the Far East. The Senator from Connecticut was so impressed with the inconsistency of this program that he refrained from speaking further about it at the time. However, on the next day the Senator from Connecticut tried to obtain a transcript of the remarks of the Senator from Ohio before the chamber of commerce, and was unable to do so. But I did find a story as reported in the New York Times, and the story as reported in the New York Times I read to the Senate, and it bore out the announcement of the Associated Press dispatch.

Unfortunately, as I said, I did not hear the complete presentation of the Senator from Ohio and I do not know how he has justified the story as reported in the New York Times and in the Associated Press dispatch. But I say, and I say it with as much force as I know how to give it, that the proposal to cut the Budget $20,000,000,000, and the Armed Forces by 500,000 men, and the support for the program of an enlarged war in the Far East, as recommended by General MacArthur, does not make sense to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Could that possibly be the reason why General MacArthur said such a proposal would be silly?

Mr. McMAHON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. KERR. Might what the Senator has just said have been in the mind of General MacArthur when he said that such a proposal of enlarging the war on the one hand and cutting it down on the other hand would not be a very sound or consistent action?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] put those propositions to General MacArthur, and, of course, he denominated them—I do not say that he said they were silly; I do not know that that was the word he used, but he did say that,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of course, he did not agree with those propositions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether or not the Senator from Connecticut in all the hearings that he has attended and all the debates in which he has engaged with those who support the General MacArthur position, has been able to find any documentation as to the number of combat divisions that Chiang Kai-shek would have, the caliber or the quality of their training, the kind of equipment and the condition of that equipment, the spirit or morale of the troops, and finally whether or not he has ever been able to find out what would happen in terms of the troops, once they landed on the mainland. I wonder whether the Senator from Connecticut has found out whether or not the British intelligence report is true, as was made available in the Newsweek magazine, which stated that over 50 percent would desert once they were on the mainland? Has the Senator from Connecticut been able to get any facts about that matter?

I have heard a great deal about this army. I wonder whether it is a retreating army or a fighting army? The last experience we had of it was that it was a retreating army. I wonder whether the Senator from Connecticut has any further evidence which would tend to show whether the army is now revitalized, whether it has in it enough spirit to make it a victorious army or whether it is the same kind of an army it was before?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that I have not heard any evidence which would back any of the estimates which have been made on the subjects the Senator has mentioned, but I will say that I am firmly convinced from what I have heard and from my study of the situation, which includes estimates of responsible military men, that if there is an invasion of the mainland of China by Chiang Kai-shek's troops there will be American troops in front of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the Senator been able to find out what troops would defend Formosa if Chiang Kai-shek's troops on Formosa were to land on the mainland of China?

Mr. McMAHON. That has not been resolved either, I will say to the Senator; nor has the question been resolved as to what would happen if we got Chiang Kai-shek back in China, and we supported him with air and sea power—and I suppose if he should return to China, we would have to support him with land troops, regardless of our intention—and then the Chinese Reds retreated beyond the Yalu, and said, "We want to make peace." I have not heard anybody resolve the dilemma we would then be in. Would we then walk out on Chiang Kai-shek and made peace or would we insist on putting him back on the throne in China? I have not heard that question resolved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that the Senator from Connecticut was present on the floor of the Senate on the occasion of the speech made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] when he discussed the tactical aircraft strength and the strategic air strength we have. I think I recall that the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out that we were still somewhat weak; that we still needed a great build-up, and that we had committed most of our available military aircraft into areas of tension already. I wonder whether or not the Senator from Connecticut could tell me—or has he been able to find out from the men who are saying that we ought to use Chiang Kai-shek's troops—how many planes we would need, who would fly the planes, who would supply the planes? I wonder if the Senator has been able to find out from those who want Chiang Kai-shek's troops to go to the mainland of China, how many guns will be needed, and how much ammunition will be needed? In other words, if we are to have another war we ought to have information as to how to get that war started, and how to win it. Has the Senator been able to obtain any information on that?

Mr. McMAHON. I think that information should be in the RECORD before we start, so we can measure that information against the statement of the Senator from Ohio that he is going to try to do his best to reduce the budget by $20,000,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am so happy the Senator from Connecticut made that last observation, because that deals with the next question I was going to ask him. There seem to be anywhere from 300,000 to 600,000 Chinese troops on Formosa. The census figures are not very accurate with respect to the number of troops on Formosa, but let us say for the purpose of illustration that there are 500,000 troops there. Has anyone in the Senate of the United States figured out how much it would cost to equip 500,000 of Chiang Kai-shek's troops? I ask that question because if the budget is to be cut by $20,000,000,000, does that mean we are going to take the equipment away from our own troops; does that mean that we are going to withdraw our troops from Western Europe; does that mean we are going to close up our present recruitment program? How are we going to equip 500,000 troops, reduce the budget by $20,000,000,000, wage and win a war in Korea, land Chiang Kai-shek's troops in China, send four divisions to Europe, and conduct a major mobilization program at home? Anyone who can give me the answer to that question should receive the Pulitzer prize for 1951. An answer to that question will mean something.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say in answer to that question, that we will have to do that trick by the use of mirrors. In my opinion the question cannot be answered by the use of common sense and logic.

Mr. President, let me make one more observation. I have heard from various sources expression of sympathy for the losses in Korea. I do not think there is any Member of this body, or of the House of Representatives, or any common sense person in the United States, who is not acutely conscious of the losses we have suffered in Korea. They are losses, as I have said before, of men who have given their lives in as great and glorious a cause as this country has ever stood for. It is by their action that we have managed to keep Asia from disintegrating.

I say that those who constantly talk about the losses in Korea had better tell the American people about the possible losses to the troops of our country and to the people of our country if we were to adopt what I regard as a rash, reckless proposal to extend the action not only into China, but into a flaming world war. That is a factor and an aspect of the situation which we have not sufficiently discussed, but which is being better understood by the American people.

What they want us to do is to solve the problem at hand without bringing on a third world war. They are not in favor of desperate and reckless military adventures, which would not result in destroying the source of the military power which exists against us in the world. When some persons try to tell the American people that there will be fewer American dead if we enlarge the situation in the air and on the water, to say nothing of on the land, and if we expose this country to the kind of danger which most of us understand, if the Senator from Ohio does not understand it, I say that the American people are understanding the answers to those suggestions, and I have no doubt what their verdict will be.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. Does the senior Senator from Connecticut happen to know the casualty rate per month in the Korean war in the case of those who serve in the Armed Forces from the State of Connecticut?

Mr. McMAHON. I do not have those figures at the tip of my tongue.

Mr. BENTON. I was told today by the press correspondent for the Hartford Courant that it is 50 a month. Of course that is a tragic loss to those 50 families.

In view of the fact that Bridgeport, per capita, is the most highly industrialized city in the United States, and is turning out more goods, per capita, through its hundreds of factories, than is any other industrial city, would the Senator make a guess as to what the casualty rate in Bridgeport could be as the result of the dropping of one bomb on that city?

Mr. McMAHON. I am sure the Senator is as aware as I am of the effects of one atomic bomb of what might be called minor size on Hiroshima. In answer to the Senator's question, I do not state that to inspire fear. After all, it is the strength of a democracy, above

that of a dictatorship, that the people of a democracy can look the facts in the face and steel themselves with the resolution required of them to meet any danger.

However, I say that the solution of our difficulties at this time is the development of an intelligent program by means of which to take the peoples of the world away from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union can have all the guns and bombs and planes it wants, including atomic weapons, but if the Soviet Union does not have the support of peoples it cannot make war. Every attempt that has been made in the Senate, during my service here, to accomplish the objective of alienating all peoples from the Russian rulers has been resolutely fought by some of the Members of this body.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that both the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut have repeated a charge which I have just completely disproved, namely, that I said we should cut the budget $20,000,000,000. What I said was that I thought $70,000,000,000 represented about the economic limit of what we could do in time of peace. I have pointed out that on the same day the President of the United States submitted to us a report—which is on my desk—covering the budget for military functions, in which he reaffirms his estimate that in the entire fiscal year beginning on the 1st of July and ending on the 30th of June of the following year the expenditures will be those which he estimated in January, namely, approximately $70,000,000,000.

What I said was that, if we took all the proposals which are being granted, they would amount to $85,000,000,000, and I thought that was beyond our economic capacity.

So what the Senator from Connecticut is objecting to is a sum which the President of the United States himself seems to think is sufficient by way of expenditures. Certainly the charges that have been made against me—and I rose only to refute them—are not supported by the President's statements.

Mr. President, let me say that we are pursuing a policy of the containment of Russian communism. That is the entire basis of our policy all over the world. We are spending money for American troops, which is the largest cost, and we are spending money for economic aid to countries and for arms aid to countries. In that policy we have repeatedly defied Russia. We have repeatedly endangered this country or have brought about a condition because of which Russia might start a third world war.

In the case of Europe we have not hesitated to say to Russia, "Cross this line and you will find yourself at war with the United States." We have not done that in respect to Asia or Indochina or anywhere else in the world. We have notified Russia that we are going to establish on their borders a tremendous army of 60 divisions, an army of millions of men who may themselves, apparently, constitute a sufficient threat of the actual invasion of Russia.

China is thousands of miles away from Russia, so anything we do in that area cannot possibly constitute a threat of invasion of Russia.

We risked a war in Greece when we supported the anti-Communists, for the Russians might have gone there and might have supported the Communists.

In this entire period we have constantly taken the risk that the Russians might start a third world war; and in Europe we have taken a far greater risk of that than we have been willing to take in Asia.

The Secretary of State blithely announced, when he returned from the Brussels Conference, that we were going to arm Germany with armored divisions. We got a quick notice from Russia then that if we did that, Russia would consider it a cause of war. General Eisenhower very wisely, I think, backed down from that position because, more than anything else, the Russians fear the possible invasion of Russia by German troops.

Over and over again we have taken the chance that Russia might start a third world war.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I shall yield in a minute.

Mr. President, I think that so far as possible we must refrain from anything which would give the Russians legitimate cause for believing that we are contemplating an invasion of Russia, for I think that is what perhaps might cause them to begin a third world war. Otherwise, they will start a third world war when they are ready to start it, regardless of what our action may be.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Ohio is aware, is he not, of the existence of a treaty of mutual assistance between Russia and Red China, to be implemented in the event either of them is attacked?

Mr. TAFT. I am also aware of the fact that all during our war with Japan, Russia had a nonaggression pact providing that Russia would cooperate with Japan, and I am further aware that Russia never kept her word in accordance with that treaty. The Russians will keep their treaties only when it is convenient to the Russian interests to do so.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Ohio aware of the existence of the treaty which has been described by me?

Mr. TAFT. I know there is such a treaty; I have not read it. Not only that, but I think it is highly unimportant, if the Senator wishes to know my opinion of it, because I say that in the past the Russians have had treaties which they have ignored or violated. The Russians had a treaty with Japan, but the Russians directly violated that treaty when they went to war with Japan; and the Russians did not go to war with Japan until they were ready to do so.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Ohio has said that we have repeatedly done that which involved a risk of provoking war with Russia equal to that which would be involved in the proposed action of expanding the present conflict in Asia on a basis which would carry it to Red China.

Mr. TAFT. That is what I have said, yes.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Ohio tell the Senator with reference to any other risk to which he has referred, wherein the taking of it would have compelled Russia either to intervene or back down in connection with a treaty which she had or has, of equal dignity with the treaty she has with Red China?

Mr. TAFT. Off the record, I do not know. I have not stated that. I have, however, seen a list of 50 treaties which Stalin had, written from the time going back to about 1940, none of which he ever kept, all of which were violated by Russia; so that what kind of treaty Russia has with anyone I think is highly unimportant.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator mentioned a treaty—a nonaggression treaty, I believe—which Russia had with Japan at the time Japan was engaged in war with China. But is it not a fact that under such nonaggression treaties, a country is bound to go to war only if its ally is attacked? If Japan did the attacking, as occurred at Pearl Harbor, or as occurred in China, there would be no obligation on Russia in such a case as that to enter into the war, would there?

Mr. TAFT. I am afraid I am not familiar with the exact terms of the treaty. I only know that when the Russians did go to war with Japan, they directly violated the treaty—and they did not hesitate to do it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator from Ohio know, first, that the agreement which Russia had with Japan was not a mutual assistance pact; and, second, that it was openly repudiated and publicly repudiated by Russia several months before she declared war on Japan?

Mr. TAFT. I could not say. I am not familiar with all the circumstances. I only say that there is nothing which has been suggested which answers the questions or the statement I have made, that we have not hesitated to give Russia cause for war. We have gone into Turkey, from which Russian cities may be bombed; we have armed the Turks; we certainly would consider the arming Mexico by Russia as a cause of war on the part of Russia. We have given them all the cause they want, if they want to go to war.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator know of any treaty which Russia has with anyone, whereby she has agreed to come into a war, or to begin a war against us or anybody else who did what the Senator has described, and as we have done in the case of Turkey?

Mr. TAFT. I know no more about the terms of the treaties which Russia has than does the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if the Senator, in confessing his ignorance, would limit it to himself, and let the Senator from Oklahoma confess his own.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS TO PERSONS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is on the desk a communication from the President of the United States, which I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the Chair) laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 10, 1951.

The honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Attached is a draft of legislation which would extend certain benefits to persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950.

I believe the desirability of such legislation will be readily apparent to the Congress. Unless and until such legislation is enacted, certain individuals already separated from the military service, and whose needs are acute, will be denied medical and hospital care.

In view of this situation, I hope the Congress will take favorable action on this legislation at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The communication will lie on the table.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, which is handling veterans' legislation, I have had conferences with the representatives of the Defense Department and other executive agencies, and I have also had a conference with a majority of the members of the Senate Finance Committee. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who, in the absence of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], is the ranking member of that committee at this time, advises me that he will not object to action upon a joint resolution, without its reference to committee. It is a very gracious concession upon the part of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and upon the part of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and other Senators, as well as on the part of the Senators on this side.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who is a member of the Senate Finance Committee, and on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution and request its immediate consideration, without reference to a committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any person who shall have served in the active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall, subject to other provisions of law and resolutions, be entitled to benefits of medical and hospital care, compensation or pension provided by law for persons who served during the period of World War II.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in explanation of the request for immediate action, I may say that certain returned soldiers who have fought in Korea now have difficulty in obtaining admittance to the hospitals, and, in fact, in certain instances, they have been denied admittance, because technically they were not wartime casualties, in that there had been no formal declaration, of course, of the Korean war, although there has been a recognition of the existence of war there, in House bill 1, covering the matter of insurance, which has already been passed by the Senate. This measure is necessary in order to provide compensation for wartime service-connected disability, and in order to admit to the hospitals, on the basis of wartime casualties, the soldiers who are returning from Korea. I therefore request immediate consideration of the joint resolution by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am in full sympathy with the purposes of this joint resolution but, reserving the right to object, I should merely like to ask the distinguished Senator whether he polled all the members of the minority?

Mr. GEORGE. I polled all the Members who were present. The distinguished Senator from Ohio, who is the second ranking minority Member, is on the floor at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is this joint resolution intended to affect in any way the benefits which are provided in the so-called GI bill of rights?

Mr. GEORGE. No, it does not touch them at all. They would be separate and distinct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is one provision in the joint resolution which I had not noticed, and about which I have some doubt. I want to say, in the first place, that I believe the Senate should know that a joint resolution to accomplish approximately these purposes was introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and that it has been pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The provision about which I am somewhat doubtful is the one which reads:

> Any person who shall have served in the active service of the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date, as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

And so forth. I have seen a good many laws dating back to the Korean war or the Korean battle, but I somewhat question the right or desirability of extending this measure in these words, "and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation."

Mr. GEORGE. I raised the same question, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I was advised that that was intended to mean "until"; in other words, that is the termination date, when it is cut off, either by Presidential proclamation or by a concurrent resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, I see; it is not intended to mean what I had thought. It is the termination date of the service.

Mr. GEORGE. The words do not refer to the beginning of the service. If the service commenced after June 27, and at any time between that date and the actual date when the war status in Korea is ended, either by Presidential proclamation or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, a disability has been suffered, the veteran will be cared for.

Mr. TAFT. There is one other matter referred to in the joint resolution. It says, "Any person who shall have served in the active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950."

That would apparently extend the privileges to anyone, whether he fought in Korea or whether he did not fight in Korea. It seems to establish the period since June 27, 1950, as a period of war for all purposes, so far as the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force of the United States are concerned. I wonder whether that is a desirable thing to do, and whether it should not be confined to those who have served abroad, or who have served in Korea. I have reached no conclusion about it.

Mr. GEORGE. To those who are otherwise eligible under existing law or who are otherwise qualified under law or resolution. There has been given to the President the power to designate combat areas. They are restricted to areas in which fighting has been going on in the east. Unless one can qualify, he cannot be considered as having been wounded in such an area. But there would be no objection to putting into the joint resolution the definite statement, if the Senator wishes to do so, that it shall apply only to those men who are killed or wounded in the combat area in Korea, or the Korean area.

The only difficulty about such a provision, however, is that it might be restrictive, because it might exclude men leaving camp. Men who have received injury in the active military service and who, under existing law or resolution, would be entitled to hospitalization, medical care, and so forth, would be cared for. The Veterans' Administration drew this resolution with the statement that the resolution would accomplish what was intended, and nothing more.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I find that the words used are the same as those in Senate Joint Resolution 68, introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I have no objection to the manner in which the words are used. I think perhaps the House should consider the question to be certain that the measure does accord with existing legislation.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. The same difficulty arose in my mind, but on reflection I think this resolution will take care of the situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the Washington Post of Thursday, May 10, on the front page of which is an article reading as follows:

VA HOSPITAL BARS VETERAN OF KOREA

TUCSON, ARIZ., May 9.—A combat veteran was denied treatment at the Veterans' hospital here today because the United States is not officially at war in Korea.

Col. J. E. Gaines, manager of the Veterans' hospital, said he was powerless to help the Korean veteran because congressional law still considers the Korean combat veteran as a peacetime soldier.

Mr. President, this joint resolution is intended to correct that and other similar situations which have been called to our attention. It is to strike through the fiction that we are not at war today, even though our forces have suffered 65,000 casualties—which means a very real war to the American people, particularly to the men who are fighting, and to those who have lost sons, brothers, or husbands there. The joint resolution is to break through the film of fiction that we are only in a police action, but that actually we are at war. It is to allow veterans to qualify as if they were wounded in a real war, which I think is the case. Is not that a proper statement of the situation?

Mr. GEORGE. The joint resolution is intended to take care of the situation which arises from the fact that in all veterans' legislation there is a distinction between peacetime service and wartime service. There has been no formal declaration of war, as the Senator from New Hampshire has indicated. That being true, for the purpose of hospitalization and compensation it is necessary to pass this joint resolution so as to give those serving in Korea who suffer service-connected casualties the same treatment they would have received if they had been in World War II.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, it recognizes that a state of war exists between the United States and the Communist government of North Korea and the Communist government of China.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator knows very well that there is a prolonged hearing in progress at this time, and I do not care to get into any technical discussion about the question. I would say only this, that so far as insurance and death compensation is concerned, we have already taken care of those soldiers who are serving or have served in active military service in Korea or in any combat area, from the time they left their camps to report for duty, where they have been actually called for service.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the fundamental reason——

Mr. GEORGE. It is to put these men on the basis of wartime casualties. Frankly, that is the reason for the joint resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. And the reason why they are war casualties is because they have been injured in a war with either Communist China or the North Korean Communist government.

Mr. GEORGE. They have been engaged in a war. I take no issue with the Senator on that point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps it is beside the point, but are the men already covered by any other law? I have in mind the case of one of our men in Vienna, Austria, who was shot by two Russians.

Mr. GEORGE. That is not a combat area.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But is such a man covered?

Mr. GEORGE. He may be covered by insurance. He was in active military service.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it should be borne in mind that this joint resolution does not apply to Army hospitals.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I imagine the reason why we have not had this kind of legislation before is that the men are taken care of in Army hospitals in Korea, and now we have the problem of taking care of them in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Mr. GEORGE. Some of them have been discharged, and while they are entitled to medical care and attention in an Army hospital, they are not so entitled in Veterans' Bureau hospitals, and will not be until this joint resolution has been enacted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator has been using the term "war casualties," and other such phrases have been used in the debate. The purpose is merely to take care of those who have service-connected disabilities, that is, disabilities incurred in connection with fighting.

It is my understanding that if they have service-connected disabilities they would be entitled to care in veterans' hospitals. But as I understand, from the report which I saw in the newspaper today, the question arises from the case of a veteran who had been discharged and whose disability is not known to have been service connected.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct; but in order to prevent a case arising where there undoubtedly is a service-connected disability, it is necessary, from the standpoint of the Veterans' Bureau, to have this joint resolution passed.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota is not questioning the importance and the necessity of passing the proposed legislation, but I would not want the RECORD to imply that it is merely opening the doors of the veterans' hospitals to those who have been injured in theaters of combat, because I believe the purpose to be to open the doors of veterans' hospitals to any veteran who has served in a combat area, whether or not he has a service-connected disability. The case in Arizona arose in connection with a veteran who did not have a known service-connected disability. He had some difficulty with his neck. Probably the disorder was cancer, or something of that sort.

Mr. GEORGE. A soldier who returns discharged from Korea and has a service-connected disability, and who would otherwise be entitled to compensation or to medical care and hospitalization without having to wait until his turn came, so to speak, might find it difficult to comply and to obtain his rights because of the construction of the law by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was wondering whether or not the case which was mentioned in the press, to which reference was made by the Senator from New Hampshire, was the type of case which would be covered by the provisions of the joint resolution. I understood that it did not involve a service-connected disability.

Mr. GEORGE. No. The person involved had had actual combat service, and the injury must have been sustained during that service.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I wanted to know. It was not an actual service-connected disability?

Mr. GEORGE. It may not have been a service-connected disability. Frequently it takes some time to determine whether or not it is.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not correct to say, as we have learned from our service on the Committee on Appropriations, that, so far as veterans are concerned, those who have service-connected disability are admitted first?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. If there is a bed available, such a veteran gets it?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. If it is not a case of a service-connected disability, if the veteran will sign a certain form—I do

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

not believe it is an affidavit—he is admitted after all service-connected disability cases have been admitted?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct, with reference to such veterans.

Mr. FERGUSON. The provisions of the joint resolution would cover men who are actually in the armed services and ordinarily would go to an Army hospital. In other words, they could be taken into a veterans' hospital?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct, as I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. When I asked a question of the distinguished Senator previously I was thinking of the joint resolution which had been introduced by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. It was mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I am wondering whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia would include as a cosponsor of his joint resolution the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be happy to do so. The committee simply did not reach a consideration of the joint resolution introduced by the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to include the name of the senior Senator from New York as a cosponsor of the pending joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 68), introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] on May 1 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 68) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a semicolon and the following: "Service on or after June 27, 1950.—Any person who served in the active military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it was never my intention to misrepresent the attitude of any Senator on any subject. At this point I wish to read into the RECORD the Associated Press Dispatch bearing upon the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] before the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, but I am wondering, inasmuch as we have broken into the consideration of the appropriation bill, and the yeas and nays had already been ordered, whether we could not proceed to vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is only 4 o'clock. I do not intend to speak for more than 3 or 4 minutes.

I read the Associated Press dispatch under date of April 30, reporting the speech of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]:

WASHINGTON.—Senator TAFT today urged a half-million-man cut in the projected American military forces and a $20,000,000,000 reduction in the mobilization budget, but called for " a more aggressive war in Asia." The present fighting, he said, is "a stalemate war," which the American public, in his opinion, will not tolerate indefinitely. TAFT asserted that "a soft-war policy" carries danger of ending in "an appeasement peace." TAFT asserted his belief that the proposed 3,500,000 strength of the American Armed Forces is too high for the economy to support indefinitely.

On the next day, May 1, the New York Times headlined a front-page article by Joseph A. Loftus:

Taft asks cut-back in armament goal—but, in debate with Acheson before United States Chamber, he urges China bombing, blockade.

The article reads:

WASHINGTON, April 30.—Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican of Ohio, demanded today a more aggressive attitude toward Communist China to wind up the Korean War, but Secretary of State Dean Acheson insisted the policy of keeping the conflict from spreading must be pursued.

Both men addressed the thirty-ninth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Skipping a little, I read:

Senator TAFT said the United States should at least try the plan of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur: use Chinese Nationalist troops, bomb Chinese Communist bases in Manchuria, and blockade Communist China.

At the same time, the Ohio Senator declared that the cost of maintaining an armed force of 3,500,000 men indefinitely could wreck the American economy. He called for a reduction of a half million in the United States Armed Forces objective and a $20,000,000,000 cut in the American mobilization budget.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAFT ASKS CUT-BACK IN ARMAMENT GOAL—BUT IN DEBATE WITH ACHESON BEFORE UNITED STATES CHAMBER HE URGES CHINA BOMBING, BLOCKADE

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican of Ohio, demanded today a more aggressive attitude toward Communist China to wind up the Korean war, but Secretary of State Dean Acheson insisted the policy of keeping the conflict from spreading must be pursued.

Both men addressed the thirty-ninth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The Secretary, who read a prepared address, was applauded politely. Senator TAFT, in a free-swinging speech, was interrupted by applause several times and received an ovation when he finished.

Senator TAFT said the United States should at least try the plan of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur: use Chinese Nationalist troops, bomb Chinese Communist bases in Manchuria, and blockade Communist China.

At the same time the Ohio Senator declared that the cost of maintaining an armed force of 3,500,000 men indefinitely could wreck the American economy. He called for a reduction of a half a million in the United States Armed Forces objective, and a $20,000,000,000 cut in the American mobilization budget.

Secretary Acheson said that the other day at Paris Andrei Gromyko, the Soviet Union's Deputy Foreign Minister, "was playing back to us some of the arguments he has been overhearing from this side of the Atlantic about Korea.

ACHESON LISTS KOREAN OBJECTIVES

"He raised the question whether or not we are going to hold to our course in Korea with firm determination," Mr. Acheson continued. "Well the answer is, 'We are.'"

Mr. Acheson said "our objectives in Korea are very clear, and there should be no misunderstanding about them." He cited three: "(1) We are trying to stop this act of aggression; (2) we are trying to keep this conflict from spreading, to the extent that it is in our power to do so; (3) we are trying to restore peace and security to the area."

The Secretary acknowledged that the fighting might spread despite efforts to limit it, that further acts of the aggressors could touch off a world war. He said it was also possible that the fighting might be brought to an end.

"The best way to do this," he said, "is for us to continue firm in our determination to meet and repel the enemy until it becomes clear to him that his aggression cannot pay. There must be an end to the fighting, there must be concrete measures against the renewal of the attack, and there must be an abandonment by the enemy of his attempt to conquer the Republic of Korea."

TAFT SEES NORTH KOREA YIELDED

Senator TAFT, referring to that statement, interpreted it as meaning Secretary Acheson was "no longer interested in North Korea, and we are going to let the Chinese Communists get away with that aggression."

Senator TAFT apparently either had read or heard the Secretary of State's remarks. He was not on the platform when the Secretary spoke. Mr. Acheson left to keep a White House engagement when Senator TAFT began speaking.

Mr. Acheson named four "accomplishments" of our Korean action:

"First, this act of aggression has not succeeded according to the Soviet plan, and whatever other actions were planned have been interfered with.

"Second, the defense against this aggression has served to arouse free men all over the world, and has stimulated them to speed up their efforts to build a strong defense system.

"Third, new vitality has pulsed through the whole idea of collective security against aggression.

"And fourth, this device of satellite aggression has been thoroughly exposed and its usefulness in other situations has been reduced."

Senator TAFT said that the present policy of President Truman and the Joint Chiefs of Staff was "a stalemate war" and that the American people would not stand for that indefinitely.

He said, "the President's hopes are almost pitiful." The Senator was applauded when he added that the President said apparently that if you don't notice that the Chinese are there, maybe they will go away.

"As far as preventing the war," Senator TAFT went on, "the President in his speech says that we prevented world war III by

moving in against the first aggressor to break the peace since the Second World War. And then he says, now we prevent world war III by not punishing the aggressor when the aggressor is bigger.

HOLDS AGGRESSION ENCOURAGED

"He says that now we prevent world war III by fighting a soft little war with the Chinese Communists, and not really doing anything about it.

"I cannot imagine anything that more encourages aggression than that attitude, because here is an aggressor who is not to be punished, whose towns are not even to be bombed, and even those who oppose him in his own country are not to be supported.

"It is perfectly safe apparently for a big aggressor to go right ahead and aggress without the slightest idea of punishment, and the turning over to him of whatever he can actually secure by force of arms."

Senator TAFT said the only argument urged today against the bombing of Chinese Communist bases in China itself was that it would bring Russia into the war. "We have taken a lot of chances on Russia's coming into the war," he said. He cited the Berlin airlift, the aid to anti-Communists in Greece, and the Atlantic Treaty.

"I think," he added, "the Russians may bring a third world war if they see something like invasion of Russia, but certainly the bombing of Manchurian bases or the use of Chiang's troops is nothing that threatens even remotely any invasion of Russian territory."

The crowd applauded this statement.

Senator TAFT said that in the end the choice must be between the MacArthur policy and what he called "the former Acheson policy, which may or may not be abandoned." The Acheson policy, he asserted, would mean the surrender of Formosa and the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

"I think it is desirable that we adopt a more aggressive attitude in China," Senator TAFT declared. "That does not mean any invasion of China. Invasion of China is morally justified, but it is something we cannot do. The measures proposed are measures to enable us to win the war in Korea, and by at least expelling the Chinese from Korea, defeating the purpose of their aggression."

Otto A. Seyferth, retiring president of the chamber, spoke on the theme of the meeting "Put Freedom First." He assailed those in business, labor, agriculture, and elsewhere who put selfish material advantages for themselves ahead of freedom.

To these he added agricultural groups, school officials, and politicians who seek subsidies, hand-outs, and special privilege.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I have inserted in the RECORD a copy of my speech. It is the stenographic report of what I said. It was made by the stenographers who were employed by the Chamber of Commerce. The text of my speech is now in the RECORD, and so is the AP report of it. I recognize the Senator's right to proceed on the basis of the AP report. However, the actual words which I used, as they were taken down at the time, are in the RECORD.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I merely wish to make it crystal clear for the RECORD that the Senator from Connecticut did not try to misrepresent any position taken by the Senator from Ohio, and to point out that his position was reported by the Associated Press, one of the great newspaper reporting services of the country, and was published by the New York Times.

Mr. President, I have only two or three more observations to make. I do not wish to delay a vote on the pending amendment.

There is developing in this country a theory which the Senator from Ohio has adopted, and which may be stated in this way: Regardless of what is done, the Russians have a timetable, which is as irrevocable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. It does not make any difference what we do; the Russians are going to follow the timetable anyway.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I decline to yield. I will yield in a moment. I say it is equivalent to saying that war is absolutely inevitable. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I said nothing of the kind. What I said was that if the Russians were going to attack, I thought they would attack when they considered it desirable from their point of view to attack. I have often expressed the opinion, and it is my view, that they are not going to attack.

I have further expressed the opinion this afternoon that if they are not going to attack, and their intention is not to attack, the only thing that would lead them to attack would be something that would threaten the invasion of Russia itself. That might change their intention not to attack. However, I say that the chances are in favor of their not attacking. I suggested nothing about a timetable. I suggested that if they do intend to attack, they will choose the time which they find to be the most suitable for their purposes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has clarified his position to his own satisfaction. I still say that it is being constantly said in this country that the Soviets will attack only when they get ready. If we reduce that argument to its absurdity, it would mean that they have fixed a certain date, and no matter what we might do, no matter how we might treat their allies, even to the point of our bombing the Kremlin itself, if it did not happen to coincide with the day they have fixed, it would not make any difference.

Mr. President, as Secretary Marshall has so ably pointed out, we conducted the Berlin airlift, and we were successful in that limited operation. There were those who declared and counseled then that we should run an armored train through the territory held by the Soviet troops. We resolved that difficulty. We went into Greece and Turkey. We gave the support within those countries which removed from them the threat of Communist aggression. But we did not engage in any side forays into Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, or Russia itself.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, we had no troops of our own in Greece. In the second place, the Bulgarians never attacked our troops, as the Chinese have done. Does the Senator realize that we have a war on our hands; that it was brought about by the administration; and that the action of the administration is what has made likely or possible a third world war through an attack by Russia?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the administration has been charged with many things, but this is the first time I have known that we initiated a war in Korea, a war which is now going on, and which has gone on since June 26, 1951; a war which came after a decision by the United Nations and the President of the United States with respect to which the Senator from Ohio has said that if it had been put to him he would have approved it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I realize the desire of my friend the minority leader and others to reach a vote on the pending measure, and I shall not take too much time.

I have been impressed today by some of the paradoxes of this debate, and by what I shall call the catch-one's-self-going-around the-corner type of argument.

Within the past 5 minutes I have heard the Senator from Ohio say that we have a war. I took down his exact words. He said, "We have a war." Yet the Senator from Ohio said in his speech before the Chamber of Commerce that he felt that a $70,000,000,000 budget was all that we could stand in peace time. I submit that if we have a war today, we had one when he spoke before the Chamber of Commerce. To say that we ought to cut the budget because a certain amount is all we can afford to spend in peacetime, and that we cannot go up to $85,000,000,000 in time of hostilities does not make much sense in terms of saying that we have a war at this day and hour. There seems to be a contradiction.

The statement has been made again and again by certain Senators, within the same debate, within the same hour, that we are at peace, and that we must be careful, and, on the other hand, stating within the next 15 minutes that we are at war. Sooner or later someone had better make up his mind.

It is perfectly obvious, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out, that we have hostilities in Korea. It is perfectly obvious that we live in a world filled with the possibility of the spread of hostilities. I say that it would be folly on the part of Congress to ignore a situation which has been documented again and again on the basis of casualties in the Korean area. The Soviet imperialistic aggressors are on the march. For us to talk about a reduction of our Armed Forces, the reduction of our preparedness budget, and to talk about waging a more elaborate and more ag-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

gressive war when we are now unprepared even to wage the kind of war we are waging, does not seem to me to be sound military strategy.

I should like to point out one further paradox. As the Senator from Connecticut was reading the press reports concerning the speech of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] the word "appeasement" crept in. There seem to be two themes in this debate, by the same speakers. On the one hand, they say that it was this administration which got us into the war. On the other hand, they say that this administration is an appeasement administration. I submit that that we cannot have appeasement and a war all in the same day, and involving the same adversary.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will let the two distinguished Senators decide to whom.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that the administration of Mr. Chamberlain, which went to Munich for the appeasement, was the same administration which found itself in power when Hitler's Germany finally struck? So it is entirely possible for an administration to become involved in war and, before the event or after the event, also to participate in appeasement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the historical analysis which the Senator from California has given me. The only trouble is that he is trying to put in a capsule a series of events which happened over months instead of days.

There is no doubt that when Chamberlain went to Munich he was an appeaser. It is also true that when Britain declared war under the obligations of her treaty with Poland she was not an appeaser.

What the Senator from Minnesota is saying at this particular hour is that it is absolutely ridiculous; it is a play on words; it is a repudiation of the meaning of words, to say that a nation is at war with another nation, and then to say that it is appeasing the same nation, because appeasement does not mean war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest that the able Senator from Minnesota wait until all the testimony is before the combined committees, to see whether or not it can be documented that the policies which this administration is undertaking will lead to a far-eastern Munich of as great significance to the peace of the world as was the original Munich.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for that advice. Would that he had given that advice some weeks ago to some of the self-styled generals who started the debate. It was not the Senator from Minnesota who decided that he knew how to conduct the war in Korea. It was not the Senator from Minnesota who decided that the MacArthur proposals represented a quick and easy path to a great military victory. All at once we find more generals in the Senate than ever came from West Point.

It was not the junior Senator from Minnesota who wanted to debate military strategy. As a matter of fact, this debate started the very minute the President dismissed General MacArthur. It had started even before that.

The junior Senator from Minnesota is simply saying to the Senator from California, the Senator from Ohio, and other Senators that we cannot have appeasement and war in the same action, at the same time, and at the same place. It is impossible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that this administration has proved that it can be that inconsistent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator believe that this administration has appeased in Formosa and has put on a war in Korea, at the same moment, on the basis of utterly inconsistent policies?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to reply to my good and able friend from Ohio. I really hesitate even to make rejoinder to that observation, because the Senator from Minnesota is not an expert in inconsistency. I yield that honor to the Senator from Ohio, who has had an inconsistent foreign policy from the very first utterance; the Senator from Ohio, who could not see the merit in military assistance; the Senator from Ohio, who had doubts as to the efficacy of the Marshall plan; the Senator from Ohio, who was disturbed as to how far we ought to go in Western Europe; the Senator from Ohio, who understands that Formosa is more important than Great Britain; the Senator from Ohio, who now has plans how to win the war in China. The Senator from Minnesota is not going to take away from the Senator from Ohio the honor of becoming a doctor of laws in inconsistency. If this administration is inconsistent, it has been getting some fine examples in the debate which has taken place on the present issue of foreign policy.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota on his statement. The Senator from Oklahoma had risen to ask the Senator from Minnesota if the Senator from Ohio had not put on a demonstration which set a new world record in the field of inconsistency.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to receive the observation of my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma. We are kindred souls in this debate, and I follow his most able leadership.

Mr. President, is it not interesting to see who is talking about appeasement? Is it not interesting to hear, for example, the minority leader talking about appeasement? I am sorry that he is not in the Chamber at this moment. I regret to have to speak of him while he is not present. Let us get him in.

Is it not interesting to hear the minority leader talk about appeasement when, if my memory serves me correctly, according to the RECORD, the minority leader did not even support the Greek-Turkish aid program?

Is it not interesting to hear the talk about appeasement on the part of Senators who voted against the North Atlantic Pact?

Is it not interesting to hear about appeasement from Senators who voted even against military assistance for our western allies? I submit that this administration has had a record of fighting communism not with words but with deeds. Let us document it again. We need to drive these points home.

The President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, proposed Greek-Turkish aid. I commend the Congress for passing the measure. But I say that the most vociferous opponents of our present foreign policy are the very men who opposed Greek-Turkish aid. Secretary of Defense Marshall, formerly the Secretary of State, Mr. Marshall, proposed in a great speech, as I recall it at Harvard University, the theme of the Marshall plan. The Marshall plan is our greatest instrument in the fight against international Communists.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me conclude that thought, and I shall be delighted to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota does not yield at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota is merely pointing out that those who have again and again tried to scuttle the Marshall plan, who have tried to limit its effectiveness, are the ones who today are talking about appeasement. I say that anyone who looks at any Communist literature, or hears Communist broadcasts, anyone who has ever heard as much as a statement from a Communist speaker, knows that the Marshall plan has been their No. 1 enemy. It is the Marshall plan they have been opposed to. It is to the eternal credit of the Congress of the United States—yes, the Eightieth Congress, Mr. President—and to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State who, during that period were President Truman and Secretary Marshall, that the Marshall plan was proposed and adopted.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if the Marshall plan as originally proposed by the present Secretary of Defense did not include Russia and its satellites as beneficiaries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Marshall plan as originally proposed was the plan for world peace, for world stabilization, for world security.

Mr. KEM. And for appeasement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the gate was left open for any nation that wished to work for peace.

Mr. KEM. Originally the Marshall plan was a plan for appeasement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to get that new and strange definition. It has taken a long time to figure it out. I am of the opinion that sooner or later we will not only hear that the Marshall plan

is a plan for appeasement, but we may hear that our atomic energy plants are, somehow or other, to be labeled "plans for appeasement," and there will be no end to such misrepresentation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is it true or not true that the Marshall plan as originally proposed by General Marshall, included Russia and the satellites as beneficiaries?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri, who is an expert on the limitations of the Marshall plan, that I do not recall that General Marshall made any mention of any limitation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, is it true——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am speaking of it in its initial stage. Let us not get down to appendices or additions or anything like that to my remarks before I get through with what I want to say. All I wish to say is that the Marshall plan was offered by this country to all the nations of the world on the basis of rebuilding their economies. It was by that kind of work, the rebuilding of the economies of the countries of the world in a spirit of friendship and assistance, that the peace of the world was to be found.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Because of what the Senator from Minnesota has just said, I should like to ask him a question. In view of the fact that the Marshall plan originally included Russia and the satellites as beneficiaries, does the Senator still want the Senate to understand that he believes the Marshall plan as then proposed was a method or plan of fighting communism?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am terribly sorry, I will say to the Senator, but I did not hear his question. I was asking for some materials I wanted brought into the Senate Chamber. Will the Senator repeat his question? I apologize to him.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator if, in view of what he just said, that the Marshall plan as originally proposed included Russia and the satellites as beneficiaries, he still wants the Senate to understand that the Marshall plan as originally proposed was a plan or method of fighting communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the Senator from Minnesota did not say that the Marshall plan, as it was originally proposed, was a plan for fighting the Soviet Union. That is not what the Senator from Minnesota said. The Senator from Minnesota said that the Marshall plan was an instrument for rebuilding the economy of all nations of the world. We offered it to all nations, that is true. The Marshall plan has turned out to be our most effective weapon against communism. I remind Senators that the more effective a weapon it became the more opposition came from some Senators. There was more enthusiasm on the part of some for the Marshall plan when it was initiated, than when it started to bring about results. There was more enthusiasm and more unanimity of support for the Marshall plan when it was originally established as a plan for offering help to all countries, when there was vote after vote in the Senate in favor of it, than when it showed results as being an effective weapon against world communism. Those who charge this administration with appeasement of communism, are the very same Senators, in the main, who voted against or to limit the Marshall plan.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say that our action in issuing a call to the nations of the world to get together for the purpose of seeing whether or not we could restore the economy of Western Europe was an example of moral leadership the dividends from which have accrued to the United States from the time that Molotov found out that what we proposed was to create a condition in Western Europe that would make it impossible for the Western European countries to drop like ripe plums into the lap of the Communists. Molotov took his crew and went home, and by going home he gave evidence to the free world that they intended to divide the free world, they intended to keep up the cold war. It was that act of "statesmanship" which did more than anythiny else to demonstrate to all the world what their malign intention was.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Connecticut, because he has pointed out what I think will stand as one of the great glories in our entire history, namely, that the United States of America, after great sacrifice in World War II, recognized that communism is born in the ruins of war, that all forms of totalitarianism find fertile soil where there is misery, poverty, unemployment, and chaos, our Nation acted to check communism—it acted boldly and effectively.

Mr. President, I think that no one can dispute that where there is economic destruction, where there is a collapse of the economy, of the political organization and structure, that here is the hunting ground of the Communist beast. So what did our our Government do? It proposed to the free nations of the world, it proposed to the people of the world, what Abraham Lincoln once proposed, "to bind up the wounds," "with malice toward none and with charity for all." And I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, that was in the spirit of the Nazarene, that was in the spirit of a Christian faith. Mr. President, it is in the spirit of a democracy. I think America will long be remembered because we were not willing to set one nation against another; that we were the peacemakers. I should like to admonish my colleagues to spend a little more time in trying to be peacemakers. I think it is about time we started spending a little more time thinking about the principles of peace, thinking about how we can honorably settle differences.

We must all spend more time in thinking about such subjects, because a war, as has been so brilliantly and ably pointed out by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], will mean destruction and catastrophe such as was never known before.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at this time. The Senator from Minnesota is merely trying to say that to brand these measures as acts of appeasement is literally to destroy the meaning of the word. I want to say that the first step toward destroying democracy is to create in people a sense of cynicism for their institutions of government. The next step toward destroying democracy is to adulterate the meaning of words. When Hitler talked "peace" he meant "war." When Hitler talked "freedom" he meant "enslavement." This Government has put up strong resistance against communism, and to call that appeasement is to destroy the meaning of the word.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Did the President of the United States consult the Senate when he ordered our troops into war in Korea?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, the President of the United States did not consult the Senate. Presidents of the United States on many occasions—I do not want to go over 175 years of history with my friend from Missouri, but if he really wishes to I shall be glad to accommodate him—have taken such action. The history of this country is, of course, filled with actions of that kind on the part of the President of the United States, who is charged under the Constitution with the common defense and protecting our borders and our security.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I then ask the Senator, with his knowledge of history, whether he can point out any case in which the Chief Magistrate of this Nation ordered our troops into battle without the consent of the Congress, and that as a result of such hasty action more than 65,000 American casualties ensued?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I cannot point out any case in which there were 65,000 casualties, but that does not in any way change the principle which is involved. Regardless of whether there are 10 casualties or 75,000 casualties, the principle is that under the Constitution and under the legal and the traditional history of our country, the President has not only the right but the obligation to defend the security of the United States by acting as Commander in Chief.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that the distinguished Senator from Missouri who asked the question is one of the very few Members of either House of Congress who felt that the President was doing wrong when he sent the troops into Korea? My impression is that a cry went up throughout the United States, from Senators, Representatives, other Government officials, and the people generally, that the President did a proper

thing when he sent our troops into Korea. General MacArthur himself said that was entirely the right thing to do, and I take it that there was no alternative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I believe some of the advocates of General MacArthur have done him an injustice. General MacArthur has talked about a global principle of foreign relations. He has talked about our commitments around the world. Yet his vociferous advocates have tried to keep the world divided into neat little packages which they could manage each week, and about which they could talk on occasion, as if those divisions were separate entities.

However, from what I have read of General MacArthur's testimony, I think he would cut the ground right out from under Mr. Hoover's position in one swift swoop; and, if I may say so, if General MacArthur did not cut the ground out from under the Senator from Ohio, at least he cut off the balcony and the ceiling.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I deny that the position I have taken is in any way inconsistent with General MacArthur's testimony on Saturday morning. I have read his statement. What he said has been grossly misrepresented by the administration press.

So far as I can see, there is absolutely nothing with which I would not agree in what General MacArthur announced to the two committees in answer to questions asked by the distinguished Senator from Texas, who asked about the general's position as to how far he should be limited by congressional action in conducting a war. I certainly would not limit anyone by congressional action in conducting a war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his observation.

I was somewhat interested, if the Senator does not mind my making a point of it, in his reference to the administration press. I should like to yield to him a few seconds so that he can name the two or three newspapers.

Mr. TAFT. The Washington Post, primarily, in its Sunday edition grossly misrepresented the position of General MacArthur and my position and any possible difference between them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wanted the Senator from Ohio to have that opportunity.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I hold in my hand a ticker report to the effect that the Senator from Minnesota today has made what seems to be a rather belligerent or warlike statement. The Senator from Minnesota is reported as declaring that the United States would go to war in a minute if India were attacked by Russia or Communist China. In that connection, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota, whether he has in mind a war by Executive order or a war by declaration of the Congress, in accordance with the Constitution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to elaborate on that statement for the edification of the Senator from Missouri. It simply is this: If the Republic of India were attacked by the Soviet Union, it is patently obvious that the first thing that would happen would be action by the United Nations. First the United Nations would act to resist that aggression; and the principle in that connection has already been established in Korea. In the second place, we would extend military assistance; and if we found it to be of advantage to our national security, we would lend India military assistance, in terms of military equipment and manpower, in order to resist the aggression.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator have in mind that in the Korean incident, our troops were ordered into Korea on one day, but the action by the United Nations followed rather belatedly on the next day? Does the Senator have in mind that there might be a similar course of action in case India were invaded by Soviet Russia or by Communist China?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I do not have that in mind. However, I appreciate the precaution the Senator from Missouri has extended.

I am not going to argue about whether we were right in going into Korea. I have on my side of the argument such exemplary witneses as General MacArthur, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the President of the United States, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and persons from both political parties. I do not think we should take up the time of this body by arguing with one or two persons whether we should have gone into Korea. We are there.

I am trying to point out that there seems to be a bit of paradox in the present situation, when, on the one hand, it is said that we are at war, but, on the other hand, it is said that we engage in appeasement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was pointing out that the Greek-Turkish aid program does not represent appeasement.

I was pointing out that the Marshall plan does not represent appeasement. It represents a mighty blow against Communist aggression.

I am pointing out that the North Atlantic Pact, a pact of collective security, does not represent appeasement. It represents positive political steps to unite the free nations of the North Atlantic community in a great, defensive alliance. That is not appeasement.

I am pointing out that the Berlin airlift was not appeasement.

I am pointing out that the military assistance program, which was suggested by the administration and was adopted by the Congress is not appeasement.

I am pointing out that the sending of our troops to Europe is not appeasement; and sending General Eisenhower to Europe is not appeasement.

Finally, Mr. President, I am pointing out that the fact that we met military aggression in Korea—military aggression started by the North Korean Government, a Communist-stooge state, a satellite of the Soviet Union—is a complete repudiation of appeasement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a final argument on this matter of appeasement, I wish to point out that the stepping up of our military production, the insistence on the part of the administration for universal military training, the fact that we are mobilizing our manpower and our industry for great defensive efforts, entirely contradict the false argument of appeasement.

I submit that it does very little good to tell the American people time after time—as they are being taxed and taxed, as their sons are being called into military service, and as the casualty lists come home—that this is appeasement. It is not appeasement. It is well planned, sensible mobilization; it is resistance of Communist aggression.

Mr. President, it is one thing to talk of appeasement, but it is quite another thing to exercise sheer military folly.

What is the argument, then, of those who are in opposition? The argument of those who are in opposition is that if we do not have an all-out war or at least a somewhat larger one than we have now, we are appeasing.

Mr. President, a similar argument could have been made in World War II because we did not fight in Switzerland, I suppose it was a sign of appeasement that at that time we did not fight in Switzerland, even though supplies were going through Switzerland to the enemy. Or I suppose it was a sign of appeasement because at that time we did not fight in Spain, either. It is true that we were not fighting in either of those countries; but, Mr. President, we were doing what we thought was sufficient and necessary to enable us to win the victory, and we won it.

It is true that during World War II some persons insisted that we open up a second front sooner than we did. The Soviet Union said we should open up a second front sooner than we did. Some persons said we were appeasing by refraining from opening up a second front until we did; but surely it was sane, sober, and proper military judgment for us to act as we did in that case.

I remind the Members of this body that during World War II the Chief of Staff was George Marshall; and I remind the Senate that during World War II, George Marshall's judgments were some of the finest military judgments ever recorded in the history of the United States. After he led our country to military victory, as he did in World War II, I am not one to distrust his judgment in the Korean War. I think his judgment on military tactics is a little better than some of the judgments which we as United States Senators may make.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the question asked by the Senator from Missouri, relative to the statement carried over the wire services that the Senator from Minnesota stated that in the event of an attack on India, the United States would immediately be involved in war, the Senator from Minnesota subsequently said, as I understood him—and I do not mean to do him an injustice—that he meant that the United Nations would promptly take action in that event.

All I can say is that I hope that in the event there is aggression in India or anywhere else, the United Nations will take action more promptly in providing the forces with which to meet the aggression than the United Nations has done in the case of Korea, because the testimony shows that 11 months after the aggression took place in Korea, all of the United Nations put together, other than the United States of America, have supplied approximately 30,000 troops, which amount to roughly only 10 percent of the troops which have been supplied by the United States, and less by three thousand than the number of troops offered by the Republic of China 5 days after the aggression took place.

The great country of India, to which the Senator has referred, up to this very day, 11 months after the war, has not supplied a single soldier, sailor, marine, or airman in the interest of collective security in Korea, and I believe has supplied one ambulance unit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from California, and I commend him for the sincerity and the pointedness of his remarks. I, too, call upon our allies to give us more help. I, too, say that our allies have let us down in the Korean effort. But I also say, by the very fact of that acknowledgment, that the United States of America, as has been pointed out by the Senator from California, is not appeasing anyone, when we are putting in 90 percent of the troops. What kind of nonsense is this, to talk about appeasement, when we are bearing the brunt of the war? Of course we are not appeasing.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In view of the fact that we have done as much as we have in what has been done in Korea, does not that point out the absolute impossibility of justifying the position taken by those who say that, because we have had so little help as we have had in the limited war in which we are involved we should engage ourselves, by our own provocation, in a war which would be 10 times as big?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I certainly concur with his point of view. Did not General MacArthur say that, if need be, we should go alone?

Mr. KERR. I understand that that was his recommendation to the committees, and I should like to ask the Senator one more question, if I may.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. General MacArthur said he favored, at the time—and he still favors—an ultimatum to China by the United States, that if China did certain things we would consider it as a declaration of war. I am merely wondering whether, in what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has heard from the other side of the aisle, there has not been an indication by certain Senators that they would now like to have us issue an ultimatum to our allies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It appears that way. It appears to me that that is the case, and it also appears to me that the United States of America, in this year of our Lord 1951, is in no position to be telling our allies that we do not want them. I have said repeatedly that these allies may not be giants, these allies may not be as rugged as we want them to be, they may not always agree with our point of view; but I say to my friends in the Senate, they are the only allies we have, they are all we have. They are our partners.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Would it not be a great accomplishment, regardless of who brought it about, the primary benefit of which would go to Soviet Russia, if anyone succeeded in driving a wedge between the United States and the allies we now have?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that it is well known that the policy line, the propaganda line, of the Soviet Union, ever since the days of the Stockholm petition, and before, has been to divide us from our allies, and we have been walking a literal tightrope to keep our allies. That is because there are forces at work in those countries, as there are in ours, who would divide us, and who would destroy the sense of unity which we have.

Here we are, on the one hand sending General Eisenhower, a great general, to Europe, to bind together these allies, and some Senators spend time back here in the Senate insulting them. I call the attention of this honorable body to the fact that when we speak of the allies, there seems to be one or two allies around here in whom some people are very much interested. I have never heard such enthusiasm for the ally Chiang Kai-shek as I have heard here on the floor of the Senate. I do not want to throw him aside. I think Chiang Kai-shek ought to defend Formosa.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that connection, and remembering the statement made a moment earlier by the distinguished Senator from California, calling attention to the fact that, in the early stages of the Korean war, Chiang Kai-shek had offered to supply 33,000 troops to help in Korea, is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that General MacArthur, himself, agreed that those troops should not be accepted, and, for two reasons, recommended that they be not accepted? After all, the question of whether the troops would be accepted was left up to the recommendation of General MacArthur. He recommended that the Nationalist troops be not accepted, for two reasons; first, according to his testimony, that their primary objective at that time was, as it is at this time, the defense of Formosa; and, second, that his own military mission, which he had sent to Formosa, had determined that the Chinese Nationalist forces were not in condition, either by training or by possession of the necessary equipment, to be integrated into the fighting forces.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alabama. The Senator from Minnesota has been informed as to that information, but I am glad to have it brought out at this point in our discussion.

I merely wish to proceed now and say a few words more about these allies of ours. We have spent much time and a good deal of effort and a sizable investment in building up our allies—allies who were left prostrate following World War II; and I repeat, these are our allies, and these allies are with us in the critical area of the world, which is in Western Europe. These allies are with us in the Near East, which is critical, and these allies, despite their limited participation, have stood with us in Korea. I recently read the remarks of the delegate to the United Nations from Canada, who took exception to the argument which had been made on the floor of the Senate that our allies had contributed so little, when he told of the valiant and heroic efforts of the Canadians, and of the Canadian Royal Air Force which is represented in Korea, and of their destroyers, which are in Korean waters; and I understand the Canadians are getting ready to send 6,000 additional troops. While our British friends have not put as many troops into the conflict as they could, from my point of view, they are effective participants with us.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question in that connection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May it not be well to make it a part of the RECORD at this point that, as I have been informed, every single member of the Canadian forces in Korea, or on the way to Korea, is a volunteer for service in Korea?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; and the Canadians have a sizable contingent there at the present time, with heavy casualties.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My understanding is that, with what they have there now, in all branches of the service, plus those who are on the way, the number will be brought to approximately 10,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be brought to 10,000, or more. I understand it will be between 10,000 and 12,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota wishes to continue, in order to preserve the continuity of his remarks, after which he will yield for questions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator will yield for a question on the point mentioned by the Senator from Alabama, in order that the RECORD

may be correct. If the Senator will yield to me, I shall not take much of his time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator quite correctly states that the testimony shows that in the early days of the Korean fighting, when we were in a retrograde movement, moving back to the Korean Pusan beachhead, General MacArthur had been asked whether he wanted the Chinese Nationalist troops at that time, and he said, for reasons which he outlined, that he did not want them. There was a supply problem, and there were a great many other problems. But the testimony also shows, and I think the Senator from Alabama will bear me out, that later, about November, I believe, or it may have been December, somewhere in that area, General MacArthur specifically asked that not only the 33,000 soldiers which the Chinese Nationalists originally offered should be accepted, but stated that it was his opinion, after he had sent a mission to Formosa, and had been there himself, and had had a chance to see for himself their condition that he should be allowed to negotiate, to get perhaps as many as 50,000, and he was quite sure the Government of the Republic of China would have been glad to comply. I thought this statement should be made, in order that the RECORD may be complete.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very glad to have that observation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, while the Senator from Minnesota is in a yielding mood, will he yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. This will be the final question for which I shall yield, until I have concluded.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator another question. As I understand, the Senator says that in the event Russia should attack India, the United Nations would be expected to act to defend India. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my hope, I would say.

Mr. KEM. How would the Senator expect the Security Council of the United Nations, in which Russia has the veto power, to act to defend India in case of attack by Russia? Is it not true that the Security Council is the only possible body in the United Nations that could act?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that comment from the Senator from Missouri, because it again points up some of the weaknesses in the structure of the United Nations organization.

At this time, Mr. President, may I pay a well-earned tribute to our Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, who saw that possibility and just did not talk about it, but went to the United Nations and got a resolution passed by the Assembly so that the Assembly can act by a two-thirds vote, thereby to circumvent the Security Council. That is the same Acheson who is supposed to be a Communist appeaser, who has taken a beating day after day on this floor. But he saw fit to get a resolution agreed to which does make the United Nations an instrumentality that can act in a situation like that to which the Senator from Missouri has referred.

Mr. President, in talking about our Allies, I want to say that if I had my choice between Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists on Formosa and the British Commonwealth, or Great Britain, as an ally, a choice which I hope will not be forced upon us, I would join up with Great Britain. Not that she is as good as we would sometimes want her to be, but she is the second most powerful nation among the free nations of the world. She is our No. 1 ally. It is ridiculous to cast aside one ally to pick up an uncertain entity. I will place the record of Great Britain as a great nation against the record of leadership of any of our other allies. The 13 nations in the North Atlantic Pact represent a major portion of the free world. They are joined with us in common principles, common culture, common law; they are our people in the sense that they believe in peace, freedom, and democracy, and we should stand with them and not abuse them.

Mr. President, may I summarize by pointing out that it is a disservice to the cause of peace, a disservice to the cause of victory, to say that our policy has been one of appeasement? I submit that the record of this Government as a leader in the United Nations, as a leader of the free nations of the world, is a record of which we can be justly proud. It is a record of uniting the free world to resist the onslaught of Communist aggression. The President, the Secretary of State, and the leadership in the House and the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, have given direction to this program. I submit, Mr. President, that it is at least a paradox in argument to say, on the one hand, that we are at war, and, on the other hand, to say that we are at peace.

My position is what it was 2 years ago, namely, that our real enemy is the Soviet Union. Let us not forget that. Let us not get ourselves embroiled in an expanding war only to find out that we can never get out of it. Let us keep our eyes on where the real source of power is. If we bomb bases in Manchuria we must also go back to Moscow. That is where the supplies are coming from. May I suggest that before we make that trip, we had better check our luggage; we had better be sure we can get there; we had better be sure of our time, our strength, and our strategy.

It boils down, then, to this, that the policy which the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Marshall, has been defending is one of sound strategy. It is a policy which is based upon building up the strength of the Nation without wrecking its economy. It is a policy of building up the strength of our allies without wrecking their economy, so that we may stand together as one great, mighty force. It is a policy of recognizing that we cannot have unity of effort unless there is a spirit of cooperation. We cannot always have our way. Our allies are free and independent nations. They are not satellites. We must expect that our allies are going to have differences of opinion with us. In any free state there are differences of opinion. If the choice I have to make is between having allies who disagree with us once in a while and having stooges who agree every time we crack the whip, I would choose the allies.

Mr. President, I plead with my colleagues that we not put ourselves into a position of taking some precipitate action before we are ready for that action. It is ridiculous to do so. We are not yet strong enough. But our strength is growing, and our adversary knows it. It will continue to grow so long as we remain united not only in our own country, but with the free nations of the world.

I plead for national unity not only to bind up the wounds in our own country, but I plead for the unity which we must have amoung our friends and allies.

Let us dedicate our efforts to the cause of peace. Let us think about what we may do to seek peace. Let us dedicate ourselves and our efforts to seeing how we can strengthen the United Nations to make it a strong instrumentality for law and order. Let us think in terms of what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] proposed some time ago and what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] proposed, universal disarmament, and the dedication of some of our treasure, our gifts, and our abundance to building up the standard of living in the world. I should like to be in the Senate at a time when this country can honestly say it has led the peoples of the world in the path of peace. The people in this country are sick of war, Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The people of our own country are anxious to be given ideals and goals which lead to peace. They do not want an extension of the war. They want a conclusion of it on honorable and just terms. I submit, Mr. President, that that is exactly what Secretary Marshall has been talking about, and that is the goal toward which the President has been directing his efforts.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have yielded the floor, but I shall be glad to accommodate my friend from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I was very much intrigued by what the Senator from Minnesota had to say about the necessity, if we start to Moscow, of checking our luggage. I have been interested in what he has had to say about the desire of the American people to preserve peace. I do not exactly understand how the Senator would reconcile his views in this respect with his declaration today that the United States would go to war in a minute if India were attacked by Russia or by Communist China. Does the Senator feel that in that event it would not be necessary for us to check our luggage to be sure we had enough to get us to Moscow?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to talk to the Senator about our traveling accommodations. What I was pointing

out was that this country has been requested to give foodstuffs to India. I was saying that a deal in that respect might be looked upon by some persons with a certain amount of disdain. I was merely saying that if some nations should call upon us for arms we would give them quickly, as we usually do. I was asking our Government to provide as expeditiously the food and the grain to keep people alive as we would provide guns and munitions to see that people are killed. I should like to have the privilege of working in the vineyard of peace. We have a war college; we have a West Point, and it appears to me that it would be well for the Members of the House and the Senate to spend some time considering how we can obtain a just and enduring peace, rather than how we can extend the conflict.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has yielded the floor.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope we can reach a vote on the pending amendment at this time, and I hope we can then finish the consideration of the bill. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who is in charge of the bill to furnish emergency food aid to India, advises me that he prefers that Senate bill 872 await action by the House of Representatives, and suggests that it go over until after they have concluded their consideration of it.

I understand there is not very much more to be done on the appropriation bill this afternoon, and if we could finish its consideration we would make House bill 1612 to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements, the unfinished business, and then adjourn until Monday. If we can get a little cooperation, Senators will not have to return until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], on behalf of himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment on page 12, line 15, to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000." On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], have been appointed members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of Hon. John Kee, late a Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] arranged to pair today with the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON]. However, on this vote both the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business. If present, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is absent on official business and arranged to pair today with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. However, on this vote both Senators, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is detained on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—35

Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Benton	Humphrey	Moody
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Connally	Kefauver	Russell
Eastland	Kerr	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Langer	Smathers
George	Long	Sparkman
Green	McClellan	Stennis
Hennings	McFarland	Underwood
Hill	McKellar	

NAYS—41

Aiken	Bridges	Byrd
Bennett	Butler, Md.	Case
Bricker	Butler, Nebr.	Cordon
Dirksen	Kem	Saltonstall
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	McCarthy	Taft
Ferguson	McMahon	Thye
Flanders	Malone	Tobey
Gillette	Martin	Welker
Hayden	Mundt	Wherry
Hendrickson	O'Conor	Williams
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Young
Hoey	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—20

Brewster	Ives	Millikin
Capehart	Jenner	Neely
Chavez	Kilgore	Nixon
Duff	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Ecton	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	Magnuson	Wiley
Hunt	Maybank	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KERR, for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to committee amendment on page 12, after line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. I yield if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may do so. The Senator from Nebraska will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that conclude all the committee amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes consideration of all the committee amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

MRS. CLAIRE PHILLIPS CLAVIER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a few miscellaneous matters which I wish to place in the RECORD at this time.

First, I wish to make a very brief announcement in regard to a distinguished citizen of my State, Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier, who was one of the great American spies during World War II. Her spy activities occurred in the Philippines, where she was of great service to our country. As I understand, she is credited by the Military Establishment with being responsible for saving a great many American lives and giving information which resulted in the destruction of a great many enemy lives, as well as the destruction of a great deal of our enemy's war matériel.

She certainly is a courageous American. She is now visiting Washington in connection with the world premiere of a motion picture which is based upon her spy activities in the Philippines. The picture is entitled "I Was an American Spy."

For her work she has received the Medal of Freedom from our Government, the only woman to have received it. It was presented to her by Gen. Mark Clark upon the recommendation of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, with the approval of the President of the United States. I can tell the Senate in all sincerity that the motion picture depicting her activities as a spy in the Philippines is one of the truest portrayals I have witnessed on the screen. This picture has been honored by having a prologue and an

epilog delivered by Gen. Mark W. Clark, Chief, Army Field Forces.

This great citizen of my State, Mrs. Clavier, is the subject of a bill which has been pending before the Senate for a couple of years, and which I reintroduced this year. I refer to Senate bill 911, a bill which seeks only to authorize her to bring legal action against the United States Government for the recovery of at least a part of the funds which she spent in her spy activities in the Philippines.

She first represented herself to the Japanese as an Italian citizen, and showed the appropriate forged papers which made it possible for her to get by with that identification for some time. But, of course, as the Italian situation changed, she then had to place herself in the position of being a national of another country. She was finally detected by the Japanese and put through all the various tortures the Japanese knew so very well how to use in the handling of military and spy prisoners.

However, the record shows, Mr. President, that she disposed of great quantities of her valuable possessions, including her jewels, and the return that she received from these properties was used in order to buy the matériel that she was able to smuggle into the hills of the Philippines to be used there by the guerrilla forces and the American rangers who were in those hills, including, for example, the obtaining by purchase from Japanese parties, so I understand, a very much needed set of radio equipment which she used for transmitting purposes in notifying American naval officials of the time of departure from Manila of a large Japanese naval force. I understand that the information which was sent over the radio transmitter she was able to smuggle into the hills for the use of our guerrilla forces, was responsible for an American naval attack on that Japanese force and its utter destruction.

I make these comments, Mr. President, only because I think it particularly appropriate, while Mrs. Clavier is in town, that the attention of the Senate be called to the merits of her bill pending before the Senate. I have received the finest cooperation from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and have his assurance that early consideration will be given by the Committee on the Judiciary to an analysis of her bill and a report on the bill. I sincerely hope the report will be favorable, and that the committee will recommend that the bill be passed. All it seeks to do is to give Mrs. Clavier the legal right, which must be done by legislation, to bring action against the United States Government in due legal process to recover the value of the property she used in carrying out spy services for our Government which proved to be of such great value to our war effort.

Mr. President, I wish now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

OUR FISCAL AND BANKING POLICY—ARTICLE BY R. C. LEFFINGWELL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief comment on an exceedingly interesting article entitled "Our Fiscal and Banking Policy," written by Mr. R. C. Leffingwell, vice chairman of J. P. Morgan & Co., and published in a recent issue of Barron's. This article was sent to me by Mr. Everett Harpham, of Eugene, Oreg., who, in my opinion, is one of the keenest students in the State of Oregon of the subject of investments and banking policies and the value of securities. After I have read the introduction and conclusion of the article, Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have the entire article incorporated as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD, thus saving my reading the entire article.

In the opening paragraph, the vice chairman of J. P. Morgan & Co., Mr. Leffingwell, says:

> We want peace, not war. We have no quarrel with the Russian people. There can be no assured peace as long as the Russian people are isolated and insulated from world opinion, and submit to the iron rule of the Kremlin and its secret police, of men who seek world dominion by fair means or foul, who do not believe in telling the truth or in being bound by their treaties. Yet peace is our goal and we must win it.
>
> The way to prevent general war is not to start a war, but to prepare our defense so effectively that our enemies dare not attack us. We and our allies must achieve promptly a balance of power, a preponderance of military power; and maintain it. General war may be avoided by convincing Stalin and his colleagues in the Politburo that, though we shall not start a war, yet, if they do, we shall win it and shall destroy them and all their works. We must go, armed cap-a-pie, about our peaceful business. That is very inconvenient, very expensive; but very necessary when brigands are about.

Then he proceeds in this able article to discuss such subjects as diverting men and material to defense; the subject of foreign aid; price fixing and wage fixing; taxes; excess-profits taxes; funding the public debt; chronic inflation; parpegging; expanding credit; cheap money, dear money, and fair money; reserve requirements; and the Treasury and the Federal Reserve.

In the concluding paragraph of this very able article he says:

> We must do everything we can to avoid inflation and cut out avoidable or deferrable or wasteful nonmilitary expenditures; but let us not be frightened by the expense of war or rearmament. In view of our great gold reserve, which is so vital to insure our buying power abroad, and more than ever precious as a war chest, there is no financial limit to the ability of the people, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve banks, and the member banks to meet the Government's defense needs or war needs. War is economic waste. There can be no pay-as-you-go policy in case of general war. But while Russia's rulers follow the self-saving plan of limited war, of war by proxy, we had better pull up our belts, reduce our luxurious civil spending, public and private, increase our taxes and fund our debt, and pay our way from day to day.

Mr. President, each one of us as an individual Senator may disagree with a premise here or there in this very able article by the vice chairman of J. P. Morgan & Co., but I am inclined to believe that most of us will agree with the major premises of his article.

It may be that some may be surprised to find the junior Senator from Oregon speaking so approvingly of a presentation by the vice chairman of J. P. Morgan & Co., but when I think a man is right in his major premises, I have always followed the practice of saying so. In these days, when we are hearing so much conflicting opinion with regard to what our fiscal policy should be, and how much we can afford to spend for defense, I believe it would be very appropriate if each Member of the Senate would read this article, which, in my opinion, is an exceedingly able discussion of fiscal and banking problems, with particular reference to the point of view of the vice chairman of J. P. Morgan & Co. that there really is no limit to our economic ability to face the defense expenditures we may have to meet in order to preserve our freedom.

In concluding my remarks on this particular item, before I turn to the next matter, Mr. President, I want to say that I think the vice chairman of J. P. Morgan & Co. could be introduced as a key witness of mine in support of the thesis I sought to defend on the floor of the Senate the other day, when I said I thought the time had come when the American people ought to be told by the leaders of government, both in the executive branch and the legislative branch, that they must proceed now to make sacrifices to a degree never before heard of in our history if the country is to survive in the great contest which is ahead of us in the fight against communism.

I happen to be one who has very little patience with the point of view that we can pay too much for defense. I think we ought to be talking in terms of how much we need to pay in order to meet the defense mobilization needs of the country, and then proceed to tighten our belts and go to work as a people and pay it. That will mean that a good many of the economic groups which today are thinking—I regretfully say—in terms of higher prices and higher profits, must be told that they are going to have to suffer a tremendous cut-back in their economic returns in order to preserve the system which gives them the freedom which goes with both political democracy and economic democracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Leffingwell, from which I have read, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

[From Barron's of November 13, 1950]

OUR FISCAL AND BANKING POLICY—HOW TO ADAPT IT TO LIMITED WAR AND REARMAMENT

(By R. C. Leffingwell, vice chairman of J. P. Morgan & Co.)

We want peace, not war. We have no quarrel with the Russian people. There can be no assured peace as long as the Russian people are isolated and insulated from world opinion, and submit to the iron rule of the Kremlin and its secret police, of men who

seek world dominion by fair means or foul, who do not believe in telling the truth or in being bound by their treaties. Yet peace is our goal and we must win it.

The way to prevent general war is not to start a war, but to prepare our defense so effectively that our enemies dare not attack us. We and our allies must achieve promptly a balance of power, a preponderance of military power; and maintain it. General war may be avoided by convincing Stalin and his colleagues in the Politiburo that, though we shall not start a war, yet, if they do, we shall win it and shall destroy them and all their works. We must go, armed cap-a-pie, about our peaceful business. That is very inconvenient, very expensive; but very necessary when brigands are about.

We have another task too. During this period of limited wars, which Russia fights by proxy or by sabotage, subversion, and revolution, we must also prove that the seeds of death are not, as Russia's rulers say, in our American enterprise system, our capital system, our profit and loss system, but that life and growth and health are here. To do this we must defend with the utmost zeal our currency and our free economy, while we strengthen our military defenses.

Korea has roused us from our uneasy sleep. We must not go to sleep again. We must be armed and alert to defend the peace.

DIVERTING MEN AND MATERIAL TO DEFENSE

The chief problem of rearmament is not finance but men and material; above all men, skilled workmen, trained soldiers and sailors and fliers. Therefore, first and foremost, and without delay, the Federal Government, and the State and municipal governments, should rigidly curtail their own demands for men and material for purposes not related to defense. Notwithstanding the siren songs of our Government's too-political economists, we cannot pile a war boom on top of a peace boom, which had already quite fully employed our manpower and resources.

The Federal Government should stop subsidizing employment and unemployment; stop its inflationary civil spending and lending while seeking men for the Armed Forces and for munitions making. It should stop subsidizing the housing program; stop road building and river and harbor work; stop subsidizing farm prices. The Government should also stop its too numerous credit agencies from their innumerable inflationary activities. It has been proliferating lending agencies; there are about 100 of them engaged in lending and giving and spending money. Our Government should be less generous to uninjured veterans of previous wars. In a world under arms everyone will be a veteran in time, and there won't be enough money to go around if we continue the practice of indiscriminate bonuses and benefits.

The inflationary pressure is not due to a money deficit or deficit financing, for there isn't any cash deficit and hasn't been since the Second World War. If the Government and the States and municipalities will divert men and material from the Government-subsidized peace boom to national defense, there need be no general shortage of goods or men and no inflationary pressure during this period of limited war and rearmament.

Much has been done in the way of increased taxes, housing control and consumer credit control, much that needed to be done, to limit the citizens' spending, and it may be well to wait a while and see the effect of the new taxes and controls before taking another turn in the screw against the citizens. But not much effort has been made yet by our governments, Federal, State, and municipal, to control themselves and their spending. Perhaps now, after election, this will be done.

Let the Government ration itself—and the States and municipalities too. Fiscal and credit controls and price controls will not suffice. If the effective demand for goods and services (and the Government's demand is always effective) exceeds the supply, inflation is inevitable. We cannot long consume more than we produce. If we try to, the swollen river of inflation will flow to sea, and the dams erected to the specifications of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve or the price and wage fixers will be washed out.

FOREIGN AID

Likewise, our Government should shrink Marshall aid; and it should instead make reciprocal lend-lease arrangements for defense with those friendly nations in Europe and elsewhere that are willing and able to defend themselves. Marshall aid has done a great and necessary job. In Europe it stopped Russia's war of subversion and revolution dead in its tracks. But, now that we have been confronted by open aggression, we must be sparing of our aid when not directly related to defense.

If we make adequate expenditure to win the local wars and to provide for the defense of ourselves and our allies, there will be no more general dollar shortage and little more need of Marshall aid. Our commercial exports will shrink as our labor and materials are diverted to the defense effort; and our foreign expenditures will rise. The dollar gap will be filled. The dollar will be no more a scarce currency. Indeed, even now it is not. Thus has come true, though partly for reasons Keynes could not foresee, the prophecy in his posthumous essay on the Balance of Payments of the United States.

Though we should revise lend-lease, the suggestion of a common fund for defense is not a good one. The American taxpayers who submit themselves to more and more burdensome taxation will not consent to accept a general liability to make up other nations' deficits. Some nations have a long history of preferring currency depreciation to more direct methods of taxation. That is their privilege. We Americans have the opposite preference; although our preference is not always our practice. This fundamentally different approach makes pooling impracticable and unfair. As long as nations have separate governments, separate legislatures, and separate systems of taxation and tax habits, they will not pool their assets and liabilities; and they should not. That would be carrying egalitarianism too far.

During the early years of the First and Second World Wars, before we came in, European nations spent their reserves in buying goods and services here and elsewhere. Now our allies' reserves are spent, and the new weapons, and our allies' weakness, put us in the first line of defense. A general war, if it comes, like the Korean War, will be primarily ours to win or lose from the beginning. Our men, our goods, our gold, will be at once engaged. Western Europe survived her victories in the two German wars only with American aid. If America makes too lavish civil expenditure at home and abroad, while at the same time making necessary defense expenditures too, who will bail America out when victory is won? Who will give Marshall aid to America then? If the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted?

We must help our friends to defend themselves against subversion, revolution, and aggression, but there must be no frittering away of our resources in indiscriminate benevolence at home or abroad.

PRICE FIXING AND WAGE FIXING

So much for self-control by our Government—the most difficult of all controls for government to exercise. What of other controls?

Congress appears to have been panicked by our early reverses in Korea, and the fear of general war, and of the election, into conferring on the President powers he did not seek, to control prices and everything. But as we have seen, the problem is to find men and material for defense; and the cure is to decrease the demand for civil purposes as the demand for defense is increased—not to dose the symptoms but to effect a cure. Price-fixing may hide the trouble for a time, but it discourages production and stimulates consumption, and the latent inflation may do more damage when it breaks out later than if it had been allowed to run its course in the first place.

The Russian rulers have it in their power to precipitate a general war now or to defer it for a year or two or ten—or maybe forever. So we must be strongly armed and yet we must remain strong financially and economically. The Russians cannot win a fighting war against us if we arm ourselves and the free Western World; but they could win their misnamed cold war if we give way to extravagant deficit financing and inflation on the one hand, or to freezing our dynamic economy on the other. That may be their best hope: That we shall bleed ourselves white by inflation; or destroy our capitalist system by adopting the state despotism which they practice.

In the period of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire the emperors tried price-fixing and failed. Price-fixing has always failed, from Diocletian to Truman. It behooves us not to be beguiled by the fallacy of the omnipotent state; not to lose our freedom in the fight to preserve it. The energy, initiative, and resiliency of the American industrial economy must be preserved if we are to win the limited war which the Russian rulers are waging against us. Price and wage controls will be necessary as temporary expedients if general war comes, but as a continuing program for a long period of limited aggression, subversion and revolution, they are likely to be deadening and self-defeating. The Government may well influence prices by determining what it will pay for what it wants, by exercising a certain restraint and prudence in stockpiling, by establishing priorities, allocations, and restrictions on civilian purchases. But general price-fixing should be avoided. Free prices provide the best method of stimulating production of the things that are really needed, and of restricting consumption of the things that are in short supply. Frozen prices tend on the contrary to limit production and stimulate consumption. Above all things we need to stimulate production and restrain consumption. The price system is an essential element in our enterprising economy, which has served us long and well. Let us not throw it away hastily.

Wage-fixing should be avoided too. The mobility of labor in the United States has been one of our greatest assets. Frozen wages tend to keep workmen in their old jobs and to reduce the mobility of labor, to retard the movement of men from nonessential to essential jobs, from one place to another, in response to the appeal of better pay. I do not believe in forced labor—or directed labor as the British euphemistically call it—and that is what wage-fixing means. I do hope and believe that in this time of national peril American workmen may be moderate in their demands, if our Government stops encouraging their demands and rewarding those who strike, and stops its own inflationary policies which increase the cost of living. But I do not think workmen will submit to be forced to work at a fixed wage for a private employer; and I do not think they should.

The way to deal with the problem is not to freeze everything, but to stop all deferable civil expenditure, impose adequate taxation, and reform our inflationary fiscal and monetary policies.

TAXES

Government should in these boom times, in this period of limited wars, pay as it goes, raise in taxes enough to pay all its expenses. This will avoid a deficit, and deficit financing, which is inflationary.

When the total tax burden is and must be very heavy indeed, the only safe rule is not to rely too heavily on any one tax, but to devise and impose a great diversity of taxes, direct and indirect, none at excessive rates, but so widely distributed in their incidence as to provide great and fairly stable revenue without being crushing in their effect on any particular groups or activities. Taxation is not an exact science and the burden of taxes falls unevenly. It is impossible for the lawmakers to foresee every contingency and everyone's problem. Undue dependence on certain kinds of taxes may have crushing effect in some special cases; and, on the other hand, may make the Treasury's revenues uncertain and erratic. There should be a variety of sources of revenue.

It is well that Congress increased income taxes in September and abandoned the proposed repeal or reduction of excise taxes. In addition to excise taxes we shall need a general retail sales tax at moderate rates. Such a tax, though anathema to some politicians and some theorists, has great practical advantages. It taxes only the last transaction, the sale to the ultimate consumer, and is not (as corporation income tax tends to be) reflected over and over again in costs and prices on the way from production to consumption. A retail sales tax has the social merit, and political demerit, of bringing to the attention of the voters the costs of government. Some local authorities already use it; but they have no exclusive right to it. It ought to be adopted by the United States.

There will have to be more tax increases when rearmament gets going, but there is no great hurry about it. The post-election tax bill should not be panicky or punitive. In spite of all the talk about a deficit, there has been an over-all Treasury cash surplus for the 5-year period since the Second World War, and also for the first quarter of this fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1950. There may be a cash surplus for the first three quarters, if not for the whole, of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, due to the increased taxes under the 1950 act, the high national income, the low unemployment, and the inevitable lag in actual spending for rearmament; for blueprints are not planes nor tanks nor submarines, alas, and appropriations are not expenditures. It may take some months to catch up with the deficit in our armament and convert it into a Treasury cash deficit. We should pay as we go, but not before we go.

EXCESS PROFITS TAX

As actual cash defense expenditures rise, there may have to be what is called an excess profits tax; but it should not be retroactive. If a retroactive excess profits tax is adopted we may have a cash surplus this fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, so large as to be deflationary. An excess profits tax is a bad tax; but need not be so very bad if its terms are fair and moderate. The only and sufficient excuse for it even in an emergency is that the Government must take the money wherever it can be got with the least disturbance to the economy; that the Government must get the money where the money is. A moderate tax of this type, a supertax for the national defense, would be better than a further increase in the straight income tax on corporations. Companies that have abnormally large income in relation to capital or past earnings are better able to bear more taxes than companies that are jogging along without benefit of defense spending and that perhaps are even hurt by curtailment of civilian spending. The 45 percent corporation income tax, however necessary, is too high already to be healthy, to permit fair dividends and adequate reserves, for the jog-along companies.

"Excess profits tax" is a horrid name, for it implies a condemnation of profits if they are large. Large profits are not necessarily excessive. To call them so plays into the hands of the Socialists, Communists, and enemies of free enterprise. We should not adopt the language of our opponents, and of the disgruntled people who think that nobody ought to be able to make any more money than anybody else, whatever his skill, energy, ability, and enterprise. Our American enterprise system is the profit system. It is that system that got the production that made victory in two world wars possible; and can do it again. This proposed tax should be called, not an excess profits tax, but a "defense supertax", a name which would indicate the special and temporary character of this tax and the fact that it is an extra tax on those companies best able to bear it.

The defense supertax should be very moderate, or it will lead to wasteful expenditure and discourage enterprise and production. By "moderate," I mean that the tax rate should be low, the base period of past earnings should be recent and fairly long, and the rate of return on capital exempted from the tax should be generous; and that the taxpayer should have the option as between the past earnings test and the capital return test. New companies and new enterprises of all companies should be exempt from the defense supertax altogether since they can have no record of past performance for comparison, and it should be our effort to encourage new undertakings. The proposal made at the last session of Congress to treat a part of the earnings of the base period as excess profits is unfair and would be ruinous to many companies. It is never in the public interest, least of all in a period of national peril, to impose punitive or destructive taxation. Let us postpone our domestic vendettas while the enemy is at the gate.

Provision for renegotiation of war and defense contracts is desirable. It is just another form of tax, and will permit the Government to collect sums from war contractors which no general tax at reasonable rates could reach. In order to expedite production, the Government must grant liberal terms to war contractors. When they turn out in the event to have been too liberal, renegotiation is only decent.

The proposed withholding tax on dividends, happily discarded in the recent act, should be dropped forever. The paper work would burden the taxpayers and the economy out of all proportion to the real gain to the Government. It is dishonest for the Government to take money even temporarily which it isn't entitled to and without a claim of right, as in the case of exempt institutions and persons whose income is so small as to be tax-free. For the small stockholder the burden is serious. Say a man owns 10 shares of A. T. & T. The dividend is $90. The proposed withholding tax is $9. How much paper work would the stockholder have to do to get back his $9? Very likely he would forget or neglect it, in which case the Government would have done him out of $9. Pretty petty business, that. All the Treasury needs is full information returns, from corporations and custodians, to catch tax dodgers. Let the tax gatherer gather his own taxes.

FUNDING THE PUBLIC DEBT

In preparing to defend ourselves and our economy, we had better get our debts in order. We may have to borrow more, and in these money matters let's take some lessons from the past.

The level of interest rates adopted for financing the Second World War was too low. The extreme cheap-money policy was inflationary. Taken in conjunction with the high level of taxation, and the full taxability of the bonds, it was not conducive to saving and investment. High taxes and low interest rates combined to make the yield of Government bonds insufficiently attractive to investors other than exempt and semiexempt institutions.

The postwar debt policy of our Treasury has been to borrow too cheap and too short. No long-term refunding has been done for 5 years; and the debt is getting shorter with the lapse of time. That policy is improvident. Our fiscal unpreparedness is comparable to our military unpreparedness.

Funding of some portion of the public debt is a matter of common prudence, and indeed of urgent importance, in view of the gravity of the international situation. Bonds should be sold to the people in as great volume as possible to lap up the savings not reached by taxes. Negotiable bonds should be sold. War loan drives should be instituted to sell them as well as the nonnegotiable savings bonds. Such drives would raise more money and they would arouse the interest of the people and give them a sense of participation in the defense effort. Tap issues should be avoided. They kill the market by keeping the supply always ahead of demand.

To promote the wide distribution of a refunding issue among small holders, tax exemption, carefully limited, might be granted to small holdings of persons of small income. I have always opposed tax exemption in general and, at the Treasury in 1917, in connection with the Second Liberty Loan, I initiated the limited taxation of Government bonds, all previous issues having been fully exempt. Later I urged the adoption of a constitutional amendment to permit Federal taxation of future issues of State and municipal bonds, and vice versa, which passed the House of Representatives in January 1923, but died in the Senate. But the present one-sided system leaves persons of large income free to buy fully tax-exempt State and municipal bonds, of which there are some twenty billions, and offers little inducement to persons of moderate income to buy fully taxable United States bonds. The public debt is too much concentrated now in the hands of corporations that are wholly or partly tax free anyway. The taxation of bond interest to people of small means is more a nuisance than a source of revenue, and limited exemption might stimulate saving and investment. A small sin against sound doctrine might do more good than harm.

CHRONIC INFLATION

For the same good purpose, a cost-of-living bonus bond has been proposed. This would be an automatic self-perpetuating inflation-accelerator. Increasing the public debt and the money supply is a method of inflation; so it is proposed to pay a bonus to bondholders and thus increase the debt and the money supply some more. During and after the First World War a rubber dollar, a price index dollar, was proposed. Now it is proposed to issue a rubber public debt. We are to have an automatic inflation of the public debt in accordance with a price index. Already some companies have given a fillip to inflation by promising an automatic cost-of-living wage increase. It is said that all parts of the community, especially Government employees, white collar workers, clergymen, college professors and others should have their compensation linked automatically to the cost of living. Our economy is to achieve perpetual motion by continually pumping in a little more inflation, fairly distributed. One wonders who will pay for it all? The forgotten man? He will be sunk without a trace. No, we shall just have to print paper

money, so that everybody may pay everybody more and more paper and receive less and less value. Inflation is the most deadly of all economic diseases. There is no way to make it painless. As with drink, the cure is to stop it.

PAR-PEGGING

One difficulty in the way of refunding the short debt and avoiding inflation seems to be the strange new doctrine of par-pegging: that Secretary Morgenthau's wartime decisions must be maintained and perpetuated, although that modest gentleman would never claim infallibility for himself, and that his level of interest rates must not be breached, that Government bonds must never be allowed to fall below par.

The par-pegging policy is, perhaps, an extreme reaction against what was done to Liberty bonds after the First World War. It was not, however, lack of support, but forced liquidation, that put the 4¼ percent Fourth Liberty Bonds, for instance, down to about 82 in 1920. The market for Liberty bonds was supported, though not pegged, by the War Finance Corporation, until the Federal Reserve's deflationary action made further support futile. The bonds had been sold by the Liberty Loan Committees in the course of campaigns in which the people had been urged to borrow to buy them. After the war the Federal Reserve began to raise its interest rates on loans secured by Government bonds, in order to force their liquidation, and finally, in 1920, the New York bank rate was raised to 6 percent in January and 7 percent in June. That was dear money, indeed, the dearest ever in Federal Reserve history. The dumping of Liberty bonds in 1920 was thus forced by the Federal Reserve, as part of its policy to control the inflation and to defend the gold standard.

Nobody proposes such a deflationary policy now. But why turn to the other extreme? Why should a long-term bond, a 2½ percent Victory bond, of the Government of the United States be made payable on demand by the Federal Reserve banks at par or better? The little fellow who buys savings bonds, E, F, and G bonds, must accept a discount or loss of interest if he cashes them before maturity. Why should the holders of bearer bonds, many of them insurance companies and tax-exempt institutions, be presented on a silver platter, free for nothing, with a market at par or better? This was a gift they hadn't contracted for or paid for.

There is no better way to make a bond attractive to investors than to pay a fair rate of interest for the money. Moderately higher interest rates on new issues should help to widen the market for Government bonds, strengthen the Government's credit, and reduce the need of resort to bank borrowing by the Government, which is inflationary. The level of interest rates in general, for long money as well as short, should be allowed to rise moderately, and bond prices should be allowed to fall commensurately; but an orderly market should be maintained and deflationary interest rates should not be tolerated.

EXPANDING CREDIT

It is not merely that the general level of interest rates is too low to be healthy; as it is. Far worse is the Federal Reserve's expansion of currency and credit in order to maintain that unduly low level of interest rates. Between December 24, 1947, and November 10, 1948, the Federal Reserve spent over $9,500,000,000 in buying up at par or more the Government's funded war debt, and the Federal Reserve sold short Treasury paper, and expanded Federal Reserve credit over $900,000,000 to pay for the bonds. From the beginning of the Korean War, from June 21 to November 1 of this year, Federal Reserve holdings of all Government securities and total Federal Reserve credit increased $1,600,000,000. In the midsummer madness of 1950 the Federal Reserve was actually expanding credit. How odd to control credit for consumers and home builders while the source of all credit pumps out more of it to oblige the Treasury. It is penny wise and pound foolish of the Treasury to borrow cheap and short and force the Federal Reserve to create money and credit to keep money cheap, interest rates low, and bond prices up. No wonder inflation threatens. The Treasury pinches some pennies in the form of nominal interest savings and the Government and the people pay through their noses in higher prices for what they buy of goods and services. The Government, being the biggest buyer, is the biggest sufferer.

CHEAP MONEY, DEAR MONEY, AND FAIR MONEY

Not only to sell more bonds and refund the short debt, but also as a measure of credit control, the Government should revise its extreme cheap-money policy. That policy subsidizes consumer spending and discourages thrift and saving. Cheap money is medicine for bad times, not for boom times. The price of money is just as important as the price of anything else. When Government freezes the price of money, as ours has done for years, it prevents the price, or interest rate, from exercising its normal function as a brake on the demand for money; and the Federal Reserve, as we have seen, must increase the supply of money in order to prevent the pressure of increasing demand for it from forcing up the price, the interest rate.

The too-cheap money policy of today is bad, but that is no reason for turning to the other extreme. Not only our own welfare, but the whole structure of the free world's economy, and the national defense, depend on the maintenance of a high degree of prosperity in the United States. Our economy cannot endure the alternation of overeating and overdrinking and overpurging which it was put through in the years before and after 1920, 1929, and 1937. I do not for a minute suggest a dear-money policy or a scarce-money policy; just a fair-money policy. It is not necessary to turn from par-pegging to bond-dumping. It is unnecessary for the Federal Reserve to inflate or deflate us. They might just let us breathe naturally.

RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Another thing to avoid is an increase in member bank reserve requirements. Indeed reserve requirements in the central reserve cities should be reduced to the levels in reserve cities, and to that extent geographical discrimination should be eliminated as Federal Reserve authorities have proposed. Making changes in reserve requirements is not a good method of credit control. It is a rough and ready method; too rough and too ready. It is a dangerous weapon: the denial of credit without regard to need or merit, instead of merely increasing its cost. The increase in member bank reserve requirements imposed by the Federal Reserve Board contributed decisively to the disastrous depression of 1937–38, and to the brief recession of 1949. The latter, though mild here and terminated by a prompt reduction of reserve requirements, had unhappy effects on world trade and on the international balance of payments, and helped to force the devaluation of almost all foreign currencies.

The purpose of increasing reserve requirements is to make money and credit scarce, or even unavailable, to industry, agriculture, and commerce, for the conduct of their business, without making it dear for the Government, and to provide funds for the Federal Reserve to buy in the public debt. What are the commercial banks for if not to lend money to credit-worthy customers for creditable business? Surely the remedy for undue expansion of business loans is not to try to force a denial of credit to industry, agriculture, and commerce, but to reduce the inflationary pressures which lead them to seek it. The reason why a company builds a plant or buys equipment or inventory is not that some wicked banker pushes money at it. Quite the contrary, the reason is that money is cheap and the company has seen the need of the plant or the equipment or the inventory in its business; and then, and only then, it goes around to a bank and seeks to borrow the money. And if it is a well-managed company engaged in legitimate business, with a satisfactory balance sheet and income account, it will probably get the money; if its own bank can't find the money then from some other. Until money becomes really scarce, the banks which have liquid assets will continue to meet the demands of their credit-worthy customers engaged in lawful and creditable and profitable business, and will when necessary sell securities in the market or to the Federal Reserve banks to enable them to do so. The Federal Reserve will have to buy these securities at high prices and low yields if it wishes, or is forced by the Treasury, to keep down the level of interest rates. The first results of increasing reserve requirements will be to take business from the poorer banks and give it to the richer banks; and to take earning assets from the member banks and give them to the Reserve banks. The last result, if the increase in reserve requirements goes too far or continues too long, will be deflation and depression. Is that the way to win a war or to defend the Nation?

Increasing cash-reserve requirements might force the Federal Reserve directly, instead of the member banks, to finance the defense effort in the first place, if and to the extent sufficient taxes are not collected and sufficient bonds are not sold to the investing public. Such direct borrowing by the Government from the Federal Reserve, highly agreeable though it is to state socialists, should by all means be avoided. Undesirable as Government borrowing from the member banks is, yet if the Government must borrow from banks at all, it had much better borrow from the member banks; that they should be enlisted in the defense effort, and stand between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. Though some member banks may later have to dispose of some of their holdings in the market or to the Federal Reserve, if the Treasury offers them more securities than they can take and keep or distribute, what they continue to hold in Government securities will exercise a certain moderating influence upon their lending policies. The necessity of applying to investors, the money market, and the member banks, for funds will exercise a salutary influence upon Treasury policies; while direct borrowing by the Treasury from the Federal Reserve, a thoroughly vicious and unorthodox practice, tends to make the Federal Reserve just a Treasury bureau and the Federal Reserve note just a greenback.

A forced loan by member banks in the guise of a supplementary reserve in certain Government paper, as proposed by the Federal Reserve Board, is quite as indefensible as an unduly high cash reserve. In some ways it would be worse. It would force the banks to buy and hold Government paper on the Government's terms. It would disable them from serving the needs of agriculture, commerce, and industry. It would operate unequally and unfairly among the banks, some of which have large and some small holdings of Government securities.

It is impracticable to police the loans of the 14,000 member and nonmember banks by direct action of the Federal Reserve or of a committee of bankers. "Direct action" was tried and failed in the twenties. The only fair, effective method of control is an increase in interest rates.

THE TREASURY AND THE FEDERAL RESERVE

There is nothing new about the present disagreement between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. As an old Treasury hand, and a New York banker, I have a good deal of sympathy for both sides. In my day in the Treasury, upward of 30 years ago, my dear friend and chief, Carter Glass, then Secretary of the Treasury and ex-officio Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, got so angry with Benjamin Strong, another dear friend of mine, then Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, for raising bank rate on Government-secured paper, that Glass threatened to have Strong disciplined. It was with no small difficulty that I succeeded in composing the differences, or at least allaying them, between these two very able and patriotic and red-headed gentlemen.

The long struggle between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve has been a losing one for the latter ever since, nearly 17 years ago, Congress reorganized the Board and took the gold behind the Federal Reserve notes away from the Federal Reserve and gave it into the custody of the Treasury. The present struggle about the level of interest rates is important not only because of the small difference of rate involved but also because of the principle involved. Shall the Treasury arrogate to itself the sole right to determine the level of interest rates for commerce, industry, and agriculture, or shall the Federal Reserve have the final decision? There are those who wish to have the issue determined by act of Congress, and power conferred decisively on the Federal Reserve. I think that would be a mistake, although I agree with the Federal Reserve, and disagree with the Treasury, about the interest rate. Our system of government is based upon the theory of checks and balances; and the view of the Founding Fathers, that no one man, or group of men, is infallible has on the whole been confirmed by history, even by current history. It is far better that the Treasury and Federal Reserve authorities, men patriotic, honest, and sincere, viewing the problem from different angles, should debate until they come to a decision in the public interest as they see it, than that either should be given power to control the other.

The Treasury is wrong in this case; but the Federal Reserve is not infallible. In 1920, 1929, and 1937 the Board showed notable unconsciousness of the violence, of the lethal nature, of the weapons which Congress had given them, and a marked tendency to go to extremes in their use. The present Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, and the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, are men of wisdom and moderation, but the Washington Board still includes in its membership men who sponsored the disastrous increase in member bank reserve requirements in 1937; and the Board has asked of Congress power to require member banks to increase reserves still further in cash and Government securities (up to 61 percent in central Reserve cities) in order to enable the Federal Reserve to buy up the funded debt, if need be, to keep it at par or better. On the whole, in view of its record, it seems just as well that the Federal Reserve has to consult and get along with the political authorities. I see no reason to grant the Federal Reserve power to override the Secretary of the Treasury, or vice versa. I think they should compose their differences, after fighting it out as equals.

But the course which the Federal Reserve authorities are pursuing of very gently pressing up the level of interest rates is correct. It is intended to exert a steady pressure with a view to preventing a further expansion, and, on the other hand, avoiding contraction. That is a fair-money policy. It is to be hoped that the Secretary will consent to yield to them the moderate increase in interest rates suggested.

CONCLUSION

We must do everything we can to avoid inflation and cut out avoidable or deferable or wasteful nonmilitary expenditures; but let us not be frightened by the expense of war or rearmament. In view of our great gold reserve, which is so vital to insure our buying power abroad, and more than ever precious as a war chest, there is no financial limit to the ability of the people, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve banks and the member banks to meet the Government's defense needs or war needs. War is economic waste. There can be no pay-as-you-go policy in case of general war. But while Russia's rulers follow the self-saving plan of limited war, of war by proxy, we had better pull up our belts, reduce our luxurious civil spending, public and private, increase our taxes and fund our debt, and pay our way from day to day.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD—BOOK BY THOMAS AMLIE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a book, entitled "Let's Look at the Record," which I understand is just off the press. It is written by Thomas Amlie. I have only scanned the book, but it purports to be an analysis of the action of Congress for the past 20 years on some of the key issues which have come before it, issues which in the opinion of Mr. Amlie lay down a line of demarcation between two points of view in the Congress, namely, the point of view which supports a growing trend toward monopolistic control in America and the contrary point of view which seeks to support the exercise of greater economic democracy in the United States, or, as Mr. Amlie points out, the difference between an ultraconservative point of view on the economic front and a so-called liberal point of view.

In making this statement, let me point out that in the introduction to the book, I am not treated in too complimentary a fashion because of my devotion to what I think is a basic tenet of political ethics if one is to hold office in one of our great political parties.

As my colleagues know, I have always held to the point of view that if one holds major political office in either of the two political parties, he has an ethical obligation not to befoul his party's nest in political campaigns by campaigning against his party. I have always said he has the right and, in fact, the duty, if he is to maintain his intellectual honesty, to remain silent in a political campaign if he cannot in good conscience and full honesty support either the platform or the major candidates of his party. Certainly he has that intellectual obligation; and he has no right to remain in his party and then proceed to campaign for the party of the opposition. If he is going to follow that course of action, he should resign from his party and should join the party of the opposition.

Thus, Mr. President, I have always held the point of view that as a liberal Republican, I should always endeavor to support my party in the campaigns and should endeavor to do all I could to get my party into power, and then should endeavor to do what I could to resolve my differences of opinion within the party, and not attempt to do so by way of supporting the opposition.

Regardless of the point of view Mr. Amlie indicates in the beginning of his book as his view of my brand of Republicanism, I wish to say that his book represents a tremendous amount of work, the kind of a digging-out job that is not very often done in checking into the record of the Congress and its Members.

I knew Tom Amlie when I was a student at the University of Wisconsin. In fact, during one year he and I were members of the same debating team. I considered him then, as I do now, a very good friend. In our student days I did not always agree with him, any more than I agree with all of his views now; but what I know of him as a liberal Republican and what I know of his powers of objectivity cause me to recommend his book to the reading of all Members of the Senate.

He is a very keen scholar. He was a great scholar in student days. After college, he entered into politics; and for one or two terms, as I recall, he was a Member of the House of Representatives from a district in Wisconsin. Since then I understand he has generally retired from political life, and has been devoting most of his time to the practice of law and to writing in the general field of politics.

From my scanning of his book, even though we may disagree with some of the observations he makes in it, I believe that it is worthy of careful reading by all Members of the Senate. I hope it will be made available in the Library of Congress and in other libraries, so that the readers of America can check up on what I think is a remarkably objective study and factual presentation of the voting records of Members of Congress during the past 20 years on the list of major issues which Mr. Amlie has selected for analysis.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS WHO SERVED IN ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair) laid before the

Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, which was, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That any person who shall have served in the active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall, subject to other provisions of law and veterans' regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, be entitled to benefits of medical, hospital, and domiciliary care, burial benefits, and they and their dependents shall be entitled to compensation or pension provided by law for persons who served during the period of World War II.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that very little has been added to the joint resolution by way of amendment on the part of the House of Representatives. Burial expenses have been expressly enumerated, and also pensions for the widows and orphans of deceased soldiers in the Korean area. That is the real gist of the amendment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask that the language be read once more? There is no objection, and the motion has been agreed to, but I should merely like to know what the language is.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator that while the House struck out all after the enacting clause, it retained the Senate joint resolution and added two things.

Mr. WHERRY. What were those two things?

Mr. GEORGE. A provision relating to burial expenses and one with regard to widows' and orphans' pensions.

Mr. WHERRY. Was that all?

Mr. GEORGE. That was all. Otherwise, it remains the same.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, so many Senators are asking me what is to be done next, that it is creating considerable confusion. I should merely like to advise Senators on the minority side that we expect to remain here until a vote is had upon the pending bill. I hope that every Senator will remain on the floor, because it is impossible to tell when a vote is going to be had on anything. I hope Senators will remain on the Senate floor until the bill has either been finally passed or defeated.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF LT. GEN. MATTHEW BUNKER RIDGWAY TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I submit a favorable report on the nomination of Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, of the Army of the United States, Commander in Chief in the Far East, to the grade of General, under the provisions of sections 504 and 505 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is before the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, the junior Senator from Washington rises to urge the immediate confirmation by the Senate of the nomination of Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway to the grade of General in the United States Army.

General Ridgway's nomination was forwarded to the Senate yesterday by the President of the United States and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The Armed Services Committee is generally guided by a policy which requires that all nominations of general and flag officers remain before the committee for a week, in order that questions concerning any nominee may be raised and settled. In the case of General Ridgway, the committee considers that the policy should be waived for cause.

As the Senate knows, General Ridgway became the commanding general of the Eighth Army in Korea shortly after the distressing death of General Walker. General Ridgway is now Acting Supreme Commander of American Forces in the Far East. He is also Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in the Far East, and he is also the United Nations Commander, and is responsible for our occupation policies throughout Japan. Since last December, General Ridgway, in the performance of his duties, has conclusively answered every conceivable question which might be raised about his capacity, courage, background, and leadership. The right to his fourth star has been earned by General Ridgway in the sight and presence of the enemy and of the free world.

General Ridgway's nomination comes before us supported by the best wishes and the admiration and respect of military men everywhere, and from those in higher authority within our Nation's Defense Establishment. General Ridgway's nomination bears endorsement by the Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Secretary of the Army, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President of the United States.

To my mind, it is proper to make mention of the extremely high regard in which General of the Army Douglas MacArthur holds General Ridgway. In response to a recent question of mine, General MacArthur said:

General Ridgway was my selection and recommendation as the commander of the Eighth Army after the unfortunate death of that very magnificent soldier, General Walker. I have known General Ridgway for 30 years. I don't think you could have made a more admirable selection in the Far East than General Ridgway. I hold him in the highest esteem not only as a soldier but as a cultured gentleman and one of the most magnificent characters I have ever been acquainted with. I do not know how there could have been any more complete cooperation, devotion, and loyalty both ways than between General Ridgway and myself.

Mr. President, I know that General MacArthur was not speaking alone for himself. He was reflecting the feelings and the appreciation of every individual throughout our forces in Korea.

In this day of trouble and grief and bloodshed, we can count ourselves fortunate in having such leadership available to us as is represented in General Ridgway. He is a combination of the very best qualities which have made our professional officer corps respected throughout the world. As one possessed of greatness, his most noted virtue is that of sharing his capability and determination for victory with others. I know of no man alive who is better equipped to be a General of the Army in a day of crisis than is Matthew Bunker Ridgway.

It seems but yesterday, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from Washington was among others who carried out General Ridgway's orders when he was an American corps commander in the European theater in World War II. In that relationship, I gained an everlasting respect and love for General Ridgway as a Christian leader of men and as a man. I am more grateful than I can express to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for permitting me this not-to-be-forgotten opportunity to present the nomination of General Ridgway to the Senate. I know that my sentiments about General Ridgway are shared by every individual who has ever known or come in contact with him. I know that every such person shares my daily prayer that a merciful God will protect General Ridgway and every last man who serves under his command, and will further the holy cause to which General Ridgway and his men have consecrated their lives and our hopes for a world at peace to come. I urge the Senate to confirm the nomination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am privileged to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to join very simply but enthusiastically in what the Senator from Washington has said. I do so because I wish to call to his attention and to the attention of the Senate the fact that General Ridgway received his early grammar-school education in our great English High School at Boston, Mass., a school which has sent many fine men into the service. We are proud of the school, and we are proud of General Ridgway as a product of the school.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have come to know that General Ridgway is a very cultured individual, and it is good now to know whence he acquired a very considerable portion of that culture.

As in executive session, I move that the nomination of General Ridgway be confirmed at this time by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I call up an amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and myself. It is identified by the date May 9, 1951, and by the letter "B."

The amendment provides that during the period of the present hostilities no economic or financial assistance shall be provided out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, other than military assistance to foreign countries, to any country which continues to ship war materials to Russia, her satellites, or to Communist China.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to state that there is no disagreement with the spirit or intent of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri and other Senators. I can state as a certainty that every Senator recognizes the Soviet Union as the cause of the existing cold war. Without inspiration from Moscow there would be no cold war. Every Senator also recognizes that in the event of another world war, the Soviet Union would be the real enemy. Therefore, we all fully support the idea that the export of strategic materials to the Soviet Union and to any and all nations whose governments are allied with the Soviet Union, including China, should and must be cut down to the maximum possible extent. My criticism is that the amendment does not go far enough, in that it would be effective only while the United States is actually engaged in hostilities.

Another criticism is that it denies economic assistance, but it does not deny military assistance. I cannot understand why we should allow any kind of military assistance to any country to which we are denying economic assistance.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say that the amendment is in exactly the form proposed by the Senator from Nebraska when his amendment was adopted by the Senate at the last session. I agree with the Senator from Arizona, and I think his criticisms are well taken. So far as I am concerned, with the consent of the other Senators proposing the amendment, I would accept a modification along the lines suggested by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it is a question which can properly be taken to conference so that we can determine how to handle it.

The final criticism I have of the amendment is that it is a matter of take it or leave it. I think there might possibly be some modification made which would permit us to do a little Yankee trading. I am sure the conferees would consider it.

Let me read to the Senator the names of the conferees:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and myself.

I think that group representing the Senate will reflect the intent of the Senate with respect to this amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to express the hope that the conferees will bring forth a definite, mandatory provision. At the last session Congress adopted the so-called Cannon amendment which might be aptly characterized as a horse-trading amendment. The National Security Council was given the duty and responsibility of handling the matter. I have been at some pains to find out what the National Security Council has done. So far as my information goes, it has done nothing but negotiate and consider, but not one gun, not one barrel of gasoline, not one ton of rubber has been withheld from the Marshall-plan countries which were shipping materials of that kind to Russia and her satellite nations, including Communist China. What the Senate wants, I think, is a definite, mandatory law, with no ground for horse trading, no ground for discretion, but a definite direction to ECA not to send any materials to Marshall-plan countries or any financial assistance if they are shipping materials of war to Russia or her satellites.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think all Senators thoroughly understand the attitude of the Senator from Missouri and we shall try to reflect that attitude in the conference. I shall be glad, after conferring with a number of the members of the committee, to accept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to it. I should like to say a word with reference to it, if I may be recognized.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona whether he recalls that during the life of the Marshall plan there have been anywhere from 50 or 60 to 95 trade treaties between the Marshall plan nations and Russia and the iron-curtain countries, providing them with every kind of goods necessary to consolidate their gains in eastern Russia and China, and with which to fight a war. We seem always to get sidetracked on the idea that unless it actually involves a gun with which to shoot, it is not warlike material, when, as a matter of fact, shirt buttons are war material when a war is in progress. The trade treaties to which I refer are actively in operation at the moment. Word came this morning that on the floor of the House of Commons it had been agreed not to ship rubber to Communist China. They have been shipping it ever since World War II closed. China is pretty well loaded up with rubber for a while, so something else will be shipped.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to have that information. I am glad the English have taken definite action. We did not do anything about the matter ourselves until last December. This country continued from June to December to permit such shipments to China.

Mr. MALONE. It was suggested on March 4, 1948, that that was exactly what the Marshall plan would do—arm Russia for a third world war, consolidate her gains, and so forth. The fact that the majority party did not pay any attention to it may be a good excuse at this time, but it was called to the attention of the Senate, and it is still going on. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] has been doing good work in the past 12 to 18 months in connection with the subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have complimented the Senator from Maryland on his good work in that respect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to take only a moment. I appreciate the action of the Senator from Arizona in accepting the amendment. It contains the identical provision which was suggested by the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators last year. When the bill passed the Senate and went to the House we were told the Wherry amendment would be taken to conference for a vote, but it was not considered in conference. It could not be discussed by the conferees until the House could take separate action on it, under a rule similar to that which exists in the Senate.

The conference report and the Wherry amendment were taken to the House for action on September 21, 1950. As a matter of record, the Wherry amendment was never voted upon in the House. Before it could be voted upon, Representative CANNON made a motion to recede from the Senate amendment, and then offered his amendment to replace the Senate amendment. The vote was taken on the Cannon amendment to replace the Wherry amendment.

When the conference report came back to the Senate, action had to be taken on the Cannon amendment over the Wherry amendment approved by the Senate. It was at that time that I made the plea that my amendment had not been considered in conference and that therefore the bill should be sent back to conference. Before it could go to conference it had to go back to the House for a vote, under the House rules. So we again offered the amendment, with other amendments, as a substitute for the Cannon amendment. Then there was a motion by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to accept the Cannon amendment. The Cannon amendment is strictly a permissive piece of legislation. The provision should be mandatory, and not permissive.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator is correct concerning the motion which I made. The Cannon amendment was the best we could get. The Senator from Nebraska was a member of the conference committee, as I was. I think the wording of the amendment he has offered is proper. The Senator from

Nebraska will be on the next conference committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator. I was not quarreling at all with the fact that he made a motion to accept the Cannon amendment. That is all that was left to do.

There is no use talking about making it strong. Frankly I would like to make it strong, and I will go along with the Senator from Arizona. If we can make it any stronger, it is all right with me. However, when the amendment goes to conference this time, regardless of what the rules of the House may be, I hope the Senate conferees will remain steadfast and stand by what the Senate has done, even if it is necessary to have the House vote on it. I hope the conferees will act on the amendment. It is only in that way that we will get the kind of statute the Senator from Missouri is seeking. The provision must be made mandatory. It must be a mandatory prohibition against shipments of strategic materials to satellite countries and to Russia itself.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. MALONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not correct to say that the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska which came up when the Senate was sitting in the old Supreme Court room, was carried by a two-thirds vote?

Mr. WHERRY. By a very substantial vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was the overwhelming opinion of the Senate that the provision should be mandatory, and that was the way it should have been written.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his observation, because it makes it all the more obligatory upon the conferees on the pending bill, especially in view of the statement made by the chairman of the committee and by the Senator from Arizona, that we should insist upon the provisions of the amendment being mandatory and in that form embodied in the statute. We should never have conceded the point last year.

Apparently the Senate will vote on the amendment in a few moments. With the recommendation of the Senator in charge of the bill, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment unanimously. I hope further the conferees on the part of the Senate will insist, regardless of the rules of the House, that the amendment actually come before the full conference committee, and that when it comes back from conference it will not be a watered-down, permissive piece of legislation, but a mandatory provision carrying out the will of the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska if the Senate has not been fully informed, ever since the first proposal of the Marshall plan, that the trade treaties existed, beginning with only a few treaties and ending up with nearly 100, between Marshall-plan countries and Russia and iron-curtain countries.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I prepared an outline in chronological order of what has been attempted for several years in the way of enacting this kind of law. I have been greatly interested in the subject for many years. Because of the lateness of the hour, I did not call attention to the outline, which consists of two pages.

Mr. MALONE. It would be well to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. It consists of only notes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an outline, in chronological order, of the attempts we have made to bring up this type of legislation, and the action taken by the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following is a summary of action on the Wherry resolution to stop exportation of strategic war materials to Soviet Russia and her captive countries, including Communist China and North Korea:

1. H. R. 7786, section X–B (ECA): Amendment first introduced to ECA section of Omnibus Appropriations Bill. It excluded use of appropriated funds to provide assistance to any participating country which exports or permits to be exported any article or commodity usable by or which could be manufactured to be useful to the armed forces of the USSR and satellites. This is the form considered by many to be too broad and general. It was defeated in vote on Section X–B, July 31, 1950, by 33 to 39. (Reference: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 8, pages 11349–11352.)

2. H. R. 8920, tax bill: Introduced amendment with same wording as that offered to H. R. 7786, August 30, 1950. Withdrew amendment September 1, 1950, with remarks that other sponsors desired to offer it in somewhat modified form as an amendment to S. 4037, internal security bill. (References: On introduction, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 10, pages 13810–13816; on withdrawal, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 10, page 14116.)

3. S. 4037 (H. R. 9490), internal-security bill (Note: There are two forms of the amendment, as offered to S. 4037): (a) Amendment, with wording considerably changed to put responsibility on Secretary of Defense was introduced, September 1, 1950. It was superseded by modified form. (b) Modified form of Wherry amendment was reintroduced on September 8, 1950. Modifications were worked out on suggestions by Senator MCCARRAN. The modified amendment was prevented from being brought up on a point of order raised by Senator ANDERSON. His contention was that the amendment was not germane to the internal security bill. (References: Speech by Senator WHERRY on purposes of amendment, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, pages 14302–14310; introduction of modified form of amendment to S. 4037, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, page 14434; withdrawal on point of germaneness, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, page 14666.)

4. H. R. 9526, supplemental appropriation bill, 1951: The remaining measure to which Senator WHERRY could attach his amendment, with any hope of passage, was H. R. 9526. In order to write legislation into an appropriation measure, he would have to give notice under rule XL that he intended to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill. Senator WHERRY's motion to suspend the rule would have to carry by a two-thirds vote of Members present and voting before a vote could be taken on his amendment.

(a) Notice of the motion to suspend and text of the amendment were offered on September 13, 1950. The wording of the amendment was the same as that offered, in the modified form, to S. 4037. On September 14, Senator WHERRY attempted to bring up his amendment "cold," on its merits. A long debate ensued. Senator LODGE offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute, unacceptable to Senator WHERRY. Senator GEORGE made an impassioned plea for the Wherry amendment as against the Lodge proposal.

Senator WHERRY then asked that his amendment be set aside temporarily and his motion to suspend the rules be brought up in order to remove the hazards of rule XVI. The motion to suspend the rules to clear the way for action on the Wherry amendment passed on a vote of 50 to 23.

(b) Action on the Wherry amendment then followed. Senator CORDON offered a minor word amendment, which was accepted by Senator WHERRY, and the Wherry amendment (as modified), passed the Senate, without dissenting voice. (References: Introduction of motion to suspend and amendment to H. R. 9526, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, page 14640; debate and vote on Wherry amendment, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, pages 14794–14809.)

There was no printing of Wherry amendment, as amended and passed by the Senate, except in printing of H. R. 9526, as it went to the House after conference. See copy attached, exhibit 4 (b).

5. Conference report on H. R. 9256: There was never a conference on the Wherry amendment. It could not be discussed by the conferees until the House could take separate action on it, under a rule similar to that in the Senate.

The conference report and the Wherry amendment were taken to the House for action on September 21, 1950. As a matter of record, the Wherry amendment was never voted upon in the House. Before it could be voted upon, Congressman CANNON introduced a motion to recede from the Senate amendment, and then offered his amendment to replace the Senate amendment. The vote was taken on the Cannon amendment to replace the Wherry amendment.

When the conference report came back to the Senate, action had to be taken on the Cannon amendment over the Wherry amendment approved by the Senate. Senator WHERRY made the plea that his amendment had not gone to conference and therefore the bill should be sent back to conference. He again offered his amendment, with still further amendments, as a substitute for the Cannon amendment. His substitute was defeated by a vote of 28 to 39, and the McKellar motion to accept the Cannon version of the Wherry amendment was accepted. (Reference: Debate on Wherry amendment and substitute, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, pages 15489–15502.)

Mr. MALONE. Do I understand that the amendment which is now before the Senate, known as the Kem amendment, is practically the same as the so-called Wherry resolution?

Mr. KEM. It is identical.

Mr. WHERRY. It is identical. The resolution which I submitted was presented not only for myself, but on behalf of many other Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. Including the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. The amendment is sponsored by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the junior Senator

from Nevada, and it contains the same language which the minority leader had submitted in the form of a resolution, in which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the junior Senator from Nevada joined.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Also the Senator from Michigan and many other Senators.

Mr. MALONE. Is the amendment to be amended now?

Mr. WHERRY. No. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has accepted the Kem amendment in toto. The remarks I made had to do with procedure in conference. I appreciated the remarks of the Senator from Michigan with reference to the vote. If we adopt the amendment unanimously at this time, I hope, regardless of the rules of the House that the amendment as adopted will be brought into conference, where it may be thrashed out. The Senate should stand fast on the mandatory provision.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska is aware, is he not, that exports from Singapore and Hong Kong of rubber, tin, steel, and practically all other materials which are necessary for war and for peace have been stepped up materially in the last 6 or 8 months, perhaps within the last few years.

Mr. WHERRY. The Cannon version on the subject does not go far enough. It is time for the Senate to take action. I know that many speeches have been made and many recommendations have been forthcoming. The pending amendment would place the responsibility squarely where it belongs. It is a mandatory provision. I think it would go a long way toward eliminating the exports which we know are being made and which should be stopped.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the able chairman of the subcommittee has indicated his acceptance of the amendment, I shall not delay the Senate but I should like to ask that a statement which I prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

The Senate Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies has been studying the export controls and policies followed by the agencies of the United States Government in Western Germany and their relation to similar activities of the West German and other allied governments. It is evident that any appraisal of the effectiveness of controls on the export of strategic and critical materials from the United States to Communist areas would be incomplete unless seen in relation to the current activities of those now carried on in Western Europe.

The subcommittee has found a deplorable condition existing with regard to export controls and policies in Western Germany.

As important as Western Germany is in east-west trade, it is evident that a study of allied and West German controls and policies in that country covers only one part of the whole picture of east-west trade, which also involves other countries with whom we have a common security interest. Formal and informal avowals of that common interest have been expressed by participation in the Atlantic Pact, NATO, the European recovery program, and the various military- and economic-aid programs which have formed a major framework of United States foreign policy since World War II.

The investigations of the subcommittee last winter in the United States alone, with respect to exports of strategic and critical materials to Communist China, an aggressor nation which is at this very moment engaged in killing United States and other troop contingents of the United Nations, revealed that even agencies of our own Government were delinquent and tardy in initiating measures to protect our national security.

The recent investigation of Western Germany has shown this to be the case there also. Strategic shipments by one of our major allies, Great Britain, to the Communist enemy, as disclosed recently in the British Parliament, have pointed up the extreme state of confusion, disagreement, and business-as-usual attitudes of large segments of the anti-Communist Western World with regard to east-west trade.

It is true that efforts have been made not only by United States agencies, but also by governments of western Europe and the United Nations to decrease, hinder, and halt the flow of war-potential materials to the eastern bloc. There is very little question, though, that these efforts have been neither adequate nor timely nor wholehearted in terms of the enormous danger that faces the Western World at present.

The question which faces us today is whether what we have done and are doing is too little and too late in countering this situation which now menaces the very freedom of Western Europe and the United States.

Discussions of measures for safeguarding our common security interests in the matter of east-west trade have been marked by quibbling, procrastination, and reluctant acquiescence in those things which are for the national and international good.

Prime Minister Attlee, in a recent statement in the British House of Commons, stated: "There is no agreement as to what is strategic." This statement is an evasive truism which has little value toward achieving effective action to halt the flow of war materials to those who seek to subjugate the free world.

Certainly there can be but a small area of disagreement as to what are strategic materials. We have tangible and definite indications in current world-wide shortages, in a review of the items which we supplied Russia in the war against Nazi Germany, and in the very extensive supplies which are being furnished at present to the North Atlantic Pact countries and, even more, in a review of those things the east is now trying hardest to obtain.

The small real area of disagreement as to which items in international trade may be strategic should be no obstacle to agreement between countries which having just fought one costly war are now engaged in further hostilities which threaten once more to involve the whole world. We already know what mobilization of resources we are requiring now in our own defense effort and in the struggle against the aggressor nations in the Far East. It is incomprehensible, then, why any western nation whose very future is jeopardized should sit back and insist upon the shipment of goods to the east on the theory that the quantity shipped is not strategic.

Defense and security interests cannot be limited to the lowest common denominator of national self-interest, nor can it be geared to the progress made by the least cooperative and least willing country in the community of western nations in limiting exports to the east of restricted material. And yet, what is the record of international cooperation in this very important context of western defense? Let us cite a few examples of international inactivity in achieving common measures of export controls.

Transit trade, shipment of goods to a friendly country whence it is transshiped to the enemy, is acknowledged as a major loophole for strategic shipments to the East, is exceeded perhaps only by direct shipments from noncooperating countries. Such trade is still uncontrolled by anything approaching a multilateral agreement of the western countries. Throughout Europe the traditional free ports are operating without any hindrance as a major channel for strategic supplies to the east.

What about West Europe's export controls? In an effort to ascertain if strategic goods are being reexported or transshipped to the eastern bloc, this country has found it necessary to check the end-use of each shipment of strategic materials to Western European nations. Let me point out, though, that this procedure is being followed not with regard to potentially unfriendly countries, but is directed toward our allies in Western Europe receiving materials, through grants, loans, and outright gifts, from the United States for their armies, their industries, and their citizens. Many of these goods are in short supply here and are needed for our own economy, but we are sharing them in the interests of western defense. Why has it been necessary to institute such checks of our friends and allies? Is it simply that there is no agreement as to what is strategic? Or is it that Western European countries do not have the will or desire to carry out steps necessary to the common defense which may be somewhat onerous to their citizens or disagreeable to their politicians or costly of trade profits.

Why has the United States stood almost alone in denouncing and prosecuting those of its own citizens who have attempted to export illegally to the eastern bloc when practically no other Western European country has done so on any comparable scale? Why is it, indeed, that trade of the western nations with the eastern bloc has increased enormously in terms of machinery and industrial goods and raw materials at a time when less total goods than ever are being offered by Eastern European countries? Much that is offered by the east is not essential to the Western European economies, and the balance there is not sufficient quantity or value to warrant the trade.

The statement made just today in the House of Commons that, in the interest of better relations between Great Britain and the United States, no more rubber would be shipped to Red China for the remainder of this year is a welcome one, even though it comes late, indeed. Maybe by the end of the year it may be possible to convince the British authorities that this ban on shipments of rubber which have contributed so vastly to the war potential of our common foe, should be continued indefinitely. This we must try to do.

It is true that in the period 1947 through 1949 some of the trade with the east was vital to the rehabilitation and supply of the Western European community. There were many items which could not be supplied from the United States if at all, as cheaply and as quickly as from the east. The Western European picture, however, has changed. The trade balance no longer favors the east. Although Western European countries still rely on eastern sources for many supplies, nowhere is there now the former urgency to obtain them from that market. Nor is the exchange in terms of hard goods or essentials in favor of the western countries. Western Europeans face a Communist trade bloc whose very motive is to play one country against another to drain from the west those goods with which a war potential of frightening proportions is being built.

It is time to face these facts squarely and with the hard-headed realism which is required to match the ruthless cunning of those who would use our very inactivity and short-sighted disagreements for their profit and our eventual destruction. The Western World must adopt and effectively enforce a collective system of dealing with the east which will not only put trade on a quid pro quo basis, but will assure that such trade will take place only when a strategic advantage inures to the west. The United States must provide leadership and receive cooperation from Western Europe in meeting the common peril which is implicit in east-west trade, to the end that no soldier of the United States or of any other of the United Nations serving in the cause of freedom will die of a bullet inscribed in the west and shipped through the courtesy of confusion, laxity, and irresolution.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it would be highly desirable for the Senate to give backing to the assertions and observations which have been made this afternoon. The Senator from Arizona has indicated his wholehearted approval of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who have been consistently in favor of such a provision.

I should like to make one comment with reference to a statement made this afternoon by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], which I appreciate, of course, because he referred to the senior Senator from Maryland. Today in the House of Commons, as the Senator from Nevada has stated, it was asserted that representatives of Great Britain have indicated their willingness to suspend shipments from Hong Kong, but they attach to their willingness the condition "for the remainder of the year," and only in respect to certain categories of shipments.

We have found that since last June, or since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, there have been exported some $357,000,000 worth of strategic supplies; from Great Britain, $11,200,000; from Hong Kong, $288,400,000; from Malaya, $56,000,000.

My only reason for emphasizing the point, and hoping that the Senate conferees will stand firm, is that we have recently received further disquieting information concerning the export policies having to do with east-west trade in Europe. It shows a disgraceful situation. The Senator from Arizona very accurately has stated that we placed controls on shipments, an all-out embargo, as of last December. I regret to say that prior to that time, when we were alleging that shipments were going forward, our own officials were making statements that no strategic supplies were being sent behind the iron curtain.

The Senator from Arizona has confirmed the fact that during the months of September, October, and November, when our boys were fighting in Korea, these shipments were being made, although our own officials were denying that that was so. I agree entirely with what has been said by other Senators, and only hope that by a show of unanimity on this floor we can indicate to the conferees that we intend to have them take action which will put a stop to this thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know that the hour is late, but I ask the Senator whether or not it is true that, while the Congress has been endeavoring to accomplish the result of stopping such trade not only between the United States and countries behind the iron curtain, but also between other nations who are our allies and Communist countries, yet the trade has been continuing and is actually helping the Soviet and its satellites in their war effort? Although we have endeavored to enact legislation prohibiting the traffic, we have not accomplished anything. Has not the time come when we must accomplish this result by mandatory legislation so far as our own country is concerned, and so far as aid to our allies is concerned?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think that is unquestionably true. I do not believe that in any other way will it be effective in regard to our attempts to have our so-called allies join with us.

Mr. FERGUSON. The situation becomes really ridiculous when we trade with our enemies. Does not the Senator feel that the time has come to act in this matter if we do not want to have the blood of our boys on our hands?

Mr. O'CONOR. I agree entirely with the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland if he does not believe that it is a disgraceful situation in the first place, when it is necessary for the Congress of the United States to enact a firm law to keep our Cabinet officers from assisting our enemies, with whom we are now at war, and to prevent our enemies from receiving materials which are war materials? Everything is war material when we are at war.

Mr. O'CONOR. I can best answer the Senator by saying that I think it is disgraceful for anyone to give assistance to our enemies. Actually this country has been giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and our allies have been doing likewise, because they have drawn very false distinctions as to what is strategic. Under that theory they have been allowing very useful materials to go behind the iron curtain because they contend that there is some doubt as to what is strategic, when there can be no question about the nature of the goods which, until the past week, they have been sending.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate on March 4 and 5, 1948, before the initial Marshall plan was passed, and inserted in the RECORD a firm trade treaty which had been made between England and Russia. The first item in the treaty was 1,100 locomotives. The list of materials comprised dozens of articles, including tool steel, electrical equipment, all kinds of construction equipment, and everything else needed to fight a war or to live in peace, everything needed to consolidate gains made in Eastern Europe. If this material could not have been furnished in the way it was, Russia and her satellites might have had to turn to other nations and change their tune and their allegiance.

Does the Senator agree with me that a large amount of the material which Communist China—of course, assisted by Communist Russia, without a doubt—is using to kill our boys in Korea was furnished and paid for by the taxpayers of America, who are the fathers of the boys being killed?

Mr. O'CONOR. Of course, I am unable to say that the identical material which has been used in killing our soldiers is traceable to a certain spot, but I think I can answer the Senator's question by saying that wholesale quantities of strategic useful war materials have gone from this country since last June, and from our allies up until very recently. It has served to build up the industrial and military potential of the Communist countries.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that for the past 4 years the State Department has continually allowed statements to leak, or has made them directly from the State Department and other departments, to the effect that in order to obtain manganese and other strategic materials from Russia we must sell the kind of material which she needs and is unable to manufacture?

Mr. O'CONOR. I cannot confirm the statement.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator remember the press dispatches?

Mr. O'CONOR. I know what the Senator is referring to, and I recall the statements which he placed in the RECORD.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. We now have the spectacle of India asking for 2,000,000 tons of wheat, or some other fantastic amount. She has many things which we could use, in the way of strategic and critical minerals and materials, such as hemp, manganese, and various other materials. She has placed an embargo or a limit upon the amount of manganese which can be shipped to this country.

The junior Senator from Nevada knows from personal study that there is more manganese in India than both India and the United States could use in the next 50 years. There is probably more manganese in South Africa than South Africa and the United States could use in 50 years; and probably more in Brazil than both the United States and Brazil could use in that length of time. Does it not add up to the fact that what our State Department has been trying to do is to convince itself, and then convince the country, that it was necessary to send certain materials

to Russia and to other Communist countries in order to obtain the materials which we needed?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am thankful to the Senator for his observation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] for himself and other Senators. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, was there a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri? I could not hear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was agreed to without objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has on the desk an amendment to the bill in relation to the salaries and expenses of the minority and majority policy committees. At this time he is not going to offer the amendment. The period remaining for the use of this fund is only about a month and a half. It would probably be impossible at this late date, to obtain such research personnel as would be required. The Senator from Michigan is withholding his amendment because of the persuasion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is the chairman of the subcommittee on legislative salaries and legislative aides. I know that he intends to make a thorough study and examination of the entire program, and that this is a matter which can be considered by the committee in connection with the regular 1952 appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I intend to go into that subject very thoroughly.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will not offer the amendment, although the subject is very important. The policy committees perform a very important and valuable function in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 3587) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, be ordered to be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO ATTORNEY EMPLOYED BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who desires to take up on Monday the motion to reconsider Senate Joint Resolution 70 to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. No action should be taken on it today, but in order that it may be the unfinished business, so that it will be taken up on Monday, I move that the Senate now proceed to consider the motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 70 was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to proceed to the motion to reconsider.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS TO PERSONS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the presiding officer be authorized to sign Senate Joint Resolution 72, to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is that the joint resolution which was passed by the Senate this afternoon?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN PRICE OF CHILEAN COPPER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada would like to call to the attention of the Senate the action of the State Department in agreeing, with what he would call indecent haste, to a 3-cent increase in the price of copper from Chile, which brings the price of Chilean copper to 28 cents per pound. This action was taken after the passage of the Free Trade Act on copper. The proponents of the bill to suspend the import taxes on copper agreed that its passage was necessary to enable the United States to get more copper from foreign sources, Chile particularly, and that the knocking down of the tariff would make more copper available.

Mr. President, I wish to read an excerpt from an article published in the Journal of Commerce on May 8, the day the increase in the Chilean copper price was agreed to. The article which is dated Washington, May 7, being a dispatch from the Washington Bureau, is as follows:

> The United States has agreed to a 3-cent increase in the price of Chilean copper, the State Department announced today.
>
> In reporting on talks carried on between the United States and Chilean Governments on copper problems, the State Department also disclosed that this country has agreed to steps designed to increase copper production in the South American country.
>
> Chile, on the other hand, has agreed to make more copper available for United States defense purposes, and to take steps to keep its copper out of the hands of countries in the Soviet bloc.

There was a blackmailed threat of selling copper to other countries in the Soviet bloc if we did not agree to the free trade on copper.

I read further:

> American copper companies with interests in Chile will expand their production without financial assistance from the United States Government but with the promise of priority assistance for equipment.

THE ADMINISTRATION DOES NOT MAKE SENSE

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada calls that indecent haste. The State Department should at least have waited a decent length of time until we could forget the reasons for suspending the duty on copper. This latest action leaves the independent producers of copper in the United States with a controlled copper price of 24 cents, with the 2 cent tariff reimposed when the price goes below 24 cents.

At the Geneva Conference, that gave birth to the GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—the State Department reduced the import tax on copper from 4 cents per pound to 2 cents per pound. A little later it then persuaded the Congress to supend even that duty, under various kinds of excuses. The question of the tax on copper belonged in the realm of foreign policy, and our relations with Chile would be injured. Lately the excuse was that it would bring more copper into this country.

Now, on top of all that, the State Department agrees to a higher price on copper from Chile.

As I have said before, Mr. President, in this connection it does not hurt the companies that own the properties in South America, in Chile, but it is a little embarrassing to the small copper producer, or the prospector, or investor who has some idea of finding or developing a new copper deposit, because private money will not be invested in his enterprise.

Mr. President, in the House Report No. 285 to accompany House bill 3336, made by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, the bill dealing with the copper import-tax suspension, we find the following on page 2:

> Despite the unanimous assurances of all the departments and agencies of the Government that suspension of the import tax on copper under present and foreseeable conditions could not adversely affect domestic producers of copper, the bill contains its own assurance in the interest of the domestic copper-mining industry by providing for revocation of the suspension whenever the price of copper falls below the price of 24 cents per pound. Accordingly, the committee is unanimous in recommending prompt enactment of the bill.

TARIFF REIMPOSITION UNREALISTIC

Mr. President, that shows just the kind of reasonsing that has been used frequently in relation to the production of many war materials in this country. In this case, a price was grabbed out of

thin air, as the junior Senator from Nevada explained when the bill was being discussed on the Senate floor; the arbitrary price of 24 cents was grabbed out of thin air as the point below which the tariff would be reimposed. This figure has no relation whatever to a fair and reasonably competitive price for foreign copper as compared with domestic copper.

On April 25, 1951, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 4335, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio called to the attention of the junior Senator from Nevada the following:

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the State Department is discussing paying to Chile 23 cents a pound for all the copper Chile produces, as compared to the 24 cents a pound which is paid to American producers?

The junior Senator from Nevada answered:

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I learned this morning that the State Department is intending to raise the price of Chilean copper. However, that is not a precedent, for in the past 18 years not a single instance in which a domestic producer got a break has come to my attention.

In other words, the State Department intends to pay more for foreign copper and for foreign zinc and for foreign lead and for foreign tungsten and for every other metal produced in a foreign country, than is paid to the domestic producers of those metals.

I quote further from the RECORD of that date, April 25. The junior Senator from Nevada said:

As the distinguished Senator from Ohio said a few moments ago, it has already been agreed—I repeat, it has already been agreed—that more will be paid to Chile for copper than the price which has been fixed in the pending bill for domestic copper.

Mr. President, quoting further from that RECORD, I said:

Mr. President, I want to make brief mention of something which has been going on throughout the country. Resolutions of mining organizations have been adopted. Most of them are set up for the particular purpose of protecting large producers. Many of these mining organizations have adopted resolutions favoring free trade on copper.

The United States Chamber of Commerce has a resolution favoring free trade.

Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States favors free trade in general, not merely in regard to copper. Copper is merely a symbol in this fight for free trade which we are discussing.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT TO BE EXTENDED

I understand that on Monday the Senate will take up the bill, H. R. 1612, to extend for two more years the authority of the thoroughly discredited Secretary of State to have complete control over industry and the workingmen of our Nation. This bill was reported unanimously by the Finance Committee. Under that bill, if it is enacted, there can be another Torquay conference; and if the job of creating free trade has not already been completed—although we believe it has—it can be completed then.

Mr. President, numerous mining organzations have gone on record by way of resolution in regard to this matter. For instance, the Nevada Mine Operators' Association, meeting at Reno, Nev., on February 23, 1951, adopted a resolution from which I now read:

Whereas it is obvious that the present duty on copper is nothing more than a hindrance to obtaining this very necessary and urgently needed metal from accessible foreign sources, such as the copper mines of South America which are owned and operated by citizens of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That for national defense and for preservation of the domestic copper mining industry, Nevada Mine Operators' Association, representing copper producers of this State, earnestly urges that the present tariff duty be suspended for the emergency, and, to that end, it endorses and recommends passage of pending legislation suspending that duty.

COPPER TAX SUSPENSION MEANS LOSS OF TAXPAYER'S MONEY AS WELL AS OF INVESTMENTS

Mr. President, all that suspension of the tariff on copper will do will be to put out of business, probably permanently, any independent domestic copper producer, unless he can receive from the Government of the United States, in payments from the Treasury—which many of them have been able to do—some of the taxpayers' money, with the result that at the end of the emergency the taxpayers' money will be lost. That procedure has made it impossible for not only the copper industry, but also the textile industry, the chinaware and pottery industry and many other industries to obtain private investment funds for their expansion.

Mr. President, the Butte Miners Union in a resolution on this subject has made the following declaration:

Resolved, That the Butte Miners Union declares its support of legislation now before Congress the purpose and intent of which is to suspend the duty on import of copper for the duration of the national emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators MURRAY and ECTON and to Congressmen MANSFIELD and D'EWART.

The international executive board of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers has issued a statement in regard to the layoffs in the brass industry. That statement appears by way of a long resolution on that subject. I read a part of the resolution:

3. During such time as copper remains in acute short supply in this country no useful purpose is served by the present duty on imported copper and it should be temporarily suspended.

* * * * *

A government which is only too anxious to provide billions to industry in rebates, subsidies, loans, and other considerations should assume some responsibility for the very existence of thousands of its citizens who are the needless victims of Government policies.

WE ALL WANT FREE TRADE ON WHAT WE BUY, TARIFFS ON WHAT WE SELL

I thoroughly agree with that statement; but I wish to call to the attention of the President of the Senate the fact that the products manufactured by the brass industry have an ad valorem tariff of anywhere from 15 to 65 percent.

The copper fabricating industry cannot live 60 days without those tariffs. I approve of a tariff on those products. Copper constitutes about 60 to 80 percent of the raw materials used by the fabricating industry; so the mining organizations have adopted numerous resolutions similar to the one adopted by the Colorado Mining Association, which includes the following statement:

In view of the fact that copper must be had if we are to maintain our standard of living and prepare for the momentous tasks ahead, we must secure all the copper possible both from domestic and foreign sources.

Mr. President, if there were free trade on fabricated copper products, just as there is free trade on copper, it would be impossible to get private capital to invest in that industry.

LARGE COMPANIES CONTROL COPPER INDUSTRY

By the way, Mr. President, 75 to 80 percent of the production in the brass industry is owned or controlled by the large companies, all of whom backed the legislation suspending the copper tariffs. However, let me state what the effect of this legislation, if enacted, will be: If the tariff is removed from copper—private investment will shy away from the domestic copper industry.

COPPER ONLY A SYMBOL

And copper is only a symbol in this fight involving 500 to 1,000 other products, such as textiles, precision instruments, chinaware, machinery and steel products of all kinds and many, many other products.

The minute we tamper with the tariffs on those products we scare away any private investment money which might otherwise be invested in those industries. Thereby, in the case of copper we destroy for at least the length of the duration of the emergency, and for as long as Congress continues to nibble at the tariff, any possibility of having private money used in looking for new deposits of copper.

MANY DEPOSITS OF COPPER ARE WAITING TO BE WORKED

By the way, Mr. President, let me state that in 11 Western States alone there are approximately 469 known copper deposits. Some of them have been worked, but most of them have not been.

Mr. President, I now read briefly from a statement made by the Senator from Georgia to the Senate when he reported out the bill to suspend the import tax on copper:

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief statement. Two amendments were made to the bill, one of which was an amendment offered in committee by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], relative to the expiration of the act, which amendment was accepted by the conferees.

Mr. President, that amendment provided for the suspension to be lifted by February 1953, or the expiration of the emergency, whichever came earlier.

The copper-tax suspension bill itself on its face is a farce and a subterfuge, Mr. President, just as is the bill which will extend for two more years the authority of the Secretary of State over all industry and all the workingmen of America, the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which will come before the Senate next Monday.

Mr. President, this copper bill is essentially no different from the 1934

Trade Agreements Act, except that it creates free trade for one product separately. I am opposed to the spirit of either one, and I warn the Senate that it is foolish and dangerous to make two separate issues of these two bills.

THE TREASURY SUPPORTS OUR ECONOMY

Mr. President, as I have said on numerous occasions, these tariff reductions are made under cover of war, under the authority of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, just as the war was supposedly the reason for suspending the copper tax. And we are in a war, regardless of what the President says about "a police action" and regardless of the fact that the veterans of the war in Korea are being turned down by Veterans' Administration hospitals because the Korean War is called a police action. Regardless of all those legal shenanigans, Mr. President, this is a war, and we are financing our industries out of the Treasury of the United States. That is the only way we can exist now, for with our present economic structure, we cannot live in time of peace.

THE KOREAN WAR CURED UNEMPLOYMENT

All of us say we want peace; but the minute we have peace, the entire economic structure of our country will crumble, just as it was starting to crumble before the so-called Korean police action began, when we had 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 men unemployed on the 26th day of June 1950, and 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 men partially employed. However, as Mr. Sawyer said very soon after the Korean War started, "We certainly cured the unemployment situation." He seemed to be very proud of that. But, Mr. President, to me that is not the way to cure unemployment.

Under cover of war, under cover of an emergency, we are completing the job of creating free trade by dividing the markets of the United States with all the nations of the world, precluding from future employment the working men in this country who get from $8 to $10 and $12 a day, making them compete with the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia, where the workers receive from 40 cents a day up to perhaps $2.50 or $3 as a maximum.

Mr. President, I want to say at this point that most foreign nations have the same machinery available now in their industries and the same technical assistance that we have in this country, so the labor cost alone is the item which affects production costs.

The House bill which has been reported out—H. R. 1612—extends the authority of the thoroughly discredited State Department for 2 years more. It continues that authority over the workingmen, the industries, and the investors of this country. As reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee, it extends the time for 2 years. The thoroughly discredited and exposed Secretary of State may at his discretion utterly destroy any group of workingmen and industries in this Nation. He may continue to select at his whim the industries which are to be destroyed and those which are to be preserved. He can rearrange the industrial map of the United States by the destruction of specific industries.

EFFECT OF TARIFF CUTS DELAYED EXCEPT ON MINES

Mr. President, the State Department has closed 75 percent of the mines of the Nation, by putting the $10-per-day miner out of work, and importing the mineral products of the 50-cents-per-day to $2-per-day miners in Europe and in Asia. I simply use minerals as an example. The same thing is true of textiles, of crockery, of precision instruments, and of chinaware, as well as of any one of 400 or 500 other products. The tariff cuts were just beginning to take effect when the so-called police action was started in Korea. As soon as we have peace again, the disastrous effect will again take hold of the economy of this country.

THE CONGRESS HAS BEEN DECEIVED

Mr. President, I wanted to call attention to the almost immediate move to increase the price of Chilean copper after the promises of how the cheaper copper and the more abundant copper would become available to the industries of the United States. What a great case was built up here for the suspension of the copper tax. I am very sure that, if the Senate of the United States had known and had been sure, when the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the junior Senator from Nevada called attention to the fact, that we were going to pay more for copper from a foreign country than we would pay to our own, higher cost producers, the Senate might have considered the bill more carefully. I have noticed many editorials to the effect that, we can outproduct anyone on account of our efficiency. There is no more efficiency in a copper mine in this country than there is in a copper mine in Chile, because the identical processes are used in Chile that are used here.

Had the Senate been fully convinced that the State Department was going to increase the price paid for Chilean copper and subject this country to the blackmail of a threat, or to a promise not to sell quite so much to a Soviet nation, all for the price of 3 cents a pound, the Senate would have rejected the copper bill. And this is not the end. There will be other concessions to foreign nations, concessions detrimental to our pride, to our self-esteem, and to our economy. Wait and see.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was otherwise engaged in committee hearings last Thursday and did not have an opportunity to take the floor to add a comment upon the commemoration of Polish Constitution Day, the 3d of May.

We in America owe much to the spirit of freedom which was enshrined in the Polish Constitution and transplanted by Poland's sons and daughters to flourish in the climate of liberty which our own Constitution provides. The spirit of Polish freedom gave us the names of such men as Kosciusko and Pulaski, whose heroism is a part of our national tradition.

But America has not served well the spirit of Polish freedom. As parties to the infamous agreement at Yalta, we have done much to extinguish the flame of freedom in Poland and to reduce a great nation and people to bondage.

We can rectify some of that by denouncing the errors of Yalta and by rededicating ourselves to polices which will yet see men who wish to be free, living in freedom.

We can and we must keep faith with the Polish people, whose sense of liberty and justice was embodied in their own great constitution, and from whom our own heritage of freedom has derived such great inspiration and tangible support.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 14, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Heyward G. Hill, of Louisiana.
Paul W. Meyer, of Colorado.

Edward D. McLaughlin, of Arkansas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Robert E. Ward, Jr., of South Carolina, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Robin E. Steussy, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Walter E. Kneeland, of Texas.
Joseph H. Rogatnick, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Arthur Doak Barnett, of New York.
Philip J. Conley, of Maine.
Leo S. Disher, Jr., of North Carolina.
Robert W. Ehrman, of the District of Columbia.
Archibald B. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Peter J. C. Adam, of New Jersey.
Wilson P. Dizard, Jr., of New York.
Robert W. Kerwin, of Missouri.
Glenn Lee Smith, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert G. Caldwell, of Massachusetts.
Herbert Cerwin, of California.
Bruce Buttles, of Pennsylvania.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following-named commissioned officer of

the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the rank indicated:

To be Assistant Director with rank of rear admiral

Robert W. Knox, effective June 1, 1951.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commander in chief, Far East, with the rank of general and as general in the Army of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom our fathers trusted and who bequeathed to us the rich heritage of a strong faith, make us daily more sensitive to Thy will and more obedient to Thy will.

May our faith be equal to the perilous times in which we are living and may we be loyal partners with all who are engaged in the difficult task of establishing Thy kingdom of peace on this earth.

Grant that we may have the courage to believe that all things will work together for our good if we love Thee. May we be confident that the day is coming when Thy promises shall be fulfilled and men and nations shall walk together on the highways of brotherhood and good will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Armstrong	Gossett	Murphy
Bailey	Granger	Murray, Wis.
Baring	Gwinn	Patman
Barrett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Powell
Battle		Price
Belcher	Hall, Leonard W.	Prouty
Blatnik		Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Harden	Regan
Burnside	Hébert	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Hedrick	Roosevelt
Carlyle	Holifield	Sadlak
Celler	Irving	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Crosser	Jackson, Wash.	
Dawson		Shafer
Dingell	Jenison	Short
Dorn	Kersten, Wis.	Sieminski
Fallon	King	Taylor
Fogarty	Latham	Velde
Fugate	Magee	Vinson
Gavin	Miller, Calif.	Vorys
Gillette	Miller, N. Y.	Wood, Ga.
Gordon	Morrison	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had completed reading the first paragraph. If there are no amendments to that paragraph, the Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the act establishing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (7. U. S. C. 411) and related acts, as follows:

Economic investigations: For conducting investigations and for acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, $2,150,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading "Economic investigations" shall be used for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 3, line 19, strike out "$2,150,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to pay tribute to a young constituent and personal friend of mine, Lt. Louis V. Genuario, of Norwalk, Conn., a West Point appointee of former Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce, and a man whom this Nation may well regard with pride.

Last Saturday Lieutenant Genuario received the Silver Star for gallantry in action.

He entered the Korean War as a veteran despite the fact that he is but 25 years old. Lieutenant Genuario served in the Air Force in China during World War II and upon his discharge entered West Point. Fresh out of West Point, he landed in Korea on September 1, and 11 days thereafter he single-handedly fought off an enemy rush, prevented a break-through and killed at least 100 men with hand grenades and an automatic rifle without regard for personal danger.

Eleven days after this marvelous feat, for which Lieutenant Genuario was awarded the Silver Star, the young officer was wounded while leading his platoon in an attack on a hill near the town of Am-Sin.

Lieutenant Genuario has been encased in a cast from the waist down ever since. He is recuperating at St. Albans Naval Hospital, and it is his fervent hope that he will soon be recalled for active service.

Such men as Lieutenant Genuario truly are representative of the finest of American manhood. While we are blessed with leaders such as he to carry the standard of freedom in this war-tortured world, we cannot help but gain eventual victory.

The complete text of the citation awarded to Lt. Louis V. Genuario for his high courage is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS SECOND INFANTRY DIVISION,
APO 248 c/o POSTMASTER,
San Francisco, Calif., October 18, 1950.

General Orders No. 70.

Section II

Award of the Silver Star: By direction of the President, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 9, 1918 (WD Bul. 43, 1918), and pursuant to authority contained in AR 600-45, the Silver Star for gallantry in action is awarded to the following-named officer:

Second Lt. Louis V. Genuario, 062696, Infantry, United States Army, a member of Company G, Thirty-eighth Infantry Regiment, Second Infantry Division, displayed gallantry in action against an armed enemy on September 12, 1950, in the vicinity of Am-Sin, Korea. On the afternoon of September 12, 1950, Lieutenant Genuario, a rifle platoon leader, was assigned the mission of utilizing his platoon as a holding force in tactics involving encirclement and ambush of a superior number of enemy troops. When the primary stages of the mission had been accomplished and the initial attack launched the platoon received the brunt of the enemy's attempt to escape the encirclement. When the success of the mission was threatened due to a weakening of our line Lieutenant Genuario, with complete disregard for his own personal safety, charged the enemy positions with hand grenades and automatic weapons fire. An enemy break-through was averted and approximately 100 enemies were annihilated. His gallant action on this occasion reflects great credit upon himself and the Armed Forces of the United States. Entered the military service from Connecticut.

By command of Major General Keiser:

GERALD G. EPLEY,
Colonel, GSC, Chief of Staff.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment occurs in line 19, page 3 of the bill, and if adopted would reduce the item from $2,150,000 to $2,000,000. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has two major lines of work. The one which in my opinion is most valuable as far as agriculture is concerned is that of assembling crop and livestock estimates. The subcommittee has recognized the good work of this particular division and the need for it, and has allowed, as you will note on line 11, page 4, approximately the full budget estimate, reducing the request by only $16,000. I am in full agreement with that section of the subcommittee's action.

However, I cannot agree that we should spend $2,150,000 on the more or less theoretical and nebulous end of the work of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics pertaining to economic investigations. The subcommittee did take away from the estimates given by the Budget for this item the sum of $379,000 and allowed $2,150,000. The attitude of the subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, in making this $379,000 reduction is well illustrated by the comments of our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. If you will turn to page 14 of the hearings, you will notice that in referring to the economic investigations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] said:

> All that information is very worth while, but it strikes me that you might give a little thought as to whether this is an abnormal period, and whether you should not wait in doing some of this sort of work.

Now, Mr. WHITTEN's remarks well illustrate the attitude of the minds of the members of the subcommittee as to the need for the expenditure of this much money for investigations into the economic aspects of agriculture at this time. The subcommittee's reaction, by the way, is reflected in our reduction of $379,000 below the amount requested for 1952.

All my amendment does is to further decrease that particular appropriation by $150,000. It would still leave those people for this work $2,000,000 and with which to make investigations and studies, based on data which they gather under the other portion of this appropriation, for which we allow them $2,850,000.

Mr. Chairman, $2,000,000 is a lot of money. It will hire approximately 400 people, at the least. Surely this should be sufficient personnel to analyze the results of the statistical data gathered by the further expenditure of another $2,850,000.

I am offering this amendment simply because I believe that we can here save $150,000 without harming agriculture in the least and without doing anybody anything but good at this time. If we must spend this $150,000, let me suggest to you a place in this bill where we could well add with advantage to what has been allotted by the subcommittee. It could be much better allocated, for example, for research into the development of new strains of rust-resistant grains. Do you Members know that in this past year 1951 we lost at least $30,000,000 in these United States because of the occurrence of that new race of rust known as 15–B. That is where I would like to see a part of this $150,000 expended and at least $50,000 of it should be definitely earmarked in this bill for that purpose. It is suggested in the report that the Department of Agriculture should utilize $50,000, but that is by no means mandatory. Just yesterday, I noticed in the press that the oat crop in certain sections this spring is already suffering the results of this new strain of rust and deteriorating rapidly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. When we talk about our feed grains, our wheat, our oats, our barley, our rye, our corn, we are talking about something worth five or six thousand million dollars a year to the people of America, five or six billions. Is it not penny-wise and pound-foolish not to place in this bill at least $150,000 for this purpose? Let us develop new strains of wheat, new varieties of wheat, barley, rye, and oats to withstand this threat to our food production.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting that we save $150,000 at this point and utilize the money where it will bring back worth-while results. The Department should get down to brass tacks and develop new strains of wheat and grain to obviate another loss of $30,000,000 such as happened this last spring in our food grain production.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, please remember that when you do vote for my amendment to save this $150,000 we are giving to the crop and livestock reporting portion in this bill every dime, practically, that they asked for. Mr. Wells is doing a good job in that particular division. We want to give him all the money, needed for that work, and we have; so do not think for a minute that I am objecting to that part of it; it is at the expense of this item, "Economic investigation," which is far too theoretical sometimes to be of much help to agriculture, and out of which I am trying to save this $150,000, Mr. Chairman. With this I leave it to the good judgment of the Members of the House as to whether or not it should be done.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who just preceded me is vitally interested in agriculture and one of the finest Members of the House of Representatives, but his argument that you just heard points out one of the problems that we have on this committee. Not a single witness who came before our committee could see how a cut could be made in the things in which he was interested. On the other hand, every one was willing to cut those things that were across the hill. When you sit on a committee and try to balance out that kind of thing you can imagine the problems that develop.

My friend from Minnesota is right in describing this problem in regard to wheat rust. He comes from that area and I appreciate his point of view. But this is just one example of what we have clear across the Nation. After month-long hearings we do our best to provide for the needs that are presented to us. Incidentally, we were not give the benefit of my friend's opinion in the subcommittee or in the full committee on this matter now under consideration. His objection is presented here on the floor, where it will get in the papers. But that is not the basis on which we should act in times when we are trying to get increased production from agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows that I reserved all of my rights on each and every item in the bill. I stated that I wanted to be in an open frame of mind so as to not preclude future consideration of amendments. The gentleman, I think, will agree that is a correct statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly will agree. But it is most unusual for a man with as fine a mind as the gentleman has to sit on a committee for 3 months listening to testimony and then find it necessary to reserve on every item while marking up the bill in the subcommittee. I should think a man would have his mind made up on some of it. But he is within his rights and I have no criticism to make. This item involves work under the activity "economic investigations." The gentleman says "I am in favor of keeping these records on crop and livestock estimates." Why do you keep these records on crop and livestock estimates? So that through these economic investigations committees of Congress and officials of the Government can use the data to arrive at conclusions and to determine parity and to determine how much material should be set aside for fertilizer, for farm machinery, and so forth. Why get up all this data if you are not going to use it? The purpose of spending the money that the gentleman says we should spend is to get this data together. Then you have to analyze it and put it together to determine what the crop outlook is. How are you going to determine how much wheat under the International Wheat Agreement you can send abroad unless you have somebody to compile and put together this data? How are you going to determine this India grain loan unless you have some idea how much grain you have?

I want to call your attention to the fact that the Department of Agriculture has asked the farmers of this country to increase production by 21,600,000 acres of land. Where are you going to get the figures to determine how much increase you should have?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman full well knows that there are $2,000,000 left in the bill for the purpose of analyzing those figures. The gentleman speaks as if the gentleman from Minnesota is endeavoring to strike out the entire $2,150,000. Let us get down to earth. We still leave them $2,000,000, and I still insist that is an awful lot of money.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is a lot of money. But the gentleman's amendment reminds me of the time when I was practicing law. I used to try lawsuits against a lawyer who represented a number of insurance companies, and he always found fault with the cost bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this lawyer always found fault with the cost bill which, of course, his client had to pay. On one occasion I had settled a lawsuit with this lawyer, we had the cost bill, and he was going over it with the clerk. He came down a certain item in the cost bill and this lawyer said, "Charlie, what in the world have you got this item in there for?" And the clerk said, "Mr. Brown, I knew you were going to question something, so I put that in there so I could take it out when you did."

Mr. Chairman, this committee sat for 3 months and we arrived at a general agreement. My friend did reserve his rights on each and every item in the bill. But he did not offer any amendments in committee that were not adopted. He is certainly within his rights. I cannot say he is wrong. I am just telling you the situation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think the statement I did not offer any amendments which were not agreed to is quite correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Could the gentleman repeat a single one that he offered which was turned down?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will recall, I tried hard to get that little additional money for a study of these new strains of wheat. The gentleman stated he would put in the report the suggestion to the Department that $50,000 be expended for this purpose. That is not agreeing to my amendment by any means.

Mr. WHITTEN. I meant any amendment the gentleman offered to reduce appropriations. Of course, the gentleman wanted to look better to his district, which is to his credit. He represents his district and I do not object to his looking after it. But this bill is supposed to look after agriculture on a Nation-wide basis. I know it is popular today to offer amendments on the floor and have the opportunity to say later on "I voted for every cut that was offered." I want to point out, however, that the amounts in this bill, as reported to you, represent a bigger reduction under last year than the amounts finally approved by this body on any bill considered thus far this year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows full well that there is not a member of our subcommittee who looks after these things from a sectional point of view. If I did, I might question the over $1,000,000 that we gave to your part of the country to take care of the pink boll worm. I did not offer any amendment to it, because I think that is a good, worth-while proposition, and I do not think the gentleman should even insinuate here that the gentleman from Minnesota is looking at it from a sectional viewpoint. Very little wheat is grown in my congressional district.

Mr. WHITTEN. I said the gentleman should look after his district. He just stated he wanted to increase the amount of money for new strains of wheat. He acted properly; there is no criticism of that. When you speak of this pink boll worm that affects cotton, the Government put up one-tenth of the amount of money in that control program. They put up 100 percent for barberry control in the gentleman's area. There are different reasons for it, and certainly it is our desire to be fair and reasonable. But I do want to make the situation clear as these small amendments are offered that you are taking something where the committee in its best judgment has reduced as much as we think we justifiably can. I am talking of the joint judgment of the committee. I think the gentleman did reserve his rights on all items, and I make no criticism of it. But, this bill is reduced now as it comes to you more than any other bill has been cut so far this year after you got through with it. I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman, of course, knows that one-half of the savings effected in this bill are as the result of what we are taking away in payments to the farmers of the Nation. We have removed, I think, $26,000,000 from the Soil Conservation, and if it were not for that we would show about 6 percent reduction instead of 11 or 12 that some people think.

Mr. WHITTEN. If you exempt each cut that we made, we did not cut it any, but in the aggregate, we cut it more than any bill that has been passed by the House this year. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment. It is an amendment that seeks to save money.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my purpose to try to economize by cutting down all possible expenditures.

Recently I appeared before this House and spoke on the subject that the Government is spending entirely too much money. I also claimed that the Government is giving away too much money. And now for a few minutes I want to show that the Government is lending too much money.

The serious result of the Government's reckless financial programs is the constant increase of the already monumental national debt. The interest on the national debt is $5,700,000,000 a year. This is over a billion dollars a year more than the total cost of the Government when Franklin D. Roosevelt was first elected.

These serious financial situations are constantly before the Ways and Means Committee, which has the duty of preparing legislation to meet the terrific Government expenditures. The committee has been holding daily meetings for more than 3 months considering another big tax bill. The people in all walks of life are worried about this tax bill, for they feel that they are already taxed to death. The people are constantly complaining about the terribly high cost of living, much of which is due to taxes of many different kinds. Everything the people buy carries many hidden taxes.

Personal income taxes are already too high but the administration is demanding that they be increased drastically. The taxes on corporations have been increasing gradually during the past few years and now it is proposed to increase them until many small corporations will be forced out of business.

Heavy increased taxes are threatened on automobiles and gasoline. Also on jewelry, candy, cosmetics, freezers, refrigerators, cigarettes and many other commodities. Why all these taxes? Mr. Chairman, if the Government would stop its reckless spending and its unreasonable give-away programs and its wild lending we would reduce the threats of inflation and would soon be able to live within our income and to reduce our big debt.

It is not an inherent right of the Government to go into the business of lending money. It should not do so except in cases where the safety of the Republic is in jeopardy. It has only been a few years since the Government went into the money-lending business. Up to about 20 years ago I think we had only entered into one lending venture. But since then the loans have been numerous and stupendous. The only limit seems to be the patience of the people.

The greatest experiment was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This organization was formed for a good purpose but the New Deal blight ruined it and recent scandalous disclosures have made it imperative that the RFC be dissolved. These men who are among the most qualified to speak on the subject, former President Herbert Hoover, former RFC Chairman Jesse Jones and Marriner Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board, vigorously and positively support my view that the RFC has outlived its usefulness and should be dissolved.

Practically all the money the Government gets comes from the people through taxes. If Washington needs money so badly for the war effort, why is it planning to advance more than $2 billion in

Government loans that have a very questionable relationship to the defense effort? During the next fiscal year, these nonessential loans are going to be paid out to farmers, businessmen, homeowners, and others at the rate of almost $6 million a day, every day of the year, including Sundays and holidays. And even in these days of high prices and huge expenditures, $6 million a day will buy a lot of guns, bullets, tanks, and planes for our Armed Forces.

Then why is this $2,000,000,000 going into such Government loans instead of going into the defense effort? That, it seems to me, raises a more basic question: Why is the Government in the lending business at all? If a loan is sound, it can usually be arranged through private credit channels, particularly in times like these when money is plentiful. And if a loan is unsound, there is no reason why the taxpayers of the Nation should be forced to take the risks and losses—even if it means fewer mink coats in Washington.

Two years ago the Hoover Commission recommended that the Government get out of the direct lending business. The Commission warned that direct lending by the Government "opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism" and "invites political and private pressure, or even corruption." The headlines of the last few weeks show how right the Hoover Commission was. I might point out here that this opinion of the Commission was not quite unanimous. Among the three dissenters was Dean Acheson, who then, as so many times since, showed his lack of both perception and foresight.

But even if there were no political corruption, even if the entire lending program was conducted on a sound basis, this is not the time for lavish Government loans. It would be bad enough if the lending program merely took $2,000,000,000 out of defense and put it into nonessentials. What is even worse is that the $2,000,000,000 in loans will actually compete with the defense effort and make our preparedness program that much more difficult.

How? In two ways. First, the "consumer" loans to farmers, homeowners and other individuals put more money into the hands of consumers to compete for a rapidly lessening supply of civilian goods available to them. The result: increased demand in the face of a declining supply—higher prices—more inflation. It was to avoid such economic folly that the Government slapped heavy restrictions on private loans. Are Government loans any less inflationary?

Second, "producer" loans which put millions into the hands of manufacturers, would help them compete with defense industries for scarce materials and scarcer manpower. Result: existing shortages would be aggravated, prices and wages would be forced even higher.

And all this fails to take into account the additional inflationary effect of the huge program of loan guarantees that the President is planning for next year—encouraging private lending to the extent of almost $9,000,000,000.

Only a small part of the $2,000,000,000 that the President wants to lend next year will go into defense production, and a still smaller part represents loans already committed. But experts have figured that if Uncle Sam would cut his lending activities to the bone, his budget and our tax bill could be reduced by about $1,500,000,000 during 1952. And if, in addition, Uncle Sam started selling some of the mortgages and other notes he now holds, he could save at least another billion dollars.

That means that with one step, Uncle Sam could get out of the lending business, remove temptation from his loan assistants, help the defense effort, and save the taxpayers $2,500,000,000. I think it is worth trying.

In considering the President's proposal for the largest Federal spending program in our peacetime history, it seems to me the most important consideration is the horrible thought that we can lose our freedom and our way of life without ever having a bomb dropped on us from a Russian plane.

Inflation is not merely a nuisance or a disagreeable condition with which we are forced to live—inflation is a threat to our very existence—a threat almost as dangerous and at least as effective as the military might of the Soviet aggressors.

And one of the surest ways to bring on a runaway inflation is through the medium of Government loans. In fact, inflation is the reason for the existence of Government lending programs, which got their greatest impetus during the thirties in an effort to inflate a depressed economy. But now we are not faced with a depressed economy that needs the pump priming of Federal loans. Now we are faced with a major preparedness program that demands every available dollar of taxpayer's money.

Mr. Chairman, we are giving away entirely too much money.

We are lending entirely too much money.

We are spending entirely too much money.

We are taxed entirely too much money.

The Truman administration has failed the American people. The Nation is divided and the people are worried. The only hope for the people and the country is in the Republican Party. The Republican Party must assume the responsibility. Now is the time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in rising to oppose this amendment, I want to congratulate this committee on the fine work that has been done. I think if the Members of the House will read the second paragraph of this report, they will have a profound admiration for the fine work done by the committee. I do not know of any appropriation bill that has come before the House that has evidenced greater study and greater consideration by the committee. On this particular amendment that has been offered, it would seem that the committee, in cutting out more than $400,000, has gone as far as we can afford to go. It would also appear to me that the gentleman who has offered this amendment has placed himself in a position of attempting to tell this House that his judgment is far superior to that of the collective judgment of his committee, which I think has done an admirable job. I think the gentleman from Mississippi, as chairman of this subcommittee, has convinced this House that he not only believes in economy, but that he is practicing economy all over the Nation and let the chips fall where they may. In view of the fine work this committee has done and the great reduction that it has made in this bill, I think that the least the membership of the House can do today is to go on record and support the majority views of that committee which has given great study and know whereof they speak, and which has not been selfish in any of its demands. I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 58, noes 53.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 64.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator, including travel and subsistence expenses of advisory committees authorized by title III of the act of August 14, 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1628–1629), and the maintenance, operation, and furnishing of facilities and services at the Agricultural Research Center, $560,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation current at the time services are rendered may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from applicable appropriations, to cover the charges, including handling and other related services, for equipment rentals (including depreciation, maintenance, and repairs); for services, supplies, equipment, and material furnished: *Provided further*, That of the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration, not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration shall be available for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements: *Provided, however*, That unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building (excepting headhouses connecting greenhouses and experimental farm houses) shall not exceed $5,000, the total amount for construction of buildings costing more than $2,500 each shall be within the limits of the estimates submitted and approved therefor, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $2,500 or 2 percent of the cost of the building as certified by the Research Administrator, whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 7 per centum of the funds of

any research appropriation of the Agricultural Research Administration, including the appropriation for the Office of the Administrator, may be transferred by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary, to any other such research appropriation in order to provide for a more effective research program: *Provided, however,* That no appropriation may be increased more than 7 percent by such transfers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday, and I hope the membership was here and listening, my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], gave you quite a discourse on the destruction that the spruce bark beetle has been inflicting on our forests. I think it is interesting to note one or two of the high points in the address of the gentleman from Colorado. No. 1, he said something like this, which is quite interesting:

Sixty percent of the total area of his district, which in its total size is almost as large as the entire State of New York, is owned by the Federal Government.

That is what the gentleman said. But let us put it on more personal terms. Let us say it is owned by the people of these United States.

That is important. Then he made another statement, which you should remember:

The area of the timberland already destroyed by these bugs in his district is as large as the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for the Members of the House to understand the size and the gigantic proportions of some of these Western States and the forest lands in those States that are still ours. They do not belong to the States and they do not pay one single dime of State taxes. So I took occasion and made the effort to find out something about our States of the West. I noticed this little remark:

Ninety percent of the Federal land, all the land that you own, as the United States of America, lies in 11 Western States.

I am going to detail those States to you because I think you should know what percentage of those States belong to you and me as legislators for the United States of America. Then I am sure the address of the gentleman from Colorado would have made more of an impression on the House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. We expended $125,000,000 to stamp out the hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico, and that was done in the interest of private property and the cattle industry. I have been willing to vote twice that amount to protect that industry from the hoof-and-mouth disease. But here we have a forest which belongs to the people of the United States which is public property and yet we hesitate to expend $3,000,000 to keep those forest lands from being infested by this spruce bark beetle in the Rocky Mountains. We do not hesitate to spend money to prevent and fight forest fires, yet we hesitate to spend $3,000,000 to protect the forests from destruction by the spruce bark beetle, with the dead trees so destroyed increasing the hazard of fires. It does not make very good sense to me. It seems like false economy.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows the position of the committee. I wish the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] would correct me if I am wrong.

In the first place, we have not sold more than $700,000 worth of timber over the last 10 years. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In the second place, you cannot get any income from that particular area unless the Government is willing to go in and build a $20,000,000 plant and utilize it to provide material for newsprint. I will obtain the gentleman more time; but I think we ought to consider this question quite thoroughly. In the second place, the company which is advocating the construction of that particular plant is a large company, the Electric Bond & Share Co. They have a lot of finances and backing. Yet they are only willing, through their subsidiary, to risk $2,000,000 on a $20,000,000 plant. If they had more confidence in the ultimate success of this particular proposition, they should be willing to put up the entire $20,000,000 rather than come to the Government and ask the taxpayers of America to put up that plant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I just wanted to show the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] that we are not acting on this in an arbitrary manner. We have gone into this very thoroughly. We cannot see the reason to dump many millions of dollars into this program when the value of the timber is not there, from all that we can learn. If you can convince the House to the contrary, I will help you in securing whatever time is necessary.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will give me time, I could certainly convince him. First, I will yield to the gentleman from California and then I will answer the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As I understand the points made by the gentleman from Colorado, they are, first, that these lands are federally owned and sometimes they are in excess of one-third of the land of an entire State; second, that the preservation of our forests is not alone for the preservation and sale of timber, but is also for the preservation of the topsoil and water; and, finally, what the gentleman from Colorado wants is some sort of determination of policy on the part of the United States so that we will not appropriate one year and not appropriate the next year, or appropriate a little instead of the right amount.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. I am glad to answer the gentleman from Minnesota. Let me show you how flat his argument falls. There are absolutely no facts to bear out any such statement. First of all, here in an area as large as the State of Rhode Island did grow fine, green, precious trees and underbrush; wonderful cover for a mountain area. Now, the gentleman says that because we have no money we are not only willing to have it totally and completely destroyed, but we are willing to let the water wash the soil away and fire to destroy that timber until it will be black, bleak waste of mountain terrain.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. What I am telling the gentleman is true. You say because we cannot sell any timber let us ruin the watershed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is nothing to prevent private industry, even if we do not go ahead with the program, from going in there. Why is it that the people of Colorado do not contribute a dollar to this work and thus fail to exhibit any real interest in this program.

Mr. HILL. The people of Colorado cannot even go on the land unless they get a permit from the Government. It is our land; we legislate for it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. They have not put up a dollar for this work. If it was in the State of Minnesota, certainly the State legislature would show some interest.

Mr. HILL. Certainly they would not put up a dime unless the Federal Government agreed to let them go in on the land and protect it. Right in this bill you propose to help cotton, and that is entirely private industry. You forget your relationship here.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. I want to commend the gentleman for his stand on this question of control of insects; also his colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. I hope the gentleman will proceed and that additional time will be given him to explain the matter fully, for I think he is making a very valuable contribution.

Mr. HILL. If sufficient time is given me I should like to go further and I will show how much land the Federal Government has in each of these States. The reason I am making this talk is not to offer an amendment, but we in this House the other day knocked out an item in the deficiency appropriation bill

we had under consideration, a $345,000 item to continue the beetle-bark extermination program that we had already started. We knocked it out and the chairman of the subcommittee not only said we should knock it out but that we should write it off.

Tell me what kind of legislation that is; you answer that question.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Aside from all that has been said thus far is it not a fact that this is the greatest reservoir of great virgin timber in the United States?

Mr. HILL. Of course it is. It is not a question of selling the mountains of the United States to some commercial company to make paper; we are building for the future, for the boys and girls who will come after us. You can replace any forest in the United States in 160 years, but what is the idea, tell me, of destroying it?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. If I yield I shall have to have three or four more minutes. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman from Minnesota said to let the legislature of your State and mine do something about it. I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he would be willing to turn these lands over to the States of New Mexico and Colorado?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes; I would.

Mr. HILL. It is all right for the gentleman to say so but he knows this House simply would not think of doing such a thing; it would not let us get hold of these lands.

Very few people can realize or visualize the vastness of this great western area. I venture to say—I have not had a chance to look it up—but I venture to say that the Federal Government has more land in these Western States than the whole United States had in the Original Thirteen Colonies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado may proceed for five additional minutes. I wish to ask him to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. This happens to be one item I took reservations on. I do feel that the House should consider that one of our great problems in the United States stems from the watersheds that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is talking about now, and it involves a little civil war that is going on down in the southwest part of the United States between Arizona and California. I think one of the things that we should consider especially in this connection is the fact that unless we protect the watersheds we are not going to solve some of those problems.

Mr. HILL. And, Mr. Chairman, allow me to say that you do not buy and sell watersheds; you do not buy and sell forests; you create them, and the Lord Himself has something to do with the production of these great forests of the United States.

Listen to these figures: The first State, Nevada; 86.77 percent of Nevada belongs to this Committee, this House, the people of the United States; only 14 percent of the area of the State of Nevada belong to the State of Nevada, and then the gentleman from Minnesota stands up here and says that the State of Nevada should take care of those forests; that is a national responsibility.

No. 2 is the great State of Arizona—and by the way these figures are as of the year 1947. They showed that 73.41 percent of the State of Arizona belongs to the United States, belongs to the House and the Senate and to the people of the United States; and yet they stand here and say: "Let those 25 percent or maybe 26 percent maintain that great Federal area."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is making a splendid statement. I am right here to say "Amen" to all of it.

Mr. HILL. But it is not enough to say "Amen." That is what my friends on the Republican side have said in times past: They say "Amen" to every part of it, but they do not vote that way. That is what I need, people to vote with me.

Mr. MURDOCK. Besides saying "Amen" to what the gentleman has said I am going to vote with him. We must protect our forests, watersheds, and all our great estate.

Mr. HILL. Let me tell you with reference to the item I mentioned a moment ago, that the Senate, as I understand, will put in the deficiency bill that item of $345,000 to continue this little experimental work and this work we are doing over there at the present time in the district represented by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Are you going to vote for that when it comes back from conference?

Now, listen to this. The state of—somebody said "confusion." That is the state you fellows are in who are opposing it, a state of confusion, not we who are supporting it.

Now, listen to this. Here is the State of Utah, No. 5. Seventy-two percent of the State of Utah belongs to the Government.

Sixty-three and seventy-six one hundredths percent of the State of Idaho belongs to the Government.

Fifty-three and ninety-two one hundredths percent of the State of Oregon belongs to the Government.

Fifty-one percent of the State of Wyoming belongs to the Government. Over one-half of the State of Wyoming is ours to legislate for.

You can hardly believe this about California, but nearly one-half of that State does not belong to California. It belongs to you and me. Here is the exact figure for 1947: 46.55 percent.

Forty-three and seventy-three one hundredths percent of the State of New Mexico belongs to the Government and 38 percent of the State of Colorado belongs to the Government. For Montana, believe it or not, over 35 percent belongs to the Government.

When you consider those figures and when you consider it is your business to consider this type of legislation, when someone gets up and says, "Let the States do it," it is a silly argument that we should not have to take your time to rebut. This is your land, this is your country. This is my country, this is your country. Let us take care of the park areas, let us take care of the mountain sections that belong to us, then when the appropriation bill comes back from the Senate I hope you will all get in line and vote for the appropriation so that we can continue to protect our forest areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. May I suggest to the gentleman that he left out the State of California.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. ENGLE. Which is owned 46 percent by the Federal Government.

Mr. HILL. No. The gentleman was not listening. I am sure I read California.

Mr. ENGLE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. We just want to be in the RECORD because we are very much concerned with the problem the gentleman refers to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say that I am not going to offer any amendment, nor will the other Congressmen from Colorado offer an amendment, but we do ask you to consider this matter thoroughly and to decide whether you are in favor of protecting the great areas that belong to the people of the United States, and especially the mountain regions of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak for control of the Englemann spruce bark beetle epidemic in the forests of Colorado.

As I have already stated in this House, unless this insect control project is continued a vast amount of timber in Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico will be exposed to destruction by the beetle epidemic. The insects already have killed 4,000,000,000 board-feet of spruce timber in western Colorado. This is the greatest loss of timber from any single insect epidemic ever experienced in the United States. Sixteen billion more feet of timber are threatened. The watershed values and the scenic values at stake are even greater.

The Appropriations Committee, in proposing the abandonment of the beetle-control work, has said that the Colorado forests are practically worthless because very little of the timber has as yet been sold for lumber. Mr. Chairman, oil in the ground and minerals still unmined have not yet been sold. Hydroelectric power in the form of water still running in the stream has not been sold. Do you call these things worthless? Is timber worthless in the home States of the gentlemen of the committee if it is not currently being cut? I shall be very glad to accept any tracts of such "worthless" timber the gentlemen might wish to give me.

Actually, 4,500,000 cords of this timber, live and bug-killed, already have been purchased by a company which is preparing to erect a pulp mill for the manufacture of paper in the area. This timber will be the basis of a new industry in western Colorado, and it will help to increase the production of much-needed newsprint paper in the United States. We now have to import some 80 percent of our newsprint pulp and paper from foreign countries. If we keep the Colorado spruce forests growing, production of pulp and paper in the area can continue indefinitely.

The Rocky Mountain spruce forests are one of the Nation's great scenic and recreational assets. I cannot give you a dollar figure for their recreational value, but I can tell you that the recreation industry is one of the most important in my State.

The watershed values are the most important of all. The spruce forests of Colorado help to maintain stable soil conditions in the mountain watersheds and to store and regulate the run-off of the snow pack upon which a large number of vital and costly irrigation and electric power projects depend. If we let all the timber be bug-killed, it will be well-nigh impossible to prevent forest fires from completing the destruction over vast areas. Then this House had better get ready to appropriate larger and larger amounts to dredge Colorado silt out of the downstream rivers and harbors and to repair the reservoirs and build the levees higher.

Members of the committee also made a point of the fact that the State had made no contribution toward the cost of the spruce bark beetle control work. Mr. Chairman, this bark beetle infestation is on Federal lands. Its control is a Federal responsibility. It is our responsibility, gentlemen, as representatives of the owners of the timber, the people of the United States.

The States are receiving some nine million dollars of Federal funds a year for the protection of private and State forest lands from fire. Alabama last year received over $300,000; Mississippi $260,000; California nearly one and one-half million dollars; Michigan nearly half a million. That is well and good. But insects can be just as destructive as fires. In many sections they actually cause far greater damage than forest fire. The intelligence of this Congress will be open to question if we spend money to fight one forest enemy while we let another take over by default. The States also received nearly $400,000 of Federal funds this year for production and distribution of tree planting stock to reforest denuded land. That is important too, but while we plant new forests it seems to me equally important that we save from destruction the forests we already have.

The Englemann spruce stands of the Rocky Mountains are one of the important reserves of timber remaining in the United States. It will certainly be needed. Call it worthless or not, it is part of the real wealth of this country. I suggest that we will do well to safeguard and protect that wealth.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] on his excellent presentation of the case for insect control in the national forests.

I can well understand the deep concern of the gentleman from Colorado for the future of the forests of Colorado. We in California have a similar problem. The greatest enemies of our great forests are the insects.

We are spending billions of dollars for national defense and many more billions of dollars for bolstering up the economy of other nations. We must not forget our own basic resources. Forests protect watersheds that are vital for the generation of electric power—vital, also, for irrigation and flood control. They provide outdoor recreation for millions. If kept productive, they can add to our national wealth and support permanent industries and they can mean jobs and payrolls for hundreds of thousands of workers. It is sheer folly to allow an epidemic of insects to destroy them.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], and other members of the Colorado delegation are particularly interested in making every reasonable effort to stop the ravages of the bark beetle. I am with them in their effort.

The Colorado and its tributaries are the main source of water for 2,500,000 acres of irrigated lands whose income is estimated at about $153,000,000 annually. In addition, some 3,000,000 people of southern California benefit directly from the Colorado by importing 63,000,000 acre feet through the Los Angeles aqueduct for domestic and industrial use and irrigation. Fifteen percent of the water from the Colorado Basin is provided by the area covered by the Engelmann spruce type.

The spruce beetle infestation needs to be fought now, when we can best protect the long-range values of watersheds, timber, recreation, and so on. Bark beetle eradication this year and next is insurance for the future. And we all know insurance is far less costly, in dollars and human effort, than rebuilding after disaster strikes.

I believe in economy, but it is not economy to allow destruction of natural resources upon which our strength depends.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few words in support of the position of my colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

The people of Wyoming are greatly concerned about the beetle epidemic that is now ravaging the Englemann spruce forests of our neighboring State, Colorado. If this infestation is not controlled, the valuable spruce stands of the Medicine Bow National Forest in southern Wyoming will soon be wiped out.

This epidemic is endangering some of the most important watershed lands in the West. These federally owned spruce forests, which are found at high elevations, collect and store the winter snows which insure regular supplies of good clear water for irrigation, hydroelectric power, and domestic purposes by the citizens of the central Rocky Mountain region and adjoining States as well.

If this beetle is allowed to continue its course unchecked, over 16,000,000,000 feet of spruce timber in Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico will be killed outright within the next few years. This is enough timber to build over 1,000,000 5-room houses. To date, over 4,000,000,000 board feet of green timber has been killed.

Besides this huge loss of the timber resource, these great areas of dead, highly inflammable trees constitute a terrific fire hazard. If fire strikes, one of the most terrible forest fires in American history may occur.

May I say to you gentlemen who have not been on a forest-fire line, who have not had to fight forest fires, who have not been burned out, as I have, at the edge of a spruce stand with only a small lake to save myself and my crew, that this is not an overestimate when I refer to the danger so far as forest fires are concerned. There is nothing more dangerous than dead down timber which a firefighter must combat in trying to get a fire line through such timber.

I believe the committee not only has tried to do a good job but is doing a good job and I commend them for it. But this is not, after all, a problem of the States, totally at least. This is federally owned land. I know in my own State, which I believe is more than 51 percent—I think it is closer to 60 percent—owned by the Federal Government at the present time, that those of us who live there have no control over those forests. We cannot do anything about it. It is up to the Government to control. You cannot measure the value of this timber in dollars and cents. You cannot replace it when it is once burned out. It is worth far more than the committee members say it is in dollars as to the value of the stand itself. Like my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], I hope that when the conference report comes back to the House and that item is put back in the bill, that you will give it your serious consideration for the preservation of one of the assets which makes this country so great.

OPS REGULATIONS BRING BACK WORLD WAR II SMALL BUSINESS HEADACHES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, in the last week, one district office of the OPS has returned 66 percent of the reports submitted by businessmen under the ceiling price regulation system. They were returned because they were incorrectly filled out. That is easy to understand.

One hardware merchant told me that he had spent 50 hours trying to make out the kind of pricing chart the OPS wants. He has another 50 hours to go before he finishes it. This is under Ceiling Price Regulation No. 7, Amendment No. 2. A few more amendments and he will be ready to go out of business entirely.

During the last war, one large industry got a simple explanation of one of the ceiling price regulations. It was written in Chinese.

From all appearances, it looks as if we have learned exactly nothing from the bitter experiences we had under the last control system. Businessmen, particularly small business people, tell me that their rents are higher, their insurance rates are higher, their advertising, payroll, delivery, freight, and tax charges are going up day after day, and nobody has figured out a formula to take care of these items.

We are all trying to keep prices from going sky high. Nobody wants the evils of inflation. But you cannot stop inflation with a lead pencil or a slide rule. If the costs of raw materials, and the costs of production are permitted to rise indefinitely, you cannot ask the little storekeeper to hold the line.

Not even a wisecrack by Michael DiSalle, Administrator for OPS, can change the facts.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMERICA HAILS THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call to your attention, and to the attention of the Members, that today we are celebrating the third anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Israel.

It is particularly appropriate that at this time the Honorable David Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister of this youngest member of the family of nations, should be making a visit of state to the United States.

I know that when I express my personal admiration and sympathy for this outpost of the democratic way of life in the midst of feudal Araby I am speaking for all the Members and for most Americans.

Mr. Chairman, it is noteworthy that when the Government of the Republic of Israel proclaimed its independent sovereignty it faced problems of startling similarity to the problems which faced the Continental Congress of the United States 175 years ago; and in addition the new Government came into being, not on an impregnable and untouched continent, but in an area surrounded by hostile neighbors, with no natural frontiers.

DOUBLED POPULATION IN 3 YEARS

Since that historic day in May 1948, when the independent Government of Israel was proclaimed this small country has more than doubled in population. Its consumption of electricity has almost doubled. The land under cultivation has increased by one-half. The national income has increased by one-third.

With a fortitude seldom equaled, Israel has absorbed its vast load of immigrants, enlarged its productive plant, stabilized its finances, fought off aggressive neighbors in one real shooting war and a long series of border clashes, joined and taken an active part in the United Nations.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is a phenomenal record; and had it not been for the rigid austerity imposed by the people of Israel on themselves the new Republic would have been tossed in a terrible inflation.

In actuality, against all these inflationary pressures, the cost of living has been reduced—not much, perhaps, but measurably.

In the face of external threats of aggressive warfare, internal threats of inflation and religious dissension, and problems which have existed in no other country at the declaration of independence, there has been no resort to authoritarian methods of government.

On the contrary, the people of Israel are probably freer in their individual lives as to religious and political opinion than any other people, including those of the United States.

THEY CALL IT REALISM

It has been necessary to carry out an economic regimentation which American businessmen would find galling; but in Israel it was recognized that the only road to survival lay in rigid economic controls until the danger mark had been passed.

The National Association of Manufacturers might call the Israel economy socialistic; the Israeli call it realistic.

Moreover, the necessity for economic controls has not by any means wiped out private enterprise; except in agriculture, which is largely carried on by collective groups who still are private entrepreneurs, commerce and industry as a whole is carried out by private individual enterprises, with the Government in actual operation only of basic industries with which private capital could not cope.

Cooperatives flourish, and are the mainstay of internal economy.

"THE LAND OF MILK AND HONEY"

Long centuries of economic neglect have reduced the "land of milk and honey"—the Arabian Peninsula—to barren wastes, broken only here and there by modern agricultural methods; and the most striking examples of modern agriculture in the entire peninsula are within the borders of Israel, where for over a half century the Jewish pioneers, in their own homeland, have been reclaiming the desert.

The proposed Jordan Valley Authority, almost certain to become a reality before many more years have passed, will open up new farming territory capable of sustaining the population.

To carry out Israel's own 3-year development program, it is necessary for the government to raise $1,500,000,000; and one-third of this is expected to be realized from the sale of bonds in the United States.

FROM THE HOLY LAND CAME WESTERN CULTURE

I am sure that you and the Members will recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the world Jewish community finds the reestablishment of Israel sovereignty specially inspiring, after a 2,000-year hiatus in a Jewish national government.

At the same time, the Western World must rejoice in the reestablishment, as a nation, of the fount and source of the inspiration of modern ethics.

Without any belittlement of the contributions made to western civilization by the Greeks, the Romans, the Egyptians, and other ancient cultures who were the forerunners of the contemporary Western World, the debt of present-day culture to those rugged clansmen of the old Arab world is beyond all reckoning.

From the Holy Land has come the ethics, the theology, and a vast store of the imagery of four continents.

AMERICANS FIRST

The debt to the Bible of the patriots who brought the United States of America into being almost two centuries ago breathes from almost every line of the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution.

When the Teutons dressed in dirty furs and lived little better than the animals they pursued, and the first people of Britain regarded blue mud as sacred decoration and oak trees as deities, the Hebrews in Palestine had a high culture of commerce, husbandry, philosophy, monotheistic religion, a code of ethics which has survived the assaults of all the dangers of the ages, and a concept of the dignity of the individual man which is at the core of the legal code of civilized nations.

Mr. Chairman, it is sometimes questioned whether the Jewish community is wholly loyal to this, our country, in view of the enthusiasm for this new nation at the eastern tip of the Mediterranean, where the ancient Kingdom of Judah flourished.

My answer is an unequivocal yes.

The Jews of America are, first and foremost, Americans, with a burning loyalty to the ideals, the institutions, and the opportunities of America that no people who have forgotten inequalities can understand.

Since the destruction of Jerusalem 20 centuries ago the Jews have been a scattered nation.

Only within the memory of some men still living have the Jews achieved generally the tolerance and acceptance that they found in America from the earliest days.

The Jews have been children of oppression, repression, persecution; they have turned toward the reestablishment of the Jewish homeland with the same

eagerness that the far-flung scions of the Irish kings have devoted, wherever they may be, to the liberation of Ireland from the British yoke.

Certainly the British were kinder masters to the Jews than the Russians, the Poles, or the Turks; but free men do not want masters.

They want freedom.

One of the characteristics dominant among Jews has been an independence of the mind and spirit that no laws, no ghettos, no torture chambers, or prison bars could ever root out as bigots tried to do.

From that bright courage of liberty has sprung the Jewish contributions of modern times, making a double debt owed to Israel by the family of nations.

Had the Jews produced no other scientist and philosopher than Albert Einstein, who made the generation of atomic energy possible, the debt would be beyond present calculation; but Einstein is only one intellectual giant in a glittering history sprinkled with the names of great philosophers, great doctors, great scientists, great administrators.

In judging the remarkable gifts given to the world by gifted Jews, it is necessary to bear in mind the duality of fealty.

The ancient Hebrew state, unlike modern Israel, was essentially a democratic theocracy. Religion was the state and the state was religious.

When the Jews were uprooted and cast to the winds, this sense of theocracy persisted, and was nourished by the imposition of restrictive laws aimed at preventing equality of citizenship of the Jews in many lands.

Wherever Jews were welcomed and made equal, that sense of nationalism became submerged in patriotic devotion to the land of birth; yet even in America there remained the dream of a reestablishment of the Jewish nation.

The advent of the horrors of political anti-Semitism, and of genocide as a national policy in Germany and its satellites, and now in Russia and its satellites, refreshed this dream, and accounts for the eagerness with which world Jewry supports and encourages the Republic of Israel, with no loss of love for the land to which each Jew may owe his political allegiance.

Mr. Chairman, on this solemn occasion, and on behalf of my coreligionists everywhere, I wish to declare the debt of gratitude which Jews owe to all men of good will who contributed to the establishment of the Republic of Israel.

This is something over and beyond any local partisanship.

At the same time, I am intensely proud that my own Democratic Party, and my own party leaders, have done so much toward the establishment and the stabilization of Israel.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses in connection with conducting investigations of the relative utility and economy of agricultural products for food, clothing, and other uses in the home, with special suggestions of plans and methods for the more effective utilization of such products for these purposes, and such economic investigations, including housing and household buying, as have for their purpose the improvement of the rural home, for coordinating nutrition services made available by Federal, State, and other agencies, and for disseminating useful information on these subjects, $1,350,000.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: Page 9, line 8, strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do not take the floor to criticize the subcommittee which brought in this bill. As a matter of fact, I think this subcomittee has done one of the outstanding jobs of the year. Its personnel are able men, and its chairman has distinguished himself from the beginning of his career in Congress as sound, as able, as conscientious, and as thorough in his work. I recognize the fact that this bill already has been cut materially, and I do not think there are many places where it should be cut more. But, I feel with the cost of maintaining the defense of this Nation so high that it is astronomical, that we have to try to save even a few dollars anywhere we can. I have asked that this item "Human nutrition and home economics" be cut from a proposed $1,350,000 to $1,000,000, recognizing first that the committee already has allotted less than the budget estimate and less than the money contained in the bill in fiscal 1951. But I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the appropriation proposed for this Bureau is approximately five times what it was a decade ago. The Bureau is asking for five times as much money as it had 10 years ago. That would indicate that this bureau, along with many other bureaus of the Government, has mushroomed more than there is justification for, and that it can and should be trimmed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this cut in addition on the premise that the committee itself in its report on page 7 states:

The committee feels that some projects of this Bureau should be postponed during the current emergency.

The amendment I offer would give real effect to that suggestion, and I do not think anything essential would be sacrificed.

I feel that it is an actual fact, Mr. Chairman, that private industry is far ahead of Government in most fields of research, that private industry is going to carry on the load as far as research is concerned, and that private industry will well take up any slack that may result from a cut in this little item for the fiscal year 1952.

I want to point out one other thing: We are spending not millions but hundreds of millions of dollars in military research. You say it is a far cry from home nutrition and home economics to military research, but I question that. Actually the dollars we are spending on military research go also into every possible phase of food and matériel testing. The facts that are brought out in that research and in industrial research are made available to all of the people of this country, and benefits from it accrue very directly to the housewives of this country.

Therefore, in all kindness to this able committee, whose work and whose members I respect most highly, I believe we can safely make this cut at this time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Florida has almost disarmed me with the nice statements he made about the committee. It is like an appellate court saying, "The learned court below," just before knocking the whey out of his decision. It is appreciated, however. Did you notice in his argument that the chief argument for cutting that item more is that it has already been cut? It that a wise way to handle appropriations on the floor? This appropriation has been cut 25 percent in the last 2 years. I take credit for having taken the leadership on it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We cut the estimate over $700,000 last year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes; we cut that much from the estimates.

In this time of food shortage, when we need to learn how to get by under the high cost of living, how to can vegetables so that they will retain their quality, how to get the vitamins we need, when 35 or 40 percent of those drafted into the Army are turned down because of malnutrition, a further cut in this item does not seem appropriate. I cannot say how many dollars they ought to have for this Bureau and I do not profess to know, but I say when you overlook the problems to which they should be seeking the answers you are being shortsighted.

I know my friend from Florida is motivated by the highest intent in offering this amendment, but have you noticed how aware he is of the things that happen in the military? It is because he sits on that committee and listens to it. When he brings his bill here I am going to listen to him, because he will know what he is talking about. But when he comes here on the floor on another matter, behind which is just as much detailed testimony and evidence, with which he is not familiar, I think he should listen to us. But since I still give him the right to have his opinion, I am sure he will give me the right to mine.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I just wonder if this is the outfit that sent me those 3,000 cookbooks that I do not need.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman may not need them, but if he studies the question of the nutrition of the people of America and studies the number of people that are turned down by the draft boards because of malnutrition he will realize that something needs to be done. There may be a thousand plans that can be offered, but something certainly needs to be done. I do want to say the work of this bureau is very important. I cannot say how much money they should have. I have certainly in-

dicated we do not want to give them too much money because, as has been pointed out, we have reduced their budget in the last two years by seven hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I simply was hoping that the gentleman would reiterate that point, Mr. Chairman, that we did make a very considerable cut on this particular bureau last year.

Mr. WHITTEN. We on the subcommittee have never followed the practice of upping these estimates by 20 percent so that the House could take it out, and I hope you will not charge us with indulging in that sort of practice, because we have never done that. We have listened to three months of testimony, and we have cut anywhere that we thought we could. Having done that, we leave the question to you. I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIKES) there were—ayes 38, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

White pine blister rust: White pine blister rust, pursuant to the act of April 26, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 594a), $3,300,000, of which $505,000 shall be available to the Department of the Interior for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering Federal lands under the jurisdiction of that Department or lands of Indian tribes which are under the jurisdiction of or retained under restrictions of the United States; $1,750,000 to the Forest Service for the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering lands under its jurisdiction; and $1,045,000 to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for leadership and general coordination of the entire program, method development, and for operations conducted under its direction for such control, including, but not confined to, the control of white pine blister rust on or endangering State and privately owned lands.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Page 18, line 16, strike out "$3,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000,000."

Page 18, line 16, strike out "$505,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000."

On page 18, line 23, strike out "$1,045,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$850,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to reduce the appropriation for white-pine blister rust by $300,000. This item is shown on page 31 of the committee report, it being the first item on that page. Three million four hundred and twenty-nine thousand dollars was appropriated for the program last year. The budgest estimate this year is $3,407,000. The committee recommends $3,330,000, which is a cut of $107,000.

The breakdown of the appropriation is shown on page 1065 of the hearings, and the detailed testimony regarding the program is set forth in the hearings on pages 1088 to 1103.

This is a program which began in 1916, with a Federal appropriation of $20,000 and State contributions of $21,974. The Federal appropriation gradually increased year by year as these things always do, and in 1933 the Federal appropriation was $604,501. The States contributed in that year $233,250.

Since 1933 the Federal appropriation has fluctuated up and down, mostly up, and in 1951 it amounted to $3,429,250, with additional State contributions in that year of $683,869. Since 1916 total Federal appropriations have amounted to $62,308,029. This sum includes $20,293,983 of NRA, WPA, and so forth, funds designated as emergency funds, between the years 1934 and 1942, inclusive. Prior to the year 1934, the year these WPA or emergency funds first began to be appropriated, the largest Federal appropriation to this purpose had been $708,560. In the year 1934, it appears that the project was turned into one of these WPA or NRA emergency projects, and that year the Federal appropriation jumped to $2,412,157. It has never gotten back to the status it occupied prior to 1934, and since that time it has fluctuated and gradually increased until in 1951 the Federal appropriation was $3,429,250.

In his testimony regarding this item, Mr. C. M. Granger, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, testified that in general it is proposed to carry along the program in the same way as it has been carried on for a number of years, substantially at the same level—the same nature of operation.

He was asked the question, "Is this going to be a continuing program from now on?" and he answered, "I think there will always have to be some activity in this field. Its dimensions are speculative."

I have noted from the hearings—page 977—that the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee had an investigation made last year regarding the operation of this program.

The investigators reported, among other things—page 982—that this white pine blister rust program had five levels of supervision above the working level, namely, division, region, area, State, and district. The investigators stated the opinion that economies could be achieved without program impairment through the elimination of the area and the State supervisors, and through the reduction in the number of districts.

Further criticism by those investigators is set forth on page 984 of the hearings regarding conditions which the Bureau states were corrected by subsequent action.

The investigators recommended a reduction in the number of districts in the Northeastern and North Central regions, which they stated should reduce overhead costs and result in fuller utilization of automotive equipment. The Bureau answered that criticism with the statement subsequently that the work of 10 State offices had been consolidated in 3 area offices in the Northeastern region, resulting in a reduction in personnel of 6 people, and that in the North Central region the number of districts was reduced from 7 to 6, but the Bureau reported no reduction in personnel as a result.

The investigators recommended that four Bureau offices in the San Francisco area should be consolidated and administered by the regional office of the blister rust-control program. The report of the investigators contained other references and suggestions, in addition to those I have mentioned.

They may be found on pages 991, 995, 996, 997, 998, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007 of the hearings.

I believe it is obvious to anyone who studies the operation of this program that there has been inefficiency in its operation, and that taxpayers' money has been wasted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the territory covered by this blister-rust proposition is owned in about even quantities between private interests and the Government?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have understood that the ownership of the land involved is about 50–50 between the Federal Government and private interests.

Mr. TABER. And the private interests contribute only one-third of the cost of protecting their own forests.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have heard that said; I do not know.

Mr. TABER. That is what I understand the facts are.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. WHITTEN] took the Bureau to task as shown on page 1011 of the hearings, where he said, among other things:

Mr. WHITTEN. I hate to keep quarreling with this Bureau but we mean to do something about this. We mean business about it. If we have to set aside money to hire some outsider to come in here and coordinate and set this thing up on an operational basis, we are ready to do it.

Prior to 1924 and before the WPA era, this program operated, and I presume very satisfactorily, on a Federal appropriation of a little more than half a million dollars, as you will see from page 1094 of the hearings.

As I have already stated, when the program was made an emergency program in the WPA era, the appropriation jumped from $604,501 in 1933 to $2,412,157 in 1934.

Since that time, it has never gotten back to its pre-WPA normal status, and the amount which it has been receiving annually for a number of years just for coordination and supervisory work alone is considerably more than the annual cost of the entire program before the WPA era.

The entire program cost the Federal Government in 1933 $604,501. The coordination and supervisory cost alone this year is $725,450, and in the 1950

fiscal year it was $727,638. The amount appropriated in this bill before us today is approximately $705,000 while the amount carried in this bill to pay for the actual work done in the field in the national forests is $1,750,000. Thus we see that $1 is spent for supervisory and coordination work to every $2.50 which is spent in the field. In other words, the ratio of labor cost to that of supervision and coordination is two and a half to one, approximately, and that, in my opinion, is not justified and should be corrected.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this an appropriation for Federal land so far as the white pine blister rust is concerned?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is for Federal land, it is also for State land and for privately owned land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, the ratio of labor cost to that of supervision and coordination is 2½ to 1 and, in my opinion, that is not justified and should be corrected. In fact, it would not surprise me at all to find that a proper investigation would disclose that this program could be taken out of the emergency or WPA status it has occupied since 1934, and placed back to the status it occupied in 1933 and for many years prior to 1933 without impairing the program.

The States are now contributing approximately as much as the Federal Government contributed prior to 1934.

The amendment which I offered calls for a cut of $105,000 in the amount which is transferred from this program to the Department of the Interior. Under the amendment $400,000 will be transferred to the Department of the Interior instead of $505,000. The amendment further calls for a cut of $195,000 in the fund of approximately $700,000 designated for leadership, coordination, and technical direction. This is more than the whole program cost in 1933, and I think the cut proposed in the supervisory end of it is thoroughly justified. I have not proposed to touch at all by this amendment the $1,750,000 appropriated to pay for the actual work done in the field.

I hope the subcommittee will investigate next year the feasibility of simply matching State funds contributed to this program, and see if it cannot be taken out of the emergency or WPA category and placed back on a normal basis.

Certainly, I think the reduction proposed in this amendment will not do the slightest harm to the program, and that it is a saving which should be effected.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia has made a very fine statement and I am inclined to agree with many of his deductions. It so happens that one of the largest and most valuable stands and one of the largest and most valuable portions of our national resources in that category are located in the Panhandle of Idaho, in the district represented by my colleague from Idaho [Mr. WOOD]. My own district borders it. We do have to protect these trees from that disease which does attack and kill the trees. It is a matter of protection of our national resources.

The points made by the gentleman from Georgia are valid and I assure him that the committee has been working on that phase of it very diligently.

I think we are ready for a vote on the amendment, as far as I am concerned. It is merely a matter of continuing to try to do the things the gentleman from Georgia has indicated should be done and we are making that effort, and to weigh against that a known cause in protecting our known national resources. I trust the amendment will be decisively voted down.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here again we have evidence of the difficulty the committee encounters in handling important problems. There is not a more sincere Member of the Congress than is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. The facts he cited to this committee a while ago come from a report to my subcommittee. But why was the report made? It was because I asked for an investigation of this program.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman will recall that I so stated in my remarks.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I appreciate that. The point I want to make is that when I succeeded to the chairmanship of this subcommittee, it was my purpose, and I have taken action, to investigate every phase in the Department where there was any question in my mind.

There are tremendous values tied up in the white pine of this country. Lumber at the present time is selling at almost unheard of prices. Somebody said that cottonwood, one of the poorest grades of lumber in the South, was selling at $35 a thousand on the stump; timber that had no use at all just a few years ago. Now, this great stand of timber, one of the greatest national resources we have, is threatened with total destruction by reason of this white pine blister rust. It has tremendous value. The Nation is dependent on it to a large extent, and there is no reason but what in this instance the Federal Government should do what it can to save this timber. I think all of us will agree with that. The question is how to go about doing that most economically? I, too, thought they were spending too much in supervision. I asked for this investigation and put the facts in the RECORD, and pointed out that we could not put up with that at all. But, whatever amount of money you put in here is inadequate to fully meet the needs, and instead of trying to take away the money to protect this millions and millions of dollars worth of timber, it would appear to be better business to instruct them to cut out this excessive supervision waste and to apply the money to get rid of the condition which destroys this timber.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas where this white pine blister rust comes from.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I have worked with this committee about 8 years and I still do not know where a lot of things come from. But, it is found in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and out in Utah.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Your report shows, does it not, that the fungus that causes it is under reasonable control, which I believe is the language you use, or the testimony given, throughout the entire area. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman has probably read the report in detail since I have, since he was preparing this amendment. Usually you get a report that it is under reasonable control. I also had a report that the operation was handled on a reasonable basis. And when I checked it I found it was not, and I put that report in the RECORD. But it does not follow that you should end a program if the objective is something that the Nation depends on. What you should do is to correct the thing that is wrong, and that is what we have set out to do.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. As far as I was able to see in reading the testimony about it, after you made that demand on them, they only represented that they eliminated seven people from their personnel.

Mr. WHITTEN. How much time elapsed from the time it was reported to the time they said how much they had done?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Your investigation was made last year, was it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. The investigation was made last year, but it was reported to me in connection with the hearings that we could proceed——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand this is an annual appropriation. What report can the gentleman give the House as to the progress made in stopping this dis-

ease in the white-pine forests of the country?

Mr. WHITTEN. So far as eradication is concerned, I cannot give the gentleman any report that shows that this disease is being eradicated, but by getting rid of the disease we are keeping it from spreading. In some States they have been able to get rid of it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. On that point, I want this to be before the committee: The ground we lost in the control of this disease during the war years, when manpower and funds were restricted somewhat, we made up in the fiscal year 1947, when we expended about $6,000,000 and did catch up pretty well with the ground we had lost. That is the reason for the appropriations since then. We think we are on a maintenance basis now, not an eradication basis.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, there is no hope that this thing will be stamped out completely and save the white-pine forests?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is nothing that I recall that would indicate they have any hopes of doing it. But by spending this money they think they can save many times in value the amount of the cost. That is a matter we have gone into. If there are any further questions, I think our record on this committee indicates that we have investigated every phase of the Department of Agriculture and taken appropriate action.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. This problem has been studied in Massachusetts. I notice the gentleman mentioned Maine, and my honorable colleague from that State stood up and wanted an answer as to that State. But this disease comes from raspberries, they say, wild raspberries. They have made everybody in Massachusetts—I do not know about Maine or somewhere else—do away with their raspberry raising, so that they will not get this white-pine blister rust. Yet we still have white-pine blister rust.

May I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact that these white-pine forests are owned by individuals, and they ought to look out for their own property.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I should like to remind the gentleman—he doubtless knows it—that there is an experimental forest in York County in my district, a white pine forest, and they are engaged in this work there. While I do not know very much about the technicalities of white pine blister rust, it is a useful work, and I should be very sorry to see it interrupted, because it is only by governmental experimentation that the individual private owner can hope to profit.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. On this matter of the preservation of the forests, is it not a fact, as we recognize it up in my State of New Hampshire, that after you have succeeded in pretty well eradicating the undergrowth, the bush that spreads this rust, you get the thing under control, so that you have virtually succeeded in isolating the disease, and with a much less amount of expenditure and effort you can hold the thing down. In many States, such as mine, we have nearly reached the point where we can say that we have virtually got the matter under control. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct. This deals with something that is a national asset in time of emergency, and it looks as if we are in one series of emergencies after another. I do not know what the answer is so far as looking after the forests of this Nation is concerned. I know we are dependent on them. I know they are threatened. We tried on this committee to work out a better way of handling it. If you will read the report, you will find we have called on the Department to give consideration to the elimination of a number of control programs, and to determine how we can get a 50-percent contribution from private or State funds, and how to have adequate State laws and to see that they are enforced. We are investigating every means of getting more for your dollar. However, in view of the tremendous value of this timber I think the answer is not to cut out the work, but to bring about a more effective use of the funds. That is what your committee has tried to do.

The gentleman from Georgia is fair. I do not want to pass up this opportunity to say again as chairman of this committee that we insisted on this investigation, trying to make the dollar go where it would do the most good. We also put it in this report. If you will just read the hearings I think you will find that the committee does not deal with the Department easily and that when we find this kind of situation existing or where we even suspect that it exists, we will investigate it. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot agree with my colleague from the South [Mr. DAVIS], but I think that great study should be given to the problem of conserving our national resources. The gentleman spoke about the emergency existing in the OPA days. I can recall those days. I was here. I can recall when there was not a bank in the United States that could pay off their depositors. Fourteen million wage earners were seeking work but could not obtain it. As a result of the foresight of the Members of this House, emergency money was set up to provide work, to provide labor. Much of it was performed in our forests, along our waterways, and in the construction of schools, dams, stockponds, and hospitals.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. But that emergency is over now, is it not?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes. But if you will let me finish, I want to say to you that you are comparing the dollar then with the dollar now. If you had a dollar then and you had a sock you would put it in the sock rather than in a bank. That dollar would buy something. You cannot perform the same functions in any walk of life now that you could at that time with the same dollar because the dollar has been changed. Even since we have been voting appropriations for the war effort, costs have gone up and we have lost two billion dollars. But when you see the forests of this great Nation being destroyed by pests, whether it be rust, beetle, or what not, and do not take any action, then we are making one of the greatest mistakes we have ever made in this Congress. We had technicians who are trained to work and do the things necessary to stop those pests. In the West I have seen the sun shining beautifully and within 15 minutes you could not see the sun because the grasshoppers were in flight. I have seen hundreds of thousands of acres of crops destroyed overnight in that way.

This is a great Nation. We have different sections and different areas and different problems. I see the gentleman from the South whose problem it is to stop the water from destroying property. I was always happy to vote with him to do that. We in the other part of the Nation, in the West, build dams. We do that not to stop destruction but to impound the water that we may provide water for cultivation during a drought. In parts of my State of New Mexico today we are not permitted to wash an automobile because we have the greatest drought we have had in 50 years. When a committee of this Congress comes in here and has studied the problems they were told to consider, I say they are specialists in that line of activity. If I am going to get up and ask to have a great amount of money stricken out that has to do with conserving our national resources, I will make a study of it and try to become a technician and then I will go before the committee and argue it out with them. But from what I have seen since I came back to this Congress—and I was happy to come back because I love everybody here—when I see what we are doing I do not think it is with any great vision. We are getting up here and offering amendments taking a couple of hundred thousands from this, that, or the other thing, and we are not familiar with the problem at all. I think study should be given to this thing. If it had not been for the foresight of this Congress during those emergency days, we would not have any forests today. Unless you keep up these applications by whatever is necessary to destroy these pests, it will continue to grow greater all the time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Does the gentleman mean to say that the gentleman from Georgia has not studied this problem?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not mean any criticism of the gentleman from Georgia. I am not here to criticize any individual. I am here to give you my impressions. I know the West, I know the East. I was born in the East. I know the South. I made a great investment down in the South, and an expensive one. I married a girl from Kentucky, and it was my most profitable investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from New Mexico who preceded me I, too, think we fail to see the over-all picture. As to private industry and what it is doing, let us go back to 1902 and take, as an example, the case of the United States Steel Corp. when that company gave to Andrew Carnegie $300,000,000 for all of his wealth and vast holdings. That included coal mines all over the United States, his railroads from Lake Erie to Pittsburgh, his huge steel plants, coking plants, everything, for $300,000,000.

This Congress gave $450,000,000 to the United States Steel, or to Ben Fairless, its president, only last month to build a new steel plant, just one, not hundreds of units as was the case in the Carnegie-United States Steel transaction.

Let us take another case; let us go back to 1932 and look at the Republic Steel Corp., the second largest corporation in the United States. At that time it was selling on the big board at 98 cents a share. Look where it has expanded to today, and yet back in 1932 they were getting ready to write it off the big board selling at 98 cents a share. But now we see this Government giving this one big corporation, at a time when you are trying to curtail efforts of this agency to save our great forests, giving this one steel company $450,000,000 to build one plant.

In talking about our forests, I have heard much talk today about New England, and I think we should take into consideration that historic part of our country. But you can get into an automobile in Rhode Island, if you will, in the morning, and be in New Hampshire by nightfall, having covered a large part of New England. But you will not do that out West where the national forests are about which we are talking. It will take you in some instances, days to drive over one of those States.

As the country grows and our economy expands the cost of government grows and our obligation to look after our natural resources grows. When we gave United States Steel the right to break ground at Morristown, Pa., 1 month ago and build that great plant on the Delaware River we thereby fastened additional expenses on the State of Pennsylvania and the Federal Government in the matter of keeping the Delaware River clean and to avoid the harmful effects of things that United States Steel is going to dump into that river. And so it is all over the Nation. It is expansion that makes this great Government great. Before we went into Korea the national economy stood at around $280,000,000,000 a year and it is undoubtedly higher today. We certainly were going to town alongside of 1932 and 1933.

I certainly hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wonder if we can get some agreement as to time. I do not like to cut anybody off, but I do hope we can get along with the bill because for various reasons that everyone knows, we want to move along with the bill. I will not submit any consent request to limit debate, but I hope we can soon get back to reading the bill.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I am one Member on my side of the aisle who has consistently voted for every amendment to reduce appropriations. I have done that in the belief that this Government must remain solvent if it is to remain a world power. But here we are dealing with an amendment which cuts down an appropriation to preserve one of the natural resources of this land, that is lumber and timber. It so happens that I come from a State—Michigan—one of whose glories once was its pine forests. They have completely disappeared; they are gone. Nothing remains but vast areas of rotting stumps. Today we are reforesting these areas of stump land in many parts of the State, in upper Michigan and the upper part of the lower peninsula. The only thing that restricts the amount of reforestation is the amount of funds available. A year or two ago I participated in a conference at Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., and examined the question of how fast this country was using its timber or lumber in comparison to the speed with which nature was reproducing it. My recollection is that we are using lumber almost twice as fast as nature is reproducing it. If that be true, and I think it is, how long will it be before this country will be entirely denuded of timber, which is one of our vital resources, particularly for national defense? For that reason I think it is a mistake to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] I have a great respect for him, I know his opinion in regard to the financial and economic status of the Nation. It is very much like my own, but I doubt very much the wisdom of accepting this amendment. It will do more harm than good.

If we are to continue and preserve this great natural resource for the benefit of the American people, it seems to me we must do everything possible to keep under control and eradicate a disease that will destroy our timber before it can be used. I listened with great interest to the gentleman from New Mexico, our able colleague and former Governor of that State [Mr. DEMPSEY], and what he said in regard to this question I reiterate and affirm.

So I hope that the committee this afternoon, even though it is economy minded, might take a second look at the amendment before a vote is taken. I think it would be best for the country that in this one instance—and perhaps the only instance for many weeks on this floor that I stand up in opposition to the amendment. The amendment should be voted down.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. May I say to the gentleman that I also come from a State which was formerly a lumber-producing State. It suffered for many years because of the ruthlessness of private industry exploitation. Now we are in the same position as is the gentleman and his State of Michigan. We are in the process of reforestation. I thoroughly agree with the comments the gentleman has just made. I feel in the matter of economy exactly as he does.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I also wish to join my colleagues from Colorado who have spoken in support of the Engelmann spruce bark beetle project in Colorado. It is appropriate to discuss our Colorado project in connection with the pending amendment, as both involve the conservation of our natural resources.

I realize there are many Members of this body who are not entirely familiar with the problems of the West such as we are discussing here today. My parents came from an eastern State, the great State of Maryland, and settled in Colorado in the early days of that State. I am a native of Colorado. Naturally, these problems are more familiar to me as a westerner than to others who live in the East. When you are properly informed as to our immediate problem in combating the attack of these beetles in our Colorado forests I am sure you will be sympathetic and will give us your support in obtaining the necessary funds for this project.

In Colorado we are very much concerned over this matter. We do not want to lose our spruce forests, which are so valuable, not alone to Colorado, but to the entire Nation. We feel that these spruce trees, which will be destroyed by these insects, unless we act promptly, should be preserved. These are national forests and this is a direct responsibility of the Federal Government.

This beetle infestation struck last year. I was not a Member of this body at that time. Congress appropriated $2,000,000 to wage this fight. As the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] stated this afternoon, no amendment will be offered to this bill for funds for our Colorado project. However, we are hoping Congress will provide the necessary funds to continue the work so effectively started last year.

I understand the Senate may include an item for this project in the deficiency appropriation bill now pending in

that body, in which event we hope the House will concur in the Senate action.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Colorado in opposition to this amendment. We have this problem in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California, and I think we should not turn down any appropriation that might result in the loss of a lot of timber. That is one of the few last resources that we ought to preserve. The beetles are raising havoc with millions of acres of fine Federal timberlands in California. We should not further hamper the Forest Service in their fight to kill this pest by reducing this already shrunken appropriation. I would like to support the gentleman's ideas in this matter and help him defeat this amendment.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the observations of the gentleman from California, and we are glad to have his support. I have observed, in the years I have served in this body, that frequently we spend much time debating the merits of appropriations involving just a few thousand dollars and enter into bitter arguments over these small items. However, when we get to the larger amounts and start to dealing in billions of dollars, we pass these appropriations quickly and sometimes with very little debate. It is strange that when we come in with a modest request for funds desperately needed to protect our great national forests, involving large quantities of valuable timber, we suddenly become economy minded. We pass appropriation bills for billions of dollars to be spent all over the world and consider our action lightly, but hesitate to spend a few dollars to preserve our natural resources here at home. We must be realistic and the time is here when we should pay more attention to these problems affecting our Western States. Of course, most of our great natural resources are located in the West, including our national forests. These great forests provide timber which will be so essential in our defense effort and which we need for our industrial development. It is unthinkable, it is unbelievable that we should refuse to appropriate what money is needed to make certain that this threat to our Colorado national forests is immediately repelled. I am no expert on forestry; I am not familiar personally with this beetle problem. I would not know a beetle if I saw one, but I have confidence in our Forest Service. They say they can get rid of these beetles if given the money to do the job, and I am certainly in favor of giving them a chance. A good start was made last year, and we cannot afford to abandon the project now.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Most people who are not from the far West do not know that the insects and the forest diseases actually harvest more timber every year in the far West than all of the commercial lumber companies put together; in other words, the insect logging company does more business in the far West than all other commercial logging companies put together, and we spend millions of dollars for fire protection, but for every tree we save from fire there is one that goes to the beetle.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman for that very pertinent observation. No doubt we have overlooked the damage done by these beetles to our timber, not alone in Colorado, but in all of our Western States. The present beetle threat is confined largely to Colorado at this time, although I understand it is spreading into Wyoming and New Mexico. Unless this beetle infestation is conquered I am advised that it will destroy a major portion of our spruce trees in Colorado, which would truly be a disaster. Let us act while there is still time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is certainly amusing to see the Members of Congress meet themselves coming back. Just about 3 days ago they passed some amendments here concerning power lines that turned back the clock for a generation, unless the Senate has the wisdom to knock them out.

You talk about these pine trees, and I am as much for conserving the timber of this country as anyone, but do you know that in recent years they have developed a process of manufacturing aluminum out of clay? From 25 to 40 percent of all clay is aluminum. There is enough aluminum in the average pine hill to supply the world. That is what one of their experts told me. He pointed to a hill out east of Tupelo where I live, and he said, "There is enough aluminum in that hill to supply the world." We have to have an abundance of cheap electricity to process it, to develop that aluminum. That is being done now, and houses are being built of aluminum, and more and more houses will be built of it as the years go by. They will be cheaper, perhaps, they will be absolutely bug and rat proof. You will see houses in the future with the framework and the inner walls made of aluminum, and probably brick or stone used for veneer.

This new day is dawning, and yet less than a week ago this Congress took it on itself to paralyze the development of the water power of this Nation and turned down an amendment that would have provided funds to demonstrate this new process of generating electricity from sun heat that, if successful, can generate untold trillions of kilowatt-hours of electricity every year.

Just as surely as the sun shines, President Peron of Argentina is using that very process today, and he says that in 2 years from now the entire Republic of Argentina will be electrified with electricity produced by the use of the sun's heat.

I remember a few years ago Congress passed a resolution to destroy all the starlings in this town, over my protest, when the starlings were destroying the Japanese beetles that were threatening to destroy every tree in Washington and the surrounding area. Thank the Lord, the starlings survived and the beetles disappeared. You do not see one today. That menace seems to have been destroyed in spite of Congress.

As far as I am concerned, I would turn these forests back to the States. I would turn every forest back to the State in which it is situated. The people of those localities know more and think more about preserving the timber than does somebody 1,000 or 3,000 miles away. Then you would not have to have all those men roaming around on the Federal payroll looking at the trees. I have never seen a man look at a pine tree yet and change its growth.

Where I live you can turn out a field in the sandy area and the next year it will grow up in pine bushes, and those bushes will grow, as a rule, something an inch in diameter every year. In 10 or 12 years you will have timber big enough to make lumber. But if you will give us the power we are entitled to, give us this 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power that you literally sealed up the other day with those amendments, let us use that and firm it up to the peak of the average year, and let them put on this experiment and show whether or not they can develop electricity from the sun's heat and provide those trillions of kilowatt-hours of electricity, if successful, they can produce more building material in 1 year than you can grow in 50 years with pine trees; and those fir trees in the Northwest do not grow half as rapidly as do the pine trees in the Southern States.

I just want to say to the Congress that many of you are meeting yourselves coming back so abruptly that I do not know whether you are going to survive the shock or not.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I spoke yesterday on the infestation of blister rust in my district in northern Idaho. This spruce beetle as yet has not affected my area. However, it has crossed over into two other States, and no doubt shortly will be getting into my territory, and I shall be very much exercised about it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Another pest has been mentioned here as an example of the ability of the pest fighters to control a given pest. I think it was the tussock moth, was it not, that was eradicated in the Coeur d'Alene area by very adept and adroit work on the part of the Forest Service?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Yes. The gentleman who takes care of that work is a very ardent friend and patient of mine. The question that has come up here which seems to be a stumbling block is the fact that there does not seem to

be any immediate respite against these infestations. Well, I am a physician, and I am still a physician, even though I happen to be a Congressman. I have fought through a great many epidemics. I remember very well the flu epidemic of 1918. We doctors fought as valiantly as we could with the poor tools that we had to fight with. We did not eradicate it in a year. I am not too sure we even did a great deal toward eradicating it at all. As one of the gentlemen previously said here a while ago, sometimes these things seem to have a self-limited course. But one must bear in mind there is a tremendous amount of destruction in human life during the course of an epidemic. Certainly if there is anything we can do it is our duty and our right to do it. I think in all probability, as far as I can find out, this work of planning the attack on the spruce beetle was not very well thought out to begin with. It was a new thing, and there were many mistakes made, as to the length of time it would take to eradicate it, and as to the best means of doing it. Inasmuch as it was not eradicated within the year, but even seemed to have spread after a year, a great many of the Members of Congress seemed to feel that the effort is not worth while. I do not think one can draw that conclusion. I certainly stand behind my neighboring State of Colorado and Nevada, I believe it is, in asking that the Congress consider restoring the cut of the funds necessary to fight the spruce beetle, or at least not to cut the measure any more so that the funds may be sufficient, or perhaps by some diversion have sufficient funds, so that a real attack may be made on this wicked infestation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 35, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $15,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 514); examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the act of June 11, 1906, and the act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, $27,122,025, of which not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for the purchase of three nursery sites.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, of course the vote has been taken now and the amendment which I offered has been defeated. As we all do when we lose a proposition, we bow to the will of the majority. However, in the short time that was allowed me to discuss this amendment, not wanting to impose myself on the body more than necessary, I did not have time to discuss as much of the detail as I would like to have done.

A great many of the Members in whose States this money is spent, of course, had the fear that to cut this appropriation would interfere with the work. If the amendment had been adopted it would not have interfered with the work at all in those States in the infested areas. The truth of the business is the main control work that is done in the field is pulling up currant and gooseberry bushes, and a little spraying, and it is so stated in the hearings by the expert from the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. The amendment did not touch the money for the work in the field. Mr. STIGLER, a member of the committee, asked this question:

I see you have an item of $1,084,500 under the white pine blister rust control operations. Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. Granger said:

That is the national forest part of the fund, Mr. Chairman, which is used for direct control work out in the field. That consists principally of destroying the currant and gooseberry bushes, which furnish the alternate host for this disease. That is the means of controlling mostly by pulling them up, though there is some spraying done.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] thought that this was going to affect the work of destroying beetles in the forests. Others thought it would interfere with the forestry work from other angles, but I want it understood, because I do not just get up and offer an amendment to cut an appropriation for the sake of seeing that we cut something. I want it understood that this was to cut the supervisory cost of this program, and in my opinion it should have been cut, and I still think it should have been cut. I want to repeat what I said, that I hope this committee will investigate it next year and if they will investigate it thoroughly I believe they will see that this program should be cut to somewhere in the neighborhood of where it was before it was changed over to a WPA project and jumped up in 1 year from $600,000 to $2,400,000.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am a member of the subcommittee and I am vitally interested in this matter. I think I can speak for the chairman of our subcommittee. I think I can state that this subcommittee will not let down in its efforts to secure the maximum value out of every tax dollar that is spent.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Certainly I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Each and every year we have had a complete investigation of this. I think we have scaled down the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine as far as possible. We investigated this matter this year, and next year we will investigate to see whether they have carried out the recommendations that we made this year.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I certainly want to commend both of these gentlemen. They are both very able men and men who have the best interests of this country at heart. I know that. I am glad to see it, but I feel this way about this supervisory cost, that a supervisory cost which is one dollar for every two dollars and a half spent for work in the field is too high and ought to be cut. There is just no argument about that in my book, and that is why I offered this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. We certainly are not trying to justify any such expenditure for supervision, but it is the belief of the committee that the gentleman is wrong since it is provided in the report that this money will go into the work in the field.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Will the gentleman just let me read. The question was asked this man about this particular item of $705,000 which I sought to cut.

Mr. STIGLER asked him on page 1089:

Mr. STIGLER. Let me ask, what work do you do under the heading there, 2 (a), which you show as leadership, coordination, and technical direction of white pine blister control? That is on page 317.

Mr. Granger did not answer it, but asked Dr. Popham if he would answer it.

Dr. Popham said:

That item provides for the over-all coordination of blister rust control between the several agencies that participate.

Mr. STIGLER. How many agencies participate in that?

Dr. POPHAM. There are three bureaus of the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, the States, and the private landowners.

There is a small staff that works with these agencies in the over-all planning, selecting

the territories to receive priority, dividing the funds according to needs, establishing standards for work, and providing general technical direction of the work.

They also check to see that standards are met, for determining in the field which areas should be worked first and which should receive a follow-up inspection later on.

As you are aware, white pine blister rust is conducted both on State and private land, and on Federal lands, falling under the management of the several Federal agencies.

That is what the expert himself stated; that is all the justification that is given for this $705,000, and verifies what I said about it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, but the committee report was written after the hearings which the gentleman quotes. I do not want the record to be left that the subcommittee or the full committee will agree to let them spend that much money.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. As I said, I am sure the gentleman's intentions are of the very best, and I am not criticizing them, but the fact remains that this appropriation of $705,000 goes for a supervisory purpose and constitutes a ratio of one dollar to two and a half of the money spent. I am firmly convinced now, as I have always been, that it is too high.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: On page 22, line 7, strike out the period and add the following: "and of which $1,351,149.37 shall be used to pay the claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the paragraph to which offered, that it is not authorized by law, and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to earmark $1,350,000 which is money illegally taken away from the western counties by the Forest Service. That money was due to these counties under the Forest Management Act of May 23, 1908, which provides that 25 percent of all moneys received during any fiscal year from each national forest shall be paid at the end of the year to the State in which the national forest is situated, to be expended as the State legislatures may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public lands of the county or counties in which the national forest is situated.

The forest management people deprived these counties of this 25 percent or a portion of it, amounting to $1,350,000. What I propose to do on page 22 of this bill is to earmark $1,350,000 of the funds allocated to forest management, which amounts to $27,122,000.

Mr. Chairman, the people who handled forest management illegally and improperly diverted this fund. This amendment seeks restitution for those counties which are deprived of that money; it seeks restitution in the only section where we can get restitution against that Federal agency which improperly diverted the funds, namely, Forest Management.

I contend, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that if there is any place in the bill where restitution can be made it must be made from the funds of the agency which improperly and illegally diverted the funds, namely, the National Forest Management Division, and that is the reason this amendment is offered at this point in the bill.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I may say to the gentleman from New York this earmarking is authorized by law, because the Congress a year ago in an act authorized the payment of these funds to the State as reimbursement for money that had been illegally diverted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it is not in the slightest degree germane to the item that is here under consideration. There is nothing in the nature of a payment of anything to anybody under that statute in this paragraph. It is, therefore, not in the slightest degree germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). The Chair is ready to rule.

The paragraph to which the amendment is offered makes an appropriation for specific purposes, namely, for the "administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests," thus the paragraph provides money for narrowly defined use only on national forests, which belong to the Federal Government.

The amendment in question seeks to make available a part of this appropriation for a purpose entirely different from the purposes spelled out in the paragraph of the bill. The amendment refers to moneys received from each national forest as set out in title 16, section 500, United States Code, which provides in part that "25 percent of all moneys received during any fiscal year from each national forest shall be paid, at the end of such year, by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such national forest is situated, to be expended as the State Legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which such national forest is situated," and so forth. The amendment would make the funds in this bill available to pay States the percentage above referred to, and the payments could be used by the States only for public roads and public schools. Regardless of the use to which the States could put the money, the payment of claims to States as outlined above is in no wise germane to the administration, protection, et cetera, of national forests. Building State roads and schools is even further remote from expenditures on Federal forests.

In keeping with the many precedents of the House holding that an amendment must be germane to the paragraph to which offered, the Chair must rule that this amendment is not germane, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, of the 435 congressional districts in the United States, the one having the most timber is that of my friend, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. My own district, which comprises most of the seacoast and Columbia River counties of Washington has more standing timber than any district except the one represented by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. I, therefore, am familiar with the timber problems now under debate.

The great cost of managing our public timber is primarily the result of having too many cooks. The Federal Government now has 16 agencies engaged in timber management. In many cases these agencies are doing duplicating and overlapping work and the result is waste of Federal funds and additional unnecessary tax burdens on the people.

In my county—Grays Harbor—there is a small lake 2 miles wide by 6 miles long. Three different Federal agencies are managing the Federal timber that stands on the borders of that lake. Many times, I have seen Government-owned automobiles of the Forest Service, the Park Service and the Indian Service all parked at one time around a swank hotel on the border of that lake. These cars had brought employees of three different Federal agencies to this hotel to attend to timber problems of the adjacent area. One agency could do the job better than three and do it at much less cost to the taxpayers.

This duplication of effort by overlapping and duplicating agencies is one of the main reasons why the management of our forests costs as much money as it does.

Now, the rules and regulations promulgated by these different overlapping agencies sometimes are most wondrous to behold.

For example, in one place a narrow 24-foot road separates timber that is managed by the Park Service and managed by the Forest Service. The Park Service has a rule which says that if a hunter kills a cougar—mountain lion—in park lands, he is subject to a fine or imprisonment, or both, for destroying wildlife in a national park. But, if the cougar crosses that narrow road and gets into the Forest Service timber and a hunter kills him there, that hunter is not fined nor imprisoned—he is entitled to a $15 bounty for having destroyed a predatory animal.

The Forest Service is charged with the responsibility of marketing federally owned timber, the selling of it to commercial establishments. But, while doing this, it operates a large recreational agency, establishes and operates parks, playgrounds, and camp sites.

The Park Service is supposed to devote itself to providing recreational facilities but it also has a large agency engaged in the sale of Federal timber.

This is a wasteful duplication of effort and a costly one to the taxpayers.

I hope that sometime Congress will take some action to eliminate some of

these unnecessary 16 agencies now engaged in administering our Federal timber. If Congress does that, it will save much confusion and also large sums of money for the taxpayers.

The Forest Service, on the whole, does a very creditable and efficient job in administering the Federal timber under its jurisdiction. I do not think the Park Service does.

In my state, the Park Service, for example, obtained the creation of a park that is larger than the State of Rhode Island. This park contains 17,000,000,000 feet of standing timber. This timber, according to the Assistant United States Forester, if sold at today's price, would bring $423,000,000.

Now, we in our area want a national park to preserve timber for future generations to see. We want a big park. But, having a park larger than the State of Rhode Island containing $423,000,000 of merchandisable timber, is too much of a good thing. It is downright absurd, ridiculous, and asinine. It is asinine because some of this timber is overripe and ought to be logged and put to useful purposes and thereby be producing revenues for the Federal Government.

The Park Service, however, has a starry-eyed theory that this timber, even the overripe timber, should never be cut for use. They have a theory that it should be permitted to die, fall to the ground and rot. This, they say, will fertilize the ground for a new crop. I have never heard anyone at all familiar with trees agree with this absurd theory.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the able gentleman for the splendid and informative statement he just made. He has directed our attention again to some of the many places in our Government where we have duplication and multiplication of effort which results in higher taxes against the people of this country. The policy presently prevents our accomplishing a very important objective he has pointed out. It ought to be corrected. I hope the House will follow the advice of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act

For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $100,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the board of county commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

Page 24, line 10, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would not undertake to vie with the fine gentleman from Mississippi in either knowledge of this bill or any attempts at economy. I think the committee has done a fine job in making numerous cuts on this appropriation, all of which could be well and can be well justified. There are other cuts, I think, that might be well justified. The amendment I am offering is one of them. The thing that is bothering me and a great many of us here in Congress and throughout the country is that here we have these appropriation bills coming up every day, many of them, in fact nearly all of them where the agencies of the Government are asking for larger appropriations of the people's money, and at the same time that we are sitting here voting away this money the Committee on Ways and Means is sitting over in another chamber and almost daily putting out reports of votes that have been taken that will lead to more and more and more taxes upon the already heavily burdened people of this country. And some of us are worried about it. We are worried not only because of the burden upon the people; we are worried because we believe these increases in taxation are going to diminish the source of the revenues of the Government by putting them so high that people are now saying, "Well, what is the use of me trying to do anything? What is the use of trying to make any money if the Congress is going to take it away from us in taxes and the Congress is going to appropriate money to fritter away in unnecessary activities and expenditures?" Now, that is the thing that has been activating this House in past weeks in trying to cut these appropriation bills. This particular amendment that I am offering is in relation to the acquisition of land. This amendment proposes to cut from $100,000 to $50,000 for the acquisition of land for the Forest Service. I am wondering in this time of stress why is it necessary to buy any more land for the Forest Service? Can we not put that off for a year or two? Why do we have to have any more land now for the Forest Service? I am wondering why the committee allowed any funds for the purchase of land. I know I have just recently heard that the Federal Government with its various agencies now owns over 8 percent of the land of my State of Virginia. I just heard the gentleman from California within the last hour stand on this floor of this House and say that the Federal Government owns 40 percent of all the land in the great State of California.

In this time of emergency can we not stop, look, and listen, and wait for a year or two before we buy any more land? I am simply asking you to cut this appropriation from $100,000 to $50,000, and just say to this agency. "If you have to buy some land, just wait for a year or two until some of these desperate emergencies are over, and then come back and tell us about it again."

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I am a member of the commission consisting of three Members from the House and three from the Senate that passes on the purchase of these tracts of land that are acquired by the Forest Service under the Weeks law and other laws. I reviewed the purchase of several of these tracts in the last year. This particular appropriation under the Weeks law in 1950 was roughly $400,000, last year $250,000, and this year is $100,000. If you will turn to page 477 of the hearings you will find why we acquired these particular tracts, which is the question the gentleman just before me asked.

The tracts we acquired this year were, every one of them, small areas inside present national forests, a few acres here and a few acres somewhere else, that were needed because they represented a fire hazard in several instances inside of national forest tracts. Another area was acquired because unsightly signs were being put up that detracted from the rest of the national forests.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman says we are going to spend this money because somebody has put an unsightly sign up on some private property. In this time of great emergency when we are spending every dollar we can save, is that a justification for buying more land?

Mr. D'EWART. I think it may well be the justification for acquiring a 5- or 10-acre tract that costs from $8 to $10 or perhaps less per acre.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. It so happens that I, too, am a member of that commission, from the House. I just wanted to say that what the gentleman has said is largely true. I have been a member of that commission now for the past decade or such a matter. It has been the policy of that commission during the past several years, I will say, and it has certainly been definitely my policy as a member of that commission, not to buy extensive tracts of land. The only purpose I can see now as justification for any appropriation at all on this subject is to fill in these isolated spots that are owned by private people, so that the Government's holdings may become solid and contiguous.

The question of whether it could stand an additional $50,000 cut or not is of course a question for the House to pass upon. I think the commission should have some money with which to make these small purchases. As the gentleman knows and as the proponent of this amendment knows, I am very much in favor of cutting these appropriations wherever we possibly can. I certainly agree not only with what the gentleman from Montana has said but what the gentleman from Virginia has said, that we ought to defer as many of these matters as possible. If the House thinks they can get along with a $50,000 cut from the rather small appropriation

that the committee has recommended, it will be perfectly agreeable with me.

Mr. D'EWART. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has been on this commission longer than I have. I concur in what he has said. I can assure the gentleman from Virginia that we examine every one of these purchases very carefully and if it is not very definitely in the public interest, to purchase a small tract, we turn it down. We need this small amount of money to protect the present holding. If it is not in the public interest and if it does not protect present holdings, certainly we turn them down. As the previous speaker said, if it is the will of the Congress that we should not make these purchases, that is the privilege of the Congress. But I think the money we do spend on the tracts are necessary in the public interest and to protect the present holdings.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to call the attention of the Congress to the fact that in 1950, the last full fiscal year, the total expenditures including supplies, materials, travel, equipment, and all that sort of thing, amounted to only $66,000, and if we cannot save $16,000 out of $66,000 it certainly is too bad.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should have made a pro forma amendment because the gentleman's amendment is in the direction that I have gone during the past several years. It is just a case of how many of these situations will arise. For instance, in 1947 the appropriation for this purpose was $2,593,000. In 1948 it was $1,000,000, and in 1951, last year, the budget estimate was $700,000, and we cut it down and we held the other body to $300,000. This year we cut it from $300,000 to $100,000. The gentleman from Virginia is just going a step faster than the committee has been willing to go. The reason for the attitude of the committee is we feel we already have too much land. But the Department does make a case each year for the purchase of small isolated tracts within a national forest, which are privately owned, where a man has the right to have his house and camp and do all those things which create a fire hazard. Last year in the conference report I insisted, and I expect to insist on it again this year, that they could not spend this for any land which was not entirely surrounded by a national forest. And if there is $100,000 worth of that kind of land, the chances are it will be a good investment. It will be a gain if we can reduce the cost of fire protection required.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Has his committee ever considered doing anything to stop the Forest Service from expanding its total ownership by a system of exchanges wherein it exchanges the cutting rights on lands it now has for the fee title for lands which it does not own but which come off the tax rolls after it has title? That is by all odds the biggest loophole. We can stop the appropriations. We can cut it from $100,000 to $50,000 or make any other cut, but so far as I know there is no way to stop the Forest Service from trading stumpage it has for the fee title to land which it does not now own but which when it takes over immediately goes on the tax rolls. So I ask the gentleman, is there anything being done to stop that kind of exchange procedure which is expanding the ownership in the national forests?

Mr. WHITTEN. This is a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and we are not supposed to do anything except appropriate funds. Every once in a while we find a situation like that and we get a little criticism here for trying to correct it, because it takes a little legislation.

I will say to the gentleman I have just recently had a report from the Comptroller General as to what has been going on in the Forest Service in that regard. It came in only in the last 10 days, but even had I had it earlier, I do not know how we could have reached it in an appropriation bill.

Mr. ENGLE. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, is the gentleman not interested in the fact that when the Forest Service trades stumpage in a national forest for a fee title to land, that money is not coming into the United States Treasury, and therefore it is necessary for the gentleman and his subcommittee to put up more money in order to take care of their operation?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says. I am sure that from time to time other members on the Appropriations Committee feel like myself, that we would like to be on legislative committees. I would like to be on a legislative committee for about 3 weeks, and I think I could correct some of these things, but we cannot do it here.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. It is my understanding from Mr. Hopkins that these exchanges were made to solidify and that they were acre-for-acre exchanges. I would like to have the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] verify that.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I think as far as I am concerned that I have already made that statement, that the purpose of the Commission in the past several years has been only to make purchases to solidify holdings that they already have. That is, to take in these isolated pieces of land owned privately that become fire hazards, and so on. So far as my friend and colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is concerned, I at least want to share credit for whatever has been cut down in that, because as a member of the Commission I have advocated that as the policy of the Commission all the way through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one additional minute in order to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. This Weeks' law money is used only east of the Mississippi River. It is used to consolidate acquired forests. That is, the forests that were purchased by the National Government east of the Mississippi River. None of this money goes west of the Mississippi, and therefore it is not applicable to grazing land, as was mentioned by the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. From the discussion it appears that the issue is whether we can defer the purchase of these lands, practically, until the emergency is over. I wonder if the gentleman recalls to what extent those purchases were made during the last emergency, World War II.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not have the figures, but this committee has cut it down since 1947 from $2,493,000 to about $100,000. Where a man has a few acres of land in a national forest, where he can have cabins and buildings which create a fire hazard, it will usually cost a great deal more than that to take care of the fire hazard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, yet I do feel that it is timely that we should make note of the receipts coming into the Federal Treasury from our national forests.

I note that the appropriation for the running of the national forests for the fiscal year 1951, is as follows:

For protection and management (money for making timber sales $4,500,000) maintenance of improvements, etc	$27,122,025
Forest fire fighting	6,000,000
Forest roads and trails	10,437,500
Range improvement	700,000
Total to run forests	44,259,525

The anticipated income from the national forests for 1951, is as follows:

Sale of timber	$45,000,000
From grazing fees, special uses and other miscellaneous uses	5,000,000
Total gross receipts	50,0000,000

These figures are extremely interesting to me, Mr. Chairman. If we do not impair the program there will be a net

return to the Federal Treasury of approximately $5,000,000 over the appropriations for the running of our national forests.

Of the total for the fiscal year 1951 between $40,000,000 and $45,000,000 is expected to be received from the sale of timber. This will be an increase from slightly over $29,000,000 in the fiscal year 1950. The rapidity of the growth of receipts is shown by the fact that the receipts for the fiscal year 1940 were $5,859,000; those for 1945 slightly over $16,000,000 as compared with anticipated receipts for the fiscal year 1951 of $50,000,000.

There are some national forests which will probably never pay their own way. They were established primarily for watershed protection, such as in southern California, and have limited revenue-producing resources. Generally, however, rapid progress is being made in having the national forests support themselves. For the fiscal year 1950, out of 152 national forests 57 were paying their own way as far as the appropriation is concerned which provides for their protection and management. On 28 national forests the receipts were in excess of all expenditures including those for permanent investments such as roads, trails, reforestation, and range revegetation.

For the current fiscal year, the receipts per thousand board feet for timber sold are almost 10 times the direct cost of handling the sale of 1,000 board feet of timber.

The basic situation is that experience clearly shows that investment of more money each year in the administration of the national forests produces additional receipts much larger than the additional expenditure.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, we should not lose sight of the fact of the financial returns to the States. Of the total gross receipts the Federal Government returns 25 percent to the States for distribution to the counties in which the national forests are located to be used for roads and schools. Another 10 percent is made available to the Forest Service to pay part of the costs of building and maintaining roads and trails in the national forests.

I commend the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. WHITTEN] and each member of the committee in their desire to not only hold the line but to maintain an increasing vision of the tremendous possibilities that are represented in our national forests.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 53, noes, 48.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Superior National Forest

For the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minn., under the provisions of the act approved June 22, 1948 (Public Law 733), $100,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 24, line 22, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$50,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is merely the companion amendment to the one just adopted by the House. There are two items in here for the acquisition of land each in the amount of $100,000. You will find them here on page 24, one under the Weeks Act and one under the general appropriations. My companion amendments propose to cut each of them $50,000.

I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have just eliminated $50,000 from an item of $100,000 that has to do with the purchase of land for Government forests. I can speak from personal knowledge, not from what I read, but from the experience I gained as Governor of the State of New Mexico. I have called out the National Guard a number of times to save the forests from fire created by the carelessness of people who were either there by invitation or were staying with small-tract people in the forest.

You have not made any saving by eliminating this $50,000 today. I could not estimate what we would waste, probably, if this amendment is agreed to. These tracts ought to be purchased and consolidated. I will vote for every nickel that you want to vote in this House for that purpose. If it involves waste I will vote for economy. But there is no economy in this amendment at all.

When you have members of a committee who have given much time and study to these items, then a Member gets up and offers an amendment to strike something out which he knows nothing about, that does not seem to me to make sense.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not true that items of this kind are not expenditures but, rather investments?

Mr. DEMPSEY. They are probably the greatest and best investment we can make. When you cut down a forest it means not only taking the timber out but in many, many instances you are ruining a watershed. The forests are what protects our watersheds. In New Mexico the ownership of forest lands by the Federal Government is terrific, and I am happy that is so because there are very few States which could protect forests such as we have out there.

Also may I say that practically all of the men who are employed in the Forestry Service are career men. They have been there for years and years and they know what they are doing. An amendment to strike out $50,000 in connection with the protection of the forests of America, I think, is very, very short-sighted.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to subscribe to the excellent train of thought injected by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY]. I know that the gentleman who has offered the amendment to reduce this appropriation by $50,000 is sincere, but I do plead with the membership to give this their serious consideration.

The area involved is a wilderness roadless area, it was established as a wilderness area by action taken by this House itself. Furthermore it was implemented by the executive department this year through Executive order which provided that no airplane shall fly over this area.

There are scattered parcels of privately owned land throughout this large consolidated national forest in my district. This consolidation has been under way now for the past 3 years to pick up the small private holdings and consolidate the entire area into a wilderness area.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the pending amendment would be a great injustice here, it would be a very unwise move, it would really be a penny-wise-pound-foolish policy. You have private holders up there who are willing to sell, who have been led to believe they will be allowed to exchange their lands or sell out to the Government. Now you have them out on a limb where they cannot build roads to reach the resort areas or private establishments up there. It has been provided by this Congress that the private owners cannot build roads to reach these areas. The only way left is by airplane, and the executive department has told them that they cannot go to their property by airplane. Now we come in here and reverse ourselves and say, "Now, we are not going to buy your property," which we indicated 3 years ago we would do by authorizing $500,000 for acquisition of these private lands.

I plead with you here to be consistent with the policy which we ourselves established 3 years ago. We appropriate $100,000 each year of the original $500,000 authorization, so a period of 5 or 6 years will be necessary to complete the purchases of the few remaining pieces of privately owned property in this national forest.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. When this point came up in the subcommittee, the subcommittee members were kind enough to ask me as to what I thought about this particular amount of $150,000 requested by the budget for this year's installment. I told them at the time that I thought it should take its cut along with other portions of the bill and I suggested that we put $100,000 into the bill instead of the $150,000. In other words, that day I was perfectly willing to take our share of the cut which I thought we should put into the bill, and I do feel that lowering this yet another $50,000, lowering it by two-thirds, will be just a little bit unfair to the previous almost unanimous action of the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman. It would be unfair to these peo-

ple who now come, after great reluctance, have yielded to the wishes of the Government and are prepared to sell out; have curtailed all plans for any resort business this summer; are prepared to move out just as soon as the moneys are available so the purchase can be made. They have no use of the property now, their own Government denying them the right of access to their own property, and being unable to sell to the Forest Service. Gentlemen, I do urge your most earnest consideration of this matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I said a few moments ago, I represent one of the largest timber districts of the United States. I said that the Forest Service is a good and efficient agency, in my opinion. I regard myself as a friend of the Forest Service. Yet, while I am a friend of the Forest Service, I believe we should make this $50,000 reduction.

This amount of money involved is not great, but by adopting this $50,000 reduction we, the Members of Congress, will be saying to the executive departments of the Government that the Congress is unalterably opposed to the constant efforts of these Federal agencies to constantly gaining ownership of more and more land by acquiring additional blocks of private holdings and placing them under Federal governmental ownership and control.

At the present time, 35 percent of all the lands in the State of Washington are owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Government owns almost 46 percent of all the land in California and owns more than 52 percent of all the land area of Oregon.

Of all the landed area of Nevada, the Federal Government owns nearly 85 percent and barely more than 15 percent is in private ownership.

The Federal Government now owns 54.31 percent of all the land in the 10 western States of this Nation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman, of course, realizes that this particular item was specifically authorized in a separate act by the Congress of the United States. It is not an action by the Forest Service, I may say to the gentleman.

In one area of my district, known as the North Shore of Lake Quinault, the Park Service wants to acquire about 10,000 acres of land that is occupied mostly by pioneer settlers of the area. It has been employing almost Hitler and Stalin tactics to drive these settlers off their farms so that it, the Park Service, may acquire the land. The Park Service has not kept the roads in decent or safe repair. The settlers have difficulty driving their cars to town or getting their children to school in busses because of the unsafe condition of the roads through federally owned park property.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. There is no expansion here. There are well defined limits to the Superior National Forest established by the Congress itself. The Congress itself here 3 years ago made available these annual payments of around $100,000 to acquire these small remaining private properties within that area and has ordered the Forest Service to go ahead and consolidate them for greater efficiency and economy. The separate private properties constitute an additional fire hazard in several instances, which compels us to spend additional moneys for fire protection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota, we should acquire that land, if it is needed, as suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] by trades rather than by spending taxpayers' money in acquiring additional property.

Mr. BLATNIK. They are doing both.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. May I say to the gentleman from Washington that those of us from the West have a pretty good idea of what the gentleman is talking about. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman in his premise that exchanges are the answer to this problem, and not the acquisition of additional land by the Federal Government, which already holds far too much.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Sometime this Congress ought to express itself as being determined to put an end to the insatiable greed of these Federal agencies which always are pressing to acquire more and more private lands and bring them under Federal ownership and control. The Federal Government already owns too much land, particularly in the West.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I think the gentleman misunderstood me. I am against the expansion of Federal ownership, but I would not be in favor of using the exchange developments here. That would do just exactly the opposite of what the gentleman has in mind. I should like to make the RECORD clear that I do not think the example is applicable in this instance.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in this day when it is extremely popular to offer amendments to whatever hits the floor, it is a little difficult to get up here and speak in each instance against the amendment. Nobody is more disturbed about the amount of land the Federal Government owns, than I am, and I have written provisions in years past which would prohibit the buying of any more land in my area. But because that is true and because it is exceedingly popular to cut down whatever is in a bill, I do not think we should lose sight of why this amount is in here and what it is for.

This Congress passed a bill providing for the Superior National Forest, and we have provided money to get it started. They have already acquired a lot of the land, but inside of it there still are a few pieces of privately owned land which increase the annual expense of keeping out forest fires and other things that may be of danger. The longer you wait to get this land the more it is going to cost you, according to everything that has happened in the last few years. If you do not want the national forest in the Superior area you should not have passed it. Having passed it, it is common sense to get the job over with rather than to drag it out.

I will agree with the good intentions of my friend from Virginia, but to prolong a thing you are committed to and are going to do does not save a dime. I think it will cost you money in this instance, just as in the amendment that was adopted a while ago. If you want to repeal some of these laws, repeal them, but if you are going to have them, let us have a little economy in the operation of them. To wait several years to buy this land that you are committed to buy does not necessarily save a dime but, as I said, we think it will cost you money.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is economy to appropriate this money at the present time, as was mentioned by the chairman of the subcommittee, because all these little tracts are being improved unwittingly by the people that own these tracts within this roadless area. Therefore, the more improvements they put on those tracts the more it is going to cost the Government when it comes time to purchase them. On top of that, you have a road condition to maintain, you have a fire hazard, and you have the sale of property to other people who come in there not knowing that the property is subject to being taken over at some time by the Forest Service. People who purchase land as a speculative matter or as an ownership matter do not always realize that this Congress has passed laws to provide for a roadless area to take over that territory. It is extremely good economy to make this appropriation now and proceed with the act the Congress has placed on the statute books.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentlemen who have addressed the House have been kind enough to speak respectfully, to say the least, of our subcommittee. But you leave us where we do not know what to do. If, without regard to why the money is here, it is just a case of cutting each item that comes up, you are going to do a lot of damage to the program of this Department. I will vote a bill requiring the Federal Government to get rid of half of its land, or even more. But as long as you have a great deal of land with some privately owned land inside of it, where you must give them the right of ingress and egress, it is unsound business just for the sake of a

record vote here to cut this amount of money.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I became somewhat familiar with this project in the Eightieth Congress in the course of the hearings held by the Committee on Agriculture on the measure which authorized these purchases. No question of economy is involved here since the work of acquisition is already going on and should be conducted in an orderly manner. To slow up the rate of purchases now through the adoption of this amendment would probably result in an increased cost to the Government for reasons which I will mention in a moment. I am in sympathy with the views expressed by my friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] with reference to the situation which he has described, but this most assuredly is not that kind of a situation. As I recall it, and I was very familiar with the project at one time, these small areas within the forest are either commercial resorts or tracts of land that are owned by rich people who have been flying their planes in there. In either case their continued existence is incompatable with the wilderness area which has been created here.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is entirely right in that assumption. In fact I think there are three or four little resorts that the Government is anxious to get out of there which are about 30 or 40 miles in, if I remember correctly. If we permit these particular resorts to expand, in a few years' time it is going to cost considerably more to get them out of there.

Mr. HOPE. In the meantime, if Congress proceeds to delay the acquisition or to raise doubts about the continuation of the program these people will not know what they should do. It leaves them in a very uncertain position, and it leaves the Forest Service in the unfortunate position of not being able to go ahead with the project in any kind of an orderly way. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] said, it will cost more if we delay the purchase and it will keep those people who are in the area in a state of suspense until they know what is going to be done. There is just no economy or any saving in the adoption of an amendment of this kind. I will go along on any amendment which promises real economy.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. In our area, when a Federal agency acquires a resort property within a national forest, it does not close up that resort, but turns around and leases it to somebody else, frequently to the very man from whom it purchased the resort. Is there any intention to continue the operation of those resorts of which I speak?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Absolutely none, if I may take the liberty of answering for the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman from Minnesota has correctly stated the situation. The law itself makes this a wilderness area and prohibits the maintenance of any resorts within its boundaries. It is an altogether different situation than the gentleman from Washington has in mind.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We are about half way through on this acquisition. This project is in collaboration with Canada, as I understand. Canada has a similar one on its side of the boundary line. It would seem very foolish to throw away approximately $300,000 that we have put into it by failing to go through with the additional $200,000 or $250,000.

Mr. HOPE. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the amendment that has been offered will serve the purpose of bringing about the results that are expected by the gentlemen who are sponsoring the amendment. However, I do wish that there were some legislation that would afford the Government the same right to sell land as they have to purchase land. I do not know that it could be put in an appropriation bill. I am sure it would be declared legislation upon an appropriation bill, but it does seem to me that if the Federal Government has authority to purchase land, they should likewise have authority to sell land.

Several years ago the Caddo River Lumber Co. was operating in my district. They were a commercial lumber company. They sold thousands of acres of land to the Ozark and Ouchita National Parks. When the Government was buying that land they bought a lot of city lots upon which there is not one stick of timber and never will be. They are city lots, I tell you. Still the Federal Government is not authorized to sell those city lots to the people who live there in the cities involved.

There is a lot of good farm land among this land that was sold by the timber company to the Federal Government, and even though the Forestry Department would like to sell that land to the public, they are not allowed to do so. The only thing they can do is to swap land. I can prove by every person connected with the Forestry Department that when you start swapping land with private people you get into a lot of trouble, because every person feels that his neighbor has been treated better than he has been treated when dealing with the Federal Government.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Agriculture will bring forth some legislation that will authorize the Federal Government to sell some of this land, even if it is necessary to use the money received from that sale to purchase additional lands.

I do not think this amendment will serve any purpose. What you are doing is this: You are curtailing the moneys available now with which to buy land out in some particular forest area. If you cut this money in half they will simply buy half of it this year and half of it next year, and I cannot see where you will save a dime by telling them you have to purchase it over a 2-year period instead of over a 1-year period.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia), there were—ayes 30, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Special acts

For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $40,000; Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, Calif., act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nev., act of June 25 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, Calif., act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, Calif., act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, Calif., act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $35,000; in all $142,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that any remarks I have made today in the Committee of the Whole be expunged from the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

UNITED NATIONS BETRAYED US

Mr. Chairman, while we are attempting to economize, let us take a look at the United Nations, which has been receiving so much of our money.

Those who put their trust either for permanent universal peace or our own national security in the United Nations should learn some of the present-day "facts of life."

Over the years, time and again from the well of the House, by news releases and public talks, I have opposed the surrendering of our independence, the policy of letting the welfare of our people and the future security of our Republic, be determined by a group of individuals whose first consideration is the advance-

ment of their own individual or national interests.

This week Secretary of Defense Marshall, no doubt inadvertently, disclosed the folly of relying upon the United Nations for our own protection or the advancement of our welfare.

David Lawrence, commenting upon the general's testimony, wrote as follows:

UNITED STATES SURRENDERED INDEPENDENCE—GENERAL MARSHALL'S TESTIMONY SHOWS 350,000 SOLDIERS WERE ABANDONED TO WHIM OF FOREIGN CABINETS

(By David Lawrence)

Secretary Marshall's testimony is in many respects even more sensational than that of General MacArthur.

For it tells the American people for the first time that they have completely lost their independence of military action in the midst of a war in which 350,000 American boys are engaged.

It tells that decisions made by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are vetoed in secret by other governments without an opportunity for the public opinion of the United States or of the world to be apprised of the facts.

It tells that, although the United States has contributed the bulk of the troops in Korea, the 13 governments which have contributed token forces decided to deny us the right to apply the military doctrine of pursuing the enemy—known as "hot pursuit."

It tell that the United Nations has appointed the United States as agent to conduct the military operations but that the agent cannot perform those military operations without continuously obtaining the consent of these Allies.

It tells that the United States, though conscious of the importance of an economic blockade to stop strategic materials and munitions from getting to the enemy, has not succeeded in persuading the principal U. N. countries now involved in that trade to stop it, even though 10 months of war in Korea have elapsed.

It tells that all these troubles and friction between the United States and its Allies were never communicated to General MacArthur except in the vaguest terms.

It tells, by implication, that the famous 13-nation declaration which was supposed to bring about a negotiation of a "cease fire" was never sent to General MacArthur and that only a brief message saying some such announcement was planned went to him on March 20 last.

It tells that the United States Government at present opposes the entry of Red China into the U. N. and opposes turning Formosa over to Communist China but that the United States Government is nevertheless willing to discuss these subjects as matters for negotiation with the Red Chinese when they agree to a cease fire.

It tells that the United States will adhere to that policy but it doesn't tell whether the United States will use its veto to turn down such a reward for aggression or will merely bow to the will of the U. N. countries eventually, as it has done on some of the military measures proposed to the U. N.

It tells that General MacArthur carried out his military instructions as Far East commander and did not violate any military orders but that his public statements—his letter answering a Member of Congress, Representative MARTIN, and his interviews answering questions that were asked by the press concerning military operations—were distasteful to the President and his advisers and really caused his dismissal.

It tells that only four men sat in with President Truman and recommended summary dismissal of General MacArthur—Messrs. Acheson, Harriman, Bradley, and Marshall.

It tells that the Joint Chiefs favored a replacement but did not have anything to do with the form of dismissal. It doesn't tell whether the Joint Chiefs were told that the President was displeased with General MacArthur's statements and was considering a change in command.

It tells that the summary dismissal was decided on suddenly as a means of preventing General MacArthur from making any further statements to the press and from developing a sort of cumulative affair of publicity. This has since come about anyway with probably more cumulative statements and hearings than anybody ever imagined.

It tells that the Secretary of Defense of the United States does not believe the enemy can be driven out of Korea, but he hopes they will withdraw after their offensives fail. He doesn't think bombardment of Manchurian bases will chase them out either, though he concedes that diversionary operations such as a blockade and other military efforts in Southeast Asia may cause them to tire of their effort to stay in Korea.

It tells that in a moment of great crisis—when MacArthur's troops were being pushed back last December after Red China entered the war—the UN allies became frightened and began to limit the operations of the UN troops, especially in fighting back in the air.

It tells that instructions went to General MacArthur forbidding him to bomb even two big distributing centers in North Korea which were 35 miles below the northern border of the country and well within Korea itself.

It tells that, despite General MacArthur's titles as Supreme Commander in Japan and UN Commander and Commander in Chief of the far eastern forces, Secretary Marshall regarded General MacArthur as just another local theater commander, without the latitude of expression to comment on military events that General Eisenhower had or Admiral Nimitz had or General MacArthur himself had during the last war, and without even the right to engage in psychological warfare in his own theater of action because it might offend UN allies.

There are many more things revealed, the significance of which will become apparent as the hearings continue. But none is more vital than the revelation that America, although contributing the bulk of the military forces and the supplies, has surrendered her independence of action and her leadership and has abandoned 350,000 American boys to the whim of foreign cabinets.

Another recent disclosure goes, if that is possible, a little further.

Here we are in a war declared by President Truman, apparently at the instigation of the United Nations. Great Britain is a member of that organization, as are France and others of our nominal paper allies; yet just recently we learned that the British colonial office confessed that in the 9 months ending in March, British Malaya sold 121 tons of rubber to Communist China and that 40,400 more tons went direct to Russia.

We also learned, still later, that Britain does not propose to cut out the shipping of rubber to Communist China. That rubber is being used to aid the Communists to kill our men who are being conscripted to fight in Korea. Yet we continue to conscript our men to fight in the Far East, while we conscript our tax dollars to aid the nations which are aiding the Communists to kill the men we send abroad.

Just how foolish, inconsistent, and cruel to our people will we continue to be? Is it not time that people, generally, give a little thought to our own national welfare, and insist that they will no longer send their men to be killed by people we are aiding with our dollars?

From the Chicago Tribune of May 7 comes an editorial on this situation, which reads as follows:

BRITISH RUBBER: FRAUD AND BETRAYAL

The British colonial office has confessed that in the 9 months ending in March British Malaya sold 120,000 tons of rubber to Communist China and 40,400 more tons direct to Russia. During all this period token British detachments were fighting in Korea, and during the later months, fighting there against Chinese Communists.

This is a lot of rubber. It is a sixth of what the United States, with its tens of millions of automobiles, uses in a normal year, and a still higher proportion of its use of natural rubber. The Chinese got only 27,500 tons from Malaya in 1949. It is almost a certainty that their increased purchases were transshipped to Stalin. The Malayan sales alone are probably a year's supply for Russia, where rubber goes exclusively to the war machine.

These sales to Communists were made during a period when rubber prices were advancing by leaps and bounds. They stood at 18½ cents a pound at the beginning of 1950, and rose as high as 80 cents. Trading has been suspended in New York because the Government is now the sole buyer of imported rubber.

There are other than military aspects to this matter. John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., called attention last August to the diversion of rubber to the Communists. He commented Friday on the admissions 2 days earlier of the British colonial office, saying:

"It is important for rubber consumers, of which the United States is by far the largest, to know if British Malaya is actually encouraging the sale of rubber to Russia, China and other iron curtain countries for the purpose of keeping the world crude rubber price high. * * * It would be of interest to all free peoples to know how Malaya is being paid for the huge amounts of rubber moving into China since the Korean War. At an average price of 70 cents a pound, the 120,000 tons of rubber purchased by China in recent months would cost approximately $168,000,000. In view of the known inflation and the lack of gold in China, payment poses an interesting question.

"Does a sub rosa cartel of crude rubber producers exist, using iron-curtain countries as a wedge to create and maintain highly inflated rubber prices?"

Mr. Collyer suspects that the British in Malaya are not merely providing our enemies with an essential war material that they cannot find in appreciable quantities in their own territories, but are giving it to them at dump prices or on credit, to gouge American and European rubber purchasers by limiting supplies.

The selfishness of Malayan and Indonesian rubber planters almost inflicted defeat on the United States and its allies a decade ago. In the face of frantic efforts by the United States to stockpile rubber in 1940 and 1941, they withheld vast supplies, which eventually fell into the hands of Japanese. Only the miracle of synthetic rubber production saved this Nation.

The Truman administration has kept control of the synthetic rubber plants. Despite its proclaimed war emergency, it was slow to reactivate them last year. The administration has also been lax in pushing the construction of plants to make the new "cold" rubber, which is the best synthetic for automobile tires. Mr. Acheson's acknowledged position as the spokesman for

British interests in the Truman Cabinet raises the question whether, to oblige Downing Street and garner dollars for the crude-rubber monopoly, American synthetic production has not been held down deliberately.

Aneurin Bevan and his left-wing followers in the British Labor Party are seeking to capitalize on resentment against the United States, based upon charges that American war production and stockpiling are depriving the British of raw materials, forcing up their costs, and crippling their industrial production. It happens that the two commodities on which prices have increased most are tin, which is controlled by the British, and rubber.

The British trade with the enemy, reducing the supply of rubber in order to gouge us with inflated prices. Then they blame the United States. The next and obvious move, already indicated by some of Mobilization Director Wilson's tender sentiments toward the Europeans, will be to demand that we pay them for using their own rubber, at the prices they have deliberately inflated.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of the appropriation for "Cooperative Range Improvements" shall be expended in any national forest until funds or other contributions at least equal to such expenditures are made available by States or other local public or private sources, except that claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the purposes of this section.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the following language beginning in line 18 on page 26 and including the proviso in lines 18 to 25 inclusive as being legislation on an appropriation bill:

Provided, That hereafter no part of the appropriation for "Cooperative Range Improvements" shall be expended in any national forest until funds or other contributions at least equal to such expenditures are made available by States or other local public or private sources, except that claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, shall be accepted as contributions for the purposes of this section.

Mr. WHITTEN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTEN. In view of the fact that a point of order has been made to the last half of the paragraph I make a point of order against the entire paragraph. I do not think it can be argued that it is not subject to a point of order. A point of order having been made to half of the paragraph, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair sustains the point of order to the entire paragraph.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Page 26, line 12, insert:

"COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

"For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $700,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to argue the point of order right now. If the gentleman intends to make a point of order against the amendment I ask him to do so now.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to surrender any rights.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am willing to argue the point of order right now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. The effect of the amendment is to restore half of a paragraph that was stricken out on a point of order and the restored half is in exactly the same words as those which went out on the point of order. Therefore, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is within the gentleman's rights. If the gentleman wishes to make the point of order and press it the Chair is ready to hear him.

Mr. WHITTEN. I make the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I call the Chair's attention to the remarks made by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] on yesterday, which appear in yesterday's RECORD which shows that this particular item I am attempting to reinsert is authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to section 12 of Public Law 478, Eighty-first Congress, which reads as follows:

Of the moneys received from grazing fees by the Treasury from each national forest during each fiscal year there shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress an amount equivalent to 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and goats and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such national forest during the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins, which appropriated amount shall be available until expended on such national forests, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for (1) artificial revegetation, including the collection or purchase of necessary seed: (2) construction and maintenance of drift or division fences and stock-watering places, bridges, corrals, driveways, or other necessary range improvements; (3) control of range-destroying rodents; or (4) eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds, in order to protect or improve the future productivity of the range.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain and respectfully call your attention to the fact that this distinctly authorizes the section of this particular paragraph which I seek by my amendment to have reinserted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] desire to be heard?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the act under which this amendment is offered provides:

An amount equivalent to 2 cents per animal-month for sheep and goats and 10 cents per animal-month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such national forest during the calendar year 1950 but not in excess of the amount derived from grazing fees received during the fiscal year 1951 from such national forests.

That is the authority. The gentleman's amendment appropriates $700,000, if I understood it correctly, and there is no indication that is the amount of the grazing fees. The authorization says that in no instance can it exceed the amount of the grazing fees received. The basic law does not provide for a flat appropriation and I respectfully submit it is not authority for an appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote a statement of Mr. Granger of the Forest Service relative to this particular item, appearing on page 490, part 1, of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

Mr. GRANGER. This is a new program which came in last year as far as this appropriation item is concerned.

It provides for using a portion of the grazing receipts, determined on a basis of 2 cents a month for sheep, 10 cents for cattle and other livestock, for grazing on the national forest land.

On the basis of that formula for 1952 the amount that would be due under that arrangement would be $750,000. More than half of that goes into the maintenance of existing improvements. The rest of it is available for construction.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is irrelevant what Mr. Granger may think, what he may say or what the records may show. That is not pertinent to the point, as I see it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I add that certainly Mr. Granger of the Forest Service is referring to the act passed by the Eighty-first Congress which I quoted to the committee in full.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is in order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, as you have seen, the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has resulted in the removal of the entire paragraph commencing on page 26, line 12. I want to be fair with the Members from the West. If we here in the House do not make here available this $700,000, I think we are doing them an injustice. Yesterday I called attention to certain things that did not seem to me to be right. In the first instance we have the Taylor grazing areas charging through the Department of the Interior on 10 cents a month for grazing a cow with calf at side upon those areas. On the other hand, the Forest Service charges up to 50 cents a month for the same pasturage. It does seem to me that even that amount is a very small fee. But, regardless of my feelings on that subject, I think it is only fair and

just to the Members from the West to permit them to have this $700,000 which the committee intended them to have for the improvement of the grass potentialities of the forest ranges. This will go into the bill in the other body. So, from a practical viewpoint, why not put it in now? I might say that if the members of this committee will study carefully the remarks of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], as given yesterday on page 5133 of yesterday's RECORD relative to this matter, I think that you will agree that it is only fair to allow the Western States to have this money without putting on such rigid restrictions as would make it impossible for those States to take advantage of that appropriation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The point the gentleman is making is this, is it not, that this money is paid by the livestock people themselves and is in a trust fund for the purposes of range improvement? Is that not correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. You might put it that way. It is in a sense a trust fund paid in by the cattlemen of the West.

Mr. ENGLE. Well, as I understood Mr. Granger's testimony he testified that it would run something like $750,000 for this coming year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. In other words, that is money that the livestock people themselves are paying in any way; it is going into the Treasury, and this simply authorizes the use of it for the purposes for which it is collected; is that not correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. Of course, I will not agree with the gentleman that the livestock people are paying in enough for the grazing privileges to the Treasury, but the gentleman is in the main correct and I think it is only fair to make this money available without strings attached which would make impossible the use of the money.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will see fit to agree to this amendment.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be understood by the members of the Committee that a few years ago this money was collected by the Forest Service and held in a separate fund and not paid into the Treasury. I believe it was this Committee that objected to that method of handling this fund for range improvement. Therefore legislation was enacted whereby those funds are now paid into the Treasury for the improvement of the range. Therefore you are, under this appropriation, simply returning funds that have been collected for a specific purpose by agreement with the stockmen. Formerly they were not paid into the Treasury; now they are paid into the Treasury and should be made available for the purpose for which they are earmarked. If this amendment prevails, that money which was paid into the Treasury for this particular purpose, that is, cooperative range improvement, will be made available.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am in agreement with the principle that is involved in the latter part of the amendment that was stricken on a point of order. By that I mean the principle of cooperation between the State-owned lands that may be grazing lands and federally owned lands that may be grazing lands, and even private lands that may be grazing lands. I feel that the greatest benefit that could come to our watersheds—and I will ask the gentleman a question based upon this—would be the greatest amount of cooperation between the Federal, State, private, and county ownership, if the latter exists. Is not that the attempt the gentleman from Montana has in mind?

Mr. D'EWART. That is true. I think you do have at the present time a large amount of cooperation. I think you should encourage it in the future.

Mr. HORAN. I do not want this amendment, if it prevails, to allow the Forest Service or anyone else who purports to be in favor of range improvement to think he has any green light in any given direction other than working together with everybody who wants to improve the watersheds.

Mr. D'EWART. That is absolutely true. We also have a cooperative fund for fire protection to which the user contributed.

On page 491 of the hearings, Mr. Granger, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, had this to say:

> We had a device by which we were using deposits made by the grazing permittees for this same purpose, which we had reason to believe was a legitimate method of obtaining funds.
>
> It was subsequently held to be in effect use of receipts. So that was discontinued. This was enacted to take place of that. We had substantially the same amount of money available for several years past under that other arrangement.

In other words, at one time this money was held out there on the forest for use for these range improvements. Because either this subcommittee or some other committee objected to that method, it is now paid into the Treasury. I think it would not be dealing in good faith if we did not recognize that situation and make the money available for the purpose for which it is intended.

Mr. Chairman, I discussed this matter at length during general debate yesterday and my remarks will be found on page 5133 of the May 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 12 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, possibly no appropriation bill this year has been given more careful scrutiny by the subcommittee of the appropriations committee than this bill and great cuts have been made again this year as last year. The House acting as a Committee of the Whole has been able to make some additional cuts, all of which is well and good. No group in our land is more anxious to see the Government budget brought down to reasonable proportions than the farmers of our land, and they are ready to stand their share of the cuts in this particular bill which deals with the department of agriculture.

The farmers are disturbed, however, by demands upon them that they increase the production of meat and grain and at the same time submit to unwieldy price control, controls invoked without due regard to the difficulties of the farmer. Unnecessary controls lead to black markets and black markets hurt everyone.

People are crying for lower prices but do they realize that the farmers receive only a small part of the price paid for food and clothing in the retail markets of the city? I have some interesting figures from a recent copy of a farm publication. Let me give you a few:

If the farmer gave away the wheat that goes into the 16-cent loaf of bread, the loaf would still cost 13.4 cents.

If the farmer gave away the wool for a $50 suit of clothes, the suit would still cost $40.50.

If the dairyman furnished the milk for a 22- or 23-cent quart of milk free, still the milk would cost the consumer 11½ cents.

If the farmer gave the beans for a 16-cent can of pork and beans, it would still be 14 cents at the grocery store.

And a package of cigarettes that sells for 20 cents would cost 17 cents if the tobacco farmer gave the tobacco absolutely without cost.

No group has been as reasonable as the farmers during the war years. They have produced without any guaranties. They have produced when their sons were serving valiantly in the armed services and the farmer has been compelled to gamble on weather, market and Government controls. The farmer has an 8-hour day all right but it is 8 hours before dinner and 8 hours after dinner.

During the war years, Iowa farmers produced 10 percent of the basic food of this country and they did it gladly and without any boasting or fanfare and with about 10 percent of the boys and girls in the armed services. Let no one ever worry about the profit that farmers make. Over a period of years, farmers never make too much profit. It may be doubted if any man ever became rich farming. Some have done well on the increase in the value of land. Farming operations with due consideration for investment, hazards of crop conditions, skill required and the long hours and hard work, never show a very big return.

Farmers can be counted on to do their share at all times.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I think we reached the point of taking half a loaf or no loaf at all. I think it would be a serious mistake to knock out this entire provision, and I therefore support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Admittedly and clearly it would be preferable to have a cooperative arrangement whereby the various States contribute as much to this meritorious program as the Federal Government proposes to contribute, but if that is not possible to achieve at this time I do not think we should eliminate the program in its entirety. The program can be a very valuable one. Clearly, there is a need for improvement of the very lands from which we now are receiving revenue and of other lands which can benefit from the program. As these lands are improved it stands to reason that they will produce greater returns.

To me, this is an investment, and I think it is a very sound investment.

At some stage later on in the consideration of this matter we should be able to arrive at a satisfactory basis for a cooperative agreement in which the States will put up their respective part of the funds.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman has stated the case 100 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is the result of legislation which we passed last year with the thought in mind of doing everything that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and that the gentleman from Mississippi wants to do, and that is to have cooperation between the users of the forests and the Government. You must remember the difference between the cooperation between private property and Federal property. They are two different things because anyone, the grazer or anyone who gets timber from the forest lands has no right, is there by sufferance of the Government. It would be impossible to go around and have people make contributions because they might not be there tomorrow. So this device was thought out and after a year or two of study we decided this was the best way to get the cooperation which is necessary and to get the users of the forest service to pay the additional cost for range improvements. It seems to me that is entirely sound, and as it has been said heretofore this money has already been contributed with the understanding that it would be used for range purposes and the purpose for which it was designed under the legislation authorizing this appropriation.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I appreciate the statement that the gentleman is making. I would also like to emphasize the point that under this permit system which is demanded of the livestock raisers this program is working in cooperation with those people on the improvements of the forest lands for the purpose of livestock raising, and those are the lands that those people have to go to.

Mr. GRANGER. That is right. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you folks who want to practice a little economy. I think we all want to practice economy. I do not want to seem facetious about it, but the title of this is Cooperative Range Improvements. The United States owns these lands, and a man for a fee grazes his cattle on those lands. The argument is advanced that the one who owns the land is under an obligation to plant forage or hay for the cattle that are on it. This is not a cooperative basis, it is all Federal Government expenditure. Oh, it says the amount of money shall be equivalent to 10 cents a month for one animal and 2 cents for another, but it does not say anything about the rates being increased to offset the Federal Government's expenditures.

Let us be practical about this matter. If you want to save some money, this amendment should be defeated. It provides that instead of the money that the Federal Government gets for grazing these people's cattle going into the Treasury, it shall go to the planting of feed out there for the cattle that are on it. Yes, they call it cooperation, because that helps to get it through, but if you want cooperation, require some local contribution and you will get it. If you want to hold down expenses in the Department of Agriculture, cut this out, so we will have some basis on which to develop a cooperative basis. This is serious business. We have worked hard on this bill. I do not resent anybody trying to cut it, but if you are trying to cut it, do not turn yourselves around and start adding to it and then claim that you are making any record of consistency.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. The hearings indicate that this money will not be used for reseeding. You are appropriating other funds in another part of the bill for reseeding.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you know why this bill was passed last year? It was indicated a while ago that our committee raised objection. I asked the Forest Service for 2 or 3 years whether they should not try to make such an arrangement. Last year the Comptroller General, at the instance of one of our colleagues, investigated it, and they have been doing it for 40 years and they would not tell us about it. They said, "That was under a device we used." I asked them, "Why do you use the 'de'." They did it in violation of the law and they did it to get this bill through.

Now, do you want to help this committee hold down expenditures? If you do, you will defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 38, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in conformance with an agreement reached among the leadership, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I have observed in the RECORD on the Gossett amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill, I was paired in favor of amendment through no fault of the pair clerk. This was erroneous and, of course, since it was a live pair, it cannot be corrected but should be briefly explained.

There should be no valid objection to some temporary decrease in the public-building program due to war necessities, but on the other hand, reduction of the committee's program of 50,000 houses to a mere token of 5,000 houses was in my judgment too drastic, and I could not have supported an amendment of this character.

I think it is generally recognized that I have continually, and I hope effectively, supported the public housing program, and I do not like to see it even temporarily curtailed to the extent suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 72. A joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 14

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of my good friend from Massachusetts if he can tell us what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District Day, and there are two bills ready, I understand, H. R. 3297, dealing with the District of Columbia Department of Civil Defense. I have a note here which reads "Accept Senate amendments."

H. R. 3957, dealing with District of Columbia building associations.

Tuesday: The Private Calendar, followed by a continuation of consideration of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. If disposed of in time it will be followed by the India emergency food relief bill.

Wednesday: Memorial services for our departed colleagues, with no legislative business for the day.

Thursday, Friday, and Saturday: Continuation of consideration of the India emergency food relief bill.

Any further program will be announced later.

Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wish to ask the majority leader when we may expect the State Department appropriation bill to be called up. We are all anxious about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to advise the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman know of anyone who could advise me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that if the gentleman would consult the chairman of the committee he could get the information from him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot get any information about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are we to understand that there will be nothing on Monday requiring a roll call?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. Should there be, under the usual understanding, any roll calls will take place on Tuesday.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a bill on the calendar for which a rule has been reported out, for the construction of the Booker Washington Hospital. I understood that was to be called up next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I announced last week that the India food relief bill would be the next order of business following the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. I have that in mind in case there is a possibility of bringing it up, but the Indian emergency food relief bill follows the disposition of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. I assume that the appropriation bill and the India food relief bill will take up all of next week, but I have in mind programing the gentleman's bill as soon as I possibly can.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a 30-minute special order for this afternoon which I ask unanimous consent to surrender, and that instead I may be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday and 30 minutes on Tuesday, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENSEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FIRST BATTALION, SEVENTH INFANTRY REGIMENT OF THE THIRD DIVISION IN KOREA

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring the attention of the Congress an outstanding patriotic service which the people of Healdsburg, Calif., located in my district, have embarked upon. They have adopted the First Battalion, Seventh Infantry Regiment, of the Third Division in Korea. The mayor proclaimed First Battalion Week for their city. Mrs. Arlene Weyand, the chairman of the committee, is the wife of the First Battalion commander, Lt. Col. Fred C. Weyand, and her task force includes the service clubs and civic organizations of Healdsburg who have banded themselves together to make the life of the members of this battalion a little better.

Twenty-four cartons have thus far been shipped to this battalion, including such items as sewing kits, cloths, towels, stationery, reading material, a radio, and various snack items.

I am placing in the RECORD three articles which are worthy of reading and may guide others to follow the fine example set by Healdsburg to assure the men who are fighting our war that they have not been forgotten.

SUSPENDING CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 428)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Amendment No. 1: This amendment provides that the suspension of the import taxes on copper shall end prior to February 15, 1953, in the event of termination prior to said date of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: These amendments provide for the free importation of twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials, effective as to merchandise entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption beginning on the 30th day after the enactment of the bill. The Senate recedes.

Amendment to the title: The Senate recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This conference report brings the bill back practically the way it passed the House?

Mr. MILLS. It is identical in all respects with the exception of an amendment adopted in the Senate providing an alternative termination date in addition to the one contained in the bill as it passed the House. Under the termination date added by the Senate amendment, the suspension of the import taxes on copper will cease in the event the President terminates the present emergency prior to February 15, 1953, the termination date under the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 257) to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any person who shall have served in the active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall, subject to other provisions of law and Veterans Regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, be entitled to benefits of medical, hospital, and domiciliary care, burial benefits, and they and their dependents shall be entitled to compensation or pension provided by law for persons who served during the period of World War II.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Mississippi just how broad this is? Would this place the veterans coming from the present conflict in the same category as the veterans of World War II and World War I so far as all legislation is concerned? For example, would the so-called GI bill of rights be involved in this?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This refers only to medical, domiciliary, and benefits of that kind?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I hope this bill will pass. I am sure it will pass unanimously. It should have been passed long ago. I introduced a bill in the Eighty-first Congress and again in this Congress that would do this. The boys fighting in Korea should be given all of the benefits that the veterans of World War II received. They are real stepchildren. The boys may die because they cannot be hospitalized after discharge in VA hospitals. The legislation should pass immediately and with great enthusiasm. The passage of this legislation will bring to the front the urgent necessity for the enactment of the 16,000-hospital-bed bill. As I pointed out in my remarks on May 3, the President could not make the statement today that "a reduction in the building program will still make it possible to provide for all service-connected patients in every geographical area." This added load of patients from the Korean conflict changes the picture materially.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but I introduced practically the same resolution. Today my attention was called to a Korean veteran who was denied admission to a veterans' hospital. I understand the Veterans' Administration has made arrangements with the Department of Defense to take care of 5,000 Korean veterans, but the folly of it all is that under the law as it stands today these men who are fighting in Korea, whether you call it police action or a war, are not entitled to the benefits of the laws that are now on the statute books. I surely hope that this resolution passes.

Mr. RANKIN. In reply to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] I think it is nothing but fair and just to say to the House that he introduced a bill several days ago along this line, and I introduced the same bill in the House this morning. This measure, however, goes a little beyond the provisions of the bill introduced by me and the gentleman from New York, and I think it will meet the situation just a little better.

I commend the gentleman from New York for his promptness in this matter.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but this is for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Mississippi a question. Someone from my district called me today and read the headlines of a newspaper to the effect that a veteran of the Korean war had been denied hospitalization in a veterans' hospital due to the fact that he was considered as having been injured in peacetime. I want to know whether or not this legislation will relieve that situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think the RECORD should show that the initiation of this legislation at this time came from Speaker RAYBURN, and it was concurred in by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and myself.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] introduced his bill several days ago, and I introduced mine this morning. As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I and the committee staff have been working on this proposition for some time—as has the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but I am trying to complete the RECORD. This is without a report from the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is unusual. However, it is something that should be done, and the Speaker initiated it, the leadership on both sides concurred in it, and the gentleman from Mississippi has now submitted a unanimous-consent request for the immediate consideration of this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. The committee has had it under consideration for some time, but we have had so much trouble getting the bills reported from the committee passed that is has slowed us up.

Here is a telegram I received from the National Commander of the American Legion this morning concerning this proposition. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 10, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House Office Building:

The AP news release dateline Tucson, Ariz., regarding Korean veteran David R. Arellano, Jr., being denied admission to VA hospital for treatment of cancer high lights need for immediate change in law to make veterans of Korean hostilities eligible to hospitalization on same basis as war veterans.

The American Legion had a bill H. R. 9644 introduced in the Eighty-first Congress on September 13, 1950, which would have given Korean veterans the same status as World War I and II veterans for purposes of hospitalization and other benefits. On January 29, 1951, Senator MARTIN introduced S. 714 and on January 9, 1951, the chairman of the House Veterans Committee introduced H. R. 1217, both at the request of the American Legion. These bills would have cured the situation. Having just returned from the Korean war theater, I am personally acquainted with the ordeal our boys are going through over there. They are certainly conducting a fighting and shooting war and should be entitled to the same status as other war veterans. In behalf of the American Legion, I call upon the United States Congress to immediately take action that will assure recognition of veterans of the Korean hostilities as war veterans and not peacetime veterans.

ERLE COCKE, Jr.,
National Commander.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a telegram from the national commander of the American Legion.)

PHOTOSTATING CERTAIN PAPERS FOR THE USE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 174) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to transmit to the University of Washington at Seattle, Wash., photostatic copies of certain papers now lodged in the House of Representatives pertaining to the organization of the Territory of Oregon for the period from the Seventeenth Congress through the Fortieth Congress as described in a list deposited with the Clerk, the cost of such photostatic copies to be paid by the University of Washington.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "Territory of Oregon" and insert in lieu thereof "Territories of Oregon and Washington."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF "GUIDE TO SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS" AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (and Appendix)" be made a House document: *Provided*, That 40,000 copies of this publication be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, strike out the word "made" and insert "printed as" in lieu thereof.

Strike out lines 5, 6, and 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "document, and that 65,000 additional copies be printed, of which 40,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities and 25,000 copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives."

PRINTING OF "100 THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT COMMUNISM, ETC." AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication of the Committee of Un-American Activities entitled "100 Things You Should Know About Communism Series, Including Spotlight on Spies," be made a House document; that there be printed 500,000 copies of this publication: *Provided*, That 375,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives and 125,000 copies shall be for the House folding room for pro rata distribution to the Members of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, strike out the word "made" and insert "printed as" in lieu thereof; after the word "document", insert the word "and."

Strike out lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "500,000 additional copies, of which 375,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities and 125,000 copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the estimated cost of this item?

Mr. STANLEY. The estimated cost is $64,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 165) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-second Congress, the Committee on the District of Columbia is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $2,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE FOR MEMBERS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1951

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 218) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the certification to the Committee on House Administration of any Representative or Delegate or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico that his allowance for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, for telephone and telegraph service authorized by section 2 of the act entitled "An act relating to telephone and telegraph service and clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives," approved June 23, 1949, has been exhausted, the committee may allow an additional sum in such amount as it may determine to be proper, but not in excess of $250, such sum to be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3939) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first two sections of the act entitled "An act relating to telephone and telegraph service and clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives," approved June 23, 1949 (2 U. S. C., secs. 46f and 46g), are amended to read as follows: "That for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, in the case of each Member of the House of Representatives, there shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration and subject to the limitations provided in section 2, the following charges:

"(1) toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Members; and

"(2) charges on strictly official telegrams sent by or on behalf of the Member.

"SEC. 2. In the case of any Member of the House of Representatives other than the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the majority whip, and the minority whip, there shall be paid under the first section of this act—

"(1) toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 150 minutes a month, except that if such aggregate number of minutes is not used in any one month the balance may be used at any other time during the fiscal year; and

"(2) charges on strictly official telegrams sent by or on behalf of the Member aggregating not more than 1,000 words a month, except that if such aggregate number of words is not used in any one month the balance may be used at any other time during the fiscal year."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act of June 23, 1949 (2 U. S. C., sec. 46h), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 6 of such act of June 23, 1949 (2 U. S. C., sec. 46i), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. As used in this act, the term 'Member' or 'Member of the House of Representatives' includes a Representative in Congress, a Delegate from a Territory, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on July 1, 1951.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I congratulate the Committee on House Administration for reporting this bill out. It does simple justice to the Members of the House. I have always felt that the $500 allowance for telegrams and telephones for Members of the House in connection with their official business would result in many Members of the House being compelled to pay much more out of their own pocket. The results have disclosed that to be the fact. As far as I am concerned, as majority leaders of the House, and the leadership in the House, we are exempt from such a limitation. So that it cramped the membership in their official duties although it did not apply to the leadership on both sides. However, it would have applied to them if they were not in that capacity, and it did apply to all other Members. This is a simple act of justice which will enable the Members of the House to more effectively carry out their duties to their constituents without incurring tremendous expense to themselves, which the constituents of no Member should ever want their Member to incur.

The resolution is a step in the right direction. It does not go as far as I think it should go, but on the other hand it is a step in the right direction,

and I want to compliment the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY] and the members of his committee in reporting out the resolution.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I certainly subscribe to all that has been said by the distinguished majority leader. The Committee on House Administration is not only rendering a service to the membership of this House, but it is rendering a material service to the people back home whom we are attempting to serve.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman will agree when I say the Committee on House Administration has worked out a very fair formula. It is fair to all Members, regardless of where their districts are located.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

One hundred and fifty minutes a month is fair to every Member, because certainly a Member telephoning long distance from Washington to Baltimore has an entirely different problem from a Member being compelled to telephone Dallas, Tex., or Los Angeles, or to some place in the Midwest. This resolution is a decided step in the direction of enabling Members of the House to more efficiently represent their people, without incurring tremendously large expenses which they must pay out of their own pockets on official business.

Mr. CANFIELD. There is no reason why Members of the House cannot give just as expeditious service as Members of the other body.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that this now places the service which we are required to give our constituents on an equitable basis for all parts of the United States, which has weighed very heavily upon those of us from the far West.

Mr. McCORMACK. The distinguished gentleman is correct. This resolution is an equitable and a fair one, not for the Members alone but for the people whom we represent, in enabling us to carry out public business.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for his observations; also the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. The Committee on House Administration has had this matter under consideration for a long time. It was recognized by the committee that a flat sum for every Member was not a fair basis on which to work it out. It is now hoped that justice will be had for all Members.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I have been watching this situation for some 28 years, and it is the first time a fair and decent formula has been worked out.

Mr. STANLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECEIPT OF MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 226) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISRAEL'S THIRD ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise today to offer a tribute to the bravest of young democracies. Tomorrow, May 11, 1951, the State of Israel reaches its third anniversary. We join with it in proudly acclaiming a series of achievements unparalleled in history.

During its first year of existence Israel won its struggle for independence in a war of liberation in which its young and brave army scored a decisive victory over a more powerful and more numerous enemy comprised of its Arab neighbors. Simultaneously, the people of Israel created their governmental machinery, a parliament, and a well-functioning administration—all established on a democratic basis.

By the time it reached its second anniversary it had become the fifty-ninth member of the United Nations and the city of Jerusalem had been established as its capital. Among its notable achievements are important progress in agricultural and industrial development, and the absorption and integration into the country's economy of vast numbers of immigrants from varied places and backgrounds. History has never before witnessed the absorption by a single country of homeless, persecuted, and penniless people from distant lands, equal in number to the population of the country accomplishing that almost impossible task.

Israel is a small country—in fact, it is among the smallest countries on the face of the earth, comprising somewhat less than 8,000 square miles. It is situated in one of the most strategic spots in the world, where three continents meet. It is of great cultural, spiritual, and moral value as the cradle of modern civilization and the place of origin of three major religions.

Small as the country is, Israel is one of the greatest melting pots in the world, where people from all corners of the earth, of different backgrounds, different languages, and even different stages of civilization are being molded into a unified nation devoted to peace and freedom. Its population today reaches more than 1,400,000 souls, of whom about 170,000 are non-Jews.

The influx of such vast numbers of immigrants to such a small country—which, had been left desolate by centuries of neglect—has presented the new state with grave challenges, primarily of an economic nature. Some of these difficulties could be solved if Israel would stop the flow of immigration to its shores, but that she refuses to do as long as there are Jews who are in need of a home and are desirous of coming there.

As a matter of fact, its parliament adopted a law which proclaims that every Jew has the right to settle in Israel, with the result that not only the homeless but also the sick and the blind, the orphans, and the aged are coming there and are being received with open arms.

Notwithstanding this vast ingathering of the exiles, Israel has made considerable strides toward establishing a sound and stable economy. It will require a few years more and the extension of considerable financial credit from abroad before these positions are solidified and secured.

The state of Israel and all its people will ever kindly remember the United States and its great President Harry S. Truman for having been the first to extend recognition to it. They will always express their gratitude for the financial assistance given them by this country in the past, which has been so tremendously helpful.

For more than three decades our country has supported Jewish aspirations in the Holy Land. This support has engendered most cordial and friendly relations between the United States and the state of Israel, which is one of the best and most understanding allies of

democratic America in the Near East. The fate and the success of Israel as a democratic state is closely linked with our own fate and with that of the entire free world.

As Israel enters its fourth year of its existence, I pray that the United States will continue to aid and assist it to the fullest possible extent with moral and material aid, knowing that as we strengthen freedom and liberty anywhere in the world we strengthen it here at home and help to unify it on a global basis, so that it can withstand attack from every source. Let us join in praying for peace in Israel, in Korea, and in every corner of the world.

I know that my colleagues join me in extending heartfelt felicitations to Israel, its officials, and its people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have permission to extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GREETINGS TO ISRAEL ON ITS ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Israel's third anniversary as an independent and sovereign state I want to extend my felicitations and warm greetings to the people of the Republic of Israel and its very able leaders. We are not only proud of their achievements, but we are also proud to have them as stanch and loyal friends of this country fighting side by side with us in the battle for freedom, democracy, and human dignity.

Three years constitute a very brief span of time in human history, but for Israel it is a whole historical epoch in which a dream of 2,000 years was realized and a people regained its nationhood and independence on its ancient soil. In this period of three short years, Israel has emerged triumphantly from a military struggle, it attained international recognition, it strengthened its democratic form of government, and it is now engaged in building secure economic foundations.

To be sure, the people of Israel are faced with a superhuman task in the solution of their economic problems, which stem primarily from the huge tide of immigration continuing uninterruptedly since the Jewish state has been established. More than a half million people have been admitted to Israel in these last 3 years and the admission of another 600,000 is planned for the coming 3 years. The vast majority of these bring with them nothing but body and soul—but also an indomitable spirit to work and build and to live a life of dignity in a place which they can at last call their home.

If given the opportunity to live in peace and build in peace, these people would be able to solve their economic problems. But genuine peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors is still a thing of the future. The lack of peaceful and harmonious relations in this very vital part of the world is of great concern to the United States at this time, and I should therefore like to see our country utilize its great prestige and utmost efforts in that direction. Peace in the Middle East is also an important safeguard for the United States.

I salute the State of Israel on its third anniversary and hope it will continue to make lasting contributions to civilization as in ancient days.

A SALUTE TO THE STATE OF ISRAEL AND ITS PRIME MINISTER

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of the third year of Israel's independence, I am happy to salute her, and to acknowledge the important position she occupies as a stronghold of democracy in the Middle East.

The new State of Israel has attained strength and stature as a free nation. It must be borne in mind that she has had to rebuild her economy, win wars, provide shelter for hundreds of thousands of oppressed human beings who came to her for help, and overcome tremendous obstacles. Although her talents and facilities have been taxed to the utmost, she is winning the up-hill struggle and has earned the respect of freedom-loving peoples the world over.

The miracles she has accomplished would not have been possible except for the zeal and undaunted courage of her citizens, who are willing to work hard and to sacrifice their all, if necessary, so that Israel might remain free. It is fortunate that Israel has splendid, courageous leaders, who by their wisdom and devotion to duty, have safely guided the new nation through these past difficult years.

One of Israel's great leaders, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion is in our country at this time. He cannot be praised too highly for the magnificent service he is rendering his nation.

It would be well if the United States would bear in mind now, and in the future, that Israel should have all the assistance she needs in making herself safe against aggression. She should be recognized as a power for democracy and an enemy of communism, and she should be accorded full cooperation in her efforts to preserve the peace.

As a salute to Israel and her Prime Minister, the Honorable David Ben-Gurion, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Max Lerner which appeared in the New York Post on May 9. This clearly pictures the Prime Minister for us, and also points out the necessity and wisdom of giving assistance to his country. I wish all the Members of this House to have an opportunity to read it:

B. G. AND HIS PEOPLE

(By Max Lerner)

Friends and opponents alike call him "B. G." with affection, admiration, and a slight hint of exasperation. He has the stance of a bull, the mane of a lion, the stubbornness of a mule, and the fiery assurance of a prophet. He led the trade-union and agrarian forces in Palestine and when the new state was created he was its inevitable Prime Minister. For him history is the art of the impossible, and he has been achieving the impossible so long that it has become a habit for him to aim at it.

He comes to New York today, and he will be welcomed not alone by Jews but by everyone who cares about freedom and the renewal of the democratic idea to which Israel is contributing.

It is natural that during David Ben-Gurion's visit to America his own country should have a crisis, for the simple reason that the whole brief history of Israel has been just one crisis after another.

The Syrians have attacked Israel on the border of Galilee. Whatever the political motives, the attack is without legal substance. But Ben-Gurion is here not to argue Israel's diplomatic case nor advance Israel's military cause, but to help launch the $500,000,000 bond issue that the Israel Government has issued for subscription in America. The money is needed not for war but for peace—for housing and land-settlement, for agricultural development, for industrialization.

While the little border settlements are fighting the onslaughs of death, Israel's head of state is here on a mission of life and construction.

I recall vividly the visit that my wife and I paid to Ein-Gev on the Sea of Galilee in the summer of 1949. The colonists had turned out to help build quite literally overnight another little settlement a few miles away. When the first few buildings had been put up, a hundred boys and girls—scarcely more than 16 or 17 years old—were left behind as the nucleus of the new settlement. By the fresh-dug ditches, the shovels, and pickaxes were stacked side by side with the rifles. In front of the settlement was the Sea of Galilee; behind it were the overhanging cliffs of a Syrian fortification. You looked out at the beauty of the lake in the sunset, but you had the uneasy sense of not knowing when the guns from the cliffs would start firing again. They have now started.

One asks why Britain and France and America, the three powers with the greatest stakes in Near East peace, have not already moved to protest the Syrian attacks, and to proffer their good offices. One asks further why the UN Armistice Commission was so dilatory in delivering at Damascus the warning which it was quick to deliver at Tel Aviv.

For if the Arab League (which is preparing a call for a war-assembly of its member states) should again attack Israel, and if the UN should again delay and debate, the cause of collective security would receive a blow. Resistance to aggression cannot be a selective process.

Two reasons come to mind to explain—for they cannot excuse—the hesitations about dealing with Syria's aggression.

One is the fear by the Western Powers of irritating the already intransigent Arab states. Iran has nationalized the British oil properties. In Iraq there is similar talk. In Egypt, there is a campaign to drive the British out of the Suez Canal. The Arabs count on fear speaking more loudly to us than a sense of justice.

Then there is the strategic place that the Arab bloc, along with India, occupies in the moves for a Korean settlement through the U. N. Here again, by threatening to sabotage the plans for a Korean peace, the Arabs can prevent the organization of a near eastern peace.

There have always been reasons in the past to excuse the failure to meet aggression against the Jews in Palestine. The new reasons are no better than the old ones.

Behind the welcome that New York gives to Ben-Gurion is the welcome that the world's greatest democracy gives to the world's youngest state which is showing such creative strides toward a meaningful democracy.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the people and authorities of the State of Israel, now

marking its third year of existence as a free and independent nation.

Few nations have suffered so much, or struggled so courageously, for the privilege of taking a proper place among the democracies of the earth. Israel's persevering belief in the fundamentals of democracy, it's determination to sacrifice life and property for ideals originally gained for it the recognition of the United States and other countries. The world, and especially the United States, looks forward to the continued strengthening of democratic ties in the Middle East. The cultural achievements the Jewish people have made in every country where they have settled in the past will now find fruition in the Middle East. We, in the United States, are proud that we have helped in the establishment of Israel. On this fourth anniversary we hail the new state as a full-fledged member of the family of peace-loving, civilized nations, and extend our best wishes its future may be as rich as its historic past.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago today a new nation was born—Israel. A new nation and yet one of the oldest civilizations. Jews all over the world, and especially in Israel, are today celebrating this miraculous event. And non-Jews who love liberty and appreciate independence will extend felicitations to this small remnant that has brought back to life that which was prophesied by Jeremiah and Ezekiel:

> I shall gather you together from amongst the peoples and shall assemble you from the countries in which you are scattered and shall give you the land of Israel.

Israel's history is unique. The Jews had lost their native land and had been scattered all over the world, yet they returned to repossess the land and build a new nation. Nothing like this in history has been recorded of any other people. Palestine was overrun, conquered, and often enslaved by many foreign nations, including Egypt, Syria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, and Turkey. But the spirit of liberty and independence never died among the Jewish people. The flame of liberty has been kept burning since their exile nearly 1,800 years ago.

UNITED STATES HELPED ESTABLISH ISRAEL

As an American I am proud of the fact that our country has played a prominent role in the reestablishment of Israel as a free nation. Early American pioneers who were permeated by the spirit of the prophets of Israel of old and steeped in the sacred Hebrew writings, have always been quick to render aid to this suffering people. The second President of the United States, John Adams, wrote:

> I really wish the Jews again in Judea, an independent nation restored to an independent government.

President Woodrow Wilson secured from Great Britain the Balfour Declaration in 1917 which laid the foundations within our time for the new State of Israel. In 1922 the Congress of the United States unanimously expressed American sympathy for the aspiration of the Jewish people to reconstitute its national home. Finally, when the State of Israel was founded 3 years ago, the United States was the first nation to accord it recognition through President Truman.

THREE YEARS OF UNPARALLELED ACHIEVEMENTS

In these three brief years wonders have been performed. This small nation of less than a million inhabitants brought into the new land 600,000 immigrants—immigrants who were for the most part homeless, without a country of their own, and exiles from foreign lands where Jews are unwanted. In this long-neglected land, ravaged by the elements of nature, vast barren areas have been restored to cultivation. New sources of water, so much needed, were brought to the surface and put to use. During these three short years, immigrants who were denied the right to own land in their native countries adjusted themselves to the new situation in Israel and became productive agricultural producers. Nearly 300 new agricultural villages sprang up in Israel. Side by side with this agricultural development industries arose; factory production increased by as much as 50 percent in this 3-year period. New cities have been erected. New transportation facilities have been built. Aviation has come to the front to an important degree.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Even while Israel was carrying on a successful war of resistance against the Arabs, the citizens of that new country took time out to adopt a constitution and establish a framework of an independent government. Moreover, even while the fighting was going on and a new government was being built, education and general cultural institutions received adequate attention. Technical institutions of a very practical character have been strengthened. Trade schools have been integrated into the educational system of the country.

THE REBIRTH OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE

The spirit of unity was strengthened in Israel by the revival in the use of the Hebrew language, which is today the accepted spoken as well as the written language in the schools, in the Government, and in the market place.

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

The statesmen of this new republic have lost no time in planning for the future. Within the next 5 years they hope to see a population of 2,000,000, which would be double the number of Jews who lived in Palestine when Israel was born 3 years ago. These men of vision and of dreams expect to develop 500 new agricultural villages. The blueprints in Israel call for the erection of 250,000 new housing units. Best of all, the political-economic architects of this new nation expect to see 2,000,000 people self-supporting, living on the fruits of their own labor. All of this is the dream of a people who are living today under a hard and low-standard austerity program.

Israel has a right to celebrate today. It deserves not only the applause but also material assistance and the encouragement of freedom-loving people in all countries, and especially in our own land.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased and personally gratified, yesterday, when the great majority of the Members of this House voted to extend the Displaced Persons Act for six more months. As one who has taken an active part in the promotion and adoption of the original displaced-persons legislation I regard this action of extension as, not only a genuine gesture of real Christian charity, but a demonstration of the righteous determination of the House membership to reassure the world of our intention to fully accept our obligations to those persecuted refugees and displaced freedom seekers.

As you know, the present Displaced Persons Act, under which so many deserving individuals, who have been thoroughly screened, have found a haven in this country, would become inoperative after June 30, this year. However, there are, according to official estimates, some 94,000 DP's in Europe who already have sponsors and relatives in the United States, guaranteeing to provide them with lodging and employment, without interfering with any American employee. That would mean, unless we did extend the act, some 60,000 would quite literally be within sight of the promised land but forbidden to enter because of a technicality. At the present rate of processing not more than 33,000 could be cleared for admission to America by June 30; what a travesty of justice, in the poignant human sense, that would be. As a matter of fact there are many more thousands of these DP's whose skills this country needs, particularly in our accelerating defense program. At least the DP's who have been promised homes and work here should not be cheated out of that promise—nor ought the willing sponsors be deprived of the opportunity to fulfill their charitable desires. I earnestly hope and urge the Senate to take early favorable action on this measure so that it will become law without delay.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, and to

strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute therefor as an amendment the provisions of House Joint Resolution 257, which recently passed the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any person who shall have served in the active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall, subject to other provisions of law and veterans' regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, be entitled to benefits of medical, hospital, and domiciliary care, burial benefits, and they and their dependents shall be entitled to compensation or pension provided by law for persons who served during the period of World War II.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That any person who shall have served in the active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall, subject to other provisions of law and Veterans' Regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, be entitled to benefits of medical, hospital, and domiciliary care, burial benefits, and they and their dependents shall be entitled to compensation or pension provided by law for persons who served during the period of World War II."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby House Joint Resolution 257 was passed were vacated, and the joint resolution was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include comments on the MacArthur ouster, from America, a national Catholic weekly review.)

THE MacARTHUR OUSTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting with my remarks an editorial entitled "The MacArthur Ouster" carried in America, a national Catholic weekly review, edited by the Jesuit Fathers, in its issue of April 21, 1951. I urge that this editorial be given serious consideration by the membership of the House and that we all take into account the considerations propounded therein. They are worthy of our deep study because in trying to understand the difficulties which now confront our country, we must at the same time, have some knowledge of the implications, the possibilities and the probabilities involved.

I know that among the membership of this body, there is a large area of agreement as to what we should do in the Far East; I know also that the area of disagreement is very small and resolves itself around the question of a third world war. It is my hope that out of the hearings now being conducted by the Senate Armed Forces and Foreign Relations Committees, we will be able to evolve a policy on which we will all agree regardless of differences and unitedly put our shoulders to the wheel in carrying it out. The stakes confronting us are great indeed because they involve our security and our future. On what this country does may well depend the outcome of the most difficult problem of our time and that is peace not only for us but for all mankind.

The editorial follows:

THE MacARTHUR OUSTER

From almost any angle you look at it, the storm now swirling around General MacArthur is deplorable. What remains of our national unity is in danger of being destroyed by the supercharged lightning flashes of emotion generated by personal and political partisanship. We discern but one hopeful ray in the lightning-riven clouds: if the controversy can be brought under control and carried on calmly on the basis of the issues involved, it may become the last "great debate" on United States foreign policy.

The one Herbert Hoover touched off 6 months ago, apparently settled by the Senate's troops-to-Europe resolution of April 4, dealt largely with our policy for Europe. Our far-eastern policy, or lack of it, was not formally debated in the Senate. The MacArthur incident for better or worse, has made such a discussion inevitable. We can only hope that it will be productive of a renewed national unity.

Already, as Walter Lippmann observed in the curious case of Senator TAFT, there is confusion as to what General MacArthur meant in his now celebrated letter to Congressman MARTIN. The general, as a columnist pointed out, wanted more than permission to bomb Red China's Manchurian bases and to use the Formosa forces of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese mainland. The general wanted permission to wage all-out war against China. Contending that the global conflict with communism has already begun, the general argued that it could be won by defeating Red China. The way to save Europe, he wrote in effect, is to defeat communism in Asia.

That involves an almost complete reversal of our present policy. The United States and its allies have long since decided to concentrate on Europe while diverting the necessary minimum to prevent a Communist sweep in Asia. The fundamental issue is therefore clear-cut. Shall the United States abandon its present efforts to safeguard Europe and devote its resources chiefly to a full-scale war with Red China?

Those who join General MacArthur in an affirmative answer to this fateful question should not overlook these considerations:

1. If we decide to join the issue in Asia, we shall have to go it alone—our Atlantic allies, the Asian-Arab Nations and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

2. Attacking China in the belief that the U. S. S. R. will not come to her aid is not a calculated risk—it is the wildest sort of gamble.

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the west, will be relatively ineffective in China. If we contemplate using them for atomic bombing, let us reflect that such bombing would have little military value, would infuriate all Asia and might invite Russian retaliation. Thus there is no hope of a short and cheap war.

4. Our long-neglected tactical Air Force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.

5. Even if Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take over an almost defenseless Europe, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. If we tempt Russia into a war for which we are still unprepared offensively, we shall expose our people to destruction, since our home defense system, both military and civil, is pitifully incomplete.

7. As the President emphasized in his address to the Nation on April 11, our present policy is designed to avoid world war III. Though it may fail, it furnishes a hope lacking in the MacArthur approach.

If these considerations are put forcibly to the American people, we believe that the last "great debate" will not be prolonged as its predecessor was, and that our people, finally satisfied that we are on the only course open to us, will then settle down to the supreme task of ensuring their security.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COST ESTIMATES OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with some concern that during the progress of hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway project, opponents of that proposal have criticized the cost estimates prepared by the Corps of Engineers and have attempted to support their position by making adverse reflections upon all estimates of cost prepared by the Corps of Engineers and submitted to the Congress in support of civil works projects of various kinds.

Specifically the opponents of the St. Lawrence project claimed in effect that the original estimates of all public works have been greatly exceeded by actual costs; and that past experience with Corps of Engineers estimates would indicate that the cost of the St. Lawrence project had been much underestimated.

I consider that these adverse reflections upon a Federal agency which has served Congress and the American public for 125 years are totally unwarranted and should not be allowed to go unchallenged.

The plans and estimates of cost which are prepared by the Corps of Engineers in accordance with specific congressional directives are of major importance to the Congress as they are the basis for action by Congress, in the authorization of civil works projects for navigation, flood control, development of hydroelectric power and for related water resources developments; and in the appropriation of funds for carrying out those projects. It is obvious therefore that the adequacy of the estimates of the Corps of Engineers is a matter of general concern; and that any adverse reflection upon them is a reflection upon the entire civil works program.

I have therefore requested the Chief of Engineers to furnish me with factual data regarding the adequacy of estimates prepared by the Corps of Engineers and I wish to lay this matter before the Congress, as it well illustrates how facts are

needed to dispel the erroneous and misleading ideas which may result from biased testimony, from superficial analyses, or from examination of a few cases which are not representative of an entire program.

The Congress should understand that an estimate of cost is a prediction of the amount in dollars that will be required to build a project, at some future date. An estimate is therefore subject to some variations and revisions as actual work progresses; and any reasonable man will recognize this. For example we all know that a dwelling built in 1937 would cost and two and a half times as much at the present time.

Let us look at the record. It is obvious that the estimates of some civil works projects have shown large increases over original estimates prepared by the Corps of Engineers. These projects are relatively few, and not representative. For example for the entire group of civil works projects complete or in operation at some 800 localities at the end of the fiscal year 1949, the record is as follows:

Total of original estimates, $1,023,200,000; total of current 1949 estimates $1,206,100,000; increase $182,900,000 or 18 percent.

Thus for this entire group of projects the increase over original estimates was only 18 percent. Most of these original estimates were prepared prior to 1940; and between that time and 1949 construction costs have risen more than 100 percent. Consequently the small rise in costs for these completed civil works projects has been well within allowable limits. In face many of these projects were completed at costs less than original estimates; and the fact that the over-all increase is so small in a period of rapidly rising construction costs is a sure indication of the adequacy and reliability of the original estimates prepared by the Corps of Engineers.

So much for past performance. Now let us consider the current program of civil works under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. The civil works program for the fiscal year 1951 as presented to the House of Representatives comprised 182 projects, including flood control and navigation improvements. The cost history of these projects embraces the period from 1906 to 1950. During this period there have been two world wars, a severe business depression, which have given rise to many factors of uncertainty as to construction costs. The original estimates on which authorization was based, for the entire group of 182 projects, date on the average from 1937. Since that time construction costs have risen steadily, as measured by the Engineering News Record construction cost index, and the cost rise applicable on the average to this group of projects is about 10 percent.

In comparison the rise in cost estimates for these 182 current projects has been as follows:

Total of original estimates, $2,638,500,000; total of current—1950—estimates, $5,912,400,000; increase, $3,273,900,000, or 124 percent.

This total cost increase of 124 percent, however, includes about 22 percent due to additional authorizations by Congress since the original estimates were prepared. This leaves 102 percent as the total increase reflecting rising construction costs and other factors influencing project costs; which you will note is somewhat less than the 129 percent construction costs rise applicable to these projects.

From these facts I can conclude only that the estimates furnished to the Congress by the Corps of Engineers have been conservative and have afforded Congress a sound basis for the authorization of civil works projects and for appropriation of civil works funds. The facts clearly refute the adverse allegations which were made during the St. Lawrence hearings. I believe that this Congress should recognize the value of a Federal agency which has served the American people well for more than a century and that irresponsible charges and allegations reflecting on the integrity of the corps should not be tolerated.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it took the case of a boy from Arizona, a veteran of the Korean War, and the attendant publicity to that episode to speed the passage of legislation which will give the Korean veterans the same benefits that World War I and World War II veterans now receive.

May I remind the House that I addressed it last year in connection with the death of three boys from my own district. I told the House about three veterans who could not secure hospitalization because of overcrowding. Two died before they got into the hospital and one died 2 days after he secured hospitalization.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentlewoman from Masaschusetts is referring to the veteran who was turned down at the Tucson hospital?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I was referring to that Korean veteran.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say that has been called to the attention of the Members from Arizona and both of us have introduced resolutions similar to the one passed by the House recently.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad of that. May I say that I introduced H. R. 353, and another resolution last year which would give the Korean veterans not only the benefit of hospitalization but all of the benefits that the veterans of World War II receive. Certainly they are entitled to all those benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I become extremely angry when I realize that day after day goes by without this relief, while at the same time some in the Veterans' Administration tell me they feel that the Korean War veterans should have all of the benefits that the veterans of World War II receive. However, they do not assist in the passage of legislation giving them all of these benefits. Nor does the Congress act.

The Rules Committee has before it a bill which was reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The chairman of that committee and I appeared before the Rules Committee in an effort to secure a rule for the consideration of the bill, which would authorize the providing of 16,000 beds which are desperately needed. But up to the present time the Rules Committee has not reported any rule.

The National Defense has authorized the Veterans' Administration to take in NP and TB patients. They are considered veterans by the Veterans' Administration because of the probable permanency of their disabilities. Why other Korean casualties in this Korean War are not considered veterans, I do not know. These NP and TB hospitals are 97, 98, and 99 percent filled and there is no place for emergency cases. The civilian hospitals tell us that 80 percent occupation of beds is the only safe risk they can take insofar as hospitalization is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the House spends hours and hours in debating cows, pigs, forests, farms, flood control, weapons of destruction, foreign aid to foreign countries, and the sending of millions of dollars to those countries, yet it does not take the time to consider legislation for the Veterans' Affairs Committee. That is not the fault of the Speaker, because legislation does not come from him. I feel, though, that if the Members rose in a body and demanded justice for the Korean veterans in the most horrible war the United States ever fought, something would be accomplished. Those boys are fighting under the most horrible conditions, under conditions of extreme cold, and other horrors that we know about, that we read about day after day. I do wish the membership would join in insisting that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs report out the bills before it. I am not asking that it report my particular bill. It does not make any difference whose bill it is, but the legislation should be passed and passed at once. How do you suppose these Korean boys feel?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for the wonderful work that she is doing for the veterans, and I entirely agree with her that the Korean veterans should be taken care of and taken care of promptly on the same basis as the veterans of World War II. I further feel that this 16,000-bed hospital legislation should be passed immediately. It was needed in 1949 and 1950 and I think it is needed today just as badly if not more than it was in those years.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We passed it last year, as the gentleman knows, and yet it does not become law.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to keep the record a little straight here. The Chair heard of this proposed legislation less than an hour ago. That is the first time that he heard that present legislation did not cover the Korean boys. He immediately got in touch with the majority and the minority leaders of the House, and the House promptly passed the legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I said it was not the fault of the Speaker. The Speaker does not pass this legislation out of committees.

The SPEAKER. That is true, but he has a good deal to do with passing it through the House, at times.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I realize that. The Speaker has been very helpful in the passage of some of my legislation, and he was kind enough to let us have the use of the caucus room for the amputees' demonstration today, and they also sent their thanks to you for it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

A NEW PHILOSOPHY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, as a preamble to my remarks I should like to read the opening paragraph of a recent column by David Lawrence in the Washington Star of last Wednesday.

Mr. Lawrence said:

> Secretary of Defense George Marshall has enunciated in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee the astounding doctrine that the minority party in Congress is not entitled to full and truthful answers from officers of the armed services, and that, in answering letters of inquiry, officers must be guided by their first loyalty to the Democratic administration, which he calls the "constituted authority."

Now it seems to me that in this observation by a man who has spent most of his adult life in studying the operations of the Federal Government, lies the explanation of much that is wrong today in the conduct of our national affairs.

For an officer of Cabinet rank to say, even by implication, that the minority party in Congress has no right to ascertain by any honorable means the facts on which alone it is possible to base the just and wise legislation so necessary at this fateful hour in world history, is to deny the validity of the American Constitution.

If the rights of the minority in Congress are not to be protected under the Constitution, then what is to become eventually of the rights of all minorities, of whatever nature, throughout this broad land of ours?

When a member of the President's Cabinet, under circumstances especially where it may be assumed that he speaks for the Chief Executive himself, ignores the clear provisions of the Constitution, and interprets the duties of his subordinates in a way that is narrowly legalistic, it is time for this Congress, and for the American people, to take warning.

Let me add that this is by no means the first instance of a tendency on the part of the administration to ride roughshod over the rights of minorities, both in Congress and among the American people. Let me cite you just one of those instances, as an example.

Possibly you recall the manner in which the administration tried by every means to keep from the minority in Congress, and from the American people, the truth concerning the notorious Amerasia case, which involved the wartime theft of secret documents relating directly to national security.

I cite this particular instance because I, personally, was party to the effort toward forcing the Amerasia case out into the open. The case was finally aired rather completely, although some of the people involved in it escaped punishment entirely, and others received only small fines.

David Lawrence went on in his column to say that under the circumstances of Defense Secretary Marshall's testimony it seems quite improbable that any testimony from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or any other military officers, hereafter could contain a single word of information which could possibly reflect on the Democratic administration.

It seems to me that under the circumstances a question might be raised concerning the sincerity, if not the truthfulness, of any and all testimony emanating from the administration side in this controversy over American policy in the Far East, with reference particularly to conduct of the war in Korea.

That such a question can properly be raised, of course I find it impossible to believe. Rather, I should say, it seems obvious that Defense Secretary Marshall failed utterly to understand and appreciate the implications of the things he said.

General Marshall—for he remains a five-star general on active duty, in spite of his present position as a Cabinet member—bears the world-wide reputation of a great soldier and an honorable man. The same is true of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff within their own spheres of activity.

Therefore let us hope that due reflection will persuade the Defense Secretary of the unsoundness of his position, and that in the end, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will labor under no restrictions as to their testimony before the joint Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at the present time I am running a questionnaire throughout the district I represent on agricultural legislation. Many of the questionnaires have been returned. One of my good friends from one of the counties I represent has written me what I think is a fairly interesting letter. He points out to me that I should not take all of the answers from the various farmers at the same value; that some farmers should be considered differently from others. I should like to read a portion of his letter:

THE STATION-WAGON INNOCENT

This false-feathered farmer lives in the shadow of the city on an independent income from inherited annuities, or Federal employment. He governs his love for the soil by great fidelity to his lawn mower, a passion for flowering shrubs, and a seasonal flirtation with a short row of radishes. Nevertheless, this ersatz horticulturist poses as a great authority on everything pertaining to growing things. He scoffs at those of us who plant our collards and okra by the moon's wanings (and set a good table thereby) and scatters new-fangled gardening heresy. Were it not for his independent income, and the saving convenience of the nearest A & P, this character would certainly starve to death. Any opinions you received from him should be disregarded.

THE OLD SOUTHERN COLONEL

This grand old gentleman, not as yet reconciled to Appomattox, runs mainly to soft rocking chairs and colored sharecroppers. His mules are sleek; his sharecroppers are lean; his fields are scientifically eroded; and his era is fast drawing to a close. And when he is finally called on to join our Lee and Jackson in that ante bellum section of Valhalla that is overshadowed by stars and bars, his plantation will go to pot; his mules into dog-food tins; and his faithful servitors to Harlem, Vero Beach, or the nearest chain gang. We all admire our colonels, though I think he is wrong in his views regarding abolition. I agree with Lincoln.

THE FOUR-TRACTOR POTENTATE

This bird is a heavy hitter in anybody's agricultural league. He, having previously amassed great wealth by a fortunate marriage, or the timely demise of a rich maiden aunt, or in his own right as a fortune teller, banker, race-track lawyer, sheriff, or numbers-racket executive, now has invested heavily in lands, blooded cattle, and farming equipment. This he has done for the purpose of evading taxes, as well as to make some pretensions to honesty. And he usually has very good luck in raking in the parities, so to speak, but he should never under any circumstances be accepted as an honest farmer.

This is the canary that warbles and trills the sweetest when Mr. Brannan opens the cuttlebone jar. He bears the same resemblance to the average farmer that an ermine-trimmed cardinal does to a barefooted Franciscan, or that the president of the American Lines does to a one-boat mullet fisherman at Cedar Keys.

But enough space for these scarecrows in Mr. Brannan's garden of dreams. We will now list our favorite's assets. This type is the Madison, Taylor, Jefferson, Hamilton, and Suwanee majority-type farmer. In the interest of brevity, and for the sake of beautiful truth, he is called the—

ONE-MULE MARTYR

This weary and heavy-laden citizen is the stumbling block whereon sound statistics prove useless, prayers seem to rebound, and idealistic theories get knocked into an inglorious one and a half gainer. He is the owner of one mule and 60 acres of Bermuda grass, is the darling of the county politicians, and an eternal rebel in his secret heart. He is painfully aware that the past has been a hard scratch, and that the future is a doubtful unknown, entirely surrounded by portents of further calamity.

He is the butt of the jokes, the victim of the banker, and an inspiring enigma, as he proves that a man can make a living where a rabbit can't, and still keep on in his stubborn and fecund way, bloody but unbowed. He will bid loud defiance to Mr. Douglas or hoot derisively at Mr. Vandenberg, yet honestly pledge undying loyalty to any drugstore demagogue who was on terms of chaw-swapping intimacy with Gran-Pap.

It is a memorable sight to observe this genuine farmer in sulfur-tongued pursuit of his arduous vocation.

Creeping around the infertile hill, under the merciless sun, through the choking dust, comes that ancient equation balanced in misery, the one-horse plow—with a desperate citizen on one end and a determined mule on the other. The farmer, ever-debt-ridden and on the verge of tears; the mule, ever by nature indisposed to much effort or any cooperation, voraciously snaps up the larger plants, and carefully tramples down the smaller ones.

And so around the hill they slowly and loudly move—the farmer pushing the plow and inveighing against the mule—the mule, lackadaisically flopping his ears and harvesting the crop while it is still in a completely edible stage. And out of our sight and then out of our hearing they slowly pass, and on into that ever-retreating tomorrow where old-age pensions beckon to man, and doubtlessly, where laughing brooks, green meadows and mountains of sweet timothy await all such mules who are true to their nature and absolutely refuse to make any show of hypocritical enthusiasm for tasks that will have to be started all over again—come spring. In their troubled wake the dust eddies then settles, the last quavering notes of heart-felt profanity gradually subside, and we have met a real farmer.

This farmer knows, or thinks he knows, that things will soon get better since they can't possiby get any worse. He has reason to believe that the boll-weevils will spare the cotton patch; the horn worms will leave the tobacco be; the rain will come in time (and no flood this time either) and the sales-tax will be repealed. And if these happy possibilities fail to come to pass, then it is always possible that the bank will accept his good faith as collateral for another poor risk, and renew the note.

So, Mr. BENNETT, there is your picture of a true Second District farmer.

If you can do anything for the one-mule boys I will be deeply grateful.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Decatur Daily of May 6, 1951.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGRATH (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. LANE) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Y. T. Tyun, Minister of Public Affairs of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a number of telegrams and letters received from cattle feeders and others regarding the roll-back which is now in effect.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include three articles.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. AYRES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. HAND) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in last night's Star relating to the late Honorable John Kee.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHATHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the passing of the late Honorable John Kee.

Mr. REAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, one of which may exceed the limit, but I ask that it may be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an analysis of conditions in the Post Office Department prepared by members of the Letter Carriers Association in his district, and a letter of transmittal to Hon. TOM MURRAY, chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and insert extraneous matter.

Mr. McGUIRE (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN (at the request of Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN), on account of illness.

To Mr. ANGELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of official business.

To Mr. FUGATE (at the request of Mr. BENNETT of Florida), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3336. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 136. An act allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer; and

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), un-

der its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 14, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

445. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Public Law No. 3, Eleventh Guam Congress, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

446. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting at the request of Governor Stainback, a certified copy of joint resolution 4, adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii, requesting the Congress of the United States of America to ratify and confirm Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1949; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

447. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the administration and sale of certain lands held by the United States in the Republic of Panama"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

448. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of Committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. J. Res. 240. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigation ordered by House Resolution 78, Eighty-second Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3442. A bill to protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases hereafter adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto; with amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. H. Res. 174. Resolution providing for the photostating of certain papers pertaining to the Territories of Oregon and Washington for the use of the University of Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 435). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 98. Concurrent resolution to make the publication, "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication; with amendment (Rept. No. 436). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 99. Concurrent resolution to make the publication, "100 Things You Should Know About Communism Series, etc.," a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication; with amendment (Rept. No. 437). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 165. Resolution to provide funds for necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Committee on the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 438). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 218. Resolution authorizing the Committee on House Administration to increase the telephone and telegraph allowance for Members of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 3939. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 440). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 4045. A bill to provide burial and hospitalization benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4046. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4047. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 4048. A bill to provide for the abatement of tax of certain trusts, the income and corpus of which are equitably owned by members of the Armed Forces who died on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations and prior to January 1, 1948; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4049. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island terminal facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4050. A bill to provide burial and hospitalization benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4051. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4052. A bill to provide burial and hospitalization benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 4053. A bill to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4054. A bill to provide for the extension of terms of patents and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4055. A bill to authorize for an additional 2-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and bridges over such canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 4056. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to rescind Ceiling Price Regulations 23 and 24, relating to ceiling prices on live beef cattle and on beef sold at wholesale; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 4057. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), to extend domiciliary or hospital care, including medical treatment, to certain veterans of the present hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 4058. A bill to provide for the preparation of sound and practical plans for the growth of the National Capital region and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H. R. 4059. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights," with respect to the provisions relating to manufacture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4060. A bill to place on the retired list certain commissioned officers of the Army who served during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4061. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Seattle, Wash., as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4062. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4063. A bill to extend the provisions of Veterans Regulation No. 10 as amended to those veterans of the Korean hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 4064. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to house concurrent resolution No. 55, relating to arranging and providing for the shipments of wheat to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4065. A bill for the relief of Castrenze Di Gaetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4066. A bill for the relief of Georgios D. Antonakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4067. A bill for the relief of Samuel Thomas Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4068. A bill for the relief of Helmuth Assmas Balthasar Russow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4069. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lucy Yarlott; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Isabelle F. Story; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4071. A bill for the relief of Demosthenes J. Dambassis and Mrs. Helen Dambassis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4072. A bill for the relief of John D. Theodoracopoulos, Mando J. Theodoracopoulos, Panagiottis Theodoracopoulos, and Charilaos Theodoracopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4073. A bill for the relief of the Union Oil Co. of California and the Matson Navigation Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4074. A bill for the relief of Prapion Diranian Der Monsessian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4075. A bill for the relief of Adrio Socci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4076. A bill for the relief of the Union Oil Co. of California and the Matson Navigation Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 14, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, who art revealed to us in the order of the world in which we live, in the truth our minds discover and, above all, in spiritual life as we touch it in the noblest sons of men: At the beginning of another week's toil we would bring our fragmentary and partial lives into the presence of Thy wholeness, we would bring our transient and temporary thoughts into the light of Thy eternity, we would bring our restless and irritated spirits into the calm strength of Thine everlasting purpose for all Thy children.

Teach us once again the everlasting mystery that only as we lose ourselves in something higher than ourselves can we find ourselves. To this end, give us great causes to live for, give us a great faith to live by. From doubt and disillusionment, from bitterness and cynicism and frustration in these difficult times, good Lord, deliver us. Let us have vision to see the way we ought to take through today's perplexing circumstances. May high decisions be made on the right side of great moral questions. Though we may not see all things clearly, let us see some great things plainly, as in the encircling gloom Thou dost give us light enough to walk by. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 10, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On May 11, 1951:

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950.

On May 14, 1951:

S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3297) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3939) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to make the publication Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication; and

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to make the publication, 100 Things You Should Know About Communism Series, etc., a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 10th instant,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on May 11, 1951, he signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FREAR was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week because of official committee business.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. NIXON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 1 week because of his appointment as a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEM was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 1 week.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LONG, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services conducting hearings on the Marine Corps band was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. PASTORE, and by unanimous consent, the Special Subcommittee To Study Railroad Retirement Legislation of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to hold hearings this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CORRECTION OF STATEMENT BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, May 9, I called attention on the floor of the Senate to an incorrect statement by Fulton Lewis, Jr., to the effect that I had failed to vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to take up a resolution for open hearings on the MacArthur affair.

On his broadcast last Wednesday night, Mr. Lewis corrected himself, and in order that the RECORD may be complete and fair to all concerned, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted at this point the pertinent excerpt from Mr. Lewis' broadcast of May 9.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To begin with tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I have an apology to make about an incorrect and unfair report which I made to you last week. I told you that Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, refrained from voting on the Wherry resolution to open the MacArthur hearings to the public after he had found that the vote was already on the administration side, that he had come into the Chamber at the close of the vote, and although he had an opportunity to cast his ballot, he refrained from doing so. He has called my attention to the fact that he was registered on that vote. He voted when his name was called on the first go-around, and then left the Chamber and returned at the end and, of course, did not vote again. My informant saw what happened then, at the end, and did not see the earlier events. And so the error. I'm very sorry for the mistake. My apologies to him and to you.

WHEAT FOR INDIA

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that after the pending motion is disposed of, I expect to move the consideration of Senate bill 872, the so-called wheat-for-India bill. It is expected that at least a couple of days will be required to dispose of that measure.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills, present petitions and memorials, make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting the 11th report of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings today, p. 5277, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, for the quarter ended March 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION OF CERTAIN DISPLACED PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of displaced persons, who upon arrival in possession of appropriate immigration visas, are found to be excludable, together with a list furnishing detailed information concerning each individual (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAW ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a law enacted by the Legislature of Guam (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FRANCHISE BY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the franchise enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Commissioner of the War Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the second semiannual report of the activities of the Commission as of September 13, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary

OVERSEAS NAVIGATION CORP. V. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Clerk of the United States Court of Claims, reporting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 338, dated September 13, 1950, that the court had dismissed the claim of the *Overseas Navigation Corp. v. the United States*, for failure to prosecute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

"Concurrent resolution objecting to the proposal by the Federal Government to increase the Federal gasoline tax

"Whereas it has been proposed that the 1½ cent a gallon Federal tax on gasoline be doubled to 3 cents a gallon as one of the means of raising additional revenue; and

"Whereas this Federal gasoline tax at its present rate now costs the people of Delaware more than $1,000,000 each year; and

"Whereas the proposed doubling of the Federal gasoline-tax rate would make a total State and Federal tax of 8 cents on every gallon of gasoline purchased in Delaware; and

"Whereas the Federal Government entered the field of gasoline taxation in 1932 on a temporary, emergency basis, later increased the tax by 50 percent to its present rate, and has tended to turn attention to this levy each time there appeared to be a need for additional revenue; and

"Whereas while there is an imperative need for increased Federal revenue on some scale to meet the demands of the national-defense emergency, heavily taxed gasoline is not a suitable subject for this additional taxation: and

"Whereas an increase in the Federal gasoline tax would make the total tax on this product so high as to jeopardize a major source of State revenue, impair vital transportation services, add to the cost of all kinds of consumer goods, spur inflationary price trends and threaten a condition of diminishing returns for both State and Federal gasoline-tax revenues: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Delaware (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That this One Hundred and Sixteenth General Assembly of the State of Delaware does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to refrain from increasing the Federal gasoline tax and to find some more equitable and economically feasible means of raising this portion of needed revenue; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and to Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS and Honorable J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., Senators from the State of Delaware in the United States Senate, and to Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS, our Representative in Congress from the State of Delaware, urging them to oppose the unreasonable proposal to double the Federal gasoline tax and to strive for the substitution of a fair and sound method of raising this revenue.

"Approved April 27, 1951.

"ELBERT N. CARVEL,
"*Governor*."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution relating to Federal support for vocational education

"Whereas vocational training in agriculture, trades and industries, homemaking, business and similar fields is an essential part of public education in our high schools and junior colleges; and

"Whereas this practical occupational training is increasingly vital in this period when food and industrial production and the maintenance of homes is so necessary to the national economy; and

"Whereas the State of California has for 34 years enjoyed the most harmonious cooperative relationship with the Federal Government in establishing and conducting through local secondary schools such necessary occupational training; and

"Whereas in view of the imminent drafting of those 18 years of age or thereabouts, it is essential that they receive the very finest occupational training before their induction into the Armed Forces; and

"Whereas the action of the Federal Bureau of the Budget in attempting to divert some $10,000,000 of the $19,000,000 Federal George Barden appropriation for vocational education to a nonexistent emergency fund is directly opposed to the recommendation of chief State school officers throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget is without precedent in almost 35 years in the operation and support of this cooperative program; and

"Whereas national preparedness for the future is dependent upon the occupational competency of our people; and

"Whereas it seems to be short-sighted economy to deprive the generation now in school of its right to occupational training; and

"Whereas the State and local support of vocational instruction in California has been increased rather than decreased; and

"Whereas this purported action by the Bureau of the Budget has been vigorously opposed throughout California by leading agricultural, industrial, and business groups and organizations: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to express its disapproval of this recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to recommend the full appropriation for the support of vocational education which has been made annually for a number of years; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this

resolution to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the chairmen of the appropriate congressional committees, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to a moratorium on Federal income-tax payments for persons in the Armed Forces

"Whereas the Korean crisis and the critical world situation have resulted in a need for rapidly increasing the strength of our Armed Forces; and

"Whereas large numbers of men are joining or being inducted into our military forces at considerable sacrifice to themselves and their families; and

"Whereas it is neither fitting nor proper that, in addition to their worries over financial obligations to private persons which they incurred while in civilian life, such persons should also be troubled by obligations owed to the Government for which they are making such sacrifices: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is urged and requested to enact legislation providing for a moratorium on the payment of Federal income taxes due from or payable by persons in the Armed Forces; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 21

"Joint resolution relative to opposing an increase in the Federal gasoline tax

"Whereas the Federal Government is considering an increase in the Federal gasoline tax to assist in financing the present national emergency; and

"Whereas the total estimated Federal motor vehicle excise taxes paid by highway users of this State in 1949 exceeded $108,577,000; and

"Whereas the total revenue derived in 1949 from California highway users under the present 1½-cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax is estimated at $42,205,000; and

"Whereas automobile registration in California has increased from 2,955,952 vehicles in December 1940 to 4,976,296 vehicles in December 1950 as a result of our great increase in population during the past decade; and

"Whereas the gasoline users of the State of California in 1950 used 2,875,399,357 gallons of gasoline as to which California gasoline taxes in the aggregate amount of $129,387,971.16 were paid, which taxes are not allowable as deductions in computing the Federal income taxes of the consumers of such gasoline, California being one of six States in which purchasers of gasoline subject to State tax may not take such deduction; and

"Whereas the Federal taxes on gasoline used in California in 1950 were $43,335,990.26, making the total Federal and California gasoline taxes paid on gasoline used in California in that year equal to $172,723,961.42; and

"Whereas the proposed increase in gasoline tax excises would not only increase the cost of operating passenger cars and privately owned commercial vehicles essential to the defense effort, but would add so much to the cost of bus and truck operation that higher fares and rates would result in ultimately higher prices to the consumer, thereby working a hardship and contributing to inflation; and

"Whereas the field of automotive taxation is one that historically and rightfully belongs to the States as it is their principal source of revenue for construction, maintenance, and patroling of highways, including matching of Federal aid for highways; and

"Whereas further encroachment by the Federal Government into this field of taxation would interfere with the taxing potential of the States for highway purposes essential to the economy and security of the State and Nation; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of this legislature that all funds derived from the levy of gasoline taxes in this State should be available for use in correcting the present deficiencies in the system of streets and highways within the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to oppose any increase in Federal gasoline tax levies; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 21

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to appropriate money for the construction of the Buchanan Dam and Reservoir on Chowchilla River

"Whereas the construction of the Buchanan Dam and Reservoir on Chowchilla River was recommended to Congress by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army in 1949; and

"Whereas the proposed dam would be 153 feet high of concrete slab and buttress type construction, and the reservoir would have a total storage capacity of 70,000 acre-feet, of which 60,000 acre-feet would be active and 10,000 acre-feet inactive, with a maximum flood-control reservation of 60,000 acre-feet; and

"Whereas prior to 1950 it was estimated by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army that the first cost of Buchanan Dam and Reservoir would be $7,247,000 and the total annual cost would be $333,100, compared to annual flood benefits of $109,000 and annual irrigation benefits of $232,000, or total annual benefits of $341,000; and

"Whereas, in the light of the recent abnormal flood damage in the floods of November and December 1950 to the area adjacent to and in the town of Chowchilla, in which damage totaling $357,000 was done and an area of 8,000 acres was inundated, it would appear that the estimated annual flood damage and consequent estimated flood benefits would be greatly increased so that the benefit-cost ratio would be far more favorable to the proposed work than it was at the time the construction was recommended; and

"Whereas due to irrigation practices below the proposed reservoir much of the flood storage upon release could be beneficially used as winter irrigation or as replenishment for underground storage along the Chowchilla River; and

"Whereas due to the increased danger of disastrous floods in this area it is necessary that the construction of Buchanan Dam and Reservoir be deferred no longer but constructed at the earliest possible time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to authorize and appropriate money for the construction of Buchanan Dam and Reservoir on the Chowchilla River at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Concurrent Resolution 55

"Concurrent resolution in behalf of aid to a friendly nation, and memorializing the Congress of the United States to arrange and provide for fair and feasible shipments of wheat to India

"Whereas in the new nation of India, 350,000,000 people have established a democracy, modeled in large upon our own; and

"Whereas the revolution that brought forth that new nation in the midst of ancient civilizations was bloodless, without violence and left no aftermath of hate toward the foreign race that for two centuries had dominated the people of India without development either in resources or governmental capacities, and had not carried them toward a human standard of living; notwithstanding which the people of India extend to that late ruling class of westerners every opportunity to aid in the best development of the new nation and its increased opportunities for all its people; and

"Whereas the people of India, developing no hatreds against any foreigners and following the philosophy of the fallen but immortal Gandhi; have feelings of respect and affection for this nation, its people, and its institutions are truly our friends; and

"Whereas that nation has suffered crop losses from monsoon failures that are unprecedented even in a nation where famines are frequent, producing famine more terrible in extent than this generation has before known; and

"Whereas these people have turned to us to buy wheat to forestall wholesale starvation, offering in cash to the extent of their capacity and seeking easy terms of long-time credit for an additional 2,000,000 tons of the wheat which we have available in abundance; and

"Whereas this petition, endorsed by the President, and pending in the Congress of the United States, has not yet been granted, though the famine danger line has passed; and

"Whereas the dictates of humanity demand that, of our plenty, the needy people of India be permitted to partake, and thus to live; the obligations of friendship require us to aid these valued millions of friends; and the highest standards of statecraft oblige us to save these people from starvation and from the engulfment by communism that would inevitably follow our turning our backs upon this duty of humanity and of friendship: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is urged to proceed with all possible speed to arrange fair and feasible terms and provide for the shipment forthwith to India of all needed quantities of wheat; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Ambassador from India to the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of

Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"Adopted by the house May 2, 1951.

"NORMAN E. PHILLES,

"Clerk of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate May 6, 1951.

"FRED I. CHASE,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution petitioning the President of the United States to appoint, and the Senate of the United States to confirm the appointment of, Hon. Francisco Corneiro for a second term as United States Attorney for the Virgin Islands

"Whereas Francisco Corneiro, of the Virgin Islands, was appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, in 1947, to be United States attorney for the Virgin Islands for a period of 4 years; and

"Whereas Mr. Corneiro's term of office will end in July 1951; and

"Whereas with the exception of a brief period of illness in the year 1950, Mr. Corneiro has served in this position with distinction and to the satisfaction of the majority of the people of the Virgin Islands; and

"Whereas, although the duties of the office of United States attorney for the Virgin Islands have increased considerably during the incumbency of Mr. Corneiro, he has cooperated fully with the executive and legislative branches of Government, giving them both legal service and legal advice as requested, in addition to acting as prosecuting attorney for the Government of the Virgin Islands; and

"Whereas in addition to his legal work, Francisco Corneiro has participated regularly in diverse civic factions which has been of great educational benefit to the people of the Virgin Islands; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands that Hon. Francisco Corneiro has done a good job as United States attorney and should be appointed to serve a second term in that office: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved and it is hereby resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands in session assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby petitioned to appoint, and the Senate of the United States is hereby petitioned to confirm the appointment of Francisco Corneiro, of St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, for a second term as United States attorney for the Virgin Islands of the United States; and be it and it is hereby further

"Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and that a copy each thereof be transmitted to the honorable the President of the Senate of the United States; the Honorable Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States; the Honorable Peyton Ford, Assistant Attorney General of the United States; the Department of the Interior; the Honorable Morris F. de Castro, Governor of the Virgin Islands; and the Honorable Francisco Corneiro, United States attorney for the Virgin Islands."

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York, N. Y., relating to appropriations for the public housing program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the National Society Daughters of the Union 1861–1865, Inc., River Edge, N. J., expressing confidence in General MacArthur; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, Washington, D. C., pledging its support of Congress in the exercise of its constitutional authority, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Indiana Federation of Clubs, Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against the closed hearings on the United States policy in Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., relating to General MacArthur, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of David Darrin, of Washington, D. C., relating to the establishment of a world court; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting held at the Polish Home, Lackawanna, N. Y., relating to the defense and restoration of the just rights of the Republic of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from the American Chamber of Commerce of the Philippines, Manila, Philippine Islands, remonstrating against the omission of American civilians from the bill (S. 1262) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to compensate members of the military and naval forces of the United States for losses sustained as a result of Japanese sequestration of bank accounts in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Armesto Ramoso and Joaquina de Ramoso, of Cabanatuan, Nueva Ecija, Philippine Islands, relating to their claim and its settlement by the United States-Philippine Islands War Damage Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Municipal Council, Meycauayan, Bulacan, Philippine Islands, expressing its gratitude to the American public for the grant of war damage claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Auxiliary to Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Massachusetts Department, Lexington, Mass., relating to the proper use of the flag, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition signed by Samuel K. Nong, and sundry citizens of Hides, Okla., praying for the repeal of the so-called McCarran Act (the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Sisterhood of the Jewish Community Center of Teaneck, N. J., signed by Mrs. I. Shapiro, president, praying for the enactment of legislation to send 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., praying for the early enactment of legislation to supply wheat to India; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Whereas Curtis Longino Waller was born of a distinguished Mississippi family in Lawrence County, Miss., January 9, 1887, was graduated from Mississippi College and Millsaps Law School, and was admitted to the bar of Mississippi in 1910, where he immediately achieved recognition and success; and

"Whereas the said Curtis L. Waller in the year 1911 became secretary to the able and eminent Pat Harrison as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, whom he served as secretary until 1914; and

"Whereas the said Curtis L. Waller patriotically responded to the call of his country by joining and serving in the Air Force of the United States in World War I as a pilot; and

"Whereas the said Curtis L. Waller was so revered and honored by the people of Hancock County, Miss., that in 1923 he was elected without opposition to the House of Representatives in the Mississippi Legislature; and

"Whereas the said Curtis L. Waller came to Florida in 1924 and immediately, by virtue of his great ability, his magnificent character, and his fine personality, endeared himself to the people of Tallahassee and Florida and became a leading citizen and distinguished member of the Florida bar, commander of the Tallahassee Post of the American Legion, and district governor of the Florida National Exchange Club; and

"Whereas his distinction as a citizen led the Honorable Doyle E. Carlton, Governor of Florida, to request the said Curtis L. Waller to assume the duties of State attorney for the Second Judicial Circuit of Florida, a position which he discharged with fidelity and great ability; and

"Whereas the eminence he enjoyed at the Florida bar and the esteem in which he was held by his fellow citizens resulted in his being drafted by the citizens of Leon County for membership in the Florida House of Representatives for the years 1933–34, where he made an outstanding record as a legislator and, among his other achievements, became the author of a new provision in the Florida State Constitution and was deeply loved and honored by his fellow legislators; and

"Whereas the said Curtis L. Waller, in response to his patriotic conviction that the greatest security for his country lay in strength through preparedness, volunteered his services to the Armed Forces and became a major, and later a lieutenant colonel, in the Specialist Reserve in the Army of the United States; and

"Whereas his legal learning, his unblemished character, his judicial temperament, led President Franklin D. Roosevelt, with the unanimous advice and consent of the Senate, to commission him as judge of the District Court of the United States for the Northern and Southern Districts of Florida on the 19th of June 1940, a position he discharged with particular distinction and devotion; and

"Whereas his eminent record as a district judge of the United States caused President Roosevelt to commission him, with the unanimous advice and consent of the Senate, on the 10th day of March 1943 as judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit; and

"Whereas the said Curtis L. Waller served as a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit until the date of his death, July 11, 1950, and as judge of the said Court of Appeals enriched the law with his learning, strengthened the court with his character, and added new security to the liberties and freedom of our citizens through his interpretation and declaration of the Constitution and the laws of our land and through his great ability, magnanimous sentiment, and devotion to the American way of life contributed to the majesty and might of our democratic Republic; and

"Whereas the State of Florida and the Legislature of the State of Florida desire in some fitting way to remember and to honor the said Curtis L. Waller and deem it appropriate that such recognition can be extended and such honor worthily bestowed by setting aside as a public park, and honoring with his name, the area lying between the capitol and the supreme court building in Tallahassee, which was his home, where he was honored and loved for more than a quarter of a century by his fellow citizens, and which area is peculiarly appropriate because of the service of the said Curtis L. Waller

as a legislator in the capitol and his having been one of those to achieve the highest judicial office ever held by a citizen of Florida: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Florida (the senate concurring), That there is hereby set apart as a public park, and dedicated to the memory of Curtis L. Waller, the area between the capitol and the supreme court building in Tallahassee, Fla., the same hereafter to be maintained, developed, and preserved by the State of Florida as a public park and to bear the name of him who honored Florida and whom Florida delights to honor, the Curtis L. Waller Park."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1467. A bill for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1468. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; and

S. 1469. A bill for the relief of Julie Bettelheim and Evelyn Lang Hirsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1470. A bill for the relief of Panagiotes Roumeliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1471. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that veterans of World War II who died during the 5-year period immediately following their separation from the active military or naval services shall be deemed fully insured individuals; and

S. 1472. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1473. A bill for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore; and

S. 1474. A bill for the relief of E. C. Browder and Charles Kenyon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1475. A bill to amend section 1 of the act to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved December 16, 1941; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1476. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, to restore to certain persons who were in a furlough status with respect to carriers on August 29, 1935, their eligibility for annuities under such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1477. A bill for the relief of Spiro Pavlou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1478. A bill for the relief of Maddalena Tornusciolo;

S. 1479. A bill for the relief of Miss Adele Frattini;

S. 1480. A bill for the relief of Istvan Tamasi; and

S. 1481. A bill for the relief of Sisters Linda Salerno, Luigiana C. Cairo, Antonietta Impieri, Anna Impieri, Rosina Scarlato, Iolanda Gaglianone, Maria Assunta Scaramuzzo, Francescaina Conterucci, and Filomena Lupinacci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1482. A bill for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTON:

S. 1483. A bill for the relief of Olindo Balboni, his wife and son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3939) to amend the Act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Article written by her paying tribute to the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

By Mr. IVES:

Address on the subject Republican Responsibility delivered by him at the third annual dinner of the New York Republican State Committee on May 10, 1951, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City.

Letter entitled "Path to Victory," written by a freshman at Cornell University, and published in the Cornell Sun in April 1951, regarding the war in Korea.

By Mr. BENTON:

Address on the subject Television: How Can the Public Interest Best Be Served?, delivered by him at the opening session of the twenty-first institute for education by radio-television, on May 3, 1951.

Letter addressed by him to the Secretary of the Treasury embodying recommendations and suggestions regarding the United States Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Address on the subject Israel's Struggle: A World Example, delivered by him at a luncheon meeting of Hadassah, New Mexico Chapter, Albuquerque, N. Mex., May 6, 1951.

Address containing some comments on our foreign and domestic policies, delivered by him before the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of New Mexico, at Hobbs, N. Mex., May 3, 1951.

Article entitled "CHAVEZ' Pounding Improves Senate Bill of Regulating Migratory Labor," written by Thomas L. Stokes and published May 9, 1951.

Editorial entitled "Senator CHAVEZ' Battle Over Wetbacks," published in the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News, May 4, 1951, discussing the wetback issue in connection with the farm labor bill.

Telegram from the Citrus Workers and Fruit Processors Union, Local 24473, of Mission, Tex., regarding the fight against the importation of alien labor in connection with the farm labor bill.

By Mr. KERR:

Excerpts from radio interview with Senator KILGORE on foreign policy, broadcast over 10 West Virginia radio stations on May 13, 1951.

By Mr. HILL:

Address on the subject Contribution of the Farm Credit Administration to Land Tenure, delivered by I. W. Duggan, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, at Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, January 15, 1951.

Article on Civil Defense, by Philip Wylie, guest of Columnist Walter Winchell, published in the New York Daily Mirror of May 11, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "How Come?" published in the Washington Evening Star of May 13, 1951.

Editorial entitled "Aiding the Enemy," from the Washington Evening Star, regarding the attitude of Senator KEM on the shipment of arms and strategic materials to Russia.

Article entitled "What's Wrong With Being an Oil Company?" written by Ernestine Adams, and reprinted from the Petroleum Engineer for April 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Norway Cets Its (Home) Guard Up," written by Nat S. Finney and published in a recent issue of the Minneapolis Star.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Letter on the subject of the University of Arkansas and the arts, written by Harry S. Ashmore, of Fayetteville, Ark., and published on the editorial page of the Arkansas Gazette.

Letter on the subject of the exchange-of-students program, dated May 7, 1951, written by R. Douglas Archer, teaching assistant, University of Minnesota Institute of Technology, and an editorial entitled "Fulbright Scholars," published in the New Orleans States of May 8, 1951.

By Mr. LODGE:

Statement entitled "My Stand," written by E. S. Weed, of the Marblehead (Mass.) Messenger, regarding the MacArthur controversy.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Article entitled "States in Strait-Jackets," written by Richard L. Neuberger, and published in the April 1951 issue of the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Editorial entitled "So Much Nonsense," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 29, 1951, regarding the charges of appeasement of communism.

Editorial entitled "Not My Responsibility," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 5, having to do with General MacArthur and the Korean war.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Editorial entitled "A Will To Win," published in the May 14 edition of Life magazine, regarding General MacArthur and the war in Korea.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Editorial entitled "Professor, Are You Teaching the American Way of Life?" written by Robert D. Lynn and published in the Shield and Diamond, official publication of the Pi Kappa Alpha Fraternity.

FAR-EASTERN POLICY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Grand Forks Herald dated May 9, 1951. This editorial, I believe, contains an excellent analysis of the present controversy over our far-eastern policy.

Also, Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Nonpartisan Leader of Thursday, May 10, 1951.

So far as I am able to ascertain, this is the only editorial appearing in any of the North Dakota newspapers on the pro-Marshall side.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Grand Forks Herald of May 9, 1951]

PRESIDENT DODGES THE KOREAN ISSUE

It is apparent from General Marshall's testimony and the Monday night address by President Truman that the administration is seeking to pass the buck to General MacArthur in the Korean situation.

General Marshall told the senatorial committees that MacArthur's peace overtures late in March destroyed for the time being any chances of a Korean War settlement.

Then the President, in his address, indulged in a lot of panic talk intended to make it appear that MacArthur somehow was responsible for the Korean affair and was trying to precipitate a third world war.

All this is part of the great political smear intended to relieve the administration of the responsibility for starting the Korean misadventure—a responsibility that rests entirely with the President.

It is obvious now that the whole administration approach, echoed by a responsive military set-up, is to get out from in under the Korean mess to save its political face for the 1952 elections.

MacArthur is the goat. He was given that title dramatically when the President suddenly fired him from his far-eastern commands, and now the rest of the props are being set up to complete the picture.

To give additional emphasis to the danger in MacArthur's thinking, the Democratic administration is screaming about the warmongering policies of the Republicans, and charging they are playing politics with the future of the Nation.

A Democratic Party leader named Al Smith once suggested that the place to go for answers in politics was the record, and it still seems the proper source of information.

Well, the record shows that we went into World War I, and World War II, and the Korean War all under Democratic administrations, which obviously set the stage for our "forced" entry in each case.

Getting down to the current affair in Korea, which now somehow seems to be pretty much the fault of General MacArthur, we have the details so recently in mind that they need little clarification.

This is strictly a Truman affair, entered into without consent of Congress, by a snap decision that reversed what we and Russia had foolishly accepted as our foreign policy in the Far East.

There is no point in reviewing the whole affair. Truman, Marshall, and Secretary Acheson, in a cozy meeting in the White House, decided we should go into Korea, Congress or no Congress, and in we went.

In order to make the picture official, we dragged the U. N. in with us—a simple matter, for surely the U. N. quite properly should have objected to the North Korean invasion of South Korea.

Obviously, that objection would have been empty without the fighting forces of the United States—no other U. N. member could have effectively opposed a row of dominoes.

Thus the Korean affair became Truman's war, or the Roosevelt memorial war, if you wish, for the late President set the stage for it by handing Russia its far-eastern advantages on a tray.

If we were justified in going into Korea last June in the face of our declared intention of staying out of Korea and Formosa in any far-eastern show-down, it would seem we should be justified in trying to complete the job there.

The Herald does not say we are justified in carrying the war into China on a ground basis—something no one, including MacArthur, has even suggested, despite the administration's inferences to the contrary.

But the Herald also has not said that we were justified in going into Korea after we had repeatedly said we were wiping our hands of Korea and Formosa. Certainly we were not justified in going in on the basis of snap judgment of an incompetent and with our sorry lack of preparedness in the Far East.

But the thing to remember is that we did go in, however, reluctantly as a Nation, and with a lot of lofty declarations and street corner bragging by the White House fumbler.

Once in, with our military might committed to the job of "running the bandits" out of South Korea, later changed by the U. N. to cover all Korea, what was our goal?

In the eyes of MacArthur, as a soldier and not as a diplomatic pea rattling around in a bass drum, that goal was the attainment of the purposes announced so boldly by the U. N., acting for the forces of the United States and South Koreans, with a few token units from a dozen other U. N. countries.

To achieve that goal, it was necessary to achieve some sort of victory—in other words, it became necessary to lick the Red forces in Korea to the point of surrender or their elimination from the soil of Korea.

MacArthur's proposal to go after the Red bases in Manchuria was vetoed by the second guessers in Washington and London and Paris, acting through the U. N.

Truman, finally scared to death by the result of his "off the cuff" decision last June to plunge our forces into the Korean war, now envisions a third world war if we don't stay in our "meat grinder" role in Korea.

In some way, he thinks we will win if we don't get into any decisive fighting—we mustn't arouse the sleeping bear that is Russia; far better to let her understand that we know our limited sphere in this war.

Thus we continue to let Russia call the rules, with the President warning us that if we don't follow Russia's rules we may be bombed to death in our principal cities, apparently unable to do anything about it.

It would seem the President is merely 11 months too late in arriving at this conclusion. Quite likely we will continue to fumble away additional American lives in Korea, and then find ourselves reluctantly following MacArthur's plan. We have already picked up some of it by extending financial aid to the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa.

The alternative is appeasement, surrender to the Chinese Reds on their demands for a place in the U. N., and the withdrawal of our U. N. troops from Korea. If we are not to fight with everything we have, that might seem the sensible solution. So what are we waiting for?

[From the Nonpartisan Leader of May 10, 1951]

THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Now that the MacArthur controversy has been given a bit of publicity, the press of the country can feel free to talk about the subject.

In the past we haven't felt free. General MacArthur has come back to America claiming that he is right and that the administration—including General Marshall—is wrong.

Of course General MacArthur has no business to make such statements.

If President Truman desired to do so he could at once call the general on the carpet and give him a court martial for insubordination, conduct unbecoming an officer and flagrant attempts to go over the head of his Commander in Chief.

General Marshall's statements before the Congress this week show very clearly the falseness of MacArthur's views.

But he indicated the United States is prepared to launch air and naval attacks on Red China if the Communists strike at American forces outside Korea. MacArthur wants a naval blockade and air blow now.

Marshall himself a five-star general, also said it is not true that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been willing to go along with MacArthur's views but have been vetoed by him and President Truman.

And the Defense Secretary flatly backed President Truman's dismissal of MacArthur from the far-eastern commands. He said MacArthur had "grown so far out of sympathy" with established policies that "there was no other recourse but to relieve him."

Marshall, who was wartime Army Chief of Staff, was in the witness chair before two Senate committees—Armed Services and Foreign Relations—which are inquiring into MacArthur's dismissal and the policy disputes behind it.

The Leader believes that General Marshall is right, and that General MacArthur is wrong.

We also think that the public fanfare that has accompanied MacArthur's recent trip to America has been only temporary.

General Marshall who, as Chief of Staff, won the war for us, is certainly more worthy of confidence than is General MacArthur, who only talks about what he will, or might, do.

The Leader will string along with General Marshall—and we think the country would do well to do likewise.

PRINTING OF HOUSE PUBLICATION ENTITLED "GUIDE TO SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS"

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 98, which was read by the Legislative Clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (and Appendix)" be printed as a House document, and that 65,000 additional copies be printed, of which 40,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities and 25,000 copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is a subject which relates exclusively to the House of Representatives. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF HOUSE PUBLICATION ENTITLED "100 THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT COMMUNISM SERIES, ETC."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 99, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "100 Things You Should Know About Communism Series, Including Spotlight on Spies," be printed as a House document and that there be printed 500,000 additional copies, of which 375,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities and 125,000 copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the situation with reference to this concurrent resolution is identical with that relating to House Concurrent Resolution 98. I

move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

NOMINATIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report certain routine nominations in the Regular Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be received.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the nominations may be considered and confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, as in executive session, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 19 1

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it has been expected that the Senate would take up for consideration House bill 1612, an act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, but, in view of the fact that there are some other matters which should be disposed of promptly, and also because the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is ill at this time, and probably will not be able to return to the Senate for work before Wednesday or Thursday of this week, I think it might as well be understood at this time that we will not call up the bill before, let us say, Thursday, if that is agreeable.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his observation. I am wondering if there is a possibility of letting the bill go over for about a week. I do not know what should be done.

Mr. GEORGE. I think perhaps we should await the return of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. It might go over for the week, although I should like to bring it up. Since the bill was reported unanimously to the Senate, I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Colorado present when we take up the bill. He has given much thought to it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any objection to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia or myself asking the majority leader to have it made the unfinished business at the conclusion of this week's work, whether that be on Thursday or Friday, and debate it next Monday?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection to whatever disposition the majority leader wishes to make of it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like very much to take up the reciprocal trade bill this week, if the distinguished Senator from Colorado is able to be present. I believe that the suggestion of the eminent Senator from Georgia is proper, and that we should wait and ascertain the desire of the Senator from Colorado. It had been planned to take up the bill this morning, but we found it necessary to substitute the wheat-to-India bill. I should like to have the trade agreements extension bill follow that bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I happen to know that it would accommodate the distinguished Senator from Colorado if the Senate could take up the bill a week from today. Anything the majority leader desires will be satisfactory. However, in the event the Wheat-to-India bill does not require more than a day or two, I hope that something else will be used to fill in the time until the distinguished Senator from Colorado is ready for the debate on the trade agreements bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. The truth is that we have nothing on the calendar to fill in which would take only a day or two; we are awaiting committee action on many bills.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, while the distinguished Senator from Georgia is in the Chamber I should like to ask him what House bill 1612 includes in the way of renewing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. That is to say, how long does it extend the authority of the Secretary of State over tariffs and import fees?

Mr. GEORGE. It extends it for 2 years. The House version would have extended the act for 3 years. In the Finance Committee the extension was cut down to 2 years from some date in June of this year. Other amendments were also made to the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Does the bill as reported to the Senate incorporate the amendments which were included in the House version of the bill, such as the peril-point amendment, so-called, which requires the President to write a letter to Congress if he disregards what is known as the peril point fixed by the Tariff Commission?

Mr. GEORGE. It includes the peril-point amendment, with some slight changes which, in the unanimous opinion of the committee, strengthen the bill. It also includes an escape clause, patterned after the form of the escape clause inserted by the House, but with some material and substantial amendments. It also includes all the other amendments adopted by the House, but each one of them with certain amendments.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if the new escape clause included in the bill leaves it to the discretion of the Secretary of State, or makes it mandatory for the President to invoke the escape clause. Is the provision mandatory or permissive?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to discuss the escape clause at great length. However, as I recall, it is possible under the escape clause for any interested party, for the Ways and Means Committee of the House or the Finance Committee of the Senate, for the Tariff Commission on its own motion, or for the President on his own motion, to invoke the escape clause. By referring to the printed report the Senator will see that the escape clause is one which is calculated and intended to protect the interests of American producers. I think he will also see that all future agreements must contain the escape clause, and also that the President, as rapidly and as soon as possible, must cause the escape clause to be inserted in all outstanding agreements in which a similar escape is not now provided.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, for more than 19 centuries mankind has had three unfailing sources of inspiration to heroic efforts, great accomplishments, and sublime achievements. For more than 1,900 years the words that represent these everflowing fountains of inspiration have charmed the ears, brightened the hopes, and thrilled the hearts of all the children of men. They have incited the genius that has produced the most exquisite pictures ever painted, the most beautiful poems ever written, the most melodious songs ever sung—songs, poems, and pictures that have given us sunshine for our shadows, joy for our sorrows, and smiles for our tears and intimated to us the bliss of immortality in that home of the soul in which righteousness abides forever and peace and happiness never end.

These three mighty, magic, and inspiring words are "Jesus," "home," and "mother."

The first of them impelled Charles Wesley to write:

Jesus, lover of my soul,
Let me to Thy bosom fly;
While the nearer waters roll,
While the tempest still is high.

All my trust on Thee is stayed;
All my help from Thee I bring;
Cover my defenseless head
With the shadow of Thy wing.

Hide me, O my Saviour, hide,
Till the storm of life is past;
Safe into the haven guide,
O receive my soul at last.

What unspeakable consolation born of boundless faith in the everlasting Father's imperishable love for His erring children is revealed in this beautiful hymn. Its music, "like a sea of glory, has spread from pole to pole."

The second of our mighty, magic words prompted John Howard Payne to compose a deathless song that has been sung and played around the world. Millions of weary wanderers on foreign strands have been transported upon the wings of imagination back to the romantic scenes of their childhood, to the picturesque paths which their infancy knew, to the happy days of the long ago by that soothing symphony of sublime sentiment:

'Mid pleasures and palaces though we may roam,
Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home;
A charm from the sky seems to hallow us there,
Which, seek through the world, is ne'er met with elsewhere.
Home! Home! Sweet, sweet home!
Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home.

And the last of this tranquilizing trinity of wondrous words, with the stirring force of the celestial muse of Isaiah, impelled Elizabeth Akers Allen to write the following lofty, rare, and rapturous poem that is destined to live until the everlasting hills, "the vales stretching in

pensive quietness between," and "old ocean's gray and melancholy waste," shall be no more:

Backward, turn backward, O Time, in your flight,
Make me a child again just for tonight!
Mother, come back from the echoless shore,
Take me again to your heart, as of yore;
Kiss from my forehead the furrows of care,
Smooth the few silver threads out of my hair;
Over my slumber your loving watch keep
Rock me to sleep, mother, rock me to sleep.

Backward, flow backward, O tide of the years!
I am so weary of toil and of tears—
Toil without recompense, tears all in vain!
Take them and give me my childhood again.
I have grown weary of dust and decay,
Weary of flinging my soul-wealth away;
Weary of sowing for others to reap;
Rock me to sleep, mother, rock me to sleep.

Mother, dear mother, the years have been long
Since I last hushed to your lullaby song.
Sing then, and unto my soul it shall seem
Manhood's years have been only a dream.
Clasped to your breast in a loving embrace,
With your light lashes just sweeping my face.
Never hereafter to wake or to weep—
Rock me to sleep, mother, rock me to sleep.

Kings and potentates and parliaments have proclaimed holidays, thanksgiving days, and emancipation days for observance by the people of various kingdoms and countries and states. But Miss Anna M. Jarvis, a distinguished woman of West Virginia, has established Mother's Day in the love, in the devotion, and in the throbbing heart of the humanity of every Christian country in the world.

Today we venerate the sacred name and memory of mother. We laud the virtue, extol the spirit of self-sacrifice, and eulogize the loving kindness of every mother living; and with bowed heads, grateful hearts, and generous hands we in imagination lay new wreaths of the freshest, the fairest, and the most fragrant flowers upon the graves of all the mothers who have gone from the fitful land of the living into the silent land of the dead. In this hour of sober reflection we realize that everyone who treads the globe owes his birth to the unspeakable agony of a mother. From mother's breast the baby first was fed. In mother's arms the baby first was lulled to sleep. Mother, in the twilight hour of baby's existence, breathed the fervent prayer:

That He who stills the raven's clamorous nest,
And decks the lily fair in flowery pride,
Would, in the way His wisdom sees the best,
For her darling child provide; but chiefly
In her loved one's heart, with grace divine preside.

Then, as the days grew into the months and the months lengthened into the years, mother's life became a continuous round of solicitude, service, and sacrifice for her child.

Mother's tired hands made the first dress that baby ever wore. Mother's deft fingers made playthings for the little one that filled his eyes with wonder and his heart with joy.

A splinter in baby's finger, a briar in baby's foot, or a bruise on baby's toe became an affliction of such momentous consequence that only mother could heal it; only mother could banish its ache; only mother could exile its pain; only mother could smile away the tears it caused to flow down baby's cheeks.

And a little later mother, like an inexhaustible encyclopedia of universal knowledge, informed her baby about the birds and the beasts and the flowers and the trees. She discussed with him the cause of day and night; of winter's storm and summer's calm; the mysteries of the earth and sea and sky. She explained as best she could the marvels of the sun and moon and stars and the grandeur of the far-off Milky Way—that silvery sea of celestial glory which forever beckons the children of earth to lift their thoughts to heavenly heights and devoutly thank the everlasting Father for His goodness that never slumbers and His mercy that never sleeps.

And the little one at night upon his knees, at mother's side, with mother's hand upon his head, learned to say in the lisping accents of childhood:

Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray the Lord my soul to keep,
If I should die before I wake,
I pray the Lord my soul to take.
And this I ask for Jesus' sake,
Amen.

Thus from the day of the birth of her babe, toiling, sorrowing, rejoicing, onward through life mother goes, generously giving the best of her thought and energy and effort and life to the development of her child into a successful, useful, righteous woman or man.

But until "the stars are old, and the sun grows cold, and the leaves of the Judgment Book unfold," no one will ever know the full measure of service the mothers of earth have constantly rendered their children.

The following touching story illustrates the fact that the average mother is ever ready to sacrifice as sublimely for her children as the mother pelican is said to sacrifice for her young by feeding them the lifeblood from her breast:

A poverty-stricken Italian woman was, as a result of the death of her husband, compelled to work in a sweatshop to support her three young children. A humane organization learned that this unfortunate woman was in the last stage of consumption and endeavored to take her from her task. But she resisted and continued to work until the very hour of her death. During her last moments a companion asked her why she worked so hard and so long. And she gasped, "I had to work to get the grub for the little kids."

Greater love than this has no woman shown. She laid down her life for her children.

Just such love as this poor, dying Italian woman had for her children every other mother has for her own.

In token of our heartfelt appreciation of the great boon of maternal devotion which we all enjoy, or have enjoyed in the days gone by, let us habitually exalt the name, commemorate the memory, and sing the praise of our mothers, and let us earnestly beseech our Heavenly Father to love them and keep them, and shower His richest blessings upon them forever and forever.

O mother, thou wert ever one with nature,
All things fair spoke to my soul of thee;
The azure depths of air,
Sunrise and starbeam, and the moonlight rare,
Splendors of summer, winter's frost and snow,
Autumn's rich glow, bird, river, flower, and tree.

Mother, thou wert in love's first whisper,
And the slow thrill of its dying kiss;
In the strong ebb and flow of the resistless tides of joy and woe;
In life's supremest hour thou hadst a share,
Its stress of prayer, its rapturous trance of bliss.

Mother, leave me not now when the long shadows fall athwart the sunset bars;
Hold thou my soul in thrall till it shall answer to a mightier call.
Remain thou with me till the holy night puts out the light,
And kindles all the stars.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO ATTORNEY EMPLOYED BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. FERGUSON to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has indicated that the presence of a quorum is desirable. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McClellan
Anderson	Hayden	McFarland
Benton	Hendrickson	McKellar
Brewster	Hennings	McMahon
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bridges	Hill	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Mundt
Cain	Humphrey	Murray
Capehart	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Ives	Pastore
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kerr	Sparkman
Duff	Kilgore	Stennis
Dworshak	Knowland	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Underwood
Ellender	Lodge	Welker
Ferguson	Long	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	
Gillette	McCarthy	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate

on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

EMBARGO ON ARMS, MUNITIONS, ETC., WHICH MIGHT ADD TO THE WAR-MAKING POTENTIAL OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to submit a concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received. Does the Senator from Florida wish to have it read at this time?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), as follows:

Whereas the United States has initiated a proposal, under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations would (1) call upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; (2) urge that steps be taken to guard against circumvention or nullification of such embargo through loopholes which might enable the Chinese Communists to acquire the banned materials; and (3) establish a special committee to receive periodic reports from the complying member nations and to take other measures aimed at making the embargo as effective as possible; and

Whereas Communist China has long since been branded an aggressor by an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations; and

Whereas more than a dozen member nations are participating directly with the United States in the heroic military action against the common enemy in Korea, and the troops of such nations are being shot at and killed by the Chinese Communists; and

Whereas no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby requests and urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

SEC. 2. Copies of this resolution shall be transmitted through the Secretary of State to the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the United States representative in the United Nations, and the deputy United States representatives in the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie upon the table under the rule.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which has just been read.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection so as to permit me to speak briefly upon the resolution which I have just submitted?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the resolution which has just been read and which will lie on the table to await action by the Senate, which I trust will be very prompt action, is a concurrent resolution by which it is sought to get a definite verdict by the Congress of the United States—I hope a unanimous verdict—supporting the action taken last week by the United States delegation in the General Assembly of the United Nations. Our delegation offered a resolution to propose action in the General Assembly by which an embargo would be placed on the shipment of war goods to Communist China. If such action is taken by the General Assembly, it will be the first effective step toward stopping the flow from the free world to Communist China not only of arms and of ammunition but of every material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

I am sure that every Senator and every Member of the House of Representatives very strongly supports our delegation in the United Nations in this action. I am sure we all were happy to note last week that one of our greatest allies, if not our greatest, the United Kingdom, has finally decided that it, too, should take affirmative action in this direction.

Members of the Senate will recall that only last week, and for the first time, those responsible for the Government of Great Britain admitted publicly the fact that large supplies of rubber had been moving from British Malaya to Red China, and they have now taken affirmative action looking to the stopping of that particular movement of war-necessary goods, namely, crude rubber. We understand from what has been stated in the press and from information coming from other sources that Great Britain has finally and at long last decided that she will see the United States through in the effort to stop the shipment of war goods to China which many months ago suggested and, indeed, demanded in repeated statement made upon the floor of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

This action through the declaration and enforcement of an embargo has seemed so wholly necessary and so completely natural that it is disturbing and distressing that such action was not taken a long time ago. With the United Nations now fighting on Korean soil against Red China, and with Red China's armies there those of an aggressor, a government which has been branded as an aggressor by action of the General Assembly of the United Nations itself, it has seemed to me inconceivable that such action should not be taken by the voluntary act of the members of the United Nations, without awaiting or requiring the collective action which is now proposed, under the leadership of the United States, by the United Nations itself.

Mr. President, I am happy to note from the ticker tape this morning that our delegation is proceeding with diligence and with aggressiveness, and that the first step of several which are required to be taken before effective embargo action may be initiated has been taken this morning.

I read into the RECORD at this time the bulletin from the Associated Press on this subject. It is dated this morning, at Lake Success:

The United Nations Sanctions Committee today voted a world-wide ban on shipments of war goods to Communist China. The vote was 11 to 0, with Egypt abstaining. The sanctions group is a 14-nation body set up to consider punishment of Red China for her intervention in Korea. The committee's vote is only the first step toward imposition of the world-wide embargo.

Mr. President, I am sure the Members of this body remember that after there had been pending in the U. N. committees and in the General Assembly itself for a long period of time action proposed by our delegates to brand Red China as an aggressor, the matter had been delayed to such an extent that the Senate felt itself impelled unanimously to back the action of our delegation there in its effort, which was finally successful. Members of the Senate will recall that the unanimous vote of the Senate of the United States upon the McClelland resolution made it wholly clear that, divided as we might be on other lesser questions, the people and the Representatives of the people of the United States were not divided at all on a matter of that sort, vitally affecting, as it did, the lives and welfare of a quarter of a million of our fighting men in Korea. Affirmative action by the General Assembly of the United Nations, branding Red China as an aggressor, followed speedily the unanimous action of the Senate adopting the McClelland resolution.

I am sure that similar action by a unanimous vote of the membership of the Senate, to be followed, I hope, by similar action in the House of Representatives as speedily as such action can be taken, will certainly uphold the hands and sustain the efforts of our delegation

in the United Nations, and will, I believe, bring speedy and effective action at that place.

I am sorry that the action which I requested cannot be taken today. I am going to ask, however, that the concurrent resolution lie on the table, to be taken from the table and considered at the earliest possible moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Florida that since objection is made, the concurrent resolution will lie over under the rule.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Florida for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate, and I add my voice in support of what he has said. In fact, I should like to join in sponsoring the concurrent resolution, because I believe it deals with a matter which should be immediately considered. I am sorry that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has objected, because I know of nothing that is more important than consideration by the Senate and the House of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, while the President of the United States has the right to make foreign policy, and in a way, instruct the American delegates to the United Nations as to what they should do, I believe that for the purpose of focusing public opinion in America, as well as world opinion, nothing better could happen than that the Senate immediately consider the concurrent resolution, debate and deliberate upon its subject matter, and adopt it as quickly as possible. After all, we seek not only to have united efforts exerted on the floor of the Senate, but also among our people as a whole, and we also seek to have world opinion aroused, and to enlist world movement behind our efforts. We want to demonstrate that we are united on the question of the furnishing of arms and munitions, and the other materials which can be used in aiding an enemy which is trying to destroy our forces, and is to a great extent, succeeding.

Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Arizona will reconsider his position. The matter is a very important one.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am not making objection on my own part. Request has been made by another Senator that the concurrent resolution go over for a day. I may say that I am heartily in favor of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the comments made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I wish to make it very clear for the RECORD that the Senator from Arizona, in telling me he would have to object to the immediate consideration of my resolution did so on the ground that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, was not present, but was attending the hearing now in progress, and he felt that he should have the opportunity to pass upon the concurrent resolution. Therefore, I join the Senator from Michigan in the hope that we may have affirmative action at the very earliest possible moment. I am very happy to have the name of the Senator from Michigan added to my own name as a sponsor of the concurrent resolution.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

THE DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR—LETTER FROM MONROE L. FOX

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me so I may read into the RECORD a one-page letter?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to read into the RECORD at this point a letter written to me by a blind veteran of my State dealing with matters which are very much in discussion at the moment. The letter is as follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 11, 1951.*

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I am the blind veteran that I hope you will remember meeting in Chama, N. Mex., and I am writing this to express my opinion on the current MacArthur situation.

First, though, I should like to tell you that because I have invested my eyes in our Nation's future, I believe that it is my duty, not only to my Nation, but also to myself to protect my investment. Therefore, I make it a point to keep up with current developments; therefore, I believe that I understand the background of this situation enough to state that I believe that President Truman acted correctly in dismissing General MacArthur. Of course, I can only speak in this letter for myself, but I believe in the people, and when they have had time to consider all the various angles of this proposition I believe that the majority of the people, if they do not already do so, will approve the President's actions.

May I point out that while President Truman may have acted rather bruskly, General MacArthur certainly acted in such a manner as to openly challenge the Presidential authority. That challenge had to be met. The whole situation is unfortunate, but while the general is a brilliant military man and is perhaps qualified to speak on far-eastern affairs, he is not in a position to view the world situation with the perspective that is absolutely necessary for the makings of political policy. That should and must be left up to our President and our State Department.

May I also suggest that you do not give undue weight to what appears to be a majority of opinion as expressed by telegrams critical of the President's actions. I should like to point out that it is always the dissenters who cry the loudest, thus making up in volume what they lack in either quantity or quality.

In hope that it will lend weight to my opinion, I should like to state that I am a college graduate with a major in political science and that I am now studying law at the University of New Mexico. Therefore, I feel that my incentive and my background qualify my opinion for your serious consideration.

Sincerely,

MONROE L. FOX.

Mr. President, I respectfully call to the attention of the Senate how nobly and how calmly the writer of the letter, who lost his eyesight in the service of his country, has expressed his opinion.

I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding to me.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO ATTORNEY EMPLOYED BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion by Mr. FERGUSON to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk may read the joint resolution we are considering, Senate Joint Resolution 70, which was passed on May 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of Robert T. Murphy as an attorney on a temporary basis to assist the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284, of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to explain the origin of the joint resolution. The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the other members of which are the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], unanimously requested that they have the benefit of the services of Mr. Murphy in preparing amendments to the Corrupt Practices Act or other acts of Congress relating to the subject of their investigation, which was scurrilous literature issued during political campaigns. I can assure the Senate that any change in the law which may be recommended by the subcommittee or reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration will come with a unanimous recommendation, because we all realize that any measure reported to this body and enacted into law would apply equally to Members of both political parties. The committee has been unanimous in its action in this respect, and I am sure will continue to occupy that position.

Based upon that request, the entire Committee on Rules and Administration considered the matter, and the joint resolution was reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration as an original joint resolution. I should like to explain how that came about, because there has been some misunderstanding.

I was informed at the time that a resolution identical in terms with Senate Joint Resolution 70, except for a change in name, had been passed by the Senate to relieve Mr. Nelson Deranian, who was the legal counsel for the Committee on

Rules and Administration in the Eightieth Congress. He was a very able lawyer who rendered excellent service. I was informed at the time that the same kind of exemption had been asked for him, and had been obtained.

However, I find that the resolution was prepared in the committee, but was not reported and was not passed, and that Mr. Deranian actually served for 2 years without any exemption at all. The committee never had a finer legal consultant than Mr. Nelson Deranian, who maintained his law office in Washington, but was instantly available for any service which the committee requested.

The situation with respect to Mr. Murphy is that he also maintains a law office in Washington. I understand that he has some cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission, which would disqualify him unless he were granted this relief. In 1944 Mr. Murphy was counsel for the Committee on Campaign Expenditures, of which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] was chairman. That committee conducted numerous investigations throughout the country of alleged violations of the Corrupt Practices Act, and submitted a final report, which I am told is now being used in some of the colleges as a textbook, because it so clearly sets forth the Federal election laws.

The committee desires to obtain the services of this especially qualified man for a period of from 60 to 90 days to help the committee write any changes in the law upon which it may agree. That is the sole purpose of the joint resolution. It passed the Senate by unanimous consent on the 4th of May. On the 7th of May the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] entered a motion to reconsider the action taken by the Senate. Normally, the way to dispose of the motion to reconsider would be for me to move to lay the motion on the table. However, the motion to lay on the table would not be debatable. I therefore have no desire to make such a motion at this time, because I am quite sure that the Senator from Michigan is entitled to time to explain why he took this action.

At this time I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] if I have correctly stated the desires of his subcommittee with respect to employing Mr. Murphy.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Arizona has stated very clearly and explicitly the problem which faces the subcommittee of his Committee on Rules and Administration. Because of the unanticipated length of time consumed in public hearings of certain complaints with reference to the Maryland senatorial election, the special counsel for the subcommittee was compelled to return to his private law practice, which leaves us without anyone to take up the work in the preparation of the report and in certain other exigencies which are now facing us.

I am convinced that the work will not require more than from 60 to 90 days. Of course, there are thousands of lawyers in the country. There are many lawyers who would perhaps welcome this employment for 60 or 90 days. However, it is difficult to find an attorney who is competent and able to furnish us the help which we most earnestly need.

As the Senator from Arizona has stated, this man not only has had experience in this field, having served in this capacity with another committee, but he has made himself available to us for the period of from 60 to 90 days which will be necessary.

I am in full sympathy with the principle embodied in the law, but I believe that an exigency of this kind fully justifies the request which we have made. If it is not granted we shall be left without competent counsel to help us to complete the work which we are required to perform as a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Can the Senator tell us the proposed rate of compensation of Mr. Murphy, the counsel whom it is desired to employ?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is exactly the same as was the compensation of Mr. Deranian, at the rate of approximately $10,000 a year.

Mr. HENNINGS. On a monthly basis, that would be approximately $833.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is it the Senator's understanding that this work will require not more than 3 months?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is estimated to require from 60 to 90 days to complete the work.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the provision of the law is invoked, it means that for compensation of approximately $2,400 counsel will be asked to forego for 2 years all business and matters relating to the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. He cannot afford to do so, any more than Mr. Deranian could afford it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator know where competent counsel might conceivably be found?

Mr. HAYDEN. I could go to Tucson or Phoenix, Ariz., and I am quite sure that I could find a young lawyer with sufficient ability, so that if he had the time to gain a background of information on the election laws, he could probably render this service. However, I do not know how to go about finding a man experienced in this field, except as the subcommittee has proceeded.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan such time as he desires.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration has stated that the joint resolution concerns the employment of counsel for 2 or 3 months. The Senator from Missouri has stated it would be difficult to engage a lawyer who would be willing to take the position for $2,400, and tie himself up for a period of 2 years, during which time he could not take a case against the United States Government.

Mr. President, it is not so simple as that, and I wish to go into the issues involved. The Senator from Michigan has no desire to make of it a personal issue. Mr. Robert T. Murphy is known to me as a high-grade, high-class, competent lawyer. The Senator from Michigan wishes to discuss the great principle which is involved. The principle goes to the very root of good government. It is along that line that I wish to discuss the question.

At the close of the session on Friday, May 4, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] asked unanimous consent to report an original joint resolution from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to suspend the application—and I underscore these words—to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

The effect of this is that the Senate and the House are being asked by law to suspend the application of a law. Before we do so I think we should consider the matter in the light of our being asked to repeal a law as it applies to the appointment of this particular man. Then we must ask ourselves the question, Why should we repeal a law to exempt one man when there are thousands of lawyers in the United States who could fill the position without repealing the law?

I think we should further consider why we passed the law. We should ask ourselves whether it is a good law. If it is to be repealed for the benefit of the person involved in the present case, why should we have such a general law upon the statute books?

When the Senator from Arizona asked unanimous consent to report the resolution he also asked for its immediate consideration and passage. It is most unusual to undertake to repeal a law without first having the repealing measure sent to a committee. I understand, of course, that the resolution was signed by every member of the committee. With that in mind, I know that the distinguished Senator from Arizona felt he was justified in not having the joint resolution referred to a committee for regular consideration and in asking unanimous consent for its immediate consideration and passage. It was, however, an unusual circumstance and I believe we should not have passed upon it without the most careful consideration and extended deliberation, considering the legal and moral principles that are involved.

The Senator from Michigan was engaged in official business at the time, and was not on the floor of the Senate when the joint resolution was reported and passed. As an original resolution there was no advance notice of its filing or of its being reported. It was not placed on the calendar and it was not accompanied by a written report. After the Senator from Michigan noted the action in the RECORD, and after consultation with the office of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, he entered a motion, on the 7th day of May, to reconsider the action of the Senate by which the joint resolution was passed. It is that motion which is the pending business and to which I am addressing myself.

At the time of entering the motion I was unaware of the fact that I was acquainted with Mr. Murphy, the attorney whom the Committee on Rules and Administration desires to employ. As I have indicated, there was no written report accompanying the resolution which would have served as a source of information on the contemplated appointment. It develops that I am acquainted with Mr. Murphy. As I said before, I hold him in high personal regard. I wish to make the RECORD clear with respect to that fact so that there will be no misunderstanding of my purpose in moving to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed. I wish to make it clear that my action has nothing to do with personalities. It has nothing to do with the man himself. There is no question of personalities involved, nor does the motion in any way relate to the work of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, to whom I have learned Mr. Murphy would be assigned. The questions boils down to whether or not we should repeal the laws as they would apply to Mr. Murphy or to Mr. X, as we might call him so far as the present discussion is concerned.

Mr. President, I am strongly opposed to the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 70 on two grounds, which I believe deserve the whole-hearted support of the Senate as a whole.

First, its enactment would represent a violation of the Legislative Reorganization Act, as set forth in rule XXV of the Senate, in that it would not have been referred first to the Committee on the Judiciary, thus would deprive that committee of its proper jurisdictional authority.

The Committee on the Judiciary is a very important committee of the Senate. It is composed exclusively of lawyers. It therefore represents a cross section of the thinking of the bar of the United States. It has certain jurisdictional authority which I believe should be maintained, particularly when it comes to a question of repealing a law such as we are now considering.

Second, Senate Joint Resolution 70 falls within the category of measures to whose enactment I am vigorously opposed on strong moral and legal grounds.

JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

I wish to speak first in behalf of protecting the jurisdictional integrity of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution proposes to waive established statutory provisions which are known as the conflict of interest statutes. We had better underline those words, "conflict of interest statutes." In the case of the individual who would be employed by the Committee on Rules and Administration the resolution states that his service or employment within the committee "shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284, of title 18 of the United States Code." Title 18 is a criminal title of the United States Code. We are asked, in effect, to repeal sections 281, 283, and 284 in this instance.

The resolution goes much further than that, by providing also, "or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States."

In short, the resolution would repeal for the benefit of this individual not only the three specific sections of the statute, but every other statutory provision which might impose "restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States."

Mr. President, a little later I shall point out not only the three sections to which I have referred but some of the other sections which are involved.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is a subject matter which is exclusively within the province of the Committee on the Judiciary to pass upon. But the resolution was not referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It was handled by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I contend had no authority or power to act upon it. In complete sincerity I say that the Committee on the Judiciary cannot be deprived of an opportunity to pass upon this matter without doing great harm to the whole spirit of jurisdictional authority provided in the Congressional Reorganization Act, adopted as rule XXV of the Senate.

It is perhaps unfortunate that with a number of similar cases arising, the Reorganization Act and the Rules of the Senate are not more explicit in conferring committee jurisdiction over them. But there can be no doubt in my mind, or from a fair reading of the law and the rule, that the jurisdictional authority conferred on the Judiciary Committee was intended to embrace this subject matter.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that sections 1 (k) and 1 (o) of Senate rule XXV be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sections were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULE XXV

(k) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.
2. Constitutional amendments.
3. Federal courts and judges.
4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.
5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.
6. National penitentiaries.
7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.
8. Holidays and celebrations.
9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.
10. State and Territorial boundary lines.
11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.
12. Civil liberties.
13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.
14. Patent Office.
15. Immigration and naturalization.
16. Apportionment of Representatives.
17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.
18. Interstate compacts generally.

* * * * * *

(o) (1) Committee on Rules and Administration, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

(A) Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

(B) Except as provided in paragraph (n) 8, matters relating to the Library of Congress and the Senate library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

(C) Except as provided in paragraph (n) 8, matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

(D) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

(E) Matters relating to parliamentary rules; floor and gallery rules; Senate Restaurant; administration of the Senate Office Building and of the Senate wing of the Capitol; assignment of office space; and services to the Senate.

(F) Matters relating to printing and correction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of assigning office space in the Senate wing of the Capitol and in the Senate Office Building.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, those are the sections which confer jurisdiction on the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules and Administration, respectively.

In accordance with the purpose of rule XXV, as it defines the authority of the standing committees, section 1 (k) of that rule provides that there shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary—

All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects—

And included among them we find paragraph 5, which reads as follows:

Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

Mr. President, in that connection I wish to emphasize the word "revision."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator from Michigan on the question of the proper reference of the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary, but I should like to ask a question. Is not the purpose of the reference of the joint resolution to have the committee

make a proper investigation and determine whether the situation in the particular case is such that the laws apply to it?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is one of the purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Is not another purpose to permit the committee to exercise the discretion which is so necessary to be exercised, because laws cannot be laid down with a straightedge and sometimes it may be necessary to have deviations made from them? Of course, that situation does not apply to crimes such as murder; but in the administration of various other laws deviations sometimes may be necessary.

Does not the Senator think there are occasions when exemptions or deviations may be necessary at the national level?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot say that I agree, Mr. President. In fact, I know I disagree with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. He and I have debated this matter many times in committee. I am, indeed, sorry that the Senator from West Virginia does not agree with me on this question.

Mr. KILGORE. I am, indeed, sorry that the Senator from Michigan cannot agree with me on it.

Only recently I was checking on a study which had been made of human beings, and I discovered that only 15 percent of humans born into this world, who reach the age of 15, are judged to be absolutely normal in physique or build. I think a somewhat similar situation applies in respect to the enforcement of laws. Inasmuch as in only 15 cases out of 100 does the form divine of the human being reach what are regarded as the normal standards, and 85 percent of the time human beings are found to be abnormal or subnormal in certain physical aspects or particulars, it seems to me that a somewhat similar situation must apply in regard to the application of laws to particular situations. Does not the Senator from Michigan think the laws should be applied on such a basis?

In other words, let us consider the case of a man who has only one eye. Even with one eye, he may be able to do a very good job of a certain sort. Of course, the visual requirement for service in the National Defense Establishment is that the applicant's eyes be 20–20. On the other hand, deviations are allowed in the case of many jobs.

I recall that the other day a marine failed to pass the customary physical examination; but the Surgeon General granted a special exemption in his case and allowed him to remain in the service, ever though he could not meet the standards which were generally required.

So, I ask the Senator from Michigan whether the Judiciary Committee cannot function in a somewhat similar way, namely, as, let us say, the Surgeon General acts when he says, "We shall allow a waiver in this case, because this man has special qualifications which enable him to do a fine job in a certain category, even though he cannot pass the examination which is generally required."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I do not agree that the situations are parallel, because in one broad discretion is allowed, whereas the law we are considering at this time is a criminal statute. As lawyers, we are familiar with the proposition that at times exemptions are made because of sex or for some other reason. However, when we pass a criminal law, it is a universal law; the criminal laws apply to all. We speak about justice being blind, in that justice does not recognize the frailties of humans, even though we know that a certain degree of mercy and sympathy must always be exercised in connection with the imposition of penalties or sentences, and consideration should be given to the question of whether intent is involved, and so forth.

However, I do not share the opinion that we can simply change the criminal laws in order to make allowance for the physical characteristics or physique of a particular person. The criminal laws are not made on any such basis. We try to have such laws apply generally. That is what distinguishes our great Republic from many other countries.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Michigan will yield again, let me say that I well know his experience on the bench of Michigan. Both of us well know that the State laws give great latitude to judges in regard to the imposition of sentences. Has it not been the Senator's experience as a judge that sentences are often graduated on the basis of mental attainments or physical condition, even at times extending down to probation?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, yes; that is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not the Senator realize that that often occurs in order to make proper disposition of a certain situation?

So the law perhaps is not so inflexible as might be supposed. In fact, in some States is it not a fact, may I ask the Senator, that a judge can give only an indeterminate sentence, and must leave the final decision up to a board which will study the mental attainments and physical characteristics of the person involved, before the final sentence is imposed?

Is it not also a fact that both the Senate and the House of Representatives recently passed a law known as the Youth Correction Act, by which judges are authorized to turn over to the Department of Justice anyone who has not attained the age of 22, in order that the appropriate sentence may be determined?

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course there is a great distinction between the right of a judge to impose sentence under an indeterminate sentence law and the situation in the case before us. In the former, the judge is simply following the law. In the latter, Congress is asked to repeal a law as it applies to one person.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well. But is it a repealer of the law when a judge grants one person probation, but gives another person 10 or 20 or 30 or 40 years in the penitentiary? That is not a repeal of the law; it is an exercise of what we call judicial discretion.

Mr. FERGUSON. But it is exercised within the law; it is done in compliance with the law.

Mr. KILGORE. However, in this case is not the Judiciary Committee charged with the exercise of judicial discretion in taking care of the United States of America under any special circumstances which may arise?

Mr. FERGUSON. The point on which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and I disagree at this particular moment is that, though we both agree the question should be referred to the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from West Virginia apparently thinks that in this case an exception should be made when it is referred to that committee.

Mr. KILGORE. I cannot speak for the Judiciary Committee, but I know that if we agree that it ought to go to the Judiciary Committee, that committee will have to exercise discretion, in order to avoid a hard-and-fast rule. The penalty must fit the crime, according to the facts of a particular case must it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask the Senator what he thinks would be the position of the citizen who did not receive the benefit of the exception. That is, if the exception were applied to one, but not to another, would the Senator consider that to be just? Is the question to be decided merely upon the accident that one man resides in the District of Columbia, and has been engaged in work for the committee heretofore? In that case is he to be given an exemption, whereas another man, a citizen of equal capacity, is not to be given the benefit of an exemption?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to my very good friend, the Senator from Michigan, that I think it is going a little bit afield to say that John Jones, Bill Smith, or someone else who has been charged with the commission of a crime has been improperly dealt with because he did not receive a minimum sentence, when another man did. That occurs every day in court, does it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, if the Senator is speaking of sentences imposed; but this is not a question of sentence.

Mr. KILGORE. A certain amount of discretion is allowed to the judge. In special cases does not the Senator from Michigan think that in the national interest discretion ought to be allowed? Judges are permitted to exercise discretion in the public interest, are they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I know the Senator's argument and I regret we cannot agree. Mr. President, rule XXV, as it confers jurisdiction on the Judiciary Committee, does not refer specifically to "waivers of statutes of the United States." But there should be no doubt in the mind of anyone that a waiver is in effect a revision. Therefore any proposal to waive a statute of the United States falls into the category, which is specifically provided for, of the "revision of the statutes of the United States," and it must belong within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the jurisdictional powers of the Committee on Rules and Administration, but certainly there is nothing in the jurisdictional powers of that committee, or in the powers of any other committee, remotely suggesting that the Committee on Rules and Administration has authority to pass upon this subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I certainly agree entirely with the Senator from Michigan with respect to jurisdiction. The Committee on Rules and Administration is not in any sense asserting that it has such jurisdiction. I stated to the Senator that I acted upon the information which was given me, that a resolution of this kind had been previously reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand.

Mr. HAYDEN. With respect to the meaning and intent of the rule, I may say that, of course, if I had to proceed over again, I would have the resolution referred to the Judiciary Committee. We have no disagreement on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was hoping we could have a reconsideration, and that then the joint resolution would be referred to the proper committee. I understand that the Senator from Arizona was under the impression that a resolution exactly like the one now pending had been considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and had been reported to the Senate, but that, after a search, he finds that that was not the fact, though he stated it very clearly on the Senate floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not agree absolutely with the Senator from Michigan on the question of referring the resolution to the Judiciary Committee, but, if the committee had jurisdiction, it would not be an arbitrary jurisdiction but a purely discretionary one, would it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I may say to the Senator that, once the joint resolution is referred to the committee, it has power to deal with it as it may see fit.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is true that the instant case involves the Committee on Rules and Administration. But, as the distinguished Senator from Arizona would agree, I believe, to concede that each committee has authority to pass upon any matter affecting it, would be to reduce to an absurdity the jurisdictional rules of the Senate.

If that were the case, why would any committee, seeking additional funds in connection with its own work, ever bother to refer a resolution calling for funds to the Committee on Rules and Administration? True enough, the Committee on Rules and Administration has jurisdiction over matters relating to the payment of money from the contingent fund of the Senate, or creating a charge upon that fund. But the logic of the Committee on Rules and Administration asserting exclusive jurisdiction, or any jurisdiction, over a Senate joint resolution which revises the statutes of the United States, simply because it is interested in the person to be employed, would in turn justify any committee seeking funds to bypass the Committee on Rules and Administration despite its jurisdiction, because certainly the committee asking the funds has an interest.

Proof that this subject matter is within the province of the Judiciary Committee may be ascertained from the fact that four other conflict-of-interest waivers have already been assigned to the Judiciary Committee in the present Congress. One of these involves precisely the same situation contemplated in Senate Joint Resolution 70, the employment of an attorney by a standing committee of the Senate. Another concerns attorneys to be employed by a select committee of the House. In the last Congress, three bills or resolutions involving waivers of the conflict-of-interest statutes were referred to the Judiciary Committee. As a matter of fact and by precise analogy, two of those measures concerned individuals to be employed by Senate or House committees.

There is no room for doubt in my mind that Senate Joint Resolution 70 should have been referred in proper form to the Judiciary Committee, and I therefore speak for the integrity of that committee's jurisdictional authority in asking reconsideration of the vote whereby the joint resolution, as reported from the Rules Committee, was passed.

The Senator from Michigan has contacted the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who, at the present moment, is in Nevada. From my telephone conversation with him, I know he feels that the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to should be reconsidered, and that the resolution should be referred to the Judiciary Committee for its consideration.

MORALITY IN PUBLIC OFFICE AND WAIVER OF THE CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST STATUTES

I am also opposed to the enactment of this resolution as contrary to sound principle of law and ethics, and I think this gets down to the real point of the case. Ethics must play a great part in American life. This great Republic must rely upon the ethics of its people, upon their moral code, and their standards of moral and ethical conduct. In many cases, laws are not essential, because people acknowledge themselves to be bound by ethics and by moral standards, upon which reliance may be placed. If it became necessary to discard entirely our code of morals and ethics, we would have to pass a criminal statute to cover every detail of business and social life, and every relationship between man and man.

I assert that there are certain sound principles of ethics which apply in cases of the kind we are discussing. Because of the existence of ethical standards, it became necessary to build up the law and to embody these ethical principles in legislation along this particular line, in order to make certain of the rule which would govern in a particular case.

For these reasons I am opposed not only to the resolution in question but to all similar legislative proposals which have been or may be laid before us. Let me repeat again that my opposition is based upon principles I have stated, and there is no question of personalities involved whatsoever.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator mean that there are two codes of ethics in the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; not at all.

Mr. KILGORE. A code of ethics for members of the armed services; that is, commissioned personnel of the armed services, and a code of ethics for those persons who wear civilian clothing?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am not contending that at all.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator will admit that the specific law to which he has referred has in the past covered cases of officers in the armed services doing things which are prohibited to citizens of the United States who wear civilian clothing.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is a provision of exemption, which I shall later cover, referring to retired officers.

Mr. KILGORE. They are still on the payroll, and can be recalled for active duty, can they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. They are retired under a specific section of law, and their retirement is definite. They cannot be discharged if they do not serve as someone in the administration thinks they should serve.

Mr. KILGORE. I am not reflecting upon those officers, but I am wondering if we should draw a distinction between those who are commissioned officers and those who are not.

Mr. FERGUSON. It applies to Army officers specifically. Section 281 provides:

> Nothing herein shall be construed to allow any retired officer to represent any person in the sale of anything to the Government through a department in whose service he holds a retirement.

The simple facts of the situation are that we have before us a number of measures which propose, for the benefit of certain individuals, to make lawful a whole field of activity which has specifically been made illegal and which is generally regarded as unethical.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask the Senator if he means that accepting such appointments is for the betterment of those individuals. Does he wish to imply that merely because a man accepts a position with a committee he is bettering his situation?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan feels that to make this exemption would break down the standard and would permit the camel's nose to get under the tent. I shall cite cases showing what has happened.

I am quite aware than on past occasions the practice of serving private interests and the Government simultaneously, despite the conflict of interests which the law recognizes and prohibits, has been condoned by legislative waivers. I say those are bad precedents for these times, and should not be perpetuated. The whole question of moral tone in public office is involved in these waivers, and

there has never been a time in my experience when it was so important to avoid any further undercutting of high standards of trust in public life.

PUBLIC OFFICE IS A PUBLIC TRUST

There are a number of cases of proposed waivers of the conflict of interests statutes before the Congress at the present time. Some, like Senate Joint Resolution 70, and Senate bill 630, the latter of which affects the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, would provide waivers for men to serve on congressional committee staffs. Others, like House bill 2829, which affects the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, would provide waivers for persons on special boards or commissions in the executive branch.

These measures have come before the Congress at a time when the traditional standards of good conduct in public office seem to have fallen dangerously near the level of the gutter. Crime and corruption are not only tolerated by public officials, but have been shown to be in actual partnership with politicians in high places.

The situation has been definitely brought before the public through the Kefauver committee, showing the crime and corruption which are being permitted. In view of the low standards being attributed by the people to men in public life, the time has come when we must individually and collectively raise our standards and enforce all those which have been enacted so that the people can respect public officials if they are to believe in the principles of the Republic.

Wrongdoing short of open violation of the law is regarded by many today as an evidence of cleverness. Fixers and influence peddlers practice their evil trade without shame or censure. They are often shielded from on high, and they continue to hold positions of honor and prestige even after their exposure.

I do not need to elaborate on that sordid story. For one phase of it, and the most serious phase since it concerns offices of highest authority, I refer to the graphic account in the current issue of Look magazine.

The deterioration of morality in public office which plagues us today calls for a revival of respect for law and good conscience. This is no time for Congress to be waiving the law for the purpose of clothing with legality that which has heretofore been declared improper. Nor is this the time for Congress to be enacting legislation to give color of propriety to that which is generally regarded as morally and ethically wrong.

It is traditional in America that an individual who accepts public office thereby binds himself to a standard of conduct which is above that expected of the ordinary citizen not similarly honored. Thus it is that through the years there has developed an ethical concept which, together with certain specific provisions of law, forms a code of conduct for public officials which is best stated in the expression, "Public office is a public trust."

President Grover Cleveland, in his letter accepting the nomination for Governor of the State of New York in October, 1882, wrote:

> Public officers are servants and agents of the people to execute the laws which the people have made.

Years before the time of Grover Cleveland, on February 13, 1835, John C. Calhoun said:

> The very essence of a free government consists in considering offices as public trusts, bestowed for the good of the country, and not for the benefit of an individual or a party.

Before that, Henry Clay, speaking at Ashland, Ky., in March 1829, said:

> Government is a trust, and the officers of the Government are trustees; and both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people.

The basic principles of good conduct which underlie the concept that a public office is a public trust are so well established in our way of life that they have often been construed as having the force and effect of law. Thus the Attorney General of the United States has held in an opinion which he rendered on April 27, 1942, that—

> Apart from statute, there are certain principles of fair dealing which have the force of law and which are applicable to all officers of the Government. A public office is a public trust. No public officer can lawfully engage in business activities which are incompatible with the duties of his office. He cannot in his private or official character enter into engagements in which he has, or can have—

I repeat—

> or can have, a conflicting personal interest. He cannot allow his public duties to be neglected by reason of attention to his private affairs. * * * Such conflicts of interest are not tolerated in the case of any private fiduciary, and they are doubly prescribed for a public trustee.

Mr. President, all the courts that have to deal with trust relationships and fiduciary relationships always apply the very strict principle that a man cannot serve two masters. The same principle applies to public employment.

THE CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST LAWS

A body of law has been developed and put on the statute books over a long period of years which has as its purpose the fortification of the more commonly understood moral and ethical concepts which apply to those who hold public office. Among the specific statutes contained in this body of law is section 281 of title 18 of the United States Code. That statute makes it illegal for officers and employees of the United States to receive or agree to receive compensation from private sources for services rendered or agreed to be rendered to private parties in relation to proceedings, contracts, claims, or other matters before departments, agencies, courts martial, officers, or commissions of the United States Government in cases where the United States is a party in interest, and prescribes punishment.

That is one of the statutes it is proposed to repeal so far as the particular man named in the resolution is concerned. It is specifically proposed to repeal that act. Then he would be allowed to receive compensation from private sources, or to agree to receive such compensation, for services rendered or agreed to be rendered to private persons in relation to proceedings before the Government. It is proposed to repeal that section of the statute.

Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard are specifically exempted from the provision of the law which I have cited. But there is a reason therefor, Mr. President. Their employment is determined by statute, and the exemption is granted by a general statute. Referring to the earlier question of the Senator from West Virginia, no double standard is involved, because the basic considerations are quite different.

Section 281 of title 18 of the United States Code merely says to employees of the Government of the United States that it is improper for them to work for two masters at the same time and accept pay from both when one of those employers is the Government of the United States, and the work the employee is doing for his private employer is in conflict with the interest of his public employer, the Government of the United States.

Another statute concerned with the matter of good conduct for public officials is section 283 of title 18 of the United States Code. That section of the law makes it illegal for officers and employees of the United States to serve as agents or attorneys in prosecuting claims against the United States; it makes it illegal for officers and employees of the United States to aid or assist or otherwise support the prosecution of claims against their employer, the Government of the United States; it provides a punishment, by fine or imprisonment, or both, for officers and employees of the United States who receive gratuities or who accept any share of or interest in claims which they prosecute against the United States while in the employ of the United States. Think of repealing this statute, which merely provides that while a person is an employee of the United States he cannot act as a lawyer against the United States.

Let us consider the theory of this statute in terms of ordinary business life by taking one of the large corporations, let us say General Motors Corporation, as an example. Who would ever contend that the president of the General Motors Corporation could, as a practicing attorney, take a claim from another party and prosecute it against the General Motors Corporation? If he were to do so, immediately a hue and cry would be raised by the stockholders. The question would immediately be asked, "How can that happen? Under what moral code can the president of the General Motors Corporation, or any other officer of the corporation, bring suit against the corporation on behalf of someone else?" The hue and cry of the stockholders would be justified, because no man can serve two masters. I am speaking for all the stockholders in the Government of

the United States in defending the identical principle.

Mr. President, it is proposed to repeal the law which prohibits a lawyer who is employed by the United States to sue the very employer for whom he is working; and in this particular case it is indicated the individual in question has claims pending before a department of the Government.

Mr. President, we all know what human nature is. Such laws as the one we are discussing are passed to prevent human beings from being tempted. Let us consider the particular man named in the resolution who is working for a great arm of the Senate of the United States, the Committee on Rules and Administration. On the same day he is working for that committee he appears on behalf of a claimant before one of the Government bureaus. It is not machines who are trying the cases before that bureau. Human beings are asked to judge the case brought before one branch of the Government by an employee of another very important branch of the Government, and the Senate Rules Committee is a very important branch of Government. Any individual employed by it is presumed to have a great deal of stature. Are those who are judging that case not likely to be tempted to say, "His side must be the right side"?

Mr. President, let us not be parties to tempting human beings in that way. Let us retain on the statute books the laws now in force relating to such practices, and the purposes for which they were intended.

Mr. President, certainly the stockholders of a great corporation would not permit its president, its vice president, or any other employee to file a claim and prosecute it against the stockholders while working for the corporation. Neither will the citizens of the United States permit the doing of such a thing as that now proposed to be done, when they realize what we are asked to do. The people expect that every man in the employ of the Government will refrain from prosecuting claims against the Government while he is working for the Government. The law gives them assurance on that score.

Section 283 of title 18 of the United States Code merely prohibits Government employees from serving as agents or attorneys or to otherwise assist in the prosecution of claims against their employer, the Government of the United States. It merely says that Government employees may not accept pay for such activities against their employer, the Government of the United States, from whom they also receive pay, and whose interests they are under oath to foster and protect.

Not only are the three sections I referred to repealed by the joint resolution, but all other laws which are in conflict with this employment are repealed.

Still another statutory provision designed to reinforce the concept that a public office is a public trust is section 99 of title 5 of the United States Code. That provision of law makes it unlawful for former employees of the various Government departments to prosecute or even aid in prosecuting claims against the Government which were pending before the department in which that employee worked during the period of his Government employment. The bar is for 2 years next following the employee's departure from the Government service.

I am glad the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is in the Chamber, because I believe he interpreted the law too broadly. He stated that this man, by taking a job for 2 or 3 months and receiving $2,400, would be barred during the next 2 years from taking any business involving the Government. That is not the fact. The prohibition is against his taking business against the department in which he is employed for 2 years. That is all that section applies to.

Still another statute is section 284 of title XVIII of the United States Code. That provision of law disqualifies former officers and employees of any agency of the United States Government from prosecuting or acting as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting claims against the United States involving any subject matter on which such former employee performed duty or with which he was directly connected while he was working for the Government. The disqualification extends to commissioned officer assigned to duty with any Government agency, and it is applicable for 2 years following a former Government officer or employee's departure from the Government service. Violations are punishable by fine and imprisonment, or both.

The first provision applies to the department in which the employee worked, and the second relates to the subject matter on which such former employee performed duty or with which he was directly connected while he was working for the Government. Think of allowing a man to go into one of the large bureaus of the Government and working upon a particular matter, and then immediately going out and suing the Government, or the department in which he was employed, on a claim which is handled in that department. We should not tempt people in that way.

Suppose a man made very serious errors while he was a Government employee, and later recognized them. He could go out and file a claim in behalf of a client and be able to obtain money because of his errors. We should not breach statutes such as the ones to which I have referred. These statutes are fundamentals in establishing moral standards in public office, and to breach any is to establish the precedent for breaching all.

I should like to point to three matters which have been disclosed by the committee of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in the RFC hearings. We are talking about repealing statutes which prohibit persons from having interests adverse to the Government of the United States while they are employees of the Government, or immediately following such employment. I think the penalties under such statutes should be increased. They should be made to include more persons. Let me cite three cases which illustrate the loopholes in the law. I assume they are loopholes. At least the persons involved have not been prosecuted. So far as the record is concerned, these names might well be John Does. However, they have been disclosed in the hearings, and I believe that we ought to know about whom we are talking. Therefore, I give the names, which are taken from the official records.

The first case involves a man by the name of Hubert Steele. Central Iron & Steel Co. had a loan application before the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which was turned down all along the line, and even by the examiner in the central office. The examiner making the adverse report was taken off the case and Hubert Steele was substituted. He approved the loan and it went through. It may have been perfectly proper. The other man may have made a mistake; but I am wondering what the citizens back home think. Within 10 days after the approval of the loan Steele was retained by the law firm of Goodwin, Rosenbaum, Meecham & Bailen, which had been representing Central Iron and Steel before the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, at $15,000 per annum, with $5,000 paid in advance.

Are we going to tell the people of the United States that there is nothing wrong in that kind of case? The Judiciary Committee should take some action about it. We must cover this kind of case. Many a man has been hanged on circumstantial evidence. Circumstantial evidence can prove just as conclusive as direct evidence. In many cases it has been known to prove the guilt of a person beyond reasonable doubt. What do the people say about this kind of case? Can such things continue? Ethics alone should prohibit a man from taking such employment.

I am sure it was thought by the Congress that it would not be necessary to cover such a bold piece of conduct as this. In this case a man left the employ of the Government, and within 10 days accepted employment with the law firm which represented the company which received a loan.

Let me cite the next case, involving a man named Allen Freeze. Freeze was assistant comptroller of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the record shows was active in behalf of the Texmass Co. even while in that office. He resigned and went on leave. Apparently even while he was still on terminal leave, being paid by the Federal Government, he was hired by the Texmass Co. at $28,000 per annum to represent it before the RFC. Think of it, Mr. President. He left a $7,000, $8,000, or $9,000 job and, while still on terminal leave, accepted a $28,000 job with a company to represent it before the RFC. I am surprised that the officers and directors of that corporation would have the unmitigated gall to do such a thing. In a separate judicial proceeding a judge severely castigated Texmass for this conduct, saying that it was apparent that Freeze had been hired by Texmass only because of his close connection with

the RFC. Who would not have castigated it? Every citizen of the United States should.

Let me take the next case, that of John Hagerty. John Hagerty was agency manager for RFC at Boston. At one time he had disapproved a loan application by the Waltham Watch Co. for $4,500,000. Then he changed his mind and approved it. He may have been right; but the people are not going to believe that he was right, after what I say now. The record shows him calling a Member of Congress and seeking his active intervention in obtaining immediate favorable action on the loan from the RFC Board. Hagerty resigned from the RFC to take a position at $30,000 per annum as president and general manager of Waltham, a little more than a month after a loan of $6,000,000 had been authorized.

That is not the only case. Let us consider Mr. Merl Young's activities. He was on the payrolls of two corporations. Both corporations were having negotiations with the RFC. According to the testimony neither one knew that he was getting a salary and expense money from the other. Think of the depth to which morality in Government has sunk. He was dealing with the Government, Mr. President. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was very mild in his remark when, speaking of Mr. Dawson, he said that he is entitled to his opinion, and the Senator from Arkansas is entitled to his, as to the right and wrong in these cases.

Another statute in the same general category is section 434 of title 18 of the United States Code. It declares it to be illegal and improper for any person who is an officer, agent, or member of a private business enterprise, or who may have a direct or indirect interest in seeing that a private business enterprise makes a profit or gets a contract, to serve at the same time as an officer or agent of the Government in the transaction of Government business with his own private business organization. Violations of this law are punishable by fine and imprisonment, or both.

The Senator from Michigan was the chairman of a committee which investigated Gen. Bennett Meyers, of the United States Air Force. It took weeks to ferret out his negotiations with his own company as procurement officer in the Air Force. He even put stock in the names of employees, so as to get around the kind of provision of law I have referred to. We are asked to repeal such laws. We are asked to make it simple for such a violation to occur. We are told, "Don't prohibit this kind of activity. Let them go ahead. Let them proceed in this way."

Section 434 of title 18 of the United States Code makes it a felony for persons who work for the Government of the United States to throw Government business to their own private firms for the purpose of making a personal profit.

Another statute, which is the last one I shall cite, is section 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code. It makes it improper for any Government officer or employee to receive a salary from anyone other than the Government of the United States in compensation for his services as a Government official or employee. It prescribes penalties not only for the Government official who accepts such payments from private sources, but also for those who make the payments. Section 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code makes it a misdemeanor for Government employees to accept payments from private sources for Government work for which they are at the same time being paid by the Government.

LEGAL ETHICS AND THE CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST LAWS

It is surprising that the spokesmen of the legal profession have not long since refuted the gratuitous reflections upon the integrity, the competence, and the patriotism of the bar which are inherent in the arguments which have been advanced to bring about the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 70 and similar measures, to waive those provisions of the conflict-of-interest laws which apply directly to attorneys at law.

Mr. President, the American Bar Association should be before Congress pleading that we insist on such statutes remaining in effect. If the bar is to retain its high competence and patriotism it must stand back of the ethics which have been the basis of such laws, and which have been codified and crystallized into the law. It is amazing that the profession itself has not challenged the contention that there is a scarcity of qualified lawyers who are willing to accept government employment unless the government first waives the conflict-of-interest laws. I am sure that there are members of the bar who would take such employment and not expect to violate any of the conflict-in-interest laws.

The bar associations should rise to the occasion. It is well agreed that if the profession is to keep its high place in society it must clean itself of subversives. The bar associations must act, when they consider what happened in the trial of cases involving subversives. A distinguished member of the bar has written a report along that line. I hope the entire bar of the country will consider the question, and will back up the enforcement of the laws. In line with that internal policing of the profession I hope the bar will also object to the waiver of the conflict-of-interest laws, so far as lawyers are concerned.

Mr. President, it is my belief that a fair inquiry will reveal that there are many adequately qualified lawyers willing to accept employment with either the President's Commission or Senate committees, even though such employment may mean the possible sacrifice of present or future personal financial profit or advantage in connection with matters involving the Federal Government. The shortage, if in fact a shortage exists, will be a shortage of politically acceptable, but not of professionally qualified, lawyers.

The legal profession is a public service profession. Its members are every bit as civic-minded and as public spirited as are other Americans. Although there may be exceptions, lawyers usually accept public responsibility with a ready willingness, and can be found in positions of responsibility and trust in all levels of government. The former counsel of the Rules Committee did not ask for any exemptions because he felt, I am sure, that it was not necessary for him to violate any laws or code of ethics.

From its earliest days the legal profession has held its members to a higher level of public conduct than is required of the ordinary citizen. This arises in part from the fact that lawyers are officers of the courts and hold positions of a quasi-public character in our system for the administration of justice.

As a consequence of the special status of lawyers in our social and political system there is a very special standard of good conduct for attorneys which is somewhat sterner than that generally regarded as applicable to the ordinary citizen. That standard has been formalized and has machinery for its enforcement. The courts are vested with summary jurisdiction to discipline attorneys who commit offenses against morals and good conscience in their relation to the administration of justice. The lawyer who violates the standards of good conduct of the legal profession is subject to discipline by fine, suspension, or disbarment. The latter punishment has often been referred to as "professional death."

It is not conducive to the good reputation of the legal profession or to the maintenance of public respect for the legal profession to waive or make exceptions to the recognized niceties of professional conduct. It is immaterial whether the exceptions and the waivers are effected by positive enactment such as is proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 70, or merely by lax enforcement of prescribed standards. The ultimate result is the same, namely, loss of public confidence in the profession.

The preamble to the enumerated canons of professional ethics of the American Bar Association points out that in America the stability of the courts and all of the departments of Government rests upon the approval of the people. Thus it is peculiarly essential in America that the public have absolute confidence in the integrity and the impartiality of the system for administering justice. Attorneys at law, of course, are a part of that system.

The canons of ethics of the American Bar Association not only forbid the actual performance of unethical acts, but also frown on conduct which merely has the possibility of leading laymen to suspect that unethical acts are being performed. Thus, attorneys are bound by the ethics of their profession to avoid not only that which is clearly unethical but also that which can become the subject of suspicion and thereby damage the high reputation of the profession.

THIS IS NO TIME TO WAIVE THE LAW

Those who have selected this moment of history as the appropriate time to ask the Congress to waive the conflict-of-interest laws actually, even though unwittingly, are offending the honesty and integrity of every Member of the Congress. In effect, they propose that the

Congress get into step with the political morality of the Truman administration and actually enact legislation to grant waivers and make exceptions not only for the personal benefit of certain favored individuals but even for whole groups of specially selected employees.

Those who have selected this moment of history as the appropriate time to seek legislation to waive the Federal conflict-of-interest laws are blissfully unaware of the true temper of the American people. They assume that the public regard for morality and ethics in relation to public office has fallen to the low level which is characteristic of the present administration. I say that advisedly, Mr. President. It is sad, but it is true. The committees which have been holding hearings know what has gone on, and they have shown it to the public.

The structure of Government under which we live cannot long endure if we depart from the rule that law enforcement must be without favor and without exception. The rule of equal justice under law must be applied. One favor here and one exception there merely lead to other favors and to other exceptions. Such a procedure breaks down the moral fabric of the American people, and particularly of those who are in public life. Therefore, Mr. President, we should not make such exceptions. If they are made, persons coming into the service of the Federal Government and hearing about the exceptions and about what is going on, naturally will ask, "Why should we attempt to maintain a high moral plane and a high code of ethics in the Government service?" They will ask, "Why should the public service be regarded as a public trust?" if they know that the Senate has by unanimous consent made an exception in the case now before us.

Mr. President, waiver of the conflict-of-interest laws is against the public interest. I am sure that any member of the Committee on Rules and Administration who thinks about this matter twice or even three times will agree that there must be another way out, another way to proceed in this case, that someone else must be available, or that the man now considered for the position will serve in that position without having the exception made, without making a shipwreck of the law. Mr. President, the application of the rule of expediency does make a shipwreck of the law, and therefore, it should not be countenanced.

As I have said, waiver of the conflict-of-interest laws is against the public interest. One exception, even in the most meritorious case, becomes a precedent and becomes ground for further exceptions. One exception demonstrates that the door can be opened; and a door which has once been opened, can be opened a second, a third, or even a fourth time. In the end it may even swing to the touch of anyone who chooses to turn the knob and exert even the slightest pressure.

Waiver of the conflict-of-interest laws loosens the grip of those laws. Even one waiver is a long step in the direction of the ultimate breakdown of their effectiveness.

Much of the evil in government today is beyond the reach of the law. It can be overcome only by a return to basic principles of morality and ethics. It can be cleaned up only by a revival of good conscience and a rebirth of precise respect for the law.

There is no room in our Government for favoritism and exceptions. Those who are unwilling or unable to subordinate their personal interests to the public service have no business accepting Federal employment. By the same token, it is neither morally nor legally proper that anyone be appointed to a Federal job if his private interests conflict with the duties he will be expected to perform in his public office.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Michigan whether he desires to have a record vote taken in this case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I should like to have a record vote taken. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well; I am glad to have the absence of a quorum suggested, because I do not desire to move to lay the Senator's motion on the table, and thus cut off debate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection to having such a motion made, for the result of a vote on that motion would no doubt be the same as that of a vote on any other motion in connection with this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but I do not wish to cut off debate at any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McClellan
Anderson	Hayden	McFarland
Benton	Hendrickson	McKellar
Brewster	Hennings	McMahon
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bridges	Hill	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Mundt
Cain	Humphrey	Murray
Capehart	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Ives	Pastore
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kerr	Sparkman
Duff	Kilgore	Stennis
Dworshak	Knowland	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Underwood
Ellender	Lodge	Welker
Ferguson	Long	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	
Gillette	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to comment on what the Senator from Michigan had to say in his argument as to the enforcement of the laws and their general application. In that respect I am in entire accord with him. There are, however, some exceptions, one particular exception being the case of a competent lawyer, resident in Washington, whose service was desired for 60 to 90 days to aid the Committee on Rules and Administration in reporting a bill to amend the Corrupt Practices Act. Any bill of that kind which is reported is reported unanimously, because when election time comes Republican and Democratic candidates will be subject to the law. Of course, we want the best talent we can get, and we want to conclude the work as quickly as possible. To employ a man who does not have the background possessed by Mr. Murphy by reason of his services in 1944 would mean delay and expense to the Government. If I thought that in employing him there was anything immoral, or anything incompatible with the real and true principles of the law as enunciated by the Senator from Michigan, I would not now move that the motion to reconsider the passage by the Senate of Senate Joint Resolution 70 be laid on the table. I make that motion at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona, which is not debatable.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, may we have a division?

On a division, Mr. HAYDEN's motion was agreed to, and so the motion of Mr. FERGUSON was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RODINO, Mr. MACHROWICZ, and Mr. JONAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1322) for the relief of Harry C. Goakes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. FRAZIER, and Mr. JONAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2782) granting jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. FRAZIER, and Mr. KEATING were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of

the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen; and

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery; and

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 872, calendar No. 277.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, it was not anticipated by the sponsors of Senate bill 872 that it would come before the Senate for consideration this afternoon. Under the program announced, it was expected the Senate would proceed to the consideration of the reciprocal trade agreements bill, but because of the indisposition of a Member of the Senate, request was made that that bill go over. Consequently the eminent majority leader has moved to proceed to the consideration of the measure called the aid-to-India bill, Senate bill 872.

Having been designated by the Committee on Foreign Relations to open the debate on the bill I have conferred with its sponsors, headed by the esteemed Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. They are not anticipating that there will be a vote on any of the amendments or on the measure itself this afternoon, but in order to open the discussion, I wish to present in a general way a statement with reference to the bill.

Mr. President, before I discuss the provisions of the pending bill, I wish to take a moment to place this measure in its proper historical setting. The bill providing emergency food aid to India is the first major piece of legislation dealing with India that has ever come before the Congress of the United States. That alone makes this an historic occasion. But added to this is the fact that everything we say and do here regarding the bill is going to make an indelible first impression on the people of India. They know they will be listening to the true voice of America speaking to them from the halls of Congress. All we say here will be heard in India; all we do here will be felt in India. So let us not be diverted, by the emergency character of this legislation, from a full awareness of the far-reaching effects and permanent results which our deliberations must inevitably produce.

It is less than 4 years since the British Government relinquished its imperial dominion over this vast Asiatic area. It is less than 4 years since India and Pakistan emerged from colonial status and joined the community of independent nations.

It is only 15 months since the people of the larger of these new states adopted their own constitution and established themselves, on January 26, 1950, under a representative government, as the sovereign, democratic Republic of India.

Taken together, these events must certainly be counted among the greatest historical achievements of our century. The sheer fact that India, so long the prized possession of the British Empire, has at last attained her freedom, is itself a world-shaking development, while the appearance of a new state in South Asia, covering a million square miles and governing more than 350,000,000 people, has wrought such an immense change in the international scene that few of us have as yet appreciated its full meaning or understood its long-range implications.

There has not yet been time, in these four short years, either for India clearly to establish her position in the world and define her role on the international stage, or for us in the United States to develop, with any certainty and consistency, the basic pattern of the long-term relationships we intend to have with India. All this is still in flux.

I believe that India is destined to become one of the world's great powers. As she consolidates her achievements since attaining independence, as she solves the immense problems left from the days of British rule as well as those involving Pakistan created by partition, as she develops her vast resources for the benefit of her people and of world commerce in general, as she proceeds with her tremendous new tasks of internal reform, the Republic of India is found to become an ever-growing power in the world, exercising an ever-greater influence on the affairs of men.

For this reason, if for no other, we are obliged to give the most careful thought to the place India is likely to hold in the world community so that we may make the best considered plans for the future relations which our country is to have with India.

I am confident that I speak for all Americans when I say that our objective is to build the soundest possible foundation of friendship with the people of the newly born Republic of India.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Maryland has before him an article which he clipped from the Baltimore Evening Sun of Saturday, May 12, 1951. It relates a story which shows that the United States, although very bountiful to the Indian people through huge shipments of wheat in the past, has received no credit whatever for its bounty; but that Russia, by giving a mere 50,000 tons of wheat to India, has captured the imagination of the Indian people; that Prime Minister Nehru has gone before the Indian Parliament and acclaimed Russia's act, which seems to have resulted in swinging the people of India away from this country and into the orbit of the Russians. Why is that?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Maryland has directed attention to a very important and a very salient fact; and because of the situation to which he refers there is a provision in the pending measure that the people of India will be apprised and must be apprised of what we are doing, and that as a condition precedent, an agreement must be entered into whereby they will be informed of the sources of this aid.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes, of course.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. How is it proposed that that be done—by propaganda means, or by labeling of the sacks, or in some other manner? How is the bounty of this country to be brought home to these people?

Mr. GILLETTE. The bill itself does not go into detail, except to specify that our State Department is directed that prior to the making available of this food it shall enter into negotiations and agree with India that the food will be distributed in the first place on a fair and equitable basis, regardless of race or religion, and that the recipients will be informed of the source of the food. As to the details of the agreement, the bill itself does not specify. That is left for future consideration. But that is a condition precedent.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. May I ask the Senator from Iowa if he would object if I asked unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 12, 1951, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very glad to have the Senator do that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read the dispatch to which the Senator from Maryland alluded; in fact it was carried, I imagine, in most of the newspapers throughout the country, in the form of a dispatch from the United Press or the Associated Press, under a New Delhi date

line. I think that if the Senator from Maryland will look over the dispatch to which he has called the attention of the Senate he will note that the Russian Ambassador made a very dramatic presentation of his propaganda, along with the 50,000 tons of Russia wheat. In other words, the Russian Ambassador said, "This is no time for talking about terms when people are starving," and with all the grandiose display of propaganda of which the Soviet propagandists are capable he merely made a statement that the Russian Government wanted to send 50,000 tons of wheat, "and after a while we will talk about terms."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; that is not correct. The article I have is an AP dispatch from New Delhi, India, dated May 12. The burden of the article is that the shipment of Russian wheat, which is not a gratuity, because, as I understand, the Indian Government paid full value for the 50,000 tons of wheat—the burden of the article seems to be that the Russian move has completely obscured the fact that the United States, over a period of months, has been sending 100,000 tons of wheat to India free of cost to the people of India.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to supplement the article by another published in the Washington Star, which sets forth that the Russian Ambassador said to the Prime Minister of India, "We will talk about terms later on." That leads me to say that in this conflict of ideas, when we are trying to seek the friendship of other peoples, dramatic moves are apparently very desirable.

I commend the Senator from Iowa for his leadership in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I commend other Members as well for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate so that the issue may be voted on.

I point out that we have not been giving 100,000 tons of wheat. My friend from Maryland is misinformed. We have been selling 100,000 tons of cereal grain at a concessional price. The United States Government has not given 100,000 tons of cereal grain or wheat for months. That is what we are talking about now. Had we had the legislative authority to give it, I am sure that it would have been given long ago. It was sold. The deal was consummated in the month of October 1950 for 390,000 tons of milo grains, which is a type of food product suitable for the diet of the Indian people.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

In connection with the question which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] just asked me, subsection (b) of section 6, on page 4 of the bill, provides that one of the agreements which must be entered into as a condition precedent is—

> To give full and continuous publicity in India to the assistance furnished by the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know how the distribution of this relief grain is to be supervised by the United States? Is any organization undertaking the job, as in the case of Yugoslavia, for example?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is the purpose. Subsection (a) of section 6, on page 3 of the bill, relating to the distribution of these supplies contains the following requirement for a preliminary agreement:

> To distribute the supplies made available under this act, as well as similar supplies obtained locally or imported from outside sources by the Government of India, among the people of India without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief.

There is also the provision which I have just read in answer to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. GILLETTE. Just a moment. There is an additional requirement in subsection (c) of section 6, on page 4:

> To permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in India of supplies made available under authority of this act.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator explain why it is that, in addition to demanding the right—and very properly so—to supervise and inspect the distribution of the grain which is sent from the United States, we also demand the right to supervise the entire relief program of India, which amounts to some nine and a half million tons a year? As a matter of fact, I declined to be a cosponsor of this bill because I thought that was an unwarranted interference with the internal affairs of another country. I do not know that it could have been avoided if at the same time we were to retain supervision over the 1,000,000 tons which we propose to furnish. However, it seemed to me to be going pretty far to require India to place in effect a civil rights program, when we cannot even pass one through the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I should be glad to have anyone answer the question.

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to answer the question. I believe that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and his colleague will offer an amendment to strike out that particular provision, because provision is made in another part of the bill for the operation to be under ECA, under the same conditions under which ECA operates in European countries. In one case we have grants, and in the other loans. This will be a loan project before we are through with it, and it will be handled as a loan under ECA.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Iowa. I think that would be a distinct improvement. I thought it would be going too far to require India to put in effect a civil rights program, or meet any other requirements which we cannot meet in the United States; and in addition, to apply these requirements not only to the 1,000,000 tons of grain which we contemplate shipping to India as a part of this program, but also to the other 8,500,000 tons which she must get from some other country or furnish herself. I do not see why we should claim the right to supervise the entire relief program of India.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I think the Senator's position is quite logical. The question which he has raised was discussed in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us something about the manner in which ECA has handled the relief distribution of food? Has the ECA handled relief grains for Yugoslavia? I know that the work has been supervised by CARE, and I understand that that organization has done an excellent job of supervising the distribution, and also giving the people of Yugoslavia full publicity as to where the grain came from.

Mr. GILLETTE. While the Senator from Iowa has no personal knowledge, he is informed that ECA closely supervises all the distribution of such aid in the European area.

Mr. AIKEN. Let us hope that some improvements are made in this respect before the bill is finally passed.

Mr. GILLETTE. I share the hope of the Senator from Vermont, and I thank him.

Not only during the present dark struggle with the aggressive imperialism of the Soviet Union, but long after that struggle will have ended, the United States will want to have in south Asia genuine friends and stanch allies of human liberty.

Without in any way diminishing the efforts we are making to form the most friendly ties with the other newly established independent nations in southeast and south Asia, but rather as an integral part of this policy, we must make a special effort and take special pains to link ourselves in friendship with the people of the largest, most populous, and potentially most powerful country in that vast area.

It is of the utmost importance for the future that the relations which are now developing between the people of the American Republic and the people of the Indian Republic be grounded in mutual understanding, mutual desire to build an enduring and stable friendship, and mutual tolerance of the inevitable differences between us.

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

Because of the series of natural calamities that have befallen the Indian people in the past year, we in America have been afforded an opportunity to demonstrate, by action rather than merely by words, our friendship, our human fellow-feeling, and our confidence in the people of India.

What the Congress of the United States does in answer to India's appeal

for food cannot but have the most profound and far-reaching effect on the attitude of the peoples of India and of all Asia toward our country. How we meet the emergency resulting from famine conditions in India will go far to determine the character of our long-range relationships with that country. We have a responsibility, therefore, not only to our own generation, but to those that will follow us. Our children and our grandchildren will live in the same world with the children and grandchildren of the present generation of India. The attitudes they hold for one another may one day bear decisively on the course of world history.

What we do here is likewise under the scrutiny of the entire world. We are going to give some sort of answer to India's appeal. I pray that our answer will be one that leads to friendship and not to animosity, that looks to the future as well as to the present and the past, and that will make all Americans proud to be Americans and all the people of India proud to be our friends.

I have spoken of an emergency. It is a more pressing emergency today than it was 4 months ago. It becomes more pressing every day that goes by. The line between safety and disaster may have already been crossed.

I hold in my hand a telegram dated April 23, from Calcutta, which reads in part as follows:

> Press reports 6 dead, 35 injured Cooch-Bihar town when police fired at mob during disturbances arising from food shortages in this former princely state about 300 miles north of Calcutta.
>
> Disturbances included parade several thousand hunger marchers, food riot in bazaar, and hunger strike by five citizens. Police pelted by bricks, acid bulbs. Deputy commissioner, other senior officials manhandled, one official vehicle burned. Twenty-four policemen injured included two thrown into water tank. Troops now patrolling town where general suspension business prevails. Food riots also reported two towns nearby.

I hold in my hand another telegram of the same date from New Delhi, which reads in part as follows:

> Five more starvation deaths Bihar where 1,600,000 affected. India begins talks Vietnam rice. Lack rain threatens maize crop Bihar. Food situation West Bengal, Ahmedabad worsens.

I also have in my hand a telegram from our Ambassador in New Delhi dated in late March which states that the American agricultural attaché has visited Bihar province and personally inspected growing conditions there. The rice crop was off by 50 percent. The land was too hard, because of drought, to plant new crops. Rations which were supposed to be 8 ounces per day, having been reduced from 12 ounces a day, could not be met because the ration shops had only enough wheat to meet half this ration.

I also have here a story printed in the New York Times of April 23, the headline of which reads, "Famine migration indicated in India," and a paragraph of which reads: "Responsible leaders and newspapers have begun cautiously to warn the Government of the possibility of a repetition in Bihar of another Bengal famine." Senators will recall that in the frightful 1943 famine in Bengal, the death toll amounted to from one and one-half to three million persons.

Mr. President, the starvation which threatens our friends in India this year can be prevented. It can be prevented by the people of the United States acting through their Congress. The need is acute and immediate. We have a substantial carry-over of food grains. At an average cost of less than a dollar from each of our citizens, we can help the Indian people in this moment of their dire need. We can send the food they must have from stocks on hand in the United States.

THE BILL'S PROVISIONS

It is my privilege to bring to the floor of the Senate S. 872, which was introduced by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for himself and 29 other Senators of both parties. This bill was considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], for 5 days and reported without a dissenting vote, with a few amendments which I shall describe in a moment.

Before discussing the provisions of the bill, I want to commend the initiative and perseverance of the Senator from New Jersey. Weeks before the President asked the Congress to consider this matter, the Senator from New Jersey took the initiative, together with a bipartisan group from both Houses of Congress, in giving careful study to the situation in India and to possible ways in which the United States could help meet the emergency. On January 30, these Members addressed a letter to the President asking for his support for the proposed assistance. The following week they discussed the situation with the President.

During this period, I had the privilege of consulting about the situation in India not only with the Senator from New Jersey but with the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee on Near East and African Affairs, of which I am chairman, and with representatives of the Department of State. Out of these discussions came the bill, which, in amended form, is now before us.

LOAN OR GIFT

When S. 872 was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, it provided that the United States should give 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India for the sole purpose of meeting the emergency need there.

Our committee gave careful consideration to the question of whether the United States should give this food to India, or lend India the funds with which to buy the wheat. We were confronted with a situation in which India had asked the United States for help, on special and easy terms. The President of the United States recommended that a substantial portion of the requested grain be made available promptly on a grant basis; that is, as a gift.

The committee decided that, as a matter of principle, it would be in the best interest of the people of the United States and of India, to provide assistance on a half-loan half-grant basis.

Section 4 of the bill, therefore, provides that, of the $95,000,000 to be made immediately available, one-half is to be in the form of a gift, and one-half in the form of a loan. Section 5 of the bill authorizes a similar 50–50 ratio between gift and loan for an additional $95,000,000 to be available during fiscal 1952, if an on-the-spot survey reveals the need, and if the Congress approves additional appropriations. We know for certain that 1,000,000 tons is needed, but we do not yet know how much of the second million tons will be required.

There were several reasons why the committee decided on a half-grant half-loan program. In the first place, we did not feel that we could disregard the fact that the Indian Government asked for assistance on special and easy terms. India did not ask for an outright gift. While the committee fully appreciated India's need for help, we could not avoid feeling that to give India the entire amount requested would be inappropriate, in view of the form in which the request was made. Some members also felt it would possibly set a questionable precedent.

On the other hand, the committee had in mind that by providing some of the assistance in the form of a grant, counterpart funds would be generated in India which could be used for agricultural and industrial development in that country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. There is one additional portion of the bill, as reported by the committee, which I do not understand, and as to which I should like to have some illumination. It refers to the deposit of amounts in a special account "for the benefit of the people of India in programs to increase food production, to develop industrial and mineral resources, and in other projects and programs, economic and legislative, as may prove desirable, in the mutual interest of the United States and India." What is meant by the words "and legislative" as they refer to programs? What kind of legislative program would be of mutual interest?

Mr. GILLETTE. It was reported to us that the enactment of some legislation might be necessary to enable India to effectuate the building up of its food production and its industrial production.

Mr. AIKEN. The provision does not apply to the formulation of political policies of any description?

Mr. GILLETTE. No. If it did, I would not support it.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not think so. I did not believe the Senator from Iowa would do so. I merely wished to make it clear that it is not intended to promote any political program.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad the Senator asked the question.

Counterpart funds in rupees can serve to improve agricultural productivity in such a way as to make repetitions of famine threats less likely in the future. India can benefit greatly from technical advice

available in the United States. The existence of rupee funds will not only stimulate efforts in India to remove the causes of famine but will also enable India to develop industrial and mineral resources that will earn dollars for her and help the free world grow in strength.

The bill contains, in Section 6, the requirement that no assistance is to be given until an agreement has been concluded between India and the United States. This agreement is to include the normal conditions that the Congress has developed during past years in connection with programs of aid to Western Europe and, most recently, in the Yugoslav aid bill. According to the Department of State, this section seeks no undertakings that would be unacceptable to the Government of India.

Section 8 of the bill provides that assistance is to be furnished under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended. This means that such provisions as that requiring 50 percent of the supplies be sent in American-flag ships if they are available, would be applicable to this program. The last section of the committee report is devoted to describing the applicable provisions of the ECA Act.

Section 10 authorizes an advance from the RFC to the Department of Commerce to enable the Maritime Administration to break out some hundred merchant ships of the reserve fleet to carry this wheat. It is expected that most of this advance will be recouped from the freight which India will pay for the shipment of this food and from freight that will be earned by these vessels as they return to the United States with strategic materials from the Middle East and South Africa.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did I understand the Senator to say that it would enable the Department of Commerce to prepare 100 ships?

Mr. GILLETTE. Through funds of the RFC.

Mr. AIKEN. The number of ships was 100?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. It would mean one round trip for each ship, if they are 10,000-ton ships?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not know what sized ships would be involved.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not a Liberty ship carry approximately 10,000 tons of grain?

Mr. GILLETTE. I understand that to be the capacity. However, I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. AIKEN. It would result in outfitting 100 commercial ships and charging the cost to the wheat-for-India appropriation, would it not?

Mr. GILLETTE. I did not understand the question of the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. If 100 ships are to carry the wheat, with each carrying 10,000 tons, it would mean that 1,000,000 tons would be carried, with each ship making 1 trip, would it not?

Mr. GILLETTE. It is contemplated that each ship will made one round trip. If additional food is made available later on, additional trips will be made.

Mr. AIKEN. How long is required for a ship to make a round trip to India? Is 1 month required for a round trip?

Mr. GILLETTE. It take 45 days to make the trip one way.

Mr. AIKEN. Then it will require 100 ships, each carrying 10,000 tons of grain, to transport 1,000,000 tons of grain to Indian between now and the 1st of October, when the need is likely to be the greatest. Is that correct?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in addition to this rapid survey of the bill's major provisions, there are two other matters I want to discuss briefly. One relates to strategic materials which are available in India, and the other to the shipment of flour to India.

STRATEGIC MATERIALS

There has been considerable discussion in the press about India's embargo of the export of monazite sands, a source material for certain rare earths that are valuable in defense production in the United States and also a source for thorium used in connection with atomic-energy research. The Indian embargo has existed since 1946 and is now embodied in the Indian Atomic Energy Act.

The committee examined this matter most carefully. It heard a representative of the industry most directly affected by the Indian embargo. The committee was satisfied, after discussing this matter in executive sessions, that steps are being taken which assure that the defense interests of the United States will be properly protected. The committee felt, as the report states, that "it would not be proper for this Government to use its position as the principal available source of food grains for India as a device to seek to compel the Indian Government to lift its embargo on monazite."

India is also the source of other strategic materials. The United States is the principal purchaser in India of manganese, mica, jute and jute products, and miscellaneous other strategic materials. Page 8 of the report gives a table of Indian exports of these materials.

JUTE AND JUTE PRODUCTS

The committee examined the question of jute prices in the United States and the steps which our Government has taken in connection with the requisition by the Indian Government of burlap under contract to American purchasers. It believes that steps are now being taken which will assure the continued flow of jute and jute products to this country.

For my part, I want to emphasize the importance I attach to the absolute necessity of having the Department of State work most closely with American businessmen who are dependent on foreign sources for certain raw materials. At a time when many governments are engaged in trade which we in the United States believe is more properly the field of private enterprise, it is extremely important that American private traders have the assistance of their Government in dealings with foreign governments engaged in such trade.

SHIPMENT OF FLOUR

The committee received a number of suggestions that a certain proportion of the wheat shipped to India be in the form of flour. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] brought this matter to the attention of the Administrator for Economic Cooperation. In view of the assurances which Mr. Foster gave to the Senator from Washington on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that the exchange of correspondence on this important matter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
April 24, 1951.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: When the India aid bill was introduced, I announced my intention of submitting an amendment requiring a specified percentage of wheat, to be moved under its provision, be given in the form of flour. I stated that my decision to offer a formal amendment would be determined after obtaining information on the amount of flour that might move as a result of normal shipping, milling, and related factors.

On March 29, I addressed a letter to the ECA Administrator, propounding the following questions:

"1. What factors will dictate the movement of a portion of the wheat in the form of flour?

"2. Approximately what percentage of the total gift would be so affected?

"3. Would you oppose an amendment to the bill, summarizing these judgments?

"4. If your answer (to question 3) is 'Yes,' would you also oppose including a paragraph in the committee report dealing with this subject?"

Yesterday, April 23, I received a response to my inquiry. I am attaching a copy of the response, signed by Mr. Foster, ECA Administrator. I quote the most important portions of the letter:

"We believe it would be unwise to prescribe in advance that any particular percentage of the wheat supplied to India be in the form of flour. * * * We hope that final determination of the percentage can await actual shipping and distribution experience. If first shipments are successful, it is possible that as much as 20,000 to 30,000 tons per month could be shipped as flour but if spoilage proves to be excessive, shipments of flour or atta would have to be curtailed.

"* * * From the point of view of expediting the movement of large quantities of food to India in a limited time, there are real advantages in shipping flour or atta as well as grain. This is because flour can be exported through ports additional to those through which whole grain can be shipped and because at the ports flour utilizes facilities other than those which are used for grain. Hence, since there is urgent need for the highest possible level of shipments, ECA would look with favor upon shipments of flour and/or atta provided these products can be shipped and distributed successfully. * * *

"We would not object if the committee report on the India aid program includes a paragraph dealing with these subjects."

Mr. Foster addressed his letter to me on April 20. As I have stated before, it reached me on April 23. Your committee voted to report the India aid bill on April 20—hence, I had no opportunity to call this matter to

your attention while the bill and the committee report were still under discussion.

Flour millers in the Pacific Northwest are still running at less than 70 percent capacity. Too, terminal and country storage facilities in this area are glutted with wheat. Opportunity to grind a substantial portion of this wheat into flour or atta would accomplish a double objective—using idle milling capacity and at the same time making available more storage space for the coming wheat crop. There may be other sections of the country where similar conditions prevail.

I would oppose subverting the prime objective of the India aid bill; namely, relief for starving people. On the other hand, I see no wisdom in failing to help a segment of our own industry when this can be done without injury to the India aid program itself.

Since I received the Administrator's letter too late to obtain formal consideration by your committee, I respectfully request that you insert, as a part of your floor recommendations, my March 29 letter and Mr. Foster's response of April 20, thus making ECA's attitude on shipments of flour to India a part of the legislative record.

Thank you and kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

By direction:

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1951.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: This is in reply to your letter of March 29, 1951, in which you requested my comments on the desirability of incorporating in the impending India-aid legislation a provision which would requre that a specified percentage of the wheat, to be supplied to India under the aid program, be made available in the form of flour. You also indicated that you are considering a provision which would require the procurement agency to ship wheat from those sections of the United States where storage facilities are most seriously glutted.

We believe it would be unwise to prescribe in advance that any particular percentage of the wheat supplied to India be in the form of flour. However, if the India-aid legislation is passed without such a provision, we are quite certain that some flour or atta will be shipped, but we hesitate at this time to attempt to estimate the percentage. We hope that final determination of the percentage can await actual shipping and distribution experience. If first shipments are successful, it is possible that as much as 20,000 to 30,000 tons per month could be shipped as flour but if spoilage proves to be excessive, shipments of flour or atta would need to be curtailed.

The Indian consumer normally prefers to obtain his weekly wheat ration in the form of whole grain after which it is ground by his family or by a local grinder. Hence, from the standpoint of distribution and consumption in India, shipments in the form of whole wheat are likely to prove more satisfactory than shipments in the form of flour and certainly less risks would be involved in the shipping. The 72-percent extraction wheat flour regularly produced in the United States is not commonly used by those people of India who are suffering most from insufficient food. From this standpoint atta would be much more satisfactory, but since atta is a product of very high extraction, it is much more difficult to keep.

From the point of view of expediting the movement of large quantities of food to India in a limited time, there are real advantages in shipping flour or atta as well as grain. This is because flour can be exported through ports additional to those through which whole grain can be shipped and because at the ports flour utilizes facilities other than those which are used for grain. Hence, since there is urgent need for the highest possible level of shipments, ECA would look with favor upon shipments of flour and/or atta provided these products can be shipped and distributed successfully. We believe it would be most unwise to ship any product to India which is likely to spoil before it can be utilized but we hope that by using multiwall bags and by taking other necessary precautions the danger of atta spoilage during the long shipping and distribution period can be minimized.

We hope also that we can avoid a provision which would require shipments from areas where storage facilities are most seriously glutted. Certainly such a provision should not confine shipments strictly to the glutted storage area. If adopted, the provision by all means should permit exports from other areas as long as all the grain which can be made available at ports is being exported from the glutted storage area. Otherwise, the export program for India would break down as soon as storage difficulties developed at any specific coastal range. Under circumstances existing today a provision such as the one you propose would not affect the level of exports from any specific coastal range since we are exporting from all coastal ranges all the grain that can be made available at the ports. Incidentally, we doubt that a provision such as this would have relieved the Pacific Northwest grain-storage problem this past summer and fall, since grain exports from that area were limited principally by an insufficient quantity of boxcars rather than by a lack of export demand for the grain.

We would not object if the committee report on the India-aid program includes a paragraph dealing with these subjects. We hope, however, that any such comments will recognize that it is not desirable to use public funds for flour or atta for India to the extent that these products cannot successfully be used in that country and that emphasis on shipments from a specific area where a storage problem exists should not be the cause of a diminished rate of total United States exports to India.

If we can be of any further service, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Administrator.

MARCH 29, 1951.

Mr. WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FOSTER: As you know, I am cosponsoring the Aid to India bill. At the time the bill was introduced I announced my intention of offering an amendment requiring a reasonable percentage of the wheat given India to move in the form of flour. In addition, I indicated I was considering incorporating a provision requiring the procurement agency to take wheat from those sections of the country where storage facilities are most seriously glutted.

I felt it necessary out of fairness to the other sponsors to make these announcements. By doing so, I reserved the right to pursue an independent course of action should subsequent developments so dictate.

I have had a number of conversations with representatives of the milling and shipping industries since introduction of the Aid to India bill. These representatives in turn had conferred with members of your staff, with appropriate officials of the Department of Agriculture and others.

They inform me that a number of circumstances surrounding the India situation will in the natural course of events compel sizable shipments of flour. They point out, for example, that milling facilities in India are incapable of grinding in the required time all of the wheat that should be distributed in flour form. In addition, there is the problem of internal transshipments and of packaging.

If the picture given me is correct, there may be no need of offering a formal amendment to S. 872. Circumstances I have mentioned plus others will operate to accomplish the objective I have in mind, namely, movement in the form of flour of 15 to 20 percent of the wheat we give India.

I will appreciate having your views on the proposition herein stated. In your best judgment:

1. What factors will dictate the movement of a portion of the wheat in the form of flour?
2. Approximately what percentage of the total gift would be so affected?
3. Would you oppose an amendment to the bill formalizing these judgments?
4. If your answer is "Yes," would you also oppose, including a paragraph in the committee report dealing with this subject?

Thank you for your many past courtesies.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have tried, in as brief a statement as possible, to give Members a clear view of the principal provisions of the bill and to point to some of the problems the committee considered. In conclusion, I wish to stress what seems to me the most important, overriding reason for our helping India's people at this time.

Regardless of the causes of this impending famine—the droughts, the floods, the earthquakes, the errors in judgment and mistaken policies which may have contributed to the tragedy—we cannot ignore the facts: and the facts are that people in India are already dying of starvation, and that more people in India will die of starvation, unless food grains which are available and are in surplus in the great American granary are shipped to them in time.

The people of this country have never been found wanting when other people have been in need because of great natural disasters that have overtaken them. We have never turned a deaf ear or refused to share our plenty. Without regard for the race, the creed, or the political belief of the people in trouble, Americans are always willing to extend a helping hand. The tremendous volume of mail I have received during past months urging swift action on this measure convinces me beyond any doubt that our people want to send this help to India now. They are right. We should do so.

I know that there will be some who will support this bill because they think it is a good way to fight communism in Asia. I do not think, for a minute, that we can purchase protection or insure support against communism by sending 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India. But if we cannot purchase insurance against communism by this bill, we can nonetheless recognize that our failure to do what we can to prevent starvation in India would most certainly provide an unparalleled opening for Communist agitation among the underfed peoples of India—and of all Asia against a prosperous, well-fed, dog-in-the-manger—as they would designate us—America. We

are not so blind as to want to give them this opening.

In past years, through our churches, our clubs, and our charitable organizations like the Red Cross, Americans have many times dug down into their pockets to help their fellow men abroad. The present job is too big to be handled that way.

Mr. President, I have received a number of letters from persons in the New England area and from persons in the Middle West area who already have contributed, as individuals, their assistance in the way of funds or in the way of grain actually to be sent to India. The same spirit that has prompted private citizens and groups to support voluntary relief programs in the past now prompts them to ask us, as their representatives, to transmit American aid through Government channels to the people of India. Indifference to human suffering is a positive evil that our conscience cannot tolerate.

Our primary concern in considering this measure, Mr. President, is therefore not how this emergency arose, but how to meet it swiftly and effectively now that it has come. The vital issue before us is not the question of relations between India and Pakistan, not the diplomatic positions taken by governments, not the price of jute or the shipment of minerals, not the matter of sterling balances, and not even the threat of Communist manipulation of India's misery. The vital issue is how best we can grasp this opportunity to speak and act as friends of the Indian people. Mr. President, our purpose is not to help the Government of India, but to help the people of India.

Their answer to our action will come flowing back to us, and to our children and grandchildren—not in the form of gratitude, which we do not seek and should not ask, but in the form of friendship based on their recognition that we are their brothers in common humanity. This transcends all else in the kind of relationship we want with the people of India.

There is an old Indian proverb that says:

Help thy brother's boat across—and lo, thine own has reached the shore.

Mr. President, I feel confident of what America's answer will be: the United States will help the great new democracy of India to meet the crisis it faces today.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 12, 1951]

SOVIET-TO-INDIA WHEAT CALLED UNITED STATES SET-BACK

NEW DELHI, INDIA, May 12.—The United States has appeared to have suffered a major propaganda set-back in India as the result of Russia's skillfully timed move to send 50,000 tons of wheat to feed the country's famine-threatened millions.

Indian officials, men on the street and the Indian press greeted the Soviet move with widespread approval. They have been receiving with growing impatience the weeks-long reports on the ups and downs of United States proposals to grant or loan 2,000,000 tons of food grains to India.

It is apparent that an important segment of Indian public opinion, which has been wavering between the east and the west swung further toward the Russian camp after this latest development.

UNITED STATES AID OBSCURED

The Russian move completely obscured the fact that the United States in the past months has been expediting grain shipments to India at the rate of more than 100,000 tons a month.

United States information and other propaganda means have failed to get across to the average Indian the fact that what the Soviets are doing on small scale the United States has been doing for a long time on a larger scale.

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehur himself contributed to this swing of sentiment by the dramatic manner in which he told Parliament that not only had negotiations for Russian wheat started but that Russian ships laden with wheat already were on their way.

TIMING HURTS UNITED STATES

He made this announcement first and then told Parliament an hour later that India was in accord with whichever proposal the United States adopted for sending 2,000,000 tons of wheat. But the Russian announcement blunted the effect of the other.

Despite the apparent importance of this Russian gesture, top Government officials directly responsible for finding food to avert the threatened famine say they still must place their main reliance on the United States for future supply.

"From August on," he declared, "we have only 300,000 tons per month in sight and we must have an average of 600,000 tons. There is no place in the world which can supply that food and the shipping to get it to us at that rate except the United States."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator explain a little more in detail the cause of the ending of the exportations of jute and burlap from India to the United States?

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, behind that question are the contentions between Pakistan, which is the jute-growing section, and India.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice from the report that the United States evidently imports from 20 to 25 percent of the Indian production of jute and burlap, the supply of which I understand has dried up. I know that one bag manufacturer in my State found it necessary to close his plant because of inability to obtain any more burlap.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it due to the difficulties which exist between India and Pakistan?

Mr. GILLETTE. It is primarily attributable to those difficulties, and the fact that India, in order to relieve herself of the need of Pakistan jute, diverted to the production of jute some of her acreage which had been used for food purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know whether the prices of burlap and jute come under ceilings in this country?

Mr. GILLETTE. Frankly, I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. Was any ceiling imposed on the price of burlap or jute in the United States?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not believe so.

Mr. AIKEN. Did it come under the general freeze order of December 15 to January 26?

Mr. GILLETTE. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. AIKEN. I was simply trying to ascertain whether the drying up of the supply of jute and burlap might have been attributable in any way to the fixing of prices below the level of the world market.

Mr. GILLETTE. Frankly, I am unable to say. I shall endeavor to get the information for the Senator and place it in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I rise to support the pending bill, and, in an introductory way, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, who has just spoken on the subject, and who has adequately covered the case purely from the committee standpoint. I thank him for his kind references to my efforts in this connection, and I return the compliment, because, without the aid of the Senator from Iowa and of other Senators who have joined in this cause, it would have been difficult for us to make progress with this important proposed legislation.

For nearly 3 months since the pending bill for emergency food aid to India was introduced on February 15, world problems and world issues of overriding importance have claimed the time of the Senate. It is entirely proper that this should have been the case, but it would be a great misfortune if our preoccupation with these great issues and events on which our national safety depends were to blind us to the significance of the pending measure. I am convinced that this bill, which I had the honor to introduce and which bears the names of 29 distinguished cosponsors of both parties, and which is, therefore, signally bipartisan in character, directly touches the important interests of our Nation and the moral ideals of the American people.

ORIGIN OF THE BILL

Before I go into details of the pending bill I should like to point out that it is the result of hard work and initiative on the part of Members of the Congress—and in that statement I include both Houses—to a degree that is not unusual in the field of foreign affairs. This fact is clear from the list of the Senate cosponsors, whose names I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the list of cosponsors with Mr. SMITH of New Jersey of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Quite a number of the Senators who are cosponsors of the bill, as well as those

Members of the House who cosponsored a similar measure, took an active interest as early as last December in the problem created by the Indian food emergency. We had numerous conferences with representatives of private groups and with officials of the ECA, the Department of State, and the Department of Agriculture, and through those conferences we developed the main facts of the situation. It was clear to us that this was a matter of urgency because of the inevitable delay in the legislative process and at the time needed for the grain to arrive in India before the food shortage there began to result in famine conditions.

Let me say at that point, Mr. President, that the subsequent delay due to many unavoidable causes makes the matter even more urgent today than it was when the bill was introduced. Having this in mind, we proceeded in January to frame legislation, and on January 30 we addressed a letter to the President outlining the facts of the problem and asking for his support in dealing with it. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has already referred to this, but I have it in my prepared manuscript, so I shall repeat this history. This letter was signed by 14 Senators and 11 Representatives on both sides of the aisle, and as far as I know it was the first official communication that was made on this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter to the President with the names of the signers be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1951.

The PRESIDENT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Over 3 years ago the people of India entered a new era as a free and independent member of the family of nations. We, as Members of Congress, have been aware of the common devotion of the American people and the people of India to the ideals of human liberty.

This year India is faced with an emergency food shortage and has asked the United States for help. We have been discussing this situation among ourselves and with interested citizens groups, and have come to the conclusion that a favorable response by the United States to this Indian request would be in harmony with the interests and traditional policy of the United States and would furnish a concrete demonstration of the friendship and good will existing between our people and theirs.

A series of misfortunes including earthquakes, floods, droughts, and locusts has cut India's grain production this year 6,000,000 tons below her minimum requirements. It is our understanding that, in an effort to make up this shortage, the Indian Government has arranged to purchase some 4,000,000 tons from Canada, Australia, Argentina, and the United States. These emergency purchases have drastically reduced India's foreign-exchange reserves, so that she is reported to be unable to purchase the remaining 2,000,000 tons needed to prevent widespread famine. For this remaining deficit India has appealed to the United States for emergency aid, and we understand the United States is in a position to meet that request.

To that end we are considering the introduction of legislation under which Congress would authorize the necessary emergency assistance. Unless we act promptly, many hundreds of thousands of people in India face starvation.

It is our hope that we may have an early opportunity to discuss this question with you in detail. In our view the need to prevent starvation is entirely separate from all political considerations. It is our further view that a response to that need should not imply any commitment on the part of the United States beyond the present emergency food situation. We do not want our desire to help the suffering people of India, within the reasonable limits of our capacities, to be regarded as in any sense lessening our opposition to the apparent views of the Government of India with respect to the Chinese Communist aggression in Korea. On the other hand, our firm opposition to this apparent position of the Government of India on that issue does not lessen in the least our desire to help relieve the acute food shortage in India.

As a bipartisan group, therefore, we hope we may have your support for our proposal and that we may coordinate our efforts with those of the executive branch. We look forward to hearing from you at your early convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, RALPH E. FLANDERS, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, IRVING M. IVES, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, WAYNE L. MORSE, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, JAMES E. MURRAY, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, CHARLES W. TOBEY, United States Senators; FRANCES P. BOLTON, THURMOND CHATHAM, JAMES G. FULTON, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, JACOB K. JAVITS, WALTER H. JUDD, EDNA F. KELLY, MIKE MANSFIELD, THOMAS E. MORGAN, ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Members of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. After receiving this letter, the President arranged with a number of the signers a meeting which took place in the White House on February 5. I had the honor to be present on that occasion with my colleagues. At that meeting the President assured us of his support and discussed with us some of the problems of the program we had in mind. I may add that he agreed with us at that time that the administration of the program should be handled by the ECA, and that is provided for in the pending bill.

I think that answers a good many questions which have been raised, because we know the efficiency of the administration of ECA in the Marshall plan countries, and the same type of administration will be applied in the handling of this program.

One week later, on February 12, the President sent to Congress a special message recommending legislation to meet the Indian request for assistance. Bills were promptly introduced in both Houses on February 15.

I have mentioned these facts, Mr. President, in order to show the wide bipartisan initiative and support in the Congress that have been evident in the development of this legislation from the very beginning. I wish to express my appreciation to the many Senators who have joined in this bipartisan effort

EXTENT OF THE FOOD EMERGENCY

Let me present now a few basic figures with regard to the Indian food situation. The people of India consume every year approximately 50,000,000 tons of food grains in order to meet their very low average daily diet of about 1,700 calories.

If we ponder that figure, we see that the very best they can do is to reach a goal of about 1,700 calories.

In the past few years some 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 tons of grain have been purchased abroad annually, but, owing to the disasters of 1950—and I stress 1950—India found it necessary to import in excess of 6,000,000 tons this year in order to avert famine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New Jersey has brought out the point that the Indian people use 50,000,000 tons of food grains a year. To put his figures in another way, the 2,000,000 tons called for under this bill would represent about a 2 weeks' supply. Is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. From the figures I have, I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that, even in this bill, we are providing but a very small part of the total supply of grain which India uses in any one year, are we not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is true, and I am glad the Senator called attention to that fact. The figures I am about to present will further develop the way this emergency arose in this particular year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. What percentage of India's imported food grains have come from the United States in previous years?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota would not want to put the Senator from New Jersey in a difficult position of giving figures regarding previous years' exports. Perhaps some of my aides here can develop them, and I shall be glad to have them developed for the RECORD. Frankly, I do not know what the percentage in past years has been.

Mr. THYE. Another question I had in mind, if the Senator will yield, is this: How many tons of food grains has India received from the United States within the past 3 months, or, let us say, in the past winter?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. From our studies we have discovered, as I recall, that India buys about 100,000 tons a month from the United States.

Mr. THYE. So India has been obtaining from the United States about 100,000 tons of food grains per month?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I am correctly informed, that is the fact.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will allow me, as one of the cosponsors of the pending bill, I may say that the quicker we enact this proposed legislation the better it will be for the people of India, who are in dire need of this food. I certainly hope that this bill may be passed within

the next day or two. I should like to see it passed this afternoon, if it were possible to get action on it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his statement. I received some figures recently with respect to the danger confronting the Indian people. If we do not aid them promptly, millions of persons may starve at a time when we have wheat available to meet their need. I know that, irrespective of every other consideration, all of us as human beings want to think in terms of helping starving women and children at this time when we are able to help them. That is the great motivation behind the bill. I shall try to bring out some of the questions which have been raised, and I shall try to answer questions which may be asked, but the great motivation behind the bill is to help starving women and children. We are interested only in saving human lives.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The very able Senator has covered most of the thoughts I had in mind with reference to this question. If the United States Government differs politically with the Government of India, the question should be taken up through diplomatic channels with the Government of India. But here is a question of thousands of starving persons, and we should give them aid. There are many persons in dire need. If such a situation existed in the United States, we would try to meet it and take care of the people. So we must help the innocent people of India.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator from Minnesota has eloquently expressed the motivation of the sponsors of the proposed legislation.

Mr. THYE. It was because I felt so strongly about the question that I was a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from New Jersey has pointed out that the primary purpose of the bill is to save human lives in India. I presume the Senator has been reading the statements published in the press during the past few weeks indicating that possibly the Prime Minister of India is not greatly concerned with legislation of this kind which might save the lives of his people. Press statements a few days ago indicated that an agreement had been negotiated with Russia whereby 50,000 tons of grain, a quantity equivalent to what we have been sending to India every 2 weeks, would be made available by Russia for consumption in India. A great hullabaloo is made by the Prime Minister for psychological purposes, to impress upon the people of India the fact that the Communist Government of Russia is making available 50,000 tons of wheat.

Can the Senator tell us why there has not been a greater degree of cooperation on the part of the Prime Minister of India in our effort to help to prevent the unnecessary starvation of thousands of his own people? There seems to have been a complete disregard of cooperation with this country. It is difficult for many Americans to understand that unfriendly attitude on the part of Indian officials.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to have the statement by the Senator from Idaho, and I should like to comment on it. I was disturbed, as was the Senator from Idaho, by the situation to which he refers, and I took it up with the embassy in Washington and talked with the Indian Ambassador. I have the text of a statement made by Mr. Nehru himself. If I read the last two paragraphs of the statement I think it will bring out the fact that there must have been some newspaper exaggeration which was not justified.

There is no doubt that there is a feeling in Asia against the western nations. There is no doubt that there is a feeling in that area against the United States. There is no doubt that there is a tendency to try to exaggerate differences rather than to arrive at cooperation. I am advised that the hostile press in India has slanted toward Russia. They talk of 50,000 tons when we are talking in terms of 2,000,000 tons. I am hoping we shall get a better reaction from the Indian press when this problem is taken care of.

Let me read from the statement of Nehru:

> In our view there are no political or discriminatory conditions attached to these two bills—

Referring to the House and Senate bills—

> and therefore there can be no objection on these grounds to our acceptance of either of them. While the form in which assistance is given to India is a matter for the United States of America to decide, we would prefer the terms embodied in the House bill, which are simpler.

I shall discuss that a little later, Mr. President.

> I should like to express our gratitude to the Government of the United States of America for the efforts they have made to send food grains to India. I should also like to express our deep appreciation of the messages as well as offers of material help unofficially received from many citizens of the United States.

That is the official press release from the Indian services in Washington. It was sent to me because of my inquiry as to the strange reports about what Russia is doing, and nothing being said about what the United States is doing.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I hope I can proceed with my text, but I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. My only reason for asking the question about the amount of food grains which have gone to India from the United States was in order to draw out the fact that we have been a kind and generous nation, and have sent available food grains to India. We have not received the type of publicity which has been given to Russia for her 50,000 tons of food grains. I wanted to bring out the facts in order that those who may read the RECORD, and those who may want to criticize Congress by saying it has harshly treated India, may realize what we have been sending to India. I did not ask the question for the purpose of embarrassing anyone. I wanted to get the facts into the RECORD in order to show that publicity had been given to Soviet Russia when Soviet Russia had not done one-tenth of what we had done to relieve starving persons in India.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is entirely correct, and I thank him for his statement. I think it is most important to bring out those facts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have printed in the RECORD a table which appears in the report of the committee at page 4. It is entitled "1951 Imports of Food Grains Procured or in Process of Procurement, by Source and Commodity." It lists the various supplying countries, including, of course, the United States, and points out figures as to wheat and flour, grain sorghum, and rice.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1951 imports of food grains procured or in process of procurement, by source and commodity

Supplying country	Commodity	Long tons
Australia	Wheat and flour (wheat equivalent).	382,000
Pakistan	do	27,000
Canada	Wheat	200,000
Argentina	do	600,000
Uruguay	do	50,000
United States	do	350,000
International Wheat Agreement.	do	452,000
Subtotal, wheat and flour.		2,261,000
United States	Milo (grain sorghum).	338,000
Thailand	Rice	338,000
Pakistan	do	300,000
Burma	do	225,000
China	do	50,000
Viet Nam (Indochina)	do	30,000
Egypt	do	5,000
Subtotal, rice and milo.		1,378,000
Total food grains procured or being arranged.		3,639,000
Additional amounts to be procured with additional funds.		367,000
Grand total		4,006,000

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator from Michigan desire to ask a question?

Mr. MOODY. I simply want to subscribe to the sentiment expressed by the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Minnesota. It is about time to act on this measure, because if we delay action, it will give the Communists an opportunity to paint an entirely false picture in Asia of our intentions and policies. I am very glad to see such wide bipartisan support for the measure.

Will the Senator yield for a question with reference to a matter of detail?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. In section 3 of the bill I notice a change has been made from the original wording, so it now reads

that assistance shall be provided in either "food grains, or equivalents."

I should like to know whether that will include legumes such as beans and so on of which there are a surplus in the United States?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That was the purpose in widening the original definition. I think the very question of beans was involved in using the word "equivalents." The words "food grains" were not quite broad enough, and there might be other categories of food which could be supplied.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, in the past few years some 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 tons of grain have been purchased abroad annually by India, but owing to the disasters of 1950, and I want to emphasize this, India found it necessary to import something over 6,000,000 tons this year in order to avert famine. Of this amount India was able to buy on the world market with her own resources nearly 4,000,000 tons, and her purchase program up to date has now approached that figure. The figures I have just placed in the RECORD from the table cover about the 4,000,000 tons, from the sources of supply to which I am referring. But India foresaw last December that she would be unable to pay cash for the remaining deficit of 2,000,000 tons, and it is for this amount that she requested aid from the United States.

We all realized that 2,000,000 tons was a round figure, and that various factors could change it from month to month. But since 2,000,000 tons was the amount requested by India, we have treated that figure as an over-all ceiling, with the possibility that a lesser amount would turn out to be sufficient. That is true whether we pass the bill as it was reported from the committee by my colleague, the Senator from Iowa, or change it to a loan basis by the amendment which will be offered, and which I shall discuss at a later point in my remarks. The figure of $190,000,000 remains in either case, that being the approximate cost of 2,000,000 tons of grain; and that figure sets an over-all ceiling on the size of the program.

Let me point out also that under section 3 the assistance "shall be for the sole purpose of providing food grains, or equivalents," as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] just called to my attention, "to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, drought, and other conditions existing in India in 1950."

We are talking now of the condition in India in 1950, and the effect on its people in this year, 1951.

We inserted that section in order to make it entirely clear that the grain we send must be used for no other purpose than to meet the present food emergency. It could not be used, for instance, for sale to other countries or for stockpiling in anticipation of future shortages. In light of the obvious emergency need that safeguard may perhaps be unnecessary, but we inserted it in order to remove any possible doubts on this point.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL—NATIONAL INTEREST AND MORAL DUTY

I should like now to discuss the purpose of this bill, and to present to the Senate my own view of what it means to the United States. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] just made a very eloquent reference to why we are proposing to take this action. I should like to develop that point a little further

The purpose of the bill is described in section 2 as follows:

It is the purpose of this act to serve the cause of world peace and thus provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency food assistance to the people of India in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in that country.

I am sure we will all agree that to serve the cause of peace—the cause of a just and lasting peace among nations—is to serve the common defense and general welfare of our own country. I believe that the present bill will serve the cause of peace by strengthening freedom among the vast multitudes of India, and by promoting relations of friendship and good will between ourselves and the Indian Nation.

India is a new free nation which gained its independence less than 4 years ago after a long period of struggle. It is the second most populous nation in the world, with 350,000,000 people, with tremendous natural resources and an incalculable future potential for good or evil.

The Senate will remember that General MacArthur, in his recent historic address to Congress, presented an eloquent discussion of the recent revolutionary ferment in Asia and of the needs and aspirations of the Asian peoples, numbering nearly half the population of the globe, at this moment in world history. I should like to quote General MacArthur's words at this point, because they apply with dramatic force to the present situation in India. General MacArthur said:

Long exploited by the so-called colonial powers, with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice, individual dignity, or a higher standard of life such as guided our own noble administration of the Philippines the peoples of Asia found their opportunity in the war just past to throw off the shackles of colonialism and now see the dawn of a new opportunity and heretofore unfelt dignity and the self-respect of political freedom.

Mustering half of the earth's population, and 60 percent of its natural resources, these peoples are rapidly consolidating a new force, both moral and material, with which to raise the living standard and erect adaptations of the design of modern progress to their own distinct cultural environments. Whether one adheres to the concept of colonialism or not, this is the direction of Asian progress and it may not be stopped. It is a corollary to the shift of the world economic frontier, as the whole epicenter of world affairs rotates back toward the area whence it started.

In this situation it becomes vital that our own country orient its policies in consonance with this basic evolutionary condition rather than pursue to course blind to reality that the colonial era is now past and the Asia peoples covet the right to shape their own free destiny. What they seek now is friendly guidance, understanding, and support, not imperious direction; the dignity of equality, not the shame of subjugation.

Their prewar standard of life, pitifully low, is infinitely lower now in the devastation left in war's wake. World ideologies play little part in Asian thinking and are little understood. What the people strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, a little firmer roof over their heads, and the realization of a normal nationalist urge for political freedom.

Mr. President, there can be no question that this situation which General MacArthur outlined so clearly, and which applies so completely to India, contains serious dangers to world peace. The people of India are seeking to develop their own way of life and their own national destiny. The great masses know nothing of politics or ideologies. Today they stand between the western tradition, on which their present political institutions are founded, and the insistent appeal of ruthless Soviet Communist propaganda. They are faced with the choice whether to continue on the hard path to freedom or perhaps to turn to the desperate remedy of communism. For the hungry masses of India there is one supreme test by which that choice will be guided: "Will we have enough to eat?"

That is the insistent question. I can add my own personal testimony because when I attended the conference of the Interparliamentary Union in Dublin last year the message brought to us from the Far East, from Burma, from Thailand, from Indochina, from Indonesia, from other far-eastern countries, was the message of famine. Will the western nations realize that what is needed there in order to stabilize that area of the world, is some way to meet this desperate need? At this moment that vital question of physical survival for millions of human beings in India lies in our hands. I do not pretend that the enactment of this bill will by itself solve the pressing political and economic problems of India. No aid we could possibly give would do that. But I do maintain that this aid, coming at a moment of widespread physical hunger and distress, will play a critical and indispensable part. Added to India's own efforts to meet the food emergency, this proposed aid program is of vital economic importance.

Beyond that, Mr. President, it is also of vital psychological importance. This is one of those moments in the battle for the minds of men when words without deeds are powerless. All India has been watching and waiting for the American response to their request. To illustrate this point, I have in my hand copies of two leading newspapers of New Delhi for February 9, 2 days after former President Hoover conferred with the President at the White House on the Indian food emergency. The headline on the front page of the Statesman reads: "Truman favors food aid for India—Hoover's appeal for large United States grant endorsed."

The same day the Hindustan Times devoted its leading article to this subject with the headline: "Hoover endorses food aid to India—Americans asked to make sacrifice—Way now clear for Congress to act."

These examples serve to illustrate the keen attention with which India has been following the prospect of American aid. Unfortunately, I do not have more recent newspapers from India, but Senators may well imagine how greatly this anxious attention in India has been heightened in recent weeks as actual famine began to appear in parts of the country with all the attendant distress, the riots, the calling out of troops, and the beginning of uncontrolled migration in search of food. In this desperate situation the decision is up to us, Mr. President, and I am certain that our action here will stand as a landmark in the history of the Asian peoples and their relations with the west.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator spoke about the immediate needs and the current difficulties of the situation. Am I correct in believing that it is really a question of planning and preparing, so that the authorities in India may know how much grain they can afford to use at any given time? Is it not true that if this bill is enacted, our grain will be used probably next January and February, but that it should be planned for now?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think that is a part of the program, but I believe that some of our grain will get there more promptly than that. We are thinking now of the question of transportation, on which I shall touch in a moment, and the question of speeding it up as rapidly as possible. I do not know whether next January or February will be the earliest time at which our grain will arrive there, but we know that there will be continued famine unless we can follow through with the program now being worked out in connection with the 4,000,000 tons which I mentioned earlier as being on the way.

I have been trying, Mr. President, to indicate the vast implications of this bill for our future political relations with India and the rest of Asia. I believe that it is by decisions such as the one now facing us that the destiny of nations is determined. But I cannot leave the matter at that. I cannot escape the conclusion that there is bound up with these issues of national interest a simple, direct moral issue which lays an even higher claim upon our consciences as a free people. Even if there were no question of national interest involved, this moral issue should strike us with inescapable force. We as a people adhere to the principle implicit in Christ's second commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." In the world of today all men are our neighbors. We cannot escape that fact. The very lives of countless people in India depend upon our decision. In this ultimate moral sense it is idle to ask what the world may think of us. We must rather ask what we can think of ourselves after we have met this issue and made our decision.

I think there can be no doubt that there is a humanitarian impulse on the part of the American people to go to the aid of these human beings in India who are in such distress. My mail, and the mail of other Senators, bears witness to that impulse. The size of this problem is such that the impulse can be translated into action only through the action of Congress and the Federal Government. Therefore I submit that this moral issue lies clearly in our own hands. We must face it and meet it in a way which will uphold the tradition of human brotherhood which is our most precious inheritance.

CRITICISMS OF THE INDIAN GOVERNMENT

Now, Mr. President, let me turn to a brief review of certain criticisms of the Indian Government which have been made in connection with this bill. I think we are not completely frank if we do not review all the points which have been brought up, because this is a controversial subject. I believe that these criticisms are in large part justified, but I feel strongly that we would be wrong to hold back help for starving men, women, and children because of mistakes of their Government for which those masses are in no way responsible. That follows through on the point made by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who stressed the same point.

First of all we know of India's policy toward Communist China and toward the Korean War. No Senator has been more consistently opposed to these policies than I have. But it is clear to me that the masses of Indian people who today need our help did not make those policies and may know little or nothing about them.

Secondly, there have been justifiable criticisms of India's trade policy toward Pakistan. My distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] points out in the report of the committee some things which he himself discovered when he was in India last summer. We have had considerable evidence that in the course of carrying on a trade war with Pakistan, India has aggravated her own food difficulties both by refusing to buy available food in Pakistan and by planting rice lands to jute and cotton instead of importing these commodities from Pakistan. I think it is fair to point out that these actions have been only a contributing factor, and that even with normal trade between India and Pakistan there would still have been a serious food crisis in India this year from natural causes alone. It is also proper to point out that India has now largely normalized her trade relations with Pakistan through the trade agreement of last February, under which India expects to import 325,000 tons of grain this year. I am glad to note that. In any case, it is obvious that the hungry millions of India did not make these trade policies of the past, and that we cannot fill their stomachs by criticizing their Government in this connection.

Finally, there have been criticisms of India's export policies with respect to burlap and certain strategic minerals, including monazite sands, in which we are interested. Since 1946 there has been a statutory embargo on the export of monazite, which has various industrial uses, including atomic energy development. Our Government should press for legislative relief all along the line, because these export controls by the Indian Government are hard to justify between friendly nations. But again I submit that it would be wrong to punish the people for these policies of their Government, and it would be a mistake to try to solve these issues in the persent bill. This is not the place to deal with those matters. The place to deal with them is in the normal diplomatic relations between our two Governments.

This bill has to do with human beings, not governments—people, not political issues. The question before us is that of saving human lives.

NO PRECEDENT FOR FUTURE AID

Mr. President, there has been hesitation among some Senators to enter into this program on the ground that it might establish a precedent for future aid, either in India or elsewhere, which would be beyond our resources. This hesitation is understandable, and I am sympathetic toward it, but I ask the Senate to approach this bill in the same spirit in which we approach all legislation—in other words, to consider it on its own merits. We have had ample testimony that the United States can spare the requested grain without causing any threat to our own resources. To guard against the possibility of shortages as result of poor crops, I would favor an amendment to require certification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the gain can safely be spared, and I understand from my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] that such an amendment will be offered. If I were not reassured on this point, and if I did not believe it to be our national interest and our moral duty to relieve India's distress, I should not be supporting this bill. If India or any other country should appeal to us in the future for emergency aid of this kind, we should deal with any such appeal on its merits, applying to it the same principles of justice and common sense and national interest which we apply here.

FINANCING PROVISIONS

I turn now to the method of financing the aid program. After thorough discussion the committee arrived at a formula whereby the program would be equally divided between a grant and a loan. In view of recent developments, however, I now favor an amendment which will be offered to put the whole program on a loan basis.

I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that I have not changed by view that the committee's original position, putting half of the program on a grant basis, was a wise one under the circumstances which prevailed at the time. We had in mind the creation of a counterpart fund, equivalent to the portion of the aid furnished as a grant, which would be used for agricultural and other development projects in India. This is in line with our policy in the Marshall-plan countries, of using counterpart funds where we made grants for internal developments.

These projects would have helped India to achieve economic stability and

to prevent the recurrence of the famine conditions which have made it necessary for India to ask for outside aid. I believe that this provision would be in the interest of the United States both from the point of view of sound long-range economy and from the point of view of creating conditions under which India can continue in the path of freedom.

The new element in the picture, as most Senators know, is the statement of Prime Minister Nehru last Thursday that, although his Government would agree to the terms of either the Senate bill or the House bill, they prefer the simpler terms of the bill now before the House, the essence of which is that the whole program is put on a loan basis. That is the statement of Mr. Nehru, to which I referred a few moments ago in reply to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. So far as I am concerned this statement by Mr. Nehru entirely removes any question of a grant from this aid program, because the Indian Government has now shown that it is not anxious at this time to assume the various obligations which the grant program would involve. There is now no necessity for debate in Congress as to the value of this grant program from the point of view of our own interests. We can now agree, I am sure, on the loan basis so far as financing is concerned, and in this way we can proceed to meet the main issue—the issue of providing as speedily as possible the necessary amount of grain to alleviate the human disaster of starvation in India this year.

I should like to make two further points with respect to financing. The first is that, under the amendment which is being offered by my distinguished colleague from Michigan and other Senators, the funds needed to advance the $190,000,000 credit to India will come so far as possible from funds already appropriated to the ECA. I doubt if we shall need any further authorization or further appropriation.

Mr. Foster, the ECA Administrator, has already assured us that ECA has at least $95,000,000 which can be applied to the India program. We have discussed with the ECA their fiscal position, and the possibility has developed that ECA will have substantially more than $95,000,000 left over at the end of the current fiscal year. The proposed amendment therefore provides that whatever does remain in uncommitted ECA funds as of June 30 shall be applied to this program, up to the limit of $190,000,000 and in no case less than the $95,000,000 on which we have already had a firm assurance.

My second point on financing has to do with the probable terms of the loan. Under section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act, which is the governing language under the pending bill—that is to say, our bill provides that this program shall be handled by the ECA—the exact terms will be worked out by the Administrator after consulting with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. This is the procedure hitherto followed in extending credits to the European countries, and it is probable that the credit to India will follow the pattern established in those earlier credits to Europe.

Almost all of these have been extended for periods of 33 to 35 years at an interest rate of 2½ percent on unpaid principal. Semiannual interest payments might begin immediately, and payments on principal would probably be deferred to the end of a grace period of 6 or 8 years.

STRATEGIC MATERIALS

I turn now to the language in the proposed amendment which provides for repayment not only in money but also in materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources. This language first appeared in the original Economic Cooperation Act and is contained in the India aid bill, H. R. 3791, now before the House. There is a considerable history of American imports of strategic materials from India, and I think there can be no disagreement that it is in our national interest to maintain and if possible increase this flow.

In this connection I wish to read a portion of Prime Minister Nehru's statement in the Indian Parliament last Thursday:

> There is a reference to our supplying various kinds of materials to the United States of America in part payment for the grain supplied. We shall gladly supply such materials as are available in India and can be spared by us. But I should like to make it clear that it is a fundamental part of our foreign policy that such material as is particularly related to the production of atomic or like weapons should not be supplied by us to foreign countries.

That was the contention we had to deal with on the subject of strategic materials. It seemed to be the principle of the Indians not to export anything which had to do with atomic weapons.

This statement by Mr. Nehru indicates clearly that India will supply raw materials in part payment for our aid, with the exception he mentioned, which applies particularly to monazite sands on which India maintains a statutory embargo. The language of the new amendment does not require that monazite or any other specified material be included in the repayment, and I commend that approach because I believe it would be poor statesmanship for the United States to seek to coerce India on this point by means of this legislation, the essence of which is the saving of human lives by emergency food assistance.

I believe our Government should proceed vigorously to prevail on India to lift its embargo on the export of monazite and other materials that are now prohibited.

I hope we shall be able to include monazite, but I believe it to be a matter for negotiation between our representatives and representatives of India. However, I think it would be a tragedy if this humanitarian program were to collapse over the question of strategic materials, which poses an entirely separate issue.

CONCLUSION—THE IMPORTANCE OF SPEED

In conclusion, Mr. President, in these remarks I have sought to cover the most important provisions of the bill and to express to the Senate my strong feeling of its importance, both as a matter of national interest and in light of our moral duty to suffering human beings. Before I close I should like to stress the necessity of acting with speed on this measure. The original target date for the beginning of shipments was April 1—over a month ago. That target date was calculated as the latest that we could begin and still have 2,000,000 tons of grain on hand in India in time to meet the emergency during the summer months. In the meantime conditions in some parts of India have grown very serious. In some places the government rationing system has temporarily collapsed for lack of grain. There have been some food riots in which people were killed. Troops have been called out in critical areas to prevent increased disorder. There is a threat of large-scale spontaneous migration out of the worst food deficit areas, which all the disorder and suffering that such migration involves.

Mr. President, this emergency aid to India is a clear case in which our national interests and our Christian instincts join together in a call for neighborly help to human beings in their hour of deep distress. The mistakes and failings of the Indian Government are well known and have been fully discussed, but we all know that these things do not change or remove the stark fact of hunger. We know and the world knows that America has the means to relieve that hunger which afflicts millions of men, women, and children in India today and which will grow more serious in the months immediately before us. The future of our relations with all the people of Asia will surely be affected by our decision. We are faced with an inescapable moral challenge. I submit that we must meet it now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First I wish to commend the able Senator from New Jersey for the very fine presentation which he has given us, and at the same time I wish to say the same thing with reference to the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who served as the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the matter. I believe we have had just about as complete a presentation as we could have of the problem and program.

There are two points concerning which I wish to address some remarks to the able Senator from New Jersey. First, with reference to strategic materials, of course we would like very much to get them from India. India does not wish us to tie any strings to the bill. We see in the press from time to time insistent demands that we tie in such conditions. I am rather of the impression that perhaps a great many of our people do not understand the full facts relating to the subject. Is not the situation very largely that India is not opposed to selling us the necessary materials, but that she is eager to develop within her own country the industry for processing them, in order to give employment to her own people in the development of

raw materials into the finished or semi-finished product?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is undoubtedly one of the problems involved in the whole discussion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We ran into the same situation in connection with jute, burlap, and some of the other strategic materials which the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have the floor, Mr. President. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor. I was asking the Senator to yield. However, I shall be glad to interrupt my questioning at this point if the Senator from New Jersey wishes to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Following the question asked by the Senator from Alabama, in addition to helping India build herself up, is not the question of blocked sterling involved? Can India get raw material to the United States except on a barter basis, if then?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course that is involved. India has large balances of blocked sterling in London, but she cannot get the necessary dollars. We went all over the question of whether we should ask for sterling credits in London. The dollar situation was such that India could not pay in dollars for what she was getting.

So we went back to the question of barter. Some of our colleagues thought we should name this, that, or the other strategic material. Personally I think that would be unwise; I do not think we should limit the matter in that way.

There are certain kinds and types of strategic raw materials which we would like to obtain, of course. If obtaining those commodities is left to negotiation between representatives of the United States and representatives of India, I think that transaction can largely be applied to the discharge of this obligation; but I should hate to see placed in the bill limitations which would specify so many tons of this, that, or the other commodity, because we cannot foresee what the situation will be, and such an arrangement would not give us sufficient flexibility in the negotiations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey another question, if he will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would not a barter arrangement be entirely contrary to our customary concept of the economic system? In other words, we have never adopted the barter concept in international trade.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct. If we started it, it would be difficult to lay down the proper rules.

I think some barter arrangements will enter into this situation, in that if it is possible to obtain some raw materials as a result of this situation, following our giving of the aid, that probably will be worked out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I know the Senator from New Jersey has gone thoroughly into this situation. Regardless of the problem of finding a solution for the friction—much of which I think is seeming, rather than real——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Regardless of that, does not the able Senator from New Jersey feel that on the basis of the future arrangements which we shall work out, we certainly shall be able to build a better and a more friendly reltaionship between the United States and India?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I know that I am expressing a view which is held by the distinguished Senator from Alabama when I say that is one of the most important motivations in the entire enterprise. Entirely aside from giving help to starving women and children, which we always wish to do whenever we see such a situation existing anywhere in the world today, we are most desirous of having a better understanding with the people in the far eastern area and having them understand that regardless of whether they wish to have this matter handled on a business basis or on a grant basis, we are prepared to meet the needs which are presented by the existence of a starvation condition anywhere in the world.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should also like to ask the Senator whether it is true that we must recognize the truth that General MacArthur laid down so well in his speech before the two Houses of Congress, namely, that the people of Asia today have a feeling of the need for self-determination more than at any time in the history of the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator from Alabama. Before he entered the Chamber, I read at some length the paragraphs in General MacArthur's speech in which that subject was covered. I agree entirely with that principle, and I base my concurrence in it on my own experience at Dublin last year, where we learned very definitely the feeling of those people in regard to that matter and their keen desire to attain those objectives. They are very anxious to help themselves to attain those objectives, and are most anxious to have us give them whatever service we can render in that connection. I know that General MacArthur will agree with my statement—and I repeat it—that those people are endeavoring to find their own place in the destiny of nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly agree with the Senator from New Jersey, and I am glad he has brought out that point. I know of no better time to bring it out than now, when we are discussing the present situation in India.

As a matter of fact, that statement applies to all areas of the world and to nearly all countries—certainly to the countries to which we usually refer as underdeveloped countries or perhaps as backward areas. Today there is a resurgence of independent action such as we have never seen before. If we are to make friends in the family of nations, we must recognize that spirit. Does not the Senator from New Jersey agree that is true?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree entirely. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama, who last fall was a very able representative of this Government in the United Nations, that undoubtedly he developed the feeling he has just expressed because of the contacts he had at the United Nations' meetings with representatives of the other nations who were there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the able Senator that it was my privilege to serve there—and it was my principal work there—as a member of the committee which handled economic matters. I have said many times before that in that way I became impressed far more than I ever would have been otherwise with the existence throughout the world of a great desire on the part of people to better their condition. They are looking to us, as the Senator from New Jersey has pointed out, for leadership and guidance in helping them to help themselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is the real point—to help them help themselves. I thank the Senator from Alabama for making that great contribution to this debate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not intend to go into this matter; but inasmuch as the Senator from New Jersey has suggested it, perhaps I may impose on his time long enough to say—and I have said this many, many times—that most of the people of the United States and, I dare say, most people throughout the world in considering the United Nations and its work think of the part of its program which they see on the television or which they read in the newspaper headlines, namely, the things the Security Council does or the things the Political Committee does. People so often fail to realize that when the Charter of the United Nations was written, just as much emphasis was laid on the economic side as on the political side. As a matter of fact, if a poll were taken among the 60 nations which constitute the membership of the United Nations, to ascertain their opinion of the best way to build a peaceful world, they would say that instead of something the Security Council might do or something the Political Committee might do, the best way to attain that goal would be by means of the program of helping the underdeveloped nations develop themselves and helping create for their people a higher standard of living.

The United Nations' study made among 70 nations shows that more than 30 of them, if I recall correctly, have a per capita annual income of $100 or less; and 13 of them, if I correctly recall, have a per capita annual income of $50 or less; whereas the people of the United State have a per capita annual income of $1,500, on the average. So I think we can understand some of the strivings and the hopes of the people of other lands—strivings and hopes which often must appear to be absolutely futile in their great desire to do something to lift their people to a higher standard of living.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am sure the Senator from Alabama will agree with me that the studying of those problems and the effort to solve them and the effort to help those people probably constitute the best road to peace we can think of.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I think it is the greatest challenge we face today.

I have supported as strongly as has the Senator from New Jersey every bit of our defense program; but I think one of the great dangers with which we are confronted is the possibility that in stressing our defense program we may forget to keep our eye on the goal the Senator from New Jersey has just mentioned, namely, the need to help those nations as soon as we can possibly afford to do so, and to the greatest degree that we can afford to do so, so as to help them help themselves to obtain better conditions.

Mr. President, I rose to discuss an entirely different matter. At this time I should like to ask one question, which will be brief. Nevertheless I wish to ask the question, because I think the subject of it is a matter of concern to a considerable number of our people. I know that the Senator from New Jersey has already discussed it in part. I refer now to the publicity given to this matter. We have seen in the newspapers in the past few days, for instance, that both Red China and Red Russia have beaten us to the game, so to speak. I remember that much ado was made over the fact that Soviet Russia was shipping 50,000 tons of grain to India. The able Senator from New Jersey mentioned that earlier in his remarks, and spoke of what a small amount that is as compared to the 2,000,000 tons of grain we are speaking of now.

Is it not true that the 50,000 tons of grain which Russia has shipped to India is grain which was purchased, just as India has purchased hundreds of thousands of tons of grain in the United States in the recent past? I believe I have read that in the past few months India has purchased 400,000 tons of wheat in the United States in the normal channels of trade. As compared to the 50,000 tons of grain which have gone from Russia to India, 400,000 tons of wheat have gone in the normal channels of trade from the United States to India.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have the figures of this past year, and I have shown where India is getting her grain this year. We are, in connection with this emergency bill, proposing to provide about 2,000,000 tons of grain, but 4,000,000 tons in addition to that is included in the total deficit of 6,000,000 tons. A few moments ago I put in the RECORD a table which shows where those supplies came from; according to which, as the Senator said, the United States showed up as the largest participant in the whole program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey further yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yet the Senator argues, I am sure quite fairly, that there is urgent need of action on our part in order not only to stop adverse publicity but to meet the very acute need in India and to stave off hunger and famine. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has been standing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey two questions regarding the technical details. Does he not see a very considerable advantage in amending this bill so as to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify that the wheat which would go to India under the bill is not needed for the subsistence of the people of the United States, or words to that effect, as in the ECA program? In other words, when our crop this year is being reduced we first want to make certain that we satisfy the requirements of the people of our country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is entirely correct. I may say to the Senator that I referred to that matter in my remarks, and as an aside, when the Senator had stepped out, I said I understood that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was going to offer an amendment along that line, an amendment which I should be very happy to support, and which I am sure my colleagues who are cosponsors of the bill would be happy to support. I think it very pertinent now to have such a provision included in the bill in order to clarify some doubts which have arisen in the minds of some persons as to whether we are going to have enough wheat for ourselves and for export.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator that I have offered such an amendment in the name of the senior Senator from Michigan and myself.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for doing so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My other question is this: The bill contains a proviso which will permit the expenditure of $20,000,000 for the purpose of rehabilitating ships, if in the opinion of the President it becomes necessary. Would it not be helpful to include a provision to the effect that the President shall certify in writing to the Committee on Foreign Relations, or to the Congress, the fact that such a sum is needed for the rehabilitation of ships?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The suggestion, was made to me before I began my remarks, that the President might simply make a public proclamation to the effect that the ships would be needed in order to meet this emergency, and in order to justify the RFC in making an advance. But it should be noted, I may say, that under the bill the advance may be made only "to the extent the President finds that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation," and so forth. It should also be noted that the ceiling on the amount authorized to take the Liberty ships out of mothballs is estimated at $20,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My thought would be to ask the President to certify in writing to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should be very glad to accept an amendment, so far as I can do so. I represent 29 different sponsors. I cannot quite bind them all, but so far as I can, I should be glad to approve having such a provision in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the bill, in its original form, provided for an outright grant of 2,000,000 tons of wheat.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say to the Senator that in committee we provided half grant and half loan.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the original bill provided for an outright grant, did it not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Originally it was entirely a matter of grant, that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was that request made by the Government of India, or was it suggested by our Government?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am advised that the Government of India asked for a loan upon reasonable terms—upon easy terms—but our Government felt that the wiser method of dealing with this question, since it involved consumable goods, rather than capital investment, would be by means of a grant, with the corresponding counterpart funds, a subject which has caused quite a debate back and forth throughout the negotiations. The Senator is quite correct, that in its original form, the bill provided for an outright grant.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has been stated on the floor of the Senate several times that the Government of India merely asked for credit terms.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is substantially correct, and Mr. Nehru reiterated it last Thursday, when he said that either one of the bills was satisfactory. Of course, it was up to us to decide what we wanted to do, but he said that he thought they rather preferred the House bill, which was less complex, and the language of which was based entirely upon a loan basis, not upon a grant basis. Evidently they want a loan. I have advised the Senate in my remarks that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and other Senators are about to offer an amendment, to place it on a loan basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood the Senator was going to support the principle of a loan.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. As I say, I cannot speak for all my cosponsors, but I think they would probably be willing, in the light of Mr. Nehru's remarks, to agree to the loan basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. From page 3 of the report I notice that the Government of India has purchased 3,900,000 tons of food grains. Does the Senator from

New Jersey know whether that was purchased on a cash basis or on a credit basis?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think they used their resources to take care of what amounted to approximately 4,000,000 tons out of a need for 6,000,000 tons. They could handle it under their regular method of finance.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that they would buy, more or less, for cash, to the extent of their needs, with the exception of the 2,000,000 tons which they want from us. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct; bearing in mind, I may say to the Senator, that they purchased some of that on the regular financial terms, from the United States as well as from other countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any evidence produced to show whether any other country offered to assist India to the extent that was proposed in the original bill?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not to that extent, no.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did any other country offer to assist India, except us?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We have covered that in the Committee's report, which I have before me. I read from page 4:

> The United States is one of the few places left in the world which does have food grains available for 1951. According to testimony before the committee, the United States will carry over at the end of this crop year from four hundred and twenty-five to four hundred and fifty million bushels of wheat.

It is possible that that has been slightly reduced since then.

Mr. ELLENDER. That leads to my next question. I should like to ask my distinguished friend from New Jersey whether, in considering this allocation of grain to India, the committee took into consideration the grain shortage which now faces our country?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The committee took that into consideration, and I may say that those of us who have been working on this bill immediately called up the Department of Agriculture, immediately called up the ECA, and immediately went to headquarters, to ascertain whether the anticipated grain shortage in the United States would affect the domestic situation. As I have just said to the senior Senator from Massachusetts, if he offers an amendment requiring a certification by the Secretary of Agriculture, in the protection of our own people, I shall certainly be glad to support such an amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean the insertion of a provision to the bill, making it obligatory that there be a certification by the Department of Agriculture as to our ability to sell or barter grains to meet the requirements of India?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to a matter about which the Senator from Louisiana inquired, namely, the obtaining of wheat from other countries, is it not true that India probably could buy this wheat from the United States, if she had some way of paying for it in money that we could accept, and that India has been able, in making purchases from various other countries, to pay for the wheat with soft currency, or, as in the case of Argentina, has been able to use the barter process, but that she lacked the dollars with which to buy?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the point is that, if the same offer were made to us, we might be able to make some kind of terms with India. India was willing, as I understood, to purchase this wheat on any easy credit basis, but, instead of doing that, we said, "Oh, no, let us not sell, we will give it to them." I am wondering how long we can continue to give, give, give.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say to the Senator, as I said a little earlier, there was discussion as to whether the grain should be supplied on the grant basis, or on the part-grant basis, not on an all-out loan basis, because of the counterpart fund feature and the possibility of aiding agricultural processes in India so as to do something toward alleviating such difficulties in the future.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the counterpart fund would be used for the rehabilitation of India itself. We would not receive any part of that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; but we would get the benefit of India progressing toward her own self-development.

Mr. President, in light of the discussion there has been handed to me a statement by the Department of Agriculture of the United States with reference to the wheat outlook, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in order to indicate our situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Why not read it into the RECORD?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has been suggested that I read the statement into the RECORD. It is as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES WHEAT OUTLOOK SUPPLIED BY THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Current May 10 official crop forecasts indicated that United States wheat production in 1951 would be about 991,000,000 bushels. The estimated carry-over for July 1, 1951, is around 425,000,000 bushels or 423,000,000 a year earlier.

The most recent—May 10—official forecast of the 1951 winter-wheat crop indicates a harvest of 682,000,000 bushels, as compared to 751,000,000 bushels actually harvested in 1950. The estimate this time last year was 689,000,000 bushels, and 751,000,000 were harvested. The preliminary forecast of the 1951 spring-wheat crop indicates a year of about 309,000,000 bushels, as compared to 276,000,000 bushels harvested in 1950.

It is estimated that the carry-over on July 1, 1951, will be 425,000,000 bushels which compares favorably with the prewar (1932–41) average carry-over of 235,000,000 bushels. During this period, however, United States exports were at a low level compared with present movement. After taking into account United States requirement for food consumption, livestock feed, waste, seed and exports, including quantities for shipment to Japan and Korea, the United States can supply India with 2,000,000 tons (about 75,000,000 bushels) of wheat without jeopardizing its immediate supply, but it will, of course, reduce the prospective carry-over in 1951–52.

While the United States can spare the whole amount in wheat without cutting into our requirements, other grains or their equivalents can be used to make up the 2,000,000 tons for India. Emergency food aid can be supplied to India without harm to the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield the floor, unless the Senator has a question.

Mr. STENNIS. I was seeking the floor in my own right.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EMBARGO ON SHIPMENT OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND OTHER MATERIALS TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I trust that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 31, submitted by the Senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], will be quickly adopted by the Congress. This resolution "urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China."

Mr. President, when the United Nations Charter was being formulated, it was thought by many that one of the strongest weapons it provided for curbing a potential aggressor, or an aggressor, was the imposition of economic sanctions. In actual practice, we have seen it is easier for the United Nations to engage in an almost year-long war involving thousands of casualties, than it is to get the member nations to adopt measures to shut off arms, ammunition, and other materials that add to the war-making power of our enemy.

The time is ripe for the passage of this resolution by the Congress of the United States. The United Kingdom and France have indicated their willingness to support a move by the United States in the United Nations for affirmative action regarding an economic blockade, and we should promptly act with what I believe will be a unanimous vote of the Congress, thus showing to the other member nations of the United Nations and to the world, our strong desires and also our appreciation to the other member nations for their support of our proposal.

Mr. President, since I prepared these remarks I have obtained from the news ticker an Associated Press report that the Special Sanctions Committee of the United Nations, by a vote of 11 to 0, have agreed to recommend to the United Nations General Assembly the adoption of the resolution introduced by the United States with reference to the embargo. Two nations, Yugoslavia and

Burma, named to the committee, declined to serve. Egypt abstained from voting because she has no trade with Communist China and because of another reason mentioned. The nations voting in favor of the embargo were the United States, Britain, France, Australia, Canada, Brazil, Philippines, Burma, Mexico, and Venezuela.

In fact, Mr. President, we have already too long delayed pressing for such a program. When I say "we," I mean the United States. I think it is a glaring instance of our failure to press forward every day, every week, and every month since Red China entered the war, for the control, by the strongest possible means, of an economic embargo.

An inherent weakness of the United Nations has been glaringly exposed, when we have let 6 months of actual fighting pass without affirmative action as to the embargo. The United Nations voted overnight to send troops to Korea, but for more than 6 months has delayed the embargo that should have been imposed as soon as Red China's aggressive action was recognized. It seems to me that the blame lies at our door, as well as at the door of other member nations, for this inexcusable delay. Of course, we have been urging this action all along, but my point is that we have not urged it strongly enough.

I hope I am not being ungenerous when I say that I personally believe that our allies who have been fighting with us in Korea have been dragging their feet most unfortunately on this very point, and I am glad to see at least a partial change in policy on their part.

I wish to commend the authors of this resolution for its broad, sweeping language, particularly the words, "and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China." Virtually all the materials are strategic under conditions of modern warfare.

I express the hope that the United Nations will not get lost in debate over what is or what is not "strategic" materials. To be effective, the embargo must be broad and sweeping. What we need is immediate action.

I trust, Mr. President, that this resolution will be taken up as the first order of business tomorrow, and that it will then speedily receive the unanimous vote of the Congress, which it so well deserves.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to express my very warm appreciation of the kind words the Senator has spoken with reference to the resolution submitted by myself and, I am happy to say, joined in by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if it is not his view that the unanimous approval of the resolution by the Senate and then by the House of Representatives would almost surely speed the action now being considered by committees of the United Nations, looking finally to the declaration of an embargo by the General Assembly of the United Nations? Does not the Senator believe that prompt consideration and the unanimous adoption of the resolution by the two Houses of Congress would have the same result as that obtained by the passage of the McClellan resolution at the time the United Nations had been delaying action for weeks and months upon a simple resolution branding Red China as an aggressor, in which instance, as the Senator will recall, affirmative action was taken by the United Nations within a very few days after the demonstration of unanimous support from both sides of the aisle when the McClellan resolution was agreed to by the Senate? Does not the Senator believe, in short, that the adoption of the concurrent resolution would accomplish a speeding of the final action so eagerly desired upon the pending measure now being considered in the General Assembly?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, Mr. President. I can put it this way, that failure on the part of the American Congress to act formally on this subject, failure to pass a measure along this line, would certainly be taken as a lack of interest and as a failure to support the United States resolution itself. On the other had, I think the Senator from Florida is correct in his contention that affirmative action in the Senate would greatly speed up and strengthen and bring forth positive affirmative action on the resolution in the United Nations, and it also would strengthen and increase the chances to have strong language included in the resolution. The tendency may be to water it down before the United Nations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly approve the Senator's estimate of the situation. I believe that the tendency may manifest itself to deal with the subject with kid gloves rather than with brawn and good red muscle tissue. It is the latter kind of action which I think the situation requires.

My question would be this: Does not the Senator think that now, while the iron is hot by reason of the fact that our allies, Great Britain and France, have at long last shown their complete willingness and even eagerness to deal with the situation, is the uniquely appropriate time to press the matter in the United Nations to an immediate, affirmative conclusion?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from Florida is entirely correct that we ought to press on all fronts. In the United Nations there ought to be strong representations from the State Department and from the Chief Executive and other agencies of our Government. They certainly should center their interest and fire upon this timely subject. Again I want to commend the Senator from Florida for submitting this very fine concurrent resolution, and again call attention to its timeliness.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very grateful to the able Senator from Mississippi for his comment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. GILLETTE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Oscar B. Ryder, of Virginia, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission, for the term expiring June 16, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified.

That concludes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. GILLETTE. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 15, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of May 2, 1951):

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. John L. Hall, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowance of a vice admiral while serving as commander, western sea frontier.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Oscar B. Ryder, of Virginia, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1957.

IN THE ARMY

Appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be captains

Margaret K. Aldrich, ANC, N772113.
Elizabeth R. Perry, ANC, N797300.

To be first lieutenants

Dolores L. Evanson, WMSC, M2810.
Genevieve Lescsak, WMSC, M1125.

To be second lieutenants

Jean C. Altenburger, WAC, L1010260.
Clarissa L. Aping, WAC, L1010279.
Alice M. Barr, WAC, L1010258.
Eva M. Benson, WAC, L1010264.
Frances J. Biddle, WAC, L1010267.
Patricia L. Bouldin, WAC, L1010261.
Barbara J. Brown, WAC, L1010263.
Eva M. Burgess, WAC, L1010255.
Salona Butler, WAC, L1010278.
Helen R. Coplen, WAC, L1010273.
Vivian E. Davis, WAC, L1010276.
Irene S. Ebel, WAC, L1010274.
Irene Evans, WAC, L1010256.
Pola L. Garrett, WAC, L1010238.
Irene S. Gulledge, WAC, L1010244.
Ruth Holland, WAC, L1010233.
Janet A. Jawelak, WAC, L1010237.
Shirley J. Justice, WAC, L1010250.
Esther E. Lenox, WAC, L1010270.
Sonja G. Lunoe, WAC, L1010241.
Kitt M. MacMichael, WAC, L1010245.
Phyllis J. Morsman, WAC, L1010259.
Patricia J. Pomeroy, WAC, L1010272.
Dorothy Sherba, WAC, L1010275.
Jacquelyn R. Sollars, WAC, L1010257.
Barbara J. Wardell, WAC, L1010282.
Helen A. Way, WAC, L1010280.
Martha L. Weeks, WAC, L1010269.
Elizabeth A. Whittaker, WAC, L1010281.
Kathleen I. Wilkes, WAC, L1010234.
Sadie E. Yoshizaki, WAC, L1010236.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 14, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, we thank Thee for Thy gracious and beneficent plan of home and family life which Thou art continually seeking to hallow with Thy presence.

We rejoice in the privilege and blessedness which was ours to observe a day dedicated both to the sacred memory of mothers no longer with us in the flesh and to the glorious ministry of mothers who are still with us to share their life and their love.

We are grateful for that sacrificial mother love which surrounded and cared for us long before we knew it and for that kindness and tenderness which always deemed us better than we are.

Humbly and penitently we confess that we have not kept inviolate those ideals of nobility of character which our mothers nourished within our hearts and that we have not lived up to the pride and hope which shone in their eyes.

Grant that Mother's Day may have been for all of us not only a time of commemoration but of consecration, and may its sacred significance abide with us as a blessed influence.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 10, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 28, 1951:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to give the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

On May 11, 1951:

H. R. 139. An act for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis;

H. R. 1422. An act for the relief of Carl Parks;

H. R. 1798. An act for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased;

H. R. 2175. An act for the relief of Addie Dean Corner Scott;

H. R. 2304. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers; and

H. R. 2714. An act for the relief of Marcelle Lecomte.

On May 12, 1951:

H. R. 136. An act allowing the consumer of gasoline to deduct, for income-tax purposes, State taxes on gasoline imposed on the wholesaler and passed on to the consumer.

On May 14, 1951:

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Oksana Stepanovna Kasenkina;

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins;

H. R. 820. An act for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis;

H. R. 898. An act for the relief of Gunter Arno Thelemann;

H. R. 1117. An act for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of Pietro Giannettino; and

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Elena Erbez.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3587. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROVIDING BENEFITS FOR PERSONS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES AFTER JUNE 27, 1950

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAY 11, 1951.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority heretofore granted, the Clerk received today from the Secretary of the Senate the following message:

That the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) entitled "Joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950."

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, May 10, 1951, he did on Friday, May 11, 1951, sign the following enrolled joint resolution:

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, so much misinformation has been spread about this joint resolution, which Congress hurriedly passed on last Thursday, and which has now been approved by the President and is Public Law 28, that, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I think I should give the House, and the country, the real facts concerning this measure.

The amendments which I offered on the floor, and which were approved by the House and agreed to in the Senate, considerably broadened the resolution as originally submitted to the Congress, and made it really effective. My amendments added burial benefits and domiciliary care, and in addition to that, made it clear that this legislation would also provide benefits for the dependents of veterans who served on and after June 27, 1950, and who were entirely left out of the original resolution. This latter point is particularly important, since it most vitally affects the widows and orphans of the men who are dying in Korea.

This measure, which is now Public Law 28, provides the following benefits:

First. Hospital care and domiciliary care for non-service-connected disabilities in the same manner as now provided for World War II veterans. This means that a man can be admitted to a Veterans' Administration hospital for an injury not received or connected with the service where a statement is signed that he is unable to pay for the hospitalization and medical care and where a bed is available. Service-connected cases and emergency cases continue to have priority for admission.

Second. Burial benefits in the amount of $150 and an American flag.

Third. Compensation and pension to both the veterans and their dependents, at the rates and conditions set forth in the table below:

Rates for wartime service-connected disabilities under Public Law 2, 73d Cong., as amended, and Veterans Regulations (war service-connected rates, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, pt. I)

10 percent disability	$15
20 percent disability	30
30 percent disability	45
40 percent disability	60
50 percent disability	75
60 percent disability	90
70 percent disability	105
80 percent disability	120
90 percent disability	135
Total disability	150

Anatomical loss, or loss of use of 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, rates (a) to (j) increased monthly by	$42
Anatomical loss, or loss of use of 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of used by	[1] 42
Anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or blind both eyes with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	240
Anatomical loss, or loss of use of 2 extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	282
Anatomical loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or help as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or suffered anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation	318
Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more rates in (l) to (n), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, monthly compensation	360
In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of	360

[1] But in no event to exceed $360.

Additional disability compensation because of dependents [1]

Wife, no child	$21.00
Wife, 1 child	35.00
Wife, 2 children	45.50
Wife 3 or more children	56.00
No wife, 1 child	14.00
No wife, 2 children	24.50
No wife, 3 or more children	35.00
Dependent parent or parents:	
1	17.50
2	35.00

[1] Above rates are for 100 percent disability. If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 50 percent, additional compensation is authorized in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in the applicable table, above, as the degree of disability bears to the total disability; e. g., war service-connected disability of 50 percent, compensation rate $75—if veteran has a wife, his compensation is increased as follows: $75+$10.50=$85.50.

Rates of compensation to widows, children, and parents of deceased veterans

For service-connected death:	
Widow, no child	$75
Widow, 1 child	105
Each additional child	25
No widow, 1 child	58
No widow, 2 children	82
No widow, 3 children	106
Each additional child	20
Dependent parents:	
1 parent	60
2 parents (each)	35

Non-service-connected pension for veterans

90 days or more service or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty. In active service before cessation of hostilities: [1, 2]	
Rates:	
Permanent and total	$60
Rated permanent and total for continuous period of 10 years or reach age 65 years	72

Any impairment of mind or body which is sufficient to render it impossible for the average person to follow a substantially gainful occupation and where it is reasonably certain that such impairment will continue throughout the life of the disabled person. Administrator authorized to classify diseases and disorders as permament and total, where justified in his judgment. Willful misconduct or vicious habits a bar.

[1] Subject to income limitations of $1,000 if single and $2,500 if married or with dependents. In determining annual income, payments of war risk term insurance, U. S. Government life (converted) insurance (national service life insurance, regulatory) payments under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, and amounts received under provisions of Federal Overtime Pay Act of 1945, other than increases in basic compensation, not considered.

[2] Any veteran meeting service requirements and income limits less than 55 years of age who has a single disability of 60 percent or more, or 2 or more disabilities, 1 of which is 40 percent or more, making a combined rating of 70 percent or more, and who is unemployable, shall be entitled to $60 a month pension. The same rate applies to a man aged 55 who has disability of 60 percent or more, single or combined, and upon reaching age 60, the disability requirement is reduced to 50 percent. Upon reaching age 65, the veteran must show a disability of 10 per cent or more and the rate is $72. In each case a finding of unemployability must be made (extension 5 to 1945 Disability Rating Schedule.)

Non-service-connected pension for dependents [1]

Widow	$42.00
Widow, 1 child	54.00
Each additional child	6.00
No widow, 1 child	21.60
No widow, 2 children	32.40
No widow, 3 children	43.20
Each additional child	4.80

[1] Subject to income limitation of $1,000 as to widow without child, or a child, and $2,500 as to widow with child or children. In determining annual income, any payments by U. S. Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration not considered. Where payments to widow disallowed or discontinued due to income limitation, payment may be made to child or children as though there is no widow. Veteran must have had a service-connected disability of some degree in order for widow to qualify for pension.

Fourth. One-year presumptive period of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases listed in Public Law 748, Eightieth Congress. This generally provides for a 1-year presumption of service connection after the date of discharge or for such additional period as may be indicated by a medical finding as to the time of incubation of such disease. Active pulmonary tuberculosis has a 3-year presumptive period, in accordance with Public Law 573 of the Eighty-first Congress.

Fifth. Public Law 28 is restricted to laws and veterans' regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration and thus does not involve retirement rights which some former members of the Armed Forces enjoy. Neither does it provide for preference in the obtaining of Federal employment on a parity with World War II veterans.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am also including at this point a letter with enclosures which I have received from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, containing a full report on this case.

The matters referred to read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington D. C., May 11, 1951.

Hon. J. E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: In reply to your request of May 11, I am glad to give you complete information on the case of David R. Arellano, Jr., of Tucson, Ariz.

On March 26, 1951, this veteran sought hospitalization at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Tucson, Ariz. At that time he had never filed a claim for disability in connection with his service. He had an honorable discharge from the Marine Corps, dated January 24, 1951, issued at Treasure Island, Calif. The reason for the discharge was dependency not medical consideration.

Under existing law, the Veterans' Administration had authority to hospitalize Korean veterans only under provisions of VA regulations which authorize hospitalization in case of emergency to potential beneficiaries.

Examination of the veteran at the hospital showed that he was in need of medical care but it was determined that this need was not sufficiently urgent to be considered to constitute an emergency.

The hospital at Tucson was sufficiently interested in the case so that on April 2, 1951, they telegraphed central office stating that the veteran was in need of an operation and requesting details regarding eligibility for hospitalization. On April 3, central office wired the hospital that no law had been passed by the Congress and, therefore, Korean veterans could only be hospitalized under the provisions made for peacetime veterans.

Mr. Arellano was advised that he should file a claim for compensation and that following adjudication of that claim his eligibility could be determined.

After receiving your letter, I talked with the manager of the hospital at Tucson. He informed me that the hospital had taken a blood count, performed an X-ray of the jaw to determine whether or not there was any bone involvement. Their examination revealed a secondary anemia and a cyst of the submaxillary gland.

Further examinations at the Pima County Hospital, where Mr. Arellano is now hospitalized led to the belief that he may have Hodgkins disease, although this has not been definitely determined.

A biopsy has been performed to secure specimen material for use of the pathologist in microscopic study. There has been developed no positive evidence of carcinoma of the throat as was stated in the newspaper article and no operation has been performed.

Mr. Arellano has been informed that should Senate Joint Resolution 72, which has passed both Houses of the Congress, be signed

by the President, that he will be offered hospitalization in the VA hospital at Tucson and the transfer will be effected if he wishes.

Copies of wire of April 2 from the manager, requesting information of central office; reply of April 3 from central office to the manager; telegraphic report filed by the Tucson hospital manager on May 10; and wire of April 11 from information service representative from that area reviewing the entire case are attached for your information.

The manager at Tucson is filing a telegraphic report, supplying the information I received over the telephone today. This will be forwarded you as soon as it is received.

Sincerely,

CARL R. GRAY,
Administrator.

From Gaines, Manager, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Tucson, Ariz.

To Assistant Chief Medical Director, Outpatient Svc-Veterans' Administration Central Office, Washington, D. C.:

David Reyes Arellano, corporal, United States Marine Corps, SN1052555, enlisted March 18, 1950, Tucson, Ariz., honorably discharged for dependency, January 24, 1951, Treasure Island, Calif., served in Korea, applying for hospitalization for cyst of submaxillary gland which he states he had in Korea. No claim filed. Condition not emergency but examining physician states operation should not be delayed. Report delayed. Please furnish as soon as possible details regarding eligibility of Korean vets under R&PR 6047 /C/ and 6047 /D/ / 5; HP 10MB/.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
April 3, 1951.

MANAGER,
Veterans' Administration Hospital,
Tucson, Ariz.:

Reurtel April 2 concerning David Reyes Arellano, serial 1052555. No law passed by Congress to date regarding Korean veterans. Therefore at present they are not [repeat] not considered war veterans and must meet eligibility requirements of peacetime veterans. Mr. Arellano should file claim for compensation and following adjudication determination can be made regarding eligibility.

HARDING.

MAY 11, 1951.

From Dr. Justin E. Gaines, Manager, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Tucson, Ariz.

To Chg Medical Director, Veterans' Administration Central Office, Washington, D. C.
(Attention Dr. E. Eastwood, Chief, commanding officer, Outpatient Operations Division.)

Reference is made to telephone conversation with your office this date pd. On March 26, 1951, David Reyes Arellano, claim No. none, reported to this hospital and presented his discharge papers showing the following information: Cln enlisted March 18, 1950, Tucson, Ariz. Smcln honorably discharged January 24, 1951, Treasure Island, Calif. Smcln serial No. 1052555 pd. due to the fact that this veteran had service in Korea his discharge was carefully studied and it was noted that the reason for discharge was dependency. There was a note on the discharge that the man had been wounded in action, however this had no bearing on the type of discharge. In my opinion at the time the man was interviewed he was not eligible, however, I referred him to the examining physician to determine whether or not he was a medical emergency. He was examined by an out-patient physician who referred him to the Eent specialist. This physician decided that the man needed hospitalization for glandular enlargement of neck provided he was eligible. However, both examining physicians further stated that he was not a medical emergency. A Twx with detailed information was sent to the Assistant Chief Medical Director, Washington, D. C., on April 2, 1951, and reply received April 3, 1951, stating that Korean veterans' eligibility was the same as a peacetime veteran. Certain laboratory examinations were accomplished Cma veteran advised professionally and urged to file claim immediately.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *May 11, 1951.*

To Veterans' Administration Central Office, Washington, D. C.
(Attention Director, Information Service.)

As per your telephonic request this date the following additional information is furnished regarding the physical status, medical advice, and follow-up in the case of David Arellano, veteran of Korean campaign. Veteran honorably discharged United States Marine Corps January 24, 1951, for dependency reasons. Applied at Veterans' Administration hospital Tucson for medical attention for first time on March 26, 1951. Gave history of auto accident in November 1950 in Korea when he was struck in chest. Occasional pains in chest since. More often when yawning. Principal complaint, however, was a swelling under right jaw which he stated he had noticed for the past 2 months. Examination on that date showed a small swelling under right jaw; heart and lungs were negative; enlarged tonsils; temperature, 99°; pulse, 72; respiration, 16; X-ray of chest on March 26, 1951, was essentially normal, with no evidence of recent bone structure damage. He was diagnosed at that time as possibly having a submaxillary gland cyst. The veteran was not considered a hospital emergency by either of the two examining physicians and in view of his apparent ineligibility for Veterans' Administration hospitalization was advised to apply for county hospital care and attention for further study and indicated treatment. He was advised that if we could be of any further assistance within the law and regulations to contact us at any time. Essentially nothing further was heard from this veteran except a few inquiries from various sources as to why this man was not taken over by our hospital until May 1, 1951. In the meantime, an American Legion service officer who had been working closely with us on this case had been endeavoring to obtain country care for the veteran. On May 1, 1951, the veteran was again examined in our out-patient department. The mass under the right jaw was slightly larger 2¾ inches, with some swelling around same, with some palpable glands in the anterior cervical chain. A tentative diagnosis of Hodgkins disease was made by the examining physician. Temperature was 99.4 and pulse 80. Another chest X-ray taken on this date as well as an X-ray of the right jaw showed no bony involvement. Blood count showed a mild secondary anemia and an elevated sedimentation rate. Steps were taken by our chief professional services, social service, and the American Legion service officer through direct contact to obtain a bed for the veteran in the local county hospital and same was secured on May 7 (the exact date of admission uncertain). Through telephone contact with the medical superintendent of the county hospital, we have learned that a biopsy of the mass was accomplished on May 8, 1951, and a frozen section study revealed a condition to be yet differentiated by closer study between sarcoma and Hodgkins disease. The latter being our tentative diagnosis. Probable indicated treatment is deep X-ray therapy in preference to surgery. Veteran was visited in person at the county hospital by the manager, Veterans' Administration hospital, Tucson, on May 10, 1951, and advised that as soon as our central office notified us concerning new Korean veteran law we would be glad to accept him as a patient for further treatment if he so desired. The veteran stated he would decide accordingly after he had talked to his wife. I left the veteran in a seemingly pleasant mood and happy that the new law had been so expeditiously handled.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 227) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective May 10, 1951, the Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 30 Members during the remainder of the Eighty-second Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the years one of the most valuable members of the House organization has been our distinguished parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler. When he was suddenly taken ill last January each and every one of us was very grieved and each and every one of us followed his illness with close attention. I know that all of my colleagues will be so happy to know that he has recovered in health and is with us again this morning. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the point following the Speaker's statement and submission of the report on the veteran's bill and that I may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following disposition of the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

MEMORIAL SERVICES, MAY 16

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, each year about this time it becomes my solemn duty to call the attention of the Membership to our annual Memorial observance for deceased colleagues.

The services this year will be held on Wednesday, the 16th, for nine of our number who have departed from us since the last ceremony. Two Senators, Virgil Chapman and Arthur Vandenberg, and seven Members of this body, Lesinski, Lemke, Bulwinkle, Meyer, Sullivan, Buchanan, and Kee, will be honored on this year's occasion. Mr. PRESTON, of Georgia, and Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York, will deliver the addresses, and the United States Marine Corps Orchestra will furnish the music.

I cannot stress too strongly the obligation I feel is incumbent on all of us to make an honest effort to be in the Chamber on Wednesday. The program lasts but 75 minutes, and that is all too little for the fine men who served with us so honorably.

THE HOUSING SITUATION

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 4, this House at a late hour in the afternoon, with many Members avoidably or unavoidably absent, adopted the Gossett amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 3880, which in effect scuttled the public housing program previously adopted and authorized by Congress. By this amendment, the House cut down the number of housing units authorized for the next fiscal year to a mere 5,000.

The effects of this action by Congress are already being felt. The public in every metropolitan community in the country is aroused. Already suffering under a tremendous housing shortage, this cut from the 135,000 units provided in the administration program to 5,000 can never be explained satisfactorily to those who are looking to this Congress for relief from present substandard slum conditions. And with all-out mobilization in sight, these conditions are bound to get worse and the need for housing more critical. The President, recognizing the war effort and scarcity of material, directed the Public Housing Administration to cut the number of units for next year from 135,000 to 75,000. Our Appropriations Committee drastically cut that figure to 50,000. Our action in cutting that figure to a mere 5,000 is a mockery and will be reflected in the entire economy of our country unless something is done to remedy the situation. It is not yet too late. I sincerely trust that the Senate will correct the tragic error committed here and that when this legislation goes to the conferees, there will emerge a bill which more equitably takes under consideration the needs of the workers now living in slum areas and the needs of our entire Nation.

PROTECTION FOR THE SHRIMP INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill (H. R. 4064) for the protection and preservation of our important shrimp industry.

PURPOSE OF BILL

At present we have no duty on the importation of shrimp from foreign countries. Fresh and frozen shrimp were placed on the free list in the Tariff Act of 1922 and again in the Tariff Act of 1930. They have remained free of duty ever since.

My bill, which is practically the same as the bills introduced by my colleagues, Representatives THOMPSON, LYLE, and BENTSEN, of Texas, would impose an ad valorem duty of 35 percent on the importation of shrimp in all its forms. It would apply to shrimp, shrimp tails, and shrimp meat; fresh or frozen, or prepared, canned, or preserved in any manner. The bill would go into effect immediately upon its adoption.

NO INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS INVOLVED

Prior to World War II we imported considerable quantities of shrimp from Japan and other foreign countries, as well as from Mexico. From the beginning of that conflict, and ever since that time, however, practically all of our shrimp imports come from Mexico, and in ever-increasing volume.

On January 30, 1943, we made a trade agreement with Mexico. Under this agreement we made trade concessions to Mexico on a long list of commodities, and Mexico, in turn, extended certain concessions to the United States. We bound ourselves to maintain shrimp on the duty-free list. Mexico began to export huge quantities of shrimp into the United States, and the industry immediately felt the impact. We lodged protests with the State Department, but we were told that no relief could be obtained, in view of our trade agreement. Despite the threat to our industry, we carried out our agreement to the letter with our friends across the Rio Grande; we kept faith.

Now, in 1948 the Government of Mexico took it upon themselves to disregard the trade agreement. They not only withdrew all trade concessions in our favor, but raised the tariffs against many of our commodities flowing into that country. In a press release dated June 23, 1950, our State Department announced:

> In 1947 the Mexican Government, impelled by these circumstances and after consultation with this Government in cases where consultation was required, took a number of steps to restrict imports. These steps included a prohibition against imports of a wide range of nonessential goods, including some items covered by the trade agreement, and a change to the ad valorem equivalent, or higher, of the duty in 1942 on some 5,000 items not covered by the trade agreement.

And still our State Department resisted our efforts to provide special relief for the shrimp industry, hoping, we suppose, that in any renewed trade agreement with Mexico we could somehow expect better treatment. In any event, negotiations were undertaken to renew the agreement, and those negotiations went on for some years.

In view of the importance of international trade agreements generally, and especially in the light of negotiations for possible renewal of our trade agreement with Mexico, those of us in the House of Representatives who have the interest at heart of the shrimp and other industries in like distress decided not to take a chance. When the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was acted on in the House recently, we offered and succeeded in passing, in the House, two amendments thereto, namely: the so-called peril-point amendment and the so-called escape clause amendment. In connection with future international trade agreements, relief is afforded under the first amendment for any industry which might be imperiled as a result of any agreement; and under the second amendment we will be able to escape the adverse effect of any agreement by reserving the right "to suspend the concession with respect to any particular commodity"—such as shrimp—"in whole or in part, to withdraw or modify the concession or to establish import quotas," whenever the commodity is entering our country in such "increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers."

As it turned out, our Government failed to get together with Mexico after 2 years of negotiations and our trade agreement had to be terminated by mutual consent on December 31, 1950.

But we must not lose sight of the importance of the two amendments I have described. Suppose we should renew negotiations with Mexico and a new trade agreement should be entered into between the two countries in the future, what then would be the situation? If these amendments are approved by the Senate, this would mean that the hands of Congress and of our shrimp industry could not be hog-tied in connection with any new agreement as they were under the terms of our obligations under the old agreement. On the contrary, we would have the right to escape from under any possible burdensome provision thereof. We would reserve the right, without violating any honorable obligation, "to suspend the concession in whole or in part, to withdraw or modify the concession or to establish import quotas" with respect to shrimp by proving that this commodity is entering this country in such "increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there are at present no international obligations which would commit this country to

maintain the duty-free status of shrimp, and I hope that the State Department will lend its aid to pass, or at least will not obstruct the passage of my bill to impose ad valorem duty of 35 percent on the importation of shrimp.

IMPORTANCE OF INDUSTRY

The shrimp industry is of tremendous importance to the economy of our country. Here are the incontestable facts supplied to me by the National Fisheries Institute, Inc., and the National Shrimp Canners & Packers Association.

In my own State of Louisiana there are 115,000 persons dependent for a livelihood on the shrimp industry. This, of course, includes shrimp catchers, plant or shore workers and their families. I am told that 65 percent, or 74,750, of these people reside in the Third Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

There are at least 7,000 shrimp-fishing craft in the United States, valued at approximately $150,000,000.

There are about 580 shore-shrimp establishments in the United States, valued at approximately $20,000,000.

Louisiana is the largest shrimp-producing area in the United States. For example, approximately 70 percent of all the canned shrimp is produced in Louisiana. It is no wonder then that the investment in the shrimp industry in my State, including boats, nets, plants, and so forth, is conservatively estimated at $49,508,000.

Those workers and that invested capital produced about 195,000,000 pounds of whole shrimp in 1950, for which the fishermen received approximately $40,000,000.

Only by adding the profits made by and the taxes collected down the line from the manufacturer, distributor, wholesaler and retailer can one get a true perspective of the importance of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, the shrimp industry ought to be promoted; and we are obligated to protect it.

IMPORTS FROM MEXICO

Mr. Speaker, the following table was compiled at my request by the United States Tariff Commission. This is an impartial agency established by Congress, and the information is correct. It shows in graphic form the increased tempo of shrimp imports from Mexico since 1939, as compared with our shrimp production in the United States since that time.

Year	United States production (pounds)	Mexican imports (pounds)	Value of Mexican imports
1939	150,250,000	6,037,000	$226,000
1943	151,631,000	9,136,000	1,347,000
1945	191,345,000	12,520,000	2,357,000
1946	192,000,000	19,169,000	3,616,000
1947	191,000,000	21,033,000	5,132,000
1948	167,000,000	24,148,000	9,981,000
1949	175,000,000	46,717,000	13,450,000
1950	195,000,000	63,048,000	18,477,000

The above figures are in terms of whole shrimp as landed by the fishermen. The conversion formula is as follows: One hundred pounds of fresh, whole shrimp reduce themselves down and produce 59 pounds of fresh or frozen headless shrimp; they produce 13 pounds of dried shrimp; they produce 25 pounds of canned shrimp.

An analysis of the foregoing table reveals the following startling, cold facts: Since the termination of hostilities at the end of World War II, that is from 1945 to 1950, inclusive, our shrimp production in the United States has remained practically steady from year to year. In fact, it is noted that our production decreased in 1948 and 1949.

During the same period of time imports of shrimp from Mexico have increased by leaps and bounds. For instance, Mexican imports in 1945 amounted to 12,520,000 pounds, while in 1950 the quantity was 63,038,000. This is an increase of 403 percent. In 1945 the value of shrimp flowing into the United States from Mexico was $2,357,000, while the value in 1950 was $18,477,000.

Now, let us take a look at the situation prior to World War II. In 1939 our production of shrimp in the United States was 150,250,000 pounds, while the production in 1950 was 195,000,000 pounds. This is an increase of only 29 percent.

In 1939 Mexico shipped into the United States 6,037,000 pounds of shrimp, while in 1950 we received 63,048,000 from that country. This is an increase of over 900 percent. In 1939 the value of the Mexican imports was $226,000, while in 1950 the value was $18,477,000.

It is true that our consumption of shrimp in the United States has increased since 1939 and especially from 1945 through 1950. But it is perfectly obvious that the fishermen in the United States did not get and have not been receiving the benefit of the increased consumption. As a matter of fact, our production decreased in 1948 and 1949. I have previously demonstrated that we had the facilities and the capacity and the equipment to supply the increased demand. Despite this fact, however, the records show that while in 1939 Mexico supplied 4 percent of our consumption, in 1950 Mexico supplied 25 percent of our consumption.

Prior to World War II we used to import considerable quantities of shrimp from Japan, but the records of the Tariff Commission show that from 1940 through 1947 we did not import a pound of shrimp from Japan. In 1948, 1949, and 1950 we imported from Japan only an inconsequential quantity. The truth of the matter is that since 1945 Mexico has captured this particular market and has received the benefit of our increased consumption to the detriment of our domestic trade.

Mr. Speaker, our fishermen are alarmed; they have a right to complain and under our form of government there should be no right without a remedy. The purpose of my bill, Mr. Speaker, is to afford a remedy for the intolerable plight in which our shrimp industry finds itself.

UNEQUAL TREATMENT

Now, in order to plumb the depths of the problem we must understand, first, the divergent legal concepts obtaining in Mexico and the United States in respect to import and export trade, and second, the different standards of living prevailing in the two countries.

Under the Constitution of the United States, exports cannot be taxed. Both the General Government and the States are specifically prohibited from taxing commodities shipped out of the country. But our founding fathers in the Constitution reserved unto Congress the right to impose duties or taxes on imports or on goods entering our shores whenever a threat to any particular industry exists. Wisely applied these two provisions have promoted production and protected our trade. As a result we usually enjoy prosperity and a high standard of living in the United States.

As I have explained, Congress has not heretofore exercised the inherent right to impose a duty on shrimp. We have permitted shrimp to remain on the free list during all these years. So far as shrimp is concerned, however, our considerate attitude has been a one-way traffic in favor of Mexico and I want to prove that the unequal treatment we have received at the hands of Mexico herself makes it necessary and imperative that we arise to the protection of the rights of our own people.

While we cannot tax exports, Mexico can and does. The Mexican Government assesses various taxes upon their exports of shrimp. The latest decree was published on February 3, but was effective retroactively as of January 27, 1951. Under this decree the taxes are assessed upon an arbitrary value for export purposes. The various taxes amount to 9 cents per pound for fresh shrimp to 4.7 cents per pound for frozen, taken in the Gulf of Mexico. The obvious intent of the differential in the tax on fresh and frozen shrimp is to encourage the freezing and packaging of the product in Mexico rather than in the United States, which is another way of saying that Mexico is taking care of herself.

I have already developed the fact that in 1950 Mexico exported into the United States 63,048,000 pounds of shrimp. I have been unable to obtain accurate figures on the percent that comes in fresh and the percent coming in frozen. On the basis of fresh shrimp, the export taxes collected by Mexico in 1950—63,048,000 pounds at 9 cents per pound—would be $5,674,320. On the basis of frozen shrimp—63,048,000 pounds at 4.7 cents per pound—the amount would be $2,963,256. If we assume that fresh and frozen shrimp entered in equal proportions, the amount would be $4,318,788.

The export tax of 9 cents per pound on fresh shrimp is the equivalent of a tax of about 20 percent of the price received by the fishermen for their shrimp in 1950.

Now, shrimp commanded a comparatively good price in 1950 and one would imagine that the export tax imposed by Mexico would somehow be used to improve the lot of Mexican labor. But they don't do it that way in Mexico. For instance, I am advised that in 1950 Mexican labor in the shrimp industry received 11½ cents per hour, while the average in this country was approximately 75 cents per hour. Instead of helping Mexican labor in some way, the export tax is passed on to the American consumer. The result is that Mexican labor sweats and the American consumer pays the price of the tax. In other

words, during 1950 the American consumers, including the fishermen of my own district, contributed to the Mexican Government in export taxes anywhere from $2,963,256 to $5,674,320 for the dubious privilege of helping to destroy our shrimp industry in this country.

But that is not all. In addition to an export tax on shrimp shipped out of Mexico, the Mexican Government also imposes an import tax on shrimp entering Mexico from this country. Fresh or refrigerated shrimp are dutiable at pesos 0.10 per gross kilo, plus 10 percent ad valorem. The duty on dried, salted, or preserved shrimp is pesos 0.80 per legal kilo, plus 35 percent ad valorem.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the Mexican Government gets us coming and going. They impose a tax, paid by the American housewife, on shrimp exported out of Mexico, and then not satisfied with that, they impose an import tax on shrimp shipped by us to Mexico.

REALISTIC PROTECTION

At first blush, some people might regard an ad valorem duty of 35 percent as being somewhat high. On reflection, however, any reasonable person will understand and admit that such a duty is absolutely necessary in order to be at all effective.

For instance, my bill is an amendment to section 721 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, which imposes a similar duty on other commodities. It might be suggested that the amendment should be tacked onto section 721 (a), which imposes an ad valorem duty of 15 percent on specified commodities. If that suggestion were adopted, however, it would be well within the power of the Mexican Government to nullify our action as a practical proposition.

For instance, as I have previously brought out, the Mexican export tax on fresh shrimp is 9 cents per pound, which is equivalent to about 20 percent of the price received by the fishermen for their shrimp on the basis of the 1950 market price. If the market should go down, the arbitrary 9 cents per pound export tax imposed by Mexico would proportionately increase the percentage over 20 percent. Now, if we should impose a duty of only 15 percent, or even 20 percent, the only thing the Mexican Government would have to do to completely erase this supposed protection to our industry would be to repeal the export tax. It is true that the Mexican treasury would be short that much money, but it is not felt that the American consumer would profit thereby, because the Mexican shippers usually sell at the prevailing market in the United States. On the other hand, if they would use the repeal as a means of undercutting price in the United States our industry would suffer that much more.

It is clear, therefore, that a half measure, or even a three-quarter measure, would not provide effective relief. If such measures were employed they would merely serve to illustrate the story of the man in the well.

One upon a time a man fell in a well 30 feet deep. Hearing the outcry, a passerby, with all good intentions, resolved to save his life. The Good Samaritan rushed to the barn nearby and hurriedly, too hurriedly, fetched one of the ropes on the rack. He threw the rope to the individual in distress, but the rope was only 20 feet long. He realized too late that he had grabbed the wrong rope, and before any other effective measures could be employed, the man in the well drowned.

Now, we must grab the right rope, else our industry will be ruined before we can save it.

My proposal, Mr. Speaker, is intended to and will, if enacted, provide the necessary, effective, and realistic protection to the great shrimping industry in the United States, and especially to the fishermen and plant workers and their families in my district, approximately 75,000 in number, who are dependent upon this important industry for their livelihood.

With all the sincerity at my command, I solicit and urge the support of all my colleagues.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3468) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense, and that this bill be rereferred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

WASTE PAPER BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, before our Committee on Appropriations we were requested for additional appropriations for the production of chart paper because it had increased in cost 105 percent since Korea.

We have a newsprint shortage in the country at the present time. Let me show you three envelopes 12 by 16; I imagine all of you got them. Each of these contained a very small enclosure of letter size. I merely want to suggest in all kindness that somebody inform the departments that we have envelopes about the size 4 by 9, which would adequately protect letter-size enclosures and save a great deal of paper, as well as postage, for these large envelopes weigh at least 2 ounces. These were all received in one mail from the same agency, the Office of Price Stabilization, but they are not the only offenders. It is done every day, by other agencies.

INCREASE OF THE TAX ON WINE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to record my congratulations to the Ways and Means Committee for its wise decision in recommending an increase of 12½ percent on the tax on wines.

This shows how outrageous the recommendation of the Treasury Department was, which recommended increases on wine taxes of 233⅓ percent and 150 percent. The action of the committee brought the tax in line with other spirits and will be cheerfully accepted by the wine producers of California.

We must remember that the wine industry is merely one part of the grape industry. In every sense it is an agricultural activity and one that looms very large in the economic life of California. We are all happy over the decision by the Ways and Means Committee, which held extensive hearings on the subject.

Incidentally, our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler, is one of the best connoisseurs of fine wine in Washington.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, THOMAS, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address recently made by President Truman.

The address referred to follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS TO INDUSTRY ADVISORY GROUP

Thank you very much. My first visit to this auditorium, Mr. Secretary, was on a Meet-the-Press Program, when I was a United States Senator, making some investigations in the Second World War. It was not a very satisfactory meeting for me. I hope this one will be more satisfactory to you. It came out all right, though. They got me into more trouble than any man has ever gotten into in the history of the world.

Mr. Secretary and gentlemen of the conference, I am glad to meet with you gentlemen here today.

I know that you are all ready to do everything you can to help out in this time of emergency—and I want to emphasize that statement, the country never has been in a greater emergency—and I know you will do a

good job. You have a fine man to work with in Oscar Chapman. He is thoroughly familiar with the natural resources you gentlemen are here to advise us about, and we could not have a better man in charge of the mobilization of those resources for the defense effort.

Now, I want to say to you that every man that I have asked to help in this project has been a man of ability and patriotism, and don't let anybody tell you anything else.

I appreciate very much the fact that you are willing to come and help us with our mobilization problems. It shows that when our country has a big job to do people are ready to pitch in and help. And let me tell you now our country does have a big job to do—just about the biggest and the hardest job in history.

WARNS AGAINST RELAXING

One of the worst difficulties we have to overcome is the feeling that we can relax because we are not in an all-out war. That is a terrible mistake. We cannot afford to relax. We have three enemies to overcome, one abroad and two at home.

Aggression is the first one. We are shooting that one out in Korea, as we did in Greece and Berlin and other places.

No. 2 is inflation. That is a home product we are taxing and by controls curing inflation—we hope.

No. 3 is the worst of all, and that is relaxation. You can't cure the tendency to relax every time there is a lull in the hostilities.

The Secretary of the Treasury was talking to me at the Cabinet meeting recently, in which he said that every time it looks as if we are winning, either the fight against inflation or the fight against aggression, you can see the country relax as the crises, and securities and things of that kind go up and down. You must meet this situation head-on. And the thing that you gentlemen can do is to overcome the worst of our three enecies—relaxation.

Our mobilization problem is different in some ways from what it was in World War II, but it is just as urgent, and just as important to our national survival.

Today, the danger is world-wide, but the actual fighting is limited to a small area, where we are trying to keep it. We are trying to keep the conflict limited, and to bring it to a victorious end, just as rapidly as possible.

STRENGTH MUST INCREASE

But peace in Korea will not put an end to the global danger of Soviet aggression. We must build up enough military strength—enough military strength actually in existence—to convince the Kremlin that it ought not to start a world war.

We must prepare ourselves to mobilize quickly for war in case the Kremlin is reckless enough in spite of everything, to plunge the world into a general conflict.

Our defense experts—both military and civilian—have developed a definite, concrete plan to do these two things. This plan provides for bigger active armed forces, and lays the foundation for complete mobilization, if that should become necessary. We must carry out that plan as rapidly as we possibly can. We want to reach our goal just as fast as the men can be trained, the plants built, and the equipment and supplies turned out.

During the next couple of years, while we are building up this military strength, we shall be diverting materials, converting plants, and disrupting normal life for businessmen and consumers. It will not be as drastic as a shake-up as if we were in a global war, but whatever the situation calls for must be done. Our continued existence as a nation may depend on how well we carry out this program.

In the next year or two, the military-production program is going to require extensive use of production controls and a good strong anti-inflation program. So far, we have only begun to feel the effect of military demands on our supplies of raw materials, manpower, and plant capacity. But we are going to feel this effect severely in the months to come. The largest part of the problem is still ahead of us. Now, I want to emphasize this: the largest part of the problem is still ahead of us.

AMOUNT OF ORDERS PLACED

Since last June, about $26,000,000,000 worth of orders have been placed for military equipment and construction. Only a small part of that has been delivered as yet.

Moreover, we still have about $58,000,000,000 worth of orders to place, in the next 14 months, under our present military plans.

You can easily see, therefore, that the demands of military production on materials and manpower will be going up month by month for a long time. That is why it is urgently necessary that the Congress continue for 2 years more the production controls authorized by the Defense Production Act.

It is also urgently necessary for the Congress to extend the authority for inflation controls—controls on prices, wages and credit, and rents. And by that I mean adequate authority to do the job—authority not crippled by a lot of special exemptions for special groups. This is absolutely vital for the future of this great Nation of ours.

Most of you are businessmen, who understand the terrible effects that the inflationary spiral could have on our economy if it is not kept in check. Now you have got a leading businessman in control of that very thing. You know how extremely important it is to hit inflation and hit it hard. To do that, we will have to use price and wage controls for the next 2 or 3 years at least.

There are some people who think we can now abandon price and wage controls and still stop inflation. They say that heavy taxes and other so-called indirect controls can do the whole job from here on. But as bigger and bigger military orders hit our economy, that will be clearly impossible.

HEAVY TAXES NEEDED

Of course, heavy taxes are needed, and I'm doing my best to get the Congress to enact enough taxes to keep the budget in balance. I would be delighted if each one of you would urge your Congressman and Senators to raise taxes. I am serious about this: I think you ought to be asking the Congress for higher taxes.

But when you do that, be sure to urge them to extend price and wage controls, too. It all goes together, if we are going to meet this situation.

The plain fact is that when you expand production, as we are doing now in this country, people have more money to spend. And when that expanded production goes into military goods, there aren't enough civilian goods for people to spend the extra money on. This creates an inflationary gap. That is what is going to happen over the next year or two. There is no escaping it. It is going to get worse before it gets better. And those who are spreading the foolish notion that we can get through this period without price and wage controls are doing the country an immense amount of harm.

We hope that this period will not be long and that the time will come in 2 or 3 years when we can begin to take controls off. We are moving as rapidly as we can to expand the productive capacity of the country. Assuming that the Kremlin does not bring on a world war, we hope that our productive capacity will soon be great enough so that we can carry the defense program and still produce an ample supply of civilian goods. When that time comes, we should be able to do without controls.

If we are to bring that about, you gentlemen here must help us. You are particularly concerned with producing various types of raw materials and minerals, fuel and power. Increased capacity to produce these vital materials is basic not only to our defense, but to the kind of economy we want to have in the future.

I see no limit to the economic future of this country. I have said that time and again and have been called a dreamer and a visionary for doing it, but it is coming about.

RATE OF PRODUCTION

In the first half of this year, we are producing goods and services at an estimated annual rate of about $307,000,000,000. This is about the same allowing for price changes, as the annual rate achieved in 1944—the peak production year of World War II. The present rate is almost $40,000,000,000 higher than what we did in 1948. But we have not yet reached the ceiling. We have the resources and the technology to grow by about 5 percent a year over the next few years, in about 3 years this would lift our output to about $350,000,000,000, measured in present prices. And we can go far beyond that.

That is the sort of picture I ask you gentlemen to keep before you during this emergency period. The world is in a dangerous condition, but we know what we must do about it. It will take patience and determination. It will take good solid American patriotism—the kind that puts the national interest ahead of the selfish interest.

The people of the United States, together with the people of the other free countries, can win a victory in the struggle with Soviet communism. I'm just as sure of that as I'm sure I am standing here.

What it will take is hard work by everybody in the country, willingness by everybody to carry his fair share of the load.

That is what we are asking of you gentlemen here. And I am very sure that you are going to do your part.

Thank you very much.

ELEVENTH REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the eleventh report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) as amended, as well as the programs of economic aid to China and the general area of China under the China Area Aid Act (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong.), and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 430, 447, and 535, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United

States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended December 31, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 10, 1951.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3207, a bill to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows.

Page 2, line 22, strike out all after "greater" over to and including "amended" in line 5 on page 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, by striking out this amendment just how does it affect the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. It strikes out reference to civil-service retirement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think perhaps that is the amendment I objected to when we had it before our committee. It does give them an opportunity to serve on the civil defense set-up that is supposed to be operating in the District. We are getting a good many critical letters from people relative to the state of the defense in the District of Columbia. Whether it is good or bad, it does give the members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Metropolitan Fire Department an opportunity to serve in this capacity. I see no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill [H. R. 3957] to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 691 of the act of March 3, 1901, entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 26–404), is hereby amended—

(1) By striking out "the Comptroller of the Currency, in addition to the powers conferred upon him by law for the examination of national banks, is further authorized, whenever he may deem it useful," and by inserting in lieu thereof "the Home Loan Bank Board is authorized, whenever such Board may deem it useful";

(2) By striking out "not exceed the sum of $25 for the first $500,000 or fractional part thereof of assets and the sum of $10 for each additional $250,000 or fractional part thereof of assets, and";

(3) By striking out "The said comptroller shall also have power to take possession of any company or association whenever in his judgment it is insolvent or is knowingly violating the laws under which such company is incorporated, and to liquidate the same in the manner provided in the laws of the United States in respect to national banks:", and by inserting in lieu thereof "The Home Loan Bank Board shall also have power to take possession of any company or association whenever in the Board's judgment any such company or association is insolvent or is knowingly violating the laws under which it is operated and to liquidate the same in the manner provided in rules and regulations which said Board is hereby authorized to adopt, and said Board may also provide in such rules and regulations a procedure for the voluntary liquidation of any such company or association; and if any such company or association which has not gone into liquidation and for which a receiver has not already been appointed for other lawful cause shall discontinue its operations for a period of 60 days, the Home Loan Bank Board may, if such Board deems it advisable, appoint a receiver for such company or association:";

(4) By striking out "Comptroller of the Currency" wherever appearing in such section and by inserting in lieu thereof "Home Loan Bank Board"; and

(5) By striking out the word "him" from the second sentence of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "such Board."

SEC. 2. Section 691a of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 26–405) is hereby amended—

(1) By striking out "Comptroller of the Currency" wherever appearing in such section, and by inserting in lieu thereof "Home Loan Bank Board";

(2) By striking out "he" and "his" wherever appearing in paragraph (e) of such section, and by inserting in lieu thereof "such Board" and "such Board's", respectively; and

(3) By striking out in paragraph (g) of such section "if said examination is made beyond the limits of the District of Columbia, but if made within the limits of the District of Columbia, the cost of the examination to be at the same rate and upon the same terms as provided in section 691."

SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of the act of April 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 500), as amended by the act of March 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 1564; D. C. Code, sec. 26–103 (c)), is hereby amended by striking out "Comptroller of the Currency" wherever appearing in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "Home Loan Bank Board," and by adding after the phrase "to maintain any office or place of business in the District of Columbia," the following: "other than a foreign association which qualifies for a certificate of authority under section 691a of the act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 26–405)."

SEC. 4. Any powers, duties, and functions of the Comptroller of the Currency with respect to building associations and building and loan associations operating in the District of Columbia which are not transferred to the Home Loan Bank Board by the specific statutory amendments herein contained are also hereby transferred from the Comptroller of the Currency to the Home Loan Bank Board.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to transfer certain functions relating to building associations organized or doing business in the District of Columbia from the Comptroller of the Currency to the Home Loan Bank Board.

There are 28 associations operating in the District of Columbia, 23 are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Greensboro, N. C., and all but 4 are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, insuring each up to $10,000. Nine of these associations are Federal savings and loan associations supervised and examined by the Home Loan Bank Board; 14 associations, while insured, have not federalized and are operating under the laws of the District of Columbia, and for this reason it is necessary that they pay for two examinations, one by the Comptroller of the Currency and one by the Home Loan Bank Board. The Comptroller of the Currency has on several occasions requested that the examination and supervision of the non-Federal associations be transferred to the Home Loan Bank Board and part of the annual report for the year 1949 by the Comptroller of the Currency relating to this matter is quoted below:

Of the numerous building and loan associations in the city of Washington, some operate under provisions of the District of Columbia Code and others (Federal savings and loan associations) under the provisions of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933. * * * The building associations * * * operating under local law are supervised by this office. Those belonging to the Nationwide system are respectively supervised by the Home Loan Bank Board. * * *.

In the interest of uniformity and efficiency in the supervision of these organizations it is again recommended that the functions of the Comptroller of the Currency with respect to building associations (and credit unions) be transferred to the Board named.

It is upon the above recommendation that this legislation is initiated and this bill has the approval of the Home Loan Bank Board, the District of Columbia Building and Loan League, and the Commissioners for the District of Columbia as well as the Comptroller of the Currency.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

REPUDIATE YALTA AND POTSDAM

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the free world is paying a staggering price for the private agreements made

between Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill at Yalta and confirmed and concluded by Truman, Stalin, and Attlee at Potsdam. The understandings reached at those conferences, but never presented to the Congress for approval, have plunged the free world into a state of confusion and despair. The arrangements claimed peace as the objective and in this they have utterly failed, as we prepare for another war. The basis for a just and lasting peace rests on high moral grounds. At Yalta and Potsdam moral principles gave way to expediency, wishful thinking, and political chicanery. At their inception they were doomed to failure because they ignored the moral law.

Mr. Speaker, one writer has well said that—

> We find ourselves in the position, at once tragic and ridiculous, of trying to escape from the trap which we helped to set for ourselves by acquiescing in a peace settlement that was both a denial of all the ideals for which the war was being fought and an abandonment of some very vital considerations of American national security.

It cannot be denied, Mr. Speaker, that a great military victory was achieved in 1945. Nor can it be denied that this great military victory was scotched by political ineptitude and the well-known double-cross.

Mr. Speaker, it is well to keep the record straight on the Yalta and Potsdam conferences so the people will know where to place the responsibility for the present debacle in world affairs. What did our statesmen agree to do?

First, they agreed to completely disarm Germany and Japan and thereby removed all effective barriers that existed between Russia and the free world.

Secondly, they agreed to the partition of Poland in the absence of any Polish representative. Almost half of Poland's prewar territory and one-third of the Polish population were transferred to communistic Russia in absolute violation of the North Atlantic Charter. These unjust annexations caused the uprooting of millions of people. It was a dastardly act well known to the present administration yet no move has been made to repudiate that action.

Thirdly, they betrayed China at Yalta, also. Stalin was induced to enter the war against Japan upon the promises of Roosevelt and Churchill that Communist Russia should get the Kurile Islands—close to Alaska—south Sakhalin, outer Mongolia, and a preferred position in Manchuria, the richest industrialized area of China. And that is not all. It was further agreed that Stalin was to have the naval base of Port Arthur at the southern tip of Manchuria plus a right of joint operation of the Manchurian railways, plus a special position in the trade of Manchuria's largest port, the port of Dairen. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Soviet dominates China and Korea? Stalin received this gift on a silver platter. The present administration, well aware of the immorality and rascality of these acts, has failed to repudiate them. Why has it failed to act?

Fourthly, the men who conferred at Yalta also authorized the dismemberment of Germany and permitted the transfer and use of German slave labor as reparations. And this in the name of freedom. No more inhuman act has ever been perpetrated by a free people. The United States also agreed to return Russian citizens who were then living in its zone of occupation. Our occupational authorities carried out this diabolical agreement and thousands of political refugees were returned to be shot or jailed in concentration camps. Yet this shameful conduct has not been repudiated.

Fifthly, it authorized the transfer to Germany of German populations of German ethnic origin who remained in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Mass deportations were carried out with extreme brutality. Today, these expellees, numbering about 14,000,000, have created a social, economic, and political problem that is retarding a sound recovery in Germany. Actually it is a threat to the peace of Europe. This inhuman act of expulsion has never been repudiated.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the charge that has been made that Yalta and Potsdam are horrible examples of irresponsible secret diplomacy. This Congress should repudiate both. We should confess that we sinned against man and God at Yalta and Potsdam. This would be good for the soul of America. By such an act we could atone for our immoral conduct against Poland, China, and Germany. Such a courageous act would win us millions of friends all over the world. It would be a tonic to people who live under dictatorships and who have been losing faith in countries who parade under the banner of liberty yet who have been parties to agreements that deny that very principle.

Mr. Speaker, let us return to that high moral ground set forth in the Atlantic Charter. Here we have the force to meet totalitarianism as exemplified by communism. We can and will win this contest, but it will take courage, honesty, and a faith equal to that which stirred the souls of the men who fought to establish this country for liberty and freedom.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has given a very fine review of what happened at Yalta. I wonder if the gentleman could inform our colleagues of some of the men who were at Yalta who represented this country. Was there a Mr. Hiss there? Was there a General Marshall, and others who may have participated in the Yalta Conference, and as to whether they knew anything about these diabolical agreements entered into with Stalin?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; I think the men you have mentioned were there. I will add to what you have said that General Marshall on occasion when he appeared before our committee was asked a question about his appearance at Yalta and he said that he had no knowledge of this agreement; that this was a matter for the men who had control of the political situation, and that it was their responsibility and not the responsibility of the military.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then I also recall that when the late Roosevelt sat in the chair delivering his speech on what happened in Yalta, a sick man of course at that time, and probably ill over there, it seemed to me he said something about there being no secret agreement. It later developed that there was some agreement which the Vice President himself was not aware of, until it was brought to his attention.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed. I shall never forget the day that the departed President sat here and made that statement. I think since that time the record has been made clear that there were secret agreements to our great disadvantage.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then the gentleman will agree that in order to make agreements or a treaty such as this, they ought to come out before the other body and in the full view of the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There should at no time be private agreements such as were entered into at Yalta and Potsdam.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HALE. For some time I have had a resolution pending in the Committee on Foreign Affairs for denouncing the Yalta agreement. I think the gentleman would be in sympathy with the purposes of that resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I certainly would be, because I am offering one today, I may say to the gentleman from Maine. I did not know your resolution was before our committee. Was it introduced this year?

Mr. HALE. It was introduced in the Eighty-first Congress and again at the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress. I would like very much if progress could be made toward favorable action on such a resolution, which action seems to be most important.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would be very glad to join in that.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has referred to 14,000,000 expellees in Germany.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know whether or not there is some disposition on the part of anybody in the United Nations or in the United States to be of some assistance to that economic problem in Germany?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is my understanding that nothing has been done to alleviate the terrible situation that exists among those 14,000,000 expellees. I am not cognizant of any action taken on the part of the United Nations in that direction.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will recall we passed a bill extending the life of the Displaced Persons Act for 6 months.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The purpose of which is to liquidate it. Many persons believe that the Displaced Persons Act has something to do with the refugees. They are of a different category, are they not?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. The International Refugee Organization has to liquidate this fiscal year. We are told that by the time of liquidation most of the displaced persons who are in the other category, other than that of the expellees, will either have been transferred to Israel, to Australia, to South America, to the United States, or other parts of the world. But when we interrogated the witnesses coming before our committee as to the expellees, they told us that after the displaced persons program is over there is no program whatsoever to deal with these 14,000,000 expellees, who are a tremendous impact on the economy of Germany.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. They told us that they will have to remain in Germany and live off the economy of that country. Now, can the gentleman tell us anything that has been done toward facing that economic problem?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is my understanding that nothing has been done. Recently we had before our subcommittee a delegation of Germans who were members of the West German Parliament. That matter was discussed and they said no effort had been made that they knew of to alleviate the condition to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. STEFAN. What do they want us, as the United States, to do about it?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. They did not ask, as far as I know, that we do something about it. They were rather of the opinion that it was a job for the United Nations and that something should be done there.

Mr. STEFAN. And nothing has been done yet?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Nothing has been done, so far as I know.

Mr. STEFAN. I was told by the Food Administrator in Germany, who had much to do in bringing food to Germany through the GARIO, that it was impossible for Germany to absorb that number of people because their economy is so low. He stated to me that while we were doing a good job as far as the displaced persons are concerned, under the International Refugee Organization, people in high places fear about this tremendous economic problem of these 14,000,000 expelees, and something has to be done about it sometime.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. They ought to let them go back to their homes. That is where they belong.

Mr. STEFAN. I am told if they go back to their homes they will be liquidated.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It is a very bad situation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include as a part of my remarks, at the conclusion of my statement, a copy of the resolution that I have offered today to repudiate the Yalta and Potsdam private agreements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I would like to compliment the gentleman for bringing up this subject which I think should be brought up on a nonpolitical basis. I completely agree with the statements expressed by the gentleman. I would like to ask him if he does not believe that regardless of the fact of whether or not our representatives should or should not have entered into the Yalta and Potsdam secret agreements, we have no legal or moral right to be bound by those agreements because they have been broken by Soviet Russia in refusing to give free elections as agreed. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would agree with the gentleman.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

Whereas the private agreements concluded in 1945 at Yalta and Potsdam, were based on a complete disregard for the strategic interests of the United States and the free world, and represent a denial of the free and democratic ideals, as expressed in the North Atlantic Charter, which have always been cherished by the American people and for which millions fought World War II; and

Whereas, specifically, the Yalta agreement sanctioned Soviet domination of Eastern Europe and of east Asia, the betrayal of Poland and the mutilation of its natural boundaries, the transfer of the national allegiance of millions of persons without plebiscite or other recognition of their rights to self-determination, and the uprooting of other millions of persons; and

Whereas, specifically, the Potsdam agreement sanctioned the betrayal of China, granting the Soviets a preferred position in Manchuria, the richest and most industrialized area of China, a position which was promptly used as the assembly point and main military base for the Communist conquest of China; and

Whereas the Potsdam agreement, in addition to promising the Soviet Government other vast and invaluable territorial concessions, authorized the dismemberment of Germany and the use of Germans as slave labor by the Soviets, and promised the Soviet Government that the United States would return Soviet political and other refugees for repatriation, that is, for concentration camps or death; and

Whereas the Potsdam agreement provided for the expulsion and transfer of millions of Germans of German ethnic origin from Eastern Europe, Central Europe, and the Balkans to Germany where they have deterred economic and political recovery in Western Germany and have thereby endangered the peace of all Europe; and

Whereas the Soviet Government has consistently disregarded the provisions of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements which it has found inconvenient to honor, including the provision for free and unfettered elections in Poland and the provisions for treating Germany as an economic unit and for encouraging free political parties in Germany; and

Whereas, although the Yalta and Potsdam agreements are the closest approach to a peace settlement for World War II existing today, and although these two agreements, by their inexpedient provisions, have cost the United States untold billions for defense, occupation costs, and foreign economic support, and have led the free world to the brink of another global war, these agreements were made in secrecy and without Congressional participation, approval, or ratification: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the private agreements concluded in 1945 at Yalta and Potsdam should be forthwith repudiated by the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

IMPERIAL DAM AND ALL-AMERICAN CANAL

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of the Interior appropriation bill, which a notation here recalls to my mind was May 1, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], made a statement in the House to the effect that the Imperial irrigation district had not repaid to the United States any of the building costs of the Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal. Ordinarily I do not think it necessary to come to the floor to correct what are obviously errors, but this statement has been repeated in other committees and at other times on the floor and I think I should correct the statement formally in the RECORD.

I think the gentleman from Arizona is as aware as I am of the contract of December 1, 1932, which was reprinted in the Eightieth Congress, in House Document No. 717 at page A595. The contract is there given in full, the contract between the Imperial irrigation district and the Department of the Interior, from which I now quote, as follows:

ART. 12. The amount herein agreed to be paid to the United States shall be due and payable in not more than forty (40) annual installments commencing with the calendar year next succeeding the year when notice of completion of all work provided for herein is given to the district or under the provisions of article 10 (a) hereof upon termination of work through failure of Congress to make necessary appropriations therefor. * * * The sums payable annually as set forth above shall be divided into two equal semiannual payments, payable on March 1 and September 1 of each year; provided, however, that if notice of the completion of work is given to the district subsequent to September 1 of any year the first semiannual installment of charges hereunder shall be due and payable on March 1 of the second succeeding year.

Mr. Speaker, the construction of the All-American Canal has been completed for several years, but the Secretary of the Interior continues to refuse to give notice of that completion. This is because of the unilateral decision of the Secretary of the Interior to abrogate the provisions of article 12 which I have just read to you and to abrogate the provisions of other contracts, and to abrogate the restrictions which were placed by the other body in the so-called Mexican Water Treaty.

The letter in which the Secretary of the Interior made public his decision is dated November 7, 1950. I now read a paragraph of that letter to you:

It is my determination—

Said the Secretary of the Interior—

It is my determination that, within the framework of the foregoing interpretation of article 23 of the treaty, the only method by which the Department of the Interior can assure the necessary ownership, control, and jurisdiction required by the treaty in connection with water deliveries to Mexico is through the operation and maintenance by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal from Imperial Dam to and including the Pilot Knob check and wasteway.

The other day in discussing this same matter on the floor I read to you the statement of the Secretary of State which is the primary agency involved with treaty enforcement. The Secretary of State did not say that this was the only way to do it; he said:

The Department—

Meaning the Department of State—

after consultation with the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, and the United States Section, International Water and Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, reached the view that under the provisions of the treaty of 1944 a Federal or a State or a local agency might perform the actual operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal facilities.

That is a direct quotation from a letter addressed to me under date of October 5, 1949, and signed by Mr. Ernest A. Gross, Assistant Secretary of State. The consultation to which the letter refers took place in Los Angeles in September 1947 and representatives of the various agencies, including the Imperial irrigation district, were present. Please note, Mr. Speaker, that the decision, on the part of the State Department was that a local agency, meaning the Imperial district, could properly operate and maintain the canal. This simply confirmed the previous agreements and the contract.

The Secretary of Interior is actually without power by any such self-declaration to abrogate the Boulder Canyon Project Act, to abrogate his Department's contracts thereunder, and to abrogate the reservations which the Senate placed in the Mexican Water Treaty.

The point I want to make today—and I do not want to fill this discussion with quotations, although if it becomes necessary I can do so; the point I want to make is that even though the Secretary of Interior has not declared this to be finished, has not given notice of completion to the Imperial irrigation district, the Imperial irrigation district has been making payments from the net proceeds of the power developed at the canal, and with the amount paid in this current year these payments will total approximately a half million dollars, which is very different from the statement that the Imperial irrigation district is not paying any money at all.

I think we should properly raise the question here, why does the Secretary of the Interior refuse to announce completion of the canal? Why does he not let money in greater amounts be paid back to the United States?

Because, under the 1932 contract, which is a valid contract between the Imperial district and the United States, the canal is then to be turned over to the Imperial irrigation district. Article 8 of the contract provides:

The district shall at its own cost and without expense to the United States care for, operate, and maintain the same in such manner that such works shall remain in as good and efficient condition and of equal capacity for the diversion, transportation and distribution of water as when received from the United States, reasonable wear and damage by the elements excepted. * * * After the care, operation, and maintenance of the aforesaid works have been assumed by the district, the district shall save the United States, its officers, agents, and employees harmless as to any and all injury and damage to persons and property which may arise out of the care, operation, and maintenance thereof.

Further, the district subsequently agreed, through an exchange of letters with the Department of the Interior, that if it does not carry out control and operation of the canal in a manner satisfactory to the Department, this operation may be taken away from it, which is a very one-sided agreement in itself.

Moreover, the Secretary has refused the Imperial irrigation district the right to proceed with the development of the Pilot Knob power site on the canal, a right granted Imperial irrigation district by the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the contract heretofore referred to.

There was a reason for that provision. It was the intention in setting up that contract that the money, part of which should be used to repay the cost of the canal and keep the taxpayers of the United States free not only of all the initial cost but free of the subsequent operation cost, should be paid out of some of these power revenues. Again the Secretary, representing the United States, has broken faith with citizens of the United States. This delay has already cost the district hundreds of thousands of dollars in the loss of power that would have been produced by that plant, and I would emphasize to you, Mr. Speaker, that the delay has cost the Nation millions and millions of barrels of fuel oil which had to be burned to produce power this plant could have produced.

The gentleman from Arizona, I think, assumed that the Secretary of the Interior had authority under the water treaty, which is repeated in House Document No. 717, to abrogate the Imperial contract made in 1932. The actual reservations in that treaty specifically set forth these two items which I will now read into the RECORD:

(a) No commitment for works to be built by the United States * * * other than those specifically provided for in the treaty could be made without prior approval of Congress (H. Doc. 717, 80th Cong., p. A882). The works enumerated in the treaty make no reference to the All-American Canal. Therefore, reservation (a) prohibits any commitment for the authorization of the All-American Canal under the guise of authority derived from the Mexican Water Treaty without prior authorization of Congress.

Reservation (b) is also pertinent; it provides—House Document 717, Eightieth Congress, page A883:

(b) Insofar as they affect persons and property in the territorial limits of the United States, the powers and functions of the Secretary of State of the United States, the Commissioner of the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, the United States section of said Commission, and any other officer or employee of the United States, shall be subject to the statutory and constitutional controls and processes.

Now, this unilateral, administrative decision, having no basis in law, and for which, as shown above, no commitment may be made without prior authorization by Congress, is not the exercise, Mr. Speaker, of one of the constitutional controls and processes. The Secretary of the Interior has no authority to make this determination. It is contrary to the provisions of the 1932 contract.

Then the final reservation in the treaty, the most important stipulation seems to me to be this:

(c) That nothing contained in the treaty or protocol shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of State of the United States, the Commissioner of the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, or the United States section of said Commission, directly or indirectly, to alter or control the distribution of water to users within the territorial limits of any of the individual States.

And that is exactly what this determination on the part of the Secretary does. By attempting to seize the permanent control of the All-American Canal, the Department of the Interior directly attempts to "alter the distribution of water to users within the territorial limits of any of the individual States," for such action would divest the Imperial irrigation district of the operation and control of its water supply. The attempt to limit the appropriation for the Imperial irrigation district, which was in the Interior bill, and which caused the exchange between the gentleman from Arizona and myself, is simply an attempt to coerce the Imperial district to abdicate its right under the contract. This House, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker, struck out the appropriation and the wording. Imperial is ready to assume control of the All-American Canal and to increase repayments. The only obstacle in the path of the process outlined in the 1932 contract is the refusal of the Secretary to give "notice of completion" of the works which we all know are complete and which, under the law, he is required to do, and there is no possible excuse for further evasion.

The All-American Canal costs will be repaid in full. Imperial has not and does not intend to ask for any change in the contract. All Imperial asks is that the United States carry it out.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my friend from Arizona I will interpolate a little suggestion about taking the beans out of our own eyes before we take the

goats out of others' eyes. The gentleman will recognize the story from a Thursday morning breakfast.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman and I are both Biblical students, and he knows the force of Biblical quotations.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Somewhat altered.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is the question I would like to ask. We want to get the record straight. This record of water problems on the lower Colorado River is so complex that it is difficult to get it straight and make it clear and that is why I am asking the question. How much did the gentleman say had been paid by the Imperial irrigation district?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not have before me the record of the date on which the payment was actually made, but when this year's payment is made it will be about half a million dollars. I think it was $400,000 up to the end of the last calendar year.

Mr. MURDOCK. Relying on my memory, I recall that when M. J. Dowd, engineer for the Imperial irrigation district, was before a committee over which I presided in 1946, I asked him that same question, How much has the Imperial irrigation district paid toward construction costs? My recollection is that he said in 1946, although the canal and the Imperial diversion dam had been in use since 1941, nothing had been repaid. Again M. J. Dowd, the same individual, was before my committee last year, and I asked him the same question, and my recollection is he replied in 1950 that something over $400,000 had been repaid.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is right.

Mr. MURDOCK. Are those figures about correct, as the gentleman has them?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that is correct. I do not know about the statement of Mr. Dowd before the gentleman's committee. That is subject to determination. But whatever the condition was several years ago, $400,000 has been paid and, in my opinion and I think in the opinion of the gentleman from Arizona, perhaps was not necessarily paid, because under the contract the notice of completion in all projects of this kind is made and then payments begin, in the meantime most projects have begun to accumulate money in the bank for the purpose of repayment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I grant that what the gentleman has just said is technically correct. That is the thing I wanted to get straight. I believe the contract said that the repayment shall be made in about 40 annual payments.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. The cost of the All-American Canal and this complete facility, as I recall it, was in the neighborhood of $40,000,000. If one of those annual repayments had been made it would be in the neighborhood of $1,000,000, would it not?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, but the gentleman avoids the issue. The issue is that until it is declared finished the district is not required to pay anything, and it has paid $500,000. It paid it out of revenues from the power, but it has not been permitted to increase the revenues from power, which was part of the contract. Further, the gentleman should come back to the point I am discussing, and that is that there is not any reason in law, any reason in right, or any reason at all, why the Secretary of the Interior should not declare it finished, except that he wants to seize the operation of the canal.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I merely wanted now to find out whether they had made one of those annual payments. I cannot agree with the gentleman on all of that assumption regarding the Secretary of the Interior. I will not have time, because there are other special orders for today, to answer the gentleman on that point. However, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in order that I may answer that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no answer. Here are all the facts. I have asked permission to extend my remarks and, therefore, shall put in some of the material from the Department of State and the Department of the Interior which will prove exactly what I am saying.

In conclusion, since the gentleman has brought this part of the subject up, I think we will agree on one thing, that if the subject is as difficult and as complicated as he says it is not a matter to be solved by putting something in an appropriation bill as it comes to the floor but should be heard before the gentleman's own committee, of which he is the very distinguished chairman. We will be glad to present all these matters to the committee. What we want to do is to confirm the contract with the district and the United States, and the reservations in the treaty. They are there. They are law, and you cannot get around it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to assure the gentleman of two things: First, that when I said the other day it was my information that nothing had been repaid by the District on their repayment contract, I was taking that from the Bureau of Reclamation. I have that in black and white from them.

I also want to say before this House at this moment that I think I am correct that no one of the 40 annual payments for the repayment has been made.

Mr. PHILLIPS. They are not due. Does the gentleman wish us to pay them and abrogate our rights in the canal? Why does not the gentleman direct his inquiries and his very able presentations to the Department of the Interior, and make the Department of the Interior, with which he has unquestioned influence, live up to the contract it made, which relieves the taxpayers from all cost? Why does the gentleman from Arizona wish the taxpayers of the United States to pay the cost of operation and maintenance, of something which the Department agreed should be paid by the district and not by the taxpayers?

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly do not agree that your proposal would save the taxpayers. On May 1 I made the statement, maybe not too fully or clearly, that the gentleman's district, the Imperial irrigation district, does need relief from a portion of this debt burden and that in my opinion a part of the cost of the All-American Canal, which is now used because of a treaty to carry out an international obligation, should not be charged to the Imperial irrigation district but should be paid for by the United States Government, who must continue to operate this facility to carry on an international obligation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman, but I do not think we need relief. I think we need simple justice and the carrying out of a contract with the United States of America. The gentlemen should also remember that the Coachella division of the canal is also part of the problem and that was only recently finished. We used to carry out contracts under the law—why can we not do that now in the United States? Is it necessary to put in a resolution requiring the United States to fulfill a valid contract?

Mr. MURDOCK. I disagree absolutely with the gentleman in respect to carrying out this particular contract. We must not, and I said this to Secretary George Marshall when he was Secretary of State, we must not turn over the operation of the Imperial Diversion Dam to the Imperial Irrigation District, as well as the first section of the canal down to the international border when we are trying to carry out an international obligation. We have adopted a treaty with Mexico which changes the whole situation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman knows as well as I know that is not involved. I want the gentleman to realize he is making a very firm statement that the Department of the Interior should abrogate three contracts. I do not think he means to make it. I have too high a respect for the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. The United States Government has made a contract with the Imperial Irrigation District. It has made many contracts in the past. Contracts ought to be kept, but there comes a time occasionally when the national interest and safety depends upon changing a contract.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Just on the word of one department, headed by an appointee of the President—he shall say that the contract shall be disregarded? Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. MURDOCK. The Mexican treaty was adopted by a vote of 76 to 10 in the other body.

Mr. PHILLIPS. With reservations which protected the canal, almost by naming it. With reservations which I read to you. The gentleman knows that better than I do.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am not convinced about that. I simply want that facility which is now under treaty to carry out an international obligation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will put the restrictions in the RECORD, and the gentleman can read them again.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will yield further. Bear in mind that several other irrigation districts get water from the Imperial Diversion Dam. They get it in Arizona as well as other districts in California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Have the Arizona users ever had any trouble getting it?

Mr. MURDOCK. They might.

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, no—have they had any trouble? The answer is "No," in case the gentleman is at a loss for the word.

Mr. MURDOCK. The point is I do not want any other users to control my faucet. I want to be able to control it myself.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. That is exactly the point I have been making here this afternoon in 30 minutes. We do not want somebody else controlling our faucet, especially someone who so lightly abrogates written contracts. That is our faucet, you know—that is all the water we have in the valley.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to take the opportunity, following the extension of my remarks, to give my view as to why the United States Government must continue to operate that facility.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not "continue to operate"—but take it away from the people with whom they have contracted to operate it.

Mr. MURDOCK. For more than 10 years the Bureau of Reclamation has been operating it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It has been operating it under this evasive statement that it has not yet been finished, although it was actually finished several years ago.

It is still in a construction period which, according to the Secretary of the Interior, has not ended. You and I know it ended long ago, because the gentleman was out there at the time it did end.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will introduce a bill, or tell me what kind of a bill to introduce to charge off a proper part of the cost to the Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal against the indebtedness of the Imperial Irrigation District, I will be only too happy to further that legislation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It seems to me, as I said, we would be glad to discuss the matter. I do not agree to help, however, in an illegal act. You are asking me to furnish a plan so that the Bureau of Reclamation can take away the control of our water. The district wants the water it contracted for, and under the terms it contracted to pay for it, and not at the expense of the taxpayers. The gentleman knows that on the other side of the river they have not always been so particular about protecting the taxpayers. I think the gentleman would do well to clean out his own house a little before he supports any attempt to abrogate contracts on nothing but the word of one Presidential appointee, the Secretary of the Interior, on our side of the river. Does not the gentleman think that that is so?

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman understands that all of us may have beams in our own eyes. I recognize the truth of that. The thing I want to impress upon the House at this time is that this facility is carrying out an international obligation and must not be left outside the State Department.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not even if the Secretary of State thinks it is all right? The Secretary of the Interior is to be preferred in international matters to the Secretary of State? Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. The Secretary of the Interior is merely the engineer. The Secretary of State acting for the Department of State is the boss.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, and the Secretary of State thinks it is all right for the District to operate the canal under the terms of the contract. I have already quoted from the State Department letter. The gentleman is discussing something that, as I said a moment ago, is very complicated, and I am trying to simplify it. All we want is to carry out the contracts we made, every one of them very clear, and every one of them saying that we should pay the bills and not the taxpayers of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under this leave to extend my remarks following the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], I hope to clear up some matters discussed here since May 1 with regard to the Imperial diversion dam and the first section of the All-American Canal which may be confused in the minds of the Members. The RECORD of May 1, on pages 4656 to 4659, especially the last two of the pages indicated, if read in conjunction with this RECORD today, will tend to clarify the situation. First let it be understood that although the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and I seem to be in direct opposition in certain of our statements that it does not necessarily follow that one of us is wrong nor that both of us are wrong. In one case both of us are right, but we are not talking about the same thing.

Now to illustrate, let us center our attention upon this simple question: has the Imperial irrigation district begun to make repayments to the Government on its construction costs? The Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal were built by the United States Government through the Bureau of Reclamation, and according to a contract in 1932 this construction cost of about $40,000,000 was to be repaid by the Imperial irrigation district in about 40 annual payments. Now I have stated that the Imperial irrigation district, after 10 or more years of highly beneficial use of the facilities, has not made a single repayment under the contract, or at least such is my information. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] states that the Imperial district has paid something like a half million dollars. I think both his statement and mine are true. What is the difference, or what is the explanation? Obviously a half milion dollars would not be as much as one annual repayment. The gentleman himself says that what they have paid was simply the power revenues which amount was credited to the district against the indebtedness. That does not mean that the water users in the Imperial district as such paid that amount of money, and the gentleman himself says that the contract repayments are not even due unless and until the Secretary of the Interior declares the project completed and the facility is turned over to the district officials by formal proclamation.

I do know of this condition imposed by the contract and spoke of it on May 1, and I do know that technically none of the 40 annual repayments are yet due, even though for all intents and purposes the works have been completed for more than 10 years and more than 25,000,000 acre-feet of water have been furnished the Imperial Valley through those works. As I said on May 1, I am informed that more than $760,000,000 of gross agricultural production during those same 10 years have been produced in the Imperial Valley by the use of this quantity of Colorado River water. I pointed that out in order to impress upon Congress that somebody ought to begin to pay for something pretty soon. But in fairness to the managers of the Imperial irrigation district, I did mention the contract by the terms of which they are technically relieved from the legal obligation to start repayments, until the works are formally turned over to them. Thus the gentleman is correct in saying that the district has paid something toward its indebtedness, but not on the contract, and I am correct in saying the district has not begun repayments under the contract.

However, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and I are directly opposite in our views on another and correlative matter. He complains that the Government has not kept its word in that contract, meaning that the Government has not turned over complete control of the Imperial Diversion Dam and the first section of the All-American canal as he thinks it ought to do in fairness to the Imperial irrigation district. Now I have strong feelings in the opposite direction in this matter, and they are that the United States Government should not turn over the control of the Imperial irrigation district regardless of their contract. Why? There are several reasons.

It would not be fair to several other districts in Arizona and in California, who are using the same facilities, to give this control to the Imperial irrigation district. It certainly would not be wise for the United States of America to turn over to the Imperial irrigation district of California, or any other irrigation district, the carrying out of the provisions of the water treaty made between the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico in 1945. In still another respect, it is unthinkable—I might say unconscionable—to turn over this great facility—commandeered by the Government to carry out a treaty—to the Imperial irrigation district to use as they have plainly indicated in the record that they intend to use it.

What do I mean by that? I mean that the record contains indisputable proof and documentary evidence that they would use that facility to their own advantage and profit and to the untold loss to the American people. What would that use be? Briefly, it would be to take water out of the Colorado River and drop it at the border of Mexico to produce power, using it at the rate of 5,000,000 acre-feet annually and by so doing consign that life-giving water to foreigners, thereby putting it forever beyond the use of American citizens. In spite of all the sophistry and all the talked-about economy and the saving to the taxpayer, that use—commendable as it may seem to be to produce hydroelectric power—is a wanton act of selfishness unsurpassed by anything that has ever come to my knowledge. Such is the meaning of the contract which the representatives from southern California, testifying before my committee, insist that the Government carry out to the letter. Time permitted me on this extension will not let me marshal the documentary proof of their intent, but I will do so at another time.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and I are diametrically opposed on this question: Should the United States Government turn over the operation and control of the Imperial Dam and the first section of the All-American Canal to the Imperial irrigation district? He says it should do so. I say it should not do so. In extending his remarks he may produce evidence—other than the contract—which he feels substantiates his view. I want later to produce evidence to show that it was never expected that the contract should remain unchanged by the treaty. I maintain that the treaty shall prevail wherever there is a conflict, and I further maintain that our Nation can "live with" that treaty.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, May 15, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, grave concern over the welfare of our fighting men in Korea prompts me to take the floor of the House this afternoon to make these few remarks. Whatever the outcome of the great debate that is now raging in the other body, one thing is certain. There is one thing that that so-called great debate has brought to light, and that is that we in the United States have no foreign policy designed to bring us victory in Korea; we have no foreign policy that can be interpreted in the light of reason.

On the other hand, we have received the suggestions of General MacArthur, which are in direct conflict with those presented by proponents of our present foreign policy. Whatever may be said of what General MacArthur proposes, at least he offers us a policy capable of definition. His policy offers a blueprint for victory in Korea; a plan whereby we can attain future world peace; and he offers us an opportunity to establish ourselves as the real defenders of freedom and liberty everywhere.

I would not attempt to compare the relative merits of the MacArthur proposals as opposed to those of President Truman and Secretary Marshall; but it must be admitted that the Truman-Marshall-Acheson plan—whether we like it or not—offers nothing but appeasement, continued warfare, death, and the ever-present danger of defeat.

News of the issues in this so-called great debate has reached our men in Korea, and that is why I am taking the floor this afternoon. Our men in Korea have been reading in the Stars and Stripes and in their letters from home of the arguments which have been presented to the other body by those who formulate our foreign policy. General Marshall, Secretary Acheson, and others have testified that these boys now fighting in Korea have no chance for victory; they are merely fighting a war of confinement that may last for months—for years, even decades—if we continue to follow our present line of appeasement. These foreign policy experts admit that we are stalemated, unless and until our Air Force can go beyond the Manchurian border; until we throw a blockade around the coast of China; and, in general, conform to the suggestions made to us by General MacArthur.

The other day, in the Washington Star, an article appeared stating that our Air Force men in Korea had reached a new low in morale because of ridiculous restrictions on their aerial activities. It said that our flyers patrolling the Manchurian border must sit up there in their airplanes like "sitting ducks," dodging flack being thrown up by enemy antiaircraft guns just across the river, and they cannot because of these restrictions return their fire. Certainly our airmen are not feeling good about that; nor are such idiotic restrictions helping their morale. That kind of policy is utterly ridiculous; it is more than that: It is criminal. I include the afore-mentioned item, which appeared in the Washington Star on Thursday, May 10, 1951:

JET PILOTS JOKE ABOUT EXPLOITS, BUT YALU BORDER ANGERS THEM

(By William C. Barnard)

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE BASE, KOREA, May 10.—Fighter pilots in the 312-plane allied strike at Sinuiju yesterday returned voicing increased dislike for the Yalu River boundary between Korea and Manchuria.

It was galling, the pilots said, to watch the enemy strike at them from what General MacArthur has called their Manchurian sanctuary. It is just across the river from Sinuiju.

United Nations policy barred the flyers from knocking out the antiaircraft guns which fired at them from across the Yalu. Nor were they permitted to attack Communist planes they saw just over the border.

The enemy craft were right there in plain sight, first warming up to take the air, and later gaining altitude on their own side of the river, pilots said. Fifty Red planes took the air but only thirteen attacked.

The Fifth Air Force announced that 95 buildings containing enemy troops and supplies were destroyed or damaged in the strike, along with a large fuel dump and 5 vehicles.

One Red plane was definitely destroyed and two damaged on the ground, the Air Force said. They were identified as Russian-built LA-5's—conventional-type fighters—instead of Russian Yaks, also propeller-driven planes, as first announced.

The Air Force acknowledged damage to one of its planes. Marine flyers reported eight of theirs suffered minor damage.

Maj. George G. Loving, Jr., Lynchburg, Va., and Maj. Andrew Jackson Alexander, of Anderson, S. C., were among the flyers who reported they could see the Red planes sitting on the field at Antung, Manchuria, and in the air on the Manchurian side.

Major Loving said AA guns on the Manchurian side tried to get him, but "of course, I was not allowed to shoot back at them." He said he saw 80 MIG-15 Russian-type jets on the Antung field, in plain view, but "I couldn't cross that border to get them."

Major Alexander said enemy planes swept down on the allied flyers from their superior altitude as the Americans headed for their bases.

He thought he downed one, but another MIG damaged his plane with cannon fire. He was lucky to get home.

Jet pilots are a breezy, good-humored lot. They joke about their exploits. But the Red Manchurian sanctuary is the one thing they don't joke about. To them it is no laughing matter.

Mr. Speaker, the real purpose of my taking the floor this afternoon is to read to the House two communications from Korea that have recently been called to my attention. One, I received in my office, from a young man I have known since he was a baby; a youngster born and raised in my home town. He is one of my neighbors. His education, at Mississippi State College, was interrupted about a year ago when he got a call to go with the Reserves on active duty. He is now in Korea. I want to read this letter to you:

Dear JOHN BELL: We have just completed a railroad bridge that must have cost us and the rest of the taxpayers plenty here at Wonju. We were supposed to build a railroad from here to Seoul, but now it looks like we are not going to do this as it looks like this "political" war seems to be going the other way for a little while.

He gave special emphasis to the word "political."

Continuing:

JOHN BELL, we sure would like to hear your ideas on this war and what you think will happen. Most of us in this unit are from Mississippi, and all of us know you and know you will let us in on the straight dope about this whole situation.

I wish I could. They are entitled to know.

Most of the boys are veterans and have families at home. You know how hard it is on them to have to leave their homes and families and come over here to fight this war, or, as you in Washington say, to help in this police action.

And here he underscored the words "police action" That seems to be an awfully unpopular phrase in Korea.

Then we hear about the way things are going back home, about the way it seems that most people have forgotten us or are ignoring us. We don't seem to think that the South Koreans want to fight. Every time a big battle comes up and we need them they turn and run, leaving our boys holding the

bag. They go back to their homes, pull off their uniforms, and are civilians back with their families. To top all this off, we read in the Stars and Stripes where the Korean reserves are getting out to farm.

And that is the second time I have had that called to my attention. Is it possible that these conditions exist?

Called out to farm farmland which cannot grow grass, let alone anything fit to eat.

There's one more thing we would like to know: When is the United States of America, the strongest Nation in the world, going to start fighting this war? Are they going to let us over here fight and die while the draft dodgers stay back home and enjoy the democracies we are fighting for? You there in Congress argue about whether or not you will draft 18-year-olds, while your past voters are over here dying.

And listen to this:

If you could see and smell the stack of deceased voters just across the road from our camp I believe there would be some changes somewhere.

Well, I guess I had better close now as I want to enjoy this can of beer we got tonight, as it is the first we have had in months.

Mr. Speaker, that letter is very straightforward; it is a sincere outpouring from the mind of a fine young man in Korea who sees no hope for the future. This young man is wondering why we will not let our Air Force go beyond the borders of Manchuria and cut off those sources of supply that are keeping our enemies fighting. He is wondering why we refuse him the aid of the Chinese Nationalists; he is wondering why he must stay in Korea, while our draft quotas are being reduced. It just does not make sense.

This is not the only evidence of dissatisfaction and low morale among our service men I have had called to my attention lately. In one of the Jackson, Miss., newspapers there recently appeared a joint letter sent to the editor and signed by 32 Mississippi men serving in Korea. Each and every one of these boys signed his name to that letter, and the letter with their names signed thereto was printed in that newspaper for the world to see. They did not try to conceal their identities; they wanted to let the people back home know what was going on regardless of what the consequences might be.

I will read that letter in a moment. But first, I have made certain deletions, for very obvious reasons, and I am not going to include the names of the signers, although this was taken from a news article that carried the names of each of them.

Their letter reads as follows:

We, the undersigned enlisted Reserve personnel of the ——— ——— now stationed in Korea, have, in our opinion, a legitimate and justifiable complaint which we feel should be made public through the medium of the press. It has been brought to our attention that the draft quota for the month of April has been cut in half and plans are being formulated to fill the manpower deficiency this may cause by calling in additional Reserve units. We hear, also that a lot of political wrangling is going on back there in an effort to effect a fair and impartial draft plan. Very little has been accomplished thus far. While the politicians argue the Reservists are bearing the brunt of this so-called police action.

You will notice these boys use the same term "police action" as was used by the other young man in the preceding letter which I read to the House:

We believe that the general public knows very little of the true state of affairs concerning the Reservists. We are also of the opinion that the American people are misinformed on the true condition of the Reserve Units in Korea. Otherwise, a little justice might conceivably be meted out in our favor. With that in mind we wish, without prejudice or bitterness to tell our story of a typical Reserve outfit abroad.

This battalion was called to active duty in August 1950—many months before plans were made to call up small units of battalion and company size. We were volunteered it seems. We don't know why or by whom. From September 1, to December 28, 1950, we were retained in the States for training. Our training consisted, mainly, of reading Army manuals, engaging in close-order drill and hearing ambitious brass tell us what wonderful soldiers we were. At the end of this period we were told that we were well trained and ready to embark.

Our physical examination, August 12, 1950, given by five inebriated physicians (the undersigned will attest to this) was, to all intents and purposes, a farce, but it was highly commendable to the one we underwent at * * * prior to embarkation. An Army medic looked down our throats with the help of a tongue depressor and declared us fit for combat. As a result we have a great number of men here who would (be) disqualified immediately should they, having been released, try to reenlist in the service. Nevertheless, the aged and lame and infirm keep coming over while the politicians at home continue to argue over the advisability of sending able-bodied men into the fight.

At present we are engaged in the reconstruction of roads and bridges to facilitate the flow of military traffic to the front. We are proud of the job we are doing. But we are confronted with problems and difficulties which shock and astonish us. For example, we are well clothed and well fed—but other than that we've very little to fight with. Our equipment is insufficient and obsolete. Spare parts for equipment which are often vital are practically unobtainable. Vital construction material, gasoline, fuel oil, pioneer equipment, explosives, and hundreds of other critical items come to us in such pitiful dribbles that the act of stealing from other hard-pressed outfits is no longer frowned upon. Our battalion is full strength yet we do not have a battalion doctor. Our boys engage in heavy dangerous work each day accompanied by a first-aid man.

Each of us lives in deadly fear of serious injury because emergency hospitalization is so remote. They tell us there is a shortage of M. D.'s. What has become of the great army of medical men who adequately cared for 16,000,000 men in World War II? What in hell has happened to America's great manufacturing potential—her famous assembly-line production? Where are all the new improved weapons, atomic and otherwise? Why all this national apathy toward this very real war? Does America not realize that her sons are over here in great numbers? Is it true that an effort is being made to prolong this "police action" indefinitely in order to perpetuate the current business boom on the home front? We want to know the answers to a few of these questions.

Don't misunderstand us. We love our country. We are willing to fight for our way of life. But we are getting damn tired of hogging all the glory. We are all veterans of World War I with an average of 2 years overseas service. Can you visualize the tremendous war potential our country would possess should every American male spend that much time in military service? And why not? Why should 20-year-old citizen John Doe be exempted from the draft because he has a wife, when 35-year-old Reservist Richard Roe, veteran of World War II, who has a wife and two children, is now fighting in Korea? It is becoming increasingly evident that patriotism in America is penalized rather than rewarded. No one can truthfully refute this. Every draft law that has been enacted, every item of publicity concerning active participation in war, all the forces that make up our defense set-up seem to favor the draft dodger and the slacker. Anyone who dares show a spark of patriotic willingness is worked to the limit of endurance. This is putting it mildly. Many of us who had our lives interrupted in World War II are back again. But this time we have reached the middle age. Some of us, if we survive, must seek employment again. What will happen to us this time? What sort of phony rehabilitation plan will they humiliate us with when this action is over?

GI Joe of the ERC is not making any unreasonable demands. He merely wants to be treated fairly. He knows the filth and horror and inconveniences of war—he's had it before. He was, unfortunately, both in an era of universal turmoil and conflict. But in this instance, he feels that he has been duped. However, do not misjudge his mentality. He is not an automaton who will be caught napping again and again. The Reservist is compiling names of the powers that be—and he will not forget. The list is long. But, united, the discharged Reservist will have tremendous power and influence.

We are the have-nots. We have no doctor, no chaplain, no recreation, no special services, no bathing facilities, no laundry, no morale—and, judging from recent happenings, no hope.

That letter was signed by 32 men who were not afraid to have their names printed in the newspapers so that the brass could see it. I will not, though, list their names here.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman from Mississippi on the very fine statement he has made, and I would like to ask him this question: Does the gentleman believe, in view of our present policy in Korea, that we want to win a military victory there?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not know what our present policy in Korea is. Whatever it is, it certainly does not point to a solution of the military problem that we face over there.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I should like to make this observation in connection with the question I have just asked. It is not a secret that at the United Nations they do not want a military victory. I have a fear that we are going along with that policy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think it is significant that in neither one of these letters was any mention made of the United Nations troops that are now supposedly fighting in Korea. I think perhaps the reason is that these boys have not seen any of these United Nations troops and probably do not even know they are supposed to be there.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman on bringing these two letters to the attention of the House and the country. The gentleman himself has had a distinguished record in the service. Can the gentleman imagine the bitterness of any military man who is committed to a military assignment and then prohibited from carrying out that assignment in order to win? To me, it is a most pathetic situation in which we are now in Korea. These men have been sent off to war, to put their own lives in jeopardy, but they still are refused the wherewithal to win the war.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I well recall in General MacArthur's address to Congress the question he said his men at the front asked him: "General, why must we surrender military advantage to an enemy in the field?" He said he could not answer. Certainly I cannot answer that question.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I, too, want to commend the gentleman on this fine statement. I am wondering if these men who signed their names to the statement will be dismissed and returned to the United States, so they can tell their story to the American people as General MacArthur has done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Their names were printed in this newspaper and they are available to the public through the pages of this newspaper. If the gentleman would like to present their case to the Armed Forces Committee I would be most happy to let them have their names.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It seems to me the point the letter from the reservists in the construction battalion made the strongest was the unfair way in which our reservists have been treated in connection with their call to duty in the present war in Korea and in connection with our general mobilization. Does not the gentleman think the Congress can act perhaps the most quickly today to do something about this, and in the best manner, by acting upon this current draft bill now pending in conference, which offers for the first time some hope of alleviating the problem of the reservist, some hope, that is, for the first time of its being acted on by the Congress since this situation developed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Of course, the Congress does not have any control of legislation after it gets in the hands of the bureaucrats. It was by Executive order that the draft quotas were cut in March and April—not by any act of the Congress. That is what these boys are complaining about.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The Congress should put into law, as it has taken some steps to do during its consideration of this current draft bill, some specific provision for the relief of the reservists.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the gentleman knows that a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services is considering at the present time a bill covering reserves in the future. In the past the treatment of the reserves has been based on a policy for today and disregard tomorrow. If I have anything to do with the writing of this bill covering the reserves of the future, everything will be spelled out leaving nothing to the discretion of the Department of Defense so far as the reserves are concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman, who has a distinguished record in both world wars. If he were writing the legislation, I would not worry about it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to suggest that as soon as the battle of the brass hats that is raging in the Senate committee is over we might send for some of these boys who are doing the fighting and suffering; and bring them here and find out what is going on in Korea.

I noticed in the paper the other day that they were fighting with their fists and their gunstocks. If we are going into an all-out war in China, the Chinese can furnish anywhere from 300 to 500 men to our one, and fight a hundred years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman will note from these letters that these boys apparently resent the fact that this has been called a police action. I am sure they would be amused, if not completely bewildered or disgusted, if they could read the press releases following the action taken in the House and the other body the last time we met, giving Korean war veterans benefits and entitlements due to men who served in the Armed Forces of America during wartime.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. There seems to be a great deal of boasting on the part of certain people within our Defense Department that we are killing a lot of Chinese and that the ratio may be 50 to 1. I feel one American soldier and one American life is not to be used as a pawn for 50 Chinese. I am sure that the life of one American is more important to him, to his family, and to his country than 50 or 100 or 1,000 Chinese.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. So far as I am concerned, the life of one American soldier is worth more than all armies and soldiers of Communist China, North Korea, or Russia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I commend the gentleman for the courage that he has displayed today in bringing these matters to the attention of the House, and to the country, and especially for the sincerity of his address, and more especially coming from a man who has had the experience that he has had in war.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank my good friend from Kansas.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. In reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] or in accord with what he said, I have seen it stated time and time again that the Chinese could give 500 to our 1 and fight indefinitely, and that our only chance to win is through the use of these implements which we have developed in this country—the airplane, the atomic bomb, the jet engine, and so forth; and that we cannot do it by sending these boys out in the field without the proper weapons to fight with their fists or their gunstocks or to freeze to death, as many of them have done in the frigid area of Korea.

For that reason I should like to have some of these boys come back home, such as the ones who wrote those letters which my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississisippi, has just read, and tell the Congress what is going on in Korea and give us the real picture.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I feel the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi is rendering a signal service in calling the attention of the House to the condition of some of these reservists. The condition of some reservists whose plight has come to my attention is pathetic. They have not received proper treatment. I want to protest along with the gentleman from Mississippi against this unfair treatment and I urge appropriate action be taken to relieve them from the conditions that they are suffering from.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. McVEY. I commend the gentleman for the very excellent treatment he has given this important subject. I feel that the gentleman has made a fine contribution to the great debate by his remarks and his unbiased attitude certainly attests to the sincerity of the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. I would like also to commend the gentleman from Mississippi for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress. However, I want to mention that many Members of this Congress take pride in criticizing the administration for the very things this Congress has or has not done. I say that the whole fault for this entire situation can be laid in the lap of the Congress.

Just a few days ago I noticed when they were examining the various high brass in a committee of the other body that some of the committee members

stated, in asking questions of the high brass, that we are not fighting communism, but that we are only fighting imperialistic actions of Russia. Communism is communism, whether in Russia or elsewhere. Of course, those statements were to justify this Congress in supporting communism on one hand while fighting communism on the other. All Communists are imperialistically inclined in their beliefs. This Congress has had the opportunity on a number of occasions to do something about that for which they are now cricitizing the administration. We have given money to Yugoslavia, a communistic government, to encourage them in their communistic beliefs—buying with our wealth while Russia takes through infiltration. The majority of Congress has helped bring about the situation that we are now criticizing, and still we say it is not our fault; that it is the fault of the administration. Actually, truthfully, and sincerely, if we would assume the obligations and responsibilities placed upon us by section 8, article IV, of the Constitution of the United States, and provide for the common defense of this country, we would not need to blame President Truman or Secretary of State Acheson, who has been a complete failure since the day he was brought into office, nor General Marshall for all the things that are now going on. Those two Secretaries have been failures, but this Congress helped to install General Marshall whose beliefs are in accordance with Secretary of State Dean Acheson, whom you are criticizing. If the Congress would assume its responsibilities rather than sit here and criticize, we would get along a whole lot better.

I want to ask you if this is not true——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. There are a few people in Congress who are so administration-minded that they would stay with the administration on any issue—right or wrong. There are others, while biased and prejudiced against the administration, who would side-step any effort in Congress to correct the situation in order to keep politics alive for future use. You gentlemen know who they are. There are not enough individual-thinking Members of this Congress to get anything done. Too much politics is being played on both sides of the vital issues. All of us know that. There are a few who would do anything that the President told them to do. There are others, speaking of those I mentioned a little while ago, who would like to keep up this criticism in order that they might use it in the elections in 1952. There are not enough individual-thinking Members for the better welfare of our people. Many Members are now criticizing others while in truth they should be criticizing themselves for their own derelictions. It is a shame and a disgrace that some Members will sit here day in and day out and do absolutely nothing but find fault with and pass the buck to others in efforts to shield their own ineptitudes. Yes, I would help kick Dean Acheson and General Marshall out of office. I have never regretted having been among the few to protest and vote against the appointment of General Marshall. All of you who are hollering and criticizing just look and see how you voted on that Marshall deal. Why not admit your error while pointing out mistakes of others?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I can tell from what he has to say that he is just as bewildered and confused and disgusted as I am. I voted the same way the gentleman voted on every one of those issues. I want to go on record as agreeing wholeheartedly with what he has had to say.

However, regardless of where the fault lies the fact is that we are in a bad shape in Korea. The fact remains that we are going to have to get out of that hole over there, whether we get out by winning the war in Korea or whether we get out by just throwing up our hands and pulling out.

Mr. TACKETT. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. Do you not think that many of these Congressmen who supported General Marshall are trying to dodge their own acts by criticizing Dean Acheson rather than the General that they put in power as Secretary of Defense? Those two secretaries see everything alike.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You know, when General MacArthur was fired, they gave as the reason the need for civilian control of the military, while only last fall they had brought before the Congress a bill to repeal a law requiring the placing of civilians in charge of the military, and make General Marshall Secretary of National Defense—a civilian position.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I was one who took the flood against the appointment of General Marshall to his present position. Everything I said then has been borne out. We did not need to wait, for it was borne out before, when he fell into World War II backward at Pearl Harbor and did not remember where he was the night before, and apparently he did not know that the Japs were coming, although they were coming across an open sea 5,000 miles wide.

I am one Member who also voted against the Bevin plan that has been called the Marshall plan, to bankrupt America by financing foreign countries, some of which are now using those funds to buy weapons for the North Koreans to kill our boys with.

I want to congratulate my colleague from Mississippi on the splendid statement he has made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank my colleague from Mississippi. As I said a moment ago, I do not like to indulge in a discussion of personalities, but the fact remains that American boys are fighting and dying in Korea and we can see no way of ending the conflict over there under present circumstances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if this Congress gets busy and approves a conference report on UMT we will be making a great contribution to welfare of the Reserves?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am sure we will; yes.

But for the present, we should leave no stone unturned until our boys are victorious in Korea. This so-called police action may be merely a game to some of those high in international circles, but the stakes they are playing for are American lives.

I would base our future action in Korea on one of two premises: Win the war or withdraw. To do otherwise, is to sacrifice our most precious commodity—American lives.

JOHN CLARKE

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1235) for the relief of John Clarke, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after "unpaid", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of either of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand this statement simply adds the usual 10-percent clause to the bill as passed in the House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. That is all.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANOR K. SAVIDGE

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 849) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge,

with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Henry W. Savidge, deceased, of Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims of said estate against the United States for loss of earnings sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by the said Henry W. Savidge as a result of his having been struck on December 28, 1942, by an Army vehicle in Philadelphia, Pa.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the only change made by the Senate amendment is to change the name of the beneficiary of the bill from an individual to an estate?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

D. A. MONTGOMERY

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 703) for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after "Code", insert ": *Provided, however*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AL PARKER

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 656) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "That", insert ", notwithstanding any limitation upon the United States district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon tort claims against the United States which accrue prior to January 1, 1945."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is just a technical amendment to take care of possible conflict between the bill as we passed it and existing statutory law.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. It is merely a clarifying amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. A. C. LUPCHO

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 645) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe that the Senate reduced the amount?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. From ten to five.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the House passed a bill for $10,000 and the Senate bill provides for only $5,000?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM BERGEN

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 588) to confer jurisdiction upon the district court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "injuries", insert "allegedly."

Page 2, line 7, after "Code", insert: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objecton to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

T. L. MORROW

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RODINO, MACHROWICZ, and JONAS.

HARRY C. GOAKES

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1822) for the relief of Harry C. Goakes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, FRAZIER, and JONAS.

AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2782) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, FRAZIER, and KEATING.

BROOKLYN EAGLE WINS PULITZER PRIZE FOR DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE

(Mr. KEOUGH (at the request of Mr. BYRNE of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, we of Brooklyn, particularly, noted the recent award of the Pulitzer prize for distinguished public service conferred upon the Brooklyn Eagle, our borough's outstanding newspaper. Brooklynites know that for many years the Eagle has been alert to its responsibilities with a civic consciousness that has always been outstanding. This is especially so since the newspaper has come under the direction of its present publisher, Frank D. Schroth, and his staff of talented editors and reporters. The basis for its award

was the outstanding reportorial job done prior to the investigation into organized crime by our capable District Attorney Miles F. McDonald. Public officials of Brooklyn and New York City are always content to place their future in the courageous, objective, and capable hands of those charged with publishing the Brooklyn Eagle, knowing that they will be treated without fear or favor. We salute Mr. Schroth and his staff.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and that they appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING CO.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many of the Members have been following in the last few days the transaction whereby the Columbia Broadcasting Co. had planned to purchase the radio and television facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. That transaction would mean, if it had been completed, that the Columbia Broadcasting Co. would own all of the television and radio rights of one of the great companies of this country.

Although that deal has not been consummated, and according to news we hear now it probably will not be, I think it should be called not only to the attention of the Members of Congress but the country as a whole should know of the tremendous importance of some change in the law to prevent any such merger or the acquisition of the assets of one corporation by another in such a field where it can readily mean monopoly.

We all know, of course, under the Clayton Act, it is unlawful for any corporation engaged in commerce to acquire stock of a competitive organization where the effect would be to lessen competition. It would seem that the same principle of law should be applied to the radio and television field.

It is only a matter of time until education will come greatly into television. The monopoly that would be created is going to be bad for the country. It also has to do, of course, with freedom of speech.

It is very, very unfortunate if any one organization or any one spokesman of this country gets within his control most of the facilities of radio and television, no matter what side he may take, whether he happens to have one viewpoint or another.

We have been fortunate so far with the competition we have had. The public has been enabled to hear both sides of most questions. But, if any monopoly is created, as could very well have been done by this transaction, it will hurt the country.

I hope the Members of Congress will give some thought to it as an attempt may be made to have some change made in the law to have radio and television be treated the same as other industries.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to commend the gentleman on his watchfulness in this matter. After all, if one group obtains control of anything affecting such a vast intelligence area, you might say, so far as the people are concerned, it would be disastrous.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman. I think it is doubly important, for this reason: In recent years we have seen a continuing tendency on the part of the press to have certain large companies acquire other newspapers, so that gradually their is a tendency toward monopoly in that field. That is not so dangerous yet because there are still hundreds of newspapers. But in the radio field, there are now only three large companies, the American Broadcasting Co., Columbia Broadcasting System, and the Mutual Broadcasting System. We already have almost monopolistic conditions. We must not allow any further monopoly in that field.

We need more, not fewer, media for disseminating information and the country should become alert to the situation before it is too late.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin), from April 28 through May 19, 1951, on account of illness.

To Mr. ROGERS of Texas (at the request of Mr. GOSSETT) for the remainder of this week, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSAY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by the United Society of Friends Women.

Mr. JCHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an article from the Air Force magazine.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from a letter he received from China.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial by Mr. Arthur I. Boreman, publisher, Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial and a brief article regarding the announcement of the Cordell Hull Foundation.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include appropriate material.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. LYLE), was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. McMULLEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 15, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

449. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Quarterly Report of the activities authorized by Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress, for the period ending March 31, 1951, dealing with war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

450. A letter from the Chairman, War Claims Commission, transmitting the Second Semiannual Report of the War Claims Commission for the period ending September 13, 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

451. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of displaced persons; etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

452. A letter from the Acting Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified copy of a franchise enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico, ordinance No. 832, relating to the operation of a lighthouse business in the harbor of San Juan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

453. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

454. A letter from the Secretary, Territory of Alaska, transmitting copies of the laws enacted by the Twentieth Territorial Legislature, pursuant to section 6-1-2, Alaska Compiled Laws Annotated 1949; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1788. A bill to authorize the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians to make contracts for professional legal services with approval of the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe; with amendments (Rept. No. 441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1632. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; with amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1899. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution"; without amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. Senate Joint Resolution 35. Joint resolution to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions; without amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3216. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lula M. Whitebear; with amendments (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 4077. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 4078. A bill to increase disability and death compensation rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 4079. A bill for the establishment of a temporary national advisory committee for the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4080. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, to adjust the salaries of officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4081. A bill to authorize the lease and purchase by the United States of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R 4082. A bill to amend sections 42 and 43 of the Internal Revenue Code to give an option to domestic corporations to report income of foreign branches at the time of receipt in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4083. A bill to suspend certain provisions of law with respect to retirement for other than physical reasons for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4084. A bill to reorganize the Department of State in the interest of economy, efficiency, and a more effective administration of foreign affairs; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4085. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to rescind Ceiling Price Regulations 23 and 24, relating to ceiling prices on live beef cattle and on beef sold at wholesale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the private agreements concluded in 1945 at Yalta and Potsdam should be forthwith repudiated by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution urging the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action with respect to placing an arms embargo on Communist China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed 1,000 additional copies of serial 1, part 1, of the hearings held before said committee entitled "Study of Monopoly Power," authorized by House Resolution 95, Eighty-second Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Federal support for vocational education, and requesting the appropriation of money for the construction of the Buchanan Dam and Reservoir on Chowchilla River; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, objecting to the proposal by the Federal Government to increase the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to taxes on incomes, on inheritances and gifts, and amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to approving the resurvey of the agricultural flood-control program on the Washita watershed, and to appropriate certain sums annually to carry into effect the findings of said survey; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to the Texas natural-gas production situation and the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting Congress to increase the compensation to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Governor and Secretary of Hawaii, and judges of certain courts in the Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4086. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Medina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 4087. A bill for the relief of Dino Di Luca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN (by request):

H. R. 4088. A bill for the relief of John Carlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

281. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of F. R. Shelledy and 62 other citizens of the Osage, Iowa, community in opposition to a program of universal military conscription; to the Committee on Armed Services.

282. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the Michigan Society of Professional Engineers concerning the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

283. By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Society Daughters of the American Colonists, Washington, D. C., relative to resolutions unanimously adopted at the Thirtieth (National) General Assembly of the Daughters of the American Colonists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. A. J. McCartney, D. D., LL. D., Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Once more, our Father, we would begin the legislative day with Thee. As we pause for this reverential moment may we be still and know that Thou art God. We invoke Thy blessing upon the Members of the Senate whether present or absent. Give strength for our burdens; equipment for our tasks; wisdom for our responsibilities; insight for our times; clarity of our thoughts; charity for our speech; courage for our convictions; and unfaltering faith in Thy divine purpose for our national destiny. So may the safety, honor, and general welfare of our Nation be advanced that happiness, peace, and prosperity may be established upon the sure foundation of truth and justice, virtue and piety.

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 14, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3957) to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke; and

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the First Guam Legislature, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Resolution 4

Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the Governor of Guam to change section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam to provide a different method of electing members of the Legislature of Guam

Whereas section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam provides among other things that "The legislative power of Guam, except as otherwise provided in the act, shall be vested in a legislature which shall consist of a single house of not to exceed 21 members to be elected at large"; and

Whereas the election of members at large tends to work a hardship on those residents of Guam who live in rural or sparsely populated areas by depriving them of representation in the Guam Legislature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Guam Legislature, That the Congress and President of the United States are hereby respectfully petitioned and memorialized to amend the Organic Act of Guam so as to provide for the election of the 21 members of the Guam Legislature in accordance with the laws of Guam or as the Guam Legislature shall provide; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Interior and the Governor of Guam are hereby respectfully petitioned and memorialized to assist, plead, and exert all possible efforts toward the accomplishment of the purpose and intent of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive secretary of the Guam Legislature be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a copy of the resolution to the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senate of the United States, the President of the United States, and to the Governor of Guam.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, LANSING, MICH.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Michigan Junior Chamber of Commerce, strongly endorsing the immediate commencement of the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project as essential to our national defense effort, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the immediate commencement of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is essential to our national defense effort; and

Whereas the immediate commencement of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is indispensable as a measure of national security and defense to insure access through protected waterways to the only substantial source of high-grade, open-pit ore in the North American Continent outside of the Lake Superior area; and

Whereas the seaway is essential to insure the flow of such basic metal to the great industries located in the Great Lakes region at a reasonable and economical cost; and

Whereas the seaway will provide power facilities to domestic and industrial users in a power deficit St. Lawrence area; and

Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is the only sound economical and practical approach to the problem of transporting raw materials into the great industrial areas in the Great Lakes region and the shipment of finished products to world markets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Michigan Junior Chamber of Commerce at its board of directors' meeting held March 11, 1951, go on record as being unequivocally in favor of immediate action by the Congress of the United States on enabling legislation, and such incidental legislation as shall insure the realization of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all local organizations affiliated with the Michigan Junior Chamber of Commerce and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce with the request that these organizations pass similar resolutions; further, that a copy of this resolution be sent to all Michigan Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and that the Honorable HOMER FERGUSON be requested to read this resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EUGENE ANDERSON,
President.

JAMES J. COHOON,
Secretary.

DECLARATION ON FOREIGN POLICY—PETITION OF WISCONSIN PUBLIC LEADERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 72 leaders of Wisconsin public opinion, constituting a declaration on foreign policy, and I ask unanimous consent that a press release and the petition, including the signatures, together with a statement prepared by me in connection therewith, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the press release and petition were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE

Seventy-two Wisconsin leaders released today a "call to action" calling for establishment of a UN Armed Services Committee to integrate armed forces of UN members as Eisenhower is now uniting those of the Atlantic nations.

The statement also called for revision of the UN charter to give the UN "powers necessary to compel settlement of international disputes by means other than war."

Dr. J. Martin Klotsche, chairman of the sponsoring committee, pointed out that the UN does not now have any means of directing military efforts undertaken in its behalf, but must turn that responsibility over to member nations. "We cannot expect other nations to make significant contributions to UN military efforts unless, through a UN Armed Services Committee, they have a share in determining the use of those forces," stated Dr. Klotsche.

The Wisconsin call to action asked that, through Charter revision, the UN be given the right to control armaments through laws applicable to individual offenders, to maintain armed forces for meeting aggression, and to raise dependable revenue sufficient for its task of halting aggression and preserving the peace.

"Even though the Soviet Union or others may refuse," the proclamation stated, "the UN should be established on the basis of the revised, veto-free charter as soon as a majority of the nations ratify. A strong UN government, preserving to the nations full jurisdiction over domestic affairs, is the only sure protection against recurring wars."

WISCONSIN CALL TO ACTION

Our country and the entire world stand on the knife-edge of disaster.

The UN, because of Charter limitations, has been unable to prevent aggression or to unite the world in the face of aggression. We are now called upon to choose whether to discard the UN because of its limitations, or to keep the UN and remove its limitations. To discard the UN is to resign ourselves to war as the final arbiter of world disputes. It is surely the better part of wisdom to keep the UN and endow it with the power it must have to halt aggression and preserve the peace.

Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of Wisconsin, urge President Truman, in cooperation with the leaders of Congress, to press for immediate adoption within the UN of the following proposals:

1. Establishment of a UN Armed Services Committee under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. A civilian leader of world-wide stature should head the committee and act as commander in chief of the UN armed forces. To insure full and proportionate sharing by each nation in the burdens of defense, the committee must be empowered to integrate and direct the armed forces of the participating nations. The military powers of the various UN members would then be united to meet aggression anywhere in the world as the armed forces of the Atlantic nations are now being united to meet any aggression in Europe.

2. Revision of the UN Charter to include these carefully limited powers necessary to compel settlement of international disputes by means other than war: (a) The right to make enforcible laws to control armaments; (b) the right to apply those laws through UN courts to individual offenders rather than entire nations, thus stopping aggression at its source; (c) the right to maintain effective, tyranny-proof, armed forces to meet aggression; (d) the right to raise dependable revenue.

The necessary revisions might well be drafted by a Charter Review Commission appointed under article 22 of the Charter. The revision must include a more adequate method of UN representation than the present system of "one nation—one vote."

The UN should be established on the basis of the revised, veto-free charter as soon as a majority of the nations ratify, even though the Soviet Union or others may refuse. A strong UN Government, preserving to the nations full jurisdiction over domestic affairs, is the only sure protection against recurring wars.

The cataclysm of war may still be prevented, should our Nation follow this policy immediately and vigorously. If full-scale war does again overtake us, this course of action will unite the free world and conclude the conflict with the enduring peace which alone can redeem the terrible cost of victory.

SIGNERS OF THE WISCONSIN CALL TO ACTION

Rev. Merrill R. Abbey, First University Methodist Church, Madison, Wis.; M. B. Atkinson, editor, Eau Claire Leader and Telegram, Eau Claire, Wis.; Rev. Dwight Moody Bahr, Waukesha Baptist Church, Waukesha, Wis.; R. L. Bangsberg, editor, La Crosse Tribune, La Crosse, Wis.; Catherine Behrens, president, Wisconsin Education Association, Kenosha, Wis.; Elston L. Belknap, M. D., Milwaukee, Wis.; Maude E. Blackstone, board member of United Council of Church Women of America, Waukesha, Wis.; Charles Broughton, editor, Sheboygan Press, Sheboygan, Wis.; Marshall F. Browne, Madison printer, Madison, Wis.; R. G. Chamberlin, principal, Rufus King High School, Milwaukee, Wis.; R. E. Chesebro, president, Handknit Hosiery Co., Sheboygan, Wis.; Mrs. F. H. Clausen, State commander, American Cancer Society, Horicon, Wis.

Ellis H. Dana, executive vice president, Wisconsin Council of Churches; Bill Dodds, regional educational and political action director, UAW-CIO, Milwaukee, Wis.; Helen R. Doege, Marshfield, Wis.; Sarah C. Ettenheim, president, Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, Milwaukee, Wis.; Jerome Fox, chairman, Democratic State Central Committee, Madison, Wis.; J. F. Friedrick, regional director, Wisconsin American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.; C. E. Garton, president, Garton Toy Co., Sheboygan, Wis.; Berhard Gettelman, State senator, Milwaukee, Wis.; W. Giese, superintendent of schools, Racine, Wis.; Dorothy Gill, treasurer, H. H. West, Milwaukee, Wis.; Robert Gordon, chairman, Post-Zeidler Chapter, American Veterans Committee, Milwaukee, Wis.

O. L. Hall, president, Bank of Sheboygan, Sheboygan, Wis.; Francis A. Henson, director of educational and political action, International Union, UAW-AFL; Fred R. Holt, superintendent of schools, West Bend, Wis.; T. J. Jenson, superintendent of Shorewood schools, Shorewood, Wis.; William V. Kelley, director, Urban League, Milwaukee, Wis.; Michael S. Kies, county superintendent of schools, Safety Building, Milwaukee, Wis.; Harvey Kitzman, regional director of Wisconsin and Minnesota, UAW-CIO, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Norbert Klein, Wisconsin club woman, Milwaukee, Wis.; Dr. J. Martin Klotsche, president, Milwaukee State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Anthony Knackert, Holy Name Parish, Sheboygan, Wis.; G. H. Koenig, editor, Waukesha Daily Freeman, Waukesha, Wis.

Mrs. L. A. Leadbetter, Rhinelander, Wis.; Robert Lewis, education director, Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, Madison, Wis.; J. P. Mann, superintendent of schools, Appleton, Wis.; Roy Matson, editor, Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis.; Henry Maier, State senator, Milwaukee, Wis.; Edward Mesheski, chairman, Milwaukee County Democratic Organizing Committee, Milwaukee, Wis.; Frank Meyer, managing editor, Shawano Evening Leader, Shawano, Wis.; Bishop I. Richard Mewaldt, president of Western District Executive Board of Moravian Church, Madison, Wis.; Gaylord Nelson, State senator, Madison, Wis.; Rev. Jess H. Norenberg, superintendent, Wisconsin Congregational Conference, Madison, Wis.; Rabbi Murray Peiman, Racine, Wis.

Llewellyn Pfankuchen, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Carl Prange, chairman of the board, Prange Department Stores, Sheboygan, Wis.; Paul A. Pratt, vice president, Bordens Gridley Division, president, Milwaukee Association of Commerce, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Charles A. Puls, Luther Memorial Church, Madison, Wis.; Rev. Ensworth Reisner, First Methodist Church of Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.; Hugo J. Ripp, vice general chairman of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks and State chairman of the Wisconsin State Legislative Committee; Nelson Vance Russell, president, Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.

Rev. E. P. Sabin, rector, St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Madison, Wis.; Sidney H. Sayles, director, Milwaukee Anti-Defamation League, Milwaukee, Wis.; Judge L. H. Schlichting, Sheboygan County judge, Sheboygan, Wis.; Jennie T. Schrage, chairman, WFWC department of public affairs, Madison, Wis.; Mrs. Ed Schulenberg, chairman of international relations, eighth district, WFWC, Sheboygan, Wis.; Christ Seraphim, former Milwaukee County commander of the American Legion, now chairman of housing committee of American Legion; Mr. S. F. Shattuck, former member, board of directors, Kimberly-Clark; Robert A. Straughn, M. D., Jackson Clinic, Madison, Wis.; A. A. Suppan, vice president, Wisconsin Federation of Teachers, professor, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.; Manfred Swarsensky, M. D., Rabbi Temple Beth El, Madison, Wis.

Maurice Terry, director, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Milwaukee; Mrs. Konrad C. Testwuide, former chairman, Council of Social Agencies, Sheboygan, Wis.; Mrs. George Thompson, Hudson, Wis.; Clifford G. Times, publisher, the Rhinelander News, Rhinelander, Wis.; Earl W. Villmow, commander, General Charles King Post, American Legion, Milwaukee, Wis.; Lester Washburn, international president, UAW-AFL, Waukesha, Wis.; Karl Werwath, president, Milwaukee School of Engineering, Milwaukee, Wis.; M. O. Withey, M. D., dean of College of Engineering, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Stuart B. Wright, general manager, American Automobile Association, Wisconsin division, Madison, Wis.; Charles Zadok, 7748 North Club Circle, Milwaukee 1, Wis.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

All over our Nation there is a tremendous ferment as men and women of good will probe their own consciences and confer with their neighbors in an effort to think out what

they feel to be the best approach toward the grim problem of preventing war.

My own State of Wisconsin, long a leader in political and social progress, is a splendid case in point. I have the text of a press release sent out last Sunday on the subject of strengthening the United Nation's Charter. This release describes the signing of a declaration on foreign policy by some 72 leaders of Wisconsin public opinion. I am profoundly interested in this call to action even though I do not agree with all of the points which it has included.

I see in this call, however, another constructive and encouraging sign of the tremendous search among our people for ways and means to stave off a third world holocaust. The people at the grass roots of America are deeply desirous that their Congress shall know that they, the people, want to play the most helpful possible role in this gravest of all problems.

I congratulate these men and women, among whom are numbered some of the outstanding private citizens of my State.

Represented among them are some of our ablest newspapermen, labor leaders, spiritual thinkers, women leaders, educators, veteran leaders, welfare workers, and others.

I personally wholeheartedly believe as those folks who signed this petition do, that the United States must continue to place her faith in the United Nations. We dare not discard the UN. We must ever seek to strengthen it so that it may fulfill the prayers of mankind. I do, however, want to mention this:

In 1950, I personally served on a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which considered numerous specific proposals to revise the UN Charter. It was our decision following lengthy hearings that it was not so much the questionable organizational procedures and limited powers of the United Nations which have brought us to the present impasse, but rather it was the imperialistic tendencies of the Soviet Union. Even with a flawless international mechanism, perfect in its structure, perfect in its form, we would not be further along the path to peace if the Soviet Union persisted in her present menacing policies. So, it is my judgment that it is the spirit of the international organization rather than the substance, that is, the form, the outward manifestations which will really determine world peace.

If the Soviet Union were to change its policies, if there were to be a genuine change in the Kremlin's heart (as inconceivable as that seems today) and not merely another deceptive so-called peace offensive cloaking warlike actions, then it is my judgment that the world would breathe a lot easier.

However, insofar as this Wisconsin declaration is concerned, I feel that those folks who have gone to the trouble of thinking out and preparing this petition and collecting other signatures should be commended, and I should like to do so publicly at this time.

With many of the individuals on this petition, I have agreed practically uniformly; with others, I have disagreed just as frequently, but to all of them on this occasion, I extend my heartiest good wishes. Partisan differences, personal differences matter as naught in the face of the problem of world peace.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1484. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1485. A bill for the relief of Luigi Dini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1486. A bill to amend the statute relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 1487. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1488. A bill for the relief of Asnif Antreassian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1489. A bill to prevent the entry of certain mollusks into the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1490. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Hartley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1491. A bill to extend the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System in the case of veterans who served in the active military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 1492. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Fifty-second Annual National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in New York, N. Y., from August 26, 1951, through August 31, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MILITARY LEAVE FOR SUBSTITUTE POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would grant to substitute employees of the Post Office Department the same right with respect to pay during periods of active-duty training in the Reserves as are now enjoyed by regular employees in postal service. Under present regulations, regular classified employees are entitled to military leave without loss of pay for training periods of not to exceed 15 days, but classified substitute employees are denied this right. My bill would simply give substitute employees the same right to military leave.

The bill (S. 1486) to amend the statute relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and the National Guard, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED CEREMONY IN HONOR OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee, composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare plans for and to hold an appropriate ceremony in honor of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent many years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States and died as the result of a fall while working on the rotunda frieze, his last assignment in the Capitol. Such ceremony shall be held in the rotunda of the Capitol on July 26, 1951, the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, or on such other day as the committee herein provided for may designate. The committee shall extend invitations to attend the ceremony to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Ambassador of Italy, and such other public officials and persons in private life as the committee may select.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1397) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3957) to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sixteen postmasters.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HUNT:

An address on the subject The Coal Industry in the Modern Crisis, delivered by Senator O'MAHONEY, before the American Mining Congress Coal Show, in Cleveland, Ohio, May 14, 1951.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

A statement prepared by him in tribute to the Finnish maritime industry.

By Mr. HILL:

An address on the subject Collective Bargaining Today, delivered by Paul L. Styles, a member of the National Labor Relations Board, at the Thirty-ninth Convention of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers,

in Philadelphia, Pa., May 7, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.

By Mr. NEELY:

Letter regarding the commutations of the sentences of 79 German war criminals, addressed by Frederick C. McKee, Chairman of the Committee on National Affairs, to the Christian Science Monitor.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "The British," written by Bruce Barton, and published in the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post-Times of April 15, 1951, discussing the attitude of the British toward America.

Letter, dated May 10, 1951, addressed by Charles Scott Williams, to the editor of the Williamsport (Pa.) Sun, discussing the effect of planning of our foreign policy.

By Mr. THYE:

Article relating to conditions in agriculture, written by Henry T. McKnight, and published in the May issue of the Breeder Stockman.

Editorial referring to the beef-price rollback, published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of May 12, 1951.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Editorial entitled "The Seaway and the Waterway," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 3, 1951, relating to the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway on Chicago plans for developing traffic on the Illinois seaway.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

A discussion between Senator BRIDGES and W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, on the subject The Basic Issues of Our Foreign Policy, broadcast over the American Forum of the Air on May 13, 1951.

Statement by Elise Hatt Campbell (Mrs. Dudley Rhodes Campbell), of Birmingham, Mich., entitled "Young Lithuanian DP Serves in American Army."

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President during the period ending December 31, 1951, sufficient funds to provide not in excess of 2,000,000 long tons of food grains and to provide for such administrative expenses as are not covered by local currency furnished by the Government of India in accordance with sections 4 and 5 of this act: *Provided*, That the expenditures authorized hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of meeting the emergency need in India arising during the period ending December 31, 1951.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. The assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food grains, or equivalents, to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, drought, and other conditions existing in India in 1950.

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby authorized to be made available to the President during the period ending June 30, 1952:

(a) Not to exceed $47,500,000 for assistance on a grant basis, which shall be immediately available from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; and

(b) Not to exceed $47,500,000 to be made available from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $95,000,000 for use during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That not more than one-half of such amount shall be for assistance on a grant basis and the balance for assistance on credit terms in conformity with the provisions of section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to support S. 872, a bill to furnish emergency food aid to India. I support this bill for humanitarian reasons. I believe that if we pass this bill with this basic thought in mind, it will bolster the ultimate security of the United States. It will make the inroads of communism into India more difficult. I do not approve many of the policies of the Indian Government. If I permitted my reactions to some of the positions taken by the Indian Government to dominate my thoughts, I could not be in favor of this bill. But I do not want to see people go hungry if I am in any position to help them. Hungry people are not friendly people. Hungry people are not thoughtful people. Hungry people think only of their immediate physical needs. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the shipment of 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India.

There are 350,000,000 people in India. That is a population two and one-third times as great as ours. The Indian Government reports that the total 1951 requirement for food grains is approximately 50,000,000 tons. Of this amount, 44,000,000 tons come from local production, 4,000,000 tons has to be purchased by India and allocated and transferred under the International Wheat Agreement. Included in this is 680,000 tons of wheat and milo directly purchased in the United States. The United States has the only remaining sufficiently large available supply of wheat to make up the 50,000,000 tons which is necessary to feed India. If there is to be any assurance given by the Indian Government to the Indian people that they are not going to starve, the best estimates call for 2,000,000 tons more of food grains.

On the basis of 50,000,300 tons a year, 2,000,000 tons is approximately a 2 weeks' supply. What we will do, therefore, if we pass this bill is to give India's ration system a minimum grain supply for 2 weeks out of a total of 52 weeks in a year. The Indian people live so close to the margin of subsistence that even a slight reduction in the amount of food available means death to thousands. The Indian caloric intake is about one-half that of the average American citizen. To reduce it further means famine. India knows famine, but I do not believe that it is wise or helpful to us in the United States on a humanitarian basis and on the basis of our own security to permit famine in India, if we can avoid it through making available 2,000,000 tons of our surplus supply of wheat.

The question has been raised as to whether there is a surplus supply of wheat in the United States in the amount of 2,000,000 tons. A million tons of wheat is 37,500,000 bushels of wheat. On April 12 Secretary of Agriculture Brannan appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. At that time he estimated that our carry-over including the 1951 crop would be 425,000,000 bushels. He told the committee that the minimum safe carry-over was 325,000,000 bushels. Two million tons is equal to 75,000,000 bushels. But we are only planning to send initially 37,500,000 bushels.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. On what date was the crop estimate made to which the Senator from Massachusetts has just referred?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That crop estimate was made on April 12. I know there has been a new and a lower estimate, which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know by what amount the estimate as to winter wheat is off, as shown in the last crop report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that the estimates were read into the RECORD and appear on page 5269 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. Are the figures set forth on that page of the RECORD the same as the Senator has just given?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read from the statement of the United States wheat outlook, supplied by the United States Department of Agriculture, as it appears on page 5269:

> The preliminary forecast of the 1951 spring-wheat crop indicates a year of about 309,000,000 bushels, as compared to 276,000,000 bushels harvested in 1950.

Are those the figures to which the Senator from Nebraska referred?

Mr. WHERRY. The figures in the statement from which the Senator just read, which were placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], are, I am sure, identical with the figures for the winter-wheat crop the Senator from Massachusetts has just quoted. I simply wanted the Senator to state for the RECORD whether he had heard that the estimate of winter wheat for this year, as indicated by the last crop report, already shows a decrease of 44,000,000 bushels.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the estimate for the wheat crop is off; that there is a later estimate than the estimate from which I read. I used the estimate because that was the figure given by Secretary Brannan to the Committee on Appropriations on April 12, and I knew it to be accurate. I agree with the Senator that the figures are off since that time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. It so happens that I have the figures for the May 1, 1951, crop report. The winter wheat estimate is 682,196,000 bushels. In 1950 we produced 750,000,000 bushels. This will be the smallest crop since 1943, when we raised 537,000,000 bushels of winter wheat.

If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me to make a brief statement of my opinion on the wheat situation, let me say that we are threatened with a greatly reduced surplus. Of course, the surplus is one of the problems which the wheat growers of the United States watch very closely. We have had surpluses or carry-overs as high as from 500,000,000 to 600,000,000 bushels. We are now down to 420,000,000 bushels or less.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a carry-over.

Mr. CARLSON. That is the estimated carry-over on July 1. With a reduced estimated production this year, the carry-over probably will decrease to 300,000,000 bushels on June 30, 1952, which is a dangerously low surplus.

I bring up this point for this reason. The Midwest is the great winter wheat-producing area of the United States. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will not object if I state that Kansas raises normally one-fourth of the winter wheat of the Nation. Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, and portions of Nebraska are seriously hurt this year so far as wheat production is concerned. In this great wheat-producing area a new disease, called mosaic, has appeared. This plant virus inoculates the roots, moves up through the plant when it begins to come out of the dormant stage in the spring. So far we have no definite method of control. Our wheat production has been decreasing for the past 2 years.

I think that is a matter which should be given serious consideration by the Senate when it comes to allocating a large amount of grain to any other country. We should consider the future reserves of the United States. If we have a short crop in 1952, there will be a clamor from the people of the Nation because of the shortage of grain. We have had eight very bountiful years in the wheat belt. It seems that now we may be entering a cycle of lower production.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say most respectfully to the Senator from Kansas that, coming as I do from Massachusetts, I would not for one moment attempt to compete with him on information concerning the problem of the wheat grower. When the Senator's predecessor in the Senate, the late distinguished Senator Reed, of Kansas, was here, in the war years of 1945 and 1946, we used to discuss the problem of the carry-over. I relied on him to a great extent, and upon his prognostications.

I agree with the Senator from Kansas that we are getting down toward the lower limit. The Senator will agree with me that during the war years and immediately after the war, we were down to a much lower carry-over than we will have, as nearly as the estimates now indicate, even if we send 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India. The Senator will agree with that, will he not?

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator from Massachusetts will further yield on that point, following the drought years of the early 1930's, we were down to a carry-over of 83,167,000 bushels in 1937, which was the lowest in the Nation's history.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What was the carry-over in 1945?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not happen to have before me the figures for 1945, but I have the figure for 1947. In 1947 the carry-over was 83,813,000 bushels. In 1949 it was 307,952,000 bushels. In 1950 it was 420,018,000 bushels. This year it is estimated at 420,000,000 bushels.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator that the carry-over has reached a low level; but I hope it will not get so low that we cannot do what is proposed by this bill and still be safe in the United States.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, as a part of the colloquy between the Senator from Massachusetts and myself, some figures or tables which I received from the Department of Agriculture with reference to United States wheat production and the carry-over of wheat stocks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In thousands of bushels]

	Wheat production		All corn	
	United States	Kansas	United States	Kansas
1941	941,970	173,332	2,651,889	55,980
1942	969,381	200,101	3,068,562	82,415
1943	843,513	144,241	2,905,980	77,308
1944	1,060,111	187,700	3,088,110	97,598
1945	1,108,224	207,939	2,880,933	68,563
1946	1,153,046	212,977	3,240,950	65,231
1947	1,367,186	286,702	2,383,970	40,443
1948	1,313,534	231,368	3,681,793	81,304
1949	1,141,188	164,208	3,379,436	73,196
1950	1,026,756	178,060	3,131,099	93,188
1951	[1] 1,036,000	152,218	[2] 3,050,000	
Apr. 1 winter wheat	[1] 726,512			
May 1 winter wheat	682,196			
Conditional Mar. 1	[1] 309,000			

[1] Combination of Apr. 1 winter wheat and Mar. 1 conditional spring wheat.
[2] March intentions.

Carry-over wheat stocks July 1

[In thousands of bushels]

	United States	Kansas
1937	[1] 83,167	
1947	83,813	6,295
1948	195,991	44,355
1949	307,952	47,868
1950	420,018	80,691
1951	[2]	
Peak:		
1942	[3] 630,775	
1943	[3] 618,897	

[1] Lowest.
[2] 400,000,000 to 420,000,000 bushels. Estimated on basis of expected utilization and exports.
[3] Wheat feeding program.

Carry-over corn stocks Oct. 1

[In thousands of bushels]

	United States	Kansas		
		Off-farm	Farm, all	Total
1946	172,926	283	6,479	6,762
1947	285,564	617	5,432	6,049
1948	125,386	134	2,502	2,636
1949	825,306	817	17,084	17,901
1950	860,470	8,964	7,449	16,403
1951	[1]			

[1] 675,000,000 to 700,000,000 bushels. Estimated on basis of expected utilization and exports.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say, if the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me, that I called the Department of Agriculture a few minutes ago, and a new carry-over figure was given to me within the past 30 minutes, by telephone. It is not over the signature of anyone. The carry-over now on hand of winter wheat is estimated at 408,000,000 bushels.

I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he knows what the carry-over of corn was in 1950, as of October 1?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I could not compete with the Senator from Nebraska on that question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what the anticipated carry-over is for October 1, 1951?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to have the Senator tell me.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know whether the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has these figures or not; but while I will take off my hat to Kansas when it comes to producing wheat, I will not take my hat off to Kansas when it comes to producing good cattle and good corn, because it is from those commodities that we in Nebraska make our living.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one of those representing the State of Massachusetts, I will not take my hat off to any other State when it comes to good poultry and dairy products, provided the farmers of Massachusetts can get the corn.

Mr. WHERRY. That is subject to debate. However, I shall not argue the point now.

I suggest to the distinguished Senator that these figures also came from the Department of Agriculture: The carry-over of corn as of October 1, 1950, was 860,000,000 bushels. That is not a terrific carry-over, although we have had some wonderful crops. When I asked the question I learned that we are now using more corn than we are producing, regardless of what our crops are.

However, what alarms me is that the estimate for the 1951 carry-over has dropped to 665,000,000 bushels. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is a cattle feeder. He once told me that he fed out some steers. Corn has a definite relationship to meat.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the Senator questioning me now?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I ask the Senator that question. Does he feed his cattle corn?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Corn has a great deal to do with the quality of meat.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to obtain prime meat, one must feed cattle on corn.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the best thing to feed them.

Mr. WHERRY. On the one hand, we are putting price ceilings and roll backs on beef. On the other hand, we take out of the market thirty-seven and one-half million bushels of wheat when we are facing one of the lowest carry-overs—if the crop continues to deteriorate—we have had in a number of

years. We are also facing a corn carry-over which will be depreciated nearly 25 percent.

With those figures in mind, does not the Senator feel that the tendency of all prices for grains and meats will be upward? How can we control the price of meat and reduce it if the price of the commodity which makes the meat becomes higher? It will become higher as the crop estimates show that the crop is short in supply.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not question the fact that controls on prices of the scarcer grains will be extremely helpful, and probably necessary. I do not pretend to have the knowledge regarding meat which the Senator from Nebraska has. I do pretend to have equal knowledge with him as to the need to assure security in this country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not questioning the Senator's desire to feed hungry people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Nebraska concurs in that desire, does he not?

Mr. WHERRY. I think we are all glad to feed hungry people elsewhere if we can feed them without injury to our own people. I think everyone goes along with that premise. That is another matter.

My point is this: Halfway through the Senator's remarks he made mention of the fact that, according to reports from the Department of Agriculture which were placed in the RECORD yesterday, 2,000,000 tons of wheat could be taken out of our supply without apparently causing any particular difficulty in our grain market. I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that my feeling is that it will have an effect upon the market. We are facing shortages of supply. In order to keep prices down we are now putting on rollbacks and beef ceilings. Does not the Senator feel that it will be increasingly difficult to reduce meat prices 10 percent—which I think is the goal of Mr. DiSalle by October—if we are in a market in which the supply of grain is decreasing, which has a tendency to force prices up? As an agricultural man, speaking from a selfish viewpoint—and I believe I speak the sentiments of the Senator from Kansas—the more I can get for grain the better I like it.

On the other hand, we are called upon to put controls and price ceilings on meat, when we are taking away a source of supply of grain, which will result in driving prices upward. As the price of grain goes upward, the price of meat will rise. If the price of meat does not rise, it will require a degree of enforcement which we have never had to keep meat prices at a level where the people can afford to pay.

I did not want to let the statement stand that in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture we could afford to send this wheat to India without its having any effect upon the market. My judgment is that it would have a tremendous effect on the market. It is not the total yield that makes the market. It is the surplus that makes the market. It is proposed, first, that we send to India 37,500,000 bushels. That would have an effect, of course. Then the second 37,500,000 bushels will have a decided effect upon the carry-over. I suppose that would happen within about a year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The first 37,500,000 bushels would be authorized by the pending bill. The second 37,500,000 bushels would be the subject of further consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. It would be considered within the year. If we approved the first 37,500,000 bushels, we would probably be obligated morally to commit the second 37,500,000 bushels.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not commit the second 37,500,000 bushels to be sent if there were a serious shortage in this country at the time.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, then, why we should not commit the first 37,500,000 bushels and then wait to find out what we can do with respect to the second 37,500,000 bushels?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer to the question is that we are doing our best at the present time, as I see it, to permit the Government of India to make plans on a minimum-subsistence basis.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator think we too should make plans in the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, we should make our plans. However, at the moment, while we may cut our reserves more than we would like to for safety, we still can make our plans to authorize the second 2,000,000 tons.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to assure the Senator from Massachusetts of my sympathetic understanding so far as hungry and starving people are concerned. However, I think it is proper that it should be called to the attention of the Senate that in a year, or perhaps 2 years, our wheat and corn prices and other commodity prices will be increased because of a shortage of such commodities. Senators may then rise on the floor of the Senate and complain bitterly about it. Therefore, I think the matter should be called to the attention of the Senate at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I believe that what the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Nebraska have said is of great value. It calls to our attention certain problems within our country with relation to food, as well as the problems that exist in other countries.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am very happy to yield to my colleague and friend from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is my friend, too. On that point we are dealing on a reciprocal basis. Does the Senator know what the outlook is for the oats crop?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have stated that I am from Massachusetts, and I do not pretend to have the knowledge the Senator from Nebraska has with respect to food grains.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the compliment of the Senator from Massachusetts. It is a fact that we must look into the situation. The outlook for oats is one of the poorest we have had in years. The weather was too dry to begin with, and then it was too wet. Proper planning has not been undertaken. I asked the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture what he expected to do. He said, "We will try to raise more corn." However, in that respect we are working under an acreage limitation. The way to produce more corn is by means of better fertilization, or something of that kind. The acreage has been fixed.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the production of oats helps out the wheat crop. All such commodities are substitutes for wheat. Whatever affects corn affects wheat. Whatever affects oats affects wheat. I am not saying how the situation may develop, but I am pointing out to the distinguished Senator that our reserves of winter wheat are rapidly falling to a new low. The oats outlook is bad. Corn will be up 25 percent, according to the best estimates. We are using more corn than we are producing.

When we add these facts together and try to translate the result into the production of meat, and consider the housewife going to the corner store to buy meat for the family, it will be increasingly difficult to maintain the price of meat on the basis of the present supply. All such factors are interrelated, and they must be considered in planning for the people of this country, just as such factors must be considered in planning by other countries on behalf of their citizens.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe we should keep our eyes on the ultimate goal, which is the security of our country, as it is involved with other countries of the world. Hungry people and starving people are not thoughtful people. We must keep our minds on that thought and rely on the best estimate we can obtain. We must keep our reserves above a proper level for subsistence purposes in the United States. If our reserves begin to fall below a safe and proper level, I shall be the first one to say that the second 37,500,000 bushels should not be sent to India.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to read a few paragraphs from this morning's newspaper, as a basis for my question:

> House taxmakers yesterday voted to hit consumer pocketbooks for another $607,000,000 a year on a wide variety of items, including cigarettes, automobiles, radio and television sets, jewelry, household appliances, and sporting goods.

The article goes on to say:

> The tax on passenger automobiles and motorcycles would be raised from 7 to 10 percent of the manufacturer's price, a total of $196,000,000 more in taxes. The Treasury had requested an increase to 20 percent.

The article continues:

The committee decided to leave the Federal tax on gasoline unchanged, at 1½ cents a gallon, but voted to impose the same tax on Diesel fuel oil used on highways, to yield $7,500,000 additional.

Automobile trucks, busses, and truck trailers would be taxed 8 instead of 5 percent of manufacturer's price, to yield $61,000,000 more, under the committee proposal.

* * * * *

The committee voted to boost the manufacturer's excise tax on radios, television sets, phonographs, phonograph records, and musical instruments from 10 to 15 percent, producing $55,000,000 more revenue. The Treasury requested an increase from 10 to 25 percent.

The junior Senator from Nevada agrees wholeheartedly with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that we should feed all the hungry people we can feed.

Our difficulty, it seems to me, is that we have a too perfect tax system in our country. Apparently the Senate believes that because we can sell bonds to our people on the basis of deficit financing, and because we have a perfect taxing system which can reach the last stenographer farthest away from Washington to make her pay $10 or $15 a week out of a very small salary, we have money with which to buy wheat to give away.

The junior Senator from Nevada believes that taxation has about reached the saturation point. We are now close to the point where the law of diminishing returns takes over. The Government bonds we are selling have reached a point where they are now no longer so attractive to the people of our country. If we pulled the support from under the bonds, many believe they would go as low as 83, the point reached following World War I, and they might go much lower. The banks are full of Government bonds. If they were to go to 90, it could break most of the banks in America. Under the deposit-insurance law we would give the depositors greenbacks worth about 40 cents on the dollar today as compared to 10 or 12 years ago.

I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts whether he believes that we should now issue bonds for the value of 2,000,000 tons of wheat. Of course, we would have to do so, because the wheat must be paid for by someone at the going price on the farm.

We would give the wheat to a country which has undeveloped raw materials we need. The junior Senator from Nevada visited India, where he discussed such raw materials with Nehru, who is the Prime Minister of India. India is willing to give only a 1- or 2-year, and, at a maximum, a 3-year lease on its manganese deposits. A deposit of manganese can hardly be explored in that length of time. They are not mining manganese themselves. Is the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts aware of the fact that there is a virtual embargo on manganese shipments from India to the United States above a certain amount? Is the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts familiar with the fact that India contains amounts of manganese not only sufficient for her own needs, but enough for the needs of the United States for the next 50 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Nevada, first, that I believe we should balance our budget to the best of our ability.

My answer to the second point the Senator makes—and I believe I am correct in giving the figures from memory; I do not say that I am absolutely correct, but I believe I am substantially correct—is that I understand that the largest block of Government bonds ever sold on a nonnegotiable basis was sold in April. It amounted to approximately $13,000,000,000 worth, I understand, of Government bonds of the longest term.

In answer to the third point the Senator from Nevada has made, I would say that I do not think we can undertake this transaction with India on a barter basis. If we should go into it on a barter basis, then we would run into the problems of blocked sterling, and so forth, which I do not think should enter into this particular transaction.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that we are running into the sterling bloc aspect very acutely in connection with the bill which will be before the Senate on Monday, namely, H. R. 1612, which continues the authority for the continual lowering, in haphazard fashion, of tariffs and import fees without any regard to the differential between living standards in foreign nations and in the United States.

We shall have to consider the sterling bloc because the countries in that bloc refuse to give up their imperial preference tariffs, but will get the benefit of all of the Torquay bilateral agreements to lower tariffs which were made by us on the basis of the most-favored-nation clause of the Geneva agreement. Furthermore, every agreement we have made for the lowering of tariffs or import fees on a bilateral basis, contained the most-favored-nation clause, thus extending to every nation in the world, including the British Empire countries the benefits of our duty reductions without the other nations giving anything in return.

Mr. President, If the Senator from Massachusetts will yield further, I would like to ask him if he is aware of the fact that Pakistan, which is on the doorstep of India, has wheat for sale.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall take up that point later; I am prepared to give the figures in that connection during the course of my remarks.

Mr. MALONE. Then I shall be very glad to read the Senator's speech as to the reasons why India should not buy wheat from a country which is adjacent to it. As a matter of fact, Pakistan was a part of India until Britain surrendered rule over India and saw fit to have her divided into two countries, with a part of Pakistan on one side of India and a part of Pakistan on the other side of India, the two parts being approximately 400 or 500 miles distant from each other, which, of course, makes it practically impossible for the two to survive.

I should like to be informed by the Senator as to the details in respect to why India should not buy the wheat which is available in Pakistan. That question is important, because those two countries are now on the verge, if not war, at least of a serious diplomatic rift. Therefore, we should inquire why normal trade relations have not been established between those two countries, so that they can utilize the food supplies there available.

Our taxes are reaching the saturation point—our public debt is almost beyond the imagination, the annual interest being more than was required to finance the entire Government 20 years ago.

We are running our Government on an emergency basis—deficit financing for subsidies and contracts to keep the economy afloat. Will it stand the continual pressure?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall try to answer that question. Perhaps my answer will not be satisfactory to the Senator, but at least I shall try to answer it.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has already covered this point in his speech, but I wonder whether a plan is being made for the distribution of the wheat on the basis that it is to be a gift for the relief of hunger. Is there any plan whereby this particular wheat will reach the hungry people without charge?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is in charge of the bill. I was originally in favor of the half-grant-half-loan basis. I believe that the House bill, somewhat changed in form by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, would put this transaction on a loan basis. I have no authority for saying so, but I believe that those in charge of the committee report will accept the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, so that the transaction will be on a loan basis entirely, and not on a half-loan-half-grant basis. Therefore, I have stricken from the few remarks I have to make any comments in favor of sending the wheat to India on a grant basis.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield, in order to permit the Senator from Iowa to answer that specific question.

Mr. GILLETTE. I did not hear the specific question, but I heard the answer of the Senator from Massachusetts, which indicates that the Senator from Iowa, in charge of the bill, is prepared to accept such an amendment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa, of course acting for the committee which has reported the half-loan-half-grant measure, would not feel that he was in a position where he could accept the amendment, representing, as he does, the committee and its findings.

The Senator from Iowa was informed that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and his cosponsors in the introduction of the bill are ready to accept the

amendment which has been offered; but I would not be in a position to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my remark, then, to the Senator from Nebraska should follow out the suggestion the Senator from Iowa has just made.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, so that I may ask a further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I preface my question with the following remark: In making a trip around the world with a congressional delegation in 1946, we visited places where UNRRA relief was being delivered in the Orient. I wonder whether a similar situation might arise at this time. In the case of UNRRA, we found large harbors which were completely filled with UNRRA vessels which had been loaded in the United States by crews which worked at night, overtime, in order to get the cargoes to the Orient very quickly so as to relieve hunger. We were surprised to find harbors filled with vessels which had been in the harbors anywhere from 1 month to 3 months, and still were either completely unloaded or partially unloaded, so it was believed. However, when the vessels reached the dock to be unloaded, so that the food which had been sent by UNRRA might be used to relieve hungry people, the vessels were found to be either completely unloaded or partially unloaded by that time.

So, Mr. President, if a gift is made at this time, I hope arrangements will be made to follow it through so as to see that the relief reaches the people it is intended to reach, namely, the hungry people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that is to be done. It is believed that the wheat going to India under the provisions of this bill, if the full amount of wheat is sent from the United States to India, will be only a 2 weeks' supply for India. It will be only a small part of the entire amount needed in India, but will allow India to plan in such a way that the grain sent from the United States can be used with the larger supplies of grain India will obtain from other sources, and thus make it possible for the people of India to have sufficient grain for a minimum subsistence, namely, under 2,000 calories, and enable India to have sufficient grain to carry its people until the next year.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. There was another item in connection with the distribution of UNRRA relief which did not satisfy me very well. It was that it became a relief to governments, rather than a relief to people, because the governments receiving the relief sold the material which we had sent for relief, and the returns went into the treasuries of the governments. I hope nothing of that sort will occur at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This grain will be sent to India on a loan basis, if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is adopted. So the Government of India will buy the grain on an easy-term basis, extending over a period of years.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Is there any assurance that the Indian Government in handling the grain in that way will not make a profit on the deal?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I sincerely hope not, but I have no assurance that it will not.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I may say, for whatever interest it may be to Senators who now are on the floor, that the principal export of India, I believe, is jute, or what we call burlap. Great quantities of it are used in the United States. It is a very essential product for us. At the present time it is bringing, in the world market, a price which is about 500 percent higher than the price normally is. An ordinary jute bag which used to sell for a nickel, or up to a dime in some instances, now brings anywhere from 60 to 75 cents. It would appear to me that, with an export business of that kind, the Indian Government should be able to finance the purchase of the food grains which are needed for its people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I am wondering whether the Senator will agree that it would not look very well for the Government of the United States to reject this request for wheat to be sent to starving India, in view of the fact that since the end of World War II, we have already given to the small country of Greece nearly $2,000,000,000. Is that not true, particularly at this time, when we have had a surplus of wheat, in fact, a burdensome surplus, until our present short crop developed? It now appears that even after supplying wheat to India, we will still have a carry-over of about 400,000,000 bushels as of July 1 next. Comparing that with the carry-over which we had shortly after the war, of about 80,000,000 bushels, it would seem to me that we could well afford to give this wheat to India.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to have that opinion expressed by the Senator from North Dakota, who comes from a State which supplies so much of our grain.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, if we need more wheat, I believe we are in a position to raise more. Our problem with wheat over the years, has been one of surpluses, not shortages.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

I should now like to continue with my statement, very briefly.

The figures I gave as to the carry-over would bring Brannan's estimate down to approximately 388,000,000 bushels, or 63,000,000 bushels above the safe carry-over. However, on May 7 the estimate of the 1951 crop stated in the New York Times was as follows:

> Prospects now are that the crop will be the smallest since 1943.

This may make Brannan's estimate slightly lower. However, I remember very well the testimony to the Appropriations Committee several years ago when it was estimated by responsible public officials that we could get along on a carry-over of only 150,000,000 bushels. In fact, the figures then given were even lower. So that I believe that we can safely say that we will have a sufficient supply of surplus grains to provide this 37,500,000 bushels, and later in the year, if the second million tons is needed, we can determine the wheat supply at that time when the facts as to the 1951 crop are known.

I have offered an amendment in conjunction with the senior Senator from Michigan—and I should like to have the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] join with us—to require the Secretary of Agriculture to certify that there is sufficient food grain to satisfy the needs of our American people before this wheat is sent to India.

The question will be asked: Why do we send this wheat to India? I think it is helpful for us to picture just where India lies in the world today—of her position in the continent of Asia between the east and the west. We can well recognize the tremendous potentialities of India in the world of today and the future. Just recently we have seen millions of Chinese disappear behind the iron curtain. There are 350,000,000 men, women, and children living in India. Can we take any chance whatever of seeing them disappear behind the iron curtain? Unquestionably it is clear that our objective today and in the years ahead is to strive unceasingly not only to gain new friends in this troubled world, but especially to hold those we now have. Starving people create unrest and feed easily upon the ideologies Communist leaders are even now urging upon India. India today is one of the tremendous uncertain and unknown quantities in this world. We want to live on peaceful and friendly terms with the people of India. We want to help them to triumph over communistic theories and pressures. There is little doubt that the Government of India could find sufficient resources in one way or another to pay for all of the grain that is shipped. But if our primary objective is one of humanitarian interest and to remain friendly with India and increase that friendship, then it is our goal to keep the Indians from starving and at the same time make it possible for India to build herself up so that measures like the one now contemplated will not have to be taken in the years to come. We do not want to be in the position of having the Government of India or any of its leading citizens say that we in the United States drove a tough bargain when they in India needed grain for their starving millions. I not only desire that hungry people be assisted, but so assisted that they feel we have performed an act of friendship, and not driven a heartless bargain in their time of need.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much wheat India at this time is buying monthly from the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have those figures in my prepared statement, which I shall come to later, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that we are now providing India with about 100,000 tons of wheat a month. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We are supplying a very substantial amount. What the exact figure is, I am unable to say.

Mr. WHERRY. If this additional wheat is to be supplied on the basis of a loan, why are we expecting that we shall then be in a more favorable position than we are at this time, when we are selling India 100,000 tons of wheat a month, on a loan basis?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We are doing that on a strictly business basis.

Mr. WHERRY. What would be the difference between doing it on a strictly business basis, and doing it the way now proposed? Is the loan to be a straight loan, or are there to be loopholes in it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The loan is to be made on the basis of ECA conditions, as I understand. That statement will be made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield, I should like to ask a further question, inasmuch as he has taken a great interest in this matter; and I can understand that he would. The Senate is entitled to know precisely the kind of loan which is to be made to India, to enable her to buy this wheat. We are already supplying 100,000 tons a month. What kind of loan is this to be? Has anyone described it? Is it to be strictly a business transaction? Is the money we loan to be repaid, or will the loan be coupled with numerous conditions and loopholes? If the Senator will permit me to say so, the ECA loans have been considered in the Senate to be more or less in the nature of grants, as I understand. It has been said the loans will never be repaid. What is the difference between an ECA loan and the presently proposed loan to India? It is proposed that we loan the money. If so, what kind of loan is it to be? Is the money to be repaid, or are we merely making a nominal loan, which, in fact, is in the nature of a grant?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope we shall get the money back. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, I certainly believe that the ECA funds were advanced on a grant basis and on a loan basis. This loan to India is to be made in a similar manner, and the conditions which are applicable to ECA loans, as I understand the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, are to apply to the loan to India. I would hope that the loans will be repaid.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator from Massachusetts tell me whether any ECA loans have been repaid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am unable to say to what extent they have been repaid. They extend over a period of time.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether any of the loans have been repaid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am unable to answer that question affirmatively, of my own knowledge.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will yield further, I should like to suggest to him that I think the Senate is entitled to know now whether this money is to be advanced on a loan basis. If so, what kind of loan is it to be? Is it to be a loan similar to loans which are made by the Government to our own citizens? Is it a loan which has loopholes in it, so that, in the event of certain contingencies, the loan will become a grant? If the transaction is to be in the nature of a straight loan, we ought to know it. If it is to be a loan with loopholes, as the result of which the money would never be repaid, it would be in the nature of a grant. I think the Senate ought to know the basis upon which the money is to be advanced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I hope the ECA loans will be repaid over the years. As I understand, under the terms of the ECA program, no payments are yet due. That has just been called to my attention.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator from Massachusetts tell us how much money we have loaned foreign countries during the past 10 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer the question without first investigating the facts.

Mr. WHERRY. If I were to suggest that loans, grants, and credits amounted to more than $100,000,000,000, would the Senator feel that that figure was out of line, for the period of the past 10 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator refer to advances made by way of loans or by way of grants?

Mr. WHERRY. I refer to advances made on a loan basis. I consider that many of the loans were grants, though they are supposed to be loans. I speak not only of ECA, but also of the Export-Import Bank, of the Bretton Woods Agreement, and of all agencies which are loaning money to foreigners.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator's figures are perhaps high.

Mr. WHERRY. I would not want to make an excessive statement to my distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, but I am satisfied that if the Senator will undertake a little research, he will find that during the period of 10 years the United States has made foreign loans, grants, and credits in excess of $100,000,000,000. The Senator from Massachusetts, is one of the able members of the Committee on Appropriations, and I compliment him on his industry. But I happen to have examined into those figures. Does the Senator know how much of that large amount has been repaid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Nebraska obviously knows the answer, or he would not ask the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know, and that is what I am endeavoring to ascertain. I have been unable to find that any of it has been repaid. I hope that some of it has been. I share the hope of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators in that respect. The only agency, so far as I know, which would know anything about it, would probably be the watchdog committee; or, we might inquire of ECA. During all these months, I have been unable to ascertain how much of the loans has been repaid if anything.

The only point I raise is this: When anyone takes exceptions to statements which are made about this matter or even asks questions regarding the validity of the proposed loan, immediately he is said to be against feeding hungry children. I am as anxious to feed starving people as is the Senator from Massachusetts. No Senator is critical of such a generous impulse. I know the Senator from Massachusetts feels that way about it. We are all in the same corner, so far as the desirability of the project is concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that the questions he raises are eminently proper and eminently practical. I shall be glad to endeavor to get some of the answers, and, later in the debate, if they are still pertinent, I shall try to present them. I am sorry I was not fully prepared to answer the questions asked. I did not anticipate that I would be asked how much of the money loaned to foreign governments during the past 10 years had been repaid.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts sits with the junior Senator from Nebraska on the Appropriations Committee, I am sure the Senator has not been surprised by the questions I have asked, for I daresay he feels he might expect anything from the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would expect anything that was practical and intelligent.

Mr. President, during the war India ran her economy at a rate which did not allow for proper or adequate depreciation and renewal. As a result, today India finds her whole economic machine badly in need of repair. To make those repairs and to put the machine in working order, she has laid out a long-range program to try to rehabilitate herself and go forward with ever-increasing ability to look after herself. This cannot be done without heavy additional outlays of capital. If we take away too many of the funds which India proposes to use as capital for this rehabilitation to pay for the grain, then we may well be faced with an entirely different question, which is just this: How much might it be wise to give to India to help her rehabilitate herself, just as we have given through the ECA to other countries? We want to try to work out a program for the benefit of India that will help assure that great country that it can go ahead with the internal development of its economic resources with the hope that the development of these sources will avoid possible famines in the future and help bring to the people of India some of the comforts of life which we know in this country.

I personally joined in introducing the original bill which would send this 2,000,000 tons of wheat half on a loan basis and half on a grant basis. I believe there is a good argument for the reasons in support of that view which I have just briefly stated. I understand, however, that though the terms of the original bill were well-warranted, those sponsoring the bill have agreed to accept an amendment which would put the action entirely on a loan basis substantially similar to the terms of the House bill. I, therefore, have not attempted to debate this part of the bill, but will go along with the idea of furnishing the wheat on a loan basis in accordance with ECA lending facilities.

From all that I can gather I believe that the population of India is fundamentally favorably inclined toward the United States. I believe it is an axiom in advertising that it is far easier to push and accelerate a trend than it ever is to reverse it. If the trend is in our favor, as I believe it to be, then we should try to accelerate that trend before it has become too late. I believe the time has arrived when we can deal with India on a humanitarian basis without necessarily getting into some of the questions which have been raised as to why and how India got to the point of needing these two million additional tons of food grain.

It has been suggested that we require India to ship us various strategic materials in return for any grant we may make. Today there are various strategic materials that we are receiving from India. In 1950 nearly 585,000 tons of manganese and 260,000 tons of mica were shipped by India to the United States; from January 1 to March 3 of this year, 110,000 tons of manganese. Without going into other shipments of strategic materials, I should like to point out that certain manganese is an exceedingly important strategic material and is essential to our economy. Why, then, not swap United States wheat for Indian manganese? The answers are the same as those which I have been endeavoring to make, namely, if India is to develop and become self-sufficient, and take an increasingly active part in the affairs of the world, it must earn dollars. If it uses its strategic materials simply to buy wheat to tide over an emergency, it will not earn any dollars; the dollar balance which would result if we paid directly for the manganese will be nonexistent, and the building up of India's economic machine will suffer accordingly. The furnishing of raw materials is one of the assets to which I referred when I stated that the Government of India had resources with which it could meet payments for the food grain. But I believe the prudent method of operating is not to force India to do this at this time, as I do not believe it is conducive to the friendship which we must continue and to the basic purpose of allowing India to build its economic strength. The stronger friend India is, the greater is our need to have its friendship.

Allegations have been made that the food shortage resulted from failure in India to buy wheat in Pakistan, which was available, and also to the diversion from food grains to jute and cotton. While I do not condone in any way any action of India that would fail to keep it on a friendly basis with Pakistan, while I do not condone in any way the disagreements which exist about Kashmir, I should like to discuss briefly these allegations.

As to the first point: In early 1950, India's imports were based upon estimated requirements to keep the rationing system functioning properly. Had India then bought Pakistan wheat, it would have correspondingly reduced its purchases from other sources. During the course of the year Pakistan sold its grain elsewhere. By the time the natural catastrophes made it evident that more grain was needed, the Pakistan grain was not available.

As to the second point: India increased its jute acreage only some 150,000 acres in 1950. Not all of this increased acreage was at the expense of food grains, and the total decrease of food-grain production resulting from this diversion probably did not exceed 175,000 tons. The foreign exchange value of these cash crops made it possible to buy grain abroad equivalent to all that could have been produced on this land—and more, too.

India's financial difficulties have been attributed to the almost complete stoppage of legal trade with Pakistan during 1950. There is no questioning the fact that both countries suffered from this trade impasse. Had normal trade occurred, the two countries would have been in a better general economic position as 1951 began. However, it is highly doubtful that India would have had larger foreign exchange resources available to buy food grain, as it normally runs a deficit in its trade account with Pakistan.

In any case, India and Pakistan signed a comprehensive trade agreement on February 25, 1951, and the reestablishment of normal trade patterns can be expected. Under the terms of the agreement, India is to receive 325,000 tons of food grain from Pakistan in 1951. This grain will be included in the Indian purchase program of 4,000,000 tons. It will not reduce India's need for the 2,000,000 tons requested.

India has taken certain steps in the United Nations with which I totally disagree, but I reiterate that I believe that the compelling reason that transcends all others why this bill should pass is the humanitarian heart of America. I have studied all the reasons which have been brought to my attention as to why the bill should not pass. I have studied the question of foreign exchange, and the question of the blocked sterling which is owned by the Indian Government. I have looked into the question of the amount of currency and gold which is needed to underlie the Indian currency. I reiterate, I am fully aware that there are resources in India which, if it were deemed advisable, could be forced out to meet immediate payments for this grain. But let me add again that the whole purpose back of this bill, the whole purpose for which I joined the other Senators in introducing the original version, was because our stake in the peace of the world—east and west—is too vital and too grave for us to fail to do our utmost to live and work on a friendly basis with the great Republic of India.

In closing, I would like to quote from an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of April 4, 1951, which I think sets forth very clearly the point which I have endeavored to stress:

> In the state of Bihar in India the grain ration has been reduced below 9 ounces a day and is considered less than enough to assure survival for long of those who depend on the ration alone. Relief of such conditions takes weeks even after shipment of grain is authorized, and other provinces are approaching similar distress.
>
> In such circumstances discussion of ideologies becomes academic, but Communist incitement and agitation thrive. So great an American as Senator Borah, an authority on the United States Constitution and its importance, said in 1934, "The people can't eat the Constitution."
>
> The people of India cannot satisfyingly fill their stomachs with preachments on freedom and opportunity if they have not the opportunity to eat.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Massachusetts yields the floor, will he yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have in my hand Report No. 373, to accompany House bill 3791, a bill whose title is: "To furnish emergency food relief assistance to India." I wish to read from page 5 of that report a paragraph which is numbered "4." Reference is made in the report to the fact that the Export-Import Bank shall make loans, and to the credit terms on which they shall be made. Paragraph 4 reads:

> If at any time or from time to time the parties hereto determine that it would be to their common interests because of adverse economic conditions or for any other reasons to postpone, or provide for the postponement, of any instalments of interest or principal or to provide that such instalments or any part thereof shall be made and received in local currency—

This particular agreement, Mr. President, was with Iceland—

> of Iceland at a rate of exchange to be agreed upon, or to modify the aforesaid promissory note in any respect, they may by mutual agreement in writing, provide for any such postponement, or payment in local currency, or other modification hereof. Any agreement for payment in local currency may specify the purposes for which such currency may be used.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator again to state from what he is reading?

Mr. WHERRY. From the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951. The report accompanies House bill 3791. The committee is citing the different methods by which loans have already been made. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts what the agreement with India is and to call his attention to the fact that under the agreement with Iceland the promissory note can be altered in any way desired, by mutual consent. To my way of thinking what I have read shows the loan to be a type of loan entirely different from straight loans by this Government to a foreign country such as have been made in the past, or to individuals

in this country who borrow money from the Government.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What it amounts to is that it is subject to renegotiation.

Mr. WHERRY. No, it is not subject to renegotiation, in the sense that taxes will have to be paid in connection with it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It can only be altered with our consent.

Mr. WHERRY. With our consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Only with our consent.

Mr. WHERRY. With our consent, yes.

TELEVISION AND EDUCATION

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to two stories which have appeared within the past week in the New York Times. They bear on a crucial problem, which the Congress has so far largely neglected. They present views on that problem which are in startling contrast. The first story, headed "Regents propose State TV network to aid education," under the byline of Jack Gould, radio and television editor of the Times, was carried on the front page of last Tuesday's Times. The second, also by Mr. Gould, headed "Commercial TV stations oppose holding channels for education," appeared in last Thursday's Times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles by Jack Gould, which were published in the New York Times of last Tuesday and Thursday, may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I shall take a few minutes to point a moral from these two articles. Less than a month ago, together with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 127, calling for a study by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which the present distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair] is chairman, on what the Federal Government can now do to help realize the magnificent potentialities of television for education and public service. A portion of that resolution covered the issue raised by these two stories in the Times. The issue cannot wait. In March the Federal Communications Commission, announcing its plan for ending the freeze on the assignment of new TV channels, tentatively reserved 209 station allocations for education, or about 10 percent of the total. The freeze has existed since September 30, 1948, and the failure of the FCC to allocate any frequencies during this 2½-year period has been called a freeze by the trade.

Within the coming weeks the FCC will hold hearings, and will begin to make its present tentative allocations of last March definite and final, after the testimony is in. Then we shall see, I fear, Mr. President, a new kind of freeze—a kind of "freeze in reverse"—with all or almost all available TV channels finally assigned. Yes, this freeze will set the pattern of American television for decades and even generations to come.

Let me touch first on the story describing the opposition of the commercial TV stations to the FCC's proposal to assign these 209 channels for education. The story reports that the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the great commercial trade association in this field, is demanding these channels largely for entertainment and advertising. The association protests the proposal of the FCC to set aside even 10 percent of the new facilities for education and public service. The National Association of Broadcasters contends that educational reservations are reservations for a special class of applicants. The National Association argues, according to the Times, that the educational reservations may be wasted through nonuse, or limited use, or use for the benefit of a limited audience.

Let me contrast that story with the story in last Tuesday's Times dealing with the action of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, which has supervisory authority over 8,000 educational institutions. This board is prepared to ask the State Legislature of New York for $3,500,000 to build 11 transmitters for educational television in New York State. Mr. Jacob L. Holtzmann, chairman of the regents committee on the subject, said:

> It is as important for the educational system to have television channels as schoolhouses, and I don't know in the future which will be more important. The television channels are the most valuable natural resource the people possess today. We, the regents, maintain we have a first mortgage on those channels and we're going to fight for them.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to contrast Mr. Holtzmann's statement with that of the commercial broadcasters, who claim that the educational channels will be wasted, or used on limited audiences. When Mr. Holtzmann calls these channels the most valuable natural resource the people possess, he is not conceding that Bing Crosby is more important than education because his audience is more unlimited. This is the credo of the advertiser, but not of the educator. Mr. Holtzmann knows that if we are to save the world from catastrophe and damnation, we must rely on education to play its great role. Mr. Holtzmann knows that TV is the greatest potential educational instrument ever devised.

I ask the Senate to consider which is the greater waste, using the new channels largely for entertainment and advertising or using as many and as much of the new facilities as possible for education and public service? I do not contend the former is in any sense wasteful, but surely neither is the latter. I ask: Are the educators not indeed a very "special class of applicants"? Do our schoolhouses have to be kept open 24 hours a day in order to be great national assets? Can we indeed judge adversely the potential value of television to all American citizens because as much as 10 percent of its channels are to be "limited" to educational institutions?

Let us take a very extreme example, an example which I will not defend, and which no one would defend. But let us suppose that by reserving all television channels exclusively for the young—every single available channel to be used for formal education for the young, and only for formal education—let us assume we could educate the next generation to the level of our best university graduates today. I do not even suggest that that is possible, but let us suppose it might be. This indeed outdoes the American dream. It is not only the expression of the dream of Jefferson that each of us receive the best education we can absorb, but it assumes each of us can absorb a college education. Now, would not the fathers and mothers of America cheerfully give up television for themselves, and clamor to give it up, for such a goal as this for their children? I call this a very extreme example. I use it to show that Americans are prepared to make sacrifices for an important educational goal. However, one reason my example is extreme is that the potential use of television in the field of adult education is far, far greater, though perhaps less self-evident, than in the field of formal education. Mr. Holtzmann and the board of regents of New York State are addressing themselves only to formal education, and not at all to the major field in which television can achieve its greatest potential public use, which is the field of adult education.

Last Thursday evening, when I addressed 1,800 radio and television educators meeting at Columbus, Ohio, I pointed out that one of the taunts which has been hurled at the small number of hopeful educators who are aroused to the potential educational importance of television in the contest for channels is, "Where is the money coming from?" That is the taunt of 100 years ago, then hurled against the dream of free public education for all children.

My comment is now, as was the comment at that time of the defenders of free education for all children, that the American people believe in education. They have fought for it and will continue to fight for it. They will find the money, and they will not deny educational television to themselves or their children once they have seen its power continually exerted, as we all saw it so dramatically in the Kefauver hearings.

In the past 3 months three private foundations have appropriated a total of more than $1,000,000 for educational radio and educational television. No one could have anticipated that action even 6 months ago. Now comes the action of the New York regents. This is the most dramatic action so far. I congratulate the New York Times for featuring that story on its front page. I should like to hope that this action may serve as a model for the entire Nation.

Far from failing to apply for the educational channels which the Federal Communications Commission has tentatively allocated, the New York regents have asked for three more channels for their own use—three more channels than the FCC tentatively reserved in its March

rulings for education in New York. Yet the charge has been made that the FCC reserved too many frequencies for education.

Mr. President, New York's example is one which I should like to see studied and emulated by State boards of education in every other State of the Union. I am today writing to the board of education in my own State of Connecticut. I do not know how many other instances there may be, or how many may develop, in which the number of educational reservations made by the FCC will prove to be inadequate for a given State. In my own State of Connecticut there is only one such reservation; and the station, if it materializes, will be able to reach parts of only three of our eight counties. It will not reach the other five counties at all.

In Massachusetts there is only one educational reservation. In New Jersey there is not a single educational reservation. Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Jersey are States not without some fame and background and history in the field of education.

Yet the commercial broadcasters have now challenged even the 209 reservations already made. Further, I think all will agree that the commercial broadcasters have shown that they can exert very heavy pressure in Washington. Their challenge is thus high cause for alarm.

As another example of this same kind of pressure, I invite the attention of Members of Congress to a resolution adopted by a national convention of the Television Board of this same association, the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, at a meeting in Chicago on April 17. I do not know whether this resolution has been called to the attention of my colleague the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], with whom I sponsored the resolution to which this resolution refers. The resolution of the Television Board singles out Senator HUNT's and my resolution for the singular honor of condemnation.

Copies of this resolution, by the Television Board of the NAB, were sent to the present distinguished Presiding Officer, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado] and to all other members of that committee, as well as to Mr. Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I do not know how widely the resolution has been distributed.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am happy to yield to my cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut a question. Are the interests sponsoring television outlets and those owning television companies approximately the same as the interests which now own and control radio?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, I think that is a fair generality.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator from Connecticut aware of the fact that in the early allocation of radio channels and frequencies five of the most favorable were allocated to the city of New York, clear across the United States to the Pacific coast? I think the Senator is aware of the fact that no radio station has sufficient capacity, or ever will have, to use any frequency in the broadcast band for the entire distance across the United States.

Mr. BENTON. I have recently been reminded of that fact by the able Senator from Wyoming. Of course, in referring to the allocations to the city of New York, the Senator means allocations to private corporations of New York City, does he not? The Senator does not mean allocations to the city itself.

Mr. HUNT. Not to the city government.

Mr. BENTON. To private corporations located in the city of New York.

Mr. HUNT. Yes. Is the Senator from Connecticut further aware of the fact that even though the radio frequencies which have been assigned are useful only as far as the central States, and are of no use at the present time to anyone so far as concerns reaching the area toward the Pacific coast, those of us living in the Rocky Mountain area who have made application to be allocated those same frequencies have not had that privilege, and have been denied the use of unused frequencies simply because a monopoly was obtained in the early days of radio by companies in New York City?

Mr. BENTON. I greatly appreciate the contribution of the able Senator from Wyoming. One thing I am pleading for today, as I shall try to bring out still more clearly in a moment, is the passage of some time before the FCC allots all these TV frequencies, so that we shall not freeze television into a monopolistic pattern in the way the Senator from Wyoming suggests that radio was frozen in its early days.

The resolution to which I refer from the Television Board of the NAB protests because such an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as the Senator from Wyoming and I have called for, would require a period of not less than from 6 to 12 months.

I do not necessarily agree that the kind of investigation we have in mind would require from 6 to 12 months.

The Federal Communications Commission itself plans holding hearings which involves some delay. Some part of the alleged period of from 6 to 12 months will be consumed by the FCC itself. But let us assume that our proposed Senate investigation would involve the FCC in a delay of as much as from 6 to 12 months. Yes; let us contrast such a small delay with the next two decades or the next 50 years, which is what we are talking about if we allow the telesion pattern to freeze and harden if the FCC now allocate all available channels.

Instead of reading further from this resolution of condemnation, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. BENTON. I now remind again the Senate of the nature of the resolution sponsored by the Senator from Wyoming and myself, the amendment to which the resolution from this trade association is opposed.

Our resolution seeks to explore the impact of television on America's children—home life, education, sports, public affairs, rival forms of communication and entertainment, reading habits, language, and morals. It seeks to direct Congress and its appropriate committees toward this end, an end wholly devoted to the public interest, and not the private profit of any group.

The Federal Communications Commission, which faces immense problems, showed both enlightenment and courage in making tentative educational reservations. However, the reservations may be too few. Further, the FCC has given no assurances as to how long it will hold them open. I would hope that one result of a Senate study would be the adoption of a resolution or the passage of a bill strengthening the hand of the FCC in this matter, and guaranteeing to education the full time and full chance it deserves.

I submit, Mr. President, that educators throughout the country should be given time and encouragement to study the impact and the implications of the action taken by the New York regents. This does and will take time and it does and will take encouragement. The far-flung implications of the leadership of the regents are such as to stagger the imagination. Yes; consideration of them will take more than a few months; and because education moves so slowly, I fear more than a few years.

When the FCC allocates new channels at this time surely the least that we can ask of the FCC is that a sufficient number of channel allocations be held up until the National, State, and local educational boards have had time to determine the need and extent of their potential requirements. Other institutions devoted to public service should also be given time.

Furthermore, I believe that time is needed for a new commercial development. It is the development of the so-called subscription method, carrying no advertising, by which the customer pays for the service, instead of the advertiser. Such a system, in the opinion of those who have studied it, would greatly stimulate the development of educational, informational, and public-service programs.

Moreover, I suggest that before the FCC allocates its new channels to commercial broadcasters, it define more clearly the famous phrase "public interest, convenience, and necessity" as applied to television.

I congratulate the FCC on requiring annual reports from TV licensees, when they apply each year for renewal, instead of every 3 years, as is the practice in radio. Let us now, for the granting of licenses and for their review through annual reports, establish far higher standards than have ever applied to radio. Indeed, before we allocate any further TV frequencies, let us get some measure of agreement on the standards.

I believe one great area for agreement is in the field of good listening time for public-service programs. When we de-

termine what programs can fairly be deemed "educational" or "public service," let us see that they get a good percentage of good listening time. Let us put such programs on at hours when people can hear them, in good evening hours, not merely in the nonsalable hours in the morning or late at night.

It would take chapters to review my own personal experience in my dealings as an officer of the University of Chicago, in my efforts to secure reasonably good listening times for the University of Chicago Round Table and other university programs.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut if it is not a fact that radio and television are in a different category entirely from a newspaper, for example, with respect to the right of personal expression either by an editor or a writer for a newspaper, because in reality radio and television are in effect controlled by Government-owned channels, which are acquired by license from the Government? In that respect, does not the Senator feel that there is a difference between the right to freedom of speech which a person has in a newspaper or on the stump or in a park, as compared with his right to exercise free speech under a Government license?

Mr. BENTON. There is a very great difference, because channels are limited, and they are allocated by the Government. No one can open up a radio station, in the same way, let us say, as he can print a pamphlet or make a speech in the park.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. That is my position, and I think it is the position of most people. There does exist a further difficulty, however. The distinguished Senator is talking about education. We ought to have a great deal of sympathy for his view, especially as education may be disseminated through television.

Mr. BENTON. And public-service programs in general.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Does it not extend even beyond education? There are a great many worth-while programs that ought to be put on the air over radio or television. I am not complaining about the Senator's idea. What I am trying to express is that it must be done by license. Many good features and many fine programs which ought to be put on the air by radio and televsion are foreclosed from going on the air because it is impossible to meet the expense involved, or because of this, that, or the other reason. In other words, it is impossible to get that right, because of the fact that the channels are licensed.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished minority leader up to his last phrase. But it is not merely because of the fact that channels are licensed that restrictions are encountered. It is also because of the commercial dominance of key listening hours.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I was about to make. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to make one further observation. Certainly I do not wish to detract in any way from his speech. Let us assume that a radio commentator makes some comments with respect to a Member of the Senate. It is very difficult for the Member of the Senate to get time on the radio or on television to debate, discuss, meet, amend, or correct the remarks. He does not own a channel and he has no license. On the other hand, such a comment could be dealt with in a newspaper, on the stump, or in a speech in a park.

What I am inquiring about is whether the Senator from Connecticut feels—and I understand he may offer a resolution, or another Senator may do so after reading his remarks or listening to them—that it may be about time when, in the interest of freedom of speech and in the interest of television channels, as well as in the interest of radio wave lengths, for the public to have a greater right than they have now, if I may express myself in that way, to acquire and have the use of such facilities, so that any cause, whatever may be, can be conveyed to the American people?

Mr. BENTON. I could not agree more wholeheartedly with the distinguished minority leader. I should like to address a question to him if I may. I found in my recent campaign in Connecticut the most difficult, embarrassing, and perplexing problem of my entire experience in politics. It was the problem of raising money to finance the campaign. The problem in recent years has been greatly intensified by the constantly mounting cost of radio and television time. Would the distinguished minority leader agree with me that it would not be unsuitable for the Senate, in allocating these very valuable frequencies, for which thousands of people are clamoring, and in which thousands of people see potential fortunes, to examine the possibility of having licensees provide major candidates of both parties, when they run for office, with a certain fixed amount of free television time? Would not such an understanding greatly relieve the strain that is placed on candidates, and increasingly so over the years? Indeed, I am told that political campaigns in Connecticut now cost three, four, or five times what they cost 20 years ago. Radio, and increasingly, television, lie at the heart of that problem of rapidly rising costs.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that I certainly agree that television is most important as a means of communication in connection with campaigns. Certainly in the future the political compaigns will change in nature to a great extent in cases in which television can be used and where the reception warrants its use.

Mr. BENTON. Yes; campaigns will continue to change in that way, and will continue to grow more expensive.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and television time will be prohibitive in cost under such circumstances, unless arrangements are made to provide for its use in the campaigns. In fact, the inability, because of the expense, of prospective candidates to obtain television time would be very likely to completely foreclose many of them from entering the campaigns.

Mr. President, when I asked my question, I really did not have political campaigns in mind, although I think the point is well taken.

My question is this: Does not the Senator from Connecticut feel that it is time to make some arrangements whereby radio and television time will be available to those in public life who find that false charges of a serious nature have been made against them over the radio or the television?

I do not know how such arrangements could be made. At the present time we scarcely have sufficient Members of the Senate to conduct all the investigations which are going on and still have some Members of the Senate available for attendance on the floor of the Senate. However, I feel that the question of allocating time on the radio and the television has become a serious one. Certainly when false charges are made against persons either in public life or elsewhere, an opportunity to answer them should be available. Time on the radio or the television should also be available to worthy programs for school or church purposes. Why is it necessary that persons who wish to handle such programs are faced with competition from businesses and sponsors which can afford to spend tremendous sums of money in obtaining time on the radio or the television at times when people generally would like to see and hear such great issues discussed?

So I wish to ask whether the Senator has in mind an investigation in that connection? Does he expect to submit a resolution on that subject, or does he feel that we can handle the matter by considering all its angles and phases?

Let me state why I am interested in this question. Not long ago a certain commentator said a very vicious thing about the junior Senator from Nebraska. Up until now it has been my theory that the best way to get along is for one just to live his normal life and let his record answer any such vicious accusations. Perhaps that is always the best treatment to give to those who would attempt to involve one in debate about such vicious and scurrilous remarks. Nevertheless, there comes a time when certainly a person has a right to defend himself, or there comes a time when a worthy cause should be presented. That cannot be done now, because the time on the television and the radio is almost always allocated to great enterprises or business which can afford to pay large sums for the time.

It seems to me that somewhere along the line time must be allocated so that those who are falsely charged by radio or television or about whom unfair remarks are made will have an equal opportunity to reply, just as they have an opportunity to do by speaking in parks today or by inserting statements in the newspapers. However, of course, it

would be impossible for me to hire 15 minutes' time on a national broadcasting system. The Senator from Connecticut knows that very well.

On the other hand, if false information or scurrilous statements go out over the radio or the television, should not those about whom such remarks are made have an equal opportunity to reply? Yet today that is not possible, not only because of the great cost, but also because the time on the radio and the television is controlled under license arrangements. The result is that such persons do not have the opportunity they otherwise would have to defend themselves. That is only one point. I could give the Senator hundreds of examples why I think the question of control by the license of Government-owned facilities has become a very serious question in connection with both television and radio.

I wonder whether the Senator feels that a complete investigation of all phases of the question might be a good thing and might be of great aid to the Federal Communications Commission and to other Government agencies as they allocate such time.

Mr. BENTON. I concur, Mr. President.

However, I do not have the answer to one of the questions which has been asked by the distinguished minority leader, to wit, how to make it possible satisfactorily to provide a forum to answer such charges. That is a difficult question. It requires much analysis and study, and this is a good time to precipitate both. I think the question should be examined, and that proper standards should be established.

I know that, as applied to television, today, before frequencies are allocated to the commercial broadcasters, now is the time to try to clarify the matter and to provide the kind of standards which are needed. For instance, an applicant for a television station in my State—one who shall be nameless, for he is in a competitive situation now—is eager to get a television frequency available in his city. In talking to him, I asked him, "Would you agree, in order to get this station, to give up the time from 6 to 8 p. m. three evenings a week—on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, let us say—so that time could be used for public-service programs?"

This distinguished and able businessman replied, "Certainly."

That is what he is now willing to do in order to persuade the FCC to assign the frequency to him. However, Mr. President, I think that same attitude would be too much to expect of human nature 5 or 10 years hence.

The best estimate that has been made indicates that a billion dollars a year will be going from advertisers into television within 5 years. When we reach that situation, considering the enormous commercial pressures which will then exist in connection with television, as they now exist in connection with radio, it certainly will be too much to expect any corporate executive then voluntarily to say, "I give up the time from 6 to 8 p. m. three nights a week"—program time which may be worth several thousand dollars in revenue to a local station. So, in my opinion, the time to explore this matter is before the Federal Communications Commission hands out the frequencies now so eagerly sought.

I have high regard for the Federal Communications Commission and its officials. Many of them have worked for industry, and many of them will, in the future, work for industry. These men are, moreover, subject to constant and tremendous pressure from the radio and television industries. No comparable support comes to them when they adopt policies other than those which fall into line with the standards fostered by the radio industry.

Even a day or two of hearings on this matter by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, not to mention the comments just made by the able Senator from Nebraska on the floor of the Senate, may prove to be encouragement to the Federal Communications Commission to help establish standards which will encourage educators and applicants and station owners to make renewed efforts to arrive at far higher standards.

Mr. President, last week I told a group of television educators in Columbus that—

> Except for those who are responsible for the formulation of our foreign policy, I do not know any group which could have a greater impact on our country's future; you are poised at the threshold of a great, new mansion for the human mind.

Mr. President, in my judgment that was not an overstatement. I feel that we in the Senate should help them cross that threshold. I feel that all Senators should assist these men of good will, and others like them, who appreciate the vast potentialities of television, and who wish to see this great new medium devoted to the welfare of mankind.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the most interesting and constructive editorial on this subject I have seen printed by any newspaper or magazine. It comes from a small and not too well-known Catholic newspaper published in New Haven, in my State, the Catholic Transcript, of May 10, and it is headed "Television's future."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEVISION'S FUTURE

Where is television going? The question is not unimportant. It concerns every man, woman, and child in this country. For television, despite the fact that it has by no means attained its full growth, is already a tremendous power. How influential it is was brought out recently in a Senate speech by the Honorable WILLIAM BENTON, Senator from Connecticut.

The occasion of the Senator's speech was the televising of the public hearings of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Crime in Interstate Commerce. This committee might have done its work in relative obscurity if it were not for one of the most astonishing phenomena this country has ever seen. Senator BENTON describes it.

"In half a dozen big cities—but most particularly in New York City—there was no rush at the rush hour," says Senator BENTON. "Stores were empty, office work was at a standstill, theater seats were vacant. It was not merely that the secretaries were late; the bosses did not even show up. The housework did not get done. All this was not the result of any freak of the weather nor of any stimulated outburst of the carnival spirit. This required no Hollywood publicity men, no high-powered promotion, not a line of advertising."

What was going on? "As all of us now know it was the result of televising the public hearings of the Special Senate Committee." And it gives reason for earnest and serious thought, not only to Senator BENTON but to the rest of us. The Senator, widely experienced in the field of radio, was amazed at the tremendous impact of the new medium of communication. And he was moved to suggest action.

"Because the Kefauver hearings have now dramatized for all of us the astonishing power of television to serve good ends, as well as trivial or bad ends," he said, "I believe that the Congress should at once take a sharp look, 'new look' at television in relation to our national life. No one who has read, even superficially, the newspapers and magazines in the last few months can doubt the widespread public concern about this new medium. The discussion rolls on: the effect of TV on children, on home life, on education, on sports, on public affairs, on rival forms of communication and entertainment, on reading habits, on language, on morals."

Where is television going? Will it arrive finally at a status similar to that of the radio, where give-away programs are the outstanding features of an industry devoted mostly to entertainment and advertising features, an industry in which cultural presentations have less and less time devoted to them and where religion is relegated to a very minor position? Nobody knows. But surely, as Senator BENTON intimates, television, that great medium of mass communication, which is so much more forceful than radio in its impact upon the public mind, should not be allowed to drift into futility. Certainly the public interest has a right to be served by television in the fields of education, of religion, of objective news and commentary, of politics and public service.

EXHIBIT 1

REGENTS PROPOSE STATE TV NETWORK TO AID EDUCATION—BOARD WILL SEEK $3,500,000 FROM LEGISLATURE TO BUILD STATIONS IN 10 AREAS—CHANNELS ASKED OF FCC—HEAD OF SPECIAL UNIT STUDYING PLAN SAYS AIRWAYS ARE AS VALUABLE AS SCHOOLHOUSES

(By Jack Gould)

A plan for a State network of 11 educational television stations, under which the resources of colleges, schools, museums, art galleries and libraries would be used to provide special video programs for both school children and adults, was announced yesterday by the board of regents.

The board revealed that it would ask the legislature for $3,500,000 with which to construct two transmitters in this city and one each in Buffalo, Rochester, the Albany-Schenectady-Troy area, Binghamton, Ithaca, Syracuse, the Utica-Rome area, Poughkeepsie and Malone.

Disclosure of the plan, by far the most comprehensive yet suggested for educational use of the television medium, was made in a document filed in Washington with the Federal Communications Commission, which was asked by the board to set aside the channels necessary for the project's success.

FREEZE ON CONSTRUCTION NOTED

Actual operation of the network could not begin for a year or two, it was noted, because of the governmental freeze on the construction of new stations.

John P. Myers, chancelor of the board of regents, and Dr. Lewis A. Wilson, State

commissioner of education and president of the University of the State of New York, agreed that the proposed network would provide unlimited opportunities to extend the State's educational program.

The board's approval of the plan was based on recommendations made by a special committee of regents appointed to study television, including Jacob L. Holtzmann, chairman; Vice Chancelor Edward R. Eastman and Roger W. Straus.

Mr. Holtzmann said that he viewed with "extreme criticism some of the bad things made available to children on television" and that he personally disapproved of children being told about the pleasures of beer drinking while they watched the Brooklyn Dodgers.

"Whether a laxative works or not or perspiration disappears under your arm, that is a matter of taste," he continued. "We wouldn't say, 'Don't do that.' What we want to do is to provide an alternative."

WILL FIGHT FOR CHANNELS

Mr. Holtzmann acknowledged that the regents might run into conflict with commercial interests that also sought the limited number of television channels available, but made it clear that the regents were prepared for any contest that might develop.

"It is as important for the educational system to have television channels as schoolhouses, and I don't know in the future which will be more important," he said. "The television channels are the most valuable natural resource the people possess today.

"We, the regents, maintain we have a first mortgage on those channels and we're going to fight for them."

The regents, who have supervisory authority over more than 8,000 public and private educational cultural institutions in the State, filed its plan with the FCC only a matter of hours before the deadline for comment on the Commission's proposed allocations of new channels for video outlets.

For the most part the regents endorsed the Commission's proposals for educational outlets in New York State, but in the case of several cities proposed further changes, some of which were expected to elicit protests from prospective commercial broadcasters.

In the cases of Buffalo and Rochester, the regents suggested that their educational stations receive channels in the present receiving band known as the very high frequency, which could be picked up on existing sets. The Commission originally had suggested that the two educational stations be in the new band known as the ultra high frequency. To receive the new band present set owners ultimately will have to have sets equipped with converters or internally readjusted.

WOULD RESERVE HIGH BANDS

In the case of New York City, where all available channels in present band are already in use, the regents endorsed the Commission's reservation of one channel in the new high band, but thought that two would be needed. They also proposed the reservation of new-band channels in Poughkeepsie and Malone.

Should the Commission not reserve the additional channels in New York City, Malone, and Poughkeepsie, the regents proposed a sharing of television facilities in those areas as between commercial, educational, and other television services.

Mr. Holtzmann said that he could not as yet outline specific programing proposals but did offer several typical examples the regents had in mind. For one, he said, expert teachers with a special knack for giving instruction in a subject could be heard and seen by students all over the State as a supplement to the guidance that the youngsters normally received from their own teachers.

A child in a comparatively remote rural area up-State, he added, could see for himself the treasures of the Metropolitan Museum of Art on Fifth Avenue. With all of the State's cultural organizations cooperating, Mr. Holtzmann explained, there was virtually no limit to the possibilities for further child guidance, both as part of their regular curriculum and in other programs they might see at home.

Another possibility, according to Mr. Holtzmann, would be to have prominent figures in the news, such as General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, speak directly to perhaps millions of children during school hours.

SEEN SUITED FOR ADULTS ALSO

Mr. Wilson envisioned the proposed television network as being ideally suited to the conduct of an adult educational program, especially in clarifying international affairs and the conflicting ideologies that separate the Western World and Communist Russia.

According to Mr. Wilson, the major merit of the plan of the regents is to "stake out a claim" to channels that would be of use to perhaps hundreds of educational institutions. Without some such centralization of operation, he said, the Federal Communications Commission would face a hopeless task in choosing which universities should have stations. For one college to operate a TV station alone, he said, might prove financially onerous.

Both Mr. Holtzmann and Mr. Wilson acknowledged that it might cost upward of $2,500,000 annually to maintain a chain of 11 stations, which would be equipped to originate programs locally and feed them to the network. They believed that many educational institutions and communities might be willing to bear a share of the total cost in exchange for the added service received, but they noted that the legislature might prefer to keep the whole project under State financing.

Program costs would run extra, Mr. Holtzmann and Mr. Wilson agreed, but they said that they would not be nearly as high as for commercial stations. He believed that many prominent artists would cooperate if they knew their services were benefiting school children.

EXHIBIT 2

COMMERCIAL TV STATIONS OPPOSE HOLDING CHANNELS FOR EDUCATION

(By Jack Gould)

The National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, representing the majority of commercial stations in the country, went on record yesterday in opposition to the blanket reservation of television channels for noncommercial and educational institutions.

The association, in comments filed in Washington with the Federal Communications Commission, charged that the educators would waste the channels either through not using them at all, using them only on a limited basis, or reaching only limited audiences.

The formal position of most of the commercial television industry became known only 2 days after the New York State Board of Regents proposed a plan for establishing a network of 11 educational stations throughout the State. The regents had asked the FCC to reserve the necessary channels.

ONE INDUSTRY HEAD APPROVES

The action of the regents did draw approval, however, from one industry source. Benjamin Abrams, president of the Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp., one of the larger set manufacturers, congratulated the board on its "forward-looking step."

He pointed out that such a plan would aid the manufacturing industry through "a tremendously expanded market for the sale of television from the standpoint that television now may become standard equipment in the classroom."

In a statement prepared by its counsel, Thad H. Brown, Jr., the association of television broadcasters said that it objected to the reservation of channels for "a special class of applicants."

"The assignment of a noncommercial educational channel in a specific community should be arrived at only on a case-to-case basis founded upon a bona fide showing of public interest, convenience, and necessity," the association maintained.

The association contended that recent hearings on the matter of educational channels, which led to a tentative FCC decision to set aside roughly 10 percent of spectrum space for such broadcasting, had not justified a blanket reservation.

Arguments advanced by the Joint Committee on Educational Television, representing many leading national educational groups, the association declared, were "vague, confused, and generally contradictory."

The broadcasters' group also argued that the educators took an "unrealistic view" as regards the cost of television operations and had not advanced a feasible plan upon which stable utilization of noncommercial channels could be effected.

EXHIBIT 3

RESOLUTION RE SENATE RESOLUTION 127 OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTERS

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission is conducting a hearing in Dockets No. 8736 et al., concerning the allocation of television channels and the revision of Standards of Good Engineering Practice with regard to television broadcasts; and

Whereas in order to accomplish this hearing and its objectives, the Federal Communications Commission has been unable to grant construction permits for new and additional television stations since September 1948; and

Whereas in view of this necessary action by the Commission only a minor percentage of the communities of the United States can receive television broadcasts at this time; and

Whereas many States are presently without any local television service; and

Whereas the peoples of many communities and rural areas, now unserved, are deprived of a television service now available to the residents of the larger cities of the Nation; and

Whereas this unserved public deserves and is clamoring for television service within the immediate future; and

Whereas thousands of pages of transcript have been taken by the Federal Communications Commission and months of hearing have occurred with regard to these dockets; and

Whereas the Commission is now entering the final phases of hearing on these comprehensive issues; and

Whereas opportunity to be heard has been and is being provided to interested parties, including the public, the commercial television industry, and educational institutions and agencies; and

Whereas an investigation, as contemplated in Senate Resolution 127, would encompass a duplication of the past 3 years of effort on behalf of the duly appointed Federal Communications Commission; and

Whereas such an investigation would entail the receiving of expert engineering, programing and allocations testimony; and

Whereas such an investigation would require a period of not less than 6 to 12 months; and

Whereas such an investigation would unnecessarily delay the termination of the so-called "freeze" and would continue to deprive the presently unserved public of a television service; and

Whereas the licensing provisions of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, including the criteria public interest, convenience, and necessity, as reviewed from time to time by the courts of the United States, furnish the bases of licensee qualifications and responsibility: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the membership of the television board of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters be recorded as unalterably opposed to Senate Resolution 127; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be provided by the chairman of the television board to the Honorable EDWIN JOHNSON, chairman, and other members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and to the Honorable Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family;

S. 119. An act for the relief of Joseph Girardi;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen;

S. 822. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg; and

S. 824. An act for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; and

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to direct my remarks toward the pending business, Senate bill 872, a bill to furnish emergency aid to India. First of all, I wish to express my full support and my commendation of the remarks and the general program as outlined by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The arguments in support of S. 872 were then supplemented and expanded by the principal sponsor of Senate bill 872, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I was very much pleased to have had an opportunity to listen to a portion of the address by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. All these Senators are sponsors or cosponsors of Senate bill 872. I am proud to be a sponsor of the bill and to be associated with these Senators.

Mr. President, I am sure that most of the argument as to the necessity for this proposed legislation has been fairly well developed. It is my purpose to summarize the points and to assist in the documentation of the importance of the immediate and speedy passage of the bill.

First of all, let me direct my attention to the background of this entire program of grain for India. I do not approach this subject as a Johnny-come-lately. I have been interested in America's relationships with the Republic of India ever since the first day I became a United States Senator. In fact, I recall that within the past year and a half, on several occasions I have addressed myself to the over-all political and economic relationships with the free nation of India, the greatest free nation in the Asiatic area. I have been concerned over the fact that we may not develop the kind of wholesome, friendly, cooperative relationships which we vitally need on the Asiatic mainland. I recognize that there has been justifiable concern on the part of the Senate and on the part of officials in all branches of our Government over what has happened in China.

If there is one thing which I can emphasize in my remarks today, it is that the time to prevent, in another area, namely, India, a repetition of what has happened in China is now. Instead of worrying about and discussing the reports which come from India as to her alleged friendship toward the Soviet Union and as to indications that she may be moving into the Communist fold, the time for the United States of America to act before that nation has been destroyed, either from within or from without.

I recall the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as to certain of the attitudes expressed by some of the political leaders of India, their hesitancy, for example, to give us the all-out support which we need in Korea, the fact that the Prime Minister of India on several occasions has stated that he wished not to associate himself either with the East or the West, that he would like to preserve a position of neutrality.

I think those of us who are students of American history, even cursory students, recognize that this once happened in our own national development. It is not unusual for countries which have just obtained their own freedom and independence to desire to steer a middle course, to keep away from the storms of great powers. India has attempted, in her few years of independence, to steer down what she calls a middle path. I am afraid she will discover that that is not possible, because in this complex world I am quite confident that the day will come when men and women and nations must make up their minds where they stand.

But, Mr. President, any student of the history of any nation will find that there has been a time in its history when its leadership said, "No foreign entanglements." How many times have you and I, Mr. President, heard the remarks read from Washington's farewell address, warning the American people in the early days of the Republic to avoid foreign entanglements? It was a natural course of development for our own Nation. I only mention that because we, as a people, in this Nation, the United States of America, ought to be most understanding and most tolerant in our attitudes toward other peoples who are aspiring to what we have in terms of national independence.

It should also be noted that India is a country which has lived under the domination of a foreign power for over 300 years. Today she is jealous of her independence. She exemplifies a great sense of national pride. I think it fair to say that wherever a spirit of nationalism is born anew and has crystallized into national independence, the leaders of any such country speak out very strongly, and they often make statements which may be misinterpreted. Again I say that our history is filled with instances when our national leaders have again and again stated things in critical hours of history which were often subject to misinterpretation.

There was a time in our own history when those beyond the seas did not know whether we were for England or for France, in the days when the French and the British were constantly at war. Our leaders were trying to steer our country in a course which would protect our own national security. I am sure the leaders of India are doing that now.

It is not our responsibility to settle all the internal difficulties, nor to try to chart the course of political action, of a friendly nation, but, Mr. President, whether or not the Republic of India has done all that she should have done, she has done some things which have surely helped us.

First, she has preserved her own independence. India is dominated neither by the Soviet Union nor by the United States or any other power. India is her own master.

Second, the Republic of India associated itself with us in the Korean crisis. I would remind the Senate that had she not done so, we could well have found ourselves involved in hostilities in the Asiatic area, without a single Asiatic power on our side. That surely would have played into the hands of the Kremlin propaganda masters, who would have said, "Here, again, is a western Occidental power intruding into the Asiatic area. Here is a new type of imperialism." But all of that was set aside because our friends in the Asiatic area, led by the Republic of India and its Prime Minister, associated themselves with the resolution to stop aggression in Korea. I wish that India would do much more, but at least, on the moral side and on the political side she has associated herself with those nations dedicated to the principle of the United Nations and resisting aggression.

I think it equally important that India's constitution has been patterned along the lines of the American Constitution. I think it very important that in this area which has long been a colony, with all that comes from a colonial status, with exploitation, with others governing her, draining her resources, India which for hundreds of years was a colony, is today a self-governing country. She has a government based upon the

right to vote, a government dedicated to the traditional democratic freedoms in which we so strongly believe. The constitution and the Government are dedicated to freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and freedom to assemble and to petition. It is not easy to establish a free government, particularly in an area of the world where freedom has not long lived.

I have given all this as background. Furthermore, I want to point out a background which I think is characteristic of every nation in which communism succeeds. Make no mistake about it, if we lose the Republic of India to Communist aggression from without, or to infiltration from within, we shall have suffered a major defeat; and when I say "we," I mean the freedom-loving people of the world. Here is a nation of more than 350,000,000 people, a nation which has potentially rich resources which can be developed; a nation which has the beginning of an industrial system; a nation which strategically is of vital importance to the security of the free world. All one need do is to look at the map to see that India, which literally comes up under the underbelly of the Soviet Empire, Siberia, has control of the entrance to the Near East and into the Pacific. Her boundaries, her coast line, her ports are all important to the free world.

Mr. President, nations are destroyed from within by Communist infiltration where there is famine, where there is economic chaos, where there is a breakdown of economic institutions. Make no mistake about it, Mr. President, if India is unable to survive the vicissitudes of economic disturbance for the next few years, it may well fall into the lap of the Communist aggressors. The time to stop that is now. I, for one, am convinced that if the Republic of India were attacked by the Soviet Union, or if she were attacked by any other power, we would immediately give food with which to feed her people. I feel confident in my own mind that we would supply her with military assistance. In other words, we would do everything we could to see that she survived as a free nation.

The record of our country is one of always helping those who try to defend themselves. Our history in foreign policy is one of assisting nations that are struggling to maintain their independence. The only question is, When shall we start the assistance? Shall we wait to put out the fire after it has started, or shall we practice a little fire prevention before fire breaks out? Shall we resist the attack of the Communist subversion before it literally consumes the body politic, or shall we wait until the system is malignant with the cancerous growth of communism, and then rush in to perform major surgery?

I have not the slightest doubt that had the Republic of India been attacked by Communist armies we would not be debating this bill; we would have found a way to give help immediately. It is time that the Congress and the representatives of the executive branch of our Government awaken to the fact that Russia is practicing a new form of aggression. In those areas in which she thinks she can deliver a death blow with a military stroke, she delivers it. In many other areas she bides her time, and, like a malignant disease, eats away and finally consumes the vital institutions and the economy of a nation. I think the record is open and clear-cut that the method now being practiced is that of infiltration—moving from within.

Remember, too, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union has trained agents. It has a long-range program. Russia spent 25 years training the people who were to rob China of its freedom, and it has been spending 25 or 30 years training people who would like to rob India of her freedom. The Soviet Union has a system of libraries and reading rooms all over India; and while we debate as to whether we should broadcast a little more information through the medium of the Voice of America the Soviet Union acts. I happen to know from personal visitation on the part of eminent scholars in the field of far-eastern relations that all through India today there are hundreds upon hundreds of little information centers spreading the poison of communism to the villagers, the peasantry, the natives. All too often our country deals only with those who have elevated themselves to top positions. If we want friendly connections in any country we must get close to the hearts of the people, because prime ministers come and go, and cabinet members come and go. The element of the constituency that is important involves those that make possible the government. Particularly is this true of republican government.

So, Mr. President, my appeal today is that we do something not only for the Government, but for the people of India, so that they may understand that the heart of America is a good heart, a generous heart, an understanding heart. There are always those who say, "Why do not the peoples of the world know that we are generous? Have we not proved it?" Good deeds are harder to explain than are bad deeds. I think I can demonstrate my point. A man can live a perfectly good, wholesome, clean life; he can love his wife, his children, his neighbors, and his relatives; he can dedicate his life to Christian service 365 days in the year; but he may never get a headline. But if he should step out of line a little, have an accident with his car, or have a struggle with one of his friends or with a member of his family, his name will be printed all over the pages of newspapers.

We must get the people of the world to understand that the heart of America is not to be found in some of the remarks made by some Americans. Our task today is to get the people of the world to understand that the heart, mind, and spirit of the American people are full of generosity, peace, helpfulness, gratitude, and charity, and that we are not clothed in armor, waving sabers and swords, and wanting to conquer and to destroy.

Remember that our enemies are continuously telling of our weaknesses at the top level and down at the bottom, and continually driving the point home where it counts. For the life of me, Mr. President, I have never been able to understand why American politicians have not been able to see what is going on.

No one ever got elected to public office merely by knowing the president of the chamber of commerce. No one ever was elected to public office by knowing the so-called best people. There are not enough of them to elect anyone. The real people constitute the great mass of the constituency.

Mr. President, I am appealing today for the passage of Senate bill 872, which will affect the lives of millions of people; a measure which means the difference between life and death; a measure which can be interpreted in the simplest terms that people can understand. People understand hunger, and they understand those who answer the call to satisfy the simple needs of life, such as the requirement of food.

There is a great deal we could do to improve our relationships. Throughout the world the United States has a reputation for answering any request for arms aid. Whenever we talk about who our friends are, the first question that is asked is, "Will they fight Joe Stalin?" If they will fight Joe Stalin we will say, "You are our pals." I know one cannot afford to be too choosy when it comes to an all-out struggle; however, it is important to emphasize the fact that we must have a few other friends who have something more to offer than just being against Joe Stalin. If any country will give us the assurance that if bullets start to fly in a certain part of the world, it will fight for us, we say, "Just write out your grocery bill, give us your bill of particulars, and we will take care of it."

Mr. President, India is a nation which has been brought up in the philosophy of Ghandi. Ghandi was a pacifist. He was a great man who left an impression upon his people. It is good that people believe in and talk about the cause of peace. It is well that there are some people who are interested in the preservation of human life and who are to be peacemakers. All I am saying is, Let us not exclude from our orbit of friendship those who may feel that peace is a worthy goal, because this Nation is dedicated to peace, too.

Our methods of approaching the conditions of peace may be a little bit different from those of some of our friends. Be that as it may, our objective is world peace, and our task is to be able to explain to the family of nations that we are the agents of peace and not the agents of war. Our first job at home is to recognize that in the war of propaganda the Communist states are winning by being able to brand us time and time again as warmongers and as warriors.

I regret this, Mr. President. On the day before Good Friday I said on the floor of the Senate:

> What a paradox! Here we are, by faith and religion and political background, the peacemakers, and yet the Communists brand us as being warmongers. Here we are, by our whole history, the liberators, the emancipators; and yet the Communists brand us as the oppressors, and take unto themselves the right of being called the emancipators.

What hypocrisy! Be that as it may, what is true does not always go forth as truth to the minds of the people. Frequently truth is what the people believe to be true, and in many areas of the world we have lost the minds of the people, we have lost their friendship, we have lost their cooperation, because they have been fed a stack of lies day in and day out, week in and week out.

We have watched that happen in our own country, and it can happen elsewhere. Hitler proved that the big lie pays off even if only for a short time. Our answer to Mr. Hitler had to be given on the battlefield, whereas, in fact, it is now quite well understood that had we answered him earlier, had we answered the challenge of Hitlerism before Hitler attained power, we might never have needed to go onto the battlefield. So I am appealing today that the great American Nation answer these great basic human needs before it is too late.

What India is asking for today is not 300 tanks. She is not asking for arms aid. She is not asking for money to develop atomic energy plants. What she is asking for is something we have in abundance. We do not have to retool a factory to produce what she needs. We do not have to give anyone the benefit of tax amortization schedules so he can rebuild or start up a new plant to produce what India needs. We do not have to recruit a whole new group of laborers to produce what India needs. We already have it. We have the millions of bushels of wheat that India needs. We have it in storage; we have had it in storage for a long time.

This is only to remind ourselves again that food is a weapon in the arsenal of democracy, and that particularly it is an effective weapon where people are hungry. We have an arsenal of democracy filled with food. In fact, we have had so much of it that it has hurt us. First of all, I suppose it has not done some of us any good at home, because we have overeaten. Second, it has hurt us propagandawise because more than 60 percent of the population of the world is living on a subsistence diet. 150,000,000 Americans are living on a diet of as much as can be consumed, and much of what is planted is left over. In fact, we are having to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars each year to store the extra food, and then we spend other hundreds of thousands of dollars to curtail the production of food.

What do the Communists say about this? They say to the people of Asia who are hungry and weary of war, they say to people who are new in their nationalism and their independence, they say to the people of Asia who have been dominated by the British, the French, and the Dutch for centuries: "Here is Uncle Sam in the United States. He is taking over now. The other countries are too weak to hold on. If you want arms, he will supply them. But if you ask for food—well, that will have to be debated for months."

Mr. President, I do not want my remarks to be misinterpreted. I am not saying that this is the truth. I am saying this is what some people believe to be the truth. I think the facts are crystal clear.

Mr. President, I wish to read from a letter which I received from an eminent clergyman, who is presently in India, and who has written to me on many occasions. The letter I have is from the head of one of the Protestant missions in India. The letter points out that the Communists have been making tremendous progress in their propaganda because of our failure to act with dispatch upon the question of wheat for India. The letter is dated April 18, 1951, from 12 Boulevard Road, Delhi, India, and is signed by J. Waskom Pickett. Mr. Pickett is the head of one of the Protestant missions in India, as I stated.

Mr. President, I pay tribute to the missions of our churches that have been feeding these people, helping them, performing Christian service, while the Government of the United States has been dilly-dallying around, wondering whether a bill would ever be passed. The bill has been before us for 3 months. People who are hungry, who have an average caloric intake of 900 calories per day, can die of starvation before the bill is passed. When that happens, it is difficult to explain why there has been so much delay in shipping the wheat. The families of those who have passed away because of hunger, who know that food is available, do not look upon one who has stores of food as being a very charitable and kindly person.

What does my friend, the bishop, have to say? By the way, the bishop was here a little over a year ago. I took him over to see the President of the United States. I took him to the State Department to talk to the Secretary of State and to the Under Secretary of State. He met with some of my colleagues in the Senate. A year ago I was saying to my colleagues and saying to the President and to the Secretary of State, "The time to act is NOW."

Oh, yes, the Communists, the Russians, have come forward now with 50,000 tons of wheat. It does not amount to much, but they make a lot of noise about it. We could have given 50,000 tons a year ago and it would not have hurt us one bit. We wasted that much wheat because we had to store it. The farmers of America can produce more than they have been asked to produce. We had the wheat, but we did not have the will or the insight to make good use of it. I was, I suppose, talking in the wilderness, and the wilderness of politics, urging our Government and its representatives to do something before it was too late. Now we are coming in on the caboose. We are coming in late. China has already offered rice. Russia has already delivered some wheat. Oh, we have sold some. That is not an act of charity. We have sold the wheat. Other nations, regardless of whether they will continue to do so, have given some food.

What does the bishop have to say? I read:

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am very happy to have your letter of the 9th instant with copies of the newspaper release in which you quote my cablegram and of the earlier release on the subject of wheat for India. The effect of the long delay in dealing with the wheat bill is really serious. The original proposal evoked gratitude in every Indian heart and had action been taken immediately it would have blunted all the efforts the Communists are making to create prejudice and hostility against the U. S. A. But we have given the Communists opportunity to organize and to hurt us and they have used it very cleverly.

Mr. President, this is not a letter from the State Department. This is not a letter from our Ambassador—a man whom I hold in high regard. This is not a letter from a Government official. This is a letter from a man who mingles with the people. This is a letter from a gentleman who knows what the people are thinking, because it is his job to convert people to the Christian faith. He is working with these people day in and day out. I spent many hours with this fine bishop. I have listened to his story. What he told me a year ago he has documented again and again in many letters to my office, letters I have read to my colleagues and to my friends. What does he say? "The original proposal evoked gratitude in every Indian heart."

Let me say to my colleagues that they should not go around complaining if it seems that some of the Indian people are beginning to believe that Russia is their friend. We had the chance. When we miss the boat we have no one else to blame but ourselves, particularly when we have the ticket. We had the ticket. We had the wheat. We were given the opportunity. Now we are saying, "The Indian Government seems to be a little more sympathetic toward Russia than it is toward us." I am not worried about the Indian Government. I am thinking about the Indian people, the hungry ones. We had an opportunity in the month of February. Why does it take from February until May to decide whether or not to feed someone who is starving? I ask any Senator if he would like to have the question of whether he was to live or die debated in the Congress for 3 months.

We missed the boat. What else does the bishop says?—

We have given the Communists opportunity to organize and to hurt us, and they have used it rather cleverly.

Yes; they have used it cleverly. Do Senators know what they have been doing? They have been winning municipal elections. That is where political trends start, and not at the top. The trouble with Washington is that everyone is looking on top. Everyone is looking at the dome. We had better look at the foundations once in a while. Elections are not won on top. They are won down where the folks are. Communism does not take hold by getting on top. It takes hold down at the bottom, where the little people who are never heard from are. They are the ones who are never the subject of comment, either pro or con, in the editorial columns. No one ever talks about them on the radio. But they are the ones who spell either success or failure. They are the ones who turn governments upside down. They are the ones who do the

bleeding and dying in revolutions and in wars.

Mr. President, the hour is late. As a matter of fact, this may be too little and too late. When are we going to wake up? When will this Government find out that when human need is crying out for human assistance, the time to act is now? There is not the shadow of a doubt in the mind of any reasonable person that millions of people have been dying of starvation. No reasonable evidence has been presented by any person anywhere to disprove the fact that we could have met this need a year ago. At least we could have met it in January or February.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that more than a year ago the Senator from Minnesota tried to get aid for India?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did. My friend the Senator from Illinois knows that I went to the State Department, and, in fact, went to the President, more than a year ago. I referred to that fact just before the Senator entered the Chamber. I had been working on this project simply because I am interested in the welfare of my own country, as well as that of the Indian people. I was impressed by the fact that we have been doing all kinds of moaning and groaning about what is happening in China. I feel bad about it. We have lost the free people of China. Now we are beginning to lose the free people of India. That means 800,000,000 people. On the basis of a head count, we must do a great deal of converting before we can overcome that set-back.

So when we are talking about this bill, we are not talking about being jolly good fellows. We are not doing something to salve our own consciences. Consider the aim of the bill. It is directed toward the national security and common defense of the United States.

We have learned that we have some stakes in Asia. I remind every Member of this body that the hue and cry today is that we ought to be doing more in Asia. The thing we are being asked to do more of in Asia, however, is making war. The Senator from Minnesota wants to save a few lives. I believe that if we can save a few lives, we may not have to make war; or, if we must make war, we can win it.

But if we should lose India, which is today the leading power of the free areas of Asia, we shall have lost all. Next it will be Indochina, then Burma, then Ceylon, then Thailand. Then it well may be the Philippines. Whether we like the Prime Minister of India or not, the fact of the matter is that he is the recognized political spokesman of the free nations of the south and southeast Asiatic area. Joseph Stalin knows that, even if we do not. Joseph Stalin is not giving him a political blood test every 15 minutes, either. He is playing for the long pull. He takes a long look and says, "This seems to be a likely candidate. At least there is hope. I am going to work on him."

The Senator from Minnesota is saying that the man in charge of the Indian Government looks like a good bet for democracy, for the long pull. At least India has made a start along democratic lines. It is a republic. It has hope of maintaining its freedom. However, freedom does not live long in starvation. Freedom does not survive without a little bread. Freedom cannot long hold itself as a force to unite the people if the people are destroyed by malnutrition, disease, and poverty.

So what we are talking about is a great foreign relations program. We do not have to debate as to how many divisions we are going to send. No one is asking for divisions. We do not have to debate as to whether we are going to send 75-mm. guns or 105-mm. howitzers. We do not need to debate the question whether we have enough air power to do this or not.

What we are asked to give we already have. It has been lying around in storage tanks and ships. It is costing the Government of the United States hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to keep it. I speak of wheat and other cereal grains. The American farmer will produce a great deal more of them if he is given an opportunity. Farm folks do not have to be cajoled into producing. They know how to produce. They have to be cajoled into not producing. Our problem has been to keep them from producing too much.

As I stated earlier, no farmer will come here and ask for a special tax amortization plan to enable him to produce another bushel of wheat. He will not ask for the 5-year schedule, with 20 percent off each year. He will say, "Just give us the go-ahead sign, the market price, and we will produce the sinews of peace to fill the arsenal of democracy."

Lest anyone think I am giving this a partisan twist, which I would not do under any circumstances, let me say that when one is hungry it does not matter whether he is a Republican, a Democrat, or a Socialist; and when one is dead, he is dead for a long time, no matter what he dies from.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article by Harold E. Stassen, a former Governor of the State of Minnesota. Mr. Stassen is an eminent leader in the Republican Party. The article is condensed from his series of articles in the Ladies Home Journal.

What does Mr. Stassen say? He is 100 percent right. The caption on the article is "India: No. 1 Target of World Communism." That is a headline story. Mr. Stassen says:

> It is my own view that the men in the Kremlin now look on India as the No. 1 target of world communism. I base that belief on the indications of heightened activity in the Communist cells in India. I base it also on the Tibet move. The march of Chinese Communist troops into Tibet does not make sense on any basis other than as a move by the Soviet Union to bring pressure on India.

Mr. President, this article is worth the attention of every American. I commend the reading of it to Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask to have the article printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA: NO. 1 TARGET OF WORLD COMMUNISM

(By Harold E. Stassen)

(Condensed from the Ladies' Home Journal)

My recent conference with Prime Minister Nehru in New Delhi confirmed my impression that this leader of 350,000,000 people on the subcontinent of Asia is a supporter of neither communism nor capitalism. He is a believer in neither Stalin's materialistic ideology of force, nor our western dynamic philosophy of liberty. He has not the slightest inclination toward transforming India into a satellite of the Soviet Union or of making it subservient toward the United States.

Nehru is India's prime minister, but more than that, he is unquestionably the true leader of the crowded millions of his nation.

The next 10 years will be difficult for Nehru, for India, and for the world. Some of the difficulty will be caused by Nehru's own hot temper, which smolders beneath the surface and at times breaks out in real turbulence. Kashmir is an example of that.

But this temper is by no means the most important thing we need to understand about Nehru. There is a very great need for a broad understanding of Nehru and India by America and its leaders, and an equally great need for a broad understanding of America and its leaders by Nehru and India.

We in America, by nature and by experience, always think of only two sides in any contest; we are always inclined to ask: "Which side are you on?" We are slow to realize that in the clash of ways of life between the Communist ideology of the Soviet Union's leadership and the free way of life which America represents, neither Nehru nor India can be properly placed on either side, and will not be so placed in the immediate years ahead.

They definitely belong in a third position, and they belong there by reason of their age-old religious and philosophic background, by reason of their geographic position, and by reason of their recent experiences.

It is well to keep in mind that Nehru, himself, spent many years of his life in jail, put there by the British in the course of the long struggle for Indian independence.

Nehru's three principal books were all written during his periods in prison. During these early years, Nehru was strongly attracted to the Soviet Union of Russia and to communism as it was practiced there. He expressed then the confident belief that India had nothing to fear from Russia and that British rule over minorities in India compared very badly with Soviet rule in Russia.

But after noting the developments in the Balkans after World War II and observing the violent and subversive role of the Communist Party in India and in other Asiatic countries following the Communist Calcutta conference of February 1948, Nehru was fully disillusioned.

Last December he said: "What I object to about communism * * * is the suppression of the individual, which I am convinced is bad for the individual, the race, and everybody."

In his visit to Indonesia in June 1950, he told the Indonesian parliament that Communists do not tend to build up anything but rather disrupt everything, producing chaotic conditions and evoking reactionary forces.

If anything, this attitude has stiffened. During my visit to New Delhi, I found him to be not only thoroughly alert to the evils of Russian Communist imperialism but fully aware that a campaign of passive resistance would be ruthlessly crushed by Russian communism. He well knew that passive resistance could be effective only against a nation such as the British, a nation with a moral code and a restraining public opinion. It is clear, therefore, that he, and India with him, intends to resist—actively and effectively—all Communist threats from within or from without.

India continues to hope, I think erroneously, that Chinese Communists leadership will not be aggressive and will take a benign turn. Nevertheless, India is concerned over Tibet, took forthright measures to stabilize Nepal on the Chinese border, and continues to take vigorous action against internal Communist activity. For instance, late in February of this year the national parliament, with only one dissenting vote, took firm action against Communists within India.

This change in Nehru's attitude toward Russian communism, and the effect of that change upon America's relations with him and the nation that he leads, raises the very important question of Nehru's integrity. Can we believe him? Is he a man of his word? Does he have inflexible personal honor? I believe the answer is "Yes."

This was Gandhi's appraisal:

"He [Nehru] is pure as the crystal. He is truthful beyond suspicion. He is a knight without fear, without reproach. The nation is safe in his hands."

Nehru's India has many serious problems, but if, under his leadership, it can successfully keep out of the clutches of Communist imperialism, maintain political stability, and slowly but steadily improve its standard of living, its success may mark the crucial turning point in the world Communist drive.

It is my own view that the men in the Kremlin now look on India as the No. 1 target of world communism. I base that belief on the indications of heightened activity in the Communist cells in India. I base it also on the Tibet move. The march of Chinese Communist troops into Tibet does not make sense on any basis other than as a move by the Soviet Union to bring pressure on India.

I believe India will feel more of these pressures. The Communists will try to keep the Kashmir dispute aflame. They will stir up other conflicts between Pakistan and India. They will constantly endeavor to divide Nehru and India from the west, and at the same time try to undermine Nehru at home by clamoring that he is subservient to the west.

I believe the seriousness of the situation will result in lessening the negative emphasis implicit in the religions of India and will substitute a more affirmative approach to national problems.

Much depends on such an evolvement. For it will have a direct bearing upon India's progress in solving the problems represented by the words "land," "water," "babies," "cows," and "capital."

But in the solving of each of these problems, much will also depend upon the future relationships between India and America. Nehru must learn more of the truth about America. I believe he will. I strongly believe that if we in America once realize that Nehru and his country are and will be neither close friends to us nor distant opponents, neither an echo of America nor a voice of Moscow, and then develop a policy toward them that accords full recognition of their third position, tremendous good will result for the people of both countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also bring to the attention of the Senate a lead article in the New York Times under date of April 23, 1951. The article is entitled "Famine Migration Indicated in India."

The article goes on to explain what has been happening in certain of the provinces, how the Government is attempting to divert foodstuffs from the provinces which have a little more food than others, and how the rationing system is beginning to break down—a system which affects the lives of 125,000,000 people. If that rationing system breaks down, 125,000,000 people may well perish. The grain which this Government has been asked to provide is for the rationing system, to feed into the pipelines of the Government system for rationing out the food so that those poor souls can at least exist on a subsistence diet.

Do Senators think we have trouble in Asia now? Just let India go down the pipeline into the Communist sewer, and we shall never have an end of trouble. We shall lose all.

Mr. President, what are we doing is not one-tenth of what is necessary, but I suppose we must go along at an easy pace. I am going to settle for that which is possible. Abraham Lincoln once said that politics is the art of the possible. Even foreign policy is the art of the possible.

I wish to drive home this point, because some day these words will be prophetic. I say that if by any failure on our part we permit this Nation to slip into the hands of the Communist dictatorship, we may well lose the battle for a free world. If General MacArthur is right when he says that the issue of communism will be settled in Asia, I would suggest that his stanch supporters had better give wholehearted support to preventing that section of the world from going Communist. I say it can be done without guns at this time. We may have to use guns. I do not know. If we do, we should be prepared. In the meantime, we can use what we have in abundance—food, food.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMINE MIGRATION INDICATED IN INDIA—NEW DELHI'S REPORTS CAUTIOUS, BUT NEED, NOTABLY IN BIHAR, HEIGHTENS PLEA TO UNITED STATES

NEW DELHI, INDIA, April 22.—The food situation in Bihar state has deteriorated to a point where the disastrous effects of famine have begun to appear. Prices of rice and other grains have gone up so high that small landowners are forced to sell their farms and cattle to buy food.

Landless farm laborers have begun to drift aimlessly to neighboring states in search of food and work.

Officials here think that no migration of serious proportions has started, but they do not hold out hopes that it will not start soon.

Responsible leaders and newspapers have begun cautiously to warn the Government of the possibility of a repetition in Bihar of another Bengal famine.

The Central Government has mobilized all available grain surpluses as well as transport to rush food to deficit regions in north Bihar. But all these efforts will barely meet the need of millions of people.

PROSPECT CALLED UNCERTAIN

Asked what were the chances of saving Bihar from imminent famine, the Bihar States Food Minister, Anugraha Narain Sinha, was reported to have said in Patna yesterday that "the issue is entirely in the lap of the gods."

Indian purchases of food grains have begun to arrive and are being transshipped from ports directly to deficit regions. India expects to receive 350,000 tons of food grains this month and a similar quantity in succeeding months. Out of this volume, 50,000 tons each month will be sent to Bihar and the rest will be distributed to other needy states.

Immediate needs are officially estimated at 1,000,000 tons. The maximum New Delhi has found it possible to allot is 600,000 tons. At present 3,000 tons of grains are being moved into Bihar daily; the quantity is considered insufficient to meet urgent demands.

The threatening famine with all its concomitant repercussions has once again focussed attention on United States aid. It is being acknowledged at highest governmental levels that prospect of getting Russian wheat or Chinese rice in time to prevent a crisis is out of the question, as negotiations with the governments are as yet in preliminary stage. Furthermore there is no certainty that the deals will succeed.

In view of the uncertain factors, there is unanimous opinion in all responsible quarters that only the United States could help at this critical period because it has the grain at hand as well as the ships to transport it.

The position has worsened to such an extent that Indians no longer care on what basis American food comes; they are only anxious that it should come in time.

PLANNING GROUP URGES GIFT

WASHINGTON, April 22.—As sentiment in Congress mounted for a loan, the National Planning Association urged today that grain for famine-threatened India be made available as a gift. It said any effort to tie financial strings to the 2,000,000 tons of food grains needed in the present crisis "would strike at the stability desperately needed by India if it is to remain democratic."

The association's committee on international policy said it was its considered judgment "that the American people should respond promptly and in a spirit of Christian charity to the appeal from India for grain to feed her starving people."

"We do not believe," a statement by the committee said, "that the welfare of this country will be served in any way by conditioning our response to political objectives or to recent differences of opinion expressed in the United Nations. On the contrary, we feel that hundreds of millions of Asiatics, both inside and outside of India, will regard the action which we take on this matter as a sure sign of our future intentions in the Far East."

Supporting President Truman's request for the assistance to India as a gift, the association asserted India could not pay off a loan without impairment of her 6-year program for economic development. It emphasized that a downward trend of living standards in India must be halted so that the country could "withstand possible emergencies in the future."

ANALOGY TO MARSHALL PLAN

The 20-member Committee on International Policy, headed by Frank Altschul and including John Kenneth Galbraith, Carter Goodrich, and Lithgow Osborne, said that

there would be a double advantage to the United States if the aid was provided as a gift.

"It is recommended that receipts in India from the sale of grain given by this country should be set apart as counterpart funds," it said. "The United States Government can properly ask to have the equal voice in the expenditure of these funds that it now has in the use of counterpart funds of European countries participating in the Marshall plan.

"In this way, we can, in effect, use twice our appropriations for food for India: first, to feed the starving and, second, to aid India in her much needed economic development program."

The appeal was made as the House Foreign Affairs Committee prepared to meet tomorrow to vote on a new bill providing a $190,000,000 loan, extended on easy terms, under which India could buy the grain. On Friday, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee decided to provide the aid half as a gift, half as a loan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, lest anyone in the Senate or in Congress think that what I am talking about is not supported by the American people, I should like to call one other fact to the attention of the Senate. I hesitate to quote from a public opinion poll. I suppose such polls are often used to substantiate an argument. I submit this merely as another point in my argument.

On Wednesday, April, 25, the public opinion service conducted by Mr. Gallup found the following to be the opinion of American people. The question asked was, "Should we give India grain?"

Fifty-nine percent of the Republicans interrogated said yes.

Democrats, 60 percent.

Independents, 57 percent.

I would venture to say that any Senator would be glad to receive a vote as high as that. Get me 57 percent support for my policy or candidacy, and I will be very glad to settle for it. I would be very glad to settle for much less than that. How many say we should not support grain for India? Thirty-two percent of the Republicans, 31 percent of the Democrats, and 32 percent of the independents. That is almost a 2 to 1 vote. It is very interesting. I am sure the American people have properly expressed themselves.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I missed some of the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. I should like to ask him whether he is familiar with the experience of the combined food boards and later of the international board in the distribution of food by the Indian Government at the time of what might be described as the famine of 1946. If not, it might be interesting to relate the experience.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have the Senator from New Mexico do so at this time. I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the Members of the Senate that the one country the Government of which we are absolutely certain had exact knowledge of what to do with meager supplies of food was India. It was possible to give the people of India a sack full of grain, and they knew how to divide it cupful by cupful, because they have been used to short rations for a long time. They understood how to do it. They understood how to make a fair division. We had trouble in many other parts of the world, as Members of the Senate know. There were areas where people who lived in cities moved out to farms, because their relatives on the farms were able to feed them better than they could be fed in the cities. We did not find that to be the situation in India. They understand the collection of grain and the distribution of grain.

Our first experience in shipping wheat into certain areas of India was unfortunate, because the people were accustomed to eating rice. They took the wheat and made a sort of gruel out of it. It was not used as we would have like to see it used as a substitute for what they had been eating. However, it was not long before they taught themselves to bake it and make other satisfactory uses of it. We were supplying food to several hundred million people, on a partial basis, at least, and the one country in which I was absolutely certain, as was every member of the Board, the supply would be received properly and distributed equitably was India. That is why I have been so very much interested in seeing the supply of grain go to India. We know it will be adequately used and equitably divided. It will not be lost. We became convinced that they saved every minute grain of wheat that was sent. They lost nothing. It was divided cupful by cupful. That could not be done in any other part of the world.

I am glad that the proposal has been supported by so many Senators, because it involves a recognition of the fact that India is a land which understands what to do with supplies that are sent to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. He has supplied some very valuable information. I am certain it will be of real interest to every Member of the Senate as he voted on the bill. The people of the country will want to know that the supply of grain will be equitably and efficiently distributed.

Arguments have been made in opposition to the proposal. Many of such arguments have been answered by Senators who have preceded me. For example, it is asked, "Why does not India pay for the wheat?" It is asked, "Why does not the Republic of India pay cash for the extra 2,000,000 tons of wheat?"

The answer, primarily, is that she does not have the dollars with which to pay. We deal in dollars.

Others have asked, "Why does she not set up some sort of system by which she could use her sterling balance?"

Mr. President, the Republic of India is dedicating most of its sterling balance, which it has on deposit in London, to the program outlined under the Colombo plan, a plan for long-range development, over a period of 5 or 6 years, to do that which is imperative.

Let me make it quite clear that the proposal to help feed the people of India is a proposal based on an emergency. It is an effort to keep the patient alive until he can regain his strength and rebuild himself. The long-range program for India is one which is very much a part of internal development, land reclamation, irrigation, drainage, development of fertilizers, new practices in agriculture, and scientific farming, as well as new, modern farming equipment.

Mr. President, the Indian Government has spent millions of dollars to improve its farms, to improve the fertility of its soil, and to expand its acreage. The Indian Government has a Grow More Food Campaign. It is trying to combat a famine which recurs about once every 7 years. Once in every 7 years India is faced with such a situation.

As has been pointed out, the famine is worse this year because of a whole series of calamities which have affected India. There have been floods, droughts, locusts, earthquakes—every conceivable calamity that could fall upon the people. All such calamities have fallen on the agricutural areas of India. I wish to say again that what we are attempting to do is not to satisfy the long-term needs of the people of India, but to satisfy the emergency need of keeping body and soul together.

Therefore, it would be unwise for the Indian Government to expend the few dollars it has, by which it can do business with us, for emergency grains. It is to our advantage that she expend her sterling balance and her dollars for the fundamental and basic development of her industry and agriculture.

Mr. President, that is where our point-4 program comes in. We did not do very much about it. We did get it started. I think we have appropriated something like $28,000,000. We have appropriated $28,000,000 for scientific and technological assistance all around the world. We are going to appropriate $53,000,000,000 or $54,000,000,000 to arm ourselves—only $28,000,000 for technological and scientific assistance.

Mr. President, here is a program that can be of great help in the long pull and for the long term. In other words, we must extend our help on the basis of scientific and technological knowledge to many nations, not only to India. We must do what we are doing in north Africa, in Latin-American countries, in South American countries, in the Near East, and in the Asiatic area, in Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia.

Those who ask that the Government of India pay cash for the wheat are in effect actually asking that we serve the ends of communism. The first thing that could lead to Communist domination in India would be a complete collapse of its economic system. The Government of India is making heroic efforts to hold its economic system together. Someone has said that many confusing statements are coming out of New Delhi, particularly out of Parliament. I have heard many asking: "What does the Prime Minister want?" I agree that it is very difficult at times to find out what he does want. However, I interpret his

message to be: "Yes, we will be glad to accept an outright loan."

As we know, the loan as proposed in one branch of our Congress would not have any conditions or strings at all tied to it.

So the Prime Minister of India says, "We will accept the loan." He has also said that he finds the terms of the Senate bill very acceptable. The important point is that the Prime Minister of India has said that he prefers that this bill impose no qualifications or limitations or requirements upon the Indian Government.

Mr. President, do not you think that is a very natural thing for such a man to say to his own people? To be sure, the Prime Minister of India is speaking in terms that his people will understand. To be sure, he is trying to resist Russian pressure, and he has also been trying to resist some pressure on the part of some Members of our own Congress.

The question which should be in our minds is, "What do we wish to do"—not "What does someone else want us to do?"

My honest opinion of what we should do—although I know we shall not do it—is to give the wheat to India under the terms of an ECA grant. If that were done, then when the grain went into the marketing system in India, whenever a bushel of it was sold, a counterpart fund of rupees, the Indian medium of currency, would be developed, and that counterpart fund would be under the joint management of ECA representatives and representatives of the Indian Government. That would mean that after making the gift, the Government of the United States would have something to say about its proper use—the use of the counterpart fund of Indian money, which would be developed as a result of the gift, for the development of agriculture, irrigation, and other improvements in India. That is the advantage of making a gift under such an arrangement.

On the contrary, if the wheat were sent to India as a loan which it is presumed the Government of India would pay back with interest, the United States would have absolutely nothing to say about what was done in India in terms of the internal development of India.

To be sure, Mr. President, the Prime Minister of India says that the terms of a loan sound better to him—in other words, with no control by us of the use of the funds which would be developed. However, we should remember that the counterpart funds which would be developed in the way I have suggested would be used in that country itself; so what looks like a gift would in fact be an investment.

The Senate bill provides for what is to be half a gift and half a loan. It is a compromise with the terms of the original bill.

I have submitted an amendment which I feel is worthy of consideration by the Senate. The amendment is not too different from the terms of the bill as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. My amendment merely provides that in the first year there will be a grant of $95,000,000, and in the second year there will be a grant or a loan of $95,000,000, depending upon the determination made by the Administrator for Economic Cooperation. The amendment provides that after the Administrator for Economic Cooperation determines, "after consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, that circumstances make it necessary, such sum of not to exceed $95,000,000 may be made available for assistance to India on a grant basis upon approval by the Congress."

That language simply means that in the second year if the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration ascertains that India can repay the loan and will repay the loan, the matter will be placed on a loan basis, and the money, with interest, will be collected. If, however, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation ascertains, after consulting with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, that the economic status of India is such that she cannot repay the loan, then we simply shall give the money to her. Does that make sense, Mr. President? I think so. After all, one way to make an enemy is to loan him money which he simply can never repay. One way to make a man always cross to the other side of the street when he sees you and always be your enemy is to lend him money which he will never be able to repay.

I have reason to believe that the Government of India is already committed up to the hilt. The Indian Government has been keeping up with the loans already made to it. However, it has been straining under a program of austerity and a program of very careful planning to enable it to keep up with the payment of both principal and interest on the loans which already are outstanding. So, Mr. President, if we lend the Government of India more money at this time, we shall be lending it money which it will not be able to repay. That will not help us make friends.

On the other hand, if the suggestion I now make is adopted, the result will be that India will be able, by means of the use of the counterpart funds, to make great improvements which will be of tremendous aid to her internal development.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder whether I correctly understood the Senator from Minnesota to say that this grain will be sent to India and will be given to hungry and starving people there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Perhaps I did not read the bill correctly; but I should like to refer to section 6, paragraph (d) on page 4:

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of India equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of India from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Does that mean that the goods are to be sold by the Indian Government and then given to the people of India?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Of course, the language we find in this bill is the kind of language which bewilders people generally. However, this language is written in accordance with the legalistic doctrine which we think we have to follow. Instead of saying what we wish to do, we say it in terms which require a lawyer to explain.

This provision of the bill simply means that we shall provide funds which will be used as a grant which will be used to buy wheat, and the wheat then will go into the government rationing storehouses in India, into the pools, so to speak; and it will be pumped out of those pools into the pipelines of the rationing system, and will be sold from that rationing system to those who can afford to pay for it, or will be given as relief to those who cannot pay for it; and for every bushel that is sold to people who can pay for it and for every bushel that is provided by way of relief to those who cannot pay for it, the Government of India will set up a counterpart fund. In other words, the result of our sending the wheat to India will be the development in India of a counterpart fund which will be used for the development of the internal economy of India—its agriculture or other natural resources.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has certainly brought out a good point.

I have been receiving many, many letters from good folks who are urging me to vote to send grain to India. No doubt those good folks would say, after reading this bill, "How do you change all of this bill into wheat for the hungry people of India?"

Of course, that is a good question. My friend, the Senator from Maryland, or my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, do not get out a plow and use it a little if they want to get wheat, but they go to a grain elevator and buy wheat. The Commodity Credit Corporation has a sizable amount of wheat in storage. As a matter of fact, that wheat is amply adequate to meet all the needs of this loan or this grant, and then some.

So the Government of the United States would make available from ECA funds $95,000,000, this year, under the provisions of my amendment, and that would be followed by $95,0000,000 next year, or a total of $190,000,000. Fifty percent of it would be a grant the first year, and 50 percent would be a loan. That money would be converted into wheat, and the wheat would be sent to India, and there would be unloaded at the ports of India and would go into the Government warehouses, and then would go into the rationing system in India, and then would go into the homes and finally would go into the stomachs of the people, and they would live. The matter is just that simple. Every time the Government of India sold some of that wheat from its rationing system, it would put a certain number of rupees into a bank or fund, and that money would be earmarked. Every time the Government of India gave wheat to people who could not afford to buy it, the Government of India, would put a certain number of rupees

into the same fund. Finally that fund would be used for internal improvements in India—for fertilizer or for the irrigation of land or for the reclamation of land. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If we are going to try to prevent the Orient from falling into Soviet hands, as the Senator has well pointed out, it is important that we establish a working basis with the Indian Government. We attempted to keep China from going Communist, but waited until the Chinese Nationalist Government was in such bad condition that $2,000,000,000 worth of military aid would not pump them out. Now, we are sending additional hundreds of millions of dollars, hoping again to try to save something of what Chiang Kai-shek's government has left. But if we want to set a pattern for working with the Indian Government to help build a strong democratic government there, is not this about the best opportunity we shall have to begin to work with those people on a basis which they can understand?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct. He has stated, in a nutshell, the whole heart of this argument. In other words, what the Senator from Louisiana is saying is, "Let us do what we ought to do, before we are compelled to do what we might not need to do." That is what he is saying. He is saying, "Let us help out a few folks now, before it is too late."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder whether the Senator would be interested in having his attention called to another instance which cut a little pattern similar to the experiences in China. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the fact that approximately 5 years ago the Italian people were confronted with a very serious election, in which most of the political experts of Europe were confident that the Communist element in the Italian Government would succeed. The Senator is familiar with the fact that it was an extremely important election to us, because it meant the success of our efforts in Greece and Turkey, and probably in Australia, and possibly in certain other areas, specifically in France, which was very close to the Italian situation. So the very thing which is here proposed was tried.

Promises had been made by the Russian Government as to what it would do, but the Russian Government did not furnish very much actual grain for Italy. Immediately before the Italian election, approximately 150,000 tons of American grain, which was already floating on the high seas, was diverted to Italy and made available to the Italian people in a form which they understood. It was made into pasta, and became available in food which they could utilize. It came in trucks with flying American flags. That food, with the great cooperation of the Catholic Church, and other fine organizations, saved the Italian people from being engulfed in communism.

I hope the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota and the contribution by the Senator from Louisiana, tend to point out that it is possible to do something worth while if it is done soon enough, that India is an area in which something effective can be done, and that an opportunity still remains to do it. I hope the Senator will continue his plea for taking action now on any basis which is agreeable to the leaders of India, even though we may not understand the delicate political problems which a given leader may face within that country.

I may say to the Senator that I would have been better satisfied, when the grain to which I have referred was diverted on the high seas to Italy, if we had had some sort of promissory note from the Italian Ambassador, or some sort of assurance from the Italian Government. But, if that assurance had been given by the Italian Government, it would have been a clue to the Communist workers in Italy that the United States was taking a far bigger hand in that threat than they otherwise might have believed. Because it was handled on the very sort of indefinite basis upon which the workers of that country thought it had to be handled, we were able to deliver the wheat at the very time that they wanted it, and it accomplished the very purpose the Italian Government said it would accomplish. I think the best proof of it is that within succeeding years we have seen in Italy a strengthening of the effort against communism, and a development of a much stronger situation all over Europe, because of that change in Italy. I think it noteworthy to observe how much development agriculturally there has been in Italy, and that now we may begin to regard Italy as one of the strong countries.

I am sure that if wheat is supplied to India, the people there will make the best use of it. They may not make an immediate accounting of what happens, by saying, "We will pay you so many dollars on such and such a date." A great deal of it must be in the shape of a grant, as it was in the case of the grain sent to Italy, but surely no food was ever given for a better purpose, so far as Italy was concerned, than that food, which came at the very moment they needed it most. I hope that food contemplated by the pending bill will reach India in time to fill her great need.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico again. As a matter of fact, I believe he was the Secretary of Agriculture, was he not, when that program was under way?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, but I was not responsible for working it out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. The Senator, however, was fully informed as to what the program of our Government was, was he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, and I may say to the Senator it was an extremely difficult situation, because most persons said, "You are going to pour this wheat down a rat hole. You will only fatten these people so the Communists can use them. There is no chance whatever of winning the Italian election. The Communists are certain to win it." It seemed almost certain that that would happen, but there were several persons in the Government—one of whom, I am happy to say, was the very able Secretary of Defense, the late James Forrestal—who believed that it was possible still to win that election in Italy. Many persons knew of the great personal contribution made at that time by Secretary Forrestal. His judgment, combined with the judgment of the State Department and the judgment of the Italian officials, persuaded us to go ahead with the undertaking, even though many people thought it inexpedient and possibly unwise. It is barely possible that the things we propose to do here may turn out to be unwise, but the probabilities are that they will prove to be a very wise investment on the part of the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely want to thank the Senator. I am happy that he noted the possibility, that despite all our efforts, things may not work out as we want them to; but at leas. I would like to know that we made an effort. I would like to know that if we should lose the fight to keep India a part of the free world, at least we were in the fight, and were making a contribution to the winning of the fight.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. At least, on other chances we have taken along the same line, we have not done too badly on these calculated risks, have we?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have done very well.

Mr. LONG. The situation in Italy was mentioned. France is still a democratic nation. Belguim and Holland are still democratic nations, and Austria is still voting democratic, wherever free elections are held. They still seem to side with the democratic free way of life, rather than with the Communists.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is correct. I think the facts today are that our humanitarian and economic-aid programs have had greater effect even than our military program, enabling us to see a gain in the friendship of government after government, so that we could build the right kind of common defense. It is important that we build that common defense.

Mr. President, I desire to read a quotation from our Ambassador to India, Mr. Loy Henderson, because, as so many people have said to me, it appears that the Government of India is a little difficult to deal with. They seem to be so edgy; sort of sensitive. Insecure people, insecure governments are always sensitive. New governments are always sensitive. It is our job, as a mature democracy, to understand the human frailties and to understand these human reactions. As a matter of fact, we are a little bit sensitive, once in a while, too. If anyone rises in the House of Commons to say an unkind word about us, we

snort around here and flex our muscles for days.

I recently read that the members of the New Zealand Parliament were flexing their muscles, saying they did not like what the Washington Post had written in an editorial. The Washington Post is read in New Zealand, whose people are making a substantial contribution to the Korean War. Of course, everyone is a little bit edgy. Let me read what Mr. Henderson had to say:

It has not been easy for India to decide to make its appeal to the United States for assistance. The Indian people cherish their new freedom. They wish to exercise it to the full. They do not wish to feel that their right to formulate and carry out internal and foreign policies of their own choosing is in any way curtailed because of a sense of obligation toward any foreign country, friendly though that country may be. The Indian people would probably prefer to starve rather than to sacrifice any of their political and economic independence. India, feeling as it does about these matters, has displayed great confidence in the disinterested friendship of the United States by appealing to it for aid in this time of need.

Mr. Henderson continues:

I hope that the United States will show by the manner in which it treats this appeal that the confidence of India was not misplaced. I have no doubt that Indian people would be shocked, hurt, and disillusioned if this American aid should not be forthcoming at a time when difficulties are crowding in on a hard-pressed government and people from all sides, both externally and internally. And we may be sure that our critics and enemies would know how to exploit such a situation to their own great advantage.

What is Mr. Henderson saying? He is simply saying that here is a new country, a country new in its freedom. Here is a country that, after the sacrifices which its people have made, after the leadership of a Gandhi and a Nehru, at long last has thrown off British domination and now stands as a free people.

Of course a free nation is jealous of its prerogatives, and it hates to ask or plead for assistance, but the situation has finally become so desperate that it had to ask for help. Such people are the kind upon which we can depend. They are not the kind who come crying to us every time they are in trouble. They waited until the situation was so desperate that they had to do something about it.

Our country has waited for months to answer this cry of human suffering. It borders upon something that is shameful. We should act with dispatch and in such terms that no one in the world can for a single minute misunderstand what we do. Let it be known to the world that so long as there is food on the American table, so long as our storehouses are filled with our abundance, so long as our land is able to produce, this Nation will not stand by and let another nation starve, but will share its abundance with those who are suffering.

Let us remember that those who give, receive. I have never known of a nation that gave away all its substance in charity. I remember that this country was once hoarding its substance, and we ended up with unemployment, depression, and disaster. We have recently been acting like the Good Samaritan and have been criticized at times because we are too generous. I would rather be criticized for being generous than for being an Old Scrooge. Believe me, the more we give the more we shall receive. As we have cast our bread upon the waters, it has come back to us a thousandfold, not simply a hundredfold or tenfold. With every bushel of wheat we give, we give life. When we give life and the hope of life, we give something that is eternal, and people do not forget it.

That is my appeal to the Senate, Mr. President. All the facts of economics, all the hard facts of international politics, say that this is a good bill. It is good, sound policy on the part of our country.

What a tragedy, Mr. President, that we have waited so long.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator realizes that while this debate is going on, the Russian Government is labeling our efforts today as blackmail. My attention has been called to a news dispatch which reads as follows:

The increasing famine in India is the direct result of nearly two centuries of colonial rule by the British imperialists, which has put Indian agriculture into a state of great chaos. At present, the ruling circles of the United States are trying to exploit India's difficulties in order to subjugate it to its influence.

By way of political blackmail and speculation on the national calamity of the 350,000,000 Indian people, the American imperialists are trying to force India to give support to their bloody intervention in Korea and to capture rich Indian resources of strategic raw materials.

For 5 months—

Even the Russians know how long it has been going on—

For 5 months they have been trying to attain the complete political and economic subjugation of India as payment for the delivery of American grain. However, the Indian people are not yielding to the American blackmail.

I ask the Senator from Minnesota if he thinks there is any Member of this body who believes this grain would be shipped for the sake of the economic subjugation of India by the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can honestly say that even those who have questioned the advisability of the bill have never voiced an attitude, either publicly or privately, that there is any intent of economic subjugation of India by the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator is familiar with the fact that when the Government of the United States sent some corn to Yugoslavia, a country which does not use wheat as much as it uses other cereals, at a time of extreme difficulty there, it was said we were trying to exercise some sort of wrong influence on the Government of Yugoslavia, and the United States offered to deliver the wheat through the Red Cross or any other agency so that the people could have it. Years later we find that Yugoslavia rises up and has more strength to resist the Russian aggressor, and perhaps has done a great service to free nations around the world.

I wonder if the Senator is familiar with the fact that in 1950, when every effort was being made by General Clay and his staff to aid Germany, the official Russian propaganda organs in the city of Berlin were day-by-day printing the statement that the grain we were shipping to Germany was surplus grain for which no sale could be found anywhere in the world, when, as a matter of fact, we were closing down American industries in order to ship the grain. They went on to say that we were selling it at such a high price that the German people would be sold into subjugation for a thousand years, when the grain was actually charged for at something like $2.20 a bushel, and the going prices for grain supplied by other nations ranged as high as $6 a bushel. The Russian Government is now calling it political blackmail when we try to supply grain to India. I am glad the Senator stressed the fact that when we give, we receive in return. It is only when we hoard that we have difficulty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. "If your son asks for bread, will you give him a stone? If he asks for fish, will you give him a serpent?"

In other words, Mr. President, when nations ask for bread, for sustenance, let us not give something that makes a mockery of giving. We cannot put conditions on aid when human misery is involved. The way to answer these Communist lies is by deeds so pure and so clear in their purpose and intent that even those vicious liars of the Kremlin cannot interpret them falsely. They talk about blackmail. They are blackmail artists; they are blackmailing the world. They cannot even give out a press release without using the word. We can tell the kind of person a man is by the kind of material he gives out.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator is not in favor of striking section 6 (b) from the bill, is he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not suggesting eliminating anything from the bill as it was reported from the committee. But, as I have said, let us not say that India must deliver so many tons of manganese. Let us leave that question open for honest negotiation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think that is a very salutary provision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure it is. I think all will agree that it is a salutary provision.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is not one of our great difficulties the fact that we have gone so far in the other direction that we have not been given due credit? I am told that food has been distributed in such a fashion that no one knew where it came from. I think that is a very disastrous thing. When grain was delivered to Italy it was delivered in trucks bearing the American flag. I am glad the Sena-

tor from Maryland raised the question, because even though we do not desire to furnish grain out of a spirit of getting something for it, I think it is proper that people know the source of the contribution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

While some individuals in our country have spoken of the result of the recent Russian propaganda in connection with 50,000 tons of grain, which, of course, is only a small percentage point of what is being given, there was recognition of our efforts by the Prime Minister of India. I have here some remarks of the Prime Minister of India made on Thursday of last week. Let me quote the concluding two paragraphs of his statement:

In our view there are no political or discriminatory conditions attached to these two bills—

Referring, of course, to the House and the Senate bills—

and therefore there can be no objection on these grounds to our acceptance of either of them. While the form in which assistance is given to India is a matter for the United States of America to decide, we would prefer the terms embodied in the House bill, which are simpler.

I think the important part of that sentence is:

While the form in which assistance is given to India is a matter for the United States of America to decide—

Then he concludes, Mr. President:

I should like to express our gratitude to the Government of the United States of America for the efforts they have made to send food grains to India. I should also like to express our deep appreciation of the messages as well as offers of material help unofficially received from many citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, the Prime Minister of India has said, "Thank you." He has not only said "Thank you" to the Government of the United States, but he has said "Thank you" to the churches, to programs such as CARE, the Red Cross, to CROP, and others. The trouble is that he did mention earlier that there was some deal with the Soviet Union; that India wanted to get some 100,000 tons of wheat from them. That is what has built up feeling.

The fact of the matter is that the Prime Minister has paid his respects and uttered his expressions of gratitude to the United States of America.

Let me summarize. I say that it is in our national interest, for the common defense, that we pass the Senate bill providing for food aid to the Republic of India. I say that it is to our interest in the over-all struggle against international aggressive world communism to take such action. I say this measure represents the beginning of an effective program to combat the conditions that are conducive to the growth and the development of communism.

I detail my argument by saying that in any country where there are conditions of economic depression, where there is a condition of famine and of disease and poverty, that there is the country where the soil is fertile for the seed of Communist growth. It is axiomatic in political history that where the economic fabric has begun to disintegrate, where the economic society shows signs of cracking up, there is exactly where communism is on the march.

Mr. President, I say it is better that we have a little preventive medicine right now. A few ounces of prevention may well save many pounds of cure. I point out that the people of the Republic of India are suffering from mass starvation. I also point out that India is the greatest free country on the Asiatic mainland. Its importance to us cannot be overestimated. Its importance geographically, its importance in terms of natural resources, cannot be overestimated. But even more fundamental, my colleagues, the cordial friendly relationships and understandings with the people and leaders of India are necessary to our well-being.

Mr. President, I point out that it is within our power to answer this great need without taxing our resources, without upsetting our economy. I point out that the supplies are available, and that the Government of India is willing and ready to cooperate with us in the transportation and shipment of this grain.

I point out that the amount of money involved in this great program is small in comparison with the amount of money we have expended for arms and for national defense and for other foreign-aid programs.

In conclusion, I call upon my colleagues in the Senate to pass the pending measure, and pass it quickly. I call upon them to give serious consideration to the amendment I have offered, which is an improving amendment. I believe I am correct in saying that my amendment is in substance the same as the report of the subcommittee before it went to the full Committee on Foreign Relations. But whatever may be the terms of the proposed legislation, whether the aid is a loan, whether it is a grant, whether it is part grant and part loan, whether it is the Humphrey-Lehman-Benton amendment—whatever may be its terms, let us act quickly, and let us act with clean hands.

Let us say to the Government of India, to the people of India, that the United States of America asks no pledges, seeks no understanding in terms of future reward; that "We, the people of the United States, who ourselves have suffered in times of adversity, extend to you the hand of human fellowship." That "What we are doing is working together in the vineyards of freedom, and regardless of what the future may have to offer, we, as Members of this body, know that we did something again that is decent."

Today the people are crying out for their leaders to be decent. They are not asking for us to be smart; they are asking us to be decent. They are asking us to be honorable human beings. That is all they want of us. The American people want honor, and integrity, in government. They have the right to expect it. They want their leaders in Congress to act like courageous, prudent but generous human beings, and not like political puppets. They want every Member of the Senate and House to respond with a warm heart of human fellowship.

The American people are sick and tired of all the shenanigans we go through, of all the delays we indulge in. What they want in the Congress of the United States today is action in simple terms, the kind of action that we take when we discover that a neighbor of ours is hungry. We do not sit around the table and bargain as to how many feet of fence we can get from him if we give him a bowl of soup. Our people want us to treat other peoples as we would treat our own kinfolk when we find them to be suffering from hunger. When our neighbors are hungry, we help feed them. Even if those neighbors should turn against us later, yet we can then say that in the critical hour of need we were on the side of God. That is the side I want to be on now and in the days to come.

Mr. President, I never felt I was more right than on this issue, and the sooner we can pass the bill, the better it will be.

Mr. President, I desire now to submit a request on behalf of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE FOOD-FOR-INDIA BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on the proposed legislation which is now pending. As we all know the junior Senator from New York is one of the cosponsors and an ardent advocate of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement by Mr. LEHMAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE FOOD-FOR-INDIA BILL

The bill now before the Senate, to provide food to forestall mass starvation in India, may, in the long view of history, be considered one of the most important pieces of legislation to be taken up in this session of Congress. This proposal springs from the deep wells of humanitarianism in America. It keeps faith with a long record of American generosity in cases where other peoples have been beset by natural disasters.

In 1923, after Japan's catastrophic earthquake, we did not stop to ask what the policies of the Japanese Government were in regard to this or that political matter. Thousands of Japanese were homeless and confronted with desperate privations. America opened her great heart and sent help. There have been many similar instances.

Now, in the year 1951, India, a new Republic, a new member of the sisterhood of nations, faces a threat to her national existence in the form of a drastic grain shortage.

This grain shortage was not man-made. It resulted from floods in the Punjab and in other grain-producing areas of India. It resulted from drought in certain sections. India found herself coming into the year 1951 with a shortage of 6,000,000 tons of grain.

She has supplied part of this shortage by purchases in the world market, including the United States. She needs 2,000,000 additional tons of grain for which she cannot afford to pay.

When I said she cannot afford to pay for this grain, I meant that she could not pay for this grain—according to all the facts I

have seen—and still carry on the programs which are vital to the maintenance of stability, peace and order in India and to forestall the recurrence of such crises as the present one.

Of course, India has some pound sterling balances. But it would be poor neighborliness on our part to ask that these sterling balances which are so vitally needed to enable her to carry on her economic and political programs be used to procure grain. India could obtain grain from Russia or China by giving these Communist countries vital raw materials which she now sells to the United States for dollars. But this would be self-defeating, both from our point of view and from India's.

It is true that India, in the request that she made for grain, asked only for easy terms. India did not ask for a grant. This is a true characteristic of a proud people and a proud Government—too proud to ask for a gift or to ask for charity.

In my judgment we should have done the wholly generous thing instead of the partially generous thing. We should have made a free grant of a least the first million tons of grain and then have taken another look with regard to the second half of this amount. I regret very much that such terms are not included in the legislation now before us. If it were possible to make the terms much more generous than they are, I would support it with all my heart.

I do not think that we should insist upon any political conditions. I do not think that we should insist upon any quid pro quo in terms of raw materials of any kind. Let us not try to use this generous act as a lever for the advancement of our own immediate and narrow national interest. Our national interest will be served in a much broader and finer way by a generous attitude of enlightened self-interest.

Many of our people, as individuals, have in recent days, demonstrated the spirit which animates this country by private gifts of grain to India. I think that the Congress can do no less than to take this hint from the people.

For the past several weeks we have been discussing intently and vigorously the issues involved in our far-eastern policy. The eyes of the Nation and of the world are fastened on the Far East today more than at any time in recent history. India is an integral part of the Far East. It is one of the cultural centers of the Far East. All the peoples of the Far East, including the peoples of southeastern Asia, look to India for cultural and political leadership. We dare not turn our backs on India. We dare not act in a niggardly or ungenerous manner. We will reap the harvest that we sow. It is my belief that by prompt and wholehearted action on this India measure, we will garner more friendship and understanding in the Far East than by any other single act we could possibly perform at this time.

Let us show the world, and especially the peoples of the Far East, that the policies of America are truly based on an interest in the welfare and well-being of individuals regardless of race or absolute political conformity. If we demonstrate that this is our policy, we will have won a great and lasting victory in the Orient and in the world.

IMPORTATIONS OF BURLAP FROM INDIA—LETTER FROM AUSTIN BROOKS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter, dated April 4, 1951, from Austin Brooks, the general manager of the El Rancho Milling Co., of Clovis, N. Mex., relative to the importations of burlap from India.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EL RANCHO MILLING CO.,
Clovis, N. Mex., April 4, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ: I know that you are troubled about many trivial matters and that such a demand is made upon your time that I hesitate to even write you relative to the matter at hand, but the situation has been growing steadily worse for some several months, and unless an improvement is brought about, and that shortly, our industry will be prostrate.

I refer to the present very critical burlap situation. Possibly you are familiar with the fact that the burlap has been coming into this country from India in insufficient quantities for more than a year, and I know that the reserve supplies of this product are completely exhausted, and, as might be expected, prices have skyrocketed. The situation has become so critical that we are paying more for used burlap bags than we were paying 1 year ago for brand-new burlap bags.

From information which has come to me by way of representatives from the various bag-manufacturing companies and through the press it appears that India is letting their burlap go to Argentina, Russia, or some other countries, in many instances on a barter basis.

It has been of considerable concern to me that in recent weeks considerable comment has been in the newspapers and over the radio relative to a proposition to appropriate the American taxpayers' money to buy a great gob of grain and either give to India or loan to them on a very favorable basis. Now, I am not familiar with all of the reasons behind this move, and surely there must be good ones, but I am wondering if it would not be expedient to require of India that she sell us, for dollars, as many yards of burlap as we have been customarily receiving from that country, as a condition to receiving of this grant of grain. I cannot see how this would be putting strings on the deal, and unless something is done to protect the American farmer and rancher great quantities of his produce is going to deteriorate and waste simply because he does not have a package in which to put it.

You are aware, of course, that it is impossible for us to substitute cotton and paper bags for burlap, for the mere reason that both of these items are critically short also. The manufacturers of cotton and paper bags are doing well to supply the customers who have over the years been using this particular kind of package.

I cannot overemphasize the seriousness of this particular problem and as to how it adversely affects New Mexico stockmen and ranchers. True, it adversely effects this business, but if worse comes to worse we will have our product here available in bulk, and it will be up to the rancher to figure out some means to transport it to his ranch, and you know that with the building materials so critically short that the ranchers of this State could not construct the type of storage houses and barns which would accommodate range feed in bulk form.

It is my hope that you will investigate this matter thoroughly and verify the situation which I have described, and use your influence to give us some relief.

Sincerely yours,

EL RANCHO MILLING CO.,
AUSTIN BROOKS.

EMBARGO BY UNITED NATIONS ON SHIPMENTS OF WAR MATERIALS TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me so I may ask for consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war material to Communist China?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], without losing the floor thereby, so he may present the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Michigan that he may yield to the Senator from Florida, without losing the floor thereby, for the purpose stated? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Michigan in yielding to me so I may bring up for immediate consideration Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, which I submitted for myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] yesterday. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to give the backing of Congress, which I hope will be unanimous, to the present effort of our delegation to the United Nations, which is seeking to have the General Assembly of the United Nations take action placing an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

I may say to the Senate, before asking for unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution, that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], have both advised me that they have no objection to the presentation of the concurrent resolution at this time.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at this time I modify the concurrent resolution by striking out section 2, which is its last section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not expect, of course, to object to this resolution. I merely wish to state to the Senator from Florida that I think it is 10 months late. However, I sincerely hope that the Sen-

ate will unanimously approve the resolution today, in order to place the Senate on record as emphatically opposing the shipment of arms, munitions, and war materials to those who are fighting our boys in Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire from the Senator from Florida whether or not the resolution submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] probably a month or so ago is similar to this resolution? Has it ever been brought out of committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I would rather have the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] make categorical answer to that question. However, it is my information that the resolution referred to was much more far reaching than this one. It had to do with the whole general subject of employment of sanctions against Red China. Without knowing what has transpired, I remind the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the Foreign Relations Committee has been engrossed in hearings for a period of several weeks. The hearings are still in progress. I suspect that the committee has not had the opportunity to go into the subject in detail. However, I respectfully request that the Senator address his question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Maryland that at the moment I cannot tell him what the status of the resolution to which he refers is. However, I believe that the questions involved were as the Senator from Florida has mentioned, and that we have not made a formal report on the resolution. It has been referred to a subcommittee. But there is no harm in that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have no objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is that with the understanding that the pending business will not be permanently displaced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has no effect on the pending business. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has yielded to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] with the understanding that the Senator from Michigan is to retain his position on the floor.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order to keep the record clear, the Senator from Florida makes it plain that it is his understanding that he is simply asking for temporary displacement of the pending business in order to give consideration to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, which he believes can be disposed of in a rather short space of time. At least he hopes so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quorum call?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to do so, if I may do it without losing my place on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the call.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in yielding to me so that I may bring on for immediate consideration Senate Concurrent Resolution 31. I am also grateful to the Senate for having given unanimous consent for such course to be followed.

Before beginning the rather short presentation which I shall make of the resolution, I wish to modify it by withdrawing section 2 thereof, leaving the resolution otherwise unchanged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has modified his resolution accordingly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 is a simple but important resolution. I believe the time when we are considering it is a highly important moment for taking the very action which is proposed by the resolution. The concurrent resolution has been submitted in the Senate by the Senator from Florida, on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], so as to make clear that its sponsorship is completely bipartisan, or, indeed, nonpartisan, as it is. An identical concurrent resolution has been offered in the House of Representatives by one of my colleagues, Representative ROGERS of Florida.

The reason for haste in the consideration of the concurrent resolution is that the United Nations Organization, through its important committees, is even now considering the action which we propose and urge by the concurrent resolution. Only yesterday the special committee on additional measures to supplement the finding that Red China is an aggressor nation passed, by a vote of 11 to 0, a measure which had been proposed by the United States delegation to the United Nations. One vote was not cast, because Egypt abstained from voting. Two other votes could not be cast because two of the nations which had been appointed to the special committee, namely, Burma and Yugoslavia, declined appointment. Therefore, the committee consists of only 12 members. I repeat, that 11 of the members yesterday voted for the measure proposed by the United States delegation. The other member, Egypt, abstained from voting.

On Thursday, the day after tomorrow, the question will be heard by the Political Committee of the United Nations, which consists of 60 members. The Committee has as its members a representative from every nation which is a member of the United Nations. It would appear that a stiff fight on the proposal may be expected on Thursday before the Political Committee of the United Nations.

The concurrent resolution would voice the request and the urgent insistence of the Congress of the United States, if such resolutions be adopted by both Houses of Congress, that the General Assembly of the United Nations shall take early action leading to the placing of an embargo upon shipments to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

I may say that not only has the concurrent resolution been cleared for consideration by the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY], but also by other members of the committee, so that in deed and in truth the measure comes on now with the support and approval of most members of that committee, as the Senator from Florida understands. I hope that the distinguished Senator from Texas and the members of the committee from the other side of the aisle may take occasion to voice their approval of the resolution before debate on it shall be concluded.

The reason why the Committee on Foreign Relations could not give consideration to the concurrent resolution is that the committee is sitting on a very hard schedule, in its joint session with the Committee on Armed Services, in the hearing of various witnesses in the so-called MacArthur investigation. I believe General Bradley is the witness who is presently being heard. The situation has precluded any immediate consideration of the matter by the committee.

The Senator from Florida is grateful to the committee, its chairman, and several of its members, for having informally made a study of the resolution and for having consented that it now be considered on the floor of the Senate with their approval.

The Senator from Florida feels that the Senate should know that in the House of Representatives unanimous action was taken this morning by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is not engaged in the hearings going on in the Senate, supporting an identical resolution offered in that body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say that I commend the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Michigan for having submitted the resolution. I only wish that we had acted on the matter earlier. I am very glad to identify myself with the purposes of the resolution.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I very warmly thank the Senator from New Jersey. I yield now to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONOR. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that I commend very highly his action and forthrightness in this particularly important connection. Needless to say, I am in hearty accord with the Senator from Florida, because on February 19, I had the opportunity of submitting Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 which is substantially similar to the concurrent resolution now submitted by the Senator from Florida.

Let me ask the Senator from Florida whether any reasons were assigned by the three nations which did not vote, as the Senator from Florida has indicated: Namely, Egypt, by way of abstention, and the other two, Burma and Yugoslavia, by not qualifying their members. Does the Senator know whether any reasons were assigned for the abstention of for the failure to appoint members to the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have that information. However, I understand that there were no members from the Soviet bloc of nations on the Special Committee for Additional Measures, and I understand that it is quite apparent that a real battle may be anticipated on Thursday, when the report of the special committee will reach the Political Committee of the General Assembly, for its action—the Political Committee being composed of 60 members, namely, a member for each of the member nations of the United Nations.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I understand that the Senator from Florida has modified his concurrent resolution by eliminating section 2. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. Does the Senator from Florida feel that it is in the interest of more orderly procedure and possibly will be of greater benefit?

Mr. HOLLAND. I feel that section 2 is completely unnecessary. When the Congress takes action, I think the press, the radio, and all other avenues of communication will make the news of that action speedily available to all concerned. Therefore, I think the addition of a section requiring the furnishing of copies is unnecessary. So, at the request of the Senator from Texas, I have been very glad to eliminate that section.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I am sure the Senator from Florida has been advised generally about this matter. Let me ask whether he knows that at this very hour a shipment of approximately 3,500 tons of rubber is on the high seas, en route from one member of the British Commonwealth of nations to Communist China, and also that in the recent past other shipments have gone to Communist China from a number of nations which are members of the United Nations, and that therefore the Senator's concurrent resolution is not only timely but is absolutely required if there is to be any united action on the part of the nations with which we are supposed to be allied in the fight against world-wide communism.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that is correct. The press has apprised the world that even though our ally, Great Britain, has imposed a strict embargo against the movement of crude rubber from British Malaya, yet prior to the time of the taking effect of that embargo, a shipload of crude rubber was prepared for shipment and left in time to be on the high seas at this time, and I understand that there is at least an open question as to the ability of Britain to stop that shipment. I hope legal means will be found to stop it.

However, in the meantime the fact that day after day shipments were getting under way, points out the need for haste. I feel that greater haste might appropriately have been taken, as suggested by my friend, the Senator from Maryland, some months ago.

I remind the Senator from Maryland that the action now proposed is not unilateral action, and our delegation to the United Nations is suggesting this action for the first time has the strong backing of our allies, Great Britain and France. It now appears that our delegation in the United Nations has gone as far as it can go. I understand that our delegation there is asking for as much as it can hope to have enacted at this time.

The action now pending in the United Nations committee does not go as far as our own Nation already has gone, largely under the prodding of the Senator from Maryland and his associates in reporting the unsatisfactory conditions which existed last fall and this spring with reference to the continued trafficking between certain of our ports and Communist China.

So the action now sought to be taken by the United States under the leadership of the United States does not go as far as many of us would like to go, but does, as I understand, go as far as we can hope to go in view of the varied points of view prevailing at the United Nations.

I am happy that the time has come when such action seems to be about to be taken in the immediate future. I hope that here today we can do our part in making it clear that the Senate and House of Representatives stand unanimously behind our delegation to the United Nations in insisting upon this action. The complete unity of approach in this case is something which differs from our condition in other fields. I feel that we can well call attention to it. We should be proud to let the world know that we stand as one man back of our delegation to the United Nations in this matter.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his very generous observation.

His concurrent resolution goes farther, does it not, than the action taken by Great Britain individually, for example, last week, when it acted through the British Parliament only in regard to rubber, and then conditioned that action by making it apply only to shipments which will be made during the remainder of the year?

In complimenting the Senator from Florida as I do, let me emphasize the fact that his concurrent resolution goes very much farther than the action which has been taken by the individual nations, because his concurrent resolution includes many other strategic items which hitherto have not been included by the individual nations.

Therefore, I commend the Senator from Florida very highly for the very fine action he has taken in this respect.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the first place, I commend the Senator from Florida for the concurrent resolution. I am thoroughly in accord with it. I expect to vote for it, and I shall support it in every way I can.

Did I correctly understand the Senator from Florida to say that the concurrent resolution was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee and has the approval of that committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask that question because as a member of that committee, I did not know that had been done.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; my statement was that the only reason why I did not ask that my concurrent resolution be submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee was the urgency of the matter, because of the limited amount of time available, for the real fight will take place on Thursday in New York.

So, instead of following the usual channel of submitting such matters to the committee, I have done my best to contact, in the first place, the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee, and also the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the ranking minority member of the committee, and all other members of the committee whom I could contact in the limited time available. I understand that the Senator from Texas has also charged the chief adviser of the

committee with the same duty, namely, to contact all members of the committee whom he possibly could contact. I am further advised that all persons connected with the committee felt that the urgency of the matter justified that action. That is what I intended to say.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe that every member of the committee will vote for the concurrent resolution as a committee matter, and I do not raise the slightest objection to it because of the fact that it was not formally submitted to the committee. I raise no objection on that score. I am supporting the concurrent resolution.

However, I am intrigued by the procedure in the present case, because so often in the past when measures of far less importance and far less international implications than those of a measure calling for the application of tremendous sanctions against certain areas in the world have been brought up, repeated statements have been made in the Senate that, "This matter must be submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee, and that committee must hold hearings and must do this, that, and the other thing regarding it." So I am intrigued by the complete lack in this case of any demand that this measure be submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee.

As I say, I raise no objection to the concurrent resolution on that account, for I favor the concurrent resolution and I am prepared to vote in favor of it now. I think it should be adopted.

However, I point out that there is a little difference between the treatment of this concurrent resolution and the treatment of some other measures in regard to which demand has been made, on the basis of principle, that the formal procedure be followed; and the Foreign Relations Committee has demanded, in that connection, that certain urgent measures be submitted to the committee before the Senate acted on them on the floor of the Senate.

I make this comment, not in criticism of the Senator from Florida—because I favor his concurrent resolution, and I do not ask that it be referred to the committee—but merely to call attention to the rather unusual situation in connection with the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his comment.

Again I call attention to the fact that the pendency of this question in the United Nations and the fact that what appears to be the toughest battle of all is likely to occur on Thursday justify, I believe, that the resolution not follow the customary course. Therefore, I approached the chairman and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee in the way I have stated.

For the further information of the Senator from Iowa, I am able to state that a similar committee in the House of Representatives unanimously has approved this measure, believing, as the Senator from Iowa and I do, that the urgency of the situation requires quick action.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for but one question or observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say that it is never necessary for the Senator from Florida to state to me the righteousness of his personal motives. I have the utmost confidence in his motives at all times.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is no question about this resolution. I am for it. I think the Senator did perfectly right. I am not asking for an explanation. I am merely calling attention to a rather unusual situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his graciousness.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Personally, I should like to associate myself enthusiastically with the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida and the senior Senator from Michigan. I think it is completely consistent with the attitude of the vast majority of the Members of the United State Senate. On last Wednesday we had about a 4-hour debate on the floor of the Senate, in which the shipments to Red China were involved to an extent. As I recall, 16 or 17 Senators expressed themselves at that time, and the sentiment expressed was unanimously in favor of stopping the shipment of war supplies to our enemies. I think it is perfectly consistent with the Kem amendment also, which was offered, adopted, and accepted without a yea-and-nay vote. I think it is definitely a step in the right direction.

I should however like to inquire of the Senator from Florida, who has devoted much time and study to this matter, whether he feels that the embargo will be enforced by the navies of the respective countries of the United Nations, or whether it is to be left largely to each country to deny itself these shipments abroad, and is only to be enforced by each country in its own way?

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the Senator I requested that information, and was advised that the program as now offered includes enforcement by each of the nations who will be affected by it; but also, under the supervision of a committee—either the present "additional measures" committee, or some other committee of some character, to be named—as to the degree of enforcement. I want to say for the RECORD at this time that I am informed that the suggestion of our delegation to the United Nations already approved yesterday by the committee, and which will be considered by the Political Committee on Thursday, embraces these factors, which I shall read into the RECORD:

An embargo of shipments to Communist China, of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, petroleums, atomic energy materials, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

These are items which would be of immediate consequence on the Korean battlefield. To cite only one example, the denial of petroleum to the Chinese Communist armies would have a serious effect on their mobility. Such is the information furnished by our delegation to the United Nations. I also understand that they feel that this is the maximum which they can hope to get at this time.

The Senator from Florida wants to say that he feels it is a very fine development, when they have worked matters up to the stage where they can get what they hope will be a tremendous majority vote for a program as far-reaching as this, though it may not be so far-reaching as would be desired by others, and as the Senator from Florida himself would approve.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, it is the matter of enforcement which is the test of the real strength of this resolution. The Senator from South Dakota quite agrees with the Senator from Florida that this is a step in the right direction, and that, if the resolution were to be adopted by a vast majority of members of the United Nations and fastidious enforcement was pledged by those who vote for it, that would be a great help. But, since certain nations have abstained, since there are those who declined to serve on the committee, and since there may be those who will vote against it on final passage, the Senator from South Dakota is curious to know whether the Senator from Florida shares with him the feeling that this may also prove a step in the direction of eventually setting up an economic blockade, if that becomes necessary in order to bring about the objectives toward which this resolution moves?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not know whether it will grow into that, but he would be pleased to see it develop into just such a situation. That is the individual expression of the Senator from Florida. He reiterates that he understands that this is as far as we can hope to obtain general accord among the nations other than the Soviet bloc, who comprise the membership of the United Nations, and he feels that it is a very salutory thing to be done. Quoting again from an expression which he had had indirectly from our officials at the United Nations:

Beyond this, we believe that to proclaim our collective agreement on such measures—

That is, the collective agreement of the United States with other nations, including enough to make a great majority of all of the nations—

will impress upon the Chinese Communist regime and their supporters the unity of our purpose and of our determination to repeal the aggression. We should not underestimate the effect that such a demonstration of strength and solidarity would have on the forces of aggression.

I certainly join in that expression.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. As I say, I want to salute whomever it was, whether the Senator from Florida, or the Senator

from Michigan, or both, acting jointly—at any rate, some very patriotic philologist—for writing on page 2, these words:

> Whereas no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world.

That, it seems to me, sets the target toward which we are moving by the adoption of this resolution. If the United Nations desires to move in that direction, they should not only adopt the language of the resolution now before it, but also if it becomes necessary to have an economic blockade to achieve this target, I am sure the Senator from Florida and the Senator from South Dakota will say, "So let it be."

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from South Dakota has certainly correctly spoken for the Senator from Florida in that matter, and in mentioning that particular paragraph from the preamble which the Senator from South Dakota has read. I may say it seems to the Senator from Florida, too, that that paragraph is the crux of the situation. We now have our own armies fighting, and, of course, they are the great majority of the men who are there, other than the South Koreans—fighting beside 14 other nations, comprising 15 free nations who have sent armed forces into South Korea to join the South Koreans. It would be an anomaly and a monstrosity, indeed, if we found that nations which had themselves participated in the action of the United Nations in entering into this effort to repeal aggression, would send from their shores and from their factories bullets and ammunition and materials of war with which to strike down these soldiers from 15 of the freedom-loving nations who serve there together in such a high cause.

Mr. MUNDT. I entirely agree.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to commend the Senator from Florida upon this resolution. I assure him of my support. My only anxiety is that it does not go far enough to achieve the results which I think we desire and need at this time in the war against Red China. The resolution imposes an embargo only on ammunition, arms, and materials of war. It does not carry with it an enforcement provision. It is simply left up to the nations who are willing to agree to it, in the event the United Nations imposes such an embargo, to decide for themselves whether they will in good faith comply with it.

I go a little further than does this resolution. When our boys are fighting and being killed, of course, no friendly nation, no ally, should supply any arms, materials, or ammunition to be used against the Allied troops. But I am wondering about those nations that would not support it and would not join in it and who will ignore any action the United Nations may take.

What we want to do is to stop the war, to bring it to a victorious conclusion as quickly as may be possible. Assuming that the supplies which are cut off by this embargo would have their effect upon the military strength and striking power of the Red Chinese, if they make up the loss from other sources we shall have gained but very little. I think the United Nations should go further, and we should go further, and impose a complete blockade against the ports of China, not only to make certain that the embargo is enforced, but to prevent supplies from reaching the Chinese Communists from other sources which may be available to them.

If the Senator will recall, on the 16th of January of this year I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 37, declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately take such measures against Communist China as would be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security, including the application by members of the United Nations of measures for the complete interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, and other means of communication, the severance of diplomatic relations, and operations by air, sea, and land forces, by members of the United Nations.

On the 23d of January that resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. So far as I know, no action has been taken on it, though hearings have been held. If the resolution was too strong, if it needed some modification, if it needed to be toned down to express the sentiment contained in the resolution of the Senator from Florida, that is action which should have been taken long ago. We have been at war with Red China since last November. There has been no indication, so far as the public knows, of any willingness on China's part to cease fire, bring the war to an end, and undertake to negotiate a peaceful settlement. Everything we have heard from China has been insults upon insults, and threats of more vicious and deadly conflict.

I say to the Senator from Florida that, while I shall support his resolution, I do not believe it goes far enough. I believe our Government and our people, since they are providing the great majority of the military strength which is opposing the forces of aggression and conquest, should insist that every action be taken necessary to achieve victory, not simply partial action, not merely one step, such as the pending resolution proposes. We owe it to the young men of America who are fighting for us, and I think every other allied nation which has troops in Korea, which has faith in the United Nations, and is relying upon the United Nations as an instrumentality of peace and an opposition to aggression, owes it to its people, to join in measures designed to put all possible pressure upon the Red Chinese Government in order to weaken her, and tend to bring the conflict to an end with a minimum loss of life.

Mr. President, I shall support the resolution of the Senator from Florida, but it is my regret, and I express it here, that we have not been more vigilant and strong in our attitude toward our colleagues in the United Nations in prosecuting the war more vigorously. Although the present struggle is an undeclared war, it is as deadly as if declaration of it had been made. I have never before heard of a situation in which major powers were at war, where troops were fighting on the field of battle in such a deadly conflict, yet diplomatic relations were carried on with the enemy country. I cannot understand it. To me it is a new and strange way to fight a war. The concessions suggested, from my viewpoint, are in the nature of appeasement. We are trying to appease, we are trying to make concessions and use them as a means of inducement to try to achieve a settlement of the war. I do not believe we shall succeed. Every time we withhold the pressure and the power we should supply we simply weaken ourselves in our effort to fight to victory.

I believe we should impose an embargo on everything, all kinds of merchandise. If the enemy cannot eat, it cannot fight. While that is a drastic means to take, what is happening to our boys is also drastic. We have not taken such measures, but we are beginning, step by step, at a belated time, considering the seriousness of the war, to take some action, and it seems to me that is a stupidly poor way to fight a war to victory against a powerful foe.

Mr. President, I believe the American people are ready for us to bring the war to a conclusion. They are ready for us to fight with all we have. I know that is the way the fathers and mothers who have sons in Korea who are paying the supreme sacrifice feel about it.

I commend the able Senator from Florida. I shall not offer my resolution as an amendment to his or as a substitute for it, but I do say that what it proposes is the next step, if we are going to proceed step by step. I regret that we are doing it in that way; but since we are, the next step is immediately to blockade the ports of China, sever diplomatic relations, and disrupt her economy in every way we can. We can weaken her sufficiently by those means so that she will not have war potentials that are so deadly as are those which she is now employing against our forces.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. O'CONOR addressed the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall yield in a moment if I may be permitted to make reply to the Senator from Arkansas.

First, I appreciate the expression of support which the Senator has given. As one Senator, I feel that the Senate and the Nation are beholden to the Senator from Arkansas for having submitted a series of three resolutions, two of which were adopted by the Senate unanimously. The Senator from Florida was glad to speak in support of those resolutions. The third resolution was referred, as the Senator from Arkansas stated, to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That resolution was more far-reaching than is the resolution which the

Senator from Florida now proposes. The Senator from Florida wants to make it very clear, however, that neither he nor anyone who stands with him, nor, in his opinion, the Senator from Arkansas when he stands with him, can be charged with any sort of appeasement, because what we are trying to do is to recognize the practicalities of the situation. There is now pending a proposal in the United Nations, where we have to deal with the representatives of 52 other nations who stand generally with us. Our delegation has to deal with the representatives of 52 other nations which stood with it in supporting the United Nations action in Korea, and just as the distinguished Senator from Michigan and I find it necessary on the floor of the Senate to give and take to reach legislation that represents the will of the great majority of the Senators, so, no doubt, our delegation has to give and take in reaching similar results in the General Assembly in the United Nations.

It is my understanding that this is as much as can be hoped for in the way of progress at this time. The Senator from Florida thinks that this proposal goes a long way. He believes it deserves the unanimous support and backing of the Senate of the United States and of the entire Congress. He thinks we would overlook an excellent chance to show the unity and solidarity of our people and their representatives in standing back of our delegation in urging that this affirmative step be taken. I will say to the Senate it is an affirmative step. Like the Senator from Arkansas, I have wanted to see affirmative steps as we approach not only the solution of the problem, but the victory we desire and will win because our cause is just. But the Senator from Florida feels this is the next affirmative step that can be taken under present conditions, and that we would overlook a good chance to help support and sustain those who represent us if we did not take this means of telling them that we are with them, that we are back of them, and that we hope that the other nations of the 52 who voted with them for the effort in Korea, will now stand solidly with them in suporting this embargo.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I shall support his concurrent resolution because I think it is a step in the right direction, as I believe the resolution pending before the United Nations is a step in the right direction. I think the Senator from Florida will agree with me that the American people, and I believe the people of the free world, are not going to be satisfied with a mere affirmative vote by the United Nations as Lake Success. The meat of the coconut is going to be how they apply the restrictions after the vote has been taken. If they merely take a vote and let the months pass without making some practical application of it, they will have simply been making an empty gesture.

I say to the Senator from Prorida that while it is a late step, nevertheless it is a desirable one. It is almost 11 months since the fighting started in Korea. It is almost 6 months since Communist China first sent her organized troops into Korea in an act of aggression against the United Nations forces. As the Senator probably knows, of the 60 members of the United Nations about five are generally classified with the Soviet and the satellite powers. That leaves 55 outside the Soviet bloc. Up to the present time, at least up until April 30, the only nations members of the United Nations that had fighting forces in Korean were the following: The United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Great Britain, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, and the Union of South Africa.

That, if I am not mistaken, is 14 U. N. members in all with fighting forces helping to stem aggression in Korea. If the United Nations is to survive as an agency of collective security it seems to me its members will have to recognize that there is a responsibility upon each and every member of that organization to send troops in the interest of preserving a system of international law and order.

Perhaps a case can be made for some of the nations not furnishing troops, but it seems to me that no case can be made for any nation to decline at least to contribute an embargo against an aggressor. The free people of the world, and I believe the people of the United States, will make their final determination as to the success of the United Nations based upon what the other nations do forthwith to bring this embargo into play.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say I thoroughly agree with the sentiment expressed by the Senator from California, that not the mere voting of this embargo, but the following with the necessary degree of enforcement of this embargo, will be the measure of the approval on the part of the American people of this step which we hope will be taken shortly by the General Assembly of the United Nations under the leadership of the United States. I thoroughly agree that if there is not, following the adoption of the embargo, strict enforcement of it, there will be very great disappointment in the hearts of the people of our Nation and, of course, in the hearts of their representatives here.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I may say to the Senator from Florida in connection with the observations which have been made by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that I think it very wise that the Senator from Florida has limited his concurrent resolution at this time to the specific question which is before the United Nations. Otherwise, there would be opened a limitless number of questions which undoubtedly would complicate the matter. So I think the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Michigan, both of whom have been so consistently behind this general subject matter, have acted very prudently and wisely in limiting it as they have done.

May I inquire of the Senator from Florida whether it is not a fact that in the proposal before the United Nations it is required that there be a follow-up, and that the nations report periodically—I think it is every 30 days—as to the shipments which are being made, if any, so as to determine the strategic nature of the materials?

Mr. HOLLAND. The pending suggestion has included the idea that either the committee already functioning or some like committee, should be appointed to receive these reports, and to review them periodically, to check up on them, and to bring complaint, if there is not the strictest degree of enforcement. The Senator from Maryland is correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further so as to permit me to make one comment which I think is in order?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. In relation to the broader subject matter to which the Senator from Arkansas referred—and I agree with everything he said—the Senate committee inquiring into shipments has scheduled public hearings, which are to be resumed tomorrow, incidentally, which have to do with another phase of this matter, and which points out the good judgment of the Senators who have submitted this concurrent resolution in not bringing that subject into this particular concurrent resolution, because the investigation we have been pursuing and in connection with which we are to take testimony tomorrow and henceforth has to do with shipments—east-west trade—in and out of Germany. The investigation shows a shocking situation and, incidentally, points to laxity on the part of our own officials.

So we feel that it might very well not be in order to have the provision in the concurernt resolution which was originally proposed, because there has been presented a situation in Germany which shows that there is a virtual sieve through which critical materials have been going to points beyond the iron curtain. We are going to take testimony about that, to show the public what is transpiring at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for his comments. I am very sure the people of the Nation generally will join the Senator from Florida in expressing their very high degree of confidence that any such situation, if discovered by the committee headed by the able Senator from Maryland, will be corrected. It is in his power to do it, because he has already shown a willingness to come to grips with this question, and to bring it right out in the light where the people can see it and insist that it be corrected. He has already applied great correction to the earlier existing condition of which we were all ashamed when we found it existed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not quite understand the Senator from Maryland with reference to what the hearings were anticipated to disclose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas in order that he may propound a question to the Senator from Maryland, and that the Senator from Maryland may answer the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was not quite clear whether the goods and materials of which the Senator from Maryland spoke were from West Germany, where we have control of the economy.

Mr. O'CONOR. Undoubtedly so. The inspections made by the staff member, who has returned only very recently from Western Germany, have revealed that along the interzonal borders there have been steady shipments, trainloads of them, coming from the section under the tripartite set-up of Great Britain, France, and the United States. There has been a virtual sieve through which such shipments have been going. The staff member estimates that the chance of inspection along that border is only one out of a thousand, and that the chance that such shipments will be stopped is even less than that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a shocking revelation. I hope that the facts will be disclosed and that appropriate action will be recommended and taken.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am heartily in support of the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Florida. The resolution of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has been pending for a considerable period before the Committee on Foreign Relations, but because of the scope which it covered, which is considerably greater than that of the pending resolution, we were not able to get around to it because of the pressure of other responsibilities.

This is a matter in which I feel we are all deeply interested. The fact that an embargo proposal is now pending in the United Nations and will probably be acted on within the next day or two makes it very important that we act speedily and forward our action to the United Nations. So I bespeak for the concurrent resolution the support of all Senators. I believe that our action will be justified, and that the people of the country will respond heartily to what we are doing.

The Senator from Florida has been quite diligent and vigilant about this matter. He and I have conferred a number of times. I am very happy indeed to cooperate with him and aid him in securing the adoption of his resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan wishes to make a few observations on the resolution of which he is cosponsor. I hesitate to do so because I think it is very important that the resolution be adopted immediately, and that notice be given to the United Nations General Assembly as soon as possible. Yet I think the RECORD ought to indicate how deeply the United States Senate feels upon this very important question, by means of individual expressions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan for the purpose indicated?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan for the purpose of allowing him to make brief observations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, my remarks relate to the unusual situation of a United Nations war. Heretofore we have had alliances, but we have now, for the first time in the history of man, what is known as a war under a collective security arrangement.

We have discovered, however, that nations somehow do not recognize that when they are a part of a collective security arrangement, they, too, are at war. I think that is why we are suffering as we have suffered in fighting the Korean War. It is very difficult to understand how a nation could trade with its enemy while at war. Yet that is what has been occurring with respect to the Chinese Communists. No nation could have an enemy more violent than the enemy which the United Nations have in this war, yet we see member nations engaging in trade with that enemy.

When the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Michigan were in the Far East in December, and were discussing the whole problem of collective defense in meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association at Canberra, we found that there were some nations which simply could not conceive of the fact that they, too, were at war.

As a matter of fact, as late as a few days ago we discovered that one of our veterans who had returned from Korea could not get into a veterans' hospital because the United States could not realize or had not officially admitted that it was in real war with China. We have been 11 months awakening to the fact that each and every one of the 53 United Nations which supported the United Nations action in Korea is in effect at war.

We who are trained in the law know a great deal about legal fictions. We use them in the law to solve certain problems. But, as far as Korea is concerned, I think we must wipe out all the fictions, and consider that we are in fact at war.

The Senator from Michigan spoke on the floor of the Senate on the 12th of July, indicating that we had a new structure in the world, a United Nations Organization, which was at war with North Korea. I then urged that any nation which gave aid and comfort, as a member of the United Nations, to North Korea certainly was, under the regulations of the United Nations, guilty of treason. I urged that was treason because, in effect, all the members of the United Nations were members of an organized society which was engaged in fighting the war against North Korea, and the definition of treason is giving aid and comfort to an enemy in time of war.

When China itself came into the war and went to war against the United Nations, and against each and every member thereof, we discovered certain nations trading with the enemy. Russia was supplying North Korea, and is doing so today. Now we discover that China is receiving rubber and is getting aid and comfort in other ways from other member nations.

Mr. President, how late it is! The boys who have died realized how late it is. Those who have been maimed for life and are suffering today know how long it has been. But if on Thursday, at Lake Success, we can get the various nations to recognize that they, too, are at war, and that when they send anything to China or North Korea that is going to inflict injury upon any boy or man of the United Nations, they are aiding an enemy, and that, in effect, their nation is guilty of treason, we shall have accomplished something.

Mr. President, let us adopt this resolution immediately and tell the other members of the United Nations that the two bodies which have a right to speak for public opinion in America say in no uncertain terms that we request and urge the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials—and I underscore the words "all other materials" for the benefit of the United Nations—which might aid in the war-making potential of Communist China.

Mr. President, when the vote is taken in the United Nations, let us see whether or not the 53 nations will recognize the true situation. Today the question has been asked as to whether we are going to back an edict with shot and shell. I hope the members of the United Nations will realize that they are at war. We hear a nation, through its foreign secretary, say that it intends to furnish rubber, no matter what happens. We have heard the expression used, "We will trade with the devil if it is in our interest." I want that nation to know that it is trading with the devil when it trades with China, when that nation itself is at war with China.

I hope that these remarks and our action on the floor of the Senate today will penetrate the souls of the leaders of the various nations so that they will understand that this is war, and that every one of the nations which has subscribed to the United Nations Charter, whether they have a man on the battlefield or not, is at war with China and at war with North Korea, and that they will prohibit any shipments of aid or the giving of any comfort to this real enemy.

Mr. President, although it is late and although we might want stronger language in the resolution, if a nation will only use its conscience, which is the conscience of the people of that nation, it will understand that the resolution prohibits absolutely any shipments. That is what we in Congress, speaking for the minds and the conscience of the American people, will be saying when we adopt this resolution today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the fervent words of the Senator from Michigan. In closing, I wish to say that in the adoption of the resolution the Senate would be approving the program presented to the United Nations by our delegation. I wish to read more specifically what the program involves, as expressed in the resolution.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very glad to yield in a moment, after I have completed my statement on this point.

The resolution before the United Nations calls for an embargo on the shipment to areas under the control of Red China and Communist North Korea of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey wishes to commend the able Senator from Florida and the able Senator from Michigan for the very worth-while effort which they have put forth in connection with the pending concurrent resolution. He wishes to associate himself with the purposes of the resolution and pledges his wholehearted support. A long step forward is being made. There is much to be said also for the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the junior Senator from New Jersey would like also to associate himself with the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. We have an opportunity to take an affirmative step, which will show that the Senate and Congress stand together behind our representation in the United Nations. If we adopt the resolution it will show that there is no disunity or disagreement between us on this important question though some of us would like to go much further. We believe that our representatives are representing us loyally in the United Nations. I feel that the taking of such an affirmative step will not only hold up their hands and give the impression to the people of the world that our Nation stands together on this vital matter, but it will also have a very real effect upon the minds of our fighting men in Korea. It will say to them that, in spite of all the bickering that may be going on with reference to details of the strategy or policy which is to be adopted, on this question we are proceeding arm in arm throughout our Nation, and that we are determined to go as far as we can go to protect them while they are on the battlefield against weapons, guns, and all the other materials that may come from any free nation, and to protect them from any harm that may originate in a free nation. It would say to them that there is absolutely no difference between us and that as Americans we stand back of cutting off this nefarious traffic.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is an old saying that everybody's business is nobody's business. It looks as though when we get into a United Nations war the United Nations war seems to be no individual country's war. That is why the matter should be called to their attention. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. HOLLAND. There is much in the observation of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator knows of my interest in the resolution and my support of it yesterday in a brief speech on the floor of the Senate. I again wish to commend his very fine work on the resolution. I should like further to supplement the record with the eight provisions of the resolution which is now pending before the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent to insert the eight provisions, as published in the Washington Post. I wish to call particular attention to the second provision, which reads:

Each country will determine which commodities exported from its territory fall within the embargo and will slap on controls.

Mr. President, I ask that the eight provisions, as published in the Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I voice the hope that when the resolution has been adopted by the United Nations each country will see fit to give it a very strict interpretation, because otherwise it would be merely a milk and water proposition, which would not accomplish the results intended. I further express the hope that even with the adoption of the pending concurrent resolution the Foreign Relations Committee will continue its consideration of the very serious question, which is being glaringly overlooked by the United Nations, namely, that of an economic embargo, or sanctions. If such remedy does not work we shall be driven to take such measures as we think the circumstances justify.

EXHIBIT 1

The resolution calls for—

1. An embargo on the shipment to areas under the control of Red China and Communist North Korea of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic-energy materials, petroleum, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

2. Each country will determine which commodities exported from its territory fall within the embargo and will slap on controls.

3. Each country will try to prevent circumvention of controls, such as transshipment by a state not complying with the embargo.

4. Each country will cooperate with other states in carrying it out.

5. Each country will report to the Additional Measures Committee, which will oversee the embargo, within 30 days on the measures taken.

6. The Additional Measures Committee will continue its consideration of steps to meet the aggression in Korea.

7. The U. N. reaffirms its policy calling for a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the achievement of U. N. objectives by peaceful means.

8. The U. N. requests the Good Offices Committee to continue its work.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for one question? It will take only 30 seconds to ask the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of the resolution. I have been in favor of such an embargo against the Chinese Reds for a long time. Is it not just as important that the recipient countries of ECA aid be prohibited from exporting to Russia and satellite countries materials which aid Russia and Red China? It seems to me the same principle is involved. We have shut off such traffic from the United States. Why should it not be shut off from Great Britain and the other countries who are doing the very thing that we are trying to prohibit by the pending concurrent resolution?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator that it is important that shipments through other channels shall be shut off, and that the resolution which was adopted yesterday by one committee of the United Nations, and which goes to the political committee on Thursday, does include such a provision.

Mr. WHERRY. As long as 2 years ago the junior Senator from Nebraska offered amendments to prohibit the shipment of strategic materials. The distinguished Senator from Florida has done very splendid work in providing that all materials which might be used in conducting a war be prohibited and that an embargo be placed against them. That is the very thing we attempted to do 2 years ago. I hope that when the conferees meet on the third supplemental appropriation bill, which was passed by the Senate 3 or 4 days ago, the House will adopt the Senate version of the Kem amendment, which requires that countries who get ECA funds be prohibited from doing the things the Senator's resolution would proscribe.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator, and I join in his hope.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution as modified.

The concurrent resolution, as modified, was agreed to, with the accompanying preamble, as follows:

Whereas the United States has initiated a proposal, under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations would (1) call upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; (2) urge that steps be taken to guard against circumvention or nullification of such embargo through loopholes which might enable the Chinese Communists to acquire the banned materials; and (3) establish a special committee to receive periodic reports from the complying member nations and to take other measures aimed at making the embargo as effective as possible; and

Whereas Communist China has long since been branded an aggressor by an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations; and

Whereas more than a dozen member nations are participating directly with the

United States in the heroic military action against the common enemy in Korea, and the troops of such nations are being shot at, and killed, by the Chinese Communists; and

Whereas no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby requests and urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 16, 1951, beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock, noon, debate upon any amendment or motion, including appeals, that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India shall be limited to not exceeding 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], respectively, and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator for Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], provided (1) that in the event the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or some other Senator designated by him; and (2) that no amendment or motion which is not germane to the subject matter of said bill shall be received; provided further that debate upon the bill itself be limited to 1 hour, to be divided equally and controlled respectively by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or some other Senator designated by him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has been attempting this afternoon to submit a resolution in the form of an amendment to the bill. I simply wish to be sure that under the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, if it is entered, no interpretation which might be given to it would exclude the consideration of my amendment. I do not know whether the amendment will be considered relevant, because it deals with the disposition of the interest to be collected from India. I should like to have the right to have my amendment considered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has the Senator submitted his amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. I have it here, but I have not yet submitted it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator submit it now, so it can be received, printed, and lie on the table?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, if I may obtain unanimous consent for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota wait a minute until the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is read. I should like to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MUNDT, as follows:

On page 5, between lines 10 and 11, add a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 8. Any sums paid by the Government of India on or before January 1, 1957 (or such later date as may hereafter be specified by act of Congress), as interest on the principal of any debt incurred under this act shall be placed in a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to remain available until expended. This account shall be available to the Department of State for the following uses:

"(a) allocation, for designated educational, agricultural, experimental, scientific, medical, or philanthropic activities, to American institutions engaged in such activities in India;

"(b) studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States and its Territories and possessions (1) for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of India and (2) with the approval of appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in India, for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of the United States to participate in similar activities in India, including in both cases travel expenses, tuition, subsistence, and other allowances and expenses incident to such activities; and

"(c) the selection, purchase, and shipment of (1) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of India, and (2) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in India, and (3) the interchange of similar materials and equipment from India for higher education and research in the United States."

Renumber suceeding sections and references thereto.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the amendment considered as being germane and as coming within the germaneness provision of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection to the proposed agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the amendment has already been submitted and now lies on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course it would still be subject to a point of order, if a point of order were made.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course I understand that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. However, the Chair does not wish to pass on that matter until a point of order is made.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, so far as the unanimous-consent agreement, as proposed, is concerned, I ask that the amendment be considered as being germane and that an exception be made in the case of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota be considered as germane, regardless of any circumstances.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that under the proposed agreement all amendments must be submitted now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; but amendments to be submitted in the future must be germane, if the proposed agreement is entered.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; they must be germane.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as a part of the unanimous-consent proposal, I also include a provision that debate on the bill be limited to one hour and one-half, to be divided equally.

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, is there objection to the request that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota be regarded as germane? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request, as modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely rise to submit an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is now considering a proposed unanimous-consent agreement in regard to limitation of debate on Senate bill 872. That matter has nothing to do with an amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it does have something to do with an amendment, Mr. President, because on a former occasion when we were debating the farm labor bill, I found myself confronted with difficulty when I attempted to submit an amendment after a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to limitation of debate on the bill and amendments to it had been entered. I wish to be sure that I do not become involved in such a situation in connection with this measure.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that no such limitation is involved in connection with the proposed agreement now before the Senate, other than that all amendments must be germane; and I assume that the Senator's amendment is germane.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well; so long as I can submit the amendment later, I shall not object to the proposed agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement does not limit the right of Senators to submit amendments which are germane.

Is there objection to the proposed agreement as modified?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I wish to point out that I reserve the right to act as I see fit and to vote as I see fit on all amendments which are submitted to the bill.

I reserve that right in connection with the provision of the proposed agreement in regard to the division of time and my designation as the one to handle the assignment of part of the time. The fact that I am charged with assigning part of the time does not mean, I point out, that I shall be either for or against a particular committee amendment or other amendment. I have agreed to such proposals, and I shall do so again, but I wish it distinctly understood that I continue to have the right to vote as I choose on all such matters.

Let me also point out that although I do not object to the request to have the amendment which has been referred to considered as germane, nevertheless I wish to suggest to the majority leader that if request is made that an amendment be considered germane and if a quorum call is not had at the time, before the request is acted on, Members of the Senate who then are absent are thus foreclosed from having an opportunity to object. I believe that situation should receive consideration when attempts are made at the last minute to have certain amendments considered as being germane, for in reality every Senator should have an opportunity to make a point of order against such amendments. Therefore, I point out that the proposal to consider certain amendments as being germane is rather far-reaching, and definitely should not be considered as establishing a precedent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely submit the amendment to which I have referred, so there will be no question about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified; and, therefore, it is entered.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the agreement as modified provides for the limitation on debate to begin at 12 o'clock or 12:30?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Twelve o'clock.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I meant to provide for 12:30. I ask unanimous consent to have the agreement modified accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the agreement will be modified accordingly.

The agreement as entered was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 16, 1951, beginning at the hour of 12:30 p. m., debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India shall be limited to not exceeding 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. WHERRY, respectively, and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. GILLETTE: *Provided*, (1) That in the event Mr. GILLETTE is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by Mr. WHERRY or some Senator designated by him; and (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the said bill shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour and 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. WHERRY or some Senator designated by him, respectively.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Debate on the entire bill is to be limited to 1 hour and one-half, with 45 minutes to each side; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; that modification was made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], for himself, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, has submitted an amendment. I send to the desk a modification of the amendment and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the modification.

The modification of the amendment, submitted by Mr. FERGUSON, for himself, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. BRIDGES, was read, as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike out all of sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. The assistance authorized by this act shall be made only on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"SEC. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to utilize not in excess of $190,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1952, of which sum (1) not less than $100,000,000 shall be made available immediately from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and (2) $90,000,000 shall be available from any balance of such funds unallotted and unobligated as of June 30, 1951, *Provided*, That if such amount unallotted and unobligated is less than $90,000,000 an amount equal to the difference shall be obtained from the issuance of notes in such amount by the Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration, who is hereby authorized and directed to issue such notes from time to time during fiscal years 1951 and 1952 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to purchase such notes and, in making such purchases to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act as amended; *And provided further*, That $50,000,000 reserved by the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to section 1214 of Public Law 759 of the Eighty-first Congress from funds appropriated by that act for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 as amended, shall not be available for purposes of this section.

"SEC. 6. The credit terms provided for in section 4 shall include repayment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator for Economic Cooperation and the Government of India), or otherwise of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this amendment departs from the provision of the pending bill in three respects.

First. This amendment provides that the entire amount of assistance authorized shall be made available as a loan rather than on basis of half loan, half grant. The loan basis would be in accord with the manner in which aid has been extended to many of the Marshall plan countries under the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Second. The amendment provides that funds for this loan shall be made available out of appropriations heretofore made to the Economic Cooperation Administration, which will not be required by that agency to continue the European recovery program for the balance of the present fiscal year. If those funds are not sufficient, the balance required would be made available under a public-debt transaction.

Third. It is proposed that the credit terms extended in making this loan shall include permissive repayment provisions by the transfer to the United States of certain materials which India can provide and which are required by the United States as a result of actual or potential deficiencies in the supply of such materials.

At the outset let me stipulate that the sponsors of this amendment are anxious, as Americans are always anxious, to respond to a humanitarian call within the limits of our ability to do so. Let there be no question of that.

But when we tax the American taxpayers and deduct from their earnings at the source, we must always remember that charity is a virtue, but also that charity begins at home. In taking the tax dollar from the American worker we must bear in mind also that we represent him, as a trustee of that tax money, and that when we use it, we should use it as he would have us use it, and as he would administer that charity.

I am sure that, when the American taxpayer feels that there is a famine at this time in India, even though contributed to in part by the action of man, rather than being an act of God, he is glad that we are in a position at this time to extend help, but he will want us to extend his help wisely.

We disagree with the means proposed by the pending bill for the discharge of our humanitarian desires, and we therefore propose an alternate method. We deny the validity of grant as the basis for this aid. We believe that the loan basis will satisfy India's need, and will impose no undue hardship on her.

When the Senator from Nevada offered this amendment, he offered for the RECORD a statement tracing the legislative background of the proposal now before us, and he presented documentary evidence of India's asset position and capacity to service a loan of the nature that would be authorized by the amendment. There is also available the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, House Report 373 on H. R. 3791,

which even more fully offers conclusive evidence of the feasibility and the desirability of the proposal represented by this amendment.

The compelling feature of the background for this legislation is that India herself has never asked for a grant. The official appeal, presented in a note by the Indian Government dated February 8, 1951, simply requests "the United States Government to give * * * ad hoc assistance during 1951 to obtain 2,000,000 tons of food grains and would greatly appreciate if the grain be supplied on special and easy terms."

I wish to repeat the conditions of assistance contemplated in that request—on special and easy terms.

That simply does not represent a request for a grant, and there is no record of such a request. It is a part of a carefree, grandiose, global give-away philosophy that would gratuitously alter that request to provide for a gift in whole or in part.

I am sure that the American taxpayer, particularly the workingman from whose pay a deduction is made at the source, would feel that, when India requests only a loan, we, as trustees of the fund which we collect as a tax should not gratuitously offer to give his money away if we decide that some assistance is justified.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the purpose of the Senator's amendment to leave to the American and Indian officials the determination of what the price shall be for the wheat, and also for the commodities which will be exchanged for the wheat, as well as the rate at which deliveries shall be made by the Indian Government in return for the wheat?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It would then be necessary, would it not, for them to reach an agreement, which might be based on the world wheat agreement price, or on the world market price, as to the fair exchange price of one commodity for another?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, and I think that is the only way in which this matter can be handled.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not intended, is it, that India shall be required to make deliveries more rapidly than would be economically feasible for her?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The Senator from Michigan understands how India feels about this. If India could negotiate the price and the terms of payment, it would be to them a legitimate business deal.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Michigan understands, does he not, that all other arrangements made by India with other countries for grains have either been on a cash basis or on the basis of barter?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, there have been no gifts from other countries, so far as we know, have there?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That reminds me of the fact that upon one occasion I was present at a round-table discussion with Nelson Johnson, former Ambassador to China and Australia, and several students from the Far East. The students were selected to come to America. They came from countries in the Near East and the Far East. They were young men and women who were entering college, and they were familiar with the respective countries in which they lived. It was very difficult for them to understand how America could offer gifts to another nation. They asked, "Well, what do you really want? What do you want in return?" They said they would rather know in advance what would be expected in return, rather than be told at some later time. Until very recently their countries were ruled as colonies in the Far East and in the Near East, and it can readily be understood that these young people, and all their people, thought they had a right to look a gift horse in the mouth, because they needed to know what they would later be required to give in return.

For that reason I think I can understand the attitude of Mr. Nehru, when he stated he wanted our aid to be a loan and not a gift. He wanted to be able to say to his people that they were going to be able to stand upon their own feet. I am hoping that Mr. Nehru's government and those which follow in India will feel that this is a loan and an obligation to be repaid at the very earliest possible date. I feel satisfied that if some outside interest does not interfere—Russia, for instance—it will be treated as a loan. But the difficulty is—and it is difficult for them to understand—Russia comes into the question.

The Senator from Michigan knows of no case in which Russia ever made a gift to another nation. Russia's materialism sometimes works rather subtly. I recall when Russia put a propaganda show on in Calcutta. The Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Michigan went to see the motion picture, which was a propaganda picture sponsored by the Russians. We paid admission in the regular theater in order to see it. Russia did not give one cent. When we were putting out moving pictures it was done free of charge. I think Russia had a better crowd in the theater by virtue of charging for the show rather than operating it free of charge. Russia understands human nature. I say we must understand it, too. We must understand that we cannot buy peace.

I think Nehru knows just what he is doing when he says to his people, "I do not want this to be a gift, in connection with which there will be counterpart funds." Counterpart funds are strings attached to our aid. They would enable us to participate in India's internal development program. Nehru apparently does not want that. I think he is being sensible. I also think he is doing this country a great service in declining an arrangement that calls for counterpart funds.

Mr. President, we are having great difficulty in solving the problem of counterpart funds. In Italy there is a game called "counterpart fund," which has been introduced to try to get the people to know the meaning of the word "counterpart." I doubt that there is one citizen in America out of 10,000 who understands the counterpart fund about which we are speaking. One Senator just pointed to himself to indicate that he doubts whether he understands it.

Outside of Athens I talked to a farmer about the ECA program and found that he had never heard of it. I asked him about the Marshall plan. He had never heard of that. I talked to him through an interpreter, of course. I said, "Did you ever receive anything that came from America?"

He said, "Yes; I got a mule."

He happened to have the mule with him. I asked him if he was not grateful to America for giving him the mule.

He replied, "Oh, no; America did not give me the mule."

America gave the mule to the Greek Government, and the Greek Government sold the mule to the farmer for enough drachmas to make $150. Was that farmer grateful to America? No. He had to pay full compensation in Greek drachmas for the mule, and it was Greek drachmas that we call by the high-sounding name of counterpart funds. He is not very grateful about that expression of our generosity, because he had to pay for it out of his pocket.

I was on a farm near Paris and met a farmer who had a tractor for which he had paid counterpart funds. The French Government not only charged him the cost of the tractor we had contributed but it placed a 50-percent tariff on it, payable by the farmer. The farmer paid the price of the tractor plus a 50-percent tariff. The price he paid the French Government was called by the high-sounding name "counterpart fund."

Do we think we can get good will out of that expression? If the foreign governments want to give things to their people, they should not use this so-called subterfuge of a counterpart fund.

The only valid question relative to the conditions of assistance requested by India is whether the loan basis we propose contains special and easy terms. When a man thinks he is receiving easy terms he thinks he is getting a bargain. People like to think they are getting bargains. I am sure that if we give India a bargain in terms, she will feel better about it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Michigan believe that the people of India would be better satisfied to receive the fair market value for their commodities than to be required to sell them at a very low price, and then receive charity as payment for them?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I have in mind particularly the case of burlap, the price of which was forced down by our own estimable agency known as the OPS. Not long ago India controlled the price of burlap, which was selling for slightly more than 22 cents a pound. Then the controls were taken off, and the price went to the world price of 26 cents a pound. That was the world market price at the time. Then the OPS proclaimed

a general freeze as of December and early January, which reduced the price of burlap in this country below the world market price which India could get by selling elsewhere. We then stopped getting burlap from India, because our Government agency had interfered with the world market price and said, in effect, "You cannot sell your burlap in America." We use approximately from 20 to 25 percent of the burlap output of India. India was told, in effect, "You cannot sell it in the United States unless you sell it below what you can get somewhere else in the world."

The price has gone to 34 cents. Large manufacturers who are in the most-favored situation under the OPS ruling can get some burlap, but, at the same time, not all our manufacturers can get it today because of the restrictions put on them, not by India, but by our own Government. Why should not India get the world market price if she can get it?

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, the Indian people have the right to ask, "What do you expect in the future?"

Mr. AIKEN. I sometimes think there are those in our Government who regard foreign governments in the same light in which they regard the American farmer. They want to give them a hand-out and force them to sell at half price.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator seen the proposed terms of the loan? I am speaking of the loan which it is now suggested we provide for India.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I shall insert in the RECORD an extract from the ECA Act, which indicates the kind of loan that is contemplated. I was about to refer to the type of loan and its terms. I think we must leave it to the Administrator to negotiate the nature of the loan, as well as the price of the material. We must expect that the Administrator will be honest both to the United States taxpayer and to the Indian recipients in the negotiations.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator seen the terms of some of the loans made to other nations?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have.

Mr. WHERRY. From their provisions, would the Senator think they constitute what could be called a straight Government loan?

Mr. FERGUSON. Some of them contain exceptional terms.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator seen the one with Iceland?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have seen reference to the terms of the loan to Iceland.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the distinguished Senator from Michigan will examine the volume which gives a report on the loans, the agreements, and the conditions. I submit to the Senator that some of the agreements I have seen provide that by mutual consent of both parties they can change or alter completely the promissory note given as a basis for the loan. The reason why I ask the question is because there are amendments which provide for a loan. What kind of a loan? Is it a loan which is a straight Government loan, without any conditions, and which will be paid when it matures, or are there loopholes which make it only a loan in name, but in reality a grant in the event the terms are altered? That is the point I am making.

Mr. FERGUSON. The loan will be under the provisions of a law which Congress has passed, section 111 (c) paragraph 2 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. In a case such as this it is very difficult in advance to prescribe definitely the terms. The loan must be negotiated in good faith. I take it for granted that the terms of such loans should be reported. The Senator from Nebraska has indicated that in the last 10 years the United States Government has loaned—what was the amount, $100,000,000,000?

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure the Senator heard me make that statement earlier today. What I attempted to say was that that amount represented grants or loans, and I said that in my opinion most of these transactions are grants. I said the total amount was more than $100,000,000,000 in the last 10 years. The reason why I mention that is that the so-called instruments which the Department says are loans, to me seem to be nothing more than grants. My feeling is that inasmuch as our Government has canceled many other debts, the administration can cancel or change the loan in any way the administration desires to change it under an agreement containing such terms as those which were negotiated with Iceland, if it feels that the economic situation of a country which has made a loan from us is such that it cannot meet the terms of the loan.

My point is: Is this a loan which is dependable? Are we to be paid back? Will the taxpayers be reimbursed? Or is this a loan which contains such loopholes that it can be canceled when and if the two Governments decide mutually that it should be canceled?

Mr. FERGUSON. The loan would come under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act, section 111 (c), paragraph 2. I would say that if officials of the Government made a loan which was in effect a grant, they would be violating their oaths of office. A loan is a loan. A loan must be made, and if it is not to be paid back then it is not a loan. Certainly it is intended that this loan to India shall be paid back.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to read paragraph 4, as it appears in the House Foreign Relations Committee report, and which I read earlier today:

If at any time or from time to time the parties hereto determine that it would be in their common interests because of adverse economic conditions—

Note this—

because of adverse economic conditions or for any other reasons to postpone, or provide for the postponement, of any installments of interest or principal or to provide that such installments or any part thereof shall be made and received in local currency of Iceland at a rate of exchange to be agreed upon, or to modify the aforesaid promissory note in any respect, they may by mutual agreement in writing provide for any such postponement, or payment in local currency, or any modification hereof. Any agreement for payment in local currency may specify the purposes for which such currency may be used.

I call attention to the words "or to modify the aforesaid promissory note in any respect." Would the Senator consider that to be language which would serve as the basis for what we would call a good Government loan?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that is a stipulation in a particular loan agreement. That is not the language of the act. I made reference a moment ago to the provisions of the law under which the loan would have to be made. I now ask unanimous consent that the relevant portions of section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(2) When it is determined that assistance should be extended under the provisions of this title on credit terms, the Administrator shall allocate funds for the purpose to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, make and administer the credit on terms specified by the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. * * *

* * * The notes hereinabove authorized shall be redeemable at the option of the Administrator before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such notes and shall have such maturity as may be determined by the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Each such note shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the note. Payment under this paragraph of the purchase price of such notes and repayments thereof by the Administrator shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. In allocating funds to the Export-Import Bank of Washington for assistance on credit terms under this paragraph, the Administrator shall first utilize such funds realized from the sale of notes authorized by this paragraph as he determines to be available for this purpose, and when such funds are exhausted, or after the end of 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, whichever is earlier, he shall utilize any funds appropriated under this title. The Administrator shall make advances to, or reimburse, the Export-Import Bank of Washington for necessary administrative expenses in connection with such credits. Credits made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington with funds so allocated to it by the Administrator shall not be considered in determining whether the bank has outstanding at any one time loans and guaranties to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529), as amended. Amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made under this paragraph shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury: *Provided*, That, to the extent required for such purpose, amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made out of funds realized from the sale of notes authorized under this paragraph shall be deposited into the Treasury for the purpose of the retirement of such notes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The language of that provision does not go so far that a loan can be converted into a grant.

Mr. WHERRY. A provision such as I just read into the RECORD is not one that should be the basis for a loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is how the Senator from Michigan feels.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly the State Department, or whatever agency is to handle the loan, will have some idea of what the provisions of the loan will be. Why does not the Congress know about it? Is it to be a loan which tomorrow or next year or 5 years from now or at a later date, may, in its terms, be changed? It will probably run for 30 or 35 years. The present administration will be out of office and another administration will be in office. Under such a stipulation as that made in connection with the loan to Iceland, even though the promissory note be negotiated in good faith by the present administration, a future administration can accept a modification of the agreement. Why cannot we know whether the provisions of an agreement for a loan to India will be based on similar language as the loan to Iceland? If it is, then what we would be doing would be to make a grant instead of a loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, the Senator from Michigan does not feel that is correct, because each credit transaction involves an agreement setting forth the amount of the loan and any other necessary arrangement.

Mr. WHERRY. It fixes the due date.

Mr. FERGUSON. Accompanying the agreement is a promissory note, containing the interest rate, and the terms for repayment of principal and interest.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Nebraska understands that when a promissory note is given, it is intended that it shall be a loan, and not a grant. Unless we enter into an agreement in the form of a treaty, which, after it has been negotiated is ratified by the Senate, we must proceed in the way indicated.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate does not confirm or ratify a negotiated loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. To do what the Senator from Nebraska wants done would necessitate the negotiation of a loan in such a form that it would have to be ratified by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator from Michigan agree with the junior Senator from Nebraska that it is about time that some branch of the Government should have knowledge of the amount of loans which are being made to foreign countries, whether they are bona fide loans, or whether they are grants, or whether they are loans containing so many loopholes that they never will be paid? Certainly the Senator knows the experience of the United States in connection with loans made to foreign countries. It is certainly not a very healthy and satisfactory experience.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan realizes that. I think that is why it is good for us to have this debate. It certainly should serve as a warning to those who negotiate the loans, that the Senate of the United States expects that they be genuine loans, and not grants-in-aid or gifts.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it behooves the proponents of this measure to come forward and give the Members of the Senate some assurance that what is proposed to be done now is to make a loan, because it seems to me that overnight what is proposed to be done may be changed from a loan to a grant. If loan agreements have loopholes in them which will result in the loan never being paid back, I cannot for the life of me see any difference between such loan agreements and grants.

I think we ought to be fair to the American people about this matter. If this is to be a loan, and it is expected to be repaid, the promissory note should not be altered any more than a promissory note would be altered in private life. If I sign a promissory note, I must pay the note and the interest on it. I cannot suggest 6 months or a year from now that the terms of such a promissory note be altered or that it be canceled. I would not be permitted to suggest that I pay only 10 cents on the dollar. Of course, if there were a bankruptcy proceeding, that would be a different proposition. If any conditions placed in the agreement loans are bankrupt, we ought to know about it now.

If the Senate is to approve this loan its Members should know that it is really a loan, which it is expected shall be paid back; that it is a straight loan made upon the basis of negotiations between governments, and there should not be any conditions placed in the agreement which would permit either country to step out from under any of its provisions on any pretext. The loan ought to be repaid; otherwise it would not be a loan. We should not grant a loan if the agreement contains loopholes as big as houses through which its provisions can be altered.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan agrees that it should not be a grant, and it would not be a grant if our public officials, acting as trustees, under their oaths of office acted as they should.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan said that the provisions of a loan could be handled much like the negotiating of a treaty. I agree with the Senator. In such a case should not the officials of the department handling the matter come to the Senate and ask the Senate to ratify the provisions of the agreement, or, in case there should be proposed alterations in the promissory note, to ratify the alterations, within the provisions of the law?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that if it were not for the situation now existing in connection with the proposed aid to India, the time element involved, such a matter could be negotiated and brought back to the Senate in the nature of a treaty, and ratified by the Senate. But under the Economic Cooperation Act we have created the authority to make certain kinds of loans, and it expedites matters to be able to avail ourselves of that authortiy in the present instance.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am certainly not in disagreement with the interpretation of the law which the Congress enacted; but in view of the statement made a moment ago by the distinguished Senator from Michigan to the effect that the loan could be negotiated as a treaty, and that we could write certain provisions into it, of the loan is negotiated on the basis of a straight promissory note, if the note is altered and the debtor is relieved of the debt, does not the Senator feel that at least the departments of the Government should come before the Senate and and give the Senate an opportunity to alter the note, rather than having it altered by the department which made the loan?

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the Senator from Michigan feels that public officials should act in good faith, and should report defaults. They should report to the various committees, particularly the Appropriations Committees, all defaults. The Senator from Nebraska has had some sad experiences. One of them has been that he cannot find out just how much money we have loaned. I, too, should like to know the answers to these questions. Another thing the Senator is unable to find out is whether or not any of the loans are in default.

Mr. WHERRY. Or whether any of them have been paid.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much money has been paid on foreign loans during the past 10 years?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Nebraska has indicated that he cannot find out. The Senator from Michigan realizes that it is a pretty difficult thing to find out when the Senator from Nebraska cannot find it out. But we have discovered that, under the guise of so-called security, many things are secreted from the American people when they should not be.

One of the things which the Senator is trying to find out is how many loans we have made, how many are in default, and how many have been paid, as well as how many agreements have been changed and why they have been changed. The facts ought to come to the attention of the American public, because, after all, these are tax dollars that are being used. The situation is very much like that in which the trustee of an estate lends money from the estate, money which belongs to widows and children, without keeping track of whether the loans are being paid or not. When the public officials of America and of other nations recognize the fact that these are trust funds, and not their own funds, then we shall have honesty and morality in government. That is what we need.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not quarreling over the point of whether the Senate or both Houses of Congress should be informed. I believe that both Houses passed on the British loan.

I should like to ask the Senator another question. If India has furs or jute for sale and does not wish to dispose of them now, she can obtain a loan from the RFC, can she not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe special authority would be required.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly she can obtain a loan from the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. FERGUSON. If she has good collateral.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I mean.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not good enough for a bank loan, but good enough for this purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot understand the purpose of changing from a grant to a loan overnight, on the theory that this is a loan. The experience with ECA loans has been that we adopt the attitude, "We will lend it to them. Perhaps we shall get it back, but probably we shall not get it back." That is the theory under which an ECA loan is made.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator from Nebraska understands that the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senator from Michigan do not want this transaction to go through as a grant. They want it to be a loan. They expect that it will be negotiated on reasonable and fair terms, and that the loan will be repaid. Any nation which defaults on such a loan when it has the capacity to pay, like any other debtor in a similar situation, acquires the reputation of not keeping its agreements.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has no doubt, has he, that India is about as likely to repay the loan in goods as are most of the other countries to which we are lending money. That is particularly true because India produces things which we must buy, and which do not come in competition with our own producers in the United States. It is the logical place to buy.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, India has certain commodities, of which jute is one. She has a capacity to repay and we should expect her to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The United States is a large user of jute, because we bag so many things. Jute is raised in India. I am glad to note that in February, India removed the embargo with respect to Pakistan. India is partly to blame for her own famine condition. It is to blame to a great extent. India had a trade war with Pakistan. She planted jute instead of wheat because she did not want to buy jute for the mills in Calcutta from East Bengal. There was a trade war in progress. There was no rhyme or reason for the trade war, except that the Indian Government wanted to destroy the Pakistanian Government. The Senator from Michigan feels that that is a fact. But Pakistan had a war on with the Indian Government up in Kashmir. The United Nations has sent a representative over there to try to settle that war. Those two nations, as young nations, had better settle down and try to do business. The Senator from Michigan saw wheat in Pakistan lying on the wharf. It could not be shipped anywhere, and it was destroyed by virtue of age. India would not buy a grain of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that India has now made arrangements to buy 10,000 tons of wheat from Pakistan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I am glad to note that the trade war is being settled.

Mr. AIKEN. India is getting wheat from Pakistan. It is probably getting jute from Pakistan. I believe the trouble referred to is partly due to the fact that, as I understand, India had devalued her currency, but Pakistan had not got around to doing that necessary thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was one of the reasons.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In commercial transactions between the Indian Government and countries in South America or Russia, involving wheat, is it true that cash is paid? Or is the wheat bought on an exchange basis, so that there is a quid pro quo involved?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the way Russia does business.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How about the South American countries?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think they operate in the same way. I know of no country outside the United States which takes the tax dollar and gives it away. In her colonial empire England used a similar arrangement, but I believe that everyone who was under that colonial empire expected to pay the money back in tax dollars or otherwise, and then some. But I know of no nation in the history of the world, unless it had a colonial empire, which followed such a plan. We do not have a colonial empire, so we do not follow that program under such a guise. I know of no other country which takes its tax dollars, as we do, under the general-welfare clause, or under our national-defense program, and gives them away.

Everyone knows that one of the big reasons for fighting the revolutionary war was taxation without representation. In other words, we were being taxed in the Colonies and the money was being taken over to England and used by the English. We said that we were fighting a war because we were being taxed and did not have any representation in the British Parliament. Now we are doing exactly the same thing. In the case of Britain, she was taxing the Colonies. Now we are taxing the people of America and sending the money to England and other countries where we have no representation. That is exactly what was done in colonial days.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In view of the fact that in India there are stocks of burlap, chrome, and other strategic materials and commodities which are needed in the United States in the interest of national preparedness, it would seem that the Indian Government would prefer to conduct this transaction on a commercial basis, rather than to establish a precedent which might be embarrassing later.

Mr. FERGUSON. She does. We placed in this particular amendment the idea of exchange of strategic materials.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why is this loan being made through ECA?

Mr. FERGUSON. Because ECA is one of the agencies which is established for the making of loans. Either the ECA or the Export-Import Bank can make such loans, although the latter is authorized only to make production loans, I believe. ECA represents the only method we have presently available of making a loan like this.

Mr. WHERRY. It would be possible to make a loan through the Export-Import Bank without the necessity of going to ECA at all. If it is contemplated that repayment will be made in goods on a commercial basis, I maintain the Export-Import Bank is the agency through which the loan should be made.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Export-Import Bank acts as the operating agency for ECA. When the ECA passes out of existence the Export-Import Bank will handle such matters. I hope the ECA will go out of business, because it will have outlived its span of life in 1952.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not correct to say that under ECA much easier terms are provided? In other words, ECA does what it wishes to do. Under the Export-Import Bank there is a semblance of a straight loan made between countries.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. We passed the law. It is perhaps the best method that we have in existence at the present time. The terms of each loan are arrived at by the ECA Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. Loans are extended on that agreed basis. Therefore, we have the machinery available, and it is hoped that the officials will act as trustees for American taxpayer dollars and honestly carry out the functions that they are supposed to carry out. If they do so, we will have a loan, not a grant.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator consider modifying his amendment so as to provide that section 4 of the Iceland agreement shall not apply in the loan to India unless Congress first gives its full approval to it? The Senator need not give his answer at this time. He may wish to think it over. We are being told that aid to India will be granted on the basis of a loan, which will be paid back. Therefore, it would seem to me that a provision should be inserted that the Iceland agreement shall not apply. Unless ECA wants to make it under the law to which the Senator has referred, why

should it not be necessary to come back to Congress to get full approval of any such agreement?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that ECA has the organizational set-up to deal with a situation which involves a measure of relief, whereas the Export-Import Bank is supposed to deal only with strictly sound business propositions? I believe there is about the same difference as there is between the Farmers Home Administration and the Production Credit Associations. The Farmers Home Administration deals with situations which, strictly speaking, are not sound banking propositions, although the percentage of repayments has been remarkably high.

The Production Credit Associations, which deal with American farmers, are just as restricted as any bank. I would say in that respect we have perhaps an analogy with the Indian situation. The Senator from Michigan proposes to have the ECA handle it, rather than the Export-Import Bank, which perhaps could not make a loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is, out of its own funds?

Mr. AIKEN. Out of its own funds.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There may be some provision under which it would not be a production loan, and, therefore, it would have to be handled by ECA. I am not certain about it. However, I ask the Senator once again, if it is to be a loan and, as we are told, it is to be paid back, whether there can be any objection to a modification of section 4 along the line I have suggested? I do not see anything wrong with it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will give consideration to the suggestion.

In general, ECA loans have been for periods of 33 to 35 years, at an interest rate of 2½ percent on unpaid principal, with a period of grace for beginning interest payments of from 2 to 4 years, and a period of grace for beginning principal payments of from 6 to 8 years.

There is no desire to strait-jacket the terms of the loan contemplated by this amendment in order to provide the "special and easy terms" which India has requested, and therefore there is no attempt to write the loan conditions into the bill or to depart from the discretionary authority provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the ECA Act.

The Senator from Michigan does feel, however, that each loan should be considered by the officials making it on the basis that they are dealing with trust funds of the taxpayers of America, and that they should constantly keep in mind that it is a loan, not a gift.

As a matter of probabilities we have a statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the NCA probably would advise a loan for 35 years at 2½ percent interest with the required semiannual payments of principal deferred for 6 or 8 years, but with no grace period for the required semiannual payments of interest.

These probable terms fully meet the only conditions of aid which were requested by the Indian Government, and in the light of that government's asset position would be entirely within its capacity to service.

It is ironical that we, who sincerely wish to demonstrate our generosity to the people of India, should have to quibble as to whether the conditions or terms of our assistance would be offensive to the beneficiaries. But that is just what has been happening.

It is a cruel irony that this quibbling should take place when the Indian Government itself has given so little credit to this Nation for its generous intentions, and in fact has served the propaganda line of the Soviet Union by stressing an announcement that Russia has just agreed to sell 50,000 tons of wheat to India. That announcement to the Indian Parliament by Prime Minister Nehru was greeted by cheers.

What was never said was that in the first 4 months of this year the United States has sold and delivered to India 411,000 tons of grain, during which same period something like 42,000 tons, or about one-tenth as much, had been dispatched on similar terms by Communist China.

I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press dispatch from New Delhi, dated May 12, be printed at this point in my remarks, as it recites this extraordinary account of India's gratefulness to this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES AIDES IN INDIA SEE PRESTIGE LOSS—PRO-SOVIET FEELING INSPIRED BY RUSSIAN GRAIN SHIPMENT IS LAID IN PART TO NEHRU

NEW DELHI, INDIA, May 12.—United States officials are chagrined at the pro-Soviet feeling engendered here by the shipment of Russian wheat to this nation, announced on the same day that Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru accepted the terms for much larger United States aid.

Mr. Nehru himself contributed to a major Communist propaganda gain among India's hungry millions by the dramatic announcement in Parliament Thursday that "Russian ships with wheat have started for India." He referred to a relatively minor 50,000-ton purchase.

Only an hour later did he tell Parliament that he saw no political strings attached to the famine relief bills in the United States Congress to supply India with 2,000,000 tons of wheat.

The result was that the American move to help was obscured by the start of the Russian shipment. Obscured also was the fact that more than 100,000 tons are coming to India each month from the United States through regular trade channels.

One influential newspaper, the British-controlled Statesman, headlined the Russian move and gave secondary position to India's acceptance of United States terms.

The same attitude was reflected in other parts of the Indian press, and in the conversations of Indian officials, leaders, and plain citizens.

For weeks, Indians have been viewing with growing impatience reports from Washington on the ups and downs of the proposals for a grant or loan to India. It is a $190,000,000 project.

An important segment of Indian opinion, wavering between east and west, swung farther toward the Soviet camp when Mr. Nehru announced that Russia already was starting the 50,000 tons without waiting for the conclusion of negotiations on the terms.

The Indian Government and United States Information Services have failed to get across to the Indian people that the United States has been doing for a long time on a large scale what the Soviet Union proposes to do on a small scale.

Shipping records show that the United States has sold and delivered 411,000 tons of grain to India in the first 4 months of this year. The only delivery from Communist countries in that period was 42,000 tons from Communist China.

But Indian journalists are increasingly caustic about the slow progress of the famine relief bills in Congress.

"The United States took only 24 hours to help Korea, but it already has taken 6 months to help save India's people," said one Indian journalist.

The Hindustan Times, which often reflects Government opinion said in an editorial:

"Americans are making a poor impression psychologically on our people by the way they are discussing the request for 2,000,000 tons of food grains."

Mr. FERGUSON. However that may be, Mr. President, we do have the question whether this current assistance program will meet India's requirements in a manner acceptable to that Nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

CONCURRENCE BY THE HOUSE IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 31

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am sure it is very good news to the Chair and to the Senator from Michigan that the House so speedily adopted the concurrent resolution which the Senate adopted earlier this afternoon. It will be evidence to the United Nations, particularly to our delegation, that Congress acted very speedily in accordance with the feelings of the American people.

This speedy action by Congress will be evidence to the other nations of how deeply the American people feel about this vital matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). If the Senate will permit the present occupant of the chair to state what he feels he may properly express, the Chair would like to commend the Senator from Michigan for his statement and to join him therein as far as he can properly do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to congratulate both the Chair, the Senator from Florida, and the Senator from Michigan on this splendid accomplishment today in the Senate, and to rejoice with both of them that the House of Representatives has acted so promptly on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this quick action should also give heart to the American people and should show

them that the Congress can act speedily when speedy action is required.

Frequently, statements are made about the slowness of Congress to act, and on many occasions the newspaper headlines carry the word "filibuster," with the result that the American people receive the impression that Congress cannot act speedily. However, the concurrent resolution was submitted only yesterday; it lay over for 1 day, under the rule, and now has been adopted by the Senate and, after going to the House of Representatives, has been adopted by that body. If the concurrent resolution were a measure which required the signature of the President, it could very readily be signed by the President this evening and thus could become the law of the land. However, the concurrent resolution does not require Presidential signature. It is an expression of the will of Congress as to what should happen.

I hope the American people will recognize that when Congress should act speedily, it can do so, and does so.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have already stated why I believe the current assistance program, as my amendment would provide it, should meet India's requirements in a manner acceptable to India. The Indian Prime Minister, in fact, has acknowledged as much.

Somewhat later on the day that Nehru informed the Indian Parliament of Russia's great generosity, he made entirely clear that the terms and conditions of aid contemplated in this amendment are altogether agreeable. Here is what he said, in discussing the bills which are before the United States Senate and House of Representatives at the present time:

> In our view [they] have no political or discriminatory conditions attached to them and there can be no objection on these grounds to our accepting either of these two. We prefer the terms of the House bill because they are simpler.

The terms of the House bill, let me add, are essentially those of this amendment.

The present bill provides that $95,000,000 of the funds authorized by this measure shall be provided out of the appropriation heretofore made to the Economic Cooperation Administration. The committee report indicates that according to ECA officials, that much would be available as not needed for the current year's recovery program in Europe.

There is no record to advise us whether or not ECA has indicated that anything more than $95,000,000 would not be needed for current year operations of ECA. The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that ECA will have enough funds to provide all or most of the sum required by this measure without interfering with the current year's recovery program in Europe.

I shall not go into the details of ECA's anticipated unobligated balances as of the end of the current fiscal year. It is conceded that the absolute minimum will be in the neighborhood of $120,000,000 and there is every reason to expect it will exceed that amount.

What we provide is that such unobligated balances as remain, in no event less than $10,000,000 shall be made available for this loan program. There is no desire to cut off the amount of ECA funds which may go to Formosa or as military aid under that program. Any difference between what can be made available from ECA's balances and the total of $190,000,000 authorized for this India wheat program would be made available through a public-debt transaction.

The third provision of this amendment is that the terms for the extended credit shall include provision for repayment by the transfer of strategic or critical materials to the United States. There is nothing mandatory about the extent to which these materials shall be transferred as repayment.

As indicated by the Senator from Vermont, we must do business with India and India must do business with us on a businesslike basis. The authority is permissive, so as not to handcuff the lending authorities; but in the language of the House Foreign Affairs Committee report on a similar proposal, this would not be "an invitation to the executive branch to ignore the responsibility to acquire these strategic materials wherever possible."

Mr. President, again I say that when these agencies are handling the taxpayers' dollars, which are trust funds, they should keep in mind that the United States should on every possible occasion acquire strategic materials and should exert every possible effort to obtain them. India, which is one of the nations at the present time associated with us in the United Nations in the war, should feel the same way about that matter.

Mr. President, the fact is that India produces a number of materials regarded by the United States as critical or strategic. Among these are beryl, castor-oil seed, chromite, cyanite, manganese, mica, monazite, opium, pepper, shellac, talc, zircon, coconut oil, rutile, and natural-rubber latex, all of which are on the Munitions Board group I stockpile list. She also produces jute, leather, and sesame oil, which are in short supply in this country, although they are not being stockpiled.

These are all items which the United States needs in its battle for survival and the support of its allies in the fight against communism.

By the way, Mr. President, India must always remember, and we must remember, that India is one of the nations which is joined with us in the United Nations in the same battle against communism. If India forgets that she is in the battle against communism, communism can take over India very quickly, and then Mr. Nehru and his Government certainly will cease to function.

India needs food; but as the House committee has said:

> With due regard for India's policies on strategic and critical materials * * * in the long-term view strategic materials are as vital to national survival of the United States as food grains are to India.

That is true, Mr. President, because war can kill our people as well as starvation can kill the people of India.

It seems only right and proper that our Nation and the Indian Nation should exchange these items which are so necessary to each of us. Therefore, the amendment provides that the terms of the loan shall contain provision for a continuous flow of some of these strategic items to the United States. It is indeed a small price to pay for the loan and the value that such a loan will bring to the Indian people.

I hope the sponsors of the bill will accept this amendment. I believe it is acceptable to the Senator from New Jersey, and perhaps he can speak for the other sponsors, or at least perhaps he can say a few words in regard to the amendment and in favor of it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mention has frequently been made of the 50,000 tons of wheat which Russia is selling to India.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether there have been stated for the RECORD the amounts India has already arranged to purchase from the United States during the present year, entirely aside from the arrangements to be made under the provisions of the pending bills.

As I have the figures, which I think are up to date, of the 55,000,000 bushels of wheat which India is entitled to buy at a low price—a lower price, let us say—under the world wheat agreement, we are to furnish 28,000,000 bushels. So about 750,000 tons of wheat will go to India from the United States under the International Wheat Agreement arrangement.

We also have sold to India this year about 125,000 tons of wheat entirely aside from the wheat-agreement arrangement. I assume that wheat was sold at a higher price.

Then last month India arranged to buy 300,000 tons of sorghum grain in the United States. Thus India has already arranged for a total of approximately 1,175,000 tons of grain to come from the United States. That is over half India's normal importations of grain of all kinds.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but that does not seem to be mentioned in the international news releases. The failure to mention it is most unfortunate.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. So we have already arranged to provide India with more than 20 times the amount of grain which Russia agreed to sell India, which agreement received such widespread publicity.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let me point out that the wheat we have already arranged to sell to India has been sold or is to be sold at a reduced rate.

Mr. AIKEN. The 750,000 tons of wheat which we are furnishing under the international wheat agreement is being furnished at the reduced rate. I do not know exactly what it is. It cannot be over $1.80 a bushel. How much less than that it is this year, I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The difference between the world rate and the American rate at the time, is to their advantage, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; but it cannot be over $1.80, as I understand; so we have already, in the first 3 months of this year, arranged to provide India with almost 1,200,000 tons of wheat and sorghum.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for an observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan upon the presentation he has made of his proposed amendment to the pending bill. As the one who introduced the bill, although I cannot speak for all the cosponsors, and though, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I cannot speak for the members of that committee, I should like to say that, from my experience during the past few weeks, and especially from my contacts with the Indian Embassy in Washington, together with the recent statement made by Mr. Nehru, of India, it seems to me we would be taking the proper action, if we were to adopt the proposal contained in the amendment, to make this an outright loan, rather than half grant and half loan, as originally proposed. Many arguments could be made in favor of a grant, with counterpart funds, and the regular procedure for a grant under the ECA program; but, in the light of the circumstances, and in view of the fact that the Indian Government itself appears to prefer the loan basis, I think we should concur in that view. Therefore, so far as the Senator from New Jersey is concerned, as the proposer of the bill, I hope that my colleagues who are cosponsoring the bill with me will agree with my view. It seems wise for us to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, which he has so ably presented.

I propose to speak further on this point, tomorrow, if necessary, before the bill is finally voted on; but tonight I merely make this statement of my approval of the amendment. I have been in conference for some days with the Senator from Michigan and other Senators interested in the amendment. We have come to an agreement as to the terms and as to the way the ECA will work in handling this important program. So again I thank the Senator from Michigan for his contribution and his great assistance in helping us with this proposed legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. President, while I have the floor I wish to address myself to another section of the pending measure. Section 10 of the bill would provide for an advance of $20,000,000 from the RFC to reactivate reserve Liberty ships, for use in transporting the wheat to India, if the President finds that private shipping facilities are unavailable or inadequate. There are no published Senate hearings on this bill, but the committee report shows the cost of reactivating 100 Liberty ships would be $14,000,000, of which amount $2,000,000 would be recaptured on one voyage through freight charges.

It seems to me we should not incur such a tremendous expense as that represented by the difference in the costs and the freight revenues that might be returned, unless it is absolutely essential. I have good reason to believe it would not be necessary to reactivate the reserve ships to carry this grain, and I therefore wonder why this section is necessary.

In hearings before the Appropriations Committee last month, the Secretary of Agriculture told how well shipments of grain were going to India through regular trade channels. The Senator from Michigan asked him particularly about the ability of private shippers to transport this grain. I should hope we would simply project that shipping program under this bill, and that, as his testimony would indicate, no shipping difficulties would be encountered.

I know that evidence was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee regarding a critical shipping condition, which might affect this program adversely. I believe further examination will show that situation has been much relieved since the Foreign Relations Committee heard the testimony. A member of my staff has contacted the Director of the Transportation and Warehousing Branch of the Department of Agriculture, who would be responsible for moving this grain to India, and he has confirmed that fact. We were informed that the aid program could be superimposed upon the current shipping program without anticipating any great difficulty, and without reactivating the reserve ships. I have requested the Secretary of Agriculture to confirm this information by letter, though as yet I have not received such confirmation from him.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a telegram which I sent to Secretary Brannan on Saturday, May 12, to which I am, of course, expecting a reply momentarily.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 12, 1951.

HON. CHARLES BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.:

Would you please confirm by letter Monday whether contemplated India wheat program can be carried out by trade shipping facilities now available and operating without resort to reactivating reserve cargo ships. My understanding that can be done follows your answers to my questions in appropriations hearings April 12 and from telephone conversation between Mr. Hudtloff and my assistant Thursday. Also would appreciate your comment on availability of wheat for India under contemplated program considering Friday report on domestic crop prospects. Would you not agree a proviso requiring your certification of availability above necessary domestic carryovers was highly desirable to protect against any critical deterioration in domestic reserves as a result of reduced crop prospects. Personal regards.

HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. For the purpose of making certain that the expense of reactivating ships will not be incurred unnecessarily, I wonder whether the Senator from Iowa, who is in charge of the bill, will not accept an amendment to section 10, reading as follows:

On page 6, line 2, strike out the word "finds" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "after consultation with appropriate Government officials and representatives of private shipping, finds and proclaims."

Mr. GILLETTE. Being in charge of the bill on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, I think I am justified in accepting the amendment which the Senator from Michigan has just offered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As the proposer of the bill, I am glad to accept the amendment. We had in mind, of course, that there must be a finding that private shipping was not available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that a committee amendment is pending before the Senate, so the actual acceptance of this amendment will have to wait until after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Then I shall change my statement, and instead of saying that I accept it, I may say that I shall be glad to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, is there an amendment now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment is now pending. That amendment is itself subject to amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, Mr. President, I should like to offer the amendment which I sent to the desk as an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is advised that the amendment sent forward by the Senator from Michigan is in order only as an amendment to a portion of the pending committee amendment. It may not be offered as an amendment at this time, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it may be offered as an amendment to the pending committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment sent forward by the Senator from Michigan is recognized as an amendment proposed to the pending committee amendment.

A CITIZEN RETURNS HIS PMA CHECK

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a matter here which I am sure the Senator from Vermont will appreciate, since he and the Senator from Michigan have been interested in certain activities of the Production and Marketing Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I shall ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have just sent to the Secretary of the Treasury.

With this letter I have enclosed a properly endorsed check from Hilarian Bibicoff of Chelsea, Mich., which represents a payment to him by the United States Government for attending a county PMA meeting.

Mr. Bibicoff had written me to describe the meeting which he attended and to request that I deposit his check "anywhere with the Government, except the PMA and the USDA, a wasteful and unnecessary agency," because "I do not feel justified to accept taxpayers' money for nothing."

Mr. President, I want to compliment Mr. Bibicoff for the spirit he has displayed. The amount of the check is altogether immaterial. The point is, as I have written the Secretary of the Treasury, that Mr. Bibicoff's letter is another demonstration to me of the basic good sense and integrity of the people of our country. There must be thousands of people like Mr. Bibicoff who are thoroughly disgusted with the waste and extravagance in Government policies and operations.

It is indeed refreshing to see that the people themselves have better judgment and more concern about Government expenditures than do the bureaus and agencies which needlessly spend the the people's money.

Of course, it can be seen why Mr. Bibicoff did not want his check to go back to the Production and Marketing Administration, because he believed it would be used to pay someone else in the same manner. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 15, 1951.

Hon. JOHN SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Herewith I enclose a check for the sum of $7.50 properly endorsed for deposit in the Treasury of the United States.

This check was sent to me by a citizen of Michigan with instructions to see that the money it represents be returned to the Government and deposited in any account except that of the Production and Marketing Administration.

This check is a payment by the Washtenaw County PMA Committee of the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture, to a Michigan farmer, Mr. Hilarian Bibicoff, for attending a PMA meeting in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Mr. Bibicoff does not want this money, and his letter to me shows how unnecessary the expenditure was. He writes:

"DEAR SENATOR: With this letter I am enclosing a Government check I received for attending a meeting of a County PMA in Ann Arbor, Washtenaw County, Michigan.

"At the time all I had to hear was a reading of a statement of Secretary Mr. Brannan (a copy was distributed among all community representatives present) and three identical requests for more corn and soy beans from three agents of the USDA. (A letter to this effect reached me a few days later.)

"I do not feel justified to accept taxpayers money for nothing and wish you to deposit this check anywhere with the Government, except the PMA of the USDA, a wasteful and unnecessary agency.

"Sincerely yours,

"H. BIBICOFF."

Mr. Bibicoff's letter is another demonstration to me of the basic good sense and integrity of the people of our country. There must be thousands of people like Mr. Bibicoff who are thoroughly disgusted with the waste and extravagance in Government policies and operations.

I recall very clearly a similar occurrence on something of a wholesale scale a year ago. A large PMA meeting was held in St. Paul on April 3 and 4, 1950. Routine farm business was the excuse for calling part of the group together, but the main attraction was a speech on the Brannan plan by the Secretary of Agriculture. For this purpose the PMA went out of its way to guarantee a large attendance. Farmers who had no occasion to be there were persuaded to come and all were promised 2 days' subsistence at $8 per day and 5 cents per mile travel pay.

There was some dispute about the number in attendance, but it seems that over 4,000 farmers were entitled to claim subsistence and travel pay for attending the meeting. At the time of our inquiry, I recall, 2,043 claims for reimbursement had been made and the total paid out for this single meeting was $34,000.

In these days when the need for government economy is so impelling, and when inflation threatens the very future of our country, it is refreshing indeed to see that people themselves have better judgment and more concern about government expenditures than do the bureaus and agencies which needlessly spend other people's money.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Bibicoff, but I hope you will also send him some official acknowledgement that you have received the return of this money.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received May 15 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

James W. Bohlander	Cecil B. Johnson
Gordon R. Bryan, Jr.	Robert J. Piette
Lloyd H. Carpenter	Charles H. Propster, Jr
Donald E. Ellis	John A. Richardson
Donald I. Garnett	Rogers P. Ryerson
James F. George	Robert W. Wilson
Kenneth L. Holmes	

William F. Blaze (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

John F. Hassenplug
John D. Tomlinson

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Clovis M. Baker	Gary C. Leighty
Gerald Barton	Franklin "J" Lesh
Daniel W. Blaylock II	Allan G. Lewis
David T. Boyd	James R. Maxwell III
John M. Daniel, Jr.	Robert G. Rogers, Jr.
Albert D. Falther, Jr.	Charles H. Samuelson
Arthur C. Folli	Herbert W. Severns
Newton R. Fuller	Jack L. Short
Gary D. Ghostley	Robert T. Silkett
Karl R. Jacobson	Glenn A. Tomlinson
Richard C. F. Kerwath	Eugene A. Ulrich
Rufus M. King	Matthew H. Van Order
Willet B. Kiplinger	Andrew J. Walsh
John A. Kohler	Bruce C. Young
Bertil R. Koller	Robert E. Young
Richard J. Larsen	

Roger H. Burnet (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.

George L. Otis, Jr. (Naval ROTC), to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Charles J. Roth, Jr.
George P. Turci

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Harry E. Atkinson	Benjamin C. Pratt
James P. Coley	John P. Recher
James P. Connolly II	John B. Reynolds
William P. Foxworth	William R. Riddell, Jr.
David D. Francis	Walter A. Robertson
William H. Hildemann	John J. Ross III
John H. House	Dan W. Schausten
Joseph F. Inman, Jr.	Paul A. Shrader
Branch Jordan	Paul L. Siegmund
William D. Lauerman, Jr.	William J. Southerland, Jr.
Fred D. MacLean, Jr.	Charles C. M. Woodward
Richard C. Marsh	Thomas V. A. Wornham
Clarence E. May, Jr.	
Rowland M. Murphy	
Martin I. Penner	

Leo M. Schneider, Jr. (Naval ROTC), to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Harry "D" McGee

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Francis L. Bergquist
Ralph E. Munson

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Sylvia J. Lanneau	Gilda G. Whitfield
Dorothy I. Moore	Gloria M. Whitfield

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Shirley M. Bailey
Kathryn M. Drozda
Frances R. Kissinger

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Robert H. Pepper
Gerald C. Thomas

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

John Halla	Randolph McC. Pate
Edwin A. Pollock	Clayton C. Jerome

Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God, who hast entrusted us with a high vocation, grant that in these strange and perilous days we may discharge our duties and

responsibilities faithfully and with a pure and steadfast devotion.

We are humbly conscious of our own frailty and inadequacy but we know that in Thy divine wisdom and mercy Thou art able and willing to use us even to the limit of our meager capacities and abilities.

May we daily be numbered among all who are seeking to establish Thy kingdom of peace upon this earth. May the day be hastened when Thy promises shall be gloriously fulfilled.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 14, 1951:

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrzej Wojcicki, and Stanislaw Wojcicki;

H. R. 664. An act for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Allidritt;

H. R. 789. An act for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Taro Takara;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu;

H. R. 1264. An act for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton; and

H. R. 2357. An act for the relief of Lucia Adamos.

On May 15, 1951:

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 859. An act for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski;

H. R. 1121. An act for the relief of Chin Yok Kong;

H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin; and

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of Sook Kat.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to make the publication, Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication; and

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to make the publication, 100 Things You Should Know About Communism Series, etc., a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE LATE OSCAR DE PRIEST

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, today we note the passing of former Congressman Oscar De Priest who died at Provident Hospital in Chicago last Saturday. Those who were his colleagues in the Seventy-first, Seventy-second, and Seventy-third Congresses will remember his advent into this Hall back in 1929. He stood on the floor with other Members-elect and took the oath while former Congressman Nicholas Longworth was Speaker. He came to this body, "Horatio Alger-like," the son of former slave parents, blazing landmarks on his upward climb from a little lad in Florence, Ala., where he was born in 1871. He attended public school in Salina, Kans., where his parents migrated to the wheat fields of that area. The small town was no permanent place for him. He left Salina for Dayton and Defiance, Ohio, spent a short while in Toledo, then later found his place in business and politics in Chicago, Ill. He started business as a house painter, later became a painter-contractor. Developing traits of leadership he became associated with the late Congressman Martin B. Madden, whom he succeeded as the Representative from the First District of Illinois. His figure was noticeable on the floor—tall, white-haired, and distinguished. He seldom made formal speeches in the House but he was recognized and respected for his fearless leadership, courage, and his ever-present influence against racial segregation in any form. He had no urge for a multiplicity of bills in the hopper but was active in the work of his committee assignments, especially the Committee on Indian Affairs. His services in his State and city included a term as Cook County commissioner, and first of his race to be elected to the city council in Chicago.

Mr. De Priest was an outstanding leader of the colored race and was always in the forefront in any fight to improve conditions for his people and establish a dignified place for them in society.

In honoring his memory today I wish to include the following tribute to his life and character which was paid to Mr. De Priest by his former secretary, Mr. Morris Lewis:

Gnarled, and worn, still tall, less straight, he stood, a great oak in the forest. His were the years of service to mankind, and his God, just as he saw it. Unswerving, unbending, he had hewn to the line, let the chips fall where they may. Consistently he shouted aloud—this is my land, my native land, of whom then shall I be afraid. I am the son of my father, of earth and of heaven, a creature of God Almighty, made in His image, and I am not afraid. He feared no man, or set of men; he was resolute, immovable, like the Rock of Ages. His record is one of achievement, of works well done, a beacon light for leaders of all generations to follow. Out of the multiplicity of his travels, the paths he trod, the councils he joined, from the beginning as the little son of former slave parents in Alabama, to a seat in the Congress of the United States is a fine example for Negro posterity. Verily, in his community, in this Nation, among his people, the name of Oscar De Priest is a household word.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in this tribute to a former Member of the House. It was my privilege to serve in the Congress with Oscar De Priest. I also was associated with him in several of our national campaigns.

He was a man of great ability and devoted to the service of his adopted city of Chicago. Born a slave, he was able through study, sacrifices, and a ceaseless ambition to rise to a position of trust and esteem. He was a devoted worker for the colored race and he hoped through his efforts to improve their position in the world. He was a Republican by tradition and gave generously of his time to advance the cause of his party. As a Congressman he won distinction and respect. Through his fine service he made it possible for others to follow. My sincere sympathy is extended to the wife and family of our former colleague.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I learned with most profound sorrow of the death of a former colleague from the State of Illinois. I speak of Oscar De Priest, of Chicago, Ill., who served in the Seventy-first, Seventy-second, and Seventy-third Congresses. I had the good fortune to have served with him during the Seventy-third Congress.

To millions of people Oscar De Priest will be remembered as having been the first colored person from Illinois to serve in the Congress of the United States. I shall remember him as one of pleasing personality, of exceptional ability, as one who was helpful to me as a new Member of Congress when I first came here in 1933. He was indeed a true friend and loved and respected by everyone who knew him.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, it was my very great privilege to have known Oscar De Priest, to have known him very well.

When I campaigned for a seat in this body in 1946 he was my confidant, my counselor, and my friend.

He had a great capacity for friendship, and his friends of all creeds and races were legion.

Born of slave parents, his span of life encompassed that period of American history that witnessed tremendous forward strides by his race, an objective that was dear to his heart. He was a true representative of his race and a conscientious representative of all of the people. He was representative of the fact that under our American way of life a man from humble beginnings could reach great heights.

His life and his works have left the world a better place in which to live.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, Oscar De Priest was well known in Kansas, and stood high in the esteem of all who knew him.

His life demonstrates that this is truly the "Land of Opportunity," and no-

where else could a man with his humble beginnings rise to such heights.

In his passing, a great American has left us, leaving with us a great influence for good.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Honorable Oscar De Priest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 228) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 228), as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

GOVERNOR WARREN: ABLE EXECUTIVE WITH GREAT HUMAN APPEAL

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest in last night's Washington Star that many delegates at the Republican conference in Tulsa, Okla., were looking with favor upon the prospect of having Earl Warren as the Republican candidate for President in 1952.

I wish to emphatically state to Republicans in particular and to all voters who want a change in 1952 that Mr. Warren is the man who can bring that about, and how.

After Governor Warren had served 2 terms—8 years—this is how the voters of his State treated him in 1950: In his campaign for Governor he carried every county in the State; he defeated his opponent, James Roosevelt, by 1,173,808, and in the County of Los Angeles he won by over 434,000 votes. This is more than Taft's majority—431,184—in Ohio in 1950.

Governor Warren's vote was a vote of confidence, based upon 8 years of performance; on his integrity and high ethical concept of the public service; on his refusal to play cheap politics in the making of appointments. It was a vote of confidence in his ability to understand and to develop programs for the solution of the problems of today in his State and also on the national level.

Everyone admits that we must have a change in national administration, after 20 years of rule by one party. Earl Warren is the man who can assure that result. He would revive the confidence of the American people in their National Government. He would bring courage, ethics, integrity, efficiency, and the human touch back into the National Government.

His record is his best salesman. I hope that every American voter will study and learn it.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER CANCELED AND SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for this afternoon which I desire to cancel, as I do not have my material ready.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next after all other business and on Monday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CEREMONY IN HONOR OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Con. Res. 100) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee, composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare plans for and to hold an appropriate ceremony in honor of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent many years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States and died as the result of a fall while working on the rotunda frieze, his last assignment in the Capitol. Such ceremony shall be held in the Rotunda of the Capitol on July 26, 1951, the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, or on such other day as the committee herein provided for may designate. The committee shall extend invitations to attend the ceremony to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Member of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Ambassador of Italy, and such other public officials and persons in private life as the committee may select.

PROTECTING GIRL SCOUTS IN USE OF EMBLEMS AND BADGES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3442) to protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases hereafter adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1950, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and to use, in carrying out its purposes, all emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases now or heretofore used by the old corporation in carrying out its program and hereafter used by the corporation, including the sole and exclusive right to use, or to authorize the use of, during the existence of the corporation, the badge of the Girl Scouts, Inc., which is referred to in the act of August 12, 1937 (Public, No. 259, 75th Cong.; 50 Stat. 623), and all the other aforesaid emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases in connection with the manufacturing, advertising, and selling of equipment and merchandise, it being distinctly and definitely understood, however, that nothing in this act shall interfere or conflict with established or vested rights."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "corporation", insert "and by its successor."

And on lines 2 and 3 delete the words "and hereafter used by the corporation."

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out "merchandise, it being distinctly and definitely understood, however, that" and insert in lieu thereof "merchandise: *Provided, however*, That."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases heretofore adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

MORRIS TUTNAUER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of Morris Tutnauer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Morris Tutnauer, of New York City, N. Y., the sum of $28,365.50, in full settlement of

all claims against the United States by said Morris Tutnauer on account of the injuries sustained by him when an automobile being operated by him was struck by a War Department automobile on July 22, 1943, in Queens County, New York City, N. Y., said War Department automobile being operated by a private of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$28,365.50" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD W. BRITTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 658) for the relief of Harold W. Britton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold W. Britton, of Pawtucket, R. I., the sum of $2,712.80. Payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Harold W. Britton against the United States on account of his unwarranted suspension on December 7, 1945, from duty as a civilian employee of the War Department at Camp Miles Standish, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,712.80" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL MATELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1443) for the relief of Paul Matelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Matelli, Chicago, Ill., the sum of $900. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul Matelli against the United States for refund of part of the amount of $1,000 which he posted as cash bail bond in the case of The United States of America against Edward Caselli, and which was forfeited by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois on December 6, 1932. Such court, on October 29, 1935, ordered the refund of $900 of such amount to the said Paul Matelli ($100 being deducted as court costs) but such refund could not be made because such amount had been covered into the Treasury: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EVELYN CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2913) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MRS. ALBERT W. LACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 765–770), the Bureau of Employees' Compensation is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Mrs. Albert W. Lack, widow of Albert W. Lack, for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of personal injuries alleged to have been sustained by Albert W. Lack on October 29, 1942, while in the performance of his duty as a member of the Coast Guard Temporary Reserve in the Ingall's Ship Yard, Pascagoula, Miss.; and the Bureau, after such consideration of such claim, shall determine and make findings of fact thereon and make an award for payment of compensation to Mrs. Albert W. Lack, as widow of Albert W. Lack, provided for in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "the", insert "Department of Labor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNDRY FORMER STUDENTS OF AIR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3562) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Raymond Pohl, Jr., 505A Magnolia Avenue, Frederick, Md., $83.95; Dan K. Rawlings, 205 Laurel Avenue, Corbin, Ky., $13.10; Harold L. Reed, 201 West Lindell Street, West Frankfort, Ill., $12.20; Marcus A. Sessi, 417 West Pennview Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $3; Robert D. Simmons, 835½ Broadway, New Orleans, La., $23.85; Harry P. Smith, Jr., 2225 Chesapeake Avenue, Hampton, Va., $60.66; Paul E. Smith, 2109 Eoff Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $6.10; Raymond C. Sowko, Gleenland Apartments, State College, Pa., $444.40; Clyde C. Spears, 347 Linden Walk, Lexington, Ky., $236.60; Donald E. Spears, 123 West Central Avenue, Belle, W. Va., $212.70; Homer R. Steele, Route 1, Fairview, W. Va., $142; John D. Stiles, Wadestown, W. Va., $110.20; George F. Stock, Jr., Hollandale, Miss., $236.95; David A. Stockton, 105 East Seventh Street, box 256, Ritzville, Wash., $179.65; Frank A. Sullivan, 7949 Susquehanna Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $396.80; William K. Sutton, 981 Fincastle Road, Lexington, Ky., $141.25; Floyd Ramsey Tarr, 3729 Mariamont Drive, Weirton, W. Va., $170.05; Hagop H. Terzagian, 217 Myrtle Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., $338.85; Jack Alfred Thalimer, 4518 West Grace Street, Richmond, Va., $226.80; Eugene R. Thomas, 9 South York Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $223.20; Forest G. Thompson, 2201 Frederica Street, Owensboro, Ky., $157.80; Joseph C. Thompson, box 700, O. M. S., Travis AFB, Fairview, Calif., $423.25; Thomas W. Tigertt, box 93, Wilmer, Tex., $583.90; Richard J. Torchia, 630 Dow Avenue, Carnegie, Pa., $229.80; Lee C. Truman, Jr., 2422 Allen Street, Owensboro, Ky., $252.40; Charles B. Upshaw, 394 West Wesley Road NW., Atlanta, Ga., $191; George J. Walters, Jr., 438 South Dallas Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., $435.55; Gilbert Watz, 834 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., $366.45; Arthur J. Weinsten, 501 Manheim Street (22–A), Philadelphia, Pa., $200.10; Robert J. Weiss, 111 West Cherryhill Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $239.25; James Bernard Welborn, 442 Cherry Street, Russellville, Ky., $107.55; Earl M. Williams, box 204, Evarts, Ky., $297.50; Edwin J. Williams, Jr., 1832 Chuckatuck Avenue, Petersburg, Va., $505.60; Charles P. Wilson, Jr., Route 1, Walkersville, W. Va., $404.16; and Harold W. Wilson, 205½ Fourth Street, Parkersburg, W. Va., $324.20. The payment of said sums shall be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of the abovenamed claimants against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property as a result of a fire that occurred on June 28, 1948, in the building in which they were quartered at Langley Air Force Base, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3651) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on September 28, 1942, when the car which he was driving was struck by a United States Army vehicle on the highway near Alamogordo, N. Mex.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claim, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from any payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELINA MARSIGLIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3653) for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Angelina Marsiglia, New York City, N. Y., the sum of $10,000 in addition to $1,288.50 for medical and funeral expenses. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Angelina Marsiglia against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Michael R. Marsiglia, who was fatally injured on December 2, 1944, when he was struck by a United States Army motor vehicle while said motor vehicle was proceeding on and over the public highway at the corner of West Houston and Varick Streets, Manhattan, New York City, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN K. JACKSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of John K. Jackson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John K. Jackson, of Astoria, Oreg., the sum of $4,442.30, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages for personal injuries suffered on December 22, 1937, at Astoria, Oreg., when shot by Garwyn S. Diehl, radioman, first class, United States Navy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIRCEA GROSSU AND HIS FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 77) for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mircea Grossu, his wife Lucia, and their son, Mircea John, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officers to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH GIRARDI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 119) for the relief of Joseph Girardi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Joseph Girardi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT JOHANNA SORENSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Robert Johanna Sorensen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LARS DANIEL SORENSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 166) for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lars Daniel Sorensen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ROBERT M. STERNBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 822) for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg (Hanae Sano), Japanese wife of Robert M. Sternberg, an American citizen.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERTRUD LOMNITZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 824) for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gertrud Lomnitz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 9.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in

which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-3490319, Abe Shizu.
A-2663540, Abramo, Filippo.
A-3002010, Ahmed, Ismail.
A-3161900, Ahmed, Yusef or Yousef Ahmed and Kasim Said.
A-6961793, Aitken, Marcella Vitalini.
A-9777218, Albanese, Frank.
A-3262789, Albert, Mary (nee Teuber).
A-2541785, Albert, Anton.
A-1369863, Albu, George Vasile or Josif Toth.
A-3528892, Alfonso, Joaquina Maria Mrs. or Joaquina Maria Alfonso, formerly Fidalgo (nee Pinto); J. Maria Alfonso; Joaquina Goncalves Barroso; Joaquina Maria Pinto; Joaquinnia Alfonza; Maria Josquina Pinto; Joaquina Maria Pinto Barraso dias Fidago; Mary Alfonso; Maria Alfonso.
A-4513584, Allie, Ahmed Ben (alias Ahmed Allie alias Samuel Ben Allie).
A-5537150, Alt, Fred Willy.
A-5673027, Andrew, Peter James or Pete James Andrew or Panagiotis Demetriou Andritsakos.
A-3209-55, Andriolas, Leonidas Nick or Leonidas Andreolas.
A-6357998, Anestakis, Paraskevi or Paraskevi Kornelios Anestakis or Paraskeri Anestaki.
A-1190242, Antonelos, Alexandros Demetriou or Anthony Antonelos.
A-6397402, Antypas, William George.
A-2900070, Apergis, Konstantinos Nicolaou or Gus Pappas.
A-4874680, Arsenis, Peter Gabriel.
A-1161603, Atkinson, George.
A-4440886, Baddo, Benedicto Balais or Victor Baddu.
A-6737990, Baldini, Malania Ada (nee Tozzi).
A-5391338, Babaris, Pavlos, or Paul Felix.
A-3832721, Barberis, Vasilios or Bill Barbaris or Varvaris.
A-1771910, Bargellini, Louis.
A-3901595, Baucc, Basilio.
A-5778253, Baxter, Bessie Margaret Rosalind or Bessie Rosalind Margaret Baxter or Bessie Margaret Rosalind Durn (nee Dow).
A-6317580, Belazis, Niki Thomas or Mrs. Niki Angelopoulos Belzais (nee Niki Polyrios Angelopoulou) or Niki Belazis.
A-3760573, Benedix, Ernst Gustav.
A-6798708, Benton, Madeleine Patricia formerly Parker (nee Quick).
A-6709270, Berck, Lionel Neil.
A-4483707, Bertuccelli, Amleto.
A-1662385, Biale, Giovanni Battista or John Battista Biale or Gio Batta Biale.
A-5886141, Blanco, Mary Florence Byrne alias Mabel Blanco.
A-9795302, Bluet, Roger Gabriel Marie Maurice or Roger Gabriel Bluet.
A-4164153, Bolnavita, Zaharia.
A-4069160, Bonechi, Dante.
A-6457503, Bonime, Selma or Selma Plaschupges (nee Selma Fehl).
A-6958173, Bonner, John Herbert.
A-4941272, Bosetti, Enrico Ambrogio.
A-3498346, Bostos, Demetrios Nicholas or James Nicholas Bastos or Demetrios Nicholas.
A-6390971, Braun, Elly (nee Schlesinger).
A-4474635, Buono, Domenico Lo or Joe Costa.
A-1800618, Bursich, Louis.
A-6576275, Butkus, Antanos.
A-5040766, Caetano, Joao, Jr.
A-2691402, Campbell, Anna Mary or Anastasia Carey.
A-9559042, Carbajo, Salvador Pena.
A-6160261, Carfagna, Frank Joseph.
A-6910279, Carney, Valeria Boyle (nee Boyle).
A-4395390, Carpino, Agostino Eugenio Angelo or Carmelo Angelo Carpino or Angelo Carpino.
A-7083796, Caruso, Michael Vittorio.
A-5257495, Chamberlain, Mary Elizabeth.
A-7575864, Chan, Woon Lum or William Chan.
A-7575866, Chan, Kwan Ying Taam or Mrs. William Chan.
A-7575865, Chan, Shirley Shui-Ling.
A-6855472, Chang, Meng Ling.
A-7081472, Chang, Shurman You Hsi or You-Hsi Chang.
A-7580983, Chang, Shurman Shao Mei.
A-4279952, Chao, Fang Yu or David Chao.
A-4518181, Chao, Manual Perez.
A-709?967, Chayes, Chainine or Norman Chayes.
A-6760582, Chejfec, Nevel or Joel Chafetz.
A-5873433, Chen, Julia I. H. (Chinese name—I-Hsuan) or Julia H. Chen.
A-5726674, Chi, En Tao or Andrew Robert Chi.
A-7050354, Chin, Quong Lun.
A-5151824, Chira, Betty (nee Dweck).
A-7268982, Chounard, Janice Veronica or Janice Veronica Dunn.
A-4965336, Christensen, Charles William.
A-5833884, Christiades, Athanasios Georgiou.
A-1007342, Cintala, Andrej or Andy Cintala.
A-4356595, Coelho, Joaquim.
A-5560179, Coggins, John William.
A-6146599, Coleman, Garland Michael.
A-3891055, Conlon, Matthew.
A-7049117, Contogiannis, Constantinos Demetrios.
A-3675543, Cornelius, Margaret (nee Nicholson), formerly Steacy.
A-4504050, Dan, Eng Suey or Suey Eng or Edward Eng.
A-4105803, Dantas, Alberto.
A-7203444, De Lisa, Velia.
A-5406233, Demouchikos, John Nicholas or John Nick Dimos or Ioannia Demouchikos or John Nick Demouchikos or Ioannia Nicolaos Demouchikos.
A-3251192, De Barros, Antonio Rodrigues or Antonio Rodrigues.
A-6153523, De Mandelbaum, Carmen Rickards or Carmen R. Mandelbaum; Carmen Rickards Mandelbaum.
A-6813667, De Martini, Rosa Victoria.
A-3046685, De Martino, Pasquale.
A-3126180, De Mergel, Maria Lunar (nee Lunar).
A-7050741, De Olmedo, Guadalupe Sevilla or Inez Garcia.
A-3662123, De Pirro, Filippo or Lilippo De Pisso.
A-5959320, De Winne, Vitale or Vital De Winne also known as August De Winne.
A-4502595, Diamantakis, Maria (nee Maria Papageorgiu).
A-1364906, Di Costanzo, Lucy (nee Trani) or Lucy Trany.
A-3852007, Dock, Lee or Dock Lee.
A-5529780, Donohue, Alexandra (nee Trzetrzewinski) or Alexandra Trzet.
A-6741596, Dorenfeld, Lola (nee Lola Elainbaum).
A-4417414, Dos Santos, Agostinho Goncalves or Augustino Santos.
A-6676366, Dracius, Raphael Anatole.
A-7599638, Durantini, Caterina Alice.
A-4947782, Economou, Vasilios Alexandrou or Basil Alexander Economou.
A-7203604, Edquid, Uldarico M. or Uldarico Maatubang Edquid.
A-7203603, Edquid, Ludivino M. or Ludivino Maatubank Edquid.
A-7203601, Edquid, Ida Ruth M. or Ida Ruth Maatubang Edquid.
A-7188365, Eide, Inger Else.
A-6246412, Elefther, Sofia.
A-3403559, Eng, Bee.
A-6261634, Etimos, Martha (nee Koudjari or Kotzaria).
A-6840137, Etimos, Mary.
A-3493248, Evenson, Olav Arthur or Arthur Boyd.
A-3370301, Fabio, Carmelo or Charles or Charlie Fabio.
A6738370, Fabrizio, Anna Maria (nee Cappelletta).
A-6651932, Fait, Josef Ferdinand or Josef F. Fait or Josef Fait.
A-6821621, Fait, Eliska or Eliska Freiberg.
A-7079681, Farhat, Mansour.
A-5142947, Fatovic, Ante.
A-5124482, Fernandez, John or John Fernandez Marino.
A-4931665, Ferenz, John.
A-4185448, Fernandez, Pilar (nee Rodriguez).
A-5204552, Ferri, Domingo Pinar.
A-5683153, Fikaris, Constantinos or Costas or Gust Fikaris.
A-6486998, Filipovic, Frank or Franjo.
A-5244846, Finando, Yetta (nee Feiga Yenta Kalich) or Feiga Yetta Tuch.
A-1179300, Fischl, Anna (nee Weissberger).
A-4920771, Fong, Woo Lan or Woo Lang Fong (Shee).
A-5107266, Fontana, Adelino or Leo Fontana.
A-3694110, Fook, Wong or Fook Wong.
A-4919356, Fragakis, Gerasimos George or Jerry Fragakis.
A-2326918, Fragkias, Jerry or Gerassimos Gragkias.
A-6505233, Franczoz, Emery or Emeric or Imre Franczos or Moishe or Mirko or Imre Franczoz.
A-6505227, Franczoz, Ireni (nee Menczer) or Irene Franczoz or Franczos.
A-6828309, Fuller, Stanley William.
A-6163652, Funk, Clementina Fidela (nee Clementina Fidela Cuyugan).
A-5243083, Galatolo, Armando.
A-6044645, Galos, William Ernest or Emanuel Galos or William Emanuel Galos or William Ernest Mastrosoff or Kobeliachenko.
A-4532091, Geller, Louis or Liepe Celler.
A-7083777, German, Philip Zaker.
A-6495830, Gevorkian, Vazgen or Gevorgian (alias Vazgen Nazar-Begian).
A-3866024, Glinos, John.
A-1245466, Goldstein, Fred or Fritz Goldstein or Fritz Goldstone.
A-3610193, Gomes, Anthony Lopes or Anthony Santos Gomes or Antonio Gomes or Anthony Santos and Antonio Santos.
A-3792106, Goo, Oy Lin Lam or Lam Oy Lin or Oy Ling Lum.
A-6799266, Grabner, Katherine Siha or Katherine Siha.
A-6690075, Graiman, Helen or Helene Slobotzki.
A-5954836, Gralak, Ludwig or Ludwik Gralak.
A-3054760, Gray, John William.
A-3237203, Greer, Thomas Anthony.
A-7222258, Grimes, Francis or Francois Scherer.
A-5280985, Grivich, Ivan or John Grivich.
A-5049393, Grumberg, Romuald Peter or Roman Peter Eilers.
A-4792060, Hafenbraedl, Otto or Charles Hafenbraedl.
A-6502870, Halberstam, Janka (nee Janka Ungar).
A-9144350, Hamiga, Franciszek.
A-6042315, Hanacik, Anna (nee Barvir).
A-7601609, Harlow, Constantine or Constantin Harlow.
A-3398080, Hart, Ida Miriam (nee Schwartz).
A-7741274, Haynie, Ann Feng or Anna Budich.
A-6989369, Heathorn, George Alfred or George Alfred Heath.
A-7525841, Helm, Betty Stucken.
A-6261619, Heropoulos, Galliope (nee Mavromatis).
A-5016580, Hewitt, Barbara.
A-7251784, Hill, Aarne Allan or Aarne Allan Jaakkola.
A-3019321, Hiltunen, Anna.
A-4223203, Hing, Leung, Wai or Leung Shee.
A-3843187, Chow, Chan Fung or F. C. Chan or Chan Chow Ming.
A-3421389, Holmsten, Sylvia Suleima (nee Harma).

A-9574471, Holst, Prehen Wilhelm.
A-6920809, Hondas, John.
A-3066243, Hong, Sheng Hwa or Hung or Wesley Sheng.
A-5740977, Hong, Florence Fung Yee Wong (nee Fung Yee Wong).
A-5371149, Horngacher, Hedwig Magdalena or Sister Mary Blanka Horngacher.
A-4948589, Howlett, John Joseph.
A-4949207, Huff, Bertha Isabella or Bertha Isabella Hanna.
A-4829032, Huneke, Nikolaus.
A-1145007, Hurtl, Frank Anthony or Franz Anton Hurtl, Frank Anton Hurtl or Frank Anthony Xavier Hurtl, Frank Hurtdle.
A-1187113, Hyuck, Choy Lung or Choy Long Hyuck or Hugh L. Choy.
A-3237648, Iwanaga, Toshio.
A-6652953, Jakobowicz, Rosalia or Rozalia Jakobowitz or Rosalia Buxbaum or Rozalia Menczer.
A-7081613, Janner, Maria Hubertina.
A-4068105, Janssenes, Michael.
A-7127705, Jelsovsky, Karl or Carl Heinz or Carl Heinz Jelsovsky or Heinz Henninger or Karl Heinz Henninger.
A-6862515, Jepeway, Marie or Marie Salim De Miguel.
A-1441431, Jianakas, Epaminonoas Zenophone or Peter Jianakas.
A-4349998, Johannsen, Emil Peter.
A-4949774, Johnson, Lempi Alexandra Koskinen.
A-4751308, Johnson, Martha Irene or Martha Irene Miskala.
A-5399796, Junus, Jeff.
A-6258288, Juul, Poul Tage.
A-9799503, Kadlec, Edward Laurence.
A-3511268, Kaliszczuk, Onofry or Fred Kallin or Otto Fred Kallin.
A-7188278, Kamp, Gisela Mertins or Gisela Kamp Mertins.
A-1984087, Kane, Sara or Sale Kane.
A-3282333, Kaps, Frank alias Frank Capps (alias Kapsch alias Capsch).
A-7130272, Kaptzan, Ariadna.
A-5065624, Karas, Dora or Dnora Karasik.
A-3321122, Karavolos, Stavros Nicolau (alias Steve Nicolau Karavolos).
A-5916574, Karlsen, Karl Bjorn.
A-9663171, Karnavouras, Michael.
A-4284828, Karnuts, John.
A-3876266, Karnuts, Elizabeth (nee Kiss).
A-1895336, Katikas, Christos Nicolau.
A-5038520, Katona, Laszlo (or Louis).
A-5633270, Katsimpiris, Nickolaos Michael or Nick Fadis.
A-1393507, Katz, Dorothy or Dwojra Katz or Kora Katz (nee Dorothy Mandelbaum).
A-6347259, Katzias, Concepcion (nee Linares).
A-7140301, Kee, Yip Hon or Hon Yip or Hon Kee Yip.
A-5335599, Kegyes, John or Janos Kegyes.
A-6716722, Kekenak, Steve.
A-6009275, Khodabandeh, Mostafa.
A-3284953, Kim, Lucia or Ryang Kim.
A-6145917, King, Patricia Biel (nee Patricia Biel).
A-7736558, Kircan, Rasit.
A-5359485, Klimm, Basilius.
A-3558777, Koltz, Harry.
A-5157018, Komar, Julianna.
A-5130827, Koplowitz, Bertha formerly Miller formerly Wachman (nee Grabovsky).
A 9545100, Kopassakis, Emmanuel Xenophon or Emmanuel Xenophon Copassakis or Kopassis, or Kopasakis.
A-1122763, Koprowski, Boleslaw Karol or Boleslaw Koprowski.
A-4345827, Korman, John.
A-5137819, Kornis, Louis or Louis E. Kornis.
A-7222416, Koulianos, Theofilos or Theofilos Coulianos or Teddy Koulos.
A-3684843, Kozas, Semon or James Alexander Cozano.
A-2880774, Kremke, Harry Herman.
A-5505097, Kremmydas, Panagiotis or Panagiotis Krommydas or Panagiotis Grommydas or Panagiote Crommidas or Peter Dallas or Pete Dallas.
A-3025719, Kuchta, John.
A-5234321, Kuhle, Arnold John or John J. Purvishk.
A-5589982, Krause, Elizabeth Pauline or Elizabeth Pauline Kuhle or Elizabeth Paula Purvishk.
A-4528748, Kukkanen, Lydia.
A-5275512, Kushigemachi, Suyekichi.
A-6763383, Kuypers, Corstinus.
A-2449614, Kuypers, Jannetje Maria (nee De Groot).
A-4349542, Kwan, Hai Lu or Harry Lu Kwan.
A-5028506, Kwan, Siu Ying Hou or Susan Kwan or Susan Y. Kwan.
A-1289859, Kyriakides, Costas or Costas Papazoglou or Gus Pappras.
A-4508155, Labaro, Raffaele.
A-3707772, Labos, De Devenyi Rajmond or Raymond Labos or Raymond Von Labos.
A-2194854, Labrinidis, Ioannis Michael or John Lambros or John Michael Lambros or Michael Lambros or Ioannis Michael Lamprinidis or Ioannis Lamprinidis.
A-4144162, Lacono, Federico.
A-1417553, Lanahas, Nickalos.
A-6676346, Lande, Sevine (nee Serine Skeie).
A-7084939, Lang, Gudrun Margarete.
A-5191791, Langa, Michel or Michel Langas or Mike Langa.
A-1121428, Langemyr, Knut or Knute Langmuir.
A-4269828, Lannou, Jean Herve Marie or John Lannou.
A-5441581, Lauridsen, Halvor Norup.
A-4414522, Laux, Rosine Katherina (nee Seitz).
A-9799330, Laynas, John George.
A-5253289, Lee, Bessie Pi-Yun or Bessie Pi Yun Wang (maiden name).
A-9765299, Lee, Bor or Lee Bor Cheung.
A-3336117, Leon, Emanuel Constantin or Emanuel Constantinou Leontopoulos.
A-2150253, Lewinski, John Stanislaw.
A-7068990, Lewis, Guilhermina Mendonca Toledo.
A-4892573, Lione, Edward John or Edoardo Giovanni Lione.
A-5267443, Liptak, Andrew.
A-3935383, Lo, Shih Ting or Steven Lo.
A-6867963, Loftus, Larry Arthur.
A-7092277, Long, Danny Boyd or Danny Boyd or Danny Boyd Vaubell.
A-4883409, Longolius, Conrad Rudolf.
A-6921120, Lordt, Antoine Leon.
A-3836853, Losada, Manuel Fraga.
A-5196440, Lourbacos, Petros or Pete or Peter Lourbacos.
A-3428707, Lourenco, Jose Maria.
A-5916063, Malliaroudakis, Constantinos Pericles or Kostas Pericles Malliaroudakis or Gust Malliaroudakis.
A-3349959, Mallon, Sarah Jane (nee Devlin).
A-2645007, Manalis, Constantinos or Gus Manalis.
A-4706257, Maniatis, Constantinos or Gus Manos.
A-7083491, Mantzaris, George or Georgios Mantzaris.
A-4027807, Manzino, Torino Hugo.
A-4845930, Mariotti, Anelio.
A-4516836, Mark, August George or August Mark.
A-3436330, Markarian, Markar.
A-3500860, Martin, Andrew or Andras Marton.
A-4025266, Martinez, Antonio Gonzalez.
A-6661338, Marttinen, Lea Mirjam.
A-6661330, Marttinen, Risto Kullervo.
A-6661337, Marttinen, Hannu Matti.
A-6661336, Marttinen, Pekke.
A-7203781, Mascarinas, Arturo or Arturo Ando.
A-7203782, Mascarinas, Antonio or Antonio Ando.
A-3803609, Matsuba, Shige.
A-3413681, Mattera, John or Giovanni Mattera.
A-3360760, Matura, Marijan.
A-7145885, Mazzone, Giuseppina Pala.
A-7049500, Mekjian, Dikranoi or Dikranoi Semizoglu.
A-2362402, Metaxas, Gerasimos Agourias or Jerry Mataxes.
A-4724981, Micko, Stefan.
A-5009846, Milcetich, Peter or Peter or Pete Miller.
A-3036784, Milisis, John.
A-3493407, Miller, Aino Johanna or Aino Johanna Matsel (nee Kolemainen).
A-6415774, Miller, Eugenie Gabrielle Fuynel (nee Eugenie Gabrielle Guynel).
A-6415773, Miller, Charlotte Jennifer.
A-6742024, Milrod, Izrael.
A-7092040, Milrod, Lydia Ruth.
A-2571918, Moi, Jung Yin or Teddy Moi.
A-2982568, Moi, Goon Shee or Wai Ying.
A-6010467, Monzo, Jessie Leaetta (nee Alexandra or De Alexandra).
A-4040538, Morales, Matilde or Matilde Torre.
A-7203774, Morrow, Maria or Maria Morariu.
A-7203794, Moschos, Nick John or Nicolaos John Moschos.
A-2398946, Moy, Shee Tong.
A-5946330, Muller, Eugenia.
A-3837483, Musial, Hans Erich Kurt or Hans Peschkow or Erick Musial.
A-5317545, Musiu, Mihail Johan or Mike Johns or John Michael or Mihail Joan Musi.
A-6923076, McCutcheon, Grace (nee Grace Steinmetz).
A-4635079, Napoleoni, Maria Palma.
A-4032775, Neider, Edward Julius or Edort Julius Neider.
A-3621598, Nicolescu, Traian or Dan or Daniel Nicholas or Dan Nicolescu or Floria Bergian.
A-1126088, Nicosia, Gaetano or David C. Marsano.
A-7527958, Noxon, Anne Wookdridge.
A-4726441, Nunes, Serafino Da Rocha.
A-6925755, Oaks, Eugene Vernon.
A-6316253, O'Connor, Earle Robin.
A-7178580, Odenbach, Rolf Dieter.
A-7200144, Olmer, Joseph or Joseph Morris Olmer.
A-2521766, On, Law (How) Duck or Wilbur Hall.
A-2279204, Haw (How), So Woon Ying or Susie Hall (nee So Woon Ying).
A-3563377, Ortoljo, Math of Matthew or Matthew John Ortoljo.
A-4056004, Orzea, Candit or Orzia or John Orzea.
A-7115536, Oseguera, Karl or Karl Vizvari.
A-5602910, Otamendi, Maria or Sister Marta.
A-2934218, Ozaki, Yoshio (nee Toshiyo Miyano).
A-7767272, Ozdizdar, Hamdi Hasan.
A-5524682, Paasuke, August Richard.
A-4125236, Pagano, Aniello.
A-2457076, Page, Albert Joseph.
A-3871266, Pagoulatos, Jerasimos or Jerry Pagoulatos
A-7222516, Panagakos, Dimitra or Dimitra Nicholas Selimou (maiden name).
A-6482587, Panagopoulos, Eugene.
A-4082705, Pangos, Eugenio.
A-3085849, Pantazis, John Nicholas or John Pantazis.
A-9777311, Papadakis, Nicolaos.
A-7117540, Papademas, Charalambos (alias Bob).
A-9505138, Papadopoulos, Stefanos.
A-3544491, Papoutsis, George.
A-5734016, Paris, May Estelle.
A-4363160, Pastor, Charles Emil (alias Karaly Emeil Pastor).
A-4501417, Patterson, John.

A-4129552, Pejko, Joseph or Jozef or Joe Baker.
A-4212645, Pelechata, Anna.
A-6839278, Perdew, Blanche Sophie Ghilsiane or Blanche Sophie Ghlisiane De Vriendt.
A-9561382, Perez, Andres or Andrew Perez.
A-1565944, Pessl, Eric.
A-3817284, Peters, Benjamin or Peter Benjamin and Samuel Anderson.
A-3451259, Petrator, Peter or Petros Petratos.
A-2556975, Petratos, Peter Panagiotis.
A-5598847, Petrowsky, Emil Edouard Bernhard or Emil Werner.
A-1125876, Phasoulakes, Eustratios Michel or George Fasalakis or Fassalakis or George Michael Fasalakis or Fassalakis.
A-6589456, Pihala, Kaiho Marjatta (nee Valo).
A-6569457, Pihala, Kauko Einar or Kauko Einar Riuttanen.
A-2073410, Ping, Poon Shut (Mrs. George Fung).
A-4706265, Plagmann, Max or Michael or Michale Lewis.
A-4388693, Pochert, Emil Herman.
A-7003110, Polselli, Federico or Frederick Polselli.
A-6771537, Posantzis, Vasilios Homer.
A-6924081, Poulios, Theodore.
A-6217721, Prester, Julio.
A-3543489, Prochaska, Nora Zweybruck or Nora Editha Ernestine Prochaska.
A-7203353, Quinagon, Fely or Fely Guzman Quinagon formerly Felipa Reyes.
A-7203352, Quinagon, Maurice or Maurice Guzman Quinagon formerly Mauricio Guzman Reyes or Mauricio Amador Reyes.
A-3632442, Quinn, James Hannick.
A-5188632, Racenstein, Harry or Harry Ratzenstein.
A-1275470, Raftopoulos, Deoneseos Socrates or Dennis Raftis.
A-5114083, Ramiene, Chana (nee Epstein) or Chana Ramm.
A-4366566, Ramos, Carlos Gumsindo.
A-9580343, Rasmussen, Erik Aage.
A-6970209, Rasofsky, Ladislav or Larry Rush.
A-5314172, Raypert, Stanislawa (nee Kowalski).
A-1247190, Reeves, Clara Brandon (nee Morrison) or Clara Lewis Erandon Reeves.
A-6887362, Reid, Irma Maria or Serena Irma Maria Reid.
A-4082754, Reitz, Margaret Kunst or Margaret Schmidt.
A-6921469, Rekow, Christine Kay.
A-5803209, Riley, Harry Edward (alias Harry Edward Bull).
A-4817858, Rinaldi, Antonio.
A-7070752, Rivera-Medrano, Augusto.
A-4307763, Robles, Gregorio Laciste.
A-5890431, Roig, Juan Jose Balta Seller.
A-5154920, Rose, Ramiro.
A-4829114, Rosovich, Emil Zebo or Eusebio Rosovich.
A-7140438, Rossbacher, Ingeborg Gerda.
A-3866831, Roussos, John.
A-2199705, Ruckdeschel, August Franz.
A-7264094, Ruppert, Peter Karl or Peter Karl Ruppert Jones.
A-7264095, Ruppert, Kurt or Kurt Ruppert Jones.
A-1819037, Russo, Francesco or Frank Russo.
A-3971558, Rytkonen, Waino Heikki.
A-3639497, Sabaija, Joseph or Josip.
A-7085229, Sagner, Karin Monica Eliese.
A-5720260, Sakaguchi, Namie or Namie Saruwatari.
A-4525969, Sakamoto, Shonosuke or Frank Sakamoto.
A-4855886, Sakamoto, Koito.
A-5749141, Sandberg, Gustaf Adolf.
A-9702346, Sandnes, Rolf George.
A-5885559, Sang, Ho or Sang Ho or Ho Tin Sik.
A-2890222, Sanles, Ricardo Santos or Diamontino Almeira Campos.
A-6711698, Santini, Enrico Enio.
A-3209614, Sardis, Eleftherios Nicholas.
A-5111935, Schaefer, Reinhardt.
A-5388287, Schaefer, William Erich or Willi Erich Schaefer or Willie E. Schaefer or Eriche Max Willy Schaefer.
A-4381292, Schonfeld, Isidor.
A-5985477, Schultz, Helena (nee Pawlak).
A-4553340, Schwalie, Barbara.
A-3405484, Schwulera, Ida (nee Kommorowski).
A-1978517, Scibetta, Josephine or Giuseppa or Giuseppina Scibetta or Schibetta (nee Perrone or Perrune or Hrrone).
A-5329509, Seemann, Rudolf.
A-5475209, Seitzer, Catherine (nee Appinel) formerly Brett.
A-1966918, Shadrina, Agreppina Terentievna.
A-6216427, Shee, Der Lee.
A-5120812, Sheung, Chan Lai or Evelyn Jiu.
A-5870139, Silinonte, Giuseppe or Joseph or Giuseppe or Joseph Silinunte or Silinunte or Silimonte or Selinonte or Selimunte or Selimonte or Selinunte or De Girolomo or Muffolette or Muoletta or Mouletta or Nuffolette or Monte.
A-6032827, Simhon, Enrique, or Entique Simhon Cohen.
A-7719736, Skellas, Stefanos.
A-1459289, Sklavounos, Aggelos or Angelo Sklavos.
A-2561863, Smith, Stephen Klar.
A-6187108, Souza, Mary Alice Kim or Mary Alice Souze Kim or Mary Alice Kim.
A-3555511, Spathari, Antonio.
A-5571492, Nitas, Antonios Speridon or Evangelos Stelatos.
A-4411288, Spicjarich, John.
A-4054497, Spithogiannis, Lambros Konstantine or Louis Spittas.
A-6623448, Steinfeld, Paul.
A-6623449(Steinfeld, Ruzena (nee Herzog), alias Roise or Rosalie Herzog.
A-7247857, Stephan, Irene Jerome or Irene Nicolaou Stefanitsis (maiden name).
A-3372820, Stenger, Michael.
A-3269664, Stulman, Max, or Norbert Max Stulmann.
A-9522398, Sundstrum, Karl Hjalmar.
A-5359125, Svevar, Axel Lennart Waldemar or Axel Svevar.
A-7197893, Switzeny, Peter Klaus.
A-7197894, Switzeny, Leonora.
A-2442047, Syvertsen, Bernt Johan or Bert Johan Syvertsen.
A-9777416, Szczepski, Walenty or Valentine Szczepski.
A-5628354, Sze, Manuel, or Sze Chiu Wah or Sze Chiu Hua.
A-4261394, Takahashi, Iku.
A-2891028, Tang, Kwok Cho or Danny Tang.
A-7604862, Tang, Marguerite Zing-Tsung or Mrs. Zubin Percy Tang.
A-7604864, Tang, Zubin Percy.
A-7604861, Tang, Mina.
A-1370061, Tanikawa, Masahi or Tadashi Tanikawa.
A-4909619, Teachman, Brame Jay or Teackman or Ben Teachman.
A-3300712, Terecido, Ramon Deus or Ramon Deus.
A-4301512, Terpich, Romano Dominic or Romano Terpich.
A-9559475, Throbjornsen, Arne Thorlef.
A-5905102, Toralballa, Leopoldo Vasquez.
A-5379958, Toralballa, Gloria (nee Cortes).
A-4652.74, Torcello Rodulfo.
A-5972551, Traquena, Apriano Marques.
A-6145977, Trenah, Purificacion Nabong.
A-4032321, Tsang, Betty Ling or Shu Hsieng Tsang (nee Ling) or Elixabeth Simpson Ling.
A-1056611, Tsang, Sien Moo or Seymour.
A-5873471, Tsien, Virginia or Cho Ing or Virginia C. Tsien.
A-3416836, Tsikouris, Helen or Helen Gatis Tsikouris or Helen Kouskoutis.
A-4495399, Tsikouris, Ioannis or John Tsikouris or Giovannis Kachias or John Nicolaou Kakias or John Chekouris.
A-5248482, Tyler, Bertha Drewett or Bertha Tyler.
A-6346545, Vaccaro, Alida Margaretha (nee Martens) formerly Gravesteyn.
A-6970152, Vago, Isabella Natalina.
A-4120108, Valentis, Jacovoa or Jacobos Valentis or Jacovos J. Valentis.
A-9739379, Vanenburg, Jules Armand.
A-6094783, Varian, Maria Franco.
A-6094785, Varian, Morris Franco.
A-6094786, Varian, Terestia Franco.
A-6094787, Varian, Helen Franco.
A-6806886, Vecere, Maria Maddalena or Placentra or Peluso (nee Sevilla).
A-6173909, Ver, Paz Silva.
A-4095062, Veta, Benedetto.
A-9625152, Vigorita, Gaetano or Thomas Vigorita.
A-4319801, Visnjak, George Philip or George Visnjak.
A-6701189, Wagner, Gisele Marie Therese or Gisela Wagner.
A-4532548, Warnack, Fritz Johann.
A-5026668, Wegelius, Lennart.
A-6383530, Weintraub, Stanislaus.
A-5225571, Weiss, John or John or Janos Weiss.
A-5294022, Weller, John.
A-7197925, Wellner, Christine Doris.
A-3099209, Weskis, Johannes.
A-6920066, Wiest, Harold Henri.
A-2088278, Wilkinson, Maurice Finbar.
A-6723783, Williamson, James Oliver or John James Peters.
A-2599271, Wincup, Charles Christopher.
A-4800918, Wing, Ching or Hing Ching or Jimmie Hing.
A-7145748, Woods, Synnove or Synnove Pedersen or Synnove Pedersen Woods.
A-3588100, Wujcik, Paul or Wujick.
A-3583105, Wujcik, Frances or Wujick (nee Slawak).
A-4322153, Yaco (Jaco) Ymrich or Emrich or Imrich or Yatsko, Emrich.
A-2411482, Yamicic, Josef or Joseph Yamich.
A-3726892, Yau, Lam Chai or Walter Lum or Lum Chai You (alias Walter Lam or Lam San Ping).
A-5363278, Yokoya, Yoshi or Sei Cho or Shiqu Ono or Yoshi Mori or Toshi Toyoshima.
A-7203690, Young, Choy Shie or Choy Sie Young or Choy Yong.
A-9687179, Yeun, Wong or Wong Yun.
A-1344004, Yunger, Anna Steibel or Anna Kirch (maiden name).
A-2383005, Zainudin, Yousuf or Esouf Jainodin or Eusoof Jainoo.
A-5819992, Zamparo, Frank or Francesco Zamparo.
A-5292396, Zanicos, Kyriakos.
A-2795128, Zolas, Astghik formerly Boyadjian (nee Hatabian).
A-7011519, Zolas, Edward.
A-7011518, Zolas, Astghik Fimi.
A-4043587, Zorilla, Jesus Aparicio or Jesus Zorilla or Zorrilla.
A-7598245, Mora y Gonzales, Isidoro Felipe de.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 13, strike the registration number and name:
"A-3760573, Benedix, Ernest Gustav."
On page 9, line 6, strike the registration number and name:
"A-5243083, Galatolo, Armando."
On page 11, lines 8 and 9, strike the registration number and name:
"A-5371149, Horngacher, Hedwig Magdalena or Sister Mary Blanka Horngacher."
On page 23, line 2, strike the registration number and name:
"A-5885559, Sang, Ho or Sang Ho or Ho Tin Sik."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 10.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than six months:

A-2045097, Abalo, Celestino or George Abalo or Celestine Aballe.

A-5706398, Ackerman, Zelda (nee Schneider).

A-4158873, Agaccio, Edmondo Giuseppe or Edmondo Joseph Agaccio or Joe Agaccio or Edmondo Ogaccio.

A-5310181, Akiyama, Sur iyuki or Stanley Akiyama.

A-7112346, Allen, Arthur Albert (alias Albert, Allen).

A-6719955, Almaz, Paul Salin.

A-3311107, Alves, Jose Lino.

A-4736061, Anagnostidis, Constantin Emanuel or Gustav or Constantin Emannel or Constantin Emanuel Efstratadis or Lorenz Melarand or Milerand.

A-744135, Angelaras, Dimetrios.

A-5373734, Angeles, Lopez, Augustine George (Jorge) or Agustine Angeles Comacho or Augustine George Angeles.

A-7081526, Angelopoulous, John or John Angel.

A-5183849, Arakaki, Taro or Isamu Okamura.

A-9777123, Baches, Loukas or Lucas Bachas.

A-5147731, Backhaus, Elizabeth or Elizabeth Hartman or Elizabeth Vogel or Elizabeth Klein.

A-4548118, Backhaus, Joseph or Joseph Klein.

A-5665084, Badamo, Giuseppe or Joseph.

A-6315183, Ballis, Constantin Stavros.

A-4443905, Ballis, Helen Constantine (nee Andrews or Andriou).

A-5952407, Ballis, Kimon or Cimon Constantin.

A-6867159, Barbieri, Giorgio Angelo.

A-6732354, Barbosa-Ramos, Rosendo (alias Roberto Rodriguez).

A-7083924, Barone, Antonio or Tony Barone.

A-7083924, Barone, Antonio or Tony Barone.

A-7776922, Nathalie, Velmo or Bascome (nee Joell).

A-6984660, Bastoni, Albertina Fosca (nee Mariotti).

A-6322088, Beck, Redvers Howard, or Redvers Howard Simpson.

A-6322087, Beck, Margaret Elizabeth (nee Gazzard), formerly Simpson.

A-3923566, Bekrakis, John.

A-6911160, Belvedere, Vittorio.

A-5261578, Berry, Robert Duncan.

A-2818969, Bertoglio, Giacomo (alias Pete Bertoglio).

A-7197804, Bestani, Mohamed Adib Amine.

A-4723723, Bladt, Michael, or Mikal Bledt.

A-4083331, Blais, Marie Madelaine (nee Gagne).

A-6706400, Bodfish, George aka Juergen Kantor.

A-6887476, Bonati, Richard Joseph.

A-9777127, Bonello, Anthony.

A-9533410, Boot, Anton.

A-3883407, Bottino, Mariano.

A-7070343, Boules, Antonios Michael.

A-6438769, Bove, Fulvia Teresa (or Theresa) (nee Capuana) or Sylvia Capulano.

A-3790584, Bravo, Thomas Amorin.

A-3469669, Bregant, Francis Charles, or Franz or Frank Bregant.

A-4015777, Brown, Jack.

A-7140108, Brussee, Wietske Van Der Goot.

A-7240575, Buchinnick, Harri, or Harry Kitz.

A-7178460, Buono, Giuseppe, or Joseph Buono or Jose Buono.

A-7278601, Butterfield, Jean Donald.

A-2072584, Cacerez, Saturnino Rodriguez.

A-4394545, Calcanides, Sofia (nee Christoforides).

A-7029003, Calcanides, Despina.

A-1078605, Careklas, Orestes George, or Oreste Carecias.

A-5310708, Carinos, Emanuel, or Emmanuel or Emanuel Karinos.

A-6971651, Caropreso, Virginio, or Virginio Rocco Antonio Caropreso.

A-5293002, Carrieri, Raffasle (alias Ralph Carrieri).

A-3505946, Caruana, Carlo.

A-3347257, Castagna, Pietro.

A-2668695, Cavallaro, Ilario.

A-7618927, Chang, Cheng Shu Wang.

A-1459989, Charbides, Evdochia (nee Mimopoulos).

A-1775243, Charron, William Joseph.

A-4459707, Chen, Man Chu.

A-5229612, Chen, Shou Heng Chue.

A-7030751, Chen, Fung-Cheung, or Francis Feng-Hsiang Chen.

A-7030752, Chen, Raymond Fung-Chu or Fung Chu-Chen.

A-1015199, Chengges, Louis or Elias Dimitrius Chenggas or Cheggis or Tsengges.

A-3574562, Chengges, Christina or Christina Louis Chegges or Cheggis or Tsengges.

A-6028159, Chiang, Huai-Chang.

A-6028156, Chiang, Zoh-Ing (nee Shen).

A-7171734, Chin, James Chee or Wing Chin (Chan).

A-4210249, Chinchefas, Michael Constantino.

A-6355300, Chryssikos, Paul Nicholas or Paul Nicolas Chryssicos.

A-7606579, Chuan, Raymond Lu-Po.

A-3566305, Clarizio, Saverio or Sam.

A-4454594, Clasoff, Elia Dimitroff or Ilija Dimeff Klasoff or Dimovich or Lewie Dimitroff.

A-4577197, Cohen, Frances (alias Frances Kneeter).

A-4422287, Colombos, John or Ioannis Colombos.

A-6639637, Constantinides, Eugenia Savvas or Eugenia Savva (nee Eugenia Evangelou Pagonis).

A-6998281, Costas, Elpiniki or Elpiniki Petros Giannopoulou.

A-6694937, Crowder, Gertrude Agnes or Jerabek.

A-2119529, Czerniawska, Anna.

A-6899247, Daniel, Suzanne Olga or Suzanne Olga Mornaghini.

A-2918394, Daras, Gerasimos Anastassias or Gerasimos Daras or Jerry or Geris or Gerry Daras or Darros.

A-5557874, Darinskas, Bernardas or Ben Darin.

A-3465828, D'Arpino, Arcangelo.

A-5362108, Da Silva, Agostinho Ferreira or Manuel Maria.

A-1563596, Da Silva, Alfred Alves.

A-6159617, Daughenbaugh, Edith Cecilia Lopez or Eddit Lopez.

A-6718188, Davis, Aglaia Constintin Stafilas or Aglaia Constantin Stafilas.

A-4168731, Dawson, William Rudeman or William Rudman Dawson.

A-5470962, Dawson, Constance Beatrice.

A-6200600, Debney, Audrey Rennie.

A-6839756, De Carvalho, Manuel Cordeiro

A-5215233, De Covello, Vincent Scotto or Scotto, Vincent.

A-3869583, Deftereos, Nicholas John or Nicholas J. Deftereos or Nicholaos Deftereos or Nicholas Thefteros or Nick Defterios or Nick Defterion.

A-3504230, Del Greco, Dino or Danny.

A-1415099, Dell'Aquila, Pasquale.

A-5410408, De Mammos, Maria, formerly Maria Eichvald (nee Maria Amers).

A-5981624, De Seaton, Celia Torres or Celia Torres Villanueva or Celia Villanueva de Seaton or Celia Villanueva de Espinoza.

A-6535879, De Wit, Louis Charles.

A-9749370, Diamandopoulos, Eustache.

A-5417653, Di Carlo, Francesco or Frank Di Carlo.

A-4083381, Di Filippi, Antonino.

A-7049191, Di Meo, Gennaro.

A-5096248, Dimoff, Pete or Pando Eftimovich.

A-2174286, Dittiger, John Caspar or John Dittiger.

A-4360055, Dobrocky, Michael.

A-3896350, D'Oliveira, Manuel.

A-6839754, Dorizas Katina Michalopoulos (nee Katina Michalopoulos).

A-6261646, Doukis, Ourania S. (nee Ouranis Sahinis or Ourania Doukis or Ourania Doukis).

A-5353927, Drivas, George J. or Georgios Drivas or George John Drivas.

A-2212407, Du Theodora Sumner Hsu.

A-3269969, Dugdale, Ernest or Thomas Dugdale.

A-2185752, Dunat, Kuzman or Cosman Dunat.

A-6999680, Duvekot, Taetske (nee Van Der Helde aka Thea Duvekot).

A-9799328, Edwards, Alfred James.

A-7145332, Elfant, Zelman.

A-2531836, Esposito, Crescenzo or Christie or Prunk.

A-7284898, Ewing, Ernest Aleck or Ernest Aleck Kleeman.

A-7284899, Ewing, Monika Margot or Monika Margot Kleeman.

A-7188325, Fafalios, Spiros or Spiros Leonida Fafalios.

A-6979990, Farga, Soledad Maria Comparro formerly known as Soledad Maria Camporro or Soledad Camporro Alonso.

A-9652011, Fernandez, Manuel Ben or Manuel Ben.

A-7049254, Ferell, Alvan Sigfrid or Alvar Sigfrid Carlson.

A-1437306, Ferrugia, Charles.

A-6526172, Finkelstein, Benjamin or Benjamin Finkelsztejn.

A-6596017, Fisch, Esther or Esther Persiner.

A-7197054, Follet, Claude Jean Rene.

A-7197055, Follet, Guy.

A-5307372, Frank, Ernest or Ernst Stopsack.

A-7089739, Fricioni, Giuseppina (nee Ballerini).

A-5966205, Frost, Joseph or "Joe" Frost or Meroski or Marawske or Muryczka.

A-4016360, Fucco, Pasquale.

A-6389940, Fuchs, Alexander.

A-6389941, Fuchs, Serena (nee Serena Zoldan).

A-7081487, Fut, Lim Yun.

A-4506474, Garcia, Geronimo or Geronimo Garcia Nieves.

A-6972499, Garcia, Jesus Dopazo or Jesus Dopazo or De Paso.

A-9782964, Garcia, Jose Lago or Jose Garcia Lago or Lago Jose Garcia.

A-6879782, Gatsios, Panagiotis.

A-6879783, Gatsios, Olga.

A-7209333, Gavitt, Ethel May (nee Leane).

A-2405954, Georgopoulos, Konstantin Gerasimos or Jerry Gregory.

A-5558841, Giancarli, Sarah E. or Serafina Emilia Giancarli (nee Mattioli).

A-4495632, Giardina, Serafina Cascio.

A-4185674, Ginters Emma Emilia (nee Stuipe).

A-9777433, Gioulis, Constantinos Michael.

A-5112884, Glass, Rachel Anna nee Neumark or Rae Glass.

A-5564869, Glenos, Athanasios Demetrios or Tom Glenos.

A-6800343, Goldberg, Sophie or Sophie Goldenberg.

A-6092467, Gonzalez-Garcia, Demetrio.

A-2319833, Goriero, Gilbert or Gilberto Corlero or Gilbert Golero.

A-7083775, Goudas, Spiros Charilaos.
A-7180056, Gray, James McEwan.
A-1423726, Gray, Wesley.
A-6313385, Grayson, Yvonne Carole.
A-4958502, Green, Eva.
A-4173981, Grenedier, Masha (nee Golad alias Molly Grand).
A-3324111, Grenedier, Solomon or Solomon Grand or Sol Grand.
A-5647127, Grigoriou, Vasilios or Bill Grigouriu or Vasilios Grigauriu.
A-9634633, Grimley, George.
A-4545619, Grubelich, Jacob.
A-2761190, Guariglia, Nicola.
A-3513890, Gunther, Carl Heinrich or Carl Heinrich Guenther or Carl Henry Guenther.
A-6953520, Hannah Cornelia Sophie or Cornelia Sophie Van Dillem or Cornelia Sophie Tierie.
A-4471429, Hansen, Johannes Vikkelso or John Vi.
A-1345163, Hanuszek, Rosa Lina (nee Heymann).
A-7130823, Haripar, Kurt Claus formerly Bahner.
A-4421499, Havlick, Edward.
A-7125433, Heckert, France Aimee, maiden name Meister.
A-5968471, Hee, Mrs. Wong Wah or Ng Yee or Ng Woon Tai or Suey Yee Wong or Woon Tai Ng or Suey Yee or Woon Tai.
A-5278938, Hellevik, Konstanse Petrine or Konstance or Constance Petrine Hellevik.
A-6780479, Hendry, Violet Maryon Oma.
A-5877733, Hignett, Thomas Henry.
A-6904693, Him, Quon Ming or Quon Seetoo.
A-7174613, Hing, Lee Wai or Harry Lee.
A-4080327, Ho, Guy Chang-Ching.
A-7083611, Ho, Wan or Ho Wan.
A-3624950, Hoi, Lo or Hoi or Lo Park Chen.
A-3067209, Hummel, Wenzel.
A-7247151, Hutt, Florence.
A-5148709, Hyla, Wladyslaw or William Hyla.
A-1479112, Iengo, Antonio.
A-6681800, Imre, Strasser or Imre Strasser.
A-6656455, Strasser, Irene (nee Menczer).
A-4832360, Ing, Dick or Charlie Woo.
A-6921380, Inkster, Norah (nee Park).
A-5264598, Inouye, Shokichi or Henry Inouyn.
A-2659814, Ioannou, Petros or Peter Joanou.
A-1188545, Ishakawa, Kichihei or Ishikawa Kichihei or Junjiro Koshimizu.
A-6921066, Isnard, Marcel Eugene Theodore.
A-9529101, Iversen, Jhalmar Lindberg.
A-7083001, Jeffrey, Moses or Mohamed Jaferji.
A-6026320, Jensen, Ole.
A-5675472, Johansen, Halfdan Jarl or Halfdan Karl Johansen.
A-5070273, Johansson, Werner Leopold.
A-9503537, Johnsen, Kristian Henry Vincents.
A-5162750, Jongejans, Gerrit, Junior (alias George Johnson).
A-4342693, Junke, Gerhard Kurt Hugo or Gerhardt Juemke.
A-4539486, Kainz, Karl Joseph.
A-3411826, Kainz, Helen Marie.
A-4583192, Kajiwara, Kaori.
A-7130627, Kapor, Vincent Dominick or Vincent Kapor.
A-6503759, Karan, Nikola P. or Nicolas Peter Karan formerly Nikola P. Karanikitch.
A-7274254, Karavitis, Nicholas George.
A-6491559, Karibon, Lilly (nee Schott).
A-5137432, Karpenkiel, Theodore Karl or Theodore Karpenkiel.
A-3471303, Karpenkiel, Gertrude (nee Labahn).
A-1380225, Kastrissios, Emmanouel D. or Emmanouel Demetrios Kastrissios.
A-5979400, Kataoka, Yoshizo.
A-3209626, Katomeritis, Nicholas Stephanis.
A-6708259, Kavooras, Eleanora (nee Skouras).
A-6710199, Kawczynski, Antoni or Anthony Kawczynski.
A-6942762, Kechriotis, Stamatios.
A-4650836, Keller, Nicolai or Nicolae Keller.
A-4336532, Keller, Maria.
A-6920532, Kennedy, Noel Percy.
A-4588694, Keong, Louie Wah or Lay Hua Chiang or Willis Louie.
A-3207099, Khan, Peer.
A-2928807, Kimm, Richard Chi Yon or Chi Yon Kimm or Richard Chiyon Kimm.
A-3255913, Kiparisus, Evangelos Georgos or Angelo George Kipper.
A-2686954, Klausen, Karl Johan or Carl Johan Clausen.
A-9676432, Kleppe, Lars Johnson.
A-5609936, Klinger, Magdalina (nee Ganz).
A-7117817, Kloucek, Henrik, Peter.
A-7273957, Knotick, Annie or Annie Lillian Fusier.
A-4854594, Kobylinski, Aleksander (alias Arthur Collier).
A-5428796, Kosparek, Mary Frances (nee Chmelar) or Mary Frances Harrison.
A-5633426, Kostandinos, Risto or Hristo Vasil Naumovich Sandros (alias Thomas Christ Stoikoff).
A-2645008, Kousoulinos, Timoleo Panteli (alias Timoleon Koussoulinos, alias Tom Konsolas).
A-1218279, Krazik, Alexander Ignatz or Alex Krazik or Ignatz Krazik.
A-4876514, Kremedas, Ioannis Mihail or John Michael Medas or John Mitchell Medas.
A-4022622, Kylitis, Antonios or Anton Kylitis.
A-9836824, Lahti, Eino Esajas or Eino Lahti.
A-2578292, Lambrinides, Pholikroni or Paul Lambros.
A-4660341, Lanzoni, Rino Custone.
A-5986180, Lardas, Kyriakos Nick or Antonios Patrinos.
A-7099692, Larson, Gudbjorg (nee Gudbjorg Stefansdottir).
A-5627286, Laughton, Walter or Walter Lauktien.
A-6142233, Leng, Hsi-Hung.
A-7174620, Leong, Yot Chung or George Loeng or Leong Ling or Leong Ling or Mon Tong.
A-2862498, Leto, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-6505212, Leung, Alicia (nee Alicia Sevilla).
A-4650870, Levedas, George Leonidas.
A-6989241, Levi, Pamela Shirley Louise or Pam Levi.
A-5498166, Lezis, Apostolos or Paul Lazos or Jim Raftopules.
A-6570320, Liblich, Zofia (nee Laurowicz).
A-6742221, Lie, Leif.
A-7112359, Lier, Martinus Van.
A-4862099, Ling, Young or Alvin Young Ling.
A-3377965, Liu, Yoh Han or Yok John Liu or Y John Liu.
A-7267749, Lokker, Aaltje Wilhelmina or Aaltje Wilhelmina Noback.
A-6205098, Lopez, Alejandrina or Alejandrina Mendez y Perez.
A-6205070, Lopez, Manuel or Mannel Lopez y Barredo.
A-6289676, Louda, Svatava or Svatava Louda (nee Kysela).
A-6289674, Louda, Frantisek or Frank Louda.
A-2953851, Lucza, Emery Khiss or Emreic Lucza or Khiss or Emery Lucza.
A-5180161, Macaleese, Angele Marie Aimee or Angele Marie Aimee Bertrand (maiden name) or Angele Marie Aimee Defosse (first marriage).
A-4790455, MacGillicuddy, Joan Marie Therese or Joan Maggill or Joan Winfield.
A-5710585, MacGillicuddy, Mellie Veronica (nee O'Connor).
A-4405262, Macia, Rodasindo Beloso.
A-6858764, Macone, Pasquale.
A-5423568, Maggiore, Vincienzo or Vincent Maggiore.
A-6840814, Makris, Evangelia or (nee Christopoulou).
A-7145609, Mamais, Anthony or Antonios Nicolaou Mamais.
A-3386218, Manis, George C. or George Constantinos Zagrimanis.
A-9771356, Martinez, Francisco Gonzalez.
A-2647320, Martinovich, Joseph or Joso Sime Martinovic.
A-4030040, Martinsons, Anna or Stankious (nee Beckman).
A-3595092, Massimino, Mario.
A-5342620, Mastrogeorgakes, Demetrios or James Mastrogeorge.
A-2185685, Mastrojohn, John or Ioannis Mastrogianis.
A-2733208, Matsui, Yoshiaki.
A-2933516, Matsui, Matsuko.
A-5002506, Maynard, Irene Agatha (nee Ward).
A-4636736, McDowell, Thomas.
A-4961435, Mecker, Bernhard Frederich Wilhelm.
A-6965139, Mestousis, Demetrios Nick or James Nick Metousis.
A-3945643, Meteliz, Trudy Louise or Liza Meterilza or Elka Samseber.
A-2487212, Miah, Chang or Abdul Miah or Suna Miah.
A-7083159, Michalek, Peter Michael.
A-6743477, Milicia, Pietro.
A-6338533, Milias, Themis Demetrios or Themistogles Demetrios Milias.
A-5712651, Moe, Ho Fuh or Moe Ho Fuh.
A-2535148, Momjian, Harry or Haroutine Setrag Momjian.
A-6521626, Montella, Giuseppe or Joseph Montella or Guiseppe Montella or Montello.
A-5676542, Morgan, Ernest George.
A-6899744, Moschouris, Loukas.
A-4727178, Mouldevanou Konstantina I.
A-4041219, Moy, Ou.
A-2644084, Mulholland, Patrick Joseph.
A-7050104, Najera, Manuel or Manuel Najera Cano.
A-6374299, Naccache, Elias Gabriel.
A-6799271, Nannetti, Roberto or Robert Nannetti.
A-4100489, Nicolau, Stilian Iovanis or Steve John.
A-4660725, Nordbeck, True Einar or John Einar Nordbeck.
A-9606943, Norman, Horatio Macfadyen.
A-9776639, Ntuli, Isaac William.
A-5060085, Nunes, Xavier.
A-7122408, Nymann, Elsa Irene Catharina Wang (nee Elsa Irene Catharina Wang).
A-7122409, Nymann, Rolf.
A-7122410, Nymann, Bjorn.
A-4854505, Okubo, Sugao or Kudao Okubo (alias Sam Saiki).
A-6551018, Oling, Emil Isak.
A-5869211, Olsen, Agnes Ovida (nee Agnes Ovida Abrahamsen).
A-7083511, Orenbain, Saul or Salo Morit Orenbain.
A-4300703, Otero-Ventin, Jose or Jose Caruso.
A-6179490, Ozata, Mehmet Selim.
A-6965411, Pacheco, Arnaldo or Chico Pacheco.
A-3171244, Pagliara, Gennaro or Jerry Pagliara.
A-7203823, Pahy, Lota or Lotta Pary.
A-7083111, Palan, Viasta.
A-7117695, Paloheimo, Riitta Marjatta (Liikola).
A-7117696, Paloheimo, Eric Scott.
A-2150595, Papadopoulos, Kostas.
A-3327341, Papalazaros, Lazaros Demetrios or Lazaros Demetrios Papalazarou.
A-5630940, Pasquale, Alano, De.
A-6925922, Patterson, Richard.
A-6072074, Patterson, Teodora Aguilion.
A-6928373, Patterson, Sylvia.
A-4663417, Paupin, Lisa (nee Lisa Kiec or Lisa Kundsin).
A-4761664, Pelizon, Celestine Kowalska or Celestine Genovefe Klein or Clestine Kowalska.
A-9537792, Pereira, Eduardo Vicente.
A-1135764, Peros, Frane Mile.
A-6959277, Pesic, Paolo Svetislav or Paul Pesic.

A-6899278, Pesic, Milena Bojovic de (nee Milena Bojovic or Boyovic).
A-2907484, Petekas, Peter or Panagiotis Petekas.
A-4385958, Petrides, Stephan or Stephan Peters.
A-9661984, Pettersen, George.
A-5866634, Philipides, Novolaos Theodoros.
A-6965413, Phillis, Antigone or Antigone Karavia.
A-3556000, Piao, Liou King or King Piao Liou.
A-1870026, Piarulli, Constantino alias Vincenzo Piccolomo now known as Frank Spano.
A-1120486, Piccininno, Vito Antonio.
A-6844816, Pizzo, Concetta formerly Esposito (nee Borrelli).
A-9799905, Piscopos, Peter or Panagiotis Piscopos.
A-7267691, Plaxton, William Michael.
A-1352403, Podimatos, Dionissios or Denny Pappas.
A-6168542, Ponevejsky, Gita Samuilovena or Ponve.
A-6145898, Ponevejsky, Irene Anatolievna.
A-6145899, Ponevejsky, Tamara Anatolievna.
A-3308927, Poon, Sew Kai or Poon Sew Kai.
A-4364657, Portcheller, Max.
A-4382348, Portcheller, Eva (nee Trendler).
A-7032884, Portcheller, Eva.
A-4304489, Portos, Peter or Panagiotis Antonios Portocalides.
A-3492516, Pozner, Goldie or Goldie Himel.
A-6621663, Pulido, Susana Peralta Sumalbag or Susan Peralta Sumalbag.
A-3145731, Quintas, Trinidad (nee Trinidad Sosin Rey).
A-6965844, Quistgaard, Helma Kirsten Dolores or (nee Muerlin).
A-2030155, Rados, Demetrios George or James Rados.
A-2522222, Ramirez, Ramon or Ramon Ramirez Tello or Primo Reymond Raniero.
A-5085655, Rando, Giuseppe or Joseph Rando.
A-5913951, Rasmussen, Victor Emanuel.
A-4496894, Ratoliska, Dalibor Vaclav or Dalibor Ratoliska.
A-7178653, Reppas, Spiros.
A-4138551, Ricchetti, Giacomo Mario or Giacomo Carlo Domenico Ricchetti.
A-5536030, Richmond, Stanislawa Stompka Jackowski.
A-3966304, Rissone, Adelina or Adelina Kissone or Rissone or Adelina Gibellino or Adele Rissone.
A-5257814, Rodrigues, Joao or Rodriguez or John Rodrigues.
A-7092903, Rodriguez, Fredesbinda Altagracia Russo or Altagracia Russo.
A-2117428, Rodriguez, Isidro or Isidro Rodriguez y Lopez.
A-2044261, Rodriguez, Edita (nee Edita Dominguez-Fernandez).
A-3400771, Rogale, Josef (Joseph).
A-6953512, Rondon, Sidney.
A-1951935, Roumeliotis, Peter John or Panagiotis Roumeliotis.
A-3726265, Roussos, George or George M. Roussos.
A-3245886, Rudani, Enrico or Henry Rudan.
A-6828827, Ruona, Marie Maria.
A-2683038, Salutsky, Arvum or Mordche Semigielski or Max Semigielski or Abraham Salustky.
A-2819451, Samonas, Nicolaos or Nicholas Semonies.
A-7140311, Sander Bernat.
A-3629562, Sankilampi, Johan Jhalmar or John Lampi.
A-4813509, Santamaria, Ventura.
A-6711295, Sauro, Gregorina (nee Procopio).
A-5034667, Scheuer, Berish or Benjamin or Ben Scheuer.
A-4819277, Schmidt, Helene (nee Pollack).
A-5118237, Schneider, Michael or Michel Schneider.
A-5027863, Scognamillo, Giovanni or John Scognamillo.
A-1263790, Scuderi, Giuseppe or Joseph Scuderi.
A-6885543, Shalhoub, Violette Youssef (nee Fallaha).
A-6475537, Sharman, Edna Gladys May or Edna Gladys May Lane or Edna Gladys May Watton.
A-2688594, Shee, Ho or Law Ho Shee.
A-7586570, Shee, Lum Woo (maiden name); Woo Hing Sheong.
A-3811823, Shuitkas, Spiros Georgiou or Steve Adams or Styros Shuthas.
A-4466882, Siira, Sulo Onni.
A-9541852, Silinsky, Alexander Basil.
A-1221603, Siva, Ralph or Rafael (alias Arturo Sanchez).
A-2801424, Siva, Diamante or Diamante Nassy y Alterez alias Mercedes Morina Hernandez.
A-9798309, Sjolin, Erik Gunnar.
A-6062329, Smilovici, Otto-Michel or Michael Smiley.
A-5496431, Smith, Arnold Wilhelm Robert or Arnold Wilhelm Robert Ligmann.
A-5083163, Smith, Hannah (nee Callaghan).
A-6921126, Soderquist, Elof Rolf Aka.
A-4374035, Sokolowski, William Dominick or William Falconer.
A-6948925, Spacek, James Vaclav.
A-3811656, Spathis, Penogiotes or Panagiotes Spathis or Pete Panagiotis.
A-5601609, Spiegel, Sidonia (nee Hirsch).
A-6769419, Spilipoulos, Evangelos.
A-5958229, Staider, Herman Peter.
A-6678105, Stamatiou, Lesvia Jean or Lesvia Jean Simanderis.
A-2110632, Stanton, Charles or Constantine Studitis or Constantin Studiti.
A-6177929, Stave, Mary Kristiane.
A-6177930, Stave, Tonnes.
A-2091703, Stevens, Ross William or Ross William Langford or Ross Boyd.
A-5937342, Stolica, Isidoro or Isidoro Stoleca or Isidore Stolesia.
A-6816106, Syropoulos, Maria Athanasiou.
A-9765367, Tai, Lee Kin or Charlie Lee.
A-2308840, Takeuchi, Yuwako or Yuwako Yukawa.
A-6582713, Tamzarian, Kegham or Kay Tamzatian.
A-1066805, Tarcson, Maria or Mary or Maria or Mary Nyakas.
A-5407239, Tasso, Giuseppe Felice or Joseph Tasso.
A-6989473, Tessman, Manuel or Manuel Quijada.
A-7240112, Teus, Dolores Deanna or Dolores Deana Teus.
A-9733225, Thorsen, Reidar Geyer.
A-5269602, Tomaszewski, Frank.
A-3777795, Tripodi, James Vincenzo or Vincenzo Tripodi.
A-4764125, Tsemperis, Michael Nick or Michael Tsemperis or Michael N. Tsemperis or Mike N. Tsemperis.
A-5369830, Udris, John Arcid or Harry Uders.
A-5659165, Udris, Emily or Emily Auder.
A-4773369, Urrutia, David Victorio Gastelu or David Gastelu.
A-6697569, Uy, Julita Habaluyas (nee Julita De Guzman Habaluyas).
A-6407207, Uy, Yu Sin or Florencio Chuytie Uy.
A-3078317, Uzzell, Henry.
A-5908316, Valente, Raul.
A-9682129, Van Bokhoven, Alexander Johannes Andrianus Marinus or Alexander J. Van Bokhoven.
A-6195016, Vasiliou, Anna nee Vrostou or Anna Vassili.
A-4634924, Vasiloff, Bozin (alias Christ Vasilia Gerogopoulos).
A-6729843, Vassiliou, Theocharis Constantin.
A-5880791, Venzen, Lily Vitalia.
A-6357989, Vergou, Aikaterini or Katherine Vergou.
A-6346409, Vergou, Demetrios or James Vergou.
A-5335917, Vineberg, Benjamin or Benjamin Wajnbergier.
A-2790561, Vocos, James Dimitrios or James Vocos or James John Vocos.
A-7073617, Vonakis, Julia (nee Julia Charalambos Hatziharalambos).
A-6550668, Wajsman, Perla or Waisman or Perla Windman or Perla Winderman.
A-5055223, Weissman, Osias Noe or Jean Blank.
A-4332654, Wilson, Alice Ann.
A-3032503, Wolther, Irving or Isaak Wolski.
A-3501199, Wong, Tom or Wong Chou.
A-3352994, Worobetz, Dmytro or Dmytro Worubec.
A-7730396, Yamanaka, Satiko.
A-5551057, Yang, Ling Fu or Yang Ling Fu.
A-6083732, Yang, Shiang Ping.
A-6847844, Yang, Anna Hsiao or Anna Hsiao.
A-9652853, Yanushkevich, Gregorio or Gricori.
A-5099933, Yensen, Lauritz Johannes or Lauritz Johannes Jensen or Fritz L. Yensen.
A-4490275, Young, Anthony Michael Gascoyne.
A-6848712, Yu, Horace I-Sen.
A-6923858, Yu, Lota Lois.
A-5654491, Yuki, Anthony Toschimichi.
A-6992360, Zeffler, Astrid Sigrid.
A-5426265, Kulukundis, Manuel Elias also known as Manual Kulukundis.
A-5601575, Kulukundis, Calliope aka Calliope Manuel Kulukundis (nee Calliope Elias Hadjilias).
A-7029226, Kulukundis, George Elias.
A-7029225, Kulukundis, Manuel Michael.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 15, lines 13 and 14, strike the registration number and name:

"A-3377965, Liu, Yoh Han or Yok John Liu or Y John Liu."

On page 16, line 9, strike the registration number and name:

"A-5423568, Maggiore, Vincienzo, or Vincent Maggiore."

On page 18, line 19, strike the registration number and name:

"A-6965411, Pacheco, Arnaldo or Chico Pacheco."

On page 20, lines 19 and 20, strike the registration number and name:

"A-6965844, Quistgaard, Helma Kirsten Dolores or (nee Muerlin)."

On page 26, after line 18, insert the registration numbers and names:

"A-5824860, Foti, Joseph Arthur or Giuseppi Arturo Foti or Giuseppi Correale or Arthur La Pierre."

"A-6643689, Karpman, Dahlia."

"A-6191546, Haydari, Ebrahim."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MABEL MONROE BONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 629) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mabel Monroe Bonds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Mabel Monroe Bonds a patent in fee to the following described lands on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.: Lot 6 and the north half of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 33, township 36 north, range 14 west, Montana

principal meridian, containing seventy-six and sixty-one one hundredths acres, more or less.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior, upon application in writing, is hereby authorized to sell the homestead allotment numbered 1641 of Mabel Monroe Bonds, described as lot 6 and the north half of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 33, township 36 north, range 14 west, Montana principal meridian, containing seventy-six and sixty-one one-hundredths acres, and to disburse the proceeds of such sale for the benefit of Mabel Monroe Bonds: *Provided*, That when the land is offered for sale the Blackfeet Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days within which to execute a preferential right to purchase said tract at the price offered by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase: *Provided further*, That if the land is purchased by the Blackfeet Tribe or a member thereof title shall be conveyed by deed to the United States in trust for the purchaser, and if the land is purchased by a non-Indian a patent in fee shall be issued to the purchaser."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD JAMES BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 630) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Richard James Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Richard James Brown a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.: The west half of the northwest quarter, section 12, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing eighty acres.

SEC. 2. Said patent in fee when issued shall contain a reservation to the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of the oil, gas, and all other mineral deposits as provided in the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALICE E. WILLIAMS SISK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Alice E. Williams Sisk a patent in fee to the following-described land allotted to her within the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: Lots 10, 11, and 12 of section 3 and the west half and the west half of the east half of section 10, township 2 south, range 29 east, Montana principal meridian, comprising five hundred ninety-five and sixty-four one-hundredths acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL PATENT TO CHARLES A. GANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 651) to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann for the following-described lands: southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter, east half northwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter, south half northeast quarter southwest quarter, section 1, township 6 north, range 16 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, containing forty-five acres more or less according to the official plat of resurvey accepted April 1, 1943.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUE A PATENT IN FEE TO PERCIVAL H. GLENN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 964) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Percival H. Glenn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Percival H. Glenn a patent in fee to the following-described lands, known as allotment numbered 2368 on the Crow Indian Reservation, Montana: The west half of the southwest quarter of section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 and the southeast quarter of section 4 and the west half of the northwest quarter of section 10, township 4 south, and the east half of section 33 and the west half of the west half of section 34, township 3 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian, containing nine hundred ninety-six and twenty-four one-hundredths acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS BY CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1129) to validate a conveyance of certain lands by the Central Pacific Railway Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to the Union Ice Co. and Edward Barbera.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the conveyances hereinafter particularly described and heretofore executed by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain lands or interests therein, in the city of Lodi, all in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and forming a part of the right-of-way of said Central Pacific Railway Co., granted by the Government of the United States of America by an act of Congress approved July 1, 1862, entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes" (vol. 12, U. S. Stat. L. 489), and by said act as amended by act of Congress approved July 2, 1864, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes,' approved July 1, 1862" (vol. 13, U. S. Stat. L. 356), are hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed with the same force and effect as if the land involved therein had been held at the time of such conveyances by the corporations making the same under absolute fee simple title.

The conveyances, recorded in office of county recorder of San Joaquin County, Calif., in book of official records, which are hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed, are as follows:

1. September 16, 1937: the Union Ice Co., a corporation; volume 594, page 31.

2. October 8, 1946: Edward Barbera; volume 1022, page 88: *Provided*, That such legalization, validation, and confirmation shall not in any instance diminish said right-of-way to a width less than 50 feet on either side of the center of the main track or tracks of said Central Pacific Railway Co. as now established and maintained: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed to legalize, validate, or confirm any rights, titles, or interests based upon or arising out of adverse possession, prescription, or abandonment, and not confirmed by conveyance heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co. and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co.: *And provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, or other minerals in the land, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING TO KAISER STEEL CORP. OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1853) to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to Kaiser Steel Corp., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Nevada, permanent rights-of-way, not exceeding two hundred feet in width, on, over, under, through, and across public lands of the United States in the county of Riverside, State of California, in the townships, ranges, and sections described in section 2 of this act, for the purposes of constructing, operating, and maintaining any and all works, structures, facilities, roads, railroads, power lines, and pipelines necessary, convenient, incidental, or appurtenant to the operation of the mines, camp sites, and mill sites of Kaiser Steel Corp. in the vicinity of Eagle Mountain, Riverside County, in the State of California: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall, in his discretion, attach and impose such conditions on said right-of-

way, and promulgate such rules and regulations as he shall deem appropriate, consistent with the use of said rights-of-way for the purposes prescribed in this act.

SEC. 2. Said rights-of-way shall extend through all lands owned by the United States or any department or agency thereof in any of the following townships, ranges, and sections of Riverside County, in the State of California:

(a) Township 8 south, range 11 east, sections 20, 29, 28, 27, 21, 22, 23, 14, 13, and 12; township 8 south, range 12 east, sections 7, 8, 9, 10, and 3; township 7 south, range 12 east, sections 34, 35, and 36; township 7 south, range 13 east, sections 31, 32, 29, 28, 21, 22, 23, 14, 13, and 12; township 7 south, range 14 east, sections 7, 8, 5, and 4; township 6 south, range 14 east, sections 33, 28, 21, 16, 9, 8, 7, and 6; township 5 south, range 14 east, sections 31, 32, 29, 28, 27, 26, 23, 24, 13, and 12; township 5 south, range 15 east, sections 7 and 6; township 4 south, range 15 east, sections 31, 30, 19, 20, 17, 18, 7, and 6; and continuing through townships 4 south and 3 south, range 14 east, to a terminal point at the site of the mill and camp of Kaiser Steel Corp. in the vicinity of Eagle Mountain in the State of California.

(b) Township 4 south, range 15 east, sections 30, 19, 20, 17, 18, and 7, and continuing through townships 4 south and 3 south, range 14 east, to a terminal point at the site of the mill and camp of Kaiser Steel Corp. in the vicinity of Eagle Mountain in the State of California.

(c) Township 3 south, range 15 east, section 31, and continuing through townships 4 south and 3 south, range 14 east, to a terminal point at the site of the mill and camp of Kaiser Steel Corp. in the vicinity of Eagle Mountain, in the State of California.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby further authorized to grant a patent in fee to Kaiser Steel Corp., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Nevada, that property located in townships 4 south and 3 south, range 14 east, Riverside County, Calif., which said Kaiser Steel Corp. now maintains as a camp site and mill site in connection with its mining operations, and which is composed of four hundred sixty-five and eighty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior shall fix, and Kaiser Steel Corp. shall pay, a reasonable sum or sums to the United States, including compensation for the cost of surveys necessary to carry out the grants and patent authorized hereby, as consideration for such grants and patent. Said grants and patent shall include suitable detailed descriptions of the property covered thereby.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 17, after the word "to" insert "grant a."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUE PATENTS IN FEE TO CERTAIN ALLOTTEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2349) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to the following-named persons patents in fee to their allotted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Montana:

Estella Wolfe, the south half of the southeastern quarter of section 20, the northeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 29; the south half of the southwest quarter of section 21; the northwest quarter, the north half of the southwest quarter, the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of section 28; the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 27, township 5 south, range 38 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 840 acres.

Mark Wolfe, the south half of the northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 24; the north half of the northeast quarter of section 25, township 5 south, range 37 east; the south half of the southwest quarter of section 20; the northwest quarter of section 29, township 5 south, range 38 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 560 acres.

Furman E. Wolfe, south half of the southeast quarter of section 25, township 5 south, range 37 east; the southwest quarter of section 29; the northwest quarter, the south half, and the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 32, township 5 south, range 38 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 760 acres.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike out the following language: "and the northeast quarter of section."

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out the following language: "28; the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 27."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "eight" and insert in lieu thereof "six."

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out the following language: "south half of the southeastern quarter of section 25, township 5 south, range 37 east."

Page 2, line 12, following the word "the", insert "south half of the."

Page 2, line 16, strike out the word "seven" and insert in lieu thereof "six." Strike out the words "and sixty."

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS as an amendment to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 18, after the word "hundred", strike out "and sixty."

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF CERTAIN ALLOTTED INDIAN LAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3215) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Eloise White Bear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Eloise White Bear a patent in fee to the following described lands allotted to her on the Crow Indian Reservation, Montana: The southeast quarter of section 14 the northeast quarter, the west half of the southeast quarter, and the west half of the east half of the southeast quarter of section 23, and the northwest quarter and the west half of the northeast quarter of section 24, township 8 south, range 37 east, containing 680 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Interior, upon application in writing, is hereby authorized to sell the remaining lands contained in trust allotment numbered 3613 of Eloise White Bear, described as the southeast quarter of section 14; the northeast quarter, and the west half of the southeast quarter, and the west half of the east half of the southeast quarter of section 23; the west half of the northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter of section 24, all in township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 680 acres, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Eloise White Bear for her benefit."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Crow Reservation, Montana."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOMAS J. ZAFIRIADIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 616) for the relief of Tomas J. Zafiriadis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Tomas J. Zafiriadis shall be deemed to be a native of Uruguay.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANZ FURTNER AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 617) for the relief of Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck and Victoria Tuerck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck and Victoria Tuerck, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the necessary quota numbers that are required.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "the necessary quota numbers that are required" and insert "four numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GIUSEPPE MAZZONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 895) for the relief of Dr. Giuseppe Mazzone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Giuseppe Mazzone shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VASILIA PARSELLES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1233) for the relief of Mrs. Vasilia Parselles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Vasilia Parselles, of San Francisco, Calif., who entered the United States in September 1947 for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of such entry. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Turkey for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Vasilia Parselles shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SELMA CECELIA GAHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1234) for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl as of February 8, 1948, the date on which she was admitted to the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Australia for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTRANIK AYANIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Antranik Ayanian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Antranik Ayanian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOE LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2114) for the relief of Joe Lee (also known as Lee Jow).

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JINDRICH (HENRI) NOSEK AND MRS. ZDENKA NOSEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of Jindrich (Henri) Nosek and Mrs. Zdenka Nosek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jindrich (Henri) Nosek and his wife, Mrs. Zdenka Nosek, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "fee and head tax" and insert "fees and head taxes."

Line 9, strike out "alien" and insert "aliens."

Line 11, strike out "one number" and insert "two numbers."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL POST-POSNIAKOFF AND ZINAIDA POST-POSNIAKOFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2372) for the relief of Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be admitted for permanent residence pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1952).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "fee and head tax" and insert "fees and head taxes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUON MEE GEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2852) for the relief of Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and not withstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin, a minor Chinese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born daughter of Tai Hung Leong, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "amended", strike out "and not withstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIZUE SAKURADA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2853) for the relief of Shizue Sakurada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Shizue Sakurada, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Shizue Sakurada shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOROTHY FUMIE MAEDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2854) for the relief of Dorothy Fumie Maeda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Dorothy Fumie Maeda, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Dorothy Fumie Maeda shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIZU TERAUCHI PARKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2916) for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Shizu Terauchi Parks, the Japanese fiancée of Henry Francis Parks, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Shizu Terauchi Parks shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Shizu Terauchi Parks is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Henry Francis Parks, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shizu Terauchi Parks, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C. title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shizu Terauchi Parks, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Shizu Terauchi Parks as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSINA MOURADIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3063) for the relief of Rosina Mouradian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Rosina Mouradian may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIN YUEN LING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3133) for the relief of Chin Yuen Ling, minor unmarried Chinese child of a United States citizen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Chin Yuen Ling, the minor unmarried child of Chin Yick Goon, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VIVIAN M. GRAHAM AND HERBERT H. GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 643) for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Vivian M. Graham, San Pedro, Calif., the sum of $3,000, and to Herbert H. Graham, San Pedro, Calif., the sum of $6,788.25. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Mrs. Vivian M. Graham on account of personal injuries sustained by her, and of all claims against the United States of the said Herbert H. Graham on account of personal injuries, property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by him, on August 12, 1945, when an automobile operated by George T. Copp, of Bellflower, Calif., in which the said Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham were riding was in collision with a United States Marine Corps truck on United States Highway No. 66, approximately 2½ miles east of Barstow, Calif. The operator of such Marine Corps truck was not operating within the scope of his employment: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,000", and insert "$400."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$6,788.25", and insert "$2,400."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMIL SBARBORI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2363) for the relief of Emil Sbarbori.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Emil Sbarbori, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of $815. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical expenses, and loss of earning power sustained as a result of a collision on September 6, 1943, on Route No. 25, Elizabeth, N. J., between an automobile in which he was a passenger and a United States Navy station wagon No. 17791, driven by an enlisted man of the Navy, operating from the United States Navy, Department of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated," strike out the bill down to the colon in line 4, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "to Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of $375; to Edna Perfetti, of Union City, N. J., the sum of $125; to Anthony Perfetti, of Union City, N. J., the sum of $20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical expenses sustained as a result of a collision of September 6, 1943, on Route numbered 25, Elizabeth, N. J., between an automobile in which they were passengers and a United States Navy station wagon, numbered 17791, driven by a Navy employee, operating from the United States Navy, Department of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, Edna Perfetti, and Anthony Perfetti."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN R. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2453) for the relief of John R. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John R. Harris, Scranton, Pa., the sum of $326.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John R. Harris against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel performed by his wife Mary P. Harris from Scranton, Pa., to Paris, France, in March 1948, while he was serving in Paris as an officer with the Quartermaster Corps, Headquarters, American Graves Registration Command, European area: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$326.50", and insert "$201."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LULA M. WHITEBEAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3216) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lula M. Whitebear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Lula M. Whitebear a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to her on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The east half of section 11, the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter and the south half of the southwest quarter, section 12, and the northeast quarter of section 14, township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing six hundred and forty acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Lula" and insert "Lulu."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lulu M. Whitebear."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICOLETTA AND GUILIA PONTRELLI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 756) for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after "Pontrelli", insert ": *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Nicoletta Pontrelli becoming a public charge."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISE LEITZINGER AND DAUGHTER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1722) for the relief of Louis Leitzinger and her daughter, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 14 and 15 and insert "date of the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE ENCARNACION ORTIZ

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1823) for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, strike out "Upon the enactment of this act" and insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Anfuso	Frazier	Magee
Angell	Gary	Miller, Calif.
Beall	Gillette	Miller, N. Y.
Belcher	Gordon	Morgan
Boykin	Gregory	Morrison
Buckley	Gwinn	Murphy
Byrne, N. Y.	Harden	Murray, Wis.
Celler	Harrison, Va.	Pickett
Chiperfield	Heriong	Powell
Colmer	Herter	Rogers, Tex.
Coudert	Irving	Short
Cox	Jackson, Wash.	Taylor
Dawson	Jonas	Whitaker
Dempsey	Jones,	Woodruff
Dingell	Hamilton C.	
Eberharter	Kersten, Wis.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 158, Rept. No. 447), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, effective, from January 3, 1951, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (o) of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Dominion of Canada, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, May 10, the Clerk had read through and including line 25 on page 26 of the bill. If there are no amendments to be offered at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area, the Arkansas-White-Red River area, and the New England-New York area, in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, including not to exceed $100,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), to remain available until expended, $8,000,000, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the board of county commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided further*, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of $6,000,000 (with which shall be merged the unexpended balance of funds heretofore made available for these purposes) may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 27, line 14, strike out "$8,000,000," and insert $6,112,800."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will give to this particular division the same amount of new money which was given to them for the 1951 fiscal year. I am proposing to reduce the $8,000,000 now in the bill to $6,112,800. Let me call to your attention how a division or a bureau keeps on growing and growing. In 1947 we gave to this particular small division only the sum of $2,101,000. That was upped 50 percent in 1948, giving it about $3,000,000 of new money. In 1949 the appropriation was doubled and the Congress gave them $6,000,000. In 1950 we gave this bureau $9,500,000. In 1951 we gave them $10,312,000.

What happened to the $10,312,000 that the Congress last year said was necessary? If you will recall the Congress instructed the President under the one-package bill last year, and mistakenly so, to make a $550,000,000 reduction at his discretion in the one-package bill. The Congress was too worn out by the length of time that bill required to clear the House to do its work properly.

I hold it is the responsibility of the Congress under the Constitution to control the purse. The President, in order to achieve that $550,000,000 cut last year, took from this particular item the sum of $4,200,000. To my mind by that action, the administration stated that they had little confidence themselves in this particular program as it was being operated. It is disturbing, Mr. Chairman, to note this fact and I wish you would turn to page 772 of the hearings and see where the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], stated:

I notice last year that you had reductions under section 1214 of the appropriation bill. You took a cut of $4,200,000. How were you able to do that? Where did you absorb that amount of money?

Mr. Phillips, Mr. Wills' assistant, replied:

About $200,000, Mr. Chairman, from preliminary examinations and surveys and about $4,000,000 from works of improvement.

Mr. WHITTEN. You just held up the works of improvement to that extent?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is right.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the amount cut by the President under section 1214 was applied in the main to the actual work involved in flood control. Only $200,000 was taken from the large item, preliminary surveys.

Think of them spending $1,700,000 for surveys at a time when we already have 171 preliminary surveys of watersheds and full survey reports on 19 projects. Here we are in the position of actually working on only 11 watersheds, half of that work being done in two States, Mississippi and Texas, and yet when this group were told by the President that it would be necessary to take off $4,200,000 of the 1951 appropriation, did they take the bulk of that from the preliminary survey work? Oh, no. According to Mr. Phillips' statement, just quoted, $4,000,000 of the $4,200,000 reduction was saved at the expense of the actual work of construction, while $1,700,000 was expended for the further preliminary survey work and a continued program of that kind which surely could have been dispensed with rather than to reduce by half the actual flood-control work last year.

Mr. Chairman, the cut which I propose through this amendment should be applied largely at the expense of preliminary examinations and surveys. Please keep in mind, as I mentioned previously, that here is one division of Government which has grown by leaps and bounds since 1947. These people asked only $2,100,000 for this work in 1947. They very modestly increased their request to $3,500,000 for 1948. Then they jumped the request almost threefold to $9,004,000 for 1949, hiked it to $10,000,000 in 1951, and in 1951 they apparently decided there was no limit to our Treasury and unblushingly came before us and asked for $11,700,000 for the very same division which received less than one-fifth that amount only 4 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am trying to follow the gentleman's statement. I am having some difficulty in reconciling the gentleman's statement with the report. On page 13 of the report the committee states that this item has been reduced from last year's appropriation by $1,201,575. Is that correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The report is not clear, I think. I am referring to the new money that we are putting into this particular activity. Last year this particular activity had a little over $6,100,000 of new money given to it. My amendment would give to it the very same amount for this coming fiscal year. It seems that the report takes into consideration moneys which are available from previous years.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I still do not understand how you could have a reduction. The report shows less money is to be spent than last year. I just cannot reconcile the statement the gentleman makes with the report.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will turn to page 752 of the hearings, he will see that there is appropriated for 1952, $6,112,800. That is the figure I am operating upon. That is the base figure.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Would the gentleman tell us how it is we have a flood-control appropriation in an Agricultural Department appropriation bill?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, that is a puzzle to me. Of course, the responsibility of the Army engineers only goes to a certain point on these rivers. Above that you have the Department of Agriculture, on the small tributaries leading down in; and the Department of Agriculture, in turn, divides its work between the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service, and they, in turn, call in the Extension Service, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Production and Marketing Administration and two or three others. I think we should put all of this work which the Army engineers do not take care of under one group, the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. GRANGER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We should stop, look, and listen. Let us take a little money out of this appropriation, and then let us request, through the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the kind of investigation we should have, and find out exactly what we are doing

and why it is necessary to pile up a great number of preliminary surveys at a tremendous cost, when we all want the actual construction work performed as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. On page 13 of the report it is stated that the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service have a primary responsibility for this work and that the work is to prepare surveys for the installation of watershed improvements, control of water runoff and water flow, protection from soil erosion and so forth. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that this $6,000,000 that will be left could be used for range improvement in place of the $500,000 that was stricken from the bill under the Forest Service item the other day?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think this particular item has to do with that matter specifically but the language is broad enough to perhaps permit such use, if I understand the gentleman correctly.

Mr. D'EWART. No; reseeding of the ranges, holding water in the national forests.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I certainly agree with the gentleman that this money could be spent to better advantage.

All I want to do, I may state to the gentleman from Montana, is to stop, look, listen, and see where we are going.

Mr. D'EWART. It would appear to me, since part of this money is to be used by the Forest Service and since it is to retard stream flow, that it could well be used for the purposes I have mentioned and in cooperative range management.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would not want to commit myself on that.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Is there any provision made on the part of sponsoring agencies for this improvement?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes; to a certain degree. It is cooperative; it varies. Some places they even cooperate to the extent of 50 or 60 percent.

Mr. GRANGER. That sometimes just to the extent of furnishing rights-of-way?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Sometimes to the extent of very little, if any.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we all have a very high regard for our friend from Minnesota and his desire to save public money. As you may have noticed, his knowledge of this program does not come from having any of it in his district; I mean this cut would not reach Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I correct the gentleman? There is an item that reaches Minnesota, 1 of the 11.

Mr. WHITTEN. What is the name of the project?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Little Sioux in Iowa in Minnesota, the third largest. The two other projects, if the gentleman will yield, are in Mississippi and Texas. The States of Mississippi and Texas get more than half of this money.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, he groups Mississippi and Texas; I do not know what is spent in Texas, but I know the amount in Mississippi is very small as compared to the total amount in this bill, and much, much smaller when compared with the costs of the dams built there.

The question has been asked: Why put flood control in the Department of Agriculture? Mr. Chairman, let us get this matter of funds straight. Last year there was a carry-over of $3,000,000 which with the amount appropriated gave a total of $13,401,000 of funds available for work this year. With the President's reduction of $4,200,000 we have available for the present year $9,200,000. I want you to know that your committee has brought in reductions, because the amount available this year, $9,200,000, was reduced by the budget to $8,900,000. Your committee then reduced that amount by $900,000 leaving $8,000,000, as against available funds for this year of $9,200,000.

I have never made any special pleas since I have been a Member of this Congress for my district, but I do think I have the right to ask for fair play. This is a construction program, this is a case of building projects, it is a program where the States and local people put up approximately 50 percent of the cost. Let us see whether what we are asking here is fair treatment. I want to use this by way of illustration because, as I say, while some of this is in my district, we have cut it in the same way that we have cut every other item in this bill by more than 10 percent.

We have cut it as against funds available this year by 15 percent. This Congress provided funds of about $56,000,000 and went down into my area—they authorized it before I came here—and the $75,000,000 of Federal funds will be used to close up the outlets of four rivers, two are now closed and two more will be closed. The Congress appropriated the money. You have already spent $56,000,000 of it. You did not require any contribution from the folks below these dams as their contribution. When you stopped up those four rivers the effect of their being stopped up was felt in every ditch clear on up to the headwaters. Not only did you flood the land of the man in that area but the man that was back of it, where you did not take his land and where you did not pay him a dime damage by stopping up the outlet of that stream, and you made his little ditches close up, too, but when you passed this legislation for those four dams you said: "We are going to provide as a part of this for flood control work above the dam, we are going to pay 50 percent of the cost."

You did not do that for the fellow below the dam. But after two of these dams have been built, after the effects are being felt, notwithstanding the fact that the farmers in the area put up 50 percent of the cost, you say: "No, the dams are there, but we are going to take our own good time before we live up to the other obligation and try to relieve the ill effects that we have visited on you."

Those people did not want the dams, they opposed the dams, and I say that the Congress of the United States has an obligation to carry out the commitment that you made when you put these dams on those folks down there and spent $75,000,000 without any contribution locally at all. Under this program the local people have to put up 50 percent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not a fact that the Appropriations Committee over the protest of the people in the area appropriated money for the construction of those dams that visited these hardships upon the people of our district?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct, and under this amendment you would welch on your agreement to go ahead with these construction projects. These are construction projects and if you want to save money and you are committed to building something, is it helping any to drag out the period of time in which they are being built? Everything is going up, up, up. Do you save any money by needlessly dragging it out? I cannot see that.

Again I want to say to you that this is a cooperative program. The Government has committed itself in times past and your committee has reduced it by more than 10 percent. You have already put these dams there and flooded the land of these people, it has had this effect on the local streams. I say you owe it to them not to drag out this situation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We want to do what is right about this particular matter. On page 765 of the hearings the gentleman asked this question of Mr. Phillips, assistant to Mr. Will:

> I notice last year you had a reduction under section 1214 of the appropriation bill, you took a cut of $4,200,000. How were you able to do that? Where did you absorb that money?

Mr. Phillips replied:

> About $200,000, Mr. Chairman, was taken from preliminary examinations and surveys and about $4,000,000 from construction.

Now, that is what they did about the construction item the gentleman is talking about. They only took $200,000 from $1,500,000 that we gave them for preliminary surveys yet, according to the statement in the RECORD they took $4,000,000 off the actual construction money.

What is wrong? There is something wrong in the administration of the whole matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. The administration of it, as the gentleman knows, is not in this item, but the administration of it is in the Secretary's Office and in the Soil Conservation and in the Forest Service. Of course, they had to hold it up. They had their reasons for this. They had their appropriation, and the President cut off $4,000,000. What else could they do? They did not have the money; they could not spend it. We have made the same reduction here that we have made elsewhere. I plead with you to be fair. There is hardly a Member of this House who has not on occasion been before the committee. We have tried to be fair with you; we have tried to be fair with these projects. We have given the same cut here that we have given elsewhere in this bill, and I urge you, in view of the situation we have, and in view of the fact that the Congress brought it about, that you have an obligation, and you are not spending any money here needlessly. You are carrying out your commitments where the farmers put up 50 percent of the cost.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not these projects are under construction at the present time?

Mr. WHITTEN. They are in each of these cases.

Mr. GRANGER. They are all projects that are being constructed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Absolutely. The Congress has committed itself to the completion of these projects and, as I say, in my own area the project was made necessary because you appropriated $75,000,000 to stop up four rivers on the poor folks that live up above them. We said, "We will help you out of it, but you have to put up 50 percent of the cost" but now under this amendment you would be welching on that. I believe the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, and I do it for this reason: I have had some experience with surveys in my congressional district, and I know that there is very little interest taken after they get the money to get a survey. In 1944 an amendment of mine passed the House providing for a survey of the Susquehanna River on the North Branch up around my particular section. In 1948 we had a major flood there and there had been no rendition of a report of any kind by any of the authorities until that time, and nobody had any idea what the recommendations were for flood control in spite of the fact that they had citizen meeting after citizen meeting in protest against the deplorable flood conditions.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman know that survey reports and flood-control work comes entirely within the purview of the Army engineers?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We talked that point over, and the gentleman from Minnesota, in presenting his amendment, says that there is too much slight-of-hand work under the table anyhow; we will pass too much money around among these different groups, so for that reason, I think we ought to cut them; the whole bunch of them, because they certainly did wrong by my district, and they did not give them any satisfaction whatsoever. Not only that, but they slapped the House of Representatives in the face, because here was a legislative direction for those engineers to go ahead and make an elaborate report on the Susquehanna River in my district there. And what did they do? They lumped it into a big report of the north branch and nobody had any opportunity to know what was going on until just this last year, 6 years after the amendment that I had presented to the House, which was passed by the House and the Senate and approved by the President, and the executive authorities had not gone ahead and done the bidding of the Congress in the matter, so I ask the question, What is the use of having any of these surveys or directing any of these people to go ahead with orders from Congress when they deliberately ignore them?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. I have no money in this whatsoever; nothing in this appropriation goes to Tennessee, but in all fairness to the gentleman from Mississippi and to the people from Mississippi who did not want these rivers dammed up, if Congress put it on those people against their objections, do you not think it nothing but right for Congress to carry out their commitments and the promises to these people?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Is the gentleman referring to my district?

Mr. SUTTON. I am referring to the time when the gentleman was in Congress and I was, and when the gentleman from Mississippi was here, and when this was passed.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am speaking of an amendment which was adopted by the House directing a survey of flood conditions in my district. They apparently ignored it. They flouted the will of the Congress, and they apparently took the money along with it.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman says he wants to go along with cutting this appropriation.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am all for it.

Mr. SUTTON. I know the gentleman wants to economize wherever he can. I am sure the gentleman from New York is one of the top economizers, one of the most economical men in the Congress.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate that.

Mr. SUTTON. However, we made a promise to these people, we made this pledge to them. In all fairness, does not the gentleman believe we should carry out this pledge?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the gentleman's contention.

Mr. SUTTON. At the same time, the gentleman does want to carry out the promise we made to them?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am simply pointing out that the will of the Congress was flouted in the matter, and the people of my district, at least, never got any satisfaction out of legislation which was designed to improve the flood conditions in the district.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not know whether the survey to which the gentleman refers comes under the Army engineers or the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is the principle of the thing.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. However, if the gentleman will permit, I should like to quote from page 765 of the hearings:

> Mr. WHITTEN. This committee, in an effort to understand better how the Department of Agriculture operates, and to check on some of the reports that have come to us, had an investigation made of the activities of the various units within the Department, one of which was the flood-control program. I quote here from a report:
>
> "No detailed examination of the United States Department of Agriculture flood-control program was made. However, from the limited examination made, it appears that the same multiplicity of United States Department of Agriculture bureaus, with the resultant duplication and overlap, exists in this program as in the soil-conservation programs. As one Government official stated, 'the United States Department of Agriculture is trying to load the flood-control budget with many other United States Department of Agriculture bureaus. This is uneconomical and is stifling the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service which have been delegated primary responsibility for flood control by the Secretary of Agriculture'."

Those are the words of an investigator our committee put to work on the job. The gentleman cannot tell me that there is not considerable we should look into in this particular case.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The reason I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is that this is the very thing that happened in my district. I hate to see the people get a run-around. I hate to see the legislative authority of the Congress challenged. They simply make fools of all of us when they do not carry out the mandates Congress passes.

In my district, according to the headlines of the Gannett newspapers, lurid

headlines on the front page, beef is going up 28 percent, after the order to roll back the cattlemen's prices. I wonder what is going to happen when the packers take their cut. Are the people of my district going to have to pay about 25 percent more for their meat than they are now? It is something we all ought to consider, and see that this Price Administrator gets a talking to from the people of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY as a substitute to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

On page 27, line 14, strike out "$8,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500,000."

On page 28, line 4, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,800,000."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut the appropriation from $8,000,000 to $2,500,000, of which not more than $1,800,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized for necessary gully control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Would the gentleman object to an amendment providing that the Federal Government knock out all these dams, and let the water down on those people who live in the areas affected?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would.

In addition to the $2,500,000 which would be available, I think we can anticipate there will be a carry-over of up to $2,000,000 from last year's appropriation. In 1949 there was a carry-over from the previous year. From 1949 to 1950 there was a carry-over of over $1,250,000. From 1950 through 1951 there was a carry-over of over $3,000,000. Of last year's appropriation, which was $9,000,000-odd, the total funds obligated as of April 30, are about $6,000,000, which means there is an unobligated balance of over $3,000,000. So that we can anticipate at that rate of expenditure that there will be a carry-over this year, as there has been in past years, of up to $2,000,000, which will mean the total appropriation, if my substitute is accepted, will be nearly $4,500,000. I do not think there is any doubt that this program can stand this cut.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that during the war this entire program was practically cut out?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; I believe it was.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That in itself would show that it is one of those so-called nonessentials that we can certainly go slow with at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I believe this program is most worth while, but I do believe it can be postponed. Many of these programs are not of an emergency nature, and can be delayed until another year, when the situation may not be as critical. I note that the report of the committee said that these projects did not use critical and strategic material. I certaily think a dollar this year is a critical and strategic material, and I do not think we ought to go ahead with projects which are not of a defense nature.

While this whole program is intended to increase the agricultural productivity of this country over a long-range period of time, I think many of these projects which are of a general benefit to the country can be postponed to another year when we are not in as critical a period.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. ALBFRT. The gentleman from Minnesota said that this program was curtailed during the war. That is true. But, may I point out, that we did not have any flood control or any soil conservation program for 100 years in this country. Is that any reason why we should not have it now?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. I think he was making reference to a previous critical period when the dollar was in short supply. The point has been raised by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] as to whether work on these watersheds has already begun. It is true that the 11 big watersheds have work already commenced on them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. But these watersheds are divided into sub-water-sheds. Many of these have not had work commenced on them, and I think many of these can be postponed to another year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Construction is actually underway on 11 authorized projects, and my contention is that it is wasting money to continue this everlasting job of piling up preliminary reports on top of one another which we may never use for the next 20 or 30 years.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, I was trying to point out to the gentleman that these 11 watersheds are divided into sub-watersheds and many of these sub-water-sheds have not had work commenced on them, and they can be postponed until another year. I think there is no clear-cut connection between this work this year and defense this year. This program is for the purpose of increasing the productivity of agriculture in many areas of the country over a long-range period. I am for that. But I think this year, having a heavy financial deficit, many of these projects can be postponed until another time when we are not in such critical condition. I think we ought to spend money this year only when it has defense implication. I do not think anyone can argue that this is a case of spending money for defense. There will be over $4,000,000 at the end of this year for expenditures for this purpose. Emergency conditions can be dealt with and the others can be postponed over a longer period of time.

I believe this substitute should be accepted by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no purpose today in rising to talk on this proposition except to be fair. I tried to find out something about this particular provision of the bill. If you will recall, I asked some questions during general debate about this part of the bill. We have some excellent programs that are nationwide. We have the Forest Service program, which I have always strongly supported. The Soil Conservation Service has done an outstanding job. The PMA has done an outstanding job on soil conservation. I shall speak on that subject later on.

Here we have joint responsibility. We have the responsibility of the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service. Apparently, sometime, due to an act of Congress, an over-all program was set up above that, which, as near as I have been able to find out, is a duplication of the effort of the Forest Service and the soil Conservation Service. In looking at the hearings on this particular bill, I want to emphasize that this program was practically discontinued during the war years 1942 to 1947, but lest we get confused, on page 750 of the hearings, in talking about the number of positions we have "Estimated Positions, 1,033 Federal employees." Those employees are working on this particular program which, as near as I have been able to determine, appears to be a duplication.

In addition to that, we have over half of the money going for salaries. So when we talk in terms of what we are going to do as far as contracts and the fixing up of these things is concerned, over half of this money goes for personal services; duplication.

There is a group set up here that will hold a conference with people who are charged with the responsibility of doing the work. We have the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service. In addition to that we have to have a group over and above that to get those two agencies to come together in a conference and decide what they are going to do.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am very glad the gentleman is emphasizing that part, because he and I both want to see emphasis placed upon actual construction work in this particular division. I want to reiterate that when $4,200,000 was cut off last fall the flood-control group themselves took $4,000,000 of that off of construction, and only decreased their survey work by $200,000.

Mr. MARSHALL. My good friend from Minnesota is a farmer and he knows, as I do, that conservation is not conservation until it is an accomplished fact on the land. That is where it has to be. We can talk all we want to about planning, we can talk all we want about schemes of how we are going to control things, but until those things are actually carried out it does not amount to a

saving to anybody. It is a matter of piling up salaries, it is a matter of piling up expenses, it is a matter of piling up detailed data which, after all, becomes obsolete. Most of the things that we ask for in the matter of surveys have to be resurveyed again because of costs. The things in this particular bill for construction will have to all be gone over as a matter of cost, to determine what will be done.

I say this is one of the places where we can save some money and it is not going to harm anybody. A little later on we will get into some phases of the agricultural program that we are all interested in, that will save our soil—conservation practices, and all that sort of thing. This is something that can be just as well set aside. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the proof is that it was set aside during the war years 1942 to 1947.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is in position to know whereof he speaks because for quite a few years he held a very responsible position in the Department of Agriculture working in our State of Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to try to procure the assistance of the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the committee, in getting the record straight.

Both of our distinguished friends from Minnesota have said that there is no justification for piling up a large number of surveys, and I agree with that. Yet, a consistent program of planning and survey work should be carried on. Certain new projects should be started. But I should like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi how much of the money in this bill as it comes before the committee is for surveys of new projects?

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee made no special set-aside at all for surveys. Out of the funds available they have made some surveys, and it is estimated that such examinations and surveys under the budget estimate was $1,784,000. I understand this work is being carried on in 11 watersheds. I know, being on this committee, how many able Members of Congress and others have been on delegations urging this type of work which is badly needed in many areas. The only way you can start a project is to have something you can check against.

I do not know whether the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is just a straight cut, or to have the cut applied to the elimination of surveys and reallocated for construction work. Just what he has in mind I do not know.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly the purpose of the gentleman from Minnesota is to decrease to $250,000 the sum requested by the Department for preliminary surveys. I might say to the gentleman, if he will permit, the figure on the completed preliminary surveys is 171 watersheds, according to page 755 of the hearings, but we are actually working on only eleven.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I should like to find out from the gentleman whether his amendment would slow down construction on projects in basins which are already under construction.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I doubt whether it would on big projects, I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, because they have a large carry-over. At the most it would affect them to the extent of about one-fifth in work that they would do for this coming year if the Department of Agriculture would do what we are aiming at; that is, to take the bulk of this cut from preliminary surveys and also save on other items that they have requested which have very little to do with actual construction.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to have that statement in the record. I would hate to see work on projects under construction slowed down.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I feel that if we were assured that the money would be spent mainly where we want it to be spent, on actual construction, that following the passing of this present emergency the Congress would be well justified in putting up $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 a year until these particular projects are completed. This work is important. We must stop the water upstream as much as possible and prevent it from flooding the lower areas. We have a vast field to work in. I hope all of this will eventually be turned over to one agency, preferably the Soil Conservation Service, and help that agency do the sort of a job on the upper watersheds as the Army engineers is now doing with the navigable rivers.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the gentleman because we are spending on some of the large dams on these watersheds as much as $250,000,000. For a relatively small amount we can construct small dams and do soil conservation work that will prevent silting, that will preserve these great reservoirs on which the taxpayers have spent many millions of dollars. In my own State the work on the Washita Basin should be speeded and not slowed down, not only to conserve thousands of acres of good land but to protect Lake Texoma. This is a program for the conservation of soil. Contrary to the statement of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] this is not a program which duplicates any other program. The regular program of the Soil Conservation Service dovetails into this program, but under that program, construction projects such as these are not possible. On the other hand, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have no authority to go down and build these small dams on creeks and small tributaries of the larger streams.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] was not referring to duplication as far as the Army engineers are concerned. He was referring to duplication within the Department. We have about seven different agencies getting their fingers into this pie and all I am asking by my amendment is to stop, look, listen and straighten the thing out before we go ahead with further expenditure of many millions of dollars.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Will the gentleman from Minnesota amend his amendment to cut out all surveys and let the construction go ahead?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I could not agree to that.

Mr. SUTTON. I thought that was the purpose of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, I want to knock out the bulk of the preliminary surveys but I would not want in case of an emergency, for example, to prevent doing absolutely necessary preliminary or final surveys and mapping.

Mr. SUTTON. Then the gentleman wants to cut out some construction?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Very little. After all we are at war and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] so well said, we have a strategic material here, the dollar, that we are thinking about today. We must be willing to curtail even the things we favor most.

Mr. SUTTON. What is more strategic than the soil of this country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in listening to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] one would gather that at some time in the not too distant past some of these agencies had pulled a few dirty tricks on the folks down in his district. The other day I recall listening to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, who told us in several different ways that all those who had been listening to the Communists and dealing with them were getting a dirty deal. That is too bad. It is regrettable the State Department and the administration did not realize that fact long ago.

But I am wondering whether some time we are going to get back—and I

mean the Congress—and do a little homework for our own folks.

HOMEWORK NEEDS ATTENTION

While hundreds of thousands of men are fighting for "a free world"; while administration spokesmen and Members of Congress are debating how best the American people can make further sacrifices, do more for so-styled "free peoples" and "free nations," some of us have been wondering when this administration and Congress will take effective action to make our people a "free people."

Because of the propaganda put out by those who worry overmuch over the fact that other people in some parts of the world have less of this world's goods, less freedom of action than do we; our own people, those who elect a President, Vice President, and Members of Congress and who pay them, are, because of ever-increasing taxation and regimentation imposed by those who should be their servants, finding it more and more difficult to meet their tax bills, to purchase in the open market at a reasonable price, the things to which they have become accustomed.

But far worse and more harmful in the end is the ever-increasing curtailment of the freedom of the individual to exercise what so many call his "civil rights"—rights guaranteed by the Constitution heretofore exercised by all of us—rights which professional organizations intent upon protecting some civil rights, ignore.

What I am trying to put across is a realization that here in America, "the land of the free," in Georgia, for example, for weeks men and women who desired to work for a livelihood were, by a minority using deadly weapons, forcibly prevented from working.

We all know that if a man and his family would eat, he must—unless he is the object of charity or of someone's generosity—go about his daily task. But here in free America, in Georgia, individuals are not free.

While seeking, through our Armed Forces to bring freedom to a people thousands of miles away—who may resent our efforts, should we not worry a little about our own citizens?

Nor is Georgia the only place in America where men are not free.

The press tells us that in Chicago people—heads of families—cannot purchase milk for family use, for the baby or babies of the family. Why? Because those who distribute milk—which otherwise is available—refuse to permit its delivery.

While we are spending billions of dollars, sacrificing thousands of American lives, to bring about a greater degree of freedom in Asia, would it not be well if we used the laws already on the books to help the farmer sell the milk he produces, give the housewife who has the money, the opportunity to buy the milk she needs?

In Detroit, without notice, individuals who operate the city-owned transportation system have, for weeks—carried on a strike, tied up the city's transportation system.

Result? Thousands of people are forced to seek other methods of transportation. This, despite the fact that Michigan has a law which provides that when a municipal employee goes on strike he loses the job, is no longer an employee. Another law makes it a criminal offense for any individual to interfere with another who seeks to go about his daily task. A union official says, in effect, that the streetcars will not run unless the union's demands are met.

The mayor of Detroit has refused to yield to the demands of the strikers. Presumably, he realizes that if he yields to one demand, shortly others will follow.

Hundreds of thousands of people in Detroit are inconvenienced, some grievously injured because a minority refuses to recognize the law, insists upon having its will imposed upon an overwhelming majority.

And Frank X. Martel, president of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor, says:

> The DSR (Department of Street Railways) vehicles will appear only on the streets of Detroit when they are operated by members of division 26 (the striking local) under union conditions.

Does this indicate we are a free people?

Will Governor Williams meet the Martel challenge or will he yield to political pressure?

Again, permit me to ask, why should American youth be conscripted for free nations abroad while here at home—in Georgia, in Illinois, and in Michigan—our law-enforcing officers permit, because of expediency, let us say, millions of people to be deprived of their freedom?

Will some who seem to have the cares of the world on their shoulders turn their eyes homeward—do a little home work here before they continue to sacrifice the lives of more and more of our men abroad?

Instead of devoting all our thought and efforts toward the betterment of "free peoples" who do not exist, why not free Americans whose rights are denied them?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] just said, that is, that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] apparently felt that someone down in the department had played a trick on him. I think I should make some explanation of what did happen. The trick was played, to use the words of the gentleman from Michigan, on the districts which the gentleman from Mississippi and I have the honor to represent, not by anyone down in any department, but by the Congress of the United States. I do not agree with my colleague that it was exactly a trick. I am simply using his words.

Now here is what happened. In 1936, after the Army engineers had made their reports on the proposed construction of the dams and reservoirs, the Congress authorized their construction. The Congress did this even though the engineers reported the projects to be economically unsound.

The dams were put under construction prior to the war and were subsequently suspended. After the war construction was resumed and the projects are now nearing completion.

So by an act of this Congress the waters of several rivers have been backed over the farms in the north central Mississippi. I think I should add that this was done over the protest of Mr. WHITTEN and myself. We appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and begged committee members not to appropriate money for these projects. We made our case of protest on the basis of the engineers' report and submitted evidence that the projects would utterly destroy many of our farmers. The committee and the Congress, in their wisdom, disagreed; and so the projects were proceeded with. Now that is water over the mill but the effect of the projects on our districts is not. To partially compensate our people and make their burdens as light as possible, this same Congress promised that the backwaters and runoff waters would be controlled as much as possible. That is one of the purposes of this particular item in the bill. We were also assured that there would be a good project of erosion control, which would not only benefit such land as we had left, but would control the flow of waters into the reservoirs. Those were firm commitments made to us by this Congress. Now, if you want to cut that out, that is your business; but it seems to me that when and if you do, then it would be nothing but right and fair that you restore the status quo in our districts. Of course, the latter is impossible because the dams and reservoirs are about finished and certainly should be finished with the least possible delay.

All we ask is that you carry out your commitment and give us the water and erosion control projects that were so faithfully promised in consideration of the sacrifice made by our people.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] said a great portion of this money is going to administrative costs. Sure it is. Do you know why? Because the landowners are paying primarily for the actual work. The Government is primarily furnishing technical services through administrative experts and is preparing and presenting plans, all of which naturally throws a large portion of this item to administrative costs. It is more or less an administrative item because the farmers themselves are doing the work. This Congress is building the dams and reservoirs for the benefit of people below the levee free of charge, but as for us above the dams, we are getting technical services only and paying for the work. That is the agreement. Now certainly you are not going back on it.

The gentlemen of the committee have already cut this a reasonable sum, in fact, to a greater percentage than the percentage cut made in other bills that have come to the House. I think the committee has been very reasonable and I feel that we should support the item as is. If you see fit to support either of the pending amendments, that is your privilege. But such action would be most unfair and constitute a breach of agreement with our people. I have faith in your wisdom and fairness and am con-

fident you will vote down the amendments, particularly the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to propound a question to the chairman of the subcommittee. May I ask just how the pending amendments would affect the Little Sioux River project in northwest Iowa?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Little Sioux project is in the bill for approximately $908,000. The amount of the cut, of course, is much greater than that amount of money. How it would be applied I do not know, but the amount of the cut far exceeds the amount that was set up for the Little Sioux project, in Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. As I understand, the sum now in the bill is $908,000, whereas during the last fiscal year we appropriated $1,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. The committee has made reductions in our very serious efforts to hold down every project we could. We have even cut those projects which we considered to be vital to some areas.

Mr. HOEVEN. The pending amendments are in the false-economy class. I think my record for economy in Government is equal to that of anyone present. The Little Sioux River project is the pattern for soil-conservation practices throughout the United States. It was set up some years ago, and has been unduly retarded. The proposed amendments would further slow up the soil-conservation work that is being done under the project.

The situation has been particularly aggravated this year due to serious floods in the Little Sioux area. I should tell you that the Little Sioux project is almost entirely within my congressional district. The flooding of the Little Sioux it almost a yearly occurrence. Only a few weeks ago people were forced from their homes in Cherokee, Correctionville, and Spencer, in my district. The town of Anthon, due to its peculiar location, is constantly in danger from the floodwaters. That situation demands particular attention.

It seems to me that instead of retarding the development of this flood-control project we should at least stop, look, and listen. The Little Sioux project is a thing in being. The work of redeeming the land and stopping the flood waters has been going on for severral years. Our farmers are cooperating, devoting a lot of time and effort and even furnishing their own money to help complete the project. They are using soil conservation practices, are planting shrubbery and trees and are doing everything humanly possible to retain the raindrops where they fall. I therefore feel it is imperative to continue work on the project without interruption, and it should be completed as soon as possible. We are not only dealing with the destruction of rich agricultural land, but are also dealing with human beings whose lives are placed in jeopardy every time the Little Sioux goes on a rampage.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to call to the attention of the gentleman that the project which he refers to is also in my congressional district, and I think a good portion of it is in the congressional district of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. May I add, if the gentleman will bear with me, that the main part of this cut which I want to put into effect, namely, $1,500,000 of it will come out of the preliminary surveys which will not have a thing in the world to do with the Little Sioux-Minnesota River project. That project is already authorized and in construction. I will admit that about 20 percent will be the rate of reduction in our particular project which we are both interested in. I do not see that that can do much damage.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman does admit his amendment will slow down the program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It will slow it down to the extent of 20 percent on the construction end. But may I say to the gentleman, if the Department sees fit it can take most of the survey money and utilize it on the construction, where this money should be used. The Secretary has the right to do that. I do not think, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa, if this amendment is adopted, it will be necessary basically to slow up any of these 11 projects very little, if any.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House I think it is well that I give you more information about the Little Sioux problem than has already been given by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. The Little Sioux Valley begins in Minnesota about 20 miles above the Iowa-Minnesota line, and extends approximately 100 miles from that point down into the district I have the honor to represent. There is approximately 4,000 square miles in the Little Sioux River Valley. We have had terrific rains and floods there this spring to the extent that in my district right at this minute thousands upon thousands of acres of the finest land that lays outdoors is under water. The part of the Little Sioux River Valley in my district is the lower part of the valley and hence it is the people in my area that suffer most from the floodwaters which inundated the land and will keep that land from being cultivated this year when food is so badly needed. I had a phone call last Friday from a very reputable gentleman of that area who said there were 60,000 acres of land in the Little Sioux Valley in Monona County and Harrison County in my district under water at that time, and that it would be impossible to get that water off of thousands upon thousands of acres of that land in time to put in crops this year. I certainly would be the last one to ask the House to spend money that should not be spent. But I am not at all embarrassed in asking that the full amount in this bill be appropriated for this very necessary purpose. The Congress, with my help, has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to apply irrigated water on some of the poorest land that lays outdoors in the Western States and to make that land productive, but, when it comes to the point of keeping water off of the finest land that lays outdoors, it is a different story.

It does not make one from an area such as I represent feel very good after he has been kind to the Western States in appropriating money to place desert land under irrigation, to be refused a small amount, comparatively speaking, to keep the floodwaters off of the finest land that lies outdoors. Of course, the will of the House will prevail, but I do want my colleagues to know the true situation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This program keeps the floodwaters off of the good bottom farms of this country, does it not?

Mr. JENSEN. It does.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. How does spending $1,500,000 for unnecessary preliminary surveys and planning, which cannot be used for years to come in actual construction, help keep the water off of your land? You want this money spent in construction, I am sure, in the upper reaches of the streams so that the flow of too much water at one time can be retarded or prevented?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, that is what I want. They are, however, using too much money for work other than construction.

Mr. JENSEN. Very well, but survey funds are also necessary for other watersheds.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not know of a man in this House who has fought more for economy than has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], but I think the gentleman is making the wrong decision here. I know that he has the welfare of the people of his district at heart.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I have a very good understanding of the matter under discussion. Do I understand that $1,500,000 of this cut is to be taken out of surveys and investigations?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As far as I am concerned, yes. That is my intention. The record will certainly inform the Department as to where we think this reduction in the main should be applied.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman from Minnesota probably has the very best of intentions along that line, but if he had had that in mind I wonder why his amendment did not read, "No part of which shall be used for preliminary surveys." Then it would have had the effect of actually reducing the expenditure for this purpose, but he just cut the money. I am sure that he meant to have them reduce the funds for surveys, but had he wanted to do that, he should have tied it down in an amendment saying, "No part of which shall be used for such and such."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will accept an amendment to that effect, if the gentleman will prepare it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. ANDERSEN, all of us know of your great fight for soil conservation. But there is something else involved here. There are many small tributary valley-wide soil-conservation and flood-control watersheds in this United States that are now receiving attention by the Soil Conservation Service and Army engineers, that being the cheapest way for all the taxpayers to help conserve our soil and to keep our land productive and hence to hold food prices down to a fair level in those watersheds where the farmers have already contoured and terraced and filled gullies, grassed their waterways and done everything they could with their own money to conserve the soil. Now, this survey money which you say is in this bill is to be used to make surveys of that no-man's land between where the Soil Conservation Service can legally operate and where the Army engineers have authority to operate today. That is along the small streams or tributaries to the main stream. A number of resolutions have been submitted to the Committee on Public Works of this House for watersheds and flood-control surveys. The Honorable CLIFF DAVIS is the chairman of the subcommittee handling that proposed legislation. The facts are that that is the cheapest way to conserve the soil and to stop floods before the floods reach the lowlands and to keep the rain where it falls. That, my colleagues, is not only proper soil conservation but also flood prevention. I would hesitate to put language into this amendment which would deny the Soil Conservation Service, the Army engineers, and the Forest Service permission to make such surveys and investigations as they will make if money is allocated for that purpose. That also is very important. I believe the Members of this House who know something about watershed problems will agree with me that sooner or later we are going to have to treat these small watersheds as individual problems in order finally to get the complete job of soil conservation, flood prevention, and flood control done effectively. Remember that before the Army engineers or the Soil Conservation Service will operate on the streams, the farmers must have contoured and terraced, to a considerable extent, to keep the water out of the streams.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time for debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, close in 14 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of registering my opposition not only to the Andersen amendment but to the Kennedy amendment to the Andersen amendment. We in West Virginia are interested in multiple-purpose dams, not in power projects. On two of the projects in my district the Agriculture Department is using money out of these appropriated funds that you are proposing to cut today. They have joined in the State along with the Forestry Department. What we need over in West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, is some trees back on the hillsides that will stop these flash floods which over the last 10 years have drowned from 60 to 70 residents of the State of West Virginia. Only last July 34 people were drowned because our forefathers did not have presence of mind enough to leave some timber on the hillsides. It is true that there will be no actual construction work on projects in West Virginia this year, but there is a whole lot of work that should be done both by the Forestry Department, Department of Agriculture, and the Army engineers in working up these projects. I sincerely hope we will not let our ideas of economy injure so important an appropriation as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has been as responsible as any man has through the past few years, in seeing to it that soil conservation districts as such secure ample appropriations for the new districts created every year. This amendment however has nothing to do with that at all.

I am trying to cure a situation that the investigator from our committee said exists. He reported that this program, referring to the way the flood-control program is being operated, is uneconomical and is stifling the Soil Conservation Service. It is stifling it because other agencies of the department can come in and charge against this program for people it places upon its money that should rightfully be used in the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service for the actual construction program under flood control.

Is there any good reason in the name of common sense why we should continue making more surveys, to the extent of $1,500,000, than are absolutely necessary? If you will turn to page 760 you will see where the Department asks for $250,000 for general basin investigations. That money, together with the larger portion of the near $1,750,000 asked for to continue preliminary surveys and planning, could much better be devoted to the actual work upstream on projects already authorized by Congress. I am just as much for helping out my particular district as any man in the House, and one of these projects is partially in my district. I personally however do not object to seeing that project slowed down to the extent of 20 percent in construction if necessary so as to give to the Congress the opportunity to fully study this entire set-up.

We are at war and we can afford to slow down on even desirable public works so as to use our men and money in lines more closely akin to the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman from Minnesota has offered, according to my figures, would cut the works project here about $1,000,000, even though it were applied to surveys. The gentleman from Massachusetts, motivated, I am sure, by the best of intentions, offers to cut the $8,000,000 down to $2,500,000. You know, that is typical of all in these times; we all recognize the absolute need for saving money, and we all can see where we can afford to cut out anything that is across the hill. With all due deference to my good friend from Massachusetts—and I listen to him on matters coming before his Committee on Foreign Affairs—I have a very strong suspicion in my mind that he is not a great expert on the conditions that exist in Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, West Virginia, California, Oklahoma, and a number of other States. Now, he is sincere in believing that you can cut those things out in those States and it will not hurt anything, and he is honest about it, but he does not know. That is what we here on this committee do every day. The gentleman from Minnesota read from the report of the investigation. That investigation was made because I asked that it be made. Do you know who put it in the RECORD? I put it in the RECORD. Do you know why I put it in the RECORD? To tell them to correct things that the report showed were bad. First, I had the obligation to try to find out; I had the investigation made and we found out and I had the obligation of putting it in the RECORD to correct it. I had the obligation of recommending to the committee to cut out enough funds to force them to correct it, and we cut this 15 percent. I think I have discharged my responsibility, but I am going to follow it up next year and see that they do. It is not a question of somebody else finding out. We get along fine in our committee. The gentleman from Minnesota and I and the other members of the committee council together. This issue was never raised in the committee; there was not one word said about it. I think that he knows, in all sincerity, that all of us want to do what we can. The gentleman from Iowa was disturbed about the

Little Sioux. Under the amendment on the desk you just cut out so much money. There is no way to tell how much of the cut might be applied to the Little Sioux.

There is no duplication here. The people in the Secretary's office that try to coordinate that are under a different appropriation. The Soil Conservation Service does have some of its people assigned to this work. The PMA has some. This is what I think is the best approach to soil conservation. First you go out and make a plan. Then your work projects are required to fit into that plan. That is what I think effective soil conservation should be; that is what it is here. But beyond all that, this is an obligation of the Congress. I pointed out to you that the problems that exist in my area were created by the Congress when you appropriated money to build these dams. In connection with it you gave assurance that attention would be given to this kind of problem. You said the people up above the dams would have to put up 50 percent of the money, but now, under this amendment and the substitute, you say, "Well, we have got the dams in and we flooded you out, but now we are going to welch on carrying out the Government's obligation to put up 50 percent of the cost of relieving the situation which the Government brought about; you would not assist them to open small streams and do the best they can, because the Federal Government stopped up the river down below."

I believe I have a good record for economy in this Congress. I believe I have a good record on this committee. I have investigated every chance I had where I thought there was any chance of doing good. I did it here. We made proper reductions, and we are going to follow up and see that this money goes where it should go.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time on the amendments has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 100, noes 96.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. KENNEDY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 110, noes 124.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 120, noes 95.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed partially out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WHITTEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we had an agreement to start with, that we would have to object to any Member speaking out of order. I regret very much to object but this is the third day on this bill, and with the leadership trying to move forward, we must insist on the agreement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is my recollection that that agreement was with reference to general debate only. I do not recall that there was any agreement with reference to speaking under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to hold the gentleman to any agreement he did not make, and therefore I will not object.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not propose to deal with the highway question.

Mr. KEATING. I do, and I shall be glad to proceed in order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order and is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation bill, and my remarks have to do with the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. Chairman, Hopewell is a quiet, law-abiding community in western New York. When a high-powered car charged through the town at 70 to 75 miles per hour, it was overtaken and stopped by police officers. The driver is reported to have said that he was acting for the President of the United States, that he had the President's sister in the car with him, and that "the President will be distressed if his sister is detained." The police officer, thinking that this was simply another excuse for speeding, although admittedly a novel and ingenious one, insisted on taking the driver into custody.

He gave his name as Grady A. Stowe and his occupation as a special agent assigned to guard a member of the President's family. He was not able to produce a driver's license. He was sentenced to be fined $20 or imprisoned for 20 days. He paid the fine and departed.

Investigation then developed, to the surprise of the inhabitants of Hopewell and the surrounding countryside, that, sure enough, it was the President's sister traveling around in western New York in a Government-owned limousine together with two Secret Service agents assigned to drive and guard her. It further developed that the accused was from Grand View, Mo., the home town of the President's sister, and apparently a friend of the Truman family who had been placed on the Federal payroll for this usual assignment.

Justice of the Peace Warren Smithem, of Hopewell, wryly commented at the close of the proceedings in his court that he would probably now receive a letter from the President.

If this violation of law had not taken place, it is questionable whether this newly devised method of squandering the taxpayers' money would have been brought to light. One can understand why it is necessary for the President's immediate family to have protection in the form of a bodyguard. But if this same privilege is to be extended to all the President's collateral relatives, a fair inquiry would be how many there are now receiving this kind of treatment, normally accorded only to visiting dignitaries.

It is reported also that this car was traveling in an easterly direction. If they were on their way from Washington back to Grand View, Mo., they would never have had occasion to travel in anything except a northerly or westerly direction. Also it would seem that, if a guard was necessary, one man ought to be able to do the job.

It is not the dollars and cents involved in this particular incident which constitutes the inherent scandal in the situation. It is the evidence of callous disregard for the legitimate interests of the taxpayers and wage earners who must foot the bill for Government cars, chauffeurs, and bodyguards which is the really serious element in this disclosure.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman from New York proceeding further on the ground that his remarks have nothing whatever to do with appropriations for the coming fiscal year for the Department of Agriculture but concern some picayune matter which seems to be of interest only to the people of Hopewell, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. KEATING. The disclosures to which I have referred are symptomatic of the squandering of the taxpayers' money which we are seeking by the cuts in this bill to eliminate and put a stop to, at least in part. They indicate too that the need to improve the ethical and moral standards with relation to the waste of public funds in the Executive Office of the White House reaches to the highest echelon in that office. Let me hasten, however, to exculpate the President's sister. I understand she is a thoroughly estimable lady of high character. There was no reason for her to question the propriety of a sightseeing trip in a Government car with a driver and companion, all compensated out of the pay envelopes of American workers. Indeed, there was every reason for her to accept that as the norm of conduct for one with deep roots in the White House. The President has been taking everybody else in the country for a ride for 6 years. Why not his own sister?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on a point of order against the gentleman's proceeding. He is out of order and is taking the Committee for a ride by violating the rules of the House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman would acquaint himself with the rules

of the House, he would know I do not have to ask his permission to address the Chair on a point of order. I further insist on the point of order that the gentleman from New York is not proceeding in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York must proceed in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman asked to proceed out of order. There was temporary objection to it, then the objection was withheld, and the agreement is that he can proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is in error. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] objected.

Mr. McCORMACK. A Republican.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), title III of the act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1012), and the act of August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), including research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion, and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and the construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); making conservation surveys and plans and establishing measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs); establishment and operation of conservation nurseries; development and management of land utilization project lands and facilities; dissemination of information; purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings; operation and maintenance of aircraft; and furnishing of subsistence to employees; $54,278,000: *Provided*, That the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $2,500, except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing $2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $500 per building: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri, where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That not to exceed $265,000 of funds authorized for fiscal year 1951 for development of land utilization projects may remain available until expended.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 30, line 22, after the period insert a new proviso, as follows: "*Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the service."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in an attempt to make it possible for the work of the soil-conservation districts to proceed with more speed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Personally I have no objection to the amendment. I cannot speak for the committee, however.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I know there are quite a number of Members who are interested in the point I am bringing up now. I want to impress upon the Committee the fact that we have shown here a great interest in all types of soil conservation from the watershed, the very crests of our great mountains, down to the deltas of our rivers. We are interested in that and we are urging that more soil-conservation districts be formed. We are appropriating more and more money each year for this purpose. Today the total number of soil-conservation districts in the United States is somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,300 or more. That is a round figure and approximately right.

Keep in mind that if the intent of this body continues, and I hope it does, it will result in a final figure in 1970 or 1975, when we have reached the acme of this program that we want, of 15,000 people working in the Soil Conservation Service. I do not quarrel with that because we are asking for it, but I certainly would do everything in my power to provide for per diem or non-civil-service people who can qualify for this great work, a lot of which lies ahead of us. That is the intent of this amendment which I understand has been accepted by the chairman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has offered a very good amendment and I hope it will be adopted. I wonder if at the present time they have that authority?

Mr. HORAN. No.

Mr. GATHINGS. The authority to hire these civil engineers?

Mr. HORAN. No. We had a lot of trouble with that very item. This amendment will put them right on the spot as to whether or not they will do it. They have not been doing it and we have had protests from qualified civil engineers in some districts in which they have had difficulty getting technical service. The intent of the amendment is to bring out in the open that very point.

Mr. GATHINGS. I have prepared an amendment that would utilize the services, when practicable, of private civil engineers in connection with the conservation and use of agricultural land resources program. I trust that your amendment will attain that objective, if so it will not be necessary for me to present mine.

Mr. HORAN. They have that power now; the transfer of 5 percent of the conservation and use funds for the Soil Conservation Service work.

Mr. GATHINGS. Since the consolidation of the Soil Conservation Service offices with the Production and Marketing Administration local offices I have received complaints that private accredited civil engineers in counties that are not in soil conservation districts have been deprived of laying off the farms and doing this technical engineering work that they had formerly done. I hope that the gentleman's amendment will keep these engineers in business. They should not have to apply to the Government for a job.

Mr. HORAN. They have that power already, although it is on a voluntary basis.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I can see where the effect of this amendment will be for economy. This will be temporary help?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Instead of the Department hiring people on a yearly basis, then having the possibility that many of them will lay around in the off-peak period, they will simply be permitted under the gentleman's amendment to hire technical assistants when needed?

Mr. HORAN. That is exactly right.

Mr. JENSEN. Then they will be removed from the rolls when not needed?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Al-

lotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; $256,500,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, carried out during the period July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1951, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,250,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $4,966,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order No. 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1952 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $225,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 33, line 4, strike out "$225,000,000," and insert "$150,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment on page 33, line 4, to reduce the $225,000,000 figure to $150,000,000. This proposal is designed to reduce the amount of allotments to be made under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended. It has the endorsement of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and all of you have received a telegram from Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I will read. It is dated the 10th:

> Reduction Federal expenditures absolutely essential part sound inflation-control program. Unless we control inflation, we jeopardize the freedom of all citizens, farmers included. Therefore, farmers willing to do their share toward accomplishing this objective. Specifically urge your support the amendment agricultural appropriation bill to reduce agricultural conservation program funds for 1952 crop year to $150,000,000.
>
> ALLAN B. KLINE,
> *President,*
> *American Farm Bureau Federation.*

This matter is in somewhat the following situation: These funds have been spent or supposed to be spent for different items that have been handed to the farmers to use on their farms: Inorganic fertilizer to the tune of 50 percent; protective green manure crops, 15 percent; erosion-control practices, 15 percent; range and pasture improvement, 15 percent; and other items, 5 percent. The figure last year was $235,000,000 and the budget submitted that figure to go in the bill for this year and the committee cut it to $225,000,000.

The Farm Bureau at its meeting discussed this situation and they said this:

> With respect to our recommendation of $150,000,000 for the 1952 program, we reiterate our previous position that these funds be apportioned on the basis of need.
>
> The encouragement of better farming practices which this program has fostered has been a sound public investment. Many of these practices have become interwoven into farming operations to the extent that many farmers will follow them because they are good business. In other words, the educational and demonstrational aspects of the program have served their purpose. The existence of a firm demand for the greatest production of grain, fiber, and livestock products which can be turned out is an added reason for reducing these funds.

Then they quote their resolution.

That is a part of the situation. I have been up against that situation in my own territory many times. I have had many farmers come to see me about it. This is what has happened. Several hundred pounds of fertilizer would be dumped in the corner of a lot, and the farmer on whose land it was dumped would not even know it was there. At other times they have brought in fertilizer that was not suitable for the land in question, and left it with the farmers. Many times they have brought in lime where the soil was underlaid with limestone, and it would be absolutely useless to try to put lime on it with any desirable effect.

Mr. Chairman, we are right in this situation, a pretty serious situation. The Committee on Ways and Means is holding continuous sessions trying to find ways to raise money to pay the 1952 expenditure bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Every day you read of some group on whom they have increased taxes. Is it not about time that we take things in hand and undertake to reduce expenditures as far as it is possible, so that our budget can be balanced and we will not have to pay our debts with further inflated dollars? It seems to me it is about time we wake up to our responsibilities and meet them face to face. I know there will be farmers who will want to have this money handed to them, but this is not a soil conservation program. That is the item that was covered from page 28 to the middle of page 31. This is a program where we turn over money to the farmer to use on his own soil if he uses it.

I believe any friend of the farmer can come to realize that unless we do away with these things that are costing money and are for the benefit of individual farmers and for the benefit of farmers as a class, outside of such advisory programs as the Soil Conservation Service and such things as agricultural research, we are really doing them a disservice. The longer we carry on with those things and the more money we spend that way, the more we make the farmer subject to being a target of other folks.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman will be interested to know that a few weeks ago the leading farm paper in Nebraska made a check with the farmers in our State and asked them whether payments for certain soil conservation practices that benefit the farmer should be omitted from the President's budget.

The farmers voted 72 percent in favor of omitting those benefits.

Mr. TABER. That is the situation with the best of the farmers. The lights in the Chamber went out temporarily just a moment ago. The lights will go out for good if we do not begin to save money. Let us start now with an intelligent approach to this problem.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 33, line 4, strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$285,000,000."

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this the item where the cranberry bog owners were paid to sand in their bogs?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is a part of this particular program.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest problems we have and which will ever face this country is the production of food, fiber, and oil which is needed. That is a huge problem. One of the greatest problems that our forefathers had when they came to this country was the conservation of our natural resources. The pages of history are filled with examples of how Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Patrick Henry carried on soil-conservation programs. Patrick Henry said something to the effect that no man is a greater patriot than he who conserves his soil. They began that kind of work to conserve their soil. But in our greed to get the wealth out of the soil we have depleted our natural resources. We have depleted our timber supplies and depleted our soil. It is very questionable if any nation in the world has ever depleted its soil as rapidly as the United States has. Unless we do something to sustain the soil and to build up the resources that we have in this country we can very soon sink to the status of a third-rate power. All my amendment intends to do is to carry on a soil-conservation program for which the Congress originally authorized $500,000,000, on the same basis that it has heretofore been carried on. The psychological effect at this time would be very bad if we were to say that we do not need food and fiber and oil in this critical period. We made that mistake in World War I. We did not pay proper attention to the conservation of our soil, and because we did not we went into a stage in our history, which is a sad chapter to look back on. The Dust Bowl grew out of the lack of proper conservation of our soil.

We have people in a number of Federal agencies who are interested in soil conservation. The Soil Conservation Service, which we just considered, has been doing a remarkable job. The Forest Service has been doing a remarkable job. But over and above that the Production and Marketing Administration, with its agricultural conservation program, has done an outstanding job. One of the reasons it has been doing an outstanding job is that it can reach every farm family in the United States. Five and three-quarter million farms have an opportunity to carry on soil-conservation practices under this program. With an excellent job of planning this year and with the greatest of optimism, the Soil Conservation Service program will reach about 900,000 farms since its inception. This program year in and year out will reach and hence give opportunity to every farmer to comply with it. It is true enough that a leading farm organization, the National Farm Bureau Federation, of which I am a member and of which I am proud to be a member, has come out recommending that we spend $150,000,000 for soil conservation for the next fiscal year. That spirit and that intent of the National Farm Bureau does not indicate what the Farm Bureau units in my district think.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Last year the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation came out against the cotton bill. He made a mistake there, because we are in dire need of more cotton right now. Yet, he said the cotton bill 2 years ago was too liberal. I wonder what he will say on his fighting the cotton bill at this time.

Mr. MARSHALL. That indicates that it is possible for a human being to be in error. I think he is very much in error in this instance. I read his report before the Committee on Appropriations. His statement asking for a cut in this worth-while appropriation is not justified by his statement.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman referred to the Farm Bureau Federation. I wonder whether the gentleman is aware of the division in the Farm Bureau Federation Board itself.

Mr. MARSHALL. I understand it was very close.

Mr. HARDY. My information is the vote was 9 to 11.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman. I am interested in his statement because I understand that the great Senator from the gentleman's State, Senator BYRD, has advocated that we have at least $300,000,000 appropriation in order to carry on the proper conservation work.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I wonder whether the gentleman has any information to indicate whether or not this action on the part of the American Farm Bureau Federation may have a background of this internal fight in agriculture between Extension and the AAA, and whether this might be based on prejudice rather than on national interest.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is certainly not based on a knowledge of farm conditions. In every community of our country we see farms abandoned because proper soil-conservation programs are not carried out on those particular farms.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not true that Mr. Klein and a portion of the Farm Bureau Federation has for the last several years been attempting to get all of the soil-conservation functions under the Extension Service, and do you not think that this is really an underhanded way of trying to accomplish what they have been unable to accomplish otherwise?

Mr. MARSHALL. I know the Secretary of Agriculture has been doing an outstanding job in attempting to get organizations interested in soil conservation to work together. This Congress is interested in avoiding duplication of the various agencies engaged in soil conservation. The Secretary of Agriculture has made great strides in that direction. I hope that we will all give him an opportunity to make his program work. I would not know what is in the mind of Mr. Klein. I am talking today in terms of things which affect my farm neighbors. Every time we have a farm which goes to pieces because of improper maintenance of fertility, that farm becomes a burden upon the community, upon the county, and the State. Every one of us can go out into our districts now and see farms which have been abandoned on account of failure to maintain fertility. This program that we are talking about now of providing for $285,000,000 to carry on the soil conservation program to the extent it has been carried on will not provide sufficient funds to completely do the job. It will provide funds to carry on the program to the extent it has been carried on during the last year. That is highly important at this time, because we are asking our farmers to produce, as they have never had to produce before, the food and fiber that is needed. We are calling attention to the fact that we must safeguard our soil resources. We must carry out a crop rotation program. We must carry on the seeding of legume crops to protect the soil. We must provide for green manure crops, for the application of phosphate. We must provide for lime that is so badly needed to protect our soil and our land and our grasses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. What effect would the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] have should it be adopted?

Mr. MARSHALL. It appears to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would completely sabotage the program and would cut down the payments to such an extent that after allowances for administrative work which it would be absolutely necessary to maintain there would not be adequate money left to

carry on these practices so necessary for proper conservation of the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. The thing that we want to emphasize is that this is no handout to the farmers. The farmers contribute more than 50 percent of their funds besides their labor to carry on these practices. We are doing it in a democratic way, not in an autocratic way; it is not regimentation. The older countries say to the farmers or to their peasants, if you will, "You must do so and so." We do not do that in this country; we say to them that if they will carry out these worth-while practices that are intended to maintain soil fertility we will cooperate with them and give them part of the funds with which to do it. Just think what a wonderful thing that is in a country like this—to carry out principles of soil conservation in that matter. Just think what wonderful things have been done by this program and will continue to be done by this program, the building up of our water resources, the building up of soil fertility, the preservation of our greatest resource, the land; all those things which affect the future wealth and welfare of our country.

It will be entirely false economy to cut this appropriation at this time, because every dollar spent on this program renders a return of nine or ten times. We are going to need to sustain and maintain our economy in the very best manner we know how. It would be a very poor bargain to do away with soil conservation and let our soil be depleted. That is very poor economy, because we need every acre of it that we have; every particle of that soil to provide fine food and fiber to maintain the economy of our people now and for future generations.

WHY AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD NOT BE CUT

The United States cannot measure the strength of its agriculture on its capacity to satisfy only home needs for grain, cotton, and other farm products. For this purpose, our lands and farmers are more than adequate. Since 1939, United States agriculture has been shouldering increasing responsibilities reaching far beyond our shores and we need to consider carefully whether farming is strong enough when measured against these world responsibilities. The United States farm program is now a world program and our allies and many other nations await with great anxiety the determination of our food policies.

During the past decade, the role of United States agriculture as a member of the Nation's defense team has been greatly expanded. During and following World War II, United States farms provided the chief guaranty of food security for ourselves and our allies. The urgency of the present world situation on the food front demands that our agriculture be made strong enough to meet any emergencies that may arise. These demands require greater not less effort to increase and strengthen the production capacity of our farms—a production capacity which must be measured against the requirements of emergencies which may dwarf all past emergencies in intensity of demand on our agricultural resources.

The agricultural conservation program has and continues to bring about, a steady increase in the productive capacity of American farms. A high demand for food without equally vigorous programs to protect and improve our fertility reserves and expand the future productive capacity of agriculture involves risks our Nation can scarcely afford.

Periods of high production are periods of heavy drain on our soil, water, ranges and woodland resources. In such periods unless adequate programs are kept in force deterioration of our resources sets in unless labor, equipment, essential materials and supplies needed for sustained high production are provided and made readily available. Erosion and loss of fertility are a constant threat to food security. When conservation is slowed down the forces that tear down our agricultural resources speed up.

The cost of the agricultural conservation program is not great, in fact, it is small compared to the benefits. An appropriation of $285,000,000 amounts to $1.82 per person in the United States and its insular possessions. The proposed authorization of $225,000,000 would be $1.44 per person or a difference of 38 cents per person.

A food insurance policy at a cost of $1.82 is cheap indeed. A saving of 38 cents would be expensive economy right now and a gamble on food production we as a Nation cannot afford to take.

The $60,000,000 difference means much more than $60,000,000 less soil-conservation and soil-building practices applied to the land. Farmers more than match the Government contribution and throw in their labor for good measure.

One of the most remarkable things about the agricultural conservation program is that it gets soil-building measures carried out far in excess of that expected from the payments made. The effectiveness of the Government assistance in getting measures applied to the land in increasing volume and thereby strengthening the productive capacity of our farms has been clearly demonstrated.

Great strides have been made. In 1936 the use of limestone under the program was 3,600,000 tons. In 1949, 24,400,000 tons were used; however, it is estimated that 78,900,000 tons should be used annually. The story is similar for phosphate. The acreage of cover and green manure crops has increased from 5,900,000 acres in 1936 to over 17,000,000 acres in 1949. Before the program started, dust storms were becoming increasingly severe. Stripcropping, an effective wind-erosion control measure, was practiced on 6,800,000 acres in 1949. The acreage of land terraced under the program totals 16,900,000.

Little had been done about the western range prior to 1936. It was in bad shape. Stockwater and other facilities to obtain proper stock distribution and better range management are being provided for under the program but are still inadequate. Fifty-eight thousand stockwater reservoirs were built in 1949; however, over one million remain to be built. In the principal livestock-producing areas, pasture and range seedings of grasses and legumes are important to conserve soil and feed livestock. In 1949 over 5,000,000 acres were seeded under the program. This is more than double the acreage seeded in 1936. The increasing productive capacity of all our farm and ranch lands are our insurance of abundant food now and in the future.

The effect of incentive payments under the program is amply demonstrated in the following table which shows just a few practices. In 1948 the ACP authorization was cut to $150,000,000 from $300,000,000 in the previous year, 1947. The extent of practices carried out fell off sharply. In 1949, when funds authorized totaled $262,000,000 for the agricultural conservation program, substantial recovery was made in the extent of practices applied, but it will be noted that the recovery was slower for permanent-type practices. This is to be expected as contractors become scattered or get on to other work, equipment is dispersed, and farmers hesitate to go ahead in memory of the previous years' programs.

Practice	Unit	1947	1948	1949
Dams to conserve water for irrigation or livestock or to control erosion.	Number	118,096	65,028	99,368
Drainage	Acres	5,505,076	3,590,980	3,718,559
Pasture and range seeding	do	5,238,232	3,538,076	5,035,975
Liming materials	Tons	29,385,677	22,284,542	24,433,957
Green manure and cover crops	Acres	18,617,621	13,914,487	17,379,703
Terracing	do	1,592,634	1,253,337	1,566,698
Farms participating		2,729,794	2,296,056	2,586,791
Individual practices carried out		5,881,647	4,396,756	5,494,622

The picture is similar for other practices, irrigation and water conservation, erosion control, drainage and the rest. Farmers just cannot carry out conservation measures if they don't have the money. The costs of carrying out conservation measures are up; supplies, materials and labor also cost more. When a farmer has to choose between spending his money for daily necessities or conservation, the conservation loses out even though he knows that the conservation practices will repay their costs in future years. Many practices repay their costs only over a long period. Some even reduce income as compared with exploitation of the soil. Some practices do not increase production at

all. They do prevent its reduction by protecting the soil. Many practices are of more value to other land downstream than to the land on which performed. In general, the permanent and semipermanent practices are of a type that repay their costs only over a long time.

Great strides have been made but much remains to be done. It is estimated that five times the $285,000,000 I am asking for is needed annually to do the job.

Our agricultural responsibilities may be briefly reviewed.

Food and our growing population: We have a much larger population here at home to be fed than ever before and it is growing larger at the rate of about 2,000,000 each year. Our present population is over 150,000,000 and may number 170,000,000 by 1960. We must prepare ourselves to feed them diets that will keep the Nation strong.

Food and the ever-normal granary: The ever-normal granary was established in the thirties to cope with weather contingencies. We needed reserves to tide us over another emergency drought period.

Not drought, but war, emptied the granary and it was emptied despite phenomenally good weather. During the past decade, we have twice seen what seemed to be over abundant supplies of wheat, corn, cotton and other farm products rapidly disappear. Our own population growth and our international responsibilities leaves no doubt that we will need a much larger granary in the future.

Our farms must fill and maintain this more commodious granary. At the same time, they must fully meet the current requirements for food, feed and fiber.

Food and fertility reserves: Storage reserves, no matter how big we make them, are good for emergencies only. They cannot possibly be big enough for the long pull. We must place our dependence for food security on greatly expanding the productivity of our farms by increasing fertility reserves in our soils.

We have in the present situation, a far greater urgency for the creation of fertility reserves than ever existed before. Objectives must now go far beyond making up for our exploitative errors of the past and set out to create fertility reserves that will insure fruits, vegetables, grains, fibers, meat, milk, and eggs in such abundance as to fully meet the needs of our people and supply a lot for others.

Food and reconstruction: Immediate postwar years are usually those when food demands are at their peak and production the lowest. Reconstruction periods, therefore, begin with many people in war-torn countries desperately seeking food. These are years also when vanquished peoples are reconstructing their governments and seeking guidance and political principles to follow.

Food and friendship are potent answers to Communist oratory and discipline. Food helped mightily to stop communism in Western Europe; however, the margin was too close for comfort but the fact remains that we won because we could deliver food as well as oratory.

The next reconstruction period will enable United States food, if the country is prepared to supply it, to be an enormous boon to suffering humanity and a most potent political weapon. Perhaps nothing could argue so well as the fundamental strength and decency of our democracy as could the fact of its having made provision to feed a hungry world when food was most needed. In fact, at no other point, is the argument for creation of great fertility reserves in our soils quite so eloquent as this relating to reconstruction period food supplies.

Food and the financial health and vigor of agriculture: The financial health and vigor of agriculture is a necessary condition for the continued upward progress in the further development and expansion of our agricultural resources. The parity concept of price support combined with orderly marketing and production through the operations of the commodity loan and allotment programs have contributed greatly in making it possible for agriculture to gain and maintain a healthy financial condition.

The agricultural conservation program gives the needed incentive and directive force and constant vigilance necessary to assure steady improvement and protection of our food supplies for the future.

These programs were well conceived and helped create a favorable economic environment for United States agriculture. Indeed, the improved financial condition of agriculture since the inception of these programs, has been the greatest single factor in accounting for the rapid progress made in conservation farming and the phenomenal production records our farmers have made during the past decade.

I do not propose to weaken these proven programs when there is such an urgent necessity to build up the fertility reserves in our soils at a much faster rate than has heretofore been necessary. The urgency of the present international situation and our tremendous responsibilities of our Nation adds force to the view that greater, not less, effort needs to be directed toward strengthening the productive capacity of our farms.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to arguments here for several days and I am convinced we have before us three fallacies.

Just before we rose last Thursday the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] had spoken persuasively on the subject of the value of the dollar. He made the statement that there had been a change in the dollar. The gentleman was absolutely right. The fallacy is that we think we are dealing with the same kind of dollar.

The 1900 dollar is worth 31 cents today; the 1939 dollar is worth 46 cents today. If you want a very visual demonstration, it would take this $2 bill to buy what this $1 bill bought 12 years ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have but a moment and I have three points I wish to make.

The second fallacy, is one for which I will use as an illustration the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. I will vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and I will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Somehow we have been sold the idea that these expenditures can only be made if the Federal Government makes them, that these things will not be done unless the Federal Government does them, that nobody can spend money unless the Federal Government spends it, and that money cannot be secured anywhere nor work done except by the Federal Government. That fallacy has arrived in the 18 years in the increased centralization of the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Minnesota, when he thinks about it, will agree with me that many of these things will continue to be done by all good farmers. When he talks about phosphates or fertilizers he knows we are putting fertilizer on our land because it increases production, therefore we are going to get more in the way of crops. When he talks about cover crops, he knows a good farmer puts cover crops on his land, as I have done, and many of you have done, because it increases the productiveness of the land. These things will be done.

Many of the things we are talking about in the appropriation bills will be done cheaper, better, more efficiently, by the States or by the local agencies or by the farmers in this case, by the people themselves.

The third fallacy I touch upon only briefly in the time remaining. This is the fallacy that we are in a normal time. We are not in a normal time. We are in a third world war. The Congress just 2 days ago by its action on the Veterans' Hospitalization Act declared that we were in a third world war and created the veterans of the third world war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we are in an emergency, we should declare by our votes upon this floor that we are going to distribute these responsibilities. We are going to ask the States to carry some, we are going to ask the citizens to carry some; we are not going to continue the centralization of expenditures and the centralization of power as we have in the past and this, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, would be an excellent place to start. I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I want to inform the distinguished gentleman that every practice that these funds help is done by the farmers themselves, as I am sure the gentleman realizes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, and more often at their own expense.

Mr. MARSHALL. Unless these practices are encouraged by the Federal Government they will drop off. And also I would like to inform the gentleman that during this time, and I am sure the gentleman agrees with me, the farmers are going to be asked to carry a tremendous portion of our production load and that they will do the best they can.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sure they will and many of the farmers are strongly supporting this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], in sort of a dramatic way, took some bills out of his pocket. He first showed us a one dollar bill and then a bill of a higher denomination and referred to one as a New Deal bill. Yes; I remember 1930, 1931, and 1932 when we had the raw deal bill. Those were the "raw bill" deal days; those were the days when the American people were sold down the river through lack of unthinking leadership under the Republican Party and under former President Hoover. Those were the days when cotton was selling for 6 cents a pound, when wheat was selling for 25 cents a bushel, when corn was selling for about the same, and when oil was selling for 25 cents a barrel; yes, when 12 to 15 million people were unemployed, and behind them were millions of others dependent upon them, their wives and their children. So, when in his Republican-minded way my friend from California talked about the New Deal dollar, he honors the Democratic Party, because it was the leadership of the Democratic Party that took the country out of the economic nose dive it had taken and brought it back so that today instead of a $59,000,000,000 national income in 1932, last year we had a national income of $270,000,000,000, and the national income this year will be higher.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us refer briefly to the amendment offered by my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], who made a sincere argument in support of his amendment, for whom I have profound respect. I come from a district that has not got one farm in it, but I know the value of agriculture to our national life. I know, studying history, that many great nations of the past that were great agricultural nations, became deserts when they forgot the topsoil. That four to six inches or more that is the topsoil of a nation, and which is the productive part in connection with agriculture, is vital in the life of a nation. I wonder how many realize the value of the fertile topsoil to a nation. Four to six inches deep, yes, but take that away, thin it away, then the nation commences to go down and down. The strength of our Nation lies in our industry, but without agriculture we would be dependent. I am glad that we are not only a powerful industrial Nation, but I am very glad that we are a powerful agriculture nation. God has been good to us, and we have to keep that topsoil fertile; we have to keep it productive. I am speaking of one who realizes, from my study of history, what has happened to great agricultural nations of the past. Take many deserts that exist in the world of today. Yes, at one time they, too, were productive areas. Other areas of the world, great nations of the past, have come and gone, and invariably you find, as you study history, that one of the main causes has been their failure to conserve the topsoil of their land, the failure to assist agriculture in preserving its strength, in preserving its dignity, and in preserving its soil productive capacity. So, we in America, in appropriating money through the Congress of the United States for purposes of this kind, are not only making a sound investment in connection with our country as a whole, but in connection with our national defense. We are making a very important investment, because a country in these modern times, particularly with a powerful and active agriculture, is all the stronger from the angle of national defense because of it. And I am surprised to see my Republican friends offering an amendment to reduce the amount included in this bill by the committee from $225,000,000 to $150,000,000. We Democrats recognize the value of the topsoil. I hope the majority of the Republicans will join with us in defeating the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on what I conceive to be the thought of the subcommittee that has had this matter under consideration. You may not agree with us, but I think it only fair for me to come down here in the well and review the work of this subcommittee through the years, because our able chairman and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and I have served for some 6 years or more on this subcommittee which annually considers this item.

Let us once and for all give up the idea that these soil-conservation payments are anything in the nature of an addition to the income of the farmer, at a time when, to keep his place in this inflationary national income of ours, he must have in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000 a year. Certainly, in that light, this appropriation does not amount to much, so let us forget that.

Let us get on to the bill, and perhaps I might reflect the two attitudes that have obtained in our committee and the reason for what you find in the bill now. You find in this bill an appropriation of two hundred and fifty-six million-odd dollars for commitments which we made in last year's bill. Then on page 33, and that is what the amendments are addressed to, you find various amendments offered against the commitment for our next crop year, that your committee thought was fair in the light of the information that had come to us and the various ways that we as a subcommittee reacted to the various pressures and arguments both pro and con on this item.

We arrived, I think, quite generally on the figures that are in the bill by give and take. We are here today defending our action. It is not anything that we did arbitrarily, because we have lived with this item. We can cut it or we can raise it, but I feel that our judgment was such that it should remain where it is.

Our chairman has been most eloquent in the past in pointing out that this is not really an appropriation that goes to individual farmers but is a protection against erosion and the loss of valuable topsoil, and a security and assurance that we are going to have crops each succeeding year. Our ranking Republican on this committee has been most eloquent also in pointing out the good work, in addition to this type of thing, that our local committees do.

Bear in mind that none of the amendments nor the commitment does anything in the direction of lowering or adjusting or modifying the twenty-five and a quarter million dollars that is in this bill and is involved in the commitment for next year that will go for local administration, the paying of your county committees.

I make this explanation because I feel it only fair that you have the advantage of our committee work.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before commenting on the pending amendment I want to express the appreciation of those of us who come from agricultural sections of the United States to our distinguished majority leader, who historically has stood in the well of this House and defended agricultural legislation and agricultural appropriation bills. He comes from a city; nevertheless, he has been a loyal friend of agriculture. I can say that he has that same broad attitude about other segments of our economy. It is a thing that makes him one of the great majority leaders of all times, in my opinion.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York is designed to do one thing. It is the beginning of a step to kill this conservation program. I am just as confident as I can be that if it were in the power of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] today to take his pen and write off this program for good, the gentleman would not waste much time in doing it. This program originated under a Democratic administration. It has been one of the things that has made the Democratic Party strong in the agricultural sections of our country. The Democratic Party has historically sponsored legislation favorable to the farmers of the Nation. I know there are Members on the Republican side today who are not going to support this amendment and who realize the importance of this program to their sections. In the brief time I have I would like to point out to the committee that we are all concerned with our production and in how much we can increase our potential for production in this great hour of crisis.

We are allowing industry to charge off expansion costs within a period of 5 years and to depreciate capital investments in that short length of time. We are actually lending money to steel companies and machine-tool companies at practically no cost or with a very low rate of interest in order to bring about greater production. The agricultural-production effort is just as important to our war effort as our industrial effort is. So it seems to me to be penny-wise and pound-foolish to strike at one of the most important parts of our total mobilization program. Do you mean to tell me this is not an important program? I have seen it work in my section of the United States. It has brought about a total change in the type of farming that we used to engage in. This very soil-conservation program has revised and revamped our entire agricultural system in my section of the country. Today—not because of inflation, but because of this soil-conservation work, land is worth twice as much in my section of the country as it would be worth if it had not been for this very program. It has worked. It is a good investment. It is not a give-away program. It is not a subsidy. We do not back off on subsidies for shipping and for aviation and other industries. This is not an actual subsidy. It is a capital investment in America.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And the land produces twice as much as it did 15 years ago, does it not?

Mr. PRESTON. That is correct. That is the purpose of the program. The land produces more when you follow these soil-conservation practices. So I say to my friends on the right, from the city districts, I beseech you to follow the good example set by our majority leader. Let us not have a coalition in reverse on this amendment. Stand with your farmer friends and let us defeat this amendment and preserve this important plank in the program of the Democratic Party.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Taber amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that at this time I cannot agree to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. If we were not at war, I would vote for his substitute. As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has well pointed out, we on the subcommittee first took into consideration the point of how much money was spent under this program in the last crop year. We found that that sum was two hundred and fifty-six-odd million dollars. Last year, if you will recall, the Congress set the figure at $285,000,000 for the program. The President saw fit—and when I say "the President," I mean the administration—to impound last fall, as part of his $550,000,000 savings, approximately $28,000,000 which was in this particular fund and which normally would have been used to carry over into this crop year as a sort of revolving fund for the purchase of soil-conservation materials.

I think the position of the subcommittee should be upheld, because, after all, this is what we have done: First $285,000,000 was last year ordered by the Congress for this year's program. Only $256,000,000 was spent. We have taken this $256,000,000 figure which was the cost of the program for both this year and last year and we have simply cut it about 11 percent, about the same amount that was cut generally throughout the Department of Agriculture bill. We felt that this program, regardless of how much we think of it, should also take its proportionate cut. So we have placed in the bill for next year the sum of $225,000,000, and I do think that amount will give us a very good and effective program, allowing for the fact that we must save money for the war effort.

I am glad to see that this House has not tried to amend or question the actual $256,000,000 appropriation in this particular bill for this program. By putting that in there we showed faith with the farmers. We promised them last year a certain program. We are simply giving to them that particular amount of money, although, as I stated before, the budget did impound the normal carry-over on this particular program amounting to $28,000,000. We have also provided ample money for the proper operation of our PMA and committees right down to the township level. These committee organizations are the very heart of all of our price-support programs. I have fought for ample money for them ever since coming to Congress.

I might say again about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], that if things were not as tough financially as they are I would today vote for his amendment. In normal times we must have about a $300,000,000 program if we are to hope to leave our soil to our children in more fertile condition than we found it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman was talking about what the farmers had been promised. What were they promised for this program this year?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Exactly what we have in the bill. All commitments under the announced $285,000,000 program are being taken care of.

Mr. TACKETT. I understood they were promised $285,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The $285,000,000 was the base for this year's program. It has not all been expended, as far as I know.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, I want to add to what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has said, that we announced last year a $285,000,000 program. What we do in the spring is to state the amount the Government will contribute if the works are done. How much you actually owe at the end of the year depends on how much of the work has been carried out by the farmers. It was believed that the amount in the bill would be sufficient to pay our obligation to the extent it had been carried out by the farmers.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. We did provide that under the basic law, if it did not cover the amount of work done, the Government would carry out its full amount to the extent of the $285,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have provision, as the gentleman has said, that, if it does require more funds than we have put in the bill, this fund will be made available. Any commitments made by our Government should be honored.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman knows as well as I do, because I have heard him repeatedly make remarks on the floor of this House, the cost of production which the farmer has to contend with. Therefore, during this time we need to think in terms not only of right now but of future generations, as a time when an additional incentive is needed to carry on soil conservation practices. In a short-sighted way, because of lack of information, we are in danger of failing to carry out the things that we all know we should carry out in connection with good soil conservation practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] that what we have done in the bill in proposing a $225,000,000 program for 1952 is about halfway between the viewpoint of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Farmers Union. Personally, I am a member of the Farm Bureau, and here is my card for 1951. I have been a member, probably, for more years than Mr. Kline. I do not agree with his contention that we should cut this program down to $150,000,000, any more than I can agree to the contention of my friend, Mr. Christensen, head of the Farmers Union of Minnesota, who wired me today to support the Marshall amendment for $282,500,000. I think if we go between those figures, about $225,000,000, as we have placed in the bill, we will have as good a program as we can in good conscience ask the Congress to approve, considering the straits we are in today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman has made the statement that we should give the President credit for impounding the $28,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. You understand that I also gave to the Democratic administration credit for helping this soil conservation program through these years. I also want the President to

take the credit or blame, as you may look at it, for impounding that $28,000,000 last fall. In effect he cut the $285,000,000 program down to the $258,000,000 program we here give funds for.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is why I want to straighten the gentleman out. The gentleman, as I know, voted for the Taber-Thomas amendment a year ago, when the over-all bill was up before us. The reason for the impounding of that money was the action of the Congress itself and by the vote of the gentleman from Minnesota and practically everybody on that side; you voted for the Taber-Thomas amendment, and when it came back from the Senate we abdicated our authority and gave our authority down to that place on Pennsylvania Avenue about which the gentleman has been hollering for the last 15 years.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly I voted for the Thomas-Taber amendment last year, and I would do so again. But never will I vote, and never have I voted, to give to the President the power to cut our appropriations. It is our job, I may say to the gentleman from Rhode Island, here on the floor of the House to do as we wish, and should do with these appropriations; it is not up to us to give our authority to the administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is exactly what the gentleman did a year ago, and he knows it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Not with my approval.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise largely to ask one question: Does any member of this committee know of any nation in the world, any nation anywhere, any civilized nation, that is wasting its soil like the United States is?

I think that is a question for us to ponder. I do not have at my fingertips the exact details in regard to some statistics that I wish to use, but I do have the picture indelibly impressed in my mind, and I can give it to you in substance. There are two counties in Oklahoma, one of which is in my congressional district, that have lost more topsoil in the last 40 years than all of Ireland has lost in 2,000 years. As a matter of fact, we have been the most wasteful people on the face of the earth with our natural resources, and especially our soil. It has become, I am sorry to say, almost, if not, a national disgrace, and it does seem to me that if there is any place in the world where we ought to be very liberal in carrying out a program, it is right here in the field of soil conservation.

You know, we are not the largest nation in the world as far as land is concerned; it takes the sun 8 hours to cross Russia, and Russia is more than twice as large as we are from a square-miles-of-land standpoint. China is just a little bit smaller, as I remember the square miles, China proper; but China, with some of its outlying territories, is a little larger. Brazil, as I recall it, is just a little larger than we. So if we are to maintain the leadership of the world, we must be liberal in this matter contained in this appropriation bill right here.

Then there is one other thing. I do not claim to be a doctor, but I am interested in the health of my family and in my own health, in the health of my friends and in the health of America. I love America. We all do. We love this country. I am interested in the health of my fellow man of the people here in America, of you both on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle. If I read current literature correctly, and I think I do, the greatest health-giving elements in our soil are right under our very feet. The minerals that are vital and necessary to our physical well-being, we tread on every day. The most precious part of our soil is right on top and we are permitting so much of it to wash and blow away. If I read the health articles correctly that appear in our daily press and in our magazines and books, and if I am correctly informed, it is very probable that much of the heart trouble that is plaguing us, yes; and even cancer and other serious, deadly, and malignant diseases are, if not caused by, at least aggravated by, lack of proper minerals and other essential elements that ought to be in the food that we eat. It is not alone just the type of vegetables, fruit, and food generally that we eat that does us so much good, but the quality of it as well. We are permitting our very lives to be washed and blown away.

Yes, it we are to maintain this leadership of the world, and all of us want to do that, we better not start cutting here. We better support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and raise it. That is what we ought to do; and of course we should defeat the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest regret that I find myself in an opposing position to some of my very good friends with whom I generally see eye to eye.

This bill teaches us that we people from the cities have got to take more of an interest in what goes on on the farm, because we are paying the bill. We are paying it in the form of the cost of food, and in this matter of appropriation involved, we are paying it, in addition, in taxes.

I think the point that has not been brought out as yet is what we are talking about. We are talking only about what individual farmers are to be paid for taking care of their own land. We have already passed an appropriation of over $50,000,000 for advising farmers on good soil conservation practices and this is proper, indeed. We are not dealing with that now. There are also appropriations which have to do with building dams and carrying out drainage and other works—in this or other bills—in order to preserve the land. We are dealing now only with what we pay the individual farmer for using fertilizers, spreading lime, plowing under certain crops, and similar practices.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We are talking about soil conservation on a national basis, area wide. I think if you were to compile the amounts in this bill for that purpose, including all of these funds, it would be in excess of $325,000,000.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out that according to the testimony before the committee it is made very clear what these payments are for. I should like to quote from page 539.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I gather from what the gentleman says that there might be a little element of payback here.

Mr. JAVITS. No.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that if that is involved here, God save the country.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with the gentleman. Nobody has moved to eliminate this or to cut it 95 percent. The biggest cut before us is only a cut of 40 percent. So there is no paybacks in what I say nor is any whatsoever intended by me and I should like to stick solely to the facts.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad that the gentleman has prepared himself on this because, really, if there is anyone more dependent upon the farmer than the consumers in the city, I do not know who it is. The farmer is going to grow enough under any circumstances to feed himself. But those of us, like you and me, who are dependent upon that surplus which he has over and above his needs, which goes into the cities, are much more dependent on this bill right today than the farmer.

Mr. JAVITS. Might I tell the gentleman that there is no such thing as much more dependent? We in the cities are fully dependent upon the products of the farm and the farmer is fully dependent upon the city worker and employee for clothes and automobiles and machinery and often for the very fertilizer which he spreads on the ground. We are completely interdependent—city and country—and we should treat each other that way, and I propose for my part to proceed in that fashion.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, if he will get me more time.

Mr. SUTTON. As one who voted for public housing, coming from a rural section, I would like to say this: This appropriation for the soil-conservation program will enable your people in New York to buy food cheaper, because the farmer will produce more food at a cheaper price.

Mr. JAVITS. May I continue with my analysis of the situation:

The testimony before the committee shows the following—page 539:

> The rates of assistance vary by practices and by states and area so as to make the most effective use of available funds. The average rate of assistance for all practices is less than one-half the cost of performing the practice, the farmer bearing the balance of the cost.

So what we are dealing with here is how much of the cost the farmer shall get from the Government, whether he

shall get 50 percent, 40 percent, 30 percent or what percentage he shall get, and on that I think the evidence from the farm areas is very good.

I quote now from the Des Moines Register, a newspaper published in the farm area, of January 4, 1951, this very year, and under an editorial headed "Here's a place to cut the Budget" speaking about these very soil conservation payments to individual farmers they say the following:

> In other words, most of this Government money is used to pay farmers for performing good farming practices—not for conservation, in the sense of saving the soil for future use. Most of the payments go to the higher-income farmers who ordinarily farm according to approved methods. Relatively little goes to the poorer farmers who do not use up-to-date methods. Thus, the ACP payments are primarily an outright cash subsidy to high-income farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BURDICK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it has been said here that Mr. Kline, head of the Farm Bureau, has recommended this amendment. I received Mr. Kline's telegram. I also received more than 100 telegrams at the noon hour from farmers of my own district, including members of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, every one of whom has said that he was in favor of retaining the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment to reduce the authorization for the agricultural-conservation program for the year 1952. The committee in reducing this item to $225,000,000 has, in my judgment, cut it far too deep. To reduce it further to $150,000,000 would be one of the gravest errors this Congress could make at this time.

I am personally familiar with the benefits of this program in my own district. Through the aid which farmers have been given we have seen worn-out soil reclaimed and good soil saved.

The Government is calling upon American agriculture this year to produce record crops for the defense effort. Fertilizer is scarce and expensive. Unless farmers receive this assistance I am fearful that they will not be able to attain the goals set by the Department of Agriculture.

We hear a lot about the high cost of food and fiber. The only way to remedy this situation is through abundant production. Abundant production, in turn, is dependent upon the fertilizer and food and fiber-producing chemicals that are placed in the soil. This phase of the agricultural-conservation program is in every respect a defense measure. It is an anti-inflationary measure as well.

Many of the practices which have been approved by committees in my State and across the Nation are of a type designed to conserve the soil for the future benefit of this country. Many of these practices require years before dividends are returned to the farmer. The average farmer simply cannot tie up his small capital in a long-term investment. He is forced to realize a profit from year to year in order to feed and clothe and educate his family. Unless he is assisted by the Government, he will not be able to undertake many of these practices. If he fails to do so it will not be his loss so much as it will be a loss to future generations of Americans. This is not just a farm program. It is a program for all the people of this country, a program for the continuation of a strong and productive America.

The program which this Congress has been sponsoring during recent years is going to pay dividends during this emergency. Soil-conservation practices have stored up a reservoir of mineral and organic substances in our soil which will enable our farmers to produce far more of the necessary food and fiber than they would have been able to produce had we not had an agricultural-conservation program. The big crops that will be planted and produced this year are going to take their toll. They are going to tap this reservoir. We will be making a mistake that we will live to regret if we start out on a program of taking more and more from the soil and putting less and less back into it. That is going to be the precise result of an agricultural policy based on stepping up production and simultaneously reducing the agricultural-conservation program.

I sincerely hope that the amendment to reduce this item will be defeated and that this Congress will go on record as being in favor of continuing at least on an even keel the great program which during these postwar years has become a standard policy of our Government.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think it might be said that inasmuch as the Des Moines Register said something that should not necessarily make it so. It might be that the writer of the editorial could have been influenced by their neighbor, Mr. Kline.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman may have a point there.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it may seem paradoxical for someone from New York City to stand in the well and talk about a farm bill. But when one considers it and gives it some thought they must recognize that we in New York City would starve without the help of those hard-working people who till the soil. During my service in this body I have supported my friends who have advocated the various agricultural projects such as this one of soil conservation. Our tall buildings may be fine as long as they are filled, and our factories are useful as long as they are working, but when human beings leave these places, they must be fed and their food is sent to them from your State and your State and your State.

So today I rise to support the committee and take issue with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

I was impressed, as I sat in the back of the Chamber and heard a member of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] say, "Let us have no coalition in reverse." I agree with him. Let us have no coalition at any time. It was the Democratic Party that won. Only a few days ago when the people of my city suffered because of the vote on the housing bill, I am afraid we had what looked like a coalition. But that is past. Let us work as a united party because it is not your district that counts or my district alone. It is the United States of America. We want the city people to have homes as we want the farmers to be prosperous. We want the farmers to be economically strong, and I call upon my friends from New York City, and the metropolitan districts, to support the committee and support the gentlemen from the farm areas.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish the gentleman would understand that the coalition did not include all of the Representatives from agricultural districts.

Mr. McGRATH. I appreciate that, and if the gentleman remembers, I said it looked like a coalition. But I am sure I was a bit naive.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Does not the gentleman feel that at a time like this, I know the gentleman very well and know how he feels, we ought to speak not only of one party, but of one House of Representatives as Americans because that is what we are here for?

Mr. McGRATH. Why, definitely. I agree with the gentleman. The gentleman knows full well that in every speech that I have made in New York I have urged national unity. I have made some nice speeches about him, too, he has crossed the party line and done very fine things because he did that which he thought was for the good of the country. So I call on my colleague from New York City and Members from the big cities to support this bill. I am sure if we do that, the time will come when we can reason with our fellow members from the agricultural areas and they will understand our problems a little better.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. We farmers from the Midwest are eternally grateful for the fine statesmanlike support we receive from gentlemen, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], now addressing the Committee. We sincerely appreciate it. I would further like to call the attention of the gentleman that in setting aside this money and saying that this is a program for farmers we are a little bit at fault when we use that term because this is a program for all of the people of the country.

This is also a program that will not only safeguard our soil but will provide a great deal of security to the city districts in the future.

I would like to think when we speak of this appropriation that it is not an appropriation for farmers, but an appropriation for America.

Mr. McGRATH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I wonder if the gentleman does not mean that when we keep the soil the soil will keep us, whether we are from the farm or from the city.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman is correct. If we lose the soil we will be completely lost.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], and extend to you the appreciation of the farmers of the South for the great interest which the gentleman from New York shows in the welfare of all the people in the country.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Let me remind the Committee that the farmers of America are patriots. They are deeply concerned with the peril in which this country finds itself. Like all good Americans they are demanding economy and the elimination of all unnecessary spending. They are willing to do without some of the things to which they may feel themselves entitled until this emergency is over. A good many references have been made here to an amendment offered by me last week reducing public housing. I propose to be consistent and I am supporting this amendment for many of the same reasons that I supported a reduction in public housing.

I have always contended that we need a good farm program. I shall continue to support a floor under farm prices and I think that floor should be at parity. I am as strong in favor of soil conservation as anyone. However, let us not make a shibboleth of soil conservation. Let us not waste any money in the name of soil conservation. This amendment has nothing to do with the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. Chairman, I grew up on a farm, all of my people have been farmers for generations. The stability of the family-size farm is necessary to the stability of the Nation. This appropriation has nothing to do with the stability of the family-size farm. A reduction in this PMA appropriation will not hurt food production. It will eliminate some of the so-called soil-conserving practices. In my part of the country it will reduce tank building, fence building, and mesquite clearance for the time being. If we are going to reduce all other civilian spending, as I think we should, then we can well reduce this spending. A majority of the farmers in my district agree with this viewpoint. The farmers are willing to set an example for others to go by in the matter of economy.

This amendment has the official support of the Farm Bureau and numerous other farm organizations who wisely contend for reduced spending and a balanced budget. It ought to be adopted.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague from west Texas, a rancher.

Mr. FISHER. I also represent a district which is almost 100 percent agricultural and livestock raising. Practically every land owner is the recipient of benefits under this program. I associate myself with the gentleman from Texas in supporting the Taber amendment.

If the gentleman will bear with me for a moment, I should like to point out that all this talk about the farmers and producers being so strong for this program should be examined. A lot of them are realistic and know that we cannot afford everything we might like during this grave emergency. A few months ago a newspaper in my district asked me for an expression of how we can cut expenses. I told the paper, among other things, that a substantial cut could and should be made in the program which we are now considering. Following that time the directors of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers' Association, numbering some 11,000 members, every one of whom are recipients of benefits under this program, unanimously approved my position. The directors of the Tom Green County Farm Bureau Federation met and unanimously commended me for the position I then took. The Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association in their convention in Dallas 2 months ago unanimously took a similar position. The New Mexico Cattle Raisers' Association did likewise. These people are all recipients under this program, but they are deeply concerned about the plight of the Federal Treasury. They are disturbed about the solvency of this country and they want to do something about it.

As the gentleman has pointed out, this reduction will have very little to do with soil conservation, as such. We have approved the soil conservation in a preceding section. It will go on as it should. It is a great program and one in which I am intensely interested. But this is another thing, a program that can be reduced without doing any violence whatever to food production or the productivity of the soil during this emergency.

It is often said that economy is a good thing if it is applied to the other fellow. Here is a chance to apply it across the board. I have been one who has voted consistently for reductions in Federal expenditures when other appropriation bill have been brought here. I have not hesitated to vote against nonessentials in other measures. So why not apply it here and cut this appropriation by $75,000,000. Most of the work will still go on. It is not going to hurt food production to any noticeable extent. I recognize, of course, that a lot of people like to get Government checks. But let us worry a little about the magnitude of the public debt. Let us look around for a chance to do some cutting, even though it affects us from the farming and ranching areas. Let us not say, "I am for retrenchments so long as it does not affect my own people." Let us let it apply across the board.

Mr. Chairman, the people down where I come from are genuinely alarmed about the magnitude of the public debt. They are disturbed about the solvency of this Nation, and they want to make necessary sacrifices in order to put our house in order. But they do not want their money wasted during this emergency on nonessentials, things that are fine but which they can get along without. This reduction can be justified. It is sound. It is a little hard to take by some, I realize. It may not be good politics to advocate cutting such aid to one's own people. But I have an idea the people do not want all this as bad as some who have spoken here today claim. These producers know what the score is. They know about the public debt and the need for retrenchment. They know it should apply to all, and they are willing to take their share, regardless of what some of the statements amount to that we have heard here today.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I will yield briefly, but not for a lengthy statement.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], who has just spoken he spoke for the sheep raisers, the goat raisers, and the cattle growers, none of whom plow the land, and therefore their soil does not wash away.

Mr. GOSSETT. They get a large part of this money for so-called soil-conserving practices.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. If they do not need it, let the farmers have it who do need it.

Mr. GOSSETT. They are not going to get but very little out of this appropriation.

Mr. RANKIN. If they do not want it, they do not have to take it.

Mr. GOSSETT. There is a great deal to be said for the viewpoint of the gentleman from New York, with whom I do not always agree. However, in this instance I am compelled to agree with some of his observations. There are about five different farm organizations in every county in the country. There is the Production Marketing Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Extension Service, and usually the Farm Credit Administration. If we are going to be consistent, and if we are going to save this country from continued inflation due to reckless spending and save the country from economic collapse, we have to induce some efficiency entirely across the board. I, for one, intend to be consistent. When it applies to farm organizations, I say we can take it, and we will take our part of the cuts where necessary in interest of economic stability.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes, the last 10

minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objecton to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objectio .

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, in 2½ minutes I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that they are going to follow Mr. Kline who does not have 100 percent support of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. JENSEN. How does the gentleman know I am going to follow Mr. Kline?

Mr. SUTTON. I was not talking about you; I was talking about the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JENSEN. I am not following Mr. Kline in this instance.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield.

I may say to my friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that Mr. Kline was against the 75-cent minimum hour wage; he was against public housing; he was against the cotton bill last year, against liberalizing it to take care of hardship cases. Now he is against this just because he is a disappointed office seeker. He was in hopes that he would be Secretary of Agriculture under Tom Dewey. Personally I would much prefer to see some man like CLIFF HOPE as Secretary of Agriculture rather than a man like Allen Kline.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that will bring down prices for you people in the city, because if you improve the soil you will get more production. So if you people will go along with us we will produce more for you.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is a little drastic in rasing it to $285,000,000, I think we should stick to the committee figure of $225,000,000. We should maintain this, for it has already been allocated. We have made the commitment to the farmers and we should not go back on our promise to these people, because it would prove embarrassing not only to the Democratic Party, but to the Republican Party everywhere, in Congress and out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, it is not the purpose for which this money is appropriated that my people back home object to; it is the way it is being used. I represent more cranberry farmers than any man in the world, and we raise more cranberries in my district. You came down there and paid men who had anywhere from $10,000 to $200,000 invested, paid them for sanding their bogs, when there was not a soul in my district believed that they ought to have done it or who believe that they ought to do it today. Certainly if a man can afford to invest $100,000 in a cranberry bog he can afford to put sand, fertilizer, or whatever it is they put on cranberry bogs, to make it grow.

You do not need to worry about the farmers; they will get along this year and next year; and you will not need to worry about production because plenty will be raised.

We are not destroying this soil conservation program; all we are doing is cutting down a little so that we may buy guns and munitions of war to protect our lives. No one should think the whole program is gone because the gentleman from New York moves to cut it down a little.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a question that will confront the American people for generations yet to come. We have been very slow in realizing just what we are really confronted with in the washing away of our soil.

There is as much soil in the world as there ever was; it is just at the wrong place. The time will come—listen to this—the time will come when the American people will be using the facilities and inventions of our modern civilization to take the muck, the soil that is washed down into the mouths of our streams, and return it to the land.

Let me give you an example. In the Philippine Islands they have been using rice terraces for 1,500 years. Every fall they would go down into the valley and dig the muck out of the bottoms of the ditches, put it in bags or sacks, and take it back and put it on the land. In that way they have been able to produce rice throughout the centuries on land that otherwise would have been washed away probably centuries ago. Their soil would have been entirely gone in many areas if this had not been done.

I realize that some of this money may be wasted, but I should hate to turn the fate of the farmers I represent over to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and let him try to teach them how to milk ducks.

He would probably be like one fellow who came down from the city and decided he would do a little farming. He bought a milk cow. When he went out to milk her she kept switching her tail; the flies were pretty bad. He took out his book and read where it said, "If the cow switches her tail, tie the tail to a leg."

He misunderstood that, and tied it to his leg. She broke and ran, and he said later that she had not gone 200 yards with him until he saw his mistake.

I represent more small farmers than almost any other Member in Congress. The average farm in my county is around 60 acres. It is one of the most productive counties in America. I know what this soil erosion means. I know it is something to which the Congress had better turn its attention, rather than giving billions of American money to Europe, Asia, Africa, Israel, or Japan, or to some other country that is not interested in the welfare of the American people.

As far as I am concerned, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], and if that fails I shall support the bill as reported by the committee.

We have waited too long now about rebuilding the soil for the American people now and for generations to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, this is one time when I rise to speak where I have no personal interest in the matter. I live in western North Dakota, one of the last virgin spots of prairie soil in the United States. Our soil has not started to deteriorate. Maybe 100 years from now we will have to dredge the Gulf of Mexico and bring our soil back, but we are all right at the present moment, but we are here legislating for the entire country, the North, the South, the East, and the West.

I know what the soil is in the East—while in Congress I live down in Maryland and you could not raise an umbrella on that soil without fertilization and soil conservation. The farmers there are too poor to afford to rest their lands and practice soil conservation without some aid from the Government. Many old sections of the United States are in the same condition.

You Members do not understand, or many of you believe, that we are engaged in world war III, but I believe we are. Do you want to shut off that weapon that will win this war? It has won every war this country was ever engaged in—I refer to food. If it appears to you that this is the thing to do go right ahead, in the name of economy which you preach this afternoon, and do it. We can live longer in my section of the country on our wheat than you can in the East on your manufactured articles.

I listened with great interest to the speech of that bonanza tractor farmer from New York—where his broad acres of waving grain are contained within city limits—the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and I hope I may be excused if I chance to depart from his advice on this bill. I was also eager to learn the position to be taken by that other prominent power farmer of New York where his vast acreage of waving corn flourishes on Fifty-sixth Street. From his actual experience in large farm operations I felt I must follow his advice. He said to me, "Do you know anything about this bill?" I said, "How could I? You know it all, so there is nothing left for me."

But alas! I could not follow the advice of either of these noted and distinguished farm operators.

If you want to curtail production of food in the name of false economy you can save $75,000,000, but tomorrow or next week you will not hesitate to vote another $500,000,000 to Yugoslavia, to try to win Tito away from Stalin. I do not know how these two gentlemen will vote on appropriations for foreign countries which will soon be before Congress, but it is a sure thing that many Members, who now preach economy, will vote for billions to be given away to foreign countries. Those who vote billions for foreign countries shout "economy" and almost shed tears over appropriations to

assist the people of the United States. This same situation must have arisen in Shakespeare's time for he remarked once, "Consistency! Thou art a jewel."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I think this appropriation should be cut below what we have been spending for this activity, but I do not believe it should be cut 40 percent as proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Neither do I believe it should be increased at this time as would be the case under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. You can say what you want, but this is a sound program. There may be some money wasted. I expect anyone could go out and find some instance of waste just as he could in the case of any Government program. But it is becoming a better program all the time and one in which the country is getting its money's worth for the amount spent.

It has been said before, but I think it can well be emphasized, that the reason for our high standard of living in this country is in the main, because we have had a soil originally so rich, and farmers so competent that 15 percent of our people living on the farms can produce enough food and enough other farm products to take care of the rest of us. You can go to China and India and the backward countries of the world and it takes 85 to 90 percent of the people to feed 100 percent. Here 15 percent can do it, leaving 85 percent of the people to produce the luxuries and conveniences which give us the high standard of living which we enjoy.

But we can do this only as long as we can maintain the fertility of our soil. Much of our topsoil has already been lost, much of the original fertility is gone. But thank God we are restoring it through sound conservation programs as provided for in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Does the gentleman remember when he was chairman of our committee and that great committee made a trip all over this country from coast to coast interviewing farmers, large and small, and, as I remember their reaction to all of the programs that had been inaugurated, they were more in favor of soil conservation, is that not correct?

Mr. HOPE. That is absolutely correct and I am glad the gentleman calls attention to that matter because I can sincerely say that this trip convinced me as I had never been convinced before of the value of this program. We went into every part of the country, in New England, in the South, in the Southwest, in the Corn Belt, and out on the Pacific coast. We found there might be differences of opinion among farmers on other subjects but there were no differences of opinion on the value of this program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I was privileged to take that particular trip out West with the gentleman's committee, and that is my recollection. Practically every man or woman who got up to address this committee on that trip, at those three or four occasions, Denver, Salt Lake City, and Spokane, among others, were in agreement as to the good work of this particular program.

Mr. HOPE. My recollection, of course, is the same as that of the gentleman. At every 1 of the 12 formal meetings we held, as well as many informal meetings, the testimony on the part of the farmers was the same. They wanted this program continued.

And if the 85 percent of our people living off of our farms are smart they will want it continued also because they can only maintain their high standards of living as long as the farms of this country continue to produce abundantly.

I think the committee has acted wisely in making a moderate cut in this appropriation. Farmers want to do their share in balancing the Federal budget. But there is no logic and no real economy in making a 40-percent cut as urged by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I know of no legislative body which is more conscientious in its approach to questions involving appropriations than the Vermont Legislature.

In a sense each member sets himself up as an individual committee to weigh the pros and cons involved in the expenditure of public funds. The members are not niggardly or parsimonious. They can be and, on occasion, are very generous but they are aware, too, that there are times when appropriations are not in the general interest regardless of the worthiness of the purposes for which they are intended. Vermont appropriates funds to carry on the activities of government on a highly selective basis, and all such proposals have to be justified beyond a reasonable doubt before they are approved.

I mention these characteristics of the Vermont Legislature because it seems to me that it adds emphasis to its action in passing a joint resolution advocating that Congress appropriate $285,000,000 for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources. This resolution was adopted only after the most searching analysis and I am sure it represents a studied conclusion that in Vermont, at least, the merits of the program have been proven by results.

Some twelve to fifteen thousand Vermont farmers are participating in the program and in most instances they are spending far in excess of the funds received from the Federal Government.

To my mind even more important than the incentives provided to farmers for proper land use is the growing recognition of the urgent need for sound measures to conserve our natural resources as a result of this program.

The annual growth of our forest resources equals only about two-thirds of annual consumption. Nature requires anywhere from 300 to 1,000 years to create a single inch of topsoil, and about a third of this Nation's has been allowed to blow or wash away. It has been estimated that the annual cost to the United States as a result of uncontrolled erosion and water runoff amounts to about $4,000,000,000 annually, and that only 100,000,000 of the Nation's 460,000,000 acres of cropland can be counted secure against erosion.

In a very real sense modern agriculture and industry are undermining the very essentials necessary to their continued existence, and it is most important that we recognize this fact or the time may come when we shall be unable to produce enough for our people to eat and wear.

It seems to me that to reduce the appropriation to a level at least below that recommended by the committee would be a great mistake, because this would have the effect of drastically curtailing efforts to meet one of our greatest national needs, and at a time when increased production is so vital.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. HALLECK.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in my time here in Congress I have voted for most of the agricultural programs. I voted for the Soil Conservation Act. I did not vote for the Compulsory Control Act of 1938, and I have lived long enough to have many people applaud me for that action.

In the years I have been here, and more in recent years, I hear Members get up and talk about the great things these programs have done for the farmers and what a great deal has been accomplished by the Administration program. I am something of a farmer myself. I have owned a farm since 1935. I have a couple of them now. They are good, black, flat land out in Indiana, that produce very well. Practically all of that land is in cultivation. So when I talk about some of these things I speak from practical experience. I have here my north farm book, in which I have been writing down from year to year the prices I have been getting.

Let us not criticize the programs but let us keep the record straight as we see first just what happened in respect to farm prices until World War II came along. Of course, when you get in war

you cure about everything as far as prices are concerned.

I had that farm in 1938. Would you be surprised to know that that year I sold my wheat for 53 cents a bushel, my oats for 19 cents, and a lot of my corn for 33 cents? That is after we had had 5 years of these programs. Those prices are practically those of the depth of the depression.

Let us go on to 1939. I sold wheat for 57 cents a bushel, oats 23 cents, and my corn crop that I had that fall went for 40 cents a bushel. You farmers that know about these things do those sound like great big prices accomplished by some very efficient administration that rushed to the aid of the farmers? They are a little higher than they were at the depth of the depression, but not very much.

In 1940 what happened? I sold my corn for 51 cents. I sold oats for 26 cents a bushel. That is the record, and it ought to be borne in mind.

As to this particular amendment, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I supported a similar amendment—only an amendment that went further than this—back in 1947 and 1948. I took the trouble then to break down the payments going to my 12 counties out in Indiana, and they aggregated about $1,000,000. But I supported the amendment to cut it to $150,000,000 the following year and then to do away with it completely. I do not recall getting any substantial criticism for that action.

The trouble with this economy business is that we are all for economy if we will take the "me" out of it. That is the reason, knowing as I do that of this amount here to be appropriated, a very considerable amount will go into my district, that I am going to stand up in the House and say that it ought to be cut. I am going to vote to cut it.

I do not know how we are going to keep this country solvent unless we do that very thing. I could go into greater detail on this subject because, as I say, I am something of a telephone farmer. I know that out there we have learned if you sow clover with the oats and let it go to hay and seed, the second year you can raise two wacking corn crops right after that. You do not have to pay the farmers out there to plant some of his land to clover in a good crop rotation practice. He is going to do that anyway.

The cuts here proposed will leave plenty of money to carry on this program wherever it needs to be carried on.

Again may I say I do not know of any way we can meet the challenge which confronts us here as duly elected representatives responsible for the solvency of our Government—yes, and for the value of the dollar—unless we are willing to make these cuts and to make them even where it may hurt a little.

Very shortly we are going to struggle again with the question of price controls and wage controls. A great many farm people are disturbed about price and wage controls. They see what they do to them. One of the things basically which needs to be done is to put our financial house in order. When we do that we will begin to preserve and protect the value of the dollar which in my opinion is No. 1 on the domestic agenda for this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, coming from that great nonpartisan State of California, I hate to see partisanship brought into the discussion on this measure. We have been giving, or rather the Democrats have been taking credit for the soil-conservation program. We should go back a little further, some 85 years ago when Mr. Lincoln was President of the United States. He had enacted the soil-conservation measure and for some 70 years following that nothing was ever done to start soil conservation. If we are going to give anybody credit for this, you might say that out of the depression was born soil conservation, because it was primarily started to take care of the unemployment throughout the country.

I had two ranches in the Gold Ridge Conservation District which was the first district to be formed in California. I know what this program is and I have had the benefit of some of it. I believe, however, the amendment to increase this fund should be defeated. The farmers in my district are asking for economy and they are willing that economy be practiced in the field of agriculture as well as elsewhere. I just received a copy of a letter from the secretary of the Gold Ridge Soil Conservation District, and I would like to read it to you. It is directed to Mr. Waters S. Davis, Jr., National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

The letter is as follows:

GOLD RIDGE SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Sebastopol, Calif., April 30, 1951.

WALTER S. DAVIS, JR.,
National Association of Soil Conservation Districts,
League City, Tex.

DEAR SIR: We directors of the Gold Ridge Soil Conservation District, Sebastopol, Calif., are of the belief that the Conservation District movement is the democratic way of doing the conservation job. The entire program is directly in the hands of the farmer. We now have 75 percent of the Nation's farms and ranches within soil conservation districts. These districts if given a free hand and the time, can complete the conservation job ahead without farmer-conservation-subsidy. Conservation farming is profitable, and we are therefore interested in making conservation work pay its own way. At present there are two methods of selling conservation farming to the farmer; one is the soil conservation district method which fundamentally is adjusting farming to fit the land and may involve several farming practices on the same acre of land, the other method is the practice subsidy program which does not necessarily give the farm nor a portion thereof sufficient consideration for a sound land use and farming economy.

We believe that the soil conservation district program should be given the chance to do the job for which it has been equipped without interference from any other program which divides authority on conservation.

The soil conservation district program is working. The program does not come from Washington and as farmers learn to differentiate the Government program from their own district program they find a distinct and enduring liking for the latter.

Sincerely yours,

GOLD RIDGE SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
D. H. FOUTS,
BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
By D. H. FOUTS, *Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is recognized.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Taber amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to protest against the efforts of those who would curb us who are trying to maintain the fertility of our soil during this period of emergency. We are asking the farmers of this country to produce beyond anything they have ever done. The Department of Agriculture says that it will take more than 21,000,000 additional acres in soil-depleting crops than we had last year. This means we should increase our attention toward the preservation of the fertility of our soil. After all this soil conservation payment is only a payment in that it is a contribution toward the cost of soil-improving practices. Prior to the time of this program this country had wasted its resources at a faster rate than any country in history. Under this program the Government puts up about a third of the cost and the farmer puts up about two-thirds of the cost, but the total amount goes into the restoration of our soil and its productive capacity. This Nation has expended billions of dollars since the last war in foreign-aid programs. Many of them I have voted against. Nevertheless, we have through that means required in the spending of counterpart funds much larger sums on the restoration of the forests and soils of foreign nations than is involved in the present appropriation.

Today we have large food shortages in our own Nation, and yet a big part of available food comes from the fact that we have in the last 10 or 12 years given attention to increasing the ability of our pastures, through pools and grasses and other means to support more and more cattle. Through these programs we have increased the production of our soil. We have gained 19,000,000 people in the last 10 years. At that rate of increase the demands upon our soil will become ever greater as the years go by.

Prior to the present emergency we had very strict limitations upon the production of cotton and many other commodities. In my section of the country it meant that many farmers had to convert their farms to other commodities rather than cotton. The soil program helped tremendously to meet that need of converting over to beef or some other commodity which was required by law passed by this Congress.

I plead with you not to be short-sighted as to reduce this program. In my judgment it should be strengthened. Other countries are in the shape they are in today because they have consistently taken more out of the soil than they put back in. For the period of our history we have been more guilty of that than any other nation in history. A few years ago we set out to stop the drawing

out of more than we put back into our soil. Now of all times we should strive in every way to continue that policy of preserving for future generations the ability and capacity of this country to give us adequate food and fiber to maintain the high standard of living which we now enjoy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, my record in voting for economy in the operation of Government will, I believe, stand the test of severest scrutiny. I am just as much in favor of eliminating wasteful expenditures in our agricultural program as I am in other and unrelated Government undertakings. In supporting the position of the committee on this amendment, I am thoroughly convinced that the ends of economy will be served, but that further reductions in appropriations for this program, such as proposed in the Taber amendment, would, in the end, react against the cause of economy, and would, to all intents and purposes be an act of false economizing.

No program ever undertaken by a department of the Government has met with such signal success and general acceptance as has our program of soil conservation. God has blessed us with the gift of fertile soil; the maintaining of that fertility is a responsibility which we must assume ourselves. We owe it not only to ourselves, but to future generations, to see that their inheritance will not be a land devoid of fertility and incapable of producing the food and fiber necessary to sustain life. Mr. Chairman, I intend to oppose the Taber amendment and the Marshall substitute; and, instead, to support the bill as originally presented to the House by the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, on which may able friend and colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], has done such a magnificent job.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, of course, understand that the soil-conservation program is not the program of any person or political party. This great program came into being because Members of Congress of both parties were impressed with the importance of protecting and conserving the soil of this great Nation. During the consideration of the legislation which finally was enacted and culminated in this very worthwhile activity, partisan politics did not once lift its ugly head. In the success of the soil-conservation program all Members of Congress can take just pride. No one person or political party should claim full credit. It might well be said that this agency of the Government is a child with two parents, the Democratic and Republican Party.

The gentleman who has just preceded me mentioned Abraham Lincoln, the patron saint of the Republican Party. It was exactly 89 years ago today that Abraham Lincoln signed the bill which created the Department of Agriculture of the United States Government. In considering the matter now before us we should not be actuated by the spirit of partisan politics.

As I have listened to this debate and to the arguments which have been submitted for and against the pending amendment, I have been keenly conscious of the meritorious activities of this great agency of the Government. A distinguished North Carolinian, Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, is frequently referred to as the father of soil conservation for the reason that he has done more to make the people of our Republic soil conscious. Dr. Bennett, as no other man in all history, aroused all America to the sad realization that we were rapidly depleting the fertile topsoil of our farm lands. Once aroused, the people of the country sought to do something about the situation. Under this great program farmers have been taught something about the arts of agriculture and the value of diversified farming and soil-building practices. While I appreciate the fact that the soil-conservation program we are now discussing is not the program of the Soil Conservation Service, the agency which Dr. Bennett directs, it is nonetheless a program of importance and one which goes hand in hand with all of the programs of the Soil Conservation Service. Unfortunately, on account of a lack of both money and manpower, the Soil Conservation Service has not been able to reach or to serve all of the families of the Nation, but it is making great progress and bringing great lessons to all of the people of America. Through the program we are now discussing we have reached more farmers and have encouraged better practices on more farms than the Soil Conservation Service has been able to reach or to serve. Actually this program working alongside of the Soil Conservation Service has just about revolutionized agriculture in my district and in my State. Our people have been encouraged to diversify their farming and to preserve their soil and to engage in soil-building practices. They have not only been encouraged, but by these payments have been induced and persuaded to engage in many activities beneficial to their farms and better farming. North Carolina farmers have been encouraged to increase their pasture lands and to go into the business of producing beef cattle and building dairy herds, and under the program we are making magnificent progress.

Perhaps this program should be refined or altered or changed, but this is neither the time nor the place for us to make such modifications or changes. If the program is to be improved, the matter should be considered first by the legislative committee charged with the responsibility of drafting legislation. If certain farmers are receiving benefits which they should not receive, that is a matter which should be considered, and I assure you that it will be considered, and if it appears that legislation should be presented, I can assure you that our committee will present it. I urge you not to destroy or to peril this program which has meant so much to the farmers of the Nation and which will mean so much to generations yet unborn.

We must look down the long corridors of time; yes, down the road a thousand years from now, to evaluate this program properly. No man knows the value of an acre of land. Not all of the mathematicians, economists, and experts in all of the departments of the Government can tell us the actual value of the top soil of even one acre of American farm land. If it is protected through the years, it will be a blessing to generations yet unborn. We are here engaged in a program, the primary purpose of which is the storing up for future use of the fertility of the farm lands of our country, and, I repeat, the richest resources of our Nation.

If this Nation is to continue on the road of progress, we must maintain our agricultural economy and we must protect the foundation upon which that economy must be built, and that is upon the farms and ranches of America.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate our good friend the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, and the members of his subcommittee. Yes, I want to congratulate all the friends of agriculture and all of the farsighted members of the Appropriations Committee. They have made a contribution to the cause of economy and have, in a scientific way, made many reductions and accomplished many economies. I urge you again not to use an awkward meat ax on this important appropriation. I hope that the Taber amendment will be defeated and that you will stand by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and his committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is to be complimented for dragging this discussion above the partisan level. I certainly cannot understand the kind of political argument that dragged us back to the days of 1931 and 1932, when we had a Democratic House and a Republican in the White House and laid all the ills at the White House door, but when you come to talk about the Republican Eightieth Congress and a Democrat in the White House, that same gentleman seeks to lay all the ills of the country at the door of the Congress instead of the White House. In the same kind of partisan vein we hear this appeal against a coalition. If I ever heard an appeal for a coalition, and a disgraceful coalition at that, it was the argument on the part of the city folks, "We are going along with you and vote for this, but don't forget us when public housing comes around," a disgraceful coalition to raid the Treasury of the United States.

I think I represent as good an agricultural district as lies beneath the sun in this country, but I do not think the dairy farmers of Wisconsin want me here to be for economy for everybody else but

to consider the dairy cows of my district as sacred cows. I concur in what the Farm Bureau has said, that the need for economy is so great that we must all bear a share of the burden that has to come from it, and I am going to support the Taber amendment down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment should be an illustration of the importance of trying to do the reasonable thing rather than trying to do the spectacular thing. Of course, we are all for economy. I think most of us sincerely want economy. I think we would all like to see the expenditures of government reduced. But is the pending Taber amendment likely to result in any reduction of Government expenditures? If a majority of this House votes for it this afternoon, it will look good in tomorrow morning's papers, but do you really expect such a meat-ax cut to be sustained in the other body? Is it not reasonable to suppose that by accepting the committee figure you can actually reduce governmental expenditures by $60,000,000, whereas by passing an extreme amendment you may well achieve nothing more lasting than your name in tomorrow morning's papers? Do you want to cut expenses or do you want publicity?

I think we can reduce the expenditures of government. I think this committee has done a splendid job in reducing expenditures. It has brought in a bill which consistently reduces the sums appropriated for about every agency of the Department. It has made a $60,000,000 cut on a very vital activity of the Department. That is a very large cut, almost 25 percent. It is a much larger cut than we have made on most other items. Now it is urged that we record ourselves as favoring a gesture of a 50-percent cut, which would probably never be more than a gesture. It seems to me you get over on the ground of being ridiculous when you cut that far. Let us keep our promises within the realm of our ability to deliver.

Let us not get off on wild extremes; let us not try to make this a matter of partisan advantage or of personal advantage. I think that it must be fairly said that within the last 6 years we have had two great chairmen of the Committee on Agriculture, the present chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and our immediate past chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. One is a Democrat, the other a Republican. Under both these men we have had, I think most intelligent, enlightened, and progressive leadership of agriculture in this country. The same can be said for the two gentlemen who have during the same period served as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I think it is a sad day when anyone appears on this floor and tries to use a program of this kind to promote votes for either the Democratic or the Republican party; I think it is a sad day when the extreme left wing or the extreme right wing comes out here and uses this great program of maintenance of the fertility of our soil as a means of keeping someone in or putting someone out of Congress. I think it is far better that we try to follow a policy that will feed our children for a thousand years, a policy that will guarantee to America the ability to maintain a high standard of living for generations yet to come.

If you go so far as to destroy this program, you jeopardize the whole future of this country. If you go to the other extreme proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], I fear we might indeed halt all of the desirable trend toward real economy. We must cut appropriations. We must cut those which mean most to our own interest if we are to expect any reductions to the appropriations in which we are not directly interested. I have been voting for cuts all along the line. I propose that we join with the committee in making a $60,000,000 cut on an item which is especially dear to me and to my people, but I cannot concur with those who would single out our conservation program for a cut of nearly 50 percent when I know that the results of this program are probably the most lasting of any for which we make appropriations. I urge you to follow a reasonable, a common-sense, and a nonpartisan course of action.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Taber amendment. First, I would like to echo what my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], has just had to say about the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. If you have examined the report which accompanies the bill and the analysis of the various items which appear in the back of the report, you will not find a single plus mark opposite the amounts appropriated. With the exception of a very few items, each and every recommendation made to the Appropriations Committee by the Bureau of the Budget was materially reduced by this economy-minded committee. The committee has made substantial cuts in almost every item and increased none above the budget recommendation. Those of us who advocate and fight for economy should express our thanks to this committee.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has just said, this committee reduced this particular item not by just a nominal sum, but by $60,000,000. I am one of those who has been voting for a majority of the economy amendments that have been offered on this floor. And I want to say to you that I would be voting for an amendment to reduce this appropriation if the committee had not already done a good job itself. Now when the subcommittee has recognized the necessity for a reduction in appropriations and has acted accordingly by reducing this item by $60,000,000 and the over-all appropriation bill by more than 12 percent, then I think that is all we or the public can reasonably expect.

I think it is rather unfortunate that some of the officials of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I think is one of the outstanding farm organizations of America, have gotten themselves involved in support of this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. I wish to point out that the Farm Bureau Federation is taking the position it takes by virtue of a one-vote margin. Had other members of the committee been present they would not have taken the position they are taking. I know that from the Farm Bureau people in my State.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to my former chairman, whom the Republicans would do well to follow on this amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not the position of the Board of Directors of the Farm Bureau rather than the position of the members of the Farm Bureau?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Both of my friends are correct. As I was saying, I think it is most unfortunate that the bureau has become involved in this amendment. I have a very high regard for Allan Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau. I credit him with having done much for the good of American agriculture. There are times, however, when I must differ with him and this is one of those times. In passing, I think I should say that, in my judgment, a vase majority of the Bureau members would oppose this amendment. It so happens that I am a member of the Bureau, in good standing, I hope, and I certainly oppose it.

A few years ago, the House Committee on Agriculture under the able leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], traveled from one end of this country to the other. We visited in New England, the Middle Atlantic States, the South, the West, and far West. We traveled by bus so that we might make frequent stops. We met farmers in small towns, on the farms, and on the roadsides. At every stop we asked questions about this program. There were differences of opinion on several of the programs inaugurated for agriculture but this is the one program on which we found unanimous agreement. It has remolded American agriculture. It came almost too late but our farmers and the country as a whole are thankful that it came in time.

Land fertility is our greatest natural resource. It must be preserved. Year in and year out, in good times and bad, so long as this Nation shall exist, people and productive land will be the principal elements upon which we must depend for prosperity and security. It might be a fair statement to say that the world position of the United States a century hence may be foretold now by the manner in which we guard our resources, particularly our people and our land.

By comparison with Europe ours is a young country. By comparison with the ancient civilizations of Asia and Africa, it is still younger. Yet, in the century and a half since our people began to sweep

over the Alleghenies, across the prairies of the Middle West, through the Rockies and Sierras and on to the Pacific, we have run through vast stocks of productive land and timber. We have depleted our basic wealth faster by far than any other nation in history. Another century and a half of equal waste could make the United States a historical "has been," unable to feed its own people adequately, much less to use its food and fiber, as now, to encourage peace and democracy on the earth.

Our cropland has remained remarkably stable for a quarter of a century indicating that we have at long last reached the approximate limits of net expansible cropland. What we have gained by taking in new cropland during the past 25 years, we have lost to an equal extent in land discarded for crops due to loss of soil fertility.

We thus face the cruel truth that we can no longer expand onto and exploit virgin fertile soils; but must face the necessity of husbanding our soil resources in the future to even maintain our land supply in the face of a large prospective expansion of mouths to feed.

The seriousness of the situation is further accentuated by the fact that we have not learned to check our frightful waste of soil. Erosion damage is still going on at a rate of $2,000,000,000 of impairment of our farm lands per year. We have already practically ruined for further tillage a fifth of our tillable land.

I know that you have heard over and over these startling facts told in various ways. I repeat them only to emphasize that this waste is continuing in the face of a still growing population and a rigidly stable crop acreage for the past quarter of a century.

With few exceptions there are no more virgin lands. It is therefore of extreme consequence that the loss of soil fertility be checked. May the day never come when this great country of ours will become a mass importer of food as are many countries of the world today. But it can happen. May the day never come when our farm people will be forced to further crowd into our already overcrowded cities for a livelihood. That, too, can happen. Why, in the last 10 years approximately 20 percent of the people have left the farms and moved to the cities. Many left because they had permitted their lands to become so depleted that they could no longer be profitably farmed. With a little more incentive they might have remained and restored the fertility required to make the land economically productive.

There is new hope now through soil conservation. We are checking this terrible waste of our natural wealth and restoring farm life to the enviable independency which it offers.

Mr. Chairman, it is in the interest of the farmer and the consumer, it is in the interest of this and generations to follow, it is in the interest of everyone, that our soil be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, the Taber amendment which concededly will reduce and hamper our soil-conservation program is a step in the wrong direction. It should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I wish to compliment the committee for the good job it has done on this bill as a whole. I yield to no Member of Congress in my support for funds for genuine soil-conservation practices. Mr. Chairman, I honestly believe that the farmers of America as a group are the deepest thinking people in America and are to a degree more concerned about the future of America than most any other group in our Nation. They know we must reduce our staggering Federal expenditures and they are willing to take their share of the cut. I am sure that is a correct and a fair statement of their position. So I shall support the amendment to reduce this appropriation for next year in the sum of $50,000,000 below the amount recommended by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is very apparent that some of the folks from the city districts do not understand the value of the farm to the welfare of all. May I remind those Members that for every dollar the farmer takes in, labor received $4.20 in wages and for every dollar the farmer takes in the businessman receives $4.10 in trade and that the national income over the past 20 years since our farms have become mechanized has been almost exactly seven times the farm income. Please remember that all wealth springs from the soil. It follows that if the farmer does not get along then certainly the city folks will have a bad time. If we do not conserve our precious soil certainly our children and their children will suffer no end. But I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers of America are willing to take a cut in this appropriation and they will still conserve the soil. They know this House has made cuts already in many Federal agencies, and the farmers are ready and willing to take their share of cuts under present conditions in order to stave off national bankruptcy. I know that is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to close the debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, General MacArthur, when he was testifying before a committee of the Senate was asked about China by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and this was his answer:

> It is a country of poverty. The slightest dislocation in their normal processes of distribution causes the greatest convulsions in various sections of Chinese society. If you, for instance, disturb in the slightest degree the distributive systems of their food, you might well have 50,000,000 men, 50,000,000 people, starving at any one time.
>
> They live only a couple of jumps ahead of starvation. In other materials, they are almost as bad. They have practically no indigenous products that they can manufacture; they have no great manufacturing centers whatsoever.
>
> They are peculiarly vulnerable to the process of blockade. And the process of internal disruption by bombing.

You may say that is not going to happen in the United States of America, but let me say that in the brief period of 175 years of our existence we have exhausted our natural resources to a greater extent than did the nation of China in any 2,000-year period you can point out, according to the best judgment of people that we have who have made a study of that situation.

Every time this program comes up we have to meet the argument that this is a payment. If this were a payment to the farmers under present conditions I would say, "Cut it out." But this is a question of soil conservation. Under our laws we do not use the power of Government as did Hitler and Stalin. We do not say by law to the farmer, who is a trustee of our very means of existence, that "You have got to maintain the fertility of the soil." May that day never come. But, if we do have as a Nation an interest in the fertility of the soil, and in its productivity and if we are not going to require that it be taken care of by law, the only way to do it is by a system of leadership, by a system of Federal recognition of its responsibilities; yes, by a system of the Federal Government paying a part of the cost. I am not happy at the figure $225,000,000. It is a $60,000,000 reduction that we are making in next year's program. The fact that our subcommittee made that reduction does not mean that it is lessened in the least in its belief in the value of soil conservation and of the real dependency of our people, as well as future generations upon it. But how much the Government can spend depends upon what it can get the farmers to do, and I say to you if you were to put a billion and a half dollars in this bill for this purpose, there is a serious question whether you could get more soil conservation that you can for the $225,000,000 contribution toward the costs. Why? Because with the present shortages of labor, shortages of fertilizer, shortages of equipment, when the farmer finds it hard to do his regular day's work, it is hard for him to do those things so badly needed for soil fertility. The amount of money in this bill is not necessarily the measure of what we can get him to do. Now, you may say "Well if that be true, why will not $150,000,000 be enough?" I want to say to you that we need every bit of soil conservation we can help bring about. There was a period in this country when we did reduce soil-conservation practices of $150,000,000. Oh, you heard the argument here today that the farmers will carry on, but I would like to get them to look at the records. In 1947 over my protest we did reduce this program, and in 1948 the number of dams to conserve water for irrigation, for livestock, to control erosion, was reduced 45 percent. The number of range and pasture seedlings was reduced 33 percent; contour farming by 49 percent; closed range fell off 41 percent; irrigation ditches, dikes, and laterals fell off 52 percent; improving pasture and range land by eradicating poisonous plants fell off 52 percent, and we had approximately 50 percent falling off in the practices of soil conservation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. There has been talk about coalition and there has been talk here about the effect of what Mr. Kline says, that it does not necessarily present the position of the Farm Bureau. I received a telegram from Mr. Kline in which he says that he specifically urges support of the Cox amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill to reduce the fund for 1952 to $150,000,000. Is not that the effect of this amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman heard the amendment read. The amendment said $150,000,000, so the figure is the same. I am no party to a coalition. I am willing to join with anyone at any time when they are acting in what I believe to be the best interest of the country, but to join anyone against everything, is not my way, and as long as other folks are doing what they think is right, that is for them to determine. But back to this matter, and this is vital to us: It is not a case of saving money here; it is a case of whether we have a little bit of long-range interest and a long-range viewpoint in regard to the future of this country. I heard the gentleman from Indiana—and there is no brighter or abler man in this Congress, in my judgment—and I heard my close friends, the two distinguished gentlemen from Texas talk about farming. I also heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] speak on this issue. You know, the only real good ways to make lots of money farming that I know are these: One is to strike oil on your land, and lots of people in Texas have done that, I hear. The other good way to farm, and that is the way the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Indiana and myself farm, is to have a good salary on the side, and I cannot help but say, the people of the Nation would be in a bad way if they had to depend upon the production of those kind of farmers for their food and clothing. But this program reaches further than that class of farmer. This program reaches back to the interest of the people of this country, in the productivity of this country, yes, in the future of this country. True, a man cannot go out and spend money on his own land without improving that which he holds, but the folks dependent upon his production, are you and I and others in our cities and elsewhere, and all over this country. The ones dependent upon what kind of shape we leave this country in are those generations who will follow us.

In the last 10 years the population of this country increased by 19,000,000. This country has existed for 175 years. In history, what is that in the history of the Chinese people? What is 175 years in the history of the Italian people? It is only a moment. If we have wasted this great country of ours to the extent we have in that short period, what can we look to in the future if we keep it up, if our population keeps climbing at the rate of nineteen to twenty million every 10 years? This is a more serious matter than many of you think.

I grant you that many people will carry on soil conservation for 2 or 3 years, but the generating force that has been behind the efforts of private individuals, the thing that has caused lots of people to bring about soil conservation on their own farms at their own cost, has been the fact that you have had some agency pushing and pressing for it.

I happen to have a farm but I never drew a dime out of this production payment contribution in my life. Perhaps it is because I knew I was going to be up here and I did not want to be vulnerable, but I want to be honest about it, I have not done one-tenth of the soil conservation I should have done, either.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I think the gentleman is right in pointing out the fact that we have had an increase in this country. I think the statistics are that in the past 37 years we have gone from 100,000,000 to 151,000,000. That is an increase of over one third in the population in less than 40 years time.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is correct and I thank him for his contribution. We have our high standard of living because it takes mighty few of us to grow the food and fiber for the rest of us, leaving great numbers of our people to supply the automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and the thousands and one things we enjoy beyond that of any other country in the world. But you let the soil fertility go down and you are bound eventually to have conditions such that a bigger and bigger percentage of your people have to till the soil to provide the food and fiber for the rest of them. This is not a 5- or 10-year period we are talking about. The very future of our children is involved.

There is not a man within the sound of my voice that is more disturbed about the financial structure of this country than I am, but it is a financial structure. May the day never come when we have to wipe it out and start all over again, but if we have to wipe out the financial structure of this country, bad as it would be, as long as we have the soil and the natural resources and the ability to produce, it is not going to wreck us if we have to change the medium of exchange. It is the country that lets the soil go down that gets itself into the fix of Italy, France in some places, China, Greece, and India, where the medium of exchange will not work because there is too little production to exchange.

Do not let that happen to us in this country. Let us have vision. Let us have confidence enough in our future to recognize that if we are ever going to get out from under a $270,000,000,000 debt it is going to be because of our ability to produce.

In this program we are not giving the farmer anything but we are urging him to protect that soil fertility. If he will spend $3 the Federal Government will spend $1 so that our soil will be kept for future generations.

Through the Marshall plan we have put up the money to require these depleted countries to spend, in counterpart funds many times the amounts in this bill, to restore the natural resources of those countries. We required them to do that because their recovery must be based on their productivity.

Let us not gradually destroy our own country by taking out more than we put back in when we reach the place those countries are now in, there will likely be no nation like the United States with its Marshall plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and tellers reported there were—ayes 120, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF LAND BY THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, ETC. (H. DOC. NO. 133)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3096, a bill "relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration."

This bill would impose certain restrictions on the real estate transactions of

the military departments and of Federal Civil Defense Administration. In general, it would require those agencies to come into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to the acquisition or disposal of real property, including leases involving an annual rental in excess of $10,000, and including transfers of real property between the military departments or to other Federal agencies, or to States, with certain minor exceptions. A recital of compliance with the Act in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, or a recital that the conveyance or lease is not affected by the act would be conclusive evidence of the fact so recited. The bill would also repeal section 407 of Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, which requires the authority of an act of Congress enacted subsequent thereto in order for a military department generally to dispose of real property. It would also repeal a proviso contained in the Act of April 4, 1944, requiring the Secretary of the Navy to come into agreement with congressional committees prior to the acquisition or disposition by the Department of the Navy of any land acquired for naval use.

On January 15, 1951, I sent a message to the Congress urging that it repeal section 407 at its earliest opportunity. In that message I stated that that section, if permitted to stand, may seriously impede our mobilization effort by causing unnecessary and unwarranted delays in the transfer for other governmental uses of property excess to the needs of the military departments.

While H. R. 3096 would effect the repeal of section 407 of Public Law 910, it would subject to the decision of congressional committees, not only those transactions that are covered by section 407 of Public Law 910, but also transactions involving all phases of the real-estate transactions of the Department of Defense and of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, with exceptions applicable for the most part to minor and relatively unimportant transactions.

While the Congress or its Members have a special interest in a number of real estate transactions by the executive branch of the Government, full information with respect to those transactions has in the past and will in the future be made readily available to the interested committees of the Congress. However, a legal requirement for the submission of countless real estate transactions to the scrutiny of the congressional committees in an effort to furnish them with information on the relatively few transactions as to which those committees have a special interest, would result in the imposition of a severe and unnecessary administrative burden on the Department of Defense. It would not only result in the diversion of personnel from other vital tasks to the preparation of the innumerable reports that would be required but would also result in continuing delays that might well prove to be a serious impediment to the defense-procurement program. The delays that would be effected are not only the delays involved in the physical preparation of the reports required, their presentation to the congressional committees, and the review of those reports by the committees or their staff, but much greater and more serious delays resulting from the inability of the Department of Defense to plan its operations in the future until the congressional committees have acted. The transactions that would be required to be submitted to the committees are not isolated transactions unrelated to other transactions in the future, but have a definite relationship to future as well as other current transactions and affect the whole planning program. The uncertainties and delays inherent in the securing of congressional approval can only operate to the detriment of such a planning program.

One of the effects of the bill would be to force to a substantial degree the centralization in Washington of real estate operations that could otherwise be more efficiently handled in the field. A very substantial portion of the transactions by the Department of Defense originate in the field, since the real estate operations of the Department of the Army, the most active department in this field, are on a highly decentralized basis. The requirement that would be contained in H. R. 3096 would have the effect of destroying that decentralization and canceling the savings in time and money that have resulted in the past. Moreover, it would destroy the flexibility that now exists with respect to those operations that permits rapid changes and revisions of plans. Under the procedure contemplated by H. R. 3096, changes and variations in plans would have to run the whole gamut from field office to congressional committee and back again. Thus the delay will be significantly greater than would be apparent on the surface. The acquisition of general purpose space in many cities throughout the United States is handled by the General Services Administration rather than by the military departments. In those cases the military departments submit their needs to the General Services Administration, which acquires or leases space on behalf of the military department concerned. In those cases no report can be made to the congressional committees until it has been determined from the General Services Administration the form in which it proposes to make the space available. A delay thereafter might have the unfortunate effect of causing the Government to lose the opportunity to acquire the space sought.

It may well be expected that the delays that would be encountered under the present bill would be greater than that experienced by the Department of the Navy under the act of April 4, 1944. That is true because the number of significant transactions would be much greater under this bill than under the 1944 act. The requirement of review by congressional committees in the matter of acquisition and disposal of real property would to a large degree duplicate existing machinery in the agencies directly involved as well as those in the General Services Administration. It would hinder the orderly management of Federal property as contemplated by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, which was recently enacted by the Congress. Moreover, the requirement of a review of the transfer of property between the military departments of the Department of Defense is, in effect, a contradiction of the principle of increased interservice utilization of property by the military departments, which is an essential feature of unification.

Moreover, the enactment of this legislation would seem to be particularly inopportune at this time in view of the current international situation and the increasing demands for expeditious action in connection with the defense procurement program. I cannot help but feel that the Congress would not knowingly place unnecessary obstacles, such as that inherent in H. R. 3096, to the expeditious consummation of that defense procurement program.

Finally, I am concerned by what appears to me to be a gradual trend on the part of the legislative branch to participate to an even greater extent in the actual execution and administration of the laws. Under our system of government it is contemplated that the Congress will enact the laws and will leave their administration and execution to the executive branch. The delays discussed above, which would inhere in the enactment of H. R. 3096, testify to the wisdom of that constitutional policy. It would seem particularly inappropriate to depart from that policy in the field of military procurement during a period of national emergency when expeditious action may be vital to the survival of our Nation.

For these reasons I am returning this bill without my approval but with the assurance that the agencies covered by the bill will cooperate with the appropriate congressional committees in furnishing the information they desire in a manner that will not interfere with the orderly operation of their real estate transactions.

I again recommend that section 407 of Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, be repealed for the reasons set forth in my message of January 15, 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 1951.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be entered at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill printed as a House document.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that further consideration of the veto message on the bill H. R. 3096 be postponed until Thursday, May 17. The reason I do so is on account of the lateness of the hour, and I think there should be full debate on this important measure.

The motion was agreed to.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House on the third supplemental appropriation bill may have until midnight tomorrow to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ARMS EMBARGO AGAINST CHINA

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 101, urging the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action with respect to placing an arms embargo on Communist China, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state that an identical Senate concurrent resolution has just arrived at the desk. It is identical with the exception that it does not contain section 2. Does the gentleman still desire to pass the House resolution or would he prefer to pass the Senate resolution?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my consent request and instead ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, so that the RECORD will show the whole situation, section 2 of the Rogers resolution related to the transmission of a copy of the resolution to the State Department for transmittal to certain officials of the United Nations. While that is not in the Senate resolution, it would automatically follow as a matter of course. That is my understanding. I think the RECORD should show that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the United States has initiated a proposal, under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations would (1) call upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; (2) urge that steps be taken to guard against circumvention or nullification of such embargo through loopholes which might enable the Chinese Communists to acquire the banned materials; and (3) establish a special committee to receive periodic reports from the complying member nations and to take other measures aimed at making the embargo as effective as possible; and

Whereas Communist China has long since been branded an aggressor by an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations; and

Whereas more than a dozen member nations are participating directly with the United States in the heroic military action against the common enemy in Korea, and the troops of such nations are being shot at, and killed, by the Chinese Communists; and

Whereas no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby requests and urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Concurrent Resolution 101 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATION OF CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 96, opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of House of Representatives that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: Page 1, line 2, strike out "Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China" and insert "Chinese Communist authorities shall not be permitted to represent China in the United Nation.."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point on these two rather historic resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the action of this House in taking up House Resolution 96, which I introduced in January of this year, is in my opinion a historic one. It is, however, most appropriate and even more important now than when introduced.

If there was ever a time when this Congress should speak for the people, it is now. We should not only make our position firm and decisive but let the world know that we will not submit to appeasement with Communist aggression.

The action of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in reporting this resolution is to be commended. It is an expression of that great committee, as it is with this House, in unanimously approving this resolution, that we want the United Nations to know that we are opposed to the Chinese Communist authorities having a seat in the United Nations, proposing to represent the great Chinese Nation.

I appreciate the action of the committee and this House. I think the clarifying language is appropriate. It not only states our opposition to the Communists being permitted to represent China in the United Nations but, in my opinion, it makes it even more clear that we do not even recognize a Communist Chinese Government. This, in my opinion, is highly significant.

Toward the close of World War II, determined efforts were made to bring about a way for peace and a definite policy for maintaining peace. This attitude as expressed by the Congress and the American people time and again was obviously a result of the position pursued following World War I, and believed by so many to have culminated in the disastrous and devastating World War II.

Determined efforts, in cooperation with our then allies and under the leadership of our great Nation, were made for the formulation of a program through international cooperation of nations. This became known as the United Nations Organization.

We recall the enthusiasm and the encouragement of our people and the reports from other nations when the Charter was signed yonder in San Francisco, pledging these nations to a policy of peaceful relationship and a settlement of the problems among nations within the framework of that organization.

We have now reached a point which in my opinion will determine whether or not the efforts of these years will have been in vain. It appears that what happens now and in the immediate future is going to determine whether or not we will have a United Nations Organization and certainly one that will be effective.

Out of the developments, the tragedies, and the seriousness of the crisis that faces not only this Republic but other free nations of the world, momentous decisions must be made.

In view of these developments, this House in January adopted a resolution—House Resolution 77—which stated "that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nation should immediately act and declare the Chinese Communist authorities an aggressor in Korea." This resolution was brought up by unanimous consent in the House, sponsored by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

I voted for the resolution, as did most of the Members of this House. It was another expression of this House that we must take firm and definite action, but within the framework of the United Nations Organization, and through that organization we should say to any aggressor that we meant what we said when we pledged ourselves to international cooperation for peace. The United Nations has since taken similar action, and appropriately.

It will be remembered that when the North Koreans started their armies on

South Korea the United Nations was hurriedly called into session and immediately adopted a resolution declaring the North Koreans to be aggressors.

As a result of this action we were immediately drawn into the Korean debacle. It was not only through the action of the United Nations, but it appeared to be the predominant feeling of the American people that such aggression must not be permitted and that we must answer the challenge.

It will also be remembered that when our gallant fighting forces destroyed and disintegrated the main forces of the North Korean Army and reached the thirty-eighth parallel, the United Nations adopted a resolution that the United Nations forces should pursue the North Koreans to their ultimate destruction throughout all of Korea. That is, the aggressor forces in Korea should be disintegrated.

Whether this action was a mistake or not and I think it was, we had destroyed the organized aggression, disintegrated the enemy, nevertheless, it was a decision taken by the United Nations.

We have an entirely different situation, even more serious, that we must deal with now. It was the North Koreans then, even though directed by Russia. It is now the Chinese Communists with their hordes likewise directed by Russia. Then since the United Nations said the North Koreans were aggressors, we could take no other position than to declare the Chinese Communists aggressors.

We should make these firm decisions and pursue a course of action, keeping in mind our objectives to which we are pledged, our hopes and desires for peaceful relations among the Nations of the world, the preservation of the rights, privileges, and freedoms of Nations, thereby preventing aggression.

Some time ago the Senate adopted a resolution concurring in the action taken by this House. Thus the Congress of the United States, representing the people of this country, has said to the United Nations, it should take the same course of action against one aggressor as against the other.

Mao Tse-tung and his crowd have flouted the United Nations in its request for a cease fire and aggression in Korea. He laid down his own terms, obviously directed by Moscow. To accept such a truce would be a travesty. It could only lead to a policy of appeasement and inevitably another world war that would be more devastating and tragic than anything like experienced in World War II or I might say, a devastation and perhaps a destruction of civilization to the extent that any of us have little conception of what it would mean.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was so incredible that we have the reports that Mao and his gang have altered its true position, but he has said, so it is reported, that a cease-fire truce could be arranged by a meeting of certain nations, which he proposes to name.

It is quite obvious that the main objective now of Russia is that Mao and his Chinese Communists be admitted to membership and recognized in the United Nations as the representative of China, unseating Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists of China. Some of our supposed-to-be allies seem to lean that way, too.

At the same time of trying to gain this recognition they are aggressors in Korea and actually at war against the United Nations.

The Senate went a step further and adopted another resolution. It said it was the sense of the Senate that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

I heartily concur in this action. The House of Representatives should concur and thus the Congress saying that the United Nations should not admit or recognize any group while at the same time they are pursuing a policy of destruction and aggression.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, introduced a resolution which says:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

Any action short of this resolution stating the position of this Congress and of our Government would, in my opinion, be appeasement.

To pursue this course of action may very well cause our withdrawal from Korea. Even so, we would maintain the principle to which we are committed in pursuing a policy toward the preservation of our freedoms and liberties. It would not mean that we were giving in to the aggressor and adopting a course of appeasement.

I emphasize again that we have an entirely different situation and a far more serious one now with the Chinese Communists in Korea than we had last June.

As a matter of fact and being realistic we should not and cannot engage in land warfare with the Chinese in China. Our resources, our manpower, would not permit and neither would our future security require it. It would seem to me a rather hopeless task which would be most inadvisable to undertake.

I do not know and do not suppose anyone knows to what extent the Chinese Communists will continue in South Korea. If they continue to pursue their obvious intentions by sending great hordes of their armies, we should get out and stay if we are going to continue to prohibit our forces from bombing the concentration of their supplies and armies on the Manchurian border and certainly if we are not in a position to adequately provide the forces in Korea that will give our boys at least a fair chance.

Some might contend that Mao and his crowd are the Government of China and that in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter should be recognized as China's representative. As a matter of principle, I am not one of those that would recognize such a dictator of force and violence as a representative of the people of that Government. They could not in my opinion make any more contribution toward peaceful relationship among nations than has Communist Russia.

I voted against the aid to Tito or Yugoslavia at the close of the last session of Congress. I might have been wrong in that decision but as a matter of principle I believe I was right. It was contended that that action of the Congress was not a matter of principle but strategic militarily. It was strategic militarily when we joined up with Stalin and Russia in World War II but we can all see where it has led us.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can lay aside a matter of principle in any of the actions of this Congress and our Government without reaping the result of what we sow.

I believe this course of action of the Congress is in keeping with the principles and the policies which we believe to be right. The world knows that we do not seek conquests or want war; we should continue to let the world know that we are going to be firm in our position, determined in our efforts to prevent aggression and bring about a just peace. We must be consistent in our action as I believe right will prevail.

We have a force that would enslave the world, trample on free nations, and free people, and the only way we can meet it is to take such actions as this and prepare ourselves for this most difficult and unfortunate task.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the ugly head of aggressive communism undertakes to force and subvert its way over the world in four main moves, to wit: First, militarily; second, politically; third, economically; fourth, ideologically.

Voting our greatest budget in the history of our Nation on account of having to meet this threat militarily; recognizing the political moves as we do of aggressive communism; knowing that economically we could be swamped if we were not vigorous and vigilant; I, too, speak that these measures should have our unanimous and cordial clear-cut approval. Having voted for this ban and embargo relating to our economic processes, must make us realize it only weakens the false ideology of aggressive, subversive communism; but does not defeat it. It must be defeated by a better ideology. Being a member of the Un-American Activities Committee in this Congress, I speak for the utmost and sincere consideration for every Member of this House to the proposition that the world is at war now, with relation to ideologies. Military policies or economic measures will not eventually or enduringly win wars. The existence of heart, mind, and soul, is a battle of ideals and ideas. Chiefest of these ideas and ideals must come to the threshold of the fundamental principle, that what is right must triumph.

It is right that we vote as we are this day, because it is right to do so. We are now being guided by principle, rather than personalities or partisan politics. When we live on a high enough plane as American citizens, to let our daily conduct be mainly guided by the same principle in doing what is right, rather than thinking in terms of who may be

right, we will then have arrived at a level of national thinking which, in my humble judgment, will be a premise for enduring victory, over the ideological and false philosophy of aggressive subversive communism.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the House has just taken action that will have momentous significance all over the world. Without any debate at all, and with but the briefest of explanation here on the floor, this House has unanimously gone on record as urging a United Nations embargo on Communist China, and declaring that the Chinese Communist authorities should not be permitted to represent China in the United Nations. It was sufficient that the text of these two resolutions be read; no argument was needed; although any Member could have stopped action, or delayed action to insist on explanation or to make a speech, the House, by common consent, gave instant, unanimous support to these resolutions.

We are in the midst of a great debate on foreign policy in this country. Columnists and commentators and others, here and abroad, are wringing their literary hands and shedding rhetorical tears, some of them crocodile tears, at the division, the indecision, the partisanship in Congress. Communists here and over the world have been gleefully making propaganda over this. Then along come these historic resolutions, and they are passed with lightning speed, and unanimous support. This was no accident; it was no surprise action. We all knew what we were doing. There had been full consultation between the leadership on both sides; there had been full consideration of both resolutions in the Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning. The language of the Harris resolution was changed to eliminate any possibility that we might be recognizing any "Chinese Communist government," and instead we used the phrase "Chinese Communist authorities," which had been used in the House resolution, which passed January 19, urging the United Nations to declare the Chinese Communist authorities an aggressor in Korea. Of course, most of us Republicans had long advocated the policies involved in these resolutions so it was easy for us to sponsor prompt action, but there was no gloating, no recrimination, no delay here on the floor, to redebate how we all happened to be together. Everyone realized that instant, united action on this would speak louder than many, many words.

I think this action can be a lesson to our friends, and our enemies, overseas; a comfort to nervous people here at home. When something is right, and needed quickly, we have a way of getting together in a hurry, and getting it done.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the contents and purpose of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31.

It points out that the United States has initiated a proposal, under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations would, first, call upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; second, urge that steps be taken to guard against circumvention or nullification of such embargo through loopholes which might enable the Chinese Communists to acquire the banned materials; and, third, establish a special committee to receive periodic reports from the complying member nations and to take other measures aimed at making the embargo as effective as possible.

Communist China has long since been branded an aggressor by an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations.

More than a dozen member nations are participating directly with the United States in the heroic military action against the common enemy in Korea, and the troops of such nations are being shot at, and killed, by the Chinese Communists.

No United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world.

The resolution, expressing the will of the Congress of the United States requests and urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

This expression of the desire of the Congress is in full accord with the thought and in recognition of the unanimous demand of the people of the United States.

In the summer of 1950, shortly after the Korean War started, I brought to the attention of the House facts that demonstrated that certain European countries, supposed to be our allies, were engaged in this nefarious trade. It was almost incomprehensible to believe that these nations who called themselves our allies would ship to Russia and countries behind the iron curtain, as well as Red China the strategic materials and war commodities that enabled Red China to carry on the war against our boys fighting in Korea, and assist Communist countries in building their war machine against free nations. But the facts were so plain that they could not be successfully denied. This should have been a subject of protest by our State Department long ago, but until recently it failed to take any aggressive steps to stop this double dealing.

The hearings held last summer by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce revealed that there was a great hesitancy on the part of our departments of government to take any action. It seemed as if they were of the opinion that it was too delicate a matter for this country to object to how other countries, although our allies, carried on business, even with our enemies. It is gratifying to realize that there are now signs of an awakening to the injustice that has been done to our fighting men in Korea. Let us hope that we will from now on have a more realistic policy that will do justice to the boys who fight our battles.

Another resolution—House Resolution 96—that has my full support provides in effect that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the representatives of the Communist Government in China should not be entitled to representation in the United Nations. This resolution goes hand in hand with the previous resolution to which I have referred. Its adoption will go far in demonstrating that the United States does not intend to sit idly by and permit our enemies to gain recognition to which they are not entitled. Let us continue to be realistic, cease being namby-pamby, and assert our rights as a nation. Other nations, friend and foe, will have more respect for us when we do.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in order to make an explanation of House Concurrent Resolution 101, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned and deeply disturbed in that some of our allies, yea, even some of the members of the United Nations, have been shipping arms, ammunition, and strategic war materials to Communist China and to other nations through which Red China eventually received these war materials. I have wondered why some steps or measures had not been taken by our Nation or the United Nations to place a ban or embargo on the shipment of such materials, certainly when it is evident that these war materials are being used by the forces of Red China or Communist China to kill and destroy our boys engaged in the fight to prevent aggression.

I saw a gleam of hope in the proposal of our delegate in the United Nations wherein our representative offered a resolution calling upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; I thought that the Congress of the United States should contribute everything within its power to endorse, urge, and bring about the successful passage of this resolution because it will be as a clarion call for the support of the other members of the United Nations and it would prove that the people of the United States, through their elected representatives, stand as one great force back of our delegation in the United Nations in calling for an embargo.

Whereupon, on Sunday afternoon, May 6, while in my apartment reading the current news I ran across an editorial in the Evening Star commenting upon the proposal of our United Nations representative. After the reading of it I came to the conclusion that the Congress should take concurrent action in the form of a resolution urging and requesting that the General Assembly

of the United Nations take affirmative action as speedily as possible in launching an embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunition and all other war materials to Communist China.

Then on Monday morning, May 7, I prepared and introduced House Concurrent Resolution 101 and at the same time made a short talk advising the Membership of the House that I was introducing such a resolution. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was delayed in appearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee for action on this resolution on account of the sudden death of our beloved chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, Hon. John Kee, and I was advised on May 8, that no committee meeting would be held prior to May 15. It was imperative and important that speedy action be had on this resolution because of the hearing before the committee of the United Nations, and I therefore consulted with my colleague, the distinguished and able Senator from Florida than whom there is no abler and more influential in the Senate, Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, concerning his introduction and his leadership in the passage of this resolution in the Senate, and the Senator being vitally and deeply interested in the purpose of this resolution introduced a companion resolution in the Senate, joined by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on May 14 and speedily passed the resolution under unanimous-consent rule.

However, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], who succeeded as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, called a meeting of the committee on Tuesday, May 15, at which time my House Concurrent Resolution 101 was considered and unanimously recommended for passage. Whereupon, on Tuesday afternoon it was called up for consideration by unanimous consent by Chairman RICHARDS. While House Concurrent Resolution 101 was being considered in the House, the Senate concurrent resolution had been passed and had just reached the House and both resolutions being identical resolutions, with the exception of section 2 having been stricken in the Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 was substituted for House Concurrent Resolution 101 and the same was adopted by the House.

In the passage of any legislation there is always mutual help and assistance, and I particularly desire to express my appreciation to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], for the part he played in cooperating for speedy action. I also commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. LAURIE BATTLE]. Without their cooperation action could not have been obtained on this resolution so quickly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to congratulate the gentleman, but I am sorry that we did not act several months ago.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the other members of his party. They have cooperated in every way and we had no difficulty whatever in getting this measure passed when it was brought to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to make just a few short observations of the value and effect this resolution could have.

First, this resolution, which is a unanimous verdict of this Congress, will be a great force in upholding the hands of the American representatives of the General Assembly of the United Nations to bring about action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipments to Communist China of war materials from any of the United Nations.

Second, it will have a great moral and salutary force on the action of the member nations in supporting the American proposal in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Third, it will protect our soldiers and all United Nations soldiers from becoming the target of a bullet, bomb, or tank manufactured in the free world or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from a free world, and surely our boys who are fighting in Korea should not be killed and murdered with arms, guns, and tanks supplied by member nations of the United Nations for whom these soldiers are fighting; and it will serve as further proof of the United Nations unity against aggression.

Fourth, this concurrent resolution will not only give physical protection to our boys but it will give them confidence and consolation to know that the Congress of the United States is endeavoring to throw around them every means of protection.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this is a most constructive step to let the United Nations know that this Congress is behind that organization in putting an embargo on war materials and arms that can be used in the killing of our boys.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, May 20 is Cuba's Independence Day.

Neither you nor I, nor the people, nor the Congress of the United States of America may rightfully pay tribute to our proud and gallant neighbors to the south. We cannot pay tribute because the very word tribute is anathema to free men who have dedicated their lives to the cause of liberty.

We can—and we do—honor Cuba, Cubans, and Cuba's independence.

It lacks only 1 year of a half century since, in 1902, on May 20, Cuba's independence—which had been for so long a martyr's dream—became a citizen's reality.

There are historians within the sound of my voice who are already asking questions: "Why?" I can almost hear you say, "Why, if the Spanish-American War was victoriously concluded in 1898, was not Cuba free until 4 years later?"

You are entitled to your questions. You are living under a Republic. You are also entitled to your answers.

True. This Nation went to the aid of the valorous Cubans and helped to rid them of a tyranny of oppression. But there is still another tyranny besides that of oppression. I refer to the tyranny of friendship.

Let us look to our own history as an organized people for understanding of the history of a kindred organized people.

There was a vast difference between the 13 Colonies of 1766 and the 13 Colonies of 1776. The last of the major French and Indian wars had brought security and prosperity to the sparsely populated Atlantic seaboard settlements. Peace was here. The threat of Indian attack was behind us. Our great store of raw materials and the demand in Europe for those raw materials brought wealth to a few and comfort to many.

The weight of government over us by England was light. Tax after tax was removed by the English parliament. We were permitted to govern ourselves—with a slight nod to English authority by having governors, in name only, over us. Many of the colonies operated under their own provincial constitutions. The much-maligned Stamp Act was not nearly so severe a burden as the multiplicity of taxes which now rest on American wage-earners.

Then—if the burden was light—and it was light—why did Americans object to it?

Massachusetts gave a ringing answer in: "Taxation without representation!" South Carolina—with her "rattlesnake flag" cried out: "Don't tread on me!" Yes. This was the answer—the colonies wanted complete freedom; not partial freedom. All kinds of tyranny—even the tyranny of friendship—was still tyranny.

I am an American. I am a citizen of the United States.

Even as the Colonies were in the decade before 1776, just so was Cuba between the time when Spanish domination ended and the memorable May 20 when the Stars and Stripes were lowered and Cuba's own flag broke proudly on the breeze.

Cruel domination? Benevolent occupation? What are these but other names for alien control?

To be free of enemy and of friend, to be liberated from cruelty and from kindness—that was what Cuban Independence Day meant almost half a century ago. Who among us may not feel as they did the wordless exultation, the fierce glory, that all Cubans felt when the dead hand of foreign rule was—we ferverently pray—lifted forever from free Cuba?

Free people have their mistakes, their failures and their tragedies. These are the results of groping—endless trial and error—to find a practical basis for their own government. The people of the United States have been thus tested by adversity. So have the Cuban people. But, when we sweep away the wreckage of some of our dearest hopes, both peoples can say to themselves: "We can begin again. We still have our freedom."

In other words, our sister republics have everything.

We can contemplate the future without fear. Freedom is our common denominator. If the freedom of Cuba should be endangered, Cuba needs no written treaties to know who would join in the defense of her liberty. If the free Government of the United States should be threatened, we know our friend from the south would range herself by our side.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the modern miracle—the solidarity between peoples who have thrown off tyranny's yoke and who glory in governing themselves.

July 4, 1776.

May 20, 1902.

Two bright beacons guiding all men everywhere to the safe harbor of a better tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ANTHRACITE COAL STOCKPILING

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to authorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of anthracite in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the anthracite region, to promote the general national welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has a great burden of responsibility to the anthracite industry. To a great extent, the major part of the economy of the Northeastern United States is dependent upon the mining of anthracite in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania. And my congressional district, centered in the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton metropolitan area, is the very heart of these coal fields. Here lies the principal source of energy and heat for the most densely populated and most intensely industrialized section of our Nation.

To prevent the loss to the national economy of this vital natural resource and economic disaster to millions of our citizens, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill.

The problems of this vast mining industry are not alone those of economics and technology—preservation, readjustments, improvements—these call for legislative assistance.

Use of abundant supplies of energy resource materials has made the United States of America the great world power it is today. In times of peace and war these materials have multiplied the strength of our manpower to provide for us the highest standard of living in time of peace and the greatest degree of strength in time of war.

A major readjustment in the fuel-energy economy of the country has been taking place during the past several decades. Economic factors and the necessities of international affairs, rather than the sound dictates of industrial prosperity and security have been at work adversely affecting our coal industry.

War and the postwar over-all prosperity for a time mitigated the degree and effects of these changes. Lately, however, the seriousness of the situation has reflected itself so forcibly upon the anthracite industry that it threatens the industrial and civilian economy of an important segment of the country.

Last year anthracite production dropped to a point lower than at any time since 1902. In 1950 the industry supplied only 3.2 percent of the national energy requirements, compared with bituminous coal, petroleum, natural gas, and hydroelectric power, on an equivalent heat-unit basis, as shown in the following table:

National supplies of energy requirements

Source of energy	Percent supplied	
	1950	1949
Anthracite	3.2	3.5
Bituminous coal and lignite	38.2	36.4
Petroleum	35.4	36.7
Natural gas	18.7	18.5
Hydroelectric power	4.5	4.9
Total	100.0	100.0

Within recent years a definite trend has been established toward a petroleum and natural-gas economy. Unfortunately, this represents great national dependence upon two fuels of limited reserve, but more importantly, fuels which are of special strategic significance to direct military and security defense.

The national fuel economy is in a dangerous condition. Indications are that the situation will worsen before adequate readjustments can be made. A further deterioration in the international affairs leading to shrinkage of oil availability from the Middle East would spell out the beginnings of a nearly catastrophic collapse of our industrial economy.

Nationalization of the Iranian oil fields and recent riots in that country are in line with the Communist pattern of acquisition. Reduction of oil from that area means a serious weakening of Western European strength. Urgent supply from United States would be the only answer to European needs. Such a drain on our domestic production would be immediately reflected in rationing and allocation of a stringent nature. In addition, such trouble in the Middle East might soon establish a new war front, with all the dangers of a world-wide conflagration.

The Munitions Board of the Department of Defense in its recent statement of policy on the availability of fuels for the military services has already sounded the warning. It would be the height of folly for us to bury our heads in the sands. Oil supplies are restricted by inadequate production facilities, insufficient tank cars, tankers, oil lines, and refineries. Gas availability is limited by lack of transmission pipelines and distribution facilities. Coal production is limited by shortages of freight cars. In general, the national fuel economy is out of balance and practically incapable of correction in the time remaining between now and next winter.

Recent trends and happenings in domestic and international affairs have given serious emphasis to the urgency for an early improvement in the situation. National over-all industrial production rate is at an unprecedented high level under the impact of mobilization demands upon the peacetime economy. Expanded universal dependence upon fuel oil creates a double burden for our security. Our closest allies are now on a liquid-fuel economy requiring our assistance and our potential enemies are becoming well equipped with mobile equipment.

Coal, petroleum, and natural gas are the basic resources upon which we have built our great industrial power and upon which our whole military strength now depends. A weakness in this group is a flaw in our armor.

Added to the current disbalance of our fuel economy is the increasing difficulty to effect correction because of the enormous drains upon steel, transportation, manufacturing facilities, and services to meet the demands of mobilization and foreign aid.

Recent Middle East affairs tending to lessen the availability of petroleum to Western Europe, together with a decline in coal production in England, greatly magnify the seriousness of our own fuel situation.

Outbreak of war would tremendously increase our responsibilities to aid our allies with all possible supplies of replacement fuels. Such a task might come suddenly at a time when our domestic production is already straining.

Scarcities of fuels are already seriously handicapping the mobilization effort and jeopardizing our military position in Korea. Ordnance plants of World War II are ready for reactivation and in several instances are unable to obtain appropriate kinds and types of fuels. Supplies for these plants when ultimately provided must in many instances be at a sacrifice of fuels for other essential industries and the domestic economy.

Chemical demands for aviation and jet fuels, plastics and synthetic products in many instances must be met by the fuel industries. Distribution of this load upon the various fuel reources is urgently needed so that each will provide that which it can produce to the best interests of the economy and security.

Worthy reviews and studies of the national fuel economy have been made in the past. Demands of our time require that new policies be established but more importantly effort must be made to give effect to such policies. The situation today requires prompt remedial action.

In the last decade revolutionary changes have taken place in our whole economy. International responsibilities heretofore undreamed of have been accepted, national industrial economic situations have played havoc with the fuel industries.

Preliminary data for 1950 indicates that both bituminous coal and anthra-

cite continued to lose in the competition with other fuels. If the war years, 1942–45, average is used as a reference base, bituminous-coal production has dropped 15 percent, anthracite 26 percent, while fuel-oil production has increased 25 percent and gas 65 percent.

Caught with the necessity for large-scale mobilization during the period of this unprecedented shift in the fuel economy, our fuel industries are seriously disbalanced and in a dangerous plight, all are practically unable to arise to the full demands of a war emergency.

No authority disputes the ultimate return of the country to an enlarged coal demand. Just how far away this day may be no one accurately knows, but in the two-world pattern of today it is imperative that immediate effort be directed to preserve the anthracite industry and the potential industrial capabilities of this region.

A sudden reduction of the importation of foreign oil or a war emergency would place considerable of the northeastern section of the United States in urgent need for anthracite. Accordingly, something must be done to keep this industry healthy and strong for the job which might be placed upon it while it is readjusting itself.

The production of 42,664,000 tons of anthracite estimated for 1949 is about 20 percent lower than during the depth of the 1933–36 depression. Employment during the year was approximately 74,000 men.

Total reserves of anthracite are estimated at between 160 and 180 years of expected life. For petroleum and natural gas comparative figures are 12 and 30 years, respectively.

In 1947 fuel oil for the first time surpassed anthracite consumption in the primary anthracite market area and in 1948 accounted for 52 percent of the total consumption of fuels there.

The impact of these changes upon the fortunes of anthracite producers, on national security and defense planning strikes heaviest and first on the civilian economy. In the event of a sudden war emergency wherein importations of oil would be restricted and considerable amounts of domestic oil allocated for war purposes, a shift back to coal would put a large burden upon anthracite production.

Improved metallurgical processes, scarcities of important mineral resources, expanded and adjusted transportation routes, and research and development in entirely new fields all point to opportunities for improvement in the industrial economy of the anthracite industry and area in a distant future.

Today, however, the need for preservation of this industry is urgent. It has been and still is the backbone of our national industrial strength and prowess. Its problems and challenges have been many and varied. Out of this industry have come the techniques and industrial solutions which have made some of our greatest industries. Its mass-production methods have been the basic pattern for our automotive industry; its early flameproof electrical equipment and gas-protective apparatus have enabled the development of our oil and gas industries; to say nothing of the industry's contributions against poisonous gases in industry and war.

Now the day has arrived when the country is called upon to preserve this industry for the perpetuation of the overall national prosperity and security.

Our national security and defense is predicated upon the development of a strong industrial economy. All across the country we endeavor to strengthen our industries. In the international field we spend billions to better the economies of friendly nations. In doing this we purchase their products, some of which come into competition with our industries, such as is presently the case with the importation of foreign fuel oil. These are the things we must do to create a better and safer world. It was not the intent or purpose of those who designed our foreign-aid program that these efforts should redound to the detriment of our own industries. Instead, it was and is intended that our own economy and industries should adjust themselves and rise to greater success and importance.

Under these circumstances, the direction in which the anthracite industry must go to recapture its share of success and position for the betterment of the national economy is clear. But to attain this end it must have a new partnership with the Government. It seeks not a dole but an opportunity to contribute that which is peculiarly its part.

During 1949 production of anthracite fell 25.3 percent below that for 1948; similarly bituminous-coal production dropped 27.4 percent. Production figures for these two fuels during 1948 and 1949 are as follows:

Coal-production statistics

Year	Anthracite	Bituminous
	Tons	*Tons*
1948	42,664,000	435,000,000
1949	42,701,724	437,868,036

In 1918 anthracite supplied approximately 12 percent of the national energy requirements, but in 1949 it accounted for only 3.4 percent, representing a loss of about 70 percent in its relative position. In actual tonnage this was a reduction of from 98,826,084 tons in 1918 to 42,664,000 tons in 1949, or a 57-percent decrease in production.

This slumping off of the anthracite industry is a serious matter to the peacetime economy and security of the country. It has dragged down with it a most important area of the country and a segment of its population which once was industrially and technologically on a pinnacle.

One could argue long and bitterly the reasons why the anthracite industry and area are so distressed today. However, for the job of reconstruction ahead only those points which can set the course for repair and progress need be considered.

The world today has approximately 2,000,000,000 people. Using only rough estimates, it is clearly evident that numerically we have recently moved rapidly into reverse in our race against communism. The Soviet with about 250,000,000 people, China and Northern Korea with nearly 500,000,000 people, the satellite and doubtful states with 150,000,000 people, and India, Burma, and other Far East countries already close to communism with another 500,000,000 people. This gives the Communists a potential control of 1,400,000,000 people. It also leaves only a mere 600,000,000 people for us to consolidate for our side. With these odds, and many others already against us, is not the need to spur ourselves great enough? Can we afford the luxury of a blighted fuel industry and its ghost towns?

Hence the opportunity exists and the occasion demands that a constructive and objective course be set for the rehabilitation of the anthracite industry.

A forward view of the anthracite area envisions a pleasant region of high-level, well-organized industrial power in the channels of trade and commerce, across the country and seas, again setting the pattern of progress in the production, engineering, construction, and research fields, as it did in the past.

No panacea for anthracite industrial ills exists or can be concocted. Though that is true, certain palliatives can be administered which hold promise of restoration of a high degree of health.

Luckily, for this area it is strategically located where neither those interested in the prosperity of the national economy or security can long avoid giving it appropriate consideration. The area is located where its strength and position is the keystone of our whole national power.

Specifically, the more I study the difficulties of the anthracite region the more sure I am of the theory that its recovery and restoration of health depends upon its integration with other projects, programs, and plans possible of being brought to bear on this country's ills by no one person, corporation, or industry. The day has arrived when the problems of this industry require the guidance and aid of Government surveys, direction, and aid just as surely as it exists today for wheat, potatoes, and eggs. Fortunately, however, the correctives to be employed for the anthracite industry are of a type which when properly correlated lend strength and security to the country on a self-paying basis.

In the world of today we tread a difficult road, and we would be unwise to add to our difficulties by neglecting to husband the strength of the various parts of our great industrial economy, or fail to build back into it those things which have made it so great.

Let us not forget that this anthracite area, at the turn of the century, provided approximately 23 percent of the national energy requirements which gave the Nation its present great industrial strength. The country does owe the anthracite area and its people a chance under the sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNSIDE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, old soldiers may never die, as the ballad goes. But

young soldiers do. That is the tragedy and the shame of our day.

The violence of our age threatens to destroy us, for science has made us masters of destruction, while we remain dormant in our human relations.

"Our reach exceeds our grasp," wrote Vincent Sheehan. We stumble and talk, accuse and vilify, justify and explain—while young soldiers die, young American soldiers, in a far-away land.

Much has been said that were better left unsaid. As one of my old constituents recently advised me when I explained to him that I was a United States Representative in Washington, "I didn't rightly know what you wuz. I just knew you wuz up there where they do a lot of talking." And so they do, Mr. Speaker, so they do. We talk a lot—too much. We discuss so many things that mean so little to men committed to battle. We speak of war in terms of degrees—police action, limited war, enlarged war, extended war, and all-out war. To soldiers, however, and their dear ones, war remains very much the same—violence, death, and destruction.

The foreign policy of the United States and Russia is a very personal concern in every home, in every heart, in every land. Its formation can no longer rightfully be delegated to the few. And out of the present high-level discussions and testimony in a committee of the other body we pray may come an understanding of a foreign policy adaptable to the realities of this violent world.

You and I have a part. Shall we honestly face the grim realities of Korea? A part of each of us is dying there now, and it is war in all of its ugly self, without a regard to resolutions or the manner in which we became involved. We cannot escape responsibility by engaging in what seems to be now a popular pastime of accusing, impugning, vilifying, and opportuning, and then to walk away with our chests stuck out, saying "Boy, did I tell 'em off. Nor can we, with honesty and decency, say as Mr. Clarence Budington Kelland, a national Republican committeeman from Arizona, is reported to have said:

> The conduct of the war in Korea is President Truman's responsibility. He took us into the war. His far-eastern policy, or lack of it, was responsible for the building of the Chinese Communists, and so for the war of aggression, started by Reds in North Korea.

He further stated:

> I do not believe that the Republican Party should tie itself to the issue of military action as developed between General MacArthur and Mr. Truman.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford the luxury of peace at home and war in Korea—peace and plenty for the many and war and glory for the few, unrestrained enthusiasm for the battle in the political arena and lukewarm interest in what unthinking people would call the "Truman" or the "Democratic" war. It is our war, and it will not leave one American untouched. Our hands are not clean, nor can we escape responsibility.

My wife recently said, with the understanding and sadness only of a woman who has sent a man to battle, that she could not understand what seemed to be a lack of concern or interest for the soldiers, the young soldiers in Korea. She reminded me that we seldom heard men of responsibility speak with concern and interest in the few who are doing so much. She reminded me, Mr. Speaker, that as a veteran of World War II, I had but one claim on the responsible place that I hold in Congress, and that was that I should have a full grasp and understanding of war and the young soldiers who fight it, its horrors and destruction, and that I might, with that understanding, contribute a small measure to peace.

You would not be offended, I am sure, if I suggest that we whet our interest in Korea, and with all of our hearts and our experiences and our combined power, join our soldiers in their fighting of our war. Part war and part peace is not a condition acceptable to any American. The commitment of troops to combat leaves but one course—to seek victory. The supply of more than a sufficient number of men and matériel necessary to achieve such victory quickly, decisively, and with a minimum of loss, is an obligation, a moral obligation and a national obligation that cries for payment.

No foreign policy experts, no military experts, are necessary to the simple decision of this Congress to make available to our field commanders an abundance of troops and matériel sufficient to achieve the destruction or surrender of the enemy. How much? You and I do not know. Assuredly, however, the answer would be easy to obtain.

We entered Korea to win a victory or we are fools—fools with the blood of thousands of valiant men upon our hands—and I emphasize, our hands, not Mr. Truman's hands, for this Congress has resolved in favor of the war in Korea as surely and as definitely as if it had passed a resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in Manchuria and other sanctuaries of our enemy are to remain inviolate for any reason, good or bad, military or political, we are relegated to produce a force that can and will overcome the enemy in the assigned arena. All of our field commanders are agreed that our present effort is a magnificent one. That being true, could not twice the amount of troops and matériel do a better job? Or three times the present effort assure a decisive victory in Korea?

No doubt the question arises in your mind as to what is meant by victory. The diplomats would give one asnswer, perhaps the politicians another, but the answer of the soldier is the one that is important.

I am certain his answer would be that victory would result when we have so decisively punished the people we are fighting in Korea that the fighting would cease; that the soldier might sleep and rest and live; that he might return to the world of human dignity, to his home, his family, to the things that he loves, the same as you and I. Moral victory, or any other type of platitude, would not be appealing to him—only a solid and decisive destruction of the enemy in Korea will justify the blood price we have paid.

The buying-time philosophy may scund all right to some, but it does not appeal to me; nor does it, I am sure, appeal to your sons and brothers who are called upon to make the payments in the violence of battle.

Buying time is a meaningless phrase when we are as smug and content and cantankerous and as undecided and as peaceful as too many of us are here at home. If Korea is but a preliminary bout, a prelude to a major or world conflict, then the actions of this Congress, the executive branch of the Government, and the people of this country generally and of our allies are but criminal.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are acting in a criminal way if we are buying time with young lives, for certainly we are not going all out to prepare for a major war. At this very moment a bill lies dormant between the two Houses, a bill that would increase the manpower of the Army, the so-called draft bill.

I am certain that we have not reached a point in our national history that we have so dulled our consciences and our perceptions that we accept as necessary the periodic tribute of American lives, and certainly we cannot sit idly by and wait for developments or inner collapse, for so few make so many and so great sacrifices.

I do not believe that we can avoid war by warring in degrees. American soldiers in battle in whatever degree of war under any flag are entitled to the full power and might of our great country and its great people.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a portion of the front page of the Washington Star where, in one column, Draft Director Lewis B. Hershey is quoted as saying that we are in a soft period of manpower needs. In an adjoining column one of General Van Fleet's commanders is quoted as saying, "We are in good shape with what we have, but we could use more troops." I have on my desk, Mr. Speaker, a clipping wherein a soldier returned from Korea has stated that we are short on men as well as matériel, and that our equipment is not of the best type.

Can we justify peace at home and war in Korea? Can we—Democrats, Republicans, Americans—discharge our responsibility without going all out?

Mr. Speaker, our troops, our American troops are committed under the United Nations banner. They have committed with them small complements of troops of other countries. When troops of different countries are committed in a common cause they deserve the full-time allegiance of all countries involved.

As badly as we need allies, as earnestly as we may desire not to go alone, we cannot in honor or in safety accept part-time allegiance from our allies. Those who play with a common enemy commercially can never be expected to fight him wholeheartedly. Such allies are a luxury and a burden that we cannot afford. Certainly the time is now when other nations must decide their course of action, choose their friends or their would-be conquerors.

Communism is the world public enemy No. 1. Its objective is world domination and slavery. In such a fight there can be no neutrality, no interested observers. Our country did not draw the line. It was drawn by Russia.

"Which side are you on?" may not be in diplomatic language, but it is a question which demands an answer in keeping with the stark realities of this period of international violence. Traffic with the enemy is immoral and world-wide guerrilla warfare cannot be a steady diet.

Mr. Speaker, we have no alternative. We must achieve victory in Korea. If we cannot do this, then it would appear utterly ridiculous while we talk of buying time to talk, at the same time, of preparing for a so-called big war.

I know the flood of stock answers to such a statement, such answers as "That would be an entirely different matter," that "in such a war we could bring to bear all of our mighty resources," and so forth. But such answers are not satisfactory.

Little war or big war, the death of our boys is real, the liberty and the freedom of our land is imperiled. We must decisively win or we lose. Little war or big war, the arena may be different, but the game is the same. It is played for keeps.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called big war can come only as a result of the actions of Russia, directly or indirectly. Only fools would look with favor on a war with Russia, but only fools could conclude that we are at peace with Russia. Her present Government is evil and untrustworthy, without principles or decency.

It is my considered judgment that there can be no peace upon this earth so long as the present Government of Russia exists, and follows its avowed objectives, world domination and world slavery. Such a conclusion leaves little leeway. The present Government of Russia is one that must fall or be replaced by one that can live in the community of nations, or she must be outlawed, isolated, or destroyed.

The United Nations was born out of the hope and ideals of average people throughout the world. It was a prayerful expression shared by every good heart that man would abolish war as a means of settling disputes among nations. It can survive and be useful only if its courage matches its idealistic birth.

The United Nations cannot be indecisive, fearful, or the tool of any great power. It cannot condone aggression under whatever ruse it is perpetrated. Outlaws, world outlaws, strong or weak, must be branded as such and brought to justice.

The United Nations must participate in a world-wide mobilization of physical and moral strength to defeat the enemy. If it has not the character or the strength to do this, then it is a useless failure. Peace is an objective worth striving for, living for, and dying for. It is forth sacrifice, but one thing is certain, the striving, the sacrifice, and the dying must be equalized, shared by all, to bring true and lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, neither this Government nor any other government has the right to buy time with other people's blood and remain, at the same time, a half-alerted people and government. Our war is against communism, whose chief proponent is Russia.

All of the available evidence leads to but one conclusion, Russia is responsible for the invasion of South Korea and the intervention of Chinese Communists.

Russia will go to war when she feels that she can defeat the United States and other free peoples. The only peace that the present Russian Government can tolerate is one in which she can continue her conquest. To this day the only defense advanced is that the free nations develop such a military posture as to discourage Russia from attacking anywhere in the world.

There are few who would choose war over peace, few who would fail to support with money and enthusiasm a sound plan for peace, but it must be a sound plan, and not a dream. It must be gaged to realities, the realities of a cruel world. It must be a plan that we, the common people, can understand and approve. We understand war and we hate it, but we do not fear it, Mr. Speaker, for out of it has emerged our country and its freedom.

We do not understand diplomacy and we put little faith and trust in it. So often diplomacy seems to consist of elements of governments trying to keep peaceful little folks in a stew and a fight. The truth is that world-wide responsibility in an atomic age caught us unprepared. For weeks high level investigations are being conducted, and yet men die in Korea.

It seems to me that our present task is simple. We ought to quit talking so much and start working and fighting with and for those who fight for us.

Mr. Speaker, I realize all too well that I have not solved all of our problems, or perhaps, not any of them by making this statement. I do sincerely hope, however, that I have called to your attention what I believe to be the most compelling and urgent problem—victory in Korea. As I stand here now—at this moment—the Communists are massing men and matériel in Korea, hoping to destroy our armies. Have we provided and sent sufficient planes? Have we provided and sent sufficient tanks, guns, men, and matériel? Have we, Mr. Speaker, done our best? Have we joined the war with our troops in Korea? I think not.

Old soldiers may never die, but young soldiers do. Is not it time that we momentarily forget old soldiers and remember the young ones?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had the honor yesterday afternoon of having as a visitor one of our distinguished American soldiers, who commanded a famous regiment in South Korea. Although a young man of only 38 years of age, he is already a brigadier general. I sat in the presence of that fine officer, that brave man, that fine American, and asked him many questions. What noticeably impressed me was his pride in the American soldier. He said, "Those boys over there are great fighters. Their morale is high. There is no finer fighter in the world than the American soldier who is fighting in Korea." That came from the lips of one who is just back here, who was in Korea prior to June 25 of last year, who commanded a famous regiment, who was sent on special missions and special work, and who goes over to Europe in the near future for service with General Eisenhower. I should like the record to show the great pride he had in and the great tribute he paid to the American soldier who is serving and fighting in Korea.

Mr. LYLE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I might say that if the Congress of the United States had half the courage and the guts of the American soldier we would get this thing over with in just a little while.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I also had a thrilling experience within the last few days. I went out to Walter Reed Hospital last week and communed for a time with those boys who have their legs off and their arms off, and who recently returned from Korea. They, like the gentleman in the well of the House, want this war to end in victory, a real victory, not in any stalemate.

Mr. LYLE. Yes. I am sure they would join the gentleman and me in saying that they are tired of hearing all of the bickering and the accusing and all of the senseless talk, because it is an American problem, and only a solid, decisive victory and destruction of the enemy can justify the blood price we paid in Korea.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I have a high respect for the gentleman from Texas. I want to be sure I get his point. I wonder if he could not be a little more specific as to what he calls the senseless talk. I certainly appreciate there is some senseless talk, but does the gentleman mean to say that the Congress and the committees of the Congress should not concern themselves with the question as to whether the strategy which has been used in Korea and the limitations that have been placed upon our troop movements and so forth in Korea are sound or not? Does the gentleman believe we should not be going into those things at this time?

Mr. LYLE. No, I do not believe we should not.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I just wanted to be sure that I was not misunderstanding the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman knows what I am talking about. I mean in the sense of the cheap political profit that has been tried to be made out of this terrible situation in which young Americans are dying. Of course, I want the Congress to understand all of the problems. Of course, I want the Congress to have full hearings and full discussions. But I would like to see honest and sincere and decent investigation and discussion, because only that sort of conduct is worthy of the soldiers we have over there. Cheap political chicanery and statements just are not part of the American system that we have at this moment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I say I concur fully in that statement by the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. I am sure you do. I am sure you do.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman wants to see these men who have so grievously suffered and been wounded so badly have every benefit that they can receive and all of the benefits that World War I veterans have received.

Mr. LYLE. So much so that I would like to give them back their legs and their eyes and their arms, but of course that is something that we cannot do.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But we can give them everything we can to approximate giving them back what they have lost.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I am reluctant to interrupt such a fine speech by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I think we can all appreciate very much the speech he is making at this time, the timeliness of it and the challenge that is in it. I feel very strongly, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, that the hour has come when we should use every weapon at our disposal inside Korea to bring victory there. Does the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. LYLE. Anything else is criminal.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for his remarks. I value his remarks highly on any subject and especially on the subject he is now discussing. I well remember that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] spent a long time in the front line of battle in World War II. He is an outstanding American patriot and the Members of this great body are proud of him. It was from the battlefield in Italy during the latter part of World War II that he was elected to the Congress of the United States although he was not a candidate. He knows war firsthand. He served as an enlisted man and served as an officer in many battles where American soldiers were killed and injured all around him. He knows their problems. He knows what an old soldier who never dies thinks as well as a young soldier who gets killed upon the battlefield. I personally appreciate Major LYLE's remarks. I would like to ask the gentleman one question. Does the gentleman believe that although the Korean war is not a declared war, it comes nearer being a war that was initiated, at least commenced by unanimous consent of the American people and especially the American Congress, than any other war in history?

Mr. LYLE. I think so.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman for the remarks he has made in the well of the House this afternoon and for the calm, dispassionate way in which he addressed himself to the subject. I hope that our friends among the United Nations will take note of the two very important resolutions approved unanimously by our body this afternoon and will understand that we, the representatives of the American people, feel very deeply on those subjects and that they, our friends among the United Nations, will follow through in behalf of the free peoples on this earth.

Mr. LYLE. They have little choice. I think that with the world situation as it is there is not any middle ground; there is not any ground for neutrality; they are either with us or they are against us. It is a fight for the survival of freedom and decency and human dignity.

Mr. CANFIELD. In the vernacular of the street, the chips are down, and they must produce or else.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman is correct.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BURNSIDE]. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an article from the New York Times.)

DANGERS OF FASCISM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of today, Tuesday, May 15, 1951, contains the following very interesting article about Fascists organizing a world alliance:

FASCISTS ORGANIZE A WORLD ALLIANCE—NEO-NAZIS FROM EIGHT COUNTRIES SET UP INTERNATIONAL BODY AT RALLY IN SWEDEN

(By George Axelsson)

MALMOE, SWEDEN, May 13.—A new neo-Nazi international movement was founded here today by 30 Fascist leaders from eight different lands to the accompaniment of clanking Hitlerian jack boots, shouts of "Heil Hitler" and theatrical salutations with outstretched left hands.

The leaders were supported by about seventy other representatives from Sweden, Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Trieste, Denmark, and Norway, and by 350 steady and 150 casual supporters.

The rank and file are mostly students, who applauded ostentatiously, intellectuals and simple workmen from the local textile, shipbuilding, and municipal undertakings.

The hosts of the meeting were the New Swedish Movement of the Swedish Opposition, which has its roots in the naive Swedish National Socialist organization started at Upsala University and elsewhere in the early days of Hitler in 1930. This parent body dwindled about 1940 when the Swedes were dumbfounded by the Hitler-Stalin pact. It was refounded in 1941 on a strictly anti-Communist basis when Hitler invaded the Soviet Union only to fade away when Hitler perished in 1945.

With the weakening east-west wartime alliance, the movement was founded again in 1949 and acquired its present name.

The motivating force of the movement is Per Engdahl. He is a small ascetic man with abnormal short-sightedness.

During the war, Mr. Engdahl was backed by many wealthy Nazi sympathizers but he says the movement is now self-supporting. He edits an extremist periodical The Way Forward and boasts of 4,000 followers.

Yesterday's march along Malmoe's main square was followed today by the annual general meeting of the Swedish opposition with foreign guests present. Tomorrow the new international organization will go into committee and will choose a name. Tuesday an international agenda will be drafted and the gathering will break up.

The leading foreign representatives present are Dr. Franz Richter, member of the West Germany Parliament for the Socialist Reich party; Henri de Bonnifacio, chairman of the National French Committee representing 14 assorted Nationalist movements; Jean Walther, editor of the French Student Organ Occident; Signor Lanciari of Italy, who according to Per Engdahl regards Mussolini as "a portent of a timeless tradition of which fascism was not the last word"; Mr. Jordan, propaganda chief of the Danish Reform Movement; Helge Gronstad, general secretary of the Norwegian Social Betterment Movement, who served a sentence for quislingism; and Arne Bergsvik, another Norwegian extremist.

Among those who expressed solidarity with the Malmoe rally but did not manage to get here are Sir Oswald Mosley, leader of the British Union of Fascists; Otto Scorzeny, who rescued Mussolini from an Alpine fortress and planned Hitler's last stand; Johan van Dyck of Belgium and Captain Larum of the Danish National Socialist party.

Beside the national flags with which the movement marched through the streets yesterday and stacked at headquarters today are the Stars and Stripes, the Union Jack and St. Andrews banner of Czarist Russia.

One of the main objectives of the movement is to penetrate United States and British democratic organizations by taking advantage of the rising tide of anticommunism.

I want you to notice that last phrase: "By taking advantage of the rising tide of anticommunism."

On the floor of this House a number of times I have commended the Members of Congress for their fights against communism. I know that we should have done everything, and we did, within our power to destroy the threat of communism in this country. We do not like communism at home or abroad, and we have been right in our opposition to communism and fighting communism every inch of the way, but at the same time I was warning the Congress of the danger of an approach of an enemy from the right as the Communist enemy approached us from the left, that this enemy from the right could be just as devastating and destructive as the enemy from the left. There is no difference, or at least there is slight difference, between communism and fascism; they both lead to dictatorship. In arriving at that dictatorship there is a difference in the method used, it is true; but when they get to the goal, commuism and fascism are exactly the same, because each is a totalitarian government. Personally I think that the Fascist-minded people and the Fascist people in the United States look with great favor upon the rise of the commuistic movement in this country and they do not look with great favor on the destruction of communism for the reason that they want communism to remain for the purpose of having something to fight and hold up as being so horrible no decent American citizen could embrace it and having that feeling the American people will be softer and will submit easier to fascism approaching us from the right.

I think that is exactly what happened in Italy. I think that is what happened in Germany. The people were led to believe that communism was so bad and the leaders were right in teaching the people how horrible and how bad communism was, but these same leaders

failed to teach them that fascism was just as devastating and just as destructive. So when they reached that proper point it was easy for the people hating communism to the extent they did to gladly and willingly embrace the alternative of fascism. That is exactly what they did in those two great countries and what will be attempted here.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. I was thumbing through the RECORD a few days ago and I was startled to find that communism appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some 5 to 10 times more often than the word "Americanism." I wonder if we cannot make a better contribution to the future young Americans who must carry these burdens if occasionally somewhere down the line we put in some of the elements that make for Americanism and what it is. Would the gentleman let me cite one example?

I had a young lady working for me; she was very satisfactory. She came into my office the other day and asked: "Do you know I am a Catholic?" I said, "No, I did not know you were a Catholic." She laughed. Just think of it, nowhere in all the world can people go to work for the Government, do satisfactory work, and others not even know what religion they have. That is an element of Americanism. We should not overlook other Americanisms when we get so enthusiastic in chasing communism around because our Americanism is the one great saving in the world and we ought to put something in the RECORD occasionally about it.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

This last phrase here I again invite your attention to. In fact I will read the sentence again:

> One of the main objectives of the movement is to penetrate United States and British democratic organizations by taking advantage of the rising tide of anticommunism.

In other words, these Fascist groups believe that the American people have become soft, they are distrustful, they have too much bickering, too much disunity, too much confusion to resist a strong Fascist movement at this time. They have been interested in fighting communism, so these people say, and now is the time to walk in with fascism as the alternative.

We certainly hope it does not happen here in the United States, but it can happen here. There are many things happening today that will be water on the wheel, so to speak, of the Fascist movement in this country, starting abroad that is true, but there are lots of Fascist-minded people as well as Fascists in the United States.

DEPRESSION POSSIBLE

It is possible for us to have a depression right here in the grand old United States when we are enjoying a time of the greatest prosperity in our history. It is possible for us to slide into one of the worst depressions and panics this country has ever had. Many things are happening that could be cited as evidence that something like that is possible and it fits right into the Fascist fight.

I shall not go into it in this discussion, but in conclusion I want to warn the American people, I want to warn the American Congress, that communism is not the only threat we have; that fascism is just as devastating and just as destructive, and while we shall continue and we must continue on the alert against any efforts of the Communists to get any kind of a hold on our country, let us remain on the alert against the Fascists getting any kind of hold on our country. Many people are quick to condemn communism, and I am certainly glad that they do, but it would be more pleasing to me if they, in the same breath or in the same sentence or the same speech, somewhere, would also condemn fascism. They are working hand in hand, and, although their methods are different, the goal of each is the same and it leads but to one goal, and that is totalitarianism, which we must not have in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

APPRECIATION OF THE SPEECH MADE BY THE GENTLEMAN FROM TEXAS, MR. LYLE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak with deep appreciation of the very fine speech made by a great soldier and patriot, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE]. It was one of the finest speeches I ever heard and one of the finest speeches of appreciation of the men who are fighting and dying for us. I know it will mean a great deal to them, because I believe today they wonder why more people do not talk about them; why more is not done in the way of giving them the—I do not call them benefits—services that the men of other wars have received, and I know the gentleman is so interested in having them receive every benefit. Twelve of them are coming to the Capitol tomorrow regarding legislation pertaining to automobiles. It seems rather strange that they have to come and speak for themselves, but such seems to be the case.

FOREIGN POLICY—ARMING OF THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

During hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress as a member of that committee I asked the present Secretary of State some questions which are still unanswered and which I am hopeful will be asked and answered before the investigations of our far-eastern policy in this Congress are completed.

The reason I think these questions have a bearing today is that under the policies which the State Department adopted toward China at that time, and which have continued until, at least, the Chinese Communist intervention in the Korean war, we have suffered some 70,000 casualties and more than 10,000 dead.

I have talked to wounded victims of this Korean war, and I know they are confused and puzzled as to how this conflict came about and its background.

The hearings I refer to were on H. R. 6795, a bill presented by the Secretary of State, which purported to provide military advice and assistance to the Republic of China, but which, the hearings brought out, was designed also to give military training and equipment to Chinese Communist forces, so that they could be amalgamated into a new nonpolitical army, as Mr. Acheson, then Under Secretary of State, described it in his testimony.

I wish to say that to the very great credit of the Congress no final action was taken on this particular bill, but policies advanced by Mr. Acheson then were pursued, and questions asked by members of the committee were never answered.

The hearings were never published, and for that reason I think it is particularly pertinent to bring portions of the testimony to the attention of the House today.

During the hearings the following colloquy took place, while the then Secretary War, Mr. Patterson, was testifying:

> Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, the War Department did not write this bill?
>
> Secretary PATTERSON. I believe the bill was prepared in the State Department, is that not right?
>
> Mr. ACHESON. In the State, War, and Navy Coordinating Committee; by the three Departments.
>
> Mrs. ROGERS. Who actually wrote it?
>
> Mr. ACHESON. The whole committee.
>
> Mrs. ROGERS. Who is on the committee?
>
> Mr. ACHESON. I think the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Dunn, Assistant and Secretary of War Patterson, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, now Under Secretary, Mr. Sullivan.
>
> Mrs. ROGERS. Who was the legal adviser?
>
> Secretary PATTERSON. I do not know.
>
> Mrs. ROGERS. Was it the Under Secretary?
>
> Secretary PATTERSON. There is no scarcity of lawyers in that committee, or any other.

Mr. Speaker, my Congressional Directory for June 1946, the time these hearings were in progress, fails to list a State, War, and Navy Coordinating Committee. It does list a State Department Coordinating Committee with Dean Acheson as chairman. Among its members were Alger Hiss and John Carter Vincent. Mr. Hiss also is listed as Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs. Mr. Vincent is listed as Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs. Both positions, as you know had an important bearing on the matter before the committee at that time. I think my question, which was never answered, was pertinent then and that it is pertinent today in the light of the tragedy we are undergoing now in Korea.

I stated in my interrogatory, and I quote from the transcript, the original transcript and the only copy that I know to be available:

> Mrs. ROGERS. I would be interested to know who actually drafted it.

Referring to the bill.

Further on I commented:

> There is no protection in the bill against giving away military secrets.

To which Secretary Patterson replied:

> It says that if any information of that character is turned over it is under condition that it be not circulated by the Republic of China.

Further on in the record, I commented:

Mrs. ROGERS. If the State Department is going to run our military policy I think it is a very good time to bring the matter up.

Referring to the size of our own Military Establishment, which Mr. Patterson had stated could be reduced from 1,550,000 in July of that year to 1,070,000 by July of the following year:

Secretary PATTERSON. The State Department has never said we could not have more men than that.

My colleague on the committee, Mr. VORYS, then asked:

Is there fighting going on now in China?

To which the Secretary replied:

I believe there is fighting going on sporadically in Manchuria.

Now I think we should turn to Mr. Acheson, which brings us to the nub of this controversy.

Mr. Acheson presented a telegram from Gen. George C. Marshall, then in China, dated June 18, 1946, the day previous to the hearing, in which General Marshall stated:

The purpose of the bill presented to the Congress by the Secretary of State is to support the American program of creating a stable and friendly China.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that General Marshall made no reference to a State, War, and Navy coordinating committee. General Marshall continued:

The assistance to Chinese ground forces authorized in the bill would be carried out in accordance with the program of reorganization and integration of National government and Chinese Communist armies agreed upon by Government and Communist representatives.

Without passage of the bill the President and myself would lack authorization to carry out a phase of American policy toward China which appears vital to the success of our announced policy.

American assistance as contemplated under the bill to supplement the efforts of the Chinese themselves, would serve to create in China ground, air, and naval forces modern in character and of sufficient strength and effectiveness to contribute materially to stability in the Far East.

Further, Secretary Acheson states—and this is from the official transcript:

The Communist forces were lacking in the type of organization, training, and equipment which would have made practicable their incorporation into a new nonpolitical national army.

Mr. Speaker I think it is important to note that from Mr. Acheson's own lips the Communist forces in 1946 were lacking in the type of organization, training, and equipment to fulfill the role the State Department had assigned to them at that time.

I continue to read from the official transcript of Mr. Acheson's testimony:

The Communist leaders have asked, and General Marshall has agreed—

And this is Mr. Acheson speaking—

that their integration with the other forces be preceded by a brief period of United States training, and by the supply of minimum quantities of equipment.

Further on Mr. Acheson stated:

I can only emphasize to this committee the very great concern of the State Department that General Marshall's task be facilitated in carrying out the program he has proposed.

I think the House will be interested in some of the subsequent questioning in this hearing, and in Mr. Acheson's responses, particularly in view of the fact, as I said before, that the hearings have never been printed, and that no extra copies of the transcript are available to any Member of Congress, including members of the committee. Let me repeat an answer to a question asked at that time by my distinguished colleague [Mr. EATON].

Secretary—then Under Secretary—Acheson contributed a four-and-one-half-page statement, in which he said, in part:

The Chinese Army is now estimated to contain approximately 300 divisions of some 10,000 to 12,000 men each. The strength of the Communist army is estimated at present to be one-fourth as great. To effect a solution and to combine these forces into one Chinese Army will require a flexible and adequate authority. Under the reorganization which General Marshall proposes this enormous number of troops will be integrated into a new and well-trained peacetime army of reasonable size. It is impossible for me to give you in detail this proposal at this time but the ultimate goal is an army of some 60 divisions.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Does the gentlewoman mean to say that the Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson recommended taking in the Communists into the Chinese Army which was one-fourth the size of the Nationalist Chinese Army?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am reading a direct quotation from Mr. Acheson.

Mr. O'KONSKI. He actually recommended that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is in the direct quotation. The reason I am giving it at this late hour is because I want the RECORD to have it so that we may be forewarned for the future. Further, Secretary Acheson states, and this is from the official transcript which I am quoting:

The Communist forces were lacking in the type of organization, training, and equipment which would have made practical their integration into a new nonpolitical national army.

Think of that.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note from Mr. Acheson's own lips the Communist forces in 1946 were lacking in the type of organization, training, and equipment to fulfill the role the State Department had assigned to them at that time.

Continuing to read from the official transcript of Mr. Acheson's testimony, I quote:

The Communist leaders have asked and General Marshall has agreed—

And this is Mr. Acheson speaking—

that their integration with the other forces be preceded by a brief period of United States training and by the supply of minimum quantities of equipment.

Further, Mr. Acheson stated:

I can only emphasize to this committee the very great concern of the State Department that General Marshall's task be facilitated in carrying out the program he has proposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNSIDE). The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection on the part of Members who have special orders following, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Do I understand the gentlewoman to tell us that the testimony she is now reading indicates that Mr. Acheson recommended the training of Chinese Communist troops by American officers?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I am reading the quotation. This is in the transcript of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and is taken from that transcript:

The Communist leaders have asked, and General Marshall has agreed—

And this is Mr. Acheson speaking—

that their integration with the other forces be preceded by a brief period of United States training and by a supply of minimum quantities of equipment.

Mr. Acheson states further:

I can only emphasize to this committee the very great concern of the State Department that General Marshall's task be facilitated in carrying out the program he has proposed.

I think the House would be interested in some of the subsequent questioning in this hearing, and in Mr. Acheson's responses, particularly in view of the fact, as I said before, that the hearings have never been printed and no extra copies of the transcript are available to any Member of the Congress, including the members of the committee.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Will the gentlewoman be kind enough to put this full transcript into the RECORD and the source of it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, I am giving you the direct quotations and when the gentleman reads it in the RECORD he will see the direct quotations, particularly of my own questions and the answers of the witnesses.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Has any publication ever been made of this before?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Not that I know of. I made a short statement and the papers carried it pretty much all over the country, but it was not so complete a statement.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think the gentlewoman has contributed more in digging out the background of the mess that we are in than has been accomplished by the hearings of the other body so far for the past 2 weeks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was very anxious at the time regarding

the arming of Communist China, as my questions indicate, and I have been very anxious steadily ever since to know what has been going on in the way of arming and helping the Communists the way England has been arming and helping the Communists.

On Saturday two people of English descent told me that they did not want General MacArthur, which I thought was a great impertinence. He has been winning their battles for them, but they have insisted on arming Red China.

I notice on page 3 of your statement, Mr. Secretary, that General Marshall arranged for the training by our American people, with the use of American equipment, of certain Communist leaders who are to become incorporated into the national army. Are those fellows now fighting the national army in Manchuria?

Now listen to this answer by the Secretary. I quote:

Mr. ACHESON. No.

Then he resumes:

I think the situation is this, Mr. EATON, I do not believe that any such training has gone on in the past or is now going on.

Mr. Acheson continuing:

What General Marshall was asked to do, and agreed to do, and what is necessary to be done, is that when the plan for the amalgamation of the two armies is accepted, and begins to go into effect, those units of the Communist army which are going to be amalgamated with the national army will receive a period of training from 60 to 90 days before they march out to join their opposite numbers in the other army. The plan roughly contemplates that a certain number of months from the day it is to go into effect, certain divisions of the Communist army and certain divisions of the Nationalist army will be amalgamated. When that occurs, it is essential that the troops from the Communist side which go into the troops of the new Chinese army have a minimum of the same sort of training that their compatriots have had. Some of the divisions in the present national army have been trained by United States forces. These American training forces that we are talking about will be forces that will take a Communist outfit which is to be amalgamated with the new army and put it in shape so that it can readily go into the outfit. That is the program.

I asked the Secretary this question, and quote from the transcript:

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, how many Communists is it anticipated will be trained under the proposed plan?

Mr. ACHESON. I think that they will try to take all the units that are going to be put into the new army immediately preceding their joining the new army and give them a 60- or 90-day schooling.

Mrs. ROGERS. But can you give us any approximate number that will be trained?

Mr. ACHESON. I do not know. If the total size of the army is going to be 60 divisions, I do not know what proportion of the personnel would be Communist.

Mrs. ROGERS. Could you get that proportion for us?

Mr. ACHESON. The information that I have handed me is that of the 60 divisions which are contemplated, the personnel which would be equivalent of 50 divisions will come from the national army and the personnel which would be equivalent of 10 divisions will come from the Communist army.

I asked the Secretary also:

Do you think that China will turn to Russia if we do not offer the assistance—

To which he replied:

Mr. ACHESON. I have no views on that subject. I am sure that we will assist China. I do not think I want to speculate on what would happen if we did not.

Mrs. ROGERS. Is there any way we could have an agreement with China—and remember we are talking about training and military equipment for the Chinese Communist forces—Is there any way we could have an agreement with China whereby she would not used our arms against us?

Here is Mr. Acheson's reply, and I hope the Members of the House will take particular note:

Mr. ACHESON. Well, I suppose that we have that in the United Nations Charter. There all the nations agree that they will not employ force against any country except in accordance with the principles and under the procedure of the Charter. Under the principles and procedure of the Charter, if anyone wished to employ force against us, I am sure we would veto that. They will not do it. That is the technical and legal answer to your questions. I think we can rest assured that the Chinese will not do that.

Mrs. ROGERS. I suppose a fight could start before that was decided, could it not?

Mr. ACHESON. Do you mean that the Chinese would attack us? I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that we should not go into that.

Mr. ACHESON. I am sure that we do not need to worry.

Mr. Speaker, there we have the record, and the assurances given to a highly important committee of this Congress by Mr. Acheson, as long ago as 1946, that we "do not need to worry."

Well, we have many wounded boys lying now out at Walter Reed, and at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, and in service hospitals all over the country as a result of our—shall I say—misguided State Department policies. I think we did need to worry then, and I think we do need to worry now.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentlewoman just described to us what appears to have been an American project undertaken by the State Department back in 1946.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As proven by the testimony, undoubtedly.

Mr. CANFIELD. She has made reference to a bill before her committee which was the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And which the House never passed.

We had assurances then that we did not need to worry and that if the Chinese Communists made any moves toward aggression we would veto that—and I am quoting Mr. Acheson—in the United Nations.

Some of the defenders of Mr. Acheson and the State Department are making a great to-do today over their claim that Gen. Douglas MacArthur did not believe the Red Chinese would intervene in Korea. Whether he did not believe so is obscure, and we have only a purported and partial record obtained by eavesdropping at Wake Island.

But this statement by Mr. Acheson that I have quoted is on the record, and on the record before this Congress.

As long ago as 1946 Mr. Acheson was giving this Congress complete assurance that we need not worry, that China would never attack us, and that we would veto that if and whenever they might move in that direction.

I think it is time that Mr. Acheson explain what inspired his beliefs then—and his evasions—and what his views are today in this tragic matter so that we may know if he still believes as he did then, and I quote again from the official transcript:

Mr. ACHESON. I am sure that we do not need to worry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GRAIN FOR INDIA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, President Truman asked Congress to pass an aid to India bill to provide grain for the relief of that starving country.

A bill can be kept in a state of suspended animation for months, but most of the 340,000,000 people who barely exist in the Republic of India cannot manage this feat.

Nearly 5 months ago, the Government of India appealed to the United States for 2,000,000 tons of grain in order to avert a famine.

The stark facts are these:

Fifty million tons of grain were needed.

Due to floods, drought, earthquakes, and the locusts, only 44,000,000 tons could be harvested. New Delhi only had enough cash to buy 4,000,000 of the 6,000,000 ton balance required to meet minimum needs. Moreover, there are no reserves on hand. Wheat shipments are rushed to hungry areas and are consumed immediately. When children cry for food, some mothers give them mud, because there is nothing else. These are not isolated cases. The 2,000,000 tons they ask from our surplus would keep 100,000,000 Indians who get a pathetic grain ration of 9 ounces a day alive for 2 months. It would also help to build up a little reserve against shipping delays and avert mass starvation.

Must so many die from undernourishment simply because of political differences between the Governments of the United States and India?

This was not our policy toward Yugoslavia, even though that country is a Communist state, while India is not. It is one thing to be provoked by the failure of Pandit Nehru and his government to give us at least moral support in the struggle to contain aggression. I do not believe that this attitude should be carried over to the poverty-stricken people of India. Nor should the aid we can give be used as a not-so-polite form of pressure to gain concessions from them.

We, with our abundance, are the ones who are really on trial before nearly half the world's population that is but one meal away from starvation in Asia. While we defer or debate, and are kinder to our dogs and cats than we are to our fellow human beings, these millions who wither on the bone cannot stomach the the "word meals" that we offer them.

No wonder we are losing the propaganda war in the Far East.

It should be apparent to everyone by now that communism thrives on hunger and misery. And the way to check its spread through distressed areas is to send the grain that is urgently needed. After that we can help substandard areas to build up their own economies so that there will be food and gainful employment for their peoples.

If we who have the extra food, fail to help the people of India, they may turn in desperation to the Communist regimes of China and Russia who may promise wheat and rice—and even send a little—in exchange for hidden concessions. Even a promise, partly fulfilled, is better than the interminable delay that will be regarded as denial. There is no time, when a man is starving, to criticize him lengthily, because his political opinions do not exactly coincide with ours. He is more apt to respond in friendly fashion after the gnawing pangs of hunger have been eased, because we have been a friend to him in his need.

All the peoples of Asia have the notion that our high standard of living is the result of the raw materials we bought from them at a beggar's price. They believe that we got abundance in exchange for the coolie wages that dribbled down to them. If we do not erase this misconception, communism will sweep over Asia, and then it will be too late for us to prevent this tragedy and this danger. There is still a little time left in which we can regain the initiative. And the first step is to provide food for the famine-stricken areas.

I should like to see this done for humanitarian reasons alone, for that would be true to the neighborly character of the American people.

On the sidelines of this vast misery, however, and anxious to exploit it in a manner that bodes no good for the people of India, is the Communist conspiracy. Its methods are cynical, devious, and unrelenting. To checkmate them, we must be realistic.

That is why I bring up the factor of manganese, and the vital role it plays in the production of the weapons necessary for our defense.

Soviet Russia is the prime producer of this strategic mineral, while the United States is able to scrape up within its borders only 9 percent of the quantity that it requires, for the manufacture of steel. Since the spring of 1948, when we cut off shipment of war materials to the Communist sphere of influence, exports of manganese from the Soviet Union to the United States, have all but ceased.

It was then that we turned to India, poor in food, but able to supply us with one-third of the manganese ore that we need for industry, for defense, and for the emergency stockpile. If it had not been for transportation difficulties, we could have obtained more. Using ships for one-way hauls is wasteful.

Happily, by shipping food to India, we will have empty bottoms which can be used to bring back a basic industrial material which we lack. Helping India's food needs will help our own need for critical manganese.

If grain is sent to India only at a price, or if we insist that its purchase be financed by a loan, we will not be able to get sufficient manganese which is essential as a steel-hardening agent.

When you come right down to cases, we cannot adopt a superior attitude in this crisis. Events could take the power of decision away from us and we would then be the victims of our own procrastination.

In answer to those who say that grain should not be given as an outright grant, the State Department informs us, and I quote:

> India has no funds and no possibility of earning funds which could be spared to pay a debt for food. If the United States nevertheless responds to India's request by making food available only on a loan basis, it would inevitably be cited both by Soviet propagandists and by pro-Communist influences in India as demonstrating a lack of true friendship for India.

When the billions we have spent through the Marshall plan to halt communism in Europe is contrasted with our failure to help the peoples of Asia to raise their subhuman living standards, the proposal to give emergency assistance to India becomes imperative.

If we do not fill the void with food and faith, the Reds will beat us to it, and the global scales will be tipped hopelessly against us.

When our Nation has a surplus of food products as in this case, it can afford to give in the name of humanity.

When it has a shortage of industrial goods, it should expect other nations to pay in part for such of these goods as they want.

I believe that we should help India to build up her negligible trade balance on the positive side, so that she can buy from us the machinery, drugs, and fertilizer imports which she needs to build up her agriculture and industry to a self-sustaining level.

We cannot ruin this prospect at the very start by exacting payment for the food grains that are shipped to her for relief purposes.

Even though the government of India has indicated its preference for the simpler terms of the House bill, I think that we are in a better position to be generous.

We can save hundreds of thousands of lives from the starvation which has already claimed so many victims, and at the same time deal a heavy blow to Communist propaganda in Asia by furnishing emergency food aid to India without strings and without equivocation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

IS ILLINOIS CHAPTER OF NSA COMMUNIST DOMINATED?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the student body at Bradley University, Peoria, Ill., will on Friday, May 18 hold a referendum to determine if Bradley shall or shall not withdraw its membership in the National Student's Association. The NSA is a student organization consisting of representatives of over 300 American college and university student governments. Bradley University joined the NSA in February of 1950, with the understanding that it was organized to accomplish several objectives, including:

First. Promotion of beneficial aids for students in colleges and universities throughout the Nation.

Second. Sponsorship of the purchase-card system, which provides cooperative methods to obtain student discounts on purchases.

Third. Filling the long-existing need for a representative intercollegiate organization designed to serve the American student community, and to promote student interests and welfare.

The Bradley University Student Council voted to hold this important referendum next Friday as a result of a report made by Warren Reynolds, who was a delegate to an Illinois NSA convention held at Chicago on last April 22 and 23. Delegate Reynolds, according to the May 10 issue of the campus newspaper, the Bradley Scout, reported substantially as follows:

> Illinois colleges and universities in attendance, included De Paul, Rosary, Rockford, Roosevelt, Chicago, Mundelein, North Central, St. Francis, University of Illinois, and Bradley. Despite the strong opposition of Delegate Reynolds, the convention voted to stand opposed to five bills to control subversive activities now pending in the Illinois State Legislature. The convention also passed the following resolutions, which were opposed by the sole Bradley delegate:
>
> 1. To implement NSA student bill of rights on campuses.
> 2. To oppose all bills to prevent Communists from teaching.
> 3. To oppose all loyalty oaths.
> 4. To urge repeal of the McCarran-Wood Communist Control Act.
>
> Delegate Reynolds reported that all of these pro-Communist resolutions were sponsored by the large delegations from the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College.

An astute editorial writer for the Bradley Scout comments as follows on this report:

> In the face of the publication of the Reynolds report on NSA, it is difficult to fail from noticing the organization's definite Roosevelt College-Chicago University domination with very pink trends. Since Bradley is a member of this organization, which may very well have started with fine ideals only to be shattered by a group of radicals, that would make every Bradley University student in a sense a part of it. Therefore, it is very important that every student should strive toward finding out all information concerning NSA, both pro and con, and then vote accordingly. The Scout feels that since this organization has opposed ideals of the American way of life and has asserted itself as being subversive, it is the duty of every student to aid the movement toward the abandonment of NSA; but, nevertheless, before you make your decision, consider both sides. We will publish additional information next week.

It is a well known fact that powerful elements of the Illinois Communist Party, Young Communist League, and the American Youth for Democracy have in the past concentrated their efforts to influence students and faculties of the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College in the Communist movement. These subversive elements have, through their treacherous and un-American maneuvers, been able to place Communists and Communist-sympathizers in

control over many student organizations on the Roosevelt College and University of Chicago campuses. They apparently have been able to gain control of the local chapters of the National Student Association in these two institutions. These two chapters in turn have, through the usual Communist technique of divide and conquer gained control of the offices and policies of the Illinois Regional Chapter of NSA.

The National Student Association was originally organized for perfectly legitimate purposes and there seems to be little evidence at the present time that the Communist Party has actually taken over control of the NSA on a national level. It is equally a well known fact that drastic attempts by the Communist Party and the AYD to infiltrate the organization on a national level were made from its very inception. This attempt is proven by a review of the files of the Un-American Activities Committee. Mr. Walter S. Steele stated in testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee in July of 1947 as follows:

> Young reds are evidencing considerable interest at the present time in a comparatively new youth movement, the National Student's Organization which was conceived at a congress of youth held in Chicago late in 1946.

The interest of the Communists in the NSA is further shown by articles concerning it in the west coast Communist newspaper, People's World, and the Communist monthly, Political Affairs, which describes itself as "a magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism," both articles appearing just after the national constitutional convention to the NSA in 1947. People's World of September 10, 1947, claimed that the organization embraced all points of view to be found among students and, "by a vote of 401 to 36, decided to seek affiliation with the students of other lands banded together in the International Union of Students."

Political Affairs of October 1947, contained an article by Marvin Shaw, who claimed:

> The founding constitutional convention of the United States National Student Association * * * marked a milestone in the development of the postwar American student movement * * * if the National Student Association is effectively to carry out its program, it must develop some formal means of close contact and cooperation with the long-established, active national organizations, e. g., the National Intercollegiate Christian Council (YM-YMCA), the National Federation of Catholic College Students, Students for Democratic Action, Young Progressive Citizens of America, American Youth for Democracy, Association of Internes and Medical Students, the Council of Student Clubs of the Communist Party, and others. These organizations were among the founders of the NSA.

He claimed further:

> These two representatives of the Council of Student Clubs of the Communist Party, in democratic contrast to the procedure on many campuses, were able to participate actively in the convention, contributing both to the constitution and to the program.

While at the present time it appears that the NSA is free from Communist domination on a national level, all the State and regional divisions, as well as local chapters of the NSA have reason to become increasingly vigilant in view of the pro-Communist resolutions passed at the Illinois regional convention at Chicago on April 22 and 23. Certainly the fact that all of the resolutions passed at the Illinois convention expressed opposition to Communist-control legislation of national and State scope furnished evidence of the Communist domination of the Roosevelt College and the University of Chicago chapters. Students at Bradley University have recognized this undeniable truth. They realize too that these two delegations, in sponsoring the pro-Communist resolutions, were actually not so much interested in preserving academic freedoms as they were in following the Communist Party line which has for its purpose the ultimate destruction of all individual rights and freedoms.

Bradley University students face one simple problem next Friday:

> Shall they withdraw from the NSA and thereby weaken the Communist influence, or shall they stay in the organization and attempt to place loyal students in official control of the Illinois chapter who will actually be interested in furthering the stated purposes of the organization?

Having studied and watched the Communist Party technique over a period of the past 10 years, I am of the opinion that Bradley students would be wise in voting to withdraw its membership in the National Student Association and allow Roosevelt College and the University of Chicago chapters to stew in their own juice. Much can be said, however, for the contrary position.

I am extremely proud of the Bradley University student body for choosing the really representative method of solving its problem. I urge every student at Bradley University to express his or her opinion at the polls next Friday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one, to include an address by Charlotte Baruth.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a petition from a number of his constituents on taxes.

Mr. DENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. REDDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorials.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one to include an address he made on Sunday, and in the other to include an excerpt from the Great Connecticut Second Regiment March.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BAKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a bill he introduced.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] before the Republican National Committee at Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. BUDGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and insert certain extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances; to include in one an article from Pathfinder magazine, in the second a telegram and letter, and in the third an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include an editorial and a speech.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two letters.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial written by Walter F. Wright Jr.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include a newspaper article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHEPPARD, for May 17, 18, 19, and 20, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), on account of a death in the family.

To Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table, and under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke; and

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 14, 1951, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3336. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

455. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 132); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

456. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

457. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (44 Stat. 403); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 100. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; without amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 158. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (o) of the Rules of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3091. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1181. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; with amendment (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1203. A bill to amend the act of October 30, 1941, as amended, to authorize Air Force officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property; with amendment (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2737. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries; with amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1179. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; with amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Commitee on Armed Services. H. R. 1199. A bill to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects; with amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1201. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary-ration basis; with amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1215. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1216. A bill to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1200. A bill to correct an error in section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947 "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States"; without amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2735. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain military prisoners and confinement facilities to the control and management of the Attorney General; with amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2736. A bill to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Armed Services. S. 927. An act to amend section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949; with amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Community of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3899. A bill to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 96. Resolution opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations; with amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATTLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 101. Concurrent resolution urging the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action with respect to placing an arms embargo on Communist China, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 464). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2395. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 465). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIBICOFF: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 57. Concurrent resolution, reaffirming the friendship of the American people to all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; with amendments (Rept. No. 466). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 662. A bill for the relief of William O. Stevens; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 4089. A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 so as to provide for control of rents charged by the Atomic Energy Commission for housing accommodations at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4090. A bill to authorize the payment by the Veterans' Administration of increased compensation on account of service-connected total deafness to veterans in receipt of compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4091. A bill to liberalize the basis for establishing wartime service connection for active tuberculosis and the psychoses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4092. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4093. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4094. A bill to provide for research in child life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4095. A bill to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies of United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4096. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating to reinstatement of war risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4097. A bill to raise the limit placed on the monthly disability compensation payable to veterans suffering from service-connected quadraplegia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4098. A bill to authorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of anthracite in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the anthracite region, to promote the general national welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4099. A bill to readjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4100. A bill to provide that in certain cases newspapermen shall not be required to reveal in Federal courts the source of their information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4101. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4102. A bill to amend section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 (which establishes a preference for World War II veterans in the sale or rental of certain housing accommodations) so as to establish a similar preference for gold-star parents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to make nontaxable certain stock transfers made by insurance companies to secure the performance of obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4104. A bill to amend section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the income-tax treatment of sales of livestock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4105. A bill to provide that, in the application of reduction-in-force regulations promulgated under section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to locomotive engineers employed by the Panama Railroad Company, service performed in other civilian positions shall be disregarded; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 4106. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" by adding a new section thereto known as section 1732b to permit the photographic reproduction of business records and the introduction of the same in evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4107. A bill to extend to certain persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, the benefits of titles II, III, and IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4108. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), as amended, to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 40 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4109. A bill to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 4110. A bill to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4111. A bill to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4112. A bill to amend the Armed Services Leave Act of 1946 to provide leave credit for National Guard personnel undergoing training under provisions 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4113. A bill to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act to provide that distinctive mark or insignia shall not be required in the uniforms worn by members of the National Guard of the United States, both Army and Air; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4114. A bill to amend section 81, National Defense Act to provide for the reorganization of the National Guard Bureau; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 4115. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Reserve officers, formerly in the Regular Army and Navy and who were appointed prior to August 24, 1912, and March 4, 1913, respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4116. A bill to provide for the administration and sale of certain lands held by the United States in the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 4117. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4118. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in devising ways and means in preventing the destruction of Plum Island, Mass., by erosion and storms; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to create a Commission on Government Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 229. Resolution to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 230. Resolution to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, requesting the enactment of the legislation embodied in H. R. 3341, which relates to a repeal of certain provisions of the Social Security Act, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California relative to amending the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802) to authorize crediting service of cadets and midshipmen for purposes of pay and longevity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 4119. A bill for the relief of Jan de Bakker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. R. 4120. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sui Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4121. A bill for the relief of Rafael Alemany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4122. A bill for the relief of James H. Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 4123. A bill for the relief of John G. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4124. A bill for the relief of Fred Ericson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4125. A bill for the relief of L. Ferguson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 4126. A bill for the relief of Ernst Sbaschnik, Sr., Hildegard Sbaschnik, and Ernst Sbaschnik, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4127. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4128. A bill for the relief of Antonio and Francesco Lo Schiavo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 4129. A bill to authorize the appointment of James A. Pfeiffer, chief pharmacist, retired, as lieutenant (junior grade) and lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 4130. A bill for the relief of Caroline Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4131. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mark Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

284. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of Albert Christensen and others relative to the rollback on beef; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

285. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the Lawrence Institute of Technology, Detroit, Mich., explaining its scholarship program for persons who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

286. By Mr. VAN PELT: Petition of Sheboygan County Women's Club lauding Gen. Douglas MacArthur for his stand and his presentation of the facts to the people of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art in heaven and in all Thy works, whose love is unfailing and whose mercies are new every morning: In the midst of thronging duties and confused issues, we pause to commune with Thee, unseen scurce of goodness, beauty, and truth, that the light which is the light of the world may shine upon us and illumine our path of action. Grant to us a oneness of purpose that shall bring the supreme satisfaction of rendering to the Nation and to the world our utmost service unsullied by base motives or self-interest.

To this white altar of devotion we bring our pledge to administer the trust committed to our hands with integrity of character, purity of motive, cleanness of hands, and unswerving firmness of purpose in the fulfillment of the high and holy calling as servants of the Republic and of Thine. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 15, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 15, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 998) to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 616. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Zafiriadis;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck, and Victoria Tuerck;

H. R. 629. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 630. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Richard James Brown;

H. R. 631. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk;

H. R. 643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham;

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee numbered 152,419, for certain land in California;

H. R. 658. An act for the relief of Harold W. Britton;

H. R. 895. An act for the relief of Dr. Giuseppe Mazzone;

H. R. 964. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Percival H. Glenn;

H. R. 1129. An act to validate a conveyance of certain lands by the Central Pacific Railway Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to the Union Ice Co. and Edward Barbera;

H. R. 1233. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vasilia Parselles;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl;

H. R. 1443. An act for the relief of Paul Matelli;

H. R. 1457. An act for the relief of Antranik Ayanian;

H. R. 1853. An act to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of Jindrich (Henri) Nosek and Mrs. Zdenka Nosek;

H. R. 2349. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, Edna Perfetti, and Anthony Perfetti;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff;

H. R. 2453. An act for the relief of John R. Harris;

H. R. 2852. An act for the relief of Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin;

H. R. 2853. An act for the relief of Shizue Sakurada;

H. R. 2854. An act for the relief of Dorothy Fumie Maeda;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks;

H. R. 3063. An act for the relief of Rosina Mouradian;

H. R. 3133. An act for the relief of Chin Yuen Ling, minor unmarried Chinese child of a United States citizen;

H. R. 3215. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Crow Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 3216. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lulu M. Whitebear;

H. R. 3229. An act for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack;

H. R. 3442. An act to protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases heretofore adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3651. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman; and

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family;

S. 119. An act for the relief of Joseph Girardi;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen;

S. 822. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg; and

S. 824. An act for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate today, tomorrow, and Friday.

OPERATING COSTS AND PROFITS IN THE BAKERY INDUSTRY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been continuously studying the costs of various commodities, and this morning the committee wishes to file with the Senate a statement showing a completed study of operating costs and profits in the bakery industry from 1945 through the first quarter of 1951.

SUMMARY

Increases in labor and distribution costs in recent years have been more important than rising farm-product prices in increasing the cost of bakery goods. Today a pound of bakery products reflects 1.9 cents higher costs for ingredients and 2.5 cents higher costs for manufacturing labor and distribution than in 1945. The baking industry has maintained approximately the same profit ratio to total sales—3 to 5 percent—since 1946, which is equivalent to 9 to 13 percent on the invested capital of the companies reporting.

Farm products now make up a smaller proportion of the retail cost of bakery products than at any time since the end of World War II. Distribution costs have increased sharply in recent years.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to this report, and I ask unanimous consent that the entire report may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under the leadership of Chairman ELLENDER has just completed a study of operating costs and profits in the bakery industry from 1945 through the first quarter of 1951.

Ingredients used in bakery goods (mostly farm products) now represent a lower percentage of the sales dollar than in any earlier year in the study. Distribution costs increased from 23.3 percent of sales in 1945 to 26.6 in the first part of 1951, while manufacturing labor costs have changed relatively little per dollar of sales.

Profits either before or after taxes were at about the same level in 1950 and early 1951 as in earlier years. Between 3 and 4 cents out of each dollar spent for bakery goods is kept by the baking companies as net profit after taxes. Profits varied from 9 to 13 percent on the invested capital during the last 5 years of this 6-year period.

The data for four large representative companies submitting comparable information on each of these items are shown in table 1:

TABLE 1.—*Costs and profits in producing bakery products, 1945–50* [1]

Year	Cost as a percentage of gross sales						Profits per $100 invested capital
	Ingredients	Manufacturing labor	Distribution	Administration costs	Profits		
					Before taxes	After taxes	
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
1945	40.2	13.4	23.3	2.6	5.4	2.4	5.6
1946	40.9	12.1	22.2	2.5	8.7	5.2	13.1
1947	44.6	11.	22.7	2.3	6.9	3.6	10.3
1948	41.9	11.7	23.4	2.1	7.4	4.5	13.1
1949	38.4	12.6	23.4	2.4	5.9	2.7	9.6
1950	37.4	12.7	28.2	2.4	6.4	3.6	9.3
1951 [2]	36.9	12.3	26.6	2.4	6.5	3.4	.....

[1] Summary of 4 large representative bakeries submitting comparable information on each of the items listed.
[2] First quarter.

Less complete data were submitted by five additional companies making a total of nine for which certain information is available. Table 2, based on data from nine companies shows ingredients, manufacturing labor, and packaging-material cost as a percentage of sales. The nine companies show the same downward trend in farm-product costs as a percentage of sales as was noted for the four companies. The drop in ingredient costs from 42.8 percent of sales in 1946 to 38.5 percent in 1950 is a reduction of 10 percent.

TABLE 2.—*Ingredient, manufacturing labor and packaging materials costs in producing bakery products, 1946–50* [1]

Year	Gross sales	Ratio to sales			
		Total ingredient cost	Manufacturing labor cost	Packaging materials	Sum of 3 items
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1946	$369,193	42.8	13.6	2.5	58.9
1947	434,782	45.9	13.1	2.8	61.8
1948	472,580	42.4	13.6	3.1	59.1
1949	465,006	39.0	14.7	3.3	57.0
1950	484,568	38.5	13.1	3.4	57.0

[1] Summary of 9 representative bakeries submitting comparable information on each of the items listed.

The cost of manufacturing labor and packaging materials both increased as a percentage of sales. The increase in manufacturing labor was in excess of 10 percent, while packaging-materials costs increased more than one-third.

Tabulations of the more important costs per pound of product indicate the following increases between 1945 and the first quarter of 1951:

	Cents per pound of product
Increase in cost of flour	1.1
Increase in cost of all ingredients	1.9
Increase in cost of manufacturing labor	.6
Increase in cost of all labor	1.7
Increase in cost of distribution	1.9

The detailed data for the years 1945–50 are shown in table 3:

TABLE 3.—*Cost of major items per pound of bakery products, 1945–50* [1]

Year	Cost per pound product				
	Flour	All ingredients	Manufacturing labor	Total labor	Total distribution
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
1945	1.8	3.8	1.3	2.7	2.2
1946	2.2	4.5	1.3	3.0	2.4
1947	3.1	5.7	1.5	3.3	2.9
1948	3.2	5.9	1.6	3.7	3.3
1949	2.8	5.5	1.8	3.9	3.6
1950	2.9	5.4	1.8	4.7	3.8
1951 [2]	2.9	5.7	1.9	4.4	4.1
	Trends (1945=100)				
1945	100	100	100	100	100
1946	122	118	100	111	109
1947	172	150	115	122	132
1948	178	155	123	137	150
1949	156	139	138	144	164
1950	161	142	138	174	173
1951 [2]	161	150	146	163	186

[1] Summary of 4 large representative bakeries submitting comparable information on each of the items listed.
[2] First quarter.

It is clear that increases in prices of bakery products in recent years have been more largely due to rising labor and distribution costs than to higher farm prices. While total ingredient costs per pound of product increased 1.9 cents, manufacturing labor and distribution costs increased 2.5 cents.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLISH INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF POLISH SOCIETY AND CLUBS, WILMINGTON, DEL.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting sponsored by the Council of the Polish Society and clubs of Delaware, which was held on Sunday afternoon, May 6, 1951, at Wilmington, Del. The resolution calls attention to the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791; speaks of the contributions of Polish sons to the cause of the American Revolution; emphasizes the loss of Polish freedom and independence as a result of the selling of Poland down the river at Yalta, and calls upon the United States of America to demand the withdrawal of Soviet troops and secret police from Poland and the enactment of laws guaranteeing the right of suffrage to the opposite parties through the international supervision of elections in Poland.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution voted upon and passed unanimously by the assembled at a meeting commemorating the signature on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution, sponsored by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress held on Sunday afternoon, May 6, 1951, at 3:30 o'clock at the Modjeska Hall, Wilmington, Del.:

"We, Americans of Polish descent, assembled at the Modjeska Hall, at Wilmington, Del., on Sunday afternoon, May 6, 1951, to commemorate the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, one of the world's great documents of freedom, like our Declaration of Independence and to pay homage to the creators of liberty and equality for the Polish nation 160 years ago.

"Further, we, as Americans of Polish descent, upholding the American principles created at the birth of the United States, have had our sons all over the world in the past, and now in Korea, fighting the enemies of freedom.

"Whereas, from time immemorial Poland has heroically led the way in the defense of the dignity of man with its inherent rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. This prompted her to struggle for freedom even against overwhelming odds;

"Whereas triumphant Poland was able to culminate her success by giving to her people and to the world at large in the constitution of 3d of May 1791, the first democratic constitution in the Old World so akin to that of the Constitution of America. It recognized equality of all men, proclaiming religious liberty and established, by basic law, the freedoms of thought and speech;

"Whereas Poland's contribution toward gaining freedom for mankind, her assistance to the colonies during the American Revolution and the exhausting and enormously unselfish sacrifices of her sons and daughters throughout World War II, have elicited the well-earned recognition of the entire world;

"Whereas Poland is not free. Poland lost her independence, though Polish blood

spilled so profusely in the last world war was wasted, the destruction of an independent Poland was accomplished with tacit American help and consent. The promised freedom has failed to materialize when Poland's doom was sealed at Yalta; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That America should press for an end to the present reign of terror in Poland. America should demand the withdrawal of Soviet troops and secret police from Poland, should urge the enactment of an electoral law insuring the right to vote to opposition parties, should urge the international supervision of elections in Poland as already accepted in Greece; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we deem it our duty to warn all our fellow Americans and our Department of State of the imminent dangers lurking behind the much advertised plan of compensating Germany, the former aggressor and Stalin's ally and now our ward, with any Polish territory to east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers, and thereby lighting another powder keg bound to cause a new world conflagration."

Adopted by the assembled at the meeting commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 3d of May, at the Modjeska Hall, Wilmington, Del., on May 6, 1951.

VINCENT J. TOWALEWSKI,
Chairman of the Meeting.
JOHN KANICKI, *Secretary.*

FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM ON WASHITA WATERSHED, OKLAHOMA—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I hold in my hand Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 20, adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Oklahoma State Legislature on the 7th day of May 1951. The resolution pertains to the agricultural flood-control program on the Washita watershed in Oklahoma.

This is one of the outstanding conservation projects in the Nation which has been undertaken by the Department of Agriculture. It has the almost unanimous support of the citizens of my State. The soil conservation districts and their membership are fully cooperating with the Federal Government to bring about maximum conservation of soil and water on the 8,000 square miles of drainage area of the Washita River Basin.

We in Oklahoma are proud of the progress that has been made thus far, but both the State and the Federal Governments are being deprived of the multiple benefits which will accrue to this project by delaying its completion. The State legislature had this in mind when it enacted this resolution requesting acceleration of the project by seeking funds commensurate with the need to place the completed project in operation.

I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD following my remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 20

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to approve the resurvey of the agricultural flood-control program on the Washita watershed, and to appropriate certain sums annually to carry into effect the findings of said survey

Whereas on the 22d day of December 1944, the Congress of the United States authorized the agricultural flood-control program, on the Washita watershed; and

Whereas it was estimated at that time, that the project would cost around $11,000,000, and that it would take approximately 15 years for its completion; and

Whereas, since the above date, it has been determined that the cost of said project would far exceed the amount originally estimated, and at the present rate of progress, it would take 60 to 70 years to complete it; and

Whereas, on the 28th day of January 1949, the Congress of the United States authorized a resurvey of the flood damages and benefits of the above described Washita watershed, and it is understood that said resurvey is nearing completion and will be submitted to Congress for approval and further action within the next few months; and

Whereas the project on the Washita watershed will be of great value in the control of floods in the Washita River Valley and its tributaries and to the Nation as a whole, because of the increased supply of farm commodities which will result from such flood control—all of these, however, far outweigh the original cost of the project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-third Oklahoma Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to give immediate approval to the resurvey of the Washita watershed when it is completed and in order to put the findings of the resurvey into effective use, that a sum of not less than $10,000,000 be appropriated annually for the construction of the above project until same is completed; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded by the Secretary of State of the State of Oklahoma, to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Oklahoma.

Adopted by the senate the 2d day of May 1951.

JAMES E. BERRY,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of May 1951.

JAMES M. BULLARD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PROPOSED VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—RESOLUTION OF LOUIS TRAVIS POST AUXILIARY, NO. 14, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, on many occasions there has been suggested and legislation has been introduced for the establishment of a Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee. I am in this Congress a cosponsor of such legislation. The proposed Senate committee would parallel the excellent group which exists in the House of Representatives.

Veterans and veterans' organizations have been deeply concerned about the tendency of the Senate to straddle exservicemen's legislation between the Senate Finance and Labor Committees. It has often happened, therefore, that veterans' bills approved by the House of Representatives would tend to gather dust over on the Senate side. To some extent this might reflect the independent judgment of Members of the Senate. In other respects, however, it reflects a lack of clear-cut jurisdiction for veterans' affairs on our side of the Hill. We in the Senate have fewer Members than does the House to divide among the committees, but it seems to me that even our overburdened Senators would be glad to serve on a veterans' group.

I am certain that no member of the Senate intentionally wants to slight the cause of our ex-servicemen. It is obvious to all that the area of veterans' statutes enlarges as the number of veterans constantly increases. More and more servicemen are being discharged from our Armed Forces for physical reasons, particularly arising out of combat wounds in Korea.

It is our prayer that further millions of Americans may not have to be called into combat. But it is quite clear that under the draft extension legislation now pending in a Senate-House conference committee, it is inevitable that the number of Americans with military experience will soar. We hope that such military experience will not be war experience. But a decision on that issue is not up to ourselves exclusively but rather it is in considerable part up to Joseph Stalin and the leaders of Red China.

After World War II as after World War I, there has been somewhat of a tendency for America to slip back into a certain indifference to the veteran's needs once all the joyous welcome-home parades were over.

Veterans of America have not asked that the Government treat them as dependents or wards. Veterans are willing and able to stand on their own feet. They are grateful for the legislation which we have passed in their behalf, but they know that such legislation requires constant reevaluation. Yes, our appreciative Nation has conferred upon our veterans certain rights, benefits, and privileges, particularly in connection with disabilities, but these statutes on the books require constant reappraisal in the light of changing conditions, especially because of the inflationary problem.

Everybody is always talking about how much we owe to the boys and how much we are going to do for the boys and how grateful we are to the boys. What I want to do is to give more conclusive evidence to these men that we really mean what we are talking about. Actions still speak louder than words. If the veterans are going to get a runaround insofar as their legislation is concerned, it is only natural that they are going to tend to disbelieve and be cynical about the extent to which their country is actually interested in them.

I think it would be a wonderful shot in the arm for our boys in Korea if the news were to come to them that a permanent standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs had indeed been set up by the Senate to help cope with their problems.

I have in my hand a resolution of the Louis Travis Post Auxiliary, No. 14, of Milwaukee, Wis., sent to me by one of the many auxiliary posts of the Wisconsin Department of American Veterans of World War II, favoring immediate steps to establish a permanent standing Veterans' Affairs Committee in the Senate. I present the resolution for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUIS TRAVIS POST AUXILIARY,
No. 14, AMVETS,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 25, 1951.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Louis Travis AMVETS Auxiliary wholeheartedly supports the following resolution and voted to adopt it at our regular monthly business meeting held last night:

"Whereas veterans and their dependents and beneficiaries make up almost one-third of the population of the United States; and

"Whereas this largest single group of citizens with a common bond is deserving of equal consideration by the Senate of the United States; and

"Whereas all legislation which concerns veterans must go before either the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee or the Senate Finance Committee, and both the aforesaid committees are overloaded with work concerning problems other than those of particular concern to veterans; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration is the second largest business establishment in the executive department: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That AMVETS Auxiliary No. 14 requests the Senate of the United States to take immediate steps to establish a permanent standing Veterans' Affairs Committee to consider and report all legislative proposals affecting the welfare of veterans and their families."

Adopted April 24, 1951.

AMVETS AUXILIARY No. 14,
VERA O. MARKUSSEN,
President.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 16, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family;

S. 119. An act for the relief of Joseph Girardi;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen;

S. 822. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg; and

S. 824. An act for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1493. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Sisseton Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1494. A bill for the relief of George Georgacopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1495. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the acts of September 23, 1950, and September 30, 1950, providing financial assistance to local educational agencies, so as to remove discrimination against larger school districts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1496. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost, or shall lose, their lives in the armed services of the United States after June 24, 1950, and before the end of the present national emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution providing funds for reimbursement to the International Labor Organization of the added expense of holding the 1951 fall session of the governing body of the International Labor Organization in the United States instead of in Geneva, Switzerland, and for the payment of incidental expenses incurred by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 616. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Zafiriadis;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck and Victoria Tuerck;

H. R. 643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham;

H. R. 658. An act for the relief of Harold W. Britton;

H. R. 895. An act for the relief of Dr. Giuseppe Mazzone;

H. R. 1233. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vasilia Parselles;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl;

H. R. 1443. An act for the relief of Paul Matelli;

H. R. 1457. An act for the relief of Antranik Ayanian;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of Jindrich (Henri) Nosek and Mrs. Zdenka Nosek;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, Edna Perfetti, and Anthony Perfetti;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff;

H. R. 2453. An act for the relief of John R. Harris;

H. R. 2852. An act for the relief of Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin;

H. R. 2853. An act for the relief of Shizue Sakurada;

H. R. 2854. An act for the relief of Dorothy Fumie Maeda;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks;

H. R. 3063. An act for the relief of Rosina Mouradian;

H. R. 3133. An act for the relief of Chin Yuen Ling, minor unmarried Chinese child of a United States citizen;

H. R. 3229. An act for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack;

H. R. 3442. An act to protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases heretofore adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3651. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman; and

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 629. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 630. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Richard James Brown;

H. R. 631. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk;

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee numbered 152,419, for certain land in California;

H. R. 964. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Percival H. Glenn;

H. R. 1129. An act to validate a conveyance of certain lands by the Central Pacific Railway Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to the Union Ice Co. and Edward Barbera;

H. R. 1853. An act to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands;

H. R. 2349. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 3215. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Crow Reservation, Mont.; and

H. R. 3216. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lulu M. Whitebear; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

An address entitled "Protect the American Watch Industry," delivered by him before the Seventh Annual Convention of the American Watch Workers Union at Washington, D. C., on May 14, 1951.

Address on the subject Reclamation Policies, delivered by him before the Nebraska Reclamation Association at Lincoln, Nebr., February 14, 1951.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Address on the importance of people being informed as to public issues, prepared for delivery by him at the semiannual meeting of the board of directors of the Society for the Prevention of World War III in New York City on May 29, 1951.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

An editorial entitled "We're All Subject To Each Others Whims," from the Minneapolis Tribune of May 13, 1951.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Letter from Joe L. Martinez, attorney general of the State of New Mexico, regarding proposed legislation to permit continued production and further development of the mineral resources of the submerged ocean lands.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cain	Duff
Anderson	Capehart	Dworshak
Bennett	Carlson	Ellender
Benton	Case	Ferguson
Brewster	Chavez	Flanders
Bricker	Clements	Fulbright
Bridges	Connally	George
Butler, Md.	Cordon	Gillette
Butler, Nebr.	Dirksen	Green
Byrd	Douglas	Hayden

Hendrickson	Magnuson	Russell
Hennings	Malone	Saltonstall
Hickenlooper	Martin	Schoeppel
Hill	Maybank	Smathers
Hoey	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Holland	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Humphrey	McFarland	Smith, N. C.
Hunt	McKellar	Sparkman
Ives	McMahon	Stennis
Jenner	Monroney	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Moody	Thye
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	Underwood
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	Welker
Kefauver	Murray	Wherry
Kerr	Neely	Wiley
Kilgore	O'Conor	Williams
Knowland	O'Mahoney	Young
Lodge	Pastore	
Long	Robertson	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, debate is now limited to 20 minutes on each amendment, with the time to be equally divided, and 1½ hours finally on the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and also with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], a question arose as to the amount of foreign loans and grants which have been made in the past 10 years. For the record, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point, as exhibit A, a tabulation which was compiled by the Office of Business Economics, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce for the period ending December 31, 1950. I should like to have printed in the RECORD all of the column, as printed on pages A–13, A–14, A–15, A–16, and A–17 of the document which I now submit, which gives the loans broken down by countries, and which total $79,440,000,000.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as exhibit B, a table appearing on page A–12 of the same pamphlet, showing a summary of foreign aid grants and credits unutilized. They amount to $12,151,000,000, and in the tabulation they have been broken down by countries.

The total of the two tabulations is $91,500,000,000.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

APPENDIX TABLE 4.—*Summary of foreign aid (grants and credits)—By major country: Postwar period, July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1950 (before and during European recovery program, established Apr. 3, 1948), and war period, July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1945; calendar years ended Dec. 31, 1949, and 1950 (by quarters)*

[In millions of dollars]

	War and postwar periods	Postwar period			War period
		Total	During ERP period	Before ERP period	
Gross foreign aid (grants and credits)	79,440	30,216	14,721	15,495	49,224
Less: Returns	10,653	2,400	1,378	1,022	8,253
Equals: Net foreign aid	+68,787	+27,816	+13,343	+14,473	+40,971
Net grants	+58,878	+18,622	+12,313	+6,309	+40,256
Net credits	+9,909	+9,194	+1,030	+8,163	+715
ERP countries and participating dependent areas:					
Gross foreign aid	54,479	21,616	11,568	10,048	32,863
Less: Returns	7,606	1,339	785	553	6,268
Equals: Net foreign aid	+46,873	+20,277	+10,782	+9,495	+26,594
Net grants	+38,522	+12,269	+9,855	+2,414	+26,253
Net credits	+8,351	+8,008	+927	+7,081	+343
Austria:					
Gross foreign aid	759	758	459	299	1
Less: Returns	31	31	31		
Equals: Net foreign aid	+728	+727	+428	+299	+1
Net grants	+706	+705	+415	+290	+1
Net credits	+22	+22	+13	+9	
Belgium-Luxemburg:					
Gross foreign aid	791	722	500	222	69
Less: Returns	244	39	35	5	205
Equals: Net foreign aid	+547	+683	+465	+217	−136
Net grants	+373	+509	+448	+61	−136
Net credits	+174	+174	+17	+157	
British Commonwealth:					
United Kingdom:					
Gross foreign aid	35,765	6,713	2,534	4,179	29,052
Less: Returns	5,852	703	250	453	5,149
Equals: Net foreign aid	+29,914	+6,010	+2,284	+3,726	+23,904
Net grants	+25,110	+1,723	+2,078	−555	+23,387
Net credits	+4,804	+4,487	+206	+4,281	+317

	War and postwar periods	Postwar period			War period
		Total	During ERP period	Before ERP period	
ERP countries and participating dependent areas—Continued					
Denmark:					
Gross foreign aid	219	219	203	16	
Less: Returns	9	9	9		
Equals: Net foreign aid	+210	+210	+194	+16	
Net grants	+158	+158	+158		
Net credits	+52	+52	+36	+16	
France:					
Gross foreign aid	6,736	4,099	1,980	2,119	2,637
Less: Returns	1,056	190	154	36	867
Equals: Net foreign aid	+5,680	+3,910	+1,826	+2,084	+1,770
Net grants	+3,643	+1,873	+1,670	+203	+1,770
Net credits	+2,037	+2,037	+156	+1,881	
Germany:					
Gross foreign aid	3,178	3,178	2,185	992	
Less: Returns	88	88	72	16	
Equals: Net foreign aid	+3,089	+3,089	+2,113	+975	
Net grants	+3,024	+3,024	+2,139	+883	
Net credits	+66	+66	−26	+92	
Greece:					
Gross foreign aid	1,317	1,238	655	583	79
Less: Returns	40	40	35	5	
Equals: Net foreign aid	+1,277	+1,198	+620	+578	+79
Net grants	+1,178	+1,100	+626	+474	+79
Net credits	+99	+99	−6	+105	
Ireland:					
Gross foreign aid	122	122	122		
Equals: Net foreign aid	+122	+122	+122		
Net grants	+3	+3	+3		
Net credits	+119	+119	+119		

APPENDIX TABLE 4—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	War and postwar periods	Postwar period			War period
		Total	During ERP period	Before ERP period	
ERP countries and participating dependent areas—Continued					
Italy:					
Gross foreign aid	2,446	2,136	1,037	1,099	310
Less: Returns	95	90	73	17	4
Equals: Net foreign aid	+2,352	+2,046	+964	+1,082	+306
Net grants	+2,000	+1,690	+729	+960	+310
Net credits	+352	+356	+135	+221	−4
Netherlands:[1]					
Gross foreign aid	1,173	1,022	724	298	151
Less: Returns	129	92	78	14	37
Equals: Net foreign aid	+1,044	+930	+646	+284	+114
Net grants	+626	+549	+530	+19	+78
Net credits	+417	+381	+116	+265	+36
Norway:					
Gross foreign aid	285	247	209	39	37
Less: Returns	29	29	28	1	
Equals: Net foreign aid	+255	+218	+181	+37	+37
Net grants	+155	+118	+123	−5	+37
Net credits	+100	+100	+57	+42	
Sweden:					
Gross foreign aid	89	88	87	1	1
Less: Returns	6	2	2		4
Equals: Net foreign aid	+83	+86	+85	+1	−3
Net grants	+65	+64	+63	+1	+1
Net credits	+18	+22	+22		−4
Trieste:					
Gross foreign aid	38	38	25	13	
Less: Returns	1	1	1		
Equals: Net foreign aid:					
Net grants	+37	+37	+24	+13	
Turkey:					
Gross foreign aid	359	268	240	29	90
Less: Returns	21	21	15	6	
Equals: Net foreign aid	+338	+248	+225	+23	+90
Net grants	+256	+166	+157	+9	+90
Net credits	+82	+82	+68	+13	
Other countries:					
Gross foreign aid	34	33	31	2	1
Less: Returns	3	1	1		2
Equals: Net foreign aid	+30	+31	+30	+2	−1
Net grants	+19	+19	+17	+2	
Net credits	+12	+12	+13		−1
Unclassified ERP areas:					
Gross foreign aid	1,169	734	575	158	435
Equals: Net foreign aid:					
Net grants	+1,169	+734	+575	+158	+435
Other Europe:					
Gross foreign aid	12,481	1,623	76	1,547	10,858
Less: Returns	106	84	59	25	22
Equals: Net foreign aid	+12,375	+1,539	+17	+1,522	+10,836
Net grants	+11,925	+1,088	−16	+1,106	+10,836
Net credits	+451	+451	+35	+416	
Czechoslovakia:					
Gross foreign aid	221	213		213	8
Less: Returns	24	24	24		
Equals: Net foreign aid	197	189	−24	213	8
Net grants	192	183		183	8
Net credits	5	5	−24	29	
Finland:					
Gross foreign aid	145	128	34	94	17
Less: Returns	33	31	16	15	2
Equals: Net foreign aid	+112	+97	+18	+79	+14
Net grants	+3	+2		+2	+1
Net credits	+108	+95	+18	+77	+13
Poland:					
Gross foreign aid	465	443	6	437	22
Less: Returns	1	1	1		
Equals: Net foreign aid	+464	+442	+5	+437	+22
Net grants	+387	+365		+365	+22
Net credits	+76	+76	+5	+71	
U. S. S. R.:					
Gross foreign aid	11,242	465		465	10,776
Less: Returns	33	26	17	9	7
Equals: Net foreign aid	+11,209	+439	−17	+456	+10,769
Net grants	+10,986	+217	−17	+233	+10,769
Net credits	+222	+222		+222	
Other Europe—Continued					
Yugoslavia:					
Gross foreign aid	368	335	36	299	33
Equals: Net foreign aid	+367	+335	+37	+299	+33
Net grants	+332	+298	−1	+299	+33
Net credits	+36	+36	+36		
Other countries:					
Gross foreign aid	41	39		39	2
Less: Returns	14	1		1	13
Equals: Net foreign aid	+27	+38		+38	−11
Net grants	+24	+22		+22	+2
Net credits	+3	+16		+16	−13
American republics:					
Gross foreign aid	1,301	560	259	301	742
Less: Returns	354	206	133	72	149
Equals: Net foreign aid	+947	+354	+125	+229	+593
Net grants	+558	+135	+62	+74	+423
Net credits	+389	+219	+63	+155	+170
Australia:					
Gross foreign aid	925	20	1	19	905
Less: Returns	910	22	2	20	888
Equals: Net foreign aid	+15	−2	−1	−1	+17
Net grants		−8		−8	+8
Net credits	+15	+6	−1	+7	+8
Canada:					
Gross foreign aid	175	142	92	50	33
Less: Returns	167	141	141		26
Equals: Net foreign aid: Net credits	+8	+1	−49	+50	+7
China:					
Gross foreign aid	3,110	1,799	333	1,466	1,311
Less: Returns	181	117	60	56	64
Equals: Net foreign aid	+2,930	+1,683	+273	+1,410	+1,247
Net grants	+2,794	+1,567	+314	+1,253	+1,227
Net credits	+136	+116	−41	+157	+20
India:					
Gross foreign aid	788	46	1	45	742
Less: Returns	615	33	5	29	582
Equals: Net foreign aid	+172	+13	−3	+16	+160
Net grants	+1	−27	+1	−28	+28
Net credits	+172	+40	−4	+44	+132
Indonesia:[1]					
Gross foreign aid	155	151	84	67	4
Less: Returns	6	6	6		
Equals: Net foreign aid	+150	+146	+79	+67	+4
Net grants	+87	+84	+80	+4	+4
Net credits	+62	+62		+63	
Iran:					
Gross foreign aid	38	30	24	5	8
Less: Returns	10	10	4	6	
Equals: Net foreign aid	+28	+20	+20	−1	+8
Net grants		−7		−7	+8
Net credits	+27	+27	+20	+7	
Israel:					
Gross foreign aid	48	48	48		
Equals: Net foreign aid:					
Net credits	+48	+48	+48		
Japan:					
Gross foreign aid	2,007	2,007	1,024	982	
Less: Returns	287	287	151	136	
Equals: Net foreign aid	+1,720	+1,720	+874	+846	
Net grants	+1,706	+1,706	+927	+779	
Net credits	+14	+14	−54	+67	
Korea:					
Gross foreign aid	366	366	212	154	
Less: Returns	12	12	12		
Equals: Net foreign aid	+354	+354	+200	+154	
Net grants	+333	+333	+196	+136	
Net credits	+21	+21	+3	+18	
New Zealand:					
Gross foreign aid	256	7		7	249
Less: Returns	252				251
Equals: Net foreign aid	+4	+6		+7	−2
Net grants		+2		+2	−2
Net credits	+4	+4		+4	

[1] Gross foreign aid, net foreign aid, and net credits for Netherlands include $17.2 million ERP credits to Netherlands on behalf of Indonesia ($5.8 million in April-December 1948; $9.2 million in January-March 1949; $1.2 million in October-December 1949; and $1.0 million in January-March 1950). All other aid to Indonesia, including grants under the European Recovery Program, is included in the entries for that country.

APPENDIX TABLE 4—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	War and postwar periods	Postwar period		War period
		Total	During ERP period	Before ERP period	
Philippines:					
Gross foreign aid	822	769	526	243	53
Less: Returns	14	14	1	13	
Equals: Net foreign aid	+808	+755	+525	+231	+53
Net grants	+707	+655	+488	+167	+53
Net credits	+100	+100	+36	+64	
Ryukyu Islands:					
Gross foreign aid	64	60	31	29	4
Equals: Net foreign aid: Net grants	+64	+60	+31	+29	+4
Saudi Arabia:					
Gross foreign aid	35	17	1	16	18
Less: Returns	5	5	5		
Equals: Net foreign aid	+31	+12	−3	+16	+18
Net grants	+7	+2		+2	+5
Net credits	+23	+11	−3	+14	+13
Union of South Africa:					
Gross foreign aid	95	1		1	93
Less: Returns	96	94	1	93	1
Equals: Net foreign aid		−92	−1	−92	+92
Net grants		−92		−92	+92
Net credits			−1	+1	
All other and unclassified countries:					
Gross foreign aid	2,208	957	441	516	1,340
Less: Returns	32	31	13	18	1
Equals: Net foreign aid	+2,205	+926	+428	+498	+1,339
Net grants	+2,177	+861	+379	+483	+1,316
Net credits	+88	+65	+50	+15	+24

For important qualifications affecting this table, see the explanatory notes. [In original publication.]

EXHIBIT B

APPENDIX TABLE 3.—*Summary of foreign aid (grants and credits) unutilized—By program: As of Dec. 31, 1950*

[In millions of dollars]

	Total	Allocated or committed	Unallocated or uncommitted
Gross foreign aid unutilized	12,151	9,975	2,176
Grants unutilized	10,506	9,078	1,428
European recovery	3,128	1,798	1,330
Civilian supplies	361	308	53
Greek-Turkish aid	14	14	
Philippine rehabilitation	17	17	
Korean and far eastern (general area of China) aid	242	207	35
Chinese military aid	5	5	
Technical assistance and inter-American aid	37	27	10
Mutual-defense assistance	6,675	6,675	
Other	27	27	
Credits unutilized	1,645	897	748
Export-Import Bank	1,279	748	531
European recovery	157	88	69
Lend-lease (excluding settlement credits)	3	3	
Other	206	58	148

For important qualifications affecting this table, see the explanatory notes. [In original publication.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the tables I have just submitted for the RECORD do not include such loans as the International Children's fund, inter-American aid, Palestine relief, and other items which in the near future I shall have summarized in a compilation and will add to the list, totaling $91,500,000,000. I am satisfied that those additions will bring the total up to the figure I stated on the floor, namely, close to $100,000,000,000.

I thank the Senator from Michigan very much for yielding to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate having the Senator insert those figures in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment at this time and wish to speak on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is now the pending question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall not speak at length on the amendment, because I spoke on it yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well.

Mr. President, I desire to state briefly the purposes of the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have only 8 minutes, and I cannot yield under those circumstances.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to yield, but I am unable to do so.

Mr. President, I wish to trace in brief form the purposes and the provisions of the amendment.

There is no need to describe the situation in India which appeals to the humanitarian instincts of the American people and justifies this aid program. There is famine in India. In my own opinion the famine is to an extent caused by man and not by nature. That does not speak well for the policies of the Indian Government, but the fact remains that people are starving and we want to help them. I think our taxpayers want to help the people of India.

There is an element of self-interest involved. We want to help the Indian people because it is important to have their good will. I have often said that no nation can buy good will. I hope no one will think we are attempting that in this case. We are showing our good faith and our own good will to the Indian people. We expect good faith from them and from their Government and their good will in return.

The outstanding fact in the background is that India has appealed for aid, but at no time has asked for a grant or gift. She has asked only for an opportunity to purchase grain in this country on special and easy terms.

It is beyond my comprehension that anyone should gratuitously offer to extend the desired assistance as a gift when a gift was never requested. Yet that is just what has been done. The State Department, speaking through the President, has advised the making of a grant or a gift. The pending bill as it came from committee is a product of that attitude. It would provide aid on a basis of half loan, half gift.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I have proposed that the grant basis be disallowed in its entirety, and that a straight business-like loan of $190,000,000 be substituted.

Much to the confusion of the State Department, the Indian Government itself has endorsed the basis of the proposal we have put forward.

We propose that the loan basis be similar to that provided in the Economic Cooperation Act. The terms of credit for past ECA loans have been for periods of from 33 to 35 years at an interest rate of 2½ percent on the unpaid principal, and with certain periods of grace in commencing both interest and principal repayments.

There has been some discussion in this debate of a possibility that a loan administered through ECA might be converted into a grant or gift. The so-called Iceland loan provision appears in all ECA loan agreements, and provides that by mutual agreement of the parties the terms of the promissory note can be modified. That does not mean that the loan would be changed into a gift; such a

modification, I believe, would be entirely contrary to the entire purpose in changing the original proposal so as to make it a loan.

I have sought to make clear that we do not want this loan to be made into a grant or a gift. The legislative history of this measure will put all parties on notice that Congress does not wish or intend that this loan be converted into a gift at any time.

We propose that the loan be financed out of unobligated ECA balances as of June 30, in a minimum amount of $100,000,000. The difference between ECA's balances and the authorized amount of the loan would be made available through a public debt transaction.

We also propose that terms for repaying the loan shall include the transfer to the United States by India of strategic and critical materials which are in short supply in this country.

We have no desire to handcuff the negotiating authorities, and have not specified the materials or the amounts thereof that we expect India will be able to transfer to us. In my earlier remarks and in House and Senate Committee reports some of these materials are listed. Some of them are embargoed by India at the present time. We expect our negotiating authorities to bargain hard-headedly and realistically to serve our vital interests in obtaining these critical materials in exchange for the grain which India needs so desperately. I think our authorities should, without any hesitation at all, see that the embargoes are removed at the same time that we make the loan for grain to India.

It is a fact that India needs food, but our national survival is likewise dependent upon the procurement of certain materials. This assistance program is in the nature of a partnership arrangement. India is a party to the fight against world communism, and she should be. That is one reason why we are willing to extend this aid on the special and easy terms she has requested. We expect that India will reciprocate to her maximum extent, and we expect our negotiating authorities to impress that upon the Indians. No finer people can be found anywhere than the Indian people. I know that they will want to keep their promises to us. They do not want a gift. They merely want to obtain aid on reasonable terms, in order that they may eat, and I think we ought to negotiate on that basis.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has two more minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield the 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I appreciate having the time to say merely a word in support of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and his colleagues. As the original sponsor of this bill, and as one who has piloted the bill through the Foreign Relations Committee, I may say that the bill provided for a half-grant, half-loan basis; but, in the light of recent developments, and in view of the expression on the part of the Government of India itself that it prefers the loan procedure, it seems to me to be wise to change the bill in the Senate so as to put it on a total loan basis, as proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. Therefore, while I cannot speak for my cosponsors of the bill, I can urge upon them that they go along with this amendment, because it would simplify the proposed legislation.

As another reason for urging the adoption of this amendment, I may say that it is in line with the position taken by the House of Representatives in debating this question within the past few months. While much could be said in favor of writing the bill on the basis of half grant, half loan, I think it would be wise to place it entirely on a loan basis. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

I may say further that the matter has been under discussion with those who have been supporting the amendment. The original amendment has been changed in certain respects, and those of us who have been working on the bill are in agreement with the amendment which is now proposed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am placed in a rather peculiar position with reference to this proposal. The bill, as originally introduced and as considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was the basis of the report which was submitted by the committee.

I shall take but a few moments to speak of the historical background. I would not willingly consume one moment of time in an effort to delay action upon this bill. We are dealing with a young nation, a nation less than 3 years old, which, after more than a century of repression and suppression, is trying to build a modern free state, and which at the same time is trying to effect a transition from a primitive agrarian nation to an industrial nation. As if that burden were not enough, the people of India have found themselves faced with extraordinary conditions, which have left them in desperate straits with reference to the need of food to sustain life. Not only were they hungry, but they were starving; not only were they starving, but they were dying.

The new Government of India, turning to possible sources from which it could alleviate the suffering of its people, has tapped available surplus supplies throughout the world, to the limit of its resources. Some it bought, some it obtained by barter. It obtained rice from certain east Asian countries. It obtained some wheat from Russia. It has bought from the United States. However, the heads of the Indian Government eventually found themselves at the end of their resources. They found themselves two million tons short of enough to feed their people. They therefore made a request of the United States, a country which had a surplus of wheat in its granaries. The request was not for a gift or a donation, but for a loan on special and easy terms.

When the matter was brought to the attention of the Congress by the President of the United States, the suggestion was made that the assistance from this country be in the form of a gift. The proposal was in hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee for several days, and as a result of which the committee reported the bill which is presently before the Senate, providing that half of the requested sum be made available now from ECA funds already appropriated, and that the question regarding the second $95,000,000 be considered again by the Congress before it is appropriated.

In addition to that, provision was made that the ECA, out of its funds, should make a grant of half of the first $95,000,000, and the balance in the form of a loan. The bill also contains certain provisions which appear in all ECA loans with respect to supervision and publicity.

In that form the bill has been reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee without one dissenting vote. But the provision which has been presented by way of an amendment, that the entire amount be made available in the form of a loan, has been endorsed in principle by the original sponsor of the bill and, by inference and expression of hope, by a number of the other sponsors.

Representing the committee, and under my instructions from the committee, I have no choice, but to urge adoption of the bill as it was reported to the Senate. We have in the proposed amendment an example of the futility of trying on the floor of the Senate to legislate on a matter of a complicated nature. In the House of Representatives, in the case of a similar measure, the committees first recommended a gift of the entire amount, although subsequently it reported out a bill providing for a loan. It is my information, obtained indirectly, that the House may consider the question tomorrow.

Mr. President, I am anxious to get this measure into conference. I want to make available to the starving people of India the resources which we may use without detriment to ourselves. I want to do it without 1 minute of delay. I believe that passage of the bill as reported to the Senate by the committee will be one method of effectuating that objective at the earliest possible date.

If the Senate wishes to adopt the amendment which has been proposed, I shall not complain. I do not believe it wise, particularly because it would, by express wording, eliminate a number of the provisions which are now in the measure, which I deem to be efficient safeguards. Not only that, but in the event the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan were adopted, it would also leave sections 9 and 11 of the bill entirely inapplicable. It would leave a bill, which will need to be rewritten by the conferees of the two Houses, if it goes to conference as it is anticipated it will.

Mr. President, I do not care personally which course the Senate takes. Representing the Committee on Foreign Relations, I feel that its bill ought to be approved; but, as I stated previously, and as I now restate, I would not do one thing. I would not say one word, which would delay for 1 minute the meeting of

this most urgent and vital need of the Indian people. If it is the will of the Senate that the pending amendment be adopted and substituted for the particular portion of the bill reported by the committee, the bill will still go to conference, to be considered and rewritten there.

I do not urge upon the Senate either course. I am simply saying that, representing this committee, I intend to support the committee report, which was made unanimously, submitting the bill in the form in which it now appears before the Senate. If, however, the Senate feels otherwise, and wishes to substitute the other provision, it will mean extra work, it will mean further delay when the bill goes to conference; and delay is the thing which the Senator from Iowa insists must be avoided if possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that if the amendment is voted on as a whole, it will strike out a portion of the bill, including three committee amendments, beginning on line 17, page 2, and going to line 10, on page 5, so that if the amendment should be adopted, the original text of the bill and those three amendments would be eliminated.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.] The "nays" seem to have it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McMahon
Anderson	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Moody
Benton	Hickenlooper	Morse
Brewster	Hill	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Murray
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kefauver	Smathers
Connally	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Lodge	Sparkman
Duff	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	Magnuson	Taft
Ellender	Malone	Thye
Ferguson	Martin	Underwood
Flanders	Maybank	Welker
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand there is 1 minute left.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senate, in 1 minute or less, what this amendment would accomplish. India has asked for the opportunity to buy wheat on easy terms, not that it be furnished as a gift. As the bill came to the floor of the Senate it provided that half the wheat would be a gift and half would be furnished on the basis of a loan. This amendment proposes to make the whole amount of $190,000,000 a loan, which is exactly what was asked for by the Indian Government. That is what the amendment would accomplish.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan for himself and other Senators. Senators who favor the amendment will vote "yea," and those who are not in favor of it will vote "nay." The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. If present, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	Flanders	Mundt
Bennett	George	O'Conor
Brewster	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Smith, Maine
Cain	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. C.
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Case	Knowland	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Thye
Cordon	Malone	Welker
Dirksen	Martin	Wherry
Duff	Maybank	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	
Ferguson	McKellar	

NAYS—32

Anderson	Humphrey	Moody
Benton	Hunt	Morse
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Connally	Kefauver	Neely
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Kilgore	Pastore
Gillette	Long	Smathers
Green	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hayden	McFarland	Underwood
Hennings	McMahon	Young
Hill	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—12

Byrd	Kem	Millikin
Eastland	Langer	Nixon
Ecton	Lehman	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Watkins

So the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON, for himself, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. BRIDGES, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question now recurs upon the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment dated 5-14-51-A, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the regular order will be for the clerk to state the next committee amendment. The Senator's amendment will be in order later. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 11, it is proposed to insert a new section 8, as follows:

SEC. 8. Assistance provided under this act shall be provided under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, applicable to and consistent with the purposes of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my amendment is to section 8, the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts for himself and other Senators to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 11, after "SEC. 8", it is proposed to insert "(a)."

On page 5, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(b) With respect to the procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe the amendment has been accepted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who is in charge of the bill. Its purpose is to make certain of the certification by the Secretary of Agriculture that there is in this country sufficient grain for its needs before any grain is shipped to India under the terms of the bill. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I think the amendment has a very salutary purpose, and should be adopted. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for himself, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment on page 5, line 11.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that brings us to the committee amendment on page 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the next committee amendment.

The amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 1, to change the section number from "7" to "10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 2, after the word "law", to insert "to the extent that the President finds that private shipping is not avaiable on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this act."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President. I call up at this time my amendment to section 10, on page 6, line 2. The purpose of the amendment will be indicated from a reading of it, after which I shall explain the amendment briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the word "finds" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "after consultation with appropriate Government officials and representatives of private shipping, finds and proclaims."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to make certain that the expense of reactivating reserve ships which are now in mothballs so that they may transport grain to India will not be incurred unnecessarily. Yesterday I asked that this amendment be made a part of the bill, and, as I understand, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has no objection.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, yesterday I conferred with the Senator from Michigan; and with the modification in the language as he has now presented it, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment on page 6, beginning in line 2.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 6, after the word "directed", to strike out "until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to section 3 of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendments were, on page 6, line 8, after the word "aggregate", to strike out "$50,000,000 to carry out the the provisions and purposes of this act" and insert "$420,000,000 to the Department of Commerce"; in line 10, after the word "such", to strike out "time" and insert "times"; in line 11, after the word "determine", to insert "for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes"; in line 16, after the word "for", to strike out "this purpose. The" and insert "these purposes: *Provided, however,* That the"; in line 18, after the word "for", to insert "such"; in the same line, after the word "advances", to strike out "made by it hereunder," and insert "either"; in line 19, after the word "funds", to insert "hereafter"; in line 20, after the word "to", to strike out "any department or agency for the purpose of this act: *Provided,* That to the extent that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for the transportation of supplies made available under this act, funds may be advanced hereunder to the Department of Commerce for activation and operation of additional vessels from the National Defense Reserve Fleet for such transportation: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, receipts from such operations may be used by the Department of Commerce to repay such advances", and insert "the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, from receipts from vessel operations: *And provided further,* That pending such repayment these receipts may be placed in such funds or accounts and used for activating and operating vessels."; and on page 7, line 11, to change the section number from "8" to "11."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized to pay ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry in India of relief packages and supplies under the provisions of section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. Funds now or hereafter available during the period ending June 30, 1952, for furnishing assistance under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, may be used to carry out the purposes of this section.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, to those who are familiar with section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, I am sure that this amendment is very plain. But lest some may have forgotten, let me point out the direct purpose of my amendment.

A number of organizations in this country are doing a splendid job on the basis of private relief and private charitable assistance in relieving famine in India. The organizations to which I refer are such organizations as CARE; the organization known as CROP—Christian relief overseas program—and the National Red Cross. Recently it was my privilege to call upon these organizations to step up their private relief work in a coordinated program. I am happy to inform the Senate that the organizations are starting a program in every State in the Union.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, for clarification?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I call attention, in line 4 of the Senator's amendment, to the words "of relief packages and supplies." As I understand, that does not mean the wheat referred to in the pending bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I am very happy to have the Senator ask me that question. This language pertains directly to such relief packages and supplies as will be collected, purchased, and shipped by the private relief or charitable organizations.

Some 62 voluntary groups, representing all our church organizations and all the voluntary charitable organizations with national headquarters and national programs, have united in a common effort. That common effort is being carried on today primarily under the auspices of the programs known as CARE and CROP. Those organizations represent the major religious groups in the country, and have an existing organization in most States of the Union. In addition, the organizations intend to call upon the Governors of States, the mayors of cities, fraternal organizations, and the great farm organizations, such as the Farm Bureau, the National Farmers Union, the Grange, and the Federation of Cooperatives, to join in increasing the flow of relief supplies and food to the people of India.

The CARE program is likewise stepping up its national program for soliciting funds to send a special type of package which it has prepared for the

people of India. These food packages have been sent in ever-increasing numbers within the past few weeks and months, but CARE intends to put on a much more sustained drive, greatly to increase the flow of food packages.

I am happy to note that the National Red Cross is doing a job of stepping up its program of relief. As we know, it has a cooperative relationship with the Indian National Red Cross.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota whether the language which he is offering is intended to be inserted as a new section or to be inserted as a part of some other section. The reason I ask the question is that the final word in his amendment is "section." It makes certain funds available for carrying out "the purposes of this section." If this is to be a new section, the language is clear. However, if it is to be tied onto some other section, funds might be made available for some purpose other than the Senator has described.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to have the Senator bring out that point. If he will note the language of the printed amendment, he will see that it says, "At the proper place in the bill, insert the following." I suggest that the language be made a new section, providing for relief packages on the part of independent voluntary private organizations. The language which is used in lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 refers to funds now or hereafter available during the period ending June 30, 1952, for furnishing assistance under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota was misled by the language "At the proper place in the bill, insert the following." The "proper place" is not identified to the Senator from South Dakota as necessarily a new section. I wonder if we can have that understood.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I am happy to give the Senator that clear understanding. I feel that the new language should go in as a new section. I prepared the amendment rather hastily yesterday. I did not have time to examine the bill in detail, so as to determine the proper place to insert the language in the bill. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that this language ought to be a new section in the bill.

Mr. President, I do not believe that my amendment requires any further explanation, except to say that the cost of transportation is a sizable cost. It takes a considerable amount of the funds which private organizations are able to collect from citizens of the United States. Therefore, it is my wish and hope that the Government of the United States, acting through the Economic Cooperation Administration, will pay the shipping costs from a port in the United States to a port of delivery in the Republic of India.

I want it to be made crystal clear that this private relief program is well supervised. It is supervised not only in our own country but abroad. It will have supervision in the Republic of India. I want it equally clear that the private organizations to which I have referred have been doing a great job. However, they have had to expend a good portion of their funds on transportation costs. I am confident that the organizations which have now united in this fine Nation-wide program of voluntary gifts will greatly step up the flow of relief supplies. The 2,000,000 tons of wheat which we are now about to legislate into a reality—at least so far as the Senate is concerned—will barely provide subsistence. It is 2,000,000 tons which will go primarily into the rationing system of the Government of India. The program to which I am referring will be under the direction of and will be supervised and administered by the private agencies of the United States which have their counterpart in the Republic of India. I believe it is a program affording direct relief by our people as individuals to the people of India. It would do much to express the generosity, warm heart, and friendship of the American people.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. With reference to paying the expenses of the shipments from this country to India, from port to port, would the adoption of the amendment set a precedent; or is the practice being followed today in any other case? For instance, is it being followed in the case of CARE packages?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, it is being followed; and it has been provided for by legislation in other cases.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it now being followed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I understand it is being followed with respect to certain countries.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the Senator tell us the countries which are involved?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I am not mistaken, in the amendments to the ECA Act which were adopted in 1949 and 1950, certain organizations were given the privilege of enjoying free transportation for their commodities into areas where ECA was operating. ECA does not operate at the present time in India. It is my understanding that that is the case.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wanted the matter to be cleared up. I knew that that condition prevailed at one time, but I fail to recall now whether it is still in effect. I do not wish to see a precedent established. If such a provision is in effect now, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to tell the able Senator from New Hampshire that it is my understanding that that practice is being followed at this time in areas where ECA now operates. ECA does not operate in India, and therefore it is necessary to extend the privilege specifically to India.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator's understanding is correct. It does apply to all ECA countries. The amendment would make it applicable to India.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator from Minnesota say whether his amendment carries a time limit on the shipment of packages?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the expiration date is June 30, 1952. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New Hampshire for raising the point. I wish everyone to have a clear and complete understanding of the amendment.

Mr. President, in yielding the floor I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] whether he is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am willing to accept the amendment on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is agreed to.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I call up amendment B, which has been submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], for himself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and myself, and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 5, it is proposed to delete the word *"Provided"* and insert the following: *"Provided*, That at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of any equipment, materials, or commodities made available under the provisions of this act and transported on ocean vessels (computed separately for dry bulk carriers and dry cargo liners) shall be transported on United States-flag commercial vessels at market rates for United States-flag commercial vessels, if available: *Provided further*, That all charters for vessels shall be fixed on the American market through commercial channels: *Provided further*."

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I call up the amendment primarily for the purpose of propounding several questions to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] in order to establish legislative history. I ask the Senator from Iowa if the amendment was given consideration by the committee.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to read to the distinguished Senator from Maryland an excerpt from the committee report on the pending bill, as follows:

> The committee considered an amendment proposed by Senators MAGNUSON, MCMAHON, and O'CONOR on the subject of shipping 50 percent of the food grains in American-flag vessels and requiring that all charters for vessels carrying these shipments be fixed in the United States. It seemed advisable to the committee that the 50–50 shipping provision of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, be made applicable to these shipments. Section 8 of the bill has that effect as it incorporates by reference the shipping provisions of the ECA Act. This requires those administering the program to take such steps as may be necessary to assure, as far as is practicable, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities procured out of funds made available shall be transported on United States flag vessels either privately operated or operated for the United States Government to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Iowa. I also note that in section 8 of the bill as reported by the committee it is provided:

SEC. 8. Assistance provided under this act shall be provided under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, applicable to and consistent with the purposes of this act.

I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether in his opinion section 8 adequately covers the situation intended to be covered by the amendment, and whether it was the intention of the committee, by the use of such language, to give effect to the purpose outlined in the amendment to which I have referred.

Mr. GILLETTE. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, it is not only the opinion of the Senator from Iowa but it was the opinion of the committee that the provision did secure the purpose to which the Senator has alluded, which was the purpose of the amendment the committee considered.

Mr. O'CONOR. I am very grateful to the Senator from Iowa. Under the circumstances, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland withdraws the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of section 6, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, such monazite to be added to the American Government's stockpile of critical materials and dispensed to private industry in accordance with existing laws."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to say a word with reference to the amendment. The fate of this amendment will clearly decide whether we in the United States are ready, willing, and desirous of defending America to the fullest extent. I have gone into the question of monazite sand, from which are extracted certain rare earth chemicals. I do not claim to understand the involved chemistry. However, certain of these rare earth chemicals are essential to the manufacture of the heat-resistant alloy which is used in the construction of jet engines for aircraft. We are depending upon jet aircraft to defend this country in these times of stress and need.

We are at war in Korea, whether we wish to call it a war or not, and in spite of the fact that some people still prefer to call it a police action. We are told that tensions are high all over the world, and that the Communist threat is great. Certainly, I believe it is great. Certainly, too, I believe in collective security. I belive in a well-rounded security at home in the form of an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force. If we are not to close our eyes to the future, and if we really mean what we say and earnestly desire to prepare this country, we cannot go to sleep, as Rip Van Winkle did for 20 years. The situation is serious. In my judgment, Mr. President, a vote against the amendment is a vote against jet airplanes for the defense of this Nation; it is a vote against their procurement and manufacture.

I know that some of the Members of the Senate will scoff at the amendment and will say it should not be adopted. Some will say it would interfere with the bill if it were adopted. I know that some in this country will ask, "Why should we put any restrictions of that sort upon India?"

Mr. President, I am in favor of the shipment of wheat to India. I believe in the humane objectives of this bill, but I also believe in the defense of the United States. Our supply of monazite is critically low. There is very little in our stockpile. India has maintained an embargo on this ore to the United States since 1946, and our State Department has either been unable or unwilling to persuade the Indian Government to permit the shipment of this ore to the United States. Our State Department has now permitted a similar embargo to be established by Brazil. India and Brazil are the only two countries which have deposits of this ore which are available for shipment to the United States.

So far as I can determine, India has no use for monazite. India's chemical know-how and industrial potential are insufficient to enable her to refine the ore. India has a stockpile of this ore at least 30 times greater than our own. Yet to date India has been unable to use this material, which we need so badly.

India needs wheat, and I want India to have wheat. I believe that the sending of wheat to India is a humane undertaking, but I think it is high time that our Government took as much interest in the vital needs of the defense of the United States as some persons seem to be taking in the interests of other countries.

Mr. President, I have listened to the President of the United States talk about the possibility that atomic bombs may be dropped on our key industrial centers. I have seen some of our high officials appear to shiver with fear at the thought of what might occur in case of atomic attack. But, Mr. President, if we do not have sufficient jet airplanes to meet the attack, if one occurs, the responsibility for our failure to have an adequate defense in that respect will rest at least partially on every Member of the Senate who votes against this amendment.

Mr. President, we cannot bury our heads in the sand; we cannot dodge this issue. Of course the amendment is sound; of course it is right. Adoption of the amendment will not interfere with the bill at all.

If I were opposing the shipment of wheat to India, that would be another matter. However, I favor the legislation calling for the shipment of wheat to India; but I want a small but vital practical element, provided by my amendment, brought into the picture for the protection of the security of my country. If the day arrives when we need those materials, I propose we shall not be handicapped by a lack of the rare chemicals and alloys which are so urgently needed for the building of jet aircraft for the defense of our Nation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether he is also aware that there has been an embargo by India on all manganese above a certain amount, for shipment from India to the United States. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the fact that no steel can be made without manganese. Therefore it is a material which we definitely need.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I am familiar with that fact.

Mr. MALONE. In 1947, I visited Mr. Nehru in New Delhi. At that time it was possible in India to get leases of from 1 to 3 years on manganese deposits. However, it is impossible even to explore a deposit in that length of time, let alone install the necessary machinery to obtain the ore, and to have an opportunity to make a return on the investment.

Futhermore, at that time—and I have no reason to believe that any change has occurred in this respect—any organization which wished to operate in India along such lines was required to give to some Indian organization 51 percent of its stock. Is the Senator familiar with those restrictions?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I am not familiar with all those restrictions. I know of them in general, but not as to all the details.

Mr. MALONE. If I correctly understand the distinguished Senator's argument, it is that there should be a little reciprocity in connection with the pending deal.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; that is absolutely correct.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, there should be reciprocity in the case of the materials which we need very badly—for instance, hemp, much of which now goes to Argentina and to other countries with which India has made trade agreements; and also manganese and the sands to which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has referred, and many other materials which India could trade for wheat or for anything else she wanted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. But, on the other hand, not only does India refuse to trade in that way, but India makes it almost impossible for us to secure those materials. Is the Senator familiar with those facts?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I am; and I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, let me say that I want the Senate to vote on the amendment by a record vote. We do not know what will occur in the next week, the next month, the next year, the next 5 years, and the next 10 years. When the time comes, if a critical period for this Nation develops, and if we fail to have the necessary defenses, by means of our aircraft, to meet that crisis, I want the RECORD to be clear as to which Members of the Senate voted for and against the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Will the Senator read the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. Suppose we have it read by the clerk.

Mr. CASE. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of section 6, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, such monazite to be added to the American Government's stockpile of critical materials and dispensed to private industry in accordance with existing laws."

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I shall yield all of my time except 1 minuate to the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Before yielding that time to him I wish to use 1 minute to say that the members of the committee thoroughly canvassed the entire situation, and it was their conclusion that the danger to which the Senator from New Hampshire has referred does not exist.

I hold in my hand a report from the Bureau of Mines. Although it is confidential in its major statements, I shall read this portion of it:

In addition there is the bastnasite source of rare earth materials. In fact, the indicated excess of supply over demand, even without allowance for future imports, is large enough to provide for the early accumulation of monazite sufficient to reach the Munition Board's present strategic stockpile objective.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I always hesitate to differ with my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and fundamentally I do not differ with him. I think all of us are eager to have the strategic materials we need, and the only question that arises is the best way to get at this problem.

I may say that the original amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan and his colleagues provided in section 6 for the transfer to the United States not only of monazite, but also of a number of other strategic materials which it was felt we should bargain for in case this bill was passed.

After discussion with the group of Senators supporting the amendment, the amendment as finally adopted includes the following provisions as section 6—and I read now from the amendment of the Senator from Michigan and his colleagues which has been adopted:

SEC. 6. The credit terms provided for in section 4 shall include repayment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator for Economic Cooperation and the Government of India), or otherwise of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources.

The purpose of that provision is to open up negotiations between representatives of the United States and representatives of the Government of India.

The reasons why we used that language, rather than to specify all the various strategic materials, were, first, because we wished to have wider flexibility than could be obtained by specifically designating certain materials and, second, because we realized that some of these matters might be controversial and might better be handled by way of negotiation, rather than by including a definite mandate in the bill.

Let me refer now to a statement I made last Monday in connection with my remarks on the bill relating to this particular question. Inasmuch as only a few Senators were present at that time, I believe it worth while to repeat now what I said then. The remarks I made at that time were made after the committee had held its hearings and had considered this subject with representatives of India, as well. In my statement, which appears at page 5266 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 14, I said:

I turn now to the language in the proposed amendment—

That is the Ferguson amendment, to which I have just referred—

I turn now to the language in the proposed amendment which provides for repayment not only in money but also in materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources. This language first appeared in the original Economic Cooperation Act and is contained in the India aid bill, H. R. 3791, now before the House. There is a considerable history of American imports of strategic materials from India, and I think there can be no disagreement that it is in our national interest to maintain and if possible increase this flow.

In this connection I wish to read a portion of Prime Minister Nehru's statement in the Indian Parliament last Thursday:

"There is a reference to our supplying various kinds of materials to the United States of America in part payment for the grain supplied."

Prime Minister Nehru was discussing the grain-aid proposals. He continued:

"We shall gladly supply such materials as are available in India and can be spared by us. But I should like to make it clear that it is a fundamental part of our foreign policy that such material as is particularly related to the production of atomic or like weapons should not be supplied by us to foreign countries."

That is a statement of India's foreign policy by Mr. Nehru, and I understand it is a part of Indian legislation at the present time. I continue reading from my own statement of last Monday:

That was the contention we had to deal with on the subject of strategic materials. It seemed to be the principle of the Indians not to export anything which had to do with atomic weapons.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the Senator will let me first finish reading my statement, I shall be glad to yield. I continue:

This statement by Mr. Nehru indicates clearly that India will supply raw materials in part payment for our aid, with the exception, he mentioned, which applies particularly to monazite sands on which India maintains a statutory embargo. The language of the new amendment does not require that monazite or any other specified material be included in the repayment, and I commend that approach because I believe it would be poor statesmanship for the United States to seek to coerce India on this point by means of this legislation, the essence of which is the saving of human lives by emergency food assistance.

I believe our Government should proceed vigorously to prevail on India to lift its embargo on the export of monazite and other materials that are now prohibited.

I hope we shall be able to include monazite, but I believe it to be a matter for negotiation between our representatives and representatives of India. However, I think it would be a tragedy if this humanitarian program were to collapse over the question of strategic materials, which poses an entirely separate issue.

I am now glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. There are two points about which I desire to inquire of the Senator from New Jersey. Am I correct in understanding that what the Senator has read concerning materials to be used in the making of atomic weapons would not include monazite?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is claimed it would be included. It is something which has to do with atomic energy production.

Mr. BRIDGES. There are numerous uses which may be made of it, are there not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If monazite is not included, I may say to the Senator, there is no question that our negotiators could negotiate for it, as well as for the other raw materials which we need. It seemed to the committee, after having debated this question at some length, that it would be wiser to deal with the subject of repayment through the medium of specific materials by renegotiation, rather than to spell out and write in the bill mandatory conditions upon which we would furnish grain for emergency relief purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield further to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the Senator from New Jersey thinks this amendment is unnecessary. I may say there is no man in the Senate, or in the country, in my humble opinion, who possesses higher ideals than does the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. If I thought his ideals were attainable, there would then be no question in my mind about his suggestion, but I have observed what has happened in the past. I therefore cannot go into this matter blindly, unless it is tied down in some way. As the Senator has said, we are trying to do something to help save the lives of the people of India; but at the same time, I am trying to help save the lives of the people of the United States in case of a devastating atomic attack, which may come, as the President and other officials have indicated, at some time in the future. It

is my desire that our country shall be prepared.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. I might add merely one word to what the Senator said, and it, in a sense, repeats what was said earlier by the Senator from Iowa. I have had sent to me by some of my colleagues who have been working on this proposed legislation in the House, a statement by our own Bureau of Mines which was given to the House committee which was dealing with this same subject. I desire to read the statement in full. I think some of this material was given to us by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The statement reads:

The Bureau of Mines has informed the committee—

That is, the House committee—

The Bureau of Mines has informed the committee that monazite and other rare earth-mining operations in the United States now under way and planned indicate an excess of supply over demand adequate to meet our strategic objectives even without allowance for future imports and early United States self-sufficiency in these materials. The only real concerns are for supplies to meet the needs for a short period in the very near future and to meet AEC demand if research determines that thorium is an important atomic raw material.

The demand referred to is that of the Atomic Energy Commission. I simply quote that statement of the Bureau of Mines, because it indicated that the Bureau, at the moment, is not concerned with the scarcity, and if that is correct, we should rely upon our Bureau of Mines to meet the point made by the Senator from New Hampshire, that we are in desperate need of this material in order to save human life.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. I desire to speak to this particular point. North Carolina has an inexhaustible supply of monazite. The mines can be worked continuously, but, of course, whenever there are demands for it, monazite can be shipped in from other countries cheaper than we can produce it in North Carolina. The only reason why the mines are not now being operated full blast is that monazite has been shipped in from other countries, and our mines have had to close. The mines are now being opened again, and they can produce abundantly. They can produce an inexhaustible supply, and give employment to a vast number of people throughout the mountain regions of North Carolina. The only reason for their not being in operation at this time is that they have had on hand an available supply, for which they could not obtain an adequate price. With any sort of incentive, monazite can be produced by the mines of North Carolina in sufficient amounts to meet all the needs of this country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his contribution to the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired. All time for debate on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment C, and I ask that it be read and considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to add a new section, reading as follows:

SEC. 8. Any sums paid by the Government of India on or before January 1, 1957 (or such later date as may hereafter be specified by act of Congress), as interest on the principal of any debt incurred under this act shall be placed in a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to remain available until expended. This account shall be available to the Department of State for the following uses:

(a) Allocation, for designated educational, agricultural, experimental, scientific, medical, or philanthropic activities, to American institutions engaged in such activities in India;

(b) Studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States and its Territories and possessions (1) for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of India, and (2) with the approval of appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in India, for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of the United States to participate in similar activities in India, including in both cases travel expenses, tuition, subsistence, and other allowances and expenses incident to such activities; and

(c) The selection, purchase, and shipment of (1) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of India, and (2) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in India, and (3) the interchange of similar materials and equipment from India for higher education and research in the United States.

Renumber succeeding sections and references thereto.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think this amendment will not require a long explanation. I point out that the Senate has now voted to consider the aid-for-India program as in the nature of a business transaction. We are moved by humane reasons but it involves a sale of wheat on credit, and the credit bears interest. I think this is a proper and prudent procedure.

My purpose in presenting this amendment is to invite attention to the fact that we now have a rare opportunity to look ahead, beyond this year, to a time when other famines may occur in the Far East and to the need of improving the agricultural techniques, improving the economic situation, and improving the status of affairs in the fine young country of India so that there will be less danger of famines occurring in the future.

My amendment deals only with interest, not with the payment of the principal. It deals only with the amount of interest collected during the first 5 years. I suggest that we follow the pattern which I think Congress has wisely cut in the past, which has also a humanitarian accent, in dealing with the people of India in this business transaction.

Years ago, in the case of the Boxer indemnity, we made available millions of dollars for Chinese scholarships. Some of our best friends among the free Chinese today came from the young Chinese students who attended schools in this country because of the money then made available for that purpose.

The same is true with respect to the Finnish loan. I was happy to be associated with my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in suggesting that the payments on the Finnish loans be set aside for better relationships and understandings between the Finnish people and the people of America. That the Congress agreed to do. We did the same thing under the Fulbright Act providing for the increase of better understandings among the peoples of the world. The Smith-Mundt Act follows the same pattern.

It seems to me we are in a good position to provide against the future when, without some improvement in the conditions in India, recurrent difficulties and famines are likely to arise again. It is for that reason that I suggest that during the first 5 years any of the interest which is paid be set aside in the Treasury of the United States for the advancement of programs beneficial to the people of India, the programs to be worked out in conjunction with the leaders of India, to provide tuition payments for students who wish to study in this country, and to make available in India American technicians, scientists, and agricultural experts who will help train the Indian people in wiser and more productive methods of agriculture and of other economic enterprise.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I desire, first, to commend the distinguished Senator for the suggestion he has made. As he knows, I am heartily in sympathy with this approach to an international problem, and I think it would be very helpful in connection with the India aid bill. I should like to ask the Senator whether he contemplates negotiations being conducted with the Indian Government and the program being worked out in such a way that they will feel they are a participant in the exchange-of-students program. I should like the RECORD to indicate whether that will be our approach.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I invite attention to the fact that on page 2, line 3, of my amendment as it affects this proposed legislation and as it relates to the people of India, it is provided that the activities mentioned shall be conducted through "technicians who are citizens of India, and with the approval of appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in India." The only part of the bill dealing with assistance which this Government may desire to provide has reference to agencies such as the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, or Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organizations doing welfare and educational work in India as purely American enterprises.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the Senator from South Dakota on his amendment. I think it is an excellent proposal. I also wish to associate myself with everything the Senator has said regarding his amendment. My only regret is that it is not a little more liberal. It is my hope that the committee will accept it.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island very much. In pursuance of that hope, I have discussed the matter with the very genial and able chairman of the subcommittee who is handling the bill, and I am inclined to believe that he is willing to accept the amendment. So if I prove right in that conviction, I shall not detain the Senate longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I had not relinquished the floor, but I am willing that the Senator from Arkansas may have a part of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator still has 4 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and to say to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] that I hope he will accept this amendment and take it to conference. The precedents which have been set in the case of Finland and in other instances in the past, I believe, justify consideration of the amendment on that ground. I am sure the amendment will contribute a great deal to improving the relations between this country and India, which at the moment seem to have resulted in some misunderstandings. So I hope the Senator from Iowa will accept the amendment. I am thoroughly in accord with the whole purpose of it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, as the able Senator from South Dakota has stated, I discussed the amendment with him. I am in entire accord with the purpose behind it. There is, however, a question in my mind as to the constitutionality of the provision for establishing a special fund made up of interest to be paid into the Treasury of the United States, and to be disbursed at the discretion of an officer of the executive departments. While I have not studied the legal aspects of the question, it seems to me that it might well be in violation of the strict injunction of the Constitution that money cannot be paid out of the Public Treasury except through an appropriation. But that is a legal question. There has been handed to me a brief memorandum on the question prepared by the legislative counsel of the Senate. I read this excerpt from the memorandum:

Article I, section 9, clause 7, of the Constitution provides, in part, as follows:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law. * * *"

In my opinion, Senator MUNDT's amendment is not inconsistent with this provision in that his amendment is itself an appropriation.

While I am not in accord with that conclusion, it is a legal question that can well be resolved in Congress. I shall be glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know how much each year the interest would amount to?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am advised that it will be approximately $5,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. A year?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. And it would be for 5 years?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then it would amount to $25,000,000?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. And it would apply to Indian students attending colleges in America?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. That is only a part of the program.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The fund accumulated would also provide salaries, expenses, and provisions for American technicians. I am sure the Senator from Michigan realizes that in many portions of India farmers are still working with wooden sticks for plows. American agricultural technicians could be of great assistance to them, and their salaries and expenses would be paid out of this fund.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it take the place of the point 4 program?

Mr. MUNDT. In a way; yes. It would do the type of thing that the point 4 program is presumed to be doing in some areas of the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the amount involved in the amendment then were used in forwarding the point 4 program, that amount of money would actually be appropriated for that part of the program in India.

Mr. MUNDT. I quite agree that Congress should keep in mind all the other various programs when we approach something dealing with our foreign aid programs or the exchange of information, because, unfortunately, these activities are being handled by piecemeal legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator any information as to whether India would accept this proposal? Mr. Nehru indicated that he did not desire a gift. Might he treat this as a gift?

Mr. MUNDT. I would say that the Government of India would be an exception to the international pattern if that were the case, because assistance of this kind is almost universally accepted inasmuch as people like to form better relationships with this country, as we do with them. Many young Indians are now trying to attend our institutions of learning. They lack our kind of currency. I think they will welcome such an opportunity as would be afforded by my amendment. Certainly India will welcome the help of our technicians who will go to India and help them with the actual and immediate problems in developing the agricultural potentialities of that young country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder how the Senator from South Dakota arrived at the idea of providing that the Department of State should handle this work. I understand that the point 4 program, under the leadership of Dr. Bennett, has done remarkably good work in various countries around the world, including India, with what little they have with which to carry on the work. The information I gather is that those administering the point 4 program, under its present leadership, at least, would obtain far more beneficial results than would the State Department.

Mr. MUNDT. The reason why it is proposed that it be handled under the State Department is that the State Department now has the machinery available for carrying out a great many of the phases referred to in the bill. Furthermore, under the enabling legislation by which the machinery has been set up, the Department is empowered to utilize other Government agencies, and there is no reason why Dr. Bennett should not continue his work under the present category. As a matter of fact, the Smith-Mundt Act is handled by the State Department and it clearly provides for programs of the exact type included in my amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to have that explanation, because from all I can learn, those administering the point 4 program, in spite of limited means, are doing remarkably good work in a very practical way in many countries, and are at least starting off that work in a more satisfactory manner than some of the other agencies of our Government are operating.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his contribution.

Mr. President, since the Senator in charge of the bill is willing to accept the amendment, I shall relinquish the floor. I feel confident it will prove constitutional, since it conforms to the same pattern we are now using with the Finnish loan.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a statement which I prepared, and which I intended to use as a part of my argument had it been necessary to do so in the support of my amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO SENATE BILL 872, BY SENATOR MUNDT

Under the loan provisions of this bill, which is based on the precedent of loans to other countries, especially those participating in the Marshall plan, the Government of India will pay interest for the loan of this money. Interest payments will begin immediately. The amendment which I have offered proposes that the interest payments paid by India on its loan with which to buy the

needed grain would be remitted back to the Indian people in terms of a long-range aid program, quite apart from the grain distribution so needed at this moment.

Under the grant provisions of the original bill the counterpart funds set up by the distribution of grain through the rationing system would have been used for such developmental and experimental projects as would have increased the per acre yield in India. We have heard that every 10 years, for perhaps 900 years, India has been the victim of famine. The question has been asked: "Suppose we do help now; what about next year, and the year after, and the years after that?"

There is only one way to meet the problem of the years that lie ahead, and that is to share our agricultural prowess with India. Farmers in India are still plowing with the crooked stick; they are still irrigating with methods dating back five centuries; they are still unfamiliar with a proper program of fertilizing the soil.

Some work along these lines has already been done in India on a very small scale, partly through missionary institutions in various parts of India. These efforts can and should be stepped up. The interest on this loan is not in large enough amounts to encourage waste, and yet it is enough, staggered over the years, to encourage the kind of slow and careful work which the difference in the cultures between this country and India's makes necessary. This amendment also provides that, depending upon the need, this interest can be used to strengthen the efforts of our voluntary American agencies operating in India. Foremost among these are the Catholic and Protestant missionaries, the Salvation Army, American Friends Service Committee, CARE, and probably a number of others. These American agencies, furnishing a vitally important accessory program, need to be sustained in this critical period. Unfortunately, the events of the past 10 years have drained their resources, and yet demands mount daily in the Orient, in the Middle East, in Europe. People who go to their hospitals for medical care need accessory protein food such as dried milk, dried beans, dried eggs, and so on. The over-taxed hospitals have desperate shortages of medical equipment and supplies. The programs of these American institutions in India are constantly in review by the State Department's Advisory Committee on Voluntary Aid, and depending on the situation, discretion could be exercised as to whether the relief or the developmental angle should be stressed.

We have spent millions of dollars in presenting the case for the democratic process around the world. It would be hard to find a point of greater impact in India, in the Orient, and in Europe than the information that this country has said to India, "You have asked for a loan, and we have granted it to you. But we refuse to profit from your need, and the minimum interest we can grant you is being remitted to you in ways that can help you best."

There is plenty of precedent for the action which I propose in this amendment. As long ago as 1908 the United States returned $12,000,000 of the Boxer indemnity fund for use in improving educational relations between China and the United States. Thousands of Chinese students have been educated in our country since that time. In 1924, seeing the success of the program which we had inaugurated, we sent China $8,000,000 more.

In World War II we saw the benefit of that program vividly displayed. Chinese leaders, educated in this country, allied their country with us, and during the early trying days of the Pacific war, and because of their resistance to the Japanese, tied up many Japanese divisions on the Chinese mainland at a time when our own forces were in danger of being overwhelmed on Pacific islands.

After the war, when international conferences were being held, it is important to note that the Chinese delegates to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, the Food and Agriculture Conference, and the UNRRA Conference were all former students educated in this country on the money that Congress gave back to China over 40 years ago.

Again, in 1949, Congress approved a resolution sponsored by Senator SMITH and me, providing that payments on the debt which Finland owed us could be used for providing educational and technical instruction for Finnish students in the United States and to provide books and technical equipment for institutions of higher learning in Finland.

This action has provided an area of friendship for our country right on the border of Communist Russia. The Finns are our friends and believe in our philosophy of government. I feel confident that there is no criticism of our action in turning back the principle and interest of the Finnish debt for the great purpose of building international friendship through the exchange of persons and skills.

I believe that the principle of encouraging the exchange of persons, of providing technical training and instruction for less fortunate areas of the world is one which Congress has consistently supported and will continue to support.

I would like to mention two other programs which are now working successfully in forming bridges of friendship between our country and other nations.

In 1945, when the hostilities of World War II came to an end, the vast wartime-supply program of the United States was at a peak. Millions and millions of dollars' worth of equipment and supplies were either in action or waiting immediate use in storage depots around the world.

At that time, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], introduced an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, providing that a portion of the currencies and credits of other countries acquired through the sale of the vast amount of surplus property which we had overseas, might be used for educational purposes. The Fulbright Act, as it is known around the world, has helped accelerate the invaluable program of bringing foreign students to our shores so they might benefit from the experiences of living in a country using the free-enterprise system, so they might increase their skills for use in helping their fellow countrymen upon their return home, and, more important, so they would understand us and be our friends.

In 1948, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and I brought before Congress another bill which provided for the exchange of information, the Voice of America program, exchange of technical training and persons. This bill became Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress and is known as the Smith-Mundt Act.

The Smith-Mundt Act provides for cooperation with private organizations in promoting the objectives of the bill. I feel that this amendment follows closely the spirit of both the Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act as well as fitting into the pattern of legislation which Congress has passed providing for the Chinese and Finnish student-training programs.

With the adoption of this amendment we can help erase barriers of misunderstanding and intolerance. We can build a respect for the cultures of other peoples. We can make friends around the world and in areas where we need them. In the fight for men's minds and loyalties, we should use every facility at hand, and I feel sure that Congress will approve this idea for remitting the interest payments to India to help that tragic nation by training a few of its students, by providing some immediate charitable help to private groups in India, and, over the years, to gradually work toward the goal of giving her a self-supporting economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], on page 5 between lines 10 and 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a while ago the Senate adopted an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], to the committee amendment beginning in line 11, page 5. I now ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to, may be reconsidered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a modified amendment to the committee amendment has been agreed to by the Senator from Iowa. The modified amendment to the committee amendment is in an improved form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For the same Senators I now offer the modified amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 11, after "SEC. 8.", it is proposed to insert "(a)."

On page 5, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph as follows:

(b) No procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this act shall be made unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall find and certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment, is agreed to, and, without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of section 6 it is proposed to strike out the period and in lieu thereof insert the following: "such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite and manganese, such monazite and manganese to be added to the American Government's stockpile of critical materials and dispensed to private industry in accordance with existing law."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment is different from the one I offered previously, in that it includes manganese. Included in this amendment are two of the key materials for the defense of America. If we do not have those two materials I do not see how we can successfully defend America. Without them, I do not see how we can produce the steel alloys that go into the production of jet airplanes and other war materials.

The proposal is a very simple one. No one is trying, by the amendment, to interfere with the wheat for India. I am for wheat for India. I intend to support it. I believe it is a humane proposal. But I believe, as I said before, that we in this country cannot go to sleep, as Rip Van Winkle did, and forget all about the defense of our country. The situation is so serious now that many, including the President of the United States, are talking about the possibilities of an attack upon our country in the days and weeks and months and years ahead. If such an attack comes, let it not be said that an attempt was not made on the floor of the United States Senate to provide for the materials we so vitally need for our defense.

Twelve years ago I stood on the floor of the United States Senate, and in committees, and tried to stop the shipment of scrap iron and steel to Japan. Officials connected with the administration at that time, as well as others, stated, particularly in committees: "We cannot offend a great friendly power." That was just so much bunk. That steel and scrap iron came back to the United States in the bodies of American boys killed in the Pacific.

We have now before us a similar issue. Are we going to dodge it, or meet it? I say this is the issue: Are we going to defend America, or are we not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It seems strange that there has been some conflict of testimony between the Bureau of Mines and others as to our need for monazite, and also some conflict as to local deposits which are practical for working.

On the 2d day of March 1951 Mr. E. J. Lintner, Chief, Additive Alloys Branch, Office of Materials Resources, wrote a letter to Representative KERSTEN, of Wisconsin, as follows:

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1951.

DEAR MR. KERSTEN: In reply to your letter of February 28, 1951, we are only too glad to supply you with the following information regarding monazite.

Monazite was included in the original group of critical and strategic materials covered by Public Law 117, June 7, 1939. The derivatives of monazite have a number of direct and indirect military applications, such as those in searchlight arc carbons, portable gasoline lamp mantles, radio tubes, radio condensers, aerial photographic lenses, optical glass itself as well as a polishing medium for the glass, colored eyeglasses, lighter flints, military pyrotechnics, as a scavenger in the production of explosives, as a purifier in certain alloy steels, and in the new cerium-magnesium alloy for jet engines. Normal United States annual requirements amount to approximately 3,000 tons of monazite. * * *

The principal world sources of monazite are India and Brazil. Small quantities are produced in the United States (Florida and Idaho). For the period 1940–50, we produced approximately 4 percent of our total requirements, the balance being made up almost equally by India and Brazil. It is apparent therefore that we depend very heavily upon imports.

In 1946 India placed an embargo on the export of monazite. However, we received a few hundred tons in 1947, but nothing more since that year. In the last quarter of 1950, exports of monazite from Brazil were prohibited by executive decree. A bill that was signed by President Dutra on January 15, 1951, made the executive decree final. The State Department is making every effort toward correcting the situation with the above countries.

* * * In an effort to improve the stockpile position, we recently changed the purchase specification to cover not only monazite but also an ore known as bastnasite, that is found in California, Nevada, and the Belgian Congo, and the derivatives of these ores. These measures, however, will prove of slight help and our only hope of ample supplies will continue to be the existing world sources.

I have attempted to cover all the points raised in your letter and if there are any further questions, do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. LINTNER,
Chief, Additive Alloys Branch,
Office of Materials Resources.

Mr. President, note that the letter says:

For the period 1940–50, we produced approximately 4 percent of our total requirements—

Of monazite. That comes from an authoritative source of Government.

Note that the writer also said:

In the last quarter of 1950, exports of monazite from Brazil were prohibited by executive decree.

That decree became final in January 1951.

It seems there are only two sources of monazite; the first one is India, the second is Brazil. Brazil has been cut off by a decree signed in January of this year. That leaves India as our only source, except for our own local sources, which will provide only 4 percent of our needs.

It will be noted that Mr. Lintner, who is the Chief of the Additive Alloys Branch of the Office of Materials Resources, had this further to say:

These measures, however, will prove of slight help and our only hope of ample supplies will continue to be the existing world sources.

It seems strange, Mr. President, that all the emphasis should be placed on monazite sand as an ingredient of atomic energy. As a matter of fact, the Office of Materials Resources points out that it is used in manufacturing searchlight arc carbons, portable gasoline lamp mantles, radio tubes, radio condensers, aerial photographic lenses, optical glass, and a great many other critical items which are necessary for the defense effort.

Mr. President, since we produce locally only 4 percent of our requirements, and since we have been shut off from Brazil by a legislative decree of Brazil, that leaves only India as our source of supply. Therefore, I wonder what happens to the testimony which has been offered by the Bureau of Mines. There is something wrong, and some of the Government agencies ought to get together. But it seems that the letter I read was written before this issue became too acute in the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I support the effort made by the Senator from New Hampshire, because I think what his amendment proposes is in the interest of defense.

Further, if he will yield for one other observation, it seems to me that if we are going to follow the thesis of resisting Soviet and Russian materialism in the world, we had better find out who is friend and who is foe, who is going to stand in our corner, who is willing to stand up and be counted, because the struggle now is for keeps. We cannot go on forever with the capricious and arbitrary temperament which is working in this particular field. We want to know who will stand up in our corner and be counted. Otherwise, the things which are involved here must be considered as weapons, and as things which will strengthen the American economy and the American resistance effort.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator. The issue is very clear. If we believe that the security of America may be endangered in the years to come, if we want to prepare adequately, if we want the materials which are vital to our defense, such as jet engines, we ought to vote for this amendment. It has nothing to do with the humanitarian aspects of the situation in India. I am in favor of sending wheat to India. But it is time that we took our heads out of the sand and started to think about the defense of America. If the time comes a month from today, a year from today, or 5 years from today, when America is attacked and some of our cities are laid waste, and Americans are killed by the thousands, or even by the millions, as some are predicting, let Senators remember, if they cast their votes against this amendment, that they cast them against jet engines, which might be used in defending this country against such an attack.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes?

First, I wish to agree with what the Senator from New Hampshire says about obtaining and stockpiling strategic metals and minerals in this country. Today we are indeed short of a great many strategic materials, particularly copper, sulfur, pure iron, manganese, asbestos, and I do not know how many others.

We could be producing immense quantities of these commodities, Mr. President, if we could obtain the power to operate the mines and the plants which produce the materials. Most of them are found in the northeastern section of the United States. We have power going to waste not only at Quoddy, but in the St. Lawrence River. At one dam on the St. Lawrence River there is power going to waste which is the equivalent of the continuous labor of 30,000,000 laborers.

In Vermont we are producing 8 percent of the asbestos used in this country. We

cannot produce any more under present conditions. We are producing 8,000,000 pounds of copper annually, from one of the richest veins in North America. We cannot produce any more for want of power. In Vermont we are wasting possibly 100 tons of sulfur a day, and we cannot recover it. We are wasting 150 tons of pure iron every day, and we cannot recover that, either. That pure iron is an absolute necessity, not only in our atomic energy plants, but in other lines of industry. We must have power.

It seems to me that now is the time for the Congress to take steps to liberate that power and make it available so that we can produce for ourselves the metals and minerals for which we now have to send to the ends of the earth.

Mr. President, it is not India which is blocking the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. It is not Russia. It is not any other country on the face of the globe. It is a small clique of people here in the United States that is blocking this development. Canada is extremely anxious to have it developed as it is vital to the security and prosperity of that country, too. So let us use our heads and authorize the development of power and navigation which will to a great extent make us independent of the other countries of the world with respect to these strategic materials.

I understand that there are probably large deposits of manganese in the State of Maine. We know that the largest deposits of titanium in the world are in the lower St. Lawrence region. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to let these deposits lie untouched and depend on countries 10,000 or 15,000 miles away for our supply, or are we going to use common sense and provide for the security of the Nation by authorizing the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and the production on the St. Lawrence of power, which, as I have said, at one dam alone would provide energy equal to the labor of 30,000,000 Chinese coolies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the Chair). The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think I was speaking on the time of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. I am not sure.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Vermont wish some additional time?

Mr. AIKEN. I thought I was using time granted by the Senator from Iowa rather than the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Iowa would have been very glad to have yielded time to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let us settle this. I am always glad to extend a courtesy to my distinguished neighbor from Vermont. However, I did not yield him any time, and I certainly did not understand that he was using my time.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not, either.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, this colloquy is being taken out of my time. If the Senator from New Hampshire was more generous than he intended to be, it will always be put down to his credit.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Have I 5 minutes left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield the time consumed by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Senator from New Hampshire has 5 minutes left.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Against whose time is the time consumed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] charged?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Against the time of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, have I 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. A few moments ago I discussed this question when a similar amendment, having to do with monazite sand, was offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. Here we have raised again the same issue which I tried to explain then. I read extensively from my speech on page 5266 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, May 14, pointing out that this question had been carefully considered by the committee. It had been carefully considered by those who sponsored the Ferguson amendment, which has just been adopted. I pointed out that the whole matter is covered by section 6 of the Ferguson amendment, which has just been adopted as a part of the pending bill. Let me read it again:

> SEC. 6. The credit terms provided for in section 4 shall include repayment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator for Economic Cooperation and the Government of India), or otherwise of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources.

This opens the door to negotiation for these materials. As I stated, we had evidence that there was some difficulty in our dealings with various countries, including India, and that this was a matter of negotiation, and negotiations are now pending. If we desire to have certain embargoes lifted, it was the judgment of the committee—and it is my judgment—that to make the question of these raw materials a mandatory condition in this emergency case is dealing with the problem in the wrong way. If our representatives cannot handle this question in direct negotiation with the Indian Government, certainly we should not try to bring it into the bill and make it a condition of the loan.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In a moment. We have just changed the bill from a grant, which is one thing, to a loan, which is another thing. The Indians have asked for a loan on reasonable terms, and that is the legislation now before us.

It seems to me to be a serious mistake to have this issue raised again. We have just voted against the previous amendment. I cannot see any difference between that and the present amendment. It seems to me that we should leave the situation as it is provided for in section 6.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is there any hope of negotiating with the Government of India?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think there is no question about it. When this question previously arose, I read what Mr. Nehru said last Thursday. In the RECORD of Monday last I quoted from Prime Minister Nehru's statement in the Indian Parliament last Thursday, as follows:

> There is a reference to our supplying various kinds of materials to the United States of America in part payment for the grain supplied. We shall gladly supply such materials as are available in India and can be spared by us. But I should like to make it clear that it is a fundamental part of our foreign policy that such material as is particularly related to the production of atomic or like weapons should not be supplied by us to foreign countries.

I pointed out that as a matter of policy today we must negotiate with the Indian Government to lift its embargo with respect to any materials having to do with atomic weapons.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I do not understand why the Government of India should object. They have materials which are in scarce supply with us, such as manganese, mica, and castor oil for example. We have always had a considerable surplus of wheat. I believe that in the last 50 years there were only 2 years, 1934 and 1936, in which we produced less wheat than we consumed. It would seem to me that here we have a natural situation. We could trade wheat, which we have in surplus, for materials which India has in surplus. It would be a good deal for both of us.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is exactly what the bill contemplates. It contemplates that the loan would be paid off with materials that we need. We have provided for it in section 4. Mr. Nehru said he was familiar with it, and he has approved of the principle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the life of me I cannot understand why we should not write into the bill the kind of condition which is proposed, and why we should not pinpoint our needs by saying to some other country, "We have a deficiency in certain materials, and you have a surplus of them. We have a surplus of wheat." We can then set up a credit arrangement and can arrange for them to get American wheat in exchange for their manganese, for example. Our needs are approximately a million and a half tons of manganese a year, and we produce only 200,000 tons a year in the United States. Consequently there is a deficiency of more than 1,250,000 tons. They have the mines, they have the railroad running down to the docks, and they have the workers. Therefore I see nothing wrong with particularizing our own needs.

Some years ago I heard a Presidential candidate say that there is an expression among lawyers to the effect, "Always get your fee while the tears are hot." We made a mistake in lend lease. We wrote out nothing in particular. Today we cannot even get back our ships. We can get nothing back except a kind of counterfeit system of accounting which yields about 5 cents on the dollar. Are we going to be suckers in the present state of our security and danger to our country and our free system? I believe it is high time that we became just a little selfish. I am not unmindful that the Apostle Paul placed the virtue of charity at the head of the list. But charity can be misplaced at times. Certainly no one in his right mind would suggest that a charitable donation be made to the Chinese Reds of 2,000,000 tons of grain. I think at this particular time we can use some judgment, and develop a stockpile when materials are available.

In a statement made by Prime Minister Nehru on the 10th of May he said that India would send to us critical materials in proportion as India could spare them and as they were available. What was testified before the committee? It was said that they wished to save their dollar balances and their sterling balances to further their 6-year public-works program.

Suppose they decide that someone else will pay them in sterling, and they need the cash. What happens? It will be said that the material is not available. It will not be there to spare for the United States of America in a critical hour. I believe the time has come for us to stand up and look about and think in terms of our needs, and then determine who is in our corner and who is not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GILLETTE. I yielded 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. GILLETTE. If the Senator from Vermont was recognized in my time, it was not in accordance with any yielding of time by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa be granted five additional minutes, to compensate him for the time I used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the amendment, which would require substantial quantities of monazite and manganese to be shipped in order to implement the agreement, bears upon a subject which we considered at some length in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe the Senate should know that in the case of monazite sands there would be no immediate atomic energy purpose to be served if we were to have possession of monazite sand today. There is a prospect that at some future time there will be separated from such sand a product called thorium, which may be a source material for the production of atomic energy.

I wish to call attention to the fact that in our own organic law governing atomic energy affairs we have imposed an embargo on the shipment of thorium and uranium from this country. We must understand the feeling of the Indian people, after 150 years of what they regard as exploitation, that the great stock of monazite sands which they have in the province of Travancore on the Indian Ocean is the source of perhaps the future power which they need to develop their economy. As I see it, the value to us today of monazite sands rests in what are called the rare earths, and they are indeed rare. It was because of that situation that we discussed with the State Department, more particularly with Ambassador Pauley, who has had great experience in India, the question of developing a situation whereby we could get some of the supplies of monazite sands. Great progress has been made along that line.

I cannot go any further into the matter at this time. I think it was the consensus of all the members of the committee that we were going to be able to develop the situation to the satisfaction of the people of our country and the needs of our security. It is a delicate situation. I recognize the appeal that can be made by the Senator from Illinois, who talks about getting one's fee while the tears are hot. I dislike the analogy, because I believe it will put us at a great disadvantage in the very country where we are seeking not only to alleviate great human misery, but also to build some goodwill for ourselves and for the free world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not correct to say that the rare earths which are particularly important are not in controversy here? That is to say, the Indians have never refused to export them. It is the monazite, which we really do not need——

Mr. McMAHON. It is the thorium.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. That is what is involved. The rare earths, which we need, India has never embargoed. The fact that the principal party in this country interested in the material is in the State of Illinois may have some bearing on the sympathies of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not know about that, but I do say that this problem is being attacked rationally and intelligently by a man who has done in India some things which have inured to the advantage of our country. I refer to Ambassador Loy Henderson, who, in the same province of Travancore, erected a fertilizer plant which has done much to improve the food situation not only in that province, but, in fact, in that entire section of India.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I move that the amendment be amended by striking out the word "substantial"; and I now wish to address myself to the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut why we should give the wheat to India rather than have India pay for it. Of course, we understand that any loan made would be merely a loan in name only, similar to the loans we have made to Britain and other countries. When such a so-called loan is justified, perhaps it is all right, but I should like to have the Senator explain why India is not required to pay for the wheat. I suppose it is proposed that we give India the wheat because India does not have the money with which to pay for it. Is that the explanation that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut would give?

Mr. McMAHON. No. We are making this wheat available, and the whole transaction, as I understand, is predicated upon the fact that there is threatened—and, in fact, already is existing—a famine the like of which even India has never seen before.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Just a minute; I am going to give the Senator the answer to his question.

Mr. MALONE. Then let us get to the answer.

Mr. McMAHON. I have the floor, Mr. President, and I do not yield now.

The reason why we are taking this action, I presume, is because we intend to exercise some of the moral leadership which we in this country so frequently talk about. I say I hope we are doing it for that reason.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Very well; let the Senator proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I assume that we are handling the matter in this way because we wish to exercise our moral leadership, and not because we wish to drive the hardest kind of bargain we could drive.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Very well; I should like to say that, in addition to the element of great moral leadership, we should consider the fact that ordinarily when one has money he buys the food he needs. Is it because India does not have the necessary money that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut would have us furnish this great moral leadership, without payment?

Mr. McMAHON. I understand that the result of the amendment which was submitted about an hour ago is that now all the wheat will be delivered on a sale basis, rather than on the basis of part sale and part gift. I assume that the Senator from Nevada is aware of that.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, we are giving India a gift, and a gift alone, just as we have given other nations so-called loans, but never have heard of the "loans" again. In other words, in this case, as in other cases, the loan is to be a loan in name only, and we use that basis of procedure in order to put salve on our feelings when we vote for this measure.

Why does not India pay for the wheat if she has the money with which to pay for it; or does India lack the necessary funds? That is what I wish to know.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator can address himself to that point in his own time.

Mr. MALONE. I certainly will; but I wonder whether the Senator from Connecticut has any idea of what he is doing.

Mr. McMAHON. I have every idea of what I am doing. I wish the Senator from Nevada were equally sure of what he is doing.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. No; I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I say again that I think the Senate should know that the Foreign Relations Committee and the State Department have not been insensible to this question, but have attempted to initiate a program which will bring us these vital materials. Manganese, as I understand—and I think I am accurately informed as to this—is now being shipped to the United States. It is true that there is an embargo on the monazite sands. I believe there is being worked out a program which will give us the rare earths, but will enable India to keep the thorium.

If this amendment were added to the program, I believe it might result in killing the entire transaction. I hope that would not be the result, but I am certainly fearful that that might be the final accomplishment of those who would press for the adoption of this amendment.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that we would better accomplish our objective, which is to obtain the needed materials, by not adding an amendment which would kill the entire transaction and might result in our never getting any part of the materials we need, to say nothing of bringing to us the ill will which would result if the people of India were able to say that millions of their fellow citizens were starving because we refused to make provision which would give them at least a chance to avoid that terrible catastrophe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question is——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Is the vote now to be taken on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, striking out the word "substantial" in the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, how much time do Senators have in debating amendments?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that 20 minutes is allotted on each amendment by the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will answer the parliamentary inquiry: Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 20 minutes is allotted on each amendment, with the time to be divided equally, so that there will be 10 minutes on each side on each amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire has 10 minutes on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to his amendment; does he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator from Iowa, if he is opposed to the amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire will control the time in opposition. If the Senator from Iowa favors the amendment to the amendment, then the Senator from Nebraska will control the time in opposition.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I should like to have the Chair ask the Senator from Iowa whether he favors the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I now withdraw my amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment is withdrawn.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. The Senator from New Hampshire has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa whether he will be willing to accept my amendment.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am not willing to accept the amendment. I think it is fully covered in the general terms of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators. However, I am willing to take the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to conference, to see if the language can be worked out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator from Michigan rise?

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to inquire whether the Senator from New Hampshire has any time remaining, so that I may ask a question.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, have I any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

CREDIT FOR GRAIN FOR INDIA

Mr. MALONE. Then, Mr. President, I offer an amendment to be inserted in the proper place in the bill:

That India pay into the United States Treasury, to be deposited in a special fund, the delivered cost of the wheat supplied under this act, in rupees at the current rate of exchange, the rupees so deposited to be used in payment for any future materials purchased from India, at the then rate of exchange.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will send to the clerk's desk his amendment, which will be reported in the usual manner.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if you will bear with me, I shall state the amendment from memory, after which I shall send it to the desk to be read. I continue:

Such rupees to be available to any individual purchaser, at the current rate of exchange.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment, which I ask to have read in the regular manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

INDIA TO PAY IN HER OWN CURRENCY

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert:

The nation of India to pay into the United States Treasury, to be deposited in a special fund, the delivered cost of the wheat supplied under this act, in rupees at the current rate of exchange, the rupees so deposited to be used in payment for any future materials purchased from India, at the then

rate of exchange; such rupees to be available to any individual purchaser, at the current rate of exchange.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

INDIA COULD PAY WITH HER OWN MONEY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the effect of this amendment would be that the nation of India could pay for the wheat with her own money. I had inquired of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut why it was necessary to give the wheat to India in the first place, or to loan the dollars with which to pay for the wheat, since we have found through sad experience over quite a long period of time that such a loan to Asiatic or European countries really means an outright gift.

This amendment would merely require India to deposit her own rupees in the United States Treasury, in a special account, such rupees representing the cost to the United States Government of the wheat wherever delivered; and that those rupees in the special account would then become available for the future purchase of any material from India by our Government, or by any individual in the regular commercial trade between individuals of the two nations.

The amendment includes the provision that the rupees shall be available to any individual purchaser, at the current rate of exchange, whenever he may desire to purchase them, for the purpose of dealing with the nation of India or with an individual trading in the products of India.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Am I correct in understanding that the object of the Senator's amendment is to work out an equitable method of exchange, or a method of paying for the exchanges of commodities which may be made?

CURE INDIA'S DOLLAR SHORTAGE

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, that this amendment provides a simple method by which the nation of India may purchase the necessary wheat with her own money.

The junior Senator from Nevada presumes, although our record is not very clear on the matter, that our reason for loaning India the money to purchase the wheat is because she does not have the necessary dollars with which to purchase the wheat.

CONNECTICUT SENATOR DECLINED TO ANSWER

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut declined to answer the question, but I presume that is the reason. If a dollar shortage is the reason, then we would take her money at the current rate of exchange, which is about 20.6 cents to the rupee at the present time—about 5 to the dollar.

We would take it at the current rate of exchange, in full payment for the wheat delivered, wherever we make delivery.

REGULAR TRADE WITH INDIA

Those rupees would then be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, to finance future purchases from India, whether it be purchases of hemp, monazite sand, manganese, or any other material which our Government or an individual might purchase from India in the future.

It means that any individual within the United States who desired to trade with India would only have to apply to the United States Treasury for the rupees, which he would purchase at the current rate of exchange, and then do his trading with India.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator feel that that would solve the problem? If a nation has a right to impose export duties at any time it desires, would that not change the value of the rupees? Would it not be better for us to leave the matter as it is, to open and fair dealing between the parties?

Mr. MALONE. No; the imposition of export duties would have nothing to do with the value of the rupee.

If India wants to impose an export duty on manganese or on the monazite which we require, or on any other material, she has the clear right to do so. She can do that now, and, in fact, most of the nations we deal with do just that, so we pay both ways—it is a part of their plan.

Mr. FERGUSON. They can place an embargo on it.

Mr. MALONE. They can place an embargo on exports, too. There are many different trade barriers used. However, if India should seek every refuge from paying her just debts, we would at least know where we stand, and it would then be clearly demonstrated that we were not gaining her good will.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan could not agree that it would be worth that.

NO NATION COULD ASK FOR MORE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada can see nothing wrong in offering India or any other nation the materials which they say they need and offering to receive payment in their money; they certainly have nothing to lose by the transaction, and they certainly could not ask for more.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, if India placed an embargo on everything, we would not have to ship her the rest of the wheat, would we?

Mr. MALONE. No; and I would say it would not be conducive to neighborly relations all around, if she deliberately tried to nullify her bargain with us by any such subterfuge.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The wheat is to be shipped within the next few weeks or months, is it not?

Mr. MALONE. Let the wheat be shipped when the Indian rupees are paid into the United States Treasury. I think the distinguished Senator from Michigan will find that there will be no such embargo placed on all materials. Even India could not face the world as a known dead beat. We need aid, too, such as strategic materials.

Such aid should not be a one-way street. We are trying to make friends, but we have been trying to buy friendship; we are like the man in the street handing out $20 bills to make friends. He finds that he has friends only until the $20 bills are gone.

I understand the Senator's viewpoint, but there is only one reason for giving anything to any other nation, presumably, and that is because that nation does not have the money with which to pay for the things it needs.

LOANS TURN INTO GIFTS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe I heard the Senator from Nevada use the expression that this was "a gift or grant." As now set up, with the amendment, it is not a gift, it is not a grant; it is a loan, is it not?

NO SIGNIFICANT REPAYMENTS OF LOANS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I will merely refer the distinguished Senator from Michigan to the RECORD. We always go over this and mouth the platitudes, that we are, for example, loaning money to Britain, or loaning money to some other country; but no one ever hears of repayment of the money. If the distinguished Senator can point to a single comparable case in which money loaned to any country has been repaid, it would be very helpful.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan can. He cites the case of Finland.

Mr. MALONE. Oh, well, that is true, little Finland, now a satellite nation, has been paying her debts, but she is pointedly the only one—and her debt is not significant in the general picture.

Mr. FERGUSON. Any nation that wants to maintain its credit must observe its agreements.

Mr. MALONE. I ordinarily would fully agree—but it seems that none of the usual rules apply to our ventures into the international loaning business—none of them seem embarrassed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Finland is not under Russia. Anyone who visits Finland realizes that she is not under Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Finland is generally considered a satellite of the Russian nation—any independent move on her part against Russian interests has always been met with retaliatory measures.

Mr. FERGUSON. Finland has had to pay Russia a large penalty by way of reparations.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct, she has been forced to pay and we became a party to her humiliation, to our eternal discredit.

Mr. FERGUSON. But Finland is not under Russia.

Mr. MALONE. She is a Russian satellite nation—that cannot be denied—and is always subject to retaliation if she does not conform. We gave $3,750,000,000 to Britain; I suppose the Senator will agree to that—we have not been repaid—and that the prospects for such repayment are not bright, to say the least.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the Senator does not admit that we gave it.

Mr. MALONE. We gift-loaned it.

Mr. FERGUSON. We loaned it.

Mr. MALONE. And they still owe it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. We gave them $3,750,000 and they still owe it. We gave them lend-lease, and they still owe it. We gave them UNRRA loans, and they still owe them. In other words, they owe practically everything we ever loaned them and of course we know that they never intend to pay.

I propose this amendment to give India a chance to show good faith.

If we arrange for India to use her own money to purchase the materials, including the food she needs then she should have and could have no valid objections.

A SIMPLE EXCHANGE

They do not have to have dollar exchange; so we simply take our pay in her own rupees and keep the rupees until we buy from her the goods she has to sell. It looks like the most reasonable thing in the world to use rupees to purchase materials from India which we have secured from her in payment for the wheat which she now needs.

It is the reverse procedure—suppose she lifted the embargo on manganese, which we need—we pay for it in dollars—she puts the dollars in a special account until she needs more wheat.

The simplicity of the transaction either way might be difficult for a Government bureaucrat to understand—but not for the Senate of the United States.

EMBASSY EXPENSES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I invite the attention of the Senator to the expenses in connection with our Embassy, and the expenses of our consular officers, which offer an opportunity for expenditures and exchange.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator is entirely correct. We have our representatives there. We buy land and construct buildings and expend money in other activities; under my amendment we shall have the rupees to spend for those purposes also.

OUR PEOPLE ARE HARD-PRESSED

Again, Mr. President, I say that the only reason I can see for giving anything outright to anyone, when our taxpayers are so hard-pressed and we are raising taxes almost every day, would be because they do not have our dollars to pay for it—so when we offer to take their own money in payment there is no reason for the gift. Gasoline taxes were proposed to be increased yesterday by an additional one-half cent.

Speaking for people who make their living the hard way, outside of Washington, people who are not on a Government payroll, I want to say that they are not all prosperous. They are not all living on the payroll of the Government. Perhaps 60 percent of our people are hard pressed to pay their taxes and keep their children in school. We should explore the ways and means to save their money—not to spend it in reckless and thoughtless ways.

WE MUST QUIT UNSOUND PRACTICES

The junior Senator from Nevada has some concern as to how we are going to keep taxes paid and also keep our economic health. How long can we keep the pace we are going—giving away our substance on every hand.

The purpose of my amendment is simply to set up a businesslike deal.

The current rate of exchange is approximately 5 rupees to the dollar. After we should conclude this business deal, when we purchase anything from India, regardless of what it is, we can purchase it on the then current rate of exchange, using the Indian rupees received for the wheat. India does not need dollars for her purchase from us—and we would not need dollars to purchase needed goods from her.

It would be a good-neighbor deal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to speak only 1 or 2 minutes with reference to the amendment. The Senate has adopted the so-called Ferguson amendment, under the terms of which there is authorized a loan or credit terms as provided by section 111 of the ECA Act. Under the provisions of that act, as amended, the exact terms and conditions on which credit can be established with India can be determined. The effect of the proposed amendment is to lay down certain terms in negation of the authority we have given by adopting the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Clearly, the amendment of the Senator from Nevada has not been thought through by him. It is a new departure in our dealings with foreign nations by which we are to be paid with printing-press money. The very principle of the amendment which was adopted awhile ago was to bring about a firm money basis, a dollar exchange basis, instead of 50 percent of the amount being in blocked money, for use in the maintenance of embassies, and for other purposes.

How can we justify granting what the Senator from Nevada, unwittingly, is trying to accomplish in this case, with our good friends in the western part of Europe, when we are on a dollar basis in our dealings with them? We do not accept their rupees, their francs, their guilders, or any similar currency. We want the exchange in dollars. This instance clearly indicates the danger of trying to write on the floor of the Senate amendments to an important bill dealing with foreign policy. It would certainly be devastating to our relations with other nations if the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I merely desire to keep the record straight. We have not yet received from any of these nations the money in any form whatsoever. I did not understand that they were paying us in gold. What the Senator from Nevada is trying to do is to obtain some sort of a commitment so that the money can be used to buy supplies from India, whether it be manganese or some other commodity. Can the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma point out any kind of money we are getting?

Mr. MONRONEY. On the direct loans made by the ECA we are receiving payments in dollar exchange. The other countries do not have gold. What the Senator from Nevada is trying to do is to provide for accepting cigar coupons or anything else they may happen to have.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The question was raised a moment ago by the Senator from Michigan, in response to a question which I asked the distinguished Senator from Nevada, as to whether we might shut off shipments if it is expected that all the wheat covered by the bill will be delivered in a few weeks. Does the bill provide for transportation?

Mr. GILLETTE. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. Who is to furnish the transportation?

Mr. GILLETTE. The cost of the transportation is to be paid by India.

Mr. WHERRY. Are the shipments to be made in any bottoms they can secure for the transportation of the wheat?

Mr. GILLETTE. Fifty percent of the wheat is to be shipped in American bottoms.

Mr. WHERRY. That is according to the amendment with reference to our merchant marine. The wheat will not be laid down in India at any particular time, but will be shipped in an orderly fashion from our own ports, will it?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, it will take months, not weeks.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GILLETTE. I withdraw my statement with regard to yielding the remainder of my time, in order to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa knows that an amendment was proposed as to shipment on a 50–50 basis, which is the usual

provision in all foreign-aid bills. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], in my absence, posed the point to the committee. It is not provided in exactly the same language, but I notice from the report on the bill that the committee feels that section 8 incorporates by reference the shipping provisions of the ECA Act of 1948, as amended. I wonder if the Senator feels that that section sufficiently covers and protects the 50–50 provision.

Mr. GILLETTE. I stated to the Senator from Maryland that in the opinion of the Senator from Iowa, and in the opinion of the committee, it does.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared regarding the pending bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

The appeal from hungry India for food is one that strikes a responsive chord in the hearts of our people. Never has the United States refused aid to victims of disaster. And it is in this humanitarian spirit that the proposals to furnish 1,000,000 tons of food grains will be viewed and should be approved by the great mass of our citizenry.

We must not withhold the necessities of life from starving people because of the ill-advised actions of their leaders. We don't reach our decision because of Nehru, but in spite of him. The poor, helpless millions have had no part in his pronouncements.

This is Christian charity in action. Our Divine Lord when He was on earth did not refuse His help to human beings because their rulers were embittered toward Him. In later centuries His missionaries, notably St. Francis Xavier, the Apostle of the Indies, ministered to the human needs, as well as to the spiritual.

In supporting the legislation I point out the desirability of doing everything possible to assure the people of this country, who are, in the final analysis, paying the bill for so much of this food, that the actual distribution will be on the basis of need alone and that under no circumstances will anyone reap financial or other benefits thereby.

It is noted that the bill provides in section 6 very definitely that no assistance under authority of this act shall be made available until an agreement is entered into between India and the United States—

(a) to distribute the supplies made available under the act among the people of India without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief.

Also, in section (C) it is provided that the agreement between the two countries shall permit persons designated by the Government of the United States to observe without restriction the distribution in India of supplies made available under authority of the act.

It seems pertinent to emphasize these points because, all too frequently, during World War II, and particularly since the close of hostilities, there have been recurring reports from various countries to the effect that distribution of foodstuffs have not been made on the basis entirely of justice and need, but quite often, to the contrary, such distribution allegedly has served to enrich certain public officials or others, at the expense of the destitute persons for whom the foodstuffs were provided by this country.

The people of our country generally should be assured, under carefully established arrangements, that the foodstuffs which they supply will go entirely to the hungry people of India and that none of it will be distributed in a manner to benefit any single person financially or be distributed on any other basis than, as the bill so properly provides, "without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief."

A great American President once summarized the opinion of the citizens of this great country when he declared, in response to a demand from the Barbary pirates for ransom, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." In connection with the proposed grant and loan to India to meet the emergency needs which have arisen there, and as a pattern for all future grants or gifts by this country to meet emergency situations, we must paraphrase that quotation and make it, "Millions for humaritarian purposes, but not one cent to enrich any one, anywhere along the line."

In justice to the United States merchant marine and American seamen likewise, it should be emphasized that the committee in its report declared in favor of the proposal to require shipping of 50 percent of the food grains in American-flag vessels. Such an amendment to the bill, offered by the distinguished senior Senators from Washington and Connecticut and the senior Senator from Maryland, was not specifically included, the committee pointed out, because it seemed advisable that the 50–50 shipping provision of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, should be made applicable to these shipments.

This is so provided in section 8 of the bill as reported, which is satisfactory to me as one of the cosponsors of this provision in the ECA legislation. I feel confident it will accomplish the end desired, namely, to insure that the American merchant marine be assured participation, and that American seamen be given proper consideration in the matter of transporting supplies to be authorized under this proposed legislation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, yesterday in the debate on the wheat-to-India bill the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] asked me the amount of foreign aid in the form of grants and loans. I was unable to give a specific figure at the time. I have looked up the figures and have obtained figures from the Treasury Department. The pamphlet which I hold in my hand, dated March 1951, is entitled "Foreign Transactions of the United States Government." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the debate on the bill and before passage of the bill, the table listed on page 1, which gives the gross foreign aid less returns, and the net foreign aid.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

	War and postwar periods	Postwar period	War period
Gross foreign aid	79.4	30.2	49.2
Grants utilized	69.0	20.8	48.1
Less: Credit-agreement offsets to grants	1.3	1.3	
Credits utilized	11.7	10.6	1.1
Less: Returns	10.7	2.4	8.3
Reverse grants and returns	8.8	.9	7.9
Principal collected on credits	1.8	1.5	.4
Equals: Net foreign aid	68.8	27.8	41.0
Net grants	58.9	18.6	40.3
Net credits	9.9	9.2	.7

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At the same time the Senator from Nebraska asked me about the terms of the ECA loans. I hold in my hand a pamphlet entitled "Supplement to Foreign Transactions of the United States Government," dated February 1951. I ask unanimous consent to have the summary of agreements on loans and other credits outstanding, appearing on page 1 of that pamphlet, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Summary of agreements on loans and other credits outstanding, by agency, by type, by country, as of June 30, 1950*

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT: MARITIME ADMINISTRATION: MERCHANT SHIPS

	Date signed or authorized	Principal outstanding (thousands of dollars)	Interest rate	Date next payment due		Date final payment due	Agreement provides for payment in—		
				Principal	Interest		Real property	Foreign currency	United States dollars
Total		184,757	*Percent*						
Brazil	Various	5,338	3½	Various	Various	Various	No	No	Yes.
China		14,555							
Finland		854							
France		46,610							
Greece		31,392							
Italy		54,280							
Netherlands		7,217							
Norway		12,483							
Peru		3,400							
Philippines		1,806							
Turkey		5,212							
Uruguay		1,617							

TABLE 1.—*Summary of agreements on loans and other credits outstanding, by agency, by type, by country, as of June 30, 1950*—Continued

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT: ARMY DEPARTMENT: SURPLUS PROPERTY

	Date signed or authorized	Principal outstanding (thousands of dollars)	Interest rate	Date next payment due		Date final payment due	Agreement provides for payment in—		
				Principal	Interest		Real property	Foreign currency	United States dollars
			Percent						
China	Nov. 29, 1945	20,000				Indefinite	No	No	Yes.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—LOANS THROUGH EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Total		983,067							
Belgium	Nov. 24, 1948 Mar. 31, 1949 June 30, 1950	47,900	2½	June 30, 1956	June 30, 1952	Dec. 31, 1963	No	No	Yes.
Denmark	Oct. 28, 1948 Feb. 23, 1949	31,000						Yes	
France	Oct. 29, 1948 Feb. 28, 1949	172,000						No	
Iceland	July 22, 1948 June 30, 1949	2,300						Yes	
Ireland	Oct. 28, 1948 Feb. 23, 1949 Dec. 22, 1949 June 30, 1950	95,757						No	
Italy	Oct. 29, 1948 Mar. 7, 1949	67,000						No	
Luxemburg	Nov. 17, 1948 Mar. 31, 1949 June 30, 1950	3,000						No	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 872) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, because of the illness of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], it is our intention to postpone until next Monday the consideration of the bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, commonly known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, the calendar be called from the beginning for the consideration of unobjected-to bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO ATTORNEY EMPLOYED BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to state that there is on the calendar a bill, Senate bill 630, Calendar No. 227, to suspend until December 31, 1952, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is desired to consider this bill at the earliest possible date. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who objected to the bill when it was reached on the calendar, is ill. I hope the distinguished minority leader will try to get in touch with the Senator from Utah to ascertain whether it is agreeable to him that the bill be considered tomorrow in his absence. I do not want to request its consideration unless such action is agreeable to the Senator from Utah. I do not like to do such a thing, of course. But if it is agreeable to the Senator from Utah, I should like to have the bill considered tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his observation. I shall take up the matter with the majority leader tomorrow, after I have gotten in touch with the office of the Senator from Utah. He is very much interested in the bill and would like to be present when it is considered. I hope the Senator from Arizona will bear that in mind, and, in case the Senator from Utah cannot be present, I should very much appreciate it if some other measure could be considered instead of the bill mentioned by the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Some small bills perhaps can be disposed of tomorrow after the call of the calendar.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to say that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been having the services of this counsel for several months, without any compensation being paid to him. Unless the bill referred to by the Senator from Arizona is passed, we will be left without the services of a counsel who is familiar with all the work of the committee. That would be very unfortunate.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator, however, would not ask that the bill be taken up in the absence of a Senator who is ill and until he can return to the floor?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Arizona will bear with me, I will say we will do our level best to iron out the matter. I want to cooperate with the majority leader to bring before the Senate bills he desires to have considered and to have them determined as expeditiously as possible. I shall be glad to extend every courtesy possible to the Senator from Montana. I realize the situation his committee is in. I think the matter should be considered as quickly as possible. We will do our best to iron out the situation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude taken by the Senator from Nebraska on this matter, but I hope it will be found possible to take action on the bill; otherwise this man would be obliged to leave the committee. That would result in the committee being without a counsel who is familiar with its work, and who has been working for the committee for a long time.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, several of the minority members of the committee have stated that the man in question is rendering splendid service to the committee and they also are anxious that the bill be disposed of so that he may be retained. I do not want to take up the bill in the absence of the Senator from Utah, however.

Mr. MURRAY. I have consulted with Republican members of the committee and they have said they are anxious that the bill be passed so the services of this man may be retained.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] desires to have the floor. Before he begins his speech I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate consider the nominations on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the first nomination on the calendar be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the first nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other nominations on the calendar will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF JAMES P. FINNEGAN BY ST. LOUIS, MO., GRAND JURY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I noticed a press dispatch which just came over the ticker, which I wish to read for the information of the Senate:

ST. LOUIS.—United States Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS turned down an invitation to testify before a Federal grand jury investigating income-tax frauds here.

United States Attorney Drake Watson, who sent the invitation to the Delaware Republican last week, quoted WILLIAMS as replying that he "does not feel it necessary" to be heard by the grand jurors.

In order that the record may be kept straight, I desire to read my correspondence with Mr. Drake Watson. Under date of March 10, 1951, Mr. Watson wrote me a letter, which was received at my office over the week end. The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI,
St. Louis, Mo., May 10, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Our grand jury is in session and will probably be in session for 2 weeks or more. They will convene next week on Tuesday morning and will run through Friday evening.

The grand jury is, of course, interested in getting any and all facts bearing on or showing the commission of crime on the part of anyone in connection with the collection of Federal income taxes or other tax-law violations. This is one of the primary matters being investigated by this grand jury at this time.

The grand jury has requested me to convey to you an invitation from them to visit and appear before the grand jury and give them the benefit of any facts you may have bearing on or tending to show a violation on the part of anyone of the law and particularly with reference to the processing or collection of the Federal Government revenues, or the conduct of the offices or persons functioning in the offices of the said department about which you may have information that will be helpful in ferreting out crime.

Trusting you will give this invitation your consideration and will let us know whether or not you will be able to appear here, and if so, when, I am

Very truly yours,

DRAKE ..ATSON,
United States Attorney.

That letter, as I stated, was dated May 10, 1951, and arrived in my office over the weekend. On Monday of this week I addressed to Mr. Drake Watson the following letter, which I will read to the Senate:

MAY 14, 1951.

Mr. DRAKE WATSON,
United States Attorney, Eastern District of Missouri, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. WATSON: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 10, 1951, extending an invitation for me to appear before the St. Louis grand jury in reference to your investigation of James P. Finnegan and his activities while serving as collector of internal revenue in the St. Louis district. I do not feel that this is necessary since all the data contained in my speech in the United States Senate on May 7, 1951, a copy of which is enclosed, may be obtained by you from the following sources:

If you will requisition the income-tax returns of Mr. James P. Finnegan for the years 1944 to 1951, inclusive, you will find that those returns have been examined by special agents of the Intelligence Unit, and attached thereto are photostatic copies of the letters and agents' reports relating to the payments to Mr. Finnegan for his services to the corporations mentioned as well as photostatic copies of the minutes of the American Lithofold Corp. relating to their financial arrangements.

Included in the files of the Treasury Department here in Washington is another report, which you should examine, which is signed by Frank W. Lohn, special agent in charge, and Rudolph H. Hartmann, special agent, dated February 19, 1951, addressed to the "Chief, Intelligence Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C.," file No. SI-13134-M, in re: "James P. Finnegan, collector of internal revenue, St. Louis, Mo." This report documents the financial arrangements between Mr. Finnegan and Mr. John Martin Brodsky which are referred to in the latter part of my speech.

The Treasury Department should also furnish you with a copy of a report dated July 12, 1950, signed by H. B. Holt, special agent, and Thomas E. Scandon, supervisor of accounts.

A confirmation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's loans to the American Lithofold Corp., the Rel Investment Co., and the Dodier Realty & Investment Co. referred to in my remarks may be obtained from either the St. Louis office or the Washington office of the RFC.

A confirmation of the payments by the Government to the Warwick Operating Co. may be obtained either from the Treasury Department or from the Coast Guard headquarters here in Washington. A confirmation of the letter itself relating to these payments was attached by the special agents along with other letters to Mr. Finnegan's 1947 income-tax returns.

It is possible that these files referred to above might have been turned over by the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice; however, you should have no difficulty in obtaining them from one or the other.

In view of the fact that all of this data is currently documented in the files of either the Treasury or the Justice Departments you should feel no reluctance nor experience any difficulty in obtaining them for presentation to the grand jury. The Treasury Department might well have other information of which I am not aware, and I would therefore suggest that you request all such information dealing with the case.

In conclusion I call your attention to the fact that practically all the corporations and individuals named in my report and those named in the files of the Department are residents of St. Louis and therefore readily available as witnesses.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. President, I see no reason in the world why Mr. Watson, as United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, should not subpena those files if he is having any difficulty in obtaining them from the Department in Washington which he represents. I assume that he has not requested them, since he is asking me to bring them down. If Mr. Watson feels any reluctance about requesting information from the departments in Washington, after having been told exactly where the files are, I most respectfully suggest that he turn in his resignation and get out, so that we may select a man down there who has no fear of enforcing the law as it should be enforced.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know whether the able Senator from Delaware is aware of the fact that the term of Mr. Watson, United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, has expired or will expire within the next day or two. I presume he is aware that Mr. Finnegan, the collector for the eastern district, who is the subject of the Senator's observations, has already resigned. So, we presume and expect, neither of these gentlemen will be serving in his official capacity very much longer.

As the Senator from Delaware knows, Judge Moore, the judge of the eastern district, has for some time had control of the grand jury. He has charged the grand jury on these matters and has called the grand jury back and charged it again. The grand jury is now proceeding with its inquiry and I am sure it would be very happy to have any information of benefit to it from the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his statement. I am very glad to know that Mr. Watson is being relieved, because I have been somewhat concerned that Mr. Watson, as United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri failed at the time Judge Moore first called the grand jury together in March, to obtain the information which I placed before the Senate on May 7, and to place that information before the grand jury.

I believe that Judge Moore is doing an excellent job in that district, and is really trying to get to the bottom of the situation. I fully recognize the fact that in this country any man is innocent until he is proven guilty. I recognize that fact in Mr. Finnegan's case. However, any Government official whose files in Washington contain such damaging information and evidence as I called to the attention of the Senate last week should recognize that such evidence must be presented to the grand jury so that it may be given an opportunity to act.

I have been very much concerned with Mr. Watson's apparent reluctance to present this information to the grand jury. I was particularly concerned when I read in the press that he seemed to feel

that the whole case rested on the Senator from Delaware going to St. Louis and prosecuting the case. I do not believe that that is the attitude being taken by the Federal judge. I wish to congratulate him on the manner in which he has been handling this case. I think he is trying to get to the bottom of it, and I hope he can.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise merely to have printed in the RECORD copies of two letters to which the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] referred.

The first is a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, to the Senator from Delaware, dated April 21, 1951. There is only one paragraph in that letter which seems to be pertinent to the inquiry now being made by the grand jury in St. Louis into some affairs of the former collector of internal revenue. That paragraph reads as follows:

The collector at St. Louis voluntarily resigned earlier this month. You may rest assured that in the event any irregularities are found in that office, appropriate steps will be taken to effect their correction. I am determined that the revenue laws shall be administered without partiality or favor.

I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 21, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you for your letter of April 11, 1951.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his staff have indicated to you in some detail the steps which have already been taken to correct lax administrative conditions in the Third Collection District of New York. While some of the supervisory personnel have been withdrawn, there are still five men from the Washington headquarters group remaining in that office. The effectiveness of the steps taken by this group is reflected by the present much improved condition of that office.

A few months back Commissioner Schoeneman requested Collector Johnson's resignation. As you know, neither the Commissioner nor I have any power of removal over the collector. However, we have been trying for some time to find a strong person we could recommend to replace Collector Johnson—one who would be capable of holding and improving the gains we have made in the work of that office. In our efforts to obtain the proper kind of a replacement a number of persons have been considered. We have found that some did not possess the necessary qualifications, while others amply qualified have declined to accept the position. I hope that our efforts will soon result in obtaining the right person. Due to the presence of the headquarters group, however, the work of the office during this time has not suffered.

The collector at St. Louis voluntarily resigned earlier this month. You may rest assured that in the event any irregularities are found in that office, appropriate steps will be taken to effect their correction. I am determined that the revenue laws shall be administered without partiality or favor.

Your interest in the effective operation of the Bureau is heartening.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. SNYDER.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have been furnished also with a copy of a letter from the President to Mr. James P. Finnegan, the former collector. I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD, because it speaks for itself. It is in a single sentence.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 4, 1951.

Mr. JAMES P. FINNEGAN,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. FINNEGAN: Your resignation from your position as collector of internal revenue for the St. Louis district is accepted as of the close of business Saturday, April 14, 1951.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. GEORGE. As I stated during the address made in the Senate on Monday a week ago, I believe, by the distinguished Senator from Delaware, I know nothing of the facts with respect to this particular office, and nothing with respect to this particular former collector. Of course, nothing that I have to say would be misinterpreted, I am sure, in view of that statement. I merely wish to make this statement in behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury. I have been at some pains to ascertain from his office the facts insofar as he was in a position to furnish me facts. I find them to be substantially as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury has given full instructions that every effort be made to assist the grand jury at St. Louis.

That the Department has made available and is continuing to make available all returns, records, and reports of every description pertinent to the matter under inquiry.

That it has also assigned many of its agents and attorneys to render any assistance in connection with the grand jury investigation which it may request.

That testimony has been and is being freely given, and no measure has been spared by the Treasury Department to insure that all information which the grand jury may wish to have is promptly furnished.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the names of the agents who were sent to St. Louis were stated to me. I know them to be among the best men in the Department to handle a matter of this kind.

In an organization of 55,000 persons, scattered throughout the United States and that is the total number of revenue officers and agents, of course, in some isolated instances a breach of trust may be expected to develop here and there. From my own experience with the internal-revenue system, both under Democratic and Republican administrations, I have found the general organization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, both in Washington and throughout the country, to be singularly free from any just criticism, particularly after the facts had been brought to the knowledge of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or the Secretary of the Treasury, or after the facts had been discovered by these officers through their intelligence agencies.

I am particularly happy to say that I believe Mr. Snyder to be sincerely desirous of administering the Office of Secretary of the Treasury in a manner which will be above reproach. I am assured that in this instance, as in other instances, he is undertaking to aid and assist in the development of all the facts which may be pertinent and relevant in the case of the former collector in St. Louis.

I thought I ought to make that statement. I wish to repeat that the facts which have been developed through the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and which in my opinion he properly referred to the district attorney in St. Louis for presentation to the grand jury, are, of course, unknown to me, and I have had no opportunity to do more than to make inquiry regarding the prosecution of the case by the grand jury at this time.

DREW PEARSON'S STATEMENT CONCERNING CERTAIN LETTERS OF GENERAL WEDEMEYER

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, on May 6, 1951, Mr. Drew Pearson in his Sunday evening broadcast made the following statement, to which my attention has been called:

SAN FRANCISCO.—Another top general has written critical letters about far-eastern policy, Gen. Albert Wedemeyer. Wedemeyer's letters were sent to Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, but BUTLER has not made them public, so far.

Mr. President, the above statement is as far from the truth as it would be possible to make it. Lieutenant General Wedemeyer is from Nebraska, having been born and raised in Omaha. His mother still resides there. It is true that I have had some letters from the general—two or three during the past year—but never have I received a letter from him that was critical of his superiors or of the administration. All his letters to me have been relative to purely personal matters. I am making this statement simply because I want the record kept straight.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for any length of time. I wish to refer to a question which has arisen during the hearings now being conducted by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly.

The question at issue will be decided by the committee tomorrow insofar as it relates to an appeal from the decision of the Chair. I wish to make a statement at this time in view of the fact that some comments have been made to the press earlier in the day.

The reason the senior Senator from California feels so strongly in regard to the matter is that he has been in the Senate long enough to realize that each precedent that is established makes it more difficult to change a procedure later. I believe a very fundamental issue is involved. If the question of privileged communication can arise in this particular case, I predict it will arise

in later cases growing out of the so-called Blair House meetings on June 25, 26, and 27 of last year, at the time this Nation was precipitated into the Korean war.

I furnished to the combined committees this morning, and I wish to furnish for the RECORD and for the information of the Senate this afternoon, a list of casualty figures of several wars in which the United States has been engaged.

In the Revolutionary War we had 12,172 casualties. In the War of 1812 we had 6,765 casualties. In the Mexican War we had 16,399 casualties. In the Spanish-American War we had 9,530 casualties. Therefore in the four wars combined we suffered a total of 44,866 casualties.

Mr. President, we have now been engaged in the Korean war for approximately 11 months, and our casualties amount to approximately 65,000.

In other words, our casualties in the Korean war are considerably greater than the total casualties of the four wars to which I have referred.

In addition to the wars which I have mentioned, we have had five military expeditions, from 1898 to 1916. These were the Philippine incident, the Cuban pacification, the China relief, the Mexican border incident, and the Punitive expedition. In all of them together we suffered 7,392 casualties. In the four wars and five military expeditions we suffered a grand total of 52,258 casualties, as compared with approximately 65,000 casualties in 11 months of the Korean war alone.

For the information of the Senate, the only other wars in which we have been engaged have been the Civil War, with 646,352 casualties; World War I, with 333,734 casualties; and World War II, with 994,893 casualties.

As every Member of the Senate knows, the Constitution itself in Article I sets out the powers of the Congress of the United States. Among those powers specifically assigned to the Congress of the United States is the power to declare war.

Mr. President, I am now getting to a point which I think is very basic. In the discharge of our constitutional powers and responsibilities to declare war, or, if it is already in being, to recognize that a state of war exists, each Member of the Senate of the United States—96 of them—and each Member of the House of Representatives—435 of them—has every statement he makes, either for or against the resolution to declare war or to recognize that a state of war exists, properly reported by the press and written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that every person is on notice as to where the Senator or Representative stands. When the time comes to pass on such a resolution, as when President Wilson came to Congress and asked for a declaration of war, or when President Roosevelt asked that a state of war be recognized, a record is made of what each Member says and how he votes in the discharge of his responsibility to his constituents, to the Nation as a whole, to his God, and to his own conscience. That is as it should be in a responsible government. After all, we live in a republic under a responsible constitutional government. We assume certain obligations when we undertake the job of Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, and the public has a right to call upon us from time to time to account for our actions.

However, Mr. President, we now have passed from the clear basis of constitutionality envisioned by the framers of the Constitution—where the elected Members of Congress would have that responsibility and duty and would have to stand or fall by the action they took—to a twilight zone or area where five men or three men or seven men meeting in the Blair House—I do not know the exact number of men who met there; I do not know whether that fact has ever been disclosed—finally, after a period of discussion in camera, determined that our Nation would become involved in the Korean war.

Mr. President, that has nothing to do with the desirability or lack of desirability of our becoming involved there; but I merely state as a fact that under those circumstances—with the public not present and with the press not present—a decision was reached which put this Nation into a war which already has cost us more casualties than have four of the wars in which our Nation has been involved. If we can be put into a war in which we have 65,000 casualties in 11 months, and if Congress is denied the right to have full information on the subject of the decisions leading to our participation in that war, then I submit that at a future date our country might be put into a war under similar circumstances, and in that war the casualties might be, not 65,000 but 250,000, or perhaps 1,000,000.

Mr. President, here is where we come to the basic issue now confronting the combined committees. Undoubtedly in the very near future questions will be asked in regard to the Blair House meetings on June 25, and June 26, and June 27. Are we again to be faced with the defense or the objection that that relationship is a confidential one between the President of the United States and his Cabinet advisers? Are we again to be confronted with the statement that those communications are privileged? If we are, then the American people immediately will be confronted with a situation in which they have been put into a war once, and might be put into a war again without having the individual advisers of the President, who advised him as to the steps to be taken, chargeable with any accountability.

That does not happen when the Congress votes on the issue of whether our Nation will or will not be involved in war, because in the latter case every Member of Congress is on record when he votes on that issue and everything he says in Congress in connection with that issue is said publicly and is made a matter of public record.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that the Cabinet Departments are creatures of the Congress. The Congress can create a Government department and the Congress can eliminate a Government department. It is true that the Departments have certain relationships with the President of the United States, but they also have certain relationships with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, when we speak of the Pentagon Building's having a policy, we do not mean that the Pentagon Building, a building made of concrete and steel, in itself can speak, because obviously it cannot. Those who have offices in the Pentagon Building and who represent the Defense Department can speak only through the responsible official who is over them, either the Secretary of National Defense or someone who is authorized to speak for him.

Similarly, when we speak of the State Department's speaking on matters of policy, we do not mean that the actual building downtown speaks on such matters. Obviously the building itself cannot speak; but the officials of that Department can speak, and those statements come to us through either the Secretary of State or someone who is authorized to speak for him.

So, Mr. President, in connection with the meetings and discussions which occurred in the Blair House on the 25th, 26th, and 27th of June in regard to the question of whether our Nation would be involved in peace or in war, I think information as to what occurred at those meetings is pertinent to the present inquiry, because the committees making the inquiry already have available to them the fact that prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, our military authorities did not consider the Peninsula of Korea to be a particularly good place in which to be engaged in a war. However, for some reasons—perhaps good or perhaps bad—what had been the decision and judgment of our responsible military authorities was reversed.

Was that change suggested by the Department of State? If so, what the Secretary of State said at those meetings is pertinent. Or are we to have an iron curtain lowered at that point; and whenever that question arises, are we to be told that the relationship existing at those meetings was a confidential one, inasmuch as the Secretary of State then was advising with the President of the United States, and that therefore that matter is not to be a subject of our inquiry?

Mr. President, I shall have more to say about this matter at a later time; but at this time I submit that if that precedent stands, time after time in the future we may be confronted with a refusal to disclose similar information to some of our other committees or to these two committees.

In connection with the basic question of peace or war, a question which impinges not on the constitutional prerogatives of the President, but on the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress of the United States, I wish to serve notice here and now that I intend diligently to make inquiries, so that we shall not establish a precedent that in the future this country can be taken into a war in camera, so to speak, where neither the Congress nor the public will know the facts in regard to those who place our country into war or in regard to the basic decisions which are made at such a conference.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 17, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 16 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joe Warren Sheehy, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Texas, vice Hon. Randolph Bryant, deceased.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Claude L. Draper, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1956 (reappointment).

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William J. Storen, of Charleston, S. C., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C. (reappointment).

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following-named commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the rank indicated:

To be commanders

Maurice A. Hecht, effective July 6, 1951.
James C. Tison, Jr., effective July 12, 1951.
Edmund L. Jones, effective July 14, 1951.
Edward B. Brown, effective July 15, 1951.
John C. Ellerbe, effective July 16, 1951.
John C. Tribble, Jr., effective July 17, 1951.
Kenneth S. Ulm, effective July 18, 1951.

To be lieutenant commanders

Howard S. Cole, effective July 1, 1951.
Lorin F. Woodcock, effective July 2, 1951.
Marvin T. Paulson, effective July 6, 1951.
David M. Whipp, effective July 12, 1951.

To be lieutenant

Allen L. Powell, effective August 16, 1951.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Hubert W. Keith, Jr., effective July 5, 1951.
Dale E. Fisher, effective July 12, 1951.
Gordon D. Scott, effective October 21, 1951.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Ralph R. Wilson, Rockport.
William J. Dowd, South Walpole.

MINNESOTA

Marcel E. Novotny, Badger.
Raymond J. Dryden, Thief River Falls.

NORTH DAKOTA

David F. Cordner, Bismarck.

PENNSYLVANIA

John A. Linder, West Fairview.

WISCONSIN

Wayne L. Reader, Almond.
Lloyd C. Steckbauer, Aniwa.
William R. McCarville, Darlington.
Joseph L. McDonald, Endeavor.
John J. Walsh, Lannon.
Harry J. Kelley, Manitowoc.
Walter D. Hansen, Neshkoro.
Gordon E. Schuler, Plymouth.
Florian L. Schmidt, Sherwood.
Henry G. Eckert, Sister Bay.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, who art found by those who truly seek Thee, known by those who love, and seen by all whose hearts are pure, grant that daily we may be numbered among the seekers and finders of God, seeking and finding Thee here and everywhere.

May the words of our mouth, the meditations of our heart, and the work of our hands be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

By unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 15, 1951, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family;

S. 119. An act for the relief of Joseph Girardi;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorenson;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen;

S. 822. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert Sternberg; and

S. 824. An act for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 205, the Chair declares the House to be in recess for the purpose of holding memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials.

Accordingly the House stood in recess to meet at the call of the Speaker.

MEMORIAL SERVICE PROGRAM, MAY 16, 1951

Prelude, sacred selections (11:30 to 12)—United States Marine Corps Orchestra
Presiding Officer—The Speaker
Hon. SAM RAYBURN
Invocation—The Chaplain
Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D.
Solo, There Is No Death (O'Hara)—Mr. Robert C. Nicholson
At the piano—Staff Sgt. George Manof
Scripture reading and prayer—The Chaplain
Roll of deceased Members—The Clerk of the House of Representatives
Rose ritual—Hon. REVA BECK BOSONE
Representative from the State of Utah
Devotional silence.
Address—Hon. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.
Representative from the State of Georgia
Solo, Requiem (Homer)—Mr. Nicholson
Address—Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
Representative from the State of New York
Taps—Master Sgt. Edward L. Masters
Echo—Staff Sgt. John A. Gosling
Benediction—The Chaplain

The Members of the House rose and stood while the relatives of the deceased Members were escorted to seats in the House Chamber by the Committee on Memorials, preceded by the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER presided.

INVOCATION

The CHAPLAIN. Eternal God, our Father, whose heart always opens with love in response to our many needs, in the life of each of us there are times and experiences when all our feelings seem to impose silence.

We thank Thee for the joys which cheer us and for the trials which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

Grant that in this hour of sacred memory we may enter into a blessed communion with Thy spirit and the spirit of all upon whom Thou hast bestowed the benediction, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

SOLO

Mr. Robert C. Nicholson sang There Is No Death, by O'Hara.

Staff Sgt. George Manof accompanied at the piano.

SCRIPTURE READING AND PRAYER

The CHAPLAIN. The Scripture readings are taken from the Old and New Testaments.

Psalm 85:

I will hear what God the Lord will say; for He will speak peace unto His people and to His saints.

Psalm 23:

The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul; He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

In St. Paul's great chapter on the resurrection, the fifteenth of First Corinthians we find these words:

Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.

For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.

For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for as much as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.

John 14 to which struggling humanity has made a beaten path:

Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me.

In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.

And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also.

Peace I leave with you. My peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.

The following poem entitled "The Other Room" written by Robert Freeman, is a beautiful commentary on the gracious words which came from our blessed Lord:

"No, not cold beneath the grasses,
Not close-walled within the tomb;
Rather, in my Father's mansion,
Living in another room.

"Living, like the one who loves me,
Like yon child with cheeks abloom,
Out of sight, at desk or school-book,
Busy in another room.

"Nearer than the youth whom fortune
Beckons where the strange lands loom;
Just behind the hanging curtain,
Serving in another room.

"Shall I doubt my Father's mercy?
Shall I think of death as doom,
Or the stepping o'er the threshold
To a bigger, brighter room?

"Shall I blame my Father's wisdom?
Shall I sit ensv athed in gloom,
When I know my love is happy,
Waiting in the other room?"

Let us pray.

O Thou, who are the author and disposer of human life, from whom our spirits have come and unto whom they return, through Thy holy word Thou hast spoken and in our own hearts Thy voice is heard.

Grant that in our times of need we may not turn our eyes upon the ground whence no help can come but may we turn them heavenward and unto Thee.

We thank Thee for Thy servants who walked and worked with us for a little while upon this earth and who are now with Thee in heavenly blessedness, having received the reward of their faith and fidelity, even the salvation of their souls.

We rejoice that whatever was beautiful and noble in their life, in Thy sight and our sight, abides forever. We have not said "farewell" but only "good night," hoping on some blessed morn to meet and dwell with them in hallowed union in that fairer land whose language is music and where joys are unceasing.

May the sorrowing and lonely be blessed with the consolations of Thy grace and may they daily avail themselves of the companionship of that friend, who sticketh closer than a brother and who abides with us not only for a day but throughout life and eternity.

We pray that Thou will also so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Enable us by Thy grace to carry on in faith, in faithfulness and in the fear of the Lord and at the eventide of life, when Thou dost call us to Thyself, may we receive a glorious entrance into that Kingdom of eternal blessedness which Thou hast prepared for Thy children.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

ROLL OF DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. George J. Maurer, reading clerk of the House of Representatives, read the following roll:

VIRGIL MUNDAY CHAPMAN, a Senator from the State of Kentucky; born March 15, 1895; lawyer; editor in chief of the Kentucky Law Journal, 1917 and 1918; graduated from the law department of the University of Kentucky at Lexington; city attorney of Irvine, 1918–20; elected to Sixty-ninth and Seventieth Congresses; elected to the Seventy-second and to the eight succeeding Congresses; elected to the United States Senate in 1948; died March 8, 1951.

ARTHUR HENDRICK VANDENBERG, a Senator from the State of Michigan; born March 22, 1884; editor and publisher of the Grand Rapids Herald from 1906 to 1928; he was an author; chairman of the Michigan State Commission which placed the statue of Zachariah Chandler in the Capitol in 1913; appointed to the United States Senate on March 31, 1928; elected to the Senate on November 6, 1928, and served continuously until his death; delegate to United Nations Conference in 1945 at San Francisco; delegate to United Nations General Assembly at London and New York in 1946; United States adviser to the Council of Foreign Ministers at London, Paris, and New York in 1946; delegate to the 1947 Pan American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; President pro tempore of the Senate from January 4, 1947 to January 3, 1949; died April 18, 1951.

JOHN LESINSKI, a Representative from the State of Michigan; born January 3, 1835; attended Detroit University; organized several business enterprises in Michigan; for many years president of the Polish Citizens' Committee of Detroit; State commissioner in charge of the sale of Polish bonds in 1920; awarded the Polonia Restituta by the Polish Government; delegate to three Democratic national conventions; elected to the Seventy-third and the eight succeeding Congresses; chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses; died May 27, 1950.

WILLIAM LEMKE, a Representative from North Dakota; born August 13, 1878; graduated from the University of North Dakota and Yale University; studied law at Georgetown University; admitted to the bar in 1905 and started practice in Fargo, N. Dak.; member of the national executive committee of the National Nonpartisan League from 1917 to 1921; chairman of the Republican State committee from 1916 to 1920; attorney general of North Dakota in 1921 and 1922; Union Party candidate for President in 1936; elected to the Seventy-third and the three succeeding Congresses; then elected to the Seventy-eighth and to the three succeeding Congresses, and served until his death, May 30, 1950.

ALFRED LEE BULWINKLE, a Representative from the State of North Carolina; born April 21, 1883; studied law at the University of North Carolina and was admitted to the bar in 1904 and started practice in Dallas, Gaston County, N. C.; delegate to practically all of the Democratic State conventions since 1904; prosecuting attorney for the municipal court in Gastonia from 1913 to 1916; captain in North Carolina National Guard from 1909 to 1917; served on Mexican Border and, as a major, in the American Expeditionary Forces; United States adviser in the International Civil Aviation Organization Conference at Montreal, Canada, and Geneva, Switzerland, in 1947; elected to 14 Congresses, including the Eighty-first; died August 31, 1950.

HERBERT ALTON MEYER, a Representative from the State of Kansas; born August 30, 1886; attended Staunton Military Academy, Staunton, Va., and George Washington University, Washington, D. C., and graduated from National University Law School, Washington, D. C., in 1910; he was admitted to the bar in 1910; served as a captain in the United States Army Air Corps; he was assistant to the Secretary of the Interior Deparment from 1915 to 1917; a successful businessman and a publisher; he served in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses; died October 2, 1950.

JOHN BERCHMANS SULLIVAN, a Representative from the State of Missouri; born October 10, 1897; graduated from St. Louis University in 1918; served as a private in the First World War; admitted to the bar in 1921 and started practice in St. Louis; delegate to the Democratic State Conventions in 1928, 1932, and 1940; associate city counselor of St. Louis from 1936 to 1938; secretary to the mayor of St. Louis from 1938 to 1940; author of the St. Louis smoke elimination ordinance; special assistant to the United States Attorney General in 1947 and 1948; elected to the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-ninth and the Eighty-first Congresses; died January 29, 1951.

FRANK BUCHANAN, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania; born December 1, 1902; graduated from the University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., in 1925; taught in the high schools of Homestead and McKeesport, Pa.; entered business and became an economic consultant; served as Mayor of McKeesport, Pa.; elected to the Seventy-ninth Congress and was reelected to the Eightieth, Eighty-first, and Eighty-second Congresses; died April 27, 1951.

JOHN KEE, a Representative from the State of West Virginia; born August 22, 1874; attended West Virginia University at Morgantown; studied law; was admitted to the bar in 1897 and began practice in Glenville, W. Va.; he served as counsel for the Virginia Railway Co. from 1902 to 1910; in 1916 he started special legal work in Mexico; he was a member of the State senate from 1923 to 1927; he was elected to the Seventy-third and to all succeeding Congresses; chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs; died May 8, 1951.

Mrs. BOSONE, a Representative from the State of Utah, standing in front of the Speaker's rostrum, placed a memorial rose in a vase as the name of each deceased Member was read by the Clerk.

DEVOTIONAL SILENCE

There followed a period of devotional silence, during which the Members stood.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Hon. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR., a Representative from the State of Georgia, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, each civilization develops its own peculiar customs, and one of ours is to wait until death comes to give full confession of love and respect for our friends. And so today, in accordance with a long-standing custom, we are met to pay affectionate tribute to our colleagues who have departed this life during the past 12 months.

This is a tender moment for all of us who knew so well the seven Members of the House of Representatives and two Members of the Senate whose memories we honor today. It is a moment when we can put out of our minds all thoughts of material things and permit our recollection to bring before our eyes in real-

istic pageantry the hours, the days, and years spent in pleasant association with these noblemen.

Natures' own nobleman, friendly and frank
Is a man with his heart in his hand.

It is a moment of intense reality, for as we heard the honor roll called, we realized to what great extent the angel of death has been among us, and it wakes up within us the thought that we too may soon be brushed by its wings.

His wings are gray and trailing,
Azrael, Angel of Death.
And yet the souls that Azrael brings
Across the dark and cold,
Look up beneath those folded wings,
And find them lined with gold.

It is a moment of great reverence as we lift our voices in adulation, firm in the belief that listening ears in the far-off yonder will softly hear and accept the tribute we pay their precious memory.

Moreover, it is a moment of humility when the spirit takes hold and we tremble in the thought of our unworthiness. We stand in the warmth of the rays from God's light of love and all too often never look up to see from whence it comes. Let us pause in the sacredness of the hour to acknowledge our debt of love to Him who giveth life and taketh it away.

Yes, it too is a moment of consecration; a moment full with fresh thoughts of the passing from our midst of our valued friends who, beyond any doubt, won by their devoted service a seat in that invisible Congress presided over by Him from whose rulings there is no appeal. This is a moment for consecration and rededication to the proposition of immortality to the end that when the time comes to yield our term on earth that we may inherit a legacy of eternal membership in that body supreme, there to join those we honor today. I am constantly reminded of the philosophy expressed by Ingalls in his eulogy of Ben Hill, of my native State, when I ponder the glories of heaven. He said:

Every man's life is the center of a circle. Within its narrow confines he is potential; beyond he perishes. And if immortality be a splendid but delusive dream, if the incompleteness of every human career, even the longest and most fortunate, be not perfected and supplemented after its termination here, then he who fears to die should dread to live, for life would be a tragedy more desolate and inexplicable than death.

How can we find it in our hearts to believe that God will break faith with all the sons of men on the assurance of the words of Genesis:

And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

And it is on this premise that we gather today, joined by the families and close friends of our late Members, to hallow their memory with our inadequate expressions of devotion and appreciation.

These great men gave freely to the effort to preserve our Republic. Theirs the effort to see to it that representative and constitutional government for a free people did not succumb, that equality of opportunity under the law should always survive; that the restraint of the mighty and the protection of the weak be a legal fact and not an academic fiction. Theirs to hold to the ancient faith of the founders—to preserve the old fidelities of policy, to revere the precedents honorably established—but likewise to pioneer in new fields of remedy and procedure when the old order grew archaic and unstable. And there lies one of the distressing problems of congressional service; to make decisions to abandon an established tenet of policy honored during the reach of years, but now found inadequate to meet the evolution of events and the fickle currents of public opinion. It is no easy thing to remove "the ancient landmarks thy fathers have set" and neither is it a trivial thing to choose a safer outpost than the old fortress to be abandoned. Our honored colleagues measured up in the highest degree to all responsibilities devolving upon them.

No one knows better than the members of the families of these distinguished gentlemen, the sustained stress and strain of serving in Congress; the years trimmed from a normal expectancy because of the arduous hours spent in meeting duty with full measure of effort. We saw them working when they should have been resting. We noticed the hours they spent at night and on week ends dealing with the problems of the hour. We heard them spurn the advice of friends and colleagues to desist from strenuous effort, but devotion to duty overruled better judgment and now they are gone.

Farewell, friends, yet not farewell;
Where I am, ye, too, shall dwell.
I am gone before your face,
A moment's time, a little space.

Mr. Speaker, not only were our revered colleagues good men with a high sense of appreciation for moral and spiritual values, but they were wise men. How interesting it has been to me to study the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read how well and truly each of them left for posterity great words of wisdom, words of admonition. Some of these statements are startlingly accurate in caution and prediction.

Listen to the words of ARTHUR VANDENBERG, architect of the United Nations, spoken on January 10, 1945:

Mr. President, we still have two major wars to win. I said "we." That does not mean America alone. It means the continued and total battle fraternity of the United Nations. It must mean one for all and all for one; and it will mean this, unless somewhere in this grand alliance the stupid and sinister folly of ulterior ambitions shall invite the enemy to postpone our victory through our own rivalries and our own confusion. The United Nations, in even greater unity of military action than heretofore, must never, for any cause, permit this military unity to fall apart. If it does, we shall count the cost in mortal anguish, even though we stumble on to a belated, though inevitable, victory.

On February 28, 1941, JOHN KEE, who so recently left us, made a significant plea for lend-lease when he said:

We must supply this aid to England in this her time of need, not alone because it is her need, but because it is our need and the need of every other free and liberty-loving nation on earth. And if, with our help, England wins and we are saved from the horrors of war, we will be in position to lead the world back to the ways of peace, back to a love of justice and liberty, back, let us hope, once more to the love and worship of God.

We recall the timely warning given on June 27, 1949, by FRANK BUCHANAN when he said:

We have advanced a great step forward away from isolationism. Some people would try to make out that questioning of funds for foreign aid, both ECA and arms for Europe, mean a new wave of isolationism. It is a healthy sign, rather than a pessimistic one, because there is a real regard for caution and a raising of the question as to how much we really can afford to spend.

We, as Members of Congress, should awaken to the idea and to the hard economic fact that this Nation's resources are not without limit.

How right was HERBERT MEYER on July 25, 1950, when he cautioned:

In these critical days every precaution should be taken to see that no materials and supplies from the United States or any of the countries allied with the United States in the effort to confine communism should reach the forces arrayed against us.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the archives of the Congress we find well established in the record the story of the yearnings of these men for the creation of conditions and laws insuring a higher standard of living for their fellow countrymen. Allow me to quote further. These are almost familiar words from VIRGIL CHAPMAN, uttered on June 15, 1948:

Nothing is more fundamental than that the permanence and the prosperity of American institutions depend on the intelligence and character of the American people. Cultivated mind is the only leadership which free people will accept and free government cannot function long or successfully unless it derives its powers from an electorate of intelligence and character. There is more of the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights in the public school system than in any other of our cherished institutions. It is the symbol of democracy in the broadest and most vital sense in which that word can be used, including the kind of democracy that teaches every man to be his brother's keeper and to love his neighbor as himself.

Listen to ALFRED BULWINKLE on July 26, 1946, who was so long a hospital patient before his passing:

This hospital bill (Hospital Survey and Construction Act) * * * will do much to alleviate suffering, and to make the lot of many people easier. It will place this Nation of ours in the forefront of all nations in public health and public welfare.

The voice of WILLIAM LEMKE can be heard as he said on December 17, 1937:

Congress should now assume its constitutional duty and again write the Nation's laws. It should write a farm bill which will give to the farmers cost of production for that part of commodities consumed in the United States. It should write a labor bill which will give to every laboring man a living wage—an American standard of living. The time is at hand when the intelligent people of this Nation must wake up and assume their responsibility.

Then comes the voice of JOHN LESINSKI, independent and challenging, on April 19, 1946.

I care little whether legislation has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the administration so long as it is for the benefit of the many.

Striking a true tone, JOHN SULLIVAN pronounced on June 24, 1949:

I subscribe to the theory of good housing as an investment in good citizenship. I know of no single factor in our society that has more to do with shaping the American way of life than the homes our people live in.

These are but samples of the record of constructive service our brethren carved for themselves. These are but brief exhibits from a great file of evidence already accepted by the court of public acclaim.

And so, standing before the monuments these gallant men erected for themselves while among us by deed and kindly act, we bid them farewell—in sorrow but with uplifted hearts. We mourn with their loved ones; and in bereavement we recall that, while all men must meet death somewhere on the way, these our colleagues were privileged to meet it on the open road, in the day of their service, with their honors full upon them. But before we turn away we would take the sculptor's chisel and cut these words upon their monuments of alabaster clear—

Les, I have lived! Pas on
And trouble me with questions nevermore—
I suffered. I have won.
A solemn peace—my peace forevermore.
Leave me in silence here.
I have hope, no care,
I know no fear;
For I have borne—but now no longer bear.

SOLO

Mr. Robert C. Nicholson sang Requiem, by Homer.

Staff Sgt. George Manof accompanied at the piano.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, a Representative from the State of New York, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we are once more met to commemorate the passing, this year, of nine of our friends and colleagues.

It is well that we should pause, even now when the world is in such confusion and turmoil and stop to think of them, of what they were, of what they stood for, and in what they believed. We come here not as men and women grief-stricken and without hope but to renew our faith in the work that these men did and were doing, to gain courage from their example and strength from their steadfastness.

There is, in very truth, a closely knit fraternity that exists in the Congress of the United States. We all have the same problems, the same disappointments, the same successes and failures regardless of party labels, and so when we die in harness, as these nine have done, giving the last full measure of service to their country, we pause with pride and understanding and we seem to hear the words, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

These men worked to the last. They did not spare themselves. Many times, we know, that they were asked to rest, to halt, but to save themselves they could not and would not and for that, too, we admire them.

I saw a picture the other day of a young and dashing marine, evidently just dashing into combat, and the caption under the picture was: "Come on, you guys, do you want to live forever?" That boy had a smile on his lips and these, our comrades, had that same smile and that same desire to do all that the situation and the times demanded of them even if it meant shortening their lives here on earth.

The lives of these men were rewarding and for that reason, hard. Because nothing is worth having that has not cost us something to gain. The closeness to one's own little district or State is a very precious thing. The fact that people turn to their Congressman for certain services and even more important, turn to them in personal matters and problems, all these things bring truly great rewards. The friendships made with men and women in every walk of life, the broadening of one's whole horizon as day by day we get to know and understand more and more of humanity. More of its frailty, yes, but also more of its dignity, of its faith, and of its courage.

These men we honor today accomplished much because they understood these things. In this age of mechanical perfection there is still no substitute for the human touch and for human work and understanding. For that reason these human friends of ours are remembered. Great engines of peace and war are scrapped and forgotten when they have accomplished their work. But men are remembered because of that divine spark that is in us all and that goes on and on into eternity, leaving something here on earth. Here is the roll:

Senator VIRGIL MUNDAY CHAPMAN, Kentucky.

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan.

Representative JOHN LESINSKI, Michigan.

Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, North Dakota.

Representative ALFRED LEE BULWINKLE, North Carolina.

Representative HERBERT A. MEYER, Kansas.

Representative JOHN B. SULLIVAN, Missouri.

Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania.

Representative JOHN KEE, West Virginia.

As I name them each one of you will remember some personal touch, or some especial word or phrase that you will carry all through your life and that was a part of them. It is too soon for us to appraise their place in history but we know that they had little thought of that, but did the tasks that came to hand always going forward, never turning back. It is quite possible that in the future some of these colleagues of ours and their works will be proved important to humanity. It is never those who get the greatest acclaim in life who are the giants of history and it is well to remember the words of Phillips Brooks who, in writing of Christ, said:

Nineteen wide centuries have come and gone and today He is the centerpiece of the human race and the leader of the column of progress.

I am far within the mark when I say that all the armies that ever marched, and all the navies that ever were built, and all the parliaments that ever sat, and all the kings that ever reigned, put together, have not affected the life on man upon this earth as powerfully as that one solitary life.

No; as time passes and the storms and the earthquakes subside the still small voice emerges and triumphs and the stone that the builders rejected becomes the cornerstone of the building.

Today we are all worried and afraid. We are confused and it seems that so much that we had trusted has failed. We must turn again to the God of our fathers who gave them this good land and to whom they turned always in adversity and prosperity. This Nation was founded on the principle of a deep belief and faith in God. True religion and government were to be separate, but let no one imagine from that, we were an irreligious people, nothing could be farther from the truth. Of late we have turned away from these basic concepts and have begun to trust in our own strength, our own righteousness, and our own power. This has led us into confusion and sorrow. We must remember that we are equal, but under God, we must remember that His is the power and the glory and that ours is only a faint reflection of it. Man must look up and beyond himself, if he would have peace of mind, and without that he cannot succeed. The world today needs peace of mind. Needs to have faith so that we can achieve those things that at times seem beyond our reach, but with faith all things are possible.

As these Congressmen went through life, they had faith to carry on their tasks and the accomplishments and successes they achieved were their reward. Many worked for peace, others worked to make the world and this country a better place for men to live in, and if necessary die for. The earthly rewards of a Member of Congress are meager and yet we know that we love our work and that nothing else would be as satisfying. It is because this is a human job that brings us all close together in a common task. We may not always succeed, in fact we may often fail, but we know what we are striving for and what these men strove and died for; to prove that freedom under God can survive and can overcome its enemies be they ever so powerful both at home and abroad. That is a creed worth fighting for and just as our soldiers fight and die for it on battlefields, so these nine men fought and probably truly died for it right in the Congress of the United States.

To you their families and friends who are here we can but say this is a proud moment for you, this is indeed their fin-

est hour, the task has been accomplished, the victory has been won and they go on from strength to strength.

For us their colleagues who remain behind, we too are cheered and heartened by their examples, we have not always agreed but we have always respected each other. We have fought a good fight together and we will try to carry on where these, our brothers, left off until that great day:

When earth's last picture is painted and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest and faith we shall need it, lie down for an aeon or two,
Till the Master of all good workmen shall put us to work anew.

And only the Master shall praise us and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame;
But each for the joy of the working and each, in his separate star,
Shall draw the thing as he sees it for the good of things as they are.

TAPS

Master Sgt. Edward L. Masters sounded taps, the echo being sounded by Staff Sgt. John A. Gosling.

BENEDICTION

The Chaplain pronounced the following benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift upon you His countenance and give you peace. Amen.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess, the Speaker called the House to order.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 205, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 17, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3911. A bill to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged; without amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris; with amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1096. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gizella Kezdy-Reich; with amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Sageros; with amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2170. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Maria Lummer Valentine; without amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2179. A bill for the relief of Ilona Agoston; with amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2180. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence E. Eomann and her son, John A. Villas; with amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2299. A bill for the relief of Biagio Poidimani; with amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maryanna Boppel; with amendment (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 4132. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Sisseton Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4133. A bill to provide for the payment of Federal unemployment taxes into the Federal unemployment account to be available for the administration of unemployment compensation laws and public employment offices, and to return to the States the excess of such taxes over such administrative expenses, to redefine the term "employer" as used in the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution authorizing the Commisioner of Education to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of State, land-grant, and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. KEATING introduced a bill (H. R. 4134) for the relief of Kurt J. Hain, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1951

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, at morning and evening and noonday, in Thy light we would see life steadily and seeing it whole discern in it Thy purpose for us and for all Thy children. Thou knowest the lure of temptation to be less than our best; Thou understandest the drain of our daily work and the limitations of our strength. In all our relationships with our fellows, grant us the grace of meekness and the power of self-control. Remove far from us all hypocrisy and pretense. Help us this day to speak only such words and to do only such things as will leave no regret. Minister, we beseech Thee, to the deepest need of our praying hearts. What no man's voice can speak openly Thou seest inwardly.

As we lift up our hearts for divine help in these baffling and perplexing days, come down the secret stairs by which Thou canst enter every contrite heart. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 16, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1227) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of John K. Jackson, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; and

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed

Services and Foreign Relations were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1613. A bill to amend section 2883 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 320);

H. R. 2746. A bill to amend section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 321);

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Japanese Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 322).

H. R. 2192. A bill to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; with amendments (Rept. No. 323);

H. R. 2416. A bill relating to exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness; with amendments (Rept. No. 324); and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code; with an amendment (Rept. No. 325).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1497. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Emilio Seatra d'Araujo; and

S. 498. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Doherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1499. A bill for the relief of Georgette Sato; and

S. 1500. A bill for the relief of Stevan Pivnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 1501. A bill for the relief of Nicanor Maypa Balat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1502. A bill to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to veterans who served in the active military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BENNETT (for Mr. WATKINS):

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of Harold Frederick D. Wolfgramm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of Valmai Eileen Mackenzie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of John K. Jackson was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSAL FOR ARMISTICE BETWEEN THE CONFLICTING FORCES IN KOREA

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, before the Senator from Alabama suggests the absence of a quorum will he yield to me so I may make a unanimous-consent request to read into the RECORD a short resolution which I wish to submit and ask to have appropriately referred?

Mr. HILL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I make that unanimous-consent request, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas to permit civilization to be destroyed by world war III is utter insanity and unworthy of the men of this century; and

Whereas the Korean war has every appearance of being a hopeless conflict of attrition and indecisiveness and a breeder of bitter racial hatreds; and

Whereas a limited war like a limited or smoldering fire, is gravely dangerous, for it may burst forth into a world-wide conflagration at any moment; and

Whereas the North and South Koreans, the Chinese and the United Nations have suffered more than 1,000,000 casualties, with the only tangible result so far the indescribable misery which has been heaped upon the Korean people; and

Whereas tremendous strides have been made in the development of hitherto unused lethal and destructive weapons of war with potentials of unbelievable fury and horror; and

Whereas by slaughtering additional millions of humans an uneasy peace might in time be forced upon the vanquished; and

Whereas the people of the United States traditionally have held the people of China in the highest esteem and affection and still do; and

Whereas the people of the United States have long recognized the wisdom of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine so eloquently portrayed by the slogan "Asia for Asiatics" if it were to be applied to Asia; and

Whereas it has long been the policy of the American people that no nation should seek to extend its form of government over any other nation or people, but that as an inherent right every people should be left free to determine its own form of government and its own way of life, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid—the little along with the great and the powerful; and

Whereas the traditional policy and desire of the people of the United States of America is now and has been a just and enduring peace; and

Whereas it is never too early for God-fearing and peace-loving peoples to earnestly endeavor to stop needless human slaughter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations call upon all nations and all groups now engaged in the war in Korea to cease fire and declare an armistice effective at 4 a. m. (Korean time) June 25, 1951; and that prior thereto the United Nations forces retire to points south and the opposing forces retire to points north of the thirty-eighth parallel; and that before December 31, 1951, all prisoners of the Korean war shall be exchanged and all non-Korean persons, military and nonmilitary (except the ordinary diplomatic representatives), shall depart from North and South Korea.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

An address on the subject 1951 Merchandising and Management Conference, delivered by Senator SPARKMAN, on May 14, 1951, at the University of Maryland.

By Mr. BYRD:

Address by Bernard M. Baruch on the occasion of George Catlett Marshall Day at Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., May 15, 1951.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Project," published in the Utica (N. Y.) Press of March 17, 1951.

Editorial entitled "New Sources of Steel," published in the Washington Post of March 10, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

An article entitled "Small Business Is Hit by Defense Rationing," written by Joseph A. Loftus, and published in the New York Times of May 13, 1951.

An editorial entitled "Beef Rollback Is Unfair to the Cattle Feeders," published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of May 13, 1951, and a letter to the editor of the Tribune, entitled "Monkeys Could Manage Better," written by Fred C. Peters, of Janesville, Minn.

By Mr. BENNETT:

An editorial entitled "Where to, America?" discussing faith in God in the United States, and an editorial entitled "Pity the Poor Businessman," discussing price controls, both published in the Ephraim Enterprise, of Ephraim, Utah, on April 27, 1951.

An oration on the subject The Constitution, Worth Having, Worth Defending, by Miss Kay Jon Mildon, winner of the American Legion oratorical contest in Utah, together with a statement by Senator BENNETT.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

An editorial entitled "Policy Based on Fear," appearing in a recent issue of the Idaho Statesman, of Boise, Idaho.

By Mr. LANGER:

A pamphlet on the subject More Meat and How To Get It, With a Common Sense Meat Program, sponsored by farm organizations, livestock associations, meat-industry groups, and allied businesses.

By Mr. KERR:

A press release by him relative to proposals by General MacArthur and Republican policy.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO ATTORNEY EMPLOYED BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, under the order entered yesterday the Senate will proceed with the call of the calendar. I think before proceeding with the calendar there should be a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator propose to take up any measure for debate after the call of the calendar today?

Mr. HILL. We are very anxious, as the Senator knows, to dispose, if possible, of Calendar No. 227, Senate bill 630, to suspend until December 31, 1952, the application of certain Federal laws with

respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is a bill in which the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is very much interested. I wonder if we might not proceed to the consideration of that bill today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the acting majority leader will not insist upon the consideration of that bill today. The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is ill. He is vitally interested, not in the particular case covered by the bill, but in the principle involved. He feels very strongly about it. Other members of the Committee on the Judiciary wish to discuss the matter. While some Senators are very anxious to have the bill passed, other Senators would like to be heard on it. I wonder if it would not be satisfactory to have some other measure taken up today, because of the absence of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, of course we want to do all we can to accommodate the Senator from Utah whose illness we very much regret. We find ourselves, however, in this position: The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], will leave the last of next week to attend the meeting of the International Conference on Labor which will be held in Geneva, Switzerland. Naturally he is very anxious to have the bill acted upon by the Senate before he leaves. Whereas the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has his problem, we also have our problem in that the Senator from Montana wishes to have the matter disposed of before he leaves for Geneva. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that we proceed with the call of the roll at this time, and I will confer further with him about the matter.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	McMahon
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hunt	Robertson
Cain	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kilgore	Stennis
Dirksen	Knowland	Taft
Douglas	Langer	Thye
Duff	Lodge	Underwood
Dworshak	Magnuson	Welker
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
George	McKellar	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the calendar is now to be called, from the beginning. The Secretary will call the first bill on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile was announced as first in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard; the bill will be passed over.

PROTECTION AGAINST MISBRANDING, ETC., OF FUR PRODUCTS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 508) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the Senator asking that the bill go over on his own behalf, or on behalf of another Senator. If he is asking that it go over on behalf of another Senator, may I ask on whose behalf he is making the request?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is on behalf of another Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. May I inquire who the other Senator is?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am trying to ascertain the information for the Senator from Colorado. I believe three Senators requested of the calendar committee that the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should be glad to know who the Senators are.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I shall be glad to obtain the information and submit it to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection for a moment, in order that I may make a brief observation?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. LODGE. I wish the RECORD to show that I have some amendments which I wish to offer to the bill when, as, and if the bill comes before the Senate. The amendments have been submitted and printed and lie on the table. I simply wish to make this statement in regard to them, following my previous statement at the time when I submitted the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has the Senator from Massachusetts presented the amendments and have they been printed?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, I presented them on February 22, and asked to have them printed and lie on the table, where they now are. Under date of February 22, there appears in the RECORD a statement giving all the reasons for the amendments which I presented at the request of the Furriers' Guild of Boston.

So I hope the Senator from Colorado will familiarize himself with the amendments, and naturally I hope he will support them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Massachusetts further when he is going to offer the amendments. Cannot he offer them now and have them voted either up or down?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Amendments cannot be submitted until the bill is before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I realize that.

Mr. LODGE. I simply wished to serve notice that when, as, and if the bill is before the Senate, I shall offer the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill was before the Senate only 2 minutes ago.

Mr. LODGE. In that case, I offer the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is not before the Senate, and was not before the Senate a few minutes ago. At that time the question was whether there was objection to the consideration of the bill. Objection was made, and the bill did not come before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. LODGE. Will not it be in order for me to offer the amendments when the bill is before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the bill is before the Senate, it is in order to offer amendments to it; but in the meantime the mere submission of the amendments, to be printed and lie on the table, does not mean that either the amendments or the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point I am trying to make is that if the Senator who has objected will withhold the objection, the bill can come before the Senate and the amendments can be offered and acted on in the usual way. That is the point I make.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I renew my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection has been made, and the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Educational Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health and nursing professions, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 618) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill will go over.

The bill (S. 673) to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 41) prohibiting the sale in the District of Columbia of rockfish weighing more than 15 pounds was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Let the bill go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

RECONVEYANCE OF TRACT OF LAND TO TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE

The bill (H. R. 2685) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I send to the desk, for incorporation in the RECORD, a statement on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in connection with the bill. I have no objection to consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Objection was made on my request to H. R. 2685 at the last call of the calendar pending the receipt of further information which I had requested.

I now have that information at hand and it does indicate that we could, through the use of the mechanism set up in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, probably accomplish the aims of this bill more effectively and without any special legislation at all.

However, the specific case is, on the facts as presented, a meritorious one. I am informed that the land was originally donated to the Government by the Tuskegee Institute for the use of the veterans' hospital. Little use has been made of the property by the Veterans' Administration and no improvements have been placed upon it. The land is not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration. It also appears that some discretion should be allowed in reference to the reservations to be imposed so that the institute will not be prohibited from making full use of the land.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2685) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 630) to suspend until December 31, 1952, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOEY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 36) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this bill should not be considered on the call of the calendar. Therefore, I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2929) to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A companion Senate bill was passed over a few minutes ago.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill goes over.

The resolution (S. Res. 133) discharging the Committee on the District of Columbia from the further consideration of S. 656, the home-rule bill for the District, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the resolution goes over.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON MATCHING FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE FOR ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1244) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Territory of Alaska from certain restrictions upon the making of Federal contributions, and to amend the provisions thereof relating to the taking of oaths by certain civil defense personnel, which had been reported from the Commitee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "sentence", to strike out "shall not apply to" and insert "may be varied for", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the second sentence of subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the limitations upon the making of Federal contributions contained in the second, third, and fourth provisos of this sentence may be varied for the Territory of Alaska."

(b) Subsection 403 (b) of such act is amended by inserting, immediately after the second sentence thereof, the following new sentence: "After appointment and qualification for office, the director of civil defense of any State, and any subordinate civil defense officer within such State designated by the director in writing, shall be qualified to administer any such oath within such State under such regulations as the director shall prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 841) to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be made a star print of this bill (S. 841) and the Report No. 310, for the purpose of correcting certain technical errors which have been discovered since the bill was reported and since the report was printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CHANGES IN PROCEDURE WHEREBY ADMIRALS OF NAVY AND GENERALS OF MARINE CORPS ARE SELECTED FOR RETENTION IN ACTIVE SERVICE

The bill (S. 1039) to amend the provision of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the composition of boards for the recommendation of rear admirals of the Navy for continuation on the active list, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, is further amended by—

(a) Inserting in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 305 after the word "senior", the words "in permanent rank."

(b) Inserting in the first sentence of subsection (f) of section 314 between the words "active" and "list", the words "or retired" and deleting in the third proviso of that subsection the words "major general on the active list" and substituting therefor the words "major general or above on the active or retired list."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 35) to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ACCEPTANCES OF CONDITIONAL GIFTS TO FURTHER THE DEFENSE EFFORT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1230) to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with an amendment on page 2, line 16, after the word "made", to strike out "may" and insert "shall", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That to further the defense effort of the United States—

(a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept or reject on behalf of the United States any gift of money or other intangible personal property made on condition that it be used for a particular defense effort; and

(b) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to accept or reject on behalf of the United States any gift of other property, real or personal, or services, made on condition that it be used for a particular defense effort.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury may convert into money, at the best terms available, any such gift of intangible property other than money; and the Administrator of General Services may convert into money, at the best terms available, any such gift of tangible property, or transfer to any other Federal agency without reimbursement such property as he may determine usable for the particular purpose for which it was donated.

SEC. 3. There shall be established on the books of the Treasury a special account into which shall be deposited all money received as a result of such gifts.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury, in order to effectuate the purposes for which gifts accepted under this act are made, shall from time to time pay the money in such special account to such of the various appropriation accounts as in his judgment will best effectuate the intent of the donors, and such money is hereby appropriated and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of the appropriations to which paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to Senate bill 1230, Calendar 297, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD that portion of the committee report which appears on page 3, entitled "Provisions of S. 1230."

There being no objection, the portion of the committee report referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVISIONS OF S. 1230

S. 1230, as submitted to the Congress by the Treasury Department, would enable the Government of the United States to accept gifts of money and other property, real and personal, as well as services, conditioned upon their use for a particular purpose.

Section 1 would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept or reject gifts of money or other intangible personal property made to the United States, carrying a condition to the effect that they be used for some particular defense purpose. It would also authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept or reject gifts of other property, real or personal, as well as services.

Section 2 would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services to convert into cash any gifts of intangible or tangible property other than money. It would also authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to any other Federal agency without reimbursement such property as he may determine usable for the particular purpose for which it was donated.

Section 3 would establish on the books of the Treasury a special account into which conditional gifts of money and the proceeds of all other conditional gifts, would be deposited.

Section 4 would require the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the money in this special account to the various appropriation accounts made for the purpose of purchasing defense matériel and furthering the defense effort of the United States, in such a manner that the gifts would be used, as far as practicable, for the purposes for which they have been donated. This section would also automatically appropriate the money received by the Treasury for such specific purposes.

Under the provisions of this bill, the type of conditional gifts which may be accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury is limited to money and other intangible property, such as bonds, securities, and stocks. Gifts of real and personal property and services would

be handled by the Administrator of General Services. In all cases, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services would be authorized to either accept or reject any particular gift as they saw fit.

REPRESENTATION OF APPELLANTS BY CERTAIN VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The bill (S. 831) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide for designated representatives thereunder of certain veterans' organizations, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U. S. C. 863), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 14." and by adding the following new subsection:

"(b) Any appellant under section 12 of this act or under this section may choose as his or her designated representative an accredited representative of any of the following veterans' organizations: American Legion; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II; United Spanish War Veterans; American Veterans' Committee, Inc.; Disabled American Veterans; Marine Corps League; Army Mutual Aid Association; Army and Navy Union, U. S. A.; Blinded Veterans' Association; Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; Coast Guard League; Fleet Reserve Association; Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States; Jewish War Veterans of the United States; Military Order of the Purple Heart; Military Order of the World Wars; National Society—Army of Philippines; National Tribune; Navy Mutual Aid Association; Regular Veterans' Association; Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars; United Indian War Veterans, U. S. A.; Grand Army of the Republic; and any other veterans' organization incorporated or recognized by act of Congress or recognized as such by the United States Civil Service Commission under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe for such purpose. The Civil Service Commission—

(1) shall prescribe such rules, regulations, and standards as it shall deem appropriate for the conduct by such organizations and accredited representatives thereof of their duties pursuant to such sections; and

(2) may withdraw from any such organization or any accredited representative thereof its recognition pursuant to this section for the failure of such organization or accredited representative to comply with such rules, regulations, and standards, and thereafter may restore such recognition to any such organization or accredited representative under such terms and conditions as the Commission shall deem necessary to insure future compliance by such organization or accredited representative with such rules, regulations, and standards.

PURCHASE BY UNITED STATES OF YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION PROPERTY IN PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The bill (S. 718) to authorize the lease and purchase by the United States of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am very glad to give an explanation.

Mr. President, the property is located in the very heart of the city of Phoenix, and is adjacent to the present Federal courthouse. Included in the property is a substantial tract of land. When that land is combined with the courthouse property, and a city park area, which will be donated, the Government will own all but a corner of the entire block.

The directors of the Young Men's Christian Association advise me that they are compelled to sell the property because they are building a new YMCA building at a somewhat greater distance from the center of the city, and that if they can make with the Government an arrangement to pay 5 years' rent, they will turn over to the United States the title to the building and land at the end of the 5 years. So the amount to be paid contemplates the purchase price of the building, plus what will have to be paid as interest on a bank loan during the 5-year period. The payments are to be made quarterly by the Government, and at the end of 5 years the Government will own the property. It is a real bargain for the Government. It was indicated to me that the owners had received other offers for the property, but that they wanted to see this site reserved, because it would be a proper site for a Federal building, at some future time, and, as businessmen resident in the city, they would be willing to wait until June in order to see whether Congress would act favorably upon their offer. If not, they will sell the YMCA building and lot to someone else. I may say that property values in Phoenix have substantially increased, and they will have no difficulty in getting an equal or better price for the property, but they prefer to have the Government own it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, since this represents a bargain for the Government, the junior Senator from New Jersey cannot object.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is the purchase price?

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill provides a ceiling of $290,000 on the purchase price. The average rental which is being paid by the Government in the city of Phoenix at this time is $1.77 per square foot. It varies from less than the $1 to $3 per square foot. When this property is acquired, the Federal offices can move from the high-rent sections of the city, where they are presently located. This office space is needed immediately by the Government, and in this way it will be possible to save Federal funds immediately.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator from Arizona will yield, I should like to inquire whether he made a personal investigation of the matter, and whether after such investigation, he recommends it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have examined it and I recommend the purchase.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 718), which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with an amendment on page 2, line 15, after the word "States.", to insert "The rentals and the purchase price to be paid by the United States pursuant to this act shall not exceed $290,000 in the aggregate.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services, without regard to the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, is authorized to negotiate and enter into a lease-purchase agreement providing for the lease to the United States for a term of 5 years of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz., being that certain real property located at the northeast corner of Second Avenue and Monroe Street, having an area of approximately 31,000 square feet, and more particularly described as the south two hundred and twenty feet of the west one hundred and forty feet of block 93 of the city of Phoenix, Maricopa County, Ariz., as shown in book 2 of maps, page 51, together with all structures thereon and appurtenances thereto, and providing further for the vesting in the United States absolutely of title to the leased property upon expiration of the 5-year term.

SEC. 2. The agreement authorized by section 1 shall provide for the payment of rental and other consideration in such amounts and at such times and shall contain such other terms and conditions as the Administrator of General Services in his discretion shall deem to be in the best interest of the United States. The rentals and the purchase price to be paid by the United States pursuant to this act shall not exceed $290,000 in the aggregate.

SEC. 3. Payments that shall become due from the United States in pursuance of any agreement entered into under the authority of this act shall be paid from appropriations available to the General Services Administration for the payment of rents, and such additional funds as may be necessary to provide for such payments are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 279, House bill 1612, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1612), which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, because of the illness of my good friend and colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr.

MILLIKIN], it is not proposed to proceed today with the consideration of this bill. It is our intention to have the Senate recess until Monday, and to proceed to the consideration of the bill at that time, with this exception: I understand that the conferees on the part of the Senate may reach an agreement with the House conferees on the third supplemental appropriation bill, which is now in conference, and, if an agreement is reached, the Senator from Arizona, chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate, may wish on Monday to proceed to the consideration of the conference report. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether I am correct in that statement.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct, and I have no doubt that the conference report will be ready by that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair reminds Senators that a conference report is privileged.

Mr. HILL. I desired to give notice to the Senate, that on Monday, when the Senate reconvenes, we shall proceed to the consideration of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, subject, however, to the condition that, if the conferees on the third supplemental appropriation bill have in the meantime agreed on a report, the Senator from Arizona will call up the conference report; which he may do, since, as the Chair states, a conference report is a privileged matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. NORRELL had been appointed as an additional manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

CONFIRMATION OF SUNDRY NOMINATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I report favorably the nominations of six persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard and the nominations of nine persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Coast Guard.

While these are routine nominations, early consideration of them is important for this reason: These men are merchant marine officers (some of them have their masters' licenses) who have been accepted for probationary appointment and training and eventual commissions as officers in the Coast Guard. Upon completion of their indoctrination and training they will engage in merchant marine safety work. They have resigned from their old jobs and are now marking time awaiting confirmation by the Senate. They cannot take their oaths of office and begin their indoctrination until they have been confirmed, and the Coast Guard cannot set up its training class for these men until the Senate acts.

As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether these are merely routine nominations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They are routine nominations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has stated that these men resigned from their jobs. What jobs have they held, prior to this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They were in civilian positions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In what capacity?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They served in whatever capacities they happened to be called upon to fill.

Mr. CHAVEZ Does the Senator mean that they resigned civilian positions in order to enroll in the United States Coast Guard?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. They resigned in order to take these appointments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

COMPLAINT OF AN AIR CORPS OFFICER'S WIFE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have received a letter, which is very brief, from Tularosa, N. Mex., dated May 8, 1951. It is a letter from one of my constituents, the wife of an Air Corps officer in Korea. The letter reads as follows:

TULAROSA, N. MEX., *May 8, 1951.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I am enclosing two newspaper clippings from the newspapers published in Japan, and which were sent to me by my husband who has been stationed there with the 56th Strategic Reconnaissance Squadron for more than a year. In all fairness to the men overseas, who do not definitely know the length of their tours, do you honestly believe this is an example of justice? The morale of the men is at an all-time low and this very thing of letting one certain dependent fly to join her husband, though all dependent travel is closed, has not helped matters in the least.

Honestly, Senator CHAVEZ, is this fair?

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. LYLE H. DANKE.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the two newspaper clippings enclosed with Mrs. Danke's letter.

There being no objection, the two newspaper clippings referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. RIDGWAY PACKS FOR JOURNEY TO TOKYO; WILL ARRIVE SATURDAY

WASHINGTON.—Youthful, attractive Mrs. Mary A. Ridgway, wife of the United Nations Far East supreme commander, interrupted her packing long enough Monday to tell International News Service she was looking forward to enjoying the scenic beauty of Japan.

In an exclusive interview, Mrs. Ridgway said she would leave for Tokyo "Wednesday or Thursday" with her 2-year-old son Matthew, Jr., whom she calls "Matty."

(General Ridgway's office reported Tuesday that Mrs. Ridgway is scheduled to arrive in Tokyo Saturday.)

Matty has trouble pronouncing the letter "T", she said, and has been saying that he is "going to see daddy in Kokyo."

The general's wife said her principal hobbies are painting—still life, landscape, and seascape—and flower arranging. Some of her paintings and flower arrangements, she said, have won prizes in competition.

MRS. RIDGWAY DUE SOON

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Mrs. Mary A. Ridgway, wife of Far Eastern Commander Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, said Friday she and 2-year-old Matthew, Jr., will fly to Tokyo next week. A Defense Department spokesman said Mrs. Ridgway's departure is scheduled tentatively for May 2. The Ridgways will probably fly in the late President Roosevelt's C-54, the "Sacred Cow."

RIGHTS OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN MARRIED TO BRITISH SUBJECT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me bring to the attention of the Senate an interesting case concerning an American citizen, born in Illinois, who married a British subject in 1931, and from 1932 until 1940 resided in England. Never at any time did she renounce or lose her United States citizenship and, in fact, at all times held a United States passport.

At the outbreak of World War II, although she happened to be in the United States, she made no attempt to transfer ownership of any of her American assets, but fully and immediately complied with the British Finance Act of September 3, 1939, by listing all her United States securities and then remitting her entire dollar income to the Bank of England. In addition, she complied with the British order to send all her dollar capital moneys which accrued, such as inheritances or matured bonds, to England. In this way a large percentage of her total assets were transferred to England and were used by the British Government, who gave her unconvertible pounds in return.

When the husband of this American citizen was sent to the Middle East in 1940 with his regiment, she brought her two small children to the United States, as their only home was right in the center of London. The irony of it is that although she was returning to her own country, she was forced to depend on loans from her family for the entire support of herself and her two children. This was not because she had no dollars, but solely because, according to British wartime laws, she was ordered to remit her entire dollar income regularly to the Bank of England. In fact, therefore,

from the beginning of the war in 1939 until the middle of 1946, she never spent $1 of her own, being forced to rely entirely on unsecured loans from her mother, although living here in her own country the entire time. All the United States dollars which she sent to England are still there in devalued pounds and the British Treasury refuses to allow them to be reconverted, even at the present devalued rate, which represents a loss of over 40 percent of the value of the dollars which she gave to England in her emergency.

This American citizen has never returned to resume residence in England since she left in 1940. In fact, she has only been in England for 1 month, on a business trip, during the past 11 years. At the time when the largest single capital transfer—a sale of United States Treasury bonds—took place on orders from the Bank of England, she had already been back on this continent for almost a year. She knew that she would probably never return to England to live, and in fact, began divorce proceedings the year after the war was over. She certainly never thought that when the emergency was over, she would be still further penalized for an act done in good faith at an hour of need.

It seems to me that here we have an example of the way Great Britain is treating American citizens—an American citizen who did her best to aid England by sending over her United States dollars when she was already back in the United States. Not only has she not had the use of this money for the past 12 years, but having lost 40 percent due to the devaluation of the pound, she is not even now, 6 years after the war, allowed to reconvert the remainder.

Mr. President, I believe that citizens of the United States who have proved their citizenship and who have complied with all of the recommendations of the British Government are deserving of more equitable treatment with respect to their property. Insofar as I am informed, the treatment of British nationalists in the United States has been to allow them to return with their property. It occurs to me the British Government and the banks should grant our nationalists the same recognition.

DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN TRADE ON THE PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Senate has just agreed to consider the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. It is on this subject that I wish to address the Senate briefly.

Our common objective is to raise the standard of living of the peoples of the world to our standard. Some of us believe that we must hold our standard of living while we are assisting foreign nations to raise their own.

There are those, however, in contrast, that believe that the only way to secure world peace is to divide our wealth with the nations of the world so that the average standard of living will be uniform in all of the nations of the globe.

THE PRINCIPLE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The junior Senator from Nevada believes that we should develop foreign trade on the principle of fair and reasonable competition, thus maintaining our standard of living while we are assisting foreign nations to raise their own.

Through the fair and reasonable competition principle the incentive to hold the standard of living down in foreign countries is eliminated, since the differential is paid in the form of a tariff or import fee and no profit can be gained.

A raise in the living standards of the competitive nations would be recognized by a corresponding reduction in such import fee, and when world standards approximate our own then free trade would be the almost immediate and automatic result.

SECRETARY OF STATE DOMINATES INVESTORS AND WORKINGMEN

The bill (H. R. 1612) extending the Trade Agreements Act, in simple terms, provides for a 2-year extension of the power over the workingmen and investors of this Nation, by a thoroughly discredited Secretary of State.

I repeat that there is nothing in the bill that directs the President or the Secretary of State to conform to the amendments to the bill.

PERIL POINTS AND ESCAPE CLAUSE A DELUSION

Based upon the administration's 18-year record the so-called peril point and the escape clause committee amendments are delusions to wet down the workingmen and investors of this Nation while they undergo another 2 years of uncertainty with the investors backing away from their industries and the workmen's jobs and home investments made increasingly uncertain.

BIG AND SMALL BUSINESS DEFINED

Big business is for free trade and small business is against it.

Big business is any business in a financial position to install branch plants in the foreign low-wage living standard nations and ship their products into this country under the free-trade program.

The small business and the workingmen cannot possibly compete with such slave labor products imported into this country, except through writing down the wages and investments to conform to the world conditions—which can only mean a substantial reduction in the standard of living of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Politics of World Trade," under the title "Washington Affairs," by Holmes Alexander, which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette of April 16, 1951, outlining the one world thinkers background as a foundation for the whole free tree trade program in direct conformance with the Karl Marx social revolution plan of 102 years ago.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON AFFAIRS

(By Holmes Alexander)

THE POLITICS OF WORLD TRADE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Senator MALONE, whose tariff speeches often empty the Senate Chamber, says there's a reason for this mass exodus. He tells me:

"Those fellows know they can't answer me back. I've got the facts."

He's got the facts all right, probably more than anyone else on Capitol Hill. But it's like giving castor oil to a teen-ager to make the Senate open up and absorb them.

Any day now the Finance Committee will come in with its new 2-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and MALONE's going to have to sit on the Senate's chest in order to pour down enough facts to beat this administration measure.

Still, it's a subject that needs to be better understood if only because reciprocal trading is the granddaddy of the Roosevelt-Truman give-away policy, dating back to 1934. Such slighting remarks as that one are sure to incur the scorn of one-world thinkers, including a number of short-sighted industrialists whose overseas factories are coining profits on dime-an-hour wages.

But the long-term result of this tariff plan is that American small-business men are pushed to the wall, American farmers have to be subsidized by the taxpayer and American workers face unemployment every time we're not having a war or a war crisis.

Despite all the highbrow gibberish about enlightened self-interest in world commerce, reciprocal trading is reciprocal nonsense. It is a sort of half-wit brother to free trading, a nineteenth century one worldism, of which Karl Marx spoke with great affection. Addressing a group of comrades at Brussels in 1848, Marx said:

"The free-trade system works destructively. It breaks up old nationalities and carries the antagonism of the proletariat and bourgeoisie to the uttermost point. In a word, the free-trade system hastens the social revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade."

Marx, without a doubt, would have been in favor of the recent Torquay conference which showed the Reciprocal Trade Act in operation. At this 34-nation tariff talk, the United States agreed to slash import duties up to 50 percent on about 3,000 items, while 17 foreign nations reciprocated by making token cuts on a good many fewer items. Britain, along with its Commonwealth partners, declined to make any concessions at all although receiving some. France actually raised her import tariffs on some 38 items. In round figures we made a $477,000,000 concession, and the foreigners made one of $53,000,000. It was a great day for share-the-wealth internationalism.

MALONE has a bill of his own (S. 981) which would take foreign trade bargaining away from the State Department globalists and turn it over to a six-member Foreign Trade Authority which would work closely with Congress. S. 981 calls for flexible tariffs to make sure that imported items are not substantially below the price of domestic articles. MALONE might be able to sell this common-sense proposition if enough Senators would sit still and listen.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Suspending the Copper Duty," which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette of April 5, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUSPENDING THE COPPER DUTY

Unanimous approval has been given by the House Ways and Means Committee on a bill to suspend the import tax on copper. This measure is pushed by the copper fabricators in the East, and is supported by the Truman administration.

The Nation needs for its defense program all the copper it can get, and domestic pro-

duction is meeting only about two-thirds of the present consumption. The one-third imported comes directly from Chile where United States copper companies, especially Anaconda and Kennecott have large holdings.

An import tax of 4 cents a pound was levied on copper in 1932, later was cut in half by reciprocal tariff agreements. The 2-cent impost was suspended for imports by the Government during the war, and in 1947 for all copper imports, but went back into force last July 1.

Lifting the import tax will not bring in additional stores of copper as much as it will be a subsidy to the foreign producers and to the American manufacturers, and this at the expense of the domestic copper industry.

The South American copper, or the red metal from any other foreign countries, is mined and refined at extremely low cost. The United States industry, paying the highest wages in the world, cannot compete with the cheaply-produced foreign copper. Already many of the mines and smelters in this country have shut down or are operating at limited capacity, for they cannot meet such competition.

The administration has opposed the copper duty, claiming that it is against the good-neighbor policy of the New Deal and the Tru Deal. At the same time the Government calls upon the American mining industry to speed its output of strategic metals, then would penalize the local producers by letting in the foreign product at an even cheaper price.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1 TO 12

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I submit amendments Nos. 1 to 12, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with a statement accompanying each amendment, to be printed at the end of each amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the amendments and statements will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendments and statements are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

"(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States economy;

"(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports;

"(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

"(d) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

"(e) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

"RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

"SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 30, 1951, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

"FORMATION OF FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

"SEC. 3. Title III, part II, section 330, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 330. Organization of the Foreign Trade Authority.

"'(a) Membership: The United States Tariff Commission shall be reorganized and reconstituted as the Foreign Trade Authority (hereinafter referred to as the "Authority") to be composed of six directors to be hereafter appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The original directors of the Authority shall be the same persons now serving as Commissioners of the United States Tariff Commission, each such person to serve as a director of the Authority until the date when his term of office as a Commissioner of the United States Tariff Commission would have expired. Thereafter the term of office of any successor to any such director shall expire 6 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed except that a director appointed to fill a vacancy occurring for any reason other than the expiration of a term as herein provided shall be appointed only for the remainder of the term which his predecessor would otherwise have served. Directors shall be eligible for appointment to succeed themselves if otherwise qualified therefor. No person shall be eligible for appointment as a director unless he is a citizen of the United States, and, in the judgment of the President, is possessed of qualifications requisite for developing expert knowledge of tariff problems and efficiency in administering the provisions of this act. Not more than three of the directors shall be members of the same political party, and in making appointments members of different political parties shall be appointed alternately as nearly as may be practicable.

"'(b) Chairman, Vice Chairman, and salary: The President shall annually designate one of the directors as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman of the Authority. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in case of absence or disability of the Chairman. A majority of the directors in office shall constitute a quorum, but the Authority may function notwithstanding vacancies. Each director shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year. No director shall actively engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a director.'

"APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY

"SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 331 (a), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Personnel: The Authority shall appoint a secretary who shall receive compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and the Authority is hereby empowered to employ and, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, fix the compensations of such special experts, examiners, clerks, and other employees of the Authority as it may find necessary for the proper performance of its duties.'

"ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

"SEC. 5. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding at the end of section 331 the following new section:

"'SEC. 331A. Administration of Trade Agreements.

"'(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Authority, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"'(b) The Authority is hereby authorized and directed—

"'(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

"'(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this act.'

"PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

"SEC. 6. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 336. Periodic Adjustment of Import Duties.

"'(a) The Authority is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Authority finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"'(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Authority shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"'(1) The lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"'(2) Any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"'(3) The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"'(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"'(5) The actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"'(6) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"'(7) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies, excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"'(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Authority either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Authority until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"'(d) The Authority, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of said act.

"'(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Authority is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"'(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Authority shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Authority and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"'(g) No order shall be announced by the Authority under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Authority finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"'(h) The Authority, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

"'(i) For the purpose of this section—

"'(1) the term "domestic article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term "foreign article" means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"'(2) the term "United States" includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"'(3) the term "foreign country" means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"'(4) the term "landed duty paid price" means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"'(j) The Authority is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"'(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry.'

"AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

"SEC. 7. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word 'President' and substituting therefor the word 'Authority.'

"(b) Subdivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

"(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

"(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Authority, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Authority, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry.'

"(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Authority has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Authority may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.'

"(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Authority shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exist.'

"CONTINUANCE OF PERSONNEL, FUNDS, ACTIONS, AND SO FORTH

"SEC. 8. Section 339 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 339. Effect of Enactment.

"'(a) All personnel, property, records, balance of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available (or to be made available) to the United States Tariff Commission shall be transferred to the Authority for use in connection with the exercise of its functions; and such transfer shall not operate to change the status of the officers and employees transferred from the Commission to the Authority. No investigation or other proceeding pending before the Commission at such time shall abate by reason of such transfer but shall continue under the provisions of this act.

"'(b) Wherever in the Tariff Act of 1930, or in any other law, the terms "United States Tariff Commission" or "Commission" occur, such terms shall be construed to mean the "Foreign Trade Authority" and the "Authority," respectively.'

"REAPPLICATION OF SECTION 516 (O)

"SEC. 9. Section 17, subsection (c), of the Act of June 25, 1938, chapter 679, is hereby repealed.

"STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

"SEC. 10. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Foreign Trade Authority is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce, as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final.'

"REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

"SEC. 11. The Authority, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 12. This act shall take effect as of June 30, 1951.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes.'"

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment substitutes the flexible import fee bill, S. 981, for H. R. 1612 as presently reported. The title is amended to read, "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes." This substitute for the Trade Agreements Act provides for the following:

(a) It would turn the present Tariff Commission into a Foreign Trade Authority with the authority over tariff rates similar to the authority possessed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in determining freight and passenger rates.

(b) It would establish the principle of fair and reasonable competition between domestically produced goods and imports.

(c) It would permit the Foreign Trade Authority to change the tariff rates now in effect in accordance with the above principle.

(d) It would make into law the present tariff rates as established under the 1930 Tariff Act and section 350 thereof.

(e) It would provide for orderly termination of existing trade agreements under the terms thereof.

(f) It would return to Congress the responsibility over tariff making without logrolling by requiring definite legislative action to disapprove changes made by the Foreign Trade Authority.

AMENDMENT No. 2

On page 1, line 8, strike out "2 years" and insert "1 year."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment provides for the extension of the President's authority to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, for the period of 1 year, beginning June 12, 1951.

AMENDMENT No. 3

On page 3, line 18, after "Defense", insert the following: "from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, from the Committee on Finance of the Senate."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment provides that the President shall seek information and advice from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and from the Committee on Finance of the Senate, in addition to the departments and sources mentioned in section 3 (c).

AMENDMENT No. 4

On page 4, beginning in line 7, with the word "Within", strike out through the word "been" in line 9 and insert the following: "No trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be."

Beginning on page 4, with comma in line 21, strike out through the word "with" on page 5, line 12.

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes it mandatory upon the President, instead of leaving it optional, to adhere to the peril-point determinatons made by the Tariff Commission under section 3.

AMENDMENT No. 5

On page 5, line 25, after "practicable", insert the following: "(which shall not be later than six months after (1) the enactment of this act, or (2) the occasion for such action arises, whichever is later)."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes it mandatory upon the President to suspend, withdraw or prevent the application of tariff reductions, etc., to the U. S. S. R. and satellite nations within 6 months after the enactment of this act, or after the occasion for such withdrawal, etc., arises. This takes into consideration that other nations may fall under Russia's domination and will force the President to withdraw benefits to such countries within 6 months.

AMENDMENT No. 6

On page 8, line 19, after the word "practicable", insert the following: "(which shall not be later than 12 months after the enactment of this act)."

On page 8, line 23, after the period, insert the following: "Any trade agreement which cannot be brought into conformity with such policy as provided in this subsection shall be terminated by the President at the earliest date provided for by its terms or by law."

On page 9, beginning with line 1, strike out through the comma in line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Within 30 days after the expiration of 12 months after the enactment of this act."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes it mandatory upon the President to include the new escape clause in existing trade agreements within 12 months after the enactment of this act, and forces termination of trade ageements with those nations that are not willing to have this new escape clause included.

AMENDMENT No. 7

On page 11, line 6, strike out "may" and insert "shall."

On page 11, beginning in line 10 with the word "If", strike out through line 15.

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes binding upon the President adherence to the recommendations made by the Tariff Commission under the escape clause.

AMENDMENT No. 8

On page 11, line 20, after "conclusions" insert "and the reasons therefor."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment more closely defines the responsibility of the Tariff Commission in making and publishing a report if it finds that no sufficient reason exists for duty adjustments under the escape clause.

AMENDMENT No. 9

On page 13, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"(c) No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be permitted to continue in effect with respect to any agricultural commodity during any period in which a subsidy is being paid with respect to such commodity, or the price of such commodity is being supported, by any department or agency of the United States."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment removes the application of the most-favored-nation treatment, thereby preventing foreign nations from obtaining benefits from the United States without giving any concession in return.

AMENDMENT No. 10

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. —. (a) The third sentence of subsection (a) (2) of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the most-favored-nation clause), is amended by striking out 'of all foreign countries,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'only of those foreign countries which are parties to the particular agreements requiring or making appropriate such proclaimed duties and restrictions and shall so apply to such articles.'

"(b) This section shall take effect 90 days after enactment of this act."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment withdraws tariff concessions or other benefits given under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 on agricultural commodities for which a subsidy or price-support program is in operation.

AMENDMENT No. 11

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. —. No foreign-trade agreement shall hereafter be negotiated or entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to any article unless the principal supplier of such article is a party to such negotiations and to such agreement. The principal supplier of any article shall be the country growing, producing, or manufacturing the largest quantity of such article imported into the United States for consumption during the three calendar years ending last prior to the beginning of such negotiations."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment makes mandatory the use of the principal supplier rule, thereby forcing the Executive to make reductions in duties on certain commodities only with those nations which are the principal beneficiaries under such reduction.

AMENDMENT No. 12

Beginning on page 1, with line 5, strike out through line 24 on page 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession required or made appropriate by any foreign-trade agreement entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, after enactment of this act, shall be proclaimed or permitted to continue in effect after the enactment of this act."

On page 8, line 9, strike out "hereafter."

STATEMENT BY MR. MALONE

This amendment prohibits the making of further trade agreements, but retains all the present features of H. R. 1612 which pertain to trade agreements already in effect.

THE FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the substitute offered under amendment No. 1 would establish, through congressional action, of the fair and reasonable competition principle a foreign-trade authority to adjust tariffs and import fees in the same manner that Congress long ago established the reasonable return on the investment principle in the fixing of freight rates, to be administered by an independent commission named the Interstate Commerce Commission.

POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 1149

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate bill 271, to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, passed the Senate some time ago and has been approved by the President. A similar bill, House bill 1149, was received from the House, having passed the House, and was ordered to lie on the table in the Senate. In view of the approval of the Senate bill, the House bill, without objection, will be indefinitely postponed.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 21, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 17, 1951:

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Robert P. Fasulo (naval academy) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Midshipman Richard L. Anderton (naval academy) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy:

John R. Arnold
Clifford S. Babcock
Walter L. Briant
Bradford N. Bunnell
Burford A. Carlson
William F. Dudek
Owen W. Dykema
William H. Finn
Richard T. Fling
Robert W. Gillespie
Monroe C. Gollaher
Douglas C. Gregory
John G. Guffner
Richard B. Hansen
Lawrence C. Hartley
Henry F. Herbig
Hugh P. Janes
Carl W. Koch
Roger J. Lahn
Robert G. Landon
Arthur R. Loomer
David I. McGinnis
Vincent J. Madden
Richard B. Oldenburg
Royc C. Pichler
Francis L. Ready
Harry A. Saunders
Robert DeL. Schbert
Douglas J. Smith
William R. Sonnemann
Howard C. Springer
David W. Tompkins
George C. Schitzer
John R. Shaughnessy

Ronald D. Hartell (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name.

Byron S. Hollingshead, Jr. (naval ROTC) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in lieu of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Carl E. Wilbur

LIEUTENANT

John B. Riggsbee

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Howard Adler	James E. Odell
Robert W. Gibson	Nahum R. Shulman

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed:

LIEUTENANTS

Charles W. Fain, Jr.
Paul M. Leyden

Walter N. Johnson (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Thomas G. Akers	James P. Milano
James H. Berrian	Thomas G. Mitchell
Joseph C. Boudreaux, Jr.	Richard L. Sedam
	Joseph M. Tyler, Jr.
Richard M. Cox	Harry L. Wise
Daniel M. Goodacre III	

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Hilda Evans	Patricia A. Miller
Dorothy M. Hanson	Barbara Norris
Rebecca H. Jackson	Anna E. Venishnick
Patricia H. MacDonald	Clara P. Wienczek

POSTMASTER

The following-named person to be postmaster:

Ross A. Hancher to be postmaster at Elwood, Ind., in place of J. P. Mack, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Excutive nominations received by the Senate May 17, 1951:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

James N. Jensen	Robert B. Black
Joseph N. Gonyeau	William G. Roden
Walter C. Schafran	Sidney F. Hansen

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert L. Smith	Frederick W. Folger
Walter Folger	John V. Caffrey
Frederick O. Wooley	Hollis M. Walker, Jr.
Thomas Osman, Jr.	Henry E. Engelbrecht
Lyle W. Lemos	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray that Thou wilt strengthen and encourage our minds and hearts during this day with a reassuring sense of the reality of Thy greatness and goodness.

Forgive us for allowing ourselves at times to be so faithless and to feel that the noble ideals and principles, which we cherish, have lost their luster and will never be victorious.

Send us forth with new faith and hope as we pray and labor for the coming of Thy kingdom of peace and good will. Give us the intrepid spirit of the pioneer and patriot who revealed the splendor of their souls when the course which they pursued was beset by hardship and suffering.

May Thy ways of righteousness and justice and blessedness for all mankind become so clear and commanding that we shall never doubt and darken them by our indifference or by our heartless prejudices and selfish ambitions.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 872. An act to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51-21.

SUNDRY FORMER STUDENTS OF THE AIR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1227) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps. I may say that an identical bill, H. R. 3562, passed the House on May 15.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Raymond Pohl, Jr., 505A Magnolia Avenue, Frederick, Md., $83.95; Dan K. Rawlings, 205 Laurel Avenue, Corbin, Ky., $13.10; Harold L. Reed, 201 West Lindell Street, West Frankfort, Ill., $12.20; Marcus A. Sessi, 417 West Pennview Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $8; Robert D. Simmons, 835½ Broadway, New Orleans, La., $23.85; Harry P. Smith, Jr., 2225 Chesapeake Avenue, Hampton, Va., $60.66; Paul E. Smith, 2109 Eoff Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $6.10; Raymond C. Sowko, Glennland Apartments, State College, Pa., $444.40; Clyde C. Spears, 347 Linden Walk, Lexington, Ky., $233.60; Donald E. Spears, 123 West Central Avenue, Belle, W. Va., $212.70; Homer R. Steele, route 1, Fairview, W. Va., $142; John D. Stiles, Wadestown, W. Va., $110.20; George F. Stock, Jr., Hollandale, Miss., $236.95; David A. Stockton, 105 East Seventh Street, box 256, Ritzville, Wash., $179.65; Frank A. Sullivan, 7949 Susquehanna Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $396.80; William K. Sutton, 961 Fincastle Road, Lexington, Ky., $141.25; Floyd Ramsey Tarr, 3729 Marlamont Drive, Weirton, W. Va., $170.05; Hagop H. Terzagian, 217 Myrtle Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., $338.85; Jack Alfred Thallmer, 4518 West Grace Street, Richmond, Va., $226.80; Eugene R. Thomas, 9 South York Street, Wheeling, W. Va., $223.20; Forest G. Thompson, 2201 Frederica Street, Owensboro, Ky., $157.80; Joseph C. Thompson, box 700, O. M. S., Travis AFB, Fairview, Calif., $423.25; Thomas W. Tigertt, box 93, Wilmer, Tex., $583.90; Richard J. Torchia, 630 Dow Avenue, Carnegie, Pa., $229.80; Lee C. Truman, Jr., 2422 Allen Street, Owensboro, Ky., $252.40; Charles B. Upshaw, 394 West Wesley Road, Northwest, Atlanta, Ga., $191; George J. Walters, Jr., 438 South Dallas Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., $435.55; Gilbert Watz, 834 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., $366.45; Arthur J. Weinsten, 501 Manheim Street (22-A), Philadelphia, Pa., $200.10; Robert J. Weiss, 111 West Cherryhill Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., $239.25; James Bernard Welborn, 442 Cherry Street, Russellville, Ky., $107.55; Earl M. Williams, box 204, Evarts, Ky., $297.50; Edwin J. Williams, Jr., 1832 Chuckatuck Avenue, Petersburg, Va., $505.60; Charles P. Wilson, Jr., route 1, Walkersville, W. Va., $404.16; and Harold W. Wilson, 205½ Fourth Street, Parkersburg, W. Va., $324.20. The payment of said sums shall be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damages to or loss or destruction of personal property as a result of a fire that occurred on June 28, 1948, in the building in which they were quartered at Langley Air Force Base, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 3562 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Adair	Byrnes, Wis.	Hall, Leonard W.
Anderson, Calif.	Case	Halleck
Angell	Chudoff	Harvey
Bailey	Colmer	Hays, Ark.
Baker	Crumpacker	Irving
Barrett	Dawson	Jackson, Wash.
Beamer	Deane	Kennedy
Bonner	Dingell	Kersten, Wis.
Bosone	Dorn	Kirwan
Bray	Elliott	Latham
Brownson	Elsworth	McGrath
Buckley	Gillette	Magee
Butler	Granahan	Marshall
Byrne, N. Y.	Green	

Miller, Calif.	Powell	Roosevelt
Miller, N. Y.	Ramsay	Sasscer
Morgan	Redden	Scott, Hardie
Moulder	Reed, N. Y.	Shelley
Murray, Wis.	Richards	Sheppard
Perkins	Roberts	Smith, Miss.
Poage	Rogers, Tex.	Thomas

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. NORRELL, be included as one of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Senate will be notified accordingly.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY TO THE PEOPLE OF EL SALVADOR

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas earthquakes of major proportions in El Salvador on May 6 and 7, 1951, have resulted in the loss of many lives, untold suffering, and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property, rendering homeless and destitute thousands of people: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the deepest sympathy of the Congress and the people of the United States be extended to the President and the people of El Salvador in this dark hour of their suffering and distress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I should like to say that this is a resolution of sympathy to the people of El Salvador. A small country has suffered a grievous disaster in the earthquake shocks of last week. The gentleman from Missouri and I visited El Salvador last autumn in connection with the inauguration of their new president, Oscar Osorio, and while there we had an opportunity to see something of the country. It is a very friendly country to the United States, and has often demonstrated its friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I might observe that this resolution carries no appropriation, authorizes none, and involves no junkets for anybody. I hope it will receive, as I am sure it deserves, unanimously favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to comment that it should be remembered El Salvador has usually been the first country among our good neighbors to the south of us to come to the support of the United States in its international decisions. As I recall it El Salvador was the first nation to join in the declaration of war against Germany and Japan. I had an opportunity to visit El Salvador some years ago. I was asked to make a speech in Spanish in behalf of the American delegation there. They are a grand people, good neighbors, and good friends of ours. I join in the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF LAND BY THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, ETC. (H. DOC. NO. 133)

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

The question is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that under the Rules of the House I am entitled to 1 hour, during which time I can yield to other Members without, however, yielding the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a brief as to the constitutionality of the proposed legislation.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I trust Members will give me their close attention because this is one of the most important bills or measures that will be considered by the House of Representatives during this session, for it has as its objective the keeping of control in the Congress of the United States over land acquisitions and disposals in the Department of Defense and the Civil Defense Administration. The Committee on Armed Services unanimously, and the committee is composed of some 35 members, respectfully request the House of Representatives to override the President's veto. The reason we do so is that we feel the Congress, representing the American people, should have knowledge of what happens in those departments.

Back in 1942 and 1943 an agreement was entered into by the old Committee on Naval Affairs with the Administration and with the then Secretary of the Navy Knox, whereby all acquisitions of real estate of every character and all leases would be submitted to the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. That understanding continued for 2 years. Then when the House Naval Affairs Committee was preparing a public works bill, we wrote a provision into the law carrying out that agreement that existed between President Roosevelt's administration, Secretary Knox, and the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and Senate. Here is what that says:

Provided further, That prior to the acquisition or disposal, by lease or otherwise, of any land acquired for naval use under the authority of this, or any other act, the Secretary of the Navy shall come into agreement with the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the terms of such prospective acquisitions or disposals; and recital of compliance with this proviso in any instrument of conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of this or any other act shall be conclusive evidence of the Secretary's compliance with this proviso as to the property conveyed.

That has been on the statute books since April 4, 1944. When the Armed Services Committee was created by the merging of the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee, all laws applicable to the Navy fell within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committees. So since that time, since the Eightieth Congress, the Armed Services Committees have been administering for the Navy this law that was passed in 1944.

What this bill, House bill 3096, does is merely to extend that same principle to the Army and to the Air Force, because the present provision only extends to the Navy. We now say that we want to include this same principle, with some modifications. Any purchase of realty or any lease under $10,000 does not have to be submitted for the consideration of the committees.

The committee held a hearing on House bill 3096. It was unanimously passed by the committee. I appeared before the Rules Committee and obtained a rule, and the bill was unanimously passed by the House.

At the very time we were debating the bill, the Senate took up a companion bill dealing with the identical subject, which bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Senator SALTONSTALL, and the same bill with the exception of only one word, was passed by the Senate. So when the House bill reached the Senate, the Senate adopted the House bill.

Now the President has written a veto and he says this is bad legislation. He says it will involve a delay. I disagree with the President in regard to that. I also disagree that it will involve a large personnel to administer it in the Department. In the Navy Department today

there are only seven men who handle this matter that comes before the committees and House bill 3096 will require only four, a reduction of three. We process in the neighborhood of some 75 or 100 Navy requests nearly every month. We have a member of our staff and we have a special subcommittee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], and including the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and myself. We pass on these various items that come in and we promptly give consideration to them and notify the Department.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. On the question of delay, it has been my observation that experience is a pretty good teacher. The gentleman has indicated that this process has been in operation with respect to the Navy for nearly 10 years?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct, 2 years by agreement and 7 by law.

Mr. COLE of New York. My question is, Does the gentleman know of a single instance with respect to the Navy where the Navy has been occasioned any delay whatsoever?

Mr. VINSON. I do not, unless there was good reason for the delay. As a matter of fact, there is no request at the White House from the Navy Department for a veto of this measure.

I may say further that there was no objection from the Department of Justice as to the constitutionality of this question of veto.

The Congress has the right to delegate either to a department or a bureau chief authority to carry out any provisions of law in reference to the acquisition of property or the making of leases.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that this practice of having the committee check up on these bids has saved the country untold millions of dollars?

Mr. VINSON. There is no question about it. You may be saving money by cutting down this appropriation and that appropriation, but this bill is where you can save millions of dollars, and that is what the Naval Affairs Committee did in years gone by.

Let us go one step further; the Army, during the last war, had the authority to go out, and it has the authority to do it today, and lease any hotel in the United States that it may see fit to lease. You might pick up the paper tomorrow morning and find where the Army, if it saw fit to do so, had taken over the Statler Hotel. What would be your responsibility? Your responsibility as it stands today would be merely to foot the bill, and you would have no voice in the acquisition.

During the last war it became so bad that the Truman committee in the Senate made an investigation of the leasing of the hotels on Miami Beach and other cities by the Army and Navy and wrote its report. Let me read you what Senator Truman said; here is what the distinguished President said back in 1944:

> The manner in which the hotel acquisition program was carried out resulted in many injustices which the War Department has shown little inclination to prevent. Some of these doubtless could be corrected by simple negotiation, particularly where final settlements have not yet been made. To correct others, the War Department may need further legal authority. The War Department should review the entire situation in detail and report to the proper legislative committees of the Congress.

Now, listen to this:

> It should be pointed out that the Navy Department advises the legislative committees of its real estate acquisitions in advance and keeps these committees advised of its situation.

That is all this bill proposes to do; it merely proposes that when the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force desire to obtain a piece of property that they lay the facts before the two committees.

We had a hearing. General Pick, the Chief of Engineers, was there, representing the Department of Defense. When we first drafted the bill he said the bill would cause them too much trouble and too much delay; so we said to him: "General, you can write the bill to suit yourself." He wrote the bill exempting rivers and harbors and flood control projects, and exempting leases on agricultural grazing permits. The balance of the bill he wrote—of course he is against it because all departmental officials are against Congress knowing what goes on. Let me read you what the general said as the reason why he was opposed to it: "Because you would have to be more cautious. Would you not?" "Absolutely," replied General Pick. They would have to make out a case; and he said that was the reason, that they would have to be more cautious in real-estate transactions. Under the law today a commander of the Army in San Francisco may look out and say: "I want this building." He sends a notice to the Department in Washington and the Department says, "Take that building," and you have no voice in the matter, you know nothing about it until you read of it in the newspapers. They can say, with reference to any property in America, that they will lease it, and they can go one step further; they can acquire property for a manufacturing enterprise for the Department without ever submitting it to the Congress.

Let me show you what is happening right now. The Navy, in compliance with that request—and I will show you how these things happen—a few days ago said, and here is one of them that comes in now:

> The Department of the Navy is initiating action to enter into a supply contract with the Hudson Motor Car Co. for the manufacture of aircraft engines to support the accelerated aircraft-production program. In order that the Hudson Motor Car Co. can produce the engines, additional Government-owned facilities such as land, buildings, building equipment, test cells, and machine tools are required.
>
> The Bureau of Aeronautics proposes to construct the new plant, estimated cost of which is $30,000,000, on a site to be acquired by the Department of the Navy.

They then describe the site and state how much the appraised value is. When that reached the Armed Services Committee we said, "Let us have a little investigation of this." What happened? As a result of investigation the Navy made a further survey and withdrew the proposition to spend $30,000,000 to build a new plant at Detroit for the Hudson Automobile Co. because they found facilities in which they could carry on this work. Every day that same thing goes on.

All I am asking the Congress to do is to exercise the authority that the people have a right to expect of you to know what goes on when your public money is being spent. There is absolutely no unjustified delay. It will not cause any personnel difficulties anywhere down here in the departments. The Navy is doing it today with seven people and can do it under this bill with only four. Of course, the Army will have a little bit larger staff because the Army sometimes is not as cautious in the use of manpower as the other services are. But, nevertheless, it will require only a small group to administer this. It will be submitted to the committee and the committee will make an investigation.

That is what you are here for. If any man in this House that is sent here to exercise this responsibility will go back home and tell your people that you are sent to Washington only to appropriate money that the Department of Defense wants and you know nothing about it until the time comes to foot the bill, I guarantee if you make that kind of a statement they will send a man with a little more inquisitive mind to Washington.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Would the distinguished gentleman from Georgia care to comment upon the President's statement or his contention that by this legislation we would be trespassing upon the prerogatives of the executive department?

Mr. VINSON. Here is a brief covering that identical point. You do not trespass. You delegate to a bureau to do certain things. Now we are saying by law that instead of delegating it to the bureau, delegate it to yourself, delegate it to a committee here in Congress. That is all we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, last December we had up for consideration a military public-works bill involving the expenditure of $1,658,000,000 to acquire property all over the United States. I may say to the House that another bill will be up for consideration in a few days to spend $6,000,000,000 or more for military public works. We wrote a provision in that public-works bill that any real estate acquired under that bill or any other bill could not be disposed of except by a specific act of the Congress.

Now, the President had to sign the bill, but he wrote a message and he said, "I am opposed to section 407 of the bill because I do not want to require these departments to get an act of Congress when they dispose of real estate."

Let me go one step further. If we had had something like this on the statute books with reference to personal property, with reference to clothes, with reference to shoes, with reference to tanks and with reference to other equipment, we would not today be as short as we are, because one reason you are not putting today more men in the army, in your navy, and in your air force, is due to the fact that you do not have the equipment. They disposed of it because Congress had no control of it. Now, I have been here a long time, and I have been fighting during those years that I have been here for Congress to meet its responsibility and not delegate, every day of the week, more and more authority to the Executive.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. At the present time many Navy leases are coming before the committee, amounting to many millions of dollars. We can say, "We interpose no objection," or disapprove the project.

Mr. VINSON. If we find one that is coming in like this Detroit plant, involving some $30,000,000, why we stop it and look into it. I say to this House that this is a forward step in restoring to Congress its responsibility. It is the people's money that you are spending, and why should you sit idly by here when the only knowledge you have of the acquisition of a piece of property is to hear it on Sunday night from Walter Winchell or from Drew Pearson? Let us know about these things and know about them in advance.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman from Georgia elaborate on his statement that the President did sign a public-works bill which included some of the same provisions of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. That bill, Public Law 910, did not include the exact provisions. We put a provision, section 407, into that public-works bill that none of the property heretofore acquired or hereafter acquired by the military departments could be disposed of until the Congress passed a specific act, and we are on sound ground in passing legislation of that kind. Why should we permit the Department of Defense, whenever it makes up its mind, to sell this piece of property or sell that piece of property? It is Government property, and Congress should have some control over Government property.

Mr. HÉBERT. I have reference to the bill that the gentleman from Georgia referred to in connection with carrying out the informal agreement which the old Committee on Naval Affairs entered into.

Mr. VINSON. That was approved by the President back in 1944—Public Law 289, Seventy-eighth Congress. I repeat, the Navy has been doing it for 7 years, by statute, and I am merely asking the Congress to extend it to the Air Force and to the Army, and if you do so, you will not read in the paper where they have leased this building or that building. Let me tell you what we did recently.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. This bill very clearly says that none of the defense departments may acquire or dispose of any property without the agreement in advance of the Committee on Armed Services. That means that the Committee on Armed Services of the Congress must administer this law. What I would like to know is, When has the Constitution of the United States been changed so as to give this Congress the right to administer the laws that it enacts?

Mr. VINSON. If you will just merely read this brief you will find that Congress has, by the Constitution, the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States. That is the Constitution itself, and instead of saying it should be administered by the Department of Defense, Congress has the right to put in limitations on any piece of property or any method by which a piece of property may be acquired, and we say we put this responsibility on ourselves by saying to the Armed Services Committees, "You must have knowledge of it before it can be acquired."

Mr. MULTER. Your rule and regulation that you attempt to write into this bill is more than asking for the power.

Mr. VINSON. Not a bit in the world. Of course, I know what the gentleman has in mind. I know there is a little objection on the part of the Expenditures Committee. The Expenditures Committee think they have jurisdiction of this matter. They think they ought to do this. They are not going to the principle. Now, we know how to do it. We know how to hold the feet to the fire. We know well enough when they have a case from a national defense standpoint. If they do have one, there is no hesitation. Yesterday the whole committee approved some 50 or 60 of them, and they approve them every day. But every one of them is read, every one of them is briefed by our staff. We have a staff member that is paid $10,000 of the taxpayers' money, and his time is devoted to this. In years gone by a former Member of Congress did all this for the Committee on Naval Affairs.

If you want to do something constructive, if you want to know what goes on, if you want to know what happens in the departments, pass this over the President's veto.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the last 8 or 10 years, how many applications has the committee refused the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. We have rejected many. Now they go out and make their surveys and do just exactly as they did in this Detroit case. Take this Detroit instance. If it had not been for Public Law 289 the Navy Department would have made an expenditure of $30,000,000. They would have been building the plant today. But as a result of the committee's stepping in to look it over, the Navy made a survey and found other buildings, and therefore did not have to spend the $30,000,000.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. All of us realize that it is the province, duty, obligation, and responsibility of the Congress to provide for the common defense of this country. But, providing for the common defense has nothing to do with this legislation; if it did, I would be one hundred percent for its immediate adoption, because I sincerely feel that the Congress has been derelict in its responsibilities to provide for the common defense in compliance with section 8, article IV of our Constitution. To the contrary, many Members of Congress daily take pride in criticizing others for the very things the Congress has or has not done. I say that the prime reason for our present predicament in foreign affairs has been the failure of the Congress to assume its duties and responsibilities to provide for the common defense, rather than passively allow the administration to dictate such policies.

Often we hear from the floor of the House a Member say that we are not fighting communism, but that we are only fighting imperialistic actions of Russia. Of course, those statements are to justify this Congress in supporting communism on one hand while fighting communism on the other. Communism is communism whether in Russia or elsewhere. All Communists are imperialistically inclined in their beliefs. This Congress has had the opportunity on a number of occasions to do something about that for which they daily criticize others.

A majority has given money to Yugoslavia, a Communist government, to encourage them in their communistic beliefs—buying with our wealth while Russia takes through infiltration. The majority of the Congress has helped bring about the situation that we are now criticizing, and still we say that it is not our fault—that it is solely the fault of others. There are many Members in Congress who are so administration minded that they would stay with the administration on any issue—right or wrong. Those gentlemen will do anything that the President tells them to do. Many other Members, while biased and prejudiced against the administration, will sidestep any efforts in Congress to correct any detrimental situation in order to keep the turmoil alive for use in the elections in 1952.

There are not enough individual-thinking Members of this Congress to get a lot done for the better welfare of our people. Many of the same Members of Congress who are now daily criticizing Dean Acheson voted to install General Marshall as Secretary of Defense.

I have never found cause to regret having protested and fought against the installation of General Marshall; he and Acheson have the same mind. Both are failures, and it will be my pleasure to assume my portion of the responsibility in efforts to remove either or both of these misfits.

This proposed legislation is intended to allow the Congress the opportunity to administer its own legislation. I have thought since childhood that we were to maintain three separate and distinct departments of Government. Not so under the terms of this proposal, because here it is suggested that the Congress legislate the laws, rules, and regulations governing the various agencies of the Department of Defense, and then in turn administer those laws, rules, and regulations.

It is often that we criticize the administration for attempting to dictate legislation. Too, we frequently hear the Supreme Court criticized for writing legislation. Now, the Congress comes along and suggests that we delegate the authority to a portion of this House—the Armed Services Committee—to legislate, administer, and adjudicate all functions of our military forces. This is a violation of a basic principle—establishing a drastic precedent—and could well lead to abolition of our system of government. This proposal is no more drastic than a proposal to allow the Judiciary Committee of the House to determine the decision of a Federal judge; the Banking and Currency Committee of the House to pass upon all Federal Bank loans; or the Agriculture Committee of the House to pass upon all individual PMA payments. This precedent establishes no end to its possibilities.

This proposal is popular for the simple reason that the present administration is unpopular—which is a poor criterion for future effects. Of course, every committee of this Congress should assume its authority to investigate all Government departments and agencies coming within the purview and jurisdiction of the committee; but that does not mean that the committee should have the authority to administer congressional legislation. Even if the Congress were constitutionally authorized by law or principle to administer congressional legislation, I still cannot believe that one committee of this Congress should be delegated the authority to make such vital decisions for all of the other Members of Congress.

At least the Armed Services Committee, the Expenditures Committee, and the Appropriations Committee have the authority and should investigate all activities of our military departments. These investigations would reveal any wrongful expenditure of moneys and would afford this Congress an opportunity to prohibit any excessive spending by any of these defense agencies. This could and should be accomplished without changing the basic principles of our constitutional system of government.

I will appreciate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] addressing himself upon the subject of whether this legislation does not authorize the Congress to administer its own laws.

Mr. VINSON. Go one step further. If the gentleman from Arkansas will merely examine the rules of the House, he will find that by one rule of the House, which is a law, it is the duty not only of the Committee on Armed Services but of every committee of the Congress to see, to supervise, and to watch over the administration of every law that comes from that committee. That is all we are trying to do here.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] admits by his argument that the Congress is only authorized to investigate activities of our defense agencies. By this proposal the Congress is not investigating, but is permitting a committee of the Congress to administer the very laws that this Congress adopts. Of course, it is the duty of the Armed Services Committee to investigate activties of the defense agencies and to closely observe any spendthrift tendencies by any of those agencies so as to provide legislation and curtail appropriations to preclude any misuse of Government properties or moneys. That is not what this bill provides; it gives authority to the Armed Services Committee to supervise the purchasing and selling of property by the defense agencies—to administer their activities—and to veto any purchase or sale of property that does not meet with the approval of the Armed Services Committee. This is nothing short of providing that a committee of this Congress may administer all laws adopted by the Congress affecting defense agencies. The gentleman from Georgia and many other proponents of this legislation would strongly protest any similar request by another committee of this Congress.

Mr. VINSON. The Congress always has authority to say how property shall be acquired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I inquire of the gentleman if it is his impression that the operation of this system with reference to the Navy concurs with my own recollection, that at the very beginning of it, 10 years ago, the Navy resented it and chafed under it, they did not like it at all, and since they began to operate under it and have seen how the committee has dealt with these problems, they now not only accept it but welcome it, and are happy to have it and to share their responsibility with the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Let me go one step further. There was no scandal in connection with the leasing of any property or the acquisition of any property by the Navy. There was nothing in the Navy transactions that prompted what Senator Truman wrote about the Army hotel acquisition at Miami Beach and other cities. The reason is the scrutiny that these committees have over all these transactions.

We do not want this work but we have to do one of two things: We should do a complete job or wash our hands of it. We cannot do it half way. We do not want Members of Congress to come into the House and say, "What about this hotel and that hotel?" unless you place us in position to know about it. What we are asking today is that you put us in a position so that we can do a complete job.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the membership of the House and I believe the country at large should know this, that due to his faithfulness, diligence, and alertness, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has saved the taxpayers of this Nation hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEMENTE].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEMENTE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I point out to the House that the Committee on Rules in giving certain authority by resolution to the Committee on Armed Services did so with the distinct understanding and certainly with the thought in mind that that great committee would ride herd on the expenditures for which we have voted so many billions of dollars. I am sure that many of those appropriations would not have been passed or approved so easily had we not had the understanding and impression that the Committee on Armed Services would be permitted to function as the Congress desires.

Mr. CLEMENTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in corroborating the point of my distinguished chairman, I would like to read from the House Rules and Manual, Eighty-second Congress, page 474, section 136:

Legislative oversight by standing committees.

I will read the first three lines:

To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws—

Mr. Speaker, in directing my remarks to the President's veto message and the reconsideration of H. R. 3096 I wish to call to the attention of the House the importance and need for this legislation in the interests of economy and efficiency. I should like to call to the attention of the Members the hearing which I conducted as chairman of subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee with the assistance of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] relating to the proposal of the General Services Administration to lease two modern apartment houses in this city, the Boston House and the State House, for the Department of Defense. This is a perfect example of the type of real-estate transaction that this legislation will bring to light. The committee heard

testimony that the two apartment buildings were constructed under the provisions of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. That is, the funds for the construction of the buildings were obtained under mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration at 90 percent of the costs of the projects.

The GSA, which is responsible for leasing space for all Government activities in the District of Columbia, offered to lease these buildings for office space for the Defense Department. But apparently the FHA foresaw a legal obstacle that would cause embarrassment unless steps were taken to avoid it. The apartment buildings were built under legislation designed to relieve the critical shortage of veterans' housing in this area.

Therefore, the FHA advised the GSA that it could not consent to the conversion of these buildings from housing projects to office buildings unless the GSA indicated that they would institute appropriate condemnation proceedings to achieve their objective. In the absence of such a threat, the FHA felt that it would not have authority to permit the conversion and at the same time insure the mortgages under the provisions of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. On the other hand, if the GSA did condemn the buildings, it was decided that GSA would have to assume the mortgage commitments. This did not appear to be a desirable situation. Subsequently all hands agreed that the mere threat of condemnation would be of sufficient importance to relieve the FHA of its obligations under its statute. The GSA, in a letter to the FHA, furnished the threat and thus the legal obstacles were cleared.

But the owners of the apartment buildings and the Government now had to come to agreement concerning the amount of rent that would be charged. After considerable negotiations the owner of the State House submitted a letter offer to lease his building to the Government for $400,000 per year. This owner in filing his application with FHA for mortgage insurance and for the establishment of rental ceiling stated under oath that based upon his experience in renting apartments the State House would not be filled to capacity all of the time. He estimated that 7 percent of the time the apartments would be vacant. Therefore, in establishing rental ceilings, he requested the FHA to compute his gross income on the basis of 93 percent occupancy. The FHA agreed and based upon 93 percent occupancy that Federal agency established rent ceilings authorizing the owner to charge a maximum rent of $353,500 per year for this building.

With the building being used for residential housing the FHA estimated that the owner would incur expenses of liability insurance, salaries of elevator operators, maintenance men, legal and real-estate agent fees, and furnish utilities, light, gas, heat, and so forth and similar expenses with which the owner of any apartment building is confronted. It was estimated that these expenses would run about $97,000 a year. But the income of $353,500 would still allow the owner a reasonable profit on his investment.

Notwithstanding the rent ceilings thus established and the FHA's calculations of reasonable profit to the owner, the GSA proposed to pay this owner $400,000 a year and at the same time, operate and maintain the building, relieving him of all the expenses that he would have had to incur, had he rented the building for veterans' housing. Furthermore, at the expiration of the lease the Government would have had to restore the apartment building to its former condition. Here is a case where one agency of the Government proposed to lease a building, the construction of which was sponsored by another agency of the Government. The first agency entered into negotiations to pay the owner an annual rental which exceeded the ceiling established by the second agency, and furthermore, proposed to relieve the owner of all of his operating expenses. In this instance, he would have received approximately $47,000 a year more in rent and would have saved an additional $97,000 in expenses, or a total of $144,000 per annum.

Similarly, the FHA established price ceilings on the apartments in the Boston house which would have permitted the owner to receive a gross income of approximately $300,000 from rent based upon 93 percent occupancy. Again, with this maximum rent ceiling, it was estimated that the owner would incur expenses of $94,000 in operating the building. To this owner, the Government proposed to pay an annual rent of $320,000 and to relieve him of all of the maintenance and operating expenses. In this case, the owner would have made approximately $20,000 a year more in rent, by having the Government as a tenant, and would have saved $94,000 in expenses, or a total of $114,000 per year.

These violations were brought out as a result of an investigation and hearings that were held by the Armed Services Committee, which resulted in a recommendation to the Secretary of Defense that further negotiations for the leasing of these buildings were not in public interest. Still we have no statutory authority to prohibit real-estate transactions of this nature. In this instance, the Secretary of Defense followed the recommendations of the committee. Testimony revealed that there was no need for the apartments. Subcommittee was advised that the original estimates of the Defense Department to recruit 17,325 employees by June 30, 1951, have been reduced considerably. Furthermore, the GSA advised that space utilization by nondefense agencies was not as efficient as that of the Defense Department and that every effort was being made to compress the nondefense agencies into smaller quarters thereby releasing additional space for the Defense Department.

But there is further evidence of chicanery indulged in by the executive agency. The owners of these apartment buildings after agreeing to a rental price, were instructed by the GSA to submit to the Government offers to rent their apartment buildings. The offers were dated January 18, 1951. With these offers in hand, the GSA ran an advertisement in the Evening Star on February 1.

In response to questioning by members of the committee, it was testified that in an endeavor to find additional office space, advertisements were placed in the newspaper and that these two apartment owners were the only two that responded. Further testimony was that the rents were determined by the bids received, but the truth of the matter is that negotiations were carried on with the owners for months prior to the advertisement being run in the newspaper. The ads were just window dressing. It is sleight of hand such as this that causes the Members of Congress to feel that there is a definite need to review those real-estate transactions which involve large expenditures of public funds.

The enactment of the legislation that the Congress is now considering will make these transactions highly improbable if not impossible. The committees of the Congress will be advised beforehand of the proposals to acquire real estate.

While the GSA was proposing to spend approximately three-fourths of a million dollars a year for the rental of luxury apartment buildings for office space, the Armed Services Committee made a survey of the space in the Pentagon Building. That survey revealed that there was over 125,000 square feet of space on the concourse, and that a large segment of that space was occupied by such commercial establishments as the florist shop, the jewelry shop, the drug store, the dry-cleaning store, the book store, the household appliance store, the dress shop, and the shoe-repair shop.

It seems to me that the officials charged with good space utilization should examine into the propriety of housing commercial establishments in space that might be converted to office space, while at the same time proposing to spend millions of dollars for the conversion of luxury-apartment building.

Further evidence that this legislation is needed is found in the fact that here in Washington, D. C., the tendency is to lease buildings for exceptionally long terms. Of the 61 buildings being leased for Government office and warehouse space as of June 30, 1950, only six of them have been leased for a period of less than 4 years and 55 have been in effect for a period longer than 5 years. Ten of the leases have been in effect for 25 years and one of them, it was testified, has been under Government lease for 42 years. With such legislation as this on the books, these conditions would not exist.

There is nothing new in this legislation. As has been pointed out by the chairman, the Navy Department reported to committees of Congress during World War II and still does.

I understand that even prior to the enactment of legislation requiring the Navy Department to report these proposals, the Secretary of the Navy voluntarily submitted this information to the

committees for consideration and approval. Furthermore, General Pick, chief of Army engineers, in testifying before the Armed Services Committee indicated that the submissions would in no way impede the defense effort and that he would be able to comply without interfering in the slightest with his operation. For he wrote the bill.

Another example of this type legislation is Public Law No. 3, approved by the Eighty-second Congress on March 10, 1951. That law directed that the Navy Department be prohibited from selling, transferring, or otherwise disposing of any of its vessels without prior authorization by the Congress. In view of the complete satisfaction that we have had in handling the Navy projects and further in view of the real-estate transactions of the type I have just described, and in view of the legislative oversight by standing committees I strongly recommend that the House go on record in favor of overriding the President's veto and extend to the Army and Air Force that same authority as the committee now holds with respect to the Navy Department.

General Services Administration—Public Buildings Service, Region 3

Leases active on—	Number of buildings leased for—								
	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 to 9 years	10 to 14 years	15 to 19 years	20 to 24 years	25 years or more	Total
June 30, 1945	13	13	31	43	78	38	1	0	10	224
June 30, 1950	3	0	1	2	18	19	8	0	10	61

Remarks: In accordance with the reorganization plan of 1939 a number of leases formerly held by other departments were transferred to the Public Buildings Administration. Some of these transferred lease files do not have complete records of the Government's occupancy prior to the lease transfer. Accordingly, this report indicates that the Government originally leased the buildings in the year first shown in our lease files, or other records. There is, however, a possibility that the Government may have re-leased the building and then reentered at some later date.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEMENTE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not true that the $114,000 is just an annual saving? It goes on each year?

Mr. CLEMENTE. That is right. That is for each year.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEMENTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Another precedent which we have adopted has to do with the Internal Revenue law, where we have provided that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue shall review any tax revision over $200,000. I think that is an exact parallel to our present situation.

Mr. CLEMENTE. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I well know the danger of a freshman Member crossing swords with the most expert swordsman in the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], but I believe there is another side to this story, and I hope the gentleman from Georgia will give more than 5 minutes so that the other side may be told to the Members of the House. A Presidential veto is not a thing lightly undertaken and there must be some good reason for the veto. I should like to call to your attention a few facts which seem to me to indicate that it would be wise to sustain the President's veto.

On December 20, when very few Members of the House were present, the Military Property Act was brought to this floor; and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from Texas, who is also a distinguished and skilled speaker, advocated the passage of that act. That act contained section 407, and that is the subject of this legislation which is before us today. H. R. 3096 was a so-called attempt to repeal section 407. At that time the Committee on the Armed Services made just as skilled a presentation of section 407, and I will tell you what section 407 of that act required: It required that the Defense Department submit to the Congress any proposition to sell or acquire land and that Congress pass on it.

The Committee on the Armed Services passed an act which would require the administrators of personal and real property to come before the Congress and get a law passed before they could sell or dispose of, or transfer property; that is what they did, and the President a month or so later rightly asked that that section be repealed because it would make completely inoperative the function of taking care of the Federal property of this Government.

In place of coming before the House and repealing section 407 they come before you with another bill, a bill which does quite a few things. This bill, H. R. 3096, which incidentally was also passed at a time when very few Members were here—and I might say that section 407 in the original property act was not approved by the Budget Bureau or the Department of Defense; and I might say further that the Department of Defense has asked that H. R. 3096 be vetoed for good and sufficient reasons.

This bill provides that none of the defense departments can lease a building at an annual rent over $10,000 without coming to the Congress and getting permission to do so. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] just said a moment ago that from 40 to 50 of these leases and propositions to acquire property are coming before their subcommittee from the Navy alone, and the gentleman from Georgia said that they had one man assigned to review the 40 or 50 leases a day that come before them from the Navy. I ask: What kind of supervision can one man give to 40 or 50 leases from the Navy alone? And now you are going to bring the Army and the Air Force into this picture, and you are going to allow the administrative committee of this House to be the administrative bureau for the billions and billions of dollars worth of property that are in the Defense Establishment. With the addition of the Army and the Air Force to the Navy responsibilities, I can assure you that the Armed Services Committee will find itself completely unable to fulfill the obligations it seeks to impose on itself in H. R. 3096.

There is a clear line of demarcation between legislating a law and administering it, and I am saying that the President, if you will read his message in the May 15 issue, gave good and sufficient reasons why, from the standpoint of administering the property of the Government, H. R. 3096 would prove completely unworkable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the 2 minutes. In connection with the leasing of property, the Defense Departments cannot sign a lease, they cannot engage in the transfer of personal property or real property between agencies or from the agencies to cities and States. A lot of that has been done under the Surplus Property Act. Many of your States and cities have acquired military property by transfer under the clause in the Surplus Property Act. But now that cannot be done without going to Mr. VINSON's committee. I say to you that the complete staff of the Committee on Armed Services could not possibly furnish at the present time the personnel to go over all of these matters, even if they used all of their people, and, in my opinion, they have many things that are far more important than this.

This is in direct contradiction to the Property Act of 1949, the Federal Property and Administrative Act, which placed in one central agency, the General Services Administration, responsibility for preserving Government property, for disposing of Government property, for leasing property, and by that act alone, which was in complete accord with the Hoover Commission report and which passed unanimously in this House, we have eliminated bidding for leases and the bidding for property between the Defense Departments. The General Services Administration is procuring property and leasing property for all Federal agencies now and saving millions and millions of dollars. It is true there have been some mistakes made, but I assure you, when it comes to waste, the military and all of its departments have plenty of areas of waste which the gentleman's committee could concern itself with, without interfering with the property law which was passed unanimously by this Congress. Public Law 152 placed the responsibility for purchasing property, disposing of property, and leasing property for all the agencies of Government in one responsible head. That responsible head, Mr. Larsen, of General Services, can be called at any time before the Armed Services Committee or any other committee of the House to explain its action.

Mr. Speaker, I am frank to say that I urged upon the President the veto of

H. R. 3096. On May 10, I wrote to the President as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I take this means of urging upon you the veto of H. R. 3096, recently passed by the Congress?

Although this bill would repeal section 407 of Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, in accordance with your message to the Congress of January 15, 1951, other provisions are included in the bill which do not comport with an orderly and efficient program of Government property acquisition, utilization, and disposition. It was clearly the objective of the Congress, in enacting Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, to vest in the General Services Administrator over-all responsibility for the handling of Federal property. Neither section 407 of Public Law 910, nor H. R. 3096 conform to that general objective. These proposals would serve only to obscure the responsibility of the General Services Administrator and to interpose cumbersome and unworkable procedures in Federal property management.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, pages 5374–5375, contains the President's veto message on H. R. 3096. This message points out that the requirements in the bill to secure agreement from the Armed Services Committees of both Houses on all major real estate and leasing transactions of the Department of Defense and the Civilian Defense Administration would impose a heavy and unnecessary burden on the Department of Defense. Numerous personnel that should be working on vital military tasks would be diverted to the preparation of hundreds of reports for submission to the Armed Services Committees. The delays involved in this kind of procedure would impede the defense-procurement program.

The President pointed out that the resulting delays would be not only those involved in the actual preparation of the reports required, their presentation to the congressional committees, and the review of those reports by the committees and their staffs, but greater and more serious delays resulting from the inability of the Department of Defense to plan future operations until after the congressional committees had acted.

It appears to me that this legislation embodies a major fallacy of administration; it violates the proper division of labor and allocation of responsibilities between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. The surest way to destroy responsibility and accountability in the administration is to make a committee of Congress a party to each and every administrative act of any importance, such as this bill does.

I recognize, of course, as do other Members, that the real estate and leasing transactions of the military and other departments of the Government, are not always above reproach. The Congress or any appropriate committee of the Congress is entitled to criticize any or all of these transactions. It is entitled to get full information; but it is not entitled, in my humble judgment, to sit as a party in the making of the transaction. This is a basic violation of those tenets of government to which we have tried to adhere through the years.

Legislative policy is expressed in the laws that we pass. The execution of the laws, the administrative detail designed to implement these laws, rests upon the executive branch. No executive agency can be held fully accountable unless it has full responsibility for execution of the law. If the Armed Services Committee is going to take the responsibility for approving the purchase of every tract of land acquired by the military, or every office building or warehouse leased, then it seems to me that the committee has gone too far afield from its congressional duties.

Furthermore, the duties imposed upon the Armed Services Committee by this bill are duties properly vested in the General Services Administrator and other Government officials by Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress. Under Reorganization Plan 18 of 1950, the General Services Administration is responsible for acquiring general-purpose space in many cities throughout the United States. As the President pointed out in his veto message, in such cases the military departments submit their needs to the General Services Administration which acquires or leases space on behalf of the military department concerned. If H. R. 3096 were the law, presumably the General Services Administration would first have to determine the availability of space in a particular transaction; the military department would have to run up to the Hill with the proposal; the committees and their staffs would have to review the proposal, and agree to it; the military department would have to take it back to the General Services Administration; and by that time probably, the space would be gone.

I see nothing of good administration in the enactment of H. R. 3096. The broad objective of Congress in enacting Public Law 152 and creating the General Services Administration was to work toward the orderly management of Federal property, to work toward a more efficient handling of Federal property under central and responsible supervision. H. R. 3096 is a long step away from this objecive. It purports to vest in the Armed Services Committee certain management responsibilities which should rest on the General Services Administrator.

The report of the committee—House Report 292—on H. R. 3096 is very frank in stating that this bill has not been approved by the Department of Defense. It has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It is not in accord with the program of the President. At this time of national emergency, no good purpose is served by injecting committees of the Congress into the middle of the administrative actions necessary to facilitate the national defense program.

Make no mistake about it, I favor the most searching scrutiny and surveillance of this program by the Congress and its appropriate committees. I am honored, myself, to serve on one such committee, the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, with the important duty of overseeing activities in the executive branch. I wish to commend the Committee on Armed Services and its distinguished chairman for the excellent work they have done in keeping the military departments in line. My only concern, and I wish to emphasize it again, is that a clear distinction must be made between these functions of Congressional scrutiny and surveilance and the functions of administration, which latter belong to the executive branch.

Let it be noted that H. R. 3096 not only interferes with the duties and responsibilities of the General Services Administrator regarding the leasing of space for the military departments and the civilian defense administration, it would also disrupt the whole program of surplus property disposal. One military department could not even transfer a piece of land to another military department without getting an O. K. from the committee.

Declarations of surplus to the General Services Administration could not be effected without the approval of the committee.

I hope the President's veto will be upheld.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

THE LEGISLATURE ENACTS, THE EXECUTIVE ENFORCES, AND THE JUDICIARY INTERPRETS THE LAWS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am jealous of the prerogatives of this House; at the same time, I do not want this House to exercise or attempt to exercise any prerogatives of the executive department. I was taught in school that the legislative body enacted laws, the executive branch of the Government enforced them, and that the judiciary interpreted the laws. If this proposal goes over into enforcing the laws, I am going to vote against it because I do not believe we should get into the executive branch of the Government any more than the executive branch of the Government should get into the legislative branch.

PRECEDENT MORE IMPORTANT THAN THIS BILL

This particular bill is not so important as the precedent it sets and, also, may I invite your attention to the fact that this is an enlargement upon another precedent. That precedent, I think, was a bad one, but this is an enlargement upon that. So where will we stop in enlarging on these bad precedents?

The Banking and Currency Committee has a "watchdog committee," both in the House and Senate. We are overseeing the enforcement of the Defense Production Act that we passed, but we have no veto power. They do not have to consult us about the orders they issue. If we should carry this proposal to its logical conclusion, to its logical end, the "watchdog committee" should have the power to say that they cannot issue any kind of an order until it is submitted to our committee and the committee's approval obtained. That is going rather far.

Take the Committee on Agriculture: it oversees a lot of important functions. Are you going to let that committee have the same veto power this committee will have? I am referring to this committee as at present constituted. I am not criticising any of its members. I have a very high regard for the chairman and for all members of the Armed Services Committee. But I am thinking about

our constitutional form of government in the hope that we will not get the legislative into the executive branch of the Government. Suppose the Committee on Banking and Currency should say in connection with a loan from the International Bank—we passed that law; at least, we sponsored it—"We think every loan that is proposed by the International Bank providing for over, say, $100,000,000, should receive the approval of our committee first." That just shows the extreme that we could go just in that one committee.

Now, a committee is an agency of the House, and here we are delegating to the Armed Services Committee the power to act for the House. I heard the Detroit deal mentioned a while ago. It must be a sordid proposition of some kind, and I am assuming it is, and I am assuming something was wrong, but suppose that was submitted to this committee, should they pass on it for the entire 435 Members? On other deals like that there might be a difference of opinion and that the duly elected Members of the House should have a voice in it. Why leave it up to an agency of the House? Why not require the committee to submit it to the whole House of Representatives and get their approval and then let every Member who was elected from the 435 districts at least have an opportunity to be heard in support of or in opposition to it? Now, if the Committee on Armed Services can save money, all right, and I am sure that they can in many instances, overseeing the expenditure of funds, and I am all for that, but could we not enact laws to place limitations and restrictions upon these deals and punish the people who are guilty of violating these laws and have a better result than trying to administer them. And, if we are going to put it on the basis that the committee might save money, what about the Committee on Agriculture saving money in the administration of the funds that they make possible through their authorization in legislation? What about the Committee on Banking and Currency? What about the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? Should the Committee on the Judiciary in the future, if this precedent is enlarged upon, have to be consulted by the Department of Justice before it can bring antitrust suits under certain conditions?

I respectfully submit there is no end to this. So, we have a precedent in 1944, which I think was a bad precedent, and now we are attempting here to enlarge upon that bad precedent. I do not think we should do it. I am going to vote to sustain the President's veto. That is just my own opinion; just one of the 435 Members. I am not criticizing any individual for entertaining an opposite view, but I think this a serious question. Furthermore, our constituents will have a right to think that if we go into the business of seeing how these funds are spent, why should we not be responsible for the expenditure of all of them? We are taking upon ourselves an obligation which we cannot carry out. We have plenty to do in the legislative branch. We should do our own job better before attempting to run the executive branch. Like it is now the Executive is elected by the people of the United States, he is elected every 4 years. The people voted for him; they elected him. Under the Constitution he is charged with the duty of spending funds that Congress appropriates. We have no strings on the funds under the Constitution, which is right. Are we taking on an additional responsibility which eventually will be burdensome to us, and is this a very dangerous precedent established on an already bad precedent?

Let us consider for a moment how in actual practice the Armed Services Committee will probably pass upon proposed contracts that are submitted to the committee if this veto is overridden:

First. A procurement agency will submit the proposed contract to the Committee on Armed Services of the House by delivery to the chairman of the committee, or to someone acting for the chairman;

Second. The chairman will refer the proposal to the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the particular matter involved;

Third. The chairman of the subcommittee will automatically refer it to his staff, who are not Members of Congress but are employees of the subcommittee;

Fourth. Next, the staff will examine the proposal and make a recommendation to the chairman of the subcommittee;

Fifth. The chairman of the subcommittee will doubtless approve the project in 9 out of 10 cases and it will be referred back to the department sending it up, with the committee's approval;

Sixth. In the event there is something about the proposal that needs further investigation, the chairman of the subcommittee will either conduct the investigation himself, or have his staff conduct the investigation, and submit the points in dispute to his subcommittee;

Seventh. The subcommittee will then pass on it and if approved it will be sent back to the department with favorable action indicated;

Eighth. If there should be any controversy in the subcommittee over a proposal and there is a division of vote, the matter will in all probability be referred to the whole committee of 38 members of the Armed Services of the House for consideration and report;

Ninth. At a meeting of the full committee a quorum or a majority of the members must be present;

Tenth. In the event of a controversy before the whole committee of 38 members and there is a close vote, but approval is granted, the matter will then be submitted back to the department with the approval of the committee.

It will be noticed that at no time will the other Members of the House of Representatives, who are elected by their constituents from their respective districts just like the members of the Armed Services Committee, be allowed to express their approval or disapproval of the proposal.

The matter will be handled entirely by the Armed Services Committee which is an agency of the House of Representatives, but under the procedure proposed in asking us to override the President's veto no Member of the House outside of members of this committee will have any voice or authority concerning it.

This procedure is in the direction of leaving important matters to a comparative few Members of the entire body for final decision.

It is possible that the House of Representatives will not always have the same fine committee and such an excellent chairman as it has in this Congress. The powers proposed to be given to the chairman of the subcommittee under this procedure or to the chairman of the whole committee places upon either a great responsibility and burden, and if an evil person should happen to get in either one of these positions in the future great harm to our country could be done.

It occurs to me that there should be some limit to the red tape that Congress should want to impose upon our own Government and governmental affairs, and particularly in the execution of the laws that the Congress passes.

If there is a proposal by a procurement officer submitted to the Armed Services Committee when that committee is in recess who will pass on the matter? Will the chairman of the subcommittee be given the full power to pass on it? Or, will the chairman of the whole committee be given full power to pass upon it? Or, will the staff of the committee be allowed to pass upon the question involved?

It should be remembered that neither the staff of the committee, nor the members of the committee are under obligation to execute the laws. They are not under bond of any kind, and not even under oath to properly administer the funds that Congress has made available.

Let us look at this question from a different angle. The Committee on the Armed Services of the House has no power to appropriate funds; this committee merely reports favorably a bill providing lump-sum authorizations for defense purposes. When such a bill has become a law, the Defense Department in the executive branch of the Government prepares a budget itemizing in much detail how they would like to have the money expended. This request is submitted in the form of a bill, introduced by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and it is referred to the appropriate subcommittee for hearings and report. Before this subcommittee every expenditure is investigated carefully and the whole bill is gone through with a fine-tooth comb, after which a report is made to the full committee, which is usually approved by the whole Committee on Appropriations and the bill comes before the House for consideration. Then, each and every Member of the 435 Members of the House have an opportunity to express their approval or disapproval of any part of the bill, and if items have been left out that a Member believes should be inserted, an amendment can be proposed by the Member, including the item and the amount of money to be used for it and all Members of the House allowed to vote on it.

The procedure I have outlined above in the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee in the House

is duplicated in the other body, the United States Senate.

Now we are asked to not only have the appropriations so carefully safeguarded as outlined above, but also to get the approval of the Committee on Armed Services before certain expenditures can be made. And remember again, the committee that will have the power to grant the approval is not the committee of the House of Representatives that makes the appropriation possible. Although this procedure is not intended as a reflection on the Appropriations Committee, it cannot be construed as a compliment.

The Constitution, article I, section 1, contains this language:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Article II, section 1, of the United States Constitution provided:

> The Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

When Congress passes a law which provides for an expenditure of funds from the United States Treasury, the Executive is charged with the duty of spending that money and is held responsible in every way for its proper and lawful expenditure. If we tie the hands of the President and say the President cannot spend certain funds without the approval of certain committees in the Congress, this will be tying the President's hands and taking at least a part of the responsibility for the expenditure of these particular funds away from the President. The function of a congressional committee in a matter of this kind cannot be construed as a legislative function, because if it is it must be performed by the whole Congress, including both the House and Senate. Such a function cannot be considered an Executive function, because the congressional committee is no part of the executive branch of the Government, and is not included within the constitutional provision that permits it to exercise executive power. What kind of a function is it?

It occurs to me that it is not only good policy but good law under our Constitution for the Congress to hold the President responsible at all times, as the Constitution attempts to hold him responsible, and not have his responsibility divided or his powers restricted or restrained. There are plenty of ways that Congress can have influence over an attempted misuse of public funds without attempting to directly enforce the laws.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice in support of the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. He has already given this House sufficient facts to justify overriding the President's veto. I also heard the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. I am in disagreement with the position he has taken, although I do recognize some conflict of jurisdiction as between a legislative oversight affecting the jurisdiction of the expenditures committee in connection with the Federal Property Act and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services in connection with the activities of the Defense Department. Notwithstanding the fact that there may be some duplication of legislative oversight, I do contend that all of these transactions should be given consideration by the committees of Congress, and if there is any avenue of duplication, then that can be worked out later. It in no way mitigates against the wisdom of overriding the President's veto on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, my chairman is more intimately associated with the details of this matter than I am, but every member of the Committee on Armed Services of this House is fully aware of the things that can happen if the authority contained in this bill is not granted. In that connection, I want to point out some aspects of the average military public works bill that comes before our committee.

With the development of the jet aircraft it has become necessary to strengthen and lengthen practically every runway in the United States under the jurisdiction of the Navy and the Air Force. We are right now in the midst of that program, and I want to talk about that some. Large sums have already been appropriated for this purpose, and larger sums still will have to be appropriated in the early future.

As a matter of planning, it is not always possible for the agencies to pinpoint the exact location of a particular air field or the exact piece of property which will be required to extend a runway. In connection with the extension of facilities for jet aircraft, we must remember that it will sometimes be possible and sometimes be necessary to recapture some of the auxiliary fields which we have had previously and which we have turned back to the previous owners or otherwise disposed of. At the time the authorization bill is before our committee it is not always possible to determine just which of these fields must be taken back. Therefore, it becomes necessary for the Congress to grant general authorizations to the military in order to take care of these contingencies.

After the authorization bill has been passed by the Congress, the Navy then proceeds to pin point its locations, either for the extension of runways or for the acquisition of new sites, or for the reacquisition of auxiliary sites which had previously been used. That is the important part of this whole controversy.

Under the circumstances I have just outlined, the Navy is required to report the exact location and the cost of that location to the Committee on Armed Services for its concurrence or its rejection. As has been pointed out, the Navy has been following this procedure for nearly 10 years. It has been compelled by law to, however, since 1944, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason I am not too disturbed about a situation that is taking place in my own district right today. The Navy has surveyors out today surveying for an auxiliary jet airfield. People are concerned about the taking of this airfield for what reason? Because of the fact that in that area there are now three auxiliary fields that were built during the last war. Those fields are located within a radius of 15 or 20 miles. The immediate proposal is to take an entirely new site located half way between two existing fields that are only 20 miles apart. Mr. Speaker, I submit there is no sense in that. I am not too concerned about it because I know the new site cannot be acquired until after the proposal has been submitted to this Congress and the committee has made a determination as to whether it is wise and in the public interest to acquire the new site or to acquire the additional area that may be necessary at an existing field to extend the runways in that way.

While I do not contend that the Navy is infallible, I am convinced that the record of the Navy in this respect stands head and shoulders above the record of either the Army or the Air Force.

I do not doubt that the present requirement that the Navy report its real estate transactions in advance has required a limited amount of additional work by the Navy. On the other hand I am certain as a result of the personal conversations I have had with high ranking naval officers that the Navy position in its real estate transactions is greatly strengthened in its dealings with the public due to the required concurrence of appropriate congressional committees.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my chairman, not solely because he is my chairman, but because I am convinced that he is right. I am confident that more than two-thirds of this body also believe that he is right and will so state when the time comes to stand up and be counted.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, what we propose in this bill which the President has vetoed is to have your representatives protect your money. The money that these people in the Department of Defense spend affects 150,000,000 people, and 35 of the finest Members of this Congress that I have ever met, are sitting there as your representatives protecting your money and asking no favors.

Once upon a time we used to refer reverently to a document known as the Constitution. Occasionally I read that document and see what they used to do. I read it here again this morning and under section 8 of the article referring to the powers of the Congress, I found this statement:

> To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

That is exactly what we are doing, the veto to the contrary notwithstanding. I think this is one of the greatest mistakes the President has ever made. I am going to help him save himself from his own mistake—and I make no apologies for it. We are going to do exactly that today. That grand chairman at whose feet I have sat for 11 years, as St. Paul at the feet of Gamaliel, I will have you

understand, has not served in this Congress for 37 years for nothing. He has forgotten more about the Armed Forces of this Nation than RIVERS will ever learn, and that goes for a lot of these other Johnnys-come-lately.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Let us override this veto and get it over with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time remaining to the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the subcommittee handling these projects of the armed services.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, our very able chairman has covered this subject, which is a most important subject, effectively and clearly, and I shall try not to repeat any of the points he brought out.

I would like, however, to try to answer one or two of the matters that have come out in the debate. First of all I would like to explain how these acquisitions and disposals are handled in the committee. There is no delay. They come up from the Navy Department and are referred to the committee, and each proposed acquisition or disposal is sent out to the members of the committee. They have the opportunity to disapprove them within a limited time—a very limited time which, in fact, was shortened only recently to a time limit of a few days. If they do not disapprove them within that time, they are automatically approved. But it does have this effect: it lets the departments first know that their acquisitions and disposals are going to be looked at. That in itself has amounted to an immeasurable saving. I say "immeasurable" because of course we cannot measure things that have been stopped but which would have happened had it not been for this regulation.

Now, we speak about precedents. The best precedent is the precedent that has been followed in one department for approximately 5 or 6 years. The Navy Department has had to come up to the committee with its acquisitions and disposals. I say to this House, we should either repeal the law as to the Navy Department, or extend it as to these other two services.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said that we are standing on a bad precedent. I say the answer to that is obviously that if other committees would do the same thing that the Armed Services Committee is doing in this instance, the savings might be unprecedented.

Mr. SASSCER. Undoubtedly, but the need is greater in the Armed Forces than any other Department because history has shown that in acquisitions and purchases that these services go from feast to famine and in so doing the country and taxpayers can be hurt two ways. First, in the unnecessary expenditures of money in acquisitions; and second, the disapproval of proposed disposals when there is a probability of military need in the reasonable future. There was a lot of property disposed of at the end of the last war which could be used to advantage now. As to the argument on the constitutionality of this bill, we all know that the Congress is called upon to provide for the Army and Navy. In saving vast sums of money in these other two services we are following the Constitution in providing for these services, in seeing that the money is used to the best possible advantage.

At this time Congress must be expense conscious and savings conscious. But in and out of the Congress the primary thinking is directed to governmental spending in the departments. Cuts and eliminations in Government agencies must be forced to an irreducible minimum, but actually the departmental expenditure is only 1.4 percent of the national budget. We talk about that but seldom is thought, in and out of Congress, given to defense spending because our people, in their patriotism and in appreciation of the importance of defense, infrequently think of costs. But when 41.4 percent of the national budget for 1952 is to be expended by the Armed Forces, we can effect real savings in a lush field without at all affecting the result to be obtained if the Congress does its utmost to see that we obtain dollar value for dollars spent and that no lands are acquired nor unnecessary leases of hotels or office space executed.

This bill does not require law but merely requires approval of the Armed Services Committees of both Houses before acquisitions and disposals of land are entered into, and will effect real savings in substantial amounts by eliminating duplication and unnecessary expenditures.

The Navy has worked under a similar law for years and they are adjusted to it, and it has not held them up at all because they get quick action up here. The other two services object to this law that has worked so well and saved tax money in the Navy Department. It is not an attempt to administer the services, as has been said in the debate, but its passage will prohibit unnecessary purchases of real estate and the making of leases, as happened in the case of the Army in the last war, and as is going on without congressional supervision now in both the Army and the Air Force.

This requirement as to the Navy has prevented unnecessary expenditures, purchases, and leases, many times followed up by either the use of existing locations or other sites just as good, even though a little more inconvenient.

I hope the House overrides the veto.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Under the Constitution, this question must be determined by the yeas and nays.

As many as are in favor of passing the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, will as their names are called vote "yea." Those opposed will vote "nay."

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 68, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—312

Aandahl	Elston	Mansfield
Abbitt	Engle	Marshall
Abernethy	Evins	Martin, Iowa
Albert	Fallon	Martin, Mass.
Allen, Calif.	Feighan	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Fellows	Meader
Allen, La.	Fenton	Merrow
Andersen, H. Carl	Fisher	Miller, Md.
Anderson, Calif.	Ford	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Forrester	Mills
Andrews	Frazier	Morano
Arends	Fugate	Morris
Armstrong	Fulton	Morrison
Aspinall	Furcolo	Morton
Auchincloss	Gamble	Mumma
Ayres	Garmatz	Murphy
Bakewell	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Gathings	Nelson
Baring	Gavin	Nicholson
Bates, Mass.	George	Norblad
Battle	Golden	Norrell
Beall	Goodwin	O'Hara
Beckworth	Gore	O'Konski
Belcher	Gossett	Ostertag
Bender	Graham	Passman
Bennett, Fla.	Grant	Patten
Bennett, Mich.	Greenwood	Patterson
Bentsen	Gregory	Philbin
Berry	Gross	Phillips
Betts	Gwinn	Pickett
Bishop	Hagen	Polk
Blackney	Hale	Potter
Boggs, Del.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Poulson
Boggs, La.	Hand	Preston
Bolton	Harden	Price
Bow	Hardy	Prouty
Boykin	Harris	Quinn
Bramblett	Harrison, Va.	Radwan
Breen	Harrison, Wyo.	Rains
Brehm	Havenner	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Hays, Ohio	Reams
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Bryson	Heffernan	Reed, Ill.
Budge	Herlong	Reed, N. Y.
Buffett	Herter	Rees, Kans.
Burdick	Heselton	Regan
Burleson	Hess	Ribicoff
Burton	Hill	Richlman
Busbey	Hillings	Riley
Byrnes, Wis.	Hinshaw	Rivers
Bush	Hoeven	Robeson
Camp	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.
Canfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Fla.
Carlyle	Holmes	Rogers, Mass.
Case	Hope	Sadlak
Chatham	Horan	St. George
Chelf	Hull	Sasscer
Chenoweth	Hunter	Saylor
Chiperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Schwabe
Church	James	Scott, Hardie
Clemente	Jarman	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Clevenger	Jenison	Scrivner
Cole, Kans.	Jenkins	Scudder
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Secrest
Combs	Johnson	Seely-Brown
Cooley	Jonas	Shafer
Cooper	Jones, Ala.	Sheehan
Corbett	Jones, Hamilton C.	Shelley
Cotton	Jones, Woodrow W.	Short
Coudert	Kean	Sikes
Cox	Kearney	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	Kearns	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Keating	Sittler
Curtis, Mo.	Kerr	Smith, Kans.
Curtis, Nebr.	Kilburn	Smith, Miss.
Dague	Lane	Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Lanham	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Tenn.	Lantaff	Springer
Davis, Wis.	Larcade	Stanley
DeGraffenried	LeCompte	Steed
Delaney	Lind	Stefan
Dempsey	Lovre	Stigler
Denny	Lucas	Stockman
Devereux	McConnell	Sutton
D'Ewart	McCulloch	Taber
Dolliver	McDonough	Talle
Dondero	McGregor	Taylor
Donohue	McKinnon	Teague
Donovan	McMillan	Thomas
Doughton	McMullen	Thompson, Mich.
Doyle	McVey	Thompson, Tex.
Durham	Mack, Wash.	Thornberry
Eaton	Mahon	Tollefson
Elliott		Towe

Vail	Werdel	Wilson, Tex.
Van Pelt	Wharton	Winstead
Van Zandt	Wheeler	Withrow
Vaughn	Whitten	Wolcott
Velde	Wickersham	Wolverton
Vinson	Widnall	Wood, Ga.
Vorys	Wigglesworth	Wood, Idaho
Vursell	Williams, Miss.	Woodruff
Walter	Williams, N. Y.	Yorty
Watts	Willis	
Weichel	Wilson, Ind.	

NAYS—68

Addonizio	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Anfuso	Howell	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Javits	O'Neill
Bolling	Jones, Mo.	O'Toole
Burnside	Karsten, Mo.	Patman
Cannon	Kelley, Pa.	Priest
Carnahan	Kelly, N. Y.	Rabaut
Celler	Kennedy	Ramsay
Crosser	Keogh	Rhodes
Dawson	King	Rodino
Denton	Klein	Rooney
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Eberharter	Lesinski	Sieminski
Fernandez	McCarthy	Spence
Fine	McCormack	Staggers
Flood	McGuire	Tackett
Fogarty	Machrowicz	Trimble
Forand	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Gordon	Madden	Whitaker
Granger	Mitchell	Wier
Hart	Moulder	Yates
Hedrick	Multer	Zablocki
Heller	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—52

Adair	Deane	Latham
Angell	Dingell	Lyle
Bailey	Dorn	McGrath
Baker	Ellsworth	Magee
Barrett	Gillette	Miller, Calif.
Beamer	Granahan	Miller, N. Y.
Blatnik	Green	Morgan
Bonner	Hall,	Murray, Wis.
Bosone	Leonard W.	Perkins
Bray	Halleck	Ponge
Brooks	Harvey	Powell
Brownson	Hays, Ark.	Redden
Buckley	Irving	Richards
Butler	Jackson, Wash.	Roberts
Byrne, N. Y.	Judd	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	Kersten, Wis.	Sabath
Colmer	Kilday	Sheppard
Crumpacker	Kirwan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Colmer and Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Halleck and Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Granahan against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall and Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Bray and Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Crumpacker and Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

Mr. Miller of New York and Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gillette and Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Brownson and Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Redden and Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Angell.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Tuesday, May 15, the Clerk had read down to and including line 25 on page 34 of the bill.

Are there any amendments to be offered at this point?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: On page 33, line 11, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is our hope that we can complete the consideration of this bill this afternoon and that we can proceed promptly and tend to the business at hand. I hope we can confine our remarks entirely to the bill, so that we can get done with it.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to say this amendment does not in any way reduce the amount of the appropriation for the ACP funds. That was disposed of Tuesday. The purpose of the amendment is, however, to reduce the amount that any one participant might receive under the program. In 1947 the limitation was $10,000. In 1948 it was cut to $500, and in 1949, $750. In 1947, my information is that 80 percent of the participants got 40 percent of the money and 20 percent of the participants received 60 percent of the money. It seems to me we are all agreed the purpose of this program is to preserve the fertility of our soil and to conserve our natural resources. They are incentive payments—payments so that our people will hand this land on down to future generations. The amendment does not cut anybody out. It only limits one participant to $1,000. That seems to me to be a fair and just limitation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to assure the gentleman that so far as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and I are concerned, we are glad to agree to his amendment and I hope the amendment prevails.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman that the purpose of the soil-conservation program is to preserve the land and build up the fertility of the land and protect its productivity over the years. If that is the purpose of the program, do you not think that you will be handicapping the program by restricting the land on which the program will be applied?

Mr. ABBITT. This does not restrict the land whatever. It only restricts the amount of money which the large landowners and the large corporations can receive. They are in a position to carry out these land practices. In my opinion, the ones we want to help are the family farm owners and those who are not able to carry on unless they have some help from our Government. We do not want to unnecessarily pay out money to the people who are going to do this anyhow. It is an educational program, as I understand it, to help people who need the help. The large landowners who draw from $1,000 to $2,500 do not need that extra money to carry out the proper conservation practices.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think the gentleman has a basic misconception of what the program is. It is not a program to provide relief for farmers, but to provide for soil-conservation practices for the greatest amount of land in the country possible. Do you not think that the whole idea of the program is to provide benefits for the land instead of for the farmers?

Mr. ABBITT. That is what I have been saying.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am glad the gentleman has offered the amendment and I shall support it. In the discussion the other day great emphasis was laid on the fact that this was a program for the smaller farmer. Four years ago—I have no more recent figures, although perhaps the committee has—80 percent of these payees got less than $100; 65 percent of them got less than $60. I thought we should go under $1,000, but I am glad to withhold my amendment and will support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas to the amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT: Strike out "$1,000" and insert "$750."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the maximum payment to individuals from $2,500 to $750 under the Production and Marketing Administration.

Assuming the appropriation of $225,000,000 is not reduced, the funds saved by this amendment will be divided among those who get the smaller payments. If you adopt my amendment, those presently getting $2,500 and less down to $750 will still get $750 each. In doing so, you can save about $25,000,000 unless, of course, larger payments are made to smaller participants.

I agree with the gentleman from Virginia who offered the amendment to provide a maximum of $1,000, that more can be accomplished in the conservation of the soil by being more liberal

with those who receive smaller payments than to give so much of this money to the big operators. It should be observed this is separate from the big soil-conservation program for which funds are appropriated to the extent of two or three hundred million dollars a year for the employment of engineers and others who provide coordinated plans and give technical advice for conservation of land and crops. That conservation program has accomplished a great deal of good for this country. As above stated, it is separate from the program under consideration, except a part of these funds may be used in carrying out a part of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. Chairman, in these days when there is demand for saving taxpayers' money, it seems to me that those who get the larger payments from the Government for improving their own farms, ought to be willing to reduce the contribution from the Government to $750, rather than ask the Government to pay them $2,500 for doing the thing they ought to do on their own land. I remind you the maximum was $750 for a period of 2 years. There was no complaint from the average farmer.

This appropriation is for $225,000,000. Under this bill, 3.4 percent of the payees will receive $40,000,000. Think that over and see where the big share of this money is spent.

This is the way it worked last year. Out of $255,000,000, 40,000 payees got $38,500,000, which means that 1.3 percent of all of the payees got 15 percent of the money.

There were 3,097,000 participants in this program in 1950. They received an average of approximately $82. Now listen to this. Out of 3,097,000 people who received $255,000,000 last year, 560,000 received less than $20. More than one-sixth of the whole 3,000,000 people got from $1 to $20 each. How much soil conservation could $3,000,000 farmers do who received less than $20 each? Explain that if you will.

It is clear to see that the great majority of the farmers of this country did not get very much out of this program. As a matter of fact, 55.7 percent, more than half of them, got from $1 to $60, no more than $60, and yet these people who oppose this amendment would have you think that you are treating a great majority of the farmers of this country with great benevolence. I wish the farmers could know just how you are handling this thing.

One more thing. The group who get $500 or more are only 2 percent in number of those who participate. Think of it; only 2 out of every 100 get $500 or more, but they get a total of approximately $45,000,000, which again is about 20 percent of the entire $225,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, if you do not want to save approximately $25,000,000 and put it back into the Treasury, you can, without reducing the appropriation, pay it to more than 2,000,000 participants who will get less than $60 apiece. Let me repeat, under the bill, unless you adopt this amendment, you are going to pay $45,000,000 to only 15 percent of those who participate in the program. On the other hand, you are going to pay 2,385,000 farmers, or 77 percent of those who participate, less than $100 each, and yet those who oppose my amendment will shout to the housetops and say that I am by this amendment sniping at a bill because they want to pay $2,500 apiece to a number of big landowners and plantation operators, rather than pay it to the little fellow who only gets $40 or $50. He is told by this committee in doing so that the Government is particularly benevolent to him. He would not think so if he knew the facts.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to pay any funds from the Federal Government to help the farmer, then you better allocate it to the independent operator who will use it to some advantage, and not dish out as much as $40,000,000 to about 3 percent of those who participate in the farm program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who is a participant and who is familiar with this problem and knows a great deal about it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. I did not know at the time the Abbitt amendment with $1,000 was offered that the gentleman from Kansas intended to offer one for $750. Personally, I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

In order that the membership of the House may know how expenditures were made in 1950, I am including herewith a statement in round figures that I secured from the Department of Agriculture showing how PMA funds were distributed last year:

Payments	Payees	Amount paid
$1,000 to $2,500	10,000	[1] $16,818,000
$500 to $1,000	30,000	[2] 21,626,000
$400 to $500	25,000	[3] 10,813,000
$300 to $400	40,000	[4] 13,455,000
$200 to $300	92,000	22,126,000
$150 to $200	165,000	27,756,000
$100 to $150	350,000	42,057,000
$60 to $100	660,000	50,728,000
$40 to $60	525,000	25,228,000
$20 to $40	640,000	18,462,000
$1 to $20	560,000	5,931,000
Total	3,097,000	255,000,000

[1] 6.6 percent.
[2] 8½ percent.
[3] 4.2 percent.
[4] 5.3 percent.

I think anyone who is willing to examine these figures will understand that irrespective of the orations that are being delivered by those who oppose my amendment, that although they are spending $225,000,000 from the Federal Treasury, they are not passing very much of it on to the man who operates what may be described as the family-sized farm.

Please take a look at the table. How much soil conservation can 560,000 farmers do when each of them gets less than $20. Look again. Six hundred and forty thousand others will get from $20 to $40 each. So, 1,200,000 farmers out of 3,000,000 will receive less than $40. I think it is clear to those willing to examine this table that you pay $55,000,000 to 65,000 payees, and then you try to satisfy a million and a half farmers by dividing $55,000,000 among them. It hardly seems fair, does it?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this program were a handout to farmers I would be opposed to it. We are thinking in terms of conservation of our soil and whether we conserve the soil on the hills, the slopes, the plains, or elsewhere, it is conservation of the soil that we need and that we must have.

There are some faults with this program; all of us who are familiar with farming know that there are some faults with this program. We know there are some things that ought to be done to make this program better. Some of the practices that are the most needed for the conservation of our soil are not on large farms, as the debate seems to be directed to, but are on small farms. Practices may require a large expenditure in a year. I am thinking about those funds that are needed for such things as gully control and terracing which require mechanical tools to correct.

This program has a weakness, that it is set up on an annual basis. Perhaps some of the objection to this program could be overcome in connection with the payment for these practices if it extended over a longer period of years so that the farmers could make arrangements to pay for the improvement over a longer period of years. When he hires machinery to come in and stop erosion and fix up his gullies a tremendous burden of expense is placed upon him in one year which you cannot pay with a $750 or $1,000 limitation. That is a permanent improvement; that is something that stays there. The putting in of sod waterways, the putting in of dams, the putting in of anything that requires construction takes more than $500 or $750, or even more than $1,000 on small farms, and my district is made up of small farms. We are thinking in terms of things which must be done as far as permanent improvements are concerned.

If you want to fritter money away and get but little out of it, cut this program down to where it is a matter of handing out a subsidy to the farmers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman realizes that in his own State 80 percent of those who participate get less than $100.

Mr. MARSHALL. Certainly I realize that. We are thinking in terms of soil conservation. When we think in terms of soil conservation a different picture is presented to us, and the sooner we realize that the sooner we recognize one of the problems that face us in this country. We keep hammering on the thought that we are talking in terms of a small payment or a handout to a farmer, and then immediately we begin to think in terms of subsidies. Let us start thinking about conserving the soil. That is the purpose of this program. In the gentleman's own State he must know of a good many practices which require an outlay of a considerable amount of money.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman knows that in his State and in my State you cannot do much soil-conservation work with $40 or $20 or $10.

Mr. MARSHALL. Of course not. I realize that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Would it not be a whole lot better, to take the gentleman's version of it, and put in a provision for $750 and if the Soil Conservation Service wants to use the money for the little fellow, all right. You cannot do much when you have only $75 or $80 toward conserving your farm.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman talks with some wisdom and it is too bad that his foresight is not greater and that he cannot visualize and see what is happening in his own district. If he would think about the matter in terms of a permanent improvement, and I think he is interested in permanent improvements——

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman is not interested in any stopgap measure.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want the farmers to make the improvements themselves.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is the purpose of this program. It is a program that will enable the farmer to carry on practices that will help solve the problem, but the gentleman is limiting the expenditure of the funds with his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. To $750.

Mr. MARSHALL. Let me answer the gentleman's question. It will be helpful to me and I am sure it will be helpful to him. When you start to cut down the amount of expenditure that can be made in any one year, we will cause the larger proportion of this fund to go into practices that are not of a permanent nature, which he and I criticize. I am sure the gentleman must realize that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments which the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and his colleague from Kansas have offered to this bill, it seems to me, serve a purpose entirely different from their professed belief in what the Government program should do. This is not a WPA handout, it is not a subsidy for the farmers, it is not a bonus that the farmers get, it is not a matter of trying to distribute to the most people in order to get the most votes.

The purpose of these soil conservation payments is to provide an incentive by which the greatest number of acres in the country can be utilized by good conservation practices so that they will be preserved and used in the future where the richness of the soil may continue to contribute to the richness of the country.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a matter of fact, the farmer himself puts up from $2 to $3 for every $1 that the Government matches?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Of course. In connection with these payments that come up to $2,500 it means expenditures will be made of from five to ten thousand dollars for conservation purposes upon some farm during the year in which the money is paid out. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] mentioned in his able presentation of this matter, there are many of the most vital soil conservation projects which involve a large expenditure of money. It is too bad they are restricted to a 1-year period so far as incentive is concerned. When you attempt to control gulleys, when you attempt to control sheet erosion, you cannot go out and just put up a fence, dig a ditch or something like that. It involves an engineering program that must mean something for the entire community or a large segment of acreage or a large portion of a farm. I think this Congress would be resorting to WPA boondoggling tactics if it subsidized to buy votes by cutting the limitation on what soil conservation payments can be made so they will be distributed to the largest number of farmers. Why can we not change the amendment and provide that every farmer get $25, if you want to give the most payments to the most farmers? We are trying to build up these conservation practices, not pass out the most money to the largest number of farmers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I can understand that the gentleman may have big operators in his State, such as plantation owners, who would get these large payments; but it seems to me that as between the two, the large plantation owner, the big operator, would be glad and willing and does to a great degree take care of the things which the gentleman is talking about. On the other hand, you are appropriating two-hundred-and-some-odd-million dollars, would it not be better for the country at large to divide this fund and give a little more of it to the small operator who only has a small acreage rather than give a large amount of it, as was just suggested here, something like 15 or 16 percent of all this money, to only 1½ percent of the operators?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The program that the gentleman seems to suggest, it seems to me, as only a logical conclusion, would be to take this money and divide it on a head basis among all the farmers of the country. In that way you would reach the largest number of farmers. What I am trying to do in my opposition to this amendment is to attempt to get soil conservation practices established on the largest number of acres in this country.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The table that the gentleman from Kansas is quoting in connection with the size of the payments had nothing whatsoever to do with the size of the farm. There is nothing in there about the acreage of the farm. That is payment to each farm on the basis of practices that they carry out, as a matter of digging ditches, as a matter of terracing, and doing that sort of thing, and a 40-acre farm or 20-acre farm may require a large expenditure in one year. But, when the job is done, it is done, so this program and this limitation that the gentleman from Kansas is talking about is of real assistance to the small farmer when he can use in a year $2,500, but you correct some of these practices so far as the things that are destroying his soil are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is right. In my experience I can mention payments to operators of large plantations, 4,000 and 5,000 acres, who get only $40 or $50 a year out of this program, and that is because they have only indulged in conservation practices to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think under the circumstances, and considering the terrific expenses by the Government, and considering that the large landowners are doing pretty well, that they would not expect the Government to help them to the extent of $2,500 on a thing of this?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is still completely confused. This is not an effort to help the large landowners. This is an effort to not only help to to improve our land, but to save it for generations to come. Some of the biggest payments made in my State have been made to small landowners in badly eroded hill country, in taking steps to preserve a 40- or 100-acre farm and to restore it to production and keep it in production for years to come. This is not an effort for anything in behalf of the large landowners; it is in behalf of the land of the United States. I appeal to the House to consider this when they vote. If you vote to cut down these payments you are actually voting for Government subsidy to farmers on a head basis. If you vote for the soil-conservation program for the future, you will do something about making these payments applicable on a large scale to whatever conservation practices seem most applicable to the land concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have never understood that this PMA program was only in the interest of the small operator. I

have regarded it and I believe that everybody else has regarded it as a program which is in the interest of the general welfare of all the people of America. The program contemplates the protection of all of the farms and ranch lands of this great country, the idea being that we will preserve the Nation's richest resource, the fertile top soil of the farms and ranches of this Republic. If the authors of these amendments have a different idea about the program, they certainly have not made their views very clear to the Members of the House.

If the program is restricted further, then you can visualize a farmer who operates his farm through tenants. He might be eliminated from the program. The tenants will not participate. The soil will not be protected. The fertility of the soil will be wasted, and we will defeat the very purposes of the program.

Actually, I come from a part of the country where we have numerous little farms. If you look at the $2,500 limitation, you must realize that all of the people we refer to as big operators have already been eliminated from the program. I have never regarded this as a Government hand-out. I regard it as an investment in a national resource of vital importance to the people of this country.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The so-called big operator to whom the gentleman just referred has been limited by virtue of the fact there is already a limit of $2,500 on these payments.

Mr. COOLEY. The effect of that has been to eliminate the big operator, the big corporation, to whom the gentleman has referred. Actually, I have probably less at stake in this amendment than any man here, because I come from an area where we have a lot of small farms. I dare say it would not very adversely affect the people of my district. But out in your country, out in the great, wide open spaces of America, it will affect the landowners and not only the landowners but the tenants.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you do not reduce the appropriation from what you have here, the committee has reduced it from last year, so we are going to have less money. The people in the gentleman's State get an average of less than $60 per payment, do they not?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you are going to use the $225,000,000 that you are appropriating——

Mr. COOLEY. It leaves more money for my part of the country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. For the smaller operators.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. So I say I have less right to complain about it than anybody. But I do not regard these things from a sectional standpoint or as limited to my own district or my own county. I think you are going to cripple this program. As I said here the other day, I do not think any mathematician or economist connected with any department of the Government can evaluate this program if we look down through the future for a thousand years.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman is right about that, he ought to increase this appropriation, and make it twice as much.

Mr. COOLEY. I was perfectly willing to increase the appropriation. The gentleman is not telling me anything. I voted for it when it was over a half a billion dollars a year and never had cause to regret it. I remember that the gentleman, although he is a great friend of agriculture, seems to be dissatisfied with every bill that is brought out here that attempts to provide some relief for agricultural people.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is no sniping at all.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman comes now with an amendment to cut it down to $750.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am for the little fellow, not the big man.

Mr. COOLEY. All right. We are all for the little man. But what is going to happen to the little tenants on the farms down in North Carolina and the farms in Mississippi and the farms in the gentleman's district?

Mr. REES of Kansas. He will get more money under my amendment than he will under the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. COOLEY. His landlord will say, "No, we are not interested in this program and we will not build up the soil because we will not benefit by the program."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that the adoption of the pending amendment, which is perhaps designed to restrict the large operator, will actually hurt the small tenant and the small operator, because so much of the land in this country is owned by people who operate on a relatively large basis as compared to certain other areas; so while the amendment is no doubt offered to restrict the large operator, in operation it would hurt not so much the large operator in the long run as it would hurt the soil-conservation program as a whole and hurt the little tenant?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is probably right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time so that I may inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the event the pending bill is disposed of and the final vote taken today, it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that the House go over until Monday, there being no business tomorrow.

Mr. KILBURN. I object.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in soil conservation. I have many soil-conservation projects in my district and I certainly do not want to see the large operator get more than his fair share of the money that we appropriate for this program. I do, however, want the program to be successful. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia who proposed the amendment limiting individual payments to $1,000, and likewise the gentleman from Kansas, who lowered that to $750, if they are not making somewhat of a mistake and doing a grave injustice in certain cases.

In my particular congressional district there are valleys in which there are 12, 14, or more farms, and there are unquestionably innumerable congressional districts throughout the United States that have the same or similar characteristics. At the head, or nearly at the head of these valleys there is one spot which, if it is taken care of properly, would conserve the soil of the entire valley. By the limitation of $1,000 you will be doing a grave injustice to the man on whose farm the project is located, because you would make him expend a great deal more money than $1,000, when, as a matter of fact, that soil-conservation practice at that particular spot would affect the entire valley. Does the gentleman from Kansas not see the injustice of that sort of situation? How can you place a limitation of that kind and be realistic about it when there are perhaps 12 or 15 farms in the valley where near the head of the valley there is one farm upon which, if you installed an earth dam or other soil-conservation practice, you could probably eliminate almost entirely the destruction of the soil in the entire valley. The limitation of $750 as proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] would endanger, if not make ineffective, practical soil conservation in my congressional district.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know how well informed the gentleman is with respect to farm operations, but I take it he is well informed and understands the problem and knows about the problem of his own experience. At least I hope the gentleman does.

In the first place there is nothing at all to prevent these 14 farms that you speak of from going ahead and trying out a program if they want to work together on any program. If the 14 or so farms want to do soil-conservation work of course they would be entitled to the limit of $750 each. But the gentleman does not know of a single farm in his own district, and he cannot name a single farm of average size which, under the program, with all the practices that he can put into effect on an average farm, who gets $750. The gentleman could not point out such a farm in his own State. As a matter of fact $750 would be higher than the average, be-

cause the average receives less than $750 in his State. If you want to be realistic about the thing you will find in your own district, and I have the figures here, that you have hardly anybody receiving that much. You talk about these 14 or so farms. If they all want to work together, they can get $500 or $750 apiece and comply with the program and do the necessary work.

I am looking at this in a realistic manner, as the gentleman is.

Mr. WITHROW. I would like to know from someone aside from the gentleman from Kansas whether or not it is possible under this program for say 12 or 15 farmers to get together on a program and get $750 each under the provisions of the present soil-conservation act.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Provided they qualify.

Mr. WITHROW. Provided they qualify. Yes, indeed. But why place this limitation of $750? You already have a limitation of $2,500, which keeps the big fellow out of this. There is a limitation upon him. Why not let us go ahead with the program where we need help that will be constructive? Not only that, you say right now there are not any projects in my district that would cost more than $750.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. In my district there are any number of projects that are under contemplation at this time, that would cost considerably more than $750. Under this amendment you would place a limitation upon them, which would make it impossible to go ahead with the projects.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WITHROW. I do not yield.

To my mind, it would be most unwise to adopt either of these two limitations. To argue that they should be adopted under the guise of attempting to economize is an absurdity. We all know that if the program is to be a success it must actually conserve the soil. The proposed limitations would merely handicap the program and would, in my opinion, doom it to almost sure failure. We all seem to be quite in agreement that our soil must be conserved. Therefore, permit the people who are actually engaged in the soil-conservation program to operate unhampered by limitations of this kind.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If it is a fact that the gentleman does not have a farm in his district that would be affected by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, I think it speaks well for the gentleman from Wisconsin to oppose the amendment, which shows that he is looking at it from an over-all standpoint.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman.

I sincerely hope that these two limitation amendments will be promptly voted down by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly in the very fine remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], my good chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW], and others who have spoken in opposition to these amendments.

When this soil-conservation program was first inaugurated, there was no limitation whatever. Later on, a limitation of $10,000 was applied. Then, in the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, Mr. Jones, who was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, brought in what was known as H. R. 3800, which would have reduced soil-conservation payments to $5,000. That bill was not enacted into law although the House Committee on Agriculture approved it. The $10,000 limitation remained in effect until the Eightieth Congress, when it was reduced to $750. The Eighty-first Congress put into effect the $2,500 limitation, which is on the statute books today.

We have had these arguments ever since I have been in Congress. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has come in here repeatedly. One year he offered an amendment to make the limitation $250. The House of course did not look with favor upon such an amendment. We cannot conserve the soil of America by limiting these payments to $750 or $1,000. One of the greatest arguments I ever heard about the value of soil conservation was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] before the Committee on Agriculture. He emphasized the point that the topsoil is the most valuable asset America has. The proper minerals and salts in the soil is a prerequisite to the production of good food to go on the tables of the American people.

I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], our Agriculture Committee chairman, for bringing out a most important feature of the whole matter. A similar comment was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. That is this, that a large farm is nothing but an aggregation of several small farms; and until the landowner comes into the program you are denying the share tenants a chance to participate in this program; he is out completely because of the fact that he cannot come in by himself; the landowner has to sign up for these benefits.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman does not say, though, that the income is anything like equitably distributed giving those very small people a fair advantage.

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not believe in the philosophy to start with that we should limit payments just because a man has saved his money and acquired a little piece of land, farms it successfully, and buys additional acreage. I do not believe in cutting the benefits to which he is entitled under the conservation program just because he has been thrifty. I believe in the American system.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman believe in the philosophy of giving one small farmer, we will say, an acre allotment or a 2-acre allotment?

Mr. GATHINGS. Now, we are not going to get into a discussion of that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman believe in this philosophy?

Mr. GATHINGS. Unless the owner comes into the program, under the law, the tenant cannot participate in the program.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman believe in that philosophy?

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not yield further because we are not dealing with cotton allotments.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Of course not; we are talking about the philosophy of fairness.

Mr. GATHINGS. My philosophy is the American philosophy that a man has the right to go out, earn, and increase his holdings.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Tell the House how you feel about the question.

Mr. GATHINGS. I did not yield further to the gentleman. I hope that the amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, let us bear in mind that we are talking about two different programs in some instances. The Soil Conservation Service is an entirely different program from that of the Production Marketing Administration.

This limitation is a limitation on the funds to be spent by the Production Marketing Administration and it has nothing to do with the building up of terraces or contouring your hillsides; that is under the Soil Conservation Service. Of course, PMA funds are largely spent for soil-conserving practices.

The second point is, and this is important to keep in mind, that the State committee allots so much money per county and all the money is going to be spent; in fact, they nearly always run out of money in my county. And whether you take care of the big farmers or the small farmers, this money is going to be spent, all of it is going to be spent and that will happen whether this limitation is put into the bill or not. If the limitation is put into the bill it is going to be spent where it is needed most and be given to men who are entitled to it most and its benefits will be put on soils that need conservation most, and those, by and large, are the holdings of the small farmers, not the 5,000-acre farms, and the large ranches.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I wish to call attention to the fact that this program

goes right hand in hand with the soil-conservation program. The Soil Conservation Service program has done an excellent job in their planning; however, the farmer to put those practices into effect must have some means of doing it. That is the program I am talking about, and I am sure the gentleman agrees with me. We are thinking in terms of getting as many permanent improvement practices put into effect as we can.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is right.

Mr. MARSHALL. Therefore, if PMA funds can be used and directed toward such construction that, I think, would be a good answer.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think we probably agree on what we want done. We want to give the the greatest improvement to the most acres, but the gentleman and I, I believe, would do it by different methods. Under my plan it would be spread to more individuals on more farms and would be used in a way and in places where it is most needed and would do the most good. The man who has a 2,000-, a 5,000-, or a 10,000-acre ranch is not in as much need of it as 10 farmers who have small holdings. It is a subsidy that the Government is giving to encourage conservation practices. The more people who can be encouraged under the program, the better.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to commend the gentleman on the incessant effort he has made as a Member of Congress to do something about this very important problem. Unquestionably one of the most unjustifiable results that has obtained, perhaps not purposely, in the administration of the agricultural programs has been that too much goes to too few and too many got far too little from the various programs.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is substantially correct.

Mr. BECKWORTH. As I stated a moment ago, in the district I represent, and I have a letter that came just a few days ago to that effect, we have people who were allotted cotton acreage of one and two and three acres. In some instances, in one particularly, some 400 people in one county got no acreage at all. The pattern of what I am describing here is to be found in some soil conservation activities. Some small farmers benefit little. One of the ways to help bring about equity and justice in this program is to do what our distinguished and very reasonable colleague from Texas has sought to do almost from the time he came to the Congress.

Mr. GOSSETT. Let me say to the gentleman that I am not criticizing my able colleagues who represent their districts well, but most of those who are fighting this amendment the hardest come from the big farming areas. This amendment is simply an effort to distribute money more equitably and where it will do the most good. It is the small farms mostly that are being washed away.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman on being consistent at least and I want to point out the fact that while he is willing to reduce this amount he actually about 2 days ago wanted to cut the whole thing to the core, cut out about $75,000,000.

Mr. GOSSETT. I wanted to reduce PMA funds by $75,000,000 to help cut down our perilous deficit. That lacks a lot of being to the core.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is at least consistent.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman. I try to be. If there is such a thing as a farm bloc, Mr. Chairman, I am a member of such bloc. However, farmers are interested in a more efficient program and in saving public money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, the issue here has been pretty well defined. That issue is whether or not this is a program for giving hand-outs to farmers or a program to conserve the soil. That is all there is to it. The theory of the proponents of these amendments seems to be that if the size of the payments is limited more people will get them. On the other hand, an acre of soil on a large farm can erode just as easily as an acre of soil on a small farm and it will cost just as much to put it back into condition.

The gentleman from Texas has referred to the fact that there is a difference between the Soil Conservation Service program and the program providing for soil conservation payments. That is true but, as everyone knows, just recently the Secretary of Agriculture has issued an order which consolidates those programs at the local level and to a very large extent at the higher levels. From now on those two programs will be coordinated as they should be. As a matter of fact the two programs have gradually been meshed together during the past few years with the result that more and more the soil conservation payment program has become more of a program for carrying out the physical treatment of the soil, such as building of dams and terraces and that sort of thing. In other words the work has taken on a more permanent character year after year.

The more we can change this into that kind of a program, the more conservation we are going to get. That should be the ultimate objective and aim of the program and it is working in that direction more and more all the time. If, however, payments are limited too severely the amount of substantial conservation which may be accomplished is bound to be limited.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Am I incorrect in this? It has always been my impression that soil-conservation payments were made on the basis of what was earned in conserving the soil, whether it be 5 acres, 100 acres, or 1,000 acres. Am I wrong about that impression?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is correct, and I am glad he mentioned it, because it gives me a chance to point out again that it is not a matter of acreage or the size of the farm which determines how much a man earns in the way of payments. It is the practices which he carries out which determine that question. A small farm can very easily earn a larger payment than a large farm, depending upon the practices which are carried out.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] in his excellent discussion made a most significant statement when he pointed out that in a given area, the whole key to soil conservation may depend on the treatment that is given on one farm, and no one can earn the payment of that farm except the man who owns and operates that farm. If he is limited in the funds he can earn, it means that the whole project may fail. To adopt either the Abbitt amendment or the Rees amendment would be a backward step and a blow to the progress of soil conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time, not intending to use it all, but primarily to address a couple of inquiries to the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Kansas with reference to their amendments. It has been said here, and very properly so, that we should not consider this matter on a sectional basis but should look at it from the point of view of the entire country. Certainly one of the factors, if we are going to do that, which we must consider, is the amount involved for the taxpayers in these two amendments. All the talk here has been about how the farmers in this, that or the other section of the country are affected by this legislation. That is, of course, an appropriate subject of inquiry. But we must not forget that those same farmers as well as the wage earners and nearly everyone else is also affected from the point of view of footing the bill to pay for the expenditures we approve, therefore, highly important to determine whether there will be any actual money saved over-all by the adoption of either one of these amendments.

The gentleman from Kansas cited some figures, and I would like verification either from him or the gentleman from Virginia. If I understand it correctly, provided the maximum payment which can be made to any one participant is reduced from $2,500 to $1,000, it should effect a saving of somewhere around $16,000,000 over-all. Am I correct about that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. And the gentleman from Virginia agrees with the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. ABBITT. No, I did not say anything about the savings to the taxpayers. What I have in mind is that the committee has cut the appropriation from what it was last year, and that has been upheld by this body. There is less money this

year than what we have now, and my idea is that it will go around to help more if not too much money is given the large operators, for this reason: The man who is going into a large operation has sufficient assets, in my opinion, to carry it out anyway, and when we cut these small farmers, then we are really cutting conservation, in my opinion, and that was the thing I had in mind, making the payment up to $1,000, and the rest he has to carry on himself. The vast majority of these people are engaged in small practices, and I am afraid that they will stop entirely these practices.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, just following the gentleman from Virginia, if this is cut to $750—and I realize there is not so much difference in the amount of the payment—there would be approximately $28,000,000 available, and for that reason you would have, unless you are going to reduce this appropriation, that much more money to provide among these small operators.

Mr. ABBITT. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me say this, and it has been referred to here by at least two Members that regard this as a hand-out. It is no hand-out at all. It is a question of viewpoint with regard to the way you use the money. But it is money paid to the individual for doing work on his own land. This partly reimburses him for the service he renders to the country, if you want to put it that way, for conserving the soil. But it is money paid out of the Federal Treasury to the individual. It is not a hand-out or anything of the kind. Get that off your mind.

May I say to the gentleman that the payment has been as low as $750. It was that for 2 years. It has been as low as $500. So this is not an innovation of any kind.

May I say further that it is not the intent to snipe at this bill at all. If you do not want to take these amendments, that is well and good, but let us not call it sniping. It does not sound well, and does not go well with someone who is interested in these matters.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, at the time the gentleman from Virginia was recognized I was seeking recognition to offer an amendment to reduce the overall figure available for the Production and Marketing Administration program from $225,000,000 to $200,000,000. I realize there were a number here before who voted against the more serious or drastic reduction to $150,000,000 who might support a modest reduction of that kind. I am interested in and troubled by the remarks the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] made, that regardless of what we do on these amendments offered by the gentlemen from Virginia and Kansas the total amount will be spent in any event. For that reason, it seems regrettable to me that the votes are apparently lacking to accomplish a substantial saving in this appropriation of nearly a quarter of a billion dollars for these activities. The farmers themselves, with commendable spirit, have evidenced their approval of a real cut in the item we are considering through one of their spokesmen, Mr. Allen Kline, head of the National Grange. They realize that the waste of public funds or their use to advance political ends injures every segement of our economy.

I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas and, if that fails, the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, but both of them only partially solve the problem before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to close debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Far be it from me to question the motives of my friend from Kansas or my friend from Virginia, but there are lots of misapprehensions here from lots of sources. There is a formula for the distribution of such funds as are in the soil conservation program. That formula is the basis for dividing the money as between the States. That formula is the basis for divisions within the State. If my friend were to cut this down to $100 each he would not get a dime more in his county, and if the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia prevailed he would not get a dime more in his county.

Not only that, but the practices that exist in the various States under an overall classification of projects are determined by the State and county committees, so that they can select those soil practices that are badly needed in that area. Since this amendment does not affect what goes into anybody's State or what goes into anybody's county, why should you not let a county use its amount of money to meet the kind of problems it has? Some counties do have large farms. Nearly all the farmers are small farmers on a big landowner's farm. Why should not that county be permitted to use the money that is allocated to that county to meet the problems of that county? Some folks like the gentleman from Wisconsin have an area where flood control is the problem. Why should not they, if that is their problem and they have selected that as the practice that is greatly needed, set up a project that would relieve the situation?

The amount of the payment does not enter into how much land the man has and how much the money is that goes to him. When you limit the amount you limit the class and kind of project that can be done, and when you hold it down to peanuts you are limiting it to that class of soil conservation practice, which usually has less benefits.

In our committee report this year we stress the fact that we hope attention will be given to permanent and semipermanent practices. When you reduce this amount of $2,500 to $750 you seriously interfere with that.

Why do I say that? In the Eightieth Congress you had this limitation. You also reduced the amount to $150,000,000. When you did that, dams to conserve water for irrigation or livestock or to control erosion fell off 45 percent. Range and pasture seeding fell off 33 percent. Terraces fell off 21 percent. Farm land drained by open and enclosed drains fell off 41 percent. Reorganizing irrigation ditches, dikes, or laterals to prevent erosion and conserve water fell off 52 percent. Improving pasture and range land by eradicating and controlling unpalatable and poisonous plants fell off 52 percent.

The amount of money you get is fixed by the formula. We recognize in the law that each State and each county should select practices that are badly needed in the several counties. I will be the first to give the gentleman from Kansas the right the law gives him to select the practices and limitations, and his county committee can fix limitations with the approval of the State committee on the amount that goes to any one farm. But I do say that since this money goes to delta counties or western counties or goes to the mountain counties of the western section of the country, if they want to have larger projects and need these larger projects, since that money has gone to them under the formula fixed by the Congress, I think it would be unsound for me, because my problems are different, to try to limit their projects. You did not do it in the basic law. You said there should be an over-all book or catalog of project, but you said that each State and each county in the over-all picture shall select those things that are needed, and shall determine the basis upon which you contribute to the cost of the projects in those areas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman in view of the limitation of time, but I have listened to the gentleman repeatedly, and he has had to listen to me, but I do think he is trying to spread the problems which he has in his area over the Nation, and they do not quite fit. Far be it from me to try to put on his county and his State that which he does not want and which does not fit his area. But it follows that I think he is wrong to say that a county which has received so much money in the past under this program cannot work out projects that fit that county.

For that reason I hope you will defeat these amendments because if you do not defeat them you are in effect repealing the basic law.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 35, noes 72.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and Mr. ABBITT) there were—ayes 50, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMS

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the request for tellers comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, as the Clerk had already started reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out acreage allotment and marketing quota programs pursuant to provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301–1393), and to provide assistance in obtaining equipment, materials, and facilities necessary to attain needed production of agricultural commodities, $8,300,000, of which not more than $2,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express interest at this time in this particular section and disappointment over the fact that it is my understanding the committee has not made any provision whereby the Agricultural Production and Marketing Administration would provide for the measurement of cotton acreage for 1951. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether or not that is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to agree with the gentleman that one of the greatest problems we had in trying to work out the cotton acreage was the fact that we did not have adequate records. I would be forced to agree with the gentleman that there are two ways to provide money. One is for the committee to bring it in, and the other is to offer amendments. The committee has not provided funds for that purpose. It was not provided by the budget, and if the gentleman has been around for the last 2 or 3 days, and I know he has been here actively participating, he can see that we are having trouble holding the line for appropriations even where we have reduced them. So having included money over and above the budget, it was just our belief that, serious as the situation was and great as the need was, that for the time being, the committee reached the conclusion that we just could not do it. So for that reason the amount is not in the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree with the gentleman and many others that the necessity for reducing nonessential expenditures is very great. I, too, have voted for economy and reductions of nonessential spending when I could justify them. My record is clear. This is necessary and essential. I think one of the greatest disservices that can be rendered to the cotton farmers of this country is the fact that there is no provision for adequate records, and yet when the time comes to impose cotton allotments, if it does in the future, you have no records whatsoever. Everyone knows the difficulty we had last year was from the fact that the so-called Bureau of Agricultural Economics reported one acreage in the county, the farmers reported another, and the county committees reported another. Finally we got into such a dilemma that it was absolutely necessary for the Congress to do something about it in order to clear it up for the year 1950. Yet we come along in 1951 and propose later to again impose such controls on the cotton farmers. You are going to find yourselves in the same dilemma. To me that is not economy. That is an injustice to the cotton farmers of this country.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sure that the gentleman did not mean it like it sounded, as though the committee had ruined the cotton farmer in not bringing in the money. As I said, there are two ways to get this. One is for the committee to bring it in, and the other is to offer an amendment. I have not heard any amendment offered yet. I agree that the need for it is great, but I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is not exactly easy to get some of the money that we need for other things.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the very able gentleman [Mr. WHITTEN] and his committee. You have done a good job and worked hard on this appropriation. I am inclined to think that the gentleman's committee should have brought in the money necessary for measurement of cotton acreage for this year and I believe this House, in view of the experience we had last year, would have upheld the gentleman's committee. The gentleman knows I have considered preparing an amendment. I talked to him about it. I talked to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to the ranking member of that committee, and to other members of your committee. All of you seem to agree with me that it should be done, but you think it should not be brought in here as an amendment. Yet you do bring in, according to the report, funds in the agricultural production program amounting to $2,500,000 for a so-called national-defense program.

Just what that contains I do not know. It seems to me that we could very well increase the national-defense program by providing adequate records for the future for any national-defense requirement rather than simply making the statement "this is for the national-defense program," and nobody knows what the national defense program is.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi because I want to have a record made.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say to the gentleman that he has talked to me about this program. I readily agree with him as to the problem involved and further agree that it would be well if this work were done. I also raised the question with the gentleman of how he would get funds for it at this time. I notice the gentleman has not offered his amendment. I think I told the gentleman that I would not oppose his amendment, although I cannot act for the whole committee. This bill would be different in several particulars if I could. But I do recognize the problem. I refuse, however, to take any responsibility for not having it in this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 35, line 5, insert after the comma the following: "including the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on farms, whether or not marketing quotas are in effect."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the difficulty in endeavoring to provide funds——

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am not asking the gentleman to yield. I wish to make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late; the gentleman has already been recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment simply because the cotton farmers of this country should have some way of compelling a record to be made of the 1951 cotton crop. It is true, I believe—and I have talked to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture—that consideration is being given by members of his great committee to provide a program for this 1951 year, but it is well known that an effort was made in the latter part of the last Congress to do something about it. While the program did pass this House, it never did get through the other body.

This, to me, Mr. Chairman, would, in my opinion, be a directive to the Production and Marketing Administration, through the county committees as the law requires, to undertake a program of determining the cotton acreage in the counties in the cotton-producing areas throughout the United States for future reference, if and when acreage allotments are put into effect. If farmers are again forced to controls and will have to submit to acreage allotments and quotas they will at least have a record on which they could rely of the 1951 crop and thus avoid the inequities and injustices by the BAE estimates and merely guesses. It is not right that total counties' acreage planted be pulled out of thin air. A record should be made.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, with whom I have discussed this problem, as well as with other Members.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And I am sympathetic with the gentleman's problem. But I should like to know how much money is involved here, how much of this $8,300,000 would be taken for this work? Has the gentleman any idea as to that?

Mr. HARRIS. In all deference to the gentleman from Mississippi, the able chairman of the subcommittee—and I

appreciate his position and the fact he wants this program carried out and recognizes the importance and desire for the measurement of 1951 cotton acreage for future records, if and when needed. I do not want us to be faced with any such dilemma as we had last year. Answering the gentleman from Minnesota, I would say probably a million dollars. I know that some down at the Department of Agriculture contend that if we go into this, measure the 1951 cotton crop, and make a record as we should have, it would take an entirely new staff and personnel. They say it would probably take about $5,000,000. In my opinion, however, with the existing county organizations set up, committees set up in each county, I do not see why with the funds here, $8,300,000, for administering OPC program, these county committees could not assume this responsibility that would be theirs and see that the cotton farmers of this country would have a record made in order that they may know in future years if such a control program is imposed upon them just what they can depend on.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. If the gentleman's amendment were to prevail, does he have any way of knowing if this work is done that the Department would not be back up here for a supplemental or deficiency appropriation?

Mr. HARRIS. I have no way of knowing that; however, from my investigation a part of the $8,300,000 provided here with $2,500,000 for so-called assistance to national defense program could be utilized for this purpose. What is going to be the nature of the national defense problems that requires $2,500,000 as provided for that purpose for the Department of Agriculture in relation to this agriculture-production program?

Mr. HORAN. In the gentleman's contact with the Department of Agriculture does he have any reason to believe that it would cost more than a million dollars?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. In our conversation I was led to believe that if the Department is given everything that they think they should have, they will have to have new personnel for this purpose and in that instance it would cost about $5,000,000, according to them, but, in my opinion, they can do it with the present personnel supplemented some with the funds as contained in this amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Would the gentleman include language in his amendment so that we could be assured and we could be honest with the Congress or the Committee here?

Mr. HARRIS. I want the gentleman to know that I never intend to be dishonest with the Committee.

Mr. HORAN. I know that.

Mr. HARRIS. Or with the Congress. At the same time I want to be honest with the farmers in this country and try to prevent them from suffering the dilemma they did a year ago.

Mr. HORAN. I was hoping there would be language in there so we would know what we were doing here with such an amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the language speaks for itself. I believe it would be a directive to the Department of Agriculture to carry out this program, to measure the 1951 cotton acreage even though there are no quota controls or allotments in effect. It is for the purpose of having a record.

I hope this amendment is adopted. I believe it is justified and will prove to be necessary. It is not right to force controls on cotton farmers and impose further injustices of reduced allotments by failure to make records at this time when they could be correctly made.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. Chairman, we have a situation here, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted—and by the way I am sympathetic with the situation he describes—that the money, whether it be $1,000,000 or $3,000,000 or whatever amount it might be, must be expended out of this $8,300,000. It seems to me some of the work as described in that particular paragraph which the $8,300,000 was originally put in the bill for must therefore suffer. Just what particular work will suffer I have no idea whatsoever. I would much prefer voting on an amendment, if the gentleman will arrange his amendment in such fashion, limiting such expenditure under his amendment to not over $1,000,000. Then I could personally agree to it. But the door is wide open. This may require $5,000,000, then that will only leave $3,300,000 for all of the work under this particular paragraph.

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to accept an amendment to my amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman provide the language, and we will offer it? We want to be fair.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman has language to fit, I will be glad to accept it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not have the time to prepare the language. If the gentleman will put a limitation of $1,000,000 on what he seeks to do, I will be glad to accept the amendment. Why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent that his amendment be arranged in that fashion? I think the committee will agree to it.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not understand just what the gentleman means with reference to the language he proposes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Arkansas wants to do certain things. He wants the Congress to say that the work of measuring these cotton fields shall be done out of this money. I am agreeable to that if the gentleman will provide in his amendment that not over $1,000,000 of this $8,300,000 is used for that purpose.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to oppose this amendment and I can appreciate the value of having proper historical records, but I hope that the gentleman from Arkansas will accept the suggestion made and add to the amendment that the total cost shall not exceed $1,000,000. I understand that is the suggestion that was made.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman means to add $1,000,000?

Mr. COOLEY. No. Provide that the cotton survey shall not cost to exceed $1,000,000.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified as suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The effect of which will not be to increase any appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct, and I think it is fair to all parties concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. But the cost of which shall not exceed $1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, might I ask what the purpose of it is?

Mr. WHITTEN. It has been suggested, Mr. Chairman, in view of the unanimous-consent request, that the amendment be modified as follows: "Including," and then insert "not to exceed $1,000,000 be available for this purpose." That still leaves it coming out of the original figure, but it does say "not to exceed one million."

Mr. WERDEL. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: He says he does not oppose the amendment, or does not want to oppose it. I would like to know just what the purpose of the amendment is.

Mr. WHITTEN. The purpose of the amendment is first, that you now have these controls, and you had them last year on cotton acreage. At that time they had no basis on which to determine what the historical acreage was that was given to the farmers. It is anticipated after this year you have to go back to controls, and you will have no adequate records on which to base your law to go back to the control program this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas that the amendment be modified?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 35, line 5, insert after the comma, the following: "including the measurement of the acreage planted to cotton on the farms whether or not marketing quotas are in effect, providing that not more than $1,000,000 be available for this purpose."

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee some additional questions. As I understand the purpose of the amendment, it is to avoid getting into the condition that we were in last year when, after 8 years of free enterprise in the cotton industry, acreage had moved west and from one part of a State to another part of that State. As I understand the law at the

present time, controls are put on when the formula says they should be put on, and the law at the present time says when that formula does not go into effect, then anyone in the United States can raise cotton. If we want a history during that period of time of free enterprise when the formula is not in effect, somebody who proposes this amendment should tell us what the purpose of that history is when we are operating in free enterprise. If we have such a purpose that we can all agree to, then certainly why should we put into law a provision that a function be entered into by the Department which might cost $50,000,000 and limit it to the expenditure of $1,000,000 without any discussion or understanding of what the actual amount of money necessary should be.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I have talked to a number of Members of Congress on committees, both the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture and I have talked to the staff members down at the Department of Agriculture. I have been advised by some here in Congress that it would cost probably $1,000,000 to make a record of the 1951 planted acreage. The Department of Agriculture says if they have to set up a new organization altogether, go out and employ new personnel, a complete new organization, then they would expect it to cost about $5,000,000. That is the reason we think perhaps $1,000,000 would be sufficient at least to start this program.

I will say to the gentleman in answer to his other question that when we had a cotton-acreage allotment program in effect in 1950 it was based on the acreage planted in 1946, 1947, and 1948. I have in my hand the report that was issued insofar as the counties in my district are concerned. The BAE cotton-acreage report for 1946, 1947, and 1948 was one thing. The producers reported cotton acreage in an entirely different amount. The basic allotment by the committee was an entirely different acreage altogether, and the final allotment was another acreage. If we have future allotments that are going to be based on the amount of the preceding 5 years, not counting, of course, 1949, we will have a record for 1950, and the records for 1946, 1947, and 1948 will have been made, whether they are correct or not; but in order to complete it, it will be necessary to have a record for 1951. If we do not have that record, you will have the BAE reporting one thing, you will have the farmers reporting another, and you will have the committees again reporting another. This is for the purpose of having the cotton farmers of the gentleman's State as well as my own, big and little farmers, knowing exactly what they can count on if that record is made.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from California represents the largest cotton-growing county in our State. His opinion on this is good. The gentleman from Arkansas has now raised a new question. He said, "at least for a beginning." It seems to me that does raise the question of how much is involved.

Now I ask the gentleman from California this. As I remember the problem in the very small way it affected my particular district, the problem was not whether the figures were correct or not; it was whether the acreage could follow the farmer. The gentleman from California will also remember that in California a great deal of acreage was allotted to 5-acre plots. We have no 5-acre cotton farms in California. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. WERDEL. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. How would the proposal affect that?

Mr. WERDEL. That is one of the things I am trying to find out.

Mr. HARRIS. There is no better way in the world you can preserve that 5-acre block than to have a history made of it so when an allotment is made to California, whatever it will be you will know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I will not object to this request, but I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] for three additional minutes.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, may I take this additional time to say that I understand the purpose of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and I think it should be clear in the RECORD that during these years when controls are not in effect we need a history under the existing law to determine what the allotments should be when they do go into effect. I point out, however, that $1,000,000 is not enough money. If the limitation is on it, it should be increased in the Senate, because it is my recollection that in round numbers there are seven or eight million acres of cotton raised on tracts of 5 acres or less. To try to get the history of that many farms with $1,000,000, each of them having 5 acres or less, is impossible. I point that out to the Committee for its consideration.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think probably the gentleman is right. However, in view of all of the confusion we had heretofore, as well as that which we have had on the floor of the House in regard to this program, I believe there will be a sufficient amount of interest at the farm level to supplement such labor as the department will have to have to procure these accurate measurements. I think this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. WERDEL. But I point out to the gentleman there is less than a dollar per grower here to get that history. We can get more confusion if you have to make a report under such circumstances than we had last time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Any one man who goes out to take the history can walk out and see the acreage in a few minutes, and find out just how much acreage there is. And you talk about one man to a farm. One man can go out and get the correct allotment in a day for a number of farms, so it would not necessarily be a question of how much money is going to be allocated to one cotton farmer.

Mr. WERDEL. That may be true in Arkansas, but we do not walk that fast in California.

Mr. HARRIS. You know pretty well what you have in your acreage lots out there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I think the action of the House, if it takes the course today of adopting this amendment, will go a long way toward alleviating possible confusion and chaos in the future if a program of cotton acreage allotments is set up again. I am sure all of you who have been Members of the House during the past few years are familiar with the great struggles which went on here and the waste of time and various other expensive and costly delays which were occasioned as a result of the confusion which came about when we went into acreage allotments for the first time after being off of them for several years during the war.

Many of the cotton farmers in my district have indicated to me they are willing to finance a large part of this acreage measurement themselves and that it is necessary in order that a clear picture of the acreage history may be preserved. But this provision in the bill, to provide some type of acreage history by the Department, I believe can go a long way toward establishing a fairer and clearer acreage allotment program in the future.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to tell the Members of the House one experience where one cotton farmer claimed that he had so many acres planted for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reported an entirely different figure. When he finally brought in his acreage insurance certificate, they then accepted it and gave him what he said he had planted. That was the only way in the world he had of presenting any record whatsoever which they would believe. There was one farmer perhaps out of hundreds and hundreds who had a crop insurance record which they would accept.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is correct. The adoption of this amendment will save the House a lot of headaches in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time, if I may, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] for 6 minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL]. If it is necessary to increase this amount of money in the other body in order to do a fair and just job of work, it certainly should be done, because there never was a situation more chaotic which characterized the small, family-sized farmer, and larger farmers, too, than that which resulted when cotton quotas were again imposed in 1950. A great deal is being said from day to day about short crops. I read in the Washington Post recently about a short wheat crop, and about other grain crops being short. Of course we all know there has been a very short cotton crop in the last season.

One of the signal things that is never mentioned, however, is that one of the reasons for these shortages is that the farm program is having the effect, in instances at least, of driving some people off of the farms.

I have in my possession letters and information which say exactly this, that one of the reasons people are leaving the farms is because of the way in which acreage allotments are handled.

As I have said so many times, and incidentally I have placed many letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to that effect and nobody has ever disputed them, it is a known fact that throughout the South people had to leave the farms because they did not have ample acreage allotted to them to justify remaining there.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to call attention to the fact that a year ago and 2 years ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] and others of us called attention to that fact, that as a result thousands left Texas congressional districts and many thousands left western Oklahoma.

Mr. BECKWORTH. One district in my State of Texas alone lost 50,000 people in 10 years according to the last census. Other districts in States close by lost many people. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] and I predicted when certain cotton legislation was debated on the floor of the House in August 1949 this would happen. Restrictive legislation was then passed which drove people from the farms and which would not let the war workers who wanted to return to the farms and veterans return. One of the reasons is that when people sought to come back from the war and from defense plants they could not get a farm to work. I have a letter from a man who owns 320 acres of land. He said that he had been penalized $108 for growing one bale of cotton; that he had 3.6 acres. He also had 2.6 acres of peanuts. He said in effect in the letter to me, which was written on April 30, "How can you expect me to obey an order of the Government to undertake to grow more crops when I am being penalized like that this year?"

Much has been said about the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I do not know what the experience of the average Member has been, but that is one section of the Department of Agriculture where it often is rather difficult at times to get information; I suppose they do the best they can. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is correct when he makes the assertion that countless farmers have contended that they had grown so many acres of a given crop over a period of years, when the Bureau of Agricultural Economics simply said, "This is what we have on your account." As for accuracy, in my opinion most of the farmers being honest, knew what they had grown better than the BAE.

I say that this proposition of people leaving the farms, certainly in some sections of the country, is a serious thing. I think if that trend does not cease we are going to see even more shortages. I hope that as the question of shortages develops there will be a few more questions as to what relationship leaving the farm frequently by compulsion, at least indirectly, on the part of people during the last 10 years is having on shortages. I think we might very well afford to study that particular thing. After all, the commercial farmer—and there are commercial farmers—is in business to make all the dollars he can, and when the dollars become scarce he is not going to stay there like the family-sized farmer who likes to farm because he can earn a living at it and because there, too, is attached a certain amount of liberty and freedom that cannot be found in many other vocations. I repeat, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is to be commended for offering this amendment, and I hope that the proper study will be given to it in the Senate, and that ample money will be made available to see that every farmer who wants to farm is given a square deal when the acreage allotments are reimposed. Only can this occur if there are adequate and accurate records.

To show you how confused the Department of Agriculture is on this subject, I wrote a letter to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. McCormick, in which I asked him if allotments are reimposed in 1952 what will happen to farmers who undertake to grow cotton.

He answered me like this, and the letter is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the acreage allotments may be affected a whole lot, or none at all, or somewhere in between.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD certain data:

WINTER WHEAT ESTIMATE DROPS TO SMALLEST CROP SINCE 1943

(By John W. Ball)

The Government Crop Reporting Board yesterday forecast the smallest winter wheat crop since 1943. Between April 1 and May 1 the indicated crops shrank 44,000,000 bushels.

The prospect on May 1, the Board stated, was for only 632,000,000 bushels, compared with 750,000,000 bushels last year (when plantings were restricted by the Government), 902,000,000 bushels in 1949, and 1,007,000,000 bushels in 1948.

The gloomy crop outlook—which, if correct, will lower the 1952 carry-over to only 300,000,000 bushels—is almost certain to stiffen congressional opposition against giving any wheat to India. There already has been some pressure for lending India money and letting it buy the grain elsewhere.

The report clearly indicated that unless there is an unusual spring wheat crop the country this year won't raise enough wheat to meet domestic requirements and already committed exports under the International Wheat Agreement and other agreements. Planting of spring wheat, the report said, has been delayed by wet weather in most areas, but is finally progressing well.

The serious damage to the crop from drought and insect infestation is shown in the following figures: (1) Almost 27 percent of the acreage planted to wheat has been abandoned, compared to average abandonment of 10 percent; (2) yield is predicted at only 16.6 bushels an acre compared with 17.1 last year, 18.8 bushels in 1948, and 19.5 bushels in 1947.

Oats, the report said, are far below normal, averaging only 58 percent compared with 62 percent last May and an average of 71 percent for this time of year.

The report commented that farm work was badly delayed in April. It gave no estimate of the extent of damage due to late planting. It also did not comment on the delay in preparing the soil in the Midwest corn area for corn planting. It mentioned that "seeding of spring grains was delayed in much of the north central region," and then added that "seeding of spring wheat acreage, however, is now probable under fairly favorable conditions."

Spring commercial truck crops have been retarded, with prospects for 5 to 7 percent less than last year. Sharp declines from last year are foreseen for onions, cabbage, and carrots, with smaller declines for nine other vegetables. Increases are forecast in cucumbers, cantaloupes, and spinach.

"Prospects for apples are good in Maryland," the report stated. "The low temperatures during April did little damage to the crop.

"In Virginia the freeze on April 17 to 19 damaged early blooming varieties, especially Delicious. The bloom on most varieties except York has been heavy.

"In West Virginia * * * prospects are for a good crop."

EUSTACE, TEX., *April 30, 1951.*

To Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

Well, Lindy, here I come for some information from you. Now I am asking you. Well they wrote me and said I owed them $108.50 for growing a bale of cotton in 1950 because I did not sign a contract. My allotment is 3.6 acres. Say, I can't live on that small acreage. My peanuts acreage is 2.6 acres. I did not violate God's law growing one bale, as bad as we need it. My tax is so high I can't pay them everything, so high everybody left the farm and went to town to work. I am asking you, do I have to pay that $108.50, or must I ignore it? So give me your opinion on it and answer at once. If I do have to pay for it, I am quitting farming to go to town to work. I can make a better living in town. I am growing peanuts for feed for my cattle. I did not ask the Government for help, and, if I can't grow what I want to on my farm enough to keep it up, there is no need staying on it. So the farmer is so handicapped he can't grow enough anyhow.

So this year they want me to grow all the cotton I can. Trying to fine me for growing one bale in 1950, now what must I do—pay or not?

Now, here is the situation: Now I have 320 acres; my neighbor has 100 acres. He has 37 acres peanut allotment, I have 1 acre. So I am keeping a copy of this letter I am sending you. So tell me, do I have to pay or not? You find out and let me hear from you. I have been your supporter and Truman, too, so, I am trying to support the Government every way I can. My desire is grow something but the —— does not want me to sell it, but by being penalized for it. If you can read this—I am left-handed—so answer as soon as you well can.

T. C. MEWBORNE.

MINEOLA, TEX., *May 1, 1951.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Third Congressional District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have decided to write you concerning a problem that concerns not only you and I but our whole Nation.

It is the absentee ownership of land as I have seen it and read about in the State of Texas. I am sure you must have given no little thought to the matter as the decline of population in your district I feel is a definite outgrowth of this evil.

Many reasons for that decline is given by one and another authority but in my opinion the fact that good farms and ranches being as nearly unobtainable as they have become since so many business and professional people and people of means have developed the fad of buying farms as a hobby or else for speculation purposes.

* * * * * *

* * * own about 12,000 acres of land composed completely of small farms purchased and assembled into a block operated by one or two hired hands on each three or four thousand acres of land which formerly furnished a living for some 40 to 60 people or rather families.

* * * are just examples, there are numbers more owning hundreds of acres acquired in the same manner, and with hardly an exception these are people that acquired their money in some other manner than farming.

Add to these people the lower income professional people who buy one or two small farms each and the many farms our old folks are living on and not operating and not able to rent or sell under the present administration of our old age pension law and you will see the difficulties faced by a person of moderate means who likes to farm or grow stock and also the reason our population is declining in our rural areas.

Also the ill will toward our Government created by these conditions is of no small import since as I am certain you are aware, the ownership of the majority of land by a few large landowners has always been a matter of disturbance in whatever country it has and is occurring.

This is a State-wide—and probably a Nation-wide—problem as you can readily see by checking the sharp fall in the number of individually owned farms in the State of Texas during the last decade.

Being a man of limited education and experience in such matters I can recommend no pat solution but do feel that through taxes or other means this situation should be remedied for the good of our Nation and its people and especially the future generations.

I am a disabled ex-marine—World War II—sent to the farm by the doctors to find a means of livelihood more suited to my health and after 2 years of renting while trying to find a farm to buy have been made well aware of the situation in east Texas and I hope you will find this whole problem worthy of your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

BARTON S. HILL.

WILLS POINT, TEX., *April 29, 1951.*

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have been intending to write you for some time in regards to some of the things that are being passed and put on farmers and stockraisers.

First, DiSalle set the ceiling price on cotton at 45 cents and just across the Mexican border, cotton is selling for 85 cents a pound.

I sit here with a Dallas newspaper's headlines on beef prices. To be cut back 10 cents a pound. Still Brannan is asking for 16,000 bales of cotton. This is, as you know, around Wills Point, a cotton and cattle country. Our son, D. L., Jr., and I, are farming 550 acres of land, and farm machinery is up this year about 25 percent above last year. Gasoline is up 2 cents a gallon, but DiSalle, Wilson, and Brannan are doing nothing about it. Fire the hell out of all.

* * * * * *

Lindley, we think you are tops, but for God sakes what is wrong up there. Guess by now you will say just another old fogy fool. I was at the cotton meeting in the bank. In regards to cotton allotments last year, Mr. Curtis asked me to state my allotment and acreage which I did, and I do want to tell you. I, my wife, and son did appreciate what you did in getting the cotton allotment raised.

Lindley, in 1940, D. L., Jr., and I, ginned 74 bales of cotton; in 1950, we ginned 37 bales, 14,000 pounds of vetch, 600 bushels of corn. After expenses were paid, we did not pay income tax, for expenses got it all. Still the farmer makes it all.

Your friend,

DAVE FULLER.

Mr. Chairman, farmers in my section have been told to go to raising cattle. Some of them tried to do so. Note their problems in the enclosed letters:

PITTSBURG, TEX., *May 5, 1951.*

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: After reading the attached article in the Wichita Daily Times, April 29, 1951, Wichita Falls, Tex., I have learned that it is the intention of the Office of Price Stabilization to roll back the price of beef received by the producers 18 percent by October 1951.

I am not a cattle king, and it is not my intent to become a cattle baron, but I am one of the many small producers of beef cattle who would like to have a decent return on the money and time I have invested in this enterprise.

To go further into detail, I will give you the following facts relative to my operation:

I have 108 acres in Camp and Upshire Counties and I use 211 acres in Franklin County, ownership being in the family. These two farms are ordinary east Texas farms and I judge worth $11,000. The two farms are stocked with 48 cows and 2 bulls. These cows are common cows, most of them of Hereford type, with an occasional Angus, Shorthorn, or brindle cow. My bulls are Hereford and from considerably better stock than the cows. These cows are worth a minimum of $10,000.

As you will know, from your past experience, a certain amount of costly equipment is necessary in order for an organization of this type to function. These items will include a pick-up truck, wire stretchers, lariat ropes, all sorts of hand tools and shovels, etc. I believe that allowing $2,000 for this expense is not excessive. In addition, $1,000 is needed to take care of any overhead.

The annual calf crop to be expected will run about 80 percent, therefore I expect to sell around 40 calves annually from my 48 cows at April 25, 1951, prices. These calves when sold at 9 or 10 months of age would average about $100 each, or $4,000.

Expenses during the year for feed, automobile expenses and maintenance of fences and buildings alone will certainly amount to $1,000 each year, leaving a net expected return of $3,000.

If we, the producers, are cut back 18 percent as proposed by OPS, then my income will be reduced 18 percent of $4,000, which is $720. This amount deducted from my net income of $3,000 will leave only $2,280.

I believe and I think that you will agree that a return of $2,280 for 1 year's work and a $24,000 investment is entirely too little under current conditions. I also believe that this proposed OPS roll-back is unjustified and is discriminatory against the producer of beef cattle, when other expenses are not rolled back proportionately.

Any assistance or information you may be able to give will certainly be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

W. REX SPENCER.

PITTSBURG, TEX., *April 2, 1951.*

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,

DEAR SIR: I am a small farmer with a few cattle, with high-priced feed and higher wages would make an awful hard go, with cattle prices cut back.

Our cattle have been raised on high-priced feed. If the cut-back comes, I don't see anything to do except quit producing cattle.

I hope we can get some relief and am asking you to do what you can to help us cattle growers.

Very respectfully,

H. M. MELTON.

Note the answers again. I fear these small livestock growers, like the small farmers, are faced with very serious problems which could result in shortages.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your expressed interest in behalf of Mr. W. Rex Spencer, rural route 5, box 12, Pittsburg, Tex., who has objected to the control of meat prices.

On January 26, 1951, the Office of Price Stabilization issued the General Ceiling Price Regulation, which froze prices of processors and distributors at levels prevailing December 19, 1950 to January 25, 1951. This price freeze was issued on the decision that definite action was necessary to put the breaks on inflation.

During the week of June 24, 1950, immediately prior to the start of the Korean situation, the weekly average price of prime cattle at Chicago as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture was $31.42 per hundredweight. During the week of April 21, 1951, the weekly average price of prime cattle had reached $40.88 per hundredweight and the dressed carcass price was $59.70. This was in the period when cattle was in large supply. Due to this rapid rise in prices, it has been found necessary to control the price of beef because it is such an important item in our economy.

Although the average prices paid to farmers for beef cattle on January 26, 1951, had increased considerably, these prices were not frozen by the General Ceiling Price Regulation because there was no effective grading service available at the time. When the regulation was issued, however, this office stated that controls on livestock prices would be announced later. By April 15, prices of prime grade steers were 30 percent above those in June 1950. Choice grade steers were up 26 percent.

The ceiling price regulation on beef cattle will leave cattle prices at about the level prevailing December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951, or about 10 percent below recent high

levels. These ceiling prices, as reflected at the slaughter level, are 14 to 18 percent higher than the prices paid cattlemen in June of last year.

The price freeze issued last January froze prices which retailers, wholesalers, and slaughterers could charge for beef but did not, however, freeze prices at which the producers of live animals could sell their cattle. Live cattle were exempted because the Office of Price Stabilization recognized that a freeze applied without previous notice would result in a severe hardship to cattle feeders. In order to make it possible for cattle feeders to adjust their operations, the Director of Price Stabilization announced at the time of the January price freeze that ceilings on livestock prices would be issued later. Also, in the price ceilings which were announced on April 30, the adjustments in live cattle prices are made gradually and the adjustments in prices are taken in three different steps so that time will be allowed for cattle feeders to govern their transactions accordingly.

The reductions which will be effective July 29 and September 30 will leave beef cattle prices up to 7 percent above those of last June or between 120 to 125 percent of parity. Department of Agriculture estimates of production costs indicate that under these established ceiling prices, the producers will make a reasonable profit and maintain present level of beef cattle numbers.

It is felt, therefore, that the relationship of these prices to other farm commodities will be such as to be an incentive for a continuing high production of beef. You may be assured that this part of the stabilization program will be periodically reviewed, in order that any changes warranted by facts can be made so that the program will be more effective.

Very truly yours,

KARL K. BECHTOLD,
Office of the Special Assistant to the Director.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your expressed interest in behalf of Mr. H. M. Melton, rural route 5, box 12, Pittsburg, Tex., who has objected to the control of meat prices.

On January 26, 1951, the Office of Price Stabilization issued the General Ceiling Price Regulation, which froze prices of processors and distributors at levels prevailing December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951. This price freeze was issued on the decision that definite action was necessary to put the brakes on inflation.

During the week of June 24, 1950, immediately prior to the start of the Korean situation, the weekly average price of prime cattle at Chicago as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture was $31.42 per hundredweight. During the week of April 21, 1951, the weekly average price of prime cattle had reached $40.88 per hundredweight, and the dressed carcass price was $59.70. This was in the period when cattle was in large supply. Due to this rapid rise in prices, it has been found necessary to control the price of beef because it is such an important item in our economy.

Although the average prices paid to farmers for beef cattle on January 26, 1951, had increased considerably, these prices were not frozen by the General Ceiling Price Regulation because there was no effective grading service available at the time. When the regulation was issued, however, this office stated that controls on livestock prices would be announced later. By April 15, prices of prime grade steers were 30 percent above those in June 1950. Choice grade steers were up 26 percent.

The ceiling price regulation on beef cattle will leave cattle prices at about the level prevailing December 19, 1950, to January 25, 1951, or about 10 percent below recent high levels. These ceiling prices, as reflected at the slaughter level, are 14 to 18 percent higher than the prices paid cattlemen in June of last year.

The price freeze issued last January froze prices which retailers, wholesalers, and slaughterers could charge for beef but did not, however, freeze prices at which the producers of live animals could sell their cattle. Live cattle were exempted because the Office of Price Stabilization recognized that a freeze applied without previous notice would result in a severe hardship to cattle feeders. In order to make it possible for cattle feeders to adjust their operations, the Director of Price Stabilization announced at the time of the January price freeze that ceilings on livestock prices would be issued later. Also, in the price ceilings which were announced on April 30, the adjustments in live cattle prices are made gradually and the adjustments in prices are taken in three different steps so that time will be allowed for cattle feeders to govern their transactions accordingly.

The reductions, which will be effective July 29 and September 30, will leave beef cattle prices up to 7 percent above those of last June or between 120 to 125 percent of parity. Department of Agriculture estimates of production costs indicate that under these established ceiling prices, the producers will make a reasonable profit and maintain present level of beef cattle numbers.

It is felt, therefore, that the relationship of these prices to other farm commodities will be such as to be an incentive for a continuing high production of beef. You may be assured that this part of the stabilization program will be periodically reviewed, in order that any changes warranted by facts can be made so that the program will be more effective.

Very truly yours,

KARL K. BECHTOLD,
Office of the Special Assistant to the Director.

Mr. Chairman, it is unwise and dangerous in my opinion to permit segments of the farm program and certain governmental orders to have the effect of forcing people off the farm or out of the stock-raising business. I have opposed and do oppose this being done. I repeat what I have said before, I am for free enterprise on the farm just as I am for free enterprise in business.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to questions which you raised in our telephone conversation of November 27, and also in reply to your letter of November 27, 1950, regarding what might happen to a particular county's cotton-acreage allotment and the allotments for individual farms within the county, if cotton-acreage allotments should be required in 1952.

In our letter of November 24, 1950, we outlined the present provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, that would probably cause 1952 State and county cotton-acreage allotments, if required, to vary from those established in 1950—in many cases the difference would be substantial—even if no change is made in the national acreage allotment in 1952 from 1950. This is true because of changes in base periods and in formulas provided in the act for apportioning the national allotment to States and the State acreage allotments to counties. We have also discussed with you in previous letters that the provisions of the act do not include the acreage planted to cotton in 1951 in the base for establishing 1952 State and county allotments and, therefore, will not affect them.

Since farm cotton-acreage allotments are determined primarily on a uniform county percentage of cropland, the acreage planted to cotton on a farm has little bearing on the allotment. The law provides that the acreage of cotton be used in determining minimum and maximum allotments in distributing the county allotment—less the acreage reserved by the county committee—to eligible cotton farms. Therefore, if all farmers in a county should double their cotton acreage in 1951 over 1950, the 1952 farm allotments may be changed considerably or none at all or somewhere between, depending on how farmers in the particular county vary their cotton acreage in proportion to cropland.

In view of the many factors affecting allotments as provided by law it is impossible to determine what the 1952 county and farm cotton-acreage allotments would be, is required, until the provisions of the act have been applied in determining State, county, and farm allotments. Consequently, even though we assume that (1) there will be cotton-acreage allotments and marketing quotas in 1952, (2) the national allotment for 1952 would be the same as the 1950 national allotment, and (3) a particular farm or county plants exactly twice as much cotton in 1951 as was planned in 1950 it would still be impossible to determine the changes in any given county allotment or the farm allotments within a given county.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. MCCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I include several letters about peanuts and cotton:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Wellington, Tex., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 16, 1950, with reference to the peanut-acreage allotment for our country:

1. We have 109 farms with peanut allotments.

2. Producers in general should have at least 15 acres per farm in order to grow them economically.

3. There are 78 farms in the county that have an allotment of less than 15 acres.

4. We have 15 farms with less than 2-acre allotments.

5. All farms with less than 2-acre allotments will cease to grow peanuts.

6. Probably none of these producers will cease to farm for themselves, but will have to grow other crops for a livelihood.

7. We have 21 producers who applied for new-grower allotments.

8. A total of 27.3 acres were allotted to new growers of this county by the State committee.

9. On an average each new grower received 1.3 acres.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quincy, Fla., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 12, 1950, we have 175 peanut producers in Gadsden County. The least number of acres a farmer can grow economically is usually 5 acres; 89 of these allotments are under 5 acres; 39 received less than 2 acres. Nearly all of these will quit growing peanuts for harvest. We have no way of knowing how many farmers will cease to farm for themselves on this account. It will cause some to do so. Seventeen new

growers applied for peanut acreage this year—1950. We have 17.4 acres to distribute to them. These range from 0.5 to 1.7 acres.

Trusting this is the information you desired, I am,

Yours truly,

BERNARD H. CLARK,
Administrative Officer, Gadsden County, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Giddings, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of May 15 and we herewith enclose the following information:

1. Number of peanut farms in Lee County: 1,054.
2. The least number a farmer can afford to grow: 10.
3. Number of producers receiving allotments less than the above: 661.
4. Number of producers receiving allotments less than 2 acres: 174.
5. Number of producers who will cease to grow peanuts (approximate): 50.
6. Number of producers who will cease to farm for themselves (approximate): 25.
7. Number of producers who applied for new grower allotment, 1950: 72.
8. Number of acres to distribute to them: 109.7.
9. Approximate acreage for each new grower: 1.5.

Very truly yours,

WARREN D. MOODY,
Secretary, Lee County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter, dated May 13, 1950, to the Wood County PMA Committee.

We have approximately 400 peanut producers in the county. The least number of acres each producer can afford to grow is 2 acres. We have about 150 producers who received allotments of less than 2 acres. Of those growers having allotments of less than 2 acres, there will be about 25 or 50 who will cease to grow peanuts. I do not believe there will be any cease to farm for themselves. The number of new producers were 35 and the number of acres distributed was 21.4 acres and the average to each was 0.6 of an acre.

The excess acreage (for soil) up to the 1947 picked and threshed will help at least 150 or 200 producers in Wood County.

Hoping the above is the desired information, I am

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Allendale, S. C., June 1, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am listing below the information requested in your letter dated May 18, 1950:

1. What is the least number of acres an average farmer can afford to grow or economically grow: 5.
2. How many producers received allotments less than the number of acres shown in 1: 135.
3. How many peanut producers received allotments less than 2 acres: 76.
4. Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts: 50 percent.
5. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.
6. How many new producers applied for peanut acreage this year (1950): 9.
7. How many acres were distributed to them: 18.6.
8. Approximately how much did each receive: 2.

Very truly yours,

HENRY B. BARKER,
County Administrative Officer, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., April 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter of April 5, 1950, to the county committee.

(1) The number of farmers receiving 5 acres of cotton or less was 1,248. (2) The number of new producers that applied for allotments were 340. (3) The acreage that was available to distribute among the new producers was 300. (4) Each producer received from 1 to 1.1 acres. (5) The number of zero allotments were 10. (6) The percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers was 88 percent (300) applications.

The number applications left from item 2 less item 5, less item 6, consisted of 30 applications that did not meet the necessary eligibility requirements.

If you desire further information, please advise.

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Cross City, Fla., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third Congressional District of Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reference is made to your letter of May 12 relative to peanut producers in Dixie County, Fla. Dixie County is primarily a livestock county and most of the farmers produce peanuts for hog feed. However, we do have some 20 farmers who grow peanuts for digging. Of these 18 have less than 2 acres allotment. It is the general thinking of the average farmer that they cannot economically dig and pick less than 5 acres. Of the number of farmers having less than 2 acres allotments none will cease growing peanuts but about 75 percent of them will not dig. We had no new producers applying for acreage this year but the reason for this was that when told the probable size of new grower allotments those that were interested decided that it would not be worth the trouble of filling out the forms.

Trusting that this is the information that you desire, I am,

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE L. DICKINSON,
County Agent.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Burnet, Tex., May 29, 1950.

To: Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.
From: Raby A. Alford, secretary, Burnet County PMA.
Subject: Information requested in letter of May 13, 1950.

Information as requested is listed below:

What is the least number of acres average peanut producer can afford to grow: 5.

How many producers received allotments less than acreage mentioned above: 7.

How many of your peanut farmers received allotments of less than 2 acres: 2.

How many of this number (receiving allotments of less than 2 acres) will cease to grow peanuts: 2.

How many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in 1950: 2.

How many acres did you distribute to them: 4.7.

Approximately how much did each receive: 1.5 and 3.2.

OFFICE OF MAYOR,
CITY OF KILGORE, TEX.,
September 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Enclosed is a photo copy of a cotton notice to Tommie N. Nixon, who resides near Kilgore, which is self-explanatory.

I think it a shame and disgrace to penalize this man—or any other person of like status—for growing three bales of cotton on a little old worn-out east Texas farm, especially in the face of such a short cotton crop throughout the Nation this year, and with a big demand for cotton. We here in Kilgore can't buy sheets for our new hospital because of shortages of sheets on the market.

I have known Tommie for 30 years or more. During all these years he has been trying to eke out a living raising whatever crops and stock he could in order to live—not make money. He lives outside the oil field and has no income from that source. As I understand it, he didn't grow any cotton for perhaps 1 or 2 years and for that reason was refused a quota for this year.

In view of the fact there is every indication now there will be no restrictions on planting cotton in 1951; the short crop this year and the high cost of living for these poor farmers, I see no reason why these restrictions can't be lifted now and give these people the relief so badly needed.

What can you do about it now?

Regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROY H. LAIRD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Burbaw, N. C., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of May 18, 1950. The following is a list of the questions and answers requested in your letter:

1. The number of peanut producers in Pender County: 335.
2. Number of acres of peanuts a producer can grow economically: 5.
3. Number of allotments less than 5 acres in county: 185.
4. Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres: 56.
5. Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres which will not be planted: None.
6. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.
7. Number of producers who applied for new allotments in Pender County in 1950: 11.
8. How many acres did we have to distribute to them? We did not have any acreage to distribute to them as the distribution of acreage is done in Raleigh for new growers.
9. How many acres did the new growers receive in Pender County: 3.

Very truly yours,

T. W. GARRISS,
Secretary, Pender County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Henrietta, Tex., June 1, 1950.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: There are 42 peanut producers in Clay County. About 3 acres is the least number of acres a farmer can afford to grow. There were 13 producers in this county that received allotments of less than the 3 acres mentioned above. There were six producers that received allotments of less than 2 acres. Peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, will cease to grow peanuts commercially but will grow some for home use. None will cease to farm for themselves. There were 13 new producers that applied for peanut acreage in Clay County in 1950. New grower reserves were retained in the State office. All new growers received a total of 13.4 acres.

Yours truly,

ERMON D. WILLIAMS,
Secretary, Clay County PMA.

[From the Farmer-Stockman of November 1950]

TALKS WITH OUR READERS

(By Ferdie J. Deering, editor)

The futility of Government attempts to control crop production through acreage allotments is demonstrated again in the 1950 cotton-crop failure. So, for 1951 at least, there won't be any acreage controls on the cotton crop.

The breakdown of the allotment system might be glossed oved by designating last springs' "cotton surplus" as a "national reserve" this fall. But that won't keep farmers from regarding last spring's red tape in the form of red ink this fall. What does it matter if cotton sells for 40 cents a pound if you lost your crop to bugs, bad weather, and bureaucrats?

Farmers planted only about 18,000,000 of the 21,000,000 acres allotted this year, in spite of clamor for larger allotments in some areas. Texas in 1949 grew about one-third of the Nation's cotton, so drew a big cut in acreage this year. But farmers planted 8 percent less than allotted. Oklahoma, with a small allotment, failed by about 19 percent to get it all planted.

A survey by Texas Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH revealed that one reason was that, all over the Cotton Belt, thousands of farmers received less than 5 acres cotton-acreage allotment. Many of these planted no cotton.

In Oklahoma, 384 of Le Flore County's 2,097 cotton growers had less than 5 acres. In Stephens County 305 had 5 acres or less, in Atoka County 659 growers were assigned less than 5 acres. In Carter County, where Ardmore was once a major inland cotton market, 154 of the 735 old cotton growers had under 5 acres. The list could be extended in Texas, Tennessee, Arkansas, or Mississippi.

The allotments didn't cause the main reduction in cotton yields, though. Bad weather in many cases, and heavy insect damage in most sections cut yields so that farmers grew only about 10,000,000 bales of cotton, much less than our usual needs. Most of the 1948 and 1949 loan cotton has moved into trade. We need a cotton crop in 1951 to avoid a cotton shortage. Until Government can control the weather, it can't control crop production.

Commentators have a lot to say about Government losses on price-support programs. Some of it is true. Part may be easily misinterpreted.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have tabulated the information on the number of farmers who received cotton-acreage allotments of less than 5 acres which you requested in our recent telephone conversation and your note of September 26.

A summary of this information taken from the letters published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 26, July 31, September 22, and September 23 shows the following:

Number of allotments of less than 5 acres reported 22,145
Those who will grow no cotton:
  Number 4,453
  Percent 20
Those who will quit farming:
  Number 878
  Percent 4

I am returning the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and am enclosing the listing sheets as you may be interested in reviewing the individual items.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER W. WILCOX,
Senior Specialist, Agriculture, Legislative Reference Service.

Name of letter writer	Number of allotments less than 5 acres	Percent will grow no cotton	Number will grow no cotton	Percent will quit farming own farm	Number will quit farming own farm
F. P. Martin, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 8, p. 11147	170	95	162	0	0
R. J. Arnold, ibid.	76	5	4	0	0
T. Shelby Oakes, ibid., p. 11148	272	5.5	15	0	0
Buell E. Wright, ibid.	266	50-60	[1] 146	20	[1] 53
Bert N. Brumfield, ibid.	154	10	15	(2)	(2)
Murphy J. Burch, ibid.	444	25	111	2	9
R. E. Hoffman, ibid., p. 11149	186	25	47	10	19
Ray S. McEntire, ibid.	60	75	45	0	0
F. W. Bolin and C. Riley Brown, ibid.	191	15	28	52	100
Woodrow W. Booth, ibid.	300	50	150	0	0
E. N. McCall, ibid.	478	52	250	5	24
S. C. Plott, ibid., pp. 11149-11150	226	10	22	11	25
A. H. Miller, ibid., p. 11150	408	60	245	2	8
M. L. Bostick, ibid.	600	8	50	0	0
Green, Fred J., ibid.	43	58	25	0	0
Bernard H. Clark, ibid.	12	66	8	0	0
Fred K. Roberts, ibid.	540	19	100	5	26
T. W. Garriss, ibid.	267	9	25	0	0
O. R. Fulbright, ibid., p., 11151	940	11	100	(4)	(4)
R. O. Fearrington, ibid.	867	25	214	(4)	(4)
Mallie Stott, ibid.	1,380	11	[1] 150	14	20
W. P. House, ibid.	1,151	13	150	(4)	(4)
F. W. Young, ibid.	258	50	129	0	0
T. G. Norris, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 11, p. 15610	628	11	70	0	0
Vernon L. Whittle, ibid.	345	22	75	58	200
Herman L. Hales, ibid.	943	5	47	2	19
C. Howard Treece, ibid., pp. 15610-15611	204	8	16	0	0
O.W. Barnett, ibid., p. 15611	202	10	20	(4)	(4)

[1] Approximate.
[2] Very small percentage.
[3] Very small number.
[4] Not given.
[5] Estimated.

Name of letter writer	Number of allotments less than 5 acres	Percent will grow no cotton	Number will grow no cotton	Percent will quit farming own farm	Number will quit farming own farm
J. D. Stephens, ibid.	288	5	15	4	12
Ray A. Waters, ibid.	84	20	17	5	4
Arthur R. Johnson, ibid.	367	25	92	0	0
Billy H. Reynolds, ibid.	30	67	20	17	5
Lealdon Smith, ibid., p. 15612	138	0	0	0	0
Max G. Sallings, ibid.	100	1	1	2	2
William M. Belcher, ibid.	35	29	10	0	0
Carl E. Teeter (Maricopa County) also, for the State of Arizona, ibid. (letter to Hon. Murdock)	55 185	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
J. A. Sorenson, ibid., p. 15613	8	50	4	25	2
Robert E. Turner, ibid.	282	18	50	0	0
Emory Hunt, ibid.	172	35	60	6	10
Fred W. Barber, ibid., pp. 15613-15614	157	32	50	(4)	(4)
Clayton A. Burriss, ibid., p. 15614	168	26	43	12	20
Roy F. Jones, ibid.	38	66	25	13	5
R. V. Richey, ibid.	84	30	25	(4)	(4)
John A. King, ibid.	81	75	61	0	0
Frank Wells, ibid., p. 15615	140	25	35	(4)	(4)
T. M. Minchew, ibid.	393	25	100	0	0
W. H. Huddleston, ibid.	63	32	20	16	10
Alex Long, ibid.	52	15	8	5	3
Joe B. Moran, ibid.	75	20	15	5	4
B. P. McWhirter, ibid.	108	25	27	0	0
John L. Binendine, ibid., p. 15616	76	10	8	0	0
Ranell Lowman, ibid.	51	50	26	10	5
Marion M. Shivers, ibid.	132	50	66	(4)	(4)
Q. D. Wilson, ibid.	473	5	25	0	0
Roy L. O'Brien, ibid.	114	22	25	13	15
E. D. Dixon, ibid.	138	5	7	(4)	(4)
John L. Hays, ibid., p. 15617	1	0	0	0	0
James B. Stewart, ibid.	18	0	0	0	0
Berto J. Ourso, ibid.	162	31	50	0	0
Hugh G. Edgerton, ibid.	32	97	31	0	0
John H. George, ibid., p. 15618	306	10-15	40	(4)	(4)
Waldo P. O'Neal, ibid.	96	26	25	0	0
Laura Mae Hammer, ibid.	4	100	4	25	1
Alvara B. Nance, ibid., p. 15619	18	44	8	17	3
Bill E. Fisher, ibid.	56	50	28	0	0
A. B. Duke, ibid.	154	25-30	43	(4)	(4)
U. Ozel Cox, ibid.	80	0	0	None	None
Gus Harris, ibid., p. 15620	670	7.5	50	3.7	25
Anonymous, ibid.	170	23.5	40	11.7	20
De Kalb County PMA Committee, ibid.	95	31.6	30	None	None
Jack Collins, ibid.	116	15	17	None	None
F. K. Wright, ibid.	34	21	7	None	None
Charles E. Kell, ibid.	16	10	2	10	2
G. B. Fowler, ibid., p. 15621	1,146	22	250	(4)	(4)
B. T. Lake, ibid.	320	5	18	5	18
F. W. Young, ibid.	258	50	129	0	0
W. W. Hankins, Jr., ibid.	12	0	0	0	0
Lucille A. Bass, ibid., p. 15622	15	0	0	0	0
W. P. House, ibid.	1,151	13	150	(4)	(4)
George H. Carter, ibid., p. 15762	12	0	0	0	0
Cline T. Young, ibid., p. 15763	157	30	47	10	16
P. L. Barksdale, ibid.	192	8	15	0	0
Carl E. Lively, ibid.	129	9	11	(4)	(4)
C. H. Teal, ibid., p. 15765	1	100	1	0	0

[6] Not given.
[7] Slight.
[8] Very few.
[9] Small percentage.
[10] A few.

Name of letter writer	Number of allotments less than 5 acres	Percent will grow no cotton	Number will grow no cotton	Percent will quit farming own farm	Number will quit farming own farm
Alva E. Sanders, ibid	264	19	50	38	100
Demp Kearney, ibid., p. 15766	7	100	7	0	0
James M. Ratliff, ibid	56	35.7	20	0	0
A. J. Peters, ibid	115	75	86	[1]	6
Bennett P. Haman, ibid., p. 15768	33	0	0	.5	0
H. R. Hill ibid., p. 15769	250	10	25	30–40	88
T. Shelby Oakes, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 8, p. 11428	272	6	15	0	0
Summary: Number of allotments	22,145	20	4,453	4	878

[1] Estimated.

Source: Letters to Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1931, Sept. 22, 23, 1950. Compiled by Warren W. Scott, Legislative Reference Service, Economics Section, Library of Congress, Oct. 3, 1950.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, November 21, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This replies to your inquiry of November 6 with reference to changing price-support legislation to require a farmer to carry out conservation practices in order to be eligible for Government price support.

In the statement of April 7, 1949, on the general farm program before a joint session of the Senate and House Agricultural Committees, one of the conditions recommended on an eligibility for price support was the observance of minimum and sound soil-conservation practices. It is recognized that such a requirement would present certain administrative difficulties and additional costs of administration, but it is believed that if the requirements are flexible to permit local adaptations to meet local conditions, such a requirement would advance the over-all objectives of a sound farm program.

Further consideration should be given to the provision in future agricultural legislation.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. MCCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Columbia, S. C., November 20, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I thank you very much for sending me copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of September 22 and 23, 1950. You have certainly gone into the cotton-allotment problem very thoroughly.

For your information I find conditions in South Carolina very much like you describe them in your State and we do hope something can be done to straighten out allotment messes when they are reimposed on the cotton farmers.

Very truly yours,

ROY JONES,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of October 30, 1950, with which you returned our letter to you, dated October 19, regarding overplanted cotton farms.

The statements made by "Roy" on the bottom of our letter have been observed and it is certainly true that there is need for additional cotton production as stated in the press release issued October 3, 1950, in connection with the announcement that acreage allotments and marketing quotas would not be in effect on the 1951 crop of cotton, a copy of which is enclosed. In general, the press release explains the need for at least a 16,000,000-bale crop of cotton next year.

You will observe that in the last paragraph of our letter of October 19, 1950, the condition under which marketing quotas could be terminated under the legislation was set forth.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. MCCORMACK,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of October 10, 1950, copies of which you addressed to Mr. Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator, and Mr. Frank K. Woolley, Deputy Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, and with which you enclosed a letter from Mr. Roy H. Laird, Kilgore, Tex.

Cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas for 1950 were established under the authority of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. This legislation provides that the farm marketing quota for cotton shall be the actual production of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm less the farm marketing excess. The farm marketing excess is the normal production of that acreage planted to cotton on the farm which is in excess of the farm acreage allotment. If the overplanted acreage is not adjusted to the farm acreage allotment within a reasonable period, the farm marketing excess produced on the farm will be subject to penalty at a rate equal to 50 percent of the parity price for cotton as of June 15, or 15.5 cents per pound.

The farm marketing excess will in no case be larger than the normal yield per acre times the acreage planted in excess of the allotment. If the actual yield is less than the normal yield, and the producer establishes such fact to the satisfaction of the Production and Marketing Administration county committee, the farm marketing excess will be reduced to the amount by which the total production on the farm exceeds the normal yield times the allotment. In cases such as the one referred to in Mr. Laird's letter where no allotment is established for the farm, if the producer establishes, within 30 days after harvest is completed, that the actual production on the farm is less than the normal production of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm, the producer may avoid the payment of a part of the penalty or may receive a refund of a portion of the penalty previously paid.

There is no authority in the legislation for waiving the acreage adjustment provision, except by suspension or termination of marketing quotas for the 1950 crop. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by the act to terminate or increase a national marketing quota when such action is found necessary to meet a national emergency or a material increase in export demand for the commodity. However, the large majority of cotton farmers who planted in excess of their farm allotments and who intended to adjust the planted acreage to their farm allotments have already made such adjustments. Others have paid a penalty on their excess acreage and have harvested or will harvest the cotton from this acreage. The termination of the national marketing quota for the 1950 crop of cotton, at this time, therefore, would add no appreciable amount of cotton to the production of 1950. Consequently, it is our opinion that cotton-marketing quotas for the 1950 crop year should not be terminated.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
College Station, Tex., November 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested in your memorandum of October 28, I am returning the copy of correspondence from the Honorable K. T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, together with other attachments.

As outlined in my letter of October 3 and as restated in the letter of October 23 from the Assistant Secretary, it is felt that marketing quotas on the 1950 crop should not be suspended or terminated at this time. Mr. Nixen should arrange to meet with his local PMA county committee for the purpose of paying the marketing quota penalty described on Form MQ-93–Cotton.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

BIG SANDY, TEX., *November 1, 1950.*

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR LINDLEY: I am writing to explain the position I am in as a farmer. I have a farm leased in which there are 251 acres. This farm belongs to J. Press Davis. I moved on this farm in the fall of 1947. The place hadn't been farmed in several years. The following year I planted 20 acres of cotton, 10 acres of corn, and some small grain. My peanut allotment was zero. This year they allowed me 4.2 acres of cotton and no peanuts. I planted the cotton, knowing that I couldn't make much more than enough to pay my expenses and rent for the farm in which is $175. I planted 12.4 acres of peanuts. When they came to measure my crop I told them that I planted those peanuts at my own risk, but they determined to measure them anyway.

On October 23, 1950, Mr. Lewis E. Stracener, administration officer, sent a man out to see me about my peanuts. He asked me if I had tried to sell them, or if I was going to sell them. I told him I was if I could. Then I went up to talk to Mr. Stracener. He told me there would be a penalty of 5.4 cents per pound, in which would be half or more than I would get out of the peanuts.

I am a veteran of World War II. I thought freedom was what we were fighting for, but when they allowed me 4.2 acres of cotton to make a living for my wife and two children I felt that my freedom was gone.

After returning from the service I borrowed money from the FHA to buy some cattle and a tractor in which I still owe some on this debt.

The point is, if I can't plant but 4.2 acres of cotton I'll just have to quit and sell my cattle and tractor to get out of debt.

I believe since you being raised in east Texas, you know what I am up against, but I feel that there is some that don't.

That is about all I have to say except I would like very much to continue farming.

Yours very truly,

HOWARD M. SMITH.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that this amendment be adopted. It does not add anything to the over-all expenditure. I state, however, that the $1,000,000 is a limitation on the appropriation, but in my opinion the farmers feel so strongly about this that the farmers at least in my territory would be glad to contribute part of the cost, if necessary.

Another point in favor of having this measuring done is that there is a probability of more confusion than there was the last time controls were imposed. I might say, incidentally, that when inequities do occur it usually affects the small farmer to a greater extent for he does not keep the complete records that the larger farmer does.

I think that in order to protect the small farmer we should have this acreage measured, because we all do know that we are going to have limitations and crop controls put on in some future year, and I think it is very important that we do authorize this work to be done.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to make clear in reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], that I am not in agreement to furnishing any more money than is in the fund now when I agreed that $1,000,000 of this $8,300,000 be expended for this purpose. I am supporting the amendment on that basis, but I want it to appear in the RECORD that I am not suggesting that we go over to the Senate and get this $8,300,000 increased.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In this amendment here we are not asking any additional money at this time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is right and that is my reason for agreeing to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, another reason not heretofore advanced in this debate for adoption of this amendment is that the individual farmers are entitled to a better record than those afforded by BAE figures, which are based upon inaccurate gin reports and poor estimations. Cotton acreage is often afforded a county, based upon gin records, to which the county is not entitled. In such instances the acreage has been wrongfully taken from another county. There are many reasons why gin reports cannot be considered as good estimates. Some acreage in the same field will produce considerably more cotton than adjoining acreage.

It is not the large farmer who is so adversely affected without actual cotton acreage records; because as has been brought out here before, it is not difficult for him to prove the exact number of acres that he had planted to cotton; it is the small cotton farmer, the one-horse cotton farmer, so to speak, who is drastically affected.

Since it now appears that no Member will oppose the amendment, I will only take enough additional time to state that actual cotton acreage records should be established during these years that no controls are in force in order that every farmer may know his entitlement in case of future controls.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized to conclude the debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask for time; I did not understand that any time was reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses, including library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; not to exceed $20,000 for expenditures authorized by section 602 of the Organic Act of 1944 (12 U. S. C. 833); $300,000, together with not to exceed $2,325,000 of receipts from Farm Credit agencies, to be advanced to this appropriation, to cover the cost of supervision, facilities, examinations, and other services rendered to such agencies; $2,625,000.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to briefly discuss an item under the Farm Credit Administration program which was quite severely cut by the committee. I am not going to offer an amendment to increase the amount, but I do want to call the attention of the committee to the fact the entire cut which is made in the Farm Credit Administration appropriation of $280,000 falls on one division of the Farm Credit Administration, the cooperative research and service organization. That item as it came from the budget called for $580,000 and it has been reduced by the committee to $300,000 or a cut of about 48 percent. I do not know how familiar the membership may be with the work which has been done by the cooperative research and service organization, but I want to briefly call attention to the history of that organization and refer to the work it has done.

The Cooperative Research and Service Division was set up under the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926. The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 which set up the Federal Farm Board was largely based upon the cooperative marketing of farm products, and under its provisions additional duties were assigned to this Division. During the intervening years it has rendered splendid service to farmers' cooperative organizations, especially the local cooperatives which comprise 9,500 of the 10,000 farm marketing and purchasing cooperatives in this country. These local cooperatives are composed in the main of operators of family farms and the Division's work and activity has been to assist these farmers to utilize cooperatives in meeting their farm-business problems, particularly in the marketing of their products.

I am a strong believer in the value of these local cooperatives which have done much to equalize the family farmers' competitive position. In assisting them we are helping farmers to help themselves, and the total amount of money appropriated throughout the years for this agency amounts to practically nothing when compared with the over-all appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

While I do not intend to offer an amendment to restore this amount, I would like to call attention to the fact that this cut of 48 percent is one of the most severe in the bill and compares with a reduction of approximately 10 percent in the other research funds of the Department. I believe that the value of this research to farmers compares most favorably with that of the other research activities of the Department and feel that if 10 percent is considered a fair reduction in the appropriations for other research activities that no greater percentage should be applied to this item.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We all recognize the fact that as we go through the innumerable items contained in this bill perhaps the committee does make mistakes one way or the other. I am referring now to the action of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Here is one item in the bill that we may have cut too deeply. I have suggested to gentlemen who have approached me on this subject that they make their case before the other body, and then we can discuss the matter further in conference if the other body decides to increase what we have allowed here.

Mr. HOPE. I thank my good friend very much. I am entirely agreeable to the suggestion which he has just made. I know that if there is further opportunity to consider the matter he will approach it in his usual spirit of fairness and will consider the question from the able and sympathetic viewpoint in which he deals with all legislative problems.

I hope that the cooperative organizations which are interested will go before the Senate committee and make out their case, and if the Senate does increase the amount that the members of the conference committee will be inclined to give consideration to that increase on its merits.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say that sometimes in the heat of discussion we frequently overlook some things, but I want to say that there is no abler man in the House of Representatives than the gentleman from Kansas, and there is no man in the Congress that I know who knows more about the operation of agriculture and who gives a fairer approach to the subject than the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the confidence that the membership generally has in the gentleman is not exceeded by what they have in anybody else in the House, and I am glad to have this statement on this particular issue presented. As I have said many times, we cannot vouch for the accuracy of these decisions but we can give reasons. In regard to this particular item, all of the activities of the Farm Credit Administration are done for various members of the Farm Credit System, but in each case the charges are assessed back to the organization. It is only in regard to the cooperatives that the entire cost is paid by appropriation out of the Treasury. No charge is made to them for any of the work. The Farm Credit Administration provides the co-ops with professional and technical assistance, research facilities, and so on. The purpose of the committee, insofar as I understand it, was that we thought in regard to cooperatives it might be wise for them to begin to contribute to some extent toward the cost of these services, since in regard to all other services, all the charges are paid by member organizations. That has been the position of the committee. Certainly there is no prejudice on the part of the committee. If the amount of the cut is too severe, we will be glad to reconsider it. But, in view of the very fine attitude and the confidence I have in the gentleman from Kansas, I wanted to explain our position and say that we will be glad at any time to go into the matter with anyone who may have a different idea about it.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi most sincerely for his kind references. I appreciate them, especially coming from him. I am glad also to have the information which the gentleman gives me with respect to what the committee had in mind in reducing this appropriation. While I realize that the other expenditures of the Farm Credit Administration are paid for by assessments against the lending institutions under its supervision, I do not believe that such a rule could very well be applied to this activity. In the first place it is generally conceded that agricultural research activities are general in their scope and cannot very well be charged against any particular group or organization. That is true of all of our research activities as far as I know. In the second place this activity is quite similar to studies made by the Department of Commerce for business and industry which are made out of appropriated funds. In the third place the chief beneficiaries of this work have been the small local cooperatives which are not in a position to pay for this service even if some equitable method of apportioning the charges could be worked out. For these and other reasons I do not believe that the suggestion which has been made that this work be compensated for by cooperative organizations is a proper or a practical approach to the matter.

Let me report that because I have such great confidence in this subcommittee, which has brought in a splendid bill, I am simply calling attention to this situation with the thought that the cooperative organizations which are interested in this service will appear before the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I believe they can make a strong case for an increase above the amount carried in the House bill. In the event that the item is increased by the Senate I feel certain that the distinguished chairman and the other members of the House subcommittee will give the matter due and proper consideration. That is all I ask.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the deduction of $280,000 from the $580,000 portion of the funds appropriated for the Farm Credit Administration, proposed by the House Appropriations Committee, falls entirely on the Cooperative Research and Service Division of that agency.

There has been no criticism of the manner in which the staff of the Division has discharged its duties through the years. On the contrary, it has had many words of commendation from officers of farmers' cooperatives and Members of Congress. Neither has the Division expended any great amount of public funds. Its budget request for this year is only $580,000 compared with many millions approved for other agricultural programs of no greater importance than assistance to self-help organizations such as cooperatives.

The heavy cut of 48 percent for research for farmer cooperatives is out of all proportion to the statement of the House Committee Report that research funds in the Department should "under existing circumstances, be reduced by approximately 10 percent." A reasonable cut could be borne, but this cut would impair the ability of the Farm Credit Administration to carry out its basic functions in helping farmers with their cooperatives.

The statement of the committee appears to be predicated on a misunderstanding of the program of the Cooperative Research and Service Division. It is not a service agency for individual cooperatives or for other divisions of the Farm Credit Administration. Its research is generally of a broad character, and the results are useful to all cooperatives performing the functions studied, and to non-cooperatives as well. Only a part of the work of the Division during the past year was devoted to service activities for cooperatives. The remainder was research on the common problems of many cooperatives, other producers and distributors on service and educational work, a small part of the total with groups of farmers planning organization, or with small cooperatives with little financial strength.

The great majority of farmer cooperatives are small, local organizations. Perhaps 500 marketing and purchasing associations could be classified as large-scale; that is, their net worth is $1,000,000 or more. The other 9,500, for the most part, have no more than enough working capital to carry on their business operations.

Even assuming that cooperatives could pay part of the cost of research service, there is no machinery under which such funds could be collected. This would require special legislation and it would take a considerable period to work out any program to help continue the work of the agency under this basis. In the meantime, the staff would be scattered and the trained personnel now available would be gone, as there are no funds to carry on this work other than those provided by the appropriation.

The proposed cut of 48 percent for research, service, and educational work for cooperatives operated by farmers would be in opposition to the long record of Congresses favorable to helping farmers to help themselves, and to the preservation of the family-farm type of agriculture which we hold basis to our democratic economic and social system.

This list of functions is illustrative of the tasks performed, but is not all-inclusive, even though it covers a wide range of activities. Staff members of the division were able to directly assist the agencies of Government on special problems confronting cooperatives, or provide information on cooperative operations of direct assistance to the war agencies.

The first group of functions includes those aiding the war effort directly:

At the request of General Arnold, head of the Army Air Corps, the livestock and wool section of the division organized State shearing committees who assisted in attaining an annual production of 5,000,000 shearlings to make flying suits for military aviators.

In cooperation with State extension services and cooperative associations, the division set up schools in 17 States to train sheep shearers, mostly from future farmer and 4–H Clubs, who replaced a large number of regular sheep shearers who were inducted into the Armed Forces.

Surveyed wool-storage facilities at eastern points to determine space available for storage of wool stockpile.

At the request of Gen. Theron T. Weaver, of the War Department, hide-conservation schools at 20 packing plants over the country were conducted to train unskilled butchers in order to reduce cuts and scars on hides as a part of the leather-conservation program.

Conducted experiments in baling wool with cotton presses to demonstrate the amount of saving which could be made in burlap and transportation space by shipment in bales rather than in bags.

Gave assistance in the organization of agricultural transportation pools and National, State, and county transportation committees.

Assembled comparative freight rates and factual transportation information to determine most advantageous locations for grain storage and distributing facilities.

Assisted in the allocation of materials for the manufacture of new equipment and repair of needed rail, highway, and waterway equipment for the transportation of agricultural products and farm supplies.

Submitted a traffic program for conservation of tires, delivery equipment, and labor in moving farm supplies to farmers to the Department of Agriculture Committee on Conservation of Trucks and Tires for Agricultural Transportation.

A study was made of methods used by purchasing cooperatives to help farmers conserve their farm machinery and equipment during the war emergency.

Considerable effort was devoted to work with the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations on plans to conserve rubber and other scarce materials through more efficient assembling of milk and cream.

Early in World War II, the importance of adequate supplies of fats and oils was recognized. Because of previous studies and knowledge of the industry, the division was asked to make a national survey of the crushing capacity and location of oil mills in the United States. The results of this study made it possible to use existing capacity far more efficiently.

Work in the manpower field included studies of the possibilities of using manpower more efficiently in processing plants, study of labor relations in these plants, participation in training-within-industry programs for cooperatives jointly sponsored by the War Manpower Commission and banks for cooperatives. Attention was given to problems of employee recruitment, replacement, deferment, and wages.

Worked with cooperative associations to increase the efficiency of milk assembly by trucks.

Surveyed the possibilities for dehydration of fruits and vegetables by cooperatives and assisted cooperatives in developing dehydration operations as a part of the war effort.

Information was prepared on methods of training cooperatives' employees for wartime efficiency.

Specific, detailed studies were made of cooperatives to develop ways for them to meet war conditions, and to determine how they might make the greatest contribution to the war effort. These detailed works were conducted in Alabama, Indiana, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Kansas, Idaho, Washington, the Tennessee Valley Authority area, and the fifth farm credit district.

Secured gasoline, tires, and trucks for sheep-shearing crews in the West and Middle West when these items were originally denied by OPA.

Secured steel for the manufacture of sheep-shearing machines and blades after the commercial companies manufacturing these items had failed to secure an allocation of steel from the War Production Board.

The second group of functions includes those aiding in the war effort by giving direct assistance to agencies of the Government:

Assisted in bringing to the attention of selective-service officials contributions to the war effort of key employees of cooperatives in connection with their possible deferment.

The Frozen Food Locker Section was designated as the sole agency in the Department of Agriculture to pass on applications for new construction and expansion of locker plants, and to make recommendations to the WPB regarding allocations.

Furnished cost, margin, and price data to the OPA and wartime agencies relative to poultry products.

At the request of the Office of Agricultural War Relations studies were made and reports prepared on the estimated numbers and kinds of new containers and material needed for fresh fruits and vegetables in 1942, new and second-hand bags necessary for storage and shipment of raw sugar produced in 1943, and fabrics required for bags and other packaging for agricultural products and for farm supplies in 1942.

Assisted the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations on problems of packaging requirements for feed and fertilizer.

Prepared price and other related information on certain fertilizer materials for the Department of Labor and Office of Price Administration.

Served on a USDA subcommittee charged with developing a rationing program for nitrogen fertilizer.

Assistance was given to UNRRA and various agencies in the USDA on problems relating to cooperative purchasing of farm supplies.

At the request of the Surplus Marketing Administration, the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations, the Office of Production Management, the Dairy Section made studies to determine the economic soundness of establishing milk plants to be financed with lend-lease funds.

Representatives of the Dairy Section of the Division served on the committees establishing production goals for the dairy industry. Many other members of the staff served on production goal committees relative to other commodities.

Estimates were prepared for the Office of Defense Transportation and the Office of Price Administration on the quantities of petroleum handled by farmer cooperatives in 1942.

Assistance was rendered to the Department of Agriculture relative to cases involving fair application of price control programs.

Assistance was given to WPB through ascertaining the burlap requirements of rice and dry-bean cooperatives, and muslin requirements of tobacco cooperatives.

Functions of the Division aiding the war effort through assistance to the cooperatives:

Cataloged and studied each official order affecting livestock, meats and wool, and made representation to the respective war agency whenever it appeared that such order would work a hardship on cooperatives or other businesses.

Conducted a survey for the War Production Board and Office of Agricultural War Relations on all oilseed processing capacity, cooperative and otherwise, in the United States as a basis of allocation of steel in plant construction. This survey was used in the development of the whole program of plant construction to increase capacity of oilseed processing plants in 1942.

Prepared a news letter at intervals of approximately 2 weeks interpreting war orders and advising cooperatives regarding Selective Service orders, OPA regulations, and WPB orders.

Work was carried on with farmers' cooperative associations and others to assist them with wartime problems arising particularly from shortages of feed, labor, credit, and equipment—both farm and plant—in the poultry field.

Studied possibilities of greater farm production through neighborhood cooperation.

Information was developed for purchasing associations on the wartime importance of retail credit controls.

Analysis was made of the methods used by purchasing associations to meet urgent packaging problems due to shortages of burlap and other customary packaging materials.

Information was prepared and presented to cooperative managers on methods of maintaining organizational efficiency in wartime.

Material was prepared and distributed to the United States purchasing cooperatives on the experiences of British purchasing cooperatives which had been operating for several years under war conditions.

Assistance was given to cooperatives manufacturing feed in acquiring feed manufacturing facilities to help meet the critical feed shortage conditions.

Assistance was given to several large-scale cooperative purchasing associations in formulating postwar readjustment plans.

At the request of a number of State colleges of agriculture, advisory guidance was rendered to numerous dairy cooperatives through which savings were realized in both materials and manpower.

Assistance was rendered to tobacco cooperatives in connection with their problems arising from OPA regulations.

Helped to keep officials of banks for cooperatives informed regarding new regulations and orders issued from time to time. Also upon request, checked up on priority applications filed by cooperatives on projects being financed by the banks for cooperatives.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Senate will restore these funds and that the House conferees will accept the recommendations of the Senate.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the cooperatives of this country deeply appreciate the fact that they have as able a spokesman as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I concur in the statements he has made. The Cooperative Marketing

Act of 1926 provided that that research and service facilities should be provided for farmers' cooperative associations. As a result the Cooperative Research and Service Division was formed and is now an operating division of the Farm Credit Administration. During the 1951 fiscal year $585,000 was appropriated for this Division. The Bureau of the Budget estimated that $580,000 would be required for this program during fiscal 1952 and although the committee report suggests that research funds for the Department of Agriculture "should be reduced by approximately 10 percent," only $300,000 has been allotted to this program or a reduction of approximately 48 percent. It would seem that this is out of proportion to the reduction made in the funds for other agencies and would definitely have a crippling effect on a program that means so much to farmer cooperatives.

It has been suggested that the cost of this research should be paid by benefited cooperatives. While there may be merit to this proposal it would be difficult to assess the costs of the research that benefits a large group of cooperatives in varying degrees. If a business organization pays the entire cost of a research program it regards the results as its own property and is not required to make the results available to the general public as a Government agency is required to do. Traditionally research and education have been Government functions in America. This is particularly true when it affects groups of people who are not in a position to conduct their own research work. Most farmers and farmers' cooperatives are not in a position to do this work. Farmers looks to their cooperatives for help in solving their marketing problems and this Division has done good work in studying the problem and passing on the results of their research to all farmer cooperatives.

Studies made by this division on agriculture cooperatives are similar to the studies made by the Department of Commerce for business and industry and which are carried on with funds appropriated by the Congress. If one group should have the benefit of Government help for these studies, who is to say that they should be denied to another segment of our economy. If it is the will of the Congress, that Government research service should be paid by the groups benefited it would require special legislation under which such funds could be collected. It would take time to work out a program to continue the work of the agency under such a plan and in the meantime the staff would be scattered and trained personnel now available would look elsewhere for work since there are no other funds provided to carry on this work except by this appropriation.

During normal years the studies made by the Cooperative Research and Service Division are primarily for cooperatives to improve their operations and management. During World War II, studies were carried on that were valuable to all industry and to the defense agencies. Much the same program can again be carried on during this emergency. As in World War II, this Division can again help mobilize the cooperatives so that there will be full cooperation by this organized group. We feel that this agency should expect to have its appropriation reduced on the same basis as the other research agencies of the Department, however, the proposed cut of 48 percent is too drastic. This cut would be in opposition to the record of Congress that has been favorable to the program of helping farmers help themselves. Since most farmer cooperatives are made up of the family type farmer, which the Congress has time and again indicated it desired to help, this reduction is of particular harm to that group.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of Department of Agriculture, $2,157,200, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $109,280, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 44, line 14, strike out "$2,157,200" and insert "$2,082,200."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes, so that I can go into this subject thoroughly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will take only 3 percent out of the item affecting directly the immediate office of the Secretary.

I think it would be only good business to show to the gentlemen at the top of this vast organization of the Department of Agriculture, with more than 60,000 employees, that they themselves in that immediate office must try to do a little economizing. I can show the House, and I intend to do so, just where $75,000 can easily be taken out of this item without harm in any way.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is not this one of the offices that are padded with an enormous number of high-priced folks?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is what I want to bring out.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the Office of the Secretary could well operate on a maximum of $2,082,200 for the next fiscal year. Consequently, I am offering an amendment to reduce the figure in the bill from $2,157,200 by $75,000. I would like to point out several places where there seems to be an excess of high-priced personnel. Please keep in mind that the Secretary does also have access to the services of personnel in the numerous bureaus under his jurisdiction. I would also like to call your attention to a breakdown which I have analyzed for the 1952 request of the immediate office of the Secretary. We note here that the Secretary of Agriculture as a Cabinet officer receives a salary of $22,500. He has an Under Secretary who is paid $17,500. There is one Assistant Secretary of Agriculture who is paid $15,000 per year. An executive assistant to the Secretary receives $11,400. No one can really find much fault with the four top positions in the Secretary's immediate office but as we go down the list we find that there are six additional assistants to the Secretary, each of whom average $10,475 per year. We also find an Administrator of the land and water resources program who is paid $11,000. There is an agricultural economist receiving $11,400. As we scrutinize a little further 11 other positions known as administrative officers, each of whom receive about $8,800 per year are listed and to complete the bill there are six so-called agriculturists who are paid better than $9,000 each. In addition to these 24 top jobs in the Secretary's immediate office we have 48 minor positions from $3,900 up. The total amount requested for the Secretary's immediate office is $520,000.

Let us scan another Division—Personnel Administration and Service. Here the top positions are not nearly as numerous, but we do have 100 positions in that Division of the Secretary's office ranging from $11,400 for the Director of Personnel down to the compensation for clerical workers. It is interesting to note here that there are two assistant directors of personnel at $10,000 each. We have 7 chiefs of divisions in this part of the Secretary's office who are paid $9,400 each—2 assistant chiefs receiving $8,400 each—11 chiefs of sections drawing from $7,600 to $8,600. I will not enumerate the others, but will now turn to the Budget office, which is also a small division of the Secretary's office. We find

the Director of Finance and Budget receiving $11,400—and I will say, at this point, that I think that the present occupant of this position is well worth that salary. But I would suggest that perhaps he has at least one too many assistant directors of finance. I note he has four such assistant directors listed here at $9,400 each. Here, again, we find seven chiefs of divisions each being paid in the neighborhood of $8,400. We also find eight chiefs of sections receiving in the neighborhood of $6,800 each. That particular Division of the Secretary's office has 126 positions, and 16 of those positions pay $8,000 or over each.

We will now turn to the division in the Secretary's office known as General Operations, where there are 102 positions. The Director of Plant and Operations receives $10,750. He has three assistant directors under him receiving on an average $8,750. We find the usual number of chiefs of divisions, but one thing in particular stands out which I think could be studied carefully—the Real Estate Division in this particular part of the Secretary's office has a chief—an administrative officer, two administrative assistants and four architectural engineers—the latter receiving on an average about $6,100 per annum. Just why it should be necessary to hire that number of architectural engineers, I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, this outline will give some idea as to the number of high-paid positions in the Secretary's office—and I say high paid when I think of the fact that very few people in my district in southwestern Minnesota earn up to $10,000 a year in business or in the professions. Frankly, I question the advisability of the Secretary having, in addition to the three major positions directly under him, six assistants to the Secretary. You would think that one assistant to each of the top four officials would be sufficient. I also question the presence of four agriculturists in the Land and Water Resources Division. Certainly it seems that we should not have to spend $124,700 in that particular little division in the Secretary's immediate office when we have the elaborate set-ups that are in some of the major divisions of the Department, such as Soil Conservation Service, which could well handle, it would seem to me, the bulk of that work. I question the need for the numerous chiefs of divisions and chiefs of sections. It makes me wonder just who really does do the work. It would seem that perhaps there should be a division in the Secretary's office devoted to examining ways and means of eliminating useless positions in the entire Department of Agriculture and also within his immediate office.

If we remember that this reduction amounts to only 3 percent and that all of this personnel listed in these sheets I have in my hand represent less than 1 percent of the administrative personnel in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true also that the Secretary, if he has an emergency or great pressure in his office, can move people in there, and does he not now have the right under the law to do that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Secretary has the right under the law, if I am correct, to transfer funds to the extent of 7 percent from any part of the huge Department of Agriculture to another part where they may be slightly squeezed financially. He needs that elastic provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] on the section dealing with the Farm Credit Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized to close debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of the House, one of the most difficult things to defend has always been the office personnel in the city of Washington. It is always popular to cut those things that are a long way from home. I know the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is motivated by the finest of intentions. But I do want to give you my opinion and my views with regard to the Secretary's office.

The Secretary's office is operating, if this bill is passed, programs totalling approximately $720,000,000 in direct annual appropriations. In addition, in the Department of Agriculture we have the Farmers Home Administration, the International Wheat Agreement operation, the foot-and-mouth disease operation, and the rural electrification operation, which require well over a quarter of a billion dollars a year, that are operated through the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Since I have been chairman of this committee I have from time to time had serious questions raised as to the operations of various segments of the Department, and each time that has occurred I have had an investigation made, and each time I have had an investigation made I have found many things that needed to be corrected. To whom do we have to look to bring about those corrections and to see that there is proper coordination and improvement in the situation that we have found to exist? We have to look to the offices in the District of Columbia, and particularly the Secretary.

This is no plea for Charles Brannan, as such. I made the closing argument against the Brannan plan when it was before the Congress a year or two ago. I pointed out when they wanted a trial run of the Brannan plan that we had our trial run during the war, and it did not work. But if you are going to have this big operation, it is bad judgment and poor policy not to operate it from the top.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Of course the gentleman knows that all of the big number of bureaus in the Department have top men by the score, from whom Mr. Brannan can secure almost unlimited assistance if he sees fit.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is no attack on the gentleman from Minnesota. I have said that he might be right and I might be wrong, but I want to show the other side of it.

You do not have a single Department of Agriculture. You have a series of bureaus and agencies. You have the Rural Electrification Administration, you have the Bureau of Animal Industry, you have the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and you have the Bureau of Industrial Chemistry, each of them practically independent, and to some extent many of them duplicating each other, as our reports show.

We have the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. I had an investigation made there a year or two ago, and it disclosed that they had a huge amount of surplus products. Through the Secretary's office I was able to see to it that they sold around $4,000,000 worth of that property, and the money went into the Treasury. That is over and above the amount of property that was turned over to other agencies.

On top of this group of offices and agencies you have the Secretary's office. His office consists of four principal parts: his immediate office, the Office of Personnel, the Office of Budget and Finance, and the Office of Hearing Examiners which has to do with all these milk pricing orders, a very big operation.

You will recall the instance last year when the Secretary asked for three or four Assistant Secretaries. At the time I opposed it, but the record showed that he had about one-sixth as many as the Department of the Interior. Your committee has held this group down. I would like to point out something else.

In connection with the war effort we have called on the various departments to do their best for the war effort. Allotments were contemplated to be made from the national defense set-up to the various departments. I was author of a provision in the third deficiency bill which requires the Department to go ahead and do the war work and to curtail their domestic program to the extent necessary. That task is being assigned to the Secretary of Agriculture. Today we have got to look to the Secretary's office to represent us in matters having to do with beef prices, and all that kind of thing. The Office of the Secretary is the office to which we must look to protect the cause of agriculture and the individual worker in agriculture. His office has a great deal to do with the effort to get sufficient allocations of steel for farm machinery and chemicals for fertilizer. We have got to look to the Secretary's office for all those things. It is not going to be an easy job to do these things. Why, for $75,000, give them an excuse for not doing these things?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. There may be an explanation for this in the Office of the Secretary, but I notice an item for advertising. Is that to advertise the operations of the Department, or what does it entail? And how much money, if it does include that, how much of the amount intended here to be spent is spent by the Secretary for advertising what he is doing in the Department?

Mr. WHITTEN. There is no money in this bill for advertising as such.

Mr. KEATING. But the bill itself uses the word "advertising."

Mr. WHITTEN. Why do all this research work, find solutions to all these problems, and not let the people know what has been done, what can be done, and how they are made available? If there has been some misuse of funds in regard to these operations, I assure the gentleman that I will be the first to try to strike at such abuses.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the gentleman will, but I am wondering what this particular word "advertising" means in this one item. This is money to be spent and I wonder what that advertising by the Secretary of Agriculture amounted to.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I understand, that is to be used by the Secretary's office in advertising for bids for the purchase of equipment and supplies.

Mr. KEATING. If that is the purpose of the item I would, of course, have no objection. That is what I was trying to find out.

Mr. WHITTEN. For the moment it had escaped me, but as the gentleman from Rhode Island says, it is to be used for advertising for bids.

Mr. KEATING. That kind of advertising is all right. What I object to is the propaganda items for which money is spent.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me proceed with my statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that there are over 40 drawing $9,000 a year and nearly 30 drawing over $10,000 a year in this set-up?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the Congress, has through the Civil Service and the Classification Act, set up the classification of employees. Since I have been a Member, the Congress has raised the salaries. I will hold Charlie Brannan responsible for a lot of things but I will not hold him responsible for the acts of Congress. When it comes to handling the operation of a billion and a half dollars a year, when we give to him the task of seeing that farmers get adequate farm machinery, equipment, fertilizer, and so forth, when we require them to absorb national defense work, I personally do not want to give him something to hide behind by cutting out about $75,000. Since 1940, we have reduced the number of employees by about 240 and we have continuously reduced them. Last year we reduced the number 24. This year we are about $31,000 under the budget.

I certainly believe you will make a mistake if you cut further here, because it is to this office we must look for correction of the things that we find going wrong in the field. That would be true of any other department.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 63, noes 50.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 78, noes 53.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: Page 44, line 10, after the word "advertising", insert "of bids."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The question was taken: and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALE) there were—ayes 66, noes 16.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, $600,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I expect that I am in the position of the man who said that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. I appreciate the fine work that has been done by the subcommittee, and I do not pose as an expert on appropriations. I am concerned, however, about this item of $600,000 for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. I notice that it provides for $600,000, but in looking over the testimony it seems to me this office has had considerably more than that. May I ask the gentleman from Washington, who I believe has handled this item, just how much was contributed by the ECA and the point 4 agency and the Defense Production Agency?

Mr. HORAN. To my knowledge, there is none from ECA or point 4. There is an item of transfer from Research and Marketing Act funds, which takes care of the foreign agricultural specialists.

As far as my being the expert on this subcommittee on this item, I would not say that. I am very much interested in the item, and propose to take a little of the committee's time after the gentleman has concluded to explain what troubles some of us regarding it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I notice that in the testimony on page 254 Mr. ANDREWS mentioned the sum of $2,000,000 being transferred to this agency. I am sure there is considerable duplication in this matter. The State Department is doing the same kind of work. There is obviously here some conflict between State and Agriculture Departments as to who should do the work, but I have a suspicion that both of them want to do the work, to the end that there is going to be considerable duplication and the spending of more money than is needed for the purpose.

Mr. HORAN. May I say that I am glad that the gentleman from Wisconsin has brought up this subject because it does need clarification. I do not want to take the gentleman's time, though, because if I were to explain how I feel about it I would consume all of his time. I will take my own time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I appreciate that very much.

May I say that I have observed this program on the part of agriculture as it is operating in South America, and I have a great deal of praise for the effort that is being made, but somewhere pretty soon between State and Agriculture they ought to work out this matter so that there will be no duplication of effort. I think that as the matter stands now this amount could be cut in half. I would not want to leave the impression that I am here arguing the point for the State Department, because I have the feeling that the Department of Agriculture can do a much better job in this field.

I was quite interested, Mr. Chairman, in the statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture on page 238 in a letter that was quoted:

The prospects for more adequate appropriations for agriculture work within the unified Foreign Service, we believe, could be significantly improved if our two departments agreed on a program of administrative improvement that would commend itself to Congress and to organized agriculture.

It seems to me he is suggesting that both departments get together and perhaps, as one member has said, kiss and make up, and maybe between the two of them they can get a lot more money.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Are we furnishing aid in agriculture in the way of expert advice to the foreign countries, in Europe, for instance?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed.

Mr. REED of New York. I was in Ireland in 1949 and visited the agriculture college at Dublin. They have their farm agents, and they have a wonderful course in agriculture there. You see improvements all over Ireland. I do not see why we have to be contributing to that service over there. They seem to be doing very well. In the other countries I have been in they certainly were doing excellent work. It is not necessary to have our experts there in order for them to do it. They are old civilizations. Their land has stood up, and is

productive now after more than 1,000 years of cultivation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think the remarks of the gentleman from New York are well taken. I hope this subcommittee is going to give some attention to this matter of the overlapping of functions between Agriculture and State Departments and that when this appropriation comes up again next year it will be clarified.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an item which has troubled more than the gentleman from Wisconsin and has troubled me as well as this subcommittee and the entire House Committee on Agriculture. I ask your indulgence that I may review the work in the Department of Agriculture ever since 1862 when the Department was organized on foreign agricultural relations. At that time we saw fit to have men in the Department of Agriculture who could investigate or assay the market for agricultural products abroad and the production in other countries. Gradually through the years this function in the Department of Agriculture became useful. In 1930 the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations was formally organized, and that is the appropriation, for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, about which we are now talking.

The gimmick in this thing came with the Reorganization Act of 1939. In that act we made agricultural attachés and commercial attachés agents of the State Department. I know in the popular mind one would think that a foreign agricultural attaché reports back to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. He does not. He reports back to Secretary of State Acheson. I maintain that that is wrong. Certainly commercial attachés should report back to Secretary of Commerce Sawyer and not to Secretary Sawyer through the Secretary of State—no matter who the Secretary of State might be.

I maintain and from my own personal investigations and observations, I can say that we do not have effective representation for American farmers in foreign countries today. The only office we have in the United States today that really speaks for and looks out for the interest of the American farmer is the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations for which we have fully provided, according to the budget, in this bill, and the foreign agricultural commodity specialists who are paid for by a transfer of some $140,000 from the Research and Marketing Act funds.

You asked me about point 4 and the ECA. There is work being done there. The money has been expended on that. That is a separate consideration. That is expected to be terminated. But we do not want the only ones who represent and fight for American farmers in foreign countries to be abused by striking out this item from the bill. You asked me why these men did not kiss and make up. Heaven only knows the efforts that have been going on ever since we saw the mistakes that were made in the Reorganization Act of 1939 and the efforts that have been going on through the years. The House Committee on Agriculture has been working at it. We are making headway because we are defending those in government who are doing something for the good of our American farmers.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I appreciate the remarks the gentleman is making. Is it not a fact, too, that this appraisal and testimony not only of foreign production of agricultural commodities, but the possibilities of export of American agricultural commodities to foreign countries is an extremely important part of the work done by this office?

Mr. HORAN. Very definitely.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman should not give the impression that perhaps kissing and making up is the solution. What we want is a direct relationship between the Department of Agriculture and our foreign embassies and consulates. If the gentleman has the time, I would like to ask him to explain to the committee the delays which have been caused by this roundabout proceeding.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to finish what I started to say, and if it takes more time than I have, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask for the additional brief time that it will take to explain that.

Here is the difficulty. When our agricultural and other commercial attachés became members of the State Department in many instances their salaries were greater and their retirement pay was greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, in many ways they were paid better than the men who served in the Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations when they became members of the State Department. Men who had been Agriculture Department attachés have become counselors and ministers, and I believe in one instance an agricultural attaché is an ambassador. Do you not see the mistakes we made? The only way to correct it is to do what this subcommittee has been doing for many years, to defend and point up the work that is being done by this particular office in the Department of Agriculture, and to insist that, at the Cabinet level, corrections be made.

I think we are going to have to recommend a modification of the Reorganization Act of 1939 so as to make our agricultural attachés and commercial attachés report back direct to their respective Secretaries, the same as our military attachés do today. Until that time comes we have really got to correct this thing. Let us protect, in the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the group of men who are carrying on as best they can in a very troubled world, the things that need to be done to protect the farmers of America.

There is another point that should be raised. When we have an agricultural attaché he is a member of the State Department, and when we have a reciprocal trade team going to a given point, there to negotiate in a trade on tariffs that might interest us, the captain of that team is always a man high up in the Department of State. It is true that agricultural specialists and attachés do attend those hearings, but where there are two strikes on the batter and there is only one ball left to swing at, it is the man from the State Department who takes the stand and swings that bat for the third time. In other words, by our own actions we have allowed the Department of State to dominate two departments in America that are very important to the farmers of America and American businessmen. I contend that is not what we had in mind when we set up the American Cabinet system.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is saying that the office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is in a position to supply us with the best information we can get in these foreign countries.

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I would like to supplement his statement by saying that Mr. Stanley Andrews has given our committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, invaluable information on the situation in Asia.

Mr. HORAN. I understand that. We on the Committee on Agriculture have great respect for Mr. Andrews, and I understand he also is from Arkansas. I hope your committee will look into this thing in the name of equity and justice, and see if there are some modifications that should be made.

Before I close I want to pay my compliments to the House Committee on Agriculture for the report on this whole matter which they put out on March 22, which I think pretty well lays the facts before you and tells you some part of the problems and what ought to be done.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Who hired these men who are serving in these foreign countries?

Mr. HORAN. Some of them came out of the Department of Agriculture in the case of attachés, although I know of one instance where an attaché is in one of the embassies over the protest of the Secretary of Agriculture. You can see that is not good.

Mr. FOGARTY. And you cannot do anything about that?

Mr. HORAN. Not a thing. We cannot do anything about it. They are in the State Department; not in the Department of Agriculture. The office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is the only body we have speaking for the American farmer in foreign lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to pay a brief tribute to the Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, a very intelligent, sincere, and dynamic administrator, Hon. Stanley Andrews. I know that he is doing an excellent job and is performing in fine fashion the duties of his high position. Stanley Andrews is outspoken, frank, and forthright, and I have great confidence in his ability and great faith in his efforts. Until Stanley Andrews became Director of this very important agency of our Government, it was, to use a common expression, "dragging its feet," when all of the officers and employees of the agency should have been alert and wide awake to the great importance of their assignments. In my opinion this agency of the Government was woefully weak and badly handicapped.

Appreciating the importance of intelligent and effective representation in the fields of agriculture in foreign countries and realizing the weaknesses and inadequacies of this agency of Government, the House Committee on Agriculture conducted a study of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and in the course of this study members of our committee visited many foreign countries and conferred with many of our agricultural attachés and commodity specialists. We also conferred with those representing agriculture in our ECA missions abroad and likewise with the ministers of agriculture in many of the countries of the world. Our committee now has an abundance of information concerning the situations existing in different parts of the world, and we know something about the importance of the agency of the Government which we are now discussing. After conferring with Mr. Andrews and with his associates and after making the studies I have referred to, many substantial changes have been made and we earnestly believe that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is now functioning effectively and will continue to improve as Congress provides the necessary money and manpower for the needed expansion of the activities of this agency.

Instead of merely collecting statistics, many of which are of doubtful value, the employees of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations should really and truly represent American agriculture abroad and should make real contributions to the cause of agriculture around the world and, above all, should be directly responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture who, in turn, is directly responsible to Congress. All of our representatives in foreign countries should be impressed with the importance of export markets for the things produced on the American farm. Actually, many of our ambassadors are so carried away with their striped breeches and top hats and with protocol and social events they have little or no time to devote to the problems of agriculture. And many of them frankly are just not interested in anything pertaining to agriculture. Some of them are not even able to discuss the problems of agriculture with any degree of intelligence and display an utter indifference to the problems of the American farmer. Yet, even in the present situation those who are charged with the responsibility of activities pertaining to agriculture are required to report through all of this diplomatic red tape to the State Department rather than to the Department of Agriculture. While the Secretary of Agriculture selects and nominates the persons to be employed by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in foreign assignments, all such employees are attached to the State Department payroll and they become swallowed up in diplomatic red tape and some of them actually forget that after all they are just farm boys employed to do a job in a foreign country. The agricultural attachés and commodity specialists are subordinated and submerged in just about every way possible. Many of them never have a chance to discuss their problems and their responsibilities with ambassadors and ministers of agriculture in the countries to which they have been assigned.

Following our study of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and since Stanley Andrews has taken over as Director, some men have been retired and some have been hired, and all of the employees have been aroused and advised of the importance of their duties. If some of our ambassadors don't wake up to the importance of American agriculture and to the importance of export markets for the products of our farms, and if they do not show some interest in the problems of world agriculture and of the world food supply, some of them ought to be retired or fired. I do not mean to indict our entire diplomatic corps by any means. Some of our ambassadors are intensely interested in the problems of agriculture and understand the importance of American agriculture in world trade and commerce.

Just to give you an idea about how some of our agricultural men abroad are handicapped and hamstrung, I would like to call your attention to a situation which I ran across last fall. I was in the beautiful city of Lisbon and spent many hours with one of our agricultural representatives, making on-the-spot observations on some of the farms of Portugal. This representative was a man of wide experience and great competency. He had only been in Portugal for a short time, but I am convinced that he knew more about Portuguese agriculture than all the ministers of agriculture who had served Portugal in the past quarter of a century. Yet he told me that notwithstanding all that he had learned about Portuguese agriculture and the urgent problems facing the farmers of that country, he could not arrange an audience with those to whom he should tell his story. Of course an agricultural attaché or a commodity specialist cannot dash in to see a foreign minister of agriculture, nor can he at will confer with the Ambassador, but certainly someone, somehow, should be able to arrange such meetings.

I talked with another agricultural attaché who told me that although he had spent 2 or 3 years attached to a certain embassy, he was convinced that the ambassador did not even know who he was and had no idea as to his responsibilities. This man was also one of our very best agricultural representatives, and yet he, too, was hamstrung and submerged in the diplomatic whirlpool.

Our agricultural men abroad have not been accorded the same opportunities for promotion, nor have they been given the same recognition that is accorded the other employees of the State Department; so as a result of this unfortunate situation, a lot of these well-meaning and well-trained agricultural college graduates look for greener pastures and for more lucrative and more attractive assignments. They visualize themselves dressed in striped pants and Homburgs and as consuls or ministers or even perhaps ambassadors; so many of them find other positions.

The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations should be well financed and well staffed, with competent agricultural specialists, and they should be accorded all the privileges and opportunities which are accorded commercial attachés, political attachés, and other employees of the State Department.

We have been assured that efforts are now being made to improve the situation, which unfortunately has existed. I certainly hope that by appropriate administrative orders and rules and regulations the situation will be improved, and I earnestly hope that no effort will be made to reduce this appropriation for the OFAR, which I honestly consider to be very modest and a very minimum upon which the agency should be required to operate.

Through the OFAR we should be able to obtain very important information and through this agency we should be able to keep in touch with situations abroad. Great demands are being made upon our resources. Many gifts and grants to foreign countries are being authorized by Congress, and through the OFAR the Committees of Congress should be able to obtain accurate information as to the needs of those countries which petition us for either gifts, grants, or loans.

Likewise, the OFAR should be able to furnish us with pertinent information concerning our export markets for agricultural commodities, and each of the employees of this office in foreign assignments should, above all, be ambassadors of friendship in the countries where they are serving.

I observe that there has been a revival of interest in the activities of the OFAR, and I indulge the hope that this agency will become a vital force in foreign affairs and will function effectively in the welfare of our people.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work and programs

authorized by Congress in the Department, $1,271,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For preparation and display of exhibits, $104,725; for preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $75,600; for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct (7 U. S. C. 417) and not less than 230,850 copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture), as authorized by section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $611,128: *Provided*, That additional funds for preparation and display of agricultural motion pictures and exhibits relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress, not exceeding $150,000, may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices, or for the compensation of employees in such offices.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in lines 4 to 9, inclusive, page 46, on the ground that it involves additional duties on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 46, line 4, in lieu of the matter stricken insert "together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts not exceeding a total of $16,200, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the language as now offered by the gentleman from Mississippi strikes out the words "as may be determined by the Secretary." The action of transferring these additional appropriations from another fund still requires, whether those words are there or not, independent action on the part of the Secretary, therefore, it does involve additional duties on his part and is still subject to the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this language has been held to be in order many times. Under the general transfer provisions of the bill the Department of Agriculture may transfer to the extent of 7 percent. This is a limitation on the amount he may transfer, because in the absence of this limitation the 7-percent provision would apply.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Mississippi, may I say that frequently we see this language in an appropriation bill. But no point of order is made against it. When a point of order is made against such language, I believe it should be stricken because it does involve additional duties on the part of the Secretary; otherwise, there is no method of knowing how much of this amount will be transferred. It does not authorize the appropriation or transfer of a specific sum of money.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this a new appropriation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is not new at all. Without this language they could transfer a certain amount of money. With this language there is an intimation given as to how much money may be transferred. The Department has a general provision making it possible to transfer up to 7 percent. So there being no new money here and this being a limitation or reducing the amount below that which could otherwise be transferred, I respectfully insist it is not subject to a point of order. I might also point out that this is expressly authorized under 601 of the Economy Act, 31 United States Code, 686.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair feels this is a transfer within the Department of Agriculture authorized by law. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in discussing the point of order, this is a limitation on the amount of transfer insofar as the intent of the committee is concerned. While this sounds like an authorization for transferring money, to those who do not like any transfer at all it is better to have some limitation instead of none.

I respectfully submit that the amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of $76,808,000 for the net costs during the fiscal year 1950 under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1641-1642).

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph on page 50, lines 5 to 12, inclusive, International Wheat Agreement, on the ground that that is a new authorization and a direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to handle this item contrary to the manner in which it has been handled, and therefore constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

Commodity Credit Corporation: Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury by canceling notes issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in the amount of the capital impairment determined by the appraisal of June 30, 1950 (but not to exceed $427,000,000), pursuant to sections 1 and 4 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-1, 4).

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Page 51, line 21, strike out the period and insert "*Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of this appropriation shall be placed in reserve, to be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary due to the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic commodities requiring mandatory price controls."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I understand the gentleman from Mississippi is in agreement with this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say that this appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation in effect is a limitation on the administrative funds that can be used. I am well aware of the efforts on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] to try to hold down these administrative costs, and I concur in those efforts. However, realizing the great demands being made on American agriculture to produce, and knowing that the only thing that stands between them and absolute ruin under some conditions is the Commodity Credit Corporation, that we have a hesitancy to hold the limitation as low as we might otherwise. It strikes me that the approach the gentleman makes is utterly sound, and we join with him. I just want to say that we are all driving in the same direction, that the approach is sound, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the action taken by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], as well as that of the entire subcommittee. I am certain that this is a move in the right direction.

So that the background of the amendment may be fully explained and available to the Commodity Credit Corporation, I want to outline briefly the facts which led me to submit it. It would set aside $1,000,000 from the $15,000,000 recommended by the subcommittee for administrative expenses in a reserve fund and no expenditures could be made from that $1,000,000 unless and until the existence of substantial surpluses of the basic commodities developed to justify any use of any part of this $1,000,000.

The budget estimate was for $20,200,000.

Any study of the hearings presents convincing evidence of the wisdom of the subcommittee's decision to recommend a reduction of $5,200,000. It may be thought that this reduction is substantial. Of course, it is, but there is clear and sufficient evidence to convince anyone that we are amply warranted in making this further restriction.

It is clear from the hearings that no satisfactory effort was made by this Agency to relate its requests for funds to its requirements or to existing conditions. It just used the same figure it used when it submitted its supplemental request to Congress on November 29, 1950, of $3,850,000, bringing the total request in fiscal 1951 to $20,200,000. The subcommittee was amply warranted in reporting that "this"—its—"reduction is believed justified in view of the current outlook for agriculture and the probable change from surpluses to shortages in many of the commodities normally handled by the Corporation."

It is equally clear that the request submitted last fall and presented to the subcommittee on February 12 has no relation to the Agency's activities now, or in prospect for fiscal 1952.

Its latest report is for the month ending March 31. I placed in the RECORD last Wednesday the results of a study of its commodity inventories on March 31 compared to June 30, 1950.

In butter, cheese, dried milk, and dried eggs alone there was a reduction of 505,699,732 pounds, from 677,401,610 pounds to 171,701,878 pounds.

Extending this to 16 commodities, the reduction is from 6,561,211,062 pounds to 2,604,691,295 pounds, or a decrease of 60.3 percent.

The same sharp downward trend in holdings is evident in most of the other commodities. Let me give you seven examples:

	June 30, 1950	Mar. 31, 1951
Cotton.....bales..	3,413,635	86,813
Cottonseed.....tons..	211,178	2,941
Flaxseed.....bushels..	12,373,583	5,117,761
Turpentine.....gallons..	2,586,765	500,000
Oats.....bushels..	12,108,620	9,997,233
Rye.....do....	514,624	364,274
Soybeans.....do....	53,017	1,093

An examination of the estimate shows that about 75 percent is for personal services, $15,042,000 of the $20,200,000.

It is significant that this Agency's estimate shows a request for 814 more employees than in fiscal 1951, from 3,721 to 4,535.

It is of greater significance that its representative offered as one justification for its request that 2 or 3 weeks before its last appearance before the subcommittee on February 20, it had asked to be declared, and had been declared, a Defense Agency. This resulted in a very proper and pertinent examination by the subcommittee. Let me quote:

Mr. HORAN. Do not forget this: That a man who is in a defense agency, whether he is doing good work or not—and we all have to admit the possibility that he might be loafing—under certain circumstances, especially unless you and this committee can justify his existence as a Government employee, as a member working for a defense agency, he has at least one additional bargaining argument with the draft board whereas some of our 18-year-olds out on the farms who are actually producing what the PMA is interested in may not have an equal argument with the draft board in his county. That can happen. That can happen unless we take a very realistic look at this defense agency picture.

The subcommittee requested a statement of estimated price-support volume for fiscal 1952. There is a notation that it was an estimate as of February 1.

A study of that against the March 31 report points up conclusively the unrealistic approach taken by this Agency toward its requirements.

Let me take just three commodities:

	Estimated inventory	Actual inventory
	Pounds	*Pounds*
Butter	26,649,213	9,955,226
Cheese	10,902,053	7,145
Dried milk	222,931,819	94,170,819
Total	260,483,085	104,133,190

That is 156,349,895 pounds below the estimates for fiscal 1952, more than a 60-percent difference. I have tried to obtain more current information but have found no one who will give me facts as to the inventory situation today. But there is an item on the ticker in the Speaker's lobby stating that the Department of Agriculture has announced it is buying no more butter.

There is a very important statement by Mr. Trigg at page 119 of the hearings. After stating that they had $1,618,000,000 worth of commodities in inventory then, the chairman of the subcommittee said, "You have that now, but what is it going to be by the 1st of July?" Mr. Trigg replied, "We will have some new crops at that time; our budget estimate is that we will have inventories valued at $1,900,000,000 on July 1, 1951."

Standing alone this means nothing. Here is the CCC report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. On July 1, 1950, they had on hand inventories valued at $2,643,153,372.70. So their own budget estimate anticipates about $750,000,000 less to begin this coming fiscal year. And I submit I have proven how much in error their fall and winter estimates were.

Beyond this, does anybody think that this agency is going to embark on a program of buying up huge quantities of wholesome foods in the foreseeable future, with prospective shortages and skyrocketing prices. If there is any danger of this, it is one more good reason for making certain that it can do no such thing by not authorizing too much money.

The hearings also include a table—table 6 at page 68 of the hearings—showing the corporate administration expense limitations from 1938 to 1950, inclusive, in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Production Credit Corporation and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation started at $500,000 in 1938 and progressively increased each year, with two exceptions, until it reached $20,200,000 in this fiscal year. That is 394 percent increase. The other four have either progressively decreased or have increased only moderately.

I have prepared the following table from the summary and from recent reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is in millions of dollars:

1938	0.5
1939	.7
1940	2.0
1941	2.3
1942	3.5
1943	4.4
1944	5.4
1945	7.2
1946	8.9
1947	8.8
1949	8.1
1950	15.4
1951	20.2
Estimated, 1952	20.2

The subcommittee provided probably the most convincing argument for a further reduction in its report filed on April 4, 1949, and I want to quote the pertinent language:

The budget estimate for this purpose is in the sum of $12,000,000 which the committee has approved. The amount provided in the regular act for 1949 was $7,575,000. In the first deficiency bill now pending in the Senate, this 1949 amount is increased to $10,814,700. The necessity for

this increase is occasioned by the excessively large 1948 crop resulting in a drop in prices of a number of the major commodities below the level established by law, requiring substantial increases in the number of loans and other price support activities. The increase provided in the deficiency bill referred to will cover the increased activities of the corporation in this field for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Here, then, we have a clear contrast in the very substantially increased activities justifying an appropriation in the sum of $12,000,000 for fiscal 1950 in comparison to the admitted sharp decrease in activities now and in prospect for fiscal 1952.

I also placed in the Appendix of the RECORD on May 10 at page A2691 excerpts from questions and statements of members of the committee, particularly those of the able chairman of this subcommittee. I want to repeat a few of these:

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, let us just get down to brass tacks. I think you will admit, under the present outlook, that you will not have one-half the volume of commodities for the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you have had this year, will you not? (p. 118).

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. But, as I was pointing out, you will not be handling as big a volume of commodities for one thing.

Mr. TRIGG. Of course, we will not. * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. We should set these figures of administrative expense knowing today that there is every probability that you will handle less volume. If the situation gets out of hand later, you could then come back and ask for more employees for the CCC (p. 119).

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. Again, I am not suggesting a major reduction in expenses. I am just discussing the difference between $17,000,000 and $20,000,000 or $15,000,000 for that purpose. I think your figures can stand a lot of study for the next fiscal year (p. 119).

Mr. HORAN. I just want to point out that we have revised our thinking, too, up here in Congress, and the Korean war and the defense effort has caused that. The average cost has gone up, and I think that you as taxpayers are looking to us to do what we can to hold down costs wherever we can, to see that any of these items are justified in reality, and I am disturbed about the size and the shape of this particular item. I do not want to do anything to hurt the Commodity Credit Corporation. I realize what it means, but along with the chairman and the rest of this subcommittee, we need your cooperation on this. We want to do what we are supposed to do, but frankly I am still at a loss as to why this item should be increased (p. 132).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. HORAN, I think you have proven our case. The testimony up to this point is that last May and June the Commodity Credit Corporation made a survey and arrived at how much manpower it would take to handle a given volume on a per unit basis. Then they multiplied that by the volume, and they came up with this $20,200,000, which includes the $3,850,000 they are asking for now. They cannot sustain that, because they will not have that volume.

Mr. BEACH. It appears that way.

Mr. WHITTEN. You just said it was that. You said last May and June you worked up the unit cost, coming up with $20,000,000. Now you come up with the same number of dollars, so you are bound to have used the same volume. You may have some difference from one program to another, but you are using approximately the same volume in total. You cannot justify it (pp. 132–133).

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities—you cannot have anything like the volume of work through the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you had this year (p. 534).

Finally, I recognize that it could be argued that this is only a limitation and that the Agency must be expected to hold down its expenditures as far as possible. If it was a question of an operation which was either breaking even or making a profit, that might be a legitimate argument. However, from its own report, from October 17, 1933, through March 31, 1951, it shows a total loss of $2,671,384,309.

It pays the costs of administrative expenses from its capital funds, but in the final analysis that money is raised from only one source—taxation. I am certain that we are on sound ground in taking this action this afternoon. An unrestricted authorization to use the full $15,000,000 would be definitely an invitation to excessive and unnecessary expenditures. This action constitutes a clear mandate and warning that every effort should be made to manage this Corporation in the light of existing conditions and with some real consideration of the burden which is going to be placed upon the American people in terms of additional taxation.

I have every confidence that this subcommittee will examine with great care any use of this $1,000,000. I hope and believe that it will not be necessary to use any part of it. This action should bring about a definite saving to the American taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 404. No part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 55, line 2, strike out the word "cotton" and insert "any farm commodity."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I will not seek recognition if the committee feels inclined to accept the amendment. I have discussed it with some members of the committee who think it is wise to extend this prohibition to any farm commodity.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say that it is entirely possible that the gentleman is correct, but this whole issue has been batted around whether it is wise or unwise in regard to cotton. I certainly would not want to agree that it applied to others for I cannot speak for so many other commodities. It is a controversial question, and I certainly would not want to do it without adequate hearings.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the position of the gentleman from Mississippi, that he could not accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of section 404 is very obvious, and it is a commendable purpose, to provide that none of the funds shall be used for the payment of compensation to any officer or employee of this Department who causes a leak, let us say, as to the future prices of cotton or the trend in the price of cotton. Those on the inside in the Department of Agriculture do have confidential information about various farm commodities. It is very proper that the committee should provide that no part of these funds should be used to pay an employee who did give away some of this inside information. It seems to me that applies equally to any other farm commodity, and that anyone in the Department of Agriculture who gives inside information as to any farm commodity, in order that he or his friends or others may thereby profit, should be deprived of his compensation in just the same way that applies to cotton.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see any objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. It simply says that, along with cotton, if anybody in the Department of Agriculture for purposes of his own allows things to get out which might violate the secrecy which we hold upon the release of crop reports, he then is subject to discharge, or at least no funds in this measure will be allowed for his salary. I certainly agree with the gentleman from New York that this will not in any way harm the bill.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am somewhat concerned, since the gentleman's amendment is very far reaching. I am thinking particularly of the livestock industry, where we have a Federal Marketing Service which does predict the market conditions in the future, and which has been of very much protection to the farmers of the Midwest. Will the gentleman tell me what his amendment would do to the prediction of the market as far as livestock is concerned?

Mr. KEATING. My feeling is that that is a public service, and that nothing in this amendment would prevent the Secretary of Agriculture in an official way from doing anything he is doing today. This whole section is directed against those who act under the table or behind the curtain. I have no pride of authorship in the precise language "any farm commodity." It certainly is not my intention to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from issuing proper market reports. Nor do I believe this

amendment would have that effect. If the gentleman has any better language to effectuate the purpose and if he is in sympathy with my objective, I would be glad to have him substitute such language as he thinks would be preferable.

Mr. MARSHALL. I can say to the gentleman that I am in sympathy with what he is attempting to do, but to attempt to write legislation here on the floor of the House today that would cover all of these items, and I am thinking particularly about the livestock industry, would be beyond my scope, without going into hearings. When you say "prediction" as outlined in this paragraph, may I say that weather conditions affect markets, so the market might be dependent upon weather conditions. There are a number of conditions involved.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, within the cotton industry there has been quite a controversy as to whether or not this provision should be in the bill with regard to cotton, but it has been in there for a number of years and, they having become reconciled to it more or less, the committee has gone along with it. But we checked with the Department, and the information they gave us is that if you do this as to all commodities you do away with the crop and livestock estimates.

The section which the gentleman seeks to broaden provides:

> No part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer—

And that includes the Secretary of Agriculture—

> or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

It is true that the futures market on cotton has been more sensitive than any other market. If you adopt this amendment you will be destroying your marketing news service and you will be fixing it where there can be no estimate with regard to wheat and with regard to the supply of hogs and with regard to what is going to move on the market and with regard to many things that make for orderly operation at this time of all times when there is a shortage of food supplies. Now that is what I am afraid of, and there is much to indicate it, and the Department says that that is true. Now, if we had hearings on this and you may say that you might come up with a different answer, but certainly the Department, having taken their position and seeing the dangers in it now, I think you would make a serious mistake to adopt this amendment without any more explanation, other than that which the gentleman from New York intimates that he just wants others to be treated as cotton is treated. I do not want any special treatment. But some folks believe it is not good in cotton and they point out it would not work at all with regard to these other commodities. This amendment is too far reaching to be adopted without knowing what we are doing. I think this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 36, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 407. No part of the funds made available by this act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 55, line 19, strike out on pages 55 and 56 all of section 407.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike out all of section 407. That section is identical with the language which heretofore appeared in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. An amendment was offered at that time and was agreed to. Section 407 would in effect establish two pay standards for identical jobs. At this time a cost-of-living allowance is paid, under authority of Congress, to Federal employees in the Territories and possessions. In Alaska that amounts to 25 percent. In Hawaii it amounts to 20 percent, and I believe, although I am not absolutely sure, that it amounts to 25 percent in Puerto Rico. If this section is adopted, a person hired in Alaska, for example, will not receive the allowance, but the person hired in the States will get 25 percent more than the Alaskan for doing the same job. That is basically wrong.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations did include this same provision in the bill. After that the committee made a more thorough study of it and we discovered what we thought was a bad mistake.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. JENSEN. So the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and myself, the ranking member, and in fact the entire subcommittee, were agreeable to having that section stricken out of the Interior Department appropriation bill. It is identical, word for word, with the wording in this bill which the gentleman is asking to be stricken.

Mr. BARTLETT. We are grateful to the gentleman and his colleagues for doing that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If my memory serves me correctly, the cost of living in Alaska is considerably higher than it is in the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. Precisely.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The pay scale, generally speaking, is based on the same pay scale as in effect in this country, with the proviso that those who are hired in the continental United States to go to Alaska shall receive a 25-percent differential over those who work in the Territory. I think the same also applies to the Territory of Hawaii, where we all know the cost of living is extremely high. I sincerely hope each of you, the Delegate from Hawaii, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, who are behind this amendment and have explained it so fully to this House, will receive the support of the committee and that the amendment will be passed, just because simple justice must be done to the inhabitants of those areas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I appreciate that. It does cost more to live in Alaska. Some figures were released 2 weeks ago disclosing that it costs 47 percent more to live in Fairbanks than in Seattle, and 40 percent more in Anchorage. So the allowance does not even cover the increased cost of living.

The hearings disclosed only a reference in a comparatively few words to the situation in Puerto Rico. No mention was made of Alaska or Hawaii. I do not know what the situation is in Puerto Rico. It has been suggested that this should be looked into. We welcome that. If an investigation is held and the committee considers this, it will give us an opportunity to present testimony and to make our case. We have a strong case. We can demonstrate adequately that a cost-of-living allowance is justified.

I think that the committee a week ago yesterday laid the ground work for accepting this amendment, because the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] then said:

> I hope that out of the debate today and tomorrow we will have found many reasons for further consideration of constructive, honest legislation which will modify the existing legislation along that line.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. WHITTEN] said:

> We contemplate bringing in a bill of general application. Doubtless this provision will have consideration when we come to writing the bill on general application. Certainly they should be treated alike, across the board.

That is all right. Give us a chance to be heard. Give us a chance to have expert witnesses called in. This allowance now is being paid under authority conferred in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1948, as amended. Subsequently Executive Order No. 10000 was issued. Safeguards were set up. I urge the committee to accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I agree in the sentiments expressed by the Delegate from Alaska.

In the Territory of Hawaii there are today close to 25,000 civilians in the employ of the Federal Government. The adoption of this section as proposed by the committee would reduce by 20 percent the compensation of only 100 to 150 of that great army of Federal employees. I think it is grossly unfair to the employees of the Department of Agriculture that they should be singled out for this treatment.

The proposal is not only unjust but it is unsound. We know from experience that you cannot operate efficiently and effectively a group of employees in any field of work with part of them receiving 20 percent more compensation than the rest.

At the present time the Federal Government maintains a program for the eradication of the oriental fruitfly. That insect was introduced during the period of the war. Its elimination from Hawaii is important for the protection particularly of the citrus industry of the west coast. There are in the employ of the Department of Agriculture in that project 63 persons; 51 of them are residents of Hawaii; 12 are resident of the States with voting representation in Congress.

What you do by this proposal is to say to those 51 employees who live in Hawaii and maintain their residence there that they are going to have their compensation cut by 20 percent. This is colonialism of the worst sort; it is vicious, nothing less.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understood the gentleman favored the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I favor it, and I hope the committee will support it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentlemen is condemning the provision of the bill which would be amended by the gentleman from Alaska, the one the gentleman from Alaska seeks to strike from the bill.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman for clarifying my position. I approve the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska. I am merely trying to explain to the committee what will happen if Mr. BARTLETT'S amendment is not adopted and this provision eliminated from the bill. I do not want to prolong the debate any further, because we reviewed this issue very completely during the course of general debate. I do think that this is no time and this is no way to handle this particular problem and most certainly hope that the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, certainly it is not my desire to hurt anyone. This happens to be the bill that comes before our subcommittee, and insofar as the present is concerned, we are limited to what we can do in connection with the Department of Agriculture. I have been designated to prepare some language of a general nature to be offered at a later date which will be generally applicable throughout the Government.

I know there have been some complaints as a result of pay differentials under present law, and this is what we are trying to stop. Under present law, we pay a native Puerto Rican, a native Alaskan, or a native Hawaiian, a man who has lived there all his life, who has his home there, and to whom that is home, 25 percent more than we pay within the continental United States to people to do the same kind of work. It just does not seem right to me. I want to give people in Territories every chance for fair treatment. I hear from time to time that they do not think they are a part of the United States because of lack of statehood, and we all have our ideas about that. Why should you pay a native of Puerto Rico, who was born there and has his home there, 25 percent more to work in the post office in Puerto Rico than you pay a man to work in the post office in San Francisco, Kalamazoo, or New York? Why should you require the Department under the law to pay them this extra amount? Of course, they have been getting it and they disapprove our stopping that practice. If we are going to follow that practice, why should we not pay a man more to work in New York or in Boston or in the city of Washington? Are we going to pay men 25 percent more to work in New York, 15 percent more to work in Boston and 33 percent more to work in Washington? After all, we are all Americans.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is aware of the fact that under the independent offices appropriation bill the Government does not have to pay that 25 percent; it can pay a lesser amount.

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as I know it is 25 percent except in Hawaii where it is 20 percent. I believe in fair treatment, but special treatment is another matter.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Something has been said about the differential in pay so far as the State Department is concerned. We do have differentials in pay in that Department in cases where Americans work at hardship posts, but we do not pay the natives of those countries a larger amount of money than we do the Americans.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to what the gentleman from Nebraska has said, he is making a comparison between the Americans and natives of a country. Here we are making a comparison between United States citizens.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. This does not have the same effect as where a man goes to some place to work where there is a differential based on hardships. Under this system you would pay certain Americans 25 percent more at their place of residence than you would pay other Americans in continental United States for work at their homes. I think we are sound here. I am sorry that is in this one bill, but I give you my assurance it will be covered in a bill of general application which we hope to report later.

I think the amendment should be defeated. We want to treat everybody alike. We cannot justify a differential between Americans, each of them at home, and start a system where the folks in New York get one salary, the folks in Biloxi, Miss., another salary and in San Francisco another. Under this system that is what you have and we are trying to correct it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARTLETT) there were—ayes 32, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*,

That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 58, after line 4, insert "No part of any appropriation contained in this act or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Paul Leach, writing in the Detroit Free Press on February 18, 1951, said that the American people are supporting more than 45,000 Federal employees who are engaged directly or indirectly, full or part-time is dispensing information, publicity, and propaganda. This information was supplied by the Budget Bureau more than 2 years ago and since that time the tendency has been to extend these services. Many of the 45,000 are said to be carried on payrolls in capacities other than publicity. They are used part time to further administration or departmental ideas and aims and to stir up protest groups to influence legislation. He also reported that of this 45,000, 8,000 stenographers and information officers are engaged directly in public-relations work. The annual pay runs from $3,000 to $10,300, with a few section chiefs getting $15,000. Six thousand of these employees, the largest group, is on the payroll of the State Department and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] just a year ago called attention to the fact that the annual cost of Government printing alone, that is not including original research, writing type, editing, reviewing, and checking is over $50,000. One Government agency admits that editing and preparing copy for the printers costs three times as much as the annual printing. On that basis the cost of Government publicity would run about $200,000,000 annually, but this does not include the cost of research and writing.

I feel sure that the Members of this House do not realize the extent of widespread overlapping in federally owned printing plants and facilities, not only among departments, but in cities throughout the country. Did you know that there are 61 separate Government printing and duplicating plants in Washington; that there are 23 in San Francisco; 25 in Philadelphia; 16 in Chicago; 6 in Kansas City; 6 in Denver; 16 in New York, and many others? The Army and Air Force alone have 140 printing and duplicating plants, the Navy has 87, the Department of Commerce has 26, and the Interior Department has 15.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] also reported that tons and tons of undistributed Government publications are sold as waste paper each year to clear storage space for new publications. In 1947 and 1948 the Government Printing Office condemned more than 10,000,000 copies of publications. Investigators for the Senate Appropriations Committee found as many as 500,000 copies of some publications on hand and 200,000 to 300,000 copies of others.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported this amendment on all bills to which it has been presented, but I think it is particularly appropriate to the Department of Agriculture. I think the Members of this body have not yet forgotten the disgraceful experience of a year ago when the PMA committeemen were called into Minneapolis at the taxpayers expense to form a captive audience to let the Secretary of Agriculture expound his own personal strait-jacket political farm plan and hoped that those people would go to their respective home communities as disciples for that kind of a regimentation plan. Taking their cue from the Secretary himself, top flight officials in the Department of Agriculture are continuing their attempt to use that tax supported agency as a base of operations for the Democratic National Committee. On Tuesday of this week I personally witnessed another episode in that campaign to wed the agencies of the Government to the Democratic National Committee. The occasion was the award ceremony down at the Washington Monument which was held on Tuesday morning. Several Members of Congress, whose constituents were the recipients of awards there, were invited to attend. Dr. Walter Ebling, of the Department of Agriculture, at Madison, Wis., was one of those recipients, and at his suggestion I was happy to go down to the Monument for the ceremonies there. I think the idea of the ceremonies is fine, but I think the Members of Congress from both parties who attended were considerably taken aback when Assistant Secretary Hutchinson, after introducing some of the top executives of the Department and the Members of Congress and their wives who were in attendance, then introduced a certain Mr. Moore, assistant to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Except for those top-flight Agricultural Department employees and except for the Members of Congress, he was the only person there who was so honored as a dignatary. I do not know what his purpose was in introducing that one particular individual, unless it was to make the employees in the Department, who had been released from their regular employment in order to attend that ceremony, believe that, so far as the top-flight officials of the Department were concerned, the executives of the Department of Agriculture and the assistant to the Democratic National Committee were to be on the same plane in their eyes.

I have enough confidence in the people who came there to witness that ceremony to believe that they are not going to be sucked in on that kind of an effort, that they are going to resent that kind of effort. At the same time I think it reflects and is an illustration of this insidious attempt on the part of certain executives in the Department of Agriculture to use propaganda for their own purposes, paid for at the taxpayers' expense. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is indeed appropriate for this Department.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes, the last minute to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, on each of the appropriation bills this amendment has been presented. I have supported it. The amendment has carried consistently. However, during the debate on the Federal Security Administration-Labor Department appropriation bill the question was raised whether or not the Appropriations Subcommittees were staffed sufficiently to study the matter of Government propaganda and publicity with a view to determining which publications were legitimate statistical reports of the Government, which were propaganda designed to influence public opinion, and which were worthless publications costing the taxpayers a lot of money without any benefit to them and were of little or no public interest.

On that occasion the chairman of the subcommittee said that if the Members of the House would present to him evidence of wasteful and useless propaganda he would get a staff and go into the matter. It occurred to me that we have a committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which is already equipped with the subpena power and the jurisdiction to investigate wasteful expenditures of public funds on publications. Accordingly, on May 14, I addressed a letter to the gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and in that two-page letter I requested that his subcommittee look into this matter of expenditures on Government publications and propaganda.

I recommended that we find out: First, the cost to the taxpayers of the paper, the printing, the research and study, the distribution, including an estimate of the cost of franked mail, the cost of storage of the printed material, and general overhead for administrative costs. Second, whether the publication was required by law or whether it was the voluntary activity of a particular agency. Third, an appraisal of the public interest in specific publications. Fourth, a consideration of whether or not the information presently provided by Federal publications could be provided by private sources.

I find that this matter of Government publications has been one of considerable interest over a long period of time. The Senate Appropriations Committee in 1942 made a study of this subject and issued a report. In 1948 the Senate Appropriations Committee again considered the matter of Government propaganda. That committee requested examples of publications from the several agencies of the Government. In pursuance to this request they received about 84,000 different publications, which filled a whole room here in the Capitol Building. Here are a few examples of what we are paying for. Here is one on How To Control Vagrant Cats. Here is another one on Mist Netting for Birds in Japan. Here is another one, Fish for Breakfast, and Why Not? Here is another one on Japanese Ornithology and Mammalogy During World War II. That is the type of thing we are putting out and I think, although there may be some public interest in these publications, someone ought to find out what that public interest is. Someone ought to start calling a halt to theorists drafting studies with little or no public interest at the public expense and consuming thousands and thousands of square feet of storage space, vitally needed in Washington, for old, obsolete publications no longer of any interest to anyone.

I hope the committee will go diligently into the subject and unlike previous investigations of this matter will come up with some concrete recommendations which will start cutting down these Government publications. It is particularly timely in view of the newsprint shortage we have at this time and the great expenditures we must make for our mobilization effort.

I hope the Committee will support this amendment and that in all future appropriation bills similar amendments will be included and that the House will support the Hardy committee, or any other committee that shows any interest in going into this subject. By getting at the facts and the detailed justification in each instance is the only way we can separate worth-while publications from those that are useless, wasteful, and extravagant.

My letter to the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman HARDY, and his reply to me are as follows:

MAY 14, 1951.

Hon. PORTER HARDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARDY: During the debate on the various appropriation bills the question has arisen regarding the propaganda and publicity activities of the Federal Government. As you are aware in those appropriation bills which have been passed by the House, an amendment has been adopted which prohibits the use of funds appropriated for publicity and propaganda purposes, except those previously authorized by the Congress.

As you are also aware, many publications are available to Congressmen for distribution to their constituents at no charge.

I believe there is a general consensus of opinion among the Members of the Congress that the executive branch of the Government ought not to engage in activities designed to influence public opinion toward some particular national program. I think it would also be the general consensus of opinion of the Members of Congress that there are certain statistical reports and certain scientific and research activities engaged in by the Federal Government which could not very well be duplicated by any nonpublic institution.

It seems to me that the basic question is one of distinguishing between publications which it is right and proper for the agencies of the Federal Government to issue as matters of public interest on the one hand, and those which are either designed to influence public opinion or which are obsolete, wasteful, and of little or no public interest on the other hand.

It is apparent from the outset that any study of Federal publications, designed to separate those which are useful and proper as an expenditure of public funds and those which are wasteful and unnecessary, would require a great many man-hours of careful study on the part of competent and disinterested investigators.

For this reason, I discussed the matter informally with you this morning to ascertain whether or not your subcommittee which, in my opinion, has clear jurisdiction to undertake such an investigation, is adequately staffed to assume this task, and whether or not—assuming the House of Representatives supported you with sufficient funds—you thought it would be a desirable investigation for your subcommittee to pursue. It had been my intention, in case you had indicated that your subcommittee was not interested in pursuing this subject, to suggest some alternate method of exploring this particular activity of the executive branch of the Government.

I was very much gratified to find that you believed this matter was one which ought to be examined by your subcommittee.

It seems to me that there are various aspects of this problem to which attention should be devoted. Undoubtedly, additional questions will arise as any such investigation proceeds.

1. What is the annual cost to the United States taxpayers of the current volume of Federal publications, including: (a) paper and printing; (b) research and study; (c) distribution, including an estimate of the cost of franked mail; (d) storage of printed material; (d) general overhead for administrative costs.

2. Whether publication is required by law, or whether it is the voluntary activity of a particular Federal agency.

3. An appraisal of the public interest in specific publications.

4. Consideration of whether or not the information presently provided by Federal publications could be provided by private sources.

I fully appreciate that this study is of such magnitude that a great deal could not be accomplished within a short period of time. However, it would seem to me that the committee might well concentrate on those publications which appear to have little or no public interest, and which seem to involve a substantial amount of public expenditure, with a view to the early elimination of wasteful and extravagant publications. In this way the work of the committee could begin to bear fruit progressively as it engaged in its undertaking.

I assure you that I shall be only too happy to support any requests for appropriations for a larger staff for your subcommittee in case your committee desires to engage in this investigation.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: Thanks for yours of May 14 discussing in greater detail the suggestion that the subcommittee concern itself with a study of the voluminous publications of the Federal Government.

As I told you in our discussion of this subject, I do consider this an extremely worthwhile suggestion. In fact, as a part of this total picture I have addressed a communication to the Department of Labor relating to certain of its publications. It may be that through correspondence some preliminary data can be secured pending the development of certain activities in which the committee and the staff are now engaged. I think it unwise to undertake any new activity of a scope which you envisioned until after some of our current studies have progressed further.

Additionally, you are somewhat familiar with my current efforts to improve the committee staff organization. Therefore, I wish you would remind me of this suggestion so that we may give further consideration to its initiation as soon as circumstances permit.

Sincerely,

PORTER HARDY, Jr., *Chairman.*

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the bill already restricts the expenditure of funds for information to work authorized by Congress. It further provides for the transfer of funds to the Office of Information for preparation of exhibits and motion pictures relating to the programs of the various agencies of the Department authorized by Congress. There is no authority now and there is no money now appropriated under the law for the uses such as the gentleman's amendment would prohibit. If it helps the matter any more to prohibit that which they have no authority to do, I might say if you want to include that language it is all right. There has always been a difference of opinion as to whether in any particular case, in discussing the past as against the future, whether it is propaganda or good, sound argument. That difference of opinion will always exist. But if you want to make it a little stronger by prohibiting that which they have no authority to do, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 58, after line 4 insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or position required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to meat inspectors;

"(f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(g) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers.

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a similar amendment to the amendment that was adopted by the House on the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, the Interior Department appropriation bill, and the independent offices appropriation bill. However, there is some difference, which I will explain.

As I said before, each amendment must be tailored to fit the particular agency to which it will apply. This amendment exempts seasonal and casual workers in the Department of Agriculture. The Soil Conservation Service employ during their busiest seasons in the spring and fall, part-time workers who only stay on the job so long as there is work to do. This exemption also exempts fire-fighting temporary employees in the Forest Service, and so forth.

The next exemption eliminates meat inspectors. Meat inspection is necessary for the protection of everybody's health.

The next exemption is the field employees of the Soil Conservation Service, and the Production and Marketing Administration, which provide conservation assistance to the farmers and ranchers. Field employees means all agricultural employees at the county level, including office help. But the employees above the county level are not exempted under my amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The appraisal of land is a seasonal occupation. Would your amendment exempt employees of the Farm Credit Administration and the Farmers Home Administration?

Mr. JENSEN. It exempts all seasonal and casual employees at the county level.

Mr. Chairman, I now have explained the difference between this amendment and the other similar amendments which I have offered and which the House previously has adopted, except in the last proviso where certain unnecessary language has been stricken which appeared in my other amendment of this nature.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just wanted to point out that there is some difference in your amendment as offered today and the amendment you first offered to the first appropriation bill, which was the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. You have eliminated from your amendment casual and seasonal workers. That was the same type of thing we had in the Labor and Federal Security Administration bill, under the Pure Food and Drug Act, where we hired temporary employees for mosquito control, which is the control of malaria in this country, and the gentleman refused to eliminate that and he refused to eliminate the Pure Food and Drug Administration, as he has eliminated the meat inspectors today, which does more for the health and protection of the food that we eat than any other agency.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to elaborate on (d) and also on (g).

Exception (d) is recommended because unhampered seasonal employment authority is essential for handling of peak loads of work which occur in the production of woody plants and grass seed; application of conservation practices, and in farming operations on the research stations. Also in the case of fires on woodland and grassland areas owned by the Government, continuing authority must exist for on-the-spot employment of firefighters.

In connection with exception (g) I want to call attention to the report, page 13, Soil Conservation Service, Salaries and Expenses, which indicates that by the end of the fiscal year 1952 that 300 new soil-conservation districts will have to be served with somewhat less money than was available in the 1950 fiscal year. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture in his Memorandum No. 1278—Coordination of the Department's Agricultural Resources Conservation Services—dated February 15, 1951, has assigned the responsibility for the technical phases of the permanent type soil conservation work on the lands within a county to the Soil Conservation Service technician assigned to that county. This is deemed a highly desirable move on the part of the Secretary since it is aimed at assuring technical services to the agricultural conservation program of PMA for which we are appropriating a very considerable sum of money even with the cut recommended.

Thousands upon thousands of farmers have proved that the surest and safest way to get and maintain high level production from our land is by practicing conservation farming. These same farmers have learned that they use less gas and oil, have less wear of their tractors and farming tools and that they waste less water, time, fertilizer, and seed when they farm the conservation way. A continuing high level farm production is a direct part of defense mobilization, and therefore, the conservation job must go on throughout the entire emergency period. For these reasons I have exempted the field employees—which means employees at the county level—of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance direct to the farmers and ranchers. This exemption will of course also cover the clerical personnel in the field offices.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized to close debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I know it is exceedingly popular, and as we come to the conclusion of this debate, I want to say that I hope I have not said things during the consideration of this bill which appeared to be a little sharp, but this is much more serious than the case of where you are just registering a protest against the number of Government employees. The Congress set the number of employees and the number of days and hours per week which they should work. But during this war the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has attempted to exempt those that he can foresee might cause some trouble, but he cannot foresee all of them and he has not.

During this war emergency and in the changed conditions in the last several years we have got several thousand airplanes coming into this country every day from all parts of the world. They are not like ocean ships that have to land at the shore; they land over inside the country, and one out of three has got some insect or something that will do us harm if we let it get loose in this country. This means that even though we have held the total number of inspectors just as tight as we know, it means that only one out of four who may retire, or die, or go into the Army, can be replaced under this bill.

There are other examples just exactly like that. Let me read what this will mean in some instances: Of 153 offices of the Market News Service 103 are filled with only two people; one of these is a market reporter who develops data by visiting market places during trading hours, and the other is a clerk who stays in the office.

Of the 1,614 local offices of the Farmers Home Administration, 1,095 are staffed by only 2 people, a farm management supervisor and a clerk. Do you mean by this amendment that where the supervisor goes into the service for the next year that you can fill only one out of four such vacancies? Are you going to cut the Market News Service? Are you going to cripple all these organizations and stations which are run by two or three people?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that this amendment permits transfers within the agency. They can do anything they want to; they can take 10 men or a hundred men.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield further. You can if you have the people to take, but when the total number has been reduced as low as it is now, where are you going to transfer them

from? You have got to have some place to transfer them from.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What would happen in the case of the forest-fire lookouts during the summer season and fall when the forests are dry? It could mean possibly very large losses.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to be absolutely fair; I want to say that my friend has exempted seasonal and casual workers. But we have got about a thousand forest-ranger districts staffed by permanent employees. During this fear of war we are afraid we may have some atomic bombs dropping on the country, and we have to make a constant effort to obviate damage to our public domain. What are you going to do? Only one out of four forest rangers who are separated from the service can be replaced. The gentleman says you can transfer them. Yes; transfer them from some other district, and what would that mean?

Then you have meat inspection; meat inspection is exempted; everybody is scared to fool with meat inspection. But we still have this amendment applying to our inspectors of livestock in the lots; they are not exempted from the provisions of this amendment.

Hog cholera research, where the work is carried on by one man cooperating with State experimental stations in the various States. Now, listen; you farmers know well how every year on our subcommittee one man after another wants something; to one it is tobacco; to another it is grapes; to another it is something in Lower California; little one- and two-man stations which are vital to an industry in a given area.

My friend by his amendment would say that only 1 out of 4 vacancies could be filled. What confusion it would cause. He says we could take them from elsewhere in the agency; we have not got them in the agency.

If you defeat this amendment, you are not voting to keep this Federal employment at a high rate. The record shows that since 1940 we have reduced the permanent employees of the Department of Agriculture from 808,000 down to less than 65,000. That is a good record. Do not close up house on your little stations in this country and then ask why the folks are getting on your back in your industries or you will be in trouble at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 123, noes 108.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. JENSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 135, noes 93.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week as well as next week, if he can so inform us.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the completion of the bill under consideration today there will be no program for the remainder of the week. I will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

On Monday next there will be the call of the Consent Calendar with one suspension on S. 435, war-risk insurance for air commerce. I understand there is a unanimous commitee report, and it is quite important to get it through. There is no change in organic law to speak of, but it was not out of committee for 3 days to get on the Consent Calendar. The chances are that it will go through by unanimous consent, but I will put it down as a suspension, thus advising the Members that it will come up in any event.

There is a conference report which, if filed, will come up, but I do not know whether it will come up on Monday or not; if the chairman of the committee desires, it will come up on Monday.

If there are any roll calls, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and I have conferred and agreed that they will go over until Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is quite all right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tuesday and thereafter, until disposed of, we will take up H. R. 3791, the India emergency food relief bill, and after that H. R. 314, the Booker T. Washington Hospital of the Veterans' Administration. Any other program for next week, if any, will be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The India relief bill has 6 hours for general debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 58, line 5, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 410 (a) Except as hereinafter provided, reductions in each appropriation, reappropriation, loan and contract authorization or reauthorization contained in this act are hereby made in the total amount resulting from the application of the percentages indicated herein to the amounts of obligations for the fiscal year 1952, if any, included in the President's budget estimates on which each such appropriation, reappropriation, loan and contract authorization or reauthorization is based, for the following objects:

"Travel, 20 percent.
"Transportation of things, 10 percent.
"Communication services, 10 percent.
"Rents and utility services, 10 percent.
"Printing and reproduction, 10 percent.
"Other contractual services, 10 percent.
"Supplies and materials, 10 percent.
"Equipment, 10 percent.
"Lands and structures, 10 percent.
"Grants, subsidies, and contributions, 10 percent.

"(b) Amounts specifically authorized in this act to be transferred from one account to another, and limitations on such transfers, shall be subject to reduction as specified in this section only before such transfer is made, such reductions to be based on the schedules of obligations by objects, wherever appearing in the President's budget estimates, relating to such amounts.

"(c) For the purposes of this section the term 'President's budget estimates' shall be deemed to include the annual budget for the fiscal year 1952, any supplemental estimates transmitted to the Congress, and any information related to such budget or supplemental estimates.

"SEC. 411. The reductions provided for in this chapter shall not apply to the following:

"(a) Trust funds.

"(b) Funds received as payments in advance or otherwise for supplies furnished or services rendered.

"(c) Funds for Government corporations other than those made available in this act for administrative expenses or by direct appropriation for the general fund of the Treasury.

"(d) Amounts provided in this act for payment of obligations incurred under prior appropriations or authorization, and obligated balances of reappropriations.

"SEC. 412. Reductions below the amount of the President's budget estimates as made by any other section of this act in any appropriation, reappropriation, loan or contract authorization or reauthorization, or transfer authority contained herein shall be credited toward the respective reductions directed by this section."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It requires the exercise of additional duties not required by any other law. Further, it is not protected by the Holman rule because any retrenchment of expenditures by the amendment is purely speculative, for any cuts are to be made on the basis of the figures in the President's budget. You cannot look at the bill and at the amendment and tell whether the amendment would reduce expenditures. This means it is speculative, and is not protected by the Holman rule. The bill now pending before the committee specifies certain amounts for specified purposes. There is nothing in the bill before us which would indicate in the least whether it is a reduction, addition to, or anything else as far as the President's budget is concerned. The amendment which has been offered attempts to make reductions on the basis of figures in the President's budget, but that is not before us. I respectfully submit that while there may be retrenchment under the Holman rule, it has to be entirely apparent on the face of the amendment, rather than speculative. Therefore, the amendment is not saved by that rule.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. The reductions are absolutely specific in every instance, and the amount to which the reduction would apply is absolutely specific. Therefore, it is not speculative in the slightest degree. The reductions that are submitted

are in different items of services, and other expenses that relate to the bill. There is no question at all of any speculation of the requirement of additional duties anywhere.

Mr. WHITTEN. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, duties additional to those imposed by any other law are required under the terms of the amendment—they are required even to effectuate the provisions of the amendment. The amendment does not name amounts or page and line numbers. Someone has to try to figure out how much money would be appropriated by the bill if the amendment were to become a part of the bill. That surely imposes on someone the duty of making computations, and the imposition of such duties is clearly sufficient to bring the amendment into the category of legislation.

Who can look at the bill before the House and look at the amendment which is before us and state the amount by which the amendment reduces the bill, if any? I cannot state the amount the amendments reduces the bill, or whether it reduces the bill. I may think it makes a reduction and a retrenchment—the author of the amendment may be confident that it does so. But under the precedents of the House if there is any doubt about retrenchment, then the amendment cannot be protected by the Holman rule. Notwithstanding the fact that the amendment starts off by saying that reductions are made, it would be necessary in order to compute the amount of the reductions to use something that is not here—it is not before us. In fact, some of it does not even exist.

Subsection c of the amendment says that the term "President's budget estimates" shall be deemed to include the annual budget and any supplemental estimates transmitted to Congress and also any information related to such budget or supplemental estimates. Those supplemental estimates can come here a month from now, and we can be confident that there will yet be amendments to the budget for 1952. They could reduce the budget as well as increase it. How can you base reductions on something that does not ever exist yet? The amendment itself defines the term President's budget estimates" to include "any information related to such budget or supplemental estimates." If I publish a statement showing the objects of expenditure for every item in this bill to be zero—and say that it is the way some people would want it—would that not be "information related to the President's budget estimates"? If that information conflicts with the budget submitted by the President, which prevails? How could there be a more vague and indefinite reference?

Now tie all this in with the last proviso of this amendment. That states that reductions below the amount of the President's budget estimates as made by any other section of the act in any appropriation, et cetera, shall be credited toward the respective reductions directed by this amendment. The committee cut this bill 12.2 percent below the budget before it. If you credit this cut made by the committee to the reductions directed by this amendment, I believe you would have a net increase in the bill as it now stands. How does that work out so as to retrench expenditures? Surely, any retrenchment is speculative, and under the precedents that means the point of order must be sustained.

Under the precedents and the rules, the Chair may look only to what is properly of record in the pending bill, which is the bill under consideration, the law of the land and the practice of the House. The budget is not here—in fact some of it may not even exist yet, under the definition in the amendment itself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has already referred to it, but I would like to emphasize that the budget of the President and the budget estimates in relation to the Department of Agriculture are not before the House of Representatives. The House is now considering a bill, and the estimates as contained in the budget are simply sent here and referred to the Committee on Appropriations for its consideration as a piece of evidence and no more. We are not considering the budget estimate. We are considering a bill. How an amendment can relate to budget estimates and yet be germane to the pending bill is not quite clear to me. It seems to me that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Mississippi is well taken on the two grounds he has mentioned, that it is not a limitation of expenditures for the reasons he has stated and also that it is not saved by the Holman rule.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the amendment before me, but I recall there is reference in it to cutting the bill. But the formula used in cutting the bill is in relation to the President's budget and by applying the provisions of the amendment to that budget. I respectfully submit that while there may be that reference in the amendment to cutting the bill, it does not change the force of the argument which I advanced that the budget is not before the House and therefore the amendment is not in order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard a little further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the President's budget was submitted to the Congress about the 20th of January, and of course it is presently before the Congress. The intent of this amendment is to reduce travel expenditures where they are above 20 percent below the President's budget on that item of traveling. On the other things it is absolutely specific. It does not in the slightest degree or in any case increase an item, but it would prohibit an expenditure of more than a certain percent on each item below the President's budget as submitted to us. There can be no question but what it is entirely within the purview of the rule and that it is entirely specific and does not require additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard just briefly?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to call the attention of the Chair, if I may, to the fact that, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has said, the President's budget is a part of the official records of this House and is used constantly by the House as a guide and an official document. This amendment that has been submitted by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] simply places a limitation upon the appropriation bill and gives a directive as to how the funds shall be expended, using as a guide only the figures set out in the President's budget. Therefore, the amendment should be in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I be heard, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The point is made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that the budget is before the Congress. That does not hold true in this instance, because this is not the House meeting as the House. It is the Committee of the Whole, and the Committee is meeting to consider a bill having to do with appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

After very serious study on this amendment, the Chair is of the opinion that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the question then arises as to whether it is protected by the Holman rule. That rule requires the legislation to make a retrenchment of expenditures beyond doubt. Since this amendment operates against the budget estimates rather than the amounts in the bill, the question of retrenchment is speculative.

Therefore, the Chair holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is legislation upon an appropriation bill and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry my amendment was not ruled germane. My approach to this is entirely apart from agriculture or any other field. The fact remains that the Department of Agriculture is the only department according to the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report that has accomplished zero percent of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The recommendations all lie along the line of improving the administration of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am in accord with some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. However, I cannot help but say that I doubt that you ought to saddle that on the Department. The Congress has to change the law. For the time being they have to operate under the law as it is.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not agree with that. A great many recommendations can be made and a great many reductions should be made through administrative procedure. Further it behooves the executive department to submit something to Congress in the way of recommendations to act upon. In fact the Reorganization Act calls upon the Executive to submit reorganization plans to the Congress.

The Hoover Commission recommendations for the Department of Agriculture would save about $80,000,000. The amendment I sought to offer would have reduced the budget by about $70,000,000, which would have been in accord with the idea of the Hoover Commission to put the Department on a business basis.

Further, I want to state that unless the Congress is ready and willing to do something, when a department has so thumbed its nose at the people's desire for economy and efficiency, and this Congress, by refusing to comply with any of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and has a zero percentage of compliance, there is no chance of ever controlling Federal expenditures. Something should be done by this Congress. One thing that can be done is when an appropriation bill comes around we can cut the appropriation and so accomplish that purpose. That was the purpose of my amendment.

The amendment I proposed to the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1952 would have reduced the appropriation in the President's budget estimates by $89,000,000. With the amendments proposed heretofore and adopted this would result in a net cut of around $70,000,000 in the bill. The cut is a percentage cut across the board on all administrative items plus a percentage cut on the general item "Grants, subsidies, and contributions" as set out on page 1123 of the hearings before the subcommittee.

The wording of this amendment is the result of some considerable study and research on the part of various persons interested in it. It seeks to eliminate the objections raised to the Thomas-Taber amendment in Senate conference in the Eighty-first Congress. Furthermore, it is restricted to an appropriation bill for a single department and is accordingly itemized.

I cannot understand the Chair's ruling in light of these facts and the further facts that the President's Budget is set out in both the subcommittee printed hearings and the printed report No. 421 accompanying H. R. 3973.

Frankly, on general principles, I am opposed to percentage cut amendments. They are too apt to cut the good along with the bad.

However, I support this amendment on the very strong basis that the Department of Agriculture according to the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report is the only Cabinet department in which no basic recommendations of the Hoover Commission have been applied by legislation, reorganization plan, or administrative action. The committee, of which I am a member, Executive Expenditures, has the job to further the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Most of you have read the very detailed report of the Hoover Commission and its active subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture. It was made by men who knew their field. It is fair and it is sound. It is estimated that at least $80,000,000 could be saved annually by the Department of Agriculture if its recommendations were adopted. Furthermore, an annual rescission of $135,000,000 could be made to the Federal Treasury and $2,530,000,000 returned to the Treasury almost immediately through liquidations, and relinquishment of certain borrowing powers.

The question before the House, as I have said, is this, are we going to permit a department of the executive branch of our Government to thumb its nose at the people and the Congress in these days when we so badly need to restrict waste and inefficiency?

What will be the effect on the executive branch of the Government if this Congress permits a governmental department to get by unchecked when it has a zero record of compliance with sound recommendations for efficiency and economy, which incidentally will not impair any of the services now being performed, but in fact will enhance them through more efficient operation? Will there be any incentive for the further compliance by the Federal agencies with the Hoover Commission recommendations if the Congress sits idly by and fails to take the one kind of action it has available? That action I need hardly state is to cut the appropriation of the agency when the opportunity comes around. The opportunity is now here.

In my opinion a vote for this amendment is a vote for the Hoover Commission's objectives. A vote against this amendment renders ineffectual the great work of this Commission and of the Congress which set it up.

The subcommittee's cuts, it should be noted, have little or nothing to do with the cuts proposed in this amendment: $80,000,000 of the subcommittee's total cut of roughly $100,000,000 concerns three items: a $32,700,000 item which merely changes the bookkeeping and the other two items which cut back specific programs—see schedule pages 32 and 35 of subcommittee report.

The amount proposed to be cut from Agriculture's budget by this amendment is less than the amount that Agriculture can save by putting its house in order. Let me read the general findings of the Hoover Commission on the deficiencies of the Department of Agriculture:

Our task force on agricultural activities enumerates the following faults in the organization of the Department:

(a) Its rapid growth has resulted in some 20 different offices reporting directly to the Secretary, causing an unnecessary diffusion of authority.

(b) The Department has grown to its present size without sufficient integration of its parts and with considerable overlap and duplication. It is a loose confederation of independent bureaus and agencies.

(c) There are agricultural activities in other parts of the Government which overlap and duplicate those of the Department of Agriculture.

(d) The Cooperative Extension Service established by the Federal Government and the States for educational purposes is being increasingly bypassed by several of the bureaus and agencies of the Department.

(e) With the rapid growth of new activities, many field organizations at State and county levels have developed. Their work results in duplications, overlappings, and often conflicting policies. They confuse and multiply the difficulties of the farmer in his relations to the Department.

(f) The Department has organized a variety of local advisory committees at the county level, and their members tend to become local administrators of uncoordinated agencies instead of advisers.

(g) The inspection of agricultural products for protection of the consumer and the farmer is scattered through many agencies of the Government, and the resulting confusion requires producers and manufacturers to comply with regulations issued by agencies of two or more departments or administrations.

(h) The present systems of budgeting, treatment of intradepartmental funds, and earmarking of recurring funds have the cumulative effect of obscuring bureau expenditures and of promoting waste.

(i) The services and policies of the several farm credit agencies overlap. Their organization is contrary to sound banking principles. Some of them make loans which require costly individual supervision.

CONCLUSIONS

These recommendations, if accepted, would result in the elimination of overlap and conflict. They are designed to give greater efficiency and economy to the administration of the Department. Estimates, which are admittedly approximations, have been made of the amounts which might be saved by taking the actions recommended. The tabulation on page 95 of the report of our task force on agricultural activities reveals that the total specific annual savings in operating expenses by functional reorganization, as estimated by the task force, amount to over $44,000,000.

Further, by adoption of our recommendations as to credit agencies an annual saving of more than $36,000,000 can be made to the Government, the Government losses on loans can be lessened, and the Government capital now employed by lending agencies can be reduced.

Consequential returns can be made to the Treasury of funds now in the hands of agricultural credit agencies, and by the reduction of borrowing authorities.

This Commission believes useless duplication to the citizen will be eliminated, and economy to both the Government and the citizen will result from these recommendations.

If ever there was an opportunity to put yourself on record for efficiency and economy, it was now. However, the adverse ruling by the Chair has deprived us all of this opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

COST OF RAISING BEEF

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been charged that representatives of the livestock-producing industry made a very bad case for themselves in a recent public meeting here in Washington. It is charged that they were unable to answer

certain questions regarding the cost of producing livestock. However, there is another delegation in Washington at this time, headed by Frederick Sherer, president of the Nebraska's Feeder Association, who has presented a full study and analysis of beef-production costs to many Members of the House and the Senate. The final calculations of the study were made by a committee of the association, with William S. Brown, of Sioux City, Iowa, livestock market, as chairman. This study gives full detail in nine exhibits, and the explanations of these exhibits, in my opinion, answer most of the questions which were not answered at the recent public hearing here in Washington. Mr. Sherer and his associates are appearing before the House Committee on Agriculture and also the House Committee on Banking and Currency, during which time the beef-production costs will be explained in detail. Fearing, however, that very few Members of the House will be given the opportunity to study these exhibits, I include the explanations as part of my remarks:

"When you can measure what you are speaking about, and express it in numbers, you know something about it; but when you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind."—Selected.

With this thought in mind the following exhibits have been prepared to show the costs involved in cattle-feeding operations. From a study of these exhibits a measure can be made on the over-all costs involved in cattle feeding. One of the basic fallacies of Ceiling Price Regulation 23 dated April 30, 1951, issued by the Office of Price Stabilization is the lack of consideration given to the costs involved in producing the gain on cattle in the feed lot.

EXPLANATIONS OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No. 1. This exhibit is a recapitulation of basic data obtained from 20 different farmer feeders. These men prepared individual forms and the costs shown in this exhibit are actual costs as per their own experience. Out of some 300 separate cost sheets submitted, 20 were selected for the basis of this exhibit. These were more or less selected at random but an effort was always made to take the most conservative and reasonable set of costs for this study. In most cases the operations studied consisted of cattle now actually in the feed lot and are being headed for the late spring or summer market.

Exhibit No. 2. This exhibit is set up on the basis of an analysis of cost components and is comparable to a cost accounting sheet of a factory operation. All figures used are based on the data spread in exhibit No. 1. In a sense exhibit No. 2 is a study of a beef factory and should be analyzed as such. It should be noted that the gain cost in this exhibit is $35.619 per hundredweight to break even and $36.643 per hundredweight in order to yield a profit of $23.26 per head. This $23.26 per head is about 5 percent of the break-even cost of the finished steer which costs $424.96 per head to build. If the formula of cost plus 10 percent were followed, the steer should show a per head profit of $42.49. To yield this, it would have to sell approximately $2 per hundredweight higher than the figure shown of $36.643, the necessary selling price required to recover out-of-pocket expense and provide a profit of $23.26 per head. The Ceiling Price Regulation 23 order reflects around a 20-percent roll-back on selling prices as of October 1, 1951, compared to actual selling levels the date of issuance of the order, April 30. Yet, no provision is made to roll back the gain costs 20 percent. Many experienced cattle feeders state that this gain cost will increase, not decrease. (See last paragraph of Exhibit No. 8) if such is the case, production will be sharply curtailed and in some instances stopped.

Exhibit No. 3. This exhibit is a per head breakdown of costs based on the factual information gathered from the farmer feeder. This is the same information on a per head basis as shown in exhibit No. 2. This exhibit follows the same pattern of set-up as the form prepared by the feeder himself, and is a composite on the 1,742 head shown from the 20 different operations on a per head basis. The provision for a profit of $23.26 per head is very low and many operators would not be satisfied with this, nevertheless, in the lots tested this in the mean figure resulting from the actual figure specified by the men themselves.

Exhibit No. 4. This exhibit shows the break-even cost calculation, also the total amount to be recovered. The basis for these calculations appear in exhibits Nos. 2 and 3. The miscellaneous calculations in this exhibit show that the per bushel yield of beef to be 7.3 pounds. This yield would not be possible except for the fact that some of the operations used in these exhibits (No. 2 and No. 3) are a grass-feeding project which of course, "stretches" the corn. Such a yield from 1 bushel of corn would not be possible in a late fall or winter-feeding program when no grass is available. It is interesting to note that the average daily gain is 2.27 pounds which shows the operators made no attempt to minimize the gain for the feed fed.

Exhibit No. 5. This exhibit is a spread of factual information taken off of actual reports turned in by 18 different feeders. The 18 lots tested in this and exhibit No. 4 are separate and apart from those shown in exhibits No. 2 and No. 3. The purpose of this exhibit is to show that costs are much higher in certain operations than others, particularly so when contrasted to those used in the first three exhibits. Note that the cost of gain on these cattle is $43.60 per hundredweight. These cattle were fed strictly in the dry lot (no grass) and high-priced rations.

Exhibit No. 6. This exhibit shows the per head analysis of costs involved based on data in exhibit No. 5. This exhibit compares to exhibit No. 4, only on different lots of cattle tested. This calculation shows that the animal must sell for $38.30 to recover out-of-pocket expenses and produce a profit. By comparison this shows that gain costs to break even are $43.60 per hundredweight compared to $35.62 in exhibit No. 4. It has to be admitted that the cattle tested in exhibits No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4 show very low costs and are very conservative; also that the experiences of many other feeders show that out-of-pocket costs are much higher.

Exhibit No. 7. This exhibit is self-explanatory. The main difference between this exhibit and the preceding is that this reflects a completed operation. Note dates of the feeding period. These costs are actual experience of a commercial operator in Nebraska. Note that the gain cost is $39.70 per hundredweight on 2,162 head out of 6 different lots.

Exhibit No. 8. This exhibit is self-explanatory and also reflects a completed operation of a commercial feeder in Colorado. Note his per hundredweight gain cost of $40.99 to break even.

Exhibit No. 9. This exhibit shows the selling prices of live cattle at the various dates as indicated in the column headings. The prices that become effective August 1, 1951, are 4½ percent lower than the May 20 level. The October 1, 1951, price schedule is around 4½ percent under the August 1 level. The October 1 level will reflect approximately 120 percent to 125 percent of parity according to ceiling price regulation 23.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Naturally, I accept the ruling of the Chair. But I respectfully say, in view of the possibility of a similar point of order, any time in the future, what I tried to say to the Chair before he ruled: If he will look on page 1 of the bill he will see that when a bill comes to this floor it carries with it a report, and the report number is printed on the face of the bill. The report, accompanying H. R. 3973, on page 34, carries the figures of the President's budget, and compares them with the figures in this bill. Therefore, I tried to say to the Chair that the President's budget is a part of this bill before us.

I am afraid this ruling is an example of the effect of the so-called functional budget, and suggests one difficulty of saving money under a functional budget. I think that is something for us to consider as other bills come to the floor.

INCREASE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to me to know that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is at the present time conducting hearings on amending the Railroad Retirement Act. Probably no group of people in the United States are more in need of immediate consideration by the Congress than those unfortunates living on fixed incomes in this time of inflationary pressures. Those who are receiving benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act are, of course, among this group and are suffering great hardship.

I feel certain that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce made up as it is of experts in the field of railroad retirement, will expeditiously report a bill granting relief for the railroad pensioners. It is my sincere hope that in framing a bill that the committee will give serious consideration to the problem of men who have retired under the railroad retirement system who have wives to support. As we all know, the Congress in its wisdom, in amending the Social Security Act in 1939, recognized the additional financial responsibility of an annuitant burdened with the responsibility of caring for a wife. Therefore, in the social security field we have established a principle of allowing a married annuitant a financial consideration to enable him to meet his responsibility.

H. R. 3669, as proposed by the Railway Labor Executives' Association, takes steps to correct this problem as it affects railroad employees. This bill makes an allowance for the spouse of an annuitant of one-half his annuity up to a maximum of $50. It seems to me only fair that the Congress apply the same principle in the field of railroad retirement that it has seen fit to apply in social security.

There is no question but what the needs of single annuitants and married annuitants are dissimilar. Consideration for the wife in the manner prescribed by H. R. 3669 is an equitable approach. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will adopt this feature when it reports a bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a further brief announcement to the House. It was intended to bring up this afternoon House Resolution 158 to authorize the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of the said committee. Instead of bringing that up there will be called up House Concurrent Resolution 100, to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantini Brumidi. I understand there is no objection to this resolution. House Resolution 158 will be called up on Monday.

I wanted to make this announcement so the Members would understand the situation.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Jensen amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 58, after line 4 insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or position required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) to meet inspectors;

"(f) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(g) to field employees of the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration who provide conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers.

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. JENSEN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with but that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on this I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 153, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—216

Aandahl	Crawford	Hoffman, Ill.
Abbitt	Cunningham	Hoffman, Mich.
Abernethy	Curtis, Mo.	Holmes
Allen, Calif.	Curtis, Nebr.	Hope
Allen, Ill.	Dague	Horan
Andersen, H. Carl	Davis, Ga.	Hull
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Tenn.	Hunter
Andresen, August H.	Davis, Wis.	Jackson, Calif.
Andrews	Dempsey	James
Arends	Denny	Jarman
Armstrong	Devereux	Jenison
Auchincloss	D'Ewart	Jenkins
Ayres	Dolliver	Jensen
Bakewell	Dondero	Jonas
Bates, Mass.	Donovan	Jones, Woodrow W.
Battle	Doughton	Kean
Beall	Elston	Kearney
Belcher	Engle	Kearns
Bender	Fallon	Keating
Bennett, Mich.	Fellows	Kennedy
Berry	Fenton	Kilburn
Betts	Fisher	LeCompte
Bishop	Ford	Lovre
Blackney	Forrester	McConnell
Boggs, Del.	Frazier	McCulloch
Bolton	Fugate	McDonough
Bow	Fulton	McGregor
Boykin	Gamble	McVey
Brambiett	Gathings	Mack, Wash
Brehm	George	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ohio	Golden	Martin, Mass.
Bryson	Gossett	Mason
Budge	Graham	Meader
Buffett	Gross	Merrow
Burleson	Gwinn	Miller, Md.
Burton	Hagen	Miller, Nebr.
Busbey	Hale	Miller, N. Y.
Bush	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morano
Byrnes, Wis.	Hand	Morton
Camp	Harden	Mumma
Canfield	Harris	Murray, Tenn.
Case	Harrison, Va.	Nelson
Chenoweth	Harrison, Wyo.	Nicholson
Chiperfield	Hébert	Norblad
Church	Herter	O'Hara
Clevenger	Heselton	Ostertag
Cole, Kans.	Hess	Patten
Cooper	Hill	Patterson
Cotton	Hillings	Phillips
Coudert	Hinshaw	Pickett
Cox	Hoeven	Potter
Crosser	Holifield	Poulson
Davis, Wis.	Howell	Preston
Dempsey	Javits	Price
Denny	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Devereux	Jones, Mo.	Quinn
D'Ewart	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rabaut
Dolliver	Karsten, Mo.	Rains
Dondero	Kelley, Pa.	Ramsay
Donovan	Kelly, N. Y.	Rhodes
Doughton	Keogh	Riley
Elston	Kerr	Rodino
Engle	King	Rogers, Colo.
Fallon	Klein	Rogers, Fla.
Fellows	Kluczynski	Rooney
Fenton	Lane	Roosevelt
Fisher	Lanham	Sabath
Ford	Lantaff	Sasscer
Forrester	Larcade	Shelley
Frazier	Lesinski	Sieminski
Fugate	Lind	Sikes
Fulton	Lucas	Smith, Miss.
Gamble	McCarthy	Spence
Gathings	McCormack	Staggers
Gavin	McGuire	Steed
George	McKinnon	Stigler
Golden	McMillan	Sutton
Gossett	McMullen	Tackett
Graham	Machrowicz	Thomas
Gross	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Gwinn	Madden	Thornberry
Hagen	Mahon	Trimble
Hale	Mansfield	Watts
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Marshall	Welch
Hand	Mills	Whitaker
Harden	Mitchell	Whitten
Harris	Morris	Wickersham
Harrison, Va.	Morrison	Wier
Harrison, Wyo.	Moulder	Willis
Hébert	Multer	Winstead
Herter	Murdock	Withrow
Heselton	Murphy	Yorty
Hess	Norrell	Zablocki
Hill		
Hillings		
Hinshaw		
Hoeven		
Holifield		
Howell		
Javits		
Jones, Ala.		
Jones, Mo.		
Jones, Hamilton C.		
Karsten, Mo.		
Kelley, Pa.		
Kelly, N. Y.		
Keogh		
Kerr		
King		
Klein		
Kluczynski		
Lane		
Lanham		
Lantaff		
Larcade		
Lesinski		
Lind		
Lucas		
McCarthy		
McCormack		
McGuire		
McKinnon		
McMillan		
McMullen		
Machrowicz		
Mack, Ill.		
Madden		
Mahon		
Mansfield		
Marshall		
Mills		
Mitchell		
Morris		
Morrison		
Moulder		
Multer		
Murdock		
Murphy		
Norrell		
O'Brien, Ill.		
O'Brien, Mich.		
O'Konski		
O'Toole		
Passman		
Patman		
Philbin		
Polk		
Powell		
Preston		
Price		
Priest		
Quinn		
Rabaut		
Rains		
Ramsay		
Rhodes		
Riley		
Rodino		
Rogers, Colo.		
Rogers, Fla.		
Rooney		
Roosevelt		
Sabath		
Sasscer		
Shelley		
Sieminski		
Sikes		
Smith, Miss.		
Spence		
Staggers		
Steed		
Stigler		
Sutton		
Tackett		
Thomas		
Thompson, Tex.		
Thornberry		
Trimble		
Watts		
Welch		
Whitaker		
Whitten		
Wickersham		
Wier		
Willis		
Winstead		
Withrow		
Yorty		
Zablocki		

NAYS—153

Addonizio	Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Hardy	O'Brien, Mich.
Allen, La.	Hart	O'Konski
Anfuso	Havenner	O'Toole
Aspinall	Hays, Ark.	Passman
Baring	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Barrett	Heffernan	Philbin
Bates, Ky.	Heller	Polk
Beckworth	Herlong	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Holifield	Preston
Bentsen	Howell	Price
Blatnik	Javits	Priest
Boggs, La.	Jones, Ala.	Quinn
Bolling	Jones, Mo.	Rabaut
Breen	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rains
Brown, Ga.	Karsten, Mo.	Ramsay
Burdick	Kelley, Pa.	Rhodes
Burnside	Kelly, N. Y.	Riley
Cannon	Keogh	Rodino
Carlyle	Kerr	Rogers, Colo.
Carnahan	King	Rogers, Fla.
Celler	Klein	Rooney
Chatham	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Chelf	Lane	Sabath
Clemente	Lanham	Sasscer
Combs	Lantaff	Shelley
Cooley	Larcade	Sieminski
Crosser	Lesinski	Sikes
DeGraffenried	Lind	Smith, Miss.
Delaney	Lucas	Spence
Denton	McCarthy	Staggers
Dollinger	McCormack	Steed
Donohue	McGuire	Stigler
Doyle	McKinnon	Sutton
Durham	McMillan	Tackett
Eberharter	McMullen	Thomas
Elliott	Machrowicz	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Thornberry
Feighan	Madden	Trimble
Fernandez	Mahon	Watts
Fine	Mansfield	Welch
Flood	Marshall	Whitaker
Fogarty	Mills	Whitten
Forand	Mitchell	Wickersham
Furcolo	Morris	Wier
Garmatz	Morrison	Willis
Gary	Moulder	Winstead
Gordon	Multer	Withrow
Gore	Murdock	Yorty
Granger	Murphy	Zablocki
Grant	Norrell	
Greenwood		

NOT VOTING—63

Adair	Dorn	Magee
Angell	Eaton	Miller, Calif.
Bailey	Ellsworth	Morgan
Baker	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Goodwin	O'Neill
Beamer	Granahan	Perkins
Bonner	Green	Poage
Bosone	Hall, Leonard W.	Redden
Bray	Halleck	Richards
Brooks	Harvey	Rivers
Brownson	Hedrick	Roberts
Buckley	Irving	Rogers, Tex.
Butler	Jackson, Wash.	Secrest
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson	Sheppard
Chudoff	Judd	Stanley
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Stockman
Colmer	Kilday	Vinson
Corbett	Kirwan	Wood, Idaho
Crumpacker	Latham	Woodruff
Dawson	Lyle	Yates
Deane	McGrath	
Dingell	Prouty	
Radwan	Scudder	Vail
Rankin	Seely-Brown	Van Pelt
Reams	Shafer	Van Zandt
Reece, Tenn.	Sheehan	Vaughn
Reed, Ill.	Short	Velde
Reed, N. Y.	Simpson, Ill.	Vorys
Rees, Kans.	Simpson, Pa.	Vursell
Regan	Sittler	Walter
Ribicoff	Smith, Kans.	Weichel
Richlman	Smith, Va.	Werdel
Robeson	Smith, Wis.	Wharton
Rogers, Mass.	Springer	Wheeler
Sadlak	Stefan	Widnall
St. George	Taber	Wigglesworth
Saylor	Talle	Williams, Miss.
Schwabe	Taylor	Williams, N. Y.
Scott, Hardie	Teague	Wilson, Ind.
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Thompson, Mich.	Wilson, Tex.
Scrivner	Tollefson	Wolcott
	Towe	Wolverton
		Wood, Ga.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. McGrath against.
Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Granahan against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Irving against.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Jackson of Washington against.
Mr. Crumpacker for, with Mr. Chudoff against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Green against.
Mr. Brownson for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Brooks against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Roberts against.
Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Redden against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Perkins against.
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. O'Neil against.
Mr. Goodwin for, with Mr. Deane against.
Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Bailey against.
Mr. Corbett for, with Mrs. Bosone against.
Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lyle with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Wood of Idaho.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Johnson.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill just passed the enrolling clerk be authorized to make any necessary correction of section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this House ought to work now and get out of here in July.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILBURN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I state to the gentleman from New York that there is no further legislation this week.

Mr. KILBURN. What about the aid to India bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is to be taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. KILBURN. Why not take it up tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter for the leadership on this side to program. It is done after consultation. All you are doing is to force the Members to come back here tomorrow to adjourn.

Mr. KILBURN. I will not object this time, but I am serving notice that we ought to work and get out of here.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are ready to work. We are caught up on everything.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is not anything to prevent any Member working on his committee work or attending to his office work, if he wants to work, is there?

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a resolution (H. Res. 235) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That PAT SUTTON, of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives of the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

CHARGES AGAINST DR. JOSEPH W. WEINBERG

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the dismissal of contempt-of-court charges against Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg in Judge Holtzoff's court, in my opinion, calls up an immediate need for a review of the case by the Department of Justice, as recommended by the Un-American Activities Committee by a unanimous vote that Dr. Weinberg be investigated with view to perjury indictment.

I have no quarrel with the ruling of Judge Holtzoff. I am not too familiar with the details of the contempt charge on which Weinberg was acquitted, but feel that the ruling was made on ample legal precedent. A reading of the testimony of Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg when he appeared before the Un-American Activities Committee in 1949 and 1950 should convince any fair-minded person that Dr. Weinberg is not cooperating with his Government providing all the details of his connections with Steve Nelson and other members of the Communist Party in the San Francisco Bay area during his employ in the University of California Radiation Laboratories as a nuclear physicist. A further reading of the testimony of witnesses before the Un-American Activities Committee, especially that of Mr. James Sterling Murray, would indicate that Weinberg had many connections with Steve Nelson and other Communist Party members, which he has thus far denied. So I urge the Department of Justice, with the help of the FBI, to renew their efforts to bring before a grand jury the full facts concerning Weinberg. It has been a year and 10 months now since the Un-American Activities Committee unanimously recommended consideration by the Department of Justice of Weinberg's testimony. We should not allow this matter to be delayed any further.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 3587, the third supplemental appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF NORWAY'S INDEPENDENCE DAY—A TRIBUTE TO THE NORWEGIAN PEOPLE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, today is an occasion of celebration on the part of a great people. It is the birthday of Norwegian independence. On May 17, 1814, at Eidsvold, Norway, the Norwegians obtained their own independence and adopted a constitution patterned somewhat largely after our own, which we adopted 27 years before.

My own State, and my own congressional district, know these people from Norway and their descendants, to as great a degree, I believe, as any other State. These immigrants of Norway readily assimilated and prized their American citizenship; they took great pride and an active part as American citizens, and their contributions are

recognized as of the highest order. They sought education; they were highly religious; they willingly shared responsibilities of citizenship and they were inculcated with a sincerity of purpose in their everyday lives that was most admirable.

When these early Norwegian immigrants came to America, they were not seeking an easy way of life. They took their families into the wilderness, and out of that wilderness carved their destiny. Their first construction was their homes, and then the building of schools and places of worship. The development of the great Northwest is due, in large part, to the Scandinavian people who came here to make their homes and become an integral part of America.

These sons of Norway who came here, were already inculcated with the principles of freedom, justice, and independence. They became a part of, and added to, our own American culture. They became governors, State legislators, and Members of Congress, and they received appointments to high judicial offices and educational institutions. Many of my colleagues of the House are of Norwegian descent.

Norway is a small country in the family of nations, and as a nation has been faced with the problem of sustaining its economy under adversity. The world was shocked on April 9, 1940, when Norway was overrun by the war machine of the Nazis. However, the spirit of these Norwegian people was never conquered and we all rejoice that Norway has been restored to her place of freedom. That fact, in the light of present world affairs, should be a lesson to any would-be aggressor with designs to conquer this great people.

I join with our fellow American citizens of Norwegian descent in congratulating Norway upon the occasion of her independence day. It is appropriate to extend to the Norwegian people the felicitations of one freedom-loving country to another.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was read, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1951.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The Clerk is in receipt of a motion to close the hearing and print the record without delay, by the contestee in the contested election case of *W. Kingsland Macy* v. *Ernest Greenwood* for a seat in the Eighty-second Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of New York, now in progress under the statutes relating to such cases.

Since this motion contemplates action which can only be directed by the House itself, the letter and accompanying motion of the contestee in this case are transmitted for consideration.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 100.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee, composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare plans for and to hold an appropriate ceremony in honor of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent many years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States and died as the result of a fall while working on the rotunda frieze, his last assignment in the Capitol. Such ceremony shall be held in the rotunda of the Capitol on July 26, 1951, the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, or on such other day as the committee herein provided for may designate. The committee shall extend invitations to attend the ceremony to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Ambassador of Italy, and such other public officials and persons in private life as the committee may select.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday and Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include a table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PMA

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call attention to statements made on the floor of the House today concerning the appropriation for PMA, or better known as AAA funds.

Because I was unwilling to pay millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury to owners of large tracts of land for conserving their own soil, it was suggested that I might be sniping at a farm program.

It seems to me, and I am sure the participants who get these large payments are in accord with my view, that they ought to be willing to reduce their payments to $750, because they would still get that much under my amendment, rather than ask the Federal Treasury for this money.

I have always favored more liberal payments to the little fellow, the one who now gets less than $50 for soil conservation, it being my contention that a man who would qualify for as much as $2,500 or as much as $1,000, ought to conserve his own soil without this extra help. So I ask those of you who are so much interested in the big payments this afternoon to take a look at a table I have inserted in the RECORD. I think you will agree with me that you have not done much for the ordinary, average farmer, even in this appropriation of a quarter of a million dollars.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an obituary notice of the death of Colonel Legendre, who was very active in Legion circles, and a great patriot.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the San Diego Union entitled "The Great Decline."

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and to include certain statistical material.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter to Mrs. Kee.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include appropriate material.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain statistics on beef production.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in three instances.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. POULSON) was given permission to extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include correspondence, a part of which he read.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article regarding a paralyzed veteran who has accomplished wonders, who has written music that has been played by the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the American Veterans of World War II of Atlantic, Iowa, and Walnut, Iowa, and a resolution adopted by this organization.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. ENGLE), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mrs. BOSONE (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO), for Thursday, May 17, 1951, on account of illness.

To Mr. STIGLER, for 1 week, beginning Monday, May 21, 1951, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; and

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 16, 1951:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke; and

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

On May 17, 1951:

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; and

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 21, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

458. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 26, 1950, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Lynn-Nahant Beach, Mass., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 134); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with eight illustrations.

459. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close Van Ness Street between Connecticut Avenue and Reno Road NW."; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

460. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of joint resolution 8 enacted by the Legislature of Hawaii, relative to restoring to its previous status under the control of the Territory certain Hawaiian home lands required for use by the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

461. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a letter relative to receipt of a motion to close the hearing and print the record of the contested election case of W. Kingsland Macy versus Ernest Greenwood for a seat in the Eighty-second Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of New York (H. Doc. No. 135); to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CARNAHAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador; without amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Sylvio Latino; with amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2208. A bill for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter; with amendment (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2406. A bill for the relief of B. H. Manley; without amendment

(Rept. No. 479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3950. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; without amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 15. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 4135. A bill to authorize adjustments of rentals paid for premises leased for use during a national emergency; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4136. A bill to enable the States to make more adequate provision for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 4137. A bill to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4138. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4139. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the acts of September 23, 1950, and September 30, 1950, providing financial assistance to local educational agencies so as to remove discrimination against larger school districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4140. A bill to change penalties for the sale of narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4141. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4142. A bill to authorize creation of a National Commission of Decency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4143. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4144. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4145. A bill to amend sections 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1309) and section 446 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1446); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4146. A bill to provide for the granting of financial aid to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4147. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4148. A bill to increase the amount of wages that may be earned by individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require the apportionment of Representatives among the several States on the basis of the number of citizens of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the agreements concluded in 1945 at Yalta and Teheran should be forthwith repudiated by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. Res. 231. Resolution expressing it to be the sense of the House of Representatives that Secretary of State Dean Acheson should be removed from office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 232. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to the estate of Robert D. Johnson, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 233. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and studies authorized by House Resolution 158; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. Res. 234. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the utilization of military manpower by the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, requesting the return to New Jersey and to other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the States for the administration of the employment security program, so as to provide adequately for administration of the unemployment compensation law in the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4149. A bill for the relief of Maria (Henriette) Zagrabowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4150. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to Ted B. Landoe and Roderic S. Carpenter; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 4151. A bill for the relief of Stevan Pivnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 4152. A bill for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4153. A bill for the relief of Isaac H. Shohet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 4154. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4155. A bill for the relief of the minor child, "Kim," a Korean war orphan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4156. A bill for the relief of Carmen Salvador and her daughter Ruby Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri:

H. R. 4157. A bill for the relief of Sister Helena Ginal, Sister Anna Szoldrska, Sister Anna Gluchowska and Sister Bronislawa Szewczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4158. A bill for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4159. A bill for the relief of Georgette J. Zacarias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4160. A bill for the relief of M'Dahoma Ahmed Kouva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 4161. A bill for the relief of Beatrice O. Haidostian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 4162. A bill for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4163. A bill for the relief of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires of Eastover, S. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4164. A bill for the relief of Danuta Resizke Birke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4165. A bill for the relief of A. D. Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 4166. A bill for the relief of Victor Manuel Escobar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 4167. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank Rea D. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4168. A bill for the relief of M. L. Brewer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

287. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of William W. Mitchell and others concerning abuse of Presidential powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by American Hard Rubber Co., Butler, N. J.; Woman's Club of Little Falls, Little Falls, N. J.; Paterson League for the Hard of Hearing, Paterson, N. J.; Raymond Pellington Unit No. 77, American Legion Auxiliary, Paterson, N. J.; Wanaque Borough Woman's Club, Wanaque Borough, N. J.; Saint Mary's Hospital Senior Guild, Passaic, N. J.; Hawthorne Junior Woman's Club, Hawthorne, N. J.; and Ladies Auxiliary William B. Mawhinney Post No. 1593, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hawthorne, N. J.; reaffirming faith in the American voluntary way to

safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally opposes any form of national compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

289. Also, concurrent resolution passed by New Jersey State Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to return to New Jersey and to other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the States for the administration of the employment security program, so as to provide adequately for administration of the unemployment compensation law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

290. By Mr. MILLER of New York: Resolution unanimously adopted by the United Polish Organizations at a mass meeting commemorating the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, May 3, 1791, held at the Polish Home in Lackawanna, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

291. By Mr. HART: Petition of United Automobile Aircraft Agricultural Implement Workers of America to cancel regulation issued by President Truman and Gen. Lewis Hershey granting blanket deferment to college students etc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 21, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father of all mankind, whose paths are mercy and truth, before the white splendor of whose purity every vileness must shrink away: Lift us, we pray Thee, above the immediate and temporary and set our lives in the wide horizons of abiding verities. As Thy servants, and the people's, in this temple of democracy, save us from the perversion of power that has not Thee in awe. In this day of destiny for us and for the world may we be worthy of our vocation as keepers of the sacred flame. Teach us so to live and so to toil and so to speak as we play our part, in this age on ages telling, that we may face with clear conscience the gaze of our contemporaries and the judgment of posterity. May our attitudes and hopes widen every area of good will within the reach of our influence. In these darkened days may our own spirits be as a beacon of hope amid the encircling gloom of despair. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 17, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 18, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen; and

S. 166. An act for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House, having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; and

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1227. An act for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLLAND was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today, Tuesday, and Wednesday of this week.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been requested by the chairman of committee on committees of the minority, my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], to present an order which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Mr. BENNETT be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

That Mr. MCCARTHY be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with the action of the majority steering committee I send to the desk an order which I ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations as a member of the majority, and excused from further service as a member on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; and

That the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Banking and Currency as a member of the majority, and that he be also assigned to service on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the order?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not quite understand the order. I ask that it be read again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it again.

The order was again read.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now understand the order. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, was consent given for a committee meeting?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Which one?

Mr. MCFARLAND. The Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHERRY. Will they continue to meet this afternoon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Consent has been given for the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations to meet this afternoon.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the committees will probably not remain in session later than 1 o'clock.

Mr. O'CONOR. It was the understanding, in making the request, that the session would not continue for any appreciable length of time. However, there was some very important information which had to be obtained in a very short time.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 39)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the Department of the Interior, in the amount of $4,550,000, fiscal year 1952, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 52

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to amend the Social Security Act to permit a higher ratio of matching of public assistance payments in the Territory of Hawaii by virtue of a higher cost of living in that jurisdiction

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii pays its full share of Federal taxes into the Federal Treasury of the United States of America in the same manner as one and all of the 48 States; and

Whereas the cost of living in the Territory of Hawaii is consistently and appreciably higher than that in the States, as evidenced and recognized by the United States Government through its increased differential in wages and salaries to all Federal classified employees now working in the Territory and, in addition, by the higher price differentials which are being established through the Office of Price Control and which results in the placing of a heavier burden on the people of this Territory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-sixth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to amend the Social Security Act, as amended by Public Law 734, the Eighty-first Congress, to provide that in matching public assistance payments made by the Territory of Hawaii to its needy residents, the Treasury of the United States shall pay to the Territory of Hawaii—

For old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended with respect to each needy individual who at the time of such expenditure is eligible for such assistance in accordance with the existing provisions of the Social Security Act, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any such individual for any month as exceeds $60:

A. Three-fourths of such expenditure, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $24 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who receive old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to the disabled, for such month, plus

B. One-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause A;

For aid to dependent children an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children, not counting so much for such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $32.40, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $32.40 with respect to one such dependent child and $21.60 with respect to each of the other dependent children, and not counting so much of such expenditure for any month with respect to a relative with whom any of the dependent children is living as exceeds $32.40:

A. Three-fourths of such expenditures not counting so much of the expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $14.40 multiplied by the total number of dependent children and other individuals with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid for such month, plus

B. One-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause A; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Social Security, and each of the two Houses of Congress of the United States.

EXCISE TAXES ON AUTOMOBILES—RESOLUTION OF LOGAN COUNTY (N. DAK.) AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Logan County, N. Dak., Automobile Association, relating to excise taxes on automobiles.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas excise taxes on automobiles on a $2,000 car is approximately $475; and

Whereas it is proposed that at this juncture the excise-tax increases be made from $95 to $265 on a $2,000 car; and

Whereas the House Ways and Means Committee, this week, are considering excise-tax increases as hereinbefore indicated; and

Whereas the Logan County Automobile Association has given careful time and considerable consideration to this attempted tax and excise increase; and

Whereas this considerable tax increase will work unwonted harm and hardship and excessive expense to the cost of an automobile and the sale thereof; and

Whereas the item of an automobile is at this time a most lucrative form of excise tax, and already paying disproportionate amount of excise tax into the coffers of the United States Treasury; then, therefore, resistance is made by the Logan County Automobile Association to the further tax and excise increase, and of record this resistance is made felt; and

Further, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the State Senators and Representatives to Congress from the State of North Dakota at Washington, D. C., urging them to oppose this excise tax increase attempt on the ground of exhorbitancy of tax on new automobiles; and

Further, that request is made of said Senators and Representatives to effect contact with the undersigned chairman and state what action was taken by him thereon and in conformity with this resolution made.

Done this 25th day of April 1951.

ANTON BITZ,
Chairman, Logan County Automobile Association.

SURVEY OF FLOOD-CONTROL MEASURES, WINONA AREA, MINN.—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF WINONA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of Winona, Minn., on May 11, 1951, requesting an immediate and complete survey of flood-control measures necessary for the Winona area.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the recent flood of the Mississippi River has caused great damage to the property of the city of Winona, Minn., and of its residents; and

Whereas in the judgment of this council it is imperative that proper steps be taken for the prevention of future flood damage to the city of Winona; and

Whereas the city engineer has made certain recommendations for the prevention of future flood damage to the said city of Winona: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Corps of Engineers of the United States Government be requested immediately to make an immediate and complete survey of flood-control measures necessary for the Winona area; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Chief Engineer of the United States Corps of Engineers, St. Paul District, St. Paul, Minn.

Passed at Winona, Minn., May 11, 1951.

WILLIAM P. THEURER,
President of the City Council.

Attest:

ROY G. WILDGRUBE,
City Recorder.

Approved this 11th day of May, 1951.

J. ROLAND EDDIE, *Mayor.*

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. SMATHERS), members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted minority views on the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, which were ordered to be printed as part of the majority report (No. 314).

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. MALONE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LONG and Mr. SMATHERS), members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted minority views on the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, which were ordered to be printed as part of the majority report (315).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 21, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1227) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Force Officers' Training Corps.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1505. A bill for the relief of certain alien refugees;

S. 1506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Richard Rosenthal;

S. 1507. A bill for the relief of certain alien refugees; and

S. 1508. A bill for the relief of Wazir Ali Bhuyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1509. A bill for the relief of the Hotchkiss Sales Company; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1510. A bill for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; and

S. 1511. A bill for the relief of Erna Hannelore Narr and Helene Ursula Narr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1512. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1513. A bill for the relief of Thorvald Nin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 1514. A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of lobsters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INVESTIGATION OF POLICY RELATING TO PRESERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES OF ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution calling for a study by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Federal policy of withholding and reserving from use land, forest, mineral, and other valuable resources of Alaska.

The recent census report shows that the number of farms in the entire Territory of Alaska has declined from 623 to 525 during the past 10 years. Either figure is far less than the number of farms to be found in a single average county within the 48 States. I believe that one fact emphasizes how urgent it is that some measures be taken to open up the resources of the Territory and stimulate their development and use.

Until that is done, any discussion of statehood is beside the point, in my opinion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 141) submitted by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas a reasonable degree of development of the resources of Alaska is absolutely necessary both for the attainment and the success of statehood; and

Whereas of the principal Alaskan industries gold mining, fishing, and agriculture have all declined rather than increased during the past decade; and

Whereas no new industries other than Government construction have been established in Alaska for many years; and

Whereas Federal policies of reserving from private use the forest, mineral, agricultural, and fishing resources are a major element affecting the development of the Territory's resources; and

Whereas the prospect of the creation of additional Indian reservations in Alaska throws a cloud on the titles of all those who now or may hereafter hold real property there, and discourages investment in fixed assets; and

Whereas it is essential that the Congress establish a policy with respect to Federal reservations of the natural resources of Alaska to the end that these resources may be brought into productive use: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the policies of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government which are resulting in the reserving from use by private enterprise of the lands, waters, minerals, and other resources of Alaska, including but not limited to the Forest Service's policy with respect to forests, the Department of the Navy's policy with respect to petroleum, and the Department of the Interior's policy with respect to Indian reservations, mineral resources, and agricultural lands, for the purpose of determining what changes, if any, should be made in such policies in order to encourage private industry in Alaska. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the result of its investigation and study together with its recommendations.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CONNALLY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3573) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 100) to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

Address delivered by Senator MILLIKIN at the meeting of the Republican National Committee, at Tulsa, Okla., on May 11, 1951.

By Mr. STENNIS:

An address on the subject Our Purpose Is Peace, delivered by Senator KERR, at the annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Oklahoma, in Oklahoma City, Okla., on May 19, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Address delivered by him at a dinner in New London, Conn., on May 5, paying honor to Pat Sullivan, high sheriff of New London County, Conn.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

Address entitled "Every State Has Submerged Lands," delivered by Hon. Price Daniel, attorney general of Texas, at the Texas congressional dinner, Washington, D. C., on April 30, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Address on the subject of the Korean War and American policy in Asia, delivered by national commander of the American Legion Erle Cocke, Jr., at St. Louis, Mo., May 12, 1951.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

An address dealing with Latin American and Argentine affairs, delivered by James Bruce, former Ambassador to Argentina, before the Maryland Historical Society, on May 17, 1951.

Article entitled "Small Business: A Texan Learns Tricks for Survival After Federal Death Decree," written by Dewitt C. Morrill and published in the Wall Street Journal.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address on the subject Chinese-American Friendship, delivered by Hon. Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, at the China Institute dinner, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, May 18, 1951.

Economic study entitled "Small Business Fights for Survival," prepared by the Public Affairs Institute.

By Mr. LANGER:

An article entitled "Senator LANGER Was Well Pleased With Morale and Conditions at Rucker," written by Leroy Rolshoven, and published in the Mandan Pioneer of May 4, 1951.

An article entitled "Clear Channel Stations Blast NARBA Pact," written by Edwin W. Craig, and published in the May 1951 issue of the Julius Klein Newsletter, dealing with the North American regional broadcasting agreement.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

An editorial entitled "How Safe Is Public Opinion?" published in a recent issue of Spectacles, a publication of the students of Wilson Teachers College, Washington, D. C.

Tables marked "Exhibit H" and "Exhibit I," giving comparisons of tax rates and benefits received under the social security and railroad retirement laws.

By Mr. FREAR:

Statement issued by the Delaware Bankers' Association on the Program for Voluntary Credit Restraint.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Editorials regarding the universal training and service legislation, from the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, the Elizabeth (N. J.) Journal, the Providence (R. I.) Journal, the Baltimore Sun, and the Kansas City Star.

CELEBRATION OF I AM AN AMERICAN DAY IN BALTIMORE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, with so much talk these days, and a disturbing number of instances evidenced from time to time, of disloyalty to America and its ideals, it is refreshing and inspiring to be reminded, as I was yesterday at the I Am An American Day observance in Baltimore, of how great is the love of country and the high regard for its ideals among so many of our people.

Suggested some years ago by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, founder and publisher of the great chain of newspapers throughout the country, I Am An American Day has been a tremendous success from its inception, particularly in the Baltimore area. As an evidence of this I merely cite that yesterday there were nearly 25,000 persons in line, and crowds estimated to number up to 150,000 massed along the streets to review the parade, or gathered in a huge throng at Patterson Park.

At the park, following patriotic addresses by the mayor of Baltimore, Hon. Thomas D'Alesandro, and others, a large group of displaced persons took their

oath of allegiance to the United States, after marching valiantly in the parade. Merely to see those joyful new residents of our country participating so happily in this occasion, and to contrast their present enjoyment of American benefits with the utter lack of freedoms in their homelands, is to be impressed anew and forcefully with the priceless benefits attendant upon citizenship in this greatest of all countries.

With subversive elements within our country striving to undermine the love of country and respect for individual rights and freedoms which are the basis of American institutions, all who labored so much to bring about this inspiring spectacle deserve the commendation and thanks of our people, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, for his leadership in this movement and his continuing support of it from year to year; Mr. Aldine R. Bird, of the Hearst staff in Baltimore, who actually supervised the arrangements, and General Chairman Paul E. Burke, and United States Marshal Richard C. O'Connell, parade marshal.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing the nomination of John M. Allred to be postmaster at Collins, Miss., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the commemoration today of the seventieth anniversary of the founding of the American Red Cross should not be permitted to go unnoticed, in view of the outstanding service rendered our country and its people by this great organization.

Maryland is justifiably proud of the fact that the observance today will center in Glen Echo, Md., around the house used by Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross, as her early headquarters. In memory of this fact, the Montgomery County Chapter of the Red Cross is placing a plaque today in the Clara Barton House, a 32-room white clapboard home which actually was the national headquarters of the Red Cross from 1893 until 1904.

It is interesting to note that Clara Barton, who had worked as a volunteer nurses' aid in 19 battles of the Civil War, also contributed to the operation of the International Red Cross before the United States became a member. On May 21, 1881, she met with a group of friends here in Washington and formed the Association of the Red Cross, of which she was elected President.

From this humble beginning the Red Cross has grown to an organization of 1,600,000 volunteers, with more than 3,000 chapters. Moreover, by reason of the efficiency of its humanitarian endeavors, it has come to be the symbol throughout the world of the generosity of America.

On this, its seventieth anniversary, I am sure I speak for the Senate and for the people of America in offering sincere congratulations on a work well done, and earnest wishes for many more years of service to our country and to humanity.

THE MacARTHUR VIEWPOINT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to read at this time an editorial entitled "The President, General MacArthur, and Korea," which appeared in the Arizona Daily Star of May 1, 1951. The editor of the Star is Mr. William Matthews, one of our best-known Arizona citizens, who has in recent years traveled widely and has personally interviewed General MacArthur. In my judgment, Mr. Matthews makes points with which few can disagree, and I hope that this editorial will be widely read. I quote the editorial:

THE PRESIDENT, GENERAL MACARTHUR, AND KOREA

When, in his Washington and Chicago speeches, General MacArthur emphasized the need for what he called a realistic and positive Korean policy, he echoed the desires of most of the American people and gave renewed impetus to the formulation of such a policy.

The Washington administration must act in a more positive manner and act promptly. It must make its policy and the reasons for it clear to the American people. It wants victory just as badly as General MacArthur and the people. The dispute is how to win it.

General MacArthur recommends: (1) The use of Chinese Nationalist troops for an attack on the continent, (2) imposition of a naval blockade, and (3) bombing of military targets in Manchuria. By such a combination of military actions, he hopes to weaken the Chinese in Korea and win the military victory which will compel the Chinese to make peace by driving their armies behind the Yalu.

No one with common sense will dispute this plan of action, if its effects could be limited to Korea and air and sea support to the Chinese Nationalist invasion. The reason President Truman opposes is that he fears such a program will precipitate hostilities with the Soviet Union, and that support of the Chinese invasion will draw us into a war in China. In such circumstances, if the Russians keep their treaty, they would have to come to the aid of China.

If that would happen, much of our military strength would be pinned down in China, where we could not hope to injure the real source of Communist strength, which lies in the Soviet Union. Our Armies in Korea would be caught in a gigantic and costly evacuation.

That is the risk as the President sees it. President Truman is trying consciously and deliberately to limit the scope of a small war. He seeks a negotiated peace, rather than a military victory. He is trying to harmonize the American policy with that of the United Nations. He evidently hopes that determination to stay on in Korea, fighting an indecisive military action, will ultimately cause Peiping to accept a peaceful settlement which neither side could call a military victory.

General MacArthur's plan obviously widens the scope of the war and may expand it into a world-wide one. He says the military effort in the Orient would be a part of a global struggle. He thus does not minimize the prospects of war in Europe. He calls for a military victory, but assumes that a political victory will automatically follow. Who is right?

The Star believes the President is right so far. It does not believe that the military victory General MacArthur sets as an objective will bring peace with a revolutionary China. To the contrary, the Star believes it will give increased impetus to the cause of communism in China, just as allied intervention in France in the 1790's and in Russia in 1918–21 strengthened revolutionary forces of those days.

The Communist government of China will not sue for peace, when it suffers military defeat. It has been in existence in China for 20 years and more. Not all the might and power of the United States can conquer China and impose a peace. That is where General MacArthur makes a basic political mistake in his estimate and plan. China has always absorbed her conquerors.

What, then, should our policy in Korea be?

The Star makes the following recommendations, based on the underlying belief that our military forces should and must ultimately be withdrawn from Korea:

(1) Reinforce our army in Korea sufficiently to drive the Chinese armies back to the strongest natural line of defense that can be found in North Korea.

(2) Dig in along this line with a trench system, barbed wire impediments, and organized strong points, similar to what we did in World War I, but augment such a defense with mines and tank traps.

(3) Recruit and train Korean troops to man this system, but back it up with several armored divisions of U. N. forces to plug any gap that may be opened.

(4) Start the reconstruction of Korea, give the Korean people something to live for, stop coddling them as we have been prone to do, create an officers' corps, without which any defense of Korea in the future will be futile. If the Russians can organize and inspire the North Koreans to do what they did, why can't we do likewise?

(5) Make formal peace with Japan and allow her to develop her strength. This will lighten our own burden and help fill the vacuum of political power in the Orient.

(6) Proclaim our uncompromising determination to defend the line of the Aleutians, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, and Singapore by the use of our air and sea power. General MacArthur, in his speech before Congress, confirmed the military feasibility and wisdom of that.

(7) Never again land troops on the continent of Asia.

(8) Support guerrilla action of Chinese Nationalists so they can deal out some of the same kind of misery to the Peiping government that the Communists used to hand to the Nationalists.

(9) Maintain a friendly Chinese Government in Formosa in much the same way the British maintained Louis XVIII, to use when the time becomes more appropriate.

(10) Bear in mind that organized Communist power cannot be defeated in China, and can be defeated only at its source—in the Soviet Union.

Such a policy as outlined definitely seeks to limit our objectives and to accept a peace without victory. After fighting two world wars the American people should surely realize by now that military victory does not necessarily bring peace. Yet the above recommendations refuse to accept a defeat, but are militarily and politically feasible and within the limits of our strength.

Meanwhile, the war in Korea goes on. General MacArthur is due to testify before Congress, which is something he ought to have done at least 2 years ago. The chances are that Secretary Acheson is on the way out.

Events are thus carrying the country rapidly toward a decision. If we use restraint and wisdom, the influence of General MacArthur's return can generate a successful solution of this distressing problem. On the other hand, if we lose self-control, succumb to popular clamor, and make an impulsive decision representing wishful thinking, we can shout ourselves into perhaps the greatest cataclysm in all history, where we shall see in months—not years—what we call civilization destroyed before our very eyes.

ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN LAND BY ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 133)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
May 17, 1951.

The House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3096) entitled "An act relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk.

(For President's message, see proceedings of the House of Representatives of May 15, 1951, pp. 5374–5375, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the message lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the message from the President and the bill will lie on the table, and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, as the case may be, or his designee, shall come into agreement with the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to those real-estate actions by or for the use of the military departments or the Federal Civil Defense Administration that are described in (a) through (e) below, and in the manner therein described.

(a) Acquisitions of real property where fee title is to be acquired. The agreement to be reached with respect to the acquisitions described in this subsection shall be based on general plans for the project, which shall include an estimate of the total cost of the lands to be acquired.

(b) All leases to the United States of real property having an annual rental in excess of $10,000. In those cases where the project involves a group of individual leases, the agreement to be reached shall be based on general plans for the project, which shall include an estimate of the total cost of leasing such lands.

(c) Leases of Government-owned real property where the annual rental is in excess of $10,000, except that agreement with the committees shall not be required with respect to leases for agricultural or grazing purposes.

(d) All transfers of Government-owned real property under the jurisdiction of the military departments or the Federal Civil Defense Administration to other Federal agencies, or to States, including those transfers between the military departments.

(e) All reports of excess Government-owned real property to a disposal agency.

SEC. 2. This act shall apply only to real property within the continental limits of the United States, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. This act shall not apply to real property pertaining to river and harbor and flood-control projects.

SEC. 3. A recital of compliance with this act in any instrument of conveyance, including leases, to the effect that the requirements of this act have been complied with or, in the alternative, that the conveyance or lease is not affected by this act shall be conclusive evidence thereof.

SEC. 4. Section 407 of the act approved January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), and the second proviso contained in the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved April 4, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1951, and may be cited as the "Defense Land Transfer Act."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Arizona if he knows when the Senate may take up the veto message?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall have to consult with the chairman of the committee. He has not indicated to me. The only thing he wanted me to ask was that the message lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators on this side of the aisle are very much interested in it. If the consideration of the message were going over for a day or two, I could at least tell them that.

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall try to give notice.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Winthrop G. Brown, of the State Department, be permitted to occupy a seat on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Secretary will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the word "of", it is proposed to strike out "three" and insert "two."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.
Anderson	Eastland	Johnston, S. C.
Bennett	Ellender	Kem
Benton	Ferguson	Kerr
Brewster	Frear	Kilgore
Bricker	Fulbright	Knowland
Bridges	George	Langer
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Lodge
Byrd	Hayden	Long
Cain	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Capehart	Hennings	Malone
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Martin
Case	Hill	Millikin
Clements	Hoey	Monroney
Connally	Humphrey	Moody
Cordon	Hunt	Morse
Dirksen	Jenner	Mundt
Duff	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
McCarthy	Robertson	Stennis
McClellan	Russell	Taft
McFarland	Saltonstall	Thye
McKellar	Schoeppel	Underwood
McMahon	Smathers	Welker
Neely	Smith, Maine	Wherry
Nixon	Smith, N. J.	Wiley
O'Conor	Smith, N. C.	Young
O'Mahoney	Sparkman	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which is meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I believe that customarily committee amendments are considered first, but I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered first, before considering other amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may say that that is unnecessary.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that it is unnecessary. I was simply making a formal request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance has held extended hearings on H. R. 1612, a bill to extend the authority of the President to negotiate trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. It has reported the bill favorably with certain amendments. The committee amendments are recommended unanimously.

The trade agreements program has become a fundamental part of our foreign policy. It has been the instrument under which the United States has cooperated with other nations of the world in the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers. It has become to other countries the symbol of determination of the United States to continue its leadership and active participation in that work. It has been considered and renewed by the Congress six times.

I think it can fairly be said that this program commands the support of the

vast majority of the American people and of the Members of the Congress. While there has been some disagreement as to the merits of the way in which the program has been administered, there has been little disagreement with the basic validity of the principles which underlie it. We have long ago rejected isolationism in international trade and commerce. We realize that exports are vital to the prosperity of our industry and our farms and to the strength of our friends abroad. We understand that if we are to sell, we must buy. We know that a prolonged excess of exports over imports is not a favorable balance of trade. We know that we cannot be self-sufficient, and that it would not be to our best interests to be so, even were it possible. We recognize that a fruitful international trade is as vital to the prosperity of our own Nation and other friendly nations as domestic trade is to the various communities within our own borders.

So, what we are debating is not a matter of objective or of principle, but a matter of method. I think this has been clearly shown by the fact that while there have been closely divided votes in the Congress on many amendments offered in the successive renewals of the act, the final passage of the bill has been by ever-increasing majority in both Houses.

Therefore, I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss at any length the principles underlying the act or the reasons why it is important that it be continued. I shall make only two points in this connection, and shall then discuss the amendments which have been recommended by the committee.

The first point I should like to make is that the growing importance and influence of the United States in the world and the consequent increasing influence of our economic policies upon the economic and political situations of other friendly countries make it increasingly important that we maintain leadership in the work of building the kind of international trade in which the free nations can best prosper and the private enterprise in which we believe can have the best opportunity to flourish. This is true despite the difficult and disturbed conditions which exist today, because we must work to build not only immediate defenses, but the long-term strength and unity of the free world.

One of the major elements in this task is the effort to reduce unnecessary governmental barriers to international trade upon which so much of world prosperity depends. The United States has been a leader in this effort almost since the original enactment of the Trade Agreements Act. Great progress has been made, culminating in the agreements at Geneva, Annecy and now at Torquay—negotiations at which agreement was reached upon the tariff treatment of well over half the trade of the entire world. The results there achieved would not have been possible had it not been for the active participation of the United States.

It is not expected that there will be another major conference, such as those I have mentioned, within the life of the extension of the act. It is nevertheless essential that the act be extended to make clear the continued intention of this country to participate in whatever way is practical and appropriate in the improvement of international trading conditions.

If the Trade Agreements Act were not to be renewed, this would be far more than a failure to act. It would amount, in the eyes of the world, to a positive rejection by the United States of a liberal trade policy.

My second point is that although there are not expected to be any major tariff negotiations during the life of this extension, adjustments in existing agreements will, however, undoubtedly be desirable from time to time. Moreover, it is possible that it may be desirable to negotiate with one or two countries not represented at Torquay, either for their accession to the general agreement on tariffs and trade or bilaterally. It is also possible that some negotiations may develop in connection with efforts to promote greater integration in Europe which will involve some products in which we are interested and in which it would be to our advantage to participate on a limited scale. For this practical purpose, the President must have the authority conferred by the bill which is now before the Senate.

I have said that a number of questions have been raised in the past as to the way in which the program has been administered, and doubt has been expressed as to whether there have been adequate safeguards in the act itself against possible injury to domestic industry or agriculture.

It will be noted that the bill as reported contains a number of amendments. These amendments are designed to introduce into the law itself some of the safeguards which are already being employed as a matter of Executive discretion, and some new safeguards.

A number of the amendments proposed by the committee are based in the first instance on amendments adopted by the House. Others are suggested for the first time by the committee.

In the first place, the bill as passed by the House would have extended the act for 3 years. The committee believes that because of the uncertainty in the economic conditions of the world today, it would be desirable to review the operation of the act at an earlier date, and has, therefore, recommended an extension for only 2 years.

The committee has adopted the peril-point amendment approved by the House, with certain minor modifications designed to make clear that the Tariff Commission should not be in any way hampered in fulfilling its fact-supplying functions during and at the scene of trade-agreement negotiations. The Senate is already very familiar with this amendment, as it was debated in both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

The House-approved bill would have required the President to withdraw within 90 days the benefit of future tariff concessions from Communist areas. The Committee on Finance has broadened this amendment to include all concessions, past, present, and future, and has made the withdrawal of the benefit mandatory only when such action is practicable. It has also made it possible for the President, if he considers it advisable, merely to suspend the benefit of those concessions, so that countries which appear to be throwing off the yoke of communism may be quickly restored to most-favored-nation status.

The bill as reported by the committee contains an amendment dealing with the important matter of the escape clause and trade agreements. The committee believes that it has substantially improved the House amendment on this point by eliminating certain weaknesses which would have complicated its administration.

In general, this amendment is designed to allow the greatest possible freedom in the operation of existing and future trade agreements without resultant serious injury to domestic producers. It directs the President to insert an escape clause in all future agreements and, as soon as practicable, in all past agreements. He must report to Congress on action taken by him in this respect.

Recognizing, however, the varying situations which exist in our trade relations with different countries at different times, the committee places no time limit upon the President, and makes the principle of including the escape clause in existing agreements mandatory only if such action would be practicable. This is to make sure that no important interest in this country will be jeopardized by action which might be unwise or precipitate under the circumstances.

The bill as passed by the House directed the Tariff Commission to make an investigation when requested to do so by the President or any interested party or upon its own motion. The committee has strengthened this amendment by directing the Tariff Commission to make an investigation upon resolution of either House of Congress or of the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Ways and Means.

The committee has made substantial improvements in the House-approved amendment with regard to the factors to be considered by the Tariff Commission in determining whether imports are seriously injuring or threatening to injure any domestic industry. The reported amendment states that certain factors, without excluding others, are to be taken into consideration, but it does not require that those factors be conclusive evidence.

In its investigation, the Tariff Commission is to determine whether imports are entering in relatively increased quantities based on a representative period prior to the granting of the concession in question. The term "relatively increased quantities" is used in the broadest sense. It is conceivable that, because of a sharp decline in domestic consumption of a commodity, a domestic industry may be seriously injured by imports even though those imports were declining. The term "relatively" was used to allow escape action even though imports, as well as domestic output, are declining.

If, after the Tariff Commission has completed its investigation, the President does not take the escape action recommended by it, he must submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance stating why he has not made the adjustments or modifications recommended. The Tariff Commission, if it dismisses an application without a full investigation, must make and publish a report stating its findings and conclusions.

The Committee on Finance is also recommending two important amendments relating to agricultural products.

The committee did not approve the House amendment which would have prevented tariff concessions from applying to imported agricultural commodities being sold under a price-support program. It was felt that the intermittent application and withdrawal of price supports would make it impossible to make tariff concessions on the agricultural products concerned and therefore to get any worth-while tariff concessions from other countries on the agricultural products we send to them. It was felt that the uncertainties growing out of the operations contemplated by the House amendment would not help, but would rather interfere with and obstruct the normal trade in price-supported products and in the long run cost the United States more money.

The committee, however, adopted two amendments which were not in the House bill. The first of these recognizes that in the case of perishable agricultural commodities it may be necessary to take emergency action under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or under the escape provisions of this bill to prevent loss or material interference with orderly marketing. A provision to that effect has therefore been included in an amendment which provides that when emergency action is reported to the Tariff Commission and to the President as necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Tariff Commission shall make an immediate investigation and report and the President make his decision within 20 days after the Secretary of Agriculture has filed his report. The President need not await the report of the Tariff Commission if in his judgment the emergency requires earlier action.

Another amendment of great importance was the amendment suggested by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] which, as the Senate knows, had already twice been adopted by the Senate in connection with other legislation. This amendment is designed to protect the full operation of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which now, in subsection (f), contains certain limitations upon the full scope of its use by reason of the provisions of our trade agreements.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was wondering whether section 8 covered only perishable farm commodities. As I understand, it covers only perishable farm commodities. It does not apply to wheat or rye, excessive imports of which sometimes create a little trouble. Were there any demands to have the nonperishable farm commodities included in the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I will say there was very little demand. The farm organizations did not make such a demand. There was a demand to deal with the perishable commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. That would cover potatoes, apples, and tomatoes?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, potatoes, apples, and tomatoes, and various other perishables.

Mr. AIKEN. It would cover, would it not, perishable commodities that could easily demoralize the market?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. It was thought that the amended escape clause would give ample protection.

Mr. AIKEN. That is, section 7?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was discussing section 22, and I will restate a part of what I said because it is most important. Subsection (f) of section 22 contains certain limitations upon the full scope of its use by reason of the provisions of our trade agreements. That is, that was the way the matter stood before the amendment was recommended by the committee. The amendment recommended by the committee reverses this situation, and provides that if a case should arise where required action under section 22 would conflict with any trade agreement, then the action under section 22 shall prevail. The committee, of course, assumes that where a choice of remedies under section 22 makes it possible, the President will probably choose a course not incompatible with our foreign commitments.

The committee believes that these two amendments will provide important safeguards for our agricultural producers and will provide them with all the protection they need, without incurring the marked disadvantages for American agriculture which would have been involved in the House-approved amendment.

Finally, the Committee on Finance proposes an amendment restoring the right of domestic producers to appeal to a customs court if they feel they are being injured by the classification of an imported article, a right which had been terminated by the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934 insofar as products covered in trade agreements were concerned.

However, there has been an amendment of that act, section 516, which in the opinion of the committee justified the restoration of this privilege to the domestic producers; that is, the privilege of appealing from a classification ruling made by our authorities.

It also makes it clear that the passage of this measure will not indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The last two amendments are explained in the committee report and I need not take the time of the Senate to discuss them more fully.

It is my conviction, and I believe the conviction of the full committee, that the bill proposed will reaffirm the determination of the United States to participate fully in constructive leadership in the work of improving the conditions of world trade and will, at the same time, provide substantial improvements in the method of administering the program which will give all proper and reasonable safeguards to legitimate domestic interests. The safeguards contained in this measure are, of course, in addition to and not in substitution for the careful procedures already followed by the administration in the way of public notice, public hearing, careful administration and study, and so forth.

I am happy to advise the Senate that the recommendations of the committee are unanimous. I believe that it is the first time in the history of the trade agreements program that a unanimous report has been rendered on renewal of the Trade Agreements Act by the Committee on Finance.

It is the unanimous recommendation of the committee and my most earnest recommendation and hope that the bill, as amended by the committee, be passed.

Of course, from time to time, individual situations have been brought to the attention of the committee, and with respect to which the committee was impressed that the complainants were entitled to some remedy. With the amendments now in the bill it would seem to the committee, at least, that the way is open for corrective legislation in individual cases where really meritorious grounds have been established for relief.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for approval of all the committee amendments en bloc, with the full right, of course, of any Senator subsequently to move to amend or to disagree, as he would be entitled to do if we were to approve the committee amendments one by one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "three" and insert "two"; on page 3, after line 19, to strike out:

"SEC. 4. The Commission shall furnish facts, statistics, and other information at its command to officers and employees of the United States preparing for or participating in the negotiation of any foreign trade agreement; but neither the Commission nor any member, officer, or employee of the Commission shall participate in any manner (except to report findings, as provided in sec. 3 of this act and to furnish facts, statistics, and other information as required by this section) in the making of decisions with respect to the proposed terms of any foreign trade agreement or in the negotiation of any such agreement."

On page 4, line 7, to change the section number from "5" to "4"; on page 5, after line 12, to strike out:

"SEC. 6. As soon as practicable, but not more than 90 days after enactment of this act, the President shall take such action as is necessary to withdraw or prevent the application of reduced tariffs or other concessions (including the binding of an article on the free list) contained in any trade agreement

hereafter entered into under authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, to imports from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to imports from any nation or area thereof which the President deems to be dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement."

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

"SEC. 5. As soon as practicable, the President shall take such action as is necessary to suspend, withdraw, or prevent the application of any reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession contained in any trade agreement entered into under authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, to imports from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to imports from any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement."

On page 6, after line 9, to strike out:

"SEC. 7. (a) If in the course of a trade agreement any product on which a concession has been granted is being imported into the territory of one of the contracting parties in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting parties shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the concession in whole or in part, to withdraw or modify the concession, or to establish import quotas.

"(b) Upon the request of the President, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party the United States Tariff Commission shall make an investigation to determine whether any article upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement to which a clause similar to that provided in subsection (a) of this section is applicable, is being imported under such relatively increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry or a segment of such industry which produces a like or directly competitive article.

"In the course of any such investigation the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings, giving reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"Should the Tariff Commission find, as the result of its investigation and hearings, that serious injury is being caused or threatened through the importation of the article in question, it shall recommend to the President, the withdrawal or modification of the concession, its suspension in whole or in part, or the establishment of import quotas, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury.

"(c) When in the judgment of the Tariff Commission no sufficient reason exists for such a recommendation to the President it shall, after due investigation and hearings, make a finding in support of its denial of the application, setting forth the facts which have led to such conclusion. This finding shall set forth the level of duty below which, in the Commission's judgment, serious injury would occur or threaten.

"In arriving at a determination in the foregoing procedure the Tariff Commission shall deem a downward trend of production, employment and wages in the domestic industry concerned, or a decline in sales and a higher or growing inventory attributable in part to import competition, to be evidence of serious injury or a threat thereof."

On page 8, after line 6, to insert:

"SEC. 6. (a) No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession hereafter proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such relatively increased quantities (compared to a representative period prior to the concession) as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

"(b) The President, as soon as practicable, shall take such action as may be necessary to bring trade agreements heretofore entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, into conformity with the policy established in subsection (a) of this section.

"On or before January 10, 1952, and every 6 months thereafter, the President shall report to the Congress on the action taken by him under this subsection.

"SEC. 7. (a) Upon the request of the President, upon resolution of either House of Congress, upon resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party, the United States Tariff Commission shall make an investigation to determine whether any product upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such relatively increased quantities (compared to a representative period prior to the concession) as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

"In the course of any such investigation, whenever it finds evidence of serious injury or threat of serious injury or whenever so directed by resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings giving reasonable public notice thereof and shall afford reasonable opportunity for interested parties to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"Should the Tariff Commission find, as the result of its investigation and hearings, that a product on which a concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported in such relatively increased quantities (compared to a representative period prior to the concession) as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products, it shall recommend to the President the withdrawal or modification of the concession, its suspension in whole or in part, or the establishment of import quotas, to the extent and for the time necessary to prevent or remedy such injury. Within 60 days, or sooner if the President has taken action under subsection (c) of this section, the Tariff Commission shall transmit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives an exact copy of its report and recommendations to the President.

"(b) In arriving at a determination in the foregoing procedure the Tariff Commission, without excluding other factors, shall take into consideration a downward trend of production, employment, prices, profits, or wages in the domestic industry concerned, or a decline in sales, an increase in imports, either actual or relative to domestic production, a higher or growing inventory, or a decline in the proportion of the domestic market supplied by domestic producers.

"(c) Upon receipt of the Tariff Commission's report of its investigation and hearings, the President may make such adjustments in the rates of duty, impose such quotas, or make such other modifications as are found and reported by the Commission to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the respective domestic industry. If the President does not take such action within 60 days he shall immediately submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating why he has not made such adjustments or modifications, or imposed such quotas.

"(d) When in the judgment of the Tariff Commission no sufficient reason exists for a recommendation to the President that a concession should be withdrawn or modified or a quota established, it shall make and publish a report stating its findings and conclusions."

On page 11, after line 20, to strike out:

"SEC. 8. Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) No reduced tariff or other concession resulting from a trade agreement entered into under this section shall apply with respect to any agricultural commodity for which price support is available to producers in the United States unless the sales prices (as determined from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture) for the imported agricultural commodity within the United States after the application of such reduced tariff or other concession exceed the level such price support.'"

And on page 12, after line 7, to insert:

"SEC. 8. (a) In any case where the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to the President and to the Tariff Commission with regard to any agricultural commodity that due to the perishability of the commodity a condition exists requiring emergency treatment, the Tariff Commission shall make an immediate investigation under the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, or under the provisions of section 7 of this Act to determine the facts and make recommendations to the President for such relief under those provisions as may be appropriate. The President may take immediate action however, without awaiting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission if in his judgment the emergency requires such action. In any case the report and findings of the Tariff Commission and the decision of the President shall be made at the earliest possible date and in any event not more than 20 calendar days after the submission of the case to the Tariff Commission.

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(f) No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section.'

"SEC. 9. (a) The second sentence of section 2 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930,' approved June 12, 1934, as amended, is amended by striking out the word 'sections' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'section' and by striking out 'and 516 (b).'

"(b) Subsection (c) of section 17 of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 10. The enactment of this act shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the Executive Agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Will the distinguished Senator from Georgia please turn to section 7, page 2, of the committee report and from his profound knowledge of the entire complicated subject of reciprocal trade agreements favor us with his opinion on the following: If a pottery or glass factory in West Virginia should be shut down because of irresistible foreign competition, would it be possible under the pending bill, if it should become a law, for the employees as well as the employer to have the Tariff Commission make the investigation required by the circumstances of the case?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; entirely so, because it is expressly provided in this amendment that the application may be made by any interested party. Then the whole procedure under the escape clause comes into effect.

Mr. NEELY. Can the able Senator give us an estimate of the length of time required to obtain justifiable relief? Would it be a period of weeks, months, or years?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it is impossible to indicate the exact time; but under the procedure set forth it certainly ought to be made with considerable dispatch as compared with the procedure heretofore involved when an application was made invoking the escape clause in the Trade Agreements Act. More standards are provided. An effort is made in the escape clause to rationalize conditions as they actually are faced by our industries. Certain evidence is declared to be pertinent and may be admitted. It is not conclusive, and it is not exclusive of other evidence.

Among the standards set forth, it will be seen that the Tariff Commission, without excluding other factors, shall take into consideration the downward trend of production, employment, prices, profits, or wages in the domestic industry concerned, decline in sales, increase in imports, either actual or relative to domestic production, a higher or growing inventory, or a decline in the proportion of the domestic market supplied by the domestic producer. The bill provides that the escape clause may be invoked by either the House or the Senate, or by the Finance Committee of the Senate, or the Ways and Means Committee of the House, or by the Tariff Commission itself, and especially by any interested party to a trade agreement.

So it seems that at least it would be possible to contemplate a reasonable determination of the question and a reasonably early decision. I believe that such a result may with justification be expected.

Mr. NEELY. Does the distinguished Senator believe that if the bill should be enacted into law, the duration of a trade agreement injury to a glass factory or pottery would be reduced as much as 50 percent?

Mr. GEORGE. I think so. I think it would be quite possible to reduce the time, and to arrive at a final decision with reasonable dispatch.

Mr. NEELY. I sincerely thank the Senator from Georgia for the encouraging information he has most courteously supplied.

PRESIDENT'S POWER ABSOLUTE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I was about to yield the floor.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The committee amendments have already been adopted by the Senate. Does the bill, regardless of any of the amendments which were reported by the committee and which have been adopted, leave the matter of trade agreements to the discretion of the President, in the same manner as was true before the inclusion of the amendments? That is to say, if the President wishes to exercise his discretion and proceed with a trade agreement, without regard to the amendments, is it true that he may do so?

Mr. GEORGE. I think if the Senator will carefully notice the peril-point amendment, he will see that the discretion of the President is pretty severely restricted. There is no absolute discretion to disregard the findings of the Tariff Commission. With respect to that particular matter, if the President does not follow the recommendation of the Tariff Commission he must submit his report to the two tax committees of the Congress—and that means to the Congress, of course.

Mr. MALONE. Then, if he exercises his discretion and proceeds with a trade agreement, he may do so within the limits of the 50-percent reduction allowed him—the second 50 percent meaning approximately 75-percent over-all.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. Nevertheless, his discretion is considerably limited and restricted by this amendment, and is intended to be. It is further definitely restricted, as I see it, by the escape clause which has been inserted in this bill, because under the escape clause it would be quite possible for an industry actually threatened with an injury to escape. So I think when we consider all the amendments, we have placed a considerable restriction upon the power of the President to proceed arbitrarily—if it is assumed that he would proceed arbitrarily in fixing tariffs.

Mr. MALONE. It is an embarrassment rather than a restriction upon his going ahead, is it not? In other words, he may go ahead if he wishes to do so, but he must write a letter to Congress or to the committees explaining his stand, if he exceeds the peril points set by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. GEORGE. He must not only make a report, if he does disregard the peril-point provision, for example, but under the amendments the way has been opened, as I believe experience will demonstrate, for rather wide congressional action in the future in dealing with tariffs. It is true that the power would still rest in the President.

Mr. MALONE. The absolute power, that is?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MALONE. What would be opened up in the future for congressional action? Is it not correct to say that if we were to extend the act for two more years it would be opened up at the end of 2 years, and that is all?

Mr. GEORGE. The committee has recommended that the act be extended for 2 years only. The House recommended a 3-year extension.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I understand. Of course, Congress could repeal the act at any time within the 2 years, I suppose. However, under the bill there would be no opening up until the 2 years had expired. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. I did not quite understand the Senator's question.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator said that the way would be opened up for legislative action by Congress. The way would be opened only at the expiration of 2 years, in the same manner that it was opened at the expiration of the 3 years, when the act was formerly extended.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to invite the Senator's attention to a very important fact. Under the pending bill Congress would be able to initiate an escape clause action. It is a very important consideration. Such power would be placed in the hands of Congress. In certain other respects, particularly with reference to the Soviet Union and its satellite countries, the provisions of the bill would enable Congress to act, whereas at the present time it could not act without some embarrassment, at least, or hindrance.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Georgia will yield further, I believe he has now arrived at the result of the committee amendments, namely, that it would embarrass the President, or, at least, it would embarrass an ordinary President. Certainly there is no record of any embarrassment to the present President.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not use the word "embarrassment" in connection with the President. I said that under the provisions of the bill with respect to the Soviet group there might be a legislative remedy which, under existing law, Congress itself would not feel free to apply because of the existence of outstanding trade agreements which had been entered into. I was not referring to the President.

Mr. MALONE. We are talking about trade agreements. There are two categories of trade agreements. One category refers to trade agreements which have been made by the other countries of the world with Russia, under which they have been arming Russia and the satellite nations for the past 3 years at our expense. I presume the Senator from Georgia is referring to the trade agreements negotiated under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. If a movement were initiated by Congress under the escape clause, would the President be required finally to enforce the escape clause? Is there any such provision in the pending bill?

Mr. GEORGE. No; there is not.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, Congress could initiate an action but could not carry it through if the President did not approve?

Mr. GEORGE. He could stop it, but the action would be reported to Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that if the President did not give reasons which were satisfactory to Congress it could take the situation into its own hands and itself afford relief, which would have quite a deterrent effect on arbitrary action by the White House.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much. His statement is entirely correct under the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I believe there are a great many actions which Congress could take to correct an action taken by the Chief Executive. We have recently gone through such an experience. I do not believe the Senator will say it has been his observation that the President is easily embarrassed or easily scared when he thinks he has a policy.

In addition any legislation amending the act or affording relief independent of the President would have to be passed over his veto.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not discussing that point.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], injected that note.

Mr. GEORGE. Since, when application has been made invoking the escape clause, the way is opened for Congress to have a report from the President and his reasons, I assume that if he declines to follow the recommendations made, inasmuch as Congress would be free to act on them, it would be a very definite limitation upon the power of the President to disregard the recommendations for the escape clause.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, he will remember, I am sure, that for at least the 4 years during which the junior Senator from Nevada has been a member of this distinguished body the President has annually sent recommendations for this trick legislation. Now it is stated that the recommendation for the International Trade Organization, the ITO, has been abandoned. The junior Senator from Nevada doubts that it has been. However, if it has been abandoned, it is a fact that recommendation for passage had been on the President's "must" list for the past 4 years.

Mr. GEORGE. The committee has been advised that it has been abandoned; that is to say, that we would not be asked to approve it in any way.

ITO ADOPTED UNDER GATT

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Georgia is aware of the fact that the fourth chapter of the International Trade Organization has now been adopted under GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, insofar as it can be adopted without further congressional action, which is a long way I assure the Senator from Georgia. Therefore the necessity for the trade agreements themselves perhaps has largely disappeared.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say to the Senator from Nevada that I do not want to get into a discussion of that subject, because it is highly involved and probably would promote lengthy debate. However, GATT has been only provisionally accepted and only to the extent that it is consistent with our law. I believe that under the amendments we are trying to rationalize the trade agreements program, for reasons I think the Senator himself would consider to be very valid reasons. We are trying to work out a program which will transfer tariff making to the agreement side rather than leave it to the purely political considerations involved.

THE PRESIDENT HAS LAST WORD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, what it really boils down to in the last analysis is that the pending bill, including the committee amendments, does leave the power to act at the discretion of the President of the United States, the executive branch. This, judging by the manner in which the administration of the trade-agreement program has been handled, would mean that the Secretary of State would have the absolute last word as to whether or not the Government would go ahead with additional trade treaties.

Mr. GEORGE. That of course would be true so far as the President is concerned. However, by the amendments with reference to the peril point and the escape clause, there is placed a rather definite limitation, as I see it, not upon the absolute power of the President to act, but upon the making of that power effective as against the will of Congress.

ONLY SUGGESTED BY CONGRESS

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield further, let me say that then it is a matter which is suggested to the Congress. There is nothing in the bill or in the amendments is there, to require the President to do anything except make reports and write letters?

Mr. GEORGE. No; more than writing letters is required. When the peril points have been prescribed by the Tariff Commission, the President may disregard the Commission's recommendations, but then he must transmit to the Congress his reasons for doing so; and, of course, that means that the Congress has some further power of action. In a case where the peril point is invoked either by the House or by the Senate or by the taxing committees of the two Houses or by an interested party, the inquiry must be made by the Tariff Commission; and if the President again disregards the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, his reasons for doing so must be transmitted to the Congress; and, of course, the Congress then has the power to act.

So I think there is a limitation upon an absolute power, although the power actually is in the President to take final action.

Mr. MALONE. I agree thoroughly with the Senator that the President has final and conclusive power.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not say he has conclusive power; I think he has not.

Mr. MALONE. It is conclusive without further legislation.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me ask another question. In order for Congress to amend the act, Congress would have to override a Presidential veto, would it not?

Mr. GEORGE. That is true; but such a thing has been done.

Mr. MALONE. It has not been done recently.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT EXTENDS POWER OVER DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, House bill 1612, including the amendments adopted by the House of Representatives and the amendments reported by the Senate Finance Committee, is, when boiled down to its essentials, a proposal for an extension for a 2-year period of the absolute power of life or death over the workingmen and investors of this Nation by a thoroughly discredited Secretary of State.

Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as carried out by the State Department, a part of the executive branch of this Government, the regulation of our national economy, through regulation of our foreign commerce, is a subject of international negotiation, instead of being a matter handled by the legislative branch of the Government, as the Constitution directs. The act still provides for regulation of our foreign commerce by the executive branch of the Government in direct contravention of the Constitution.

SURRENDER OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER NOT BELIEVED LEGAL

Mr. President, there has been considerable doubt whether Congress has authority under the Constitution to transfer the power to regulate foreign commerce to the executive branch of the Government, and then, through international agreements, trade treaties, and other actions by the executive branch, to an international tribunal, even if that is not composed of a definite number of nations, as would have been the case under the International Trade Organization.

The GATT is almost as definite in respect to tariffs as the ITO would have been.

LET US CONSIDER THE CITIZENS AND TAXPAYERS

Mr. President, unaccustomed as the Senate has become to dealing with national issues within the legal and ethical framework of our Constitution, I cannot refrain from making a plea on behalf of the citizens of the United States—the 150,000,000 people who look to us to safeguard their welfare and who make the sacrifices incident to supporting their Federal Government and its activities.

I am well aware that it has become naive to concern oneself with the plight of the American workingman and the American taxpayer, just as it has become naive to place the interests of America

anywhere but at the bottom of the international donation list. But my conscience will not permit me to remain silent when the strength and prosperity of America are in jeopardy. "Jeopardy" is the right word to use in describing the situation brought about by the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act.

RECIPROCITY IS NONEXISTENT

Mr. President, there is no such thing as a Reciprocal Trade Act. There never has been, and the act does not operate in that manner. The phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in the act, and there is no indication that it was meant to be known as a matter of fact to bring about reciprocal trade.

TWO NATIONAL OBJECTIVES

It is no secret that most of the peaceful nations of the world have two conflicting objectives: First, they wish to safeguard their national liberty and sovereignty with the aid of America's industrial productivity; at the same time, they wish to better their own economic condition by underbidding American workers and American producers in their own backyard.

Both of these objectives are perfectly natural, and every nation should be allowed to compete in the world market, but they should not be allowed to compete unfairly.

I am going to be naive in another matter.

TEMPORARY LEGISLATION BECOMES PERMANENT AND FREEDOM TAKES A STEP BACK

I am going to assume that in our legislation the word "temporary" means temporary, the word "emergency" means emergency, and the word "expiration" means expiration.

There is little justification for my believing that these words really have those meanings, because I fail to recall a single piece of important emergency legislation passed since 1932, except the OPA Act, that has been temporary or has been allowed to expire on the day allotted for its interment.

Virtually every one of these acts has involved abandonment of constitutional responsibility on the part of the House and the Senate and has transformed it into arbitrary power in the hands of the administration.

The question as to whether some of these have been used wisely by the bureaus and by the White House has nothing to do with the basic error involved in their surrender by the people's elected representatives.

Liberty is far more easily surrendered to bureaucracy than it is recaptured. That truth should be apparent to the Senate after 18 years, Mr. President.

It is exciting and dramatic to surrender a liberty in an atmosphere of emergency and crisis. It is just plain hard, tedious work to mount the formidable force that is required to regain it. Power-hungry administrations know this, and rely upon the inertia and preoccupation of the legislative branch to leave their power intact.

However, as expressed in the old axiom, "A journey of a thousand miles begins with one step," and I propose that we take the first step now on the long journey back to the constitutional administration of our Nation, which would be an easy step to take; namely, to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on its allotted death day, June 12, next.

WHAT IS INTERNATIONAL TRADE?

I should like to say a few things about the nature of international trade.

These are obvious things, but they are easily overlooked in the confusion. In the first place, money has nothing to do with international trade. It is merely an exchange of natural resources and labor.

When any article is imported into the United States, we are importing as much unemployment as is represented in the manufacture of the article. By the same token, when something is exported from the United States, it means that some other nation is importing the amount of unemployment represented by the labor that has gone into its production. The dollar signs, the pound sterling signs, and the franc signs, that are used to measure exports and imports, do not tell the truth about the amount of employment that is involved.

Every nation tries to import its unemployment into other nations, but these efforts are not important if competition is on a fair basis. By a fair basis we mean that the other country hires our workers to make the exports to the same extent that we hire their workers.

The yardstick is the standard of living within the trading nations. The United States long ago outlawed the sweat shop within its borders, but the 1934 Trade Agreements Act reinstated sweat shop competition in the American economy.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY NO LONGER SUPREME

The time has passed when America is supreme in production. The power tools and the know-how that generated our strength—and, incidentally, which would never have come into being had it not been for the protection of American industry against foreign competition—are now becoming commonplace in most industrialized countries.

There is a world-wide wave of economic nationalism which is a result of the perfectly natural desire for every sovereign area to be economically self-sufficient. There is nothing wrong with this objective so long as it does not cripple the one country that must remain strong in order to preserve peace. It is completely unrealistic for us to regard our competitors as saints. As long as we are stupid enough to place ourselves voluntarily at a serious competitive disadvantage, we cannot expect them to refrain from cashing in.

AMERICAN RESOURCES NOT INEXHAUSTIBLE

There are many Americans—and there are apparently some in this chamber—who believe that American wealth and resources are inexhaustible; that we are the strong man whom no burden could crush. That is utter nonsense, "the bigger they are, the harder they fall."

I do not believe that anyone who supports free trade or its subtle variations would consciously give aid and comfort to the Kremlin, but there can be no doubt that anything that reduces America's economic self-sufficiency strengthens the enemy.

I have just as much sympathy and feeling of charity for the less-privileged nations as anyone has, but I have more sympathy for my own country. Charity begins at home, and the time has come to stop a form of charity that has become a racket.

Although wars are always unfortunate, America has been at least partially fortunate in that war emergencies have so disrupted the normal flow of trade as to prevent the full impact of this give-away scheme from falling upon the American economy. It is the sword hanging by the horsehair. We must remove it before it falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Mr. President, I desire to call up amendment numbered 1, which would substitute the Flexible Import Fee bill for the pending bill.

Before asking that the amendment be read, I wish to state categorically that any action under the bill including all amendments is still at the discretion of the president.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator desire at this time to offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

Mr. MALONE. I do. I shall ask unanimous consent to have the substitute considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order to consider it. As there is no other amendment pending, it is unnecessary to obtain unanimous consent.

The Senator may offer the amendment. Does he desire to have it read and printed in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. Before it is read and printed in the RECORD, I desire to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada may proceed.

AMENDMENTS LEAVE TOO MUCH POWER TO PRESIDENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I may say categorically that all amendments to the original act, including the escape clause and the so-called peril-point provision are effective only at the discretion of the President, and in no other manner. The effect of the legislation has not changed.

The argument has been made that without an extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for two years, or for any other stated interval, the manufacturers, the workers and the investors who are now affected by the trade agreements which have been made heretofore would be without a remedy.

SENATE BILL 1040 PROVIDED NEW ESCAPE CLAUSE

The Finance Committee of the Senate had before it the broadened escape clause. The committee could as well have reported it as a substitute for House bill 1612 as to have reported the escape clause amendment. A substitute bill was introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada and was before the Senate Finance Committee as Senate bill 1040. Since this bill, S. 1040, was not reported out, I introduced an amendment to H. R. 1612 which will have a similar effect. I shall ask this amendment to be called up at a later date.

Mr. President, I ask that my amendment in the nature of a substitute be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States economy;

(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports;

(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

(d) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(e) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 30, 1951, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

FORMATION OF FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. Title III, part II, section 330, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 330. Organization of the Foreign Trade Authority.

"(a) Membership: The United States Tariff Commission shall be reorganized and reconstituted as the Foreign Trade Authority (hereinafter referred to as the 'Authority') to be composed of six Directors to be hereafter appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The original Directors of the Authority shall be the same persons now serving as Commissioners of the United States Tariff Commission, each such person to serve as a Director of the Authority until the date when his term of office as a Commissioner of the United States Tariff Commission would have expired. Thereafter the term of office of any successor to any such Director shall expire 6 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed except that a Director appointed to fill a vacancy occurring for any reason other than the expiration of a term as herein provided shall be appointed only for the remainder of the term which his predecessor would otherwise have served. Directors shall be eligible for appointment to succeed themselves if otherwise qualified therefor. No person shall be eligible for appointment as a Director unless he is a citizen of the United States, and, in the judgment of the President, is possessed of qualifications requisite for developing expert knowledge of tariff problems and efficiency in administering the provisions of this act. Not more than three of the Directors shall be members of the same political party, and in making appointments members of different political parties shall be appointed alternately as nearly as may be practicable.

"(b) Chairman, Vice Chairman, and salary: The President shall annually designate one of the Directors as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman of the Authority. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in case of absence or disability of the Chairman. A majority of the Directors in office shall constitute a quorum, but the Authority may function notwithstanding vacancies. Each Director shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year. No Director shall actively engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a Director."

APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 331 (a), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Personnel: The Authority shall appoint a secretary who shall receive compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and the Authority is hereby empowered to employ and, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, fix the compensations of such special experts, examiners, clerks, and other employees of the Authority as it may find necessary for the proper performance of its duties."

ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 5. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding at the end of section 331 the following new section:

"SEC. 331A. Administration of trade agreements.

"(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Authority, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) The Authority is hereby authorized and directed—

"(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

"(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this act."

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 6. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 336. Periodic adjustment of import duties.

"(a) The Authority is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Authority finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Authority shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"(2) any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"(3) the policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"(4) increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"(5) the actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"(6) the probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices.

"(7) the degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies, excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Authority either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Authority until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"(d) The Authority, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of said act.

"(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Authority is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Authority shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Authority and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"(g) No order shall be announced by the Authority under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Authority finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"(h) The Authority, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on

the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

"(i) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'domestic article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term 'foreign article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"(2) the term 'United States' includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"(3) the term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"(4) the term 'landed duty paid price' means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"(j) The Authority is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

SEC. 7. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word "President" and substituting therefor the word "Authority."

(b) Subdivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Authority, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Authority, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry."

(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Authority has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Authority may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Authority shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exist."

CONTINUANCE OF PERSONNEL FUNDS, ACTIONS, AND SO FORTH

SEC. 8. Section 339 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 339. Effect of enactment.

"(a) All personnel, property, records, balance of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available (or to be made available) to the United States Tariff Commission shall be transferred to the Authority for use in connection with the exercise of its functions; and such transfer shall not operate to change the status of the officers and employees transferred from the Commission to the Authority. No investigation or other proceeding pending before the Commission at such time shall abate by reason of such transfer but shall continue under the provisions of this act.

"(b) Wherever in the Tariff Act of 1930, or in any other law, the terms 'United States Tariff Commission' or 'Commission' occur, such terms shall be construed to mean the 'Foreign Trade Authority' and the 'Authority', respectively."

REAPPLICATION OF SECTION 516 (c)

SEC. 9. Section 17, subsection (c), of the act of June 25, 1938, chapter 679, is hereby repealed.

STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

SEC. 10. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Foreign Trade Authority is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce, as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final."

REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

SEC. 11. The Authority, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect as of June 30, 1951.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

(At this point Mr. MALONE yielded to Mr. WHERRY to enable him to ask Mr. GEORGE a number of questions concerning the bill, following which a message was received from the House announcing its action on the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, whereupon the conference report was considered by the Senate, and debate ensued, all of which appears at the conclusion of Mr. MALONE's speech.)

AMENDMENT 1 SUBSTITUTES FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE PRINCIPLE FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada—that is, an amendment in the nature of a substitute—would simply substitute the flexible import fee bill for the sharpshooting horse-trading methods used by the State Department.

Again, the junior Senator from Nevada would like to state categorically that there has been no change in the bill, so far as the discretion of the President of the United States is concerned, the discretion of continuing to make such trades as he has already concluded under three trade conferences, the last one of which was at Torquay, England.

AMENDMENTS DO NOT CHANGE BILL

I want to say again, categorically, that there has been no change, that the bill, with the amendments reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate, is simply suggestive of certain things to be done by the President, which, if he does not choose to do them, leaves the Senate of the United States with no remedy except to pass a bill amending the Trade Agreements Act; which would then, of course, have to be passed over the Presidential veto.

The reasons given by many Senators for supporting this bill include the argument that it is impossible to pass anything else, over a veto. That, to me, is no reason at all.

SENATE HAS FOLLOWED ADMINISTRATION ADVICE

The Senate of the United States, since the junior Senator from Nevada has been a Member of it, has always accepted at face value legislation proposed by the administration, legislation coming to the Senate and to the House, as separate pieces of legislation, having no relation one to the other.

THE OBJECTIVE NEVER CHANGED

I want to say at this point, in my remarks, that, in the humble judgment of the Senator from Nevada, this is part of a well-thought-out scheme, and that the direction has never changed, from the beginning of the administration—not the beginning of Mr. Truman's administration, but beginning in 1934, when the act was first passed, which we are today debating.

The objective, the approach, has never changed, and the character and volume of the legislation coming across the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House has never changed.

PRESENT COURSE LEADS TO SOCIALISM

So, Mr. President, it is time that we added it up.

The junior Senator from Nevada has added it up several times in the past 4½ years. At this time there are at least five different approaches, all dovetailing to produce the objective of eventual socialization and nationalization of property in the United States of America.

We now have a socialistic government. There is a question at to how long we shall have to keep it, as to how to throw it off. We are following the British plan into complete socialization and nationalization of property.

TO MAINTAIN IN POWER: CONFISCATE PROPERTY

What are the various approaches, Mr. President? First, of course, it is recognized through 2,000 years of recorded history that whenever a ruler, a leader, or a dictator of a nation wanted to control his people thoroughly and completely, he took in all the material that was customarily used for money. On a desert island possibly the type of money used was a certain kind of shell. But whether it was that or some other kind of money, gold, or whatnot, it was taken over.

So, Mr. President, the first thing the administration did in 1934 was to remove the base from our money system and lock it up. Currency was then issued.

We hear a great deal of talk with reference to inflation and what a great effort the administration is making to prevent inflation.

Today is not the time to discuss that subject, but it will come, and very soon, because inflation is not being stopped, and no real attempt is being made to stop it.

With the base of our money gone, we printed for example, seven or eight billion dollars of new money last year, and there is a prospect of printing perhaps more this year.

The amount of money in circulation is a controlling factor in the inflation which we are encountering at the present time.

We are now directly dependent on greenbacks for money. They are not tied to anything.

NEXT STEP: LOSE OUR TARIFFS

What was the next step? Next came the breaking down of our tariff and import-fee system which had made it possible to preserve our standard of living.

For 75 years we had adopted the principle, in different degrees, of building our standard of living upon a tariff or import-fee system which makes up the differential between the living standards where our competition was located and the living standards in this Nation.

Mr. President, when we trade, if we want to be fair about it without dislocation of industry, we trade an hour's labor in our country for an hour's labor in some other country. If there is a different standard of living in the nation with which we are trading, if it has less income per hour and different productive power, how is the difference made up? How has it been equalized?

For 75 years it has been equalized in the only way Congress knew how to do it, namely, by a tariff or an import fee.

STEP 3: EXCESSIVE TAXATION

The next point, Mr. President, is taxation. We have legalized unlimited taxation through income and other taxes, including selling bonds and the resulting deficit financing.

WE FINANCE OTHER GOVERNMENTS

We do that not only to operate our Government now, but to finance foreign governments.

In other words, we started out with our lend-lease plan; then UNRRA; a British gift-loan of three and three-fourths billion dollars. We always call them loans to salve our conscience, just as we are doing today in connection with the pending bill, trying to cushion a troubled conscience with the peril point and escape clause.

We are offering these amendments in the nature of suggestions to the President hoping to salve our conscience while putting into the hands of a thoroughly discredited Secretary of State and his organization the fate of every working man and every investor in this Nation for two more years.

Then we had the Marshall plan, the ECA. As has been shown, we have been helping arm our enemies by means of those two great gift operations to foreign nations. Then point 4 is yet to come.

STEP 4: SUBSIDIES

Next, Mr. President, there are subsidies to take the place of tariffs and import fees, all paid for by the taxpayers of America.

We break down the tariffs and import fees through an irresponsible State Department without any regard to the differential in the standards of living to which I have referred, and then as the market becomes glutted with certain types of products, principally agricultural products, we vote a subsidy to take the place of the differential.

So, in reality, without any tariff or import fee to prevent imports from coming into this country under a fair and reasonable competitive standard, we just buy up the products; we stabilize the prices of foreign nations' agricultural products along with our own.

STEP 5: SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

We have a Securites and Exchange Commission which makes it impossible to sell stock in a new enterprise or to invest venture capital in a new enterprise unless certain hand-raised economists and engineers give the word.

Generally speaking, only the hand-raised engineers and economists can remain in office for any length of time, because the others get disgusted with the sharpshooting programs.

They say that if one is going to sell stock in a mine or other enterprise, he must know that the ore is there and that it will be profitable.

If a man is going to sell stock in some other enterprise, they must know that it will be a profitable enterprise.

It is their judgment that must be exercised ahead of time, not just the fact that a person selling stock is telling the truth to the person to whom he undertakes to sell the stock. That used to be sufficient but not for the SEC—therefore private venture investment capital is discouraged.

NORMAL ECONOMY CANNOT BE SUSTAINED

Mr. President, with those five approaches, the economy of this Nation is weakened and largely dependent upon subsidies and Government capital—or special Government concessions.

I make the statement now that it will be well known that we are in an emergency economy. To some persons it was well known 2 or 3 or 4 years after it started that that would be the result. We say we want peace. Mr. President, our economy would not stand up under the peace for which we all are praying. We could not exist 60 days if we had the peace. Our economy would crumble through the impact of the sweat-shop-labor competition.

NEED FOR GOVERNMENT "PARTNERSHIP" INCREASING

Mr. President, our hotels are filled with industrialists and others who have come to get taxpayers' money to invest in the new and enlarged plants which are needed for defense purposes. Why? The floor under wages and investments has been destroyed. Therefore they are taking no chances. They lost the investment in World War II, and now they are taking a leaf out of the book of the Government itself and getting the money from the taxpayers, through the Treasury of the United States, to finance the necessary industries, so they will lose the taxpayers' money, not their own.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. If I correctly understood the statement made by the Senator from Nevada a few moments ago, he feels that through the life of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the extension of it, recipient nations can produce goods and sell them in our market at prices which will make it favorable for them to send them to this country. In that way the workers in those countries are in competition with our own employed labor in this country. Is that correct?

MANY PRESENT TARIFFS ALREADY BELOW PERIL POINTS

Mr. MALONE. That is entirely true. Practically all the tariffs which have been tampered with are now below what is known as the peril point.

They are below the differential of cost of production, largely due to the differential in the standard-of-living cost.

An hour of labor abroad produces more in proportion to its cost than the labor here. There being no effective equalizer, then the product comes in and the labor represented in that product displaces the labor here, unless, through subsidies, which we have paid certain industries, we temporarily hold the economic structure until we get ready to let it go.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator explained the charts which are placed against the wall in the rear of the Senate Chamber?

Mr. MALONE. This might be a good time to do so.

DISPLAYS EXPLAINED

Mr WHERRY. One of the charts bears the following heading:

Comparative hourly earnings in manufacturing industries, United States and selected competitive countries.

I hope the Senator will give us an explanation of the point in which I am particularly interested. The first figure is that of the United States, $1.41. Then there are two other figures, followed by England (U. K.) 39 cents. Does that mean that in competing industries, the

same products can be made in England at 39 cents an hour, which cost in the United States $1.41 an hour?

COMPARATIVE WAGES—THREE CHARTS

Mr. MALONE. It means that men employed in manufacturing industries are employed in England at 39 cents per hour, in the United States at $1.41 an hour, in Canada, at 92 cents an hour, in Australia, at 62 cents an hour; in Germany, at 29 cents an hour; in France, at 21 cents an hour; and in Japan, at 12 cents an hour.

What this actually means is that if they have the same machinery, if they have the same opportunity in the various countries, then the difference in the wage actually represents the difference in the cost of the imported product.

If the labor in the various countries is not as efficient, then the factor of efficiency enters into this differential in the wage. But it is in no case as much as the differential in the wage, especially since we have for the last several years been paying for machinery sent to these countries.

Mr. WHERRY. The question I next wish to ask deals with that point.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to continue that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Excuse me.

TYPEWRITERS MADE IN JAPAN

Mr. MALONE. For example, Mr. James Rand is establishing a typewriter plant in Japan.

I do not know exactly what the hourly wage for workers in a typewriter plant is in New York, but I believe it is $1.50 to $2 an hour for skilled labor. In Japan such skilled labor is paid from 7 cents to 12 cents an hour.

It is true that ECA is not engaged in building up industries in Asia but UNRRA money was spent there. Mr. Rand has already transferred a factory to Scotland from New York.

Not only will that factory supply the market there, but will supply in part the market here. The result will be to displace labor in a similar factory in New York, as well as work to the disservice of the investor in the New York factory. Importations of typewriters into this country will affect other typewriter companies.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

EFFICIENCY OF LABOR OFTEN EQUAL TO UNITED STATES

Mr. WHERRY. In the case of the particular firm the Senator has mentioned, does it obtain production in Japan which is comparable to that in the United States? Or does the low wage paid in Japan mean that more persons must be employed in order to secure production equivalent to that in this country; that is, considering the production of one workman in the United States, must more persons be employed in the foreign country to produce the same amount?

The Senator has shown on the chart the hourly pay in various countries. Can employees in the United Kingdom, for example, produce at 39 cents an hour the same amount as employees in the United States produce at $1.41 an hour? Or is there a difference in the amount of work done per person in the various countries?

JAPANESE VERY EFFICIENT

Mr. MALONE. I will say that the Japanese workers are very efficient. The Japanese are just as efficient and just as productive if working on similar machines as are American workmen.

When a new factory is built in Japan by an American firm, machines of a similar kind to those used in American factories are installed, and the work is just as efficiently done as in this country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not read the testimony which was given in the House committee. I have simply read the report of the Senate committee. I have not had time to read through all the hearings. Does organized labor in this country, let us say the American Federation of Labor and the Committee for Industrial Organizations, favor the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? It would seem to me that exploiting the manufacturing in various foreign countries, and bringing the production of the factories back as merchandise to sell in this country would bring foreign labor in direct competition with American labor. Therefore I ask the Senator if the labor organizations support the extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

ORGANIZED LABOR IS WAKING UP

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, they do not support it. I shall read some communications I have received from labor organizations on that subject. I will say that the CIO does support it nationally but a branch of the CIO in Pioche, Nev., sent me a resolution condemning free trade.

I will first read a letter sent me by organized labor in Reno, Nev., as follows:

RENO CENTRAL TRADES COUNCIL

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: This communication will serve to confirm our many recent conversations with regard to the resolution submitted by you to the Reno Central Trades and Labor Council.

In order to clarify this situation, please be advised that organized labor, in Reno as well as throughout the State of Nevada, as represented by the Nevada State Federation of Labor, is definitely opposed to the use of "cheap" labor as it concerns foreign countries coming into competition with the labor market of our own Nation. We definitely feel that anything we, of organized labor, can be in a position to do to correct a situation of this nature, will be most beneficial to our country, and, that through our action, we actually will be assisting to raise the standards of other countries. It will also protect the families, the manufacturers, the taxpayers, the businessmen, and in general, the entire Nation, as it will eliminate the placing of our business on a competitive basis with that of foreign countries who use "cheap" labor.

It is a policy of the American Federation of Labor, as well as all of its affiliates, to fight and work for better conditions and wages for its members. We therefore cannot condone the use of competitive labor, especially where same are employed under substandard conditions as in some of the foreign countries of today.

Hoping that this communication will clarify the questions raised, and with personal regards, we remain,

Respectfully,

RENO CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL,
By ANGUS CAUBLE, *President.*
NEVADA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
By HARRY A. DEPAOLI, *State President.*

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. President, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the American Federation of Labor at Houston, Tex., on September 22, 1950. The resolution is entitled "Unfair Foreign Competition."

RESOLUTIONS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, HOUSTON, TEX., SEPTEMBER 22, 1950

UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION

Resolution No. 11, by Delegates Harry H. Cook, Arthur J. O'Hara, Ivan T. Uncapher, Ernest A. Merighi, American Glass Workers' Union (p. 23, first day's proceedings).

Resolution No. 12, by Delegates James M. Duffy, Charles F. Jordan, Frank Duffy, Clarence Davis, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters (p. 24, first day's proceedings).

Whereas lower wages than those prevailing in the United States account for the principal competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign countries when they ship dutiable merchandise into our domestic market; and

Whereas these lower wage scales permit dutiable goods to be sold at lower prices in this country than our own producers can meet without reducing wages or curtailing employment; and

Whereas competitive imported goods that derive their sales advantage from lower wages are as destructive of our own labor standards as were sweatshop operators in this country before the adoption of a national minimum wage; and

Whereas our labor organizations have no means of organizing the workers overseas in an effort to raise their standards, and our minimum-wage laws do not extend beyond our own country; and

Whereas it is no more necessary that foreign exporters have a competitive advantage derived from low wages in order to sell in this market than it is for sweatshop operators to make a regular practice of grossly underselling fair employers in order to compete with them; and

Whereas a healthy import trade can be created upon a basis of fair competition—

That is exactly what the substitute provides. It lays down the principle of foreign trade on a basis of fair and reasonable competition.

Continuing:

Whereas a healthy import trade can be created upon a basis of fair competition and can, in fact, thus be expanded, just as the elimination of sweatshops in the domestic economy contributes to healthy economic expansion; and

Whereas limitations on imports need not be restrictive in order to create competitive parity but, on the contrary, by creating the basis of fair competition, would contribute to the growth of trade in the international field no less than fair competition does in the domestic; and

Whereas over 60 percent of the imports into this country are now and have long been free of duty because they represent goods in the production of which other countries enjoy a natural advantage of climate, soil, or resources and which are complementary to rather than competitive with, the output of our own factories; and

Whereas the remaining 40 percent of competitive imports, if unimpeded in any way, would leave our workers at the mercy of low-wage rivalry, a process that would have only one ultimate effect, namely, the impoverishment of our labor force; and

Whereas many members of unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor know from direct and bitter experience the disastrous consequences of low-wage foreign competition which has not been properly offset by a rate of duty or other protective measure to insure its fairness: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor, while fully recognizing the many economic benefits of a healthy foreign trade, declare its disapproval of such competitive imports as derive their competitive advantage from low wages prevailing abroad, unless this unfair advantage is appropriately offset or guarded against to assure competitive parity; that the undermining of labor standards through wage competition on an international scale cannot be accepted as a legitimate form of economic improvement; that it is not necessary, as a condition of selling successfully in the United States, to offer goods at prices that substantially undercut the market; that the most healthy and voluminous trade can be built around fair competitive methods rather than seeking to base it upon price advantages that threaten loss of employment and reduction in wages; and, finally, that the American Federation of Labor express its concern over further tariff reductions that will expose our workers to unfair competition from foreign wages and thus undermine the wage standards built up in this country over the years.

TORQUAY CONFERENCE IN PROGRESS

That resolution was adopted on September 22, 1950. At that moment the Torquay negotiations had started, which resulted in the reduction or binding of the tariffs on approximately 3,000 products.

As the junior Senator from Nevada has already said, the tariffs are now almost without exception below any recognized peril point. How can a peril point be effective in that case. It cannot possibly affect anything that has gone before.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was that resolution adopted at the general annual convention held in Texas?

Mr. MALONE. It was adopted at the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in Houston, Tex., on September 22, 1950.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the resolution represent the sentiment of all the unions in that organization?

Mr. MALONE. It represents every affiliated union within the American Federation of Labor in the United States of America.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether members of that organization testified before the House or Senate committees?

Mr. MALONE. I presume this resolution was introduced in evidence.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether or not any representatives testified?

Mr. MALONE. I am not informed as to that.

WHEN LABOR UNDERSTANDS THE IMPACT

Mr. President, to show the disposition of labor whenever it fully understands the impact of this proposal, I read a letter signed by Doug Hawkins, president of the White Pine County Central Labor Council in Nevada, quoting a resolution adopted by that organization:

EAST ELY, NEV., *January 19, 1950.*

Senator MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We call your attention to the following resolution adopted by the White Pine County Central Labor Council:

"Whereas the selective free trade policy is removing the floor from under American wages and investments, causing unemployment and loss of taxable property; and

"Whereas the haphazard lowering of the import fees and tariffs without regard to the differential of the cost of production, due largely to the difference in living standards of this country and foreign competitive nations, has severely injured the nonferrous-metal mining industry: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That a telegram be sent to each of our national Senators asking them to do what they can toward correcting this deplorable situation."

DOUG HAWKINS,
President, White Pine County Central Labor Council.

FREE TRADE CLOSES INDUSTRIES

Mr. President, it is well known, it has been stated on the floor of the Senate many times, that the very policy we are seeking to extend for 2 years resulted in the closing of approximately 75 percent of the mines in the United States, affecting almost every State in the Union.

It was before the Korean police action resulting in the closing of a substantial part of the precision instrument, textile, chinaware, pottery, chemical, and many other industries.

I now read a letter from the International Association of Machinists, Local Lodge, No. 705, Sparks, Nev., dated September 16, 1949:

Re flexible import fee.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The legislative committee of Local Lodge No. 705, International Association of Machinists, Sparks, Nev., reported favorably on the matter of the flexible import fee. Whereupon the membership unanimously instructed the legislative committee to inform you that Local Lodge No. 705, International Association of Machinists, Sparks, Nev., has gone on record in favor of the flexible import fee.

The legislative committee wishes to commend the Senator for his hard work and initiative.

Yours truly,
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
SATIRIOS SOUKAROS,
Chairman.
GEORGE H. SHELTON.
JOHN L. ROBERTSON.

Mr. President, a letter from Pioche Union Local, No. 407, CIO, opposing free trade. The letter is addressed to the junior Senator from Nevada, and is dated January 17, 1950:

DEAR SIR: By unanimous vote, Pioche Union Local, No. 407, CIO, disapproves point 4 plan of the President which includes the International Trade Organization agreement and urge that you do everything possible to substitute flexible import fee as outlined in your talk at Pioche, Nev., on December 15, 1949.

Yours truly,
THOMAS L. HUTCHINGS,
President, Local No. 407.

Local No. 407, CIO, at Pioche, is a branch of the National CIO, which has approved free trade.

COMPARATIVE PRICES OF SEWING MACHINES

In direct answer to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska as to the prices of imported articles, I have before me two sewing machines. The one on my right is a Domestic; at least it is an American-made sewing machine. The other is a machine made in Japan.

The American machine sells at a price of $109.95.

The Japanese-made machine, which does exactly the same thing, sells for a price upward of $49. The only difference between the machines is in the wages paid to its makers, as between the wages of skilled labor in Japan and wages of skilled labor in America. I am given to understand that there is not much difference in the efficiency of their work. The difference in wages represents the difference between 90 cents a day paid the Japanese workmen, and the rate of $15.50 daily that is paid to the American workman. The difference in the prices of the two machines is almost in exactly the same proportion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Are the sewing machines electric machines?

Mr. MALONE. They are.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether he knows what wage per hour was paid in the factory which manufactured the machine that is labeled "Sorite."

Mr. MALONE. It is manufactured by the Sorite Sewing Machine Co.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that a Japanese company?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it an American institution which has gone to Japan?

Mr. MALONE. No; I believe it is a Japanese institution.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what wage was paid by the Japanese company?

Mr. MALONE. About 12 cents an hour.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the name of the other machine?

Mr. MALONE. I believe it is a "Domestic." It is American made.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what wages per hour were paid to manufacture the American machine?

Mr. MALONE. Based on an 8-hour day the wages would be $15.50 a day.

Mr. WHERRY. What would that amount to per hour?

Mr. MALONE. It would be about $1.94 an hour.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Japanese machine being sold in the United States?

Mr. MALONE. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what the price of it is? What is it being sold for in the United States?

Mr. MALONE. It is sold for whatever they can get for it, but the wholesale price, imported, is about $21.

Mr. WHERRY. There must be a price on it.

Mr. MALONE. An advertisement appeared in the newspapers——

Mr. WHERRY. Let me withdraw the question and ask another one. What duty was paid on the machine which was manufactured in Japan?

Mr. MALONE. A 10-percent duty.

Mr. WHERRY. Ten percent on what?

Mr. MALONE. On the cost of its manufacture in Japan.

Mr. WHERRY. Which is $17.50; is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; about $21.

Mr. WHERRY. So 10 percent of $17 is added, and the total is the cost of the machine in the United States, plus the cost of transportation. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; 10 percent of $21.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the price of the machine as it is sold in the United States?

Mr. MALONE. Ordinarily 100 percent above that. It is common practice in the trade. It is around 100 percent or 75 percent. It would make the price approximately $50. The American machine sells for about $110.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is referring to the American machine on the desk?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So there is a difference of nearly $75?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the difference in price between the two machines?

Mr. MALONE. That would be approximately right.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator says that both machines do the same kind of work?

Mr. MALONE. I am so informed by the retailer who brought both machines to my office. He told me that one will do the work of the other.

Mr. WHERRY. The same retailer sells both machines?

Mr. MALONE. No; the same retailer does not sell both machines. He was able to secure both machines.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Japanese manufactured machine in direct competition with the American machine?

Mr. MALONE. It is in direct competition with the American-made machine.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it sold alongside the American machine?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the financing of it similar to the financing of the American machine?

Mr. MALONE. I cannot say as to that. The Japanese manufacturers utilize American retailers. However, the manufacture of it in Japan is financed in Japan.

Mr. WHERRY. But the retail sale is handled in the same way.

Mr. MALONE. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. So on a competitive basis there is no difference except the price.

Mr. MALONE. No difference at all in the sale of the machine except the price.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the warranty or guaranty?

Mr. MALONE. That I cannot tell. I presume it is practically the same, because they are sold on the same basis. However, I am not sure of that. I shall try to get the information and insert it in the RECORD.

TWO SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

However, Mr. President, the point I wish to make, and the point which I have been making on the floor of the Senate for 4½ years, is that there is no way of competing on an even basis when such a big differential in wages exists throughout the world. In other words, there are two schools of thought on the subject. One school of thought, to which the junior Senator from Nevada subscribes, is that we should have a market in the United States for the goods of every nation of the world on a basis of fair and reasonable competition. What is a basis of fair and reasonable competition? Such a basis is provided by a tariff or import fee, which makes up the differential, does not prevent imports from coming in, and is fixed without any consideration of a high or low tariff, but on the basis that when goods are needed the goods can come in on a basis of fair and reasonable competition.

The other school of thought holds that we must buy our goods wherever we can buy them the cheapest. The administration subscribes to that school of thought. Of course that can only mean that goods will be bought where the labor is cheapest. Therefore there can be no possible doubt that anyone who is in favor of free trade in this country is in favor of the competition of the low-cost labor of Europe and Asia with the workers and investors of the United States of America. That will be the result if we follow the argument through to its logical conclusion. Workers are being led to believe that the administration is for the workers. They are being told: "We want labor to write its labor legislation." I say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that there is only one fair way for the labor standards and living standards of this country to be protected, and for us to protect our economy and preserve it so that we can take care of ourselves and at the same time defend some other parts of the world, whose safety may be of interest to us. And that is to have some way of preserving our standard of living in competition with other nations while we are helping other nations to raise their own standards.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I notice that several witnesses at the hearings have called attention to the fact that the peril-point provision would be of aid in helping to protect us against cheap competition. I recall very distinctly the action which was taken by the Eightieth Congress. The pending bill contains a peril-point provision, which, as was forcefully pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, covers also the importation of agricultural products. Likewise included in the pending bill there is an escape clause. Does the Senator from Nevada feel that the peril-point provision and the escape clause incorporated in the bill would give the necessary protection to the industry and labor of our country on a competitive basis at this time?

PERIL POINT AND ESCAPE CLAUSE ARE A SALVE FOR CONSCIENCES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that about all I can say for the peril-point provision and for the broadened escape clause is that they may be a substantial cushion for a troubled conscience. There is nothing in the act whatever which directs the President of the United States to do anything. I wish to read something from the RECORD which will show the distinguished Senator from Nebraska exactly what the policy of the administration is. If he believes that the peril-point provision will slacken the headlong plunge into one economic world and toward the idealistic objective of dividing the markets of this country, I would ask him to listen to one quotation from the RECORD.

The pronounced foreign policy program of the administration—often reaffirmed—was set down in detail by Assistant Secretary of State Willard H. Thorp, in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in January of last year when he said:

> The European recovery program (Marshall plan or ECA) extends immediate assistance on a short-term basis to put the European countries back on their feet.

The ECA appropriation is designed to make up the trade-balance deficits of the 16 Marshall-plan countries in cash and goods each year—our chief export is cash—until such time as the markets of this Nation have been divided with the European countries and our living standards lowered to those of such nations.

I continue to quote Mr. Thorp:

> 2. The trade agreements (act) program is an integral part of our over-all program for world economic recovery.

Under the Trade Agreements Act the markets of this Nation are being divided with the countries of the world to the point that theoretically there will be no further trade-balance deficits—in other words, no further need for ECA or the Marshall plan.

Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska how often has he heard on the floor of the Senate the statement that we must have these trade agreements, and that until such time as we can arrive at a division or proper balance of trade, we shall have to make up the difference in cash. Has not the Senator from Nebraska heard that statement made on this floor? I ask him that question.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; I have heard that observation made.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I make this further comment on Mr. Thorp's testimony: Under the Trade Agreements Act the markets of this Nation are being divided with the countries of the world to the point where theoretically there will be no further trade balance deficits—the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended removed the floor under American wages and investments—and stopped the flow of venture capital into

the business stream of our Nation—the simple expedient of putting into the hands of the industrially inexperienced State Department the power to lower the tariffs and import fees approximately 75 percent after perfunctory hearings.

I continue to quote from Mr. Thorp's testimony:

3. The International Trade Organization upon which Congress will soon be asked to take favorable action, provides a long-term mechanism—each part of this program is important. Each contributes to an effective and consistent whole.

The Assistant Secretary of State and, I believe, other witnesses for the State Department testified that they did not intend to pursue the International Trade Organization. Why should they, inasmuch as the Torquay Conference and, even earlier, the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—adopted all the commercial policies of the International Trade Organization charter, contained in chapter IV, which did not need specific congressional action.

What did they include. As a part of what they include, we find the following, under six divisions:

(a) Tariffs, preferences, and internal taxation and regulation.

(b) Quantitative restrictions and related exchange matters.

(c) Subsidies.

(d) State trade and related matters.

(e) General commercial provisions.

(f) Special provisions.

GATT PROVISIONS TO REPLACE ITO

I read an explanation of section (a)—Tariffs, Preferences, and Internal Taxation Regulations:

ART. 16. This is the most-favored-nation clause by which every member is to be accorded the advantage, favor, privilege, or immunity, unconditionally, that any member accords to any other member with respect to customs, duties, charges on imports or exports, or international transfer of payments. But such obligation does not require the elimination of preferences which do not exceed the margins provided for in the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (Geneva 1947) and existing preferences among the following territories and countries:

Mr. President, I would call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to the fact that the British Empire, the sterling-bloc countries, availed themselves of this very provision in GATT to avoid making tariff reductions. In other words, they had already made the trade agreements which were favorable to the British Empire; so, this time, instead of entering into other agreements which would have required some concessions on their part, they stayed out.

I refer to the 57 or 58 sterling-bloc countries, including, of course, Canada, India, and Australia, which means that under the most-favored-nation clause they have stayed out and have given nothing, but we make 39 or more bilateral treaties—later I shall state the exact number; and under the most-favored-nation clause the sterling-bloc countries get the advantage of everything we give any other country, without giving anything in return.

FALLACY OF FREE-TRADE PROGRAM

At this point, I wish to point out the fallacy of the entire program. It cannot be anything but free trade. If it had any merit, the most-favored-nation clause eliminates all possible fairness.

MEXICO AND MOST-FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE

For example, the trade agreement with Mexico, covering, among other things, lead, which we import from Mexico. However, Mexico decided that she wished to end that agreement in order to raise her tariffs; therefore, we canceled the agreement.

Subsequently, we made bilateral trade agreements with other nations covering the same products, including lead. Then, under the most-favored-nation clause, Mexico obtained the advantage of those agreements—in other words, the same advantages it had before; but this time Mexico gave us nothing in return. As a matter of fact, Mexico raised most of her tariffs on the commodities on which she had based her trade with us before.

TRADE AGREEMENT'S AUTHORITY MISUSED

The whole program patently is a fallacy and a subterfuge. It is one of the greatest hoaxes ever perpetrated on the American people, unless we consider the "dollar shortage" and some of the more famous sideline sales made to our people by the more ruthless foreign nations.

Our citizens give the money out of their taxes which we give to foreign countries, to permit them to use it in arming our enemies, thus enabling our enemies to kill our own boys. Therefore, perhaps the present trade program is not the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people, but it is one of the greatest.

QUOTAS, EMBARGOES, SPECIFICATIONS, MANIPULATION OF CURRENCIES

Mr. President, I wish to point out a specific example of the administration of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. This item is of intense interest at this time because of the debate now occurring on the proposed extension of the misnamed Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

There is nothing reciprocal about it.

AGREEMENTS TO LOWER TARIFFS

In the first place, the agreements are not trade agreements, but they are agreements to lower tariffs.

If the nations which are supposed to lower tariffs would live up to their agreement. However, to the contrary, although some raise their tariffs before they go into the conference, in any event, they soon invoke quotas, embargoes, specifications, manipulations of currency, and other known subterfuges by which they escape lowering their tariffs. This practice is followed by most of the nations except our own.

TARIFFS AND EXPORT TAXES FOR REVENUE

It was my good fortune to visit the Central American countries last year, and at that time to investigate their methods in manipulating their tariffs and other import fees. We went there primarily in connection with the program of Federal aid for roads. The United States had been furnishing most of the money for that purpose, and we wished to know how the work was progressing. We found that, generally speaking, the people of the Central American countries who have money will not pay taxes, and, of course, the people of those countries who do not have money cannot pay taxes.

Therefore, if those countries are to get any money, naturally they have to get it from some other source. Thus they have tariffs and export taxes for revenue. The United States seems to be about the only country which has a taxing system by which revenue can be obtained immediately. Our Government seems to be the only government in the world that is efficient in the collection of income taxes, Great Britain excepted. We can reach the last stenographer 3,000 miles away from the Capitol for an extra $2 a week in income taxes, with no effort at all.

MEXICO—AND MOST-FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE

The trade agreement with Mexico was terminated last year, because Mexico felt that she had to increase her tariff rates and discriminate against American imports in other ways.

In January of this year, therefore, new and higher tariff rates went into effect on most of the products which had been covered in the United States-Mexican trade agreements—this, following cancellation of the agreement, after the tariff increases by Mexico.

Since the beginning of this year the old 1930 tariff rates have been in effect. Mr. President, it is not only done in this manner, but when other countries ship anything into this country they have an export duty, which we do not have; and that, of course, means that we pay both ways.

We pay for sending our commodities into another country, and we pay for getting the commodities out of that country—commodities which we use.

Here is what the State Department has done at Torquay, England: the tariffs on most of the products covered in the extinct United States-Mexican agreement have been reduced in negotiations with countries other than Mexico, which was not represented at Torquay. In fact, most of the tariff rates on these products were not only reduced to the level which obtained during the term of the old trade agreement, but were reduced substantially below that point—that is, the tariffs were reduced below the agreed tariffs formerly in effect with Mexico.

This does not seem such unreasonable procedure until we take into consideration the fact that under the operation of the most-favored-nation clause Mexico is now again entitled to the lowered rates of duty—lower even than we had with them previously. Thus the effect of the termination of the Mexican trade agreement has been not only wiped out, but Mexico's relative position has substantially improved. In other words, Mexico raised the duties on the products imported into that country from the United States, and under the mismanagement of the State Department Mexico gets even lower duties on the material which he ships into our country, simply by the

process of first canceling the rates which she had made through a bilateral agreement, and then taking advantage of the most-favored-nation clause.

The legal basis for reducing the tariff rates on certain products covered in the old Mexican trade agreement below the rates then in effect is the permission, granted in the 1945 extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, to reduce by up to 50 percent the tariffs in effect on January 1, 1945.

Let me give you one example: The Tariff Act of 1930 levies a duty of $5.60 per ton of fluorspar containing more than 97 percent calcium fluoride. The trade agreement with Mexico reduced that rate to $4.20 per ton.

In January 1951 the old rate of the 1930 Tariff Act again became effective. At Torquay the State Department in negotiations with Canada reduced the rate to $2.10 per ton. The agreement rate with Mexico was $4.20 per ton. The agreement with Canada reduced it to $2.10 per ton. Therefore, despite the termination of the Mexican trade agreement, Mexican imports of fluorspar are dutiable at the new rate only. In other words, it is a reduction of one-half—50 percent—as against the $4.20.

Also, due to the termination of the trade agreement with Mexico, the tariff on lead was increased from three-fourths of a cent per pound to one and one-half cents per pound on January 1, 1951. That was because the agreement with Mexico, which had first been reduced, was later canceled. Thus the 1930 tariff rate was reestablished. At Torquay the United States negotiated lead tariff reductions with Canada and Peru and again reduced the lead duty by 50 percent. The interesting fact is that in 1950, 224,000 tons of lead were imported from Mexico while Canada supplied 117,000 tons and Peru only 48,000 tons, but under the most-favored-nation clause Mexico would again supply the majority of lead imports into the United States at the low rate of duty, without giving any concession in return.

NEGLECT OF THE PRINCIPAL SUPPLIER RULE

Mr. President, I now desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is a trick of the State Department—and a trick is what it is—to take a nation which is more or less unimportant in respect to its exports to this country of a certain product, and make a treaty with that nation.

A case in point is that the total imports of lead from Mexico in 1950 were 223,611 short tons; from Peru, 48,000 short tons; and from Canada, 117,087 short tons. So what does the State Department do? The principal country exporting lead to the United States was Mexico. She, of course, wanted to get the concession, in order that they might not be bound by any agreement which they had made.

Our State Department goes to a little country which exported to our country 48,000 short tons. They reduced the tariff on lead by 50 percent, bringing it down again to three-fourths of a cent per pound, a concession of little importance to Peru. But to Mexico, it made a terrific difference.

If there is anything reciprocal about such a deal, the junior Senator from Nevada would be very glad to know about it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator give us some idea as to what percentage of our over-all imports of lead, the 40,000 tons, shipped by Peru, represented?

Mr. MALONE. The imports of lead by the United States in 1950 totaled 540,756 short tons. From Peru we imported 48,000 short tons, which is a very insignificant amount.

Mr. LONG. It would be about 10 percent of the total amount imported by the United States from those three countries, would it not?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; about 10 percent.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that, in negotiating such an agreement, this Nation, at least theoretically, received some consideration from the nation of Peru for making the concession with regard to their lead exports to the United States?

PERU GAVE SMALL CONCESSION FOR SMALL BENEFIT

Mr. MALONE. Yes. However, the particular point I wanted to make was that they deliberately picked a country whose imports into this country were an insignificant amount of the particular item on which the agreement was made.

The advantage was immediately available to all other nations, including Mexico which was the only nation that had large exports of lead to us.

They wanted to cancel the agreement for the purpose of raising their duties but they still got the advantage of the reduction.

The Peruvian concession to the United States was tariff item 48, powdered milk.

Mr. LONG. As I understand the Senator, the agreement was negotiated with Peru whereby there was some consideration, insofar as that nation was concerned, but because of the most-favored-nations agreements with other nations, more than 90 percent of the lead gained the benefit of the reduction without the other nations making any concession to this Nation.

Mr. MALONE. That is the point.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

FOREIGN NATIONS ONLY GIVE SHAM BENEFITS

Mr. MALONE. The whole point is that the most-favored-nations clause destroys any equity that can possibly be presumed to be included in any such trade agreement, even should the nations of the world live up to their agreement. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana no doubt knows that they are not trade agreements, but are agreements to lower tariffs.

The foreign nations mostly defeat the effect of their agreements to lower tariffs through embargoes or quotas or the manipulation of the currency, as the British Commonwealth did.

Great Britain lowered the value of her money 30 percent, which had the immediate effect of lowering all our tariffs 30 percent, so far as the British Empire was concerned. It is impossible to make trade agreements with nations which manipulate their currencies, as practically all of them do.

Mr. LONG. Is not the Senator's argument, then, basically, that instead of having an established agreement which would affect every nation, consideration should be given to the cost of living and to the items produced in various countries?

FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

Mr. MALONE. Yes. The junior Senator from Nevada believes we should establish a market for foreign nations' products on the principle of fair and reasonable competition. If we are considering the case of lead, we should establish a market on the basis of what the fair and reasonable competition would be where the wage paid to foreign miners may be $1.50 to $2.50 a day while we pay $10 to $11 a day wages in the mines.

EFFICIENT MACHINERY IS NOT UNITED STATES MONOPOLY

There seems to be the fallacious belief that less efficient machinery is used abroad. That is a fallacy which the press seems to have gained.

The junior Senator from Nevada spent some time in practically all these countries. As an example, I mention South Africa, where they have abundant deposits of chromite and manganese.

Any operation would utilize the latest machinery that can be purchased in the United States.

They would have well-trained superintendents and foremen, and pay the going wage of 40 cents a day to the common labor in South Africa.

It may require two or three of the local workmen to equal one workingman in this country. They can pay six or seven of them and still have $4 or $5 left.

FACTORS AFFECTING FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand the Senator to contend that we should have a tariff which would bring about fair competition as to the commodities imported into this country. I would ask the Senator how he thinks that could be reconciled with the freight. If copper is produced in Arizona and sold, in competition, in New England, does the Senator think that imported copper should be equalized with the cost, plus the freight from Arizona to New England?

THE FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY—ICC

Mr. MALONE. Under the substitute which is offered to H. R. 1612, the Authority would operate in the same manner as the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has complete latitude in the fixing of freight rates for the carriers on the basis of a reasonable return on the investment. Under the substitute the principle of fair and reasonable competition is established, so that the factors affecting a particular commodity would be recognized.

Mr. LONG. In other words, if the copper were being consumed primarily in New England, then the Senator would agree that the market for the copper

would be the logical place to look for a determination as to the price of the commodity at that point?

ESTABLISHMENT OF IMPORT FEE BASED ON SEVERAL FACTORS

Mr. MALONE. That would be one of the factors.

The argument is made that we cannot ascertain the cost in Mexico or in South Africa or in England for example for comparative purposes. The proposed substitute includes a provision based on the landed duty-paid price. There is a provision which allows the authority to take into consideration an uneconomical operation, it does not have to take the highest cost price, but the price which it thinks is fair and reasonable.

CONSTITUTION SEPARATES NATIONAL ECONOMY FROM FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States pointedly separates the regulation of the national economy from the regulation and fixing of foreign policy.

The regulation of the national economy is placed in the hands of the Congress of the United States, the legislative branch.

It places in the Congress the responsibility for the regulation of the national economy and jurisdiction over foreign commerce. The Constitution is very specific in that regard. The fixing of foreign policy is delegated to the executive branch. The fixing of foreign policy and the regulation of the national economy have been pointedly separated by the Constitution and this separation has proved over the years to be a wise provision.

The junior Senator from Nevada still believes that it is a wise provision. Through the 1934 Trade-Agreements Act, the Congress of the United States was stampeded into transferring to the executive branch the regulation of the national economy through the regulation of foreign commerce. This simply means that the Executive has charge of all the important affairs of the Nation now. He regulates the national economy through regulation of the import fees and tariff. He fixes the foreign policy as the Constitution of the United States intended.

SENATE DOES NOT FIX FOREIGN POLICY

Over the past 5 or 6 months the Senate of the United States has spent a great deal of time trying to impress the world with the idea that the Senate should fix the foreign policy. I believe the President of the United States was entirely within his rights when he said that he intended to fix the foreign policy, because the Constitution gave him the authority to do so, and he had never been silly enough—as much as he has been abused during the last year or two—to give up his right to do so.

But the Congress of the United States, while reaching for the right to fix foreign policy overlooked the one important thing: That it does not have the power to fix foreign policy—and if the Congress passed an act transferring that power to the legislative branch—the President would no doubt have the gumption to veto it.

THE CONGRESS CAN STILL VOTE APPROPRIATIONS

The President of the United States now has the power to regulate foreign commerce and to fix foreign policy.

The Congress has left the power to make appropriations.

NEW ESCAPE CLAUSE AND END OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT EASY TO DO

Mr. President, if the Senate and the House refuse to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, it will expire on June 12.

When it expires on June 12 it simply would leave the trade agreements already made, status quo.

There is no reason whatever why the Senate Finance Committee should not have reported Senate bill 1040 providing for the escape clause and substituted it for the 2-year extension measure that has been brought to the floor.

ECONOMY WOULD CRUMBLE IN CASE OF PEACE

Mr. President, the argument is made that industries and workingmen would have no source of relief unless the act should be extended, including the escape clause, however, there is no excuse whatever why the broadened escape clause could not have been brought to the Senate floor as a substitute for the 2-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if he has about concluded his remarks or will it take him some period of time to do so?

Mr. MALONE. I think it will take a little while yet.

Mr. McFARLAND. How long?

Mr. MALONE. I am unable to estimate the time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Would the Senator be willing to yield for the purpose of a motion to recess being made until tomorrow, providing he obtains the floor after the routine business is concluded, after the convening of the Senate tomorrow?

Mr. MALONE. I should be very happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the transaction of routine business has been concluded tomorrow, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] be given the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE's speech,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me, so I may propound a question to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is in charge of the bill, if the Senator from Nevada does not thereby lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MALONE. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I may yield to the Senator from Nebraska for the purpose stated, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when I was absent from the floor an order was obtained, as I understand, agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to that procedure. However, I had already told one or two Senators that the way to retain language which was contained in the bill as it came from the House was to resist the Senate amendments. If a Senator desired to retain certain House language, I suppose it would be necessary for him to move to reconsider the vote by which an amendment was agreed to and, then, if the amendment were rejected, the House language would be reinstated. That procedure would be in order, if a Senator wanted to have the House language reinstated, would it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it would be in order to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. That being so, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia another question? The language of section 8, beginning in line 21 on page 11 and ending on line 7 on page 12, has been stricken by the committee. That is the section dealing with agricultural commodity price support. The bill as passed by the House provided that no concessions should be made which would reduce the price of agricultural products below the parity price. Am I correct in that interpretation?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I think the Senator's interpretation is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In looking through the report rather hastily, I have not found—no doubt they are in the report—the reasons why the Senate committee struck out the House language of section 8. The distinguished Senator from Georgia recalls, I am sure, the long debate we had about the importation of Canadian potatoes. I am also sure he recalls that at one time the tariff on imported Canadian potatoes, if I remember correctly, was reduced to as low as about 65 or 75 cents a hundred pounds. I think that was about the figure. At the same time in the United States the support price was about $2 a bushel. This permitted the importation of Canadian potatoes, and, as I recall, upwards of 15,000,000 bushels came into this country. I am not sure that all the 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes came from Canada. I make no reflection on Canada. The potatoes, however, came into this country. At the same time we had a surplus of potatoes and were selling them for, I believe, 1 cent a hundred pounds—perhaps I am mistaken and the price was $1 a hundred pounds—in order to get rid of the potatoes in the market. At that time there was considerable debate over the principle of permitting the importation of potatoes into this country while permitting the tariff on them to be reduced to a point which was below the support price.

I do not now argue whether support prices are right or wrong, but inasmuch as there is a support price, there seems to be a strong indication that the end result is that although the Canadian farmers came into a market which had a support price, yet the tariff was so low that they could sell the potatoes and still net $1.25 or $1.50 a bushel, and thus

we were simply subsidizing the Canadian farmers on the importation of those potatoes. I notice the House wrote into the bill language dealing with that situation. I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if he will give an explanation as to why the Senate committee struck out the House language.

Mr. GEORGE. I have done so. The Senator was not present.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry. I was attending a committee meeting.

Mr. GEORGE. I read from the committee report, which, by the way, was unanimous. The following is from page 7 of the committee report:

> The House-approved amendment which would have prevented tariff concessions from applying to imported agricultural commodities being sold under a price-support program in the United States has been deleted. It was felt that the intermittent application and withdrawal of price supports would make concessions on the products concerned untenable. The uncertainties growing out of such operations would interfere with or obstruct the normal trade in price-supported products.

It must be remembered that we export five times as much as we import of this type of products.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean potatoes?

Mr. GEORGE. I mean agricultural products.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. GEORGE. We import potatoes and we export potatoes. We are large exporters of potatoes.

I invite attention to the following language from the committee report:

> Your committee adopted an amendment designed to protect the full operation of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. If a case should arise where required action under section 22 would conflict with any trade agreement, then the action under section 22 shall prevail.

So complete protection can be given under the new provision which we have placed in the bill, making it mandatory upon the President to see that something is done to protect an agricultural commodity which is being supported under section 22. The President can do that, of course, as provided in section 22. What the bill does is to repeal subsection (f), which got into the act as an amendment, and which rather required section 22 to conform to the agreements. I believe that when the Senator considers what the House language did, he will see that, as a matter of tariff making, it is an impossible program. I read the sentence again:

> It was felt that the intermittent application and withdrawal of price supports would make concessions on the products concerned untenable.

It would be impossible to negotiate agreements with respect to them, because there would be no certainty about their operation. Since our exports of agricultural commodities exceed our imports by a considerable margin, it was felt by the committee that there ought to be certainty in the law.

The bill removes subsection (f) from section 22, and leaves section 22 in such a condition that it prevails over the agreement.

We also amended the escape clause. We took great care in amending the escape clause. The committee gave a great deal of attention to it. It seems to me that we have taken care of the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask another question. First, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the amendment found on page 13, in subsection (f), is a splendid addition to the bill. The action of Congress with respect to a previous bill apparently permitted the State Department to override these agreements, which caused some difficulty. I believe that subsection (f) is a very good amendment. But I do not see how that in any way affects the proposal of the House, unless it supersedes it. However, in my opinion, it is not a cure-all.

Mr. GEORGE. Under section 22 the President would be authorized to establish a quota on imports of an agricultural product. There is nothing to restrain him. It affords the broadest possible protection.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the Senator states that the aid upon which we might rely is that the President, after he has been advised by the Tariff Commission, or from other sources, may establish quotas under section 22.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; he may establish quotas.

Mr. WHERRY. Has he that right now?

Mr. GEORGE. He cannot do it now.

Mr. WHERRY. Quotas have been established——

Mr. GEORGE. We propose to repeal subsection (f). That repeal would assist the President in establishing quotas. Furthermore, under the escape clause any interested party can invoke the escape clause.

With those provisions, it would seem that agricultural products, the price of which we were supporting, could very well be protected. I agree with the Senator that it is illogical to support the price of a farm commodity and at the same time so reduce the protection of that particular price as to permit its undercutting and undermining.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will further yield, for the life of me I cannot see how, under the escape clause, we get legislation which is helpful. I can see that pursuant to the terms of section 8, under the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, if a condition exists requiring emergency treatment, the Tariff Commission shall make an investigation. I think that is a good thing. However, that is not mandatory. There is nothing in the provision which nullifies a concession already made. All that can be done is to investigate. Where is there any legislative relief? In the event a concession is made by the President as a result of which agricultural products come into the United States below the support price, is there any way, legislatively, to prohibit such a condition by increasing the tariff, or affording some definite relief, rather than merely suggesting the problem to the President of the United States for his consideration?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if a perishable product is involved, the Secretary of Agriculture can put in motion all the relief provisions of these several amendments. The Secretary of Agriculture can call upon the President and upon the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission must act expeditiously, and the President is given direct authority to act without waiting for the report of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree to all that.

Mr. GEORGE. In the event that the price of an agricultural commodity is being supported, or other support measures have been taken in conformity with section 22, if a question arises, the case must be adjudged on its own merits. The President has not only ample power to deal with rates in that instance, but he has express power, I should say, to establish a quota.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to take up too much time. With the exception of the escape clause, all the steps which the distinguished Senator has mentioned were followed in the case of potatoes. The President was advised; the Secretary of State was advised; the Secretary of Agriculture was advised; and in the final analysis nothing was done. The potatoes continued to come into the United States. They came in with so little protection——

Mr. GEORGE. I may say that section 22 could not apply because of the agreement. We have amended section 22. We have taken out the prohibition. It does now apply.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just commended the Senator and the committee for the very fine work in connection with the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. That amendment, coupled with the escape clause, certainly should give agriculture protection.

Mr. WHERRY. All the amendment does is to bar the State Department or the President from overriding the law as we make it.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. However, when the Senator complained before about potatoes, the agreement at that time was outstanding, and the President could not act under section 22. No action could be taken under section 22 because of the agreement itself. We have removed that impediment or inhibition. Quotas can be imposed and complete protection can be given to a commodity which is supported by any one of our farm programs.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, what the legislative effect of the amendment would be, I am not certain. I have a great respect for the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia and for the minority member of the committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I have discussed the matter personally with him. Perhaps subsection (f) does go a long way toward resolving the difficulty with respect to the importation of agricultural products. However, even though it be adhered to,

the point I am making is that there is absent any requirement that the President or the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the good suggestions of the Senator from Georgia. In the final analysis, as I read the bill, all we can hope for is an immediate investigation by the Tariff Commission. Then they would make their recommendations to the President. We have a discretionary situation in which the President may take immediate action. The bill does not say he must take action.

Mr. GEORGE. Section 22 requires the President to act. I believe if the Senator will read section 22 he will see that the fullest power is there given, and that a direct and mandatory requirement is placed upon the President. At least that is my understanding of it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to hear the Senator say so. I am glad to have his interpretation of section 22 of the Agricultural Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 33 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, 25, 28, and 34, to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 24, 26, 27, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 21, 23, 30, 31, 32 and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$3,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$5,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 18, 19, 25, 28, 33, and 34.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
GUY CORDON (with reservations),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered, and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3587, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 21, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 33 to the bill (H. R. 3587), entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum of "$1,000,000," named in said amendment, insert "$1,750,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter stricken by the said amendment insert:

"No money made available to the Department of Commerce, for maritime activities, by this or any other act shall be used in payment for a vessel the title to which is acquired by the Government either by requisition or purchase, or the use of which is taken either by requisition or agreement, or which is insured by the Government and lost while so insured, unless the price or hire to be paid therefor (except in cases where sec. 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is applicable), is computed in accordance with subsec. 902 (a) of said act, as that subsection is interpreted by the General Accounting Office."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert: "and transfers may be made between appropriations or allocations within any such department, agency, or corporation as may be necessary to carry out this proviso, and no allocation shall be made to any agency which can perform such defense activities as may have been or hereafter be assigned to such agency which can be performed by its regular personnel by use of the foregoing authority to realine its regular programs."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

"For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (i) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $25,000,000, to be equally matched with State funds, of which $20,000,000 shall be for medical supplies and equipment and $5,000,000 for training and education, to remain available to June 30, 1952."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel, or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation any article or commodity of the nature or class described: *Provided*, That after the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act and prior to the termination of the period heretofore referred to no country shall be eligible for economic or financial assistance under any such act unless within 30 days prior to the date on which such assistance is to be provided such country shall have certified to the United States that it has not, subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act, exported, or knowingly permitted the exportation of, arms, armaments, military matériel, articles, or commodities, which are subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, to any of the countries referred to in such provisions: *Provided further*, That such certification shall not relieve the Administrator for Economic Cooperation or any other officer of the United States Government of responsibility for enforcing the foregoing provisions of this section: *Provided further*, That exceptions to these provisions may be made upon an official determination of the National Security Council that such exception is in the security interest of the United States: *Provided further*, That the National Security Council shall immediately report any exception made with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the National Security Council shall at least once each quarter review all exceptions made previously and shall report

its determinations to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which an exception is made.

"(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, 25, 28, and 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I understand that the Senate has now adopted the conference report and has agreed to the several amendments of the House to certain Senate amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 34 one of the amendments which has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there may be printed an analysis of amendment 34, as prepared by legislative counsel.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

As it passed the Senate, the so-called KEM amendment provided that during a period in which our Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities, while carrying out a decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance should be extended to any foreign country which exports arms, armaments, or military matériel, or commodities which the Secretary of Defense certifies may be used in the manufacture thereof, to Russia or any of her satellites, including Communist China and Communist North Korea.

The conferees modified the amendment in the three following respects:

1. The amendment agreed upon by the conferees covers not only arms, armaments, and military matériel, and articles and commodities which the Secretary of Defense certifies may be used for the manufacture thereof, but also includes any article or commodity, regardless of its nature, if the shipment thereof to Russia and her satellites is embargoed by the United States in the interests of national security.

2. The second change made by the conferees is the addition of the matter contained in the first two provisos.

The purpose of this addition is to provide a means for enforcing the amendment, by requiring all countries receiving economic or financial aid from the United States to certify, as a condition of eligibility for such aid, that they have not, subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this bill, shipped to Russia or any of her satellites any of the items covered by the amendment; that is, arms, armaments, or military matériel; articles or commodities which may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel; and articles or commodities the shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States.

No aid could be furnished subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment in the absence of such a certification.

Also, the certification much have been obtained within 30 days prior to the time the aid is extended, so that countries receiving more or less continuous aid would be required to make monthly certifications.

In order that the various countries receiving aid from the United States will have notice of our intention to cut off aid if they continue to export prohibited items to Russia or any of her satellites, the period to be certified to, will not commence until the fifteenth day following the date of enactment.

As a result the first certification, in the case of a country to which aid is to be extended shortly after such fifteenth day, will necessarily refer to trade during only a short period of time.

For example, a country seeking aid on the sixteenth day following the date of enactment may be able to qualify therefor merely by certifying that it did not engage in the prohibited trade on that day.

If it continued to receive aid, however, it would be required to certify again 30 days thereafter that it had not exported those items to the Soviet bloc subsequent to the fifteenth day following the enactment of this bill.

It should perhaps be pointed out that these provisions are not intended to result in a denial of assistance to a country merely because it has exported an item which at the time of certification is on the prohibited list, if at the time of the exportation such item had not been placed on the prohibited list.

The second proviso was included simply for the purpose of making clear that the certification machinery is in addition to, and not in lieu of, other means of enforcement of the provisions of the amendment. In other words, it would be the duty of the ECA Administrator to terminate assistance to a country, even though it had made the necessary certification, if he determined through other means that it was engaged in the prohibited trade.

3. The last two provisos would authorize the National Security Council to make exceptions from the provisions of the amendment where, in its opinion, to do so would be in the security interest of the United States. In such case, a country can continue to receive aid from the United States even though it exports the item with respect to which exception is made to Russia or one of her satellites and cannot, therefore, make the certification required by this amendment with respect to that item.

Immediate reports of all such exceptions made by the National Security Council must be made to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committee of both Houses, and to the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, respectively, setting forth the reasons for such exceptions and an analysis of the particular country's trade with the Soviet bloc.

In addition, the National Security Council would be required to submit quarterly reports to the same committees, reviewing the exceptions made during the preceding quarter.

The last subsection of the amendment repeals the existing law on this subject which, it will be recalled, was enacted last fall as a part of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, and which merely prohibits the furnishing of economic or financial assistance to countries whose trade with Russia or any of its satellites is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the difficulty has been that the National Security Council has failed to look. If it had looked, as required by law, it would have found much trade in materials helpful to the enemy.

And this is why mandatory legislation is now needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question with reference to the amendment dealing with the International Children's Fund. I note that the explanation reads:

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $5,750,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed in approving this figure that the contribution of the United States to this program shall not exceed one-third of total funds contributed to the program by all countries.

My question of the Senator from Arizona is whether the phrase "total fund contributed to the program by all countries" includes not only the direct contributions to the children's fund, but also the estimated local contributions by recipient countries which are made to match children's fund imports under the agreement with each of the recipient countries.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is very difficult to say how an administrative agency would interpret an amendment of that kind, but my understanding is that contributions are made by the United States and contributions are made by other nations, which become available to the children's fund when met by equal amounts contributed by the country in which the funds are to be expended. In other words, if we were to raise one-third of the first dollar, that dollar must be matched again by another dollar in the country which receives the aid, so that the total amount to be expended for the benefit of the children in that country would be $2. It would seem to me reasonable to interpret this language to mean that one-third of that amount could be contributed by the United States.

Mr. HILL. One-third of the total funds that have been described by the Senator from Arizona; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that is the way the report reads.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say that I think amendment 34 is a distinct gain for the American people. The vast amounts of strategic materials and war materials which have been moving into Communist China through Hong Kong in my judgment are a shame and a disgrace. I believe this amendment is in one way an improvement over an amendment which was adopted by the Senate a few days ago. The amendment includes the words:

Shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security.

In that respect I think the amendment as submitted by the committee of conference is an improvement.

At the same time I am sorry to see inserted a provision which gives the National Security Council any discretionary power to permit a continuance of this trade. However, if the National Security Council reports to the committees of

Congress what it is doing, so that the facts will be immediately known to the public, I do not believe any great amount of harm will be done in that respect.

I am glad the amendment has been adopted. The only pity is, Mr. President, that it comes 65,000 casualties too late.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief comment with respect to the action just taken by the Senate on the conference report.

First, I should like to commend the Senate members of the committee of conference, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and other Senators who have labored so diligently to bring about this result. I think it is unquestionably a step in the right direction. However, Mr. President, it will be of little avail unless it is enforced vigilantly and with a will to carry out the decision of the Congress.

I regret very much to say that the action previously taken by the Congress was not carried out diligently and efficiently by United States officials or by officials of our supposed allies.

At this very hour there is in Eastern Germany, and also working into Western Germany, a Chinese mission, sent there by the Communist government of China, and negotiating on this very day with establishments in Western Germany, under the jurisdiction of the allied powers, to secure strategic materials to be sent behind the iron curtain and unquestionably to be used in building up the military and industrial potential of the Communists.

When we realize that the trade through Hong Kong has increased by three times between 1949 and 1950, and that the trade from Germany with Communist China has increased 2,700 percent between 1949 and 1950; when we have shown that the illegal German trade with the Russian bloc is now approximately $100,000,000 annually; when our observers found in the last month that whole trainloads of material are being sent, and that a truck carrying 30 tons of equipment or supplies is moving across the border every 3 minutes, with little or no detention and no inspection, it certainly is a sorry state of affairs.

I regret to say that these conditions are not new or of recent origin. Two years ago these conditions were reported officially to our representatives. They were informed that there was no attempt at enforcement on the interzonal or international borders, that there have been an inefficient licensing system, a lack of centralized control, and abundant opportunities for fraud and forgery, which have been taken advantage of, and that the border is wide open, as a result of which strategic materials have been flowing across the border, to places behind the iron curtain. That situation certainly represents one of the darkest pages in the history of the present crisis.

I express the hope that our officials will live up to their responsibilities and will step into this very important situation with a will and a determination to put a stop to the flow of strategic materials into the hands of the Communists, to be used against the American boys who now are fighting for survival.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask the Senator a question, because I know he spent considerable time on the amendment. I wish to thank him for his effort and his advice, because he was conducting the hearings which have shown the amount of trade and the kind of trade which was going on between the various countries.

I wish to ask the Senator whether it will be well for the State Department and the military authorities to consider very seriously this question, realizing that we are at war, and that if we trade with the enemy—whether it be the soldiers who are fighting for Soviet China or Red Korea or the army which is directing the fight from Moscow—when we give them aid and comfort we are, in effect, giving aid and comfort to an enemy of the United States as of today, because we are at war with a part of them in fact, and to all intents and purposes we are at war with the real enemies in the Kremlin. So our officials should consider that we should not give aid and comfort to those enemies, but should realize that we are really at war. Is not that a fact?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think the Senator is eminently correct. I think that in every respect the approach he has stated is the realistic approach of today. I shall go further by saying to the Senator that, in addition to any step toward giving direct help from America to the enemy countries, the use of ECA funds by the western European powers, in turn, to build up their industrial capacity, only to have it used—as it has been used in the past—to supply the Communist countries, certainly creates a very unfortunate situation which is defeating the very purposes for which ECA was originated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from Maryland feel that when we are sending money to arm and give economic aid to these countries, if they give material aid to the enemy, whether it is the enemy in the cold war or the enemy in the hot war, they in effect are destroying their own economic and their own political systems? Does not the Senator agree that the countries we aid must keep that in mind; and that when we make a variation at this time and allow this trade or any trade to go on between those countries, our public officials must keep in mind that the trade must be allowed only on the condition that it will benefit the security of the United States and her allies?

Mr. O'CONOR. That should be the only consideration on the basis of which the trade can be justified, in my opinion.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the officials certify to Congress and to the congressional committees in regard to the trade, is it not important that our committees—I refer not only to the Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee, but also to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which the Senator from Maryland also serves—should scrutinize very carefully every such transaction, to determine for the people back home whether the transaction is for the security of the United States, which means that it is for the security of our country and our allies in this war against communism. Does not the Senator from Maryland agree?

Mr. O'CONOR. I certainly agree with the Senator in everything he said in urging the necessity for the closest and most unremitting follow-up in regard to these matters. We find two situations which are illustrative. First, a list is published which on its face appears to be a clear prohibition against sending certain articles across the border, as, for example, 20-ton cranes, about which the Senator from Delaware and I heard. There was a mere change in the size, so they weigh but 18 tons and they have been going over regularly. Second, when there was a prohibition against sending an entire factory across, the shippers broke it up into 89 parts and sent over the parts, to be assembled behind the iron curtain, with the same result, of course.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Regarding that kind of trade, it is very difficult for a committee of Congress, when it merely sees the items, to determine that they would aid the enemy; but those who are in authority in our Armed Forces and in our security division ought to scrutinize carefully a situation in which a factory is being divided into 89 parts, the purpose being in effect, to deceive ourselves, and really to aid the enemy.

Mr. O'CONOR. I agree with the Senator entirely.

Mr. FERGUSON. The mere changing of the 20-ton crane to an 18-ton crane, of course, does not at all alter the fact.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is correct. I agree with the Senator entirely.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Under the Potsdam Agreement, it was provided, was it not, that reparations should be sent to Russia?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think that is a different question from the one with which we are concerned at this time. We are concerned with ECA aid to the Western European countries.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that perfectly, but is it not simply a continuation of what took place when the Potsdam Agreement was made?

Mr. O'CONOR. I understand exactly what it is to which the Senator is referring. I believe there is a distinction, however, between what was done under the Potsdam Agreement and the more recent East-West trade, which is entirely, or in part, controlled by the United States, or by the allied powers, because there is a tripartite agreement, as of course the Senator is well aware, which affords to the United States, to

Britain, and to France authority over shipments which unquestionably should have been prohibited before this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask two questions of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before we get through with it——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to ask a question in connection with the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question regarding the conference report?

Mr. O'CONOR. I gladly yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What action did the conferees take on the amendment relating to the purchase or requisitioning by the Government of American shipping?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think it would be necessary for the Senator from Delaware to ask the Senator from Tennessee, or the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Arizona can answer it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona answer that question?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate struck out the language in the bill, as the Senator will remember, and adopted his amendment. That provision of the bill was stricken out, and in lieu of it the following language was inserted:

> No money made available to the Department of Commerce, for maritime activities, by this or any other act, shall be used in payment for a vessel the title to which is acquired by the Government either by requisition or purchase, or the use of which is taken either by requisition or agreement, or which is insured by the Government and lost while so insured, unless the price or hire to be paid therefor (except in cases where sec. 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is applicable), is computed in accordance with subsection 902a of said act, as that subsection is interpreted by the General Accounting Office.

In other words, instead of their being able to get the full value of a ship at the time it was lost, the Government can take care that it does not pay more than what had originally been paid for the ship. The amendment agreed to, as I understand, is one drafted by the General Accounting Office, which, it is claimed by them, makes the provision constitutional.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the conference committee, in substance, accepted an amendment recommended by the General Accounting Office; did it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to address a question either to the Senator from Arizona or to the Senator from New Hampshire, with respect to amendment 22. It relates to the International Children's Welfare Fund. I notice language is used which is in the nature of a limitation, to the effect that "not to exceed one-third of the total funds contributed to the programs by all countries" shall be the measure of what is contributed by the United States.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that children have been the real wrecks of war, not only in Europe, but elsewhere; and one of the fine things this country has done has been to bend over on the side of generosity in behalf of those future citizens of other countries of the world. I had an opportunity to see the operations of this fund at first hand. I saw the expressions of gratitude by children as they wrote poems and drew pictures and somehow expressed in their childish way what came from the heart.

If I read the language correctly, it would exclude the contributions which are made in kind, as a sort of counterpart, by the recipient countries, which, as I understand, aggregate about $150,000,000. If that is the purport of the language, then obviously the contribution by this country in any one year would be severely limited, and would probably be reduced to approximately $2,000,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year, which, obviously, would be a very small amount, indeed, with which to carry on a supply program which is so extensive, and which relates to so many millions of children throughout the world.

I wonder whether the Senator from Arizona can clarify that point, or whether the Senator from New Hampshire can clarify it, so that those who will have under their authority the approval of the expenditure of this money will have a clear indication of the real intention of the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Oregon a moment ago indicated that perhaps my interpretation was erroneous. When we had this matter under discussion in the conference, I pointed out that there was an original contribution by the United States. There are also contributions by other nations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The dollar which is obtained in that way goes to some country where there are children who need help, which country must put up at least another dollar.

From a reading of the language, and from the way it is written in the report, my interpretation would be that our contribution "shall not exceed one-third of total funds contributed to the program by all countries."

Mr. DIRKSEN. By "contributions," does the Senator include also the $150,000,000 which has been contributed or made available by the recipient countries since this program got under way?

Mr. HAYDEN. The language is "all other countries." I have stated my interpretation. The language could be narrowly interpreted to mean only the contributions by the United States and the country matching United States funds, and stop right there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do other members of the subcommittee join and concur in the interpretation made by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will have to ask them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure the Senator from Illinois is in error, if he means that this will apply only to those within the original pool. I was hoping that that would be true of this particular appropriation, but, after making some inquiry, I am inclined to the opinion that the words "contributions to the program by all countries" mean that it will not be in excess of one-third for the contributing countries and those who have to match the contributions; so we have two funds, namely, a contributing fund and a matching fund. Therefore, when reference is made to "all countries" and the contributions to the program, it includes both the contributing fund and the matching fund, which, as has been said, will greatly reduce the amount of this fund.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Michigan for information in dollars and cents. Obviously, the Senator from Illinois cannot be in error, because he is merely very patiently seeking light on this subject and trying to divine the intentions of the conferees. Suppose the Senator puts the answer in dollars and cents.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I should like to do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Five million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars is made available under the program. How much will the administration be able to spend during the remainder of the fiscal year?

Mr. FERGUSON. They will be able to spend up to $5,700,000, not more than one-third of the total. Other nations will contribute to the amount. Let us consider three times that amount should be available, which would mean approximately $17,000,000, and assume that other countries will contribute another $17,000,000. That would mean that $34,000,000 might be contributed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am trying to find out how much, in dollars and cents, will be available. First, we make a contribution. Second, those nations which make contributions for relief outside their borders are in the next category. Third, there are the recipient countries. In all, they have put up, in what may be called counterpart funds, probably $150,000,000. But they are on the receiving end. If we consider all three categories of countries, how much, in dollars and cents, would be available?

Mr. FERGUSON. We could contribute only the amount appropriated, which is $5,750,000, not more than an amount equal to one-third of the total amount. Of course, there are private contributions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, we are not concerned with them at the moment.

Mr. FERGUSON. This provision does cut down the amount that will be contributed under the plan. The original contribution permitted was 72 percent. On the insistence of the House, that was cut so that we can now contribute 33⅓ percent, instead of 72 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I dislike to be persistent, but I am sure that some member of the committee must know how much,

in dollars and cents, the sum will amount to. Do not the hearings disclose that fact?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not the conference hearings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There should be some reasonably finite idea as to the amount, whether $2,000,000, $3,000,000, or how much will be available.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount available is the amount of money appropriated, which is $5,750,000, provided it is matched by other countries, including the country where it is received.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A list was available showing the total amount of the contributions by the contributing countries for aid beyond their borders, and the whole amount which was made up by the recipient countries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Congress obviously cannot take $5,750,000 and make it match, on a one-third basis, $150,000,000. We can go to the extent of $5,750,000 and come within the rule The report makes $5,750,000 available for the purpose.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have before me the House report on the conference agreement. It provides $5,750,000 instead of the $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The report states that the conferees are agreed that the contribution of the United States to the program shall not exceed one-third of the total funds—I emphasize the words "total funds"—contributed to the program by all countries. So it seems that the United States can put up $5,750,000, provided that amount does not exceed one-third of the total funds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The "total fund" means contributed funds and matching funds, does it?

Mr. HILL. "Total" means all funds.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is nothing in the report that would prohibit a contributing state from putting up $150,000,000. So long as we keep within the 33⅓ percent, American money to the extent of $5,750,000 can be used.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that answers the question, but I wanted to be sure.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], if the Senator from Illinois has concluded his inquiries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was about to relinquish this line of inquiry, except to emphasize once more that while I am on record as being against all kinds of foreign aid, there is one field in which we do ourselves proud, and where we get a return for our money. That is in the case of the tots and youngsters in the formative stages who still know something about the virtues of gratitude and who express their appreciation to this country. So I wanted to be reasonably certain that there would be adequate funds to carry on, because this is one feature on which we can look back with pride.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado and the junior Senator from Colorado are very much interested in securing an appropriation which could be used to heal the ravages in our western forests caused by beetle infestation. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate was very helpful to us, as was also the Senate itself. My inquiries indicate that the item was dropped out in the conference, and my inquiries also indicate that it would have been useless to take the question back to the conference. I wonder if I may have the observations of the distinguished Senator from Arizona on that point.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is quite correct. I think every member of the Senate committee was convinced that the appropriation to which the Senator refers was meritorious, and should have been allowed, but we found the House conferees adamant with reference to the item. The Senator from Colorado can bring up the matter again when the regular appropriation bill comes before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to say that I have never seen House conferees more adamant on any question than they were on this item. However, I am sure the Senator will have a good chance in the future to have the item allowed. The Senate members of the conference were overwhelmingly in favor of the amendment, but the House conferees were opposed to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado and myself, I should like to express our gratitude to the conferees for the hard fight they put up when the question was in the conference. I hope the item may receive better consideration in connection with the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senate conferees were unanimous in their position, but we encountered united opposition on the part of the House conferees. They said that the matter would be given consideration in connection with the whole policy in the regular appropriation bill. Finally, when we reached an impasse, we reluctantly yielded.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator agree that it would have been useless to take the question back to conference?

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I mean, to reject the report and have it reconsidered by the conference committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not think there would have been any change.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if all Senators have concluded, I should like to refer to the so-called Kem amendment, about which much has been said. I voted for that amendment, and I think every other member of the committee voted for it. But in the conference it was pointed out that certain exceptions should be made. I send to the desk a copy of the amendment which has now been agreed to, and ask that the clerk read it. I ask all Senators to listen as the amendment is read, because I think it is a long step in the right direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report has been agreed to, but if there be no objection the clerk may read the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with this matter. In line with what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has said respecting the Kem amendment, I have just been informed of, and it was very interesting to me to read on the ticker the news that the British high court in Hong Kong today—or at least the report has come in today—has decided to award the 40 airplanes, ownership of which was under consideration by that court, to the Communist Government of Red China. Certainly that is a very helpful action.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I am not at all surprised at the action taken by the British court. I do not think they have treated us right about the matter. That is why I voted for the Kem amendment, and that is why I voted for the amendment which I earnestly ask the Senators may listen to as it is read by the clerk.

Mr. BRIDGES. The planes in question, if Members of the Senate will recall, are the planes which were sold to certain American-Chinese Nationalist interests. The 40 planes will be used in the making of war. The decision has been under consideration by the British high court in Hong Kong. And just a short time ago over the ticker comes the word that the high court in Hong Kong has awarded the planes to the Communists of Red China, so they will have 40 more airplanes to attack American boys and kill American boys. That is a sad commentary, but it is true. It affords one more reason why the Kem amendment should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Tennessee will be read for the information of the Senate. The Chair will say to the Senator that the amendment has been adopted.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military

matériel, or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation any article or commodity of the nature or class described: *Provided*, That after the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act and prior to the termination of the period heretofore referred to no country shall be eligible for economic or financial assistance under any such act unless within 30 days prior to the date on which such assistance is to be provided such country shall have certified to the United States that it has not, subsequent to the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this act, exported, or knowingly permitted the exportation of, arms, armaments, military matériel, articles or commodities, which are subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, to any of the countries referred to in such provisions: *Provided further*, That such certification shall not relieve the Administrator for Economic Cooperation or any other officer of the United States Government of responsibility for enforcing the foregoing provisions of this section: *Provided further*, That exceptions to these provisions may be made upon an official determination of the National Security Council that such exception is in the security interest of the United States: *Provided further*, That the National Security Council shall immediately report any exception made with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the National Security Council shall at least once each quarter review all exceptions made previously and shall report its determinations to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which an exception is made.

(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President I did not detain the Senate when the conference report was brought up for consideration or during the consideration of the House amendments to the Senate amendments because I did not care to delay unduly the bill which is before the Senate as the unfinished business. At that time, however, I asked that a statement be inserted in the RECORD. It is an analysis which was prepared by the legislative counsel, which gave their interpretation of the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has just requested to have read.

Mr. President, I think the amendment greatly strengthens what the Senate by its vote in passing the bill attempted to do, which was to shut off aid to Russia or her satellite countries that in turn are furnishing aid to Communist China. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think if the provisions of the amendment are honestly, fairly, and justly administered by the officials whose duty it is to carry out its terms, and especially by the Security Council, that that will have the effect of cutting off aid to Communist China?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is an absolute "Yes." Of course, in that respect, I should like to say that a law is just as good as its administration. The Congress has done what it could do to provide an effective law. If, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee indicated in his question, that law is fairly and honestly administered, there can be no doubt as to its effectiveness. Had this been the law previously, there is no doubt that the sale of the 40 airplanes could not have been made at the time it was made.

The language of the amendment is identical with language submitted a year ago, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, with the exception that is further strengthened by this clause: "or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security."

We have an embargo on goods to Red China, and the amendment provides that all the ECA countries shall put into effect a similar embargo to Red China or they will be cut off completely from further ECA aid. So I can answer the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in the affirmative, with a considerable degree of force. Had the amendment been in effect previously there would not have been a sale of 40 airplanes to Red China by Great Britain or by any other ECA country. They would have been required to place an embargo on such airplanes before they could receive any further ECA aid.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the question asked by the Senator from Tennessee respecting the honesty and fair administration of the provisions of the amendment is very pertinent. I wonder if the Senator is aware that we put a specific mandate in the law last year against the use of any ECA funds by a country, a protectorate of which was violating the rights of American citizens, a mandate which referred specifically to the Moroccan situation? I do not know if the Senator is aware that not only is the ECA failing to carry out such a specific mandate of law, but that the State Department has connived to permit the French Government, which has no right to do so, to take the problem into the World Court. Is the Senator aware that we are still going ahead and giving ECA aid in spite of what Congress has said? Our State Department is surrendering our rights by permitting the French to take this problem to the International Court which has no right to review the matter in the first place. It is a subterfuge, a ruse, and a device to avoid enforcing the law which Congress enacted. I believe that that question was very properly raised. Will this law be enforced if we enact it? I am not too sanguine, in the light of past experience. There are those who wish to avoid the law and disregard what the Congress has told them to do.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the Senator that I have not been too happy with the administration of the Secretary of State. I think my position on that question is well known throughout the country. I will say, however, that I believe that this embargo is one of the best provisions of the new amendment.

There is also another provision which I think will be very helpful, now that the question has been raised. In this amendment it is provided that ECA shall carry out the mandate of Congress. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that this provision is now mandatory, rather than permissive.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The provision of the law last year was completely mandatory.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe that if the Senator will read the Cannon amendment, he will discover that it was watered down considerably. The provision which passed the Senate was mandatory, but when the bill got through conference and the Cannon amendment emerged it was not mandatory. I believe that if the Senator will read it he will find that it was watered down considerably from the standpoint of being a mandatory amendment.

But be that as it may, my feeling is that it is an improvement to have the additional provision in this amendment that the ECA shall see to it that the provisions of the amendment are carried out, plus an embargo against the articles which we do not permit to be shipped to Red China.

There is a further provision, which I think is a good one, namely, that before a country can get aid from ECA or any other financial agency of this Government, it is absolutely necessary that such country certify that for the previous 30 days and for the period of time from the 15th day after the passage of this act on, it has not in any way engaged in the sale of or trading in strategic materials destined for the satellite countries or for Russia. With that provision properly enforced, we do not need to depend on ECA alone to administer the act as the distinguished Senator from Iowa has brought out. We provide that the various countries shall, on their honor, make such a certification. If that is not done, and if the materials continue to flow from Western Germany through Eastern Germany, to the tune of $100,000,000 annually, as the distinguished Senator from Maryland pointed out a moment ago, and if a country certifies in dishonor, I should like to see the board or the administrator who would override a decision and make such a report known to the committees of the Senate and House, as is required immediately if an exception to these provisions is made.

I believe this is a good amendment. I think it is a step in the right direction. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and other Senators for the valiant effort which has been made over the past 2 years. I recall that a year ago, when this amendment was adopted, it went to the House, and to my way of thinking its mandatory provisions were completely nullified. It came back watered down.

I appreciate very much the work of the conferees. When they made an exception this time they gave this amendment full consideration. I believe that

with the proper administration, the addition of the qualifications which must be met in order to obtain aid will be helpful. I believe that I can say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that his work has paid off. The work of those who have been interested in prohibiting the sale of strategic materials to the enemy through satellite countries is showing results. I hope that we may be able to stop the damnable traffic of furnishing materials to the enemy with which to kill American boys.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I merely wish to say that whatever the Senator from Missouri has done in the matter has been done with the assistance and cooperation of the Senator from Nebraska and a number of other Senators. The Senator from Nebraska has been too modest in what he has said, in failing to refer to his own efficient efforts.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope the Senator from Nebraska does not feel that I am against this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the amendment is very fine. I merely wish to say that as a result of past experiences on several occasions, the genius and ingenuity of certain administrative departments in avoiding the clear mandates of the law laid down by Congress place me in the position of saying that while I am for this amendment, I shall await with interest its implementation by the departments which we charge with carrying it out.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not construe the Senator's observations as being in opposition to the amendment. I may say that I am just as apprehensive as is the Senator from Iowa about the administration not only of this amendment, but of other provisions of law which are vital in our foreign policy. All I am saying is that, so far as the Congress is concerned, and especially the Senate, I think we have done a good job legislatively by providing machinery whereby, if the law is fairly and honorably administered, ECA aid can be cut off in the case of countries which continue to furnish materials to our enemies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, has the conference report been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to take this occasion to thank my friend, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], for his kindness in yielding at this time.

TRADE WITH RUSSIA EXPOSED LONG AGO

Mr. MALONE. Before returning to the subject of the Trade Agreements Act, I want to say a few words about the Kem amendment on the conference report.

Mr. President, on March 4 and 5, 1948, the junior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD a trade treaty between England and Russia. The treaty is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is available to everyone. The first item in it was 1,100 locomotives.

It also covered 50-kilowatt mobile Diesel electric generators; steam power turbine stations; 500-kilowatt ball mills for copper ore grinding; and many other items. Practically every item could be used to arm Russia. These items were being shipped directly to Russia under a trade treaty.

ENGLAND NOT ONLY OFFENDER

England was not the only offender. The junior Senator from Nevada thought he would shock the Senate by placing in the RECORD a list of the trade treaties which the 16 countries which later became Marshall plan countries had at that moment with Russia and the iron-curtain countries.

Everything necessary to arm Russia for a third world war was being shipped. She was receiving materials necessary to enable her to consolidate her gains in the iron-curtain countries.

EIGHTY-EIGHT TRADE TREATIES

The following year, in 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD a list of 88 trade treaties, many of them made during the year following the initial passage of the Marshall plan, later known as the ECA.

All of the trade information was known to the Senate then, just as it is now. It is no secret, and never has been a secret.

Last year the junior Senator from Nevada offered an amendment to the ECA bill which would have prevented the very thing which now arouses so much disgust, but the Senate voted it down.

NOT ONLY TRADE BUT ALSO NONAGGRESSION PACTS EXPOSED

On March 30 or 31 of 1949 the junior Senator from Nevada not only placed in the RECORD a list of 88 trade treaties which were made by the Marshall plan countries during the time they were receiving our direct aid, but he also placed in the RECORD two military and economic pacts made separately by England and France with Russia. Those pacts have 12 or 15 years to run at this date, and no nation which is a party to any of the agreements or pacts has made any move to cancel them.

PACTS READ LIKE THE ATLANTIC PACT

Mr. President, I wish to read a few paragraphs from the treaties, one of which was signed in 1942. The first one was signed by Anthony Eden, on behalf of England, and by Vyacheslav Molotov, on behalf of the Soviet Union. The other treaty was made between the Soviet Union and France. Article VI of the treaty between England and the Soviet Union reads:

The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Article VII reads:

Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

The other treaty, signed by Molotov, on behalf of Russia, and by Georges Bidault was signed in 1944.

Article V provides:

The high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the high contracting parties.

Article VI reads:

The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war.

ENGLAND, FRANCE LIVING UP TO THE PACT

Mr. President, they have been living up to what they agreed to do in the economic field. Those treaties are still in full force and effect. Perhaps a resolution would be in order either to have the two economic military pacts canceled, or to have the Atlantic Pact canceled. I suppose the Senate will get around to doing it in about 2 or 3 years. Just as we are doing today.

THE WEST IS STILL ARMING RUSSIA

In 1950 the junior Senator from Nevada inserted a list of 95 recent trade treaties between the ECA countries and the Soviet satellites and the U. S. S. R. Many of the old treaties were renewed, and most of the treaties are still in effect. It is not necessary to recall that the junior Senator from Nevada was on his feet time after time talking about trade going from Hong Kong and from Singapore to Communist China. The junior Senator from Nevada was in Singapore in 1948. Shiploads of tin, rubber, and other materials were going to Communist China at that time. They are still going there, or until very, very recently.

Once in awhile a ship is picked up. I hope all ships are being stopped, but I doubt it. In fact I am informed that vital material is still going into Red China.

ENGLAND AND FRANCE PACT WITH RUSSIA

On March 30, 31, 1949, I said, in the ECA debate with Senator FORREST C. DONNELL:

Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Missouri, I say that not only is there a plain conflict between the pact and that trade agreement, but a similar pact has been made between France and Russia, and still is in effect.

Furthermore, there is a plain conflict between every one of the trade treaties made by the 15 Marshall-plan countries with the countries behind the iron curtain, for we furnish everything they could possibly want to use if they were to go to war against the United States today.

KOREA SHOWS THE RESULTS OF OUR ARMING RUSSIA

Mr. President, the Senate had the facts at that time just as it has them today. To digress from the RECORD of March 30 and March 31 of 1949 for a minute: Perhaps 60 percent of the material which is now thrown against our boys in Korea was furnished and paid for by the taxpayers of America, by the fathers of the boys who are in Korea.

That fact has been known to the Senate for 3 years. Russia and her satellites now have the material with which to go to war with us. That material, Mr. President, was furnished by us.

ARMED THE JAPS IN 1937–38

I quote further from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I recall the situation on the Pacific Coast in 1937, 1938, and 1939. I live at Reno, Nev., 240 miles from the Pacific coast. In those days the United States allowed oil and scrap iron to be sent from the United States to Japan. That was 5 years before Pearl Harbor; and even at that time every veterans' organization was opposed to those shipments.

SENATE APPROVED WITH FULL KNOWLEDGE

They have been opposed to the shipments that have been made in the last 3 years, too, which were paid for by the United States, with the approval of the Senate.

Practically everyone in the United States spoke against those shipments and complained about them—at least, everyone who had any gumption at all did. But did the administration do anything about that? Oh, no. The administration permitted the scrap iron and oil to be continued to be sent to Japan almost up to the time of Pearl Harbor, and then following Pearl Harbor sent our boys out in the Pacific to catch the steel coming back out of Japanese guns with their bare hands.

Mr. President, that is what we are dong in Korea. That is what we will be doing everywhere in the world when there is a likelihood of war with Russia or her satellites.

I continue reading:

Mr. President, that experience indicates what will happen to the steel, the locomotives, and the other manufactured articles and equipment which these nations are sending to Russia now, if we have trouble with Russia.

Mr. President, that was 3 years ago. We are continuing the quote:

YOUNG MEN TO EUROPE

Mr. President, if we continue to make such shipments and if we continue with these pacts and agreements—each one supposed to be a cure-all—I predict that it will not be long before we shall be sending our young people abroad to catch, with their bare hands again, the bullets and shells which will have been manufactured from the equipment and supplies we send abroad; and they will be the sons and daughters of the veterans of other wars, just as our young people who fought in the Second World War were the sons and daughters of veterans of the First World War. Of course, Mr. President, some of the Members of the Senate are themselves veterans of the Second World War.

Mr. President, that was in March 1949.

NATIONS STILL ON DOLE

I say to the Senator from Missouri and to the Senator from Massachusetts that, in my opinion, the Senate does not have the moral right to promote such agreements and keep the 16 Marshall-plan nations on the dole, when today they are sending the munitions of war and the facilities for arming Russia, to enable her to fight us in a third world war.

We knew it then, and we know it now. The amendment which was tacked to the supplemental appropriations bill refers to strategic materials. What are strategic materials? They are shirt buttons, rubber tires, textiles, or anything that can be used in a civilian or war economy. It is necessary to feed an army, and it is necessary to equip it.

THIS AMENDMENT WILL BE EVADED

Mr. President, you will find that the countries will be dodging the issue presented by this amendment by the mere reasoning that the material is something that cannot be shot out of a gun. In other words, it must be an article that can be used directly for war, according to the reasoning of nations anxious to trade with Russia. It must be steel, ball bearings, or munitions.

CHINA IS NOT COMPLETELY LOST IF WE ACT NOW

Mr. President, if we put a complete embargo on Communist China, she will come back to the Nationalists in a very reasonable time. Even now, after abandoning her for 2 years, if Russia cannot furnish China with what it takes to enable her to get along better than she did before, she will lose it. The Russians must be in a position to say to China: "Look what we are doing for you. We are getting you the materials you need from Singapore, Hong Kong, and other ports."

That is the way Russian has held its satellite nations for the last 5 years. She has been able to get materials for Communist China from the so-called western nations.

If we had had an embargo on Russia and her satellites—and I mean a real embargo, not merely an embargo on strategic material—4 years ago, there would be no satellite nations today.

PROPOSAL TO TAX THE SALARIES OF THE PRESIDENT, THE VICE PRESIDENT, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on Friday, May 18, 1951, President Truman spoke before the National Conference on Citizenship at the Statler Hotel here in Washington, at which time he called the attention of the country to the grave danger of inflation.

In his speech, according to the press, President Truman showed some of his old 1948 fire, by launching out against what he described as "special interest fellows"; and he followed that by advising the American people to begin taking a greater interest in their Government.

President Truman did not elaborate as to whom he meant when he referred to the "special interest fellows," but I presume he had reference to the General Vaughans, the Maragons and the other 5-percenters hanging around the White House.

But the one part of President Truman's speech which impressed me in particular was a statement which he made while speaking on the inflationary threat, at which time he called attention to the selfishness of certain people, how they were willing to have everybody except themselves make sacrifices.

To emphasize this point, the President is quoted as saying:

Everybody says prices must be held down, but you must hold down everybody's prices but mine. Everybody else must take a cut, but be careful, don't touch mine.

On January 11, 1951, following President Truman's request for additional taxes amounting to $10,000,000,000, I introduced Senate bill 357, the purpose of which was to repeal the special tax exemptions now being enjoyed by the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of Congress on the basis that the officials of the Government should set the example in making sacrifices. This bill was reintroduced on April 9, 1951, with 34 other Senators appearing as cosponsors.

On January 25, 1951, I directed a letter to the President, asking for his support of this bill.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a copy of that letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1951.

The PRESIDENT of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On January 11, 1951, I introduced S. 357, a copy of which is attached. The purpose of this bill is to repeal the special tax exemption which was extended by Congress to you as President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Members of Congress.

I have always felt that the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress should be adequately paid; however, I believe Congress made a serious mistake when it adopted the principle that a portion of their salaries be in the form of a special tax exemption. Our country was established on the sound principle that we would extend to the ruling class no benefits which were not extended to every American citizen.

Today with our country in the midst of a war and at a time when we are going to be compelled to place an additional load upon the already overburdened American taxpayers, I think that the greatest contribution that you as President and that we as Members of Congress could make to their morale and to the war effort in general would be to set the example by repealing this special exemption, thereby subjecting ourselves to the same rate of taxation as is applicable to all other American citizens.

It was in this spirit that I introduced S. 357, and I would very much appreciate having your support in this proposal. I feel confident that your endorsement would receive the enthusiastic commendation of every American citizen.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the fact that the President is allergic to letter writing accounts, I suppose, for the fact that I have not received a reply to this letter. However, in the absence of any direct reply, I presume that his statement of last Friday reflects his position on this bill—when he said:

Everybody else must take a cut, but be careful, don't touch mine.

ASSERTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, throughout my years in the Senate, I have sought to preserve the legislative prerogatives of the United States Congress. I have been concerned at the continuous whittling away of our powers, an insidious process which has been going on since 1933.

In the course of the present joint hearings of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, I have tried

to get our committee to exercise their lawful powers.

18–8 VOTE WAS BAD PRECEDENT

For that reason, I was deeply disturbed by the very harmful precedent which was established when the committee by a vote of 18 to 8 last Thursday turned down my appeal to require General Bradley to give us the full facts as to the actual conversations in the White House which preceded General MacArthur's dismissal. Mr. President, I respect the convictions of my 18 colleagues in the opposition and I respect their complete integrity, just as I respect my 7 associates who held with me. I respect the right of those 18 Senators to differ with me, but I caution them that they are contributing to the process of the whittling away of Congress' powers. Surely, our Republican forces, in particular, which have so steadfastly fought against the undermining of the legislative branch, will see eventually, and should see right now, that it was most unfortunate that some members of the GOF failed to fight for this historic cause—the independent sovereignty of our branch.

When a duly authorized committee of the United States Congress cannot request and secure the information it wants, then the question naturally arises, "Why have a committee at all?" It is now clear that these two committees will not obtain those facts.

I HOPE WHITEWASH WON'T RESULT

It is my earnest hope that this joint hearing will not end up in such a condition as to require the American people to say that it was just another whitewash and washout.

I was quoted as saying the other day that the joint hearing was a whitewash or a washout. I did not say that, however. I said I hoped we would be able to get sufficient facts, and would not, in fact, be held back, so that the conclusion of honest men everywhere would be that the hearing was a whitewash.

At this time I cannot help but think of the argument made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who said there is no immunity, and then presented the argument of privilege. I shall not argue that question. However, as I have read the articles appearing in the press, it is very clear that those who wrote the articles have not read the argument of the Senator from Georgia on that subject, nor have they told the facts to the American people.

Mr. President, the fact is that until that time the President had not once indicated to the committee nor has he since done so, that he believed the conversations to be privileged. It was General Bradley who said he had not even talked with the President on the subject of whether those conversations were confidential or privileged. That fact is shown by the record. The law cannot be fitted to the facts until we obtain the facts.

So, Mr. President, the real question is whether General Bradley has a right to claim that those conversations are privileged. Even if he has a right to make that claim, is it not the obligation of the President to disclose the facts? This issue does not go to the question of public interest, but goes to the matter of whether the people of the United States should be informed of the facts by those who know them. Should those who know the facts be required to inform the people of America why the decision to replace General MacArthur was reached?

Mr. President, we already have had three answers to that question; I understand that another one was given today. I was not in the Senate Chamber earlier today, for I was on my way to Washington, returning from Wisconsin.

So, Mr. President, I have stated that it is my sincere hope that the joint hearing now under way will not end in a condition which will require the American people to say that the hearing was merely another whitewash and washout.

On Friday afternoon, I sent to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] a letter expressing this fervent hope.

On Sunday morning, I released a statement indicating that I, for one, felt that it might contribute to the national well-being if President Truman were to be asked to testify before our committee. Why should not the President do so? In the White House conversations in regard to General MacArthur was there something really confidential, about which the people should not know? If there was, let the President say so. However, he has not made such a statement, other than to do so, I understand, inferentially to the press.

If the President does not wish to testify before these committees, we cannot compel him to do so. However, there have been hundreds of instances in which Presidents have communicated with congressional committees and have sent to them documents which they have requested. That was my desire in the present case. I had no desire to engage in cheap politics. The two committees are constituted of honorable men. Never in my 12 years of service in the Senate has a suggestion been made that my conduct has been based on cheap politics. I say that these committees and the Senate itself are entitled to the facts in this matter. That is all we wish to have.

As I have said, already there have been three different indications or conclusions as to what the facts in this matter are.

JOHN MARSHALL'S STATEMENT

I should like to make certain matters a part of the RECORD. But, before doing so, I should like to quote from a powerful ruling of Chief Justice Marshall, in the Aaron Burr case in 1808:

> That the President of the United States may be subpenaed and examined, as a witness, and required to produce any paper in his possession is not controverted.

The only modification of that rule is that if the President says he will not obey, there is no power to compel him to do so.

The statement I have just quoted was made by Chief Justice John Marshall. No greater lawyer ever lived, and he was the greatest Supreme Court Justice this country has ever had. He made that statement when our country was in the process of being formed.

The power to subpena the President and to cross-examine him is not controverted. Let all the individuals who have assumed they know everything about constitutional law ponder that simple direct statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point—

(a) The release on my letter to Chairman RUSSELL.

(b) The text of a statement which I released on Sunday, relative to possible subpenaing of the President; and

(c) The text of an editorial as published in the Los Angeles Herald Express entitled "Frustrating the Whitewash."

While my friend, the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is mentioned in this editorial, did not vote with our minority in the 18–8 ballot, I know that the editorial will hold great and valid interest.

There being no objection, the letter, statement, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY PROTESTS TO RUSSELL AGAINST "WHITEWASH" AND "WASH-OUT" TENDENCY OF JOINT HEARINGS THUS FAR

The following is the text of a letter sent by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, Wisconsin) ranking Republican, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to Hon. RICHARD RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The letter was delivered to Senator RUSSELL'S office Friday afternoon, May 18, 1951. In releasing the letter which Senator WILEY asked to be transmitted to the President, Senator WILEY expressed the hope that on the basis of this letter, "the President might reconsider his decision against the disclosure by any of his aides of the facts preceding General MacArthur's dismissal."

TEXT

"On Thursday, May 17, in the joint hearings of our two committees, I stated:

"'MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the chairman ascertain from the Chief Executive whether he would be willing that the participants in those conversations or gatherings give us what was said and if not (that is, if Mr. Truman refuses) is his refusal based upon the general thesis, that it would be damaging to the public interest if the information were given?'

"You stated in reply that if a letter were addressed to you, asking for such information, you would transmit it 'to the proper authority.'

"Then I commented: 'You shall receive the letter, sir.'

"However, yesterday afternoon, the President stated in effect to his press conference that his conversations with his advisers before coming to decisions were his business and his business alone.

"This pronouncement of the President answers quite clearly, albeit very unsatisfactory, one of the questions I was going to ask him in my letter, namely, whether the President would release his staff from any pledge, open or implied, to keep their conversations with him confidential. The President apparently will not release his staff from such a pledge—going on the theory that neither the public nor the Senate has any right to get such detailed information relating to the recall of General MacArthur or for that matter, any subsequent question which we will raise in committee.

"It is my contention that circumstances which led up to a decision affecting the whole future peace of the world definitely

are the people's business and must be revealed to the people's representatives. If the President is allowed to maintain his 'iron curtain' over this information regarding events leading to MacArthur's dismissal, we will never be able to lift the 'iron curtain' over other events which led to the downfall of Nationalist China, the blunders at Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, and any other critical issues which our committees may want to explore. Now, Mr. Chairman, no one has fought harder than I to preserve the system of checks and balances between three separate and coequal branches of government. But I ask now, How can the Congress check and balance abuses of Presidential power, errors of Presidential commission or omission, if it cannot even get the facts? Are we to legislate in the dark; is the past to be shrouded in secrecy; is our policy in the future to be based on severely limited information?

"We 96 Senators were elected to represent 154,000,000 people. We cannot go back to those people and tell them that decisions affecting the lives of 150,000 American boys fighting in Korea—that such decisions and their origins are 'the President's business and his alone.'

"I want to point out that the President has not stated that the disclosure of the facts as to his conversations, consultations and conversations—that such disclosures would be harmful to the public interest. He has simply stated an arbitrary edict that whether his conversations affect the national security or not, they are nobody else's business but his.

"I hesitate to conclude at this early stage, but I must say that from the way the joint hearings have proceeded thus far they may end up being considered not only a whitewash but a wash-out. I hope that future events may not justify such a conclusion. I am not making these remarks on the basis of any individuals or personalities involved but solely on the basis of objection to the 'cover-up' tactics thus far condoned by the joint committee majority.

"Let me also state that as one who has supported bipartisan foreign policy in Europe in every single one of its stages since the end of the Second World War, I deeply resent any charge or any innuendo to the effect that my own or my minority colleagues' approach is partisan in its goal or in its motivation. We are simply trying to get the facts, letting the chips fall where they may because we feel that a country which has suffered some 66,000 casualties including over 11,000 dead, is entitled to know everything that led up to such losses and worse losses to come so long as such information does not violate national security. It is the committee majority which has been partisan in its frantic desire to cover up and whitewash.

"I would appreciate your courtesy in transmitting this respectful message."

WILEY SUGGESTS PRESIDENT TRUMAN MIGHT WELL BE ASKED TO TESTIFY BEFORE JOINT HEARINGS ON FOREIGN POLICY

I believe that it would be very good for our Nation if President Truman were to voluntarily agree to testify before the joint hearings of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. At first mention of this proposal it might seem that such an idea is completely unthinkable. Actually, however, there are more than ample precedents for such testimony, both on a voluntary or compulsory basis, in the history of our own Government and of other democratic parliamentary systems.

Apparently, President Truman is giving information at his press conferences that we in the Senate have not been able to get at the joint closed hearings. He, himself, has taken on the entire burden of explaining just how and why the MacArthur dismissal came about. He has said that the decision was his, and that his aides went along with him. But when we asked his aides to give us facts and not merely the conclusions of the White House conversations, they refused to do so, and as a result our committee is stymied.

WE RESPECT EXECUTIVE BRANCH'S SOVEREIGN POWER

Naturally, I do not believe that the President of the United States should be examined on the basis of trivial, nonmaterial, frivolous, purely partisan questions. On the contrary, my colleagues and I on both sides of the aisle would fully respect his position as the head of a sovereign and coequal branch of Government.

PRESIDENTIAL APPEARANCE COULD ENCOURAGE UNITY

I am firmly convinced, however, that if the President were to appear before us, preferably voluntarily, and were to testify regarding his approach to the crucial issues of our times, it would have a tremendously salutary effect in encouraging as much unity as possible among parties and with the American people.

I WANTED EXECUTIVE BRANCH TESTIMONY BEFORE PEARL HARBOR

Back in February and March 1941 I urged the Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, to appear in a full Senate session to speak to us regarding the developing crisis in the Far East. Mr. Hull turned down my request. He refused to answer my questions regarding "the condition of our fleet air arm in the Philippines," refused to state (10 months before Pearl Harbor) whether we might be caught (as I implied) the way the Russians were caught in the Japanese blitz attack at Port Arthur in 1905.

In that case the actual power to subpena the President was conceded by the executive branch.

We all recognize that under foreign parliamentary systems the Prime Minister—the operating head of the executive branch—is called upon constantly to defend his actions before the legislative branch, namely, the Parliament. I am not suggesting that this practice be used in the United States constantly. But I do feel that in a grave crisis such as we are now experiencing—with American boys dying and being wounded in great numbers each month and with the possibility of a third world war hanging over us—Presidential appearance could be most helpful.

CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL ORDERED SUBPENA ON PRESIDENT JEFFERSON

If the President refused, the joint committee might very well consider subpenaing him. I want to point out that way back in 1808, President Jefferson was subpenaed in connection with the Aaron Burr trial. The great Chief Justice Marshall issued a subpena commanding President Jefferson to appear and to bring certain letters, documents, and copies of orders and instructions given by him to the armed services respecting Aaron Burr.

In that case the actual power to subpena the President was conceded by the executive branch. Government counsel, William Wirt, merely argued that the documents sought were not relevant, and he had other technical bases for objection to the subpena.

Chief Justice Marshall ruled "that the President of the United States may be subpenaed and examined as a witness and required to produce any paper in his possession is not controverted. * * * The President, although subject to the general rules which apply to others, may have sufficient motives for declining to produce a particular paper and those motives may be such as to restrain the court from enforcing its production."

The result of the Burr case was that Chief Justice Marshall very forthrightly asserted and exercised the judiciary's powers to decide whether the executive's claim of privilege was meritorious; it decided in this case that the claim had no merit.

In the current Dollar Line case, the judiciary is once more asserting its rightful power and its intention to command respect of its decisions. Let the Senate similarly preserve its powers and preserve respect of its lawful prerogatives.

MY PURPOSE IS CONSTRUCTIVE

I should like to reiterate most strongly that the whole purpose of my approach is constructive and respectful. I have no intention of trying to embarrass the Chief Executive of our country or to impair America's foreign policy. As I pointed out in my letter to Chairman RUSSELL yesterday, I personally have supported bipartisan foreign policy as regards Europe right down the line. I am merely seeking to get the facts before the American people. It would seem odd that the alert, vigilant American press at its regular conferences with the President should be able to get more facts than the American Congress through its duly constituted committees.

REPUBLICANS MUST PROVIDE LOYAL, RESPONSIBLE OPPOSITION

I recognize that several of my very able Republican colleagues on the Joint Committee differ with me. I respect the integrity of their convictions, just as I respect the Democratic colleagues of the majority, including the very distinguished chairman, DICK RUSSELL. I differ with the majority Democrats, however, just as I differ with our Republicans who voted with them, because I think it is a particular obligation of the Republican Party to serve as loyal opposition. It is up to us of the minority to furnish constructive criticism in a responsible way of what we feel to be errors of the administration's approach without, however, our forgetting that the interests of our Nation must always come before the interests of party.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express of May 18, 1951]

FRUSTRATING THE WHITEWASH

The Truman administration's hope of whitewashing the dismissal of General MacArthur through political manipulation of the joint Senate committee's hearings has been frustrated, largely through the efforts of Senators WILEY of Wisconsin and SMITH of New Jersey.

The administration succeeded in preventing public hearings, which would have made the entire testimony available to the American people hour by hour as it was given.

The administration has won the privilege of censoring the testimony before it is released for publication.

As the admnistration's first spokesman before the committee, Secretary of Defense Marshall undertook to refute General MacArthur's concise, forthright and irrefutably logical plan for winning the war in Asia by muffling it in half-truths, whole smears, evasions and confusion.

But he has not been permitted to do that.

Senators WILEY and SMITH, by pressing him with shrewd and specific questions, have elicited a much sharper and far uglier impression of the administration's dealings with General MacArthur and the Korean war than that which Secretary Marshall had undertaken to present.

Admissions extracted from him by the two insistent Senators clearly indicate that there was bitter and persistent enmity against General MacArthur in the Truman administration, and that the administration welcomed the opportunity to dismiss

him on a pretext that it thought, mistakenly, would satisfy the public.

And further admissions drawn from General Marshall make it clear that the administration, while rejecting General MacArthur's plan to end the war in Korea, has no plan of its own for bringing the fighting to a close in the foreseeable future.

If we are to escape from the costly stalemate in Korea without a long-continued slaughter of American fighting men, the American people and the American Congress must know who is influencing the administration's confused and contradictory foreign policy and in whose interest the policy is being guided.

Senators WILEY and SMITH have rendered the Nation a great service in the progress they have made toward exposing the facts the people should know.

Let us hope they will continue their labors with growing success and that other Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, will join in the process with equal vigor and determination.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I have said, I have just returned from Wisconsin. An editorial has been called to my attention, entitled "End of Appeasement," which appeared in today's Washington News. I think it very relevant to the statement which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, and I ask that it also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END OF APPEASEMENT

The State Department has ended its 6-year flirtation with the Chinese Communists.

It now denounces the Peiping regime as part of the "Communist conspiracy" and implies willingness to help the Chinese people if they will revolt against their Red masters.

Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, who announced the new policy, also pledged important aid to the Chinese Nationalist government in Formosa.

But, he said, such aid of itself can't be decisive unless the Chinese people decide for freedom and find added strength from those who refuse to believe that China is fated to become a land of tyranny and aggression.

So, for the first time, the State Department recognizes the Chinese Nationalists as allies in a common struggle against Communist aggression. And, for the first time since 1946, it makes a friendly gesture toward them.

It was in August of that year that President Truman accused "political reactionaries" in China of obstructing their country's welfare and "failing to understand the liberal trend of the times" because they opposed his plan for a coalition with the Communists.

The damage done by the disastrous policy of 6 years can't easily be repaired. But if Mr. Rusk's speech means what it seems to mean—a permanent end to appeasement of the Chinese Reds and no sell-out of Formosa—that is a distinct gain, which should help make it possible to form a truly meaningful united front against Communist aggression in Asia.

It also should now be possible for the State Department and the British Foreign Office to get together on a policy toward Asiatic communism, bringing the attitudes of the two major allies into harmony throughout the world. There is urgent need for that, since much more positive measures may be necessary in Korea if the Reds continue to pour in reinforcements. Neither there nor anywhere else can negative and divided policies hope to combat communism successfully.

As Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, points out, the Communists have been permitted to take and keep the initiative in propaganda, cultural activity, and political fields, as well as in military matters, and it is time for counterattack. His idea is not only to use active propaganda but also to aid resistance movements, much as Russia is supporting the activities of Red fifth columns in almost all countries.

Opposition to communism exists in all the Red satellite states, and movements working to undermine Moscow's control should be supported. Such underground movements, given intelligent and determined encouragement, might become the instruments of Soviet defeat.

Russia's gains have been made by measures short of war. There should be enough brains, enough ingenuity in the Western World to devise a plan for thwarting Russia's purposes without using the A-bomb or maintaining a state of defensive mobilization for a generation or more.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. KEM. I know the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has made some study of the historical precedents in this case. I should like to ask him whether President George Washington did not voluntarily appear before committees of Congress to testify.

Mr. WILEY. I am not satisfied as to how I should answer that question. I do not think I should at this time seek to argue the legal principles. The only thing I wanted to make clear, so far as I was concerned, was that I thought the President of the United States should be requested to appear before the two committees sitting jointly to tell the facts, inasmuch as General Bradley without even consulting the President raised the question of confidential communication; that the President of the United States should release General Bradley and others from an implied restraint, if that is what General Bradley considers it to be, and should indicate that this is not a controversy between the President and General MacArthur. The two committees, sitting jointly, have been constituted by this august body to conduct an investigation, and I am sorry to note that, already, too many members have taken the position that they are advocates, not investigators. The duty of each member of each of the two committees is to avoid taking sides at this time. The object of each individual should be to become an investigator, for the purpose of obtaining the facts and reaching the truth.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, since a digression has occurred, here, I ask unanimous consent that all this debate appear at the end of the debate on the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REAL POINT AT ISSUE

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say that the question in the debate and in the committee hearings, I fear, has been diverted to the question of who said one thing or another, or to matters of personalities of one kind or another, when the point at issue, as pointed out on April 18 by the junior Senator from Nevada in an address to the Senate, prior to the arrival of General MacArthur, boils down to whether we are to allow Russia to finesse control of China. Nearly all authorities agree that Russia cannot get into this war on a sustained basis with a 3,500 mile single-track railroad for supplies from the Ural factories, but the Russians do have a considerable number of planes—also factories to equip the Communist forces if they are to enjoy a sanctuary while arming and equipping the forces of Communist China.

MURDERING NATIONALIST LEADERS

During that time they are cutting off the heads of all the people who do not agree with them, as they are captured, then they will proceed through Indochina and the Malayan States and Siam, and control Asia.

The difference in judgment is whether we should blockade the coast of China and destroy the war-making industries in Manchuria, and blockade the east China coast. China had attacked us and given us an opportunty to destroy her war-making industries and to turn Chiang Kai-shek loose and turn the war back into a Chinese civil war.

The question was whether we should win the war in that manner or whether we should hold our troops in Korea and cause them to fight in the fashion of a football game, using the thirty-eighth parallel as a sort of line of scrimmage, or demarcation, passing the ball back and forth. If we continue to fiddle around in the middle of Korea until Russia controls all of China, and then all of Asia. Europe will fall of her own weight when Russia is ready to move regardless of how many troops there may be in Europe.

If we destroy China's offensive power now in that manner she could be of no further help to Russia for a considerable time and China and Asia may be saved from the Communists.

TVA ANNIVERSARY AND ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my intention on Friday last, May 18, to address myself to the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority anniversary and also make some appropriate remarks in reference to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that my remarks prepared on those subjects be printed in the body of the RECORD in the form of a statement commemorating the anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and pointing out the strategic importance to our national security of the immediate passage of the bill dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway. I earnestly solicit the attention of my colleagues to the importance of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, commending to their consideration the national security elements involved, and the importance of the development of industry, commerce, and agriculture in the great Midwest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY—TVA ANNIVERSARY AND ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

On May 18, 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority came into being. That was 18 years ago today—an 18 years which have

seen the valley of the Tennessee turned from a depressed, flood-ridden, wasted area to one of green fields, growing industries, dams, and powerhouses. It was an 18 years which began with a creative idea—that it is possible, through effective planning, to develop an entire region. It was an 18 years which saw that idea plucked from dreamland and planted in the land of reality. It was an 18 years of germination, growth, and of great and full fruition.

On this day I feel it would be particularly appropriate to review in part the accomplishments and history of TVA and to reflect briefly on the meaning of the nonexistence of another of this country's proposed regional projects—the St. Lawrence seaway.

It is not strange that these two huge river developments should be linked together in my mind, for one is merely the completed form of what the other should be. A person, if he is intelligent, learns from experience and likes to apply the learning from that experience to other experiences. This is what I and millions of people in the United States would like to do with our TVA experience. We would like to see the lessons learned there, which have benefited so greatly not only the people living in and near the river basin, but also those living in every State of the Union—we should like to see the lessons learned in TVA applied so that the millions of people living in the vast area serviced by the St. Lawrence and, in fact, the country as a whole, may reap the uncounted benefits from the development of that river.

In the years before 1933, the Tennessee, an angry, turbulent destroyer of life and property as it ran in flood year after year, was a potential giant of undeveloped power and a possible valuable addition to America's inland waterway system. At the same time, the valley of the Tennessee was annually drenched with more rain than any other region in the country except the Pacific Northwest. And the temperate climate of the valley allowed for a growing season longer than most other large areas in the country.

Here were priceless natural assets—abundant rainfall, moderate sunshine, a river which could be made navigable, and power-potential of large-scale proportions.

But there was a factor lacking in the Tennessee Valley, one which prevented this great endowment of nature from being used to advantage. There was lacking the vision and power of the human being. Mankind had not kept pace, and, as a result the land of the Tennessee Valley lay idle and uncovered during much of the growing season, the soaking rain washing away more and more of its topsoil and leaving vast stretches of useless eroded acres. Navigation of the river was virtually impossible, and floods pervaded the region contributing to crests on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

Out of the valley went the raw materials produced on its farms and forests to be made into finished products in other regions. As a consequence, the wealth that comes from human skills and machine production in the processing of these raw materials enriched other regions but added nothing to the valley. Many men and women migrated from the valley to work in the processing factories, and so out of the valley went not only its raw materials but its human resources as well.

These were some of the problems of the Tennessee basin which led men of vision like Franklin Roosevelt and George Norris of Nebraska to propose a Federal project cutting across seven States for the purpose of harnessing the river and developing its valley for the use of its 4,500,000 people. At the same time they any many others proposed to make use of the obsolete and idle nitrogen and fertilizer plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala., built in World War I.

And so the Tennessee Valley Authority was born. Congress gave it certain specific tasks to perform. It was to achieve (1) the maximum amount of flood control; (2) the maximum development of the river for navigation purposes; (3) the maximum generation of electric power consistent with flood control and navigation; (4) the proper use of marginal lands; (5) reforestation; and (6) the economic and social well-being of the people living in said river basin. Here was as challenging a task as any Government agency in the United States had ever been asked to perform.

Eighteen years have passed since these instructions were made to TVA. There can be little doubt, when one looks at the history of the accomplishments of TVA, that the 18 years have been profitable ones, for the achievements of the region have been great. They have been so great, in fact, that the Tennessee Valley Authority concluded in its 1951 annual report to Congress that "the Valley is ready to meet effectively whatever normal or emergency demands are made upon it." And this in a year of great national emergency when the full power and resources of the Valley will be brought into play.

The act creating TVA called for the maximum amount of flood control. In response TVA has built 18 major dams and has integrated them with 10 previously existing dams into a single system of flood control, thus transforming a portion of the Tennessee River Valley into a 12,000,000 acre-foot storage space for flood control. This system of 28 dams and reservoirs has already prevented $45,000,000 in flood damage to one city alone, Chattanooga, Tenn. It can reduce flood crests by 2½ to 3 feet on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, providing protection to 6,000,000 acres of rich bottom land located outside the Tennessee Valley. In January of last year, many millions of dollars of flood damage were saved when the Mississippi flood crest at Cairo, Ill., was reduced 2 feet by the operation of the TVA reservoirs. In January of 1946 one of the great floods of the river's history developed, but the dams held the flow and disaster was thwarted. Certainly one of the most dramatic results of the Authority has been its control of winter floods.

A second purpose of TVA was to develop the Tennessee River for navigation purposes. Since 1933, a 630-mile navigation channel has been dug from Knoxville to Paducah, where the Tennessee joins the Ohio. In 1949, the new channel carried freight amounting to 15 times the ton-miles carried before TVA began. This, of course, has meant a substantial annual savings in transportation costs involving especially products of higher values, such as coal, oil, grain, and steel. An avenue of water has been created between the valley and the Middle West.

A third task for the Authority was to maximize the generation of electric power, this to be done by means of the same dams which control the flood waters and provide a channel for navigation. Since the inception of TVA, a million consumers receive 12 times as much electricity as the same area produced in 1933. The power reaches the consumer through 145 publicly owned municipal and rural electric cooperative systems. These local distributors buy their power from TVA at wholesale rates and sell it to their consumers at low retail rates. The revenue from power sold by TVA is sufficient to pay for all operating costs of its power system and, in addition, has netted TVA an annual average of more than 4 percent return on its total power investment.

As I stated, the electric retail rates to consumers have been low. In the TVA area, the average rate for residential use is less than 1.5 cents per kilowatt-hour; in the United States, the average is 2.9 cents. These retail rates permit an increased use of electricity. In the TVA area the average annual use is more than 3,200 kilowatt-hours by a residential consumer; the average in the whole of the United States is about 1,825.

Perhaps a more significant set of figures, one that reflects the great economic change in the region, is the percentage figure showing the number of electrified farms in the region and the per capita income figures. In 1933 about 3 percent of the Valley's farms had electricity; today, more than 85 percent are electrified. In 1933 the per capita income of the area was 40 percent of the national average; it is now 60 percent. These rising incomes resulting in increased purchasing power permit the people of the Valley to purchase goods from every State of the Union in ever-increasing quantities. It must be remembered that any improvement in any region of the United States must necessarily work an improvement in the whole of the United States.

The 1933 act creating TVA asked the Authority to provide for the proper use of marginal lands, or, in other words, asked for the development of new agricultural techniques. The carrying out of this provision is probably the most stimulating and heartening aspect of TVA, the first of importance among its manifold accomplishments. In improved agricultural techniques to capture the soil and to put it to use we find the real essence of TVA. Here is man and nature working together to restore life to the land.

It is estimated that given the present rate of erosion in this country, our people will no longer be able to feed themselves 50 years from now. This is a startling thought when one considers the vast expanses of land in this country.

TVA, through its continuous research into agricultural technology, through its chemical plants at Muscle Shoals which produce new and improved fertilizers, through its reforestation program, through its demonstration farms throughout the area, has so far saved about 3,000,000 acres of soil. And millions more will be saved in time. Stories are manifold of the progress of the Authority in this sphere of its work—stories of the 65,000 farmers who are using new mineral fertilizers to redeem their eroded acres; stories of the million acres of cover crops which have replaced the row crops of corn, cotton, and tobacco on the hill slopes; stories of the 205,000,000 tree seedlings provided by TVA for planting on eroded and abandoned lands. Time does not permit telling these stories in any more detail, but the facts are to be had. An evening's reading of the tale of the TVA in this human sphere will leave the reader breathless with wonder at the good that can be accomplished when people, government, and nature combine their resources for improvement.

Important in the development of TVA the valley has been the TVA's efforts to encourage the State and local agencies and institutions to take responsibility for leadership and technical service to the people of the valley. Behind the physical improvements undertaken by TVA has been a philosophy reflecting a greater purpose—that of building local strength and autonomy. Where there was no State agency to take on the work of TVA within the compentence of the State, such as State planning boards, State park agencies, State fish and game commissions, TVA helped the State to establish and develop such an agency and encouraged it to take on as much of the work of the Authority as it could manage. Gradually the States have assumed a greater proportion of the responsibility for the development and improvement of the area, thus leaving the Authority to go on to problems of greater scope. Technical and financial assistance from the Federal level thus become the seeds for local programs, locally directed and controlled, and ultimately paid for out of higher incomes in the area.

TVA is based on the thesis that the whole country benefits as each region builds a stronger economy upon the native characteristics and resources that mark it as a region. This thesis is stated most simply on the tablet which each of TVA's units bears: Built for the People of the United States.

The success story of TVA can lead only to the conclusion that this thesis on which it has been built is a true one. The whole country has benefited in many obvious and many less obvious ways from the active presence of the Tennessee Valley Authority. And it will benefit even more as the region is developed to its maximum potential. During World War II and today as we enter another period of national emergency, TVA assumes an even greater importance to the welfare of the entire country. The last war saw the establishment of the Oak Ridge, Tenn., atomic energy plant and the rapid expansion of aluminum production in the area. The location of the Oak Ridge project in the Tennessee Valley was largely determined by the fact that TVA was in a position to make the required power available. The new emergency will undoubtedly bring other national defense projects. We citizens of the United States must, I think, give a vote of heartfelt thanks to those so-called visionaries 18 years ago who fought for the development of this now vital sector of our country.

Today, and for many years now, there has been an imperative need in this country for another large-scale river development—that of the St. Lawrence. As this country comes closer and closer to all-out war once again, we realize with more and more clarity the serious handicap under which our economic mobilization effort is working because of the critical shortages of transportation and electric power in the northeastern section of our country.

It is nothing short of a crime against national security and the cause of freedom that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project remains unbuilt. There can be little doubt that the refusal of Congress to pass this vital legislation because of the false fears given it by powerful defenders of monopoly and scarcity in this country, endangers the security of the United States, of Canada and of our allies.

These are strong words and they are serious words. But these are serious times and little can be gained from cautious attendance to conventionalities. On the other hand, much can be gained from legislation providing for Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River basin development.

What would be gained? The opening of the interior of the North American continent to world trade. A vast increase in vitally needed electric power for residential and industrial users in New York and New England. The break-up of the dangerous transportation bottleneck that has backed up the shipment of grain and other farm products and slowed down the movement of industrial materials and finished products. Cheap water transportation for 50,000,000 people in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence tributary area. A continuation of ore shipments to the country's steel mill centers as the supply of Lake Superior ore diminishes.

These are great gains—gains that will add wealth to our economy, gains that will provide us with additional national security, that will open up the whole Midwest to the avenues of world trade.

The St. Lawrence Seaway project has received unstinting support from the people of Minnesota who realize that with the building of the 113-mile channel in the St. Lawrence, their farm products, their wheat and flour, flaxseed and dairy foods, their lumber, farm machinery and other manufactured products will find a ready market in world trade. And in return the wealth of the world will pour back to the people of Minnesota.

Minnesota's cities on the shores of Lake Superior will become busy ocean ports on the completion of the St. Lawrence project, and with the consequent growth in agriculture, manufacturing, and shipping, the whole of the State's economy will be immeasurably improved. This, of course, would be the result for all the States of the Midwest, for the industrial State of New York and for New England, and for the western States which pour their goods into the east-bound transportation system of the United States.

I should like to dwell a moment on a particular problem which not only the State of Minnesota must face in the coming years, but also the whole of industry in this country, and, therefore, this Nation's entire economic force. It is becoming well known that the high-grade iron ore from the Lake Superior region, which supplies nearly 85 percent of America's vital steel industry, is gradually being depleted. Experts say that in 20 years, at the very latest, especially if this country becomes bound up in the demands of another war, the steel mills will need other sources of iron ore.

Iron ore in the future will come from Venezuela, Chile, Labrador, and perhaps other unfound deposits. This could well mean, and certainly would mean, that, unless the St. Lawrence project becomes a reality, steel mills will relocate near coastal ports so as to be readily accessible to the ore. Needless to say, the economy of the Midwest would suffer tragically. And Minnesota's iron-ore towns on the Mesabi and the Cuyuna would become ghost towns long before the supply of ore there could become anywhere near exhausted.

Now it is completely unnecessary that the entire industrial economy of the whole Midwest should be disrupted in this way. With the building of the St. Lawrence seaway, the steel mills would continue to have immediate access to the foreign ores coming in to supplement the ores of the Minnesota range. The steel industry would have the assurance, which it does not have today, that there would be no need for locating itself elsewhere.

And we must here give thought, too, to the national security demands of the country. Ores and shipping of all kinds coming into the Middle West would have in the St. Lawrence seaway a protected route, which would not be the case if all shipping to this country continues to arrive through coastal cities. This is a consideration which should be particularly noted in this age of potential destruction of strategic cities by bombing raids. It would seem to be axiomatic that steel mills, so vital to the preservation of this Nation, should not be forced to locate themselves along the coasts of the country.

It is unbelievable that the St. Lawrence seaway, a project which is expected to be self-liquidating in 50 years, has not been completed long before this year of 1951. For 25 years we have been considering this project in the Congress. I say it is unbelievable that the St. Lawrence seaway is not a reality. I should say, it would be unbelievable if one did not take into consideration the seaway's opponents. Throughout this long period the railroads and power companies of the Northeast, who mistakenly feel that business would be taken away from them, have been fighting the seaway. I pointed out earlier in this talk that people learn from experience. I should have said that some people learn from experience. Certainly, the railroads and the electric power concerns have not done so here. They forget the days of the railroads' opposition to the building of the Panama Canal on the assumption that the business of the roads would fall off if the Canal were dug. As it turned out, the increased trade which resulted from the Canal brought undreamed-of profits to the transcontinental roads. The power companies in the Tennessee Valley fought bitterly the proposed creation of the TVA. Today they are enjoying higher profits than they ever had in the past.

Again the thesis on which TVA was built comes to mind. "The whole country benefits as each region builds a stronger economy and utilizes the resources that mark it as a region." As any section of the country increases its standard of living through economic development of that section, the Nation as a whole gains in strength. The completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway can have no other result than the constructive improvement of every State in this Nation. It is imperative that the Eighty-second Congress authorize its construction.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

Atomic Energy Commission

Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1956. (Reappointment.)

United States Attorney

Noel Malone, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Chester L. Sumners, term expired.

In the Navy

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1951, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the 5th day of June 1951, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Richard F. Ballew, Jr.
Paul J. Melee

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated, to correct names:

Roy C. Pichler
George C. Schnitzer
Robert DeL. Schubert
Davis W. Tompkins

William H. Posladek (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy.

Joseph P. Goodson, civilian college graduate) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in lieu of second lieutenants in the Marine Corps (Naval ROTC) as previously nominated:

Harry E. Atkinson
James F. Coley
James P. Connolly II
David D. Francis
John H. House
Joseph F. Inman, Jr.
Branch Jordan
William D. Lauerman Jr.
Fred D. MacLean, Jr.
Richard C. Marsh
Clarence E. May, Jr.
Martin I. Penner
Benjamin C. Pratt
John P. Recher
John B. Reynolds
Walter A. Robertson
John J. Ross III
Paul A. Shrader
William J. Southerland, Jr.
Charles C. M. Woodward
Thomas V. A. Wornham

Ross D. Alexander (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

The following officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty:

Fred K. Thornton

Kathryn M. Nau to be a lieutenant in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated, to correct name.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 21 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

POSTMASTER

John M. Allred Collins, Miss.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 21, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Lord, our God, as we draw nigh unto Thee, compelled by our necessities, constrained by Thy love, and encouraged by every gracious invitation and promise in Thy Holy Word, we pray that we may be inspired with a nobler sense of personal integrity and social responsibility.

Show us how we may be better men with a higher regard and reverence for the principles of righteousness and justice.

Enlarge our feelings of compassion and concern for the hungry, the homeless, the hopeless, and all Thy needy children.

We penitently confess that in the area of human relationships we are frequently so thoughtless and inconsiderate, so selfish and supercilious.

Help us to understand that no man liveth unto himself and that our fate is bound up with the fate of men everywhere.

Grant that we may see more clearly that if our vexing social, economic, and international problems are ever to be solved then the soul of men and nations must be touched and transformed by the spirit of brotherhood and good will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 17, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 718. An act to authorize the lease and purchase by the United States of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 831. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide for designated representatives thereunder of certain veterans' organizations;

S. 1039. An act to amend the provision of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the composition of boards for the recommendation of rear admirals of the Navy for continuation on the active list, and for other purposes;

S. 1230. An act to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort; and

S. 1244. An act to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Territory of Alaska from certain restrictions upon the making of Federal contributions, and to amend the provisions thereof relating to the taking of oaths by certain civil defense personnel.

YOUTHS OF AMERICA

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, as the spring waxes green and balmy, the migration to our Nation's Capital increases in tempo, especially with the influx of thousands of school busses, bringing a couple of million bright, eager, young citizens, to gaze, wide-eyed at Washington's splendor.

These young folks never forget a sojourn of this kind. It remains indelibly stamped upon their minds as a great milestone.

It seems tragic that there is very little personal touch on the tours they take about the Capitol, the beautiful grounds, and the historic settings of this great national shrine.

Because of the lack of this touch, I suppose, to many, there is not enough of the glamour, the color, the imagination to visualize the vivid action of events through our history which have produced such drama and made our history so interesting.

It would be more conducive, I believe, to reality and to the assimilation of significance in every youngster's mind, if he had the assistance of some outstanding person by direct word to point out to him the greatness of our heritage.

I believe all these school groups visiting Washington should be greeted by a speaker of prominence, in the dome room or on the Capitol steps. Here could be developed the theme of our country, our Constitution, and the meaning of the Republic.

Here could the hand of welcome be extended in a more personal way than is now in practice.

Of course, insofar as my own district is concerned, everybody knows that the school kids come right to my congressional office, unless somebody back home has used political pressure or scared some professor.

By visiting me the young people are assured of an illuminating talk on Washington, a nice flag book, a map of the District of Columbia, and a blotter with your Congressman's picture on it.

I always urge all school groups from back home to make my Washington office their headquarters, and most of them take advantage of it.

But in lieu of such a practice I believe the plan I have already suggested should be used. I am, therefore, introducing the following:

A bill providing instruction of young people in the affairs of government

Whereas the youth of America is the most valued treasure we as a Nation possess; and

Whereas we who call ourselves leaders must meet the responsibility of giving our boys and girls the guidance and assistance necessary to help them in their honest desires to become good citizens and real Americans; and

Whereas the corridors of this Capitol are overflowing with boys and girls from all over the country, bright young students at life's most impressionable age and yet they receive very little recognition from the heart of our Government; and

Whereas their youthful enthusiasm and interest could be stimulated to a much greater degree than at present by inspiring words from outstanding Americans, pointing out to them that, despite sensationalism of headlines from time to time, there are good, honest, sincere, hard-working Government officials, Members of Congress, Senators, judges, who work faithfully to keep and protect that priceless heritage of American citizenship: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That a national committee of representative Americans, selected from veterans groups and other patriotic organizations be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to welcome our young people visiting the Capitol and providing them with a few personal words of enlightenment and encouragement.

There is a letter which deplores this situation and emphasizes the case in point. It appears in the May 3 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and was placed in the Appendix by Senator KEFAUVER. It was signed in the name of Charles Kress.

I assume this writer is none other than the one-time mayor of Binghamton, Charles W. Kress. If so, this represents the thinking of the foremost and most powerful Republican leader of Broome County.

The influence which Mr. Kress exercises in the Republican circles of our section is second to none. He moves constantly from our section to Washington and to Albany and other capitals and is further recognized as an outstanding Republican leader in those spheres of influence. Our local newspapers testify to this.

Of course, I have always been regarded as an outsider when it comes to being considered a political leader, and for this reason I can pick up only the most fragmentary crumbs of information that are thrown from the tables of the mighty in my native county.

However, I have been given to understand by sources close to those who know that when the mantle of leadership is relinquished by our present titular head of Broome County, it is going to be draped over the shoulders of Mr. Kress.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to

revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in signing the resolution recommending that Secretary of State Acheson be replaced immediately by a new Secretary in whom the people can have confidence, I wish to make it quite clear that, in my opinion, no question is raised about either Secretary Acheson's integrity or devotion to duty. In many respects he is a man of great ability.

However, events have shown him to have been consistently and tragically wrong in his far-eastern policy. His policy has resulted in a great people, the Chinese, being subjected to the tyrannical and godless slavery of communism fostered by imperialistic Russia. It has resulted in this Nation becoming engaged in a bloody war wherein we have suffered more casualties in less than 1 year than in an entire year of World War II.

And looking at it from the other side, we are engaged in a horrible strategy named Operation Killer, the object being to kill so many Chinese that they will quit. This is our peace plan.

Some say that Mr. Acheson was merely carrying out the policy set by President Truman. Perhaps that is so, but unlike the British system of government, we do not change the head of our Government when the people have lost confidence in a basic policy. We need to regain the confidence of the people in order to establish national unity. Mr. Acheson has become the symbol of our ill-fated eastern policy and he should go.

FABULOUS CHERRY COUNTY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an item from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Census has just released its report on Cherry County, Nebr., showing that it still retains its place as the leading county in the United States in the production of cattle. The 1950 Census tabulations show that between 1945 and 1950 Cherry County increased the number of cattle on its ranches from 237,888 to 268,456. During 1949 Cherry County ranches sold 100,000 cattle and calves for more than $13,000,000. There are more cattle in Cherry County than people in the city of Omaha, the Nebraska metropolis and almost as many as the total population of the Omaha metropolitan area. Under the headline "Fabulous Cherry County," the Grand Island (Nebr.) Daily Independent editorialized:

Cherry County, Nebr., has 5,982 square miles of area. It is larger than the combined States of Delaware and Rhode Island. It is larger than the State of Connecticut. Its area exceeds that of Buffalo, Hall, Merrick, Hamilton, Howard, Sherman, York, Polk, Greeley, and Valley Counties combined.

The census of 1950 shows that Cherry County had on its ranches last year 268,456 cattle, compared with 237,888 5 years before. Nearly 100,000 cattle and calves were sold during the year for more than $13,000,000. No other county in the United States—including Texas, suh—can equal this record.

Farms and ranches in Cherry County are on a par with the gargantuan nature of the county. The average size of each farm last year was 4,084.5 acres, and the average value of the 866 farms in the county was $61,443, more than double its value 5 years before.

A veritable John Bunyan among counties is Cherry.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. YORTY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ESTATE OF ROBERT D. JOHNSON

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 232) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to the estate of Robert D. Johnson, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Robert D. Johnson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an address made on May 18 by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The address is as follows:)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE ARMED FORCES DAY DINNER, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 18, 1951

Mr. Chairman, General Marshall, distinguished guests—the Armed Forces of Japan and Korea, and our gallant allies who are alongside our Armed Forces in Korea, I want to impress upon you, on this second anniversary of Armed Forces Day, that we are in the midst of one of the greatest crises this country has ever faced.

You fighting men, and you fighting allies in Korea and Japan, are holding the line, while we endeavor at this end to attain a peaceful settlement of the situation in the world.

For five and a half long years, we have been striving to attain a peace in the world that would be lasting.

We did not institute aggression in Korea. We not institute aggression in Greece. We did not institute aggression in Berlin.

We do not want war. We want peace.

The United Nations was organized for the purpose of enforcing the peace in the world.

When the North Koreans and Chinese began their aggressive attacks and marched into South Korea, a Republic which had been set up by the United Nations and under their aegis, it was necessary that the peace-loving nations of the world enforce that peace, and stop the aggression.

And that is exactly what we are trying to do.

When we sit here tonight, in our evening clothes, partaking of food on white tablecloths, and enjoying ourselves in other ways, bear in mind that there are men fighting and dying in an endeavor to reach that peace for which we have been striving since World War II ceased.

Remember that these men are baring their breasts for liberty and unity in the world.

It is necessary that the people of the United States, the greatest and most powerful free nation in the world—and I say that not in a bragging way, but because it happens to be the truth—the people of the United States have assumed the responsibility which no other nation in the history of the world has assumed.

We are the leaders of the free peoples of the world. It is necessary that we display that leadership, and we must display it here at home by a unity so that those young men on the battlefields of Korea shall not die in vain, so that those young men in Korea may accomplish the purpose for which they are fighting.

It is necessary that you here at home remember that this is a world crisis, that this crisis must be met through the leadership of the United States of America, and it is up to you people here at home to see that that is accomplished.

In order to accomplish that purpose, you must quit your bickering here at home, you must quit playing petty politics, you must remember that there are certain things that have to be done here at home, if we are going to accomplish the purpose.

We are fighting for time. The young men in Korea and Japan are fighting for time—for us.

There is always an emphasis on the casualties in Korea. Of course, when there is fighting, there are casualties.

But did it ever occur to you that if this necessity with which we are faced is not met, that the casualties in Korea will be one small drop in the bucket from one of those horrible bombs of which we talk so much.

Think—think—think what a responsibility your President faces in a situation of this kind. If you would think, and think clearly on this subject, you would get behind me and help me to win this peace.

And that is what I am asking you to do.

And that is what our Armed Forces are in the field to do.

It is up to you.

We have the greatest defense organization in the history of the world. There has never been a defense organization headed by so many distinguished men, who know what they are doing, from experience. There has never been a Government of the United States as united as the executive branch of this Government of ours is now.

It is up to the other branches of the Government to see that we will accomplish the purpose which God intended us to accomplish, and that is to lead the world to peace.

I hope every one of you will go home and get down on your knees and pray for guidance to do the right thing, that these young men who are now fighting on the battlefields of Korea shall not die in vain.

It is up to you.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 484)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 24, 26, 27, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 21, 23, 30, 31, 32 and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 18, 19, 25, 28, 33, and 34.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
GUY CORDON (with reservations),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER II

Legislative branch

Amendment No. 1—Senate: Inserts title as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—Payment to children of deceased Senator: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3—Contingent expenses of the Senate: Appropriates $17,878 for furniture and repairs as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5—Payments to widows of deceased Representatives: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—Senate Restaurants: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7—Government Printing Office: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER III

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 8—Federal Bureau of Investigation: Appropriates $5,872,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,147,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9—Federal Prison System: Appropriates $449,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons", as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—Civil Aeronautics Board: Deletes the House proposal of an additional amount of $25,000 for "Salaries and expenses", as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 11—Coast Guard: Strikes out House provision to appropriate an additional $1,000,000 for "Operating expenses", as proposed by the Senate.

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 12—Postal operations: Appropriates $7,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 13—Office of Education: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VI

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 14—Control of forest pests: Strikes out the Senate proposal to appropriate $345,000 for "Forest Pest Control Act," as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15—Forest Service: Appropriates $3,300,000 for "Forest development roads and trails", instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed is to provide $2,500,000 for construction and $800,000 for repairs.

CHAPTER VII

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 16—Bureau of Mines: Strikes out Senate proposal to appropriate $350,000 for construction, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17—Territories and island possessions: Appropriates $4,000,000 for "Construction, Alaska Railroad", as proposed by the House instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that if necessary up to $500,000 of funds already appropriated may be utilized for constructing shops at Anchorage, it being understood that any such additional funds will not be replaced by new appropriations.

CHAPTER VIII

Independent offices

Amendment No. 18—Office of the Housing Expediter: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 19—Vessel operations, revolving fund: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20—Vessel operations, revolving fund: Deletes Senate language as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER IX

Civil Functions, Department of the Army

Amendment No. 21: Changes title as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

International children's welfare work

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $5,750,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed in approving this figure that the contribution of the United States to this program shall not exceed one-third of total funds contributed to the program by all countries.

CHAPTER XI

Expenses of defense production

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $27,331,895 as proposed by the Senate instead of $33,029,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24: Strikes out Senate language for transfer of funds as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Civil Defense Administration

Amendment No. 25: Deletes Senate language for inclusion of security guard services as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27—Operations: Appropriates $1,750,000 of which $110,000 shall be available for civil defense communication systems as proposed by the House instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—Federal contributions: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29—Civil defense procurement fund: Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—Civil defense emergency fund: Strikes out House proposal to appropriate $100,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XII

Claims for damages, audited claims and judgments

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32: Appropriates $3,103,881 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,999,045 as proposed by the House and include the claims as set forth in Senate Document No. 25.

CHAPTER XIII

General provisions

Amendment No. 33, relating to wages paid those who advocate or belong to organizations which advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34, relating to funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 35: Changes section number as proposed by the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the conference on this bill was one of the most

harmonious I have attended and the report we submit is I believe agreeable to all Members on both sides of the aisle, so far as the House conferees are concerned, and also to all managers on the part of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. In other words, we have reached a practically unanimous agreement.

There are, of course, certain amendments in technical disagreement which are brought back under the rules of the House, but they will be submitted in accordance with agreements unanimously reached by all managers of the two Houses. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we have effected exceptional economies in drafting the conference report and all advocates of reduction in nondefense expenditures will find the figures reported by the conferees decidedly interesting. For the sake of brevity I submit them in tabular form, as follows:

Budget estimates considered in the House	$843,463,579
House committee recommendation	478,586,368
Passed House	473,165,368
Budget estimates considered in Senate	896,116,293
Senate committee recommendation	430,102,477
Passed Senate	431,127,477
Conference agreement	364,932,477
Budget estimate considered in Senate	896,116,293
Conference agreement	—364,932,477
Reduction from total budget estimate	531,183,816

As will be noted, we have agreed in conference to a figure materially lower than that passed by either House. It is an unprecedented decrease in the estimates submitted.

Mr. Speaker, if no one desires to be heard, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House consider en bloc those amendments that are in technical disagreement, on which the House managers will move to recede and concur. There are seven of them, Senate amendments Nos. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 33. These are mere formalities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 23, insert:

"For payment to Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr., son, and Barbara Vandenberg Bailey and Elizabeth Vandenberg Pfeiffer, daughters, of Arthur H. Vandenberg, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 7, insert:

"For payment to Vera D. Buchanan, widow of Frank Buchanan, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 4, line 10, insert:

"For payment to Maude F. Kee, widow of John Kee, late a Representative from the State of West Virginia, $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 5, line 6, insert:

"SENATE RESTAURANTS

"For repairs, improvements, furnishings, equipment, labor, and materials, and all necessary incidental expenses, to provide additional restaurant facilities in the Senate Office Building, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, $30,000."

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 5, line 17, insert:

"GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

"WORKING CAPITAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

"For an additional amount for 'Working capital and congressional printing and binding,' $1,200,000: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for the printing, binding, and distribution of the Federal Register in accordance with the act approved July 26, 1935 (44 U. S. C. 301–310), is increased from '$475,000' to '$675,000'."

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 12, line 13, insert:

"FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Grants for surveys and school construction

"For an additional amount for 'Grants for surveys and school construction,' to remain available until expended, $50,000,000, of which such amount as the Commissioner of Education determines to be necessary shall be available for urgently needed school facilities in areas determined by the President to be critical areas by reason of national defense activities: *Provided*, That appropriations and contract authorizations heretofore granted under this head, shall also be available to enable the Commissioner to provide school facilities pursuant to sections 203 and 204 of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815)."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 25, line 10, insert:

"SEC. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 15, line 8, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER

"Salaries and Expenses

"The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, only for the payment of terminal leave is changed from '$2,000,000' to $1,000,000.'

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum of "$1,000,000," named in said amendment, insert "$1,750,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] whose subcommittee handled this matter.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, some explanation should be made to the House with reference to this amendment because we are going to hear something about it in the next few days. To go back a little while, for the fiscal year 1951 the Congress has appropriated to the Housing Expediter a total of $13,415,500 to operate until March 31 of this year, and in giving the Expediter that sum the budget estimates were substantially reduced. On the 23rd of March of this year rent control was extended until June 30th of this year; in other words, 3 months. The Housing Expediter does not have enough money to operate during these remaining months. A Budget estimate was sent to the Senate for $1,000,000, not new money, but to earmark and use $1,000,000 of funds heretofore limited to use for terminal leave only. Unfortunately the Housing Expediter did not come to the House or any of its subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, and therefore we went into the conference with the other body without full information on the subject. We gave him, not the $1,000,000 requested, but $250,000; and frankly, it is not enough for him to do the job. He has 2,500 employees, and I was advised only about 10 minutes ago that he is going to have to release more than 1,000 employees. My suggestion, Mr. Speaker,

and the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], is simply this, that by letter or some other method you advise the Housing Expediter to carry on his duties. It was not the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to legislate him out of business, and within the next few days when the fourth supplemental appropriation bill comes along, we can make up that deficiency which, I might say, we erroneously cut off. He is entitled to the $1,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 17, strike out, beginning on line 21 down to and including line 4 on page 19, as follows:

"No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by the said amendment insert:

"No money made available to the Department of Commerce, for maritime activities, by this or any other act shall be used in payment for a vessel the title to which is acquired by the Government either by requisition or purchase, or the use of which is taken either by requisition or agreement, or which is insured by the Government and lost while so insured, unless the price or hire to be paid therefor (except in cases where section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is applicable) is computed in accordance with subsection 902 (a) of said act, as that subsection is interpreted by the General Accounting Office."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I simply would like to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri if he would be good enough to explain the difference between the language which he is now suggesting and the language which was stricken.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], whose subcommittee handled this item.

Mr. THOMAS. The language here in substitute for the original House language, I might say, is far less drastic and, I am sure, it will please the gentleman from Maine. The language in the original House bill gave to the operators, in case the ship was requisitioned and sunk, only the purchase price minus depreciation. This works out a formula in keeping with the Ship Sales Act of 1936, with which the gentleman is familiar, embodying the principles laid down in that act in sections 802 and 902 (a).

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 21, strike out all of lines 16 to 23, inclusive, as follows: "*Provided further*, That the appropriation 'Expenses of Defense Production' may be increased by transfer of not to exceed $1,834,000 of funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 to the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and the General Services Administration for the purpose of carrying out the duties and responsibilities assigned to these agencies under provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert "and transfers may be made between appropriations or allocations within any such department, agency, or corporation as may be necessary to carry out this proviso, and no allocation shall be made to any agency which can perform such defense activities as may have been or hereafter be assigned to such agency which can be performed by its regular personnel by use of the foregoing authority to realine its regular programs."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: On page 22, line 19, strike out the remainder of the page and down to and including line 5 on page 23, as follows:

"Federal contributions

"For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (1) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $80,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That of this amount $75,000,000 shall be available only for shelters and other protective facilities: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall not approve any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Federal contributions

"For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (1) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, $25,000,000, to be equally matched with State funds, of which $20,000,000 shall be for medical supplies and equipment and $5,000,000 for training and education, to remain available to June 30, 1952."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 27, line 26, insert the following:

"SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration any article or commodity of the nature or class described.

"(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 1302. (a) During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than mili-

tary assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms, or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation may be used in the manufacture of arms, armament or military matériel, or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States in the interest of national security; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator for Economic Cooperation any article or commodity of the nature or class described: *Provided*, That after the 15th day following the date of enactment of this act and prior to the termination of the period heretofore referred to no country shall be eligible for economic or financial assistance under any such act unless within 30 days prior to the date on which such assistance is to be provided such country shall have certified to the United States that it has not, subsequent to the 15th day following the date of enactment of this act, exported, or knowingly permitted the exportation of, arms, armaments, military matériel, articles, or commodities, which are subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, to any of the countries referred to in such provisions: *Provided further*, That such certification shall not relieve the Administrator for Economic Cooperation or any other officer of the United States Government of responsibility for enforcing the foregoing provisions of this section: *Provided further*, That exceptions to these provisions may be made upon an official determination of the National Security Council that such exception is in the security interest of the United States: *Provided further*, That the National Security Council shall immediately report any exception made with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the National Security Council shall at least once each quarter review all exceptions made previously and shall report its determinations to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which an exception is made.

"(b) Section 1304 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby repealed."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the need for this provision has been largely disposed of, and is now largely historical, due to the fact that the nations concerned have already voluntarily restricted their nationals and interdicted the flow of such goods to a point where at this time fully 95 percent or more of the goods embargoed by the United States Government are no longer in commerce with unfriendly nations. In a very short time the embargo will be 100 percent complete.

However, this amendment would be effective if by chance occasion for its use should rise.

In writing the provision our endeavor was to make it as flexible as possible so as to accommodate its invocation and interpretation to any need which may develop. It is self-policing. Each nation submits its own certificate. Should it ever become necessary to invoke the law in any respect, a liberal interpretation of its provisions will adequately meet any situation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S WELFARE FUND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] may proceed for 5 minutes to discuss the International Children's Welfare Fund, and the language of amendment No. 22 in the conference report which was just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask a question in connection with the last amendment? Do I understand the intention is that there will be such flexibility as will meet the requirements of the national interest of our country as the occasion may demand?

Mr. CANNON. That was our purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarifying in my own mind and in the minds of several of our colleagues who have raised a similar inquiry, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if it is not true that the language of amendment No. 22, chapter 10, in their conference report dealing with the International Children's Welfare work conflicts with or attempts to modify the organic act dealing with the International Children's Fund. In my opinion the conference report language in effect changes the terms of the original authorization, which is Public Law 535, since it sets a limitation upon the conditions under which the President can make contributions for the International Children's Welfare work. In my opinion this contradicts the authority vested in the President by the original authorization, the original organic act, which states:

The President may make contributions to the United Nations for international children's welfare work in such manner and on such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the interest of the United States.

In the appropriation bill there is no reference to any qualification or additional limitations. In this conference report the conference committee states:

That the United States contribution shall not exceed one-third of the funds made available to the fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The conference report says, "The conferees are agreed"—that is not the House of Representatives or the Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is my understanding. It is the conferees who are agreed. The original legislation and appropriation, the third supplemental appropriation bill, which was passed by this body, carried no such limitation and no such limitation was discussed or debated on the floor. May I have some comment from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on this, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House bill provided $5,000,000 for this item. The other body increased the item to $7,500,000. In conference we agreed upon a compromise of $5,750,000. It has been the objective and the goal of our Government from the beginning that we would in all international assessments restrict our contribution to one-third of the amount provided. Our idea was that in all such contributions the United States Government should provide one-third, and the remaining members of the United Nations should provide two-thirds.

The item before us is the only activity to which we have contributed a disproportionate amount. Up to this time we have been paying 72 percent, and the rest of the participants combined have been paying 28 percent.

However, in all other activities the contribution of the United States Government has been from 26 percent, as for example on food and agriculture, and the remainder of the contributors 74 percent. The highest contribution we make is the 39 percent contribution to the general fund. So, for none of the activities, except this one item, do we contribute more than 39 percent, and on most of them an average of less than 30 percent.

Accordingly, in keeping with the objective of the United States Government to pay one-third, we have in this paragraph provided additional money, but in the report the conferees expressed the opinion that in all contributions the United States Government should pay one-third and our allies two-thirds.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. It is intended by the committee that this organization can spend $5,750,000, however.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly, every cent of it. We, however express the conviction that it should be allocated on a ratio of one-third and two-thirds, one-third by the United States and two-thirds by the remaining contributors.

Mr. STEFAN. You are providing $5,750,000 and telling their committee they can expend that.

Mr. CANNON. Exactly. The gentleman's statement is accurate in every respect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has expired.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. The point of view expressed by the chairman is interesting, but the point I raise this afternoon is this: If there is a wish to provide for a change in the organic act, any limitation thereon should be made by the proper authorizing committee and by the Members themselves in the organic bill by amending the same. The attempt should not be made to amend it by a statement made upon the part of the conferees.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think what the gentleman has in mind is that the language in the conference report might represent the views of the conferees but certainly does not represent the intent of the Congress. Is that right?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I would like also to have clarification of the last phrase in the language in the conference report. It says that our contribution "shall not exceed one-third of the total funds contributed to the program by all countries." Does that include only contributions made by the governments of all countries? Or does that language include contributions that may be made by private persons or philanthropic organizations in various countries? That is, when the organization figures up the two-thirds from other countries to match our one-third, can it figure in contributions of private agencies, such as women's groups, which get together to raise money for children, as they have been doing?

A second question is this: Heretofore if the French Government contributed some money or supplies to the general fund that is to be used for children in Austria or Yugoslavia or some other country, that could be considered as a matching contribution. But if the money were contributed by the French Government for children's welfare within France it was not considered as a matching contribution. I think there ought to be clarification of what is meant by "total funds contributed by all countries." First, does it include all contributions of all governments even for children's relief and welfare within their own countries? And, second, does it include contributions by private organizations?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes in order to clear this matter up.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] points out very clearly now the questions that arise. I do not have the answers to the questions; all that is available is merely the statement in the report of the conferees, and this is without any clarification or elaboration. There are many questions such as these which should be discussed in a proper committee and then on the floor. Should there be any wish to change the formula that is the place to take it up.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. CANNON. None of the questions submitted here are pertinent to the situation. This bill does not change in any way the system of distribution or the control of that system; the only thing the bill does is to provide an appropriation of $5,750,000 for the International Children's Welfare work.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, this language is more a direction as to the future than a limitation upon the present appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. The language in the conference report is necessarily a recommendation, not a mandate, but I trust its significance will not be overlooked by all concerned.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

CONDITIONAL RELEASE OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2924) to amend section 4164 of title 18, United States Code, relating to conditional release of Federal prisoners.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, I have in the past asked that this bill be passed over without prejudice. I have however since the bill was last called, discussed the matter in detail with the United States Department of Justice prison officials, and on the basis of their reports and further information I am convinced that it is desirable legislation. I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4164 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 4164. Released prisoner as parolee

"A prisoner having served the term or terms for which he shall have been sentenced after June 29, 1932, less good-time deductions, shall be unconditionally released if there remain less than 180 days to serve. If there remain 180 days or over to be served he shall upon release be treated as if released on parole, and shall be subject to all provisions of law relating to the parole of United States prisoners until the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced less 180 days.

"This section shall not prevent delivery of a prisoner to the authorities of any State otherwise entitled to his custody."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following: "That section 4164 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4164. Released prisoner as parolee.

"'A prisoner having served his term or terms less goodtime deductions shall, upon release, be deemed as if released on parole until the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced less 180 days.

"'This section shall not prevent delivery of a prisoner to the authorities of any State otherwise entitled to his custody'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE PRIVILEGES OF CERTAIN INDEFINITE SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3605) to amend section 6 of Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, as amended, to grant annual and sick leave privileges to certain indefinite substitute employees in the postal service.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PAROLE OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3455) to amend section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, relating to parole of Federal prisoners.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FRAUD BY WIRE, RADIO, OR TELEVISION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2948) to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraud by radio.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1026) to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to supplement the authority regarding the acquisition of land for Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, Florida, as contained in section 2 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49

Stat. 2029), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to purchase or to procure with appropriated funds, in such manner as he shall consider to be in the public interest, the additional land and interests in land authorized by the said act of June 20, 1936, to be acquired for the national monument.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARE AND TREATMENT OF PERSONS AFFLICTED WITH LEPROSY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1739) authorizing an annual appropriation to provide more adequate facilities for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease in the Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of providing more adequate facilities for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease in the Territory of Hawaii, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated and made available to the Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, a sum equal to the product of (1) the average annual cost of providing care and subsistence for a patient in the National Leprosarium, Carville, La., during the three preceding fiscal years, and (2) the average daily patient census of patients with Hansen's disease provided with care and subsistence within the Territory of Hawaii by the Territorial government during such three preceding fiscal years.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 331 of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 682, 698), as amended (42 U. S. C., 1946 edition, supp. III, sec. 255), is further amended by deleting the words 'within the continental United States' which appear in the last sentence thereof, and by adding the following sentence at the end of the section: 'Upon the application of the health authority of a State, Territory, or possession outside the continental United States which provides facilities for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy, the Surgeon General shall arrange to make payments to the health authority of such State, Territory, or possession for the care and treatment in its facilities of persons so afflicted at a per diem rate, determined from time to time by the Surgeon General, which shall be approximately equal to the per diem operating cost per patient of the facility, except that such per diem rate shall not be more than the comparable per diem cost per patient at the nearest suitable facility of the Service'."

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which has the unanimous approval of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARRINGTON to the committee amendment: Page 2, strike out lines 12 to 15, inclusive, and insert "authority of a State, Territory, or possession, which is outside the continental United States and which provides facilities, care, and treatment, found by the Surgeon General to conform to reasonable standards for patient care, for persons afflicted with leprosy, the Surgeon General shall arrange to make payments to the health."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARRINGTON to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 19, after the word "shall", insert ", subject to the availability of appropriations."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN LANDS CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF CHANDLER, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2478) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby releases and removes all rights and interests reserved to, and all restrictions imposed by, the United States with respect to certain lands conveyed by the United States to the city of Chandler, Oklahoma, under the act entitled "An act to grant a military targe range of Lincoln County, Okla., to the city of Chandler, Okla., and reserving the right to use for military and aviation purposes," approved February 15, 1923.

SEC. 2. The last sentence of such act of February 15, 1923, is amended by striking out all of the matter appearing after "Chandler, Okla." and before the period at the end thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "targe" and insert "target."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE, TRANSFER, OR QUITCLAIM OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS IN FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2684) to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are no departmental reports accompanying this bill; therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RECORDATION OF SCRIP, LIEU SELECTION, AND SIMILAR RIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2889) to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

USE OF THE TRIBAL FUNDS OF THE UTE INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3795) to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, nothwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation may be expended or advanced for such purposes, including per capita payments, as may be designated by the Tribal Business Committee of said tribe and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That with the exception of a $1,000 per capita payment which is hereby authorized, no per capita payment shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior from the principal of any judgment obtained under the Jurisdictional Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), as amended, without further legislation: *Provided further*, That any funds advanced for loans by the tribe to individual Indians or associations of Indians shall be subject to regulations established for the making of loans from the revolving loan fund authorized by the act of June 18, 1934 (25 U. S. C., sec. 470).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to divide the trust funds belonging to the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians and deposited in the United States Treasury pursuant to the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 33), and section 11 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1273), as amended, including the interest thereon, by crediting 60 percent to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, consisting of the Uintah, Uncompahgre, and White River Utes, and 40 percent to the Southern Utes, consisting of the Southern Utes of the Southern Ute Reservation and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation. The funds apportioned to the Southern Utes under this section shall be divided between the Southern Utes of the Southern Ute Reservation and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation as agreed between said tribes. The shares of the respective groups shall be credited to the existing accounts established pursuant to the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560) and the act of June 13, 1930 (46 Stat. 584).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after "*Provided*," insert "That the aggregate amount of the expenditures and advances authorized by this section shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of such tribal funds now on deposit."

At the end of the bill insert:

SEC. 3. When all expenditures and advances authorized by the first section of this act have been made, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit a full and complete report thereof to the Congress.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND SECTION 28 OF THE ENABLING ACT OF ARIZONA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 108) to amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third paragraph of section 28 of the act entitled "An act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," approved June 20, 1910, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"No mortgage or other encumbrance of the said lands, or any part thereof, shall be valid in favor of any person or for any purpose or under any circumstances whatsoever. Said lands shall not be sold or leased, in whole or in part, except to the highest and best bidder at a public auction to be held at the county seat of the county wherein the lands to be affected, or the major portion thereof, shall lie, notice of which public auction shall first have been duly given by advertisement, which shall set forth the nature, time, and place of the transaction to be had, with a full description of the lands to be offered, and be published once each week for not less than ten successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation published regularly at the State capital, and in that newspaper of like circulation which shall then be regularly published nearest to the location of the lands so offered; nor shall any sale or contract for the sale of any timber or other natural product of such lands be made, save at the place, in the manner, and after the notice by publication provided for sales and leases of the lands themselves. Nothing herein contained shall prevent: (1) the leasing of any of the lands referred to in this section, in such manner as the Legislature of the State of Arizona may prescribe, for grazing, agricultural, commercial, and homesite purposes, for a term of 10 years or less; (2) the leasing of any of said lands, in such manner as the Legislature of the State of Arizona may prescribe, whether or not also leased for grazing and agricultural purposes, for mineral purposes, other than for the exploration, development, and production of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances, for a term of 20 years or less; or (3) the leasing of any of said lands, whether or not also leased for other purposes, for the exploration, development, and production of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances on, in, or under said lands for an initial term of 20 years or less and as long thereafter as oil, gas, or other hydrocarbon substance may be procured therefrom in paying quantities, the leases to be made in any manner, with or without advertisement, bidding, or appraisement, and under such terms and provisions as the Legislature of the State of Arizona may prescribe, the terms and provisions to include a reservation of a royalty to said State of not less than 12½ percent of production.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 7, strike out "or."

Page 3, line 18, after "production" insert "or (4) the Legislature of the State of Arizona from providing by proper laws for the protection of lessees of said lands, whereby such lessees shall be protected in their rights to their improvements (including water rights) in such manner that in case of lease or sale of said lands to other parties the former lessee shall be paid by the succeeding lessee or purchaser the value of such improvements and rights placed thereon by such lessee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION TO TRIBAL OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 458) authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the undisposed-of lots in the Pryor town site and the Crow Agency town site, and the undisposed-of lands on the ceded portion of the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., heretofore opened to entry or other form of disposal under the public-land laws are hereby restored to tribal ownership: *Provided*, That restoration shall be subject to any existing valid rights: *Provided further*, That restoration shall not apply to lands within any reclamation project heretofore authorized on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.

SEC. 2. The lands restored to the Crow Tribe under section 1 may be sold, and the proceeds thereof may be used solely for the acquisition by the tribe of trust or restricted lands on the Crow Reservation under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

SEC. 3. Title to lands or any interest therein acquired pursuant to this act shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Crow Tribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS WITHIN BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1221) to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to procure, in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest, the remaining non-Federal land and interests in land within the boundaries of Big Bend National Park.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITION OF LANDS TO MANASSAS NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3041) to authorize the addition of certain lands to Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to preserve important historic portions of Manassas Battlefield not now included within the Manassas National Battlefield Park, and to round out the boundaries of the park for purposes of administration, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, by donation, purchase, or condemnation, not to exceed 2,500 acres of land and interests in land within 2 miles of the intersection of United States Highway 211 and State Highway 234, including not to exceed 10 acres of land on which are situated remaining earthworks in the immediate vicinity of Centerville, Va. All properties that are acquired hereafter pursuant to this act shall become a part of the Manassas National Battlefield Park upon acquisition of title to such properties by the United States. The park and any lands added thereto in accordance with this act shall be administered in accordance with the act, approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, relating to establishment of the National Park Service.

SEC. 2. When the public interests will be benefited thereby, the Secretary is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, title to any non-Federal land or interests therein situated within the area authorized to be included within Manassas National Battlefield Park, and in exchange therefor to convey not to exceed an equal value of land or interests in land within the park for right-of-way purposes in connection with State and other highways.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "acquire, by donation, purchase, or condemnation" and insert "procure in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPEND APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 240) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigation ordered by House Resolution 78, Eighty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman have any inherent objection to the joint resolution, or does he want to study it further, or what?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I want to study it further.

Mr. CELLER. I just want to state that several members of the Committee on Ways and Means have indicated that they are very anxious to start with that investigation, and I hope the gentleman on the next occasion when we have the Consent Calendar will have a fixed determination as to really what he wishes to do.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The gentleman will try.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZE CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES TO MAKE CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1788) to authorize the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians to make contracts for professional legal services with approval of the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That contracts involving the payment or expenditure of any money or affecting any property belonging to the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians, including contracts for professional legal services, may be made by said tribes, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

SEC. 2. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after "prescribe:", insert "*Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to contracts for professional legal services involving the prosecution of claims against the United States."

Page 2, line 5, after "SEC. 2" strike out "All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed." and insert "That the second proviso in section 28 of the act of April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 148), and the provisions contained in the fifth paragraph of section 17 of the Act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1070), dealing with contracts made by the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians for professional legal services of attorneys, are hereby repealed."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians to make contracts with approval of the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASING OF RESTRICTED INDIAN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1632) to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] is present. He introduced this bill. In my opinion, he is one of the real authorities in the House on not only the Indians but legislation relating to the Indians of our country. May I ask him if he will give a brief statement as to what this bill does, particularly in connection with the use of the word "religious." I am sure all faiths are protected, but I should like the RECORD to show that in connection with whatever aspects of the bill relate to religion.

Mr. MORRIS. In answer to the distinguished majority leader, may I say that in my judgment this is an extremely important bill if justice and equity are to be done to our Indian friends over the Nation. The situation is simply this: As the situation now exists, with a few minor exceptions, leases cannot be granted for a longer period than 5 years. Experience has shown that in regard to tribally owned land and individually owned land the Indians cannot realize the full value of their land under such a restriction. For instance, no industry will go on tribal land or individually allotted land and make a large capital investment under a 5-year lease. However, if an industry can go onto such land with a 25-year lease, and renew the lease for another 25 years, making 50 years altogether, of course, it will expend large sums of money. Therefore, the Indians can realize the full value of their land for lease purposes.

May I say to the gentleman that in connection with the use of this land for religious purposes it certainly is not contemplated and never will be contemplated in any legislation that will ever be brought out of our committee that there will be any discrimination against or favoritism for any particular religion of any kind.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure that is so, but I thought a brief statement for the RECORD might be advisable, particularly since so grave and serious a trust relationship between the Government and the Indians of our country exists. Noting that the gentleman was present, and knowing him to be an authority on this type of legislation, I expected the gentleman would make a very valuable contribution and give me the information I desired.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman very much for his very kind and very gracious observation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any restricted Indian lands, whether tribally or individually owned, may be leased by the Indian owners, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for public, religious, educational, recreational, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases, and for those farming purposes which require the making of a substantial investment in the improvement of the land for the production of specialized crops as determined by said Secretary. All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed 25 years, but leases for public, religious, educational, recreational, or business purposes may include provisions authorizing their renewal for an additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and all leases shall be made under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Restricted lands of deceased Indians may be leased under this act, for the benefit of their heirs or devisees, in the circumstances and by the persons prescribed in the act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745; 25 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 380).

SEC. 3. No rent or other consideration for the use of land leased under this act shall be paid or collected more than 5 years in advance, unless so provided in the lease.

SEC. 4. The act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 962; 25 U. S. C., 1946 ed., secs. 403b and 403c), is hereby repealed, but this repeal shall not be construed to affect the validity of any lease entered into under such act prior to, or within 90 days after the approval of this act.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal any authority to lease restricted Indian lands conferred by or pursuant to any other provision of law, except as specifically provided in section 4.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, following the word "recreational," insert the word "residential."

Page 1, line 9, following the word "purposes" insert the words "(not to include grazing)."

Page 2, line 4, following the letters "tional" insert the word "residential."

Page 2, line 4, following the word "purposes" insert the words ", with the consent of both parties,."

Page 2, line 5, strike the word "an" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one."

Page 2, line 6, following the word "leases" insert the words "and renewals."

Page 2, line 6, following the word "such", insert the words "terms and."

Page 2, line 16, strike the words "five years" and insert in lieu thereof the words "one year."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1899) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "an act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution," approved February 20, 1896, as amended, and as amended February 5, 1926, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That said society is authorized to hold real and personal estate in the United States, so far only as may be necessary to its lawful ends, to an amount not exceeding $10,000,000, and may adopt a constitution and make bylaws not inconsistent with law, and may adopt a seal. Said society shall have its headquarters or principal office at Washington, in the District of Columbia."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING LAND TO POLICE JURY OF THE PARISH OF RAPIDES, LA.

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas, pursuant to Public Law 148 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture conveyed to the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, for use for the establishment and maintenance of an agricultural and vocational school, certain lands held by the United States under an agreement of transfer with the Louisiana Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, dated March 31, 1937, such lands to revert to the United States if not used for such purpose; and

Whereas, in accordance with the Rural Rehabilitation Trust Liquidation Act (Public Law 499, 81st Cong.), the Secretary of Agriculture on January 2, 1951, transferred the assets being administered by the United States under the agreement of March 31, 1937, to the Louisiana Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, and the Louisiana Rural Rehabilitation Corporation on January 8, 1951, transferred such assets back to the United States; and

Whereas it is desired to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer 25 acres of the lands transferred to such board of supervisors, as aforesaid, to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That, upon the written consent of the Louisiana Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed or other appropriate means to the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College so much of the right, title, and interest held by the United States in and to the lands transferred to such board of supervisors pursuant to the act entitled "an act to transfer certain lands situated in Rapides Parish, La., to board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College" (Public Law 148, 79th Cong.), as may be necessary to permit such board to convey 25 acres of land to the police jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for the sole purpose of holding livestock and agricultural expositions thereon.

SEC. 2. The transfer of such lands shall not be deemed to impose any liability upon the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to his obligations under the transfer agreements with the Louisiana Rural Rehabilitation Corporation.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3091) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, just what does this bill do?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING AIR FORCE OFFICERS TO TAKE ACTION ON REPORTS AND VOUCHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1203) to amend the act of October 30, 1941, as amended, to authorize Air Force officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of October 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 758, ch. 465), as amended by section 402 of the Army Organization Act of 1950, is further amended to read as follows:

"Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, for their respective Departments, officers designated by them may take action upon reports of survey and all other vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of property of the United States under the control of their respective departments, and the action taken by any such officer on said surveys or vouchers shall be final: *Provided*, That in any such case where a person or concern is held pecuniarily liable in an amount in excess of $100, such findings shall not be final until approved by the Secretary concerned or an officer designated by and acting under the authority of such Secretary for the purpose of reviewing such findings."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following in lieu thereof: "That under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force, designated officers may take action upon reports of survey and all other vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of property of the United States under the control of the Department of the Air Force, and the action taken by any such officer on those surveys or vouchers shall be final: *Provided*, That in any such case where a person or concern is held pecuniarily liable, the findings shall not be final until approved by the Secretary of the Air Force or by such officers as the Secretary may designate."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to Government property."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN NAVAL ATTACHÉS AND OBSERVERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2737) to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will someone explain the bill?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that one appropriation bill contained this limitation and always before that and always since the naval attachés have been able to employ servants for strictly official entertainment. I think it was the 1949 or 1950 appropriation bill which contained that limitation. But the Committee on Appropriations has since eliminated that provision. The amount involved is only $89,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the proviso in section 1 of the act of July 18, 1947, under the headings, "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts" and "Pay and subsistence of naval personnel" (61 Stat. 388), naval personnel shall be entitled to reimbursement for amounts expended by them during the fiscal year 1948 for hiring and maintaining permanent household staffs or for hiring servants for specific occasions of official entertainment, while in the performance of their duties in foreign countries as attachés, observers, or on any other authorized missions in connection with naval intelligence: *Provided*, That any payments which have heretofore been made for such purposes are hereby expressly validated.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the word "naval" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Navy and Marine Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 12 OF THE MISSING PERSONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1199) to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, while this is a very worth while bill, you will note it calls for an expenditure of more than $3,000,000, and therefore is not properly on the Consent Calendar. I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], chairman of the subcommittee which reported the bill, and it is understood that at a later time they will call the bill up under suspension of the rules.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING THAT A MESS OPERATED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A SUPPLY CORPS OFFICER CAN BE OPERATED EITHER ON A QUANTITY OR MONETARY-RATION BASIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1201) to amend section 4 of the Act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps Officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary-ration basis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to effect needed changes in the Navy ration," approved March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "limit of the cost of ration on destroyers, submarines, mine sweepers, tugs, aircraft, and other vessels and stations subsisted under the direction of commanding officers" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "monetary limit of the cost of ration aboard such ships and at such stations where in his opinion it is not desirable to administer the mess under the quantity allowances stated in section 1."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the word "ration" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "rations."

On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out the word "submarine" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "submarines."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN LAND AND OTHER PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1215) to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in light of the fact that there is no departmental report with reference to this legislation, and in view of the policy of the Committee on the Consent Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONVEYING HOSPITAL EQUIPMENT TO THE REPUBLIC OF PHILIPPINES FOR PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1216) to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. It has no department reports accompanying it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this bill does have a departmental report accompanying it. It is report No. 456.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Where in report 456 does one find the departmental report?

Mr. SASSCER. I am mistaken, Mr. Speaker. The departmental report is not here. I would like to take this moment, however, to make a few comments. I was quite sure the Department had approved the bill. It is true that there is no official report here, but we conducted a rather extensive hearing, and in that hearing the particular departments affected did appear before the committee and approve the legislation. Reference is made in the report on it on page 5 in the last two or three sentences.

This particular bill differs from most others that come upon this floor. It saves the Government a substantial amount of money. Some time back the hospital in the Philippine Islands became the property of the Philippine Government. We have taken out of that hospital the usable equipment. This bill permits the transfer of approximately $250,000 in replaceable equipment. We are then relieved of our responsibility of running the hospital. The hospital is costing the Government today approximately a million and a half dollars a year. In the next 5 years that would cost approximately $7,500,000. At the end of the 5-year term we are also relieved of the responsibility of taking care of a few Philippine Scouts, something around 125 of them, now in the hospital. So, in substance, we are getting out of the hospital in the Philippines, relieving ourselves of the responsibility of financing it, and for a 5-year period we assume the care of approximately 125 Philippine Scouts, which would cost us approximately a million dollars.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. My request did not go to the merits of the legislation. I certainly agree, from what information I have on the bill and from what the gentleman just said, that it is meritorious legislation. As a member of the objectors' committee, however, all of us operate under a handicap when a report does not contain the departmental reports covering the legislation. My request was intended to focus attention on that, rather than to go to the merits of the legislation.

On the gentleman's further assurance that the Department of Defense is wholeheartedly in support of the legislation I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank the gentleman and will be glad to give the House that assurance. The Department of Defense approves the proposed legislation and the Budget Bureau advises that there is no objection to it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And the Department of Defense approves it in the present form?

Mr. SASSCER. In its present form; yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It is very possible to have the Department approve a bill and then by the time the bill comes to the floor find it different in many respects from the bill originally approved. The gentleman does assure the House that as far as the bill in its present form is concerned it is approved by the Department.

Mr. SASSCER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized, subject to such terms as may be prescribed in an agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, to convey and assign, without cost to the Republic of the Philippines, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all equipment contained in or appertaining to the hospital formerly known as the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital located at Ft. McKinley, Philippine Islands, which hospital heretofore was transferred to the Republic of the Philippines pursuant to authorization contained in Public Law 381, Seventy-sixth Congress (58 Stat. 626), for the use of the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care, treatment, and hospitalization to (a) persons who on the effective date of this act are Philippine Scouts under treatment in such hospital, until such persons shall be discharged therefrom, and (b) such other persons as shall be determined by the Republic of the Philippines: *Provided*, That such agreement shall include appropriate provision that—

(1) persons who on the effective date of this act are Philippine Scouts undergoing treatment at such hospital shall, until discharge therefrom, have priority of medical care, treatment, and hospitalization over all other individuals; and

(2) such hospital shall continue to be operated for the purpose of providing medical care, treatment, and hospitalization to such persons until their discharge therefrom unless the Republic of the Philippines elects to provide such medical care, treatment, and hospitalization in other hospitals.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized, subject to the provisions of this act, for a period of not to exceed 5 years, to furnish aid in the form of grants to reimburse the Republic of the Philippines for moneys expended incident to the medical care, treatment, and hospitalization of persons who on the effective date of this act are Philippine Scouts under treatment at the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital, until they are discharged from hospitalization pursuant to section 1.

SEC. 3. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations

and impose such conditions on the grant of financial aid, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and he may delegate in whole or in part the authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or officers of the United States.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1200) to correct an error in section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947, "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 191), is amended by deleting the words "last paragraph of section 127a of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "last paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 634)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF MILITARY PRISONERS AND CONFINEMENT FACILITIES TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2735) to authorize the transfer of certain military prisoners and confinement facilities to the control and management of the Attorney General.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretaries of the Army and Navy are severally authorized, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to transfer to the control and management of the Attorney General, as mutually agreed upon, any part or all of the physical properties and facilities comprising the United States disciplinary barracks, including the several branches thereof, and the United States naval disciplinary barracks, and such other facilities under the control of the Departments of the Army or Navy and the Secretaries of the Army or Navy, as may be necessary to the operation of such barracks, together with any part or all of the personal property, equipment, furniture, supplies, and records located thereon or used in the operation or maintenance of such disciplinary barracks or facilities. When no longer required for the purposes of this act, any of the institutions and related facilities, together with the personal property, equipment, furniture, supplies, and records thereof, may be retransferred by the Attorney General without reimbursement or transfer of funds to the Department of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, as appropriate, on terms to be mutually agreed upon.

(b) The lands or reservations upon which the several United States disciplinary barracks transferred pursuant to this act are located shall be available and may be used for military tactical training purposes when such use in the judgment of the Attorney General does not interfere with the safekeeping of the inmates.

SEC. 2. The Secretaries of the Army and Navy and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the control and management of the Attorney General, as mutually agreed upon, any or all inmates undergoing confinement in the United States disciplinary barracks, including branches thereof, and United States naval disciplinary barracks. The military institutions transferred hereunder and the penal and correctional institutions (except penitentiaries) under the control and management of the Attorney General shall be deemed to be United States disciplinary barracks for the purpose of the confinement of inmates sentenced under the Articles of War: *Provided*, That the authority of the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and such other officers of their respective departments as may be authorized by law, to order the suspension, mitigation, or remission of any unexecuted portion of the sentence of any person confined pursuant to sentence of a court martial or other military tribunal and their authority to restore such persons to duty shall not be affected by this act.

SEC. 3. In amounts as may be agreed upon by the heads of the Departments concerned and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the unobligated portions of any funds currently available to the Department of the Army, Navy, or Air Force for the administration, operation, and maintenance of any institutions transferred hereunder, or for the safekeeping, maintenance, care, and related expenses of prisoners transferred hereunder, may be transferred to the Department of Justice and shall be merged with any other appropriations for expenses necessary for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including those transferred under this act.

SEC. 4. The inmates transferred to the control and management of the Attorney General shall be entitled to the more liberal of the good-time allowances provided by either sections 4161 to 4166 of title 18, United States Code, or any applicable regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

SEC. 5. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, the provisions of part III of title 18, United States Code, relating to prisons and prisoners shall be applicable to inmates and institutions transferred to the control and management of the Attorney General.

SEC. 6. That portion of section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, authorizing the Secretary of War to establish a system of parole for prisoners confined in United States disciplinary barracks (ch. 143, 38 Stat. 1075), as amended, and all of section 2 of the said act except paragraph 7 (ch. 143, 38 Stat. 1084), as amended, relating to United States disciplinary barracks, shall not be applicable to inmates or institutions under the control and management of the Attorney General.

SEC. 7. Section 4005 of title 18 of the United States Code (18 U. S. C. 4005) is amended by amending the title to read as follows: "SEC. 4005. Medical Relief; Expenses; Detail of Military Personnel" and adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Upon request of the Attorney General, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are severally authorized to detail officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel to duty at institutions under the control and management of the Attorney General for such professional or specialized duties as may be agreed upon."

With the following committee amendment:

On pages 2 and 3 delete section 2 and substitute the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the control and management of the Attorney General, as mutually agreed upon, prisoners confined pursuant to a sentence of a court-martial or other military tribunal, which sentence has been approved by the convening authority, notwithstanding that appellate review may not have been completed. The military institutions transferred hereunder and the penal and correctional institutions (except penitentiaries) under the control and management of the Attorney General shall be deemed to be United States disciplinary barracks for the purpose of article 42 of the Articles of War: *Provided*, That the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and such other officers as may be authorized by law—

"(1) to take any action authorized by the act of May 5, 1950 (Public Law 506, 81st Cong.), and regulations promulgated thereunder, prior to completion of appellate review and final action taken pursuant thereto, and

"(2) to take any action authorized by law with respect to a sentence adjudged by court-martial subsequent to appellate review and final action on such sentence, to the same extent as though the prisoner so transferred were restrained continuously under the control of an armed force,

shall not be affected by this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCES FOR CLOTHING AND EQUIPMENT TO CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2736) to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy are respectively authorized to prescribe the sum which shall be credited to each new cadet or midshipman, upon first admission to the Military Academy or the Naval Academy, to cover the cost of his initial clothing and equipment issue, which sum shall be deducted subsequently from his pay: *Provided*, That hereafter each cadet or midshipman discharged prior to graduation who is indebted to the United States on account of advances of pay to purchase required clothing and equipment shall be required to turn in to the respective academies all clothing and equipment of a distinctively military nature to the extent required to discharge such indebtedness; and, if the value of such clothing and equipment so turned in does not cover the indebtedness so incurred, then such indebtedness shall be canceled.

SEC. 2. That part of the act of June 30, 1921 (42 Stat. 68, 95), under the heading "United States Military Academy—Permanent Establishment" which reads: "*Provided further*, That hereafter each new cadet shall, upon admission to the United States Military Academy, be credited with the sum of $250 to cover the cost of his initial clothing and equipment issue, to be deducted subsequently from his pay."; and that part of the act of July 12, 1921 (42 Stat. 122, 131), under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts", which reads: *Provided*, That hereafter each new midshipman shall, upon admission to the Naval Academy, be credited with the sum of $250 to cover the cost of his initial clothing and equipment issue, to be deducted subsequently from his pay.", are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 927) to amend section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Maryland what this bill means.

Mr. SASSCER. This is a Senate bill from which the House committee eliminated what we thought was the controversial part.

The bill provides in substance for the immediate employment of not to exceed 15 persons on the retired list—not retired for disability but on the retired list in the United States Army. I may say briefly that these particular positions are directed to a field of special training in which the Central Intelligence Agency feels that by virtue of the past experience and associations of these particular persons, some of whom they have in mind, they can get persons qualified to do this particular work. It is vitally important, and they feel the authority should be given them as quickly as possible. We had an open session, then we went into a closed session, and the subcommittee was unanimously of the opinion that the bill was important.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. I think our committee heard that this bill would save the Government a good deal of money. These persons who are experts in their line are now drawing retirement pay. They are needed badly in the various services, and if they are taken from retirement, they will not cost the Government any more than new employees, and the Government will then save the retirement pay that is going to these 15 people.

Mr. SASSCER. That is correct. The bill provides that they do not draw their retirement pay and that of the office to which they will be appointed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. As I understand it, this bill gives the officers of the United States Army, including warrant officers, double pay?

Mr. SASSCER. No. Under existing law, the Central Intelligence Agency cannot go out and get these particular persons. This gives them the authority to go out and get these particular people and provides specifically that they shall not get dual pay.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to look this matter up. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that this measure simply makes possible that Central Intelligence Agency may employ up to not exceeding 15 experts, men of extraordinary skill, men of long experience, that it would be difficut to find anywhere else. It is because of their exceptional skill, outstanding ability, and long experience that they desire to have these individuals. Instead of costing us additional money, it will, as the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Maryland pointed out, save us much money, and I hope the gentleman will not ask that it go over.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that General Smith, who is head of CIA, also considers it is vitally important that he be given this authority.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Missouri, and the gentleman from Maryland I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (Act of June 20, 1949, ch. 227, sec. 6, 63 Stat. 211) is hereby amended by the addition of a subsection "(f)" as follows:

"(f) (1) Nothwithstanding section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. A. 62), or any other law prohibiting the employment of any retired commissioned or warrant officer of the armed services, the Agency is hereby authorized to employ and to pay the compensation of not more than 15 retired officers or warrant officers of the armed services while performing service for the Agency, but while so serving such retired officer or warrant officer will be entitled to receive only the compensation of his position with the Agency, or his retired pay, whichever he may elect: *Provided*, That upon appointment under the authorities of this subsection, or any other authority of law, officers or warrant officers retired for injuries or incapacities incurred in line of duty may, in addition to the elections set forth herein, elect to receive, in addition to their retired pay, additional compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which the compensation of their position with the Agency exceeds their retired pay.

"(2) Nothing in this section shall limit or affect the appointment of and payment of compensation to retired officers or warrant officers not presently or hereafter prohibited by law."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out all after the word "*Provided*" and all of lines 7 to 13, inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CERTAIN TITLES OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3899) to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth clause after the opening clause of section 1 of Title 1, United States Code, entitled "General Provisions", is amended by striking out the word "use" appearing in such clause, and in lieu thereof inserting "used", so that such clause will read as follows: "words used in the present tense include the future as well as the present;".

SEC. 2. (a) The analysis of Chapter 2 of Title 1, United States Code, immediately preceding section 101 of such title, is amended by inserting, immediately underneath item 106 in such analysis, the following two items:

"106a. Promulgation of laws.

"106b. Amendments to Constitution.".

(b) Title 1, United States Code, is further amended by inserting, immediately following section 106 of such title, the following two sections:

"§ 106a. Promulgation of laws

"Whenever a bill, order, resolution, or vote of the Senate and House of Representatives, having been approved by the President, or not having been returned by him with his objections, becomes a law or takes effect, it shall forthwith be received by the Administrator of General Services from the President; and whenever a bill, order, resolution, or vote is returned by the President with his objections, and, on being reconsidered, is agreed to be passed, and is approved by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, and thereby becomes a law or takes effect, it shall be received by the Administrator of General Services from the President of the Senate, or Speaker of the House of Representatives in whichsoever House it shall last have been so approved, and he shall carefully preserve the originals.

"§ 106b. Amendments to Constitution

"Whenever official notice is received at the General Services Administration that any amendment proposed to the Constitution of the United States has been adopted, according to the provisions of the Constitution, the Administrator of General Services shall forthwith cause the amendment to be published, with his certificate, specifying the States by which the same may have been adopted, and that the same has become valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of the Constitution of the United States.".

SEC. 3. Section 112 of Title 1, United States Code, is amended by striking out, in the first sentence of the text of such section, the reference "205 of the Revised Statutes", and in lieu thereof inserting "106b of this title", so that such section 112 will read as follows:

"§ 112. Statutes at large; contents; admissibility in evidence

"The Administrator of General Services shall cause to be compiled, edited, indexed, and published, the United States Statutes at Large, which shall contain all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during each regular session of Congress; all proclamations by the President in the numbered series issued since the date of the adjournment of the regular session of Congress next preceding; and also any amendments to the Constitution of the United States proposed or ratified pursuant to article V thereof since that date, together with the certificate of the Administrator of General Services issued in compliance with the provision contained in section 106b of this title. In the event of an extra session of Congress, the Administrator of General Services shall cause all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during said extra session to be consolidated with, and published as part of, the contents of the volume for the next regular session. The United States Statutes at Large shall be legal evidence of laws, concurrent resolutions, treaties, international agreements other than treaties, proclamations by the President, and proposed or ratified amendments to the Constitution of the United States therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.".

SEC. 4. The analysis of Title 3, United States Code, entitled "The President", immediately preceding Chapter 1 of such title, is amended by inserting, immediately after

and underneath item 3 in such analysis, the following new item:

"4. Delegation of Functions ..... 301".

SEC. 5. The analysis of Chapter 1 of Title 3, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1 of such title, is amended (1) by striking out, in item 6 of such analysis, the words "Secretary of State" and in lieu thereof inserting "Administrator of General Services", so that such item will read "6. Credentials of electors; transmission to Administrator of General Services and to Congress; public inspection."; and (2) by striking out, in item 12 of such analysis, the words "Secretary of State" and in lieu thereof inserting "Administrator of General Services", so that such item will read "12. Failure of certificates of electors to reach President of Senate or Administrator of General Services; demand on State for certificate.".

SEC. 6. Section 6 of Title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 6. Credentials of electors; transmission to Administrator of General Services and to Congress; public inspection

"It shall be the duty of the executive of each State, as soon as practicable after the conclusion of the appointment of the electors in such State by the final ascertainment, under and in pursuance of the laws of such State providing for such ascertainment, to communicate by registered mail under the seal of the State to the Administrator of General Services a certificate of such ascertainment of the electors appointed, setting forth the names of such electors and the canvass or other ascertainment under the laws of such State of the number of votes given or cast for each person for whose appointment any and all votes have been given or cast; and it shall also thereupon be the duty of the executive of each State to deliver to the electors of such State, on or before the day on which they are required by section 7 of this title to meet, six duplicate-originals of the same certificate under the seal of the State; and if there shall have been any final determination in a State in the manner provided for by law of a controversy or contest concerning the appointment of all or any of the electors of such State, it shall be the duty of the executive of such State, as soon as practicable after such determination, to communicate under the seal of the State to the Administrator of General Services a certificate of such determination in form and manner as the same shall have been made; and the certificate or certificates so received by the Administrator of General Services shall be preserved by him for one year and shall be a part of the public records of his office and shall be open to public inspection; and the Administrator of General Services at the first meeting of Congress thereafter shall transmit to the two Houses of Congress copies in full of each and every such certificate so received at the General Services Administration.".

SEC. 7. Section 11 of Title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

§ 11. Disposition of certificates

"The electors shall dispose of the certificates so made by them and the lists attached thereto in the following manner:

"First. They shall forthwith forward by registered mail one of the same to the President of the Senate at the seat of government.

"Second. Two of the same shall be delivered to the secretary of state of the State, one of which shall be held subject to the order of the President of the Senate, the other to be preserved by him for one year and shall be a part of the public records of his office and shall be open to public inspection.

"Third. On the day thereafter they shall forward by registered mail two of such certificates and lists to the Administrator of General Services at the seat of government, one of which shall be held subject to the order of the President of the Senate. The other shall be preserved by the Administrator of General Services for one year and shall be a part of the public records of his office and shall be open to public inspection.

"Fourth. They shall forthwith cause the other of the certificates and lists to be delivered to the judge of the district in which the electors shall have assembled.".

SEC. 8. Section 12 of Title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 12. Failure of certificates of electors to reach President of Senate or Administrator of General Services; demand on State for certificate

"When no certificate of vote and list mentioned in sections 9 and 11 of this title from any State shall have been received by the President of the Senate or by the Administrator of General Services by the fourth Wednesday in December, after the meeting of the electors shall have been held, the President of the Senate or, if he be absent from the seat of government, the Administrator of General Services shall request, by the most expeditious method available, the secretary of state of the State to send up the certificate and list lodged with him by the electors of such State; and it shall be his duty upon receipt of such request immediately to transmit same by registered mail to the President of the Senate at the seat of government.".

SEC. 9. Section 13 of Title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 13. Same; demand on district judge for certificate

"When no certificates of votes from any State shall have been received at the seat of government on the fourth Wednesday in December, after the meeting of the electors shall have been held, the President of the Senate or, if he be absent from the seat of government, the Administrator of General Services shall send a special messenger to the district judge in whose custody one certificate of votes from that State has been lodged, and such judge shall forthwith transmit that list by the hand of such messenger to the seat of government.".

SEC. 10. Title 3 of the United States Code is further amended by inserting, immediately after section 208 of such title, the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 4.—DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

"Sec.

301. General authorization to delegate functions; publication of delegations.
302. Scope of delegation of functions.
303. Definitions.

"§ 301. General authorization to delegate functions; publication of delegations

"The President of the United States is authorized to designate and empower the head of any department or agency in the executive branch, or any official thereof who is required to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to perform without approval, ratification, or other action by the President (1) any function which is vested in the President by law, or (2) any function which such officer is required or authorized by law to perform only with or subject to the approval, ratification, or other action of the President: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall relieve the President of his responsibility in office for the acts of any such head or other official designated by him to perform such functions. Such designation and authorization shall be in writing, shall be published in the Federal Register, shall be subject to such terms, conditions, and limitations as the President may deem advisable, and shall be revocable at any time by the President in whole or in part.

"§ 302. Scope of delegation of functions

"The authority conferred by this chapter shall apply to any function vested in the President by law if such law does not affirmatively prohibit delegation of the performance of such function as herein provided for, or specifically designate the officer or officers to whom it may be delegated. This chapter shall not be deemed to limit or derogate from any existing or inherent right of the President to delegate the performance of functions vested in him by law, and nothing herein shall be deemed to require express authorization in any case in which such an official would be presumed in law to have acted by authority or direction of the President.

"§ 303. Definitions

"As used in this chapter, the term 'function' embraces any duty, power, responsibility, authority, or discretion vested in the President or other officer concerned, and the terms 'perform' and 'performance' may be construed to mean 'exercise'."

SEC. 11. The analysis of Title 4, United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States", immediately preceding Chapter 1 of such title, is amended by inserting, immediately after and underneath item 4 in such analysis, the following new item:

"5. Official Territorial Papers.....141".

SEC. 12. Title 4 of the United States Code is further amended by inserting, immediately after section 111 of such title, the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 5.—OFFICIAL TERRITORIAL PAPERS

"Sec.

141. Collection, preparation and publication.
142. Appointment of experts.
143. Employment and utilization of other personnel; cost of copy reading and indexing.
144. Cooperation of departments and agencies.
145. Printing and distribution.
146. Authorization of appropriations.

"§ 141. Collection, preparation and publication

"The Administrator of General Services, hereinafter referred to in this chapter as the 'Administrator', shall continue to completion the work of collecting, editing, copying, and suitably arranging for issuance as a Government publication, the official papers relating to the Territories from which States of the United States were formed, in the national archives, as listed in Parker's 'Calendar of Papers in Washington Archives Relating to the Territories of the United States (to 1873)', being publication numbered 143 of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, together with such additional papers of like character which may be found.

"§ 142. Appointment of experts

"for the purpose of carrying on the work prescribed by section 141 of this title, the Administrator, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 and the civil service laws and regulations thereunder, may engage the services, either in or outside of the District of Columbia, of not to exceed five historical experts who are especially informed on the various phases of the territorial history of the United States and are especially qualified for the editorial work necessary in arranging such territorial papers for publication.

"§ 143. Employment and utilization of other personnel; cost of copy reading and indexing

"(a) In carrying out his functions under this chapter, the Administrator may employ such clerical assistants as may be necessary.

"(b) The work of copy reading and index making for the publication of the papers described in section 141 of this title shall be done by the regular editorial staff of the General Services Administration, and the cost of this particular phase of the work (prorated each month according to the number of hours spent and the annual salaries of the clerks employed) shall be charged against the annual appropriations made under section 146 of this title.

"§ 144. Cooperation of departments and agencies

"The heads of the several executive departments and independent agencies and establishments shall cooperate with the Administrator in the work prescribed by section 141 of this title by permitting access to any records deemed by him to be necessary to the completion of such work.

"§145. Printing and distribution

"(a) The Public Printer shall print and bind each volume of the official papers relating to the Territories of the United States as provided for in this chapter, of which—

"(1) four hundred and twenty copies shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for distribution, on the basis of one copy each, and as directed by the Administrator, to those historical associations, commissions, museums, or libraries, and other nondepository libraries, not to exceed eight in number within each State, Territory, or Possession, which have been or may be designated by the Governor thereof to receive such copies;

"(2) one hundred copies shall be delivered to the General Services Administration for the use of that Administration; and

"(3) one hundred copies shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents for distribution in such manner and number as may be authorized and directed by the Joint Committee on Printing.

"(b) The historical associations, commissions, museums, or libraries, and other nondepository libraries within each State, Territory, or Possession which have been or may be designated by the Governor thereof to receive the publications referred to in subsection (a) of this section, shall, during their existence, receive the succeeding volumes, the distribution of which shall be made by the Superintendent of Documents in accordance with lists of designations transmitted to him by the Administrator. A new designation may be made to the Administrator by the Governor only when a designated association, commission, museum, or library shall cease to exist, or when authorized by law.

"§ 146. Authorization of appropriations

"For the purposes of this chapter, there are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sums of not more than $50,000 for any one fiscal year."

SEC. 13. Section 1 of Title 6, United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds," is amended by striking out the words "collectors of internal revenue," so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 1. Custody

"All bonds of the Treasurer of the United States, collectors, comptrollers of customs, surveyors, and other officers of the customs, either as such officers or as disbursing officers of the Treasury, bonds of the Secretary of the Senate, Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, shall be placed in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury and filed as he may direct; and the duties required by law on March 2, 1895, of the Comptroller of the Treasury in regard to such bonds, as the successor of the Commissioner of Customs and First Comptroller of the Treasury, shall be performed by the Secretary of the Treasury.".

SEC. 14. The third sentence of section 7 of Title 9, United States Code, entitled "Arbitration," is amended to read as follows: "Said summons shall issue in the name of the arbitrator or arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be signed by the arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be directed to the said person and shall be served in the same manner as subpoenas to appear and testify before the court. If any person or persons so summoned to testify shall refuse or neglect to obey said summons, upon petition the United States district court for the district in which such arbitrators, or a majority of them, are sitting may compel the attendance of such person or persons before said arbitrator or arbitrators, or punish said person or persons for contempt in the same manner provided by law for securing the attendance of witnesses or their punishment for neglect or refusal to attend in the courts of the United States.".

SEC. 15. Section 760 of Title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard", is amended (1) by striking out, in subsection (a) of such section, the words "Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency," and in lieu thereof inserting "Secretary of Labor"; and (2) by striking out, in subsection (c) of such section, the words "Bureau for benefit.. because of an alleged injury or death, the Bureau shall notify" and in lieu thereof inserting "Secretary of Labor for benefits because of an alleged injury or death, the Secretary of Labor, or such officer, agency or employee of the Department of Labor as he shall designate, shall notify", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 760. Disability or death benefits for temporary members

"(a) In case of physical injury, or death resulting from physical injury, to any temporary member of the Reserve incurred incident to service while performing active Coast Guard duty, or engaged in authorized travel to or from such duty, the provisions of law authorizing compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, subject to this section, shall apply, and shall be administered by the Secretary of Labor in the same manner and to the same extent as if such person were a civil employee of the United States and were injured in the performance of his duty. For benefit computation, regardless of pay or pay status, such person shall be deemed to have had monthly pay of $150.

"(b) This section does not apply in any case coming within the purview of the Workmen's Compensation Law of any state, territory, or other jurisdiction because of a concurrent employment status of such temporary member; and where such temporary member or dependent would be entitled to a benefit under the provisions of law authorizing compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties and also to any concurrent benefit from the United States on account of the same disability or death, such temporary member or dependent shall elect which benefit he shall receive.

"(c) Whenever, pursuant to this section a claim is filed with the Secretary of Labor for benefits because of an alleged injury or death, the Secretary of Labor, or such officer, agency, or employee of the Department of Labor as he shall designate, shall notify the Commandant who shall cause an investigation to be made into the facts surrounding such alleged injury and make certification with respect thereto, including certification as to such injured or deceased person's temporary membership in the Reserve and his military status, and whether the injury or death occurred incident to service.

"(d) Temporary members of the Reserve who incur physical disability or contract sickness or disease while performing any specific duty to which they have been assigned by competent Coast Guard authority shall be entitled to the same hospital treatment afforded officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard.".

SEC. 16. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of Title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights", is amended by striking out "tile" appearing in such sentence, and in lieu thereof inserting "title", so that such sentence will read as follows:

"The copyright provided by this title shall protect all the copyrightable component parts of the work copyrighted, and all matter therein in which copyright is already subsisting, but without extending the duration or scope of such copyright.".

(b) The first paragraph of section 8 of Title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "June" appearing near the end of such paragraph, and in lieu thereof inserting "January", so that such paragraph will read as follows:

"No copyright shall subsist in the original text of any work which is in the public domain, or in any work which was published in this country or any foreign country prior to July 1, 1909, and has not been already copyrighted in the United States, or in any publication of the United States Government, or any reprint, in whole or in part, thereof: *Provided*, That copyright may be secured by the Postmaster General on behalf of the United States in the whole or any part of the publications authorized by section 1 of the Act of January 27, 1938 (39 U. S. C. 371).".

(c) Section 112 of Title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking out, near the beginning of the first sentence in such section, the words "such court", and in lieu thereof inserting "court mentioned in section 1338 of Title 28", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 112. Injunctions; service and enforcement

"Any court mentioned in section 1338 of Title 28 or judge thereof shall have power, upon complaint filed by any party aggrieved, to grant injunctions to prevent and restrain the violation of any right secured by this title, according to the course and principles of courts of equity, on such terms as said court or judge may deem reasonable. Any injunction that may be granted restraining and enjoining the doing of anything forbidden by this title may be served on the parties against whom such injunction may be granted anywhere in the United States, and shall be operative throughout the United States and be enforceable by proceedings in contempt or otherwise by any other court or judge possessing jurisdiction of the defendants."

SEC. 17. Section 114 of Title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking out the reference "110 of this title", appearing in such section, and in lieu thereof inserting "1338 of Title 28", so that such section 114 will read as follows:

"§ 114. Review of orders, judgments, or decrees

"The orders, judgments, or decrees of any court mentioned in section 1338 of Title 28 arising under the copyright laws of the United States may be reviewed on appeal in the manner and to the extent now provided by law for the review of cases determined in said courts, respectively.".

SEC. 18. The analysis of Chapter 23 of Title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure", immediately preceding section 431 of such title, is amended by striking out the item "431. Contracts by Member of Congress; exceptions.", and in lieu thereof inserting "431. Contracts by Member of Congress.".

SEC. 19. The catchline to section 431 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "; exceptions", so that such

catchline will read as follows: "§ 431. Contracts by Member of Congress".

SEC. 20. (2) Section 443 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 443. War contracts

"Whoever willfully secretes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys—

"(a) any records of a war contractor relating to the negotiation, award, performance, payment, interim financing, cancellation or other termination, or settlement of a war contract of $25,000 or more; or

"(b) any records of a war contractor or purchaser relating to any disposition of termination inventory in which the consideration received by any war contractor or any government agency is $5,000 or more,

before the lapse of (1) five years after such disposition of termination inventory by such war contractor or government agency, or (2) five years after the final settlement of such war contract, or (3) five years after 12 o'clock noon of December 31, 1946, whichever applicable period is longer, shall, if a corporation, be fined not more than $50,000, and, if a natural person, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"The Administrator of General Services, by regulation, may authorize the destruction of such records upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, including the requirement for the making and retaining of photographs or microphotographs, which shall have the same force and effect as the originals thereof.

"The definitions of terms in section 103 of Title 41 shall apply to similar terms used in this section."

(b) Section 603 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out, after "purpose" in such section, the words "from any such person", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 603. Place of solicitation.

"Whoever, in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties by any person mentioned in section 602 of this title, or in any navy yard, fort, or arsenal, solicits or receives any contribution of money or other thing of value for any political purpose, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.".

(c) The second paragraph of section 610 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting after "as the case may be," in such paragraph, the words 'and any person who accepts or receives any contribution,"; (2) by inserting a comma after "section" where such word precedes "shall be fined not more than $1,000" in such paragraph; and (3) by inserting, immediately after 'both' and preceding the period at the end of such paragraph, the following: "; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both", so that such paragraph will read as follows:

"Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, and any person who accepts or receives any contribution, in violation of this section, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.".

SEC. 21. Section 658 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "any production credit corporation or corporation in which a production credit corporation holds stock", and in lieu thereof inserting "any production credit association organized under sections 1131–1134m of Title 12, or in which a Production Credit Corporation holds stock", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 658. Property mortgaged or pledged to farm credit agencies

"Whoever, with intent to defraud, knowingly conceals, removes, disposes of, or converts to his own use or to that of another, any property mortgaged or pledged to, or held by, the Farm Credit Administration, any Federal intermediate credit bank, or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Farmers' Home Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture acting through the Farmers' Home Administration, any production credit association organized under sections 1131–1134m of Title 12, or in which a Production Credit Corporation holds stock, any regional agricultural credit corporation, or any bank for cooperatives, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both; but if the value of such property does not exceed $100, he shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.".

SEC. 22. The eighth paragraph of section 709 of Title 18, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever uses as a firm or business name the words 'Federal Housing', 'National Housing' or 'Public Housing Administration' or any combination or variation of those words alone or with other words reasonably calculated to convey the false impression that such name or business has some connection with, or authorization from, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, which does not in fact exist, or falsely advertises by any device whatsoever that any project, business or product has been in any way indorsed, authorized or approved by the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any agency thereof; or".

SEC. 23. The analysis of Chapter 37 of Title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 791 of such title, is amended by inserting at the end of such analysis, immediately under item 797, the following new item: "798. Disclosure of classified information.".

SEC. 24. (a) Title 18 of the United States Code is further amended by inserting in Chapter 37 of such title, immediately following section 797 of such title, the following new section:

"§ 798. Disclosure of classified information

"(a) Whoever knowingly and willfully communicates, furnishes, transmits, or otherwise makes available to an unauthorized person or publishes, or uses in any manner prejudicial to the safety or interest of the United States or for the benefit of any foreign government to the detriment of the United States any classified information—

"(1) concerning the nature, preparation, or use of any code, cipher, or cryptographic system of the United States or any foreign government; or

"(2) concerning the design, construction, use, maintenance, or repair of any device, apparatus, or appliance used or prepared or planned for use by the United States or any foreign government for cryptographic or communication intelligence purposes; or

"(3) concerning the communication intelligence activities of the United States or any foreign government; or

"(4) obtained by the processes of communication intelligence from the communications of any foreign government, knowing the same to have been obtained by such processes—

"Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"(b) As used in subsection (a) of this section—

"The term 'classified information' means information which, at the time of a violation of this section, is, for reasons of national security, specifically designated by a United States Government agency for limited or restricted dissemination or distribution;

"The terms 'code,' 'cipher,' and 'cryptographic system' include in their meanings, in addition to their usual meanings, any method of secret writing and any mechanical or electrical device or method used for the purpose of disguising or concealing the contents, significance, or meanings of communications;

"The term 'foreign government' includes in its meaning any person or persons acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of any faction, party, department, agency, bureau, or military force of or within a foreign country, whether or not such government is recognized by the United States;

"The term 'communication intelligence' means all procedures and methods used in the interception of communications and the obtaining of information from such communications by other than the intended recipients;

"The term 'unauthorized person' means any person who, or agency which, is not authorized to receive information of the categories set forth in subsection (a) of this section, by the President, or by the head of a department or agency of the United States Government which is expressly designated by the President to engage in communication intelligence activities for the United States.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the furnishing, upon lawful demand, of information to any regularly constituted committee of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States of America, or joint committee thereof.".

(b) Section 872 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting a comma immediately after the word "such" in such section; and (2) by striking out the comma immediately after the word "employment" in such section, so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 872. Extortion by officers or employees of the United States

"Whoever, being an officer, or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, or representing himself to be or assuming to act as such, under color or pretense of office or employment commits or attempts an act of extortion, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; but if the amount so extorted or demanded does not exceed $100, he shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.".

SEC. 25. The analysis of chapter 47 of Title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1001 of such title, is amended by striking out, in item 1012 of such analysis, the words "United States Housing Authority" and in lieu thereof inserting "Public Housing Administration", so that such item will read as follows: "1012. Public Housing Administration transactions.".

SEC. 26. Section 1012 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out in the catchline to such section, the words "United States Housing Authority" and in lieu thereof inserting "Public Housing Administration"; (2) by striking out, in the first paragraph of such section, the words "United States Housing Authority" and in lieu thereof inserting "Public Housing Administration"; and (3) by striking out the

word "Authority", wherever it appears in such section, and in lieu thereof inserting "Administration", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 1012. Public Housing Administration transactions

"Whoever, with intent to defraud, makes any false entry in any book of the Public Housing Administration or makes any false report or statement to or for such Administration; or

"Whoever receives any compensation, rebate, or reward, with intent to defraud such Administration or with intent unlawfully to defeat its purposes; or

"Whoever induces or influences such Administration to purchase or acquire any property or to enter into any contract and willfully fails to disclose any interest which he has in such property or in the property to which such contract relates, or any special benefit which he expects to receive as a result of such contract—

"Shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.".

SEC. 27. Section 1020 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Secretary of Agriculture", where it appears in the first and second paragraphs of such section, and in lieu thereof inserting "Secretary of Commerce", so that the first and second paragraphs will read as follows:

"Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or of any State or Territory, or whoever, whether a person, association, firm, or corporation, knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or costs of construction of any highway or related project submitted for approval to the Secretary of Commerce; or

"Whoever knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report or claim for work or materials for the construction of any highway or related project approved by the Secretary of Commerce; or".

SEC. 28. Section 1114 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "the field service of the Division of Grazing of the Department of the Interior", appearing in such section, and in lieu thereof inserting "the field service of the Department of the Interior with respect to grazing on public lands", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 1114. Protection of officers and employees of the United States

"Whoever kills any judge of the United States, any United States Attorney, any Assistant United States Attorney, or any United States marshal or deputy marshal or person employed to assist such marshal or deputy marshal, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, any post-office inspector, any officer or employee of the secret service or of the Bureau of Narcotics, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, any officer or employee of any United States penal or correctional institution, any officer, employee or agent of the customs or of the internal revenue or any person assisting him in the execution of his duties, any immigrant inspector or any immigration patrol inspector, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of the Interior designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to enforce any Act of Congress for the protection, preservation, or restoration of game and other wild birds and animals, any officer or employee of the National Park Service, any officer or employee of, or assigned to duty in, the field service of the Department of the Interior with respect to grazing on public lands, any employee of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, or any officer or employee of the Indian field service of the United States, while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of this title.".

SEC. 29. Section 1302 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of the opening clause in the text of such section, and in lieu thereof inserting a colon, so that such clause will read as follows: "Whoever knowingly deposits in the mail, or send or delivers by mail:".

SEC. 30. Section 3113 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out, in the second paragraph of such section, the words "War Department" and in lieu thereof inserting "Department of the Army", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 3113. Liquor violations in Indian country

"If any superintendent of Indian affairs, or commanding officer of a military post, or special agent of the Office of Indian Affairs for the suppression of liquor traffic among Indians and in the Indian country and any authorized deputies under his supervision has probable cause to believe that any person is about to introduce or has introduced any spirituous liquor, beer, wine or other intoxicating liquors named in sections 1154 and 1156 of this title into the Indian country in violation of law, he may cause the places, conveyances, and packages of such person to be searched. If any such intoxicating liquor is found therein, the same, together with such conveyances and packages of such person, shall be seized and delivered to the proper officer, and shall be proceeded against by libel in the proper court, and forfeited, one-half to the informer and one-half to the use of the United States. If such person be a trader, his license shall be revoked and his bond put in suit.

"Any person in the service of the United States authorized by this section to make searches and seizures, or any Indian may take and destroy any ardent spirits or wine found in the Indian country, except such as are kept or used for scientific, sacramental, medicinal, or mechanical purposes or such as may be introduced therein by the Department of the Army.

"In all cases arising under this section and sections 1154 and 1156 of this title, Indians shall be competent witnesses.".

SEC. 31. Section 4122 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out, in subsections (d) and (e) of such section, the words "National Military Establishment", and in lieu thereof inserting, in each such place, the words "Department of Defense", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 4122. Administration of Federal Prison Industries

"(a) Federal Prison Industries shall determine in what manner and to what extent industrial operations shall be carried on in Federal penal and correctional institutions for the production of commodities for consumption in such institutions or for sale to the departments or agencies of the United States, but not for sale to the public in competition with private enterprise.

"(b) Its board of directors shall provide employment for all physically fit inmates in the United States penal and correctional institutions, diversify, so far as practicable, prison industrial operations and so operate the prison shops that no single private industry shall be forced to bear an undue burden of competition from the products of the prison workshops, and to reduce to a minimum competition with private industry or free labor.

"(c) Its board of directors may provide for the vocational training of qualified inmates without regard to their industrial or other assignments.

"(d) The provisions of this chapter shall apply to the industrial employment and training of prisoners convicted by general courts-martial and confined in any institution under the jurisdiction of any department or agency comprising the Department of Defense, to the extent and under terms and conditions agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General and the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries.

"(e) Any department or agency of the Department of Defense may, without exchange of funds, transfer to Federal Prison Industries any property or equipment suitable for use in performing the functions and duties covered by agreement entered into under subsection (d) of this section.".

SEC. 32. Section 4124 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out, in the second paragraph of such section, the words "Director of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury" and in lieu thereof inserting "Administrator of General Services", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 4124. Purchase of prison-made products by Federal departments

"The several Federal departments and agencies and all other Government institutions of the United States shall purchase at not to exceed current market prices, such products of the industries authorized by this chapter as meet their requirements and may be available.

"Disputes as to the price, quality, character, or suitability of such products shall be arbitrated by a board consisting of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Administrator of General Services, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, or their representatives. Their decision shall be final and binding upon all parties.".

SEC. 33. The analysis of Chapter 313 of Title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 4241 of such title, is amended by striking out all of item 4243, in such analysis, and in lieu thereof inserting "4243. Delivery to state authorities on expiration of sentence.".

SEC. 34. Section 41 of Title 28, United States Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure", is amended by inserting, immediately preceding "Hawaii" in that part of such section relating to the composition of the Ninth judicial circuit, the following: "Guam,", so that such part will read as follows: "Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.".

SEC. 35. Subsection (a) of section 45 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after "circuit judge" in such subsection, the words "in active service who is", so that such subsection will read as follows:

"(a) The circuit judge in active service who is senior in commission shall be the chief judge of the circuit.".

SEC. 36. Section 48 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"Any court of appeals may, with the consent of the Judicial Conference of the United States, pretermit any regular term or session of the court at any place for insufficient business or other good cause.".

SEC. 37. Subsection (a) of section 136 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after "district judge"

in such subsection, the words "in active service who is", so that such subsection will read as follows:

"(a) In each district having more than one judge the district judge in active service who is senior in commission shall be the chief judge of the district court.".

SEC. 38. The first paragraph of section 333 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after "Canal Zone," in such paragraph, the following: "the District Court of Guam,", so that such paragraph will read as follows:

"The chief judge of each circuit shall summon annually the circuit and district judges of the circuit, in active service to a conference at a time and place that he designates, for the purpose of considering the business of the courts and advising means of improving the administration of justice within such circuit. He shall preside at such conference, which shall be known as the Judicial Conference of the circuit. The judges of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands shall also be summoned annually to the conferences of their respective circuits.".

SEC. 39. Section 371 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting the subsection designation "(a)" at the beginning of the first paragraph of the section; (2) by inserting the subsection designation "(b)" at the beginning of the second paragraph of the section; (3) by inserting the subsection designation "(c)" at the beginning of the fourth paragraph of the section; (4) by striking out, in the second paragraph of subsection (c) of such section (as herein so designated) the words "who retires or"; (5) by inserting, immediately after "precedence," in the second paragraph of subsection (c) of such section, the words "service as chief judge or temporary performance of the duties of that office,"; and (6) by inserting, immediately after "junior" in the second paragraph of subsection (c) of such section, the words "in commission", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 371. Resignation or retirement for age; substitute judge on failure to retire

"(a) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior who resigns after attaining the age of seventy years and after serving at least ten years continuously or otherwise shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary which he was receiving when he resigned.

"(b) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior may retain his office but retire from regular active service after attaining the age of seventy years and after serving at least ten years continuously or otherwise. He shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary of the office.

"The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a successor to a justice or judge who retires.

"(c) Whenever any circuit or district judge eligible to resign or retire under this section does neither, and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and that the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. If such additional judge is appointed, the vacancy subsequently caused by the death, resignation, or retirement of the disabled judge shall not be filled.

"Any circuit or district judge whose disability causes the appointment of an additional judge, shall, for purposes of precedence, service as chief judge or temporary performance of the duties of that office, be treated as junior in commission to the other judges of the circuit or district.".

SEC. 40. The first paragraph of section 373 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after "Canal Zone" in such paragraph, the following: ", the District Court of Guam", so that such paragraph will read as follows:

"Any judge of the United States District Courts for the districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam or the District Court of the Virgin Islands and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii who resigns, retires, or fails of reappointment or is removed by the President of the United States upon the sole ground of mental or physical disability, after attaining the age of seventy years and after serving as judge of one or more of such courts, at least sixteen years, continuously or otherwise, shall continue to receive the salary which he received when he relinquished office.".

SEC. 41. The second paragraph of subsection (c) of section 411 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "Secretary of War", and in lieu thereof inserting "Secretary of the Army", so that such second paragraph will read as follows:

"Reports and digests printed prior to June 12, 1926, shall not be furnished to the Secretary of the Army for military headquarters.".

SEC. 42. The analysis of Chapter 21 of Title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 451 of such title, is amended by inserting, immediately after "Canal Zone" in item 460 in such analysis, the following: ", Guam", so that such item will read as follows: "460. Application to Alaska, Canal Zone, Guam and Virgin Islands.".

SEC. 43. (a) Section 460 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting, immediately after "Canal Zone" in the catchline to such section, the following: ", Guam"; and (2) by inserting, immediately after "Canal Zone" in the text of such section, the following: ", the District Court of Guam"; so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 460. Application to Alaska, Canal Zone, Guam and Virgin Islands

"Sections 452–459 of this chapter shall also apply to the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam and the District Court of the Virgin Islands and the judges thereof.".

(b) The second paragraph of section 603 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the reference "sections 661–673 and 674 of Title 5" appearing in such paragraph, and in lieu thereof inserting "the Classification Act of 1949", so that such paragraph will read as follows:

"The Director shall fix the compensation of Administrative Office employees according to the Classification Act of 1949.".

SEC. 44. Section 610 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after "Canal Zone," in such section, the following: "the District Court of Guam,", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 610. Courts defined

"As used in this chapter the word 'courts' includes the courts of appeals and district courts of the United States, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Customs Court.".

SEC. 45. Subsection (b) of section 676 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after "section 411", and immediately after "sections 411 and 412", in such subsection, the words "of this title", so that such subsection will read as follows:

"(b) Whenever advance pamphlet installments and bound volumes of the Court's decisions are printed by a private printer, an adequate number of copies for distribution in accordance with the requirements of section 411 of this title and for sale to the public shall be provided and made available for these purposes in such manner and at such prices as may be determined from time to time by the Supreme Court or the Chief Justice of the United States, in lieu of compliance by the Public Printer and the Superintendent of Documents with the requirements of sections 411 and 412 of this title with respect to such copies. Pending distribution or sale, such copies shall be the property of the United States and shall be held in the custody of the marshal or such other person, organization, or agency, as the Supreme Court or the Chief Justice of the United States may designate.".

SEC. 46. The first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 753 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after "Canal Zone," in such paragraph, the following: "the District Court of Guam,", so that such paragraph will read as follows:

"(a) Each district court of the United States, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands shall appoint one or more court reporters.".

SEC. 47. The first paragraph of section 1252 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after "Canal Zone" in such paragraph, the following: ", the District Court of Guam", so that such paragraph will read as follows:

"Any party may appeal to the Supreme Court from an interlocutory or final judgment, decree or order of any court of the United States, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam and the District Court of the Virgin Islands and any court of record of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, holding an Act of Congress unconstitutional in any civil action, suit, or proceeding to which the United States or any of its agencies, or any officer or employee thereof, as such officer or employee, is a party.".

SEC. 48. Section 1291 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"Except where a direct review may be had in the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit shall have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the District Court of Guam in all cases involving the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States or any authority exercised thereunder, in all habeas corpus proceedings, and in all other civil cases where the value in controversy exceeds $5,000, exclusive of interests and costs.".

SEC. 49. Paragraph (1) of section 1292 of Title 28, United States Code, being that paragraph which follows the opening clause of such section, is amended by inserting immediately after "Canal Zone", in such paragraph, the following: "the District Court of Guam,", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 1292. Interlocutory decisions

"The courts of appeals shall have jurisdiction of appeals from:

"(1) Interlocutory orders of the district courts of the United States, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, or of the judges thereof, granting, continuing,

modifying, refusing or dissolving injunctions, or refusing to dissolve or modify injunctions, except where a direct review may be had in the Supreme Court;

"(2) Interlocutory orders appointing receivers, or refusing orders to wind up receiverships or to take steps to accomplish the purposes thereof, such as directing sales or other disposals of property;

"(3) Interlocutory decrees of such district courts or the judges thereof determining the rights and liabilities of the parties to admiralty cases in which appeals from final decrees are allowed;

"(4) Judgments in civil actions for patent infringement which are final except for accounting.".

SEC. 50. (a) Section 1294 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out the period at the end of clause (6) of such section and in lieu thereof inserting a semicolon; and (2) by adding a new clause at the end of such section, to read as follows:

"(7) From the District Court of Guam, to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.".

(b) Clause (2) of subsection (d) of section 1346 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting, immediately after "action" in such clause, the words "or claim"; and (2) by inserting, immediately after "officers" in such clause, the words "or employees", so that such subsection will read as follows:

"(d) The district courts shall not have jurisdiction under this section of:

"(1) Any civil action or claim for a pension;

"(2) Any civil action or claim to recover fees, salary, or compensation for official services of officers or employees of the United States.".

(c) Section 1498 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after and underneath the first paragraph of such section, the following new paragraph:

"For the purposes of this section, the use or manufacture of an invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government and with the authorization or consent of the Government, shall be construed as use or manufacture for the United States.".

SEC. 51. (a) The second sentence in the first paragraph of section 1821 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out, in that part which precedes the first proviso in such sentence, the word "residence", and in lieu thereof inserting "residences", so that such part will read as follows: "Witnesses who are not salaried employees of the Government and who are not in custody and who attend at points so far removed from their respective residences as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of $5 per day for expenses of subsistence including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance:".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 1915 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "furnishing a stenographic transcript and", so that such subsection will read as follows:

"(b) In any civil or criminal case the court may, upon the filing of a like affidavit, direct that the expense of printing the record on appeal, if such printing is required by the appellate court, be paid by the United States, and the same shall be paid when authorized by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.".

(c) Subsection (e) of section 1915 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Judgment may be rendered for costs at the conclusion of the suit or action as in other cases, but the United States shall not be liable for any of the costs thus incurred. If the United States has paid the cost of a stenographic transcript or printed record for the prevailing party, the same shall be taxed in favor of the United States.".

SEC. 52. The second paragraph of section 2253 of Title 28 United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be no right of appeal from such an order in a proceeding to test the validity of a warrant to remove, to another district or place for commitment or trial, a person charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the validity of his detention pending removal proceedings.".

SEC. 53. The second proviso in the third paragraph of section 125 of the Act of June 3, 1916 (ch. 134, 39 Stat. 216; 10 U. S. C., sec. 1393), as last amended by section 15 (b) of the Act of May 24, 1949 (ch. 39, 63 Stat. 91), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That when an enlisted man is discharged for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, inaptitude or otherwise than honorably, all uniform outer clothing in his possession shall be retained for military use, and, when authorized by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Navy, a suit of civilian outer clothing, and a civilian overcoat when necessary, the total cost not to exceed $30, may be issued to such discharged enlisted man of the Army, Navy or Marine Corps:".

SEC. 54. Section 6 of the Act approved October 31, 1942 (ch. 634, 56 Stat. 1014; 35 U. S. C., sec. 94) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. For the purposes of this Act, the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of an invention, whether patented or unpatented, by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government and with the authorization or consent of the Government shall be construed as manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition for the United States.".

SEC. 55. (a) Section 24 of the Organic Act of Guam (Act August 1, 1950, ch. 512, sec. 24, 64 Stat. 390; 48 U. S. C., sec. 1424b) is amended (1) by striking out, in the second sentence of subsection (a) of such section the words "and shall be entitled to the benefits of retirement provided in section 373 of title 28, United States Code" and the comma immediately preceding such words; and (2) by striking out, in subsection (c) of such section, the reference "21, 41, 43, 49, and 57" and in lieu thereof inserting "43 and 49"; so that such section will read as follows:

"SEC. 24. (a) The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a judge for the District Court of Guam who shall hold office for the term of four years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause. The judge shall receive a salary payable by the United States which shall be the same as the salary of the Governor of Guam as provided by section 26 (a) of this Act. The Chief Justice of the United States may, with the consent of the judge so assigned, assign any United States circuit or district judge to serve as a judge in the District Court of Guam whenever it is made to appear that such an assignment is necessary for the proper dispatch of the business of the court.

"(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States attorney and United States marshal for Guam to whose offices the provisions of chapters 31 and 33 of title 28, United States Code, respectively, shall apply.

"(c) The provisions of chapters 43 and 49 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply to the District Court of Guam.".

(b) Paragraph (f) of section 7 of the Act approved August 9, 1939 (ch. 618, 53 Stat. 1292 (1293); 49 U. S. C., sec. 787 (f)) is amended by striking out the reference "147 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 261)" in such paragraph, and in lieu thereof inserting "3 of Title 18." so that such paragraph will read as follows:

"(f) The words 'obligation or other security of the United States' are used as now or hereafter defined in section 8 of Title 18.".

SEC. 56. (a) The last paragraph under the subheading "General Provisions" under the heading "Navy Department" in section 101 of the Act approved December 23, 1943 (chapter 380, Title I, 57 Stat. 628 [top of page]; 34 U. S. C., sec. 197a), as amended by section 17 of the Act approved August 4, 1949 (Chapter 393, 63 Stat. 560), is hereby repealed.

(b) The second proviso in section 10 of the Act approved March 4, 1925 (chapter 536, 43 Stat. 1274; 34 U. S. C., sec. 722), is hereby repealed.

(c) The Act approved May 13, 1950 (chapter 185, P. L. 513, 81st Cong., 64 Stat. 159, 160; 50 U. S. C., secs. 46–46b) is hereby repealed.

(d) Sections 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the Act approved March 8, 1902 (chapter 140, 32 Stat. 55; 19 U. S. C., former secs. 152a [including that part of such section 6 which was not classified to 19 U. S. C., former sec. 152a], 152b, 577; 48 U. S. C., former sec. 1009) are hereby repealed.

(e) Section 23 of the Organic Act of Guam (Act August 1, 1950, chapter 512, section 23, 64 Stat. 390; 49 U. S. C., sec. 1424a) is hereby repealed.

(f) Section 3051 of Title 18, United States Code, and all of item 3051 in the analysis of chapter 203 of such title (immediately preceding section 3041 of such title), are hereby repealed.

(g) The third paragraph under the heading "United States Court of Customs Appeals" in section 1 of the Act approved March 4, 1911 (chapter 237, 36 Stat. 1170), such heading and paragraph being on page 1234 of volume 36, Statutes at Large (31 U. S. C., sec. 687), is hereby repealed.

(h) Section 204 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 2 of the act approved December 28, 1874 (chapter 9, 18 Stat. 294), and section 205 of the Revised Statutes, are hereby repealed.

(i) That part of section 73 of the Printing Act of January 12, 1895 (chapter 23, 28 Stat. 615) relating to the compilation, editing, indexing, and publication of the United States Statutes at Large, which part was amended by the Act approved June 20, 1936 (chapter 630, sec. 9, 49 Stat. 1551) and by the Act approved June 16, 1938 (chapter 477, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 760), and is classified to section 196 of Title 44, United States Code, is hereby repealed. This subsection shall not be construed as repealing that part of such section 73, as amended, which relates to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large and the United States Treaties and Other International Agreements, and is classified to section 196a of Title 44, United States Code, or any other part of such section 73, nor shall it be construed as repealing sections 112 and 112a of Title 1, United States Code, relating to the same subject matter as the subject matter in the part of such section 73 herein repealed.

(j) The act approved August 8, 1950 (chapter 646, 64 Stat. 419) is hereby repealed.

(k) There are hereby repealed the following statutes and parts of statutes:

(1) Act approved March 3, 1925, chapter 419, sections 1 and 2, 43 Stat. 1104.

(2) Act approved February 28, 1929, chapter 385, 45 Stat. 1412, 1413.

(3) Act approved March 22, 1935, chapter 39, section 1 (part), 49 Stat. 69 (only the proviso in the paragraph immediately under the heading "Collecting and Editing Official Papers of Territories of the United States", appearing on page 69).

(4) Act approved February 14, 1936, chapter 70, 49 Stat. 1139.

(5) Act approved May 15, 1936, chapter 405, section 1 (part), 49 Stat. 1311 (only the proviso in the paragraph immediately under the heading "Collecting and Editing Official Papers of the Territories of the United States", appearing on page 1311).

(6) Act approved June 16, 1937, chapter 359, section 1 (part), 50 Stat. 262, 263 (only the proviso which begins near the bottom of page 262, and ends on page 263).

(7) Act approved June 28, 1937, chapter 386, 50 Stat. 323, 324.

(8) Act approved April 27, 1938, chapter 180, section 1 (part), 52 Stat. 249 (only the proviso in the third full paragraph appearing on page 249).

(9) Act approved June 29, 1939, chapter 248, title I (part), 53 Stat. 886 (only the proviso in the last paragraph on page 886).

(10) Act approved July 31, 1945, chapter 336, 59 Stat. 510, 511.

(11) Act approved July 7, 1950, chapter 452, 64 Stat. 320.

(l) The repeal, by subsections (a)-(k) of this section, of the statutes and parts of statutes referred to in such subsections, shall not affect any rights or liabilities existing under such statutes or parts of statutes at the time this Act takes effect.

With the following committee amendments:

(1) On page 11 of the bill immediately preceding § 18, insert a new section, § 17a to read as follows:

"SEC. 17a. The analysis of chapter 2 of title 17, United States Code, immediately preceding section 101 of such title, is amended by striking out the following five items:

"'101. (f) Rules of procedure.

"'102. Jurisdiction of courts in enforcing remedies.

"'103. Joinder of proceedings for different remedies.

"'110. Jurisdiction of actions under laws.

"'111. District in which actions may be brought.'"

(2) On page 20 of the bill immediately preceding § 37, insert a new section, § 36a to read as follows:

"SEC. 36a. Subsection (b) (2) of section 90 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word 'Washington,' so that the subsection will read as follows: '(2) The Macon Division comprises the counties of Baldwin, Bibb, Bleckley, Butts, Crawford, Hancock, Houston, Jasper, Jones, Lamar, Monrone, Peach, Pulaski, Putnam, Twiggs, Upson, and Wilkinson.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2395) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure", to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 331 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 331. Mutilation, diminution, and falsification of coins

"Whoever fraudulently alters, defaces, mutilates, impairs, diminishes, falsifies, scales, or lightens any of the coins coined at the mints of the United States, or any foreign coins which are by law made current or are in actual use or circulation as money within the United States; or

"Whoever fraudulently possesses, passes, utters, publishes, or sells, or attempts to pass, utter, publish, or sell, or brings into the United States, any such coin, knowing the same to be altered, defaced, mutilated, impaired, diminished, falsified, scaled, or lightened—

"Shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

SEC. 2. Section 475 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 475. Imitating obligations or securities; advertisements

"Whoever designs, engraves, prints, makes, or executes, or utters, issues, distributes, circulates, or uses any business or professional card, notice, placard, circular, handbill, or advertisement in the likeness or similitude of any obligation or security of the United States issued under or authorized by any act of Congress or writes, prints, or otherwise impresses upon or attaches to any such instrument, obligation, or security, or any coin of the United States, any business or professional card, notice, or advertisement, or any notice or advertisement whatever, shall be fined not more than $500."

SEC. 3. Section 489 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 489. Making or possessing likeness of coins

"Whoever, within the United States, makes or brings therein from any foreign country, or possesses with intent to sell, give away, or in any other manner uses the same, except under authority of the Secretary of the Treasury or other proper officer of the United States, any token, disk, or device in the likeness or similitude as to design, color, or the inscription thereon of any of the coins of the United States or of any foreign country issued as money, either under the authority of the United States or under the authority of any foreign government shall be fined not more than $100."

SEC. 4. Section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3056. Secret Service powers

"Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the United States Secret Service, Treasury Department, is authorized to protect the person of the President of the United States and members of his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President at his request; detect and arrest any person committing any offense against the laws of the United States relating to coins, obligations, and securities of the United States and of foreign governments; detect and arrest any person violating any of the provisions of sections 508 and 509 of this title and, insofar as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal land banks, joint-stock land banks and national farm loan associations are concerned, of sections 218, 221, 433, 493, 657, 709, 1006, 1007, 1011, 1013, 1014, 1907, and 1909 of this title; detect and arrest any person committing any other offense against the laws of the United States relating to the Treasury Department and the several branches of the public service under its control; execute warrants issued under the authority of the United States; carry firearms; offer and pay rewards for services or information looking toward the apprehension of criminals; and perform such other functions and duties as are authorized by law."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 201 of title 3, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

(b) The analysis of chapter 3 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item "201. Protection of President and family authorized.".

(c) The analysis of chapter 25 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 471 of such title, is amended by striking out the words "; publisher's illustrations excepted" in item 489.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, lines, 3, 4, 5, 6, strike "committing any other offense against the laws of the United States relating to the Treasury Department and the several branches of the public service under its control" and substitute therefor "violating any laws of the United States in connection with official matters administered by and under the direct control of the Treasury Department."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE CERTAIN LAND AND OTHER PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 71, the bill (H. R. 1215) to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, during the original consideration of this bill, inasmuch as there was no departmental report indicated, I asked that it be passed over without prejudice. It has subsequently come to my attention that the Department of Defense has indicated by the committee report that it recommends enactment of the legislation, and I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The authority granted to the Secretary of the Army by the act of July 2, 1917 (40 Stat. 241), as amended, the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 562), and section 7 of the Act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 643), is hereby similarly granted to the Secretary of the Navy to be exercised with respect to the naval service of the United States. For the purpose of this section, the terms "military training camps" and "military purposes" as used in the aforementioned act of July 2, 1917, as amended, shall be deemed to include "naval training stations" and "naval purposes," respectively.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey to the Government of Puerto Rico, for highway purposes, under such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, two strips of land containing eighty and twenty-four thousandths one hundred and eighty-six one hundred-thousandths square meters and one hundred and nine and six hundred and one one-thousandths square meters, more or less, respectively, said strips being a part of approximately one hundred and eighty and fourteen one-hundredths acres of land located in the ward of Pueblo Ciejo, municipality of Guaynabo, Puerto Rico, title to which was acquired by the United States by declaration of taking filed in condemnation

proceedings in the District Court of the United States for the District of Puerto Rico Numbered 2453 Civil, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, for use as a naval training center, a donation from the city of Gainesville, Fla., of a parcel of land situated near that city, county of Alachua, State of Florida, metes and bounds description of which is as follows:

Begin at the southwest corner of block 1, range 19, Elliott and L'Engle's Addition, as per plat in deed book "J" at page 230 and 231, public records of Alachua County, Fla.; thence run east a distance of two hundred and twenty-nine and five-tenths feet to a point; thence run north parallel to the west line of block 1, 2, and 3, range 19, a distance of seven hundred and eighty feet to a point; thence run west two hundred and ninety-nine and five-tenths feet to the southwest corner of block 4, range 19; thence south seven hundred and eighty feet to the point of beginning. All lying and being in section 33, township 9, south, range 20 east, Alachua County, Fla., and containing four and thirty-nine one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all right, title, and interest of General Services Administration in and to the real property located in Jacksonville, Fla., referred to as Plancor 1595-A (residual oil terminal), and also known as the General American Transportation Co., Jacksonville, Fla., shall be transferred without exchange of funds, by General Services Administration to the Navy Department.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia for roadway purposes, under such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, two parcels of land; the first being a strip varying in width from ten feet at the westerly end to fifty feet at the easterly end, is one thousand six hundred two and eighty-seven one-hundredths feet in length, contains eighty-one one-hundredths of an acre, more or less, and is located adjacent to the southerly boundary of the naval auxiliary air station, Chincoteague, Va.; the second is a strip fifty feet in width, nine thousand five hundred sixty-eight and one one-hundredth feet in length, contains ten and sixty-nine one-hundredths acres, more or less, and traverses the southerly and easterly portion of said auxiliary air station. The metes and bounds descriptions of both parcels are on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 106. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to transfer, without exchange of funds, to the Navy Department, that land comprising the former site of Park Field Military Reservation, Shelby County, Tenn., said land being the same land which was transferred from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture by the act of July 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 1075), metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to grant, under such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, perpetual easements in the lands or portions thereof or improvements thereon hereinafter mentioned (metes and bounds description of which are on file in the Navy Department) to the following grantees:

(a) The city of New York, in that sewer line located in the New York Naval Shipyard which enters the shipyard at Clymer Street, proceeds along berth 22 to an outfall in the Wallabout Basin at berth 23 and empties into East River as shown in a map entitled "Substitute Outlet Classon Avenue Sewer System" on file in the Navy Department: *Provided*, That in addition to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper, the grant shall be on the specific condition that the city of New York waive its claim for compensation against the United States based on the condemnation proceedings in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, entitled "United States versus 25.4 acres of land in Brooklyn, etc.", Civil No. M-586.

(b) The State of Texas, for public highway purposes in, over, and across a strip of land averaging forty-four and one-half feet in width and seven thousand and six hundred feet in length containing seven and seven hundred and thirty-two one-thousandths acres, more or less, forming a part of the United States Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Cuddihy Field, Corpus Christi, Tex.

(c) The State of Texas, for public highway improvement purposes in, over, and across a strip of land averaging twenty-four and one-half feet in width and approximately two thousand seven hundred feet in length and containing one and fifty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, said strip of land now being a part of the Arlington Outlying Field (No. 25811), located in Tarrant County, Tex.

The city of San Diego, Calif., for street improvement purposes in, over, and across—

(1) a strip of land one hundred seventy-four and sixty-three one-hundredths feet in length varying in width from no feet to twelve feet for a distance of fifty-seven and three hundred and fifteen one-thousandths feet at each end, and having a constant width of twelve feet for the central sixty feet, and containing three hundred and forty-one ten-thousands of an acre; and

(2) a triangular parcel of land at the most easterly corner of Lowell and Rosecrans Streets having a length of seven and forty-two one-hundredths feet on Lowell Street and four and sixty-three one-hundredths feet on Rosecrans Street and containing an area of seventeen and seventeen one-hundredths square feet, both parcels now being a part of the United States Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif.

(e) The county of Spokane, Wash., for public highway purposes in, over, and across a parcel of land containing one and nine-tenths acres, more or less, said parcel now being a part of the Naval Supply Depot, Spokane, Wash.

(f) The State of Florida, for public highway purposes in, over, and across a strip of land one hundred and fifty feet in width and three thousand and five hundred feet in length, containing eleven and fifty-nine one-hundredths acres, more or less, said strip of land now being a part of the United States Naval Air Station, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

(g) The city of Dania, Fla., for public highway purposes in, over, and across a strip of land twenty-five feet in width and two thousand seven hundred and ninety-six and seventy-three one-hundredths feet in length and containing one and six hundred and five one-thousandths acres, more or less, said strip of land now being a part of the United States Naval Air Station, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

(h) The Fred H. Bixby Co., of Long Beach, Calif., in, over, and across a strip of land in section 35, township 4 south, range 12 west, San Bernardino base meridian, Los Angeles County, Calif., being ten feet in width for nine hundred and seventy-six and nine-tenths feet and eighteen feet in width for four hundred and eighteen and eighty-four one-hundredths feet, and containing approximately three hundred and ninety-seven one-thousandths acres: *Provided*, That in addition to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper, the foregoing grant shall contain a specific provision that said grant is in exchange for a perpetual easement which the said Bixby Co. has already conveyed to the Navy Department in a strip of land ten feet in width and three hundred and thirty-five one-hundredths feet in length lying in section 35, township 4 south, range 12 west, San Bernardino base meridian, Los Angeles County, Calif., containing six thousand eight hundred and ninety-five ten-thousandths acre, more or less; detailed descriptions of both easements are on file in the Navy Department.

(i) The Territory of Hawaii, for public highway purposes in, over, and across three adjacent strips of land of varying width and approximately three thousand feet in length and containing three and three hundred and thirty-nine one-thousandths acres, more or less, said strips of land now being a part of the naval facility known as Camp Catlin, Monanalua, Honolulu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Air Force, without reimbursement, the following property, together with all improvements and appurtenant facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto:

Project number	Type of project	Location
Plancor 220	Industrial plant	Milwaukee, Wis.
Plancor 324	Industrial plant	Adrian, Mich.
Plancor 821	Industrial plant	Johnson City, N. Y.
CIN-1	Warehouse	Indianapolis, Ind.

SEC. 302. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Air Force, without reimbursement, Plancor 2304, consisting of an industrial plant, at North Grafton, Mass., together with all improvements and appurtenant facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal propery accessory thereto: *Provided*, That such transfer shall not include inventories of raw materials and work in progress.

SEC. 303. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Army without reimbursement, Plancor 166 M, consisting of an industrial plant, at Muskegon, Mich., together with all improvements and appurtenant facilities and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto: *Provided*, That such transfer shall not include inventories of raw material and work in progress.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 14, strike out all of section 104.

Page 3, line 22, strike out "105" and insert "104."

Page 4, line 13, strike out "106", and insert "105."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND IN FLORIDA

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 53, the bill (H. R. 2684) to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida.

When the bill was originally called I asked that the bill be passed over without prejudice because no departmental

report accompanied the bill. Since that time I have been furnished with a report from the Department of the Interior. I had examined it and I find it in good shape. The bill has merit and should be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall, as soon as reasonably possible, make an investigation to determine whether or not certain lands between the shore line of the Gulf of Mexico and township 6 south, range 12 west, Tallahassee meridian, Florida, as represented on the official plat approved in April 1834 are unsurveyed public lands. The Secretary shall promptly notify all interested persons of his determination in such manner as he may find appropriate.

SEC. 2. If the Secretary finds any such unsurveyed public lands, he shall cause them to be surveyed. If such lands have not been appropriated under the public-land laws, the Secretary shall appraise such lands and offer them for sale for a period of 30 days at their appraised price to the owners of the adjoining uplands in such township.

SEC. 3. If the Secretary determines that the areas investigated under this act are not unsurveyed public lands, he shall, upon request of any adjoining upland owner, issue a quitclaim deed to the owners of adjoining upland for the lands between the original meander line and the shore line, without making a survey.

SEC. 4. For the benefits of this act the ownership of such adjoining uplands shall be determined as of the date of October 2, 1946. Any adjoining upland owner receiving a conveyance of lands under the provisions of this act, who shall have prior to receipt of such conveyance conveyed or contracted to convey any part of such lands, shall through any conveyance made under this act take title in trust for any such grantees and their successors in interest.

SEC. 5. In order to facilitate prompt execution of the investigations, examinations, surveys, or other action which may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, the Secretary may accept contributions to be used for such purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDATION OF SCRIP

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 54, the bill (H. R. 2889) to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any owner of, and any person claiming rights to, Valentine scrip, issued under the act of April 5, 1872 (17 Stat. 649); Sioux Half-Breed scrip, issued under the act of July 17, 1854 (10 Stat. 304); Supreme Court scrip, issued under the acts of June 22, 1860 (12 Stat. 85), March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 544), and June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 378); Surveyor-General scrip, issued under the act of June 2, 1858 (11 Stat. 294); a soldier's additional homestead right, granted by sections 2306 and 2307 of the Revised Statutes; a forest lieu selection right, assertable under the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1264); a lieu selection right conferred by the act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. 957); a bounty land warrant issued under the act of March 3, 1855 (10 Stat. 701); or any lieu selection or scrip right or bounty land warrant, or right in the nature of scrip issued under any act of Congress not enumerated herein (except the indemnity selection rights of any State, or of the Territory of Alaska), shall, within 3 years from the effective date of this act, present his holdings or claim for recordation by the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. In the case of a transfer after the effective date of this act, by assignment, inheritance, operation of law, or otherwise of a holding or claim of any right required by this act to be recorded, the holding or claim of right so acquired shall be presented to the Department of the Interior within 6 months after such transfer, for recordation by it; except that where such transfer occurs within the period of 3 years from the effective date of this act and the prior owner has not complied with provisions of this act, the owner or claimant by transfer shall have the remainder of such period or a period of 6 months, whichever is the longer, within which to present his claims or holdings for recordation.

SEC. 3. There shall be endorsed on the evidence of the right or warrant each recordation thereof.

SEC. 4. Claims or holdings not presented for recordation as prescribed herein shall become null and void and all rights and interests thereunder shall terminate.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the pprovisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., title 49, secs. 401–581), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XIII—WAR RISK INSURANCE

"SEC. 1301. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'American aircraft' means 'civil aircraft of the United States' as defined in section 1 (15) of this act, and any aircraft owned or chartered by or made available to the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or the government of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia.

"(b) The term 'war risks' includes, to such extent as the Secretary may determine, all or any part of those risks which are described in 'free of capture and seizure' clauses, or analogous clauses.

"(c) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Commerce.

"SEC. 1302. (a) The Secretary, with the approval of the President, and after such consultation with interested agencies of the Government as the President may require, may provide insurance and reinsurance against loss or damage arising out of war risks in the manner and to the extent provided in this title, whenever it is determined by the Secretary that such insurance adequate for the needs of the air commerce of the United States cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from companies authorized to do an insurance business in a State of the United States: *Provided*, That no insurance shall be issued under this title to cover war risks on persons or property engaged or transported exclusively in air commerce within the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

"(b) Any insurance or reinsurance issued under any of the provisions of this title shall be based, insofar as practicable, upon consideration of the risk involved.

"SEC. 1303. The Secretary may provide the insurance and reinsurance, authorized by section 1302 with respect to the following persons, property, or interest:

"(a) American aircraft, and those foreign-flag aircraft engaged in aircraft operations deemed by the Secretary to be in the interest of the national defense or the national economy of the United States, when so engaged.

"(b) Cargoes transported or to be transported on any such aircraft, including shipments by express or registered mail; air cargoes owned by citizens or residents of the United States, its Territories, or possessions; air cargoes imported to, or exported from, the United States, its Territories, or possessions and air cargoes sold or purchased by citizens or residents of the United States, its Territories, or possessions, under contracts of sale or purchase by the terms of which the risk of loss by war risks or the obligation to provide insurance against such risks is assumed by or falls upon a citizen or resident of the United States, its Territories, or possessions; air cargoes transported between any point in the United States and any point in a Territory or possession of the United States, between any point in any such Territory or possession and any point in any other such Territory or possession, or between any point in any such Territory or possession and any other point in the same Territory or possession.

"(c) The personal effects and baggage of the captains, pilots, officers, members of the crews of such aircraft, and of other persons employed or transported on such aircraft.

"(d) Captains, pilots, officers, members of the crews of such aircraft, and other persons employed or transported thereon against loss of life, injury, or detention.

"(e) Statutory or contractual obligations or other liabilities of such aircraft or of the owner or operator of such aircraft of the nature customarily covered by insurance.

"SEC. 1304. (a) Any department or agency of the United States may, with the approval of the President, procure from the Secretary any of the insurance provided under this title, except with respect to valuables covered by sections 1 and 2 of the act of July 8, 1937 (50 Stat. 479).

"(b) The Secretary is authorized with such approval to provide such insurance at the request of the Secretary of Defense, and such other agencies as the President may prescribe, without premium in consideration of the agreement of the Secretary of Defense or such agency to indemnify the Secretary against all losses covered by such insurance, and the Secretary of Defense and such other agencies are authorized to execute such indemnity agreement with the Secretary.

"SEC. 1305. (a) To the extent that he is authorized by this title to provide insurance, the Secretary may reinsure, in whole or in part, any company authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States. The Secretary may reinsure with, or cede or retrocede to, any such company, any insurance or reinsurance provided by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(b) Reinsurance shall not be provided by the Secretary at rates less than nor obtained by the Secretary at rates more than the rates established by the Secretary on the same or similar risks or the rates charged by the insurance carrier for the insurance so reinsured, whichever is most advantageous to the Secretary, except that the Secretary may make to the insurance carrier such allowances for expenses on account of the cost of services rendered or facilities furnished as he deems reasonably to accord with good business practice, but such allowance to the carrier shall not provide for any payment by the carrier on account of solicitation for or stimulation of insurance business.

"SEC. 1306. (a) Moneys appropriated by Congress to carry out the provisions of this title and all moneys received from premiums, salvage, or other recoveries and all receipts in connection with this title shall be deposited in a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States. Payments of return premiums, losses, settlements, judgments, and all liabilities incurred by the United States under this title shall be made from such funds through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department.

"(b) Such sums as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title are authorized to be appropriated to such fund.

"(c) At least annually, any balance in the revolving fund in excess of an amount determined by the Secretary to be necessary for the requirements of the fund, and for reasonable reserves to maintain the solvency of the fund shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) Annual payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts by reason of costs incurred by the Government through the employment of appropriated funds by the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this title. These payments shall be computed by applying to the average monthly balance of appropriated funds retained in the revolving fund a percentage determined annually in advance by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such percentage shall not be less than the current average rate which the Treasury pays on its marketable obligations.

"(e) The Secretary shall contribute to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the Civil Service Retirement System applicable to the employees engaged in carrying out the provisions of this title. The Secretary shall also contribute to the employees' compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Federal Security Administrator for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of the employees engaged in carrying out the provisions of this title. The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Secretary into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 1307. (a) The Secretary, in the administration of this title, may issue such policies, rules, and regulations as he deems proper and, subject to the following provisions of this subsection, may adjust and pay losses, compromise and settle claims, whether in favor of or against the United States and pay the amount of any judgment rendered against the United States in any suit, or the amount of any settlement agreed upon, in respect of any claim under insurance authorized by this title. In the case of any aircraft which is insured under the provisions of this title, (1) the policy shall specify a stated amount to be paid in the event of total loss, and such stated amount shall not exceed an amount determined by the Secretary, after consultation with the Civil Aeronautics Board, to represent the fair and reasonable value of the aircraft, and (2) the amount of any claim which is adjusted, compromised, settled, adjudged, or paid shall in no event exceed such stated amount.

"(b) The Secretary may prescribe and change forms and policies, and fix, adjust, and change the amounts insured and rates of premium provided for in this title: *Provided*, That with respect to policies in effect at the time any such change is made, such change shall apply only with the consent of the insured.

"(c) The Secretary, in administering this title, may exercise his powers, perform his duties and functions, and make his expenditures, in accordance with commercial practice in the aviation insurance business. Except as authorized in subsection (d) of this section, no insurance broker or other person acting in a similar intermediary capacity shall be paid any fee or other consideration by the Secretary by virtue of his participation in arranging any insurance wherein the Secretary directly insures any of the risk thereof.

"(d) The Secretary may, and whenever he finds it practical to do so shall, employ companies or groups of companies authorized to do an aviation insurance business in any State of the United States, to act as his underwriting agent. The Secretary may allow such companies or groups of companies fair and reasonable compensation for servicing insurance written by such companies or groups of companies as underwriting agent for the Secretary. The services of such underwriting agents may be utilized in the adjustment of claims under insurance provided by this title, but no claim shall be paid unless and until it has been approved by the Secretary. Such compensation may include an allowance for expenses reasonably incurred by such agent, but such allowance shall not include any payment by such agent on account of solicitation for or stimulation of insurance business.

"(e) The Secretary with the consent of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, including any field service thereof, may avail himself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"(f) The Secretary, in the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, shall prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act as amended (59 Stat. 597; 31 U. S. C. 841). The Secretary shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the said Government Corporation Control Act: *Provided*, That because of the business activities authorized by this title, the Secretary may exercise the powers conferred in said title, perform the duties and functions, and make expenditures required in accordance with commercial practice in the aviation insurance business, and the General Accounting Office shall allow credit for such expenditures when shown to be necessary because of the nature of such authorized activities.

"SEC. 1308. This title shall not affect rights of airmen under existing law.

"SEC. 1309. The Secretary shall include in his annual report to Congress a detailed statement of all activities and of all expenditures and receipts under this title for the period covered by such report and in addition make quarterly progress reports to the Congress with reference to contracts entered into, proposed contracts, and the general progress of his insurance activities.

"SEC. 1310. Upon disagreement as to a loss insured under this title, suit may be maintained against the United States in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in the United States district court in and for the district in which the claimant or his agent resides, notwithstanding the amount of the claim and any provision of existing law as to the jurisdiction of United States district courts, and this remedy shall be exclusive of any other action by reason of the same subject matter against any agent or employee of the United States employed or retained under this title. If the claimant has no residence in the United States, suit may be brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in any other United States district court in which the Attorney General of the United States agrees to accept service. The procedure in such suits shall otherwise be the same as that provided for suits in the district courts by title 28, United States Code, section 1346 (a) (2), so far as applicable. All persons having or claiming or who might have an interest in such insurance may be made parties either initially or upon the motion of either party. In any case where the Secretary acknowledges the indebtedness of the United States on account of such insurance, and there is a dispute as to the persons entitled to receive payment, the United States may bring an action in the nature of a bill of interpleader against such parties in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or in the United States district court of the district in which any such person resides. In such actions any party, if not a resident of or found within the district, may be brought in by order of court served in such reasonable manner as the court directs. If the court is satisfied that persons unknown might assert a claim on account of such insurance, it may direct service upon such persons unknown by publication in the Federal Register. Judgment in any such suit shall discharge the United States from further liability to any parties to such action, and to all persons when service by publication upon persons unknown is directed by the court. The period within which suits may be commenced contained in said act providing for bringing of suits against the United States shall, if claim be filed therefor within such period, be suspended from such time of filing until the claim shall have been administratively denied by the Secretary and for 60 days thereafter: *Provided, however*, That such claim shall be deemed to have been administratively denied if not acted upon within 6 months after the time of filing, unless the Secretary for good cause shown shall have otherwise agreed with the claimant.

"SEC. 1311. A person having an insurable interest in an aircraft may, with the approval of the Secretary, insure with other underwriters in an amount in excess of the amount insured with the Secretary, and, in that event, the Secretary shall not be entitled to the benefit of such insurance, but nothing in this section shall prevent the Secretary from entering into contracts of coinsurance.

"SEC. 1312. The authority of the Secretary to provide insurance and reinsurance under this title shall expire 5 years from the date of enactment of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (20) (a) of such section is amended by striking out "(except the Philippine Islands)."

(2) Paragraph (21) (a) of such section is amended by striking out "(except the Philippine Islands)."

(3) Paragraph (29) of such section is amended by striking out "(c) the Philippine Islands, except that the operation of civil aircraft within the jurisdiction of the Philippine Islands shall be governed by laws enacted by the legislature of the islands and by executive regulations designating airspace reservations or other prohibited areas; and (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "and (c)."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, while I am not opposed to the bill, for the purpose of the hearing I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is there anyone opposed to the bill who demands a second?

If not, without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I bring before the House is S. 435. This bill, I understand, passed the Senate unanimously several weeks ago. Our committee held rather extensive and exhaustive hearings with reference to it and to the companion House bill I introduced. It is known as the war risk insurance bill that would be applicable to aviation in a manner rather similar to the way war risk insurance has been applicable to our merchant ships, particularly in World War II, and then under the provisions of a bill that was passed in 1950, the provisions of which, as I understand are in effect at this time.

I think it should be borne in mind that if there is any opposition to this bill it never did manifest itself to our committee. It is for that reason we bring it here under the type of procedure we do. It passed our committee unanimously.

The committee came to the conclusion that unquestionably there is a need for this kind of legislation, if not so much today, a prospective need. There are in insurance policies what might be termed exclusion clauses. These clauses or other policy stipulations make it possible for the company to cancel within 48 hours given airline insurance on certain flights. Also these exclusion clauses make it possible for the insurance companies to say that they will not insure against certain kinds of extraordinary risks. The type of insurance this legislation would give would only be in instances where the risk is extraordinary. As a matter of fact, the legislation does provide that only where the premiums are unreasonable or where the insurance cannot be obtained do these kinds of provisions—the ones found in legislation today—operate.

The reason there was no cause for legislation like this in World War II, and I am sure some of you are wondering why there was not, is that at the beginning of World War II the Government took over in effect the airlines of the country which it needed, it took over the planes, and title to the planes rested with the United States Government. From there on in the main that which the plane did was a governmental operation. That has not been true so far. Instead, the Government has permitted the title of the planes to remain in the companies. For that reason, among others, this kind of legislation is needed.

The circumstances under which the Secretary of Commerce would have an opportunity to utilize this medium of insurance are where the given plane is flying in the interest of national defense or in the national interest. That finding the Secretary would have to make before he could use this kind of insurance. Also he would be expected to confer with other departments of our Government.

I might say furthermore that this kind of insurance would not be written with reference to flights totally within the United States and the District of Columbia. It would only be in connection with flights outside of that territory just referred, or from a point in the continental United States on the District of Columbia to the foreign areas. It is my understanding there are some 20 air lines that are currently operating into areas where this kind of insurance prospectively is needed. One question that naturally comes in the minds of the membership is, What will it cost? It is completely impossible to foresee what a plan of this kind will cost, but all the testimony we have from the representative of the Secretary of Commerce, from the General Accounting Office, from the representatives of the Air Transport Association, and through letters written by the Director of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Civil Aeronautics Board, give the impression and the very definite idea that it is hoped this will be self-sustaining. That is not an idle hope, for in a similar plan and program, a kindred program applicable to the merchant ships in World War II, not only was the program self-sustaining, but as a result of the program a profit was made for the Government after all expenses attached to the program were paid. I remember specifically that I questioned Mr. Davis, the representative of the Secretary of Commerce, along this line. I asked him if given rates were set, and it was determined that they were inadequate, and that the given rates would constitute a losing proposition, if immediately those who had had something to do with the setting of rates would undertake to revise the rates in order to make the plan one that would sustain itself. The very definite answer was that that would be done.

I believe the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can come to the House and say that every effort will be made to make this plan or project self-sustaining.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one other point before I conclude. The question might be asked: Are private insurance companies in favor of this? Those insurance companies which ordinarily would perform this type of work if no war were on, and there are some 61 of them, I am informed, were represented before our committee, and they stated conclusively that they cannot insure certain kinds of risk situations, and they feel there is a need for this kind of legislation. Although in effect it is putting the Government into a type of business in which it has not been before, those who ordinarily would perform the function definitely have expressed a need for it.

I repeat what I said in the beginning that our committee was unanimous in voting this bill out. It passed the other body unanimously, and it is hoped we will have little trouble in passing it through the House.

Furthermore, it is felt by many that there is a very urgent need, prospectively at least, for this legislation today. Certainly if great trouble should come on at a moment's notice these 48-hour clauses could be quite handicapping and particularly would that be true if the Congress were not in session, for example, in August, and overnight a serious situation should develop.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Is it not true that the committee at the very beginning was a little bit hesitant about this legislation, but after very careful study and hearings, as well as careful study in executive sessions, the committee came to a unanimous agreement that something should be done?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman has stated the fact. Our committee did not follow, as it were, this legislation as I trust it does not swallow any legislation without very detailed study. We came to the conclusion that unquestionably the need exists.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that none of the commercial insurance companies oppose this measure?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is exactly true, and that is certainly one of the compelling reasons why today we endorse it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. JONES of Alabama]. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the reason for bringing up this bill under suspension of the rules is because it was not acceptable to the Consent Calendar under the rules.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has said this is a unanimous committee report. It is. It seems to me it is a very highly necessary piece of legislation and should be passed in advance of untoward events, rather than to wait for a time when those untoward events would dictate emergency action. In other words, this is something we are doing in advance of its necessity, and occasion may never arise for its being put into operation. However, events of the last war proved that if we had had something of this sort during World War II we would have been far better off today than we are, under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I approve of this legislation and recognize its necessity. It is obviously important that the airlines and the insurance companies recognize the necessity of its immediate enactment.

The reason I asked for this time today was to point up in the RECORD a portion of the bill as to which I raised some doubt during committee consideration,

and as to which I still have some question. That is the provision for a revolving fund, under section 1306.

At the time the bill was before the committee in executive session I had not had an opportunity to take this problem up with Hon. Lindsay Warren, but I did so that day. Today I received a letter from him, from which I would like to quote in part. I shall place that letter in full in the RECORD so that we may have the full consideration on this particular point, and, if it is felt desirable, in the conference.

I had asked Mr. Warren about the revolving fund, and in his letter he says:

I heartily agree with your views on the desirability of adhering to normal appropriation procedures to the fullest extent possible. The General Accounting Office consistently has recommended against legislation to bypass or short-circuit these procedures without adequate justification.

He goes on to advise us that in some cases this type of financing provides a basis for more economic and efficient administration of certain programs, but he cautions that this should only be in cases where there is the fullest disclosure of the facts and under separate policy determinations.

I have no doubt many of you are familiar with the task force report of the Hoover Commission, which is Appendix J, filed January 13, 1949, on this very problem of revolving funds and business enterprises of the Government. Specifically there are six particular provisions which were recommended by the task force as safeguards. I shall insert those six particular conditions in the RECORD, again for full consideration of this point. I want to call attention to one particular point, in that recommendation number 6 calls for net income after payment of interest to be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts as soon as possible after the close of each month. This particular bill provides for only an annual report.

The point has been raised that once a month might be too frequent and might cause an unusual and unnecessary workload. Personally, I do not know whether that would be so. I do insist, however, that in connection with the use of revolving funds, where there is no direct check on the funds by Congress, through its appropriations and finance committees, in all of these cases where this device is utilized, it should be surrounded with full safeguards. We should also consider with great care the conditions imposed to insure that there is no abuse in its use.

Hope has been expressed that the experience of the last war would result in a net gain to the Treasury under this proposed extension of air commerce. In this connection I believe Mr. Warren has now given us an expression of caution which we should have in mind in following the developments under this program to make certain that it does not result in a wholly unanticipated and unnecessary cost to the taxpayers. As Mr. Warren states, the previous profit became possible "because our military forces whipped the submarine menace." I do not think any of us in advocating the passage of this legislation wish to leave the impression that there is any particular analogy between that situation and those which may well develop in the field of air commerce under circumstances existing today.

Mr. Warren's full letter and the attached statement are as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 21, 1951.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: Your letter of May 11, 1951, points out that in general it is wiser to provide for direct appropriations rather than to endorse the device of a revolving fund, and asks comments by the General Accounting Office on section 1306 of S. 435, which would provide for a revolving fund to finance a Civil Aeronautics Administration war-risk insurance program.

I heartily agree with your views on the desirability of adhering to normal appropriation procedures to the fullest extent possible. The General Accounting Office consistently has recommended against legislation to bypass or short-circuit those procedures without adequate justification.

In some cases, however, the revolving fund type of financing provides the basis for more economical and effective administration of programs authorized by the Congress, and for fiscal controls equal or superior to those available under appropriation procedures. In such cases there is no objection to this type of financing, provided, of course, it is authorized by the Congress as a matter of policy, upon the basis of full disclosure of facts showing the need therefor and the advantages to the Government.

Since you mention in your letter that you are not completely familiar with similar provisions in other law, I am sending along a statement showing the results of operations under several similar provisions.

The "insurance fund in the Treasury" required to be set up under section 1208 (a) of Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress—a section substantially identical in purpose to that evidently intended for section 1306 (a) of S. 435—is in fact a revolving fund, even though it is not specifically so denominated. Moneys appropriated by Congress to carry out the provisions of that act and all moneys received from operations thereunder will go into the fund, and all payments to carry on the operations will be made therefrom. When the program is completed, any balance in the fund will be for return to the Treasury. Substantially the same thing would be done under section 1306 (a) of S. 435.

Of course, under both programs the ultimate cost, or profit, as the case may be, will be for the Government. Whether it would be a gain or loss depends largely upon the fortunes of war. Those fortunes were favorable in World War II, because our military forces whipped the submarine menace, so that the war-risk insurance program of the former United States Maritime Commission wound up with some little profit to the Government.

It is hoped that this information and the enclosures will serve the purpose of your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,
Comptroller General of the United States.

EXAMPLES OF REVOLVING FUND OPERATIONS

There are three main groups of revolving funds or working capital funds:

(1) The first group comprises Government agencies engaged primarily in doing business with outsiders. These agencies generally are engaged in a business-type cycle of dealings with private business or members of the public. They are self-supporting so far as is possible, and carry on with their own earnings after an original start provided by the Government's capital investment. In fact, some of them return profits to the Treasury.

An example of these agencies is the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Now in liquidation, this corporation through effective management and sound fiscal operations not only returned the Government's investment of $200,000,000 (which put the corporation in business) but, also, paid a handsome profit for the benefit of the taxpayers.

Another example is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. No recitation of cases is required to recall the untold public service this corporation has performed. In 1948 it completed liquidation of the Government's investment. Even though this action removed the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from the audit requirements of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945, the corporation requested continuance of an independent audit of its financial transactions by the General Accounting Office, and a strong provision for such audits was written into the Federal Deposit Insurance Act of 1950, Public Law 797, Eighty-first (64 Stat. 873).

Another example is the Guaranty Loan Program of World War II, which paid all of its losses and expenses and turned back its original capital with a profit. Another is the Natural Fibers Revolving Fund which financed the purchase of natural fibers and resale thereof to Japan and contributed largely to restoration of Japanese economy. One of current interest is the rubber purchasing program of the General Services Administration under the Defense-Production Act of 1950. This one aims to purchase all possible rubber, to stockpile so much of it as is required to meet defense needs for strategic or critical materials, and to sell the rest to approved manufacturers. More than $600,000,000 in rubber purchases already have been consummated under this program, and ultimate purchases undoubtedly will be in the multibillion-dollar class. This has been done with the relatively small working capital of $600,000,000 which should not need replenishment since no loss is anticipated. Had the appropriation procedure been used, the entire amount necessary for these purchases would have had to be appropriated.

(2) The second group involves intradepartmental activities, such as "central services" carried on in the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Interior. It has proven more economical and efficient to set up a central source of services and supplies within these departments, financed by working capital funds, to serve, on a reimbursable basis, the several bureaus within each department.

(3) The third group combines certain essential factors of the first and second. In this category are agencies or bureaus which are engaged either partly or wholly in the performance of work or the rendition of services to other agencies or to outsiders, or to both. For example, about 60 percent of the work done by the National Bureau of Standards in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, was for other agencies, bureaus, or outsiders, on a reimbursable basis. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing, in the Treasury Department, does 100 percent of its work for other agencies or bureaus, and it will have a working capital fund for this purpose effective July 1, 1951.

When the Bureau of Standards established its working capital fund it gained for the first time a proper measure of fiscal control of the appropriations, funds, and allotments made available to it to carry on its work. It is now able, by the application of sound cost accounting principles and by virtue of the working capital fund type of financing, to determine with reasonable accuracy just what its costs are and how much of them

should be charged to each job being done. Hitherto that was accomplished, at best, on the basis of "guestimates." Also, it was enabled to clear out a lot of deadwood and red tape, and eliminate duplications and overlapping of administrative and accounting functions. For example, the allotment accounts were reduced from 1,100 in number to 40.

All three of these groups have proven to be suited to the revolving fund type of financing. Moreover, improved accounting and financial controls gained under this method of financing and the business type budget are better management tools, and form the basis for more accurate and informative financial reports to the President, the Congress, and the taxpayers.

Notwithstanding the foregoing discussion of the advantages, in some cases, of the revolving fund type of financing, it is to be understood that the General Accounting Office endorses its use only in specific cases under separate policy determinations. It does not change the fundamental rule that direct appropriation procedures should be followed wherever possible.

The excerpt from the Task Force Report on Revolving Funds and Business Enterprises of the Government is as follows:

Revolving funds, both for Government corporations and nonincorporated forms of Government enterprises (exclusive of lending agencies) should be permitted under the following conditions:

1. Their use should be limited to working capital funds and the purposes for which they may be used should be clearly defined by the Congress.

2. Separate appropriations should be made for capital expenditures.

3. Working capital no longer required should be returned to the Treasury in reduction of the amount of the revolving fund.

4. Authority should be given for temporary borrowing from the Treasury, limited to a certain amount or a certain percentage of the working capital.

5. Interest should be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts on working capital (but not on supply or service funds) and on borrowings which the Congress has determined are repayable from revenue-producing operations.

6. Net income, after payment of interest as above, should be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts as soon as possible after the close of each month (net income being determined without formal closing of the accounts), so as to maintain the working capital fund at the amount appropriated by Congress. Deficits should be reported to the Treasury currently and to the Congress at least once a year for the purpose of obtaining appropriations to cover such deficits.

I have examined the report of the Hoover Commission without finding anything specifically related to these particular recommendations. There were differences of opinion expressed by members of the Commission, but largely in dealing with the conduct of electric power and reclamation activities. There is one general statement contained in the report as to which there does not seem to have been any substantial difference of opinion, which has an over-all bearing on a portion of the problem involved in this legislation. Under the title of Savings—Business Enterprises, the Commission stated:

The savings to the taxpayers to be made in these business agencies are very large. They can originate from consolidations; increase in rates of interest or charges for services so as to include administrative expense; proper amortization and interest return to the Government; the incorporation of some to secure more flexibility in management, accounting, and budgeting; and more speedy liquidations. Such savings amount to large sums.

If the recommendations in this report be carried out, there would be a decrease of over 30 in the number of these agencies.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I believe the members of the committee who have preceded me have fully explained the necessity and the reasons for this legislation. When this matter came on for hearing let me say there was considerable skepticism on the part of the committee on both sides as to the need for this legislation. As the hearings proceeded and the absolute necessity for it was developed, unanimity on the part of the committee was complete that it was a very necessary piece of legislation; that while some of us were reluctant about the Government's assuming that which was the ordinary responsibility of private enterprise, nevertheless, when private enterprise came in and asked for this legislation stating that it was necessary, the objection on that phase was removed.

Mr. Speaker, in some respects this legislation is in broad general language. There have been some improvements in language, for which the committee is indebted to Mr. Perley of the legislative staff and to our own committee staff for a great deal of work and research in improving and clarifying the language of the bill as it was passed by the other body. It is true there are still some broad powers vested in the Secretary of Commerce, but by reason of the very necessity for this legislation it has been absolutely necessary that the Secretary be vested with such powers.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to this legislation and I think it has been improved by our committee over that which passed the other body.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I intended to speak perhaps more at length, but the thoughts which I had desired to express have already been covered by members of the committee who have spoken before me.

I know of no objection to the bill. I think we are all agreed that the bill is in better form than when it was received by us from the other body.

The bill has general acceptance, as far as we have been advised by testimony, from private enterprise. It seems to be a necessary, proper, and desirable matter of legislation in advance of possible anticipated events. I am therefore happy to join in the general support of this proposed legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to emphasize to the House a matter which has already been alluded to by Members who are in support of this legislation: This is not a handout from the Federal Treasury; it is in no sense a subsidy of the civil aviation industry; it will pay its own way; but rather, it provides a means of insurance protection in danger areas to civil aviation where no other means are available for securing any insurance protection.

As has been stated, this bill is a necessary and desirable instrumentality now. In view of impending events it is something which by all means should be put on the statute books.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 435, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, a parlamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, that was the bill as amended by the House committee, is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

OUR CHINA POLICY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include quotes from newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the days of miracle are not over. Last Friday night in New York City at the twenty-fifth annual dinner of the China Institute, Assistant Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, gave the world to understand that the United States of America would aid the Chinese people in any revolt against their "Colonial Russian Government."

This came, no doubt, as a great shock to the American people as well as to most of the people around the world. This is a complete reversal of our State Department's far-eastern policy over the past 6 years, and is contrary to the repeated stands taken by this administration.

The world knows that it was the first New Deal administration that recognized Soviet Russia after four previous administrations had refused to recognize their godless atheism. The world knows who furnished millions upon millions of dollars in lend-lease to Soviet Russia and saved their necks at Stalingrad. The world also knows who promised the return of Manchuria to Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist China forces, and who then sold them down the river by turning Manchuria, lock, stock, and barrel, over to Joe Stalin and his outlaws. The loss of Manchuria, of course, led to the downfall of China and forced Chiang Kai-shek to take refuge in Formosa.

The world knows who appeased the Kremlin over the past several years and granted them concessions at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. The world also knows that it was Dean Acheson, our Secretary of State, who said to "withdraw from Asia and let the dust settle,"

and who was largely responsible for the withdrawal of Lieutenant General Hodge and his 40,000 American troops because Acheson thought neither Korean nor Formosa had any military significance for our national security. Douglas MacArthur thought otherwise.

Now it is refreshing to learn that Mr. Rusk has said that the United States recognizes the Nationalist regime because it more authentically represents the views of a China demanding independence from foreign control. We have always recognized Nationalist China, a member of the U. N. Where has Mr. Rusk been?

Wonders never cease. It is Mr. Rusk who now says that the Communist rule in China "is not the Government of China, it is not Chinese. It is not entitled to speak for China in the community of nations. It is entitled only to the fruits of aggression upon which it is now willfully, openly and senselessly embarked." MacArthur is not the only one of us who has known this all the time.

Mr. Rusk's address is all the more remarkable and significant because he was strongly backed by two other administration spokesmen: Mr. Foster Dulles, who correctly added that the Kremlin was using China as a puppet to win South Korea as a strategic base against Japan; and also by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, who pictured the Peiping regime as a Russian puppet and called for American aid to both the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa and the guerrillas on the mainland.

This, Mr. Speaker, is exactly the position which Gen. Douglas MacArthur has taken for a long time. It would be amusing were it not so pathetic to see our State Department twist and squirm as it comes around to accepting MacArthur's position. From the start the general has wanted to use the Chinese Nationalist forces of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, and to arm the anti-Communists on the Chinese mainland.

The second great constructive suggestion of MacArthur was to blockade China proper and to have all the United Nations place an embargo on arms, munitions, and war materials to the Communists in Red China. Yet, some of our allied members of the U. N.—particularly Great Britain and France—have shipped large quantities of oil, steel, rubber, electronics, medicines, and other vital war materials to Red China with which to kill American boys.

It is more than gratifying to find Senator DOUGLAS, a real Democrat—but not a New Dealer, a great soldier himself—but not an appeaser, agreed with General MacArthur that the United States should not only aid the Nationalists in Formosa, but allow them to make commando raids on the mainland at their own risk; that the United States keep Red China out of the United Nations; that as many nations as possible blockade the Red mainland, and that the United States carry on counter-propaganda efforts inside China and other Asiatic countries.

Mr. Speaker, the only reason that we are in serious trouble in Korea is because of the weak, vacillating and contradictory foreign policy of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. We have men in high places in our State Department and the executive branches of our Government who walk up the hill one day and down it the next; who blow hot and cold in the same breath; who say things they do not mean and who mean things they do not say. It is high time we have some leadership at the head of our Government that is firm and fearless, virile and strong, and above all—sincere and honest.

The American people will not soon forget that because Douglas MacArthur wanted to use the Chinese Nationalist troops in Formosa and their sympathizers on the South China mainland; that because this great general insisted upon a blockade of Red China and the prohibition of shipment of war materials to aid the enemy in killing American men, the administration relieved him of his command. Yet the administration now accepts and promises to carry out his views.

The other constructive thing MacArthur wanted to do was to blast the enemy's bases of supply across the Yalu River, to bring to a quick end this savage struggle which would save many American lives. But the politicians tied his hands. Unless the situation in Korea soon improves materially, the fathers and mothers and wives of more than 70,000 casualties will force our stupid State Department to accept this part of MacArthur's strategy.

Let us hope that Americans can soon resolve their differences and that we can fight the common enemy instead of fighting one another. But the time has come when men should stop their double-talk; take a consistent stand; follow a firm policy; admit mistakes when they are made; and realize that unity consists not in blind following and unquestioning obedience but that it is a give-and-take proposition—a mutual enterprise more than a cowardly servility—and which if it lasts must rest upon the sound basis of common honesty and decency.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 153.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, effective, from January 3, 1951, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (o) of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Dominion of Canada, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MURDOCK (at the request of Mr. CLEMENTE), for week beginning May 21, on account of official business.

To Mr. CAMP, for 1 week, May 21 to May 26, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1227. An act for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one a statement.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by J. H. Frost, chairman of the Frost National Bank, of San Antonio.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Mason City Globe-Gazette, Mason City, Iowa, of May 17, 1951.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a cattle feeder, Mr. E. H. Mogck, of Montevideo, Minn., to the Minneapolis Star, in which Mr. Mogck points out clearly an objection to placing cattle feeders under the existing price rollback.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short newspaper article.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances, in each to include editorials.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith an address made by Governor Thornton, of Colorado, at the mid-year meeting of the directors of the Independent Petroleum Association of America at Denver, Colo., May 8, 1951.

Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some letters.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include newspaper articles.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks during consideration of the bill (S. 435) the war-risk insurance bill, and include certain correspondence and excerpts from reports.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some letters.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on Constantino Brumidi, the Michaelangelo of the Capitol.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include a newspaper editorial relative to the fine speech made by our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], which appeared in the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-American.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOULDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include remarks by His Eminence Cardinal Mooney.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include printed matter.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news article.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

462. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $3,734,550 for the District of Columbia, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 138); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

463. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To direct the Secretary of the Army to reestablish and correct the boundaries of the Quincy National Cemetery by the exchange of Government-owned lands in the Quincy-Graceland Cemetery, Quincy, Ill."; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

464. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "To authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Quartermaster experimental fuel station, Pike County, Mo."; to the Committee on Armed Services.

465. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 and prior fiscal years, in the amount of $1,090,491,704 together with several proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 139); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON: Committee of Conference. H. R. 3587. Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 484). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 232. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to the estate of Robert D. Johnson, late an employee of the House of Representatives, without amendment (Rept. No. 485). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4169. A bill relating to the compensation and leave benefits of officers and employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department transferred to the General Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 4170. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close Van Ness Street between Connecticut Avenue and Reno Road NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4171. A bill to grant certain educational, loan, employment, and other benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the present hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4172. A bill to extend the time within which veterans of World War II may initiate and receive education and training under part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 4173. A bill to provide an educational grant to children of certain veterans who died of service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 4174. A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of lobsters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4175. A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of lobsters;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4176. A bill to establish a program of grants-in-aid to assist the States to provide maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4177. A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of lobsters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Greece, Turkey, and Spain should be invited to become parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 236. Resolution to increase personal income-tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Assembly Joint Resolutions Nos. 32 and 29, relating to the furnishing of Federal assistance, including arms, ammunition, clothing and equipment, to the California Defense and Security Corps and/or the California National Guard Reserve, and to take necessary action to provide a national cemetery in the vicinity of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 76, relating to the enactment of an amendment to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the First Guam Congress and Resolution No. 4, relating to the changing of section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam to provide a different method of electing members of the Legislature of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4176. A bill for the relief of Nicolo LoCicero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 4179. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Goeckel and Friederick Goeckel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4180. A bill for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 4181. A bill for the relief of Leroy Peebles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4182. A bill for the relief of Clarence Sudbeck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 4183. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chai Chang Choi; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H. R. 4184. A bill for the relief of Nahi Youssef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4185. A bill for the relief of Calogero Bartollotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 4186. A bill for the relief of Enzo Melani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELROW:

H. R. 4187. A bill for the relief of Jeremiah J. O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4188. A bill for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

292. By Mr. McMULLEN: Petition of the Florida Society of Mayflower Descendants in favor of the United States Congress passing legislation to conform to Public Law 829, section 3 (c) insuring that the flag of the United States of America shall at all times occupy the place of honor whenever within the territorial boundaries of the United States of America exclusive of the international area at Lake Success; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

293. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dorothy Winer, cochairman, Chapel Human Relations, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the proposed aid-to-India bill, and requesting its passage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, who hast folded back the mantle of the night to clothe us in the golden glory of the new day, banish from our hearts all gloomy thoughts and make us glad with the brightness of hope fed by an invincible faith in eternal verities.

We praise Thee for the triumph of truth over error, to our impatience so slow, to Thyself so sure. We bless Thee for every word of truth which has been spoken the wide world through, for all of right which the human conscience has perceived and made into avenues of more abundant life for Thy children. In all our deadness, breathe on us, Breath of God.

May the life of the spirit become regnant in our lives, delivering us from indolence, from depression and disloyalty, from misuse of Thy gifts and deafness to Thy call; teaching us to sacrifice our comforts for others in answer to the want and woe of the world; making us kindly in thought, gentle in word, generous in deed, and thus lighted candles for the shedding forth of Thy radiance which is the light of the world. In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 21, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 21, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 119. An act for the relief of Joseph Girardi;

S. 822. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg; and

S. 824. An act for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 108. An act to amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands; and

S. 435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 927) to amend section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 458. An act authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1026. An act to supplement the Act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida;

H. R. 1200. An act to correct an error in section 1 of the Act of June 28, 1947, "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States";

H. R. 1201. An act to amend section 4 of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary-ration basis;

H. R. 1203. An act to authorize officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to Government property;

H. R. 1215. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1216. An act to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment

contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein;

H. R. 1221. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1632. An act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases;

H. R. 1739. An act to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy;

H. R. 1788. An act to authorize the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians to make contracts with approval of the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe;

H. R. 1899. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An Act To Incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution";

H. R. 2395. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2478. An act to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2684. An act to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida;

H. R. 2735. An act to authorize the transfer of certain military prisoners and confinement facilities to the control and management of the Attorney General;

H. R. 2736. An act to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2737. An act to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries;

H. R. 2869. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights;

H. R. 2924. An act to amend section 4164 of title 18, United States Code, relating to conditional release of Federal prisoners;

H. R. 3041. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3795. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3899. An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations were authorized to meet jointly this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, presided over by Mr. KILGORE, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUNT, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet at 2 p. m. this afternoon, during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 40)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $12,000,000, fiscal year 1952, for the Federal Security Agency, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLOSING OF VAN NESS STREET IN THE DISTRICT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close Van Ness Street between Connecticut Avenue and Reno Road Northwest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRANSFER OF QUARTERMASTER EXPERIMENTAL FUEL STATION, PIKE COUNTY, MO.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Quartermaster Experimental Fuel Station, Pike County, Mo. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RETURN OF CONTROL OVER CERTAIN HOME LANDS TO TERRITORY OF HAWAII

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting, at the request of Governor Long, a copy of Joint Resolution 8, adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii, relating to the return of control over certain home lands to the Territory of Hawaii (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUDIT REPORT ON NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the National Capital Housing Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

LAWS ENACTED BY TWENTIETH TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of Alaska, of the Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Twentieth Territorial Legislature of Alaska, 1951 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 15

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of Alabama (both houses thereof concurring):

"1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and petitioned to enact the legislation embodied in H. R. 3341 by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia, which relates to a repeal of certain provisions of the Social Security Act so as to permit each State to make public details of its public-assistance programs.

"2. That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the house to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the President of the United States Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Resolution 16

"Whereas the several States of the United States of America, by virtue of their inherent sovereignty, claim ownership to the tidelands in their offshore waters; and

"Whereas the ownership of the tidelands has, until recently, been recognized as an established vested interest within the respective coastal States since the foundation and establishment of the United States of America; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation which recognizes that title to the aforesaid offshore submerged lands should rightly be within the several States bordering such submerged lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Senators and Representatives from the State of Alabama in the Congress of the United States, be requested to support legislation that will place within the respective States title to offshore submerged lands; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Alabama."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 28

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802) to authorize crediting service of cadets and midshipmen for purposes of pay and longevity

"Whereas it has been a long-established principle of law supported by repeated decisions of the courts that cadets and midshipmen are members of the regular naval and military establishments, and that they perform active service as such and are at all times subject to the Articles of War or the Articles for the Government of the Navy, as the case may be, and subject to all orders from proper authority for duty in such places and on such services as required including trial by court martial for offenses; and

"Whereas prior to enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802), credit for service as cadets and midshipmen was allowed those who entered the Military Academy prior to August 24, 1912, and the Naval Academy prior to March 4, 1913, but is now denied such personnel; and

"Whereas the Career Compensation Act of 1949, governing the pay of members of the armed services, authorizes crediting all types

of service, Regular and Reserve, active and inactive, except cadet and midshipman service; and

"Whereas by comparison of the various types of service so credited it is clearly indicated that the full-time active service of cadets and midshipmen is entitled to be credited for pay and longevity purposes in order to establish parity of credit for active service; and

"Whereas correction of the discrimination against cadets and midshipmen as to credit for service as such has been favorably considered by committees and Members of the United States Congress, as indicated by the passage of a bill (S. 657) by the Senate during the Eightieth Congress, which bill was reported favorably by the House Committee on Armed Services: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 at an early date to establish parity of credit for active service in computing the pay of those who serve and have served as cadets and midshipmen, and to restore the right to credit for such service to those who by law prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 were entitled to it; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairmen of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to return to New Jersey and to other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the States for the administration of the employment security program, so as to provide adequately for administration of the unemployment compensation law in this State

"Whereas employers of eight or more individuals in New Jersey, in addition to the payment of contributions under the unemployment compensation law of New Jersey, also pay to the Federal Government in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, a tax of three-tenths of 1 percent of taxable payrolls; and

"Whereas these moneys are deposited in the general treasury of the United States and not earmarked specifically for the purpose of paying the cost of the unemployment insurance program in the various States; and

"Whereas New Jersey employers have paid under this excise tax the sum of $91,380,000 from 1938 to 1950, inclusive, while the Federal Government has returned to New Jersey for the administration of its employment security program during this same period only $41,674,281; making an excess of $49,705,719 in the moneys paid to the Federal Government over the grants to this State for the operation of the program; and

"Whereas the grants made to New Jersey for the operation of its unemployment insurance and employment service systems are not sufficient for an adequate administration of the employment security program: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the house of assembly concurring)*:

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to adopt legislation which will insure the return to each of the several States amounts sufficient for an adequate administration of the employment security program.

"2. The secretary of state is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the respective presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress of the United States.

"3. This concurrent resolution shall take effect immediately."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 20

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to approve the resurvey of the agricultural flood-control program on the Washita watershed, and to appropriate certain sums annually to carry into effect the findings of said survey

"Whereas on the 22d day of December 1944 the Congress of the United States authorized the agricultural flood-control program on the Washita watershed; and

"Whereas it was estimated at that time that the project would cost around $11,000,000 and that it would take approximately 15 years for its completion; and

"Whereas, since the above date, it has been determined that the cost of said project would far exceed the amount originally estimated and, at the present rate of progress, it would take 60 to 70 years to complete it; and

"Whereas on the 28th day of January 1949 the Congress of the United States authorized a resurvey of the flood damages and benefits of the above-described Washita watershed, and it is understood that said resurvey is nearing completion and will be submitted to Congress for approval and further action within the next few months; and

"Whereas the project on the Washita watershed will be of great value in the control of floods in the Washita River Valley and its tributaries and to the Nation as a whole, because of the increased supply of farm commodities which will result from such flood control—all of these, however, far outweigh the original cost of the project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-third Oklahoma Legislature (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to give immediate approval to the resurvey of the Washita watershed when it is completed and in order to put the findings of the resurvey into effective use, that a sum of not less than $10,000,000 be appropriated annually for the construction of the above project until same is completed; be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Oklahoma, to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Oklahoma.

"Adopted by the senate the 2d day of May 1951.

"JAMES E. BERRY,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of May 1951.

"JAMES M. BULLARD,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Concurrent Resolution 76

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, having previously experienced disaster inflicted by enemy forces and foreseeing possible repetition of such because of existing world conditions, included in the Territorial Disaster Relief Act of 1949, a provision to meet this emergency, in furtherance of which, considerable sums of money were expended; and

"Whereas the United States Government subsequently enacted the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, but no provision was contained therein for reimbursement from appropriations which might subsequently be made, for States or Territories which had already so acted at their own cost, as did the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas S. 1124, introduced in the United States Senate by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, proposes to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 by adding a new provision whereby the above-mentioned reimbursement may be possible; and

"Whereas the successful enactment of said bill would result in a substantial reimbursement to the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-sixth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact said amendment to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 37

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to increase the compensation to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Governor, and Secretary of Hawaii, and judges of certain courts in the Territory

"Whereas, by act 261 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1945, the compensation of the delegate to Congress from Hawaii, of the governor and secretary of Hawaii, and of the judges of the supreme and several circuit courts was increased until the Congress of the United States increases by an equal amount the compensation payable by the Federal Government to the officers mentioned; and

"Whereas living costs have markedly increased since this additional compensation was first provided and new requests are being made for further supplementing by the Territory of these federally paid salaries; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has failed to take action either to assume responsibility for the additional compensation being paid from the Territorial treasury or to further raise the federally paid salaries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-sixth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring)* That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to increase the compensation paid by the Federal Government to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, to the governor and secretary of Hawaii, and to the judges of the supreme and several circuit courts so that both the increment paid from the Territorial treasury and an amount in addition thereto sufficient to compensate for increased living costs since 1945 will be met from Federal funds; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii is instructed to introduce a measure in the Congress of the United States designed to accomplish this result and to work actively for its enactment; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United

States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate of the United States, and to the chairman of the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the executive board of the United Automobile—Aircraft—Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), Detroit, Mich., protesting against special draft deferment for college students; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the city of Newport, Ky., protesting against the curtailment of low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the State Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., of New York, N. Y., protesting against the mounting cost of food; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Queensboro Federation of Mothers' Clubs, Inc., of New York, N. Y., relating to increased personnel to prevent illegal importations of narcotics; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Soroptimist Club of North Shore Queens, Flushing, N. Y., signed by Hilda V. Blom, president, remonstrating against the ratification of the genocide treaty and the declaration of human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A radiogram from the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, signed by P. H. Spaak, president, Strasbourg, France, suggesting the advisability of a delegation of the Congress and of the Council to engage in a public discussion at some future time, either in Strasbourg, France, or Washington, D. C., of problems of common interest to the two countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from the American Federation of Grain Millers, A. F. of L., Kansas City, Mo., signed by J. A. Leveridge, vice president, remonstrating against the shipment of grain to foreign countries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Women, St. Louis, Mo., commending the Congress for amending the Internal Security Act as it relates to persons who have held nominal memberships in totalitarian organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Italian Community Center, Inc., of Union City, N. J., favoring the enactment of House bill 400, to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Continental Party of Americas, Inc., of New York, N. Y., relating to suffrage for citizens 18 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Emba Class, Emanuel Baptist Church, Ridgewood, N. J., signed by Stanley I. Stuber, praying for immediate action to supply wheat to India; ordered to lie on the table.

CURTAILMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS—RESOLUTION OF POST 452, THE AMERICAN LEGION, SPIRIT, WIS.,

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from Commander Floyd A. Starr, of American Legion Spirit Post, No. 452, at Spirit, Wis., a resolution opposing any effort to curtail the present program of veterans' rights and benefits. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which I believe conveys the views of countless ex-servicemen throughout our Nation, be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas our attention has been called to a move in certain congressional circles to amend, curtail, and abolish certain benefits now available to veterans under existing laws; and

"Whereas it is our personal opinion that the curtailment of these benefits now available to veterans has a direct bearing on our local and national economy; and

"Whereas any enactment of the suggestions now being sponsored by the Teague committee and the O'Mahoney committee will result in a direct hardship to veterans and their families and dependents: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Spirit Post, No. 452, of Ogema, Wis., with the unanimous consent of our 54 members, go on record as being opposed to the recommendations of the aforementioned committees, or any other suggestion, made under the guise of an economy measure, and aimed at crippling the existing program of benefits available to veterans, their families, and their dependents; and that we make the congressional leaders from our State aware of our feelings on the subject, and urge that they do everything in their power to defeat the suggestions of the afore-named committees, or any group intent upon destroying the rights and benefits existing under present laws, all of which benefits being justly earned over the period of years and substantiated by the sweat, blood, tears, and deeds of valor with which the history of our country is written, and in which the veterans of all our wars have played an all-important part."

SPIRIT POST, No. 452,
By FLOYD A. STARR,
Commander.
G. ELMER JOHNSON,
Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 855. A bill to provide for free transmission of official mail of members of certain United Nations commands; with amendments (Rept. No. 326); and

S. 1074. A bill to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 327).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 621. A bill to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949; with an amendment (Rept. No. 328).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3842. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 329).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2952. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Navy Band at the final reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held in Norfolk, Va., May 30 through June 2, 1951; without amendment (Rept. No. 330).

By Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 759. A bill to extend to screen vehicle contractors benefits accorded star-route contractors with respect to the renewal of contracts and adjustment of contract pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 331);

S. 826. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 332); and

S. 1246. A bill to amend certain laws relating to the submission of postmasters' accounts under oath, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 333).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1515. A bill for the relief of Edward Henry Erbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1516. A bill to provide for lump-sum payment of excess annual leave of postmasters to the credit of their retirement accounts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 1517. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes", as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement, national forest timber in amounts not exceeding $2,000 in appraised value; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 1518. A bill for the relief of Franz Borkenau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1519. A bill providing for contributions to States and local governmental units in lieu of taxes on real property held by the Federal Government; creating a commission to determine and pay such contributions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1520. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Lien-kwei Tsang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 RELATING TO INDEPENDENT SMALL BUSINESS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1397) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, without objection, the statement by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement by Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

As an individual Senator, and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and

Currency, I have continuously made every effort to obtain for independent small business its appropriate place in the economy of this Nation. During the current period of national emergency, it is more important than ever that the facilities of independent small business be utilized to the fullest extent possible in order to create a broad, efficient base for economic mobilization.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 contained some provisions intended to carry out this purpose. As chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, I have questioned those in the executive department charged with administering that act as to the part independent small business is playing in the programs undertaken under the act. The answers I have received have led me to believe that additional legislative provisions dealing with independent small business are needed in the Defense Production Act of 1950.

During the current series of hearings being held by the Committee on Banking and Currency on amendments proposed to that act, I have sought the aid of witnesses in devising specific legislation to enable independent small business to participate fully in the defense production program.

At the hearing held on May 7, 1951, I requested Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer to assist me by recommending appropriate legislation in this field to be added to the other amendments being considered to the Defense Production Act of 1950. The amendment I am now asking to have printed embodies the recommendations of the Secretary of Commerce and closely follows the purposes and pattern of S. 2943 which I introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, proposing a small-business coordinator. I understand the Secretary of Commerce has discussed this amendment with the Bureau of the Budget.

I do not wish to detract from the efforts which are being made administratively to utilize independent small business in the defense program but in my opinion further legislation is required in this field. I commend this amendment to the attention of those who really want to make effective the part independent small business can play in our Nation's economy.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 458. An act authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1026. An act to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida;

H. R. 1221. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1632. An act to authorized the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases;

H. R. 1739. An act to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy;

H. R. 1788. An act to authorize the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians to make contracts with approval of the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe;

H. R. 2478. An act to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2684. An act to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida;

H. R. 2889. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights;

H. R. 3041. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3795. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1200. An act to correct an error in section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947, "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States";

H. R. 1201. An act to amend section 4 of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary-ration basis;

H. R. 1203. An act to authorize officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to Government property;

H. R. 1215. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1216. An act to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein;

H. R. 2735. An act to authorize the transfer of certain military prisoners and confinement facilities to the control and management of the Attorney General;

H. R. 2736. An act to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2737. An act to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1899. An act to amend section 2 of the Act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution";

H. R. 2395. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2924. An act to amend section 4164 of title 18, United States Code, relating to conditional release of Federal prisoners; and

H. R. 3899. An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Eleven postmasters.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY TO PRESIDENT AND PEOPLE OF EL SALVADOR IN RECENT EARTHQUAKES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 105, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Whereas earthquakes of major proportions in El Salvador on May 6 and 7, 1951, have resulted in the loss of many lives, untold suffering, and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property, rendering homeless and destitute thousands of people: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the deepest sympathy of the Congress and the people of the United States be extended to the President and the people of El Salvador in this dark hour of their suffering and distress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this is a resolution expressing the sympathy of Congress and the American people for the people of El Salvador who have suffered as a result of the earthquakes which recently occurred in El Salvador. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD:

An address delivered by him on Armed Forces Day, May 18, 1951, at Newport News, Va.

By Mr. TAFT:

An address on the subject United States Relations with Western Europe Viewed Within the Present World-Wide International Environment, delivered by him before the American Assembly, on May 21, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

An address on price and materials controls delivered by Senator SPARKMAN before the National Industrial Conference Board, in New York, N. Y., May 17, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Program No. 41 in a series of addresses entitled "Happenings in Washington," broadcast by him to the people of Pennsylvania on May 19 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "The Meaning of 'I Am an American Day'—1951," delivered by him at I Am an American Day ceremonies in Juneau Park, Milwaukee, Wis., May 20, 1951.

By Mr. MUNDT:

An address entitled "Faith in America," delivered by Dr. J. Goodner Gill, vice president of Rider College, at the annual spring banquet of the New Jersey Association of

Schools of Business, in Newark, N. J., May 11, 1951.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Statement by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, on conditions in the rubber industry, which appears in the Appendix.

Preliminary report by Arthur E. Morgan on America's prospects in India and the East.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "What Will Beef Roll-Back Mean?" published in the June 1951 issue of the Farm Journal.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Three prize-winning essays on the subject, the Continuation and Furthering of Our Mode of Life as Characterized by the Four Freedoms, in a contest sponsored by the Henderson Woman's Club, Henderson, Ky., by Miss Suzanne Snyder, Miss Bernadette Wurth, and Miss Bettye Cobb, winners of first, second, and third prizes, respectively.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Editorials regarding the universal military training and service legislation, from the Washington News, the Birmingham Post, the New Orleans Times-Picayune, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the Buffalo Courier-Express.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "The Blinding Glare From a Senator's Searchlight," published in the San Antonio Express, commenting on a colloquy between Senator SMITH of New Jersey and Defense Secretary Marshall in the hearing before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees.

By Mr. LANGER:

An article under the headline RFC Scandal Revealed, written by Robert Young, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 22, 1951.

An article entitled "American Farmer 'Most Underpaid,' Brannan Asserts," written by Harlan Trott, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 24, 1951.

An article entitled "Resignations Near 1,000 Mark, 70 Percent at Joyfield Quit," published in the Voice of Branch 1, of the National Association of Letter Carriers, May 1951.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Editorial entitled "Silent Generals," from the Washington Star of May 22, 1951, and an article entitled "These Days," by George Sokolsky, published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 22, 1951.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I prepared concerning Maritime Day be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

It is appropriate, indeed, that today, May 22, the anniversary of the sailing in 1819 of America's first steamship, the *Savannah*, has been set aside for annual observance as National Maritime Day. If anything needs to be recalled, and to be emphasized, to the American people, it is the part, the great part, which the merchant marine plays in the economic life of our country in peacetime and in the defense of our freedoms in wartime. Only thus can we ever hope to bring home to our people the deplorable treatment which has been accorded to this great instrument of peace and national prosperity.

The American merchant marine has been rightly called the fourth arm of American defense. It has been our national good fortune that the wars of our generation have been fought on foreign soil—and if again we are forced to meet an aggressor we shall hope to keep him beyond the seas. How can this be done without a bridge of ships to keep our forces fed as well as supplied and equipped with the vast machinery needed to make modern war?

The privately owned merchant fleet flying the United States flag today totals, 1,310 ships of over 15,500,000 deadweight tons, but even this fleet is not enough to meet the needs created by the present emergency—the military needs in Korea and the civilian emergency needs of the democracies of the world. Already 272 Government cargo vessels have been withdrawn from our reserve fleet of Victory ships and Liberty ships, and these are either already in service or being prepared for service.

In the operation of these Government-owned ships use is being made of the experience and resourcefulness of American operators in the shipping industry under a policy which takes care so far as possible to see that these ships supplement our private fleets and are not operated in competition against them. Congress passed Public Law 591 providing that only after a public hearing in each case should it be ascertained that their operation is needed in the public interest, and that not United States private ships are available on reasonable terms to supply the particular need. The remainder, including some 123 Liberty ships, are either in service or being put into service by the newly organized National Shipping Authority, within the Maritime Administration.

The United States merchant marine faces a most severe competition from foreign-flag ships. This country has set standards of safety, of wages, and of maintenance aboard American-flag ships high enough to encourage our best young men to follow the calling of the sea. It is, therefore essential if we are to have for our national strength in time of peace or war a strong and vigorous merchant marine, that our shipping industry receive from this country a wholesome, dependable and substantial support. The long-range shipping bill now before this body and various bills for the granting of aid to the democracies of the world embody provisions supporting our merchant marine along the lines which I have indicated and which I believe to be of such high importance.

This country cannot sit back, however, and assume that our present fleet can meet every emergency that may arise. Despite the fact that a fleet of 25 of the new mariner class dry cargo carriers is being constructed in 5 of the shipyards of this country, which ships will have substantially twice the speed of the Victory ships which are laid up in the reserve fleet, more of them will be needed. And, of highest urgency, we must also bear in mind the need of new and fast passenger carriers available to do a vital troop-carrying job in case of need.

On this point I would like to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement by Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., which presents forcefully the need for new passenger vessel construction.

(By Frank J. Taylor, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc.)

Any appraisal of the American merchant marine that would be made on the occasion of the annual observance of National Maritime Day, May 22, would have to give recognition to the fact that this country possesses a merchant fleet that is out of balance because it lacks sufficient passenger liners.

With the completion of the *Constitution* this month and the launching of the superliner *United States* next month, the passenger-ship construction program in this country is virtually completed and little has been done about initiating new construction. Our merchant marine today is comprised of many fast and modern freighters, the largest tanker fleet in the world, and representative refrigerated units and bulk carriers, but the number and tonnage of our passenger liners are completely out of proper proportion for both our commercial needs and more important, for requirements of national defense.

Including ships in active service and in lay-up, the United States has 3,492 vessels, but of these only 79 can be listed as passenger liners. Of these only 47 are in service, the balance being in lay-up because they are either unsuitable or obsolete. When the over-all size of the American fleet and its passenger carriers are compared with those of other maritime nations, Americca's lack of balance is even more noticeable.

Great Britain, with 2,605 ships of all types, has 279 passenger vessels. Holland, with 500 vessels, has 89 in the passenger category. France, with 519 ships, has 72 liners. Italy, with 423 ships, can boast of 48 passenger carriers. Soviet Russia includes in its fleet of 432 ships 63 vessels for passengers.

That other countries realize the need for passenger liners can be readily seen in the fact that foreign nations have on order or under construction 97 liners as contrasted with the 2 presently being built in the United States.

To correct this shortage of passenger liners, Congress should take prompt action on the long-range shipping legislation now before it, which would provide a stimulus for new construction in that it would create economic conditions that would make it possible for shipowners to build more liners.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared for insertion in the RECORD on today, May 22, National Maritime Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

Today, May 22, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that this is National Maritime Day, which commemorates the sailing in 1819 of America's first steamship, the *Savannah*.

I want to take a few moments to describe the tremendous job which the American Merchant Marine has been doing in the past year, and to tell the needs of the Nation in connection with the shipping industry.

I recently returned from the Far East where it was my privilege to visit the fighting front in Korea and to talk with the men responsible for our battle against Red aggression.

You will be pleased to learn that those fighting men are strong in their praise for the work of the American shipping industry.

The war in Korea, coming suddenly as the Communists began their swift move of aggression last June, did not find America unprepared so far as its shipping was concerned.

Our privately owned vessels immediately moved in to fill the tremendous need which developed, almost overnight, for transport for men and matériel.

As the need grew, the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration began breaking out vessels from the reserve fleet which we had so wisely provided, following the end of World War II.

By late April 1951 we had withdrawn from the reserve fleets and placed in operation a total of 149 Victory cargo ships.

Then the Nation turned to the flotilla of Liberty ships, also in our reserve fleet. The National Shipping Authority since March 13 has moved rapidly to call 125 of these vessels out of mothballs. Already approximately half that number are at sea, hauling bulk cargoes of coal, grain and ores of the type

they handled so efficiently and economically in World War II.

The Federal Government, working in close cooperation with the United States shipping industry, has seen to it that the men and the weapons needed for the battle against communism have been delivered wherever needed—and on time.

We owe a salute to the men who have sailed those ships, for they have done a splendid job.

These men and ships are making it possible for the United States to demonstrate its ability to meet commitments which arise from its role as a world leader.

We must look to the future, however. We must keep our Merchant Marine strong so that it can enable this Nation to meet commitments which will come in years which lie ahead.

We need a long-range shipping program which will insure strength in all phases of the shipping industry.

We must plan for an accelerated shipbuilding program on all coasts. In addition to the 25 Mariner-class vessels which are under contract, we need more fast cargo ships which will not only be suitable for operation under war conditions but which also can serve as the future replacement vessels for our commercial fleets. The Victory and the Liberty ships of which I spoke a few moments ago are doing a grand job, yes, but we must remember they are old and cannot economically be operated for many more years. We also have additional passenger vessels, of a type which easily can be converted for use as troop transports. And we need additional vessels for our tanker fleet.

And there is another thing we must have. That is a firm resolve to keep our shipping industry strong, and to make sure that post-emergency operation of merchant ships remains in private hands. Past experience has shown the wisdom and the actual economy of private operation.

A wise, long-range program looking to the future will insure new and speedy ships to enable us to meet all competition and will insure a healthy, strong merchant marine that can step into any breach.

A combination like that will remain the fourth arm of our defense; it will keep America's economy strong and offer us protection against the aggressive designs of any warlike nation, or combination of nations.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], in the nature of a substitute for the bill H. R. 1612.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the junior Senator from Nevada now has the floor, by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brewster	Byrd
Anderson	Bricker	Cain
Bennett	Bridges	Capehart
Benton	Butler, Nebr.	Carlson
Case	Ives	Murray
Chavez	Jenner	Neely
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Cordon	Kem	O'Mahoney
Dirksen	Kerr	Pastore
Douglas	Kilgore	Robertson
Duff	Knowland	Russell
Dworshak	Langer	Saltonstall
Eastland	Lodge	Schoeppel
Ellender	Long	Smathers
Ferguson	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Malone	Smith, N. J.
George	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	Maybank	Sparkman
Green	McCarthy	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	Taft
Hendrickson	McFarland	Thye
Hennings	McKellar	Tobey
Hickenlooper	McMahon	Underwood
Hill	Millikin	Welker
Hoey	Monroney	Wherry
Holland	Moody	Wiley
Humphrey	Morse	Williams
Hunt	Mundt	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which met in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield so that I may propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from Nevada to yield so that I may propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] with reference to the subject matter we discussed yesterday afternoon.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will permit me, and it is agreeable to him, I should like to make a brief statement. I shall cover the point which I think he has in mind without elaborating on it.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be very happy to have the distinguished Senator from Georgia make any observation he may care to make so that we may have his viewpoint with respect to the striking out of the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment to which the Senator referred yesterday, when consideration of the conference report superseded proceedings on the pending bill, is the amendment to which he is now referring, I assume.

Mr. WHERRY. I have reference to the striking out by the committee of section 8 on page 11.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. Mr. President, both for the purpose of clarifying the RECORD and because I may have somewhat overstated the fact in the RECORD, I should like to say, first, that the section was stricken out because the committee believed it was impossible of administration. It would be necessary intermittently to make readjustments in order to administer the provision as it was written.

Second, the committee was of the opinion that we would lose in concessions from other countries becaue of the fact that we could not make firm, binding, and positive agreements.

Third, the price supported product exports were five times as much as imports. That is about the ratio.

Fourth, section 22, together with the escape clause, to which I called attention yesterday, would cover the problem. That was the opinion of the committee.

With reference to section 22, I wish to make clear precisely what can and cannot be done under it in view of the amendment striking out subsection (f) of section 22.

If the fact of interference by imports with a program of price support is shown—in other words, it must first be shown—the President must act under section 22.

Under section 22, this is the present requirement—

> Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States or from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he—
>
> The Secretary of Agriculture—
>
> shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice—
>
> And so forth.
>
> (b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts—

He shall then proceed to put into effect the remedies provided in section 22. It then becomes mandatory upon the President to put into effect the remedies provided in section 22.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. That was the point. Upon that point I somewhat overstated the law, and I wish to make it clear. It is not mandatory unless the President finds that the facts reported to him are

true—that is to say, unless as stated in subsection (b):

If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts—

He then must proceed.

It was the opinion of the committee—and I think this is important, and I wish to make it clear—that if further strengthening of section 22 was desirable, it should be done by way of amendment to that section in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, or in the act in which section 22 was originally inserted. That would not be a proper function of the Finance Committee, and we did not feel that we should undertake to amend that act. We did feel justified in removing the inhibition against the full operation of section 22, notwithstanding there might be in existence a trade agreement which, under the law prior to the amendment removing subsection (f), would have prevented the action by the President.

I think that is a sound position. Although I shall not put the testimony into the RECORD now, nevertheless in the record before the committee will be found the testimony of the Federal Farm Bureau's representatives and of representatives of the Cotton Council and of the Farmers Union. In other words, representatives of the farmers themselves appeared before the committee; and although they did not ask for section 8, which was a House amendment, and which was stricken, yet they agreed that it would be hard to administer, and that also the procedure might be more costly than if that amendment were stricken out.

What they did request was the elimination of subsection (f) of section 22, so that the way would be open to obtain proper relief in the event any of the price-support programs were being interfered with by the Trade Agreements Act. That is the status of the matter. Those are substantially the reasons why the committee struck out the provision, but not without first having eliminated the troublesome subsection (f) of section 22.

With that statement and explanation, I hope the Senator can see at least the position taken by the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his explanation of the committee's attitude regarding amendment 8, on page 11, which apparently was written in on the floor of the House, and which has to do with a provision which I think—at least, from first reading it; and I approach it in that light—is a meritorious one.

I cannot help but feel that it is most illogical to permit the importation into the United States of agricultural products on concessions so low, while the support prices for the same commodities are so high, that farmers of another country get the benefit of the support prices. We have had situations where surpluses of those supported commodities have been dumped on the open market; and in the case of potatoes we even dumped them into the ocean. It seems to me that is an illogical result.

Mr. GEORGE. The committee agreed substantially with the view just expressed by the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. However, the committee was of the opinion that the escape-clause provisions now to be inserted into the act, plus the treatment given to section 22, certainly make it entirely open to amend section 22 in any way that the proper Senate committee might wish to amend it.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for that observation.

I say again, for the record, that I am in complete sympathy with the recommendation as to elimination of subsection (f) on page 13. I think its elimination goes a long way in helping the situation.

Mr. GEORGE. Its elimination is absolutely necessary.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, but that does not completely clarify the situation, although that provision will correct an abuse which has been practiced at least during the past 2 years by the State Department, by means of which the State Department has had authority even to override what Congress did with reference to the importation of agricultural products, under section 22.

Mr. GEORGE. But now, with the amendment striking out subsection (f), that would not be the case.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. GEORGE. While the President would not in the first instance be compelled to act, yet if he finds upon the reports made to him by the Tariff Commission that there is cause for action, he must act; and then he has full power to act.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will permit, I should like to ask another question. I do not wish to belabor this point, but I desire to get the most complete interpretation I can from the distinguished chairman of the committee.

I think we are in agreement about the illogical result and I think we are in agreement about subsection (f).

However, if in the final analysis we are to get protection from the importation of agricultural products when price supported surpluses of those products exist in this country, or when such importation would be detrimental for other reasons, we must go back to section 22 must we not?

Mr. GEORGE. That would be true——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an interruption——

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me say that the escape clause procedure, as such, is also available.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, but there is nothing mandatory about it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; there is nothing mandatory about it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I wish to make. I deeply appreciate having the Senator from Colorado raise that point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The only reason why I intervened was that I understood the Senator thought the sole relief was under section 22. It can also be taken under the regular escape-clause procedure.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct, and I thank the Senator for his observation. However, in the final analysis, even though there is available a discretionary or permissive action under the escape clause, if anything final is to be done, we have to rely upon the provisions of section 22, with respect to agricultural products.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, but the Secretary of Agriculture is required to make a request to the President; and if there appears to be sufficient on the face to indicate that the Secretary of Agriculture is correct, then the Tariff Commission must make the investigation; and if the President finds that its report sets forth the facts as contended by the Secretary of Agriculture, the President then must act.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I endeavored to point out that if it is desirable further to strengthen section 22, I think undoubtedly it could be done, but that does not come appropriately within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I desire to raise then, is with respect to the final relief which might be had. I was sure yesterday that I understood section 22, because I happen to be a member of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. We have in the past gone over the amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act very carefully, especially in regard to agricultural price supports. But the provision in question in section 22 begins with the words "and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief"; that is, the belief that products are being imported into the United States under conditions and in quantities so as to render support programs ineffective. If he believes that, and if he has reason for that belief, "the President shall cause an immediate investigation," and so forth. Last year it was pointed out to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of State that this was not merely a provision which possibly could be overridden by an international agreement; not merely a permissive escape clause. We felt that—the State Department and the Department of Agriculture permitted an import concession, when support prices were so high, and potatoes, for example, in such great surplus, that it was ridiculous such concessions were tolerated. Yet the Secretary of State said that made no difference. He, of course, relied upon subsection (f) of section 22, which it is now proposed to amend.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. But the Secretary of State said, what is important is that we must transact business with our neighbors, and the small amount we lose in supporting the price on surplus potatoes, while imported potatoes are permitted to come in for less, is insignificant compared with the desirability of maintaining the pleasant relations

which we have with our sister country across the border.

I believe the committee amendment tightens the requirements under which section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act shall be applied, although the provisions of section 22 are still permissive.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Colorado for their great work on this bill, and especially for the amendment to subsection (f) to section 22, on page 13. To me that helps tremendously. But, in the final analysis, it is my contention that the language contained in the House bill remedies the situation, and constitutes a mandatory provision.

Mr. GEORGE. The language of the House provision would have the effect of almost killing the entire Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to do that, as the Senator knows.

Mr. GEORGE. I fear it would, because I do not think the provision could be administered.

Mr. WHERRY. For that reason I should like to ask the distinguished Senator regarding the five points which he made; first, that the House provision was deleted because it would be impracticable to administer. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to know in what particular is the provision so impractical of administration.

Mr. GEORGE. It would be necessary to change the tariff with every price fluctuation which interfered with one of the support-price programs, and that would happen again and again. It would become necessary to reimpose and to readjust until there would be no finality, and there would be no actual certainty; consequently, we could not negotiate with respect to farm products. The situation to which the Senator refers may have been unfortunate, but I think it important to bear in mind that our exports of price-supported farm products amounts to about five times our total imports of price-supported farm products. We had better handle the one-fifth as proposed by the bill as reported to the Senate, with such tightening up of section 22 by the appropriate committee as may be deemed necessary. I think, however, that the President would scarcely disregard the recommendations of his own Secretary of Agriculture. If, with a price-support program being administered, because of trade agreements or concessions there is a resultant rapid increase in imports, I think the President, while he has discretionary power, certainly would listen to his Secretary of Agriculture, and, if the Tariff Commission found certain conditions to exist and so reported to the President, I apprehend that there would now be no doubt about action.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, personally I cannot see yet wherein there is any impracticability of administration. It might be that there would be, in the case of retroactive agreements, but certainly, as to future trade agreements one could be written under which, in no event, should the concession go below the support price. I can see nothing impractical at all about that. As the support price on the great crops changes annually, it might become necessary to write a provision, including a statement of what that support price is, but I can see nothing very impractical about that. For example, the farmers who take open contracts to produce corn do not know what the support price is going to be until it is finally determined by the Department of Agriculture. Certainly there should be no distinction between a domestic farmer and a foreign farmer, so far as the support price is concerned.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator, that such a provision might be written into the bill, but it must be borne in mind that the thing which changes is the price of the imported commodity, and when it changes, it becomes necessary to make a readjustment; the result of which would be to destroy certainty in the administration of the House provision. My purpose in rising this morning was to emphasize the fact that in the opinion of the committee it is not administratively easy, at least.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, so that I may make another observation or two, I admit that all reciprocal trade agreements are very complex in form. That is true. It is difficult to write into a bill the many things which would not only please one country but which would also please all other participating countries. But I can see no difficulty at all about providing in a reciprocal trade agreement that whenever a concession is to be made, it shall not fall below the support price, depending upon what the support price is, annually.

There may be further explanation which could be made as to the difficulty of administering such a provision. If the distinguished Senator from Georgia, or the ranking minority member of the committee, has anything further to say about its administration, or will supply the information for the RECORD, I should like to have it. We do not want to pass a bill to extend reciprocal trade agreements which will destroy the exportation of our agricultural surpluses, and certainly we want to import commodities on a basis which is fair and equitable.

With reference to our huge exports of agricultural products to a considerable extent they have been caused by the programs designed to aid other countries. A large volume of our agricultural products have been sent abroad through the generosity of the American people. When that comes to an end, then the question will be, Shall we have those markets for our export products, and what will the support price be at such time?

Mr. GEORGE. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that traditionally we have had large exports of farm products. For a relatively long period of time, cotton alone constituted more than 50 percent, or at least 50 percent of our exports.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is true.

Mr. GEORGE. Also, it may be said that apples and various other farm commodities are exported. I think, if the Senator will take a very careful view of it and will read the House provision in the light of this one fact, namely, that when the price of the import goes below the parity price of the commodity——

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. GEORGE. A readjustment will become necessary. When it comes up, that is when the import price in this market comes up to parity, then it will become necessary to make another readjustment. The result would be that we could not write firm, definite agreements with respect to farm commodities which were available under the support-price program.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield further, I did not want to labor the point, but my reason for asking these questions is that I feel the House provision would accomplish the purpose of straightening out what I consider to be a very illogical position which we have taken in permitting the importation of agricultural products in direct conflict with price-support programs on agricultural products in this country. I am not sure what can be done about it. I certainly will consider the judgment of the distinguished chairman of the committee and also the judgment of the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. They have heard the testimony and have weighed the evidence, and they have given the Senate the benefit of their best judgment. But I shall hold the matter in abeyance, as I desire to look up a few facts myself. I hope the amendment will not be voted upon today.

I am rather interested in the Senator's statement that the Farm Bureau and, I understood him to say, the Farmers' Union, and I believe, some cotton organization, feel that the House provision should be deleted and that we should rely upon the provisions as outlined in the Senate committee text. But, regardless of whether an amendment is to be made to the Agricultural Adjustment Act or whether an amendment is to be made to this bill, I cannot help but feel, after the consideration that has been given to the question, that some more effective action should be taken. Either section 22 should be amended or modified to make it a mandatory provision, or we should do something as to the agreements.

We talk about preserving price supports. To my mind, the quickest way to ruin the price-support program is to permit the importation of products at a concession so low that the taxpayer has to pay the difference between what the product would normally sell for in the open market and the support price. We are thus subsidizing the farmers of foreign nations. If we do that, we shall ruin the very program which we are undertaking to strengthen agricultural production in the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Much of the discredit cast on the price-support program has been due to potatoes which were imported and added to the surplus stocks of potatoes in this country. Is not that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. I think so; yes. I offered an amendment on the floor to prevent the importation of potatoes, but it was rejected.

Mr. THYE. Potato producers have no support program to protect them if there should be an abundant harvest. The same is true with respect to apples in the Northwest, and I could refer to some other crops which are likewise affected by imports which have on a number of occasions ruined the market at the harvest season of a particular crop.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The farmers have been criticized on the floor, and we have been told that taxpayers pay a large amount of money to boost prices so that farmers may enjoy parity, which will reflect the increased cost of labor and the increased cost of materials they have to buy. The statement has been made that such a program makes all prices high. What hurts is the continuation of a support price for the world. That is what we are doing so long as we permit imports to come in with concessions so low that the farmers of other nations receive the benefit of our support price.

It seems to me that the House provision strikes at a situation which is very illogical, namely, that concessions should not be made so low that foreign agricultural products could be imported to undersell our own domestic surpluses, and foreign farmers receive the benefits of support prices. There is justification for the House provision.

No Member of the Senate has greater respect than I have for the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the distinguished ranking minority member of the Finance Committee, and for the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of that committee. That is one committee which has a reputation for working overtime. No doubt the committee has gone into the question very carefully, much more so than any of us will do in connection with the pending bill, but we have had the problem before us previously, and we shall have it again. If we are to continue to support farm prices in this country, we cannot permit the support program to be ruined by permitting unlimited quantities of foreign agricultural products to be imported when the payment of the support prices falls upon the taxpayers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that he has very ably argued the provisions of the House bill. They were also argued by the minority members of the Senate Committee on Finance, but the votes were against the line of argument which the Senator from Nebraska has been following. Personally, I reserve the right to take my own position on the question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Georgia one more question?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. With respect to the difficulty in administering the House provision, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia whether any suggestion was made as to permitting a leeway, let us say, of 5 percent either way before any adjustment is made, or something of that kind? Was any rule or measuring stick suggested to the committee for its consideration in connection with the House provision?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not recall that there was. As I told the Senator, the farm organizations said that they had full sympathy with the purpose of the provision, but they thought it would not be possible of administration. They said they thought it would be more harmful than helpful. Those who appeared before the committee at least took a definite position against section 8, but did insist upon a proper escape clause, and particularly the elimination of subsection (f) of section 22. They thought that would meet their problem. I have become convinced that it would, while having every sympathy with the House provision. If there should be any tightening up so as to make it completely mandatory upon the President to cause investigation to be made or take place under section 22, then, as I said before, that would be a matter which should address itself to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because our committee has no jurisdiction over that particular matter.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT EXTENDS POWER OVER DOMESTIC ECONOMY—CONTINUED FROM MAY 21

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, free trade, as practiced under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, is only one of the factors used to destroy our economic system.

If a deliberate attempt had been made from the beginning to destroy it, starting 18 years ago, a better job could not have been done.

Also, there is effective free trade if tariffs are lowered below the differential between the living-standard costs here and in the competitive nations, unless the wages and investments in a particular business are written down to meet the competitive level of such foreign country living-standard nations.

TARIFFS OR SUPPORT PAYMENTS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In the light of that statement, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada a question Does he not feel that we must make a choice; that we must either have support prices, which the taxpayer has to pay, or there must be protection, so that the imports will not drag the prices so low as to ruin the American producer? Is that not true? There must be one or the other.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has put his finger squarely on the sore spot. In other words, there has been a deliberate removal of the tariff or import-fee protection for the wages and investments in this country during the past 18 years, and the substitution of subsidies to uphold a tottering economy.

The establishment of subsidies is a sharpshooting game. Many times groups have attempted to secure protection for their own particular industry through sharpshooting based upon no principle at all.

Amendments have been offered to bills to protect our fur industry, to protect our oil industry, and other industries, through quotas or subsidy payments.

Such proceedings would all be unnecessary if there were a tariff established on a fair and reasonably competitive principle, administered by a Foreign Trade Authority, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is free to determine freight rates for the carriers on the basis of a reasonable return on investment.

FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY—ICC

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada served 8½ years on the Nevada Public Service Commission. What was the criterion used by that commission with respect to rates? Exactly the same as that used by the Interstate Commerce Commission—a fair and reasonable return.

How is that established? First, all the factors are considered, and the commission arrives at a fair value of the property, considering, of course, the replacement value, and the first cost.

Amortization and all other necessary factors are included. Having arrived at a fair value of the property, the commission then decides what is a fair rate of interest under the conditions obtaining in intrastate commerce, since it is a matter of State regulation.

The same rules are applied as are applied by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the regulation of interstate commerce.

Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that he would feel it necessary to try to protect intrastate railroad engaged in business in Nebraska if it were not for the fact that there is in existence the Interstate Commerce Commission.

If it were not for the existence of that Commission, the Senator from Nebraska would be here trying to get a lower rate for the farmers, or perhaps it would be necessary to try to have higher rates established for the railroads. He does not have to bother, however, because Congress has established the Interstate Commerce Commission, which takes care of such matters on an established principle.

NO SHARPSHOOTING

Mr. President, similar action is what the Senator from Nevada wants to have taken in connection with foreign commerce—the establishment of proper tariff principles on the bases of fair and reasonable competition, so there will be no need for sharpshooting.

ALL INDUSTRY AND LABOR AFFECTED

American producers of coal, of furs, of zinc and lead in Missouri, are always injured by imports of such products if the imports are priced below the fair and reasonable competition level. Let us lay down a proper principle, and sharpshooting practices will not be necessary.

We now have radio communication, and whenever a regulation is issued, whenever a tariff rate is changed, the news is available to everyone, so the next day it will be known exactly who is obtaining protection and who is not. It is impossible to keep such news from the public—and it should not be kept from the public.

SIX FACTORS TO DESTROY ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Mr. President, the six factors used in the last 18 years in preparing for the destruction of the economic system of this country include—

First. The removal of the metal base for our money, and the utter debasement of the currency of the United States of America.

There is absolutely no brake on the printing press money now. Congress has proved that it will make the change in the backing of the fictional metal base for the money. When we come to the point where we do not have enough gold in Fort Knox to have 40 percent value behind the currency, Congress changes the figure to 25 percent.

Perhaps it will not be long before they, perhaps, will change it to 15 percent, and then to 10 percent unless a definite move is made to control inflation. Congress is trained to do what the President asks it to do, and it seems that we simply cannot stop the printing of paper money, and inflation is the natural result.

Second. The free-trade program initiated through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act by the President, by his State Department, and the continual lowering of tariffs and import fees without any regard for the fair and reasonable competitive principle, and with the apparent objective from the beginning of one economic world, has laid the foundation for averaging the living standards of this country with those of the other nations of the world. Some say that was done to prevent war. Well, we have followed this path now for 18 years, and this is the second war within 10 years—world war III.

It is wearing us down "keeping us out of war."

Third. Income and other taxes are levied without restraint. They have in many cases reached the point where the law of diminishing returns takes over, and investment of venture capital is disturbed.

Just the mere fact that there is tampering with the tariffs, that there is continued tinkering with the tariffs, threatening the tariffs and import fees, not only prevents venture capital from going into a new business, but runs private capital out of the business stream of the nation.

Fourth. Subsidies are paid to producers in lieu of the tariff or import fee. As has been said, there has been a gradual substitution, of subsidies for tariffs. As a matter of fact, when the tariff and import fees are removed or substantially lowered below the differential, then the subsidies must be substituted to make up the difference, to hold our standard of living.

Fifth. The Securities and Exchange Commission, with its engineers and hand-raised economists insisting upon their own judgment as to the success of a venture before allowing stock or shares to be sold when, as a matter of fact, the real objective should be to guarantee that the truth and the facts are told to prospective investors, not to determine the feasibility of the project, because when that is finally determined without any doubt, there is no need to sell stock. This action prevents many new business developments.

Sixth. Emergency economic controls contribute greatly to socialization and nationalization of industries and complete economic control by the President of the United States.

Such control was voted by the Senate with little question.

The junior Senator from Nevada debated the question and voted against the proposal.

REGULATION OF NATIONAL ECONOMY—FIXING FOREIGN POLICY

The Constitution of the United States pointedly separates the regulation of the national economy and the fixing of foreign policy.

The regulation of foreign commerce is one of the chief factors in the regulation of the national economy, and the Constitution fixes the responsibility for such regulation in the legislative branch of the Government, the Congress of the United States.

The President is charged with the responsibility of fixing foreign policy.

The Constitution pointedly separates the regulation of the national economy and the fixing of foreign policy.

1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

In 1934 Congress passed the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transferred its constitutional responsibility—not its authority—to the executive branch of the Government.

The President now has both the fixing of foreign policy and the regulation of the national economy through one of the chief factors, the regulation of foreign commerce and the fixing of tariffs and import fees.

CONGRESS MAKES APPROPRIATIONS

That leaves the Congress, and particularly the dignified Senate, with little else to do but make appropriations, and Congress usually makes the appropriations which the President suggests. Sometimes Congress cuts the appropriations which he suggests as much as 5 or 10 percent; but already he has at least 20 percent in the appropriation that he did not expect to get, so he has a little velvet left.

At least that has been the custom in the 4½ years the junior Senator from Nevada has been a Member of this body.

ABSOLUTE DISCRETION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. President, there has been considerable debate about the amendments which are in H. R. 1612.

Let us examine those amendments. I say again categorically that the power in the President is absolute to further reduce tariffs and import fees, just as it was under the original 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Under House bill 1612, together with the amendments reported by the Senate Committee on Finance, the President's power to leave present trade agreements intact, or to make new ones, is absolute. The peril point provision and the escape clause are merely suggestive to the President, and provide a means of accomplishing something which the entire history of the State Department's action in the trade agreements field emphasizes will not be done under any consideration.

We have the much discussed peril point provision. By the way, nearly all the tariffs which have been tampered with by the State Department over a period of years are now well below the peril point.

That is brought about through the Trade Agreements Act, or through agreements to lower tariffs. They are not really trade agreements.

It is also brought about by manipulation of the currencies of foreign nations, such as the British Empire.

After they had made trade agreements for 16 years with the United States Government they lowered the price of their currency from $4.02 a pound to $2.80 a pound. At that moment they lowered the tariffs of the United States Government more than 30 percent.

So the two amendments mean nothing in tangible results, however they may form a cushion upon which to rest a troubled conscience.

BE YOUR BROKER—ENGLAND

Mr. President, if there is any doubt about this, let anyone pick up one of the leading magazines.

I believe that the page which I have before me was torn from Look or Life magazine. However, one can pick up almost any magazine of national circulation and see an advertisement such as I am about to read. This is what it says:

> Be your own importer. Because of the devalued pound you can enjoy unusual savings on these London-tailored skirts.
>
> If you went to Europe what would you bring back?
>
> Probably lace from France. Maybe damask from Ireland. And certainly a British cashmere, a British skirt. But now you can have your British skirt, even if the only ship you've seen is a canoe. For now you can shop on London's Bond Street—by mail. And you shop at Palmer's, Ltd., a favorite with smart women for over 80 years.

SHUT WEST VIRGINIA COAL MINES

I note that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is in the chair. One can shop for his own clothes in England now, just as one can shop for his own fuel in the Middle East, and shut down coal mines in West Virginia. There is no difference, except that in shopping for clothes in England we shut down textile mills in New England and in the South, and I fear perhaps some which are now growing in the West, or will grow if we ever have the long expected period of peace which has been 18 years in coming.

I continue to read from the advertisement:

Here are skirts you can't buy in the most distinguished shops this side of the ocean.

I am reading this because this is a case in point.

OUR ECONOMY AFFECTED FROM 3,000 MILES

Our tariffs are lowered by the action of a country 3,000 miles away from the eastern shore of our country.

They manipulate the actual effective value of our tariffs merely by manipulating their money system.

There is no provision in any trade agreement that has ever been made by the State Department to take care of manipulation of currency in a foreign country. There is no suggestion of the inclusion of a provision that when there is manipulation of currency in a foreign country there shall be a corresponding adjustment in tariffs.

A FARCE ON THE FACE OF IT

So, on the face of it, it is a farce and a misrepresentation when they say they want reciprocal trade.

It is not reciprocal trade that they want. They may deceive a great many people as they have done for a long time.

However, I think the situation is improving. We are like a man who has been through a great sickness. This may be the last time—and I predict that it will be—that the Senate will ever vote to extend such an agreement or give such power to a thoroughly discredited State Department and Executive.

For 2 years more he will have the absolute power of life and death over the workingmen and the investors of this Nation if the act is extended.

I continue to read from the advertisement to which I have referred:

Wait till you touch the firm British-loomed pure woolens. See the impeccable Gor-Ray tailoring, smooth as a glove at waist and hips, with permanized pleats that swing free for your country stride. These skirts are every inch aristocrats—British as an Oxford accent and midmorning tea.

Mr. President, we are very much controlled right now by the Oxford accent. Our State Department is filled with Oxford accents. So now they can buy their clothes from England by mail.

Reading further:

They've been translated into American sizes—12 to 20, zippered in the American fashion—and priced for value-conscious Americans.

The devalued British pound makes this buy possible—

That is a case in point, Mr. President. I hope the sponsors of this legislation are listening because I do not believe they thoroughly understand how we are in the power of another nation, without any action by Congress, and without any action by the State Department, except the action which has already been taken.

ENGLAND OR RUSSIA MIGHT TAKE OFFENSE

To sign a trade agreement with a foreign nation which we know manipulates currency values is as senseless as allowing the transfer of Berlin to the Russian zone without any means of ingress or egress.

It was felt, I suppose, that we might offend Russia if we asked for such a concession.

At least that was the excuse which the State Department advanced for not asking for a right of way, that to do so might offend the Russians.

I suppose the State Department is afraid of offending the British or some of the other nations if we asked for the inclusion of a clause stating that if they manipulate their currency, which results in a lowering of our tariffs by 30 or 31 percent, we may compensate for it also by a comparable raise in the tariff. I suppose they thought it might offend the British Empire.

Mr. President, we are dealing with the British Empire, which takes in about half of the countries of the world, including Australia, Canada, India. That is the British Empire we are talking about, not only England.

I read further:

The devalued British pound makes this buy possible—a skirt you'll wear for years, wear with pride—for a mere $10, plus duty. We even pay the postage.

Mr. President, they even pay the postage.

Actually, we shopped the best stores and couldn't find skirts to equal them at this unbelievably low price. So mail this coupon today. In 3 weeks your Gor-Ray skirt will be on your doorstep.

Send this order direct to London. (Airmail from any part of the United States, 15 cents; ordinary mail, 5 cents.) Palmers, Ltd., 96 New Bond Street, London W. I. (Palmers, Ltd., as agents for Gor-Ray).

Enclosed find . (Send cash, banker's draft or international postal order.)

Send me Koneray size color.
Roedean size color.

Size	12	14	16	18	20
Waist	25"	27"	29"	31"	35"
Hip	36"	38"	40"	42"	44"
Length (to hem)	31½"	32"	32"	31½"	31"

Name
Address
City Zone State

Pay $2.75 per skirt United States customs duty to your postman.

I say again that it could just as well be the fuel imported and laid down at $1.70 or $1.80 a ton on the east coast, and shut down part of the coal mines in West Virginia and some of the oil wells in Texas and California where producers ship their fuel a considerable distance from the point of production to the point of steam power generation, and to run the industries of our country.

GOLD EXODUS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The press reports that British banks are taking many million dollars' worth of our gold out of the Treasury. We recognize, of course, that at the rate of $35 an ounce gold can be sold at probably 40 percent or 50 percent more in European markets. Is gold protected in any way under the reciprocal trade agreements?

Mr. MALONE. It is fortunate that the distinguished Senator from Idaho brought up that point at this time. The junior Senator from Nevada had just stated that we have destroyed our currency by removing the metal base from the money.

Not only is our gold supply not protected, but if I were an Englishman, a Frenchman, or the national of any of the other 16 nations, I could take ECA or Marshall-plan money and buy gold from the United States Treasury at $35 an ounce, take it home with me, and sell it at a great increase.

Seventy dollars was the figure when I was there. I do not know what it is now, but I suppose it is around $60 at least. In a free market, of course, we know what gold is worth and what people will pay for it.

I was in South Africa, where an enormous amount of gold is produced. We guarantee the $35 price. The South Africans could sell their gold any place in the world where they could get more than $35 an ounce, and they could sell it to us if they could not get more than $35 an ounce elsewhere.

OUR METHODS

They could let us keep it until the price went up, and then they could buy it with ECA money and sell it back to us again at the increased price. It is not a bad system for anyone who can take advantage of it.

There is one other item which I discussed in the Senate, I believe in 1947. In accordance with the usual run of things, it is about time for something to be done about it. It usually takes about 3 years for something to take effect after it first comes before the Senate. It runs like smallpox or measles; a certain time elapses, and then the effect is produced. An analogy may be found in the action we took yesterday on the conference report on the third supplemental appropriation bill.

ARMING RUSSIA AND SATELLITE NATIONS

The junior Senator from Nevada had explained all along beginning in March 1948, that we were arming Russia with the materials they needed with which to fight a world war III with us, and to consolidate their gains in iron-curtain countries and in China.

It was all explained on March 4 and 5, 1948, when the Marshall plan first came before the Senate. Only 3½ years ago, approximately. The progress in that case has not been bad. I presume that in about another 2 years we will take action against this free-trade robbery.

In about another year or two we ought to get around to replacing the metal base under our currency and stop inflation.

That is what we need, Mr. President, to stop inflation. We need a metal base to which we can tie our currency.

Otherwise we have nothing; our currency is like a loose balloon, it will continue to soar. Let us not have it go any higher.

What would that base be? It would be gold, would it not?

DID NOT WANT MARSHALL PLAN MONEY

In 1947 I went through the coal mines and through the steel mills in Birmingham. After I had gone through the mines and mills, I found that none of

the owners of steel mills wanted any Marshall plan money. They wanted to deal with their local banks. I met a Mr. Jones in charge of a steel mill. Incidentally, I mentioned all this on the floor of the Senate in 1948, but it may have grown a little dim with age. Mr. Jones had obtained $12,000,000 for improvements, and I asked him where he was getting the money for the improvements. He was very proud of new furnaces and buildings he was erecting. I said to him, "Are you getting the money from the Bank of England?"

He said, "No. I am getting it from the local banks in Birmingham."

I said, "Don't you want any of this great Marshall plan money?"

He said, "I just want them to stay out of my hair. If we take it, we will be nationalized. We may escape that if we do not take the money."

WE ARE ON OUR WAY TO NATIONALIZATION, TOO

They did not escape nationalization, and we are riding in the same direction. The same thing will happen to our coal mines, railroads, and banks. We are getting to the point where we will be able to do nothing else. If anyone has any doubt about it, let him go out on the street and ask the first 10 men he meets, "Who is running the railroads?" They will not know, unless it be by accident. The Government of the United States is running the railroads. I would say that not over one man out of a 100 in the United States knows it. So we are about ready for nationalization of industries. We may turn the railroads back this time, but perhaps never again. Someone may introduce a bill providing for the purchase at par of the common stock of the railroads, which, with the execption of the Santa Fe Railroad and the Pennsylvania, have not paid any interest or dividends for 25 years, except in wartime. It will be said that we should pay for the stock at par. We will do exactly what was done in England. We will pay so much for each railroad, and guarantee payment out of the United States Treasury. That is what was done in England.

BRITAIN WANTED TO BORROW OUR GOLD

Mr. President, in connection with my discussion of gold, I wish to refer now to what the late Mr. Bevan had to say to me in London, after I returned there from Birmingham, England. I considered Mr. Bevan a good, rough, tough man who knew his business. He had come up the hard way, through the mines. I wanted to see Mr. Cripps and Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill was sick, and I saw Anthony Eden in his place—not a very good substitute; but I did see him.

However, Mr. Bevan turned out to be just as tough as I had thought he was. My opening statement to him was that I thought he and I should get along all right because both of us had come up the same route.

We had quite a long talk. Finally, in sizing me up—unfortunately, he has since died—he said, "You know, I was not facetious, although some people thought I was, when I suggested, a few months ago"—it was in the spring of 1948 that I talked to him—"that you should lend your gold to us. We need it to support our currency."

Of course, when he said "lend," Mr. President, he referred to one of the gift loans that the record shows we so often make.

Mr. President, ordinarily I am very serious with dealing with representatives of other governments; but that remark of his was a little too much for my Irish sense of humor, which got the best of me, unfortunately; and I said, "Mr. Bevan, for 15 years we have had an administration in the United States which claims that gold is not necessary to back up a currency; and, to judge from the press reports of your statements, you agree with that position. So when did this great change come over you?"

Unfortunately, Mr. President, that ended the interview.

I wish to say again that we should keep the record straight. If any Member of the Senate takes issue with the points I am making, I hope he will do so while I am on the floor of the Senate so that we may debate the matter. Under the provisions of the pending measure, the President's power will be absolute, just as it was when the 1934 Act was first placed on the statute books.

Nothing good will come of either the peril-point amendment or the escape clause because the entire policy and program and announced objectives of the State Department contravene the purpose of the amendments. Therefore, Mr. President, all that the amendments can possibly amount to will be a nice cushion for the troubled consciences of Senators who vote for adoption of the amendments.

Mr. President, in regard to the advertisement I read a few moments ago, as it appears in a leading magazine, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial appearing in the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer, of Doylestown, Pa. The editorial is entitled "Philadelphia and the Tariff." I read from it:

Strange indeed is it to find the Philadelphia Bulletin teaching free-trade doctrines in the heart of the great industrial empire of southeastern Pennsylvania which owes its wealth to the American protective tariff.

How quickly the new generations forget the lessons of the past.

Mr. President, they have been living off subsidies long enough now.

I read further from the editorial:

Protectionism made Philadelphia—at least took it out of the slow tailspin it was in prior to the Civil War, and built it up during the war and during the reconstruction era into one of the major manufacturing centers of all the world.

And now a great newspaper that has benefited most conspicuously from the wealth which protectionism helped to create in and around the City of Brotherly Love, ridicules and belittles the foundations upon which its own and its community's prosperity were built.

So the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer chides the Philadelphia Bulletin.

Mr. President, one of the reasons why the full impact of the present policy has not yet been felt is that we are still arming the mendicants of the world, if you please, with the industrial machinery they need in order to be able to destroy Philadelphia under the free-trade system.

The editorial in the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer goes on to say:

Now get to the $64 question. Why is it that a skirt which, made in America, would sell for $25, can be manufactured by the British to sell for $12.75, tariff duty included?

Most of the difference in cost has to do with the standards of living of the workman in England, as compared with his American counterpart. The Briton is working on a wage which is only a fraction as much as that of the American.

Mr. President, if there is any doubt about that, just take a quick glance at chart No. 3, which now is displayed here in the Senate Chamber. This chart compares the wages paid in the manufacturing industries in the United States with those paid in similar industries in the United Kingdom. The chart shows that in the United States the average is $1.41, as compared with an average of 39 cents in the United Kingdom. However, the Philadelphia Bulletin wants free trade. Mr. President, we thank God for a little newspaper like the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer, which has the guts to speak out. Perhaps it has more guts than the Senate has; I am not sure yet.

I read further from the editorial:

The items of daily life which are considered necessities by the American—an automobile, all sorts of electrical equipment, etc.—are rare luxuries among the working classes in England.

And here's the point—

The editorial now is referring to the advertisement to which I have previously referred—an advertisement by an English manufacturer, appearing in an American magazine:

Every skirt sold by mail out of the production of the British mills is one less sold from the output of American labor.

Carrying the Bulletin argument to its logical extreme, we would buy this country's skirts out of the cheaper British market, and let our own factories shut down—and our American garment workers go on relief.

Mr. President, there seems to be no difference of opinion as to what the effect would be. Nevertheless we are met with a proposal from the great—and it is great—and dignified Senate Finance Committee that for two more years we put into the hands of a thoroughly discredited State Department the fate of every workingman and every industry and every investor in the United States. Mr. President, if any Senator has any fault to find with that statement or takes any exception to it, I shall be happy to have him debate it with me at some length.

I now submit the entire editorial from the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer for printing at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Doylestown (Pa.) Daily Intelligencer for March 29, 1951]

PHILADELPHIA AND THE TARIFF

Strange indeed is it to find the Philadelphia Bulletin preaching free-trade doctrines

in the heart of the great industrial empire of southeastern Pennsylvania which owes its wealth to the American protective tariff.

How quickly the new generations forget the lessons of the past.

Protectionism made Philadelphia—at least, took it out of the slow tailspin it was in prior to the Civil War, and built it up during that war and during the reconstruction era into one of the major manufacturing centers of all the world.

And now a great newspaper that has benefited most conspicuously from the wealth which protectionism helped create in and around the City of Brotherhood Love, ridicules and belittles the foundations upon which its own and its community's prosperity were built.

The Bulletin editorial, which appeared a few days ago, was entitled "Skirts From England." It refers to the fact that British manufacturers are offering mail order business to American women through advertisements in our magazines. The offer is to sell skirts direct by mail for $10 apiece. The point which gives the Bulletin concern is that when the mailman brings the skirt, he will collect an additional $2.75 as custom duty.

Says the Bulletin:

"Here is a tax which American women pay which puts any 2 or 3 percent sales tax in the shade. It is not often the weight of this tariff duty on the American consumer is brought home so plainly. Usually it is hidden in the price paid at the stores. When women pay their $2.75 they will know at first hand what is meant by a trade barrier and a tariff."

Now, let's look into this briefly.

The whole tenor of the British advertisement is that of offering a bargain. The ads speak of a "mere" $10 plus duty. Some of them broadly intimate that the American equivalent of these skirts would cost at least $25 apiece.

Assuming this to be the fact, which it quite likely is, then the Bulletin seems to be wasting its tears over the distress of American women who are thus able to buy $25 skirts for $12.75—but can't get them for $10.

Now get to the 64-dollar question. Why is it that a skirt which, made in America, would sell for $25, can be manufactured by the British to sell for $12.75, tariff duty included?

Most of the difference in cost has to do with the standards of living of the workmen in England, as compared with his American counterpart. The Briton is working on a wage which is only a fraction as much as that of the American. The items of daily life which are considered necessities by the American—an automobile, all sorts of electrical equipment, etc.—are rare luxuries among the working classes in England.

And here's the point. Every skirt sold by mail out of the production of the British mills is one less sold from the output of American labor.

Carrying the Bulletin argument to its logical extreme, we would buy this country's skirts out of the cheaper British market, and let our own factories shut down—and our American garment workers go on relief.

Does that begin to bring out the amazing position which the Bulletin has taken in this matter?

Philadelphia is a major wool center. The products run into the millions in value, the employees far into the thousands. Whole square miles are occupied by the various types of woolen mills and associated industries, as a ride through northeast Philadelphia will quickly verify.

The Bulletin philosophy would put all these out of business—give the market to the British—and do so, not because the British are more efficient in this line of production (they are not) but because the British worker is willing to work for less money than the American, is content with lower living standards, and is no longer in a position to do anything about it, under socialist semidictatorship, even if he is discontented with his "austerity."

But the matter goes still one step further in its disturbing implications.

The difference in living standards between American and British workmen does not account for the whole difference in price between the $25 American skirt and the $10 British counterpart.

An additional reason why the American skirt is so costly is that, concealed in its price, are the extravagant American taxes, which are high among other reasons because so many American dollars have been diverted to helping finance the British experience in socialism—direct loans, the Marshall plan, ECA, etc.

American prices are automatically driven up by high taxes, a principal share of the revenue of which is turned over to foreign competitors to help subsidize lower price on commodities sent to this country to compete with American production.

Moreover, the price-differential due to low foreign standards of living, and no longer equalized by protective tariffs, is not a phenomenon to be found solely in the field of stylish skirts for women. It covers a list as long as your arm. Glassware, shoes, dishes, watches—these are but a few of an extensive and growing number of articles where the American Government has put American producers (and working people) behind the eight ball.

Sometime the day of reckoning will arrive.

TWO BASIC PHILOSOPHIES

Mr. MALONE. There are in this country two opposing philosophies of government, the second headed, of course, by the State Department, where it germinated. That is where it has put its roots down, with a subservient Congress carrying it along. There have been for generations two well-defined philosophies in the matter of our domestic production and foreign trade. There is no mystery or secret about the results of either.

One school of thought would maintain our economic structure, our wage and living standards, through an adjustable floor under wages and investments, for convenience called tariffs or import fees, based upon a fair and reasonable competitive principle.

The second school of thought has always held that our markets must be divided with all foreign countries through the removal of such a floor under wages and investments, and that direct competition must be established between the workers of this Nation and the workers of countries which have lower wage and living standards, resulting in leveling the standards of living.

Let us see what the effect would be. The State Department has from the beginning preached that by such action we shall raise to our standard the living standards of foreign nations, such as India, China, the 16 Marshall plan countries, and, in fact, all others. I have seen all these countries. The conclusion of the advocates of the second philosophy is that, as a result of the division of our wealth, and of the division of our markets, which are the basis of our national income, the wage and living standards of all the other nations of the world would be raised. The thought of dividing our markets with all the other nations of the world, 150,000,000 people as against nearly 2,250,000,000, reminds me of a man who might stand at the edge of a city reservoir with a glass of water in his hand, and who might say, "I think it is well that I average the level of the water in my water glass and the water in the city reservoir," and who, thereupon, empties his glass into the reservoir. His glass would be empty, but the affect on the reservoir would be imperceptible. That is exactly what would happen if we were ever to have a period of peace without an emergency. Can anyone remember a time when we did not have an emergency in this country? There have been 18 years of emergencies. We are praying for peace. Peace would wreck our economic system within a very short time.

The first philosophy I mentioned immediately establishes a market for the nations of the world in this country, on a fair and reasonable competitive basis, and the objective is to maintain our standard of living, through tariffs and import fees based on that principle of a fair and reasonable competition, maintaining our standard while assisting other nations to raise theirs. It is not an overnight job.

THEORISTS RUN THE COUNTRY

When those espousing the second philosophy come into government, one would believe from their attitude that the reason for everyone not being rich is that no one ever thought of it; that all that is necessary is the printing of money which will result in everyone in this country being rich; that all that is necessary is the dividing of our markets with the nations of the world, and all the nations will live exactly as we do. The dream is wonderful. But we find, unfortunately, that the old-timers, who have met business payrolls, and who know what it is to run a business, to manufacture something, or to render professional service, to meet payrolls and rent bills, do not agree with that theory; and the unfortunate part is that when the theory is tried out, and when it finally falls flat, it is then too late.

THEORISTS RUN THE COUNTRY

We find these hand-raised economists, who have never run a business, and who could not run a business, occupying offices in the State Department and in the White House. Their theory is that the more one spends, the wealthier he becomes; that all we have to do is have an emergency, in order that the money may be taken from the taxpayers of America, and everyone will become rich almost immediately—everyone, that is, except the taxpayers. What seems to be given very little thought is that it would slowly drain the heart's blood of American business and industry, and destroy the working man's wages.

The second philosophy, that of the hand-raised economists in this administration, immediately puts the workers and investors of this Nation into direct competition with the sweatshop labor of the world, and it can only result in a leveling of our own standards. It has never been denied that "one economic world" is the objective.

THE MAIN NEED IS MARKETS

Now it is said, "Well, we do not write off the tariff entirely, we only lower the tariff, we give them the benefit of a market." That is one thing which they found out through the Marshall plan. The junior Senator from Nevada, on the Senate floor, explained that the possession of manufacturing equipment is not the objective. Anyone may construct a plant and get the credit with which to do it, if he has the markets. It is possession of the markets which must come first. Any industrial engineer in America will verify that, and the junior Senator from Nevada worked in that business during the last 15 years of his professional career.

When the basis of income is divided, there is then but one way to meet the situation. Either the workers in this country will become unemployed, and the investment lost, or there will be a lowering of the wages and the writing off of enough of the investment to meet the competition. When we shall have finally used up the substance of this country—and how long that will take is a matter of conjecture—we shall be in a position similar to that of the man who has lived on not only his life's savings, but the credit based upon a character built up through a lifetime: How long does it take him to rebuild it?

FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE SUBSTITUTE

The substitute which I am today offering for the pending bill proposes two things. First, it proposes to establish a definite principle of fair and reasonable competition as the criterion of establishing a market in this country for the goods of foreign nations. It establishes fair and reasonable competition, not a barrier to keep the goods of other countries from entering the United States. The substitute does not mention high or low tariffs, but simply provides for a tariff structure ensuring fair and reasonable competition.

It seems to me that adoption of the proposal would mean that the United States of America was going a long way to establish a market for the goods of foreign nations on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. No laborer, no worker, in the United States of America, no investor that I have ever seen, has ever complained when asked to compete on a fair and reasonable basis.

FOREIGN TRADE AUTHORITY

Second, Mr. President, the substitute establishes a foreign trade authority. All it would do would be to turn the Tariff Commission into a foreign trade authority, because that more nearly represents its functions. The Tariff Commission has had long experience. It knows its business. Of course persons can be appointed to the Tariff Commission who have a philosophy which would destroy the principle of the bill, but the present members know their business, and know how to arrive at a fair and reasonable competitive basis.

So there would be established an independent foreign trade authority to determine the tariffs and import fees on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, a principle laid down by Congress in the same manner as Congress long ago laid down the principle of a reasonable return on investments as a basis of determining freight rates of common carriers, and placed the Interstate Commerce Commission in complete charge of the matter. That action would return to the Congress the responsibility which the Constitution placed in the legislative branch of the Government, and it would take that duty away from an entirely irresponsible State Department.

I suppose that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], who does me the honor to be listening to what I have to say, will agree with that statement. What we are doing, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, is simply extending for 2 years the authority over the working men and investors of this country, an authority exercised by a thoroughly discredited State Department, an authority which it has been using to remake the economic map of this country. That is the bill which the Finance Committee has reported to the Senate. The amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have offered would operate on the same principle as the law which established the Interstate Commerce Commission. A firm principle would be established. There is no principle at this time.

FIRM PRINCIPLES ABANDONED

Mr. President, all established principles for the fixing of tariffs and import fees have been abandoned. For 75 years the tariff-and-import-fee system has been utilized in establishing a market for the goods of foreign nations, with a tariff or import fee representing the differential, between the cost and productiveness of an hour of American labor and an hour of foreign labor. The principle has been abandoned by the State Department in favor of the sharpshooting and horse-trading method of lowering tariffs and import fees beyond any fair and reasonable competitive position. For what? For some mythical or fancied advantage in some other field. The sharpshooting comes about through the effort to protect a particular product which someone happens to be interested, or by selecting a certain industry to suffer especially. There is no principle whatever attached to it.

SUBSIDIES ARE NOT NEEDED UNDER FLEXIBLE TARIFF

Farm products are protected by a subsidy. I am in favor of a subsidy when tariffs and import fees are removed or utterly destroyed; but, Mr. President, 80 to 85 percent of the farm products of the Nation do not need subsidies if they have a tariff or an import fee protection on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. Such protection is removed when surplus farm products from other nations are brought into this country, not on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, but at lower prices.

Mr. President, I heard the debate with reference to potatoes coming in from Canada, and about buying kerosene with which to burn them. It seemed to the discredit of the Department of Agriculture that it was burning potatoes. I thought the Agriculture Department was wrong in recommending the system in the first place, instead of such tariffs as I am discussing, but I have noticed since I have been a Member of the Senate, during the past 4½ years, that it does not make much difference what the Secretary of Agriculture recommends, and it does not make any difference what the President recommends. The Senate of the United States has to vote on the question. If a bill does not pass, it does not become a law. That is something which we might remember when we blame the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of the Treasury. They are working under laws passed by Congress, many of which have to be renewed at certain intervals. What do we do? I think we vote by rote.

ITO NOT ABANDONED

Much credit is being given the State Department for announcing that the International Trade Organization would not be pressed upon Congress, but little attention is being paid to the fact that chapter 4, the commercial policy chapter of the International Trade Organization charter, has been adopted with the general agreement on tariffs and trade. Under GATT, all the commerical policy aspects of the International Trade Organization have been adopted for which further congressional legislation is not absolutely required, and it is expected that legislation will be offered to complete the adoption of the commerical policy chapter of the International Trade Organization charter.

In that regard, much has been made of the promise of the Secretary of State that he will not press the International Trade Organization. I want to read a paragraph from a release of the State Department of December 15, 1950, only 6 months ago, in which it is said:

> As a result of this review the interested agencies have recommended and the President has agreed that while the proposed Charter for an International Trade Organization should not be resubmitted to the Congress—

The junior Senator from Nevada stated on the floor of the Senate less than a year ago that he dared those supporting this recommendation to bring it before the Senate. The reason why it did not come to the Senate floor was because they knew it would be defeated. So they say that the proposed Charter for an International Trade Organization should not be resubmitted to the Congress.

I read further from the press release:

> Congress should be asked to consider legislation which will make American participation in the General Agreement more effective. The many serious problems now facing our Congress and the legislatures of other countries require that we concentrate on the trade programs that are most urgently needed and will most quickly produce concrete results.

So, Mr. President, we shall be asked to pass on legislation that will make all the GATT provisions effective. When that is done, I should like to have someone explain to me how far away we shall be from the International Trade Organization. Almost everything that can be done under the International Trade Organization, as proposed, can be done under GATT.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the release by the Department of State, No. 1221, dated December 6, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The release is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
December 6, 1950.

The governments participating in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, now meeting in Torquay, England, will shortly take up the question of the future administration of the agreement.

In anticipation of this discussion, the executive agencies of this Government have reviewed the status of legislation affecting American participation in the General Agreement. This includes the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which is scheduled to expire on June 12, 1951, the proposals to simplify our customs laws and regulations, and the proposed charter for an international trade organization.

As a result of this review the interested agencies have recommended and the President has agreed, that while the proposed charter for an international trade organization should not be resubmitted to the Congress, Congress should be asked to consider legislation which will make American participation in the General Agreement more effective. The many serious problems now facing our Congress and the legislatures of other countries, require that we concentrate on the trade programs that are most urgently needed and will most quickly produce concrete results.

We must, of course, continue the Trade Agreements Act. This has become a fundamental part of our foreign policy. In addition, we should continue to build upon the trade-agreements program by developing machinery for the administration of the General Agreement so as to permit it to operate more continuously and effectively.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade came into force provisionally on January 1, 1948. It is the first multination trade agreement concluded under the Trade Agreements Act. It is a landmark in the history of international commercial relations and represents the most constructive effort ever undertaken for the simultaneous reduction of trade barriers among the nations of the free world. Thirty-two governments are at present parties to the agreement and seven more are expected to join at the conclusion of the tariff negotiations now being conducted at Torquay, England.

The general agreement has achieved remarkable results. There has not, however, been any administrative machinery to permit continuing consultation among the participating countries on the problems that arise in interpreting and applying the agreement. This has been a serious handicap, since it has been difficult to handle matters of this kind solely through the semiannual sessions of the participants themselves. It is important that this handicap be removed promptly if the agreement is to do its full part in increasing trade among the free nations and in eliminating the commercial causes of international friction.

To meet the need for improved organization, the United States will suggest to the other governments concerned the creation of the necessary administrative machinery, including a small permanent staff. Appropriate legislative authority for this purpose will be sought in connection with renewal of the trade-agreements program.

Before United States participation in the general agreement can be made fully effective it will be necessary to simplify our customs laws and regulations in some respects. Certain provisions of the agreement cannot be applied until this has been done. The customs-simplification bill introduced in the Congress last spring would accomplish most of the needed improvements in the customs laws. Congressional action in this field will again be requested next year.

Mr. MALONE. The purpose of placing the release in the RECORD, Mr. President, is to bring forcibly to the attention of the Senate that the State Department is not yet through with legislation proposed to make effective the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade initiated in Geneva in 1947, and continued to this date. It is my understanding that at Torquay, the whole multilateral agreement was extended for 3 years.

PRESENT POLICY CONTINUED

There is an announced policy of the State Department, as well as of the President. That policy has been announced every few months during the last several years. We now have before us a bill which does not direct the President to do anything. I categorically say again that it does not direct the President to do anything. Therefore, who believes that there will be any change in the policy of the President of the United States and the State Department in relation to trade? It has been the announced policy to divide the markets of the United States with the foreign countries by fostering imports in order to make relief under the ECA and Marshall plan unnecessary. What does that mean? It simply means that our income is divided, so that we shall arrive at the point of having the same standard of living other countries have. It means that there will be no trade-balance deficit. What is a trade-balance deficit? It is just the same as the deficit of an individual who spends more money than he makes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Nevada look with favor on the proposal that the administration of the ECA be placed in the State Department under Mr. Acheson?

Mr. MALONE. I believe it will make little difference if the former Director of ECA, Mr. Hoffman, is placed at the head of the State Department, and Mr. Acheson is placed in charge of ECA. I think that could be done without a ripple being observed.

Mr. Hoffman has advocated the same things Mr. Acheson has advocated. Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman were very close together in their views on international trade. If it were possible to do more to arm Russia, through the Marshall Plan countries, as well as arming Communist China, and giving those nations the materials necessary to consolidate their gains, Russia to consolidate her gains and Communist China and the iron curtain countries theirs, I do believe that Mr. Acheson might improve upon that situation. That would be by reason of his having more experience, Mr. President. Mr. Acheson has had a little more experience in giving things away, and arming our enemies, and making it impossible for us to do business in the world today, than Mr. Hoffman has had. But give Mr. Hoffman time, give him time.

THE ITO THROUGH THE BACK DOOR

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to discuss the back door entrance to the ITO through GATT. Do not forget "GATT." Senators are going to hear a great deal about GATT in the next year or so, because the State Department has given their promise not to bring up the ITO. Their promise, of course, means nothing so far as I can see, because the issue will be evaded.

They have changed their international policy in the last 30 days. I see these changes coming about, although it is said there will be no change. So the junior Senator from Nevada does not believe they have had a change of heart either as to the Far East or in regard to ITO. They are simply going to reach their goal in another way, through kidding the American public. How long they can do that remains to be seen. But in reaching the ITO through the back door of GATT, Mr. President, the State Department in its release from which I have just quoted, number 1221, dated December 6, 1950, which will be found in the RECORD, announced that interested agencies have recommended, and the President has agreed, that the proposed charter for an international trade organization should not be resubmitted to the Congress.

Mr. President, I might say that ITO was here for two consecutive years at least as a must on the President's must list. The Senate has learned over a period of 16 to 18 years what a must list is, and we have been "musted" to the point where now just a suggestion has about the same effect as a demand.

This announcement seems like an amazing change of heart on the part of an administration which has assured the Congress for the last few years that the charter for an international trade organization was an integral part of the foreign economic policy of this Nation. That is what they said, Mr. President.

First, there was the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, under which the division of markets was initiated. Second, there was the Marshall plan, or ECA, which makes up the trade balance deficits of the 16 Marshall-plan countries, while we are dividing the markets of our Nation so there will be no further trade balance deficits. Then, Mr. President, there was the proposal of the International Trade Organization, which proposal was simply to put into the hands of 55 or 58 or 60 nations, whatever number should join the ITO, the handling of tariffs and other economic matters.

Our Nation was the key to the ITO. If we did not join the ITO there was nothing to divide, so there would be no ITO. Any other Nation could hold out, and there would yet be an ITO, but that was not true with respect to the United States. We are the only Nation that has any markets to divide.

SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE AN EXAMPLE

So, Mr. President, that is what they are after. That is what they were after in the San Francisco Conference in 1945, when the junior Senator from Nevada was an observer there representing the Senate Military Affairs Committee. The Senator from Nevada was not a Member

of the Senate at that time. He observed that conference for 4 months. What did he find? At the end of the conference he was asked a question in an interview. The question was "What do you think of this great international conference?" "Well," the junior Senator from Nevada said, "there were 50 nations there. The other 49 nations were there with market baskets on their arms, and there was only one nation there to put anything into those baskets." That ended the interview. But the result is as he then stated it would be. The International Trade Organization, composed of 55, or 58, or 60 nations, depending upon how many were to come into the organization, would, had we accepted it, put our tariffs through a series of manipulations and regulations, and the ITO would have had authority over allocation and production entirely. We would have been a part of the organization, but a very small part of it, because each nation would have only one vote.

What are we doing now? We are going into the ITO through the back door, using GATT as the door. Every piece of legislation coming to Congress from now on with relation to foreign trade will be a step toward the International Trade Organization; but it will not be called ITO.

Mr. Thorp and Mr. Acheson and others have said repeatedly before committees that each of the three things mentioned earlier were an integral part of the plan for world recovery. Everyone recovers but us. We are the ones who pay the bill. The mere fact that other nations were nearly 100-percent recovered—from 95 to 98 percent recovered—when we initiated the Marshall plan seems to have very little to do with it. Within a year the natural recovery would have been well over 100 percent. That was not the goal. The goal was the leveling of the living standards of the world, including our own.

Does this announcement regarding the ITO mean that the State Department has given up its plans for "one economic world"? Let us look at the facts. The press release mentioned that instead of continuing agitation for the passage of legislation allowing ratification of the charter for the ITO, the State Department will seek further extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. That is what is before us today, Mr. President, with certain new amendments. Also an effort will be made to have the new Customs Simplification Act passed by the Congress. The Customs Simplification Act is another subterfuge. It is time for the Senate to scrutinize all the proposed simplification acts and other acts allegedly for the benefit of the United States, and every move by the thoroughly discredited State Department.

What this really means is that the State Department has decided that the opposition to the International Trade Organization is so strong that it must find some other way to bring about free trade. Thus, instead of asking the Congress to approve or disapprove the Charter of the International Trade Organization, the State Department will try to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act with certain amendments which would put a large part of the ITO Charter into operation without asking the advice and consent of the Senate.

SENATE OUGHT TO RATIFY TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. President, it seems to the junior Senator from Nevada that the least the Finance Committee could do would be to amend the bill so as to make trade treaties treaties in fact, subject to approval by two-thirds of the Members of this august body. It has been so long since a treaty requiring a two-thirds vote has been submitted to the Senate, that I suppose the school children of the country have forgotten that there is any such a thing as a requirement that a treaty be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Some of the smart, hand-raised economists in the State Department do not understand the realities of the situation. Make no mistake about it; they are smart. All they lack is an anchor. All they lack is experience to tie what they know to the realities. But let no one suppose that they are not smart. Unless one understands what he is talking about, he had better not try to argue with one of them on theory.

They do not understand that there is reality to this question, a hard side to it. However, they do understand how to draft legislation, how to wet down the Congress and allay the fears of the Senate when they come before a Senate committee. The Secretary of State testified that he had no intention of bringing up the International Trade Organization. Was not that a great statement? It looked like a great surrender to a fine Senate committee. However, it was only the same old story in different words. It was not a surrender. It was going in the back door.

Another phase of the State Department's plan to circumvent a ratification of the ITO charter is the proposal to simplify the customs laws and regulations. A portion of the press release which I quoted says that before United States participation in the general agreement can be made fully effective it will be necessary to simplify our customs laws and regulations in some respects.

Mr. President, what are the "respects"? Certain provisions of the GATT cannot be implemented until this has been done. The customs-simplification bill introduced in the Congress last spring would accomplish most of the needed improvements in the customs laws. Thus we see that the State Department has found a way to avoid asking the Senate for advice and consent in making a treaty. Two simple procedures can bring about almost the same result. A change in the customs laws is necessary to make GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—more effective. This more effective GATT is made permanent and stronger by a change in some of the administrative procedures and the establishment of a permanent staff.

I am bringing this matter before the Congress at this time to serve as a warning of the devious ways in which the administration plans to hoodwink the Congress after the elections have shown that the people are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that the State Department and the President have been using every means at their command to bring about free trade and one economic world.

Mr. President, how plain does an administration have to make it to the Senate that its objective is one economic world? When we spend more than we earn it is called deficit financing, and we make up the deficit through any subterfuge we can thrust through a trusting Congress, and which Congress can convince a trusting people is necessary.

I hope it is not necessary to review the things which have been done. Everything is new as it comes along. Everything will solve all our problems. First we had lend-lease. Then we had UNRRA. Then we made a loan—perhaps it was a gift loan—of $3,750,000,000 to England.

Those who knew the truth in Europe and elsewhere knew that at first there was no intention of giving money to any other nation besides Great Britain. But we were advised that unless other nations were taken in under the cover it would probably be very difficult to get through another loan of several billion dollars to the British Empire.

MARSHALL PLAN WAS AN INNOCUOUS PARAGRAPH

So Mr. Marshall—the same Mr. Marshall who had trouble in remembering critical things at the Pearl Harbor investigation, and at a recent investigation—had a certain paragraph in his speech at Harvard. I doubt to this day if Marshall knew what was in his speech. It was only a small paragraph. However, there had been a great many conversations with representatives of the British Empire up to that point. When the newspapers headlined the subject the next morning Mr. Bevan—the same Mr. Bevan whom I described a while ago as wanting to borrow our gold to bolster their economy—took the ball on the first bounce and in 30 days told the Congress of the United States what it was going to cost us. He did not miss it by much. It was $17,000,000,000 for 5 years. Added to what we had already given in outright gifts to the world up to that point, since World War II, it amounted to about $37,000,000,000 or $38,000,000,000—a little more than—if you like comparisons, Mr. President—the total valuation for tax purposes of the 11 Western States, including California, Oregon, and Washington, and 14 Southern States, including Texas. That is how much it amounted to. Congress took it in its stride. The cushions here are soft, and the air is conditioned. Spending a billion dollars is a matter of only a few minutes' work. Seventeen billion dollars took us only a week. Unusual delay, Mr. President. Since that time it has taken less time.

HOW TO GET AROUND OPPOSITION TO ITO

Mr. President, it has become clear that the change in Congress would make it difficult to allow ratification of the charter for the ITO. Therefore this means was devised of getting around the opposition.

Let us take a closer look at the GATT and the ITO. The heart of the International Trade Organization charter is chapter IV, entitled "Commercial Policy." That is what international trade agreements deal with principally. In all essentials the chapter is identical with the text of the Geneva Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

What is GATT? In the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee entitled "Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act," on H. R. 1212, held in February 1949, part I, pages 60–151, we find a comparison between the relevant clauses of the GATT and the ITO Charter. It is an illuminating document, and I warmly recommend the hearings for the Senate's attention and study.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as interpreted by the State Department, has allowed the United States to lead the way to the formation of GATT, which puts into operation the most important provisions of the ITO.

The Customs Simplification Act would allow freer entry of commodities and would make the importation of low-cost, competitive imports even easier.

In other words, Mr. President, the administration wants to simplify the customs law, so there would be no delay at customs, or so it sounds.

Mr. President, the simplification of our laws will bear watching if proposed by the State Department.

A closer look at the Customs Simplification Act shows that the act is not exactly what its title implies. At this point I wish to say that very little legislation which has been proposed in Congress in the 4½-year period during which I have been a Member of this august body turns out upon examination to be what it appears to be. Most of the legislation is full of sleepers. There is at least one sleeper, and probably more. Usually the legislation is introduced to carry out the objective of the department which is proposing the legislation. Such an objective may have nothing whatever to do with the title. In other words, the objective of the bill may have nothing to do with the objective as announced in the title of the bill.

It is only fair to make the administration of our customs laws simpler. We are all in favor of it, if it can be done. I believe few persons would argue that the elimination of excess red tape is not a worth-while endeavor. However, under the innocuous title of "Customs Simplification" we find some provisions which go far beyond mere simplification.

Without going into detail, I do wish to point to a few facts in the Customs Simplification Act which shows that the bill would do more than just simplify.

The Antidumping Act is amended as the material injury to a domestic industry or material retarding of the establishment of a new industry in the United States must be in evidence before the Secretary of the Treasury will declare the existence of dumping. No judgment can be exercised. Mr. President, by this device the administration gives its blessing to dumping, which is the selling of foreign goods far below the actual cost of production

Moreover, any antidumping duty imposed on dumped goods in consequence of a declaration of the Secretary of the Treasury is reduced by the amount of any countervailing duties in effect.

Countervailing duties, it may be recalled, are imposed on imported goods produced with the help of grants or a bounty. What does it mean? It means that the administration severely reduces a penalty which is imposed on goods which are imported at artificially low prices.

Why am I going into these provisions? I am going into them because the Senate for the 4½ years during which the Senator from Nevada has been a Member of the Senate has had a habit of taking everything as a separate bill, as a separate objective, with no connection whatever with what has gone before or what may come in the future. That is why the junior Senator from Nevada previously pointed out six principles or six different methods of approach to wreck the economic system of the United States. Mr. President, you have to watch all the gates when you are dealing with a department of this Government.

The administration also seeks to amend the law which provides for the imposition of countervailing duties by requiring material injury to a domestic industry, or material retarding of the establishment of a new industry. The upshot of these amendments is that the administration feels that the payment of one penalty, even in the case of an offense covering both dumping goods and selling goods subsidized, is sufficient. Thus, dumping and selling subsidized foreign goods in the United States is practically legalized, except for material injury to a domestic industry. How material the injury must be is not defined.

Mr. President, I should like to ask how many Members of the Senate knew that these provisions were included in a customs simplification bill? One would naturally visualize the cutting of some red tape, so that it would not be necessary to do so much paper work or look up so many regulations. In other words, one would think that the Customs Simplification Act would speed up the entry into this country of any product which is entitled to come in, but not destroy the safeguards around American workingmen and American investors. I say it is time we started reading these bills.

Thus, Mr. President, dumping and selling foreign-subsidized goods in the United States is practically legalized, except in cases of material injury to a domestic industry. How material the injury must be is not defined; that is left to one of the hand-raised economists or one of the administration's stalwarts, who holds his job, in most cases, at least, not because of his qualifications, but because of some inside way of getting the job. I think the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has described that method several times.

Section 3 of the Customs Simplification Act amends the requirement that all imported goods bear labels giving the name of the maker and the country of origin.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am interested in the Senator's opinion of the amendment dealing with fur-bearing animals, offered last year by the Senator from Wisconsin. Will the Senator give us his opinion of it?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to do so. I believe that amendment constitutes the only possible relief from a free-trade administration that is utterly destroying the economy of the United States, except when it can use new taxpayers' money from the Treasury, thus continually increasing the public debt and increasing the taxes in its efforts to get money with which to pay subsidies and to let large contracts so as to keep our employment and our economy afloat. I say that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is the only possible relief; but if the flexible-import-fee principle were adopted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, I feel that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin would be the first to say that the adoption of his amendment would not be necessary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. For the information of the very distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, let me say that I intend to submit the amendment again this year, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin whether it is true that the fur-raising industry of the United States is practically wrecked by the importation from Russia of animal skins.

Mr. McCARTHY. Unquestionably that is true, and that situation is much more serious than many of my colleagues realize. I am very much concerned about it.

I may state that an increased number of farmers are making a substantial part of their income by means of the production of ranch-raised furs. They were doing rather well until Russia began dumping her furs into the United States.

We also know that the income from Russian furs which are dumped in the United States furnishes a major part of the funds used to finance Russian espionage work in this country. There can be no question about that.

As the Senator knows, shortly after I submitted my amendment the first time, the FBI arrested six men who were working in Amtorg, the Russian trading company which has been dumping Russian furs in the United States. At that time it developed beyond any dispute that they were using the money to purchase, for example, Geiger counters and many other instruments which they could not clear through our regular export licensing channels. In that way they were smuggling those instruments out of the United States. It also developed that they were using considerable parts of the funds thus obtained to finance their espionage work in the United States.

As the Senator knows, at that time the Senate adopted the amendment. However, the House of Representatives had not adopted it, and the State Department did a very effective job of lobbying, and succeeded in getting the conferees to knock out the amendment.

Since that time, I think the Senate and the House may have gotten a better picture of the situation; and I hope that this year, when the Senate adopts the amendment, the conferees will abide by the vote of the Senate on the amendment, and will finally, at long last, permit us to have, first some relief for a great segment of our farming population and, second, will deal, not a death blow, but at least a rather heavy blow to the Communist conspiracy in the United States, by cutting off its funds.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very glad that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has brought up that matter at this time.

I would say to him, for the RECORD—although, of course, I believe he is fully familiar with the fact, if we could reestablish a principle so that any farm products which were imported would be imported on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, from 80 to 85 percent of the farm products would not need a tariff. However, until that time and until the country comes to its senses—Mr. President, I should apologize for making that statement, for the country has come to its senses. The resolutions coming to us from labor, which I have read, and the resolution coming from the Farm Bureau in my State, which I am about to read in the course of these remarks, and what I hear when I go home and when I go to other States of the Union proves to me, that the country is at least 2 or 3 years ahead of the Senate of the United States. The country has realized the utter futility of the present free-trade program which destroys American industries and also would lower the standard of living in a futile effort to preserve our industries, after really destroying them.

However, judging by the unanimous vote on the part of the Finance Committee, it has not yet caught up with the Senate, and of course is a long way behind the people of the country. I am in hopes that the members of that committee will have an opportunity to go home this summer—unless there is another emergency or some other police action—so that at that time they can obtain at least some idea of how far ahead of them the country is, and then will get their feet on the ground in regard to some of these matters.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that I think this measure is infinitely better than the one we passed last year. However, it contains one provision which gives me considerable concern, and I think it will interest the able senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I refer to a provision to the effect that if the Senate Finance Committee or the House Ways and Means Committee finds that a certain industry is being wrecked because of unusual tariff concessions, either of those committees may require a hearing by the Tariff Commission. As the senior Senator from North Dakota pointed out the other day, one such hearing has been pending for some 13 years before the Tariff Commission.

Mr. LANGER. I beg the Senator's pardon; the hearing has been pending before the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. McCARTHY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

I wonder whether this provision would be strengthened considerably by including in it words to the effect that after the Finance Committee or the Ways and Means Committee refers the problem of a certain industry to the Tariff Commission, if the Commission does not act within a reasonable period of time—for instance, let us say, within 6 months or a year—at the end of that period, if no action has been taken, the tariff will revert to what it was prior to the making of the agreement which caused the difficulty.

What does the Senator think about that?

Mr. MALONE. I believe it would be a good provision. However, I wish to say again, as I have said to the Senate at least four or five times either today or yesterday—and I make this statement categorically—that there is nothing in this measure which directs the President to do anything.

I have several amendments to offer, and I hope the Senate will adopt them, because in that case the President will be directed to do these things.

However, I say again, so as to keep the record straight, that many inaccurate statements are made to the effect that this measure requires the President to do certain things. The actual fact is that the bill as now constituted would not require the President to do anything which he does not choose to do.

I make that statement categorically; and if any Senator wishes to debate it, I hope he will do so before the vote is taken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that I may submit certain matters for the RECORD or the Appendix, for 5 or 6 minutes, without causing the distinguished Senator from Nevada to lose the floor.

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, with that understanding.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to be captious or to raise objections unnecessarily. I, of course, shall have no objection to the insertion of matters in the RECORD, but I do not think that one speech should be interrupted by another.

Mr. LANGER. I will take but 5 or 6 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that, but we shall never finish consideration of the pending bill, if this practice is permitted to continue. At this time I raise no objection, but I serve notice now that I shall object hereafter to extraneous matters being brought before the Senate. In this case, however, I raise no objection.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(At this point Mr. MALONE yielded to Mr. LANGER, who submitted Senate resolution 142 and various matters for the Appendix and the body of the RECORD, which appear elsewhere under the appropriate headings. Mr. MALONE also yielded to Mr. MAGNUSON to address questions to Mr. GEORGE regarding the pending bill, which appear at the conclusion of the speech of Mr. MALONE.)

1949 AMENDMENTS REJECTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in line with the inquiry of the Senator from Wisconsin and the senior Senator from North Dakota as to the application of amendments proposed 2 years ago to protect against the importation of certain furs and other materials, I recall at least three amendments which had been offered. One of them was offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to protect furs through a system of quotas, I believe. If that is an incorrect statement, I shall be glad to correct it. There was at least one amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] dealing with agricultural products. One of the principal amendments offered at the time of the consideration of the last extension of the act, and which I understand may be offered again this year, was one dealing with the quota on oil imports, with which I heartily agreed. I had predicted a glut of oil imports at least a year before the bill came before the Senate, in 1949, for an extension of 3 years, but making it retroactive so that the President would not have to adhere to the peril-point procedure. The Senate never did find out by how much the President exceeded the peril-point recommendations of the Tariff Commission during the negotiations at Annecy, France.

In 1948, in a radio address to a number of West Virginia people, I predicted that imports of oil from the Middle East and other sources could conceivably close down a large number of oil-producing wells and coal mines which furnish fuel a considerable distance from the source for generating steam power and for manufacturing and industrial purposes, because fuel could be imported into this country for estimated figures of $1.70 or $1.80 a barrel. The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] offered an amendment with relation to quotas on oil imports, which would have been entirely unnecessary under a tariff system with fair and reasonable competition as a basis.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is not the Senator from Nevada forgetting other important amendments, for example, an amendment dealing with mercury? We were entirely dependent upon Spain and Portugal for mercury.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. At the same time, every mercury mine in the United States,

including one in which former President Hoover was interested, was closed.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. There was also an amendment with reference to manganese. There is manganese in Arizona, New Mexico, and some other States——

Mr. MALONE. Including Nevada.

Mr. LANGER. But we are almost totally dependent upon the Far East for manganese. Does the Senator remember the discussion?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada does remember the additional amendments.

Mr. LANGER. There was also the matter of tungsten, which we used to get from China. There was some tungsten discovered in Idaho which took care of the situation for a short time during World War II. As a matter of fact, this country is today totally dependent upon other countries for this very strategic and necessary metal.

I am sure the Senator remembers the other metals which were discussed so ably by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. He went into detail with respect to one mining product after another, which, through deals made by the State Department, were coming in from other countries, with the result that our industries were lagging and American labor was not being employed.

That is typical of what happened in World War II, when President Roosevelt stopped production of gold in Colorado, keeping 2,000 men out of employment, while at the same time gold was being shipped into this country from Canada.

When the Senator from Nevada mentioned oil and one or two other products, I am sure he forgot that we tried to amend a measure similar to the one now pending so as to take care of the mining industry of the United States. I hope the Senator will take some time to dwell upon the mining situation, with which he is perhaps as familiar as is any other Senator on the floor, coming, as he does, from the State of Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator. I do recall the amendments to which reference has been made. I mentioned oil only as an example. I am glad the Senator has seen fit to mention other products and other amendments. Such amendments would have been unnecessary if we had had a tariff and import fee system established on a principle, not on a policy such as the State Department has pursued during the past 18 years.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator remember that the testimony showed that as to mercury, during the war, a flask cost $205, but that after the war was over, mercury was permitted to come in at $85 a flask? As soon as the American mines were closed the price of mercury shot right up again, and millions of American dollars went to other countries, while the producers in this country were closed down entirely.

THE WHOLE CONCEPT OF TRADE AGREEMENTS WRONG

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada remembers those things only too well. That is one of the reasons, I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, why I am in the Senate today. Eighteen years ago, when the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was passed, its announced objective was fallacious. It was the beginning of the destruction of a long-range policy and a sound principle of building up the standard of living in this Nation above the standards of living in other nations of the world. I made up my mind at that time that the new policy was wrong. I certainly tried to gather industrial information, on its effects. This was available in the field, where businessmen and miners operate 3,000 miles away from the capital in Washington, which is a long distance, especially when we consider the way in which Washington is now being run, mostly controlled, I am sorry to say, from foreign sources. There is no question in my mind that we are following a British policy, supporting the British colonial system, and our free-trade system has a great deal to do with supporting it.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT IS SURPRISING

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada was astounded when H. R. 1612 was reported to the Senate. It seemed impossible that the Trade Agreements Act, should be extended after all the testimony involving the precision-instrument industry, the crockery industry, and almost every other industry except, perhaps, the automobile industry, heavy machinery, farm machinery, heavy road machinery, and certain other types of machinery and intricate fabricated goods which producers are not yet able to manufacture in foreign countries even with the lower wages that are paid there. Emphasis should be put on the words "not yet." But I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that if foreign producers are given 5 years it will be found that automobiles, heavy machinery, and other materials will be manufactured there and shipped to America in competition with the products manufactured here by high-standard-of-living labor and with the money of investors of this country.

It is only 3 years ago that a British or other European concerning making generators could underbid us by $250,000 on a generator costing $500,000 or $600,000. Such things are going on all the time. They are going on with respect to a half-a-million-dollar generator, and Diesel engines, down to a dress such as that described in the advertisement which was read into the RECORD today by the junior Senator from Nevada from a national magazine. Nothing is being overlooked. What is there foreign nations cannot do? The Ford organization has established itself in Europe. General Motors has established itself there. Typewriter companies are going to Scotland and Japan.

FREE IMPORTS OF GOODS ARE LIKE FREE IMMIGRATION

I ask Senators to look at the chart which appears in the back of the Senate Chamber, and then I ask them how they can vote to put into our country the products of sweatshop labor of Japan, at 12 cents an hour, that of France at 21 cents an hour, the low rates of wages paid in all other countries, with the exception of Canada.

Labor in the other countries is paid practically nothing by comparison with what is paid labor in this country. They have nothing that we call decent working conditions. Anyone who can vote to permit the entry of products manufactured by such low-paid labor would have to be in favor of free immigration, because there is no difference between the importation of the products of cheap labor and the importation of the labor itself. If any Senator would like to debate that question I should be very happy to go into it in more detail.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is not all the Senator has mentioned, and much more, of a perfect pattern with what we have seen happening during the past 20 years? Our Government has sent billions upon billions of dollars to foreign countries, for example, to build roads. One was a road through Canada, the Alcan Highway. Not only did we build it, but we even agreed to maintain it for 5 years after the war. Is it not true that in Austria, and in one foreign country after another, we have built thousands and thousands of miles of highway? Is it not true that in Austria, for example, our Government has built beautiful homes and apartment houses at the very time when our veterans cannot find homes for themselves in this country? Is it not true that in one year our Government shipped 34,000 boxcars to England and France, at a time when our own farmers could not ship their own grain to market by reason of the shortage of boxcars? Is it not true that our Government began to build a road to South America, and that after the building had proceeded as far as it could proceed, some of the machinery, almost new, was dumped?

Have we not had one illustration after another of the pattern being followed of wasting American taxpayers' money in behalf of the peoples of other countries, at a time when an investigation by a House committee disclosed that it will require $15,000,000,000 merely to take care of the highways of the United States over a 5-year period; that it is going to require $5,000,000,000 to develop our health program in this country for the next 5 years; at the very time we are having a terrific housing shortage of our own? Is it not all a part of one pattern, whether it be called the point 4 program, the ECA program, the Marshall plan program? In the last analysis does it not all simmer down to the fact that we, with 7 percent of the world's population, are trying to take care of the remaining 93 percent of the world's population scattered all over the earth, even though in this country there

are vast numbers of families trying to exist on $2,000 a year? Is not that a condition we should wipe out in America? And is not action on the bill now pending before us at least the taking of one step in the right direction?

THE COUNTRY IS RETURNING TO SANITY

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the Senator from North Dakota that there are signs of returning sanity in this country. The signs are more prevalent out where the people themselves are. There are very few of those signs in Washington, D. C. Washington is made up of people who work for the Government of the United States, or of people who work for people who work for the Government, or of people who sell something to those who work for the Government. Then there are 80 or 90 ambassadors, ministers, and consuls here, very fine, wonderful people, but they are here for one purpose, which is to get something for their countries. That, however, is not their fault. They have been encouraged to believe that the United States Treasury is a bottomless pit.

With respect to some of the matters mentioned by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, such as the building of Austrian roads, he is probably better informed than is the junior Senator from Nevada. Wherever the junior Senator from Nevada has been, however, the policy as stated by the Senator from North Dakota has obtained.

UNITED STATES AID IN ACTION

The junior Senator from Nevada went to Central America and saw the full length of the Central American road. It is true that the United States is putting up the money to build that road. The Senate Committee on Public Works made a trip there to find out what was happening to the money. We found that we had some very good men down there. The specialists working in connection with the point 4 program, which the Senator mentioned, are just beginning to swarm in.

UNITED STATES IS THE BEST TAX COLLECTOR

The Central American countries have no tax system at all. The people in those countries who have money will not pay taxes. The people in those countries who do not have money cannot pay taxes. So if roads are to be built, the money must come from some place else. The United States has the only perfect taxing system in the world, so it is the only source of ready money.

UNITED STATES SENDS SPECIALISTS ALL OVER AT OUR EXPENSE

The United States State Department is responsible for planting in the foreign nations the seed of the belief that all they have to do is to ask and they shall receive. Therefore, it was of much interest to the junior Senator from Nevada to find out, for example, what the situation was in Honduras. The President of Honduras is a very fine man. We had there an agricultural specialist and a health specialist, and about 30 other specialists paid through different funds. Specialists were beginning to come there under the point 4 program. After we had discussed the matter with the President for a little time, the junior Senator from Nevada said to the President, "Would it not be possible for you to take over these specialists?" Most of them are down there, because they cannot make a living in this country at the business they are teaching, at least not in competition with other engineers and specialists whom I know. I put the proposition to him the hard way.

So I said to the President of Honduras, "Would it be possible for you to take these men? If you want a road specialist, take him over on your payroll. Borrow him from the United States Government, just as the State of Nevada or the State of North Dakota might do, and pay his salary. He would be temporarily released."

He replied, "Yes, that would be perfectly possible."

The junior Senator from Nevada asked, "Why is it not done?" The President of Honduras replied that no one had ever asked him. That seemed to settle that question. The administration probably never even thought of that. All we do is to send men, materials, and money.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss the question of minerals, which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] brought up.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a preliminary to my question, let me say that North Dakota is not particularly interested in mining, except from the standpoint of coal. Is it not true that in the Senator's campaign in Nevada he defeated his Democratic opponent primarily upon the basis of the development of the mining industry in the Senator's State and neighboring States?

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that it was not exactly based upon the development of the mining industry. We have other industries, such as the chemical industry, the livestock and farming industry, and many others. Our industrial picture is pretty well rounded out. The issue was on the general principle of development of the United States of America, and Nevada going right along with it.

NO PROMISES

Since the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has brought up the matter of the campaign, it may be well to point out that the junior Senator from Nevada did not make any promises. Several times during the course of the campaign he said that he did not have the answers to all economic problems. The difficulty in this country is being caused by men who have had some experience, by men who know something about the economics of the country and who are searching for approaches to the proper answers. In business a man goes to his office every day and plans his work for the day, for the week, for the month, and if possible, for the year. He is never able to get too far ahead. He must continue planning every day. However, he is trying to approach the right answers. The harm is not done by men who have experience and who are trying to approximate the right answers. The harm is being done by men who come up with all the answers, and who do not even know the problems. Then when other problems are created by the answers to the problem in sight, the theorists guess at the answers. We have gone so far afield in many of our policies that if peace should ever prevail in this country, the destruction of our economic system would be almost inevitable.

CONSULTANT TO MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] mentioned tungsten and mercury. During the war the junior Senator from Nevada was a special consultant to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, in connection with the question of strategic minerals, and also in connection with the examination of military establishments. The Senator from Nevada made a report, which no doubt is still available. That report was submitted to the Senate. The junior Senator from Nevada wrote the report, as a matter of fact. No doubt it is still available to the committee, and it is just as good today as it ever was.

PRICE RISE CAN YIELD PRODUCTION

The junior Senator from Nevada pointed out that if we were to raise the price of tungsten and mercury in this country by a very small amount in the aggregate, we could become almost self-sufficient in the production of tungsten and mercury. Luckily the War Production Board had authority to make such an increase. It listened to the committee. It raised the price of tungsten from about $17 a unit to about $28. In 6 months we were practically self-sufficient in the production of tungsten in this country. The same situation was true with respect to mercury.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is exactly correct in his statement that a flask of mercury sold at approximately $200, and that we were practically self-sufficient in the production of mercury.

When the war was over, the mines in this country were closed by the simple expedient of dropping the foreign price of mercury, which was selling under the market, and reducing the tariff on import fee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that American citizens had invested many millions of dollars in equipping mercury mines, and that some of them have now been closed for 2 or 3 years because the Department of State permitted foreign mercury to come in? In time of war, the price of mercury will shoot up, and we shall have to pay Spain, Portugal, or any other country which produces it whatever price is asked. It will require perhaps a year to get our mercury mines into operation again.

FREE TRADE CLOSED MINES

Mr. MALONE. That is exactly true. While we were practically self-sufficient

at the peak of World War II, conditions which were brought about almost exactly as the senior Senator from North Dakota has described closed the mines. For example, the State Department made a deal—one of its famous trade agreements, an agreement to lower tariffs—lowering the tariff on tungsten from 50 cents a pound to 38 cents a pound. That closed every tungsten mine in the United States except one. It hung on for a while, but finally closed.

In conversation with one of the State Department officials, the junior Senator from Nevada stated that by reducing the duty the Department had closed the mines. It was just that simple. The $9, $10, or $11 a day paid to the miners here eliminated the chance to compete with tungsten produced with the 40 or 50 cents a day miners in Burma or China.

The State Department official said, "We did not lower the tariff very much." The junior Senator from Nevada said, "No; that is true. But if you take a blow-torch and cut a couple of feet off the end of the Potomac River bridge, you do not cut very much off the bridge, but you have no bridge." He went away muttering to himself. I never did understand what he thought about the question. However, the tariff was never raised.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Nevada recall that on page 1360, volume 2, of the Senate committee hearings, there is a list of American businessmen or producers who support the trade-agreements extension?

Mr. MALONE. I do not recall the page, but I remember that there is such a list.

Mr. WELKER. There is a list of approximately 34 of them.

I read with interest yesterday the press release of the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada to the effect that those who favor the extension represent what we call big business. Will the junior Senator from Nevada enlighten the junior Senator from Idaho upon his conclusions in that respect?

SMALL BUSINESS AND BIG BUSINESS

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very happy to explain what I mean by that statement.

The junior Senator from Idaho will remember that for several years we have had in the Senate a small-business committee. I believe it has been in existence during the entire period the junior Senator from Nevada has served in the Senate. This committee is very active. It holds hearings. It goes to various places, meets a great many people, and collects a great deal of information. As a matter of fact, I suppose it has as much information on business as has any other committee in the Senate.

BIG AND SMALL BUSINESS DEFINED

The question arises as to what is small business and what is big business. Finally the conversation fades out, because no one has a definition. The junior Senator from Nevada defined big business; and still cannot think of a better definition. It is a business—either an individual, a corporation, or a partnership—which is big enough and of such a nature that it can install plants in the foreign low-wage countries and take advantage of the markets in those areas, and also ship the product back here under free trade.

A small business is a business either not large enough or of such a nature that it is impossible for it to install foreign plants and to control any type of foreign manufacturing or production, paying low wages in competition with wages in this country. That is the explanation which the junior Senator from Nevada makes. The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers are guided by men who, in general, can do just what I have described. In other words, the volume of business in the membership leans toward large business, like General Motors, which can put up a factory anywhere in the world where conditions are favorable, like Ford Motors, or like Remington Rand, which is now going into Japan, as it has already gone into Scotland. It was only recently announced that a certain number of its employees in New York had been discharged.

With that kind of definition it can be easily understood why free trade can not be the solution of the labor problem, because with free trade it is possible to put slave labor and sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia in direct competition with the high-wage standard of living of this country.

ONLY EMERGENCIES CURE UNEMPLOYMENT CAUSED BY FREE TRADE

The junior Senator from Nevada, if he thought it could be done successfully, could understand why some people would advocate free trade. He does not believe it could be successfully done without the unemployment which would ensue in this country, as evidenced by the 5 or 6 milion unemployed when the great police action was instituted in Korea by the President of the United States, and the 10 or 12 million partially unemployed. Mr. Sawyer, the Secretary of Commerce, a few months after the Korean affair started, said that we had cured the unemployment problem. So we had. The same thing obtained before World War II. We had 9,000,000 unemployed when World War II came along. The record shows that we had that number of unemployed at the time of Pearl Harbor. We also had somewhere between 12 and 17 million partially unemployed.

So, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada believes that even if we were successful in our free-trade outlook of leveling living standards, unemployment insurance would soon be used up and Social Security benefits would soon be used up. Then we would go into a different form of government. We would go into nationalization and socialization of industry as has happened in England. I am sure business would not take to it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to say publicly that I know of no one who has made such a study of tariffs and trade as has the distinguished Senator from Nevada. His remarks are instructive and enlightening not only for the people of Nevada but for the people of my State of Idaho, and I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] shares my feeling as we consider all the industries in the West which are so vital to us. I wonder if I may ask the Senator one more question.

Mr. MALONE. I would be very happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. WELKER. Is it not correct to say that the bill would continue to permit foreign goods to come into the United States with few, if any, concessions given to the exports we ship to other countries?

NO RECIPROCITY

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that it is true, unfortunately, under the system that we have inaugurated. The free-trade system has been sold to the country under the guise of reciprocal-trade agreements. There is no such act as a reciprocal-trade act. It is not a bill to establish reciprocal trade. The State Department advertises it as a Reciprocal Trade Act. That is a farce and a subterfuge on the face of it. The words "reciprocal trade" do not occur in the act itself. There is no indication that it is a reciprocal-trade act. However, they have run the Government for 18 years on catchwords and phrases.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I will yield very shortly; however, I would like to finish my answer. They have sold free trade to this country under the guise of reciprocal trade. I will demonstrate how it is a defeat for us. The junior Senator from Idaho understands there is no such thing as an actual trade agreement made under the act. The agreements made are tariff-reduction agreements.

We lower tariffs almost on a unilateral basis. The record shows that the recipient nation, with which we have made a bilateral agreement, almost without exception and almost immediately, will manipulate its currency, set up a quota system, set up an embargo system, and set up specifications. They will have currency of one value when we made the agreement and of another value when we realize what has happened. It is a one-way street. That is the program established by the State Department, which is wholeheartedly and enthusiastically for giving away the markets of the United States.

There is no record—at least that the junior Senator from Nevada has ever heard of—that there has been a raising of any of our tariffs. It has always been a lowering of tariffs. We always give something away without getting an honest concession in return.

THE STERLING BLOC

As a direct example, I cite the experience at Torquay, England. The British Empire, which includes practically half of the nations of the earth, has established a so-called sterling-bloc sys-

tem. Mr. President, the sterling-bloc system works in a peculiar way. The dollars earned by the member countries are given to London to be doled out according to need. In addition, Great Britain has blocked the use of sterling balances held in London by the member countries. An Italian banker whom the junior Senator from Nevada visited in Rome in 1947 said: "We thought we were getting along very well. We had 25,000,000 pounds in sterling all ready for use after the war. Suddenly our sterling balances were blocked. So we could spend only a certain amount of it each month."

Instead of having 25,000,000 pounds in sterling to spend, he had nothing. He could buy only certain things and could spend only 10 or 15 percent of it a year, or whatever the percentage was.

INDIA WAS FORCED TO STAY IN STERLING AREA

The same thing was true in India when the junior Senator from Nevada was in India and had his long visit with Nehru. I believe it was in 1948. I believe they had seven or eight hundred million pounds in sterling, for which they had furnished material during the war to the British Empire. They had received that much credit. When they started to spend the money they were allowed to spend, I believe, only 8 or 10 percent each year. It really amounted to a restriction. In other words, it was a long-range credit. They held it over Mr. Nehru. He did not have any hopes of trading out the whole seven or eight hundred million pounds. Then he had to submit to other restrictions. He could only trade in certain ways with other countries. So India stayed in the sterling bloc. I do not recall if it was an absolute condition.

I urged him to make a long-range deal, man to man, because he has manganese and everything else that we need. In fact, he has more material than he can use. However, he could not deal openly and aboveboard and freely with other nations as long as he was in the sterling bloc.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE

To come back to the point which the distinguished Senator from Idaho has made, the Trade Agreements Act does not operate to our advantage at all. The other nations trade only when it is to their advantage to trade. We trade anyway. There is in our trade agreements what is called a most favored-nation clause under which we operate.

So when we make a bilateral trade treaty with any nation, every other nation in the world immediately is allowed to benefit from that reduction in the tariffs. The benefit to us is illusory.

Therefore, when England said point-blank that she did not want to make any more concessions at Torquay, England had already gotten any advantage she could get by means of lowering any of her own tariffs or import fees. She still had her imperial preference, and that was worth more to her.

So England said, "We will not play ball."

MOST-FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE A TRICK

The United States then went ahead and made many bilateral trade treaties with other nations, and immediately all the nations of the British Empire obtained the advantage of those concessions to the other nations, in the same way, as I have described, that Mexico benefited in regard to reductions of duties on lead and other materials.

As I have said, until last year we had a trade agreement with Mexico covering lead and certain other materials; but finally Mexico wished to increase her tariffs and we terminated the agreement. Thereupon the tariffs reverted to the 1930 tariffs. Following that, at Torquay we most carefully made with another nation agreements in regard to the same products. The result was that while Mexico was raising her tariffs on them, as she had announced she would do, she obtained the same advantage which she had before, and in some instances I believe she obtained a greater advantage than she had before, without giving us anything in return.

As proof of that statement, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing changes in United States tariffs, due to termination of Mexican trade agreements, which were canceled by the Torquay negotiations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Changes in United States tariffs due to termination of Mexican trade agreements which were canceled by Torquay negotiations

Tariff Act of 1930—par.—	Description of product	Mexican trade agreements rate of duty	Rate of duty on termination of agreement	Torquay rate of duty
1	Naphthenic acids	12½% ad val	25% ad val	6¼% ad val.
93	Zinc sulphate	½¢ per lb	¾¢ per lb	⅜¢ per lb.
202 (a)	Floor and wall tiles:			
	Not wholly or in part of cement, if valued at not more than 40 cents per square foot (except quarries or quarry tiles and ceramic mosaic tiles).	5¢ per sq. ft., but not less than 25% nor more than 35% ad val.	10¢ per sq. ft., but not less than 30% nor more than 70% ad val.	5¢ per sq. ft., but not less than 25% nor more than 35% ad val.
	Wholly or in part of cement:			
	Valued at not more than 40 cents per sq. ft	5¢ per sq. ft., but not less than 25% nor more than 35% ad val.	10¢ per sq. ft., but not less than 50% nor more than 70% ad val.	4¢ per sq. ft., but not less than 20% nor more than 28% ad val.
	Valued at more than 40 cents per sq. ft	30% ad val	60% ad val	24% ad val.
207	Fluorspar containing more than 97% of calcium fluoride	$4.20 per ton	$5.60 per ton	$2.10 per ton.
210	Common yellow, brown, red, or gray earthenware, plain or embossed, composed of a body wholly of clay which is unwashed, unmixed, and not artificially colored; common salt-glazed stoneware; all the foregoing (except earthenware and stoneware crucibles):			
	Not ornamented, incised, or decorated in any manner, and manufactures wholly or in chief value of such ware, not specially provided for.	10% ad val	15% ad val	5% ad val.
	Ornamented, incised, or decorated in any manner, and manufactures wholly or in chief value of such ware, not specially provided for.	10% ad val	20% ad val	5% ad val.
217	Vials and ampoules, wholly or in chief value of glass, not specially provided for, if unfilled:			
	If holding more than 1 pint	½¢ per lb	1¢ per lb	½¢ per lb.
	If holding not more than 1 pint and not less than ¼ pint	¾¢ per lb	1½¢ per lb	¾¢ per lb.
	If holding less than ¼ pint	25¢ per gross	50¢ per gross	25¢ per gross.
339	Table, household, kitchen, and hospital utensils, and hollow or flat ware, not specially provided for, composed wholly or in chief value of tin or tin plate, not plated with platinum, gold, or silver.	22½% ad val	40% ad val	12½%-20% ad val.
391	Lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds	3¢ per lb. on lead content	1½¢ per lb. on lead content	3¢ per lb. on lead content.
392	Lead bullion or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, antimonial scrap lead, type metal, Babbitt metal, solder, all alloys or combinations of lead not specially provided for.	1½¢ per lb. on lead content	2½¢ per lb. on lead content	1½¢ per lb. on lead content.
407	Packing boxes (empty), and packing box shooks, of wood, not specially provided for.	7½% ad val	15% ad val	3¾% ad val.
702	Sheep and lambs	$1.50 per head	$3 per head	75¢ per head.
711	Bobwhite quail, valued at $5 or less each	25¢ each	50¢ each	25¢ each.
1111	Blankets, and similar articles (including carriage and automobile robes and steamer rugs), made as units or in the piece, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of wool, not exceeding 3 yards in length, any of the foregoing if hand-woven:			
	Valued at not more than $1 per pound	20¢ per lb. and 20% ad val	30¢ per lb. and 30% ad val	30¢ per lb. and 30% ad val.
	Valued at more than $1 but not more than $1.50 per pound	20¢ per lb. and 20% ad val	33¢ per lb. and 37½% ad val	30¢ per lb. and 30% ad val.
	Valued at more than $1.50 per pound	20¢ per lb. and 20% ad val	40¢ per lb. and 40% ad val	30¢ per lb. and 30% ad val.

Changes in United States tariffs due to termination of Mexican trade agreements which were canceled by Torquay negotiations—Continued

Tariff Act of 1930—par.—	Description of product	Mexican trade agreements rate of duty	Rate of duty on termination of agreement	Torquay rate of duty
1513	Dolls, parts of dolls (including clothing), and doll heads, of whatever material composed (except those composed wholly or in chief value of any product provided for in paragraph 31, Tariff Act of 1930, and except those composed in any part, however small, of any of the laces, fabrics, embroideries, or other materials or articles provided for in paragraph 1529 (a), Tariff Act of 1930):			
	Other than products of Cuba	35% ad val.	70% ad val.	35% ad val.
1513	Toys and parts of toys, not specially provided for, wholly or in chief value of china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthenware, or stoneware:			
	Toys in the forms of musical instruments and capable of emitting sound (except toys in the forms of stringed instruments or accordions).	35% ad val.	50% ad val.	35% ad val.
1516	Wax matches: Other than products of Cuba	20% ad val.	40% ad val.	10% ad val.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for a question.

Mr. WELKER. First, Mr. President, let me say that I wish to express thanks for the profound answers which have been given me by the distinguished Senator from Nevada. I am sorry that every American workingman, who is as proud of his job as he is of the country which gives him that job, cannot hear the enlightening words of the Senator from Nevada, as he speaks at this time. I know of the study and the hard work he has given to this measure. It seems almost disgraceful that only six or seven Senators are now in the Chamber listening to the Senator's able address. However, I assure the Senator from Nevada that I shall do my part to carry the message to the people I represent.

My concluding question is this: Is it not a fact that the bill is, in effect, another wealth-division means whereby we would divide our wealth with those who live in foreign countries, inasmuch as we have to pay for our imports with hard-earned American dollars? I should like to have the Senator's observations on that point.

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 1612 USELESS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Idaho has put his finger squarely on the sore spot. The present policy can end with no other result. In other words, I again make the categorical statement that none of the amendments to H. R. 1612, neither the peril-point amendment, the escape-clause amendment, nor any of the others—will direct the President to do anything at all. To the contrary, he will be able to continue to do exactly as he has been doing.

We have had three of these international tariff-cutting conferences, and we have suffered each time. The last time, at the Torquay Conference, the tariffs on at least 3,000 or 4,000 products were either bound so that we could not raise them, or were lowered again. So in the main, the tariffs are now below the peril points, due to the fact that for so long a time we have followed a policy of lowering our tariffs and due to the inflation which has occurred, which has brought the value of our dollar down to about 35 or 40 cents, in terms of purchasing power.

Of course the result of a decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar is a lowering of the tariffs. The same effect occurs when a foreign nation lowers the value of its currency, as was done by all the nations of the British Empire and the British Commonwealth of Nations, and as was subsequently done by France, about 30 countries in all. The nations of the British Commonwealth lowered the value of the pound from $4.03 to $2.80, and that resulted in the immediate lowering of the United States tariffs by approximately 30 or 31 percent.

EVEN FOREIGN RETAILERS ADVERTISE HERE NOW

Earlier in my remarks I read into the RECORD a British advertisement from a leading American magazine and similar advertisements have appeared in many of our newspaper and magazines—for instance, the New York Times, the New York Herald-Tribune, Look magazine, the United States News and World Report—in fact, practically all the leading newspapers and magazines in this country. Practically all of them carry full-page advertisements of that sort. The advertisement to which I have already referred advises the readers to "Be your own broker. All you need to do is send $10 to us, at a cost to you of a 5-cent stamp, when sent by regular mail, and we will send you at once a very fine skirt."

The advertisement was inserted in that magazine by a London concern, and those who read the advertisement were led to believe that the dress for which they thus would pay $10 could not be purchased in the United States for less than $20 or $25. Perhaps that is so. It may be true in view of the difference between the wages paid in Britain and the wages paid in the United States. I implore all Members of the Senate to consider the difference between the wages paid in our country and those paid in Britain. The average hourly wage in manufacturing industries in the United States is $1.41, and the average hourly wage in manufacturing industries in Britain is 39 cents.

The advertisement to which I have referred went on to say that it was possible for that firm to sell for $10 a dress which would cost not less than $20 or $25 in the United States because of the lowering of the value of the pound from $4.03 to $2.80; and the advertisement advised its readers to "Be your own broker."

Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that there is nothing in this measure which would prevent the State Department from calling another Torquay Conference on the day following the passage of the bill or at any time up to the date of the expiration of the act; and now it is proposed that we extend the act for 2 years. Of course, the present act will expire on June 12, unless it is extended. In my humble opinion, the President or the Secretary of State is very likely to call another conference of that sort.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada very much for his answers to my inquiries.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

WOODPULP AND PAPER IMPORTS ARE HURTING DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In South Carolina we have a great many pulp mills. They sell millions upon millions of dollars' worth of paper. If this measure becomes law, how will it affect our pulp mills?

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that the 18-year-old policy has already affected them. The tariffs on wood pulp coming into the United States from Canada were lowered. At this moment I do not have before me a complete history of the wood-pulp industry, but it is very easily secured.

Of course, generally speaking, during the war we had some difficulty securing all the wood pulp we needed. At that time I was special consultant to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and I remember that many factories were built with American capital in Canada—and I think rightly so; I think that was a very good idea. However, the tariffs on wood pulp were lowered, and that resulted in the destruction of some of the pulp mills in the United States, just as has occurred in the case of other of our industries—for instance, just as occurred in the case of the mercury industry and the tungsten industry in the United States, because of the competition of tungsten imported from Burma, China, and Mexico and, in the case of mercury, because of competition of mercury imported from Spain and other nations.

Of course I do not know the exact conditions which exist in the pulp mills in South Carolina. However, in this connection we should consider the difference between the wages which are paid in the United States and the wages

which are paid in other countries where industries competitive with American industries are located. For example, in Canada the average hourly wage in manufacturing industries is 92 cents, but in the United States it is $1.41, as we see by the chart which now is on display in this Chamber.

Also, when we consider the chart showing the comparative hourly earnings in selected industries, we see that in the United States the average is $1.59, whereas in Canada it is 90 cents.

It is impossible, except for the most developed industries, to overcome the competition of lower-paid labor without an adequate tariff or import fee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As the Senator said a few moments ago, a decrease or reduction in the value of the dollar, causes the cut to be doubly severe, does it not?

FLEXIBILITY NOT NEW

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. The reason given by the junior Senator from Nevada is founded upon a long period of study, extending over many years. I may say it does not embarrass me to say that, because of having been 30 years in the engineering business, and 15 years, the latter part of it, in industrial engineering. It is necessary to know where raw materials come from, and to know their comparative cost. A fixed tariff never does work very well. That is why, over a period of years, and for as much as 75 years, we built this country upon a tariff. It was a fixed tariff. Immediately following World War I, there was talk of flexible import fees or tariffs. Then, in 1930, there was placed in the Tariff Act, in section 336 a provision that the Tariff Commission could raise or lower tariffs, by as much as 50 percent, upon a proper showing, and in an investigation initiated on its own motion, or on the request of any interested party and after a proper hearing. This provision worked well. But the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, with this avalanche of pressure on the part of an internationally minded State Department, to the effect that we must give away our markets, almost obliterated the tariff. There are very few people know about section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and that, if we do not extend this tariff bill for 2 years, we shall still have the flexible tariff provision of the 1930 Tariff Act to fall back on. This is applicable in every case where tariffs have not been covered by agreements, such as we have described in the course of this address.

EQUALIZE TRADE IN MAN-HOURS

I would say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and to the Senator from Idaho that what we are trying to do, and what we have done over a period of years in our awkward way, improving it from time to time—and I think the suggestion which the junior Senator is making here as a substitute has considerable merit—what we are trying to do is to equalize the trade in the hours of labor. If we are to be fair to our fellowmen and to foreign nations, it must be said that we are trading hours of labor, and that, if we take any advantage of a man, we are hurting him, and, if he takes any advantage of us, he is hurting us. The only kind of fair trade is trade upon an even basis.

Mr. President, how is that to be done? There are two things to be considered, which are major factors, and they can be taken into consideration through this bill which is offered as a substitute for the Senate Finance Committee's bill as reported. There are two major factors. First, the cost of labor; second, its productiveness. Then, of course, there is a certain transportation cost connected with getting it here. But, in the first place, it must be kept in mind that the labor in Canada is 92 cents an hour, while in the United States it is $1.41 an hour. That is one consideration. The other is efficiency. Those two factors enter into a consideration of this particular case. That may or may not absolutely represent the difference in cost, because that labor may be using older machinery, which may not be so efficient. Canadian labor in general, I think, is as efficient as labor in the United States, but nevertheless it is necessary to have an import fee in order to even up those hours of labor. Either we are trying to take advantage of another country, or we are trying to divide our markets and wealth with them, if we deny that that is true; so then there is the question, what is a tariff?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. Let me finish this one statement, after which I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina. What is the idea of a tariff? What is the idea of an import fee on a flexible basis? Flexibility means that we are not freezing a tariff for 3 years, as is being done under one of these trade agreements, where a tariff cannot be changed without another conference. That is, under certain conditions it might be changed, but we are so bloody by the time we get it changed that we lose more than we gain for the moment. So the tariff, which the foreign trade authorities will set with full latitude under the principle of fair and reasonable competition, will be determined in the same manner as the Interstate Commerce Commission fixes freight rates on the basis of reasonable return on investment. All these factors are taken into consideration. When we trade 1 hour of labor, we are trading 1 hour equal here with another hour abroad under the flexible import-fee system. I am now happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I observe from the Senator's chart that the rate in the United States is $1.41 an hour, while that in France is 21 cents an hour. It is true that in France the industries can use a great deal of machinery which we in America cannot use because they require a great deal of labor; but it is also true that, when they purchase the machinery, they get it at a very much cheaper price than we can obtain the latest machinery in America for. Is not that true?

Mr. MALONE. I think it is true.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That also offsets the capital investment, does it not?

Mr. MALONE. I understand that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So, comparing that labor with American labor, we cannot go into a field to compete with them, can we?

Mr. MALONE. We cannot, unless, in any specific country, the economics of the situation permit it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am interested in another field, that of textiles. I notice the Senator lists textiles on the chart. The designation on the chart is "wool textiles." Both wool textiles and cotton textiles are manufactured in South Carolina. As the Senator probably knows, in South Carolina work in the factories represents 28 percent of the textile hours covered in the entire United States. That, of course, involves employment of many people. How would the pending bill affect the textile workers of South Carolina who receive $1.49 an hour, when they have to compete probably with workers in France getting 21 cents an hour, or, in Germany, 29 cents an hour?

EFFECT OF LOW TARIFFS ON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. MALONE. Let us take the item on the chart "Wool Textiles." The chart shows the wages paid by comparison, though not in cents per hour. Take the United Kingdom wage as representing 100 percent, the wage in United States of America is 378 percent. In other words, we in America pay four times the wages paid in the United Kingdom. That would be paid at the switch in the Senator's State. We pay 378 percent more in wages in this country than our competitors in the United Kingdom pay. Is your worker in South Carolina 378 percent more efficient? The only way we are going to maintain an industry, as I think we are finding out now, is through an emergency, when contracts can be made, when it is possible to buy everything that anyone can produce, because we are taking money out of the Treasury for deficit financing. In 18 years we have found that we always have an emergency, we are never without one, and we always have some reason for taking money out of the Federal Treasury.

MODERN MACHINERY AVAILABLE EVERYWHERE

When we reach a peaceful period, if we ever do, industry in South Carolina will crumble and fade away in the night, because our textile worker is not 378 percent more efficient than his British counterpart. We cannot possibly compete. I want to say one more thing, which I thought of while the Senator was speaking. By way of illustration, the junior Senator from Nevada was in South Africa. As a matter of fact, I have been in all these countries with one particular purpose, namely, to find out what kind of machinery was used even in the coal mines and in the steel mills of the Ruhr, and in Birmingham, England, and in the chemical plants and chemical centers of Germany. I was interested in the economics of the country and as to how the

tariffs, import fees, and trade agreements worked. I found in South Africa that the people were very friendly. I was a visitor, and they were friendly because I was interested in their business. We flew over manganese deposits and chromite deposits. The idea of buying manganese from Russia is the craziest ever suggested. There is more manganese in South Africa, Brazil, and India than can be used in the next hundred years. Why do we have to buy it from Russia? The suggestion that we must do so is just an excuse for giving them what they want.

In South Africa I had dinner with the Prime Minister, or whatever his title may be. I said to him, "If I were younger and were not in the United States Senate, I would stay here and produce manganese." We cannot make a pound of steel without using manganese. I am sure I could get all the money necessary to buy equipment. He had already offered a long-term lease to anyone, not only to me. If I had had an opportunity to stay there, does the distinguished Senator from South Carolina believe I would have installed second-hand machinery? No; I would have purchased the latest machines that United States factories make, and I could have produced more manganese, for the labor put into the operation, than could any man in the United States because the machinery would be new.

In South Africa at that time the wage for Negro labor was 40 cents a day. Superintendents and foremen would have to be trained and their pay would have to be raised, but it would take some time before they would develop sufficiently to be able to do the work of a man in this country. But they could be paid $6 or $7 a day, and that would still leave several dollars.

I notice in newspapers all over the country the idiotic statement that we do not need any protection in this country because of our know-how and our improved machinery.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am very much interested in textiles, for the reason that I have been closely associated with that industry. I worked for 10 years as a laborer in cotton mills. I know what happens in that industry in times of depression. The work is reduced to 3 days a week instead of 5 days a week. That is what I fear may come about if our labor is thrown into competition with that of other countries where labor works so cheaply.

Mr. MALONE. That is exactly what will happen.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was talking during the week end with the operator of a chain of mills. I learned that that chain uses more cotton than is grown in the State of South Carolina. The places where the mills are located are not in the largest textile-manufacturing county in South Carolina, by any means. Henderson County manufactures more textiles, and Spartanburg and Greenville are also much larger producers. I do not want anything done that will affect the industries which do so much for my State.

Mr. MALONE. Nothing can happen so long as we have an emergency. Whether we have our troops in Iran to settle the oil dispute, or whether they are in Europe or in Korea, unless there is a war at the end of all this preparation, foreign products will come into this country in such volume that our own mills will close down or severely curtail production. It will hurt not only South Carolina, but every other State. The farmers will be injured. What will they do? They will come to the Senate to get us to make up the difference in their income. The problem comes right back to the taxpayers of the United States. I am in favor of subsidies to keep the farmers alive until such time as Congress wakes up and lays down a principle so that they can live.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Nevada does not have to tell me about that. Girls in the cotton mills in my State earn as much as $60 a week, in many instances, working five days a week. If they are cut to 4 days a week, their income is reduced by one-fifth. If they work only 3 days a week, they lose 40 percent of their wages. The man from whom they buy their clothing is affected. Everyone with whom they do business is affected. Automobile dealers and others all along the line are affected. When it comes to paying State and National income taxes, they are affected across the board. It will injure the individual taxpayers throughout the United States. The manufacturers of shoes and clothing will not sell as much as they previously sold.

Mr. MALONE. I am interested in what the Senator says, because he is carrying the point down to the detail which is necessary to understand the problem. The protection which may be afforded affects mining and agriculture. It affects not only the cotton business, but the precision-instrument business; it affects textiles not only in the South, but in New England. It affects the little textile industry which I am trying to nurse along out west. It affects every industry in the United States. What happens when they all go down at once, when unemployment starts all over the country? I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what he thinks will happen when peace, for which we all pray, arrives. When we use up our unemployment insurance, are we going to lower the wages and our standard of living and meet the competition of the United Kingdom, France, and Japan, or will we nationalize a few industries, as has been done in England?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly hope we shall not nationalize them. The next thing would be to lower the tariff to meet the competition.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am happy that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is interested. I want to point out, since he has just mentioned the fact that the cotton mills are on a 4-day workweek, that I was informed this morning that the sewing-machine manufacturers in certain areas have cut off a day from their workweek.

Mr. President, this is at the height not only of ordinary prosperity, but war prosperity. I understand, of course, that what is now going on is merely a police action, but nevertheless it has the effect of war on the economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the cost of imported sewing machines. Yesterday I had two comparable models of portable sewing machines available for inspection on the floor of the Senate. One was a domestic model, the other an imported Japanese machine. I went into the differentials yesterday. I now ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COST OF IMPORTED SEWING MACHINES

Two comparable models of portable sewing machines are available for inspection on the floor. One of them is a domestic model, the other an imported Japanese machine.

Here are some interesting data regarding those machines:

Man-hours of labor for making the head:	
Japanese machine (hours)	10
Domestic machine (hours)	8
Wages per day of production worker:	
Japanese machine	$0.90
Domestic machine	$15.50
Total labor cost per machine:	
Japanese	$1.11
Domestic	$15.50
Wholesale price, including motor and stand or case:	
Japanese machine	$28.00
Domestic machine	$84.00
Retail price:	
Japanese machine	(1)
Domestic machine	$110.00
Tariff rate (Japanese machine):	
Before GATT (percent ad valorem)	15
After GATT (percent ad valorem)	10
Imports from Japan (Japanese machines):	
Value, 1929–49	$1,450,000
Value, 1950	$4,845,000
Number, 1950	227,000

(1) What the market will bear.

In 1950, compared with 227,000 machines from Japan, the United Kingdom supplied 13,098 machines, with Italy supplying 39,394, and Germany 26,000, although the duty reductions at GATT were made with countries other than Germany, Italy, or Japan. This, of course, is an obvious case of a third nation getting all the benefit under most-favored-nation clause.

GOLD PRODUCTION AND CURRENCY BASE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I do not like to get too far afield from several matters that have been mentioned before commenting on the questions asked by the senior Senator from North Dakota and the junior Senator from Idaho. There was the matter of the shutting down of the gold industry here during the war, while we were selling gold-production machinery, heavy dredges, some of which cost seven or eight hundred thousand dollars to manufacture, to South Africa and to Canada and to other foreign nations. That was a fact well known by almost everyone. However, at the time I was simply a consultant to the Military Affairs Committee, and was so busy I had but little time to work on

that matter, and probably could have done nothing about it had I had time to work on it at that time.

Early in my address I pointed out that Marshall plan nations can buy gold from our Treasury, with Marshall plan or ECA money, and then sell it wherever they desire at whatever price they can obtain, which of course has been much more than the $35 they needed to purchase the gold from our Treasury. There are several subterfuges used by foreign nations. I do not blame the nations for making use of those subterfuges, Mr. President. I want that distinctly understood.

Two or three years ago I was in Toronto, Canada, and talked before a mining organization there. At that time the Canadians could not mine gold for $35 an ounce any more than we could in the United States. At this time practically all our gold mines, with the exception of a couple of low-cost producers, are shut down. Perhaps there may be some small mines in operation, but not very many. Most production is down. Why? Because with the inflation, wages are up, costs are up, and the gold remains at $35 an ounce. Canada has had the same trouble. But since we were the Nation which was guaranteeing the $35 an ounce for gold, what did Canada do? There are some smart people in Canada. I hand it to them. Out of the Canadian treasury they paid as high as $7 an ounce bounty or margin for the gold. If a miner produced an ounce of gold he received $7 an ounce out of the Canadian treasury, and he received $35 an ounce in America. So the producer received a total of $42, that is, $35 from the United States and $7 from the taxpayers of Canada. The Canadians mined the gold and sold it to us.

Mr. President, returning to the subject of the customs simplification plan that was proposed last year, I am given to understand a similar measure has been introduced in the present session of Congress. I have already explained how the simplification plan works. It results in goods coming in at a lower price than we can meet. There was never any idea of simplifying anything, except to bring in goods below our production costs.

RULE ON MARK OF ORIGIN EASED

Another section of the Customs Simplification Act amends the requirements for marking the name of the manufacturer and the country of origin on imported products. Thus, the immediate container in which coal tar products are imported need not be marked "Made in Germany." In that connection, the junior Senator from Nevada had a hard time finding the trademark on the Japanese sewing machine which was exhibited in the Senate Chamber yesterday. Finally, after the machine was brought back to the office, the trademark was found concealed under the electric motor.

Pen and pocketknives need not be marked "Made in Japan." Is that not a fine set-up? That ought to be emphasized. Butcher knives, table knives, and carving knives need not be marked with the name of the maker and the country of origin. Surgical instruments and scientific and laboratory instruments need not be marked. Thermostatic containers, and even medicines, need not carry identifying marks.

Thus the importation of goods from nations which use unfair trade practices, or which are in some other way offensive to the consumers in the United States, is greatly aided. No longer will an American be able to say, "I will not buy these goods since they are made in Germany or Japan." He will not know whether such products as those I have mentioned are of domestic manufacture or imported from Communist nations.

CHANGE IN VALUE FOR CUSTOMS

Fourth. Certain changes are made also in the valuation of certain products. Instead of levying the duty on the higher of either the export value or the foreign value, the Customs Simplification Act provides that the export value be taken.

This makes it possible to declare a specially low export value and bring into the United States an ever-increasing amount of low-cost foreign goods, by taking a value which will reduce the duty payable to the lowest one possible.

In the past, when the export value or United States value could not be ascertained, it was customary to take a value which was based on the cost of production, including a certain amount of profit. This will be changed under the new bill however, for a constructed value which no longer includes a specific amount of profit. Thus, the way is opened, again, to allow imports of unfairly priced foreign articles.

At this point I should like to mention that one of the statements often made by the proponents of free trade is that the consumers of this country have a right to lower-cost products if they can obtain them anywhere else in the world. I invite attention to the fact that it has not been brought to the attention of the junior Senator from Nevada that there are any products coming in from foreign lands which do not take what the traffic will bear. In other words, if there is no competition here the price is high. For example, take the case of Scotch whisky. No Scotch whisky is manufactured in this country—at least of the quality which has been imported. Therefore, even when the devaluation of the pound and the franc was made, there was no decrease in the cost of the Scotch whisky, because the price was raised in accordance with the devaluation, approximately 30 percent. So I say that to make a statement of that kind is to assume that the people of foreign nations do not understand trade, that they do not understand that they can get for their product what the traffic will bear. They do understand it. Therefore, there is no such thing as the consumer profiting by free trade, because those who ship goods into this country simply take what the traffic will bear on the market.

Let us consider item number 5 in the bill to simplify the customs rules and regulations.

Fifth. Certain imports were dutiable on the basis of American selling price. Particularly coal tar products are in this category. Now, however, under the Customs Simplification Act this American selling price as a base for duty will be changed, to an equivalent regular tariff. This means that price changes for domestic products will no longer have any bearing on the duty imposed on imported coal tar products. The flexible tariff provision, section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, is also amended by eliminating the use of American selling price from the determination of the value of imported products which are being investigated under the "Equalization of costs of production" principle.

So, Mr. President, it will be seen that the American selling price is eliminated by this simplification process.

Sixth. Last but not least, the Customs Simplification Act provides for changes in the internal-revenue taxes imposed on certain imported products, such as wines, perfumes containing distilled spirits, and oleomargarine.

This listing, although by no means exhaustive, should serve as warning that the Congress had better beware of the administration's proposals, especially if they are so innocuously named as "simplification" bills.

We are facing a determined effort by the administration to bring about the end of the ITO in devious, back-handed ways, since the opposition to the Charter itself has grown stronger. Let us step cautiously in this Congress in voting for Customs Simplification Acts, and the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act with new amendments, lest we find our hands tied even more than they are now tied in regulating the domestic economy.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate again to the fact that we must not only watch the bill under consideration, but we must watch all the approaches. There is no use in closing the gate to a corral if two strands of the wire are missing and the animals can go through the fence.

LEGISLATION FULL OF SLEEPERS

The temper and tempo of legislation coming to the floor of the Senate have not changed in 18 years. Some have said that Roosevelt was to blame. Others have said that Truman is to blame. I say that neither is to blame. We are in an undertow with this legislation. We are not told the truth. We are not told what are the real objectives of legislation which comes to the floor of the Senate. We are not told about the hidden paragraphs, the "sleepers" in these bills. I have just named six sleepers in the simplification bill introduced last year. New York newspapers, Washington newspapers, and newspapers all over the United States say, "What a great thing the simplification of customs is."

What did we think about when we visualized this great effort at simplification? We thought there had been some delay in obtaining information from various sources, or there were some other burdensome regulations.

Who visualized the situation as meaning that if we should pass this bill we would be aiding and abetting the adoption of the International Trade Organization? There are some great men on the Senate Finance Commitee. I would follow them a long way, but not this far.

The Senate Finance Committee was told, "We will not ask for the adoption of the International Trade Organization." However, the witnesses did not say, "We will ask for a simplification with six sleepers in it which will help toward the adoption of the International Trade Organization." They did not say, "We have adopted the commercial policy chapter, chapter No. 4 in the International Trade Organization's charter, through GATT." They did not tell us that. I have read the record. They did not tell us that by the adoption of chapter 4 of the International Trade Organization, they had adopted everything of a commercial policy nature in the charter of the International Trade Organization which did not need special legislation by the Congress.

They did not tell us that they were coming forward with special legislation—not the International Trade Organization, but legislation to chink up the cracks—in addition to the customs simplification. So we go along blindly, taking on faith legislation coming down from an administration which is utterly discredited before the country—especially the State Department.

Mr. President, as I have already explained, GATT has been substituted for ITO. We now have pending legislation which would chink up the cracks and make the GATT virtually an international trade organization, which the State Department has promised not to bring before the Congress. Credit is being given the State Department for announcing that the International Trade Organization would not be pressed upon Congress. I have heard members of the Senate Finance Committee say, "They have promised us not to bring the International Trade Organization before the Senate."

However, little attention is paid to the fact that chapter IV, the commercial policy chapter of the ITO Charter, has been adopted, and further congressional legislation is not required. It is expected that other legislation will be offered to complete the adoption of the commercial policy of the International Trade Organization. The pending bill on the simplification of customs would complete the job.

TARIFFS AND SUBSIDIES

I have previously touched on the difference between subsidies and tariffs. The specific difference between tariffs and import fees established upon the principle of fair and reasonable competition to establish a market in this country for foreign nations' goods and the payment of subsidies to bolster our economic structure under a free trade principle is that under tariffs and import fees the ultimate consumer of the specific goods pays the tariffs or import fees and there is no incentive for the importation of goods unless there is a definite market on that basis, whereas the payment of subsidies encourages the goods produced by the cheaper labor to be brought into the country to compete with the higher living standard products of this Nation, and then subsidies collected in taxes from all of the people are paid to the domestic producer to support the economic structure until such time as we care to let it go down or reduce our standard of living to a certain extent.

Mr. President, a tariff or import fee paid into the United States Treasury is new money. It is money that can be used to reduce the national debt. It is money that can be used to reduce taxes. It is money that can be used to run the Government of the United States. It is revenue money. When it is paid into the United States Treasury, for the privilege of bringing in a product on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, it is new money. A product will not be brought in unless a need for it exists on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

On the other hand, let us remember what a subsidy means. Of course, a tariff is paid by the ultimate consumer of the goods. What is a subsidy? A subsidy is assessed against all the people. In other words, it might result in bringing in all the potatoes in Canada, all the wheat in Canada, all the steel from anywhere. What would we do? When those goods became a glut on the market, and when the number of persons affected was of sufficient magnitude to force Congress to move, what would we do? We would put a subsidy on the products to hold up the economic structure and help the industries that are affected, as we do with agriculture. What is the result? We establish a market for foreign goods on our own parity price, regardless of what the cost is.

We did that in the case of dried eggs. We have stored the domestic eggs. We bought them for 90 cents to $1.25 a dozen and stored them in caves out in Kansas and in various storehouses throughout the country. The merchants of the country bought dried eggs abroad at lower prices. They bought them from China. We eat those eggs.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. While the distinguished Senator from Nevada is talking about imports, I wonder whether he has mentioned oil imports. I have not heard him mention oil imports into our country. It may be of interest to note that we produce approximately 7,000,000 barrels of oil daily, and that we are importing 1,000,000 barrels daily. Based on the employment of personnel, with 275,000 persons producing 7,000,000 barrels of oil daily, the importation of 1,000,000 barrels of oil undoubtedly eliminates 50,000 jobs in this country.

That, however, is not the important problem immediately, as I see it. The immediate problem from the standpoint of the oil industry, in my opinion, is to develop our potential production as rapidly as we can in order that we may have oil for defense purposes. I do not believe that any Senator or anyone else feels that we can depend on foreign oil once the chips are down. Therefore, I think it is very important that we give some consideration to the problem, which is very important from a domestic and national standpoint and also from a defense standpoint.

OIL AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am glad that the distinguished Senator has brought up the point. We did mention oil earlier in the day, although not in connection with national security. I think it is one of the most important angles in the whole discussion.

The reason why we are not producing mercury today, for example, which is absolutely necessary in any defense establishment, is because of so-called free trade, which means the lowering of the tariff below the differential of costs and below a fair and reasonable competitive level. There is no principle governing the situation. We are not producing tungsten today, although we have started to produce a little of it since some lucrative contracts have been handed out. I may say that more of them have been handed out to foreign countries because those making them are willing to pay more for foreign minerals and oil. I am not sure about oil, but I do know about minerals. The reason why we are not prepared, in our stockpiles, to defend ourselves is because over the entire period since World War II we have refused to pay for the domestic product the price which makes up the difference between the labor costs and the other factors that directly affect production in this country as compared with the foreign producer. People who say, "We must buy where we can buy cheapest," would be horrified to know, as they would if they analyzed their statement, that they are advocating the lowering of wages and the writing off of investments in this country to meet the lower price.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that I am perfectly familiar with what was happening last year before the so-called police action was undertaken in Korea. The junior Senator from Nevada remembers well that the junior Senator from West Virginia said that 35,000 coal miners were out of work in West Virginia because of the importation of cheap oil from the Middle East, which was coming in for $1.70 to $1.80 a barrel. He said that there was unemployment on the railroads; there was nothing to keep the railroads going. It was quite a speech which the Senator from West Virginia made, I assure the Senator from Kansas. At that time I discussed the matter with the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia, who said he would vote in favor of any industry in the United States which was in the same condition the coal industry in West Virginia was in, because of the competition of the 850,000 to 1,000,000 barrels of oil a day which were being imported last year. That importation caused exactly what the Senator from West Virginia said it would, namely, serious unemployment. There was a reduction in the oil production of Texas and California, and I assume that there was a cut in the oil production of Kansas. So there was widespread unemployment, amounting to more than 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 persons. In fact, when the so-called police action began in Korea on June 27, there was unemployment amounting to 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 persons, and part of the reason for it was

the long-range free-trade policy the State Department has followed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think it is important for us to give consideration to the defenses of our country, particularly in relation to the production of oil. We must know where our potential reserves of oil are, and we must be active in developing them. It is not possible to develop an oil field over night; it takes 3 or 4 or 5 years to do so. At the present time throughout the oil-producing regions of the United States there is a shortage of tubular goods. We need the pipe in order to be able to explore new fields and study the potential oil production in great areas.

I am one Senator who does not believe that we can depend upon foreign sources of supply of oil when we reach a critical period involving the defense of our country.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Kansas has brought up this point, because it is one of the most important ones facing our country in connection with its national security.

The State Department has continually worked on the theory that the administration should have the Government pay more for strategic and critical minerals and materials coming from foreign countries than it would pay for such minerals and materials which were produced in the United States. The result is that in time of emergency we are confronted with the same situation which confronted us last year when we were without sufficient mercury, and tungsten, and oil. Suddenly our authorities said, "We need to increase our production of oil by 1,000,000 barrels a day." The distinguished Senator from Kansas is familiar with that demand, is he not?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

INCREASED OIL RESERVES DISPROVED ADMINISTRATION BEFORE

Mr. MALONE. That occurred because we allowed some millions of barrels of oil a day to be imported from foreign countries, under the theory promulgated first by Secretary of the Interior Ickes, that great tower of strength for the administration, who advocated his idea that we had to conserve our domestic oil resources and that we had to save and conserve all the tungsten and all the mercury that were available in our country because we would need it for national defense.

I have been in the mining business for 30 years, which is a long period of time, and I have seen these policies come and go.

In 1925 our great Department of the Interior estimated our total oil reserves to be 5,000,000,000 barrels. If Secretary Ickes had come along then and had imposed his policy not only would we need today an additional million barrels of oil a day, but we would need, instead, an additional 6,500,000 barrels a day, because Secretary Ickes would have shut down the oil wells in order to save our reserves of oil for national defense purposes.

Mr. President, it will take us 50 years to recover from the policies of Mr. Ickes, but we are recovering from them. The policy we are discussing here today is another of the policies from which we must recover.

The result of following the Ickes policy was that the development of oil wells in the United States was curtailed or almost discontinued and prospecting in the United States was virtually discontinued. Before World War I began, we were virtually out of supplies of tungsten; and if some of the learned, handraised, so-called economists of the present administration had had their way, there would not have been any United States production of tungsten at the time when World War II began, for it was their theory that our supplies of tungsten were insufficient, and that all production of tungsten in the United States should be stopped. However, during World War II we used a great deal of oil and mercury and tungsten; but notwithstanding that fact, today we have in reserve more oil and more mercury and more tungsten than there was known to be in reserve when those economists were complaining about the situation and were saying that we were about to run out of those minerals. Contrary to their theory, larger and larger reserves of oil and mercury and tungsten have been developed in our country because of the dollar incentive which was held out to prospectors and potential producers.

However, today the situation is entirely different; today we are in the hands of some of the so-called experts of the administration who are virtually in control of the Government's departments.

EXPERTS FIRED

At the beginning of the so-called police action in Korea, or the present emergency, I was happy to see that three or four men who knew something about minerals were called in to help the Department of the Interior. I said to the Secretary of the Interior that as soon as the top officials in the administration found out those men were being used by the Department, their services would be ended; they would be dismissed. Well, Mr. President, since then most of them have been dismissed, and today very little is being done to increase mineral production in the United States.

Of course, under the present policy, very little can be done other than to give money from the Treasury to those who will go into the mining business. That is so because we have no tariff or import fees based on the principle of fair competition. Therefore, when the present emergency is over, the investments in those industries will be destroyed. The hotels in Washington are full of men who have come here to get money from the taxpayers because they have learned their lesson and they know that now the Government is going to be a partner in giving away the taxpayers' money.

So, if it is free trade that we want, the Government will be a partner in the various businesses. The result will be that at the end of the emergency a man who has invested funds in such an industry will simply walk off and forget it, for after the war his investment will be gone. Foreign competition will ruin the investments and will end the employment of thousands of our workers.

In my humble opinion, our national security is gravely threatened by the present policy; yet there are those who urge that the policy be continued.

FOREIGN PURCHASES HURT OUR INDUSTRIES

Mr. President, the present policy of "getting the materials where we can get them the cheapest for our consumers" means—and all our working men an investors should be told this—that the Government wishes to utilize the 12-cents-an-hour labor in Japan, the 21-cents-an-hour labor in France, the 19-cents-an-hour labor in Germany, the 39-cents-an-hour labor in the United Kingdom, the 62-cents-an-hour labor in Australia, and the 92-cents-an-hour labor in Canada, as compared with the $1.41-an-hour labor in the United States. Perhaps the administration thinks that our workingmen are making too much money and that the standard of living of the American workingmen is too high. What a fallacy that opinion is, Mr. President. If any Member of the Senate disagrees with my statement regarding that policy, I should like to debate the matter with him for a little while, if this matter is of interest to any other Member of the Senate.

Already today, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Idaho has referred to the definitions I have given of large business and small business. A few days ago I defined large business. I cannot think of a better definition than that one, namely, that a large business may be defined as an individual, partnership, or corporation large enough and of a nature capable of establishing in foreign, low-wage countries plants not only able to serve the immediate foreign area but also able to produce goods for importation into the United States under the present free-trade provisions, to compete with the goods produced by investors and workingmen in the higher-standard-of-living brackets in the United States.

Small business, on the other hand, may be defined as any business too small, or not of such nature as to lend itself to foreign investments.

I shall not today go into the subject of point 4, but I want to say we are now encouraging it further through the so-called point 4. What is the point 4 program of the President? It is a very simple arrangement: He will finance industry, he will borrow money from the Treasury, and establish industries in foreign countries. Not only that, but he will write off the taxes, so that such industries will not need to pay taxes. Foreign investors will have a gratuity. We can develop industry in foreign nations, not only to compete with our own labor and with our own investors, but, if one is wealthy enough to do it, or if he can get some money from the Government with which to do it, then he can keep his entire profit. It is not as it is here, where one makes a real profit and pays taxes on it. If a man will simply leave this country and take a little Government money with him, manufacture

something which he can sell not only in another country but also on the market in this country, through free trade, then everything will be all right.

SUBSTITUTE FOR H. R. 1612

Under my substitute amendment, formally introduced as Senate bill 981, the so-called peril point would automatically become the tariff, except that it would be adjustable to conform to any changed conditions. What is the peril point, the great peril point upon which we have dwelt so much during the past 2 or 3 years? I will tell the Senators what it is. It is a suggestion coming to the President of the United States through the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission reports to him what is known as a peril point, which he may exceed in his tariff negotiations. Under the conditions set forth in the substitute for H. R. 1612, the Tariff Commission changed into a foreign trade authority would have sufficient latitude to determine what the peril point is, exactly as the Tariff Commission now determines it; and, after a determination of the peril point, it becomes the tariff under the flexible import-fee system. There is no discretion on the part of the President, who is internationally minded and one-economic-world-minded.

ESCAPE CLAUSE AND PERIL POINT WOULD NOT BE USED

Guided by the Secretary of State, it is well known where his sympathies lie. Time and time again, the Secretary of State and his assistants have testified before committees. Their platform or program is well known. Every Member of the Senate should know, if he does not, that they will not use the peril point, that they will not use the escape clause, so that, within a year, or probably after 2 years, I predict that the Senate will do exactly in this matter as it did yesterday regarding the conference report on war goods and strategic materials to Russia and China. It will take about 2 years, I suppose, for it to soak in.

FIXED TARIFFS INADEQUATE

No frozen tariff has ever been completely satisfactory, even if properly adjusted in the beginning. Within a few months or years, conditions may change, through such things as inflation—and especially now, when absolutely no effort is being made to control inflation. Regardless of what anyone may say, inflation can be controlled, but the man who controls it is not going to be popular. The matter of inflation is to me like a man putting on weight. Someone says to him, "Why do you not reduce?" He says, "Well, if I could have as much fun reducing as I had in putting on weight, I would reduce." But there is no fun taking off weight. Likewise, there is no fun when inflation stops. Inflation is described as a time when new money is printed to the extent of several billion dollars a year, as we printed it last year, and when everybody is getting more money every day. Prices, too, are increasing every day. The printing of money keeps up the prices.

Mr. President, there is very little difference—in fact, there is but one difference between an individual, in his unbusinesslike practices, and the Government, in its unbusinesslike practices. The individual is through when his bank quits him, but a government is not through with its unbusinesslike practices until the money it prints becomes worthless. Remember that, for future reference. That is especially applicable to inflation now, when the curve on the inflation chart is going up, over the months, at an angle of 20° to 30°. It is now especially necessary to have a flexible tariff or import fee, if it is for the purpose of establishing fair and reasonable competition. If we want the privilege of giving away industry, and if we wish to divide the markets of the United States with the nations of the world, which is the announced objective of this administration, then a flexible import fee is unnecessary. But I do not go along with that kind of practice, and that is why the junior Senator from Nevada has determined at least to explain the system and to discuss the various factors before a vote is taken.

MANIPULATION OF CURRENCY IN ADDITION TO INFLATION

On the subject of the manipulation of currency, I may say that the United Kingdom in reducing the pound from $4.03 to $2.80, took 30 percent off the tariff of the United States of America, immediately, as explained in advertisements by the United Kingdom, which have appeared in leading magazines, for the purpose of selling her products in this country. "Be your own broker," they say, "be your own broker." When everyone in this country becomes his own broker and buys everything from some foreign nation, it will not be hard to visualize what will happen to the United States. Whence comes the income that one uses when he acts as his own broker? It is all right if but a few follow such a course, but let it become a general practice, and see where we go.

Within a very short time, a fixed tariff is thrown out of gear by inflation of the currency and manipulation of the currency systems. Under the substitute offered by me tariffs may be almost immediately adjusted, whereas, under the trade-agreements negotiations by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, a tariff is frozen for a specified length of time, usually 3 years. I understand that all the trade agreements were extended at Torquay for the period of a full 3 years. Not only the trade agreements which were made this time at Torquay, England, but also the trade agreements which were made previous to that time are then frozen for 3 years. So tariffs are frozen for 3 years, with inflation going on and with manipulation of the money systems throughout the world. Just how any sane person can look at this subject dispassionately and consider how the United States of America could in any way benefit from it is more than the junior Senator from Nevada can understand. Certainly there is not a chance on earth of winning under it. But I may say there are a few people who approach it honestly. The Senate is not approaching it honestly. There are a few people who approach it honestly, and when they do, they say it is necessary to level the standards of living of the nations of the world in order to have peace, perpetual peace, or a guaranty of peace. So that there is no competition; there is no rivalry.

WE CAN'T LEVEL LIVING STANDARDS

The junior Senator from Nevada ran into that idea in India and in other foreign countries. A few persons in this country say that we must level the standard of living, that we must not have a standard of living higher than other nations enjoy. Anyone who will approach the question honestly will acknowledge to himself that if we divided the markets with the nations of the world, it would mean a lower standard. The junior Senator from Nevada can sit down with such a man and discuss the question dispassionately with reference to what it might mean. Such a man understands that if we divide the markets it means a lowering of our wages, and our standard of living; investments must be written off to meet competition or prevent unemployment in connection with a lower standard of living. But any person, Mr. President, who claims that we can divide the markets in this country, lower the tariffs and import fees, and allow the slave-labor nations of the world to compete with our higher living standard, and still maintain our standard of living, is either deceiving himself or he has not developed far enough to understand the subject.

ESCAPE CLAUSE CAN BE EXTENDED WITHOUT EXTENSION

The President, the next point is the escape clause. It has been argued that if it is necessary to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for two more years, there should be available an escape clause for the manufacturers, industrialists, and workers who are already brought under the terms of the trade agreements. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Senate bill 1040, which was in the Senate Finance Committee when the pending bill was reported, provided for an independent escape clause to be included in all existing trade agreements. The committee could have reported the independent escape-clause bill as a substitute for House bill 1612, extending for 2 years the authority of the thoroughly discredited Secretary of State. It was not necessary to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and subject the workingmen and investors to two more years of uncertainty in order to provide an escape clause applicable to existing trade agreements.

I wish to emphasize that, Mr. President. Even if the junior Senator from Nevada had not submitted a separate escape clause, the Senate Finance Committee had ample authority to write off House bill 1612, with the exception of the escape clause, and to report it. What then would have happened? Not a bit of interference with any existing trade agreement would have occurred. They would have been on their own, and the trade agreements would have existed under the same provisions of extension or cancellation. We could have extended the act at the expiration of 3 years, or we could have canceled it without any

extension. The tariffs which had not been adjusted or had not been frozen under the provisions of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act would have come immediately under the flexible import fee provision of the 1930 Tariff Act, section 336. In other words, the Tariff Commission would have taken over any such tariffs and adjusted them, up 50 percent or down 50 percent, in accordance with the law.

So, Mr. President, I repeat that it is a fallacy to say it is necessary to extend the act two, three, or any number of years in order to give an opportunity to apply an escape clause if the President or the State Department made up their minds to utilize it. But, of course, Mr. President, there is no chance of utilizing an escape clause, no matter how it is included and made available to them. That is the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada.

The fact is that an industrially-inexperienced State Department has the power to disturb the tariff or import fee structure which constitutes the floor under wages and investments, and to discourage private venture capital, not only from creating new business organizations, but to some extent to drive it out of existing industries. A business may be entirely successful today, paying wages based on a high-living standard, while a lowering of the tariff or import fee would immediately put it in direct competition with the low-living-standard nations, and destroy investments.

That was true in the case of tungsten mining following World War II, as indicated by the distinguished Senator from Idaho. It is also true in the case of mercury mining, which was mentioned by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, and in the case of the textile industry, mentioned by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. He expressed his fears for the industry if further cuts are made, or when we arrive at a peacetime period when industry must stand on its own feet.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND FREE TRADE

The American Federation of Labor is definitely on record with a resolution opposing free trade or the manipulation of the tariffs and import fees to the point that lower-wage foreign labor is placed in competition with the American workers.

The United Mine Workers are definitely opposed to the free-trade principle.

The CIO is the only national labor organization that approves free trade.

The Nevada labor organizations, local 407, CIO, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Pioche, Nev.; White Pine County Central Labor Council, Ely, Nev.; Central Trades Labor Council, at Reno, Nev.; and the local lodge No. 705, International Association of Machinists, Sparks, Nev., a division point on the Southern Pacific Railroad, have passed resolutions opposing free trade or any manipulation of the fair and reasonable competition principle that favors foreign low-cost labor over American workers.

Mr. President, the Nevada State Farm Bureau, of Ely, Nev., on December 2, 1949, passed the following resolution:

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY—RESOLUTION 17

Whereas the selective free-trade policy adopted by the State Department, based upon the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, is lowering the American living standards through the lowering of wages and is causing unemployment and a subsequent decline in the demand for agricultural products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nevada State Farm Bureau adopts and recommends that the American Farm Bureau Federation support a domestic and foreign policy containing the following features:

I. Foreign policy: (a) Protection of private investments in foreign countries;

(b) Free convertibility of European currencies in terms of dollars;

(c) Consolidation of the European nations into a United States of Europe, and the erasing of all present trade barriers;

(d) Equal access to the trade of all nations of the world subject only to the action of the individual nations.

II. National policy: Set up a flexible import fee which would be based upon fair and reasonable competition administered by a reorganized, experienced Tariff Commission in the same manner as the long-established Interstate Commerce Commission adjusts freight rates for the carriers on a basis of the principle laid down by Congress of a reasonable return on the investment. Under a flexible import-fee principle, a market is immediately established for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of fair and reasonable competition with our own. Other nations in good conscience cannot ask for more. By so doing, America's domestic agricultural market would be greatly stabilized and cease to be a dumping ground for world surpluses. We are a land of agricultural abundance striving to maintain a standard of living unparalleled by any other nation in the world; be it further

Resolved, That the lowering of import fees and tariffs without regard to the differential of the cost of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this Nation and of foreign competitive nations has a demoralizing effect on our agricultural markets as well as those of other industries, thereby causing unemployment and loss of revenue to the American farmer.

FREE TRADE AND FREE IMMIGRATION

Mr. President, I want to say that no one can logically support free trade and oppose free immigration. The result will be the same in either case. There is little difference between the importation of the products of the sweat shop labor and the importation of such labor itself. We all know that there is a well established quota on immigration from foreign nations. The very same legislators who would vote for free trade and have been voting for it for 18 years in some form or another, would violently oppose free immigration, because that would immediately mean Mexican labor and Italian labor and European labor of all kinds would be coming in. Everyone wants to come to the United States of America. But they would violently oppose that. I venture to guess that there would be no vote cast on the Senate floor for free immigration.

But, Mr. President, when it comes to a question as to whether or not we will extend for 2 years the right and the full authority to a Secretary of State and a thoroughly discredited State Department, to dominate the workers, the investors and the industrialists of this country for another 2 years, to give them the power to remake the industrial map of the Nation, then a bill comes out of the Senate Finance Committee by unanimous vote. There is objection to it and it has amendments which mean nothing, except to put a little pressure on a President of the United States who does not recognize pressure in the case of trade with foreign nations at all because he, under 18-year-old advice, has announced his policy practically of a one economic world.

THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. President, the argument is made that Congress should not refuse to extend the free trade principle through the extension for 2 years of the State Department's authority further to manipulate tariffs and import fees. However, it must be remembered that it was the British Empire—the sterling bloc countries—which refused to enter into further trade agreements at the Torquay Conference simply because they wanted to protect the Empire preferential rates, and could see nothing to be gained by further bargaining. We are apparently the only nation in the world that has no interest in protecting our own people. Our one objective appears to be to divide our markets. We have no principle established to protect our people in any way whatsoever. We have abandoned any such principle.

KARL MARX AND FREE TRADE

Mr. President, I want to say that free trade was an established Karl Marx principle to "hasten the revolution" as he so aptly put it. Karl Marx, the outstanding Communist revolutionist of all time, made a very significant address more than 102 years ago on the subject of free trade before the Democratic Club—a very significant name—of Brussels, Belgium, on January 9, 1848. He said at that time, referring to a celebrated political writer:

> In his celebrated work upon political economy, he (Ricardo, the leading economist of his time) says: "If instead of growing our own corn * * * we discover a new market from which we can supply ourselves * * * at a cheaper price, wages will fall and profits rise. The fall in the price of agricultural produce reduces the wages, not only of the laborer employed in cultivating the soil, but also of all those employed in commerce or manufacture."
>
> * * * Besides this, the protective system helps to develop free competition within a nation. Hence we see that in countries where the bourgeoisie is beginning to make itself felt as a class, in Germany for example, it makes great efforts to obtain protective duties. They serve the bourgeoisie as weapons against feudalism and absolute monarchy, as a means for the concentration of its own powers for the realization of free trade within the country.
>
> But, generally speaking—

I am still quoting Karl Marx—

> the protective system in these days is conservative, while the free trade system works

destructively. It breaks up old nationalities and carries antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie to the uttermost point.

Mr. President, the final pronouncement of Karl Marx in his address was:

In a word, the free trade system hastens the social revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone—

I am still quoting from Mr. Karl Marx in his famous address made before the Democratic Club in Brussels on January 9, 1848—

In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade.

Mr. President, the principle has not changed in the 102 years since the outstanding Communist of all time said, in effect, that free trade destroys the working man. Now, since the investment in industry has risen from a few dollars per employed man to an average of approximately $10,000 per employed man, the investor is an equal victim. So the administration is following the line of communism, and following the line which Mr. Karl Marx described when he said:

In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade.

In other words, the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat hastens the revolution. That would seem, even at this late date, to be an objective.

Approval of the 2-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act constitutes approval of the system of reshuffling the private lives of our citizens. Let us see just how this operates, how we reshuffle industry and remake the industrial map of the United States, which has grown up over a period of 175 years, but mostly in the past 75 years, on the basis of a simple principle.

When World War II came along there was a concentration of industry in the heavy-industrial field. For 9 years before that time the administration had been working toward the free-trade setup of dividing the markets of this country, and it had just about caught up with them. There were about 9,000,000 unemployed when World War II came along, and perhaps 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 partially unemployed. Nevertheless, World War II did come along.

Instead of allowing economics to reestablish the industrial map of the United States, which had been disturbed during the emergency, what did we do? We continued the manipulation of the tariffs and import fees to establish the manufacturing industry. Then, as the Secretary of State and his assistant have said many times, the Marshall plan or the ECA was a temporary expedient to make up the balance of payments until the markets could be divided on the basis which I have described.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is fearful that the production of certain textiles will be abolished in its entirety, or, if those industries are to survive, that the standard of living will be lowered. The mining industry, the crockery industry, the precision-instrument industry, and many other industries will be trimmed down or abolished, and we shall buy those materials from foreign countries. We shall have to have a greater population in the heavy-industrial areas for the manufacture of automobiles, heavy farm machinery, heavy road machinery, and in various other industries which can be carried on in concentrated areas. I call attention to the fact that the administration and the State Department are engaged in a deliberate effort to reshuffle the population of this country and to remake the industrial map.

ARE TARIFFS A MAJOR FACTOR IN OUR PRESENT INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC TROUBLES?

Most of our economic troubles arise in Western Europe, and tariffs are major factors in this area's economic troubles. Until they are straightened out, Western Europe will remain a frustrated, unstable economic area. Those countries should not impose tariffs on each other.

Free trade is a beneficial institution for nations whose economies complement each other, as do those of England, France, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. Western Europe, without tariff barriers and without managed currencies, could, to all practical purposes, become a self-contained economic area. We would do the distressed peoples of Europe a great service to insist—which our State Department will not do—that all tariffs between them be abolished.

There are two reasons for free trade in Western Europe: First, the economies are not highly competitive, and secondly, the standard of living is sufficiently uniform to permit free interchange of labor values. Those nations do not need to protect their industries from those of their neighbors: In the main they need the products of their neighbors.

We can visualize the effect of free trade on Western Europe by looking at our own country. Suppose that the rich agricultural area of New York had been blocked off by tariffs from the industrial area of Pennsylvania? Suppose that the western cattle raiser, the wheat farmer, the cotton grower, had had to hurdle trade barriers to get their produce into the Northeastern States? Suppose the watchmakers in Massachusetts and the steel workers of the Mahoning Valley had been cramped up in a small free-trade area? We all know what would have happened: America would never have become prosperous or strong.

About 1,200 years ago Europe was on its way to becoming a United States of Europe under the unified rule of Emperor Charlemagne, but unfortunately the Emperor had three sons instead of one, and to keep them all happy he split Europe three ways, and they have been fighting ever since, recently at our expense. If they continue to fight at our expense we too shall go broke.

The incredibly inept efforts of our present administration to cure the results instead of the causes of Europe's economic troubles are without parallel in diplomatic history.

On the pretext that we must not interfere in internal affairs, which means that we must not interfere with power-hungry, selfish politicians, we are pouring our own national treasure down the drain of a tariff-ridden hopelessly inefficient economic structure.

Personally, I would be willing to have all the nations of Europe "hate our guts" for forcing them into economic unity. At least they would have someone on whom to center their common dislike, and they might wind up by liking each other.

To effect a workable free-trade program, the nations involved must do more than abolish tariffs; they must stop juggling their currency for political advantages. Until the recent devaluations most of Europe's moneys have had strictly artificial values. The best way to set the rate of exchange is to let the people themselves set it by their voluntary transactions. That is what happens in a black market. The people know the true value, and trade on that basis. What is a black market? It is a true market. It is something which is developing in this country very fast at the present time, for different reasons.

Large-scale trading requires an open market and free interchangeability of currency, which, in effect, would give Western Europe a common currency. If the one-world planners really wish to make a good start in Western Europe, they can do so by making our help dependent upon honest money and free trade in the European area.

It may be remembered that in 1948 and 1949 the junior Senator from Nevada suggested, in amendments to ECA bills, that any help we give be contingent upon free interchangeability of currencies between other nations and ourselves. I also suggested that we lend the money to private industry in such areas, if we really intended to develop the industry, instead of giving it to the Socialist governments to preserve their own kind of government.

The politicians might curse the planners, but the people would bless them. Because the struggle for markets has always been a major cause of European wars, an economically unified Europe might well become a peaceful Europe.

WHAT ROLE DO TARIFFS PLAY IN WORLD TRADE?

Tariffs have three legitimate functions: First, to raise revenue; second, to hold an umbrella over essential infant industries and protect them from being overwhelmed by established foreign competition; and third, to put a floor under the living standards of the people. We have used tariffs for 75 years for the purpose of putting a floor under the living standards of our people.

Properly planned tariffs between truly competitive nations do not seriously interfere with international trade. Rather they stimulate competition, initiative, and product improvement.

Tariffs played a vital role in the development of America.

Our industrial system and our standard of living could never have been possible without them.

Moreover, the fact that American industries were protected encouraged for-

eign capital to come in on a permanent basis with the knowledge that no ruinous competition of cheap foreign goods could destroy the investment.

The great obstacle to intercontinental trade today is not tariffs. It is the meddling of politicians into the field of trading.

If government would let the private citizen alone, they would soon have international trade back on its feet, but in the face of the existing bureaucratic restrictions this appears impossible.

As a general rule, today the person who wishes to sell is frequently required to secure an export permit before goods can be sold internationally, and the person who wishes to buy must first secure an import permit and then apply for another permit to get the funds needed to pay for the goods.

The most earnest and ethical of politicians could not avoid delay and discrimination in administering such a cumbersome piece of machinery.

This method is excused on the ground that it was needed to break up the big, bad international cartels, but the monstrosity that has been substituted for these cartels, mostly imaginary, is many times more restrictive than the worst possible combination of cartels.

Government control of international trade is part and parcel of the planned economies that sprang up after the war; if you are controlling the people's lives in the field of the domestic economy, you must also control their economic relations with other nations because they are both part of your master plan for socialistic prosperity.

The master plan does not have a chance unless the planners are the masters.

The amount of Government interference in exports and imports is an accurate measurement of Government interference with the people's liberty.

Freedom is like a ball of twine: Cut out just one small section and it falls apart.

Unfortunately the people are unaware of this truth and during emergencies they grant the Government "small" powers over their lives, believing that they will remain small.

But in order to control policy A, the Government must control policy B, which in turn cannot be controlled if the people are allowed to control policy C, which in turn, and so forth, forever. We are getting very close to the "forever."

Ambitious politicians have always been the greatest enemies of the people, and in modern times, due to the highly technical development of our economic lives, they have increased opportunities to bilk the people out of their freedom.

How many Americans know that the economic agreements arrived at in the United Nations could supersede the provisions of our Constitution?

The people are greatly handicapped and their liberty placed in jeopardy because they have no simple set of principles to guide their judgment in voting on high-sounding trade and tariff treaties, which, in their jungle of legal and technical language, contain hidden bear traps. Some of the bear traps were explained this afternoon in the matter of the customs simplification bill. The time is long past when the Senate can take at its face value any legislation that is sent to it. It is necessary to examine it very carefully.

WHAT SHOULD THE BASIC TARIFF POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES BE?

It should be just about everything that it is not now.

It should be a policy that protects the American people and reflects the traditional aims and customs of our Nation.

At present our tariff policy has been used as an instrument of power politics, and the interests of the American worker have been ignored.

As previously stated, tariffs have three legitimate functions: First, to raise revenue; second, to protect essential infant industries; and third, to place a floor under the workers' standard of living.

America is not particularly concerned about tariff revenue nor protection of essential industry, but our standard of living is of prime concern. At least it is of prime concern to everybody except the present administration.

To understand the broad outlines of what is happening, it is only necessary to remember one principle regarding foreign trade: When we export, we export unemployment; when we import, we import unemployment.

When exports and imports balance as to value and number of hours worked, we break even, and presumably both nations benefit because they get something that they needed in exchange for something they did not need.

Today we have no such balance. That is the purpose of a tariff or import fee, if administered and adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. A flexible tariff automatically makes up the differential between the cost and the productiveness of the hours of labor. Today the tariffs and import fees are lowered below, as will be admitted, any peril point or any fair and reasonable basis. Therefore we are importing unemployment. Only in an emergency, when we can take money out of the United States Treasury which belongs to the taxpayers of this Nation to make up that balance, can we survive.

For example, in the lead industry, exports of pigs and bars have dropped more than 90 percent since 1938. To make matters worse, since the same year the imports of lead pigs and bar lead have gone up 24,000 percent. That means that 240 times as much lead came into the country. In other words, in 1948, we imported 247,000 tons of unemployment for the lead workers of America.

The same thing is happening or may easily happen to other industries because Congress has given up its tariff powers to the starry-eyed economic planners.

When this embarrassing subject is brought up, someone usually starts talking fast about postwar America's selling too much abroad and not buying enough in return.

That is a trick statement because it ignores the fact that most of what we export is not sold, but is a gift from the American taxpayer to foreign countries.

In the official record, exports and imports fall into three categories: Merchandise, services, and income on investments.

In 1946, 1947, and 1948 our imports of services and income on investment were $3,000,000,000 more than our exports.

It is true that in the merchandise category our imports during that 3-year period were about $25,000,000,000 less than our exports. But here is the joker: About $18,000,000,000 of this was paid for out of gifts and loans, leaving a difference of only $7,000,000,000.

Looking at the matter in this way, we find that we bought about the same volume of goods abroad that we actually sold abroad.

Mr. President, how should we regulate our tariffs?

We do not want to freeze anybody out of our markets. We want to help all other countries; but we do not want to put the welfare of the American worker and the standard of living of the entire Nation on the sacrificial altar.

I have proposed to the Congress a means of helping other nations without penalizing America. That means is the flexible-import-fee principle that can guarantee fair and reasonable competition between American workers and the workers of other nations.

For example, a product that is fairly priced in America at $5 would not have to meet the competition of a foreign equivalent dumped into our markets at $3. Instead, the tariff on this item should be about $2, the amount needed to provide for fair competition. That arrangement would put a floor under American prosperity.

WE FINANCE OUR OWN EXPORTS

Mr. President, we have made much of the fact that we must keep up our exports to foreign countries, for various reasons. One of the reasons we give is that we must import as much as we export. Naturally over the years when we give away such enormous amounts of money, the money we give away to others in order to enable them to buy our exports is taken from the pockets of our taxpayers. Furthermore, by means of that process we really have imported unemployment; I repeat, Mr. President, that in that way we have imported unemployment to the extent that we have developed trade above the amount of the legitimate trade. By "legitimate trade" we mean the natural trade between two nations, when one nation buys from another something which the first nation cannot conveniently produce for itself. Legitimate trade is not when the first nation gives to the other nation the money with which to buy the products.

WHAT IS TRADE?

Mr. President, let us start at the bottom in considering trade. One thing of which we can be reasonably sure is that no individual or nation is going to buy anything from another individual or nation if it can conveniently be produced at home. That being true, what do we do? Through our State Department, through our great planners, we say we must keep up our exports. So we give

away approximately $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000 a year to foreign nations or people, to enable them to purchase our exports; and we call that trade. However, all we do by that means is take the money from the pockets of our own taxpayers and give it to the foreigners, to enable them to purchase the goods produced by our own industries and workers. Instead of doing that, we might as well have our own Government buy those goods directly from our own producers and then give the goods back to them as a gift, because everyone knows that the so-called loans we make to foreign countries are never repaid; they are gifts, not loans. If we continue that policy, we find that we pay for the goods in two ways, both by importing unemployment and by paying for the goods we export and sell abroad.

Mr. President, I have before me a very interesting table which illustrates exactly what I am saying. It shows the situation existing from 1909 to January 1, 1951. In the first column of the table the year is shown; in the second column we find the total production of exportable goods, in billions of dollars. That production ranges from $17,400,000,000 in 1909 to $147,200,000,000 in 1950.

In column 2 we find the exports of United States merchandise, in billions of dollars. Those exports range from $1,700,000,000 in 1909 to $10,100,000,000 in 1950.

In column 3 we find the percentage of exportable goods exported—in other words, the percentage which column 2 is of column 1. It ranges from 9.8 percent in 1909 to 6.9 percent in 1950. However, during that period the percentage falls as low as 6.5 and goes as high as 12.4.

In column 4 we find listed the United States Government grants and loans from the year 1909 to the year 1950, inclusive; these are the grants and loans we have given or made to foreign nations during that period of time. It runs as high, during the war years, as $14,016,000,000. Last year, 1950, it was $4,509,000,000.

In the next column, 5, there are shown exports minus United States grants and loans. In other words, exports of United States merchandise, as shown in column 2, in billions of dollars, minus column 4, which shows United States Government grants and loans in 1950 of $4,509,000,000, amounted to $5,600,000,000.

By the way, the percentage of the entire exports of United States merchandise in billions of dollars, as against the amount of exportable goods produced, in billions of dollars, was 6.9. But, after subtracting the billions of dollars which we give to foreign nations, with which to buy our products, we come up with 3.8 percent for 1950.

In other words, considering the billions of dollars which we gave to foreign nations, the percentage of exports runs as high as 12.4 percent, during war years. In 1925, it ran, as high as 10.2 percent; in 1946, 9.6 percent, and in 1947, 12.1 percent. But when, for example, in 1947, we subtract the amount of money which we have given away to other nations for them to buy our goods, we come back to a percentage of 7.9, even immediately following World War II. So the figure on exports runs as high as, let us say, from 6 or 7 to 9 or 10 percent on an average, with the money that we give away, and when we subtract the money we give away, and measure our foreign trade which we would have if we did not give them the money with which to buy our products, we come back to 3½ to 5½ percent, on an average, as the legitimate trade. This figure measures the amount of foreign trade which we actually have. The remainder comes from the pockets of the taxpayers. The legitimate trade of from 3½ to 5½ percent we have always had. So the great amount of trade which we are supposed to be developing for the United States has not materialized. But we have expended vast sums of money, under the excuse of lend-lease, under the excuse of UNRRA, under the excuse of the $3,750,000,000 gift loan to England, and the $17,000,000,000 representing from $4,500,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 a year under the Marshall plan and the ECA.

So, legitimate trade may still be defined as trade which comes naturally between two countries. As in the case of individuals, two countries buy things from each other which they cannot conveniently produce for themselves. Where do they buy, when we do not give them the money with which to buy? When they buy something which they cannot conveniently produce for themselves, they buy it from the country where they can get the quality they want at the lowest cost. So when we get through, we finally go broke in our frantic effort to show a good balance sheet. It is like the man who goes to a bank and requests a loan of $5,000 or $10,000, because his grocery business did not show the right volume, and who says to the banker, "If I had $5,000 or $10,000 to throw around the neighborhood the chances are I could increase my business." If he had plenty of other security, and if he argued long enough, the banker might let him have the money. But, after he had done that for a while, I am afraid his unbusinesslike practices would be ended when his security was not enough for an additional loan. As I said a while ago, earlier in my address, while an individual is through with his unbusinesslike practices when his bank quits him, the Government is not finished with its unbusinesslike practices until the money it prints has no value. We are on the way to finding out the meaning of that method of stopping our unbusinesslike practices, I fear. I did not insert it in the RECORD at the point I should have liked, but I should like now to read a letter from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. It is dated May 17. Speaking of the Small Business Committee, he said:

> DEAR GEORGE: We are all aware of the critical problem facing smaller manufacturers. Many of them have been restricted or prohibited from engaging in their normal civil production. At the same time, defense contracts have not been available to the smaller manufacturers in any volume. The resulting paradox is that small business is in real difficulty at a time when our national economy is operating at nearly an all-time high.

SMALL BUSINESS IS SUFFERING

Mr. President, that is a very sincere letter from a very sincere Senator, and it voices the very problem into which we are running headlong. It is that, under the free-trade system, small business is being scrapped, while large business, defined earlier in my address as business large enough and of such a nature as to establish foreign plants, and not only to manufacture goods for the markets in the low-wage countries within selected areas, but to ship the goods back into this country, prospers.

The objective in assisting these nations in the manner I have just described, through the division of our markets, is reached through the lowering of the tariffs and the import fees on specific products, without regard to the differential of cost of production and without regard to the difference between wages and standards of living here and in the competitive country.

TORQUAY COULD HAVE BEEN STOPPED

Congress should not only refuse to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, but it should have passed Senate bill 1122, terminating the President's authority.

However, Mr. President, the Torquay Conference has adopted the lower tariffs and import fees arrived at by that conference, so that the bill is no longer applicable. If we had passed Senate bill 1122 before the results of the Torquay Conference were adopted, we could have saved the investors and workingmen of this country untold hardship. That can not now be done, and the substitute should be passed in place of the bill which has been reported by the Senate Finance Committee, House bill 1612.

The State Department, through the policy it has adopted under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, has reversed a hundred-year-old policy of having tariffs and import fees as a floor under wages and investments, and based upon fair and reasonable competition. It has deliberately set out to transfer American jobs and investments to foreign nations under the one-economic-world program, and to lower our standards of living to the level of that of the Asiatic and European nations.

The dual objectives announced by the State Department are not compatible with favoring the imports of competitive nations and of preserving our own living standards. I have heard the testimony of Mr. Acheson to the effect that the State Department would probably not utilize the authority provided by House bill 1612 if it were to be passed by the Senate. The question is, Why should it, since the division of the markets of this Nation was completed at the supersecret conference at Torquay? It was kept secret, Mr. President, and the results have now been adopted.

The bilateral agreements consummated at Torquay with approximately 40 nations, on several thousand products, further reducing tariffs, will be subject to the most-favored-nations clause, making the terms of each trade agreement

available to every other nation, effective before June 12, the expiration date of the present act, even if the act is not continued.

ADOPT THE SUBSTITUTE

Mr. President, the adoption of the flexible import fee bill as a substitute for H. R. 1612 would make into law the present tariff rates as established through the operation of the Trade Agreements Act. It will not return the tariffs to the old level of the 1930 Tariff Act. By returning to congressional jurisdiction the authority of the tariff policy of the United States, Congress can regain control over those parts of the domestic economy which are regulated and controlled by the determination of tariff rates. The substitute for the pending bill will establish fair and reasonable competition between the products of domestic manufacturers and those of countries in which low wages and lower living standards make possible low-cost production. The flexible provision of the substitute provides for the orderly review of existing tariffs by a reconstituted Tariff Commission, with the title of "Foreign Trade Authority."

By adjusting tariff rates to the levels necessary for orderly marketing of domestic manufactured products, the flexible provision will bring about savings in the domestic budget by making unnecessary large expenditures for—

(a) Agricultural subsidies;

(b) Mining incentive payments;

(c) Government loans to domestic enterprises for the expansion of production;

(d) Loss of revenue through speeded-up amortization procedure.

It is a well-known fact that private investment is not forthcoming in sufficient volume for those industries whose economic health is endangered by unfair competition from low-cost imports. In other words, there has been several billions of dollars' worth of contracts which have been let in connection with certificates of necessity, so that expenditures made by investors can be written off and amortized within 5 years. Of course that kind of amortization is necessary because there is no protection, no floor under wages and investments, so it is likely that the investment would be lost at the end of the emergency. The Government loses the tax money, making it necessary to raise additional taxes, simply because there is no protection for private investments. The private investor prefers not to invest in industries which during normal times are robbed of their markets by the removal of tariff and import fees on their products.

Mr. President, American small business is against free trade, for, unlike big business, it cannot take advantage of foreign slave-labor wage rates. I should like to read from a statement which is applicable at this time:

Mr. President, it has been said that business favors free trade. What kind of business? Big business, the kind in a financial position to install branch plants in foreign low-wage countries and ship its products into this country under the free-trade program, is for free trade, for the simple reason that it can take advantage of the slave-labor wage rates abroad. On the other hand, small business, which cannot take advantage of foreign cheap labor and which cannot possibly compete with the importation of slave-labor products, except by writing down the wages and investments to conform to the world standards, is against free trade while there remains a wide difference in the American standards and those abroad.

Shall Congress permit the administration to continue to undermine American business? Congress must decide whether it wants to maintain our American standard of living or continue the present administration's foreign trade policy. We can't do both; we must choose between the two.

Our standard of living is seriously threatened by foreign sweatshop labor competition, permitted and encouraged by the administration's foreign trade policy. It is idiocy to say that we can compete with foreign low-wage markets on a free-trade basis without lowering our standard of living. Through the ECA, the World Bank, and other means, we have financed the installation of the latest industrial machinery in the same foreign countries which offer us competition. The difference is that their wage rates are low and their standard of living is low. As a matter of fact, in many of the countries which are dumping their products here at prices which will close our factory doors and force American workers into unemployment, the total paid for labor is often less than is paid here for social security and insurance alone.

Any one economic-world plan will bring about a leveling of the standards of the world. Any leveling means the lowering of our American standards.

The issue is clear-cut. One must be on one side or the other.

On the one side we have the one-worlders, the starry-eyed impractical do-gooders, those who love Europe more than they love America, and big business; on the other side, we have the American workingman who wants employment and wants to maintain his standard of living, the American investor in American enterprise, the Americans who are interested in the preservation of the American way of life, and small business.

It has been brought to my attention, and rightfully so, the interest independent business has in this proposition. It has a vital stake in what may be done to reduce its position in our economy. Independent small business of this Nation, we understand, numbers approximately 4,000,000 units, all employers of labor.

The interest of small business, through their accredited spokesman, the National Federation of Independent Business, and I say accredited because it is believed they have the largest individual membership of independent business and professional men of any business organization in the Nation, has been brought to my attention through the federation's Nation-wide poll of its members on three bills to investigate international trade agreements which are permitting foreign producers to flood American markets with low-tariff, low-priced slave-labor goods.

The association presented both sides of the question to its members. I quote from their official publication, the Mandate, Bulletin No. 158:

"Pro. Agreements reached by the United States Government with England are permitting the British producers to flood American markets with low-cost goods. This has caused great unemployment and suffering among American labor, is driving some old and respected American producers to bankruptcy, and is depriving our Government of much-needed taxes it would normally get."

"Con. These agreements promote international trade, enable foreign nations to rebuild themselves, and enable them to repay loans made to them by the United States."

It is significant to report the results of that poll. Eighty-four percent of its Nation-wide members urge Congress to investigate low-tariff international trade agreements; 12 percent of its members were against the proposition; 4 percent, no vote.

More recently the organization again polled its Nation-wide membership on the proposition, and presented both sides of the story for the consideration of the membership. I quote from their official publication, the Mandate, Bulletin No. 169, both the pro and the con:

"Pro. Under present and proposed reciprocal trade treaties, increased quantities of goods from many low-wage, low-living-standard foreign countries are being dumped in the United States. As a result, many American businessmen are failing and many American workers are losing their jobs. Unless our domestic industries remain strong and their employment is maintained at a high level, there can be no continued national prosperity, and without this prosperity we cannot remain the leader of the free world we are today.

And then the contrary position:

"Con. This is a plea for our Nation to return to the old high tariff policies which have caused so much turmoil in the world. As a nation we realize we have to export in order to maintain our prosperity. But to have a healthy export business we must import. And we can't import if we boost tariffs high every time American businesses suffer. This bill places our Nation in the position of seeking the right to compete freely in foreign markets, yet of denying foreigners the same right in our own land."

It is interesting to note the result of the Nation-wide poll. Eighty percent voted to protect American businessmen and their employees from cutthroat foreign competition by dumping of foreign products on our markets by low wage, low-living-standard foreign producers; 16 percent against; 4 percent, no vote.

In the face of the opinion of independent business and professional men of this Nation, which in number is the largest single segment of our economy, and we believe is the largest employer of labor, collectively, it behooves the Congress of the United States to take a determined and definite stand on international trade.

The proper solution to the problem, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, is the establishing of a flexible import-fee principle, by which the American worker and investor would be protected against unfair slave-labor competition. It is not a question of high tariff or low tariff. Under the flexible import-fee principle, the tariff, or import fee, on goods from a given foreign country would be lowered in proportion to the raising of the standard of living in that country, and when the standard of living there approximated our own, we then would have reached the utopia of free trade.

Free trade is impossible for a prosperous America as long as there remains a wide difference in the American wage standards and those abroad.

Mr. President, I think it is time that we understand where and how we arrive at the policies of the administration in power. I intend to show that the Democratic Party has always been for free trade, that is to say, has always been for the destruction of the floor under wages and investments. In this statement, I intend to show the position of the Democratic Party on tariffs from 1856 to and including 1948.

I read an excerpt from the 1856 platform:

Resolved, That there are questions connected with the foreign policy of this country which are inferior to no domestic question whatever. The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world, and, by

solemn manifestations, to place their moral influence at the side of their successful example.

That was in 1856. At that time the Democratic party declared for free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world.

In 1860 there was no mention of tariffs.

In 1864 there was no mention of tariffs.

In 1868 plank 6 of the platform read as follows:

And a tariff for revenue upon foreign imports.

Not a tariff based upon any fair and reasonable competition, nor a tariff for protection of the laborer and investor, nor for a platform under wages and investments, but a tariff "for revenue upon foreign imports."

In 1872 plank 6 of the Democratic platform read as follows:

And recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congressional districts, and to the decision of the Congress thereon, wholly free from Executive interference or dictation.

We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 4,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. It yields a dwindling, not a yearly rising revenue. It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sales of American manufacturers at home and abroad, and depleted the returns of American agriculture—an industry followed by half our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the processes of production, and wastes the fruits of labor. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all customhouse taxation shall be only for revenue.

Mr. President, we can begin to see where the idea springs from. The free-trade platform of the Democratic Party did not start in 1934. It started, according to the record, in 1856.

In the platform of 1880 there is no mention of tariffs.

I read from the platform of 1884:

The Democratic Party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But, in making reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government, taxes collected at the customhouse have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictate of justice; all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction and taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country. Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government, economically administered, including pensions, interest, and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from the customhouse taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and bearing lightest on articles of necessity. We, therefore, denounce the abuses of the existing tariff, and, subject to the preceding limitations, we demand that Federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes, and shall not exceed the needs of the Government, economically administered.

In other words, there was no talk of any tariff or import fee as a floor under wages and investments, or on any basis of fair and reasonable competition. The platform denounced such a tariff and import fee.

In 1888 the Democratic platform, under the head of "Tariff reform," read as follows:

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations. In the interests of American labor, which should in no event be neglected, the revision of our tax laws contemplated by the Democratic Party should promote the advantage of such labor by cheapening the cost of necessaries of life in the home of every workingman and at the same time securing to him steady and remunerative employment.

They ended up on both sides of the question that time. They were to have a tariff to safeguard a man his job and free trade in order to give him the products which he need for consumption.

Continuing:

Upon this question of tariff reform, so closely concerning every phase of our national life, and upon every question involved in the problem of good government, the Democratic Party submits its principles and professions to the intelligent suffrages of the American people.

Reduction of revenue

Resolved, That this convention hereby endorses and recommends the early passage of the bill for the reduction of the revenue now pending in the House of Representatives.

They end up on the free trade side, as usual, after playing pretty close to the rail all the way.

In 1892 the platform with respect to tariff legislation, in section 3, read as follows:

SEC. 3. We denounce Republican protection as a fraud—a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

We denounce the McKinley tariff law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation; we endorse the efforts made by the Democrats of the present Congress to modify its most oppressive features in the direction of free raw materials and cheaper manufactured goods that enter into general consumption, and we promise its repeal as one of the beneficent results that will follow the action of the people in entrusting power to the Democratic Party. Since the McKinley tariff went into operation there have been 10 reductions of the wages of the laboring men to 1 increase. We deny that there has been any increase of prosperity to the country since that tariff went into operation, and we point to the dullness and distress, to the wage reductions and strikes in the iron trade, as the best possible evidence that no such prosperity has resulted from the McKinley Act.

Continuing to read from the 1892 platform of the Democratic Party:

We call the attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that, after 30 years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus, the homes and farms of the country have become burdened with a real estate mortgage debt of over $2,500,000,000, exclusive of all other forms of indebtedness; that in one of the chief agricultural States of the West there appears a real estate mortgage debt averaging $165 per capita of the total population, and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in the other agricultural-exporting States. We denounce a policy which fosters no industry so much as it does that of the sheriff.

Reciprocity

SEC. 4. Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges, by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products, with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a customhouse barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world, that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products, and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessaries and comforts of life among our own people.

1896 PLATFORM

Tariff resolution

We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country, and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the Government, honestly and economically administered. We denounce as disturbing to business the Republican threat to restore the McKinley law which has twice been condemned by the people in national elections, and which, enacted under the false pleas of protection to home industry, proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade, and deprived the producers of the great American staples of access to their natural markets.

Until the money question is settled we are opposed to any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to meet the deficit in revenue caused by the adverse decision of the Supreme Court on the income tax. But for this decision by the Supreme Court, there would be no deficit in the revenue under the law passed by a Democratic Congress in strict pursuance of the uniform decisions of that Court for nearly 100 years, that Court having in that decision sustained constitutional objections to its enactment, which had previously been overruled by the ablest judges who have ever sat on that bench. We declare that it is the duty of Congress to use all the constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come from its reversal by the Court as it may hereafter be constituted, so that the burdens of taxation may be equally

and impartially laid, to the end that wealth may bear its due proportion of the expense of the Government.

1900 PLATFORM

The free list as a remedy

Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list, to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection.

The Dingley tariff law

We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure, skillfully devised to give the few favors which they do not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear.

1904 PLATFORM

Tariff legislation

The Democratic Party has been and will continue to be the consistent opponent of that class of tariff legislation by which certain interests have been permitted, through congressional favor, to draw a heavy tribute from the American people. This monstrous prevention of those equal opportunities which our political institutions were established to secure has caused what may once have been infant industries to become the greatest combinations of capital that the world has ever known. These especial favorites of the Government have, through trust methods, been converted into monopolies, thus bringing to an end domestic competition, which was the only alleged check upon the extravagant profits made possible by the protective system. These industrial combinations, by the financial assistance they can give, now control the policy of the Republican Party.

We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few, and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the Government, economically administered, and so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class, or section, to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and for the commonweal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions, and its discriminations, keeping in view the ultimate ends of "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities," and the constitutional purpose of raising a revenue by taxation, to wit, the support of the Federal Government in all its integrity and virility, but in simplicity.

Again we have the announcement, in the platform of 1904, in favor of a tariff for revenue only and not of protection or a floor under wages and investments.

1908 PLATFORM

Tariff

We welcome the belated promise of tariff reform, now offered by the Republican Party, as a tardy recognition of the righteousness of the Democratic position on this question; but the people cannot safely intrust the execution of this important work to a party which is so deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican Party. We call attention to the significant fact that the promised relief is postponed until after the coming election—an election to succeed in which the Republican Party must have that same support from the beneficiaries of the high protective tariff as it has always heretofore received from them; and to the further fact that during years of uninterrupted power no action whatever has been taken by the Republican Congress as to correct the admittedly existing tariff inequities.

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list; material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessaries of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home; and gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

Existing duties have given the manufacturers of paper a shelter behind which they have organized combinations to raise the price of pulp and paper, thus imposing a tax upon the spread of knowledge. We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber and logs, and that those articles be placed upon the free list.

Mr. President, we had an example this afternoon of the concern over the free list when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] indicated his worries over the wood-pulp industry in his State. I think we have finally reached the point where even some of the members of the Democratic Party realize that the only way by which our industries can exist is to have a floor under wages and investments that is represented by something, and we have gotten used to calling it a tariff or an import fee.

I read now the 1912 platform of the Democratic Party:

1912 PLATFORM

Tariff reform

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of Government honestly and economically administered.

The high Republican tariff is the principal cause of the unequal distribution of wealth. It is a system of taxation which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. Under its operations the American farmer and laboring man are the chief sufferers. It raises the cost of the necessaries of life to them, but does not protect their product or wages. The farmer sells largely in free markets and buys almost entirely in the protected markets. In the most highly protected industries, such as cotton and wool, steel and iron, the wages of the laborers are the lowest paid in any of our industries. We denounce the Republican pretense on that subject and assert that American wages are established by competitive conditions and not by the tariff.

We favor the immediate downward revision of the existing high, and in many cases prohibitive, tariff duties, insisting that material reductions be speedily made upon the necessaries of life. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products and articles of American manufacture which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home should be put upon the free list.

We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country, and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

We denounce the action of President Taft in vetoing the bills to reduce the tariff in the cotton, woolen, metal, and chemical schedules and the farmer's free-list bill, all of which were designed to give immediate relief to the masses from the exactions of the trusts.

The Republican Party, while promising tariff revision, has shown by its tariff legislation that such revision is not to be in the people's interest; and having been faithless to its pledges of 1908, it should no longer enjoy the confidence of the Nation. We appeal to the American people to support us in our demand for a tariff for revenue only.

That is a very consistent plank in the Democratic Party's platforms from 1906 to and including 1912—in other words, tariff duties for revenue only, without regard to any principle of fair and reasonable competition or a floor under wages and investments.

I read now the Democratic Party's 1916 platform:

1916 PLATFORM

Tariff

We reaffirm our belief in the doctrine of a tariff for the purpose of providing sufficient revenue for the operation of the Government economically administered and unreservedly indorse the Underwood tariff law as truly exemplifying that doctrine. We recognize that tariff rates are necessarily subject to change to meet changing conditions in the world's production and trade. The events of the last 2 years have brought about many momentous changes. In some respects their effects are yet conjectural and wait to be disclosed, particularly in regard to our foreign trade.

Two years of a war which has directly involved most of the chief industrial nations of the world and which has indirectly affected the life and industry of all nations, are bringing about economic changes more varied and far-reaching than the world has ever before experienced. In order to ascertain just what those changes may be, the Democratic Congress is providing for a nonpartisan tariff commission to make impartial and thorough study of every economic fact that may throw light either upon our past or upon our future fiscal policy with regard to the imposition of taxes on imports or with regard to the changed and changing conditions under which our trade is carried on. We cordially indorse this timely proposal and declare ourselves in sympathy with the principle and purpose of shaping legislation within that field in accordance with clearly established facts rather than in accordance with the demands of selfish interests or upon information provided largely if not exclusively, by them.

That is the first indication of any sane approach to the problem of establishing a nonpartisan tariff commission to find out what the situation really is.

I read now the 1920 Democratic Party platform:

1920 PLATFORM

The tariff

We reaffirm the traditional policy of the Democratic Party in favor of a tariff for revenue only—

Now we are back to where we began—and we confirm the policy of basing tariff revisions upon the intelligent research of a nonpartisan commission, rather than upon the demands of selfish interests, temporarily held in abeyance.

Mr. President, I misjudged the 1916 platform, where it looked as if the Democrats might be looking for a tariff that would put labor and investments in this country on a competitive basis with labor and investments in other countries. However, evidently they were looking for a way to obtain revenue from tariffs on a basis which would not affect imports—in other words, to get enough revenue, and to have a nonpartisan commission study tariffs from that standpoint, to secure from taxes on imports sufficient income to run the Government without

in any way having a floor under wages and investments—or, in short, a tariff arrangement not based upon any policy at all.

Mr. President, in that connection I may say that the Underwood tariff was in effect during World War I. The situation then was similar to the situation now, when the tariff has little or no effect, when an emergency exists, and when we are taking from the Treasury money with which to finance a war.

The war in Europe began in 1914, and we entered it in 1917. I remember that war very well, having taken to France early in 1918 a battery of field artillery. In 1914, when that war began, the Underwood tariff was in effect. At that time the war in Europe was of little or no concern to us, because the other nations of the world needed all the products they could obtain. The other nations then were purchasing the products of the United States, therefore, the low tariff then existing had no noticeable effect.

Following the war, along about 1921 or 1922, as I remember very well, a special session of Congress was called to save the economy of the United States which then was suffering because of the imports which were coming into the United States so rapidly. Unemployment was mounting in our country. So the Underwood tariff was opened—it being the tariff act in effect at that time—and tariffs were raised, in order to protect American industry and to put some kind of floor under wages and investments.

1924 PLATFORM

Tariff and taxation

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act is the most unjust, unscientific, and dishonest tariff tax measure ever enacted in our history.

That is the Democratic platform speaking of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act, and this platform was adopted in 1924. It continues:

It is class legislation, which defrauds all the people for the benefit of a few; it heavily increases the cost of living, penalizes agriculture, corrupts the Government, fosters paternalism, and, in the long run, does not benefit the very interests for which it was enacted.

We denounce the Republican tariff laws which are written in great part in aid of monopolies and thus prevent that reasonable exchange of commodities which would enable foreign countries to buy our surplus agricultural and manufactured products with resultant benefit to the toilers and producers of America. Trade interchange, on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating, is a time-honored doctrine of Democratic faith. We declare our party's position to be in favor of a tax on commodities entering the customhouses that will promote effective competition, protect against monopoly, and at the same time produce a fair revenue to support the Government.

The greatest contributing factor in the increase and unbalancing of prices is unscientific taxation. After having increased taxation and the cost of living by $2,000,000,000, under the Fordney-McCumber tariff, all that the Republican Party could suggest in the way of relief was a cut of $300,000,000 in direct taxes; and that was to be given principally to those with the largest incomes. Although there was no evidence of a lack of capital for investment to meet the present requirements of all legitimate industrial enterprises, and although the farmers and general consumers were bearing the brunt of tariff favors already granted to special interests, the administration was unable to devise any plan except one to grant further aid to the few. Fortunately, this plan of the administration failed, and, under Democratic leadership aided by progressive Republicans, a more equitable one was adopted, which reduces direct taxes by about $450,000,000.

This followed what almost amounted to a catastrophe after World War I, when unemployment was mounting so rapidly that a special session of the Congress was called to raise the tariffs to form some kind of floor under wages and investments. We come again to this doctrine of "trade interchange, on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating, is a time-honored doctrine of Democratic faith." I continued reading:

1928 PLATFORM

Tariff

The Democratic tariff legislation will be based on the following policies:

(a) The maintenance of legitimate business and a high standard of wages for American labor.

Now we are approaching the millennium. The Democratic Party has a tariff which supports the standard of American wages. I continue:

(b) Increasing the purchasing power of wages and income by the reduction of those monopolistic and extortionate tariff rates bestowed in payment of political debts.

We are now on the other side. We are adjusting the tariffs, in order to hold a high standard of wages, and we are reducing tariffs, so that what we buy will be cheaper. That is the customary sitting on the fence. I continue:

(c) Abolition of logrolling and restoration of the Wilson conception of a fact-finding Tariff Commission, quasi-judicial and free from the Executive domination which has destroyed the usefulness of the present Commission.

(d) Duties that will permit effective competition, insure against monopoly, and at the same time produce, a fair revenue for the support of Government. Actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of the American laborer, must be the extreme measure of every tariff rate.

This is a departure from 58 years of the Democratic platform. They are now talking about a floor under the wages of American labor. I continue:

(e) Safeguarding the public against monopoly created by special tariff favors.

We are now getting back on the other side. I continue:

(f) Equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of the tariff among all.

Wage earner, farmer, stockman, producer, and legitimate business in general have everything to gain from a Democratic tariff based on justice to all.

That would be a low tariff on what one would buy, a high tariff on what he would sell. It is a double standard for everybody. I continue:

1932 PLATFORM

We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue, with a fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference, reciprocal tariff agreements with other nations, and an international economic conference designed to restore international trade and facilitate exchange.

We condemn the Hawley-Smoot tariff law, the prohibitive rates of which have resulted in retaliatory action by more than 40 countries, created international economic hostilities, destroyed international trade, driven our factories into foreign countries, robbed the American farmer of his foreign markets, and increased the cost of production.

1936 PLATFORM

Foreign policy

We shall continue to foster the increase in our foreign trade which has been achieved by this administration; to seek by mutual agreement the lowering of those tariff barriers, quotas, and embargoes which have been raised against our exports of agricultural and industrial products; but continue as in the past to give adequate protection to our farmers and manufacturers against unfair competition or the dumping on our shores of commodities and goods produced abroad by cheap labor or subsidized by foreign governments.

This was the one particular reason for the lowering of those tariff barriers, quotas, and embargoes "which have been raised against our exports of agricultural and industrial products"—abroad, presumably, and which have increased by leaps and bounds under the policy and program of our State Department within the past 18 years. I continue:

1940 PLATFORM

We shall * * * observe and advocate international respect for the rights of others and for treaty obligations; cultivate foreign trade through desirable trade agreements; and foster economic collaboration with the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

I think this is the nearest approach to what we really have, and it is to "cultivate foreign trade through desirable trade agreements, and foster economic collaboration with the republics of the Western Hemisphere." Of course, we have now forgotten the Western Hemisphere. I continue:

1944 PLATFORM

V. We shall uphold the good-neighbor policy, and extend the trade policies initiated by the present administration.

That was very short and to the point. Since that time they have been fostering and promoting the trade policies initiated by this administration. I continue:

1948 PLATFORM

We pledge ourselves to restore the reciprocal trade agreements program formulated in 1934 by the Secretary of State Cordell Hull and operated successfully for 14 years, until crippled by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Further, we strongly endorse our country's adherence to the International Trade Organization.

Mr. President, the Democratic platform now comes to the International Trade Organization which the administration has now denounced before the Senate Finance Committee. At least, the State Department has said that it will not be again suggested. But, as has been explained earlier in my address today, they are approaching it through the back door. Through the organization known as GATT they have adopted the important Commercial Policy Chapter of the International Trade Organization Charter. They adopted it inso-

far as it can be adopted without special legislation by Congress, but warning has been given Congress that legislation will be proposed to make it effective.

It will be remembered that earlier in my address I pointed out six sleepers in proposed legislation introduced last year and again in the Eighty-second Congress, to simplify customs regulations; the idea of simplification being that we adopt the remainder of chapter IV on Commercial Policy of the International Trade Organization Charter.

Mr. President, I have been informed that the tariff schedule to which I have referred cannot be printed in the Appendix, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

(At this point Mr. MALONE yielded to Mr. MCCARTHY to insert certain matters in the RECORD, which, on request of Mr. MALONE, and by unanimous consent, were ordered to be printed at the conclusion of his speech.)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Senator from Nevada desires to conclude his first speech on this matter tonight?

Mr. MALONE. I might complete the first speech tonight.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator from Nevada desires, we will proceed, Mr. President, if the speech can be completed at any reasonably early hour. The Senator may again speak on this amendment. He has some 10 or 11 other amendments on which he can speak, so there will be no lack of opportunity for him to speak.

Mr. MALONE. It makes little difference; and if the distinguished Senator would like to recess until tomorrow, with the understanding that the Senator from Nevada will have the floor——

Mr. GEORGE. No; if the Senator wishes to continue it is quite agreeable to me. I am not too well, but I will remain.

Mr. MALONE. I do not like to continue, in consideration of the Senator's statement. If someone else would take the place of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I should feel much better about it.

Mr. President, I now conclude my first speech, for the reason just stated.

MALONE EXHIBIT 1

TABULATION OF ITEMS ON WHICH THE UNITED STATES GRANTED TARIFF CONCESSIONS AT TORQUAY

The following tabulation shows each item, identified by tariff paragraph and statistical class, on which the United States granted a concession at Torquay; the rate of duty before the concession was made and the rate afterward; the country or countries with which each concession was initially negotiated; and the value of United States imports for consumption in 1949 of each of the concession items:

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 1—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS				*Thous. of dol.*
1	Acetic or pyroligneous acid containing by weight more than 65 percent acetic acid.	¾¢ lb.	⅝¢ lb.	Canada	591
	Chloroacetic acid (include mono- and trichloroacetic acid)	2½¢ lb.	1¾¢ lb.	Canada	9
	Citric acid	17¢ lb.	8½¢ lb.	Canada	*
	Formic acid	3¢ lb.	2⅗ lb.	Germany	*
	Lactic acid containing by weight of lactic acid:				
	Less than 30 percent	2¢ lb.; 25% min.	1¢ lb.; 12½% min.	Benelux	*
	30 percent, but less than 55 percent	4¢ lb.; 25% min.	2¢ lb.; 12½% min.		
	55 percent or more	9¢ lb.; 25% min.	4½¢ lb.; 12½% min.		
	Oxalic acid	6¢ lb.	4½¢ lb.	Germany	*
	Phosphoric acid	2¢ lb.	1¢ lb.	Canada	(1)
	All other acids and acid anhydrides n. s. p. f.:				
	Naphthenic acids:				
	Liquid	25% plus ¾¢ gal. I. R. tax.	6¼% [2] plus ¾¢ gal. I. R. tax.	Benelux	439
	Solid	25%	6¼% [2]	Benelux	
	Acids and acid anhydrides, n. e. s.	25% plus 3¢ lb. (or 4½¢ lb.) I. R. tax.[3]	12½% plus 1½¢ lb. (or 2¼¢ lb.) I. R. tax.[3]	Canada	1
2	Acetylene, butylene, ethylene, and propylene derivatives (except vinyl acetate and synthetic resins made in chief value therefrom):				
	Acetylene derivatives:				
	Acetaldehyde	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	(1)
	Aldol or acetaldol	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	*
	Butyraldehyde and crotonaldehyde	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	*
	Paracetaldehyde or paraldehyde	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	*
	Homologues, polymers, ethers, esters, salts, and nitrogenous compounds and mixtures of one or more acetylene derivatives, n. s. p. f.	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	(1)
	Butylene, ethylene, and propylene derivatives:				
	Butylene chlorohydrin, dichloride, glycol, and oxide	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	*
	Ethylene chlorohydrin, diamine, dichloride, glycol, and oxide.	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	(1)
	Glycol monacetate	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	*
	Propylene chlorohydrin, dichloride, glycol, and oxide	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	*
	Ethanolamine, mono-, di-, tri-, and all other hydroxy alkyl amines and alkylene diamines.	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	132
	Allyl, crotonyl, vinyl, and other olefin or unsaturated alcohols.	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	68
	Artificial mustard oil	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Germany	*
	All other glycols or dihydric alcohols, n. e. s.	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada, Germany	*
	Homologues, polymers, ethers, esters, salts, and nitrogenous compounds and mixtures of one or more butylene, ethylene or propylene derivatives, n. s. p. f.	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	290
	Ethylene dibromide	6¢ lb. plus 30%	3¢ lb. plus 15%	Germany	*
3	Acetone, ethyl methyl ketone, and their homologues, and acetone oil	20%	10%	Canada	*
4	Mixtures of amyl, butyl, hexyl or propyl alcohols or fusel oil	6¢ lb.	3¢ lb.	Benelux	(1)
5	Salts derived from vegetable oils, animal oils, fish oils, animal fats and greases, n. e. s., or from fatty acids thereof.	25% plus 3¢ lb. (or 4½¢ lb.) I. R. tax.[3]	12½% plus 1½¢ lb. (or 2¼¢ lb.) I. R. tax.[3]	Canada, Germany	*
	Fatty alcohols and fatty acids sulphated, n. e. s., salts of fatty acids sulphated, n. e. s.	12½% [4]	12½% [4]	Canada, Germany	1
	Nicotine and nicotine sulfate	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	
	All alkaloids, salts, and derivatives, n. e. s.	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	30
	Derivatives of barbituric acid, n. e. s.	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	(1)
	Ergot derivatives (ergosterol, ergosterin)	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	18
	Urine concentrates and derivatives	12½%	12½%	Germany	*
	Solutions of urine concentrates and derivatives	12½%	12½%	Germany	*
	Vitamins and vitasterols:				
	Of animal origin	12½%	12½%	Germany	35
	Other	12½%	12½%	Germany	2
	Eucalyptol, n. e. s.	12½%	12½%	Germany	*
	Medicinal preparations of vegetable origin (chrysarobin, papain, digitalin, etc.).	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	13
	Medicinal preparations of animal origin (ox-gall, bile compounds, gland extracts, etc.).	12½%	12½%	Germany	85

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 1—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
5	Medicinal preparations n. s. p. f. not containing alcohol (except Haarlem oil).	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	378
	Salts and compounds of gluconic acid and combinations and mixtures of any of the foregoing; ergotamine tartrate, n. s. p. f.	15%	12½%	Canada, Germany	8
	Ammonium sulfocyanate or thiocyanate	12½%	12½%	Germany	(1)
	Ammonium compounds, n. e. s. (except ammonium silico-fluoride):				
	Ammonium-chrome alum	12½%	12½%	Germany	7
	Other	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	
	Barium sulfide	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	
	Barium compounds, n. e. s.	12½%	12½%	Germany	6
	Magnesium salts and compounds, n. s. p. f.	12½%	12½%	Germany	8
	All potash salts, n. s. p. f.	12½%	12½%	Germany	20
	Sodium compounds:				
	Alginate	20%	12½%	Canada, Germany	8
	Other, n. s. p. f.	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	119
	Laundry sour containing not less than 20 percent of sodium silico-fluoride and not less than 10 percent of oxalic acid, n. s. p. f.	15%	12½%	Canada, Germany	
	Chemicals elements, compounds, mixtures, salts, n. s. p. f. and not containing alcohol:				
	Beryllium, oxide or carbonate	12½% [8]	12½%	Canada, Germany	(1)
	Tellurium compounds	12½%	12½%	Germany	
	Caesium chloride, zinc arsenate and wood impregnating materials, containing salts of arsenic or salts of chromium, or both.	12½%	12½%	Germany	5
	"Other" (except textile assistants)	25%	12½%	Canada, Germany	[9] 2,365
6	Ammonium aluminum sulphate or ammonia alum	¾¢ lb.	¾¢ lb.	France	
7	Ammonium perchlorate	1¢ lb.	¾¢ lb.	France	
	Ammonium phosphate (not fertilizer)	1¼¢ lb.	¾¢ lb.	Canada	(1)
9	Argols, tartar, and wine lees, containing 90 percent or more of potassium bitartrate.	5¢ lb.	2½¢ lb.	France	
10	Balsams, crude, not containing alcohol:				
	Copaiba	5%	2½%	Brazil	40
	Fir or Canada	5%	2½%	Canada	18
12	Barium compounds:				
	Carbonate, precipitated	1¼¢ lb.	1¼¢ lb.	Germany	
	Chloride	2¢ lb.	1¾¢ lb.	Germany	(1)
	Dioxide	6¢ lb.	4¾¢ lb.	Germany	
	Hydroxide	1¼¢ lb.	1¼¢ lb.	Germany	
	Nitrate (not fertilizer grade)	2¢ lb.	1¢ lb.	Germany	8
	Oxide	2½¢ lb.	2¢ lb.	Germany	
15	Theobromine	40¢ lb.	32½¢ lb.	Benelux	326
18	Tetrachloroethane	30%	15%	France	
	Trichloroethylene	10%	7½%	France	2
21	Chemical compounds, mixtures, and salts, of which gold, platinum, rhodium, or silver are chief value.	25%	12½%	Canada	5
23	Preparations in capsules, pills, tablets, lozenges, troches, ampoules, jubes, or similar forms, including powders, nonceal-tar:				
	Medicinals:				
	Of animal origin	12½% min. [10]	12½% min	Canada	135
	Eucalyptal, n. e. s.	12½% min	12½% min	Canada	
	"Other" (except Haarlem oil)	25% min	12½% min	Canada	315
	Salts and compounds of gluconic acid, and combinations and mixtures of any of the foregoing; ergotamine tartrate, n. s. p. f.	15% min	12½% min	Canada	152
	Nonmedicinals:				
	Selenium dioxide and tellurium compounds	12½% min. [10]	12½% min	Canada	
	Chemicals, drugs, and similar substances	25% min	12½% min	Canada	10
24	Extracts for dyeing, coloring, or staining, containing alcohol:				
	20 percent or less	20¢ lb. plus 25%	20¢ lb. plus 12½%	Canada	
	Over 20 and not over 50 percent	40¢ lb. plus 25%	40¢ lb. plus 12½%	Canada	
	Over 50 percent	80¢ lb. plus 25%	80¢ lb. plus 12½%	Canada	
	Brewers' yeast, alcoholic (containing 20 percent or less alcohol)	20¢ lb. plus 25% [10]	20¢ lb. plus 12½%	Canada	1
	Flavoring extracts, fruit flavors, esters, oils, and essences, containing alcohol:				
	20 percent or less	15¢ lb. plus 18%	15¢ lb. plus 9%	Benelux	3
	More than 20 and not more than 50 percent	30¢ lb. plus 18%	30¢ lb. plus 9%	Benelux	10
	More than 50 percent	60¢ lb. plus 18%	60¢ lb. plus 9%	Benelux	(1)
26	Chloral hydrate	20%	17½%	Canada	
	Thymol, n. e. s. (except thymol obtained or derived from eucalyptus oil).	35%	17½%	Germany	1
27 (a)	Coal-tar intermediates (except phthalic anhydride, anthracene, phenol, cresols, naphthalene, azoic components and textile assistants) and finished coal-tar products.	7¢ lb. plus 40%	3½¢ lb. plus 25%	Germany	426
	Anthracene, 30 percent or more pure	7¢ lb. plus 40%	3½¢ lb. plus 20%	Germany	
	Azo, salts (including diazo salts, levamine salts, and variamine blue salts).	7¢ lb. plus 40%	3½¢ lb. plus 20%	Germany	8
	Fast color bases	7¢ lb. plus 40%	3½¢ lb. plus 20%	Germany	(1)
	Fast color salts	7¢ lb. plus 40%	3½¢ lb. plus 20%	Germany	1
	Naphthol AS and derivatives	7¢ lb. plus 40%	3½¢ lb. plus 20%	Germany	
28 (a)	Ink powder	7¢ lb. plus 45%	3½¢ lb. plus 22½%	Benelux	
28 (a)	Acetanilide, acetphenetidine, acetylsalicylic acid, and other coal-tar medicinals (except 2-benzyl-4, 5-imidazoline hydrochloride, methylphenethylhydantoin, phenylbenzyl-aminomethyl imidazoline hydrochloride, and all other medicinals derived from imidazoline or hydantoin; and except diethylamino-acetoxylidide or xylocaine).	7¢ lb. plus 45%	3½¢ lb. plus 25%	Germany, France	[11] 36
	Sodium benzoate	7¢ lb. plus 45%	3½¢ lb. plus 25%	Germany	
	Styrene	7¢ lb. plus 45%	3½¢ lb. plus 22½%	Canada	[12] 1
	Synthetic phenolic resin and all resinlike products prepared from any article provided for in pars. 27 and 1651.	7¢ lb. plus 45%	3½¢ lb. plus 22½%	Canada	156
	Vanillin	7¢ lb. plus 45%	3½¢ lb. plus 22½%	Canada	7
29	Cobalt compounds:				
	Oxide	10¢ lb.	5¢ lb.	Benelux	335
	Sulfate	5¢ lb.	2½¢ lb.	Benelux	
	Linoleate	10¢ lb.	5¢ lb.	Benelux	
30	Collodion and other liquid solutions of pyroxylin, of other cellulose esters or others, or of cellulose.	30¢ lb.	15¢ lb.	Denmark	1

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 1—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS—continued				Thous. of dol.
31 (a) (1)	Cellulose acetate, and compounds, combinations, or mixtures (except of acrylic resins), not made into finished or partly finished articles:				
	Sheets	25¢ lb	12½¢ lb	Canada	(1)
	Powder or flakes	25¢ lb	12½¢ lb	Canada	(1)
	Blocks, rods, tubes, briquets, or other forms, n. e. s	25¢ lb	12½¢ lb	Canada	6
	Waste	25¢ lb	12½¢ lb	Canada	
31 (b) (1)	All compounds of cellulose (except cellulose acetate) not made into finished or partly finished articles:				
	Transparent sheets more than 3/1000 inch and not more than 32/1000 inch in thickness:				
	Of pyroxylin, and compounds, combinations or mixtures of which pyroxylin is the component material of chief value	25¢ lb	22½¢ lb	Sweden	
	Other	30¢ lb	22½¢ lb	Sweden	
	Other forms:				
	Of pyroxylin, and compounds, combinations or mixtures of which pyroxylin is the component material of chief value	25¢ lb	20¢ lb	Sweden	
	Other:				
	Sheets, n. e. s	30¢ lb	20¢ lb	Sweden	
	Rods	30¢ lb	20¢ lb	Sweden	
	Tubes	30¢ lb	20¢ lb	Sweden	
	Other	30¢ lb	20¢ lb	Sweden	42
31 (b) (2)	Manufactures of transparent sheets, bands, and strips not exceeding 3/1000 inch in thickness of cellulose film, cellulose (except cellulose acetate) chief value	50%	25%	France	1
	Smokeless powder	60%	30%	Canada	2
31 (c)	Sheets, bands, and strips of transparent cellulose film exceeding 1 inch in width, but not exceeding 3/1000 inch in thickness, made from cellulose, except cellulose acetate	45%	22½%	Germany	3
34	Drugs of animal origin, advanced in value:				
	Fish oils, n. e. s	5% + 14½¢ lb. I. R. tax	5% + 11½¢ lb. I. R. tax	Canada	74
	Halibut-liver oil	10%	5%	Canada	106
	Drugs of animal origin	5% [9]	5% [8]	Canada	2,003
35	Drugs advanced in value:				
	Pyrethrum or insect flowers	5%	2½%	Peru	
	Derris root and tuba or tube root	5%	2½%	Peru	
	Cube (timbo or barbasco) root	5%	2½%	Peru	183
36	Coca leaves	5¢ lb	2½¢ lb	Peru	78
37	Ethers and esters containing not more than 10 percent alcohol:				
	Diethyl sulfate and dimethyl sulfate	25%	12½%	France	
	Ethyl chloride	15¢ lb	7½¢ lb	Canada	
	Ethyl ether (or sulfuric ether)	4¢ lb	2¢ lb	Canada	
	Ethers and esters, n. s. p. f	25% [8]	12½% [8]	Germany	12
38	Extracts for dyeing, coloring, or staining:				
	Chlorophyll	15%	7½%	Canada	(1)
	Logwood	10%	7½%	France	11
	Tanning extracts:				
	Hemlock, chestnut, and divi-divi	15%	7½%	Italy	1
	Valonia	3½%	3¾%	Turkey	87
39	Flavoring extracts, fruit flavors, esters, oils, and essences, not containing alcohol	10%	7½%	Benelux	69
40	Formaldehyde solution or formalin	1¾¢ lb	7/8 lb	Benelux	
	Formaldehyde, solid, or paraformaldehyde	8¢ lb	4¢ lb	Canada	
41	Gelatin, edible:				
	Valued less than 40 cents per pound	2½¢ lb. plus 10%	2¢ lb. plus 10%	Benelux	72
	Valued more than 80 cents per pound:				
	Photographic	7¢ lb. plus 20%	5¢ lb. plus 15%	France, Germany	39
	Other	7¢ lb. plus 20%	5¢ lb. plus 15%	France, Germany	3
	Agar agar	25%	18%	Korea	471
	Pectin	25%	12½%	Canada	(1)
	Casein glue	30%	15%	Canada	(1)
	Glue, animal, n. s. p. f., valued less than 40 cents per pound	2½¢ lb. plus 10%	2¢ lb. plus 10%	Germany	43
43	Ink and ink powders, n. s. p. f.:				
	Printing and lithographic	10%	5%	Canada	6
	Writing and copying	10%	5%	Canada	2
	Other	10%	5%	Canada	11
	Drawing ink	15%	7½%	Canada	7
44	Iodine, resublimed	10¢ lb	5¢ lb	Korea	(1)
46	Lead compounds:				
	Acetate white	2½¢ lb	1¼¢ lb	Canada	
	Acetate, brown, gray, or yellow	2¢ lb	1¢ lb	Canada	
	Nitrate	3¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Germany	
	Arsenate	3¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Canada	
	Resinate	3¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Canada	
47	Licorice extract in paste, rolls, or any other form	15%	12½%	Turkey	133
49	Magnesium compounds:				
	Manufactures of carbonate of magnesia	2¢ lb	1¢ lb	Canada	
	Sulphate (Epson salts)	¾¢ lb	3/8¢ lb	Germany	10
50	Manganese borate and resinate	20%	12½%	Benelux	
52	Animal and fish oils, fats, and greases:				
	Seal oil	3¢ gal. plus 2.7¢ lb., I. R. tax	3¢ gal. plus 1½¢ lb., I. R. tax	Canada	2
	Other animal and fish oils, fats, and greases, n. s. p. f.:				
	Marine-animal and fish oils, n. s. p. f. (except shark and dogfish oil and shark-liver oil and dogfish-liver oil)	20% plus 3¢ lb., I. R. tax [8]	10% plus 1½¢ lb., I. R. tax [8]	Canada	3
	Animal oils and fats, n. e. s., edible (includes edible chicken fat)	20%	10%	Canada	(1)
	Animal oils, n. s. p. f., inedible (except neatsfoot oil)	10% plus 2.7¢ lb., I. R. tax	10% plus 1½¢ lb., I. R. tax	Canada	
	Animal fats and greases, n. s. p. f	10% plus 2.7¢ lb., I. R. tax	10% plus 1½¢ lb., I. R. tax	Canada	(1)
53	Rapeseed (colza) oil, n. e. s. (not denatured)	6¢ gal. plus 4½¢ lb., I. R. tax [13]	5¾¢ gal. plus 2¼¢ lb., I. R. tax [13]	Canada	
	Expressed or extracted vegetable oils, n. s. p. f.:				
	Corn or maize oil, edible	3¢ lb., 10% min., 20% max	10%	Benelux	
	Expressed or extracted oils, n. e. s., edible	20% [10]	10% [10]	Canada	(1)
	Expressed and extracted oils, n. s. p. f	20%	10%	Canada	
55	Alizarin assistant, Turkey red oil, sulphonated oil, soaps, containing castor oil, and all soluble greases used in processes of softening, dyeing, or finishing	35% [8]	17½% [8]	Germany	(1)

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty		Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
		Jan. 1, 1951	Under Torquay Agreement		
	SCHEDULE 1—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
58	Essential or distilled oils, not containing alcohol:				
	Clove	7½%	6¼%	France	36
	Patchouli	12½%	6¼%	Indonesia	167
	Other, n. s. p. f. (except vetivert):				
	Camphor oil (artificial sassafras oil)	25%	6¼% [2]	France	105
	Cajeput	7½%	6¼%	France, Indonesia	3
	Cedar-leaf	7½%	6¼%	France	3
	Fennel	7½%	6¼%	France	3
	Ho	25%	6¼% [2]	France	18
	Juniper	7½%	6¼%	France	12
	Orris	7½%	6¼%	France	24
	Pine needle	7½%	6¼%	France	18
	Guaiac wood	7½%	6¼%	France	56
	Guayacan, essence of	7½%	6¼%	France	
	Other (including natural sassafras and rosewood)	7½%	6¼%	France	598
59	Opium, containing 8.5 percent and over of anhydrous morphine, crude.	$18 lb. of anhydrous morphine content; $1.80 lb. of opium, min.; $3 lb. of opium, max.	$9 lb. of anhydrous morphine content; $0.90 lb. of opium, min.; $1.50 lb. of opium, max.	Turkey	2,324
60	All mixtures containing essential or distilled oils, or natural or synthetic odoriferous or aromatic substances, not marketable as perfumery, cosmetics, or toilet preparations and not containing more than 10 percent of alcohol.	30¢ lb. plus 20%	20¢ lb. plus 15%	France	1,032
61	Perfumery, including cologne:				
	Containing alcohol	30¢ lb. plus 20%	20¢ lb. plus 18¾%	France	1,121
	Not containing alcohol	20%	18¾%	France	22
	Toilet waters:				
	Containing alcohol	30¢ lb. plus 20%	20¢ lb. plus 18¾%	France	86
	Not containing alcohol	20%	18¾%	France	3
	Articles of perfumery, whether in sachets or otherwise, and all preparations used as applications to the hair, mouth, teeth, or skin, such as cosmetics, dentrifices, tooth soaps, pastes, theatrical grease paints, pomades, powders, and other toilet preparations:				
	Containing alcohol	30¢ lb. plus 20%	20¢ lb. plus 18¾%	France	52
	Not containing alcohol	20%	18¾%	France	46
63	Phosphorus	8¢ lb	4¢ lb	Canada	(1)
	Phosphorus oxychloride	6¢ lb	3¢ lb	Canada	1
65 (a)	Artists', school, students', or children's paints or colors, not exceeding 1½ pounds each, net weight, assembled in paint sets, etc.	50%	35%	Germany	23
66	Chemical pigments, n. s. p. f.	25%	12½%	Norway	61
	Mineral-earth pigments, n. s. p. f. (except Vandyke brown or Cassel earth or Cassel brown).	25%	12½%	Canada	1
67	Blanc fixe or precipitated barium sulphate	1¼¢ lb	⅝¢ lb	Germany	(1)
	Barytes ore:				
	Crude	$3.50 ton	$3 ton	Canada	193
	Ground or manufactured	$7.50 ton	$6.50 ton	Canada	2
68	Blue pigments and all blues containing iron ferrocyanide or ferricyanide (including bleaches, Prussian, Chinese, and Berlin blues).	5¢ lb	4¢ lb	Benelux	2
69	Decolorizing, deodorizing, or gas-absorbing chars or carbons, whether or not activated, and all activated chars and carbons.	25%	22½%	Benelux	1
70	Chrome yellow, green (chromic oxide), and other chromium colors	25%	12½%	Germany	1
71	Lampblack	20%	10%	Germany	
	Black pigments, n. s. p. f. (not including gas or carbon black and acetylene black).	20%	10%	Germany	1
72	Lead pigments:				
	Litharge	2¼¢ lb	1¼¢ lb	Canada	40
	White lead (basic carbonate)	2¼₀¢ lb	1½₀¢ lb	Canada	73
73	Synthetic iron-oxide and iron-hydroxide pigments n. s. p. f.	15%	10%	Canada	120
78	Potassium compounds:				
	Ferrocyanide or yellow prussiate of potash	3¢ lb	2¢ lb	Benelux	
	Bromide	10¢ lb	5¢ lb	Benelux	
	Bicarbonate	1½¢ lb	1¢ lb	Germany	2
81	Sodium compounds:				
	Ferrocyanide (yellow prussiate)	1½¢ lb	1¢ lb	Benelux	
	Phosphate (except pyro phosphate) containing by weight:				
	Less than 45 percent of water	1½¢ lb	½¢ lb.[3]	Benelux	
	45 percent or more of water	¾¢ lb	¼¢ lb.[3]	Benelux	
	Sulphate, anhydrous	$3 ton	$1.50 ton	Germany	5
	Sulphite	¾¢ lb	3/16¢ lb	Germany	(1)
	Bisulphite, and metabisulphite	¾¢ lb	3/16¢ lb	Germany	
	Thiosulphate (hyposulphite)	¾¢ lb	3/16¢ lb	Germany	(1)
83	Rice starch	1¢ lb	¼¢ lb	Benelux	18
	Wheat starch	1¢ lb	¼¢ lb	Benelux	8
84	Dextrine made from potato starch or potato flour	1½¢ lb	1⅛¢ lb	Benelux	77
	Dextrine, n. s. p. f., dextrine substitutes, burnt starch or British gum, and soluble or chemically treated starch.	1½¢ lb	1⅛¢ lb	Benelux	32
85	Strontium:				
	Carbonate, precipitated, and oxide	25%	12½%	Germany	6
	Nitrate	25%	12½%	Germany	
86	Strychnine alkaloid, sulfate, and salts n. s. p. f.	20¢ oz	10¢ oz	Canada	(1)
87	Thorium nitrate, thorium oxide (thoria), and other salts, n. s. p. f., and gas-mantle scrap.	35%	30%	Brazil	
	Cerium compounds	35%	30%	Brazil	
88	Tin bichloride, tin tetrachloride, and other chemical compounds, mixtures, and salts, tin chief value.	25%	12½%	Canada	1
92	Vanilla beans	15¢ lb	7½¢ lb	France	3,491
93	Zinc chloride	¾¢ lb	65/100¢ lb	Benelux	3
	Zinc sulphate (white vitriol)	¾¢ lb	3/10¢ lb.[3]	Benelux	6
94	Collodion emulsion, liquid and solid forms	25%	18¾%	Germany	
95	Azides, fulminates, fulminating powders, and like articles	12½¢ lb	10¢ lb	Canada	
97	Tar and pitch of wood and tar oil from wood	1¢ lb	½¢ lb	Canada	(1)

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 2—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE				*Thous. of dol.*
201 (b)	Brick, n. s. p. f., not glazed, enameled, etc	$1.00 M	$0.50 M	Canada	94
202 (a)	Floor and wall tiles, not wholly or in part of cement, valued at not more than 40 cents per square foot:				
	Ceramic mosaics:				
	Valued at not more than 28¾¢ square foot	7¢ sq. ft.; 35% min.; 40% max.	5¢ sq. ft.; 25% min.; 35% max.	Benelux	3
	Valued at more than 28¾¢ square foot	10¢ sq. ft.; 30% min			
	"Other," unglazed	10¢ sq. ft.; 30% min.; 70% max.	5¢ sq. ft.; 25% min.; 35% max.	Italy	24
	"Other," glazed	10¢ sq. ft.; 30% min.; 70% max.	5¢ sq. ft.; 25% min.; 35% max.	Italy	14
	Floor and wall tiles, wholly or in part of cement:				
	Valued at not more than 40 cents per square foot	10¢ sq. ft.; 50% min.; 70% max.	4¢ sq. ft.; 20% min.; 28% max.[3]	Italy	19
	Valued at more than 40 cents per square foot	60%	24% [3]	Italy	4
204	Magnesite, dead burned and grain, and periclase	23/40¢ lb	23/40¢ lb	Austria	182
205 (c)	Manufactures (other than statues, statuettes, and bas-reliefs) of which plaster of paris is the component material of chief value, n. s. p. f.	35%	17½%	Canada	7
207	Clay, Gross-Almerode:				
	Unwrought and unmanufactured	$1 ton	50¢ ton	Germany	7
	Wrought or manufactured	$2 ton	$1 ton	Germany	
	Clays and earths, n. s. p. f.:				
	Unwrought and unmanufactured	$1 ton	50¢ ton	Germany	16
	Wrought or manufactured	$2 ton	$1 ton	Germany	(1)
207	Bentonite:				
	Unwrought and unmanufactured	75¢ ton	37½¢ ton	Canada	(1)
	Wrought or manufactured	$1.625 ton	81¼¢ ton	Canada	
	Feldspar, crude	25¢ ton	12½¢ ton	Canada	108
	Clays or earths artificially activated with acid or other material	¼¢ lb. plus 30%	⅛¢ lb. plus 15%	Germany	1
	Silica, crude, n. s. p. f	$3.50 ton	$1.75 ton	Canada	
	Fluorspar, containing above 97 percent of calcium fluoride	$5.60 ton	$2.10 ton [3]	Canada	493
208 (g)	Phlogopite (amber) waste and scrap, valued not more than 5 cents per pound.	15%	12½%	Canada	6
208 (h)	Mica, ground or pulverized	15%	12½%	Canada	17
209	Talc, steatite, or soapstone, ground, washed, powdered, or pulverized (except toilet preparations), valued not over $14 per ton.	10%	8¾%	Canada	42
210	Common yellow, brown, red, or gray earthenware and manufactures of, composed of a body wholly of clay which is unwashed, unmixed, and not artificially colored, n. s. p. f., and common salt-glazed stoneware:				
	Not ornamented, not decorated, etc	15%	5% [3]	Benelux	6
	Ornamented, decorated, etc	20%	5% [3]	Benelux	5
211	Earthenware (nonvitrified) and stoneware table and kitchen articles:				
	Plain white, yellow, brown, etc.:				
	Plates, not over 6⅜ inches in diameter and valued at 75 cents or more per doz., or over 6⅜ but not over 8⅛ inches in diameter and valued at 90¢ or more per doz., or over 8⅛ but not over 9⅛ inches in diameter and valued at $1.30 or more per doz., or over 9⅛ inches in diameter and valued at $1.55 or more per doz.; cups valued at $1 or more per doz.; saucers valued at 55 cents or more per doz.; and other articles valued at $2 or more per doz.	10¢ doz. plus 45%	10¢ doz. plus 25%	Italy	45
	Other (i. e. valued at less than the value specified above in respect to the like article).	10¢ doz. plus 45%	10¢ doz. plus 45%	Italy	
	Having a body composed wholly of clay:				
	Plates, not over 6⅜ inches in diameter and valued at 75 cents or more per doz., or over 6⅜ but not over 8⅛ inches in diameter and valued at 90¢ or more per doz., or over 8⅛ but not over 9⅛ inches in diameter and valued at $1.30 or more per doz., or over 9⅛ inches in diameter and valued at $1.55 or more per doz.; cups valued at $1 or more per doz.; and saucers valued at 55 cents or more per doz.	10¢ doz. plus 50%	10¢ doz. plus 20% [3]	Italy	[4] 1,000
	Other articles (other than plates, cups, and saucers) valued at $2 or more per doz. pieces.	10¢ doz. plus 50%	10¢ doz. plus 25%	Italy	
	Articles valued at less than the value specified above in respect to the like article.	10¢ doz. plus 50%	10¢ doz. plus 45%	Italy	
	Having a body not wholly of clay:				
	Articles valued at less than the value specified above in respect to the like article.	10¢ doz. plus 50%	10¢ doz. plus 45%	Italy	[4] 400
211	Earthenware (nonvitrified) and stoneware and manufactures of, n. s. p. f. (other than table and kitchen articles):				
	Plain white, yellow, brown, etc.:				
	Having a body not artificially colored, and composed wholly of clay:				
	Valued $10 or more per dozen	10¢ doz. plus 45%	5¢ doz. plus 25%	Benelux, Italy	[4] 15
	Valued $3 or more, but less than $10 per dozen	10¢ doz. plus 45%	10¢ doz. plus 35%	Italy	[4] 15
	Having a body not wholly of clay, and valued $10 or more per dozen.	10¢ doz. plus 35%	5¢ doz. plus 25%	Benelux, Italy	[4] 10
	Decorated, colored, etc.:				
	Having a body composed wholly of clay:				
	Valued $10 or more per dozen	10¢ doz. plus 50%	5¢ doz. plus 25%	Benelux, Italy	[4] 700
	Valued $3 or more, but less than $10 per dozen	10¢ doz. plus 50%	10¢ doz. plus 35%	Italy	[4] 730
	Having a body not wholly of clay, and valued $10 or more per dozen.	10¢ doz. plus 35%	5¢ doz. plus 25%	Benelux, Italy	[4] 50

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 2—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
212	China and porcelain, vitrified and nonabsorbent, table and kitchen articles and utensils:				
	Domestic or household ware, not containing 25 percent or more calcined bone:				
	Plain white, not painted, colored, etc.:				
	Plates, not over 6¾ inches in diameter and valued at more than $2.55 per doz., or over 6¾ but not over 7⅞ inches in diameter and valued at more than $3.45 per doz., or over 7⅞ but not over 9⅛ inches in diameter and valued at more than $5 per doz., or over 9⅛ inches in diameter and valued at more than $6 per doz.; cups valued at more than $4.45 per doz.; saucers valued at more than $1.90 per doz.; and other tableware, kitchenware, and table and kitchen utensils (except plates, cups, and saucers) valued at more than $11.50 per doz. pieces.	10¢ doz. plus 60%	10¢ doz. plus 35%	Denmark, France	[6] 10
	Decorated, colored, etc.:				
	Plates not over 6¾ inches in diameter and valued at more than $2.55 but not more than $4 per doz., or over 6¾ but not over 7⅞ inches in diameter and valued at more than $3.45 but not more than $5.40 per doz., or over 7⅞ but not over 9⅛ inches in diameter and valued at more than $5 but not more than $8 per doz., or over 9⅛ inches in diameter and valued at more than $6 but not more than $9.75 per doz.; cups, valued at more than $4.45 but not more than $7 per doz.; saucers, valued at more than $1.90 but not more than $3 per doz.; and other tableware, kitchenware, and table and kitchen utensils (except plates, cups and saucers), valued at more than $11.50 but not more than $18 per doz. pieces.	10¢ doz. plus 45%	10¢ doz. plus 35%	Germany	862
212	China and porcelain sanitary articles:				
	Closets, bowls, lavatories, sinks, etc.:				
	Plain white, not painted, colored, etc	60%	35%	Canada	(1)
	Decorated, colored, etc	70%	35%	Canada	1
214	Crushed or ground stone, n.s.p.f. (except Cornwall stone and marble chip or granite)	10%	7½%	Canada	8
	Diamond bort, manufactured (diamond dies)	20%	15%	France	80
	Feldspar, ground	15%	7½%	Canada	
217	Unfilled vials and ampoules, n. s. p. f.:				
	Holding less than ¼ pint	50¢ gross	25¢ gross	Canada	2
	Holding not less than ¼ pint, and not more than 1 pint	1¼¢ lb	¾¢ lb	Canada	
	Holding more than 1 pint	1¢ lb	¼¢ lb	Canada	
218 (a)	Biological, chemical, metallurgical, pharmaceutical, and surgical articles and utensils of all kinds wholly or in chief value of glass	85%	42½%	Germany	76
218 (b)	Tubes (except gauge glass tubes), rods, canes, and tubing finished or unfinished wholly or in chief value of glass (except fusible enamel rods and canes)	65%	32½%	France, Germany	2
218 (d)	Plated or cased glass containing 24 percent or more lead oxide	50¢ ea.; 30% min., 50% max.	30%	Benelux	[6] 1
218 (e)	Bottles and jars, wholly or in chief value of glass, whether or not fitted with or designed for use with ground-glass stoppers, of the character used or designed to be used as containers of perfume, talcum powder, toilet water, or other toilet preparations:				
	Produced by automatic machine (except by automatic machine to which molten glass is automatically fed)	25%	12½%	France	4
	Not produced by automatic machine:				
	Unfilled bottles (not including jars)	50%	45%	France	133
	Filled bottles and jars:				
	Filled with toilet preparations	20%	18¾%	France	(1)
	Filled with other preparations	75%	45%	France	
	Bottles, vials, and jars, wholly or in chief value of glass, fitted with or designed for use with ground-glass stoppers, for holding merchandise other than toilet preparations, if produced by automatic machine	25%	12½%	France	(1)
218 (f)	Table and kitchen articles and utensils, composed wholly or in chief value of glass:				
	Blown or partly blown, in the mold or otherwise, if cut or engraved, valued $3 or more each (including bubble glass)	30%	22½%	Sweden	[6] 100
218 (f)	Glassware, other than bulbs and table and kitchen articles and utensils:				
	Christmas tree ornaments valued at $7.50 or more per gross	50%	30%	Germany	959
	Blown or partly blown, in the mold or otherwise, if cut or engraved, valued $3 or more each, n.e.s. (except engraved ornamental glassware valued $8 each or over, but including bubble glass)	30%	22½%	Sweden	[6] 60
219	Cylinder, crown, and sheet glass:				
	Not over 150 square inches	63/64¢ lb.[23]	0.8¢ lb.[24]	Benelux	159
	Over 150 and not over 384 square inches	1 5/64¢ lb.[23]	0.8¢ lb.[24]	Benelux	100
	Over 384 and not over 720 square inches	1 9/32¢ lb.[23]	1¢ lb.[24]	Benelux	33
	Over 720 and not over 864 square inches	1 5/8¢ lb.[23]	1¢ lb.[24]	Benelux	6
	Over 864 and not over 1,200 square inches	1 37/64¢ lb.[23]	1.3¢ lb.[24]	Benelux	3
	Over 1,200 and not over 2,400 square inches	1 49/64¢ lb.[23]	1.3¢ lb.[24]	Benelux	13
	Over 2,400 square inches	1 31/32¢ lb.[23]	1.6¢ lb.[24]	Benelux	40
223	Plate, cylinder, crown, and sheet glass, made into mirrors, finished or partly finished:				
	Over 144 and not over 384 square inches	8¢ sq. ft., 25% min	7 1/5¢ sq. ft., 22½% min	France	4
	Over 384 and not over 720 square inches	10¢ sq. ft., 25% min	10¢ sq. ft., 22½% min	France	2
	Over 720 square inches	12¢ sq. ft., 25% min	11 1/5¢ sq. ft., 22½% min	France	11
224	Cylinder, crown, and sheet glass, when bent, frosted, sanded, enameled, beveled, etched, embossed, engraved, flashed, stained, painted, ornamented or decorated—additional duty	5%	2½%	Benelux	97
	Cylinder, crown, and sheet glass, when colored (except glass not plate glass and not less than ¼ of inch in thickness, when obscured by coloring prior to solidification)—additional duty	5%	2½%	Benelux	
	All glass described in tariff pars. 221, 222, and 223, when bent, beveled, ornamented, colored, etc. (except glass not plate glass and not less than ¼ of 1 inch in thickness, when obscured by coloring prior to solidification)—additional duty	5%	2½%	Benelux, Austria [29]	

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 2—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
228 (a)	Cathetometers, interferometers, photometers, polarimeters, polariscopes, refractometers, saccharimeters, spectrographs, spectrometers, spectroscopes, frames, mountings, and parts.	60%	50%	Germany	103
	Colorimeters, frames, mountings, and parts	60%	50%	Germany	3
	Haemacytometers, frames, mountings, and parts	60%	50%	Germany	2
	Ophthalmoscopes, slit lamps, corneal microscopes, optical measuring or testing instruments, testing or recording instruments for ophthalmological purposes, frames, mountings, and parts.	60%	50%	Germany	59
228 (b)	Opera and field glasses (not prism-binoculars), valued at more than $1 each.	20%	17½%	France	274
	Telescopes, valued more than $2 each	25%	22½%	France	21
	Frames, mountings, and parts of frames and mountings therefor	25%	22½%	France	3
228 (b)	Sextants, octants, mirrors for optical purposes, and projection lenses	45%	35%	Germany	[8] 125
230 (a)	Glass windows, stained, or painted and parts thereof, n. s. p. f	40%	30%	Austria	2
230 (c)	Glass, ruled or etched in any manner	55%	27½%	Germany	6
	Manufactures of glass, ruled or etched in any manner:				
	For photographic reproduction or engraving processes	55%	27½%	Germany	1
	For measuring or recording purposes	55%	27½%	Germany	(1)
230 (d)	All glass, and manufactures of glass, or of which glass is the component of chief value, n. e. s.	40%	25%	Benelux	61
231	Opal, enamel or cylinder glass tiles and tiling	20%	15%	Benelux	2
232 (a)	Onyx, sawed or dressed, over 2 inches thick	$1 cu. ft	50¢ cu. ft	Italy	
234 (a)	Granite:				
	Paving blocks, wholly or partly manufactured	20%	15%	Benelux	
	Hewn, dressed, pointed, pitched, lined, or polished	20%	15%	Benelux	67
	SCHEDULE 3—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF				
301	Pig iron:				
	Not containing dutiable alloy:				
	Not containing more than 1/100 percent of phosphorus	75¢ ton	60¢ ton	Benelux	1,874
	Containing more than 1/100 percent of phosphorus	75¢ ton	60¢ ton	Benelux	2,711
	Containing dutiable alloy:				
	Not containing more than 1/100 percent of phosphorus	75¢ ton	60¢ ton	Benelux	1
	Containing more than 1/100 percent of phosphorus	75¢ ton	60¢ ton	Benelux	5
	Molybdenum content in excess of 3/10 percent contained in any of the articles provided for in par. 301—additional duty.	65¢ lb	35¢ lb	Canada	
302 (d)	Ferromanganese containing not less than 4 percent carbon	1¼¢ lb.[30]	⅝¢ lb.[30]	Canada	7,188
302 (e)	Manganese silicon:				
	Containing not over 45 percent manganese	17½¢ lb.[31] plus 15%	15/16¢ lb.[31] plus 7½%	Canada	
	Containing over 45 percent manganese (include silico-manganese)	1¢ lb.[31] plus 10%	15/16¢ lb.[31] plus 7½%	Norway	
	Ferromanganese containing not over 1 percent carbon	15/16¢ lb.[31] plus 10%	15/16¢ lb.[31] plus 7½%	Norway	(1)
	Spiegeleisen containing not more than 1 percent carbon, and manganese boron.	17⅛¢ lb.[31] plus 15%	15/16¢ lb.[31] plus 7½%	France	1
302 (f)	Ferromolybdenum, molybdenum metal and powder, calcium molybdate, and other compounds and alloys of molybdenum.	50¢ lb. [32] plus 15%	25¢ lb.[32] plus 7½%	Canada	
302 (i)	Ferrosilicon, containing silicon:				
	30 percent and less than 60 percent	1¾¢ lb.[33]	1¢ lb.[33]	Canada	19
	60 percent and less than 80 percent	2¢ lb.[33]	1 3/16¢ lb.[33]	Canada	22
	80 percent and less than 90 percent	2½¢ lb.[33]	2¢ lb.[33]	Canada	
	Silicon metal	8¢ lb.[33]	4¢ lb.[33]	Canada	17
302 (j)	Silicon aluminum and aluminum silicon	5¢ lb	2½¢ lb	Canada	36
302 (k)	Chrome or chromium metal	25%	12½%	Norway	
302 (l)	Chromium carbide	25%	12½%	Canada	
	Vanadium carbide	25%	12½%	Canada	
	Chromium nickel	25%	12½%	Canada	
	Chromium silicon and ferrochromium silicon	25%	12½%	Canada	
	Chromium vanadium	25%	12½%	Canada	
	Manganese copper	25% [34]	12½% [34]	Norway	
302 (m)	Ferrophosphorus	25%	12½%	Canada	
	Ferrozirconium and zirconium ferrosilicon	25%	12½%	Norway	
	Ferroboron	25%	12½%	Canada	
	Ferroaluminum vanadium, ferromanganese vanadium, ferrosilicon vanadium, and ferrosilicon aluminum vanadium.	25%	12½%	Canada	
302 (n)	Titanium	25%	20%	Canada	} 22
	Barium, boron, strontium, thorium, vanadium	25%	12½%	Canada	
	Calcium metal	25%	17½%	Canada	5
302 (n)	Zirconium metal	25%	12½%	Benelux	2
	Alloys of 2 or more of the metals specified above in 6250.590, 6250.620, and 6250.640 (part).	25%	12½%	Canada	
	Alloys, n. s. p. f., of one or more of the metals specified above in 6250.590, 6250.620, and 6250.640 (part) or the metals columbium or niobium or tantalum with 1 or more of the metals aluminum, chromium, cobalt, copper, manganese, nickel, or silicon:				
	Calcium silicide (calcium silicon)	25%	12½%	Canada, Norway	15
	Zirconium silicon	25%	12½%	Norway	
	Other	25%	20%	Norway	[35] 5
302 (o)	Alloys, n. s. p. f., used in the manufacture of steel or iron and containing not less than 28 percent of iron, not less than 18 percent aluminum, not less than 18 percent silicon, and not less than 18 percent manganese.	12½%	6¼%	Canada	
304	All products dutiable under par. 304 (except hollow bars and hollow drill steel), valued above 16 cents per pound.	15% [36]	12½% [35]	Sweden	81
	Hollow bars and hollow drill steel:				
	Valued above 16¢ lb	15% [35] plus ¾¢ lb	12½% [35] plus 3/16¢ lb	Sweden	
	Valued above 5 and not above 8 cents per pound	15% [35] plus ⅜¢ lb	10% [35] plus 3/16¢ lb	Canada, Sweden	
305	All steel or iron in the materials and articles enumerated or described in pars. 303, 304, 307, 308, 312, 313, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 322, 323, 324, 327, and 328 containing more than 0.2 percent molybdenum—additional duty on molybdenum content.	65¢ lb	35¢ lb	Canada	
307	Boiler or other plate of iron or steel, except crucible and saw-plate steel (including common or block sheets), not thinner than 10/1000 inch, and skelp, sheared or rolled in grooves:				
	Valued not over 3 cents per pound:				
	Skelp	10% [37]; 0.175¢ lb. min.[37]	0.175¢ lb.[37]	Benelux	
	Other	10% [37]; 0.175¢ lb. min.[37]	0.175¢ lb.[37]	Benelux	(1)

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 3—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
308	Sheets of iron or steel, common or black, and boiler or other plate iron or steel thinner than $^{10}/_{1000}$ inch and skelp n. e. s., valued 3 cents or less per pound:				
	Thinner than $^{10}/_{1000}$, not thinner than $^{8}/_{1000}$ inch:				
	Skelp	10% [34]; 0.175¢ lb. min.[35]	0.175¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	
	Other	10% [34]; 0.175¢ lb. min.[35]	0.175¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	
	Thinner than $^{8}/_{1000}$, not thinner than $^{22}/_{1000}$ inch:				
	Skelp	10% [34]; 0.225¢ lb. min.[35]	0.225¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	
	Other	10% [34]; 0.225¢ lb. min.[35]	0.225¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	
312	Beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, tees, columns, post, and other structural shapes:				
	Not assembled, manufactured, or advanced	½¢ lb. [35]	⅛¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	11,618
	Machined, drilled, punched, assembled, fitted, fabricated for use or otherwise advanced.	10% [35]	7½% [35]	Benelux	35
313	Hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel, n. s. p. f., and barrel hoops, 8 inches or less in width, valued 3 cents per pound or less:				
	Thinner than ⅜, not thinner than $^{10}/_{1000}$ inch	0.15¢ lb.[35]	0.125¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	13
	Thinner than $^{10}/_{1000}$, not thinner than $^{25}/_{1000}$ inch	0.2¢ lb.[35]	0.175¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	
	Thinner than $^{25}/_{1000}$ inch	0.3¢ lb.[35]	0.275¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	
	Bands or strips of iron or steel, n. s. p. f.	15% [35]	12½% [35]	Benelux	498
	Strips of iron or steel, n. s. p. f., cold hammered, blued, brightened, tempered, or polished.	15% [35]	12½% [35]	Benelux	
314	Hoop or band iron or steel, for baling cotton, etc., cut to lengths, or manufactured into hoops or ties:				
	Cotton ties	0.15¢ lb.[35]	0.1¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	282
	Other	0.15¢ lb.[35]	0.1¢ lb.[35]	Benelux	2
316 (a)	Wire, n. s. p. f.:				
	Copper	15% [34 35]	12½% [34 35]	Canada	14
	Brass	15% [34 35]	12½% [34 35]	Canada	
	Bronze (include phosphor bronze)	15% [34 35]	12½% [34 35]	Canada	9
	Other (except gold, silver, platinum, tungsten or molybdenum).	15% [35]	12½% [35]	Benelux	44
316 (b)	Forms containing over 50 percent of tungsten, tungsten carbide, molybdenum, molybdenum carbide, or combinations, n. s. p. f.:				
	Ingots, shot, bars, or scrap:				
	Tungsten or tungsten carbide	30%	25%	Benelux	4
	Molybdenum or molybdenum carbide	30%	25%	Austria	3
	Combinations of tungsten, molybdenum, etc	30%	25%	Benelux	
	Sheets, wire, or other forms:				
	Tungsten or tungsten carbide	40%	30%	Benelux	10
	Molybdenum or molybdenum carbide	40%	30%	Austria	10
	Combinations of tungsten, molybdenum, etc	40%	30%	Benelux	
318	Woven-wire cloth, gauze, fabric, or screen made of any metal or alloy n. s. p. f.:				
	Mesh finer than 30, not finer than 90 wires to the lineal inch in warp or filling.	3¢ sq. ft.[35]; 12% min.[35]; 24% max.[35]	2½¢ sq. ft.[35]; 10% min.[35]; 20% max.[35]	Benelux, Canada	6
	Mesh finer than 90 wires to the lineal inch in warp or filling	30% [35]	25% [35]	Benelux, Canada	36
322	Rail braces, and bars for railways	⅛¢ lb. [35]	⅛¢ lb.[35]	Canada	3
	Rails	⅛¢ lb.[35]	⅛¢ lb.[35]	Canada	76
325	Anvils weighing less than 5 pounds each	45%	22½%	Austria	(1)
326	Blacksmiths' hammers, tongs, and sledges, track tools, wedges, and crowbars.	1¾¢ lb	1¼¢ lb	Canada	1
327	Castings and forgings, n. e. s.:				
	Sadirons, tailors' and hatters' irons, not electric, andirons, plates, stove plates, castings, and vessels of cast iron.	10% [35]	5% [35]	Canada	2
	Castings or cast-iron plates, machined or advanced, not made into articles.	10% [35]	5% [35]	Canada	3
	Cast hollow ware, coated, glazed, or tinned, not including enameled, or ware containing electrical elements.	20% [35]	10% [35]	Benelux	
328	Welded cylindrical furnaces, and tubes or flues of plate metal, corrugated, ribbed, or reinforced.	25% [35]	12½% [35]	Canada	5
	Rigid tubes or pipes for electrical conduits	30% [35]	15% [35]	Canada	
329	Chains and parts (except power transmission chains and parts and anchor or stud-link chains):				
	Not less than ¾ inch in diameter	1¢ lb	7/10¢ lb	Canada	1
	Less than ¾, not less than ⅜ inch in diameter	1¢ lb	⅘¢ lb	Canada	(1)
331	Cut nails and spikes over 2 inches long	3/10¢ lb	2/10¢ lb	Canada	2
	Upholsterers' nails and thumbtacks of 2 or more pieces of iron or steel.	4½¢ lb	4¢ lb	Germany	126
	Tacks and brads, cut	15%	7½%	Sweden	
334	Steel wool	10¢ lb. plus 30%	5¢ lb. plus 15%	Canada	
336	Corset clasps, corset and dress steels	35%	17½%	France	
338	Wood screws of iron or steel	15%	12½%	Benelux	2
339	Table, household, kitchen, and hospital utensils, and hollow or flatware, n. s. p. f., whether or not containing electrical heating elements:				
	Plated with platinum	65%	32½%	France	(1)
	Not plated with platinum, gold, or silver:				
	Chief value of tin:				
	Containing electrical heating elements	40%	20%	France	
	Not containing electrical heating elements	40%	12%	France	31
	Chief value of tinplate:				
	Containing electrical heating elements	40%	20%	France	
	Not containing electrical heating	40%	12%	France	57
	Illuminating articles (candlesticks, candelabra, etc.):				
	Chief value of copper	30%	20%	France	111
	Chief value of brass	30%	15%	France	
	Chief value of other base metal (except aluminum, tin, tinplate, and pewter).	40%	20%	France	17
	Carbonated water siphons:				
	Chief value of copper	25%	20%	France	
	Chief value of brass	25%	15%	France	
	Chief value of pewter	25%	12½%	France	
	Chief value of other base metal (except aluminum, tin, and tinplate).	25%	20%	France	
	Other articles of base metal (except aluminum, copper, brass, tin, tinplate, and pewter):				
	Fly swatters	40%	20%	Benelux	
	"Other," not containing electrical heating elements	40%	20%	France	52

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 3—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
340	Circular saws	20%	10%	Canada	4
	Jewelers' or piercing saws	40¢ gross	20¢ gross	Germany	74
341	Engraved plates of steel for printing, n. e. s.	15%	12½%	Canada	32
	Electrotype, stereotype, halftone, photogravure, photo-engraved plates and plates of other materials than steel engraved or otherwise prepared for printing.	15%	12½%	Canada	224
	Engraved plates for designs on glass	15%	12½%	Canada	
	Lithographic plates of stone or other material engraved, drawn, or prepared.	15%	12½%	Canada	
342	Umbrella and parasol ribs and stretchers of metal and tubes for umbrellas.	60%	30%	Austria, Germany	32
343	Spring-beard needles	$1.50 M plus 50%	75¢ M plus 25%	Germany	(1)
	Latch needles	$2 M plus 60%	$1 M plus 30%	Germany	26
350	"Other" pins, including hat, bonnet, and shawl	20%	17½%	Austria	23
352	Twist and other drills, reamers, and other tools and cutting edges for such tools, of steel, or substitutes for steel, suitable for cutting metal, n. s. p. f.	50%	25%	Germany	62
353	Transformers and parts	15%	12½%	Canada	13
	Radio apparatus and parts	15%	12½%	Benelux	771
	Sockets, attachment plugs, and switches not over 10 amperes, cut-outs, and fuses not over 30 amperes, and other wiring devices such as are used in house wiring.	35%	17½%	Canada	10
353	Electrical goods and parts, n.e.s., including signaling, welding, ignition apparatus, instruments (other than laboratory), and devices.	15%	12½%	Germany	397
	X-ray apparatus and parts (except X-ray tubes)	10%	8¾%	Sweden	137
	Articles having as an essential feature an electrical element or device, n. s. p. f.:				
	Motors:				
	Stationary, railway, vehicle, and other, n. e. s.	15%	12½%	Canada	629
	Parts of	15%	12½%	Canada	44
	Internal combustion engines, carburetor type, and parts	10%	8¾%	Canada	1
	Electric furnaces, heaters and ovens, and parts	15%	12½%	Canada	177
	Batteries, other than storage	35%	17½%	Canada	3
	Steam boilers operating with water under forced circulation at least 8 times the rate of evaporation, etc., and parts.	15%	13¾%	Canada, Germany	
	Television apparatus and parts (except cameras)	15%	12½%	Benelux	
	Calculating machines and parts specially constructed for multiplying and dividing, n. s. p. f.	15%	12½%	Sweden	178
	"Other" machines and parts which would be dutiable under par. 372 if of a kind which could be designed to operate without such electrical element or feature.	15%	13¾%	Canada, Germany	358
	"Other" and parts, such as locomotives, portable tools, refrigerators, and signs.	15%	13¾%	Canada, Germany	597
354	Pen, pocket, clasp, pruning, budding, and other knives with folding blades:				
	Valued not over 40¢ per dozen	1¾¢ ea. plus 50%	5¢ ea. plus 25%	Germany	
	Valued over 40¢, not over 50¢ per dozen	5¢ ea. plus 50%	2½¢ ea. plus 25%	Germany	
	Valued over 50¢, not over $1.25 per dozen	11¢ ea. plus 55%	5½¢ ea. plus 27½%	Germany	2
	Valued over $1.25, not over $3 per dozen	18¢ ea. plus 55%	9¢ ea. plus 27½%	Germany	4
	Valued over $3, not over $6 per dozen	25¢ ea. plus 50%	12½¢ ea. plus 25%	Germany	4
	Pen, pocket, clasp, pruning, budding, and other knives with folding blades, assembled but not fully finished:				
	Valued not over $1.25 per dozen	15¢ ea. plus 55%	7½¢ ea. plus 27½%	Germany	
	Valued over $1.25, not over $3 per dozen	18¢ ea. plus 55%	9¢ ea. plus 27½%	Germany	1
	Valued over $3, not over $6 per dozen	25¢ ea. plus 50%	12½¢ ea. plus 25%	Germany	
	Blades, handles, or other parts for pen, pocket, and other knives with folding blades:				
	Valued not over $1.25 per dozen	11¢ ea. plus 55%	5½¢ ea. plus 27½%	Germany	
	Valued over $1.25, not over $3 per dozen	18¢ ea. plus 55%	9¢ ea. plus 27½%	Germany	
	Valued over $3, not over $6 per dozen	25¢ ea. plus 50%	12½¢ ea. plus 25%	Germany	
	Valued over $6 per dozen	11¢ ea. plus 55%	5½¢ ea. plus 27½%	Germany	2
355	Table, kitchen, butchers', and similar cutlery, cleavers, forks, and steels:				
	With handles of nickel-silver, or steel, other than austenitic:				
	Less than 4 inches long (exclusive of handle):				
	Table cutlery, forks, and steels	2¢ ea. plus 12½%	1¢ ea. plus 12½%	Germany	38
	Kitchen, butchers', and similar cutlery, cleavers, forks, and steels.	2¢ ea. plus 25%	1¢ ea. plus 12½%	Germany	4
	Table cutlery, forks, and steels	4¢ ea. plus 25%	4¢ ea. plus 17½%	Germany	19
	Kitchen, butchers', and similar cutlery, cleavers, forks, and steels.	4¢ ea. plus 25%	4¢ ea. plus 17½%	Germany	8
	With handles of "other" material, including wood or wood and steel:				
	Less than 4 inches long (exclusive of handle):				
	Table cutlery, forks, and steels	2¢ ea. plus 17½%	1¢ ea. plus 17½%	Germany	10
	Kitchen, butchers', and similar cutlery, cleavers, forks, and steels.	2¢ ea. plus 17½%	1¢ ea. plus 17½%	Germany	6
	4 inches long or over (exclusive of handle):				
	Table cutlery, forks, and steels	8¢ ea. plus 35%	4¢ ea. plus 17½%	Germany	52
	Kitchen, butchers', and similar cutlery, cleavers, forks, and steels.	8¢ ea. plus 35%	4¢ ea. plus 17½%	Germany	91
	Hunting, curriers', farriers', hay, tanners', painters', shoe, beet-topping, and similar knives, forks, and steels:				
	With handles of silver (except silver-plated) or metal other than iron or steel, aluminum, and nickel-silver.	16¢ ea. plus 35%	8¢ ea. plus 17½%	Sweden	1
	With handles of wood, or wood and steel or with handles of nickel-silver, or steel other than austenitic, if less than 4 inches long (exclusive of handle).	2¢ ea. plus 12½%	1¢ ea. plus 12½%	Sweden	11
	With handles of "other" material, if less than 4 inches long (exclusive of handle).	2¢ ea. plus 17½%	1¢ ea. plus 17½%	Sweden	(1)
356	Planing-machine, tannery, leather, tobacco, paper- and pulp-mill knives; shear blades; circular cloth, cork, and cigarette cutters; and other knives and blades used in power or hand machines.	20%	10%	Germany	38
	Knives or blades for meat-cutting, slicing, or chopping machines	20%	10%	Germany	9
357	Nail, barbers', and animal clippers and blades therefor:				
	Valued not over 50¢ per dozen	3½¢ ea. plus 45%	1¾¢ ea. plus 22½%	Germany	
	Valued over 50¢ and not over $1.75 per dozen	15¢ ea. plus 45%	7½¢ ea. plus 22½%	Germany	(1)
	Valued over $1.75 per dozen	20¢ ea. plus 45%	10¢ ea. plus 22½%	Germany	20
	Scissors and shears (except pruning and sheep shears) and blades therefor, valued over $1.75 per dozen.	15¢ ea. plus 35%	10¢ ea. plus 22½%	Germany	117

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 3—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
358	Razors and parts thereof (except safety razors, or safety razor blades, handles, frames):				
	Valued less than 75¢ per dozen	18¢ ea. plus 30%	15¢ ea. plus 15%	Germany	
	Valued 75¢ and less than $1.50 per dozen	25¢ ea. plus 30%	15¢ ea. plus 15%	Germany	
	Valued $1.50 and less than $3 per dozen	30¢ ea. plus 30%	15¢ ea. plus 15%	Germany	
	Valued $3 and less than $4 per dozen	30¢ ea. plus 30%	22½¢ ea. plus 15%	Germany	
	Valued $4 or more per dozen	30¢ ea. plus 30%	22½¢ ea. plus 15%	Germany	109
359	Dental instruments and parts thereof, wholly or in part of metal (except those in chief value of glass):				
	Burrs	35%	22½%	Germany	375
	Hypodermic needles and parts	30% as	17½%	Germany	8
	Extraction forceps and parts	30% as	17½%	Germany	19
	Other and parts	35%	17½%	Germany	44
360	Instruments, including mathematical apparatus, utensils, appliances, and parts, n. s. p. f., of metals, not plated with gold, silver, or platinum:				
	Laboratory scales, balances, and analytical weights	40%	30%	Germany	124
	Integrators, integraphs, planimeters, and map measures	40%	30%	Germany	21
	"Other"	40%	30%	Germany	121
	Drawing instruments and parts, wholly or in chief value of metal	45%	22½%	Germany	519
	Slide rules wholly or in chief value of synthetic resins	40%	20%	Denmark	[2] 1
361	Slip joint pliers valued not over $2 per dozen	60%	30%	Germany	
363	Swords and sidearms	50%	25%	Germany	8
365	Rifles over $50 each	25%	16¼%	Benelux	108
366	Pistols and revolvers, automatic, single shot, magazine, or revolving, valued over $8 each	$3.50 ea. plus 55%	$1.75 ea. plus 27½%	Italy	12
	Parts of and fittings for automatic, single-shot, magazine, or revolving pistols and revolvers	105%	52½%	Italy	1
368 (a)	Clocks and clock movements:				
	Valued not more than $1.10 each:				
	Lever movements of plate and bridge type construction:				
	1⅞/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	55¢ ea. plus 65%	27½¢ ea. plus 32½%	Germany	1
	More than 4 jewels	27½¢ ea. plus 32½%			(1)
	Over 2 inches in width	55¢ ea. plus 65%			(1)
	Other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	55¢ ea. plus 65%			1
	Valued more than $1.10, not more than $2.25 each:				
	Lever movements of plate and bridge type construction:				
	1⅞/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	$1 each plus 65 percent	50¢ ea. plus 32½%	Germany	1
	More than 4 jewels	50¢ ea. plus 32½%			(1)
	Over 2 inches in width	$1 ea. plus 65%			1
	Other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	$1 ea. plus 65%			15
	Valued more than $2.25, not more than $5 each:				
	Lever movements of plate and bridge type construction:				
	1⅞/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	$1.50 ea. plus 65%	75¢ ea. plus 32½%	Germany	1
	More than 4 jewels	75¢ ea. plus 32½%			1
	Over 2 inches in width	$1.50 ea. plus 65%			2
	Other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	$1.50 ea. plus 65%			20
	Valued more than $5, not more than $10 each:				
	Lever movements of plate and bridge type construction:				
	1⅞/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	$3 each plus 65%	$1.50 each plus 32½%	Germany	1
	More than 4 jewels	$1.50 each plus 32½%			1
	Over 2 inches in width	$3 each plus 65%			23
	Other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	$3 each plus 65%			46
	Valued more than $10 each:				
	Lever movements of plate and bridge type construction:				
	1⅞/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	$4.50 each plus 65%	$2.25 each plus 32½%	Germany	1
	More than 4 jewels	$2.25 each plus 32½%			8
	Over 2 inches in width	$4.50 each plus 65%			17
	Other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	$4.50 each plus 65%			144
	Jewels contained in clocks and clock movements of plate and bridge type construction, 1⅞/100 inches, but not more than 2 inches in width, and having more than 4 jewels	12½¢ each additional	12½¢ each additional	Germany	
	Jewels, n. e. s.	25¢ each additional	12½¢ each additional	Germany	
368 (c)	Parts of clocks and clock movements:				
	Valued not more than $1.10 each:				
	Pillar or bottom plates:				
	1⅞/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	27½¢ each plus 32½%	13¾¢ each plus 16¼%	Germany	
	More than 4 jewels	13¾¢ each plus 16¼%			(1)
	Over 2 inches in width	27½¢ each plus 32½%			
	Plates for assembly of all other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	27½¢ each plus 32½%			
	Valued more than $1.10, not more than $2.25 each:				
	Pillar or bottom plates:				
	1⅞/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	50¢ each plus 32½%	25¢ each plus 16¼%	Germany	(1)
	More than 4 jewels	25¢ each plus 16¼%			
	Over 2 inches in width	50¢ each plus 32½%			
	Plates for assembly of all other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	50¢ each plus 32½%			
	Valued more than $2.25, not more than $5 each:				
	Pillar or bottom plates:				
	1⅞/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	75¢ each plus 32½%	37½¢ each plus 16¼%	Germany	(1)
	More than 4 jewels	37½¢ each plus 16¼%			
	Over 2 inches in width	75¢ each plus 32½%			
	Plates for assembly of all other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	75¢ each plus 32½%			
	Valued more than $5, not more than $10 each:				
	Pillar or bottom plates:				
	1⅞/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	$1.50 each plus 32½%	75¢ each plus 16¼%	Germany	(1)
	More than 4 jewels	75¢ each plus 16¼%			
	Over 2 inches in width	$1.50 each plus 32½%			
	Plates for assembly of all other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	$1.50 each plus 32½%			

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 3—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
368 (c)	Parts of clocks and clock movements—Continued				
	Valued more than $10 each:				
	Pillar or bottom plates:				
	1 7/100 inches or more but not over 2 inches in width:				
	Not more than 4 jewels	$2.25 each plus 32½%			
	More than 4 jewels	$1.12½ each plus 16¼%	$1.12½ each plus 16¼%	Germany	
	Over 2 inches in width	$2.25 each plus 32½%			
	Plates for assembly of all other clocks and clock movements, n. e. s.	$2.25 each plus 32½%			
	Parts or pieces of assemblies or subassemblies attached to plates (except plates or jewels).	5¢ each additional	2½¢ each additional	Germany	
	Assemblies or subassemblies consisting of 2 or more parts or pieces, joined or fastened together (except jewels), n. e. s.	3¢ each part or piece plus 65%	1½¢ each part or piece plus 32½%	Germany	2
	Jewels in assemblies or subassemblies	25¢ each additional	12½¢ each additional	Germany	
	"Other" parts imported with complete movements (not exceeding in value 1½% of the value of such movements).	45%	22½%	Germany	(1)
	"Other" parts, n. s. p. f. (except jewels)	65%	32½%	Germany	8
368 (d)	Dials for clocks, imported separately	50%	25%	Germany	2
368 (g)	Taximeters	45%	22½%	Sweden	2
	Parts of	45%	22½%	Sweden	2
370	Pleasure boats, sail, steam, or motor propelled, valued not more than $15,000 each:				
	Motor propelled	15%	7½%	Canada	204
	Other	15%	7½%	Canada	93
	Internal combustion motorboat engines:				
	Carburetor type	15%	8¼%	Canada	13
	Other (include Diesel and semi-Diesel), weighing not more than 2,500 pounds each.	15%	8¼%	Canada	1
372	Sewing machines valued not over $10 each	10%	7½%	Germany	51
	Cash registers and parts	15%	12½%	Canada, Sweden	40
	Printing machinery, except for textiles:				
	Printing presses	25%	12½%	Germany, Italy [6]	289
	Parts of	25%	12½%	Germany, Italy [6]	22
	Other, except duplicating machines	25%	12½%	Germany	207
	Parts of	25%	12½%	Germany	43
	Bookbinding machinery and parts	25%	12½%	Canada	13
	Paper box machinery and parts	20%	12½%	Canada	59
	Knitting machines and parts:				
	Full-fashioned hosiery	40%	20%	Germany	
	Parts of	40%	20%	Germany	1
	"Other" (include flat, tricot machines, and warp looms)	27½%	20%	Germany	38
	Parts of	27½%	20%	Germany	43
	Looms:				
	Pile	40%	20%	Germany	1
	Other	40%	20%	Germany	47
	Parts	40%	20%	Germany	58
	Cream separators valued at more than $100 each	25%	12½%	Germany	58
	Parts of	25%	12½%	Germany	11
	Apparatus for generation of acetylene gas from calcium carbide, and parts.	15%	10%	Canada	3
	Other machines, finished or unfinished, n. s. p. f.:				
	Forged steel grinding balls	27½%	13¾%	Germany	
	Carburetor type internal combustion engines	10%	8¼%	Canada	33
	Parts of	10%	8¼%	Canada	17
	"Other" tobacco machinery and parts	15%	13¾%	Sweden	61
	Compressors, air and gas	15%	13¾%	Canada	23
	Parts of	15%	13¾%	Canada	1
	Food preparing and manufacturing machinery and parts, n. e. s.	15%	13¾%	Italy	1
	Brewing machines and parts	15%	13¾%	Canada	1
	Mining machinery and parts	15%	13¾%	Canada	100
	Machines for making paper pulp or paper, and parts of	15%	10%	Canada	426
	Calculating machines and parts specially constructed for multiplying and dividing, not having an electric motor as an essential feature.	15%	12½%	Sweden	86
	"Other" wrapping and packaging machinery and parts (include cigar bunching and cigarette packaging and wrapping machines).	15%	13¾%	Canada	153
	Sawmill and other woodworking machines and parts:				
	Reciprocating gang-saw machines	15%	13¾%	Canada	
	Parts of	15%	13¾%	Canada	5
	Other and parts	15%	13¾%	Canada	424
	Machinery and parts, n. e. s.	15%	13¾%	Canada, Germany	3,639
374	Aluminum metal and alloys, crude	2¢ lb.	1½¢ lb.	Canada	21,569
377	Bismuth	3½%	1¾%	Peru	834
380	German silver, or nickel silver, unmanufactured	20% [3]	10% [3]	Canada	
382 (a)	Bronze powder not of aluminum	14¢ lb.	10¢ lb.	Germany	14
	Aluminum bronze powder and powdered foil	12¢ lb.	6¢ lb.	Germany	12
388	Types, new	30%	15%	Germany	89
389	Nickel tubes or tubing:				
	Not cold-rolled, cold-drawn, or cold-worked	12½%	6¼%	Canada	
	Cold-rolled, cold-drawn, or cold-worked	17½%	8¾%	Canada	(1)
390	Bottle caps of metal, collapsible tubes, and sprinkler tops (except screw caps and patented closures):				
	Not decorated, enameled, plated, or embossed	15%	12½%	France	7
	Decorated, enameled, plated, or embossed	20%	17½%	Benelux	60
391	Lead, contained in lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds, not actually recovered (except lead contained in copper, gold, or silver ores or copper mattes).	1½¢ lb. [4]	¾¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	
	Lead ores, flue dust, nes, and mattes	1½¢ lb. [4]	¾¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	34,526
	Flue dust or fume containing lead and zinc, and other minerals or metals.	1½¢ lb. [4]	¾¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	
392	Lead:				
	Bullion or base bullion	2¼¢ lb. [4]	1⅛¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	376
	Pigs and bars	2¼¢ lb. [4]	1⅛¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	80,648
	Reclaimed, scrap, dross, and lead, nes (except antimonial lead)	2¼¢ lb. [4]	1⅛¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	4,004
	Type metal and antimonial lead	2¼¢ lb. [4]	1⅛¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	2,256
	Babbitt metal and solder	2½¢ lb. [4]	1¼¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	259
	Alloys and combinations of lead, n. s. p. f.:				
	In chief value of lead	2¼¢ lb. [4]	1⅛¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	5
	Not in chief value of lead (include leady antimony and white metal).	2½¢ lb. [4]	1¼¢ lb. [4]	Canada, Peru	100
	Pipe, sheets, shot, glaziers' and wire	2½¢ lb.	1¼¢ lb.	Canada, Peru	101

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 3—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
393	Zinc-bearing ores (except pyrites containing not more than 3% zinc)	3/4¢ lb.[42]	3/5¢ lb.[42]	Canada, Peru	16,008
	Zinc contained in zinc-bearing ores, nes, not recoverable	3/4¢ lb.[42]	3/5¢ lb.[42]	Canada, Peru	
394	Zinc in blocks, pigs or slabs	7/8¢ lb.	7/10¢ lb.	Canada, Peru	29,341
	Zinc dust	7/8¢ lb.	7/10¢ lb.	Canada, Peru	4
395	Embossing rollers of metal	30%	15%	Germany	19
396	Bit braces	45%	22½%	Germany	658
	Pipe tools, wrenches, spanners, screw-drivers, vises, hammers and parts, of metal	45%	22½%	Germany	26
	Calipers, rules, micrometers, and parts, of metal	45%	22½%	Germany	85
	Folding rules of aluminum and parts	65%[43]	32½%	Germany	
397	Articles or wares, n. s. p. f., whether partly or wholly manufactured:				
	Plated with platinum, but not in chief value thereof	65%	32½%	France	(1)
	Composed wholly or in chief value of iron, steel, lead, copper, brass, nickel, pewter, zinc, aluminum, or other metal, but not plated with platinum, gold, or silver, or colored with gold lacquer:				
	Lead rivets, nuts, washers, and screws, having shanks, threads, or holes not over 0.24-inch in diameter	2¢ lb.; 15% min.; 30% max	2¢ lb.; 15% min.; 30% max	Germany	
	Lead manufactures, n. s. p. f	2¢ lb.; 15% min.; 45% max	2¢ lb.; 15% min.; 30% max	Germany	29
	Wire fencing and netting composed of wires smaller than 5/100-inch, not smaller than 3/100-inch in diameter, if coated with zinc or metal before weaving	30%	25%	Germany	
	Tin manufactures, n. s. p. f	22½%	12%	France	25
	Tin plate manufactures, n. s. p. f:				
	Containers	22½%	12%	France	76
	Other	22½%	12%	France	88
	Heating and cooking stoves, n. s. p. f., and parts	22½%	12½%	Canada	8
	Styluses	22½%	11¼%	Canada	
	Blow torches and incandescent lamps operated by compressed air and kerosene or gasoline	22½%	12½%	Sweden	4
	Parts of carbonated water siphons (except of lead, tin, and tin plate)	22½%	12½%	France	(1)
	SCHEDULE 4—WOOD AND MANUFACTURES OF				
404	Hardwood flooring:				
	Spanish cedar	5% plus $1.50 M bd. ft. I. R. tax.	5% plus 75¢ M bd. ft. I. R. tax.	Dominican Republic.	
	Lignum-vitae	7½% plus $3 M bd. ft. I. R. tax.	7½% plus $1.50 M bd. ft. I. R. tax.	Dominican Republic.	
	Lancewood, ebony, and boxwood	7½% plus $3 M bd. ft. I. R. tax.	7½% plus $1.50 M bd. ft. I. R. tax.	Dominican Republic.	
	Granadilla, rosewood, and satinwood	5% plus $1.50 M bd. ft. I. R. tax.	5% plus 75¢ M bd. ft. I. R. tax.	Dominican Republic.	
	Mahogany	5% plus $1.50 M bd. ft.	5% plus 75¢ M bd. ft.	Dominican Republic.	
	Plywood:				
405	Birch	20%	15%	Canada	1,969
	Parana pine	40%	25%	Brazil	25
	Other (except plywood of alder, red pine, and Spanish cedar and plywood with face ply of Western red cedar)	40%	20%	Benelux, Canada, and France.[44]	[45] 194
406	Blocks or sticks, heading and stave bolts, hubs for wheels, rough hewn, shaped, sawed or bored	5%	2½%	Canada	246
407	Beer barrels or kegs, empty, of wood	15%	7½%	Canada	
	Packing boxes, empty, and packing box shooks of wood, n. s. p. f	15%	3¾% [3]	Canada	205
411	Baskets and bags of willow (osier)	50%	25%	Benelux	697
412	Wood moldings and carvings to be used in architectural and furniture decoration	40%	20%	Germany	7
	Paint-brush handles of wood	15%	10%	Canada	203
412	Manufactures wholly or in chief value of wood or bark, n. s. p. f.:				
	Broom and mop handles, not less than 3/4 inch in diameter, not less than 38 inches long	15%	10%	Canada	115
	Canoes and canoe paddles	15%	10%	Canada	8
	Horse-drawn carriages, drays, trucks, and other horse-drawn vehicles and parts	10%[46]	10%	Canada	2
	Ice hockey sticks	15%	10%	Canada	26
	Toboggans	15%	10%	Canada	3
	SCHEDULE 5—SUGAR, MOLASSES, AND MANUFACTURES OF				
501	Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 sugar degrees, and all mixtures containing sugar and water, testing by the polariscope above 50 sugar degrees and not above 75 sugar degrees	0.4709375¢ lb. [34]	0.428125¢ lb. [34 48]	Dominican Republic, Peru.	[49] 5,349
	And for each additional sugar degree shown by the polariscopic test	0.0103125¢ lb. additional for each sugar degree, and fractions of a degree in proportion.	0.009375¢ lb. additional for each sugar degree, and fractions of a degree in proportion.[48]	Dominican Republic, Peru.	
	Note: Computed rate for 96 degree sugar	0.6875¢ lb	0.625¢ lb		
502	Molasses and sugar sirups, n. s. p. f., containing soluble nonsugar solids equal to 6 percent or less of the total soluble solids, testing not above 48 per centum total sugars	0.155¢ gal.[34]	0.135¢ gal.[34 47]	Dominican Republic.	[49] 23
	And for each additional per centum total sugars	0.1705¢ gal. additional for each 1%, and fractions of 1% in proportion.	0.151¢ gal. additional for each 1%, and fractions of 1% in proportion.[47]	Dominican Republic.	
	Note: Computed rate for 75% total sugars	4.7585¢ gal	4.212¢ gal		
	SCHEDULE 6—TOBACCO AND MANUFACTURES OF				
601	Cigarette leaf tobacco, unstemmed (other than smoke-cured tobacco having the flavor and aroma characteristic of smoke-cured Latakia leaf tobacco)	20¢ lb	15¢ lb	Turkey	45,343
605	Cigars and cheroots	$4.20 lb. plus 25%	$2.25 lb. plus 12½%	Benelux	[49] 5

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty		Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
		Jan. 1, 1951	Under Torquay Agreement		
	SCHEDULE 7—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS				*Thous. of dol.*
701	Beef and mutton tallow:				
	Edible	1/4¢ lb. plus 1 1/2¢ lb. I. R. tax	1/4¢ lb. plus 3/4¢ lb. I. R. tax	Canada	(1)
	Inedible	1/4¢ lb. plus 1 1/2¢ lb. I. R. tax	1/4¢ lb. plus 3/4¢ lb. I. R. tax	Canada	104
702	Sheep and lambs	$3 head	75¢ head [2]	Canada	791
704	Reindeer meat, fresh, chilled, or frozen, n. s. p. f.	6¢ lb.	3¢ lb.	Norway	
706	Meats, fresh, chilled or frozen, n. s. p. f. (except edible offal)	6¢ lb.; 20% min.	3¢ lb.; 10% min.	Canada	7
707	Cream	[20¢ gal.,[48] 15¢ gal.[49]	15¢ gal.[48] 5¢ ¢ gal.[49]	Canada	
708 (c)	Malted milk and compounds, or mixtures of, or substitutes for, milk or cream.	35%	17 1/2%	Canada	(1)
710	Cheese:				
	Romano in original loaves made from cows' milk	7¢ lb.; 25% min.[8]	7¢ lb.; 20% min.	Italy	[6] 1,600
	Pecorino in original loaves not suitable for grating	5¢ lb.; 25% min.[8]	5¢ lb.; 20% min.	Italy	[6] 200
	Reggiano in original loaves	7¢ lb.; 25% min.	5¢ lb.; 20% min.	Italy	[6] 500
	Parmesano in original loaves	7¢ lb.; 25% min.	7¢ lb.; 20% min.	Italy	[6] 11
	Provoloni in original loaves	5¢ lb.; 25% min.	5¢ lb.; 20% min.	Italy	[6] 535
	Provolette	5¢ lb.; 25% min.	5¢ lb.; 20% min.	Italy	[6] 21
	Cheddar, not processed otherwise than by division into pieces	3 1/2¢ lb.; 17 1/2% min.	3¢ lb.; 15% min.	Canada	964
	Edam and Gouda:				
	Containing 40 percent or more of butterfat	3 1/2¢ lb.; 15% min.	3¢ lb.; 15% min.	Benelux	395
	Other	5¢ lb.; 25% min.	5¢ lb.; 20% min.	Benelux	2
	"Other" cheese and substitutes for cheese	5¢ lb.; 25% min.	5¢ lb.; 20% min.	Italy, Norway	[6] 1,100
711	Bob White quail, valued $5 or less each	50¢ ea.	25¢ ea.	Benelux	(1)
	Game birds, other than Bob White quail, valued over $2.50 and not over $5 each.	10%	25¢ ea.	Benelux	2
	Song birds, valued $5 or less each	50¢ ea.	25¢ ea.	Benelux, Germany	204
	Other birds n. s. p. f., valued over $2.50 and not over $5 each	10%	25¢ ea.	Benelux	2
714	Horses, other than for breeding, and not for immediate slaughter:				
	Valued not over $150 per head	$10 head	$7.50 head	Canada	154
	Valued over $150 per head	15%	8 1/4%	Canada	174
717 (a)	Mackerel, fresh, whole or beheaded, or eviscerated, or both	3/4¢ lb.	1/2¢ lb.	Canada	65
718 (a)	Fish, prepared or preserved in any manner, when packed in oil or oil and other substances:				
	Bonito and yellow tail:				
	Valued not over 9 cents per pound [31]	30 1/2%	22%	Peru	2
	Valued over 9 cents per pound [31]	21%	15%	Peru	3,615
	Sardines neither skinned nor boned, but smoked before canning, valued over 18 not 23 cents per pound.[31]	20%	15%	Norway	[6] 6
	Anchovies, valued not over 9 cents per pound [31]	22% [8]	22%	Italy	2
	Antipasto, valued not over 9 cents per pound [31]	44%	22%	Italy	(1)
718 (b)	Fish not in oil or in oil and other substances, in airtight containers weighing, with contents, not over 15 pounds each:				
	Salmon	25%	15%	Canada	255
	Sardines in immediate containers weighing, with contents, less than 8 ounces.	12 1/2%	10%	Norway	[6] 396
	"Other" sardines and "other" herring (include snacks, tidbits, rollmops, sprats).	12 1/2%	6 1/4%	Norway	[6] 149
	Fish cakes, balls, and pudding	12 1/2%	6 1/4%	Norway	[7] 184
719 (4)	Herring, pickled or salted (include sprats, pilchards, and anchovies):				
	In containers, not airtight, weighing, with contents, not more than 15 pounds each.	15%	12 1/2%	Benelux	
	In containers, weighing, with contents, more than 15 pounds each and containing each not more than 10 pounds of herring.	1/2¢ lb.[32]	3/8¢ lb.[32]	Benelux	181
720 (a) (2)	Herring, smoked or kippered (except hard-dry smoked), whole or beheaded, not packed in oil or in oil and other substances and not packed in airtight containers weighing, with contents, 15 pounds or less each.	1¢ lb.	3/4¢ lb.	Norway	23
720 (a) (6)	"Other" fish, smoke or kippered, not in oil or in oil and other substances and not packed in airtight containers, weighing with contents not more than 15 pounds each.	10%	6 1/4%	Norway	8
721 (b)	Razor clams, canned	10%	7 1/2%	Canada	13
	Clam chowder, clam juice, and clam juice in combination with other substances.	35%	17 1/2%	Canada	4
721 (c)	Fish paste and fish sauce	15%	10%	Norway	51
721 (d)	Caviar and other fish roe (except sturgeon):				
	Not boiled or not packed in airtight containers	10¢ lb.	5¢ lb.	Canada	67
	Boiled and packed in airtight containers	15%	7 1/2%	Norway	29
724	Hybrid seed corn (or maize), certified	25¢ bu. (56 lbs.)	12 1/2¢ bu. (56 lbs.)	Canada	[6] 221
726	Oatmeal, rolled oats, oat grits, and similar oat products	10%; 40¢ per 100 lbs. min.; 80¢ per 100 lbs. max.	10%; 20¢ per 100 lbs. min.; 80¢ per 100 lbs. max.	Canada	14
	Oats, unhulled, ground	25¢ per 100 lbs.	12 1/2¢ per 100 lbs.	Canada	4
728	Rye malt	30¢ per 100 lbs.	22 1/2¢ per 100 lbs.	Canada	
	Rye flour and meal	30¢ per 100 lbs.	22 1/2¢ per 100 lbs.	Canada	(1)
730	Mixed feeds	5%	2 1/2%	Canada	58
	Dogfood, unfit for human consumption, canned and dried, containing grain products.	5%	2 1/2%	Canada	(1)
732	Cereal breakfast foods and preparations, n. s. p. f.	10%	5%	Canada	23
736	Blueberries:				
	Frozen	10%	8 1/4%	Canada	610
	Otherwise prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.	10%	8 1/4%	Canada	1
740	Figs, fresh, dried, or in brine:				
	Valued less than 7¢ pound	3¢ lb.	2 1/2¢ lb.	Turkey	1
	Valued 7 cents or more per pound	3¢ lb.	2 1/2¢ lb.	Turkey	588
742	Grapes (except hothouse), imported for consumption July 1 to the following Feb. 14, inclusive.	17 1/2¢ cu. ft.	12 1/2¢ cu. ft.	Canada	227
	Raisins made from seedless grapes:				
	Sultana	1 1/2¢ lb.	1¢ lb.	Turkey	8
	Other	1 1/2¢ lb.	1 1/2¢ lb.	Turkey	
752	Cantaloups, imported for consumption Aug. 1 to Sept. 15, inclusive	25%	20%	Canada	2
	Candied, crystallized, or glace apricots, figs, dates, peaches, pears, plums, prunes, prunelles, berries, and other fruits, n. s. p. f.	15%	12 1/2%	France	8
	Guavas in brine, pickled, dried, desiccated or evaporated	31%	17 1/2%	Dominican Republic.	1
	Bananas (except dried, desiccated, or evaporated), plantains, papayas, cashew apples, mameyes colorados, sweetsops, soursops, and sapodillas, in brine, pickled, dried, desiccated, evaporated, or otherwise prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.	31%	17 1/2%	Dominican Republic.	39
	Mixtures of 2 or more fruits, prepared or preserved	21%	17 1/2%	Dominican Republic.	

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 7—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
753	Bulbs, bulb roots, or corms, cultivated for flowers or foliage:				
	Tulip bulbs	$3 M	$2 M	Benelux	3,760
	Lily bulbs	$6 M	$4.50 M	Benelux	412
	Narcissus bulbs	$5 M	$3 M	Benelux	1,093
	Lily of the valley pips	$6 M	$3 M	Denmark, Germany	57
	Bulbs, roots, rootstocks, clumps, corms, etc., n. e. s.	10%	7½%	Benelux	1,733
	Orchids, cut, fresh, dried, prepared, or preserved	25%	12½%	Denmark	25
754	Seedlings and cuttings of Manetti, multiflora, and brier rose, rugosa, and other rose stock 3 years old or less.	$1 M	50¢ M	Benelux	12
756	Chestnuts, including marrons, candied or prepared or preserved in any manner (include dried and peeled chestnut kernels).	8¢ lb	6¼¢ lb	Italy	54
757	Shelled filberts	8¢ lb	8¢ lb	Turkey	1,543
762	Sunflower seed	2¢ lb	1¢ lb	Canada	26
763	Grass and other forage crop seeds:				
	Vetch, other than hairy vetch	1½¢ lb	1¢ lb	Turkey	389
	Kentucky bluegrass seed	2¢ lb	1¼¢ lb	Denmark	17
764	Garden and field seeds:				
	Beet (except sugar beet) (include Swiss chard)	2¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Benelux	2
	Cabbage	5¢ lb	3¢ lb	Benelux, Denmark	51
	Canary	½¢ lb	¾¢ lb	France, Turkey	595
	Carrot	3¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Benelux	(1)
	Cauliflower	25¢ lb	12½¢ lb	Benelux, Denmark	68
	Kale	2¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Benelux	12
	Kohlrabi	5¢ lb	4¢ lb	Benelux, Denmark	3
	Parsley	2¢ lb	1¢ lb	France	(1)
	Parsnip	3¢ lb	2¢ lb	Benelux	5
	Radish	2¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Benelux	94
	Spinach	½¢ lb	¾¢ lb	Benelux	247
	Turnip, other than rutabaga	2¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Benelux	176
	Rutabaga	2¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Benelux, Denmark	15
	Flower	3¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Benelux, Denmark	336
	Seeds, n. s. p. f. (except sesbania seed)	2¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Benelux	186
766	Beets, fresh (other than sugar beets)	10%	5%	Canada	28
768	Mushrooms, canned, or otherwise prepared or preserved (except dried).	5¢ lb.[52] plus 15%	4¢ lb.[52] plus 12½%	France	225
770	Onion sets	2½¢ lb	1¼¢ lb	Canada	(1)
774	Vegetables in their natural state:				
	Cauliflower, imported for consumption Aug. 6 to Oct. 15, inclusive.	25%	12½%	Canada	(1)
	Radishes, imported for consumption, Sept. 1 to following June 30, inclusive.	25%	12½%	Canada	(1)
	Horseradish, crude	3¢ lb	1½¢ lb	Sweden	23
775	Cucumbers, pickled	25%	17½%	Benelux	161
	Onions, pickled or packed in salt or in brine	15%	12½%	Benelux	264
777 (a)	Cocoa, unsweetened	1¢ lb.[53]	¾¢ lb.[53]	Benelux	2,079
	Chocolate, unsweetened	1¢ lb.[53]	¾¢ lb.[53]	Benelux, Dominican Republic.	1,563
777 (b)	Cocoa, sweetened, valued 10 cents or more per pound	15%	10%	Benelux	4
	Chocolate, sweetened:				
	In bars or blocks weighing 10 pounds or more each	1½¢ lb	1¢ lb	Benelux, Dominican Republic.	17
	In any other form, whether or not prepared, and valued at 10 cents or more per pound.	15%	10%	Benelux, Dominican Republic.	370
780	Hop extract	$2.40 lb	$1.20 lb	Benelux	
781	Mustard seed, whole	1¼¢ lb	7¢ lb	Canada, Denmark	665
	Marjoram leaves, in glass or other small packages	25%	12½%	France	1
783	Raw cotton (except linters):				
	Staple 1⅛ or more, but less than 1¼ inches	3½¢ lb	3½¢ lb.[54]	Peru	25
	Staple 1¼ or more, but less than 1⅜ inches	3½¢ lb	3½¢ lb.[54]	Peru	2,330
	Staple 1⅜ or more, but less than 1 13/16 inches	3½¢ lb	3½¢ lb.[54]	Peru	5,182
	Staple 1 13/16 inches and over	3½¢ lb	1¾¢ lb	Peru	1,692
	SCHEDULE 8—SPIRITS, WINES AND OTHER BEVERAGES				
802	Whiskey (except Scotch, Scotch type, Irish, and Irish type):				
	Aged in wooden containers at least 4 years prior to entry:				
	In containers holding each 1 gallon or less (in cases)	$1.50 pf. gal	$1.25 pf. gal	Canada	[55] 24,884
	In containers holding each more than 1 gallon (in casks or barrels).	$1.50 pf. gal	$1.25 pf. gal	Canada	[56] 1,564
	Other	$1.50 pf. gal	$1.25 pf. gal	Canada	[55] 156
	Arrack	$5 pf. gal	$2.50 pf. gal	Benelux	(1)
803	Champagne and all other sparkling wines, valued not more than $6 per gallon.	$2 gal	$1.50 gal	France	418
804	Still wines containing not more than 24% alcohol:				
	Still wines (except vermouth) produced from grapes:				
	Containing 14% or less of alcohol:				
	In containers holding each 1 gallon or less	40¢ gal	37½¢ gal	France, Germany	3,528
	In containers holding each more than 1 gallon	75¢ gal	62½¢ gal	France	14
	Containing more than 14%, but not more than 24% of alcohol:				
	Marsala-type in containers holding each 1 gallon or less	$1.25 gal	62½¢ gal	Italy	[55] 81
	"Other," n. e. s. (including ginger wine or ginger cordial):				
	In containers holding each 1 gallon or less	62½¢ gal	62½¢ gal	Denmark	151
	In containers holding each more than 1 gallon	62½¢ gal	62½¢ gal	Denmark	1
805	Liquid malt, malt sirup, and fluid malt extracts, n. e. s.:				
	For use in baking, manufacturing, etc	$1 gal	50¢ gal	Benelux, Canada	
	Other	$1 gal	50¢ gal	Benelux	
	Malt extract, solid or condensed:				
	For use in baking, manufacturing, etc	60%	30%	Benelux	
	Other	60%	30%	Benelux, Canada	
806 (a)	Grape juice, grape sirup, and similar grape products:				
	Containing or producing less than 1% alcohol	70¢ gal	45¢ gal	Canada	(1)
	Containing or producing 1% or more alcohol	70¢ gal. plus $5 pf. gal.[57]	45¢ gal. plus $2.50 pf. gal.[57]	Canada	

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 9—COTTON MANUFACTURES				*Thous. of dol.*
907	Filled or coated cotton cloths, n. s. p. f.	12½%	10%	Benelux	22
909	Cotton twill-back velveteens, in the piece, cut or uncut:				
	Valued less than 65 cents per square yard	25¢ sq. yd.; 25% min.; 44% max.	25¢ sq. yd.; 22½% min.; 44% max.	Italy	152
	Valued 65 cents or more per square yard				
911 (a)	Cotton blankets and blanket cloth, napped or unnapped:				
	Not Jacquard-figured:				
	Blankets	30%; 14¼¢ lb. min.	15%; 7⅛¢ lb. min.	Germany	1
	Blanket cloth	30%; 14¼¢ lb. min.	15%; 7⅛¢ lb. min.	Germany	
	Jacquard-figured:				
	Blankets	45%	30%	Benelux	(1)
	Blanket cloth	45%	30%	Benelux	(1)
911 (b)	Polishing, dust, and mop cloths, wholly or in chief value of cotton, not pile fabric.	15%	12½%	Benelux	11
912	Miscellaneous articles of cotton, or cotton and rubber:				
	Fabrics with fast edges, not exceeding 12 inches in width, and articles made from them, n. s. p. f.	35%	17½%	Germany	11
	Garters, suspenders, and braces	20%	17½%	France	3
	Loom harness, healds, and collets of vegetable fiber	35%	17½%	Canada, France	
	Labels, for garments or other articles of vegetable fiber	15%	12½%	Benelux	1
916 (b)	Hose and half-hose, made or cut from knitted fabric of vegetable fiber, n. s. p. f.	30%	15%	France	5
923	Manufactures, wholly or chief value of cotton, n. s. p. f.:				
	Terry-woven towels valued 45 cents or more each	22½¢ lb.; 20% min.; 35% max.	22½¢ lb.; 15% min.; 35% max.	Benelux	4
	"Other" articles and manufactures of cotton n. s. p. f. (except articles of pile construction).	40%	30%	Austria	[2] 550
	SCHEDULE 10—FLAX, HEMP, JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF				
1001	Unmanufactured flax:				
	Straw	$1.50 ton	75¢ ton	Canada	21
	Tow	½¢ lb.	¼¢ lb.	Canada	224
1017	Wearing apparel of vegetable fiber other than cotton, n. s. p. f. (not including shirt collars and cuffs of flax).	20%	17½%	France	21
1021	Carpets, carpeting, mats, matting, and rugs, wholly or in chief value of flax or hemp, or a mixture of them, or a mixture of either or both with jute.	17½%	17½%	Benelux	70
	SCHEDULE 11—WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF				
1102 (b)	Hair of the alpaca, llama, and vicuna:				
	In the grease	18¢ lb.[3]	9¢ lb.[3]	Peru	258
	On the skin	16¢ lb.[3]	8¢ lb.[3]	Peru	
	Washed	18¢ lb.[3]	9¢ lb.[3]	Peru	1,212
	Sorted, or matchings, if not scoured	19¢ lb.[3]	9½¢ lb.[3]	Peru	2
	Scoured	21¢ lb.[3]	10½¢ lb.[3]	Peru	24
1105 (a)	Garnetted wool waste	14½¢ lb.	12½¢ lb.	Benelux	24
	Wool noils, carbonized	17¢ lb.	16¢ lb.	Benelux	222
	Wool thread or yarn waste	11½¢ lb.	10¢ lb.	Benelux	2,362
	Wool card or burr waste, not carbonized	10½¢ lb.	9¢ lb.	Benelux	349
	Wool wastes, n. s. p. f.	10½¢ lb.	9¢ lb.	Benelux	111
1106	Tops of hair (include camel's hair, mohair, wool, alpaca, and vicuna tops).	27¾¢ lb plus 12½%	27¾¢ lb. plus 6¼%	Benelux	3,024
	Other wool, advanced, but not further advanced than roving	27¾¢ lb. plus 12½%	27¾¢ lb. plus 6¼%	Benelux	105
1107	Yarns of wool and other hair (including mohair yarns, but excluding yarns of Angora rabbit hair):				
	Valued not over 60¢ per pound	30¢ lb. plus 20%	30¢ lb. plus 15%	Germany	(1)
	Valued over 60¢, not over $1 per pound	30¢ lb. plus 20%	30¢ lb. plus 15%	Germany	28
	Valued over $1, not over $1.50 per pound	30¢ lb. plus 20%	30¢ lb. plus 15%	Germany	66
	Valued over $1.50 per pound	30¢ lb. plus 20%	30¢ lb. plus 15%	Germany	3,243
1109 (a)	Green billiard cloths in the piece, weighing more than 11 ounces but not more than 15 ounces per square yard, wholly of wool:				
	Valued not over $1.25 per pound	37½¢ lb. plus 25%	37½¢ lb. plus 20%	Benelux	(1)
	Valued over $1.25, not over $2 per pound	37½¢ lb. plus 25%	37½¢ lb. plus 20%	Benelux	
	Valued over $2 per pound	37½¢ lb. plus 25%	37½¢ lb. plus 20%	Benelux	120
1109 (b)	Felts, belts, etc., woven, for machines:				
	Valued not over $1.25 per pound	37½¢ lb. plus 20%	37½¢ lb. plus 15%	France	
	Valued over $1.25, not over $2 per pound	37½¢ lb. plus 20%	37½¢ lb. plus 15%	France	1
	Valued over $2 per pound	37½¢ lb. plus 20%	37½¢ lb. plus 15%	France	3
1111	Blankets, hand-woven, not exceeding 3 yards in length, plain or embroidered:				
	Valued not over $1 per pound	30¢ lb. plus 30%	30¢ lb. plus 30%	Peru	1
	Valued over $1, not over $1.50 per pound	33¢ lb. plus 37½%	30¢ lb. plus 30%	Peru	(1)
	Valued over $1.50 per pound	40¢ lb. plus 40%	30¢ lb. plus 30%	Peru	5
	Carriage and automobile robes, steamer rugs, etc., made as units or in the piece, handwoven, finished or unfinished, not exceeding 3 yards in length, plain or embroidered:				
	Valued not over $1 per pound	30¢ lb. plus 30%	30¢ lb. plus 30%	Peru	(1)
	Valued over $1, not over $1.50 per pound	33¢ lb. plus 37½%	30¢ lb. plus 30%	Peru	(1)
	Valued over $1.50 per pound	40¢ lb. plus 40%	30¢ lb. plus 30%	Peru	2
1114 (d)	Outerwear and other articles of wool, knit or crocheted, n. s. p. f., valued over $5 per pound.	37½¢ lb. plus 20%	37½¢ lb. plus 20%	Austria	3,732
1116 (a)	Oriental, Axminster, Savonnerie, Aubusson, and other carpets and carpeting, mats, rugs, art squares, etc., not made on a power-loom, if wholly or in chief value of hair of the alpaca, llama, guanaco, huarizo, suri, misti, or a combination of the hair of two or more of these species.	15¢ sq. ft.; 22½% min.	12½¢ sq. ft.; 11¼% min.	Peru	[4] 3
1116 (b)	Oriental weave carpets, rugs, etc., of wool, produced on a power-driven loom.	30%	25%	Benelux	136
1117 (a)	Carpets, rugs, mats, etc., and parts of:				
	Valued not over 40 cents per square foot:				
	Axminster, n. s. p. f.	30%	25%	Benelux	24
	Wilton	40%	25%	Benelux	188
	Brussels	30%	25%	Benelux	18
	Velvet and tapestry	30%	25%	Benelux	165
	Carpets and rugs of like character (except Wilton), n. s. p. f.	30%	25%	Benelux	63
	Valued over 40 cents per square foot:				
	Axminster, n. s. p. f.	30%	25%	Benelux	119
	Wilton	30%	25%	Benelux	2,702
	Brussels	30%	25%	Benelux	22
	Velvet and tapestry	30%	25%	Benelux	93
	Carpets and rugs of like character	30%	25%	Benelux	608

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty		Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
		Jan. 1, 1951	Under Torquay Agreement		
	SCHEDULE 11—WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
1117 (c)	Floor coverings, including mats and druggets, n. s. p. f., valued at more than 40 cents per square foot, wholly or in chief value of hair of the alpaca, llama, guanaco, huarizo, suri, misti, or any combination of them.	40%	30%	Peru	
1119	Tapestry and upholstery goods of wool (not including pile fabrics) weighing over 4 ounces per square yard:				
	Valued not over 80 cents per pound	37½¢ plus 25%	37½¢ lb. plus 22½%	Austria	(1)
	Valued over 80 cents, not over $1.25 per pound	37½¢ plus 25%	37½¢ lb. plus 22½%	Austria	
	Valued over $1.25, not over $2.00 per pound	37½¢ lb. plus 25%	37½¢ lb. plus 22½%	Austria	(1)
	Valued over $2 per pound	37½¢ lb. plus 25%	37½¢ lb. plus 17½%	Austria	39
	SCHEDULE 12—SILK MANUFACTURES				
1202	Spun silk or schappe silk yarn, or yarn of silk and rayon or other synthetic textile, and roving:				
	Singles:				
	Not bleached, dyed, or colored	40%	25%	Benelux, Italy	47
	Bleached, dyed, or colored	50%	30%	Benelux, Italy	8
	Plied:				
	Not bleached, dyed, or colored	50%	30%	Benelux, Italy	
	Bleached, dyed, or colored	50%	30%	Benelux	3
1203	Thrown silk not more advanced than singles, tram, or organzine	20%	10%	Canada	507
1204	Sewing silk, twist, floss, and silk threads or yarns, n. s. p. f.	40%	20%	Canada	10
1205	Woven fabrics, wholly of silk, or silk-mixed:				
	Exceeding 30 inches in width:				
	Jacquard-figured:				
	In the gray	65%	32½%	Italy	(1)
	Bleached, printed, piece-dyed, or yarn-dyed, if silk-mixed and valued over $5 per pound.	35%	32½%	Italy	114
	Not jacquard-figured:				
	Bleached, printed, piece-dyed, or yarn-dyed, if silk-mixed:				
	Valued $5 or less per pound	55%	27½%	Italy	6
	Valued over $5 per pound	30%	27½%	Italy	40
	Not exceeding 30 inches in width (includes umbrella silk or Gloria cloth), bleached, printed, dyed, or colored, if silk-mixed and valued over $5 per pound:				
	Not jacquard-figured	30%	27½%	Italy	21
	Jacquard-figured	35%	32½%	Italy	104
1207	Fabrics with fast edges of silk, not over 12 inches wide, and articles made therefrom:				
	Jacquard-figured:				
	Ribbons	25%	22½%	France	(1)
	Bandings, beltings, bindings, etc	25%	22½%	France	
	Garters, suspenders, and braces	20%	17½%	France	(1)
	Not jacquard-figured:				
	Ribbons	25%	22½%	France	13
	Bandings, beltings, bindings, etc	25%	22½%	France	3
	Garters, suspenders, and braces	20%	17½%	France	1
	Tubings	25%	22½%	France	32
	Cords and tassels	25%	22½%	France	(1)
1208	Knit fabric of silk in the piece	30%	27½%	France	36
1210	Silk wearing apparel, not knit or crocheted, not embroidered or of lace.	35%	32½%	France	1,277
1211	Other manufactures wholly or in chief value of silk, n. s. p. f.	35%	32½%	Italy	120
	SCHEDULE 13—MANUFACTURES OF RAYON OR OTHER SYNTHETIC TEXTILE				
1301	Yarns of rayon or other synthetic fiber:				
	Having not more than 20 turns twist per inch:				
	Singles, weighing per length of 450 meters:				
	Less than 150 deniers	27½%; 32½¢ lb. min.	25%; 27½¢ lb. min.	Benelux	203
	Plied, weighing per length of 450 meters:				
	150 deniers or more	25%; 27½¢ lb. min.	25%; 25¢ lb. min.	Benelux	(1)
	Less than 150 deniers	30%; 37½¢ lb. min.	27½%; 32½¢ lb. min.	Benelux	1
	Having more than 20 turns twist per inch:				
	Singles, weighing per length of 450 meters:				
	Less than 150 deniers	27½%; [60] 32½¢ lb. min.[60]	25%; [60] 27½¢ lb. min.[60]	Benelux	
	Plied, weighing per length of 450 meters:				
	150 deniers or more	25%; [60] 27½¢ lb. min.[60]	25%; [60] 25¢ lb. min.[60]	Benelux	
	Less than 150 deniers	30%; [60] 37½¢ lb. min.[60]	27½%; [60] 32½¢ lb. min.[60]	Benelux	(1)
1302	Filaments of rayon or other synthetic textile, not exceeding 30 inches in length other than waste (whether known as cut fiber, staple fiber, or by any other name).	20%	15%	Benelux	4,841
1304	Yarns of rayon or other synthetic textile, put up for handwork	30%; 27½¢ lb. min.	27½%; 25¢ lb. min.	France	(1)
	Sewing thread of rayon or other synthetic textile	30%; 27½¢ lb. min.	27½%; 25¢ lb. min.	France	(1)
1305	Rayon or other synthetic textile in bands or strips not exceeding 1 inch in width, suitable for manufacture of textiles.	25%; 27½¢ lb. min.	25%; 25¢ lb. min.	France	20
1306	Woven fabrics in the piece of rayon and other synthetic textile, n. s. p. f.:				
	Valued not more than $4 per pound:				
	Not Jacquard-figured	27½¢ lb. plus 45%	25¢ lb. plus 22½%	France, Italy	195
	Jacquard-figured	27½¢ lb. plus 45%	25¢ lb. plus 22½%	France, Italy	15
	Valued more than $4 per pound:				
	Not Jacquard-figured	27½¢ lb. plus 22½%	25¢ lb. plus 22½% [61]	France	138
	Jacquard-figured	27½¢ lb. plus 22½%	25¢ lb. plus 22½% [61]	France	49
1308	Fabrics with fast edges of rayon or other synthetic textile not over 12 inches wide and articles made therefrom:				
	Ribbons:				
	Jacquard-figured	27½¢ lb. plus 25%	25¢ lb. plus 25% [62]	France	48
	Not Jacquard-figured	27½¢ lb. plus 25%	25¢ lb. plus 25% [62]	France	224
	Other, including garters, suspenders, and braces:				
	Jacquard-figured	27½¢ lb. plus 25%	25¢ lb. plus 22½%	Benelux, France	2
	Not Jacquered-figured	27½¢ lb. plus 25%	25¢ lb. plus 22½%	Benelux, France	6
	Tubings	27½¢ lb. plus 25%	25¢ lb. plus 22½%	Benelux, France	
	Cords and tassels	27½¢ lb. plus 25%	25¢ lb. plus 22½%	France	1

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty		Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
		Jan. 1, 1951	Under Torquay Agreement		
	SCHEDULE 13—MANUFACTURES OF RAYON OR OTHER SYNTHETIC TEXTILE—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
1309	Manufactures of rayon or other synthetic textile:				
	Knit fabric in the piece	27½¢ lb. plus 30%	25¢ lb. plus 30% [61]	France	9
	Wearing apparel, n. e. s., knit or crocheted:				
	Gloves and mittens:				
	Valued less than $1.50 per dozen pairs	27½¢ lb. plus 65%	25¢ lb. plus 65% [61]	France	
	Valued $1.50 or more per dozen pairs	27½¢ lb. plus 32½%	25¢ lb. plus 32½% [61]	France	(1)
	Hose and half-hose	27½¢ lb. plus 35%	25¢ lb. plus 35% [61]	France	3
	Underwear:				
	Valued not more than $1.75 per pound	27½¢ lb. plus 35%	25¢ lb. plus 35% [61]	France	
	Valued more than $1.75 per pound	27½¢ lb. plus 35%	25¢ lb. plus 35% [61]	France	2
	Outerwear and other articles, n. e. s.	27½¢ lb. plus 35%	25¢ lb. plus 32½%	France	34
1310	Handkerchiefs and woven mufflers of rayon or other synthetic textile:				
	Not hemmed	27½¢ lb. plus 60%	25¢ lb. plus 30%	France	(1)
	Hemmed or hemstitched	27½¢ lb. plus 65%	25¢ lb. plus 32½%	France	4
1311	Wearing apparel of rayon or other synthetic textile, not knit or crocheted, n. s. p. f.	27½¢ lb. plus 35%	25¢ lb. plus 32½%	France	59
1312	"Other" manufactures of rayon or other synthetic textile, n. s. p. f.	27½¢ lb. plus 35%	25¢ lb. plus 35% [61]	France	169
	SCHEDULE 14—PAPERS AND BOOKS				
1402	Leather board, or compress leather, counter board, and solid fiber shoeboard, not processed.	10%	7½%	Canada	128
1403	Filter masse or filter stock	20%	15%	Germany	12
1404	Tissue and papers similar to tissue, stereotype, copying, condenser, carbon, bibulous, pottery, waxing, india and bible papers, valued not more than 15¢ pound:				
	Weighing not over 6 pounds to the ream	3¢ lb. plus 10%	1¼¢ lb. plus 5%	Norway	(1)
	Weighing over 6 and less than 10 pounds	2½¢ lb. plus 7½%	1¼¢ lb. plus 3¾%	Sweden	3
1405	Surface-coated paper:				
	Embossed or printed, not lithographically	4½¢ lb. plus 10%	2½¢ lb. plus 10%	Canada	16
	Covered with metal or its solutions, n. s. p. f., or with gelatin, linseed oil cement, or flock.	4½¢ lb. plus 10%	2½¢ lb. plus 10%	Germany	33
	Covered with metal or its solutions, and weighing less than 15 pounds per ream.	4½¢ lb. plus 10%	2½¢ lb. plus 10%	Germany	4
	Uncoated papers, decorated or covered with a design, fancy effect, pattern or character, not embossed or printed otherwise than lithographically, or wholly or partly covered with metal, etc.:				
	Wrapping paper	4½¢ lb. plus 10%	2½¢ lb. plus 10%	Benelux	2
	Other papers	4½¢ lb. plus 10%	2½¢ lb. plus 10%	Germany	1
	Gummed papers, n. s. p. f.	5¢ lb.	2½¢ lb.	Canada	(1)
	Printed matter (other than lithographic) composed of surface-coated and other papers dutiable under par. 1405, n. s. p. f.	4½¢ lb. plus 10%	2½¢ lb. plus 10%	France	7
1405	Boxes of paper, papier mache, or wood, covered or lined:				
	With surfaced-coated, parchment, lithographed, or similar papers.	5¢ lb. plus 5%	2½¢ lb. plus 5%	France	47
	With cotton or other vegetable fiber	5¢ lb. plus 10%	2½¢ lb. plus 10%	France	48
	Unsensitized photographic paper:				
	Basic	5%	2½%	Germany	137
	Baryta coated	5%	2½%	Germany	144
1406	Lithographic prints:				
	Cigar bands, printed in 8 or more colors, not in metal leaf	35¢ lb.	25¢ lb.	Benelux	
	Printed in metal leaf:				
	Labels and flaps, n. e. s.	60¢ lb.	30¢ lb.	Canada	
	Labels, flaps, and bands (except cigar bands) not exceeding 10 square inches, embossed or die-cut.	65¢ lb.	32½¢ lb.	Benelux	
	Fashion magazines or periodicals printed in whole or in part by lithographic process or decorated by hand.	8¢ lb.	4¢ lb.	Austria	11
	Decalcomanias, in ceramic colors, weighing per 1,000 sheets of 20 x 30 inches:				
	Not over 100 pounds	$1.25 lb. plus 15%	75¢ lb. plus 10%	Germany	2
	Over 100 pounds	30¢ lb. plus 15%	18¢ lb. plus 10%	Germany	35
1407 (a)	Drawing paper, and paper similar to drawing paper, weighing 8 pounds or more per ream, and valued less than 40 cents per pound:				
	Ruled, bordered, embossed, printed, lined or decorated (except by lithographic process).	3¢ lb. plus 25%	1½¢ lb. plus 12½%	Germany	
	Not ruled, bordered, embossed, etc.	3¢ lb. plus 15%	1½¢ lb. plus 7½%	Germany	4
1407 (b)	Sheets of writing, letter, and note paper, with border gummed or perforated, with or without inserts, prepared for use as combination sheet and envelope.	40%	20%	France	(1)
1409	Hanging paper not printed, lithographed, dyed, or colored	7½%	5%	Canada	3
1410	Printed matter not of bona fide foreign authorship (except books, including prayer books, pamphlets, music and tourist literature).	15%	10%	Canada	45
1410	Post cards (except American views), plain, decorated, embossed, or printed, except by lithographic process.	25%	15%	France	15
1413	Pulpboard in rolls for wallboard, surface stained, lined, or plate finished.	10%	7½%	Canada	1,344
	Stereotype-matrix mat or board, valued not more than ¼6 cent per square inch.	35%	20%	Germany	
	Ribbon fly catchers or fly ribbons of paper	27½%	20%	Benelux, Canada	
	Paper tubes for holding yarn and thread:				
	Parallel	1¢ lb. plus 25%	½¢ lb. plus 12½%	Germany	
	Tapered	3¢ lb. plus 35%	2¢ lb. plus 25%	Germany	(1)
	SCHEDULE 15—SUNDRIES				
1502	Lacrosse sticks, n. s. p. f.	10%	7½%	Canada	17
	Ice skates	15%	12½%	Canada	179
	Parts of	15%	12½%	Canada	
	Roller skates	15%	10%	Canada	(1)
	Parts of	15%	10%	Canada	
1503	Spangles, n. s. p. f.	27½%	17½%	Benelux	10

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 15—SUNDRIES—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
1504 (b)	Hats, bonnets, and hoods:				
	Not sewed and not blocked or trimmed:				
	Not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained:				
	Straw	15%	12½%	Italy	757
	Ramie	15%	12½%	Italy	160
	Other (chip, grass, cuba bark, osier, willow, real horsehair, and rattan)	25%	12½%	Italy	47
	Bleached, dyed, colored, or stained:				
	Straw	25¢ doz. plus 15%	25¢ doz. plus 12½%	Italy	213
	Ramie	25¢ doz. plus 15%	25¢ doz. plus 12½%	Italy	707
	Other (chip, grass, cuba bark, osier, willow, real horsehair, and rattan)	25¢ doz. plus 25%	25¢ doz. plus 12½%	Italy	43
	Not sewed, but blocked or trimmed:				
	Straw	$2.40 doz. plus 15%	$2.40 doz. plus 12½%	France, Italy	21
	Palm leaf	$2.40 doz. plus 15%	$2.40 doz. plus 12½%	France	1
	Other	$2.40 doz. plus 15%	$2.40 doz. plus 12½%	France	1
	Sewed (whether or not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained):				
	Straw, not blocked or trimmed	$3 doz. plus 25%	$2.50 doz. plus 25%	Italy	50
	Chip	$3 doz. plus 25%	$1.50 doz. plus 25%	France, Italy	(1)
	Other	$3 doz. plus 25%	$1.50 doz. plus 25%	France	1
1506	Paint brushes (including artists'), n. s. p. f	50%	25%	Germany	13
	Hair pencils (including artists')	2¢ ea.; 10% min.; 40% max	1¢ ea.; 10% min.; 40% max	France	351
1513	Dolls, n. s. p. f	70%	35%	Italy	111
	Toy marbles	70%	35%	Germany	(1)
	Toy games, containers, favors, and souvenirs	70%	50%	Germany	10
	Air rifles	70%	35%	Benelux, Germany	9
	Garlands, festooning, and Christmas tree decorations of tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions or metal threads	70%	35%	Germany	12
	All other toys, n. s. p. f.:				
	In the forms of musical instruments and capable of emitting sound (except stringed instruments or accordions)	50%	35%	Germany	50
	Mechanical toys and parts, n. e. s. (except figures or images of animate objects wholly or in chief value of metal)	70%	50%	Germany	426
	Other toys	70%	35%	Germany	362
	Parts of toys, n. s. p. f. (except parts wholly or in chief value of china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthenware, or stoneware)	70%	50%	Germany	
1514	Manufactures of artificial abrasives, not containing dutiable alloys:				
	Artificial abrasives in grains, or ground, pulverized, refined, or manufactured	1¢ lb	½¢ lb	Norway	15
	Wheels, files, and other manufactures of artificial abrasives, n. s. p. f (include manufactures of corundum or silicon except wheels in chief value thereof)	10%	5%	Canada	8
1516	Wax matches	40%	10% [3]	Italy	3
1517	Percussion caps	30%	15%	Canada	(1)
1519 (a)	Dressed coney and rabbit furs:				
	Not dyed	17½%	12½%	Benelux, France	1
	Dyed	20%	15%	Benelux, France	13
1523	Manufactures of human hair, n. s. p. f	25%	17½%	France	132
1527 (a)	Jewelry of gold or platinum	40%	30%	France	223
	Parts of (include mountings)	40%	30%	France	15
1527 (c)	Articles valued over 20 cents per dozen pieces, to be worn on apparel or carried on or about or attached to the person, and parts thereof:				
	Gold or platinum:				
	Buckles	40%	30%	France	2
	All other articles (including chains, n. e. s., cigar cutters, cigar holders, cigar lighters, card, cigar, cigarette, and coin cases and holders, combs, mesh bags and purses, match boxes, stamp cases, millinery, military, and hair ornaments, pins, powder and vanity cases, watch bracelets, collar, cuffs, and dress buttons, and like articles)	40%	30%	France	24
	Parts of	40%	30%	France	1
	Other metals:				
	Valued over 20 cents but not over $5 per dozen pieces or parts:				
	Cigar and cigarette lighters and parts	110%	55%	Austria	4
	Mesh bags and parts	110%	55%	Germany	1
	Valued over $5 per dozen pieces or parts:				
	Cigarette cases and parts	45%	35%	Austria	4
	Compacts, powder, and vanity cases and parts	45%	35%	Austria, France	14
	Ladies' handbags, set with, and in chief value of, rhinestones and parts	45%	35%	France	2
	Mesh bags and parts	110%	35% [3]	France	(1)
	Buckles and parts	45%	35%	France	1
	Other articles, n. e. s., and parts	45%	35%	France	64
1527 (d)	Stampings, galleries, mesh, and other metal materials suitable for manufacture of any articles dutiable under par. 1527:				
	Gold or platinum	75%	37½%	France	
	Other metal	80%	40%	France, Germany	248
1528	Imitation precious stones, cut or faceted, and imitation semiprecious stones, faceted	10%	10%	Austria	8,495
	Synthetic precious and semiprecious stones, cut or faceted, for use in the manufacture of jewelry	10%	10%	France	680
1529 (a)	Wholly hand-made laces, lace fabrics, and lace articles, exceeding 2 inches in width and valued $150 or more per lb.:				
	Cotton Flax, hemp, or ramie Wool Silk Rayon or other synthetic textile Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads	25%	22½%	Benelux	6
	Articles (except wearing apparel) in part of hand-made lace, but containing no machine-made material or article provided for in 1529 (a), if the lace exceeds 2 inches in width, and if the articles are valued $150 or more per pound:				
	Cotton Flax, hemp, or ramie Wool Silk Rayon or other synthetic textile Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal thread	25%	22½%	Benelux	3

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 15—SUNDRIES—continued				Thous. of dol.
1529 (a)	Articles (except wearing apparel) in part of hand-made lace over 2 inches in width, and in part of hand-made lace not over 2 inches in width, containing no machine-made material or article provided for in par. 1529 (a):				
	Valued more than $50 and less than $150 per pound:				
	Cotton, Flax, hemp, or ramie, Wool, Silk, Rayon or other synthetic textile, Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal thread	60%	30%	Benelux	
	Valued $150 or more per pound:				
	Cotton, Flax, hemp, or ramie, Wool, Silk, Rayon or other synthetic textile, Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal thread	60%	22½% [1]	Benelux	(2)
	Lace, lace fabrics, and lace articles (except veils and veilings) made on a Levers (including go-through) lace machine, whether or not embroidered:				
	Made full gauge on a machine of 12-point or finer:				
	Cotton, if made with independent beams	40%	35%	France	3,894
	Silk	40%	35%	France	811
	Not made full gauge on a machine of 12-point or finer:				
	Cotton	75%	67%	France	273
	Rayon or other synthetic textiles	75%	65%	France	280
1529 (a)	Flouncings, all-overs, neck-rufflings, flutings, quillings, ruchings, tuckings, insertings, galloons, edgings, trimmings, gimps, and ornaments, and articles wholly or in part thereof, but not in part of lace, and not ornamented:				
	Cotton:				
	Flouncings and all-overs and articles wholly or in part thereof				
	Neck rufflings, flutings, quillings, ruchings, tuckings, etc., and articles wholly or in part thereof				
	Flax, hemp, or ramie:				
	Flouncings and all-overs and articles wholly or in part thereof				
	Neck rufflings, flutings, quillings, ruchings, tuckings, etc., and articles wholly or in part thereof	50%	45%	France	62
	Wool, Silk, Rayon or other synthetic textile, Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads				
1529 (a)	Lace, lace fabrics, and lace articles (except veils or veilings) made on a bobbinet-Jacquard machine, whether or not embroidered:				
	Cotton, Flax, hemp, or ramie, Wool, Silk, Rayon or other synthetic textiles, Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal thread	35%	25%	France	180
	Lace, lace fabrics, and lace articles (except veils and veilings), machine-made, n. e. s. (including Barmen):				
	Cotton, Flax, hemp, or ramie, Wool, Silk, Rayon or other synthetic textiles, Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal thread	60%	50%	France	58
	Lace, lace fabrics, and lace articles (except wearing apparel) in part of hand-made lace and in part of machine-made lace or net (semi-hand-made lace):				
	Cotton, Flax, hemp, or ramie, Wool, Silk, Rayon or other synthetic textile, Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads	60%	45%	Benelux	[3] 1
1529 (a)	Articles (except wearing apparel) in part of machine-made lace, n e.s.:				
	Cotton, Flax, hemp, or ramie, Wool, Silk, Rayon or other synthetic textile, Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads	80%	67%	France	[3] 5
	Veils and veilings made on any lace or net machine, whether or not embroidered:				
	Silk	45%	32½%	France	441
	Rayon or other synthetic textiles	45%	32½%	France	530
	Nets and nettings, not embroidered, made on a bobbinet machine:				
	Silk	45%	30%	France	254
	Rayon or other synthetic textile	45%	32½%	France	445
1529 (a)	Braids provided for in par. 1529 (a) (except hat braids) and articles in part of such braids, but not in part of lace and not ornamented:				
	Braids, loom woven and ornamented in weaving, or made by hand, or on a braid, knitting, or lace machine:				
	Cotton, Flax, hemp, or ramie, Wool, Silk, Rayon or other synthetic textile, Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads	50%	45%	France	21
	Wearing apparel, in part of braids:				
	Cotton, Flax, hemp, or ramie, Wool, Silk, Rayon or other synthetic textile, Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads	50%	45%	France	7

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 15—SUNDRIES—continued				*Thous. of dol.*
	Braids provided for in par. 1529 (a) (except hat braids) and articles in part of such braids, but not in part of lace and not ornamented—Continued				
	Articles (not wearing apparel), in part of braids:				
	Cotton				
	Flax, hemp, or ramie				
	Wool	90%	45%	France	
	Silk				
	Rayon or other synthetic textile				
	Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads				
1529 (a)	Fabrics and articles (except wearing apparel), ornamented, but not in part of lace, however provided for in par. 1529 (a):				
	Embroideries, n. e. s., including edgings, insertings, and galloons:				
	Wool				
	Silk				
	Rayon or other synthetic textile				
	Flouncing and all-overs, neck rufflings, flutings, quillings, ruchings, tuckings, trimmings, gimps, and ornaments, n. e. s.:				
	Wool				
	Silk				
	Rayon or other synthetic textile				
	Other ornamented fabrics and articles:				
	Wool				
	Silk				
	Rayon and other synthetic textile	50%	45%	France	458
	Ornamented fabrics and articles, n. e. s., wholly or in chief value of tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads.				
	Fabrics and articles of beads, bugles, and spangles:				
	Beaded ornaments and beaded trimmings				
	Other fabrics and articles (except beaded frimes) ornamented with beads, bugles, or spangles, or embroidered, tamboured, appliqued, or scalloped:				
	Beaded handbags				
	Plates for beaded handbags				
	Other				
	Leather and leather articles, ornamented				
1528 (a)	Wearing apparel, wholly or in part of lace (except handkerchiefs, cotton fabric gloves, veils, body-supporting garments, and articles wholly of hand-made lace):				
	Of machine-made lace:				
	Cotton				
	Flax, hemp or ramie				
	Wool	50%	45%	France	34
	Silk				
	Rayon or other synthetic textile				
	Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads				
	Of hand-made lace:				
	Cotton				
	Flax, hemp, or ramie				
	Wool	50%	45%	France	76
	Silk				
	Rayon or other synthetic textile				
	Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads				
	Wearing apparel in part of fringes, not containing lace or embroidery:				
	Cotton				
	Flax, hemp, or ramie				
	Wool	50%	45%	France	48
	Silk				
	Rayon or other synthetic textile				
	Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads				
1529 (a)	Wearing apparel wholly or in part of net or netting, not ornamented:				
	Cotton				
	Flax, hemp, or ramie				
	Wool	90%	45%	France	(2)
	Silk				
	Rayon or other synthetic textile				
	Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads				
1529 (b)	Silk handkerchiefs, ornamented, or wholly or in part of lace:				
	Valued not more than 70 cents per dozen and not made with hand-rolled or hand-made hems.	2¢ ea. plus 30%	2¢ ea. plus 20%	France	
	Valued more than 70 cents per dozen, or if made with hand-rolled or hand-made hems.	3¢ ea. plus 30%	2¢ ea. plus 20%	France	23
1529 (c)	Elastic fabrics, in part of india rubber	25%	20%	France	14
1530 (b) (4)	Cattle side upper leather: Grains	12½%	10%	Canada	97
1530 (b) (5)	Glove and garment leather, bovine	15%	10%	Canada	117
1530 (c)	Leather made from hides or skins of other than bovine species (except fancy leather):				
	Goat and kid (except shoe, glove, or garment)	15%	10%	France	87
	Sheep and lamb (except shoe, glove, or garment)	15%	10%	France	81
	"Other" glove and garment leather, n. e. s.	15%	10%	Canada	103
1530 (c)	Boots, shoes, or other footwear (including athletic or sporting boots and shoes) made wholly or in chief value of leather, n. s. p. f.:				
	Skating boots and shoes, McKay sewed, attached to ice skates	15%	12½%	Canada	(1)
	"Other" boots, shoes, or other footwear, n. e. s.:				
	Men's	20%	10%	Canada	100
	Youths' and boys'	20%	10%	Canada	12
	Boots, shoes, and other footwear with uppers and soles in chief value of wool felt.	35%	17½%	Canada	(2) 56
1531	Leather (except reptile), rawhide, and parchment manufactures, fitted with traveling, bottle, drinking, dining or luncheon, sewing, manicure, and similar sets.	25%	20%	Germany	27
1535	Fishhooks, n. s. p. f.	35%	30%	Norway	1,093
1536	Wax manufactures (except skiwax), n. s. p. f.	20% [3]	10% [3]	Germany	3
1537 (a)	Manufactures of quills	25%	12½%	France	8
	Manufactures of raffia palm leaf	25%	12½%	France	300
1537 (b)	Rubber heels and soles	25%	12½%	Canada	2
	"Other" gutta-percha manufactures, n. e. s.	25%	12½%	Germany	10
1539 (b)	Laminated products and manufactures of laminated products having a synthetic resin or resinlike binder:				
	Sheets or plates	15¢ lb. plus 25%	7½¢ lb. plus 12½%	Canada	(1)
	Manufactures, n. e. s.	50¢ lb. plus 40%	25¢ lb. plus 20%	Canada	15
	Manufactures of nonlaminated plastics having a synthetic resin or resinlike binder.	35¢ lb. plus 30%	25¢ lb. plus 20%	Austria, Canada	24
1540	Moss and sea grass, eelgrass, and seaweed, manufactured or dyed	5%	5%	Korea	195

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	SCHEDULE 15—SUNDRIES—continued				*Thous. of sol.*
1541 (a)	Musical instruments and parts thereof, n. s. p. f.:				
	Parts for brass wind instruments with cup pieces	40%	30%	France	7
	Mouth organs or harmonicas	40%	20%	Germany	251
	Parts thereof	40%	20%	Germany	1
	Organs (except pipe organs)	40%	20%	Canada	1
	Parts thereof	40%	20%	Canada	1
	Pianos:				
	Grand	40%	20%	Germany	11
	Other	40%	20%	Benelux	31
	Parts thereof (including actions)	40%	20%	Canada	7
	Wood winds:				
	Clarinets, assembled	20%	15%	France	
	Saxophones, assembled	20%	15%	France	
	Other, assembled	20%	15%	France	1,058
	Parts thereof	20%	15%	France	
	Bows	40%	20%	France	63
	"Other" musical instruments, n. e. s.	28%	20%	Austria	36
	"Other" parts, n. e. s.	28%	20%	Austria	(1)
	Violin bow hair	40%	20%	France	1
	Pitch pipes, tuning forks, tuning hammers, and metronomes	40%	20%	Germany	4
	Pipe organs	15%	10%	Canada	211
	Parts thereof	15%	10%	Canada	5
	Chin rests for violins	40%	20%	France, Germany	1
	Bridges for fretted stringed instruments, n. s. p. f.	50%	40%	France, Germany	(1)
	Strings for musical instruments:				
	Catgut, oriental gut, or other gut	40%	20%	Germany	6
	Steel or other metal	40%	20%	Germany	4
	Tuning pins	$1M plus 35%	50¢M plus 17½%	Canada	8
1541 (b)	Violins, violas, violoncellos, double basses, and parts, the foregoing made after year 1800:				
	Assembled instruments:				
	Valued less than $50 each	$1.25 ea. plus 30%	62½¢ ea. plus 17½%	France, Germany	45
	Valued $50 or more, but less than $100 each	$1.25 ea. plus 25%	62½¢ ea. plus 17½%	France, Germany	14
	Valued $100 or more each	$1.25 ea. plus 17½%	62½¢ ea. plus 17½%	France, Germany	7
	Unassembled parts	30%	20%	France, Germany	25
1544	Rosaries, chaplets, and similar articles of religious devotion:				
	Gold, silver, platinum, gold plate, silver plate, or precious or imitation precious stones.	50%	15% [3]	France	188
	Other material, valued not more than $1.25 per dozen	15%	15%	France	222
1547 (b)	Paintings in oil, mineral, water, or other colors, pastels and drawings and sketches in pen and ink, pencil or water color (whether or not works of art) suitable as designs for textiles, floor coverings, wallpaper or wall coverings.	10%	5%	France	101
1548	Peat moss, poultry and stable grade	50¢ ton	25¢ ton	Canada	871
1549 (a)	Pencils of lead or other material not metal, n. s. p. f.:				
	Of colored lead	50¢ gross plus 30%	50¢ gross plus 15%	Germany	2
	Of "other" material	50¢ gross plus 30%	50¢ gross plus 15%	Germany	2
	"Other" pencils stamped with names other than the manufacturers' or the manufacturers' trade name or trade-mark.	50¢ gross plus 25%	50¢ gross plus 15%	Germany	
1549 (b)	Black leads for pencils, not in wood or other material, and black leads exceeding 0.06 inches in diameter.	6¢ gross	3¢ gross	Germany	8
	Leads not exceeding 0.06 inch in diameter and not exceeding 2 inches in length known as refills.	10¢ gross	5¢ gross	Germany	(1)
	Colored or crayon leads, n. s. p. f.	40%	20%	Germany	5
1551	Photographic cameras (other than motion picture and box type), n. s. p. f., of which the lens is not the component of chief value, valued at $10 or more each.	20%	15%	Germany	[4] 2,650
1552	Common tobacco pipes and pipe bowls, wholly of clay and valued over 40 cents per gross.	22½%	11¼%	Benelux	8
	Finished tobacco pipes, with bowls of wood or root (except brier), valued less than $1.20 per dozen.	2½¢ ea. plus 40%	1¼¢ ea. plus 20%	Austria	(1)
	Tobacco pipes, partly finished, with bowls of wood or root (except brier), valued less than $1.20 per dozen.	2½¢ ea. plus 40%	1¼¢ ea. plus 20%	Austria	(1)
	"Other" tobacco pipes, including meerschaum, n. s. p. f.	5¢ ea. plus 60%	2½¢ ea. plus 30%	Austria, Turkey	2
	Pipe bowls of wood other than brier, valued less than $1.20 per dozen.	2½¢ ea. plus 40%	1¼¢ ea. plus 20%	Austria	2
	Pipe bowls, n. s. p. f.	5¢ ea. plus 60%	2½¢ ea. plus 30%	Austria	(1)
	Cigar and cigarette holders, n. s. p. f.	5¢ ea. plus 15%	2½¢ ea. plus 15%	Austria	15
	Mouthpieces for pipes, cigar, and cigarette holders	2½¢ ea. plus 15%	1¼¢ ea. plus 15%	Austria	6
	Cigarette paper (except cork paper):				
	In bobbins	30%	22½%	France	(1)
	Flat	30%	22½%	France	1
	Cigarette paper in blocks, cigarette books, and book covers	30%	22½%	France	3
	Cases for pipes, cigar and cigarette holders	30%	15%	Austria	2
	Meerschaum, unmanufactured	10%	5%	Turkey	11
1554	Handles and sticks for umbrellas, parasols, sun shades, and walking canes, wholly or in chief value of synthetic resin.	75%	37½%	Austria	(1)
1555	Textile wastes, n. s. p. f.:				
	Waste rags and clips:				
	Rayon	7½%	4%	Canada	[5] 12
	Silk	7½%	4%	Canada	10
	Waste of cotton-merino, including angola journal-packing waste	7½%	4%	Canada	2
	Press cloth waste	7½%	4%	Canada	1
	Other, including flax and jute-thread waste	7½%	4%	Canada	305
	Fur wastes, n. s. p. f.	7½%	4%	Benelux	73
	Lecithin and materials in chief value thereof	7½%	4%	Norway	2
	Other wastes, n. s. p. f., including materials consisting of shells, dust, particles of cocoa beans, and cocoa cake and cocoa cake meal.	7½% [6]	4% [6]	Canada, Sweden [6]	1,312
1556	Bleached beeswax	20%	15%	France	1
1558	Articles manufactured in whole or in part, n. s. p. f.:				
	Yeast:				
	Brewers' yeast, nonalcoholic	20%	10%	Canada	1
	Other yeast	20%	10%	Canada	4
	Fatty acids derived from vegetable oils, animal or fish oils, or animals fats and greases, n. e. s.:				
	Linseed oil	15% plus 4½¢ lb. I. R. tax	10% plus 4½¢ lb. I. R. tax	Canada	
	Cottonseed oil	15%	10%	Canada	11
	Soybean oil	15%	10%	Canada	
	Other	15% [6]	10% [6]	Canada	42
	Incense	20%	10%	Benelux	4
	"Other" (except tall oil or liquid rosin)	20%	10%	Italy, Indonesia, Peru.	455

See footnotes at end of table.

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty: Jan. 1, 1951	Rate of duty: Under Torquay Agreement	Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
	FREE LIST				*Thous. of dol.*
1601	Acids and acid anhydrides:				
	Hydrochloric (muriatic)	Free	Bound free	Benelux	(1)
	Nitric	Free	Bound free	Norway	
	Valerianic	Free	Bound free	Benelux	2
1602	Licorice root (crude)	Free	Bound free	Turkey	1,627
1605	Albumen, n. s. p. f.	Free	Bound free	Benelux	
1609	Cochineal	Free	Bound free	Peru	21
1610	Antitoxins, serums, vaccines, viruses, and bacterins for therapeutic purposes.	Free	Bound free	Canada	9
1623	Bread, yeast-leavened, other than hard crisp rye	Free	Bound free	Norway	38
1643	Shoe machines, and parts of	Free	Bound free	Canada, Germany	181
1647	Chrome ore or chromite:				
	Chemical grade	Free	Bound free	Turkey	2,413
	Metallurgical grade	Free	Bound free	Turkey	18,384
	Refractory grade	Free	Bound free	Turkey	3,392
1657	Composition metal, copper chief value, n. s. p. f.	Free [31]	Bound free [31]	Benelux	964
1659	Copper acetate and subacetate (verdigris)	Free [31]	Bound free [31]	Benelux	
1664	Vanadium-bearing flue dust	Free	Bound free	Benelux	
	Metallic mineral substances, crude, n. s. p. f. (such as drosses, skimmings, residues, brass foundry ash, and flue dust).	Free	Bound free	Benelux	378
1667	Potassium cyanide	Free	Bound free	Germany	
	Cyanide salts and mixtures, n. s. p. f.	Free	Bound free	Germany	
1669	Ginseng	Free	Bound free	Korea	21
	Fish oils, n. e. s.	Free plus 1½¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Bound free plus 1½¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Canada	(1)
1670	Dyeing and tanning materials:				
	Valonia (except valonia extract)	Free	Bound free	Turkey	106
	Tara	Free	Bound free	Peru	23
	Divi divi	Free	Bound free	Dominican Republic.	86
1671	Eggs of birds, fish, and insects	Free	Bound free	Canada	23
1672	Emery ore	Free	Bound free	Turkey	20
1673	Enfleurage greases	Free	Bound free	France	
1685	Limestone, crude, crushed, or broken, ground or pulverized, when imported to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer.	Free	Bound free	Canada	56
1686	Sandarac varnish gum, n. s. p. f.	Free	Bound free	France	9
1688	Animal soft hair, dressed (other than horse, cattle, and ox)	Free	Bound free	France	248
1695	Horses and mules for immediate slaughter	Free	Bound free	Canada	439
1700	Dross or residuum from burnt pyrites	Free	Bound free	Canada	28
1719	Vanadium ore or concentrates	Free	Bound free	Peru	272
1722	Angelica seed and root	Free	Bound free	Benelux	5
	Cube (timbo or barbasco) root	Free	Bound free	Peru	687
	Red squill	Free	Bound free	France	7
	"Other" seaweeds and vegetable substances, crude or unmanufactured (except lycopodium plants).	Free	Bound free	Korea	70
1727	Hempseed	Free plus 0.62¢ lb. I. R. tax	Bound free plus 0.62¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Turkey	17
	Kapok seed	Free plus 2¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Bound free plus 1¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Indochina	
	Tucum nuts	Free	Bound free	Brazil	42
	Seeds and nuts, n. s. p. f., when oils therefrom are free	Free	Bound free	France	19
1728	Nux vomica	Free	Bound free	France	38
	Gentian	Free	Bound free	France	28
1732	Rapeseed (colza) oil, denatured, for mechanical or manufacturing purposes.	Free plus 4½¢ lb. I. R. tax [13]	Bound free plus 2¼¢ lb. I. R. tax. [15]	Canada	100
1737	Sugar beet seed	Free	Bound free	Germany	2
1752	Silk waste, n. s. p. f., unmanufactured	Free	Bound free	Korea	255
1753	Wild or tussah silk, unmanufactured	Free	Bound free	Korea	
1768	Coriander seed	Free	Bound free	France	106
1791	Typewriters	Free	Bound free	Canada	2,054
1793	Urea, n. e. s.	Free	Bound free	Germany	208
1796	Montan mineral wax	Free	Bound free	Benelux	260
	Ozokerite and other mineral wax, n. s. p. f.	Free [5]	Bound free [5]	Benelux, Germany	11
1803 (3)	Evergreen Christmas trees	Free	Bound free	Canada	2,092
1812	Gobelin tapestries used as wall hangings	Free	Bound free	France	2

[1] Less than $500.
[2] Although the negotiated rate is less than 50 percent of the rate on Jan. 1, 1951, it is not less than 50 percent of the rate on Jan. 1, 1945.
[3] Subject to internal revenue tax if derived from taxable oils.
[5] Temporary rate, schedule III of trade agreement with Argentina.
[10] Dutiable at 25 percent if uncompounded medicinal preparations.
[12] Dutiable at 25 percent if selenium dioxide.
[14] Dutiable at 20¢ lb. plus 12½% if a medicinal compound.
[15] Not taxable if used in the manufacture of rubber substitutes or lubricating oil.
[16] Subject to internal revenue tax if perilla oil.
[22] Not separately provided for in the statistical classification.
[23] Dutiable at not less than 30 percent if weighing less than 16 ounces, but not less than 12 ounces per square foot. Higher rates of duty, equivalent to those in effect on Jan. 1, 1945, apply to colored glass subject to the additional duty provided under tariff par. 224.
[24] Dutiable at not less than 20 percent if weighing less than 16 ounces, but not less than 12 ounces per square foot. Rates negotiated at Torquay will apply to colored glass subject to the additional duty provided under tariff par. 224.
[25] Only the additional rate on glass described in tariff par. 221 was negotiated with Austria.
[30] On the metallic manganese content.
[31] On the manganese content.
[32] On the molybdenum content.
[33] On the silicon content.
[34] Subject to internal revenue tax.
[35] Base duty; imports of these products are subject to additional duties under various provisions of the Tariff Act.
[37] Only the rate on tobacco machinery other than wrapping and packing machines and tobacco cutting and industrial cigarette-making machines, and parts was negotiated with Sweden.
[38] Dutiable at 2¢ each plus 12½ percent if table, carving, cake, pie, butter, fruit, cheese, or fish knives, forks, or steels.
[39] Dutiable at 35 percent if parts.
[40] Only the rate on flat-bed cylinder letter presses and parts was negotiated with Italy.
[41] On lead content.
[42] On zinc content.
[43] Dutiable at 45 percent if parts.
[44] Benelux, plywood of okoume; France, plywood of baboon; and Canada, "other" plywood.
[45] Concession effective only when quota provisions of Sugar Act of 1948 or equivalent legislation are in effect, whether or not the quotas are applied. If quota legislation terminated, the United States will establish quota with rate for quota quantity not lower than Torquay rate, provided President finds such quota and rate may be established giving due consideration to interests in United States sugar market of domestic producers and materially affected contracting parties. Any quota and rate so established to be subject to modification if found necessary to give effect to above consideration. Torquay concession will be restored if sugar quota legislation subsequently becomes effective.
[46] Excludes imports from Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines.
[47] Concession effective only when quota provisions of Sugar Act of 1948 or equivalent legislation are in effect, whether or not the quotas are applied.
[48] Applicable to entries of not more than 1.5 million gallons in any calendar year.
[49] Applicable to entries in excess of 1.5 million gallons.
[51] Including weight of immediate container.
[52] Net weight.
[53] On drained weight.
[54] The United States reserves the right to modify or suspend the concession granted on cotton having a staple 1⅛ or more but under 1 1/32 inches long during any period when imports into the United States of such cotton are not subject to limitation.
[55] On the alcohol content contained therein or that can be produced therefrom.
[56] On clean content.
[60] Subject to an additional cumulative duty of 22½ cents per pound.
[61] Only compensatory part of duty (expressed in cents per pound) was negotiate at Torquay; ad valorem part was negotiated at Geneva.
[62] Canada, entire class; Sweden, tall oil pitch.
[63] Estimate.

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE's speech,

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Nevada will yield to me, to allow me to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question about one provision of the bill, provided it be placed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MALONE. I should be happy to yield with the same understanding, and provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to address an inquiry to the very distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, as follows:

On page 12 of the bill, section 8, the committee has inserted the following:

> In any case where the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to the President and to the Tariff Commission with regard to any agricultural commodity that, due to the perishability of the commodity, a condition exists requiring emergency treatment.

I am wondering—as many others in my area are wondering—whether there is any definition of the products which might be determined to be perishable under this provision.

Mr. GEORGE. No; there is none in the bill, but it has reference to perishable agricultural and horticultural products. Ordinarily, I suppose, the words would take their usual significance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A great number of persons in the Pacific Northwest are thinking in terms of fruit, such as apples and pears, and whether or not they would be included.

Mr. GEORGE. They would be included beyond all doubt.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

PREDICTIONS OF CONSTANTINE BROWN

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to have placed in the RECORD the May 20 column of Constantine Brown entitled "Signs Indicate Kremlin May Strike This Year."

Before inserting this column, however, I should like to preface it with some of the past predictions of this reporter which have proven amazingly and tragically correct. Going back to November 29, 1941, he wrote:

> The Japanese Government's answer to last week's State Department note will in all likelihood be the salvos of her men of war. The earlier estimates of high officials in Washington that a crisis may be expected within the next 2 or 3 months has now been narrowed to a few weeks—even a few days.

That was written just 10 days before Pearl Harbor.

On June 6, 1950, a year ago, Constantine Brown told his public that—

> The start of the Communist invasion is set for the second half of this month.

The war in Korea began the following June 25. Bear in mind that this report of Constantine Brown's was written just 5 days after President Truman told the American people that "We are closer now to peace than we have been in the last 5 years." President Truman made that statement at a press conference on June 1, 1950.

Over the past 18 months—I can even say, since VJ-day—Constantine Brown has been constantly warning the public of the grave danger of a third world war. In February of 1950 he wrote:

> The United States is in a more critical situation than ever before in its history.

So I think we may read with complete confidence a list of excerpts from the column of Constantine Brown over the past 7 months, which covers the developments in Europe and the Near East, and which are the background and basis for his column of May 20.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have these excerpts printed in the body of the RECORD, together with the column of Constantine Brown of May 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE COLUMN OF CONSTANTINE BROWN SHOWING DEVELOPMENTS IN EUROPE AND NEAR EAST FROM OCTOBER 8, 1950, TO APRIL 28, 1951

October 8: In addition to some 40 Red divisions in the area between the Vistula and the Spree Rivers there are at least 100,000 German troops in the Russian zone.

October 9: The French Government is still adamant against the rearming of Western Germany. French and British politicians are equally adamant about providing Spain with war matériel to equip at least a portion of their first-line soldiers.

October 18: The present ministry [French], headed by Rene Pleven, is on the way out. The French Foreign Minister refused bluntly last week to permit the Turkish Republic to be added to the Atlantic Pact.

November 1: The French are waging a bitter battle in Washington [against] the rearmament of a limited German force.

November 2: The attitude of French Premier Rene Pleven and Defense Minister Jules Moch is regarded by most military men as actual sabotage of western military plans.

November 17: The American Government itself has not purged itself completely of its animosity toward the Franco government in Spain.

December 1: We have sent across the Atlantic nearly a billion dollars' worth of war matériel. None of the Atlantic Pact nations have made any effort to translate the blueprints for military preparedness into actuality.

December 19: Last week end Moscow fired a shot across our bow when it warned Great Britain and France that any plan to rearm Western Germany would break Russia's mutual assistance treaties with those two countries. Our French friends have procrastinated so long that it is too late to attempt to rearm the Germans.

December 20: The elevated and subway system which circles Berlin is controlled by the Russians. Nothing could be easier for the East Germans, who take their orders from Moscow, than to put 10,000 or 15,000 men on these trains between 2 and 6 a. m., bring them into western Berlin, occupy the telephone exchange by surprise, arrest Mayor Ernst Reuter and a number of other high West German officials, send squads of troops to the home of the Allied general and other officers, and then "invite" the Allies to leave Berlin immediately.

January 22: Across the Elbe River at least 40 Russian divisions and more than 2,000 planes are poised to strike whenever the Kremlin gives the order.

January 30: They (the French) are willing now to listen to those who would accept Soviet domination for a generation or two rather than take a chance by opposing a Russian aggression.

February 2: Unless the Prime Ministers on the European side of the Atlantic coalition take the necessary steps to transform their factories into war industries, it is unlikely that this country can produce enough for the rearmament of Western Europe.

February 4: The Russians are said to have today 175 divisions. The nations of the Atlantic Pact have an active military strength of only 11 divisions ready to fight. Spain, which is still being ideologically boycotted, actually has 40 divisions under arms. Yugoslavia has 15 battle-ready divisions and another 10 divisions trained but not equipped with modern arms. Greece has 10 divisions under arms and Turkey is estimated to have 20 divisions in full strength.

February 11: In 1937, as a member of Parliament, he [Attlee] visited in Barcelona [Spain] the British volunteer battalion which was fighting on the side of the Red Loyalists.

Mr. Attlee was moved by their bravery to the point of giving the Communist clenched-fist salute to the members of the unit. He also wrote them a letter of congratulations ending with the old Marxist slogan: "Workers of the world, unite."

February 16: Last Wednesday Secretary of State Acheson warned Russia that the "peace fabric" would be seriously damaged if an attack is made against Yugoslavia. But he carefully refrained from including Greece and Turkey.

February 20: The United States Government, committed to help the major part of the world economically and militarily, neglected the Iranians, who are asking us for military materials and economic aid. These requests were unheeded. The Shah decided to come to this country last May. He was given the usual "treatment." On his return to Tehran he gave his Prime Minister the green light to go ahead with negotiations with Russia. The suppression of the Voice of America was the first major sign that something had gone wrong.

February 20: The latest reports from Tehran show that under "public pressure" Premier Razmara insists on Iran's freedom to handle its own oil interests, inspired by the Soviet Embassy.

February 25: Arabia and Iran are far richer prizes for the Russians at this time than Western Europe because of their unlimited oil resources.

March 1: The atomic-energy program may be impaired by the difficulty of obtaining a material known as monazite sands, which exist in large quantities in India. Secretary of State Acheson and his aides will be questioned about the State Department's total lack of initiative in making any effort to obtain for the United States stockpiles of this vital strategic material. We now depend on small deposits from Brazil. In April 1946 India placed an embargo (to the United States) on that export of monazite sands.

March 2: Premier Rene Pleven's government in France has fallen.

March 7: The Moslem peoples from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic are in a state of ferment today.

March 9: Despite official statements in Paris that everything is quiet in Morocco, it appears that conditions in that protectorate are deteriorating. Syrian and other Arab parliaments are protesting loudly against alleged French outrages.

The fact that the American Government overlooked French violations of American

Tariff paragraph	Commodity description	Rate of duty		Torquay negotiating country	Total United States imports for consumption, 1949
		Jan. 1, 1951	Under Torquay Agreement		
	FREE LIST				*Thous. of dol.*
1001	Acids and acid anhydrides:				
	Hydrochloric (muriatic)	Free	Bound free	Benelux	(1)
	Nitric	Free	Bound free	Norway	
	Valerianic	Free	Bound free	Benelux	2
1002	Licorice root (crude)	Free	Bound free	Turkey	1,627
1005	Albumen, n. s. p. f.	Free	Bound free	Benelux	
1009	Cochineal	Free	Bound free	Peru	21
1010	Antitoxins, serums, vaccines, viruses, and bacterins for therapeutic purposes.	Free	Bound free	Canada	9
1023	Bread, yeast-leavened, other than hard crisp rye	Free	Bound free	Norway	38
1043	Shoe machines, and parts of	Free	Bound free	Canada, Germany	181
1047	Chrome ore or chromite:				
	Chemical grade	Free	Bound free	Turkey	2,413
	Metallurgical grade	Free	Bound free	Turkey	18,384
	Refractory grade	Free	Bound free	Turkey	3,392
1057	Composition metal, copper chief value, n. s. p. f.	Free [34]	Bound free [34]	Benelux	964
1059	Copper acetate and subacetate (verdigris)	Free [34]	Bound free [34]	Benelux	
1064	Vanadium-bearing flue dust	Free	Bound free	Benelux	
	Metallic mineral substances, crude, n. s. p. f. (such as drosses, skimmings, residues, brass foundry ash, and flue dust).	Free	Bound free	Benelux	378
1067	Potassium cyanide	Free	Bound free	Germany	
	Cyanide salts and mixtures, n. s. p. f.	Free	Bound free	Germany	
1069	Ginseng	Free	Bound free	Korea	21
	Fish oils, n. e. s.	Free plus 1½¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Bound free plus 1½¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Canada	(1)
1070	Dyeing and tanning materials:				
	Valonia (except valonia extract)	Free	Bound free	Turkey	106
	Tara	Free	Bound free	Peru	23
	Divi divi	Free	Bound free	Dominican Republic.	86
1071	Eggs of birds, fish, and insects	Free	Bound free	Canada	23
1072	Emery ore	Free	Bound free	Turkey	20
1073	Enfleurage greases	Free	Bound free	France	
1085	Limestone, crude, crushed, or broken, ground or pulverized, when imported to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer.	Free	Bound free	Canada	56
1086	Sandarac varnish gum, n. s. p. f.	Free	Bound free	France	9
1088	Animal soft hair, dressed (other than horse, cattle, and ox)	Free	Bound free	France	248
1095	Horses and mules for immediate slaughter	Free	Bound free	Canada	439
1700	Dross or residuum from burnt pyrites	Free	Bound free	Canada	28
1719	Vanadium ore or concentrates	Free	Bound free	Peru	272
1722	Angelica seed and root	Free	Bound free	Benelux	5
	Cube (timbo or barbasco) root	Free	Bound free	Peru	687
	Red squill	Free	Bound free	France	7
	"Other" seaweeds and vegetable substances, crude or unmanufactured (except lycopodium plants).	Free	Bound free	Korea	70
1727	Hempseed	Free plus 0.62¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Bound free plus 0.62¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Turkey	17
	Kapok seed	Free plus 2¢ lb. I. R. tax	Bound free plus 1¢ lb. I. R. tax.	Indochina	
	Tucum nuts	Free	Bound free	Brazil	42
	Seeds and nuts, n. s. p. f., when oils therefrom are free	Free	Bound free	France	19
1728	Nux vomica	Free	Bound free	France	38
	Gentian	Free	Bound free	France	28
1732	Rapeseed (colza) oil, denatured, for mechanical or manufacturing purposes.	Free plus 4½¢ lb. I. R. tax [13]	Bound free plus 2¼¢ lb. I. R. tax.[13]	Canada	100
1737	Sugar beet seed	Free	Bound free	Germany	2
1762	Silk waste, n. s. p. f., unmanufactured	Free	Bound free	Korea	255
1763	Wild or tussah silk, unmanufactured	Free	Bound free	Korea	
1768	Coriander seed	Free	Bound free	France	106
1791	Typewriters	Free	Bound free	Canada	2,054
1793	Urea, n. e. s.	Free	Bound free	Germany	208
1796	Montan mineral wax	Free	Bound free	Benelux	259
	Ozokerite and other mineral wax, n. s. p. f.	Free [5]	Bound free [5]	Benelux, Germany	11
1803 (3)	Evergreen Christmas trees	Free	Bound free	Canada	2,092
1812	Gobelin tapestries used as wall hangings	Free	Bound free	France	2

[1] Less than $500.
[3] Although the negotiated rate is less than 50 percent of the rate on Jan. 1, 1931, it is not less than 50 percent of the rate on Jan. 1, 1945.
[5] Subject to internal revenue tax if derived from taxable oils.
[6] Temporary rate, schedule III of trade agreement with Argentina.
[10] Dutiable at 25 percent if uncompounded medicinal preparations.
[12] Dutiable at 25 percent if selenium dioxide.
[14] Dutiable at 20¢ lb. plus 12½% if a medicinal compound.
[15] Not taxable if used in the manufacture of rubber substitutes or lubricating oil.
[16] Subject to internal revenue tax if perilla oil.
[21] Not separately provided for in the statistical classification.
[23] Dutiable at not less than 30 percent if weighing less than 16 ounces, but not less than 12 ounces per square foot. Higher rates of duty, equivalent to those in effect on Jan. 1, 1945, apply to colored glass subject to the additional duty provided under tariff par. 224.
[24] Dutiable at not less than 20 percent if weighing less than 16 ounces, but not less than 12 ounces per square foot. Rates negotiated at Torquay will apply to colored glass subject to the additional duty provided under tariff par. 224.
[25] Only the additional rate on glass described in tariff par. 221 was negotiated with Austria.
[30] On the metallic manganese content.
[31] On the manganese content.
[32] On the molybdenum content.
[33] On the silicon content.
[34] Subject to internal revenue tax.
[35] Base duty; imports of these products are subject to additional duties under various provisions of the Tariff Act.
[37] Only the rate on tobacco machinery other than wrapping and packing machines and tobacco cutting and industrial cigarette-making machines, and parts was negotiated with Sweden.
[38] Dutiable at 2¢ each plus 12½ percent if table, carving, cake, pie, butter, fruit, cheese, or fish knives, forks, or steels.
[39] Dutiable at 35 percent if parts.
[40] Only the rate on flat-bed cylinder letter presses and parts was negotiated with Italy.
[41] On lead content.
[42] On zinc content.
[43] Dutiable at 45 percent if parts.
[44] Benelux, plywood of okoume; France, plywood of baboon; and Canada, "other" plywood.
[45] Concession effective only when quota provisions of Sugar Act of 1948 or equivalent legislation are in effect, whether or not the quotas are applied. If quota legislation terminated, the United States will establish quota with rate for quota quantity not lower than Torquay rate, provided President finds such quota and rate may be established giving due consideration to interests in United States sugar market of domestic producers and materially affected contracting parties. Any quota and rate so established to be subject to modification if found necessary to give effect to above consideration. Torquay concession will be restored if sugar quota legislation subsequently becomes effective.
[46] Excludes imports from Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines.
[47] Concession effective only when quota provisions of Sugar Act of 1948 or equivalent legislation are in effect, whether or not the quotas are applied.
[48] Applicable to entries of not more than 1.5 million gallons in any calendar year.
[49] Applicable to entries in excess of 1.5 million gallons.
[51] Including weight of immediate container.
[52] Net weight.
[53] On drained weight.
[54] The United States reserves the right to modify or suspend the concession granted on cotton having a staple 1⅛ or more but under 1 1/16 inches long during any period when imports into the United States of such cotton are not subject to limitation.
[55] On the alcohol content contained therein or that can be produced therefrom.
[59] On clean content.
[60] Subject to an additional cumulative duty of 22½ cents per pound.
[61] Only compensatory part of duty (expressed in cents per pound) was negotiate at Torquay; ad valorem part was negotiated at Geneva.
[63] Canada, entire class; Sweden, tall oil pitch.
[65] Estimate.

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE's speech,

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Nevada will yield to me, to allow me to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question about one provision of the bill, provided it be placed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MALONE. I should be happy to yield with the same understanding, and provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to address an inquiry to the very distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, as follows:

On page 12 of the bill, section 8, the committee has inserted the following:

> In any case where the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to the President and to the Tariff Commission with regard to any agricultural commodity that, due to the perishability of the commodity, a condition exists requiring emergency treatment.

I am wondering—as many others in my area are wondering—whether there is any definition of the products which might be determined to be perishable under this provision.

Mr. GEORGE. No; there is none in the bill, but it has reference to perishable agricultural and horticultural products. Ordinarily, I suppose, the words would take their usual significance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A great number of persons in the Pacific Northwest are thinking in terms of fruit, such as apples and pears, and whether or not they would be included.

Mr. GEORGE. They would be included beyond all doubt.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

PREDICTIONS OF CONSTANTINE BROWN

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to have placed in the RECORD the May 20 column of Constantine Brown entitled "Signs Indicate Kremlin May Strike This Year."

Before inserting this column, however, I should like to preface it with some of the past predictions of this reporter which have proven amazingly and tragically correct. Going back to November 29, 1941, he wrote:

> The Japanese Government's answer to last week's State Department note will in all likelihood be the salvos of her men of war. The earlier estimates of high officials in Washington that a crisis may be expected within the next 2 or 3 months has now been narrowed to a few weeks—even a few days.

That was written just 10 days before Pearl Harbor.

On June 6, 1950, a year ago, Constantine Brown told his public that—

> The start of the Communist invasion is set for the second half of this month.

The war in Korea began the following June 25. Bear in mind that this report of Constantine Brown's was written just 5 days after President Truman told the American people that "We are closer now to peace than we have been in the last 5 years." President Truman made that statement at a press conference on June 1, 1950.

Over the past 18 months—I can even say, since VJ-day—Constantine Brown has been constantly warning the public of the grave danger of a third world war. In February of 1950 he wrote:

> The United States is in a more critical situation than ever before in its history.

So I think we may read with complete confidence a list of excerpts from the column of Constantine Brown over the past 7 months, which covers the developments in Europe and the Near East, and which are the background and basis for his column of May 20.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have these excerpts printed in the body of the RECORD, together with the column of Constantine Brown of May 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE COLUMN OF CONSTANTINE BROWN SHOWING DEVELOPMENTS IN EUROPE AND NEAR EAST FROM OCTOBER 8, 1950, TO APRIL 28, 1951

October 8: In addition to some 40 Red divisions in the area between the Vistula and the Spree Rivers there are at least 100,000 German troops in the Russian zone.

October 9: The French Government is still adamant against the rearming of Western Germany. French and British politicians are equally adamant about providing Spain with war matériel to equip at least a portion of their first-line soldiers.

October 18: The present ministry [French], headed by Rene Pleven, is on the way out. The French Foreign Minister refused bluntly last week to permit the Turkish Republic to be added to the Atlantic Pact.

November 1: The French are waging a bitter battle in Washington [against] the rearmament of a limited German force.

November 2: The attitude of French Premier Rene Pleven and Defense Minister Jules Moch is regarded by most military men as actual sabotage of western military plans.

November 17: The American Government itself has not purged itself completely of its animosity toward the Franco government in Spain.

December 1: We have sent across the Atlantic nearly a billion dollars' worth of war matériel. None of the Atlantic Pact nations have made any effort to translate the blueprints for military preparedness into actuality.

December 19: Last week end Moscow fired a shot across our bow when it warned Great Britain and France that any plan to rearm Western Germany would break Russia's mutual assistance treaties with those two countries. Our French friends have procrastinated so long that it is too late to attempt to rearm the Germans.

December 20: The elevated and subway system which circles Berlin is controlled by the Russians. Nothing could be easier for the East Germans, who take their orders from Moscow, than to put 10,000 or 15,000 men on these trains between 2 and 6 a. m., bring them into western Berlin, occupy the telephone exchange by surprise, arrest Mayor Ernst Reuter and a number of other high West German officials, send squads of troops to the home of the Allied general and other officers, and then "invite" the Allies to leave Berlin immediately.

January 22: Across the Elbe River at least 40 Russian divisions and more than 2,000 planes are poised to strike whenever the Kremlin gives the order.

January 30: They (the French) are willing now to listen to those who would accept Soviet domination for a generation or two rather than take a chance by opposing a Russian aggression.

February 2: Unless the Prime Ministers on the European side of the Atlantic coalition take the necessary steps to transform their factories into war industries, it is unlikely that this country can produce enough for the rearmament of Western Europe.

February 4: The Russians are said to have today 175 divisions. The nations of the Atlantic Pact have an active military strength of only 11 divisions ready to fight. Spain, which is still being ideologically boycotted, actually has 40 divisions under arms. Yugoslavia has 15 battle-ready divisions and another 10 divisions trained but not equipped with modern arms. Greece has 10 divisions under arms and Turkey is estimated to have 20 divisions in full strength.

February 11: In 1937, as a member of Parliament, he [Attlee] visited in Barcelona [Spain] the British volunteer battalion which was fighting on the side of the Red Loyalists.

Mr. Attlee was moved by their bravery to the point of giving the Communist clenched-fist salute to the members of the unit. He also wrote them a letter of congratulations ending with the old Marxist slogan: "Workers of the world, unite."

February 16: Last Wednesday Secretary of State Acheson warned Russia that the "peace fabric" would be seriously damaged if an attack is made against Yugoslavia. But he carefully refrained from including Greece and Turkey.

February 20: The United States Government, committed to help the major part of the world economically and militarily, neglected the Iranians, who are asking us for military materials and economic aid. These requests were unheeded. The Shah decided to come to this country last May. He was given the usual "treatment." On his return to Tehran he gave his Prime Minister the green light to go ahead with negotiations with Russia. The suppression of the Voice of America was the first major sign that something had gone wrong.

February 20: The latest reports from Tehran show that under "public pressure" Premier Razmara insists on Iran's freedom to handle its own oil interests, inspired by the Soviet Embassy.

February 25: Arabia and Iran are far richer prizes for the Russians at this time than Western Europe because of their unlimited oil resources.

March 1: The atomic-energy program may be impaired by the difficulty of obtaining a material known as monazite sands, which exist in large quantities in India. Secretary of State Acheson and his aides will be questioned about the State Department's total lack of initiative in making any effort to obtain for the United States stockpiles of this vital strategic material. We now depend on small deposits from Brazil. In April 1946 India placed an embargo (to the United States) on that export of monazite sands.

March 2: Premier Rene Pleven's government in France has fallen.

March 7: The Moslem peoples from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic are in a state of ferment today.

March 9: Despite official statements in Paris that everything is quiet in Morocco, it appears that conditions in that protectorate are deteriorating. Syrian and other Arab parliaments are protesting loudly against alleged French outrages.

The fact that the American Government overlooked French violations of American

interests in Morocco is not taken into consideration. These violations were so serious that Congress provided in the 1951 ECA appropriations act that aid to France should be conditional on its compliance with American treaties in Morocco.

Secretary of State Acheson directed this provision of the law be ignored.

March 11: We have been warned repeatedly by Americans in Morocco that "the lid would blow off" unless the Arabs are given far greater independence than they now have. But these counsels have been ignored.

March 13: Disturbances are reported to have broken out in Barcelona, Spain. A strike followed by street riots was caused by the prospect of about 650,000 persons, most of them employed in the cotton mills, becoming unemployed in the next few weeks because of the lack of cotton. The Export-Import Bank did not provide any portion of the loan to be used for the purchase of wheat or corn in this country. There is a surplus of wheat in the United States.

March 16: The new Prime Minister of Iran, Hoysen Ala, is strongly pro-American. He accepted the premiership last week reluctantly, because he realizes that he can expect only little effective support from this country.

American observers in Iran warned that the Soviet Government was very active in developing a national feeling for nationalization of Iran's underground resources. Unfortunately, our Government paid little attention to these warnings.

March 18: There has been a spurt of energy (in France) since former President Hoover made his first speech last December and the foreign ambassadors reported that it has been well received by the American people. But when assurances came from Washington that, in spite of Mr. Hoover and his henchmen in the Senate and House, the needed appropriations would be rammed through anyway, the enthusiasms to prepare cooled.

March 3: When diplomats from the middle and near eastern countries and American businessmen who feared trouble in Iran this spring queried responsible State Department officials about the situation, they were told blandly not to worry.

April 3. [It is hoped] that the British Government will show greater imagination and political acumen in dealing with the Egyptian problem than it did in the case of Iran. There is a strong possibility that Egypt also may be lost.

April 5. The Senate is likely to make gross errors when it votes on international matters under pressure from the administration. An amendment offered last Tuesday by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, was approved by an overwhelming majority. It proved that it was the sense of the Senate that the peace treaty with Italy, which prevents that nation from contributing substantially to western defense, should be changed.

April 8. Moscow is planning a spectacular bloodless coup. It will offer the peoples of Germany complete unification of eastern and western zones, a free election in the western zone and creation of a national assembly for the unified Reich with Eastern Germany receiving one-third of the seats in the new Reichstag.

American taxpayers have provided the Armed Forces of the United States with the staggering total of $130,000,000,000 between 1946 and 1952. Yet this country appears totally unprepared. The lamentable state of unpreparedness was pointed out by Senator MCMAHON.

April 27. The slowness of the State Department to include Turkey in any kind of formal defense program has led to Ankara's order to its Ambassador in Washington to return immediately for consultation.

April 29. The danger of our slowness to develop the defenses of Alaska is even greater when we consider that a successful Soviet attack on that Territory would place Soviet aviation within easy range of our industrial centers in the West and Middle West. The fact is that we have less than 25,000 men in the ground and air force in Alaska. There are at least 150,000 Red troops in the portion of Siberia facing Alaska. About 30,000 are paratroops.

April 30. The resignation of Iran's western-minded Prime Minister Hussein Ala is regarded in Washington as the beginning of the end of that country's freedom. Russia has skillfully engineered the doom of that country. The United States and Great Britain have abetted that move.

[From the Washington Star of May 20, 1951]

SIGNS INDICATE KREMLIN MAY STRIKE THIS YEAR—SLOWNESS IN PREPARATION, WEAKNESS, AND LACK OF UNITY AMONG ALLIES MAY ENCOURAGE ACTION

(By Constantine Brown)

There are growing fears in Washington as well as the European capitals that the Kremlin may decide to strike globally at the free world this year. These fears are based on the following factors:

(1) Political uncertainties in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations;

(2) The slowness of military preparations in countries outside the iron curtain;

(3) The lack of unity among the Allies as to implementation of the defense of the free world; and

(4) The avowed impotence of the United States to resist a Red onslaught. Top American military leaders have announced formally that we are not prepared for a showdown with the U. S. S. R. and her satellites and must not risk a world conflict.

Up to last November the top military and political strategists of the free nations were still convinced that because of certain shortcomings in the Soviet and satellite armor, they still had at least 2 years before the final show-down.

1953 WAS ESTIMATE

Intelligence from the satellite countries is spotty. That from the U. S. S. R. is mostly guesswork. But by piecing together during the last 3 years what information could be obtained through the iron curtain, responsible officials came to the conclusion that not until 1953 would the Soviets reach the height of their military preparedness, especially in the output of atomic weapons. This evaluation was strengthened by the fact that Russia permitted the Greek guerrilla movement to die on the vine and it eventually gave up the blockade of Berlin after nearly a year.

These provocative actions engineered by the Kremlin were abandoned, it was said, because the United States—and to a lesser degree its associates—showed a determination to meet force with force.

The third attempt of the U. S. S. R. to challenge the free world took place on June 25, 1950, when the North Korean puppets attacked the South Korean Republic's forces. The immediate—though nominal—reaction by the United Nations and the real retaliation by the United States was supposed to have given pause to the men in the Kremlin.

The Korean action was totally different from our actions in Greece and Berlin. We actually threw fighting men—the flower of America's Regular Army—into the combat and after a few weeks, when we had recovered from the surprise attack, we succeeded in practically destroying the whole North Korean army. It looked as if we had met successfully the first Soviet challenge on the battlefield.

THREAT OF DEFEAT

Our victory in Korea would have been a death blow to Soviet plans for world domination. Moscow threw into the battle millions of Chinese Communist regulars. We suffered painful defeats. America's allies in the United Nations who had taken a chance in voting for intervention in Korea became scared.

Instead of meeting this new onslaught with the same determination as last June, they started begging the Chinese Communists to accept a truce which, in effect, would have given them a real political victory. They refused, that is to say the U. S. S. R. instructed its Peiping puppets to refuse.

Here was a chance to bleed American armies white. Moscow suspected—or had reasons to be sure—that the American forces would not be permitted to use every advantage at their disposal to defeat the Chinese Red hordes. It is a strange coincidence that it was principally our allies in the U. N. who vetoed the use of the Air Forces in Korea to bomb the air and concentration centers of the enemy, not only across the Yalu River, but also within Korea itself, because they were situated 35 miles from the Soviet borders.

Orientals know and respect the ruthless use of power. Likewise, they take as evidence of fear and timidity the honest endeavors of the westerners to check the bloodshed which would inevitably occur in a third world war. This timidity of the Allied high command in Washington and at Lake Success determined Moscow to order its Chinese puppets to resume their offensive operations.

Meanwhile, they strengthened their own effectives in eastern Manchuria and on Sakhalin Island. They replied to the western conciliatory policies with a threat of further aggression. They succeeded in intimidating not only the European members of NATO, but also the American Government, which directed the military operations in the Pacific.

CHANGED PUBLIC ATTITUDE

But on the other side of the ledger the Russians discovered something their agents in the United States had failed to tell their superiors in the Kremlin. That was a change of attitude on the part of the American people themselves.

While the country by and large would not hesitate to make the utmost sacrifices for lasting peace, the people became aware of the threat to their own life and freedom if Russia were to win.

The men in the Kremlin had reckoned on much-weakened morale among the American people. For nearly 10 years their agents—Americans and foreigners—had been hard at work to undermine the American mind. They had tried to prove that our mode of life and our Constitution were relics of the past.

They seemed to gain ground until the real test came. Then the results were sadly disappointing for the men in the Kremlin. After these many years of intense propaganda and subversions in all strata of America's society the American people are still patriotic—in the old meaning of the word—and ready for any test.

NATO BUT A BLUEPRINT

This unquestionably is a far more important factor in the reported decision of Russia to strike this year. The Kremlin knows that for the time being NATO is no more than a blueprint. It has failed to do anything constructive for the creation of a real army.

France and Britain are in the throes of a domestic political crisis. Even if we remove from the picture the important factor of Communist domination or infiltration in British and French social life, the people of both these European pillars of the NATO are war-weary and afraid that another war would doom them.

Maybe Russia does not possess the stockpile of atom bombs with which to wage a destructive atomic bombardment of the United States. Maybe she does not have all the

planes she needs for offensive operations. Maybe she does not have all the necessary amounts of high-octane gas and oil for a continued operation. But in relation to the state of unpreparedness of Western European nations, she has more than enough to jump the gun and still get to the channel within a few weeks after her massed forces have started moving.

The few American divisions on the way to Germany may cause a delay of a few days or even 2 weeks. But they alone, with the meager support of the NATO forces, will not be able to stop the Reds, particularly if the operations in Europe take place simultaneously with an extension of present military actions in the Far East.

The real reason for France's and Britain's absolute opposition to inclusion in western defense of all nations with strong military potential—Germany, Spain, Greece, Turkey, etc.—is not so much the fear or dislike of these people, but the fear that such an action might invite Russian attack.

HOPE FOR DELAY

They know that so long as the rearmament program proceeds slowly Russia, which is well-informed of the real situation, might mark time in the hope of picking Western Europe like a ripe plum after the United States defeat in the Far East is complete.

But the new trend among the American people to resist Russian aggression wherever and whenever it develops may have important repercussions on the rest of the free world. Under the impact of public opinion, the allied governments may be forced to translate their present slow defense measures into actual efforts. Moreover, there is an even stronger possibility that before the summer is over the United States Government, under the impact of public opinion, may begin to provide the Spaniards, the Turks, the Greeks, and the Germans with the proper equipment for their armed forces, which far exceed those of the other allies in numbers and training.

At present, however, these factors are only potentials, which Russia can disrupt by a direct action which would disturb whatever strong defense Europe and America may organize in the future. For the time being Western Europe is in a political turmoil, with various political parties jockeying for power. The military forces of the NATO are smaller than they were a year ago, because France had to reduce her nine combat divisions by three, which had to be sent to north Africa and Indochina.

UNITED STATES NOT READY

For the time being also the NATO's veto on the inclusion of real European military powers—Spain, Turkey, and Greece—still stands and will not be immediately overruled by the United States. Moreover, in this country, General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees last Tuesday that "America is not ready for a show-down with Russia and should not risk a world conflict by adopting General MacArthur's war proposals."

This declaration is factual as far as our immediate preparedness is concerned. It is also well-known to Moscow, where in the past our most intimate military, scientific and diplomatic secrets have been no secret at all. But this situation existed also in 1941, before Pearl Harbor. Yet as soon as the Oriental branch of the Axis committed an aggression the American people resolutely went to war.

Weak as our ground forces are, compared to our global commitments, they are for more numerous and better equipped than they were 10 years ago. The Air Force is much stronger qualitatively and quantitatively than it was then, and the Navy is ready for any emergency.

The only thing that we lack is the courageous and electrifying leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. His slogan that all we have to fear is fear itself apparently is not shared by his present successor and his principal advisers.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me. I am sorry that I have not been able to be present to hear the entire address of the Senator, but I assure him that it is one address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I intend to read very carefully.

I may also say, Mr. President, that I agree with much the Senator from Nevada says, but whether we agree with the Senator or not, he certainly is contributing a great deal to the American people in covering the picture of the present situation as he sees it, in the intelligent manner in which he has been covering it.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

INVESTIGATION OF METHODS OF HOXSEY CANCER CLINIC, DALLAS, TEX., IN THE TREATMENT OF CANCER

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE's speech.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed first, to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether the methods employed by the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic, of Dallas, Tex., in the treatment of cancer have proved to be a cure for such disease; and second, to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 142), submitted by Mr. LANGER, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether the methods employed by the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic, of Dallas, Tex., in the treatment of cancer have proved to be a cure for such disease, and (2) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the Committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $_____ shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. LANGER. In connection with the resolution, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "United States Witness Concedes Good in Cancer Remedy," published in the Dallas Morning News, December 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES WITNESS CONCEDES GOOD IN CANCER REMEDY—OSTEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN TELLS OF STUDIES AT HOXSEY CLINIC

(By Warren Leslie)

A Government witness conceded Thursday that he had seen Harry Hoxsey's treatment for cancer used on hundreds of patients, and that it had produced good results.

The witness was Dr. Lynwood E. Downs, an osteopathic physician of Denver, Colo. Dr. Downs testified as a Government witness in a suit to keep Hoxsey from sending his cancer medicine through the mails.

In Federal Judge William Hawley Atwell's court, Dr. Downs said that during a period of study at Hoxsey's clinic in 1947, he had seen nearly all types of cancer represented in hundreds of patients. Under cross-examination by Defense Attorney Herbert K. Hyde, he said that many of these patients had visibly improved after treatment.

"The results, in many cases, were moderately good to quite good," Downs said.

The doctor was one of nearly a score of witnesses called by the Government during the day to establish that Hoxsey is sending a black-brown and a pink medicine through the mails, and to try to establish that it won't help cancer.

A chemist from the Pure Food and Drugs Administration in Washington, Llewellyn Hopkins Welch, said he had analyzed seven different bottles of Hoxsey's mixture and that the mixture was different each time.

In one case, Welch said, the concentrate was 94.5 percent water, 4.5 percent potassium iodide, 0.9 percent plant extract, and a trace of licoricelike flavoring.

In other bottles, the witness said, the ingredients were alcohol, sugars, pepsin, and other mineral matter, always with a better than 50 percent water base. He conceded that many drugs now known to be effective in the treatment of other diseases have either an alcohol or water base.

With the seven bottles of Hoxsey's solution the Government conducted a large-scale experiment. The bottles were sent to the Jackson Memorial Laboratory, at Bar Harbor, Maine, for use on mice. Five groups of 25 mice apiece, all with malignant tumors, were given Hoxsey's formula four times daily, as prescribed, said Dr. William S. Murray, of the laboratory.

A control group of 25 diseased mice were treated in every way like the other mice except for the Hoxsey treatment, which they didn't get.

Dr. Murray testified that, upon concluding the treatment, he could observe no difference between the mice treated with Hoxsey's mixture and the other mice.

He also said that between the time of first examination of the diseased tissue (biopsy) and autopsy the tumors of the medicated group had without exception grown larger than the others.

On cross-examination Dr. Murray admitted that no supporting medication had been given the mice to aid in their elimination of poisons contained in the drug.

He was asked by the Government what effect he thought the medication had had.

"None," he said. "The mice uniformly had malignant tumors as they had in the first place."

In cross-examination, Hyde won from Murray the admission that hormones, which

are sometimes prescribed for cancer, sometimes seem to cause it.

The slides of the mice's diseased tissues were then sent to Dr. G. B. Mider of Rochester, N. Y. He testified that under a microscope he could find no difference between tissues of mice which had been treated and tissues of mice which had not.

Dr. Mider then testified that he was satisfied in some cases with the results of recognized cancer treatments such as X-ray, radium, hormones and surgery. He said he knew of only one drug which, taken orally, might help a cancer patient.

"If it won't cure cancer, it may at least arrest its growth," the doctor said. But he added that the drug was still entirely in the experimental stage.

Defense attorneys tripped him up at one point. After he had implied that iodine had never been known in the treatment of cancer, Hyde won from him the admission that radioactive iodine has been prescribed in certain cases of cancer of the thyroid.

Two recognized specialists in the field, Dr. David I. Macht and Dr. Max Alexander Goldzier of Baltimore and New York, respectively, testified that potassium can be extremely dangerous to human beings. (Hoxsey's resolution contains, in some cases, potassium iodide.)

Dr. Macht, who has taught at Johns Hopkins for 18 years, said that potassium iodide in a 4.5 percent solution would be roughly equivalent to about 8 to 10 grains a day. A 1-grain quantity in the wrong person could cause many unhappy effects, such as sniffles, irritation of the bronchi, skin eruptions, sometimes serious, and, in great enough doses, actual destruction of body organs.

He said that potassium is a cumulative drug and that sooner or later a steady intake of a grain a day would be almost certain to produce untoward effects.

It was his opinion that the other ingredients in Hoxsey's solution, without the potassium iodide, would produce no pharmacological effect at all.

Dr. Goldzhier said that on the basis of his own experiments made through the years, it was his conclusion that potassium increases the rate of growth of the cancer and would tend to spread the malignancy.

Hyde challenged the testimony of both men on the grounds that medical science is constantly changing its mind about what is a cure for what. He forced both men to admit that they had not tested the Hoxsey mixture per se.

Both men are medical doctors. Government prosecutors O. Morris Harrell and Joseph Maguire said they would have many more witnesses to call Friday, and the case is expected to run at least until Saturday.

Four Pure Food and Drugs Administration inspectors testified that Hoxsey was shipping his medicine through the mails, and the case of Mrs. H. P. Harris, who died last October after treatment for cancer at Hoxsey's clinic, was brought out in testimony by her widower and two medical doctors who treated her.

Mr. LANGER. I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that an action was brought by the United States Government, which was tried before Federal Judge William Hawley Atwell, a few months ago, against Harry Hoxsey, the cancer specialist. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Judge Atwell Upholds Hoxsey Cancer Remedy," which appeared in the Dallas Morning News, December 22, 1950, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

JUDGE ATWELL UPHOLDS HOXSEY CANCER REMEDY

(By Warren Leslie)

Federal Judge William Hawley Atwell Thursday rejected the Federal Government's case to stop Harry Hoxey, cancer specialist, from sending his medicine through the mails into interstate commerce.

He thus nullified—at least in this lower court—the Government's mammoth effort to prove that Harry Hoxsey cannot cure cancer.

For the judge said he could, in some cases.

And the judge said Hoxsey's cure was "reasonably comparable" to those medically recognized, such as radium, surgery, and X-ray.

Judge Atwell added that Hoxsey's cure did not bring the physical suffering of radium and survery, if not properly administered.

Point by point, the judge backed up the defendant.

The United States attorney's office for this area declared it would recommend appeal. Officers of the Pure Food and Drug Administration, which brought the suit, said they also would recommend appeal.

An appeal would have to be approved by the Attorney General's office, and be filed within 2 months. It would go to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans.

Judge Atwell's decision ended 6 days of testimony by more than 150 witnesses. The great majority of those men and women who said they had had cancer spoke up for Hoxsey. Many of these were Government witnesses.

The Government called them to the stand with the full knowledge that most of them would say Hoxsey had helped or cured them. With the help of scores of medical doctors from all over the United States, the Government sought to show that these people were incorrect; that a man does not know whether or not he has cancer; that only competent medical examination can accurately diagnose the disease.

Judge Atwell made findings of fact as well as conclusions of law. Here are several of his findings:

"Point 3. That the respondents' treatment is not injurious. Some it cures and some it does not cure, and some it relieves somewhat. That the respondents do not guarantee to cure.

"Point 4. That the statements contained in said labels so pleaded are neither false nor misleading. That if in doubt as to the effectuality of the treatment, they (the Hoxsey Clinic) take the patient on trial, and, frequently, without charge to the patient.

"Point 5. That the percentage of efficient and beneficial treatments by the respondents is reasonably comparable to the efficiency and success of surgery and radium, and without the physical suffering and dire consequences of radium, if improperly administered, and surgery, if not successful in completely removing the entire malignant portion.

"Point 7. That the respondents do have two basic medicines to which are added, if and when the examination of the patient calls for such additions, a large number of drugs and mitigations in a separate room at the clinic. That it also subtracts and changes the basic elements of the medicines as indicated, * * * by the full physical examination of the patient. * * *"

The judge also found that the Hoxsey Clinic had shipped no medicine or booklets since institution of the suit.

His conclusion read:

"The facts disclosed by the testimony and found as above, as well as the failure of the Government to successfully carry the burden and show by a preponderance of testimony the correctness of its charges, merits and must have a refusal of the injunctive relief sought, and a dismissal of the bill."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, also in the same connection, I desire to call the attention of all Senators to the fact that the Surgeon General of the United States has refused to make an investigation for the purpose of determining whether Dr. Hoxsey has or has not found a cure for cancer. I have here a letter written by the Surgeon General to Mr. Hoxsey, under date of November 24, 1950. I ask that the letter be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., November 24, 1950.

Mr. HARRY M. HOXSEY,
Hoxsey Cancer Clinic, Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. HOXSEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 8 with reference to the consideration by the National Advisory Cancer Council at its recent meeting of the records submitted in support of your request that the methods of cancer treatment of the Hoxsey Cancer Clinic be investigated by the National Cancer Institute.

The letter of November 1, 1950, addressed to you by Dr. J. R. Heller of the National Cancer Institute, which notified you of the council's report adverse to your request, was sent with my full authority. Under the Public Health Service Act, the function of the National Advisory Cancer Council is to advise the Surgeon General and the reports of the council, are, therefore, properly made to me.

I am informed that suit has been instituted in the District Court of the United States at Dallas, Tex., styled *United States of America* v. *Hoxsey Cancer Clinic* and *Harry M. Hoxsey* in connection with alleged violations of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. In view particularly of this litigation no further statement in this matter appears in order pending the outcome of the litigation.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD A. SCHEELE,
Surgeon General.

Mr. LANGER. In the same connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated May 4, 1950, addressed to Harry M. Hoxsey by J. R. Heller, M. D., Director of the National Cancer Institute, which apparently is under the United States Public Health Service. I ask that the letter be printed in full, together with an accompanying statement of policy of the National Cancer Institute regarding investigation of "Cancer Cures."

There being no objection, the letter with the accompanying statement, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HEALTH,
Bethesda, Md., May 4, 1950.

Mr. HARRY M. HOXSEY,
Hoxsey Cancer Clinic, Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. HOXSEY: Your letter of April 21, 1950, to Surgeon General Scheele, and the attached correspondence, has been referred to this office for reply.

It is noted that you have extended an invitation to the Food and Drug Administration and also to the Surgeon General to invite any one selected to come to Dallas and "make a private or personal investigation of this clinic and our activities."

You may recall a report, or you may have in your file copies of a report, submitted to

you on December 21, 1945, by Dr. R. R. Spencer, then Chief of the National Cancer Institute. In this report 60 histories of cancer cases submitted by you as cured were carefully reviewed. It was revealed that of 40 cases of external cancer there was no histological (biopsy) proof of cancer in 25; and of the 20 alleged cases of internal cancer no histological proof of cancer was submitted in 15.

Obviously this did not meet the criteria laid down in the policy of our National Advisory Cancer Council, a copy of which is again submitted. Whenever these criteria are met, we will be glad to make an investigation.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. HELLER, M. D.,
Director, National Cancer Institute.

POLICY OF THE NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE REGARDING INVESTIGATION OF "CANCER CURES"

The National Cancer Institute receives hundreds of requests to test so-called cancer cures. Most of these are pastes, ointments, or salves which fall in the category of escharotics, that is, substances which, when applied to external cancer, destroy it by "eating out" the tissue. Such treatments were used by the medical profession years ago but are used very little today. In cases in which this type of treatment is considered desirable, the medical profession has suitable formulas available.

Some of the treatments advocated have no scientific evidence to support them and others are mere theories. The National Cancer Institute is willing to investigate any treatment claimed as a cure for cancer provided the author can present any reasonable proof of merit. Accordingly it has established the following conditions which must be met before it will give consideration to requests for the examination of new treatments for cancer:

1. The method of treatment must be explained fully. There must be no secrecy whatsoever in regard to the composition or the nature of the treatment.

2. Complete clinical records must be submitted of a suitable number of cancer patients, treated with the remedy or method in question under competent medical supervision, and in each such case the diagnosis of cancer must rest on competent and verifiable microscopic examination.

3. The records must show that the patients survived at least 5 years following treatment.

Approved by the National Advisory Cancer Council, June 6, 1947.

INVESTIGATION OF COST OF LITIGATION INVOLVING REINSTATEMENT OF A GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this morning I made a motion in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which was unanimously agreed to, as follows:

That there be a full investigation by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the article which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday morning, headed "United States defeated in a one-half-million firing action; printer ordered reinstated; judge scores high cost."

In other words, in the case of Orton T. (Tex) Campbell, involving veteran's preference, according to Judge T. Alan Goldsborough and the Washington Post, the United States Government has spent about $500,000 in finding out whether this veteran is entitled to his job, which pays $5,450 a year. I desire to ascertain whether this case is going to be appealed, and whether it is going to cost the Government another $250,000 in addition to the $500,000 already spent to determine whether this veteran may have this $5,400 job. I ask unanimous consent that the motion I made this morning before the committee be printed in full, together with the article, entitled "United States Defeated in a One-half-Million Firing Action," published in the Washington Post, of May 19, 1951, to be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the motion and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I move that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee conduct an immediate investigation to ascertain whether or not the United States Government spent the sum of one-half million dollars to investigate this $5,000 position, that the truth or falsity of that statement be determined by the Civil Service Committee or any properly constituted subcommittee thereof, that all the necessary witnesses be subpenaed or asked to attend, and that the investigation be made promptly, immediately, fully, and completely and that a report be made to this committee not later than 2 weeks from today.

UNITED STATES DEFEATED IN ONE-HALF MILLION FIRING ACTION—PRINTER ORDERED REINSTATED; JUDGE SCORES HIGH COST

(By Thomas Winship)

The Government yesterday lost a half-million-dollar court battle to fire a $5,450-a-year Federal printer.

The bill may run even higher when the case is appealed.

District Court Judge T. Alan Goldsborough ordered the printer reinstated in his old job, after condemning costly Government litigation in general.

Winner was Orton T. (Tex) Campbell, a 30-year-old World War II fighter-plane pilot, who was discharged from his Government Printing Office job in June 1949 after starting a court fight in a veterans preference dispute.

PLANS RETURN TO GPO

Campbell, who lives at 214 Massachusetts Avenue NW., now is an assistant foreman in the composing room of the Washington Post.

He said last night that he intends to return to GPO.

The judge ruled on Campbell's suit for reinstatement, then admonished the Government's attorney, E. Leo Backus, of the Justice Department:

"I hope it never happens again that an administrative agency spends half a million dollars to get rid of one employee. If that is the practice of administrative agencies, they ought to be abolished. * * * It is so extraordinary, I can't characterize it," declared the angry jurist.

Backus countered that it was a test case and undoubtedly the Government would appeal it to the Supreme Court, which may cort thousands more.

NOT ANOTHER HALF MILLION

"Don't spend another half-million dollars," interrupted Goldsborough. "Make it a quarter of a million this time."

Philip L. Cole, Deputy Public Printer, made the $500,000 estimate of the cost thus far to carry out the Campbell proceeding, Backus said. The bulk of the figure represents working time of Justice, GPO, and Civil Service Commission officials and employees.

In his ruling, Goldsborough upheld the position of Campbell's attorney, Warren E. Miller, that his client had been denied the right to cross-examine witnesses during his 1949 ouster hearing before the Civil Service Commission.

Campbell's attorney also had argued that the charges were vague, not detailed, as prescribed under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and civil service regulations.

GOVERNMENT CONTENTION

Backus insisted yesterday that Campbell was fired on specific charges, and the CSC hearing was conducted properly. The printer was accused of "circulating false statements and obstructing work at Government Printing Office."

It all began when Campbell returned from military service in January 1946 to learn, he said, that his CAF-7 job had been reclassified to CAF-11. GPO reinstated him with the CAF-7 grade. Campbell contended he was entitled to the higher rating.

He filed suit in district court asking that the Public Printer be forced to give him the CAF-11 grade. Campbell lost this case on jurisdiction and appealed. It is now pending before the court of appeals. GPO fired Campbell June 3, 1949, 3 days before the case was to be heard before the appeals court. Campbell then filed his suit for reinstatement on which Goldsborough ruled yesterday.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for yielding to me.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks and insertions by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] appear in the RECORD following the debate on the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H. R. 3587. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to permit the board of supervisors of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions.

RECESS

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 22 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Robert I. Millonzi, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Wayne Coy, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1951. (Reappointment.)

COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

Paul W. Brosman, of Louisiana, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1956.

George W. Latimer, of Utah, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1961.

Robert Emmett Quinn, of Rhode Island, to be judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1966.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. James Alward Van Fleet, O3847 (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Eighth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. Edward Hale Brooks, O6657 (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Second Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. William Morris Hoge, O4437, United States Army, for appointment as corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Doyle Overlton Hickey, O10123, United States Army, for appointment as chief of staff, Far East Command, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral:

REAR ADMIRAL, LINE

Charles D. Wheelock	John P. Whitney
Richard M. Watt, Jr.	Hugh H. Goodwin
Paul E. Pihl	Edgar A. Cruise
Wilson D. Leggett, Jr.	Thomas B. Brittain
Harold D. Baker	Richard P. Glass
Herbert E. Regan	Clark L. Green
Thomas M. Stokes	Leon J. Huffman
Robert E. Blick, Jr.	Harold A. Houser
Frank T. Watkins	John M. Higgins
Tom B. Hill	John B. Pearson, Jr.
Carl F. Espe	

REAR ADMIRAL, MEDICAL CORPS

Leslie O. Stone
Clifford A. Swanson

REAR ADMIRAL, SUPPLY CORPS

George F. Yoran
Robert F. Batchelder

REAR ADMIRAL, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William O. Hiltabidle, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we rejoice that in our moments of prayer and worship Thou art always speaking unto us, seeking to give wisdom to our minds and courage to our hearts.

We pray that the confusion and chaos of our times may not bring doubt and despair and defeat to our souls.

Forgive us for taking counsel with our fears and allowing days of darkness and disaster to shatter our faith and shut out the vision of Thy grace and power.

Grant that as valiant soldiers we may strive to conquer those devastating and destructive desires and ambitions which are raging in the hearts of men and nations and filling the life of humanity with so much sorrow and suffering.

May we daily gird ourselves with confidence and hope and dedicate all the energies of body, mind, and soul to the supreme task of building a world community ruled by the spirit of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments Nos. 18, 19, 25, 28, and 34 to the above-entitled bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to repeal the restrictions placed upon the Federal low-rent housing program by the independent offices appropriations bill passed by the House on May 4 and not yet acted on in the other body. This appropriation bill cut to 5,000 units the number for which annual contributions contracts, the basis for federally assisted low-rent housing, could be made in the fiscal year 1952 and limited to 50,000 the number of units for which such annual contributions could be contracted in any subsequent fiscal year.

It is my intention to restore the provisions which Congress passed in the Housing Act of 1949 with bipartisan support providing for 135,000 federally assisted low-rent housing units per year for each of the fiscal years through 1954 with the right in the President to reduce this amount to 50,000 units or to increase it to 200,000 units after receiving advice from the Council of Economic Advisers as to "the general effect of such increase or decrease upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy, if such action is in the public interest."

It is essential that a vehicle be afforded by which public dissent can be expressed from the action which would result in gutting the whole Federal public housing program for this fiscal year and my bill will serve this purpose. I am concerned lest those who have always been opposed to publicly assisted low-rent housing should seize this opportunity to utilize defense mobilization to accomplish what they failed to accomplish when the Housing Act of 1949 was passed. At that time it was public demand which was heard and which was successful and I believe that public demand will again have to be heard.

It has been stated by some that considerable absenteeism on May 4, 1951, the day the vote was taken in the House, had a great deal to do with the result. An analysis of the vote and of the situation indicates that the result would not have been changed even with the absentees present as the issue had in effect been decided the previous day when the House voted 219 to 159 to consider the independent offices appropriation bill though it legislated in respect of the public housing program. This way of deciding the issue overnight, in view of the months of hearings and debate and the years of consideration which went into the Housing Act of 1949, can hardly be considered to have been adequate consideration.

The argument of defense mobilization is being made to block a reasonable Federal public housing program. The President has found that 75,000 units for the fiscal year 1952 are warranted considering defense mobilization needs. The Appropriations Subcommittee which handled the bill and the whole Appropriations Committee found that 50,000 units could be allowed even under defense mobilization.

The need is especially great now because of the greatly increased pressure on low-income families eligible for public housing due to the galloping inflation and the cost of living especially in the price of foods. The hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee showed a vast demand of about 20 times the number of applications from families eligible for public housing compared to the supply of units available or to become available within a year, and that this type of demand persists in cities from Atlanta, Ga., to Fresno, Calif., and from Boston to Tampa. New York, with a continuing critical housing shortage, is hit especially hard, according to its mayor, with 10,000 to 15,000 units immediately cut off for 1952 and the prospects for an estimated 30,000 units more indefinitely postponed.

At a time when our people are asked to hazard their lives in a great effort for national security, the least we can do is to protect as far as possible the social welfare advances which have been achieved. I should think that this argument would be equally appealing even to those who have fought public hous-

ing; yet, it is this very program which is being made mercilessly to suffer. National unity in this great national defense effort is not to be fortified in this way.

A SALUTE TO A GREAT HERO, CAPT. JAMES W. JABARA

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Members of the House to the heroic deeds and to pay tribute to a fellow Kansan, Capt. James W. Jabara, of Wichita, Kans.

Press releases from Korea have reported that this 26-year old Kansan became the first ace jet flyer in history last Sunday in a swirling dog fight over northwest Korea. Captain Jabara is credited with having destroyed two of the three Russian-made MIG–15 jets shot down by F–86 Sabre jets near the Manchurian border. These jets were his fifth and sixth in the Korean war—one more than was required for the captain to be designated as an ace flyer. In Sunday's air battle 50 Red jets were caught by our Sabre jets south of the Yalu River. In addition to the three Red planes destroyed, others were listed as probably destroyed and several damaged.

Captain Jabara very briefly described his experience in these words:

> I tacked onto three MIG's at 35,000 feet and picked out the last man. I fired two bursts which ripped up the fuselage and the left wing. The MIG burst into flames and snaprolled twice. At about 10,000 feet the pilot bailed out. Just as he jumped, the MIG disintegrated into a thousand pieces of flaming debris. I climbed back to 20,000 feet and immediately bounced six more MIGs. I fired two bursts into one of them, scoring heavily both times. It fell into an uncontrolled spin and all I could see was a whirl of fire.

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible experience. It is war at its worst. Here is a man who faced the possibility and probability of a horrible death in order to achieve his goal. He assumed his assignment voluntarily and his action was far beyond the call of duty.

In World War II, Captain Jabara went on 133 missions. He has 6½ air victories to his credit over Europe in World War II. He was awarded the Air Medal with 20 clusters, a Presidential citation, and the European campaign ribbon with six battle stars.

So we salute another heroic American, a man who risked his life far beyond the call of duty and in the hope that the world might be a better and finer place within which to live.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Albert	Dondero	Murdock
Angell	Dorn	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Fallon	O'Brien, Mich.
Barrett	Frazier	Potter
Beall	Garmatz	Riley
Bonner	Gillette	Rogers, Fla.
Bosone	Hart	Secrest
Boykin	Harvey	Shelley
Eryson	Hébert	Smith, Miss.
Buckley	Hinshaw	Springer
Budge	Hoffman, Ill.	Stigler
Butler	Horan	Sutton
Camp	Howell	Tackett
Cannon	Irving	Taylor
Chenoweth	Kennedy	Van Pelt
Colmer	Kersten, Wis.	Vursell
Cotton	Kirwan	Watts
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Widnall
Davis, Wis.	Martin, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
Dawson	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Dingell	Morgan	Winstead
Dolliver	Morris	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATTLE). On this roll call 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDIA EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 195

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 209 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], to be used and yielded as he sees fit, and I now yield 10 minutes to myself.

Because of the widespread interest in providing wheat for India, the Rules Committee concluded to bring the Carnahan bill here, in order that the House might determine for itself if the bill should be considered.

I oppose the adoption of the pending rule because I know that we are being made the victims of a well-planned and well-conduced campaign to blackmail Congress into doing something that it should not do.

Behind the Indian wheat bill there is a combination of influences:

First. There are the church people who believe that the proposal is to give bread to hungry people.

Second. There are those wanting to initiate another give-away program that will call for an additional $7,000,000,000.

Third. There are those wanting to continue the policy of appeasing everything that is Russian.

Fourth. There are the one-worlders.

Fifth. There are those seeking political advantage or wanting to avoid political disadvantage.

Sixth. There are those who believe that the best way to resist communism is to buy friends.

Seventh. There are those who know that in pursuing this course we are playing the Russian game.

Eighth. There are those who, though clean-minded and right-intentioned, believe that Christian charity compels us to feed the hungry wherever they may be found, to feed both friend and foe, and without regard for consequences.

Ninth. And there are the confused, following a course of confusion laid out by confused people. A bill allowing India to spend every cent with Russia and China.

Around the first of March of the present year, and under the prompting of somebody, 11 members of the Foreign Affairs Committee introduced 11 identical bills to give 2,000,000 long tons of wheat to India; and not to be outdone, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] introduced a bill of his own.

The Foreign Affairs Committee chose to report the bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, but when the bill was brought to the Rules Committee on application for a rule, and when examination of the proposal was sought to be made, its sponsors ran away and left their child cold upon the committee table.

Later the Foreign Affairs Committee came back to the Rules Committee with another bill, the Carnahan bill, proposing to make an ECA loan of $190,000,000 to India.

I invite you to take a look at this bill. While saying "That the assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, droughts," and so forth, India is not obligated to buy one grain of wheat from the United States or from anybody else. She can spend the money for any kind of food she may want, and need not spend one dime for food obtained from the United States.

What a cheat and a swindle is this proposal.

A majority of the committee sponsoring the bill say they do not like it, that they do not want it, that they favor making an outright grant, but that they take this bill as a last resort.

Remember, India did not come here begging for a grant. Oh, no. India is too proud to beg. She came here for a loan on easy terms, just the kind of a loan that is here proposed, because India knows, as every informed person knows, that ECA loans are nothing but grants.

Of all the billions loaned by ECA, there has not been paid, up to this date, one thin dime on principal or interest, and nothing of any consequence will ever be paid on these loans. The loans were made with no expectation of their ever being paid, and the billions loaned were received with no sense of obligation to pay.

The Foreign Affairs Committee, in its report, says:

> The committee believes that a loan would be an unrealistic approach to the problem. It would be contrary to the firmly established policy of the United States not to make loans where there is no reasonable expectation that they can be repaid. Furthermore, a loan that cannot be repaid engenders ill will instead of creating good will.

And further, this committee had this to say in its report:

> The committee considered this matter carefully, for it could not recommend to the House any grant if India's resources would warrant further purchases out of its own funds.

So, a majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee is satisfied that India cannot repay this proposed loan and should not be expected to pay it.

Mr. Acheson, of the State Department, testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee, said that India could not pay for the wheat without straining her economy. He further said:

> Our own studies show that India could not pay for these 2,000,000 tons without drawing heavily upon its sterling balances with the United Kingdom.

Those sterling balances, incidentally, amount to $1,800,000,000.

He said further:

> If the balances were used to finance the importation of the 2,000,000 tons of grain we are here discussing, the funds available for developmental and other essential purposes would be correspondingly reduced.

Mr. Acheson further said—and I ask that you pay particular attention to this:

> If its—
>
> India's—
>
> credit were pledged for grain, it would be unable to qualify for the hoped-for developmental loans. In addition, credits for the acquisition of consumers goods * * * are economically unsound.

So Mr. Acheson is against making India a loan. But let me again repeat what he said:

> If its—
>
> India's—
>
> credit were pledged for grain, it would be unable to qualify for the hoped-for developmental loans.

What the Secretary had in mind was that in the execution of India's Colombo plan, about which the Foreign Affairs Committee had much to say in its report on the bill, India would need to borrow $3,864,000,000, the most of which she expects to borrow from the United States through the Export-Import Bank. And the Foreign Affairs Committee having this in mind, took care to say in its report:

> The committee desires to emphasize that this bill does not deal with the development plan, but with a food crisis.

So there you have the viewpoint of the Secretary of State and a majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

But there were minority members of the committee who disagreed with this viewpoint, and they made a report which is an official document of the Congress, and from which I quote:

> India needs grain immediately; we have the grain. We need strategic materials from India over a period of years; India has these materials; manganese, mica, burlap, monazite sands, and so forth. We should make India a loan which can be repaid in strategic materials. We should not make the Government of India a gift it has not asked for.

The monazite sand and burlap referred to in this report are two commodities of which India is the chief supplier. We have little monazite sand and no burlap. India has embargoed the exportation of jute, burlap, and monazite sand to the United States.

Monazite sand is something from which thorium and the rare earths are produced. Thorium is used in the making of the atom bomb. India, as stated, is the chief source of this sand. But under the promptings of Russia she embargoed its shipment to the United States, and in addition thereto, and again under the promptings of Russia, her representative went to Brazil and influenced that country to embargo the exportation of monazite sand except in government-to-government transactions. The sand that Brazil has was mined by an American chemical company that went to Brazil upon Brazil's urging and developed two mines, and now, because of the embargo, this company cannot get one grain of its production.

This sand which India has is worth nothing to her except as she can convert it into foreign exchange. But she takes the position that it is better for her people to starve than to barter this sand for food to feed them.

These minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee said further:

> Most of the people in the world are hungry. The State Department, in presenting the point 4 program, said "primitive agricultural methods and poor transportation so limit the production and distribution of food that two-thirds of the world's population have barely enough to eat to sustain life."

And again these gentlemen said:

> The 2,000,000 tons requested from us by India is only about one-twenty-fifth of what India expects to obtain this year. The failure to obtain this food will not in itself cause famine or starvation in India; on the other hand, delivering it will not prevent hunger and malnutrition in India.

In view of this statement, it is difficult to understand how these gentlemen would favor the Carnahan bill. The minority report signed by these gentlemen further states: "A 6-year loan would not ruin India or its plan"—meaning the Colombo plan.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and his associates, in referring to the $71,000,000,000 budget that we are endeavoring to raise, further stated:

> We know that the proposed gift to India is not in that budget at all, but is above and outside it. If we start making appropriations outside our $71,000,000,000 budget, we will have little chance to reach a pay-as-we-go basis, and this gift to India will be added to our national debt. * * * either India or the United States is going to go in debt for this grain. We owe it to India and the rest of the world, as well as to ourselves, to remain strong enough here at home to carry our own great share of the burdens of the defense of freedom.

And let me give you one more quote from this minority report:

> We are urged to do this as an act of charity. We believe that charity is the greatest thing in the world, but it is a voluntary virtue. There is no such thing as compulsory charity. We hope that every Member of Congress is charitable with his own money. We do not believe that Congress has the right, under our Constitution, to be charitable with money taken from taxpayers without their consent.

It may be said that the quotes that I have given are taken from the minority report of the Foreign Affairs Committee on the Morgan bill, and because they represent the views of the minority they should not be persuasive; but let me remind you the report blasted the life out of the majority report and killed the Morgan bill.

In the debate in the Senate on that body's Indian wheat bill, Senator HUMPHREY said that to him Nehru looks like a good bet for democracy. But is he?

Mr. Harold E. Stassen said:

> The men in the Kremlin now look on India as the No. 1 target of world communism.

He further said that Nehru, during his early years, "was strongly attracted to the Soviet Union of Russia and to communism as it was practiced there."

In the Senate debate on the same day, May 15, 1951, Senator FERGUSON placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an Associated Press dispatch from New Delhi, India, dated May 12, reading, in part, as follows:

> United States officials are chagrined at the pro-Soviet feeling engendered here by the shipment of Russian wheat to this nation, announced on the same day that Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru accepted the terms for much larger United States aid.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Only an hour later did he tell Parliament that he saw no political strings attached to the famine-relief bills in the United States Congress to supply India with 2,000,000 tons of wheat.
>
> The result was that the American move to help was obscured by the start of the Russian shipment. Obscured also was the fact that more than 100,000 tons are coming to India each month from the United States through regular trade channels.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> The same attitude was reflected in other parts of the Indian press, and in the conversations of Indian officials, leaders, and plain citizens.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> An important segment of Indian opinion, wavering between east and west, swung fur-

ther toward the Soviet camp when Mr. Nehru announced that Russia already was starting the 50,000 tons without waiting for the conclusion of negotiations on the terms.

The Indian Government and United States Information Services have failed to get across to the Indian people that the United States has been doing for a long time on a large scale what the Soviet Union proposes to do on a small scale.

Shipping records show that the United St..tes has sold and delivered 411,000 tons of grain to India in the first 4 months of this year. The only delivery from Communist countries in that period was 42,000 tons from Communist China.

But Indian journalists are increasingly caustic about the slow progress of the famine relief bills in Congress.

"The United States took only 24 hours to help Korea, but it already has taken 6 months to help save India's people," sai one Indian journalist.

Is India our friend? If so, why is the press of India so violently anti-American? If India is our friend, why are anti-American meetings being held all over India at this very moment? Look at the record made by Nehru in the United Nations, where he has uniformly taken Russia's side whenever controversy between Russia and the United States has arisen.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if the gentleman knows that since this man DeSilvo, known as DiSalle, has reduced the price of cotton $135 a bale in this country, India has quit growing so much wheat and gone to growing more cotton?

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself seven additional minutes.

He refused to join with his associates in the United Nations in declaring China the aggressor in Korea. He refused to join in the laying down of an embargo against Communist China. He protests our resistance to Chinese communism. And India, although a member of the United Nations under whose flag the war in Korea is being fought, has not furnished one soldier to defend the free world.

If you think India is our friend, then look to the speech made in Austin, Tex., February 25, 1951, by Dr. Bharatan Kumarappa, India's delegate to the United Nations Social Commission. This representative of India said:

> Communism, which Russia is seeking to realize, from the point of view of nonviolence, we feel has an ideal which is essentially a nonviolent idea. The goal of communism is a goal in which there is no room for exploitation or for suppression of the weak by the strong. * * * That goal, therefore, the Communist goal, I am sure you will admit is a goal which is a nonviolent goal, and must attract people who believe in nonviolence.

Do these words sound like those of a country that is taking the side of the United States in the desperate struggle that she is having with Communist Russia?

This protagonist of the Communist doctrine further said:

> Besides nonviolence, and liberty, we have this great desire to improve our standard of living. I think from that point of view Russia would have an appeal to us, because we are people who have old economic and social organizations, and it is necessary for us to build a new way of life. We are sort of hampered and hindered at every step by these old conventional ideas. Such people have to have some kind of a revolution, something that will shake them to their very foundations and put new life into them. That way I think Russia with its revolution would serve a useful purpose to perhaps get rid of our old feudalism, landlordism, and things of that kind, and make wealth available for the masses of our country. That way Russia would appeal to us, as you can see.

Is this the language of a friend of our country?

This missionary for Russian communism explained India's hostility to the United States in these words:

> Let me * * * tell you the kind of things that make us feel somewhat more hesitant toward you today. And I emphasize the word "today," because but yesterday our attitude toward the United States was one of great friendliness and expectation, but latterly because of policies that are being pursued in the world, we have begun to adopt a more hesitant attitude toward America. The first of these, I might mention, is this: That we find you arming yourselves, drafting, making elaborate preparations for war, and spending fabulous amounts of money. Not only are you arming, but you are going to other countries with arms and ammunitions, even countries that do not wish to fight you go to—like Germany or Japan today. You go to them and tell them that here are arms and ammunition for you. Go ahead with preparations for defense and fight. So America appears to us to be very, very war-minded today because of its preparations and its policies. It is something that we see in the newspapers, hear over our radio; therefore, it is not something that can escape our notice. As over against that, you must also remember that Russia creates a very different side as to what is happening. It is quite likely that a great deal is happening, and those who are in the know of things can probably give us facts and figures. But the ordinary person in India, who just looks at newspapers and listens to radios, and doesn't bother to go behind what reaches the ears—that kind of person is apt to gain the impression that as between Russia and America, America appears to be the country that is most definitely preparing for war. She is arming herself and arming others. That is an impression, you must remember—that in India we are beginning to think that America is definitely the country which today is very war-minded. She is spending her money and her resources on war, arms, and ammunition.

And again the doctor said:

> Today what we find is that the other people of the world are much less inclined to fight than you are. Even Britain and France, Italy, these countries are war-devastated countries—Germany and Japan—all these are war-devastated, and the only country that appears to have enough strength in her to think of a war—I am not talking of Russia—appears to be the United States. * * *
>
> * * * America appears with her troops in various parts of the world—in Korea, in Formosa, for instance. And we in Asia are very sensitive to that fact. You may think: Is not Russia appearing with her troops? I do not think so. Russia is not appearing directly with her troops. She may be aiding and abetting national movements in Asia, but we do not see Russian troops anywhere. But we do see American troops in various parts of the world, and it is creating a very bad impression in the minds of Asia that America is now appearing with her military might in various parts of Asia. That is a thing for you to remember.

Dr. Kumarappa further said:

> If Asia is quietly drifting toward Russia, it is partly because of the policies being pursued by the United States.

What are the policies of our country to which this Indian official takes exception? It is because, as a matter of self-preservation, we have been compelled to resist the aggressions of Russia.

This Indian official further says—and mark the words:

> We do not care about communism so much. We are bothered a great deal about the foreigner in Asia. If only you understood that, you wouldn't want to go and waste 1 cent on helping the foreigner in Asia.

And here I would like to say to the good church people of the country whose representatives for years have labored in China and India, that they might as well get prepared for these Communist-dominated countries to chase out of these lands their missionaries who have sought to take to the old world the Christian religion.

And this same representative of India had this to say:

> And we are not so bothered about communism in Asia. * * * For you, communism is enemy No. 1, and you feel that it is necessary to get rid of communism from off the face of the earth. So far as we go, we regard imperialism as enemy No. 1, not communism. The reason for that is this: that we do not associate any imperialism in communism as you do. Here I see a definite parting of the way, because in America you associate communism with Russian imperialism. We do not see it that way. Our attitude is that communism is a certain philosophy, a certain economic and social organization we can have, which we can evolve out of our own traditions. * * * We are free to develop it according to our own best traditions as we choose. And so far as Communist China goes, it appears that communism there is not a mere matter of Russian dictation, but it is something that is being developed in China by the patriots of China—the Nationalists leaders of China who are so eager, like our own leaders in India, to do something for the people of their land. They have been inspired by this communism philosophy, which as I told you has a beautiful hope, and they are seeking to shape that in accordance with their own traditions. Naturally, they do get help and support from Russia, because when two people have the same kind of philosophy, it is natural for people to seek each other's help, especially when they know that the rest of the world is rather antagonistic. Communist China may have obtained help, perhaps, from America herself because America and China have been friends for years together. But when America bangs the door against Communist China in the United Nations, and has been the only nation amongst the members of the United

Nations who has been most unwilling to allow a seat in the United Nations, then can you blame Communist China if for her support she goes always to Russia? That may not have been the case if America had been more friendly toward Communist China. So far as we go, I say, we do not see Russia's imperialism behind communism.

I should like here to make the observation that India, to all intends and purposes, has already embraced the doctrine of communism. She is, of course, opposed to the violence involved in the Russian system, but defending China for turning to Russia for help because the two countries had embraced the same philosophy, it is reasonable to assume that in any further conflict between Russia and the United States that might be brought about, India, because of having embraced the Communist philosophy, would find it natural to take Russia's side, just as she defends China for seeking and accepting Russian support.

Is there any famine in India? Are the Indian people any hungrier now than they have been in all their long history? Nehru says that there is no famine, but that there is a shortage of grain, which India expects to get from some source in order that no famine might develop.

The church people of the country, because of propaganda, have been led to believe that millions of people in India are starving daily, and they think that the food we give or supply will go to feed the hungry of this unhappy land. But this is not the case. Whatever food we supply will go to the Indian Government, who in turn will sell it to her people, which means that the hungry of India who have means with which to buy will eat, but those having no money may be permitted to die.

And here it might be well to remember that India has 180,000,000 sacred cows, and God in heaven alone knows how many sacred monkeys. She has 10,000,000 sacred or professional beggars. All of these will have the first claim on any food that we may send to India.

Now, I can understand that there are those who will not like my having said this. They will contend that this is something that should not be taken into consideration; that sacred cows, sacred monkeys, and sacred beggars are a part of the Indian religion; and in that they are right. But it might also be said that it is a religion that our already overburdened taxpayers should not be compelled to support.

I said that this was the beginning of a second Marshall plan. I think it should be more specifically called the Javits plan, because the gentleman from New York has been doing the thinking and the planning and the canvassing for the plan.

And why was India selected? To start off with, it was because of the humanitarian equation that was involved and the ability to whip up sentimental support. By passing this bill you will be giving a vote of confidence in Dean Acheson. You will be continuing the policy of appeasing all things Russian. You will be irrevocably committing the country to the policy of the distribution of the wealth of the Nation to all the peoples of the world. And you will be initiating another little give-away program that will call for the expenditure of $7,000,000,000. Following India will come a train of other countries, and to make certain that she be the second to be considered, Israel has already spoken out, and effort is being made to pledge Members of this body in favor of the expected grant to that country.

Mr. Speaker, are we able to do more than fulfill the commitments that we have already given? Are we able to do more than take care of our existing obligations? Mr. Acheson thinks we are. He thinks we can. He thinks we should. He says that for India to pay for the grain she needs, she would strain her economy and impair her ability to qualify for the loan of the money she needs in the execution of her Colombo plan.

Mr. Speaker, what about our own economy? Is it not already strained? Are we the Shylock painted by so many people throughout the world? Has it been forgotten that for the 10 years prior to December 1950 this country had given away and loaned on terms amounting almost to grants, a little in excess of one hundred billion dollars? So, Mr. Speaker, again I ask, what about our own economy?

Our national debt rapidly approaches $300,000,000,000. The per capita debt of our people is above $1,695, whereas the per capita debt of India is only $12. By increasing her per capita debt 45 cents, India could secure the funds which it is here insisted that the United States provide.

It is proposed that this gift to India be added to the national debt. Will that be the manner of taking care of all the necessitous peoples in all other parts of the world? Just how high can this national debt become before it tumbles over and wrecks the economy of the country?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I am sorry; I cannot.

Here we are endeavoring to service a $71,000,000,000 budget. The President is calling for more money, for the imposition of heavier taxes. Our Ways and Means Committee has sought everywhere for this needed money, and it cannot find it. We have for weeks been whittling down appropriation bills to enable us to finance our defense program. And in the face of this critical and apparently hopeless situation, we are called upon to further burden the American taxpayer to the tune of giving $200,000,000 to India.

What a snare and a delusion is this proposal. To me it is the height of insanity.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when I first learned about this grain to India bill I looked upon it with favor because I thought it was to be a loan and not a gift; I thought that the United States had the grain and that India needed it. I thought that India had mica, manganese, monazite sands, jute, and certain strategic materials that we needed in the war effort; I thought it would be well that we should trade the grain to India and that in turn we would receive these strategic materials; first, because we need them; and, second, every bit that we take from India I thought would be taking away from Russia.

I discussed this grain bill with many of our colleagues, and without exception they favored this loan to India; there was no opposition to it. Then finally I read in the papers that the State Department, notwithstanding Nehru and the Indian Government asked for a loan, not a gift, the State Department said "No, Mr. Nehru, although you have merely asked for a loan—no, sir—good old Uncle Sam, from whom the people of the world will take everything they can—we do not want to make a loan; we do not want to make a mutual agreement on 'this proposition"; the State Department said: "We are going to give it to you."

Mr. Speaker, knowing the State Department as I know it, I am not surprised that it would sell the taxpayers of the United States down the river. I definitely feel that they are more interested in the welfare of foreign countries than they are in the welfare of the United States.

Of course, we all appreciate the plight of the people of India and we want to be charitable to them, but that old maxim still remains firmly imbedded in my mind that charity begins at home. While we talk about the undernourished people of India, is that not true of the people of Israel, of Iran, of Spain, of Arabia, of Pakistan, of Yugoslavia, of all the countries throughout Africa? Is it not true that they are all undernourished? How in the world can 150,000,000 people in our own country provide the necessities of life for approximately a billion people scattered all over the world who are undernourished?

I say that this is a precedent. How can we justify giving grain to India without giving grain to Israel, Spain, Iran, Yugoslavia, and to the other peoples throughout the world?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Why, in Great Britain the people are reduced to 9 cents' worth of meat a week each. So if we are going to help anybody, it seems to me they would be demanding more consideration.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the easiest way to make an enemy is to help one country and not help other countries that are just as deserving.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is it not the gentleman's understanding that following India, in

the event that Congress takes favorable action upon this bill, there will come a train of other countries asking for similar treatment? The demands being made total $7,000,000,000.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true without question. My understanding is the proposed amount is $9,000,000,000 for foreign relief.

Mr. Speaker, we hear that this is for the defense of the United States. Is it not true that all of these countries that I just enumerated—Spain, Israel, Arabia, Pakistan, and the rest of them—are important in the defense of this Nation? I say that although this bill involves the gigantic sum of $190,000,000, in the event this bill is passed by the Congress you will have one brought in for Israel involving $150,000,000; you will have one brought in for Pakistan, Iran, and about 30 other countries.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is addressing himself to the merits of the bill. Do I understand the gentleman is opposed to the adoption of the rule or just addressing himself to the merits of the bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am personally opposed to the adoption of the rule as well as the bill itself.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia a question? Is the gentleman from Georgia opposed to the adoption of the rule?

Mr. COX. Of course, I am opposed to the adoption of the rule and I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. That raises a very interesting question. Here we have a gentleman from the Rules Committee handling a report of the committee opposed to the rule, and those who would like to speak the other way cannot get any time to speak. That is a most unusual situation. I have never seen it in all the years I have been in Congress.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that before the end of debate on this rule there will probably be more speaking for the rule than opposed to it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Apropos of the majority leader's suggestion about this situation, I well recall in my time here in recent years when rules have been handled by members of the Rules Committee who were opposed to the adoption of the rule.

Mr. COX. That is practiced very frequently. In handling the rule for the majority side I agreed to give time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and I have agreed to give time to the Speaker.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For the enlightenment of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for whom I have great affection, and for his information, I may add that after the leadership of the House decided they did not want the India wheat bill brought out promptly, letters went out to people all over the United States from officials of the Rules Committee saying that the only reason why the bill had not been reported was because the terrible minority of that committee had blocked consideration of a rule when it had never been called up for a vote. So there are many peculiar things that happened to this bill, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not true that the Democratic Party leadership of this House as well as the Republican Party leadership of this House is not only for the rule, but for this loan-to-India bill?

I am authoritatively advised this is the case.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do not want to attempt to say what other Members are thinking.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Let me suggest to my friend that he ask the gentleman if he is not opposed to the bill before the House now; that he favors making a gift to India? Is that not right? Does the gentleman not favor making a gift?

Mr. FULTON. May I answer? My position on the present bill is that the provisions should have been put under the ECA program. Savings made under the ECA measure would be almost enough to make up the expenditures proposed in this bill. The duty would be placed upon the ECA Administrator, Mr. Foster, to determine how much India should pay, and what should be a grant as in all ECA appropriations. If India could pay, then they should negotiate that portion as a loan. But, when India cannot pay for all, that part should be a gift for which no payment reasonably could be expected.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will say in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the Republicans did not have any meeting of the policy committee in regard to this India grain proposition.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. COX. I call the attention of the membership to the fact that in the press report sent out from New Delhi on yesterday, as regards the request to send soldiers to India, that India ridiculed the suggestion and her Congress said, "We shall never fight the Chinese who are good and friendly neighbors."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this gift to India because the United States cannot afford it; that is the main reason. We just cannot afford to send it over there. Like the rest of you, I have seen the members of the Committee on Appropriations when they have gotten on the floor of this House and brought us over for teller votes, like my good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and perhaps we should have been over here all the time anyway, for some insignificant amount, maybe $400,000 or $1,000,000. So I say, there are many Members of this House who talk about economy, but do they practice it?

They go home and tell their constituents that "I am for economy" but they merely talk economy and then proceed to vote for ridiculous bills such as the one before us amounting to billions of dollars.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate the fine statement the gentleman has made. He mentioned the fact that we brought the membership over here to vote on small amounts. Of course, the amendment which I offered is not chicken feed; that will save over $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951. But, even a few hundred thousand is worth saving when a small straw may break the camel's back. So, we are trying to save wherever we can.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that I am not ridiculing him; I am admiring him a great deal for the hundreds of million he personally saves the taxpayer each year by his careful work on the Appropriation Committee.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I understand from the gentleman's argument that he does not concede that $190,000,000 covers the whole, over-all investment. Nothing has been said yet about how we are going to ship this wheat. I understand we will require 90 Liberty ships, that will have to be rehabilitated and reconverted, and they will have to be restaffed. This will entail an expense of millions and millions of dollars. Does the gentleman take that into consideration, besides the expenditure of $190,000,000? That is just the beginning of this raid on the Treasury.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Taking the wheat at the world price rather than the domestic price, we lose an additional $60,000,000. In other words, the program will cost $270,000,000.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Statements have been made here concerning international politics. Does the gentleman think we can mix human suffering with international politics?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. When it comes to the matter of human suffering, perhaps in national defense, and so forth, I will go along just as far as the gentleman will go.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think it is a fair proposition in the adoption of a rule that only 13 minutes are left to those who favor the rule, out of the hour?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say to the gentleman that I am sure he will be satisfied in regard to the handling of the rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. You will be, I am sure.

Mr. COX. There have been many occasions when the gentleman was not satisfied.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking about the distribution of the time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the United States owes approximately $258,000,000,000. We are also committed for approximately another $100,000,000,000. The past year we taxed the people $55,000,000,000, but still that was not enough. The Committee on Ways and Means attempted to tax the people an additional $16,000,000,000, but they were unable to do it. The Committee on Ways and Means were even seriously considering taxing bubble gum and lollipops for the children, along with other taxes on candy. That is how desperate this Nation has become.

When it comes to a time when they are going to tax bubble gum and lollipops in order to scatter billions of dollars throughout the entire world, I would say it is about time for us to stop, look, and listen.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am wondering if the gentleman found any who were supporting this bill who were reluctant to give of their own funds but were willing to vote a tax on somebody else to contribute.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say no, but I would say the ones who are behind this are the ones that talk economy most to their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, article I, section 8 of the Constitution instructs the Congress to provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the people. I do not believe that provision to provide for the common defense and the general welfare means that this Congress can confiscate the money of the people of the United States through taxation and then send it to the four winds throughout the world. I do not think the Constitution intended that we do that.

When they start talking about the defense of this country, Mr. Speaker, the greatest defense this country can possibly have is a solvent government. When these people say, "Let us give it to India without any reservations whatsoever," the Indian Government does not say, "We are going to give you strategic materials." They do not say, "We are going to vote with you in the United Nations." They do not say, "We will fight communism." They do not say, "We will help you fight aggression." About 90 percent of the forces fighting aggression over 7,000 miles away are American boys. They do not come in and help us. All they say is, "You give this wheat to us unconditionally."

I will say this, that I think Mr. Nehru was amazed when he asked for a loan and the State Department said, "No, Mr. Nehru, we are going to give it to you." I think Mr. Nehru himself was surprised and amazed at these things.

Now, in order that I shall be fair, I will say to my good friend, the majority leader, I wanted to take longer, but I want to give some in favor of this rule time, so I will yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. What time is the gentleman yielding?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 18 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman from Illinois think that is fair?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I again repeat, that the gentleman from Massachusetts will be satisfied with the allotment of the time.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the 5 minutes that my colleague has yielded to me. Of course, I am for the adoption of this rule and I am strongly in favor of the passage of this bill. This is not a gift; this is merely a loan, a loan to a people who I know will appreciate it in years to come.

We are, and have been, appropriating millions upon millions to assist a warring nation, Nazi-controlled Germany—this so-called now-believed friendly nation that forced us into a war that cost us several hundred billion dollars—notwithstanding the fact that every reliable report from our own sources clearly shows the same Nazi forces are in control of Germany again and are reorganizing to launch anew their campaign to place "Germany uber alles." It is being done under the pretext that we can now rely on their aid in the event Russia should attack in Europe.

We are also appropriating and giving away to Great Britain, not millions, but billions, to revive her economy and control of world trade so that she can compete with us. Much of the assistance we have given Great Britain has gone into war material which she has and is disposing of to Russia and its satellites. In exchange for this great help, Great Britain is holding us up on tin, wool, rubber and other critical defense materials. She is making us pay through the nose for every short-supply item she controls.

Yes, we have appropriated additional millions, yes billions, and are still aiding another so-called friendly nation, Japan, the perpetrators of the dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor; a nation which is now disposing of much war material to China, now designated as a Communist nation, and to many other countries too numerous to mention.

In addition to all of the grants mentioned, we are paying out millions upon millions for warehousing surplus foodstuffs, grains, and so forth, and we may be obliged to spend millions more to build additional warehouse facilities. This bill will relieve us of some of that tremendous expense.

All of the above aid has been, and is being, given in the belief that we are helping friends; that it is necessary to ward off the grave threat of communism. Yes, gentlemen, this administration is attempting at every turn to estop the spread of communism. This bill, in my opinion, will accomplish this very purpose in one of the most vital corners of the world. The one fear I entertain is that if this bill should fail, communism might well engulf the nearly half billion souls in India. Communism thrives on starvation and poverty. But when a truly friendly nation and its people appeal to us for assistance in the form of grains for its starving millions, a great cry of opposition emanates from the economizers on the grounds that India has not been cooperating with us, when every intelligent and well-informed person knows that India is not a warring nation. Theirs has been a policy of peace; they are opposed to war. Their leaders today are following in the footsteps of that great advocate of peace, Gandhi, one of the truly great leaders in all history. His simple manner of steadfastly adhering to the fundamental principle that great issues between nations can be resolved without resort to war, should serve as a guiding light to world leaders today in the stress and turmoil that now engulfs us. He had the courage and the audacity to hold his ground against the might of the British Empire. He demonstrated to the world that peace can prevail without the slaughter and destruction that accompanies war. India and her leaders today are emulating Gandhi notwithstanding the hardships and suffering that accompany such a stand when nature denies her people the sustenance to maintain life.

We are now called upon to share of our plenty in grains provided by a divine providence so that millions in faraway India may not hunger and die. Throughout history it has been the policy of our great land to aid the suffering, the hungry, those in want or trouble. As I stated before, we have poured out billions to warring and undeserving nations, but we quibble and argue over this vital relief to a friendly people. I am thoroughly convinced that 75 percent of the American people, if not more, strongly favor this legislation providing the relief the Indian people seek.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] laid great stress on an unfriendly remark by an Indian representative. There is no justification or evidence to charge that he spoke for the millions of people of India—no more

than the gentleman from Georgia or I speak for the people of our country.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which committee unanimously, after weeks of careful deliberation and study, reported this bill, and when there was some objection to the giving of this grain, the committee agreed that it should be changed to make it a loan which will be repaid in time. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to thank the gentleman for his courtesy. I tried to get time from the volcanic gentleman from Georgia, who erupts at the most unexpected times and places, to give me at least 5 minutes on the rule. Therefore, I will have to depend upon the indulgence of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COX. I intended yielding 4 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman told me he would not give me time.

Mr. COX. I told you to ask the gentleman from Illinois for the time—that I intended giving the gentleman from Illinois 10 minutes, but I intend to yield the gentleman from South Carolina 4 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. I did not feel that I should ask the gentleman from Illinois for his time. Nevertheless, I am sorry if I misunderstood my friend the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Mississippi will have plenty of opportunity to answer the volcanic charges of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is what I wanted to see. I want to see the House have plenty of opportunity to discuss the merits of this bill. It has been alleged here by the gentleman from Georgia that the people of India are not starving. As a matter of fact, what we want to do is to present the case to the House and let the House decide whether or not the people of India are hungry and starving. The gentleman from Georgia has said something about Nehru. We want the House to have an opportunity to decide, through the evidence presented to the House, as to whether those things being said about Mr. Nehru have a sound foundation. I am not pleading Mr. Nehru's case here, for that gentleman is an inscrutable mystery, as is all India.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has said that the people of India are unfriendly to the people of the United States. If you read some of the newspapers in the United States you will come to the conclusion that the people of the United States are not friendly to the people of India. That is not the case. Now I want to ask the gentleman this: Does not the gentleman from Georgia think that the fair thing to do, in view of the controversy, in view of the differences of opinion, is to bring this bill to the floor of the House and let the House debate it and come to a decision on the basis of the evidence. The rule proposes 6 hours debate. It should be approved and then let the House come to its own conclusion after that debate.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for the statement he has made.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was tied up in my committee for many weeks. During this time I was being assailed and was held responsible for the delay in the granting of a rule for its consideration. As chairman of the Committee on Rules I have received thousands of letters from all over the United States—from church organizations of every denomination, civic groups, labor organizations and individuals—pleading for and urging that a rule be granted without delay. Finally I was able to secure favorable action, and the responsibility now rests with this House to provide this urgent relief to a starving and stricken people. Humanity demands that we do so.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to include just a few of the thousands of letters, resolutions, and telegrams I have received in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. The following is a telegram from the executive secretary and the director of the relief program, foreign mission board of the Southern Baptist Convention:

RICHMOND, VA., *March 22, 1951.*

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building:

The situation in India is desperate and ours is one of the few countries that can help meet the needs of her starving millions. We therefore urge you to use your good offices to secure passage of House Resolution 3017.

M. T. RANKIN,
Executive Secretary,
GEORGE W. SADLER,
Director, Relief Program, Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

A letter from the New York Annual Conference, the Methodist Church:

NEW YORK ANNUAL CONFERENCE,
THE METHODIST CHURCH,
May 12, 1951.

CHAIRMAN,
House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The New York Annual Conference, in its session on Friday morning, May 11, adopted unanimously the following resolution:

"*Re it resolved*, That this New York Annual Conference of the Methodist Church go on record as strongly favoring the immediate action of our United States Congress in supplying 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; to the Secretary of State; to the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives; to Senators IRVING IVES and HERMAN LEHMAN, of New York State; to the Indian Ambassadress, and to the World Council of Churches."

The annual session of the New York Conference is a representative body of 140 ministers and 100 lay delegates, representing 75,000 people of the Methodist Church in and around New York City.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS W. M. ROLLAND,
Secretary.

A resolution adopted by the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE BOARDS OF THE AMERICAN BAPTIST FOREIGN MISSION SOCIETY AND THE WOMEN'S AMERICAN BAPTIST FOREIGN MISSION SOCIETY

WHEAT FOR INDIA

Recognizing the tremendous need of India's people for food, intensified in recent months by a series of national disasters; and

Aware of large stores of food grain held by the Government of the United States of America: Be it

Resolved, That the boards of managers of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society and the Women's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society declare themselves in favor of the Government of the United States of America making available to the Government of India 2,000,000 tons of wheat upon mutually agreeable terms.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 23, 1951.*

A telegram from Atlanta, Ga., Young Women's Christian Association, signed by Mrs. Joseph C. Read, president:

ATLANTA, GA., *April 9, 1951.*

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

The Atlanta Young Women's Christian Association representing over 6,000 members in Fulton and DeKalb Counties in session this morning to O. K. official action to urge the Rules Committee to immediately release the bill providing surplus grain to India for full debate on the House floor.

MRS. JOSEPH C. READ, *President.*

A telegram from the Synagogue Council of America, signed by Dr. Bernard J. Bamberger, president:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 10, 1951.*

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Synagogue Council of America representing all branches of American Judaism, at its plenary session held last Wednesday, April 4, unanimously voted to urge speedy passage of the aid-to-India bill for humanitarian reasons and to strengthen the forces of democracy throughout the world. We urge speedy action in view of the growing crisis involving the lives of millions of innocent, helpless people.

DR. BERNARD J. BAMBERGER,
President.

A resolution adopted by the National Maritime Union of America:

FOOD FOR INDIA

The people of India have one of the lowest living standards of any people anywhere. This meager subsistence of the Indian people is threatened by a 6,000,000-ton grain shortage. Since grain comprises about 75 percent of the diet of the Indian people, this extreme shortage means that thousands of Indians face actual starvation. The people of the United States are opposed to starvation—anywhere—anytime. We must translate our opposition to starvation into a practical assault on want, by giving the people of India our surplus grain.

H. R. 3791 and S. 872 would provide the people of India with up to 2,000,000 tons of excess grain.

The brotherhood of man, the general welfare of the United States and the cause of world peace dictate the early adoption by the Congress of these bills as emergency food relief, in order to alleviate hunger and prevent mass starvation of the people of India.

(Resolution adopted at national council meeting, National Maritime Union, April 4, 1951.)

A resolution adopted by the City Club of Chicago and forwarded to me by Mr. John A. Lapp, president:

WHEAT FOR INDIA

"Famine in India" is an ancient cry which the world has heard so often that it has become indifferent to it. Nevertheless, this is a genuine crisis for India, in which, for no fault of their own, millions of people are hungry and millions will die unless others share their food with them. The present government has plans for the improvement of agriculture, and can claim that it has not yet had time, since independence was achieved several years ago, to put the nation on a self-supporting basis.

In the current welter of international politics America should cherish this chance to do a simple act of generosity, one effect of which might be to restore to mankind a faith in itself as necessary as food.

It is said by some that wheat should be withheld from India until she agrees to sell us certain materials which she has in abundance and which we need. Unfortunately this commerce has political implications, requiring negotiations between governments, and to insist that no wheat shall be sent until these negotiations are concluded in our favor is to use food as a weapon. We would be withholding bread from people who do not even know that we have a quarrel with them.

It is proposed in Congress that we send 2,000,000 tons of wheat out of our present surplus of over 17,000,000 tons. Such a gift in no way jeopardizes the food supply of the American people.

If this wheat is sent, the people of India will know about it, and their gratitude will endure for a generation. The true Voice of America will be heard in the most effective of all possible broadcasts: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Club of Chicago favors the granting of immediate aid to India in this time of famine in the amount proposed in the bill now being considered in Congress, in the name of our common humanity.

A letter from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions:

AMERICAN BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS,
Boston, Mass., April 9, 1951.

The Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SABATH: It is my understanding that House of Representatives bill No. 3017 providing for shipment of food grains to India is now held in the Rules Committee of the House.

As one who lived in India from 1919 to 1943 and is still in constant communication with India, I am deeply impressed by the need of India for this food. I believe that the best interests of the United States of America as well as the people of India will be served by the shipment of this grain just as soon as possible. I do not believe that the world can continue half rich and half poor and still have peace. Everything that we can do to help the people of India to a better standard of living will contribute to the peace which we all so much desire.

Therefore, may I urge upon you with all the force I possess the necessity of securing immediate action on this bill which is pending in the Rules Committee. I trust that you and your associates will have this bill brought before the House for action at once.

Very sincerely yours,

RAYMOND A. DUDLEY.

A letter from the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis, Mo., signed by Father Daniel C. O'Connell, S. J.:

MISSOURI PROVINCE EDUCATIONAL
INSTITUTE,
St. Louis, Mo., April 12, 1951.

The Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As chairman of the House Rules Committee, you hold an important position with regard to the India Emergency Food Act of 1951, which is now being delayed by that committee in the process of legislation.

It is my conviction that the crisis brought on at present by the lack of grain in northern India demands that whatever technical difficulties stand in the way of legislation for relief measures as provided for in the India Emergency Food Act of 1951 be settled immediately.

If the moral obligation of assisting fellow human beings in an hour of desperate need were the only element to be considered, I think their need would be sufficient to warrant material aid from the United States. But the fact that offers of grain have come from other quarters—Red China and Russia—in lieu of offers from the United States, makes the legislation seem quite imperative. I consider the propaganda advantages for Communist Russia and the disadvantages for our Nation arising from such propaganda very weighty considerations in the decision at hand. Needless to say, the impending starvation of perhaps millions of Indians should outweigh political interests which may conflict with legislation for its relief.

Very truly yours,

DANIEL C. O'CONNELL, S. J.

A resolution adopted by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches:

RESOLUTION ON FOOD FOR INDIA ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL ACTION OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., JANUARY 30, 1951

The food situation in India has reached the proportions of a major calamity. A series of natural calamities, including earthquakes, floods, visitation of locusts, and drought have reduced the supply of food grains more than 6,000,000 tons below the amount required. In many areas there is near famine and it is anticipated that acute famine conditions will prevail unless immediate relief comes from other countries.

The Government of India has made arrangements for the purchase of approximately 4,000,000 tons of food grains from Canada, Australia, Argentina, and the United States. The United States is the only country from which the additional 2,000,000 tons can be obtained, but India's dollar holdings do not permit her to buy them.

The food is available in the United States. We understand that the cost would be about $150,000,000. We urge that the Congress take action to make this amount available.

Since we have the food and India desperately needs it, nothing should stand in the way of speedy action.

A statement prepared by the board of foreign missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States:

GRAIN FOR INDIA

The board of foreign missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, meeting in regular session on March 13, 1951, in New York City, expressed its concern that action has so long been delayed on the proposal before Congress that grain be sent to relieve the desperate need in India. The board urges the committees of the House and Senate to expedite consideration of the bills before them and to secure favorable action as soon as possible. The board believes that the traditional position of Christian America refuses to permit technicalities to stand in the way of feeding starving human beings when it is within our capacity to save their lives.

A letter from the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
DIVISION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS,
April 24, 1951.

To the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States of America:

DEAR SIRS: We of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America feel constrained to write one further word in regard to the present legislation on "food for India." There has seldom been an issue facing Congress and the people of America on which the churches of this country have given more enthusiastic support or shown a greater concern. This concern has been solely humanitarian. Political and economic questions have been raised. For the past 3 months these have been allowed to obscure the real issue that faces us.

Very simply stated, the issue is this: The people of India, numbering 250,000,000, are in desperate need of food. India has been laid low by a series of unprecedented natural calamities over which the people had no control. Their normal food yield has been so severely reduced that they face the year ahead with a shortage of 6,000,0000 tons of food grains. In this hour of distress the people of India have turned to their friends in the west. In particular, they have requested that America render special aid. It is a case of our being asked to give of our abundance to a people who have nothing.

Daily the picture grows darker with reports from India telling of widespread starvation, of hungry people having to be restrained by the police, of thousands migrating from their homes in the attempt to find food. Calcutta, Delhi, and Madras are more than names on a map—they are areas where countless thousands of people stand facing the west with hands outstretched. We are haunted by the words of the New Testament: "Lord, when saw we Thee hungry and fed Thee?" * * * "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

Surely the time has come to act. America and India need each other. Mutual need presupposes mutual help. Let us help India now with swift and generous action. Let us provide without delay the 2,000,000 tons of food grains which India has requested and which she so desperately needs.

The churches of America will be counting on your help.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL STEVENSON,
Secretary.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, a telegram just handed to me by our distinguished majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, who fears he will be denied time to present it himself. It was addressed to him by the Honorable William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader of the House,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The situation in India holds the threat of general starvation for millions of human beings in that country and calls for prompt and generous action on the part of the United States. We should supply them wheat

to tide them over this emergency and assure them of the opportunity to purchase additional supplies until normal sources of grain are again available to them. Such a policy is a matter of basic humanity for which there are many precedents in our history. In addition the security of our way of life requires that we use our resources to make friends for our Government in the global struggle in which we are involved. India by position and by its numbers of people is a key country in this struggle. In the name of these two purposes, humanity and loyalty to human freedom, I urge speedy action on the legislation to provide wheat for India.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I know if you gentlemen had seen one-quarter or one-tenth of the thousands of telegrams and letters that have come to me as chairman of the Committee on Rules complaining about the delay on this legislation, you would support this rule and then vote for the bill because I am firm in my belief that it is in the best interest of our country. This rule should be adopted and the bill passed without further delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be folly for the House to reject this rule. I agree with the gentleman who just preceded me, that with 6 hours of debate on the bill the House will have ample time to make its decision in calmness and deliberation, and to work its will. The rule should be adopted.

With reference to the bill itself, I can think of no really sound and logical businesslike reason for making this loan or for passing this bill. In the first place the Treasury of the United States is in bad shape. The debt of our country is astronomical. The tax burden is terrific. In the second place, I have lately received from the Department of Agriculture a report, dated May 2, to the effect that there is no surplus of grain in the United States. I could recite many other reasons why it is illogical and unreasonable to pass this bill, but I must call attention to the fact that neither is war sensible or logical or reasonable. Perhaps the most profitless and illogical and unreasonable undertaking by civilized man is war. We are now engaged in war. We have just recently gone through two major wars. This House has appropriated billions upon billions of dollars for war and disaster. So I take the view on this matter of a loan to the Government of India for the purchase of two million tons of grain, that we have been forced into a situation that we cannot now avoid. There is only one reasonable thing to do: that is to do just as we do when we are plunged into a war—take it for what it is, make the necessary appropriation, do the job that has to be done, make the loan and send the grain to India and be done with it. Leave out logic, leave out reason, and leave out the facts. They will not support our action on this matter.

The only fact involved here is that there are some people in India who need food. Mass starvation in India is a grim threat. The Government of India has asked us to help them. Those are the only compelling factors. We have recently helped other nations in identically the same way with loans when there was no starvation to be considered. But in this instance the government of a country which has not heretofore come to us for a loan states that they need this money for grain for starving people. Mr. Speaker, we cannot now, in the face of starvation, suddenly reverse a benevolent policy which we have followed for several years. We must make this loan and send this grain in the hope, first of all, that it will prevent starvation; and, secondly, that the people of India will understand that we really think as well of them as we do of the other peoples of the world.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Does not the gentleman think it is noteworthy that former President Herbert Hoover who has always been a sound economist has come out strongly for this aid to India?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I know that former President Hoover is one of the greatest humanitarians and one of the greatest statesmen in this world today; and I know that Mr. Hoover's feeling about starvation is that we should do anything we can to prevent it at any time anywhere in the world. I certainly honor him for that view, but I do not think the Members need to place much emphasis on the opinions of people outside this body today. It is our problem; we have to face it; we will listen to 6 hours of debate and make our decision. I merely mention these things to point out why this rule should be adopted.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in the very brief time that is allotted here it is obviously impossible to discuss all the factual statements that have already been made in regard to this bill and that I am sure inadvertently have misrepresented the situation with respect to some very important considerations.

The matter that is before us now is a very simple one; it is a question of whether or not we will adopt a rule so as to allow those who spent many, many hours and many days in studying this matter to present their case, to present their arguments with respect to the desirability of the loan that is provided for in the bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I shall be pleased to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that this bill has the unanimous support of the Republican members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs? And is it not true that the Committee on Rules gave more time, 6 hours, more time than we asked for, because the Committee on Rules as a body felt that, this being one of the first foreign policy bills of the year there should be full debate, and then under the 5-minute rule the House could work its will on this legislation?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. VORYS. It would be utter folly, disastrous internationally, if we refused to consider this vital matter, this perplexing matter on the floor.

Mr. HERTER. I fully agree with the gentleman. It seems to me that from the point of view of the conduct of our foreign relations if, without giving due consideration to this matter and consideration of all the argument that will be brought before us, we should reject the first plea that has been made to us by a great independent state, it would have a very serious effect on our international relations. We may disagree with many of the things that Mr. Nehru said or that other Indians have said. That is not the issue; the issue is that a great people are in serious difficulty. Because of the fact that they in serious difficulty, have asked this country for a loan, if we should not be willing to argue the case and find out the facts, if we should reject this rule, as I say, it would have a very serious effect on our international relations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe the gentleman will agree with me when I say the representatives of many religions—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—have placed themselves on record in support of legislation that will meet this situation.

Mr. HERTER. There is no question about that. Not only has everyone who has been in India pleaded in favor of this bill, but every witness who knows the situation on the ground has pleaded for it. To reject it on the basis of not adopting this rule would be, in my opinion, very serious.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Can the gentleman explain why the word "wheat" does not appear any place in this bill?

Mr. HERTER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. We talk about wheat all the time.

Mr. HERTER. Wheat is not the issue.

Mr. VORYS. Would it not be better to go into the merits of the bill on that point in the 6 hours of general debate?

Mr. HERTER. Yes. The point raised by the gentleman from Iowa has been gone over very carefully and it illustrates the very point I am trying to make. In the 6 hours of general debate perhaps we may have a chance to indicate that this bill has been better thought through than some people think it has.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman brought to the attention of the House that the Republic of India is a new nation. Am I correct in saying that this is the first request that new country has made of us?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the rule is adopted so that the House can consider this measure in detail.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this admittedly complicated and controversial subject has suffered over a period of months from as much misunderstanding and sometimes misrepresentations as any I have ever seen. The confusion has come as much from the friends and supporters of the bill, it has seemed to me, as from its opponents. But behind all the secondary issues are certain clear and indisputable facts.

The central issue is not the State Department. The central issue is not Mr. Nehru. We can discuss both of them and many other matters in the 6 hours of general debate. The key fact is this: that without the food provided in this bill there is going to be mass starvation in India. With mass starvation in India the Government of that new republic will almost certainly fall within a matter of months and be replaced by a government completely and totally subservient to and the agent of the Kremlin. Such an event would be of the gravest peril to our country from the standpoint of our security and our hope and desire to have order and peace in the world so that we can cut down the expenditures we are now having to make for armaments which are running our budget up to over $70,000,000,000 a year, which we simply cannot continue indefinitely.

Since, without this bill there will be mass starvation in India, which would likely lead to the fall of the independent Government of India and replacement of that Government by a Communist government, which would be a disaster to our own proper interests, then we must take the action necessary to prevent such mass starvation. The central issue basically is just as simple as that.

I admire the Indian Government for coming and asking for this assistance on the basis of special and easy terms rather than as a grant, even though India is probably less able to afford repayment of a loan than many other countries to whom we have given gifts. Because of natural disasters India has to import 6,000,000 tons of grain this year. It is scratching the bottom of the barrel to get the funds to pay for 4,000,000 tons of grain. It cannot get enough foreign exchange for the extra 2,000,000 tons of grain it needs to prevent starvation. This bill does not give that amount to them. It makes it available as a loan whose terms will have to be negotiated. It is possible the full amount will not be required. It is a self-respecting transaction with benefits to both parties.

I hope we will pass this rule and not deny the House the opportunity to discuss and debate all, not just a part, of the facts on this issue of such great importance to the people of India and to our own country.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, since the matter of a gift or loan to India has been before us and discussed, to me it has been one of the most amazing things that it has been my privilege to witness in the many years I have been in this Congress. When this question first arose, I found few, if any, people against even a gift or a grant. As things went on, the ball began to roll and certain influences began to work. In the moment that I have I would like to adopt the very sound and sane remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. Here is a great contest, considered by a great committee of this House, and individually it is one of the outstanding and one of the ablest committees of this House. They bring a bill in here, providing not for a gift, but a proposed loan, with practically a unanimous report, and then Members in this House ask this House to vote against even considering the work of this great committee. There have been a few times since I have been here, either under a Democratic or a Republican administration, when it might have been justified for Members of this House to have denied a committee its day in this House, but it seems to me this question is so far-reaching, especially in the kind of world in which we live, and God knows it is the most dangerous one in which anyone living in a democracy today ever breathed air in. If it had not been for Marshall aid in connection with the rehabilitation of Italy and France, those countries would today have been in the bosom of communism. Hungry women and children, clinging to the breadwinner of a family with no bread to win, would have voted for a change because they could make it no worse. Consequently, should we not argue this great question in this House, and after this committee has a right to present its case and the opposition the opportunity to present its case, then determine the issue, but not on whether or not the House should be granted the poor privilege of considering this question? We need friends in the east, and sometimes I wonder if some gentlemen have forgotten that we need friends the world around in the east as well as the west. You talk about expense. I do not want to offend this great Nation with 300,000,000 people in it today by refusing to even consider this bread to the starving people of India. I doubt if within the next generation we will have any friends in India or probably not in any other part of the great east, with its teeming millions of people. We need friends in this world today as we never needed them before. I am for this rule and I am for this bill because I think it will help us from a selfish standpoint; if for no other reason I would be for the consideration and the passage of this bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the eloquent plea made by the Speaker for a free press and free speech, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks after the vote on the resolution and include certain letters and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, one salient fact relating to this bill has not come out in the debate on the rule. This whole proposition did not come up from the State Department. It was presented to the President by a bi-partisan group from both houses of Congress and on their initiative. In the Senate this group consisted of seven Democrats and six Republicans, among them some of the most distinguished Members of the Senate, and from this House five Republicans and five Democrats. This bipartisan group called upon the President and asked him to send up a message which would activate the legislation through the Congress. It was this group that introduced the legislation in the House and Senate, not the respective committee chairmen. The Members who introduced the bill here were Representatives FRANCES P. BOLTON, THURMOND CHATHAM, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, JACOB K. JAVITS, WALTER H. JUDD, EDNA F. KELLY, THOMAS E. MORGAN, ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF and ROY W. WIER, and in the other body, Senators ANDREWS, BENTON, CLEMENTS, DOUGLAS, DUFF, FLANDERS, HENDRICKSON, HENNINGS, HILL, HUMPHREY, IVES, KEFAUVER, KILGORE, KNOWLAND, LEHMAN, MCMAHON, MORSE, MAGNUSON, MURRAY, NEELY, NIXON, O'MAHONEY, PASTORE, SALTONSTALL, SMITH of Maine, SMITH of New Jersey, TAFT, THYE, TOBEY, and YOUNG.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that we have lost at least up to this point, 400,000,000, of Asia's 1,000,000,000 when mainland China left the list of the free peoples and right now, this minute, there are in jeopardy in this House 350,000,000 more—the people of India. Is it not unthinkable that we should turn our backs on the fulcrum of Asia, which is now India, after we have lost China, by denying them a hearing on the first thing this young and proud Nation has asked for? That would be the height of irresponsibility in the handling of our foreign affairs. Yet that is exactly what we are being asked to do now when we are asked to turn down this rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have probably dispelled the fear of my good friend the majority leader. There have been two Members that have spoken against this rule and eight that have spoken in favor of it, including the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The question of dispelling a fear is not involved, because I may express my views, but underneath that I have profound respect for my friend from Illinois and a deep affection for my friend from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is a wholly unexpected pleasure, because I was sitting there calmly, at least calm inwardly, with the expectation that my friend from Georgia had agreed with others to give them all the time he had under his control.

To say that some of the statements made by my friend from Georgia [Mr. Cox] are not worthy of consideration would be to close our eyes to the facts. That is all the more reason why we should have the opportunity to explore them during general debate. We know from experience that in the limited time available on a rule, particularly where a far-reaching question of this kind is involved, Members cannot go into any kind of an extended debate in relation to the merits of the bill.

The statements by Mr. Nehru we have, of course, read. To say that we are immune to them would be an incorrect statement and an insult. There are differentiations between Mr. Nehru and other public officials of India. To say that some of the press of India have not made statements unfriendly to America would be to close our eyes to a fact. But on the other hand, to say that all of the press of India is that way would be an incorrect statement. Going into the consideration of the bill and having debate on the question will give us an opportunity to discuss the problems of a new nation. A great part of the world is going through what may be termed revolutionary nationalism. There are many factors and many questions which can and should be discussed during general debate which cannot be discussed in the limited time during the consideration of the rule.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. There are more people in India than in all of Western Europe which comes within the Marshall plan. We have repeatedly debated on the floor of the House and studied the Western European situation and the Chinese situation. But this great nation of India, next to the biggest on earth, as far as population is concerned, has not had, during the dozen years I have been here, any over-all consideration on the floor of the House. But now to attempt to understand the ramifications and issues of India's situation in 1 hour's time and to dispose of them is unthinkable. We are going to need a day or so even to get a bird's-eye view of merely the problem, let alone the solution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

As an illustration I have some notes in my hand which I made the other night in studying and thinking about this problem. We all do that in our hotels or our apartments in the evening, studying and making notes. As I say I have these notes which I made the other evening on this question, but I cannot go into them now. During general debate, however, I would have the opportunity to explain more fully my thoughts on the question, and those who oppose the bill can do the same thing.

Out of that sort of discussion engaged in by the House on the high level of debate that the House of Representatives has always maintained and which I am proud of, with 6 hours of general debate and then further the debate under the 5-minute rule, the opportunity will exist for Members to develop the facts one way or the other. That opportunity, Mr. Speaker, is denied to the membership in the event that we refuse to adopt the rule. I hope the rule will be adopted.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Illinois saw fit to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for it so happens that Mr. JAVITS is the Member of Congress who has been doing the thinking and the planning for the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the proposal to give wheat to India.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. The gentleman from New York is now canvassing the Members of the House to secure pledges in support of that proposal.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman from Georgia ought to yield for a correction. As a matter of fact, I myself had as much to do with this bill as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia declines to yield.

Mr. COX. Gentlemen, speaking in favor of the adoption of the rule, having made the point that this is a loan—yes, an easy loan—a loan made with no expectation of repayment—a loan received with no sense of obligation of ever paying. Of all the billions of dollars loaned by the ECA, not one thin dime has been paid on either interest or principal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman who presides over this body made a very soothing and persuasive statement. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] likewise made a very fine statement. The gentleman from Massachusetts made a fine statement—all favoring the adoption of this bill which means a gift. But I call their attention to the fact that on another occasion:

> In a boat to sea,
> Sailed wise men three,
> On a brilliant night in June.
> They carried a net—
> And their hearts were set—
> On fishing up the moon.

There was just as much sense in the efforts of these three wise men to fish up the moon, as there is in supposing that the extension of this loan to India will buy Indian friendship.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON), there were—ayes 211, noes 13.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just prior to the vote on the rule, we listened to an eloquent, touching, and sensible plea from the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], in behalf of the adoption of the rule.

From the remarks of the Speaker it was evident that he favored, and favored strongly, the granting of an opportunity to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to be heard in behalf of the bill for aid to India.

In effect, that very logical talk was a plea for the present recognition and application of the constitutional guaranties of the right of free speech—the right of all to be heard.

I have no way of knowing the gentleman's attitude on the activities of the so-called House Committee on Lobbying. In my judgment, the activities of that committee's staff were a deliberate and fairly successful attempt to deny to three organizations—the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Constitutional Educational League, and the National Economic Council, Inc.—representing several million people, the constitutional right to be heard—a right for which the Speaker today so consistently and successfully pleaded.

Would that the present administration and the Democratic Party which the Speaker serves so well and so faithfully, would adhere on all occasions to the principles for which the gentleman sought and received support.

In my humble judgment it is unfortunate that a committee of this House, even though it be but a select and special committee, should have been used to suppress free speech and a free press.

Permit me now to show how the majority party has, through a House committee's staff, denied the very right for which the Speaker today contended. And also to show how equal justice under law does not now prevail under the policies established and adhered to by the gentleman's party.

THE DENIAL OF FREE SPEECH, A FREE PRESS, OF EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW

Though President Harry S. Truman has repeatedly stated that he did not object to criticism, that Government departments and agencies should be free from corruption, and the law upheld, his actions which have more force than his words, indicate that whatever may be his convictions, he seeks—and apparently for political advantage—to deny free speech, a free press, equal justice under law, to his critics.

A few days ago, referring to statements of some columnists and evidently having in mind the recent comments of

Fulton Lewis, Jr., a White House secretary announced that those comments, true or false, would not be answered by the President.

That attitude on the part of the President is not in accord with his actions. Some remember how he vigorously resented the criticism of his daughter's musical talent, the actions of the Marines, his profane and vulgar reference to a certain columnist, his rather frequent temperamental impatience with those with whom he disagrees.

More recently, he sent General Marshall and General Bradley—who will undoubtedly be followed by Dean Acheson and others—to refute the statements of General MacArthur who was recalled when he protested what he believed the needless sacrifice of American lives.

But, in this undertaking, the President—instead of laying the cards on the table—hides behind the cloak of confidential communications and, to date, has refused to permit General Bradley to give the public the real facts behind the removal of General MacArthur.

This denial of information to Congress is in line, as I will attempt to show, with the President's policy of refusing to give Congress any information which might enable it to legislate wisely when it is apparent that such information might reflect discredit upon the President or his administration.

But, first, a few general statements:

Sometimes a knowledge of recent and current events enables us to see and appraise a little more clearly the destination toward which we are bound.

FREE SPEECH AND A FREE PRESS

The first amendment to the Constitution states that—

> Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

At the moment the press of this country is viewing with alarm and indignation the suppression of a free press in our sister republic of Argentina. The press admits that there is little which we can do to remedy that situation. The President of Argentina, were he so disposed, might, with propriety, suggest to our indignant editors, publishers, columnists, and radio commentators that, instead of lecturing him on the suppression of the press, the denial of the right of free speech in Argentina, they first do a little home work in connection with similar, if less spectacular, suppression here in the United States of America. He might ask why they are so concerned about his suppression, of a newspaper, while apparently they, with comparative complacency, submit, without vigorous protest to the attempt to suppress the opponents of the present administration who have, acting within the law, criticized this administration because in governing the people it has departed from constitutional principles, not only tolerated but encouraged those who would by force, or other illegal means, overthrow our Government.

Permit me, very briefly and inadequately, to show that this administration has been and is making a sustained effort to deny the right of free speech, to suppress a free press.

One man, Joseph Kamp, was sentenced to 4 months in jail, denied the right of free speech, a free press, ostensibly on the charge that he was guilty of contempt of Congress—in reality because he had criticized the Communists and the New Deal.

Another, Ed Rumely, was recently prosecuted and convicted on a charge of contempt of Congress—the real reason being that he exercised his right to free speech, a free press in behalf of an organization which advocated constitutional processes and, in so doing, criticized the New Deal.

In each of these cases the administration attempted to suppress free speech and a free press.

JOSEPH KAMP

In 1945 a committee of the House, led by then Congressman—late Secretary of Agriculture—CLINTON P. ANDERSON, called before it one Joseph Kamp, who was the directing official of the Constitutional Educational League. That organization was not a political organization. It was engaged in the publication and circulation of leaflets and pamphlets which advocate constitutional government, bitterly criticized Communists and their activities and, incidentally, the philosophy of the New Dealers and the advocates of one world organizations.

There was no charge that the publications of the league were seditious, libelous, or that its publications or activities in any way violated any postal regulation or law of the land, either State or Federal.

The publications of the league were more or less factual; the arguments comparatively logical and the conclusions set forth relatively sound; but those publications, because they pointed out the danger from communism and from the adoption of New Deal philosophy, named certain individuals who were Communists, who were in positions of authority in the administration, were extremely harmful to the New Deal and the Communist cause.

The House committee inquiring into election activities and of which Congressman ANDERSON of New Mexico was chairman, even though the Constitutional Educational League was not engaged in political activities, but admittedly was writing, publishing and circulating material opposed to the political philosophy of the Communists and the New Deal subpenaed Kamp and demanded that he name those who were making contributions to the league.

The activities of the committee were directed by a staff, under the leadership of John Abt who had held responsible positions in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Abt was later shown, by the testimony of Lee Pressman, who also held responsible Government positions under the New Deal and who was general counsel of the CIO, to be a member of the same Communist cell as did Pressman and Nathan Witt, at one time general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board. Pressman admitted all three—he, Abt and Witt—while on the administration payroll belonged to the same Communist cell here in Washington.

Kamp, realizing that Abt's purpose was, by smear and vilification—by pressure and intimidation—to induce those who contributed to the league to withhold their contributions, refused to name the contributors to the league. Kamp preferred to thwart the efforts of the Communists, to protect those who had contributed to the effort to maintain constitutional government in this country by standing upon his constitutional right and going to jail.

On the theory that the league was engaged in political activities—and it requires a violent stretching of the imagination to reach that conclusion—Congress, overwhelmingly New Deal, voted to cite him for contempt. Kamp was convicted, served his time, and will again be tried for a subsequent refusal to bend the knee and bow the head to the Truman administration when called before the House Lobbying Committee in an obvious attempt to destroy the league.

DR. EDWARD A. RUMELY, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

The Committee for Constitutional Government, incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, is a nonprofit organization[1] the purpose of which is, as its name implies, the preservation of constitutional Government in the United States.

The Committee for Constitutional Government attempted to point out what it considered unconstitutional tendencies, advocating a return to constitutional government by sending out letters, news releases, publishing and circulating pamphlets and promoting the sale of various publications and books.

[1] Committee for Constitutional Government, incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. Officers, Dr. Williford I. King, Chairman; Sumner Gerard, Treasurer. Address all mail: 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y., Telephone Murray Hill 4-1102. Washington Headquarters: National Press Building, Washington, D. C. Partial List of Advisory Board: William Macferran, Jr., Topeka, Kans.; Frank E. Gannett, Rochester, N. Y.; Colonel O. R. McGuire, Washington, D. C.; Edward R. Eastman, Ithaca, N. Y.; W. C. Dennis, Richmond, Ind.; Thomas James Norton, Kansas City, Mo.; O. A. Taylor, New York, N. Y.; Rev. S. K. Wilson, S. J., Detroit, Mich.; Hon. Edward R. Burke, Washington, D. C.; Dr. George W. Crane, Chicago, Ill.; Gleason L. Archer, Boston, Mass.; E. Randolph Williams, Richmond, Va.; Robert G. Allen, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. John R. McCarl, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. H. Doorly, Omaha, Neb.; Canton O'Donnell, Denver, Colo.; Robert B. Dresser, Providence, R. I.; Louis J. Taber, Columbus, Ohio.; Malcolm McDermott, Durham, N. C.; Fred H. Sexauer, Auburn, N. Y.; Lamar Fleming, Jr., Houston, Tex.; Hon. Harry Woodring, Topeka, Kans.; J. R. Breed, Kansas City, Mo.; J. S. Kimmel, Davenport, Iowa; J. H. Gipson, Caldwell, Idaho; Harvey C. Freuhauf, Detroit, Mich.; E. B. Gallaher, Norwalk, Conn.; Arthur Graham Glasgow, Palm Beach, Fla.; A. G. Heinsohn, Jr., Knoxville, Tenn.; Albert Penn, Goshen, Ind.; H. J. Rand, Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. Edward A. Rumely, New York, N. Y.; Homer Tomlinson, Fort Worth, Tex.; Dr. William C. Black, San Diego, Calif.

Dr. Edward A. Rumely is the executive secretary of the committee. Not so long ago he was called before a House committee charged with investigating lobbying activities. The activities of this committee were at one time directed by Louis Little, a Pittsburgh attorney with an unsavory record, to which reference was made by me in the House on June 21, 1950.[2]

[2] WHERE IS THE COMMITTEE STAFF HEADING?

While no investigation has been made, from information which has been volunteered, some doubt is created as to the direction in which two members of the staff are traveling.

SPINGARN OF THE STAFF AND PART OF HIS PREVIOUS RECORD

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 1, page 669, shows that Jerome H. Spingarn was employed as research assistant to the chairman of the committee.

During the activities of the House Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission—in 1943–44—Spingarn was Assistant Chief of the FCC's War Problems Division, which Division and others of the FCC, operated in conjunction with the Office of War Information too, and in the opinion of some, caused many American citizens to be taken off the air and out of their jobs at numerous foreign language broadcast stations in the United States.

Americans taken off the air were frequently replaced with alien refugees, some enemy alien refugees; and some of those replacements in their jobs censored our religious programs—such as Easter and Christmas programs, and the like.

The FCC never called Spingarn as a witness when it made its defense of charges against it; but, as shown by the hearings of said committee, Spingarn's name was mentioned and referred to by other witnesses as having taken a prominent part in preventing due renewal of the foreign language broadcast station licenses and in taking Americans off the radio.

An examination of the testimony taken in the hearings just referred to shows that many times other witnesses referred to Mr. Spingarn in such a way that it might be construed as indicating that he was not one who would give unbiased consideration to an inquiry into the activities of organizations engaged in a campaign designed to jealously guard and promote constitutional government.

COMMITTEE STAFF ATTORNEY LOUIS LITTLE—BUCHANAN'S STATEMENT

From the well of the House on the 15th, it was stated that I had been advised in substance, that another member of the committee staff, Louis Little, an attorney, had acted as bondsman for certain individuals charged with criminal offenses, some of whom were or became his clients.

After that statement was made, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] advised me that I was in error—that there might be another Louis Little in Pittsburgh. The following then occurred:

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. * * * Can you give me the street address and something that I may determine whether or not I have unjustly referred to Louis Little? I find in the telephone directory but one Louis Little, and he is listed as an attorney.

"Mr. BUCHANAN. He has a law office at No. 7 Court Place, Pittsburgh.

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the one that is in the directory. * * *

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman say that I was in error when I said that he had signed bonds?

Later it was learned that the bonds referred to were not signed by Louis Little, personally, but were signed by his secretary, Marie Griffin, and Pittsburgh records, I am advised, will show that in some 5,000 cases the bonds were paid for by a check which, in the upper right-hand corner bore the statement, "Louis Little, attorney at law, 7 Court Place," drawn on the Potter Title & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., and signed "Louis Little by Marie E. Griffin, attorney in fact."

The foregoing shows that while, technically, the question as to whether Louis Little, attorney for the committee, who had a large practice in petty—and not so petty—criminal cases in Pittsburgh, followed the practice of signing bonds personally might be answered in the negative, what he did was to authorize

"Mr. BUCHANAN. That is correct. He is not a professional bondsman.

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is your statement?

"Mr. BUCHANAN. That is my statement, and I believe verification of this fact has been handed to me by a member of the staff who has talked to Mr. Little. I believe that he is in the House Gallery listening to this colloquy.

"Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will be glad to correct any misstatement I may have made, if I find court records do not refer to the Louis Little who is on the committee staff.

"Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution."

In view of the foregoing, which I assume means that the Louis Little who is on the staff of the committee has not signed, nor is responsible for the signing of any bond in criminal cases, in some of which cases he later appeared as the attorney, and in view of the fact that Mr. Little, whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] stated he believed was in the House Gallery listening to the colloquy, the gentleman's statement, which I assume means that Mr. Little had nothing to do with bailing out those charged with criminal offenses, it may be assumed that the Members of the House will accept the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

QUERY AS TO WHETHER, IN SPITE OF BUCHANAN'S STATEMENT ON FLOOR, LOUIS LITTLE IS NOT INTERESTED IN SIGNING OF BONDS FOR THOSE CHARGED WITH OFFENSES

However, permit me to inquire of the attorney for the committee, Mr. Little, through the courtesy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], the chairman of the Lobbying Committee, whether he, Mr. Little, was not interested in procuring bondsmen for the individuals named hereafter and who were charged with certain offenses in the courts of Pittsburgh:

"Adam Hilliard, 121, Feb. 1949, solicitation to sodomy.

"Giles Royston, 189, Feb. 1949, felonious assault and battery.

"Harvey Condon, 262, Feb. 1949, violation Public Apartment Act.

"Theodore Ferris, 294, Feb. 1949, felonious assault and battery.

"Ellsworth Ferris, 221, Mar. 1949, assault.

"Richard Ziller, 118, Mar. 1949, arson.

"Henry Taylor, 296, Mar. 1949, solicitation to sodomy.

"Jackie Green, 284–295, May 1949, keeping assignation house, prostitution, assignation.

"Bernard Nichols, 310, Sept. 1949, felonious assault and battery.

"William Jennings, 156, 1949, felonious assault and battery.

"Virginia Clark, 44, Oct. 1949, prostitution and assignation.

"Huston Henderson, 462, Sept. 1949, larceny, receiving stolen goods.

"Louise Radgett, 461, Sept. 1949, violation public arrest.

"Engus Dixon, 363, Apr. 1950, prostitution and assignation.

"Boswell Ellis, 651, June 1949, felonious assault; 77, June 1949, prostitution, assignation. K. B. H.—K. D. H., failure to support legal children.

"Helen Wilhams, 255–256, June 1949, 704, Sept., prostitution and assignation, K. B. H.—K. D. H.

"Julius Gordon, 390, Sept. 1949, larceny, R. T.

"Leon McLean, 901, Sept. 1949, aggravated assault and battery.

"Calvin Homsky, 781, Sept. 1949, larceny, receiving stolen goods.

"Albert Meyors, 525, Sept. 1949, fraudulent conversion.

"George Jones, 202, June 1949, felonious assault and battery.

"George Hill, 143, Apr. 1950, felonious assault and battery.

"Herman Beasley, 140, Nov. 1949, felonious assault and battery.

"Mary Stewart, 289, Oct. 1949, prostitution and assignation.

"Jessie Brown, 143, Nov. 1949, keeping house assignation.

"Ollie Davis, 64, Nov. 1949, prostitution.

"Anna Ford, 446 and 447, Nov. 1949, prostitution keeping house and assignation.

"Unici Ernest, 36 and 47, Dec. 1949, keeping bawdy house, violation beverage act.

"Pauline Brown, 264, Jan. 1950; 51, Jan. 1950, O. and T.

"Elmer Maish, prostitution and assignation, robbery of person.

"Robert Grady, 55, Mar. 1950, O and T., burglary, receiving stolen goods (repeater).

"William H. Coleman, 22, May 1950, O. and T. solicitation.

"Robert Lott, 78, May 1950, malicious mischief.

"John Green, alias O, 297, Apr. 1950, felonious assault and battery, Harry Hanks, 153, May 1950, assault and battery to rape; George Hanks, O. and T., 52, May, receiving stolen goods.

"Thomas Miller, 377, May 1950, pointing firearms and assault (long record).

"William Edwards, 722, Sept. 1949, Lowt., 500, Feb. 1950, larceny and receiving stolen goods.

"James Austen, 510, Jan. 1949, larceny and receiving stolen goods.

"Roy Jack, 525, Oct. 1948, pointing firearms.

"Frank Talck, assault with intent to ravish.

"Louise Baxton, O, 90, Feb. 1949, assault and battery, 597, Feb. 1949, surety.

"Carlton Barrett, Jr., 256–261, Feb. 1949, public indecency.

"Henry Gathers, 349, Feb. 1949, violation of liquor laws.

"Theodore Fair, 100, Mar. 1949, felonious assault.

"Richard Gauffrey, 293, Mar. 1949, pointing firearms, assault.

"James Guerry, two charges, involuntary manslaughter.

"Leo Chapman, 433, Sept. 1949, violation firearms act (record of moral offenses).

"Robert Hoezenrother, 436, Sept. 1949, larceny, receiving stolen goods.

"Robert E. Bechtold, 221–222, Nov. 1949, worthless checks, conspiracy.

"John Sobrush, 184, Mar. 1950, adultery and bastardy.

"Kenneth Richtold, 373–374–515–840, Sept. 1949, worthless check, conspiracy.

"Meto Ehrum (Gypsy), public asst. violation.

"Sam Flurellen, 7–8, Jan., receiving stolen goods.

his secretary, Marie Griffin, to sign such bonds and to issue checks to pay for them—a devious maneuver.

Among the books which were either published or sold by the Committee for Constitutional Government was one written by Thomas James Norton entitled "The Constitution of the United States"; another was The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn. The publication and circulation of both of these books has been bitterly condemned by certain labor organizations. Some of these organizations have themselves circulated Mr. Patman's bitter misleading attacks on the committee and Rumely. The committee placed more than 600,000 copies of the Flynn book in 6 months. Other books were Why the Taft-Hartley Law? by Irving G. McCann, and Compulsory Medical Care and the Welfare State, by Melchior Palyi.

That the Committee for Constitutional Government was engaged not in lobbying but in an educational program to combat socialism and restore constitutional government is evidenced by its record. It sent out hundreds of thousands of publications which undoubtedly aided in the defeat of President Roosevelt's "court packing" bill. Shortly thereafter the Committee for Constitutional Government asked:

> Why are the American people who, under the Constitution, have had for more than 150 years the highest scale of living, better housing, more food, greater freedom in their civil, religious, and personal lives than any people in history ever enjoyed, so ready to accept dangerous panaceas undermining constitutional free enterprise?

The committee's investigation revealed that certain Rugg textbooks which, in its opinion at least, misrepresented our Constitution as a device of rich men to protect their property, were being used in the instruction of some 3,000,000 high-school students. To combat that trend, the committee advocated the reading of certain other books.

The Honorable James M. Beck, a former Solicitor General of the United States, acting for the American Bar Association, reported that the best available book for the teaching of both youth and adults in the fundamentals in our form of government was a book hereinbefore referred to, Thomas James Norton's The Constitution of the United States; Its Sources and Application.

In the years 1938 and 1939 the committee caused to be distributed to the high-school students in public and parochial schools of Rochester many of these books. They then caused the book to be circulated in Texas beginning with Dallas and Houston where tens of thousands of students, both colored and white, received copies of the books and competed not only for war-bond prizes but for a university scholarship of $1,000.

It may be that this Texas move accounts for the bitter repeated statements made by our colleague from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, and which statements were later circulated by certain labor organizations.

Still later, hundreds of schools and universities distributed hundreds of thousands of these books. Permit me to name but a few of those schools: Duquesne, 3,000; Great Neck High School, N. Y., 1,750; Bemidji State Teachers College, Minn., 1,800; Fordham University, 10,000; University of Nevada, 1,000; Mississippi State College for Women, 1,625; Yale, 2,200; University of Notre Dame, 3,500; and Harding College, Ark., 4,500.

As a matter of fact, the FBI purchased copies of a book on the Constitution for its local offices so that its agents might the better understand constitutional provisions. A publisher in Spokane, Wash., had, for a number of years, purchased copies of the Norton book for those who graduated in the high school in his community. The FBI, the publisher, and many others would, if the definition of the Lobbying Committee had been followed, have been guilty of lobbying activities.

Another book circulated by the committee was former Congressman Samuel B. Pettengill's Jefferson, the Forgotten Man. In 1938 the committee sent out 68,000 of these books. In 5 months the committee sent out 450,000 copies of Pettengill's Smoke Screen. More than 400,000 copies of Pettengill's third book, For Americans Only, which was produced with the aid of Professor Bartholomew, of Notre Dame, were sent out.

The committee has published or distributed more than 2,500,000 educational books. A notable contribution to the restoration of constitutional government in this country. Never, so far as I have been able to learn, has the publication and distribution of any one of these books or pamphlets been challenged as a violation of any law or ethical practice.

If the Committee for Constitutional Government has the right, as it has, to publish any of these books; and if the purchasers have the right, as they have, to buy those books, why should the committee be required to disclose the names of those who purchase?

Unlike Kamp, Dr. Rumely did not refuse to give the committee the names of those who made contributions of sums in excess of $500 but he did refuse to give the committee the names of those who purchased books from, or through, the Committee for Constitutional Government.

By the Congress Rumely was cited for contempt, was later convicted and his appeal is now pending.

Several editorials have commented on that conviction, have called attention to the fact that by the conviction, freedom of speech and a free press have been denied.[3] The same criticism applies to the Kamp conviction.

"Emmett Jones, 373, Nov. 1948, assault and battery.

"Sam Dickson, 978, Oct. 1948, assault and battery.

"Gus Jordan, 2, Oct. 1948, felonious assault and battery.

"Pearl Davis, sodomy (long record liquor).

"James Hunter, 196, Sept. 1948, O. and T., burglary, receiving stolen goods.

"Thomas Avery, 990, Sept. 1948, adultery.

"Robert Almond, 989, Sept. 1948, adultery.

"William Campbell, 994, Sept. 1948, keeping bawdy house.

"Robert Grant, 425, June 1948, assault and battery.

"Joseph Hyfnagel, 485, June 1948, self-administering drugs.

"David S. Daughterty, 640, Oct. 1948, O. and E., robbery from person.

"Henry Huriston, 197, Mar. 1948, violation of Public Asst. Act.

"Ralph Boyce, 97, May 1948, assault and battery.

"James Hamilton, 66-67, May 1948, aggravated assault and battery.

"Eugene Barber, 146, Nov. 1947, violation Public Asst. Act; 453, Apr. 1948, larceny.

"Francis King, 37, Apr. 1948, indecent assault (repeater).

"Amanda Clark, 301, Mar. 1948, assault and battery, 409, March, surety.

"La Verne Allen, 66, Feb. 1948, prostitution and assignation.

"Delbert Kidd, 48, Feb. 1948, aggravated assault and battery.

"Wilbert Brower, 164, Jan. 1948, larceny, automobile.

"Kenneth Lowe, 143, Dec. 1947, violation liquor laws.

"Carrie Bradley, 45, Nov. 1947, robbery from person (has long record as prostitute).

"Wylie Coyle, 19, Nov. 1947, receiving stolen goods.

"Margaret Fagan, 68, Oct. 1947, adultery.

"Lewzie Gross, 278, Oct. 1947, drunk and disorderly.

"Margaret Anderson, 134, Sept. 1947, sodomy.

"Clarence Budd, 662, Sept. 1947, February, assault and battery.

"Richard Ellis, 375, Sept. 1947, larceny.

"Dunbar King, 232, Sept. 1947, drunk and disorderly.

"Stanley Dushue, 379, June 1948, neglect of minor children.

"Dolores Adams, 29, Sept. 1949, prostitution and assignation.

"Zayuna Allen, 66, Feb. 1948, prostitution and assignation."

DO CONGRESSMEN LACK COURAGE OR INCLINATION TO FIGHT BACK?

There is an old saying that murder will out. It is my humble opinion that, if those who believe in constitutional government, who believe that right and justice will prevail, have the courage of their convictions, will stand up and fight, this smear effort will but strengthen the convictions, increase the courage and determination of those who wish to preserve the liberty of the citizen, the security of our Nation.

---

[3] [From the Columbus (Ohio) Sunday Dispatch of April 22, 1951]

A GLARING PARADOX

News dispatches from Washington on the same day the past week carried reports of the outcome of two trials in which individuals were charged with contempt of Congress.

One defendant, Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, was found guilty and faces a maximum penalty of 3 years in jail and $3,000 fine.

His offense was in refusing to tell Congress who contributed money to finance distribution of books and literature by his organization, which is opposed to the policies of the Truman administration. His defense was based on the freedom of speech guaranties in the Bill of Rights. A Federal jury found this contention invalid, although in two previous trials on similar counts, Rumely had been acquitted.

The second defendant, Frank Hashmall, former head of the Communist Party here in Franklin County, and a notorious and defiant subversive in Columbus and later in Cincinnati, was held guiltless by a Federal judge on the contempt charge for refusing to answer questions about Communist activities in Ohio. His attorneys successfully contended that he need not give testimony that tended to incriminate him.

It is not here contended that the strictly legal merits of each case were not correctly

Following his conviction, Dr. Rumely was asked by a probation officer whether

---

interpreted. It is contended that there is a glaring paradox apparent in the justice rendered the two men.

The one who is guilty, if he is guilty in more than a technical sense, was no more than overzealous and perhaps indiscreet. The one acquitted is an open and avowed Communist. No further definition of his character or his sympathies or his aims is needed.

The loyal American for whom Congressmen appeared as character witnesses was hounded by the Government in three successive legal actions until, on the third try, he was convicted. The Communist was turned loose by a Federal judge without being required to face a jury.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader of April 23, 1951]

THE GUILT OF DR. RUMELY

The conviction of Dr. Edward A. Rumely for contempt of Congress comes as one more disturbing symptom of the creeping consumption which afflicts a nation that once breathed the air of freedom. This newspaper had not commented earlier upon the charges brought against Dr. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government. The accusation seemed too preposterous to dignify; we could not imagine that a jury would convict.

Yet now a jury has convicted. Dr. Rumely has been found guilty of contempt in refusing to give the Buchanan committee of the House the names of those American citizens who purchased books from the committee which he heads. The conviction will be appealed, of course, and one may express a steadfast hope that the trial court's decision will be reversed. If the conviction is sustained through appellate proceedings, the doctrine of freedom of the press in this Nation will have suffered a damaging blow.

What was the sin of Dr. Rumely?

The case dates back to the formation of the Buchanan committee on August 12, 1949. In March 1950, the committee began its investigation of lobbying activities. On May 31, the committee dispatched its incredible directive that 16b of the Nation's leading corporations provide within 2 weeks a detailed statement of expenditures for (a) the travel of personnel to Washington, (b) the maintenance of any Washington office, and (c) for printed or duplicated matter dealing with public issues which might be the subject of Federal legislative action. All this information—and much other information covering nearly 3½ years—was to be supplied in itemized detail down to the process used (mimeographed, multigraphed, printed, etc.) for duplicated matter, the expenses of long-distance telephone calls, and the name of every corporation employee who traveled at company expense to Washington.

But most particularly, the Buchanan committee demanded from these corporations a statement of all expenditures in connection with the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Foundation for Economic Education, the Public Affairs Institute, and other organizations devoted to fighting the socialistic trend of the Federal Government. It is noteworthy that the Buchanan committee did not call upon such friends of the administration as Henry Kaiser, Consolidated Vultee, the CIO, PAC, or any left-wing or liberal propaganda organizations.

When this contemptible fishing expedition failed to produce results the Buchanan committee shifted to an assault upon the Committee for Constitutional Government directly. No other organization has been so steadfast in opposing the concept of big government as the CCG. The Buchanan group demanded 26 items of information. Pursuant to a subpena, Dr. Rumely and his associates handed over hundreds of papers and records. Voluntarily they met 25 of the committee's 26 demands. But they refused to meet the twenty-sixth; they refused to disclose the names of individuals or associations that have purchased the CCG's books.

What are these invidious books the Buchanan committee would track to earth? The Constitution of the United States, by Thomas James Norton; the Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn; Why the Taft-Hartley Law? by Irving G. McCann; Compulsory Medical Care and the Welfare State, by Melchior Palyi. Thousands of copies of these books were purchased through the CCG by individuals, companies, school authorities, and others. Those who have purchased the books represent, in general, the most intelligent and active opposition to the spread of socialism in the United States—and the Buchanan committee knew it. Once their names were made public the familiar smear campaign of Fair Deal hatchetmen could go to work on them.

If the line of attack laid down by the Buchanan committee is upheld, every newspaper criticizing the prevailing administration would run the risk that administration flunkeys could demand the names of its subscribers and advertisers. If individuals and businessmen are to be harassed when they distribute any duplicated matter dealing with public issues which might be the subject of Federal legislative action, then virtually nothing will be left free of Government inquisition.

It is proper, in our view, for Congress to inquire into the sources of direct lobbying—direct attempts to influence the vote of individual Members on particular legislation. But neither the Buchanan committee nor any other agency of Congress has any business inquiring into the general political beliefs of the citizens or the philosophy which inclines any man to support or oppose the Fair Deal. The Buchanan committee is as vicious and as evil an instrument as Washington has spawned. If that's contempt—and it certainly is intended to be—let the committee send another subpena down here.

[From the Northern Virginia Daily]

THE CASE OF DR. RUMELY

Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, has been convicted of contempt in a District of Columbia court for refusing to furnish the House Lobby Committee the names of bulk purchasers of the book, The Road Ahead, a publication designed to inform the American people of what is being done to their Constitution by the present regime in Washington. The Committee for Constitutional Government is an organization set up by a group of loyal Americans, financed by private gifts and subscriptions and by the sale of its publications, and dedicated to the high purposes of saving America from its steady drift toward the maelstrom of national socialism. Its books and other publications have helped to awaken the American people to the dangers ahead.

The House Lobby Committee was appointed to investigate and report to the House on lobbying practices on Capitol Hill. The committee is headed by Representative BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, one of the rankest New Dealers in Congress. A majority of its members are Democrats, of course. Lobbying has become an unqualified nuisance in Congress—not the efforts of local constituents to discuss public issues with their Representatives as provided in the Constitution, but the activities of vast organized interests, who spend millions of dollars in efforts to influence the passage of legislation favorable to their particular interest and its aims and purposes. The committee was appointed to investigate this situation and recommend such corrective legislation as their findings might seem to warrant.

The left-wing elements immediately seized control of the committee with the chairman's full cooperation, and used it to shield lobbyists of their own ilk and punish those whom they happened to dislike. The real purpose of the committee was completely prostituted to serve partisan ends. Representatives of the major labor organizations, for example, were let off very lightly, though it is a well-known fact that they maintain one of the largest and most vicious lobbies in Congress. They were not required to tell how much money they were spending, where it came from, or what it was being spent for. But when Dr. Rumely, representing an organization which was seeking to restore constitutional government in this country, appeared before them for questioning, they gave him the works.

Dr. Rumely was cited for contempt because he refused to tell the committee who made bulk purchases of the book, The Road Ahead, purchases in quantity for Nation-wide distribution. Just what that had to do with lobbying in Washington has not yet been explained. The publication and distribution of books and pamphlets and other writings, however partisan, has been considered the right of freemen since the days of Magna Carta. Influencing public sentiment through such publications has never before been considered a matter of such questionable character as to warrant congressional investigation of a person's private business. Yet for refusal to answer the committee's question, Dr. Rumely was cited for contempt, tried, and convicted. The committee did not bring charges against a confessed Negro Communist who did the same thing. That is what is happening to the Constitution in Washington.

PRESS FREEDOM INVOLVED IN RUMELY CASE

(Dr. Edward A. Rumely is scheduled to be sentenced on Friday for his refusal to furnish the Buchanan Lobbying Committee the names of bulk purchasers of The Road Ahead and other books. He is the executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government. The books in question advocate a return to constitutional government in this country.—EDITOR.)

(By Edward A. Rumely)

What happened to Edward A. Rumely may be of limited importance to anyone who reads these words, but what happens to the right of anyone to read such words or any words is of momentous importance.

The proceedings of the Buchanan Lobby Committee have raised the far-reaching issue of whether American citizens still have the right to print, to distribute to others, and themselves to read all sides of a question. The stand we have taken affects the freedom of all who write and speak and print.

The Committee for Constitutional Government distributed 750,000 copies of the book, The Road Ahead, and 500,000 copies of its condensation, showing how a drift toward socialism leads to poverty and serfdom to the state. Fair Deal members of the Buchanan committee didn't like that book and said so. They attacked our committee on radio, in press statements, and on the floor of Congress. They demanded the names of book purchasers. I refused to comply with their demands on the advice of counsel, and under the instructions of the trustees of the Committee for Constitutional Government on the ground that this demand violates the first and fourth amendments, part of the Bill of Rights.

Now the Buchanan committee is dead. The names of the purchasers of our literature have not been and will not be revealed. Two questions remain. First, is a citizen to be punished in retaliation for a stand to uphold

he would be willing to appear before the congressional committee and purge himself of the contempt charge. He replied

---

constitutional rights of everyone? As the executive secretary of an organization formed to uphold constitutional government, I am morally obligated to take the course which I did.

To the Buchanan committee I said, "I cannot yield where a constitutional issue is involved. If we set the precedent of yielding against our conviction and against the advice of our lawyers that the first and fourth amendments cover our book operations, why then, we, instead of upholding constitutional government are setting a precedent to break it down, and we are not going to do it. It is a hot spot; I do not want to be in the spot."

The second question is: How far will a future congressional committee or Government inquisitors be able to encroach upon basic rights of citizens which heretofore have been regarded as inviolable?

The Buchanan committee destroyed $125,000 of our income from book sales and necessitated additional expenditures of scores of thousands for sales effort to overcome the resistance, and direct mail educational work on the constitutional issues involved which with the legal and court costs altogether total approximately $100,000. What publisher of some other book popular yet frowned upon by a temporary Government majority will suffer similar penalties in the future?

Some progress has been made during the past 9 months. The discussion of the actions of the Buchanan committee have already emphasized to the public the threat to our liberties that unquestionably exists. Only this month did we see one of the foremost newspapers of the Western Hemisphere (La Prensa) destroyed by a similar citation for contempt by the Legislature of the Argentine—an action which resulted in the loss of freedom to the entire press of the Argentine.

We, of course, will appeal. We shall intensify at the bar of public opinion our educational effort on this constitutional question. We are grateful to the tens of thousands who have rallied and given moral and financial support in the committee's struggle to safeguard citizens' rights against the power of encroaching big Government.

[From the Editor and Publisher of April 21, 1951]

RUMELY CONVICTION

Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, was convicted by a jury in Washington for contempt of Congress for refusing to give the names of those who purchased quantities of books published by the committee.

Too many side issues have been injected into this case.

Suspicion has been cast on Dr. Rumely's motives and integrity by recalling his conviction after World War I, along with two attorneys, on a charge of conspiring to make an improper report to the Alien Property Custodian concerning the financing of his purchase of the New York Daily Mail. Prosecuted under the Trading With the Enemy Act, Dr. Rumely at times has been accused erroneously of being convicted as a German agent. Actually, he and the two attorneys were given a full pardon by President Coolidge on the recommendation of Attorney General Harlan Stone, the prosecuting attorney and the trial judge acting in concert with 11 of the jurors on the basis of new evidence which had been withheld at the trial.

Suspicion has been cast on the motives and integrity of the Committee for Constitutional Government by labor leaders, Fair Dealers, and New Dealers.

These issues—the merit of the work of the committee and the career of the personality involved, Dr. Rumely—have no bearing on the problem.

Judge Richmond B. Keech instructed the jurors they only had to find Dr. Rumely had committed "willful default" to return a guilty verdict. There need not have been an evil or bad purpose for the refusal, the jury was told, for a witness decides at his own peril whether he has "a legal right" to refuse to produce information desired by probers.

The defendant took the position he was "morally obligated" to take the course he did; that he was under instructions from the committee's trustees to stand upon a strict interpretation of the Constitution's Bill of Rights.

The Buchanan committee which brought the contempt citation defined in lobbying as "any attempt by individuals or groups to influence Government decision." If the court declares publication of a book is lobbying, then how long before magazine and newspaper articles are included?

Congressmen and Senators receive dozens of books and clippings every day revealing various phases of public and private opinion on controversial legislation. There is no compulsion for them to read them. There is no compulsion for them to believe what they read.

Here is an organization that happened to be registered as a lobbyist. Is the court going to declare, because of that, it cannot publish opinions on legislation without revealing who else might subscribe to those views by buying the book? Are then other publishers of similar views in books, magazines, and newspapers going to be required to register as lobbyists?

We wonder if the Washington jury weighed the greater issues at stake and we hope the courts ultimately will get to the heart of the matter and defend the right to publish and buy political literature without political intimidation.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of April 2, 1951]

THOUGHT CONTROL

On April 12, Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, is slated to go on trial for contempt of Congress.

Dr. Rumely's crime is that he refused to give a House Committee on Lobbying the names of persons who bought certain CCG literature. CCG records were extracted from the files and names given the committee in confidence got into the hands of pro-administration columnists and radio commentators.

Why was the lobbying committee so interested in the Committee for Constitutional Government? Frank Chodorov, speaking for the CCG, contends it is because the CCG has opposed socialized medicine, deficit-financing, rent control and other Roosevelt and Truman administrations policies.

The House Committee on Lobbying has since died but the contempt citations made by it, often against the wish of minority members, are being tried. Dr. Rumely, furthermore, is cast in an unfavorable light by being listed with individuals refusing to reveal their presumed connections with the Communist Party.

Obviously, if the administration learned the identity of persons on the CCG's mailing list, it could discourage the anticollectivistic organizations by harassment and intimidation.

Dr. Rumely's case is a symptom of how far the insidious disease of thought control has pervaded Government circles.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of April 20, 1951]

EQUALITY AT LAW

Dr. Edward A. Rumely is charged with contempt of Congress because he published and sold books for the Committee for Constitutional Government that were opposed to the Fair Deal policies and would not give the Buchanan committee the names of people who bought the books.

Chairman Buchanan contended that these books were sold for the purpose of influencing legislation, and, therefore, the sales violate the Antilobbying Act.

Now, if it is a crime to sell a book that is opposed to administration policies, we shall have no liberties left—not a one. If a book publisher can be called before a congressional committee and ordered to give the names of people who buy his books, so that they can be used perhaps for reprisals, a newspaper publisher who opposes policies of the administration can also be called on to give the same information.

What intrigues us is that Dr. Rumely's trial begins about the same time that Walter Reuther let it be known that he has a million dollars in his political-education fund, all collected from members of the United Automobile Workers by the simple device of increasing the dues of the members.

If that political-education fund is not for lobbying purposes or for influencing elections, we should like to hear Mr. Reuther's explanation of its purpose.

Dr. Rumely is charged with violating the law because he sold books and refused to give the names of the buyers. Reuther collects a million dollars from union members without their consent to influence both legislation and elections, but the Buchanan committee pays no attention to him.

Do law violations depend on the person committing the act?

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 21, 1951]

A CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

The jury in Washington which found Dr. Edward A. Rumely guilty of contempt of Congress either does not understand the Constitution or cares nothing for it. The trial was before Federal District Judge Richmond B. Keech, chiefly known as the jurist who refused to find John L. Lewis guilty of contempt in pursuing last winter's coal strike in defiance of an injunction. If Judge Keech recognized a constitutional issue, his instructions to the jury do not disclose it.

Dr. Rumely felt that if he honored the wishes of Chairman Frank Buchanan and his colleagues of the New Deal majority, the dominant political clique thereafter would have a precedent for invading the immunities granted the press under the first amendment and of everyone under the fourth amendment, restraining agents of the state from illegal search and seizure of persons, papers, or property.

The books distributed through Dr. Rumely's committee happened to be in praise of constitutional government, an economic system of free incentive, and limited powers of state intervention into the lives and affairs of people. They also happened to point out that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations were embarked upon a course parallel to that taken by British socialism in its aggrandizement of state authority.

That such opinions might be offensive to New Dealers is apparent, but the character of the product of any press does not affect—short of liability under the laws of libel—its right under the Constitution to be free of Government interference. This was the issue which Representative Buchanan chose to ignore, and which the jury, in finding Dr. Rumely guilty, apparently could not comprehend.

that, in his opinion, and that of his lawyers, he had not been guilty of con-

Nor did Judge Keech, the New Deal fellow traveler, enlighten the jury, for his instructions were that it had only to decide that Dr. Rumely was in "willful default" in refusing to answer Buchanan's improper question in order to hold Rumely guilty.

Since the constitutional right of free existence pertains to the published work, the rights of those who print, handle, and read the work are collateral and of similar constitutional standing. Representative Buchanan, for political purposes, was willing to set them at naught, and in this he, and not Dr. Rumely, stood in contempt. His contempt was of the Constitution itself.

If the arbitrary Buchanan rule were allowed to stand, Government would be empowered, by the warrant of committee authority asserted by the chairman, to harass any person or institution printing or possessing published matter offensive to a political majority. For Mr. Buchanan said that lobbying constituted "any attempt by individuals or groups to influence governmental decision," and there is no one who writes, prints, or publishes who cannot be brought within these elastic bounds.

We are confident that the jury's endorsement of this pernicious doctrine will be upset upon review, for, if it were to survive, the courts would have handed a license to the state to exercise unlimited tyranny over the expression of all ideas.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of June 12, 1950]

ANOTHER BLACK COMMITTEE

The conduct of an investigation into lobbying by a committee under Representative Frank Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, has drawn deserved condemnation from other Members of the House. Mr. Buchanan has proceeded with little respect for normal congressional procedures of subpenaing witnesses and examining them or for the Constitutional protection of free speech and a free press.

If anything approaching such high-handed methods were employed by a congressional committeee dealing with suspected Communists or other subversives, there would be an immediate outcry from the liberal wing of the eastern press. Representative Buchanan's activities, however, have been greeted with dead silence by these professed champions of due process and the inviolability of the individual.

It has been established by the officers of certain private organizations dedicated to the safeguarding of the American constitutional system that Mr. Buchanan has had the volunteer assistance in his smearing campaign of a poison pen outfit misnamed Friends of Democracy.

This is a propaganda racket conducted by Rex Stout, a goat-bearded mystery writer, once on the editorial board of the Communist magazine, New Masses, in association with Leon Birkhead, an ex-preacher, and one Avedis Derounian, a Levantine of many aliases, sometimes known as John Roy Carlson.

REWARDED BY TAX EXEMPTIONS

The principal interest of this crowd seems to be to advance the creeping New Deal revolution by assassinating the character of anyone manful enough to withstand its mud guns and to defend a Constitutional Republic. The New Deal recognizes that it has valuable auxiliaries in Stout, Birkhead, and Derounian, and has conferred upon them tax exemption for what contributions they can get by shaking the bushes, justifying this extraordinary boon on the ground that the outfit is engaging in an "educational" work.

It has become apparent that Mr. Buchanan's interest in "lobbying" is confined to the activities of organizations which openly oppose the New Deal and call for a return to constitutionalism. One such group, in furtherance of the goal of acquainting the people with the New Deal's progress into socialism, appears to have published some books and to have assisted in the publication and distribution of at least one other—John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead.

* * * * *

Representative Buchanan has endeavored to represent these activities, which certainly are valid, as some sort of nefarious plot, and has levied upon the publishing agency a demand that it spread before him the names of those contributing to publication and those who purchased the books. This approach is in open contravention of the first amendment guaranteeing that the State may not abridge the right to a free press, and it would also appear to violate the fourth amendment governing security of person and property against unreasonable searches and seizures.

The further Buchanan proceeds, the more it is apparent that he has patterned his star chamber proceedings upon the model of the infamous inquisition into lobbying conducted by Senator Hugo Black in the early period of the New Deal. In that fishing expedition, Black subpenaed the complete telegraphic correspondence of more than 1,000 specified persons and groups, piling up more than 5,000,000 copies of messages, which were then used to smear the opponents of the Roosevelt administration.

THE PRINTING PRESS

The first amendment to the United States Constitution guaranteed a free press.

In the language of the late eighteenth century, "press" referred to the mechanical device—then the hand press—which placed the ink impressions on paper. The first amendment was a guaranty to the people to be able to own and use a press without governmental interference.

Since then, through common usage, freedom of the press to most people has been transferred to our newspapers, books, and magazines—the product instead of the machine. Actually, the guaranty still applies to the physical equipment—the printing press—and neither the Congress nor the courts have ever said otherwise.

[From Editor and Publisher of June 10, 1950]

Now, a congressional committee investigating "lobbying" is seeking to force users of the printing press to divulge information on the amount of money spent and received, what press was used, who bought the books, etc. Such data is not only being asked of the Committee for Constitutional Government but from 166 business corporations. The latter inquiry is directed at those who have run copy "dealing with public issues which might be the subject of Federal legislative action."

Every issue of every newspaper and practically every magazine carries editorials "dealing with public issues which might be the subject of Federal legislative action." The committee might well ask those publications who their subscribers and their advertisers are. The issue is the same.

The Committee for Constitutional Government has availed itself of the right to use a printing press to print books on issues confronting the people just as other groups have done in the century and a half of our existence as a Nation. The 166 corporations and many individuals have availed themselves of the right to hire the use of a press and the services of someone else to print and distribute their views.

The current investigation of the House committee is an invasion of the guaranteed right of the American people to own, hire, or use a printing press without interference.

tempt,' had merely asserted his right to free speech and free press.

'OFFICE OF THE PROBATION OFFICER,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1951.

Mr. EDWARD A. RUMELY,
Executive Secretary, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. RUMELY: With further reference to your case now pending in this court, I have received from Mr. E. Fred Sweet, chief probation officer of the Federal court in New York City, a report on the matter which we had requested him to prepare for us. Although Mr. Sweet has made a very complete and comprehensive statement, in reviewing it I find that he did not apparently inquire of your attitude relative to the matter on which you were convicted, contempt of Congress. In the past it has been the policy of my office to ask this question of people so convicted and so that we can report to our court your feelings at this time, will you please let me know whether or not, if given the opportunity, you would be willing to reappear before the congressional committee that subpenaed you and purge yourself. Of course, if you feel that you do not desire to answer this question, you may so state.

As we desire to have this matter before the court for a very early disposition, will you please reply by return mail or at the latest so that it will be received no later than next Wednesday, May 9.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD W. GARRETT,
Chief United States Probation Officer.

MAY 7, 1951.

Mr. EDWARD W. GARRETT,
Chief, United States Probation Officer, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GARRETT: I have before me your letter of May 4 and I am glad to reply forthrightly and immediately.

Your Mr. E. Fred Sweet remarked that since I had tangled repeatedly with congressional committees, did I have a pugnacious disposition and did I, when young, tend to get into brawls. I told him quite the contrary. I also told him that I had never taken the initiative with a congressional committee, but only had been obliged to resist what the trustees of our committee though were unconstitutional demands.

Please note the attached booklet, Needed Now, published when the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale was chairman of the committee. You will find his statement of the committee's purposes in the prologue and epilogue of the booklet. On page 12 you will find an account of our difficulties with the Black-Minton committee. In that case, on my first day's testimony, a group of constitutionally-minded Senators sent secretaries to observe. During the recess I received word that a majority of the Senate were strongly of the opinion that the fourth amendment was being violated in the demands upon me and that if I stood my ground the Black-Minton committee would be abolished. Exactly that occurred by cutting off further funds. My subpena fees and travel expenses to Washington remain unpaid.

In that case I acted on the instructions of the chairman of the Committee For Constitutional Government who had conferred widely with legal authorities.

Again in 1944 when the Anderson committee, investigating campaign expenditures, asked for the names of all who had given $100 or more, the committee pointed out that it had never favored or opposed any party or candidate and was merely exercising its constitutional right of petition and therefore

In the Rumely case, as in the Kamp case, no claim is made that the publications of the committee are either libelous or in violation of any State or Federal law; nor has there been any claim that either Kamp or Rumely did anything or said anything which was libelous or in violation of State or Federal law.

In the Rumely case, as in the Kamp case, the evidence is clear that the purpose of the persecution and the prosecution was to suppress free speech, deny a free press to those who hold views in conflict with the New Deal or the Communist political philosophy.

In the Rumely case, in addition to those individuals and organizations desiring to destroy the Committee for Constitutional Government because of its sustained attack and effectiveness against socialism and communism, certain labor organizations, one the CIO, in certain affiliates of which the Communists had gained control, became actively interested. This interest continued even after the CIO had expelled a num-

---

was not subject to the requirement of reporting. In that case on my second trial the jury acquitted. We, of course, had acted on the advise of the most eminent counsel.

In the present case when Louis Little, the investigator of the Buchanan committee, called first and read to my secretary the 26 requirements, I immediately said, "We will comply with 25 of the 26 questions, but I am in doubt as to the twenty-sixth which calls for the names of purchasers of our books in quantity." I immediately called up the editor of Editor and Publisher, and asked him what he thought, stating that I was in doubt whether such inquiry could be made of a publisher, legally. He said, "You are 100 percent right." His editorial appears on page 4 of the enclosed statement, Assault on Free Speech and a Free Press.

Mr. Frank Gannett, one of our trustees wrote the board of trustees as follows:

"I agree that the Buchanan committee has gone far out of bounds in considering the committee's sale of books as coming under the Lobbying Act. I don't think they have any right to demand the names of purchasers of books and I hope our committee stands firm in refusing to give out such information. I believe the Constitution protects the right to privacy in such matters."

Mr. Gannett is the publisher of 22 newspapers and at times has been spokesman for the entire newspaper world on constitutional issues.

We did not say immediately that we would not comply but, as the record of the Buchanan committee hearings itself shows, this question was kept open until the trustees could take counsel with eminent lawyers including Thomas J. Norton, the author of The Constitution of the United States; Its Sources and Its Application, selected by the Honorable James Beck of the American Bar Association, as the most authoritative book on the Constitution available. Only 80,000 copies had been distributed by two large publishers during the previous 20 years. By using the methods applied in the distribution of the Bible—where one person reading it, places it into the hands of another, particularly among youth—we were able to get out far larger quantities. We have put out 600,000 copies, many under the donor plan, to half the colleges and universities in the United States who ask for copies to distribute to their students. When we began distributing this book in 1940, I set for myself a goal of 1,000,000 copies. One of the purchasers of this book was a publisher in Spokane who presents a copy to all high-school graduates each year. His purchases exceed the minimum set by the Buchanan committee. Of course, there is no relationship whatever between the distribution of this book and lobbying.

Likewise, the FBI purchased hundreds of copies for use in local branches so that their agents might be informed on constitutional questions.

We are a major publishing enterprise. Of approximately 4,000,000 copies out, half were distributed in the 8 years between 1933 and 1946, years before the Lobbying Act was passed. The charge by Chairman BUCHANAN, even before my appearance, that our book sales were a phony sales dodge to conceal large contributions was totally unfounded but that misconception was so widely lodged that even during the trial the court remarked that if asked about our book sales as a source of income for the committee's activities, we were obliged to give the information.

I was criticized by the trustees because an analysis by our chairman showed that on the first 600,000 copies of The Road Ahead sold, we had a loss of 6 cents per copy because of the low 50 cent price, or $36,000. But, we were able to distribute, in round figures, 750,000 copies.

Since our committee is dedicated to safeguarding constitutional principles, I felt that I had a moral obligation to uphold what I regarded as a basic constitutional principle, particularly since the most eminent counsel the committee could consult and the attorney who acted for me personally, Mr. Neil Burkinshaw, advised me that the demand of the Buchanan committee violated the first and fourth amendments.

Last Saturday a leading attorney in Chicago told me, "Unless you can win in the court of appeals or the Supreme Court, a reaffirmation of the validity of the first and fourth amendments, I feel that our whole Constitution is endangered because the Constitution can only be upheld with the free and unhindered expression of a viewpoint on all sides of a question which these two articles of the Bill of Rights make possible."

Ninety percent of all newspapers that have spoken on the issue, strongly uphold the position the trustees of our committee instructed me to take. Please see the attached letter by Mr. John T. Flynn and the editorials, typical of 90 percent of the editorial comment that has been made. Note also the marked passages in my statement made after the conviction. I added, "I am in a hot spot and I do not like to be in it."

Under these circumstances you will see why I felt myself compelled to take the stand I did on 1 of the 26 demands of the Buchanan committee. On the other 25 where no such constitutional question was involved, we cooperated as helpfully as we possibly could. Three to four investigators were given unhindered access for 3 weeks to our files and books. Almost 1,000 pieces of literature and letters they requested were photostated and turned over to them. The hundreds of pages of fine print in the Buchanan committee hearings, more than obtained from any other source, show this far-reaching cooperation, as do the 175 pages of forthright testimony on my part, withholding only the names of the purchasers of our books.

As a matter of fact, few organizations have upheld and glorified Congress as extensively as our committee. We dug out and told and retold to millions the story of George Washington who directed Major L'Enfant not to place the Capitol in the valley where the Washington Monument stands, but on the hill so that it might dominate the scene, for the legislative branch in a Republic must be supreme and control policy.

The booklet "Needed Now—Capacity for Leadership," has on page 32 a eulogy on Congress by former Congressman S. B. Pettengill. We have printed three-fourths million and distributed 700,000 of this booklet and hundreds of thousands of the Pettengill article in a separate leaflet.

I took the stand I did, not willfully in the sense of evil intent or desire to do wrong, but in response to the instructions of our trustees in accordance with the advice of eminent lawyers whom they consulted and the advice of my personal attorney, upon which I relied, namely, that constitutional principle was at stake and I was morally obligated to uphold it.

And of course I knew, as came out in the Buchanan committee hearings, that three of the members of that committee believed that the Bill of Rights prevented the committee from invading our rights as publishers. Please note what CLARENCE BROWN, himself a publisher, said on the floor in arguing against citation.

To sum up, my attitude is that of the utmost cooperation with Congress in every possible way. Probably no organization has gone so far in educating the country as we did on the basic provisions of our constitutional republic by distributing one-quarter million copies of the embossed Bill of Rights, 150,000 to schoolrooms with an average of 30 pupils each and more than two and one-half million copies of What American Democracy Means to Me, written by my daughter Niles Rumely Newton when she was 16 years old, in which she embodied the same tradition with reference to our form of government.

I am sorry that this letter had to be so long, but I feel it necessary to outline why I felt compelled to take the stand I did. The Buchanan committee is out of existence and I hope and trust that I may be able to comply as I did with 25 of the 26 Buchanan committee demands, without ever again having an issue of constitutional rights of all citizens involved.

A great philosopher said: "The tragic decisions of life must be made not between right and wrong, but between two rights—in this case the rights of a congressional committee to investigate on the one hand and on the other the inalienable constitutional rights of citizens under the first and fourth amendments.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD A. RUMELY,
Executive Secretary.

P. S.—After dictating the foregoing, I again studied your letter of May 4. You state that it has been the policy to ask persons convicted of contempt of Congress "Whether or not given the opportunity, you would be willing to reappear before a congressional committee that subpenaed you and purge yourself."

If wrong-doing on my part were involved, it would be wholly proper to expect that I purge myself, but in two previous cases committees of Congress were proved to have made unwarranted and improper demands; once by the Senate itself; next, by the court. I am firmly convinced that the Buchanan committee violated citizens' rights by inquiring as to the names of bulk purchasers of books and that, ultimately, the stand taken by me will be vindicated in the higher courts.

To act otherwise than I did would require that I act contrary to convictions that have been built up by 14 years of service to the Committee To Uphold Constitutional Government—which name was changed, in 1941, by incorporation in the District of Columbia, to the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

ber of its affiliates because they were controlled by the Communists.

The Committee for Constitutional Government had something to do with either the publication or the circulation of McCann's book, Why the Taft-Hartley Law?

Louis Little, when chief counsel of the House Lobbying Committee, insisted that the Committee for Constitutional Government give him the names of all of those who had purchased 100 or more copies of McCann's book. Not only that book in which, presumably, labor unions were interested but Flynn's book, The Road Ahead, and Norton's book on the Constitution were attacked and condemned by labor unions and their publications.

Nor did Dr. Rumely escape personal attack. Dr. Rumely and two attorneys had, at one time, been convicted of a violation of the Trading With the Enemy Act in World War I. The substance of the charge was that the defendants had used money furnished by the Imperial German Government to buy or to finance the Evening Mail and that they failed on December 4, 1917, to report that fact. Later, the two attorneys were exonerated, their disbarment canceled, and their good standing in the bar association reestablished. Later, after a full investigation which established the fact that Rumely was innocent a pardon was granted him. Yet, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], notwithstanding that the true situation has been called to his attention, has repeatedly referred to this conviction as though it was a just one and was still in force. I again repeat, his remarks as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been circulated, how many hundreds of thousands of copies it has been impossible to learn, by certain labor organizations. Will the Lobbying Committee call the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and force him to tell who purchased and paid for copies of his speeches criticizing the CCG and Dr. Rumely?

The gentleman from Texas and others who seek to silence the Committee for Constitutional Government well know the meaning of a pardon. Let me quote from Thirty-ninth American Jurisprudence, page 550, and there are many other authorities, including some from the United States Supreme Court, to the same effect:

> In the case of a full pardon, it relieves the punishment and blots out of existence the guilt of the offender to such an extent that in the eye of the law he is innocent as if he had never committed the offense. So completely is an offense considered to be obliterated by a pardon that it has been held that pardon of treason or felony, even after conviction, will enable a man to have an action of slander for calling him a traitor or felon.

Nevertheless, time and again, from the well of the House Dr. Rumely was bitterly attacked by the gentleman from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN. Attacks were also made upon the organization by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER]. That there was method in these attacks and apparently a deliberate attempt to circulate them is evidenced by the fact that reprints of the remarks of these two gentlemen were later ordered from the Government Printer.

All efforts to learn how many of these reprints of the remarks of Congressmen PATMAN and BIEMILLER, attacking Dr. Rumely and the Committee for Constitutional Government, were obtained from the Government Printer, by whom they were paid for, and whether they were sent out under Government frank proved to be futile.

The charges made against the committee and Dr. Rumely were most injurious and were answered by the Committee for Constitutional Government and by Dr. Rumely.[5]

Louis Little, when chief counsel of the House Lobbying Committee, insisted that

---

[Telegram]

MAY 8, 1951.

Mr. EDWARD W. GARRETT,
Chief United States Probation Officer, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C.:

Please add to my letter of May 7, replying to your letter of May 4, the following final paragraph:

"If, contrary to my expectations, the higher courts do not uphold my stand on the first and fourth amendments as against a congressional committee, it will be the law of the land that a congressional committee has an absolute right of inquiry, regardless of constitutional limitations. Under those circumstances, I am confident the trustees of the Committee for Constitutional Government would feel as I should that the law of the land required our compliance with the demands of a congressional committee."

EDWARD A. RUMELY,
Executive Secretary, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., New York, N. Y.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 8, 1951.*

To Mrs. F. S. Rumely, E. Scott Rumely, Miss Isabel Rumely, Mrs. John M. Munn, Mrs. Michael Newton.

From E. A. Rumely.

One of the most moving meetings I ever had with Theodore Roosevelt was the second day after word had come that Quentin Roosevelt, the child closest and dearest to him, who had volunteered in World War I as a flyer, had been killed over the lines in France. I have never seen the colonel so deeply moved. As he talked of Quentin he said, "The great things in life often can be accomplished only by sacrifice. We must be willing to pay with our bodies for our souls desires."

In the crowd, few people are willing to take a resolute stand. When one does, fearlessly, it challenges attention and gives an opportunity for leadership. I have many times in my life felt that I had to take a stand that was unpopular and that might bring crowd reaction against me. For myself I have never had regrets. Often I was troubled because I had to carry mother along into storm and stress.

You children were small and my contact with you and the family gave me measureless strength for whatever befell outside. While the Mail case was breaking, little Scotty toddled into the bedroom every morning to look down at the trains below. Contact with him and you children and mother wiped out the stress of an infuriated crowd.

I deeply regretted in my recent encounters that you had to pay in publicity part of the cost of my fight but never was there from anyone a critical word. That has meant much to me.

The probation officer in New York after a 2½ hour interview, during which he appeared much interested in the committee and my stand, said, "One thing I cannot understand. No one else gets tangled with Congress time and again as you do. Were you pugnacious and inclined to get into brawls when you were a young man?" I explained that I had never gone down to Congress to pick on anyone, that on the contrary, they had always come to my office to pick on us and that my job was to ward off their attacks.

Yesterday I had a letter from the Chief Probation Officer of the United States, asking whether I would purge myself by giving to the Buchanan Committee, if I had an opportunity now, what I had declined to give them before. Of course I would not but I had to say it in a way that would not smack of defiance. Copy of his letter and my communications to him are enclosed herewith.

---

[5] THE ASSAULT ON FREE SPEECH AND A FREE PRESS

(Statement by Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary, Committee for Constitutional Government)

There is on the Federal statute books no legal definition of lobbying. For lack of it, a committee of Congress has the power to intimidate and silence the expression of opposition opinion on public measures.

Congress has thus far neglected to define lobbying, and the chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, Representative Frank Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, has declared publicly that his committee "has come to no conclusion" as to any definition of the term.

Any such definition, he said, "comes within the realm of the proper legislative committee of the House." And yet, at another time, Mr. Buchanan told members of his committee that he had a "definition" that should guide them. He read it to them, quoting from the Yale Law Journal of January 1947: "any attempt by individuals or groups to influence governmental decision." This definition, he said, "is, in my opinion, the one we should follow in our investigation."

ORDINARY CITIZENS IN JEOPARDY

For lack of a legal definition of lobbying, the American citizen lives today in a no-man's land. He does not know whether what he does with respect to public measures, however lawful, is something for which he may be subpenaed to Washington, his private papers rifled, and himself friends and supporters be exposed or smeared as having done something shady and disreputable. However honorable and lawful his conduct may be, a conscienceless committee of Congress can always put an innuendo upon it.

This is a species of political blackmail that should not be tolerated in a free republic. It exists for lack of a definition of lobbying. Free speech and a free press can be suppressed as well by such subtle means, as by brown shirts nailing shut the doors of a newspaper office, denying the publisher paper to print (as in the Argentine), or putting authors of political tracts in Siberian salt mines.

This political blackmail is legal only because there is nothing to make it illegal. There is no definition of what is not lobbying, which Congress is bound to respect. It has unfettered power. But unfettered power has no place in a republic.

ILLEGAL LOBBYING EASILY EXPOSED

There is lobbying that is illegal, such as bribing a Member of Congress. There is lobbying that is clearly lawful and yet within the legitimate power of Congress to investigate and legislate upon, such as who stirred up a flood of telegrams to support or defeat a pending bill. A Congressman is entitled to know the source of the telegrams, so that he can intelligently estimate their worth,

EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW

Permit me now to cite the conduct of our President, Harry S. Truman, which established beyond argument the fact that this administration does not follow the legend carved in marble over the door of the United States Supreme Court here in Washington, which is: "Equal Justice Under Law."

---

whether they were paid for by the apparent sender as his own honest "petition for the redress of grievances," or whether the sender is a cat's-paw for a secret principal, such as Joe Stalin or a tycoon of organized industrial, financial, or labor power.

The right of Congress to investigate such forms of lobbying must be clearly admitted. But we now go to the fundamentals of free government, which is government by public opinion. An examination of illustrative cases involving free speech and a free press will mark out the boundaries of action beyond which Congress should have no power to investigate, intimidate, or introduce thought control in the United States.

Great books have made history. Uncle Tom's Cabin helped to mold public opinion, which led to the adoption of the Civil War amendments to the Federal Constitution. Certain of the novels of Charles Dickens led to the reform of debtors' prison laws. Tom Paine's Appeal To Reason fired the soldiers of the Revolution to continue their struggle.

Question: Were Julia Ward Howe or Dickens or Paine, or their publishers, or those who bought and circulated their books lobbyists? Did any of them do anything that a hostile Congress should be permitted to investigate? Much as we may hate the views expressed by Karl Marx in Das Kapital, the distribution of that book should be equally free from political intimidation. For, as Justice Holmes said, freedom of speech does not apply only to the views the majority likes. It includes freedom for the thought we hate. Otherwise, society is denied the benefit of criticism of old ideals and the growth of new ideas.

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS CONCERNED

Next, let us look at the position of newspapers and magazines in a land in which lobbying is not defined. Here are two newspapers—one New Deal, the other Republican or Dixiecrat; one proadministration, the other, consistently antiadministration. The proadministration paper need not worry—so long as the administration is in power. It is a fixed law of war and politics not to attack your allies. As the courts have said, "The majority protects itself," while it is a majority.

But here is the antiadministration or minority newspaper, called by the majority a "sheet" or "rag." Are its editorials attacking the administration, or bills pending in Congress, a form of lobbying? Should Congress have any power at all to suppress its editorials by any means whatever? Should it have any power to demand the names and addresses of the subscribers to the paper? Should it have any power by any means to hold this newspaper up to public obloquy; to bring pressure on its advertisers to withdraw advertising revenue? Or to cause its subscribers to boycott it?

How about a letter to the Voice of the People column? Or groups such as the Committee of Correspondence of the American Revolution? Or articles published today like the Federalist Papers written for, and the speeches and tracts of Patrick Henry and others against the adoption of the Constitution in 1787? How about any tract, speech, letter, or company or institutional advertisement today on public measures like low taxes and economy in government, or protecting the thrifty against the robbery of inflation? Are they next in line?

Kamp and Rumely were convicted because they refused to give committees of Congress the names of those who contributed to the efforts of the two organizations, or who paid for books furnished by the Constitutional Educational League and the Committee for Constitutional Government.

But, President Truman follows a similar procedure.

Many have not the facilities for presenting their ideas and viewpoints. Have they not the right to buy and distribute books and literature produced by others, and if they do so, are they not under the same protection of the Bill of Rights as authors and editorial writers whose material they distribute?

INFRINGING ON CITIZENS' RIGHTS

Bear in mind that the American citizen has rights whose free exercise is beyond the power of Government, direct or indirect. As Justice Jackson of the Supreme Court has said:

"The very purpose of the Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials, and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the Court. One's right to life, liberty, and property, free speech, a free press, freedom of ownership and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections."

Hitler consolidated his control over the German people, in part by his own propaganda, but equally by the suppression, by either direct or undercover means, of free speech and a free press in opposition to his program. His dark shadow lingers over the world. He taught others how to proceed.

We have the great rights of free speech; a free press; to petition for the redress of grievances; and to be secure in our persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable search and seizure. To preserve those rights against insidious impairment, we need a legal definition of lobbying; we need a "foul line" established so that Congress may pursue its legitimate activities, and the citizen be free from its illegitimate activities.

That definition is implicit in what has been written above. It is the distinction between what is direct and indirect, a distinction made by the courts thousands of times. Otherwise, as Chief Justice Hughes once said, "There would be virtually no limit to Federal power."

THE REAL DISTINCTION

If the purpose and effect of the lobbying is upon the Congress or a Congressman or Senator directly, that is on one side of the line. It may be wholly legal and honorable, yet it is something the Congress has the right to investigate. It may be buttonholing the individual Congressman; it may be Coxey's Army marching on Washington to demand the issuance of greenbacks. Whatever it is, if its impact is directly on Congress or one of its Members, it is subject to investigation.

If, however, Mr. A writes a book, or an editorial, or a tract, or makes a speech on a public measure, leaving to the reader or hearer to decide what political action he should take, if any, that is on the other side of the line. That is free speech and a free press. It should be wholly beyond the power of Congress to investigate, suppress or intimidate. If Mr. B, fired by the book or editorial, takes the matter up with his Congressman on his own initiative, Mr. B may be lobbying, but Mr. A is not.

If Mr. A, however, tells Mr. B, "write your Congressman to support or defeat this bill," and Mr. B does so, then both are lobbying. Mr. A has put the thing in motion. It is like

There is no claim—there never has been any claim—that either organization was engaged in any unlawful activity. Nor was there ever any claim that either Kamp or Rumely was engaged in an unlawful activity. It is ap-

---

the legal doctrine of proximate cause" in negligence cases.

In the one case, it is public opinion that is being molded; in the other case, it is congressional action that is being pressured. It ought not be hard for honest men to distinguish between Congress and the public.

MUST FREEDOM WITHER?

Unless a line is drawn along this boundary that separates the direct from the indirect, free speech and a free press must wither when politicians of the majority "turn the heat on." It is not ancient history that records what Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and Peron have done to human liberty.

The right of the loyal American to freely have his say before the public on any question must be preserved from any form of intimidation by any agency of Government. Otherwise, the servant of the people becomes their master.

In the great case of *Grosjean* v. *American Press Co.* (297 U. S. 238), the Supreme Court held that Huey Long had no power to silence opposition newspapers by a punitive tax on revenues. It said that the Bill of Rights forbids any action of the Goverment designed to prevent free and general discussion of public matters.

It has been my unwelcome duty as executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, under the direction of its trustees, to refuse compliance with demands by committees of Congress, which, we believed violated constitutional rights of ourselves and of all Americans.

INTRUSION THRICE REPULSED

In 1938, agents of the Minton Senate committee demanded permission to dragnet the files of the National Committee To Uphold Constitutional Government, asking for all records, papers, memoranda, books, and documents in your possession. We refused. We were not cited for contempt nor even reprimanded by the full Senate. The Senate, largely because of these unwarranted demands upon our committee, refused to grant Senator Minton's request for additional funds and thus ended the Black-Minton Committee, which had harassed business for years.

In 1944, the Anderson Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures demanded under subpena the names of all who had contributed $100 or more to the work of the Committee for Constitutional Government. These names were refused. My citation for contempt was voted by the Anderson Committee. The House not being in session, the citation was referred by the Speaker of the House to the Attorney General. My indictment for contempt of Congress followed. My defense was that our committee, supported by Democrats and Republicans alike, neither favoring nor opposing any party or candidate, was urging a philosophy of government, and that this was beyond the constitutional power of a congressional committee to investigate. The jury decided we were within our rights in refusing to comply with the subpena, and brought in an acquittal verdict in 20 minutes.

The Buchanan committee has been supplied practically all of the information it asked on 24 out of 26 points. We flatly refused to answer on the others, which demanded the names of purchasers of our books and literature. This, we contend, is a violation of the first and fourth amendments.

Chairman Buchanan has stated to the press that he will move on the basis of this refusal to cite me for contempt of Congress.

parent that these men were convicted because—and solely because—they and the two organizations by which they were employed, were effectively combatting the political theories of the New Deal and the Communists.

Kamp was called before a congressional committee investigating elections; Rumely was called before a congressional committee investigating lobbying.

Neither Kamp nor the Constitutional Educational League had anything to do with elections nor did either make any attempt to influence the result of elections except as the publications produced and circulated, convinced voters that the welfare of the country would be promoted by repudiating the political theories of the New Dealers, the efforts of the Communists to overthrow this Government by force or illegal means.

Neither Dr. Rumely nor the Committee for Constitutional Government was engaged in improper or illegal lobbying, unless it be that opposition to an administration or the advocacy of constitutional government is such. Under one definition of lobbying falls every political argument, but it does not follow that such form of lobbying is illegal or improper. We all engage in that form of lobbying every time we make a talk or write a letter carrying political implications.

Under the subterfuge that to enable it to legislate, Congress, through its committees had the right to know and needed names of those who paid for the publication or circulation of certain publications sent out or sold by these two organizations, and that the refusal of Kamp and Rumely to give that information was a contempt of Congress; they were convicted.

HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT

Let me now cite you to the facts which show that our President, Harry S. Truman, protecting the Communists, not only refused to give a congressional committee information which would have assisted it in writing legislation, followed a similar course but that he in addition deliberately violated a Federal statute.

In January, February, and March of 1948 a duly authorized subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor was making an investigation of a strike against Government Services, Inc., a private nonprofit corporation operating 42 cafetrias in Federal buildings under the direction of Federal officials. The strike was called by United Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers, Local 471. Officers of the UPW, which was the parent organization, and of local 471, had refused to file the non-Communist affidavit required under the Taft-Hartley Act and two of these officers, Alfred Bernstein and Abraham Flaxer, refused to answer the question as to whether they were, or had been, members of the Communist Party.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AIDS A COMMUNIST-DOMINATED UNION

President Truman exerted pressure in an effort to force the GSI to deal with this Communist-controlled union. He called certain individuals to a conference at the White House on February 10 1948. At this conference there was present the President, Gen. Philip B. Fleming, head of the Federal Works Agency which had charge of the buildings in which the cafeterias were operated; Mr. Schwellenback, Secretary of Labor; Mr. John R. Steelman, and Mr. Clark M. Clifford. It was charged that, at this conference, the President attempted to coerce the GSI into negotiating and agreeing with the Communist-controlled union.

To ascertain whether that charge was true, whether the President, who had taken oath to support the laws of the land, who had publicly announced that he would enforce the Taft-Hartley Act, was attempting to force an evasion of that law, which was only enacted over his veto, the subcommittee twice issued a subpena calling for the appearance of John R. Steelman, a Presidential adviser, who was present at the conference.

Accepting service of the subpena, conceding its validity, Mr. Steelman, on March 9, 1948, wrote the following letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 9, 1948.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am returning to you herewith two subpenas recently issued to me on behalf of your subcommittee. On Saturday, March 6, I received a subpena calling for my attendance at a hearing to be held that afternoon. On Monday, March 8, I received another subpena calling for my attendance at a hearing to be held the same day.

As you know, my official duties are to advise and assist the President of the United States. After the receipt of each of these subpenas, I promptly informed the President, and in each instance the President directed me in view of my duties as his assistant, not to appear before your subcommittee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. STEELMAN,
The Assistant to the President.

Mr. Steelman also called me over the phone, acknowledged receipt of the subpenas, acknowledged their validity, stated that he personally was willing to appear, but that the President had advised him not to appear before the subcommittee.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN ADVISES IGNORING FEDERAL STATUTE

There is a Federal statute on the books. It is the law of the land which the President took oath to uphold. The pertinent words are:

Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by the authority of either House of Congress to give testimony or to produce papers upon any matter under inquiry before * * * any committee of either House of Congress lawfully makes default * * * shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month, nor more than 12 months. (U. S. Code, title 192, of title 2.)

That statute President Truman advised Mr. Steelman to ignore—thus placing himself as one above the law.

PRESIDENT AGAIN DEFIES CONGRESS

Just a few days ago General Bradley, appearing before a joint committee of the Senate inquiring into the dismissal of General MacArthur, refused to give that committee certain information on the ground that he was the "confidential adviser of the President."

Whatever may be, from a legal standpoint, the soundness of that position, there is no question whatever but that the President, in the GSI-Steelman matter, advised the violation of a Federal statute.

If the testimony which Mr. Steelman might have given the committee was privileged, that is no reason why he should not have accepted the subpena and claimed the privilege.

The incident shows that the President considers himself above and beyond the law. That the law that would require you or me to obey a subpena does not apply to him. That position, of course, is unsound. The proper legal course for the President to have followed in the Steelman matter was to have told Mr. Steelman to appear, as have General Marshall and General Bradley, and then if privilege existed because testimony would have disclosed a confidential communication, to have claimed that privilege. Dr. Steelman's refusal to appear and testify furthered the interest of the Communist-controlled union. His refusal was at the direction of the President who, in this instance, aided the Communist-dominated union.

Still another instance which shows that the President considers himself above the law is so-called Dollar Steamship litigation.

Several years ago the Government became interested in this steamship line and acquired certain of the stock of the corporation. The question of whether the stock was purchased outright by the Government or was transferred to it as security for a loan has been under consideration by the courts.

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals, from which to date there has been no successful appeal to the United States Supreme Court, recently decided the stock belonged to the corporation and ordered Secretary of Commerce Sawyer to transfer it to the corporation. President Harry S. Truman advised Mr. Sawyer to ignore the order to transfer the stock, apparently backed in that opinion by the Attorney General and the Department of Justice. On Friday, May 18, 1951, the United States Court of Appeals found Mr. Sawyer; Assistant Attorney General Peyton Ford; Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman; Assistant Commerce Secretary Philip Fleming; George L. Killion, head of the American President Lines, Ltd.; Government attorneys Newell A. Clapp, Edward H. Hickey, Donald B. MacGuineas, and Philip Angele, and finally, Paul D. Page, Jr., who recently resigned from the Commerce Department, guilty of civil contempt, because they had refused—following Truman's advice—to comply with the court order. The question now before His Excellency, President Harry S. Truman, is whether he will permit his subordinates to comply with this court order, or whether they will go to jail; or whether, by some form of decree the President will attempt to aid them to avoid the force of the order.

President Harry S. Truman—your President and mine—it is evident by the

manner in which he has covered up for Hiss and Acheson, the "5 percenters" and the "deep freezers," those who are guilty of other offenses, his subordinates' persecution of Kamp and Rumley, the vilification by his political allies of these two men, his refusal to permit Bradley and others to testify before the Senate committee, his defiance of the court's order to transfer the Dollar stock—does not believe in free speech or a free press nor in equal justice under law when the exercise of those rights guaranteed by the Constitution come in conflict with his own political or administrative policies.

INDIA EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3791, with Mr. THOMAS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] is recognized for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] for 3 hours.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are now beginning discussion of H. R. 3791, a bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India. And while the aid to be furnished through this legislation is truly emergency in character, let us be sure that we place this measure in its proper historical setting.

India has just recently attained a place among the free democratic countries of the world. In less than 4 years, India has emerged from a colonial status into the long-sought-for position as an independent nation. And it has been less than a year and a half since the people of India adopted their own constitution and set in motion a representative government as the Republic of India. This government is sovereign and democratic.

These two world-shaping events: India's shedding of colonial status, and India's assuming independence, taken together, are outstanding events of our time. They can well be for the free world the greatest achievements of the century.

We stand at the threshold of perhaps the free world's greatest opportunity. India, that great land mass in South Asia, the home of approximately 350,000,000 fellow human beings, which for so long has been a prized colonial possession, has at last attained independence. This is such an immense change in the over-all world scene that we have not as yet fully realized its over-all long-range meaning.

The free world has ample reason to be proud of the accomplishments of this very young Republic. A new nation has attained independence and has set in motion a sovereign democratic government. A government of, by, and for a great mass of humanity made up of individuals who collectively face toward the free world.

No one with justice, balance, or reason could expect the Republic of India, not yet 2 years old, to have definitely established her position in the world or to have clearly defined her role on the present complicated international stage. Nor has there been time yet for our Government to work out with India the details of a basic pattern for the long-term relationships which should exist between two great sister republics. I am sure all Americans want to start laying a solid foundation on which we can build lasting friendship and mutual confidence with the people of this newly-born Republic.

This bill to provide emergency-food relief to India is our first major opportunity as legislators to make a contribution to setting the international pattern between the two countries. This is the first piece of major legislation dealing with the Republic of India to come before Congress. That fact alone makes the consideration of this bill an historic occasion. The question for each of us to carefully weigh is shall we use this international opportunity as a chance to build confidence, understanding, and friendship, or shall we choose a course which will lead to misunderstanding, distrust, and conflict. This golden opportunity will not come again. We must soon decide one way or the other. Let none of us fail to understand or forget that far-reaching effects and permanent results will follow our decisions in connection with this bill. We now have the chance to do one of two things. We can build strength for a free world, or we can give aid and comfort to our would-be conquerors.

This legislation demands thinking that is clear and cool. It demands tolerance, which is sensible and just. It demands friendship which is mutual and sincere. It demands action which is definite and courageous. This first and thus basic agreement between two great governments must be considered on its own merits and the long-term implications. The basic issue involved is relief food for starving fellow human beings. It is neither the time nor place, for making demands or pressing bargains. Such actions would certainly not be in harmony with our long-established tradition of sharing what we have with the victims of adversity or distress.

The final action which Congress takes on this legislation may well be considered as the laying of a cornerstone. Yes; the cornerstone of future relations between India and the free world. And remember, India has the potential and I believe is destined to become one of the world's great powers. She is at present besieged by many serious problems. Problems which require courage and detemination. She must pull together achievements since gaining independence; she must solve the numerous problems which carry over from colonial rule; there are the added problems created by the Pakistan and India Partition; and she must, in the midst of these problems, get at the job of developing her own vast resources. Accomplishments to date have not only given new hope to the masses of her own people but are positive indications that India is to become an ever-increasing power in the world. Are we going to lend help and encouragement to a great people as they strive toward the very same attainments which we have for years been so determined to achieve, or will we selfishly make the road to freedom, security, and abundance more difficult than necessary for this newly born Republic.

Not only will our final action on this bill have world-shaping results but our words will help set the pattern of the future relationship between the two nations. Everything we say and do in connection with this bill will help to make those first and lasting imprints on the people of India. Anything we say which has propaganda value for our enemies will be continuously repeated to the people of India and to all other oppressed people throughout the world. Then let us not be diverted by issues which are not a part of the problem involved. Our only purpose here is to further help bring relief to human beings faced with hunger, starvation, and death. This is no time to find fault or to criticize. Rather, let us speak only the words which are uppermost in the minds and hearts of a great majority of our own people. These are words of sympathy, of encouragement, of friendship, and of help.

H. R. 3791 has been very carefully studied by your Foreign Affairs Committee, and the draft of this bill represents the best combined judgment of the committee. We have been guided in our thinking by suggestions from many Members of the House. We have no intention or desire to restrict adequate discussion. Any member of our committee will be glad to help with any question or problem which may arise. If we do not have the answer, we will help try to find the answer. However, we sincerely hope the bill will be discussed and finally passed in an atmosphere prompted only by friendship and genuine concern for a great people who are earnestly working their way toward the security and the responsibilities of independence and national maturity.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In reading the Bible the other night I ran across these remarks that are taken from the Proverbs. I think the gentleman will agree with me they are very pertinent:

> Withhold not good from them to whom it is due, when it is in the power of thine hand to do it.
>
> Say not unto thy neighbour, Go, and come again, and tomorrow I will give; when thou hast it by thee.

Does not the gentleman think those words are most pertinent on this occasion?

Mr. CARNAHAN. They certainly are and they express what is in the hearts of the American people.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The bill that the gentleman's committee reported proposes to lend to India $190,000,000 under ECA, is that correct?

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. COX. Is it the gentleman's understanding that ECA loans are treated as grants?

Mr. CARNAHAN. No, it is not my understanding they are treated as grants.

Mr. COX. Is it the gentleman's understanding that of the billions of ECA loans that have been made, not one dime has been paid on either interest or principal?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I might ask the gentleman is there any interest due at the present time?

Mr. COX. What does the gentleman have to say about that? The loans were made a long time ago, does that not indicate to the gentleman's mind that the loans were made with no expectation of repayment and that these countries are proceeding with no sense of obligation to repay them?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The answer to the gentleman's questions appears on page 5 of the committee report. None of the interest on any of these loans is due until June 30 of next year and none of the principal until 1956. So none of them can be in arrears.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says that the bill proposes to lend India $190,000,000. In other words, the United States does not propose to furnish one grain of wheat to the so-called hungry people of India, is that not so?

Mr. CARNAHAN. The money is lent to India for the purchase of grain in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. COX. Under the bill lending India $190,000,000, there is no obligation on the part of India to spend one dime of it in the United States; she may spend the entire $190,000,000 in the satisfying of her full needs by trade with Russia and Communist China, is that not true?

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is not the intention of the bill.

Mr. COX. I know that, but is that not possible under the terms of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Let anyone who thinks to the contrary speak up, because I assert that is a fact.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that the Indians have purchased a great amount of wheat in this country up to this time?

Mr. COX. Yes; and on which we have lost several million dollars.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Where are the places in the world where they can buy wheat today?

Mr. CARNAHAN. There is only one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This country and possibly Canada.

Mr. COX. Did she not buy it from Russia, and does not Nehru say: "In the event you do not let us have the wheat we will go to Russia and Communist China to get our grain needs"?

Mr. CARNAHAN. India must get grain to feed her people.

Mr. COX. Does not Nehru say that there are no starving people in India now?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I do not know that he said that.

Mr. COX. He says further he will not let them starve because he will supply his grain needs by trading with China and with Russia.

Mr. CARNAHAN. He certainly will make every effort possible to feed his people.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman from Georgia tell us if he were in Nehru's position he would do otherwise?

Mr. COX. If I were in Nehru's position I would feed my people even if it necessitated the postponement of my industrial program—the Colombo plan. I would draw on my sterling reserves in England. I would use my minerals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think the Colombo plan is in being; it is still in the talking stage.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman from Georgia expect the United States to accept sterling reserves in payment for wheat?

Mr. COX. I take it that the United States would be very glad to let India have the wheat if India would obligate herself to the payment of purchases made here.

Mr. JUDD. India is already buying from us more than 100,000 tons of wheat a month, and she does not have enough foreign exchange to buy more from us. It is not a question of how much her sterling reserves somewhere might be. Our country is not willing to sell grain to her or to anyone else except for hard currency.

Mr. COX. But India has minerals of which we are in short supply. She has laid down an embargo against the exportation of those minerals. In addition to that, under Russian influence she went to Brazil and influenced Brazil to lay down a like embargo on the exportation of monazite sand. The sand in Brazil had been mined by an American company, who had developed two mines in Brazil and under the insistence of Brazil.

Mr. JUDD. The fact remains, in her atomic energy act she has a provision exactly like ours, that atomic energy materials cannot be exported. We have it in our law. What is wrong about her having it in hers?

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman any information that it would be economically possible to process this plant in India?

Mr. JUDD. I doubt that it can be. On the other hand, I do not see how you can expect people who have been brought up for hundreds of years under pacifist teachings, and whose greatest leader in centuries was Mr. Ghandi who taught them and led them in the way of nonviolence, to change overnight any more than the people of Georgia can be expected to change overnight views they have held for several hundred years.

Mr. COX. Nehru will not let us have the monazite because it is a product that goes into the making of the atomic bomb.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; that is exactly the reason for it. India is barring the export of any materials that can be used in the making of atomic weapons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it ought to be brought out, in response to what the gentleman from Georgia has said, that as far as manganese, a very scarce material in this country, is concerned, we are getting by far the great majority of that which India produces. I recall reading in the RECORD during the debate in the Senate on the India aid bill that Senator HOEY, of North Carolina said they had more monazite in North Carolina than they could possible use in this country.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is known or ought to be known that the only monazite that is being obtained in the United States at the present time is a very small quantity that is obtained in Florida and one other little mine where the production is inconsequential; it does not amount to anything. Monazite is in short supply.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I will say to the gentleman that the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, said that the United States is not in a short supply of monazite.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the answer made by the gentleman from Georgia, I would like to quote from the Staff Memorandum of Information on India Emergency Assistance Act, page 31:

> The Bureau of Mines has informed the committee that monazite and other rare earth mining operations in the United States now under way and planned indicate an excess of supply over demand adequate to meet our strategic objectives even without allowance for future imports and early United States self-sufficiency in these materials. The only real concerns are for supplies to meet the needs for a short period in the very near future and to meet AEC demand if research determines that thorium is an important atomic raw material.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman from Georgia has raised the question whether this wheat can be purchased with American funds from Russia or China. Now, is it not the intention of the Committee that this wheat shall only be purchased in the United States with American funds, and that the gentleman will offer a committee amendment with the following proviso:

Provided, That funds made available for purposes of this act shall be used for the purchase of food grain, or the equivalent in the United States when such commodities are available.

So there will be no question about the committee's intention, is it not the gentleman's intention to offer such an amendment?

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is right.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Then the gentleman agrees that such an amendment is necessary to keep India from spending this money, if she should so desire, with Russia or with Communist China, which is in the bill the gentleman is asking this House to pass?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I suppose the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have enough humility to realize that there may be some imperfections in this bill. Certainly we could welcome on the part of the House such amendments as would clarify and make this bill stronger. Therefore, during debate under the 5-minute rule, there will be opportunity to discuss amendments and make this bill stronger, if it is necessary. We believe this amendment will make it stronger.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does the gentleman believe that the people of India are the only people throughout the world that are undernourished?

Mr. CARNAHAN. No, that certainly is not true.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does the gentleman believe the United States should help all the undernourished people throughout the world?

Mr. CARNAHAN. We certainly should help any undernourished people throughout the world if it is within our power to do so.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does the gentleman think it is advisable to pick out one nation of undernourished people and provide the necessities of life for one nation, and let probably 30 other nations go without giving them anything should they ask for help?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The answer is that we are dealing here with an emergency situation, not trying to overcome all undernutrition.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I asked the question of the gentleman from Missouri. I should like to have the gentleman's reply to that question, if he will give it.

Mr. CARNAHAN. We will deal with each separate problem as they arise. I have yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. On page 2 of the bill, beginning in line 16, it is stated:

Provided further, That the assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of floods, droughts, and other natural disasters suffered by India in 1950.

This is not a bill to take care of all the undernourished and unfortunate people of the world, this is a bill to help the people of India in an emergency resulting from acts of God.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he thinks the United States is in financial condition to take care of all the undernourished people throughout the world, probably from three-quarters of a billion to a billion? Does the gentleman favor that?

Mr. JUDD. No, I do not favor that. I do not think we are in a position to do it. I do not think it would be a kindness to them, if we were. It is not the way to try to solve the long-term problem. The gentleman knows that I have always followed the policy, including 10 years I spent as a missionary in China investing not other people's lives or money but my own, of trying to help people help themselves. However, in an emergency like this there is not time to carry out the long-term programs of better fertilization, better irrigation, better seed selection, better prevention of plant pestilences, better health, and all those things. You have to have an emergency program to take care of an immediate emergency.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. There have been reports that the Government of India has denied shipments of mica and manganese to this country. I have here a special press release issued by the Government of India Information Services which states:

The Government of India wishes to state emphatically that there is no foundation for these press reports. The export quota of high-grade manganese ore fixed for 1951 is 800,000 tons and there is no restriction on the export of low-grade manganese ore. During January-December 1950, out of a total export of 728,280 tons for all destinations, 530,885 tons were shipped to the United States alone.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to review just what this bill is that we have before us. It is a proposal to authorize a loan not to exceed $190,000,000 for the limited purposes mentioned of meeting emergency food needs. It is not a wheat loan and it is not a grain loan. It is a food loan. It is a so-called ECA loan. I had considerable to do with writing section 111 (c) 2 in the original ECA Act. Here is the way the loan will be negotiated. The Administrator of ECA is the negotiator, under this ECA law. He negotiates, but the negotiations have to be approved by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, which consists of the following: The Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson; the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder; the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer; the head of the Federal Reserve bank, Mr. Martin; the head of the Export-Import Bank, Mr. Gaston; and the ECA Administrator, Mr. Foster. Those six advise one of their number, Bill Foster, head of the ECA, what the terms of the loan shall be. The legislation before you does not attempt to spell out what the terms should be. There has been a great deal of discussion that it is going to be a 35-year loan. There is nothing in the law about that. The legislation does, however, require on the first page beginning at line 9: "Including payment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the Government of India) of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources." That language is from the ECA law. That is the statutory way we prescribe that the payment of the loan must include repayment in strategic materials. It is perfectly amazing the amount of strategic materials that India has. Some people say that India is a rich country, full of poor people. If you will look at page 26 of this document, entitled "Staff Memorandum of Information," which is available at the committee table, you will find that strategic and critical materials exported or available for export by India for the calendar year 1950 amounted to $379,000,000, and that the United States received of that $188,000,000. So that India is able to repay a loan in just the sort of things that we want. Therefore, the proposition before us is rather a simple one. India needs food in a hurry and we need strategic materials that India has, not in a hurry, but over the years.

So we authorize our officials, and that is a pretty high-class battery of officials, three Cabinet officers and the head of the Federal Reserve, the head of the Export-Import Bank, and the head of ECA to negotiate a loan. I believe that we should not attempt to write in any further conditions. That is a matter the House will want to decide. It seems to me when you authorize a loan there are two ways to handle it. One would be like the British loan, for which I did not vote, where the loan is negotiated and all of the terms then brought to the Congress for approval. The other way would be to authorize officials to negotiate a loan in the future. For a future loan, you may be tying the hands of your own negotiators by writing conditions in advance. But in a loan bill you require repayment, the obligation of repayment that is the fundamental requirement.

I have been unable to secure from the executive departments the terms they intend to propose. I have been told, as my friend the gentleman from Georgia has pointed out, that the Secretary of States does not yet approve doing this as a loan.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be kind enough to yield to me?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I want to pay the gentleman a compliment by testifying to the fact that in my judgment he is the best authority in the Congress on foreign affairs. I believe that to be the opinion of his colleagues on his side.

May I ask the gentleman this question: Does not the amendment, which the author of the bill the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] stated he intended to offer, run counter to the philosophy of the gentleman from Ohio? In other words, has not the gentleman taken the position, did he not take that position in committee when the bill was formulated, and since that time, that since it is a loan it was not within the proper prerogatives of the committee to tell India how and where to buy the grain.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is right. I have not by any means decided what my position will be on the amendment which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] will offer.

Mr. COX. And under the terms of the bill, except for the transfer of strategic materials, India could buy her food needs in Russia or in Communist China? That is true, is it not?

Mr. VORYS. Under the bill as drafted, if the negotiators did not put in any provisions on that subject, that would be true. But let us look at that for a minute. We have a foreign affairs subcommittee studying this whole matter of east-west trade—trade through the iron curtain. I surmise that our subcommittee will be proposing legislation which will make certain that we do not furnish aid to those who arm our enemies. However, we find vast quantities of grain, lumber, and coal coming out from behind the iron curtain to Western Europe, and to our friends in Asia. Now, there has to be trade, they have to get something for what they export, or they will not export. Is it the smart thing for us to cut off all trade going in, and therefore all trade going out, which will mean that a great many people in Europe, and perhaps in Asia, will either starve or will come and ask increased foreign aid from us? I think not. I think that the way we would control that trade is by what is exported from the free world. I think it is perfectly conceivable that India might take dollars and buy some grain from Russia and it may be—I do not know, because I am not an agricultural expert—but it may be that Russia is better off for grain this year than we are. The estimators tell us that we have the worst prospects in a number of years in our grain crops for the coming year. We do not have surpluses running over. It might be the smart thing for India to buy grain from Russia. They get the dollars, but when they try to spend the dollars they find they cannot get anyone to export what they want, if effective export controls are working. I simply raise that question because we are not going to be able to settle all of the problems of our foreign affairs in this bill. This whole problem of east-west trade, through the iron curtain, the control of it to the advantage of the free peoples, is going to be laid in the lap of Congress this year.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to have the gentleman put in the RECORD here whether or not India gets any preference or any priority over any other ECA country that we deal with, or are they given the same general terms as all of the others got before?

Mr. VORYS. This bill before you provides exactly the same loan machinery that was provided for the ECA countries and for Spain. Thirteen loans have been made under this system of negotiation by the Administrator, approved by this national advisory council, in the amount of $1,184,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Let me follow this up. I happen to be the one who insisted that we write into the ECA law a requirement that $1,000,000,000 would be available only as loans. The first year the administration was opposed to that, but it was in the law and those loans have been made. Now, it is true that they have, because of the prospective dollar shortage in balance of payments postponed payments of interest or principal, so that no payments are yet due. It is true that those 35-year loans were for a longer period than I thought they should be. The Spanish loan was for 20 years. However, it seems to me that when you have a country like India with adequate resources, that is willing to make a loan, we can well leave it to those negotiators. I have only been able to secure this much assurance from anyone in the Executive Department, and it is informal, unofficial assurance: They say, if Congress decides this it to be a loan, we are not going to make any fuzzy loans.

Mr. COX. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman not think that it was traveling upon thin ice when he took the position that in the use of this $190,000,000 loan to India it might be smart for India to spend a part of it in making purchases from Russia?

Mr. VORYS. What do you mean by "thin ice"? Do you think that it is a bad thing for us to get all we can of the grain and lumber and stuff like that out from behind the iron curtain for the free peoples of the world? Is that a bad thing?

Mr. COX. Let me answer the gentleman by asking him a question. Does he favor setting up an arrangement so as to make it possible for the Russian economy to be supported by trade carried on with money furnished by America as between India and Russia?

Mr. VORYS. No; I do not favor that.

Mr. COX. Is not that the position the gentleman took here?

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. COX. What is the smart thing to do? The gentleman, as I understood, said he thought it was a smart thing for India to take some of this money and use it to buy things that Russia has to sell.

Mr. VORYS. I said that if we had proper controls on what could be bought with the dollars, and I am not sure we have such controls now——

Mr. COX. Let me ask the gentleman——

Mr. VORYS. Now, wait a minute. Here is what I either said or meant to say: I said that if we had proper controls on what could be bought with dollars either in this country or over the world, then it might not be such a dumb thing to let Russia get some dollars for wheat if we are shy of wheat and they have got plenty, and then let Russia find out they could not buy anything that they wanted with the dollars. That is what I mean.

Mr. COX. But has not the gentleman said that the United States loses complete control over these dollars when she lets India have them?

Mr. VORYS. No; I did not. What I have said is this: I attempted to go through it at some length—that the terms and conditions of the loan which would be authorized will be passed on by this national advisory council, and I cannot conceive that Secretary Snyder, that Charlie Sawyer, Bill Martin——

Mr. COX. Mr. Acheson.

Mr. VORYS. Secretary Acheson, too. He would probably deal more generously with India than the Secretary of Commerce or the Treasury or the head of the Federal Reserve bank. Between the six of them I have considerable confidence, not complete, but at least considerable confidence, that they would write in terms that would be beneficial to the United States, and that they would not permit terms that would be injurious to the United States.

Mr. COX. Now, I should like to pay the gentleman a compliment. I think I know something of the gentleman's views on this whole subject. I have examined with great care the minority report he filed on the original bill and I want to say to him that his report, perfect as it was, defeated the bill that his committee had offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. There is no doubt that Premier Nehru has made statements with which the gentleman and I and many others disagree, but does the gentleman think his lack of graciousness and probably want of good will should cause us to deny aid to famine-stricken India?

Mr. VORYS. No. Prime Minister Nehru has made aid to India just about as difficult as possible throughout this spring. I hope I do not get into a position here where I have got to defend all of the statements and actions of the chief of State of India or of the United States during this past spring, because that would be embarrassing to me.

Mr. Nehru has attempted to work both sides of the street intellectually. He says, "Now, we are a very young nation; therefore, you have got to treat us very kindly, remembering that we are young and green, and you must make allowances for our youth." Then out of the other side of his mouth he says to America—I could name some Americans he said it to this spring—"Oh, you Americans are so adolescent. We Indians are an ancient people with a culture thousands of years old; we had a rich civilization when your ancestors were running around in bearskins or bare skin. You really ought to revere and venerate the ancient wisdom that comes from us."

Now, it is a little difficult to go along with both of those arguments at once.

Then again we hear shocking and rather insulting things that he and some of his people have said about us, and about Russia, too.

It is rather interesting that instead of attempting even to be a friendly neutral and work both sides of the street in his friendship, he has in many instances taken the position of being a hostile neutral, both with us and with the Communists. In the very same speeches which my friend from Georgia quoted, Dr. Kumarrapa said nasty things about the United States, and then said some nasty things about the Russian Communists. They apparently feel that is the way they can preserve their independence.

I am one of those who feel that the position of India on the matter of declaring Red China an aggressor was morally indefensible and practically disastrous. I happen to feel that way, and I am still answering your question, but we come back to the fact that there are millions of people over there who are hungry and on the road to starvation, regardless of what we think of Nehru. I talked with Bishop Werner who has just returned from India. Some of the shocking things he saw were people eating the bark from trees and getting 8 ounces of grain a day. Those are things that wring your heart. It is true that the people of India have been hungry for a long time, but it is also true that there is just ahead a great need and a probable famine, and that this grain will be extremely helpful, if we can furnish it on mutually satisfactory terms, regardless of our opinions on Nehru.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. We all recognize that the gentleman is probably one of the most outstanding men in the House on foreign affairs because he has had every opportunity before he came to Congress, and afterwards, to observe it. But here is what troubles me. The gentleman has described Nehru very accurately, according to the newspaper reports, and he has probably a much finer way to praise him than I do, but the gentleman knows that the great trouble has been not with purchasing supplies in this country but with the delivery of them.

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Does the gentleman think that with this man's attitude any American is going to be able to dictate or provide how the food is going to be distributed? Does the gentleman not think that Nehru will be so strong, and he will take all this food and do just as he pleases with it, and send it up to Russia, if he wants to, or trade it off or sell it out? What assurances have we that the people of India are even going to get this wheat?

Mr. VORYS. We have no assurances, and we had no assurance under the original grant bill, where the grain was a gift not to the people of India but to the Government of India, which was to sell it to the people. This was one of the reasons I took a dim view of the original bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman talked about the suffering people in India. I believe that we all want to help suffering people, but it happens that there are about a billion undernourished people throughout the world.

Mr. VORYS. About a billion and a half.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That includes, I believe, about 40 or 50 or 60, maybe 70 countries. Does the gentleman feel that the United States is in a good enough financial condition to take care of the billion and a half undernourished people throughout the world, and if he believes we should take care of all of them, what countries does he believe we should take care of first?

Mr. VORYS. I do not think we have either the money or, if we had the money and the desire, there just is not food enough to take care of all those people. Therefore, what we have to do is to use our resources wisely, and that is what I suggest we do. I know one thing, whereas if you authorize a gift of a couple of million tons of grain to a country, they may be tempted to ask for all they can get as a gift, but if you make them a loan so that they will have to pay you back, it is quite likely that they will not buy any more grain than they absolutely need. Therefore, I felt in this instance, and I think in some other instances that may come up later this year, that we should be thinking in terms of loans rather than always in terms of grants.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. VORYS. I have answered the gentleman's question. He said, "Do you think we have the money or the food to feed all the hungry people?" My answer is "No."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Then what nations, in your opinion, should be taken care of by the United States? Who should decide which nations should be provided for?

Mr. VORYS. This Congress is going to decide that. This bill came up ahead of time because of an emergency, but this Congress is going to have a bill from our committee which will involve, among other things, regardless of how it is paid for, the movement of a great deal of food across the ocean to countries which are in short supply, and this Congress is going to decide, I think, in these instances.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does the gentleman mind telling me which countries he thinks should be provided for of the 70 undernourished countries? Which ones do you think should be provided for?

Mr. VORYS. I cannot make a list of them at this time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the gentleman tell me the number of them; how many, in the gentleman's own mind, should be provided with the necessities of life?

Mr. VORYS. There are a great many countries that may be short of food. There are some that are able to produce surpluses now. I cannot go into that question now. You will hear from me later this year.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman an easy question?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wish to quote VORYS in committee against VORYS on the floor. In the minority report that the gentleman filed on the original bill that his committee turned out he made this statement:

> The 2,000,000 tons requested from us by India is only about one twenty-fifth of what India expects to obtain this year.

This is what I want to emphasize, and this is the language of the gentleman from Ohio:

> The failure to obtain this food will not in itself cause famine or starvation in India; on the other hand, delivering it will not prevent hunger and malnutrition in India.

Mr. VORYS. I think that is true. I made that statement and I think that is something we have to bear in mind. It is the same point my friend from Illinois was bringing up: We cannot take care of all the hungry of the world. I think, however, that we can help very vitally in tiding India over, and we can prevent a number of instances of starvation.

We attempted in our committee to get an estimate of how many would die if we did not do this. We found it would not work out mathematically, because, as the gentleman has said, what is proposed is one twenty-fifth of the whole supply of grain for India for a year, and of course there is no one who would starve to death if he got twenty-four twenty-fifths of what he had gotten the year before. The supply question for a nation, however, is not as simple as that.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman remember also stating in this splendid document to which I refer and of which I believe the gentleman is the author:

> A 6-year loan would not ruin India or its plan.

Mr. VORYS. I certainly remember writing that. The 6-year loan would be more in line than a 35-year loan.

Mr. COX. Do I understand that the gentleman would oppose the adoption of

the amendment which the author of the bill said he would offer when we got to considering the bill under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said I was taking that one under advisement. I have felt that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not the fount of all wisdom in connection with these matters. Not only have I felt that way myself but I have urged my committee colleagues, during this period of general debate, to give consideration to all suggestions for amendments and changes, but not to attempt at this stage of the game, on the first day of debate, to say yes or no on proposed amendments. Certainly my own position is clear. I do not know of any amendment anybody could suggest today about which I would say, "I am for that," or "I am against it."

Mr. COX. If the people of the country knew the work the gentleman has done on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, they would have great cause to thank God that the gentleman belongs to that group.

Mr. VORYS. I think I ought to yield the floor right at that point.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have been amazed during this debate today and through all of the weeks that we waded through this rule. I sat through a great deal of testimony by people who were qualified to testify during the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this India grain bill. We brought agricultural experts back from New Delhi. We had missionaries—Catholic missionaries and Methodist missionaries who had firsthand information. I cannot for the life of me see why we should be standing here and spending our time debating and arguing on the terms and how the interest is going to run when people are not only starving in India but are going to starve in far greater numbers unless they get this grain. I am convinced of that as much as I have ever been convinced of any one fact in all my life.

Several million people in India are going to starve unless they get additional grain. That is a fact and it is indisputable to any one who heard the testimony.

As I say, the testimony was by qualified witnesses.

Now if we as a Christian nation, and I think we are a Christian people, are going to try to help to alleviate this enormous calamity and this situation, I remind you, has come about by a series of calamities, then why should we not provide that the grain shall be available and let qualified people decide about the terms and bicker and argue whether we are going to get this or that back. I want to see people saved from starving. Let us say we are neighbors. If you were my neighbor and I said, "I wish you would let me have some wheat or corn on especially easy terms", I know I would get it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is a rich man.

Mr. CHATHAM. Rich in my friends, sir.

Mr. COX. He likewise happens to be one of the trustees of all of the people of the country. If a man should come to the gentleman for a loan, even if it be to relieve hunger, would the gentleman consider making the loan without any security whatever for 35 years at 2 and one-half percent? If the gentleman were acting as trustee of all of the people of the country, would the gentleman as a responsible and understanding citizen, regard that as a wise thing to do?

Mr. CHATHAM. Considering myself as trustee for all of the people of the country, I was in favor and still am in favor of making this a grant. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. COX. In other words, the gentleman does not like the pending bill because it provides for a loan.

Mr. CHATHAM. I like the pending bill because I think it will get grain to India. I said I was in favor of making it a grant. First of all I am in favor of getting grain to starving people.

Mr. COX. Is not the pending bill as near an outright grant as it was possible for the committee to make and at the same time call it a loan.

Mr. CHATHAM. No; in my opinion, sir, I think the Indian people will pay their debts.

Mr. COX. After 35 years?

Mr. CHATHAM. Even after 50 years or 75 years.

Mr. COX. What is the gentleman's idea? Does the gentleman think that because of the necessitous condition of India we should make it a 100-year loan?

Mr. CHATHAM. I have not mentioned a 100-year loan, sir.

Mr. COX. The gentleman did mention a gift, however.

Mr. CHATHAM. I was for the gift.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is not that the whole purpose of this debate? It depends on how you approach the problem. If you look at it like a cold-blooded banker, of course it should not be done. But if you look at it as a proposition that will gain friends in a part of the world where we are very weak, and also help to save millions of people, is it not a very well worth-while project?

Mr. CHATHAM. I think the gentleman has well expressed the proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I was talking about neighbors. I am a citizen of North Carolina. If the people of Georgia should have an unprecedented series of floods and droughts and freezes, and if they lost their crops and we got word from the people of Georgia that they were going to starve unless they got some grain from North Carolina and that they would like to have it on especially easy terms, do you think that we would not send the grain to Georgia?

Mr. COX. Suppose the gentleman was president of his bank?

Mr. CHATHAM. Well, sir, this is asking for grain for starving people.

Mr. COX. I know—I know—and Georgia is asking you, as president of a great bank, to help her in her bad situation.

Mr. CHATHAM. I have never been a banker, sir. But if the people of Georgia appeal to the people of North Carolina, or vice versa, I am sure they would get the grain and starving people would get food and the terms could be worked out. I imagine it would be a gift if we had the grain or if your people in Georgia had the grain if the situation was reversed.

Mr. Chairman, we are in one world. We are closer to India today through our modern means of transportation than my State was to Georgia during Civil War times. They are our people as much as any other people in the world. I am not going to talk about what we are going to get back from doing this deed, because if we put enough strings onto this, I do not think we should get very much back because I think that in that event, perhaps, the name of Uncle Shylock could be applied to us again. I think the people of this country want to help the starving people everywhere. The gentleman from Illinois says that of course people are starving everywhere. I thoroughly agree. But our own agricultural experts, these religious missionaries, and so forth, have testified that in this generation nothing has ever hit India like this. We have grain available and strangely enough some opponents of this measure today said that they must buy this grain only from America. They say there should be an amendment that the money should be spent only for grain in America.

Only yesterday some opponent said we are not going to have grain—we are going to have a short wheat crop.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says it has been discovered by the author of the bill and by the committee sponsoring it that an amendment is necessary to protect the interests of the United States. The gentleman's colleagues have said that his committee spent weeks on this bill; that they carefully worked out what they thought represented a fair proposal, and still they come in here with a bill that is faulty, as the gentleman now says it is, and in order to protect the interests of the United States it must be amended.

Mr. CHATHAM. I would like to correct the gentleman. My colleagues in the House have said that an amendment should be made to protect the United States and sell this grain, but other people who have been against it have said we are faced with a short wheat crop; that we should not let them have the grain. Then, where will they get the grain if they do not buy it somewhere else, as in the Argentine or Australia or Canada?

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman favor extending this $100,000,000 loan under conditions that will make it possible for

India to go to Pakistan or to go to Russia or to go to Communist China or go to Burma or anywhere else to obtain her food requirements?

Mr. CHATHAM. I want no mistake in my answer. I would be in favor of her buying that grain wherever she could get it in the world, if it would save people from starving to death.

Mr. COX. Even from Russia?

Mr. CHATHAM. Friend or foe.

Mr. COX. The gentleman makes a remarkable statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that other free countries have bought grain from Russia?

Mr. COX. But not paid for with American dollars.

Mr. CHATHAM. If we had starvation here, would you be in favor of buying grain from Russia today?

Mr. COX. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. CHATHAM. If we had starvation here today would you be in favor of buying grain from Russia if it was the only place we could get it?

Mr. COX. I would under all circumstances insist upon doing business with people whom I knew to be our friends.

Mr. CHATHAM. That is not an answer to my question, sir.

Mr. COX. What does the gentleman say?

Mr. CHATHAM. I say I would buy it wherever I could get it.

Mr. COX. If I were the head of the American Government and famine was upon the people, I would use the resources of the Government to the extent of my power to satisfy the needs of hunger.

Mr. CHATHAM. The gentleman has not answered my question yet. Would you buy it from Russia if it were the only place you could get it?

Mr. COX. Am I on trial or is the gentleman's bill on trial?

Mr. CHATHAM. You asked me a direct question.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will repeat the question I will undertake to answer it.

Mr. CHATHAM. Would you be in favor of buying grain from Russia if the American people were starving and Russia was the only source of supply?

Mr. COX. To prevent starvation of my people I would take relief from wherever it might be obtained.

Mr. CHATHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Now will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHATHAM. Yes, I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it the gentleman's understanding that Pakistan had 500,000 tons of wheat that she offered to India, and that because of India's trade warfare against Pakistan, India, refused to take it?

Mr. CHATHAM. No.

Mr. COX. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. CHATHAM. No, that is not may understanding.

Mr. COX. Is it the gentleman's understanding that India obtained a certain quantity of rice from Burma when she could have acquired a great deal more?

Mr. CHATHAM. It is not.

Mr. COX. Is it likewise the gentleman's understanding that a few weeks ago Canada offered India wheat and that she refused to accept it, claiming that it was not prime wheat and that the people of India preferred to wait and fulfill their grain needs by taking wheat from Canada from her 1951 prime wheat crop? Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. CHATHAM. Not completely, sir.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Apart from the humanitarian aspects of this bill which, in my opinion, in themselves justify a grant to India rather than the loan which is involved in this bill, does not the gentleman believe that in this troubled world in which we live today the sheer propaganda value—and we are spending millions of dollars on the Voice of America to convince the people of the world that we are right—that the sheer propaganda value of this bill is sufficient to necessitate its passage?

Mr. CHATHAM. I believe that we should try to relieve distress where we find it.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I have already yielded 10 minutes of my time, but I yield for a question, a brief one.

Mr. BURLESON. I was just going to suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that being in the position of the head of a government trying to save my people from starving I would take great delight in having some other country furnish money for that purpose.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I wanted to comment for a moment, if I might, on the few words that the gentleman from Georgia, our honored colleague, said of their effort to buy Canadian wheat, but that they are not buying it. I want to remind the gentleman from Georgia that that was grade 6 wheat which is unfit for human consumption. Why should they buy it?

Mr. CHATHAM. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the sterling balances in India. India's sterling balances have gone down in 4 years from $4,900,000,000 to $1,750,000,000. That is the only real backing she has got for her currency. She is a new democracy. In 3 years her sterling balances have gone down very materially, and it is probably unsound financing for her to pay out any more money.

I feel that the Christian people in the United States are behind this deal; I feel that in our hearts any one of us would help a starving person anywhere if we could. I feel that the people of the United States would share what they have. So I cannot get over the fact that the gentleman this morning said as the ninth group there are the people of the Christian Church who feed the hungry, friend or foe. I am sure that he and I are on exactly the same basis there. We believe in the Christian Church; we have bread here; we can save people from starving who have, as I say, had an unprecedented series of disasters. They want to be our friends. India has historically been friendly with the United States; they will continue to be our friends if we act as friends. I hope and pray, my colleagues, that you will pass this legislation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, in the 10 minutes at my disposal I should like to take up certain phases of the bill itself and try as far as I may to give the factual background which prompted those particular passages in the bill. I wish to begin with the very last section of the bill because it was obvious from the colloquy that took place between the gentleman from Georgia and I believe the gentleman from Missouri when the rule was under consideration that there was a complete misapprehension as to what it provided.

The last provision of the bill takes care of the shipment of grain to India. At the present time shipping is in extraordinarily short supply the world over. It was obvious when this bill was being considered at the outset that regardless of our own internal transportation difficulties about which I would like to say a word in a moment, it would be impossible to find the shipping in the world marts to get this grain to India unless a further number of ships were broken out from the reserve fleet that is now tied up in the various rivers and harbors of this country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. From where do the bottoms come in which they have been carrying all this stuff to Hong Kong, both the British and Americans?

Mr. HERTER. That in terms of relative tonnage is very small compared to what is involved here. The shipments that are involved in this case are bulk shipments. The ships that would carry grain are of the Liberty type or of the general trader type, that have gone all over the world carrying coal, carrying ores and carrying grain. The number of those ships available today, largely because of the unexpected coal shortage in Europe, not entirely because of the far-eastern situation or the tonnage that carries things into Hong Kong, has developed a very serious situation, so that even recently in the last supplementary appropriation bill we had to appropriate $20,000,000 to break out new ships to take care of our commitments in Europe. The tonnage that has gone into Hong Kong and I despise anything going into China or Hong Kong—I say that to the gentleman now—has come, the important part of it, from Malaya,

has come from other parts of the British Empire, has come in part through tramp ships that would not be adequate for this particular trade.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman explain whether the cost of equipping these ships, taking them out of moth balls, rehabilitating them, putting on crews, getting them in shipshape so that they can carry 2,000,000 tons of wheat, will be added to the $190,000,000 loan, and will India ultimately be responsible for that additional cost, or do we make that contribution as sort of a side issue in addition to the $190,000,000 loan we are making to India?

Mr. HERTER. I am coming to that. The facts are a little distorted and I want to make them clear. I can give the gentleman the arithmetic very simply.

When we first began to consider aid to India, we had assurances that only a million tons could be gotten out of this country and to India in time to be effective in this famine situation. Our way of thinking was in terms of a million tons, with the possibility of a second million tons but not necessarily a probability of it. In order to ship a million tons of grain from this country—the average cargo is roughly 8,000 tons—it would take 120 ships. The round trip runs from 4 to 4½ months to India and picking up a return cargo, either in India or in Africa. So that the time period that was involved if the grain was to get there required our figuring in terms of one round trip per ship. The cost of breaking out a ship from the mothball fleet is roughly $140,000. Today the cost of carrying grain the distance required, from the Gulf ports or from Western ports to India, is roughly $25 a ton. For an 8,000-ton cargo that means 25 times 8, roughly, $200,000. We were told that with the going rates today the entire cost of breaking out the ships, plus fuel, plus insurance, plus running them, could be paid out of one single round trip.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman satisfied with the figure he has just given?

Mr. HERTER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Do not the studies made, and which his committee has used as the basis for their recommendation, disclose that of the $20,000,000 appropriated $14,000,000 will have to be used in the activation of these ships and that the full amount recouped as a result of shipments to India will be $2,000,000 and that the Government will take a loss of $12,000,000?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is quite correct except for one thing. I noticed that same statement was made in the other body when this matter was debated over there. Someone had received a set of figures in which a zero had been omitted. The actual return is $20,000,000.

Mr. COX. I thought the gentleman just a few minutes ago said that the cost of the shipment of 8,000 tons was $200,000.

Mr. HERTER. I am talking about a single trip.

Mr. COX. That is what we get. In other words, you ship to India 8,000 tons and the freight on the shipment is $200,000.

Mr. HERTER. If the gentleman will take a million tons at a rate of $25 a ton that would be $25,000,000 merely for the shipment of the wheat from here to India. That does not include the return cargo. They expect a considerable return cargo, both in ores from India and in ores from Africa. In other words, the round trip will much more than pay the entire cost of the voyage plus the cost of breaking the ship out in the first instance.

That is because of the high freight rates that exist the world over today, due to the shortage of shipping.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do we have any more assurance that we will have a return cargo than we had when we sent ships over to Singapore to get rubber and they came back with their holds empty?

Mr. HERTER. Only the assurance given by the Shipping Board. The mere cost of taking the grain from here to India would pay all costs, other than insurance, including breaking out, and they figure the return cargo from India will more than pay for the insurance item and more than pay for all of the cost of the round trip.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it not true that we are required to take more and more ships out of mothballs for the purpose of picking up the ores and strategic materials from Asia and Europe at the present time?

Mr. HERTER. That is right. The shipping situation is getting progressively more acute. As a matter of fact, we are breaking out more ships by reason of our Korean operations, but that appears under a different heading. The one essential point that I have not mentioned here is that the Indian Government is paying for every cent of the cost of shipping that grain. They have agreed to pay every cent of it in dollars.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The United States takes a loss on the grain, though, does it not?

Mr. HERTER. That depends entirely from what pool the grain is taken. May I explain that? The United States takes a loss on the grain only if the grain is sold from the grain that is pooled under the International Wheat Agreement.

Mr. COX. That is right.

Mr. HERTER. If it is taken from that, but I think the gentleman will find that India has already bought and paid for everything to which she was entitled under the International Wheat Agreement. This grain is over and above the allocation under the International Wheat Agreement, and therefore the cost of this grain will be the market price.

Mr. COX. Is it the understanding of the gentleman, and can he speak authoritatively to the point of giving the House assurance that if India uses any of this $190,000,000 to buy wheat from the United States, that she will take it at the domestic price?

Mr. HERTER. I would give the gentleman that assurance very definitely from every figure we have received, but I think I ought to clarify this point. This does not provide that all shipments shall be made in wheat, so in fact, when the first million tons were being computed it was figured—and this is a rough calculation—that of it 660,000 tons would be wheat, 250,000 tons milo, 70,000 tons corn, and 20,000 tons rice. At the present time, if I might continue, the Commodity Credit Corporation still has in its possession a considerable quantity of sorghum. That would be included under this head of milo. The price of that is relatively small compared to wheat.

The question of its availability for shipment is a very important point. As I indicated earlier, there is a real problem involved in getting this wheat to India; it is a real problem domestically, and it is a real problem in connection with shipping. As the Members of the House know, we are tremendously short of boxcars in this country. The actual movement of wheat from interior points to Gulf ports or other ports from which it might be picked up and carried is a very serious problem. That is why many of us have had questions as to whether physically over more than 1,000,000 tons could be carried out of the country.

In addition this bill provides that there can go out of this country only so much in the form of grain as certified by the Secretary of Agriculture as being surplus to our vital needs. In other words, we are protecting it to that extent, so that in the event of a worsening of our winter wheat situation, or failure in the future of our spring wheat situation there will be an ample carry-over in this country to protect the country.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. What impact will the spending of this $190,000,000 have on our finances? One hundred and ninety million dollars is a lot of money, especially to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, who are trying every day to raise money. What will be the impact of this on our financial economy?

Mr. HERTER. Considering the totals we are spending at this moment, I do not think it would have a very heavy impact. The fears some of us had initially were that if we suddenly passed a bill making provision for the export of an

additional 2,000,000 tons of grain it would affect the grain markets, and that grain prices would go up in this country. I am told that in the grain market the shipment of this grain has already been completely discounted, and it has not affected our grain market because we have a very considerable carry-over from last year.

Mr. JENKINS. Would this be a fair guess, that it would take at least 6 months to move this wheat?

Mr. HERTER. The whole 2,000,000 tons? At least 6 months. I am somewhat skeptical as to whether the whole amount will ever be moved, or that that amount of money will ever be borrowed.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman I know to be one of the clearest-minded Members of this body. May I inquire if he regards as necessary in order to protect the interests of the United States the amendment the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN], the author of the bill, says he intends to offer?

Mr. HERTER. I am ashamed to say I was off the floor of the House when his statement was made. For that reason, I am not familiar with the amendment.

Mr. COX. The announcement that he would offer that amendment was in response to calling his attention to the fact that under the provisions of the bill we now have before us it would be within the right of India to take the full amount of the loan and spend the full amount of it in acquiring its food needs from Russia and from Communist China.

Mr. HERTER. If that is the point of it, may I answer the gentleman's question this way: No. 1, I think it is a fairly academic matter. The committee at the very outset canvassed the whole question as to where grain could be purchased elsewhere in the world and was convinced that there was no reserve carry-over in any country of the world except here in the United States.

Offers of two kinds have been made to the Indians. In my opinion, they were essentially propaganda offers. One of them was an offer of a comparatively small amount of rice from China. The second was the offer of 50,000 tons, which is a small amount in the picture, from Soviet Russia. It was that amount that the gentleman quite rightly questioned when it was announced with considerable hurrahs in India.

Mr. COX. That is right.

Mr. HERTER. After the Russians had made the offer of 50,000 tons to India they found that they were unable to get from India what they wanted in exchange for it. It was a barter deal. When the Russians found that they were unable to get what they wanted from India, they raised their offer from 50,000 tons to 500,000 tons for purely propaganda purposes, knowing that it could not possibly be accepted.

Actually, from a physical point of view, I have serious doubts whether Russia is going to ship even 50,000 tons, because from all reports Russia has been squeezing its satellites in Europe of their own grain in order to take care of her own internal and army needs.

Mr. COX. May I ask the gentleman if he agrees with the philosophy of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that in making this loan it is not within the rights of the Congress to prescribe how the money shall be spent and, therefore, it should be left to India to spend American dollars with Russia if she so sees fit or with China if she elects?

Mr. HERTER. I think it is entirely up to the negotiators with respect to the loan. The loan can carry with it any conditions the Congress or the ECA sets. The gentleman knows that when loans are made they are subject to negotiation. The question as to what conditions may be imposed on a loan is a matter of judgment. Personally, I would be satisfied from the point of view of this loan, and I know the gentleman from Georgia would not be, that the terms and conditions of the loan be made by the ECA. I think enough has been said with regard to the method of repayment, and it is spelled out here in the bill, that under the ECA terms the methods of repayment should include payments in materials in which we are in short supply and which we wish.

I think there is a very real danger in spelling out here something that completely ties the hands of the negotiator, which might not be at all advisable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When the State Department officials appeared before the committee, did they recommend that some beans be shipped under this proposal?

Mr. HERTER. They very definitely mentioned pulses. They said it might be much easier to ship some peas from the Northwest, and some of the beans from the Middle West and they would naturally take that into consideration in the purchase of the particular foodstuffs.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understood the gentleman a while ago in specifying what was to be shipped, beans were not mentioned?

Mr. HERTER. Beans were not mentioned. In the original list pulses were mentioned. On the printed list just read I did not include pulses, but they were very definitely mentioned in the testimony.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have this situation before us right now. Gentlemen have been mentioning the absence of a wheat reserve, yet in this country in my home State we have hundreds of thousands of bags of high quality beans which the markets in this country absolutely refuse to absorb. I eat those beans from day to day and week to week. We use them in our homes. Why, in the name of common sense, is it not possible under a program of this kind with the wheat shortage such as exists in the world today, can we not ship products of that kind to India?

Mr. HERTER. As the gentleman will notice, that question was asked again at the time the rule was being debated. We keep talking about wheat all of the time. Wheat is not mentioned in the bill anywhere. What is mentioned is food grains, or food.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not quite likely that in the negotiations under this loan provision India will tend to seek those things that are cheapest, whereas if it has been a matter of a gift, there might be a different attitude

Mr. HERTER. There is no question about that. As a matter of fact, from the point of view of India, if rice were obtainable, I think they would much rather have rice from the standpoint of the eating habits of the majority of her people in the areas of greater starvation. But wheat is the next best thing that can be furnished. As a matter of fact, there again the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture is of the utmost importance.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand it, that if this bill is passed by the House, then they have to go through negotiations to determine what grains are going to be shipped and in what amounts? Then you say it is going to take 6 months to ship the entire amount of 2,000,000 tons?

Mr. HERTER. It will take 6 months to get the entire amount there.

Mr. GROSS. How long are these negotiations going to take? Are we going to get any food over there if the people are starving, and are we going to be able to do anything to aid them if the bill is passed?

Mr. HERTER. That is our hope. May I say to the gentleman that the principal aid of this bill, if it is passed, will not be in getting food quickly to India but will be in allowing the Indians to release their reserve stocks, including seed, which they have had to keep in their control, not knowing whether we were going to furnish the grains or not. If they know the grain is coming within the next 6 months from this country, then they can release even the seed grain which they have had to hold back in order to assure crops in another year.

Mr. GROSS. How much do they have in reserve, and what do they have?

Mr. HERTER. The reserve situation has been a very, very difficult one.

Mr. GROSS. How much do they have? How many million tons, or how many million bushels?

Mr. HERTER. Roughly I do not know how much they have used from the time we got the original figure, but they had 3,500,000 tons.

Mr. GROSS. Of what?

Mr. HERTER. Of wheat and rice. That was what they were able to buy from their farmers to put into their rationing system.

Mr. GROSS. That is all they got?

Mr. HERTER. That is all they got into their rationing system from their farmers.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. COX. I take it the gentleman is familiar with the debate in the other body on their India wheat bill?

Mr. HERTER. I am.

Mr. COX. Was the gentleman impressed with the concern manifested by the understanding and tough-minded Senator WHERRY as regards whether or not these transactions would be an honest-to-God bona fide loan?

Mr. HERTER. I think that certainly would be a matter of proper concern.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman recall that in the debate Senator WHERRY developed the fact that in the loan made to Iceland that it is quite within the right of the borrower to insist upon a modification of the loan for the extension of time in the use of the loan and in the handling of the transaction in such manner as to make the promise to pay of no value whatever?

Mr. HERTER. I will answer the gentleman in this way: I am not too worried about the soundness of this loan. I have had serious question as to the wisdom of the loan, as the gentleman knows. The soundness of the loan depends entirely on the extent to which the Indians themselves are going to curtail their own requirements from abroad in order to service the loan in the future.

Mr. COX. May I ask the gentleman if he is acquainted with the fact that they have 180 million sacred cows in India, and God knows how many sacred monkeys?

Mr. HERTER. I have heard the gentleman talk about both the sacred cows and sacred monkeys before.

Mr. COX. And 10,000,000 sacred beggars; and does not the gentleman understand that these sacred things have first claim upon any food that we send to India?

Mr. HERTER. That is true in certain areas, without question, but I do not think anything we can write in this legislation can completely change all of the social customs of that country.

Mr. COX. But they are customs that the Congress ought not compel the American taxpayer to support.

Mr. HERTER. We should do that to the very minimum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, foreign policy today is not only a question of politics, but economics, finance, and propaganda. By the delay of this Congress we have greatly undercut the effectiveness of this legislation even when passed.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have just looked up the Iceland loan, and I find these words:

> If at any time or from time to time the parties thereto—
>
> Both parties, not one—
>
> determine that it would be in their common interest, because of adverse economic conditions or for any other reason, to postpone—

And so forth. I simply call the attention of the House to the fact that both parties would have to agree. It was not left to one party.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, we must finally have action on India wheat. This is no world for dawdlers. Many long and hungry days have gone by since the Foreign Affairs Committee on March 5, 1951, voted out a grain-to-India bill. Not only is the grain needed to save human lives, but it would implement in a practical way our foreign policy to strengthen freedom, understanding, and friendship in the key nation of India.

We must all realize that foreign policy today is not only a question of politics but also a question of economics, finance, and propaganda. By the unwarranted delay of this Congress, we have greatly undercut the effectiveness of this legislation. The Soviets have again stolen a cheap victory by making shipments of wheat for pay, while legislative red tape has ensnarled our good intentions.

Frankly, Nehru has played fast and loose at this game. His public praise of this small Russian shipment, while ignoring our large shipments to date, is unworthy of him. There is little question but that some Indian leaders dislike, distrust, and fear the United States. They still are blind to the new arch-colonialism of the U. S. S. R.

An experienced and shrewd observer, now in the Far East, has just written me from India to the following effect: Nehru's influence is waning and his party will have its troubles in the coming election. While he is regarded everywhere as a great individual and a truly noble man, he has been slow to tackle the great problems facing his nation. His policies are beginning to be questioned in India and throughout the Far East, and he will have to start delivering deeds instead of speeches.

The newly established nation of India is hypersensitive and has an almost morbid dread of being pressured. They see affronts when none are intended. This national touchiness is something we should understand if we would be world effective. Nehru, like many political candidates the world over prior to election, uses methods that play to local pride. It is ironical that those who holler the loudest about foreign influence in our policies become shocked when a Nehru or a Bevan raise the same cry in their own nations.

We must be mature enough as a leader not to allow ourselves to be touchy and irritable when some other nation shows a deviation from our stand and our policies. We cannot lose our heads with hot retaliation and retort. In the present complicated world situation, no individual or nation is infallible.

Today we should be thinking of the starving millions of India instead of Nehru. The 2,000,000 bushels of wheat are for the India masses. Let us not deny life to these millions and then, self-righteously, blame their stavation on Nehru's statements. Let us not lose the good will and love of the Indian people. By defeating this bill we would lose a great opportunity. Not to send the wheat after all our palaver and motions would be a great blow to United States world standing.

I am against imposing conditions in this bill, not only because of India's self-respect, but our own self-respect. Are the policies and principles of the great United States going to be achieved by wringing concessions out of a starving people? Instead of gratitude, we would incur hatred.

India adopted its policy of an embargo on exports of raw materials of atomic energy in 1946—long before it faced its present food crisis. This country, too, has a similar embargo on such raw materials. Our Nation would resent having a change in our atomic energy policies forced upon us. Are we justified, then, in resenting India's wanting to keep her atomic energy policies intact. As for manganese, we have received more than the lion's share of India's production of this strategic material.

The eyes of the entire world are always focused on what we do in this Chamber. Some of us are annoyed with that fact—bothered that our actions have repercussions in all corners of the earth and that there are calculated risks in what we do. But I would remind this House that, in the words of George Eliot, "no great deed is done by falterers who ask for certainty." In contrast to those who waver, there are people who are thankful that we are looked to for leadership, for guidance, and for help. Are we not telling the world that our Americanism has more than promises to offer, while communism promises everything, gives nothing, and destroys all freedom? Will it be in the general welfare of the United States if the troubled world should turn to communism, or is it in our welfare that they should look to our great American principles in action? Those are the questions that go to the very essence of our foreign policy. If we do not lead, no other free nation can take our place. That is certain. If we do not lead, communism, ever poised, will rush into the vacuum created by our abdication.

We no longer live in the carefree times when we can ignore the rest of the planet, or when the rest of the world can ignore us. The objective of the Soviet Government has been to discredit the United States, to undermine American prestige everywhere, and to present a viciously false picture of America, Americans, and American principles. Let us not by our conduct deliberately play into the hands of the Kremlin. Yes, we may be annoyed that we have reached a position of leadership. But how critical for the world it would be should communism take the lead.

Our world, as far as experience and range of activities are concerned, has expanded astronomically. Human relationships have been modified on a global scale. Contacts between peoples in the remotest areas have become possible. Their culture, politics, philosophy, and strategy have repercussions on all other peoples—and so do their actions.

There are three factors which sustain the world leadership of our Nation in its relations with other countries. The first is our power—our great natural resources, our great wealth, our military

might, our productive capacity, our genius in creating the material things which make life more comfortable. The second is our spiritual voice—the understanding by the rest of the world what the United States is all about. The third is our heart. It is the American heart whereby we demonstrate that what we say we believe in and that what we do is to be exercised for the common good of all mankind. The true yardstick of our greatness lies in our faith by deeds. We should be proud of our generosity. I do not mean that our generosity is always appreciated. We do not always get a quid pro quo for our generosity. A truly generous person does not expect appreciation. But the point I want to make is that America is respected for her actions of generosity—her faith by deeds.

To me, the India relief bill represents another opportunity to express ourselves within an expanding framework of rich traditions, traditions which all freedom-loving peoples everywhere in the world can only respect.

What has made America great? It has been our dedication to the great principles adopted by our founding fathers and nurtured by great Americans ever since. It is America's spiritual power. This was beautifully expressed by William Tyler Page in his The American's Creed:

> I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

This creed was accepted by this House on behalf of the people of America on April 3, 1918. Is this House going to live up to that creed by responding to a humanitarian appeal? Or is the creed going to be cast aside? Are we going to demonstrate our faith in American principles by deeds? This is the fundamental challenge of the bill for relief to India. In the words of Vergil in his Aeneid, "And do we still hesitate to extend our renown by deeds?"

With the widening of our responsibilities, our belief in ourselves must become stronger and more vigorous. Now is the time to renew our faith in our own institutions as a world force and to regain the sense of national spiritual purpose which gives vitality and confidence to life, whether of individuals or the whole Nation. Spiritual power is the key to America's greatness. Spiritual power is the ultimate key to the world's ills. We have that power. We have only to exercise it. As a Nation, we must set peace and freedom for all as our goals, believe in them and find a way to achieve these objectives. The true wealth of the United States is this spiritual power—if we will only use it.

The far eastern policy of our Government has been the object of a great barrage of criticism. Our policy in that area is negative, it has no substance, no direction, it is said. But many who hurl this criticism are the very ones who raise their hands in horror whenever a positive step forward is proposed. The India relief bill is such a step. It will be proof positive that when America talks about freedom and security and brotherhood for the Far East, we mean what we say.

To go through with this program is an answer to Kremlin-inspired propaganda in the Far East. If we should fail to heed the call of suffering India, we will be accused by the teeming millions of Asia of failing to live up to the principles of our western civilization. They will consider our western civilization as a sham and a mockery and they will be compelled to look elsewhere. We will have failed them by our lack of example—by our lack of faith by deeds.

But there has always been starvation in India, and there always will be, say the faint-hearted objectors. I would say to them that although this bill is designed to meet the immediate food crisis in India, the original bill attempted to strike at the causes which in the past have produced famines there. I refer to the counterpart-fund mechanism. This represents the highest form of charity. Under the terms of that bill, India would have put up her own currency equivalent to the revenue she gets from the sale of the food grains supplied by the United States. These local currency funds would be used for know-how and show-how projects—irrigation, increasing production, all the techniques of modern agricultural methods. Not only could these counterpart funds have been used to increase food production, but also strategic materials for the mutual benefit of the United States and India. That bill was a right start in the right direction. The original bill represented the highest form of charity. I am thinking of the immortal words of Moses Ben Maimon, better known as Maimonides, who back in the twelfth century outlined the eight categories of charity.

> The eighth—

He said—

> and the most meritorious of all, is to anticipate charity, by preventing poverty; namely, to assist the reduced fellow-man, either by a considerable gift, or a sum of money, or by teaching him a trade, or by putting him in the way of business, so that he may earn an honest livelihood, and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding out his hand for charity. * * * This is the highest step and the summit of charity's golden ladder.

To salvage part of this program, I shall support the Mundt amendment. It is a step forward in the exercise of the far-sighted leadership which the world has come to expect of the United States. It is a realistic approach and at the same time it is an unselfish approach. It is true that under the bill now under consideration interest payments on this loan will have to be made by India, but under the amendment these payments will be used for the benefit of India. The payments will, in effect, constitute a sort of counterpart fund, and will accomplish many of the features of the counterpart-fund mechanism, now a well-established feature of our legislative policy.

The impulse behind this amendment is the desire to share with India, for India's benefit, our technical know-how, particularly in the field of agriculture which is so important to her because of her food needs. Some work along these lines is now being done, although on a very limited scale, through missionary institutions and other voluntary relief agencies in various parts of India, such as the Catholic and Protestant missionaries, the Salvation Army, American Friends Service Committee, CARE, and a number of others. Subsection (a) of this amendment will enable these organizations to continue and broaden their magnificent educational and philanthropic work on behalf of the people of India. In subsection (b) of the amendment, there is proposed a program with which the Congress is familiar. It is a program based on the fundamental necessity for technical training and education of foreign students here in the United States so that they will have not only the benefit of our instruction and training and educational facilities to use back home, but also an understanding of American institutions. Subsection (b) will enable qualified students from India to come to the United States and engage in the type of studies which when applied back in India can help immeasurably in cutting down on future famines and national disasters. It will fit neatly into the pattern of congressional assistance for Chinese students, Iranian students, and Finnish students. Subsection (c) will enable the United States to send to India scientific, technical, and literary books, as well as laboratory and technical equipment and the interchange of such material between the two countries. This is the type of program the Congress has consistently supported and it should be extended here.

But supposing we should fail to give any food to India now. Supposing, as a result of the internal upheavals following in the wake of the widespread famine, communism should take over in India. The irony of such a situation would be that the objectors, who are anti-Communists, would, by their short-sighted failure to act in a time of crisis, have helped topple India into the power of the Kremlin.

In these days of global storm and stress, I would say that the one thing we need most of all, as a matter of pure enlightened self-interest, is friendship—good will. Can anyone in this House maintain that the good will of the people of India is not in the general welfare of the United States? To say so shows no comprehension of the struggle we face. I would say that he has no comprehension of the reasons behind our failure in the Far East. I would say that such a person does not understand that we must buttress our fast talk with fast deeds. We must reinforce man's faith in human brotherhood, in western civilization, and in the spiritual values which have made America great.

So, in considering this bill, let us turn for guidance to our noble American traditions, to the faith by deeds which has made our country strong, and let us be

constantly aware of the great struggle in which we are now engaged to preserve these traditions against the most perfidious threat free people have ever known. Let us give succor to those who look to our spiritual values.

Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days.

Under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD by including an editorial from the Manchester (Conn.) Evening Herald of May 18, 1951:

WHY DO THIS TO OURSELVES?

We suppose most of the Members of Congress, and too many of the people of this country, think we are determining the Communist or non-Communist future of Asia by our fighting in Korea and the strategy employed in it.

It is entirely possible that there is much more decision about the future of Asia—or at least about the future of our own prestige and leadership in Asia—involved in the relatively minor matter of wheat for India.

This issue is a battlefield, too. It is the battlefield on which we, by our own action, are going to determine how the people of Asia feel about us, whether they think of us in the role of the big, helpful brother, or think of us in the role of rough, would-be master. It is the mind of Asia which is one of the great stakes in the world today. And the danger we run, in our hodge-podge of policies, in the imperialistic recommendations of some noted Americans, is that we shall become the pet aversion of that Asiatic mind, instead of its favorite friend.

Issues which become tests of our attitude attain, then, an importance beyond their own realistic significance. Wheat for India has become one of those issues, a test of our attitude and thinking toward an Asiatic people. Perhaps the basic test involved is not so much what we do, as how we do it.

On this issue we are giving ourselves one disheartening defeat after another. We seem perversely determined to place ourselves in the worst possible light. We are fiddling and fadding our way along from one narrow, ungenerous point of view to another still worse. Action in the Senate Wednesday brought the bill for wheat to India into the worst form yet—all loans and no gift, and a demand for atomic materials from India written in.

It would have been better for us, and cleaner for our reputation, if we had said "no" many weeks ago. Such a clean refusal on our part would have been better for us than our current effort to say a yes which includes, however, so much obvious bias against India and so much congressional distaste for the proposition itself. We have taken something which began as a charitable, humanitarian proposal and we are steadily translating it into something progressively shabbier. One would think, as the hates and prejudices and narrowness of Congressmen exhibit themselves in this issue become so symbolic, that we were deliberately trying to set ourselves back in the world to affect our own abrupt withdrawal from the war for men's minds.

There is of course no such deliberate attempt. What is happening, unfortunately, is that we are letting our own poisons come to a most unlucky dominance of our handling of an issue which has become symbolic. We are batting India around, in our legislative by-play, as if it were a senseless rubber ball. The world watches, and Asia is forming a mental image of American. How could we do this to ourselves?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I agree with the splendid statement made by the able gentleman from Connecticut, a hard-working member of our committee. I personally believe there will be great gratitude, good will, and appreciation in India toward the United States, but even if there should not be, the main purpose of the bill is not to win good will; the main purpose is to help this new republic remain independent.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. And that in itself will be a tremendous benefit or reimbursement to the United States of America.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes.

I may say to the gentleman that all you have to do is to look at the map and see that India is a great subcontinent of 350,000,000 people. Many people talk about the large cost of this bill to the United States of $190,000,000. I wonder what it would be worth to the United States of America, as a practical proposition, if we could but stop for 1 year India from going Communist; 1 year, let us say, or even a week or a month that these 350,000,000 people should not now be added to the 800,000,000 people under Communist domination.

Mr. JUDD. To put it the other way, how much more than the cost of this bill would it cost the taxpayers of the United States if the Government of India should be weakened and go down and the Communists take over, and then all southeast Asia with its tin and rubber and oil and spices and other commodities which are essential to our economy and also essential to prosperous world trade and commerce.

Mr. RIBICOFF. If India went Communist, the whole great Eurasian island would at that stage be in complete control of Soviet imperialism. With China and India added to the Communist orbit it would be absolutely impossible for any other nation or any other peoples in that vast area to hold out against communism. I believe that those who have any understanding of geopolitics will realize that anyone getting control of that great Eurasian island—and with that would go Africa, which is part of it—will mean the control of the world. Certainly as a policy for the general welfare of the United States we must do everything possible to save that great Eurasian island from complete Communist domination.

Mr. JUDD. So that our choice in this bill is not between the cost of this bill and something less; our choice is between the cost of this bill and something much more.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Absolutely.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is an understanding Member of this body. Does he not believe it to be the height of folly to think that we can buy India off of communism by either giving her or lending her $190,000,000?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do not think we can buy any country and I do not propose this loan as a question of buying that country.

Mr. COX. One more question. Does the gentleman, from the information that he has, not agree that to all intents and purposes India had already embraced communism, less the element of violence involved in the Russian system?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do not, sir. I would say to the gentleman from Georgia that a close study of the Indian situation and the events surrounding that country indicate that India has stronger laws to suppress communism than the United States of America. The Government of India under its laws can throw a Communist in jail without habeas corpus or without trial.

Mr. COX. Let me ask the gentleman this further question. Is it not the information of the gentleman that the wise men of India, who represent India in an official capacity, are now accusing the United States and abusing the United States for resisting Communist China, and have they not said and have they not defended China's turning to Russia upon the ground that they have the same philosophy, and therefore it is necessary that in time of stress China should have turned to Russia?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman has made a frank statement and I shall give the gentleman a frank reply. I think that Nehru himself, and some of the men in his government, are just as misguided about world conditions as many men in the United States, including this House. As many people in this House do not realize that we have a single world so Nehru does not realize that this is a single world. Nehru is under the belief that he can maintain a third force, an area of neutralism. Nehru sets himself up in the role of a new guiding force to gather the people around him and around India, to hold them up against the United States and Russia. That is a role that Nehru seeks for himself. I do not think that Nehru will prevail in those ideas. I think it will become understood by Nehru, too, that once China is completely in the orbit of Soviet Russia, their turn will come next and, as I said, this experienced observer who has just written me from India says there is great dissatisfaction in India among thinking people because of his policies which they realize can only lead to ultimate disaster. So I would say to the gentleman that certainly because Nehru may be misguided, because Nehru may be wrong, we should not condemn 350,000,000 people to starvation. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia would not want to be associated with many of the ideas propounded by people in positions of authority in this country. Why under the same circumstances should you place on the 350,000,000 Indians the apparent dislike of the philosophy and the ideas of Nehru, who happens to be in power in India today?

Mr. COX. If anybody in India has the right to speak for India it is Nehru; is that not so?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Nehru is the official, executive head of the Government. The answer is yes.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman understand that Nehru takes the position that India's enemy No. 1 is the imperialistic west and not Communist Russia?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say that Nehru is trying to play both ends against the middle. I think Nehru is going to be disillusioned.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman prepared to defend the accusation that Nehru is pro-Communist?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No, I do not think Nehru is pro-Communist. I think I have just a little understanding of the Asiatic mind. I should like to propound this idea to the gentleman. Nehru at the present time has a country, which he is governing, that is very close to the borders of Communist geographical and actual power. I suppose that if there were an invasion, Nehru could not do very much about it. I suppose that as the head of India he is trying not to incur the displeasure of Russia. I think in the long run what will happen to Nehru will happen to every nation that thinks it can play "footsie" with Russian imperialism. That is why I make the point that we have to understand his geographical position. We have to understand that basically, from a religious standpoint and from a moral standpoint, the people of India are anti-Communist. We certainly should do nothing to drive India into the hands of the Communists.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman is not in position to concede the pro-communism of Nehru, then is he prepared to admit that Nehru's son-in-law is a violent Communist?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say that I do not know whether Nehru's son-in-law is a violent Communist or not, but again I would say, I would dislike to have the responsibility as an individual and also to help with the responsibility as a nation to condemn 350,000,000 people on the fact of whether Nehru's son-in-law is or is not a Communist.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman from Georgia has said that some of the leaders of thought of India and perhaps Mr. Nehru himself have said that their No. 1 enemy is western imperialism. I think it is understandable that they should still consider that their No. 1 enemy, because it is that with which they have had first-hand experience for several centuries. They have been softer toward communism because of its attractive promises and because they have not had first-hand experience with it. But it has been the universal experience of all people that when they come up against the realities of communism they have found it to be not less of an enemy but a greater enemy.

After all, it took our Government 23 years to learn what the Government of China discovered in March of 1927 about the nature, objectives, and methods of communism in Asia. If it took us until June 25 of last year to wake up to the true nature of communism in Asia, we have to give Nehru a few more weeks or months in which to wake up, too. When he is faced with the realities of communism at home as he has been recently within his own country, he has thrown them into jail ruthlessly. He is reported to have had 17,000 Communists in concentration camps, which is more than there ever were in jail in China. So I do not believe the present softness of Nehru toward communism in other countries about which the gentleman from Georgia is worrying, will long be a real cause for fear. Nehru will learn too, I hope in time. We are only trying, if we can, to keep India independent until they learn from their own experience where their best friends and their greatest enemies are.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman is exactly right. I would say that few people in the House of Representatives understand the oriental mind as well as the gentleman who just spoke. I think it behooves all of us in the House to have a little humbleness and humility about the great complicated problems facing the world. None of us has all the answers.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. YATES. With reference to Nehru's son-in-law, does not the gentleman know of a partner in the House of Morgan whose son is an acknowledged Communist in our own country?

Mr. RIBICOFF. So I have heard.

Mr. YATES. I certainly think that member of the house of Morgan is not influenced by the thinking of his son.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question, however, Is not India in a turmoil today in the sense that perhaps General MacArthur spoke about when he addressed the joint meeting of the Congress when he pointed out the tremendous movement of the people which is taking place in Asia? And is not Nehru himself sitting on top of this perhaps revolutionary crest so that at any moment he may tumble and some new government may come into power which more carefully expresses the wishes of the Indian people? And further, is it not true that in the event we do not pass this bill, we may well drive the masses of those people away from this country?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the gentleman. I yield to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would like to say to the gentleman presently addressing the committee that I have great respect for his opinions, although I may not always agree with him. Reference has been made, or the gentleman himself made reference to the fact that unless we come to the aid of the Indian people at this time there is this threat of communism. Of course we have heard that argument on many, many occasions here on the floor of the House. I am wondering whether there is anything in the record before us to indicate that if this grain does not go to India, that India will go communistic. How do you feel about the matter?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would reply to the gentleman in this way. No, there is not anything in the record, but I think all of us who are studying the question of world movements and who are studying the question of communism and studying the question of peoples, have the realization that some of the things that breed communism are hunger, disease, hopelessness, and sickness. I think the Speaker of the House, in the short time of 3 minutes that he had to speak, very ably explained that. Certainly I do not think that although you may expect one person to go hungry you can expect a nation to commit national suicide or suffer national starvation.

If a hungry man who has nothing and who knows nothing about ideas or ideals feels he will get relief by embracing communism, he will embrace communism. Now, certainly that, too, may be an empty gesture, but if position A means nothing to him what is he to lose by embracing idea B? Absolutely nothing. Certainly if we in America are willing to condemn the rest of the world to starvation and hunger, we ourselves not only are forfeiting our position of great world leaders, but I would say it would mean we are voluntarily turning over the rest of the world to communism in a very, very easy way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to make just a brief observation in response to the very pointed and proper question raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I was chairman of a special committee to investigate communism and nazism 15 years ago. That does not mean to say that I am any specialist on those problems, but like all of us we have studied, and every one of us in the House of Representatives has definite views as a result of his studies in the performance of his duties. But it seems to me that from a world-wide angle, looking at communism as an ideology, it has no appeal in the moral field. It has only an appeal to the warped mind. It has no appeal as a school of political science. Certainly by the natural law we all want the same freedom and some of the fruits of our efforts. We inherit certain things that man does not give us which come from God himself through the natural law. Those things can be suppressed, but never destroyed. It is in the economic field as the gentleman from Connecticut has so ably and brilliantly referred to that communism is widespread and that it is as a result of economic difficulties and sickness, as the gentleman pointed out, that communism plants its seeds.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would like to add a footnote to what the distinguished majority leader has said. I am unwilling to say that only a materialistic approach and an economic approach is what will defeat communism. I do not think you are ever, as a nation, going to be able to guide world opinion unless we advance an ideal around which the world can rally. As I look at this bill

it is not a question of economics, but a question of whether America has the spiritual force and the spirit itself to pass this. Only thus can we show the world that we understand the spiritual factors of life and not only the material facts of life.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the so-called India Assistance Act, H. R. 3791.

I believe that an American citizen is entitled to use as he pleases the fruits of his labors beyond the tax levies required for essential governmental services and the defense of his country.

Also, I believe that every American, Christian or non-Christian, who believes in human brotherhood has an individual responsibility to help alleviate suffering as his necessities permit.

Those who practice this belief can make their gifts through the appropriate agencies to relieve starvation in India. They should do that in accordance with the direction of their own conscience.

As a Member of Congress, I cannot persuade myself that I have the right, let alone the competence, to make compulsory levies on other people for charitable purposes.

Most Christians I know would rebel if their pastor would arbitrarily assess them as he saw fit for specific foreign-mission charities.

For political officeholders to arrogate such power to themselves completely removes such action from the realm of Christian charity.

The whole business then becomes a sleazy mixture of power politics behind the mask of Christian brotherhood.

Mr. Chairman, contributions for charity and humanitarian purposes must be voluntary or they cease to be charity. It is just that simple.

We should not usurp the responsibility of the churches, even though we are urged by many religious leaders to do so.

Mr. Chairman, if you get friends by buying them with loans or gifts, Russia and China should be among our best friends today.

Conscript charity, and that is exactly what this bill attempts, can achieve no good in the long run. It never has done so. It never will do so.

This House should not kid itself, should not confuse this issue by pretending that it is practicing Christian charity.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I do not know anywhere in the bill or the committee report where it is suggested that this is Christian charity or any other kind of charity.

Mr. BUFFETT. Would the gentleman contend that the debate on this bill has not been flavored all the way through with the claim that this is a charitable responsibility of ours?

Mr. JUDD. I do not think that has been the major point at all. I agree with the gentleman that while he is justified in using his money for his charity, and I am justified in using my money for mine, I am not justified in using his money, collected by taxes, for my charity. If that were what this program is, I could not vote for it. Again and again and again it has been said that this is a case where what our hearts prompt us to do coincides with what is in the interest of our country, world order, and peace for us to do. Those are the controlling objectives of this program. This is not solely or primarily a charitable operation.

Mr. BUFFETT. Then it becomes a question of whether or not we can make a loan and thereby secure friends?

Mr. JUDD. No. I have to disagree that it is an operation whose primary purpose is to secure friends. I do not think you can buy friends. The purpose is to help a young, struggling government whose independence is important to our security to maintain that independence.

Mr. BUFFETT. I would suggest to the gentleman that the record of the last 10 years does not give much encouragement to the belief that you can either bribe people to be your friends or buy people to be your friends.

I recall a little verse I saw in a cigar store when I was a paper boy at the age of 12, a verse that it took me a while to understand, will give the answer to this proposal from that standpoint.

It ran like this: "I loaned money to three friends; I lost the three friends, also the money. I have decided to lose no more friends."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman recalls the American Revolution when that great patriot of France and America, Lafayette, not only helped out but came here and helped, that in gratitude to the great Lafayette at a time when our republic was being founded and we were in difficulty, we have his picture right over here on the walls of the American Congress. So we certainly did not lose a friend, and we gained a republic.

Mr. BUFFETT. And Lafayette came voluntarily under his own decision as an individual.

Mr. FULTON. Of course, but it was the French fleet standing off Yorktown that permitted us to beat the British.

Mr. BUFFETT. I will tell you this, that I am not going to try to deceive my people by making them think that I am generous and Christian by voting away their savings.

To me there is nothing generous or Christian in voting other people's money away for handouts and levying taxes on people who are having difficulty enough under present circumstances to pay their own bills.

I just cannot vote more taxes on them for what is proposed as Christian charity. For 10 years I have seen our money being lent out with results that have generally been unsatisfactory and in some cases disastrous.

Mr. FULTON. Although I disagree with the gentleman I compliment him on the integrity of his opinion.

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I should like to say to the House that much talk of strategic materials has been brought into this discussion with particular reference to manganese, monazite, and uranium. I would remind the Members that the gentleman who is about to address the committee—the membership knows this already but I want to impress it upon them—is vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy created under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, and he is the chairman of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of strategic materials. I know of no Member of this House who has really done more for national defense in his quiet, modest, and determined way than the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I simply want to corroborate everything the gentleman from South Carolina has said with respect to the capacity of the gentleman from North Carolina in connection with this problem of critical materials and its relationship to the atomic-energy program.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman from New York very much.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing this measure today I think probably, as has been mentioned here on the floor of the House by other members of the committee, that the important matter is, of course, trying to build friendship and security for our country. It is obtained not when all risk has been excluded but when risk has been brought into rational balance with the ends which we hope to gain. A free country, of course, always has to make certain changes for the sake of maintaining freedom that a communistic country does not have to take. So in discussing this issue here before us today, may I say that to us as Americans our aim is friendship. We often become disappointed when friendship is not returned to us immediately.

Mr. Chairman, this measure goes far beyond just the Indians. I do not believe this country will ever adopt a policy of moral isolationism. So it reaches far beyond the shores of India and approaches the hearts of other people in other lands. The action we take here, in my opinion, is going to be very far reaching.

I do not care to discuss the characters involved in this issue because I do not feel I know enough about their own personal life to say what type of individuals today are ruling India. So the matter I primarily want to discuss here is the matter of materials.

We today are using thorium in our operations in connection with atomic

energy. I thought it would be of some benefit to the House and the members of the committee to know the use and the domestic sources and foreign sources of this material, and also some of the restrictions that we have thrown about fissionable material by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

We adopted in that act a policy, and made it the law of the land, that no fissionable material shall be exported; also we placed a heavy fine upon individuals who violated that act—5 years imprisonment and a $10,000 fine. So we did practically the same thing that we are accusing India of doing, placing an embargo on fissionable material. We did that in 1946. So I do not think we should blame India for trying to protect her own material.

The Commission today under the act is authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire any fissionable material or any interest therein outside the United States or any interest in facilities for the production of this material or any real property on which such facilities are located, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the revised statutes, title 41, section 5, upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security or upon a showing that an advertising is not reasonably practicable and partial and advance payments may be made under contracts for such purposes.

Today negotiations are going on and have been for some time past in an effort to acquire this material which the Atomic Energy Commission today has the authority to acquire. Negotiations are at present going on. I cannot go into the details of all these negotiations that have been had, but I can say to the House and to the committee that progress, in my opinion, is being made. So that I am not concerned so much about that as I am about the three other materials which they are today shipping to this country—magnesium, monazite, mica, and some others in a small amount.

The following data is pertinent to the current debate on uses and availability of monazite sands:

First. Domestic sources: The principal domestic source currently in operation is at McCall, Idaho, operated by the Warren Dredging Co. for the Rare Earths Development Co. Production is now at about 50 tons per month and is expected to rise rapidly to a rate of 3,500 tons per year by the end of 1951 and to reach 5,000 tons per year in 1952. Other domestic sources in Florida, the Carolinas, and other areas are smaller and not economically operable in the present circumstances.

Second. Foreign sources: India and Brazil are the two principal producers of high-grade monazite sands. Both have embargoes on shipments, but the nature of the embargoes differs. India flatly forbids shipments of the ore, but would permit shipment of the refined products other than thorium if a plant were constructed in India to produce such products. Brazil forbids shipments in response to individual private contracts. It specifically permits shipments on the basis of Government and Government negotiations, but does not yet have the administrative machinery in operation to process requests for such negotiations. A request for negotiation has been made by the United States Government, but is not technically pending because of the absence of the necessary machinery. The Brazilian Government has been notified, however, of the United States interest in conducting negotiations at the earliest opportunity. A processing plant with an actual output of 150 tons per month of undifferentiated rare earth products is in operation in Brazil and sells its products on the open free world markets. Part of the output of this plant is currently imported by private United States commercial enterprises, including the Cerium Metals Corp., a manufacturer of lighter flints and special products.

Third. Thorium uses: Thorium has limited historical commercial uses, such as gas-lamp mantles. It is now a controlled element in the United States under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 because thorium is convertible, through the addition of nuclear particles, to uranium—isotope 233—which is fissionable and is usable both in atomic weapons and in production of power, as well as for byproducts. Major facilities to effect this conversion of thorium are not now in existence although experimental programs directed toward such conversion are in progress. Existing industrial and Government inventories are adequate for those firm requirements now in hand. Prospects for domestic production support estimates of thorium requirements at later dates.

Fourth. Rare earth uses: The Munitions Board has listed the following among the uses of rare earths: Searchlight-arc carbons; gasoline-lamp mantles; radio tubes; radio condensers; aerial photographic lenses; optical glass itself, as well as a polishing medium for glass; colored eyeglasses; lighter flints; military pyrotechnics; as a scavenger in the production of explosives; as a purifier in certain alloy steels; and in the new cerium-magnesium alloy for jet engines. The latter reference is to experimental alloys now undergoing tests but not in any engines in normal military jet service.

Fifth. Annual consumption: The Munitions Board has stated that "normal United States annual requirements amount to approximately 3,000 tons of monazite." Other estimates of requirements up to 3,500 tons per year have been received.

Sixth. Market prices: Because of the small volume of world trade in monazite sands, an accurate market price is essentially nonexistent. The Bureau of Mines has reported a figure of $245 per metric ton, 65 percent rare earth oxides in 1949. Reports of Brazilian sales up to the end of 1950, when the embargo stopped shipments there, have gone as high as $365 per metric ton.

SUMMARY

Domestic monazite sands production is scheduled to exceed domestic consumption of contained products by the end of 1951. Foreign sources are limited by embargo on the ore in India and a requirement that only government-to-government shipments are permissible from Brazil. Refined products are available from Brazil on the open market. Statements before the India Congress indicate that all products except thorium oxide will be available out of Indian production in the event that a production plant is constructed.

Domestic consumption of the products of monazite sands are between 3,000 and 3,500 tons of ore equivalent per year.

What I am primarily concerned about today is manganese, beryl, and kyanite, which is the principal one. Manganese, today, in my opinion, is far more important to us than any thorium in India or anywhere else in the world, because it is used in the production of steel. We have to have it. We are producing around 110,000,000 tons of steel today and expect to up that.

The amount of manganese we are importing from India and the price which we are paying for it remain entirely satisfactory, according to Mr. Walsh, Director of the Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration. In my opinion, he is one of the best men in the Federal Government today. While it is true that a large part of the manganese being imported from India is going to private industry, this does not mean we are not getting it for the stockpile, because it is as necessary to go into industry as into the stockpile, and probably more so at this time.

Beryl is one of the metals we use considerably in developing atomic energy. While it is true that we would like to import more beryl from India and everywhere else, we continue to get as much now as we have in the past, and it cannot be said that the changes in the international situation have in any way prejudiced the amount of beryl which we continue to import from India. It also should be pointed out that there are other sources from which we can and do import beryl. These are reasonably good supply sources and should meet our demands for this strategic material for the next year.

Kyanite is very essential. It is the metal that is used to line the high B. t. u. electric magnetic steel furnaces today. You simply have to have it.

India is a source of large deposits of kyanite. We started more than a year ago trying to assist those mines in every way we could to aid production. However, the fact that we are able to import so little of it from India is no reflection upon the attitude of the Indian Government toward this Government. The facts are that the meager supply is attributed to extremely bad management and the operation of the mines. We have know that for almost 2 years.

In addition to the three items above enumerated, some mention should be made of monazite sands. Unfortunately, attention has been concentrated on monazite sands, where in my opinion it should not be concentrated. Suppose that India slaps an embargo on manganese, beryl, and kyanite. In my opin-

ion, it would be far worse than an embargo on monazite sand.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may answer his argument on the feasibility of setting up a plant in India to process monazite sand. May I say to the gentleman that the governments that have investigated this question have found that the processing of monazite sand in India is an economic impossibility.

One grain of sand contains 16 elements.

Mr. DURHAM. Twenty.

Mr. COX. All right; I will accept the amendment.

The chemistry is to break up the one grain and extract each element separately. Any chemist will tell you that that is extremely complicated chemistry, particularly when doing it on a mass-production basis.

As to the availability of raw materials, to do this chemistry all the chemical acids and all the alkalis are required. India does not produce all the mineral acids and does not produce any of the alkalis, which means that certain materials would have to be shipped from the United States for the operation of a plant in India. The cost would be increased to a prohibitive point.

At the Lindsay Light & Chemical Co. plant, where monazite sand is processed, there rolls a tank car of caustic soda each morning. Every second morning there comes in a tank car of muriatic acid.

There comes into the plant daily acids to the total amount of 400,000 pounds.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman's argument is nil because he knows and I know that there is enough technical skill in this country to operate any kind of plant.

Mr. COX. I am glad the gentleman has made that observation, because to locate a plant in India we would have to ship to that country the entire territory of West Chicago.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was very much interested in the emphasis the gentleman placed on manganese. I come from a part of the country where most of the manganese produced in this country is mined. We produce in this country just about 10 percent of our manganese needs. We have to depend for the other 90 percent on our imports. Is it not true that we get most of our manganese from India? And is it not further true that we get in excess of three-quarters of India's production at a reasonable price, besides?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes, at about 40 percent at the present time. And as the gentleman well knows, the world's supplies primarily have come from Russia for the last 100 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. At the present time, of course, that is all out.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As a member of the Atomic Energy Committee as well as the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I want to align myself with the statement the gentleman made in regard to the rare earths and monazite elements which he has spoken of. As a matter of fact, all of this big hullabaloo on the subject of the monazite sands is being raised by one company, one commercial company in the United States, which has a monopoly on the importation of monazite sands from India, or at least they did have a monopoly up until some time ago. The Indian Government asked that a plant be set up in their own country to process these sands. They have a perfect right under their government to ask that their industry be established in their country. Because this company in the United States is at loggerheads with the Indian Government, they have caused this great hullabaloo, and as the gentleman has repeatedly said, the subject of monazite sands is not anywhere near as important. It is used in research in the atomic program, it is true; but there are other sources of it. The real problem of importance, as far as minerals are concerned, is the problem of obtaining manganese and mica and kyanite, which we are getting from India.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman who has just spoken needs some information in the interest of accuracy.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, for 29 years I have been very particularly interested in India. I happen to have followed their philosophy a good deal, and I think I may know perhaps a little more about that part of their life, at least, than some of the other Members of the House of Representatives. I have also followed the life of Mr. Nehru very closely for the last 29 years. He is a young man of considerable promise. He got rather a bad start in life by being jailed by the British Government of India which was then in power. I believe he spent at least 3 or 4 years in jail altogether because of his communistic leanings, even at that time, and his violent anti-British policies which he advocated. He was brought up as a boy and educated in Moscow. He is a Communist. Make no mistake about that. So far as his people are concerned, you cannot help but feel sorry for them. They have been downtrodden, living on a high plateau there for four or five thousand years. Part of that plateau is arid. Large rivers run in deep canyons, so that it is not very easy to irrigate this land. As a matter of fact, in all probability no one will ever be able to do anything which will help support the masses who live in that sun-baked central plateau of India. Its soil has not been enriched, and by reason of their religion, holding all animal life sacred so that they do not kill their cattle, they do not kill anything, not even the serpents which bite them, the flies or mosquitoes which sting them—all life is sacred. Even in this country, which is a great deal more fertile, we would have great difficulty in getting along if we held our animal life that sacred. We would find ourselves on short rations very soon, which no doubt will happen on account of the roll-back price on beef. However, that does not apply to pork and mutton here yet.

You should feel particularly sorry for these folk in India, too, from the standpoint of not knowing where to turn. They were more or less oppressed by their British overlords, although I have heard it frequently said—I am British-born, you know—I have heard it frequently said by British friends of mine that Britain poured more money into India than she ever took out, and that some of the Hindus that I have known in my life also felt that in an over-all way the occupation of India by Britain was a blessing. The fact remains that they have had famines. They always will have famines, so long as the majority of the people who live in that sun-baked plateau in the central part of India persist in living there. It just does not have the wherewithal to support human life. In some way they will either have to get out from there, as they have been doing for many thousands of years, to kingdom come, or begin again great migrations from the plains of India, which caused the birth of such nations as yours and mine, as they came out from those northern plains of India and surrounding countries and came down into Russia, into the Teutonic areas, and even down into Greece and Persia. They will have to do it again, or simply migrate to kingdom come, generation by generation.

You cannot blame India on account of the fact that wherever you look about them in Asia, they see the result of the great American double-cross. I am very much afraid you would have to give many hundred billions of tons of wheat as an object lesson to them, for them to forget what this country did to China, our friend. We have never had any particular friendship for India, nor have we had any enmity. We have been rather neutral toward them. They were under British domination and influence. But we did have friendship with China, and when the time came for helping the Nationalist Government in China, we gave them the double-cross. In many ways I do not blame Nehru for feeling about American capitalism, as he calls it, or American imperialism, as he apparently does feel. You cannot blame the man, but whether or not this gift or a loan of wheat is going to change that, I am unable to say. I doubt it.

I have been very much interested too in this thought, that a gift or loan of this wheat to India would—oh, it does not make much difference what you call it; you can call it buying friendship or buying them away from communism or persuading them; it does not make much

difference. The end result is the same. The question arises, Can you do it? Can you get anywhere?

One of the former speakers a few moments ago said that communism was bred in poverty. It is not too long ago since our J. Edgar Hoover testified that there were at least 50,000 Communists in the United States. If that be the case we should keep our wheat at home, should we not? Because we have at this time a greater percentage of Communists in the United States. The 50,000 does not by any means represent all there are; that may be all that Mr. Hoover could get his tabs on, but it does not by any means represent all the Communists and fellow travelers there are in these United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The Communists in this country were not made Communists by poverty.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I am just going to bring that out.

Mr. RANKIN. I have never seen a Communist in this country who was not well-fed, well-financed, well-housed, and well-dressed.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Correct, sir. We can take Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia was the European America; they were the Yankees of Europe. My wife and I happened to attend a sort of world's fair put on in Radio City, New York, three winters ago. That was just shortly before Czechoslovakia was taken over by the Communists. They had the very finest in the way of instruments and tools of all kinds and sorts, cured hams, clothing, woolen goods, glassware, microscopes, medical and surgical equipment the equal of ours. They were a rich country. Poverty surely never made Czechoslovakia Communist.

The thing that makes Communists is this international stuff, this one world business that gets out and teaches people here in the United States to forget their heritage, to forget the manner of people from which they came; that teaches them that citizenship in this country is not good enough, that we can produce the feed to supply everybody, to tell everybody how they shall govern their country; that we shall start out and build a little United States in every country, that this is the only type of government upon the face of the earth which is worth while starting anywhere. How nonsensical. Those of you who followed the procedings of the Kefauver Committee know that it is not too ideal. We have not made too much of a success of it and I would much rather see our Nation and other people permitted to do those things they desire, to set up their own government according to their own ideals. If we can help them, yes.

Now, let us come to this charity bill. This Nation in a narrow sense was not Christian; the name "Christ" does not occur in the Declaration of Independence or in the Constitution; now was it used in the Constitutional Convention; nor in fact does it yet appear in any of our State documents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. VORYS. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman say that the Declaration of Independence does not recognize the omnipotence of God?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. No; I said the name of Christ.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, wait a minute.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. That is what I said. I refuse to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, my friend.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I stated a fact, but do not attempt to take me beyond where I went. I will admit that most of the urgency now being put forth for this giving of wheat to India has come from the Christian churches of this country. No one is preventing them from using charity. I would be wholly in favor of that, and I think it is the duty of the Christian churches to dig down in their pockets and provide the money to buy the wheat to send to India. It is a fine idea and I am for it. I am not able to find anywhere in the Constitution of the United States where it says one word, or even gives a hint, that this Nation and this Congress have any right to give taxpayers' money to anyone for any purpose whatever except in payment of legitimate bills against the United States. It makes no provision for charity, even to our own people, much less to nationals of other countries.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, there is a time-honored tale that comes out of the Far East about a wise man who speaks to his disciple and remarks, "I hold before you a pane of glass. What do you see?"

The disciple looks through the pane of glass, and he says: "I see a kine in the pasture, the gently flowing river in the distance, the mountain far away, birds, and flowers, and trees."

Then the wise man takes away the pane of glass and holds before a young man a mirror, and he asks, "Now what do you see?"

The younger man says, "I can only see myself."

The wise man says, "See what a difference a little silver makes? You can only see yourself."

Now, do not let our wealth and our store of worldly goods cause us only to see ourselves. That is too often the effect with us. Let us see the grave danger that exists in India as the result of drought and floods and swarms of locusts and earthquakes that devastate the crops of India and may cause a ruthless famine in that country. Remember that only a few years ago over a million souls perished during a famine in Bengal. Do not see yourselves only, see what may happen to India because of these devastations.

The American people have always responded to the cry of suffering. The American people have always aided the hungry and granted relief from famine. It is part of our oldest tradition, and we cannot part from that tradition now. Grant—loan—half loan—at least act now before it is too late.

Famine conditions will soon become acute in India. The dead will need no food. Time is running out. Soon arms outstretched for help will grow limp, wilt away, and drop beside bellies swollen with hunger of people about to die. Let not Premier Nehru's seeming failure to recognize the niceties of the situation becloud the issue. Forgive his bad timing and his lack of diplomacy when he deprecates conditions that we might attach to any aid. Frankly, we attach no conditions—no burdensome conditions at least. Forgive even his exaggerating the Soviet offers of grain, because the greater issue is food for the starving, for the poor, and the lonely Hindustani.

And I say this to the gentleman who just preceded me: India is not in love with Russia, but, also, she is not entirely sold on the west, and I take emphatic exception to the statement made that Mr. Nehru is a Communist. He is an anti-Communist. I, too, have read the works of Nehru, and I have delved into the philosophy of Gandhi. I am a member of the India League, whose president, J. J. Singh, appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and made an eloquent plea for the passage of this bill. He will tell you, because to my mind he is a great expert on India in this country, that Nehru is not a Communist. He is recognized as the great exponent of peace and democracy. However, remember that Nehru lives across the street from Communist China. He feels the effect of the Communists in China and all the other Communists in countries around and about him. Some of us here this afternoon would want him continually to throw stones at his neighbors, to fight with them. But they forget what they would do with the Communists of China so near to them. But this bill is not a question of communism. The real issue here is starvation, and our duty to prevent starvation. Differences over foreign policy should not confound the issue. We should not withhold grains, nor should we exact any political concessions.

Oil will not mix with water, as you know; nor will human suffering mix with international politics. Let us not fall prey to the Soviet propaganda that American generosity undermines the independence of every country that accepts it. Also, the passage of this bill will not change the political views of the Indians. It will help us make friends.

Finally, one more story, if I may give it to you, to illustrate that we may be too late. The story is told about a beggar who accosts two men. One willingly gives, and the other haughtily disdains, and then suddenly the latter feels a tap on his shoulder. He turns around and sees it is the angel of death, and he rushes forward to make amends, to give

the beggar something. The angel of death says, "No; it is too late. One never repairs the holes of a ship after the ship has set out to sea." Let us not wait. It may be too late already. I do not want the finger of guilt to be pointed at us because we failed to respond.

Mahatma Gandhi, whose mantle has fallen upou Nehru, wisely said: "My patriotism is not an exclusive thing. It is all-embracing, and I should reject that patriotism which sought to mount upon the distress or the exploitation of other nationalities. The conception of my patriotism is nothing if it is not always, in every case, without exception, consistent with the broadest good of humanity at large."

In the name of that "patriotism"—"an all-embracing" patriotism—in the name of "broadest good of humanity," I ask for the passage of this bill.

I ask that, too, in the name of the delightful and charming and scholarly sister of Pandit Nehru, Madame Pandit, the Indian Ambassadoress to the United States. She has done so much to develop closeness between our nations, the democracy of India and the democracy of the United States. I rejoice in her friendship, and hope soon that the joyous tidings will reach her that this bill has passed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this piece of legislation. I regard it as humanitarian legislation which on the whole is calculated to strengthen the will of the people of India to resist Communist aggression and the subtler assaults of Communist infiltration. Of course I do not know how successfully it will fulfill these functions. There is plenty in the political leadership of Indian to give me pause and to cause me misgivings. Unfortunately there is plenty in the political leadership of the United States to give me pause and to cause me misgivings.

I hold in my hand two press releases, each dated May 17, 1951, both captioned Department of State. One press release is numbered 406 and the other is numbered 407. I do not know, but I infer that the numbers are serial numbers used in connection with State Department releases. No. 406 is an address by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, at the China Institute Dinner, Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, last Friday, May 18. No. 407 is an address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles at the same dinner. Both addresses are captioned "Chinese-American friendship." The releases have been supplied me by the State Department of which Mr. Rusk and Mr. Dulles are both responsible representatives. I have not the time to read you all of both addresses which were obviously calculated to attest Chinese-American friendship and I take it that there is no Member of this House that would not want to see warm and friendly relations established between this country and China. The difficulty is that the Chinese government in Peiping has fallen under the domination of Moscow.

Let me quote you a few passages from Mr. Rusk's admirable speech:

> American influence among the Chinese people is intolerable to those in power in Peiping and Moscow because they know, and quite rightly, that the idea of national and individual freedom which is at the heart of American political thought is the greatest threat to their own evil purposes.
>
> • • • • •
>
> The independence of China is gravely threatened. In the Communist world there is room for only one master—a jealous and implacable master, whose price of friendship is complete submission. • • • How many Chinese will remember in time the fates of Rajk, Kostov, Petkov, Clementis, and all those in other satellites who discovered that being Communist is not enough for the conspirators of the Kremlin?
>
> The freedoms of the Chinese people are disappearing. Trial by mob, mass slaughter, banishment as forced labor to Manchuria, Siberia, or Sinkiang, the arbitrary seizure of property, the destruction of loyalties within the family, the suppression of free speech—these are the facts behind the parades and celebrations and the empty promises.

Then he says in closing:

> But we can tell our friends in China that the United States will not acquiesce in the degradation which is being forced upon them. We do not recognize the authorities in Peiping for what they pretend to be. The Peiping regime may be a colonial Russian government—a Slavic Manchukuo on a larger scale. It is not the government of China. It does not pass the first test. It is not Chinese.
>
> • • • • •
>
> We recognize the National Government of the Republic of China, even though the territory under its control is severely restricted. We believe it more authentically represents the views of the great body of the people of China, particularly their historic demand for independence from foreign control. That government will continue to receive important aid and assistance from the United States.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that was a good speech. It was my idea of a good speech. Saturday morning I sat down and wrote a letter to Mr. Rusk with a thrill, complimenting him on the speech. I suspect, and the newspapers intimate, that hundreds, if not thousands, of Americans did the same thing.

The newspapers last Saturday morning came out with a statement that our policy toward the Nationalist Government had changed, that our whole Chinese policy had changed. David Lawrence had a piece yesterday in the Evening Star, which I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] put in the RECORD, calling attention to the fact that the new Chinese policy was highly moral, signaling a return to the tradition of John Hay, Wilson, and Hughes. It seems to me that the inferences our newspapers and the press generally drew from this speech were perfectly legitimate inferences.

But in this morning's paper Mr. Michael J. McDermott, the State Department press official, denies that there has been any change of policy or change in attitude toward China. He says this speech is simply a restatement of the deep and long-standing friendship between the Chinese and the American people. Mr. McDermott says that "to try to build these statements into far-reaching conclusions of involvement in the Chinese civil war is absolutely not justified."

Of course I do not know what Mr. McDermott's idea of "involvement" might be. But certainly there could be no franker statement of the fact than that in the Chinese Civil War we think the Nationalists are right and the Communists are wrong. That, of course, does not mean we are going to embark in a war on the Chinese mainland, which, despite some things which have been said irresponsibly here and there, nobody anywhere is in favor of doing. But the formal denial by Mr. McDermott in the official press release is nothing to the newspaper reports which say that, and I am reading a comment in this morning's Washington Post by Ferdinand Kuhn:

> The resulting atmosphere in some important Pentagon offices was as sulfurous as it used to be in the State Department when Air Force officers spoke likewise on their own.

The State Department declined to tell reporters whether Secretary Acheson had been consulted. Secretary Acheson was described as "hopping mad"—"leading foreign embassies are utterly bewildered. Their representatives will ask for explanations." And so on.

It seems to me that what the country is entitled to and certainly what the Congress is entitled to is to have these speeches of Mr. Rusk and Mr. Dulles plainly avowed as enunciating current American policy or authoritatively disavowed by the Secretary of State and the respective speakers disciplined for making unauthorized statements on a solemn occasion.

But I suspect the Secretary of State dislikes all these speeches, not because they are unauthorized, but because they have been extraordinarily popular. Mr. Rusk and Mr. Dulles have committed the ultimate sin. They said something that is absolutely true, just as General MacArthur said things that were absolutely true and incurred a penalty.

Last summer when the fighting broke out in Korea the President used language indicating that Formosa was to be protected. General MacArthur, in a letter to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, commended the President's words, and no sooner had General MacArthur commended the President's words, than the words were disavowed. Early in 1950 Secretary Acheson said that Formosa was outside the defense perimeter of the United States. Now that General MacArthur has come back, Secretary Marshall has stated a precisely contrary view. This Rusk episode is more of the same thing. What are we going to believe in this country? Above all, what is the Nationalist Government of China to believe? Over a series of years we blow hot and we blow cold. It seems to me high time that the State Department stop trifling with a serious situation. The State Department is stultifying itself, mystifying our people, and antagonizing our allies. Even grain will

not breed confidence abroad. What we need is integrity.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, there appears to be two opposite lines of thought on the question of furnishing grain to India. One line is that of a grant, or under terms which could amount to a grant; another line apparently is to furnish no grain to India.

Between these two lines of thought might be found the correct answer.

So far as I am concerned, and I believe so far as this House is concerned, we stand ready to solve any problem in the Christian way. I am a Christian and am thoroughly in accord with the Christian precepts. I do not think that every wild-eyed theory, coming from sources that do not even admit that Christianity is a correct principle of life, squares with the teachings of the lowly Nazarene. The truth is, Christianity is a practical thing.

Charity is fine when individually practiced. That is to say, when we go into our own pockets and dispense charity. But, running our hands into our people's pockets and taking their money in the name of charity is another thing. I conceive it to be the duty of this Congress to understand that they are the trustees of the taxpayers of this country, and that the taxpayers are the ones to dispense their own charities, suffice it to say, I do not think that we are running a charitable institution here, dispensing the wealth of the people of our country, who are now groaning over the terrific taxes they are now paying, and those additional taxes they know they will have to pay, and who are now going through a period of expected controls, and who must gird themselves for the battle to preserve their country and their way of life, including Christianity, for Christianity is being assailed as never before.

Neither do I agree that we should say "No" to India on her request for grain.

It rather appears to me, and I think to our people who are usually sensible and practicable, if we will give them a chance to express themselves, that this matter can be worked out in a manner that will square with all Christian concepts, and that we can make a reasonably friendly business deal with India.

So far as giving is concerned, it is plain that India has never asked for a gift, and we would be unfair to India unless we approach this matter in that light. It was our State Department who suggested this gift, and the blame for that part of this argument lies on its shoulders, plus some agitators who apparently make a practice to rush to fine organizations for endorsements of their extravagant practices and ardent desires to continue wrecking the economy of this country. I might add, that the temper and patience of our people have been sorely tried with these agitators, and they have reached the end of their cable tow, whether they realize it or not.

It has been scattered abroad, and I have letters to that effect, that we have more grain than we know what to do with. That does not happen to be the case at all, and I am rather inclined to state that those responsible for putting out this information knew that was not the case. It thoroughly appears from testimony in these hearings that we have less wheat and grain in storage than we have had in many years; that to furnish this grain to India will strain us, unless we can recoup by harvesting a large grain crop this year and all information, including the Government information, is that prospects for this year are poor indeed. So—we do not have a surplus—we are even doing a risky thing to send 2,000,000 tons of grain from this country now, since we have furnished India already 411,000 tons of grain this year. Yet, we are ready to assume that risk, and to tighten our belts some in order to give India an opportunity to have grain to supply its needs.

It is also said that India will undoubtedly starve unless grain is sent immediately. In fact, early this year it was testified that India would starve if grain was not furnished immediately. But, India has not starved and Nehru does not paint the picture that black. Nehru indicates that starving will be at a minimum if they get no grain, but would like to have grain to prevent a short supply, and I can understand Mr. Nehru on that.

Now, India makes a case for needing grain. We also have a case to make. We have some grain, but our people are in a terrible emergency. We need monasite for our existence. We need manganese. We need strategic materials that are utterly necessary in the event of all-out war. These materials are more necessary to our preservation than grain is to India perhaps. You can die from starvation and you can also die from atomic bombs. I am old fashioned enough to believe in protecting the United States. India put an embargo on monasite in 1946. Our State Department has done nothing apparently to get that embargo removed. We were able to get monasite to some extent in Brazil, but I understand that Brazil has placed an embargo on it, and it has been said that India helped to influence Brazil to do this. So far as I know, and have been able to find out, India has no need for her monasite, but it is very precious to us. Sending wheat to India is humane, but I say, India sending monasite to the United States is intensely humane also, so much so that I do not want to be held responsible for not making every effort I can to get it for us.

Manganese is essential to steel making. I wonder if anyone doubts that the making of steel is essential to our life?

We need burlap. My people are crying for help in this regard. India has a large stockpile of burlap. We have none. Every farmer is paying $6 for 10 sacks to hold a ton of fertilizer; so are our peanut farmers and shellers; Florida could not get 25 percent of its requirements for vegetables and citrus this year; Idaho, Maine and every section of this country has suffered the same. Burlap is almost unobtainable. Our military needs burlap in the worst sort of way.

Now, here is the Christian thing: Let us work out a business deal with India. Christianity is a reciprocal and mutual thing. Let us work out a deal that will not be for this one instance, but one that will be mutually satisfactory to two friendly nations. Let us trade this wheat or grain, which India needs, to India for goods we need. It will help both of us. We know India has never had enough grain and this condition is nothing new. But, God gave India the remedy, when in His wisdom and graciousness he gave India these materials we need. God gave the nations an opportunity to carry on friendly relations with each other. We can arrange to grow enough grain to feed us and India; India can furnish us these things we need annually.

Now, here is my solution: India wants from us now about one-fourth of the amount she found necessary in 1951 to supplement her needs for 1951, having bought about three-fourths of the amount necessary from us and others. This being only one-fourth of the supplemental needs for a single year, then, if India cannot pay for this in strategic materials without straining her economy, then India is in desperate straits indeed. But, let us give her easy terms. Let us give her 6 to 10 years to pay this back in strategic materials, and let us tell her to anticipate her grain needs for other years and that we will make a realistic attempt to furnish it on a barter basis. Our farmers will rally behind us and will produce the grain; you need never doubt that. We owe a debt to our farmers that sometimes we forget. They will produce the grain to get the manganese to make our steel, and the monazite to make our atomic bombs, and the burlap to wrap our crops, thereby protecting their sons and daughters and their country against the awful spectre threatening to engulf the world.

Yes, Christianity is a practicable thing. Let us put our State Department to work for the United States. Let us realize now that we must be men and women dedicated to our God and our country, that we must necessarily impose on our own people burdensome taxes, regulations, and duties, and that we are going to do it, not because we want to, but because the time has come when it must be done. You will be surprised how ripe the people are for some realistic and practicable approaches to our problems.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. COX. As the neighbor and friend of the gentleman who has just addressed the committee, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate him upon the excellence of his statement, because he reflects a fine balance of mind and temper, and an understanding of the subject he discusses.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise this afternoon to give some factual re-

plies to several of the charges that have been leveled against the Government of India. I will quote specifically so that the Members may hear the statements of responsible and friendly people who have loosely been called Communists at times in this debate.

I quote from a pamphlet entitled "Communist Violence in India." This booklet was issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Government of India in September of 1949. I can read you the government policy statements as to the methods used by the Communist Party and what the policy of the Government of India is in respect to that party. It is stated on page 7 of this pamphlet:

In furtherance of this policy, the government have arrested a number of members of the Communist Party of India and have taken such other precautionary measures as they deem necessary. They have advised provincial governments to do likewise so as to ensure that vital installations are protected against sabotage. They have no doubt that in doing so they have the full support of the country and of this House which is wedded to democratic procedure and is entirely opposed to methods of violence.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman inform the committee if these Indians were arrested because they were Communists or because they sought to perpetrate sabotage against the Government? That is the important part of it.

Mr. FULTON. I would like to be very careful as I answer the gentleman. When you are asking whether it is as a member of a party or a subversive foreign group that the persons have been arrested or whether they are merely people who have sabotaged, you must look at the context in which the Indian Government makes its policy. That is a general statement necessarily, and regardless of how the particular individual was arrested for violation of the law, the Government itself must lay down the policy as to what is the proper method of handling the Communist Party members and the Communist Party when they engage in subversive or sabotage activities in India. No one questions that the Government of India has acted firmly in this policy area.

Let me speak shortly about the general railway strike of India, and as to how the Government viewed it. As you know, we in the United States of America had Communists that infiltrated into the unions, business, and institutions of this country, and a Government policy had to be adopted in respect to this situation. Some of us, as members, felt it was a mistake simply to require Communist affidavits from one group, singling out the union members. We felt the requirement should have been broader, to include persons in key positions, such as Government departments, and businessmen, educators, and so forth. The Taft-Hartley law picked out just one group and did it wrongly—and I have consistently felt that this was an injustice.

The Government of India says this about its policy in handling the general strike issue:

The Communist Party of India has recently concentrated on the issue of a general strike on the railways as well as in other essential services of paramount importance to the community. It has looked upon these strikes not from the trade union or economic point of view, meant to better the lot of the workers, but as a weapon designed to create a chaotic state in the country which, it is thought, would help the party to gain its other objectives, whatever they might be.

Thus the Indian Government has definitely stated the Communist Party through joint action and engaging in general strikes, has tried to further their objectives, to which action the Government of India is unalterably opposed.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has not found it agreeable to give a responsive answer to the question I asked as to whether the Indians were put in jail because they were Communists or because they were guilty of sabotage. Let me modify the question. Were the Indians arrested because they were Communists or because of an alleged commission of a crime?

Mr. FULTON. They were arrested because of an alleged commission of a crime, and I thank heaven in this country we have not gotten to the thought-control methods where a person is put in jail because he might believe something, even though wrong. It is only because an individual engages in party activities as a representative or agent of a foreign power that he is put into the confines of a jail in this country. In India, as in the United States, the citizen is permitted and has the right to believe what he will, think as he will, and without subversive action or sabotage activities, can proclaim his ideas from the roof tops. It should be noted our Government has not suppressed the Daily Worker here. Why should we then attempt to require more of India in a loan transaction, which this bill now is, than the United States Government requires at home? You can believe in no law at all, and you will not be put in jail here.

Mr. COX. What is the point in the gentleman's statement that India had jailed many thousands of Communists?

Mr. FULTON. Well, I will give you Nehru's statement then, to explain.

Mr. COX. No. The gentleman was combating the idea that Nehru is not pro-Communist.

Mr. FULTON. Oh, yes; and I will give you his statement directly on that.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. If the Communists are causing that much internal dissention in India proper, why does Nehru support the Communist position in the United Nations?

Mr. FULTON. Nehru does not support the Communist position in the United Nations. The Indian Government on certain questions has agreed with Britain, on others with the United States of America, on others with a far eastern and middle eastern bloc, and on other questions has maintained a neutral or nonparticipating position. Many Republicans do not agree with all the Truman positions on Korea, China and Formosa and I am sure I don't agree entirely with Truman or Nehru, for that matter.

Mr. COX. What does he support?

Mr. FULTON. May I answer that directly? If we can leave a little less heat out of this debate we will get a little more light. I will try to answer the questions as they come up and try to answer them fairly and carefully. On February 28, 1949, Prime Minister Nehru stated his position about the Communist Party as follows to the Parliament of India:

The Communist Party of India has, during the past year, adopted an attitude not only of open hostility to the Government but one which can be described as bordering on open revolt. This policy has been given effect too intensively in certain limited areas of India and has resulted in violence, indulging in murders, arson, and looting as well as acts of sabotage. The house is well aware of the Communist revolts that have taken place in countries bordering on India. It was presumably in furtherance of the same policy that attempts were made in India to incite people to active revolt. Fortunately, these attempts failed because of the strength of popular opinion against them and the action taken by the Government. Nevertheless, a great deal of misery and damage was caused by them in certain parts of India.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is not the very part of the business that the gentleman is referring to the fact that the Government of India is not coddling Communists, whereas in Czechoslovakia, when the workers took over the factories, they were given free rein, and in India they were jailed, so that if Nehru can jail them the Communists are not going to take over the country by subversion; they will go to jail first. Is that not the point of the business?

Mr. FULTON. That is correct. On page 21 the pamphlet does not refer to them merely as prisoners, but it speaks of these people as Communist prisoners, and then it goes on to explain how they were treated in jail.

I think this discussion helps reach a result, and while I disagree with the gentleman, nevertheless I respect his opinion. The gentleman, I believe, criticizes Mr. Nehru for having said certain things that would make Nehru look as if he were slightly friendly, let us say, to either a Communist dictatorship, or the Communist dictator, Mr. Stalin. Mr. Truman in 1948 referred to the Communist dictator, Mr. Stalin, as "good old Joe; he is not such a bad fellow." In the light of that statement from the head of our Government, it would come with ill grace for any of us to criticize Nehru for less friendliness to Stalin and

actually for too much cold neutrality in respect to many of Mr. Truman's policies.

Mr. COX. The gentleman finds it pleasing to defend Mr. Nehru.

Mr. FULTON. Not to defend him, but to stand up and explain his views. He needs no defense.

Mr. COX. The gentleman does not concede that he is a pro-Communist.

Mr. FULTON. Not in the least; no. A man who has stood so long for freedom is not for any totalitarian concept. Nehru has represented determinedly his effort for a free India, with his compatriots, Mahatma Gandhi, and his good sister, Madame Pandit, even at the expense of his own and their personal liberty. A man jailed for advocating a free India knows well the penalties exacted by arbitrary authority from the individual citizen.

How can we criticize Nehru for inaction when President Truman said the issue of communism in the United States was merely a red herring drawn by the Republican Party across the American scene for political purposes?

Mr. COX. Of course I did not agree with him.

Mr. FULTON. Then we also must conclude that everybody does not agree with all Mr. Nehru's statements, either, at home or abroad.

Mr. COX. I took exception to the statement made then and I take exception now. I have opposed this policy of appeasing everything Russian, as has been done by our country for a long time. Therefore, I oppose this additional step in that same direction.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman favor the adoption of this bill on humanitarian grounds alone, or is he interested in reclaiming India from communism?

Mr. FULTON. I am very interested in being what might be called by the gentleman's President, his former President, President Roosevelt, a good neighbor, first. Secondly, I am trying by this effort to obtain the conditions in a free world so that peoples of a free world can live and can progress among themselves without pushing down any group or any class or forcing any person into a totalitarian state of any kind. Included in this policy is the purpose, to build up and to make strong this country. And I may say as a Republican on this side of the House that in respect to this India assistance legislation it stands me in good stead to be standing on this question with our former Republican President, Herbert Hoover, who was known as a humanitarian. We are preventing starvation by this bill, and promoting also a strong free world of the kind we would all like to see come soon.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. FULTON. Let us go a little bit further into the attitude of the Government of India, and examine the Home Minister's statement in the Parliament on this question.

Home Minister C. Rajagopalachari laid on the table in Parliament March 10, 1951, a statement explaining the government's policy and attitude toward the Communist Party of India and the Hindu Mahasabha.

The Home Minister was asked whether the attention of the government had been drawn to certain statements in the press by the Communist Party and the Hindu Mahasabha challenging certain statements made by the honorable minister in the course of a debate in Parliament.

The following is the text of the Home Minister's statement:

The attention of the government was drawn to a press item dated February 17, 1951, to the effect that the Communist Party challenged the Home Minister to withdraw the Preventive Detention Act and do certain other things and then, it was stated that they would act as a regular political party in the open; presumably, dropping their present violent and secret activities.

If the men who grouped themselves and practice terrorism and sabotage in the name of communism will not merely issue a challenge and make conditional offers of adopting a peaceful and open political life, but will back their profession with practice, we could take the risk involved in trusting them. Past conduct cannot just be wiped out by a single press statement. Such declarations should be backed by practical behavior. The honorable members have read Ignazio Silone's narrative of the meeting of the Communist Party at which, when British Communists were asked on their return home to make a public declaration in a certain sense, but actually to do the contrary, and one of the British Communists exclaimed "But that would be a lie," loud laughter greeted this simplicity and filled the hall. The Communists could not understand the Englishman's stupid objection to making a misleading or false declaration. The fact of the matter is that the Communist Party's discipline involves a psychological mechanism whereby each single member becomes progressively identified with the collective organization until his sense of scruple or moral hesitation is totally wiped out. Ethical objections become just ancient wrongs worthy of scorn and derision.

Three leading Indian Communists have issued a statement to their comrade on September 23, 1950, explaining the Communist Party's policy: It is categorically stated herein that the policy should put the peasant movement progressively on the rails of armed struggle and that in agrarian relations they should by mass mobilization and direct action, as in Telengana, create armed forces in rural areas and strong bases for their operations. It is further categorically stated therein that there is no question of liquidating Telengana but that on the contrary, it is the question of raising the movement in the rest of the country to the level of Telengana.

The Politburo of the Communist Party in India issued the policy statement on November 15, 1950, in the following terms: "Finally it is necessary to clearly grasp the truth that armed struggle has become the principal form of struggle in the present agrarian revolutionary stage that our national liberation movement has grown to."

It was added that simultaneously they should adopt and coordinate all other conceivable forms of struggle such as economic and political strikes, demonstrations, agricultural labor and tenant struggle, signature collections for peace-pledge election contests, and so on. The following is from the special circular of the central committee of the party:

"Central committee notes that certain statements are being made demanding the withdrawal of the heroic struggle of the Telengana people led by the Communist Party against their age-long oppressors with arms in hand for land and liberty. The central committee wishes the ranks of the party to note that such acts will be disruptive of the Telengana struggle, the harbinger of the people's democratic revolution in India which the enemy is trying to drown in blood. The central committee lays stress upon all party members and people to defend Telengana by all the means at their disposal."

An important foreign Communist who was invited to advise the Indian Communist Party gave the following opinion in December 1950: "It is the task of the Communist Party to skillfully utilize the stand of the Nehru Government on questions like Korea, the atom bomb, and so forth. Regarding armed struggle as we have stated in our letter, we do not deny that ultimately a revolution in India will and must take the form of armed struggle. It is hardly to be debated."

It is thus clear that we cannot accept declarations and challenges but we must await the facts and whether the crime reported from Telengana, Madras, Assam, and elsewhere shows a substantial decrease.

The attention of the government was also drawn to the statement on behalf of the Hindu Mahasabha dated February 18, 1951. It is gratifying to read in it that its policy of communalism does not include violence. But there is the basic fact that their policies have an inherent tendency to rouse strong passion between communities and to generate violence. Their line of thought and propaganda, therefore, of action, is inconsistent with the basic principle of our Constitution. What is communalism to us is nationalism to them. All the same we can tolerate anything if deception and violence be truely shed. The Hindu Mahasabha claims that it is a battle of culture. There would be no difficulty if the Hindu code of conduct were truly respected and followed. In the pattern of behaviour known as Hindu culture there is no room for violence or hatred. If Hindu Mahasabhaites preached and practiced Hinduism as our sages understood and taught it, they would indeed be ideal citizens and the most honored places in the state, including parliament, would undoubtedly be filled by them.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India, had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

UNECONOMICAL AND INEFFICIENT PROCUREMENT METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, postwar history shows that during World War II the Federal Government literally lost billions of dollars as the result of uneconomical and inefficient procurement methods and procedures. In some instances conditions were so bad criminal prosecutions and convictions resulted. At the present time, during the current

mobilization effort, is the executive branch of the Federal Government making the same sad errors?

Several months ago a specific case was called to my attention which on the record indicates beyond any doubt that the Army procurement program is again "snafued" beyond comprehension. Evidence in my possession which I will include in my remarks shows a callous disregard by the Chicago quartermaster depot of sound business practices and the most economical and efficient use of the Nation's production facilities. Furthermore, QM officials in the instant case have utterly disregarded their own warnings to businessmen who bid on Government contracts. The conduct of the officials of the Chicago QM depot in this case is unbelievably bad. A careful and comprehensive review of the whole case with its many ramifications indicates how fouled up and costly in dollars and time a simple business transaction can get when a number of Government agencies are involved.

Before giving the details of this sordid mess I predict the following unfortunate results from the numerous blunders in the handling of this relatively simple business transaction.

First. The Army will not have delivery on the contract pursuant to the terms of the agreement. This is already a fact so I am no prophet in this regard. It should be stated, however, that this was predicted months ago by many persons familiar with the situation.

Second. If the folding chairs are ever delivered, they will be of inferior quality and not up to specifications.

Third. If Consolidated Industries does ever produce and deliver the folding chairs, an attempt will be made subsequently by the company to obtain a better price for the chairs from the Government. The basis for such a spurious claim will be hardship. The only hardship in this case, past, present, or future, is to the American taxpayer and the mobilization effort.

The net result generally of this entire transaction will be an additional load on the already overburdened American taxpayer plus the lack of delivery of an item which the QM depot described as important to our national security.

Here are the documented facts. You can draw your own conclusions. About the 1st of February of 1951 responsible representatives of the American Seating Co., of Grand Rapids, Mich., informed me that some weeks beforehand the quartermaster depot in Chicago had requested two bids on 120,000 folding chairs for delivery within 90 days after the bids had been accepted by the Government. For identification purposes this or these invitations to bid were numbered as follows: QM–11–009–51–1383 and QM–11–009–51–1384. Attached to the invitations to bid was the following:

CAUTION—IMPORTANT NOTICE TO BIDDERS

This is an Armed Forces procurement. It is important to our national security.

Be sure that you can manufacture, produce, and deliver item or items bid upon on time. Delivery schedules have been carefully computed and coordinated. Promptness is vital. Do not bid unless you can meet the delivery schedule. Note paragraph 11, Default. The Government has the right to terminate contract and charge excess costs against contractor in case of failure to make delivery within the time specified.

Before bidding be certain your material suppliers can deliver promptly if you are awarded a contract. Shortages of materials and labor failure of subcontractors to meet your production schedule may force you into default. The Government does not agree to furnish you with materials unless specified in the invitation.

You must meet specification requirements. Before bidding be sure you can produce an article that will be acceptable under specification requirements.

Do not violate covenant against contingent fees article in the enclosed invitation and bid forms. If you do—

(1) Your contract may be canceled as therein provided, or

(2) The amount of the contingent fee may be deducted from the contract price paid you.

Quantity bid on: You may bid on the full quantity or any part thereof. If bidding on less than full quantity, be sure to indicate exact quantity bid on. (See pars. 1 and 14 of terms and conditions of invitation re increase or decrease option of Government.)

To not make changes in provisions of invitation and bid forms: If a change is made by bidder, and as a result the bid is not responsive, it cannot be considered for award.

Be certain that you understand all of the terms and conditions of this invitation. If in doubt, communicate with this office for clarification prior to submitting bid.

Bids cannot be modified or withdrawn after time of opening.

I call your particular attention to the warning that—

This is an Armed Forces procurement. It is important to our national security. Be sure that you can manufacture, produce and deliver item or items bid upon on time. Delivery schedules have been carefully computed and coordinated. Promptness is vital. Do not bid unless you can meet the delivery schedule. Note paragraph 11, "default." The Government has the right to terminate contract and change excess costs against contractor in case of failure to make delivery within time specified.

According to information presented to me by various sources there were 14 concerns which submitted bids on one or both of the aforementioned invitations to bid. On the two contracts Consolidated Industries of Memphis, Tenn., was low on 118,004 folding chairs with bids of $380,337.76. The next lowest bidder was a concern by the name of Acme Seating Co. with a bid of $435,000. It is my understanding the American Seating Co. was the next lowest bidder.

On the surface it would seem that the Chicago Quartermaster Depot should have awarded the contract to Consolidated Industries inasmuch as it was the low bidder. A careful, objective and honest appraisal of all the facts, however, should have convinced the Army procurement officials that the signing of the contract with Consolidated Industries would lead to the present deplorable situation. The Quartermaster officials have contended and undoubtedly will continue to contend that such a thorough investigation was made. The record speaks for itself. If an investigation was made it was either insufficient to protect the Government's interest or those making the investigation were incompetent to do the job.

All of the bidders on these two bids except Consolidated Industries were established chair manufacturers. Consolidated Industries had never made a folding chair. The company had no established plant for the production of the required folding chairs. It was not tooled up for the job.

At the time the award was made the Munitions Board had already issued Manual No. 90–1, Production Planning for Emergency Procurement. I quote from page 3, paragraph 1.3.5:

Plans for thorough utilization of existing manufacutring facilities will be developed, thereby minimizing the need for new construction.

Page 25, paragraph 2.3.54:

Additional machine tools and industrial equipment required: An important function of the production allocation program is to minimize the need for additional machine tools and industrial equipment in time of war. This objective can be accomplished in part by planning thorough utilization of existing tools and equipment. Management and Procurement Planning Officers are urged to bear this in mind in developing production plans.

There existed at the time this award was made, and still exists, more than sufficient manufacturing capacity to manufacture more than the number of chairs required for both military and civilian use as evidenced by the number of responsible bidders who attempted to secure this contract. Why then did the Chicago Quartermaster Depot disregard entirely—

First. That Consolidated did not have an established plant?

Second. That Consolidated had never made a chair?

Third. That Consolidated would have to tool up as previously stated?

The invitations to bid specifically required that the awards be made to a financially responsible party. The record again speaks for itself. Consolidated Industries, in order to finance the production of the chairs, made application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan of $75,000.

At this point I ask this question: Should a Government loaning agency, the RFC for example, loan the taxpayers' money so that a new company can be set up to compete with the already existing manufacturers who have sufficient plant and production facilities to handle the entire military and civilion needs in the folding-chair industry? Of course, the answer is "No." In this instance established chair manufacturers and their thousands of employees have paid their taxes to Uncle Sam, and now these established manufacturers and their skilled and trained employees find their tax dollars being used to set up competing and totally unneeded facilities to handle military and civilian needs. In my judgment, it is not morally right to the established companies or their employees for the Federal Government to use their hard-earned tax moneys for such a purpose.

At the time I first learned of this scheme to set up a new company with Uncle Sam's tax money so Consolidated could enter an already adequate business

field, it seemed to me, in light of the fact that Consolidated could not possibly produce on its contract, that the Government was putting itself in a very unenviable position. Again these fears, predictions, and warnings have unfortunately come true.

Let us look at the situation. The quartermaster officials awarded the contract to the lowest bidder, Consolidated, even though the Army was repeatedly warned ahead of time that the company could not possibly perform. To finance the company, RFC authorized a $75,000 loan of your tax dollars. Now what happens if Consolidated cannot perform on its contract, and it obviously cannot. If the quartermaster officials cancel Consolidated's contract, RFC is left holding the bag. RFC, if the funds have been disbursed in order to prevent a loss to the Government, quite likely will pressure the quartermaster to go easy on Consolidated. This means Consolidated will not be held to its contract as to delivery date, quality specifications on the chairs, and possibly some relief as to price. Already Consolidated has failed to produce the folding chairs within the 90-day period required by the contract. In fact, not one single chair of acceptable quality has been delivered. The samples supplied to the quartermaster officials are not up to standard and likely will never be. It will be interesting to see what is done by the Army if and when Consolidated says it needs a better price to do the job.

At the time this entire matter came to my attention I conferred with a number of Federal agencies who might have some information concerning Consolidated Industries and those individuals connected with the company. Inasmuch as this company or those behind it had done business with the Veterans' Administration, I wrote the Veterans' Administration on February 5 for certain information. My letter of that date reads as follows:

Gen. CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrations of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. A. K. Maiers.)

DEAR GENERAL GRAY: I write at this time for a full and complete report on any and all contracts and business dealings the Veterans' Administration has had with Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn. It is my understanding that the Veterans' Administration has canceled one or more contracts with this company and is now seeking to recover certain funds on behalf of the Federal Government.

I thank you in advance for a prompt reply and a full disclosure of all available evidence.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

The Veterans' Administration on February 8 answered with the following very illuminating letter:

Hon. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORD: This will confirm the conversation with a representative of this service in response to your letter of February 5, 1951, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in which you requested a full and complete report regarding the Consolidated Industries, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.

As stated, this Administration has had no contractual or business dealings with the Consolidated Industries, Inc., and therefore no contracts have been either executed or canceled.

For your confidential information, an investigation of the National Vocational and Technical College, Memphis and Chattanooga, Tenn., revealed that it was owned by Mr. J. W. P. Fleming, who is also the owner of the Consolidated Industries, as well as several other business ventures in the State of Tennessee and the State of Mississippi. A contract was executed between this Administration and the National Vocational and Technical College for the purpose of providing educational training for veterans under the provisions of Public Laws 16 and 346; however, in October 1950 the officials of the school advised the veterans and the Veterans' Administration that the school was being closed and as of this date is still closed.

It was also established that tools, supplies, and equipment were being purchased at a discount through the Consolidated Industries, Inc., for the use of the veterans in training at the National Vocational and Technical College and in turn such items were increased as high as 25 percent in price at the time the school billed the Veterans' Administration for services rendered. In view of this, together with information to the effect that the school was not rendering all services to the veterans for which they had billed the Veterans' Administration, a full and complete audit was requested in an effort to establish the extent of overpayment. Officials of the National Vocational and Technical College refused the Veterans' Administration permission to audit the books of the school and in October 1950 a subpena was served upon the school in an effort to secure the books and records. Again the school refused and employed legal counsel in defending their position. The office of the United States attorney, Memphis, Tenn., has been requested to enforce the provisions of the subpena and it is understood that the matter is to be placed before the court in the near future.

I believe the above information, together with that given to you by the representative of this service, will assist you in your inquiry, and in the event this office can be of further service to you, do not hesitate to advise.

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. GALBRAITH,
Director, Inspection-Investigation Service.

The quartermaster officials in Chicago were warned in advance that Veterans' Administration was not pleased with its dealings with this organization and the individuals involved in its organization. A thorough investigation by the Army with the help of Veterans' Administration might well have prevented the predicament now facing the quartermaster officials.

The RFC was also contacted by me on February 5 as shown by the following letter:

Mr. W. ALMA HARBER,
Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARBER: I have been informed that the RFC has on January 22, 1951, consummated a $100,000 loan to Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn. Will you kindly give me a report on the basis or justification for this loan?

In addition to the above, will you kindly reply to the following specific questions?

1. Did the RFC officials handling this loan know of the cancellation of a Consolidated Industries, Inc., contract by the Veterans' Administration?

2. If there was no knowledge of this contract cancellation, was an adequate examination made of the background, past history, and financial resources and reliability of Consolidated Industries, Inc.?

3. Does RFC seek financial reports on prospective borrowers from Dun and Bradstreet?

4. Was such a report sought by RFC in this case?

I thank you in advance for a full and prompt reply to the above.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

RFC replied on February 13 by the following letter:

Hon. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORD: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 5, 1951, requesting certain information in connection with Consolidated Industries, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.

As our Mr. Dodds advised you by telephone a few days ago, our Nashville Loan Agency authorized a loan to this company in the amount of $75,000 on January 22, 1951, but the loan has not been consummated since no disbursement has been made.

We have requested Mr. Lee Davis, acting manager of the Nashville Loan Agency, to make a complete investigation and submit a report on this case, meanwhile withholding disbursement until further advice from this office. As soon as we have Mr. Davis' report we will be able to answer the questions contained in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. HARBER,
Chairman.

This letter indicates that RFC, as of that date at least, was using some caution in the matter. You will note, however, that my questions were not answered in full.

Because of the information given me by the Veterans' Administration, I wrote the following letter on February 5 to the Department of Justice:

Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: During the past few days I have been investigating the transactions of a company known as the Consolidated Industries, Inc., located in Memphis, Tenn.

I have been informed that the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have made an investigation of this company. The Veterans' Administration informs me that the Justice Department is now considering taking action against the above corporation. I write at this time requesting any information you have available on what the Department of Justice intends to do against this corporation. A full and detailed report on this case will be appreciated.

I will appreciate a speedy reply. Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

On February 6 the Attorney General acknowledged my previous letter and indicated a full report would follow. On February 27 I received the following communication from Peyton Ford,

Deputy Attorney General of the Department of Justice:

HON. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This will refer to your letter of February 5, 1951, addressed to the Attorney General in which you request to be advised as to what action this Department intends to take against the Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn. Your inquiry is predicated upon information received by you that this company has been investigated by the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The records of this Department show that the investigation being conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation is based upon several complaints received by the Bureau in which the complainants alleged that the Consolidated Industries, Inc., has defrauded the Government in connection with several contracts for training veterans pursuant to the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Allowance Act of 1944. These contracts are between the Veterans' Administration and the National Vocational and Technical College, Colored Division, of Chattanooga, Tenn. (formerly Chattanooga Vocational School). According to the complainants, the Consolidated Industries, Inc., and the National Vocational and Technical College are owned and operated by the same individual.

Since the investigation of this matter is still in a pending status, we are unable, at the present time, to determine what, if any, action should be taken against the Consolidated Industries, Inc.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

One can draw his own conclusions as to whether or not the Justice Department is proceeding adequately in light of the information given by the Veterans' Administration.

The American Seating Co. and its several thousand employees have a natural interest in seeing that the Federal Government is operated properly and economically. The responsible officials of this company have made every effort to see that Army officials had the full facts in this case before the contracts were awarded. I am told the QM officials in Chicago and Washington were repeatedly warned and cautioned by representatives of America Seating Co., all to no avail. The record shows these representatives knew from long experience something about folding chairs. The following letter dated February 6 from the QM depot is most illuminating in light of recent developments:

AMERICAN SEATING CO.,
New York, N. Y.

(Attention: Mr. Martin E. Kornbluth.)

Re Invitations Nos. QM-11-009-51-1383, QM-11-009-51-1384.

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to your telegram of February 1, 1951, wherein you protest a proposed award of chairs, folding, metal, covered by the captioned invitations for bids to Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn., and allege as your reasons therefor that the said proposed award would be improper inasmuch as Consolidated Industries, Inc., lacks tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, or other requirements necessary to the manufacture of the supplies involved by the required delivery date and in order to acquire the same would have to duplicate already existing facilities.

This office has carefully considered the allegations set forth in your wire of protest and has determined that such allegations are without merit in view of the fact that the procurement contemplated under the said invitations for bids was undertaken pursuant to formal advertising. Under the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 and of the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, this depot has no alternative other than to make an award to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder submitting quotations in accordance with the advertised requirements set forth in the said invitations for bids. In the instant case, this depot has carefully investigated financial responsibility, plant facilities, and background of experience enjoyed by Consolidated Industries, Inc., and is convinced that such bidder is well financed, has adequate plant facilities, and on the basis of previous experience is well qualified to manufacture and deliver the supplies covered by the captioned invitations in strict accordance with the specifications and delivery schedule cited therein.

It is believed that a possible misunderstanding exists with respect to the obligations of the interested contracting officer in connection with making awards pursuant to formal advertising as opposed to negotiations. In the former case, this depot is without authority to inquire into the matter of duplication of existing facilities; in the latter case, this depot is restricted to policy established by the Department of the Army, which policy by reason of the national emergency is currently opposed to the duplication of existing facilities where existing facilities appear to be adequate to effect necessary procurement. Consequently, different criteria may be applicable to the same commodity dependent upon whether procurement is effected by formal advertising or by means of negotiation and, as a result thereof, this depot is currently procuring under both sets of rules. While any misunderstanding which may have resulted from the coexistence of both methods of procurement is regrettable, it is not believed that the best interests of the Government would be served by the cancellation of formally advertised procurements previously in effect for the sole purpose of effectuating a policy which was adopted subsequent thereto and intended to apply to procurement by negotiation only.

Consideration having been given to the foregoing, it is believed that your company will now agree that Consolidated Industries, Inc. were in fact the lowest responsive and responsible bidder under the captioned invitations and as such are entitled to an award consistent with its bid. Accordingly, your protest is denied and your are advised that award is being made this date to the Consolidated Industries, Inc. in accordance with its bids.

Very truly yours,

W. B. BRADLEY, Jr.,
Captain, Quartermaster Corps.
Contracting Officer.

Please note how far wrong the Quartermaster officials were. The record speaks for itself. There is either incompetency or a lack of good business practice and judgment in this branch of the Department of Defense. Particular notice should be paid to the second paragraph of Captain Bradley's letter.

On February 5, I wrote the following letter to General Everett Busch at Fifth Army Headquarters. His reply of February 12 is also included in the record.

Gen. EVERETT BUSCH.
Fifth Army Headquarters,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR GENERAL BUSCH: I am writing in reference to the following:

Invitations to Bid Nos. QM 11-009-51-1383, QM 11-009-51-1384.

Would you kindly furnish me with the following data:

1. Have the awards on the above Invitations to Bid been made and if so on what dates?

2. If the awards have been made when must performance on the contract be completed? I would like the exact date.

3. What is the contract price for Consolidated Industries, Inc.?

4. If the award is made to Consolidated Industries, Inc. on the basis of their bid or bids, is this contract subject to subsequent renegotiation to a higher figure under any War Powers legislation?

I thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

HON. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORD: Reference is made to your letter dated 5 February 1951 concerning Invitations for Bid Numbers QM 11-009-51-1383 and QM 11-009-51-1384. Your inquiries are answered as follows:

1. Contract No. DA 11-009 qm-6508 (OI No. 8127-GS-51) and Contract Nos. DA 11-009 qm-6512 (OI No. 8131-GS-51) were awarded under Invitations for Bids Numbers QM 11-009-51-1383 and QM 11-009-51-1384, respectively, to Consolidated Industries, Inc., under date of 6 February 1951.

2. The completion date for 27,970 units covered by the first cited Contract is 7 April 1951. 43,030 units covered thereunder are for delivery from 8 April 1951 through 8 May 1951. 47,004 units covered by the second mentioned Contract are for delivery by 7 April 1951.

3. The unit prices set forth in contract No. DA 11-009 qm 6508 are $3.19 each for domestic pack items and $3.44 each for the export pack item. The total contract price is $230,395. The unit prices set forth in contract No. DA 11-009 qm-6512 are $3.19 each for items 1a through 1f, all of which are domestic pack. The total contract price is $149,942.76.

4. The contracts hereinabove referred to contain no provision under which any upward renegotiation in price may be made.

Sincerely,

E. BUSCH.
Brigadier General, United States Army, Commanding.

On April 25 I again contacted General Busch as shown by the following:

Gen. EVERETT BUSCH.
Fifth Army Headquarters,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR GENERAL BUSCH: This is in further reply to your letter of February 12 in reference to Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn. I will appreciate your giving me a status report on the progress of the contracts with this corporation. If possible, a speedy reply will be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am,

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.

The reply from General Busch is most illuminating and it is quoted in its entirety:

HON. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re: Consolidated Industries, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.

DEAR MR. FORD: This will reply to your inquiry under date of April 25 concerning the status and progress of our contracts with Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn.

We have two contracts with this small-business firm, both awarded on February 6, 1951.

1. Contract DA 11-009-QM-6512 (OI 8131-GS-51):

Item: 47,004 chairs, folding, metal.

Delivery schedule: March 1-31, 1951.

Deliveries to date: None.

2. Contract DA 11-009-QM-6508 (OI 8127-GS-51):

Item: 71,000 chairs, folding, metal.

Delivery schedule: 27,970 by April 7, 1951; 43,030 April 8 to May 8, 1951.

Deliveries to date: None.

The president of Consolidated Industries called at this depot on April 27 and brought with him sample chairs from his first production. It is our earnest hope that shipments will be forthcoming in the near future.

The administration of these two contracts has required a considerable expenditure of time and effort on the part of my hard-pressed purchasing people; however, in view of the policy of the Congress in regard to small business, we have been reluctant to take any action which might be interpreted as either discriminatory or punitive.

For your information, this data has been furnished the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, United States Senate, who also is interested in these contracts.

Sincerely yours,

E. BUSCH,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Commanding.

General Busch's letter admits everything that was predicted months ago by responsible parties has now taken place. The contracts have not been performed as required and, unquestionably, never will be. The excuses given by the Army are weak and inadequate. General Busch's staff would not have been hard pressed in handling this procurement if the original warnings had been heeded. Congress is interested in small business during the mobilization effort, but the comment by General Busch in this case is simply an ineffectual alibi. The quartermaster officials should have shown better judgment. Certainly some of the other 13 bidders on these two contracts fall in the category of small business and they, being established folding-chair manufacturers, could have produced on time and in line with contract specifications.

The last paragraph of General Busch's letter seems unusual. I have no way of knowing what was intended by this reference to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Some months ago when this case was first called to my attention I was informed by the Army officials that Consolidated had a DO priority for the necessary steel for this contract and that as a result the material was on hand. This scarce material was obtained on the basis of these contracts for the defense effort. It has languished in storage for too long a time without being put to proper use. In the meantime, other manufacturers of defense and civilian products are without their share of steel. Will it ever be used on the contract? Probably not. Certainly not if the quartermaster officials take the long-overdue action to cancel Consolidated's contract. If canceled, what happens to the steel obtained by Consolidated?

On April 25 I wrote the NPA in reference to this problem generally as shown by the following letter:

Mr. JOHN PECKHAM,
Director of Compliance,
National Production Authority,
Commerce Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PECKHAM: John Milanowski on my staff discussed with you the policy of the use of DO ratings for steel and other allocated materials.

I will appreciate an official opinion from you regarding the fact that under existing regulations there is no way to check or stop the indiscriminate use of a DO rating with more than one seller. As a matter of fact, I will appreciate a complete analysis of the DO ratings system with your own comments and suggestions on how best we can tighten up the loopholes.

As time is of the essence in this request, a speedy reply will be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.

The reply from NPA indicates there is little hope of recapturing the steel from consolidated if the Army officials cancel the contracts. In my judgment this is a deplorable situation in that it means there is further pressure on the quartermaster depot to continue its contracts with a company that cannot perform on its legal obligations. Furthermore, Consolidated by hoarding this steel for the past 3 or 4 months has crippled other concerns that are badly in need of this critical material.

Within the last several weeks the American Seating Co. in writing has informed the quartermaster depot officials it could and would supply the required folding chairs at the rate of 5,000 per day and at the price set forth in its original bid or bids. Other original bidders undoubtedly would do likewise.

Consolidated Industries obviously is in default at considerable expense and inconvenience to the Federal Government. General Busch's letter of April 28 is definite proof of this statement. A few days ago a presumably responsible Army official in the Quartermaster Depot in Chicago when asked what the Army procurement officials would do about this delinquent contract, allegedly said:

> We have 900 delinquent contractors now, and 1 more would only make it 901.

With such an attitude prevalent, how can the Government's interest be properly protected. Such an indefensible attitude means the mobilization effort will inevitably cost more tax dollars. In addition, the necessary supplies and materials for the war effort will never be acquired. I only hope there is not the same callous disregard for efficiency when it comes to the procurement of tanks, guns, and planes.

In closing, this should be said. The Quartermaster officials themselves and no one else are responsible for the mess. Here is a summary of the case. A financial report received by the commanding general of the Chicago Quartermaster Depot most certainly showed that this contractor did not have the resources to handle a contract of this type. A properly conducted survey of the facilities of Consolidated Industries should have shown that this company had never made a folding chair. They were not manufacturers but had attempted to run a Veterans' Vocational and Technical College. They had no machinery, tools, dies, and jigs. They had not even made a sample chair, prepared a detailed drawing, or even submitted a catalog illustration or photograph of any kind of what they intended to furnish. They certainly did not have any testing or research department as required by the specifications.

There existed at the time this award was made, and still exists, more than sufficient manufacturing capacity to manufacture more than the number of chairs required for both military and civilian use as evidenced by the number of responsible bidders who attempted to secure this contract. I repeat, why then did the Chicago Quartermaster Depot disregard entirely—

First. That the manufacturer did not have financial responsibility.

Second. That he did not have the necessary plant facility for such an operation.

Third. That he had never made a chair.

Fourth. That he would have to tool up as previously stated.

Why was this company given special privileges? Why now are they still being given special privileges when they have defaulted on their contract? If the Armed Forces need the chairs, the Defense Department should exercise their rights of buying against this manufacturer's contract. There are established manufacturers ready and willing to manufacture these chairs within a few days time who can give the Armed Forces what they need.

Right now the Chicago Quartermaster Depot is still listening to alibis and all kinds of excuses as to why this contractor cannot deliver. The sample chair submitted, supposedly from their first production, does not comply with the specifications and up to the time of the preparation of these remarks the Chicago Quartermaster Depot has not accepted a chair as complying with the specifications and, therefore, no chairs have been produced on this contract. An earnest hope that shipments will be forthcoming, as stated in the commanding general's letter, is wishful thinking. This manufacturer at his best, even if he could make a chair to comply with the specifications, with his present facility could not produce over 600 acceptable chairs per day or would require about 200 additional days to complete the contracts. As previously stated, there are reputable manufacturers willing at this time to produce as many as 5,000 chairs per day in just one facility. It would take about 25 days of such production to complete the contracts by the use of established manufacturers.

In closing, let me say it is regrettable that it is necessary for the legislative branch of the Government to investigate the work of the executive branch of the Federal Government, however, when such a case comes to the attention of a Member of the Congress it is his duty

to lay the facts before the public in hopes that in the future such conditions will not recur. Our GI's on the far flung battlefronts expect everyone to do his full share at home. I urgently plead that this be our criterion in all phases of the defense effort in the critical days ahead.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 718. An act to authorize the lease and purchase by the United States of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 831. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide for designated representatives thereunder of certain veterans' organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1039. An act to amend the provision of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the composition of boards for the recommendation of rear admirals of the Navy for continuation on the active list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1230. An act to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1244. An act to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Territory of Alaska from certain restrictions upon the making of Federal contributions, and to amend the provisions thereof relating to the taking of oaths by certain civil-defense personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3587. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to permit the board of supervisors of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. BOSONE (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) for Tuesday, May 22, on account of illness.

To Mr. ALBERT for May 22, 23, 24, 25, on account of official business.

To Mr. GOLDEN, through May 29, on account of necessary visit to home district, including making arrangements for homecoming of Lieutenant Dodd, winner of Congressional Medal of Honor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. James Mead.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in Life magazine.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by the Norwegian Ambassador.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. CRUMPACKER) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. NICHOLSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from Lewis Millett, a captain in Korea.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. Frost, a banker of Texas, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $184.50.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include three letters.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Atlantic Monthly.

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some remarks of his own and some by Judge Jones, of the Court of Claims, and other extraneous material.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include telegrams, letters, and other extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. BROWNSON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include articles.

Mr. WOODRUFF (at the request of Mr. JUDD) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an address by Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, at Tulsa, Okla., on May 12.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. Glen Davis.

Mr. FINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include an editorial.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each include one or more editorials.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. RIBICOFF) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison; without amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2538. A bill for the relief of Joe Bargas; without amendment (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2771. A bill for the relief of Lon Weaver; without amendment (Rept. No. 488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3708. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner; without amendment (Rept. No. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4165. A bill for the relief of A. D. Woods; without amendment (Rept. No. 490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4189. A bill providing for the right of hearing and appeal by classified civil-service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 4190. A bill to authorize the presentation of claims of the Coos (or Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (or Kalawatset) and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H. R. 4191. A bill to provide that certain World War I and World War II veterans who were awarded the Military Order of the Purple Heart shall be exempt from involuntary active duty with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4192. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the national encampment of the Auxiliary to Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War to be held in Columbus, Ohio, August 19 to August 23, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4193. A bill to authorize payment of the servicemen's indemnity to survivors of members of the National Guard who die while engaged in any training duty under competent orders; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 4194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to provide that embezzled funds shall be included in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to impose a tax of 100 percent on illegally obtained income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 4196. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4197. A bill to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii that certain Hawaiian home lands required for the use of the board of water supply of the city and county of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the status of Hawaiian home lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4198. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 291 of the Sessions Laws of Hawaii, 1949, which included Maui County Waterworks Board under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 4199. A bill to authorize the transfer of lands from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4200. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4201. A bill to make certain revisions in the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4202. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide for designated representatives thereunder of certain veterans' organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4203. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 7 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4204. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4205. A bill to provide retirement benefits for the Chief of the Dental Division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4206. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4207. A bill to repeal limitations contained in other laws on federally assisted low-rent housing projects authorized by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 4208. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4209. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4210. A bill to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4211. A bill to amend acts relating to garagekeepers' and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4212. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4213. A bill to extend for 1 year the 5-year period of limitation on the presentation of Indian claims to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4214. A bill to permit unincorporated businesses to be taxed as corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United Nations take such steps against Communist China necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 29, relating to the American Indian; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolutions Nos. 22 and 24, relating to the consideration of the use of certain highways in the region of Lake Tahoe and California State Highway Sign Route 88 for civil and military defense in the case of emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benjamin Blumenfeld Fielding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Elbert B. Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4217. A bill for the relief of Janis Lamberts and Pauline Leontine Lamberts, his wife, and Harold Lamberts and Arnis Lamberts, their minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4218. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Agnes Stevens Fisher; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4219. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Hazel Sau Fong Hee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Hidetaro Yamaguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4222. A bill for the relief of Kurie Sassayama Tasato and Charlyne Kazue Tasato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4223. A bill for the relief of Richard F. Harvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4224. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Hartley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4225. A bill for the relief of Elias Miltiades Iordanopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 4226. A bill for the relief of Walter M. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4227. A bill for the relief of Fred Uziel and Mrs. Loretta Uziel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4228. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorene M. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

294. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition signed by 74 railroad employees urging enactment of legislation amending the Railroad Retirement Act so as to provide retirement after 30 years of service at half pay, pay to be based on the five highest years of earnings, not to exceed $4,000, also requesting enactment of legislation which will assure the widow of a railroad employee drawing a pension equal to one-half of her husband's earned annuity, after she reaches the age of 50, and requesting further a minimum pension of $100 per month and optional retirement at 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

295. By Mr. SHEEHAN: Petition of the Chicago Veterans Civic Association, Inc., of Cook County, Ill., resolving that the CVCA denounces universal military training in its

present form since it has no place in the scheme of American living and is contrary to the cause of world peace. Our peace-loving people realize our freedoms are threatened and that a state of emergency does exist; and thus recognize the existing compulsory military draft of limited tenure; that is, for the length of any one particular emergency. The principles of our way of life cannot long endure if we allow future foreign wars, taxes, restrictions, and controls to make us the pawns of a bureaucratic, socialistic, militaristic state. Universal military training if enacted will prove a crime against our American way of life and against our soldiers of all American wars who had fought and died that this Nation might live; to the Committee on Armed Services.

296. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mr. Kenneth R. Kurtz, president, United States National Student Association, Pennsylvania regional headquarters, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that Congress pass legislation that will send wheat to India to relieve the famine condition there; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Omnipotent, who art above all nations, and yet who dost dwell with those of an humble and a contrite heart: By Thine indwelling presence, we beseech Thee, cleanse us now from the soil and defilement of these feverish, hectic days in which our strength is spent. Flow through us like clean waters and carry from our hearts the tensions, the resentments, the irritations, and the fears which spoil the music of our lives and lessen the effectiveness of our service. Open our eyes to the faults and evils which mar our own democracy, and which we so readily condemn in other parts of the world. Remind us that beyond the appraisal of man there falls upon our lives the searching light of Thy judgment. Widen our sympathies, expand our understanding, override our prejudice, until the whole earth be our fatherland and stricken, starving humanity, under all skies, our care. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 22, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, May 23, 1951, he signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 3587. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to permit the board of supervisors of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. Res. 136. Resolution authorizing an investigation of crime and related problems in the District of Columbia, without amendment (Rept. No. 334); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 61. A bill for the relief of Sister Carmen Teva Ramos (Rept. No. 335);

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Michail Ioannou Bourbakis (Rept. No. 336);

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines (Rept. No. 337);

S. 1105. A bill for the relief of K. C. Be, Swannio Be, Wie Go Be, Wie Hwa Be, Wie Bhing Be, and Swie Tien Be (Rept. No. 338);

H. R. 715. A bill for the relief of Aenny Blank (Rept. No. 339);

H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Hampton (Rept. No. 340);

H. R. 1120. A bill for the relief of William Yinson Lee (Rept. No. 341);

H. R. 1431. A bill for the relief of Tetsuko Hidaka (Rept. No. 342); and

H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of Kimi Hatano (Rept. No. 343).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 211. A bill for the relief of Maria Enriquez (Rept. No. 344);

S. 289. A bill for the relief of Arno Edvin Kolm (Rept. No. 345);

S. 501. A bill for the relief of Willem Houwink (Rept. No. 346);

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Wilma M. Stiehl (Rept. No. 347);

S. 526. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lorna Wan-Hsi Feng (Rept. No. 348);

S. 543. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Jean Clarke (Rept. No. 349);

S. 930. A bill for the relief of Ivan Herben, his wife, son, and daughter-in-law (Rept. No. 350);

H. R. 400. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy (Rept. No. 351); and

H. R. 795. A bill for the relief of Carlos Sanchez Perez (Rept. No. 352).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 581. A bill for the relief of Toshiki Ishigo and his children, Kiyoko and Chiyiko Ishigo (Rept. No. 353).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 354).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1590. A bill for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 355).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; with an amendment (Rept. No. 356).

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 23, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1521. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1522. A bill for the relief of Washib Ullah;

S. 1523. A bill for the relief of Kara W. Ellari;

S. 1524. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Colandrea; and

S. 1525. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Shafi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1526. A bill to provide that the antitrust laws shall not apply to organized professional sports enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. MCFARLAND):

S. 1527. A bill for the relief of Sisters Dolores Illa Martori, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1528. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Wan Hsien Wu, Dorothea Wan Lien Wu, Ray Kiu Wu, Christine Wan Ming Wu, and Ying Victor Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1529. A bill to require the keeping of more detailed records and the furnishing of additional information by certain persons for income tax purposes;

S. 1530. A bill to establish a 2-year period of validity for basic permits issued under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act;

S. 1531. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for the preservation of records and for other purposes; and

S. 1532. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'CONOR when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1533. A bill to designate a Floyd B. Olson Memorial Triangle in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the erection of a memorial plaque in such triangle; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1534. A bill for the relief of Midori Akimoto, also known as Sharlene Akimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 1535. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide that nothing therein shall invalidate the provisions of State laws prohibiting strikes in public utilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1536. A bill to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as the North Lobato and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1537. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II"; and

S. 1538. A bill for the relief of O. E. Hambleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1539. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service," approved March 2, 1931; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 1540. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in lands beneath inland navigable waters and to the recognition of equities in submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT RELATING TO PROHIBITION OF STRIKES IN PUBLIC UTILITIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the so-called Taft-Hartley law so as to permit the respective States to deal with utility strikes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on this subject, together with an explanatory memorandum, a resolution adopted by the Public Relations Committee of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, and five newspaper editorials, which I have assembled in support of this legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the matters referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1535) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide that nothing therein shall invalidate the provisions of State laws prohibiting strikes in public utilities, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. HENDRICKSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement, explanatory memorandum, resolution, and editorials presented by Mr. WILEY are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

This action is made imperatively necessary by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in February which invalidated the Wisconsin compulsory arbitration law which governed the handling of labor disputes in essential services furnished by public utilities.

UTILITY STRIKES WRECK WHOLE CITIES

By this amendment today, we hope to handle one of the most critical problems of this technological age, namely, the problem of the possible paralysis of entire cities, regions, and States by the shutting down of a public utility. In recent years, there have been a tremendous number of disastrous instances, for example, the tugboat strike in New York, the prolonged Detroit transit strike and others wherein whole communities have been absolutely paralyzed by the decision of a union and/or of management, which resulted in a stoppage. It is absolutely impossible to estimate the tremendous direct and indirect financial costs of such a municipal paralysis, the staggering drop in business volume, the loss in profits, interests, dividends, wages in general and other harmful consequences to the very lives of individuals.

TEXT OF AMENDMENT

The amendment being introduced today reads as follows:

"Section 14 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(c) (1) Nothing in this act or the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, shall be construed to nullify the provisions of any State or Territorial law which regulate or qualify the right of employees of a public utility to strike, or which prohibit strikes by such employees.

"'(2) As used in this subsection the term 'public utility' means an employer engaged in the business of furnishing water, light, heat, gas, electric power, sanitation, passenger transportation, or communication services to the public, or of operating a gas pipeline or a toll bridge or tunnel.'"

I might incidentally mention that I had hoped to introduce this amendment right after the Supreme Court decision. However, the need for further research in this matter, as well as the conflicting pressures of a great mass of other work, including Foreign Relations Committee hearings, prevented me.

I will not presume at this point to attempt to argue the legal merits of the majority and minority opinions of the Supreme Court in the February case. What I am concerned with for the present is the net effect of the Supreme Court's action, when by a vote of 6 to 3 it decided that the Wisconsin law banning utility strikes was in open conflict with the Federal Taft-Hartley law and was therefore null and void.

LIMITS OF TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

It should be remembered that the Taft-Hartley law does not of itself ban strikes in key industries. It merely provides for injunction powers against Nation-wide emergency strikes. However, these injunctions are limited to 80 days, after which a union can legally strike. Moreover, even such injunctions cannot be used against a public-utility strike, unless the walk-out actually affects a major part of the industry nationally.

Recognizing the deficiencies of the Taft-Hartley statute, therefore, various States like Wisconsin, New Jersey, Virginia, Florida, have tried to find ways and means of preventing local utility strikes from completely paralyzing their communities. The theory behind the Wisconsin and similar statutes was that the States could act on such walk-outs because they were local in nature. The dissenting Court opinion written by Justice Felix Frankfurter confirmed the right of the States to act accordingly.

Under the Wisconsin statute State courts were empowered to issue injunctions against such utility walk-outs. Employers and unions in the field were compelled to accept the settlements ordered by State-appointed arbitrators if negotiations bogged down.

WHAT THE MAJORITY RULED

The majority of the Supreme Court did not cover all aspects of the Badger law, but merely indicated that it felt that the Wisconsin statute was in conflict with the portion of the Taft-Hartley law, which guarantees the right of workers to strike.

The Court majority did not consider the appeal by labor unions to the effect that the Wisconsin statute allegedly created a condition of "involuntary servitude" by denying the workers the right to strike. I do not personally believe that any such condition at all was created. Chief Justice Vinson, in the majority opinion, merely stated that the Wisconsin act was not "emergency legislation," but a comprehensive code for the settlement of labor disputes between public-utility employers and employees. The Chief Justice stated that public utilities were in the domain of interstate commerce. He went on to say:

"Where, as here, the State seeks to deny entirely a federally guaranteed right which Congress itself restricted only to a limited extent in case of national emergencies, however serious, it is manifest that the State legislation is in conflict with Federal law.

"Such State legislation must yield as conflicting with the exercise of federally protected labor rights."

WHAT THE MINORITY DECISION HELD

In the minority opinion, Justice Frankfurter commented "it is not reasonable to impute to the Congress the desire to leave States helpless in meeting local situations when Congress restricted national intervention to national emergencies."

Justice Frankfurter rightly pointed out that the Supreme Court has in the past amply sustained portions of the Wisconsin labor laws which dealt with matters not spe-

cifically covered in Federal laws. Among these were State statutes dealing with mass picketing and intermittent work stoppages and with the two-thirds vote requirement for maintenance of union-shop clauses in collective-bargaining agreements.

Justice Frankfurter also noted that the Taft-Hartley law does not in specific terms deal with the problem of local strikes in public utilities. He added that Congress considered and rejected provisions for settling utility disputes under Federal law. He pointed out that it was up to Congress to be explicit if it desires to remove "from the orbit of State regulation matters of such intimate concern to a locality as the continued maintenance of services on which the decent life of a modern community rests."

The stoppage of utility services so clearly involves the needs of a community as to "evoke instinctively" the power of Government, Justice Frankfurter maintained. He warned that the Supreme Court should not "ignore history and economic facts" in interpreting Federal legislation that comes within the area of interacting State and Federal control.

"To derive from the general language of the Federal act a 'right' to strike in violation of a State law regulating public utilities is to strip from words the limits inherent in their context," Frankfurter contended.

Now the Supreme Court's decision has aroused tremendous controversy in Wisconsin. We Badgers have always felt that we were pioneering in the Nation in protecting our local communities. Some of our ablest officials including our present Attorney General Vernon Thompson, Mrs. Beatrice Lampert of his office, State Senator Gordon Bubolz, Mr. L. E. Gooding of the State employment relations board and others have worked long and hard in this field.

ENEMIES COULD SABOTAGE UTILITIES

It is obvious that in this atomic age, the public utility system of a country represents a No. 1 target for enemy sabotage and destruction. It is obvious, too, that if a single Communist or other seditionist is well placed in an electric, gas, or streetcar transportation or similar system, he or she can paralyze that system and can go a long way toward crippling America's defensive and offensive capacity.

I do not in any way impugn the patriotic sentiments of the rank and file workers in transportation and other public-utility fields, nor of their union officers. I know that these union members recognize that they have a special obligation to the public to keep services rolling. Nevertheless, it is a fact that there have been numerous occasions when the public utilities have been paralyzed, and that was what helped create the Wisconsin and similar State statutes in the first place.

I RESPECT LABOR'S RIGHTS

Now, having been a workingman myself, starting in the sawmills of northern Wisconsin over four decades ago, I am not inclined to take away a legitimate right of labor. On the contrary, I believe fervently in labor's right to decent pay, equitable hours, working conditions, etc. But I believe still more fervently that the most paramount interest of all is the public interest, and I say that we simply cannot allow whole cities to be paralyzed either by instances of labor's and/or management's obstinacy or by any other factor which causes a strike. Some elements in management might not like stern arbitration measures taken in the field of public utilities any more than some elements in labor might, but their likes or dislikes are not nearly as important as the welfare of the American public.

That fact will be and, I believe, is recognized by enlightened segments in both management or labor. They appreciate the terrible consequences of a ruinous strike to utility management and labor themselves. What could sour the public against labor more speedily than a walkout by a few individuals which blacks out a whole city? Does labor think that the public will tolerate such arbitrary action?

LETTER FROM SENATOR TAFT

Now, the question naturally arises sooner or later: How correct was the Supreme Court's interpretation of Congress' intent? To get the answer to that question, I wrote to Senator ROBERT TAFT and, as usual, he came promptly back with a very clear-cut and helpful answer. He stated that he had reread the portion of his remarks quoted in the Supreme Court decision, but that he could not see in his remarks any justification whatsoever for the Court's action.

Senator TAFT stated in his letter of May 11 to me:

"At no place did I say, either expressly or impliedly, that States should or could not attempt to regulate or prohibit strikes in public utilities. We merely decided that the Federal Government would not do so in the bill we were considering.

"I quite agree that the line between Federal power and State power in the field of labor-management relations is a hazy and indefinite one. The concept of interstate commerce has been constantly extended beyond the point where I think it ought to be. But no matter how clearly that line may be drawn, I believe there is a large field where both Federal and State action should be permitted. Obviously the Federal Government has not intended to set up any police action against breach of the peace, and that whole field remains with the States even when the dispute is under Federal control. I think the same thing applies to State action such as that taken by Wisconsin to protect the health and safety of its citizens. Under these circumstances, I believe that Federal action in this field should not be considered to exclude State action unless the law explicitly so provides, or unless the State action conflicts directly with the terms of the Federal statute.

"I am quite certain that the committee and the Senate had no intention whatever in passing the Taft-Hartley law, or its national emergency section, to supersede State action to deal with labor-management disputes in public utilities within the borders of the State."

DIRECT DEBATE ON THIS POINT

Then Senator TAFT recalled this fact: On June 4, 1947, during House debate on the final conference report on the Taft-Hartley law, there was a direct reference to the Wisconsin statute in a colloquy between Congressman Fred Hartley, of New Jersey, and Congressman CHARLES KERSTEN, of Milwaukee.

The exchange read:

"Mr. KERSTEN. I would like to ask the gentleman about that portion which pertains to the validity of State laws. Wisconsin and other States have their own labor-relations laws. We are very anxious that disputes be settled at the State level insofar as it is possible. Can the gentleman give us assurance on that proposition so that it is a matter of record, that that is the sense of the language and the report?

"Mr. HARTLEY. That is the sense of the language of the bill and of the report. That is my interpretation of the bill, that this will not interfere with the State of Wisconsin in the administration of its own laws. In other words, this will not interfere with the validity of the laws within that State."

Now, I dare say there is not a single Member of the Senate who doubts the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio is one of our ablest experts in the field of labor relations, and particularly in the field of interpretation of the statute which bears his name and that of former Congressman Fred Hartley, of New Jersey. While it is obvious that there are a tremendous number of differences between the Ohio Senator and his colleagues of the Democratic majority, there is no man who disputes the keenness of his observation nor the clearness of his recollection on a matter on which he worked so long and so hard, namely, the Labor-Management Act of 1947.

REPRINTING OF SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Finally, by way of reinforcing the need for this amendment today, I am having various materials reprinted at this point, as follows:

(1) A brief memorandum on the amendment.

(2) A resolution of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, adopted at a meeting of the public relations committee on March 28, 1951. (I want to commend the WEC, incidentally, for its clear-sighted recognition of the problem—recognition which is thoroughly shared by the private utility industry.)

(3) Editorials from the Milwaukee Journal, the Manitowoc Herald-Times, the Two Rivers Reporter, the Stevens Point Journal, and other leading newspapers across the country, as noted in each instance.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM ON AMENDMENT

The Supreme Court in the case of Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and *Motor Coach Employees of America, Division 998, et al.* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board*, decided February 26, 1951, held the Wisconsin statute relating to strikes by employees of public utilities unconstitutional on two grounds:

1. That Congress had preempted the field, and

2. That certain provisions of the State statute were in conflict with the Federal law.

To overcome the first ground presents no serious drafting problems, since this can be accomplished merely by the Congress giving its consent to State legislation in the same field.

The second ground, however, raises some problems.

In its opinion, in the case referred to above, the Supreme Court pointed out that certain provisions of the Wisconsin statute were inconsistent with the National Labor Relations Act. One of the provisions referred to by the Court in this regard was the provision of the Wisconsin statute which required, in providing for arbitration, that collective bargaining continue only until an impasse is reached. The Federal Act imposes a duty upon the parties to continue their bargaining efforts even though a strike may be in progress.

The amendment has been drafted in such a way as to permit the States to enact laws similar to the Wisconsin Act, which conflicts in certain respects with the Federal act. In employing the general language necessary to describe such State statutes, it has been necessary to partially open the door to the enactment of other provisions, which may or may not be desirable, in conflict with the Federal act.

Unfortunately, we have been unable to discover any effective way of restricting the States in the exercise of the authority granted them in the bill. If we were to require all antistrike legislation enacted by the States to be consistent with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, we would obviously defeat the purpose of this amendment; and so we have had no alternative but to leave the State power rather general.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, MARCH 28, 1951

Whereas the experience in Wisconsin under the compulsory arbitration law for labor disputes affecting the essential services of utility companies in its short time of operation demonstrated the value of such law by preventing any interruption of essential services to the public; and

Whereas the interests of both labor and management have been protected in such disputes as were brought to arbitration through hearings before impartial tribunals; and

Whereas those arbitrations in which REA cooperatives have been involved have tended to lead to a stabilization of relations between labor and management, chiefly because the parties have been compelled to recognize the superior right of the public to a continuity of service, and both parties have as a result sincerely endeavored to fairly negotiate upon their problems; and

Whereas 95 percent of all farmers receiving electric service are totally dependent upon it for the necessities of life, such as water, and the operation of machinery for the production of food on a day-to-day basis absolutely requiring continuity of service 24 hours a day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress is petitioned to amend the Taft-Hartley law in such manner as to remove any question of the constitutionality of the Wisconsin public-utility compulsory arbitration law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Wisconsin congressional delegation.

TO RESTORE UTILITY STRIKE BAN

The United States Supreme Court, in a 6-to-3 decision on February 26, declared invalid the 1947 statute prohibiting strikes by employees of public utilities. The high Court said that the law was in conflict with the Taft-Hartley Act and therefore void.

Because of this ruling, unions of water, light, heat, gas, electric, and communications companies in this State—and in several other States which adopted similar laws—are now free to strike to dramatize their demands, if they so choose. They are free to do this despite the fact that even momentary work stoppages in some types of utilities must inevitably cause serious menace to public health and safety.

Study of the decision reveals no practical way by which Wisconsin can protect itself against emergencies arising from utility strikes as long as the Taft-Hartley Act provision remains as it now is.

It is gratifying, therefore, to note that Senator WILEY is asking the the Senate Labor Committee to draft an amendment expressly to permit States to ban utility strikes and to set up a compulsory arbitration system.

The Wisconsin law operated successfully for several years. Under it many difficult labor disputes were amicably settled. The public interest was safeguarded. The bulk of labor gradually came to accept its provisions.

We hope that Congress will see the need for the restoration of this type of law and will make the minor change in the Taft-Hartley Act which will make that restoration possible. If it does not, the time may well come when a labor-management deadlock will lead to a strike which may leave our cities and countryside dark, without electricity, gas, or communications.

[From the Manitowoc Herald-Times of March 2, 1951]

BEAT STRIKE BAN

This week the United States Supreme Court struck down Wisconsin's antistrike law for employees in public utilities on the ground that the State law conflicts with the Taft-Hartley Act. Enacted in 1947 the law offered some protection to consumers.

Today there is no substitute for gas or electricity in the modern home. A strike in the middle of winter could effectively freeze out the residents dependent on these services.

The Supreme Court said in effect that employees of public utilities have the same right to strike in labor disputes as workers in other fields. This is based on the theory that union rights of free assembly and free speech would otherwise be denied. How to cope with interruptions in vital public services is now thrown back to legislative bodies which must try to find some way to enforce labor peace on behalf of the public. The decision apparently closes the door for all time on the theory the public interests demand that utilities be classified differently than other industry and workers in utilities occupy a different niche than those in other occupations.

The Court rules that such a classification subjected public utility employees to involuntary servitude under the Constitution. There are not many alternatives open to control utility services. Unionized workers in those fields with the clear right to strike if they choose now assured can be expected to take advantage of it at times.

Such expedients as Government seizure and operation during a strike, have not been particularly effective in recent railroad strikes. It is doubtful if they would be any more valuable in power or communication utilities than in transportation.

If a difficult situation arises out of abuse of rights defined in the new decision it is certain new legislation, that will stand a high court test, will be attempted.

[From the Two Rivers Reporter of March 24, 1951]

SEEK NEW MEASURE

The United States Supreme Court recently held invalid a Wisconsin statute banning strikes against public utilities, on the ground the law was contrary to the much-discussed Taft-Hartley Act. Now a movement is on foot in Washington to amend the Taft-Hartley law to allow State governments to outlaw strikes against utilities. Among those interested in having this change made is United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin.

The knocked-out law provided for compulsory arbitration against utilities providing heat, water, gas, electric power, public-passenger transportation and communications. WILEY insists the law is a good one but adds he has no quarrel with the High Court. He simply wants the Taft-Hartley law amended to eliminate the conflict between Federal and State statutes. He would change the section of the Federal law on which the Supreme Court relied in voiding the Wisconsin law.

WILEY contends it would be folly, in the face of the present national emergency, to leave a State helpless when a union might plunge a city into darkness or turn off its heat. WILEY said the Wisconsin statute was a model for similar laws which have been enacted by various States.

Chief Justice Vinson wrote the majority opinion in the 6-to-3 decision. He contended that the Taft-Hartley Act guarantees the right to strike of all workers in inter-State commerce. He placed utilities in the category of inter-State commerce.

Justice Frankfurter in the dissenting opinion held there was no reason to believe that Congress contemplated prohibiting State governments from enacting laws to prevent paralysis within their boundaries. Frankfurter wrote:

"Whether the State chose wisely in adopting arbitration rather than taking no measure or taking a more forceful measure to protect the public interest is not for us to decide. Seizure or martial law or other affirmative action by the State might be just as deleterious to collective bargaining as enforced arbitration, apart from raising other contentious issues.

"If there is legislative choice it is not for us to demand that what is chosen should commend itself to our private notions of wise policy."

"I find no indication in the statute that States are not equally free to protect the public interest in State emergencies," Frankfurter added.

WILEY says he will address a formal appeal to the Senate Labor Committee to amend the Taft-Hartley Act.

[From the Stevens Point Journal of March 5, 1951]

PUBLIC ENTITLED TO PROTECTION

Now that the United States Supreme Court has knocked out the Wisconsin law banning strikes against public utilities, on the ground that it conflicts with Federal labor laws, many people are wondering what recourse the public might have in the event of disruption of vital services due to labor disputes.

The law which was declared unconstitutional in a split decision was enacted by the Wisconsin Legislature in 1947. In forbidding strikes in utilities, it provided for compulsory arbitration of labor-management disputes. It was a controversial subject from the time it was proposed until it received its death blow at the hands of the Nation's highest court.

If Federal laws do not recognize the right of the public to protection from stoppage of such vital services as electricity, water, and gas, it seems that Congress has a responsibility to correct the situation. The public health and general welfare are too closely bound up with these services to permit any serious interruption of them. The public interest demands settlement of disputes between labor and management in industries supplying vital utility services in some other way than through strikes which interfere with such services.

We have long since outgrown the kerosene lamp, the back-yard pump and the wood-burning kitchen range and heater. We are, in effect, slaves to modern conveniences. We are entitled to be protected in our enjoyment of them. We should not have to be innocent victims of disputes between labor and management.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 6, 1951]

UTILITY STRIKE LAW DECISION

From the Indianapolis Star: "The decision of the United States Supreme Court striking down the Wisconsin public utilities compulsory arbitration law is amazing. If the principles outlined by the majority are applied to all States having such laws, State governments will be powerless to protect the people against dangerous public utility strikes. Conceivably they could not even suppress Communist inspired strikes in such services in a national crisis."

From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "Short of a section-by-section comparison, Missouri's King-Thompson act on balance appears to be, if anything, stronger than the Wisconsin law against public utility strikes, now declared unconstitutional in a 6-to-3 decision of the Supreme Court.

"So it is clear enough that both Wisconsin and Missouri went beyond Congress. But may not the States experiment further, so long as it is reasonable, within their smaller laboratories? Justices Frankfurter, Burton, and Minton think so. They say that the States are not precluded just because Con-

gress has a special interest in the commerce field."

From the Atlanta Constitution: "The Supreme Court's decision yesterday outlawing the Wisconsin ban of strikes in public utilities puts the matter of protection from such strikes squarely up to Congress.

"Justice Vinson, speaking for the majority in the case, said the Wisconsin law, upon which similar laws in several other States are said to be based, violates the National Labor Relations Act.

"Congress can, and should, amend the act so as to permit utility strikes to be outlawed. It is a question of protection of the rights of the many against abuse of privilege by the few."

From the Racine Journal Times: "Merely outlawing the State statute does not solve the problem that brought forth the utility antistrike act. The public wants, and should have, protection against loss of utility services, and some way must be found to provide that protection."

From the Janesville Gazette: "How to cope with interruptions in vital public services is now tossed back to legislative bodies, which must try to find some way to enforce labor peace on behalf of the public. The decision apparently closes the door, once and for all, on the theory that the public interest demands that utilities be classified differently from other industry and that workers in utilities occupy a different niche than those in other occupations.

"History is being made in a relatively new field, and there is hope that union organizations themselves are becoming more conscious of social responsibilities.

"If a difficult condition arises out of abuse of rights defined in the new decision, it is certain new legislation will be attempted."

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests and to effect permanent transfer of those lands, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, Representative at Large from the State of New Mexico, which deals with the subject matter of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1536) to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as the North Lobato and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief-program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1951.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You will remember that when Public Law 499, an act to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, was passed in May of last year, we were assured that under section 2 (f), which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with the State rural rehabilitation corporations, the grant lands in New Mexico purchased with rural rehabilitation funds could be continued as at present under the administration of the Forest Service, which is satisfactory to the people using the lands, and that by agreement with the Secretary those lands could be placed permanently under the administration of the Forest Service so as to relieve those people from the constant threat of liquidation.

That section provides:

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with any State rural rehabilitation corporation or other State agency or official having jurisdiction of the trust assets which have been returned pursuant to application made therefor under section 2 (c) hereof, and upon such terms and conditions and for such periods of time as may be mutually agreeable, to accept, administer, expend, and use in such State all or any part of such trust assets or any other funds of such State rural rehabilitation corporation or State agency, which are transferred to the Secretary for carrying out the purposes of titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and in accordance with the applicable provisions of title IV thereof as now or hereafter amended. Funds appropriated for the administration of said act shall also be available for carrying out such agreements."

The Rural Rehabilitation Corporation has by resolution requested that those two grants remain in the Department of Agriculture for administration, and that they be permanently placed under the Forest Service. Recognizing that there exists the right to have these lands administered as at present with the aid of the Farmers Home Administration up to May 3, 1953, the deadline for liquidation or transfer of the assets, the Corporation also requested that $25,000 of the assets remain with the Department to be used insofar as necessary in carrying out the intent and purpose for which the lands were purchased up to that date of May 3, 1953, that being the estimated amount necessary for that purpose for that period of time.

In this I think the Corporation acted very wisely and magnanimously, but we are now stumped in that the Solicitors for the Department of Agriculture feel it necessary that additional enabling legislation be enacted specifically authorizing the placing of those lands under the Forest Service on a permanent basis. Consequently we have been told that unless such authorizing legislation is passed, the lands would have to be liquidated by sale by May 3, 1953, or else returned to the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation for administration by it in the manner and under the inhibitions contained in section 2 (c) of the act as trust funds. That Corporation is, of course, in no position to administer those lands in that manner without some very substantial appropriations of public moneys by the State, and that would be too much to expect. On the other hand administration by the Forest Service would in time fully serve the purpose and would be advantageous to the counties in which the lands are located and to the State itself.

I had some doubts that the bill as it passed the House last May was sufficient to permit that arrangement, but was assured that the conference committee would broaden the language to accomplish the purpose, and that if it did not do so, the Chairman of the House committee would lend his aid toward passage of enabling legislation if that were necessary. Further, Mr. HOPE, the ranking Republican member of the House committee, finally came around to favoring that treatment, as shown by the record, insofar as these particular lands were concerned. I did not wish to place any obstacles in the passage of the bill which was most desirable and indeed necessary to prevent other assets in the various States being diverted from their original purpose. I therefore acquiesced with the assurance above referred to. The conference committee did attempt to broaden the language, but as interpreted by the Solicitors it does not go far enough.

In line with the understanding above outlined, I have been for some time working with the Department of Agriculture, and with the Bureau of Land Management which has jurisdiction of the mineral deposits in said lands, and we have drafted a bill which I think accomplishes the end desired for the benefit of the people using the lands. Section 1 of the draft which I enclose authorizes the placing of these two tracts under permanent Forest administration not later than May 3, 1953. This date is the same deadline date for the consummation of these agreements or the liquidation of the assets. This draft could have provided for a forthwith transfer, but there is need for time to permit gradual readjustment of the people involved to the kind of administration required under Forest Service rules. The bill as drawn permits the Department to give those people more time to fully get on their feet where they can be on their own without the assistance and guidance now provided for them, and which may be continued to be provided for them through the wise foresight of the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation in making it possible to use so much of the funds as may be necessary, but not to exceed $25,000, for that purpose. Of course the Department may succeed in more rapidly getting them to that point and may save a considerable portion of that fund, which may then be retransferred by the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation to the Farmers Home Administration before the deadline of May 3, 1953.

Section 2 of the draft is added assurance to those people in New Mexico that the work of rehabilitation and adjustment will be recognized by the Forest Service in the matter of grazing permits and the manner of their handling and issuance by the Department.

Section 3 deals with the minerals. The Bureau of Land Management had authority to issue mineral leases under the Mineral Leasing Act and under section 402 of Reorganization Plan No. 3, of 1946 (60 Stat. 1099), but that section contains a proviso which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That mineral development of such lands (acquired lands) shall be authorized by the Secretary of the Interior only when he is advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that such development shall not interfere with the primary purpose for which the land was acquired, and only in accordance with such conditions as may be specified by the Secretary of Agriculture in order to protect such purposes."

The Department of Agriculture has, since the enactment of Public Law 499, interpreted section 5 of that act as preventing their granting the approval required by the above proviso from and after the passage of Public Law 499 last May. That section 5 reads in part as follows:

"None of the properties or assets held on the date of the approval of this act by the Secretary as trustee pursuant to trust agreements with the various State rural rehabilitation corporations may be used by the Secretary for any purpose after the effective date of this act, except for the purposes authorized under section 2 (d) of this act * * *."

That, of course, was not the intent of section 5, and I disagree with the Department of Agriculture's view of it and so does the Bureau of Land Management as I understand, but of course that Bureau cannot act on applications for mineral leases without

the clearance by the Department of Agriculture which it declines to give because of said section 5. That places the minerals in a position where they are completely frozen and may not be explored, as no one else has authority to act. Although I think we could convince the Department of Agriculture, there is enough ambiguity to raise the question and we thought it wise to clear the situation once and for all insofar as these two tracts of land are concerned. In conjunction with both Departments we have drafted section 3 to take care of that situation, which will permit the two Departments to act now and makes the right to act thereafer also clear.

This bill affects only two of the five grants originally purchased with rehabilitation funds, the Pueblo grant in San Miguel County and the North Lobato grant in Rio Arriba County. Two of the others have been purchased by the people involved and have been paid in full and are completely liquidated. The fifth one is the Costilla grant in Taos County. There the people formed an association which purchased the land and gave a mortgage for it. The mortgage is held as an asset in trust for the State of New Mexico and therefore cannot be dealt with in the same manner as these two grants. This is one on which the solution for it is still under study. The State game department is interested in a portion of the land. Other portions would well be placed under Forest Service administration. It might be possible to reach an agreement whereby the State of New Mexico would purchase a part of it and reduce the debt, and whereby the Forest Service could take over the forest lands by further reducing the mortgage, with the right of the people to fully acquire the bottom lands and a right to the grazing privileges on the Forest Service much in the same manner as the arrangement agreed upon with respect to the grants affected by the bill.

Since this bill will ultimately be referred to the Agriculture Committee of which you are a member, and in view of your continued and sympathetic interest in behalf of the people who depend on these two tracts for their economic base, I would appreciate it tremendously if you would join with me by introducing this bill in the Senate simultaneously with my introducing it in the House.

Sincerely yours,

A. M. FERNANDEZ.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO EMPLOY ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 143), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 215, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 9, 1950, authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ additional personnel, is hereby continued until August 31, 1952.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENT

Mr. BENNETT submitted an amendment to the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KEM:

Report by Abraham Lincoln Kilby, of Vandalia, Mo., on Socialism in Action in Great Britain.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Reprint of broadcast by Henry J. Taylor, giving the background of General MacArthur's homecoming.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Sermon on the subject Washington Confidential—Another View, by Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church, Washingon, D. C., on Sunday, May 20, 1951.

Report entitled "Big Businesses Grabs Defense Plants," prepared by the Public Affairs Institute.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

A tabulation, marked "Exhibit J," giving a comparison between social-security and railroad-retirement tax payments and benefits.

By Mr. McMAHON:

Editorial entitled "The Defense Secretary Makes Answer," published in the New Haven (Conn.) Evening Register of May 9, 1951, regarding testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly.

Editorial entitled "Substitute for Victory," from the Vet-Times of May 5, 1951.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

Article entitled "Fears United States Decay," from the Kansas City Times of April 2, 1951, dealing with a statement by Dean W. Malott, chancelor of the University of Kansas, referring to America's being on the way to socialism.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article entitled "Six Hundred Percent Increase in Subsidized Ship Lines' Net Worth," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 18, 1951.

An article entitled "Income Tax Unit's Error Minimized by United States Attorney," from a St. Louis, Mo., newspaper, and an editorial entitled "A Suspicious Business," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 12, 1951, dealing with an error in information given to a grand jury by a Federal judge.

By Mr. MALONE:

A press release from his office, under date of May 21, 1951, summarizing the speech made by him in the Senate on that day in regard to House bill 1612, extending the Trade Agreements Act.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] in the nature of a substitute to the pending bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] desired to have some matters placed in the RECORD. I do not see him on the floor. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Nevada wishes to proceed again or not. His substitute is the pending amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Nevada, I believe, understood that the Senator from Florida was going to query the chairman of the committee about some matters relative to his amendment. I believe the Senator from Florida is engaged in committee work at this moment. My distinguished colleague from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] wants to make a few observations on the bill, and he is ready to proceed, if it is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. It is agreeable to me, Mr. President. Of course, I should like to have the substitute disposed of, but it would be necessary to have a quorum call before doing that.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, the bill we have before us, H. R. 1612, in my judgment, represents a sharp improvement over the legislation under which the trade-agreements program has been conducted in the past.

It is not a perfect piece of legislation—far from it. At the same time I believe that, used properly, this bill could be a forward step in providing adequate protection to American industry and agriculture, and at the same time form the basis for a sound policy of international trade.

Most of the defects we have observed in the trade-agreements program during the past few years have been defects in administration rather than defects in the law. The Trade Agreements Act has always provided that tariff adjustments could be made upward as well as downward. But unfortunately, not a single upward adjustment has been made, no matter how clearly the need was shown. Trade agreements negotiated during the past few years have all included an escape clause, but unfortunately those escape clauses have not been used. Even the peril-point proposal could have been and should have been followed as a matter of practical common sense by those administering this program over the years. In other words, there never was any excuse for making concessions below the point at which domestic industry and agriculture would be injured.

Under this bill we have attempted to pin down some of these principles into firm law so that they cannot be evaded. I do not know that we have been wholly successful. As a practical matter it is not possible to correct defects in administration by making changes in the basic law. The only way to make a real improvement in the execution of this program is to put new people in charge of handling it.

I should like to call particular attention to two or three provisions of the bill. Section 10 is particularly important because it makes absolutely clear that Congress has never approved the general agreement on tariffs and trade negotiated at Geneva. There was some pretense by representatives of the exec-

utive departments that Congress had given implicit approval of this agreement at one time or another. I hope the committee's action in including this section will make it clear that that is not the case.

Section 9 will restore to domestic manufacturers the right to challenge the classifications made by customs inspectors in levying duties on imported goods. At present, when goods are imported and the customs collector makes a decision as to how they should be classified and what duty they should pay, the importer may, if he chooses, disagree with that decision and appeal to the courts against it. The domestic group, however, for whose protection the duty is levied, is not allowed to go to court against those custom classifications. Obviously, this system is clearly discriminatory aaginst the domestic industry affected. I am extremely glad that the committee has seen fit to restore the rights of domestic industries under section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930. I hope this provision may be of some value to the domestic jeweled watch industry which has been severely injured as a result of the Swiss agreement.

Section 8 (b) is particularly important since it unequivocally gives section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act a priority or a superior status to any provision which may be written or which may have been written into any trade agreement. Section 22 is the section which permits the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent imported farm products from destroying or injuring our domestic agricultural programs.

Time after time in the past, we have found that farm imports have come into this country and flooded our markets at the very time when we were trying, through domestic measures, to maintain farm prices at a reasonable level. In an address to the Senate on September 9, 1949, I listed product after product in which this situation occurred.

For example, at that time, we were supporting the prices of barley, oats, and rye, and the Commodity Credit Corporation was buying or taking over under loan large quantities of these products in order to maintain the price. At the very same time, additional quantities of barley, oats, and rye were being imported from Canada and elsewhere to add to the surplus and to counteract the efforts of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

We were buying up potatoes and destroying them, but Canada was shipping in additional surplus potatoes as fast as we could destroy the domestic surplus. We were making loans and buying up flax seed, soybeans, butter, peanuts, and other vegetable fats and oils, while at the same time, through the trade agreements program, over a billion pounds of competitive oils and fats were being imported each calendar year. We were supporting the domestic price of wool, but we were encouraging foreign wool to enter in competition with our own wool. Thus, our Government with one hand through the Commodity Credit Corporation was trying to hold up the price of domestic farm products; with the other hand, through the trade-agreements program, it was helping to knock them down.

Whenever any attempt was made to correct this situation through section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, we were told that no quota or additional import fee could be imposed on such imports by the Secretary of Agriculture, because we had entered into trade agreements which prohibited us from protecting our domestic farm prices.

This bill attempts to correct that situation. It states flatly that no trade agreement shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. I do not think there can be any misunderstanding about the meaning of this provision. By this section, Congress is serving clear notice that it wants our domestic agricultural price structure to be protected.

Mr. President, the trade-agreements program has already done serious harm to a number of domestic agricultural products. I hope it will be possible to repair this damage either through the escape-clause section or through the section 22 procedure under this bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The very able and distinguished Senator from Nebraska is not only familiar with the agricultural problem which we have in the Midwest and in the Nation, but he has rendered outstanding service in connection with the agricultural program. I ask him if, in his opinion, the pending bill takes care of the competition which we receive from imported agricultural commodities.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that it is my feeling that, with the adoption of the provision with reference to making section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act the determining factor when such situations arise the bill would bring the relief which is needed to protect American agriculture.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I note on page 11 of the bill, beginning after line 20 and continuing to the end of line 7 on page 12, that the committee has struck out a section dealing with the importation of agricultural commodities. I should like to read it for the RECORD:

SEC. 8. Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) No reduced tariff or other concession resulting from a trade agreement entered into under this section shall apply with respect to any agricultural commodity for which price support is available to producers in the United States unless the sales prices (as determined from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture) for the imported agricultural commodity within the United States after the application of such reduced tariff or other concession exceed the level of such price support."

The Finance Committee struck out that House provision which, as I understand, if enacted, would prohibit the importation of competitive agricultural commodities below the price-support level. Will the distinguished Senator from Nebraska discuss that question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think the Senator from Kansas will find that the new section 8 takes care of the situation. At least, in my opinion, it does. That section begins on page 12, line 8. I read subsection (b):

(b) Subsection (f) of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section."

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides protection for American agriculture, just as it has always done.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator for this clarification. I sincerely hope that the pending bill will work in the way which I am sure the Senator from Nebraska intends it should work, and as others interested in agriculture intend it should.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Many other Senators have expressed the same thought to members of the committee with reference to the agricultural section. If any improvement or change is needed, I hope it will be made before the passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I had just made the statement that the Trade Agreements Act had already done considerable harm to American agriculture. I expressed the hope that that would not occur again, because of the adoption of the amendment which has just been quoted.

One example of a domestic industry which has been seriously injured is the casein industry, which has been almost destroyed under the operations of the trade-agreements program. Casein is a product manufactured from skim milk, and is used principally for sizing paper. It is an extra outlet for the dairy farmer and provides him with a sizable market for his skim milk, which otherwise might be fed to the hogs or go to waste. It is particularly important in those sections of the country which produce milk primarily for its butterfat content, and for which, therefore, the skim milk is a byproduct.

Under the tariff rates in effect before any trade agreement was negotiated affecting casein, domestic producers supplied virtually the entire domestic market. I have before me a table which compares domestic production with imports and which shows that during most of the 1930's, domestic producers supplied from 75 to 99 percent of the market. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Casein, dry: Production and imports for consumption, United States, 1930–51

[Thousands of pounds]

	Production [1]	Imports for consumption [2]
1930	41,965	18,500
1931	35,335	3,503
1932	24,428	1,201
1933	24,087	8,142
1934	37,331	1,191
1935	37,638	3,230
1936	46,140	16,209
1937	67,467	5,210
1938	48,549	417
1939	40,878	15,832
1940	46,616	24,523
1941	47,346	41,518
1942	42,268	16,819
1943	18,386	28,052
1944	15,264	47,225
1945	12,333	51,610
1946	18,319	45,346
1947	35,831	20,887
1948	14,372	40,585
1949	18,348	33,061
1950	19,150	54,552
1951, January and February	2,565	9,691

[1] Compiled from reports of P. & M. A., U. S. D. A., and B. A. E., U. S. D. A.
[2] Bureau of the Census.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Late in 1951, the duty on casein was reduced from 5½ cents per pound to 2¾ cents per pound. Almost immediately, the domestic industry started to slip. Imports have mounted during recent years. Domestic producers have supplied only 25 to 35 percent of the market. The rest has been supplied by imports.

In 1950, domestic production amounted to 19,150,000 pounds, while imports amounted to 54,552,000 pounds. During the first 2 months of 1951, the latest period for which I have figures, domestic production was only 2,565,000 pounds; while imports were 9,691,000 pounds.

It takes 35 pounds of skim milk to produce 1 pound of casein. Evidently, the imports of casein during 1950 amounted to the equivalent of 2,000,000,000 pounds of liquid skim milk. During that same year, 1950, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 351,600,000 pounds of dried skim milk in order to take it off the market and maintain dairy prices. Since it requires about 11 pounds of skim milk for each pound of dried skim milk, the Commodity Credit Corporation had to supply a market for nearly 4,000,000,000 pounds of surplus skim milk. That was the size of the surplus of skim milk. Of that 4,000,000,000 pounds, approximately 2,000,000,000 pounds represented the casein shipped in here from Argentina.

To put it another way, if the domestic casein industry had been permitted to supply the American market for casein, 2,000,000,000 additional pounds of skim milk from the farm could have gone into that market and would not have had to be purchased from the Government.

Just a few days ago, another far-reaching agreement was concluded by our Government with a number of other governments at Torquay, England. I shall not try to analyze that agreement in detail, but would like to call attention to just one item which is typical of the way this program has been conducted under the present administration. Paragraph 710 of the Tariff Act contains the duties on cheese of various types. Practically all of the various types of cheese have suffered duty reductions during the past few years.

Now, under the Torquay Agreement, most of them have again been reduced. Cheddar cheese, which is the most important type of cheese from the standpoint of quantity, was reduced again from 3½ cents per pound to 3 cents per pound, and the minimum rate was also lowered. Before the trade-agreements program was started, the duty of most types of cheese, I believe, was 7 cents a pound.

Mr. President, I simply cannot understand the reasoning which would lead the State Department to make another reduction on the duty on cheese. Cheese imports have been increasing sharply in recent years. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, cheese imports of all types amounted to 13,740,000 pounds; during the fiscal year ending in 1947, they were nearly 16,000,000; the following year, nearly 17,000,000; the following year, over 25,000,000; and the following year, which ended last June 30, they amounted to 42,593,000 pounds. During the first 8 months of this present fiscal year—the period from last July through February—they already amounted to 47,584,000 pounds, for just that 8-month period. In the face of this rapid increase in the rate of imports of cheese, the State Department has chosen to inflict another duty reduction on cheese. Cheese, of course, is another one of those items which the Commodity Credit Corporation had to purchase in large quantities as late as last year because of the tremendous domestic surplus.

I desire to mention one more industry, and that is wool. During the past 10 years, since January 1, 1941, our sheep population has declined from 47,441,000 to only 28,065,000, a decrease of 41 percent. The domestic production of wool is being gradually, steadily, systematically, deliberately destroyed under this trade-agreements program. A few years ago we produced three-fourths of our wool needs in this country, and when World War II broke out we found it very handy to have a safe supply of wool at hand. Now, when this present crisis broke upon us, that domestic source of supply had been seriously reduced, and we immediately found ourselves dependent on foreign countries, most of them a good many thousands of miles away. The supplies simply were not there. The price of wool has jumped outrageously, but I hope no one will suppose that the domestic wool producer is responsible for this sudden sharp rise in prices. The domestic producer is not getting the money you are paying for a wool suit today. The domestic producer has almost been put out of business during this past decade. Over half the wool comes from abroad, and it is the foreign producer who is reaping the benefits of our misguided policy.

These three examples, Mr. President—casein, cheese, and wool—in my opinion, demonstrate conclusively the folly of the policies we have followed during recent years in conducting our foreign-trade program. I believe all three of these industries would have legitimate cause for complaint that they have been seriously injured by the trade-agreements program. We have tried to provide an avenue of relief for them in this bill.

I sincerely hope they will derive some benefit from it. These situations should never have been permitted to occur. This program has been in the hands of "one worlders" and men who were determined to reduce every tariff rate on any excuse they could find. The act under which they have been operating has given them broad authority to make whatever arbitrary decisions suited their pleasure. In this renewal we have tried to tighten up the act and give domestic producers more consideration. We have tried to tighten up the standards under which those administering the act can operate, so as to eliminate some of the arbitrary decisions from which we have suffered in the past.

The bill, if enacted, will provide some definite improvements over what we have had, but it is definitely not a permanent solution. For the present I believe it is the best we can get. Ultimately, we shall have to write legislation that will give real protection to American producers. When American agriculture, industry, and labor realize how they have been sold down the river under this low-tariff policy, I predict their demand for legislation that will give them really effective protection against low-wage imports will be irresistible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, when the pending bill, H. R. 1612, was being considered by the able Committee on Finance under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I appeared before the committee on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself, and presented briefly the situation facing Florida fruit and vegetable growers, especially the latter.

Because of the perishability of their products and the heavy competition which they face from certain vegetables imported from Cuba and from Mexico, the machinery provided in the present Trade Agreements Act and in the pending bill, H. R. 1612, as it came over from the House of Representatives, does not do equity to the domestic producers of fruits and vegetables.

This is due in large part to the perishability of most vegetables and some fruits, which cannot be stored, but must be marketed immediately upon being harvested. Excessive and erratic imports from Cuba and Mexico constitute a continuing and serious economic threat to the domestic industry, particularly in Florida.

Mr. Luther L. Chandler, representing the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, testified before the committee, and brought out clearly that when imports are reasonable in volume the return to the grower of highly perishable vegetables and fruits is fair, but when imports are erratic and heavy both the foreign and domestic producers sustain financial loss, with no compensating sav-

ing to the ultimate consumer, the general public.

Mr. President, I submitted to the committee for its consideration an amendment which was carefully designed to meet the situation. At this time I should like to incorporate the amendment in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HOLLAND was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. . (a) Whenever, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, the President has reason to believe that any one or more perishable fruits or vegetables are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions or in such quantities as to materially interfere with the orderly marketing of such commodity or commodities in the United States, he shall establish such import quotas on any such commodity as he may find necessary to provide for the orderly marketing of such commodity in the United States. Such quotas shall be established on a daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, or yearly basis, as may be advisable in the case of each respective commodity.

"(b) Any such quota shall be fixed at a point calculated to maintain the price received by the American producer at the parity level, and may be adjusted from time to time, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, with a view to maintaining the parity price.

"(c) In the preparation of his recommendations to the President the Secretary of Agriculture shall consult domestic producers and such representatives of foreign producers as he may deem to be of assistance in the formulation of mutually advantageous regulations."

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my understanding that a spokesman for the Department of State advised the committee that my amendment was unworkable, but that a substitute, which was inserted by the committee, and which appears as section 8 (a) in the committee bill, would accomplish practically the same objectives.

In brief, my amendment provides that when imports are such as to interfere or threaten to interfere with orderly marketing of perishable fruits and vegetables, the President, may upon recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, may establish such import quotas as he deems necessary to maintain the average price received by the American producers at the parity level. Such quotas could be adjusted when found necessary. If the domestic supply was reduced periodically by unfavorable weather conditions, or for other reasons, thereby causing an undue price rise, or the threat of such price rise, the President, acting upon recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, could immediately waive the quotas, or adjust the quotas proportionately.

Mr. President, I shall not dwell in detail at this time on either the problem or its suggested solution. It has been thoroughly covered in the hearing record. I think a sound case was made for the adoption of new remedies adapted to the specific needs of perishable fruits and vegetables. It is obvious that the committee concurred, at least, in the need for such action, as evidenced by the inclusion by the committee of section 8 (a) in the bill which it reported.

The committee report made reference to the program in a statement appearing on pages 6 and 7 of the report. I now read from the report, under the heading "Perishable agricultural products—Emergency action (sec. 8)." The committee stated the following at that point in the report:

Recognizing that, in the case of perishable agricultural commodities, emergency action under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or under the escape provisions of the bill may be necessary to prevent loss or material interference with orderly marketing, a provision for such emergency action has been included in the bill. When such action is reported as necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Tariff Commission and to the President, the Tariff Commission shall make an immediate investigation. The President, however, may take action without awaiting the Tariff Commission report if, in his judgment, the emergency requires such action. In any event, the Tariff Commission is to conclude its investigation and report, and the President is to make his decision, within 20 days after the Secretary of Agriculture has filed his report.

Let me digress at this time to say that I appreciate the fact that the committee has sought to deal with this question through the amendment, and I hope the fact that the committee prescribed this emergency action and required that it must be taken, if taken at all, within 20 days, will afford the possibility of some real relief to the producers of highly perishable fruits and vegetables in the United States.

I continue to read from the report:

The planting, or offering for sale, or shipment of large quantities of perishable products within and without the country may create conditions which would require emergency action. Upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, the President would be entitled to take steps which might prevent the spoilage of large quantities of perishables or alleviate international problems resulting from foreign as well as domestic surpluses.

Mr. President, in connection with the action of the committee, the committee also issued a news release on the same date when it made its report, I believe. The news release is dated April 26, 1951. Since the news release made specific reference to this particular amendment, as well as to the amendment which I had offered before the committee, I shall read, as a part of my remarks, the paragraph of the news release by the committee which deals with that subject:

Although the amendment regarding perishable agricultural products proposed by Senator HOLLAND was not adopted in its original form, the committee approved an amendment providing for emergency action with regard to perishable agricultural commodities. In such cases, after a recommendation to the President and to the Tariff Commission by the Secretary of Agriculture, the President may take immediate action or, if it is practicable, he may wait for a Tariff Commission report, which must be submitted not later than 20 calendar days after the Secretary of Agriculture has made his original recommendation.

Mr. President, because of the anxiety which is felt by both my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and myself and by the industries in our State and industries elsewhere which compete with off-shore industries which produce highly perishable vegetables and fruits by using labor which is paid only a small fraction of what labor is paid in America, and because we fully believe that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the other members of his committee intended that their proposed remedy for this subject—namely, section 8 (a) of the pending bill—would actually meet the needs of the producers of perishable fruits and vegetables, and in order to clarify, for the RECORD, the manner in which it is proposed that operations under section 8 (a) of the bill will meet the needs of the producers of perishable fruits and vegetables, I have requested the distinguished Senator from Georgia to allow me to ask him a series of questions which, if asked and answered in the form in which I am sure the Senator from Georgia will answer them, I have felt might assure further the relief of the producers of perishable fruits and vegetables of our Nation which is desired, I am sure, and intended to be granted under section 8 (a).

So I ask unanimous consent at this time that I may be permitted to address to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia several questions, with a view to incorporating both the questions and the Senator's answers into the RECORD, so that the legislative history of section 8 (a) may be made entirely clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at this time, as a predicate for my questions, I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD my letter of May 10, 1951, to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Georgia. The letter contains the questions; but in having the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, I ask that it be printed without including the questions themselves, which I now propose to ask separately to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

There being no objection, the portion of the letter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
May 10, 1951.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: You will recall that when H. R. 1612 was being considered by the Senate Committee on Finance I appeared before the committee on behalf of Senator SMATHERS and myself, and presented briefly the situation facing Florida vegetable growers. Due to the perishability of their products, the machinery provided in the present Trade Agreements Act and in the bill which is now before us does not do equity to the domestic vegetable producer. This is due in

large part to the perishability of these commodities, which cannot be stored, but must be marketed immediately upon being harvested. Excessive and erratic imports constitute a serious economic threat to the domestic industry.

The witness for the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, in testifying before the committee, brought out clearly that when imports are reasonable in volume, the return to the grower is fair, but when the current shipments are erratic and heavy, both the foreign and domestic producer sustain financial loss, with no compensating saving to the ultimate consumer.

I offered for committee consideration an amendment which was carefully drawn to meet this situation. It is my understanding that a spokesman for the Department of State told the committee that my amendment was unacceptable, but that a substitute which appears as section 8 (a) in the committee bill would accomplish practically the same objectives.

In brief, my amendment provided that when imports were such that they interfered or threatened to interfere with orderly marketing of perishable fruits and vegetables, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, could establish such import quotas as he deemed necessary to maintain the average price received by the American producer at the parity level. These quotas could be adjusted when found necessary. If the domestic supply were reduced periodically by weather disasters, thereby causing an undue price rise, the President, acting upon recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, could immediately waive or adjust the quotas.

I am not going to dwell in detail at this time on either the problem, or the suggested solution. That has been thoroughly covered in the hearing record. I think a sound case was made for the adoption of new remedies adaptable to the specific needs of perishable fruits and vegetables. It is obvious that the committee concurred in the need for action, as evidenced by the inclusion of section 8 (a).

I list herewith nine questions which I plan to ask you on the Senate floor during the debate on this bill. I am submitting these questions in advance so that you will have an opportunity to study them prior to the time of the debate on this bill. My constituents in Florida feel that it is desirable to develop some legislative background on this subject by asking you these questions. I will be grateful for your cooperation in this matter, and will be glad to reword any of the questions that you think can be better worded.

Questions relative to section 8 (a) of H. R. 1612 and Senate Report 299:

(Questions omitted.)

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

(Copy to Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my first question to the distinguished chairman is this: Is it proper to assume that the language of section 8 (a) and the phrasing of the part of the report which I have read into the RECORD indicate the committee clearly recognized the necessity for taking adequate steps toward the solution of the problems peculiar to perishable fruits and vegetables which have serious foreign competition?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in answer to that question, I believe it is proper to say on behalf of the committee that the committee recognized that perishable fruits and vegetables, by virtue of their perishability, were at times subject to peculiar difficulties not applicable to other agricultural commodities and that, therefore, existing machinery should be adapted to meet these difficulties when they are proved to exist, so far as it was administratively feasible to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then section 8 (a), as reported by the committee, was designed to meet these difficulties, insofar as it was feasible to do so; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. My second question is this: In preparing section 8 (a) and the report, did the committee take into consideration the statement of the problem by the Florida witness, Mr. Chandler, and the suggested remedies?

Mr. GEORGE. The committee gave full consideration to the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida and by the witness to whom he now refers.

Mr. HOLLAND. My next question is this: Was it the intent of the committee to recognize the need for emergency action in the case of these perishables, rather than to require that they follow the lengthy procedures prescribed for securing relief for storable commodities?

Mr. GEORGE. The committee report explicitly recognized "that, in the case of perishable agricultural commodities, emergency action under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or under the escape provisions of the bill may be necessary to prevent loss or material interference with orderly marketing."

Mr. HOLLAND. It was the intention of the committee, was it not, by means of the emergency provisions incorporated in section 8 (a) to allow much quicker and more effective action than could ordinarily be taken for storable commodities under the old sections of the bill? In connection with this question, I also submit my fourth question, as follows: In using in the report the following language: "The planting, offering for sale, or shipment of large quantities of perishable products within or without the country may create conditions which may require emergency action," is it the intent that, when the Secretary of Agriculture reports in advance of planting and/or harvesting that such conditions exist, or threaten to exist, the President shall be authorized to take emergency action which will prevent the existence of these conditions, rather than being compelled to wait until they actually occur?

Mr. GEORGE. The answer to the question lies not only in this sentence of the report but in the rest of this section of the report and, more importantly, in the provisions of section 8 (a) itself. Section 8 (a) is designed to offer relief, on the speediest basis possible, in accordance with the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the provisions of the escape clause in section 7 of the bill. Under both these provisions it is not necessary to delay remedial action until the injury has actually occurred.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. As a short addition to that particular question, I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia, is it to be understood that, in determining whether there is going to be an emergency condition, the President and the Secretary of Agriculture are not required to wait until the crop is actually ready for marketing, but, at an earlier stage, either at the time of planting, or prior thereto, or thereafter, as it becomes clear that there is or may be more than a reasonable amount of the product to meet the market demands, they may avail themselves of the emergency provisions of section 8 (a) of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that, of course, is a somewhat difficult question, but I would say in response to it that the Secretary of Agriculture should, of course, use foresight. Unusually large plantings abroad in the areas supplying this country would be a factor which should be known and followed closely, so that, if evidence is presented that an actual emergency situation would ensue, the President and Secretary of Agriculture might be ready to institute action promptly to invoke the remedy which we undertook to provide in section 8 (a) of the bill. That is as nearly responsive to the question as I feel at liberty, or am able, to make it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I particularly appreciate that answer, because it makes clear for the RECORD that neither the Secretary of Agriculture nor the President of the United States must needs wait until the actual excess amount of production is in hand, but that they are required to, and may, exercise reasonable foresight and caution to determine, ahead of the actual existence of the excess product, the fact that there will be such an excess, or that such an excess is seriously threatened.

My fifth question to the distinguished Senator is this: Was it the intent of the committee, in phrasing section 8 (a), to make available to producers of perishable fruits and vegetables, the various remedies provided in other sections of this bill, but on an emergency basis, because of perishability?

Mr. GEORGE. It was intended, in consideration of the perishability aspect, to make available, on an emergency basis, the remedies afforded by section 7 of the bill relating to the escape clause and by section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. My sixth question: Is it therefore the intent of the committee that import quotas may be one of the remedies available in the event the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment?

Mr. GEORGE. Import quotas are one of the remedies which would be available under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, or under section 7 of this bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the emergency provisions of section 8 (a) would make both section 7 and section 22, and the remedies thereunder, available, if the emergency were found to exist, and were declared by the President of the United States to exist. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct, yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. My next question: In view of the fact that the Department of Agriculture, which is directed to make the initial report, has available to it the facts and information upon which a determination as to the need for such an import quota might be made, and has the experienced personnel that could equitably administer such a program, is it the intent of the committee that the President be asked to delegate to the Secretary of Agriculture the necessary authority for carrying out the emergency provisions of section 8 (a)?

Mr. GEORGE. I may say that, as the distinguished Senator has noted, the Secretary of Agriculture would make the initial determination and report as to whether a condition exists requiring emergency treatment. The Tariff Commission would then make an immediate investigation to determine the facts and make recommendations to the President for such relief under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or section 7 of this bill as may be appropriate. After the Tariff Commission has made its recommendation, or even before if the emergency merits, the President will decide on the action to take. He might decide to raise the duty or impose a quota. The mechanics of applying rates of duty or quotas to imported commodities would ordinarily be the responsibility of the Bureau of Customs.

Mr. HOLLAND. My eighth question to the distinguished Senator is this: Is it the intent of the committee that such a program should be administered in a manner that would make possible a fair return to the domestic and foreign producer, without penalizing the consumer?

Mr. GEORGE. It is the hope of the committee that the entire trade-agreements program should be administered in a manner that would make possible a fair return to the domestic and foreign producer, without penalizing the consumer.

Mr. HOLLAND. My last question—and I thank the distinguished Senator for his patience—is this: Is it not true that the hearing record——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I have the last question and answer, please?

Mr. GEORGE. The last question asked?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. The last question asked was No. 8.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator wish me to repeat the question 8?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe I have it here. Will the Senator yield so that I may add an observation of my own?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not believe there is a legal requirement that the program be administered in a manner which would make possible a fair return to the domestic and foreign producer without penalizing the consumer, although I would hope that, as the result of intelligent administration, such a result might flow from the procedures called for in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. My ninth and last question is: Is it not true that the hearing record contains copies of agreements reached between domestic and foreign producers of perishable winter vegetables, in which they suggest that their respective governments adopt legislation which would make such a plan operative?

Mr. GEORGE. The answer to that question is that the record of the committee hearings contains a copy of the agreement between the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association and the Association of Fruit and Vegetable Growers and Exporters of Cuba and an agreement between the Florida Association and the West Coast of Mexico Vegetable Association of Nogales, Ariz. The associations agreed to recommend that trade agreements or other agreements be negotiated between the United States and Cuba and the United States and Mexico with a view to the imposition of absolute quotas on imports of tomatoes into the United States from Cuba and Mexico and to the reduction of the United States tariff on fresh tomatoes by 50 percent or the fullest extent allowed by law.

In the hearing record there also appears the amendment proposed by the Florida Association, and later submitted to the committee for its consideration, providing for the imposition of absolute quotas on tomato imports, with a view to maintaining the market price at parity. After the submission of this proposed amendment the West Coast of Mexico Vegetable Association wrote the committee that, by unanimous vote, it had withdrawn its support of the original plan and expressed its opposition to the proposed amendment. I thought that fact should be added to the answer.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia and also the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

I may say, Mr. President, that a copy of my letter to the Senator from Georgia went to the ranking minority member of the Finance Committee, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, because both of these Senators, and, indeed, all members of the committee, had been highly sympathetic to the problem of the Florida producers of perishable fruits and vegetables during the course of the hearings, and the two Senators from Florida felt that the committee, in the submission of its proposed new section 8 (a), was going as far as it felt it could go to meet the undoubted problem of the people who are confronted with the very difficult competition from offshore producers of perishable fruits and vegetables who pay their labor only a fraction of what is paid in Florida and elsewhere in the United States.

In closing, Mr. President, I desire to say that, in my judgment, the producers of perishable products as good Americans have gone a long, long way in their effort to cooperate to meet the need of the Nation and the need of the world for a reciprocal trade-agreement structure under which the resumption of world trade may be encouraged and enhanced.

I want it to appear in the RECORD that, notwithstanding the fact that the reciprocal trade agreement formerly existing with Mexico had been canceled, so that a peculiarly difficult situation was created under which one of the offshore producers, namely, the Republic of Cuba, was still under reciprocal trade relations with our Nation, whereas Mexico was not, our producers have, through their various organizations, through numerous conferences with the Department of State, with the Government and the producing groups in Cuba and in Mexico, with the marketing group, and the importing group, particularly in the West, endeavored to reach some solution other than through a request for an amendment to this important act.

The sole purpose of this long series of questions and of the very clear and helpful answers which have been read into the RECORD is the hope of all concerned—and I am sure I speak for all concerned—that real help may be given to those large industries in our Nation which, in the production of much-needed perishable fruits and vegetables, find themselves confronted with competition from offshore, where cheap labor makes possible sales at prices far below those which can be fixed upon similar goods produced in the United States. I am hoping that the needed relief will come to our producers and will leave them in such a position that they can continue their wholesome attitude toward the whole plan.

Mr. President, I again express my very deep appreciation to the chairman of the committee, to the distinguished ranking minority member, and to the committee as a whole for its helpfulness and its manifest effort to reach and to meet this very difficult problem in such a way as to leave thousands of persons whose living is dependent upon the production of these commodities in such a position that they can wholeheartedly support our Government in this worthwhile reciprocal trade-agreement system.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for his statement, and I can assure him that the committee looked with great concern and interest upon the problem which he presented to us. It is hoped that the remedy which the bill provides may be of service and of use and benefit to the producers of perishable fruits and vegetables.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be placed in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence which I have had with the Department of State on the same subject, through a letter of May 1, 1951, to Hon. Winthrop G. Brown, Acting Director, Office of International Materials Policy, of the State Department, and through the reply of Mr. Brown addressed to me under date of May 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 1, 1951.

HON. WINTHROP G. BROWN,
Director, Office International Trade Policy, State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: This letter is written as a follow-up of my telephone call to you yesterday morning, at which time I advised

you that I had just had an opportunity to examine a copy of H. R. 1612 as it was reported by the Finance Committee, and the committee report. I have noted that the committee did not adopt my amendment regarding perishable agricultural commodities, but did adopt an amendment providing for emergency action with regard to perishable agricultural commodities as outlined in section 8 (a) of the bill as reported by the committee.

I understand that testimony was given to the Finance Committee in executive session that my amendment was not acceptable to the State Department, but that the substitute amendment was acceptable and further that the substitute would allow the accomplishment of the same objectives as my amendment. You will find these objectives set forth in my testimony before the committee on March 1, 1951, which begins on page 443, part I of the printed hearing record. Also, the testimony on behalf of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association on this same subject begins on page 472.

I will appreciate a clear statement from you of the reasons why you believe that the committee amendment as outlined in section 8 (a) will accomplish my stated objectives.

Thanking you for an early reply, I remain, with cordial regards,

Yours faithfully,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 9, 1951.

The Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: I have received your letter of May 1 requesting our views regarding section 8 (a) of the trade agreements bill, as reported out by the Senate Finance Committee, in connection with the orderly marketing of perishable commodities.

As noted in the testimony you presented before the Finance Committee and in the testimony of Mr. Chandler, the purpose of introducing legislation relating to imports of perishable fruits and vegetables was to guard against serious injury to the domestic industry arising from sudden, heavy shipments from Cuba and Mexico which depressed the market price abnormally. In order to insure more orderly marketing of these perishable commodities, the amendment which you proposed would provide for the imposition of absolute quotas on imports, on a daily, weekly, monthly, or yearly basis. The account which Mr. Chandler and his colleagues gave us of the situation at earlier intervals showed that daily quotas would be necessary if the problem with which he was concerned was to be effectively solved. The amendment would also require that the quotas be fixed at a point calculated to maintain parity and be adjusted from time to time with a view to maintaining the parity price.

The amendment would create a number of difficulties. For one thing, the amendment did not seem administratively feasible in two principal respects. First, the amendment would require that import quotas be set at a point calculated to maintain the market price of the commodity concerned at parity. The effect of an import quota on the price of a product in the importing country would be difficult to determine under the best of conditions. To calculate in advance a quota which would maintain the parity price on products subject to such sharp fluctuations as the ones in question are alleged to be would be extremely difficult, if at all possible. The amendment, to be sure, anticipated that the quotas would be adjusted from time to time with a view to maintaining the parity price, but the necessity for such adjustment due to the inability to calculate accurately in advance a quota maintaining parity emphasizes the great administrative burdens involved in the proposal.

Second, it did not appear administratively feasible to apply import quotas for as short a period as the amendment envisaged. In analyzing the proposal originally presented by the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, it was found that entries of tomatoes are made at more than 50 places. The Customs Bureau has stated that the administrative burden involved in applying daily or weekly quotas at so many different points of entry would be administratively impracticable. To try to meet this problem, consideration was given to allocating the quotas among ports of entry, but such an arrangement appeared questionable on legal grounds, the Constitution providing in article I, section 9, for equal treatment among the ports of the various States.

In addition to these administrative difficulties, the amendment provided only for limitations on imports, not for comparable restrictions on domestic marketing or production. To apply restrictions to imports but not to domestic marketing or production (a) would probably be ineffective in ensuring orderly marketing in view of the important impact on the price of the quantity of domestic products likely to be offered for sale and (b) would violate the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Furthermore, sufficient authority already exists under section 22 of the Agricultural Amendment Act for the imposition of the controls contemplated by the amendment to the extent that they are feasible and shown to be necessary. Under section 22 import quotas may be imposed in conjunction with domestic marketing restrictions in order to protect the operation of a farm program, for example, a program to assure the orderly marketing of perishable commodities. Authority for limiting imports also exists in connection with action which may be taken under the escape clauses of trade agreements.

Section 8 (a) of the bill reported out by the Finance Committee was suggested by the American Farm Bureau Federation. It is intended to safeguard the orderly marketing of perishable fruits and vegetables through existing mechanisms by speeding up the procedures under these mechanisms so as to assure prompt relief where the circumstances require.

Briefly, section 8 (a) provides that when the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to the President and the Tariff Commission that due to the perishability of an agricultural commodity a situation exists requiring emergency treatment, the Tariff Commission shall make an immediate investigation under the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or under the escape clause provisions in section 7 of the Senate bill to determine the facts and make recommendations to the President for such relief under those provisions as may be appropriate. The President may take action without awaiting the recommendations of the Commission if the emergency requires such action. In any case the finding of the Commission and the decision of the President must be taken at the earliest possible date and in any event not more than 20 days after the case has been submitted to the Tariff Commission.

This procedure, it should be noted, offers two major avenues of relief to domestic producers of perishable crops adversely affected by imports. On the one hand, it offers relief in accordance with section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. Hence, if imports are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to nullify or materially interfere with a farm program on perishable commodities, then the President would be free to impose either fees or quotas on such imports in order to correct the difficulty. On the other hand, the procedure offers relief under the escape clause provisions in section 7 of the Senate bill. Hence, if as a result of a concession on a perishable commodity, imports are entering in such relatively increased quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry, the President is free to withdraw or suspend the concession or impose import quotas in order to prevent or remedy the injury.

Not only does section 8 (a) provide these two, broad means of relief but it ensures that these means will be utilized as expeditiously as possible. It requires the Tariff Commission to make an investigation immediately upon a determination by the Secretary of Agriculture that an emergency situation exists, thus short-cutting the present procedures in the application of section 22 which require going through the President. Even more importantly, the Tariff Commission must make its finding and the President his decision as soon as possible and at the maximum within 20 days after the Tariff Commission gets the case. Finally, the President is authorized, if he thinks it necessary, to act without waiting for the recommendation of the Tariff Commission.

These procedures are comprehensive in their coverage and designed to operate as rapidly as it is reasonably possible to expect. It seems to me that they can make as much of a contribution toward meeting the problem with which you and your constituents are concerned as is administratively practicable and I hope that they will help to meet any difficulties which may arise.

Sincerely yours,

WINTHROP G. BROWN,
Acting Director, Office of International Materials Policy.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I see that the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has reached the floor, and I hope he is ready to proceed with the discussion of his amendment in the nature of a substitute.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT EXTENDS POWER OVER DOMESTIC ECONOMY—CONTINUED FROM MAY 22

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have listened very carefully to the debate this morning and to the question-and-answer series with reference to how certain perishable products might be protected.

However, such protection depends upon an implied inclination on the part of the administration, in administering the act, to protect them.

Mr. President, I say again, categorically, that there is nothing in the bill, H. R. 1612, as reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee, that directs the President to do anything.

THE AMENDMENTS GIVE HIM NO ADDITIONAL POWER AND TAKES NONE AWAY

He may protect the perishable agricultural goods industry; he may protect the mining industry; he may protect the textile industry; he may protect the crockery industry; he may protect the precision-instrument industry which is indispensable during war, as are most of the industries mentioned; he may protect such industries which have been pushed to the verge of ruin by the lowered tariffs and import fees when we ever reach the time of peace for which we pray, instead of being in an emergency in which we continually take money out of the pockets of the taxpayers, even beyond their ability to pay, and

then in addition engage in deficit financing and selling bonds to the people in order to hold up our economic structure.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. As I understood the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, he made the statement that the President of the United States might protect industries. I was intrigued a moment ago by a question submitted by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Would the Senator from Nevada kindly enlighten me as to what protection, if any, a produce grower in Florida would have under this bill, as enunciated by the questions propounded a while ago and by the answers apparently already in the hands of the Senator from Georgia?

THE PROPOSED ACT A DELUSION

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very happy to answer the distinguished Senator from Idaho that the perishable agricultural products of Florida have the same protection that all other products of industries in the United States have, and that is the amount of protection that a thoroughly discredited State Department chooses to give them—no more and no less. The 2-year extension proposed by this bill would simply extend that disgraceful procedure.

The bill reported to the Senate is a farce on the face of it, a subterfuge, and a delusion of the American people, because the policy established by the State Department and the President of the United States, presented many times before committees by the Secretary of State and his associates, and by the President in his speeches and messages to Congress, is to make up the trade balance deficits of foreign nations of gifts, loans, through the division of the markets of this Nation—divide the source of our income. In effect, transfer jobs to foreign soil.

Until such division of the markets could be made the trade balance deficits would be made up through gift loans, Marshall plan, ECA, point 4, and so forth. Under these schemes it is proposed to take capital out of the United States and put it behind the sweatshop labor of foreign nations, and produce goods for those nations, and also ship goods into the United States market, thus putting American workmen on the street.

That is what it provides, in so many words. I defy anyone to prove differently on the Senate floor.

UNITED STATES ECONOMY STILL AT MERCY OF STATE DEPARTMENT

Therefore I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida that if the measure before us becomes law American producers will be at the mercy of the State Department, which has its eye fixed 3,000 or 10,000 miles away from the shores of America, and not in America at all. In the 4 years and a half the junior Senator from Nevada has been a Member of the Senate he has never known of the State Department having voiced a policy that had the interest of the American producers in mind. If the newspapers have correctly reported the State Department policies and their statements during 15 years before that, what I have said also applies to that period.

Under this measure, as it has reached the Senate floor, the State Department can continue to remake the industrial map of the United States, as it has been doing for 15 years. Administration policy can put out of business the fruit industry of Florida and California. It can put the miners and textile operators out of business. The present policy not only makes it possible but makes it attractive for American capital to go into low-cost labor countries, where sweatshop labor obtains, and not only produce sufficient to supply the markets of those countries, but can send foreign products to the United States.

We hear much voluble debate, ream after ream of it in the RECORD, with respect to what great markets we are establishing for the United States in foreign countries under the ECA program. We heard much talk on this subject, which the public now must understand to have been a lie on the face of it, that the development under ECA would result in making available markets for American businessmen. We heard much such talk during the debate on the subject on the Senate floor. We are not only making it possible but we are making it attractive by the further proposal under point 4 to take away the markets of American businessmen by reason of the fact that no income tax is to be paid on the profits on American investments in other countries.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Nevada remember that about 2½ years ago, before the Geneva meeting was held a hearing was had downtown before some so-called experts for the purpose of fixing the prices on products of the mines?

Mr. MALONE. Yes, I recall it.

Mr. LANGER. The senior Senator from North Dakota attended one of those meetings and sat through it for 3 or 4 hours. I may say that I had never seen one of those so-called experts before. They were men who had never been elected by the people of the country.

Mr. MALONE. And the Senator, perhaps, has never seen them since.

Mr. LANGER. They were a group of so-called professionals. Most of them had some kind of college degree. Afterward I made inquiry and found that very few of them had ever been in a mine.

I am curious to know what was the experience of the Senator from Nevada with those experts. Did the Senator ever attend one of the hearings?

THEORISTS MEDDLE IN BUSINESS

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota the junior Senator from Nevada will say he attended one of those hearings prior to 1947; I believe it was immediately following World War II. I cannot now fix the date exactly. That was when the junior Senator from Nevada was special consultant to the Senate Military Affairs Committee on Strategic Minerals and Materials. A member of the Military Affairs Committee requested the now junior Senator from Nevada to attend one of the hearings. The member of the committee said: "Hold them if you can until I can arrive. I will be late." Thus, the now junior Senator from Nevada, attended one of the meetings.

The senior Senator from North Dakota could not have more aptly described those who conducted the hearings. The men there were nonentities. No one had ever heard of them. I thought I was fairly well acquainted in technical circles, having belonged to various engineering societies, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and many others, for 30 years. But I had never heard of these individuals. They were holding hearings on tungsten. The junior Senator from Nevada has several times mentioned tungsten on the floor of the Senate. These individuals were about to shut down the tungsten industry. They asserted they were going to lower the tariff on tungsten from 50 cents a pound to 38 cents a pound.

The Senator I mentioned, who was head of the subcommittee on Strategic Minerals and Materials of the Senate Military Affairs Committee finally arrived. He is a man whom I greatly admire. He is one of the best Senators on this floor. He was also one of the best Governors Colorado ever had. His name is ED JOHNSON. Big Ed finally arrived, and I witnessed a spectacle which nearly caused me to break down and cry. Here was this well-informed Senator, a man of highest reputation in the Senate standing before these great judges, whom no one had ever heard of, whom no one had ever seen before, and whom no one has ever seen since, so far as I know. They had nothing to do in the way of judging the Senator's evidence. They had only to pass it on to some State Department committee, in whose archives, no doubt, it is still buried. Big ED JOHNSON stood there with his hat in his hand and begged them, almost with tears in his eyes, not to shut down the tungsten mines of the United States by putting into effect the proposed reduction. Did they pay any attention to his plea? They did not even understand what he said.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I must leave the floor, but I want to ask one other question which came to my mind as the result of the interrogation of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I will ask the Senator from Nevada if, from his study of the bill, whether he knows in the proposed Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951 there is anything that will protect the potato growers of the

United States from the awful disgrace of the importation of Canadian potatoes? The result of the importation being that Idaho No. 1 potatoes lay in the fields and rotted because we could not secure a decent market, or a market which would return to the potato growers of the West even the cost of the fertilizer and irrigation? Can the Senator enlighten me as, apparently, the Senator from Florida was enlightened as a result of his questions relating to perishable commodities? Is there anything in the pending bill that will protect the potato growers of Colorado, Idaho, California, or any other State in the Union from the importation of poor quality Canadian potatoes which flooded every storeroom in America last year to the financial damage and near ruin of the potato producers of the United States?

Mr. MALONE. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Idaho I will say I have no written answer, but I will do the best I can. There is absolutely nothing in the bill, as it is reported to the Senate, with the peril-point amendment, with the escape clause in it, with all the amendments it contains, that would compel or direct the Secretary of State or the President of the United States to change their policy, which is announced and definitely established, and that is not only not to protect American products but to encourage imports. If the junior Senator from Nevada were to take the time to present to the Senate one one-hundredth of the speeches, testimony, and policies laid down by the State Department, we would not finish this debate until the snow flies.

PRESENT AMENDMENTS WILL NOT CHANGE POLICY

There is nothing the most far-reaching imagination can conceive that could compel the Secretary of State to change one iota of the trend of the conferences in Geneva, at Annecy, or the one just ended in Torquay, England, where tariffs were either bound or lowered, without regard to the principle of fair and reasonable competition. The only purpose of the conferences was to furnish markets for the goods of foreign countries. What was the administration's objective which was announced before the very committee which reported this bill? It was to divide the markets to the point where it would not be necessary to send five, six, or seven billion dollars to foreign nations to make up trade-balance deficits, through the Marshall plan, through UNRRA, through point 4, and all the other gigantically expensive, preposterous plans which have been foisted upon the trusting people of the United States for 18 years.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MALONE. I yield first to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I take it I can give no assurance to the people of my State and of other States in the West who grow potatoes, that under the terms of the bill they will not suffer a recurrence of the awful marketing year of 1950 by virtue of the wide open door, the give-away program, whereby the Secretary of State and the President of the United States say to the potato growers of Canada, "Come in and compete against American potato growers."

Is that observation correct?

SUBSIDIES NEEDED BECAUSE OF LACK OF PROTECTION

Mr. MALONE. I should say that it is. As a matter of fact, instead of expecting any protection, the distinguished Senator from Idaho had better get ready to vote to increase the subsidies.

Let me say to the Senator, and to the heads of all industries in this country, and to the working men of America, that many of our people do not have jobs. The working men of America are not all in factories. Many of them are using a hoe. Many of them are trying to find jobs. Jobs are not plentiful now, although we are at the peak of the police action which is going on in Korea, with billions of dollars being dumped into factories to make jobs. Many of our people do not have jobs. So I say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that the junior Senator from Nevada will vote for subsidies to hold jobs for American workers, in lieu of tariffs and import fees, until the Congress of the United States gets its feet on the ground and begins to talk sense.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Before the Senator from Idaho departs from the Chamber, I should like to make one contribution to the debate, if I may.

First. There is no subsidy so far as Irish potatoes are concerned.

Second. The price-support program which contributed to the debacle of last year, which the Senator has mentioned, has been done away with by an amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Louisiana, and other Senators to prevent and avert a situation in which potatoes would be attracted to a protected market in which Federal money was being spent improperly in the support of a perishable agricultural product.

The third thing I should like to say is that, so far as potatoes are concerned they are affected just as much by section 8 (a) as are the various perishable crops which were mentioned by the Senator from Florida in the presentation of his questions to the Senator from Georgia.

The Senator from Florida felt—and he hopes the Senator from Idaho will approve this approach—that instead of adopting merely a critical and destructive attitude toward the whole program, the producers of perishable commodities of his State were to be commended and assisted in their effort to work out, through a remedial amendment to this legislation, and through agreements entered into with producers in Cuba and Mexico, a program under which the public would not be harmed and the producers of particular perishable agricultural commodities would be helped and brought under the program in a helpful way.

This much of the remarks of the Senator from Nevada is, of course, correct—that the President of the United States does have discretion as to what he will do.

Mr. MALONE. He has absolute discretion, has he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that the Senator from Nevada was unduly critical in that portion of his remarks directed against the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and all other members of the very able Senate Committee on Finance, who, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, endeavored to go as far as they felt they could in helping to meet the problems of the potato producers of Idaho, and producers of other perishable crops throughout the Nation. Instead of being castigated for having gone to the lengths they did in the effort to allow emergency methods to be followed in taking care of the problems of the producers of perishable crops, the Senator from Florida feels that members of the Finance Committee are to be commended and thanked.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida wish to ask the Senator from Nevada a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. The only question the Senator from Florida would like to ask the Senator from Nevada, who commented so liberally upon an exchange of questions and answers which he had never seen, is whether or not he had seen those questions and answers before, and was therefore able to make the general denunciation of them which he made in answer to the question of the Senator from Idaho. Had the Senator ever seen or heard the questions of the Senator from Florida and the answers of the Senator from Georgia prior to the time they were brought out on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MALONE. That is a very good question. I heard the questions read and I heard the answers read. I think that is a very good way to do it. I think that is the only way a good case could be made for the bill. A case cannot be made for the bill if the questions asked by the senior Senator from Florida are answered by anyone else.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may reply to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I must leave the Chamber. I enjoyed the remarks of the senior Senator from Florida with respect to the potato industry of Idaho. However, I must correct him.

The potato growers of Idaho did not suffer last year by virtue of the subsidy or price controls. Fully 65 percent of the potato growers of Idaho have nothing to do with subsidies or price controls. We feel that the commodity which we produce does not need subsidies or controls. But when we have a Government which opens the gate to thousands of tons of worthless Canadian potatoes which compete with us in the open market, as a result of the open-door policy,

we are ruined. That is why the potato grower of Idaho was ruined last year. Now the Senator from Florida tells us that we have done away with subsidies and price controls on potatoes.

What, may I ask, will be done to the potato grower of Idaho this year? He will have no subsidy and no price control. Again he will have the open-door policy. The door will be again open to the Canadian potato producers.

It seems to me that all the Idaho potato grower and the potato growers of Washington, Oregon, and Colorado can look forward to is that the Secretary of State will again say to Canada, "Send in your potatoes by the boatload, by the truckload, and compete with American potato growers of the West."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may reply?

Mr. MALONE. I yield, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to the Senator from Idaho, who doubtless knows the situation in Idaho much better than I could know it, that as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the Senator from Florida was very happy when the Idaho Irish Potato Producers Association supported the request and recommendation of a similar group from Florida, to do away with price supports on Irish potatoes, which, apparently, the Idaho producers felt had brought on the destructive situation of last year which has been described by the Senator from Idaho. It is a fact that not only potato producers in Idaho took that constructive position, but also potato producers in Colorado, so ably represented by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance. I am not advised as to what was the attitude of the potato producers of Washington, who were mentioned by the Senator from Idaho. The potato producers of the Nation by a great majority made it very clear that they thought the price-support program had been iniquitous and that it had never been justified when applied to a perishable crop, and they thought it was the existence of the price-support program which invited the heavy flow of Irish potatoes across our borders from Canada.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question? I believe I am learning something about the intricacies of international trade and tariffs.

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WELKER. I must again invite the attention of the senior Senator from Florida to the very salient fact that in February of this year I visited the warehouse of the Wynn-Lovett Grocery Co., in Jacksonville, Fla., which is owned and operated by three very dear college friends of mine. There I saw with my own eyes the reason why the Idaho producers of potatoes, who did not care about subsidies or to depend on someone to hand out money as a guaranty, but were willing to rely on their great product, were in their grave difficulty. In the Wynn-Lovett warehouse in Jacksonville I saw dozens of carloads of Canadian potatoes. They were being sold for practically nothing. Considering the freight differential between Idaho and Florida, it was impossible, of course, for the people of the South or even the people of the East to get the Idaho product. It was due to the open-door policy which in effect said to Canada, "Ship into the United States all the potatoes you can and compete against the great potato industry of the West."

That is the situation which I wish to bring to the attention of the able Senator from Florida because it has been brought home to me. I saw hundreds of producers in Idaho last year go nearly bankrupt by reason of the policy of permitting Canadian potatoes to be imported, with no tariff, and compete against our producers. That is the question I must answer to my people back home.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make one more observation?

Mr. MALONE. I am always happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. The only observation I should like to make is that I hope the potato producers of Idaho will get the same type of relief and as effective relief from the provisions of the new act as the perishable-commodity producers of Florida, who must meet the competition from Cuba and Mexico, hope to receive. We made a good-faith effort to get it. Of course, we cannot control the functioning of the President of the United States. There is no doubt about that. However, we believe that we have made a case and that we will get relief from the President by way of the amended act, as we hope it will be amended. We hope we will get relief for our people, and we likewise hope that the potato producers of Idaho will get relief under the same section of the act.

Mr. WELKER. But the Senator brings it down to hope, and hope alone.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I gladly yield.

Mr. LANGER. Before the distinguished Senator from Idaho leaves the floor I wish to commend him for the very fine fight he was making in behalf of the potato growers in the State of Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. He has done a marvelous job. I am sure the people of his State will appreciate it when they learn exactly what he has done with reference to the pending bill.

The State of North Dakota is very much interested in the potato market, because the State of Idaho and other States of the Union who wish to grow good potatoes get their potato seed from North Dakota. We furnish seed to the potato growers of Colorado, Idaho, and Nevada. We furnish seed for the State of Maine. We furnish the seed for practically every country on the face of the globe. It is the only State in the Union, I believe, in which the seed is certified and guaranteed by the State. When I was Governor of the State a law was passed which provides that the seed must be certified. Previously some seed had gone out which did not grow. We established a system under which our agricultural college and its extension divisions inspect the seed. On the sacks of seed as they are shipped out there is carried a statement which says, in effect: "Guaranteed by the State of North Dakota."

The State of Idaho has done good work in getting its potatoes advertised. I have gone into restaurants where they have advertised Idaho potatoes. I say to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] that very likely the Idaho potatoes served in the restaurants came from seed which was grown in North Dakota.

Coming back to what the junior Senator from Idaho said about growers in Idaho going bankrupt, I wish to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nevada to one fact, and ask him a question with respect to it. Does he not know that last year in North Dakota, located adjacent to Canada, there were thousands upon thousands of acres of potatoes on which the potatoes were never dug, and that at the same time, while we were not digging the potatoes in North Dakota, thousands of tons and trainloads of potatoes came into our country from Canada? Is the Senator familiar with the fact?

PRESENT AMENDMENTS JUST A SOP

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the junior Senator from Nevada is familiar with the fact that potatoes did come in by shipload, trainload, and truckload. The junior Senator from Nevada is entirely familiar with that fact. The cushion which has been prepared for Senators, in order to ease their consciences for voting for the bill, is the vain hope that the State Department, which has been proved to be entirely foreign-minded, and which has been proved by statements and press releases for 18 years to have one objective, namely, to divide our markets with foreign nations and not to protect our industry at all, may have a change of heart through the amendments which have been offered to the bill. That hope should be dashed. In other words, the Secretary of State and the President may have a change of heart and keep the working men and investors of our country from being wiped out, but it is most unlikely. I say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the amendments are not needed. They were in no way needed for a change of heart in the administration to come about, because under the original 1934 act the President and the Secretary of State had full authority to take care of the investors and working men of this country. However, their policy, announced again and again through press releases and testimony, was to the contrary. Now by way of the amendments we make it possible again for them to protect American producers if they have a change of heart, but everyone ought to realize the hopelessness of that expectation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

NEVADA PRIDES ITSELF ON DOMESTIC COMPETITION

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield, but first I wish to say that Nevada enjoys competition with North Dakota

and Idaho in the potato-raising industry. We too have certified seed. We enjoy the competition with North Dakota. We hope to be able to enjoy the competition with the State of North Dakota, with the State of Idaho, and also with the State of Nebraska. We enjoy it with all other States. We enjoy competition with other States in potato growing, mining, agriculture, and livestock raising. Incidentally, the only reason why anyone still engages in the cattle-raising business in the United States is because of the hoof-and-mouth disease abroad. If the disease is ever cured in Mexico and Argentina, we will all be out of the cattle business here, because there will be no protection against foreign meat imports.

As I said, Nevada enjoys competition with other States, because other States pay approximately the same wages under similar conditions. However, we do not want competition with Canadian labor, which is paid about two-thirds of what the labor in our country is paid, as evidenced by the charts on view in the rear of the Chamber. We cannot meet such competition. We must have something to make up for it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, there is no competition between North Dakota potatoes and Nevada potatoes because no one will buy a Nevada potato until the North Dakota seed has been exhausted. So, in reality, there is no competition between them.

I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada if he is not astonished by the admission made a few minutes ago by the senior Senator from Florida, who said that the entire potato program had resulted in a loss of millions of dollars to the Government. Did not that surprise the Senator from Nevada?

TARIFFS HAVE GIVEN WAY TO SUBSIDIES

Mr. MALONE. It is not surprising, really. As I explained yesterday, the policy which has been adopted by the administration is one of substituting subsidies for tariffs. A tariff is paid by the consumers of the particular product, whereas a subsidy is paid by all the taxpayers. The difference between a tariff and a subsidy which is of importance to the taxpayer, under a tariff system of fair and reasonable competition, no one will pay the tariff and will import a commodity unless there is a market for it, whereas under a subsidy system no one cares whether there is a market for the commodity ahead of time, but large imports come in at low prices and the commodities thus imported compete with the similar commodities produced in this country by higher-cost labor. Then, when there is no market for the domestic commodities replaced by cheap imports, they are destroyed—for instance, by pouring kerosene on the surplus potatoes; and naturally the result of the subsidy policy is a tremendous loss to the Government.

In short, the difference between a tariff and a subsidy is that under a subsidy in the United States, 150,000,000 people are called upon by the Government to provide large amounts of money with which to pay to subsidize an industry, whereas under a system of fair and reasonable competition, based on a tariff, the products are sold for what they are worth. That is the only difference.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that practically all wars the United States has had, have occurred under a Democratic administration?

Mr. MALONE. Every war in which our country has been involved during my lifetime has occurred under a Democratic administration; and in each case the administration then in power said that it had to take this action or that, to keep us out of war, but each one of them carrying us really into it.

Mr. LANGER. In view of all the experience the Democratic Party has had with having our country engaged in one war after another, does not the Senator from Nevada think it peculiar that the Democratic Party would not by this time have devised some system whereby subsidies and price controls and tariffs would be taken care of?

Today, after Democratic administrations have had the two recent World Wars, the senior Senator from Florida has said that millions of dollars were lost by the present administration in paying subsidies on potatoes. Is it not true that during the past 18 years the Democratic administration has had thousands of lawyers upon its payrolls and has had hundreds of thousands of other Federal employees; and does not the Senator believe that by this time they should have devised laws which would take effect the moment the Democratic administration got us into another war, so as to prevent the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars, such as were lost as a result of the subsidy on potatoes alone? Does not the present situation go to prove the incompetency and inefficiency of the Democratic administration?

THE BASIS OF TRADE

Mr. MALONE. As a matter of fact, the history of foreign trade beyond the amount of normal trade is that it leads to war. The administration says that if we develop foreign trade we shall prevent wars; but the history of foreign trade is that it leads to war, because there is only one kind of even trade, and practically no nation is satisfied with an even trade. The nations are working for advantage, in connection with trade.

Yesterday I explained what a tariff really does. The only reason for a tariff is to make it possible to trade on an even basis hours of labor in one country with hours of labor in another country.

The charts which now are on display in the Senate Chamber show why there cannot be international trade on an even basis. So the tariff is nothing more or less than a means of evening not only the cost of the labor but the productiveness of the labor, for two items are involved in labor, namely, its cost and its productiveness. In some countries labor is less productive because of either less efficient machinery or less efficient labor. A tariff which takes those factors into consideration is an evener; and if the tariff is adjusted on a flexible basis, it will result in having the hours-of-labor products of the United States traded for the hours-of-labor products of another country. If that arrangement could be worked out, it would be conducive to peace, because then there would be no advantage to a foreign country to hold down its slave labor so as to be able to permit the exportation under a free-trade system, of low-cost commodities which only result in causing antagonism on the part of the laboring men and the investors in the country to which those products are exported.

KARL MARX AND THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION

Mr. President, Karl Marx was an expert on that business. Yesterday I stated for the RECORD what Karl Marx said on this subject. He made a famous address on this subject before the Democratic Club in Brussels, Belgium, on January 9, 1848. In the course of that address he made the following statement:

> But, generally speaking, the protective system in these days is conservative, while the free-trade system works destructively. It breaks up old nationalities and carries antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie to the uttermost point. In a word, the free-trade system hastens the social revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade.

Mr. President, the only difference between the conditions which exist at this time and the conditions existing at the time when Karl Marx made that statement is that today a much larger investment in required; an investment of somewhere between $8,000 and $12,000, on the average, must be made for every man who works in industry. In those days labor was available at a much lower cost.

Yesterday, when I referred to that statement by Karl Marx, I made the following comment:

> Mr. President, the principle has not changed in the 102 years since the outstanding Communist of all time said, in effect, that free trade destroys the workingman. Now, since the investment in industry has risen from a few dollars per employed man to an average of approximately $10,000 per employed man, the investor is an equal victim. So the administration is following the line of communism, and following the line which Mr. Karl Marx described when he said:
>
> "In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade."
>
> In other words, the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat hastens the revolution. That would seem even at this late date to be an objective.

So the workingmen and the investors are the victims of free trade. In the long run, a nation which obtains the advantage in the way that foreign nations do when they can undersell us by means of a free-trade system, causes so many difficulties in the other country that the result is the very war which the Democratic administration has claimed it could prevent.

Yesterday, in my remarks before the Senate, I referred to the Underwood tar-

iff, which existed in 1914. That tariff had such a bad result that immediately after World War I a special session of Congress was called to take action to save the workingmen and investors of the United States.

It is obvious that a free-trade system brings on the very thing which the Democratic administration says it wishes to prevent, and the record demonstrates that clearly.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator from Nevada familiar with the article written by Woodrow Wilson after World War I, in which he said that war was caused by economic conditions?

Mr. MALONE. I am not entirely familiar with the article, although I know about it.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that his article bears out exactly the argument now being made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada. I recommend the reading of the article to the Senator and I suggest that the pertinent portions of the article be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I should like to point out again that 72,000 millionaires were created during World War I. Does not the Senator from Nevada agree that is the correct figure?

Mr. MALONE. That is the record, I believe.

Mr. LANGER. Yes. In other words, those 72,000 millionaires made their money from the poor people of the United States, and that war took place under a Democratic administration. Certainly after the experience in World War I, would it not seem reasonable that when the Democratic Party again got into control—in 1933, and saw the war coming on—for President Roosevelt announced time and again that he saw it coming on—one of the first things that Democratic administration would have done would have been to consider carefully the experience the preceding Democratic administration had in World War I, and then to pass laws which would keep the cost of living from rising and would prevent the creation of a new crop of war millionaires? However, is it not true that, as a result of World War II, more millionaires were created than the ones who were created as a result of World War I? Is not that the record?

Mr. MALONE. I am not entirely familiar with that subject, but I have read press reports which indicate that that probably is true.

SPEEDED-UP AMORTIZATION

Furthermore, more millionaires will be made in connection with the present emergency than have ever before been made, because we are now shoveling the taxpayers' money out in two ways: first, by financing industries, so as to permit them to expand; and, second, by providing a short amortization period—5 years—for the investments. As a matter of fact, in many cases the money actually is borrowed, although sometimes it is furnished by the companies or the individuals concerned. However, Government revenue is lost by permitting the amortization of the investments on a short-term basis. Tax money is lost, and the poor individual taxpayers have to make it up. I have an up-to-date list or tables showing the enterprises which have received certificates of necessity, for the amortization of the new investment over a period of 5 years. Unfortunately the tables are not quite complete, and I shall endeavor to complete them for the RECORD at a later date. I ask unanimous consent to have that material inserted at this point in the RECORD. Of course, as I said before, many of these firms have borrowed money from the Government as the basis of their added investments, and that is taking from the tax money billions upon billions of dollars of additional tax money which would not be necessary, were it not for the free-trade program.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

5-YEAR AMORTIZATION

Necessity certificates issued

THROUGH JAN. 30, 1951

TA No.	Applicant	Application amount [1]	Amount certified [2]	Product or service
1	Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.	$60,959,100	$54,241,774	Steel ingots.
2	do	23,762,300	20,759,213	Steel blooms—slabs.
3	do	4,625,000	4,222,805	Steel—scarfing.
4	do	14,921,000	14,771,000	Steel bars.
5	do	7,248,700	6,948,700	Metallurgical coke.
6	do	10,130,000	9,930,000	Steel rods.
7	do	19,702,000	18,302,000	Tin plate.
8	do	3,182,000	2,882,932	Iron ore unloader.
9	Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp.	8,351,220	7,086,500	Fibrous glass.
11	Northwestern Steel & Wire Co.	4,505,000	4,500,000	Small bars and shapes.
12	do	12,002,000	8,500,000	Melting stock.
14	Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp.	805,961	805,961	Pig iron.
16	Radio Receptor Co., Inc.	490,000	(3)	Electronic equipment.
18	Donner-Hanna Coke Corp.	2,324,736	2,324,736	Coke ovens.
19	Great Lakes Steel Corp.	24,803,800	24,400,000	Pig iron.
20	Albion Malleable Iron Co.	1,353,380	1,353,380	Iron castings.
21	Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.	20,135,000	20,135,000	Steel ingots.
22	do	31,560,000	31,560,000	Pig iron, coke, ingots.
23	do	34,400,000	34,400,000	Steel ingots.
25	Allied Control Co.	56,149	56,149	Relays and coils.
26	do	35,430	35,430	Do.
27	Quaker Rubber Corp.	1,218,553	1,218,553	Industrial rubber goods.
28	Chicago & Eastern Illinois R. R. Co.	3,500,000	3,500,000	Transportation (boxcars).
30	do	640,000	640,000	Transportation (gondola cars).
35	Aeroquip Corp.[4]	376,367	376,367	Flexible hose lines.
38	Lone Star Steel Co.	73,425,200	73,425,200	Steel tubing.
39	Connors Steel Co.	1,286,970	1,286,970	Rolling-mill products.
42	Lehigh Valley R. R.	8,535,490	8,535,490	Transportation (box, hopper, and flat cars).
45	United Steel & Wire Co.	30,060	30,060	Barbed wire.
47	Marsh Steel Corp.	215,650	55,650	Steel warehousing.
51	General Refractories Co.	77,500	77,500	Silica—refractory brick.
52	do	55,695	55,695	Refractory brick.
53	do	78,832	78,832	Do.
54	do	2,040,530	2,040,530	Do.
55	do	1,310,090	1,310,090	Do.
56	do	63,030	63,030	Do.
57	do	548,100	548,100	Do.
58	Harbison-Walker Refractories Co.	1,817,205	1,816,815	Do.
59	do	5,399,775	5,385,298	Do.
60	do	1,433,424	1,433,424	Do.
61	do	852,703	852,703	Do.
62	Edward Swanson trading as Edson Tool & Manufacturing Co.	25,000	25,000	Battery boxes.
64	Schaefer Machine Co.	21,385	21,385	Bolts, shafts, fittings, etc., for aircraft.
66	Heintz Manufacturing Co.	210,000	204,000	Cartridge cases, artillery projectiles.
68	Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp.	750,000	675,000 75,000	Fibrous glass.
69	S. K. Wellman Co.	3,678,770	3,650,870	Clutch and brake parts.

[1] Cost of facilities estimated by applicant.
[2] Amount of preceding column eligible for percentage certification.
[3] No dollar amount certified at time certificate was issued.
[4] Application revised, returned to delegate agency.

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

THROUGH JAN. 30, 1951—continued

TA No.	Applicant	Application amount	Amount certified	Product or service
71	West Virginia Steel & Manufacturing Co	$3,014,352	$3,014,352	Semifinished steel.
72	The Cooper Alloy Foundry	243,358	243,358	Metal centrifugal and sand castings.
73	Empire Steel Co	9,550,000	9,543,500	Carbon and silicon steel.
74	Great Lakes Steel Co	18,000,000	17,280,000	Coke ovens.
77	Houdaille-Hershey Corp	640,000	640,000	Tank track link bodies.
82	Republic Steel Corp	77,950,000	77,662,000	Steel ingots.
87	Sylvania Electric Products, Inc	1,075,000	1,065,000	Electronics.
92	Arwood Precision Casting Co	94,100	92,100	Castings.
101	Grumann Aircraft Engineering Corp	88,825	88,825	Airplane parts.
104	The Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co	9,941,184	9,941,184	Transportation (railroad-car ferries).
105	The Parker Appliance Co	512,721	503,221	Rubber rings, gaskets, seals.
106	The Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co	31,587,000	31,587,000	Transportation (freight cars).
109	Kaiser Steel Corp	24,595,000	20,160,100	Steel ingots—tin plate.
113	Hazleton Steel & Tubing Co	4,275,340	4,175,430	Steel tubing.
115	Micro Switch Division of Minneapolis-Honeywell	650,000	630,000	Electrical appliances (precision switches).
117	Mechanical Products, Inc	159,857	159,857	Electrical appliances.
118	Switlik Parachute Co., Inc.[1]	249,048	249,048	Parachutes, life vests, etc.
120	Austenal Laboratories, Inc	292,850	292,850	Aircraft parts.
122	Roller Bearing Co. of America	1,453,961	1,427,461	Bearings.
123	Capital Foundry Co	1,452,500	1,377,500	Steel castings.
126	The Barden Co	622,693	622,693	Ball bearings.
137	Star Tool & Die Works	266,000	230,000	Aircraft fixtures.
142	Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc	359,007	359,007	Clutch plates.
144	Mexico Refractories Co	1,409,950	1,409,950	Refractory brick.
146	Carboloy Co., Inc	2,199,215	2,174,215	Tungsten carbide cores.
147	do	320,000	320,000	Tungsten carbide blanks.
151	Struthers Wells Corp	17,501	17,501	Gun tubes.
155	Waldorf Instrument Corp	59,423	59,423	Jet engine metering devices.
156	Gitz Bros	3,404	3,375	Shaft seals for aircraft, tank engines.
158	General Refractories Co	602,326	602,326	Refractory brick.
161	Blaw-Knox Co	58,000	58,000	Steel castings.
167	Seren Tool & Manufacturing	2,832	2,832	Tank gun assemblies.
169	Collins Engineering Co	95,000	95,000	Aircraft hardware.
170	Thompson Products, Inc	4,930,000	4,930,000	Aircraft engine parts.
172	Air Reduction Co., Inc	562,125	562,125	Liquid oxygen.
173	Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co	2,316,618	2,316,618	Electronic controls (aircraft).
174	Crucible Steel Co. of America	1,127,749	1,127,749	Coal.
175	do	3,166,320	3,166,320	Coke.
176	do	22,957,824	22,957,824	Steel ingots—pig iron.
181	Woodward Iron Co	4,500,000	4,500,000	Pig iron.
183	The Dow Chemical Co	17,180,000	17,124,750	Magnesium sheet.
184	do	4,150,000	4,150,000	Magnesium extrusions.
185	do	3,237,000	3,237,000	Magnesium alloy, sheets and extrusions.
186	do	1,065,000	1,065,000	Do.
187	do	791,600	791,600	Magnesium alloy and extrusions.
188	do	578,400	578,400	Magnesium sheet.
189	do	194,000	194,000	Magnesium sheet, extrusions and alloy.
190	do	350,000	350,000	Do.
196	White Fuel Corp	800,000	800,000	Storage (petroleum products).
197	The Dolite Co	100,000	100,000	Roasted refractory dolomite.
198	do	35,417	35,417	Roasted refractory brick.
199	Union Oil Co. of California	135,000	135,000	Aviation gas.
201	Ohio River Co	1,458,622	1,458,622	Transportation (steel barges).
202	do	400,000	400,000	Transportation (tow boat).
203	Brooks & Perkins Inc	573,500	536,000	Magnesium alloy, sheets and plate.
213	Alabama By-Products Corp	2,418,636	2,418,636	Metallurgical coke, benzene, tar.
217	American Lava Corp	712,140	712,140	Ceramic cores.
218	Tube Processing Inc	12,425	12,425	Fuel and oil lines (aircraft).
219	Keystone Steel & Wire	1,500,000	1,500,000	Steel ingots.
222	Northwest Magnesite Co	5,811,091	5,786,979	Dead burned magnesite.
223	Harbison-Walker Refractories Co	925,231	925,231	Calcined clay.
224	do	1,621,345	1,621,345	Refractory brick.
225	do	1,024,999	1,024,999	Silica, refractory brick.
227	Experiment, Inc	28,000	28,000	Research (guided missiles and jet engines).
233	McPhillips & Co., Inc	34,180	34,180	Pack, field and parachute.
236	General Refractories Co	3,677,550	3,677,550	Refractory brick.
239	Warren Webster & Co	250,000	250,000	Booster metal parts (ordnance).
240	The New York Air Brake Co	748,870	748,870	Hydraulic pumps (aircraft).
241	Green River Steel Co	8,001,032	8,001,032	Carbon steels.
242	Island Machine Co., Inc	45,928	45,928	Precision machined aircraft assemblies and parts.
247	Dresser Industries, Inc	663,070	636,845	Steel rings (jet engines).
264	Cook Electric Co	276,094	267,043	Relay, assembly, fuel, control switch aircraft.
265	The Aircraft Fittings Co	124,506	124,506	Tube fittings, hose couplings, aircraft.
267	Lehigh & New England R. R. Co	2,275,000	2,275,000	Transportation (rail).
270	Harvey Machine Co., Inc.[1]	400,000	400,000	Rocket fuzes and shells.
271	General Laboratory Associates, Inc	83,100	81,100	Ignition equipment, aircraft.
276	Republic Steel Corp	6,000,000	6,000,000	Coke.
278	do	500,000	500,000	Pig iron.
279	do	1,750,000	1,750,000	Steel ingots.
280	do	705,000	705,000	Do.
281	do	7,000,000	7,000,000	Coke.
283	Surplus & Salvage Co., Inc	30,000	30,000	Scrap (iron).
294	Gould-National Batteries, Inc	1,056,500	1,051,500	Ordnance and aircraft batteries.
298	Raytheon Manufacturing Co	2,007,720	2,007,720	Magnetron tubes.
299	Armco Steel Co	12,243,981	12,243,981	Steel ingots and plates.
300	do	59,275,000	59,275,000	Coke, pig iron, steel products.
301	Sheffield Steel Corp	10,500,000	10,500,000	Steel ingots.
312	Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co	3,788,000	3,788,000	Auto-pilots, fuel gages, gyros (aircraft).
314	The M. W. Kellogg Co	154,084	127,733	Liquid rocket engines.
325	The Dolite Co	35,000	35,000	Roasted refractory dolomite.
326	do	166,700	166,700	Do.
327	do	426,993	426,993	Do.
328	do	73,294	73,294	Do.
329	McLouth Steel Corp	2,294,442	2,294,442	Steel ingots, hot rolled steel.
334	The Massey-Harris Co	1,806,196	1,779,096	Carriage, howitzer.
351	Hofmann Industries, Inc	241,800	223,800	Carbon steel (strip).
352	Sharon Tube Co	2,333,532	2,313,532	Pipe.
362	The Apex Tool Co	139,754	135,754	Aircraft engines, parts and accessories.
369	Castings Engineers, Inc.[1]	125,692	100,692	Precision invest castings.
372	Merrill Bros	141,934	141,934	Impression die forgings (metals).
373	The M. B. Manufacturing Co., Inc	108,240	108,240	Aircraft engine mounts and fittings.
374	The Deutsch Co	54,333	54,333	Hydraulic fittings, aircraft, rocket fins.
375	Aircraft Products Co	12,354	12,354	Machine metal parts for aircraft.

[1] Application revised, returned to delegate agency.

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

THROUGH JAN. 30, 1951—continued

TA No.	Applicant	Application amount	Amount certified	Product or service
377	Armco Steel Co	$32,000,000	$32,000,000	Hot rolled steel.
378	do	1,426,725	1,426,725	Hot rolled electrical steel sheets.
379	do	49,046,700	49,046,700	Coke, pig iron, steel ingots.
381	National Steel Co	4,210,000	4,210,000	Coke.
382	do	2,868,425	2,868,425	Steel ingots.
385	Detroit Steel Corp	52,942,848	47,797,100	Carbon, sheet steel.
394	Extruded Hinge Co	21,500	21,500	Aircraft hinges and connectors.
396	The Glenn L. Martin Co	76,496	76,496	Aircraft, guided missiles, special weapons.
399	Howard Foundry Co	1,222,175	1,222,175	Combustion cases, jet engine (aircraft).
401	California Bag & Metal Co	41,390	41,390	Scrap iron (processing).
406	Wheeling Steel Corp	8,750,000	8,750,000	Coke.
409	Chrysler Corp	15,975,900	15,975,900	Military tanks.
410	Oceanside Machine Shop	31,035	31,035	Machining steel parts for airplanes.
411	do	12,584	12,584	Do.
417	Whitney Blake Co	451,951	451,951	Field wire (Signal Corps).
424	J. P. Seeburg	127,230	354,179	Radio and radar apparatus.
425	The Deutsch Co	354,179	125,000	Hydraulic fittings (aircraft).
432	Miller Printing Machinery Co	125,000	5,166,139	Mounts for 90 millimeter gun.
445	Republic Aviation Corp	5,348,047	1,215,685	Aircraft.
450	Spencer Wire Co	1,215,685	50,000	Copper wire; steel wire.
452	Blaw-Knox Division of Blaw-Knox	50,000	103,970	Radio, radar towers.
458	Detroit Kellering Co	103,970	13,710	Machining of engine mount.
463	Capital City Machine	13,710	5,266,000	Tools, gages (aircraft).
471	Allegheny Ludlum Steel Co	5,266,000	555,000	Alloy steel sheets.
474	Machlett Laboratories, Inc	555,000	3,298,035	Electronic tubes.
476	Jones & Laughlin Ore Co	3,500,000	2,951,425	Iron ore.
477	do	2,951,425	8,043,700	Sintered iron ore.
478	do	9,093,700	1,962,000	Iron ore.
479	do	2,000,000	7,590,833	Steel tube rounds.
482	A. O. Smith	7,605,990	14,214	Pipe, gas transmission.
488	Progress Manufacturing Co., Inc	14,214	638,000	Spot welding (electronic equipment).
492	Washburn Wire Co	638,000	30,000	Steel ingots.
511	Aero Trades Manufacturing Co	37,000	30,040	Aircraft parts assembly.
515	Silent Glow Oil Burner Corp	30,040	725,406	Mine case, mine crate.
520	Filtrol Corp	725,406		Palleted catalyst (for use in gasoline and rubber production).
521	do	1,979,703	1,979,703	S. R. catalyst.
523	Special Steels Co	227,751	23,468	Scrap iron and steel.
530	AVCO Manufacturing Co	23,468	47,803	Tappet guides (aircraft).
531	National Water Lift Co	47,803	45,942	Housing assembly (aircraft).
535	Acme Industrial Co	45,942	75,551	Hydraulic parts (aircraft).
538	South-Bend Screw Products, Inc	75,551	412,534	Aircraft engine parts.
539	The Wel-Met Co	412,534	1,377,782	Bearings and parts (aircraft ordnance).
546	Lehigh Valley R. R. Co	1,377,782	1,659,659	Transportation (rail).
571	Harbison-Walker Refractories Co	1,659,659	5,309,131	Refractories.
572	do	5,309,131	1,115,922	Silica refractories.
574	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	1,115,922	1,142,417	Aircraft parts.
576	The Thomas Steel Co	1,142,417	64,935	Cold-rolled steel.
577	Cablair Products Co	64,935	60,600	Airframe machined parts.
585	Tung-Sol Lamp Works, Inc	60,600	22,891,877	Electron tube.
588	McLouth Steel Corp	24,055,906	83,071	Steel ingots.
595	Marcus Mason & Co., Inc	83,071	281,014	Couplings (aircraft).
600	Boeing Airplane Co	343,107	5,997,534	Aircraft.
602	Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co	5,997,534	10,114,480	Transportation (rail).
605	do	10,114,480	23,450	Do.
611	Hutchinson Pipe and Waste Materials	23,450	136,892	Steel scrap.
614	Commercial Metals Co	136,892	1,400,000	Scrap iron.
622	Ohio Ferro-Alloys Corp	1,400,000	2,120,000	Ferromanganese, silicomanganese.
628	Pittsburgh Steel Co	2,120,000	8,757,000	Pig iron.
629	do	8,757,000	7,254,000	Steel ingots.
630	do	7,254,000	38,047,000	Shell steel, forging billets.
631	do	38,097,000	35,000	Steel plates and sheets.
646	Steel Briquette Corp	35,000	135,574	Steel scrap (tin can briquettes).
651	Lavelle Aircraft Corp	135,574	118,000	Engine mounts for airplanes.
707	Acro Supply Manufacturing Co	118,000	467,265	Aircraft hardware and parts.
710	A. P. Green Fire Brick Co	467,265	294,229	Refractories (fire brick).
711	do	294,229	982,000	Do.
724	National Steel Corp. (Weirton)	982,000	1,352,000	Tin, steel scrap.
725	do	1,352,000	6,000,000	Pig iron.
727	The Interlake Steamship Co	6,000,000	550,605	Transportation (lake ore ship).
731	Sundstrand Machine Tool Corp	550,605	2,827,175	Alternator drive (aircraft).
732	do	2,827,175	720,000	Do.
733	Raytheon Manufacturing Co	800,000	2,200	Tubes (electronic).
742	Hansen-Lynn	2,200	335,850	Aircraft controls.
751	Walsh Refractories Corp	335,850	581,702	Refractories (brick).
755	Big Savage Refractories Corp	581,702	52,464	Do.
769	Aircraft Engineering Products	52,464	655,000	Aircraft hydraulic cylinders.
784	Axelson Manufacturing Co	1,125,000	41,525,000	Aircraft gears.
787	Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co	41,525,000	4,263,000	Iron ores, steel.
788	Geneva Steel Co	4,263,000	326,255,000	Steel ingots.
789	Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp	351,414,000	46,631,420	Pig iron, steel ingots, coke and coal chemicals.
790	National Tube Co	46,631,420	16,500,000	Buttweld pipe.
791	Pittsburgh Steamship Co	16,500,000	6,490,000	Transportation (lake ore ship).
792	Bradley Transportation Co	6,490,000	12,000,000	Transportation (lake freighter).
801	The Columbia Transportation Co	12,000,000	19,847,085	Transportation (lake ore ship).
836	United Aircraft Corp. (Pratt & Whitney)	19,847,085	2,691,105	Aircraft engines and parts.
837	United Aircraft Corp. (Sikorsky division)	2,691,105	2,369,460	Helicopters and parts.
838	United Aircraft Corp. (Hamilton Standard)	2,369,460	2,894,783	Aircraft propellers and equipment.
858	Lewyt Corp	3,194,783	281,024	Communication equipment.
878	North American Refractories Co	281,024	1,172,000	Silica brick.
898	National Steel Corp. (Weirton division)	1,172,000	650,600	Pig iron.
899	Great Lakes Steel Corp.[1]	650,600	2,062,700	Steel products.
902	do	2,062,700	250,000,000	Coke.
907	New England Steel Development Corp	250,000,000	816,410	Steel.
912	Weatherhead Co	827,610	94,360	Aircraft hose assemblies.
920	Jackson-Hope Towing Co., Inc	94,360	170,000	Transportation (barge).
922	The Ironton Fire Brick Co	170,000	295,000	Firebrick and plastic refractories.
951	Keystone Steel & Wire Co	295,000	1,605,000	Steel wire.
953	Rotary Electric Steel Co	1,605,000	216,694	Steel bars.
959	Goodyear Corp	216,694	450,000	Fuel tanks.
972	Rotary Electric Steel Co	450,000	396,000	Steel ingots.
1036	Republic Steel Corp	396,000	18,884,000	Do.
1103	Bethlehem Steel Co	19,034,000		Pig iron, steel ingots.

[1] Application revised, returned to delegate agency.

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

THROUGH JAN. 30, 1951—continued

TA No.	Applicant	Application amount	Amount certified	Product or service
1104	Oregon Steel Mills	$245,865	$245,865	Steel ingots and bars.
1114	Bethlehem Steel Co	1,642,000	1,642,000	Steel ingots, rails.
1115	do	36,401,000	36,401,000	Coke, pig iron, steel ingots.
1116	do	2,906,000	2,231,000	Pig iron, steel ingots.
1119	Bethlehem Pacific Coast Steel Corp	3,248,000	2,932,000	Steel ingots, nuts and bolts.
1120	do	362,000	362,000	Steel ingots, bolts.
1145	Bethlehem Steel Co	56,000,000	56,000,000	Coke, pig iron, steel ingots.
1147	do	2,831,000	2,831,000	Steel ingots and slabs.
1148	do	19,613,000	19,613,000	Coke, pig iron, steel ingots.
1149	Bethlehem Pacific Coast Steel Corp	2,123,000	2,123,000	Steel ingots.
1181	Nicholson Universal Steamship	9,930,000	9,930,000	Transportation (Lakes freighters).
1215	Laclede Steel Co	492,233	492,233	Steel ingots.
1222	National Steel Corp. (Weirton division)	3,319,000	3,319,000	Pig iron, steel ingots.
1464	Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp	8,955,300	8,955,300	Pig iron.
1465	do	9,259,000	9,259,000	Steel ingots.
1466	do	9,144,850	9,144,850	Steel plates, sheets and strips.
1467	do	1,485,000	1,485,000	Steel ingots and slabs.

Source: Business Expansion Office (Byron D. Woodside, Director).

JAN. 25 TO MAR. 7

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or use	Amount certified
North American Rayon Co., Childersburg, Ala.	Rayon yarns	$18,759,098
B. F. Goodrich Co., Marion, Ohio	Aircraft type hose	2,401,516
Chicago & Eastern Illinois R. R. Co., Chicago, Ill.	Railway transportation	581,964
Chicago Heights Terminal Transfer Co., Chicago Heights, Ill.	do	290,982
Do	do	450,000
Atwood-Vacuum Machine Co., Rockford, Ill.	Aircraft parts	1,500,000
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., New York State.	Railway transportation	76,249
Diecraft, Pulaski Highway, Baltimore, Md.	Tools, dies, jigs	422,599
Lehigh Portland Cement Co., Bunnell, Fla.	Portland cement	11,062,280
Halifax Paper Co., Roanoke Rapids, Va.	Kraft pulp, paper, and corrugated board.	6,200,000
Boston & Maine R. R.	Railway transportation, Diesel locomotive.	2,916,880
Rothschild Oil Co., Santa Fe Springs, Calif.	Components for aviation gas.	2,050,000
Waldorf Instrument Co., New York, N. Y.	Aircraft parts	160,000
Do	do	59,423
Gitz Bros., Chicago, Ill.	do	3,375
Chesapeake & Ohio R. R. Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Railway transportation	66,422,000
Union Oil Co. of California	Gasoline components	4,500,000
Ohio River Co., Cincinnati, Ohio	River transportation, steel barges.	1,458,622
Ohio River Co., Cincinnati, Ohio	River transportation, towboats.	400,000
Chicago & Great Western R. R. Co.	Railway transportation for entire system.	1,757,624
Wheeling Bronze Castings Co., Glen Dale, W. Va.	Bushings, pistons, bearings	20,544
Fletcher Oil Co., Wilmington, Calif.	Gasoline, fuel oil	176,250
Experiment, Inc., Richmond, Va	Research	28,000
T. C. Wheaton Co., Millville, N. J.	Pharmaceutical glassware	1,445,443
Wheaton Glass Co., Millville, N. J.	do	891,934
Levington Shipbuilding Co., Orange, Tex.	Transportation, petroleum barges.	580,000
Waste Material Corp., Michigan City, Ind.	Processing scrap iron	14,480
Armour & Co., Bartow, Fla.	Sulfuric acid and triple sulfur phosphate.	1,975,500
Wm. Miller Corp., Pasadena, Calif.	Engineering services, research instruments.	185,000
A. L. Mechling Barge Lines, Inc., Mississippi River.	Transportation, barge oil	138,000
Skirvin Tool & Engineering Co., Indianapolis, Ind.	Assemblies for aircraft and Diesel locomotives.	129,500
Surplus & Salvage Co., Inc., Jamestown, N. Y.	Scrap iron	30,000
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio R. R. (entire system).	Rail freight cars and locomotives.	14,550,241
Calaveras Cement Co., San Andreas, Calif.	Portland cement	2,235,106
Armco Steel Corp., Rusk, Tex.	Iron ore	1,500,000
Gibraltar Corrugated Paper Co., Inc., North Bergen, N. J.	Corrugated paper board	2,269,850
Wood River Oil Refining Co., Inc., Gary, Ind.	Gasoline, fuel oil	7,086,000
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co. (entire system).	Railway transportation	23,700,000
Fitchburg Paper Co., Fitchburg, Mass.	Wood, pulp, paper	598,614
Union Bag & Paper Co., Savannah, Ga.	Corrugated boxes, paper, and waxed paper.	18,000,000
Harbor Tug & Barge, San Francisco, Calif.	Transportation, towboat	75,000
Levelland Refining Co., Levelland, Tex.	Aviation gasoline	2,441,763
John I. Hay Co., inland waterways	Transportation, towboat	505,000
Detroit Steel Corp., Portsmouth, Ohio	Carlion, sheet and steel	47,797,100
Hufford Machine Works, El Segundo, Calif.	Metal aircraft parts	204,184
Macon Iron & Paper, Macon, Ga.	Waste paper, steel scrap	38,000
California Bag & Metal Co., Portland, Oreg.	Scrap iron, processed	41,390
The Bay Petroleum Co., Chalmette, La.	Gasoline components	1,726,500
Columbus Engineering Co., Columbus, Ohio.	Ordnance supplies	$40,000
Riegel Paper Corp., Columbus County, N. C.	Pine, pulp and hardwood pulp.	13,807,500
Spokane International, Spokane, Wash.	Railroad transportation	160,129
North Carolina Pulp, Plymouth, N. C.	Semichemical pulp	1,051,713
Harbor Tug & Barge, San Francisco, Calif.	Transportation, towboat	75,000
Upper Mississippi Towing Co., Minneapolis, Minn.	Transportation, barge	962,597
Wilson Transit Co., Great Lakes area	Transportation, Great Lakes ore.	533,687
Hollingswirth & Whitney, Mobile, Ala.	Pulp and specialty papers	13,800,000
Pan American Refining Co., Texas City, Tex.	Benzene	1,100,000
Eastern Rayon Mills, Parkersburg, W. Va.	Rayon tire yarn	9,025,000
Chesapeake & Ohio R. R. Co., Cheviot, Ohio, to Peru, Ind.	Track line	3,501,600
Capital City Machine, Hartford, Conn.	Aircraft supplies	13,710
Meade Corp. (undisclosed)	Kraft container board	21,480,000
Meade Corp., Chillicothe, Ohio	Wood pulp	4,930,500
Meade Corp., Kingsport, Tenn.	Wood pulp (soda)	4,258,000
Gulf Oil Corp., Port Arthur, Tex.	Isobutane gasoline	18,485,342
Ace Steel Baling, Inc., Toledo, Ohio	Scrap iron	41,245
Defoe Shipbuilding Co., Bay City, Mich.	Transportation, Great Lakes ore.	61,270
Heintz Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Aircraft parts	694,800
Burgess Norton Manufacturing Co., Geneva, Ill.	Tank parts	98,000
Do	do	206,975
Do	do	388,000
Reiss Steamship Co., Manitowoc, Wis.	Transportation, Great Lakes ore.	365,000
Lakeside & Marblehead R. R. Co., Marblehead, Ohio.	Railroad transportation	98,182
Special Steels Co., Newark, N. J.	Scrap iron and steel	227,751
Thilmony Pulp & Paper Co., Kaukauna, Wis.	Kraft paper	2,962,000
Marine Transit Co., Illinois River	Transportation, barge	384,515
Marvel Schebler Products Division, Borg-Warner Co., Decatur, Ill.	Aircraft parts	796,112
Pesco Products Division, Borg-Warner Co., Bedford, Ohio.	Aircraft accessories	996,078
Goldberg Iron & Steel, Columbus, Ohio	Ferrous and nonferrous scrap.	215,000
Lehigh Valley R. R. Co., New York State.	Railroad transportation	1,377,782
Huss Lumber Co., Chicago, Ill.	Lumber	585,970
W. S. Moore Co., Virginia, Minn.	Iron ore	175,000
Seaboard Air Line R. R. Co. (rail system).	Transportation	16,786,401
Do	do	9,593,916
Commercial Metals, Beaumont, Tex.	Scrap iron	130,601
Hutchinson Pipe & Waste Fort Worth, Tex.	do	148,914
Hutchinson Pipe & Waste Materials Co., Odessa, Tex.	Steel scrap	23,450
Commercial Metals Co., Houston, Tex.	Scrap iron	136,592
Ohio Ferro Alloys Corp., Philo, Ohio	Ferro and silica manganese	1,700,000
DeBardeleben Coal Corp., River Bluff, Ala.	Coal transportation	850,000
Hillman Transportation Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Transportation, barge	900,000
Steel Briquette Corp., Atlanta, Ga.	Steel scrap (tin can briquettes).	35,000
The Trane Co., Lacrosse, Wis.	Aluminum neat transfer service.	409,756
Consolidated-Vultee Aviation Corp., San Diego, Calif.	Airplanes	139,600
Do	Airplane parts	1,511,838
Super Service Motor Freight Co., Nashville, Tenn.	Truck transportation	470,000
Continental Steel Corp., Kokomo, Ind.	Steel ingots and sheets	5,302,000
Aero Supply Manufacturing Co., Corry, Pa.	Aircraft hardware and parts	118,000

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

JAN. 25 TO MAR. 7—continued

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or use	Amount certified
Learner Co., Oakland, Calif.	Ferrous and nonferrous scrap.	$90,500
National Steel Corp. (Weirton Division), Weirton, W. Va.	Tin, steel scrap	982,000
Do	Pig iron	1,352,000
Interlake Steamship Co., Great Lakes area	Great Lakes ore transportation.	6,000,000
Boeing Aircraft Co., Seattle, Wash	Engineering aircraft production.	1,405,000
Southern Railway Co., rail system	Transportation	10,250,000
Globe Iron Co., Jackson, Ohio	Pig iron	451,500
Hansen-Lynn, Burbank, Calif.	Aircraft controls	2,200
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio	Aircraft parts	32,978
St. Joe Paper Co., Port St. Joe, Fla.	Kraft container board	24,010,958
Ideal Cement Co., Trident, Mont., Superior, Nebr., Ada, Okla., Baton Rouge, La., Mobile, Ala.	Portland cement	9,896,554
Marlin Rockwell Corp., Plainville, Conn.	Aircraft parts	1,104,965
Aircraft Engineering Products, Clifton, N. J.	do	52,464
Metalcraft Manufacturing Co., Phoenix, Ariz.	Tools, dies, jigs	92,894
Holub Iron & Steel, Akron, Ohio	Scrap steel	117,282
National Lead Co., Tohawus, N. Y.	Iron ore concentrate	475,138
Aerojet Engineering Co., Azusa, Calif.	Ordnance supplies	611,000
Nordberg Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.	Diesel engines	3,694,409
Nordberg Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Diesel engine components	1,076,887
Columbia Transportation Co., Great Lakes	Great Lakes ore transportation.	12,000,000
Marine Transit Co., Illinois River	Transportation, towing	900,000
Midwest Rubber Reclaiming Co., East St. Louis, Ill.	Reclaimed rubber	1,600,000
Union Oil Co. of California, Wilmington, Calif.	Gasoline and fuel oil	12,000,000
J. A. Riggs Tractor Co., West Memphis, Ark.	Repairing and rebuilding tractors.	30,000
American Box Board, Flier City, Mich.	Wood pulp	7,694,446
Universal Cyclops Steel, Titusville, Pa.	Steel forms	629,000
Universal Cyclops Steel, Bridgeville, Pa.	Steel ingots	2,366,000
Carolina Giant Cement Co., Harleyville, S. C.	Portland and masonry cement.	4,671,310
Seaboard Airline Railroad Co., rail system.	Railroad transportation	1,015,000
Petco Corp., Blue Island, Ill.	Fuel oil and gasoline	1,936,000
Georgia, Florida & Alabama R. R. Co., Georgia.	Railway transportation	72,000
Seaboard Airline R. R. Co., Savannah, Ga., to Mobile, Ala.	do	319,000
Seaboard Airline R. R. Co., Atlanta, Ga., to Birmingham, Ala.	do	2,869,142
National Steel Corp. (Weirton Division), Weirton, W. Va.	Pig iron	1,172,000
Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich.	Steel products	650,600
Hanna Furnace Corp., Buffalo, N. Y.	Pig iron	175,000
Great Lakes Steel Corp., Zug Island, River Rouge, Mich.	Coke	2,062,700
Sharon Steel Corp., Farrell, Pa.	Scrap steel	190,600
Weatherhead Co., Antwerp, Ohio	Aircraft hose, assemblies	816,410
Green Bay Paper & Pulp, Green Bay, Wis.	Semichemical pulp and corrugating liner board.	197,116
Seaboard Airline Railroad Co., rail system.	Railway transportation	3,705,077
Kaiser Steel Corp., Fontana, Calif.	Iron ore, pig iron, and rolled sheets.	15,475,527
Permanente Cement Co., Permanente, Calif.	Portland cement	3,422,000
Keystone Steel & Wire Co., Peoria, Ill.	Steel wire	295,000
Rotary Electric Steel Co., Macomb County, Mich.	Steel bars	1,605,000
Goodyear Corp., Akron, Ohio	Fuel tanks	216,694
Rotary Electric Steel Co., Warrenton Township, Macomb County, Mich.	Steel ingots	450,000
Air Research Manufacturing Co. of Arizona, Phoenix, Ariz.	Aircraft parts	1,959,728
Air Research Manufacturing Co. (division of Garrett Corp.), Los Angeles, Calif.	do	608,777
Pueblo Steel Corp., Pueblo, Colo.	Seamless and merchant pipe	80,000,000
Atlas Processing Co., Shreveport, La.	Benzene	2,600,000
Henry Flugeltaub, Evansville, Ind.	Scrap metal	41,000
Rohr Aircraft Co., Chula Vista, Calif.	Aircraft parts	83,887
Lapointe Machine Tool, Hudson, Mass.	Broaching machine tools	1,399,064
Libby-Owens-Ford Glass, Ottawa, Ill.	Laminated plastic sheets	353,000
Republic Steel Corp., Buffalo, N. Y.	Steel ingots	386,000
Atlantic Steel & Iron, Springfield, Mass.	Iron and steel scrap	20,839
Olin Industries, Inc., New Britain, Conn.	Ordnance material	1,015,315
Granite City Steel Co., Granite City, Ill.	Ingots and rolled steel	3,640,000
Wallingford Steel Co., Wallingford, Conn.	Cold rolled steel	115,000
Oregon Steel Mills, Portland, Oreg.	Steel ingots and bars	245,865
M. F. A. Oil Co., Memphis, Tenn.	Gasoline	1,720,000
Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.	Pig iron, steel ingots	2,231,000
Bethlehem Steel Co., Johnstown, Cambria County, Pa.	Pig iron and steel ingots	28,386,000
Bethlehem Steel Co., Lebanon, Pa.	Bolts, nuts, rivets	1,193,000
Bethlehem Steel Co., Seattle, Wash.	Steel ingots, bolts	136,000
Bethlehem Steel Co., Pottstown, Pa.	Fabricated steel	66,000
Do	do	65,000
Bethlehem Steel Co., Seattle, Wash.	do	1,409,000
Bethlehem Steel Co., Cornwall, Pa.	Pyrites and iron ore	77,000
Bethlehem Steel Co., Lackawanna, Erie County, N. Y.	Transportation	853,000
Do	Transportation-dredging lake channel.	6,250,000
Bethlehem Steel Co. Bethlehem, Pa.	Molds for steel ingots, steel products.	3,586,000
Bethlehem Cub Iron Mines, Morgantown, Banks County, Pa.	Pyrites and iron ore	$24,343,000
Bethlehem Cuba Iron Mines, Warwick Township, Chester County, Pa.	do	4,037,000
Bethlehem Steel Co., Great Lakes	Transportation	12,000,000
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., East Chicago, Ind.	Buttweld pipe	7,800,000
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio.	Steel slabs and booms	4,489,000
Babcock & Wilcox Tube Co., Beaver Falls, Pa.	Alloy steel and tubes	6,315,000
Nicholson Universal Steamship, Detroit, Mich.	Transportation, lake freighters.	9,930,000
Olin Industries, Inc., East Alton, Ill.	Ordnance supplies	1,015,315
J. H. Holan Corp., Cleveland, Ohio	Special truck bodies for public utility companies.	643,389
Detroit & Mackinac Ry. Co., rail system	Railroad transportation	600,000
Laclede Steel Co., Alton, Ill.	Steel ingots	402,333
Aurora Gasoline Co. and Keystone Oil, Detroit, Mich.	Diesel and industrial fuels	3,970,000
National Steel Corp. (Weirton Division), Hancock County, W. Va.	Pig iron and steel ingots	3,319,000
Sunland Refining Co., Bakersfield, Calif.	Gasoline, fuel oils	501,653
Vanadium Corp. of America, town of Niagara, N. Y.	Ferro chromium	1,160,639
Vanadium Corp. of America, New Haven, W. Va.	Silicon metal, ferro silicon	6,910,000
Cleveland Graphite Bronze Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Aircraft parts	561,699
Allis Chalmers Manufacturing Co., La Porte, Ind.	Cargo tractor (ordnance)	2,576,000
A. P. Green Firebrick Co., Mexico, Mo.	Firebrick refractories	1,550,339
Western Oil & Fuel Co., between Duluth and Superior on county highway.	Gasoline, fuel oil	5,992,000
General Electric Co., Owensboro, Ky.	Electronic tubes	336,306
Hot Point, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.	Aircraft parts	1,913,000
Northrop Aviation, Inc., Hawthorne, Calif.	Aircraft	2,046,100
Cincinnati Milling Machine Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.	Milling machine lathes	4,156,958
Cincinnati Milling Machine Co., Wilmington, Ohio.	Machine tools	3,472,600
Cleveland-Cliffs Steamship Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Transportation, lake or shipments.	6,000,000
Globe Brick Co., Newell, W. Va.	Firebrick (refractory)	1,271,766
Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp., Pasadena, Calif.	Wind tunnel testing	661,666
Do	do	1,333,333
Do	do	666,667
Do	do	661,666
Do	do	661,675
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.	Pig iron	8,955,300
Do	Steel ingots	9,250,000
Do	Steel plates, sheets, strips	9,144,850
Do	Steel ingots and slabs	1,485,000
Wright Aeronautical Corp., Caldwell, N. J.	Aircraft parts	578,600
Wright Aeronautical Corp., Woodridge, N. J.	do	5,334,440
Wright Aeronautical Corp., Garfield, N. J.	do	6,124,000
Republic Steel Corp., South Chicago, Ill.	Seamless tubing	21,500,000
North American Refractories Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Refractory brick	737,704
General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.	Services, research and development.	448,000
Derby Oil Co., Wichita, Kans.	High octane gas and fuel	2,606,041
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Aliquippa, Pa.	Steel beams, angles, and wire.	2,154,000
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Thermally treated steel	201,600
Do	Hot-rolled material	709,000
International Minerals & Chemicals Corp., Mulberry, Fla.	Chemicals	6,600,000
Ethyl Corp., Baton Rouge, La.	Antiknock compounds	175,000
Stowe-Fuller Refractories Co., Alexandria, Pa.	Silica refractory brick	197,000
Robinson Clay Co., Parral, Ohio	Silica clay refractory brick	185,400
Stowe-Fuller Refractories Co., Strasburg, Ohio.	Silica refractory brick	369,000
General Electric Co., New Hartford, N. Y.	Electronic equipment	15,693,000
Phillips Petroleum Co., Phillips, Tex.	Propane and butane	4,656,575
Ben Hur Refining Corp., Long Beach, Calif.	Gasoline, fuel oil	2,220,000
Cleveland-Cliffe Steamship Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Great Lakes transportation, cargo ships.	4,000,000
Avco Manufacturing Corp. (Crosley Division), Richmond, Ind.	Fire-control systems	1,909,000
Hughes Aircraft Co., Tucson, Ariz.	Ordnance supplies	7,289,000
Northwestern Refining Co., St. Paul, Minn	Octane gasoline	2,074,908
Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Aircraft supplies	24,500,000
Superior Refinery Owners, Inc., Superior, Wis.	Gasoline, oil	1,228,800
General Electric Co., Lockland, Ohio	Aircraft parts	25,695,911
General Electric Co., Lynn, Mass.	do	4,037,024
General Electric Co., Everett, Mass.	do	647,669
Sunray Oil Corp., Stephens County, Okla.	Gasoline components	1,720,866
Armour & Co., Fort Worth, Tex.	Blood plasma	850,000
Tennessee Eastman Corp., Longview, Tex.	Ethyl alcohol, synthetic	5,787,000
Clayton Manufacturing Co., Rosemeade, Calif.	Steam-cleaning machines, hydraulic dynamometers.	38,106
Lee Paper Co., Vicksburg, Mich.	Fine paper, bonds, maps, etc	1,000,745
Gem City Engineering Co., Dayton, Ohio.	Tools, dies, gages	60,466

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

JAN. 25 TO MAR. 7—continued

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or use	Amount certified
Magnum Corp., Barrington, Ill.	Magnesium and aluminum castings.	$8,851
Cincinnati Gear Co., Cincinnati, Ohio	Gears (Diesel and hydraulic).	97,791
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc., Muncie, Ind.	Tank tracks	398,698
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc., Akron, Ohio.	Tank bogie wheels and rollers.	322,855
Southern Pacific Co., Roseville, Calif.	Railroad transportation	4,591,500
Greenback Industries, Inc., Greenback, Tenn.	Copper powder, tin powder, brass powder.	370,922
Cotton Producers Co., Oraloma, northwest Fresno City, Calif.	Cotton ginning	175,630
Producers Cotton Oil Co., Westhaven, southwest Fresno City, Calif.	do	175,630
Cotton Oil Co., southwest Fresno City Calif.	do	175,630
Cotton Oil Co., Kermay, Calif.	do	175,630
Ferrocote Machine Co., Bridgeton, N. J.	Power presses	186,275
Patterson Foundry & Machine Co., East Liverpool, Ohio.	Equipment for rolling mills.	73,767
Nelson Stud Welding, Lorain, Ohio (division of Morton Gregory Corp.).	Welding equipment	184,660
Wendt-Sonis Co., Hannibal, Mo	Tools and machinery	14,436
Accurate Products Co., Hillside, N. J.	Experimental tools	102,715
Standard Steel Spring Co., Gary, Ind.	Springs for vehicles	101,800
Kingston Products Co., Kokomo, Ind.	Tank truck pins	49,146
Wendelight Corp., Albertson, Long Island.	Optical precision instruments.	115,435
Crobalt, Inc., Ann Arbor, Mich.	Cutting tools	41,200
Rheem Manufacturing Co., Sparrows Point, Md.	Metal shipping containers	534,783
Skarda, Inc., El Monte, Calif.	Ordnance supplies	172,411
Continental Foundry & Machine Co., East Chicago, Ind.	Tank turrets	192,711
Continental Foundry & Machine Co., Wheeling, W. Va.	Coat armor	60,776
B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio	Testing tires	73,448
Therm Electric Meters Co., Inc., Ithaca, N. Y.	Forge dies and trim dies	196,314
Avalon Manufacturing Co., Garfield, N. J.	Sockets, terminals, rivets, and studs.	20,826
Westberg Tool & Manufacturing Co., Bridgeport, Conn.	Tools and dies	6,426
Union Pacific Railroad Co., rail system	Railroad transportation	5,807,500
General Motors Co., Wayne, Mich.	Diesel engines	1,317,893
Master Tool & Die Co., Inc., Detroit, Mich.	Tank parts	10,202
Bryant Chucking & Grinding Co., Springfield, Vt.	Rifles and spare parts, and grinding machines.	37,876
Cincinnati Milling Machine Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.	Abrasive, grinding wheels	371,040
Milwaukee Solvay Coke Co., Milwaukee, Wis.	Coke, benzol, and xylol	1,200,000
Stewart-Warner Corp., Chicago, Ill.	Ordnance supplies	503,461
Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co., Neville Island, Pa.	Pig iron	$9,150,000
Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., Everett, Wash.	Paper pulp	19,125,000
Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., Longview, Wash.	Pulp, container board	12,469,377
Timken Roller Bearing Co., Canton, Ohio.	Steel bars, seamless tubing	3,462,000
H. P. Deuscher Co., Hamilton, Ohio	Gray iron castings	33,791
Libby-Owens Ford Glass Co., Toledo, Ohio.	Fibrous glass	737,780 3,413,800
Rayonier, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Cellulose	873,610
Do	do	1,412,418
Do	do	1,507,980
Firth Sterling Steel & Carbide Co., McKeesport, Pa.	Metal cutting tools	219,956
Pan-American Southern Corp., New Orleans, La.	Gasoline	5,500,000
Hartford Electrical Steel Corp., Hartford, Conn.	Steel sheet	3,243,000
New Britain Machine Co., New Britain, Conn.	Bolts and nuts	737,159
American Brake Shoe Co., Detroit, Mich.	Brake lining	13,593
Cincinnati Gear Co., Cincinnati, Ohio	Gears	236,643
Timken-Detroit Axle Co., south central Ohio.	Axle transfer cases and parts.	15,650,000
Standard Oil Co. of California, El Segundo, Calif.	Benzene and gasoline	14,000,000
White Fuel Corp., Boston, Mass.	Storage of petroleum products.	600,000
Screw Products of America, Los Angeles, Calif.	Self-locking nuts	1,575,709
International Business Machines Corp., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Ordnance supplies	17,910,000
Burgess-Norton Manufacturing Co., Geneva, Ill.	Tank truck bodies	157,600
Cupples Products Corp., Maplewood, Mo.	Alloy aluminum extrusions	881,798
Rockford Aeromatic Products Co., Rockford, Ill.	Universal joint bearings	35,000
Eaton Manufacturing Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Compressor blades for aircraft.	850,000
National Steel Corp. (Weirton division), Weirton, W. Va.	Pig iron	15,450,000
Sealol Corp., Providence, R. I.	Oil seals	55,000
Fairchild Camera & Instrument Co., Long Island, N. Y.	Aerial photographic equipment.	4,395,292
Lodish Corp., Cudahy, Wis.	Steel forgings	3,757,452
Shenango Furnace Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Water transportation for iron ore.	1,158,000
Do	do	798,671
Do	do	1,050,500
Chisholm Boyd & White Co., Chicago, Ill.	Mechanical press	28,040
Aircraft Tapered Sheets, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.	Wings and fuselage fittings	499,204
International Paper Co., Natchez, Miss.	Bleached dissolving pulp	22,034,300
Do	Bleached pulp	20,937,658
Pratt & Letchworth Co., Inc., Buffalo, N.Y.	Core assemblies	210,908
Argus Camera, Inc., Ann Arbor, Mich.	Lenses, prisms, etc	450,000

In addition to the above listing, 3 applications from the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. have been certified for indefinite amounts pending the submission of supplemental information by Kaiser. Total amount of the 3 original applications was $80,500,000.

MAR. 7 TO APR. 6

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or service	Amount applied for	Amount eligible	Percentage certified
Continental Machines, Inc., Savage, Minn.	Sewing machines, metal cut-off machines, gage blocks, special gages.	$262,250	$262,250	85
Onsrud Machine Works, Inc., Chicago, Ill.	Metalworking machinery (aircraft)	26,629	26,629	90
Three M Tool & Die Co., York, Pa.	Machine tools, dies	15,000	15,000	75
Swan Engineering & Machine Co., Bettendorf, Iowa	Tools, dies, jigs, and fixtures	26,194	26,194	80
Jefferson Engineering & Manufacturing Co., Detroit, Mich.	Tank track components	118,782	118,782	85
Matheson Hydro-carbon Chemical Corp., Doe Run, Ky.	Isobutane	19,000,000	18,980,095	75
Red Arrow Steamship Co., home port, Sheboygan, Wis.	Transportation (Great Lakes)	325,000	325,000	80
The Hobart Bros. Co., Troy, Ohio.	Electric arc welders, power plant	13,787	13,787	75
Diesel Betz Co., Belleville, Ill.	Dies, jigs, and fixtures	44,461	44,461	90
Harvey Machine Co., Kalispell, Mont., and in Northwest.	Aluminum pig, bauxite	95,000,000	94,700,000	85
Reynolds Metals Co., Corpus Christi, Tex.	Aluminum	79,665,278	78,365,278	80
Aluminum Co. of America, Massena, N. Y.	Housing for employees	2,000,000		
Calhoun Development Co., near Port Lavaca, Tex.	Housing facilities	2,173,776		
ALCOA, unknown	Primary aluminum	60,000,000	64,775,236	80
Calhoun Development Co., Port Comfort, Tex.	Housing facilities	1,200,000		
Chicago & Eastern Illinois R. R. Co., home office, Chicago, Ill.	Transportation, rail	363,761	363,761	80
Seaboard Air Line R. R. Co., railroad line between Moncure, N. C., and Aberdeen, N. C.	do	851,000	851,000	65
The Jackson Iron & Steel Co., Jackson, Ohio.	Silvery pig iron	2,438,550	2,438,550	85
The Timken-Detroit Axle Co., Detroit, Mich.	Axles for military vehicles	732,302	732,302	90
The Timken-Detroit Axle Co., Oshkosh, Wis.	do	429,014	429,014	80
The Timken-Detroit Axle Co., Ashtabula, Ohio.	do	4,878	4,878	75
The Timken-Detroit Axle Co., Kenton, Ohio.	do	49,760	49,760	85
The Timken-Detroit Axle Co., New Castle, Pa.	do	309,970	309,970	80
Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Watervliet, N. Y.	Steel ingots	3,242,000	3,242,000	75
The Cleveland Pneumatic Tool Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Airplane landing gear	702,231	688,231	80
Do	do	375,000	350,000	75
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., Burlington, Iowa.	Subminiature electron tubes	4,277,322	4,252,322	75
Solar Aircraft Co., Des Moines, Iowa.	Aircraft engine parts	1,750,000	1,679,000	75
Solar Aircraft Co., San Diego, Calif.	Manifold banks for aircraft engine	23,486	23,486	85
Do	Hood for aircraft engine	1,250	1,250	75
Do	Parts for jet engines	109,347	109,347	85
Do	Aircraft engine parts	158,549	158,549	75
Solar Aircraft Co., Des Moines, Iowa.	do	15,284	15,284	85
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., Towanda, Pa.	Tungsten and molybdenum (wire, powder, sheet).	2,899,335	2,899,335	80
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., Warren, Pa.	Electron tubes	790,695	790,695	80
Solar Aircraft Co., San Diego, Calif.	Aircraft engine components	152,653	152,653	80

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

MAR. 7 TO APR. 6—continued

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or service	Amount applied for	Amount eligible	Percentage certified
Virginia Smelting Co., West Norfolk, Va.	Zinc powder, chlorine gas	$1,265,485	$1,265,485	75
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Wilmington, N. C.	Rail transportation	2,330,000	2,330,000	50
The Sherwin-Williams Co., Chicago, Ill.	Refined napthalene	274,050	274,050	55
St. Joseph Lead Co. of Pennsylvania, Josephtown, Pa.	Slab zinc	1,498,070	1,498,070	75
Randolph Metals Co., Canton, Mass.	do	49,753	49,185	75
Manasco Manufacturing Co., Burbank, Calif.	Hydraulic landing gears	771,634	663,634	80
The Sherwin-Williams Co., Chicago, Ill.	Refined para cresol	279,150	279,150	55
Monsanto Chemical Co., Monsanto, Ill.	Chlorine and caustic soda	1,450,000	1,450,000	50
Wyandotte Chemicals Corp., Wyandotte, Mich.	do	760,000	760,000	50
Stauffer Chemical Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.	Chlorine and caustic soda, carbon tetrachloride	5,155,000	5,155,000	50
Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., Wyandotte, Mich.	Chlorine, caustic soda	1,380,753	1,380,753	50
Diamond Alkali Co., Deer Park, Pasadena, Tex.	do	5,900,000	5,900,000	50
Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., Calvert City, Ky.	do	6,500,000	6,500,000	50
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Natrium, W. Va.	do	10,200,000	10,200,000	50
Southern Alkali Corp., Lake Charles, La.	do	10,080,000	10,080,000	50
Southern Alkali Corp., Corpus Christi, Tex.	do	8,665,000	8,665,000	50
Michigan Chemical Corp., St. Louis, Mich.	do	9,940,000	9,945,258	50
Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co. of Washington, Tacoma, Wash.	do	445,000	445,000	50
Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co. of Washington, Portland, Oreg.	do	1,497,598	1,497,598	50
Mathieson Alabama Chemical Corp., McIntosh, Ala.	do	8,124,800	8,124,800	50
National Distillers Chemical Corp., Ashtabula, Ohio	Chlorine, sodium	3,960,000	3,960,000	50
Do	do	9,600,000	[1] 9,600,000	50
Mathieson Hydrocarbon Chemical Corp., Saltsville, Va.	Liquid chlorine	9,149,960	9,149,960	50
The Dow Chemical Co., Freeport, Tex.	Chlorine, caustic soda	34,619,000	34,619,000	50
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., Hopewell, Va.	Chlorine	2,150,000	2,150,000	50
Diamond Alkali Co., Painesville, Ohio	do	2,182,910	2,182,910	50
Hooker Electro-Chemical Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.	do	688,000	448,000	50
Diamond Alkali Co., Deer Park, Pasadena, Tex.	Chlorine, caustic soda	2,264,220	2,264,220	50
Do	do	3,396,330	3,396,330	50
The Solvay Process Division, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., unknown	Chlorine	29,200,000	[1] 29,000,000	50
North Carolina Pulp Co., Plymouth, N. C.	Chlorine, caustic soda	1,300,000	1,300,000	50
Southern Ferro Alloys Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.	do	3,250,000	[1] 3,250,000	50
The Dow Chemical Co., Pittsburg, Calif.	do	606,400	606,400	50
Do	do	2,333,360	2,333,360	50
Innis, Speiden & Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.	do	800,000	800,000	50
The Dow Chemical Co., Freeport, Tex.	Perchlorоethylene, chlorine	3,141,000	3,141,000	50
Brown Co., Berlin, N. H.	Chlorine, caustic soda	221,500	221,500	50
Niagara Alkali Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.	Chlorine	1,045,088	1,045,088	50
Frontier Chemical Co. of Kansas Inc., Sedgwick County, Kans.	Chlorine, hydrochloric acid	1,467,800	1,432,800	50
The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.	Chlorine, caustic soda	2,600,000	2,600,000	50
Ahlberg Bearing Co., Chicago, Ill.	Ball bearings	550,000	550,000	85
Mountain States Bean Co., Denver, Colo.	Food storage	766,500	766,500	40
Seaboard Air Lines R. R. Co., railroad line near Eulonia, S. C., and Andrews, S. C.	Rail transportation	267,500	267,500	65
The Torrington Co., Inc., of Indiana, South Bend, Ind.	Antifriction bearings	312,549	312,549	85
Sheridan Towing Co., Inc., New York and Philadelphia	Tugboat transportation	550,000	550,000	70
Tyson Bearing Corp., Massillon, Ohio	Roller bearings	71,515	71,515	90
W. J. Bullock, Inc., Birmingham, Ala.	Secondary aluminum, zinc, brass	765,000	765,000	75
B. & M. Towing Co., Gulf coast to Pittsburgh	Oil transportation, barges, tugboats	569,882	319,882 250,000	80 70
George Sall Metals Co., Inc., undecided	Nonferrous metals	665,000	615,000	75
McAllister Bros., Inc., New York Harbor	Towboat transportation	140,375	140,375	70
Ohio Steel Foundry Co., Lima, Ohio	Steel rolling-mill rolls	1,001,622	1,001,622	80
American Barge Lines Co., Mississippi River (howe office, Jeffersonville, Ind.)	Water transportation	1,513,609	970,806	80
New York, Chicago & St. Louis Ry. Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Rail transportation	2,452,007	2,452,007	80
Lebanon Steel Foundry, Lebanon, Pa.	Armor castings for tanks	891,591	891,591	75
Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co., Wilmington, N. C.	Rail transportation	21,393,333	21,393,333	65
Tyson Bearing Corp., Massillon, Ohio	Roller bearings	1,145,000	1,145,000	90
Chemstrand Corp., Decatur, Ala.	Staple synthetic fiber	25,531,500	25,531,500	50
Chemstrand Corp., to be selected	Nylon filament	88,500,000	88,500,000	50
Monsanto Chemical Co., Texas City, Tex.	Acrylonitrile, hydrogen cyanide	25,633,000	25,633,000	50
National Distillers Chemical Corp., Ashtabula, Ohio	Chlorine, liquid sodium	9,656,490	9,656,490	50
Wyandotte Chemical Corp., Wyandotte, Mich.	Chlorine, caustic soda	22,572,000	[1] 21,761,880	50
W. A. Handley Manufacturing Co., Roanoke, Ala.	Heavy cotton fabrics	300,564	300,564	60
Spartan Mills, Spartanburg, S. C.	Army duck	334,658	334,658	70
Romac Mills, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.	Cotton duck	598,320	598,320	60
Spartan Mills, Spartanburg, S. C.	Army duck	379,654	379,654	70
Brookside Mills, Inc., Knoxville, Tenn.	Cotton duck	4,586,400	4,586,400	60
Mexia Textile Mills, Inc., Mexia, Tex.	Duck cloth	203,108	203,108	60
Pacolet Manufacturing Co., New Holland, Ga.	do	1,870,725	1,870,725	60
Limestone Manufacturing Co., Caffney, S. C.	Shelter duck	1,089,235	1,089,235	60
Continental Sulphur & Phosphate Corp., Cody, Wyo.	Sulfur	1,850,000	1,850,000	85
United Drill & Tool Corp. (Whitman & Barnes division), Plymouth, Mich.	Cutting tools, drills	133,617	133,617	90
Champion Forge Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Steel drop forgings	470,296	470,296	80
Seaboard Air Line R. R. Co., Savannah, Ga.	Rail transportation	3,184,000	3,014,000	65
Stratos division, Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., Farmingdale, Long Island, N. Y.	Ground air conditioner	36,309	36,309	85
Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., Farmingdale, Long Island, N. Y.	Ordnance	11,202	11,202	85
Do	Aircraft engines	5,979	5,979	75
Ford Motor Co., Cincinnati, Ohio	Oil pump assemblies	2,925,577	2,925,577	75
General Motors Corp., Saginaw, Mich.	Ball-bearing adjustors	235,760	226,760	90
General Motors Corp., Flint, Mich.	Spark plugs	40,275	40,275	75
Menasco Manufacturing Co., Burbank, Calif.	Landing gears	350,000	350,000	75
General Motors Corp., Grand Rapids, Mich.	Aircraft engine parts	1,598,000	1,598,000	75
General Motors Corp., Harrison, N. J.	Roller bearings	276,672	276,672	90
Good-All Electric Manufacturing Co., Ogallala, Nebr.	Metal-clad condensers	200,000	200,000	75
Mechanics Universal Joint Division of Borg-Warner Corp., Rockford, Ill.	Joint assemblies for aircraft	150,000	150,000	75
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Mead, Wash.	Aluminum pig	5,870,500	5,870,500	80
Do	do	364,006	364,006	80
Titeflex, Inc., Newark, N. J.	Radio and ignition components	289,065	289,065	80
General Motors Corp., Vandalia, Ohio	Propeller assembly	180,655	180,655	90
Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio	Aircraft parts	200,929	200,929	80
Reynolds Metals Co., Jones Mills, Ark.	Aluminum pig	4,300,000	4,300,000	80
Reynolds Aluminum Co., Troutdale, Oreg.	do	475,450	475,450	80
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Aliquippa, Pa.	Pipe and tubing	1,593,250	1,377,000	60
Do	Recovery of iron	789,000	742,650	85
Marine Fuel Transfer Corp., New York Harbor	Barge fuel oil transportation	225,000	225,000	80
Peerless Woolen Mills, Rossville, Ga.	Melton, kersey, flannel	1,963,000	578,000	60
John L. Hutcheson, Jr., Cleveland, Tenn.	Woolen cloth	2,250,000	2,250,000	60
Red Star Towing & Transportation Co., New York Harbor	Barge transportation	75,000	75,000	80
Do	do	225,000	225,000	80
Do	Diesel tug	350,000	350,000	70

[1] Less amount to be determined subsequently for mercury.

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

MAR. 7 TO APR. 6—continued

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or service	Amount applied for	Amount eligible	Percentage certified
New York, Chicago & St. Louis R. R. Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Rail transportation	$4,889,548	$4,889,548	65
Boeing Airplane Co., Seattle, Wash	Aircraft and accessories	4,941,916	4,941,916	85
Johns-Manville Corp., Bridgewater Township, Somerset County, N. J	Research and development of mineral fibers	3,817,000	3,817,000	75
The Cornelius Co., New Brighton, Minn	Aircraft air compressors	49,873	49,873	90
St. Regis Kraft Corp., Eastport, Fla	Wood pulp	17,638,000	17,638,000	60
Bergen Wire Rope Co., Lodi, N. J	Field wire conductors	60,000	60,000	75
Lycoming-Spencer Division of AVCO Manufacturing Corp., Williamsport, Pa	Throttle body assemblies	20,675	20,675	90
Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Watervliet, N. Y	Stainless steel	3,200,000	3,200,000	70
Sun Oil Co., Marcus Hook, Pa	Benzene, toluene	8,380,000	8,380,000	85
Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank and Van Nuys, Calif	Airplanes	3,696,693	3,371,238	85
Bell Aircraft Corp., Wheatfield, Niagara County, N. Y	Research, development engineering	250,000	250,000	75
Cities Service Oil Co., Ponca City, Okla	Gasoline, fuel oil	6,500,000	6,500,000	75
Heli Coil Corp., Danbury, Conn	Bushings, screw members, tools	244,429	244,429	80
Jack & Heintz Precision Industries, Inc., Maple Heights, Ohio	Aircraft rotating electrical equipment	410,900	411,900	90
Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., Farmingdale, Long Island, N. Y	Aircraft engine parts	12,357	2,414	75
Fairchild Aircraft Division, Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., Hagerstown, Md	Airplanes	83,118	71,456	80
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Aliquippa, Pa	Transportation, barge loading	495,000	495,000	60
Do	Slag handling	93,000	93,000	85
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa	Steel plates, sheets, strip	9,392,743	3,777,987	60
General Motors Corp., Vandalia, Ohio	Actuators	277,781	277,781	90
Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp., San Diego, Calif	Aircraft	144,851	144,851	75
Wyman-Gordon Co., Harvey, Ill	Engine crankshafts	4,848,200	4,848,200	80
Rockwood Oil Terminals, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio	Transportation, oil barge	100,817	100,817	80
Bouchard Transportation Co., Inc., New York, N. Y	Oil barge	242,500	242,500	80
Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp., Piscataway Township, N. J	Welding equipment	211,470	211,470	90
National Steel Corp. (division of Weirton Steel Co.), Weirton, W. Va	Pig iron, steel ingots, etc	422,895	422,895	85
Phillips Oil Co., Borger, Tex	Aviation alkylate, gasoline, and Diesel fuel	15,573,700	15,573,700	75
Ashland Oil & Refining Co., St. Elmo and Wood River, Ill	Gasoline, kerosene	725,000	665,000	75
B. No. 90 Corp., care of Bouchard Transportation Co., Inc., New York, N. Y	Oil barge	242,500	242,500	80
Western States Refining Co., North Salt Lake, Utah	Gasoline	1,413,250	1,092,700	75
Sinclair Refining Co., Houston, Tex	Normal butylenes	27,000,000	27,000,000	75
Delhi gasoline plant, Sun Oil Co., Delhi, La	Isobutane	238,497	238,497	85
Frontier Natural Gasoline Co., Loco Hills, N. Mex	Natural gasoline	703,986	703,986	75
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Sugar Creek, Mo	Gasoline, kerosene	21,170,000	21,170,000	75
Premier Petroleum Co., Fort Worth, Tex	Gasoline	650,000	650,000	75
B. No. 70 Corp., care of Bouchard Transportation Co., Inc., New York, N. Y	Oil barge	242,500	242,500	80
Polan Industries, Hunting, W. Va	Glass bulbs, tubing, and flares for tubes	2,263,000	2,245,000	75
Continental Oil Co., Lake Charles, La	Gasoline, components, byproducts	23,820,150	23,820,150	80
River Co., Inc., New Orleans, La. (home port)	Water transportation, towboat and barge	820,000	510,000	80
			340,000	70
Columbine Development Co., Columbine, Colo	Bleached sulfate pulp	16,552,000	15,846,000	65
Larson & Quigley Co., Chicago, Ill	Aircraft engine parts	37,348	37,348	90
Thompson Industries, Inc., Mineola, N. Y	Ball bearings	14,129	14,129	90
Union Tank Car Co., Chicago, Ill	Rail transportation	3,279,000	3,279,000	80
Do	do	3,185,000	3,185,000	80
Aluminum Co. of America (Alcoa reduction works), Alcoa, Tenn	Primary aluminum	912,900	912,900	80
Gulf Oil Corp., Port Arthur, Tex	Ethylene	15,427,000	15,427,000	80
United Aircraft Corp., East Hartford, Conn	Ordnance	329,855	329,855	80
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Whiting, Ind	Components for aviation gasoline	938,500	938,500	100
Kanotex Refining Co., Arkansas City, Kans	High-octane gasoline	2,347,423	2,347,423	75
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa	Steel	379,600	379,600	75
Do	Steel ingots	104,600	101,900	75
Genesee Transporting Co., Nashville, Tenn	Water transportation	800,000	300,000	80
			800,000	70
Petco Corp., Milwaukee, home office	Transportation, towboat	350,000	350,000	70
Bloom Engineering Co., Inc., Pittsburgh	Equipment for industrial furnaces, pipe insulation material.	165,080	157,080	80
The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y	Photographic papers	296,500	296,500	75
The B G Corp., Ridgefield, N. J	Spark plugs	1,400,000	1,400,000	75
Engineering Reproduction, Inc., Detroit	Reproduction of drafts for engineering	95,000	75,000	75
Talley Machine & Manufacturing Corp., Los Angeles, Calif	Machine work (aircraft parts)	27,434	27,434	90
Cargo Carriers, Inc., Wilmington, Del., home port	Transportation, tub and barge	700,000	325,000	80
			375,000	70
The Heim Co., Fairfield, Conn	Special bearings	20,878	20,878	90
H. Levine Cooperage, Vernon, Calif	Reconditioning of steel drums	267,659	267,659	50
Research Welding & Engineering Co., South Gate, Calif	Tank assemblies and aircraft	16,500	16,500	90
Seaboard Air Line R. R. Co., West Jacksonville, Fla	Railroad transportation	247,000	247,000	65
Samuel Greenfield Co., scrap-iron depot, Buffalo, N. Y	Processing steel scrap	136,621	126,621	75
Union Tank Car Co., Chicago	Railroad transportation	2,275,000	2,275,000	80
The J. E. Baker Co., West Manchester Township, York County, Pa	Dead burned dolomite	2,038,895	2,038,895	85
Ethyl Corp., Houston, Tex	Antiknock compounds	45,000,000	44,135,000	85
Ethyl Corp., Baton Rouge, La	do	4,041,000	4,041,000	75
Ethyl-Dow Chemical Co., Freeport, Tex	Ethylene dibromide	8,185,000	8,185,000	100
National Grinding Wheel Co., Inc., Tonawanda, N. Y	Abrasive products	295,117	295,117	75
Patapsco & Black Rivers R. R. Co., Baltimore, Md	Transportation	523,000	360,000	75
			163,000	65
Philadelphia, Bethlehem & New England R. R. Co., Bethlehem, Pa	Railroad transportation	200,000	200,000	75
Union Tank Car Co., Chicago, Ill	do	4,550,000	4,550,000	80
General Motors Corp., Cleveland	Diesel engine	1,744,282	1,744,282	75
Siskin Steel & Supply Co., Inc., Chattanooga, Tenn	Steel scrap	59,792	39,792	75
Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp., Harrison, N. J	Pumps	285,906	285,906	85
Slade Machine Products Co., Cleveland	Aircraft engine parts	23,885	23,885	90
American Non-Gran Bronze Co., Berwyn, Pa	Aircraft engine valve guides	60,413	60,413	85
Atlas Steel & Supply Co., Cleveland	Baled scrap iron	102,040	102,040	75
The Lederer Iron & Steel Co., Cleveland	Scrap iron	98,253	98,253	75
Alaska Junk Co., Seattle	do	70,000	30,000	75
Apex Steel & Supply Co., Chicago	Iron and steel scrap	142,700	142,700	75
Greer Hydraulics, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y	Testing equipment	335,000	325,000	75
Dover Stamping Co., Fall River, Mass	Steel drums	3,917	3,917	75
Dow Corning Corp., Midland, Mich	Silicone, rubber	1,460,000	1,460,000	75
Lufkin Foundry & Machinery Co., Lufkin, Tex	Oil pumping units	100,000	100,000	75
Texas Vitrified Pipe Co., Mineral Wells, Tex	Vitrified clay sewer pipe	250,000	250,000	75
Litton Industries, San Carlos, Calif	Magnetron tubes	269,227	248,277	85
Steel City Iron & Metal Co., Inc., Youngstown, Ohio	Steel scrap	14,616	14,616	75
Seaboard Refractories, Raritan Township, N. J	Mullite, silicon, carbide, and clay refractories	174,700	174,700	85
Fitzgibbon Boiler Co., Inc., Oswego, N. Y	Hulls for tanks	1,750,000	1,750,000	75
Murray Refractories Co., Murray, Utah	Silica refractories	86,890	86,890	85
Landowne Steel & Iron, Morton, Pa	Ordnance supplies	6,500	6,500	75
Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Philadelphia	Instruments for measuring, recording	780,000	731,000	75
Bol, Ltd., New York, N. Y	Research and development	11,201	11,201	85
Powers Regulator Co., Skokie, Ill	Process control apparatus, valves	2,378,390	1,588,390	75
The M. Cohen & Son Co., Cleveland	Iron and steel scrap	53,591	53,591	75
Jackson Iron & Metal Co., Inc., Jackson, Mich	Processing scrap metal	20,608	20,608	75
Mayer Pollock, Pottstown, Pa	Steel scrap	75,000	75,000	75
Hoyne Iron & Steel Co., Chicago, Ill	Copper scrap	150,111	146,000	75

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

MAR. 7 TO APR. 6—continued

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or service	Amount applied for	Amount eligible	Percentage certified
Euclid Road Machinery Co., Euclid, Ohio	Scrapers, loaders	$2,017,762	$2,017,762	50
Great Lakes Steamship Co., Inc., Superior, Wis	Water transportation	216,500	216,500	80
Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio	Airplane wheels	269,600	269,600	85
California Bag & Metal Co., Portland, Oreg	Sheet-metal scrap	69,000	69,000	75
Abe & Albert A. Kaufman Iron & Metal Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Scrap iron	26,568	26,568	75
Ace Iron & Metal Co., Detroit	Scrap iron and steel	119,366	119,366	75
Hartford Machine Screw Co., Windsor, Conn	Aircraft engine parts	428,402	426,213	85
Laclede-Christy Co. of Colorado, Canon City, Colo	Clay firebrick and tile	347,000	347,000	85
Patapsco & Back Rivers R. R., Sparrows Point, Md	Railroad transportation	300,000	300,000	75
South Buffalo R. R. Co., Lackawanna, N. Y	do	995,000	600,000 395,000	75 65
Crouse-Hinds Co., Syracuse, N. Y	Conduit fittings	5,098,985	5,098,985	75
Sun Oil Co., Marcus Hook, Pa	Aviation gasoline	2,577,145	2,577,145	100
Taylor Refining Co., Corpus Christi, Tex	Butanes, gasoline and oil	5,057,493	5,057,493	75
The Kellex Corp., Summit, N. J	Research, development, and construction services	285,000	260,000	75
A. P. Ward & Son, Inc., Pensacola, Fla., home port	Water transportation	140,000	140,000	70
Hardinge Bros., Inc., Elmira, N. Y	Lathes	128,957	128,957	85
Aluminum Co. of America, Port Lavaca, Tex	Primary aluminum	43,564,618	5,209,375	80
Clearfield Clay Products Co., Clearfield, Pa	Ladle brick	1,338,765	1,333,765	85
General Refractories Co., Rockdale, Ill	Silica refractory brick	189,820	189,820	85
General Refractories Co., Los Angeles, Calif	do	462,000	462,000	85
General Refractories Co., Portsmouth, Ohio	do	65,000	65,000	85
General Refractories Co., Bucks County, Pa	Silica refractory brick	3,782,550	3,782,550	85
General Refractories Co., Joliet, Ill	do	541,920	541,920	85
C. A. Dunham Co., Marshalltown, Iowa	Steam traps and valves	109,418	109,418	75
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Neodesha, Kans	Gasoline	10,029,000	10,029,000	80
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Whiting, Ind	Aviation gasoline	2,327,500	2,327,500	100
Mechanics Universal Joint Division, Memphis, Tenn	Joint assemblies for combat vehicles	270,000	270,000	75
The Climax Fire Brick Co., Climax, Pa	Refractories	363,200	363,200	85
Laclede-Christy Co., Bessemer, Ala	Clay firebrick	140,500	140,500	85
Red Bank Division, Red Bank, N. J	Dynamotors	142,377	142,377	85
Friez Instrument Division, Towson, Md	Measuring instruments	93,861	93,861	85
Bendix Radio Division of Bendix Radio Corp., Towson, Md	Aircraft communications and radar equipment	1,026,882	1,008,474	75
Laclede-Christy Co., Warm Springs, Calif	Clay firebrick	125,000	125,000	85
Laclede-Christy Co., Clearfield City, Pa	do	200,000	200,000	85
Laclede-Christy Co., Ottawa, Ill	Firebrick	220,000	220,000	85
Dana Corp., Marion, Ind	Transmission devices	5,825,822	5,750,000	75
Fairfield Manufacturing Co., Lafayette, Ind	Worm gears	2,930,889	2,917,389	75
Carroll B. Fulton & William H. Olmstead, San Antonio, Tex	Aviation gasoline	12,000,000	11,925,000	80
Burgess Battery Co., Galena, Ill	Dry batteries for Signal Corps	42,000	40,000	75
Clover Box & Manufacturing Co., Inc., New York, N. Y	Nose assembly for airborne searchlight	3,466	3,466	80
Chicago Aerial Survey Co., Chicago, Ill	Aircraft photographic equipment	11,231	11,231	85
W. R. Cranes Co., Verona, Wis	Metal fabrication and construction	35,000	35,000	75
Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn	Hydroquinone	755,000	755,000	60
The Carborundum Co., Calvert City, Ky	Aluminum oxide	3,273,000	3,233,000	50
Kansas City Southern Ry. Co., Kansas City, Mo	Railroad transportation	3,375,000	3,375,000	65
American Electric Motors, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif	Gyroscope motors, aircraft	22,635	4,246	85
Shipowners & Merchants Towboat Co., Ltd., San Francisco	Transportation, towboat	250,000	250,000	70
Do	do	250,000	250,000	70
The Karl Douglas Co., Inglewood, Calif	Fabrication of aircraft landing gear	20,588	20,588	90
American District Steam Co., Inc., North Tonawanda, N. Y	Foundry building and equipment	473,162	473,162	80
Steelton & Highspire R. R. Co., Steelton, Pa	Railroad transportation	275,000	200,000 75,000	75 65
Gerotor May Corp., Baltimore, Md	Hydraulic valves	203,680	203,680	85
United States Rubber Co., Passaic, N. J	Hose	86,742	86,742	75
Do	Side panels, dispense package	13,693	13,693	75
Monroe Scrap Metal, Inc., Shreveport, La	Scrap iron	125,000	125,000	75
Brown & Root, Inc., Houston, Tex	Rebuilding tanks	329,933	329,933	75
Strom Steel Ball Co., Cicero, Ill	Steel balls	915,000	790,000	80
Gerotor May Corp., Baltimore, Md	Valves, pumps	42,895	42,895	75
Granite City Steel Co., Granite City, Ill	Pig iron, steel ingots	71,250,000	63,033,000	80
William L. Gilbert Clock Corp., Winsted, Conn	Timing units, fuses	5,693	4,693	85
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Moss Landing, Monterey County, Calif	Periclase, magnesium oxide, dolomite	915,472	915,472	70
Indiana Gear Work, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind	Aircraft gear units	94,535	92,835	85
Georgia, Florida & Alabama R. R. Co., between Richland and Bainbridge, Ga	Railroad transportation	93,572	93,572	65
Peerless Tool & Engineering Co., Chicago, Ill	Precision machining and fabricating aircraft engine components	149,087	149,087	90
Wyckoff Steel Co., Chicago, Ill	Steel bars and shapes	685,350	685,350	60
Wyckoff Steel Co., Ambridge, Pa	Steel bars, carbon, and alloys	118,385	118,385	60
Manlove Manufacturing Co., Los Angeles, Calif	Aircraft valves	10,989	10,989	90
Monarch Steel Co., Hammond, Ind	Steel bars	300,000	300,000	60
Associated Iron & Metal Co., Oakland, Calif	Scrap iron	54,076	40,050	75
Wisconsin-Appleton Co., South Milwaukee, Wis	Iron castings	1,293,419	1,293,419	75
Metal Fabricators Corp., Waltham, Mass	Aircraft engine parts	29,000	29,000	75
Cameron Iron Works, Inc., Houston, Tex	Forged and rough-machined beech rings	2,915,417	2,915,417	75
Bendix Products Division, Bendix Aviation Corp., South Bend, Ind	Aircraft landing gear	1,196,843	1,183,668	80
Stoner Manufacturing Co., Aurora, Ill	Brass cartridge cases	144,649	144,649	75
Lake Erie Engineering Corp., Tonawanda, N. Y	Hydraulic presses	271,758	271,758	80
The National Radiator Co., Danville, Pa	Iron powder	4,617,530	4,592,530	60
Greenback Metal Powder Co., Inc., Dayton, Ohio	do	4,741,605	4,726,605	60
Monsanto Chemical Co., Near Pocatello, Idaho (tentative)	Phosphorus	7,500,000	7,450,000	50
St. Paul & Tacoma Lumber Co., Tacoma, Wash	Wood chips for pulp	600,000	435,000	65
Bower Roller Bearing Co., Detroit, Mich	Roller bearings	2,247,686	2,122,686	85
The Stanley Works, New Britain, Conn	Cold-rolled steel	906,182	906,182	60
Ashland Oil & Refining Co., Canton, Ohio	Gasoline, butane, jet fuels	3,870,000	3,870,000	75
Gladding, McBean & Co., Pittsburg, Calif	Fire clay refractory products	1,712,089	1,683,589	85
Gladding, McBean & Co., South Gate, Calif	Brick refractory	710,050	655,050	85
Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich	Rear axle housings	196,991	196,991	90
Johns Hartford Tool Co., Inc., Hartford, Conn	Aircraft engine parts	8,038	8,038	90
Rockport Steamship Co., Manitowoc, Wis	Water transportation	1,000,000	1,000,000	80
Premier Petroleum Co., Fort Worth, Tex	Jet fuel, butane, gasoline	3,580,000	3,580,000	75
Westvaco Chemical Division, Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., Pocatello, Idaho	Elemental phosphorus	9,000,000	9,000,000	50
Ingram Products Co., Nashville, Tenn	Transportation, barges	1,244,000	764,000 480,000	80 70
E. & G. Brooke Iron Co., Exeter Township, Berks County, Pa	Pig iron	175,000	130,450	85
United Aircraft Corp., Hamilton Standard Division, Windsor Locks, Conn	Aircraft propellers	17,000,000	16,800,000	75
United Aircraft Corp. (Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division), North Haven, Conn	Aircraft engines and parts	14,200,000	14,000,000	75
United Aircraft Corp. (Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division), East Hartford, Conn	Aircraft engines	8,400,000	8,400,000	75
Korhumel-Heffron & Preiss Steel Co., Evanston, Ill	Cold-rolled spring steel	1,182,904	1,167,904	60
Koppers Co., Inc., Petrolia, Pa	Resorcinol	617,000	617,000	50

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

MAR. 7 TO APR. 6—continued

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or service	Amount applied for	Amount eligible	Percentage certified
The Cold Metal Products Co., Youngstown, Ohio	Strip steel	$1,287,800	$1,267,185	60
Canton Drop Forging & Manufacturing Co., Canton, Ohio	Propeller extrusions	114,306	114,306	75
Do	Forgings (jet engines)	250,000	250,000	75
SKF Industries, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa	Roller bearings and lock nuts	5,749,693	5,749,693	85
Hoberg Paper Mills, Inc., Green Bay, Wis	Paper towels, sulfite pulp	100,000	100,000	65
Plainville Metal Works, Plainville, Conn	Parachute hardware	14,663	14,663	80
Los Angeles Die Casting Co., Los Angeles, Calif	Die castings	17,554	17,554	75
The Champion Paper & Fibre Co., Canton, N. C	Bleached chemical pulp	4,345,742	4,336,418	65
Stover Lock Nut & Machinery Corp., Easton, Pa	Safety nuts, tank track pins	299,000	299,000	70
National Gypsum Co., Newburgh, N. Y	Gypsum paper	476,106	476,106	50
Latrobe Electric Steel Co., Latrobe, Pa	Tool steels (high speed)	4,149,000	4,149,000	75
Hawthorne Finishing Co., St. Louis, Mo	Treating of cotton duck	186,497	180,497	60
The Flintkote Co., Santa Clara, Calif	Paperboard products: Shipping containers	2,700,000	2,625,000	50
The Chesapeake Corp. of Virginia, West Point, Va	Pulp (wood)	980,815	934,648	65
Pacific Piston Ring Co., Los Angeles, Calif	Aircraft valves	30,303	30,303	90
American Brake Shoe Co., Chicago, Ill	Forgings for tank track, shell bodies	219,442	172,969	80
Avon Tube Division, Higbie Manufacturing Co., Rochester, Mich	Electric-weld steel tubing	209,240	209,240	60
Manchester Board & Paper Co., Inc., Richmond, Va	Paperboard	4,000,000	4,000,000	50
Norma-Hoffman Bearings Corp., Stamford, Conn	Instrument ball bearings	350,000	350,000	75
Glass Fibers, Inc., Defiance, Ohio	Glass superfine wool	1,717,278	{ 1,467,403 231,750	85 50
SKF Industries, Inc., Shippensburg, Pa	Roller, ball bearings, lock nuts	902,103	886,103	85
Rhinelander Paper Co., Rhinelander, Wis	Glassine and wax papers	2,929,526	1,436,303	50
The Okonite Co., Passaic, N. J	Shipboard cables (electricity)	10,000	10,000	75
William E. Hooper & Sons Co., Woodberry, Baltimore, Md	Cotton duck, rope, cord	354,900	354,900	60
Rowan Cotton Mills Co., Salisbury, N. C	Knitting yarns	768,000	708,000	60
Philadelphia Textile Finishers, Inc., Norristown, Pa	Finishes to cotton duck	52,000	52,000	60
Eaton Manufacturing Co., Battle Creek, Mich	Blades for jet engines	848,318	848,318	75
California Refining Co., Perth Amboy, N. J	Gasoline, fuels	32,950,583	32,950,583	80
Mills Mill, Woodruff plant, Woodruff, S. C	Cotton cloth	1,255,552	886,906	60
Chesnee Mills, Inc., Chesnee, S. C	do	1,530,617	1,421,737	60
Coast Centerless Grinding Co., Los Angeles, Calif	Precision grinding, honing, lapping, and machine work.	66,215	48,215	90
Morris & Cumings Dredging Co., Inc., New York Harbor, N. Y., and east coast, United States.	Dredging channels, harbors	1,100,000	550,000	50
Commercial Construction Co., Inc., Houston, Tex	Scrap iron	80,138	80,138	75
Commercial Metals Co., Houston, Tex	do	50,000	50,000	75
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa	Transportation (towboats, barges)	2,571,700	{ 720,175 1,833,525	70 80
National Steel Corp., Lorain, Ohio	Transportation (lake freighter)	6,500,000	6,500,000	80
California-Dorsan Heat Treating Co., Los Angeles, Calif	Steel fittings, bolts	224,672	151,672	75
Axelson Manufacturing Co., Vernon, Calif	Aircraft assemblies	230,688	230,688	85
Kennecott Copper Corp., White Pine County, Nev	Virgin copper	7,342,910	3,987,910	85
Thompson Trailer Corp., unknown	Housing for radar	455,000	445,000	75
Mills Mill, Saxon plant, Spartanburg, S. C	Cotton cloth	956,239	956,239	60
Rotary Electric Steel Co., Macomb County, Mich	Alloy and stainless steel billets	886,000	886,000	60
Aluminum Co. of America (Cleveland Works), Cleveland, Ohio	Aluminum, aircraft engine forgings	2,749,000	2,749,000	75
Fuller Manufacturing Co., Kalamazoo, Mich	Automotive transmissions	1,178,787	1,101,010	80
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa	Steel scarfing	1,461,800	1,343,695	70
Stoner Manufacturing Co., Aurora, Ill	Brass cartridge cases	15,993	15,993	75
Inland Equipment Co., Nashville, Tenn	Rocket head assembly	56,534	56,534	85
Olin Industries, Inc., Covington, Tenn	Dry batteries	490,511	490,510	75
Aircraft Hardware Manufacturing Co., Inc., New York, N. Y	Aircraft hardware	19,976	19,976	85
Rem-Cru Titanium, Inc., Midland, Pa	Titanium ingots	450,000	450,000	75
Ingersoll Steel Division, Borg-Warner Corp., New Castle, Ind	Steel ingots	562,368	562,368	75
Ben Levy, doing business as Island City Iron & Metal Co., Galveston, Tex	Scrap iron	25,000	25,000	75
Moskowitz Bros., Cincinnati, Ohio	do	20,000	20,000	75
Aircraft Precision Products, Inc., Oak Park Mich	Parts for jet engines	59,541	52,211	90
Ohio Ferro-Alloys Corp., Philo, Ohio	Ferro-silicon	237,500	237,500	85
Metalweld, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa	Spraying protective coating on shafts	237,000	213,000	60
Pacific Moulded Products Co., Los Angeles, Calif	Research (rubber and rubber synthetics)	5,609	5,609	75
Lukens Steel Co., Coatesville, Pa	Steel fabrication and assembly	142,000	142,000	60
Tantalum Defense Corp., North Chicago, Ill	Tungsten wire, sheet and fabricated parts; tungsten powder.	827,193	827,193	85
Globe Steel Tubes Co., Milwaukee, Wis	Steel tubing	780,434	780,434	75
Wells Aircraft Parts Co., Los Angeles, Calif	Machined aircraft parts	5,153	4,188	85
Hydraulic Units, Inc., Glendale, Calif	Hydraulic controls for aircraft	32,879	32,879	85
Summers Gyroscope Co., Santa Monica, Calif	Gyroscopic aircraft instruments	78,657	70,844	85
Columbia Iron & Metal Co., Girard, Ohio	Ferrous scrap	1,023,715	948,715	75

APR. 14 TO APR. 26

Chotin, Inc., New Orleans, La	Oil transportation, barges and towboat	$372,345	{ $178,000 394,345	80 70
New York Transformer Co., Inc., Alpha, N. J	Transformers for electronic equipment	50,000	50,000	75
Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., West Leechburg, Pa	Steel strip	3,800,000	3,800,000	70
The Torrington Co., Torrington, Conn	Antifriction bearings	1,854,897	1,645,098	80
Towle & Son Co., Philadelphia, Pa	Aircraft engine instruments	49,500	49,500	85
Interstate Engineering Corp., El Segundo, Calif	Aircraft parts	94,826	94,826	85
Climax Uranium Co., Grand Junction, Colo	Uranium oxide	909,023	908,194	90
Buckeye Cotton Oil Co., Chemical Pulp Division, Perry, Fla	Wood pulp, dissolving grade	26,777,735	21,527,735	65
Allen B. Dumont Laboratories, Inc., Clifton, N. J	Electronic equipment	27,625	27,625	75
Offshore Oil Transport Co., Houston, Tex	Transportation, towboat	124,210	124,210	70
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif	Earth-mover tire repairs	38,791	38,791	50
Pacific Valves, Inc., Long Beach, Calif	Industrial steel valves	45,800	45,800	85
General Ceramics & Steatite Corp., Keasbey, N. J	Transformer cores, materials for condensers	345,253	345,253	75
The Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Philadelphia, Pa	Transportation, rail	7,908,165	7,908,165	80
Do	do	3,000,000	3,000,000	80
Do	do	555,000	555,000	80
Do	do	1,574,420	1,574,420	80
Do	do	1,799,420	1,799,420	80
Do	do	2,731,330	2,731,330	80
Do	do	6,550,152	6,550,152	80
Do	do	8,525,000	8,525,000	80
Natona Mills, Inc., Dallas, Pa	Cotton twine netting, camouflage	22,525	22,525	60
Technicraft Laboratories, Inc., Thomaston, Conn	Electronic components	76,006	76,006	75
The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio	Testing tires	106,353	106,353	75
Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa	Radar equipment	903,266	903,266	80
New Hampshire Ball Bearings, Inc., Peterborough, N. H	Precision ball bearings	38,783	38,783	85
Varian Associates, Palo Alto, Calif	Electronic equipment, tubes for radar	2,455,933	2,455,933	75
N. H. N. Tool & Die Works, Garwood, N. J	Stampings, metal	6,314	6,314	75
Seaboard Air Line R. R. Co., Hialeah, Fla	Transportation, rail	157,800	127,636	65

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

APR. 14 TO APR. 26—continued

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or service	Amount applied for	Amount eligible	Percentage certified
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Salinas, Calif.	Calcined dolomite	$1,173,000	$1,173,000	85
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Baltimore, Md.	Transportation, rail	5,642,160	5,642,160	80
Electronic Associates, Inc., Long Branch, N. J.	Electronic instrumentation	8,709	8,709	85
United States Testing Co., Inc., Hoboken, N. J.	Testing of electronic equipment	11,829	11,829	75
Norma-Hoffmann Bearings Corp., Stanford, Conn.	Instrument ball bearings	180,000	180,000	75
Sonnet Supply Co., Hawthorne, Calif.	Cutting tools	17,091	17,091	90
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Baltimore, Md.	Transportation, rail	4,534,000	4,534,000	80
The Torrington Co., Torrington, Conn.	Roller bearings	281,566	281,566	85
Oil Transfer Corp., New York, N. Y.	Tank barges	500,000	500,000	80
Chotin Transportation, Inc., New Orleans, La.	Transportation, barge	97,875	97,875	80
United Drill & Tool Corp. (Chicago-Latrobe Twist Drill Works Division), Chicago, Ill.	Cutting tools, drills	201,058	201,058	85
Coyle Lines, Inc., home port, Wilmington, Del.	Transportation, towboats	1,200,000	1,200,000	70
Tex-Mex Towing Co., Inc., Houston, Tex.	do	131,039	131,039	70
The Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Transportation, rail	1,475,000	1,475,000	80
Do	do	5,220,000	5,220,000	80
Gisholt Machine Co., Madison, Wis.	Machine tools	324,577	324,577	85
Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Transportation, rail	1,075,772	1,075,772	80
American Smelting & Refining Co., New York, N. Y.	do	600,000	600,000	80
National Twist Drill & Tool Co., Rochester, Mich.	Metal-cutting tools	835,947	835,947	80
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Baltimore, Md.	Transportation, rail	1,569,000	1,569,000	80
John Mohr & Sons, Chicago, Ill.	Construction of heavy industrial equipment	226,225	169,806	80
C. F. Harms Co., New York Harbor, N. Y.	Transportation, barge	73,100	73,100	90
Skagit Steel & Iron Works, Sedro Woolley, Wash.	Winch	22,137	22,317	75
Buffalo, Rochester & Pittsburgh Ry. Co., Baltimore, Md.	Transportation, rail	5,330,839	5,330,829	65
American Smelting & Refining Co., New York, N. Y.	Hopper cars	75,000	75,000	80
American Steamship Co., Manitowoc, Wis.	Transportation, freight vessel	6,593,253	6,593,273	80
R. & B. Tool & Gauge Co., Detroit, Mich.	Gages, tools, dies, fixtures	52,882	52,882	85
Star Cutter Co., Farmington, Mich.	Metal cutting tools	545,045	401,745	80
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Baltimore, Md.	Transportation, rail	4,567,100	4,567,100	80
The Steel Improvement & Forge Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Aircraft engine parts	169,162	169,162	75
City Pattern Foundry & Machine Co., Detroit, Mich.	Metal patterns, castings	[6] 134,911	134,911	85
The Standard Lime & Stone Co., Woodville, Ohio	Dolmitic lime	22,022	22,022	85
The Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Transportation, rail	4,143,750	4,143,750	80
Do	do	4,474,744	4,474,744	80
Do	do	11,050,000	11,050,000	80
White-Roth Machine Corp., Lorain, Ohio	Mining machines	122,180	122,180	50
Aluminum Ore Co. (Bauxite, Arkansas works), Bauxite, Ark.	Alumina	54,000,000	53,900,000	80
Cosden Petroleum Corp., Big Spring, Tex.	Benzene	2,950,000	2,950,000	85
The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.	Ethylene dibromide	70,000	70,000	100
The Dow Chemical Co., Ludington, Mich.	Bromine	433,500	433,500	100
The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.	Ethylene dibromide	240,000	240,000	100
Do	Bromine	630,000	630,000	100
Do	Crude ethylene dibromide	100,000	100,000	100
The Benson Manufacturing Co., Kansas City, Mo.	Gasoline tanks, aircraft, oil tanks	559,000	511,127	80
Reynolds Aluminum Co., Jones Mills, Ark.	Aluminum pig	370,000	370,000	80
Le Roi Co., Milwaukee, Wis.	Engine, air compressors, generator sets	350,595	350,595	70
Hogan Laboratories, Inc., New York, N. Y.	Research and development, electronic	14,205	14,205	85
Philadelphia, Bethlehem & New England R. R. Co.	Transportation, rail	896,000	275,000	60
			600,000	75
South Buffalo Ry. Co., Lackawanna, N. Y.	do	1,877,000	1,183,000	65
			694,000	75
Warren Petroleum Corp., unknown	do	6,986,280	6,986,280	80
The Southland Towing Co., Louisville, Ky.	Towboat and barge transportation	535,026	325,402	70
			209,624	80
Dana Corp., Toledo, Ohio	Transmission, gears (truck)	3,418,583	3,418,583	75
Sturges Gin Co., Somerton, Ariz.	Ginning of cotton	76,250	74,250	65
Sturges Gin Co., Yuma, Ariz.	do	76,250	74,250	65
Kearfett Manufacturing Corp., Newark, N. J.	Instrument motors and synchros	61,724	59,358	75
Moynahan Bronze Co., Flat Rock, Mich.	Aircraft hinges	241,130	[7] 241,130	80
W. H. Nichols Co., Waltham, Mass.	Aircraft engine pumps	202,934	202,934	85
Growers Gin Co., Inc., Gilbert, Ariz.	Lint cotton and cottonseed	143,380	121,880	65
Harper & Bowers, Estill, S. C.	Grain elevator	135,250	132,500	50
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Newport, Del.	Titanium	1,227,000	1,227,000	90
The Pure Oil Co., Toledo, Ohio	Butenes	7,140,000	7,140,000	75
The Ferro Engineering Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Refractory bottom rings	280,000	255,000	75
Shafter-Wasco Ginning Co., Inc., Shafter, Calif.	Cotton ginning	126,572	120,557	65
The Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Transportation, rail	1,700,000	1,700,000	80
The Standard Lime & Stone Co., McCook, Ill.	Double-burned dolomite	679,333	679,333	85
Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Transportation, barge	450,000	450,000	80
Belle City Malleable Iron Co., Racine, Wis.	Electric steel castings	1,508,064	1,508,064	75
Macon, Dublin & Savannah R. R. Co., Portsmouth, Va.	Transportation, rail	281,364	281,364	65
The Wheland Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.	Guns	2,750,000	2,697,000	90

[6] The net amount certified is the amount remaining after deducting the current or sale value of the replaced facilities from the cost of $134,911 estimated in the application.

[7] The net amount certified is the amount remaining after deducting the cost of the land, and the current or sale value of the replaced facilities from the cost of $241,130 estimated in the application.

APR. 27 TO MAY 3

Agricultural Products Co., Queen Creek, Ariz.	Ginning of cotton	$169,322	$167,322	65
Agricultural Products Co., Eley, Ariz.	do	169,322	167,322	65
Cattani Cotton Gins, Arvin, Calif.	do	165,436	165,436	65
Growers' Ginning & Marketing Co., Casa Grande, Ariz.	do	168,122	167,322	65
S. A. Camp Ginning Co., Wheeler Ridge, Calif.	do	134,190	124,190	65
Camp & McFarland, Delano, Calif.	do	134,190	124,190	65
Sam Hamburg Farms A Corp., Los Banos, Calif.	Lint, cottonseed	148,686	148,686	65
Maricopa Cotton Gin Co., Bakersfield, Calif.	Raw cotton	165,436	165,436	65
Plastic Wire & Cable Corp., Jewett City, Conn.	Wire	125,000	125,000	75
The Dow Chemical Co., Ludington, Mich.	Magnesium chloride	1,422,000	1,422,000	85
Metallurgical Laboratories, Bayside, N. Y.	Research and development	1,600,000	1,600,000	75
Shell Oil Co., Deer Park (Harris County), Tex.	Benzene	10,400,000	10,400,000	85
The Pure Oil Co., Nederland, Tex.	Butenes	11,140,000	11,140,000	75
Old Colony Manufacturing Corp., Taunton, Mass.	Cotton duck	472,640	472,640	60
Shell Oil Co., Wood River, Ill.	Butenes storage	243,000	243,000	100
Do	Pipeline	274,000	274,000	75
Standard Oil Co. of California, Richmond, Calif.	Alkylate	24,000	24,000	100
American Cyanamid Co., Michigan City, Ind.	Synthetic fluid cracking catalyst	5,116,987	5,077,035	85
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., East St. Louis, Ill.	Butene	260,000	260,000	100
Aromatics Refining Co., Inc., Baton Rouge, La.	Benzene, xylene, toluene concentrate, motor gasoline	11,930,000	11,630,000	85
The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Co., New York, N. Y. (home office).	Transportation, rail	2,825,275	2,825,275	80
The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Co., New York, N. Y.	do	1,923,556	1,923,556	80
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Baltimore, Md.	do	7,861,750	7,861,750	80

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

APR. 27 TO MAY 3—continued

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or service	Amount applied for	Amount eligible	Percentage certified
Aerojet Engineering Corp., Nimbus, Calif.	Ordnance	$2,275,965	$2,065,465	75
West Point Manufacturing Co., Langdale, Ala.	Cotton duck	678,799	678,799	60
Great Lakes Steamship Co., Inc., Cleveland, Ohio	Water transportation, iron ore	6,000,000	6,000,000	80
Roosevelt Oil & Refining Corp., Mount Pleasant, Mich.	Benzene	1,500,000	1,500,000	85
Texas Natural Gasoline Corp., Rankin and Tye, Tex.	Rail transportation of iso-butene and normal butene in tank cars.	435,000	435,000	80
The New York Central R. R. Co., New York, N. Y.	Transportation, rail	5,261,000	5,261,000	80
Do.	do	4,660,000	4,660,000	80
Do.	do	2,772,000	2,772,000	80
Do.	do	5,450,000	5,450,000	80
Do.	do	3,065,000	3,065,000	80
Do.	do	2,625,000	2,625,000	80
Seaboard Shipping Corp., New York, N. Y.	Water transportation of oil	254,819	254,819	80
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Baltimore, Md.	Transportation, rail	5,300,611	4,505,865	65
The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Co., New York, N. Y.	do	5,428,380	5,428,380	65
Gaylord Container Corp., Bogalusa, Washington Parish, La.	Sulfate pulp	6,975,630	6,205,303	60
Arvey Corp., Memphis, Tenn.	Chlorine, caustic soda	1,678,315	1,678,315	50
Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., Rossford, Ohio	Plate glass	14,183,000	14,183,000	80
Monsanto Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Malaic anhydride	1,345,000	1,345,000	60
Potash Co. of America, Dumas, Tex.	Potassium sulfate hydrochloric acid	815,000	783,000	50
Monsanto Chemical Co., Springfield, Mass.	Research	188,000	188,000	50
The Harshaw Chemical Co., Elyria, Ohio	Chrome alumina	149,082	78,600	70
Dow Corning Corp., Midland, Mich.	Methyl chloride	820,000	820,000	70
Air Reduction Co., Inc., Calvert City, Ky.	Calcium carbide	8,328,000	4,491,000	60
Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., Langdon, Minn.	Trifluorecetic acid	471,609	471,609	85
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Aliquippa, Pa.	Commercial fertilizers	70,000	69,400	85
Monsanto Chemical Co., Monsanto, Ill.	Copper and quinolinolate	41,250	21,250	70
The Harshaw Chemical Co., Elyria, Ohio	Synthetic optical crystal	108,000	108,000	80
United States Industrial Chemicals, Inc., Baltimore, Md.	Ethyl alcohol	328,815	328,815	50
The Dow Chemical Co., Freeport, Tex.	Pipeline for petroleum gases	1,061,000	1,061,000	60
Do.	Ethylene	5,000,000	5,000,000	60
Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., Calvert City, Ky.	Hydrofluoric acid	341,088	341,088	75
Air Reduction Co., Inc., Louisville, Ky.	Acetylene	103,416	103,416	60
The Dow Chemical Co., Pittsburg, Calif.	Methylene chloride	670,000	670,000	70
The Chesapeake & Ohio R. R. Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Transportation, rail	23,757,704	17,133,436	65
Collins Radio Co., Arcadia, Calif.	Radio units	842,382	777,382	80
The New York Central R. R. Co., New York, N. Y.	Transportation, rail	4,415,000	4,415,000	80
National Container Corp., Valdosta, Ga.	Kraft pulp, paper	25,000,000	23,165,000	60
Aluminum Co. of America (Massena reduction plant), Massena, N. Y.	Primary aluminum	2,359,000	2,359,000	95
Carolina Aluminum Co., Badin, N. C.	do	295,000	295,000	95
The New York Central R. R. Co., New York, N. Y.	Transportation, rail	1,866,593	1,866,593	65
Do.	do	2,307,832	2,307,832	65
Do.	do	383,650	383,650	65
Do.	do	2,257,132	2,257,132	65
Aluminum Co. of America (Point Comfort works), Port Lavaca, Tex.	Primary aluminum	34,000,000	34,000,000	80
Standard Oil Co. of Texas, El Paso, Tex.	Heating oils and gasolines, Diesel fuels	10,264,000	10,264,000	80
Electric Steel Castings Co., Indianapolis, Ind.	Steel castings	9,083	9,083	75
Wagner Malleable Iron Co., Decatur, Ill.	Iron castings	300,000	300,000	75
Western Alloyed Steel Casting Co., Minneapolis, Minn.	Steel castings	7,905	7,905	75
National Malleable & Steel Castings Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Iron castings	3,547,875	3,547,875	75
National Malleable & Steel Castings Co., Sharon Pa.	Ingots and steel castings	544,000	544,000	75
National Malleable & Steel Castings Co., Cicero, Ill.	Malleable and steel castings	921,000	921,000	75
National Malleable & Steel Castings Co., Indianapolis, Ind.	Malleable iron castings	1,123,000	1,118,500	75
Standard Steel Spring Co., Coraopolis, Pa.	Springs, universal joints	175,000	175,000	75
National Malleable & Steel Castings Co., Melrose Park, Ill.	Steel castings	158,000	158,000	75
The Harrison Steel Castings Co., Attica, Ind.	do	658,476	658,476	75
Victor Chemical Works, Silver Bow, Mont.	White phosphorus ferrophosphorus	9,320,688	9,304,950	50
Electrical Engineering & Manufacturing Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.	Electrical motors	196,500	[1] 144,500	75
Detroit Aluminum & Brass Corp., Bellefontaine, Ohio.	Friction bearings	1,081,413	1,071,413	75
Evans Tool & Die Co., Detroit, Mich.	Machining castings	59,243	59,243	85
Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co., Neville Island, Pa.	Coke, benzol	6,115,000	6,115,000	85
New England Forest Products, Inc., Berlin, N. H.	Wood fiber board	2,850,000	2,762,000	50
Crown-Zellerbach Corp., Camas, Wash.	Pulp	19,794,500	19,732,769	65
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Baltimore, Md.	Transportation, rail	1,732,560	1,732,560	65
Macon, Dublin & Savannah R. R. Co., Portsmouth, Va.	do	117,497	113,497	65
Standard Oil Co. (an Indiana corporation), Wood River, Ill.	Alcohols	2,552,000	2,552,000	80
Standard Oil Co. (an Indiana corporation), Sugar Creek, Mo.	Olefin concentrate for alcohol	142,060	142,060	80
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Baltimore, Md.	Transportation, rail	781,280	781,280	65

[1] Amount to be diminished by current value or sale price of old building being replaced.

MAY 4 TO 11, 1951

E. R. Squibb & Sons, New Brunswick, N. J.	Penicillin and streptomycin	$3,472,000	$3,472,000	60
Sharp & Dohme, Inc., West Point, Pa., Upper Gynedd Township	Dried human blood plasma	958,000	958,000	75
Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., Groton, Conn.	Antibiotics (penicillin and streptomycin)	8,692,000	8,692,000	65
Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.	do	890,000	890,000	65
Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., Terre Haute, Ind.	do	475,000	475,000	65
American Cyanamid Co., Pearl River, N. Y.	Aureomycin	6,000,000	6,000,000	60
Cutter Laboratories, Berkeley, Calif.	Penicillin	146,988	146,988	70
Do.	Dried human plasma and blood fractions	104,420	90,738	75
Novocol Chemical Manufacturing Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Anesthetic cartridges	85,000	85,000	50
J. T. Baker Chemical Co., Phillipsburg, N. J.	Penicillin	168,100	168,000	70
Climax Uranium Co., Outlaw and Calamity Mess, Colo., and Cactus Rat, Utah	Mineral ores	173,699	173,699	90
Continental Can Co., Inc., Hopewell, Va.	Drum liner board	7,350,846	7,350,846	50
Servel, Inc., Evansville, Ind.	Airplane parts	1,231,000	1,231,000	75
National-Standard Co., Clifton, N. J.	Cold-rolled strip steel	786,000	786,000	60
Hooker Electrochemical Co., Tacoma, Wash.	Chlorine	2,734,592	2,734,592	50
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., Warren, Pa.	Parts of electron tubes	427,533	427,533	80
Titanium Metals Corp. of America, Henderson, Nev.	Titanium metal	14,162,840	14,162,840	90
Johnson Bronze Co., New Castle, Pa.	Sleeve bearings	614,833	502,493	75
Do.	do	785,118	785,118	75
The Trane Co., La Crosse, Wis.	Heat transfer surface	671,800	671,800	75
The Alabama Great Southern R. R. Co., Birmingham, Ala.	Transportation, rail	9,200,000	8,814,000	65
Flint Belt R. R. Co., Flint, Mich.	do	92,320	92,320	65
The Chesapeake & Ohio R. R. Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	do	2,383,763	2,383,763	65
Douglas Tool Co., Hazel Park, Mich.	Ordnance, aircraft component	68,000	60,000	75
Wickes Engineering & Construction Co., Camden, N. J.	Electronic equipment	230,977	230,977	75
Vulcan Mold & Iron Co., Lansing, Ill.	Ingot molds and accessories	1,022,800	1,022,800	75
The Delaware & Hudson R. R. Corp., New York, N. Y.	Transportation, rail	18,606,197	{ 12,925,000 5,681,197	80 65

Necessity certificates issued—Continued

MAY 4 TO 11, 1951—continued

Name of company and location of facilities	Product or service	Amount applied for	Amount eligible	Percentage certified
The Cleveland-Cliffs Steamship Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Transportation, Lakes ore ship	$900,000	$900,000	80
Do	do	900,000	900,000	80
Phillips Oil Co., Sweeny, Tex	Aviation gasoline	8,417,400	8,417,400	85
Calolina Farms Gin, Kern County, Calif	Cotton and cottonseed	391,223	268,573	65
Penn Engineering & Manufacturing Corp., Buckingham, Pa	Self-clinching fasteners, hardware	22,458	22,458	85
Hudson Wire Co., Cassopolis, Mich	Insulated magnet wire	368,700	368,700	80
Casting Engineers, Inc., Chicago, Ill	Precision castings	133,815	113,817	85
Highway Trailer Co., Edgerton, Wis	Trailers	80,000	80,000	75
Transicoil Corp., New York, N. Y	Motors, generators, and gear trains	12,850	12,870	90
Carroll Pressed Metal Co., Worcester, Mass	Metal stampings and fabrication	4,675	4,618	90
Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Co., Birmingham, Ala	Coke and coal chemicals	1,976,200	1,976,200	85
Wells Aircraft Parts Co., Los Angeles, Calif	Aircraft parts	95,000	95,040	90
Advance Electric & Relay Co., Burbank, Calif	Electrical relays	87,010	87,010	75
Cosden Petroleum Corp., Big Spring, Tex	Gasoline	270,000	270,000	75
Morrison Steel Products, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y	Stowage boxes, fenders, braces	1,720,007	1,720,007	80
Georgia-Pacific Plywood & Lumber Co., Jackson, Miss	Lumber	60,000	60,000	50
Zallea Bros., Wilmington, Del	Piping	34,018	30,635	75
Liberty Products Corp., Farmingdale, N. Y	Aircraft parts	180,070	180,070	90
The Monongahela Connecting R. R. Co., Pittsburgh, Pa	Transportation, rail	1,166,700	1,096,700	65
Do	do	1,784,889	1,525,700	65
Electric Specialty Co., Stamford, Conn	Armature laminations, castings (electrical)	15,683	15,683	90
Townsend Co., New Brighton, Pa	Self-locking nuts	196,500	196,500	75
Allen-Bradley Co., Milwaukee, Wis	Potentiometers	632,030	632,030	75
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Whiting, Ind	Benzene	1,170,000	1,170,000	85
Humble Oil & Refining Co., Baytown, Tex	Alkylate	177,845	177,845	100
Patterson Oil Terminals, Inc., Paulsboro, N. J	Storage of petroleum	725,000	725,000	85
H. V. Parker Grain Co., Hugoton, Stevens County, Kans	Grain storage	67,500	67,500	50
The Norman Lumber Co., Louisville, Ky	Lumber	17,500	17,500	50
Horner Flooring Co., Dollar Bay, Mich	Hardwood lumber	51,319	39,068	50
Standard Pressed Steel Co., Jenkintown, Pa	Set screws, shop equipment	6,708,067	6,697,540	75
Stauffer Chemical Co., Richmond, Calif	Ferric sulfate	147,204	147,204	50
Hartford Tool & Die Co., Inc. Hartford, Conn	Parts for aircraft engines	30,526	30,526	80
American Gystoscope Makers, Inc., New York, N. Y	Optical instruments	65,673	65,633	75
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Trentwood, Wash	Stretcher aluminum plate	350,000	350,000	75
Bethlehem Steel Co., Sparrows Point, Baltimore, Md	Sulfuric acid	4,000,000	4,000,000	70
General Chemical Division, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., Newark, N. J	do	6,840,000	6,300,000	70
Stauffer Chemical Co., Comton, Calif	do	150,000	114,000	70
General Chemical Division, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., Newell, Pa	do	1,910,000	1,910,000	70
The Cessna Aircraft Co., Wichita, Kans	Tail assemblies, aircraft components	947,186	946,536	80
Rome Cable Corp., Rome, N. Y	Cable (Signal Corps)	915,526	779,109	75
Woodward Iron Co., Woodward, Ala	Coke	2,820,000	2,820,000	85
The Cleveland Twist Drill Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Metal cutting tools	4,251,357	4,063,357	75
The Cuyahoga Valley Railway Co., Jennings Rd., Cleveland, Ohio	Transportation, rail	424,000	320,000	65
			4,000	50
Godin Tool & Die Co., Detroit 5, Mich	Tools, jigs	257,300	257,300	80
The Bridgwater Machine Co., Akron, Ohio	Airplane parts	56,051	56,051	85
The B. F. Goodrich Co., Troy, Ohio	do	107,285	107,285	90
Greenfield Tap & Die Corp., Greenfield, Mass	Cutting tools	1,782,960	1,717,291	75
Alamo Water Transportation Co., Houston, Tex	Transportation, barge	223,600	223,600	80
Seaboard Air Line R. R. Co., Tampa, Fla	Transportation, rail	906,685	702,333	65
Tank Barge, Inc., San Francisco, Calif	Transportation, barge	239,501	239,501	80
Cutter Laboratories, East Chattanooga, Tenn	Solutions (intravenous), appliance sets (plasma)	956,096	924,426	80
United States Rubber Co., Bristol, R. I	Communications wire	111,338	108,864	75
Druge Bros, Manufacturing Co., Oakland, Calif	Ordnance parts	139,375	119,375	90
Beckman & Whitley, Inc., San Carlos, Calif	Ordnance components	15,866	15,866	90
The Great Lakes Towing Co., Towing Cleveland, Ohio	Towing service	2,000,444	2,000,444	70
Globe Hoist Co., Des Moines, Iowa	Bolts, fittings, bushings	67,485	67,485	90
The New York Central R. R. Co., New York, N. Y	Transportation, rail	6,735,000	6,735,000	65
The New York Central R. R. Co., New York, N. Y. (home office)	do	2,709,450	2,709,450	65
Do	do	804,292	804,292	65
Do	do	629,528	629,528	65
Ehrhardt Tool & Machine Co. (unknown)	Gages, dies, and precision tools	52,532	52,532	90
The Coleman Co., Inc., Wichita, Kans	Airplane parts	347,135	347,135	80
Roots-Connersville Blower Corp., Connersville, Ind	Centrifugal compressors	1,037,887	1,030,324	80
William Whitman Co., Inc., Lawrence, Mass	Wool serge cloth	212,521	212,521	60
The Texas & Pacific R. R. Co., Dallas, Tex. (home office)	Transportation, freight cars	5,078,539	5,078,539	80
Kingwell Bros., Ltd., San Francisco, Calif	Sleeve bushings	62,016	62,016	90
Atlantic Coast Terminals, Inc., Newark, N. J	Storage (petroleum)	1,542,541	1,478,516	85
Hermetic Seal Products Co., Newark, N. J	Terminals, plugs for radio	167,000	157,000	80
Winslow Manufacturing Co., Cleveland, Ohio	Gages, jigs, and fixtures	26,001	26,001	90
Westinghouse Electric Corp., Anne Arundel County, Md	Ordnance	11,515,000	11,475,000	75
Old Dutch Refining Co., Muskegon, Mich	Fuels	616,280	616,280	95
Hytron Radion & Electronics Corp., Danvers, Mass	Electron tubes	3,400,000	3,353,000	75
The Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa	Flats and bands in coils, round rods in coils, round bars.	7,152,000	7,152,000	60
R. G. LeTourneau, Inc., Longview, Tex	Steel plates	4,550,000	4,550,000	70

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, not only have investments a short amortization period, but a great many industries have a contract from the Government at a certain price and for enough production to cover the amortization period.

Now, why is that necessary? Two or three times within the past 60 or 90 days, on the floor of the Senate, the junior Senator from Nevada has discussed that very situation. The Senate has created a condition for which I blame only the United States Senate, not President Roosevelt, not President Truman, not Acheson, not the House of Representatives; I blame the Senate. Under this condition it is impossible for a private investor to put his money into the extension of a plant, which may be, let us say, a plant engaged in mining, for the purpose of producing tungsten or mercury; or into the extension of a textile plant of a certain needed type, or in the extension of any other kind of plant which produces goods of a nature which can be converted to peacetime production. Most of them are of that character. What is the reason for that? It is because, resulting from the removal of tariffs and import fees, the floor under the investment is gone, and as soon as the war is over the investment will be utterly destroyed. Men engaged in industry did not acquire the knowledge they now have without being smart enough to know that if they invested their own money, it will be lost; so they come to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, they come to the General Services Administration, they come to the Bureau of Mines in the Interior Department, and they come to the Defense Production Administration crying for investment capital. The hotels of Washington are full of these men, and they are getting money by the billions of dollars.

I may say it is not the fault of these businessmen. I admire them for knowing their business. The Senate of the United States created the condition which makes it impossible for them to invest their own money. So, as the junior Senator from Nevada said last September of the floor of the Senate, and as carried by the press at the time, we could save more than $9,000,000,000 on

our domestic program. The President asked for $10,000,000,000 for this investment program. We did not need $10,000,000,000, for we could save $9,000,000,000 in the regular budget. We could have done that, but there was no disposition to do it.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has said several times recently, within the past 3 or 4 or 5 months, that we could save $9,000,000,000 on our domestic budget, and I agree with him. But I say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that $9,000,000,000 is not drop in the bucket compared to what could be saved if we adopted business policies and principles, so that the businessmen of America could invest their money and know where they were going to land following an emergency.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. But is it not true that, during all the time the distinguished Senator has mentioned, and during the past 20 years, this country has been in charge of the Democrats, and that if the very policy for which the Senator is contending has not been put into effect, it is the fault, not of the Senate, but of the Democratic Party, which has been in control continuously, with the exception of the life of the Eightieth Congress, during which we tried to have the policy changed?

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, I come back to the fact that individuals have to vote on the Senate floor. Senators understand what is going on here, as no one else can possibly understand, because they are here when the questions are being debated.

Mr. LANGER. Of course; but is it not true that, aside from the period of the life of the Eightieth Congress, the Senate has been controlled by the Democratic majority?

Mr. MALONE. That is true. But even a Democrat understands an argument. He does not need to be controlled by the President of the United States, and a Secretary of State who is entirely foreign-minded. They are only a part of the Government. There are three branches of the Government, and the mere fact that the Democratic majority has controlled all three from the White House for a considerable time is not the fault of the President. Everyone likes to have authority. The lust for power apparently grows on all men, as we learn by observing people who are in important offices. But the question leads down to the Senate of the United States and to every individual Senator. Let every Senator examine his record to see what he has done. If he likes it, let him continue it; if he does not like it, let him change it. He is not controlled, and he should not be controlled, from the White House or from the office of the Secretary of State.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho shares the sentiments expressed by the junior Senator from Nevada, in connection with his insistence upon the maintenance of certain safeguards for the benefit of the industries of the United States, particularly in the face of huge imports of potatoes from Canada and other countries. However, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to a situation which undoubtedly exists, and which it is difficult to explain.

A perusal of the hearings will disclose that many Members of Congress endorse the general principle of reciprocal trade agreements, with this exception: They contend that, insofar as the specific industries of the respective States are concerned, they are entitled to protection. For instance, in the Northwest, it may be the mining industry, and, in the Southwest, the lumber industry. In the Southeast, it may be the oil industry, and in the Midwest and in the Allegheny section, the pottery, glassware, and woodworking industries. In the New England States it may be the watch-and-clock industry, and the various other industries operating in that area. In each case, invariably, a Member of Congress will insist that reciprocal trade agreements are very desirable, except that, in specific cases involving their States, there should be exemptions.

I ask the junior Senator from Nevada, if each State or each particular industrial area of the United States were to contend that it is entitled to exemptions of protection under reciprocal trade agreements then is it not true that, if we view all these exemptions compositely and consider the welfare of the entire country, it becomes very obvious that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is not desirable from the standpoint of promoting the welfare of agriculture, industry, and labor in this country?

Mr. MALONE. I may say, in answer to the distinguished Senator from Idaho, that he is entirely correct as far as he goes. We have been sharpshooting, by either protecting individual segments of the economy, as with subsidies, or by destroying others by tariff cuts. But the sharpshooting days are over. We are familiar with the fact that each particular section of the country favors protection on something it produces and favors free trade in everything else. The steel fabricators come before the committees to make their case, urging that they must have their raw material imported under free trade, but that they must have a tariff of from 15 percent to 65 percent ad valorem on everything they make, from a hairpin to a bar of brass. That, of course, is the provincial theory, but it has been the theory, and it led to log rolling on the Senate floor, no doubt, over the years. But we have passed that point. We must adopt a principle. There is no principle represented by the measure which is now pending before the Senate. Witness the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, who says that there are now permissive amendments in the bill, "and we hope," the Senator said, "that we can prevail on the Secretary of State to protect our perishable agricultural products, under these permissive amendments."

We still have a great deal of this special pleading, this sectionalism and provincialism, but the sentiments are slowly changing. To wit: I have today received the resolution adopted at the Thirty-eighth Annual Congress of the National Society of New England Women. This society went on record as opposed to the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. They did not advocate protection of any single item or industry, but went the whole way. I ask unanimous consent to have the short resolution inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL CONGRESS, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN, SWAMPSCOTT, MASS., MAY 16–18, 1951

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT OF 1934 AS EXTENDED

Whereas our great mass production system is the basis of our national defense,

Whereas the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as extended which expires in June 1951 has, through the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program negotiated by the State Department, removed protection from our workers and investors against the competition of low-paid workers of other nations, thereby gravely injuring various industries in this country and weakening our economy; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Society of New England Women urge Congress not to extend the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as extended, but to reestablish the principle of flexible import fees in keeping with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. MALONE. Let me finish my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

I will say to the Senator from Idaho that he has placed his finger on the feature that is vital at this moment. Sane men must arrive at a principle; they can no longer sharpshoot; they can no longer be concerned only with the products of Idaho or of California or of Texas. No doubt, there will be an oil-quota amendment before we are through, because oil is produced in the great State of Texas. It is a bad precedent, as long as it is not based on a principle. Some of us will vote for it, because only through some such arrangement can the oil wells be kept running. As soon as we have the peace, for which we all pray, oil will come in without any hindrance from the cheap-labor countries. Then rationing of oil production in Texas will start, and the oil producers will be here to protect their industry, just as the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is trying to protect the industry of his State. All I want to do is to have each individual Senator face the facts and say, "Let us have the principle of fair and reasonable competition laid down for all."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that only a few short months ago every Republican, every Member on this side of the aisle,

voted against a bill which the Democrats brought in having to do with reciprocal trade treaties? Yet the Senator says it is a matter for each individual Senator.

Mr. MALONE. I did not say it was a matter for each individual Senator. I supported the Senator from Idaho in his statement that under the present administration this situation has been brought about.

(At this point Mr. MALONE yielded to Mr. LODGE for a statement with reference to the pending bill and to other Senators for various matters, which, on request of Mr. MALONE, and by unanimous consent, were ordered to be printed at the conclusion of his speech.)

AMENDMENTS DO NOT INTRODUCE ANYTHING NEW

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am opposed to the entire free-trade program of the State Department.

I say again, categorically, that the measure now reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee leaves every decision in the hands of the President and the thoroughly discredited State Department; and in making that statement, I refer to both the so-called peril-point amendment and the so-called escape-clause amendment. Those amendments would not give the President or the Secretary of State one iota of authority less than the authority they already have. Those amendments do not direct either the President or the Secretary of State to do anything that they have not previously been directed to do, except possibly less specifically so. The point is, this bill cannot force them to do anything.

I say again that the bill provides for a convenient cushion for the troubled conscience of any Senator who votes for free trade between our Nation, a Nation of high-living standards, and the lower-standard nations elsewhere in the world, and who votes to divide the markets of the United States with the sweatshop labor countries elsewhere in the world.

There is no substance to the statement that it is necessary to extend for 2 years the power of the Secretary of State and of the State Department and of the President under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act in order that the workingmen and investors of the United States may obtain relief. Our workingmen and investors already have been affected adversely by the so-called trade agreements, which really are not trade agreements, but are only treaties to lower tariffs.

ESCAPE CLAUSE COULD BE INCLUDED WITHOUT EXTENSION

Instead of the measure now before us, Mr. President, the Finance Committee could have reported to the Senate a substitute which would contain the escape-clause and would make it applicable to all previous trade agreements, in the same manner as would be done by the bill now before us, but would not propose to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

THE PRESENT POLICY IS NOT PRO-AMERICAN

Mr. President, the present administration's policy of division of the markets of the United States with the nations of the rest of the world is well known. As stated many times before committees of Congress, the alleged purpose of that policy is to give to foreign nations enough of our markets so as to make unnecessary the cash gifts we have made in the past by means of UNRRA, the Marshall plan, and the cash gifts which now it is proposed that we make under the so-called point 4 program.

INDUSTRIAL MAP OF UNITED STATES REMADE

Of course, the proposed point 4 program has the added advantage that under that program products made in foreign countries by branches of United States concerns could in many instances be imported into the United States without the payment of income taxes on the profits of those foreign operations.

It is obvious that it is the deliberate intention of the present administration to remake the industrial map of the United States. The administration has been engaged in that program for 18 years, and has extended it to practically all the products of this country, even including clothespins. The administration is pursuing its plan of remaking the industrial map of the United States by means of restricting the operations of many of our industries—for example, the mining industry. Seventy-five percent of the mines in the United States were closed down and a large part of the textile industry was closing down just before the beginning of the so-called police action in Korea which either put our young men back to work or put them into the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, the policy of the administration of remaking the industrial map of the United States results in restrictions on our mining industry, our glass industry, our pottery industry, our petroleum industry, our coal industry, and our precision-instrument industry. Those industries would thus be discriminated against in favor of foreign developments.

The national security of our country is threatened when we are made to depend, in time of emergency, upon the shipment of vitally needed raw materials from nations which are from 1,000 to 3,000 miles removed from our shores.

SUBSTITUTE FOR H. R. 1612

Mr. President, I am offering a substitute for the pending measure. The substitute will do two specific things. First, it will adopt the principle of fair and reasonable competition as a basis for establishing in the United States a market for the goods produced by foreign countries, as contrasted with the sharpshooting methods of the State Department which is deliberately attempting to divide the markets of the United States with the low-wage, low-living standard countries of the rest of the world, on the theory that that will make it unnecessary to make up their trade-balance deficits each year in cash.

My proposal would change that policy, and, instead, would have us proceed on the basis of the principle of fair and reasonable competition. That principle would be administed by a Foreign Trade Authority which would have sufficient latitude to be able to consider all the factors which affect the need for such an adjustment.

In the second place, my substitute would change the present long-experienced Tariff Commission into a Foreign Trade Authority. The new name would more correctly indicate the job that organization would be doing. The Foreign Trade Authority thus established would have, in regard to the fixing of tariffs and import fees on the principle of fair and reasonable competition, the same lattitude that the Interstate Commerce Commission has had for many years in regard to fixing freight rates for the common carriers on the basis of a reasonable return on their investments. In other words, Mr. President, my proposal would do away with the horse trading and sharpshooting and the logrolling and practically all the complaints which are offered in regard to the trade agreements made under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FREE TRADE BY MANY DIFFERENT METHODS

Again I call attention to the fact that many of the proposed legislative acts which have come before the Congress—coming in from different directions and by means of different gates—have a common objective. However, few persons connect the Marshall plan, the point 4, and the other trick plans for making gift loans with the free-trade program to divide the markets of the United States with the other nations of the world, as initiated under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

THE ITO IS NOT DEAD

Few persons connect free trade with the International Trade Organization proposal, which now has been denounced by the State Department, because GATT had already adopted commercial policy chapter, chapter 4, of the International Trade Organization Charter. Chapter 4 of the ITO Charter is really a partial substitute for the ITO itself, and therefore representatives of the administration informed the Finance Committee that they would no longer push for our participation in the International Trade Organization.

So, under GATT, we adopted the important commercial policy provisions of the ITO, and notice is served on Congress, through a public statement, that legislation will be presented from time to time to make it entirely effective.

Yesterday, on the Senate floor, the junior Senator from Nevada explained the customs simplification bill, which is proposed and which is before the Congress at this moment. It was introduced last year, in the Eighty-first Congress, and revived now in the Eighty-second Congress, with six sleepers in it, all designed for what purpose? To complete the job of making the International Trade Organization almost completely effective. In turn, what does it do? It ties the hands of the sovereign United States in regard to many commercial policy matters. And all this was brought about when the Congress passed the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and thereby gave up its responsibility over the tariffs and the regulation of the foreign trade of the United States. The Congress surrendered this responsibility

without referring it to the people for a vote, and surrendered its authority to the Executive.

Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, Congress transferred that responsibility to the executive department. The President already having authority, under the Constitution, to fix foreign policy, it left nothing for the Congress to do except to make appropriations.

Under the ITO and under the commercial chapter policy—a chapter, now, in lieu of ITO—and with the six sleepers in the proposal now before the Congress, in regard to customs changes, complete the job, the effective transfer of the regulation of the foreign trade of this Nation from the executive department, where Congress put it, to an international tribunal, is completed. So I am calling attention to the different gates through which the interested parties come to the Senate and to the House of Representatives to complete a job which will end ultimately in the complete socialization and nationalization of private property within this country.

UNCONTROLLED INFLATION

We hear much debate about inflation. The President, we are led to believe, is lying awake at night worrying about inflation, but few people connect the removal of the metal base of our monetary system with the current inflation. We may as well cut the string of a toy balloon and then complain because it rises, as to cut the string, so to speak, tying the printed money to the metal base in this country, an authority which Congress deliberately gave to a President of the United States to do. The legislation was passed by the Senate. The administration should then and there have known, and they no doubt did know, that inflation was inevitable.

What was wanted, I suppose, was to have more money in the Government's pockets so that it might be able to give more money to everyone, while continuing to hold prices and the value of money at the former levels. Unfortunately, that is not the way it operates. It is as if someone were trying to support free trade, in order to help foreign nations make up their trade-balance deficits, while at the same time supporting a tariff to protect the workingmen and investors of this country. One might as well try to be on both sides of a barbed wire fence at one time. One cannot be on both sides of it. One can be on either side that he chooses, but he cannot be on both sides.

SMALL BUSINESS BEING ELIMINATED

Yesterday I read into the RECORD a letter from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a man of estimable character, and a good Senator. In his letter he complains to me that small business, supposedly at the height of the prosperity of this Nation as the result of the arming of the Nation, with more contracts being let than it is possible to fulfill, is suffering because it does not get the work.

Few people connect the gradual destruction of the small business of the country with the free-trade program. Free trade for this Nation means that the large business organizations and aggregations of capital go behind the low-wage curtain in the foreign nations of the world, where they take over the markets of those nations from the small business concerns located therein, and also from the small business concerns located in this country, that have to some extent a foreign market for their goods. The large aggregations of capital take that market.

Small business in this country no longer has a market in the foreign nations, except temporarily and until such time as industries can be started in those nations. But in addition to that, the large business organizations not only take the markets there, and saturate those markets, but, under free trade, they then bring their manufactures back into this country, goods which are produced by the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia, to displace the small-business man.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] may take either side of this question he desires. If he wants to favor free trade, he should not complain about the small business of this country going down the drain, which is where it is going. There is no place for small business under a free-trade program, with large aggregations of capital allowed to go into the foreign countries, to export their products to those countries and to bring back into this country the products of those countries, produced by low-wage labor with the same machinery and under the same direction, when, hour for hour, factories abroad can produce as much as can be produced in our country, and at a lower cost. A man who can vote for this bill need not complain of the destruction of small business in this country.

I am for large aggregations of capital in this country. They are necessary to the carrying on of proper production, but I am also for enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust law. I am also for protection of the wage earner and investor in this country, upon a fair and reasonable competitive basis.

The complaint of the Senator from Alabama is that, at the height of the emergency, small business institutions are not prospering, and that, because of a lack of work, directly traceable to free trade, the Marshall Plan, and the point 4 program of the administration, the opportunity for small business in this country to succeed is gradually lessening and disappearing.

U. N. CHARTER OUTLAWS OUR CONSTITUTION

It has been noted that by reason of the United Nations Charter a California judge held a California land-holding law to be void.

Mr. President, in that connection, it happens that this morning there appeared an editorial in the Washington Times-Herald which is very interesting. It is entitled "Treaties Threatening Domestic Law."

I wonder how many persons have thought of the circumstance that treaties come before the Senate for a majority vote nowadays, by calling it by a different name. It used to take a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify a treaty, and a treaty could not be ratified otherwise. Treaties now come before Congress for a majority vote, by calling them agreements. Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, we have the spectacle of trade treaties being made, although officially they are executive agreements. It is not just a "happenstance" that we are ruining our economy; we are deliberately doing it. Every 3 years we extend the Trade Agreements Act, and the Congress washes its hands of it until the next time. It has been extended every time it came up for extension since 1934.

What has happened to the Congress of the United States? In my opinion, Congress has come to the point where it wants other people to take its responsibility. I would not go so far as to say Members are mentally lazy, but they have come to the point where they will transfer their authority at the least beckoning of an Executive who has already announced that he wants to give the country's markets away. The least the Senate could do would be to go on record by taking back from the incompetent State Department the authority to give away our markets, the basis of our income, and to destroy utterly the workingmen and investors of this Nation.

Mr. President, the editorial to which I have referred reads, in part, as follows:

Because California has had an unfortunate experience with the United Nations members of the State's legislature are seeking an amendment to the Federal Constitution specifying that the sovereignty of the National Government and of the 48 States "shall not be abolished or altered by any treaty or Executive agreement."

The proposed amendment is similar in purpose to one which the American Bar Association's committee on peace and law has taken under consideration. The amendment under study would provide that no treaty should become the supreme law of the land except to the extent that Congress thereafter passed specific laws to make it so.

Mr. President, some of our States and the American Bar Association have come to the point where they do not trust Congress to exercise its judgment in the matter of treaties which violate not only economic laws but other conditions that go to the well being of this Nation. In other words, they do not trust the judgment of the United States Senate. That is one of the greatest condemnations, in my opinion, that could possibly be visited on a Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point the editorial from which I read two brief paragraphs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATIES THREATENING DOMESTIC LAW

Because California has had an unfortunate experience with the United Nations, members of the State's legislature are seeking an amendment to the Federal Constitution specifying that the sovereignty of the National Government and of the 48 States "shall not be abolished or altered by any treaty or executive agreement."

The proposed amendment is similar in purpose to one which the American Bar Association's committee on peace and law has taken under consideration. The amendment under study would provide that no

treaty should become the supreme law of the land except to the extent that Congress thereafter passed specific laws to make it so.

TREATIES VERSUS UNITED STATES LAW

California's difficulties arose because of the existence of the constitutional provision that treaties shall be the supreme law, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. Some eager beavers on the Court of Appeals in California seized on this pretext in a case affecting alien land tenure to decree that any State law of California must yield to any statement conflicting with it which could be found in the United Nations Charter or even in such pronouncements as the U. N. declaration of human rights.

The court contended that even pious statements in the U. N. Charter outlining what were considered to be desirable, if largely unrealizable, conditions were binding upon any state ratifying the Charter. It adopted a like attitude with reference to the declaration of human rights, which is admittedly a mere statement of aims and aspirations, and not of legal obligation, and has never been submitted to the Senate for approval.

Because the California decision made clear that there is a real danger to American law and institutions, the State legislature decided that the safest method of foreclosing further usurpations of domestic rights was by constitutional amendment. This decision was taken even though there is an excellent possibility that the court of appeals decision will be thrown out upon review.

CLOSE THE DOOR

We subscribe to the belief that the best insurance against a danger of this kind is to close the constitutional door by passage of an amendment which will allow no legal quibble. The American Constitution, unlike all others, says that treaties are the "supreme law." Internationalist zealots and weak-minded courts will always be willing to try to abuse the opportunity thus afforded to subordinate the Constitution and domestic law to international authority and thus undermine the Republic.

The issue might be thought to have been settled once and for all in the decision of the Supreme Court in the Cherokee tobacco case in 1870. This case concerned a controversy over whether the internal revenue law applied to tobacco manufactured in Indian territory. The Cherokees contended that they were exempt under their treaty of 1866 with the Federal Government.

"It need hardly be said," stated Justice Swayne in his decision for the court, "that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument."

While this principle may still apply, despite the subsequent interpretations of the applications of the treaty clause, Justice Swayne pointed out that there will always be a twilight zone: "The effects of treaties and acts of Congress, when in conflict, is not settled by the Constitution * * * A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty."

As long as this condition obtains, domestic law will remain in jeopardy of the caprice of courts. An amendment to the Constitution, drawn in clear and unequivocal terms, can forever bar this threat to our sovereignty.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the bill upon which we are about to vote and which was brought to the Senate floor from the distinguished Senate Finance Committee, also threatens the well being of the people of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point chapter IV, the commercial policy chapter of the International Trade Organization, which has been on the "must" list for the past 3 years. Now the President of the United States and the State Department have decided that, through the adoption of the commercial policy chapter of the ITO which I have asked unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this time for the ready reference of Senators, and through various bills, such as the customs simplification bill to bring the United States into the ITO through the back door. We do occasionally get a warning that the State Department will from time to time propose legislation to complete it. I invite the attention of the Senate to this back-door method of the State Department and the administration in completing an organization which the Secretary of State testified before the Senate Finance Committee he did not intend again to bring before the Senate.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER IV. COMMERCIAL POLICY

SECTION A. TARIFFS, PREFERENCES, AND INTERNAL TAXATION AND REGULATIONS

Article 16. General most-favored-nation treatment

1. With respect to customs duties and charges of any kind imposed on or in connection with importation or exportation or imposed on the international transfer of payments for imports or exports, and with respect to the method of levying such duties and charges, and with respect to all rules and formalities in connection with importation and exportation, and with respect to all matters within the scope of paragraphs 2 and 4 of article 18, any advantage, favor, privilege, or immunity granted by any member to any product originating in or destined for any other country shall be accorded immediately and unconditionally to the like product originating in or destined for all other member countries.

2. The provisions of paragraph 1 shall not require the elimination, except as provided in article 17, of any preferences in respect of import duties or charges which do not exceed the margins provided for in paragraph 4 and which fall within the following descriptions:

(a) preferences in force exclusively between two or more of the territories listed in Annex A, subject to the conditions set forth therein;

(b) preferences in force exclusively between two or more territories which on July 1, 1939, were connected by common sovereignty or relations of protection or suzerainty and which are listed in annexes B, C, D, and E;

(c) preferences in force exclusively between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba;

(e) preferences in force exclusively between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America, including the dependent territories of the latter;

(e) preferences in force exclusively between neighboring countries listed in Annexes F, G, H, I, and J.

3. The provisions of paragraph 1 shall not apply to preferences between the countries formerly a part of the Ottoman Empire and detached from it on July 24, 1923, provided such preferences fulfill the applicable requirements of article 15.

4. The margin of preference on any product in respect of which a preference is permitted under paragraph 2 shall not exceed (a) the maximum margin provided for under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or any subsequent operative agreement resulting from negotiations under article 17, or (b) if not provided for under such agreements, the margin existing either on April 10, 1947, or on any earlier date established for a member as a basis for negotiating the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, at the option of such member.

5. The imposition of a margin of tariff preference not in excess of the amount necessary to compensate for the elimination of a margin of preference in an internal tax existing on April 10, 1947, exclusively between two or more of the territories in respect of which preferential import duties or charges are permitted under paragraph 2, shall not be deemed to be contrary to the provisions of this article, it being understood that any such margin of tariff preference shall be subject to the provisions of article 17.

Article 17. Reduction of tariffs and elimination of preferences

1. Each member shall, upon the request of any other member or members, and subject to procedural arrangements established by the Organization, enter into and carry out with such other member or members negotiations directed to the substantial reduction of the general levels of tariffs and other charges on imports and exports, and to the elimination of the preferences referred to in paragraph 2 of article 16, on a reciprocal and mutually advantageous basis.

2. The negotiations provided for in paragraph 1 shall proceed in accordance with the following rules:

(a) Such negotiations shall be conducted on a selective product-by-product basis which will afford adequate opportunity to take into account the needs of individual countries and individual industries. Members shall be free not to grant concessions on particular products and, in the granting of a concession, they may reduce the duty, bind it at its then-existing level, or undertake not to raise it above a specified higher level.

(b) No member shall be required to grant unilateral concessions, or to grant concessions to other members without receiving adequate concessions in return. Account shall be taken of the value to any member of obtaining in its own right and by direct obligation the indirect concessions which it would otherwise enjoy only by virtue of article 16.

(c) In negotiations relating to any specific product with respect to which a preference applies—

(i) when a reduction is negotiated only in the most-favored-nation rate, such reduction shall operate automatically to reduce or eliminate the margin of preference applicable to that product;

(ii) when a reduction is negotiated only in the preferential rate, the most-favored-nation rate shall automatically be reduced to the extent of such reduction;

(iii) when it is agreed that reductions will be negotiated in both the most-favored-nation rate and the preferential rate, the reduction in each shall be that agreed by the parties to the negotiations;

(iv) no margin of preference shall be increased.

(d) The binding against increase of low duties or of duty-free treatment shall in principle be recognized as a concession equivalent in value to the substantial reduction of high duties or the elimination of tariff preferences.

(e) Prior international obligations shall not be invoked to frustrate the requirement under paragraph 1 to negotiate with respect to preferences, it being understood that

agreements which result from such negotiations and which conflict with such obligations shall not require the modification or termination of such obligations except (i) with the consent of the parties to such obligations, or, in the absence of such consent, (ii) by modification or termination of such obligations in accordance with their terms.

3. The negotiations leading to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, concluded at Geneva on October 30, 1947, shall be deemed to be negotiations pursuant to this article. The concessions agreed upon as a result of all other negotiations completed by a member pursuant to this article shall be incorporated in the general agreement on terms to be agreed with the parties thereto. If any member enters into any agreement relating to tariffs or preferences which is not concluded pursuant to this article, the negotiations leading to such agreement shall nevertheless conform to the requirements of paragraph 2 (c).

4. (a) The provisions of article 16 shall not prevent the operation of paragraph 5 (b) of article XXV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, as amended at the first session of the contracting parties.

(b) If a member has failed to become a contracting party to the general agreement within two years from the entry into force of this charter with respect to such member, the provisions of article 16 shall cease to require, at the end of that period, the application to the trade of such member country of the concessions granted in the appropriate schedule annexed to the general agreement by another member which has requested the first member to negotiate with a view to becoming a contracting party to the general agreement but has not successfully concluded negotiations: *Provided*, That the Organization may, by a majority of the votes cast, require the continued application of such concessions to the trade of any member country which has been unreasonably prevented from becoming a contracting party to the general agreement pursuant to negotiations in accordance with the provisions of this article.

(c) If a member which is a contracting party to the general agreement proposes to withhold tariff concessions from the trade of a member country which is not a contracting party, it shall give notice in writing to the Organization and to the affected member. The latter member may request the Organization to require the continuance of such concessions, and if such a request has been made the tariff concession shall not be withheld pending a decision by the Organization under the provisions of subparagraph (b) of this paragraph.

(d) In any determination whether a member has been unreasonably prevented from becoming a contracting party to the general agreement, and in any determination under the provisions of chapter VIII whether a member has failed without sufficient justification to fulfill its obligations under paragraph 1 of this article, the Organization shall have regard to all relevant circumstances, including the developmental, reconstruction and other needs, and the general fiscal structures, of the member countries concerned and to the provisions of the charter as a whole.

(e) If such concessions are in fact withheld, so as to result in the application to the trade of a member country of duties higher than would otherwise have been applicable, such member shall then be free, within 60 days after such action becomes effective, to give written notice of withdrawal from the Organization. The withdrawal shall become effective upon the expiration of 60 days from the day on which such notice is received by the director general.

Article 18. National treatment on internal taxation and regulation

1. The members recognize that internal taxes and other internal charges, and laws, regulations, and requirements affecting the internal sale, offering for sale, purchase, transportation, distribution or use of products, and internal quantitative regulations requiring the mixture, processing or use of products in specified amounts or proportions, should not be applied to imported or domestic products so as to afford protection to domestic production.

2. The products of any member country imported into any other member country shall not be subject, directly or indirectly, to internal taxes or other internal charges of any kind in excess of those applied, directly or indirectly, to like domestic products. Moreover, no member shall otherwise apply internal taxes or other internal charges to imported or domestic products in a manner contrary to the principles set forth in paragraph 1.

3. With respect to any existing internal tax which is inconsistent with the provisions of paragraph 2 but which is specifically authorized under a trade agreement, in force on April 10, 1947, in which the import duty on the taxed product is bound against increase, the member imposing the tax shall be free to postpone the application of the provisions of paragraph 2 to such tax until such time as it can obtain release from the obligations of such trade agreement in order to permit the increase of such duty to the extent necessary to compensate for the elimination of the protective element of the tax.

4. The products of any member country imported into any other member country shall be accorded treatment no less favorable than that accorded to like products of national origin in respect of all laws, regulations, and requirements affecting their internal sale, offering for sale, purchase, transportation, distribution or use. The provision of this paragraph shall not prevent the application of differential internal transportation charges which are based exclusively on the economic operation of the means of transport and not on the nationality of the product.

5. No member shall establish or maintain any internal quantitative regulation relating to the mixture, processing or use of products in specified amounts or proportions which requires, directly or indirectly, that any specified amount or proportion of any product which is the subject of the regulation must be supplied from domestic sources. Moreover, no member shall otherwise apply internal quantitative regulations in a manner contrary to the principles set forth in paragraph 1.

6. The provisions of paragraph 5 shall not apply to any internal quantitative regulation in force in any member country on July 1, 1939, April 10, 1947, or on the date of this Charter, at the option of that member: *Provided*, That any such regulation which is contrary to the provisions of paragraph 5 shall not be modified to the detriment of imports and shall be subject to the negotiation and shall accordingly be treated as a customs duty for the purposes of article 17.

7. No internal quantitative regulation relating to the mixture, processing or use of products in specified amounts or proportions shall be applied in such a manner as to allocate any such amount or proportion among external sources of supply.

8. (a) The provisions of this article shall not apply to laws, regulations or requirements governing the procurement by governmental agencies of products purchased for governmental purposes and not with a view to commercial resale or with a view to use in the production of goods for commercial sale.

(b) The provisions of this article shall not prevent the payment of subsidies exclusively to domestic producers, including payments to domestic producers derived from the proceeds of internal taxes or charges applied consistently with provisions of this article and subsidies effected through governmental purchases of domestic products.

9. The members recognize that internal maximum price control measures, even though conforming to the other provisions of this article, can have effects prejudicial to the interests of member countries supplying imported products. Accordingly, members applying such measures shall take account of the interests of exporting member countries with a view to avoiding to the fullest practicable extent such prejudicial effects.

Article 19. Special provisions relating to cinematograph films

The provisions of article 18 shall not prevent any member from establishing or maintaining internal quantitative regulations relating to exposed cinematograph films. Any such regulations shall take the form of screen quotas which shall conform to the following conditions and requirements:

(a) Screen quotas may require the exhibition of cinematograph films of national origin during a specified minimum proportion of the total screen time actually utilized over a specified period of not less than 1 year, in the commercial exhibition of all films of whatever origin, and shall be computed on the basis of screen time per theater per year or the equivalent thereof.

(b) With the exception of screen time reserved for films of national origin under a screen quota, screen time, including screen time released by administrative action from time reserved for films of national origin, shall not be allocated formally or in effect among sources of supply.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (b) any member may maintain screen quotas conforming to the requirements of subparagraph (a) which reserve a minimum proportion of screen time for films of a specified origin other than that of the member imposing such screen quotas: *Provided*, That such minimum proportion of screen time shall not be increased above the level in effect on April 10, 1947.

(d) Screen quotas shall be subject to negotiation and shall accordingly be treated as customs duties for the purposes of article 17.

SECTION B. QUANTITATIVE RESTRICTIONS AND RELATED EXCHANGE MATTERS

Article 20. General elimination of quantitative restrictions

1. No prohibitions or restrictions other than duties, taxes or other charges, whether made effective through quotas, import or export licenses or other measures, shall be instituted or maintained by any member on the importation of any product of any other member country or on the exportation or sale for export or any product destined for any other member country.

2. The provisions of paragraph 1 shall not extend to the following:

(a) Export prohibitions or restrictions applied for the period necessary to prevent or relieve critical shortages of foodstuffs or other products essential to the exporting member country;

(b) Import and export prohibitions or restrictions necessary to the application of standards or regulation for the classification, grading or marketing of commodities in international trade; if, in the opinion of the Organization, the standards or regulations adopted by a member under this subparagraph have an unduly restrictive effect on trade, the Organization may request the member to revise the standards or regula-

tions: *Provided*, That it shall not request the revision of standards internationally agreed pursuant to recommendations made under paragraph 7 of article 39;

(c) Import restrictions on any agricultural or fisheries product, imported in any form, necessary to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate effectively—

(i) to restrict the quantities of the like domestic product permitted to be marketed or produced, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic agricultural or fisheries product for which the imported product can be directly substituted; or

(ii) to remove a temporary surplus of the like domestic product, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic agricultural or fisheries product for which the imported product can be directly substituted by making the surplus available to certain groups of domestic consumers free of charge or at prices below the current market level; or

(iii) to restrict the quantities permitted to be produced of any animal product the production of which is directly dependent, wholly or mainly, on the imported commodity, if the domestic production of that commodity is relatively negligible.

3. With regard to import restrictions applied under the provisions of paragraph 2 (c):

(a) such restrictions shall be applied only so long as the governmental measures referred to in paragraph 2 (c) are in force, and, when applied to the import of products of which domestic supplies are available during only a part of the year, shall not be applied in such a way as to prevent their import in quantities sufficient to satisfy demand for current consumption purposes during those periods of the year when like domestic products, or domestic products for which the imported product can be directly substituted, are not available;

(b) any Member intending to introduce restrictions on the importation of any product shall, in order to avoid unnecessary damage to the interests of exporting countries, give notice in writing as far in advance as practicable to the Organization and to members having a substantial interest in supplying that product, in order to afford such members adequate opportunity for consultation in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 2 (d) and 4 of article 22, before the restrictions enter into force. At the request of the importing member concerned, the notification and any information disclosed during the consultations shall be kept strictly confidential;

(c) any member applying such restrictions shall give public notice of the total quantity or value of the product permitted to be imported during a specified future period and of any change in such quantity or value;

(d) any restrictions applied under paragraph 2 (c) (i) shall not be such as will reduce the total of imports relative to the total of domestic production, as compared with the proportion which might reasonably be expected to rule between the two in the absence of restrictions. In determining this proportion, the member applying the restrictions shall pay due regard to the proportion prevailing during a previous representative period and to any special factors which may have affected or may be affecting the trade in the product concerned.

4. Throughout this section the terms "import restrictions" and "export restrictions" include restrictions made effective through state-trading operations.

Article 21. Restrictions to safeguard the balance of payments

1. The members recognize that—

(a) it is primarily the responsibility of each member to safeguard its external financial position and to achieve and maintain stable equilibrium in its balance of payments.

(b) an adverse balance of payments of one member country may have important effects on the trade and balance of payments of other member countries, if it results in, or may lead to, the imposition by the member of restrictions affecting international trade;

(c) the balance of payments of each member country is of concern to other members, and therefore it is desirable that the Organization should promote consultations among members and, where possible, agreed action consistent with this charter for the purpose of correcting a maladjustment in the balance of payments; and

(d) action taken to restore stable equilibrium in the balance of payments should, so far as the member or members concerned find possible, employ methods which expand rather than contract international trade.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 20, any member, in order to safeguard its external financial position and balance of payments, may restrict the quantity or value of merchandise permitted to be imported, subject to the provisions of the following paragraphs of this article.

3. (a) No member shall institute, maintain, or intensify import restrictions under this article except to the extent necessary—

(i) to forestall the imminent threat of, or to stop, a serious decline in its monetary reserves, or

(ii) in the case of a member with very low monetary reserves, to achieve a reasonable rate of increase in its reserves.

Due regard shall be paid in either case to any special factors which may be affecting the member's reserves or need for reserves, including, where special external credits or other resources are available to it, the need to provide for the appropriate use of such credits or resources.

(b) A member applying restrictions under subparagraph (a) shall progressively relax and ultimately eliminate them, in accordance with the provisions of that subparagraph, as its external financial position improves. This provision shall not be interpreted to mean that a member is required to relax or remove such restrictions if that relaxation or removal would thereupon produce conditions justifying the intensification or institution, respectively, of restrictions under subparagraph (a).

(c) Members undertake—

(i) not to apply restrictions so as to prevent unreasonably the importation of any description of merchandise in minimum commercial quantities the exclusion of which would impair regular channels of trade, or restrictions which would prevent the importation of commercial samples or prevent the importation of such minimum quantities of a product as may be necessary to obtain and maintain patent, trade-mark, copyright, or similar rights under industrial or intellectual property laws;

(ii) to apply restrictions under this article in such a way as to avoid unnecessary damage to the commercial or economic interests of any other member, including interests under articles 3 and 9.

4. (a) The members recognize that in the early years of the Organization all of them will be confronted in varying degrees with problems of economic adjustment resulting from the war. During this period the Organization shall, when required to take decisions under this article or under article 23, take full account of the difficulties of postwar adjustment and of the need which a member may have to use import restrictions as a step toward the restoration of equilibrium in its balance of payments on a sound and lasting basis.

(b) The members recognize that, as a result of domestic policies directed toward the fulfillment of a member's obligations under article 3 relating to the achievement and maintenance of full and productive employment and large and steadily growing demand, or its obligations under article 9 relating to the reconstruction or development of industrial and other economic resources and to the raising of standards of productivity, such a member may find that demands for foreign exchange on account of imports and other current payments are absorbing the foreign exchange resources currently available to it in such a manner as to exercise pressure on its monetary reserves which would justify the institution or maintenance of restrictions under paragraph 3 of this article. Accordingly,

(i) No member shall be required to withdraw or modify restrictions which it is applying under this article on the ground that a change in such policies would render these restrictions unnecessary;

(ii) Any member applying import restrictions under this article may determine the incidence of the restrictions on imports of different products or classes of products in such a way as to give priority to the importation of those products which are more essential in the light of such policies.

(c) Members undertake, in carrying out their domestic policies, to pay due regard to the need for restoring equilibrium in their balance of payments on a sound and lasting basis and to the desirability of assuring an economic employment of productive resources.

5. (a) Any member which is not applying restrictions under this article, but is considering the need to do so, shall, before instituting such restrictions (or, in circumstances in which prior consultation is impracticable, immediately after doing so), consult with the organization as to the nature of its balance-of-payments difficulties, alternative corrective measures which may be available, and the possible effect of such me sures on the economies of other members. No member shall be required in the course of consultations under this subparagraph to indicate in advance the choice or timing of any particular measure which it may ultimately determine to adopt.

(b) The Organization may at any time invite any member which is applying import re.trictions under this article to enter into such consultations with it, and shall invite any member substantially intensifying such restrictions to consult within 30 days. A member thus invited shall participate in the consultations. The Organization may invite any other member to take part in the consultations. Not later than 2 years from the day on which this charter enters into force, the Organization shall review all restrictions existing on that day and still applied under this article at the time of the review.

(c) Any member may consult with the Organization with a view to obtaining the prior approval of the Organization for restrictions which the member proposes, under this article, to maintain, intensify or institute, or for the maintenance, intensification or institution of restrictions under specified future conditions. As a result of such consultations, the Organization may approve in advance the maintenance, intensification or institution of restrictions by the member in question insofar as the general extent, degree of intensity, and duration of the restrictions are concerned. To the extent to which such approval has been given, the requirements of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph shall be deemed to have been fulfilled, and the action of the member applying the restrictions shall not be open to challenge under subparagraph (d) of this paragraph on the ground that such action is inconsistent with the provisions of subparagraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 3.

(d) Any member which considers that another member is applying restrictions under this article inconsistently with the provisions of paragraph 3 or 4 of this article or with those of article 22 (subject to the provisions of art. 23) may bring the matter to the Organization for discussion; and the member applying the restrictions shall participate in the discussion. If, on the basis of the case presented by the member initiating the procedure, it appears to the Organization that the trade of that member is adversely affected, the Organization shall submit its views to the parties with the aim of achieving a settlement of the matter in question which is satisfactory to the parties and to the Organization. If no such settlement is reached and if the Organization determines that the restrictions are being applied inconsistently with the provisions of paragraphs 3 or 4 of this article or with those of article 22 (subject to the provisions of art. 23), the Organization shall recommend the withdrawal or modification of the restrictions. If the restrictions are not withdrawn or modified in accordance with the recommendation of the Organization within 60 days, the Organization may release any member from specified obligations or concessions under or pursuant to this charter toward the member applying the restrictions.

(e) In consultations between a member and the Organization under this paragraph there shall be full and free discussion as to the various causes and the nature of the member's balance-of-payments difficulties. It is recognized that premature disclosure of the prospective application, withdrawal or modification of any restrictions under this article might stimulate speculative trade and financial movements which would tend to defeat the purposes of this article. Accordingly, the Organization shall make provision for the observance of the utmost secrecy in the conduct of any consultation.

6. If there is a persistent and widespread application of import restrictions under this article, indicating the existence of a general disequilibrium which is restricting international trade, the Organization shall initiate discussions to consider whether other measures might be taken, either by those members whose balances of payments are under pressure or by those members whose balances of payments are tending to be exceptionally favorable, or by any appropriate intergovernmental organization, to remove the underlying causes of the disequilibrium. On the invitation of the Organization, members shall participate in such discussions.

Article 22. Nondiscriminatory administration of quantitative restrictions

1. No prohibition or restriction shall be applied by any member on the importation of any product of any other member country or on the exportation of any product destined for any other member country, unless the importation of the like product of all third countries or the exportation of the like product to all third countries is similarly prohibited or restricted.

2. In applying import restrictions to any product, members shall aim at a distribution of trade in such product approaching as closely as possible to the shares which the various member countries might be expected to obtain in the absence of such restrictions, and to this end shall observe the following provisions:

(a) Wherever practicable, quotas representing the total amount of permitted imports (whether allocated among supplying countries or not) shall be fixed, and notice given of their amount in accordance with paragraph 3 (b);

(b) In cases in which quotas are not practicable, the restrictions may be applied by means of import licenses or permits without a quota;

(c) Members shall not accept for purchases of operating quotas allocated in accordance with subparagraph (d) of this paragraph, require that import licenses or permits be utilized for the importation of the product concerned from a particular country or source;

(d) in cases in which a quota is allocated among supplying countries, the member applying the restrictions may seek agreement with respect to the allocation of shares in the quota with all other members having a substantial interest in supplying the product concerned. In cases in which this method is not reasonably practicable, the member concerned shall allot to member countries having a substantial interest in supplying the product shares of the total quantity or value of imports of the product based upon the proportions supplied by such member countries during a previous representative period, due account being taken of any special factors which may have affected or may be affecting the trade in the product. No conditions or formalities shall be imposed which would prevent any member country from utilizing fully the share of any such total quantity or value which has been allotted to it, subject to importation being made within any prescribed period to which the quota may relate.

3. (a) In the case of import restrictions involving the granting of import licenses, the member applying the restrictions shall provide, upon the request of any member having an interest in the trade in the product concerned, all relevant information concerning the administration of the restrictions, the import licenses granted over a recent period and the distribution of such licenses among supplying countries: *Provided*, That there shall be no obligation to supply information as to the names of importing or supplying enterprises.

(b) In the case of import restrictions involving the fixing of quotas, the member applying the restrictions shall give public notice of the total quantity or value of the product or products which will be permitted to be imported during a specified future period and of any change in such quantity or value. Any supplies of the product in question which were en route at the time at which public notice was given shall not be excluded from entry; *Provided*, That they may be counted, so far as practicable, against the quantity permitted to be imported in the period in question, and also, where necessary, against the quantities permitted to be imported in the next following period or periods, and *Provided further*, That if any member customarily exempts from such restrictions products entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during a period of 30 days after the day of such public notice, such practice shall be considered full compliance with this subparagraph.

(c) In the case of quotas allocated among supplying countries, the member applying the restrictions shall promptly inform all other members having an interest in supplying the product concerned of the shares in the quota currently allocated, by quantity or value, to the various supplying countries and shall give public notice thereof.

(d) If the Organization finds, upon the request of a member, that the interests of that member would be seriously prejudiced by giving, in regard to certain products, the public notice required under subparagraphs (b) and (c) of this paragraph, by reason of the fact that a large part of its imports of such products is supplied by nonmember countries, the Organization shall release the member from compliance with the obligations in question to the extent and for such time as it finds necessary to prevent such prejudice. Any request made by a member pursuant to this subparagraph shall be acted upon promptly by the Organization.

4. With regard to restrictions applied in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 (d) of this article or under the provisions of paragraph 2 (c) of article 20, the selection of a representative period for any product and the appraisal of any special factors affecting the trade in the product shall be made initially by the member applying the restrictions; *Provided*, That such member shall, upon the request of any other member having a substantial interest in supplying that product, or upon the request of the Organization, consult promptly with the other member or the Organization regarding the need for an adjustment of the proportion determined or of the base period selected, or for the reappraisal of the special factors involved, or for the elimination of conditions, formalities or any other provisions established unilaterally with regard to the allocation of an adequate quota or its unrestricted utilization.

5. The provisions of this article shall apply to any tariff quota instituted or maintained by any member and, insofar as applicable, the principles of this article shall also extend to export restrictions.

Article 23. Exceptions to the rule of nondiscrimination

1. (a) The members recognize that the aftermath of the war has brought difficult problems of economic adjustment which do not permit the immediate full achievement of nondiscriminatory administration of quantitative restrictions and therefore require the exceptional transitional period arrangements set forth in this paragraph.

(b) A member which applies restrictions under article 21 may, in the use of such restrictions, deviate from the provisions of article 22 in a manner having equivalent effect to restrictions on payments and transfers for current international transactions which that member may at that time apply under article XIV of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund, or under an analogous provision of a special exchange agreement entered into pursuant to paragraph 6 of article 24.

(c) A member which is applying restrictions under article 21 and which on March 1, 1948, was applying import restrictions to safeguard its balance of payments in a manner which deviated from the rules of nondiscrimination set forth in article 22 may, to the extent that such deviation would not have been authorized on that date by subparagraph (b), continue so to deviate, and may adapt such deviation to changing circumstances.

(d) Any member which before July 1, 1948, has signed the Protocol of Provisional Application agreed upon at Geneva on October 30, 1947, and which by such signature has provisionally accepted the principles of paragraph 1 of article 23 of the Draft Charter submitted to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment by the Preparatory Committee, may elect, by written notice to the Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization or to the Organization before January 1, 1949, to be governed by the provisions of annex K of this charter, which embodies such principles, in lieu of the provisions of subparagraphs (b) and (c) of this paragraph. The provisions of subparagraphs (b) and (c) shall not be applicable to members which have so elected to be governed by the provisions of annex K; and conversely, the provisions of annex K shall not be applicable to members which have not so elected.

(e) The policies applied in the use of import restrictions under subparagraphs (b) and (c) or under annex K in the postwar transitional period shall be designed to promote the maximum development of multilateral trade possible during that period and to expedite the attainment of a balance-of-payments position which will no longer require resort to the provisions of article 21 or to transitional exchange arrangements.

(f) A member may deviate from the provisions of article 22, pursuant to subpara-

graph (b) or (c) of this paragraph or pursuan to annex K, only so long as it is availing itself of the postwar transitional period arrangements under article XIV of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund, or of an analogous provision of a special exchange agreement entered into under paragraph 6 of article 24.

(g) Not later than March 1, 1950 (3 years after the date on which the International Monetary Fund began operations) and in each year thereafter, the Organization shall report on any action still being taken by members under subparagraphs (b) and (c) of this paragraph or under annex K, in March 1952, and in each year thereafter, any member still entitled to take action under the provisions of subparagraph (c) or of annex K shall consult the Organization as to any deviations from article 22 still in force pursuant to such provisions and as to its continued resort to such provisions. After March 1, 1952, any action under annex K going beyond the maintenance in force of deviations on which such consultation has taken place and which the Organization has not found unjustifiable, or their adaptation to changing circumstances, shall be subject to any limitations of a general character which the Organization may prescribe in the light of the member's circumstances.

(h) The Organization may, if it deems such action necessary in exceptional circumstances, make representations to any member entitled to take action under the provisions of subparagraph (c) that conditions are favorable for the termination of any particular deviation from the provisions of article 22, or for the general abandonment of deviations, under the provisions of that subparagraph. After March 1, 1952, the Organization may make such representations, in exceptional circumstances, to any member entitled to take action under annex K. The member shall be given a suitable time to reply to such representations. If the Organization finds that the member persists in unjustifiable deviation from the provisions of article 22, the member shall, within 60 days, limit or terminate such deviations as the Organization may specify.

2. Whether or not its transitional period arrangements have terminated pursuant to paragraph 1 (f), a member which is applying import restrictions under article 21 may, with the consent of the Organization, temporarily deviate from the provisions of article 22 in respect of a small part of its external trade where the benefits to the member or members concerned substantially outweigh any injury which may result to the trade of other members.

3. The provisions of article 22 shall not preclude restrictions in accordance with the provisions of article 21 which either—

(a) are applied against imports from other countries, but not as among themselves, by a group of territories having a common quota in the International Monetary Fund, on condition that such restrictions are in all other respects consistent with the provisions of article 22, or

(b) assist, in the period until December 31, 1951, by measures not involving substantial departure from the provision of article 22, another country whose economy has been disrupted by war.

4. A member applying import restrictions under article 21 shall not be precluded by this section from applying measures to direct its exports in such a manner as to increase its earnings of currencies which it can use without deviation from the provisions of article 22.

5. A member shall not be precluded by this section from applying quantitative restrictions—

(a) having equivalent effect to exchange restrictions authorized under section 3 (b) of article VII of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund; or

(b) under the preferential arrangements provided for in annex A of this charter, pending the outcome of the negotiations referred to therein.

Article 24. Relationship with the International Monetary Fund and exchange arrangements

1. The Organization shall seek cooperation with the International Monetary Fund to the end that the organization and the fund may pursue a coordinated policy with regard to exchange questions within the jurisdiction of the fund and questions of quantitative restrictions and other trade measures within the jurisdiction of the Organization.

2. In all cases in which the Organization is called upon to consider or deal with problems concerning monetary reserves, balance of payments or foreign exchange arrangements, the Organization shall consult fully with the fund. In such consultation, the Organization shall accept all findings of statistical and other facts presented by the fund relating to foreign exchange, monetary reserves and balance of payments, and shall accept the determination of the fund whether action by a member with respect to exchange matters is in accordance with the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund, or with the terms of a special exchange agreement entered into between that member and the Organization pursuant to paragraph 6 of this article. When the Organization is examining a situation in the light of the relevant considerations under all the pertinent provisions of article 21 for the purpose of reaching its final decision in cases involving the criteria set forth in paragraph 3 (a) of that article, it shall accept the determination of the fund as to what constitutes a serious decline in the member's monetary reserves, a very low level of its monetary reserves or a reasonable rate of increase in its monetary reserves, and as to the financial aspects of other matters covered in consultation in such cases.

3. The Organization shall seek agreement with the fund regarding procedures for consultation under paragraph 2 of this article. Any such agreement, other than informal arrangements of a temporary or administrative character, shall be subject to confirmation by the Conference.

4. Members shall not, by exchange action, frustrate the intent of the provisions of this section, nor, by trade action, the intent of the provisions of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund.

5. If the Organization considers, at any time, that exchange restrictions on payments and transfers in connection with imports are being applied by a member in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of this section with respect to quantitative restrictions, it shall report thereon to the fund.

6. (a) Any member of the Organization which is not a member of the fund shall, within a time to be determined by the Organization after consultation with the fund, become a member of the fund, or failing that, enter into a special exchange agreement with the Organization. A member of the Organization which ceases to be a member of the fund shall forthwith enter into a special exchange agreement with the Organization. Any special exchange agreement entered into by a member under this subparagraph shall thereupon become part of its obligations under this charter.

(b) Any such agreement shall provide to the satisfaction of the Organization that the objectives of this charter will not be frustrated as a result of action with respect to exchange matters by the member in question.

(c) Any such agreement shall not impose obligations on the member with respect to exchange matters generally more restrictive than those imposed by the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund on members of the fund.

(d) No member shall be required to enter into any such agreement so long as it uses solely the currency of another member and so long as neither the member nor the country whose currency is being used maintains exchange restrictions. Nevertheless, if the Organization at any time considers that the absence of a special exchange agreement may be permitting action which tends to frustrate the purposes of any of the provisions of this charter, it may require the member to enter into a special exchange agreement in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph. A member of the Organization which is not a member of the fund and which has not entered into a special exchange agreement may be required at any time to consult with the Organization on any exchange problem.

7. A member which is not a member of the fund, whether or not it has entered into a special exchange agreement, shall furnish such information within the general scope of section 5 of article VIII of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund as the Organization may require in order to carry out its functions under this charter.

8. Nothing in this section shall preclude—

(a) the use by a member of exchange controls or exchange restrictions in accordance with the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund or with that member's special exchange agreement with the Organization; or

(b) the use by a member of restrictions or controls on imports or exports, the sole effect of which, in addition to the effects permitted under articles 20, 21, 22, and 23, is to make effective such exchange controls or exchange restrictions.

SECTION C. SUBSIDIES

Article 25. Subsidies in general

If any member grants or maintains any subsidy, including any form of income or price support, which operates directly or indirectly to maintain or increase exports of any product from, or to reduce, or prevent an increase in, imports of any product into, its territory, the member shall notify the Organization in writing of the extent and effect of the subsidization, of the estimated effect of the subsidization on the quantity of the affected product or products imported into or exported from its territory and of the circumstances making the subsidization necessary. In any case in which a member considers that serious prejudice to its interests is caused or threatened by any such subsidization, the member granting the subsidy shall, upon request, discuss with the other member or members concerned, or with the Organization, the possibility of limiting the subsidization.

Article 26. Additional provisions on export subsidies

1. No member shall grant, directly or indirectly, any subsidy on the export of any product, or establish or maintain any other system, which subsidy or system results in the sale of such product for export at a price lower than the comparable price charged for the like product to buyers in the domestic market, due allowance being made for differences in the conditions and terms of sale, for differences in taxation, and for other differences affecting price comparability.

2. The exemption of exported products from duties or taxes imposed in respect of like products when consumed domestically, or the remission of such duties or taxes in amounts not in excess of those which have accrued, shall not be deemed to be in conflict with the provisions of paragraph 1. The use of the proceeds of such duties or taxes to make payments to domestic producers in general of those products shall be considered as a case under article 25.

3. Members shall give effect to the provisions of paragraph 1 at the earliest practicable date but not later than 2 years from the day on which this charter enters into force. If any member considers itself unable to do so in respect of any particular product or products, it shall, at least 3 months before the expiration of such period, give notice in writing to the Organization, requesting a specific extension of the period. Such notice shall be accompanied by a full analysis of the system in question and the circumstances justifying it. The Organization shall then determine whether the extension requested should be made and, if so, on what terms.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1, any member may subsidize the exports of any product to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to offset a subsidy granted by a nonmember affecting the member's exports of the product. However, the member shall, upon the request of the Organization or of any other member which considers that its interests are seriously prejudiced by such action, consult with the Organization or with that member, as appropriate, with a view to reaching a satisfactory adjustment of the matter.

Article 27. Special treatment of primary commodities

1. A system for the stabilization of the domestic price or of the return to domestic producers of a primary commodity, independently of the movements of export prices, which results at times in the sale of the commodity for export at a price lower than the comparable price charged for the like commodity to buyers in the domestic market, shall be considered not to involve a subsidy on export within the meaning of paragraph 1 of article 26, if the Organization determines that—

(a) the system has also resulted, or is so designed as to result, in the sale of the commodity for export at a price higher than the comparable price charged for the like commodity to buyers in the domestic market; and

(b) the system is so operated, or is designed so to operate, either because of the effective regulation of production or otherwise, as not to stimulate exports unduly or otherwise seriously prejudice the interests of other members.

2. Any member granting a subsidy in respect of a primary commodity shall cooperate at all times in efforts to negotiate agreements, under the procedures set forth in chapter VI, with regard to that commodity.

3. In any case involving a primary commodity, if a member considers that its interests would be seriously prejudiced by compliance with the provisions of article 26, or if a member considers that its interests are seriously prejudiced by the granting of any form of subsidy, the procedures set forth in chapter VI may be followed. The member which considers that its interests are thus seriously prejudiced shall, however, be exempt provisionally from the requirements of paragraphs 1 and 3 of article 26 in respect of that commodity, but shall be subject to the provisions of article 28.

4. No member shall grant a new subsidy or increase an existing subsidy affecting the export of a primary commodity, during a commodity conference called for the purpose of negotiating an intergovernmental control agreement for the commodity concerned, unless the Organization concurs, in which case such new or additional subsidy shall be subject to the provisions of article 28.

5. If the measures provided for in chapter VI have not succeeded, or do not promise to succeed, within a reasonable period of time, or if the conclusion of a commodity agreement is not an appropriate solution, any member which considers that its interests are seriously prejudiced shall not be subject to the requirements of paragraphs 1 and 3 of article 26 in respect of that commodity, but shall be subject to the provisions of article 28.

Article 28. Undertaking regarding stimulation of exports of primary commodities

1. Any member granting any form of subsidy, which operates directly or indirectly to maintain or increase the export of any primary commodity from its territory, shall not apply the subsidy in such a way as to have the effect of maintaining or acquiring for that member more than an equitable share of world trade in that commodity.

2. As required under the provisions of article 25, the member granting such subsidy shall promptly notify the Organization of the extent and nature of the subsidization, of the estimated effect of the subsidization on the quantity of the affected commodity exported from its territory, and of the circumstances making the subsidization necessary. The member shall promptly consult with any other member which considers that serious prejudice to its interests is caused or threatened by the subsidization.

3. If, within a reasonable period of time, no agreement is reached in such consultation, the Organization shall determine what constitutes an equitable share of world trade in the commodity concerned and the member granting the subsidy shall conform to this determination.

4. In making the determination referred to in paragraph 3, the Organization shall take into account any factors which may have affected or may be affecting world trade in the commodity concerned, and shall have particular regard to:

(a) the member country's share of world trade in the commodity during a previous representative period;

(b) whether the member country's share of world trade in the commodity is so small that the effect of the subsidy on such trade is likely to be of minor significance;

(c) the degree of importance of the external trade in the commodity to the economy of the member country granting, and to the economics of the member countries materially affected by, the subsidy;

(d) the existence of price stabilization systems conforming to the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 27;

(e) the desirability of facilitating the gradual expansion of production for export in those areas able to satisfy world market requirements of the commodity concerned in the most effective and economic manner, and therefore of limiting any subsidies or other measures which make that expansion difficult.

SECTION D. STATE TRADING AND RELATED MATTERS

Article 29. Nondiscriminatory treatment

1. (a) Each member undertakes that if it establishes or maintains a state enterprise, wherever located, or grants to any enterprise, formally or in effect, exclusive or special privileges, such enterprise shall, in its purchases and sales involving either imports or exports, act in a manner consistent with the general principles of nondiscriminatory treatment prescribed in this charter for governmental measures affecting imports or exports by private traders.

(b) The provisions of subparagraph (a) shall be understood to require that such enterprises shall, having due regard to the other provisions of this charter, make at any such purchases or sales solely in accordance with commercial considerations, including price, quality, availability, marketability, transportation and other conditions of purchase or sale, and shall afford the enterprises of the other member countries adequate opportunity, in accordance with customary business practice, to compete for participation in such purchases or sales.

(c) No member shall prevent any enterprise (whether or not an enterprise described in subparagraph (a)) under its jurisdiction from acting in accordance with the principles of subparagraphs (a) and (b).

2. The provisions of paragraph 1 shall not apply to imports of products purchased for governmental purposes and not with a view to commercial resale or with a view to use in the production of goods for commercial sale. With respect to such imports, and with respect to the laws, regulations, and requirements referred to in paragraph 8 (a) of article 18, each member shall accord to the trade of the other members fair and equitable treatment.

Article 30. Marketing organizations

If a member establishes or maintains a marketing board, commission or similar organization, the member shall be subject—

(a) with respect to purchases or sales by any such organization, to the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 29;

(b) with respect to any regulations of any such organizations governing the operations of private enterprises, to the other relevant provisions of this charter.

Article 31. Expansion of trade

1. If a member establishes, maintains or authorizes, formally or in effect, a monopoly of the importation or exportation of any product, the member shall, upon the request of any other member or members having a substantial interest in trade with it in the product concerned, negotiate with such other member or members in the manner provided for under article 17 in respect of tariffs, and subject to all the provisions of this charter with respect to such tariff negotiations, with the object of achieving—

(a) in the case of an export monopoly, arrangements designed to limit or reduce any protection that might be afforded through the operation of the monopoly to domestic users of the monopolized product, or designed to assure exports of the monopolized product in adequate quantities at reasonable prices;

(b) in the case of an import monopoly, arrangements designed to limit or reduce any protection that might be afforded through the operation of the monopoly to domestic producers of the monopolized product, or designed to relax any limitation on imports which is comparable with a limitation made subject to negotiation under other provisions of this chapter.

2. In order to satisfy the requirements of paragraph 1 (b), the member establishing, maintaining, or authorizing a monopoly shall negotiate—

(a) for the establishment of the maximum import duty that may be applied in respect of the product concerned; or

(b) for any other mutually satisfactory arrangement consistent with the provisions of this charter, if it is evident to the negotiating parties that to negotiate a maximum import duty under subparagraph (a) of this paragraph is impracticable or would be ineffective for the achievement of the objectives of paragraph 1; any member entering into negotiations under this subparagraph shall afford to other interested members an opportunity for consultation.

3. In any case in which a maximum import duty is not negotiated under paragraph 2 (a), the member establishing, maintaining, or authorizing the import monopoly shall make public, or notify the Organization of, the maximum import duty which it will apply in respect of the product concerned.

4. The import duty negotiated under paragraph 2, or made public or notified to the Organization under paragraph 3, shall represent the maximum margin by which the price charged by the import monopoly for the imported product (exclusive of internal taxes conforming to the provisions of article 18, transportation, distribution, and other expenses incident to the purchase, sale, or further processing, and a reasonable margin of profit) may exceed the landed cost: *Pro-*

vided, That regard may be had to average landed costs and selling prices over recent periods: *And provided further*, That, where the product concerned is a primary commodity which is the subject of a domestic price stabilization arrangement, provision may be made for adjustment to take account of wide fluctuations or variations in world prices, subject where a maximum duty has been negotiated to agreement between the countries parties to the negotiations.

5. With regard to any product to which the provisions of this article apply, the monopoly shall, wherever this principle can be effectively applied and subject to the other provisions of this charter, import and offer for sale such quantities of the product as will be sufficient to satisfy the full domestic demand for the imported product, account being taken of any rationing to consumers of the imported and like domestic product which may be in force at that time.

6. In applying the provisions of this article, due regard shall be had for the fact that some monopolies are established and operated mainly for social, cultural, humanitarian, or revenue purposes.

7. This article shall not limit the use by members of any form of assistance to domestic producers permitted by other provisions of this charter.

Article 32. Liquidation of noncommercial stocks

1. If a member holding stocks of any primary commodity accumulated for noncommercial purposes should liquidate such stocks, it shall carry out the liquidation, as far as practicable, in a manner that will avoid serious disturbance to world markets for the commodity concerned.

2. Such member shall:

(a) give not less than 4 months' public notice of its intention to liquidate such stocks; or

(b) give not less than 4 months' prior notice to the Organization of such intention.

3. Such member shall, at the request of any member which considers itself substantially interested, consult as to the best means of avoiding substantial injury to the economic interests of producers and consumers of the primary commodity in question. In cases where the interests of several members might be substantially affected, the Organization may participate in the consultations, and the member holding the stocks shall give due consideration to its recommendations.

4. The provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 shall not apply to routine disposal of supplies necessary for the rotation of stocks to avoid deterioration.

SECTION E. GENERAL COMMERCIAL PROVISIONS

Article 33. Freedom of transit

1. Goods (including baggage), and also vessels and other means of transport, shall be deemed to be in transit across the territory of a member country when the passage across such territory, with or without transshipment, warehousing, breaking bulk, or change in the mode of transport, is only a portion of a complete journey beginning and terminating beyond the frontier of the member country across whose territory the traffic passes. Traffic of this nature is termed in this article "traffic in transit."

2. There shall be freedom of transit through each member country, via the routes most convenient for international transit, for traffic in transit to or from other member countries. No distinction shall be made which is based on the flag of vessels, the place of origin, departure, entry, exit or destination, or on any circumstances relating to the ownership of goods, of vessels, or of other means of transport.

3. Any member may require that traffic in transit through its territory be entered at the proper customhouse, but, except in cases of failure to comply with applicable customs laws and regulations, such traffic coming from or going to other member countries shall not be subject to any unnecessary delays or restrictions and shall be exempt from customs duties and from all transit duties or other charges imposed in respect of transit, except charges commensurate with administrative expenses entailed by transit or with the cost of services rendered.

4. All charges and regulations imposed by members on traffic in transit to or from other member countries shall be reasonable, having regard to the conditions of the traffic.

5. With respect to all charges, regulations, and formalities in connection with transit, each member shall accord to traffic in transit to or from any other member country treatment no less favorable than the treatment accorded to traffic in transit to or from any third country.

6. The Organization may undertake studies, make recommendations, and promote international agreement relating to the simplification of customs regulations concerning traffic in transit, the equitable use of facilities required for such transit, and other measures designed to promote the objectives of this article. Members shall cooperate with each other directly and through the Organization to this end.

7. Each member shall accord to goods which have been in transit through any other member country treatment no less favorable than that which would have been accorded to such goods had they been transported from their place of origin to their destination without going through such other member country. Any member shall, however, be free to maintain its requirements of direct consignment existing on the date of this charter, in respect of any goods in regard to which such direct consignment is a requisite condition of eligibility for entry of the goods at preferential rates of duty or has relation to the member's prescribed method of valuation for customs purposes.

8. The provisions of this article shall not apply to the operation of aircraft in transit, but shall apply to air transit of goods (including baggage).

Article 34. Antidumping and countervailing duties

1. The members recognize that dumping, by which products of one country are introduced into the commerce of another country at less than the normal value of the products, is to be condemned if it causes or threatens material injury to an established industry in a member country or materially retards the establishment of a domestic industry. For the purposes of this article, a product is to be considered as being introduced into the commerce of an importing country at less than its normal value, if the price of the product exported from one country to another—

(a) is less than the comparable price, in the ordinary course of trade, for the like product when destined for consumption in the exporting country, or,

(b) in the absence of such domestic price, is less than either—

(i) the highest comparable price for the like product for export to any third country in the ordinary course of trade, or

(ii) the cost of production of the product in the country of origin plus a reasonable addition for selling cost and profit.

Due allowance shall be made in each case for differences in conditions and terms of sale, for differences in taxation, and for other differences affecting price comparability.

2. In order to offset or prevent dumping a member may levy on any dumped product an antidumping duty not greater in amount than the margin of dumping in respect of such product. For the purposes of this article, the margin of dumping is the price difference determined in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1.

3. No countervailing duty shall be levied on any product of any member country imported into another member country in excess of an amount equal to the estimated bounty or subsidy determined to have been granted, directly or indirectly, on the manufacture, production or export of such product in the country of origin or exportation, including any special subsidy to the transportation of a particular product. The term "countervailing duty" shall be understood to mean a special duty levied for the purpose of offsetting any bounty or subsidy bestowed, directly or indirectly, upon the manufacture, production or export of any merchandise.

4. No product of any member country imported into any other member country shall be subject to antidumping or countervailing duty by reason of the exemption of such product from duties or taxes borne by the like product when destined for consumption in the country of origin or exportation, or by reason of the refund of such duties or taxes.

5. No product of any member country imported into any other member country shall be subject to both antidumping and countervailing duties to compensate for the same situation of dumping or export subsidization.

6. No member shall levy any antidumping or countervailing duty on the importation of any product of another member country unless it determines that the effect of the dumping or subsidization, as the case may be, is such as to cause or threaten material injury to an established domestic industry, or is such as to retard materially the establishment of a domestic industry. The Organization may waive the requirements of this paragraph so as to permit a member to levy an antidumping or countervailing duty on the importation of any product for the purpose of offsetting dumping or subsidization which causes or threatens material injury to an industry in another member country exporting the product concerned to the importing member country.

7. A system for the stabilization of the domestic price or of the return to domestic producers of a primary commodity, independently of the movements of export prices, which results at times in the sale of the commodity for export at a price lower than the comparable price charged for the like commodity to buyers in the domestic market, shall be presumed not to result in material injury within the meaning of paragraph 6 if it is determined by consultation among the members substantially interested in the commodity concerned that:

(a) the system has also resulted in the sale of the commodity for export at a price higher than the comparable price charged for the like commodity to buyers in the domestic market, and

(b) the system is so operated, either because of the effective regulation of production, or otherwise, as not to stimulate exports unduly or otherwise seriously prejudice the interests of other members.

Article 35. Valuation for customs purposes

1. The members shall work toward the standardization, as far as practicable, of definitions of value and of procedures for determining the value of products subject to customs duties or other charges or restrictions based upon or regulated in any manner by value. With a view to furthering cooperation to this end, the Organization may study and recommend to members such bases and methods for determining value for customs purposes as would appear best suited to the needs of commerce and most capable of general adoption.

2. The members recognize the validity of the general principles of valuation set forth in paragraphs 3, 4, and 5, and they undertake to give effect, at the earliest practicable date, to these principles in respect of all

products subject to duties or other charges or restrictions on importation based upon or regulated in any manner by value. Moreover, they shall, upon a request by another member directly affected, review in the light of these principles the operation of any of their laws or regulations relating to value for customs purposes. The Organization may request from members reports on steps taken by them in pursuance of the provisions of this article.

3. (a) The value for customs purposes of imported merchandise should be based on the actual value of the imported merchandise on which duty is assessed, or of like merchandise, and should not be based on the value of merchandise of national origin or on arbitrary or fictitious values.

(b) "Actual value" should be the price at which at a time and place determined by the legislation of the country of importation, and in the ordinary course of trade, such or like merchandise is sold or offered for sale under fully competitive conditions. To the extent to which the price of such or like merchandise is governed by the quantity in a particular transaction, the price to be considered should uniformly be related to either (i) comparable quantities, or (ii) quantities not less favorable to importers than those in which the greater volume of the merchandise is sold in the trade between the countries of exportation and importation.

(c) When the actual value is not ascertainable in accordance with subparagraph (b), the value for customs purposes should be based on the nearest ascertainable equivalent of such value.

4. The value for customs purposes of any imported product should not include the amount of any internal tax, applicable within the country of origin or export, from which the imported product has been exempted or has been or will be relieved by means of refund.

5. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, where it is necessary for the purposes of paragraph 3 for a member to convert into its own currency a price expressed in the currency of another country, the conversion rate of exchange to be used shall be based on the par values of the currencies involved, as established pursuant to the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund or by special exchange agreements entered into pursuant to article 24 of this charter.

(b) Where no such par value has been established, the conversion rate shall reflect effectively the current value of such currency in commercial transactions.

(c) The Organization, in agreement with the International Monetary Fund, shall formulate rules governing the conversion by members of any foreign currency in respect of which multiple rates of exchange are maintained consistently with the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund. Any member may apply such rules in respect of such foreign currencies for the purposes of paragraph 3 of this article as an alternative to the use of par values. Until such rules are adopted by the Organization, any member may employ, in respect of any such foreign currency, rules of conversion for the purposes of paragraph 3 of this article which are designed to reflect effectively the value of such foreign currency in commercial transactions.

6. Nothing in this article shall be construed to require any member to alter the method of converting currencies for customs purposes which is applicable in its territory on the date of this charter, if such alteration would have the effect of increasing generally the amounts of duty payable.

7. The bases and methods for determining the value of products subject to duties or other charges or restrictions based upon or regulated in any manner by value should be stable and should be given sufficient publicity to enable traders to estimate, with a reasonable degree of certainty, the value for customs purposes.

Article 36. Formalities connected with importation and exportation

1. The members recognize that all fees and charges of whatever character (other than import and export duties and other than taxes within the purview of article 18) imposed by governmental authorities on or in connection with importation or exportation should be limited in amount to the approximate cost of services rendered and should not represent an indirect protection to domestic products or a taxation of imports or exports for fiscal purposes. The members also recognize the need for reducing the number and diversity of such fees and charges, for minimizing the incidence and complexity of import and export formalities, and for decreasing and simplifying import and export documentation requirements.

2. The members shall take action in accordance with the principles and objectives of paragraph 1 at the earliest practicable date. Moreover, they shall, upon request by another member directly affected, review the operation of any of their laws and regulations in the light of these principles. The Organization may request from members reports on steps taken by them in pursuance of the provisions of this paragraph.

3. The provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 shall extend to fees, charges, formalities, and requirements imposed by governmental authorities in connection with importation and exportation, including those relating to—

(a) consular transactions, such as those relating to consular invoices and certificates;

(b) quantitative restrictions;

(c) licensing;

(d) exchange control;

(e) statistical services;

(f) documents, documentation, and certification;

(g) analysis and inspection; and

(h) quarantine, sanitation, and fumigation.

4. The organization may study and recommend to members specific measures for the simplification and standardization of customs formalities and techniques and for the elimination of unnecessary customs requirements, including those relating to advertising matter and samples for use only in taking orders for merchandise.

5. No member shall impose substantial penalties for minor breaches of customs regulations or procedural requirements. In particular, no penalty in respect of any omission or mistake in customs documentation which is easily rectifiable and obviously made without fraudulent intent or gross negligence shall be greater than necessary to serve merely as a warning.

6. The members recognize that tariff descriptions based on distinctive regional or geographical names should not be used in such a manner as to discriminate against products of member countries. Accordingly, the members shall cooperate with each other directly and through the Organization with a view to eliminating at the earliest practicable date practices which are inconsistent with this principle.

Article 37. Marks of origin

1. The members recognize that, in adopting and implementing laws and regulations relating to marks of origin, the difficulties and inconveniences which such measures may cause to the commerce and industry of exporting countries should be reduced to a minimum.

2. Each member shall accord to the products of each other member country treatment with regard to marking requirements no less favorable than the treatment accorded to like products of any third country.

3. Whenever it is administratively practicable to do so, members should permit required marks of origin to be affixed at the time of importation.

4. The laws and regulations of members relating to the marking of imported products shall be such as to permit compliance without seriously damaging the products or materially reducing their value or unreasonably increasing their cost.

5. The members agree to work in cooperation through the Organization toward the early elimination of unnecessary marking requirements. The Organization may study and recommend to members measures directed to this end, including the adoption of schedules of general categories of products, in respect of which marking requirements operate to restrict trade to an extent disproportionate to any proper purpose to be served, and which shall not in any case be required to be marked to indicate their origin.

6. As a general rule no special duty or penalty should be imposed by any member for failure to comply with marking requirements prior to importation unless corrective marking is unreasonably delayed or deceptive marks have been affixed or the required marking has been intentionally omitted.

7. The members shall cooperate with each other directly and through the Organization with a view to preventing the use of trade names in such manner as to misrepresent the true origin of a product, to the detriment of the distinctive regional or geographical names of products of a member country which are protected by the legislation of such country. Each member shall accord full and sympathetic consideration to such requests or representations as may be made by any other member regarding the application of the undertaking set forth in the preceding sentence to names of products which have been communicated to it by the other member. The Organization may recommend a conference of interested members on this subject.

Article 38. Publication and administration of trade regulations

1. Laws, regulations, judicial decisions and administrative rulings of general application made effective by any member, pertaining to the classification or the valuation of products for customs purposes, or to rates of duty, taxes or other charges, or to requirements, restrictions or prohibitions on imports or exports or on the transfer of payments therefor, or affecting their sale, distribution, transportation, insurance, warehousing, inspection, exhibition, processing, mixing or other use, shall be published promptly in such a manner as to enable governments and traders to become acquainted with them. Agreements affecting international trade policy which are in force between the government or governmental agency of any member country and the government or governmental agency of any other country shall also be published. Copies of such laws, regulations, decisions, rulings and agreements shall be communicated promptly to the Organization. The provisions of this paragraph shall not require any member to divulge confidential information the disclosure of which would impede law enforcement or otherwise be contrary to the public interest or would prejudice the legitimate commercial interests of particular enterprises, public or private.

2. No measure of general application taken by any member effecting an advance in a rate of duty or other charge on imports under an established and uniform practice or imposing a new or more burdensome requirement, restriction or prohibition on imports, or on the transfer of payments therefor, shall be enforced before such measure has been officially made public.

3. (a) Each member shall administer in a uniform, impartial and reasonable manner all its laws, regulations, decisions and rulings of the kind described in paragraph 1. Suitable facilities shall be afforded for traders directly affected by any of those matters to consult with the appropriate governmental authorities.

(b) Each member shall maintain, or institute as soon as practicable, judicial, arbitral or administrative tribunals or procedures for the purpose, inter alia, of the prompt review and correction of administrative action relating to customs matters. Such tribunals or procedures shall be independent of the agencies entrusted with administrative enforcement and their decisions shall be implemented by, and shall govern the practice of, such agencies unless an appeal is lodged with a court or tribunal of superior jurisdiction within the time prescribed for appeals to be lodged by importers: *Provided* that the central administration of such agency may take steps to obtain a review of the matter in another proceeding if there is good cause to believe that the decision is inconsistent with established principles of law or the actual facts.

(c) The provisions of subparagraph (b) shall not require the elimination or substitution of procedures in force in a member country on the date of this charter which in fact provide for an objective and impartial review of administrative action, even though such procedures are not fully or formally independent of the agencies entrusted with administrative enforcement. Any member employing such procedures shall, upon request, furnish the organization with full information thereon in order that the organization may determine whether such procedures conform to the requirements of this subparagraph.

Article 39. Information, statistics, and trade terminology

1. The members shall communicate to the organization, or to such agency as may be designated for the purpose by the organization, as promptly and in as much detail as is reasonably practicable:

(a) statistics of their external trade in goods (imports, exports and, where applicable, reexports, transit and transshipment and goods in warehouse or in bond);

(b) statistics of governmental revenue from import and export duties and other taxes on goods moving in international trade and, insofar as readily ascertainable, of subsidy payments affecting such trade.

2. So far as possible, the statistics referred to in paragraph 1 shall be related to tariff classifications and shall be in such form as to reveal the operation of any restrictions on importation or exportation which are based on or regulated in any manner by quantity or value or amounts of exchange made available.

3. The members shall publish regularly and as promptly as possible the statistics referred to in paragraph 1.

4. The members shall give careful consideration to any recommendations which the Organization may make to them with a view to improving the statistical information furnished under paragraph 1.

5. The members shall make available to the Organization, at its request and insofar as is reasonably practicable, such other statistical inforation as the Organization may deem necessary to enable it to fulfill its functions, provided that such information is not being furnished to other intergovernmental organizations from which the Organization can obtain it.

6. The Organization shall act as a center for the collection, exchange, and publication of statistical information of the kind referred to in paragraph 1. The Organization, in collaboration with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and with any other organization deemed appropriate, may engage in studies with a view to improving the methods of collecting, analyzing, and publishing economic statistics and may promote the international comparability of such statistics, including the possible international adoption of standard tariff and commodity classifications.

7. The Organization, in cooperation with the other organizations referred to in paragraph 6, may also study the question of adopting standards, nomenclatures, terms, and forms to be used in international trade and in the official documents and statistics of members relating thereto, and may recommend the general acceptance by members of such standards, nomenclatures, terms, and forms.

SECTION F. SPECIAL PROVISIONS

Article 40. Emergency action on imports of particular products

1. (a) If, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of the obligations incurred by a member under or pursuant to this chapter, including tariff concessions, any product is being imported into the territory of that member in such relatively increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the member shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the obligation in whole or in part or to withdraw or modify the concession.

(b) If any product which is the subject of a concession with respect to a preference is being imported into the territory of a member in the circumstances set forth in subparagraph (a), so as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or directly competitive products in the territory of a member which receives or received such preference, the importing member shall be free, if that other member so requests, to suspend the relevant obligation in whole or in part or to withdraw or modify the concession in respect of the product, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury.

2. Before any member shall take action pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1, it shall give notice in writing to the organization as far in advance as may be practicable and shall afford the organization and those members having a substantial interest as exporters of the product concerned an opportunity to consult with it in respect of the proposed action. When such notice is given in regard to a concession relating to a preference, the notice shall name the member which has requested the action. In circumstances of special urgency, where delay would cause damage which it would be difficult to repair, action under paragraph 1 may be taken provisionally without prior consultation, on the condition that consultation shall be effected immediately after taking such action.

3. (a) If agreement among the interested members with respect to the action is not reached, the member which proposes to take or continue the action shall, nevertheless, be free to do so, and if such action is taken or continued, the affected members shall then be free, not later than 90 days after such action is taken, to suspend, upon the expiration of 30 days from the day on which written notice of such suspension is received by the organization, the application to the trade of the member taking such action, or, in the case envisaged in paragraph 1 (b), to the trade of the member requesting such action, of such substantially equivalent obligations or concessions under or pursuant to this chapter the suspension of which the organization does not disapprove.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (a), where action is taken without prior consultation under paragraph 2 and causes or threatens serious injury in the territory of a member to the domestic producers of products affected by the action, that member shall, where delay would cause damage difficult to repair, be free to suspend, upon the taking of the action and throughout the period of consultation, such obligations or concessions as may be necessary to prevent or remedy the injury.

4. Nothing in this article shall be construed—

(a) to require any member, in connection with the withdrawal or modification by such member of any concession negotiated pursuant to article 17, to consult with or obtain the agreement of members other than those members which are contracting parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, or

(b) to authorize any member which is not a contracting party to that agreement, to withdraw from or suspend obligations under this charter by reason of the withdrawal or modification of such concession.

Article 41. Consultation

Each member shall accord sympathetic consideration to, and shall afford adequate opportunity for consultation regarding, such representations as may be made by any other member with respect to the operation of customs regulations and formalities, antidumping and countervailing duties, quantitative and exchange regulations, internal price regulations, subsidies, transit regulations and practices, State trading, sanitary laws and regulations for the protection of human, animal, or plant life or health, and generally with respect to all matters affecting the operation of this chapter.

Article 42. Territorial application of chapter IV

1. The provisions of chapter IV shall apply to the metropolitan customs territories of the members and to any other customs territories in respect of which this charter has been accepted in accordance with the provisions of article 104. Each such customs territory shall, exclusively for the purposes of the territorial application of chapter IV, be treated as though it were a member; *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not be construed to create any rights or obligations as between two or more customs territories in respect of which this charter has been accepted by a single member.

2. For the purposes of this chapter a customs territory shall be understood to mean any territory with respect to which separate tariffs or other regulations of commerce are maintained for a substantial part of the trade of such territory with other territories.

Article 43. Frontier traffic

The provisions of this chapter shall not be construed to prevent—

(a) Advantages accorded by any member to adjacent countries in order to facilitate frontier traffic;

(b) Advantages accorded to the trade with the Free Territory of Trieste by countries contiguous to that territory, provided that such advantages are not in conflict with the treaties of peace arising out of the Second World War.

Article 44. Customs unions and free-trade areas

1. Members recognize the desirability of increasing freedom of trade by the development, through voluntary agreements, of closer integration between the economies of the countries parties to such agreements. They also recognize that the purpose of a customs union or free-trade area should be to facilitate trade between the parties and not to raise barriers to the trade of other member countries with such parties.

2. Accordingly, the provisions of this chapter shall not prevent, as between the territories of members, the formation of a customs union or of a free-trade area or the adoption of an interim agreement necessary for the formation of a customs union or of a free-trade area: *Provided*, That—

(a) with respect to a customs union, or an interim agreement leading to the formation of a customs union, the duties and other regulations of commerce imposed at the institution of any such union or interim agreement in respect of trade with member countries not parties to such union or agreement shall not on the whole be higher or more restrictive than the general incidence of the duties and regulations of commerce applicable in the constituent territories prior to the formation of such union or the adoption of such interim agreement, as the case may be;

(b) with respect to a free-trade area, or an interim agreement leading to the formation of a free-trade area, the duties and other regulations of commerce maintained in each of the constituent territories and applicable at the formation of such free-trade area or the adoption of such interim agreement to the trade of member countries not included in such area or not parties to such agreement shall not be higher or more restrictive than the corresponding duties and other regulations of commerce existing in the same constituent territories prior to the formation of the free-trade area, or interim agreement, as the case may be; and

(c) any interim agreement referred to in subparagraphs (a) or (b) shall include a plan and schedule for the formation of such a customs union or of such a free-trade area within a reasonable length of time.

3. (a) Any member deciding to enter into a customs union or free-trade area, or an interim agreement leading to the formation of such a union or area, shall promptly notify the organization and shall make available to it such information regarding the proposed union or area as will enable the organization to make such reports and recommendations to members as it may deem appropriate.

(b) If, after having studied the plan and schedule provided for in an interim agreement referred to in paragraph 2 in consultation with the parties to that agreement and taking due account of the information made available in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (a), the Organization finds that such agreement is not likely to result in the formation of a customs union or of a free-trade area within the period contemplated by the parties to the agreement or that such period is not a reasonable one, the Organization shall make recommendations to the parties to the agreement. The parties shall not maintain or put into force, as the case may be, such agreement if they are not prepared to modify it in accordance with these recommendations.

(c) Any substantial change in the plan or schedule referred to in paragraph 2 (c) shall be communicated to the Organization, which may request the members concerned to consult with it if the change seems likely to jeopardize or delay unduly the formation of the customs union or of the free-trade area.

4. For the purposes of this charter—

(a) a customs union shall be understood to mean the substitution of a single customs territory for two or more customs territories, so that—

(i) duties and other restrictive regulations of commerce (except, where necessary, those permitted under section B of chapter IV and under article 45) are eliminated with respect to substantially all the trade between the constituent territories of the union or at least with respect to substantially all the trade in products originating in such territories; and

(ii) subject to the provisions of paragraph 5, substantially the same duties and other regulations of commerce are applied by each of the members of the union to the trade of territories not included in the union;

(b) a free-trade area shall be understood to mean a group or two or more customs territories in which the duties and other restrictive regulations of commerce (except, where necessary, those permitted under section B of chapter IV and under article 45) are eliminated on substantially all the trade between the constituent territories in products originating in such territories.

5. The preferences referred to in paragraph 2 of article 16 shall not be affected by the formation of a customs union or of a free-trade area but may be eliminated or adjusted by means of negotiations with members affected. This procedure of negotiations with affected members shall, in particular, apply to the elimination of preferences required to conform with the provisions of paragraph 4 (a) (i) and paragraph 4 (b).

6. The Organization may, by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, approve proposals which do not fully comply with the requirements of the preceding paragraphs, provided that such proposals lead to the formation of a customs union or of a free-trade area in the sense of this article.

Article 45. General exceptions to chapter IV

1. Subject to the requirement that such measures are not applied in a manner which would constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination between member countries where the same conditions prevail, or a disguised restriction on international trade, nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent the adoption or enforcement by any member of measures—

(a) (i) necessary to protect public morals;

(ii) necessary to the enforcement of laws and regulations relating to public safety;

(iii) necessary to protect human, animal, or plant life or health;

(iv) relating to the importation or exportation of gold or silver;

(v) necessary to secure compliance with laws or regulations which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, including those relating to customs enforcement, the enforcement of monopolies operated under section D of this chapter, the protection of patents, trade marks, and copyrights, and the prevention of deceptive practices;

(vi) relating to the products of prison labor;

(vii) imposed for the protection of national treasures of artistic, historic, or archaeological value;

(viii) relating to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources if such measures are made effective in conjunction with restrictions on domestic production or consumption;

(ix) taken in pursuance of intergovernmental commodity agreements concluded in accordance with the provisions of chapter VI;

(x) taken in pursuance of any intergovernmental agreement which relates solely to the conservation of fisheries resources, migratory birds or wild animals and which is subject to the requirements of paragraph 1 (d) of article 70; or

(xi) involving restrictions on exports of domestic materials necessary to assure essential quantities of such materials to a domestic processing industry during periods when the domestic price of such materials is held below the world price as part of a governmental stabilization plan: *Provided*, That such restrictions shall not operate to increase the exports of or the protection afforded to such domestic industry and shall not depart from the provisions of this chapter relating to nondiscrimination;

(b) (i) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in general or local short supply: *Provided*, That any such measures shall be consistent with any general intergovernmental arrangements directed to an equitable international distribution of such products or, in the absence of such arrangements, with the principle that all members are entitled to an equitable share of the international supply of such products;

(ii) essential to the control of prices by a member country, experiencing shortages subsequent to the Second World War; or

(iii) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government of any member country, or of industries developed in any member country owing to the exigencies of the Second World War which it would be uneconomic to maintain in normal conditions: *Provided*, That such measures shall not be instituted by any member except after consultation with other interested members with a view to appropriate international action.

(2) Measures instituted or maintained under paragraph 1 (b) which are inconsistent with the other provisions of this chapter shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased, and in any event not later than at a date to be specified by the organization: *Provided*, That such date may be deferred for a further period or periods, with the concurrence of the organization, either generally or in relation to particular measures taken by members in respect of particular products.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, during my address yesterday, I read into the RECORD the complete platform record of the Democratic Party from 1856 to 1948, inclusive, on the tariff question. I now ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point the position of the Republican Party on tariffs from 1856 to 1948, inclusive, and a short tariff history of the United States.

There being no objection, the platform planks on tariffs of the Republican Party from 1856 to 1948, inclusive, and a short tariff history were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSITION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ON TARIFFS FROM 1856 TO 1948

1856 PLATFORM

No mention of tariffs.

1860 PLATFORM

Plank 12: "That, while providing revenue for the support of the general Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts, as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country."

1864 PLATFORM

No mention of tariffs.

1868 PLATFORM

No mention of tariffs.

1872 PLATFORM

Plank 7: "The annual revenue, after paying current expenditures, pensions, and the interest on the public debt, should furnish a moderate balance for the reduction of the principal, and that revenue, except so much as may be derived from a tax on tobacco and liquors, should be raised by duties upon importations, the details of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor, and promote the industries, prosperity, and growth of the whole country."

1876 PLATFORM

Plank 8: "The revenue necessary for current expenditures and the obligations of the public debt must be largely derived from

duties upon importations, which, so far as possible, should be adjusted to promote the interests of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country."

1880 PLATFORM

Plank 5: "We reaffirm the belief avowed in 1876, that the duties levied for the purpose of revenue should so discriminate as to favor American labor."

1884 PLATFORM

"We therefore demand that the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made, not 'for revenue only,' but that in raising the requisite revenues for the Government such duties shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor, as well as capital, may have its just reward, and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

"Against the so-called economic system of the Democratic Party, which would degrade our labor to the foreign standard, we enter our earnest protest."

1888 PLATFORM

Protection to American industries

We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction as proposed by the President and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests, except those of the usurer and the sheriff. We denounce the Mills bill as destructive to the general business, the labor, and the farming interests of the country, and we heartily endorse the consistent and patriotic action of the Republican Representatives in Congress in opposing its passage.

Duties on wool

We condemn the proposition of the Democratic Party to place wool on the free list, and we insist that the duties thereon shall be adjusted and maintained so as to furnish full and adequate protection to that industry throughout the United States.

The internal revenue

The Republican Party would effect all needed reduction of the national revenue by repealing the taxes upon tobacco, which are an annoyance and burden to agriculture, and the tax upon spirits used in the arts and for mechanical purposes, and by such revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which cannot be produced at home. If there shall still remain a larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the Government, we favor the entire repeal of internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system, at the joint behests of the whisky trusts and the agents of foreign manufacturers.

1892 PLATFORM

The principle of protection

We reaffirm the American doctrine of protection. We call attention to its growth abroad. We maintain that the prosperous condition of our country is largely due to the wise revenue legislation of the last Republican Congress. We believe that all articles which cannot be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty, and that on all imports coming into competition with products of American labor there should be levied duties equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

We assert that the prices of manufactured articles of general consumption have been reduced under the operations of the Tariff Act of 1890.

We denounce the efforts of the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives to destroy our tariff laws piecemeal, as manifested by their attacks upon wool, lead, and lead ores, the chief products of a number of States, and we ask the people for their judgment thereon.

Triumph of reciprocity

We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic Party to this practical business measure, and claim that, executed by a Republican administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

1896 PLATFORM

Tariff

We renew and emphasize our allegiance to the policy of protection as the bulwark of American industrial independence and the foundation of American development and prosperity. This true American policy taxes foreign products and encourages home industry; it puts the burden of revenue on foreign goods; it secures the American market for the American producer; it upholds the American standard of wages for the American workingman; it puts the factory by the side of the farm, and makes the American farmer less dependent on foreign demand and prices; it diffuses general thrift, and founds the strength of all on the strength of each. In its reasonable application it is just, fair to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism.

We denounce the present Democratic tariff as sectional, injurious to the public credit, and destructive to business enterprise. We demand such an equitable tariff on foreign imports which have come into competition with American products as will not only furnish adequate revenue for the necessary expenses of the Government, but will protect American labor from degradation to the wage level of other lands. We are not pledged to any particular schedules. The question of rates is a practical question to be governed by the conditions of time and of production; the ruling and uncompromising principle is the protection and development of American labor and industry. The country demands a right settlement, and then it wants rest.

Reciprocity

We believe the repeal of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity, and we demand their renewal and extension on such terms as will equalize our trade with other nations, remove the restrictions which now obstruct the sale of American products of our farms, forests, and factories.

Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished. Protection for what we produce; free admission for the necessaries of life which we do not produce; reciprocity agreements of mutual interests which gain open markets for us in return for our open market to others. Protection builds up domestic industry and trade, and secures our own market for ourselves; reciprocity builds up foreign trade, and finds an outlet for our surplus.

Sugar

We condemn the present administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican Party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than $100,000,000 annually.

Wool and woolens

To all our products—to those of the mine and the fields as well as to those of the shop and the factory; to hemp, to wool, the products of the great industry of sheep husbandry, as well as to the finished woolens of the mills—we promise the most ample protection.

Merchant marine

We favor restoring the American policy of discriminating duties for the upbuilding of our merchant marine and the protection of our shipping in the foreign-carrying trade, so that American ships—the product of American labor, employed in American shipyards, sailing under the Stars and Stripes, and manned, officered, and owned by Americans—may regain the carrying of our foreign commerce.

1900 PLATFORM

Protection policy reaffirmed

We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor. In that policy our industries have been established, diversified, and maintained. By protecting the home market, competition has been stimulated and production cheapened. Opportunity to the inventive genius of our people has been secured and wages in every department of labor maintained at high rates—higher now than ever before, and always distinguishing our working people in their better conditions of life from those of any competing country. Enjoying the blessings of the American common school, secure in the right of self-government, and protected in the occupancy of their own markets, their constantly increasing knowledge and skill have enabled them to finally enter the markets of the world.

Reciprocity favored

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

1904 PLATFORM

The protective tariff

Protection which guards and develops our industries is a cardinal policy of the Republican Party. The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

We insist upon the maintenance of the principles of protection, and, therefore, rates of duty should be readjusted only when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration, but this work cannot safely be committed to any other hands than those of the Republican Party. To entrust it to the Democratic Party is to invite disaster. Whether, as in 1892, the Democratic Party declares the protective tariff unconstitutional, or whether it demands tariff reform or tariff revision, its real object is always the destruction of the protective system.

However specious the name, the purpose is ever the same. A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity.

To a Republican Congress and a Republican President this great question can be safely entrusted. When the only free-trade country among the great nations agitates a return to protection, the chief protective country should not falter in maintaining it.

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

1908 PLATFORM

Tariff revision promised

The Republican Party declares unequivocally for a revision of the tariff by a special session of the Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President, and commends the steps already taken to this end in the work assigned to the appropriate committees of Congress, which are now investigating the operation and effect of these schedules. In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries. We favor establishment of a maximum and minimum rate to be administered by the President under the limitations fixed by the law, the maximum to be available to meet the discrimination by foreign countries against American goods entering our markets, and the minimum representing the normal measure of protection at home, the aim and the purpose of Republican policy being not only to preserve without excessive duties the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage workers of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system.

Philippine tariff

Between the United States and the Philippines we believe in a free interchange of products with such limitations as to sugar and tobacco as will afford adequate protection to domestic interests.

1912 PLATFORM

The tariff policy

We reaffirm our belief in a protective tariff. The Republican tariff policy has been of the greatest benefit to the country, developing our resources, diversifying our industries, and protecting our workingmen against competition with cheaper labor abroad, thus establishing for our wage earners the American standard of living. The protective tariff is so woven into the fabric of our industrial and agricultural life that to substitute for it a tariff for revenue only would destroy many industries and throw millions of our people out of employment. The products of the farm and of the mine should receive the same measure of protection as other products of American labor.

We hold that the import duties should be high enough, while yielding a sufficient revenue, to protect adequately American industries and wages. Some of the existing import duties are too high and should be reduced. Readjustment should be made from time to time to conform to changing conditions and to reduce excessive rates, but without injury to any American industry. To accomplish this correct information is indispensable. This information can best be obtained by an expert commission, as the large volume of useful facts contained in the recent reports of the Tariff Board has demonstrated.

Tariff board endorsed

The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of a tariff board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it. We condemn the Democratic Party for its failure either to provide funds for the continuance of this board or to make some other provision for securing the information requisite for intelligent tariff legislation. We protest against the Democratic method of legislating on these vitally important subjects without careful investigation.

We condemn the Democratic tariff bills passed by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress as sectional, as injurious to the public credit, and as destructive of business enterprise.

1916 PLATFORM

Tariff

The Republican Party stands now, as always, in the fullest sense for the policy of tariff protection to American industries and American labor and does not regard an antidumping provision as an adequate substitute.

Such protection should be reasonable in amount but sufficient to protect adequately American industries and American labor and so adjusted as to prevent undue exactions by monopolies or trust. It should, moreover, give special attention to securing the industrial independence of the United States as in the case of dyestuffs.

Through wise tariff and industrial legislation our industries can be so organized that they will become not only a commercial bulwark but a powerful aid to national defense.

The Underwood Tariff Act is a complete failure in every respect. Under its administration, imports have enormously increased in spite of the fact that intercourse with foreign countries has been largely cut off by reason of the war, while the revenues of which we stand in such dire need have been greatly reduced.

Under the normal conditions which prevailed prior to the war it was clearly demonstrated that this act deprived the American producer and the American wage earner of that protection which enabled them to meet their foreign competitors, and but for the adventitious conditions created by the war, would long since have paralyzed all forms of American industry and deprived American labor of its just reward.

It has not in the least degree reduced the cost of living, which has constantly advanced from the date of its enactment. The welfare of our people demands its repeal and the substitution of a measure which in peace as well as in war will produce ample revenue and give reasonable protection to all forms of American production in mine, forest, field, and factory.

We favor the creation of a tariff commission with complete power to gather and compile information for the use of Congress in all matters relating to the tariff.

1920 PLATFORM

International trade and tariff

The uncertain and unsettled condition of internal balances, the abnormal economic and trade situation of the world, and the impossibility of forecasting accurately even the near future, preclude the formulation of a definite program to meet conditions a year hence. But the Republican Party reaffirms its belief in the protective principle and pledges itself to a revision of the tariff as soon as conditions shall make it necessary for the preservation of the home market or American labor, agriculture, and industry.

1924 PLATFORM

The tariff

We affirm our belief in the protective tariff to extend needed protection to our productive industries. We believe in protection as a national policy with equal regard to all sections and to agriculture and industry. It is only by adherence to this policy that the interests of the consumers can be safeguarded and American agriculture, American labor, and American manufacturers be assured a return sufficient to perpetuate American standards of life.

A protective tariff is designed to support the high American economic level of life for the average family and to prevent a lowering to the levels of economic life prevailing in other lands. It is the history of the Nation that the protective system has ever justified itself by promoting industrial activity and employment, enormously increasing our purchasing power, restoring confidence, and bringing increased prosperity to all.

The tariff protection to our industry works for increased consumption of domestic agricultural products by an employed population instead of one unable to purchase the necessities of life. Without the strict maintenance of the tariff principle our farmers will need always to compete with cheap lands and cheap labor abroad, and with lower standards of living.

The enormous value of the protective principle has once more been demonstrated by the effects of the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921 and the Tariff Act of 1922.

We believe that the power of the President to decrease or increase any rate of duty in the tariff act furnishes a safeguard against excessive duties and against too low customs charges, and affords ample opportunity for tariff duties to be adjusted after a hearing that they may cover the actual differences in the cost of production in the United States and the principal competing countries of the world.

1928 PLATFORM

Tariff

We reaffirm our belief in the protective tariff as a fundamental and essential principle of the economic life of this Nation. While certain provisions of the present law require revision in the light of changes in the world competitive situation since its enactment, the record of the United States since 1922 clearly shows that the fundamental protective principle of the law has been fully justified. It has stimulated the development of our natural resources, provided fuller employment at higher wages through the promotion of industrial activity, assured thereby the continuance of the farmer's major market, and further raised the standards of living and general comfort and well-being of our people. The great expansion in the wealth of our Nation during the past 50 years, and particularly in the past decade, could not have been accomplished without a protective tariff system designed to promote the vital interests of all classes.

Nor have these manifest benefits been restricted to any particular section of the country. They are enjoyed throughout the land either directly or indirectly. Their stimulus has been felt in industries, farming sections, trade circles, and communities in every quarter. However, we realize that there are certain industries which cannot now successfully compete with foreign producers because of lower foreign wages and a lower cost of living abroad, and we pledge the next Republican Congress to an examination and where necessary a revision of these schedules to the end that American labor in these industries may again command the home market, may maintain its standard of living, and may count upon steady employment in its accustomed field.

Adherence to that policy is essential for the continued prosperity of the country. Under it the standard of living of the American people has been raised to the highest levels ever known. Its example has been eagerly followed by the rest of the world whose experts have repeatedly reported with approval the relationship of this policy to our prosperity, with the resultant emulation of that example by other nations.

A protective tariff is as vital to American agriculture as it is to American manufacturing. The Republican Party believes that the

home market, built up under the protective policy, belongs to the American farmer, and it pledges its support of legislation which will give this market to him to the full extent of his ability to supply it. Agriculture derives large benefits not only directly from the protective duties levied on competitive farm products of foreign origin but also, indirectly, from the increase in the purchasing power of the American workmen employed in industries similarly protected. These benefits extend also to persons engaged in trade, transportation, and other activities.

The Tariff Act of 1922 has justified itself in the expansion of our foreign trade during the past 5 years. Our domestic exports have increased from $3,800,000,000 in 1922 to $4,800,000,000 in 1927. During the same period imports have increased from $3,100,000,000 to $4,400,000,000. Contrary to the prophesies of its critics, the present tariff law has not hampered the natural growth in the exportation of the products of American agriculture, industry, and mining, nor has it restricted the importation of foreign commodities which this country can utilize without jeopardizing its economic structure.

The United States is the largest customer in the world today. If we were not prosperous and able to buy, the rest of the world also would suffer. It is inconceivable that American labor will ever consent to the abolition of protection, which would bring the American standard of living down to the level of that in Europe, or that the people in this country were curtailed and its market at home, if not destroyed, at least seriously impaired.

1932 PLATFORM

The tariff

The Republican Party has always been the stanch supporter of the American system of a protective tariff. It believes that the home market, built up under that policy, the greatest and richest market in the world, belongs first to American agriculture, industry, and labor. No pretext can justify the surrender of that market to such competition as would destroy our farms, mines, and factories, and lower the standard of living which we have established for our workers.

Because many foreign countries have recently abandoned the gold standard, as a result of which the costs of many commodities produced in such countries have, at least for the time being, fallen materially in terms of American currency, adequate tariff protection is today particularly essential to the welfare of the American people. The Tariff Commission should promptly investigate individual commodities so afflicted by currency depreciation, and report to the President any increase in duties found necessary to equalize domestic with foreign costs of production.

To fix the duties on some thousands of commodities, subject to highly complex conditions, is necessarily a difficult technical task. It is unavoidable that some of the rates established by legislation should, even at the time of their enactment, be too low or too high. Moreover, a subsequent change in costs or other conditions may render obsolete a rate that was before appropriate. The Republican Party has, therefore, long supported the policy of a flexible tariff, giving power to the President, after investigation by an impartial commission and in accordance with prescribed principles, to modify the rates named by the Congress.

We commend the President's veto of the measure, sponsored by Democratic Congressmen, which would have transferred from the President to the Congress the authority to put into effect the findings of the Tariff Commission. Approval of the measure would have returned tariff making to politics and destroyed the progress made during 10 years of effort to lift it out of logrolling methods. We pledge the Republican Party to a policy which will retain the gains made and enlarge the present scope of greater progress.

We favor the extension of the general Republican principle of tariff protection to our natural-resource industries, including the products of our farms, forests, mines, and oil wells, with compensatory duties on the manufactured and refined products thereof.

1936 PLATFORM

Tariff

Nearly 60 percent of all imports into the United States are now free of duty. The other 40 percent of imports compete directly with the product of our industry. We would keep on the free list all products not grown or produced in the United States in commercial quantities. As to all commodities that commercially compete with our farms, our forests, our mines, our fisheries, our oil wells, our labor, and our industries, sufficient protection should be maintained at all times to defend the American farmer and the American wage earner from the destructive competition emanating from the subsidies of foreign governments and the imports from low-wage and depreciated-currency countries.

We will repeal the present reciprocal-trade-agreement law. It is futile and dangerous. Its effect on agriculture and industry has been destructive. Its continuation would work to the detriment of the wage earner and farmer.

We will restore the principle of the flexible tariff in order to meet changing economic conditions here and abroad and broaden by careful definition the powers of the Tariff Commission in order to extend this policy along nonpartisan lines.

We will adjust tariffs with a view to promoting international trade, the stabilization of currencies, and the attainment of a proper balance between agriculture and industry.

We condemn the secret negotiation of reciprocal trade treaties without public hearing or legislative approval.

1940 PLATFORM

Tariff and reciprocal trade

We are threatened by unfair competition in world markets and by the invasion of our home markets, especially by the products of state-controlled foreign economies.

We believe in tariff protection for agriculture, labor, and industry, as essential to our American standard of living. The measure of the protection shall be determined by scientific methods with due regard to the interest of the consumer.

We shall explore every possibility of reopening the channels of international trade through negotiations so conducted as to produce genuine reciprocity and expand our exports.

We condemn the manner in which the so-called reciprocal trade agreements of the New Deal have been put into effect without adequate hearings, with undue haste, without proper consideration of our domestic producers, and without congressional approval. These defects we shall correct.

1944 PLATFORM

Foreign trade

We assure American farmers, livestock producers, workers, and industry that we will establish and maintain a fair protective tariff on competitive products so that the standards of living of our people shall not be impaired through the importation of commodities produced abroad by labor or producers functioning upon lower standards than our own.

If the postwar world is to be properly organized, a great extension of world trade will be necessary to repair the wastes of war and build an enduring peace. The Republican Party, always remembering that its primary obligation, which must be fulfilled, is to our own workers, our own farmers, and our own industry, pledges that it will join with others in leadership in every cooperative effort to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade. We will always bear in mind that the domestic market is America's greatest market and that tariffs which protect it against foreign competition should be modified only by reciprocal bilateral trade agreements approved by Congress.

1948 PLATFORM

At all times safeguarding our own industry and agriculture, and under efficient administrative procedures for the legitimate consideration of domestic needs, we shall support the system of reciprocal trade and encourage international commerce.

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN PLATFORM FOREIGN TRADE PLANK

1950

The Foreign Trade Plank: Excerpt from the Republican principles and objectives adopted on February 6, 1950, by the Republican National Committee, in cooperation with the Republican Policy Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C.

"We favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and we assert that this can be done within the Republican principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. A strong American economy is a vital factor for our security."

This is in line with the flexible import fee bill offered as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (the first part of the administration's three-part free trade program) in September of 1949—and is now in the Senate Finance Committee as a regular bill.

The foreign trade plank in the national Republican platform is also in accord with the resolutions passed in 1949 by the Nevada Republican State Executive Committee, the Nevada State Farm Bureau, and by the Ploche Union Local, No. 407, CIO, the White Pine County Central Labor Council, the Legislative Committee of Local Lodge 706 International Association of Machinists and the Property Owners Association of Clark County, State of Nevada, and the Washoe County Central Trades Council. Signed by Angus Cauble, president of the council and Harry Depoali, president of the Nevada State American Federation of Labor.

A SHORT TARIFF HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

I. DEFINITION OF TARIFFS

There are two basically different kinds of tariffs:

(a) Revenue tariffs.

(b) Protective tariffs.

A revenue tariff is one which is levied on imports with the objective of raising the maximum revenue for the support of the Government. To maximize revenue it is necessary to have large imports which require low tariff rates.

A protective tariff is one which is designed to protect domestic manufactures, or mining, or agriculture from imports from abroad. The more protective a tariff is, the more it will keep out imports. A tariff which is 100 percent protective will keep out all imports.

Hence, a completely protective tariff will yield no revenue to the Government since there will be no imports.

II. HISTORY OF UNITED STATES TARIFFS FROM 1780 TO 1949

A short survey of tariff history of the United States can be best described by dividing it into seven periods.

A. The period 1780 to 1789 (American Government under the Articles of Confederation).

B. The period 1789 to 1816 (interval from the establishment of the United States under the Constitution to the end of the War of 1812).

C. The period 1816 to 1861 (interval from the end of the War of 1812 to the beginning of the Civil War).

D. The period 1861 to 1913 (interval from the Civil War to Woodrow Wilson's free-trade program).

E. The period of 1913 to 1921 (interval of free-trade tariffs under Woodrow Wilson and the Democrats).

F. The period 1921 to 1934 (interval of protective tariffs under Republican administration).

G. The period 1934 to 1948 (interval of trade agreements and free trade).

The principal development during each of these seven periods will be described in order.

A. Confederation period, 1780-89

When the 13 American Colonies declared their independence from England, they formed a provisional Government in 1776 known as the Confederation Government which provided for a Continental Congress. The new Government operated under the Articles of Confederation which were finally ratified in 1781.

Under the Confederation Government, the individual States levied numerous tariffs, many of which were definitely protective tariffs.

During the period from 1780 to 1789 Pennsylvania enacted 15 tariff acts; Virginia, 12; Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland, 7 each; Connecticut, 6, and the other States a lesser number.

The tariffs levied in the Middle Atlantic and New England States were protective tariffs or for purposes of retaliation, while those of the Southern States were chiefly revenue tariffs.

B. Period from 1789 to 1816

With the establishment of the United States Government in 1789, control over foreign commerce was reserved to the Federal Government so that the individual States lost their power to levy import duties. The new Congress under the Constitution met for the first time on March 4, 1789, and its first act was to levy a tariff primarily for revenue purposes.

During the period from 1789 to 1816 numerous tariff acts were passed, but the first time a definite protective tariff system was passed was in 1816, after the close of the War of 1812. It was designed to protect the infant manufacturing industries that had sprung up during the war from a flood of cheap postwar manufactured products from England.

The revenue tariff passed in 1789 provided for import duties ranging from 5 percent to 15 percent, with no commodities on the free list. A 5-percent duty was levied on all commodities not otherwise enumerated.

From 1789 to the beginning of the War of 1812, Congress passed 13 tariff laws, raising duties on some commodities to secure higher revenues and placing other commodities on the free list.

The average level of tariffs from 1791 to 1812, found by dividing the duties collected by the value of the dutiable imports each year, ranged from 11.2 percent in 1795 to 37.2 percent in 1808. The level of tariffs for each year from 1791 to 1812 is as follows:

Rate of duty on dutiable imports

Year:	Percent
1791	15.34
1792	11.54
1793	14.68
1794	17.10
1795	11.21
1796	12.02
1797	15.60
1798	19.99
1799	19.70
1800	17.42
1801	16.61
1802	30.67
1803	20.52
1804	22.76
1805	19.19
1806	21.22
1807	20.09
1808	37.22
1809	18.80
1810	14.07
1811	35.62
1812	13.07

The average level of tariffs for the 10-year period from 1791 to 1800 was just under 15 percent (14.89 percent) while for the 10-year period 1801 to 1810 it was 21.4 percent.

It is of great interest to note that during the first two decades of the Republic the tariff level ranged from 15 to 21 percent, a period when tariffs were primarily for revenue and not for protection. This was the free-trade period in American tariff history. Yet last year, 1948, the average tariffs on dutiable imports were only 13.7 percent, an amount lower than during the first 25 years of our history. It can truly be said that today America is a free-trade country, with the lowest level of tariffs in its history, with tariffs lower than the revenue tariffs of 150 years ago.

C. Tariffs from 1816 to 1861

The 45-year period from 1816 to the Civil War in 1861 was marked by the inauguration of a protective-tariff system in 1816 just after the close of the War of 1812. Increasing protection was given manufactures for the next 15 to 20 years, after which the level of protective tariffs showed a downward trend to 1861.

The upward trend of protective tariffs to 1830 and the trend toward lower protective tariffs from 1830 to 1860 is indicated in the average tariff level by 10-year periods from 1810 to 1860. These were as follows:

Duties collected as a percent of the value of dutiable imports

10-year period:	Percent
1811–20	24.06
1821–30	37.47
1831–40	31.22
1841–50	27.01
1851–60	24.06

While protective tariffs when averaged for 10-year periods varied from a low of 24 percent to a high of 37 percent, the range for individual years was much greater. In 1830 the tariff level was 47.59 percent and was in excess of 40 percent for the years 1826, 1828, 1829, 1833, and 1835. For the 10 years ending in 1845, with the exception of 1 year, the tariff level was never less than 25 percent and never over 30 percent. From a level of 30 percent in 1845 the tariff declined gradually during the next 15 years to a level of only 19 and a fraction percent for the years 1859, 1860, and 1861. This was the lowest tariff level reached until 1920 when the Wilsonian free trade tariff took effect at the end of World War I.

The principal tariff acts passed between 1816 and 1861 were the acts of 1816, 1824, 1828, 1833, 1842, 1846, and 1857. The first three of these acts (1816, 1824, and 1828) raised tariffs and gave a high degree of protection to cotton and woolen goods and to some kinds of iron. In the tariff of 1828, for example, tariffs on woolen goods reached 100 percent ad valorem.

Beginning with the tariff act of 1833, protective duties were lowered in each successive tariff act with the exception of the 1842 act which raised tariffs for the 4-year period from 1842 to 1846. The Walker Tariff Act of 1846 and the Tariff Act of 1857 brought about substantial reductions in tariffs, the average tariff level falling from 29.2 percent in 1846 to 19.1 percent in 1851.

It was during the congressional battles over the tariff acts of 1828 and 1833 that the split between the South and the North over protective tariffs became acute, the South favoring tariffs for revenue only and the North favoring high tariffs to protect manufacturers who were rapidly expanding in the Northern States.

D. Tariffs from 1861 to 1913

The 53-year period from the beginning of the Civil War to the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson in 1913 was a period when the Republican Party was in power almost all of the time and when the tariffs were maintained consistently at a protectionist level. The annual level of the tariff by 10-year periods from 1860 to 1913 never fell below 40 percent and never rose much above 40 percent, although the level nearly reached 50 percent from 1898 to 1904. The average annual tariff level by decades during this period was as follows:

Tariff level (annual average)

10-year period:	Percent
1861–70	44.62
1871–80	41.95
1881–90	44.53
1891–1900	46.73
1901–10	45.20

During the Civil War period from 1861 to 1865 a series of tariff acts was passed, the net effect of which was to raise the level of tariffs from 19.1 percent in 1861 to 53.1 percent in 1865. Tariffs were raised for three reasons: To increase revenues to help finance the war; to provide additional protection for manufacturing; and to impose countervailing duties to equal the internal-revenue taxes levied on various manufactured products as a means of helping to finance the war.

During the first few years after the war ended in 1865 tariffs were lowered on various commodities, such as coffee, tea, sugar, spices, etc., but these were revenue tariffs. At the same time tariff duties on woolens and other manufactured goods of certain kinds were increased. The net effect was to maintain the protective-tariff general level above 40 percent, or over twice that when the war began.

The election of Grover Cleveland on the Democratic ticket in 1892 led to the passage of the Wilson Tariff Act—named for the Congressman who introduced the bill—in 1894. Some duties were reduced under the 1894 act, but the net effect on the general level of tariffs was slight.

When the Republicans came back into power with the election of McKinley in 1896, they quickly passed a new tariff act on July 24, 1897, known as the Dingley Act. This act provided for substantial increases in protective-tariff duties on many commodities so that for the next 7 years the average tariff level was about 50 percent. This was the peak level of protective tariffs for a seven-consecutive-year period throughout our entire history.

This 7-year period of high protective tariffs averaging about 50 percent came to an end with the year 1904. For this year the tariff level was 49 percent and gradually sank year by year to a level of 40 percent for the year 1913.

Brief mention should be made of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act passed in 1909 by the Republicans under President Taft. Both

major parties in the election of 1908 adopted a plank in their platform favoring a downward revision of the tariff. This Tariff Act provided for reductions in tariffs on 584 items and for increases on 300 items, many of which were on cotton goods of various types. The net effect of this tariff was to bring about a slight decrease in the tariff level from 1909 to 1913. The tariff level fell from 43 percent in 1909 to 40 percent in 1913.

E. Tariffs from 1913 to 1921

In the election campaign of 1912 the Republican Party came out boldly in its platform in favor of protective tariffs, while the Democratic Party platform came out flatly opposed to all protective tariffs and stated it believed in tariffs for revenue only. In fact, the Democratic platform went so far as to assert the following:

"We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue."

Because of the split in the Republican Party occasioned by Teddy Roosevelt's formation of the Bull Moose Party, the Democrats won the election and Woodrow Wilson became President on March 4, 1913.

The first thing Congress did after Wilson's inauguration was to take up the question of revision of the tariffs and on October 3, 1913, the Underwood Tariff Act was passed. The Underwood tariff reduced tariffs on many commodities and eliminated tariffs entirely on a large number of commodities, placing them on the free list.

Under the Underwood tariff the following commodities were deprived of all tariffs and placed on the free list: Raw wool; metals; agricultural products including live cattle, meats, wheat, corn, flax, tea, hemp; and numerous manufactures including boots, shoes, gunpowder, wood pulp, and print paper.

The full economic effects of these drastic reductions in tariffs could not be measured during the immediate years that followed because 9 months after the passage of the act, World War I broke out in Europe. The war greatly increased the demand for United States exports and greatly reduced imports from Europe at the same time that imports increased from other continents. But even so a pronounced drop in the tariff level occurred between 1914 and 1918 which became even greater in the 2 years following the war. The tariff level by years from 1913 to 1920 was as follows:

	Percent
1913	40.1
1914	37.6
1915	33.4
1916	30.7
1917	27.2
1918	24.4
1919	21.3
1920	16.4

These levels of tariff just described are the ratio between the value of duties collected and the value of all dutiable imports. If the value of imports on the free list are included, the tariff level for 1921 was only 6.4 percent compared with 17.7 percent for 1913.

It is of interest to note that the level of protective tariffs fell over 50 percent in 5 years and fell 33 percent during the 2-year period 1918 to 1920. It is also significant to note that a slump in prices and widespread unemployment accompanied these rapid reductions in protective tariffs.

So disastrous had become the fall in prices and unemployment in 1920, particularly the fall in agricultural prices, that an emergency tariff was rushed through May 28, 1921. The return of the Republican Party to power in the Presidential election in November 1920, paved the way for new tariff legislation providing for adequate protective tariffs.

F. Tariffs from 1921 to 1934

During the 14-year period from 1921 to 1934 three important tariff acts were passed; the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921, the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, and the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930.

The Emergency Tariff Act of 1921

The Emergency Tariff Act of 1921 was rushed through primarily for three reasons. In the first place, it was to satisfy the widespread demand of American farmers for protection from imports of foreign agricultural products. In the second place, it was to prevent the dumping of foreign-produced goods in the United States at prices below the foreigners' cost of production. Finally, in the third place, it was to provide for the protection of American producers against the devaluation of foreign currencies, a device which was widespread after World War I as a means of circumventing protective tariffs of other countries.

The tremendous slump in farm prices following loss of foreign markets threatened the American farmer with competition from foreign agricultural producers and was the principal reason for rushing through the tariff legislation in 1921. Protective duties were levied on imports of wheat, flaxseed, corn, beans, peanuts, potatoes, onions, rice, peanut, cottonseed and soya bean oils, cattle, sheep, and fresh or frozen meats. The import duty levied on wheat was 35 cents per bushel, on corn 15 cents per bushel, on potatoes 25 cents per bushel, on beans 2 cents per pound, and sheep $2 per head, on fresh or frozen meats 2 cents per pound, on peanuts 3 cents per pound, on rice 2 cents per pound, on cattle 30 percent ad valorem, and meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for, 25 percent ad valorem. Protective duties were also levied on cotton, wool, sugar, butter, cheese, milk, tobacco, apples, cherries, and other products.

The Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922

The Emergency Act of 1921 was superseded the following year by the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922.

Since the passage of the Underwood Tariff Act in 1913 drastic changes in the economic conditions in the United States and other countries had occurred as a result of World War I and the conditions which followed the war. These changes in conditions in world production and trade required a reappraisal of American tariff policy. In general the tariff adjustments of 1922 took the form of higher duties. The enactment of higher import duties in 1922 may be attributed to the following five causes:

1. Fear of excessive imports following the cessation of hostilities and the return to more normal conditions.

2. The demand for higher duties by a number of industries, especially chemical and mineral, newly created or greatly expanded as a result of the extraordinary demands made upon them by the shutting off of foreign sources of supply during the war.

3. The increased competition encountered by staple agricultural products resulting from overproduction in domestic areas under the stimulus of war conditions and the return to production of low-cost areas developed during the war as well as by the return to production in various war areas.

4. The demand that industries producing material essential to war be encouraged.

5. Changes in economic conditions resulting from depreciation of currency in many European countries and from the depression of 1921.

The professed general objective of the 1922 Tariff Act was to restore import duties to approximately the level prevailing before the Underwood Tariff Act of 1913. In the majority of schedules this was actually done although in individual cases duties were lowered while in other cases they were raised above the 1913 level. For example, duties were raised on chemicals, oils, and paints from 22 to 29 percent ad valorem, on metals and manufactures of metals from 24 to 33 percent ad valorem, and on wood and manufactures of wood from 13 to 24 percent. On the other hand, import duties on tobacco and manufactures of tobacco were reduced from 83 to 54 percent, while duties on spirits, wines, and other beverages were reduced from 90 to 39 percent ad valorem. The net effect of all the changes can be seen by comparing the ad valorem rate of duty on dutiable imports for the year 1914 and the year 1926, 4 years after the passage of the act. In 1926 import duties collected averaged 39 percent of the value of all dutiable imports compared with 38 percent for the year 1914. For the entire period from the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Act, September 22, 1922, to the passage of the Hawley-Smoot law, June 18, 1930, the average import duties were 38.5 percent of the value of all dutiable imports.

Under the Payne-Aldrich tariff from 1909 to 1913 import duties were 40.8 percent of the value of dutiable imports. Hence, it will be seen that the protective tariffs under the Republicans during the decade following World War I were lower than the tariffs prior to the First World War. Furthermore, during the decade of the 1920's a larger percent of our imports came in free of any duties than during the prewar period, 1909 to 1913. During the decade of the 1920's 64 percent of all our imports came in free of duty while only 53 percent of all imports came in free of duty during the period 1909 to 1913.

Flexible Tariff Provisions

The Tariff Act of 1922 also provided, in section 315, for a system of flexible tariffs in order to equalize foreign and domestic costs of production. The President was authorized to increase or decrease existing rates of duties by not more than 50 percent after investigation by the Tariff Commission. Very few changes, however, were made under this authorization prior to 1934 and, in these cases where the President exerted his power, it was usually to raise duties.

Another important provision of the act of 1922 was that contained in section 316, which provided for additional duties, or in extreme cases, that imports might be completely prohibited, if a foreign country engaged in unfair competition.

The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930

The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 was passed primarily in order to provide still greater protection for the American farmer against competitive imports of oil, fats, dairy products, hides, skins, and numerous other agricultural products. The purpose was to preserve the home market in these commodities for the American farmer. Furthermore, certain other industries were experiencing increased competition from imports of foreign goods and demanded more protection. Some increases in import duties on industrial products were, also, made to compensate for the higher duties upon raw materials which were provided by the 1930 act.

The net effect of the various tariff changes in the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act was to raise the average import-duty level over the 1922 act from 38 percent to 41 percent ad valorem. Since, however, the period from 1930 through 1933 was one of depression and declining prices and, since many duties were specific, the net effect was to raise the average level of tariffs considerably above 41 percent. The average amount of import duties collected as a percentage of the value of all dutiable imports reached 59.1 percent for the year 1932, but by 1935, as prices rose, had dropped back to 42.9 percent.

The Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930 continued the flexible tariff provisions of the 1922 act, which authorized the President to increase or decrease the duties by as much as 50 percent on recommendation of the Tariff Commission. One change was made, however,

The power of the Tariff Commission was strengthened and the President was no longer given the power to alter the actual rate recommended.

The Revenue Acts of 1932 and 1934

In 1932 an amendment was attached to a revenue act providing for the imposition of duties on petroleum, petroleum products, coal, lumber, and copper. In 1934 similar action was taken with respect to whale and fish oils. These new duties were classed as import taxes and were not considered as import duties subject to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Conclusions, 1920–34 Period

In conclusion, it may be stated that the level of protective tariffs under the Republicans from 1922 to 1930 was slightly lower than the level which prevailed from 1880 to 1913. Under the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930 the level of tariff rates was slightly increased but the actual effect was a substantial temporary increase in the tariff level because of the rapid fall in prices from 1930 to 1933. With the return of rising prices, which began in 1932, the protective-tariff level started to decline and in 1936 fell to 39.2 percent. This is a level approximately equal to that during the 1920's under the Fordney-McCumber Act. Not enough trade agreements had been signed by 1936 under the terms of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to noticeably affect the tariff level. During 1934 and 1935 only nine trade agreements had been signed and in every case but one were with small countries such as Belgium, Cuba, Haiti, and Honduras.

G. Tariffs from 1934 to 1949

Despite the fact that there have been no new tariff acts since the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Act in 1930, we must regard the period from June 1934 to the present as a separate one in the tariff history of the United States. On the 12th of June 1934 Congress passed an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, the so-called Trade Agreements Act. With this amendment Congress authorized the President to negotiate and enter into foreign-trade agreements. To give the President bargaining power he was authorized to raise or lower tariffs a maximum of 50 percent of the rates of the Tariff Act of 1930. The ostensible reason for surrendering the legislative function in regard to making tariffs was the desire to assist in the then existing emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic employment and the present economic depression, etc.

In advocating this means of reducing tariffs, the Roosevelt administration lived up to its commitments in the Democratic Party platform of the 1932 election, when the party had pledged reduction of tariffs. The act had been passed primarily as an emergency measure, and under the terms of the act its duration was to be 3 years. However, under this authority the administration reduced tariffs to the lowest level in United States history, and several extensions of the act continued it far beyond the point when it could have had any justification as an emergency measure. In 1937 and 1940 the act was extended for 3 years each, and in 1943 for 2 years only. In 1945 it was extended for another 3 years, and the President was again entitled to raise or lower the rates of duty by a maximum of 50 percent of the rates in force on January 1, 1945. In other words, those products which had suffered a reduction by 50 percent of the rate under the 1930 act by virtue of the first Trade Agreements Act, could again be affected by a further reduction of 50 percent. Thus, on a good number of products the reduction of duties reached 75 percent of the rates provided for under the Tariff Act of 1930. In 1948 the Trade Agreements Act was continued for 1 year only, with a few changes, the most important being the provision for peril-point studies by the Tariff Commission.

Under the Trade Agreements Act trade agreements with 42 nations are in effect today. Twenty-three of these agreements were negotiated in one great tariff-cutting festival at Geneva, Switzerland, where 23 nations bartered and horse-traded with each other for tariff reductions.

At the present time in Annecy, France, the GATT nations have again met to discuss the results of the first Geneva agreements on tariffs and trade, and to negotiate with 13 more nations on further tariff cuts.

The agreements entered into under the Trade Agreements Act are executive agreements and as such are not subject to congressional approval. The function of legislating on tariffs was surrendered to the President under the 1934 act.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point excerpts from a press dispatch appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of May 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In his attack on the legislation, MALONE denounced the reciprocal trade agreements as "farcical" and "delusionary." He said American living standards are threatened by tariff reductions negotiated by the State Department, which are opening United States markets to sweatshop labor in Europe and Asia.

SEES PROSPERITY PERILED

"Unaccustomed as the Senate has become to dealing with national issues within the legal and ethical framework of our Constitution," he said, "I cannot refrain from making a plea on behalf of the citizens of the United States—the 150,000,000 people who look to us to safeguard their welfare and who make the sacrifices incident to supporting their Federal Government and activities.

"I am well aware that it has become naive to concern oneself with the plight of the American workingman and the American taxpayer, just as it has become naive to place the interests of America anywhere but at the bottom of the international donation list. But my conscience will not permit me to remain silent when the strength and prosperity of America are in jeopardy," MALONE said.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD a Washington Times-Herald dispatch of Tuesday, May 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE DEPICTS HOW TRADE PACTS HURT BUSINESSES

(By William Strand)

The effects of New Deal tariff policies on American industry were pointedly illustrated yesterday on the Senate floor by Senator MALONE, Republican, of Nevada.

The Senator barged into the Senate bearing a pair of household sewing machines. He plunked them on his desk beside copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a stack of notes and other documents.

Then he began speaking against legislation before the Chamber, calling for a 2-year extension of the administration's reciprocal trade-agreements program.

LABOR COST DIFFERENCE

Both the sewing machines were table models. Both were electrical. Both were of a size and shape familiar in American homes for more than a generation. One was made in America, said MALONE.

It cost a dealer $86.25. Its retail selling price was $109.95. The other was made in Japan, MALONE continued. It cost an importer slightly more than $20. After it reached this country, a motor, a light, and a carrying case were added, bringing the total cost to a wholesaler or jobber to approximately $27.

This machine, the Senator said, sold at retail last Friday for $77.50. The difference was in the cost of labor which went into the manufacture of each of the machines, MALONE asserted.

The workingman who built the Jap machine, he said, was paid 12 cents an hour. The American who produced the similar machine in this country got an average of $1.75 per hour.

When the two machines reached the retail market, he emphasized, they competed on an equal footing for an American purchaser.

"Congress must decide whether it wants to maintain our American standard of living or continue the present administration's foreign trade," the Senator declared.

STANDARDS THREATENED

"Our present standard of living is seriously threatened by foreign sweatshop labor competition, permitted and encouraged by this legislation. It is idiocy to say that we can compete with foreign, low-wage markets on a free trade basis without lowering our own standards.

The competition from abroad being offered the United States sewing machine industry, MALONE charged, is merely one example of how the reciprocal trade agreements have laid a heavy hand on 8,000 American enterprises.

He said the program, dating from 1934, represents an attempt to promote world trade at the expense of American labor.

"Any one-economic-world plan will bring about a leveling of conditions of employment everywhere," MALONE told his colleagues.

"Leveling in this form means the lowering of American standards which are traditionally the highest in the world."

TARIFFS BELOW PERIL POINT NOW

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, our tariffs and import fees, as explained by the junior Senator from Nevada, are already generally substantially below the so-called peril point after 18 years of tampering by an incompetent State Department having no sense of the delicate balance between the markets and wages and investments.

The tariff or import fee levied upon cheap foreign labor goods, to provide a fair and reasonable competitive price level, goes into the United States Treasury and can be utilized to reduce the national debt, for the current operating expenses of the Government, or to lower taxes.

So there we have a twofold purpose. The real purpose is to provide fair and reasonable competitive bases, and to provide markets for all the goods of the world in the United States of America on that principle. The secondary effect would be that a considerable amount of money would be collected for the United States Treasury.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may ask unanimous consent to be excused from the session of the Senate for an hour?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is the fairest imaginable levy since the source of such imports is largely the foreign countries where industrial plants have been financed by the American taxpayers through the Marshall plan, or the point 4 program.

The tariff or import fee will render the continued use of sweat-shop labor unprofitable, and thus foreign living standards may begin to rise.

Foreign nations must be encouraged to create their own markets through gradually raising their own low-wage standard of living—just as has been done in this country.

Families existing upon 50 cents to $2.50 or $3 per day are not in the market for radios, washing machines, refrigerators, electric appliances, and automobiles. One American worker who can be protected by that fair and reasonable principle is in the market for more goods than 50 such families in low-wage countries.

The State Department's free-trade program not only encourages the nations to hold their wages down to undersell like products in this country, but through opening our market wide to them without any equalizer of the wide differential between the living standard wages here and abroad the result can only be a substantial lowering of our own hard-earned standards.

No workingman in this Nation has ever objected, or no investor in this Nation has ever objected to competing on an even basis with any country where the prevailing wages are approximately the same.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the material upon which are based the tables which have been utilized in the debate, numbered 1, on the left, and No. 2 and No. 3, in the back of the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been informed that charts cannot be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MALONE. There is no request, Mr. President, to have the charts included. I simply ask that the material upon which tables Nos. 1, 2, and 3, are based may be printed in the RECORD, without the charts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TABLE I.—*Comparative hourly earnings of employees in manufacturing for certain foreign countries and the United States—last quarter, 1949 (converted into dollars)*

Country	Hourly earnings	Percentage of United States
United States	$1.41	100
Canada	.92	65
Australia	.60	43
United Kingdom	.39	28
Germany	.29	21
France	.21	15
Japan	[1].12	9

[1] Computed on basis of 8-hour day, from reported daily earnings of $0.97.

Source: Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, Statistical Office of United Nations (data based on International Labor Office information).

TABLE II.—*Hourly wage rates applicable to production in United States and foreign countries, selected from briefs submitted by industry members of the American Tariff League before CRI, 1950*

Country	Item or work involved	Foreign wage rate	United States wage rate	Percentage of foreign to United States rate
United Kingdom	Lithographic products	$0.52	$2.44	0.21
	Vitrified chinaware	.50	1.35	.22
	Hand-made glassware	[1].39	[2] 1.75	.22
	Bicycles	.34	1.75	.20
	Sporting arms and firearms	.50	1.50	.33
	Clocks and watches	.36	1.46	.25
	Wool textiles	.35	1.32	.27
	Plastic dolls, plastics	[3] 12.00	[3] 55.00	.22
	Pottery	.40	1.40	.29
	Rayon industry	[3] 17.36	[3] 57.60	.30
	Stone and quarry	[3] 14.46	[3] 70.00–80.00	.21–.18
	Leather glove industry	[4].33	[4] 1.60	.21
	do	[5].20	[5].92	.22
	Chemicals and allied industries	[6].48	1.30	.37
	do	7.33	1.57	.21
Canada	do	[8] 1.01	1.30	.78
	Aluminum industry	[9].90	1.59	.57
	Lead mining	[10] 1.20	1.56	.77
	Mechanical and electrical industries	1.91	1.37	.66
France	Chemical industry	.28–.80	1.57	.18–.51
	Mechanical and electrical industries	.29	1.44	.20
	Leav. lace industry, weaving and other	.19–.28	.81–1.60	.23–.17
	Sporting arms and firearms	[1].39–.39	1.50	.24–.26
	Vitrified chinaware	.26	1.35	.19
	Scientific instruments	.34	1.40–2.50	.24–.14
French Morocco	Lead mining	.12	1.56	.08
Japan	Clocks and watches	.14	1.46	.09
	Wool textiles	[11].10	1.32	.08
	Vitrified chinaware	.10	1.35	.07
	Pottery	.09	1.40	.06
	Scientific instruments	.12	1.50	.08
Australia	Lead mining	1.10–1.25	1.56	.71–.80
Germany	Chemical industry	.28–.83	1.57	.18–.53
	Mechanical and electrical industry	.35	1.37	.26
	Clocks and watches	.23	1.46	.16
	Pottery	.30	1.40	.21
	Scientific instruments	.29	1.50	.19
Italy	do	[3].27	[3] 1.40–2.50	.19–.11
	Pottery	.20	1.40	.14
	Stone and quarry	[3] 11.21	[3] 70.00–80.00	.16–.14
	Vitrified chinaware	.23	1.35	.17
	Chemical industry	.26–.56	1.57	.17–.36
Belgium	Sporting arms and firearms	[12].60	1.50	.40
	Vitrified chinaware	.28	1.35	.21
Sweden	Stone and quarry	[13] 17.76	70.00–80.00	.25–.22
Switzerland	Clocks and watches	.56	1.46	.38
Czechoslovakia	Vitrified chinaware	.20	1.35	.15
	Hand-made glassware	.36	1.75	.21
Peru	Lead mining	[10].07–.09	1.56	.04–.06
Bolivia	do	[10].07–.09	1.56	.04–.06
Mexico	do	[10].30	1.56	.19
Turkey	Fig industry	[14] 2.00	[15] 20.00	.10
South Africa	Lead mining	.06–.10	1.56	.04–.06

[1] Before devaluation. Includes skilled and unskilled labor.
[2] Includes skilled labor only.
[3] Weekly wage.
[4] Male workers.
[5] Female.
[6] Based on weekly wage of $21.07 for 44-hour week.
[7] Wage data submitted by different source.
[8] Includes overtime and 44-hour week.
[9] After devaluation. Data submitted before the U. S. Tariff Commission, March 1950.
[10] Data submitted before U. S. Tariff Commission, May 1950.
[11] Highest rate paid.
[12] Estimated.
[13] Highest rate in Europe.
[14] Per diem.
[15] Per diem up to $20.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this country was built upon the resources of freemen. The problem is an exchange of goods with other countries. The impact on our own people is not yet felt in all its destructive force, for two reasons:

One. We are still in the process of arming the mendicant labor of the world with our industrial machinery.

Two. We are bolstering our economy with subsidies paid to producers lacking adequate markets—and emergency contracts for war and other materials.

The industrial machinery for foreign countries, the subsidies bolstering sagging markets, and the emergency contracts are all being financed through so-called deficit financing and exorbitant taxes.

Mr. President, the tariff or import fee is simply a method of evening or compensating for any differential in the cost and productiveness of an hour's labor—as between this country and where the foreign competitor is located—so that an hour's labor here may be traded for an hour's labor in a foreign country without loss or gain to either nation, where the trade is a natural trade and assists both countries. That comes about naturally, Mr. President, when individuals of each nation buy and sell.

Mr. President, it makes no sense to raise the taxes of the people of America or indulge in deficit financing, through the selling of bonds to our people, to force trade, beyond the normal rate. Under present principles we are furnishing countries the money with which to buy our products on the theory that they will get so used to it that they will

continue to do it even after we quit furnishing the money. We are forcing trade beyond the normal trade that comes about anyway between two areas of complementary economies. The present method of forcing artificial trade, is like two barbers in the same block trying to make a living shaving each other.

Mr. President, of course there would be no tariff on imports of goods not produced here. No one proposes anything of that kind. The only ones who do that are the foreign nations themselves who raise tariffs for revenue only, just as the Central American countries and Mexico are doing at this time, and just the same as England and many of the nations of Europe are doing. If anyone wants to know how that operates, all that is necessary is to ask someone who is trying to import his automobile into England or into some other country when he wants to take up residence there.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered substitutes a fair and reasonable competitive principle in place of a sharpshooting method which has been employed for 18 long years, and which it is now proposed be continued for 2 years, in the hands of a thoroughly discredited State Department, and industrially inexperienced State Department.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE's speech,

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the able Senator from Nevada that I am sorry I have not been able to be present to listen to a great part of his able address because of my attendance on the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, sitting jointly but I have listened to enough of his speech to know the patriotic motives which inspire him. While not agreeing with all his statements, I certainly pay my tribute to his persistence, his industry, and the completeness with which he is championing the cause. I think it has had a very beneficial effect.

I should like to make a brief statement, and, in order not to interrupt the Senator's remarks, I should be glad to have my statement appear at some other point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that this bill embodies a workable method for promoting the advantage which comes to us from a sound international trade and at the same time for protecting our own essential industries from unfair and destructive competition.

While healthy international trade is a good thing which raises the standard of living, gives markets for Americans who produce goods for sale abroad, and enables foreign nations to pay their own way instead of being dependent on our own Treasury, there is also no doubt that it should not be conducted in such a way as to injure our national defense by crippling those industries on whose output the defense effort vitally depends, that it should not be conducted unjustly and that it is certainly not fair for a few American industries to carry the whole load of expense occasioned by foreign imports.

In international trade, the rules of justice and reason should apply. If it is good to reduce trade barriers in one part of the world, it is certainly a good thing to reduce them in other parts. If sweatshops are bad at home, as they certainly are, then they are bad abroad. If prevention of monopoly and encouragement of competition is a good thing at home, as we Americans know it to be, then it must be a good principle to encourage abroad.

The pending legislation seems to me designed to promote a sound foreign trade, making it possible for the United States to get the benefits of such a trade without its dangers. Of course, the administration of these laws, no matter how good the laws may be, is another matter. But I believe the pending bill to be workable and meritorious, and I intend to vote for it.

I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would regret it if the junior Senator from Massachusetts should leave the floor at this time without hearing my remarks.

Mr. LODGE. The hearing in which I am engaged is about to begin. There are two sessions a day. I shall remain for a few minutes.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator's statement is one of the greatest statements on both sides of a very important question that I have ever listened to.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator wants to be fair, I know. My statement is not on both sides at all; it is on the American side.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will listen, I will tell him why. It is impossible to protect an industry if we are going to lower the tariffs and import fees below a fair and reasonable basis and allow cheap foreign products to come in, because no human being can gage how much a tariff could be lowered without destroying the industry involved. If the distinguished Senator has not consulted firms in his own State, let me say that I know, from 15 years experience in the industrial engineering business, dealing with such firms, the businesses included in the top 10 percent are the ones which make a profit. The others merely carry the load. If we cut off that 10 percent, we destroy the industry. There is no such thing as the Secretary of State, with no experience, with no one under him having had any actual practical industrial experience, being able to determine how he can lower a tariff and not injure industry and throw men out of work.

Mr. LODGE. Permit me to say, in reply, that I agree that tariffs should never be reduced below the point which is essential to keep the industries going in a prosperous way. It is my understanding that the bill contains a peril-point amendment.

Let me say in connection with industries and with labor in my own State, that I am in close contact with many of them, and they are in support of the pending bill, because they think it will give them the protection which the Senator and I both want them to have.

Mr. MALONE. I am also in close touch with industries, and they are in favor of the amendments reported, because they are told that is all they can get.

I want to say for the benefit of the Senator that the peril point is a delusion, because tariffs are already below the peril point, at least those which have been acted upon through any one of the three conferences starting with Geneva and ending in Torquay. The peril point does not apply.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to my able friend that I assume that the people who communicate with me know how to read the English language, and that they have reached the conclusion to support the bill on a basis of free will, and they sincerely want me to support the bill.

Mr. MALONE. I have no more comments on the correspondence of the distinguished Senator, but I say, categorically, that there is nothing in this bill that directs the President or the Secretary of State to do anything. The policy is already well founded; it is embedded in the heart of this administration, as the Senator well knows. It is to divide the markets, just as the Senator said in his very well-written statement. I did not misunderstand him when he said we would divide the markets, in effect, to such a point that nations could sell enough goods to support themselves and carry their own weight so we would not have to give them any more money. There is one paragraph which says just that.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS RELATING TO MILITARY SITUATION IN FAR EAST

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE's speech,

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported favorably, without amendment Senate Resolution 138, submitted by Mr. RUSSELL on May 7, 1951, which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 2,000 additional copies of part 1 and of each subsequent part of the joint hearings held before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, relative to the Military Situation in the Far East, be printed for the use of said committees.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, House bill 3939, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3939) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill relates solely to the procedure with respect to tele-

phone and telegraph service of the House of Representatives. It has nothing to do with the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3939).

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to emphasize the observation made by the distinguished chairman of the committee that this bill is for the benefit of House Members and does not relate to Senate Members. I have no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. What amount of money is involved?

Mr. HAYDEN. It increases the telephone allowance in the House from $500 to $700 a year, and contains some other provisions, but they are all House provisions, and have nothing to do with Senate business. It is merely a matter of courtesy to the House for the Senate to pass the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The allowance deals with messages in the territory of a Representative in Congress which do not issue from the exchange here, and for which evidence in the way of bills must be offered in support of the fact that the messages are necessary in connection with official business done away from Washington. The bill provides for increase in the allowance authorization already made?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3939) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPROPRIATE CEREMONY IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL IN HONOR OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, House Concurrent Resolution 100, and I request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (H. Con. Res. 100) to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the resolution carries no expense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 100) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee, composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare plans for and to hold an appropriate ceremony in honor of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent many years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States and died as the result of a fall while working on the Rotunda frieze, his last assignment in the Capitol. Such ceremony shall be held in the Rotunda of the Capitol on July 26, 1951, the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, or on such other day as the committee herein provided for may designate. The committee shall extend invitations to attend the ceremony to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Ambassador of Italy, and such other public officials and persons in private life as the committee may select.

PAYMENT OF WITNESSES SUMMONED BEFORE THE SENATE OR ITS COMMITTEES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably an original resolution, and I request its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 144) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the rule for paying witnesses summoned to appear before the Senate or any of its committees shall be as follows: For each day a witness shall attend, not to exceed $9, and not to exceed $9 for each day spent in traveling to or from the place of examination by the usual route. A witness shall also be entitled to be reimbursed his necessary expenses for traveling to and from the place of examination, in no case to exceed the sum of 7 cents a mile for the distance by him actually traveled for the purpose of appearing as a witness.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the resolution provides for an increase in the sum paid witnesses summoned by Senate committees from $3 to $9 a day, which is the standard amount paid witnesses.

I might state before the resolution is considered that last year we paid out $613 to witnesses summoned to testify before Senate committees. That was on the basis of a per diem of $3 per day. But the usual per diem paid other Government witnesses is $9. If the amount were to be increased so the witnesses were to be paid the customary rates, it would result in an expense of probably $1,800 a year to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to observe in connection with the resolution that some 4 or 4½ years ago I recommended a similar change, because I felt it was absurd to bring witnesses here and pay them $3 a day and have them lose their time. They cannot live on $3 a day. Such a change should have gone into effect a long time ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 144) was considered and agreed to.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me so I may introduce several bills?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield, Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor thereby, and that the matters presented by the Senator may appear at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and for all the other members of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, namely, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference four bills, the purpose of which is to carry out in part the recommendations made in the third interim report of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the bills introduced by Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. WILEY) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 1529. A bill to require the keeping of more detailed records and the furnishing of additional information by certain persons for income-tax purposes;

S. 1530. A bill to establish a 2-year period of validity for basic permits issued under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act;

S. 1531. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for the preservation of records and for other purposes; and

S. 1532. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on the very day when the committee entered upon its extended term, May 1, we took steps to have drafted a number of legislative proposals in exact accordance with the recommendations of the committee. The legislative council of the Senate was formally requested to cooperate with our committee and its staff, and such cooperation was given immediately and effectively.

Drafts of the various proposals were submitted and received the study of members of the committee and our counsel. After this additional study was completed and revisions made, it was decided to submit them to the Attorney General of the United States with our request that comments and recommendations be given by the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice has been most helpful and cooperative. Headed

by its able Deputy Attorney General Peyton Ford, a staff of attorneys in the Department made a most thorough analysis of the proposals, and has submitted detailed statements upon each of the proposed measures. The Senate committee reviewed these comments and recommendations, and unanimously decided upon the drafts that have been submitted at this time.

Before commenting on the specific details of the bills now being introduced, I wish to state that work is proceeding on the remaining legislative proposals which we expect to introduce in the near future. These matters are of a more involved nature and, while extensive study has already been given to them, the drafts are being given further careful consideration in order to bring them into exact conformity with the committee's recommendations and at the same time avoid unnecessary conflict with other statutes and administrative procedures.

EXPLANATION OF BILLS NOW BEING INTRODUCED

The committee has explored the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code with great care, and has found several points at which it feels the impact of the Federal tax laws on illegal gambling and similar illegal activities can be sharpened. Three of the bills submitted today concern these points.

First, the committee has been much impressed with loopholes in the present law relating to deductions from gross income, which make it possible for persons engaged in illegal gambling enterprises to deduct expenses, often on the same basis as those who are engaged in lawful trades and businesses. Accordingly section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code would be clarified in a proposed amendment so as to make it perfectly clear that no expense attributable to any illegal wagering transaction shall be allowable as a deduction. Consistently with this change, the committee has also proposed to change section 23 (h) which now allows taxpayers to deduct the amount of their losses from any gambling winnings reported as income, so as to prohibit the deduction of any loss incurred in illegal wagering.

Second, the committee feels that a precise attack should be made on the special problem raised by the accounts and records of professional gambling establishments, which handle large amounts of cash and are, for this reason, peculiarly able to conceal income and distort their reports. Accordingly, another amendment to section 54 of the Code has been prepared to require the operators of such establishments to report—on an annual basis—daily summaries of their gains and losses. In the case of operators who are violating local laws and are, therefore, even more apt to conceal or falsify, the amendment requires records of every separate wagering transaction. The committee feels that this amendment should be supported by a severe penalty provision, and a fine of $10,000 with imprisonment up to 2 years has therefore been specified.

The third proposal relates to records required to be kept by taxpayers. At the present time law-enforcement officers are seriously handicapped by the failure of gamblers and other illegal operators to keep adequate records and accounts. An amendment to section 54 of the Internal Revenue Code has therefore been prepared which will impose a definite statutory obligation upon all taxpayers to keep records for a period of 7 years. It should be noted that with respect to the ordinary taxpayer this statutory requirement is closely in accord with the present regulations which impose a duty to keep records so long as they may be relevant in any tax matter—that is, a period of more than 6 years. The new requirement would be enforced by the penalty provisions of section 145 which make any breach thereof a misdemeanor and any breach arising out of willful attempt to evade taxation a felony.

The fourth bill submitted touches the problem of racketeering elements in the liquor industry. Under the present Federal Alcohol Administration Act the basic permit for importing, distilling, or acting as wholesaler of intoxicants is granted to individuals by the Alcohol Tax Unit for an indefinite period. The committee feels that the periodic granting and renewal of such permits would be a more effective means of licensing the liquor industry and eliminating illegal operators while still imposing a minimum burden on legitimate enterprises in this field. The amendment is therefore submitted which will cause permits to expire and come up for renewal at the end of each 2-year period.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. KEM. It is very encouraging to know that the work of the Crime Investigating Committee is going on under the able leadership of the Senator from Maryland. I wrote the Senator from Maryland a few days ago inquiring whether it would be possible for his committee to come into Missouri to conduct some other investigations which some people in my State consider to be highly desirable. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Maryland to the fact that since I wrote him that letter the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has called attention on the floor of the Senate to some irregularities—to use a euphemistic term—which appear to have existed in the office of the collector of internal revenue in St. Louis. Altogether the situation in Missouri—and I say this with great regret and chagrin—is one which seems to me to call for an early visit from the Crime Investigating Committee. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether he thinks that will be possible.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am very happy to reply to the Senator from Missouri and to give him assurance that his communication, which was received and which has been placed before the entire committee consisting of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is present in the Chamber, is under consideration. Of course, as the able Senator from Missouri will understand, it would not be prudent and the best of judgment for the committee to announce in advance exactly what it is going to do and when and how; but suffice it to say, the committee has been working earnestly with a very capable staff since the first of the month, when the extended life of the committee began, and all the Senators whom I have mentioned have been cooperating very actively, although at great sacrifice to themselves, because of their other occupations on the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations. Each and every one of these matters is to be very thoroughly considered. The committee is already advised of certain facts to which the Senator has referred, and of which they are well aware.

I can merely say at this time that the committee is giving and in the time it has remaining, will continue to give consideration to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, as also to that of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], who I see in the Chamber, and of other Senators. We intend to go into everything that can possibly be gone into in the limited time at our disposal, although in as thoroughgoing a manner as we can in order that we may report back to the Senate on all facts and circumstances.

Mr. KEM. I am very gratified to hear the statement of the able Senator from Maryland. I may say that it came as a distinct shock to many citizens of Missouri, when they read the interim report which had been made by the committee and learned that after the visit of the committee to Missouri no mention whatever was made of what many people in my State consider a mother crime of a long series of other crimes. I refer to the theft of the ballots constituting evidence in the vote-fraud cases in Kansas City. That theft occurred on May 27, 1947. I express the hope that when the committee returns to Missouri, if it sees fit to do so, it will investigate that crime and make a report so that the people of the State will know that it has been investigated.

Mr. O'CONOR. I again assure the Senator that all that he has said will be given very thoughtful and careful consideration.

Mr. KEM. It seems difficult to conceive of anything more relevant to an investigation of the connection between politics and crime than a crime which consisted of the suppression of evidence after 72 people had been indicted for failing to count the ballots as they had been cast. If we cannot maintain free elections in this country, if we cannot have ballots counted as they are cast, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland how we can maintain our free institutions.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not like to interpose objection, but there is a bill before the Senate. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has the floor. He yielded for a specific purpose. This is developing into a long debate. I shall be obliged to insist upon the regular order from now on, unless there is a specific statement that a particular matter for which consideration is sought will not consume any great length of time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it seems to me that the importance of this subject certainly justifies the brief questions placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not question that at all.

Mr. KEM. I have no apology for raising my voice at this time to ask that the subject to which I referred be investigated.

Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield first to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada.

AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to House bill 2782.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I must ask if this is going to occupy the Senate for any considerable length of time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope that it will be disposed of very quickly.

Mr. GEORGE. If that be true, I have no objection, if the Senator from Nevada wishes to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I yield under the same conditions, that these transactions appear at the end of the remarks of the junior Senator from Nevada, and also under the condition that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Or rather for a question. I am in sympathy with the attempt of the senior Senator from Georgia to complete consideration of the pending bill.

With respect to the various unanimous-consent requests, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that when unanimous consent is given, as it was given in the case of the Senator from Maryland, and a question so vital as is the one relative to the investigation of elections in Missouri is raised, it seems to me that the time to have objected was when unanimous consent was requested. There was no call for the regular order then. Time and time again the distinguished Senator from Missouri has asked for an investigation of the situation in Missouri which is close to his heart. If we are going to take up that subject at all, it seems to me that there should be full discussion of it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the request was made by the Senator from Maryland that he be allowed to introduce some bills or resolutions. I did not object. Then the Senator from Maryland made a speech.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, the Senator from Missouri was seeking to reply to it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. All of which means that we are losing a great deal of time on the bill before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in accord with what the distinguished Senator from Georgia wishes to do; but when the question is opened up by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, it is my contention that the Senator from Missouri should have ample time to make reply.

Mr. GEORGE. That is passed. I simply raise the question, not with any desire to cut off the Senator from Missouri, but to expedite consideration of the pending bill. I am obliged to invoke the regular order if we are to make any progress at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. All I ask is that the message from the House be laid before the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief statement?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield under the same conditions under which I have previously yielded.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada has yielded to the senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I dislike to be embroiled in this cross-fire. I wish to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada. Also I wish to yield to the Senator from Missouri to complete his statement. All this discussion will appear at the end of my address, anyway. I think the senior Senator from Nevada should be permitted to have laid before the Senate the message from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2782) granting jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a private relief bill, which the Senate passed with an amendment. The bill does not provide for payment of a claim, but only for giving the claimant his day in court.

The House has disagreed to the Senate amendment, and has requested a conference.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. LANGER conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there are several messages from the House which I should like to dispose of, if the Senator from Nevada will yield to me.

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada under the same conditions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens," which were on page 3, to strike out line 13; on page 9, to strike out line 6; on page 11, to strike out lines 8 and 9; and on page 23, to strike out line 2.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the leaders on both sides. This is a concurrent resolution recording congressional approval of the action of the Attorney General in suspending deportation in certain cases.

The House has amended Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 by striking out the names of four aliens. The cases of three of these aliens were withdrawn by the Attorney General, and the case of one of the aliens was approved on a prior concurrent resolution.

Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 9.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House as to Senate Concurrent Resolution 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 15, strike out lines 13 and 14; on page 16, strike out line 9; on page 18, strike out line 19; on page 20, strike out lines 19 and 20; and on page 26, after line 18, insert:

A-5824860, Foti, Joseph Arthur or Giuseppi Arturo Foti or Giuseppi Correale or Arthur La Piere.

A-6643689, Karpman, Dahlia.

A-6191546, Haydari, Ebrahim.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a concurrent resolution recording congressional approval of the action of the Attorney General in suspending deportation in certain cases.

The House has amended Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 by striking out the names of four aliens whose cases were withdrawn by the Attorney General and adding the names of three aliens.

Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 10.

Let me say that before I made this motion we carefully checked the three aliens whose names were added by the House.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. May I inquire of the Senator what aliens he has in mind, and in the cases of how many aliens is deportation authorized to be suspended?

Mr. McCARRAN. This is a concurrent resolution dealing with a number of aliens en bloc. Under the law the Attorney General may suspend deportation. When he suspends deportation he must submit the matter to the Congress for approval. The names come before us in groups. Sometimes there are as many as 100 in a group. They must be very carefully screened by the staff of the Judiciary Committee.

Concurrent resolutions covering the matter are adopted by the Senate on the call of the Consent Calendar. They then go over to the House. In some instances the House amends them, as in this instance. I do not have before me the names.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have complete confidence in the work of the Committee on the Judiciary in screening the persons mentioned in such measures. In the present case, as I understand, the aliens were mentioned in the concurrent resolution which was passed on a call of the calendar. I understand four aliens are involved. I further understand that their names were stricken by the House.

Mr. McCARRAN. Three names were stricken by the House.

Mr. WHERRY. I further understand that three substitutions were made by the House for the three names that were stricken; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. What I should like to inquire about is the method employed by the Committee on the Judiciary in handling the substitution of names. As I understand, such striking and substitution was done by the House, and was not considered by the Senate committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. The concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate. It was sent to the House. The House Judiciary Committee considered the concurrent resolution and amended it. It was then adopted by the House, as amended. It was then returned to the Senate. The submitted names have again been screened by the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I was inquiring about.

Mr. McCARRAN. That has been done.

Mr. WHERRY. The three names have been screened?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If they had been included originally, no doubt the same result would have been brought about when the concurrent resolution was adopted on the call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Mr. President, let me say again, as I have repeatedly said heretofore, I am not satisfied with the method which is now being pursued. I do not like it at all. I am sorry that I must deal with the matter in this way, but we are forced to deal with it the best way we can.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely inquired about the procedure which was followed with respect to the specific names which were substituted, particularly as to how they were screened. The Senator has satisfactorily explained the procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the junior Senator from Nevada for yielding.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEM and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor I shall be very happy to yield, provided further that the ensuing remarks appear at the end of the debate on the pending bill. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri, because he first addressed the Chair, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have always had the highest regard for the Senator from Georgia, and I still have, but I am at a loss to understand why he should have undertaken to cut off the relevant and material questions which I addressed to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. They had to do with a statement made by the Senator from Maryland. I believe the bill in which the Senator from Georgia is interested is a very important measure. I have listened to the debate, and I do not minimize the importance of the bill. However, I do not hesitate to say that I do not believe it is more important than a question involving the very maintenance of free institutions in the United States. There can be no subject more important for consideration by the Senate than the question of how we can insure free elections and make certain that the ballots of our fellow citizens are counted as they are cast.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, necessarily, if we are to make any progress, I would have to invoke the strict rule of procedure. I have been very indulgent. We have been considering one amendment for three full days. The Senator who is presenting the amendment has yielded again and again.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. No.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, is the Senator speaking in his own time?

Mr. GEORGE. I am answering the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I addressed some remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I invoke the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am disposed to yield to any Senator for the transaction of important business on condition that I do not lose the floor and that the debate, or whatever may ensue, with respect to extraneous subjects, appear at the end of my remarks.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I regret that the question has come up, and that the debate has ensued in the spirit that it has. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana under the same conditions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill, with the understanding that if debate ensues——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has invoked the regular order.

Mr. GEORGE. I have yielded repeatedly to Members of the Senate for the presentation of matters which do not consume time or do not lead to debate. I shall be glad to do it again, with the understanding that it will not lead to debate.

Mr. LONG. No; I do not believe it will lead to debate. If it does, I shall be glad to withdraw my request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield, under the same conditions.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that the Senator from Georgia has stated that if the request of the junior Senator from Louisiana leads to debate, he will ask for the regular order. I wish to point out that such request should have been made when the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] was on his feet. Inasmuch as he made his speech, I believe the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has the right to answer it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, do the rules of the Senate permit the Senator from Georgia to act as arbiter of the proceedings of the Senate, in permitting some Senators to speak out of the regular order, but invoking the regular order when other Senators address the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia can make a point of order, and the Chair will rule on it. However, the Senator from Nevada has the floor. If the regular order is invoked, the Senator from Nevada can yield only for the purpose of a question.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEM. Under what circumstances is the Senator from Louisiana now addressing the Chair?

Mr. LONG. I was attempting to ask unanimous consent, but I have not had a chance to ask it because of the many interruptions.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEM. Is it proper for the Senator from Louisiana to ask for unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has no way of knowing for what purpose the Senator from Louisiana rises until he states the purpose.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Chair to shut off the Senator from Missouri at the request of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair merely ruled, when the regular order was invoked, that the regular order would have to be followed.

Mr. KEM. How long does the regular order continue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It continues until the objection to proceeding out of the regular order is withdrawn.

ATTENDANCE OF UNITED STATES NAVY BAND AT FINAL REUNION OF THE UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2952) to authorize the attendance of the United States Navy Band at the final reunion of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held in Norfolk, Va., May 30, through June 2, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor and that the proceedings in connection with the Senator's request appear at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose I have indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana asked for unanimous consent, did he not?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does he now move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside?

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. LONG. I may explain that it is a bill to permit the Navy Band to play at the final reunion of the United Confederate Veterans. It has been the policy of Congress to permit one of the principal service bands to play each year at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans and at the meeting of the Grand Army of the Republic. This will be the final meeting of the Confederate Veterans. It will be held at Norfolk, Va. There will be no opportunity to reach the bill on the call of the calendar.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is difficult for the Senator from Missouri to understand why an objection should be made to his addressing himself to a question involving the preservation of the fundamental institutions of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair——

Mr. KEM. I am addressing the Chair under my reservation of the right to object.

I wish to say that I am in entire accord with having the Navy Band play at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans; I have no objection at all to having that done. I have no objection to having the matter brought before the Senate at this time. However, under what conditions and circumstances and by what chain of reasoning is the conclusion reached that that matter is proper and relevant, but that when I address myself to the question of the counting of ballots and the destruction of evidence and the preservation of our free institutions, that question is suddenly one for which the other proceedings in the Senate should not be interrupted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection was not heard when the Senator from Maryland made his unanimous-consent request. Subsequently, objection was made. The Chair does not undertake to explain why objection was made in one case and was not made in the other. However, objection was made.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I understand the Chair's statement, and I think it is entirely correct and proper. I merely express the opinion that it is passing strange that objection is made when I address myself to the subject I have mentioned, whereas no objection was made to the request involving the sending of the Navy Band to the Confederate reunion at Norfolk.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall have to call for the regular order again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is called for.

The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEM. Can the regular order be invoked to prevent a Senator from expressing an opinion after he has reserved the right to object?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A brief statement can be made in connection with a reservation of the right to object, but thereafter the regular order can be called for at any time.

Mr. KEM. Under what circumstances, and for how long——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, again I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for. The Senator from Nevada has the floor, and he will proceed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I regret to call for the regular order, and thus prevent having the other matter acted on. However, I cannot agree to have interminable debate on other matters occur in the midst of our proceedings on the measure which is the unfinished business.

After the conclusion of Mr. MALONE'S speech,

DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to President Truman's statement of Thursday, May 17, in which he admitted that he decided to dismiss General MacArthur March 24, nearly 2 weeks before he learned of the General's letter to Representative MARTIN.

Now the cat is out of the bag. From the beginning there has been something mysterious about the charge that General MacArthur wrecked the President's plans for peace by offering the Chinese Communists a cease-fire.

It was sound psychological warfare for General MacArthur to remind the Chinese Communists, when he asked for a cease-fire, that we were ready to step up the attack. That is what any experienced negotiator would have done. How could it have wrecked a genuine peace settlement?

General MacArthur's reply to the President gives us the clue.

General MacArthur states that he had twice before made the same offer for a cease-fire but "without the slightest exception being taken thereto."

Such a cease-fire statement, he continued, "could only be regarded as supplementary to and in full support of any political move toward peace unless an agreement was in contemplation on the enemy's own terms."

Congress cannot ignore the charge that the administration is planning a peace settlement which gives the Communists everything they desire.

Let us look at the record. The State Department tells us that admitting Red China to the UN is a purely procedural matter, so we cannot veto it. General Ridgway says that our stopping at the thirty-eighth parallel, giving half of Korea to Russia, will be a tremendous victory. The British propose that we postpone the question of Formosa.

Mr. Dulles, in the proposed Japanese peace treaty, gives Russia permanent title to half of Sakhalin and the Kuriles, which our Government blithely gave away at Yalta.

What, I ask, do these proposals add up to except a peace on the enemy's own terms? Is there anything the Soviet Union might desire that we have not already promised them in these statements?

Of course, the American Government, even our present Government, would not dare openly to accept an arrangement for giving Formosa to Red China, or giving the Chinese Communists a seat in the U. N. But there is more than one way to skin a cat.

It is possible to emphasize all the unimportant issues and postpone the important ones, until the attention of the American public can be diverted, after a while, by another Berlin airlift in a new setting, Vienna, let us say.

The Soviet Union has told us exactly what she wants in settlement of the Korean adventure. In a resolution introduced in the U. N. Assembly, December 9, 1950, the U. S. S. R. "seeking a peaceful settlement of the Korean question and the restoration of peace and security in the Far East," proposed—

1. That all foreign troops be withdrawn immediately from Korea.

2. That the decision on the Korean question be entrusted to the Korean people themselves.

All the Soviet Union wants is to get the American Armed Forces out of Asia. Then time and the fifth column will do the rest. Every peace proposal by the administration or its supporters fits that design precisely.

For months the administration's artists in propaganda have been softening us up in preparation for a Yalta peace in the Far East, for a settlement which at first would look like a victory, but, like Yalta, would in reality be a sell-out. Of course the administration will put in a few harsh words against "aggression." But the Soviet leaders understand double-talk quite as well as do our experts in the State Department.

The latest stage in this softening-up in preparation for a Yalta peace is Mr. Rusk's statement before the China Institute on May 18.

Mr. Rusk says:

We do not recognize the authorities in Peiping for what they pretend to be.

Does that mean anything? No. It is nothing but double-talk.

Mr. Rusk says:

The Peiping regime may be a colonial Russian Government * * * it is not Chinese.

Does that mean anything? Does it make any firm commitments upon which the free Chinese can rely? No. It is simply double-talk.

Mr. Rusk says:

We recognize the National Government of the Republic of China.

Does that mean anything? No. It is the same double-talk we used at Cairo, at Potsdam, at the Foreign Ministers Conference in Moscow, and in General Marshall's instructions when he went to China to sell out the Nationalist Government to the Communists.

This administration must have peace in Korea. It cannot go into the next campaign without an end to the Korean fighting. Acheson promised that we would wait for the dust to settle in Korea, but General MacArthur reminds us that it is not dust which is settling in Korea, but the blood of American fighting men.

The administration wants peace for the next campaign. The Russian rulers want peace so that they can maintain east-west trade, and get more good American and British machine tools and airplane engines in preparation for the final showdown.

The air in Washington is full of rumors that a peace settlement is near. Such a peace settlement would be worse than Munich. It would tell the Soviet Union in plain English that she could have another year or two to rearm.

In the meantime, her agents and stooges in our Government would keep our foreign policy and our military policy in a turmoil, so that we would spend ourselves into bankruptcy, but get nothing for it but huge garrisons in places where they are not needed.

When will the American people see that we cannot entrust the future peace to the men who have betrayed the past?

This administration double-crossed Poland and Bulgaria. It double-crossed free China. It double-crossed the Syngman Rhee government in Korea. It's only policy is the double-cross. We cannot have another Yalta. We cannot have peace in Asia if the negotiations are carried on by the men of Yalta.

Congress has the power to end this betrayal. But do we want to stop it? Our trouble stems from the fact the State Department has wound its octopus arms about our whole Military Establishment.

Neither the President nor Congress nor the people can get honest military advice if it differs from the plans of the power-hungry State Department leaders.

When the State Department plans to sell us out, no voice can be lifted in protest.

General MacArthur risked his professional life to warn us, but we in Congress have not yet listened to what he said.

If we are to have any military security whatever, Congress must free the Military Establishment from its subordinate position in the administration colossus. To do that we must trim the State Department down to size. It must return to the historic role of the State Department, to advise the President on foreign policy.

I am not ignoring the work of Secretary Acheson. He deserves full credit for the foreign policy for which he has worked so faithfully; for the shame of Yalta and Potsdam; for the fall of Poland and the fall of China; for the frightful loss of prestige of the State Department, the reduction of our top military men to the role of ventriloquist's dummy while the Soviet military power grows.

But Acheson is not important in himself. He is a vastly over-rated figure. He is important because of the power which is now gathered in the Department and managed by our hidden government, while he serves as the well-groomed front.

I do not want to see Secretary Acheson dismissed and another Acheson take his place while we lose six precious months waiting for the doubters to see the obvious. Even if the President, by chance, put a good, patriotic man in Acheson's place, the inner circle would know exactly how to close his eyes, fill his ears with sweet sounds, and carry on unhindered. I want instead to tear down the power of which Acheson is the figure-head. I want to dismantle the huge executive establishment, with its hidden rooms and hidden corridors into which Congress cannot peer.

The State Department is swollen out of all relationship to its historic role. It is staffed by people trained in the Hopkins-Wallace-Hiss school of foreign affairs. It is engaged in ruthless empire-building so it can have more money and more power than any other agency, and dictate the whole policy the administration must follow.

It has reduced our top generals and admirals to errand boys, public relations experts, whose task it is to sell the State Department's secret policy to a doubting people.

It aims to become, as Fulton Lewis, Jr., called it, the American politburo.

But let us be honest. Congress is responsible for the size, shape, and functions of the executive departments. If the State Department has grown wild, like a cancer, it is our fault. We appropriate the money and assign the powers under which the Department operates.

It is our task to take back the excess powers we, ourselves, voted to the State Department. In the power of the purse we have all the means we need. The time is now. The State Department appropriation for next year will soon be before this body.

I propose, Mr. President, that Congress set to work this month to trim off all the functions now exercised by the State Department which interfere with its single essential function.

We need a foreign service to be our eyes and ears in every country.

We need a Secretary of State who will conform to the great American tradition in foreign policy—the Monroe Doctrine and the open door. We do not want anything else. We want no economists working on Torquay conferences to destroy our free economy.

We want no Voice of America hiring our newspapermen and seducing our editors into becoming part of the propaganda ministry of the administration. We want no American pro-consuls telling foreign governments how they must vote in U. N. to get ECA aid.

It is not the duty of Congress to control the President's nominations for his Cabinet officers. It is our duty, our inescapable duty, to control the size and shape in the executive establishment.

We must begin with the State Department, cut it back and free the Defense Department from its tutelage by State. That is the only way we can begin to make an honest American foreign policy, and an honest American military policy.

With a true American policy, we may have peace or we may have war. But whatever comes, the American people will meet it, provided only it is peace with honor or war with honor.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. PASTORE in the chair]. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and that the order for the calling of the roll may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the question at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Am I correct in my understanding that no amendment is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Bennett	Hoey	Moody
Benton	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Murray
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	Nixon
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Chavez	Kem	Robertson
Connally	Kilgore	Russell
Cordon	Knowland	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Langer	Schoeppel
Douglas	Lodge	Smathers
Duff	Long	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Malone	Sparkman
Ferguson	Martin	Stennis
Flanders	Maybank	Taft
Fulbright	McCarran	Thye
George	McCarthy	Tobey
Green	McClellan	Underwood
Hayden	McFarland	Welker
Hendrickson	McKellar	Williams
Hennings	McMahon	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which met in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] wishes to have a roll call in connection with his amendment in the nature of a substitute. We are ready for the vote. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the third reading of the bill be reconsidered and that the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada was rejected be also reconsidered, so that there may be a yea-and-nay vote upon the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the request made by the senior Senator from Georgia, because when the action was taken I had left the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. JENNER and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which met in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] who is also absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—15

Bennett	Case	Long
Bricker	Dirksen	Malone
Butler, Nebr.	Dworshak	Mundt
Capehart	Jenner	Schoeppel
Carlson	Langer	Welker

NAYS—65

Aiken	Holland	Moody
Anderson	Humphrey	Morse
Benton	Hunt	Murray
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kem	Pastore
Douglas	Kilgore	Robertson
Duff	Knowland	Russell
Ellender	Lodge	Saltonstall
Ferguson	Magnuson	Smathers
Flanders	Martin	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Maybank	Smith, N. J.
George	McCarran	Sparkman
Green	McCarthy	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	Taft
Hendrickson	McFarland	Thye
Hennings	McKellar	Tobey
Hickenlooper	McMahon	Underwood
Hill	Millikin	Williams
Hoey	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—16

Brewster	Frear	Watkins
Bridges	Gillette	Wherry
Butler, Md.	Kefauver	Wiley
Clements	Kerr	Young
Eastland	Lehman	
Ecton	Smith, N. C.	

So Mr. MALONE's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, at about 3 o'clock I asked unanimous consent that I might leave the Senate Chamber for approximately an hour. That consent was given. I was unavoidably detained and was absent when the yea and nay vote was taken on the Malone substitute amendment to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that, following the vote, I may have inserted in the RECORD the statement that if I had been present in the Senate Chamber, and had been permitted to vote on the Malone substitute amendment, I would have voted for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my reason for making this statement is that although, with the inclusion in the bill of subparagraph (f) on page 13, I think the committee has gone a long way toward helping to tighten up the bill and to eliminate the abuse of the reciprocal trade agreements provision, to a point where it would be helpful in affording some protection, yet I have a feeling,

based on past experience, that it is still within the hands of the administration to do as they choose.

There is not a mandatory provision in the bill which would finally give the relief asked for, and so long as Mr. Acheson is Secretary of State, and running the economy both on the foreign front and on the domestic front, it is my opinion that we cannot obtain the kind of administration which will protect American industry, American agriculture, and American labor. Although I want to compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and also the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from Colorado, upon the work they have done to help tighten the present act, my opinion is, nevertheless, that if we are to get protection, we must get it through legislation, not through dependence upon the Secretary of State to administer the laws which Congress writes for him to administer.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, the minority leader, for his remarks, in which he stated he would have voted for the substitute had he been present. Further, I wish to join with the Senator in his remarks in which he complimented the committee upon the hard work done by it. I know through personal observation that the members of the committee have been very diligent. I may also say categorically in the bill they reported no actual limitations were placed on the President or on the Secretary of State which did not exist previously, and they gave to neither of them any new authority. The law remains as it has always been, in the last analysis, with the power of absolute decision in the discretion of the President, and of the Secretary of State through the President of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and myself I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 11. Paragraph 1519 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Effective July 1, 1951, the quantity of mink, silver fox, and muskrat furs or skins, dressed or undressed, imported during any import year shall not exceed 25 percent of the domestic production during the preceding import year of mink, silver fox, and muskrat furs and skins, respectively.

"(2) For the purposes of this subparagraph, in determining the quantity of mink, silver fox, and muskrat furs and skins imported during any import year, such furs and skins or parts thereof contained in wholly or partly manufactured articles shall be taken into account.

"(3) As used in this subparagraph, the term, 'import year' means the 12-month period beginning on July 1 of any calendar year."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I intend to take but a few minutes of the Senate's time on the bill. Before doing so, I request the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has asked for the yeas and nays on his amendment. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation? Am I out of order to ask the Senator to yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that it shall first be decided whether the demand for the yeas and nays is sufficiently seconded.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Wisconsin now yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder if I could make the suggestion to the distinguished chairman of the committee that we take the amendment to conference.

Mr. GEORGE. I am willing to take it to conference, but I can not guarantee to hold it in conference. I am quite sure the House would not consent to accept the amendment. I am willing, however, to take it to conference and have it presented to the House. I cannot give any assurance that it would be accepted. However, the only possible result of an affirmative vote would be to have the amendment taken to conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin could get no more assurance, even if, after long debate, the amendment were adopted by the Senate, and the proceedings could be short-circuited by acceptance of the amendment now.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment is somewhat different from any we have had. It deals with a percentage of a particular product. I think I should say in all frankness that I do not believe the House will accept the amendment. However, I am willing to take it to conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin again yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe the subject matter, in some particulars, goes outside the reciprocal trade system.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And that, therefore, direct action of this kind may be necessary.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I am willing to take the amendment to conference if that is agreeable to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have already accomplished what I would accomplish by a vote. I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. The committee will accept the amendment and take it to conference for full consideration by the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] on behalf of himself, his colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I was about to make on this amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO H. R. 1612

It is unnecessary to go into detail in explaining the plight of our domestic fur-producing industry, as most Senators are aware of the liquidation that is taking place. This matter has been fully aired and recognized by members of the Finance Committee. Many of us were hopeful last year that the acute condition could have been somewhat relieved by a substantial reduction in the fur excise tax so that the fur market could have been expanded so as to absorb the tremendous increase in our fur imports. As our present state of emergency makes this approach impossible, it is imperative that immediate action be taken to place a limited curb on imports as set forth in the proposed amendment.

As pointed out during the hearings on the Trade Agreements Act, our fur producers have been caught in a squeeze. While fur sales have declined 50 percent, as shown by the decrease in our excise-tax receipts from ninety-seven million in 1946 to forty-eight million in 1950, imports have increased over 300 percent since the war as compared to prewar years. It is also a well known fact that 30 percent of our fur imports are coming from communistic-controlled countries.

Now, just a word or two about the amendment. It is not an attempt to solve the entire problem of the fur-producing industry, but is directed as giving effective, reasonable protection to those in greatest need. Imports of mink, silver fox, and muskrat account for only approximately 20 percent of the total dollar value of our present fur imports. But they make up an important part of our domestic fur-producing industry. I am sure the Senators from Louisiana and Texas where a considerable portion of our muskrat are raised, can give you a very vivid picture of the serious condition the fur producers in their States are in. It is interesting to note that from the figures of the Fish and Wildlife Service, muskrat catch in Louisiana has dropped from 6,000,000 pelts in 1943 to 3,000,000 in 1949. The reason for the sharp decline is that present prices do not pay the cost of harvesting the crop. The Tariff Commission figures reveal that our total muskrat imports have increased from 1,000,000 pelts in 1943 to 3,500,000 in 1950. Imports of muskrat from Russia show the greatest increase from one-half million pelts in 1943 to 2,000,000 pelts in 1950.

Figures reveal our domestic production of mink has remained relatively static since 1947 at about two and one-third million pelts. On the other hand, imports of mink pelts have increased from 320,000 in 1946 to over 1,000,000 in 1950, or 400-percent increase.

The seriousness of the situation is reflected in the financial statement of the fur-farming industry wherein the cost of production has increased to $18 per pelt. The average price of mink pelts in 1949 and 1950 dropped to prewar levels of $15. This small industry shows an operating loss of millions of dollars, and over a thousand farmers have been forced out of business during the past year. Another large number has been forced

to secure Government emergency loans from the Farmers Home Administration in order to stay in business. A large percentage of these are GI's, many of whom are disabled veterans.

We have just gone through the sad experience of having the domestic silver fox industry practically wiped out since the war because of the tremendous influx of foreign furs. The Department of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, is making a desperate attempt, through emergency loans, to try and revive this industry, or at least keep alive a small foundation breeding herd so we won't have to go to Russia and buy breeding stock when this industry recovers. The amendment is designed to keep foreign countries from smothering out its life as soon as it starts to revive.

A repetition of the same condition that has practically wiped out our silver fox industry will wipe out our mink and muskrat industries if something is not done immediately to prevent it.

The amendment is very reasonable. There are 33 different kinds of fur imported into the United States. The amendment applies to only three kinds of fur: silver fox, mink, and muskrat, wherein considerable investment has gone into domestically producing these furs. If the amendment had been in effect during the past 4 years, it would have only reduced our annual total fur imports approximately 6 percent. This small reduction would largely be absorbed by communistic-controlled countries whose imports have increased most.

It is questionable whether Congress should continue to keep a heavy tax on the product of an industry that is going broke in order to finance foreign aid programs to stop the spread of communism abroad. But it is simply asinine to call sons of fur farmers to go to war to stop the spread of communism and while they are fighting, and dying, have their business wiped out by importation of furs from communistic countries.

Due to the modifications that have been made in the Trade Agreements Act as reported it is very likely that some Senators may feel that the bill if passed as reported would provide a means of solving the problem of the fur producers thereby making the proposed amendment unnecessary. The fur farmers claim the bill as now constituted does not and will not provide a means of solving their problem. This involves considerations beyond those of tariff or duties or other economic aspects of general nature involved in foreign trade. Therefore, the amendment is not offered to give special treatment to an industry whose problem is common with other industries, but is offered to protect an American industry that is being destroyed as a result of unusual circumstances that have developed since the last war.

SCHEDULE A

TABLE 1.—*Imports of raw furs*

Year	Millions of dollars	Year	Millions of dollars
1930 to 1939	50	1945	146
1940	75	1946	242
1941	106	1947	124
1942	70	1948	163
1943	93	1949	105
1944	127	1950	104

TABLE 2.—*Collections from excise tax on furs*

Calendar years	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Millions of dollars	97.4	83.3	73.1	53.7	48.8

TABLE 3.—*Russian imports compared to total fur imports*

[Millions of dollars]

Year	Total	Russia
1930 to 1939	50	5
1940	75	13
1941	106	22
1942	70	15
1943	93	18
1944	127	32
1945	146	26
1946	242	69
1947	124	41
1948	163	58
1949	105	24
1950	105	[1]20

[1] Reduction 1950 was a result of longshoremen's refusal to unload Russian furs.

In relation to the amendment, I want to call to your attention that in 1949 when this same bill was up for extension, I proposed a similar amendment to the one now being offered. I want to read one paragraph from the statement I made at that time, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 10, page 12878:

"Besides the economic problem involved, it is evident from information released that Russia's primary interest in disposing of all her furs in the United States is to implement carrying out her communistic program in our country, first by providing a source of dollars necessary to finance her program, and, second, by being able to maintain a large fur business in the United States, which she is using as a base of operation to legally funnel into and out of our country key communistic supporters. In this connection, I call attention to the evidence and the record in the Coplon trial.

"Russia's fur business is handled by the Amtorg Corp., of New York, which is owned and operated by the Russian Government, and is known by the FBI to be carrying on espionage activities.

"It is evident that regardless of price or effect on the domestic producer, Russia will continue to dump all her furs on our market unless some protective action is taken by Congress."

As vindication of the accuracy of this statement, I am now going to read a short excerpt from the testimony of Benjamin Gitlow, one-time secretary general of the American Communist Party, as presented befor the Subversive Activities Control Board on April 24, 1951:

"Amtorg was the trading corporation in the United States of the Soviety Government.

"Amtorg cleared with the Communist Party of the United States, the American personnel it hired to determine whether or not they could be trusted to work in Amtorg.

"A large number of members of the Communist Party worked in Amtorg, and those members who worked in Amtorg were formed into a special group.

"Amtorg supported the Communist Party press by putting advertisements, particularly in the foreign language, in newspapers of the Communist Party for which they paid in excess of the advertising rates for such advertisements.

"Furthermore, the Amtorg made it possible for the Communist Party School of Business Relations in what it was doing to realize moneys financially from insurance and other activities.

"In addition to that, the Amtorg sought the assistance of the Communist Party, whenever technical delegations came to this country, to attach Communist Party members to these delegations as translators, and so forth, who would be tied in with the OGPU representative that traveled with these delegations for information purposes."

Figures from the Tariff Commission reveal that during the past 5 years we have imported over a quarter billion dollars worth of furs from Communist-dominated countries, over one hundred ninety million of which have come directly from Russia. In face of the longshoremen's embargo against unloading Russian furs during the past year (1950), we imported over $20,000,000 of furs from Russia and $6,000,000 worth of furs from China. Why in the name of common sense do we continue to finance the spread of communism on one hand and fight it on the other?

There can be no doubt but that a portion of the $6,000,000 we paid to China for furs last year went toward paying for the shipments of rubber from England. Neither can there be any doubt as to what use Russia is making of the $20,000,000 she received from her fur shipments to us.

In addition to the issue of involving the security of our country, the amendment presents a clear-cut economic case. Is Congress going to place heavy taxes on our industries, draft their sons into service, and subject them to the many other wartime measures necessary to fight communism abroad and then turn our backs on them under the cloak of appeasement and allow their businesses to be wiped out by the importation of products from communistic countries?

The amendment may only affect a small industry, but the principal in back of it is not small.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, would it be in order at this time to move that the Senate instruct the conferees to insist upon the amendments of the Senate?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not do that. I should be compelled to resist such a motion, because the Senate conferees will do the best they can. When the bill comes back to the Senate there will be an opportunity to be heard on the amendment. I thought I should be frank in stating to the Senator that the House probably will not accept it, although the House will be free to work out any amendment. It may be that a provision of some kind can be agreed upon. I hope the Senator will not ask for any instructions at this time which would bind the conferees to the point where they could only insist on this particular amendment. We would be lost in that sort of conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the Senator makes a point.

Mr. CAIN subsequently said: Mr. President, it is my understanding that earlier in the afternoon the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] offered a fur amendment which was accepted and which is to be taken to conference. It had been my intention to speak briefly but pointedly in support of that amendment, but because of duties which kept me in the joint committee hearing this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I had prepared concerning the amendment be printed in the body of the RECORD to follow any references to the amendment itself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of May 16, 1951, is this short article:

"NEW YORK, May 15. The New York Journal-American said today that six New York

importers have just concluded a deal with the Soviet fur trust which will drop over a million dollars into Communist hands.

"The newspaper said the Soviet embassy in London confirmed the deal but refused to disclose the names of the members of the New York syndicate which arranged the million-dollar purchase.

"The story also stated that the Soviet trust, taking note of the refusal of American longshoremen to unload Russian-made goods, will guarantee delivery of the skins only to Helsinki, Finland.

"The Journal-American said the New York syndicate was compelled to pay for the Russian skins in American dollars, which the Communists need badly for the purchase of military material."

It is absurd to spend billions of dollars to stop the spread of communism when we are, in fact, supplying Russia with the necessary dollars to finance her organized communistic programs at home and abroad. It is embarrassing for Congress to tax and tax, spend and spend to aid foreign countries who may be struggling under the handicap of having a deficit dollar trade balance so as to throw off the yoke of communism, and go on permitting the Soviet Union to build up a substantial surplus dollar trade balance.

Figures from the Tariff Commission reveal that our imports from Russia during the past 3 years (1948, 1949, 1950) totaled $160,000,000, while our exports to Russia amounted to only $34,000,000, leaving a surplus dollar trade balance for the Kremlin of $126,000,000.

This is a very sizable sum of dollars to use in financing the Communist Party in the United States, or to purchase war material from countries lacking dollar exchange.

The Trade Agreements Act is proving to be a boon to communism. Contrary to the general belief built up in the minds of many Senators, that the major portion of our imports from Russia consist of strategic materials, the figures show that 50 percent of the total imports from Russia consist of fur, and only a very small percentage of materials are even vital or necessary for our security and defense programs.

Every agency of government that has anything to do with the administration of the Trade Agreements Act, is familiar with these facts and their direct bearing on our security and the hardship it is causing the American fur producers.

Yet, year in and year out, nothing is done, and nothing will be done to prevent this small industry from being entirely wiped out by communism unless Congress comes to their rescue and gives them this small means of protection.

I urge the Senate to adopt the fur amendment, send it to conference, and insist on its passage.

TABLE A

[In millions of dollars]

	1948	1949	1950
Imports from Russia	78	42	40
Exports to Russia	27	6	1
Trade balance	51	36	39

TABLE B

[In millions of dollars]

	1948	1949	1950
Total imports from Russia	78	42	40
Fur imports from Russia	38	24	[1]20

[1] Reduction 1950 result of longshoremen's refusal to unload Russian furs.

TABLE C.—*Principal imports from Russia, 1950*

Furs and manufactures	$21,060,989
Sausage casings of sheep, lamb, and goat	1,005,162
Crab meat, crab sauce, and crab paste, prepared or preserved in containers	2,304,398
Cigarette leaf tobacco, unstemmed, other than latakia	2,465,662
Cotton linters	1,578,090
Manganese ore (including ferruginous) or concentrates, and manganiferous iron ore, containing 35 percent and over of manganese, other than battery grade	2,085,225
Chrome ore or chromite, metallurgial grade	2,172,578
Platinum metals and native combinations thereof: Palladium	857,391
Crude glycerine	911,141
All others	5,827,402

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the junior Senator from Washington would permit me to associate myself with him in connection with the remarks made by him.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very pleased to be in my colleague's company.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful that my associate, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, was able to be on the floor to offer his amendment. I had expected to offer it, but when I saw how things were going in the committees, I was glad to find out that the amendment had been accepted and would be taken to conference.

The fur industry has been very badly injured by competition from abroad, and I believe the conferees, whoever they may be, should insist on protecting this great industry which means so much in connection with the livelihood of so many persons in this Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have two amendments on the desk which I do not wish to press at this time. I believe that a question will clear up one of them.

The other matter, which involved a definition of the word "perishables" in the bill was cleared up day before yesterday by the answer of the distinguished chairman of the committee.

I should like to ask one further question.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to try to answer it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On page 5492 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21, the Senator from Georgia, in discussing the bill, made this statement:

> Another amendment of great importance was the amendment suggested by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] which, as the Senate knows, had already twice been adopted by the Senate in connection with other legislation. This amendment is designed to protect the full operation of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which now, in subsection (f), contains certain limitations upon the full scope of its use by reason of the provisions of our trade agreements.

After examining the amendment, the committee added this language:

> No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section.

What concerned some of the sponsors of the amendment and myself was the use of the additional words "the requirements of." I talked with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] informally and he explained that he thought those words might strengthen the amendment. I was wondering whether the Senator from Georgia had the same opinion.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have the same general view. I should like to add that the purpose of inserting this language is that if the President, when certain facts appear, can give an effective remedy without violating an agreement, but within the terms of an agreement, so to speak, he may have that opportunity; but if he cannot, this section will prevail. This section carries out the philosophy of the distinguished Senator from Washington in the two bills which have previously passed the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, it is the opinion of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Colorado that this language adds an additional situation to the requirements of section 22. It might be that the remedy could be carried out within the terms of the agreement.

Mr. GEORGE. It might be. But if there were an irreconcilable conflict, the President would be obliged to carry out the section 22 provision so as to grant relief.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall not press my two amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to ask if there would be any objection to inserting the word "promptly" on page 9, in line 9, after the word "shall." Section 7 of the committee amendment proposes that upon the request of the President, or upon resolution of either House of Congress or of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives——

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator from South Dakota give me the page again?

Mr. CASE. It is on page 9, line 9. This is the section which has to do with the investigation by the United States Tariff Commission.

Mr. GEORGE. There would be no objection to such an amendment. If the Senator wishes to offer such an amendment, there will be no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 9, line 9, after the word "shall", to insert the word "promptly." This is in accord with the time element which has been included at several points in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 9, after the word "shall", it is proposed to

insert the word "promptly," so as to read:

The United States Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation—

And so forth.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is no objection to the amendment. That was the intention of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has about a dozen amendments. I do not know whether or not he intends to abandon them. I wish we knew, so that we would not have to do this all over again if he should decide not to abandon them. Cannot the Senator from Nevada be called into the Chamber so that we may know whether or not he intends to press his amendments?

Mr. DWORSHAK rose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask if the Senator from Idaho has an amendment to offer?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No. I wish to speak for 20 or 25 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate during the past 3 days. I think the Committee on Finance should be commended for the desirable changes and revisions which have been recommended in the law as it has been in force for the past 2 years. However, in checking through the hearings on House bill 1612 before the Senate committee, I am somewhat amazed to read the comments made by Secretary Acheson. I quote from page 3 the following statement by Mr. Acheson:

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing in support of the trade-agreements program to urge extension of the Trade Agreements Act. I cannot, however, support H. R. 1612 as amended in the House of Representatives. I do not think that the bill as amended is in the national interest.

On page 6 of the hearings Secretary Acheson said:

H. R. 1612, as reported to the House of Representatives by the Ways and Means Committee, extended the authority of the President to negotiate trade agreements under the Trade Agreements Act in the same form in which it has existed for most of the life of the program. I believe that the record of accomplishment under the act and the way the authority conferred by the act has been administered fully justify that action.

It is apparent that, although the Senate committee, in the bill currently before this body, has recommended the insertion of amendments providing for the peril point and for an escape clause, so long as the State Department is charged with the administration of this program we can expect nothing but sabotage of the program. As I have said, I think the committee is deserving of commendation, but the record shows that so far as Secretary Acheson is concerned, in the administration of the act this body can anticipate that there will be no beneficial results, even though amendments are adopted providing for the peril point and the escape-clause approach to safeguard the interests of any industries in the United States which are adversely affected by the operations of the act.

In 1934 we entered upon a new course of action in regard to foreign trade. For more than 300 years we had been carrying on a trade of necessity to build up the industry and economy of a virile, alert Nation. We were affording protection through tariff from foreign competition to our weak industries with the result that thrift and ingenuity made of us an almost self-supporting Nation.

Through the protection afforded our industry we were protecting not only production but also protecting the standards of labor, wages, and employment which have brought to America the highest standard of living of any country in the world.

While we still maintain our high standard of living, we are doing it on borrowed money. And we are trying to make concessions to reduce our standard of living to those countries by which we are surrounded with unilateral trade agreements, reciprocity agreements, exchange agreements designed to be reciprocal in nature with escape clauses administered not by constitutional authority vested in the subdivisions of this Government, but through delegated powers extended to the administrative department with responsibility to no one and power so absolute and so protected that whole segments of our economy could practically become destroyed before the Congress could recapture the power it has no right to delegate away.

In 1934 we embarked on this new method of tariff procedure of enacting legislation to give the authority vested in the Congress to the President. It was said at that time—and the position is defended by some Members of Congress—that this is the program under which it was planned to make reciprocal trade agreements to encourage trade with other nations. This is a noble objective. We want trade with other nations; we need trade with other nations; we have to have trade with other nations, for we are no longer an independent, self-supporting Nation. We are now a Nation dependent upon other nations with a $60,000,000 unfavorable balance of trade last year, dependent upon other nations for wool, meat, and fiber. And so under this dependency with the typical reciprocal agreements we have built up a condition of trade which has literally destroyed some very important industries in this country. We are now invited by approval of H. R. 1612 not only to continue the destruction but to bring in a few more industries to be destroyed.

Mr. President, our reciprocal trade agreements are a one-way street, with the United States making most of the concessions. This has resulted in lowering tariffs on many agricultural commodities and other products, causing real hardships to many of our domestic industries.

Since 1939, whenever this Trade Agreement Act has been before Congress for extension, I have voted against it. In the first place, I do not believe that Congress should delegate its authority over international trade to the President.

To illustrate this, I refer to the conference which has been held at Torquay, England, for several months. As a result of this conference with 17 other nations, the United States has granted tariff reductions of as much as 50 percent. Attempts to conclude trade agreements with the British Commonwealth have failed apparently because of sterling preference among those nations. The tariff concessions which the United States granted at Torquay will apply to 1,325 items, many of which reductions will adversely affect labor and production here in America.

Once this agreement is effective, the authority of acceptance or rejection of trade agreements no longer rests with the Congress, and to retrieve this power is almost impossible.

It may be well to point out the illogical situation, created under the Torquay agreement, in which Great Britain and the Commonwealth nations refuse to cooperate in any way. Yet, under the most-favored-nation clause, Britain and the Commonwealth nations will be the beneficiaries of all the concessions made by the United States. At the same time they are not making any concessions of any kind on trade with the United States.

SHEEP INDUSTRY UNDERMINED

Let us take a look at the sheep and wool industry under reciprocal trade agreements. I want to point out to you what has happened under the reciprocal wool agreements. Ten years ago we were producing 61 percent of the wool needed for consumption in the United States and it was not many years ago we were a wool-exporting Nation. But in the past 10 years the sheep population has declined from 47,441,000 head to 23,065,000 head, a decrease of 41 percent. Today we are furnishing only 26 percent of the needs of this country. The price rise is 102 percent in the last 10 years on wool in the grease, from 28 cents in 1940 to 57 cents in 1950.

Mr. President, while it is easy to lay the blame on decreased ranges, lack of herders, Government restrictions, I cannot agree to this, for it is not only the range sheep that declined in the past few years that has caused the loss in wool poundage or sheep numbers. It is the passing out of the farm flocks—the sheep held in small flocks on farm pastures. The decline is due to the importations of foreign wool from Australia brought into this country for storage and then never again leaving this country. It is due to the lack of tariff protection and to the decline of the dollar value and the planting of land into field crops instead of pastures to pay high property taxes now required of cheap dollars.

Instead of protecting this industry by tariffs, we have let it decline until today we are dependent upon other nations for over half the wool now consumed here. I presume we can go on subsidizing the land crops that should be going into pastures to produce wool and mutton. We wonder at the shortage of meat; well, you cannot increase a population by 20,000,000 people and decrease 19,376,000 head of sheep in 10 years without affecting the market supply of meat.

During the past year we have been at the mercy of foreign wool producers and prices have doubled and tripled. This is the penalty we are paying for failing to give adequate protection to our domestic sheep industry.

Yes, our sheep and wool industry has been undermined by reciprocal trade agreements which have no semblance of being reciprocal. Reciprocal is a delusion, a hypocritical expression used to deceive, to fool, to hoodwink, and to destroy.

LEAD AND ZINC AFFECTED

Mr. President, Idaho has a special interest in the Trade Agreements Extension Act, for Idaho ranks first among the States in the production of mined zinc, and second in lead. The mining industry of my State has just learned of the cuts made in the existing tariffs on lead and zinc under the Torquay Conference proceedings.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not a fact that Idaho also leads in the production of antimony, producing 94 percent of the antimony produced in the United States?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Idaho produces a large percentage of many other minerals which are now considered strategic in building up our national preparedness.

Mr. LANGER. Which includes antimony.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator. While these reductions are of secondary importance at the moment, because of the Government price controls under which these mining industries are operating, artificially depressing the price to the Idaho miner, they do have long-term implications which disturb me. Not only does the Government drastically cut the metal tariff, but it simultaneously prevents the lead and zinc miner from selling his output at the higher price today at which Mexican, Canadian, Peruvian, and Australian lead and zinc are being sold. It does not make sense.

The tariffs on lead and zinc have now reached a point where they are so slight as to be almost negligible. The protection granted lead under the Torquay decision is only about 6 percent. The protection remaining to zinc is only about 3 percent, at today's prices. If the lead- and zinc-mining industries could have foreseen in 1930 the great inflation of 1950, they would have requested ad valorem rather than specific rates of duty.

Mr. President, in the case of lead the State Department deviated from a principle that I understood they ordinarily use in concluding negotiations—namely, not entertaining any reductions unless they were requested by the country accounting for the greatest exports to this country. In lead, Mexico, with its comparatively low-labor cost, is the most important foreign shipper of lead to the United States. But the cut in lead was made at the instance of Canada and Peru. Under our most-favored-nation policy, however, Mexico will receive the benefit of this important reduction. Inasmuch as the Mexican Trade Agreement was abrogated as of the beginning of 1951, Mexico will reap a benefit from the Torquay negotiations for which the United States is receiving nothing in return from Mexico.

DEVALUATION OF CURRENCIES

The lead miners in the United States have been very much concerned with the effect of the devaluation of foreign currencies on the tariff protection which Congress had accorded them. Apparently no consideration was given in the Torquay decisions as to the effect of devaluation on the tariff rates established for lead and zinc. In fact, a representative of the State Department took the attitude before the Senate Finance Committee on H. R. 1612 that they were perfectly correct in not considering devaluation because, if anyone was injured as the result of currency devaluation, he should try to secure relief through the escape clause. Inasmuch as the Senate Finance Committee's report follows these recommendations, it is especially important that the escape clause be so worded by this body that it will give industry every opportunity to include devaluation as one of the factors to be considered in an escape-clause proceeding.

By means of the bill which it has reported, the Senate Finance Committee has wisely attempted to define and broaden the scope of topics which the Tariff Commission must consider in coming to an escape-clause determination. My own State legislature last January was so concerned over the impact of currency devaluation not only on mineral products but on agriculture that it adopted a resolution memorializing Congress on the subject and requesting relief through proper adjustment of tariff rates.

Mr. President, if devaluation had been given consideration by the negotiators at Torquay, they would have found that Canada first devalued its currency about 10 percent, although at present the Canadian dollar is only 6 percent devaluated. In Peru the currency devaluation amounts to over 50 percent. The slash of about 6 percent in the tariff on lead therefore, virtually establishes free trade in lead between Canada and the United States, inasmuch as the amount of protection remaining to the Idaho lead miner is just about offset by the devaluation of the Canadian dollar.

IMPACT TO BE FELT LATER

For Peru the situation is vastly to Peru's benefit; and were it not for the fact that today Peru can get more for its lead in Europe, where lead now is selling for about 20 cents a pound, than it can by selling it in the United States for 18½ cents a pound, we would expect the entire Peruvian lead production to come into this country, as it has done recently. The full impact of the tariff cut that has been made will not be felt until the present defense emergency is over. Then the present price controls and the artificial stimulus of rearmament to industry will have disappeared, and labor may have cause for complaint as it sees its jobs affected by large imports of lead into the United States from low-cost foreign mines.

Mr. President, I wonder what animated the Torquay negotiators to cut the lead rate, when last year, for the first time in history, more lead—550,000 tons—was imported into the United States than was mined in our country; namely, 430,000 tons. How much more lead should be imported to satisfy the international planners? Our domestic mine production is far below what it used to be. Tariff cuts are no way to invite the necessary exploration and development of our still great native resources.

About a year ago the domestic mining industry was facing ruinously low prices because of heavy imports of lead, zinc, copper, and other minerals. As a result, many mines had closed because of inability to operate on a profitable basis in competition with the low-cost production of foreign mines. During such periods it is vitally important to have some tariff protection to enable our own mines, with their high-operating costs, to compete with production in countries where the miners receive only a fraction of the wages paid in the United States.

Apparently our international policies are compounded not only of a desire to strip the mining industry and our other industries of their tariff protection, but actually to subsidize foreign producers. Recently it was announced by the State Department that it was proposing to buy Chilean copper at 27½ cents and sell it in the United States at 24 cents, with the taxpayers to absorb the loss. Moreover, at a hearing before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs it was developed that the Office of Price Stabilization is planning to buy foreign lead at 20 cents a pound and resell it in the United States at the ceiling price of 17 cents a pound. Under those circumstances, tariffs do not mean much; but it is illogical to see our people being taxed to permit the purchase of foreign nonferrous metals from countries in which labor is paid only a few cents an hour, and the resale of the metal here at a loss, and then to have our people taxed to make up the difference. If controls are imposed on the mining industry, coupled with the crippling of permanent tariff protection and an evident desire to subsidize foreign-mining operations, we shall not only seriously affect the future orderly development of our mineral resources, but we shall also be encouraging the very thing we are supposed to be fighting—statism and ultimately communism.

This period of limited emergency is hardly the time to make an intelligent long-range tariff determination and to cut the tariff rates on lead, zinc, and other commodities. I think action on

those two metals might well have awaited the end of the emergency-defense period. The injury that has been done is momentarily obscured by the international political situation. It remains to be seen whether or not Torquay's slashes were in the public interest.

PLEA FOR EXEMPTIONS

Mr. President, a brief survey of the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on House bill 1612 will disclose the appearance at those hearings of representatives of many industries in the United States. Those representatives appealed for some protection for their specific industries. As I pointed out earlier this afternoon in a colloquy with the junior Senator from Nevada, it is rather strange to witness the representatives of various industries from many regions of the United States appear before congressional committees and before executive agencies and departments requesting specific exemptions to protect their own industries.

Mr. President, in the West we have the lumber and the mineral industries; in the Mississippi Valley there are the livestock and agricultural industries; in the Central Atlantic States there are the pottery, glassware, woodworking, and other industries; in New England there are the textile, shoe-manufacturing, watch-manufacturing, and fishery industries; and in many of the Southwestern States we find the production of the oil which is so essential to us, particularly in time of emergency. Those who come from the Southeastern States plead for protection of the fresh-vegetable and fresh-fruit industries in those States. In fact, during the 16 years since the commencement of the reciprocal-trade-agreement program, we have heard many appeals made every year before congressional groups; and those who have made those appeals have pointed out that although there may be some justification for the broad principles which are involved in the reciprocal trade agreements, those agreements can be supported by certain States and certain regions only when protection and safeguards and even exemptions are provided for those specific industries.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to point out that it is very difficult to comprehend how a broad reciprocal-trade program can be highly desirable for the United States. I concur in the contention that we should have international trade relations on an equitable basis with other nations; but how can it be contended that this reciprocal-trade-agreement program is sound, desirable, and equitable so far as the United States is concerned, when we observe that most of the States of the Union send to Washington their representatives who plead with Congress for support for their own industries?

It seems to me that a logical procedure would be to take a composite viewpoint of all the industries in the United States and consider the interests not only of business and industry but also of agriculture and labor, and then recognize that if we are to maintain our high standards of living, which have characterized the United States of America for well over a century, we should be realistic in facing this program.

So far as I am concerned, I will not stand in this body—nor have I done so at any time during my membership in either the House of Representatives or the Senate—and plead for preferential treatment for any particular industry in my own State. If the industries of my State are entitled to protection and safeguards, I think we should extend comparable treatment to other regions and States throughout the entire Nation.

Mr. President, on that basis I cannot justify support of this reciprocal-trade program, even though the Finance Committee has improved the bill materially.

I wish to pay my compliments to the distinguished chairman of that committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and to other members of the committee who have done such an effective job in trying to establish proper safeguards.

However, at the same time we must recognize that the administration of this program is in the hands of the State Department; and we have the testimony of Secretary Acheson that so far as he is concerned, he will not countenance the peril-point amendment or the escape-clause amendment because he wants to have almost absolute and arbitrary authority over the international trade of our country.

Mr. President, under such circumstances, I cannot vote to delegate the constitutional authority of the legislative branch to Secretary Acheson and the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada has a few amendments to offer to the bill, but, in deference to the Senator from Georgia, who is not feeling well, a very brief discription of each amendment will be presented, and no yea-and-nay vote will be requested, so that the time required for the presentation of the amendments will not be great. I now ask that amendment No. 2, offered by the junior Senator from Nevada, be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "2 years" and insert "1 year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, amendment No. 2 provides for the extension of the authority to enter into trade agreements for 1 year instead of 2 years. The House version of H. R. 1612 provided for a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act which was changed to 2 years by the Senate Finance Committee.

This amendment serves two purposes:

First. The war in Korea has produced a rearmament effort which has brought economic dislocations which greatly obscure the effects that tariff cuts have had on many domestic industries. With peak demand in most fields of production and with the Government being a large purchaser of consumer goods and defense materials, no one can forecast economic conditions even as far as 1 year ahead. Under these circumstances a 1-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act is all that should be provided for, should the Congress decide to extend it at all.

Second. The other purpose which would be served by a 1-year extension would be continued supervision of the administration of the Trade Agreements Act by the State Department as well as the effects of the tariff reductions. Each extension of the Trade Agreements Act has caused long hearings to be held in which both the administration's side as well as the domestic producers' viewpoints were thoroughly aired, and many people feel that these hearings have provided the domestic manufacturers with the only fair tribunal for the airing of their frequent and just complaints.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, as to the pending amendment, I may say that many of us thought a 1-year extension would be better than a 2-year extension, but upon further thought we concluded that 2 years was more practicable for the reason, frankly, that a 1-year extension would throw this entire subject into the middle of an election year, and that was not thought to be desirable, so we compromised. We reduced the provision of the House bill from 3 years to 2, and were unanimous in that decision in committee.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if I may say so, I think the greatest thing which could happen would be to throw this entire matter into the middle of the election year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; I understand that that is the Senator's viewpoint. He will not disallow my own viewpoint, which is that it would be a very bad thing to do, and that the subject would not receive the careful consideration in the middle of an election year that it would in calmer times and, I hope, under more favorable circumstances.

Mr. MALONE. Consideration of the subject in calmer times has always resulted for the past 18 years in continuing the authority of the Secretary of State unimpaired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment No. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 18, after the word "Defense", it is proposed to insert "from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, from the Committee on Finance of the Senate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, section 3 (c) of the present version of H. R. 1612 provides that the President, before concluding a trade agreement, shall seek information and advice from certain departments of the Government.

This amendment provides that in addition to the departments mentioned, the President shall also seek information and advice from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Heretofore the Congress has not been consulted in regard to the making of trade agreements and has only been presented with the final results at the end of trade-agreement negotiations. This amendment would remove some of the secrecy under which the executive branch prepares for the trade-agreement negotiations and would add the valuable advice of the pertinent committees of Congress to the planning of tariff-reduction conferences.

This amendment does not remove the secrecy which is regarded as necessary for bargaining power in the negotiations proper. It merely provides that the President shall consult the above-mentioned committees of Congress for information and advice. This amendment is quite parallel with the Senate version of H. R. 1612, which provides that the President shall report to the Congress if he has exceeded the recommendations made by the Tariff Commission under the peril-point provision, or has not followed the Tariff Commission's advice on changes under the escape clause. This amendment would, to a small degree, give Congress a hand in determining the course of trade-agreement policy. The advice and counsel of the Members of Congress represented on the two committees would bring into the trade-agreements program the experience and the legislative viewpoints of men who have had at their command the extensive information brought out in the hearings on the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that neither the House Ways and Means Committee nor the Senate Finance Committee is equipped to do a good job in connection with this particular matter. It would involve vast staff work and a great number of hearings in order to participate constructively. We do not have the necessary staff. I hope, therefore, that the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I respect the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, but I respectfully suggest that most persons in the State Department dealing with the subject show a profound ignorance of it. Therefore, if it is thought that persons regularly appointed by the Congress of the United States can contribute any more misinformation than is contributed already, I would feel like withdrawing the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, beginning in line 7 with the word "Within", it is proposed to strike out through the word "been" in line 9 and insert the following: "No trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be."

On page 4, beginning with the comma in line 21, strike out through the word "with" on page 5, line 12.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the present version of House bill 1612 provides that the Tariff Commission shall make recommendations to the President in regard to the levels to which tariffs could be reduced, but the President is not forced to adhere to these recommendations. All that the peril-point feature calls for is merely a report by the President to Congress on the reasons for which he has seen fit to disregard the advice given him.

This amendment makes adherence to Tariff Commission recommendations mandatory. Thus the usually unbiased viewpoint of the Tariff Commission will have to be accepted. This amendment would stop the present policy of using the Trade Agreements Act for purposes of foreign policy and foreign aid as has been done so frequently before.

The present version of the peril-point feature must be regarded as an insufficient safeguard to domestic industries endangered by unfair foreign competition.

In other words, Mr. President, it would change the announced policy of the State Department as to making cash advances to foreign countries until such time as the markets of this Nation can be divided with the nations of the world, so that the advances of cash can make up their trade balances.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the proposed amendment goes to the heart of the so-called peril-point provision. The distinguished junior Senator from Nevada says it requires no more than a letter from the President to the Congress, but that letter is a very significant and potent factor in the whole business. When the President sends a letter to the Congress stating that he has disregarded a peril point, he has to give a good reason, or the Congress has instant jurisdiction to override what the President would do, and it would undoubtedly proceed to do so. If the President should give a foolish reason for disregarding a peril point, he would do so at his own peril. It is a great mistake to think that the provision is without potency. The very fact that it has met with such serious resistance, and the very fact that it was repealed by the Eighty-first Congress, indicate that it is regarded as a provision of important substance.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Colorado that the present provision in the bill is effective, I see no reason why, if Congress is going to establish a peril point, it should not be a binding one. If the peril-point principle is right, I think it should be a part of the law, and I do not think the President should have the right to overrule the general principle laid down by Congress in the bill. So far as I am concerned, I merely want to go on record as in favor of this particular amendment. I think it is essential, if the Congress is to assert its right to legislate on the subject of tariffs.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I heartily agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, but I want to comment briefly on the statement of the junior Senator from Colorado that I said the President must write Congress and give a report and a reason for disregarding the peril point. If we have come to the point on the Senate floor where a reason given by the State Department and the President of the United States sounds like a good reason to us, if we have that confidence, it is something that must have been newly generated.

Mr. President, under the provisions of my amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill, which amendment was rejected, the situation could have been effectively governed so that there would not be manipulation of currency and numerous other subterfuges to escape the logical conclusions of the trade agreement. The flexible tariffs would become operative, and the Foreign Trade Authority could take up the matter and adjust it to the existing conditions. A frozen tariff, whether the State Department freezes it or the Tariff Commission freezes it, is still frozen.

So, Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Ohio in asking, why allow the President of the United States to give a reason which he thinks is good? He has given us reasons for 4 years, and the State Department has piled reason upon reason, its object being the alleged desirability of dividing the wealth of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 4, offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, when there is a recommendation for an increase or a decrease of a tariff duty, it is always left finally to the President, and it necessarily should be. Undoubtedly, under the peril-point amendment in this bill, the President, 99 times out of 100, would follow the recommendations made by the Tariff Commission and would not go below the peril point fixed by the Commission, because he would have to give publicly his reasons for his action. But there might and there do arise cases where actually a technical justification could be found for fixing a low peril point. It would, however, result in injury, severe injury, to some major American interest.

Therefore, in all our tariff making, when the Tariff Commission itself has been given authority to recommend an increase up and down of 50 percent, I think it has been left finally with the President whether he would approve it. I think it would be a very great mistake to bind the President to put into effect anything the Tariff Commission might recommend with respect to the peril point beyond what the bill provides. It is hedged about by every possible restriction and limitation, as I see it, to the point where there never need be, except in very exceptional situations, any fear

that the President will not follow the recommendation of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question. Has it come to his attention in recent years that the President or the Secretary of State have paid any attention to a common-sense attitude on tariff rates? On the other hand, has it not come to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the tariffs which have been tampered with and tinkered with for 18 years are already below any such a peril point as is being suggested now?

Mr. GEORGE. I am aware of the fact, Mr. President, that our tariff duties have been lowered. But I earnestly invite the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that the amendment in the bill as it now stands, with some slight improvements, but not weakening improvements, was an amendment that was really formulated by the Eightieth Congress. It does not make the State Department too happy, I can assure the Senator, if that will cause him not to insist too strongly upon his motion, to have this in the bill. But the committee thought it ought to be in the bill, and the committee decided to put it in the bill because the committee believed the time had come when, based upon our experience, we should begin to do a practical job of stepping up the mechanics of the system of tariff adjustments and trade agreements.

Hence we believed that the peril point provision ought to be included in the bill. It is, in my judgment, a very meritorious provision. I think it will be effective in nearly all instances. Certainly if the President should override it there would have to be the strongest reason given by him why some major American industry would be hurt if he did not do so. So I think the President ought to have the discretion the Executive has had under every one of our flexible tariff provisions so far as I now recall.

Mr. MALONE. That would not be the manner in which we would establish a flexible import fee under the Foreign Trade Authority which was suggested as a substitute. I do not agree with this discretionary power, of course. I wish I could join the Senator from Georgia in his childlike faith in the President and in the Secretary of State in trying to protect the workingmen and investors of this country. I should like to say, in closing, that no instance can be cited, except in an insignificant one where any attention whatever was paid to a petition presented to the Reciprocal Committee. There was what was called the Committee for Reciprocity of the State Department, and other agencies, which heard grievances. There was one instance, I believe, in connection with an insignificant matter, when a great deal of political pressure was brought to bear, when attention was paid. But there was no other similar instance in 18 long years.

Therefore I think it would be difficult to make anyone believe that the Secretary of State and the President of the United States would change their long-established and announced policy of dividing the markets with the foreign nations of the world to help them balance their trade. I know of no reason anyone should possibly have for coming to such a conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] numbered 4.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment numbered 5 and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 25, after "practicable", it is proposed to insert the following: "(which shall not be later than 6 months after (1) the enactment of this act, or (2) the occasion for such action arises, whichever is later)."

Mr. MALONE. Amendment No. 5 makes it mandatory upon the President to suspend, withdraw, or prevent the application of any reduction in duty or binding of any existing customs-excise treatment or other concession to the U. S. S. R. and other Communist-controlled governments within a period of 6 months. In addition, it forces the President to withdraw the concessions to those nations which fall under Communist control in the future.

It simply is not reasonable, in the present period of world tension, to have trade agreements with Communist nations such as we have with Czechoslovakia, or to give concessions to such nations under the operation of the most-favored-nation clause. It must be realized that Communist nations, as well as all others, benefit from any concessions made by the United States without giving any advantage to the United States in return.

The Senate bill says the President shall take such action as soon as practicable. This feature should be tightened up and a time limit put on such withdrawal.

This amendment strengthens and improves the present Senate version of the bill.

For at least the 4½ years the junior Senator from Nevada has served in the Senate, whenever the tension really has tightened, when we were complaining about trading with Russia, all at once an isolated news press dispatch would appear some place stating that of course we had to obtain manganese from Russia as well as other strategic materials, so we must not disturb the status quo. I deny that it is necessary to obtain any material from Russia. As a matter of fact, it is very likely, if investigations were carried on, that it would be found we could obtain manganese cheaper from other countries. That is simply a subterfuge and a blind used by the State Department to continue something that they think they should continue, trade with the Red countries, something which the Senate now has condemned, although in very weak language, I must say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] numbered 5.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 6, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 19, after the word "practicable", it is proposed to insert the following: "(which shall not be later than 12 months after the enactment of this act)."

On page 8, line 23, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

> Any trade agreement which cannot be brought into conformity with such policy as provided in this subsection shall be terminated by the President at the earliest date provided for by its terms or by law.

On page 9, beginning with line 1, it is proposed to strike out through the comma in line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Within 30 days after the expiration of 12 months after the enactment of this act."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, section 6 (b) of the Senate version of H. R. 1612 provides that the President include the new escape clause in existing trade agreements "as soon as practicable." Amendment No. 6 puts a time limit of 12 months on the inclusion of the escape clause, and provides that trade agreements which cannot be brought into conformity with that policy shall be terminated. This provision gives the President bargaining power in his negotiations with the signatory nations to include the new and strengthened escape clause. In addition, the President shall report to Congress the status of the negotiations, or termination of trade agreements under this section within 30 days after the expiration of the 12-month time limit.

Under the present wording of "as soon as practicable" the President is given too much latitude to conform to the desires of Congress, and I believe it to be only fair to the domestic producers injured by tariff reductions made heretofore to speed up the application and availability of the new escape clause. It must not be forgotten that the peril-point procedure, and the inclusion of the new escape clause in new trade agreements is severely limited by the fact that the administration plans no further tariff reduction agreements for the next 3 years, if we can take the Secretary of State at his word. The junior Senator from Nevada believes that that was a way of "wetting down" the Senate Finance Committee, and that almost immediately following the next election another conference will be called, and under this extension there will be plenty of time to reduce tariffs further. There will be 2 years more of the ruinous tariff reductions under which we are now suffering, and under which we shall suffer further as soon as the Torquay agreements have become effective, or at least as soon as the emergency is over—if we ever see another day in the United States without an emergency. The junior Senator from Nevada is beginning to doubt that, so long as the present administration is in power.

I invite attention again to what Secretary Acheson said on Monday, January 22, 1951, during the hearings before the

Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives:

> It is * * * not expected that there will be another Torquay within the life of the extension provided for in H. R. 1612.

The House version of H. R. 1612 provided for a 3-year extension.

The Secretary also said that the Department would not again bring before Congress the International Trade Organization, and the committee made much of that statement. However, the junior Senator from Nevada has adequately proved, I hope, that they will adopt the essentials of the International Trade Organization in another manner, by other approaches, which will be just as effective. The junior Senator from Nevada has no way of digging out the facts and learning the real intentions of the State Department. However, if this statement is as true as the other, then it is a subterfuge to cover up a move to bring about a further reduction.

In the light of these facts, the inclusion of the new escape clause in existing trade agreements is of greater importance than either the peril-point procedure, or the escape clause in future agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 6 offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 7 which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "may" and insert "shall"; and on page 11, beginning in line 10 with the word "If", it is proposed to strike out through line 15.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, section 7 (c) provides that the President shall make a report to Congress if he decides not to make the changes in the rates of duty recommended by the Tariff Commission under the escape clause. This provision is parallel to the permissive feature of the peril-point procedure, and I believe it to be unsound.

Amendment No. 7 provides that the President shall make the changes recommended under the escape clause. Of course, this removes the necessity of the President writing a letter to Congress explaining why he did not make the recommended changes. Thus the two amendments, Nos. 7 and 4, are complementary and strengthen the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, whether it be under the escape clause or under the peril-point procedure.

By removing the permissive features of each of these provisions, we relieve the President of much of the temptation to use the Trade Agreements Act and thus the tariffs of this country for purposes of foreign policy advantage or as a feature of foreign aid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada on page 11.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment numbered 8, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 20, after the word "conclusions," it is proposed to insert "and the reasons therefor."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, section 7 (d) requires the Tariff Commission to make and publish a report stating its findings and conclusions if adjustments of tariff rates under the escape clause are found unnecessary. Amendment 8 adds the words "and the reasons therefor" after the words "stating its findings and conclusions."

Under the present wording it is not made clear that the Tariff Commission should state the reasons why, on the basis of the available information, adjustments of tariff rates under the escape clause would be unnecessary.

It does not make sense to require the Tariff Commission to make a report containing statistics and conclusions to be drawn from them without giving adequate explanation why these conclusions were arrived at. This amendment therefore strengthens the report feature of the escape-clause provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 8 offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment numbered 9, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, between lines 6 and 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

> (c) No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be permitted to continue in effect with respect to any agricultural commodity during any period in which a subsidy is being paid with respect to such commodity, or the price of such commodity is being supported, by any department or agency of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. By withdrawing any reduction of duties on agricultural commodities under a subsidy or price-support program, the amendment No. 9 will result in keeping down imports of those agricultural commodities produced abroad. Thus, the cost to the taxpayer of the programs will be reduced, and we will aid the more orderly marketing of our agricultural surplus commodities. It makes no sense to have a price-support program or a subsidy in operation when imports are entering this country at reduced tariff rates. Such a policy results in a price-support program being run for the benefit of foreign producers. This amendment would result in great savings in our agricultural price-support programs and in many cases would remove the need for such a program entirely. If amendment No. 1 to H. R. 1612—which is, of course, the substitute for H. R. 1612—had been accepted, it is believed that about 85 percent of all price-support and subsidy programs could have been eliminated by having a flexible import fee on the imports of competitive agricultural commodities. However, in the absence of the flexible import fee, we can at least return to the tariff rates of the Tariff Act of 1930 for those commodities which are in surplus in the United States.

It was brought out very clearly in the debate this afternoon that subsidies had been paid to our own producers on commodities with respect to which the market was being flooded from outside sources. This amendment would tend to prevent repetition of any such action.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this amendment is similar to the House provision designated section 8, at the bottom of page 11, and continuing over onto page 12. It has an added feature, namely, the subsidy instead of merely the support price, but it is, in reality, the same amendment in principle.

This is one way to reach a vote on the House language. I shall support this amendment. No doubt it will be defeated. I cannot conceive of the continuation of an effort so illogical. We continue to import into this country agricultural products at such a concession or reduction in tariff that those products are permitted to come in even when there is a domestic surplus; yet we expect the American taxpayers to support the prices of such products.

I cannot conceive of such a situation continuing. After considerable questioning I have been told on the Senate floor by the distinguished chairman of the committee and also by other Senators that the way to meet the situation is to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. I wish to say now that if the amendment is rejected, I certainly shall try to do it in that way. I shall prepare the necessary legislation to stop the importation of agricultural products into the United States at a concession which is so low that it permits foreign farmers to sell their produce in our open market, while our products are supported by the price-support program, thus enabling many of the foreign farmers to receive what amounts to a subsidy at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States. If the pending amendment is defeated, I shall certainly do it. When the time comes, I hope the answer will not be "You should have done it when we extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act." I hope I shall get support to correct the illogical situation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say that the provision is contained in the House bill, and it will be in conference. There will be an opportunity to consider it carefully in conference.

I invite the Senator's attention to testimony given before the committee by the farmers themselves. I express the hope that the Senate will not approve the amendment, but leave the subject open for conference. It is already in the House bill, as I have said, and we shall have full opportunity to

take it up in conference. I wish to read two or three lines from the testimony given before the committee. I read first from the statement of the president of the National Cotton Council:

We are particularly concerned about section 8. While we believe very strongly that the United States agricultural as well as industrial interests should in all cases be adequately safeguarded, we think the protective action should be carefully considered so it will not produce reaction and repercussion abroad that will result in a net loss to the United States. Section 8 of the bill, if adopted, we fear would seriously react on American agriculture and result in the cancellation of existing concessions and possibly the establishment of higher barriers against our export so that the United States might lose more than it gains. This seems very likely in view of the fact that our exports of price-supported agricultural commodities are roughly 4½ times our imports of those commodities. We feel that the protection to United States agriculture can be more adequately provided under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended than under the automatic provisions of section 8.

Consequently they recommended the treatment which is provided for by the pending bill.

A spokesman for the Federal Farm Bureau Federation called attention to table No. 2, with respect to the ratio of exports to imports of price-supported products, to which I have already referred. I quote from the testimony of Mr. Lynn:

Mr. LYNN. We think they would be far more tempted to do it under section 8, if adopted, than they will if it is eliminated, because section 8—no concession would be binding and, in other words, it would be flexible; if the product reached the price support or lower, therefore, you could give no real binding figures on concessions, and I believe that the foreign countries, particularly in Western Europe, are in better position to put in "gadgets," if you please, in regard to trade agreements than we are, because they have demonstrated time and time again that they have a lot of gadgets that they can use in keeping out our imports.

He recommended that section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act be amended. The same recommendation was made by the spokesman for the Farmers Union. He emphasized the danger of the proposed amendment and asked that the amendment be made in Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire who was the spokesman from North Dakota to whom the Senator referred as the first spokesman? I did not get his name.

Mr. GEORGE. The first one was Mr. Young, of the National Cotton Council.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. He is from Memphis, Tenn. I know him very well. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected, because in conference we shall have full opportunity to consider the subject.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to state for the benefit of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, of whom I am very fond, that it would be very much easier for the conference committee to deal with the matter if such an amendment as I have proposed were included also in the Senate bill. Then it would be a matter of coordinating the language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" have it, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote has been announced.

Mr. MALONE. I call up my amendment numbered 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. No foreign trade agreement shall hereafter be negotiated or entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to any article unless the principal supplier of such article is a party to such negotiations and to such agreement. The principal supplier of any article shall be the country growing, producing, or manufacturing the largest quantity of such article imported into the United States for consumption during the three calendar years ending last prior to the beginning of such negotiations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this provision requires the President in any negotiations for the conclusion of a trade agreement to adhere to the principal-supplier rule.

Although the State Department claims that tariff concessions are generally given only to the nation which is the principal supplier of the article in question, in actual practice this rule has frequently been violated. For instance, certain reductions of duties have been made in the past in negotiations with Sweden, although Great Britain was primarily interested in those concessions.

The most flagrant example has been the reduction of duties on lead ore, bullion, and so forth, at Torquay, in negotiations with Canada and Peru. Mexico has historically been the principal supplier for the American market and, following the termination of the trade agreement with Mexico, the tariff on lead was increased to the 1930 rate on January 1, 1951. At Torquay, however, in negotiations with countries that were not the principal supplier, duties on lead were again reduced to the Mexican rate. Therefore, without giving anything in return, Mexico can again export to the United States under the same rates of duty as were in effect until January 1, 1951.

The termination of the trade agreement with Mexico has thus been completely subverted. That is the most flagrant example, but there have been many others.

The amendment also would establish the standards which would be applicable in connection with proclaiming a country as the principal supplier of the commodity; that would be done by selecting the nation which in the preceding three calendar years had imported the largest amount of that article into the United States.

Mr. President, I consider this amendment to be of very great importance for the simple reason that in connection with this matter the State Department has used just another subterfuge in establishing a bad and dangerous program to which little attention ordinarily is paid because the ordinary producer does not think the program makes very much difference, insamuch as the foreign country which is said to be directly affected supplies so small an amount of that particular product. However, those who take that attitude forget that once the agreement is made, at once all other nations are entitled—under the most-favored-nation clause—to the duty reduction made by the agreement, without giving anything to us in return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 16, it is proposed to strike out the words "or directly competitive" and insert the words "or similar."

It is proposed that the same amendment be made on page 2, line 19; page 4, line 17; page 8, line 17; page 9, line 17; and page 10, line 11.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if this amendment is adopted, it will restore the language carried in the 1948 extension of the General Trade Agreements Act, as that extension was negotiated at Geneva. The phrase "like or similar article" was used in the peril-point extension of the 1948 agreement. It seems unwise to tie to some other commodity the arrangements with regard to one particular commodity. Certainly each commodity should stand on its own feet.

Therefore, I advocate the restoration of that language, so that the phrase will be "like or similar articles," as used in the peril-point provision of the 1948 extension of the Trade Agreements Act. That act was passed by the Eightieth Congress.

So, Mr. President, I request the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator state briefly the effect of the amendment if it is adopted?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. The effect will simply be to restore the language I have stated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that but what would that mean?

Mr. CONNALLY. The drive for the incorporation of the new words "directly competitive articles" is made by the coal

interests, as against the fuel-oil interests; but I think it is a mistake to tie one commodity to another, rather than to have each commodity stand on its own feet and to have the tariff on that commodity based upon a consideration of that kind.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask whether I correctly understand his amendment to mean that he is in favor of free trade on every commodity except oil.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I do not favor free trade on all commodities other than oil, as the Senator from Nevada should know.

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to be informed of that fact.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator stays happy.

Mr. MALONE. I think all of us could do so if we could have for each of approximately 8,000 products an amendment similar to the amendment now pending, which would exempt oil.

Mr. CONNALLY. This amendment does not exempt anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment No. 12, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 5, it is proposed to strike out through line 24, on page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession required or made appropriate by any foreign trade agreement entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, after enactment of this act, shall be proclaimed or permitted to continue in effect after the enactment of this act.

On page 8, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "hereafter."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, let me say that I am highly gratified that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] at least has made a record in the case of oil. In that connection, I wish to point out what I have tried to explain in former addresses I have made in the Senate, namely, that practically everyone wants a tariff on what is produced in his own State, but wants free trade or lower tariffs on what the people of his State purchase.

Let me say that my amendment No. 12 forbids the further reduction of duties under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, but otherwise leaves the pertinent parts of House bill 1612 intact. Of course, the amendment also removes the entire peril-point procedure, because it would be applicable only in the case of new trade agreements. Thus the amendment No. 12 makes all the changes in the bill which are called for in the present version of House bill 1612 and, which are applicable to trade agreements already in effect: namely, the new escape clause, the withdrawal of concessions to Russia and her satellites, the section dealing with section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the section on judicial review of tariff classifications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, in line 10, after the word "investigation", it is proposed to insert: "and make a report thereon not later than 1 year after the application is made."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the committee will have no objection to accepting and taking to conference that amendment. It simply requires the making of a report by the Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say that I have submitted the amendment for the reason that, time without number, applications which have been made to the Federal Trade Commission for action in connection with these matters have remained pending for long periods. A short time ago, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which was investigating the appointment of new employees, I found that during the operations of the Federal Trade Commission under its former membership, before new members were appointed by the President, more than 200 cases had been pending before the Commission for periods of time ranging from 3 to 13 years, without having any reports made on them by the Commission.

We should not permit such delays in connection with the Tariff Commisison. So I certainly thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for agreeing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota has been agreed to.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, preliminary to requesting the yeas and nays, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capehart	Dworshak
Anderson	Carlson	Eastland
Bennett	Case	Ellender
Benton	Chavez	Ferguson
Bricker	Connally	Flanders
Butler, Nebr.	Cordon	Fulbright
Byrd	Dirksen	George
Cain	Douglas	Hayden
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Robertson
Hennings	Malone	Russell
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Saltonstall
Hill	McCarran	Schoeppel
Hoey	McCarthy	Smathers
Holland	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Humphrey	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Ives	McKellar	Sparkman
Jenner	McMahon	Stennis
Johnson, Colo.	Millikin	Taft
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Moody	Tobey
Kilgore	Morse	Underwood
Knowland	Mundt	Wherry
Langer	Nixon	Wiley
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Williams
Long	Pastore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MILLIKIN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a couple of questions which I desire to ask the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] with whom I discussed the subject matter of the questions.

In my State, and also in the State of Washington, there is a situation in which the two Senators from Washington as well as the two Senators from Oregon have been much interested. The tree-nut industry has been greatly concerned about the reciprocal-trade problems which have developed over the years, resulting in many detrimental effects to that industry. We are seeking, in connection with the pending measure, the elimination from section 8, subsection (f), line 5, page 13, of the bill, the following three words: "with the requirements."

It is desired to have the section read:

No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with this section.

I should like to ask my good friend from Colorado if I am correct in my understanding that the committee is not disposed to strike the words "with the requirements", and if he would be so kind as to make a statement now, for the purpose of legislative history, as to why the committee is not disposed to strike those three words.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In my opinion, the language was put into the bill deliberately to strengthen rather than to weaken that section. It is intended to make it clear that our domestic programs under section 22 shall prevail and shall override anything inconsistent found in international agreements. That is the purpose of the language, to make it very clear that the requirements or the provisions of section 22, shall prevail and shall override all other inconsistent things to be found in international agreements.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that it is the view of the Senator from Colorado, and, I believe, the view of the committee as a whole, that the striking of these particular three words would weaken the best possible protection of the interest of the nut industry rather than strengthen it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is my opinion, and I believe it is the opinion of the other members of the committee. I should like to ask the distinguished

chairman of the committee whether he concurs in my view of the matter?

Mr. GEORGE. I concur in the Senator's statement.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado another question? Am I correct in my understanding that at least a part of the so-called Magnuson-Morse amendment, which has been adopted during the past 2 or 3 years in connection with the reciprocal-trade program in connection with agricultural products, is incorporated in the pending bill, namely, the language referred to in the last sentence on page 8 of the committee's report?—

> No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section.

The principle of that language has been incorporated in the final draft of the bill, has it not? The language I am referring to is the last sentence on page 8 of the committee report, the bottom of the page.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator give me a moment to examine that. I wonder if we are looking at the same reports.

Mr. MORSE. It appears at the bottom of page 8.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That language to which the Senator refers on page 8 is the language which is in the bill and reflects the interpretation which I have given to the distinguished Senator, which has been concurred in by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a half minute to make a statement for the RECORD, and I am sure that I speak also for the two Senators from Washington as well as my colleague from Oregon. The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I have discussed the other sections of the Magnuson-Morse amendment with the members of the committee, and we became satisfied that with the change I have just referred to we have obtained the best protection for the nut industry of the Pacific Northwest that could possibly be obtained, and that it would have been a useless gesture on our part of trying to make a fight for all the provisions of the Magnuson-Morse amendment. We feel that we really owe an expression of thanks to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] representing the majority side of the committee and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] representing the minority side of the committee for the cooperation they have extended to us in strengthening the bill so that, in our opinion, it will to a much better extent protect the nut industry than it has been protected in times past.

It is a matter of regret to me, as I am sure it is to the senior Senator from Washington, that what we have been able to accomplish does not completely satisfy the representatives of the nut industry of the Pacific Northwest, but I am satisfied that in due course of time they are going to find that the four Senators from Oregon and Washington have performed the best service that could be performed in protecting their interest in the bill at this time.

With the permission of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and for the purpose of the RECORD, I should like to ask the Senator if he does not associate himself with my remarks in regard to this matter; that we have worked out, in our opinion, the best possible adjustment of the problems of the nut industry in connection with this bill that can be worked out legislatively in this session of Congress?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Washington thoroughly agrees with the Senator from Oregon that the bill will surely protect the nut industry in any future trade agreements. Of course we did strive to simplify the procedure by which tariffs may be raised or lowered under present trade agreements, but the committee did not see fit to accept that. We think, however, a great stride forward has been made, and the committee was practically unanimous in agreeing that the language placed in the bill by the committee would do what we propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which met in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent on official business at the Pentagon Building on behalf of the State of West Virginia.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would, if present, vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF and Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF and Mr. MARTIN] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—72

Aiken	Hennings	Millikin
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bennett	Hill	Moody
Benton	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Nixon
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Jenner	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Connally	Knowland	Smathers
Cordon	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Long	Sparkman
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	Maybank	Taft
Ferguson	McCarran	Thye
Flanders	McCarthy	Tobey
Fulbright	McClellan	Underwood
George	McFarland	Wherry
Hayden	McKellar	Wiley
Hendrickson	McMahon	Williams

NAYS—2

Dworshak Malone

NOT VOTING—22

Brewster	Green	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Clements	Kem	Watkins
Duff	Kerr	Welker
Ecton	Lehman	Young
Frear	Martin	
Gillette	Murray	

So the bill (H. R. 1612) was passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered, and that the clerks be authorized to make clerical and other typographical corrections in the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF ENABLING ACT OF ARIZONA RELATING TO TERMS OF LEASES OF STATE-OWNED LANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 108) to amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for

the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands, which were, on page 3, line 5, to strike out "or", where it appears the second time in said line; and on page 3, line 16, after "production", to insert a semicolon and "or (4) the Legislature of the State of Arizona from providing by proper laws for the protection of lessees of said lands, whereby such lessees shall be protected in their rights to their improvements (including water rights) in such manner that in case of lease or sale of said lands to other parties the former lessee shall be paid by the succeeding lessee or purchaser the value of such improvements and rights placed thereon by such lessee."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the House has passed this bill with two amendments, I consulted the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], as well as both Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. MCFARLAND], who were the introducers of the bill. There is no objection to the House amendments, and I shall move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

This is a bill amending the enabling act by which the State of Arizona was admitted into the Union. It amends section 28 of that act by authorizing the State legislature to enact appropriate laws to allow lands which were conveyed to the State to be leased.

Mr. WHERRY. The House has amended the bill. Is it now proposed that the Senate concur in the House amendments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. The amendments are very simple.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they satisfactory to the minority members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 8, to strike out "includes" and insert "means"; on page 2, lines 22 and 23, to strike out "the continental United States (excluding Alaska)" and insert "the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia"; on page 3, line 7, to strike out "owned by citizens of the United States or"; on page 3, line 22, to strike cut all after "sessions;" down to and including "possessions" in line 24, and insert "air cargoes transported between any point in the United States and any point in a Territory or possession of the United States, between any point in any such Territory or possession and any point in any other such Territory or possession, or between any point in any such Territory or possession and any other point in the same Territory or possession"; on page 4, line 2, to strike out "and crews" and insert "members of the crews"; on page 4, line 3, after "sons" to insert "employed or"; on page 4, line 6, to strike out "and" and insert "or"; on page 4, lines 6 and 7, to strike out "by an enemy of the United States"; on page 4, lines 13 and 14, to strike out "as provided for in this title, except as provided in" and insert "provided under this title, except with respect to valuables covered by"; on page 7, line 15, to strike out "and may" and insert "and, subject to the following provisions of this subsection, may"; on page 7, line 20, to strike out all after "this" down to and including line 3, on page 8, and insert "title. In the case of any aircraft which is insured under the provisions of this title, (1) the policy shall specify a stated amount to be paid in the event of total loss, and such stated amount shall not exceed an amount determined by the Secretary, after consultation with the Civil Aeronautics Board, to represent the fair and reasonable value of the aircraft, and (2) the amount of any claim which is adjusted, compromised, settled, adjudged, or paid shall in no event exceed such stated amount.", and on page 13, after line 3, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (20) (a) of such section is amended by striking out "(except the Philippine Islands)."

(2) Paragraph (21) (a) of such section is amended by striking out "(except the Philippine Islands)."

(3) Paragraph (29) of such section is amended by striking out "(c) the Philippine Islands, except that the operation of civil aircraft within the jurisdiction of the Philippine Islands shall be governed by laws enacted by the legislature of the islands and by executive regulations designating airspace reservations or other prohibited areas; and (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "and (c)."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the House, in passing this bill, adopted, primarily, clarifying amendments which should be agreed to by the Senate.

There are three minor changes in substance which constitute improvements to the bill. One appears in paragraph (a) of section 1303 which is amended to authorize the Secretary to provide war-risk insurance with respect to foreign-flag aircraft only if and when they are engaged in aircraft operations deemed by the Secretary to be in the interest of national defense or national economy of the United States. As passsed by the Senate, the bill also would have permitted provision of such insurance for foreign-flag aircraft owned by citizens of the United States without regard to whether such aircraft were engaged in operations of this character.

A second amendment of substance was the deletion in paragraph (d) of section 1303 of the words "by an enemy of the United States." This language was stricken because of the difficulty of determining who are enemies in such situations as now exist in Korea. By striking out these words, the Secretary can determine which detentions should be insurable without becoming involved in the complex question of determining the enemies of the United States.

A third amendment adds an entirely new section 2 to the bill to bring up to date certain definitions contained in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to the status of the Philippine Islands.

The action by the House has improved the bill from a drafting point of view and the amendments should be agreed to by the Senate.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the House made two or three clarifying amendments to the bill as passed by the Senate, and the Senator is now asking the Senate to concur in the House amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator consulted members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I have not been able to consult all of them.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3842, which is the fourth supplemental appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Mrs. Grace C. Beasley, to be postmaster at Pelahatchie, Miss., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Harold C. Stuart, resigned.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joe Barnes Harrison, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia, vice Henry O. Camp, deceased.

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Arthur W. Crocker, of Maryland, to the position of examiner in chief on the Board of Appeals of the United States Patent Office.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert W. Knox, to be Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with rank of rear admiral; and

Maurice A. Hecht, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

POSTMASTER—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nomination of Arthur L. Jennings to be postmaster at Texarkana, Arkansas-Texas, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS—NEW REPORTS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the remaining nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 24, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

George W. Folta, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska. He is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired April 30, 1951.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Donald S. Burns, Corps of Engineers, to serve as president and member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. John S. Seybold, to be relieved.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Egbert Frank Bullene, O9708, United States Army, for appointment as Chief Chemical Officer, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Merwyn H. Squires, Chestnut Hill.

NEW YORK

Lee S. Murphy, Unadilla.
Thomas A. Brown, Wyandanch.

NORTH DAKOTA

Vivian M. Hilden, Reeder.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph K. Brown, Blue Ridge Summit.
Charles J. F. Ellis, Connellsville.
Stewart S. Young, Duncannon.
Keat P. Heefner, Mercersburg.
James L. O'Toole, Sharon.
Charles L. Johnston, Waynesboro.

TEXAS

Joyce W. Kemp, Fort Davis.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Grace C. Beasley, Pelahatchie, Miss.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the bountiful benefactor, ministering to the needs of our beloved country in every generation, make us more truly grateful for our glorious heritage of freedom and democracy.

Grant that we may be eager to prove worthy of these blessings which today are demanding so much of struggle and sacrifice on the part of many of our fellow citizens.

We pray that the Members of our Congress may know how to legislate wisely as they seek to find ways and means of defending and developing this heritage for the welfare and happiness of all mankind.

We give Thee all the praise and the glory through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3939. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives;

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; and

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2782) entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, May 24, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

Albert	Dondero	Hoffman, Ill.
Angell	Donovan	Irving
Barden	Dorn	Judd
Barrett	Doughton	Kelley, Pa.
Bow	Engle	Kennedy
Budge	Gillette	Kersten, Wis.
Burton	Golden	Kirwan
Camp	Gossett	Lyle
Cole, Kans.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Harvey	Murdock
Dawson	Hébert	Murray, Wis.
D'Ewart	Hedrick	O'Brien, Mich.
Dingell		Potter

Powell	Springer	Williams, Miss.
Regan	Stigler	Willis
Rivers	Sutton	Winstead
Secrest	Tackett	
Shelley	Taylor	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDIA EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3791, with Mr. THOMAS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] provided my colleague on the majority side will also agree to yield him 1 minute, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order for the 2 minutes on a matter which he feels to be of vital importance.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to extend my gratitude to the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle for giving me this 2 minutes of time and permitting me to speak out of order.

Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago in a 1-minute speech I extended to the membership of the House and their wives a most cordial invitation on the part of the city of Norfolk to be the guests of that city at the forthcoming final Confederate reunion. That Confederate reunion will be held in Norfolk, Va., beginning on May 30 and extending through June 2.

The congressional part of this trip will begin on June 1 and will end on June 3. I hope the Members will listen because following my first invitation you received an official invitation and I want it distinctly understood that this invitation is extended to the Yankees with that detestable prefix just the same as it was to us Rebels and it not only extends to the Yankees but it includes their wives as well. They will receive a most cordial welcome down in my district.

May I call attention to some of the details that are involved?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman said something about the Yankees. Did he have a prefix to that?

Mr. HARDY. I said you could put that prefix on if you cared to.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I heard the gentleman say that the Yankees could bring their wives. Can the Yankees bring their husbands, too?

Mr. HARDY. Yes, by all means.

Transportation will be provided by air. Housing will be provided in Norfolk. We will leave Washington on June 1, returning on June 3. There will be some very interesting entertainment provided, including a trip to Fort Monroe for dedication of the Jefferson Davis casemate where he was imprisoned at Fort Monroe. Other features included the reenactment of the battle between the first two ironclad vessels, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, that just proves the generosity of my Yankee friends.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to point out that it is going to be a full period of activity, with reenactment of the battle between the first two ironclads. There is a most cordial welcome awaiting. But we do need to know who is going to make the trip and we need to know promptly in order that transportation arrangements may be made. I have arranged with the Sergeant at Arms office to receive acknowledgments and telephone calls from Members to indicate who will be there. But we must have this information by tomorrow. I think you received a card in the mail today, and if you have not returned it, please do so at once and let us know whether you can or cannot come.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, this matter which we are presently considering is a most important one. It has to do with our economy, our security, and our position in the world. Through all of my years in Congress it seems that we have been having such matters coming before us almost constantly. They present problems that disturb all of us. I think, however, that by and large we have sought to resolve those problems in the way that our conscience and our judgment dictated.

I voted for the rule yesterday for the consideration of this very important matter thereby providing for debate on and probable amendment of the measure. I sincerely hope that in the consideration of the measure before us we may work out such an approach as is beneficial not only to the people of India and their government but to the people of this country—an approach which contributes to our own security and strength. It is on such a basis that the great people who claim allegiance to my party, such as Mr. Herbert Hoover, and, I understand, most of the members of the committee on our side of the aisle, are supporting this measure—assuming, of course, that the measure can be worked out in a mutually satisfactory and advantageous way. In that connection I know there are a good many who have high hopes that as this measure may finally evolve it can, to assist us in providing for our security both at home and abroad, make available materials that we vitally need.

Yesterday our distinguished Speaker reminded this body—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 22, 1951, page 5624:

> If it had not been for Marshall aid in connection with the rehabilitation of Italy and France, those countries would today have been in the bosom of communism.

To me the distinguished Speaker's observation is a source of gratification, since the interim aid program for France and Italy, of which he speaks, was in fact made possible through the action of the Republican Eightieth Congress, in which I was privileged to serve as majority leader.

I think it is also worthy of note that the aid program for Greece and Turkey was brought to passage in that Congress, as was the program for economic assistance to Europe.

It was during the first session of the Eightieth Congress that Republicans passed a foreign-aid program involving funds in excess of $2,000,000,000. During the second session we appropriated more than $7,000,000,000 for these purposes in a broad program designed to help foreign nations preserve their independence against the threat of communism.

Moreover, and what is more germane to the current discussion, this money was appropriated by a Republican Congress to implement an effective program of recovery for Europe at a time when the administration had embarked upon a program which history has demonstrated was coddling, aiding, and abetting the enemies of freedom in Asia. I refer to the insistence of the State Department that the Communist Chinese were merely agrarian reformers who were entitled to a full voice in the government of Nationalist China.

I am certain a great many Members here today will vividly recall that the Eightieth Republican Congress also called for effective aid to Nationalist China at a time when such assistance had a reasonable chance of bearing the same fruits which have attended our efforts in Europe.

In that Congress we authorized $570,000,000 of economic and military aid to China, in the same act with an ECA. I well recall the administration opponents of such action at that time said we were trying to sabotage the European-aid program. They said we could not put the program through on time if we included Greek-Turkey aid and aid to Nationalist China. But what are the facts? What does history record? It is that we put the combined one-package program through within the deadline set.

What, then, you may well ask, happened to this attempt on our part to correlate these programs of foreign aid for both the east and the west, reference to which two areas was made by the Speaker? After we provided such money on April 2, 1948, none of that military

aid that we authorized for China was extended until 8 months later. In that interim many battles against the Communist Chinese had been fought and lost.

The failure to properly administer the support to Asia and to China at a time when it would have been effective lies at the doorstep of an administration which was unwilling to effectively carry out the designs for the enterprise of restraining communism as it pertained to the Far East.

More than a year ago, almost 2 years ago, I was pointing out to the people of this country that the leaders of the Republican Party were consulted on the formation of an anti-Communist policy in Europe, and most of us supported that program, but we were never consulted on the policy in Asia, and we vigorously opposed that policy as it began to unfold.

This is what I said almost 2 years ago:

> Today Manchuria is gone, China is gone, and the threat of communism is pointed straight at Burma, Indochina, Tibet, and Malaya, with India and the Philippines and all the rest of Asia as the final targets. Our abandonment of our China ally to the Soviet conspiracy is one of the great tragedies of all time.

Our distinguished Speaker pointed out yesterday that we need friends in the East—and he wondered if some gentlemen have forgotten that we need friends the world around, in the East as well as the West.

He could not have been directing his remarks to this side of the aisle, because the record is abundantly clear that the Republican Party has long since recognized the need for friends in all parts of the globe. It was in the light of this realization that Republicans in the Eightieth Congress predicated their program.

We recognized the value of the friendship of Nationalist China.

The administration insisted that we open the door to the "agrarian reformers" of Mao Tse-tung, the Communist.

What is the relative position of these people today?

Chiang Kai-shek and the forces of Nationalist China under him are bottled up on the island of Formosa by edict of our Government. Only at this late date is the administration recognizing the wisdom of lending aid in this direction. How far it will go I have no way of knowing.

On the other hand, where is the friendship the administration courted with Mao Tse-tung and his Communist legions? It is broken on the battlefields of Korea. Those "argarian reformers" wooed by the State Department are killing our boys in Korea today.

My party needs no reminder that America needs friends around the world. Our Republican declaration of foreign policy at the time of the Eightieth Congress was this:

> We support the United Nations Organization for international peace. * * * We support the indispensable inter-American system as a regional part of the international organization. * * * We will engage in essential international relief as a humanitarian obligation and to prevent chaos through misery.

In foreign affairs the Republican Eightieth Congress did, indeed, comply with all its constitutional responsibilities. It did, indeed, strive for an enduring world peace.

In the light of this record of the Republican Eightieth Congress I thank our distinguished Speaker for calling the attention of this membership to the effectiveness of the program we made possible in the interests of the peoples of free Europe and of Greece and Turkey.

And in the light of the great tragedy which has befallen us in Asia I regret that the administration did not see fit at the proper time to conscientiously execute the will of the Republican Eightieth Congress in respect to our program for the strengthening of a free and independent Asia.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that in the discussions on measures of this nature we must seemingly stand naked before the world. We voice our opinions about our neighbors who live with us in this close, compact community of nations, and sometimes our remarks are not complimentary. I do not know of a remedial answer. It is our way of doing things, but obviously we over-indulge at times in this respect. Never before, for instance, in the history of any nation have we held a council of war in front of our enemies as is now in process in other parts of this Capitol. I am applying my statements to a condition rather than as a criticism toward individuals.

The system under which we operate, with all the activity which the meaning of freedom embraces, together with our rather candid nature and disposition, in the heat of discussions we often exercise little restraint. In the early years of our Government, and, in fact, until comparatively recent times, the freedom of discussions on the floor of this Congress usually applied to domestic issues. We were not globally involved, but since becoming thus involved, our responsibility in this respect has become much greater.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to be moderate and considerate in my remarks, although it does become necessary to discuss the attitude of India and particularly a short reference to the philosophy of Mr. Nehru.

However, I want to make a general reference to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who has just preceded me. I want to parentheticaly add that to me it is also regrettable to deal in hindsight alone, unless it is a positive factor to avoid mistakes in the future. In other words, much of what the gentleman has just said suggests a political approach rather than a constructive answer to the many questions involved in the legislation before us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall try as best I can to pick up the continuity of the discussion we had on this bill yesterday.

First, I want to take occasion to correct the RECORD of yesterday when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Rules Committee, stated that this bill came out of the Foreign Affairs Committee by unanimous vote. I voted against this bill in the committee and also opposed the first bill which was presented to the Rules Committee, but which was rejected.

Incidentally, it was probably not known to the Rules Committee when it rejected the original bill, known as the Morgan bill, that the majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee would pass out any sort of measure and the form—that is, grant or loan—was not determining. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] will probably want to bear this action in mind for future reference.

As a matter of fact, I agree in some respects with the majority on the Committee that if a bill must be produced, it makes little difference whether it is on a loan or on a grant basis. That will indicate how much I think of the worthiness of the loan. If I were for the bill, the loan feature, under the circumstances, would be a subterfuge.

As a compliment to the staff of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I say this in all sincerity and with no facetiousness whatever—they were able to produce for the committee an able argument in the first instance that a loan to India was not a good loan. When it was decided the aid provided in this legislation would be on the basis of a loan, they were then able to produce a strong argument substantiating that viewpoint. Here is the language of the first proposition—that is, when it called for a grant:

> The committee gave special consideration to the question of whether the aid requested by India should be made available as a loan "on special and easy terms," as requested by the Indian Government, or as an outright grant. The committee believes that a loan would be an unrealistic approach to the problem. It would be contrary to the firmly established policy of the United States not to make loans where there is no reasonable expectation that they can be repaid. Furthermore, a loan that can not be repaid engenders ill will instead of creating goodwill.

After the Rules Committee refused to grant a rule providing aid on a grant basis, the committee then rewrote loan provisions or provisions for repayment. Then, our staff, at the request of the committee, of course, had to say this in the report:

> There is no question of India's ability to service a loan of the size authorized by this bill. The most conservative estimates indicate that at the present time, India's excess reserves over requirement is equivalent to about $500,000,000.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CHATHAM. The gentleman said it was his opinion that this was put on a loan basis as a subterfuge.

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will pardon me, I said that if I had supported both propositions which have been involved in this effort, I would feel my action to be a subterfuge. Please understand me. I do not mean that the gentleman is a party to a subterfuge.

His views are his own and I respect them. I am sure he will be as liberal with me.

Mr. CHATHAM. I do not believe any member of the Foreign Affairs Committee was a party to a subterfuge.

Mr. BURLESON. And I did not intend to indicate such. If I were supporting this bill and that was the route I had to take, if that was the thing which had to convince me of the worthiness of the loan, I would consider it a sop. If I were trying to justify the fact to my people back home that this is a worthy loan, I would want more than I have yet seen produced on which to base my support.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Just on the basis of facts and nothing else, it is a fact that when we were discussing this idea of a grant we all knew that if we made a grant to India that would help them in their development plan. In other words, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] so eloquently explained, food would be eaten up within a year, and it would not represent a tangible, permanent asset. Hence, if you drew down the money in terms of a loan, you would reduce the capability of India to pursue her own development plans. If you give it to them as a grant, you would not impair their financial position to pursue their own development. I think that is a fair explanation.

Mr. BURLESON. I trust the gentleman will not take too much of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. I would just like to point out one other significant fact to the folks back home. I got this from the International Bank this morning. India has never defaulted on any external debt. Is it not fair to say that that is a mighty good debt record and a mighty good precursor for a loan?

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman knows that India has not had an opportunity very long to incur debts on her own, nor has any debt come due which she must meet and repay.

Mr. JAVITS. She has been under the British constantly as a dominion, and she has never defaulted on a debt.

Mr. BURLESON. I have no quarrel with the matter of India's good intention and her past performance, but say the least, she has not assumed very much responsibility in this respect and therefore has scant record which can point to future possibilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to a few things which I think will be of interest to the House in considering these matters before us. First, there is the military operation of India in Kashmir. It is my information that it is costing the Indian Government a sum approximating the cost of the grain which we propose to send them under this legislation. As you know, the dispute between India and Pakistan involving the territory of Kashmir is of long standing. Pakistan has shown great improvement since her independence and is a friend of the United States. India claims Kashmir is opposed to Pakistan, and maintains forces to hold that State and denies the request of the United Nations to pull her troops out in order that a free and unhindered election can be held. My argument is not for Pakistan as opposed to India, but if India can afford to maintain her present military operation in this respect, she might afford to spend money for food for her starving people.

Considerable discussion was had yesterday on the philosophies and attitude of Mr. Nehru toward the western countries on the one hand, and those countries embracing communism on the other. I doubt if the American mind can understand Mr. Nehru, but it is my conception that has one foot firmly planted in Gandhiism and the other in the materialism manifested by India's action in Kashmir and also in Mr. Nehru's attitude, and others of his Government, toward western civilization. In other words, he wants his cake and eat it too.

Is there real suffering and real famine in India? Doubtless there is. There always has been. Since 1803, as far back as the record is clear, there has been a famine in India on the average of about every 7 years. Now if we are wrong in meeting such a condition on a humanitarian basis today, our forefathers were negligent men also, and did not heed the need of the suffering. Poverty and disease are a common thing in India, as everyone knows, but on May 1 in a speech, Mr. Nehru had this to say:

> We have large areas in India today which are deficient in food and some which hover on the verge of famine, and yet there are also other parts of India which have produced surplus food grains. Taking India as a whole, the deficit is not so great as imagined. We can only meet this crisis by pooling all our resources and using them to the best advantage all over India. It would be shameful to all of us if some people die of lack of food while others have abundance of it; if some of the states have to face widespread undernourishment and starvation while others have a surplus.

So, in Mr. Nehru's own words on May 1, he does not despair of the situation in India to the extent which has been expressed here on the floor of this House during this debate. He was appealing to those areas of India which had a surplus of food grains to share it with those who had none. As I understand it, he had recently made a rather extended trip over India and found that in the States of Bihar and Madras the deficit in food was rather severe; whereas in other parts, for instance in Uttar Pradesh, a great grain and rice producing area, supplies of food grains were on hand and in surplus. Now, Mr. Chairman, if India is unable to make distribution of food among her peoples with some supplies on hand, how can we expect them to do so with grains shipped to the Indian ports? As you know, India is a country of tremendous area. Transportation and communication facilities are very poor. That is one of their problems. It is not the problem we have under consideration here. Therefore, I doubt if the intents in this legislation can physically be brought about.

Some of you on the floor of this House, like myself, have been in the Far East. Some of you, like myself, served in the Armed Forces in that part of the world and saw how things were done. You may, for instance, have seen the operation of UNRRA, which resulted in those who had, having more, and those who had not, still having not. I fear the result in India would be the same under this system. Under this bill, as has been pointed up here in the debate, we have nothing to do with the distribution, and in this respect I would have preferred the measure which provided the assistance as an outright grant. If it were a grant, we could at least supervise the distribution and see that it was used for the purpose intended. We have no strings on the $190,000,000 which we would spend under this measure.

In connection with food supply, let me say a word to those of you who evidently have the impression that surplus grain in this country is running out of our ears. When representatives of the Agricultural Department, the Farm Bureau, and other farm organizations appeared before our committee testifying in behalf of this bill, they referred to the good grain prospects at that time. Mind you, this was in February. I questioned these officials of the farm organizations and the United States Department of Agriculture on the matter of good grain prospects in the Southwest and the great wheat producing areas in the Midwest. I reminded them of the severe drought which existed, which has not yet in many places been broken. They contended the winter wheat prospect was good. Subsequent reports have proved just how wrong they were, and now they simply say that spring wheat prospects are good, and maybe they are, but much can happen. Now, if the world was unfortunate enough to be plunged into an all-out war, tremendous demands would be made upon us for food grains. This country would have to supply many troops. If we can't protect this country from every conceivable eventuality, how can we expect to protect some other nation which could not and would not contribute anything in such a war?

This is not a humanitarian proposition. No one could hold greater compassion for suffering people than I, and I know that every Member of this Congress likewise feels compassion for unfortunate people, but I repeat, this is not a humanitarian measure. It is political as surely as we sit here, and it is not the policy of this country to abolish poverty wherever it is. If it were the policy, it would be an impossibility. The United States of America cannot continue indefinitely to feed half the world and fight the other half. This action, if it passes, is an invitation to every nation in the world to appeal for help in the form of loans, and they likely will do so. In other aid programs there has been a tangibility. For instance, the $50,000,000 aid to Yugoslavia which we passed near the close of the last session of Congress was a gamble that Yugoslavia's 32 divisions, fairly well armed and equipped, would be on our side in case trouble developed with Russia. That is a tangible asset. Other aid programs have likewise had some such tangibility, the degree of which was estimated in some form or other. I repeat, there is no tangibility

in this respect in India. India has no intent of assisting this Government, even by its moral support, and she has no physical support. In a few days from now, the State of Israel will be requesting a loan of something over $125,000,000. What can you say to Israel if you approve this loan to India? What can you say to the Arab states, Africa, the southeast Asian states—as to that matter, any country in the world with whom we have a semblance of friendship? If it is the policy of this country to take care of all unfortunate people of the world, we should have given aid to little El Salvador, which a few days ago suffered a devastating earthquake in which more than 1,200 people were killed and an inestimable amount of property destroyed. We passed a resolution a few days ago, and I understand it has now passed the other body, in connection with El Salvador's disaster. You know what we gave them, do you not? We gave them sympathy. I voted for it. I would also vote to extend that much to India or any other part of the world. In 1949 a severe earthquake laid waste to a great area in Ecuador. They needed $5,000,000. I saw that area and walked over a considerable part of it. The American Red Cross was doing and did a wonderful job. The American Government gave nothing. They are not going Communist and we have their friendship.

By this action, I cannot believe we will guarantee the friendship of the Government of India or the Indian people. Neither do I believe we can buy our way around this world. We cannot continue to place the heavy burden of taxation upon our people and to flagrantly throw our resources to the far corners of this world and expect to remain strong. We can maintain a stability in this world by our strength, which certainly cannot be maintained if we ever become weak. We are the only people who can maintain it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Texas has raised through his remarks some question about the need for assistance in India. I have studied the evidence taken before the committee. It seems to me that the evidence conclusively justifies and establishes a case. But I have here a statement by the Catholic Association for International Peace dated February 16, which states in part:

> The Indian Government requests 2,000,000 tons of food grains from the United States as the minimum to continue the ration in 1951 at the level prevailing in 1950 to build back India's depleted grain reserves to a minimum safe level. The Indian Government bases this request for aid on the contention that summer floods, earthquakes, and fall droughts have critically reduced domestic grain supplies.
>
> So far as can presently be ascertained, summer floods in some areas did wipe out grain reserves held by Indian farmers and destroyed seed stocks as well. Earthquakes did destroy some villages and otherwise hampered production.
>
> But most importantly, in some of the principal rice-growing provinces, autumn rainfall was far below normal, with very serious effects upon rice production.
>
> The evidence on these points appears to be conclusive. So, too, is the evidence that the people of India are faced with a dangerous grain shortage unless additional imports are provided—though there is lack of full agreement as to how bad the situation actually is.

I think it is on that that there is some honest misunderstanding. Continuing:

> It would appear to be significant, however, that the per capita daily grain ration has been reduced by 25 percent in Bombay and other ration areas.

Representatives of all religions favor the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the remarks of my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and I want to compliment him on the speech he made. There were some parts of it, of course, with regard to which an honest difference of opinion could exist. But I am not going to make any reference to them because I feel it would be unjustifiable on my part on this occasion. We in the House have always had a fairly good bipartisan relationship, never seriously impaired, and the substance of the speech of the gentleman from Indiana, in my opinion, is to strengthen the bipartisan relationship that should exist in both branches of the Congress in connection with foreign affairs. My comment is one, if I will not be put in a false position of trying to say something pleasant because I admire my friend even when we disagree, of commendation because as I listened to the speech the gentleman made it was of a strengthening nature and the few comments he made upon which there might be some honest disagreement were pertinent from his angle but from my angle it would be unjustifiable for me to undertake to differentiate on this occasion.

In the consideration of the bill before us, I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should realize the people of India are emerging from a long period of struggle and frustration. We are a nation of one-hundred-and-sixty-odd years of existence. We know the trying days of our own Nation as we study the history of our early constitutional days. Here is a people and a Nation that have just emerged from colonial control, exploitation as they believe, and we must expect that that long period of struggle and frustration is going to leave its imprint for some little time to come. We must realize that the feelings of generations cannot be forgotten in a few years.

We should also appreciate that the Chinese Communist invasion of Tibet presents new problems to India and undoubtedly has and will continue to produce a profound change in the state of mind of responsible leaders of India. As I view the situation, there is no question but what the threat of Communist aggression has produced unrest in India, particularly due to the Red Communists going into Tibet. The Communist invasion of Tibet at least must cause India to recognize its significance and its potential threat to India.

Let us not overlook in the consideration of this bill the fact that in an official statement the Chinese Communist News Agency not so long ago called Nehru the running dog of American and British imperialism.

We must recognize with an understanding that to the people of India the white soldiery for generations are to them the symbol of oppression and exploitation. Whether it be a fact or not, that was their feeling and is still their feeling. Whether or not this opinion was right or justified is immaterial. It exists so far as the people of India are concerned. They feel they are justified in entertaining such feelings and opinions.

As I read the newspapers of India, particularly in recent months, I cannot fail to note a marked swing to a more favorable comment on Indian-American relations; also to note the increasing critical comment on Communist expansion in Asia. We must also realize that there are other officials and persons in India than Mr. Nehru. And I do not want any remarks I make today to be used abroad for propaganda purposes by the Communists or anyone else, so I shall express myself in a restrained manner. But I think that Mr. Nehru is not the issue. Assuming the strongest case is made against him, as evidence by some of the statements made by colleagues of mine, I do not consider Mr. Nehru to be the issue.

The issue is whether or not there is starvation facing those people. That to me is the primary call. Charity means something to me. I am not going to give a sermon because in my little humble way I try to live up as a human being to what I believe in. But those of us who believe in God know that He and His Holy Son, the Redeemer, has told us the greatest possession we can have is charity. I recognize we cannot bring about a utopia in the world, and the remarks of my friend from Texas are pertinent in that respect. Nevertheless, where we can we should not close our eyes to suffering humanity. The only crime they committed is that they were born in India. None of us was consulted when we were brought onto this earth as to our racial origin, to our parents, to our color, as to where we should be born, and we are very fortunate that we were born in the United States; at least, I consider that I was very fortunate that I was born in the United States, and I will make a public confession that God has particularly blessed me in giving me at birth the dear mother that he did. What would be our feeling if we were born abroad, in India or behind the iron curtain, and we wanted freedom? We do not believe in communism; we are against it. But we must stand for something. We stand for the dignity of the individual. Our civilization and our way of life represents something to stand for. I am not against communism alone; I am for something, and when I am for the things I believe in, I am against communism. We will never meet the problems of the

day being against something all the time and being on the defensive. I try to live up to my own little way as a human being in the things I believe in. I believe in God, for example. I believe in a government of laws that can only exist where there are people who believe in God. We may differ about this or that proposition, but we all believe in the dignity of the individual. That is a spiritual gift. You could not have that under communism, where there is hatred, and where the origin is hate. So, we stand for something, and in order to stand for something we have got to do those things that will convey to other people the fact that we do stand for something. As I view this bill, we are conveying to the people of India and the people of the world that America stands for great ideas, not only spiritually, but governmentally, and our governmental ideas are the result of the spiritual ideals we believe in. I lay my support of this bill on the ground of charity, God-given charity. Out of it will flow many other things. I recognize the intemperate statements made by some of the officials of India, but let us not forget, as I said, that for generations they have been under the control of the white soldiery. I hope Mr. Nehru will not think all persons of the white race are like those that he thinks persecuted him. If he is going to have a feeling against every member of the white race because of what he has undergone, he is wrong. That is not the right way to think. That is not the right way for anyone to think. But, in the passage of this bill we are making a great contribution, one that is related to deep values, and in my opinion will bring not only immediate, but long-range understanding and a better understanding between the people of India and America, and that it will have far-reaching effects among all other peoples of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass without any crippling amendments.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to most of the debate yesterday and today I have the feeling that we are basing the need for the program in the present bill on the ground that there is acute starvation and great distress in India. I believe it is incumbent upon the proponents of the legislation to show that such is the fact. I think there is serious doubt about that. For the sake of the record, I want to bring to bear in support of my doubts the very statement of Mr. Nehru, the leader of India. I do that by referring to certain excerpts from a radio talk he gave to the Indian people on the 1st of May 1951—this year. He starts out by saying:

I am going to speak to you about the food situation in our country. What do those words convey to you? They might mean just some slight maladjustment which we should try to remedy, or they might mean starvation and famine for larger numbers of our countrymen. Let us try to understand objectively what exactly the situation is. On one hand we have exaggerated reports of famine conditions prevailing over wide areas and deaths from starvation. On the other hand, an attempt is made to minimize the gravity of the situation. The truth lies somewhere between the two and is bad enough. There are in India today wide areas, more especially in the states of Bihar and Madras, where food is lacking and is supplied in insufficient quantities and hence there is continuous undernourishment. Some are unable to bear this strain for long and weaken and collapse. Famine, as we have grown to understand this awful word does not exist to any wide extent at this stage. But the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land.

I quote again:

While we welcome all the help we can get from foreign countries, we have made it clear that such help must not have any political strings attached to it, any conditions which are unbecoming for a self-respecting nation to accept, any pressure to change our domestic or international policy. We would be unworthy of the high responsibilities with which we have been charged if we bartered away in the slightest degree our country's self-respect or freedom of action, even for something which we need so badly.

I shall not deal here with the wider and more basic problem of food in India, although that must be understood by us all in its implications; nor will I say much at this stage about the intimate connection of the food problem with that of the growth of population, both human beings and animals. It is clear to me that we cannot ultimately tackle the food problem by itself, ignoring these other factors.

We have large areas in India today which are deficient in food and some which hover on the verge of famine, and yet there are also other parts of India which produce surplus foodgrains. Taking India as a whole, the deficit is not so great as imagined. We can only meet this crisis by pooling all our resources and using them to the best advantage all over India. It would be shameful to all of us if some people die of lack of food while others have abundance of it; if some of the states have to face widespread undernourishment and starvation while others have a surplus. There is heavy responsibility at this moment on those states or areas which are described surplus, for it is to them that we must look to supply the need of those who lack food. We cannot think any more in narrow terms of our own particular state and ignore the agonizing call from a sister state. We have to realize that whatever help may or may not come from abroad, the burden and responsibility rests upon all of us and if any part of India goes down, we go down with it. In this, as in other matters, India is one and we must function therefore as a united whole.

I quote again:

I have learned with surprise and distress that some people are coming in the way of procurement and are actually preaching against it—

I might say, parenthetically, that this word "procurement" means coming into the production of grain.

If they think that the manner or method of procurement is not right, they have every justification for trying to rectify it or to improve it, but to say or do anything which hinders procurement is to invite famine and death for our people.

Procurement therefore must have first place.

Mind you, he also says this:

The new wheat is coming in and it is our good fortune that the crop has been on the whole a good one. Let us make the best of it and pour out this life-giving substance to those from whom life might be ebbing away. Let us all function with efficiency and integrity and not allow either our self-interest or our greed for profit or the red tape of official machinery to come in the way of speedy and adequate relief.

Quoting again:

I am sure that our people, as soon as they realize the nature of the crisis will cooperate in this common endeavor and not seek private profit out of their neighbor's misfortune. If any still continue to hoard, the committee should bring this matter to public notice. Some gifts of food grains have been made to me and I have welcomed them. I know that these gifts do not go a long way toward solving the national problem, but they are of importance in creating that atmosphere of self-help and cooperation which is so necessary today.

Mr. Chairman, what did Nehru say about starvation and famine? Briefly, I want to sum up in four points what he said because it has a direct bearing upon the charge that there is great suffering and that there is great danger that there will be a very extreme famine condition. Here are Nehru's own words, and I quote again:

Famine, as we have grown to understand this awful word does not exist to any wide extent at this stage. But the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land.

Again I quote:

We have large areas in India today which are deficient in food and some which hover on the verge of famine, and yet there are also other parts of India which produce surplus food grains. Taking India as a whole, the deficit is not so great as imagined.

Quoting further:

The new wheat is coming in and it is our good fortune that the crop has been on the whole a good one.

I am sure that our people, as soon as they realize the nature of the crisis, will cooperate in this common endeavor and not seek private profit out of their neighbor's misfortune. If any still continue to hoard, the committee should bring this matter to public notice. Some gifts of food grains have been made to me and I have welcomed them. I know that these gifts do not go a long way toward solving the national problem, but they are of importance in creating that atmosphere of self-help and cooperation which is so necessary today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this statement by Nehru himself should be persuasive in indicating to us that while there may be some danger of extreme suffering and hardship, the problem is not as acute as it has been painted by this legislation. This legislation refers to "emergency need arising from external sequence of floods, drought, and other natural disasters." Mr. Nehru is absolutely silent about that. Is it not strange that he has failed to do so.

I have a feeling that this program is not one that was designed originally to take care of the need that has been set forth in the legislation, but rather it was originally conceived to gain the good will of Mr. Nehru, and that is political and not economic. That is the situation as I see it today.

Of course, we know that while there may be a condition that is going to be bad, we also know that Nehru is preach-

ing to his people the concept that if they are ultimately to overcome this condition which faces them almost annually, it is a matter which they themselves must solve. This is an agricultural problem for the people of India.

There are many things that might be said, that the food grains that are short today are being consumed by animals, which could well take care of any need the Indian people have today. We do not like to talk about that kind of a situation because it is an internal problem; but, after all, we are the ones who are going to foot this bill. I sympathize with, and I support as a matter of fact, the idea that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] referred to when he addressed the Committee a few minutes ago. The question in my mind is, how far we are going to continue this kind of operation now before us? Are we going to try to take care of famine conditions all over the world? Are we going to assume the responsibility of arming nations all over the world? I do not know how you may feel about this, but, as far as I am concerned, my first responsibility is to my own country. We are in bad financial condition, confronted with higher taxes, economic controls, and diminishing consumer goods. In other words our standard of living is going down.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it not known to the gentleman that there are a flock of countries sitting on the steps of the Capitol now expecting to come to your committee for hand-outs in the event you adopt this Indian bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. COX. In other words, the information that I have, and it is reliable, is that it totals $7,000,000,000. When are we to end this give-away program, if we expect this country to survive?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I can only say this to the gentleman, that we had better end it now or the voters will take care of us in the next election.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to read two sentences from the official India News Bulletin issued by the Embassy of India, Washington, D. C., February 16, 1951, page 7:

> It might also be pointed out that jute is one of India's most important industries which earns nearly 45 percent of her dollar exchange. India can hardly afford to starve it.

In other words, while the people starve it is perfectly all right says the Indian Government, to divert acreage from production of food crops to jute, in order to profit by it, regardless of human misery and starvation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In that connection I might say that there was a reduction in the acreage for the production of food grains to the extent of 1,200,000 acres this year. That all goes to this problem.

I think India is big enough and resourceful enough to work itself out of this problem without reliance upon the United States of America. That is the position of Mr. Nehru and it is an admirable one and I commend him for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Laying aside the charity involved in this and the payment involved, let me ask the gentleman this question: Assuming that this deal is made in accordance with the provisions of this bill and a loan is facilitated through the machinery of the Export-Import Bank, in the gentleman's opinion will that loan be as sound as similar loans made through the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to insert in the RECORD—and for this I have secured permission in the House—the speech by Mr. Nehru on May 1, and also an article from the New York Times of May 2, on this question entitled "Nehru Bars Food With Strings."

(The matter referred to follows:)

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER NEHRU BROADCAST OVER ALL-INDIA RADIO MAY 1, 1951

I am going to speak to you about the food situation in our country. What do those words convey to you? They might mean just some slight maladjustment which we should try to remedy, or they might mean starvation and famine for larger number of our countrymen. Let us try to understand objectively what exactly the situation is. On one hand we have exaggerated reports of famine conditions prevailing over wide areas and deaths from starvation. On the other hand, an attempt is made to minimize the gravity of the situation. The truth lies somewhere between the two and is bad enough. There are in India today wide areas, more especially the instates of Bihar and Madras, where food is lacking and is supplied in insufficient quantities and hence there is continuous undernourishment. Some are unable to bear this strain for long and weaken and collapse. Famine, as we have grown to understand this awful word does not exist to any wide extent at this stage. But the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land.

What, then, are we going to do about it? We cannot look on while tragedy develops. We cannot live our everyday lives when starvation and death march with stealthy steps toward many of our people. There are many important and even vital problems confronting us in the international and domestic sphere, but there is nothing more vital or of greater importance today than to meet this menace of famine. What are our brave schemes worth if we cannot even save our people from that worst of fates—death by slow starvation? It serves little purpose to spend our time apportioning blame. We have to be up and doing to meet and counter this danger that confronts our people. Each one of us must realize what is happening and what is likely to happen. Each one of us must do his bit to prevent this happening. We have to face a very difficult situation, and I do not want anyone to minimize this difficulty. Nevertheless, I am convinced that we can face it successfully if only we show awareness and determination to do our utmost to crush the evil which threatens to overwhelm us. Let us declare war on famine and all of its brood.

This is not a question of politics or economics on which there can be any difference of opinion. Only the small in mind can try to take advantage or worse still, try to aggravate this situation for political purposes. If we cannot pull together in this matter, then indeed, we are men and women of petty statute who cannot rise to any occasion or any crisis.

We have tried our utmost to procure food grains from distant countries. We have purchased them to the utmost of our capacity, and ship after ship is coming in laden with this precious commodity and yet this is not enough and we have tried and are trying to get more. I should like to express my appreciation and gratitude to the many countries which have helped us in this matter: To the United States of America, which has the good fortune to have abundant supplies and which has also provided us with ships for transport; to China, which in spite of its own need has already sent us several shiploads and which is going to send us more; to Soviet Russia, which I hope will also be sending us wheat before long. I should like also to express my appreciation of the help given us by the Government of the United Kingdom in securing ships which we so badly need. Above all, I should like to express my deep gratitude to innumerable individuals in various countries, to the common man everywhere for not only his sympathy in our misfortune but also his desire to help to the best of his ability. In the United States of America, a nonofficial emergency committee which was formed for this purpose has done excellent work.

While we welcome all the help we can get from foreign countries, we have made it clear that such help must not have any political strings attached to it, any conditions which are unbecoming for a self-respecting nation to accept, any pressure to change our domestic or international policy. We would be unworthy of the high responsibilities with which we have been charged if we bartered away in the slightest degree our country's self-respect or freedom of action, even for something which we need so badly.

I shall not deal here with the wider and more basic problem of food in India, although that must be understood by us in all its implications; nor will I say much at this stage about the intimate connection of the food problem with that of the growth of population, both human beings and animals. It is clear to me that we cannot ultimately tackle the food problem by itself, ignoring these other factors.

We have sought help from abroad, as needs we must, and we shall continue to do so under pressure of necessity, but the conviction is growing upon me more forcibly than ever how dangerous it is for us to depend for this primary necessity of life on foreign countries. We can never function with the freedom that we desire if we are always dependent in this matter on others. It is only when we obtain self-sufficiency in food that we can progress and develop our policies. Otherwise, there is the continuous pressure of circumstance, there is trouble and misery and there is sometimes shame and humiliation.

We have large areas in India today which are deficient in food and some which hover on the verge of famine, and yet there are also other parts of India which produce surplus food grains. Taking India as a whole, the deficit is not so great as imagined. We can only meet this crisis by pooling all our resources and using them to the best advantage all over India. It would be shameful to all of us if some people die of lack of food while others have abundance of it; if some of the states have to face widespread undernourishment and starvation while others have a surplus. There is heavy responsibility at this moment on those states or areas which are described surplus, for it is to them that we must look to supply the need of those who lack food. We cannot

think any more in narrow terms of our own particular state and ignore the agonizing call from a sister state. We have to realize that whatever help may or may not come from abroad, the burden and responsibility rest upon all of us and if any part of India goes down, we go down with it. In this, as in other matters, India is one and we must function therefore as a united whole.

Two days ago I visited the district of Bulandshahr Uttar Pradesh. From the point of view of food, it is relatively more fortunate. When I told the people there of the sufferings of their brothers and sisters in Bihar or far off Madras, they were moved and immediately, without my asking for it, many offered their help and their gifts. This spontaneous gesture affected me deeply, and I realized that if only our people knew what the facts were, they would come to the rescue even at a sacrifice for themselves.

The immediate need is procurement of food grains. This has to be pushed to the utmost extent. There may be gifts, and we shall welcome them, but ultimately it is the amount of food grains that we procure that will make a difference. If this is so, then it becomes of essential importance for all of us to work our hardest to procure more than we have ever done in the past. This becomes the duty of our administration and of the trader and of the farmer and the peasant in the field. At this moment for any person to hoard or to speculate on food is a crime and a disgrace. If we think too much of our tomorrows and the day after, what of those who may see no tomorrow?

I have learned with surprise and distress that some people are coming in the way of procurement and are actually preaching against it. If they think that the manner or method of procurement is not right, they have every justification for trying to rectify it or to improve it, but to say or do anything which hinders procurement is to invite famine and death for our people.

Procurement therefore must have first place. The new wheat is coming in and it is our good fortune that the crop has been on the whole a good one. Let us make the best of it and pour out this life-giving substance to those from whom life might be ebbing away. Let us all function with efficiency and integrity and not allow either our self-interest or our greed for profit or the red tape of official machinery to come in the way of speedy and adequate relief.

What else can we do? Perhaps you know that our Army has offered help in the distribution of food or otherwise. We welcome that offer, because our Army is efficient and disciplined and I am sure that the help they give us will be valuable. I welcome it even more because I should like our Army to be not only the brave defenders of our freedom from external aggression, but also efficient servants of the people who can always be called upon in time of need. The Army and the people are one, and they must help each other.

In some of the areas that have been badly affected, notably in Bihar and parts of Madras, unemployment has grown and the purchasing power is vanishing so that even if foodgrains are available, there is no money to buy them. In these areas, it is important and urgent to start public works and to give relief and some purchasing power. These public works can be of many kinds. Primarily, they should concern themselves with growing more food wherever this is possible or any other kinds of works of permanent value. Wells can be made, village tanks can be dug and cleaned, roads can be constructed.

There must be many young men including students in our colleges and universities as well as in higher classes, secondary schools, for whom such labor should be welcome both from national and individual points of view. Personally, I have long been convinced that our educational process is incomplete unless the student has put in manual labor of some kind, and I hope that the time may come when a course of such labor should be made an essential part of school and college education, without which no degrees or diplomas can be given. Participation in such labor should be made compulsory. The practical effect of this will be appreciable. The psychological effect would be even more important, but, above all, this will result in improving the quality of the younger generation and making them fitter for any task that they might subsequently undertake. For them to throw themselves in a disciplined and organized way into this work of food production and relief as well as of public works in aid of it would have a tremendous effect on the Nation. Such work cannot be undertaken spasmodically and should be carefully organized and supervised. No person who is not earnest about it and hard working should undertake it.

We have large schemes for growing more food which are run under official auspices. Let the people start their small schemes on their own initiative and grow food wherever they can manage to do so—parks, gardens, uncultivated land in rural areas, compounds or public institutions, and private residences.

In any organized scheme for procurement or distribution, Government agencies must necessarily function, but that is not enough and it should be supplemented by private agency in a hundred ways. I suggest that each village should form a small committee of its own whose function should be to help every person in that village. That committee should assume responsibility for the village and those who lack food should be supported by those who have a little surplus. Of course, where necessary, official help will be given, but the village should function as a cooperative unit in this matter and the committee should also see to it that there is no hoarding by anyone in that village. I am sure that our people, as soon as they realize the nature of the crisis, will cooperate in this common endeavor and not seek private profit out of their neighbor's misfortune. If any still continue to hoard, the committee should bring this matter to public notice. Some gifts of foodgrains have been made to me and I have welcomed them. I know that these gifts do not go a long way toward solving the national problem, but they are of importance in creating that atmosphere of self-help and cooperation which is so necessary today. Therefore I should like to encourage such gifts. Naturally, any foodgrains sent as a gift will not be sold. They will be distributed free to those who stand in need of them. They will be sent to areas most affected in Bihar and Madras. I suggest that the district magistrate of the area concerned be informed of these gifts and he can make arrangements for their dispatch according to directions.

When we are seeking to make the most of every ounce of foodgrains that we have, can there be greater folly, if not much worse, than waste? We are a people whose social habits have encouraged waste. This must be considered as an offense against common decency and must be stopped.

May I suggest also that each one of us should demonstrate active sympathy and a desire to help by giving up one meal a week. This is no great sacrifice for anyone. Let the foodgrains so saved be collected and sent as gifts in the manner I have suggested above.

If this is done in any adequate measure as it should be, then we have conquered and survived this food crisis.

I have ventured to place before you certain suggestions for action. I want you to have not only an intellectual appreciation of the situation in India, but also emotional awareness of the tragedy that fast approaches us. I want you to look upon it as something intimately affecting you and not as some distant occurrence with which you have little concern. I want you above all to think of common Mother India, whose children we are, of her honor and self-respect and of her distress in the agony of many of her children. Let us put all our resources, all our strength and energy in this war against famine which we must and will win.

[From the New York Times May 2, 1951]

NEHRU BARS FOOD WITH ANY "STRINGS"—SAYS INDIA WILL NOT BARTER FREEDOM OF ACTION—UNITED STATES BILL IS CAUSING RESENTMENT

NEW DELHI, INDIA, May 1.—Prime Minister Jawaharal Nehru declared today that India, though grateful for help, would not accept food from any country if it had "any political strings attached to it."

Reviewing the food situation in a Nation-wide broadcast, he added: "We would be unworthy of the high responsibilites with which we have been charged if we bartered away in the slightest degree our country's self-respect or freedom of action even for something which we need so badly."

Indian opinion strongly supports Nehru's view. Every important newspaper published today official and parliamentary reactions to the speech by Mr. Nehru on Sunday in which he expressed a similar view.

FOOD POLICY BEING RESHAPED

According to the newspapers, the general reaction was that the conditions in the United States Senate bill on aid to India were so obnoxious that the Government of India had decided not to rely any longer on 2,000,000 tons of United States grain and that the food importing policy was being recast. A large section of parliamentary opinion, according to reports, favored rejection of American help even if it materialized ultimately.

An official of the Food Ministry said these reports were rather speculative and that government was not committed to any policy of outright rejection of United States help.

Strong exception has been taken to three conditions in the Senate bill. These would require India (1) to distribute supplies obtained locally or imported without discrimination as to caste, color, or creed, (2) give full and continuous publicity in India for American assistance and (3) permit unrestricted observation of distributions by Americans.

Officials here expressed the view that all three conditions in the Senate bill were being voluntarily observed, but that writing them into an agreement was objectionable. Meanwhile the food problem has been placed on a war footing and is being dealt with by a special cabinet subcommittee that meets every day.

AIMS AT SELF-SUFFICIENCY

In his broadcast the Prime Minister warned his countrymen of the "dangerous consequences inherent in constant dependence upon outside help for food."

"We have sought help from abroad and we shall continue to do so under pressure of necessity," he said.

"But we can never function with the freedom that we desire if we are always dependent in this matter on others. It is only when we obtain self-sufficiency in food that we can progress and develop our politics."

Famine as it is understood by the people does not exist to any wide extent at this stage, he said, adding, "but the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land." He said he emphasized the need for intensification of internal procurement measures and for starting urgently a number of public works to increase the purchasing power of the poor.

Communist China has agreed to supply India immediately with 50,000 tons more of rice, according to information received from

Peiping, an official of the Food Ministry said today. This is the second agreement concluded with China within the last 4 days. Last week it was announced that Peiping had agreed to supply 50,000 tons of milo sorghum grain.

At the same time the Chinese Government has made arrangements to ship the 100,000 tons of grain as speedily as possible and officials here expect consignment by early July—when the crucial period for Bihar starts. Both transactions, officials said, form part of a deal with China for 1,000,000 tons of food grains for which negotiations are being carried on in Peiping.

The Indian Government will shortly resume negotiations with the Soviet Embassy here for 500,000 tons of wheat offered by Moscow in exchange for jute.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman time to yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. COX. The gentleman referred to the animal population of India that eat wheat. They consume 2,000,000 tons a year. In other words, it is known to everyone who knows anything about India that they have 180,000,000 sacred cows; they have 136,000,000 sacred monkeys; they have 10,000,000 sacred or professional beggars—and all these sacred things will have a first claim on any wheat that may be procured by money lent to India. Was the gentleman ever in India? Did he ever see a flock of sacred monkeys come in on a little grain merchant and eat him out of house and home, yet he could not punch one of them out of his grain bin?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I have never been in India, but I may say I am sure Mr. Nehru recognized that situation to which the gentleman refers and that something will have to be done about it.

Mr. COX. They say it is religion and that, therefore, it ought not to be referred to in this debate, but it is a religion that the overburdened taxpayers of this country ought not to be compelled to support.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We must face the question before us on a realistic basis.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, author of bill H. R. 3791, for allowing me to speak at this time. As you know, I am a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The committee met this morning and we go into session again early this afternoon. We are having some very important sessions and are sitting today while you debate this important grain to India issue, I therefore appreciate being allowed to speak at this time.

I thought that in the few minutes allotted to me, I would try to avoid repetition of some of the arguments for the bill that are chiefly based upon costs or dollar value; or alleged economic objections, or the usual line. I thought I would try to call your attention to the fact that there is something in America not less important that we must not lose; I think we have lost too much of it already, for our own safety—the value of an idea; the following of an ideal.

The only way in God's world that you can overcome the idea of communism is with a better idea. The idea of communism has caught or is forced upon people in Asia and elsewhere. Aggressive communism is afloat in the world and is capturing the imagination of the hungry people of the world because most of the people of the world are hungry; their bellies are empty; their children are starving; I fear for my Nation that if in connection with this bill we refuse to stand forthright and righteously upon the premise that America will share that of which she has a superabundance with the people of the starving world, that shall surely lose our own respect as well as destroying chances of winning and holding friends in Asia.

I have here a letter which I shall quote, written from a man in south India. It is an eye-witness account. Here is what Donald F. Ebright wrote on May 4, 1951, from India:

In the villages, where 90 percent of the population lives, people are walking skeletons. Wells and "tanks" or ponds are dry. Prices are soaring. Nothing grows on the parched land, and because of the lack of fodder, large numbers of cattle are dead. Large numbers of men have migrated to the cities in hope of getting employment and food for themselves and their families. Behind them are left sickly children and gaunt wives who cry with hunger. A series of natural calamities exceeding anything seen since 1910, plus the continuing burden of aiding refugees not yet resettled from the terrible uprooting of millions when the subcontinent divided into two in 1947 and 1948, plagues the young Government of India. The Government is doing the best it can with inadequate resources.

It is important that Americans realize that the people of India are doing everything they can for themselves.

Here then is down-to-date eyewitness testimony and evidence of the actual famine condition about which we are speaking. Why then should any Member oppose this bill and ask us to rely on hearsay or rumor or gossip as to the facts? Mr. Ebright was speaking for the Methodist Board of Foreign Missions of America when he wrote the foregoing report which I have read.

The report of our House committee shows that on January 30, 1951, the bipartisan delegation from the Senate and House waited upon the President of the United States and urged him to have help sent to India. In the letter which they wrote the President, from both sides of the political aisle of this House and the Senate, they said:

Unless we act promptly many hundreds of thousands of people of India face starvation.

The unanimous report of the splendid House Foreign Affairs Committee also said:

The evidence presented to the committee at open hearings on H. R. 3017 left no doubt of widespread crop destruction caused by a series of earthquakes, floods, and locust plagues. The committee believes that India's request should be met.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unwilling to rely upon the distinguished bipartisan committee of this Congress in this matter. I cannot subjugate such committee report and opinion to any partisan or strictly political argument which has been, or will be, or may be made against this bill.

When our American Constitution was written the important consideration and restraints concerned were largely political. Therefore, our own Constitution and the following Bill of Rights were primarily directed toward removing these political restraints. Rights of freedom of speech; freedom of choice of religion; rights to a fair trial—these were some of the rights which were obtained through bloody sacrifices.

Granting that the masses of the people of India do not presently comprehend these political rights we have gained; the starving people of India do comprehend the gnaws of hunger and starvation. They do comprehend from whence their starvation is removed. We can help spank spreading communism by spreading the practice of American idealism.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have an abiding and enduring faith that the American idealism which speaks out for human dignity and for human rights, can be made more than a match for aggressive communism. And, sir, we cannot force this fact to the attention of hundreds of millions of people in a more positive, direct manner, with less expense with no loss of life, as easily and as positively, as we can to furnish them grain to survive upon and let them know it is because we think kindly of them; let them know it is because we want them to live and not die from hunger; let them know that we have a high regard for them because they are human beings; let them know we are not interested in giving them the grain in order to get their millions of dollars of interest on a proposed 2½-percent loan; let them know that America has ideals which it lives by as well as boasts about; let them feel the application of American ideals.

I read history which tells me that the surest way a false idea or ideology can be whipped is to match it with an idea or ideal which has enduring value in the hearts and minds and souls of men. My argument is that the getting of this grain to the starving folks without materialistic gain for ourselves, is a matchless idea; even to starving people. It is matchless and more powerful than powder and bullets. It is applied Americanism.

I know some of you will say that the basis of my reasoning is not sound. You will say it is idealistic. You will say it costs too much money. Well, Mr. Chairman, answer me that way if you will, but applied American idealism, when founded upon the rock of sound, unselfish generosity and charity, always whips greed, selfishness, and petty thinking. No generous thought on impulse is illy founded. Applied American idealism will whip aggressive communism.

We in America need to put perspiration into patriotism. We need to put more inspiration into our democracy. An inspired democracy practicing American ideals will not perish. We need to perspire by the doing of unselfish, sound deeds in keeping with the highest ethical

and religious conceptions of our forefathers and of ourselves. India is a case in point at present. We must put within our own daily consciousness such power of conviction for and on behalf of our highest American ideals that it will make us daily vigilant and vigorous in daily support thereof. Sir, a self-sacrifice and a national sacrifice in behalf of deserving peoples are two of the ideals of American history which we must not forget to practice right now in this very day and circumstance. The destiny of our Nation ultimately will be determined by our applied ideals and ideas far more than by powder and bombs.

I am very conscious of the fact that, being a member of the Un-American Activities Committee and sitting there as I do day after day and oftentimes, even though the House is in session as it is today, that there is forced upon my conscience realization of the fact that we in America need by concrete evidence, if you please, to give convincing proof to the hungry people of India that America is not pinching the eagle on the almighty dollar until it screams and screeches for mercy. The Communists say that is our habit. America's ideals, historically, are not mercenary: India is a present opportunity to practice what we preach. There are millions of people in India who are hungry today. This moment they need relief. They are dying in their tracks on filth. America has a superabundance of grain. This is proof America should share it with the starving people of India or with the starving people of any other part of the world, up to the unselfish ideal limit of our own safety. As a very proud American citizen I am not against a foreign policy of my country which says to the people of the world, that the ideal of the American people is to share and share graciously; to share without our hands behind our backs for reward; to share unselfishly to the maximum of our ability, consistent with our own national economy and national security. The heart of the American people is soundly unselfish and generous. It is part of the American ideal.

I may say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I know of no other idealism in the bosom of my country v hich at this time would be as powerful as would be the declared policy of my country that it will share unselfishly; that it will save the starving children of India if possible; that it will save the starving mothers of India; and that it will share its superabundance with the starving peoples in the world, consistent with our national security and our national economy. The dollar mark does not beget American idealism. American idealism must whip the idea of communism. From the time of our American Declaration of Independence we have been fighting for the dignity of the individual. This is part of the American ideal. We have been fighting for opportunities for individuals to have an individual consciousness and personality as contradistinguished to the mass consciousness which existed prior to the American Revolution. As I see it, one of the very fundamental concepts of our American way of life as distinguished from aggressive, grasping, militaristic communism now on the march is that we in America have an ideal that should not make it necessary for us to want something back in return for our every generosity of kind deed. I am not ashamed of the fact I believe in the American gospel which says in substance, that if we "cast our bread upon the waters, it will return in due time well buttered."

Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable talk about our not being able to afford it. I say we cannot afford to not do it. There has been considerable talk about politics. Some have relied, this very hour of debate, on Nehru as an authority as to the famine in India, and in the next breath they have condemned him as being a politician, not to be relied upon. The distinction, to me, between aggressive communism on the march, the communism which has gone on the march to conquer the ideas and ideals of man, is the rival ideal, if you please, not only of the dignity of the individual for which my son and thousands of others have died, but an ideal that we in America possess, which teaches us that it is worth while to do good without thought of reward. If we in America cannot practice that sort of ideal sufficiently enough and graciously enough and unselfishly enough to overcome the idea of aggressive communism, which is based on materialism, then I do not know of any idea or ideal that America does possess which can be as powerful. We must put vigilance and vigor into our American idealism, based upon unselfishness. Communists feed the bellies of these people. When people are hungry they do not stop to think of what is right or wrong. Their hunger naturally conquers their reason. Those who stop their hunger naturally have their good will. Let us practice applied Christianity. Let us prove America's ideas and ideals are not all materialism.

This is not a matter of Nehru or the State Department. This is a heartbeat of American people saying that they demand we save starving women and children. I will say this to you, that if we in this Congress will rise and make this transaction on as generous terms as is humanly possible to them I believe it will do more to captivate not only the imagination, but the understanding of the peoples of the world, than would spending billions of dollars for bullets and power. We presently need to spend both.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for a question.

Mr. JONAS. I want to say this to the gentleman, that I am sure no one will be affected by the splendid emotional appeal he is making, but is this not true that history discloses that every year there is a major famine somewhere throughout the world, and if we follow the gentleman's reasoning we will have to assume not only at the present time, but for generations to come, there will be famines, and that the alleviation of those famines is our responsibility?

Mr. DOYLE. I want to say that we should assume the responsibility of our American ideals as contradistinguished from the Communist ideals of materialism. One is greed, one is selfishness, one is militarism, and one is to conquer people. You can conquer people through their appetities. This is what communism does.

Mr. JONAS. Well, it is not realistic.

Mr. DOYLE. It is realistic. It is the American way. We must follow it to win out.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, there have been some suggestions made, I do not know how seriously, that we do not have sufficient food reserves in the country to enable us to export the maximum quantity of food which would be called for under this proposal. I do not believe that there is any basis for a contention of that kind and I would like to briefly point out what our situation is with respect to grain and other food that might be exported under this legislation.

There has been a considerable amount of talk about a poor wheat crop this year and we are going to have the smallest crop that we have had for a number of years. It may be less than 1,000,000,000 bushels, but not very much less, according to the latest estimates. Most of us have gotten so used to billion-bushel wheat crops that we forget we had but one billion-bushel wheat crop in this country until 1944. Since that time we have had several, and it is fortunate that we have because we have not only been able to supply needed food to other nations and take care of our own needs, but we have been able to build up a sizable reserve. The carry-over of wheat on July 1, according to the best available estimates, will be about 423,000,000,000 bushels. That, added to a crop of approximately 1,000,000,000 bushels this year means a supply for the 1951–52 marketing year of 1,400,000,000 bushels. Of course, wheat is only one of the commodities that will be exported under this legislation. It probably will not comprise more than two-thirds of the total; perhaps not that much. There will be grain sorghums, as another important element, a commodity of which we have a large supply. This year there will be planted, perhaps, the largest acreage of grain sorghums that we have ever known in this country. A great deal of the wheat acreage which has been lost by winter kill and other causes in the Southwest will be planted in grain sorghums this year, and there is no reason, so far as I can see, why we cannot send, if necessary, four or five hundred thousand tons of grain sorghums to India.

Other commodities that are mentioned—corn, beans, and rice—are in good supply so that there can be no question, I am sure, but that we have whatever food may be necessary to send under this legislation.

While we are on the subject of food, I want to point out how very fortunate we are in this country as far as our food supply is concerned. If we compare the figures now with our production before World War II. we find that our annual

production of food in this country is about 42 percent above what it was preceding World War II. The consumption of food on the part of our people has increased above any figure which it was before the beginning of World War II, and it is estimated that for 1951 it will be 13 percent per capita above any prewar year.

This food is not only greater in quantity, it is greater in quality in that it consists more largely of the protective foods, the proteins, meat, eggs, dairy products, and fresh fruits and vegetables.

A stranger from Mars, if he came to this country, or a visitor from India or any other country where food is scarce, could not help but be astounded by the talk he would hear on the question of food. He would be amazed to find that at least two-thirds of the adult people in this country are watching the scales every day to see how much they have lost or gained. If there is any one personal problem the American people are interested in today it is their weight. I understand the most popular feature article that has appeared in American newspapers in recent months has been this Fat Boy Elmer diet story that people are reading because they are interested in reducing their weight. Of course the reason they are overweight is that they are eating too much food.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think the standard of living is too high in this country?

Mr. HOPE. I am not saying the standard of living is too high, I am saying that in this country instead of suffering from underconsumption of food there are millions of people who at least think that they are suffering from overconsumption of the abundant food supply we have in this country.

Contrast that with the situation in a country like India. I do not know the extent of the starvation in India. There are different figures on that. But I am sure there are going to be milions of people in India who will starve if that country is not able to procure additional food, and there is no place they can get any substantial quantity of it except in the United States of America. We take food for granted in this country. Some countries have taken famines for granted. But that is no longer true to the extent it has been in the past. I do not think there is a country in the world today where the people are not demanding that their government, whatever kind of government they have, make every possible effort to secure for them an adequate supply of food. We all know in the restless atmosphere which prevails in many countries in the world today that any failure on the part of a government to make the maximum effort to secure food for its people is the greatest possible inducement to accept a political philosophy like communism. Such people are even more likely to fall prey to Communist agitation when they contrast their misery with the lush supply of food in countries like our own. We cannot furnish food enough from our supplies to take care of all the world's hunger, but I think we owe it to ourselves and the world to make available our surpluses to areas where actual starvation is taking place. I believe any steps we take under this legislation to supply to India additional supplies of food will pay dividends, in that it will prevent the trend toward communism which exists in every ill-fed and undernourished country in the world today.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that under the provisions of the bill now before the Committee, and which the Committee is considering, there is no provision made for the shipping of one kernel of wheat or any other sort of grain to India? Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman understands that the legislation authorizes the shipping of food to India and authorizes the extension of credit for that purpose.

Mr. COX. With great respect, I must say the gentleman is mistaken as to what the bill says. The bill proposes to lend India $190,000,000, which $190,000,000 India can spend with Russia or with Communist China as she sees fit.

Mr. HOPE. She can spend it for food which is vitally needed; yes. And as I have already stated the only place in the world today from which any considerable quantity of surplus food can be procured is the United States. I have discussed the economic and political aspects of this matter. There is a humanitarian side also. We are a Christian Nation. Our people have deep sympathy for those in distress wherever they may be. Since the end of World War II American farmers alone have contributed millions of bushels of grain and other food supplies to hungry people all over the world. Millions of other Americans have made their contributions of food and clothing through churches and philanthropic organizations.

The situation in India is too big a problem for private efforts but I am sure that the American people as a whole are keenly interested in this legislation and in having our Government make food supplies available to the people of India. I have received many letters, the contents of which indicated they were written from the hearts of good Christian people urging that Congress do everything possible to meet this need. Many of them would like to send it as a gift. The Government of India has not asked it as a gift. All that has been requested is special and easy terms of payment. That is all that this bill provides. Under the circumstances passage of this legislation without crippling amendments is the least we can do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, there is one question at this moment that I would like to try to clear up, and that is the question of India's ability to repay this loan.

As I understand it, there is no question of India's ability to service a loan of the size authorized by the bill. India's excess of reserves over requirements is around $500,000,000. The burden of this loan might reduce the amount available for her total development program, but that is not definite, either. She is already exporting all the commodities which her mines and industries can produce at this time without greater additional outlay of capital. The bulk of these commodities comes to the United States and the free world.

This age is dominated by force, ideas of force, and subversion—the army of communism versus the army of the free world. To one or the other of these the whole world must turn. Nations may want to remain neutral, but history is shaping the need for decisions, and the United States must help these nations decide. It is with this global background of force that I believe we must consider this bill, H. R. 3791. It has a very historical setting.

As my colleagues pointed out yesterday, this is the first time that this new nation has asked for assistance of the Congress and the people of the United States. Our actions and deliberations on this bill will not only be heard and felt in India but will be heard and felt all over Asia.

Our concern in considering this measure is not primarily how the emergency arose, but how we can assist in meeting this emergency swiftly and effectively now that we have been asked for assistance. Personally I feel that this vital issue is not the question of the relationship of Pakistan and India, not the political, diplomatic position taken by the Indian Government, not the price of jute nor the barter of minerals, not the problem of sterling balances. The vital issue is how we can help our fellow men, the Indian people. We have the opportunity, a long overdue response to the people of a new nation, India.

I personally joined a group of sponsors to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India on a grant basis. I felt that the objective deserved this support, but since this method was not acceptable to many, I support the method outlined in H. R. 3791 to furnish food grains on a loan basis in accordance with ECA lending facilities.

Through our ECA program, Russia failed in the West and then turned to the East. The aim of Russia is to widen the gap between the East and the West. It is her new method in dividing and absorbing the nations of the world.

India turned to the West for assistance. Now is our chance to assist this new independent Nation as we were aided in the early days of our Republic, when we severed our relationship with the same mother country, England.

It is this infant republic we are asked to help, whose constitution is modeled after that of the United States Constitution, and it contains a similar bill of rights. Fundamentally, our form of government and our way of life are her ideal. India needs our help in this critical period or assistance would not have been requested. Her need is known to be positive.

Indians are a proud people and a suspicious people, particularly suspicious of Europeans, in whose class Americans are placed. The basis for this sentiment may be partly a result of the English colonization period. I fear that is the real feeling in the world today, and this is our opportunity to check their fears in that the United States has no thought of aggression and no desire for exploitation.

Most of us agree on the humanitarian aspect, particularly since we have a surplus of grain; but as practical-minded Americans, there is another side. It is practical and it is good business. To me it has an intrinsic, political aspect, which I am going to explain.

This aid is necessary for world peace and for the general welfare of the United States in order that this new independent republic shall remain a free nation. It is consistent with the foreign policy of the United States in order to create situations of strength for new independent nations, and to permit them to work out their own internal problems by democratic processes, as the United States did during the early days of our Republic. But, to me, more important than any other situation is the fact that India is geographically important to the free world, due to the fact that if India is absorbed into the orbit of Russia, it would accrue to the benefit of Russia alone, to the detriment of the free world, and particularly to the United States.

It would cut off our vital raw-material-supply lines. As you and I know today, the United States lifelines for vital raw material, reach to every segment of the globe, and at the very doorstep of India for the tin, manganese, rubber, and other strategic materials that keep industry and the arms program at top speed.

Any unfriendly nations able to sever shipping routes in this area, to control India, would place the United States and the free world in jeopardy.

It was only recently, last week, that I really realized that almost all of our strategic material that are necessary for these supplies are imported by the United States.

Crude rubber must come from outside the United States. The supplies come from Malaya, Indonesia, and Thailand.

Chrome ore needed for making alloy steel is produced in this country in small quantities. Russia formerly furnished this material. Our supply now comes from Turkey, the Philippines, and South Africa.

Tin is imported from Malaya, Bolivia, and Indonesia.

Manganese is a metal for which no adequate substitute has been found in making steel. More than 93 percent is imported from the Gold Coast of Africa and from India.

India shipped to the United States in 1950, 585,971 tons of manganese, three-quarters of its total exports. The bulk of the remainder went to the United Kingdom. There is a current rumor that there has been a cut in manganese shipments in 1951. This is not true. From January 1 to March 3, 110,000 long tons have been shipped to the United States. This is a rate about 10 percent greater than the average of 1950. Arrivals in February alone to one company in the United States were 16,000 tons.

To review briefly the foreign trade of India, I want to emphasize the fact that India imports from the United States amounted to $230,000,000, while the exports to the United States were valued at $192,000,000.

Mica: Indian exports of mica in 1950 to all countries totaled 340,000 hundredweight. Of this total the United States took 80 percent and of this 37 percent went to the United States stockpile.

Jute: The jute industry has in past years accounted for more than a third of India's total foreign exchange earnings, and almost three-fifths of its dollar earnings. The United States is the leading importer of Indian jute manufactures. There is one point I want to make at this time and that is that India has no trade with the Soviet Union in strategic materials and has had none since 1946. I believe, no matter how we feel on this bill, that the importance of keeping these routes open for our strategic supplies is most essential to the national security of the United States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. COX. The gentlewoman made the observation that this was the first time India has ever come to the United States for aid. Is the gentlewoman aware of the fact that on two of the lots of wheat that we let her have during the present year we took a considerable loss on one which she got at the world price rather than at the domestic price?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I do.

Mr. COX. And that on the other we gave her a reduction of $9,000,000 in the price?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I realize that. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that he is in error. The commodity in question was not wheat but milo. In late May and early June 1950, the Commodity Credit Corporation was ready and anxious to sell to India some milo which we had and which was in danger of spoiling. We sold the milo at $1.80 per hundredweight—a little bit below the going export price. It would have spoiled had we not sold it. By selling it to India, we got cash. Had we not sold it, we would have lost the 200,000 tons.

A few months later we made another sale of milo to India at $1.40 per hundredweight. We did absorb some of this cost. The gentleman is again in error. The cost we absorbed was about $6,600,000, not $9,000,000 as the gentleman says. We did this under section 32 of Public Law 320, the agriculture laws of which the gentleman is an ardent supporter.

Our sacrifices for peace in the world transcend the reasons for arguments against the passage of this bill. Either we must extend the hand of friendship to India in her need or cast her to the forces of evil and destruction—the army of communism.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a considerable amount of enlightening debate on this subject and we will hear more. I shall endeavor in the time that has been yielded to me to answer the major arguments which have been made with respect to this legislation.

First, let me state briefly why I believe this legislation must be passed in the national security interest of the United States. We are dealing here with 350,000,000 people in South Asia out of a total of roughly 700,000,000 people who are left in the list of the free peoples in that area of the world.

The new Republic of India came into being only on January 26, 1950, having received its independent status in August of 1947. The subcontinent of India is the fulcrum of Asia, a state that is directly on the border of China, and, therefore, certainly influenced by the fact that communism has triumphed in China and that China has a rampant army of something in the neighborhood of two to four million men. For the relief of distress in India we are asked to make an investment, asked to make a loan to this Nation, to this government which has not defaulted on any of its external debts, a loan to relieve an urgent famine situation.

There is some argument that we should turn our back on this nation and run the risk of jeopardizing the one remaining really big anchor that the free peoples have in Asia. It seems almost inconceivable that that argument can be made in the face of the evidence before us. Why is it made? First, it is said that India is not our declared ally against the Soviet bloc; second, that the famine is really not serious; and third, that we should get strategic materials from India.

It is perfectly clear that the people of India are a free people today, and if any evidence of that is required, it is shown by many facts. For example, 43 deputies of the India's Parliament had perfect freedom to send a communication by cable to the Congress of the United States about this very food-aid bill. The only thing that Mr. Nehru could do about it was to lecture them on the fact that that was not the way to run a government; in other words, that India could not conduct her affairs by having individual representatives of what is tantamount to their Congress communicate with another sovereign power.

Secondly, this Dr. Kumarrapa, whose speech has been read here in part and referred to several times, I think his actions and statements prove that India is a very free country. The Government of India said that Dr. Kumarrapa had a perfect right to state his own position as a lecturer in the United States in his private capacity. This is the official statement dated March 9, 1951:

> He is authorized to speak for the Government of India only in the social commission of the United Nations to which he is a delegate on subjects coming up before that commission in accordance with the Government's instructions.

Then they add:

Any views expressed by him on topics outside the commission or on topics other than those before it are his own, and the Government has no responsibility for them.

He was completely repudiated, and everything he said was completely repudiated by the Government of India, but he was not jailed for saying it.

Let us see about India's record in the United Nations. Despite the fact she is sitting on the doorstep of Communist China, it is my recollection she did join originally in one of the key votes when the question of sending U. N. forces in to repel aggression in Korea was concerned. Away back in June she joined I recall, with other United Nations powers in asking that action be taken to stop aggression in Korea. Since that time it is a fact that she has abstained in the United Nations in respect of condemning the aggression of the Communist Chinese and a declaration of an embargo on shipping war materials to Communist China. There is no condoning that. It is our mission to try to win India over to our side, not 33⅓ percent as demonstrated by the three votes I have described, but by 100 percent.

Now, what is the way to win her over? To hit her over the head or to let millions of her people starve to death? Or shall we win her over on the relatively cheap basis of giving her this essential food aid? The answer is self evident.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. It occurs to me that most of the arguments today have involved the relationship between the United States Government and the new Government of India. I wonder if the gentleman will explain, so that not only the Congress but the people of the country will understand, just how will the starving people of India, not the Government of India, but the starving people of India, get the grain we want to provide by this bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I will be glad to answer the gentleman if he will permit me to proceed for a minute on this point. I will go right to the next point which involves the claim that the famine is not real in India.

The key to India, the key to Nehru, and the key to everything we face is found in the May 1st speech that my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin referred to. In the next to the last sentence of that speech this is what Nehru said, and I want you to remember that he is elected by the people, he is a politician like anyone else who has to be elected. He said:

I want you above all to drink of common mother India, whose children we are, of her honor and self-respect and of her distress in the agony of many of her children. Let us put all our resources, all our strength and energy in this war against famine which we must and will win.

He was expressing pride in his nation and pride in his people.

Mr. Chairman, he made that speech on May 1. The Foreign Affairs Committee had reported out an aid to India bill in March. There it was the 1st of May. India was facing a famine situation. No action had been taken in the Congress of the United States, either by the House of Representatives or by the Senate. What did you expect Mr. Nehru to say to the people of India? Should he have said to his people you have the liberty to starve? Or did you expect him to make a speech castigating the United States? Or did you expect him to say what he did say: "All right, my dear people, we are facing famine; the best we can do is to depend upon ourselves."

I ask you as reasonable men, what did you want him to say on May 1 in face of complete failure of action on the part of the Congress of the United States? We are disturbed, and rightfully, that Nehru made a fuss over the fact that the Russians had shipped only 50,000 tons of grain into India, on barter, whereas we had shipped hundreds of thousands of tons India bought here. But should we not ask ourselves if perhaps we ourselves invited that very action by the delay on this bill. What else did we expect? Did you expect anything other than implied criticism of our own delays, if delay was wrong? If we feel delay was not wrong, let us not be surprised. Let us be adults and accept the consequences.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How much excess grain have we in this country now?

Mr. JAVITS. The distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] just made a speech a few moments ago in which he said that we are fully able to meet the requirements of this particular bill insofar as grain—grain sorghums, milo, and wheat are concerned.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Some reference has been made as to exactly how this grain will be distributed. It will be distributed through the Indian ration system, will it not?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. May I point out to my distinguished colleague from Ohio that we went to the trouble of calling in the United States agricultural attaché in India, Clifford C. Taylor. We were tremendously impressed with him. Mr. Taylor advised us that the rationing system in India was excellent and he proved it in the following way, and this appears at page 37 of the hearings. He said that at one time just to test their rationing system India took off rationing in 1947, thinking if there were any hoarded stocks they would come out in an open market. Nothing more came out. Apparently the rationing system was so good that it was reaching all of the available stocks in the country.

As to distribution within the country, Mr. Taylor testified that he had checked the distribution system in the areas of the country in which it functioned. It covers either in ful' or in part 125,000,000 people. He was able to vouch to us for the fact that was equitable distribution and that it did fully the job we had a right to expect and that the people would get the grain.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the starving people of India be forced to buy this grain or will it be given to them by the Government of India?

Mr. JAVITS. The people of India will buy the grain with money which they either have, because they earn it, or on the basis of work-relief projects which are initiated in India to see that they get the money with which to buy the grain; indigents—and we have had full discussion on that score—are cared for by free grain distribution through governmental channels in refugee camps. In rural areas indigent people are, through long-accepted custom, supported by their own family group, which in turn participates in the rationing system.

In this case we have a loan. And as to what happens to the money the people pay, we hope India will have money enough to make its payments on time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The money that is received by the Indian Government on the sale of this grain or food in India is then put in a joint account, and it is called counterpart funds.

Mr. JAVITS. Not now. This is a straight loan proposition.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman, of course, has no understanding of the provisions of the bill, as you would judge from that statement; is that not correct?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry.

Mr. COX. But he is wrong; is he not?

Mr. JAVITS. On that particular counterpart point.

Mr. FULTON. That was in the previous bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is interested in getting food to the hungry people of India or to the people who will become hungry.

Mr. JAVITS. I am interested in relieving the famine situation in India.

Mr. COX. If that is the purpose of the gentleman, why did he not provide, or see that it was provided for in the bill that he is now supporting, that the wheat or the grain or the food that India may need she should obtain from the United States, purchasing it with this $190,000,000?

Mr. JAVITS. As far as the $190,000,000 is concerned, we can rely upon the arrangements between the ECA and the Indian Government to take care of the purchase of as much food grains as America can possibly sell. May I say this, too, there is food grain in essence available primarily only in the United States. The questions the gentleman asks are quite impractical. The grain

surplus is here. The people of India have themselves scratched the bottom of the barrel in Canada, Argentina, Australia, and New Zealand and other areas for grain supply. The only thing the gentleman is thinking about is that they will put this money in their jeans and go into the Soviet Union and give them dollars for grain. Now, that is assuming that there is a surplus of grain in the Soviet Union that they want to sell, but I think we can certainly depend on the Economic Cooperation Administration, run by Bill Foster, to see that no such thing takes place.

Mr. COX. But under the provisions of the gentleman's bill India could spend every dime of this $190,000,000 in purchasing food from Russia.

Mr. JAVITS. Under the provisions of the bill, according to the gentleman, India could use the money for pate de foie gras and truffles. The gentleman is talking about complete impracticalities.

Mr. COX. The gentleman favors the adoption of this bill. Does he expect this to be the only case of this nature that Congress will be called upon to handle?

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly do not, neither does the gentleman or anyone else. The President has already told us that he is bringing in an eight-and-one-half to nine-billion-dollar economic aid bill. May I ask the gentleman this: Does the gentleman want to spend every dollar that is spent to win this struggle against communism with inert and deadly weapons, or does he want to try to win over communism with life-giving goods—with grain as we try to do here?

Mr. COX. I want to end the ECA program that has cost us so much already.

Mr. JAVITS. I want to end the struggle against communism with the decisive defeat of communism, and if that is the difference between the gentleman and I, then I will stand on my position.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman permit me to propound one more question?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman from Georgia raised the question with the gentleman from New York that he raised with the gentleman from Missouri. At that time I stated for the benefit of the House, and I would like to reiterate that the committee will offer an amendment to clarify any doubt about the money that will come from this loan, to be used first to buy available grain in the United States of America, so that there will be no question about that.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I should like to propound two questions to the gentleman from New York. First, I may have a misconception of Mr. Nehru's statement of May 1. As I understood his speech, what he said was this: He was appealing to the Indian people to go into the far corners and bring out all the grain and all the foodstuffs they had. The impression I got from his speech was that he feels they can take care of themselves. The implication is all through it.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me answer that question, and then we will go on to the next one.

I just pointed out that the frame of reference in which he was saying this was the frame of reference that he had no right to except any help from the United States or anybody else up to that point. And may I point out another thing. The Indian people were getting 9 ounces of grain by way of ration distribution. They have as a matter of life and death to raise it to 12. They still cannot make it. Nine ounces of grain means 900 calories a day. Twelve ounces means 1,200 calories a day. They have alleged that they are going to do it, but they cannot make it. Does not that disprove the idea the gentleman has that some way or other they have scraped up 2,000,000 tons of grain from the corners?

Mr. BURLESON. It is suggested to me that we know more about their conditions than Mr. Nehru knows.

Mr. JAVITS. That is not so, because the Indian Government wants this grain aid urgently. It is continuing to want it up to this very day, and that is known to all who read and listen. It wants it because it must have it to avert famine. Recent food riots in India should certainly be convincing enough on that point.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS].

INDIVIDUAL HELP FOR INDIVIDUALS IN INDIA

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, the strength of this country is that we have been individual people working under a Government which recognizes and protects and gives dignity to us as individuals. We must keep it that way. But we cannot any longer blindly close our eyes to the fact that even our complex society has reached proportions where individual and voluntary corporal acts of mercy are inadequate. We came reluctantly to the recognition during the depression years of the early thirties that we could not let people in this country starve because the burden on individual charity was too great. It was a very hard decision for many to make, but I suppose there is no one conversant with these facts who now would say that we could have come through these devastating years depending on private charity or individual effort to take care of the hungry people of this great country.

I can still feel the accusing eyes of hungry people in the soup lines at the Salvation Army headquarters and other private charities. I still have a sickening nausea when there comes recollection of those families under the bridge abutments cooking in discarded cans whatever scraps of food they could find over fires of driftwood. Then came Government aid. It was a new venture. It was not well organized at first, but through Government, not individual, action it saved the lives and self-respect of the individual. We are at that position now with India. Members have said our contribution should be individual—if this effort is to be classified as charity. I agree that the instance of the Good Samaritan on the road to Jericho is the ideal—it is being followed today by thousands of sturdy citizens throughout this country who have a concern for these starving people of India. In my own State of Ohio, headed last year by Mr. Frank Farnsworth, a stalwart citizen of the district I have the honor to represent, the crop organization collected from the farmers of Ohio and shipped to the needy people of the world about a hundred carloads of food grain. The individuals in this fine organization, realizing their inability to meet the vast need in India, are urging Congress to pass this bill to send grain to India.

We should frankly face the facts as to what this bill is and what it is not. It is not a club to force the Republic of India to change its laws with reference to its embargo on monazite sands. Under similar circumstances, I believe Americans would be willing to starve before we would let any other nation take advantage of our extreme misery to cause us to violate our principles.

It is not a bribe to get India to take sides with the United States or the United Nations. Of course, we hope and expect that—but loyal friendships are not bought and trusted allies are not bribed—these relationships are earned.

It is not a bankable loan in the sense that we can expect to foreclose on this new republic and its people if it is not paid according to its terms. But it is first a cup of cold water and a loaf of bread to a very hungry and needy neighbor. A neighbor whose conduct we have not approved of as measured by our standard. We do not like some of their associates. We sometimes feel that they should come half way around the world for their pals and forget about those who live in the same neighborhood with them. Some of us do not even like their pets. But as sure as there is a God who controls our destiny the only way these 350,000,000 people of India can be brought to join with us in a program of good will in the world is to demonstrate that we have some love and good will in our own hearts.

Second, it is an opportunity to establish a bridgehead of friendship to a nation of 350,000,000 people who have great world possibilities. Just now we complain of their habits and practices and defense mechanisms. But remember the Republic of India is less than 6 years old. Let us look at the Turkish nation and people—how far they have come in the past 25 years. Given time, friendship, and encouragement India can even exceed the record of Turkey, Japan, or any other Asiatic country in learning the art of making available for its people the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If the food provided by this bill can help do that every cent is well invested.

The missionaries went into India from a desire from within themselves to help these people. They created a great residue of love and respect among the people of India for America—although covered up with a lot of debris of unfortunate statements by thoughtless public figures in both countries.

Then the American businessman went to India with a desire from without to make money and to extend the benefits of American enterprise to that land.

The opportunity now exists through this food grain to show the people of India that all of America has a concern for them as individuals. We are not trying to change their religion or their form of government. We are not trying to exploit their resources. We are just being the kind of neighbor who deserves their respect and confidence.

This is the only approach which justifies the passage of this bill. It is the only approach which is good business as well as good neighborliness. It is not the act of the shyster who wants to get his fee while the tears are hot but of the lawyer who wants to help to build for his client a fine business in which both can have continued pleasure and profit. It is the approach of the friend and neighbor who expects to live cooperatively alongside another in a very small world for a very long time.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to know how much wheat we have in this country that is available for India or anyone else.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The Department of Agriculture advises we have around 450,000,000 bushels. This bill provides for 2,000,000 tons, or about 80,000,000 bushels. The Department of Agriculture says we have sufficient but not a surplus of wheat. They also say that the winter wheat has been reduced through a disease called mosaic, by 25 percent.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I am concerned about the Government going in on price controls when we have a surplus of things. Is there any reason in the world why we should have price controls on a commodity of which there is a surplus?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Naturally, when you send things abroad, that makes the price of the article higher, because that creates, if not a scarcity, a less amount available with increased costs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday I said when I first heard about this grant-to-India bill, I was in favor of it because I thought it was going to be a mutual proposition; that the United States had grain which India needed and that they had strategic materials, monozite sand, jute, magnesium, and things that are necessary to the defense of this country. But, as I stated yesterday, even though Mr. Nehru did not ask for any gift, the State Department came in and said, "Regardless, we want to give it you anyway."

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I also asked certain questions. I asked those questions of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee particularly, and they have gone unanswered—every one of them. I said, "If we do give this grain to India, will the Indian Government trade us strategic material for it, which we need badly?"

There has been no answer to that question.

Another question I asked the Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday was this: "Will the Indian Government, if we give them this grain, agree to fight communism?"

There has not been one member of the Foreign Affairs Committee who answered that question.

Another question I asked yesterday: "If we give them this grain, will the Indian Government furnish troops alongside of our boys who are being slaughtered, 7,000 miles away, on foreign shores?" Yes, American young men who are fighting practically alone.

There has been no discussion or explanation of that by any member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Another question I asked: "Will the Indian Government, if we give them this grain, vote with the United States occasionally before the United Nations?" So far to my knowledge they have voted against the United States every time.

There has been no answer to that.

Then, above all, I said: "In the event that the United States gives the Indian Government this grain, will Nehru stop applauding Russia?" You know he opened the Indian Parliament a week or so ago praising Russia but did not say one good word about the United States.

There has been no answer to any of these questions.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not now.

Mr. FULTON. Not even for an answer from a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to your questions?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will yield later; not at this point. All that has been discussed in this discussion—and that includes the remarks by our beloved Speaker also—is that this is the human thing to do; that the people of India are suffering. That has been the whole argument of those who favor this proposition. There has been no other reason given except the people of India are suffering.

That is true of a billion and a half people throughout the world; they are also undernourished. I say to you the surest way to make an enemy out of any country is to give one nation and refuse to give other nations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not just now. I will yield later.

I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that there are hundreds of millions of people throughout Israel, Egypt, and other such places who are starving. I venture to say there are millions of Americans who are undernourished at the present time. I would say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that undoubtedly if he will go home to his district he will find thousands right in his own district who are undernourished. One of the things I cannot understand is that there are so many Americans in high official life who, I am sure, spend more time attempting to solve the plight of people living outside the United States than they do in solving our problems here at home.

So it comes down to the question: Why should we help them when they will not help us?

In regard to the remarks of the Speaker, whom we all love and respect, he said if we do not give this to India we will be offending them. Offending them—think of that. Are they not offending us when they refuse to go along with us in this war against communism and aggression? Why are we sending our boys throughout the world to be slaughtered? We are fighting aggression and we are fighting communism.

Has India by any kind of action indicated that they are helping us in our grave hour? Of course not. Our Government is spending billions of dollars. We are a nation with a national debt of $258,000,000,000 and committed to another $100,000,000,000. Our Ways and Means Committee is seeking ways and means to bring in more money. This year we are spending $55,000,000,000 and still running in the red many billions. Next year it is proposed that we spend $100,000,000,000 and we will go in the red again next year $35,000,000,000 and the year after another $35,000,000,000. Notwithstanding that we are raising our taxes, it will still leave a large part of it for our children, our grandchildren, and future generations to pay. Still people insist that we give and give and give.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] if he would construe the adoption of this bill to mean that Congress was committing itself to give like treatment to a dozen other nations now sitting on the steps of the Capitol?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is a good question.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman agrees with me that the adoption of this bill will mean a vote of confidence in Dean Acheson, and it will be committing this Congress to the support of the Javits plan which will call for about $7,000,000,000 in addition to that already pledged?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that that is a very splendid statement, and I am sorry that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is not present to give answer.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am sorry; I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. Chairman, when we start talking about giving away $190,000,000 to buy this wheat, it means it will require the payment of 800,000 income-tax payers of the United States who are paying $20 per month or $240 income tax this year. As I say, the Ways and Means Committee is working day and night to try to raise money to meet our needs. They even seriously considered a tax of 20 percent on lollipops, bubble gum, and all candies. Still we come in here now and want to give all this money to a nation

that has been against us and still refuses to cooperate with us.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked me to yield. I now ask him this question: How are we being benefited directly or indirectly by passing this bill except the satisfaction of relieving starvation in one nation against dozens of other nations whom we also want as our friends?

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman asks me if the United States of America is being benefited?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes; except for the satisfaction of having relieved suffering in one nation when there are 20 others appealing for like aid?

Mr. FULTON. The United States of America is being benefited because we are getting an ally that will stand by us if we maintain our high principles, in the event of trouble and world war III. India supplied 2,250,000 troops to the Allies in World War II, had 106,000 casualties, and had 36,000 men killed. Right alongside of our own men in Italy they fought, too.

Mr. COX. Ask the gentleman how many troops they have in Korea.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Here is a question for the gentleman, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee: Does he not think the Government of India should give us strategic materials which we need and which will go to Russia unless we do get them?

Mr. FULTON. I certainly do believe India has cooperated and will cooperate in this respect. We are friendly peoples at this time—let us not alienate good friends.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think that the Government of India should fight communism?

Mr. FULTON. The Government of India is fighting communism right at home, and everybody admits it is doing a good job. Nobody even questions that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania think the Government of India should furnish troops to fight alongside with our boys being slaughtered 7,000 miles away?

Mr. COX. Will my friend permit the gentleman from Pennsylvania to say how many soldiers India has in Korea now?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. None.

Does not the gentleman think that the Government of India should vote occasionally with us in the United Nations?

Does not the gentleman think the Government should compliment us once in a while rather than applaud Russia any time Russia does some insignificant thing like when Russia sold 50,000 tons of wheat to India?

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated unless the government of India trades us strategic material for the grain. Unless India in no uncertain terms agrees to fight communism and communistic aggression; unless India agrees to furnish troops to help our boys in Korea; unless India agrees to vote with peace-loving nations in the United Nations; unless Prime Minister Nehru and other high officials of the Indian Government do not stop applauding the words and actions of the communistic government of Russia.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice to those of my colleagues who have spoken in support of H. R. 3791, a bill to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India.

The program contemplated by this bill represents statesmanship of the highest order. Furthermore, it is consistent with the history and the record of generous help with which the people of the United States have on many occasions responded to the needs of unfortunates in foreign lands. The bill before us proposes a measure which is in keeping with the highest and finest traditions of our Republic.

From the testimony which has been heard in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and public opinion as expressed in the press, over the radio, in public forums, and in messages which we have all received from citizens in all parts of the country, it is clear that this bill has the solid support of the people of the United States.

While this response is spontaneous and is founded on the unfailing humanitarian instinct of the American people and their deep friendship for the people of India, it is at the same time based on a realistic approach to the problem of foreign affairs. The Republic of India is a new free nation which gained its independence from colonialism less than 4 years ago following a long period of storm and stress. On January 26, 1950, India was established, under a representative government, as the democratic Republic of India. It is the second most populous nation in the world, with its 350,000,000 people living in an area of a million square miles. Ahead there lies a great future for this young republic, provided that we can demonstrate our friendship when the friendship of the free world is so important to her survival. India is striving for a world of peace and freedom, a world in which its people and all other people may develop their own political, social, and economic institutions. The people and the leaders of India have chosen for their country and for themselves the institutions of democracy. Today the people of India stand between the traditions of our western civilization, on which their institutions are founded, and the ruthless propaganda of imperialist Soviet communism. Hungry Indians, with no food relief to look forward to, are not concerned with ideologies. If we should fail them and the U. S. S. R. should feed them, we will, in effect, have thrust them into the waiting arms of imperialistic communism. This we must avoid, for if we fail India, we fail the teeming millions of Asia who also are looking to us for guidance. The enactment of this bill will serve as a symbol of encouragement and hope to all those people.

I believe that these are fundamentals which the people of the United States clearly recognize. Their first instinct is, of course, humanitarian, but let us not imagine for one moment that they are not as much concerned with the general welfare and security of the United States as is the Congress itself. They know full well that if a starving India should fall prey to the forces of communism, it will seriously threaten the security of the vital interests of the United States in the Far East.

If India is to win her race against starvation, we must act with speed. The target date originally set for the beginning of shipments was April 1, almost 2 months ago. Conditions in India have been getting much worse than expected. Food riots have broken out, and in some areas the government rationing system has temporarily collapsed. The situation is truly desperate. We cannot, we must not, delay any longer.

President Truman pointed out in his special message to the Congress asking for authorization to send relief to India, and I quote:

> It is not our objective in foreign affairs to dominate other nations. Our objective is to strengthen the free nations through cooperation—free and voluntary cooperation based on a common devotion to freedom.

This bill eminently fits into that pattern of our foreign policy, the high traditions of the American people, and the wisdom and foresight of the Congress.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I approach a final decision on the matter of emergency grain for India with considerable trepidation and some misgivings.

If time would permit, and I were inclined to do so, I could offer some five or six reasons why I oppose this legislation. But when I consider it from a humanitarian standpoint, and realizing that America has to have friends today, I come to the conclusion that its benefits outweigh any objection I might have.

In arriving at my decision I am thinking along the same line that the majority of my colleagues in the House are thinking in their decision to support this legislation, and in after months, when I am asked by my constituents as to why I voted as I propose to vote today, I will offer the same explanation as the man did who was brought before the magistrate and charged with throwing a brick through a plate-glass window. The magistrate said, "Sam, why did you do it?" Sam said, "Your Honor, at the time I thought it was the proper thing to do."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the original group who became aware of what the probable famine that would come to India as a result of floods and droughts and the youth of her government. As it happened, I had had a good many contacts with Indians for many years. I have friends in India. Some of them are nurses who have been to this country to our schools of nursing; others of them are doctors who have institutions in India. Others are members of various interesting groups.

The first Ambassador from India had a most charming wife, Madam Rama Rau who did much during their tour of duty in the new Embassy to win friends for India. I heard her speak in Cleveland about the conditions in which the

great mass of the people lived, the miracle that the Indian women were trying to do. She had much to say of their appreciation of the generosity of Americans. Among other things, she told of what it meant to the Indian people to have the ambulances and the mobile hospital units that had been sent over. So much could be accomplished, so much could be done that was impossible without them, and in addition, they were the visible evidence that the people of America wanted to help them, to give them hope and courage as well as health. But then she hesitated and said:

> Ladies, there is one thing I think you do not understand and that is the stark reality of the poverty of the Indian people. Much as we need this help you have so generously sent, grateful as we are for this practical evidence of your desire to make these health units available to us, we have to find the money to run them and sometimes it is a very difficult matter.

We realized suddenly that we should have known, should have realized that in a new country so vast as India, poverty is on every hand and that a maintenance fund should have accompanied the gift.

Mr. Chairman, the longer I live and the more I have to do with those great countries on the other side of the earth the more I realize that the Western World has not as yet any real comprehension of the problems and the complexities confronting those new-born nations. It has been my privilege to know some of the men and women of India, to study some of their ancient wisdom, to help in a very small way to build better health conditions here and there. I have the greatest possible admiration for the courage with which they are attacking the almost fantastic problems facing them.

When I learned of the droughts and the floods that had overtaken great sections of the country I was glad to join with the small group of Senators and Congressmen who went to the President and asked that something be done about it.

It had not occurred to us to do anything except make it all a gift out of our plenty toward their need. To me there was an added reason to make it a grant as we had done in Europe so that counterpart funds would be set up, and with those funds India could improve agricultural methods materially.

Into the midst of that particular moment of my thinking came my distinguished colleague LARRY SMITH with the story of two plows brought over from India literally in the hands of two of his friends. One was the very oldest of plows—all wood. The other was metal. These men had told him that with the wooden plow a man could prepare only 2 acres but with the metal he could prepare 10. Perhaps we might have found a way to put metal plows onto the Indian farms. Maybe we can yet. "Plows for India!" That would be a great slogan for some of our generous and practical friends. Maybe we could start something like that. They cost only $2.60.

This noon I was asked, "Why does a man come back from India at this point and say that some of the storage bins are filled with rice and the Government will not sell it?" May I suggest that the Government of India is very aware that there are no refills for those bins and that until there are definite assurances that the pipelines will be kept full from this end they dare not risk having none at all. When they know those bins can be refilled, they can use enough of that rice to keep the people from starving.

There has been asked here on the floor the question, "How is this grain going to get to the people?"

I have here a perfectly fascinating collection of papers and pictures showing the whole process, starting with the arrival of a wheat ship at Bombay and going all the way through, showing the care given the grain, the people queued up at the ration stations, and so forth. If you can pay you pay and if you cannot pay you do not pay. If there is no grain nobody gets any. I think there is no country in the world that has so fair a rationing system and so excellent a system of distribution of the ration food to the people as has India. The big problem is one of keeping the pipelines filled so that they can have something in their storage bins which they can distribute. If there is nothing in those bins nothing can be distributed.

I have here a number of editorials from some of our papers, like the Atlanta Journal and the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Macon Telegraph. They give so clear a picture that I confess I am a little surprised that more of our membership has not benefited from reading them in the Speaker's lobby.

It is asked—why should we do for a country whose spokesman is not too friendly—indeed when he is ungracious.

The fact that we do not agree entirely with the man who happens to be head of the Government was one of the reasons why we originals in this whole matter felt it would be of peculiar importance that the representatives of the people of America should want to do something for the people of India, regardless of the disagreements that might exist between our respective Governments. For that reason we were particularly eager that this gesture and this contribution to their very life should be made.

I want to say this, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the House of Representatives of the fact that we have been told in many ways, through many religions, and in many languages, but perhaps most pertinently in our own, that "he who loveth his own life over much shall lose it" and that the only way to retain anything is to give it freely. I am so certain that this is in conformity with a universal law which, if disobeyed, will bring down upon our own heads exactly what we earn by an unwillingness to share our plenty with the starving.

What do you think it means to the mothers in India to read of surplus grains in the United States when their children are starving to death? Does that bring us any friendship? And mind you, I am not buying friendship when I vote for this bill. No, I am doing what I believe to be my human duty to other human beings, and I will do it in every part of the world it is possible for me to do it in and in the best way that it can be done, knowing all the time that unless I possess something I cannot give it away. So I must not be careless lest I have nothing to give.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very deeply on some of these matters because to me the very life of my own country is at stake—the spiritual life of my own country. Without the spirit there is no life. Unless we pull ourselves together, friends, and find again the basic principles of human understanding, the human give and take, the kind of thing that built our little villages in the beginning of our country, we may find ourselves lost. Now there seems to be no time for kindness, for the simple realities of community living. I am certain that unless we know that the universal law of life is a law of giving, that as Walt Whitman said, "The gift is to the giver and comes back most to him," then indeed will our Nation and our people be in grave danger.

I am so certain of that fact that I believe that these deeds come back most to us when we do these things which mean life to the children of tomorrow in other countries, but I am certain also that if we do not fulfill our responsibilities toward those in need across the world our own future is jeopardized to a degree that few of us here today can possibly appreciate.

It is a moment when we as individuals and as a Nation must remember that—

> The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein.

Now and always it is His world, and all of us are His people. Yes, we must use our best intelligence in all we do. We must not waste, but we must use and with care. Wasteful extravagance, throwing things away, destroying them as we have been doing for the past 20 years, indeed for a century, is also a violation of the law. By what right do we throw out that which would be life to another? We should not forget that everything we eat dies to make us live. What right have we to life? Is it ours, or God's? What right have we to the death of all this that becomes us, unless we use it rightly, unless we share its equivalent that others too may live, and unless we can see clearly through the confusions that are thrown around us on every side, that we have a destiny in the world, that we may not have been fulfilling over well? To me food to India is part of our recognition of this destiny.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has again expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the very fine remarks made yesterday by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have thoroughly acquainted myself with the matter of

monazite sands in India. It is my considered opinion that the Senate took unwise and ill-considered action in accepting the Bridges amendment to S. 872. The amendment is embodied in the second half of section 6 of the Senate bill. The Bridges amendment requires that India use monazite sand and manganese as well as cash to pay for that half of the wheat shipment which is not an outright grant. Now there are certain faults on the face of the amendment—for example, it does not say how much monazite or manganese—but I wish to address myself to a much deeper implication in this section of the bill.

Let us take up the matter of monazite sand first. This sand—and this is common knowledge—furnishes thorium, among other elements. The United States Atomic Energy Commission definitely has an interest in the establishment of an agreement between our Government and the Government of India concerning monazite.

In 1946 India placed an embargo upon the export of monazite. We have done the same thing here in the United States under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. The reasons for this are obvious: they have to do with protection of local atomic-energy development, with neutrality factors, and, in India's case, with a desire to handle such a commodity in the best interest of that nation's economic program. In 1947 India made an exception to its embargo. It entered into an agreement with a private French company for the construction of a monazite processing plant in India in exchange for limited monazite shipments to France. I am told, however, the French company has not constructed this plant to date.

I am advised that negotiations between our Government and India concerning monazite are now pending. I have high hopes for the success of these negotiations. We are already receiving important quantities of other strategic materials from India, such as manganese, kyanite and others as a result of private negotiation.

I am convinced from the information I have received that if shipment of wheat to India is made conditional upon the export of monazite to the United States, shipments of wheat will be refused by the Indian Government. It would be refused because such a condition would be considered a flagrant invasion of India's sovereignty and it would seriously weaken the position of the non-Communist Congress Party in India. If the Indian Government were to accede to this provision it would give the Indian Communists (and there are many of them) the best issue they ever had around which to rally support from the Indian masses.

What is important, from our point of view, is that if India should be forced to reject our offer—shipment of all strategic materials to the United States from India might well be placed in jeopardy. Here is a rough idea of important items we are already getting from India through voluntary and amicable negotiations:

Eighty-seven percent of all imports of mica to the United States.

Fifty-five percent of all imports of kyanite to the United States.

Seventy-nine percent of all imports of jute to the United States.

Eighty-nine percent of all imports of shellac to the United States.

Thirty-six percent of all imports of manganese to the United States.

Twenty-nine percent of all imports of castor beans to the United States—for industrial lubricant as well as other lubricant use.

Ten percent of all imports of hides to the United States.

If all these supplies, including monazite, were cut off from the United States, one can see that the latter half of section 6 of the Senate bill is not a help but a terrible hindrance to our defense program. Not only does it prevent us from obtaining strategic materials but it makes us the worst kind of a Simon Legree in the eyes of the world. To insert this provision in the bill is to introduce a strain that completely blocks the quality of mercy in providing a starving neighbor with something to eat.

The inclusion of manganese in the provision introduced by Senator BRIDGES is equally ill-considered. We are already obtaining from 65 to 70 percent of the entire India output of manganese. Does it make sense to introduce an element of compulsion into the India-aid bill in a situation like that? I repeat, this provision may well end the strategic materials we are now getting from India. It will achieve just exactly the opposite result that it intends.

Members of this House have a responsibility—a responsibility to legislate in the long-range interest of our Nation's security, and an immediate responsibility not to handicap and destroy work now being done by the executive branch of our Government. I do not have to dwell on what effect this provision would have on our foreign relations. It would place us in the role of a bully who throws his weight around just to show he can get what he wants even if it is foolish to get it. Is that the kind of an impression we wish to create? Is that the way to win friends and keep our much-needed allies in this highly precarious conflict between communism and democracy as we know it?

This bill is founded on a humanitarian basis—that the American people will not stand by unmoved while millions of innocent people starve in India. It is contrary to the purpose of this measure that we should exact a pound of flesh for that which we seek to do out of our natural generosity.

Think of how Moscow has been interpreting this proposed amendment. Such propaganda opportunities are never lost on the Russians who seek to distort the aims of the United States. I urge the House not to give them further opportunity to distort our purposes.

It is high time we settle down to the gravest responsibility this country ever had—to help establish peace and justice among the nations and, above all, to defend our democratic way of life.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman knows the further fact, does he not, that as far as manganese and mica especially are concerned, they are extremely rare in this country; as a matter of fact, we do not produce more than 10 percent of our own manganese needs. According to the figures the gentleman has given 36 percent of our total imports of manganese come from India. I believe if the gentleman will go a little further he will find that 36 percent which comes into us represents more than 75 percent of India's production; not only that, but also we are getting it at a very reasonable price.

I think on the basis of the figures the gentleman has given and the statements he has made that our economic relationship with India in regard to these products is a very sound, very fine, and a very good one.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that particular point?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Not for the moment; I wish to comment on the question asked by the gentleman from Montana. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. Here we find ourselves in a situation where we have been getting the vast majority of our imports of these strategic materials from India by private negotiation. That seems to be a pretty effective means of obtaining the materials. I see no reason why we should throw that means of obtaining strategic materials out of the window by adopting a policy of compulsion.

Mr. COX. Now will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman favor extending this loan to India without obligating that country in anywise to make transfers of any of the minerals that she has in surplus and which are in short supply here at home?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I have talked about this to one of the outstanding businessmen of this country who is quite familiar with India. He has carried on business negotiations in India. He has also been responsible in large measure for the contracts that have been made for the purchase of these strategic materials. He feels under all the circumstances that the best way to do it is by private negotiation. I have confidence in people who are familiar with the facts.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman understand that India has placed an embargo on the exportation of monazite sand and that it is in short supply in this country?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman followed my statement, I covered that.

Mr. COX. I followed the gentleman's statement, but I did not get the point.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I stated that India has an embargo on monazite sands, the same sort of embargo that the United States has on all fissionable material. We have not only

put a ban on the export of it but it can not be owned privately in the United States. It is a Government monopoly.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman understand that the production of monazite sand in the United States amounts to very little, that there is only a handful to be obtained in Florida and that they are trying to develop it in one of the Middle Northwestern States?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Well, I know there is very little of it in the United States and I know that India is not the only country that has monazite sand. As a matter of fact, it can be found in Brazil as well as in India.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know that under India's persuasion Brazil has likewise imposed an embargo on the exportation of the sand mined there by an Illinois company at the invitation of Brazil.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman's argument does not quite make sense because here is the United States of America placing an embargo on the very material he is talking about.

Mr. COX. I would think that the gentleman would object to having his argument tested to the full extent also.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I take the gentleman's own argument. Is he opposed to the present Government monopoly on fissionable material, which is the law of the land?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. COX. I am opposed to letting India have one grain of wheat so long as India refuses to let us have the materials for which she has no use in the world except to convert into foreign exchange and which we need so badly.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer the gentleman by saying again that I have talked with a very substantial businessman of our country about this important matter. He is personally familiar with the problem. He feels very confidently that we can get this by negotiation. The past history of negotiation indicates that we can get this strategic material.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Georgia is talking about getting monazite from India as well as other strategic materials. Is it not a fact that the thing the gentleman from Georgia wants to do will defeat his own very purpose? We will not only get no monazite because it is prohibited from being exported from India but we will not get manganese from India and we are getting 75 percent of it now through negotiation as the gentleman has said. In other words, you will be cutting off the nose of the United States to spite its face.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is quite right. The moment you introduce the element of compulsion you will run into trouble. We have used the art of negotiation to achieve this vast amount of material which the United States of America is now receiving from India. It is predicated upon the work done by an outstanding businessman. I have faith in our people who are handling the negotiations for this material.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is a very important member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Is it not a fact that there has been no shortage in the United States up until this time of thorium coming from monazite sand?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to call the attention of the committee again to a statement I made on yesterday as follows:

> The Bureau of Mines has informed the committee that monazite and other rare-earth-mining operations in the United States now under way and planned indicate an excess of supply over demand adequate to meet our strategic objectives even without allowance for future imports and early United States self-sufficiency in these materials.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's fine comment. I may say with further reference to Brazil, so that we may clarify that point on monazite once and for all, that Brazil will agree to the shipment of monazite on a government-to-government basis. Such an agreement, as I understand it, only awaits the establishment of the necessary administrative machinery in Brazil. The trouble has been that an American company that has a monopoly on monazite, has refused to put in a processing plant in Brazil as requested by the Government as they refused to do in India, and that is why we have not been getting monazite from either India or Brazil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Atomic Energy Committee I want to aline myself with the statement made by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], as well as the one made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] yesterday. I also want to make this statement, that the subject of monazite sands is not an important subject to the atomic energy development at this time in the Nation. It is used strictly from the standpoint of certain research, and there are other supplies available. The importance of the monazite sand argument rests solely upon the monopoly by a certain concern in Chicago that has been deprived of its supply of Indian monazite sands, and they have been the ones responsible for bringing the monazite argument into the discussion.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I cannot. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. COX. Well, I do not blame the gentleman, because that is not true.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All right, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says that the Lindsay Chemical Co. is responsible for bringing monazite into this picture.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman named the company. I did not name the company.

Mr. COX. I know, but I know who the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad the gentleman knows the company.

Mr. COX. I was working on that phase of the case before I knew that the Lindsay Chemical Co. existed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, I am glad the gentleman is that farsighted.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman would give me time, I would tell the story.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has had more time than I, and I am a member of the committee, and I will not yield further.

On February 8, 1951, the Government of India through its Ambassador, Madame Pandit, requested that the United States assist India in obtaining 2,000,000 tons of food grains to meet an unusual and critical emergency which threatened famine in many parts of India. The formal request stated that India "would greatly appreciate if the grain be supplied on special and easy terms."

In considering this request, an analysis was made of India's ability to pay for this grain. India is a new nation and has many fiscal problems. Her financial resources are very limited. It is very doubtful if India could comply with the previous loan qualifications of the Export-Import Bank. It was therefore thought advisable, both from the humanitarian standpoint and from the standpoint of supporting the new government in India, that the 2,000,000 tons of grain be given to the starving Indian people. It so happened that the United States was the only nation possessed of an appreciable surplus carryover of grain from the previous year's crops.

It should be clearly stated that the starvation threatened in India is not the usual subnormal nutritional threat, which has always existed in India during normal crop years. This is an unusual famine condition caused by unusual floods and droughts in grain-bearing areas. It, therefore, was not the case of ordinary malnutrition which is always present, but malnutrition carried to the point of mass starvation due to the unusual conditions.

Strong opposition arose in Congress against giving the grain to India since they had requested it on a loan basis. This opposition was particularly strong in the House Committee on Rules, and approval of a rule was postponed for several months. The introduction of a bill with a loan provision finally occurred. A rule was reluctantly granted, and although an attempt was made on the floor to defeat the rule, that attempt was badly defeated by a vote of 211 to

13. The bill itself is now under discussion in the House.

In my opinion, H. R. 3791 should be passed. While I am not in favor of some of the public pronouncements of Nehru, and I certainly believe that the attitude of the new Indian Government of trying to appease Russia is a policy which they will sooner or later regret, I still can understand some of the reasons which prompt the weak, militarily and financially speaking, to take such a stand.

The new state of India is naturally somewhat nervous and apprehensive of the strong Communist governments of Russia and China, which lie near its northern border. India's leaders are also confronted with strong political opposition from within. The Nehru government with all its faults is a constitutional government, and it is definitely anti-Communist.

If the Nehru government should fall, it is doubtful whether it would be supplanted by a constitutional government. The chances are that the new government would be a dictatorship of either the right or the left. Under these circumstances, the investment made in supplying grain to millions of starving people in India accomplishes two objectives: that of feeding the starving and that of supporting a free government.

We cannot afford to stand idly by with tremendous surpluses of food while millions starve. We cannot afford it either from a humanitarian standpoint or from the standpoint of world prestige and world security.

World leadership has been forced upon us by developments beyond our power. We are being judged throughout the world by what we do on these great international problems. If we rise to the challenge presented and furnish the world real leadership, we will earn the respect of the rest of the nations, especially those of the free world. If we, through selfishness or lack of vision, fail to furnish this leadership, we will lose their respect and we will destroy their faith in the value of democracy.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. As a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, could the gentleman tell us how we in the United States could justify our embargo on fissionable materials, if we are asking other nations to break their embargo?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I cannot. I say that the sovereignty of India is just as sacred to them as the sovereignty of the United States is to us.

This problem must be viewed, therefore, not only in humanitarian terms, but in terms of effective leadership of world opinion.

I am confident that it is right morally, and right from the standpoint of strengthening the free world, for us to pass this bill and send our surplus food to the starving people of India. I am confident, if we press forward with faith in the rightness of our cause, that the Government and the people of India will be strengthened and will be friendly to the other peoples of the free world when they are needed.

This extension of aid to India is an evidence of our maturity and the acceptance of one of the responsibilities of world leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one point about this opportunity to come to the aid of the millions that are starving in India. We are not dealing with malnutrition in India as it normally obtains there. This is an emergency that has been brought on by droughts and by floods, which causes malnutrition to advance into the area of mass starvation. So it is an unusual situation and is not the normal situation of malnutrition that obtains generally in India.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the people of North Dakota—that is a great majority of them—disapprove of the appropriations this Government has made to finance loans, which are never paid, and gifts to foreign countries and are disappointed with the money we have sunk in the Marshall plan and in the North Atlantic Pact. They feel that an end must finally be put to the spending of these billions and the increase of our taxes in this country.

But when it comes to feeding the starving, no matter in what country they may be, a different side of spending is realized. When we can do it, the people of North Dakota will be first to share their food with starving people. The feeding of the people of India for which this appropriation is asked, is not a war measure; it is not a gesture to secure support from India, it is a cause which appeals to humanity.

I am well aware of the action of India in these troubled times; I know they do not support us in the U. N.; I know they will not send any troops to aid the U. N. cause in Korea; I know they will appease Red China and Russia to any extent of which they are capable, and if I could retaliate against that Government, I would do it. We cannot retaliate against that Government without abandoning the people in it to starvation; and in the year of our Lord 1951, it would not be a thing a Christian nation should do, when it has the means of allaying that hunger and death.

To some it may seem that we shall never get anything back for this act or even any credit for it, but still it is the Christian thing to do. Maybe the benefits of this Nation will return a hundredfold by our following the right thing regardless of all consequences. It will surely be a demonstration to the world that there is at least one nation on earth that is not seeking pay for the good things it does.

We have given away billions for a lesser cause; we have poured billions into the British Empire until every baldheaded man in England is fitted out with a toupee paid for by the people of the United States. Along with these toupees we have thrown in, with reckless abandon, false teeth and eye glasses, while we have thousands in this country who have to go on through life baldheaded, toothless, and unable to see where they are going.

You say, we only loaned this money to England. Well I wish some intelligent economist in this House would tell me the difference between a gift and a loan which never will be paid. England has not paid anything on World War I yet, well on this I will say that England's intentions were good. We made an adjustment with her and canceled the principal if England would pay 2 percent on the interest. She accepted the offer—who would not?—but stuck us again. She did not have the 2 percent so she gave us a note for that, and up to this minute she has not paid that note and, as I surmise has no intention of doing so. So while we collected that 2 percent interest we received no money but another note. In other words, she paid nothing and increased her note to us.

In this aid to the hungry people of India I dislike to assume it is a loan—in the end it will be a gift and why leave any cause to charge us with being a shylock. The issue with me is to feed India with a gift of 2,000,000 tons of wheat, or refuse to do it. Forget the loan and not stir up in the minds of the people of the United States that we are making a good hard banker's bargain, when we know all the time we are making a gift. We are exercising charity so why make it appear as anything else.

There is only one condition I would require in aiding India. I would so word the gift that the 2,000,000 tons of wheat had to go to the starving people and not into the treasury of the Indian Government, or into the hands of food speculators similar to our experience in Greece. We should preserve the right in this appropriation to have a representative of this Government check the distribution of this food and prevent speculators and the Indian Government itself from profiting on the misery of her own people.

I have voted against all appropriations for the Marshall plan and for the North Atlantic Pact and every other appropriation intended to buy friendship, but I have never refused to vote for an appropriation to alleviate the suffering of starving people no matter where they are. The first-named appropriations went to support a policy—which I thought wrong—the last is an appropriation in the name of Christian principles of humanity. Remember that a good deed is never lost—it lives—and will come back to the doer a hundredfold.

While we have had experience in making these loans, we have never collected any of them except from some little countries.

Mr. JOHNSON. What about Finland? They have paid every dollar of their debt to us.

Mr. BURDICK. I was going to say a couple of the smaller countries, probably the least able of anybody to pay, have paid their debts to us.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I do not think the gentleman quite does justice to India by blaming her for all of the habits of the

British. The Indians have never yet defaulted on an international loan that I know of. They have the resources to pay the loan. I do not see why, if they remain independent, they will not pay. It seems to me a little unfair to blame them in advance with a lot of the frailties of our European neighbors when they have never yet exhibited those frailties.

Mr. BURDICK. I am a follower of Patrick Henry, and he said "There is no way of judging the future except by the past."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Do you not think we ought to give India an opportunity to prove whether she will or will not pay? It is such a young and new nation that it has never yet had an opportunity to fall down on meeting any of its obligations as have other nations. But just give India the opportunity and the time and she will probably default like her foster father, Great Britain, has defaulted on every loan we have ever made to it.

Mr. BURDICK. I do not think you will be disappointed. But I do not want to fool the American people right now into making them believe that we are making a loan. I am in favor of giving India the money to stop starvation. I will vote for what we have—it is not the way I wanted it, but I do believe that the way you have hedged this in in the bill is a good thing. You are not going to send any wheat over there which is going to interfere with the necessary supplies for this country because it provides in the bill that you cannot do that. Some might think I am in favor of this bill because I represent the wheat growers of this country, and that we are trying to get rid of some of our surplus, but that is not the case at all. We do not have very much surplus wheat in this country when you take into consideration the short crop which is coming up in the soft wheat belt. We better not talk too much about surpluses until the end of the season comes around.

Here is one thing I want to let you know—this Government has not spent a dime in supporting the price of wheat in America. It has not cost the Government a nickel. The fact is they have made $49,000,000 by having the price support on wheat because the world market price of wheat has been ahead of what the farmers received all the time. I hope no one, and especially no one in the State of North Dakota, who happens to read what I have said, will draw the inference that we are selfish about the matter. I understand, and I believe I have reason for so understanding—or at least I can say I am satisfied that India is not going to vote with us in the United Nations. I am satisfied that India is not going to send forces to help us in Korea.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it not the conviction of the gentleman that India is pro-Communist and pro-Russian?

Mr. BURDICK. No, and I will tell you why. India will never be Communist, because communism strikes at two things—it strikes at capitalism—that is No. 1. The next thing it strikes at is religion, and you cannot do anything with the Indians when you attack their religion. I think they are perfectly safe so far as that is concerned.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I am the most yielding man you ever saw.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am delighted to hear that.

The gentleman, and many of the other eloquent speakers this afternoon, has given the impression that the United States has sent absolutely no grain to India. Is that the gentleman's conception, that we have sent no grain to India?

Mr. BURDICK. I was trying to find these sheets but you interrupted me and I confess I missed your question.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I happen to have been in touch with the Department of Agriculture this afternoon. I understand that during the last few months we have sent a considerable amount of grain to India. I do not understand we have been thanked for it, although Russia who has sent far less, has had very generous thanks and has been given great publicity. I understand we have shipped over 400,000 tons, which is a considerable amount. It seems to me we are rather at fault in not publicizing that fact. Of course, I realize we do not want to be thanked for our generosity. We are accustomed to being kicked in the teeth for giving away things, but I do think it might be well to publicize having given this wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to follow the genial gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], for whom we all have the greatest affection and respect.

I was interested in the fact, however, that he based some of his conclusions on the bad record of Britain. I would like to point out that until there was a collapse of the inter-allied debt structure throughout the world in the early thirties, Britain did not default in a single interest or principal payment due the United States. No private loan to Britain has ever been in default. However, that is not relevant to this question.

It seems altogether appropriate, whichever side we take as to the India problem, that there be continued reference to our religious ideals. I know that those opposing this bill are as charitable-minded as I, and in the presence of suffering would exhibit personal generosity. Whatever I say about the wisdom of the generous policy by our Government, I am sure that anybody with whom I differ will understand that it is not an indictment of viewpoints.

However, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] put her hand upon something that is basic in this whole discussion. It is that America, a favored nation, cannot stand before the world with a surplus of food and let millions die for lack of it. We do not want an adverse judgment of history to be imposed upon us.

I do not know whether Mr. Nehru is a sound leader or not. I know that I disagree with some of his utterances, but I am sure I do not understand the Orient as well as I might. I am willing to grant that judgments should be reserved on some points as the new republics mature. We must be patient and tolerant for in the fundamental struggle they are on the free world's side. There are other sources of information than Nehru's speeches, statements that cannot be questioned that the situation in India is desperate.

In the final analysis, the vote of this House will rest upon that fact; that is, if we do not send grain, millions of people in India will die. I do not know how many. There is some question about that, of course, for disease factors enter the calculations. It is true that there is always some suffering in India, but it is not true that this is a normal condition or a continuing situation. We have an emergency to deal with. Let us make no mistake about that. It began with an earthquake, followed by floods, then a drought in another part of the country, and finally the locusts. India has had a series of disasters that should win the sympathy of the American people. The hunger of masses of her people is appalling.

Here is one basis for the insistence that hunger is widespread; it is a letter from the executive secretary of the Agricultural Missions, Inc., founded by Dr. John R. Mott. On its board of directors serves my good friend, a Member of this House, the gentleman from New York, RALPH W. GWINN. I refer to that because it is a leading organization in the field of missions. This is what one of the missionaries says:

> We are nearing the end of February, but it looks like the height of the dry summer season. Our monsoon failed in October-November for the fourth successive year. We have not had a drop of rain since November 17 and things are dry, terribly so. We have installed a third Diesel oil pump in a desperate attempt to raise as much food as possible, since grains are so difficult to get to feed man and beast. Naturally the income from our farm has been affected very badly, and a serious financial situation faces us as it does all farmers in south India today. We do not know where we can find fodder for our cattle. We would like to sell some of our dairy stock, but prices are so low due to the fodder scarcity that we hesitate to "give them away," having spent so much time and money to breed and raise them. Food for our workers and students is no less desperate. I can assure you that the 2,000,000 tons of food India hopes to get from America is indeed badly needed. We have never faced a more desperate situation. The coming 4 or 5 months will be dreadful, we fear. I can see nothing else than sheer famine, starvation, and death for man and beast unless help comes and soon. It is impossible to exaggerate the staggering need.

So we are not depending upon the representations of Nehru for the conditions which the House Foreign Affairs Committee presents to this House in a plea for this loan for food.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand, the gentleman's argument is, and I am sure the gentleman attempted to justify it, that India needs this wheat for her survival; is that correct?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. For the survival of her people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, the survival of her people. The United States of America needs this monazite sand from which thorium is derived, and manganese for our survival in a dangerous war. If that be true, what would be unChristian in having a little cooperation and understanding that we furnish the wheat and the food that India needs for her survival, and in return that India furnish us manganese and the monazite sand we need for our survival? Thus both these great nations can survive.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I get the gentleman's question and I think all the Members understand it. It is a question that may represent our differences, and the differences are not substantial unless the House feels that we should tie the hands of our negotiators. On yesterday the House received accurate information on this subject from the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and others serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I hope by this time it is clear that while we are entitled to ask India to meet our needs in such respects as she can, we should not place our negotiators in a position in which the whole transaction will fall if we are not able to induce India to meet all of the requirements of a rigid amendment. In that case we would lose minerals, India the food.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. On that point may I make an observation?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I cannot yield further; I am sorry.

I hope that when we get into a discussion of that question the House will hear us dispassionately; and, although we may have exhibited emotion about human suffering, I trust that our efforts will be regarded as consistent with our desire to protect our own country. If, as the gentleman from Ohio says, we can in this transaction secure a continued supply of manganese, or if India is in a position under her policy to give us other strategic material, then it is to our interest to do it. But we must not exploit suffering and widespread hunger, and we must not put the ECA that negotiates the terms in the position of turning down the plea for food.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. CHATHAM. For the RECORD, is it not true that the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], said yesterday that in our domestic monazite sands, production is scheduled to exceed domestic consumption of end production by the end of 1951?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is correct.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, may I just take this concluding minute to highlight the point that has been made. It is repetitious, but this is one of the fateful periods in human history and I believe, if I might speak with conviction, that much depends on the decision of this House when we take the final vote.

There is a precedent for this assistance. It is not the first time that the American Congress has been asked to send food to starving people. In 1921 the people in the Valley of the Volga River, millions of Russian people living under a communistic regime, asked for help and we sent it.

In 1924 the victims of an earthquake under the Government of Japan, a rising power that undertook to destroy and to enslave us, the millions of victims of an earthquake asked the United States for help and we sent it.

On many occasions the United States has been asked for help by the stricken people of Germany, those who rose against us, and because we did not propose to let suffering people die, we sent them help.

To the people of China, the flood sufferers in the valley of the Yangtze we have extended aid on more than one occasion.

We should be no less generous with the people of India.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COX: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the "India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951."

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized and directed to provide emergency food relief assistance to India on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (except that such credit terms shall provide for repayment by India of the entire principal of, and all interest on, any credit so extended not later than 6 years after the date on which such credit for India is established), including payment by transfer, or otherwise, to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the Government of India) of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources; such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, beryl, raw jute, and cyanite. The Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes for this purpose from time to time during the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 in an amount not to exceed $190,000,000 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury who is authorized and directed to make such purchases; and in making such purchases, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act, as amended: *Provided*, That with respect to the procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this act the Secretray of Agriculture shall certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States: *Provided further*, That the assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of floods, droughts, and other natural disasters suffered by India in 1950.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to the extent that the President finds that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose: *Provided*, That pursuant to agreements made between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest not later than June 30, 1952, for such advances either from funds hereafter made available to the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, from receipts from vessel operations: *Provided further*, That pending such repayment receipts from vessel operations may be placed in such funds or accounts and used for activating and operating vessels."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this extension of time because I have not had an opportunity to address the House on the merits of the bill. The Committee on Foreign Affairs came before the Committee on Rules and asked for 2 hours general debate. That committee extended the time to 6 hours with the understanding that the opposition would have some time. I was not able to get one minute.

Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer as a substitute for the pending bill with some changes the bill recently turned out by the Senate which, in my judgment, is a very great improvement upon the House bill, but that bill deals with matters extraneous to the pending bill and therefore ran into the trouble of being subject to points of order, and because of that I have offered the substitute which is now before you.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eleven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of correcting a statement?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I am concerned about that because I have tried to be fair, and if the gentleman asked the Committee on Foreign Affairs for time, I did not know it or I would have given him part of my time.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman is always clever, and I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, the committee will observe that this substitute now before you having been offered by myself is the committee bill with two changes. On page 1, line 9 of the bill after the word "amended"—and if you have the bill before you I beg of you to refer to it—this additional language is proposed to be inserted "except that such credit terms shall provide for repayment by India of the entire principal of, and all interest on, any credit so extended not later than 6 years after the date on which such credit for India is established."

On that phase you will recall it was developed in the debate that the Committee on Foreign Affairs originally reported a bill to make a grant of 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India, and they made it a grant upon the ground that India could not pay for the wheat. If you will look to the report filed by that committee you will find substantiation for that statement. Then later they came back with the bill that is now before you to make a loan of $190,000,000 to India and they take the position that India's resources are sufficient to make India a good risk, and therefore the transaction is a bona fide one, that the loan is a good loan, and that the loan will be repaid.

The Secretary of State took the position that while India had the resources with which to pay the loan they ought not to be pledged because it would embarrass India's qualifying for an industrial loan, which, incidentally, I should like again to inform you is for three-billion-eight-hundred-million-odd dollars, the greater portion of which she expects to get from the Export-Import Bank.

Let us go to the second amendment to the committee bill. On page 1, line 10, after "by transfer" insert a comma and the further words "or otherwise." That is a minor amendment, and I will not dwell upon it.

Then there is an amendment on page 2, line 3, and this I do believe to be of great importance. It was a point that was discussed at great length in the Senate. It was the Bridges amendment, which was adopted overwhelmingly. The language is this:

> Page 2, line 3, insert before the period a semicolon and the following: "such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, beryl, raw jute, and cyanite."

I cannot conceive that this Committee would for a moment consider making a loan of $190,000,000 to India without at the same time at least making some effort to assure India's repaying the loan.

You have heard advocates of the pending bill tell you that calling it a loan is a subterfuge. One of the last gentlemen making a speech supporting the bill, the gentleman from North Dakota, said that if you thought you were going to get payment of a dime upon this transaction you were fooling yourselves. So there you have it.

I want to inquire why there can be any possible objection, other than that offered by the Secretary of State, to requiring India to send us some of the minerals she has, some of the jute fiber she has, and which are in short supply in this country, we having no fiber and little of the monazite sand about which you have heard much.

Let me tell you just a bit about this particular commodity. India is the main source of monazite sand. Her production is larger and the quality is better than that produced anywhere else in the world. Next to India, Brazil has the greatest quantity. There is none in the United States except a little which is found in Florida which only amounts to a handful, and I believe it is in Nevada where they are undertaking to develop mines. But it is believed that it will take 2 years or more before it will be possible, even exerting our effort to the maximum, to get enough monazite to meet the requirements. India, I say, has that sand. She has it mined now. It is sacked and stacked up in the thousands and thousands of tons. But Russia came into India, and Russia dominates India, make no mistake, my friends—Russia came into India and influenced India to lay down an embargo against the shipping of that sand. That was not all. Indian representatives went to Brazil and influenced that country to lay down a like embargo— an embargo upon the sand which is mined by an Illinois company at the invitation of Brazil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to impose myself upon the committee, but some of these things ought to be cleared up. This Illinois company which is the principal chemist in that field made an investment above $400,000 in Brazil and at the insistence of Brazil, but because of the interest of India the investment of more than $400,000 is a total loss unless the company can export the monazite sand. Monazite sand is a vital and necessary materal. Almost the entire output of the products of this Illinois company is taken by the Atomic Energy Commission. It is important. It is of no use to India except as she can convert it to foreign exchange. Something has been said about India wanting to process this sand herself. An endeavor has been made to coerce—mark you—an endeavor has been made to coerce and to drive this Illinois company to go into India and develop such a plant. The development of such a plant there would mean the dismantling of the plant which is operating in this country. The operation of such a plant in India would be an economic impossibility. Into the plant of the chemist to which I have referred, there rolls every morning acids and alkalis totaling 400,000 pounds. India produces few of these acids. She produces none of the alkalis. She cannot process the sand. She entered into an agreement with a company in France. They found it likewise impossible to process the sand on an economic basis. But even since the laying down of the embargo India has exported certain quantities of the sand to a French company, whose name I could give, and with which there was formerly associated an outstanding French Communist. My dear friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, made a very emotional speech this morning, to which I responded. I want to say to you we cannot legislate upon the basis of emotion alone. He said he was in favor of something, and I want to join him and say, too, I am in favor of something. I think the one-worldism which we have been practicing has carried us to a dangerous extreme.

I do not see that it is possible for us to hold together and be a solvent, strong country, if we continue to carry on this give-away program. Yes, I favor something. I favor keeping flying the flag above the dome of this Capitol, which gives itself in complete fullness to the winds of God that blow. We must give some consideration to the ability of our people to carry on in this proposed fashion. I want to tell you here and now that if we ever mean to bring to an end this give-away program, here is the place to start.

I have asked this question and have had no answer from members of the committee, "Will the adoption of this bill mean this Congress committing itself to a give-away program that has already been outlined and which is being engineered by a Member of this House, that will call for the additional expenditure of in excess of $7,000,000,000?" Are you for that sort of program? Are you prepared to make that kind of pledge? It is your problem. This is your country. My concern in its preservation is no greater than yours. Let us come together as responsible people, with a common concern, and make a decision that represents sanity, patriotism, and a concern for the solvency of this Republic.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] yesterday and today. I notice his complaint that he was given no time under general debate on this bill. I recall that on yesterday when we were considering the rule he monopolized more of the time than any other Member. Not only that, but when the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, went to

ask him for time he refused him and said he had none. Later, of course, he offered to give him 4 minutes, but then it was too late.

The gentleman from Georgia is making a great to-do about a give-away program. I should like to call to his attention the fact that I was one of those who opposed the original India-aid grant bill, because I felt that we should report out this measure on a loan basis, due to the fact that the Indian Government had asked for assistance on easy terms. Now the gentleman comes in, if I understand his amended bill correctly, with a new bill. Does this House not realize that he and his group are responsible for the bill which is before us at the present time? The Rules Committee turned down the original bill, and they told the Foreign Affairs Committee the kind of bill they would accept, and that is the kind of bill they got, a bill which calls for a loan, a loan which I understand will be worked out between the Indian Government and the ECA, a loan which the gentleman from Georgia wants to cut down to a 6-year basis and to which he wants to add certain amendments. I wonder if this House does not know by now what this particular substitute means. We are dealing with a new country, a country which has been in existence only a few years as a free nation. Here we are dealing with a third new bill on this subject, while we are discussing the terms laid down by the gentleman from Georgia in defiance of the wishes of the committee which brought out this bill. He brings up the question of monazite. I never heard of this mineral, or rare earth, until lately. The gentleman brings up the question of manganese. I know something about that, because it happens that in my State of Montana 90 percent of the manganese produced in this country is mined; but 90 percent is not a great deal, because all we can do at our very best is to supply 10 percent of our national needs. The gentleman brings up the question of manganese and says we should put clauses in this bill to make certain that the Indian Government will ship us manganese. They are shipping us approximately 40 percent of our total imports and needs. They are shipping us in excess of 75 percent of the manganese which they produce. These figures have been brought out by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], all members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Now we come to the question of monazite. I have read twice, and I am going to burden this Committee again by reading a third time just what the Bureau of Mines has to say about this particu lar substance, this substance which the Indian Government, I understand, has put under its own control just as we have put certain rare materials in this country under our own sole control. Here is what the Bureau of Mines says about monazite:

1. The Bureau of Mines has informed the committee that monazite and other rare earth mining operations in the United States now under way and planned indicate an excess of supply over demand adequate to meet our strategic objectives even without allowance for future imports and early United States self-sufficiency in these materials. The only real concerns are for supplies to meet the needs for a short period in the very near future and to meet AEC demand if research determines that thorium is an important atomic raw material.

I should like to call to your attention that one of the arguments used against the present bill is that in view of our interest in a monazite supply and India's interest in a food supply reciprocity is not an unreasonable requirement. Reciprocity is never an unreasonable requirement. But, Mr. Chairman, this is a loan; it is not a give-away program as far as I am concerned, and I expect the Indian Government to repay this loan if the bill is passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that as far as I am concerned this is a loan; it is not the beginning of a give-away program for India or any other part of the Middle East. This measure is being advanced in good faith, and I am quite certain on the basis of the Indian Government's request for easy terms and assistance at this particular time that it is their intention to repay this loan as its earliest convenience.

I have heard some remarks about an American concern being interested in monazite in India. I have also heard members of the Atomic Energy Committee, Members of this House, state that at the present time negotiations are being carried on between this company and the Indian Government and between this company and the Government of Brazil. In both instances it appears that a favorable reaction can be expected; and on the basis of negotiations voluntarily entered into, not forced upon a government or a company, that it is possible that an agreement might be worked out. So when we consider these things let us look at the factors truthfully; let us not only recognize the humanitarian aspects of the people who are starving, of people who are the victims of drouth and famine, of the people who do need help, but also let us look at it from the practical viewpoint of the assistance which India has rendered to this country. Remember the amount in percentage of kyanite that we get from India, the manganese and mica and other minerals of which we are in short supply and all of which we need; think seriously of the economic relationship which now exists and let us defeat this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia and keep that economic relationship on a high plane.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee I have made a special effort to look into the monazite question. I have tried to find out the significance of the Indian embargo to us. I have tried to find out what our real needs are for monazite and for the thorium and rare earths which can be extracted from it. I have tried to find out what other sources we have besides India and what our own production is and what we can produce should the need arise. I have also tried to find out what portion of our annual consumption of rare earths is for our defense efforts in contrast with our ordinary commercial needs.

The facts on this important matter have been stated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the distinguished vice chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee. I agree with the clear and pointed statement which he made yesterday and wish to underscore it by telling you what I have found out. In the first place, I think it is significant that despite the fact that India has embargoed monazite shipments since 1946 we have been able to fill our needs from our own resources and from imports from Brazil. In the second place, I want to tell you that although thorium and rare earths are important to our defense effort and this problem must not be neglected, their importance has been greatly exaggerated by persons lobbying Members of the Congress on this matter and by Members arguing for a monazite amendment to this bill. As to thorium, the distinguished vice chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee has already pointed out that at present thorium is not used in our atomic energy program except on an experimental basis.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Did I understand the gentleman to say something about lobbyists being up here lobbying for some part of this bill?

Mr. PRICE. I made a statement to the effect that Members of Congress have been contacted at great length on the question of thorium.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman overlooked the fact that the State Department has had five up here every day since consideration of this bill started?

Mr. PRICE. I am not entering into that argument with the gentleman from Georgia. I say there probably have been discussions on both sides of the question. I was referring to those who have been talking about the question of monazite.

This does not mean that we are uninterested in monazite. It does mean that there is no need for us to be stampeded into a foolish amendment which could only hurt our relations with India and could not help us to get the monazite we want. It means that we have time to work out our problems on a decent, sensible basis as one free nation does with another.

Now, as to the rare earths, I have been under the impression that great quantities of rare earths are currently needed for our defense program. This impression has certainly been given by lobbyists for this monazite amendment and by some Members speaking for it. I find,

however, the facts do not support this allegation. It is probably impossible to determine the exact quantities of rare earths which are needed for various items used in our defense effort since some comes in through commercial channels, but it is the belief of persons who are best acquainted with this matter that the use for defense purposes is a relatively small part of our total consumption. The use of the remainder for nondefense purposes is also not entirely clear, but some idea of it can be gathered from the fact that a spokesman for the industry which makes flints for cigarette lighters has declared that 90 or 95 percent of cerium salts, the major one of the rare earths, is used in the lighter flint industry. Now I do not mean to say that the lighter flint industry is not a respectable one or that you would not be inconvenienced if we had no lighter flints, but I do mean to say that this is the sort of situation which would make it laughable if it were not tragic that there should be a serious proposal that we should not send food to India to prevent perhaps millions of people from starving unless India will send us monazite to make lighter flints.

The real significance in the fact that the use of rare earths is a relatively small part of our total domestic consumption comes from the fact that our domestic production in the last 2 years has already been about 30 percent of our total domestic consumption. It is not necessary to assert whether this will cover all of our defense needs or not, because we already know that this year the stepped-up rate of our current production is nearly twice what it was last year and will be in the neighborhood of 60 percent of our consumption last year. I cite these figures because they show very clearly that if we need to we can meet our defense requirements for rare earths out of our own production. I do not think this will be necessary though because we have until recently been receiving a substantial supply of rare earths from our friendly neighbor Brazil and there is no reason to believe that the current discussions between our State Department and Brazil will not succeed in continuing this supply.

My conclusion from these facts is not that we should give up our efforts to make arrangements with the Indian Government. What I say is that this is a separate problem. It is the kind of problem which has been handled with complete success on such important raw materials as manganese and mica and others. It is the kind of problem which should be approached on the basis of friendly negotiation. We all know that the Indian people have just achieved their independence after hundreds of years of colonial status. We all know that they are just as jealous of their independence as we are of ours. We have only to think how we would react to a demand of the kind which this amendment would propose if such a demand were made on us. The sensible thing to do here is the American thing: Vote this bill without any gratuitous, insulting, demeaning amendments. Vote it as an act of humanity in the American tradition. Vote it as a matter of American self-interest in the stability and progress of a nation of 350,000,000 people—the largest free nation in Asia—and then let our representatives sit down with the Indian Government in a calm and friendly negotiation.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to get a little light on this subject concerning which I frankly feel I am somewhat confused in view of the opposing statements as to the situation so far as monazite is concerned from the various people who have spoken with some authority here. In the first place, I want to make it very clear that I am definitely in favor of doing all within reason to provide humanitarian needs, that I am in favor of helping the people of India take care of their starving people, and if we can do it we should.

Now, on this question of monazite, whether or not it is important, and how much we are getting of it, I have a letter here that I think will be of some help in clarifying the point. I think we should know the facts so far as our sources are concerned and just how much reliance we can place upon statements that are not supported by facts. This letter was addressed to me on March 2, 1951, by the Munitions Board, by Mr. E. J. Lintner, and was in direct response to an inquiry regarding our monazite situation:

DEAR MR. KERSTEN: In reply to your letter of February 28, 1951, we are only too glad to supply you with the following information regarding monazite.

Monazite was included in the original group of critical and strategic materials covered by Public Law 117, June 7, 1939. The derivatives of monazite have a number of direct and indirect military applications, such as those in searchlight arc carbons, portable gasoline lamp mantles, radio tubes, radio condensers, aerial photographic lenses, optical glass itself as well as a polishing medium for the glass, colored eyeglasses, lighter flints, military pyrotechnics, as a scavenger in the production of explosives, as a purifier in certain alloy steels, and in the new cerium-magnesium alloy for jet engines. Normal United States annual requirements amount to approximately 3,000 tons of monazite. * * *

The principal world sources of monazite are India and Brazil. Small quantities are produced in the United States (Florida and Idaho). For the period, 1940–50, we produced approximately 4 percent of our total requirements, the balance being made up almost equally by India and Brazil. It is apparent therefore that we depend very heavily upon imports.

In 1946, India placed an embargo on the export of monazite. However, we received a few hundreds tons in 1947, but nothing more since that year. In the last quarter of 1950, exports of monazite from Brazil were prohibited by executive decree. A bill that was signed by President Dutra on January 15, 1951, made the executive decree final.

In other words, our Brazil source was shut off at the beginning of this year.

The State Department is making every effort toward correcting the situation with the above countries.

I interpolate, I certainly hope they are.

Then there is a deletion of another portion of this letter for security purposes, and it closes:

In an effort to improve the stockpile position, we recently changed the purchase specification to cover not only monazite but also an ore known as bastnasite, that is found in California, Nevada, and the Belgian Congo, and the derivatives of these ores. These measures, however, will prove of slight help and our only hope of ample supplies will continue to be the existing world sources.

I have attempted to cover all the points raised in your letter and if there are any further questions, do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. LINTNER.

If we are to rely on our Munitions Board, we presently depend heavily on foreign sources for monazite. To those gentlemen who get up here and say that this is not so important, I say that your Munitions Board says otherwise. If we are to give the State Department in our argument and our debate here the idea that we are not too much concerned about it, here is the Munitions Board that says we are concerned. They are strategic materials, and we definitely depend upon foreign supplies.

Now, gentlemen of the Committee, what are the facts?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Stringfellow Barr, former president of St. John's College in Annapolis, has recently published an article, Let's Join the Human Race. In his introductory paragraph, he says:

If the American Government is to find a foreign policy, a policy that is constructive and realistic, we American citizens had better have a good realistic look at the human race.

Here are some significant facts:

Each day, on the average, 200,000 babies are born in this world. The chance that any of these will be born in the United States is 1 out of 20 and the chance of its being born in the Soviet Union is a little bit better. The chance of the child being born white is not more than 1 in 3. The chance of its being Chinese is 1 in 4. The chance of its being born in India is better than 1 in 9. If the child is born colored, it will probably be born either among people who have recently revolted and thrown out the white folks who used to govern them or else in a country that is still trying to throw the white folks out. The child that is born in Africa will probably learn this maxim: Never trust the white man. Each child born has about a 1 in 4 chance of being a Christian. It is far more likely that he would be Confucian or Buddhist, a Mohammedan or a Taoist. The child born in India has only a 50-50 chance of growing to maturity. In the case of the many colored children, the chances are overwhelming that he will be chronically sick for his entire life from malaria, or from intestinal parasites, TB, or other diseases and even if not chronically sick, he will be weak from hunger. The chances are 2 to 1 for each child born that he will suffer from malnutrition either from too little

food or from an unbalanced diet. The chances are very good, too, that each colored child will suffer from famine. The child born colored will have only 1 in 4 chances of learning to read. He will most likely live in a mud hut with a dirt floor, no chimney, and a thatched roof. In addition he is almost certain to work on land of the landlord, to be deeply in debt to the local money lender and to pay an annual interest rate of anywhere from 30 to 100 percent.

The issue today is a simple one. It is a clear one. I would not claim the time of the House to express my views if it were complex. I would remain silent while men more experienced in foreign policy, men with fuller knowledge of the intricacies of diplomacy, advised me. Some of the speakers today are trying to make this into a complex issue. They have spoken of its possible effect on our relations with Pakistan; they have suggested other complexities. Nevertheless, the issue before us today remains a simple one. It is a question of whether or not we will give aid to a starving people—to the people of a nation which does not have food, which could not have raised it, which cannot buy it.

In this situation, we, a Nation with a surplus of wheat, are called upon to share a part of that surplus. I know that our surplus is not sufficient to guard us against every possibility. Our carryover is not large enough to supply the American people in the event of total crop failure in the United States in 1951. It may not be large enough to supply us if we have a 50 percent crop failure, but it is large enough to meet any reasonable or likely failure of our own crop. Our choice is then between withholding aid so as to protect ourselves against a most unlikely contingency, or of giving aid to meet a real and pressing need. Justice demands and charity urges us to act quickly.

Let us not propose seriously to use the starvation of a people as the direct means, as a lever, to advance our national or international interests. Let us act in this case with dignity, with reserve, with decency. Let us not conduct curselves as though we were running the soup kitchen of a gospel mission, demanding that those who receive our soup, first sing our hymns and confess their sins. Let us not exact as the price of the bread we give, the self-respect, the integrity of the peoples of India. Let us not demand that they sing our national anthem, and confess their national faults. Soup-kitchen and breadline conversions are notoriously short-lived.

Let us not succumb to the temptation to be dishonorable in the name of preserving honor, or indecent in the name of decency. Once we stoop to the use of dishonorable means, no matter how noble our purpose, our goal, may be, we shall have lost the cause. In that first compromise we sign the death warrant of honor, even though we sign it in invisible ink our enemies will cast it before us, blackened by the acid of time and we and our cause shall stand condemned by our own hand in the tribunal of history.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I had a good bit to do with drafting the committee bill. I want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, on adopting so much of it, but I respectfully differ with him with reference to the two respects in which he would change the bill. He proposes a time of 6 years. He proposes to add to the language which already requires repayment in strategic materials some extra special language along that line. Here is the trouble about it. When you provide certain requirements in advance with respect to a loan yet to be negotiated, you tend to tie the hands of your own negotiators because maximums become minimums and minimums become maximums. Statutory requirements or concessions cannot be used for bargaining purposes. It would indeed really be a pity if this whole thing fell through because India should say, "Well, we could pay it in 7 years, but not in 6 years," or "We could pay it in 8 years and not in 6 years." But if the substitute is adopted the negotiators' hands would be tied. Who would those negotiators be? We talk about the State Department all the time. Under both the gentleman's substitute and the committee bill the State Department will have a one-sixth voice in the matter. The negotiator will be Bill Foster, head of the ECA. He will have to get the approval of five others on the council of which he is a member. There will be Secretary of State Acheson; John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury; Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce; Bill Martin, head of the Federal Reserve; and Herb Gaston, head of the Export-Import Bank. We know those people, we have been assured that they will say, "If it is a loan which Congress authorizes, it is not going to be a fuzzy loan." We know if we are going to need strategic materials, we will need them for longer than a period of 6 years. How much of them do we need? The Cox substitute does not tell us how much. The committee bill requires that repayment shall include "materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies in its own resources." In addition to those words the Cox substitute says, "immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities," of named strategic materials.

When is "immediate"? How often is "continuing"? How much is "substantial"? Under the substitute bill you still leave discretion to those same negotiators to put reasonable interpretations on those words. Now, if you cannot trust those negotiators to be discreet and wise and to represent the best interests of our country, to make a good trade, if you cannot trust them, then you should not be either for the committee bill or the substitute. On the other hand, if you can trust them then do not stick language in the bill which is offensive to some thin-skinned people over there, which would require a change in their domestic law which we would be unwilling to make in our own law on monazite sands. Leave them something to bargain about. Here is one significant thing: House members of the Committee on Atomic Energy have stood in the well of the House and have told you part of the facts. I suspect they have not been in a position to tell you all the facts about this monazite sands situation, except that they come to you and say, "Leave that part out of the bill. Everything is going along pretty well as is with reference to monazite sands." They say other things are more important and that you do not need this in the law.

Now, one more reason I hope this amendment is not adopted is that it attempts to put in terms, requirements, and conditions which we did not offer to the ECA countries and to Spain. It might be construed as an attempt to draw an international color line when we offer international loans. On the one hand we leave this council of negotiators with broad authority, which they have exercised in 13 cases in Europe, lending $1,184,000,000, but when it comes to India we attempt to write in conditions which make it a different sort of thing, which are diplomatically offensive, but which still leave those negotiators with discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes. I ask this because the gentleman has great knowledge of the subject which he is discussing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman understand that the language of the amendment, to which he takes exception, is word for word the Bridges amendment to the bill that the Senate recently passed?

Mr. VORYS. I do, and I took exception to it there for the reason that it is needlessly offensive diplomatically, but it still leaves discretion to these same negotiators.

Mr. COX. Am I correct in remembering that the gentleman said on yesterday with respect to the other phase of the amendment which he has discussed that a 6-year loan was a much more rational transaction than a 35-year loan?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The gentleman also referred to a reference I made earlier where even a 6-year loan would not necessarily paralyze the Indian economy. However, a 6-year loan would desperately burden the Indian economy at a time when we all hope they will go ahead with some sort of improvement plan. The gentleman from Georgia pointed out the amounts that India would like to get for an improvement plan. My own feeling is there ought to be an improvement plan over there; but, just as in the Marshall plan, the swelling was reduced substantially before it came to Congress by those who originally proposed it, a similar reduction would have to be made in

the Indian improvement plan. The gentleman must remember there is further legislation coming up this spring with reference to regional economic and military plans.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has said he is opposed to making India a fuzzy loan. The gentleman's bill, with which he had much to do in writing and possibly wrote it, provides India an ECA loan.

Mr. VORYS. Authorizing the negotiation of a loan under that law.

Mr. COX. Contemplating that it will be a 35-year loan.

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. COX. As most all ECA loans are?

Mr. VORYS. No. Too many of them have been for 35 years, but the gentleman will remember when the matter was presented to the Rules Committee I urged a comparison between this and the Spanish loan, which was for 20 years.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman put his finger on a single ECA loan, unless it be the Spanish and Belgian loans, that is not a fuzzy loan?

Mr. VORYS. I happen to think that all of these loans will pay out if we have world peace. I am proud of the fact that I am one who insisted that we get some of our ECA activities on a loan basis.

Mr. COX. If we assume that world conditions will remain as they are, is there any reason to hope that we will get a dime of it? The gentleman must take consideration of the fact that we are now at war. This should make a very great difference.

Mr. VORYS. Yes. I think the gentleman's hopes and fears are like mine. We both are fearful of war, but our hope is that we can achieve world peace, law, order, and justice, and if we have that sort of a world India can pay back the loan, if we do not make it too long, and India will pay it back in things we need. But I want to leave the negotiators free to say how much of one or the other of these materials will be furnished over how long a period, and allow the negotiators to sit down and bargain with India in a way that two proud sovereign nations are accustomed to do.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VORYS. I must yield to my friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question of fact?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. India is indebted to the International Bank for $64,500,000. Those are loans running between 15 and 25 years. Is it thinkable that a 6-year loan would be satisfactory for food purposes when India is able to get bank money from 15 to 25 years? And is not this getting to be a rear guard action?

Mr. VORYS. We all understand, of course, that a food loan is not a good kind of loan except that it is better for a person to borrow money to pay the grocer than it is not to pay him at all.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. VORYS. Let us not forget that it is a pretty simple thing we have before us here: India's people are hungry; famine is threatened for want of grain in a hurry. We want some strategic materials they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. We want some strategic materials they have, not in a hurry, not in 6 years, but over a long period of years. All right; we get together; we do what India asks. Do not forget that when we grant them a loan we are doing what they asked.

If this were the last transaction we were ever to have with India that would be one thing and we should try to write everything into this bill. This is the first. We have had rather painful relations as far as I am concerned, based upon the position of India in the United Nations, but I do not think we should consider the views and sentiments of the Chief of State of India as the sole criterion for our friendship and relationships with India any more than the people of the world I hope judge the United States entirely by what our Chief of State says and does. I think that by going into this on a business basis, permitting these three Cabinet officers and three other officials to negotiate, we can meet the emergency needs of the Indian people and also have the beginning of what I hope will be a mutually profitable friendship. I urge you not to put in here limitations that will hamstring our negotiators when they come to the bargaining stage of discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for 1 additional minute that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement at the beginning of his excellent talk regarding the obtaining of strategic materials. Is the language in the bill of the committee, in the opinion of the gentleman, mandatory or permissive in that regard?

Mr. VORYS. The language of the committee bill is mandatory that strategic materials must be obtained. It does not spell out how much should be obtained any more than does the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that where an amendment is offered on the floor of the House that has not been seen by any of the members of the committee or the other Members of the House before its offering, that it should not be considered lightly. This amendment contains at least one provision that was not raised in the other body and that is an entirely new one here; for the first time it brings in jute and jute products among the materials of which a continuous flow is required from India in substantial quantities.

I know something about jute because some of the largest producers of jute products are in my State. I also know what great concern the farmers of this country have in a continuing supply of jute. But take the requirement that India must furnish us a continuing supply of jute and jute products; it so happens that India does not produce jute except in very small quantities. The old India under British domination before the division between Pakistan and India produced it in large quantities, but the jute was produced almost entirely in Pakistan and not in India proper. As a matter of fact, the trade agreement recently entered into between India and Pakistan required Pakistan to supply India for processing in India's mills a million bales of jute by June 30, 1951, and two and a half million bales in the next 12 months. The scarcity of our supply of jute today is due to the fact that India and Pakistan had a tremendous row in their trade dealings owing to the fact that Pakistan did not devalue her currency whereas India did, and it was not until the middle of March that this trade agreement was finally reached. However, at any moment Pakistan may say to India: We will not send you any further jute.

At that point we will be requiring India to supply to us something which India could not possibly supply because India has not the jute production.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman overlooked the fact that in carrying on this trade warfare against Pakistan, India has tried to destroy her economy and to break down the profits that Pakistan would obtain?

Mr. HERTER. I am merely pointing out that you cannot require the delivery of something the country has not got itself.

The second point has to do with the 6-year repayment schedule. I do not know whether the gentleman from Georgia who offered this amendment figured how much India would have to repay per year and how that would affect her own financial situation.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman let me answer that?

Mr. HERTER. I will give the figures myself, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. COX. I have examined everything that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has said on the subject, and I arrive at this 6-year figure because he used it in this minority report that he filed which, as I said on yesterday, knocked the brains out of the committee report and killed the committee bill.

Mr. HERTER. I am sure the gentleman had some good reason for the 6

years. But I would like to point out that 6 years would require India to pay back in dollars $36,000,000 a year for the next 6 years. The Indian balance-of-payments picture is not a very good one to say the least. India is 5 years old. She has had five independent years. During that time the only reserves that she had on which to back her currency and on which to purchase what she needed in the outside world was money which was blocked, the blocked pound, which remained in Great Britain and which had accumulated for India on account of war purchases. These have been reduced one-third of their total as of the present time.

In 1950, for the first time India reached an approximate balance of trade.

Her exports and imports were approximately in balance. But now she has had to use almost every dollar that she could accumulate for the purchase of food. The gentleman from Georgia is entirely right that she has purchased 500,000 tons of food from us. But she is at the end of her dollar rope and that is the reason she came in and asked for this special treatment. The gentleman's amendment would put on her a burden of $36,000,000 per year. Possibly she can pay it, but obviously whoever is negotiating the loan should have sufficient freedom to be able to take a look at her economic position and make certain she is not being strangled by too heavy a payment when she is trying to get on her feet and having a difficult time doing it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today I had something to say about the proposition that is now before us and about my own fundamental convictions on how matters of this sort should be approached.

It has always seemed to me that in foreign policy matters we ought to keep in our minds the question of our own enlightened self-interest. To my mind such a view is entirely compatible with our meeting such responsibilities as may be ours in the world. So far as I have observed, those same motives pretty well govern other nations in their relationships with the nations of the world. I also said that I know a great many people want to support this legislation if an arrangement can be worked out that is mutually satisfactory and advantageous. That necessarily means satisfactory to the parties, India and our Government, and advantageous so far as it is possible to make it advantageous to India and to our Government and to our people. Certainly, on my record no one can rightfully challenge me on my position in respect to these matters that have come before us. A great many people have criticized me on occasion for going along too far in trying to work out some of these problems. Others have criticized me for not going along far enough.

I referred to the Economic Cooperation legislation earlier today. I said I supported it, and I did. I think it has done much good. I think also in retrospect, and having learned of some of its operations as I have in recent months, that it could have accomplished much more for us and cur own interest and for the welfare and the stability of the peace-loving peoples of the earth. We should have seen to it that there was coming to us, yes, and operating among the beneficiary nations themselves, more of a quid pro quo, that might reasonably be expected to go along with the things that we were undertaking to do.

Now, what is the situation that this amendment presents? First of all, I question the limit of 6 years. I have never discussed the matter with the gentleman from Georgia. Perhaps 6 years is too short a period, although certainly it would seem to me that some reasonable period might well be included in this legislation. Possibly we did not have it in other legislation that has gone before, but we are dealing with this legislation now, and I think we have a practical problem.

Secondly, everyone admits, and the committee in its report admits, that India produces and has materials that are needed here, materials essential in our own operations both at home and as we attempt to make ourselves strong for whatever may confront us on the international front.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Merely to point out to the gentleman that every one of these materials, except monazite, we are getting the vast majority of today, and there is no reason to believe that it will not continue.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, my understanding is that they have not been coming to us in the quantity that they might.

I want to cite the committee report, and after all I think we ought to be able to rely on the committee report. If you have a copy of it look at page 6. It refers to a number of materials which India possesses, regarded by the United States as strategic or critical. The following commodities are No. 1 on the stockpile list: Beryl, castor oil seed, chromite, coconut oil, cyanite, manganese, mica, monazite, opium, pepper, natural rubber latex, rutile, shellac, talc, and zircon. It makes reference to jute, mentioned by my very able friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. Then in the next paragraph it says the export of some of these materials, notably beryl, monazite, and raw jute is prohibited. Those are three of the articles that the gentleman from Georgia talks about in his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Then the report says:

> All of these materials are vitally needed by the United States. Although the computations are made in dollars, based on prices, repayment of loans in kind, and barter transactions, are well established in United States policies. The committee believes this means of repayment should be utilized where possible in this transaction. However, the committee does not believe it desirable to put the loan in a strait-jacket by requiring payment in kind as the only means of discharging the loan. For this reason, the language is permissive. At the same time, the committee desires to point out that the permissive language is not an invitation to the executive branch to ignore the responsibility to acquire these strategic materials wherever possible. With due regard for India's policies on strategic and critical materials, the committee desires to observe that in the long-term view, strategic materials are as vital to national survival of the United States as food grains are to India.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Does not that mean in effect that the committee in its thinking wants barter transactions, wants immediate returns in terms of material; and in effect does not the 6-year amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia mean increased pressure upon the Indian people to pay off in those necessary materials?

Mr. HALLECK. I think if the 6-year provision were adopted, and, as I said, I personally am not sure but what that is too short a time, it undoubtedly would exert that kind of pressure. I want to commend the committee on going as far as it did in pointing up the desirability, if not the necessity, of trying to get some of the things we need as we give to India some of the things India needs.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does the gentleman know how much manganese we got from India last year?

Mr. HALLECK. No, I do not know in tons.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does the gentleman know how much mica we got from India last year?

Mr. HALLECK. No, I do not know in tons.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does the gentleman know how much burlap we got last year?

Mr. HALLECK. No.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Then it is evident the gentleman is talking generalities and does not know the facts.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman from Connecticut that he may claim to be an expert in all these matters, knowing all the details of tonnages, and I am perfectly willing to grant him that privilege if he wants it. But I take it he joined in what the committee has reported, and that report itself recognizes the need and the equity of obtaining these materials from India. Obviously the committee, in its study of this matter, believed that we should try to obtain more of these materials, much needed in this country.

I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] very properly said the additional language contained in the substitute in these words "such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite, beryl, raw jute, and cyanite," yet leaves to the negotiators, the administrator, a permissive operation. There is no absolute requirement, as the gentle-

man from Ohio pointed out, that we get any given quantity of jute or any given quantity of anything else. But what does the language do? It imposes upon the Administrator of the ECA and other representatives of our Government who are going to make these negotiations on our behalf an added obligation. That obligation is to do everything they can within reason and honor to get as many of these materials as they can. This is for two reasons: First, that we get repayment as we go along; and, second, that we get as great quantities as is proper and fair under the circumstances of these materials that are badly needed for our own economy and national security.

In other words, so far as I am concerned, and going back to my original thesis, we want to help the free peoples in the world. We want to help people who need food, but we must recognize that America is not a bottomless barrel to be tapped for everybody at any time or for any sort of purpose that might strike somebody's fancy. We must recognize, as I see it, that as we go along helping other people, we ought to try to get them to help us as much as they can, whether it is fighting in Korea or getting the materials we need here at home to maintain ourselves, making it possible for us to go on trying to be a potential force in the world to help free peoples who look to us for guidance and support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I have been examining the report and I find there is no statement in the report as to the quantity of normal consumption or the amount available to India. There is absolutely no justification for any operation so far as the report is concerned. I wonder would the gentleman be so kind, if he would, as to enlighten us on that question.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say to the gentleman that India at the present time, because of this drought and other conditions, is short approximately 6,000,000 tons of wheat. India is purchasing throughout the rest of the world, including the United States, 4,000,000 tons, and is now 2,000,000 tons short.

Mr. TABER. What is the normal crop in India, and what are the normal importations?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. May I suggest that there is a special memorandum of information on the India Emergency Assistance Act at the table here, which contains the most complete and thorough information on that subject beginning at page 6. The gentleman from New York can probably acquaint himself fully with that matter by just reading that report.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I will be glad to supply that information for the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the difficulties so far in the discussion is the use of so many generalities. The gentleman from Indiana certainly gave a very impassioned argument to the House, but he cited no facts to us. He made a great to-do over the fact that we needed these strategic materials and were not getting them from India. I asked the gentleman when he had the floor if he knew what we were getting and obviously he did not have that information.

The House should know that in 1950 the United States received from India 576,454 tons of manganese, which is approximately 75 percent of India's export production of manganese. So far as mica is concerned, we received 211,725 hundredweight, which again is about 75 percent of its export of mica. When it comes to jute and jute goods we received 217,452 tons, which is approximately, when we consider burlap, and that is what we basically need in this country, about 65 percent of the Indian export of burlap and jute products. When you consider that in 1949, prior to the war, we were receiving about 53 percent of India's burlap exports and in 1950 we received about 65 percent of India's burlap exports, can it be said that we are not getting a fair proportion of India's exports of the critical materials that we need?

I wish to point out something about the high cost of burlap, because there seems to be a lack of understanding among the Members of the House and the users of this product. The reason the prices have been high is due to American profiteering and not to Indian profiteering. In 1949 the gap between the landed price of burlap and the market price in the United States on the most widely used type was one-tenth of 1 cent a yard. In October 1950 the gap between the landed price of burlap and the market price was 15.4 cents a yard. So if you talk about the rise in price of burlap, look to your American dealers and not to the Indian Government.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The figures which the gentleman quoted as regards the exports of manganese and jute were for 1950?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Could the gentleman advise us as to whether or not India has, in recent months, placed any embargo on the shipment of these items out of India?

Mr. RIBICOFF. They have not. As far as these items are concerned, we are getting even a larger proportion during 1951. There was a temporary embargo on jute, but not burlap, when India was short on raw jute from Pakistan. I might state, that, due to the settlement of India's trade quarrel with Pakistan, and more jute coming into burlap manufacturing markets in India, we will now start getting more yardage of burlap.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman should point out the percentage you are getting of these critical and strategic materials, and the fact that long-term contracts exist on practically all of them.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question? Do I understand it to be the consensus of the Members of the House on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that you are satisfied with the monazite world situation as it affects the United States, without the necessity of requiring monazite sands from India?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct, as it exists today. For the future no one can predict the need that might come into the picture.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I might point out to the House that we are talking about today. We are talking about India's food needs for 1951 and not for the next 25 years. If we are talking about India's food needs for this year, what right have we got to talk about monazite for future years, especially in view of her long established embargo policy and the statements from the gentleman from North Carolina.

The statement made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] certainly demolishes completely the argument that has been made by the proponents to put a condition of monazite in this bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. COX. I would like the gentleman to yield in order that I might ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] if he knows what quantity of monazite sands are available to the United States.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman recalls that I went over those figures yesterday in the RECORD. At the present time there are monazite sands available to this country, government to government, from Brazil. Monazite sands are available to us from Idaho. The only question which the gentleman is concerned about is because of the fact that we have one manufacturer in this country that wants to buy monazite sand from India today at $35 and he has to pay the Idaho miners $235 a ton for it.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know that the concern to which he has referred is a concern that went to Brazil and developed two mines at the instance of Brazil?

Mr. DURHAM. And he was offered the same proposition in Idaho and would not accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] at the beginning asked me about India's total food requirements. I should now like to state that India's total minimum food requirements for 1951 for its 350,000,000 people were 50,670,000 tons. The total production of food grains in India was 43,770,000 tons. The total available pipeline supplies was 700,000 tons. Purchases by India and allocations and transfers under International Wheat Agreement was 3,090,000 tons. Assistance requested from the United States is 2,000,000 tons. This gives a total of 50,370,000 tons or a balanced need of 300,000 tons. In other words, this 2,000,000 tons just about takes them under their total requirements, their absolute minimum of 50,670,000 tons for 1951.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to bring to the attention of the committee while the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. DURHAM], is here, the fact that he is the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic energy. On yesterday he told this House, if I remember correctly, that manganese was the vital product at this time, and the gentleman from Connecticut has brought out the fact that in excess of 75 percent of India's production is imported into this country, and that that comprises about 40 percent of our total need; so we should not underestimate the importance of manganese in the steel and related industries.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Just by way of filling out the answer to the question asked by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. TABER], the production of food grains in India in 1950 was 49,240,000 tons. The production this year is 43,770,000 tons; and that is where the famine shortage exists.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make a statement. A number of Members have been seeking recognition for a long while. The Chair is endeavoring to follow two well-established practices, that of recognizing first members of the committee, otherwise alternating on either side of the aisle.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member of the committee and is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, there is a defect in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] that may have escaped his attention. His amendment requires that the Government of India shall keep a continuous supply of these materials flowing. I should like to point out that the trade so far between the two countries, India and America, has been between private business concerns and not between the governments of the countries themselves.

As to manganese, I come from the city of Pittsburgh and represent a large part of it. We use tremendous quantities of manganese in the steel industry, as you know, and if we do not get this strategic material, our mills and our economy will shut down. You may ask us in Pittsburgh: Has the flow of manganese from India been satisfactory? And that is the question the gentleman from Indiana asked, Have the United States mills and factories been getting the vital material? I say to you as a Representative from the great industrial center of Pittsburgh: There certainly has been full cooperation in the delivery of manganese from India to date.

Indian exports of manganese to all countries in 1950 totaled 795,000 tons, and we in the United States received 585,000 tons from India. That has been keeping our mills running, and has increased the strategic stockpiles.

The stockpiling purchases by the United States Government of manganese from India have been made only through private importers. There has been no purchase whatever from the Government of India. I believe therefore that the Cox amendment has this defect in it, that it departs from private enterprise and goes down the socialistic road through a basic concept of state trading instead of private enterprise. I have heard everything when I hear that promise from the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I should like to say to the gentleman that there is no defect in the amendment, that the amendment was drawn as intended for the acquisition of these minerals to add to the Government stockpiles.

Mr. FULTON. I am sorry that I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. COX. It was necessary in order to meet a situation over which we had no control. The State Department is in this picture, you have to recognize them as being in the picture and you have to deal with the situation with that knowledge.

Mr. FULTON. Now that the gentleman has brought up the United States stockpile, 37 percent of the total manganese imports in the year 1950 went into the United States stockpile. This was done through private importers exclusively without the State Department being in it, and I will stand on that statement.

Mr. COX. But under direction that it should be fed to private enterprise by the Government. The gentleman will find that provision in the law.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman refers to the committee bill. Of course, if he will observe, the language in the Cox substitute in respect to the Government of India is the same language as contained in the committee bill.

Mr. FULTON. But, as the gentleman knows, the form of this particular committee bill was a bill forced by the Rules Committee. It was indicated that if we came before the Rules Committee with this kind of a loan bill the legislation would go through. Now we come here with that kind of a bill and we find the greatest opposition from several ranking members of the Rules Committee on the very provisions we were asked to submit.

May I then ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] this: He has asked yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] the following question:

> I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] if he would construe the adoption of this bill—
>
> That is the committee bill—
>
> to mean that Congress commits itself to giving like treatment to a dozen other nations now sitting on the steps of the Capitol?

Mr. COX. Exactly so.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman has the same inferred defect in the amendment he has offered because he also has a loan provision, simply reducing the loan from approximately 20 to 6 years. So the gentleman from Georgia is encouraging the 12 nations to sit on the steps of the Capitol by his amendment, just as he infers the Foreign Affairs Committee bill would do.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I ask the gentleman if he would construe the adoption of this amendment as giving a commitment on the question of granting aid to other countries, now sitting on the steps down here and in the galleries, on the same terms as given to India?

Mr. FULTON. I do not consider this bill as any further commitment whatever. But I do say if the gentleman from Georgia sees as the defect in the committee bill that there is such commitment, the same defect is likewise in the gentleman's 6-year-loan amendment, which he now sponsors. So the gentleman is hoisted by his own petard.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not very clear as to why this amendment has been offered; that is, this is nothing but a rearguard action to defeat the whole bill?

Mr. FULTON. Yes, and may I point out that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] was the one who stood on the floor of the House here yesterday and pleaded: "Do not by any means even pass the rule; do not consider the legislation." I ask the gentleman from Georgia does he really wish to press his amendment offering a 6-year loan to India?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have been one of those who has been seeking recognition and I am apprehensive that at this hour of the day a motion will be made to curtail debate which will leave those of us who have been patiently awaiting recognition an opportunity to speak only for a minute or a minute and a half. I shall have to object pretty soon to any further extension.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the question is: Is the gentleman from Georgia logical in his objection to a loan earlier and in his complete opposition to the rule, or is he logical now in asking for a 6-year loan to India by his amendment? In which position is the gentleman from Georgia right, and in which is he wrong?

Mr. COX. I may say to the gentleman that I have never made a statement upon this floor in which I was not sincere.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman, but the question is, when was the gentleman correct in his positions, yesterday or on his loan amendment to India today.

Mr. COX. I am undertaking by this amendment to make the bill less objectionable and I want to say to my colleagues that I am still opposed to it. I am still opposed to granting a loan to India.

Mr. FULTON. Then the gentleman is one of those Members who will vote against his own loan amendment?

Mr. COX. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FULTON. Is the gentleman then one of the Members who will vote against the 6-year-loan to India amendment which he now proposes?

Mr. COX. I made my position entirely clear. I said I am undertaking to make the committee's bill less objectionable. I do think the adoption of the amendment will improve the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to ask my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] a question. Assuming, by chance, that your substitute should be adopted, would you then vote for the bill on passage?

Mr. COX. I said at the outset I take the position that the loan ought not to be made. I have not run away from that position. Does that make my position clear?

Mr. FULTON. Returning to our supply of strategic materials, we cannot afford in this country to have shipments of mica from India shut off either, for sonic instruments in which mica is used are vital for the defense program. We have had come from India 134,855 hundredweight of mica in 1950 for our strategic stockpile, we must remember. If Congress should put these rigid and inacceptable conditions on the loan, India is probably going to say: "The United States would not be acting as a friendly nation but is dealing tough; India will shut off the strategic defense materials India is even now freely supplying the United States."

Cooperation, mutual trust, and reciprocal trade, would immediately cease, a series of reprisals would begin, and neither our honor nor our defense program, nor our industrial centers such as Pittsburgh can afford it. We should not cause such a disastrous break in our historic friendly relations with India.

Substantial contributions were made by the Indian subcontinent to the Allied war effort during World War II. We needed India's friendship then, and we need and should prize our mutual friendship now.

The Indian Army, which was then composed of men now belonging to both the Republic of India and the Dominion of Pakistan, reached a peak strength of over 2,000,000 troops during the course of the late war. Of these 943,000 served overseas. The Indian Army suffered 106,594 casualties including 36,696 men killed. This Army won more than 7,000 awards. Included in this figure were 31 Victoria Crosses, a very high number of the highest award which can be bestowed in the British Empire. These Indian men volunteered to fight side by side with our fine United States troops. The largest volunteer army in World War II was India's without a draft.

Some of the more notable campaigns in which the Indian Army participated are listed below:

Africa: The Fourth and Fifth India Divisions fought in Africa with distinction, and played a prominent part in the final action which was climaxed by the capture of the German general, von Arnim, successor to General Rommel. General Arnim was forced to surrender to the Indian formation. Previous to this engagement the Indians were active in driving the Italians out of East Africa and Ethiopia.

Italy: Three famous Indian Divisions played significant roles in the campaign in Italy. The Eighth Indian Division entered the campaign in October 1943, the Fourth Division in December 1943, and the Tenth Division in April 1944.

For 2½ years of the North African campaign, India was responsible for supplying the bulk of stores for this theater of operation. Allied troops in the Middle East wore clothes made in India and walked in boots supplied by Indian factories. Nearly 90 percent of the tents, canvas ground sheets, etcetera, used in the Middle East came from India. All in all, India shipped 1,500,000 tons of stores to the Middle East. Included in this figure were: assault craft, camouflage paints, nets, medical stores equipment for the comfort of troops.

I wish to call attention to the statement of May 23, 1951, from the United States Department of Defense in regard to India's contribution to World War II, submitted to me by Lt. Col. Tudhope of the Department:

With regard to the contribution made by India to the war effort during World War II the following statements may be made:

1. India raised an army (exclusive of navy and air force) of peak strength totaling 2,049,317 men as of July 1945.

2. In connection with battle participation, India furnished 16 divisions in January 1945.

3. By the first month of the United States participation in the war (January 1942) India already had mobilized 13 divisions of which 5 were in combat. These divisions were raised from an initial arm force of 180,000 men.

4. It can be said that India held the Middle East for the Allies from 1939 to 1942. This is the time of the African-Libyan campaign.

5. India also contributed largely to the reconquest of Burma where 11 Indian divisions were committed.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India, had come to no resolution thereon.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this late hour of the day to make a simple announcement.

I am chairman of the subcommittee that has been investigating the Reserve activities. I have received many inquiries from Members of Congress and from the public generally as to why the delay in handling the affairs of that subcommittee regarding the Reserve components.

The reason is that we must wait until the manpower bill is disposed of by the committee of conference. It is obvious to all of us who have thought about the Reserve program that we cannot proceed to write legislation when we do not konw what the over-all manpower picture is going to be. If, for instance, we have a bill voted into law which will give us universal military training, following which the Reserves will be placed from 6 to 8 years in Reserve components, we can write one type of bill. On the other hand, if we are thrown back on a voluntary program where the Reserve organizations must be built on a purely voluntary basis, an entirely different type of legislation is in order and will have to be enacted.

In considering the present state of the Reserve situation with all of the troubles that the Reserves have had, it is going to be extremely difficult to write any kind of voluntary Reserve legislation at the present time.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CLEO C. REEVES, FLOYD L. MURPHY, AND FABIAN P. DURAND

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$150" and insert "$123."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$410.10" and insert "$168.10."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the amounts in the Senate amendments are lower than the amounts in the bill as passed by the House?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, having observed some of the confusion which has been created in American thinking as to far-eastern matters, I feel compelled to present information that has come to my knowledge.

Asia is in the throes of rethinking its economic, religious, and sociological approaches to life. Many have heard there was a better way of life. For eons of time, and also true today, a full stomach is the chief desire of the masses of the people of Asia. This is quite a contrast to America, where we are laboriously trying to keep our middles within reasonable bounds.

The Japanese have studied our free-enterprise system and they like it. They have made vast progress. This has been done in spite of the lack of natural resources.

What is another great desire of the people of Asia? A little plot of land to call their own. They crave to run their fingers into the soil and say, "This is mine." A closeness to the soil spells security to them.

The Communists are not coming into Asia promising collective farms and Marxian ideology. Instead, they have been constantly pointing out weakness in the old order. Their chief weapon is creating a caldron of dissatisfaction. As the dissatisfaction mounts they worm their way into the leadership of the opposition to the existing government. The Communists expect when the government fails to take over the control.

In Asia there is a very small middle class. Our democracy thrives in conjunction with a vast middle class. Communism is set up to give its strongest appeal to poverty-ridden countries. In a few simple words, if we expect democracy to grow in Asia there must be a spread in the ownership of land and an increase in the standard of living of the masses of the people through a system like the point 4.

Preparation for war is essential. We must have sufficient materials and manpower to stop imperialist Russian communism and then see to it that Russia knows we have this power. If we are strong Russia will delay action in the hope that we will someday be weak. In order to remain strong, we must have a positive build up of the ideals in which America was cradled. Our ideals belong not only to us, but to mankind. For others to acquire our ideals insures them and us a protection of a good standard of living. It is essential then for us to resubscribe to the ideals of 1776. Our way of life is dependent not only on subscribing to such ideals, but to extending them. It logically follows that the propaganda budget must be expanded. Exchange students, professors, and outstanding young leaders of their farm groups must be brought over to see our way of life in action. Otherwise, it means constant war.

This is a positive approach. Our ancestors had a positive grasp of religion and economics. I definitely feel if we had spent more money on missionaries we would be spending less today on war. Missionaries were demonstration agents of our way of life.

Let us look beneath the surface of the revolution in China and inquire "what happened, and why?"

Three factors explain the Communist success in China: First, the collapse of the old Confucian social structure; second, Marxian promises; third, the growth of a strong national movement.

The Communists took advantage of the decadence and collapse of a social structure that had been held together by the ethical concepts of China's ancient philosophers Confucius and Mencius, for 2,500 years. The scholar-official class stood at the head of this system. This group served as the guardians of China's cultural past by setting the proper example for the people. It was to embody all the ancient virtues taught by Confucius; filial piety, propriety, justice, and benevolence. The duty of the sovereign, according to Confucian thinking, was exemplary living.

The character of the ruler—

Said Confucius—

is like wind, and the character of the common people is like grass, and the grass bends in the direction of the wind.

The scholar-official assumed dictatorial power, but this power was restrained by strict adherence to the virtuous pattern laid down by the philosophers.

Unfortunately, virtue departed and war lords came in as the old system was discredited as obsolete in an age of science and progressive education. Chinese youth did not realize that science was truth and also the old philosophy sought piety, justice, and benevolence, which are really handmaidens of truth. This group lived on, but without a soul. The termite-infested framework stayed on ready to be toppled by the Communists.

Chiang Kai-shek instituted some reforms, but let us not forget that his political philosophy was Confucian, as was that of his camp followers. He joined the Methodist Church and added ethical teachings found in the Bible to his Confucian list. The outgrowth was the New Life Movement, but China needed more than virtuous dictatorship. It needed complete reform. The possibility of reform was limited under Confucian philosophy as it would mean dismissal of one's loyal supporters, relatives, and friends. Obviously, under the Confucian system, the answer is, "No," for filial piety and loyalty to friends are cardinal virtues. Redemption was the only other recourse which Chiang was unable to effect, so retreat and retreat was the order of the day. Some dismissals came about as well as some redemption.

The Chinese Nationalists are now on the Island of Formosa where they are being aided. Our Government has been discouraged with them, but we have never given them up. We have partially fed them all along.

Now General MacArthur wants us to arm them for an attack on the Chinese mainland. In 1949, however, MacArthur did not have a very exalted opinion of Chiang's army. I was a member of a special delegation to the Far East in September of that year.

"I consider Chiang a highly intelligent leader," MacArthur told us, "but he knows nothing about the art of war. He is surrounded by corrupt officials and generals. His troops are very ineffective and poorly equipped."

Distrust of Chiang's forces was widespread in southeast Asia. Leaders there begged us not to send further equipment to the Chinese Nationalists, unless it was closely supervised. Newspaper stories out of Parkersburg, W. Va., in October 1949, quote me to the effect that the government of Chiang Kai-shek has wasted some $2,100,000,000 in aid from this country. We learned the Chinese Nationalist officials actually have sold some jeeps given them on Guam even before they could be loaded on ships and sent to China.

At the time of our visit General MacArthur advocated the bombing of Chinese cities as a solution to the problems confronting us in Asia. He outlined four things that he considered necessary to save the situation:

First. Declare United States support for anyone opposed to communism.

Second. Place 500 planes in the hands of some "war horse" similar to General Chennault.

Third. Give volunteers the right to join such a fighting force without penalty.

Fourth. Assign surplus ships to the Chinese Navy sufficient to blockade and destroy China coastal cities.

The general estimated the cost of bombing the mainland at $10,000,000,000. He said that the bombing would have to be followed up with occupation by American ground troops, at least enough for leadership purposes. Such an occupation, he said, would cost about forty billion.

MacArthur also told us that he did not expect an outbreak in Korea because the Chinese and Russian Communists had it outflanked and could have taken it any time they pleased. Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, MacArthur's intelligence chief in Tokyo, assured us that there would be no war in Korea for 2 years. The North Korean attack took place 9 months later.

Though MacArthur and Willoughby called the Chinese Reds "greatly overrated," and said we did not have to worry about them, American military leaders in Seoul held a very different opinion.

We spent 4 days in Seoul with Brig. Gen. W. L. Roberts, Chief of the United States Military Advisory Group to the Republic of Korea. I stayed in his home and had many opportunities to discuss these problems with him. General Roberts expressed grave concern over the situation there. He told us that elements of three North Korean divisions that had been fighting in China for 10 years had just arrived in North Korea.

Further interesting facts came to our attention when we were in Indochina. At the time we were there, the French had 175,000 troops fighting the Communists in Indochina, and the British had 50,000 fighting them in the jungles of Malaya. The French authorities told me that for 5 years prior to our visit, one-half of the graduating class of the French Military Academy had been casualties in the fighting against the Communists. These allies of ours have not shirked from the fighting. Many other countries have now joined them. For the first time in history we now have a truly international army fighting for peace and freedom.

I am deeply concerned over avoiding world war III, and I am positive that the stand of the United States and the United Nations forces in Korea has helped toward that end. I believe that the effort in Korea has kept Indochina, the gateway to southeast Asia's 8,000,000 people, from the Communists. To extend the war to the Chinese mainland would be costly and disastrous.

I have compiled some figures based on defense department records to show what that cost might well be in terms of soldier casualties. They show that the total Japanese casualties in China from the Japanese invasion of China until Pearl Harbor were 176,152. Their casualties, in China only, from Pearl Harbor until the end of World War II were 243,048.

So the total Japanese casualties in China were 419,200. These are only the casualties shown on partial records captured by our Armed Forces. During the entire time, the Japanese kept one and a half million of their best trained troops in China. The war held no conclusion for them, until they were finally driven out.

I have gained the impression from studying the question that Chiang wants his troops to invade the mainland only if he secures logistical support from the United States, as General MacArthur has recommended. He knows full well that if logistical support is provided the United States will be forced into an all-out war to regain China for Chiang.

I wish here to compliment General MacArthur on a good job in Japan. I have done my best here to give you the picture as I have seen it.

I maintain we should not go it alone, but should add our influence and power for a stronger United Nations for world peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I shall be glad to.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made a very valuable contribution by detailing the talks he had abroad with General MacArthur and others, and the gentleman commented that one of the statements made by General MacArthur was that we should furnish 500 planes.

Mr. BURNSIDE. The request was for 500.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; to be furnished to whom?

Mr. BURNSIDE. To the Chinese. He asked us first for bomber planes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was anything said about how those planes would be used?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Those planes would be used in bombing Chinese cities, the thought being that if you knocked out communication centers China would easily fall.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman was a member of what committee at the time General MacArthur made these statements?

Mr. BURNSIDE. The Executive Expenditures Committee.

Mr. KEATING. There were others present?

Mr. BURNSIDE. There were five—Walter Huber, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE], and myself.

Mr. KEATING. Did the gentleman and his committee render a report on its return?

Mr. BURNSIDE. We were very anxious for a report. I, personally, was most anxious to have a report. But I went to the floor leader, to the Speaker, to the national defense officials and I understand the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] went to the President, and it was thought this type of information at that time would be very dangerous to our international relations and I was asked personally not to give the statements out.

Mr. KEATING. Was any report filed at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes. Our committee filed a report, but this type of material was not in it because they thought it would be dangerous to our international relations.

Mr. KEATING. None of the material about which the gentleman is telling us today was incorporated in the official report filed at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I would not say none of it was incorporated, but the part that would endanger our international relations was left out.

Mr. KEATING. All of the information with reference to what General MacArthur stated to the gentleman and his committee was not contained in the report?

Mr. BURNSIDE. At that time we thought it would be very bad to put those statements in, since General MacArthur was Commander in Chief of the United Nations forces in the Far East.

Mr. KEATING. These additional statements with reference to his communications to the committee have just been brought to light recently?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes. I was asked not to release them.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman was asked by the committee?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, the committee did not want to release them. I had contacted others. I personally contacted the Speaker and the floor leader.

Mr. KEATING. At the time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. When we got back.

Mr. KEATING. And it was at their request that none of this information was given out?

Mr. BURNSIDE. We thought it would be dangerous to give it out, dangerous to our international relations.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Over what period was it that the Japanese lost 400,000 troops or had 400,000 casualties?

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is only a partial record. That is still not an accurate figure because these are the only ones we captured from the Japanese and the Japanese did not send back the whole picture.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That was in the Sino-Japanese War over a period of 10 years?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I broke it down into two parts. The first part was 176,452 and World War II was 243,048 that we know of.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is over a 10-year period anyway?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman makes the point that because of these tremendous losses in China the United Nations should not go into China?

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is a question to take into consideration and I thought the House would be interested in those figures. I had them compiled. Certainly with Japan very close by it would be much easier for that country, as far as

cost is concerned. That would be one reason why occupation costs would be high in China.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not favor invading China; but from the figures the gentleman has given us it appears we have had more casualties in the Korean conflict per year than there were in the Chinese-Japanese War?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Than we did?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Than the Japanese did.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I said that this is only partial. I tried to get the very best figures I could, that were available. I do not know how many there were and I doubt that the Japanese even know how many were lost.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The point I am making is this: We have had some 65,000 casualties in less than 1 year, but over a period of more than 10 years the Japanese only sustained 400,000.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I am not positive whether these were deaths or are casualties.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. What was the date of the gentleman's visit?

Mr. BURNSIDE. In August and September 1949.

Mr. KEATING. 1949?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes. We were not involved in any fighting at all.

Mr. KEATING. We were not in any war at all.

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. This was a statement by General MacArthur about what should be done in the future if we should get in a war.

Mr. BURNSIDE. He raised it as a possibility. No; he was advocating it as a possibility of starting a war.

Mr. KEATING. Of starting a war. In other words, he was advocating that our country begin a war; was he?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I guess, from the statement. Would you not say that is what it meant?

Mr. KEATING. When the gentleman returned from this trip, if one of our Far East commanders was advocating that we start a war, did not the gentleman feel that that was of importance to bring to the attention of the House?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Precisely, I did bring it, and evidently the Joint Chiefs of Staff then so acted that we did not start the war. Orders were so given that one was not started.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, upon the gentleman's return he reported the matter to someone and General MacArthur was called off on starting a war?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I do not know. I merely did what I thought was important and reported to the people that could take proper action.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman reported it to his committee, of course.

Mr. BURNSIDE. No, we did not take it up with the whole committee. That was not taken up with the whole committee. When a large number of people receive information it does not remain secret. That was taken up directly with the Speaker, and the floor leader, and national defense, and the President of the United States.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman reported to the Speaker and the floor leader at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. At that time.

Mr. KEATING. That MacArthur was advocating starting a war in the Far East?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, that was a possibility. You can interpret it. These are the exact quotes. We took notes on that when we left and the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE, can substantiate those statements, too.

Mr. KEATING. But the gentleman made no official report nor did his committee in reference to any of these matters?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I think it is official if you report to the leaders in charge of this Government.

Mr. KEATING. I was referring to a report in writing to anyone.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, sometimes it is much better not to put things in writing when they directly affect our international relations in such an important question as the one we had at hand.

Mr. KEATING. Sometimes one puts important matters in writing, also.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, we have some in writing with the proper people, that is true, but we did not turn it back to the committee. A written statement was presented to the President.

Mr. KEATING. By the gentleman and his committee at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. No, not the whole committee. The individuals presented it.

Mr. KEATING. At that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. At that time.

Mr. KEATING. Did the gentleman participate in the communication which was sent to the President at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Well, certainly the ideas I have given here were taken over by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE, to the President.

Mr. KEATING. At that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. At that time. I called National Defense at that time. I spoke to the Speaker at that time. I spoke to the floor leader at that time.

Mr. KEATING. Did the gentleman and the gentleman from North Carolina and others or any others prepare any letter or other document which they presented to the President at that time?

Mr. BURNSIDE. The President has the written statement at that time.

Mr. KEATING. Signed by the gentleman?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Signed by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE, but I agreed to the statement.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman saw it before it was delivered to the President?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes; and this statement I have given here is also agreed to by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. If I am not mistaken, it was the President who told the world in the summer of 1950 that we had never been closer to world peace in 5 years. However, it was only a few weeks later that all hell broke out in Korea.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I cannot answer for that.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that veterans of World War II will soon be deprived of benefits under the GI bill unless the time is extended beyond July 25. Also that all GI benefits should likewise be extended to the Korean veterans.

Any veteran of World War II who desires to undertake a course of education or training under the so-called GI bill of rights must initiate such education or training within 4 years after his discharge, or within 4 years after the termination of war—July 25, 1951—whichever is the later date. This means that any veteran who was discharged before July 25, 1947, must initiate his education or training before July 25, 1951, or he will lose his rights to such education or training.

To my way of thinking this will work a great hardship on many veterans throughout the Nation unless the benefit period is extended. Veterans of World War II returned home from service with many problems. It is true that a great number have been able to take advantage of the educational training afforded under the GI bill. Others on account of sickness, financial difficulties, and such problems as taking care of their children and parents, were not able to follow the course of their neighbor and enter school at an early date. Such circumstances in many instances are changing.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair that we afford a reasonable opportunity for all veterans of World War II to take full advantage of the GI bill. Under an amendment that I introduced to the GI bill, an eligible veteran would be permitted to initiate a course of education or training within 4 years after his discharge or within 7 years after the termination of the war—July 25, 1951—whichever is the later date. Existing law provides that education or training under the GI bill of rights must be completed within 9 years after the war—July 25, 1956. My amendment would provide that such education or training must be completed by July 25, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, not only should the full benefits of the GI bill be extended for World War II veterans, but those same benefits should be extended to all the Korean veterans. It is true that the Eighty-second Congress recently enacted a law making medical, hospital, burial benefits and compensation or pension benefits available to persons serving in the Armed Forces on or after July 27, 1950—extending to such date as shall be later specified. This does not extend the World War II benefits such as vocational

rehabilitation, education, and training. Government guaranteed loans for housing and business, and readjustment allowances to the Korean veterans.

It is quite clear that persons on duty with the Armed Forces today are serving during a period of armed conflict and should be recognized as more than peacetime veterans. Many persons are being drafted into the Armed Forces from civilian life. They are having their education, training, or business activities interrupted, and are facing the hazards of the field of battle. To compensate for the physical hazards, the Congress recently enacted Public Law 28, but no benefits have been offered as compensation for the interruption of their education, training, or business activities. Certainly these veterans are entitled to the same consideration given the veterans of World War II.

To extend World War II veterans' benefits to the Korean veterans will require several adjustments in the time limitation factors. In order to allow ample time for veterans of Korea to become rehabilitated, and in order that they may take full advantage of these benefits, the limitations concerning application for benefits should be extended by at least 3 years and the period of time within which these benefits may be used should be extended by 3 years. Benefits of any nature will be worthless if their time limitations expire before the veteran is in a position to make use of them. The most equitable extension would be to extend to such date as shall be later specified by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, bills are now pending before the Veterans' Affairs Committee extending the benefits of the GI Bill of Rights to persons who serve on active duty during the period of present hostilities. Thus, persons so serving may become eligible for the same educational benefits, the same home, farm, and business loan benefits, the same assistance in seeking employment after release from active service, and the same readjustment allowances, as were made available for veterans of World War II. I sincerely hope that the House of Representatives will shortly extend the full benefits of the GI bill to the Korean veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think very likely the gentleman has introduced legislation to extend the time for World War II veterans for their education, and I have also introduced a bill which would give the Korean boys the benefits of GI training. Certainly the Korean boys ought to have it and they are pleading for that training.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts know whether or not her committee is planning hearings on this legislation within the near future?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not know. I know that I have asked for hearings, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to thank the gentlewoman for her contribution and I wish to state that I have likewise bills pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for that purpose.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATES of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a tribute to Kentucky by Daniel Francis Clancy.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. BREEN asked and given permission to extend his remarks and include certain statements from constituents of his district.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one include a speech by Brig. Gen. Donald P. Booth on May 19 at the Polish Soldiers Home of New York.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a soldier.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two speeches delivered at the proceedings of the Panama Canal Society's annual meeting honoring William Howard Taft.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the Governor of the State of New York.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. AYRES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to include in his remarks on the India aid bill certain excerpts.

Mr. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Parsons (Kans.) Sun.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a proclamation by the city of Heraldsburg, Calif., and a newspaper item.

Mr. VAIL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Tom Moore, the great Irish poet.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Reader's Digest entitled "The Air-Power Odds Against Us."

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement from Labor.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKWORTH (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two addresses by Hon. CHARLES HALLECK, at Tulsa, Okla., May 11 and 12.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHARTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a speech delivered in the city of Pittsburgh by Mr. Robert W. Hansen.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a statement by the Zionist Council and an editorial on the Huleh Marshes appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Tuskegee Institute a tract of land in Macon County, Ala.; and

H. R. 3587. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 24, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

466. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Air Force certain property in the State of Mississippi," was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CLEMENTE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 385. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., with amendment (Rept. No. 492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to provide that the first Navy supercarrier shall be named the *James V. Forrestal*, with amendment (Rept. No. 494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3573. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settling of New Castle, Del., to be held in New Castle, Del., on June 16, 1951, with amendment (Rept. No. 495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, without amendment (Rept. No. 491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1834. A bill for the relief of Florence Grace Pond Whitehill; without amendment (Rept. No. 493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4229. A bill to provide that the antitrust laws shall not apply to organized professional sports enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4230. A bill to provide that the antitrust laws shall not apply to organized professional sports enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4231. A bill to provide that the antitrust laws shall not apply to organized professional sports enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4232. A bill to provide additional income tax relief for supporting blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4233. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans or cash payments in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FUGATE:

H. R. 4234. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4235. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4236. A bill to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as the North Laboto and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4237. A bill to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4238. A bill to repeal limitations contained in other laws on federally assisted low-rent housing projects authorized by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 4239. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to reestablish and correct the boundaries of the Quincy National Cemetery by the exchange of Government-owned lands in the Quincy-Graceland Cemetery, Quincy, Ill.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 4240. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, relating to the use of broadcasting facilities by candidates for public office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4241. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4242. A bill to amend section 801 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, in relation to exports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4243. A bill to preserve the primary military functions of the Barksdale Air Force Base bombing and gunnery range and to provide for payment to the city of Shreveport, La., of proceeds from leasing of oil, gas, or other mineral deposits within said Air Force base bombing and gunnery range, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 4244. A bill for the relief of Herta Anna Maria Kottulinsky von Kottulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of former Capt. Charles W. Reid; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENISON:

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maude M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of Sigmund Spitz and Gertrude Spitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4250. A bill for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

297. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Arthur Raabe, secretary, Queensboro Federation of Mothers' Clubs, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging that legislation be passed to guard against the smuggling of narcotics into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in this quiet moment we would be conscious that Thou art nearer than breathing, nearer than hands or feet. Help us to put into the common round of daily life the awareness of Thy presence and the reality of eternal values. Forgive us that at times we are so dull of heart that burning bushes beside our path leave us unmoved and that in a world so full of Thy beauty we are so blind. In a day great with crisis and freighted with destiny for all the earth, save us from the unpardonable sin of making the hopes of the despairing world the pawns of partisan politics. In faith and confidence may we commit our ways unto Thee. Grant us a clearer vision of Thy way and Thy will and renewed courage to follow the gleam in this confusing hour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 23, 195., was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand; and

H. R. 3939. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the period of the International Labor Conference, to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, commencing June 6. The Senator from Montana, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has been named as one of the representatives of the Government at that conference and will be required to leave May 26, returning about July 10, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLEMENTS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

Mr. AIKEN, on his own request, and by unanimous consent, was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until next Wednesday.

MEETING OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PALMER, ALASKA, AIRPORT PROJECT—INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 357)

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I submit to the Senate an interim report of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee setting forth the results of its investigation of the airport project at Palmer, Alaska. This is a unanimous report of the subcommittee. However, two present members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], were not members of the subcommittee at the time we undertook this investigation, and for that reason they have not taken part in the preparation of the report.

This report sets forth the findings and conclusions of the subcommittee resulting from its investigation of the handling of the Palmer, Alaska, Airport project by officials of the Territory of Alaska and the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The investigation was predicated upon information which was brought to the attention of the Senate and the subcommittee by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. On August 16, 1950, the Senator from Nebraska submitted Senate Resolution 331, which would authorize the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the acquisition of the Palmer Airport by the Territory of Alaska and the proposed spending of Federal funds in this project under the provisions of the Federal Airport Act. The subcommittee decided to conduct this inquiry under its broad general authority as set forth in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, rather than to proceed under Senate Resolution 331.

Members of the subcommittee staff made on-the-spot inquiries in Alaska and sworn testimony was heard by the subcommittee here in Washington. It is the conclusion of the subcommittee that Territorial and Civil Aeronautics Administration officials attempted to shift the entire cost of the new improvements on the Palmer Airport to the Federal Government. As a direct result of our investigation the $145,000 which was authorized in Federal aid for the Palmer Airport has not been paid to the Territory by the Federal Government. Nor will any part of this sum be paid out of the Federal Treasury until the Comptroller General has had an opportunity to make a thorough study and review of all of the facts and circumstances of this case to the end that the Congress may be assured that the Federal Airport Act is being administered efficiently and economically, in accordance with the provisions of the law and the intent of Congress.

This subcommittee is authorized to investigate the activities of the executive branch of the Government, with a view of determining its economy and efficiency. In the instant case, we found that some officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Territory of Alaska attempted by deceit and subterfuge to obtain indirectly Federal matching funds which could not have been obtained directly under existing law. As is stated in the final conclusion of the subcommittee's report, it is the considered opinion of the subcommittee that public officials entrusted with the responsibility of expending public funds are charged with the duty of handling these funds in a judicious and businesslike manner. The subcommittee will not tolerate inefficiency, mismanagement, or indifference in the handling of Federal funds and when such conditions are found to exist the subcommittee will take appropriation steps, as it has done in this case, to correct the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I could not hear clearly everything the Senator from North Carolina said. Does the subcommittee recommend that no appropriation be made with respect to the project?

Mr. HOEY. That has already been attended to.

Mr. WHERRY. That has been attended to anyway?

Mr. HOEY. Yes. Now no money will be paid until the Comptroller General has passed on the question. It will go through the regular course of procedure.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 1541. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1542. A bill to encourage fuller participation by small business concerns in soundly expanded foreign trade through Government insurance for United States exports; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 1543. A bill to aid small business, to assist in promoting maximum employment and production, and to encourage the free flow of capital into small business enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BENTON, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 1544. A bill to amend the existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, to provide additional punishment for violations of such laws, and to permit the United States, as well as private persons, to commence treble-damage actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1545. A bill for the relief of Boshir Micah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1546. A bill to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Flathead Indian Agency, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR):

S. 1547. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1548. A bill for the relief of Ladislas Gyorki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JURISDICTION OVER NATURAL GAS PIPELINES ACROSS PUBLIC LANDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to

the bill (S. 1346) to place jurisdiction of natural gas pipelines constructed in part or in whole across public lands, including the forest reserves of the United States, in the Federal Power Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "TENSIONS WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION"—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY (S. DOC. NO. 41)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a pamphlet entitled "Tensions Within the Soviet Union" was prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I am convinced that this valuable study should have a more extensive distribution. It should be made available to the Congress as a whole and to the depository libraries for government publications. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the pamphlet be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement regarding the pamphlet entitled "Tensions Within the Soviet Union." I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

TENSIONS WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION

For a long time I have been convinced—as have many others in this country—that we are failing to take advantage of an important opportunity for improving our understanding of the Russian people, and for their understanding of us. On February 8, I joined several other Senators in sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, a resolution which reaffirms the abiding friendship of the American people for all other people, including the people of Russia. Today I wish to go one step further along this same road, which I am convinced is the right way to the peaceful filling of the void in understanding, which now separates us from the Soviet citizens. The void is being kept wide and deep by the ruling clique in the Kremlin in order to maintain itself in power and to exploit the Russian people for its own selfish purposes.

But I am convinced that the void can be bridged in spite of the Kremlin clique, and it behooves us to do everything we can to accomplish this objective. We have only friendship for the Russian people, and our job is to make that clear to them. If they reciprocate by a similar feeling for us, peace between our two countries can be assured.

The Soviet leaders would have us believe, as Winston Churchill put it, that the Soviet Union and its people are a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. They have therefore carefully fostered the myth that the Soviet Union is monolithic in character and its citizens give spontaneous, loyal, and enthusiastic support to the regime. But the evidence at hand flatly contradicts this impression. Soviet sources and the testimony of displaced persons and refugees show clearly that there is an impressive list of tensions within Russia.

The dictatorial Soviet regime has lost the confidence of a large part of the indoctrinated youth. Wide circles of the intelligentsia refuse to follow the whims of party directives. Religious groups establish clandestine churches and fight back the revival of the antireligious policies of an atheistic government. Minority groups—the Ukrainians, the Tartars, the Baltic peoples, and others—show separatist tendencies, and the Jewish people are frustrated in their desire to migrate to Israel. The Red army is put under strict control permeated with secret agents. Soviet women have their own grievances because of forced heavy labor duties as a part of their much vaunted freedom, and because of the deprivation of a proper share in political influence and in the professions open to them. The Soviet worker is economically and politically enslaved. The Soviet trade unions, which should protect the workers are forced instead to take their orders from the regime. The collective farms are inefficiently manned by an unwilling peasantry who have never reconciled themselves to the loss of their former independence. Forced labor camps, in which millions of people starve to death, have become a permanent feature of the regime, and at the same time the spawning ground of discontent and hatred for the oppressive rule.

There are tensions and conflicts within the Party itself, and between the managerial groups and the centralistic bureaucracy. But, above all, there is misapprehension, fear and distrust on the part of millions of ordinary and honest Soviet citizens that they are being led into another holocaust by the policies and actions of their government.

Recent visitors and those in a position to comment give ample support to the thesis that these tensions are real and of substantial proportions. Paul Hoffman, when he was director of ECA, constantly repeated that he was convinced that it was only a question of time before the Soviet Union would be confronted with internal troubles. Governor Stassen reported on his recent return from a world tour that "People everywhere, including the iron curtain countries, want peace and freedom and the Russian Kremlin faces a counter-revolution which will included the Red army itself, if it begins an aggressive war."

Gen. Lucius Clay had the following to say in answer to my questions in the hearings on the assignment of American ground forces to Europe:

"Of course, there is still armed resistance going on in the Ukraine. It was only a few months ago that the guerrilla leader of the resistance movement in the Ukraine was killed in action in the Ukraine. They have never stopped in their resistance. I think that in the event of all-out war we could expect a very real movement in the Ukraine to the support of the western position. * * * In fact, the Russians have had to run a very vigorous police state in the Ukraine to keep order. * * * (A) great many elements in Poland, Rumania, and Hungary. * * * I think could be counted upon for some active help if we got into total war and we were able to provide them with any real support. * * * They have just had a very recent purge in the Czechoslovakian Government which apparently came about because of the unwillingness even on the part of some of the Communists to accept complete dictation from Moscow, somewhat the same situation that led to Yugoslavia breaking away from the Kremlin.

"All of those elements are elements that I think we should support and arrange to use in that accomplishing of our objectives."

Observers of the magazine Intelligence Digest, edited by the British expert, Kenneth de Courcy, report in the February 1951 issue that partisan activity within the Soviet Union is both strong and increasing. They report that organized guerrilla activities are growing in the Caucasus and the Ukraine. The reports of this magazine's observers are supported by the announcement on November 1, 1950, of the creation in the Soviet Union of a new decoration to be conferred on members of the MVD "for courage in action, fighting bandits and bandit bands."

And so I repeat, there is a deep cleavage between wide strata of the Soviet population and the clique residing in the Kremlin—a regime which can only maintain itself in power by a policy of terror, of brutal oppression, of secret police action, by deceit, and by evil machinations and conspiracy. The true feeling of the Russian people is illustrated by the words of Russian refugee Leonid Smirnov as he writes in Colliers magazine of February 24, 1951, of Russian oil activities in the Arctic. Mr. Smirnov recalls that "In the Emba Trust, I learned many lessons. One was that all sorts of people in that part of Russia—just as in my native region—hated the Communist system. My wagon driver (when he had got to have confidence in me) was fond of remarking that when the overthrow came he would spend the first 3 days in church, the next 3 days getting drunk, and then, for the rest of his life, would work every day for himself."

Where terror reigns inertia sets in. Strictly supervised people do not dare to translate their discontent and dissatisfaction into action—particularly when they cease trusting each other and do not know to whom they can turn and when they fail to hear their friends abroad. I am convinced that not only should we deliver protest notes to the Soviet Foreign Office, but should try to reach the Russian people themselves over the heads of the Communist government. I am convinced that we should try to reach the individual groups within the Soviet society; to point out to them how their individual grievances can be taken care of in the world of free men; to assure them of our friendship and to promise them our help in the decisive hour. Such a program should appeal to them in the name of their own century-long aspirations for freedom and prosperity. In particular we need to assert and reassert that it is the policies of the Soviet Government that cause the future of the world to hang in the balance.

If we are to accomplish this mission, we must make ourselves ready by studying the mood and temper of the Russian people—their hopes and aspirations, their sufferings and tragedies. As a preliminary step toward providing ourselves with the information needed for this mission, I have requested the Library of Congress to prepare for me a comprehensive analysis of the chief grievances of the various strata of Soviet society.

That matter has now been prepared, but I am convinced that this valuable study should have a more extensive distribution. The pamphlet should be made available to the Congress as a whole and to the depository libraries for Government publications. I therefore have asked unanimous consent that the pamphlet entitled "Tensions Within the Soviet Union" be printed as a Senate document.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

An address entitled "The Republican Party Is Bewitched, Bothered, and Bewildered," delivered by Senator KERR to the Democratic Regional Conference in Denver, Colo., on May 23, 1951.

By Mr. KEM:

An address delivered by him at the Armed Forces Day celebration in St. Louis, Mo., on May 19, 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

A letter written by him to the editor of the Washington Post regarding his proposal that the President be invited to testify be-

fore the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, sitting jointly investigating the dismissal of General MacArthur.

By Mr. MARTIN:

A release by his office on May 14, 1951, with reference to the necessity for the Government to protect the watch-making industry of the United States.

Address on the subject Freedom Is No Accident, delivered by Stanley C. Bumm at a recent Americanism rally.

Tabulation of results of poll on national issues taken by the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

By Mr. IVES:

Address on the subject Orderly Change Through Blue Cross, delivered by Charles Garside, president of the Associated Hospital Service of New York before the Greater New York Hospital Association, Hotel Roosevelt, New York, May 9, 1951, discussing the place of the voluntary hospital in the American hospital system.

By Mr. LANGER:

Address on the subject The Forgotten Millions, delivered by Miss Marie T. Gerhard, in Volksverein Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on May 13, 1951, at the commemoration of the sixtieth anniversay of Pope Leo XIII's labor encyclical, rerum novarum.

Statement by G. M. Higley, secretary of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Harrisburg, Pa., referring to salaries and working conditions of postal employees.

By Mr. AIKEN:

An editorial entitled "Farmers and Controls," published in the Rutland (Vt.) Herald of May 23, 1951.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Editorials with reference to the proposed Military Training Act, from the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald, the New York Herald Tribune, the Louisville Courier Journal, the Kansas City Star, and the Christian Science Monitor.

By Mr. MOODY:

Article from the current issue of the United Automobile Worker regarding the beef price regulation issued by Price Administrator Di-Salle.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

An article entitled "How Acheson Urged Us To Back China Reds," written by Fulton Lewis, Jr., and published in the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel of May 11, 1951.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

A document entitled "An Open Letter to the Congress of the United States of America" suggesting that, at the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, to be celebrated at Philadelphia, this year, consideration be given to the subject of taxation without representation.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 147)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk.

(For the President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, pp. 5844–5849.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, since the President's mutual security program covers virtually all of the world outside of the Soviet bloc and recommends huge expenditure of cash and goods over this vast area, the next step is for the committees of Congress having jurisdiction to examine his proposals.

It is especially important that General Eisenhower be asked to appear before the appropriate congressional committees to report on progress made in his mission to help Europe rearm. I am sure that the American people, through their Congress, are entitled to have justification for the foreign-aid program that the President now recommends. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I shall do my utmost to obtain such justifications.

Mr. McMAHON subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. McMAHON. I noticed that the bill which accompanied the message received from the President regarding economic defense assistance for foreign nations was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. I realize that the major portion of the money for military assistance is to be allocated to other free nations. However, I should like to point out to the Chair that the ECA program was handled entirely by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I desire to say for the RECORD that I intend to consult with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—in fact, all the members of the committee—so that we may make our views known as to the jurisdiction here involved? I think it would be unfortunate if the world were to get the idea that our efforts abroad are to be dominated solely by military necessity. I do not wish to encroach further upon the time of the Senate, except to say that I think this matter should be discussed with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations as quickly as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to observe in that connection that he referred the message of the President to the Committee on Armed Services, because, obviously, the major portion of the message deals with questions of defense, which are appropriate to go to the Committee on Armed Services. If the message dealt only with ECA aid under the Marshall plan, it would naturally go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Chair has no power to refer a message of this kind, or the bill which would accomplish the purpose of the message, to any joint committee, or to two committees sitting jointly. If a bill comes in, dealing separately with that part of the message relating to armed services and national defense, and aid to other countries in defense, it would go to the Armed Services Committee. If a separate bill comes in dealing with the ECA portion of the bill, it would probably go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but, since the message deals with both subjects, and since the preponderant portion of it seems to the Chair to deal with the question of defense, the Chair felt that it should go to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. McMAHON. The Chair was right in saying that there is no power to send it to two committees, but I wanted to make it plain for the record that it would probably be necessary for both committees to consider an arrangement whereby they would sit jointly to consider the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is House bill 3342 the unfinished business? I think it is. I believe it was so ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the unfinished business.

ISSUES HIGHLIGHTED BY MacARTHUR HEARINGS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARTHY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should first like to ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD, at this point, a verbatim recording of a talk I made in Cudahy, Wis., in regard to the attempted breaking of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR McCARTHY TAKEN FROM RECORDING OF SPEECH MADE IN CUDAHY, WIS., APRIL 23, 1951

Fellow Americans, thank you very, very much.

I think it is unnecessary for me to tell you that I thoroughly enjoy getting away from Washington for a few hours and back here in the United States again. It's a good feeling.

There are any number of things we might well discuss tonight. With your permission, I would like to discuss briefly what I think is the most important issue that has ever faced this Nation—and the decision reached on this issue may well, and undoubtedly will, determine the life or death of all of western civilization.

Last week, I sat in the House of Representatives at a joint meeting of the Congress and listened to one of the greatest Americans ever born, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I listened to the greatest speech—actually the greatest speech which I have ever heard or hope to hear—listened to a man who is recognized the world over by both his friends and his enemies as the greatest military leader and strategist since even before the days of Genghis Khan.

He wasn't there, ladies and gentlemen, as a Democrat; he wasn't there as a Republican. He was there as an American. I don't think there is anyone who recognizes or realizes more fully that this Communist fight which we are now in, both at home and abroad, should not be a fight between America's two political parties. We should compliment Douglas MacArthur for doing all he humanly could to keep this out of the realm of politics—for, God knows, the millions and millions of loyal Democrats in this Nation are just as loyal and hate communism just as much as the millions of loyal Republicans in this Nation. Unfortunately, some men of little minds—who do not honestly represent the people of this Nation—have been promoting this into a political fight.

I would like now to discuss briefly General MacArthur's speech. He discussed almost solely a question upon which he has more intimate information and knowledge than any other man in this country—that question is how we can win the war in the Pacific, the war against communism in Asia, with the least number of deaths, the least amount of destruction and the least number of American wives and mothers again going deep into the valley of darkness and despair. That is the subject which he discussed with us.

As you know, before he even began his speech there was a great hue and cry for his scalp. I think it might be well to know who led that hue and cry. I have in my hand the Daily Worker—that is, the New York Daily Worker. As you know, this is the official organ of the Communist Party in the United States and speaks for the party. Quite gleefully, the Daily Worker says that a

tremendous feeling of gratification will be felt all over the Nation because General MacArthur was broken—then in the subheads, "Good Riddance of MacArthur." But even more significant, and while this paper isn't known for its truthfulness, in this case we find them speaking the truth in an editorial, by the head of their party, saying, "The Communists were the first to demand the recall of MacArthur as a menace." A great number of the party liners have been falling into line. The Communists have been leading the smear attack on General Douglas MacArthur, and you find the camp-following papers all over the country doing the same. When you read those editorials smearing Douglas MacArthur, remember that the Communist Party considers him their greatest menace—remember that—and has long considered him their greatest menace, as he is.

There are some things which I think we should keep in mind as we examine General MacArthur's speech. We should keep in mind that we are at war tonight—regardless of what anyone tells you. We should remember that this is a war not of our choosing. We didn't start it. The Communists started it. We cannot stop it except by victory and, as Douglas MacArthur said, "There is no substitute for victory in a war." We should remember also that, as far as the Chinese Communists are concerned, this is to them an all-out war. They are hitting us with everything they have. Don't forget that when anyone talks about an all-out war with Communist China. Keep in mind also that we are not hitting them with everything that we have.

Remember that 60,000 American boys have given their lives or their blood since the twenty-sixth day of June. Keep in mind that every month 6,000 American boys give their lives or their blood in that Korean war. Keep in mind that tonight—as we speak here, during this 12-hour period—Americans will either die or be crippled in Korea.

You can call that a big war, or you can call it a little war; you can call it world war III, or you can call it a police action. Regardless of what you call it, ladies and gentlemen, any of your sons who get killed over there are just as dead. One of the tasks which those of us whom you have sent to Washington must do is, in this case, to forget politics and carefully examine our foreign policy, if you can call it that. We must examine it and see if that policy can be reshaped to the end that less Americans will die in this war in which we are now engaged. That was the subject which General MacArthur discussed before the Senate and the House the other day. He discussed the unusual situation, the unusual circumstances, under which he was forced to fight. And if I may, I would like to take a minute or two of your time to review this most fantastic situation that, to my knowledge, has ever existed in time of war.

Always before when a nation has been at war they wanted to win. Always before a nation has wanted to win with the least amount of death and destruction. But let's see what we are doing over in China today—and this would be unbelievable except that the orders are in writing. Let's go back a few months when the North Koreans—the Communists—moved into South Korea. As you know, there were roughly 600,000 anti-Communist troops on the island of Formosa. At that time Chiang Kai-shek, the leader of those troops, was doing a fairly good job of blockading the Communist ports of China. Then what happened? The Seventh Fleet was ordered to move in. Let's take a look at the orders given our Navy: No. 1 in the orders was that the Seventh Fleet was to break the blockade—break the blockade—of the Communist ports. Do you get that picture? Our Seventh Fleet, operating with American boys, American money, was ordered to go in and make sure that the anti-Communist planes could no longer sink the ships carrying war materials to Communist ports. And, No. 2 you have the picture of the China coast and, off the coast about 100 miles, the island of Formosa—the Seventh Fleet (again unbelievable except that it is all a matter of record) was ordered to protect about 1,000 miles of Communist coast and make sure that our friends and allies on Formosa, the legal Government of China could not land—could not land—on the Communist China coast. There might have been some reason why that order was signed on the 26th of June before the Communists started killing Americans. Perhaps if one's reasoning were twisted enough he might think up some reason. But, ladies and gentlemen, there is no reason on God's earth why that order should exist as of tonight.

If you have two sons and one is in the Naval Reserve, and he is called back into the Navy, he may go with the Seventh Fleet. His task as of tonight is to protect the long-exposed flank of the Communists in China. That is the task of the Seventh Fleet. The admiral in charge, in order to call the American people's attention to this (he can't object, of course, or he would go the way of MacArthur), said, "My major task is to protect the Communist coast."

So, one of your boys is in there protecting the Communist coast, and since that blockade has been broken, ladies and gentlemen, a vast amount of war material has been flowing into the Communist ports of China finding its way up north into Korea, where it is now being used against American soldiers. What is more, those soldiers of Communist China who, prior to the time the Seventh Fleet came into the picture, had the job of protecting their own Communist coastline from invasion, are now free to fight against us in Korea. Our fleet is doing their coastal protection job for them. This, incidentally, is what the State Department calls punishing the aggressor."

Let's take the other son. He is drafted into the Army. He is sent to Korea. His task as of tonight is to fight the Communists that are being protected by his brother in the Seventh Fleet. Now do you wonder why MacArthur couldn't stomach it?

Then let's take a bit more of the picture, if I may. The Communists have been building up their air strength beyond the Yalu River. Their airfields, communication centers, and troop concentration points are just beyond the Yalu River. As you know, American bombers under orders from Washington can bomb only as far as the Yalu River and no farther. Beyond that the Communists are building up their air strength. General MacArthur asked to be allowed to destroy them before they could slaughter his men. Our State Department said "No," even though those airplanes are coming over and shooting down American bombers, even though they are killing Americans—they said "No," we can't hit them, because if we did we might make them mad.

But while MacArthur was in charge there was still some doubt in the minds of the Communist leaders. There was always the chance that maybe some day reason might prevail and MacArthur would be allowed to have his own way so that he could start killing the enemy. So the Communists were afraid to build up too much strength in places vulnerable to our bombers. But, ladies and gentlemen, since they were notified that any American fighting man who even suggested we fight back would get the axe, their strength has been doubling and tripling. And this is significant—since MacArthur was fired, more American B–29's have been shot down than had been previously shot down during the entire Korean war. General Stratemeyer, head of the Air Force in Korea, reported recently in an interview with United States News that the Communists were rapidly building up their air strength. He said there is nothing we can do about it. We must sit and wait like sitting ducks. It will be surprising if General Stratemeyer is not dismissed for thus criticizing what we are doing—I should say not doing—in Korea.

One of the things I think we should remember is that Truman is not responsible for the fantastic situation in which we find ourselves. I think the President is essentially just as loyal as the average American. I don't think he wants the Communists to win any more than you or I do. He isn't part of the Hiss-Acheson-Lattimore-Jessup crowd. I do think that is the hopeful spot in this whole picture. The unfortunate thing is that he confuses stubbornness with strength of character. He is a man of extremely small mind and great stubbornness. In addition, the Acheson group has a tremendous, almost hypnotic influence over him.

Mr. Truman is President of this Nation in name only, and those who say we should impeach him actually are discussing something which would be largely a waste of time—because he isn't, ladies and gentlemen, the President of these United States—nor did he fire General MacArthur. That firing was done by a sinister, many-headed and many-tentacled monster—one that was conceived in the Kremlin, given birth to by Dean Gooderham Acheson with Attlee and Morrison acting as the midwives. A sinister monster, ladies and gentlemen, consisting largely of the old Hiss crowd which still controls not only our foreign policy but, as of the firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, now also controls the military policy and military strategy of this Nation.

Now, in speaking of the Hiss crowd, we don't have to take the word of MCCARTHY as to the danger of this crowd. Let's take the word of a very good friend and ardent supporter of President Roosevelt, an ardent New Dealer and also a good American, Adolph Berle, Assistant Secretary of State. He appeared before the Un-American Activities Committee and testified in 1948. He was asked—keep in mind that this is a man who was in the State Department, not a member of the opposite party trying to embarrass Mr. Truman but an ardent Democrat and an ardent New Dealer—he was asked to explain the unusual workings of that State Department, and here is his testimony under oath. He says: "When I was in the Department, there were two groups striving for power. There was the pro-Communist group headed by Alger Hiss and Dean Acheson and then there was the anti-Communist group; but the anti-Communist group has disappeared and the pro-Communist group has taken over. It is obvious, of course, that they have taken over." We didn't need that testimony to know it any more than you need a Communist Party card to detect a Communist. They leave their political footprints down every corridor they tread.

Take, for example, when Alger Hiss, and Gromyko, and Jebb of England drafted the Yalta agreement—the agreement selling out all of Poland to the Communists. Now our Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, didn't know at that time that Alger Hiss was a Communist and a Russian spy. But, nevertheless, our Ambassador had no trouble detecting the evil of this Kremlin agent. Let me quote his exact words. He said, "When I looked over this document I couldn't believe my eyes. Every line speaks a complete surrender to Stalin."

Now, I would like to give you the records of just one or two of the individuals who are making the plans, the kind of plans that General MacArthur couldn't stomach—the plans that MacArthur had tried to defeat whenever he could. I am not doing this because I am concerned about punishing these individuals. Frankly, we don't have

time enough for that now, but I do think the American people, all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from New Orleans to St. Paul, should have a picture of the typical individuals who are so bad for America. In doing this I might also call your attention to the fact that, while I have been exposing these individuals on the Senate floor—and it is not a pleasant task; I would be happy to have someone else do it—every Communist Party line paper has been screaming to high heaven, "McCARTHY does this under the cloak of Senatorial immunity." They know, of course, that I can't stand outside the Senate door and shout these facts to the other Senators through the door. They know also that if I did the newspapers of this Nation would be afraid to carry the facts for fear of libel suits. The only way I can force them to put these facts into their own papers is to do this from the Senate floor so they will have enough guts to carry the story.

But, in addition to that, we have been accommodating those who say, "Tell the story off the Senate floor." And tonight I am going to give you the facts on two individuals high in our State Department. If what I tell you is true, ladies and gentlemen—if what I tell you is true—then I am sure you will agree that they are bad for America and good for Communist Russia. If what I say is false, they are being very grossly libeled and they should start those suits they have been talking about.

Now keep in mind as I give you the picture of these individuals that they are neither Democrats nor Republicans. They are some of the bureaucrats who have worked their way from the bottom to the top with the help of the dupes and the stooges of the Kremlin in our Government. They are the friends, if you please, of Alger Hiss.

Let me first give you the picture of one whom I consider—no, first let's take a name you have heard considerable of. Let's take the case of John Service. You will hear more about poor, innocent John before we are through. He is one of the "innocent people who were smeared," you understand, by "wild and irresponsible" charges. He was the subject of many bleeding-heart editorials. Let's look at the record of Service. Nothing new about his story.

When Pat Hurley was the Ambassador to China, he sent back repeated dispatches to the President saying, "Mr. President, I can't work with the motley crowd you have over in my office. These men, Mr. President, are not good for America; they are good for Communist Russia. When top-secret material comes to me, and is seen by these individuals, within a matter of hours or days it shows up at the Communist headquarters at Yenan." Hurley pleaded, "Call them home, Mr. President. One of them, Mr. President, is John Stewart Service." Well, the President called Service back. Keep in mind this is all a matter of record—nothing from secret files. The President called him back; he was promoted and given a better job in the State Department.

But the picture doesn't end there. Far from it. While he was back in this country he was picked up—he was arrested by the FBI with five other codefendants. Keep in mind we are talking about one of our planners now, one of the men making the plans which led to MacArthur's dismissal. He and five others were arrested in a case which J. Edgar Hoover was quoted as having referred to as a 100-percent airtight case of espionage—and J. Edgar Hoover does not make careless statements—he is one of the greatest men we have in Washington. What do you think happened to this case? (1) Service was not convicted; (2) he was not tried; (3) he was not indicted. What did happen? Under Secretary Joseph Grew, who was then Under Secretary of State, insisted that the defendants in this case be tried. He was told, however, that if we tried those people and they were found guilty, then we might make Communist Russia mad. Joe Grew said, "I don't give a tinker's dam whether you make them mad or not; they must go to trial." But they never went to trial—Service was let off. So what happened? Joe Grew resigned, and then Dean Gooderham Acheson took over Joe Grew's job. John Service was not only promptly rehired; he was also put on the Board which had complete charge of the promotions and placement of all State Department personnel in the entire Asiatic theater. This was Dean Acheson's first act.

When I named Service as one of those dangerous to this Nation, he was holding a top job over in India, one of the trouble spots of the world. He was called back before the unlamented Tydings committee—after much protest; much editorializing—and the FBI was called before the committee. And under oath the FBI said when Service was back in this country we trailed him from the State Department with large brown envelopes under his arm; we trailed him to the hotel room of Phillip Jaffe. Phillip Jaffe was known to us as a Communist. (Phillip Jaffe had been named under oath as a Russian spy. He was later tried and found guilty in connection with the theft of some 17 secret and other classified Government documents.) They said, "We trailed this State Department expert to the hotel room of Jaffee. We trailed him away without those brown envelopes. Then we put microphones in the hotel room of this known Communist. We listened to the conversation between this State Department expert and Phillip Jaffe. We heard Service discussing with Jaffe the top-secret military information that he had turned over to him."

But the story does not end there. Now the tragic part: the Loyalty Board met, had a hearing, and said, "Now this is an example of McCarthyism at its worst." They said, "By smearing a poor, innocent man like Service who might have been a bit naive (didn't know what he was carrying under his arm, of course) it makes it impossible for us to hire other good, loyal Americans like Service." And they said, "He must be put back on his job in the State Department." That is where he is tonight.

Now I hesitate taking too much of your time on this, but I do think it is important to have one or two of these cases in mind so you will know who is doing your planning for you; so you will know the facts when the left-wing elements of the press cry and say, "No proof, no proof." I want to go into another of these cases so that you will know what the proof is, and know how urgent it is, ladies and gentlemen, that we get rid of these individuals at the very earliest opportunity. If we can't get rid of them, at least we can spotlight them so their teeth are pulled and they can't continue their foul work.

Let me give you one other case quickly. If I may—that of Philip Jessup, our roving Ambassador, the man who was sent to the East for the purpose of making recommendations to Dean Acheson. After he came back, Dean Acheson made a public statement. He said, "South Korea is not within any area which we intend to defend." Do you follow that? Three times that statement was made. To the Communists of the world he said, "We don't intend to defend South Korea." Of course, the Communists took the invitation and they moved into Korea. He also said, "We don't intend to defend Formosa." In other words, let the 500,000 anti-Communists on that island fall to communism.

Now let me give you a picture of this man. He is one of the really top men, the roving Ambassador. Again nothing hinges on conjecture. Here is a photostat showing that Mr. Jessup had editorial control of the publication of an organization officially listed as a secret front—doing the work of the Communist Party. You understand that organization was not named by McCARTHY as a Communist front; it was named by a legislative committee as a front for and doing the work of the Communist Party. We gave the Tydings Committee the publications put out under Mr. Jessup's editorial control, showing that the magazine followed the Communist Party line in Asia almost right down to the last period. We gave them the names of some 10 Communist writers who did the writing for the Jessup publication. That alone should be enough reason to get rid of the man, but there is much more.

When the Communist, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, appeared before the committee, we asked him if his money were supporting the Jessup publication. He refused to answer on the grounds that an answer might incriminate him. It might not have incriminated him but it would have incriminated some others who are doing the planning. After a great deal of difficulty, however, we dug up—and I hold in my hand the photostats—checks totaling $6,500 of Communist money used to support the publication of this Communist front which was trying to sell the Communist Party line to America. This is a part of the picture, ladies and gentlemen, of the sellout in Asia. This is one of the reasons why MacArthur was discharged. Now again the committee said, "Well, maybe our roving Ambassador was so naive he didn't know why the Communists were paying that money." You can be sure that if he was so naive, if he didn't know why the Communists were paying the money, they certainly knew they were getting a dollar's worth for every dollar spent.

Before I go on with this man's record, let me first give you the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover when he appeared before the committee. He said that it is possible that a naive person may be duped into joining one Communist front, perhaps even two, but when you find them belonging to five or six—this is the head of the FBI testifying—you can be sure then that they are either so naive that they are a danger to America if they hold a top job or else they are in sympathy with the Communist cause.

Mr. Jessup was affiliated, ladies and gentlemen, with not one, not two, not three, not four, but five—five—organizations that were officially listed as fronts for and doing the work of the Communist Party.

Keep in mind that I am not standing up here indicting Mr. Jessup because I care what happens to him as a person. I am exposing this man's record because he is a typical case of those individuals who are bad for this country and who have had the knife and have been using it on Douglas MacArthur—and who will use it on everyone who stands for the things MacArthur stands for.

But that does not give you his entire picture. Let me give you a bit more. In 1946, the Communist Party line, as you know, was to try to convince the American people that we could have peace if only America stopped manufacturing atomic bombs. That was the party line. Now it wasn't surprising to find the Daily Worker, Frederick Field, Bella Dodd, and Earl Browder urging that we throw away the one defense which we had then against international communism, while at the same time the Communists, through the Fuchs and others whose names will be coming up from day to day were stealing our atomic bomb secrets for Russia. It wasn't surprising to find the top Communists doing that but rather surprising to find our Ambassador at Large urging that. And I have in my hand a photostat taken from the New York Times of February 16, 1946—listen to this, if you will—in which Mr. Jessup urges, in a signed petition, that the United States should at once stop the production of the atomic bombs and that all atomic bomb material as produced be eliminated by appropriate means, such as dumping it into the ocean.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we got the evidence, and the ill-famed Tydings committee said, "No. We don't want to hear it. He has been okayed by the Loyalty Board."

We sent the evidence over to the President thinking maybe he didn't know about this man, who was his Ambassador at Large, the man drafting the plans for the Pacific. We sent him copies of the publication showing how it consistently followed the Communist Party line; we sent him copies of the checks showing Communist money supported this publication; copies of the photostats showing the Communist front affiliation; and the petition in the New York Times. We sent him this evidence and said, "Mr. President, don't you think now you should take action and get rid of this man?" Just before that the President had made the statement that if anyone knew of any dangerous people in Government they should not shout it to the public; they should bring it to him and, he said, "I, your President, will act." When we sent all of this material to him, ladies and gentlemen, he acted; he acted the next day. What do you think that action consisted of? It consisted of giving top secret clearance to Mr. Jessup to all atomic and hydrogen bomb information.

Another of the men I named at that time was Stephen Brunauer, who was head of the high explosive section of the Navy. Stephen Brunauer was named along with his wife, Esther Brunauer, who was holding a $9,000 or $10,000 a year job in the State Department handling top secret material. At that time there was a vast amount of crying about my swearing these two "poor innocent" people. And the Tyding committee refused to act. At that time, I begged them to go into executive session. I said, "Let me give you the facts on this man." But the left-wing and Communist press kept shouting about these two "poor innocent" people and the Tydings committee shied away as usual. Well finally—finally—about a week ago, the Navy caught up with Stephen Brunauer. He has been dropped from the payroll. But they caught up with him rather late because in the meantime his great and good friend, Noel Field, one of the most dangerous Communists, had left this country with all of the atomic-bomb information which he could gather; and had disappeared behind the iron curtain.

Now, as I say, I don't give you the picture of these individuals because I am concerned with punishing them. Once they are exposed—once we can get them out of the Government where they can no longer do their damage, I don't care whether they are punished. Unless the American people get a clear picture of what is going on, however, the sell-out is going to continue until it is too late.

Now, there is only one way—one way—that we can save this country, ladies and gentlemen. It isn't by impeaching Truman, because the old Acheson crowd will still be there. The answer is first to strike in the very heart—the very heart of the octopus—and impeach Dean Gooderham Acheson; and then, after we have done that, clean out the old Yalta crowd, lock, stock, and barrel. Certainly, the President can find enough loyal Democrats in this Nation to fill their jobs.

Now, there are those who say, "McCARTHY, why do you waste your time trying to expose these individuals? Why don't you leave them there?" They say, "In 1952, then we will have a change of administration. We can have a house cleaning." The only bad thing about that, ladies and gentlemen, is that 1952 may well be too late. We cannot wait that long. It is time, at long last, for the Democrats and Republicans of this Nation to forget what party they belong to; to exert enough pressure upon their Representative in Washington so that we can have a real American Government. "If only," as one of my Democratic friends said the other day, "Mr. Truman would realize that no one in that crowd is a Democrat; not one of them is a Republican." He said, "If only he would realize that, he would do not only a great thing for the country, but also for his own Democratic Party. Then maybe we would have a house cleaning." And it is up to you, ladies and gentlemen—up to the people of this Nation—to convince the President that it is unwise to continue the course he has been following. When that is done, maybe we will have a house cleaning. There are many fine Democrats in this country who recognize the problem. One of my good Democratic friends in the Senate has said, "Thanks to General MacArthur, our former enemy, Japan, is now our friend. Thanks to the State Department, our former ally, China, is now our enemy." If only President Truman would recognize this fact and stop the rapid pace of our sell-out.

Now, Mr. Truman had a choice between MacArthur and the other crowd. He made his choice. I sincerely hope that he is not going to continue along that line. This crowd that Mr. Truman has chosen to follow, this crowd that is controlling our destiny—expert propagandists all—has hit upon a good slogan, a slogan to appeal to the American people, knowing that we all want peace; none of us wants war. They say that if MacArthur's plan were followed it would extend the war in China. I had a letter from a farm boy back in the town of Grand Chute several days ago. He said, "I read that, and I would like to ask a question." He said, "I understand that the only place there are American troops is in Korea and, when they say we will extend the war all over China, tell me how they can hit us where we ain't." Well, I sent that letter over to the State Department and suggested to them that, when they talk about extending the war in China, they explain to the American people how the Chinese Communists can hit us where we ain't. The only place they can hit us is in Korea, and they are hitting us there as hard as they can.

Now, as Douglas MacArthur said, unless we change our plans, this war is going to last indefinitely, which means that every month—let's bring it down to every day—every day roughly 200 American boys will pay with their lives and blood. I have talked to every military man I know in Washington, from the Air Force, the Marines, the Army and Navy, and they all agree—there is no way on God's earth we can win that war if we have a military strategy dictated from the State Department. One of the fundamental things in war is that either you kill the enemy or he kills you. If you merely add two and two it means that we must send our planes over and destroy the enemy's planes, supply lines and troop concentrations beyond the Yalu River. War is, as you know, the unpleasant science of death and destruction; and if you don't kill him, he kills you. But the new theory set forth by the State Department is that we can't follow that theory—we can't kill them first, because if we kill them first we may make them mad.

Unless there is a change, ladies and gentlemen, either we must sell out and appease communism once again or that war will continue indefinitely.

Now I have taken a lot more of your time than I intended to. In closing, I would like to, if I may, take about 1 minute to deal with the most sinister part of this picture. Nothing new. I have here an article written by the State Department expert, Owen Lattimore, the man who was called upon to give secret instructions to roving Ambassador Jessup before he started to rove. Here is the whole key—the whole key, ladies and gentlemen, to their modus operandi, their method of operation—one they have found very successful; one they have been following and will continue to follow. This appeared in the Sunday Compass for July 17, 1949 (this is even before McCarthyism). Referring to China, Lattimore says, as the operation proceeded, the conduct of American policy became increasingly delicate—that is, the problem of how to allow them to fall without making it look as if the United States had pushed them—and he praises the State Department for having let China fall without it appearing that we had pushed her. Then Lattimore goes on to say Korea is another chapter in the same unhappy history. And he says, "The thing"—listen to this; here is the key to the operation—he says, "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall * * *" (keep in mind this is before the North Koreans invaded) "* * * but not to let it look as though we pushed them. Hence"—listen to this—"Hence, the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000."

Do you get the awfulness of this? Here is the architect of our far-eastern policy saying the problem, my friends, is to betray our allies but don't let the world know we pushed them; don't let the American suckers know we pushed them. So, he said, let's give them $150,000,000—this is after we pulled our soldiers out of Korea—knowing full well, of course, that $150,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 wouldn't save South Korea unless they had arms and ammunition; but arranging it so shrewdly that when South Korea did fall our experts could then say to the American people, "We gave them $150,000,000." But at the time they were urging that we give them $150,000,000 in economic aid, the Senate and the House—Republicans and Democrats alike, ladies and gentleman, I don't believe there was one dissenting vote—appropriated $10,000,000 earmarked for military aid for South Korea. We said, we want this spent to buy the tanks and guns, and planes, and the ammunition, so that the people of South Korea can do their own fighting and do their own dying, if necessary. But what happened, ladies and gentlemen? Over a year later, when the North Koreans invaded South Korea, what do you think had been done with the $10,000,000? Less than $200 of it had been spent and that was used to pay for the loading of some baling wire which never got to Korea.

Now there, ladies and gentlemen, is the whole secret of the operation. We first said we'll spend $150,000,000 to save Korea. Then Acheson announced to the Communists that Korea is not within our line of defense. But something happened to the President after Acheson said we won't protect South Korea. Someone convinced the President that we should protect South Korea. So for a time it looked as though communism had been double-crossed and that we were going to stop the march in Asia. But then we find the whole operation coming back into effect. This time, instead of spending $150,000,000, what the experts are doing, what they are saying, is "We will spend 6,000 American lives each month, but tie their hands in such a manner that Korea will fall, we will do it cleverly so that the American people won't know we pushed her."

One of the things that I hope we do in Washington is to call in the heads of our military and of the State Department and make them answer for this. They say, "No, it is secret. We can't tell you." But I think the American people who are spending thirty, forty, fifty billion dollars a year in American lives are entitled to know those secrets. Call them in and say, "Gentlemen, Douglas MacArthur has said that you all agreed that you couldn't win the war in Korea the way it is being fought; you all agreed that if you keep on fighting it this way American boys will die unnecessarily." And say, "Now, gentlemen, tell us who on God's earth vetoed—vetoed—the plans of the military." Find out who in the State Department devised this insidiously clever way of attempting to let

Korea fall with the cost of some American lives, so that the American people won't know we pushed her.

As you know, while MacArthur was over giving his speech, there was sitting in the White House, planning the smear which had already started, Dean Acheson and his cohorts. Now the old Yalta crowd thinks they have MacArthur's scalp. They think they have destroyed MacArthur. But I believe if you will watch what is happening in America you will find that they have not destroyed Gen. Douglas MacArthur. When I heard him in the Senate saying, "Old soldiers never die; they just fade away," when I heard him go on to say that he was about to do that, to fade away and bid the Senate and the country good-by, I think about that time there was a prayer on the lips of almost every Senator—the prayer that, instead of saying good-by, what he actually was saying to the crowd of traitors who thought they had destroyed him was: "I will return."

EXCERPTS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD, at this point, certain excerpts from the testimony of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR BEFORE CLOSED HEARINGS OF SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE AND SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, 1951

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR'S FOUR POINTS FOR ENDING KOREAN WAR AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE WITH LEAST LOSS OF LIVES

The Joint Chiefs of Staff in a memorandum dated January 12, 1951, agreed in detail with each of these points. However, the National Security Council decided against following the advice of General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The National Security Council consists of Gen. George Marshall, Secretary of State Acheson, President Truman, the Vice President, and the head of the National Security Resources Board.

1. Intensification of our economic blockade against Communist China.

2. Imposition of a naval blockade against the China coast.

3. Removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal areas and of Manchuria.

4. Removal of restrictions on the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa with logistical support to contribute to their effective operations against the common enemy.

AMERICAN PEOPLE ENTITLED TO WHOLE TRUTH

I believe it is in the interest, the public interest, that diverse opinions on any controversial issue shall be fully aired.

I understand completely that the totalitarian and the Soviet method is entirely in contradiction to that, that they do muzzle certain segments of society. I do not believe that is the American way.

And if your question is intended to mean that I would be subservient to and not register within the proper processes my opinions, I would refute it at once.

Otherwise you do not get what is the foundation of the very liberty that we breathe, that the people are entitled to have the facts, that the judgment of the Government itself is subject to their opinion and to their control; and in order to exercise that, they are entitled to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

* * * It seems to me that the American people are entitled to certain basic facts, when it involves the lives of their sons, and, perhaps, the future of our country.

I do not believe in the gag rule.

* * * * *

GREATEST POLITICAL MISTAKE IN 100 YEARS

It is my own personal opinion that the greatest political mistake we made in a hundred years in the Pacific was in allowing the Communists to grow in power in China.

I think, at one stroke, we undid everything, starting from John Hay, through Taft, Leonard Wood, Woodrow Wilson, Henry Stimson, and all those great architects of our Pacific policy.

I believe it was fundamental, and I believe we will pay for it for a century.

* * * * *

INDECISIVE FIGHTING LEADS TO UNNECESSARY DEATHS

You speak of American forces being sucked into China, ground forces. I invite your attention to the fact that hundreds of thousands of American ground forces have already been committed in Korea, and if you keep on this indecisive fighting, hundreds of thousands more of them will go there.

Our losses already, the battle casualties, are approaching 65,000. This conflict in Korea has already lasted almost as long as General Eisenhower's decisive campaign which brought the European war to an end. And yet the only program that I have been able to hear is that we shall indecisively go on resisting aggression. Whatever that may mean. And if you do, you are going to have thousands and thousands and thousands of American lives that will fall, and in my own opinion events finally will catch up with you, so that you will have to stop it in some way; and then the great question is, Where does the responsibility of that blood rest?

This I am quite sure—it is not going to rest on my shoulders.

* * * * *

NO POLICY IN KOREA

The only way I know, when a nation wars on you, is to beat her by force. I do not know of any argument that will bring an end to this thing.

War, in itself, is the application of superior force, and as we chose that path, and have entered upon that path, it seems to me that we must end it in some way.

Now, there are only three ways that I can see: Either to pursue it to victory; to surrender to an enemy and end it on his terms; or, what I think is the worst of all choices—to go on indefinitely neither to win or lose, in that stalemate—because what we are doing is sacrificing thousands of men while we are doing it.

If you could just say that this line stops aggression, and we didn't lose the men, that would be a different thing. But every day over there you have this terrific and savage conflict, the most savage I ever fought in; and you are losing the very flower of our youth. If you keep on month after month, and month after month, why, these losses are going to mount up to figures which would stagger the imagination.

War never before in the history of the world has been applied in a piecemeal way, that you make half-war, and not whole war.

Now that China is using the maximum of her force against us is quite evident; and, we are not using the maximum of ours against her in reply.

The result is we do not even use to the maximum the forces at our disposal, the scientific methods, and the result is that for every percentage you take away in the use of the Air and the Navy, you add a percentage to the dead American infantrymen.

It may seem emotional for me to say that, but I happen to be the man that had to send them into it. The blood, to some extent, would rest on me; and with the objectives I believe I could stop them. It seems terrific to me that we should not attempt something.

The inertia that exists. There is no policy. There is nothing. I tell you, no plan or anything.

When you say merely, "we are going to continue to fight aggression," that is not what the enemy is fighting for.

The enemy is fighting for a very definite purpose—to destroy our forces in Korea.

* * * * *

FANTASTIC FAVORITISM OF WAR TO CHINA

I don't seem how it is possible that Communist China could be more at war with us than she is today. We are not at war with her. We are very limited in our repulse of her efforts. * * * It is an almost fantastic favoritism of war to her.

* * * * *

CANNOT BUY TIME WITH AMERICAN LIVES

I shrink with a horror that I cannot express in words at this continuous slaughter of men in Korea.

The battle casualties in Korea today probably have passed the million-man mark. Our own casualties, American casualties, have passed 65,000. The Koreans have lost about 140,000. Our losses on our side are a quarter of a million men. I am not talking of the civilian populations, who must have lost many, many, many times that.

The enemy probably has lost 750,000 casualties. There are 145,000 of them that are now in our prison bull pens, prisoners; so they might be excepted from that figure because they live; but a million men in less than 11 months of fighting, in less than 11 months of this conflict, have already gone, and it grows more savage every day.

I just cannot brush that off as a Korean skirmish. I believe that is something of such tremendous importance that it must be solved, and it cannot be solved by the nebulous process of saying, "Give us time and we will be prepared; or we will be in a better shape 2 years from now," which is argumentative.

I don't know whether we will or not, and neither do you, because you do not know, and none of us know, the capacity of the enemy.

He may build faster than we do. I couldn't tell you.

I don't know that. You are gambling on chances. But I say there is no chance in Korea, because it is a fact, you have lost a million men now. You will lose more than a million if you go on another year, if you go on until 1953, you will lose another million.

What are you trying to protect?

The war in Korea has already almost destroyed that nation of 20,000,000 people.

I have never seen such devastation.

I have seen, I guess, as much blood and disaster as any living man, and it just curdled my stomach, the last time I was there. After I looked at that wreckage and those thousands of women and children and everything, I vomited.

Now are you going to let that go on, by any sophistry of reasoning of possibilities? They may be there, but this is a certainty.

What are you going to do? Once more, I repeat the question: What is the policy in Korea?

If you go indefinitely, you are perpetuating a slaughter such as I have never heard of in the history of mankind.

THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Senator may yield by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to permit the Senator from Nebraska to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska if he will withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for the reason that my time is limited this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. I will withdraw it or withhold it, if that is satisfactory to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for a quorum call will be rescinded and further proceedings under the call will be suspended.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Bradley Admits Lack of Policy," and an article by Constantine Brown entitled "Peace Proposal Terms Revealed," both articles appearing in the Washington Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRADLEY ADMITS LACK OF POLICY—BOTH UNITED NATIONS AND UNITED STATES ARE MARKING TIME, HOPING CHINESE REDS WILL NEGOTIATE SETTLEMENT

(By David Lawrence)

Unfortunately, the full text of the Senate inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the removal of General MacArthur is not getting to the public—or to many officials here either, because it is so voluminous that most newspapers haven't the paper to print it.

It costs at least $25 a day to buy it from the stenographers. The Senate committee will print it a few weeks hence.

This correspondent has read every word of the testimony from the beginning and can state that the record is full of rambling, repetitious, and contradictory statements by Senators as well as by witnesses.

The record shows that the committee has needed a counsel and associate counsel to represent the two sides of the controversy and to get the facts arranged in some sort of understandable sequence.

Only now, in the last hours of General Bradley's testimony, have some of the most essential facts in the whole hearing been developed as a result of intermittent questioning by Senators KNOWLAND, WILEY, SMITH of New Jersey, and HICKENLOOPER.

From General Bradley's testimony it now is established that:

1. General Bradley is not familiar with the terms of the alleged document which was supposed to have been circulated among 14 nations about a cease-fire negotiation March 20 last and which, it is now conceded, was never sent to General MacArthur.

2. Although a message was sent, saying the State Department was planning some such announcement, nothing more was ever sent to General MacArthur giving him any word as to a decision to do it. At that time scarcely a week went by that some U. N. plan to bring about a cease fire wasn't reported in the press as the hope of this or that U. N. faction.

3. The charge that General MacArthur appropriated the language and the terms of the document allegedly circulated among the 14 nations has now been disproved. He never was sent any such document. There is some question that any such document ever was seen by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

4. General Bradley says General MacArthur should have known that there was such a document planned and that he should not have addressed a surrender demand to the enemy. General MacArthur has said in a public statement that he twice had addressed similar demands to the enemy commander and that he did a third time on his own initiative what he previously had twice been authorized to do.

5. General Bradley says that the famous message to the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was not in disagreement with the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the strategic importance of Formosa and that he does not know what in that document could have caused the President or the Secretary of State to have been displeased.

6. General Bradley says that General MacArthur did not commit any act of military insubordination and that, so far as he knows, the far-eastern commander was dismissed for stating certain views publicly, even though it is difficult now to point out just what phrases, if any, were embarrassing and he prefers the Secretary of State to point them out when he testifies.

7. The views of General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs have been and are generally in agreement on the military course to be pushed, but the difference lies in evaluating Russia's intentions. General MacArthur thinks the Russians will not intervene if Manchurian bases are bombed. General Bradley thinks they might intervene, and that it is this risk which he and other members of the Joint Chiefs say should not be taken.

8. There was a very poor liaison between General MacArthur and Washington. Although Washington officials assumed that the general knew about certain developments, they failed to keep him posted on what they were trying to do through the United Nations, and yet they claim his message to the Chinese commander upset their cease-fire negotiations. There is no evidence that the Chinese were then or have since then been willing to talk peace.

9. It is estimated by General Bradley—just as General MacArthur claimed—that neither the United States nor the U. N. has any policy in Korea at present except to fight a passive defense, and that there is no intention to carry the war to the bases of supply of the enemy—Red China.

So it looks—and General Bradley admits it—as if the U. N. is marking time. The U. N. is waiting for the Chinese Communists to oblige us and negotiate a settlement. Several Senators on the committee are trying to find out what kind of settlement the U. N. or our Government could possibly make which—after withdrawal of our forces—could prevent the Communists at any time from marching across the border again.

PEACE PROPOSAL TERMS REVEALED—ARMISTICE PLANS DRAFTED HERE WERE SUBMITTED TO U. N. FOR APPROVAL AND TRANSMISSION TO PEIPING

(By Constantine Brown)

This reporter learns from an unimpeachable source that the armistice proposal which was drafted last March in Washington and submitted to the United Nations for approval and transmission to Peiping contained, among other things, the following terms:

(1) After a cease-fire has become effective and the fighting forces have been withdrawn a new election should be held for the whole of Korea, under the control of a special mission from the U. N. in which those countries which had sent military forces to Korea would be excluded.

(2) A "neutral force" would police both sides of the thirty-eighth parallel until the elections have taken place and a new unified government has been established.

(3) Formosa—still formally a Japanese possession—would be placed under a United Nations trusteeship for a period of 5 years, at the end of which its status would be decided by a plebiscite.

Nothing was said about the Chinese Communist Government replacing the Nationalist in the U. N. But Secretary of State Acheson previously had stated that while this country would oppose the Chinese Communist claim to the seat in the U. N., there was no possibility of using the veto and this Government would abide by the decision of the majority.

On March 24, while this cease-fire arrangement was being readied for transmission to Peiping, General MacArthur made an unofficial statement in Tokyo, urging the Red commander in the field to come and discuss with him conditions to end the fighting in Korea. This, it is now admitted, contributed more than any other of the supreme commander's "indiscretions" to his abrupt removal.

What irked Washington and some of our allies in the United Nations more than the threat of reprisals against China itself, was his statement to the enemy that the settlement would be based on realizing the political objectives of the United Nations, which had remained unchanged from the original directives for unifying the peninsula.

Apparently, General MacArthur had in mind the directions sent to him by the United Nations last June, soon after the North Korean army attacked South Korea. He failed to realize that in the interim, particularly after the intervention of the Chinese Communists on the side of the North Koreans, there had been a change of heart among some members of the U. N. which participated in the campaign and which had much to say about the political and military conduct of the war.

Press dispatches from Tokyo, which carried General MacArthur's demand on the Red commander, added—and it was cleared by the censors—that General MacArthur told the world diplomats that in his opinion no special concessions were necessary to settle the Korean affair. This, on the basis of the present information, was exactly opposite to what Washington and the United Nations had in mind at that time.

General MacArthur felt that if the enemy were convinced that the Allies were determined in their objectives, the Red leaders might be induced to come to terms. The warning about dire consequences and total destruction in event of noncompliance with the terms was intended to convey to the Reds our decision to stick by the principles which brought the Allied forces into the Korean war.

The former supreme commander is far better acquainted with the mentality of his Asiatic opponents than either President Truman, his political and military advisers in Washington or the British or French representatives in the United Nations. He was convinced that in dealing with orientals we must lead from strength and not from weakness.

Last winter's attempts for an armistice or settlement did not succeed because we cowered instead of taking a firm position with the Communist foes.

In Washington this attitude of the general was immediately considered as sabotage of what was described as "well-conceived proposals," which were couched in terms to save our face and at the same time yield to the enemy.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe the MacArthur investigation has

been very valuable and that a great service has been performed, in that there have been highlighted the two principal issues involved, the two points of difference between those who agree with General MacArthur and those who follow the administration's point of view. The first issue is whether the generals or the politicians shall control our military operations on the field of battle. The second and equally important issue, Mr. President, is whether a general's first duty is to the American people or to the political party which happens to be in power at a particular moment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. As I understand, the first question which the Senator is going to discuss—and I am sorry I cannot remain in the Chamber to hear him discuss it—is whether——

Mr. McCARTHY. Whether the generals or the politicians shall control military operations on the field of battle.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator going to discuss the politicians at the Waldorf Hotel in New York?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am going to discuss the attempted control of military strategy by politicians who are in power, not those who are out of power, because those who are out of power exercise no such control. If the Senator from Connecticut, in referring to the politicians at the Waldorf Hotel, is referring to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, I believe the American people feel he has performed a tremendous service to his country in attempting to keep the issues of life and death out of politics. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut will agree with me, and I am sure any man with normal reason will agree, that the contest between the American people and international communism, whether it be at home or abroad, should not have degenerated into a contest between America's two great political parties. There is no reason on God's earth why the Democrats should be pitted against the Republicans on the issues of saving the Nation and stopping the onward roll of international atheistic communism. I think the man to whom the Senator refers as a politician in the Waldorf Hotel is the direct opposite from the popular conception of a politician. He is a statesman, and if we had followed his advice, we should not be indulging in petty politics on this question which is so important, while American boys are dying every day in Korea.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Connecticut did not refer to General MacArthur as a politician at the Waldorf. He was referring to other politicians, including Mr. Herbert Hoover, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]——

Mr. WHERRY. Wait a minute. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska was not there, I will withdraw that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not there. The only time I have had the pleasure of greeting General MacArthur was at the airport, and then I escorted him to his hotel. I should have liked to greet him at any other time when it would have been possible, but I have been denied the privilege of doing so except on the occasion at the airport.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Nebraska for including him in the retinue that called at the Waldorf Hotel for consultations. I understand from newspaper reports that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and Mr. Hoover have been in conference with General MacArthur at the Waldorf Hotel concerning his plans. I do not deny them the right to go there as many times as they care to, and to consult with him about anything under the sun, but I wondered whether the Senator from Wisconsin, if he was going to talk about politicians in general, was intending to talk about the politicians who visited General MacArthur at the Waldorf Hotel. That was the question I wanted to ask the Senator. The Senator has stated that he does not intend to discuss them. That is all right with me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to discuss them if the Senator from Connecticut so desires.

I gather from what the senior Senator from Connecticut has said that he thinks it is wrong for men representing the sovereign States of the Union to go to the man who is recognized as an outstanding authority in the entire Asiatic field; the man who long has stood as a solid wall against Communist aggression; the man who the Communists, as early as 1945, swore they had to "get"; the man who the "pinkos" in the State Department knew they had to "get" if their program was to be successful; the man who, according to President Truman—with changes made in his statement by his secretary the next day—he had removed because he had the temerity to tell the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that he thought it would be a tragedy to follow the Yalta crowd's plan and sell out Formosa, even as they had sold out other sections of the world.

If the Senator from Connecticut thinks it is wrong for the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or anyone else to consult this expert and get his opinion as to how the war should be fought, then I think the Senator from Connecticut might well give that subject more and deeper thought.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is——

Mr. McCARTHY. I yielded for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. I will ask the Senator if he has not made a speech in which he has characterized the attitude of the Senator from Connecticut in terms exactly opposite from what he said, which was that he did not challenge the right of any Member of the Congress to talk with General MacArthur on anything about which they wanted to consult him. I asked the Senator, if he was going to talk about the politicians, whether he was going to talk about the political confabs in the Waldorf Hotel, and the Senator said he was not going to do so. That ends it, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator wait for an answer?

Mr. McMAHON. I stated that I had an engagement which I must keep, but I shall wait for the Senator's answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. I appreciate that. I intend to discuss the all-important issue of whether the generals on the field of battle are to be guided by the new rule set down, that is, that the politicians who happen to be in power at a particular time shall govern strategy and tactics. I shall discuss that question in detail.

Incidentally, while the Senator is on the floor, let me say I am very curious to know whether he agrees with his colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who publicly stated a short time ago that he was the man who advised the President to relieve General MacArthur—political interference in the military of a serious nature. I wondered if that was a joint action by both the Senators from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, does the Senator wish an answer?

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may ask for an answer, and obtain unanimous consent that I shall not lose the floor by having the Senator from Connecticut answer my question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may yield without losing the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Connecticut was speaking for himself when he made that statement. But lest there be any misapprehension in the mind of the Senator from Wisconsin as to where the senior Senator from Connecticut stands on this issue—and certainly he has no doubt about that matter—let me say that, No. 1, I stand for the constitutional right of the President of the United States to remove General MacArthur. No. 2, I say the record demonstrates beyond the shadow of a doubt, so far as the Senator from Connecticut is concerned, that the President was warranted in making the removal; and, No. 3, the senior Senator from Connecticut states that it is his opinion that the testimony given in this investigation demonstrates beyond a shadow of a doubt the wisdom of the President of the United States in having done what he has done.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the testimony we have had from our military figures, such as General Marshall and General Bradley—and we have been told that they are to be supported by General Vandenberg and General Collins, and by Admiral Sherman—demonstrates that the top military leadership in this country—and what a leadership it is, tried and tested and proved in battle—are united in the opinion that the strategy which was advocated by General MacArthur was calculated to take an unwarranted risk in plunging us into a horrible world war III, while following the strategy which they have outlined

may result in avoiding that terrible conflict.

So I say to the Senator from Wisconsin, let him be under no misapprehension as to where the Senator from Connecticut stands. I think he already knew where I stood when he asked the question.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. First let me comment on the answer of the Senator from Connecticut.

I have long known where the Senator from Connecticut stood. I think the people of his State and the people of the country are entitled to know how the two Senators from Connecticut stand. I think the Senate and the country also are entitled to know that the Senator from Connecticut today tells the Senate that he had prejudged this case, made up his mind long before the hearings end.

I think we should also make the record clear at this time as to just where the first attack on Gen. Douglas MacArthur started. Let me also make it clear that I am not intimating that the senior Senator from Connecticut had any part in the original decision. But his thinking does parallel it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish my comment on the Senator's remarks, and I shall then be glad to yield to him.

In 1945 the Politburo of the Communist Party met. Louis Budenz at that time was editor of the Communist Daily Worker, the official organ of the party, and as such, of course, had to know the innermost workings of that party. If he did not, he could not properly run the party's official paper. He testified that they met even before VJ-day and decided what their paramount tasks were to be. He testified that their No. 1 task was the destruction in the minds of the American people of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; that they knew that until they had accomplished that they could not accomplish their aims in the Pacific, namely, the creation of a Red Asia and a Red Pacific to wash our western shores with its communistic, atheistic erosion.

Mr. President, I may say I am very, very sorry that the Senator from Connecticut saw fit suddenly to leave the floor, but I assume he has work to do some place else.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish these comments, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The records also show that an attack upon General MacArthur was then unleashed in all its fury. It almost appeared as though they were turning back history's pages and reopening the mouth of the Cloaca Maxima in view of the amount of sewage which was spewed forth by the men of the Communist Party and the loyal camp followers. The leaders in that movement were men like Owen Lattimore, Philip Jessup, Drew Pearson, and that whole motley crew. Incidentally Pearson spearheaded the attack by the camp-following poison-pen artists. I think we should keep in mind that this is the same Jessup who took with him to Wake Island a woman whose task it was to sit behind a partition and eavesdrop and spy on Gen. Douglas MacArthur, without MacArthur knowing anything about it—a foul, dirty business.

I think we should also make the record clear at this time, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut, that both Marshall and Bradley testified that there was not a single case in which MacArthur ever failed to follow out a military order. He followed them out in every particular.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not wish to engage in a pro- or anti-MacArthur controversy, because I think the general demonstrated ample ability to take care of himself.

Mr. McCARTHY. He certainly did.

Mr. AIKEN. He has shown a commendable attitude, in view of the fact that some people have tried to use him and other people have tried to destroy him. I think he has done an excellent job in taking care of himself. But I could not help but notice the inference in the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut that General MacArthur and the Republican Party were attempting to get this country into war; that we are the war party, as I understand the Democratic spokesman to say.

As I came through the corridor a moment ago and looked at the United Press ticker, I noticed that General Bradley had told the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee this morning that our casualties in Korea had not been 65,000, but that our total casualties, battle and otherwise, were 141,000 during the past 11 months. It does not seem to me that any administration that has involved us in a situation which has brought 141,000 casualties to our country in 11 months, really has the right to charge any other political party with trying to get the Nation into war.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I think the Senator from Vermont should be corrected.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, I should be if I am wrong.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me to add to what the Senator from Connecticut said. What the Senator from Connecticut said was that the course and the policy which had been advised by General MacArthur, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, might well plunge us into a total and complete conflict in which the casualties would not be what the Senator from Vermont has listed, but might well run into millions and millions and millions. But I would also say to the Senator from Vermont, with the consent of the Senator from Wisconsin—and I thank him for his courtesy—that so far as the casualties are concerned it is important to note that 70,000 of them are nonbattle casualties.

Mr. AIKEN. Frozen feet, frozen arms, frozen legs.

Mr. McMAHON. They are nonbattle casualties; and 85 percent of those men have returned to the lines. They include men who may have had to have a tooth pulled. They include men who may have had bad colds and were temporarily disabled thereby. But 85 percent of those men are back in the line fighting. I think it is important to emphasize that fact. I think the Senator would want to have that fact pointed out. Among the 15 percent who are not back in the lines are the ones who have had frozen feet, as I understand, and that picture is bad; but I do not think the Senator from Vermont wants to exaggerate it or paint it any worse than it is.

Mr. AIKEN. No. The Senator from Connecticut has told the situation as it has come over the ticker. I do not know how many of these casualties were men who had frozen feet or frozen arms or frozen legs or anything of that nature. I expect they were all disagreeable and painful injuries. They were certainly casualties of the war. We do not know whether there would have been more or less casualties had General MacArthur been permitted to destroy the enemy's equipment at its source or at the Yalu River.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Connecticut a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will yield in a moment. First, let me comment on the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut.

I hold in my hand an article entitled "Truman Sends Denver Parley Hint of Tour." Dropping down, the article says:

> Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, Oklahoma, who keynoted the late President Roosevelt's fourth-term nomination, and who some say has Vice Presidential ideas himself, said MacArthur, Taft, Wherry, and Hoover already have pinned the "War label" on themselves.

I should like to say that one of the wars which the Republicans are trying to stop as of today is the war between Americans in the Seventh Fleet and Americans in Korea.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. In just a moment I shall.

As of today we have the most fantastic situation which this or any other nation has ever witnessed anywhere in war or peacetime. As of this very moment, as Senators know, there is an order to the Seventh Fleet providing that it shall do two things: First, make sure that Chiang Kai-shek will not bomb any of the ships carrying war materials to Communist China. Senators know that General MacArthur testified that in one short period of time $40,000,000 worth of war materials flowed through one Communist port.

The second part of the order is that the Seventh Fleet protect the long exposed southern flank of the Communists, the entire southern coast of China, from any landing by our friends the 600,000 soldiers on the island of Formosa.

Let us see what the result is. That means that if one American boy—let us say the son of Mrs. Jones—is in the Naval Reserve, and he is called back and sent

to the Seventh Fleet, his task is to protect the Communist coast line. Incidentally, Douglas MacArthur testified that our protection of the Communist coast line has released two entire Communist armies which were stationed on that coast line. As he said, elements of both those armies have been identified in Korea as of today.

Let us take Mrs. Jones' other son. Let us assume that he is drafted into the Army or the Marine Corps and sent to Korea. His task at this very moment is to fight the Communists who are being protected by his brother in the Seventh Fleet, the most traitorous, most unusual, most fantastic order that I think any Member of the Senate has ever heard of. It is a war between brother and brother, under the orders of the State Department. Any boy who is killed in Korea today with war materials shipped into Communist China since our Seventh Fleet broke the blockade of the Communist ports has had his death warrant signed and sealed by the politicians—not politicians in the Waldorf Hotel, as the Senator from Connecticut would intimate, but the politicians who are now running not only our State Department, but our armies.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Wisconsin: Is it not also true that there are certain places in North Korea itself which we cannot bomb because our own State Department countermanded a military order which called for their bombing?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was asking me a question about yielding. I missed a part of the Senator's question. I am sorry.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The question is this: Is it not also true that there are certain portions of North Korea itself, well south of the Manchurian border, which we cannot bomb because the State Department gave an order countermanding a military order to bomb them?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is definitely correct. The Senator is speaking of the town of Rashin, which is somewhere between 17 and 35 miles south of the Korean border in Korea, according to the testimony.

General MacArthur testified that Rashin is a staging point and a supply depot for the Communists. He said that every one of his senior officers, including the head of the air force, advised the destruction of the supplies and troop concentrations at Rashin, because if they did not, it would mean the death of many more Americans and other troops of the United Nations.

General MacArthur stated that that order was countermanded from Washington. General Marshall was on the stand, and with his usual bad memory, he did not know who was responsible for the order countermanding the military order. In other words, the Secretary of Defense did not know why we were not allowed to bomb important military targets within our zone of operation. He was asked why he thought they were not bombed, and he said—listen to this, Mr. President—"If you destroy those supply depots, if you break up the troop concentrations at Rashin, they perhaps could establish other supply and ammunition dumps north of the border." In other words, "Do not eat breakfast, because you may become hungry again anyway."

General Bradley came to the stand. His memory on this point was a bit better. He was asked whether or not the Joint Chiefs had urged that action or advised it. He answered "No." He said that this was a State Department order.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Purely a political order.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

In that connection, I think the Senator from Maryland is aware of the fact that when General MacArthur was on the stand he testified that when the Chinese Communists started to pour across the Yalu River in an undeclared war, he ordered his planes to bomb our half of the bridges across the Yalu, the purpose being to keep the Communists on their own side of the river where they belonged. As he said, they greatly outnumbered our men. The purpose was to keep them where they belonged and save the lives of American boys. Let me read his testimony on that point. This has not been contradicted at all. I read from page 49 of the testimony:

> As soon as we realized that the Chinese were moving across the Yalu in force as a national—as national entities, I ordered the bridges across the Yalu bombed from the Korean side, half way to the stream. That order was countermanded from Washington, and it was only when I protested violently that I was allowed to continue my original directive.

We know that during the time that order stood countermanded, Chinese Communists poured vast numbers of troops and vast amounts of military equipment across the Yalu. We know that while that order stood countermanded, and because it was countermanded, a sizable number of American boys died.

Let me, if I may, give Senators a specific example. If we multiply this case by thousands, perhaps we can better understand why General MacArthur felt that he had a duty to bring the truth to the American people even if it meant the end of his glorious military career.

Let us take the case of Bob Smith, from Middleburg, Pa. When the Communists started to pour across the Yalu Bob Smith was up at Chanjin Reservoir. He was wounded. He lay in a gutter for 3 days and nights. The Communists overran his position. He played dead. They took off his shoes and some of his clothing. Then he and some other wounded GI's crawled to a dugout or hut. A unit of Marines learned about those wounded soldiers, and slugged a bloody path through the Communist ring and rescued them.

Today Bob Smith is at home in Middleburg, Pa., but his hands and his feet are still in the hills on this side of the Yalu—a tribute to the traitorous Red Communist clique in our State Department, who have been in power ever since before the days of Yalta. I suggest that when the day comes that Bob Smith can walk, when he gets his artificial limbs, he first walk over to the State Department and call upon the great Red Dean of fashion if he is still there. He should say to him, "Mr. Acheson, I was there while MacArthur's order stood countermanded by you. I saw the Communists pour across the Yalu. I saw your agrarian reformers on horseback firing rockets at us—reincarnations of the horsemen of Genghis Khan." He should say to Acheson: "You and your lace handkerchief crowd have never had to fight in the cold, so you cannot know its bitterness."

He should say to him "You never felt the shock of bullets, so you cannot know their pain."

He should say to him, "Dean, thousands of American boys have faced those twin killers because you and your crimson crowd betrayed us."

He should say, "Mr. Acheson, if you want to at long last perform one service for the American people you should not only resign from the State Department but you should remove yourself from this country and go to the nation for which you have been struggling and fighting so long."

Mr. President, I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a short time ago the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] included me in a so-called group of politicians which has been going to the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. That was an erroneous statement. The reason I refer to it is because I wish to keep the record straight. I am not apologizing. I wish the RECORD to show that I would have liked to have if the General had invited me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should have liked to have been invited, too.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the RECORD to show that I remonstrated, and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut withdrew my name. I do not wish the RECORD to show that I am apologizing. Instead, I wish the RECORD to show that I would have liked to have gone there. I should have liked very much to have been consulted by General MacArthur. I should have liked very much to have been able to advise with General MacArthur. However, the record should be kept straight. He did not ask me to come, and therefore I did not go. I doubt if the other gentlemen were asked to come for any purpose except to discuss the situation so far as previous statements were concerned, which the General had made with reference to the campaign in Korea.

I have met General MacArthur. I met him at the airport. I talked to him at the hotel in Washington for 25 or 30 minutes, as he reviewed the situation. I heard his speech in the House Chamber. I am sure I speak for the American people when I say that the General does not need anyone to talk for him, that he does not need anyone to come to talk to him at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, whether it be the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or the Senator

from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], even though the latter Senator has given us his advice and his interpretation of politicians.

I believe the American people know that the general's program is sound. I believe the American people know that he was not guilty of insubordination, as has been charged. Therefore, the President of the United States did not use good wisdom when he removed General MacArthur from his commands. If the general had had his way, instead of the Secretary of State having his way, we would not be in the terrible war in which we are now engaged. We would not be faced with situations such as have been brought to our attention so forcefully by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], particularly such cases as that of Bob Smith and others, who have suffered because of the blunders and the floundering of an administration which is completely dizzy, as was so well shown by the cartoon in the Washington Star of 2 days ago, with its fumbling policy in the Pacific.

(At this point Mr. McCARTHY yielded to Mr. WHERRY, and, after debate, it was agreed that the fourth supplemental appropriation bill should be considered, without Mr. McCARTHY losing his right to the floor. The debate and proceedings on the appropriation bill appear in the RECORD following the conclusion of Mr. McCARTHY'S speech.)

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Returning to the subject matter which was the basis for the colloquy prior to the time the appropriation bill was injected into the speech of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin; there was the general charge made by the Senator from Connecticut about politicians consulting with General MacArthur, attempting to consult with him, I suppose, or to be consulted by him, on the politics of our program and our policies in Korea, and especially in all of southeast Asia. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin a question. While that criticism is being made, what does the Senator think and how does he feel about the fact that military men frequently are subjected to considerable supervision, at least, if not restriction, by the issuance of directive No. 10, I believe it is.

Mr. LANGER. The gag rule.

Mr. WHERRY. It is suggested that it is "the gag rule." By that I mean that those who speak for the military must clear their speeches with the administration so that what they say shall not be in direct contradiction with administration policies. I may not quote the language of the directive verbatim, but that is the sense of it.

Does not the Senator feel that on the other hand the administration is leaning over backward to carry out that order so that the military men who might speak their minds and give us the information we need are foreclosed by this gag rule from giving the American people their solid judgment about policies in the Pacific area?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator from Nebraska has raised a very important point. That I believe is one of the two important issues which have been high lighted by the MacArthur hearings. Along the line of the Senator's question, I should like to read brief excerpts from the testimony of General Bradley before the committees. I read from page 1968–A of the record of the hearings:

Senator BRIDGES. If it reaches the time in this country where you think the political decision is affecting what you believe to be basically right militarily, what would you do?

General BRADLEY. Well, if after several instances in which the best military advice we could give was turned down for other reasons, I would decide that my advice was no longer of any help, why, I would quit.

Dropping down:

Senator BRIDGES. Would you speak out, tell the American public?

General BRADLEY. No, sir.

Senator BRIDGES. Don't you think it is your duty, your loyalty to your country, to do that?

General BRADLEY. No, sir; I don't think so. I have been brought up a little differently.

Dropping down further:

Senator BRIDGES. Should not you speak out?

General BRADLEY. I would, yes, to the constituted authorities; yes.

Senator BRIDGES. But you would stop there?

General BRADLEY. Yes.

I would not be so concerned if this were only one man saying, "I feel that my duty is to the political party which is in power at the moment, whether it be Democratic or Republican." If there were only one man saying that it would not be so bad. But here is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff notifying every officer and every enlisted man that not only do they have no right to speak the truth if the truth differs from the political policies of the administration in power, but that in his opinion they have no right to speak the truth even after they have resigned, and even if they think the Nation is being wrecked by political or military decisions.

In my opinion, this is one of the most dangerous policies that has been initiated. It did not come to life only during these hearings. I hold in my hand the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 18, 1950. At that time I read into the RECORD testimony of the Secretary of the Navy on this identical point. This was after Admiral Denfeld had been broken because he dared to come down and tell the Armed Services Committee what he thought the facts were. Senators will recall that at that time he said it was a great mistake to scrap the large aircraft carrier which we were building. He said, "We shall need it some day." Incidentally, it has been proved that he was right. While we scrapped one aircraft carrier which we were building at that time and lost millions of dollars upon the contract, since the war in Korea has started we have been letting new contracts. I think the fact that he was right was only incidental to the issue involved however. The point was that because he came down and spoke the truth he was told, "You can no longer be Chief of Naval Operations."

Let me read the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy. The very able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was questioning Mr. Matthews about his concept of loyalty. Under questioning by the Senator from California this was what Matthews said. It is found on page 111 of the record of the hearings:

Secretary MATTHEWS. I am just as convinced as you are that the congressional committees should have that right.

At that time he was referring to the right to get the facts. Secretary Matthews said:

The individual should have not only the right but the duty to testify, to be absolutely sure that he will not suffer any reprisal by doing so.

So far, so good. Then he adds this:

But I also think that * * * he must be prepared, in a sense, to take the consequences.

The Secretary of the Navy is saying, "You can go before a committee and tell the truth, but if you do you must take the consequences."

What should the consequences of telling the truth be? It was made very clear that the consequence was that one would end his career in the Navy, as Admiral Denfeld did.

Let me go further. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] asked this question on page 113:

Well, then, they are all on notice here that if they do disagree, even if I or any other member of the committee asks a question, they are apt to be removed and sent, perhaps, to a less desirable or more distant post?

Secretary MATTHEWS. Whether you ask the question or not, that would be the case.

Does not that make the picture plain? The Senator from California says:

Even if I or any other member of the committee asks a question of one of your officers, and he tells the truth, he is apt to be removed and sent, perhaps, to a less desirable or a more distant post.

Secretary Matthews said:

Whether you ask the question or not, that would be the case.

Listen to this:

The important thing is that he entertains that conviction in opposition to his superior officer.

This was in January 1950. And now Marshall comes aboard and, in effect, says, "You must resign before you can differ with the politicians who are in power at the moment." Then Bradley comes along and says, "Even after I had resigned I would feel that I had no right to tell the American people the truth if the truth would show that the politicians in power were wrong."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether or not the former Secretary of Defense has ever made a statement to the American people as to the causes surrounding his requested resignation?

Mr. McCARTHY. Unfortunately, I do not think he has made such a statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator feel that if he were to make such a state-

ment it would be most revealing with respect to some of the policies of the administration?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that former Secretary of Defense Johnson, for whom I have a relatively high opinion, owes a duty to the American people, and that he should come forward and tell why he also was fired. We know that Secretary Johnson differed with Secretary Acheson. I think we can assume that whenever Johnson differed with Acheson, the odds were about 100 to 1 that Johnson was right.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. In a moment I shall be glad to yield?

While some of us have questioned Johnson's judgment at times while he was Secretary of Defense, and while I think he did some things which were not in the best interests of the Nation, I do not believe that anyone could question his Americanism. He was loyal to America, and in that respect he certainly differed from the great Red Dean of fashion.

Mr. WHERRY. I supported Louis Johnson. I was one of the first to testify for him. He is an able man. I am satisfied today that he is a great American. I am also satisfied that because he is a good soldier, possibly he has not told the American people what I think they ought to know. I only hope that such a distinguished person will come forward, now that he has resigned and has been a good soldier, and complete his duty to the people of the country by giving us his opinions and observations about what happened at the time he was asked to remove himself as Secretary of Defense.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that in the disputes which arose between the then Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, decisions were made against Louis Johnson, and the only thing left for him to do was to resign.

Let me ask one further question, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. McCARTHY. Before the Senator asks his next question, let me say that I also hold in my hand a copy of the hearings covering General Marshall's testimony. I refer to page 984. General Marshall is discussing the question of whether or not the Secretary of Defense or other high officers have the right to tell a congressional committee the truth as they see it, if it differs from what the politicians in power think should be done. He says:

> I honestly thought it was ruinous for me to come out in opposition to my Commander in Chief.

Is it possible to conceive anything like that? A man who holds that position says, "I did not talk because if I had it would have been ruinous for me." In other words, it would have ruined his career. There is a great difference between a man like Marshall and a man like MacArthur. As we all know, MacArthur put his duty to his country above that of his duty to politicians in power and above his career.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Because General MacArthur did that, along comes the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and indicts him, trying to smear and slur the general on political matters. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. McCARTHY. The smears were coming from a vast number of places. The smear started even before MacArthur decided to leave his post.

Mr. WHERRY. I can understand that perfectly. However, the point was raised by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut this morning, and he attempted to interpret it for the American people. In other words, because outstanding Americans decided to visit the general, it meant he was down in the political gutter and was mixing political medicine under the cloak of national security. Therefore, he was accused of lowering himself to that level, because he had the courage to speak his convictions. When he stated his convictions to those in power and they rejected them, he was smeared because he was taking his case to the American people.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say in that connection that it would be a great service to the Nation if the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who have been engaging in criticism of General MacArthur, would take their hats in hand and go over to the Waldorf Hotel also and sit down and learn some of the simple military facts of life. Perhaps when they came back we would have less politics on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate I did not think the day would ever come when I would have to listen to Senators, representing sovereign States, actually debating whether we, the American people, have the right and courage to defend the lives of our young men. I did not think the day would come when I would hear the height of such "jackassery" as that of a Senator saying that we are not in a war, even though we have suffered 140,000 casualties, and that a general who wanted to end the war and cut down our casualties would be accused of trying to start a war.

Mr. President, I long had a high regard for General Bradley as a general. However, General Bradley comes to the committee and says in answer to a question as to why certain things were not done, "It is the wrong enemy, the wrong time, and the wrong place." I saw that statement headlined all over the country. The intimation is, of course, that General MacArthur had picked the time, the place, and the enemy.

I do not believe the American people are so naive as to be taken in by that statement. First of all, we know that the President picked the time, upon the advice of the man who testified, General Bradley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He picked the place; he picked Korea. MacArthur testified that he was never consulted. The enemy was not picked by us. It was either picked by Red China or Red Russia. So MacArthur had nothing to do with picking either the time, the place, or the enemy.

Those are some facts that we should keep in mind.

Before I yield for another question, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to an article appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday at page A3171. It was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at the request of Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN. I shall read only the last paragraph of the article, and I recommend the reading of the entire article to every Member of the Senate. The article is written by an Australian. He says, speaking of General MacArthur:

> May all this grand record be remembered long after present points of difference in approach to the present problems in the east are in the dust. General MacArthur certainly saved more of the British Empire than did any other leader in the field. For this—apart from the larger results in world affairs—both England and Australia and I may add New Zealand and the peoples of many a Pacific island owe him an immeasurable debt of thanks.

Mr. President, I wish those who read the mouthings of the great camp following smear brigade would keep that in mind. In connection with the great smear against MacArthur we should keep in mind certain other facts also.

I have in my hand a copy of the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party. The copy I have in my hand was issued the day after the attempt was made to break MacArthur. The headline says:

> Good riddance to MacArthur—Now end the war.

And I have heard those words used time after time on the other side of the aisle.

> A tremendous feeling of gratification will be felt all over the Nation today, now that war-hungry General MacArthur has been fired.

I now go to the editorial, written by the official head of the Communist Party:

> The Communists were among the first to demand the recall of MacArthur as a menace to the American and world peace. This was a patriotic service, for which they were reviled and smeared, but events have proved them right.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an article entitled "Reds Plotted 6 Years To Get MacArthur–Out," written by the former editor of the Communist Daily Worker, and published in the New York Daily Mirror on April 23, 1951. As the former editor, of course, he was fully aware of the machinations of the Communist Party. He so testified.

The author points out that the national board of the Soviet fifth column adopted a resolution on the next tasks. He sets forth that one of the No. 1 tasks was the constant smear and attempt to deceive the American people in order to destroy Douglas MacArthur in the eyes of his countrymen, because they knew

they could not achieve their aim of a Red Pacific while Douglas MacArthur was there.

I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle are doing a great disservice to their own party when they are labeling their party as the party of whimpering and whining appeasers of communism and when they try to say that we, the American people have sunk so low that we do not dare fight back to protect the lives of our boys because if we do so some other nation might come into the war.

Mr. President, I say that when the day comes that we are afraid to fight back to protect the lives of our young men, when we adopt a policy which says we dare not win, because of groveling fear of another potential aggressor—when the American people back up that kind of policy, we as a Nation shall no longer deserve to live. I am convinced that the American people do not back that kind of whining and whimpering appeasement, which so many of my friends on the other side of the aisle want to make part and parcel of the policy of their party.

As I say, they could do a great service, not only to the American people, but to their own party, if they could only forget politics on this subject for a while and spend more time listening, not to men who say, "I would not endanger my career by telling the truth," but listening to the man who says—and I quote from Douglas MacArthur's testimony:

> I believe it is in the interest, the public interest, that diverse opinions on any controversial issue should be fully aired. I understand completely that the totalitarian and the Soviet method is entirely in contradiction to that, that they do muzzle certain segments of society. I do not believe that is the American way.

He says further:

> It seems to me that the American people are entitled to certain basic facts when it involves the lives of their sons and perhaps the future of their country. I do not believe in the gag rule.

I do not have the testimony before me, but he also testified that he spoke out because he felt the American people were entitled to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Frankly, I do not know what can be done by the Senate to repudiate the idea that military men must be gagged; that even though they are on the public payroll, they cannot tell the people of our country the truth. It would appear that not much can be accomplished along that line while we have an administration that maintains such a type of brass curtain around the Pentagon; we can only hope that such a system will be destroyed before it causes the death of this Nation.

In connection with this matter, Mr. President, I think all of us should keep in mind an item to which I have called attention before, and to which I again call attention. It is an item appearing in the publication The Sunday Compass for July 17, 1949, a Communist line paper. In it there appears an article entitled "South Korea—Another China," by the great State Department expert, Owen Lattimore. I urge that all Members of the Senate and all Members of the House of Representatives and all the people of our country generally read the article, so that all of us can better understand what goes on when members of the crimson clique get up and wave their hands and say, "We are going to fight Communists," but then sell America under the table. Listen to the traitorous modus operandi. In the article he says—and I quote it verbatim:

> The problem was how to allow them—
>
> China—
>
> to fall without making it look as if the United States had pushed them. Such a policy never succeeds completely, and critics have done their best to make the public believe that the United States did push Chiang and the Kuomintang over the cliff.

Again he says:

> The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall—but not to let it look as though we pushed it. Hence the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000.

So, Mr. President, there the treacherous, tragic picture is laid bare. The article from which I have just read, was published before the North Koreans moved into South Korea. In that article, Owen Lattimore wrote, in effect, "In order not to let the American people know that we pushed our friends behind the iron curtain, let us give the South Koreans $150,000,000."

And the State Department dutifully recommended that such a grant be made, but made sure that none of that money would be used for military aid.

On July 17, 1949, that policy was to give South Korea $150,000,000 so as to let South Korea fall, but not let it appear to the American people that the United States pushed her. However, today we find the situation has changed. Today, instead of using $150,000,000 of their own money in order to receive the American people the lives and the blood of 141,000 American men have been used, up to this date in the traitorous double deal of "Let them fall but don't let the American people know we pushed them."

Mr. President, I think it is interesting to find that although we have been repeatedly told that the casualties were only about 65,000 today General Bradley under cross examination admitted that the number of casualties is actually 141,000.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to compliment the able chairman of the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], on conducting what appears to be a fair investigation.

I may say that I think the Nation owes the people of Maryland a debt of gratitude, because if they had not acted as they did last year, instead of having DICK RUSSELL as chairman of the committee and in charge of the investigation, we would have as chairman the whitewash artist of 1950, the great Millard Tydings.

Mr. President, last of all I wish to say that again I recommend to the Senate and to the country as a whole a very close following of the two all-important issues which have been highlighted and spotlighted by the investigating committee. The first of those issues is whether the generals or the politicians will control our military operations on the field of battle. To show that the politicians have been doing that, we need only refer to General Bradley's testimony. He was asked why our armed forces could not bomb one of the military objectives in Korea—not in Russia or in China, but in Korea. He said, "The State Department has always objected to that bombing." That testimony has not been contradicted, and of course it will not be contradicted. The issue of political control of military tactics and strategy on the field of battle is also presented by part of the testimony of General Douglas MacArthur, who said—as shown on page 49:

> As soon as we realized that the Chinese were moving across the Yalu in force, I ordered the bridges across the Yalu bombed from the Korean side halfway to the stream. That order was countermanded from Washington, and it was only when I protested violently that I was allowed to continue my original directive.

Mr. President, the other issue to which I call the attention of the American people is the gag rule which is established by the Secretary of Defense, and, more clearly, by the Chiefs of Staff, when they say, "I feel that I never can and never shall tell the truth as I see it, even if the crime being perpetrated on the American people is so great that I feel I must resign my job as Chief of Staff; and even after I have resigned, I do not feel that I would have the duty to tell the American people"—which, in effect, is saying to every military man who comes before any congressional committee and is sworn to tell the truth, that unless he commits officially approved perjury and says, "I back up the political party which happens to be in power at the moment," his military career is ended.

Mr. President, the adoption of such a policy and the failure of Congress to do anything about it will, I believe, be infinitely more dangerous than anything which has occurred to the United States over the past decade.

FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin further yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to make a request of the Senator from Wisconsin. After he yields to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, will the Senator agree, provided he does not thereby lose the floor, in view of the fact that he has not even started to make the speech he intends to make, to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and to the manager of the fourth supplemental appropriation bill, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], so that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of that appropriation bill? It would be understood that the Senator from Wisconsin would be entitled to the floor upon the termination of the consideration of the fourth supplemental appropriation bill, and that he may proceed to make his speech at that time. I wonder if it would be satisfactory to the

Senator from Wisconsin to proceed in that manner.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from Tennessee how long he expects consideration of the appropriation bill will take?

Mr. McKELLAR. Only a few moments, I should think.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that the Senator from Arizona must attend a meeting at 2 o'clock.

Mr. McKELLAR. I must attend one also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is a unanimous consent request being made?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; unanimous consent would be required so that the Senator from Wisconsin may retain his right to the floor. He would be recognized immediately upon the conclusion of consideration of the appropriation bill. He would be recognized at that time to make the speech he is entitled to make at this time if he were to keep the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it contemplated that we will complete consideration of a $6,500,000,000 appropriation bill in a few minutes?

Mr. McKELLAR. I so understand. The report is unanimous on the part of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That may be. I wish to allude to one item, which is the proposed transfer of $25,000,000 to the Office of Education for the purpose of constructing school buildings on Federal property.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will have an opportunity to say whatever he wished to say.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wish to make an observation because I, too, must return to a committee meeting. Incidentally, committee meetings have been held at the rate of two a day for such a long time that one becomes a stranger to the Senate floor. However, I wish to raise the point now that the testimony with reference to the item has been meager indeed, if any at all. Furthermore, there is involved a fine question of jurisdiction and sovereignty. It may conceivably be one of the little entering wedges which finally puts the Federal Government into the field of education, and could bring about the ultimate socialization of this another activity which has been religiously guarded by the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Wisconsin yield at this time with the understanding that he will retain his right to the floor and resume his remarks at the conclusion of the Senate's consideration of the fourth supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be very glad to do so, on one condition. So as to avoid the remote possibility that some lengthy speeches may be made during the consideration of the appropriation bill, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I shall be glad to yield such time as he desires to take not to exceed 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. We hope to complete consideration of the appropriation bill by 2 o'clock.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall wish to offer an amendment to the appropriation bill. I certainly do not desire to lose any right to offer such an amendment and to speak on it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me suggest, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Arizona, that I yield such time as may be necessary to complete action on the appropriation bill, but not later than 2 o'clock. If consideration has not been completed by 2 o'clock, I shall consider yielding additional time, provided I have unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor by so doing.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] yield the floor until 2 o'clock for the purpose stated.

Mr. McCARTHY. Until not later than 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. With the understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin will be recognized at 2 o'clock and regain the floor at that time if debate on the appropriation bill should proceed beyond 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is understood. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Independent Offices—Atomic Energy Commission", on page 1, line 11, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$46,800,000" and insert "$59,323,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

OFFICE OF HOUSING EXPEDITER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, only for the payment of terminal leave, as amended by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, is changed from $1,750,000 to $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Department of Defense—Department of the Army—Finance Department", on page 2, line 16, after "Travel of the Army", to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$32,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Departmental salaries and expenses", on page 3, line 14, after "Contingent expenses", to strike out "$1,274,000" and insert "$1,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Navy", on page 3, line 19, after "Navy personnel general expenses", to strike out "$20,873,000" and insert "$20,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 11, after "*Provided further,*" to strike out "That the amount to be used for the expansion of private plants shall not exceed "$400,000,000"" and insert "That the amount to be expended on the purchase of land or the construction of buildings of any character for the expansion of private plants shall not exceed $100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Air Force—major procurement other than aircraft", on page 5, line 21, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$360,000,000" and insert "$340,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition and construction of real property", on page 6, line 3, after the word "law", to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$281,664,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not rise to oppose the amendment, at least not until I know more about it. I notice that the intention is to finance a school-construction program out of the funds appropriated to the armed services. As I have done before, I wish to call the attention of the Senate again to the great danger which lies in undertaking to finance civilian programs of government out of appropriations for the armed services. That was done quite frequently during World War II, and I think it was a dangerous procedure to follow. It can lead directly to military government.

In this case, as I have said, I am not opposing the proposed $25,000,000 appropriation for this purpose; but I wish to say that we should get away from attempting to finance any programs for health, education, highway construction, and other civilian purposes out of funds which are appropriated for the armed services. On many occasions we have seen Congress turn down requests for appropriations for worthy projects and later be confronted with the temptation to provide the funds from the appropriations for the armed services because no one questions those appropriations, particularly in time of emergency or in time of war. However, I insist that it is a dangerous procedure, and should be departed from as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I may explain that this amendment was offered in the committee by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], with the idea that within the total appropriations for the Department of Defense an amount of slack could be found to enable $25,000,000 to be used for school buildings and school facilities on Federal Government

defense installations. Of course, the facilities would not be constructed outside of those areas.

Mr. AIKEN. This amendment simply transfers $25,000,000 from the appropriations for the armed services to the appropriations for the Office of Education, as I understand.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but the fund will be available only for the construction of schools on Federal property at defense installations.

Everyone understands that by reason of the defense installations, workmen move there with their families, and thus load down the local school systems; and something must be done to provide space for the schools.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say to the Senator that I agree with his statement that something must be done in the situations which this proposal is intended to meet. However, instead of taking the money from the appropriations for the armed services and transferring it to the appropriations for the Office of Education, it seems to me this item would more properly come within the appropriations which go directly to the Federal Security Agency. I wonder why the proposal to provide $25,000,000 for this purpose happens to be made in connection with this bill, rather than in connection with the Federal Security Agency appropriation bill, which I understand is being marked up this very day and probably will be on the floor of the Senate within a few days.

Mr. HAYDEN. That issue was raised in the committee; but a majority of the committee decided that it would be possible for the Department to find $25,000,000 for that purpose out of its total appropriations. If the Senate does not wish to have that done, the Senate can reject the amendment. If the Senate approves of having that done, the Senate can dispose of the issue by adopting the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is somewhat astonishing to me to find that it is proposed that $25,000,000 of Department of Defense funds be transferred to the Office of Education. Frankly, I have not been able to find a line of testimony on that subject in the hearings.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no testimony on it in the hearings. The amendment was offered in the committee at the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Originally the Senator from Michigan suggested $50,000,000. Subsequently the committee agreed to report this amendment in the amount of $25,000,000. There is nothing in the hearings about it, but heretofore the committee has had testimony about the crowded conditions in and around defense installations and setting forth that the local communities cannot bear the expenses incident to providing school buildings in those areas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course this money would be expended under the provisions of section 204 of Public Law 815, which was passed by the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Roughly speaking, it provides that if no State revenues are available and if the facilities do not exist, the Commissioner of Education can use the fund to provide the facilities. That provision is made in rather broad language. Certainly I should like to see the authority spelled out and defined.

Therefore, Mr. President, I cannot very well agree to the adoption of an amendment of this sort, which has not been supported or fortified by any testimony.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to get a little more information from the Senator from Arizona. This proposal to transfer $25,000,000 to the Office of Education would, if adopted, result in having that amount of money used for the construction of schools on Federal property at defense installations. It seems to me the amendment does not make provision for relief of the educational agencies of States in areas where the Federal installations are so small as not to warrant the construction of schoolhouses or where the schools are not located on Government-owned property. I should like to ask the Senator what provision is made in that case—in other words, a case in which, let us say, not more than 100 families are located on a defense installation, and yet they may be located in a very small town. I have one in mind, in particular. I doubt that they want to build a schoolhouse; they cannot afford to build a schoolhouse, even with Federal aid. Yet they have a heavy burden placed upon them. What provision is made for assisting such a town?

Mr. HAYDEN. This bill does not contain any provision to meet that situation. Money for that purpose would have to be included in the regular annual appropriation bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that matter being considered?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not serve on that subcommittee, but I understand there is an additional budget estimate for all such purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Again I wish to say that I am in sympathy with the purpose of the amendment, but I think it is in the wrong place.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that Public Law 815, of the Eighty-first Congress, which is cited in this amendment, provides for aid for construction on both military installations and on projects where the schools are built by the local school districts?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct; but by this amendment we would confine this money to military installations. That would be done by means of the wording of the amendment.

Mr. CASE. There are two or three points which occur to me in connection with the legislative history of this matter. One is that heretofore, in making appropriations for the Army or for the Air Force, we have included an authorization for the Secretary of either of those Departments to make contributions, out of funds appropriated to the Department, for the purpose of paying tuition and other educational costs. The distinguished Senator will remember that in the military appropriation bill we used to have a clause authorizing them to pay $100 per pupil, and later it was increased, as I recall, to $120, and later it was increased to $140.

Mr. HAYDEN. There were varying rates of pay by various agencies. The Marine Corps paid at one rate; the Indian Service paid at another rate; and so forth.

Mr. CASE. But those payments were made for the operation of schools or for tuition.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I do not recall any instance in which we have appropriated funds in such a fashion as this for the construction of school buildings; but by means of this amendment, that is now proposed, apparently under authority of Public Law 815. However, that is only half of the authority provided by Public Law 815. If there have been no estimates of specific needs for such projects——

Mr. HAYDEN. There have not been.

Mr. CASE. And if the entire matter is to come up in connection with another appropriation bill, in order to take care of schools and school facilities which are needed off the military reservations, I do not see why the entire subject should not be treated as one at that time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to obtain a little clarification of the amendment. It reads in part as follows:

for construction of schools on Federal property at defense installations.

That would exclude military reservations, would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. The amendment would be limited strictly to ordnance plants and other construction in the nature of defense industries, would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. The idea the Senator from Michigan had in mind was that provision should be made in the case of workmen who go to defense installations, and whose children overburden the schools.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I was present both at the subcommittee hearings when the subcommittee gave consideration to this item and at the time when the full committee considered it and agreed to the so-called Ferguson amendment.

The total over-all request for educational facilities on Federal property at such defense installations was $51,000,000. Rather than allow that sum, the amendment was finally agreed to in the amount of $25,000,000; and that amendment, which is the so-called Ferguson amendment, would allow the Armed Services to take from their appropriations an amount up to $25,000,000 to be used to aid in the construction at such places of buildings for educational use.

Mr. President, the need which is sought to be met by means of this amendment is quite familiar to anyone who had the responsibility of administering the affairs of a State during World War II, when defense installations were being constructed and workmen and their families were moving to those locations. In many cases, their families had to live in trailer camps or in other

temporary living quarters; and in those areas the schools either were congested as a result of the increase in the number of children of school age, or else the local school districts could not accommodate the children of school age who thus moved into their communities.

That problem is quite familiar to all of us who served as Governors during that period and had to help meet the educational needs of our States, and had to listen to statements by the boards of education or the educational directors as to the plight of the various school districts and as to the urgent need of action being taken to relieve their problems. I know that I need only to look back in my memory to 1943, 1944, and 1945, to understand what had to be done in certain school districts in the State of Minnesota.

For that reason, I thought the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was an economy measure which would relieve the school districts in areas where great populations had gathered because of the location there of defense installations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am most happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I may point out that this provision, as written, apparently would not help the school district of a town or county, but would simply provide an appropriation for the construction of schools on federally owned property. As I understand, it would not help the local community in any way, except as it might keep the children of the workers in defense plants from their schools—and that was not the purpose of Public Law 815. The purpose of that act was to make a contribution to the locality which had to build additional educational facilities.

Mr. THYE. I may say to the very able and distinguished Senator from Vermont that this provision of the bill would have the same result if the appropriation had been made directly under the act. We have appropriated funds under section 204 of the act. I believe the very able Senator from Michigan, who is the author of the amendment, and who is now present in the Senate Chamber, can clarify the matter for the record.

Mr. AIKEN. This provision will not permit the spending of any of the $25,000,000 for anything not on Federal property. It will not permit the giving of assistance to the town, county, or city where children from the post might be attending school. I think it is a question of whether the installation is to be on Federal property.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, so far as this provision is concerned, although the net effect of the amendment is to free a corresponding amount of funds under Public Law 815 appropriations for the purposes of school construction on other than military installations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator advise us whether the funds to be expended for schools under section 202 of the bill would be for temporary buildings or permanent buildings?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator refers to section 204 of Public Law 815, I cannot describe exactly what kind of building might be erected. It would be on one kind of military installation or another.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. DWORSHAK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, since he is the author of the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was absent from the Senate Chamber when I received word that this matter was before the Senate, and I immediately returned to the floor. I am interested in this subject, and, to the best of my ability, I shall be glad to answer any questions which may be asked.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may inform the Senator from Michigan as to what has taken place thus far. There has been objection to the committee amendment, on the ground, first of all, that there is no supporting testimony in the hearings of the committee, and consequently this would constitute a transfer of already appropriated defense funds, or funds to be appropriated under this bill for school purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. We had testimony regarding this matter. I may add, in connection with the third supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But there was no testimony in the printed hearings which accompanied the bill which is before the Senate at the present time.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to make the point that, under section 202 of the law passed by the Eighty-first Congress, it is possible for communities which are charged with this educational responsibility, and which do not have facilities for these children, to share in school funds. The contributions, as I understand, will be made; but under the instant provision of the appropriation bill, the money shall be supplied according to section 204 of Public Law 815, of the Eighty-first Congress, to the Office of Education, which, under the $25,000,000 appropriation, will appraise the situation, to find out whether the facilities are available, and then, with respect to those children who are on Federal property, as I understand, the expenditure can be made. The language is rather broad, in that it provides that the Commissioner of Education can provide facilities. How far are we going to go with this program, and what is the testimony on the subject?

Mr. FERGUSON. In the third supplemental appropriation bill we appropriated $50,000,000 for the purposes of Public Law 815. A request was made on the floor for another $50,000,000. A vote was taken, and the request was rejected. The Senator from Michigan felt that it was rejected because another appropriation of $50,000,000 was pending in the regular 1952 appropriation bill. Testimony presented in connection with the third supplemental appropriation showed the need for Public Law 815 funds. It also showed that a substantial portion of the funds appropriated to the Office of Education under Public Law 815 was being drained off, in accordance with a section of the law, for purposes of school construction on military installations. This resulted in a reduction of the funds available for school construction in federally impacted areas, other than on military posts. In offering this amendment we felt that the cost of the schools which are to be built on military installations could be absorbed, at least in part, from the appropriations to the Military Establishment. In effect, we would thereby be adding $25,000,000 to the Public Law 815 fund, by taking it out of the military budget.

There is no doubt in the mind of the Senator from Michigan that if this item is allowed, it will save the taxpayers $25,000,000. If disallowed, this $25,000,000 will be used within the Defense Establishment for some other purpose which is not an absolute necessity to our defense. Another $25,000,000 will also be spent through the Office of Education for the construction of school buildings on military installations under Public Law 815. In short, the sum will be spent twice. We propose that it be spent only once, by requiring the military to transfer the money to the Office of Education and not permit the Defense Department to spend it for some other purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the Senator will admit that there will be no saving, because, whether it is spent by the Federal Government or by the States is merely a matter of sixes and sevens. Someone will be required to pay it, and it will be the taxpayer.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt in the mind of the Senator from Michigan that it will be necessary that we build school buildings on some of the fields, particularly the air fields. For one thing, certain of the States do not allow the erection upon Federal property of a school building or any other building. Various air fields are being built, and we should consider the number of Federal employees, including personnel in the armed services, who will be sent to the various installations. It is for the purpose of educating those children that the schools will be built. That was a provision of Public Law 815, and an obligation assumed under that act. There will be a saving, because we would require the military to put up $25,000,000 of the money for that purpose instead of appropriating for it directly.

When we were considering the third supplemental appropriation bill, one of the reasons advanced for voting against the additional $50,000,000 for school construction—and the Senator from Michigan voted against it—was that further action should await the regular 1952 appropriation bill. I feel that by requiring this transfer from the military funds we are accommodating at least a part of the request for additional appropriations under Public Law 815 that we are going to receive later. The point is that in addition to any other aid for school construction under Public Law 815, we have to build these schools which are on the military installations. The Senator from Michigan is not in favor of Federal education, and the purpose is not to have

Federal education. There are certain types of military installations—and I shall try to get them for the Senator—which require the education of the military personnel assigned to various posts. If the United States Government will erect the school building, then the States will be able to man the school buildings, in order that we may educate the children.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to point out that the time factor here calls for a transfer before August 31.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the bill has to be approved and has to be signed by the President. Finally, it will be necessary to make an allocation of the funds, after which will come the transfer.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The school sessions begin in the first week of September. If we assume that they use all the time allowed under this bill, they will have but a few days before the beginning of the school sessions within which the transfer of funds is to be accomplished.

I am conscious of the fact that they may have made their preparations and plans before that time; but the language provides the appropriation for the construction of schools; it does not say anything about augmenting an existing school; it does not provide for repairing old buildings. If it is for the construction of school facilities, there is not such a hurry that it cannot await a little more consideration.

Mr. FERGUSON. It will wait if we strike it out of the bill, but the funds will be used by the military for other purposes, some of which are nonessential, and we shall have to appropriate later for this particular item.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask, at that point, if there are in the bill funds which are going to be used for nonessential purposes, whether some member of the subcommittee can point out the provisions, so that I shall have the distinct pleasure of voting against such funds.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois realizes that when we are appropriating billions of dollars there is always fat. That is something we all know. But the Senator and I cannot locate the fat, even though we may try, no matter how sharp our eyes and our glasses may be, so that it may be stricken out. Nor do we have a knife capable of taking it out. I am being very frank with the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Inasmuch as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is going to offer an amendment in a little while, I shall be glad to wait until we have considered his amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. What the Senator has stated corroborates what many of us have felt about military appropriations, namely, that they contain a great deal of fat. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan can give us any estimate as to how much fat there is besides the $25,000,000 which he seems to feel is lying around and can be picked up very easily.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot advise the Senator from Missouri exactly where the fat is. Much as I regret the necessity of the admission, I frankly cannot put my finger on it. I am satisfied that no man or no group of men making up the budgets can ask for and have appropriated $40,000,000,000—and next year it will be $60,000,000,000—without some fat being contained in the amount. The Senator and I cannot locate it, or at least all of it.

We tried to and we did remove some fat. Let us take the item of garbage trucks, for example, for which appropriations are to be made. They will cost approximately $12,000 each. We felt there was some fat involved in that item, because garbage trucks for the city of Washington, D. C., cost approximately $6,000 apiece. The Air Force says it is necessary to have $12,000 trucks. They want trucks for refuse collections, and such a truck would cost $12,109. A garbage truck would cost $8,500. The Air Force wants 201 garbage trucks and 193 refuse trucks.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the difference between refuse and garbage?

Mr. FERGUSON. One difference is the cost—$4,000 on each truck. Ever since I have been a Member of the Congress I have advocated a staff for the Appropriations Committee to ascertain where the fat is located in the appropriations. The Appropriations Committee is doing the best it can, but, in my opinion, it does not have the necessary staff. Here is a point at which we could save thousands of dollars by having a staff which could ascertain all the facts with reference to these particular trucks.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator believe that when Congress is considering the matter of refuse, it should put the accent on the second syllable more often?

Mr. FERGUSON. I concur wholeheartedly.

I am informed that a garbage truck in Washington costs $7,500. I thought it was $6,000. A trash truck costs $6,000. There is a difference of only $1,500, but it is a difference of $4,000 when the Air Force figures it.

We have tried on a number of occasions to single out particular items for reduction which will illustrate the fat. I could cite one item in a bill soon to come up for consideration which provides for meals for students who come to this country. It involves enormous sums of money, at least for the designated purposes. It will take approximately 102 taxpayers to pay for the meals, such as banquets and entertainment, for those students who are coming. I shall use the figures in some future remarks. I think the cost is in the neighborhood of $8 or $9 for an individual meal. Those are items that can be singled out.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is that for military meals?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it is in the State Department appropriation bill, which will come up later. I cite the garbage trucks as evidence that we knew there was some fat involved in this bill. We took $20,000,000 out of this appropriation on the basis of demonstrated facts with regard to the garbage trucks.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What the distinguished Senator has been saying is known to everyone who has ever worked on a military appropriation bill. It is difficult to find the fat which exists. The evidence is written in the record of the rescissions which have been made on prior appropriation bills. Time after time we have found that all the money was not needed.

I have written an amendment, which I mentioned a moment ago, which goes directly to the problem which the Senator has described. If I may, I should like to read it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should appreciate it if the Senator would do so.

Mr. CASE. I propose to insert another section, which would act directly on the principle which is here proposed in the matter of authorizing the Secretary of Defense to take out some of the fat and apply it to a project. The amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 203. There is hereby rescinded 5 percent of the gross amount of funds appropriated in this act to the Department of Defense, and that amount is hereby reappropriated to the Treasury of the United States for payment on a reduction of the national debt.

Mr. President, that proceeds upon the theory that there is fat in military appropriations, and that it is difficult to put our fingers on it. It proceeds upon the fact discovered by the very distinguished Representative from the State of Michigan, whom the Senator from Michigan knows very well, Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL, who, when he was chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with the Department of Defense, proceeded on the theory that it was possible to save up to 10 percent. I recall very well what he told me on one occasion, that someone had admitted that there was not any part of the Department of Defense that could not take a 10-percent cut.

I realize that it is difficult to cut military appropriations, and it is difficult to put one's finger on the fat. The language of my amendment proposes that 5 percent be rescinded and be appropriated for application on the national debt. It provides that the Secretary shall find a saving of 5 cents on the dollar.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan agrees that in his opinion 5 percent can be deducted out of these funds without affecting national security. Last year the Senator from Michigan joined the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Virginia and other Senators in urging a 10-percent cut in the general supply bills. We were satisfied the various agencies could still operate with that amount of cut. What did we find? I will say it was not a 10-percent cut which eventuated. It was a cut of a little more than $500,-

000,000, one-half billion dollars. When we did that there was screaming from the various housetops of the agencies that the agencies would be destroyed. What happened? Not only did the President take out the one-half billion dollars, but he took out——

Mr. CASE. Sixty million dollars more, I think it was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Will the Senator from Michigan suspend for a moment? The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous consent agreement previously entered into, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield so I may address a question to him?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator from Wisconsin yield 30 more minutes for consideration of the appropriation bill, or would he prefer to proceed with his statement?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I have some remarks to make which will take about 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan would be glad to return later to continue the discussion which has just taken place.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The bill which has just been discussed involves $6,500,000,000. I certainly would not want to limit discussion of that bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

Mr. MCCARTHY. On the other hand, if it will inconvenience the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is in charge of the bill, or if it will disrupt committee hearings if I do not yield, I shall be glad to yield another half hour, if we may have any assurance whatever that proceedings will then be concluded. I am inclined to think, however, that it will require more than half an hour to complete action on the appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I withdraw the request. I think the way to facilitate matters is to permit the Senator from Wisconsin to conclude his remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment to complete my statement?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amount we authorized to be deducted was $550,000,000, instead of $500,000,000. The amount the President took out over and above the $550,000,000 as fat was $30,000,000 more. So we have demonstrated that not only could $550,000,00 be taken out from the agencies, but that a further sum of $30,000,000 could be taken out. I will have something to say about the fund a little later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for about 3 minutes? I want to make a comment in relation to the statements which have been made, particularly by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming for 3 minutes, if I may have unanimous consent that I shall not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall have to object unless I can be assured that the Senator will take only 3 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from North Dakota can hold his watch on me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from South Dakota that the House committee in reporting the bill accompanied it with a report in which it was specifically declared that in the opinion of the House committee the funds carried in the bill were essential to enable the three agencies of the Department of Defense to carry on essential programs in the procurement of material and equipment and the inducting of men into the armed services. The members of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate went over the items with the greatest care. We scrutinized the various figures. We made several reductions. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], which was adopted by the committee, was for the purpose of making an additional reduction.

We had a letter from the Secretary of Defense pointing out that the money is needed, and needed quickly. The fiscal year ends on the 30th of June, scarcely 5 weeks away. Unless this money is made available we are in danger of preventing the continuous procurement of items.

I earnestly ask the Senator to withhold his amendment until the bill for 1952 comes to the Senate. I give him the assurance that the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has already notified the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense, and all who are concerned in the three services that we intend to go over the 1952 appropriation with a fine tooth comb. We are assured in a letter we have received that in order to prevent an interruption of procurement the bill should be passed.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for having yielded to me.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. MCCARTHY. For what length of time?

Mr. CASE. For about a minute.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield if I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin may yield to the Senator from South Dakota, and the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that I appreciate the assurance he has given us that the members of his subcommittee will go over the proposals for the regular budget with a fine tooth comb, but the evidence, as the committee knows, that that is not effective in dealing with large sums, of millions of dollars, is found in sections 201 and 202 of the pending bill. In section 201 it is provided that the money, unless specifically made available until expended, shall not be so available, recognizing that military appropriations characteristically and chronically carry large round figures, and that if the sums appropriated are available until expended the result always is that in the future either there is money to be rescinded or projects have been included which could have been curtailed or money could have been saved.

The additional section 202 recognizes, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan said, that there is fat in the bill, and that we are proposing to recover $25,000,000 of it by letting it be used for school buildings. My suggestion is that the committee say to the defense agencies, "Save a nickel on a dollar." Anyone who has worked on military appropriations knows that that can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all the discussion on the appropriation bill appear in the RECORD after my remarks, in view of the fact that I made some remarks before discussion of the appropriation bill began.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Mr. MCCARTHY resumed and concluded his speech, which appears continuously on previous pages of the RECORD.)

FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

After the conclusion of Mr. MCCARTHY's speech,

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 6, beginning in line 19.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Jenner
Anderson	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Bennett	Ellender	Johnson, Tex.
Benton	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Brewster	Flanders	Kefauver
Bricker	Frear	Kem
Bridges	Fulbright	Kerr
Butler, Md.	George	Kilgore
Butler, Nebr.	Hayden	Knowland
Byrd	Hendrickson	Langer
Cain	Hennings	Lodge
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Long
Carlson	Hill	Magnuson
Case	Hoey	Malone
Chavez	Holland	Martin
Connally	Humphrey	Maybank
Cordon	Hunt	McCarran
Dirksen	Ives	McCarthy

McClellan	Nixon	Sparkman
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Stennis
McKellar	Pastore	Taft
McMahon	Robertson	Thye
Millikin	Russell	Tobey
Monroney	Saltonstall	Underwood
Moody	Schoeppel	Welker
Morse	Smathers	Wherry
Mundt	Smith, Maine	Wiley
Murray	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Neely	Smith, N. C.	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which met in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 6, line 19.

Mr. DIRKSEN and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, may I be recognized to speak on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement on the amendment. I believe I am familiar with the situation in the State of Kansas, at least in connection with schools on and surrounding military reservations and defense areas. I should like to support the amendment, but I do not believe it takes care of a situation which I think is a real problem in my State, and, I am sure, in every other State. The amendment is limited to construction of schools on Federal property at defense installations. I may not correctly understand the language of it, but my idea is that it would deal only with new installations on Federal property.

As I understand, we could build school buildings on this Federal property, but after the buildings were constructed the State of Kansas could not furnish teachers, custodial help, or vote funds for maintenance and fuel. It seems to me the bill should be amended so as to provide that the communities in the area should have these funds, and then they could take care of the school situation in the particular areas involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator was asked what the money could be used for. I should like to read section 204 of Public Law 815:

CHILDREN FOR WHOM LOCAL AGENCIES ARE UNABLE TO PROVIDE EDUCATION

SEC. 204. In the case of children who reside on Federal property—

(1) if no tax revenues of the State or any political subdivision thereof may be expended for the free public education of such children; or

(2) if it is the judgment of the Commissioner, after he has consulted with the appropriate State educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children, the Commissioner shall make such arrangements for constructing or otherwise providing school facilities as may be necessary for the education of such children. To the maximum extent practicable school facilities provided under this section shall be comparable to the school facilities provided for children in comparable communities in the State. This section shall not apply (A) to children who reside on Federal property under the control of the Atomic Energy Commission, and (B) to Indian children attending federally operated Indian schools. Whenever it will be necessary for the Commissioner to provide school facilities for children residing on Federal property under this section, no local educational agency shall be entitled to receive payment under section 202 with respect to the attendance of such children.

That will indicate to the Senator what we are aiming at in this committee amendment to the pending bill. Funds for constructing school facilities on military installations in accordance with this law would be made available from military appropriations.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the information furnished by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I was trying to interpret this section to read for the construction of schools only on Federal property, or on Federal property at defense installations, which I presume would have to be operated by the Federal Government. In other words, if there was an ordnance plant in a State, with literally hundreds of workers coming into that particular section, a school could not be constructed there because the Federal Government would not be operating it; it would be operated by a private agency.

Mr. FERGUSON. That would not be covered by the section I have read at all. The idea was to take money which had already been appropriated, or was being appropriated, to the national defense, so it might be used for the purpose of erecting school buildings on federally operated defense plant properties, in accordance with section 204 of the law, which I have just read into the RECORD.

Section 204 does not apply to a place such as the Willow Run plant in Michigan. There a large industrial plant was built by the Government—nontaxable property, of course. A great many people came there to work and to live, some living in privately owned houses and some in publicly constructed houses. The impact of this activity surrounding the federally constructed plant was terrific and completely overburdened local school facilities. That situation is covered by section 202, whereby the Federal Government assumed some responsibility for assisting in the construction of needed school buildings. But that does not apply to what we are now discussing, at least directly.

The $50,000,000 we have already appropriated in the third supplemental appropriation bill covers that kind of building, but from that appropriation there must also be taken money for section 204, the construction on military posts. If we take the money out of this large pending appropriation—I am satisfied the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force can take it out—and make it available under section 204 of Public Law 815, we will not have to appropriate the same amount later. It will be spent for the purpose set forth in the section and no other, although it has the collateral effect of freeing a like sum for section 202 purposes from funds already appropriated.

Mr. CARLSON. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question? Is it his thought that should the fund be voted and buildings constructed on defense installations, local States and communities could supply these schools with teachers and maintain the schools?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is the purpose of it. The various State laws provide that the States cannot tax the people for constructing buildings at these places, but they can actually furnish the teachers, and do furnish the teachers in all but, I think, about three States. My memory does not serve me what the States are. The State of Kansas may be one of them.

Mr. CARLSON. My judgment is that Kansas would be one of them, because I do not see how any local tax moneys could be raised from the surrounding communities, and I do not believe the State would be in a position to furnish teachers and maintenance for these schools.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his explanation, but I still say that I am not satisfied that the provision takes care of the situation, which is acute in many areas in my State and other States of the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the last committee amendment, on page 6, beginning in line 19. [Putting the question.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask for a division.

On a division the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. KERR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I withdraw that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we have not yet completed the committee amendments, have we?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The last committee amendment was just acted upon.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have another amendment from the committee to offer. I have been directed by the committee to offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield for that purpose?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota has no objection to the consideration of all the committee amendments

first, which is the proper order of procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bonneville Power Administration

Construction

For an additional amount for "Construction," $3,672,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HAYDEN. This matter was considered by the committee. It relates to the development of aluminum in the Northwest, in the State of Washington. The Aluminum Co. of America has entered into a firm contract with a power company, a local utility, and the Bonneville Power Administration. The major expenditures are to be made by other agencies, but the $3,672,000 is required properly to connect the Bonneville Power lines with the aluminum plant.

The committee heard testimony as to the relative cost of producing aluminum there, and in Louisiana, and it develops that it can be produced in less time—it is very badly needed—and at less cost in that area than elsewhere. Therefore, the committee was satisfied that the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was there a budget estimate for the $3,672,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SECTION 203. There is hereby rescinded 5 percent of the gross amount appropriated to the Department of Defense in this act and that amount is hereby reappropriated to the Treasury.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in view of the action taken on the committee amendment, the section I have offered should be numbered 202, and should appear at line 19 on page 6 of the bill. The numbering I gave was in contemplation of the committee amendment as it appears in the printed bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be corrected accordingly.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this amendment seeks to do something about the much-discussed fat in military appropriations. During the discussion of the committee amendment the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] repeatedly alluded to the fat which exists in military appropriations, and the very great difficulty which any Member of Congress has in putting his finger on this place or that place when we are dealing with such large appropriations, and determining the amount of money which might be withheld.

In addition to the difficulty because of the large sums involved, there is the fact that whenever there comes before the Congress a bill carrying military appropriations or money for national defense, the average Member is reluctant to do anything about it. In the first place, he does not want in any sense to lessen the support which is necessary for carrying on military operations. We all agree that national security is essential to the Nation.

This amendment, therefore, was one about which I thought a great deal before I offered it. It represents an attempt to make it possible to provide every penny which is needed for any particular or given project, but to say that the Defense Department shall, in its operations, save 5 cents on the dollar. It is my firm conviction that the Defense Department can save 5 cents on each dollar of the money which is appropriated for it.

During a rather long period of service on the Appropriations Committee of the House, and on the subcommittee dealing with the Army and Air Force, as well as the deficiency subcommittee, where appropriations for the Navy were involved, it became my conclusion that the Defense Department and its subdepartments dealt many times with projects for which no exact cost estimate was possible. I came to the conclusion that it is possible to save money, and that defense budgets are no more sacred than any other, and must not be regarded as infallible in their computation, any more than budgets for other agencies of the Government.

The problem is this: We do not want to cripple any particular project which is necessary. The problem has two phases. One phase directs itself to the contracts which the Government may let at an excessive price, or with respect to which excessive profits are realized, either by reason of the fact that the Government may provide some of the tools for the job, or because it is a new project and the contracting company does not have any experience, and after it gets experience it finds that it is possible to produce a given article for less than the original estimates. When a company goes into the production of a new article, it must allow itself plenty of leeway.

From the study of the first problem, we developed the renegotiation procedures under which we operated during most of World War II. The renegotiation amendment was an amendment offered to the sixth supplemental defense bill in 1942. It was attacked at first because it was said that it was impossible to administer. However, it was demonstrated that it was possible to bring about renegotiations. The renegotiation procedure was credited in World War II with having saved more than $10,000,000,000 in direct recaptures by the Government, in addition to economies and savings from forward pricing on new jobs.

Renegotiation has been approved by this Congress, and has been applied to procurement for defense agencies and affiliated agencies of the Government in the current conflict. Renegotiation applies only to contracts which are let by the Government and which result in excessive profits. Renegotiation is directed to excessive profits in connection with expenditures with respect to which savings can be made at the expense of the person or corporation that otherwise would realize excessive or inordinate profits.

This amendment seeks to go to the other phase of wasteful military expenditures or unnecessary military expenditures. It seeks to bring some pressure to bear upon the Defense Establishment itself, so that in its allocations and its contract expenditures it may be induced to save some money.

As I mentioned during the colloquy with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], during a hearing which was being conducted by Representative ENGEL when he was chairman of the subcommittee handling military appropriations in the House, he asked a particular agency if it was not possible to save 10 percent on its total budget. First the representatives of the agency demurred, but as they came to discuss the question and go into it, they agreed that practically every branch of the Defense Establishment, if it really wanted to save, could save 10 percent. I have heard Mr. ENGEL say on the floor of the House many times that any Government agency could save 10 percent. This amendment does not propose a saving of 10 percent. It suggests a saving of only 5 percent.

Proof of the fact that a saving can be accomplished in this way is found in the many rescission bills which Congress has passed from time to time. We have been giving the Defense Establishment the money it asks, and then when it is unable to expend it all, after a few years we ask for a list of the unexpended balances. We find a list of unexpended balances—so many hundred thousand dollars in this project, so many millions here, and so many millions there. Congress has recaptured that money by rescission bills, but that comes too late—although better late than never in this instance. However, it comes after the particular branch of the Defense Establishment has had free range within the total amount of the appropriation, and finally, after 2, 3, 4, 5, or even 6 years, it finds that it is unable to expend all the money allocated or appropriated for the particular project. We have sought to recapture the money by rescission bills. Had I known that this bill was coming up this afternoon, or had the facilities been available to me, I would have made available to the Senate this afternoon a list of the various rescission bills which have been passed by Congress since 1945, showing the amounts involved.

Many Members of the Senate must recall that at one time the national debt was up to about $276,000,000,000. The fact that it was brought down to less than $260 000,000,000 was due primarily to the passage of the rescission bills. I remember one rescission bill which carried something more than $11,000,000,000. Those rescission bills were accomplished partly, it is true, by reason of the fact that some contracts could be canceled or terminated after the shooting had stopped in World War II. However, in a great many instances rescissions were accomplished with respect to unexpended balances in items for which there was no necessity to make the expenditure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire merely to make one comment. The reduction of the national debt from $277,000,000,000, which was the figure when the shooting ended, to $257,000,000,000, was due entirely to the application upon the national debt of $20,000,000,000 which had been raised by the last bond drive just before Japan surrendered. The recission bills which were afterward passed represented the recission of appropriations which had not been expended, and obligations which had not been made, and which, therefore, had not gone into the national debt.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. I think the statement of the Senator from Wyoming is correct. If I said what I had in mind, I do not think there is any particular conflict between what I said and what the Senator from Wyoming has said. The $20,000,000,000 which was raised by the sale of additional bonds, which made possible the reduction of the debt, was raised in anticipation of the cash demands for the contracts which had been proposed and which were outstanding. I am sure the record will show that more than $11,000,000,000 worth of rescissions were made on the basis of canceled contracts, and contracts which did not need to be completed. We passed a law dealing with the termination of contracts, and provided funds for the settlement of contracts which were terminated in advance of the deliveries contemplated by the contracts.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is a little disturbed about the particular approach to a reduction. I am fully conscious of the fact that unquestionably there is a great deal of what we might term fat in appropriations of this character. On the other hand, as the Senator from South Dakota has already pointed out, by reason of renegotiation a vast sum of money which had been appropriated during World War II was taken back into the Treasury. We have on the statute books a renegotiation act which will be applicable to all defense items.

In view of the fact that at this time there are so many contracts outstanding which are of the negotiated class, in which a figure must be set, and it is not known by either contracting party whether the amount set is a reasonable figure, and the costs of the work, and the like, cannot be reasonably known in advance, would it not be the part of wisdom at this time, when we are hurriedly attempting to get our defense house in order, to accept the figure which the committee has recommended, and rest in the knowledge that in renegotiation we can recover if there has been an excess payment, at the same time not imperiling the defense program by leaving in what might turn out to be an inadequate amount with which to make a contract at this time, because of lack of knowledge as to the amount necessary?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Oregon has raised the question, because he makes clear the need for a wider understanding of two phases of military expenditures. Renegotiation applies to a contract which is let. It makes possible a recapture after a contract has been let. It goes to the excessive profits which may accrue within a contract. However, renegotiation by its very nature does not place any strings or inhibitions upon the Defense Establishment itself in making a contract.

As a matter of fact, it says in effect to the Defense Department: "You can be a little more careless so far as the amounts in the contracts are concerned, because we have the renegotiation clause in them, which gives you the opportunity to go into the companies' books and audit them in order to determine what are allowable costs." Therefore, it says to the Defense Department: "Go ahead and operate in a hurry and do what you think is necessary, because you can recapture the money."

Mr. President, it does not place any halter upon the Defense Establishment itself in the making of contracts or in direct expenditures by the Military Establishment. That is why, in attempting to find some way to get at this other phase of economy, it is necessary to establish in the Defense Department the procedure which the amendment proposes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I have not worked the matter out mathematically, but only by rough calculation, but if I am correct, the Senator's amendment would mean a rescission of $350,000,000.

Mr. CASE. Three hundred and twenty million dollars, I estimate.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator's figure must be more accurate than mine. $320,000,000 out of $6,000,000,000?

Mr. CASE. Six billion four hundred and seventy-nine million dollars, according to the budget estimates.

Mr. CORDON. In view of the fact that the reductions in the civilian budget have approximated a little less than that, in which case there is no recapture provision, it seems to me we would be cutting rather deeply into the defense figure if we were to cut it by 5 percent.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. At this point, with the Senator's permission, I should like to read two paragraphs from a letter written by a soldier on duty in the United States. He says:

> A great deal could be done to cut fat out of the military budget. I see many things which make me sick. It would be interesting to know how many millions are being spent for Armed Forces Day throughout the world. The other day the post engineer remarked to me how many thousands he had already spent in getting ready for the celebrations. Then he said, "I wonder if it's worth it. I think the people of this country know we have an army." There is a great deal of truth in that. Lip service is given to economy for this celebration, but it will cost a tremendous sum throughout the world. Is there really any good reason for it? I don't remember much about it during the war. We may have had Army Day, but if we did we just had a parade and a few speeches and let go at that. This thing will be a three-ring circus. Planes will fly overhead, and exhibits will be opened by most of the sections.
>
> Another thing which disturbs me is the rush to spend money before the end of the fiscal year. They act as if it would be a crime to have anything left at the end of the fiscal year to turn back. The argument is that if anything is left next year's appropriation would be cut down and we might need it and could not get it. I am spending a few hundred dollars which is probably really not essential, but which will increase our service substantially.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the contribution which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Utah. I would provide a pocketbook for the Defense Establishment, in which they could put the money, so that it would not burn a hole in their pockets. As they saw the deadline for the availability of funds approaching, they could put the money where it could safely go, namely, into the Treasury of the United States.

The average Member of Congress finds it very difficult to apply any kind of yardstick to military appropriations. He does not wish to hurt such appropriations or the allocation of funds. I do not. The amendment is drawn with the object of saying to the Defense Department, "We have not touched the amounts reported by the committee so far as specific allocations are concerned. With reference to a particular item, you can use for it the total amount that is allocated for the project. However, as to the total amount of funds available to the Department of Defense, somewhere along the line you shall pick up the dollars you do not need and save enough of them so that you can return to the Treasury 5 cents on the dollar of the total amount made available."

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If it were not so tragic it would be amusing to hear some of the speeches which are now being made on the floor of the Senate by Senators who are in favor of economy. All of a sudden they want to economize. The very Senators who dished out billions upon billions upon billions of dollars suddenly want to take it out of the hides of the poor people of this country. The appropriation now under consideration is a typical example. In connection with this appropriation it is proposed to save a nickel out of every dollar.

I refer, for example, to the loan to England, amounting to $3,750,000,000. Where were the Senators then who are now shouting for economy? We were told, "The loan is going to be repaid. The sterling bloc is going to be opened up. Everything is going to be fine." Instead of that, England used the money to put over the socialistic system of government they have there at the present time.

I wonder if my distinguished friend from South Dakota knows, for example, just what the Marshall plan has meant to South Dakota. There are approxi-

mately the same number of people in South Dakota as there are in the State of North Dakota. I hold in my hand a table which shows what the Marshall plan has cost Adams County, N. Dak. Adams County adjoins South Dakota.

Adams County in 1940 had a population of 4,664 people. What did it cost the farm families of Adams County, where there were 1,000 farm families? Their share of the cost of the Marshall plan was $1,455,821. That was just for the Marshall plan, alone; it did not include any of the $3,750,000,000 which was given to Britain, and it did not include the other funds which we sent abroad.

I have before me a breakdown in regard to the foreign aid given by the United States. These figures were prepared by the research section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The figures include all foreign aid between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, including loans, property credits, advances, relief and rehabilitation funds, and authorizations from lend-lease grants, the International Bank, and the International Fund. The total amount of those funds which were given to foreign countries by the United States between July 1, 1945, after World War II was entirely over, and June 30, 1947—a period of approximately 2 years—was $24,099,211,087. I wish to repeat that figure for the benefit of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who at that time was not a Member of the Senate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. President, as I said, I wish to repeat that figure. It is $24,099,211,087. That is what the Senate voted for. My distinguished friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was not a Member of the Senate at that time, nor was my distinguished friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], nor were some of the other Senators who are now Members of this body. Only a very small group of the present Members of the Senate were then Members of the Senate and voted against those terrifically large appropriations.

In this connection let us consider the largest city in the State of North Dakota, Fargo. In 1940, Fargo had a population of 32,580. Do you know, Mr. President, what the debt under the Marshall plan, of the city of Fargo is? It is $10,169,521—more than $10,000,000 for that city; and for the county in which Fargo is located, Cass County, the debt under the Marshall plan is $16,496,286.

In North Dakota we have a small county called Oliver. In Oliver County there is a small village known as Center Village. It has a population of 509 people; and their share of the Marshall plan is $158,879.

Mr. President, what was involved in the Ferguson amendment? In my opinion, Indians, more than any other persons, were involved, because the Indians of North Dakota are affected by the entire Missouri River Basin project. A number of Indians live in North Dakota and a number of Indians live in South Dakota. There are Indians at Standing Rock, and they will be flooded out. I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who can name a single treaty which ever has been kept by the white men with the Indians. Time and time again on this floor I challenged former Senator Thomas of Oklahoma, who was Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, to name just one treaty ever made with the red men by the white men that was kept. He was unable to name one.

Mr. President, by means of the Ferguson amendment, $25,000,000 would have been appropriated for school purposes or for school construction purposes. The other day when the Third Supplemental Appropriation bill was before us, I voted for the $100,000,000 item which was proposed for school purposes. Only $50,000,000 was finally allowed, although we asked for the entire $100,000,000.

During the last war more than 600,000 American boys were rejected for service in the Military Establishment of our country because they could not read or write, and almost an equal number were rejected because of poor health, due to malnutrition or heaven knows what. Because of both reasons, over a million of our boys were rejected for service in the Military Establishment.

Mr. President, so long as I am a Member of the Senate, whenever I feel that the Indians or other persons who live in projects which the Federal Government takes over, need help by way of proper facilities, I certainly am going to vote for it for them.

This matter reminds me of an interview about which I read in the newspapers last night. The interview was given by the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. According to the newspaper account, he said, "I am in favor of a 6.9 percent increase"—in other words, less than 7 percent, as I recall, although he may have favored an increase of 7 percent plus—"in the pay of the Federal employees."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from North Dakota introduced a bill to increase the salaries of the Federal employees 17 percent. That is the very least that should be done. The statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island, to which I have referred, was made by him individually; he did not make the statement as chairman of the subcommittee, but gave only his individual views, as he had a right to do. He frankly said that he did not know what the other two members of the subcommittee would do.

Mr. President, it has been almost 2 years since postal employees and other Federal Government workers received an increase in their wages. However, the last salary increase they received was not so large as to make a further increase unnecessary. On the contrary, since the last increase was made in the wages of postal employees and other Federal employees, prices and living costs have risen and risen. In terms of dollars and cents, the 1949 wage increase was $120 per employee annually, or $10 a month.

I call attention to the fact that in recent years not a single pay increase for Federal employees has come under a Democratic administration. Those employees had to rely upon the Republicans in the case of every wage increase they received.

The late President Franklin Roosevelt talked a great deal about, "We shall help the undernourished and underprivileged one-third of the population"; but, Mr. President, do you realize that the Federal Government employees did not receive a pay increase from March 1925 until 1945, 20 years later, and 13 years after the Democrats took over? Why did the Federal employees receive a wage increase then? They received it because some of them were virtually starving to death. I took some of the testimony in that connection. We found that one family with four children were getting one pound of butter a month; and when we asked the mother of that family about the amount of meat they were getting, we found they were not getting beefsteak or chicken, but were getting hamburger once a week.

Mr. President, in North Dakota, where I come from, hamburger is real meat. Where I come from, we take meat and press it together and make a hamburger sandwich, and we have some real meat between the two slices of bread. However, this lady said the hamburger she bought once a week in Washington was so poor that her children had to eat it with a spoon. It was like soup; the amount of meat in it was so small that it would not even stick together. That is the testimony which was presented to us at that time.

Finally we succeeded in securing a small pay increase for those employees. But, Mr. President, do you know what happened almost as soon as that pay increase was given the Federal employees in 1945? Ten days after that pay increase was given the Federal employees an Executive order doing away with overtime for Federal employees was issued.

In the meantime the income tax was raised. It was raised on people in the extremely low brackets. The result was that these poor people had less money to take home than they had before we passed the pay-increase law. Instead of giving them the $10 a month increase which they got in 1949—and mind you, Mr. President, the senior Senator from North Dakota is one of those who led the fight to get them a decent increase, though we could not get it—instead of giving them $10 a month, it should have been five or six times that amount, if there were any thought of bringing Government salaries more closely into line with living costs.

Since 1949, and particularly since the early months of 1950, prices have all but sky-rocketed out of sight for Federal employees.

A staff report was issued April 1, 1951, by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I want everyone to know exactly what that committee is. It is a

joint congressional committee, established by the House and Senate. In that report, the committee refers to the accelerated rate of price increases in recent months in this manner:

The rate of price increases since April 1950—nearly 10 percent annually for living costs and 20 percent for wholesale prices—represents about the steepest price increases and the worst experience in American price history.

Now we hear talk about an increase in pay of 6, 7, 8, or 9 percent, when the report of our own committee states that wholesale prices have increased since April 1950 about 20 percent. Postal employees can vouch for the above-quoted description of our times. They are experiencing the worst conditions they have ever been forced to undergo, both in the matter of salary and in regards to working conditions in general. Is it any wonder that nearly 1,000 letter carriers in Detroit are quitting their jobs? Is it any wonder that it took 5 days to deliver one letter from the fourth-floor office of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to the second floor of the Senate Office Building? These statistics published by the Bureau of Labor and other Federal and private agencies reflect only those living costs which are included in their particular survey. None of them, for example, reflect many of the hidden costs workers have to pay. Since 1949 income tax has been increased 25 percent. Employees have to pay it, but it doesn't show up in the figures being used to euchre these same employees out of a decent pay boost. State and local taxes have also increased since 1949, but these increases in employee expenses do not show up in the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics now being used to fix the amount of any future salary increase for employees. It seems almost certain that another increase in income taxes will be passed by this Congress very shortly. In fact, in this morning's newspaper, something is said about another 12-percent increase. The current talking figure is an additional 12½ percent. That was in the newspaper this morning. Postal employees and other Federal workers will be "socked" again. There are bills in this Congress pending before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to give a 17 percent salary boost to postal personnel and other Federal workers covered under the Classification Act. They have the sponsorship of Senators on both sides of the aisle. They represent fair and reasonable requests on the part of the employees.

In fact, the percentage requested by the employees represent less than the Civil Service Commission admits is needed to bring wages up to par with prices. That agency has stated that a 21-percent increase would be needed at this time. This is what Mr. Robert Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, told a subcommittee of the Senate Post Office Committee on May 16:

From August 1939 to March 1951, the consumers' price index advanced from 98.6 to 184.5, an increase of 87.1 percent. To attempt to meet this rise by a corresponding rise in scheduled rates would require a current average pay increase of about 21 percent.

Yet we hear talk about an increase of 6 or 7 percent, when Mr. Ramspeck himself testified that a 21-percent increase is what is needed. Despite this admitted need for a minimum of 21 percent increase in wages, a recommendation was made to grant classified employees "an average increase of 6.9 percent." I say it would be a shame and a disgrace if the Senate did not grant an increase of at least 17 percent. In my opinion, it ought to be 21 percent, as testified by Mr. Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

Low pay in the postal service has had a terrific impact on that agency. Employees are quitting in wholesale numbers. Yesterday I placed in the RECORD a statement showing that 1,000 postal employees were quitting in Detroit alone. The officers of the National Association of Letter Carriers recently conducted a Nation-wide poll of the 50 largest post offices in the country. They asked how many letter carriers had quit since July 1, 1950. The answers were astounding. It was as high as 40 percent in some places, particularly in the defense-production areas; the over-all average was placed at about 25 percent. This is a shocking situation. Think of the millions of taxpayers' money being poured down a hole in hiring new postal workers and then training them, only to have them leave for better-paying jobs before they have an opportunity to repay in service a part of the Government investment in them. This personnel turnover in the postal agency has become so acute that local postmasters are advertising in the newspapers for help. Here is just one of the several advertisements that have been called to my attention in recent weeks. This is from the May 10 issue of the West Memphis News, of West Memphis, Ark. It appears in the classified ad section of that paper and is headed "Postal help needed." It reads:

The local post office is in need of personnel to qualify to carry mail. Pay begins at $1.31 per hour, and applications are needed at once.

See Donald Hall, postmaster at West Memphis Post Office.

As a part of my remarks, I wish to insert at this point a reprint of an interview with the postmaster at Eureka, Calif. Because of the high turn-over of workers in his post office, the postmaster described the situation as "the worst condition in its history."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOW PAY, PERSONNEL TURN-OVER AFFECT LOCAL MAIL DELIVERIES

Low pay for mail carriers and a resulting high turn-over in personnel were the chief reasons given by Postmaster William Lambert for erratic delivery service here in an interview with representatives of this newspaper.

"The Post Office Department is in the worst condition in its history," he declared.

"The condition exists almost everywhere in the United States where comparatively high hourly rates for other labor prevail," he pointed out. "Turn-over in carriers here has been around the 50-percent mark since last October," he stated, adding "that men with high rents and average families cannot make a living at prevailing carrier pay."

Sick lay-offs and vacations of experienced men have added to the confusion created by a majority of new and temporary employees. On a single day last week some 15 men were off work for varied reasons.

Temporary and beginner's pay is far substandard compared to other labor in this region, with permanent civil-service employees faring little better.

Starting pay is $1.31 per hour, far below mill and woods labor. It raises 5 cents per hour per year. Two veteran employees have applied for 6 months' leave of absence to work in the woods in order to pull themselves out of the hole.

"Temporary carriers are all on hourly pay, and the post office has no hold on them whatsoever," Lambert said. "Men have deserted routes half way through deliveries, leaving the mail for others to pick up later."

Under existing conditions, it is nearly impossible to keep enough men on hand to make routine deliveries, and newly developed areas, increases in population, loss of experienced, regular men to military service all combine to the detriment of the service, the postmaster related.

STOP-GAP JOB

Pleas to Washington to permit overtime or compensatory pay have resulted in persistent refusal, and newcomers to the service use it as a stop-gap job until they find better paying occupations. Such pay was allowed during wartime, but appeals now meet with stony refusal to even consider such a course.

A single local route had six different carriers in 8 days, Lambert stated, adding that it requires 6 months to develop a carrier to maximum efficiency.

Increases in "wastebasket" mail, such as circulars, unsolicited mail advertising, and cheap mail-order commerce from elsewhere also have overburdened the service. Delays in arrival resulting in pile-ups also complicate deliveries.

RURAL ROUTES

Rural routes are even more of a problem and difficult to handle, he added, noting that rural-route carriers performed nearly all the functions of the post office itself outside the city. The rural-route carrier is in himself a mobile post office, Lambert said.

Conditions are so bad at Willits, for example, that the postmaster himself is carrying mail for 3 hours a day.

Another significant reason for errors in delivery is the increase in transient employees in recent years, the postmaster concluded.

At one time most postal employees were home-town products who knew the city and its residents at first hand, while the majority of current outside employees are either newcomers or comparatively so.

UP TO UNITED STATES

"Until the Government increases the mail carrier's pay to present living standards I'm afraid that there is little to be done about the situation. It just isn't attractive enough for men to make a career of it as they used to."

Lambert added that the regular civil-service employees who were drawing higher pay because of long service were performing faultlessly, and that some of the newer employees were doing work which was difficult to criticize.

"And that's it," Lambert said, ending the interview by literally throwing up his hands.

Mr. LANGER. The pay grades in the postal service are unlike the pay grades in any other branch of the Federal Government. The only political party which has understood that is the Republican Party, because every time we tried to get a decent increase in wages, it has been the Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle who have fought it. There was no increase in 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, or 1930. There was no increase during the entire decade 1930–40. There was no increase until 1945.

The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress, the Congress which the President went all over the country condemning and saying it was the worst Congress in all history, took care of the Federal workers by giving them an increase of $460. It should have been $1,000, Mr. President. We proved that it should have been $1,000, but, finally, they received $460.

The pay grades in the postal service are unlike pay grades in any other branch of the Federal Government. Letter carriers and postal clerks start at the lowest or entrance grade regardless of education, training, or experience. In other words, regardless of their responsibilities or the intricacies of their duties, they start at the bottom rung of the pay-scale ladder.

Mr. President, there were veterans who were mail handlers. Before the committee it was testified that some of them had been in the fox holes at Okinawa and at Guadalcanal. They received $1,900 a year. Some of them had wives and children. If any persons think that, with the small pay increase those veterans received, I was in favor of giving $24,000,000,000 to countries in Europe, Ethiopia, and to almost every other country on the face of the globe, when our Federal employees were trying to get along on sandwiches, trying to get along with 1 pound of butter a month, they do not understand the senior Senator from North Dakota.

An amendment has been offered which is supposed to save a nickel out of each dollar. I say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that even if we do not get through at this time the amendment to which I have referred, it will be taken care of in the next supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. President, it takes 10 years to reach the top grade in the postal service. The entrance salary at the present time is $2,670 a year. Mind you, the Republican Party gave it to them. It was done by that "terrible" Congress which the President condemned as being the worst in all history. We raised salaries to $2,670 a year. I submit that that amount is not sufficient to keep body and soul together. How, in these times, can a man support a wife and children on $2,670 a year? How in the world can it be enough for an employee to maintain his home and attempt to give his children a decent education, clothe them, feed them, and take care of their medical bills? It cannot be done. Congress should not expect them even to attempt it on that low salary.

Mr. President, one of the co-sponsors of Senate bill 355 was the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. He knows from his own experience what it means to be poor. He was left an orphan when he was 11 years of age, and he worked with his hands in the cotton mills. He knows what it means to get along on a small sum of money. He joined the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and myself, in sponsoring the bill. The bill provided for a 17 percent increase in wages from top to bottom. It would also reduce the existing number of pay grades from 11 to six. This actually represents an elimination of four grades, as the present grades one and two are existent in statute only, having been partially eliminated in the last pay raise granted employees.

I want to say something about these low pay grades and point out a crying need for correction in them. Four or 5 years ago the Congress granted postal employees a pay raise. That was in 1945. It was the first pay increase that they had received in 20 years. It became Public Law 134 and completely reclassified the pay structure for the postal service. In addition to a reclassification bill, it was also intended to be a salary increase bill.

Unfortunately, in reclassifying the grades in the postal service, the entrance salary was kept at $1,700 per year, the same entrance salary that existed prior to the passage of Public Law 134.

Since the passage of that act, there have been several bills passed with the idea of correcting this specific injustice. Public Law 35, in the Eightieth Congress; Public Law 317, in the Seventy-ninth Congress; Public Law 577, in the Seventy-ninth Congress; and Public Law 428, in the Eighty-first Congress, modified the law so as to provide pay increases for certain veterans who were on the register, and for substitutes on becoming regulars. All of the letter carriers, however, who entered the service after June 30, 1945, have been penalized because of the failure of the Seventy-ninth Congress to eliminate those four grades. Public Law 428 attempted to correct this injustice, by partially eliminating the first two grades. There are some extremely inequitable cases that exist because of the confusion that has surrounded these grades for the past 6 years. For example, a letter carrier who entered the service on June 1, 1945, is today receiving $3,570 per annum. However, an employee who entered the service on July 1, 1945—1 month later—is today only receiving $3,170 per annum. In the correction provided for in Public Law 428, where many of the employees in Grade one were promoted to Grade two, and those in Grade two were promoted to Grade three, there was no promotion granted to the letter carriers in Grade three. Consequently, a letter carrier who entered the postal service on July 1, 1947, receives exactly the same pay today as one who entered on October 1, 1949, 2 years and 3 months later. This situation is both unfair and extremely bad for morale.

Representatives of the employees have appeared before the Senate committee and, in my opinion, they have presented an intelligent case for a 17-percent wage increase along with the other provisions of Senate bill 355. They have very conclusively demonstrated that anything less than a 17-percent increase will leave their earnings far behind prices. They have also made an excellent case for the inequity that has existed in the lower grades since the enactment of Public Law 134, almost 6 years ago. In fact, they have pointed out that the initial inequity has been compounded by each succeeding congressional enactment of pay measures. If we want to be fair and do the right thing by these postal employees, the only thing we can do is pass Senate bill 355 as it was introduced. It was introduced by two Democrats and two Republicans.

Mr. President, I speak not only for the postal employees, but for all Federal employees. Much has been said about the amount of money involved, about the idea of giving the poor devils who work for the Federal Government an increase of 17 percent. It is said that it will cost too much money. That did not bother the administration when they were taking care of Ethiopia; it did not bother them when, five times, they sent money to South America, and when millions of dollars were sent to Korea, or when we passed a bill providing for $3,750,000,000 for Great Britain. There are 13 States in this Union, Mr. President, which have an assessed valuation of less than $1,000,000,000, and that figure covers every cow, every horse, every pig, every acre of land. The total assessment is less than $1,000,000,000. Yet we gave England $3,750,000,000. As is shown by the Congressional Library Report, from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, we gave loans, property credits, advances, relief, and rehabilitation, and authorizations from lend-lease grants, the International Bank and the International Fund, amounting to $24,099,211,087.

Mr. President, in view of that record, I am not so much interested in saving a nickel on a dollar, especially not when the money is to go to building schools in the State of North Dakota, to building schools in the State of South Dakota, to building schools in every one of our States where poor communities need them.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. CASE. This does not refer to the school item at all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I refuse to yield.

In order to keep the record straight, I want to read into the RECORD in full, section 202, the one we are now debating.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, we are not debating section 202. Section 202 was voted on a long time ago.

Mr. LANGER. I am still speaking on it. I do not care how often it may be voted on. I am still talking about section 202. It reads:

SEC. 202. Not to exceed $25,000,000 of any appropriations available to agencies of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1951, as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, shall be transferred on or before August 31, 1951, to the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the construction of schools on Federal property at defense installations, as authorized in section 204 of Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, and when so transferred shall remain available until expended.

Mr. President, I have here section 204 of Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, second session. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that section 204 of the law that relates to schools is not involved in the pending amendment whatsoever. The

committee amendment, section 202, as it appears in the committee print, was voted on some time ago. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota relates to the entire appropriation for the Defense Establishment, and does not involve section 202 as proposed by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I took this opportunity to interpose in order that the RECORD may be made clear. I do not want the RECORD to make it appear that the section which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has asked to have printed in the RECORD has anything whatsoever to do with the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

I have no objection.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 204 of Public Law 815 may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILDREN FOR WHOM LOCAL AGENCIES ARE UNABLE TO PROVIDE EDUCATION

SEC. 204. In the case of children who reside on Federal property—

(1) If no tax revenues of the State or any political subdivision thereof may be expended for the free public education of such children; or

(2) If it is the judgment of the Commissioner, after he has consulted with the appropriate State educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children, the Commissioner shall make such arrangements for constructing or otherwise providing school facilities as may be necessary for the education of such children. To the maximum extent practicable school facilities provided under this section shall be comparable to the school facilities provided for children in comparable communities in the State. This section shall not apply (A) to children who reside on Federal property under the control of the Atomic Energy Commission, and (B) to Indian children attending federally operated Indian schools. Whenever it will be necessary for the Commissioner to provide school facilities for children residing on Federal property under this section, no local educational agency shall be entitled to receive payment under section 202 with respect to the attendance of such children.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the entire argument is typical. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Michigan is not present. Last year he offered several amendments to appropriation bills. Amendments were also offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Sometimes they wanted to cut off 5 percent from an appropriation. Sometimes they wanted to cut off 10 percent. I am proud of the fact that the senior Senator from North Dakota voted against such proposals every single time they were made.

Not only that, Mr. President, but in connection with appropriations some Senators tried to pass the buck to the President of the United States. They said the President should cut off some portions of the appropriations. They said he should be given authority to reduce some of the appropriations. The very Senate which passed the Marshall plan bill, and all the other give-away programs, thought it would be kind of nice to pass the buck to the President a part of the time.

Mr. President, I now desire to return to the subject of the letter carriers. There is unanimity among the postal groups in favor of S. 355 as it was written and introduced. There is not a breach in their line. Every day and every mail brings in more examples of hardship cases among postal employees, particularly the men in the low grades. I know that every other Senator is receiving mail pointing out these hardships and the need for immediate action on the part of Congress to give a decent standard of living to these faithful and conscientious Government workers.

The other day in Chicago the executive council of the American Federation of Labor unanimously endorsed this 17 percent increase bill. They made a careful investigation of all the claims of the employees and came to the conclusion that anything less than 17 percent would be a fraud on these employees.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the endorsement and statement issued by the AFL which appeared in the Weekly News Service of that federation under date of May 22.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL CALLS PROPOSED PAY RISE FOR UNITED STATES WORKERS AN EVASION

The American Federation of Labor is convinced that Congress should give immediate attention to Federal pay legislation. Bills to give Government employees their first wage increase since 1949 have been pending before Congress since January.

The distortions and inequities in the present Federal wage scale are obvious to anyone willing to face the facts. Employee representatives have presented strong evidence to support their case for a 17 percent increase. It has been demonstrated that a lesser amount will still leave earnings behind prices. The Executive Council believes the evidence clearly supports that conclusion.

Yet after 5 months of dilatory tactics, administration spokesmen now suggest a 6.9 percent increase. The figure represents an "average" increase; some employees would actually receive less than 6 percent.

At the time this proposal was made to a Senate committee considering Federal salary legislation, administration spokesmen readily admitted that Government pay has lagged behind prices. Comparing wage increases from August 1939 to March 1951 with the increase in cost of living for the same period, the Senate was advised that "to attempt to meet this rise by a corresponding rise in scheduled rates would require a current average pay increase of about 21 percent." Despite this admission, a 6.9 percent increase was recommended.

This 6.9 percent proposal amounts to a complete evasion of the realities actually confronting employees.

At best the 1949 pay adjustment was a half-way measure. It fell far short of the Government-approved standard for adjustments covering employees in private industry. Since 1949 the steepest price increases in our national history have taken place, and the end is not in sight. Spiraling prices are admittedly most damaging to fixed income groups.

Congress should reject ill-conceived attempts to whittle down the size of pay measures affecting Federal personnel. Inadequate salaries have done more to demoralize Government employees than any other factor. This demoralization is reflected in the wholesale exodus of trained and experienced workers, who are attracted to better-paying jobs in private industry.

Waving a flag in front of inadequately paid employees will not stop this shocking turn-over in trained personnel. A fair wage, which will assure a decent-living standard, is the only answer.

The Executive Council asks Congress not to treat Government workers as mere items on a cost sheet. They are not to be regarded as a faceless mass whose legitimate needs and aspirations are to be cast aside without carefully weighing the merits of their requests. Employees have a right to look upon Congress as the keeper of the national conscience in the protection and furtherance of laws affecting their wages and conditions of labor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when Mr. Donaldson, the Postmaster General, was testifying before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee just a week ago today, May 17, he was positive and very firm in his declaration that something had to be done about increasing wages for postal employees. He outlined some of the grave difficulties confronting the postal establishment in attempting to maintain service without adequate personnel. More important, he pointed out that he cannot hire sufficient personnel at the prevailing wage rate he is allowed to pay employees.

The people of this Nation have been asked to strengthen our economic, industrial, and spiritual resources to meet the challenge of communism and the other distractions prevalent in the world today. I think one of the most important links in the economic strength of this country is good postal communications. If we are going to have a run-down postal service, manned by underpaid and disgruntled employees, we are going to have no postal service at all. Our defense effort is going to suffer and it is going to be penny-wise economy in the long run.

As the American Federation of Labor statement pointed out, it is not enough to wave a flag in front of these people and ask them to stay on the job, delivering mail at inadequate rates. We have got to pay them decent wages and give them good working conditions or else they are going to seek employment elsewhere.

Mr. President, think of employees working in a post office in which every time it rains the water comes through the roof. Some employees must work in such buildings in all weather, and become afflicted by rheumatism and other illnesses. Such conditions prevail in various places in the United States.

Mr. President, a spokesman from the Wage Stabilization Board appeared before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service just yesterday to clarify the policy of the WSB with respect to Government wages. This spokesman, Mr. Samuel Edes, said in effect that the Wage Stabilization Board had no control over Federal wages, and, more importantly, the 10 percent formula did not necessarily restrict any action the Congress would take in the matter of Federal wages.

Mr. Eric Johnston gave a similar opinion a few weeks ago in response to a request of Government employees on their status under the policies governing our wage structure today. Mr. Johnston replied to the employees to the effect that he not only had no jurisdiction over the pay of Federal employees, but that it was, in fact, the responsibility of Congress. I think that responsibility has been well placed, and this Congress should face it and act on the salary bills before it and relieve these Government employees from the hardships they are now suffering on account of what they are at present receiving in the way of salaries.

Mr. President, let me show how a letter carrier, or a mail handler, or someone else working for the postal service, or in any other Federal job, must work. He receives perhaps $2,500 or $3,000—at the very most $3,500 or $3,600. There is illness in his family. The result is that he takes many years to pay off the high doctor bills and hospital bills.

Who ever heard of a son of one of these postal employees going to college unless he got a scholarship? A little while ago a gentleman appeared before one of our committees. He was a big, fine, sleek, well-fed gentleman, with a big diamond ring. He was opposed to the wage increase. He was opposed to raising the pension to more than $50 a month. I could see from his face that he had just returned from Florida. I said to him, "Do you know of a single letter carrier or a single postal employee, or a single Federal worker in the lower brackets who spends 3 or 4 months a year in Florida in the sunshine? If you can name one, I will agree with you." Of course he could not name a single one.

I want to come back to the matter of aid to foreign countries. These employees say to themselves, "The Government is sending money all over the world, and is building dams everywhere in the world." As a matter of fact, the Army engineers are now building nearly as many dams in foreign countries as they are building in the United States. They are building so many dams in foreign countries that some of the best personnel is over in Africa and in other places building dams and constructing reclamation projects.

When I was in Austria last summer I took a ride from Vienna. I am glad that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is present, because for a long time he was High Commissioner in upper Austria. I wanted to go from Vienna to Linz. I went through Salzburg, a distance of nearly 400 miles. I drove for hour after hour over roads built with American taxpayers' money.

Finally I arrived at Linz. There I found the Hermann Goering Works. They had been built during the war. There they were, on the Rhine River. There was $12,000,000 of American money going into the rehabilitation of the Hermann Goering Works. I said to the manager, "Russia is 100 yards away from you, on the other side of the river. If there should be a war, how long would it take Russia to come across the river 100 yards and take these works?"

He said, "Fifteen minutes."

I said, "In other words, we are building this magnificent munitions plant for Russia. Russia could take it over in 15 minutes."

He replied, "Yes."

That is where $12,000,000 of our money went.

In Linz apartment house after apartment house was being built. They were beautiful apartments, consisting of four or five or six rooms each. I looked at them. There were many blocks of them. I went to the head of the ECA and said, "Why in heaven's name are we putting hundreds of thousands of dollars into apartment houses on the border of Russia, in the city of Linz, when our own veterans in the United States cannot even get homes or buy material?" He said that they had the money to spend, and that those were the orders from Washington.

So in Austria beautiful apartments were being built with American money when within two blocks of this Capitol we have slums which beggar description. I remember well when the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] came to the Senate 3 or 4 years ago. He had been here less than a week when pictures appeared in all the daily newspapers showing the Senator from Illinois inspecting the slums within two or three blocks from the National Capitol. If the distinguished occupant of the Chair or any other Senator doubts that statement, I will show him, within four blocks of the Capitol, slums which have no electric lights, and not even kerosene lamps. As a matter of fact, they are lighted by tallow and a wick. That condition prevails within four blocks of the United States Capitol.

I remember when Mr. Roosevelt was running for President in 1932. The Democratic Party was going to be the party for the underprivileged. They were going to take care of the one-third which did not have enough to eat or enough to wear. The Democrats have been in office for nearly 20 years. The other day Dewey Anderson, the very man whom they themselves hired, the Director of the National Institute of Public Affairs, which is controlled almost entirely by the Democrats, and whose board of directors has upon it James Roosevelt, the son of the late President, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and many famous names, stated that there are 10,000,000 families trying to exist in the United States on less than $2,000 a year. I placed that information in the RECORD. I did not notice that a single Democratic Senator commented upon it.

I well remember when Mr. Roosevelt ran again in 1936. Again he was going to take care of the underprivileged one-third. When he ran again in 1940, he was going to take care of them once more. In 1944 he was going to take care of them again. The Democrats have been taking care of the underprivileged one-third for 20 years, and each year the poor people have been getting poorer and poorer. I suppose that when the Democrats meet this year at the next national convention they will again have a plank like the one which they had the last time, to the effect that they represent the poor people.

It is sickening, Mr. President, to think that in World War I, under a Democratic administration, 72,000 millionaires were created. The Democrats had all the experience of World War I; and yet when World War II came along there was not one law on the statute books which would keep down the high cost of living. All the experience gained in World War I meant nothing to them, apparently.

In World War II more millionaires were created than in World War I. The Democrats have thousands of lawyers upon the payroll. There were many lawyers in the OPA. One would think that with thousands of lawyers on the payroll they could have got together and drafted some laws which would be available at the present time, when we have war in Korea. Yet we find the same increase in prices. We find Senators trying to reduce appropriations so that a nickel can be saved out of every dollar.

When the Joint Economic Committee stated that prices had increased very greatly, we found Mr. Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, saying that the increase has been approximately 21 percent.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD the experience of one State, the State of North Dakota, with a population of 621,000, to show what 2 years of give-away loans have meant to every single county in the State of North Dakota, and what they have meant in terms of dollars and cents to one city in each county—usually the county seat. If any Senator or taxpayer will peruse this information he will find that the Government of the United States has given away $24,000,000,000, as I have described, from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947. My guess is that the taxpayer is not going to be very much impressed when some Senator rises and says that he wants to save a nickel out of every dollar. It is being taken out of the hides of our Federal employees. They are being given a pay increase which is far too small. That will not sit very well with the people of the country when they come to examine the question and to realize the fine job which the average Federal employee does for the United States Government.

A while ago a distinguished Representative said there were too many Federal employees. He said that men sit with their feet on their desks and read newspapers, and that the women and girls bring their knitting to some of the Federal agencies.

Mr. President, when I became chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service we engaged two very distinguished women, two outstanding women of the United States. They visited agency after agency, not only in Washington, but in Philadelphia, New York, and on the west coast. They would walk into offices, and no one would know who they were. No one knew that they were working for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. They went into the Internal Revenue Bureau's office in New York City, for example, to ascertain if anyone was loafing on the job. They wanted to find out whether we had too many employees.

Every time I hear a Senator or Representative rise on the floor and say we

could cut the number of Federal employees I feel like saying to him: "Name the department where the cuts can be made. Name the department." It is easy to say: "We have too many Federal employees." It is easy to say that 5 percent, 10 percent, or 15 percent of them should be fired. However, when those who make such statements are asked to name the place where the employees should be fired, somehow or other they do not seem to be able to reply.

Are they going to take the nurses away from Walter Reed Hospital, where there are already too few nurses? Are they going to cut down on the number of mail carriers, when the average mail carrier is not getting enough pay to exist on? In Heaven's name, what Federal employees are they going to fire? In my opinion, many such statements about firing Federal employees are nothing more than demagoguery.

It is easy to rise in public and assert that we should cut expenses. Everyone wants to cut expenses. When those making such proposals want to take it out of the hides of the poor Government employees, from the fellows who are barely able to get along on $3,500 or $4,000 a year, if they are in the upper brackets, or on $2,000 or $2,500, if they are in the lower brackets, it is not being fair to the individuals or to our Government. The Government of the United States is entitled to have the best employees and the best-paid employees it can possibly get. Our Government should pay an honest dollar for every honest piece of work that is rendered by a Federal employee.

In order that the people of the country may know exactly what the give-away program has cost, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks figures showing the total cost of all foreign aid, apportioned on a Nation-wide per capita basis, as applied to the population of counties and principal towns in North Dakota. The figures are based on the sixteenth census of the United States, 1940, Population, volume 1, pages 793 and 795 to 803. The figures for North Dakota are based on the seventeenth biennial report of the tax commissioner of the State of North Dakota, July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1944, pages 12 to 20. The statement is signed by M. Loretta Stankard, general research section, April 9, 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total cost of foreign aid apportioned on a Nation-wide per capita basis as applied to the population of counties and principal towns in North Dakota

	I Population 1940	II Share of foreign aid commitments, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947 (population × $183.03) based on $24,099,211,087	III Share of European recovery program 1948–52 (population × $129.11) based on $17 billion	Share of total foreign aid provided and proposed 1945–47, 1948–52 (column II plus column III) based on $41,099,211,087
Adams County	4,664	$853,652	$602,169	$1,455,821
Hettinger, city	1,138	208,288	146,927	355,215
Barnes County	17,814	3,260,406	2,299,966	5,560,462
Valley City	5,917	1,082,989	763,944	1,846,933
Benson County	12,629	2,311,486	1,630,530	3,942,016
Maddock, city	691	126,474	89,215	215,689
Billings County	2,531	463,249	326,777	790,026
Fryburg township	340	62,230	43,897	106,127
Bottineau County	13,253	2,425,697	1,711,095	4,136,792
Bottineau, city	1,739	318,289	224,522	542,811
Bowman County	3,860	706,496	498,365	1,204,861
Bowman, village	967	176,990	124,849	301,839
Burke County	7,653	1,400,729	988,079	2,388,808
Bowbells, city	787	144,045	101,610	245,655
Burleigh County	22,736	4,161,370	2,935,445	7,096,815
Bismarck, city	15,496	2,836,233	2,000,689	4,836,922
Cass County	52,849	9,672,952	6,823,334	16,496,286
Fargo, city	32,580	5,963,117	4,206,404	10,169,521
Cavalier County	13,923	2,548,327	1,797,599	4,345,926
Langdon, city	1,546	282,964	199,604	482,568
Dickey County	9,696	1,774,659	1,251,851	3,026,510
Oakes, city	1,665	304,745	214,968	519,713
Divide County	7,086	1,296,951	914,873	2,211,824
Crosby, city	1,404	256,974	181,270	438,244
Dunn County	8,376	1,533,059	1,081,425	2,614,484
Killdeer, city	650	118,970	83,922	202,892
Eddy County	5,741	1,050,775	741,221	1,791,996
New Rockford, city	2,017	369,172	260,415	629,587
Emmons County	11,699	2,141,268	1,510,458	3,651,726
Linton, city	1,602	293,214	206,834	500,048
Foster County	5,824	1,065,967	751,937	1,817,904
Carrington, city	1,850	338,606	238,854	577,460
Golden Valley County	3,498	640,239	451,627	1,091,866
Beach, city	1,178	215,609	152,092	367,701
Grand Forks County	34,518	6,317,830	4,456,619	10,774,449
Grand Forks, city	20,228	3,702,331	2,611,637	6,313,968
Grant County	8,364	1,512,560	1,066,965	2,579,525
Elgin, city	583	106,706	75,271	181,977
Griggs County	5,818	1,064,869	751,162	1,816,031
Cooperstown, city	1,077	197,123	139,051	336,174
Hettinger County	7,457	1,364,855	962,773	2,327,628
Mott, city	1,220	223,297	157,514	380,811
Kidder County	6,692	1,224,837	864,004	2,088,841
Steele, city	721	131,965	93,088	225,053
La Moure County	10,208	1,884,843	1,329,575	3,214,418
La Moure, city	990	181,200	127,819	309,019
Logan County	7,561	1,383,890	976,201	2,360,091
Napoleon, village	982	179,735	126,786	306,521
McHenry County	14,034	2,568,643	1,811,930	4,380,573
Velva, city	1,017	186,142	131,305	317,447
McIntosh County	8,984	1,644,342	1,159,924	2,804,266
Ashley, city	1,345	246,175	173,653	419,828
McKenzie County	8,426	1,542,211	1,087,881	2,630,092
Watford City, village	1,073	196,391	138,535	334,926
McLean County	16,082	$2,943,488	$2,076,347	$5,019,835
Garrison, city	1,117	204,445	144,216	348,661
Mercer County	9,611	1,759,101	1,240,876	2,999,977
Beulah, village	942	172,414	121,622	294,036
Morton County	20,184	3,694,278	2,605,956	6,300,234
Mandan, city	6,685	1,223,556	863,100	2,086,656
Mountrail County	10,482	1,918,520	1,353,331	3,271,851
Stanley, city	1,058	193,646	136,598	330,244
Nelson County	9,129	1,670,881	1,178,645	2,849,526
Lakota, city	907	166,008	117,103	283,111
Oliver County	3,859	706,313	498,235	1,204,548
Center, village	509	93,162	65,717	158,879
Pembina County	15,671	2,868,263	2,023,283	4,891,546
Walhalla, city	1,138	208,288	146,927	355,215
Pierce County	9,208	1,685,340	1,188,845	2,874,185
Rugby, city	2,215	405,411	285,979	691,390
Ramsey County	15,626	2,860,027	2,017,473	4,877,500
Devils Lake, city	6,204	1,135,518	800,998	1,936,516
Ransom County	10,061	1,841,465	1,298,976	3,140,441
Lisbon, city	1,997	365,511	257,833	623,344
Renville County	5,533	1,012,705	714,366	1,727,071
Mohall, city	687	125,742	88,699	214,441
Richland County	20,519	3,755,593	2,649,208	6,404,801
Wahpeton, city	3,747	685,813	483,775	1,169,588
Rolette County	12,583	2,303,066	1,624,591	3,927,657
Rolla, city	1,008	184,494	130,143	314,637
Sargent County	8,693	1,591,080	1,122,383	2,713,433
Milnor, city	677	123,911	87,407	211,358
Sheridan County	6,616	1,210,926	854,192	2,065,118
McClusky, city	924	169,120	119,298	288,418
Sioux County	4,419	808,810	570,537	1,379,747
Selfridge, village	329	60,217	42,477	102,694
Slope County	2,932	536,644	378,551	915,195
Marmarth, city	626	114,577	80,823	195,400
Stark County	15,414	2,821,224	1,990,102	4,811,326
Dickinson, city	5,839	1,068,712	753,873	1,822,585
Steele County	6,193	1,133,505	799,578	1,933,083
Finley, city	677	123,911	87,407	211,318
Stutsman County	23,495	4,300,290	3,033,439	7,333,729
Jamestown, city	8,790	1,608,854	1,134,877	2,743,711
Towner County	7,200	1,317,816	929,592	2,247,408
Cando, city	1,282	234,644	165,519	400,163
Traill County	12,300	2,251,269	1,588,053	3,839,322
Mayville, city	1,351	247,274	174,428	421,702
Walsh County	20,747	3,797,323	2,678,645	6,475,968
Grafton, city	4,070	744,932	525,478	1,270,410
Ward County	31,981	5,853,482	4,129,067	9,982,549
Minot, city	16,577	3,034,088	2,140,256	5,174,344
Wells County	11,198	2,049,570	1,445,774	3,495,344
Harvey, city	1,851	338,789	238,983	577,772
Williams County	16,315	2,986,134	2,106,430	5,092,564
Williston, city	5,790	1,059,744	747,547	1,807,291
Total, North Dakota	641,935	117,493,363	82,880,228	200,373,591

NOTES.—Details will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Local taxes (county, township, school, city and village, park district, city and county special assessments, and hail taxes) collected in all the counties in North Dakota in 1943 totaled $18,432,135.25. A breakdown of these taxes by county is not available.

The figure used in column II for all foreign aid between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947 ($24,099,211,087), included loans, property credits, advances, relief and rehabilitation, and authorizations from Lend-Lease grants, the International Bank, and the International Fund. This aid was extended to many foreign countries in South America and Eastern Europe as well as to Western Europe. Some of the authorizations included in the above figures have not been used by the recipient countries.

The per capita figures used in columns II and III are based on a 1940 figure of the population of the United States of 131,669,275. The 1940 population figure is used because it is the latest available for many local units of government. However, the population of the United States had grown to an estimated 143,382,000 by July 1, 1947. If the 1947 population figure were used instead of the 1940 figure, the per capita cost of foreign aid between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, would be $168.08 rather than $183.03; and the cost of the proposed European recovery program would be $118.56 rather than $129.11. However, if the population of these localities grew in proportion to the national increase in population, the aid figures would be substantially the same as those shown above.

Sources: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Population, volume I, pp. 793 and 795 to 803.

Seventeenth Biennial Report of the Tax Commissioner of the State of North Dakota, July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1944, pp. 12-20.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, first the junior Senator from New Jersey desires to correct an observation made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. The Senator conferred upon the junior Senator from New Jersey a very high title when he referred to him as the High Commissioner of Upper Austria. Actually, Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey was the Deputy Military Governor of Upper Austria. I should like to have the RECORD show the correction.

Mr. President, later in the session, I shall endeavor, through appropriate studies, to focus the attention of the Senate upon some of the glaring weaknesses which stand in the way of true efficiency in our legislative proceedings in the Senate, but leading up to those studies, I shall endeavor to provide the record with sound observations from persons who see our faults from without.

As my first contribution in this respect in the current session, I cite an article from the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, May 20, 1951, entitled "Congress Needs a 'Focal Point'" by Robert Heller. I have no doubt that upon careful reading of this article, some Members of the Senate will take issue with one or more of Mr. Heller's suggestions, but taken as a whole, the article should, if given careful study—and I hope it will be given very careful study by every Member of the Senate—serve to stimulate some constructive thinking in the Senate which will ultimately resolve itself into vigorous action for the improvement of those procedures which no Member of the Senate can deny to be faulty.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Heller's article be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS NEEDS A "FOCAL POINT"—A CENTER OF RESPONSIBILITY TO WHICH THE VOTERS OF BOTH PARTIES COULD REFER WOULD BE PROVIDED BY SETTING UP POLICY COMMITTEES

(By Robert Heller)

If Henry Clay or Daniel Webster could walk into the United States Senate today, they would find startling changes, but one thing would be familiar—the way Congress operates. Since their day the role of government has been vastly enlarged, but the machinery for passing the laws that now regulate so much of the citizen's life and activities until recently has been little different from that of 100 years ago, when the problems of government were relatively simple.

Congress is today operating as a group of autonomous, conflicting, irreconcilable committees, and the public is growing impatient with the results. Many people feel that Congress, with its control of the purse and hence of the country's economic life, must show more leadership if our form of government is to survive. In the present world crisis the Nation cannot afford a legislative branch that turns in a performance that is at best mediocre. Congress must measure up to its great responsibilities. This does not mean that it should encroach on the Executive's management function; it does mean that Congress must take a more active part in forming policy. The problem is one of organization rather than of personnel. Even the most able people in Congress, and they represent some of the country's best brains, cannot do their jobs adequately until the remaining fundamental faults in the organization of Congress are corrected.

The pressing need for reform has brought legislative reorganization and improvement again under consideration in Washington. The Senate Committee on Executive Expenditures is now reviewing the performance of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—the only previous effort to improve the internal operation of Congress that has been partially successful. On the basis of this investigation, a bill to achieve further reforms may be drawn up and introduced.

The chief weakness in the operation of Congress is its lack of a center of responsibility. Congress needs a formal, definite operating organization, a focal point on which the voters' attention would be fixed, where approval or disapproval for the actions of Congress could be assigned. Therefore, I suggest the creation of majority and minority policy committees, which will provide not only the needed centers of responsibility but also a formal and centralized means of communication with the executive departments.

The most powerful Members of Congress are the standing committee chairmen, in whose committees the legislative work is done. In the House and Senate these standing committee chairmen should be welded into a management policy committee whose chairman would be the majority leader. In this way the majority party's program, as worked out by the committee, would represent the party membership, commanding its support in both Houses and promoting cooperation with the executive departments. In the same way, a minority policy committee, composed of the ranking minority party member of each of the standing committees, with the minority leader as chairman, should be formed in each House. Its operation would parallel the majority policy committee's, and it would develop the minority party's legislative program.

These committees would provide the means whereby differences between the two parties could be adjusted; where this was impossible, the minority policy committees would set forth the alternative program that would be put into effect if the minority party were in power, and allow the people to evaluate it. The procedure would also serve to eliminate the minority attacks on the majority program which now are made from a variety of positions, some of which contradict each other and do not offer constructive alternatives.

While I am convinced that such policy committees offer the only solution to the basic organization problems of Congress, it must be emphasized that they are no cure-all. The composition of Congress and the nature of its Members preclude members of a party from always staying in line on specific issues, and no one, unless he is an advocate of dictatorship, would want it different. The present disagreement today within the Republican Party on the administration's foreign policy is a case in point. Some Members favor the administration's efforts to proceed cautiously in Asia while building up defenses against possible Communist aggression in Europe, while others condemn the administration for not fighting an all-out war against communism in Asia.

These are honest differences of opinion, and policy committees are not going to change them. On other issues the policy committees will be unable to hold a certain percentage of the membership in line because of home pressures. But whether there is 80 percent, 60 percent, or even 50 percent agreement, at least some percentage of centralized control would be achieved; also a focal point in Congress would be provided where responsibility for each party's actions or inaction would be fixed. As Congress operates now, this cannot be done.

Let us take a couple of examples of financial irresponsibility under the present set-up. The General Appropriation Act of 1951, the omnibus appropriation bill which consolidated 11 separate supply bills, was an advance toward modern procedure, but included in this act were many appropriations not economically justifiable and not in the national interest. For instance, it included a flood-control provision to protect lands inundated by the Clinton River in Michigan to the extent of about $1,000,000 for less than 400 acres of land affected. This means more than $2,500 an acre of tax money. Another flood-control project in the act, at North Adams, Mass., to control the Hoosic River, is estimated to cost $13,170,000, on which a return of 10 cents on the dollar can be expected. These two projects are under way.

The above examples are chosen at random; there are many others. Inclusion of projects of this kind is the result of horse trading. Members of Congress from different sections of the country agree to support known pork-barrel measures to obtain patronage for their own areas. The consequence is tremendous, unjustified expenditures, made possible by the autonomy of the various standing committees, including two fiscal committees in each house working independently and in conflict with each other. This is fiscal anarchy.

Now let us see what would have happened to these projects if the policy committees were operating under the surveillance of the people.

With the majority leader as chairman of the majority policy committee, each of the standing committee chairmen would have his day in court. The chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee would have to present to the majority leader their programs, and show what they were made up of. Included in those programs would have been the appropriations for the Clinton and Hoosic River projects. The entire policy committee would be fully aware of the Government's estimated income and would have announced its ceiling on spending. The $1,000,000 for the Clinton River and the $13,170,000 for the Hoosic would have to be considered in the light of that ceiling, and approval or disapproval made on that basis. In the event the estimated expenditures for public works exceeded the budget set for them, the proffered legislation would be returned by direction of the majority policy committee to the standing committees involved for necessary pruning.

In effect, the result would be that the majority policy committee, representing the entire majority party, would have to think in national terms. It would be far less inclined to go along with projects designed to fatten up a local community at the expense of the rest of the country.

In summary, creation of majority policy committees would set up a chain of command from the majority leaders to the standing committees, to the individual members of Congress, to the people. Minority policy committees would create the same chain of command to the people who are opposed to the program and action of the party in power. This is the essence of the two-party system and the only way to run a democracy. So much for the proposed policy committees. There are other steps Congress should take toward improvement.

The Senate is periodically hamstrung by filibusters, the function of which is simply to enforce the will of the minority on the majority. A change in Senate rules to require that only a simple majority of its members is needed to stop filibusters would prevent this. At the same time the Senate should adopt a relevancy rule requiring debate on the floor to be germane to the pending business.

The Senate doesn't have time for idle conversation, but in the last session it took 2 weeks (and 500 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine and 3 weeks to pass the Kerr Natural Gas bill (which the President promptly vetoed). There were more important things it should have been doing.

At the beginning of this session the House repealed its 21-day rule which had prevented the Rules Committee from sitting, indefinitely or perpetually, on legislation reported favorably by other standing committees. The result is that, in practice, legislative action is now within the control not of a majority of the House but of a coalition of seven members of the Committee on Rules. This is obviously not democratic procedure.

The Members of Congress are tremendously overburdened. Their efforts are dissipated over such a variety of activities that it is a physical impossibility for them to devote sufficient attention to the most important lawmaking job in the world. The obvious answer to this is delegation of the less-important duties, such as a ban on private immigration bills, enforced limitation of other private bills, greater reliance on administrative assistants, particularly in the running of errands for the folks back home, and granting of home rule for the District of Columbia.

Home rule is a perennial issue on Capitol Hill. In May 1949 the Senate approved home rule without a dissenting vote, but that bill could never get out of a House District Committee pigeonhole to become law. The results of our National Legislature, acting as city council for the District, are more than a little ludicrous. For instance, on December 18, 1950, just after the President had declared a state of national emergency and congressional leaders were being briefed on the war by General Bradley, the House paused to consider, amend, and pass a bill to provide for the support of children born out of wedlock in the District of Columbia.

There are other procedural devices that should be adopted. For example, the House spends the equivalent of 1 month each session answering roll calls. The overwhelming percentage of this time could be saved by the installation of a modern electric roll-call system. Sixteen States have them in successful operation now. The House should follow this lead.

Finally, Congressmen's salaries should be raised and adequate pensions provided. Many Members of Congress, who know that when they complete their terms they will have less money than when they began, would rather swim the Potomac than introduce measures to correct the situation; this is simply because the Members of Congress are in the anomalous position of being the only means by which their compensation can be increased. Part of this problem can be avoided.

If Congress would ask the Supreme Court to review its compensation the Court would be within its constitutional authority in agreeing to do so. Its prestige and its independence of Congress are great enough to assure the objectivity of its review and public acceptance. In the event the Supreme Court would not take on the job, Congress should call on a carefully selected independent commission to analyze and evaluate the congressional job and determine the commensurate pay. This would be a logical basis on which to peg congressional salaries and pensions at the right level.

The objection will be made that with a general salary freeze in effect this is no time for Congress to consider defrosting its own compensation. This is not a valid argument. Congressional salaries and pensions should have been evaluated and raised long before the current wage freeze. The objective of raising congressional salaries and pensions would be to pay what the job is worth and insure that able men would not be deterred from seeking congressional office because compensation is so far below comparable levels in private business.

Why is it that these reforms have not been put into effect before now?

The basic reason is that the Members of Congress are preoccupied with their many difficult jobs and do not like to buckle down to an unspectacular task of housekeeping. Moreover, Congress is a cross section of the country, made up of leaders and laggards, the able and the incompetent, the smart and the stupid, all of them subject to the usual frailties of humanity. Cooperation among Members is hindered by personal animosities and differences in outlook, and agreement on internal reform is made more difficult because the problem is one of technical organization which the voters cannot be expected to understand, and therefore it has little political sex appeal.

A further obstacle is the turnover that occurs every 2 years in the House and every 6 years in the Senate. As often as interest in reorganization is generated a change of faces takes place, and a new educational effort must be undertaken.

In view of the obstacles, what chance is there that these proposals for improving the operation of Congress will be adopted? I believe the chances are good. It is my conviction that eventually world economic and political factors will force the change. But it would be far better to anticipate the necessity by making Congress more effective now.

A great opportunity exists for Congress to catch up on the last 100 years. The proposed reforms would not immediately cure all the ills which hamper the functioning of Congress, but they would provide a new approach that in time would bring vast improvement. The steps I have outlined will tend to make the Congress more efficient and enable it to cope more promptly with the problems that confront it. The welfare of the country requires their adoption.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold it.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. WILLIAM CRAWFORD GORGAS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, today there is being unveiled in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University, the bust and tablet of an Army doctor who gave to the world one of the most complete and impressive demonstrations in history of the conquest of science over disease, who saved countless lives, and who reclaimed tropical lands to civilization. I refer, of course, to Gen. William Crawford Gorgas, the son of Alabama who, in developing techniques for destroying the breeding places of yellow fever mosquitoes, not only made possible the building of the Panama Canal, but conquered the scourge of two centuries. Habana, Panama, the Transvaal, and the endemic regions of yellow fever in South America are only the best-known sites of his activities. Not only as a scientist, but as a leader of men and as the hero of two of the most successful campaigns against disease ever waged, does the name of Gorgas deserve to be held in honored memory.

No one can read the story of the accomplishments of this great American without being inspired by the power of one man with courage combined with knowledge and perseverance. William Crawford Gorgas was the kind of man who, once he was convinced by the best evidence that the mosquito was the carrier of the dread yellow fever, could stand up under ridicule, chicancery, and ignorance. "If it is the mosquito, I am going to get rid of the mosquito," he said in pest-ridden Habana in 1898. "They say we can't do it?" he added. "Perhaps we can't, but we shall try." In these three short sentences, perhaps, lies the secret of the success of this doctor-general who combined the knowledge of a scientist with the skill of an administrator.

To understand the full measure of his contribution, it is necessary to remind ourselves of the nature of the disease which he conquered. Yellow fever had been the scourge of South American and Caribbean ports for more than two and one-half centuries. It was a malady that constantly threatened. Terrible epidemics were periodically bursting forth in that area, and from time to time reaching out to attack the coast cities of the United States. New Orleans, Mobile, Charleston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, New Haven, Nantucket Island, Boston, and other places had many times been invaded. In 1793 a yellow-fever epidemic killed 4,000 men, women and children in Philadelphia, or one-tenth of the entire population. The vivid accounts of the Philadelphia epidemic, left by Dr. Benjamin Rush and Matthew Carey, give us a picture of the suffering, the tragedy, and the terror caused by this unknown and impalpable enemy. The gulf towns, especially New Orleans, were probably the greatest sufferers through the years, yet one of the worst epidemics recorded is that in Memphis in 1878, when this one city had 17,000 cases and more than 5,000 deaths, with all of the horrors which accompany such a plague. In that same year there were more than 100,000 cases and 20,000 deaths in the United States. Outbreaks in the eighties and nineties were constantly taking place.

As a young doctor, William Crawford Gorgas had himself been a victim of the disease. He contracted it in line of duty at his first station following graduation from Bellevue Hospital, at Fort Brown, Tex. Following his recovery he dedicated himself to the conquest of this scourge which continued to defy all of the knowledge and skills developed during the nineteenth century for the control and prevention of disease. Indeed, the public terror inspired by yellow fever was caused chiefly by the fact that it behaved so mysteriously. Various theories were advanced. Some learned gentlemen maintained that it carried by the Gulf Stream, others that it was caused by "swamp miasma," by the explosion of poisons in the air, by dry particles of dust, and even by eating apples.

Yellow fever behaved in a most perplexing fashion. People who constantly associated with the disease frequently failed to contract it, while thousands who had never come near a patient were suddenly victimized. Hundreds who fled an infested city became ill, while just as many who remained in town es-

caped it entirely. Men and women could sleep in the same room with yellow-fever patients, even wear their clothes, and still not catch the disease. Most bewildering of all was the fact that the new science of sanitation, which had wrought such miracles in overcoming other diseases, seemed to have no effect.

William Crawford Gorgas himself played an important role in clarifying the fact that even the most thorough sanitation measures were of no avail in combating yellow fever. Named as chief sanitary officer following the occupation of Habana in 1898, he set about the task of fighting the disease with the only methods science had yet discovered—the segregation of the sick, the quarantining of infected localities, and general cleanliness. This was no small task in itself, for Habana had for generations been known as a pest hole, dangerous not only to herself but to the entire American hemisphere. Gorgas set to work on the task of cleaning up a city rendered even more filthy by 5 years of military operations. He set to work with a completeness which gave his name a unique fame. American magazines featured photographs of pre-Gorgas and after-Gorgas Habana showing on the one hand a street full of rubbish, puddles of stagnant water, household refuse, and dirty gullies serving as open sewers. On the other hand were displayed post-Gorgas pictures of the same street—orderly, clean, and safe. The general death rate of Habana declined, and such disorders as typhoid, dysentery, and the like all but disappeared.

But deaths from yellow fever began to increase rapidly. The sound sanitation measures of scrubbing, burning, and disinfection had, it seemed, stimulated rather than destroyed this one disease. The epidemic began in the latter part of 1899 and spread rapidly. The Associated Press announced that there was not a block in Habana that did not have from 1 to 17 cases. Most mysterious of all was the fact that the parts of the city that were cleanest and housed the cleanest population were the ones in which yellow fever raged with the greatest virulence. The poorer quarters did not suffer nearly so much. We now know the reason for this phenomena. One attack of yellow fever created an immunity in the patient who survived. The native population, practically all immune, occupied the less cleanly sections of the city, while the Americans and the thousands of Spanish who migrated to Cuba following the war were not immune, but they usually lived in the better districts.

Meanwhile the Reed-Carter research had uncovered the real truth about yellow fever—the fact that the disease was carried by mosquitoes which, in order to become a carrier, must bite the sick person sometime within the first 3 days of his illness. Although most scientists considered Reed's discovery a brilliant academic performance, there was considerable feeling that he had reduced the situation to one of utter despair. How could unaccountable billions of mosquitoes be destroyed? For a brief period isolation and innoculation were tried. It was William Crawford Gorgas who had the courage and the imagination to attack the mosquitoes. His method was to destroy the contagion at its source.

We all know how he worked this miracle. Armed with pails of oil, and reinforced with a careful card-catalog system which registered each house and family in Habana and showed the number of water barrels, tanks, jugs, or other containers in the family's possession, Gorgas and his crew set to work. The secret weapon was a thin layer of petroleum on the top of all water, which spelled death for mosquito larvae. He began his work in March, 1901—and the death rate dropped almost immediately. In July and August of that year there were only five deaths, and shortly it became clear that the disease had completely disappeared. Dramatic as yellow fever had always been, there was, perhaps, nothing in its history quite so dramatic as the suddenness with which it disappeared from Habana. The whole scientific world was awed in the presence of this tremendous fact.

On July 29, Walter Reed himself wrote to Gorgas:

> The news from Habana is simply delightful. It shows that your acquaintance with the local conditions was much better than mine. That you have succeeded in throttling the epidemic appears beyond question and it is to your everlasting credit. A man of less discretion, enthusiasm, and energy would have made a fiasco of it. Whereas you, my dear Gorgas, availing yourself of the results of the work at Camp Lazear, have rid that pest hole, Habana, of her yellow plague. All honor to you, my dear boy.

With typical modesty, Gorgas replied, giving Reed full credit for his discovery and adding:

> I am very happy to serve in the more humble role of being the first to put your discovery to extensive practical application.

Meanwhile, fate was carving out a new challenge for the man who had come to be regarded as the hero of Habana. Gorgas was called home to Washington in 1902, and assigned the project of overcoming the disease hazard which was responsible for the French failure in the project of building a canal across Panama. For 2 years he studied the problem, reviewing the French experience, visiting the Suez Canal and Panama, and making his plans. In this enterprise he encountered a new kind of problem—namely difficulties with administrative officers in charge of the project. Expenditures for sanitary improvements and the control of mosquitoes were regarded in some important quarters as graft and extravagance. In addition, Panama presented some new problems and results were far less dramatic than they had been in Habana. Twice the commissioners recommended that Gorgas be removed—in part because he seemed more concerned with destroying the mosquitoes rather than with concentrating entirely upon sanitation measures. Only the intervention of the President, Theodore Roosevelt, saved him. But despite the difficulty caused by lack of cooperation, Gorgas not only rid the Canal Zone of yellow fever, but made the cities of Panama and Colon models of sanitation. His reputation had extended until he was generally regarded as the foremost sanitary expert of the world.

The State of Alabama is tremendously proud of William Crawford Gorgas. His father was Gen. Josiah Gorgas, Chief of Ordnance of the Confederate Army and president of the University of Alabama. His mother was Amelia Gayle, daughter of Judge John Gayle, who was a Governor of Alabama. We are proud of the fact that he received his formal education in the South and that he considered Alabama his home. During World War I, when he was serving as Surgeon General of the United States, the officers of the Alabama brigade in Macon, Ga., tendered him a dinner. He responded with a happy speech, in which he said:

> I have had every honor my profession could give me. My Government has given me every honor that it could bestow upon any physician in its medical service. Yet I am not satisfied. I still have one ambition to realize before I can count my life happy and rounded out. I wish it were possible for the President to reduce my rank and put me in command, in active service in France, of that brigade of splendid Alabamians whom I have seen here.

The world has honored the career and the memory of William Crawford Gorgas in many ways. In 1913 he visited South Africa, to make recommendations for the control of pneumonia among Negro mine workers. In 1916 the then recently-organized International Health Board enlisted him as an adviser and sent him on a tour of South and Central America to fight yellow fever. During World War I he served as head of the medical service of the Army until after the Armistice, and then retired from the Army, he resumed his work with the International Health Board. In May 1920 he sailed with his staff for London, commissioned to investigate yellow fever on the west coast of Africa. He died in London, on July 4, 1920, following a paralytic stroke. On his deathbed he spoke of his keen disappointment at being so suddenly halted in the midst of his labors—but his calm fortitude never forsook him. He remained cheerful to the end. Commenting on his death, the London Lancet wrote editorially:

> He was the best known and most uniformly successful medical administrator not of his age alone but of any age, and his work is comparable only with that recorded of Moses. No sooner were discoveries made tracing an endemic disease to a source removable by rigid hygienic measures than the services of this master-administrator were requisitioned to the farthest quarter of the globe to carry out such measures. And, as if by magic, the areas were cleansed and freed.

Two important institutions stand today as special memorials to his work: The Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine in Washington, D. C., and the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory of Tropical Research in Panama upon whose board of trustees I have served for many years. It would be difficult to estimate how many lives were saved in the Pacific during World War II as a result not only of his work but of the research which is being carried on in his memory.

But today, most of all, I should like to pay tribute to him for the qualities of spirit he possessed, and which were, indeed, to a very large degree responsible,

for his success. In these dark times we can all draw courage from the example of a man who was not cast down by failure, who was never deterred by ridicule or ignorance, who weighed all evidence carefully but was never afraid of a new idea, and who had the imagination and vision to attack a job most men said was impossible. In today's world we are facing threats which are as sinister and as unpredictable as was the curse of yellow fever for two centuries. Indeed, it might be said that the destructive powers of this disease were a threat as devastating to seaport communities of the past, as is the new menace of the atomic bomb today. In such times we can draw special strength from the example of William Crawford Gorgas. And we can find courage in his words of quiet conviction in Habana:

> They say we can't do it? Perhaps we can't, but we shall try.

I have often said that France has her Louis Pasteur, England has her Joseph Lister, and America has her William Crawford Gorgas.

FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. HENDRICKSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the Chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Hennings	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Robertson
Carlson	Kerr	Taft
Case	Kilgore	Thye
Chavez	Langer	Underwood
Cordon	Martin	Wherry
Dworshak	Maybank	
Ferguson	McFarland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. WILEY answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEM, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the pending amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would cut 5 percent from all the appropriations in the bill for the Department of Defense. The amendment was not presented to the committee. It appears for the first time upon the floor. As the report of the committee shows, the evidence which has already been obtained by the committee has proved that inflation has already reduced the purchasing power of the money carried in this bill by almost 25 percent.

To illustrate what this means, I asked the Navy Department to make a statement as to what the reduced purchasing power would amount to in terms of implements of war. The loss of purchasing power in the Navy alone would be sufficient to purchase 60 submarines or 2,500 fighter planes. In other words, inflation has already shot out of the sky 2,500 fighter planes. We are now asked to inflict a further cut of 5 percent upon the purchasing power of the Department of Defense at a time when the money is needed more than ever before.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator will permit me to make this observation, I sat in the hearings and learned that so much money has been lost by inflation that we can get only 7,000 tanks for the amount of money requested. Inflation has already cut 20 percent from the funds. Congress must pay more attention to inflation rather than be appealing for a 5-percent saving.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am certain the Senator knows that it is a fact that Congress passed last August what was known as the 1950 Defense Production Act, which was an anti-inflation act, and that the administration did not put it into effect until January of this year; indeed, it is not yet in full effect. Is it not also a fact that when the bill came to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee there were absolutely no provisions in it for price and wage control, and that if it had not been for the action of the committee there would not have been any price control in the 1950 defense production bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I know that the Defense Production Act was passed at the last session of Congress. I know that it was not put into effect as soon as I would have put it into effect. That, however, is not the question we are now discussing. The question is whether or not we shall make an additional 5-percent cut in the appropriation for the procurement of necessary weapons to enable the Armed Forces to do the job they must do. The testimony before the committee indicates clearly that of the appropriation for the Army, $1,600,000,000 is for procurement; that of the appropriation for the Navy, $1,200,000,000 is for the procurement of weapons; that of the appropriation for the Department of the Air Force a little more than $1,000,000,000 is required for procurement of instruments of war.

We are taking men into the three armed services. We must equip them. The appropriations carried in the bill are for the purpose of subsistence, for pay, and for equipment. I assure the Members of the Senate that the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is chairman, has scrutinized the appropriation in the greatest detail. We feel that the appropriation is now necessary.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. As the bill was reported by the committee, the appropriation for national defense amounts to $6,379,673,000. For the Atomic Energy Commission, which is supposed to be very closely allied to the national defense, the appropriation is only $59,323,000. Those two make a total of $6,438,996,000.

The question now is as to whether we are going to appropriate money to defend our country or whether we are not. I hope Senators on both sides of the aisle will agree that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that last year, when we had the general appropriation bill before us, and the Congress reached agreement with respect to a reduction of a dollar amount, representing approximately one-half billion dollars on that bill, even then the defense appropriations were excluded from the reduction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that at this time the appropriation bill is before us in supplemental form solely in order that the Defense Establishment can move in the field of securing contracts for procurement in the armaments section and other defensive divisions, without having to wait until a general appropriation bill can be passed, and that the general appropriation bill will amount to from $50,000,000,000 to $60,000,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. The Under Secretary of the Navy, testifying before the House

committee, before the bill came to the Senate, said:

> Our procurement money will all be obligated or committed by the end of this month. We will not be buying anything else at the end of the month.

That testimony was given during the month of April.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Then does it not follow that if the reduction be made at this time it can do nothing but retard the letting of essential defense contracts, and cannot achieve what I think is the very worthy object of the Senator sponsoring it, that of having economy in the Defense Establishment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator brought that up. It serves to introduce the statement made by the Secretary of Defense in a letter addressed to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on May 21, 1951. He said:

> Many procurement programs are rapidly approaching the place where, in the event additional funds are not available, interruptions of present production schedules must result.

To adopt the amendment would, in my opinion, be disastrous to the defense program. I want the Members of the Senate to understand clearly that it is the unanimous desire of the Subcommittee on National Defense to make a thorough study of all appropriations carried in the bill for the fiscal year 1952.

I have already advised the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense, and the appropriate budget officers for each one of the departments, that it will be our first job to call them before us and to have them indicate what they are doing to keep expenditures down. We must keep expenditures down. The committee will examine with the greatest care every budget item that comes on the 1952 bill. But fiscal year 1951 is running out. The bill ought to be passed. It should not be delayed in conference, and I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the full text of the letter from the Secretary of Defense to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 21, 1951.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I understand that your committee has finished hearings of the Department of Defense portion of the fourth supplemental appropriation bill, 1951. Although the various representatives of the Army, Navy, and Air Force may have pointed out to you during the hearings the urgency of the early appropriation of additional funds to continue the various military programs during the remainder of the current fiscal year, I feel that I should advise you personally of the extreme urgency of securing additional funds at an early date, and of the importance of these additional funds in connection with the continued prosecution of military operations in Korea and insuring that there shall be no interruption in the flow of military equipment and supplies from the industrial production lines.

It is realized that the estimates covering military requirements for the remainder of the fiscal year were not submitted to the Congress for consideration until April 7, 1951. This was later than anyone concerned desired. The delay, however, was caused by the time required to review the over-all program and to screen the initial requests so that your committee would be presented only with those items which were found necessary to finance during the current fiscal year, deferring for your subsequent consideration those items which could be included in the fiscal year 1952 estimates without detriment to the military situation.

The three military departments are now in straitened circumstances in a number of areas which are vital to the continued build-up of our military strength. Many procurement programs are rapidly approaching the place where, in the event additional funds are not available, interruptions of present production schedules must result. In addition, the Government agencies involved in the expansion of production facilities and in the allocation of scarce basic materials have been informed and have geared their efforts to these established plans. Any interruption in carrying out the military procurement program would have serious effects on the economy and in the rapidity with which our forces are to be provided with modern equipment.

The Army technical services, for example, in order to assure continuity in increased industrial production have carefully programed, and worked out with manufacturers, production schedules for such items as ammunition, tanks, radar, electronics, and combat vehicles. Any interruption in accomplishing these schedules would delay achieving the desired readiness of the Army. In the Quartermaster Corps funds for the procurement of subsistence and for the procurement of clothing and equipage are presently overobligated in support of the troops now in the service, some of whom are in Korea. Additional funds are also required for the pay and allowances for the balance of this fiscal year of the increased number of troops now in the Army.

The Department of the Air Force, in planning its procurement program for the balance of fiscal year 1951 and for the full year 1952, first assumed that additional funds now included in the proposed fourth supplemental appropriations bill would be available during April or early in May. Any further delay in obtaining additional funds for this purpose would have detrimental effects on the Air Force programs and will shortly interrupt planned production schedules. The Air Force major procurement programs financed from the appropriation "aircraft and related procurement" and "major procurement other than aircraft" have virtually been completely committed and obligated to the point where further procurement and other combat equipment required for the Air Force must stop. Additional funds are also required to continue without interruption the tools and tooling program. Operation and maintenance funds for the Air Force have also been virtually fully committed and obligated to the point where decisions as to slowing down the training program must be made unless funds are shortly forthcoming. The operation and maintenance appropriation of the Air Force finances the bulk of the payrolls of civilian personnel in that military department. Funds now available are inadequate to provide for the pay of civilians which will become due for payment on May 26.

In the Department of the Navy the lack of additional funds will delay the placement of contracts. This is deferring the delivery of urgent military equipment to the operating forces, including those in Korea. Tools and tooling for the future production of aircraft is included in the bill now before you, and the further initiation of the program must await action on the request now before you. Other areas of primary concern are Navy ordnance and Navy electronics. In the case of naval ammunition alone it is urgently necessary, at the earliest possible time, to place additional contracts in the amount of approximately $180,000,000.

In order, therefore, to avoid interruption in the deliveries of needed military equipment and supplies, and to be in a position to continue the payment of troops and civilian personnel for the balance of the fiscal year, I urge the earliest possible action on the supplemental request now before your committee. Anything you may do to accomplish this result will be appreciated, and will greatly assist in rapidly carrying out the program of building up our military strength.

Faithfully yours,

———— ————.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. In view of the time element, when we are almost at the very end of the fiscal year, is not necessarily true that any cut in the appropriations now must reflect a cutting down of authority in the Defense Establishment to make the firm contracts which are necessary for procurement of materials to be delivered and to be paid for some time in the future—perhaps it may be months, it may be a year or two? That is true because we can no longer give contract authority to the agencies under which they would be authorized to make their procurement contracts, without their having the appropriation. Because of that, does it not follow that the reduction must of necessity be a reduction in authority for procurement contracts which are essential at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It cannot possibly be applied to the subsistence of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, or to the clothing of those forces. The reduction will all have to come out of the authority for procurement contracts before the 30th of June.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not intend to vote for the 5-percent reduction, but I wish to read a few lines from page 7 of the committee report, and then I desire to comment upon them. I read as follows:

> In reference to the Signal Service increases, it is surprising that quantity production of this equipment has not brought about reduction in unit costs to offset, at least in part, increased costs of labor and materials. The cost of one type of switchboard has risen from $994 to $4,802, or 383 percent. Portable switchboards have gone from $513 to $1,454, or 160 percent. A special type radio set has gone from $4,597 to $20,185, an increase of 339.2 percent. Another radio set went from $400 to $950, or 137 percent. Sound-ranging sets have jumped from $4,959 to $15,600, an increase of 252 percent. Power units have risen from $333 to $758, or 124 percent.

Mr. President, I do not deny those figures, but I suggest to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which handled the 1950 Defense Production Act, that we call before our committee the procurement agencies and let them explain. I do not think they can explain, at least to my satisfaction, that the material costs and labor costs have gone up on a radio set from $4,500 to $20,000. It does not make sense. We ought to look into it and find out what is going on.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Indiana that such cost increases cannot be explained. I am opposed to the 5-percent cut. I think it would be a tragedy. However, I believe that if the Army and Navy and the Air Corps will let the people of the country know when there are opportunities to bid on procurement contracts, and let small-business interests take part in Government procurement, we can cut the 1952 budget materially. It is ridiculous when we consider the price increases which have resulted purely from lack of interest by the Defense Establishment. I have never seen such lack of interest in trying to save money.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hope the chairman will call before the committee the procurement agencies and call upon them to justify the increases. Under the act, we are charged with observing the administration of the act.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator well knows that since January I have been trying to get representatives of the Army, the Navy, and other defense activities to let the Banking and Currency Committee know at least what are defense areas. I have never been able to find out one word from them.

Mr. CAPEHART. My opinion——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the regular order, may I ask the able Senator from North Dakota?

My opinion is that it will be found that specifications on certain products have been changed. If the specifications have not been changed, and if completely new products are not called for, then there is no justification under the sun for the price of a radio set going from $4,500 or $9,700 to $27,000. It cannot possibly be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that on pages 309, 310, 311, 312, and 313 of the hearings there is information which the Armed Services Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations obtained from the responsible officials. I should like to ask unanimous consent to have those pages printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the pages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—PRICE INCREASES

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER,
Washington 25, D. C., May 15, 1951.

From: Assistant Comptroller, Director of Budgets and Reports.

To: Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).
(Attention: Office of Progress Reports and Statistics.)

Subject: Effect of price increases on Navy Department procurement.

1. During fiscal year 1951 the sharp increases in the prices of the items the Navy buys had a marked effect on the Navy budget. These increases are reflected in the Bureau of Labor Statistics' indexes for manufactured products and semimanufactured products. The index for semimanufactured products increased 26.3 percent between June 1950 and March 1951, while manufactured products increased 14.5 percent during the same period. For both types of items the approximate average increase would be 20 percent. If this were applied to Navy Department fiscal year 1951 appropriations for procurement, the lost purchasing power would amount to approximately $1,000,000,000.

2. The effect of this decrease in purchasing power can best be visualized in terms of types of end items. For example, based upon averages of the current estimated costs of various types of equipment in significant categories, the purchasing power lost by inflation represents, roughly, any one of the following: 5 large aircraft carriers, 40 destroyers, 60 submarines, 2,500 fighter aircraft, or 100,000 torpedoes.

3. The fourth supplemental 1951 budget estimates were based upon December 1950 price levels which reflected the rise in prices during the period from June to December 1950. The increases that have occurred since that time will limit the extent to which the Navy is able to fulfill the programs that involve large-scale procurement. It is virtually impossible to set forth the effect of price increases applicable to any single supplemental appropriation estimate because in most instances there is no comparable "pre-inflation" procurement of the military items under current procurement.

4. The amounts that were specifically labeled in the fourth supplemental as "price increases" are as follows:

Military personnel, Navy:	
Travel	$4,568,000
Clothing	11,669,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps:	
Travel	2,985,000
Clothing	2,613,000
Construction of aircraft and related procurement	52,000,000
Aircraft and facilities	5,000,000
Medical care	1,200,000
Total	80,035,000

(a) The increase under travel represents the effect of revised Joint Travel Regulations, effective April 1, 1951. The regulations reduced officer travel rates by approximately 8 percent, but increased enlisted and dependent rates by 50 percent, an over-all increase of 33 percent.

(b) The amount of the clothing-price increase is based upon an increase in the cost of the "clothing bag" (initial issue of clothing to enlisted personnel) from $118.35 to $254.75 in the case of the Navy, and from $148 to $231.72 in the case of the Marine Corps. In addition, maintenance allowances for clothing increased approximately in proportion.

(c) The $52,000,000 under construction of aircraft represents the net amount of price increases affecting aircraft components and accessories, principally electronic equipment, engines, and instruments. In general, aviation material prices have increased about 20 percent, but the economies of quantity production have tended to offset a portion of this.

(d) The $5,000,000 shown under aircraft and facilities represents increased costs of special aviation material and labor rates and is required to maintain the previously programed level of operations and necessary support.

(e) The $1,200,000 under medical care represents a 5.2-percent increase in prices for medical stores, based upon an item analysis of July 1950 to February 1951 procurement made by the Army Surgeon General, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget in their review of the supplemental estimates. The 5.2 percent was applied to the $24,296,000 value of medical stores in the 1951 budget.

E. W. CLEXTON.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—PRICE INCREASES

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1951.

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

In accordance with your request I am attaching additional information with respect to price changes in relation to military budgets.

1. The Army has provided information on the total procurement to which the amounts requested for price increases in the fourth supplemental apply, as well as unit-cost data as requested. Additional information is also provided by Signal Corps on the reasons for some of the large increases in unit costs which have occurred.

2. An April 1951 report on price changes of Air Force procured items is attached which, within limits, provides some information pertinent to Air Force procurement. In accordance with your request this morning we are asking Air Force to provide information on the extent to which they have reduced procurement of major items from 1951 funds because of price increases.

3. The information for Navy is as yet incomplete since key personnel have been in appropriation hearings all week. They advise that their information will be available not later than Monday, May 14. We shall transmit it as soon as received.

FOSTER ADAMS,
Director, Office of Progress Reports and Statistics.

Department of the Army's table, amounts included in the third supplemental, to cover price increase on articles already financed, fiscal year 1951

The table represents the amount of money the Army requested in the fourth supplemental appropriation (Army third) in order to cover price increases which occurred either since the second supplemental appropriation requests were being prepared or since the beginning of the fiscal year (in cases where definitive contracts were not written until after the second supplemental).

An example of the manner in which the figures were obtained is given by General Lawton on page 186 of the hearings on the fourth supplemental appropriation bill:

"You have already approved for us 50,950 of these (radio) sets in appropriations. In the budget estimates that we came up here with we figured the unit cost as $2,771. Now, since we were up here we have written a definitive contract with a contractor, and the final contract price is $2,944.

"The increased price of the unit, of this set, is $173.

"Then if we multiply the unit increase in price by 50,950 we come up to $8,000,000 plus."

In order to obtain the percent increase in the price of a particular item, it is necessary to apply the amount requested to the amount of procurement involved for each project or item. On page 148 of the hearings, Colonel Marshall gives an example of this:

"Mr. MAHON. For the special quartermaster equipment you are requesting $3,335,000.

"Colonel MARSHALL. Yes, sir. That represents a price increase only. * * * That is a price increase on the funds which we had on hand on November 1; 5.1 percent price increase on $65,000,000."

Attachment 1 shows for each project or item the amount requested in the fourth supplemental (Army third) to cover price increases, the amount of procurement to which the increase applies, and the percent increase.

Attachment 2 shows for some specific items, the unit cost as estimated in earlier fiscal 1951 budgets, the unit cost estimated in the fourth supplemental, and the percent increase.

ATTACHMENT 1.—*Amounts included in fourth supplemental (Army third) to cover price increases and the amount of procurement involved, Department of the Army*

Project or item	Amount requested to cover price increases	Amount of procurement involved	Percent increase
Quartermaster service, Army	$4,352,775	$256,045,580	1.7
Regular supplies	38,426,755	292,195,437	1.3
123 Office supplies	2,913,679	39,913,413	7.3
124 Other regular supplies	13,508,562	79,462,131	17.0
127 Special quartermaster equipment	3,335,724	65,374,860	5.1
128 Supplies for handling liquid fuels and lubricants	9,408,141	42,764,200	22.0
129 Liquid fuels and lubricants	3,811,180	31,750,833	12.0
424 Packing and crating	5,449,259	32,921,000	16.6
Clothing and equipage: 131 Purchase of clothing and equipage	174,469,000	610,031,400	28.6
Signal service of the Army	132,206,095	343,574,894	38.5
3 AN/ORC-3-8 radio set	8,832,000	141,182,450	6.2
5 AN/MPQ Mobile counter motor fire control radar	4,160,000	13,800,000	30.0
7 Pu-181 ( )/PGC-1 power unit	712,096	570,770	124.7
16 TC-21 telephone terminal set	267,930	8,830,420	3.0
17 TC-22 telegraph terminal set	312,051	1,629,240	19.2
Signal service of the Army—Continued			
18 U-17 ( ) MTQ truck	$2,150,000	$7,448,227	28.9
19 AN/TRC 12 radio relay set	2,058,960	4,142,148	49.7
20 CX-1065 ( )/G cable assembly	2,304,225	24,148,399	9.6
21 SB-22 ( )/PT switchboard, portable	14,633,056	8,099,150	180.7
22 SB-86 ( )/P switchboard	6,549,871	1,711,000	382.8
23 AN/GRR-5 radio set	2,644,800	1,923,200	137.5
24 AN/MRC-2 radio set	1,251,250	4,068,000	30.8
25 AN/TCC-4 telegraph terminal set	8,327,016	8,533,390	97.6
26 AN/TND-1 sound ranging set	4,335,000	2,142,252	202.4
27 AN/TRC-11 radio terminal set	1,841,520	2,967,796	62.1
28 AN/TRC-24 radio set	67,115,125	19,789,056	339.2
29 WD-1 ( ) TT wire	3,017,295	91,240,400	3.3
30 AN/TLB-1 search receiver	1,693,960	1,348,996	125.6
Engineer service, Army	34,242,285	345,000,000	9.9
Ordnance service and supplies, Army: [1] 120 Procurement of ammunition: Artillery ammunition	187,000,000	1,892,282,508	9.9
Maintenance and operation, U. S. Military Academy	98,000	593,054	16.5
Total	570,794,910	3,739,722,873	15.3

[1] Projects 131 and 133, Ordnance service and supplies, have been omitted from the tabulation because the increase in prices on those items was due to—
Project 131—changes in specifications and modifications of the end item; project 133—the original estimated contract cost was submitted without benefit of production engineering or drawings. (See p. 241 of hearings on fourth supplemental.)

ATTACHMENT 2.—*Comparison of unit costs of selected items as estimated in fourth supplemental (Army third) and in earlier budget requests*

Item	Unit cost in earlier budget requests	Unit cost in fourth supplemental	Percent increase
3 AN/ORC-3-8-radio set	$2,771	$2,944	6.2
5 AN/MPQ mobile counter motor fire-control radar	100,000	130,000	30.0
7 Pu-181 ( )/PGC-1 power unit	333	748	124.7
16 TC-21 telephone terminal set	6,670	6,870	3.0
17 TC-22 telegraph terminal set	6,389	7,611	19.1
18 U-17( ) MTQ truck	7,758	10,000	28.9
19 AN/TRC 12 radio relay set	7,477	11,190	49.7
20 CX-1065 ( )/G cable assembly	151	165	9.3
21 SB-22 ( )/PT switchboard portable	518	1,454	180.7
22 SB-86 ( )/P switchboard	$994	$4,802	383.1
23 AN/GRR-5 radio set	400	950	137.5
24 AN/MRC-2 radio set	36,649	48,125	31.3
25 AN/TCC-4 telegraph terminal set	6,161	12,174	97.6
26 AN/TND-1 sound ranging set	4,959	15,000	202.5
27 AN/TRC-11 radio terminal set	4,733	7,673	62.1
28 AN/TRC-24 radio set	4,597	20,185	339.2
29 WD-1 ( ) TT wire	92	95	3.3
30 AN/TLB-1 search receiver	29,326	65,150	122.2

Signal Service of the Army—Price increases of items of signal communications equipment

1. The fiscal year 1951 budget estimates (basic, first, and second supplemental) were based on—

(a) Prices paid for items previously procured prior to July 1, 1950, on an advertised basis.

(b) On those items which had never been previously procured our engineers estimated the cost based on the latest procurement of like items.

2. Contract prices paid for items procured this fiscal year have been based on advertised bids, where the item was susceptible, and negotiated basis.

3. In general the price rise subsequent to June 30, 1950, is occasioned by—

(a) Some inflation;

(b) Increased cost of labor (including payment of overtime) in order to obtain early deliveries which are required as a military necessity;

(c) Some material shortages which increase material prices to obtain the commodity;

(d) Additional tooling and engineering costs in order to obtain several producers of the same item;

(e) Changes in specification in order to meet requirements and obtain the maximum quality of a military communications system such as subminiturization;

(f) The increased Federal excise tax on communications equipments.

4. Detailed reasons for price increases of items in third supplemental estimate:

(a) Those items which were previously procured follow:

Item	Old price	New price
(1) AN/TRC-12 radio relay set. The original estimated cost of this radio set was based on a fiscal year 1949 contract awarded under competitive bidding. The general price rise of labor and material since the Korean situation and the acquisition of an additional source necessitated a further cost for tooling and engineering which contributed to the increased cost of the item.	$7,477	$11,190
(2) SB-22 switchboard. The original estimate for this switchboard was based on a Signal Corps engineering estimate computed at pre-Korea prices. In order to obtain required production, 4 sources of supply were necessary, resulting in additional costs for tooling and engineering which contributed to the increased cost of this item.	518	1,454

(b) Those items which have not been previously procured:

Item	Budget estimated price	Contract price
(1) PU-181( ) PGC-1 power unit. The original unit cost was based on a Signal Corps engineering evaluation made during fiscal year 1950, prior to the general price rise. Further, since 2 sources of production are required for this item, the resulting dual cost of tooling and engineering contributed to the increased cost.	$333	$748
(2) AN/TND-1 sound ranging set. The original estimate for this sound ranging set was based on a Signal Corps engineering estimate. The increased cost of basic components since the Korean situation, plus costs for tooling and engineering for additional sources to meet production requirements has contributed to the increased costs of these items.	4,959	15,000
(3) AN/TLB-1 search receiver. The original estimate for the search receiver was based on a Signal Corps engineering estimate. The increased cost of basic components since the Korean situation, plus costs for tooling and engineering for addi-	29,326	65,150

Item	Budget estimated price	Contract price
tional sources to meet production requirements has contributed to the increased costs of these items.		
(4) SB-86 switchboard. The original estimate for this switchboard was based on a Signal Corps engineering estimate. The increased cost of basic components since the Korean situation, plus costs for tooling and engineering for additional sources to meet production requirements has contributed to the increased costs of these items.	$694	$4,802
(5) AN/GRR-5 radio set. The original estimate for the radio set was based on a Signal Corps engineering estimate. The increased cost of basic components since the Korean situation, plus costs for tooling and engineering for additional sources to meet production requirements, has contributed to the increased costs of these items.	400	950
(6) AN/TCC-4 telegraph terminal set. The original estimate for the radio set was based on a Signal Corps engineering estimate. The increased cost of basic components since the Korean situation, plus costs for tooling and engineering for additional sources to meet production requirements, has contributed to the increased costs of these items.	6,161	12,174
(7) AN/TRC-24 radio set. The original estimated unit cost of this radio set was made by the Signal Corps engineers based on the prior procurement of a similar item. However, a newly developed transceiver was not taken into account and included in the estimated cost of this item. The inclusion of this major component in the set plus added costs for production engineering and tooling by 5 manufacturers to obtain the production required, contributed to the increased cost of this item.	4,597	20,185

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have the Senator from South Carolina and the Senate understand that the committee has already called upon these agencies for reports. The reports will be coming in. The Armed Services Committee will be very glad to cooperate with the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, who is also a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, in the effort to see why such increases should be brought about. The evidence before us indicated that the majority of such contracts were being handled by four or five very large companies.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the point I make. Four or five large companies handle all the contracts. That is the only statement I have to make. The small duck mills in my State are without work; yet we are amortizing and subsidizing new mills to go into the market. The Defense Establishment has totally failed in safeguarding that situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am certain that the chairman of the joint committee of the House and Senate, which is charged with certain responsibilities under the terms of the 1950 Defense Production Act, under which the pricing and allocation of materials originates, will call before the committee the agencies responsible for giving such figures to the Appropriations Committee, and let them justify the figures. Let them prove to us that there have been such increases in the cost of labor and materials.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have a letter in my office from General Feldman saying that he has not enough money to buy some duck for the Army or Navy, and that further funds are needed. Still we are amortizing and subsidizing new duck mills to be placed in operation. That is being done in Mr. Charles Wilson's office.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the able Senator from South Carolina that perhaps we ought to eliminate such items until we get the facts. Perhaps we ought to eliminate an item with respect to which the cost has risen from $4,500 to $27,000 until we get the facts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that would be an improper action to take.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me make this statement, please. I feel that that would be an unwise action to take, because there will be ample time after the appropriation bill is passed, and before these payments are made, for both committees to determine what the costs are.

We are dealing here with electronic devices which have enabled our forces in Korea to turn back the great Chinese attack in the last week. It was the ability of the men in the forward ranks to send radio communications to the artillery in the rear which enabled them to put the barrage down where it should be put down. That is the reason why we should not take the action suggested.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, the able Senator is correct in saying that we want all the radar and electronic devices which the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force need. However, I read in the report that the Signal Corps advised the Appropriations Committee that the cost of labor and materials in a certain radio unit had gone up from $4,500 to $20,000. I do not believe it, unless all the electrical specifications were changed, and they came out with a completely new product. If there were no change in the electrical specifications of the unit, the labor and material costs did not go up from $4,500 to $20,000. I want to talk to representatives of the procurement department which made the purchases to find out exactly what happened, because, in my opinion, someone is misrepresenting the facts to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read one or two sentences from the committee report on page 6:

> It should be noted that the increase for the Signal Service covers a period in most cases back to the original budget prepared in September of 1949. A number of these items, however, were newly developed and had never been produced in quantity, so that original price estimates were necessarily based on preliminary engineering estimates, and subsequent price quotations reflect in some instances revised cost estimates based on definitive contracts.

The Signal Corps has been notified by the Appropriations Committee that a complete analysis of all these figures is to be required. That will be done, I assure the Senator, before the bills payable are presented.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator. I am certain that the joint committee will likewise look into the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It ought to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. It should look into the question.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that under existing law the armed services are permitted to deviate from appropriations within certain limitations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A law was enacted during World War II in the interest of getting quick action when necessary. Under the terms of that law certain transfers were permitted.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact also, as the Senator well knows, that recently the Signal Corps took money appropriated by the Congress for the building of a depot in Pennsylvania and switched it to a deposit on the purchase of an office building in Philadelphia for the procurement of matériel?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The transfer to which the Senator is referring was only the transfer of the purchase of one building instead of another.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Is it not a fact also that the quickest way to bring about improvement is to adopt such procedure as will cause Government agencies to stick to the appropriations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say that we have done so; and that was the purpose. However, I have urged upon the Senate that we should not adopt this 5-percent slash all the way across the board. In my judgment, that would endanger the very defense program upon which we are engaged.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that that is why I am supporting the Senator's stand. We should pick out the items we can cut, in favor of the items that we must not cut.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, when I rose——

Mr. KILGORE. If I may finish, I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if it is not a fact that in his business such a problem arises every time the directors have a meeting and every time the president sits down at his desk. Is that not a customary problem which has to be met every time a group has a meeting? They sit down and discuss what it is necessary to cut and what should not be cut. It is always decided that unnecessary items are to be cut, in favor of necessary things, based upon the financial status of the company. In this case it would be the financial status of the country we would have to consider.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the able Senator from West Virginia has missed my point. As I said when I rose, I would be against a 5-percent cut because I do not believe this bill is the proper place where such a cut should be made. I rose to invite attention to the fact that some items listed by the Signal Corps, for example, have gone up from 100 to 300 percent. I do not believe that, unless they have completely, 100 percent, changed

the specifications and have built a 100-percent different type of product. It could not be correct, if any good judgment whatever was used in placing the orders originally.

I rose to suggest to the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is chairman of the committee considering the 1950 Defense Production Act, that we call before us the procurement agencies and ask them to justify their statements with reference to the items. That is my purpose. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator has referred to the fact that Congress inserted a wage and price control provision in the Defense Production Act without any request for it from the administration. I wish to say that that may have been one of the big mistakes of the Congress. If it had been properly applied, the provision could have been of tremendous service to the country. If it had been properly applied, it would not have been necessary for the prices of any commodities, military or otherwise, to rise 100, 200, 300, or 500 percent.

However, the manner in which the provision of law which gave the administration authority to control wages and prices has been applied is nothing short of a tragic farce. In fact, instead of controlling prices, it has had the opposite effect. We had inflationary statements by members of the official family which finally resulted in creating panic buying in this country. Housewives went to stores and bought things they would not need for months ahead. They did it because they were told prices would go up. The result was that prices did go up.

As applied, that provision of law has probably increased consumer costs substantially, and has not reduced them at all. It should have been applied honestly and fairly. Instead, its application was held up until prices had been artificially stimulated to an unreasonably high level. Then OPS began to write rules and regulations. As they wrote them, they sent them to Members of Congress. The number of rules and regulations has been increasing with each passing day.

I do not know that any Member of the Senate has counted the number of releases which he has received from OPS. Last month I took it upon myself to count the number of releases received from the Office of Price Stabilization during one forenoon. There were 86 of them. I received 86 of them in one forenoon. About six of them reported on industry advisory committee meetings. For example, 21 members of the board sat on the Advisory Committee on Underwear, Lingerie, and Negligee. They got together in Washington, at taxpayers' expense. They reported: "Present inventories are heavy, and they are in process of liquidation." Yet 21 of the 24 members were called together. They showed up at the meeting for the purpose of controlling the heavy supply.

There was also a meeting of the Advisory committee on Automotive Original Equipment Parts. There was a meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Toilet Tissue Industry, which appointed a subcommittee to get further information before it made any recommendation at all. The other committees had to do with ceiling-price regulations, orders, maintenance of regulations and orders, interpretation of maintenance of regulations and orders, or clarification of regulations and orders.

Mr. President, I do not think anything comparable to this is going on in any other country in the world. Certainly there was nothing comparable to it during World War II. At least there was some slight efficiency in OPA. It appears to be entirely lacking in OPS.

The main purpose of the 86 releases issued by OPS in 1 day appears to be to make work for hundreds of thousands of persons, who would probably much rather be employed in more productive and beneficial work. A political machine is being built for the election in 1952. Make no mistake about it. If anyone can point to anyone except an administration Democrat who is getting a job on the enforcement boards, I should like to have him do so. Furthermore, they are making potential criminals out of every businessman, trader, and storekeeper in the United States, by putting the fear of his Government into him.

Mr. President, we spend a great deal of time in talking about the danger to democracy and freedom in India, Korea, Iran, the Ruhr, and elsewhere. If we do not wish to live under a politically controlled state, and if we value our freedom, I suggest that instead of spending all our time in looking at what is going on thousands of miles away, we spend a substantial part of it looking at what is going on within 2 miles of the Capitol.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I rise again, Mr. President, only to refer, by way of example to the Link trainers. We discussed their cost. Probably it could be reduced by one-tenth. I say it with all due respect to the Link brothers. They had no previous experience. I believe such a reduction should be made as an encouragement to our services. Why should we let a contract for $4,700 for a Link trainer when probably it could be built at a profit for considerably less than that? The construction of superior electronic devices should be encouraged.

I believe also that the Senate should consider the advisability of printing the remainder of the hearings of the committee, so that the Senate and the people of the United States could be advised of the wastefulness of the contractual system which has been and still is in effect. Unless curative measures are taken, such a system will continue to exist in the future with reference to the question of national defense.

Mr. President, I maintain that procurement by expert procurement officers could reduce the Federal budget by 15 percent, not 5 percent or 10 percent. I say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that if he attempted to operate his plants on the basis of the procurement system the Government now has, either he would have to float a new stock issue or he would have to float a very extensive bond issue.

For that reason, I think something should be done to improve the present procurement situation in the Federal Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I simply wish to say, for the benefit of Senators who entered the Chamber after I first submitted the amendment, and who did not hear it read, that it would not apply a 5 percent cut to the individual items carried in this appropriation bill. Inasmuch as the amendment is very brief, I shall read it:

> There is hereby rescinded 5 percent of the gross amount appropriated to the Department of Defense in this act, and that amount is hereby reappropriated to the Treasury.

Mr. President, if we are to accomplish anything in the way of economy, it will be necessary that real economy be practiced in the procurement sections of the Government, and particularly in the management of the various branches of the Defense Establishment. We shall never be able to approach balancing the budget of the Federal Government, in which from $40,000,000,000 to $60,000,000,000 a year is for the Defense Establishment—or more than 50 percent of the total budget, perhaps running up to as high as 60 percent or 70 percent—and we shall never approach making the revenues of the Federal Government equal its appropriations, if the Defense Establishment continues under the present system.

Therefore, I have offered this amendment, and I think it warrants careful consideration. Congress should find some way by which, without injuring procurement, some real savings can be achieved.

Earlier in the debate, references were made to cases in which various branches of the Defense Establishment have found money in their pockets as they approached the end of the fiscal year. Those cases indicate that in making the appropriations, the Congress should make a change, so as to prevent the recurrence of that condition.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota has had service in the House of Representatives as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Has it not been his experience in that connection, particularly during World War II, that it is difficult to achieve any real degree of economy, especially in the Armed Forces, because those in charge of procurement and expenditures in the Armed Forces so consistently flout the will and the mandates of Congress, and make expenditures without regard to economy, and subsequently request Congress to make deficiency appropriations and supplemental appropriations?

Mr. CASE. That is true; and under that situation, in a short time after making the appropriations we find that unexpended balances remain in the hands of those agencies; and then we pass appropriation recission bills, after we have given those agencies carte blanche authority to make expenditures. Every time Congress makes such large appropriations, various of those agencies end their fiscal years with unexpended balances, and then requests are made to permit them to spend those unexpended balances. After all, Mr. President, the time for us to achieve economy is when we make the appropriations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from South Dakota recall that at the end of each of two fiscal years during World War II, the Armed Forces had surpluses of approximately $30,000,000,000, which meant that Congress had appropriated for each of those fiscal years $30,000,000,000 in excess of the requirements of the Armed Forces at that time?

Mr. CASE. I recall that there were large unexpended balances.

Mr. President, I am sure that the committee itself was aware of the need for action in this situation, or else the committee never would have reported the bill with section 201 in it.

I urge the adoption of my amendment; and I also urge its serious consideration in connection with including it in future appropriation bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which has been submitted by my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], in which I have joined as a cosponsor. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$17,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,743,000."

On page 4, before the semicolon in line 15, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "of which $1,243,000 shall be used for construction, installation, or repair of sewage facilities at the naval base, Newport, R. I."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island, submitted by him for himself and his colleague.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in explaining the amendment to the Senate, I wish to call attention to the fact that for the past several years my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and his colleagues representing the State of Rhode Island have tried to urge upon the Navy and the Congress the need for the construction of sewage disposal facilities at the Newport naval installation. Every day millions of gallons of raw sewage and filth are being dumped into the waters of Narragansett Bay at the naval installation at Newport. The people of my State became so aroused in 1947 at the time when we experienced great difficulty with poliomyelitis in our community, and when it was said by some medical authorities that polluted waters could contribute to the outbreaks of poliomyelitis, that at that time they initiated an antipollution program, which up until this time has cost them more than $10,000,000. However, until this moment the Navy Department has done nothing with reference to curing the bad situation which exists at the naval station at Newport.

At the last session of Congress there was passed a bill authorizing the appropriation of $1,243,000 for the construction of such facilities. However, until this moment that appropriation has not been made.

I feel that there is a tremendous need for these facilities at Newport. At the last session of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, it authorized the city of Newport to issue bonds to the extent of $2,000,000 in order to build and perfect sewage-disposal facilities for that city.

I regret that the members of the committee did not see fit to include this amendment in the bill which the committee reported. I hope very much that the amendment does not have to be put to a vote; I seriously hope that the members of the committee will accept the amendment and will take it to conference.

In any event, Mr. President, I feel that there is a moral, a legal, and a practical responsibility upon the Navy and the Congress to clean up the dirty mess which exists at the Newport naval establishment; and I urge the members of the committee to approve the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], on behalf of himself and his colleague (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, perhaps we could agree to take the amendment to conference; I see no objection to doing that. However, we could not give assurances as to how far we would go in conference in insisting that the amendment be retained in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have a vote taken on the amendment.

I would be perfectly willing to have the amendment brought up in connection with the regular appropriation bill to which it should be offered. The amendment may have a great deal of merit. However, I think it is not proper to offer the amendment to the bill now pending. Therefore, I wish to have an opportunity to vote against the amendment at this time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Let me ask whether there is a budget request or estimate for this item.

Mr. WHERRY. There is none.

I do not know how urgent the need is in connection with this matter; but I do know that if we begin this process on the floor of the Senate, it will be virtually endless. For instance, there are a number of amendments which I should like to offer on the same basis. However, that basis is the wrong one for us to use in this connection—in other words, to attempt to write legislation into a supplemental appropriation bill.

Of course I do not say that this item does not have merit.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Nebraska has made a very sensible and constructive suggestion, which is, that this amendment should be proposed to the regular appropriation bill, not to this fourth supplemental bill. The amendment on behalf of the Senators from Rhode Island was presented to the committee, with the reasons for it, but the committee, by an overwhelming vote, determined that it should not be made a part of this fourth supplemental bill, and that, if we once opened the door to such procedure, the difficulties we would encounter might be endless.

The sponsors of the amendment can go before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate in connection with the regular bill, make their presentation, and let the committee act on it then; but I think that if we should once open the door by incorporating this amendment in the fourth supplemental bill, we would be getting into serious trouble.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from California for his observations. I also wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not saying anything about the merits of the proposal. It may be that, when the matter comes up in connection with the regular appropriation bill, I may be enthusiastically for it; I do not know. I am saying that in my opinion this bill is not the place for the proposed amendment, and I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will not press it, because, if this is the way we are to legislate, it will open the door, as has been so forcefully stated by the Senator from California, to numerous amendments, which might be probably quite as meritorious as this one, and which would come before us without Budget estimates, to be written into an emergency bill, without receiving proper consideration. I hope the Senator will submit the matter in connection with the regular appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], for himself and his colleague [Mr. GREEN]. The "noes" appear to have it. The "noes" have it.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has already ruled that the amendment was not agreed to. The bill is open

to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time. The bill, H. R. 3842, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks at the desk be authorized to make necessary changes and corrections in chapter and section numbers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTENDANCE OF NAVY BAND AT FINAL REUNION OF UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS, NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2952, Calendar 310.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, H. R. 2952, to authorize the attendance of the United States Navy Band at the final reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Norfolk, Va., May 30 through June 2, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the majority leader that he ask unanimous consent for passage of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF DAM AND INCIDENTAL WORKS AT BRIDGE CANYON

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to announce that it is my intention on Monday next to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 153, Senate bill 75, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, unless prevented by the taking up of a conference report, or by some other form of interruption.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I correctly understand that on Monday the Senator proposes to move the consideration of Senate bill 75, the so-called central Arizona project?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. I wanted the Senate to have this information in advance.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur W. Crocker to be Examiner in Chief on the Board of Appeals of the United States Patent Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joe Barnes Harrison to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the present intention is that the Senate will not hold a session next Wednesday, May 30, which will be Memorial Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 28, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 17), 1951.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Arthur W. Crocker, of Maryland, to be Examiner in Chief on the Board of Appeals of the United States Patent Office.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Joe Barnes Harrison, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named commisisoned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for appointment to the rank indicated, subject to qualifications provided by law, effective on date indicated after their names:

To be Assistant Director with rank of rear admiral, effective June 1, 1951

Robert W. Knox

To be commanders

Maurice A. Hecht, effective July 6, 1951.
James C. Tison, Jr., effective July 12, 1951.
Edmund L. Jones, effective July 14, 1951
Edward B. Brown, effective July 15, 1951.
John C. Ellerbe, effective July 16, 1951.
John C. Tribble, Jr., effective July 17, 1951.
Kenneth S. Ulm, effective July 18, 1951.

To be lieutenant commanders

Howard S. Cole, effective July 1, 1951.
Lorin F. Woodcock, effective July 2, 1951.
Marvin T. Paulson, effective July 6, 1951.
David M. Whipp, effective July 12, 1951.

To be lieutenant

Allen L. Powell, effective August 16, 1951.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Hubert W. Keith, Jr., effective July 5, 1951.
Dale E. Fisher, effective July 12, 1951.
Gordon D. Scott, effective October 21, 1951.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal God, from whom alone cometh our strength and courage to rise victoriously above all the confusion and struggle of life, may we daily serve Thee with an obedient faith and a joyous confidence.

Grant that in these uncertain times, with their ever-shifting human scenes and baffling circumstances and perplexing problems, we may find our peace and hope in the assurance of Thy unchanging goodness, wisdom, and power.

Inspire us with an earnest longing to be the champion of every just and righteous cause. May we never be guilty of the most heinous of all sacrileges, that of a careless indifference to the tremendous

sacrifices which our fellow men are making for us on the field of battle far away from home and loved ones.

We pray that the social order and civilization, which we are endeavoring to build into the life of our Nation and the world, may not be pagan and secular in character but may it be supremely moral and spiritual, bearing the marks of the righteousness of God and the righteousness of God-fearing men and women.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 16, 1951:

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of R. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil and Howard A. Monroe;

H. R. 667. An act for the relief of Hildegarde Dettling and Judith Ingeborg Dettling;

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr.;

H. R. 1141. An act for the relief of St. Patrick Hospital and the Western Montana Clinic;

H. R. 3291. An act to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 3292. An act to amend subdivision a of section 55, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernand Van Den Branden;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Charles R. Keicher;

H. R. 2450. An act for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano; and

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports.

On May 17, 1951:

H. R. 2654. An act to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress; and

H. R. 3196. An act to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

On May 18, 1951:

H. R. 321. An act to provide that on and after January 1, 1952, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker; and

H. R. 1150. An act for the relief of Mario Pucci, Giacomo Favetti, Giuseppe Omati, Vincenze Andreani, Lambrune Sarzanini, and Alessandre Costa.

On May 19, 1951:

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery; and

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge.

On May 21, 1951:

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter;

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz; and

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

On May 22, 1951:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke; and

H. R. 3336. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1612. An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 108. An act to amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands; and

S. 435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Senate completed its action on H. R. 1612, to extend the President's authority to enter into trade agreements. According to the RECORD, a number of changes were made in the House-approved version of the bill, and one of those concerned suspension of concessions to iron-curtain countries.

Under the Senate provision, suspension of all concessions, past and future, is made mandatory. I believe the provisions are sufficiently broad to cover most-favored-nations concessions as well as those specifically granted under reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I am highly gratified that the Senate has seen fit to include such a provision in the bill it is sending to the House for concurrence. It is virtually what I urged during the Eighty-first Congress when I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 203 on May 15, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and his committee will accept the Senate amendment, and that it shall be concurred in unanimously by the House.

Under the House version only future concessions to Russia and her satellites are banned. The Senate knocks out existing concessions, thus providing a potent economic weapon in our struggle to halt Communist imperialism and aggression. By authorizing a suspension, the door is left open for any satellite to throw off the yoke of Moscow and again restore itself to the status of a most favored nation. It is a wise and prudent provision.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Albert	Evins	Murdock
Angell	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Golden	Perkins
Beall	Gossett	Potter
Bow	Hall,	Poulson
Boykin	Leonard W.	Powell
Brehm	Harvey	Reece, Tenn.
Budge	Hébert	Regan
Burton	Hoffman, Ill.	Roosevelt
Camp	Irving	Secrest
Cellar	Jackson, Calif.	Springer
Church	Kersten, Wis.	Stigler
Dawson	Kirwan	Sutton
Deane	Lind	Towe
D'Ewart	Lyle	Williams, Miss.
Dingell	McConnell	Willis
Dolliver	Magee	Winstead
Dondero	Miller, Calif.	Woodruff
Dorn	Miller, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDIA EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3791, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pend-

ing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, debate on the amendment has not yet been concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is closed unless some Member seeks recognition.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes, certainly I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment which I have offered, in two respects. One, in line 8, section 2, page 1, strike out "six years" and insert in lieu thereof "ten years."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a further unanimous-consent request?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes, I yield.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the amendment I have offered in another respect: After the word "jute" in line 16 of section 2, page 1, add "burlap, manganese, and beryl."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I object to the unanimous-consent request is the very reason I have risen in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. His request indicates that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has not thoroughly thought through the effect of the amendment proposed by him on yesterday.

The committee bill, as reported, does everything that the Cox amendment does. Everything and a whole lot more. It provides for the exchange to this country of all kinds of materials and minerals which India has and which we need. The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is to itemize the particular items which the Congress declares the Administrator must negotiate with the Government of India to receive in payment.

I think it is very unfortunate that the amendment which the gentleman from Georgia has offered was offered in the fashion it is, by amending the entire bill, striking out the entire committee bill and substituting the gentleman's bill, which changes the committee bill in only two particulars. One, with respect to the life of the loan; and the other with respect to the terms of repayment; two complete and separate subjects, which should be considered by the House separately. Unfortunately, the House will not have an opportunity to pass on these questions separately.

Under the Cox amendment the gentleman recognizes that the Administrator must have some discretion in negotiating these repayments. What will be the attitude of the Administrator if the Cox amendment is adopted? He will tell the Indian Government: "Congress has told me that I am not to be interested in your manganese which you have been sending to my country; I am not interested in these other things which my country has been receiving from you. The only thing I must negotiate with you is on monazite sands and the items contained in the Cox amendment, beryl, jute, and monazite sands." What will be the attitude of the Indian Government? They will say, "All right. Since you cannot deal with me for manganese, I will not sell it to you at any price; but since you insist I pay you in monazite sands. I will give you monazite sands, but instead of charging you $60 a ton I will charge you $1,000 a ton." What is to be the yardstick by which the value of monazite sand is to be laid alongside of the value of wheat?

Does the gentleman from Georgia contemplate that a bushel of monazite sand will be received in return for every bushel of wheat? That, of course, is absurd. What he expects is that a dollar equation for equivalent value will be used.

The gentleman from Ohio made the very persuasive argument, I think, that we should all have in mind that no matter what our personal attitude is with respect to the political attitude of the people who head up the Indian Government, we are dealing with a new and a proud government. We must respect their integrity, their pride, just as much as we would expect the representatives of our own Government to have a degree of pride. So when the Congress tells the foreign government that it must repay in a particular type of commodity and names or identifies the material and especially with respect to monazite, which has been grossly overrated, in this debate, and I am happy to join with my other colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to urge that this House not accept the Cox amendment for the reason that it would destroy the very purpose which the gentleman from Georgia seeks to achieve, an objective which I, too, support.

If the Cox amendment is adopted, it is my confident expectation that instead of getting monazite, jute, beryllium, or cyanite in larger quantities we will get them in much reduced quantities; instead of getting manganese and the other critical materials which we vitally need and which we do not have we will get them in reduced quantities.

The end effect is we will not be as well off with the Cox amendment as with the committee proposal, and therefore urge defeat of the Cox proposal.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief. I want to commend the gentleman from New York for a very fine statement. I think the gentleman from Georgia has the same objective with reference to strategic materials as any good American has in trying to do what is in the best interests of America in this critical hour.

America is short of strategic materials; we are critically short of some strategic materials. America has followed a program of negotiation with India. The RECORD of yesterday I think discloses what has been accomplished. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] who is chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee dealing with strategic materials made an excellent statement on this subject. The gentleman from North Carolina is well informed on this particular problem, and I have full confidence in his good judgment. He has been familiar with this problem over a period of years. The RECORD will disclose that by following the policy we have followed in the past with India we will get the maximum amount of strategic materials so essential to the defense program at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I should like to have the gentleman tell us or give us his views as to the possibility of getting these materials that are prohibited by Indian law at the present time.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I shall be glad to discuss that point rather briefly. I do not want to go into too much detail, because I do not want to say anything on the floor of this House that is going to interfere with negotiations that are now under way. But the law of India according to my understanding is not mandatory with reference to monazite; that is, we have a provision in our atomic energy statute which is mandatory; our statute states that all fissionable material shall be a Government monopoly; that is, that it cannot be privately owned in the United States but must be sold to the Government. The statute of India, I believe, is similar, except that it is not mandatory. I believe, and I have faith in those who are trying to do some work in this field, that through negotiation probably involving the construction of a processing plant, an offer that India made to the French Government that failed, that something can be worked out. As the gentleman from New York pointed out a moment ago, however, monazite has simply been overplayed in this debate. It is difficult to indicate its importance in the future. But the big thing is we have a lot of other critical materials we are getting from India that are vital to our defense program. It will affect the whole defense posture of the Nation. I hope we will repose some faith and confidence in people who have made a thorough study of this matter. The House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy both Republicans and Democrats alike believe the present policy of negotiation is the best course to follow in obtaining these strategic materials.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the fact that apparently the Congress is getting ready to help India with this shipment of wheat, does not the gentleman agree with me that we might fairly expect from them without regard to the quantity of materials that are needed by us and that we have received in the past, that we might step up those receipts insofar as our needs can be demonstrated?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think there is a great deal of merit in the gentleman's suggestion. If you will look at the RECORD of yesterday and the list of critical materials we are currently getting from India you will find that we have accomplished a great deal by negotiation. Let us not jeopardize our present program by adopting the Cox amendment.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. What does the gentleman suppose India will do with their manganese if we do not buy it? Russia does not need it. And India has no other market but the United States.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman does not think Russia would buy it?

Mr. KEARNS. No; they have all they need.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am not so sure about that. Russia might use the manganese for certain bargaining purposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD to the substitute offered by Mr. COX:

After the word "jute" in the sixteenth line of section 2, page 1, add "burlap, manganese and beryl."

In line 8, section 2, page 1, strike out "six years" and insert "ten years."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we would like to hear the point of order now before we hear the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has the privilege of reserving a point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. No, he does not unless he receives unanimous consent. I demand that he state the point of order now. We want to hear the point of order discussed.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, on page 6 of the committee report there is a brief paragraph on the probable terms of the loan mechanism in this proposal before us. The committee report says:

The committee has been advised that, subject to later determination by the NAC, the terms of a loan to India under authority of this bill would probably be those usually prevailing in previous ECA loans. This would mean a loan for 35 years at 2½ percent.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I know, since the inception of this Government people who have handled food transactions on a credit basis have always operated on a short-term loan basis on the theory that as food moves from the primary producer into the channels of consumption the loan shall be liquidated as the food disappears. Personally, I think this is one of the most unsound approaches that has ever been made by Congress insofar as a food transaction is concerned. Therefore I am in favor of supporting the Cox substitute, which he has attempted to revise by unanimous consent, and which will reduce the period of this loan to no more than 10 years.

The debate on this bill carries me back to the conversation between Lord Keynes, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Lockhart, Mr. Fletcher, our Secretary of State, and Secretary of the Treasury, and members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, when England first requested the $5,000,000,000 to help unlock the sterling balances which England owed to India and other countries. India was a great participant in those sterling balances and, of course, we went along with that $3,750,000,000 loan, as it was then called, and later as it became a gift, and thus assisted India very greatly in connection with the distribution of those funds which we provided.

In addition, we have gone along with the Bretton Woods Agreement, the International Credit Bank, the stabilization fund, and based on the debate on this bill India is receiving and will receive great benefits through the International Credit Bank. I regret that all Members of the House have not had a chance to visit extensively in India. I have no more idea that this shipment of wheat will alleviate substantially the suffering in India than I have that I am going to fly over the moon tonight. There is an insatiable appetite over there that we can do little or nothing about if we pour all of our wheat production into India. Now, that is just the cold-blooded fact. The bill also reminds me of an experience which I had in Shanghai, China, on an occasion there when I went to the Commissioner of the Port and said to him, "I would like to see your port records. I would like to go through the ships anchored out in the river and along the docks, and into the godowns and check a little into our 15 shiploads of UNRRA supplies." He turned over to me the four best experts in his office, and they visited along with me on the trip. We found that 75 percent of the total cargo disappeared from the ship before it reached the warehouse or the godown. We found that 15 percent of the 25 percent which reached the godown disappeared before it got up the river to the poor and hungry people. Or let me repeat it this way: 50 percent was pilfered before it left the ships for the godown, 25 from the ships to the godown, 15 percent after it reached the godown, and 10 percent reached the poor people up the river for whom UNRRA supplies were sent. That whole operation became such a disgrace that public support in this country was withdrawn from the UNRRA program and we had to cancel out the proposition and quit the program.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I want to thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. As the gentleman stated, it does what I asked unanimous consent to do. The gentleman always thinks soundly on subjects that he discusses. The difference in conditions that existed heretofore when ECA loans were made is this, that at the present time we are at war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, and also ECA loans have been theoretically presented on the proposition that you were rebuilding countries from an economic standpoint. This is a very brief food-supply situation, and we should restrict this loan to a short term by all means.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this transaction started out to be a gift by this Government of $190,000,000 to the Government of India.

Regardless of the efforts made to sugar-coat it, or disguise it, I am convinced that if we pass this bill, it will wind up in the end as a gift of $190,000,000 to the Government of India.

It would be a radical departure from long-established custom for us to collect a debt from another government, and I, for one, have no hope that India will ever repay the money if this bill passes.

Not only do the global thinkers in our Government expect to give this $190,000,000 to India but they are planning to give her billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money, if India can get established through this bill as a member of the ECA group. The amount involved in this bill is just the entering wedge of a larger spending program, and what I fear will be an ever-expanding program of spending American taxpayers' money for the development of India.

In his testimony on this legislation, the Secretary of State told the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

When those of us in the executive branch of the Government considered the Indian suggestions that the 2,000,000 tons of food grain might be made available on a long-term credit basis, we discovered that the problems created were much the same as those involved in the use of India's sterling balances. India hopes to finance part of its 6-year development program by loans. Its debt-servicing capacity is limited. If its credit were pledged for grain, it would be unable to qualify for the hoped-for developmental loans. In addition, credits for the acquisition of consumer goods such as foodstuffs required to meet an emergency situation are economically unsound as they provide no basis for the creation of income and foreign exchange to repay the credit.

It is clear to me that our own interest and India's interest require that we provide the grain which India needs to supplement its purchase program on a grant basis.

India's plight has been greatly exaggerated by some of the advocates of this

proposal. Although it has been claimed by some that India is threatened by a famine, and with mass starvation, if we do not pass this bill, that claim will not stand investigation.

The truth is that while India is short 2,000,000 tons of food grain, India is not threatened with a famine. Nor are her people facing starvation because of that shortage.

Even Mr. Willard Thorpe, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, who testified in favor of giving this grain to India, very frankly told the committee in substance that a failure to send the grain would mean malnutrition for a large number of people, but not starvation. His testimony is set out on page 60 of the committee hearings.

Here are the facts regarding India's food grain shortage. India's total food grain requirement for the year is 50,670,000 tons. In spite of all the talk about locusts, earthquakes, droughts, and floods, the fact is that she produced 43,770,000 tons. She had 700,000 tons available in her pipeline supplies, making a total of 44,470,000 tons. She had a shortage, then, of only 6,200,000 tons, which left her not a famine-stricken nation, faced with mass starvation. It left her with an original shortage of a little more than one-ninth of her normal year's supply—committee report, page 6.

She is not short now even one-ninth of her normal supply. She has supplied herself with the greater part of that shortage. The shortage which now exists is one twenty-fifth of her need for the year—one twenty-fifth, or a 2 weeks' supply.

Now, a food shortage which amounts to only a 2 weeks' supply out of a 12 months' period is not a famine. You cannot enlarge that into a famine, even by the wildest kind of exaggeration. You cannot make a famine out of that kind of shortage, no matter how hard you are looking for a famine. If they were not able to get another bushel of grain, and if the worst came to worst, the other 50 weeks' normal supply of food grains could be spread out a little thinner, and without any serious difficulty whatever, this would enable them to sustain the people and prevent starvation.

When a pro-Communist country, such as India is, is short only a 2 weeks' supply of grain out of a 12 months' normal supply, we are not justified in calling this relatively minor shortage a famine; and it affords no reason to lay an additional burden of $190,000,000 on the shoulders of the already overburdened American taxpayers who have been called upon this year to furnish the money for a $71,600,000,000 budget.

There is another thing which should be considered in passing on these issues. India has a lot of other food in addition to these food grains in question. While their food grains provide them with 900 calories a day, they have other foods which bring the individual diet up to 1,700 or 1,800 calories per day.

Available food in India is not by any means limited to these food grains. Mr. Clifford C. Taylor, agricultural counselor to the American Embassy in India, testified to that effect. His testimony is found on page 33 of the hearings.

That testimony is as follows:

Mr. MORGAN. Are there any proteins or fats in their diet?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh yes. There are peanuts.

Mr. MORGAN. Are there proteins in their diet?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. They have a number of crops which make up the meat part of the diet of a vegetarian population.

Mr. MORGAN. With regard to these rationed people, 9 ounces of grain would be about 900 calories a day?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is right. They are now reduced from 12 ounces to 9 ounces on their rations, but we are speaking of the rationed grains, and that is the problem with which we are dealing. In addition to that, they have sugar, which they grow. They have peanuts that they grow. They have cow peas, chick peas, and pigeon peas which they grow. These peas make up the protein part of their diet.

Mr. MORGAN. They get fats from the peanuts?

Mr. TAYLOR. Another important animal fat is a butter made out of buffalo milk, or cow's milk.

The total ration of which we speak supplied from the ration shops is either 1,200 calories or 900 calories as at present, but that is not the total consumption of a family. The consumption per individual, per person, is more on the order of 1,700 calories or 1,800 calories, or within that bracket.

If India is able to supply her food needs through her own efforts, are we then justified in adding the $190,000,000 to the American taxpayers' burden? Can India supply these needs in some other practical manner?

She has done it when other food shortages arose.

These so-called famines are no new thing in India. The committee report shows on page 16 that India has a so-called famine or food shortage on an average of about every 7 years. The report shows that 21 famines occurred between 1803 and 1943. They are not new to India, and they have met them and dealt with them before.

There was a food shortage in India in 1943. After the Bengal famine in 1943, India reduced its cotton acreage and planted that land to other crops. On page 35 of the hearings, Mr. Taylor, the American embassy's agricultural counsellor to India, points out that after the Bengal famine India reduced its cotton acreage from 20,000,000 acres down to 10 or 11 million acres, and used that acreage for other crops. It is a fair deduction from his testimony that one-third to one-half of that acreage reduction went into food crops.

They can reduce cotton acreage this year, and they can make a crop of milo or sorghum grain by August of this year, the time when it would be possible at the very earliest to begin to move these food grains into India in appreciable quantities.

However, instead of reducing cotton acreage, India has actually increased her cotton acreage 1,200,000 acres.

On page 10 of the committee report, the testimony of Mr. Taylor is set forth, in which he says:

I will say the total increase in cotton acreage this year was 1,200,000; 1,200,000 acres diverted from food grains or other crops into cotton.

Now, if India so lightly regards this 2 weeks' deficiency, or 2 weeks' shortage of food grains, that she is not willing to take a step which is within her power to take, namely to reduce her cotton acreage for 1 year and plant it to food-grain crops, which could be harvested in time to meet the need, what is there about the matter which makes it our responsibility to lay another $190,000,000 on the shoulders of American taxpayers? Now, I want to talk a little about India's ability to pay for this food. The government of India sends out a news bulletin just about every week. It is mailed by the Government of India at 2107 Massachusetts Avenue NW., here in Washington. On March 7, 1951, the India news bulletin which I received contained this statement:

India's over-all balance of payment position has been favorable since the last quarter of 1949, and is still moving in her favor. A net surplus of $138,600,000 was recorded during the year following devaluation, as compared with a deficit of $522,900,000 dollars in the year preceding devaluation.

Much detailed testimony regarding India's financial status is set forth in the committee report on pages 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Much testimony on the subject is contained in the hearings before the committee. The truth is, and it cannot be denied and will not be denied, that India has a sterling balance of $1,750,000,000; that she has a $247,000,000 gold reserve; as will be seen on page 64 of the committee hearings, that she has $50,000,000 foreign exchange, all of which totals up to more than $2,000,000,000.

That is India's financial position, while our financial position is that we have no balance whatever. On the contrary, we have an outstanding national debt of approximately $256,000,000,000. In addition to that, we have had a budget of $71,600,000,000 presented to us for the next fiscal year, and we do not know at this moment what additional sums will be added to that budget.

In this situation, then, the question presents itself: Why does not India, being in position to do so, take $190,000,000 of her balance of more than $2,000,000,000 and buy this food grain and end this controversy. Right there is where we find the milk in the coconut.

India has promulgated a 6-year development plan, involving among other things, development of irrigation and rural electrification projects, development of transportation facilities, expanding its iron and steel production, and many other development and expansion features.

The details of this 6-year development program are set forth on page 9, together with their cost. The total cost over the 6-year period is $3,864,000,000, or an average annual expenditure of $644,000,000.

While India is planning this expansion program, we here in the United States are curtailing rural electrification projects, irrigation projects, development of waterways, and projects of various kinds all over the country, because of the need to conserve our finances for the war effort.

As we look further into India's development and expansion program, we find the old familiar proposition—we find that, and I quote from the committee report on page 9:

> India estimates that it can finance from internal sources about $2,163,000,000. The remainder, a sum of $1,701,000,000, will have to come from sources outside India, including substantial amounts from the sterling balances, one of India's few sources of accumulated capital.

Now the truth of the matter is, India wants us to finance this 6-year development and expansion program, and if we take India into the ECA group through this pending bill, the skids will be greased for us to begin to finance India's development and expansion program, and when we begin to finance it, the chances are good that the program will expand into a 7- or 10-year program, and the amount will expand from $3,864,000,000 into a program of twice or possibly three times that amount.

On this point, Mr. Willard Thorpe, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, testified before the committee:

> There is a meeting going on among countries discussing their next steps on the Colombo plan. I think, to be quite frank about it, they are looking forward to assistance from the United States.
>
> I think I will have to say that in our foreign-assistance program, as we come before the Congress a little later, it may well be that some part of the support of the Colombo plan may appear. That is not a promise or a threat at this point. It is just a matter of being honest about it.

This testimony appears on pages 68 and 69 of the committee hearings.

So it is evident to me that this is the first step, and is a part of an over-all plan for India, under which the American taxpayers will have saddled upon them the responsibility for financing a welfare program for India's 350,000,000 people and for the development of her vast land area.

Where is the logic in our curtailing here in America rural electrification projects, irrigation projects, and waterway development, because we need to conserve our finances for the war effort, and go right ahead and enter a program to spend the money thus saved to pay for these same facilities and developments in India? Where would be the logic in our doing that, even if India was a stanch ally? Where is the logic in doing it, particularly when India has manifested at every opportunity, her intention to oppose our plans for carrying on a cold war and possibly a hot war against the enemy of freedom for all the world?

If we acknowledge a responsibility, and assume a responsibility, in this instance of supplying this food shortage, it will amount to an implied statement to all the nations and peoples of the world that whenever a food shortage develops anywhere, America will consider it her responsibility to supply that shortage.

Through our commitments to allies, and through our obligations growing out of wars we have engaged in, we are now carrying a great part of the world on our backs.

Do we feel that we are now obligated, and strong enough financially and otherwise, to take on countries which are not our allies, and with whom we have no commitments, military or otherwise?

The action proposed here will be bad for this country in a number of respects. First, it will set the pattern of bringing India into the ECA group, and will start us upon the road of financing all her projects. It will set the pattern for bringing other countries into the ECA group through the same method, and will lead other countries to believe that they are entitled to the same treatment from us that we give to India.

Third, it will establish a precedent on the part of our Government of calling upon our taxpayers to assume the responsibility and obligation of furnishing food to all hungry people of all countries, wherever hunger may develop in the world.

And, if a similar situation develops somewhere else in the world this year, or one or more similar situations develop somewhere else next year, and we find that our resources will not permit us to take the same action with such countries as we take now with India, we will make enemies of that country or those people to whom such aid may not be extended.

The popular belief among the people of this country is that under this proposed aid-to-India plan the American Government will give free, to hungry people in India, these food grains, for the purpose of preventing mass death by starvation.

That belief is erroneous in just about every particular. To begin with, the grain is not given to hungry people. It is given to the Government of India. The Government of India then sells it to the consumer. The consumer who pay his money out of his pocket for this food feels no gratitude to our Government or to the American people. Furthermore, there is no danger of mass death by starvation in India whether this grain goes there or not. The worst that can happen is some malnutrition resulting from the spreading of 50 weeks' supply of food a little thinner to cover 52 weeks.

I would not deny food to hungry people. Hungry people who are able to pay for their food ought to pay for it. It is poor business any way you look at it to give food to people who are able to buy it. It is bad for them, and it is bad for those who give it.

I am willing even to barter food to India, and it cannot be said by India or anyone else that India is not in position to barter us some of her own natural resources for some of our food.

India is now bartering her natural resources for food with Communist China.

On page 40 of the committee hearings, Mr. Stanley Andrews, Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, testified as follows regarding India's barter trade with Communist China:

> Mr. VORYS. With regard to China, you say they are buying from China?
>
> Mr. ANDREWS. They have bought 50,000 tons from China.
>
> Mr. VORYS. And they are paying for that?
>
> Mr. ANDREWS. It is barter. They are trading jute for rice.

If India can trade jute to Communist China for rice, and she is trading it, she can certainly trade jute and other raw materials to the United States of America for wheat and other foods.

I will not agree that India can do business with Communist China on that basis, and refuse to do business with us on the same basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I am sorry that this legislation has come before the House. I think it is unfortunate. The reason I think it is unfortunate is that I do not think it is necessary. The other thing that bothers me most is that we are likely to get us another free ride new customer. We are still handing out millions to every customer throughout this world that we began making donations to several years ago.

I am further disturbed because I am pretty well satisfied it is going to pass and will cost the taxpayers of this country $190,000,000, which will only be opening the door to take on and keep this customer in the future.

Since I have been in Congress we have given away to other countries of the world about $100,000,000,000. I voted against most of it. That is not our money but the taxpayers' money. Some of it has done a lot of good. A great deal of it, probably many billions, have been wasted. I had hoped that sometime we would begin to take a greater interest, and spend more time on the floor of this House looking after the interests of our own taxpayers; and that sometime we would be able to bring a halt to this giving away policy. But here we are confronted with another would-be recipient. I am discouraged at that.

I am also discouraged by the fact that if you will look back over 10 years, notwithstanding the fact we have been laboring under excessive taxes, we have spent $206,000,000,000 more than we have taken in, which has been added to the national debt which now stands at about $257,000,000,000.

The President is asking for about $71,500,000,000 for the coming budget, and says that our taxes will have to be increased. They will have to be.

Our Ways and Means Committee has been diligently searching into every nook and cranny of the economy of this country to see where we can get a few more billions for national defense in this time of crisis. They are not going to be

able to get the 10 billion, in my judgment, which the President requests. That committee is the intake valve into the Treasury. We are here spending 3 or 4 days in debate, trying to again loosen the valve in the outgo. It has been turned open by this Congress too often now. I want us to turn the outgo valve to the right, shut it off, and stop this drain on the Treasury.

We shall never balance the budget and we shall not preserve the financial solvency of this Nation unless the Congress puts its foot down and operates in the interest of our own people in the hope of keeping this country in a sound financial condition.

I think the greatest service we could render India today in this Congress—and I do not know why we should be so terribly interested in India—would be to turn down this loan and let that be the beginning of a policy of this Government to give away less to the other nations of the world in the future than we have been giving to them in the past 10 years. I say this because I believe the greatest good that can come to India and all of the countries of the world is for this Nation of ours to be so conducted from the executive department and from the floor of this Congress as to keep it sound and strong financially so that it can continue to make its contribution to the world and to world peace.

Those who argue for this gift, and that is what it means, of $190,000,000 to India, should ask themselves the question, "How long can this continue until we have destroyed our own Government and plunged our people into bankruptcy and poverty?"

I do not see how, in good conscience, we can afford to further give immense sums of money to foreign countries unless we demand a return of materials we need which they have in payment of such gifts.

This money should not be made available unless such conditions are met. It is time you quit giving the people's money away.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this measure.

This wild-eyed internationalism is wrecking this Republic. Lenin said 30 years ago that the way to destroy the United States Government was to bankrupt it; and you are going right down that road today, if you pass a measure like this.

Nobody need kid himself about what this measure is for; it is to give to Nehru, the Communist leader of India, $190,000,000, either in money or in wheat. Could anybody who heard his speech before this Congress fail to recognize the fact that he was an out-and-out Communist?

They talk about those people starving. Why, they starved to death on the streets of their capital city, New Delhi, as well as Calcutta, when they were making bumper crops of forty-eight or fifty million tons of wheat a year.

Let me show you what the highbrows in India—the ones who will really get this money—let me show you how they live. I read from a United Press report from New Delhi, India, that came to my desk today. It says:

WEALTHY POTENTATE OF INDIA LOSES PENSION OF $546,000 A YEAR

NEW DELHI, INDIA.—The fabulously wealthy Gaekwar of Baroda lost his appeal Monday for the restoration of his $546,000-a-year pension, but he still may be permitted to be called Your Highness.

The Ministry of State turned down the potentate's plea for the return of his sovereign right taken from him April 12.

The Government of India deposed the Gaekwar in favor of his son. It charged him with challenging the constitution and misusing $10,000,000 in public funds. It gave him 1 month to appeal the ruling. The appeal was denied today.

The Gaekwar is a famous race horse owner and spender.

I presume the Gaekwar's son will now get the $546,000 a year which the Gaekwar was drawing all the time, and which others are drawing throughout India, where they wear more diamonds than anywhere else in the world.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has said that Nehru is a Communist.

Mr. RANKIN. Why, of course.

Mr. COX. Permit me to quote from Nehru's own words, in which he said:

I do believe in communism as an ideal of society. For essentially it is socialism, and socialism, I think, is the only way if the world is to escape disaster.

Mr. RANKIN. One need not go further than Nehru's speech here before Congress. Anyone who heard that speech knew he was a Communist.

Mr. COX. May I quote one further sentence from Nehru. He said:

And Russia, what of her? An outcast like us from the nations and much slandered and often erring. But in spite of her many mistakes she stands today as the greatest opponent of imperialism, and her record with the nations of the East has been just and generous.

Mr. RANKIN. That ought to convince you.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact that at one time the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek was sympathetic to Communist ideology?

Mr. RANKIN. He may have been. I do not know.

They have been starving to death on the streets of Delhi, Calcutta, and other cities in India for years and years; and they will still starve to death, even if you give Nehru all this wheat.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman think President Truman was correct when, as the leader of the Democratic Party, he said at one time in 1948, "Good old Joe Stalin, he is not such a bad fellow"?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not.

Mr. FULTON. The United States can hardly criticize Nehru when the head of our Government made that statement.

Mr. RANKIN. That was not my statement, nor did it express my views.

Now, gentlemen, they are robbing the American farmers with this DiSalle order fixing the price of cotton in the country $135 a bale below the world price. The farmers of Mississippi will lose under this reduction in the price of cotton $270,000,000 on their cotton this year. My farmers will lose $270,000,000 this year if they make the 2,000,000 bales of cotton they are being asked to produce.

India has cut her wheat acreage 30 percent this year and has begun to grow cotton instead, and is asking us to send them this wheat paid for out of the pockets of the overburdened taxpayers of America, including the farmers of Mississippi. Every county will pay an average of more than $50,000 of it. Do you think a bond issue for that amount would carry in a single county in your district if the people understood it? It is about time that the Congress woke up to the fact you are bankrupting this country by giving money to Nehru, Tito, and other Communist leaders throughout the world.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I was wondering if the gentleman's figures were right about the maharaja. I think the pension that was granted him was $750,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Maybe his son is going to get $750,000, but the old man only got $546,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. When the Secretary of State was testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee a member of the committee inquired as to why the wealth of the 700 princes of India whose fortunes run all the way from two to eight billion dollars and the Secretary gave the supercilious answer that he did not know they were the people wanting wheat.

Mr. RANKIN. You are not giving this wheat to the people of India any more than you gave that money to the people of Yugoslavia which you voted for Tito. Those people in Yugoslavia did not know Tito got that money. This money you have been pouring into the rat holes of Europe has gone into the pockets of a few alleged leaders. The people did not get any of that money, and most of them do not know anything about it. This country is more unpopular in Europe today than she was before you began this crazy extravagance. To continue it simply means the wreck and ruin of this country which the people are looking to us to protect.

I hope the entire measure is defeated on a final vote. We cannot afford to bankrupt our country in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious from the tone of the debate that this bill has now simmered down to a question of whether you want India to grow cotton or you do not. Quite obviously those who are most bitterly opposed to it on the Democratic side are those from the cotton States who seem to fear that there may be some cotton grown on land that otherwise grew wheat. It is a matter of personal opinion and decision insofar as every Member of this House is concerned as to whether he is going to vote for or against the bill. That has no relation whatsoever to the Cox substitute or even the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] to the Cox substitute, which includes certain other materials that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] will insist we get back in return for wheat, and make a deal on.

Now when it comes to placing in the bill any specific items for repayment to the United States of the loan that is proposed here to be made, let me ask this question of the Members of this House, as I believe good businessmen you all are: If you were to make a loan to someone, whether or not you expected it to be repaid, and were to say, "I am going to loan you $200, or $2,000,000"—or whatever it might be, "and I will take repayment of that in certain commodities," and you do not specify the price and quantity of the commodity when you make the loan, are you smart or are you dumb? When you specifically state those commodities, you lay yourselves wide open to being held up if price and quantities are not specified. Now, that is just common sense, and every farmer in this House should know it and every other businessman in this body as well. It is perfectly absurd to place any such restrictions upon negotiators as to say, "We will take repayment in thus and so-and-so" without specifying quantities and price. That is silly. Whether or not you wish to vote for the bill or against the bill, as the case may be, for goodness sake, do not put these restrictions of the Cox substitute in this bill. While I do not have as much confidence in some of the negotiators of this Government as it is presently constituted, as I might otherwise have, nevertheless I am going to place as much confidence as I may in them, and that confidence would call upon me as a businessman of some experience—not as much, perhaps, as some of you here, but still about 35 years of it—to not state exactly what, other than cash, you wish, in return, unless you put the price on, the price at which you are willing to accept it. There is no such price on any of these items mentioned. There is a generalization of materials that are needed and in short supply in the United States. That is more than sufficient. It would be far better to not even go that far at this point. The best deal would be to limit repayment to cash.

If what you want to do is to bring the price down on these items and get more of them per dollar, so to speak, then only generalize and give these negotiators an opportunity to deal as best they may.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. If this matter is handled by the State Department, regardless of what legislation we pass here today, does the gentleman actually think that we will ever get a thin dime back for this wheat, ECA included?

Mr. HINSHAW. I will reply to the gentleman in this way: Some time back we passed the ECA legislation. We have put out a great deal of money. My friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and others just now made a great complaint about there being Socialists in the Government of India, and I believe Tito was mentioned a moment ago. It seems to me, however, that these same gentlemen were heartily in favor of giving all of the credit that they could give to Socialist Great Britain. Why? Not because they were Socialists, which they are, obviously, but perhaps because they buy cotton. Now, let us get the figures straight here. I am merely taking this from what has been said on this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am sure the gentleman, upon reflection, will withdraw his statement impugning the motives of the Members of this House for the votes they have cast in the past. I will say for myself that when voting on ECA I never thought of cotton and do not now.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, when the gentleman states that, I am glad to accept his statement. However, my memory of the ECA debates brings forth quite clearly the various products that were then in long supply in the United States, including cotton, which might very easily be sent abroad at a price satisfactory to the farmers of this country, and cotton was a large part of it. I believe that millions of bales of cotton have been shipped out under the ECA program. I do not impugn the motives of those who, like myself, voted for ECA, but the subject of cotton grown in India was brought up on this floor a few moments ago by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who seemed to complain that India was growing cotton on some lands that had grown wheat. I gathered it was their idea that if India should stop growing that cotton and grow wheat that this bill was unnecessary and hence, in order to stop the growing of that cotton and force the Indians to return to wheat on those lands, this bill should be defeated.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think every Member of the Congress holds the gentleman from California in the highest regard. His judgment is generally good. The gentleman just said there was no price set on these critical materials we were to get from India.

Mr. HINSHAW. I did.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman must also realize that there is no price set on the goods we are supposed to send to India under the provisions of the bill, so we are on an even barter level.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; you are not, because your barter deal is not being made in advance of the time of payment. Of course, there is an open market in the United States for wheat. I assume the Government of the United States is a large purchaser of wheat and knows what the price is and how much wheat it expects to get for $190,000,000. But there is no token whatsoever in this substitute bill as to how much jute, how much manganese, how much monasite, or anything else is going to be repaid in any future time, or at what price.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman will admit that we have a world market price?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; not on those items you do not.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

May I just answer the gentleman from Iowa by stating that practically all the jute in the world comes from India, and the crops are not yet raised for subsequent years, so no price has been placed on them, and no price can be placed on them in this bill. Prices on these other items are whatever price the United States is willing and anxious to bid for them.

Mr. JENSEN. I realize that.

Mr. HINSHAW. When it comes to monazite sand, manganese, and that sort of thing, there are some places around the world where it can be bought, but because of the demands that have been made by the United States, and particularly by Russia, the price has been raised enormously in no time at all. If what you want to do is raise these prices further, then ask for specific items to be paid back under this bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Referring to the statement the gentleman made a moment ago and the obvious implication about

the sale of cotton through ECA to ECA participating countries, particularly to Britain, I am sure the gentleman did not mean that we from the cotton-producing area voted for ECA because of the market it would make for cotton. I can assure him that I voted for ECA for other reasons. I voted for it simply for our own national security and welfare and to prevent those countries torn, destroyed, and devastated by war from falling into the Russian Communist fold. May I ask the gentleman this: Is it not a fact that the ECA program was adopted solely for the purpose of the security and the welfare of the United States and the peace of the world, and to prevent Communist expansion and aggression?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly the reason why this bill is just as important as the billions that you passed out to the Socialist government of England and the other socialistic countries under ECA.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman contend there is any security advantage whatsoever in this proposal?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; I do.

Mr. HARRIS. I would be glad to hear the gentleman's views on that. I cannot see it. This is the very thing I hope somebody will explain, because a great many of us feel that if there were some security value, we might have a different viewpoint.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can give the gentleman this much, and this is a subject which comes under the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I wish I could give the gentleman all the information which came to the committee. While there are other sources in the world than certain portions of India where monazite sands are found, including some small amounts in the Carolinas in the United States and some in Brazil, the principal world supply source now known is in India.

Some time ago it was the desire of the United States to acquire these monazite sands or the product thereof, which is thorium, which is useful in the atomic energy work, quite useful, incidentally, although not greatly used at the present time. India is the principal world source of supply for that item. Some time ago, when we were considering negotiating for some of these sands, they asked us if in consideration of it we might assist them to build some plants for the primary extraction of thorium from the sands. The thorium runs anywhere from 8 to 10 percent, and it has to be removed from the sand. Those in our country who were then interested in that sort of a deal declined to do that, and said they would take the sands only. Along came the French and they said, "Yes, we will put up certain plants for you in India for the extraction of this material." Whether it was to be done with ECA money or not, I do not know, but that is not the point here. The point of the matter is that they obtained an embargo against the export of thorium sands largely, I believe, in consideration for the agreement that the French Government or the French people, or whoever it was, would build these plants in India. That embargo stands today. We can get along without thorium, but we would like to have it. Everybody knows we would like to have it. We would like to have all we can get of it. We want the thorium contained in those sands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes, because this is important to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. It certainly is important, and I would like to say I have not heard yet the gentleman say anything about the security value which attaches to this. This is purely political. To me a principle is involved as it was when I voted against giving millions to Yugoslavia's Communist Tito.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will give me a chance to explain, I will do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. We are at the present time considering negotiating on this same subject. These negotiations will become active shortly. We believe that in the consideration of this bill in part it will make possible the kind of a deal we want to have made, first to remove that embargo, and secondly to permit us to get the product of this monazite sand which is thorium, a fissionable material. If you put monazite in this bill then you will be throwing these negotiations right straight out the window. That is a matter of vital importance to the national defense of the United States. That is but one item involved in this whole set-up.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Assuming, as the committee does assume in its report, that India needs wheat, and assuming that India has materials and commodities which we need, as the committee report recognizes, then can the gentleman see any objection to imposing upon the people who are to carry on the negotiations for our Government the additional obligation, implicit in the amendment which is before us, to get as much of those materials as they reasonably can? In other words, I cannot understand why a special reference to monazite sands would mean that we would not get any monazite sand.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman may not be able to understand it, but I, as a businessman, understand it. I understand that if you try to put a compulsion upon a free person he will say, "To heck with you," and let it go at that.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Every House Member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has also said, if you put this in, we will not get what we might otherwise get.

Mr. HINSHAW. Every member of that committee has so stated. We ask the House to believe it. If you do not want to believe us, that is your business. But you do have the advice of every member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that has taken the floor of the House including myself. If the membership of this House does not want to take that advice, then do not take it. If you believe us, then take that advice, for goodness sake, and strike this language out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would not ask the indulgence of the House for five additional minutes if I had at any time spoken during general debate, or taken the floor since the bill has been read for amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished chairman of the committee be granted 10 additional minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, but I think I can say everything I want to say in 5 minutes. I appreciate the gentleman's thoughtfulness, however.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Georgia, the author of this amendment, has been perfectly candid, as he always is. He says he wants to kill the bill, and I admit if his amendment passes, it will kill the good effects of the bill, both so far as India is concerned, and so far as our own country is concerned.

His amendment starts out by saying that India will never repay, and his amendment guarantees that India will never repay, because India cannot pay under his amendment.

India is a young nation. I wish the Members would remember that. She has not had a constitution for more than 2 years. She has had independence for only about 4 years. In our generosity in the matter of making loans to other nations of the world, do not forget most of them have been established for hundred of years, have an established economic set-up, established government, established trends of thoughts, do not have to deal with the great minority problems and religious problems that occur in India. In every case I think those nations have been allowed as long as 30 or 35 years, with perhaps one exception, and that not shorter than 20 years, to amortize these loans. Under the ECA Act those nations will not have to pay interest for 2½ years, and the interest is 2½ percent. Payments on the principal will not begin for 6 or 8 years. Here we are asking India which

has been a colony under the British Empire for 300 years, inexperienced in government, not to mention finances, through the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], to pay in 6 years, not only the interest but the principal. Now, if we put that provision in the bill, it will mean that interest payments semi-annually will be $2,500,000; annually $5,000,000; a total of $31,000,000. The principal, semi-annually will be about $16,000,000, and the annual payments will be about $32,000,000. The total will be $220,000,000.

That is a tough assignment to give to an infant nation like India. I advise the House to think hard before passing this amendment.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] blew in with his amendment like a monsoon on the Indian Ocean and just as unexpectedly as a monsoon. Although usually he is one of the kindest men I have ever known, a man who has deep sympathy for the suffering of any country, he has come here on this floor, and if I have been able to catch the spirit of what he said, he has not shown one iota of sympathy for the teeming 350,000,000 people of India.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. Not at this time. The gentleman has talked more on this bill than any other 25 Members in this House. If I can get just a little additional time I will yield to the gentleman when I finish.

Now, it has been said by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and he is my dear friend and I have great respect for him, and also by another dear friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], and I have great respect for him also, that as a matter of fact there is no real suffering in India any more than there has always been.

Now, let us look at this as Representatives of 150,000,000 people whose normal diet is in the neighborhood of 3,200 calories per person, and then go to India where the normal diet is never over 1,700 calories. An American would die on 1,700 calories. Then, let us remember that, according to the testimony before our committee, which has been uncontradicted, this diet, on account of scarcity of foods in India has gone down to about 900 calories. Imagine that. Nine hundred calories. That is uncontradicted. What we are trying to do and what the Government of India is trying to do is to raise that bare living diet in India to 1,200 calories, not to 1,700; you are not going to be able to do that with this money; you just simply cannot do it. Are you going to give it to them and then take it away? I think it is recognized here that India can repay this money, and the United States is going to expect them to, but do not give it to them and tell them they have got to repay it in 6 years, because that debt cannot be amortized in that length of time. It reminds me very much of what might happen down in the gentleman's own State of Georgia, where a young farmer gets married, rents a house, buys a mule, but has not money enough to put in his crop. He goes to his banker in January and says: "My reputation is good for paying my debts; I have not any assets free of debt; I want a loan to plant my crop and plow it so I can repay you what I already owe at the end of the year." The banker says: "I will let you have this money if you will repay it in June; if you will do that I will let you have it." The farmer says: "I cannot gather my crop, maybe it is cotton; I do not pick my crop until August and September; I just cannot repay you in June, and I might just as well go into bankruptcy now and quit farming as to have to accept a loan under the terms you offer." If that banker insisted on such a proposition to the young man, he would have made an enemy for life; there is no doubt about it; just as much an enemy as we would make of India if we say: "We are going to grant you this loan but you have got to repay it in 6 years"; knowing all the time that she cannot pay in that time.

I have not dealt with the other element of the amendment, the strategic-materials element. I think the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has adequately answered the points raised by the gentleman from Georgia and those who advocate his amendment. Six of the best men in Congress from both sides of the aisle, men who have served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for months and months, who know more secrets than you and I know or than we should know, and I want to pay a tribute to those men, they have never disclosed those secrets to us or anybody else. Six of them testified here today that it would not be in the best interest of the United States to adopt this amendment.

This is not my bill; I am not in love with the way the State Department handled this bill, and I have told them so. This bill started out as a sort of spontaneous combustion affair where 31 Members of the other body, 16 Democrats and 15 Republicans, introduced identical bills; and over here in the House 12 Members introduced identical bills. That is the way this thing started out, long before the President recommended it to the Congress, long before the State Department recommended it. On the Foreign Affairs Committee nine members introduced identical bills, five Democrats and four Republicans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. So you see where this thing comes from; it comes from the grass roots; it does not come originally from Mr. Acheson; it does not come from Mr. Truman; it does not even come from Mr. Hoover, although he approved it; it comes from the grass roots of this Congress.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The Secretary of State has not yet approved doing this by way of a loan.

Mr. RICHARDS. Not that I know of.

The gentleman from Georgia ended his plea yesterday demanding the defeat of this bill and the passage of his amendment "in the name of sanity," "in the name of patriotism," and "in the name of the solvency" of this Government. Those were his moods. So far as "sanity" is concerned, this is the sanest group of men and women I know. I am willing to leave the issue with you. As to "patriotism," to my mind, patriotism has never been synonymous with selfishness. To my mind, patriotism does not demand that when someone asks you for bread you hand him a stone. That is what the Cox amendment does.

My friend goes on down the line and he talks about "solvency." All of us here are interested in the solvency of this great country of ours. The question of solvency is going to come up here, too, when the 1951 defense bill, amounting to sixty or seventy billion dollars is presented for consideration. The question of solvency is going to come up again when the matter of arms aid to foreign nations we need to stand beside us in this fight against communism. Of course, we would all be derelict if we were not interested in the solvency of this country, but this bill amounts to about one-fourth of 1 percent of what our appropriations will be for national defense.

The thing that puzzles me about the great speech of the gentleman from Georgia is his emphasis on sanity, solvency, and patriotism, yet no one word was said about Christianity.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If my memory serves me right, the gentleman himself was as cold as ice toward this proposition when it first arose. Am I correct?

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, I have been cold to a good many useless and extravagant propositions and I may be cold to a good many more regardless of what the State Department says. It took me a long time, I will say, to come to the conclusion that this bill should be passed, but I came to that conclusion and I stand by it.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman permit me to remind him that along with other of his colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs they first offered a proposal to give 2,000,000 long tons of wheat to India and that the reason given for making it as a gift was that India was unable to pay?

Mr. RICHARDS. I may say to the gentleman that the great Committee on Foreign Affairs bowed to the great Rules Committee, which has probably written as much legislation as the standing committees of this House, and I think improperly so.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman let me quote from his report on the original bill, which says:

> The committee considered this matter carefully for it could not recommend to the House any grant if India's resources would warrant further purchases out of its own funds.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is not reading from a report on the bill now before the House.

Mr. COX. I am reading from the report on the original bill that the gentleman and his committee reported.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am not arguing about that.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman is not certain, I have his report and I now offer it to him.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am not arguing for or against that report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additonal minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Georgia well said, we should consider this bill from the standpoint of sanity, patriotism, and the solvency of our country. But we must too consider it from the standpoint of Christianity, for we profess to be a Christian people. Mr. Chairman, the people of India are dying from hunger. What are we going to do about it?

The Book of all books has the answer: "Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days."

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as one who opposed this bill in committee and will vote against its passage on this floor, I think it would be a great mistake to impose upon this measure the amendments now before us. I think that to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan turns an improbability into an impossibility. I think to put our negotiators into a strait-jacket will bring about conditions that would be much more lamentable than not to pass the bill at all. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, assuming this measure will pass this House, and it will do so without my vote, I think that on the issue which we face immediately in these amendments, we would make a serious mistake to adopt them.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. What caused the gentleman to take this opposition to this proposed legislation?

Mr. BURLESON. I wish the gentleman had heard the speech I made yesterday.

Mr. GAVIN. I am sorry I did not.

Mr. BURLESON. The basis of my opposition is because this measure has no tangibility whatever. Let me compare this to the Yugoslav aid. In that bill there were involved 32 well-trained and fairly well-equipped divisions which we believed would be on our side if trouble occurred with Russia and her satellites. On that proposition we gambled $50,000,000. I was for it. There is absolutely no such consideration in this bill. This is a political measure. There is nothing to support a reasonable belief that this legislation will benefit the United States of America. I disagree with my able and distinguished chairman that this is a humanitarian measure. To me it is not. I have as much compassion in my heart for unfortunate people throughout this world as any man. I know that everyone here feels likewise. But it is not the policy of the United States to abolish poverty all over the world; of course it is not. If that were our policy then let us feed the Chinese Communists, all people in Southeast Asia; all the people in the Middle East, and all those who are in poverty in South America. But that is not our policy—at least I do not suppose it is—we are not doing that but maybe we intend to. We cannot fight half the peoples of the world and feed the other half, and that seems to be the direction in which we are going. Every man knows we cannot continue such a course indefinitely, and that is my reason, very briefly.

Mr. GAVIN. I think they are very excellent reasons.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs attempted to prove that this was a Christian gesture by citing the Book of books. I would like to have the chairman show me in that Book where we, as Christians, are admonished to borrow money to donate to charity.

Mr. BURLESON. Of course, I do not want to enter into that controversy. But I simply cannot see that this is a humanitarian proposition, that it is a charitable move, because, if it were, and that solely, I do not think this Congress would have the authority to give away the substance of the people on whom we are placing the heaviest tax burden in all our history.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, 2,000 years ago a great teacher, perhaps the greatest teacher who ever came upon this planet, when asked by the religious leaders of those days whether they should pay tribute to Caesar or not, made this answer:

> Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's.

Now, if this is Christian charity, and it is, then the Government should have nothing whatsoever to do with it. This, as I said the other day, is not a Christian government. It is Caesar with power to take care of all of your temporal affairs as between man and man here and also with other nations.

I repeat, nowhere in this Government is there one word or a jot or a tittle which makes any preparation whatever for this Government's granting charity to anyone.

I am sorry in a way that I was not privileged to be back here 14, 15, or 16 years ago, or less, when these great grants were being given under the Marshall plan. I presume many of you were here then, and I presume many of you heard the very same talk that it was Christian charity to give these huge amounts. I imagine the talk this morning does not vary a great deal from the talks that were heard at that time.

What is the effect of that Christian charity which was given? Every country in Europe and practically all over the world were firm friends of ours until we began to give them something. There is not a man in this House who has not had relatives that he has given something to, and they have ceased to be first cousins, to use an old English expression. They are not first cousins any more after you give them anything in the line of money. If we want to lose the friendship of India, I cannot conceive of any quicker way to do it than either by loan or grant to advance them this grain.

They have the money, there is no question about that. They have more money than we have. We are broke. Gentlemen say we are in debt $276,000,000,000. I got a statement last Friday from one of the men who goes around the offices, and I am told he is reliable, that our total indebtedness, Federal, State, municipal, and whatnot, is over $400,000,000,000.

I presume all of you who have constituents in farming communities have gotten the same kind of letters I have protesting against high taxes, protesting against the levying of any further taxes, protesting that they are unable to educate their children, to clothe them, to buy them shoes, and even to feed them properly. Even steak long since passed out of the picture, rollback or no rollback, for any of the farming people unless they raise the beef themselves. It has passed out of the picture for the laboring man. We are in no condition to dispense charity worldwide.

Some of the gentlemen here brought out the fact of the monazite sands. The largest monazite area in the world happens to be in my district. I traveled all over it last October. It is located immediately south of Cascade in central Idaho. It is a tract of land 30 miles long and approximately 20 miles wide. It is the richest deposit of thorium sands in the world. There is at the present time the largest dredge in the world operating it. We are going to have all kinds of monazite right in our own country. The question came up the other day that they were charging too much for it, but there is no reason why the United States in case of war cannot take it over.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, we have been on this amendment and amendments thereto over 4 hours. I ask

unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. HOLIFIELD and to Mr. FULTON was given to Mr. McCORMACK.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to get into a controversy with the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD] on the subject which he has opened up, because it is an emotional subject, and it is best not to get into that sort of discussion too much, but my friend said that 2,000 years ago a great Teacher came across the earth. I suppose he referred to the Redeemer. My belief, Mr. Chairman, is that the Redeemer is the Son of God. He was not a teacher only. He is the Son of God. However, others might feel differently, according to their religious conscience, and if that is the case, I respect their views in disagreement. My friend also says this is not a Christian Nation. Ours is a Judaic Christian civilization. So far as the recognition of God by our forefathers is concerned, I call the attention of my friend to the Declaration of Independence, and I suggest to him that he again read that great document, where in the very opening language those who signed that immortal document recognized the laws of nature and nature's God and said:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

Now, Mr. Chairman, coming back to a discussion of the pending amendment, my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has offered a substitute amendment. Just imagine the situation he places the House of Representatives in when he says that, if his amendment is adopted, he would not vote for it himself. He is asking the House to adopt his amendment, and then if it is adopted, he would vote against the bill.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho, since I mentioned the gentleman.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. What I meant to say was that I did not consider this to be a Christian administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well now, we will not get into that. The gentleman did not say that. I can discuss that at some other time.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to Mr. Nehru, let me refresh the memory of the membership by calling to their attention that some weeks ago 34 or 35 members of the legislative body in India sent a telegram to the Speaker in which they said:

> We would like to see United States and India cooperate with countries Commonwealth and other democracies in securing world peace through collective security.

Then with further reference to the wheat situation we find the following:

> We are confident such gesture of solidarity on part of representatives of American people toward people of India would strengthen friendship and understanding between our two countries and bring them closer together.

General MacArthur made certain statements when he addressed us, and I want to state here that there is very little area of disagreement between General MacArthur and JOHN McCORMACK. I would also point out that there is, however, a wide area of disagreement between General MacArthur and most of my friends on the Republican side in their views, but we will not go into that, now.

General MacArthur referred to half of the earth's population and 60 percent of its natural resources being in the east.

Let me refresh your memory here. He said further:

> What they seek now is friendly guidance, understanding and support, not imperialist direction; dignity of equality, and not shameful subjugation.

On the question of security, he said:

> These political and social conditions have but an indirect bearing upon our own national security, but do afford a backdrop to contemporary planning which must be thoughtfully considered if we are to avoid the pitfalls of unrealism.

One more observation. The restrictions placed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia could be entered into by agreement, but when you put them into law relating to another country, that country would be justified in saying, "It infringes our sovereignty." It is one thing to make an agreement and another thing as a condition precedent where the sovereignty of another nation is involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with the statement made by the distinguished Majority Leader that ours is a Judeo-Christian civilization. I believe that the ideologies involved in the over-all world conflict will be solved on that basis, that it is a conflict between the principles of our Judeo-Christian civilization and the principles of atheistic materialism known as communism. The people who follow the way of life of Mahatma Gandhi are very close to the Christian idea. Mr. Nehru, or anybody else in India who might be inclined to temporize with Marxism should realize the conflict in the basic ideologies involved, and they should not withhold proper trade of these materials that are useful to both India and the United States in this over-all conflict, wherein atheistic communism, if successful, would destroy not only our Judeo-Christian civilization but also all of the great spiritual values of the peoples of India.

I would like to introduce at this time a copy of a letter from the Government of India setting out the basic law with regard to their position in trading these vital elements that are necessary for the defense of the free world. There is no absolute prohibition in the basic Indian law, as was inferred. There is permissive use, and the Government of India should act upon that in the light of the over-all conflict between these two basic ideologies.

The letters are as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
INFORMATION SERVICES,
Washington D. C., April 4, 1951.

DEAR MR. KERSTEN: Please refer to my letter of March 15 in reply to yours of March 13, 1951.

With reference to the second paragraph of my letter the position in regard to monazite sands is as follows:

Under section 10 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act enacted by the Indian Parliament on April 15, 1948, "the Central Government may, by order published in the Official Gazette, prohibit, except under license granted by it * * * the acquisition, production, treatment, possession, use, disposal, export or import (i) of any of the prescribed substances; or (ii) of any minerals specified in the order, being minerals from which in the opinion of the Central Government any of the prescribed substances can be obtained."

"Prescribed substances" are defined as "uranium, thorium, plutonium, neptunium, or beryllium, or any of their respective compounds or any other substance which the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, prescribe, being a substance which in its opinion is or may be used for the production or use of atomic energy or research into matters connected therewith."

The availability of monazite sands in India is limited. Accordingly, under export trade regulation No. 91–C. W. (10)/48 dated February 21, 1949, the export of monazite sands from India to any destination is not permitted. India needs these sands in her research on atomic energy and other related problems.

Sincerely yours,

M. MOULIK.

EMBASSY OF INDIA,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1951.

Representative CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
Member of Congress,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KERSTEN: I wish to thank you for your letter of March 13 and for your courtesy in sending me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your speech on the India grain bill delivered in the House on March 5.

Your statement has raised so many questions of fact and policy that it requires detailed study before we are in a position to comment on it. I may assure you, however, that it is receiving our best attention and that we shall send you a communication on the subject as early as possible.

Sincerely yours,

M. MOULIK, *Attaché.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that most every Member of the House is agreed that we should get critical and needed war materials from India in return for the foodstuffs this bill pro-

vides to India. Monazite sand mentioned in the Cox substitute is the item that disturbs the opponents of the substitute.

So I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the word "monazite" be stricken from the Cox amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JENSEN. It is very strange, Mr. Chairman, and surely comes in poor taste to object to my request, since monazite has been the item which disturbs the gentlemen who oppose the Cox substitute. There can be only one purpose for such objection, which is that by the deletion of monazite the Cox substitute is strengthened and hence would have a good chance of being adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be transferred to the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to say a word in regard to the question raised by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] a moment ago. He said he had not heard anything in the debate that showed why this bill is important to the security of the United States.

It is right and honest to say frankly that if this bill is passed no one can guarantee that India is going to have a strong constitutional government that will commit itself openly to our side in this world struggle. But we must look at the opposite side of the shield also. I can guarantee, I think, without arrogating any special wisdom to myself that if we do not pass this bill and there is widespread starvation in India, as there will be despite all that has been said to the contrary, and the Indian Government is so shaken that it collapses and India is taken over by a government that is a satellite of the Soviet Union, then the tangible damage to this country and its security will be beyond calculation. We cannot assure anyone that any of the things we are doing in Europe or Asia or anywhere else, including our own defense measures, are going to insure our security, they are all a gamble. But not to take the steps represents a greater gamble. It is similar to the problem a doctor has when dealing with a cancer; he cannot guarantee that the patient is going to get well if he operates, but he can guarantee that the patient is going to die if he does not operate. We, too, are dealing with a cancer, Communist aggression, that encroaches ruthlessly and relentlessly on tissues that do not belong to it; and while we cannot be sure that the steps we take in this measure will do all that we hope to check the threat of that cancer to India and to ourselves and the free world, yet we can be sure that without it we and the free world would be in far greater danger. To do nothing effective about a malignant process is not the conservative thing. Rather it is the most dangerous, the most radical procedure that one can follow.

The sum and substance of this matter is that we have certain foodstuffs that India needs, and India has certain raw materials that we need. The question then on this amendment offered by my good friend from Georgia is, Which is the better way to get the materials that we need? By condescending charity? No. I knew a missionary in China who thought that the way to help people was always to give them things. I saw him one day give a bottle of expensive medicine, without charge, to a Chinese patient who could have paid for it, at least in part. A man walked right out of the dispensary into the street and poured the medicine on the pavement. He assumed it would be no good or it would not have been given to him for nothing. Neither side gets any benefit from condescending charity to anyone who is able to pay part or all of the cost.

At the other extreme, attempted coercion is not the way to achieve the desired objective. The Indians are a proud people, as are we. Let us sit down with them as equals, negotiating in mutual self-respect, each helping the other solve its problems. That is the best way to get from them the things we ourselves need.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the manner in which this legislation is presented, convinces me that the hungry people of India will not be the recipients of the grain authorized in this bill, unless they have the money to pay for it. A little of the food may trickle down to the starving, but my experience indicates that most of the hungry persons do not possess the money with which to buy the food that is available.

I remember very well when we had the interim aid bill before Congress in 1947 which was the beginning of the Marshall plan. One of the main arguments for the bill was to send good to the starving people of Europe, to stop the spread of communism. Certainly, that was a Christian objective to which all of us subscribed. However, we found that the Truman administration bill provided for large gifts of food to the western European governments to be sold by the recipient governments to the people. I found on a visit to those countries that the hungry people did not have the money with which to buy the food that was available in the market places. Since I was interested in stopping the spread of communism by providing food for hungry people, I proposed an amendment to the interim aid bill which provided that 60 percent of our food gift should be distributed to destitute and starving people by the Red Cross, and other church and charitable organizations. My amendment failed, and I was told that there was no intention to directly feed hungry people with the food that was being provided by the American people.

In other words, since the people were required to pay, often very high prices, for the billions of dollars worth of food which we gave without cost to the respective governments of Western Europe, there has been little or no appreciation to the United States for our contribution to their welfare.

I had planned to offer an amendment to the first India grain bill reported by the committee, which authorized a gift of $2,000,000 tons of bread grains, directing that the grain be distributed by the Red Cross and church and charitable organizations to hungry persons. I felt that such a distribution of food to the hungry people of India would have been in harmony with the best Christian traditions. However, the bill to which my amendment would have been germane was withdrawn by the committee, and we are now considering a measure that provides for a sale of grain to the Indian Government.

While I am very skeptical about the starving people of India being able to buy any of this food from their government because of lack of money, I hope that some of them will be in a position to secure a few crumbs of bread from the American grain which is now being sold by us to the Indian Government on credit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman, but I will not take it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, considering the limitations under which I am compelled to operate, I have done my best to protect what I conceive to be the best interests of my country. If in my zeal and enthusiasm I have seemed rude and inconsiderate, let me express my regret. If I have impressed others as being overzealous or ruthless, let me offer my apology.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that we are being hurried into taking a position that does not represent the best interest of the country. In the early part of the debate I said we were being blackmailed into the making of a loan, which is a grant, to an unfriendly people. Without intending to offend any of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, I wish to repeat that that is the effect of what is being done. India comes to us for wheat. She says that her people may some time later be hungry and will be hungry if it cannot obtain grain. We say: "All right, we have the wheat, but you have things that we want. In the first place, you have money in your pocket."

India says: "I cannot spend my money because that will embarrass my qualifying for asking for industrial loans for which I am coming to you."

Then we say: "You have minerals that are with us in short supply and which are surplus to you and which is valueless to you except that you can convert them into foreign exchange." She says: "We cannot do that; that, too, would take resources that will embarrass our qualifying to ask you for a loan of $3,800,000,000."

Mr. Chairman, this whole proposition is the height of insanity. Mr. Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, this House, sir, is laying upon your back the further duty of finding money that you have not been able to find already under the request of the President of your country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE].

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I am just amazed that a bill of this type should have any opposition. When I first heard of its introduction I thought, as either a gift or a loan, there would not be any opposition to it in the great House of Representatives. The delay this bill has encountered is inexcusable.

Many of the opponents are worried about the amount of money and the cost involved in this bill and whether the people of this country can bear the appropriation of $190,000,000. I am going to refresh your memory on some statistics. I am sure you know about some of them. In the light of these facts I am about to give you, if you can vote "no" on this bill I am sure you cannot harmonize it with your conscience. The American people are not hurt. We are eating, as we were told yesterday, more than any other nation. I am sure that the majority of the Members of this House can tighten their belts. I can. I am 10 pounds overweight and most of the Members here are.

Listen to these statistics: On alcohol beverages we spent almost $8,000,000,000. On tobacco we spent almost $4,500,000,000. On cosmetics—and, frankly, I think they are very necessary, but we would not die if we did not have them—we spent almost $1,500,000,000. On gambling the American people spent $20,000,000,000 last year. That makes a total of about $40,000,000,000 spent for those things that are certainly not necessary. Surely, we can answer the cry of food for famine-devastated India.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take any more time on this measure. I have great respect for my friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], as he well knows. I respect his ability and I respect his integrity. He has just made a statement that I know is sincere. But the thing that concerns me at the present time is the damage his amendment will do to the security of this country. At the present time there is a strong movement on foot in this country to dip into our stockpiling in this country. Personally, I do not think that this is the time to do it. Take manganese. What are you going to do with the Cox amendment? You are going to abrogate private contracts that extend over a period of years—private contracts made with individuals in this country. Congress does not want to do that and cannot do it, in my opinion. Now, that is one bad feature and one of the things that his amendment would do. You are going to force them to nationalize the mining industry. We do not want to do that either, if we can help it. Nobody believes in that. Whether or not we will get our money back for this wheat is another problem. The question has been asked: What security is there in this sale? There is about $125,000,000 to $150,000,000 worth of security in this thing from a strategic and critical materials viewpoint. If that is not security at this hour, I do not know what I am speaking about. We simply cannot carry out this war effort that we are obligated to carry out for our own national security, let alone the other countries and the civilian requirements, and the obligations that we have already assumed, unless we secure them. The Creator of this universe simply did not put the elements all in one place. He was wise; He did not do that; He provided them all around the world, and they do not exist in just one country. Gentlemen, you can grow wheat and you can increase the yield, but you cannot grow basic elements such as manganese, kymite, beryl, and others. We live from 96 elements around the world, and man, with all of his skill down through time from the creation, has only recently added to this number. I ask this committee to vote down the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my brief statement has no significance whatever concerning this bill, but a short time ago my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] may have unwittingly left an unfortunate impression with the House when he suggested that some of our southern brothers might have been motivated in this connection by a cotton complex. I only want to say, and I somehow feel impelled to say this, that in my service in the House I have found that there is no group here among us more entitled to our respect than they. I disagree with them often, yet I want to pay to them now my tribute that there is no group that has greater patriotism or finer loyalty to their country or better judgment than our Members from the southern part of the United States.

This, Mr. Chairman, is from the heart of a New Jersey Republican and a damyankee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 101, noes 137.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COX) there were—ayes 103, noes 135.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"Whereas the people of India are threatened with famine, hunger, starvation, and untold suffering; and

"Whereas the people of India urgently require approximately 2,000,000 long tons of food grains in order to avert a severe food shortage; and

"Whereas the Government and the people of the United States, in recognition of the immediate need of the people of India for emergency food relief and in the interest of humanity, friendship, and world peace, desire to extend relief to India within the limits of the resources and facilities of the United States; and

"Whereas the alleviation of a famine in India can best be accomplished, without causing undue hardship to the economy of any single country, through joint assistance furnished by all the nations of the world, acting together in good faith; in a sense of brotherhood and peace, according to their respective resources and facilities; and

"Whereas the United Nations is the proper forum in which to initiate, develop, and undertake a plan of joint assistance, by the member nations thereof, in order to avert a threatened famine in India: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of Congress—

"(1) that the United States should take such action in the United Nations as may be necessary and appropriate to secure the immediate formulation and adoption of a plan pursuant to which joint assistance will be provided by all member nations of the United Nations, on a proportionate basis to be determined in accordance with their respective resources and economic ability, to the people of India to provide needed food grains and to prevent a threatened famine;

"(2) that in order to alleviate the existing famine conditions in India, and until such time as a joint assistance plan for India is formulated and adopted in the United Nations, the United States should immediately make available to the United Nations, for shipment to the people of India, not to exceed 2,000,000 long tons of food grains;

"(3) that upon formulation and adoption of a joint assistance plan for India by the United Nations, the United States should then be reimbursed by the member nations to the extent of the relief to be furnished by each such nation, either in food grains, money, or trade credits, for the food grains advanced by the United States to the United Nations, for shipment to the people of India."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I must make a point of order against the gentleman's amendment. With the permission of the committee, I would like to reserve the point of order because the gentleman from Florida has a very fine idea in his amendment, but it is not particularly pertinent to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] may hold in abeyance his point of order against the amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, on April 3 of this year I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 88, which proposed a plan for supplying food grains to India through the United Nations, thereby saving the American taxpayer millions of dollars. I regret that a point of order prevents consideration of this proposal by the House.

At the outset, however, let it be understood that I do not favor standing idly by while the people of India starve. Food grains must be furnished these hungry people for numerous reasons which have already been discussed in debate. In addition to the fact that the population of India is expanding rapidly, there are numerous other factors which indicate that the problem before us today is a recurring one.

Much can be said about the fact that the plight of the Indian people has been brought about because of India's cold war and resultant trade difficulties with Pakistan. While this does not obviate the need of the Indian people for food, nevertheless, we should consider this background in our approach to the problem. Pakistan, which formerly was a part of India, is largely agricultural. Because of religious difficulties, the two countries were partitioned at the time they were granted independence by Great Britain. India, of course, resented losing the Pakistan area, but some feeling existed that the country would not be able to survive as an independent nation and would eventually fall back into the hands of India.

Since March of 1950 India has maintained a large concentration of troops on the border of Pakistan, and an Indian Army of considerable strength occupies a portion of Kashmir. These forces hold a large area of that state in order to prevent, or render impossible, the conduct of a free and impartial plebiscite to ascertain the political wishes of the people of that state. Because of these border tensions and disturbed world conditions, India has appropriated approximately half of its annual budget for military purposes.

Pakistan is the main source of jute for the entire world, and has always supplied cotton for Indian industries. Since 1947 the Government of India has devoted additional acreage to the production of jute and cotton, so that it would not be dependent on Pakistan for these products, and India's Minister of Food and Agriculture is reported to have said on January 7, 1951, that India has lost 900,000 tons of food in 1950 due to a diversion of the country's food grain lands to jute and cotton. The Indian Embassy on November 30, 1950, announced that the area devoted to jute and cotton will be increased by 1,000,000 acres, land which could have been utilized for wheat or other food crops.

The Indian people are now being called upon to bear the consequences of this policy.

Again I repeat, that the premise must be kept in mind in considering this problem, that thousands of Indian people will die for lack of food this year, and every effort must be made to help these unfortunate people. Human beings, wherever they be, must be saved from starvation and famine. In my opinion it would be a grave mistake for Congress in any way to connect the question of aid for the people of India with Prime Minister Nehru's attitude toward Korea. However unrealistic that attitude may be in our eyes, hunger and politics do not mix, and any attempt to associate them would harm the United States throughout all of Asia.

But the thing that troubles me, in connection with this proposal, is the feeling that we Americans are being blackjacked into being humanitarians on the theory that we will lose friends in Asia if we taxpayers do not foot the bill. Why is it that the American taxpayer is continually called upon to help the unfortunate people in every country? Surely our first duty must be to our own people—those citizens of ours who are caught today between rising taxes and the high cost of living.

If the members of the United Nations sincerely want to help the peoples of the world to live a better life, then why cannot they too exhibit a little brotherly love—just a small bit of humanitarianism insofar as the people of India are concerned?

The Grain Bulletin of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, dated January 1949, shows the following countries, among others, to be exporters of wheat flour, and rye: Russia, Canada, Argentina, Turkey, Ethiopia, and Australia. To that list may be added: Pakistan, North Africa, and some of the Danube countries.

The same bulletin shows the following countries to be exporters of maize, barley, and oats: Denmark, Rumania, Russia, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Turkey, Iran and Iraq, British West Africa, French North Africa, and Australia.

China, French Indochina, Burma, and Indonesia are great rice-growing countries.

These facts are cited merely to point out that other nations, besides the United States, are exporters of food grains.

I therefore proposed that we introduce into the United Nations a resolution recognizing the immediate need of the Indian people for food grains to prevent famine, and calling on all nations of the world to join with us in a great humanitarian cause to provide relief for these unfortunate world brothers. Anticipating the ready approval of the United Nations, we can offer to advance to that body in furtherance of such a cause, and as evidence of our good faith, such food grains as are needed to avert a famine.

Should such a resolution be adopted in the United Nations, and should such mutual aid be furnished by the United Nations, on a formula to be agreed upon, then the American people will still have shown the humanitarianism for which this country has always been known, and yet, the American taxpayer will be saved the onus of carrying the entire burden of the suffering world, both today and when similar situations arise in the future.

Should Russia and her satellites refuse to participate in such a plan, what position will they be in, insofar as the people of India are concerned? This was a good opportunity to turn the tables, in effect, and call the Communist bluff.

Russia, China, and the satellites will either have to "put up or shut up" as far as the suffering people of Asia are concerned.

The American taxpayer had everything to gain and nothing to lose by having pursued such a proposal, and we must remember that we have bought few friends for the billions we have spent in foreign aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

I am hopeful, therefore, that this proposal can be more fully explored before we find ourselves again in the position we are in today.

Although reluctantly, I intend to vote for the bill now under consideration, not only for the reasons advanced by the committee, but for the further reason that to reject this measure now would be of considerably more propaganda value to the Communists, throughout all of Asia, than the total cost of the proposal before us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his excellent legislative proposal; I think that would be the finest solution to this problem that could be adopted by the House. Did the gentleman receive any consideration before the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. LANTAFF. Yes; the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee were very kind and considerate and listened at length to this proposal.

Mr. GROSS. I just heard the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs say that this is a splendid idea. I wonder why the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not adopt this sort of thing instead of the hand-out they are apparently proposing here.

Mr. LANTAFF. I am not familiar with the reasons why it was not approved.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Will the gentleman explain what difference there is between the former UNRRA plan which this Congress discarded almost unanimously, and

the gentleman's present plan? To me it looks like it is a proposal for an organization of the same type as the old United Nations relief organization.

Mr. LANTAFF. In many respects it is similar. The primary difference is that this proposal would be handled through the United Nations. If the United Nations has any meaning, India should look to the United Nations for relief rather than to this Congress.

Mr. FULTON. We found UNRRA did not work practically, and the United States gave it up.

Mr. LANTAFF. We certainly should not put ourselves in the position of obligating ourselves to feed all the unfortunate people of the world, at the expense of the American taxpayer, when the United Nations is functioning. Certainly the other countries of the world should accept some of the responsibility for relief.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill. I do not want to be heard on the point of order because I believe it is obvious.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] makes a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida on the ground that it is not germane to the bill. The gentleman from Florida concedes the point of order. It is very clear to the Chair that the fundamental purpose of the amendment is not germane to the fundamental purpose of the bill.

The point of order, therefore, is sustained.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after a great deal of thought I have finally decided to impose upon the membership for a few minutes in the hope that I may be able to help some of you in arriving at a decision on this legislation. We used to say that an expert on India was any American who had been there as much as 3 days but not more than 5; he would have to be there at least 3 days to learn enough about it to sound like an expert, but if he stayed there as many as 5 he would come to the realization that you could not be an expert on a country like India.

It so happens that I have lived in India; I spent about a year there. I have listened to this debate, and I find that so many Members in all their sincere effort to consider this legislation seem to have some ideas about India and the problems there that do not exist. I want to start out by saying that I make no claim to being an expert on India, but perhaps I can make a few observations about the country based on my personal experience there that will help. First let me say that the only way that I can vote for legislation of this sort is on this simple basis: We know that our country is one of the leaders in the world today whether we like it or not, and we know that we are desperately preoccupied in various parts of the world trying to solve various problems. Our national security is involved, and for that reason it is to our advantage to try to maintain at least the status quo in other countries in the world until we get our present problems disposed of. For this reason and because the world knows we are the richest country in the world, and the world thinks we have too much of everything, and because it would have repercussions in the minds of friendly people everywhere if we sat out and permitted mass starvation to break out in India or anywhere else, we must face the selfish interest we have here involved. So to me the only concern that we need have in whether or not people are going to starve in India is a selfish one and I will support the legislation from that standpoint and that standpoint alone.

If I had time I would endeavor to try to make known to you the sensitive state of mind that the Indian people have. I can assure you it is my studied opinion you are not going to make or lose any friends in India whether you do or do not enact this legislation because they do not sell their friendship that way.

In the first place, there is no such thing as an Indian in the sense that we think of the nationals of any country. India has 22 major languages. It is a country of fantastic contrasts. There are many different racial origins. If you could put yourself in the shoes of Mr. Nehru in trying to rule over a country made up of such a conglomeration of people and conflict of interests he is faced with, you might get some idea of the tremendous job he has to steer a young nation in these times.

I believe we have no worry about how to do business with India. The Indian people were trained in the art of trade by the British and they are good hard traders. Whenever you have something to offer that appeals to businessmen everywhere, I can assure you you will get a hearing in India because they will react to you the same way we do when we are involved in hard-headed business transactions. We do not have to worry about that. We can do business with them on the same basis that we have done business in our own country and which has made our Nation great.

This country has an occupational plague, if you want to call it that, of having more people than it can feed. When we speak of famine, I do not know how many of you have lived in the middle of a famine, but I had the misfortune of experiencing part of the famine that existed in India during the recent war. I can tell you that it is a very horrible thing to see people dying all around you from starvation. The figure was given here of a million. The British Government then in charge admitted to two million, and the Indian politicians claimed three million. It is beyond the human mind to conceive.

I do not believe we can solve any of India's long-range problems whether we do or do not help them, but we are going to be weighed on the scales of public opinion in the world, having all of this wheat, more than we need, and permitting mass starvation in that country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma a question that has been bothering a number of us who have sat here and listened to every word of this lengthy discussion, who would like to support this proposal but are deeply troubled by several questions that have not as yet been answered. The gentleman is touching one of them.

Here is a situation of the Indian people. Can we have any assurance from any source whatsoever—it certainly cannot be written into the bill as such—that the people of India, the people out at the grass roots who are supposed to be benefited by this proposal, will have any information in regard to those who furnish this loan or this bounty or whatever you want to call it? Will there be any psychological impact upon their thinking whereby the purpose that we want to serve, namely to strengthen them against communism and so on, will be served?

Mr. STEED. I can only answer the question in this way. My purpose of being in India during the war was with the Office of War Information and was to dispense information about the United States to the people of India. I had the experience of meeting the press of India, and I found that they do have a very effective press, and I could not conceive of anything having this intense interest of those people not being made well known, whether we do or do not. Perhaps I can help by saying this: A lot of us forget that during World War II India furnished the largest all-volunteer army of any nation involved in that war, and they fought on our side. They had 4,000,000 volunteers, and some of the finest fighting that was done was by the troops from India. The Indian Navy also gave a fine account of itself. So, the Indian people have proved that they are on the side of democracy; even when they were a colonial power, they voluntarily came in and helped this country in our fight. I have no fear that India will go Communist. I do not think that those fears are well founded, because I know a good many of the leaders of that country and I know that they are as aware of the evils of it as we are. I try to appreciate the problems that Mr. Nehru has. I have met him and talked to him a number of times, and I came to have a very, very high regard for him. We have some faint notion of the tremendous problems he is faced with in trying to build up that country. There are many factors that he has to take into consideration, and I think the least we can do is to try to be as fair and reasonable with him in trying to understand what he says and does or thinks as possible because, after all, we play poli-

tics in America, too, for our domestic reasons, and he has some of the same problems on his hands, only complicated many times over.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that India furnished 4,000,000 troops in the last war?

Mr. STEED. India had 4,000,000 volunteer troops who were engaged in World War II.

Mr. GROSS. How many of those did she commit to combat, does the gentleman know?

Mr. STEED. India committed her troops to combat in proportion to any other army. They fought in the Middle East; they fought in Africa, in the Burmese jungles. They fought wherever the British Government wanted them to fight, because they were under the command of the British Government.

Mr. GROSS. If they could raise 4,000,000 men to arms and commit them to action in World War II, where are they today in Korea?

Mr. STEED. Well, the gentleman, of course, brings up a point that would take a lot of time to discuss, because until you go into the so-called nonviolence theories that the Indian leaders hold, that would be hard to explain.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman said he witnessed hundreds of thousands of people starving to death over in India when he was there. Now, did they starve to death because they did not have money to buy the food that was available?

Mr. STEED. At that time the source of rice from Siam and from Indochina and Malaya had been cut off because those countries were then occupied by Japan and they could not get the food that they normally would receive from those areas.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is the gentleman convinced that if this grain is provided and the Indian Government puts it into their ration system and sells it to the people, that it will alleviate some of the starvation over there?

Mr. STEED. Well, I am sure that it will. Of course, if I had my way about it, I would not do it the way this bill proposes to do it.

To me, the issue is this simple: If it serves our selfish, national security problem to stave off mass starvation in India or anywhere else, then by all means we should pass this bill.

I think the facts warrant a vote for the bill, even though this is not the best approach to the problem.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the first section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman who has just spoken, and I wish that we all had more first-hand information on this question. As I said in my question to the gentleman earlier, there are many of us who would like to support this proposal for many of the reasons that have been given, but at the same time we are deeply concerned in regard to what we are going to get in return, not by way of material substance, of course, but other things that we need during this war effort. While these things are immaterial, nevertheless they are tremendously important to our security.

I asked a question of the gentleman as to whether we could have any assurance that the people of India would even know of the contribution we are making in granting this loan, this bounty, or whatever it might be.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The fact is that we have left this to the ECA to negotiate and make their normal contract, expressly for that reason, because the ECA has run in Europe a very successful public relations organization, which has told the American story in Europe, and will do the same in India.

I should like to point out to the gentleman that Nehru criticized these bills, but then came around and agreed that the conditions of the House bill, which at that time spelled out the fact that there should be publicity in India, when it was a grant, were all right; so that you have a commitment there on his part that he is not going to oppose it, and it is inherent in the ECA procedure.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman for that contribution, but I must say that after observing the operation of ECA in Europe personally several times during the last 4 years I have been disappointed at the actual results that have accrued to this Nation in public relations. We should have gotten more from our generosity than we have.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The majority leader at the time he was speaking made the point there were 35 members of the Indian Parliament who had written to this Congress, over the opposition of Nehru, and Nehru made a statement for the press that this was done without the sanction of the Government. The communication from the members of the Indian Parliament urged that the American people engage in sending wheat to their country, looking to that to build up the friendship between their country and ours. I am sure those members of the Indian Parliament will know about it and be able to tell the people of their districts about it, for one thing.

May I make this further point: Certainly, if the bill does not go through, cannot the gentleman imagine the harvest of hate that will be reaped among the Indian people at a time when they need our help?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I agree that the gentleman has a point there, but let me go on to another question. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, because perhaps he can give a practical answer to it. I have not heard of any adequate quid pro quo, meaning something that will accrue to our interests, politically. I grant you, again, you cannot write such a provision as this into the bill. But the gentleman who spoke a moment ago who has been in India, pointed out that they had 4,000,000 men under arms in the recent war, and it was very well pointed out by the gentleman from Iowa in his question that they have not assisted us in this Korean war. We cannot write it into the bill, but it seems to me that somewhere along the line those who are going to administer this loan and carry on the negotiations should have it well understood that the American people would like to have better understanding with the Government and people of India in regard to their cooperation in our own security and the security of the United Nations.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman has raised an important point, and I have no doubt whatsoever that there will be widespread knowledge and appreciation throughout India of the assistance given by the United States; but I think we have to keep our minds on the ball. The real return and recompense to the United States is not that they come to us and say, "Thank you, thank you." The real reward to us is that they stay independent. The greatest contribution they can render the United States is to retain their national independence. Our American objective is not to secure a quid pro quo in the sense of making India in the least subservient to our country. We are not trying to make satellites as the Kremlin does. Other than obtaining certain Indian strategic materials which we need, our main objective is furthered if they stay free and independent, even though they do not come out openly on our side in this world struggle. It is of the greatest importance to our security that our enemies in this world not be able to get control of India's manpower and resources and strategic bases. I think we have to keep that goal first in our minds. The greatest service they can render us is to keep their Government independent of the Soviet Union, which we know is turning heaven and earth to get control of it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman for that observation. I quite agree with him. I should like to point out, however, that unless we win this Korean War, and I say "win," and by win I mean that the aggressors are defeated on the battlefield, the pressure will start immediately on Indochina, upon Thailand, upon Burma, upon Tibet, and upon India.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic

Cooperation is authorized and directed to provide emergency food relief assistance to India on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including payment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the Government of India) of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources. The Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes for this purpose from time to time during the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 in an amount not to exceed $190,000,000 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury who is authorized and directed to make such purchases; and in making such purchases, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act, as amended: *Provided*, That with respect to the procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States: *Provided further*, That the assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of floods, droughts, and other natural disasters suffered by India in 1950.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIBICOFF: On page 2, line 12, after "amended", insert the following: "*Provided*, That funds made available for purposes of this act shall be used only for the purchase of foodgrains or equivalent in the United States, and *Provided further*."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to reassure the House concerning the intentions of this bill. During the debate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and other Members raised the query whether or not under the bill as now written this money could be used to buy this wheat and food grains from Russia or China. It has never been the intention of the committee that this should be the case. So in order to make clear to the Members of the House, and there is some doubt under the language as now contained in the bill, we are offering this amendment to assure that the $190,000,000 can be used only for buying the foodgrains or equivalent in the United States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Gladly.

Mr. COX. I am glad the gentleman offered his amendment, because it obviates the necessity of my offering an amendment which I expected to ask the committee to consider which added a new proviso and which read as follows:

Provided further, That no assistance hereunder shall be utilized in trade with Communist China, Russia, or any Russian satellite country.

The gentleman's amendment would seem to obviate the necessity of my offering my amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman's amendment strike out the provision in the bill which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that we have adequate supplies?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No, that language still is in the bill. This is an additional proviso and goes in at line 12. The subsequent proviso still remains in the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Would the gentleman describe to the House what would be included in the reference to food grains or other equivalent?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I assume that "other equivalents" would be food of any other category that could be used as a substitute for food grains, if we did not have food grains.

Mr. COLE of New York. All of the discussion throughout the debate for the last 3 or 4 days has been centered on wheat.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is right. But it would be wheat, milo, sorghum, probably beans, or any other type of food that the Indians could use in their diet if wheat itself is not available.

Mr. COLE of New York. It means any kind of food products?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct. It means any kind of food products.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. When this amendment was originally drafted, it contained a phrase that the food grains or their equivalent authorized in the bill should be procured only in the United States "if they are available in the United States." I note the gentleman has stricken out that clause. I wonder if he can tell us why. I thought that phrase was a good idea. Suppose we should have a domestic food shortage as a result of a drought, or something of the sort. In that event, I think it would be of great advantage to our country to have the grain for India bought perhaps in Argentina or Australia or somewhere other than in the United States. We do not have a shortage now, but we might have. I wish the gentleman would explain why he believes it is better to leave that phrase out.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In discussing this with the chairman of the committee we came to the conclusion that it was justified because we are loaning United States dollars. I was originally for a grant and would still prefer a grant. If we are loaning our dollars it would seem to us that our dollars should only be made available to buy food grains in the United States.

Mr. JUDD. If available.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Whether available or not. If not available and negotiations had to be carried on to get the food from other countries, I assume the fair thing would be for India to try to negotiate a loan or barter from Argentina or such country that had the food instead of the United States.

Mr. JUDD. But there are in this country at the present time more than adequate stocks for the purposes contemplated in this bill, are there not?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct. The reason this was not in the bill in the first place was that we assumed from all the testimony that the only food grains available anywhere in the world to take care of this need were in the United States. Further, this money was being placed as a credit in the United States, and during the negotiations we further assumed that the negotiator would see to it that the money would be used only to buy food grains and other food in the United States. But the question has been raised, and legitimately, that the bill does not spell that out. We can see no objection to spelling it out in order to reassure the House of our intentions.

Mr. JUDD. And, third, we do have an adequate supply.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last week a headline news story was carried in the press of this country stating that Russia had sold India 50,000 tons of wheat. No doubt, this information was carried over the radio and in the newspapers of India as a generous effort on the part of Communist Russia to help the starving people in India. The news story seemed to indicate that no other country was helping India.

While Russia is getting a lot of publicity for selling India less than 2,000,000 bushels of wheat for hard cold cash or gold, it is significant to note that there has been no publicity that the United States has sold to India 2,000,0000 tons of wheat and other grain which is equivalent to nearly 75,000,000 bushels, during the 13-month period which ends on August 1, 1951. This grain was partly subsidized by the ECA to the extent of $7,000,000 and from section 32 funds by additional millions. It seems to me, that our State Department has no desire to let the people of India and this country know that we have supplied the Indian Government with almost 40 times as much grain as Russia, to relieve the hungry people of India.

It seems to me that the President and the other branches of the executive department are ashamed to publicize what we are doing to help hungry people in India and other countries of the world.

The failure of the Federal Government to give proper publicity to what we are doing to relieve hunger in all parts of the world reminds me of what took place in France in 1947 when we were shipping hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of food to France as a part of the relief program. I visited France and other Marshall-plan countries in 1947, and when I asked Ambassador Caffrey, our official representative in France, as to the reason why he did not publicize our gifts of food to the French people, he indicated that our country was too big to take advantage of a situation of this kind by giving it publicity.

When we were not receiving any publicity for our food gifts to France, Russia received a tremendous amount of publicity in the French papers and over the

radio for having sold France a few cargoes of wheat. Incidentally, we paid for the Russian wheat and the transportation of it from Russia to France. That was in American dollars. Russia got the publicity, and we got nothing but ill-will because the people were not told of our gifts to the French people, but we paid the bill.

Mr. PICKETT. Does not the gentleman believe that one reason there has not been much publicity about the fact that India got 2,000,000 tons of grain that we have sent them already is that we have been doing it so much that it was not unusual and therefore not noteworthy, whereas Russia has never done it, or has done it so seldom that her offer of 50,000 bushels made the headlines all over the world?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman may be correct in his assumption.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CHATHAM. I believe, sir, that the 2,000,000 tons they have arranged to buy in this country have been in the regular markets of the country and paid for in the regular way.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Quite so. Whereas Russia has let her have only 50,000 tons of grain, India will have taken 2,000,000 tons out of the United States by August 1. I am glad the gentleman mentioned about its being a commercial transaction; yes, partly so, but the ECA contributed $7,000,000 to that, and a considerable amount of money was taken out of section 32 funds to finance the purchase of the grain that went to India as a subsidy.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. The price of the wheat that went to India in the last 12 months has not been at the domestic market price.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; I say it has been subsidized through the use of ECA and section 32 funds.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. It was paid for. All the wheat that went to India was paid for in cash. Senator AIKEN brought that out in the other body.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that is true. I think that the first suggestion that came up was that they wanted to pay for it.

Mr. COX. But it meant the loss of many millions of dollars to this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The grain is available and has been available. India has been purchasing it from the United States and she still is getting more grain from this country than from any other nation in the world in the last 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In a moment I will yield.

I want to point out that India got 450,000 tons of wheat from Argentina, but they did not pay for it in cash; they gave them 60,000 tons of jute in trade for the wheat; whereas at the same time they were canceling contracts for burlap and jute, firm contracts that had been made with companies in this country to manufacture burlap; they canceled our contracts in order to trade that burlap to Argentina for wheat. India has been and is able to pay for wheat for this and other countries by paying cash or with critical material like jute and burlap.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I should like to ask the gentleman whether if we vote for this bill we are voting for the United States or are we voting for Russia?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot answer that question. I am for the United States first, myself.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. Is it not true that at the time India canceled the jute contracts they told our manufacturers of burlap that they would renew those contracts and consider them binding upon themselves but at a 100-percent increase in cost?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct; and, in addition to that, India put the export duty on burlap at 14 cents a yard, I believe it was; it was extremely high.

Mr. FULTON. Fourteen cents a yard is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. India voted to put an additional penalty on the American people for all the jute and burlap she sent to this country.

Mr. Chairman, I insist that it is about time that our State Department does a little advertising of what the United States is doing to help India and other countries of the world when we are doing so much instead of letting Communist Russia secure all of the credit for doing so little.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, delegations of college students who have come to Washington to press for grain to India may help to light a fire under an indifferent Congress. The action of these young people exemplifies one of the finest facts of the American character—a willingness to help less fortunate people without haggling over terms. Some of this spirit might well be absorbed by those legislators who are still arguing over whether to make the grain a loan or half loan and half gift. While Congress dallies, Indian babies in one area, according to a news report, are being fed mud and paper to fill their hollow stomachs.

It must be acknowledged that whatever aid Congress decides to extend probably will be done despite rather than because of Prime Minister Nehru. Mr. Nehru's speech of last week, rejecting aid with strings attached, understandably caused some resentment in Congress. Just what Mr. Nehru would consider "strings" is unclear; the usual conditions spoken of in connection with a gift are distribution without discrimination, full publicity to the gift, and the presence of American observers. These conditions would be by no means unreasonable.

Despite Mr. Nehru's untimely words, however, the practical fact is that a Congress which so far has made no tangible gesture of help is in a poor position to resent what he says. Moreover, a great deal more than annoyance with Mr. Nehru's peccadillos is involved in the relief of famine in India. There seems to be little chance at this point of obtaining congressional assent to a clear gift; but certainly the Senate approach of half gift-half loan (which could be repaid in strategic materials) needs to be tested promptly. The important thing is to get some sort of decision, for every day of delay makes the toll of famine rise. The visiting college students have grasped that time is of the essence, even if Congress as yet has not.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], was mistaken in characterizing the 50,000,000 tons as a sale. As I understand that, it was not a sale but an offer to barter so stringent that it has not been accepted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, our good friend, Judge COX, has as much mercy, charity, and compassion in his heart as does any Member of this House. I am sure that he has been and is now prompted by sincere impulses and by the purest of motives. I traveled with Judge COX on one occasion. In 1947 we traveled in many parts of the war-torn and devastated areas in Germany. When our train made its very first stop out of Berlin, hundreds of little children, hungry and in great distress, came close to the Pullmans on which we were traveling. Knowing that we were to visit the demolished and destroyed parts of Germany, just about every member of the American delegation took along candy and cookies and other articles which were to be given away. When the train made its first stop and we saw these hungry and unhappy

little children, every one of us opened our baggage and passed out the candy, the cookies, and other things which we had taken along with us. Judge COX not only gave away candies and cookies and soap and other things but I well remember that our genial and distinguished friend actually pulled the sweater off his own back and gave it to a little German girl. That act of charity and compassion made a very profound impression upon me and upon every other member of our delegation. I, therefore, know that he is charitable and generous and all of us must admit that he possesses a high degree of intelligence and patriotism which cannot be questioned.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for and have actively supported just about all of the foreign aid bills which have been enacted—loans to Britain, to Greece, and to Turkey, and loans and gifts and grants which have been made under the Marshall plan. I am frank to confess, however, that I have not always been prompted by entirely unselfish motives. I have appreciated the fact that the people of my district, State, and Nation have a vested and vital interest in world trade and commerce and, above all, a very sincere interest in world peace. I have believed and I still believe that as a Nation we have a right to use the seven seas and to send our ships of commerce into all of the ports of the world. The people of my district are actually dependent upon foreign trade and commerce and they, too, realize that we cannot trade with devastated nations and with countries whose economies have been destroyed. So in voting for all of this foreign aid I have not been inspired always to do so out of altruistic impulses.

In voting for the pending measure, I am frankly motivated almost entirely by humanitarian emotions and by a Christian spirit which prompts me to want to aid those in distress. With me this is no business deal except to the extent that in fairness I feel that the recipient should respond with payment to the extent of the recipients' ability to respond. I have given considerable thought and consideration to all of the implications which are involved. I do not doubt for one moment that starvation is or will soon be prevalent in India. I do not doubt that countless thousands of people will die of starvation. I, therefore, believe that it is becoming a great Nation to aid the people in distress in that far distant land. But, Mr. Chairman, I am mindful of the fact that even though we taxed our resources to the utmost, we could not feed all of the people of the world. While we can relieve distress in India, at least in some degree by the passing of this bill and by providing the aid and assistance contemplated, this should neither be considered as a precedent nor policy but rather as an isolated emergency. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am motivated by humanitarian impulses and emotions and I am not actuated in any degree by a desire to aid oppression nor to strengthen the armed forces of the country which is to receive the benefits of this assistance. Frankly, I would not look with favor upon an outright grant to India for the reason that I honestly believe that India can pay and should be required to pay for the aid we are called upon to render. Actually, I am not so sure that the horrible situation now existing in India was not precipitated by or at least aggravated by economic warfare which India has been waging against Pakistan. If the aid we are about to give to India is for the ulterior purpose of aiding India in its fight against Pakistan, then this bill should be defeated. I have discussed this matter with people from Pakistan and I have also discussed it with people from India. I know that the people of Pakistan feel and believe that India can pay dollar for dollar for everything that India needs to receive from us and I believe that India can pay, if not with dollars, then with strategic materials. The people of Pakistan, likewise, believe that the result of our aid to India will be to strengthen the Indian armies in Kashmir so that India can carry on its fight in more formidable fashion. Certainly this cannot be the purpose of the pending bill but I, too, am somewhat apprehensive. In this critical situation the word "starvation" keeps ringing in my ears.

Mr. Chairman, I know a little something about how some of the people of the world feel about us. I have attended several international meetings. I had an experience in Ireland last fall which I shall long remember. I was attending a meeting in Dublin, a meeting which was attended by delegates from many nations. I sat there with the American delegation as the general debate proceeded, thinking that perhaps someone would take the rostrum and commend the people of America for their generous contributions to the welfare and security of the people of other nations. Man after man came to the rostrum, and many fine and flowery speeches were made, but not one word of praise for America came from the lips of any man until a little brown fellow from the Philippines came to make his speech. He complimented America and the people of our great country on our many magnanimous programs and with great sincerity praised our Government and our people. After he had taken his seat other men followed him to the rostrum. I will not attempt to quote any particular persons, but here are some of the things that were said by the men who spoke: "Yes; America has been generous and very magnanimous in its gifts to the white people of Europe, but what has America done for the black and brown men of the east?" They said, "No nation has a greater right to burn vital food or to pour it into the sea while other human beings are starving." Another expression was, "We cannot sit on the doorsteps of the White House with our caps in our hands and ask for charity." Another remark was substantially this: "You talk about the spark that may start the next world war. That spark may well be smoldering somewhere in the east."

Yes, Mr. Chairman, they pointed the accusing finger at America and held us up to scorn. Back of all of these statements was some sort of a veiled threat. So it appears that our purpose has not been understood nor have our programs been well understood by some of the people of some of the nations who claim to be the friends of freedom. There in far-away Ireland we were forced into the position of having to explain the philosophy and the purpose of our programs.

Apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] regarding publicity or the lack of publicity, I would like to call your attention to the very unfavorable publicity which we have actually received here at home. Much of the publicity and propaganda which have had their origin right here at home has tended to bring us into great disrepute around the world. I hold in my hand a cartoon which appeared in Washington papers and which no doubt made its way around the world. It is called the Sermon on the Mount. The cartoonist pictures the Eighty-second Congress standing on top of a mountain of grain and at the foot of the mountain a starving Indian mother with her starving child and written on a sign which is being held up by the Eighty-second Congress are these words, "You don't get anything for nothing in this world, pal." This, Mr. Chairman, is mean and vicious propaganda designed for a wicked purpose and intended to bring this Congress into disrepute. We are told that India has not asked for gifts or grants and yet this cartoonist in his zeal pictures his own country and this Congress as a Shylock inspired by unholy greed. This sort of sordid propaganda is constantly encouraging the people of the world to believe that we have an unlimited abundance of food and fiber and that because of our selfishness and greed we are unwilling to aid the starving and distressed people of other parts of the world. No nation in all the tides of time has ever been more generous than has our own Nation. No country in all history has ever embraced programs of such magnitude nor has any country ever initiated or financed a more magnanimous nor a more charitable program than the programs upon which we have embarked. We are told that we are trying to make friends and yet well-meaning people are alienating our friendships throughout the world. I sometimes believe that the more we give in the way of aid and assistance, the more we are expected to give and I have just about concluded that you cannot buy friendship and keep it bought.

We have been talking for months about grain for the starving people of India; now we are coming to the end of this long debate. While we are talking, human beings are suffering. If we are to render aid, let us get on with the job. As I contemplate the suffering of the people of India, I am mindful of the fact that a man named Sir Humphrey Gilbert once said, "Delay doth ofttimes prevent the performance of good things, for the wings of man's life are plumed with the feathers of death." If we are to pluck even a few of the "feathers of death" from the wings of the lives of the people of India, let us get on with the passage of this bill, but with its passage may we let

the world know that after all there is a limit to our resources. If we were to pile up our national debt alongside of the mountain of grain pictured by the cartoonist, the mountain of grain would shrink to insignificance and our national debt would almost reach to the sky. Some people do not seem to realize the gigantic proportions of our national obligations. We are told that we owe more money than all of the other nations of the earth put together. There is an old maxim of equity to the effect that "one must be just before one is generous." No man can doubt the fact that we have been generous even to the point that we might not have been just with our own people.

It seems to me that we should reappraise all of our foreign aid programs and our foreign policy and ask ourselves the question: Are we just with the people of our own great country? Here in America men and women are working themselves weary producing and earning. Yes, and in giving to the less fortunate people in far distant countries. Yet with all of this, we are called imperialistic. This aid will at least prove beyond doubt that in our generosity and in our charity we do not draw the color line and we are not influenced either by race, color, or creed.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of attentiveness for almost 3 days now to this very important debate, and I have come to draw certain conclusions after listening very carefully to both sides. I have weighed heavily the consequences of voting one way or the other.

As far as I am concerned, the passage of this bill and the consideration of it is not a gamble as to whether we are going to make a friend or whether we are going to make an enemy, because the stark, cold record is there. We are faced with a death struggle in Korea today that has cost the United States of America not 69,000 casualties, as we have been told by the Pentagon, but the word leaked out today after cross-examination of Gen. Omar Bradley that our actual casualties were 141,995. Those were our actual casualties in the Korean War, twice the amount that has been published. When we suffer almost 150,000 casualties in a death struggle in Korea, it seems that there is a definite opportunity for nations to tell whether they are our friends or whether they are our enemies.

As far as I am concerned, India has proved to us that it is not our friend in the Korean struggle. They have proven time and again they are our enemies. They have stood against us in the United Nations organization. They have taken the side of the North Koreans. They have taken the side of Red China. They have taken the side of Russia. I cannot reconcile the Congress of the United States of America feeding to the tune of $190,000,000 of the taxpayers' money a country that has shown in this death struggle in Korea that they are not with us, they are against us.

I cannot conceive of a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] a little while ago said, saying that this $190,000,000 will keep India independent, or at least keep India neutral. India is not neutral in this struggle in Korea, remember that. India has stated officially that they will not send a single soldier to Korea. India has stated specifically and officially that they will continue to trade with Korea and with Red China.

Look how foolish we must appear in the eyes of the world if we pass this bill. Just a little while ago, a few days ago, we passed a bill urging the United Nations to put an embargo on Red China, and at the very time that we passed that resolution India had officially stated that they are going to continue to do business with Red China. As a matter of fact, just a few days ago they shipped 50 American-made trucks to Red China. How they got those trucks, I do not know, but they did it.

Look how silly we are going to look to the 12 nations of the world who have contributed troops in Korea. How silly we are going to look to them when we pass out a $190,000,000 grant to the only independent nation in the United Nations organization—the only one, mind you, that gives aid and comfort to the enemy. There is a reason why Poland stood against us in the United Nations in this Korean situation, because Poland is under the domination of Russia, and we put them there at Yalta. The same thing can be said of Czechoslovakia and these other nations that went along with Red China and Red Russia and the North Koreans. But there is no excuse whatever for India's going along with the North Koreans and Red China and Red Russia, because India is an independent nation. They owe no allegiance whatever to Russia. Yet they have cast their lot in this death struggle, where we have suffered almost 150,000 casualties, with Red Russia, Red China, and North Korea. We are going to look like a bunch of stupid jackasses if we pick that nation and give them a gift of $190,000,000. The only independent, free nation that has refused to follow the sanctions imposed by the United Nations has refused to follow even naming Red China as an aggressor, believe it or not. Of all nations, we pick one that has cast its lot with the enemy. We single them out and give them a present of $190,000,000. Yet we are told we must do it to make friends. To me this course of action is one fraught with consequences the world over. This fraud on the people of America should be defeated.

In other words, so far as I am concerned there is no question of keeping India on our side, or keeping them neutral, because India as an independent nation is not neutral. They have cast their lot with the enemy, and we are rewarding them to the tune of $190,000,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last paragraph.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I inquire how many amendments are going to be offered to the section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that there is only one amendment at the desk and in addition two more to be offered.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, then, that all debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, there appeared here on the floor of this House some little time ago one, who by popular acclaim has earned the right to be known and recognized as the world's first citizen.

In the magnificent address which he made he in effect said, "I am an old soldier. I have fought a good fight. My race is run. But I would remind you that an old soldier never dies; he simply fades away."

With those words he electrified this great country of ours.

Mr. Chairman, I know my limitations. I do not fool myself by indulging the idea that I am anything more than ordinary, but I do know that in this debate I have been candid, and have not attempted to win support for my position by the use of arguments that were unfair.

So, as far as this contest is concerned, and I think it of tremendous importance to the future of our country, I have done my best. As an old soldier I have endeavored to fulfill my responsibility, but as that great patriot and soldier, old soldiers never die, they simply fade away. Therefore, so far as any further debate on the bill is concerned, I fade out of the picture. But, my colleagues, there are other problems with which we must wrestle, and on tomorrow I will be back locking step with you in the fight to keep the flag still flying.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 2, line 6, strike out the figure "$190,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is humanly possible to deliver grain to the extent of $190,000,000 in time to meet the crisis that exists in India. We were informed

in committee that the crisis is between the 1st of April and the 1st of September. After that the new crop comes in.

I am submitting to you this afternoon that it is perfectly senseless to attempt to authorize $190,000,000 for grain that cannot humanly be sent to meet the needs. If we authorize $100,000,000 it would be sufficient to take care of that need.

Many questions arise in this matter. I want to call attention to a press release of Reuters out of New Delhi, India, yesterday. I quote:

> India now has steady supplies of about 500,000 tons of food grains for each critical month from May to August. Food Minister K. M. Manchi told the food committee of the Congress Party tonight that the spring harvest had increased stocks from 750,000 tons in January to 1,400,000 tons in May.

I also call attention to a press release from the Indian Embassy here in Washington, the India News Bulletin, on this matter of all-out effort to increase the production of food. The date line is April 10, 1951. Listen to what the Indian Embassy says about the food situation and it ought to know what the facts are:

> During the 2 years 1948 and 1950 various schemes completed under the grow-more-food campaign have produced an additional 1,740,000 tons of food grains as against a target of 1,780,000 tons. This left a balance of 3,060,000 tons to be achieved during 1950 and 1952 on the basis of an estimated deficit of 4,800,000 tons to be made up by March 1952.

Mind you, March 1952. The food-grain problem, so far as the Embassy of India is concerned, will have been met. That is the target date of self-sufficiency in food. Now, I ask you what is the possible justification for us to authorize $190,000,000 today for this program when they cannot possibly use it? You could not buy it, you could not ship it before the first of August, and by that time this emergency will be over.

I repeat what I said yesterday, that it was Nehru who said that famine as we have grown to understand this awful word does not exist to any wide extent at this date; and he also said, and it is proven by this article that I have just referred to, that the new wheat is coming in and "it is our good fortune that the crop on the whole has been a good one."

I submit to you that we ought not think in terms of humanitarian effort only, even though we are all so motivated. The facts indicate that we cannot buy the grain and we cannot ship it, in time to meet the need so there is no sense to make this authorization for the full amount of $190,000,000. The sum of $100,000,000 will do the job this bill intends.

I am prompted to ask also as we consider this and other bills that will come before us soon: Where are we going to get the money? We have not had Bob Rich around here for a long time, but he always asked that pertinent question. Have we been thinking this afternoon as to where this money is coming from? Oh, $190,000,000 is a drop in the bucket. It does not amount to a great deal. This morning, came word that the Ways and Means Committee are compelled to vote an increase in our personal taxes of 12½ percent. Is there anything in this record before this House today which indicates that the people of India are paying taxes to help out on this situation? Of course there is not; it is only the American people who are asked to be the suckers in this kind of program. Other similar programs will soon be presented.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The Ways and Means Committee has been in almost constant session since February 5 trying to raise the necessary money to keep up with the spending of this Congress and it just cannot be done. We are scraping the bottom of the barrel. There was asked, as you know, at the beginning, $16,500,000,000. It was soon found necessary to reduce it to $10,000,000,000. Now, by taxing everything from razor blades, pencils, baseballs that the children use, and scraping the bottom of the barrel they find they can raise only $7,000,000,000.

There is where we are; yet we are trying to give away more money. And I want to make another statement, and I say this seriously. On the basis of and as a part of their religion the people of India feel they must not kill a single monkey, and there are as many monkeys in India as there are human beings, and those human beings will allocate their food to the monkeys rather than to their starving children. The sacred cows are going to get part of this. We have to be realistic about this whole matter. The prospect for sufficient grain for our own people is not too encouraging.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. A $90,000,000 cut off this bill will still give India what it needs and wants.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may advise the gentleman from South Carolina that under unanimous consent his time was assigned to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I understood that the gentleman from Georgia refused that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair put the request and it was not objected to.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be given to the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, may I say in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] that the gentleman is doubtless, too, opposed to the $100,000,000 that his amendment provides. In other words, he is against the whole thing. If you were to cut it down to fifty million I imagine the gentleman would be against that.

He says that in India they have so much grain. Well, they have some grain, but it is in the pipeline. If they go ahead and pump the pipeline dry, it will take 3 months to replenish the supply.

As I said previously, the Indian people are living on about 900 calories. The old high level was 1,700 calories. We are trying to build it back up to 1,200 calories. The reason it is down to 900 calories right now is because the pipeline is almost dry and they cannot pump any more out of the line because they do not know that they will get additional grain from any source. They have to keep a reserve in order to keep down actual starvation. We people in the United States are used to about 3,000 calories. The best in India was 1,700. They are living now on 900 calories. Through this bill we are trying to build that up to 1,200 calories which from the standpoint of Americans is still a starvation diet. We could not exist on it.

Do not forget that the gentleman from Wisconsin is opposed to the hundred million, he is opposed to ninety million, and he is opposed to fifty million.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The committee bill provides authorization for not to exceed $190,000,000?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. When you are borrowing money you are not going to borrow any more than you need. That is the advantage to me of the loan formula.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman from Wisconsin is right and they only need to buy a million tons, they are not going to borrow money that they do not need for grain. I think lending the amount is an important thing.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is correct. They needed 6,000,000 tons. They have bought with their own money 4,000,000 tons. They have got to have 2,000,000 tons in addition to live. That is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, here are the facts, and that is what we are after in this debate. I am sure if the House is satisfied that this bill fundamentally should pass, it does not want to build a bridge that is only part way built and drop the Indian people into the river in the middle.

The fact is, as my colleague from Wisconsin has said, that the spring harvest in India of wheat is just coming in. If not, we would not be talking about one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and thirty million people of India on a ration system and 15,000,000 people of India in peril of famine; we would be talking about 350,000,000 people being directly affected.

The same news dispatch my colleague refers to say that India now has steady supplies of about 500,000 tons of food grains for each critical month from May to August. But then we find that 500,000 tons of food grains per month means exactly 900 calories per day to each of the people of India on the ration list, or the 9 ounces of grain a day, and that is exactly what we are here to pass legis-

lation to correct. According to the facts made available to the committee, it took 520,000 tons of food grains per month in the first quarter of 1951 to provide only this 9-ounce ration per day. We are here to debate whether we want to let the people of India go down the drain with an average of 900 calories a day for the one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and thirty million on the ration list or whether we want to help them. So that we are debating right now on this amendment to cut by almost one-half the $190,000,000, whether we will build just that part of the bridge to take India over the peril of famine, which India cannot build herself.

Now, what my colleague says is, "Let us not extend this bridge all the way across the river; let us just add a little more onto it, $100,000,000 worth." Well, that will still drop the Indian people into the river just as they would be dropped into the river if we gave them no part of the money at all. We have either got to do this job or not do this job, and the facts and the figures, which, after all, are all we can go by, demonstrate that if we leave the people of India with their present food grain supply in their bins they can have 900 calories a day, which is a famine level.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I point out that there is a Life magazine on the desk, of the May 23 issue, showing the horror-stricken faces of the starving Indians, as well as Indian people lying on the cement starving to death. If there is any doubt about it, look at the pictures and be convinced.

Mr. JAVITS. May I make one other point? There has been a lot of argument here just about what India is doing for herself in the way of grain. The normal harvest of India in the year 1949–50 was 49,000,000 tons of grain. The harvest in the year 1950–51 is 43,000,000 tons of grain. There is the situation, and you cannot argue it away in any way, shape, or form. That is the fundamental and basic fact and that is why we are legislating today to help relieve famine in India.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that when this legislation originally came to the House that President Truman requested that it be 1,000,000 tons?

Mr. JAVITS. But the difficulty is that the House did not act at that time. The House has waited so many months that if we are going to do the job required we have to provide for the 2,000,000 tons—certainly with the necessary authority—or if we do not, we do not act adequately now. Our negotiators on the loan can deal with the timing, the allowabilities, and the installments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin which reduces the amount proposed in the bill from 190,000,000 to 100,000,000. You cannot laugh away $90,000,000 by talking about calories as the previous speaker has been doing. Ninety million dollars is a lot of money, and if you do not believe this, you come and sit with us on the Committee on Ways and Means some day and see how long it takes us and what we have got to do to raise $90,000,000 in taxes from people who are already taxed too much. In the big tax bill that we are now writing we have raised the income tax of all who pay income tax by 12½ percent. We have been compelled to tax the women for nearly every garment they wear and any jewelry that they buy, and we have taxed the men in nearly every way that we thought we could get an extra tax dollar. Ninety million dollars is a lot of money and could be a terrific fund for evil if not handled intelligently. Of course, I am for the reduction proposed in this amendment. I would vote for a reduction down to $50,000,000. That would be enough to start with. Fifty million dollars is more money than many of the counties in the United States would appraise at if you appraised all the real estate and all the personal property in the county. So, let us not worry about calories when we are talking about millions. What I am interested in is that this money will be spent wisely. I think we all know that over in the other body the first bill introduced there provided for a loan and a gift. One-half to be a complete grant, and the other half to be a loan, which loan was to be repaid. The bill we are considering here today deals only with a loan. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] a question. I ask him because he is very well posted in these matters. My question is, What are the essential differences between this bill that we are considering and the bill passed by the other body?

Mr. VORYS. The amounts are exactly the same, $190,000,000. In the Senate bill, not less than $100,000,000 shall be made immediately available from ECA appropriations already made. The remaining $90,000,000 will also come from ECA funds if they are available as of June 30, 1951. Any amount short of $90,000,000 will be provided by a "self-generating" public-debt transaction of the type provided in the House bill. To my mind that is really money whether it has been appropriated or not, but it does not make much difference. The Bridges amendment which provides for the transfer of substantial quantities of monazite and manganese from India as repayment is not in this bill at the present time. The Mundt amendment, providing for a broad range of educational opportunities for Indian students, professors, and technicians out of the interest payments for the next 5 years is not in the bill before us. The provision, which I understand will be offered here, for paying for shipment of relief packages, is in the Senate bill. The termination provision, providing that the President or Congress by concurrent resolution can terminate all or any part of the assistance is in the Senate bill. We have felt that that is not appropriate if you are going to have it in the form of a loan. After the contract is made for the loan neither the President nor the Congress could come in and change it. That gives the gentleman the information he wants?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, Mr. VORYS, I appreciate your lucid explanation. I judge from that we can safely say that the House bill generally is preferable to the Senate bill, because it covers the situation more completely.

Mr. VORYS. Yes. Mr. Nehru said in his latest statement that he preferred the House bill because it did not attempt to write in all the conditions that were in the Senate bill before it was amended by that body.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; I am glad to yield to my friend from Wisconsin, whose judgment I respect on all these foreign affairs matters.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman from New York has made some reference to calories. I am quoting now from page 33, the testimony of Mr. Taylor:

> The total ration of which we speak supplied from the ration shops is either 1,200 calories or 900 calories as at present, but that is not the total consumption of a family. The total consumption per individual, per person, is more on the order of 1,700 calories, or 1,800 calories, or within that bracket.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently advocated and voted for economy. I have voted against most of these foreign loans because I felt that the money would be wasted. My trip to Europe about 3 years ago as a member of the committee appointed by the Speaker to study the situation in Europe convinced me that much of the money and provisions sent to the European countries went for purposes that were not for the best interest of our country or for the best interest of the world. I think that $50,000,000 is as much as this bill should carry. This money cannot be spent all at once. It should not be spent in any reckless way. It should be spent carefully. Our Government officials who have handled these European loans and gifts have wasted many millions of dollars, but surely they have learned by this time not to permit themselves to be fooled and duped by these foreign grafters and in some instances traitors and criminals. If I thought that our Government officials were going to be lead around by the nose in the handling of this money, I would not vote one penny to India or to any other country. This loan is being made on a different basis than most of our other loans. This loan is in anticipation of a war and not to rebuild after a war.

On my trip to Europe which I just mentioned, I did see some instances where the money and provisions had been handled in such a way as to be beneficial to the people of the countries that received it and also beneficial to the world in that it tended to develop good feeling between nations and peoples.

The debates in the Senate on this matter of aid to India early indicated that the Senate was not in favor of passing legislation that would result in our making an outright gift of this money or supplies to India. I think that the sentiment of the country would be overwhelmingly against making a $190,000,000 gift to India. The people would not be in favor of making any gifts if they knew the facts. The facts are that up to date India has paid in cash or in commodities for every assistance she has had from any foreign country. If she has paid other countries why not pay the United States. She has not been given any gifts and Nehru, the Prime Minister, disdainfully claims that his country will not accept gifts. Therefore we are all agreed that the thing to do is to loan such money as our representatives think should be loaned and then arrange for cash payments or payment in goods which India has a great supply and of which our country needs and must purchase from some country.

In spite of this fact, there has been an effort made to give the impression to the country, especially to the church people, that it is our country's duty to donate millions upon millions of our hard-earned taxpayers' money to be spent by the unreliable official heads of India and her provinces. I am glad that the Senate early decided that it would make no gifts, and I am glad that the very able and efficient Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives recommended that we make no gifts to India but on the contrary that we have a strict understanding to the effect that India must repay this loan with interest either in money or commodities.

Bishop Werner of the Methodist Church has taken an active interest in this program. He has been somewhat critical of Congressmen who are not inclined to want to give away the taxpayers money. In reply to a letter that he wrote me some time ago, I stated my position on this subject. I am glad that the Senate and House of Representatives both have approved my viewpoint and my position. I am sorry that the bishop found it convenient to go into my section of the State of Ohio and to publicly find fault with my position. I hope he retraces his steps and lets the people know the financial facts and know that the Senate and House of Representatives, by tremendous majorities, have supported my viewpoint completely.

Bishop Werner, in his last letter to me says:

> When I return to America, I am scheduled to speak in seven mass meetings across the State (Ohio). I propose to say in no uncertain words that which I trust will be interpretive of the true situation of the desperate and tragic needs of this people.

I did not take this as a threat and I invite him to realize the situation from the standpoint of the tremendous cost, and from the standpoint that Nehru has plainly indicated his friendship toward Russian communism.

If we were to divide our people up into groups, there is no doubt that the church people are the finest group of our population from the standpoint of morals and charitable inclinations. On the other hand, we must not lose sight of the fact that the church people pay their share of the taxes and that the church people are almost universally loyal and patriotic Americans. The public press has for some time been indicating that some few of the bishops of the Methodist Church are considered to be considerably to the left when measured for their true loyal Americanism. I have the profoundest respect for the board of bishops of the Methodist Church. I yield to them on all matters of theology, but on matters of national finance and of international relationships it would be reasonable to suppose that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States might know as much about national and international matters as the average American citizen. The considerate view of the church people when they are fully advised is worthy of the consideration of all of us. This matter of relief to India should not be made a church responsibility. The church people will always do their part. It is a matter for all Americans regardless of race, creed, or color.

Outside of the fact that $190,000,000 is a tremendous sum of money and outside of the fact that no doubt there are many people in India who need assistance, the principal problem that confronts us as Members of Congress and representatives of the people of the United States, is to see to it that this money is used for the best interest of the Indian people and also for the best interest of the American taxpayers. The best interest of the American taxpayer is that in these unsettled times we do those things that will protect our country against our well-recognized enemy Joe Stalin and his communistic satellites. We all know that Europe and Asia are boiling in the cauldron of war. We all know that Joe Stalin stands by and stirs the cauldron as it boils. We know that communism is soulless and that it gives no consideration to honesty or decency. It would be a terrific travesty if this money that the Congress appropriates for aid to India would be manipulated by Nehru and his cohorts so that Stalin and Russia and communism will be the chief beneficiaries. Uncle Sam is a grand old man, but however grand he is it must be recognized that he has been Uncle Sap on many occasions in the deals that have been made by Roosevelt and Acheson and their satellites.

I am constrained to vote for this measure for three reasons: First, I know that the American people want to be charitable and to do more than their part in establishing peace in the world; second, I believe that there is considerable need for food in India; third, I hope that our American representatives who handle these negotiations by which this tremendous sum is spent will do it honestly and patriotically and for the best interests of the American people who pay the bill. Any American given the responsibility of spending this great sum of money would be more vile than Benedict Arnold if he should fail in his trust.

If those who administer this trust are honest and faithful they will not spend all of this money simply because the Congress has voted this great sum. If they find after spending a few thousand dollars that the further spending of money would not inure to the benefit of the poor people of India or to the benefit of our country and the peace-loving countries of the world, then they should refuse to enter into further negotiations that would lead toward spending any more of these funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 69, noes 95.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and Mr. RICHARDS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 91, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: Page 2, line 3, after the period, insert a new sentence, as follows: "The Administrator is directed and instructed that in his negotiations with the Government of India he shall, so far as practicable and possible, obtain for the United States the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of such materials, particularly those found to be strategic and critical."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I think those who have listened to the reading of the amendment can understand very well what it means. It comes in the bill at the top of page 2, following the language presently contained in the bill, in which reference is made to materials in respect to which we are deficient in this country.

This language simply imposes upon the Administrator the obligation, so far as possible and practicable, to obtain for us in exchange for the wheat that we are providing in this legislation, those materials needed in this country.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Am I correct in my understanding of the amendment, to this effect, that the amendment does not hamstring the Administrator or negotiator at all?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not see how it could hamstring him. It is simply an expression of the desire or intent of Congress that in his negotiations—it refers to the Administrator and to his negotiations with the Government of India—he shall obtain for us in part payment at least as much as possible of the materials referred to in the language in the committee bill. It says to him, "so far as practicable and possible, obtain for us in this country as many of these supplies as you can."

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to say that I think the gentleman's amendment will accomplish a useful purpose and that it is in line with the feeling of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Insofar as I am concerned, I will agree to the amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] knows that we here in the House have debated this issue, and I cannot see how he could oppose this amendment. Before he speaks, let me read just two sentences from a statement made by Prime Minister Nehru to the Parliament of India on May 10:

> There is a reference to our supplying various kinds of materials to the United States of America in part payment for the grain supplied. We shall gladly supply such materials as are available in India and can be spared by us.

Does that not simply mean that if the administrator will be diligent in his efforts to get the materials we need, we may wind up in payment in things we need as we go along, or substantially so?

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. I have not been at one with the committee, in that I have resisted any amendments offered in the committee that the rest were willing to go for; but in this instance the gentleman's amendment provides exactly what I think the Administrator ought to do, and I think it is not objectionable and it might be encouraging to the Administrator.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman's amendment is an indication of how the Congress feels, a direction without being binding, and if they cannot get all they can get some. I favor the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 1 minute of my time be assigned to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. If this amendment is accepted by the Committee and by the House, would the gentleman then vote for this bill?

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has asked me, and I say "Yes," and that answer does not imply any deal on my part or any compromise of any view or conviction held by me.

Mr. FULTON. Thank you, and I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I would prefer that hereafter he not ask me that sort of question. I do not know how many more amendments may be offered to this bill. It may be so amended that the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself would not vote for the bill. But he has asked me and I have answered.

Now, let me just say further that we have been getting more than $100,000,000 worth of goods from India each year, manganese, badly needed in this country, and other things badly needed. I think this amendment clearly indicates that we expect those who represent us in these negotiations to get those materials for us in the greatest possible amount, and if that is done, as I say, it may well be that we will have very substantial repayment in kind. To my mind that is highly desirable.

I said earlier in the debate that I hoped we could work out a bill here mutually satisfactory and advantageous to both India and ourselves. This amendment, if adopted and conscientiously administered, can accomplish much in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] is recognized.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, the true purpose of and actual intent for the ECA program was to rehabilitate friendly foreign nations in Europe. In many instances, however, we all realize that the major portion of such benefits under the program were used to enhance personal gains to a few fellows who sponsored the idea in this country, leaving far too little of the intended benefits for the eligible recipients under the ECA program. For this reason, I have never supported the Marshall plan during peacetime. I have supported the program as a war effort during this international emergency. The Marshall plan has never been anything more or less than a war measure; and it is regrettable that profiteering by many of the sponsors of this program has left such little remaining benefits from the huge appropriation for friendly European countries in our efforts to win wars short of battle.

Perhaps I should state to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] that I live in the Cotton Belt of this country, but that I have never attempted to justify the actions of some of the cotton dealers in their efforts to profiteer under the ECA program at the expense of the taxpayer. No; I have never attempted to justify the swindling of moneys provided for suffering humanity. I might add that the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] or no other Member from any section of this country can justify like swindling by other Marshall plan sponsors concerning other commodities handled under the ECA program.

At least this India grain bill is the lesser of foreign-aid evils submitted to Congress during my tenure of office. It affords little opportunity to the sponsors and promoters to profiteer. I am going to support this bill because only food for suffering humanity is involved. I am supporting it as a war measure—and that is exactly what it is. I am supporting the bill because the defeat of this legislation following this debate would be detrimental to our national security on the diplomatic front.

Actually I am at a loss to know how any member from any section of this country can justify opposition to this bill after having supported the ECA program or the aid to communistic Yugoslavia. As I have heretofore stated, I have never supported the Marshall plan during peacetime, and I did everything within my power to preclude aid to Yugoslavia. Now I would just like for one of you who supported either of these afore-mentioned measures to justify your vote against this food bill for starving humanity.

No; I do not go for the theory that has just been advanced by several of the gentlemen this afternoon that we should force independent India to join up with us before we afford food to starving people of India. Such a policy is the same as being advocated and practiced by Russia. We would be bound with our wealth while Russia takes with force. There is no difference. We should never impose our system of government upon any people any more than we should tolerate efforts by outsiders to change our principles of government.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing the lending of a considerable sum of money which the United States does not have, which the Appropriations Committee does not know where to get, and which the Ways and Means Committee is unable to find new sources to provide. That might be considered unfortunate, but I think a more unfortunate aspect of this situation is that in the opinion of many people the plan proposed to help India is not the plan which would best help India nor the best for the United States. I do not set up my opinion against the opinion of the committee, which I respect. I presume the committee has consulted the same references and talked to the same people I have. We have never bought real friendship with money. That has never been done in the history of the world. What little value we might have secured from this grain sale probably has been lost by the delay between last November and now. The serious thing, Mr. Chairman, is that what India needs is help to increase her own grain production.

India is today drilling an increasing number of water wells, as many of you know. India today harvests her crops not as we harvest our crops but with a sickle or a small scythe. Just one scientific advance in the harvesting of grain would provide the grain we are talking about here.

India today plows her fields with the same wooden plows with which she plowed generations ago. For a price of $2 and a small amount of steel we could provide India, through her own blacksmiths and the small factories of her own country, with steel points to her plows, for no more than $2 each, which in one season, Mr. Chairman, would pull India out of the class of famine-threatened countries and would do more for India than anything we are talking about today.

Mr. Chairman, I have intended to vote against this bill because of its ineffectiveness. I would like to vote for the same amount of money, or any amount of money which would do for India what I am suggesting, which would make it possible for India to help herself. That

is the American method of help, that is the sensible and intelligent method of help, and I submit to you it is the Christian method of help.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORTON: Page 2, line 16, after "United States", insert "nor require him to promulgate regulations for the curtailment of the domestic use of such products during the period of such procurement."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an additional proviso. In the bill at the present time we require the Secretary of Agriculture to certify that the procurement of these grains will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States. My additional proviso merely states that the procurement of these grains will not require the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate regulations curtailing the domestic use of such grains during the period of the procurement.

We have seen times when the Secretary of Agriculture has promulgated certain regulations curtailing the use of grains. For example, I think it was in 1947 he required that all of the mills of the country put a certain amount of feed in flour, thereby depriving our meat producers of the United States of necessary foodstuffs. It soon became evident that would not work, but, in the meantime, 5 or 6 months had gone by and hundreds of thousands of hundredweight of edible flour and feed were wasted.

I do not know what the Secretary of Agriculture is going to do in the way of regulations, and I do not think anyone here knows, but I just want to be sure that if he certifies this is not in opposition to the vital needs of the country he will not the next day, before the ink is dry, when this becomes law put out some regulation curtailing the use of the grains involved here in our domestic field.

The domestic consumption and use of grains industrially, commercially, and agriculturally. I do not want them to curtail the amount that can be fed on the farm as a result of this legislation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is this intended to protect the distillers of this country?

Mr. MORTON. This is intended to protect the entire economy of this country.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's amendment is not germane. I do not know what the gentleman's objective is. I have heard some talk about certain interests being interested in this amendment. I do not make that charge or anything like it, but it does seem to me that the sense of this amendment is that we are dealing with a phase of our domestic economy here that would not come within the scope of the bill. I did not see a copy of the amendment before the gentleman offered it, but just offhand, I would say that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MORTON. I do, Mr. Chairman. The bill specifically provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of this country. I just go one step further and say that if he certifies that it does not impair the vital needs of this country he cannot, while this grain is being purchased, go ahead and pass a lot of regulations on the excuse that we had to ship this grain to India, so that we have to go back to 80-percent flour, or anything else as he forced us to do in 1947. The amendment is germane. He has to give his certification, and this qualifies the certification and tightens it up. I think we ought to tighten up the action of the Secretary of Agriculture in any way we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment which, in the words of the gentleman from Kentucky, goes one step further than the pending bill, and also in the words of the gentleman from Kentucky, makes an additional proviso. The gentleman from South Carolina makes the point of order that the additional proviso is not germane. Clause 7 of rule XVI says that no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment. The test of germaneness, it seems to the Chair, is whether or not a new subject matter is introduced by way of amendment. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that his additional proviso is related to the proviso in the bill. The Chair would cite to the gentleman the precedent on page 88, volume 9, of Cannon's Precedents which says this:

The fact that two subjects are related does not necessarily render them germane.

Under the rule cited and the precedent cited, and others at hand, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHELLEY: On page 2, after line 20, insert a new section:

"SEC. 3. Assistance provided under this act shall be provided under the provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, applicable to and consistent with the purposes of this act."

And amend the title.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have been hopeful that the amendment would be accepted by the committee. If a point of order is insisted upon, I certainly want to reserve the right to argue the point.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment as proposed is section 8 of the bill adopted by the other body in the identical language that exists in the ECA bill, in the aid to Yugoslavia bill, and in the other bills we have passed on relief and assistance and loan programs. The purpose I have in offering this amendment at this time is to protect that principle which was established in the aforementioned pieces of legislation in regard to assuring that the cargoes carried shall be carried at least 50 percent in vessels of American registry.

I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the Maritime Board, with the ECA representatives, with representatives of steamship management, and with representatives of steamship labor. They are all in agreement as to its usefulness and the desirability of having it in the bill.

It does not appear in the bill at this time, and I think some of the reasons for its need may not be apparent. I will state frankly at the present time the plan is to carry the grain in American vessels taken out of the laid-up fleet and operated under general agency agreement by American operators. There are few, if any, private American vessels available at the moment but this program may go on for some time, and none of us know now just what change might occur in the availability of vessels. Therefore, purely in conformity with the legislation which we have adopted previously, this amendment is suggested, and I sincerely hope the House will adopt it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is necessary also that provision be made considerably in advance of the use of the vessels.

Mr. SHELLEY. That is true. I thank the gentleman for making that observation.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. He is a member of our committee, and I think he is very well informed on the subject matter. I hope the gentleman has emphasized in his remarks that this is the typical legislation which is already in the ECA Act and other acts, and does provide in the event of necessity that at least some American bottoms will be used in this shipping.

Mr. SHELLEY. That is right.

Mr. HAND. I support the gentleman's amendment with pleasure.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There still is nothing in the bill to compel the purchase of American food products, is there?

Mr. SHELLEY. I think that amendment has already been offered and adopted earlier.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order that this amendment is not germane. It goes beyond the scope of this legislation and introduces a new subject. It brings in a section of law

which is not germane to this section. It has to do with putting additional charges on the Government of India, which is not germane to this legislation.

May I point out that in the ECA legislation we were furnishing grants. This section which it is attempted to lug into this act has to do with what should be done with the shipping of materials which were granted to ECA countries. There cannot conceivably be any connection between this section of the ECA law attempted to be brought into this act and this bill dealing with a loan to a foreign country.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair make this inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio. In line 9 of page 1 of the bill reference is made to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 as amended. The gentleman from California offers an amendment which also provides that the assistance provided under this act shall be provided under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 as amended. Will the gentleman from Ohio explain his point of order further in this particular regard?

Mr. VORYS. Section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is referred to in section 2. Section 111 (c) (2) has to do with the provision of assistance on credit terms. It has to do with credit. The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is a long bill. The provision which the gentleman's amendment seeks to bring in, I do not have its number at the moment, is nowhere near section 111 (c). It has to do with shipping provisions in another entirely different part of the act. The mere fact that reference is made, not even by an amendment, but reference is made to one section, a credit section of the law, does not make the entire law germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Ohio noticed that in section 3, page 2 of the pending bill, reference is made to conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this act? And further, on page 3 reference is made to shipping and other items which, it seems to the Chair, might be referred to by the amendment of the gentleman from California.

Mr. VORYS. It seems to me that a mere reference to the text of the amendment shows that what the gentleman is trying to do is to get relief under this law for American shipping. That is what the gentleman's statement was about and that is what the language in the ECA law is about. It has to do with relief for American shipping. The provision about shipping under section 3 of the committee bill certainly has nothing to do with relief for American shipping, but is to provide bottoms for India to haul this grain.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SHELLEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

I wish to thank the Chairman for the observation he has made that the bill does refer, on page 1, line 9, to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and in line 8 to section 111 (c) (2). The amendment which I have offered will invoke section 111 (a) (2) which has been left out of the bill in its present form, and does not seek relief for American shipping, but simply does that which I should think every Member of the House would be glad to do, simply to assure that products of this country going to India under the circumstances discussed for the last several days will, at least to the extent of 50 percent, go in American bottoms. There are other references, as the Chair pointed out, to the use of shipping at the present time. They are going in American bottoms. Money has been provided for the reconditioning of those vessels. But we do not know from day to day just what the availability of vessels may be. All that is asked is that the provision heretofore adopted, approximately four times by the Congress, be adopted in this bill and give to a very vital industry of this country that assurance of support from the Congress of the United States to which they are entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Chair correctly understand the gentleman to say that the amendment offered by the gentleman, which the Chair hopes the gentleman understands is rather complicated for hurried study by the Chair, would bring into play an additional section of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which is not the subject matter of the bill before the Committee?

Mr. SHELLEY. It will not bring into play an additional section. It says "the administration shall be as provided," and so forth, which is the language of my amendment. It is applicable to and consistent with the purposes of the act. Its effect would be to guarantee the shipping provision being carried out. It brings in another portion of the same section, section 111.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If the Chair will look at the Economic Cooperation Act, he will find that the section which refers to shipping is 111 (a) (2) found on page 9 of the copy of the act which I have:

> At least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities shall be shipped in American bottoms.

That is the gist of it. The section which is not even amendment, but which is used as descriptive of the method of rendering credit terms, is section 111 (c) (2), which will be found on page 13, four pages over:

> When it is determined that assistance should be extended under the provisions of this title on credit terms—

If the Chairman has page 13 before him, he will find section 111 (c) (2), the last paragraph on the page. It is four pages away and a thousand miles different in subject matter from the subsection referred to in the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It seems to me, very briefly, Mr. Chairman, that support of the amendment lies on page 3 of the bill rather than in the point raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. The present bill has in it authorization for the activation and operation of vessels for transportation, which is a very broad provision. The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is to my mind distinctly a limitation upon the provisions already in the bill. Consideration by the Chairman should lie against that and not against the other point raised.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the amendment is in order because on page 2, line 23, it specifically refers to the terms and conditions upon which private shipping shall be or not be available under this act. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] certainly refers to the terms and conditions upon which private shipping shall be available.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). The Chair is ready to rule.

The bill before the Committee, in section 2, page 1, makes specific reference to subsection 111, subsection (c), paragraph (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; the amendment offered by the gentleman from California proposes to insert a new section in the pending bill which would provide that the assistance rendered by the bill shall be under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Administration Act of 1948 as amended, applicable to and consistent with the provisions of said act.

It has been necessary for the Chair to examine, though hurriedly, the section and subsection of the Economic Cooperation Administration Act of 1948, specifically referred to by the pending bill, and the additional subsections and paragraphs which, it seems to the Chair, are proposed to be introduced by the amendment of the gentleman from California. Section 111 has three subsections, each dealing with somewhat separate, though not entirely unrelated, subject matters. A further complication arises out of the fact that the subject of shipping, which is not referred to by section 111 (c) (2) but is a subject dealt with by other subsections of section 111, is dealt with by section (3) of the pending bill, though, the Chairman wishes to point out, said references of section (3) do not relate to shipping or operations under the Economic Cooperation Administration Act of 1948.

Upon close examination, the Chair finds that the amendment proposes the injection of new subject matter, not now within the text of the pending bill, by making the assistance which the pending bill would provide subject to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 which differ from subsection (c), paragraph (2), of section 111 of said act, specifically referred to by the pending bill.

The fundamental test of germaneness being whether a proposed amendment would inject new and different subject matter, though not necessarily unrelated matter, into the legislation, the Chair is constrained to feel that the proposed

amendment, even though it proposes to subject the pending bill to certain provisions of an act, a limited part of which act is referred to by the pending bill, does not meet the test of germaneness, and, therefore, sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to the extent that the President finds that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose: *Provided*, That pursuant to agreements made between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest not later than June 30, 1952, for such advances either from funds hereafter made available to the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, from receipts from vessel operations: *Provided further*, That pending such repayment, receipts from vessel operations may be placed in such funds or accounts and used for activating and operating vessels.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: On page 3, after line 19, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized to pay ocean-freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry in India on relief packages and supplies under the provisions of section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including relief packages and supplies of the American Red Cross. Funds now or hereafter available during the period ending June 30, 1952, for furnishing assistance under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, may be used to carry out the purposes of this section."

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to make provision for the carrying of relief packages by CARE and for ocean freight services for relief, charitable, and church organizations in the same fashion that we are presently doing it for the countries participating in the Marshall plan aid.

This language, Mr. Chairman, is taken from the ECA Act of 1948 and applies to India relief.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman have any idea as to what this will cost ECA or the taxpayers?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The freight expense so far has amounted to a little over $4,000,000, and for that $4,000,000 there has been transported goods totaling $76,600,000. It seems to me we get some idea from that comparison what the expense might be. Of course, the gentleman understands there is a limit of $20,000,000 in the bill for freight expenses. The Government of India has already expended for ocean transportation for grains purchased in the United States between June of last year and May of this year $35,000,000. That is on their private purchases. From those figures the gentleman from Wisconsin might get some idea of the expense. I know of his sincere desire to save money for the taxpayers of our country. I have an idea, too, that he is sympathetic with my objective which is to transfer as much of the burden as we can to the voluntary agencies. It is my feeling that this would be an encouragement to them. That is the reason I have offered the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would like to make the point that it would be a sum in addition to what is being authorized in this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It would, possibly, and theoretically it would run in excess of that, but I think it would be inconsequential. I do not believe the gentleman from Wisconsin would disagree with the other observation that we could draw out of the charitably minded people of America, and that includes nearly all of us, a large number of contributions for this purpose. It will have a lessened impact, of course, on the negotiations; in other words, it might be helping the Government of India to that extent. If the predictions that have been made by some as to repayment prospects, the rather dismal prospects, are true, then, of course, we would be saving not the Government of India but our own taxpayers.

Quite aside from that the people of America want to have a sense of sharing in this program. The gentleman knows we do not achieve that by voting tax money. That is another important factor. The gentleman also knows that the agency known as CARE as well as the Church World Service, the National Catholic Welfare agencies, the American Red Cross, and others, have rendered a notable service in the relief program. We would give to India a grand symbol of the feeling of charity for them in their distress.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am rather surprised that the gentleman would say we have not shared.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I did not intend that. We have indeed shared, Mr. Chairman, and I did not intend to leave that impression. As a matter of fact, it might surprise the people of America and the world to examine the record of voluntary contributions since the end of the war. The people of the world would be interested in the fact that over the years there has been given to the suffering populations of the world in excess of $2,000,000,000 in private contributions which includes all types of aid.

We were divided in the committee on this program. There were some who felt it should be all grant, there were some who felt as the bill is now reported, that it should be all loan, and there were others of us who felt it might reasonably include a partial grant. This tends to accomplish that because I concede that there is a slight subsidy. But in view of the fact it would bring into this relief program a large amount of voluntary contributions, it would have a beneficial effect and I think it would serve the taxpayers' interests.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have written into the committee bill a straightforward business proposition of a loan to India. Here is a chance to do something for charity. I believe with Henry Drummond that charity is "the greatest thing in the world," but I agree with my colleagues that there is no such thing as compulsory charity; that charity is a voluntary, individual virtue, and that no Congressman has a right to feel so charitable that he takes taxpayers' money away from them by force and uses it for a charitable purpose in a foreign land. But when charitable contributions are made by our people we can at least facilitate their getting across the ocean. We can do a thing that we did for Europe in the ECA law, and I am glad to support this amendment, which uses the ECA mechanism. As a matter of fact, I suggested this plan to the gentleman from Arkansas some weeks ago. It simply provides that, if people make relief gifts, the Government will pay the freight.

"Give us this day our daily bread." That is in the prayer Jesus said we should use. To hungry people of the Orient in His day, and today, that is a very real prayer. We all have a duty to help God answer that prayer. The word "daily" is an attempted translation of the word "epiousios" in the Greek testament. I understand it has never been used any place in the world except in the Lord's Prayer. So nobody knows just what "epiousios" means. It does not mean "daily." I had the Library of Congress look it up. It comes from words that may mean approaching a goal, necessary, proper, but in any case it has a mystic meaning there all of its own. That prayer is answered in many ways—through the annual miracle of crops springing from the soil, through trade in these crops, through loans, and through gifts. That last is charity; that is religion; that is something we cannot compel people to do, but after they have done it, we have a right to ship the proceeds of their charity abroad in order to increase the effectiveness of the gift and decrease the need for governmental relief.

I have contributed through our Methodist Church to Indian relief, as I hope all of you have through your own churches or charities. The Methodists are contributing about $12,000 a month for this purpose. There has been up to date $3,190,987 of private relief in the past year and parcel-post remittances running up to $241,829.07.

Here is a breakdown and analysis of this relief:

Cash contributions to Indian Embassy (as of May 2, 1951)	$5,536.75
Cash contribution made by U. N. employees to the Secretary-General	11,000.00
Private institutional relief aid, Jan. 1, 1950, to Mar. 31, 1951	1,074,451.00
Personal remittances of cost, January through December 1950	2,100,000.00
Total	3,190,987.75

This does not include parcel post remittances as follows:

1950: 465,647 pounds (average value 41 cents per pound)	$190,915.27
1951: (First quarter) 124,180 pounds (average value 41 cents per pound)	50,913.80
Total	241,829.07

These are not included above, since it is not possible to estimate the overlap in figures. Parcel post remittances cover all parcel post, and probably include some of the institutional aid.

(a) Agencies furnishing aid:	
American Friends Service Committee	$92,619
CARE	190,244
Church World Service	172,239
(Jewish) Joint Distribution Committee	473,113
War Relief Service (National Catholic Welfare)	95,467
World Student Service Fund	23,383
YWCA	14,044
Others	13,342
Total	1,074,451

(b) Breakdown of aid by kind:	
Cash	539,478
Food (2,884,194 pounds)	465,076
Clothing (23,760 pounds)	33,725
Educational equipment and supplies	2,509
Industrial equipment	67
Hospital and medical supplies	99
Miscellaneous	13,497
Total	1,074,451

Personal remittances are not "aid" in the strict sense. The figures given here represent all personal remittances sent through banks, and would include remittances of Indian nationals in this country to their families.

All of this, however, is charity. It goes to people who need it without charge. It should be encouraged, but obviously the total is too small to meet the total need.

Mr. Chairman, on the total picture in India I wish to read a letter from Bishop Hazen G. Werner, of the Methodist Church, which is self-explanatory:

MAY 22, 1951.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN VORYS: It is my understanding Congress will vote this week on emergency aid to India. Mrs. Werner and I have just returned from a 2-month tour of India and are now reporting our findings to the 500,000 Methodists of Ohio. In my public addresses I am making certain statements concerning the matter of India's request for surplus American wheat.

1. India is not pro-Communist. India is tougher on Communists than we are. While I was there seven Communists were hanged and 1,066 were jailed without trial.

2. India is not anti-American. As you have noted in your own hearings, India shipped more than three-fourths of her exportable supply of manganese and mica to us in 1950. She has stepped up her production of these critical materials at our request. Through her development plan she is doing everything possible within the limits of her pitfully small national income to increase production of these and other materials which we want.

3. India is adolescent in her attitudes toward the outside world. The new republic is a child in the family of nations. Like a child she feels a strong desire to work things out for herself without interference from well-meaning uncles and aunts. She reminds us of our own childhood as a nation.

4. India is the greatest potential bastion of democracy in Asia. We cannot afford to lose her good will. Our shameful delay in providing emergency food supplies for her starving people is a betrayal not only of Christian principles but of American security. Let no Congressman hide behind the argument that there has been starvation in India for centuries. The hard fact is 100,000,000 Indians are living on the starvation level and many face death in the next few months unless we do something about it. The Indian people know this; so does the rest of the world. Let those who would delay longer plans to send American wheat be aware of the responsibility they bear and for which they will surely be held to account.

5. We have debated too long whether the wheat shall me made available as a grant or a loan. I believe our delay has cost us heavily in good will which could have been won by a prompter act of open generosity. Let us respect in India that independent spirit which we pride ourselves upon, and let us extend this aid with faith in India's love for those democratic principles which are dear to us and to all freemen.

Very sincerely yours,

HAZEN G. WERNER.

I have traveled in India. My wife was born in India of Methodist missionary parents. I bring you this recent letter to me which bears out my own feeling about this matter. I am one of those who believes that we should do what India asked us to do, and give them a grain loan. We are going to do it this afternoon. We should have done it long ago. I have been trying to do it for 3 months. In addition, however, while we cannot force charity from our people we can, at least, put through this amendment which will furnish the shipping to take the charitable relief gifts to the people of India who need it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas. In fact, it was my intention to offer practically the same amendment.

The very best kind of assistance which we can render is that which goes directly from the people of this country to the peoples of foreign lands. The organization known as CARE and another known as CROP—Christian Relief Overseas Program—as well as the National Red Cross have done an outstanding job in providing aid to stricken peoples abroad through voluntary channels. It seems to me we should encourage in every legitimate way humanitarian and unselfish activities of this kind.

I felt the same way about the program, enacted in the Eightieth Congress and continued in subsequent Congresses for economic aid to various countries throughout the world. We made provision in that legislation, similar to the suggestion now made for inclusion in the aid-to-India bill.

It is altogether possible that the contributions of CARE food packages and other similar voluntary contributions may reduce to some extent the total amount required to be borrowed by the Government of India to meet its present critical food shortage.

The principle part of this bill relates to a straight business-like loan which, if India follows past fiscal history, will be repaid either in cash or in much-needed materials. To provide that the shipping cost of relief packages may be defrayed from ECA funds involves an extremely moderate expenditure and will, in my judgment, yield rich dividends.

Whether or not this amendment is adopted, I have decided to support this measure. The strategic and critical materials which our country is to receive under its terms will result in fully as much benefit to us as is represented by the aid flowing to India in the form of grain. While our need for manganese, mica, and the other materials which India can furnish is not as critical as India's need for food from the point of view of preserving human lives, it is almost impossible to overestimate the great damage which we would suffer, were the import of these materials to our country from India to cease. Many of the wheels of industry would stop, thousands would be thrown out of work, and particularly at this critical time in our Nation's life, it would result in a situation fraught with the greatest peril.

A second and perhaps equally important reason for supporting this bill seems to me to be that we thereby demonstrate that a genuine plea by hungry people for food will be answered, regardless of their race, religion, or political leanings, if it is within our power to assist. If we can firmly fix that American principle in the minds of nearly one-fifth of the world's population, it will be a major victory in the battle for men's minds which now engages the principal nations of the world.

Of course, under our Constitution, strong as our humanitarian instincts may be, we cannot vote to use American funds or resources to aid the peoples of foreign countries, unless we are convinced that such action promotes the general welfare or assists in the defense of our own country. In the absence of such a conviction, we must satisfy our desire to extend charitable assistance by private philanthropies. That the result of passing this bill, however, will be the promotion of the general welfare and a perhaps decisive step in the defense of our own country is clear to me. From the political point of view, the most important feature of our relations with India is that they maintain at least a neutral attitude in the world-wide struggle in which we are now so deeply involved.

It is regrettable that there has been such long delay in submitting this bill to us for action. It has been amended

in some respects which will probably improve it. My hope is that it will be speedily enacted and the food be started on its way before it is too late. I believe we will never regret a favorable vote for this legislation.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 23 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H. R. 3791, a bill drawn to loan India up to $190,000,000 to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India. However, it is my sincere hope that, as we in the Congress consider H. R. 3791, we remember what Frank C. Laubach has written in his recent book, Wake Up or Blow Up—an advance copy of this book was mailed to each Member of Congress. As a reminder of the book's content, let me quote the introductory part, entitled "This Book in Brief":

THIS BOOK IN BRIEF

A third world war can end in any horror, perhaps even the destruction of the United States. We can prevent that war.

Communism has been winning a cold war since 1920.

We can prevent communism from taking the rest of the world.

We can do these things the moment we see how and begin to do them.

Bombs and jet planes cannot win cold wars.

The bottom four-fifths of the world are going Communist because they are hungry, terribly unhappy, and grimly determined to rise out of their destitution.

We can stop communism cold by lifting those wretched people above their misery and desperation. We can do it by sharing our know-how. They love us when we help them; they hate us when we don't.

They are not satisfied with old clothes, surplus food, loans of money. They want to rise to our level. They will settle for nothing less.

They lack progressive methods, and will follow anyone who promises to help them rise.

The Communists, out to capture the world, studied these desires and promised everything.

Our error is that we gave these masses few promises, after Woodrow Wilson first promised and then cracked up; since then little hope has been offered them, and our deeds have been totally inadequate to the vast need.

Where we did help, the results were miraculous. The few technical experts we sent abroad have had tremendous success.

One missionary in every three helps with education and medicine, and a handful of missionaries help with agriculture. Everybody loves them and treats them like kings. Missionaries clamor for America to contribute this aid on a world scale.

I have worked with missionaries in adult education in 68 countries.

I have worked with the educational departments of 50 governments.

I have mingled with the illiterate three-fifths of the human race, taught them, listened to their pleas, seen their eagerness to learn, their boundless gratitude for a chance to learn, the pathetic way they follow any leader who loves them.

Where we go with literacy, or medicine, or agriculture, they throng to us, love us, follow us, want our religion.

They are as easy to win, if we are there to do it, as a hungry man is to feed.

We could make Christians out of 1,200,000,000 illiterate non-Christians if we taught them, helped them better their conditions; and so revealed to them the love of Christ.

No country which I have visited prevents us from carrying out our program of "each one teach and win one." Fifty countries invite us to help them.

But there is less than one missionary, Catholic or Protestant, with technical training of any kind, for every 100,000 illiterate non-Christians. Not one missionary trained to write for new literates in 2,000,000. Not one trained in agriculture for every 12 illiterates.

The United Nations and the United States have adopted a plan to help needy areas with technical aid.

Governments, business, philanthropy, and the church should unite in an all-out, Nation-wide, world-wide attack of world poverty, disease, and oppression by helping people to help themselves.

We could conquer the world's heart by serving it, as Jesus said we should. But in this all-out attack of help, the church has a very basic responsibility. It must find the right kind of men.

The technicians will fail unless they have the type of character that the church at its best produces: men with high honor, good habits, integrity, warm heart, Christlike compassionate desire to help—democratic and congenial men who are "color blind," loving and beloved.

Such men would do as much to raise the ideals of people as they would to teach skills. They would be living witnesses for Christ, and living witnesses for America at her best.

With 100,000 such men strategically planted over the world, our Christian way of life would become popular, and the counsels of violence, revolution, hate, murder, robbery, and lies, would dry up and blow away, because there would be nothing to be violent about. People don't want to murder anybody when they are hopeful and happy and grateful. At least half of those hundred thousand men should be supported by the churches.

Christian missions ought to send out at least 50,000 highly trained technical experts wherever they are wanted. This would cost $2,000,000 a year. That money would be available if each church member would set aside 5 percent of his income for this foreign-mission program—an average of a dollar a week per member.

We must also put pressure on all governments to give every farmer enough land on which to work for himself. There is no good teaching him how to farm if he has no land. Land reform can be effected by purchasing the great feudal estates and reselling to tenants, as was done in Northern Ireland, or by cooperative farming, and by reclaiming hundreds of millions of acres of now dry and useless land.

The crusade for freedom and the Voice of America will be mockery until we do this. If we talk about the glory of our freedom, the hungry people, thinking only of food, will ask: "Do you mean freedom from want? What are you doing about it?"

If we start this program on an adequate scale we shall have the desperate, retarded areas of the world back of us within 2 years, and the threat of this hour will melt like fog before the sun. Our experiences in many countries indicate that it requires from 1 to 2 years to change hatred to love if we do it this way.

This is 100 percent the way of Christ, who said that anybody in trouble is our neighbor; so help him and love him.

This is the only way to convert Russia to the way of Christ.

As surprising world-wide kindness wins the nations, the Communists in Russia will see that violence and hate die out like a candle against loving service, and they will change over to our weapons. Then we shall have a war of kindness to conquer the heart of the world. Who could ask more?

Is this too good to be true? Not unless we are too selfish to try it. Let us try Christianity. It has never been tried by the nations.

But time is running out; it will soon be too late. So be a missionary to everybody you meet; tell him this is the way out. Start your missionaries moving, or go yourself. Pay what every Christian ought to pay. Success depends upon how many do their part adequately.

And pray. Pray for the delegates of the United Nations and write and tell them you are praying for them.

Thus you will become powerful in two directions for bringing in the peace.

You have been looking for the answer. You are the answer, if you do what every Christian ought to do. But refusing to be the answer, or even being satisfied with half an answer, is asking for disaster.

If we fail because the majority refuse to help, if we are blown up, we shall be able at least to face the great Judge and hear Him say:

"Well done, good and faithful servant * * * enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

The way to lay up a treasure in heaven is to help human need. It is the only way that Jesus ever gave us. What we hold we lose, what we use to help others is ours forever.

This résumé is necessarily bare, unsupported assertion; the proof lies in the pages which follow.

If true, this is enormously urgent. It is too urgent to be thrown aside without careful study. Too urgent not to press upon the attention of everybody you know. It may decide the issue of survival.

You will not like all of this book; some of it will sting and hurt you. But when you have finished, you will see a glorious vision, you will know the only answer to our dilemma, and you will see that answer within your grasp, for you will be part of the answer.

For here is the way, the only way to save our country, our world, and our loved ones from being swept over the brink of unthinkable horror.

So let it hurt. Your pain is part of the birth pangs of a new world.

If the book lacks polish, so does hot lava. It was written to try to help save the world, and printed posthaste. It was written to call America's attention sharply to the only issue that matters now: whether America will wake up or blow up.

Loans or gifts are only a temporary solution. On the other hand, sharing America's know-how may well be the answer to the world threat of communism. Our point 4 program is designed to carry our know-how to those of this world who need and want our technical assistance. As we vote $190,000,000 emergency loan to India, I hope we will remember that to date we have appropriated only $34,500,000 for point 4. I hope the Congress will take to heart the counsel of Wake Up or Blow Up and give the point 4 program a chance to prove what sharing our know-how with the underdeveloped areas of the world can do in the conflict with communism and in our efforts for peace in the world.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I, a member of the opposition, compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], on the very excellent maiden speech he has just made.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be given to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRAY: On page 3, at line 20, add a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 4 (a) any sums payable by the Government of India, under the interest terms agreed to between the Government of the United States and the Government of India, on or before January 1, 1957 (or such later date as may hereafter be specified by act of Congress) as interest on the principal of any debt incurred under this act shall, when paid, be placed in a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to remain available until expended. This account shall be available to the Department of State for the following uses:

"(1) Allocation, for designated educational, agricultural, experimental, scientific, medical, or philanthropic activities, to American institutions engaged in such activities in India;

"(2) Studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States and in its Territories or possessions (1) for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of India, and (2) with the approval of appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in India, for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of the United States to participate in similar activities in India, including in both cases travel expenses, tuition, subsistence and other allowances and expenses incident to such activities; and

"(3) The selection, purchase, and shipment of (1) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of India and (2) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in India, and (3) the interchange of similar materials and equipment from India for higher education and research in the United States.

"(b) Funds made available in accordance with the provisions stated above may be used to defray costs of administering the program authorized herein.

"(c) Disbursements from the special deposit account shall be made by the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, upon vouchers duly certified by the Secretary of State or by authorized certifying officers of the Department of State."

Renumber succeeding sections and reference thereto.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not introduced to injure this bill for I am strongly in favor of the Wheat to India bill. The purpose of this amendment is to aid the bill to carry out the long range intent to really aid the Indian people.

It is the same amendment as the Mundt amendment which was added to the Senate bill. It answers many of the objections being raised by the opponents of this legislation.

There is not a person on this floor who wants the Indian people to suffer starvation. We do, however, hear on all sides that America cannot forever feed starving India; that there is unconscionable wealth along with abject poverty in India; that the Nehru government is not responsive to the Indian people; that the giving of grain to India will not permanently solve the Indian problem, nor prevent it from occurring again and again. These arguments are understandable. We must remember that this wheat that we propose to give to India is the result of toil of Americans. It must only be used for a most worth-while cause.

What America wants is for India to solve her own political and economic problems. This amendment offers such a solution. It aims toward a permanent cure of the present economic condition in India rather than merely a temporary expedient. This amendment allows the interest paid on this loan for a period of years to be used to marshal and use the great potential power of American missions and relief organizations.

There is much precedent for this amendment. After the Boxer Rebellion in China the United States took the money paid by China in indemnity and brought Chinese students to America. The good that resulted from this for China and the good will toward the United States because of this is incalculable. It led to almost a half century of most happy relations with the United States and this good will has only recently been broken by blundering.

The Finnish loan had a similar clause which has brought great good will between Finland and the United States. It has helped little Finland to resist Russian aggression although almost surrounded by Russian territory.

The organizations that would use this money are representative of true America; of the men, women, and children from the cities and crossroads. These organizations have already accomplished great things in removing the fetishes, ignorance, selfishness, and greed of India as well as other places in the Orient. Let me give you an example. For centuries, the peasant farmer in India has plowed by merely scratching the ground with a stick. Americans in India, such as Higganbotham and Father McCauley, have demonstrated that a simple plow which can be manufactured in India for $2 and pulled by oxen or people, will turn over the ground and would practically make India self-supporting for its food. American know-how with this money can accomplish worlds of good. This amendment enables America, through its relief and charitable organizations, to operate in India to accomplish this great good.

While I have never been in India, I have become acquainted with the tremendous good accomplished by these American missions in other places in Asia. In Korea, when the Japanese were repatriated, the only thing good and substantial that remained was the work of American missionaries. For instance, Frank Williams and his wife, in the area of Chonju, had made tremendous progress in bettering agriculture and living conditions in that entire area. The average American is a great salesman for the American way of life. I have seen the American GI abroad share his rations with the native children when he scarcely had enough for himself. He sold America and our American Christian way of life to the world to such an extent that by fall of 1945 the United States was the most respected and revered country on earth. Since that time the Washington bureaucrats have not done so well in selling America. The American missionaries, both Catholic and Protestant, in India, CARE, American Friends Service Committee, and such allied organizations, can and will, if given the opportunity, sell the American way of life to these people. American youth can go abroad with these organizations to again sell America, to help build a free world and economy, not to kill and be killed.

India, 360,000,000 strong, with proper opportunities that America can give her under this plan, can be a great force for our way of life. A wrecked Indian economy, filled with starving people, will be a tremendous force for communism. No American who has seen starvation can be unresponsive to this problem. A free India, working out its own economy with our help, will remedy their terrible economic conditions and will develop a government that is responsive to its needs.

All this amendment attempts to do with the interest on this loan is to allow American know-how to assist the people in India in developing their nation economically, religiously, socially, and politically.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Is your amendment similar to the Mundt amendment in the Senate?

Mr. BRAY. It is exactly the Mundt amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I think there is considerable merit in your amendment and it will be a pleasure to support it.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. May I compliment the gentleman on the fact that he is the author of the fundamental idea which is incorporated in this amendment and had discussed it with me many weeks ago.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman for this constructive amendment. I believe if this amendment were adopted it would be actually the most constructive part of this bill. The gentleman has rendered a great service, as was pointed out. This would be a real positive program to try

to remedy the basic defect of the Indian system, and it means more production.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I want to compliment the gentleman because it will show the young people of India that we are interested in them and interested in helping them along.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to join those who are endorsing the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman. I had planned to introduce a similar amendment myself. I think it does offer the most constructive approach to this problem that has been mentioned in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, because of my admiration for the gentleman I dislike to press the point of order, but I think the rules of the House keep our thinking straight. I therefore make the point of order. I submit the gentleman's amendment goes far beyond the scope of the legislation. It introduces a great deal of new matter and provides for an appropriation in a legislative act, and is therefore not in order.

I think similar legislation will be considered probably by our committee later, but it is obviously not in order at this time because it is not germane, and it provides for appropriating in this act funds that will be the proceeds of interest on a loan and not yet negotiated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order briefly?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I think this does raise a very serious question for the Chairman. I would hope very much that the question could be put to us in this House. The only basis on which I think the point of order might be overruled is that it is dealing with the disposition of the proceeds of a loan. We are providing for a loan in the bill, and I might point out that the section of the ECA act which is referred to provides that terms of this kind shall be negotiated by the ECA negotiators, and it appears to me the Chair could consistently sustain this amendment on the ground that it is a direction to the negotiators as to what they should write into the terms and conditions of that loan in making their agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BRAY. No, Mr. Chairman. I felt that it was germane or I would not have offered it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk has reported, providing certain conditions relating to the assistance proposed to be granted under the pending bill; in addition it proposes the creation of a fund and makes available those funds for certain specific purposes.

The gentleman from Ohio makes a point of order against the amendment on two grounds: One, that it is not germane; two, that it seeks to make an appropriation.

The Chair would call attention to page 88 of Cannon's Precedents where the following statement is made:

> The mere fact that an amendment proposes to attain the same end sought to be attained by the bill to which offered—

Which is the contention of the gentleman from Indiana—

> does not render it germane.
>
> Though the proposed amendment seeks accomplishment of ends undoubtedly worthy and somewhat related to the aims of the pending bill, it does provide conditions separate and apart from the pending bill.

Clause 4 of rule 21 provides:

> No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing an amendment be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction.

The proposed amendment would in the opinion of the Chair, violate this rule.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Ohio in both respects.

The gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is recognized.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. SHELLEY: Page 3, line 19, insert a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 4. No materials made available by ECA funds provided, authorized, or made available by this act may be transported from the United States unless at least 50 percent thereof are moved in American flag vessels."

(Mr. WERDEL and Mr. CANFIELD asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. SHELLEY.)

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, one never wins a point if one gives up the first time; so I am back again with the same subject matter in a different approach and one which I sincerely hope is not subject to a point of order and one against which I believe a point of order cannot be sustained. Now that I have tried to advise everybody as to how it should be handled I will explain this amendment again.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains no provision such as is contained in the other assistance acts passed by Congress requiring that 50 percent of the cargoes going abroad on loan or assistance bases be carried in American vessels. You will recall that when this type of program was first initiated by this country, Congress had neglected to make such provisions, and immediately a great outcry and a very justifiable outcry developed from the American merchant marine, and I am using that term to include both portions of the ship-carrying trade, management, and labor. The program started out with the chartering of foreign vessels, Panamanian, Greek, Italian vessels, which were in the main Liberty vessels bought by these countries and by foreign business interests in these countries from the United States Government.

In recognition of the duty of the Congress and the Government of the United States to afford some protection to this segment of American industry, the merchant marine industry and to those employed in it, we adopted this policy. It is in keeping with the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Under this bill and under the thought as to how it shall be administered, there probably might not be a problem. There is no shipping available to any extent at the present moment. There are probably few, if any, American vessels under private operation available at this time. The vessels that will carry it, as I understand, are to be taken out of the United States "mothball fleet," handled by the Federal Maritime Board, and reconditioned and used to carry this grain. But in view of recent developments and in light of the situation existing today, the industry is anxious to have again an expression of this policy, which we have announced in all of our bills, in this one. No one of us knows from day to day what contingencies might develop, what change in the maritime picture of the world might take place, and, therefore, we feel this protection should be written in even though it is probably an academic approach at the present time.

Since the Congress has heretofore adopted this principle, I feel there certainly cannot be any real sound objection to its inclusion in this bill unless it is simply the objection of those who have objected to any cooperation on the part of the Government with keeping the American flag on the seas. I sincerely hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I was very much touched by the moving talk on charity made by my very distinguished and beloved friend from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and may I state to the House that I think he has done a superb job on that committee. He is an old friend and teammate, but I wish he would remember that charity begins at home. That is an expression that is trite, but, anyway, it is well known.

Another thing he said, that I agree with, is that we probably do not have the right to vote the American taxpayers' money away in pure charity, no matter how worthy the cause. He has assured us that this is not a "fuzzy" loan. Let not our thinking be "fuzzy" either at this time and let us try to see if there is any reason why we should not try to use it as something to help the American people. That is about the only excuse I can see to support this measure.

I hope there will be no opposition to the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from California. I am sorry that my charitable and dear friend from Ohio felt it necessary to make a point of order against the amendment the last time. Certainly if we are doing this to defend the American people, as well as for charity, there is nothing more important than keeping our merchant

marine in a prosperous condition. It is true that perhaps under the present situation maybe all of this is unnecessary, but the principle which has been brought out and emphasized by the gentleman from California is one that is very important to our national defense. We must try to cloak with some security the great and important merchant marine which is so vital to our defense on every front.

I do not see how it can possibly hurt anything to think a little bit about the American people while we are thinking about people who are starving abroad. So, I hope that this amendment will be adopted without controversy, and we will, in so doing, assure the American merchant marine that we are still thinking about them.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I thank my charitable friend for yielding to me. I merely wish to say that I did not secure time on this amendment. I did not make a point of order, but I am against it. This is not a case of bringing in relief for American shipping and wishing it on to India. It is not a case of pure charity; it is impure charity. I hope that it will be defeated, but I do not think it will.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I am glad the gentleman thinks that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate on the merchant marine question which is involved. I hope that the last sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Ohio that the amendment will pass is a true prognostication. I wish to join with the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] in urging the adoption of this amendment. I am not particularly interested in whether some private operator makes or loses money in the American merchant marine as a private business, but I am very much interested in seeing that we have a healthy merchant marine in constant operation immediately available when required by the Defense Establishment. This is the policy stated in the Merchant Marine Act and it has been the policy stated by the House on many occasions. I urge that you do support this amendment and restate this policy which will keep this operation which is so necessary in times of emergency available to us.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. My good and able friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] was talking about charity. That seems to be a subject much discussed these days, and I wonder if he noted in the paper today that President Truman is asking for $8,500,000,000 more to speed up American aid to a free world. So, along with this $190,000,000 you are going to be asked to put up $8,500,000,000 in the very near future for charity.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and hope that it does not take the attention of the House away from the fact that this amendment needs support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill. This is my first venture into the well of the House and, believe me, I speak with humility. I speak because I must, not to give you, my fellow Members, reasons why you should support this bill, but to tell you why I must support it. My reasons are based on two statements that I accept from the able members of the Foreign Affairs Committee as true without question: First, that India is in need—that millions of her people will starve if they do not get food; second, that we in America have the food to supply that need—not from our own requirements, mind you, but from our abundance—and that we are to supply it on terms that would apply between a pair of proud and intelligent gentlemen in this House. I must vote for this bill, then, because the America I serve is a Nation under God, and while I can find in our Bible many reasons why I should help and feed my neighbor who is in need—aye, even my enemy, if you please—I can find not one admonition to let him starve when I have the means to help him.

I must support this bill, then, because I hold that the moral laws that govern nations are the same as those that govern men. I hold that one of the terrible things about them is that they work—that God is just.

Because I hold that my ability, my time, and my property are not mine. They are only mine in trust to use as best I can in that highest of all callings—in which even the humblest and most simple can excel—the service of others.

I therefore hold that this same sense of stewardship applies to our America because, first, we are stewards of a vision of freedom, the blessings of which we must strive to help all men to achieve, else this vision of freedom will perish. Secondly, because we people of America are also stewards of a greater material wealth than has ever been dreamed of by any nation at any time in the world's history. Do you think we have earned all this alone? No, I tell you that we as a nation can well look at the world about us and say as the bishop did while observing the criminals entering the prison mess hall, "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

I tell you, gentlemen, we are children of His grace, trustees of His bounty, and we are charged with the responsibility to do with it all of the good that we can. I hold that feeding these starving people is a part of our responsibility and a part of that good which we must perform.

I must vote for this bill because I believe that you cannot do a good deed and in the long run reap evil for it, because I believe with all my heart that the gift carries a great deal more benefit for him who gives than for him who receives. I must vote for this bill because I represent a fine and generous district in Fayette and Somerset Counties of Pennsylvania, whose people suffered more during the bleak days of the depression than the people of almost any other area in America; a people who know what it means to be hungry and in need, and a people who are today writing to urge that I do all in my power to see that these people are fed.

In closing, may I call to mind the inscription on the tomb of a noble in a medieval castle somewhere in Europe. This is what it says: "What I kept, I lost; what I spent, I had; what I gave, I have."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that I shall not oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this bill I hope the House will not be too much affected by what has been written by Mr. Nehru or what he is reported to have said. I know nothing about Mr. Nehru. As far as I have been able to find out, he is as inscrutable and as much a mystery as India itself. But there is one thing we must remember, that here is India, with a constitution only 2½ years old, and with liberty that has come to that nation only four years ago, right here on the borders of China and its teeming millions now dominated by Soviet Russia. You cannot blame Mr. Nehru for trying to walk a tightrope. He wants to keep his infant nation at peace until she learns to walk.

What happened to our infant Republic after we had won our independence? We won our independence through the help of France. Remember deGrasse, deRochambeau, Lafayette. The American people were as indebted to the French nation and people as we were ever indebted to anyone. Yet the Father of our Country in his farewell address 14 years after we secured our independence reminded us time after time about excessive love and partiality for any particular nation.

Why did George Washington give that advice? Because he knew that if in our infancy we became embroiled in the conflicts of great powers it would be our ruination.

At that time the world battle was between the British Empire and the French Empire. Those two Empires dominated practically the whole earth. Today there is another world battle, between communism and democracy. Russia leads communism and we lead the democratic nations of the world.

Today India is in the same place we were 160 years ago. Mr. Nehru cannot be blamed for telling his nation in its infancy exactly the same thing George Washington told our forefathers. India is not particularly obligated to Russia or to the United States; certainly not as much as we were obligated to France. When George Washington was President he was beset by hotheads from everywhere to declare for one side or the other. Partiality was about to tear our young country apart, but Washington

stood firm and today our great country is a monument to his wisdom.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] when he said this Nation of ours was a giant among nations. Maybe so, but in my humble judgment, ever since the depression of the late twenties and early thirities, it has been a cowardly giant and we have been ruled by fear.

We had the depression which grew out of the desecration and waste of World War I. In those days because we were so fearful, so lacking in courage we refused to go to work, to work and save and get ourselves out of it as always before had our forefathers. We began to follow a program of laying down on our job, of giving away this, that, and the other thing, first to one group and then to another. We have been doing that ever since until now too many of us loaf and moan and gripe and wait with, as it were, our months open, our hands out for some one to help us. Well might we be admonished, "Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways, and be wise."

We are now so fearful that the principles of our Constitution may not be sound; we are so fearful that the courage and endurance of our people may not be sufficient to defend ourselves, that we as a nation are seeking the aid, attempting to buy the friendship, of every other nation on earth. Unfortunately we are not getting anywhere in that attempt. Even those who pretend to be friendly; those to whom we have given millions of dollars, we find betraying us by trading with the enemy—yes, even when their greed brings death to men we send to fight a common enemy.

During the debate on the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, and no one questions his sincerity or his patriotism, his desire to be helpful to the country, and I might say, incidentally, that the gentleman probably knows as much about the Far East and its people, yes even more than most Members of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota told us that mass starvation was threatening the people of India. That if we did not prevent that mass starvation, the present independent Indian Government would go out of existence and in its place there would be a government subservient to Russia. He overlooks the regrettable fact that the present government of India is more than just friendly to Russia and Red China.

Fear—you see. He and many others are afraid—afraid of what those starving people, a people who he asserts cannot even feed themselves may do through war. Then today, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, who is not only a Christian, a missionary, but a physician, cited the case of the doctor who is confronted by a patient suffering from cancer. The doctor knows that neither dieting nor medication will bring a cure. An operation may be helpful.

"I can operate. I cannot guarantee a cure. The cancer will kill you. An operation may cure you."

Our good friend likened the world's condition to that of the patient. He frankly admitted, and frankness is one of his many, many virtues, that this operation might not bring results in India, but that, without it, India was lost, would become the stooge of Red China and Russia.

Of the results of granting this $190,000,000 loan to India, he added that no one could guarantee that it would even be helpful. Presumably, he and those who feel likewise think it is, and the phrase runs, "A calculated risk."

Fear, again, that we cannot exist without these other nations determines the course of many who support this legislation, fear and a child like faith that always bread cast upon the waters will return.

But what the gentleman forgot was that the operation which he advocates is an operation on the pocketbook and the natural resources and the manpower of this country. The doctor and those of like mind are not operating against communism.

They are temporizing with the cancer—communism. They are using medication; in this case, $190,000,000, when they know, or should know, from bitter experience, that communism yields neither to kindness, to charity, to argument, nor to logic.

Their school of thought, instead of advocating the removal of the cancer—communism—seeks to prevent its growth by appropriations to the bodies which harbor it, in this case, India, where the son of the ruler is said to be an out and out Communist and where the government itself has demonstrated its sympathy for communism.

We have had communism and Communists here in Washington in the Federal Government on the Federal pay roll for the last 10 or 15 years.

Have those in authority in the executive department, in particular, the White House and the Department of Justice, operated on the Communists? No.

When some Members of Congress, including the gentleman from Minnesota, sought to operate, their efforts were discouraged by an administration whose chief refused to admit the well-known fact that the Communists were here, were boring from within.

That is where the doctor slips in his illustration and gets off the track—fear all the time is the thing that shapes our actions.

What I fear, and I am afraid, terribly afraid is—and I have watched some of our friends on the Committee of Foreign Affairs, no one questions their motives—of course some of us question their judgment and conclusions which they reach—what I am afraid of is that they will again have, as so often in the past they have had, their way about giving away our resources. The bitter lessons of the past make no impression on them.

They just repeat their stock excuse—if we had not fought World War I, World War II, and if we do not fight world war III we would have been, we will be, destroyed as a nation. They have no proof of their claim. They have no facts to justify it. They do not know whether if Hitler and Stalin had fought it out they would have destroyed each other.

What we do know is that following the advice of the one-worlders, the internationalists, we have bankrupted our Nation, given our people regimentation and inflation, brought death to thousands of our men in Korea.

We know that General Bradley has in the last few days confessed his inability to answer the question which so many times I have asked from the well of the House, "What is it that our men in Korea must do, which having done, the war will end, peace be made, they return to their homes?"

We spent some $39,000,000,000 in attempting to aid other nations throughout the world. I am afraid those who on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs have been shaping our foreign policy will continue to give away not only our dollars, not only our natural resources, but give away, as we are now doing in Korea—how many thousands of our men? The statement came over the radio today, more than 141,000 casualties, and General Bradley said they were not counting those who had lost a foot or an arm from frost bite or from being frozen. They are not counting them.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; I cannot yield.

What I am afraid of is that we will continue to give away our men until finally having followed the majority on that committee we will find they have placed this country in the situation in which Stalin "good old Joe," would like to see us—defenseless, helpless, because we have wasted our resources and our manpower.

Today, earlier in the debate our colleague from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE], and I hope she will leave her helpful remarks in the RECORD, in substance said that when this bill first came she did not think there would be any votes against it—that if some did vote against it she thought a conscience might bother one so voting. Maybe so. But we did not get into any one of the first two World Wars nor into world war III by following the advice of Washington and Jefferson to avoid the troubles of other nations, nor did we get into any one of them because we were isolationists. We got into all three of these wars by following the advice of our internationalist friends and advisers. I have no doubt but that the members of our committee acted in good faith, believed they were advocating policies which might keep us out of war but the sad, sad fact is that we are in world war III, that death and desola-

tion has come to many an American home, that many an American boy has closed his eyes in his last final sleep thousands of miles from home and friends, that his sacrifice has been in vain, that he does not knowing why he died.

The majority of our committee members tell us we are, or rather our men are fighting for a free world, a mouth-filling expression, but where is there a free nation or people. In 10 minutes or less I will venture to prove that even here our people are not free.

Permit me to say to our colleague from Utah that my conscience does bother me—for I fear I have left undone something that I might have done which would, perhaps, have prevented our country becoming involved in these last two wars. Something that might have helped to keep us out of those wars, prevented the deaths of our men on foreign soil.

Permit a repetition. General Bradley, before the Senate committee, has not yet given an answer to the question I have asked time and time again, What is it that our men must do in Korea or elsewhere which, having done, peace will come to the world and they can come home? Why continue to sacrifice the youth of this land when you do not know what you are trying to do? Nor how you intend to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, in 1950 when I urged in a speech on this floor that the Asiatic yearning for progress be translated into a definite program for non-Communist countries of Asia, I said then, and I believe now, that—

We need desperately to make allies of these people in Asia not yet submerged by the Communist tidal wave.

We must make allies in Asia or we are doomed to protracted, costly, and indecisive wars.

We will have to acquire a new perspective and a new kind of realism about ways to solve age-old problems of Asia that cry for solution.

Democracy must become a shattering force in raising the living standards, and thus the hopes of the millions of underprivileged in Asia.

The Indian National Congress, Prime Minister Nehru's party, outlined in 1950 a rising in the standard of living of the people. The six points of this program were the following:

First. Development of basic and essential industries.

Second. Early realization of self-sufficiency in food.

Third. Adequate supply of essential raw materials for industry.

Fourth. Orderly and progressive reduction in the general level of prices.

Fifth. Full and efficient utilization of industrial capacity.

Sixth. Planned development of village and small-scale industries.

Advance in each of these fields has real meaning to us as a free nation.

India's 6-year Columbo economic development plan has meaning to us. For the success of this plan India must use its foreign exchange to purchase goods not available from its own plants. It is my hope that a loan made to enable India to purchase grain will not have the effect of forcing curtailment of a program the individual Indian must consider as promising him just a little better standard of living over the present $40 per capita per year.

All who know Asia say its people are determined to improve on their present pitiful existence.

This improvement in living standards has real meaning to us in the United States. A rapid and constant improvement of Asiatic purchasing power would create a tremendous demand for our products.

As a matter of fact, we will need increasing amounts of foreign resources in the expanding defense production program.

We have heard much of manganese, mica, and other strategic materials we need from India. Some have tried to infer that India sought to reduce its exports to us. The case is quite contrary to this inference.

In 1950 India shipped us 585,971 tons of manganese and 260,000 tons of mica, about three-fourths of its total production. Instead of the inference of reduced exports in 1951, actual manganese shipments have been running 10 percent above those of 1950.

In view of our expanding defense production needs, we should be far more concerned over shipments in the years to come.

Suppose that through our hesitation in this day when India asks help to keep its people from starvation, we create doubt of our good neighborliness. Suppose that this doubt confirms in the Indian mind the untruths of Communistic propaganda. Suppose that out of this the teeming, poverty-stricken people of India succumb to the blandishments of Communist lies.

With India and its 350,000,000 people in the opposing Communistic bloc, we would have real worry about the source of strategic materials for our productive plant.

But I have too much confidence in the good sense of both this Nation and the Indian people to think that this misunderstanding will be permitted to grow.

Because the grant of the wheat to India was in the interest of both India and ourselves, I favored the original bill reported by the committee.

But since we now have a loan bill, I think it should be made clear the loan program is adopted with no aim to slow the Indian development plan.

To put obstacles in the path of that development plan would not only postpone that day when India's millions upon millions of people will see the possibility of a new day when they as people will no longer have to dwell in chronic poverty, ignorance, disease and despair.

India is an underdeveloped economy and its standard of living is lower today than it was 10 years ago. The Colombo plan was designed to reverse this trend. About 40 percent of the $4,000,000,000 cost was to be devoted to improvements in transportation and mineral production. Only if transportation and mineral production increased can we expect additional imports.

So it is in our interest as well as India that we should oppose placing a mortgage on the future of India.

Those who favor the loan have said in Rules Committee that India can repay without slowing down its development plan I hope this is a fact because we will not gain by adding to the crushing burdens now on the underprivileged of the non-Communist world.

A peaceful world cannot afford to have billions of people living on the verge of starvation and thus ready prey to the lies of imperialistic communism.

The humanitarian program to assist in meeting the threat of starvation in India is, to me, a necessary part of an essential international program which includes point 4.

If we fail to move in the face of disaster brought about by the natural forces of flood, drought and earthquake, our protestations on point 4 will begin to fall on deaf ears.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India, pursuant to House Resolution 209, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill with the following amendment: On page 2, line 6, strike out "$190,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin), there were—ayes 73, noes 181.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 293, nays 94, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—293

Aandahl	Fenton	McGrath
Abbitt	Fernandez	McGuire
Adair	Fine	McKinnon
Addonizio	Flood	McMullen
Allen, Calif.	Fogarty	Machrowicz
Andersen, H. Carl	Forand	Mack, Ill.
	Ford	Mack, Wash.
Anderson, Calif.	Frazier	Madden
Anfuso	Fugate	Magee
Armstrong	Fulton	Mahon
Aspinall	Furcolo	Mansfield
Auchincloss	Gamble	Marshall
Ayres	Garmatz	Martin, Mass.
Bailey	Gary	Meader
Bakewell	Goodwin	Merrow
Baring	Gordon	Miller, N. Y.
Barrett	Gore	Mills
Bates, Ky.	Granahan	Mitchell
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Morano
Battle	Grant	Morgan
Beamer	Green	Morris
Beckworth	Greenwood	Morrison
Belcher	Gregory	Morton
Bender	Hagen	Moulder
Bennett, Fla.	Hale	Multer
Berry	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murphy
Betts		Nelson
Blackney	Hall, Leonard W.	Norblad
Blatnik		O'Brien, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Halleck	O'Brien, Mich.
Boggs, La.	Hand	O'Neill
Boiling	Harden	Ostertag
Bolton	Hardy	O'Toole
Bosone	Hart	Patman
Bramblett	Havenner	Patten
Bray	Hays, Ark.	Patterson
Breen	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Brooks	Hedrick	Polk
Brown, Ga.	Heffernan	Poulson
Brown, Ohio	Heller	Powell
Brownson	Herlong	Preston
Bryson	Herter	Price
Buckley	Heselton	Priest
Burdick	Hess	Prouty
Burnside	Hill	Quinn
Butler	Hillings	Rabaut
Byrne, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Radwan
Canfield	Holifield	Rains
Cannon	Holmes	Ramsay
Carnahan	Hope	Reams
Case	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Celler	Howell	Rhodes
Chatham	Hunter	Ribicoff
Chelf	Jackson, Calif.	Richards
Chenoweth	Jackson, Wash.	Riehlman
Chudoff	James	Riley
Church	Jarman	Rivers
Clemente	Javits	Roberts
Cole, Kans.	Jenkins	Rodino
Combs	Johnson	Rogers, Colo.
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Cooper	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Corbett	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rooney
Cotton		Roosevelt
Coudert	Judd	Sabath
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Sadlak
Crumpacker	Kean	St. George
Cunningham	Kearney	Sasscer
Curtis, Mo.	Keating	Saylor
Dague	Kelley, Pa.	Scott, Hardie
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson	Kennedy	
Deane	Keogh	Scudder
DeGraffenried	Kerr	Seely-Brown
Delaney	Kersten, Wis.	Shelley
Dempsey	Kilburn	Sheppard
Denny	Kilday	Sieminski
Denton	King	Sikes
Devereux	Klein	Sittler
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Smith, Miss.
Donohue	Lane	Spence
Donovan	Lanham	Staggers
Doyle	Lantaff	Steed
Durham	Latham	Stockman
Eaton	LeCompte	Tackett
Eberharter	Lesinski	Talle
Elliott	Lovre	Taylor
Ellsworth	McCarthy	Thomas
Elston	McConnell	Thompson, Mich.
Engle	McCormack	
Fallon	McCulloch	Thompson, Tex.
Feighan	McDonough	Thornberry
Tollefson	Weichel	Williams, N. Y.
Trimble	Welch	Wilson, Ind.
Van Zandt	Wharton	Withrow
Vaughn	Whitaker	Wolverton
Vinson	Wickersham	Yates
Vorys	Widnall	Yorty
Walter	Wier	Zablocki
Watts	Wigglesworth	

NAYS—94

Abernethy	Fisher	Phillips
Allen, Ill.	Forrester	Pickett
Allen, La.	Gathings	Poage
Andresen, August H.	Gavin	Rankin
	George	Redden
Andrews	Gossett	Reed, Ill.
Arends	Graham	Reed, N. Y.
Baker	Gross	Robeson
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Rogers, Tex.
Bentsen	Harrison, Va.	Schwabe
Bishop	Hoeven	Scrivner
Bonner	Hoffman, Mich.	Shafer
Boykin	Hull	Sheehan
Brehm	Jenison	Short
Buffett	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Burleson	Jonas	Simpson, Pa.
Busbey	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Kans.
Bush		Smith, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearns	Smith, Wis.
Carlyle	Larcade	Stanley
Chiperfield	Lucas	Stefan
Clevenger	McVey	Teague
Cole, N. Y.	Martin, Iowa	Vail
Colmer	Mason	Van Pelt
Cox	Miller, Md.	Velde
Crawford	Miller, Nebr.	Vursell
Curtis, Nebr.	Mumma	Werdel
Davis, Ga.	Murray, Tenn.	Wheeler
Davis, Wis.	Nicholson	Whitten
Dorn	O'Hara	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	O'Konski	Wolcott
Fellows	Passman	Wood, Idaho

NOT VOTING—45

Albert	Gwinn	Perkins
Angell	Harrison, Wyo.	Potter
Barden	Harvey	Reece, Tenn
Beall	Hébert	Regan
Bow	Hoffman, Ill.	Secrest
Budge	Irving	Springer
Burton	Kirwan	Stigler
Camp	Lind	Sutton
D'Ewart	Lyle	Taber
Dingell	McGregor	Towe
Dolliver	McMillan	Williams, Miss.
Dondero	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Evins	Murdock	Winstead
Gillette	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Ga.
Golden	Norrell	Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Albert for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Williams of Mississippi against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Stigler for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Norrell against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Regan against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Gillette against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Harrison of Wyoming for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. Beall for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Irving with Mr. D'Ewart.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Burton with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Potter.

Mr. Lind with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Golden.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Angell.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Sutton with Mr. Budge.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951."

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to serve the cause of world peace and thus provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency food assistance to the people of India in order to alleviate starvation and mass suffering threatened by famine conditions in that country.

SEC. 3. The assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food grains, or equivalents, to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, drought, and other conditions existing in India in 1950.

SEC. 4. The assistance authorized by this act shall be made only on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to utilize not in excess of $190,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1952, of which sum (1) not less than $100,000,000 shall be made available immediately from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; and (2) $90,000,000 shall be available from any balance of such funds unallotted and unobligated as of June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That if such amount unallotted and unobligated is less than $90,000,000 an amount equal to the difference shall be obtained from the issuance of notes in such amount by the Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration, who is hereby authorized and directed to issue such notes from time to time during fiscal years 1951 and 1952 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to purchase such notes and, in making such purchases to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act as amended: *And provided further*, That $50,000,000 reserved by the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to section 1214 of Public Law 759 of the Eighty-first Congress from funds appropriated by that act for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 as amended, shall not be available for purposes of this section.

SEC. 6. The credit terms provided for in section 4 shall include repayment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator for Economic Cooperation and the Government of India), or otherwise of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources; such transfer of materials to include the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite and manganese, such monazite and manganese to be added to the American Government's stockpile of critical materials and dispensed to private industry in accordance with existing law.

SEC. 7. Any sums paid by the Government of India on or before January 1, 1957 (or such later date as may hereafter be specified by act of Congress), as interest on the principal of any debt incurred under this act shall be placed in a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to

remain available until expended. This account shall be available to the Department of State for the following uses.

(a) Allocation, for designated educational, agricultural, experimental, scientific, medical, or philanthropic activities, to American institutions engaged in such activities in India;

(b) Studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States and its Territories and possessions (1) for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of India, and (2) with the approval of appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in India, for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of the United States to participate in similar activities in India, including in both cases travel expenses, tuition, subsistence, and other allowances and expenses incident to such activities; and

(c) The selection, purchase, and shipment of (1) American scientific technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of India, and (2) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in India, and (3) the interchange of similar materials and equipment from India for higher education and research in the United States.

SEC. 8. (a) Assistance provided under this act shall be provided under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, applicable to and consistent with the purposes of this act.

(b) No procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this act shall be made unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall find and certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States.

SEC. 9. All or any portion of the funds made available under authority of this act may be transferred by the President to any department or agency of the executive branch of the Government, to be expended for the purpose of this act. Funds so transferred may be expended under the authority of any provision of law, not inconsistent with this act, applicable to the departments or agencies concerned except that funds so transferred shall not be commingled with other funds of such departments or agencies and shall be accounted for separately.

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to the extent that the President, after consultation with appropriate Government officials and representatives of private shipping, finds and proclaims that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for these purposes: *Provided, however,* That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for such advances either from funds hereafter made available to the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, from receipts from vessel operations: *And provided further,* That pending such repayment these receipts may be placed in such funds or accounts and used for activating and operating vessels.

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized to pay ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry in India of relief packages and supplies under the provisions of section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. Funds now or hereafter available during the period ending June 30, 1952, for furnishing assistance under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, may be used to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 12. All or any part of the assistance provided hereunder shall be terminated by the President whenever he, or Congress by concurrent resolution, determines that because of changed conditions continuation of assistance is unnecessary or undesirable. Termination of assistance to India under this section may include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under this act and not yet delivered.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H. R. 3791 as passed by the House, as follows: "That this act may be cited as the 'India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951.'

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized and directed to provide emergency food relief assistance to India on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including payment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the Government of India) of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources. The Administrator is directed and instructed that in his negotiations with the Government of India he shall, so far as practicable and possible, obtain for the United States the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of such materials particularly those found to be strategic and critical. The Administrator is authorized and directed to issue notes for this purpose from time to time during the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 in an amount not to exceed $190,000,000 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury who is authorized and directed to make such purchases; and in making such purchases, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act, as amended: *Provided,* That funds made available for purposes of this act shall be used only for the purchase of food grains or equivalent in the United States: *Provided,* That with respect to the procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States: *Provided further,* That the assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of floods, droughts, and other natural disasters suffered by India in 1950.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to the extent that the President finds that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose: *Provided,* That pursuant to agreements made between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest not later than June 30, 1952, for such advances either from funds hereafter made available to the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, from receipts from vessel operations: *Provided further,* That pending such repayment receipts from vessel operations may be placed in such funds or accounts and used for activating and operating vessels.

"SEC. 4. No materials made available by the use of funds provided, authorized, or made available by this act may be transported from the United States unless at least 50 percent thereof are moved in American-flag vessels.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized to pay ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry in India of relief packages and supplies under the provisions of section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including the relief packages and supplies of the American Red Cross. Funds now or hereafter available during the periods ending June 30, 1952, for furnishing assistance under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, may be used to carry out the purposes of this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 3791 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, and request a conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RICHARDS, CARNAHAN, RIBICOFF, VORYS, and SMITH of Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, COOPER, DINGELL, MILLS, REED of New York, JENKINS, and SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have no legislative program for next week, as yet. Wednesday is Memorial Day. Of course, if any important bill is reported out of any committee to come up next week, the membership will be given adequate notice. But I want to state frankly that I know of no program for next week and am not expecting any.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following special orders heretofore entered.

THE PUBLIC HOUSING SITUATION—H. R. 4207

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today in receipt of a letter from Hon. Raymond M. Foley, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, stating that 75,000 federally assisted low-rent housing units, in accordance with determination of the President, can be contracted for during the fiscal year 1951–52 without conflict with defense mobilization. I quote the material part of Mr. Foley's letter as follows:

As you know, we have been directed by the President to proceed for the fiscal year 1951–52 with a program of 75,000 public-housing units out of a total of 135,000 units authorized. In this connection, no compelling reason has been brought to our attention which would warrant reducing the figure of 75,000 on the basis of material shortages for such housing.

It now appears quite clear that the action taken on the independent offices appropriations bill, which in effect destroyed the Federal public-housing program for the coming fiscal year, was unwarranted by any requirements of defense mobilization, but was rather dictated by an effort to reverse on an appropriations bill a housing program which had been authorized by the Congress in the Housing Act of 1949 after years of effort and consideration. The low-income families, particularly in the large cities of the country, are deeply aggrieved by this action and the House action is being bitterly protested. Demand from families for these units even on the present program is running at 20–1 to supply in these cities. My bill, H. R. 4207, seeking to repeal the House action, is a means by which Members from these areas may express themselves. I hope that Members will give this bill early and vigorous support in getting hearings and House action on it.

The full text of the letter from Mr. Foley follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1951.

Hon. J. K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: As Mr. Manly Fleischmann, Administrator, National Production Authority, advised you in his letter of May 18, your letter of May 8 to him has been referred to this Agency for reply. In your letter you advert to the recent amendment to NPA Order M-4 requiring a permit for construction, including housing, consuming more than 25 tons of steel and seek information as to the number of public-housing units to be constructed in the fiscal year 1951–52 which could receive the necessary material allocations under the particular amendment to Order M-4.

You will be interested to know that members of my staff have been conferring with officials of the NPA with respect to the recent amendment to Order M-4 insofar as such amendment purports to cover housing construction. It is my understanding that the amendment was not intended to cover housing construction and that a clarifying amendment is being prepared jointly by this Agency and the NPA in this respect. We anticipate that such amendment will be issued within the next 3 or 4 days.

As you know, we have been directed by the President to proceed for the fiscal year 1951–52 with a program of 75,000 public-housing units out of a total of 135,000 units authorized. In this connection, no compelling reason has been brought to our attention which would warrant reducing the figure of 75,000 on the basis of material shortages for such housing.

With respect to the number of public-housing units to be constructed during this period which could receive material allocations, it is our intention, as claimant for all housing construction, to seek from the NPA whatever material assistance may be required for the total number of public-housing units which may, in fact, be undertaken during this period on the basis of funds made available by the Congress.

If you desire any further information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think there is real merit in what the gentleman says. The President asked for 75,000 units.

The House action was unfortunate and as one who voted against the crippling cut I hope the House will reappraise this situation sensibly.

Mr. JAVITS. The President did ask for exactly 75,000 units.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentleman know that in the year and a half the Agency has been in existence it has been able to start only 34,000?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think that is any answer. It requires time to acquire sites, to arrange to sell bonds of the local housing authorities, to make plans, and to let contracts. What has been done in the independent offices appropriation bill in the House is to end this activity in substance for new starts in the fiscal year 1951–52, except for only 5,000 units. This in the face of over 40,000 units in preparation for the contract stage in New York City alone and with the enormous demand from low-income families throughout the country to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MILITARY AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO FREE NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 147)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Three weeks ago I transmitted to the Congress a request for $60,000,000,000 for the United States defense establishment during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

I am now recommending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, a mutual security program as follows:

(1) Military assistance to other free nations in the amount of 6.25 billion dollars.

(2) Economic assistance to other free nations in the amount of 2.25 billion dollars, primarily to support expanded defense efforts abroad.

These amounts compare with 5.3 billion dollars appropriated for military assistance, and 3.0 billion dollars for economic assistance, in the current fiscal year.

The program for our own Armed Forces and this mutual security program interlock. The one builds upon the other. The purpose of each is the security of the United States—the security of American lives and homes against attack and the security of our rights and liberties as law-abiding members of the world community.

Our country has greater economic strength and larger potential military power than any other nation on earth. But we do not and we should not stand alone. We cannot maintain our civilization, if the rest of the world is split up, subjugated, and organized against us by the Kremlin.

This is a very real and terrible danger. But it can be overcome. To do so, we must work with the rest of the free world: we must join other free nations in common defense plans; we must con-

cert our economic strength with theirs for the common good; and we must help other free countries to build the military and economic power needed to make impossible the Communist dreams of world conquest.

This is hard common sense and sound economy. The dollars spent under the mutual-security program will build more strength in support of our security than we could build at home with the same expenditure of funds.

This mutual-security program brings together our various foreign-aid programs, including the arms aid of the mutual-defense-assistance program, economic assistance for Europe—now being directed primarily to support of rearmament—and our economic aid to underdeveloped areas under the point 4 concept. Every one of these programs has proved its worth.

In preparing the present recommendations, each of these separate programs has been revised in the light of the emergency situation that exists in the world and the extraordinary demands that are being placed on our Nation. The amounts, the geographical areas, and the purposes of the aid have all been chosen in order to bring about the greatest possible increase in the security of the United States and the whole free world.

Under this program the United States will send tanks, guns, and planes to a number of free countries, in Europe and other parts of the world, which are building up armed forces against the threat of Communist attack. We will also send economic help to a number of countries—economic help ranging from machinery and materials with which to make weapons, to seeds, medicine, and technical assistance with which to conquer communism's allies of starvation and sickness.

This program was designed with three major characteristics of the Soviet threat in mind:

First, the Soviet threat is world-wide. In Europe, in Asia, in our own hemisphere, the strategy of the Kremlin concentrates on trying to pick off the free countries one by one, so that their resources and people can be organized against the rest of the free world. That is why the mutual-security program includes essential help to free countries all around the world which are exposed to the danger of internal or external Communist pressures.

Second, the Soviet threat is total; it affects every form of human endeavor. Communist attack may come in the form of armies marching across frontiers; or it may come in the form of internal subversion. Economic warfare, psychological warfare, political infiltration, sabotage, the marching of armies—these are interchangeable aggressive weapons which the Soviet rulers use singly or together according to shifting calculations of greatest advantage. That is why the free world must concentrate upon building not only military strength, but also economic, political, and moral strength. That is why the mutual-security program includes economic as well as military assistance.

Third, the Soviet threat is of indefinite duration. The free world must take into account both the possibility that the Soviet rulers may soon start all-out armed aggression, and the possibility that they may carry on their aggressive tactics for many years by measures short of all-out war.

That is why the task of the free world now is not only to build defenses urgently in the immediate future, but also to prepare for the long pull. We of the free countries must make preparations now so that when our Armed Forces have been built up we will be able to maintain them for years, if necessary, and at the same time grow in underlying economic strength more soundly and more rapidly than the Soviet dictatorship.

The free nations have the resources and the will to overcome all these aspects of the Soviet threat. Together, our potential strength is enormous. The free nations have 75 percent of the world's industrial capacity and most of the world's raw materials.

Most important of all, free men, all around the world, have the determination to stop Communist aggression and to achieve peace. The Communist aggression in Korea dispelled any lingering doubts that the Kremlin is willing to threaten the peace of the world.

The job before the free nations is to organize their potential resources and together to convert them into actual military and economic strength. Our associates in the free world are now making vigorous efforts to this end. The mutual security program will provide them with resources required to supplement and make effective their efforts. It is not a program under which we will carry the rest of the free world on our backs. It could not succeed if that were the case. The program is founded on the principle of mutual effort and the knowledge that we can help effectively only those who help themselves.

The proposed aid is related to the resources available to each recipient country, its economic stability, and the burdens it has assumed. Our aid will be provided only for essential needs that the country cannot meet by its own efforts. The need for aid will be continuously reviewed in the light of each country's performance and of economic and political changes.

The bulk of the assistance under the mutual security program will be military equipment. Most of this will go to our partners in the North Atlantic Treaty, but in addition substantial quantities will be supplied to nations in Asia and the Middle East. Military equipment to supplement their own will be provided to countries when they have organized forces which require this equipment in order to become effective fighting units. With our assistance, the free world as a whole will be able to strengthen its military defenses rapidly. Without such aid, the necessary build-up would be dangerously delayed if not impossible.

In addition to supplying military equipment, this program will provide economic aid for a number of countries. In most countries in Europe, and in some countries in other parts of the world, this economic aid will enable the recipients to carry on larger defense programs than would otherwise be possible. In a few cases, some further economic help is necessary to continue progress toward recovery. In Asia and other underdeveloped areas, this program will enable the people to make headway against conditions of poverty and stagnation which are principal assets of Soviet infiltration.

The condition of the people in the underdeveloped areas would be a matter of humanitarian concern even if our national security were not involved. Major improvement in these conditions is necessarily a long-term process, in which the countries' own efforts, private investment, and public developmental loans should play the largest part. Carefully selected projects of technical assistance and initial development on a grant basis, however, can speed up this process and provide tangible benefits even in the short run.

The underdeveloped countries in Asia, South America, and Africa, produce strategic materials which are essential to the defense and economic health of the free world. Production of these materials must be increased. Loans and developmental help are needed. The development of the resources of these countries helps them by raising their standard of living and increasing their resistance to Communist subversion, and helps the whole free world by increasing the supply of raw materials essential to defense and to an expanding world economy.

To enable the underdeveloped areas to expand their production of strategic materials, they must be assured of being able to obtain the essential supplies and equipment they need from our country. Indeed, our entire security program will be successful only if the materials available to the free world are distributed in the way that will best contribute to the build-up of total free world strength. The mutual security program, like the program for our own Armed Forces, has been examined from the standpoint of the availability of supplies, materials and equipment that are required to carry it out. We believe these resources can and must be made available out of the expanding production of the free world.

In each area, the United States aid which I propose will be a small part of the total resources available for military and economic purposes—but that small proportion is crucial. In all these areas of the world, larger amounts of United States assistance could be put to good use and would pay real dividends. But I have limited the assistance I am recommending to what is absolutely necessary, under the emergency conditions we are in today, to help these countries build essential military and economic strength.

I propose that the total funds required under the mutual security program be divided as follows:

Mutual-security program, 1952

[In millions]

	Economic	Military
Europe	$1,650	$5,240
Middle East and Northern Africa	125	415
Asia	375	555
Latin America	22	40
Administrative expenses	78	
Total	2,250	6,250

The military aid for Greece and Turkey is included in the amount for the Middle East. The amount of the economic aid for Europe includes the economic aid for Greece and Turkey. For convenience, the estimated requirements for administrative expenses for the entire program—approximately $73,000,000—is shown as a single figure under economic aid.

The amounts requested for economic aid include $13,000,000 to be furnished the United Nations and the Organization of American States for their technical assistance programs.

The economic, as well as the military aid recommended, is grant assistance to be provided through appropriated funds. Loans by the Export-Import Bank will also continue to play an important role in our efforts to assist the economic progress of friendly countries. In order that full use may be made of the opportunities for loans, especially to develop strategic materials, I recommend that the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank be increased by $1,000,000,000. Not all of the increased lending authority, of course, will be used in the coming year.

With this program of assistance to the total free world effort, we will move forward rapidly toward a situation giving reasonable assurance against aggression.

Moreover, the mutual security program is designed to taper off as soon as our safety will permit. The creation of effective military forces in being, coupled with increased productivity, will make it possible, within a few years, for most areas of the free world to maintain their defenses and sustain their economies without further grant assistance from this country.

The creation of this strength will provide a defensive shield against aggression for all the free world. Ever since the war, the free nations have been going forward to develop their resources and improve the lot of their people. Ever since the war, the free nations have been working together to create a world community in which each nation, respecting world law, can play its distinctive and honorable role.

The only kind of war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies—poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy. This is an effort which makes use of the great elements of our strength—our economic power, our science, our organizing ability, our political principles, our enthusiasm as free men with faith in the future. This is an effort to build, not to destroy; to grow in freedom and justice and mutual respect; to replace the force of arms with the force of peaceful change.

We have no doubt about the outcome of this free-world effort. But we must be strong and we must have strong partners if we are to discourage new acts of violence by the power hungry, and to win the opportunity to carry on our work of peaceful progress.

For the time being, therefore, the emphasis in our cooperation with the other free nations must be on building our defensive shield against aggression. This shields threatens no one. It will never be used for aggression. But it will be used instantly for defense.

The strengthening of the free world along these lines is the best hope of producing changes in the policies of the Soviet Union without a world war. Military defense forces will put a stop to the Kremlin's hope of easy conquest. Growing prosperity in the free countries will frustrate Soviet political warfare. In these circumstances, the Soviet rulers will face growing internal pressures. The peoples under Soviet control will grow more and more restive under the burden of an aggressive and futile policy of hostility toward the whole world. The rulers of the Soviet Union will be forced by these pressures to abandon their policy of aggression.

It is too early to predict how or when this policy will change. But this program of mutual security will help to bring about such a change. It is certain that the united vigor and cooperative action of the free world can produce such results if we act in time. No system based on slavery and terror can long withstand the tremendous human energies that are released by the advance of freedom.

EUROPE

For the security of the United States, for the survival of freedom in the world, free Europe is a critical area that must be defended.

The people of Europe free from Soviet control number 300,000,000. They operate a great industrial plant, second only to our own. They occupy a uniquely strategic location. They are at once the most tempting prize for Soviet ambitions and our strongest allies in the world struggle for freedom.

The loss of Europe to the Soviet Union would not only be tragic in itself; it would also result in a tremendous shift of world power. It would compel us to convert the United States into an isolated garrison state.

That is why, 3 years ago, when the countries of Europe were trembling on the brink of economic collapse, the United States launched its program of aid for European recovery.

That is why, 2 years ago, the United States and Canada joined 10 Western European countries — Iceland, Great Britain, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, Portugal, and Italy—in the North Atlantic Treaty, declaring that an attack on one would be considered an attack on all.

The North Atlantic Treaty reflects the basic fact of international life that the freedom of Western Europe and the freedom of North America are inseparable.

Under that treaty, defense plans have been developed by the military leaders of the North Atlantic Treaty countries. Under General Eisenhower's central command, a unified army, navy, and air force is being organized for the defense of Western Europe, composed of national forces assigned by individual nations.

The key element in the defense of free Europe is the ability to hold on the ground. Western Europe lacks the insulation of wide oceans. Major preparations must therefore be made to hold its lands—by well-armed manpower on the ground, by the great striking force of airpower, and by a seapower which commands its surrounding waters and important lines of communication.

The European countries themselves are providing the great majority of the forces needed. The United States also has Army, Navy, and Air Force units in Europe, which add to the power of the combined defense forces, and more units will move there, both from this country and from Canada.

Our European partners in the North Atlantic Treaty now have over 2,000,000 men under arms, plus large numbers of trained reserves. The bulk of Western Europe's armed forces are pledged to General Eisenhower's command. Moreover, some of these countries—notably France and Britain—have sizable forces fighting in Malaya, Indochina, and Korea, and have other important overseas defense commitments. The combat power of Western European forces is rising steadily as equipment becomes available and periods of military service are lengthened.

Rearmament will cause a severe drain on the Western European countries. Through their own efforts, national and collective, and with the vital assistance of the Marshall plan, Western Europe has made a remarkable record of economic recovery since 1947. Production and trade have been restored and financial conditions have been greatly improved. In the free countries of Europe, communism has been checked and thrown back. The original goals of the Marshall plan have been largely achieved.

But the western European countries are by no means yet free from the after effects of the most destructive war in history.

They are living on a very narrow economic margin. Whereas our standard of living is nearly 50 percent higher that it was before World War II, theirs has only recently reached their prewar levels, which were much lower than ours.

The European countries cannot move rapidly into sufficient large-scale military production to provide all the equipment required for the essential expansion of their forces. Over the next few years, they do expect to increase their production of military equipment. In the coming fiscal year, it will be more than double the pre-Korean rate. But the most they can do will not be enough to equip their armed forces on the time

schedule necessary for the common defense.

The United States, with its huge and flexible industrial capacity and greater margin for diverting resources to military production, can and should continue to supply military equipment to our allies in Western Europe. In this way, many divisions, air squadrons, and naval vessels can be brought to active duty in the next year or two which otherwise could not be.

In the immediately coming years, the crucial need is to produce the initial equipment for a very rapid build-up of forces. The expanding European productive capacity will contribute increasingly to this build-up. With this capacity, Europe should be able to meet the smaller continuing maintenance and replacement requirements without substantial outside aid.

The military aid for Europe I am recommending amounts to 5.3 billion dollars. I also recommend economic assistance for this area for the coming year in the amount of 1.65 billion dollars.

Because of the degree of economic recovery which has been attained, the total economic assistance I am requesting for European countries next year—despite the large new burdens of European rearmament—is substantially reduced from the amount we have provided in the current fiscal year.

However, in the free countries of Europe which are rearming, the proposed increases in military production and the building of armed forces will require large diversions of manpower and other economic resources away from production of goods for consumption, for investment, and for export. To carry these greatly enlarged military burdens, our partners in Europe will be taking measures to increase taxes and mobilize their resources through economic controls. Despite determined efforts in this direction they will need some continuing economic assistance.

Some aid is also proposed for Western Germany, which by its support of occupation forces is assisting the defense effort and which may later make more direct contributions to the common defense. In Austria and Trieste, which cannot directly contribute to the rearmament effort, but whose economies are handicapped by special difficulties, economic aid must also be continued to maintain political stability. Certain economic assistance for Yugoslavia is proposed to help meet its minimum requirements in maintaining strength against the threat of Soviet imperialism.

This economic aid is critical—that is, it is the essential condition of an increase in European military effort. It should make possible European production many times larger than the amount of the support given.

MIDDLE EAST

The countries of the Middle East are, for the most part, less developed industrially than those of Europe. They are, nevertheless, of great importance to the security of the entire free world. This region is a vital link of land, sea, and air communications between Europe, Asia, and Africa. In the free nations of the Middle East lie half of the oil reserves of the world.

No part of the world is more directly exposed to Soviet pressure. The Kremlin has lost no opportunity to stir these troubled waters, as the postwar record amply demonstrates. Civil war in Greece; pressure for Turkish concessions on the Dardanelles; sponsorship of the rebellious Tudeh party in Iran; furthering of factional strife in the Arab States and Israel—all reflect a concerted design for the extension of Soviet domination to this vital area.

There is no simple formula for increasing stability and security in the Middle East. With the help of American military and economic assistance, Soviet pressure has already been firmly resisted in Turkey and the Soviet-inspired guerrilla war has been decisively defeated in Greece. But the pressure against the Middle East is unremitting. It can be overcome only by a continued build-up of armed defenses and the fostering of economic development. Only through such measures can these peoples advance toward stability and improved living conditions, and be assured that their aims can best be achieved through strengthening their associations in the free world.

To these ends, I am recommending 415 million dollars in military aid, for Greece, Turkey, and Iran; a portion of this aid will be available for other middle-eastern nations if necessary. I am also recommending 125 million dollars in economic aid for middle eastern countries, exclusive of Greece and Turkey for whom economic aid is provided as part of the program for Europe. This amount also includes programs of technical assistance to Libya, Liberia, and Ethiopia, three independent states of Africa whose economic problems are similar to those of the middle-eastern countries.

Continuing military aid for Greece and Turkey will make possible the further strengthening of these countries' large and well-trained armed forces, which have already displayed their valiant resolution in the fight for freedom in Korea. In Iran, continuing military aid is required to help build internal security and defense, together with economic aid to help sustain the Iranian economy and give impetus to the much-needed longer-term process of economic development for the benefit of the Iranian people.

In the Arab States and Israel, the fundamental requirement is a regional approach to the basic problems of economic development. This is urgently needed to reduce existing tensions, especially through the orderly settlement of homeless refugees. The program for the Arab States will expand needed food production through the development of land and water resources. The program for Israel will help that country to maintain her economy during an especially trying period of her national development. At the same time, the program of assistance to the Arab refugees from Palestine, which will necessarily extend beyond the coming fiscal year, has the threefold purpose of assisting the settlement of the refugees, of strengthening those states wherein they settle, and assisting both Israel and the Arab States by removing this threat to the peace of the area.

The program I am now proposing is a balanced program for strengthening the security of the Middle East. It will make a solid contribution to our hopes for peace.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

In Asia, in a vast arc stretching from Afghanistan to Korea, free countries are struggling to meet Communist aggression in all its many forms. Some of these countries are battling the Communist armies of Soviet satellites; some are engaged in bitter civil strife against Communist-led guerrillas; all of them face the immediate danger of Communist subversion.

Soviet intentions with regard to these countries are unmistakably clear. Using the weapons of subversion, false propaganda and civil war, the Kremlin has already reduced China to the status of a satellite. The Soviet rulers have turned their satellite armies loose on the Republic of Korea. Communist rebellion is raging in Indochina. In Burma, the Philippines, and other places, Communist-inspired groups are stirring up internal disorder. In all countries, they are trying to exploit deep-seated economic difficulties—poverty, illiteracy, and disease.

This campaign threatens to absorb the manpower and the vital resources of the east into the Soviet design of world conquest. It threatens to deprive the free nations of some of their most vitally needed raw materials. It threatens to turn more of the peaceful millions of the east into armies to be used as pawns at the disposal of the Kremlin.

Aside from immediate considerations of security, the continued independence of these nations is vital to the future of the free world. Many of these nations are new to self-government. They have dedicated themselves to the ideals of national independence, of human liberty, and social progress. Their hundreds of millions of citizens are eager for justice and liberty and a stake in the future.

These countries demonstrate the power and vitality of the ideals of our own American Revolution; they mark the sweeping advance across the world of the concepts of freedom and brotherhood. To lose these countries to the rulers of the Kremlin would be more than a blow to our military security and our economic life. It would be a terrible defeat for the ideals of freedom—with grave spiritual consequences for men everywhere who share our faith in freedom.

All these considerations make it essential for the United States to help the free countries of Asia in their struggle to make good their independence and bring economic and social progress to their people. Where the governments of these countries are striving to establish free and stable political institutions, to build up their military defenses, and to raise the standard of living above the level of bare subsistence, we can and should give them assistance. We cannot replace their own strong efforts, but we can supplement them.

This mutual-security program is intended to do that. On the military side, it will supply certain of the Asian countries with items of military equipment and the training they need for their defense forces. On the economic side, it will provide a number of the Asian countries with the most urgently needed commodities, machinery, and tools, and with technical advice in such fields as agriculture, industry, health, and governmental administration.

The assistance I am recommending for Asian countries, 555 million dollars in military aid and 375 million dollars in economic aid, is so planned as to meet the most pressing needs in the various countries, and is intended to provide the crucial margin of resources which will enable them to move forward.

Military assistance under this program will go to the Chinese armies on Formosa, to help keep that island out of the hands of Communist China. It will go to Indochina, where over 100,000 French troops are fighting side by side with the forces of Viet Nam, Laos, and Cambodia against Communist-led forces. It will go to the Philippines and to Thailand, to help build forces strong enough to insure internal security and discourage outside attack. Some of these military-assistance funds will also be available for allocation to other countries in the area if a critical need arises.

The military aid under this program will supplement other military efforts against communism in Asia. The countries we will be aiding, and a number of others, are supporting military forces with their own funds. France is supplying the largest part of the military supplies needed in Indochina, and Britain is supplying her forces which are fighting guerrillas in the Malay States. The substantial military aid we are giving to the forces of the Republic of Korea is included in the budget for our military services.

The struggle for security and peace in Asia is far more than a military matter. In many of the Asian countries, including all the countries which need military aid, economic assistance is also required.

These countries urgently need help in their efforts to overcome the desperate conditions of poverty, illiteracy, and disease which are the heart of the Asian problem. It is a terrible fact that poverty is increasing rather than diminishing in much of Asia. Millions of people exist at bare subsistence levels.

The Asian countries are doing what they can on their own to meet this problem. An encouraging proposal affecting a number of these countries is the Colombo plan for technical assistance and economic development worked out under the auspices of the British Commonwealth. In addition, some aid to Asian countries will be furnished through the programs of the United Nations.

These sources of aid alone will not, however, suffice to reverse the downward trend in living standards. Aid from the United States is also necessary.

Sizable programs of technical assistance and capital development are now being carried on by the Economic Cooperation Administration in some of these countries under the point 4 concept. A portion of the funds I am now recommending will provide for continuing these programs and extending them to other countries. These funds will be used to send out technical experts and equipment needed to improve health, agriculture, transportation, and communications services and assist in the development of natural resources.

In addition, the funds I am now recommending will provide necessary economic support for defense programs in Indochina, Formosa, and the Philippines.

Finally, the economic aid funds I am requesting for Asia include 112.5 million dollars for the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency. Together with 50 million dollars which are likely to remain unexpended from funds available for Korean aid for the present fiscal year, those funds will be made available to the Agency at such time as conditions in Korea permit the reconstruction program to be undertaken.

In preparing these recommendations for economic aid, projects which should be financed by loans have been excluded. The investment of private capital and public loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Export-Import Bank will play an important part in the economic progress of Asia, as in other parts of the world.

In the administration of this program, loans, grants, and technical assistance will be meshed together with the plans and efforts of each of the recipient countries for the development of its own resources. Only in this manner can the various kinds of outside aid available to an Asian country be used most effectively and without duplication or overlapping.

These economic programs will have as their goal the creation of conditions eliminating the need for further grant aid for economic development. Such programs look toward the creation of sound government finances and public services, and toward more stable economic and political foundations for raising living standards and creating broader opportunities. It will take time to reach these goals, but they must be steadily pursued. Our aid will provide a dynamic force in that direction and will thus contribute strongly to freedom and peace in Asia.

LATIN AMERICA

The United States and the other American Republics agreed in 1947, in the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, that an armed attack upon one of them is to be regarded as an armed attack on all, and to act together for the common defense.

Our good neighbors to the south are more than willing to share in defending the hemisphere. But there are real limits on their ability to do so without some aid from us. They produce little modern military equipment.

During World War II, defense tasks in Latin America required the use of over 75,000 United States troops, as well as considerable United States naval forces. The armed forces of the Latin-American States did not at that time have the equipment or training to carry out those defense tasks by themselves.

It makes good sense that, in planning the defense of this hemisphere, the United States should aid the Latin-American countries to prepare for and take over certain hemisphere defense tasks that are of interest to us all—tasks they are willing to do and well able to handle, with a little help in equipping and training their forces. Consequently, I am recommending 40 million dollars in military assistance to these countries.

In addition, I recommend 22 million dollars in economic aid to carry forward the excellent technical assistance work that is now under way in the other American States in developing agriculture, natural resources, and health, education, and other types of basic services. This type of assistance has already proved its worth in the Latin-American area. It is helping to raise living standards, hasten economic development, and strengthen both peoples and governments in warding off the danger of Communist subversion.

This grant assistance is helping to lay the foundation for an expanding volume of capital development, through public and private loans and investments, in the other American Republics. The United States is already providing major economic help to Latin-American countries through loans by the Export-Import Bank. Fortunately, the relative geographic security and the economic position of the American Republics make possible large amounts of private loans and investments—the normal and desirable means of fostering economic development.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

The proposed organization for administering the mutual security program is based on the experience we have had so far, under the arrangements established by the Congress in legislation authorizing previous military and economic aid programs.

The administration of military aid will be handled, as at present, by the Department of Defense, which will be able to insure full coordination between United States production of equipment for our own forces and equipment for our allies. The Department of Defense is responsible for evaluating the equipment deficiencies of the forces of our allies, under mutually agreed strategic concepts, and is charged with procurement, inspection, and transportation of military equipment provided by this country.

Administration of economic assistance for Western Europe and most of the countries in the Middle East, Africa, and South and Southeast Asia will be carried on by the Economic Cooperation Administration. This agency has already proved its effectiveness in aiding countries to achieve economic recovery and is now administering economic assistance in support of our mutual defense and security objectives in Europe and Southeast Asia. The economic aid programs for Latin America and certain other countries in which the economic aid is limited almost wholly to technical assistance are now administered by the Technical Cooperation Administration of the State Department. Consideration is now being given to the question of whether or not it would be desirable to

transfer the administration of these programs to the Economic Cooperation Administration during the period that that agency is administering other foreign economic aid programs.

These agencies will work very closely with the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in achieving a proper integration between loan and grant programs.

In order to insure coordinated policy guidance in administering military and economic aid programs, a key coordinating committee has been established composed of senior representatives of the executive agencies concerned. This International Security Affairs Committee has developed out of the experience of an executive committee that had previously been coordinating operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. The chairman of the new committee, the Director of International Security Affairs, is a senior official of the Department of State confirmed by the Senate, and occupies a position authorized by the Congress under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act.

I recommend this mutual security program to the Congress as another vital step along the road to real security and lasting peace. Peace through collective strength is a difficult course. It is not without danger. There can be no absolute assurance of success. But there are far greater dangers in any other course.

We cannot win peace through appeasement. We cannot gain security in isolation. We will not surrender.

Let it never be forgotten, however, that we are ready as we have always been, to follow the road of peaceful settlement of disputes, of control and reduction of armaments, of cooperation in applying man's talents to the building of a just and prosperous world society.

If the rulers of the Soviet Union did not drown their words of peace with the drums of war, if their professions of peaceful intent were matched by deeds, the century in which we live could become the brightest man has known upon this earth. For our part, if peace could be made sure, the American people would be glad to invest a part of the resources we must now allocate to defense to a large-scale program of world-wide economic development.

The benefits of such a program would be immense; the cost a small part of what we must now pay to build our defenses at home and abroad. With such a program, we could, in cooperation with other peoples, inaugurate the most hopeful and fruitful period of peaceful development the world has ever seen.

This was our vision 6 years ago, when the war came to a close. Let us never forget it. And let us never give up our hopes and our efforts to make it a reality.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 24, 1951.*

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RENUNCIATION OF THE ITALIAN PEACE TREATY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in advocating the renunciation of the Italian Peace Treaty, it is well to recall a little of the background against which the terms were drawn and briefly summarize their provisions. The Italian Peace Treaty was the result of protracted negotiations among the Allies. Italy had accepted the terms of a severe armistice in September 1943. After that she had cooperated with the Allies and had been accepted as a cobelligerent. Because of this she expected better peace terms, but it could not be ignored that as a member of the Axis she had inflicted great damage upon some countries.

It had been agreed at Potsdam in 1945 that the foreign ministers should draft treaties, including one for Italy and that a treaty should be offered to her as soon as possible in consideration of her peculiar status during the later years of the war. Consultations began in London in the fall of 1945 and continued in Paris during the following spring and early summer. The full peace conference was held in Paris later in the summer of 1946. This conference became largely a forum in which the smaller nations, including Italy, were allowed to express their views. The Italian Premier, de Gasperi, made an impassioned plea for more favorable terms for Italy but this had no effect upon the final decisions. He objected especially to four provisions: the internationalization of Trieste, the giving up of the Italian colonies, restrictions on the navy, and the giving of Italian territory near to the French border to France. The Italians especially wanted to keep their frontier line at Mont Cenis which is entirely on the Italian side of the watershed. This area contains hydroelectric plants which supply power for industries in Turin and railways in northwest Italy.

The final text of the treaty was drafted and signed at Paris on February 10, 1947. It was promptly ratified by the western Allies and later by Russia. It became effective on September 15, 1947, upon deposit of the ratifications in Paris.

By the terms of the treaty, the boundaries of continental Italy were changed. France received four small areas, including the disputed Mont Cenis and Briga-Tenda regions. She promptly made arrangements with Italy guaranteeing that the latter should receive the power and water supply previously received from these sources. The frontier zone to a depth of 20 kilometers on the Italian side was to be demobilized.

After long discussion it was decided to let Italy keep the South Tyrol, leaving the Austrian-Italian frontier unchanged. However, the Ministers of the two countries made an agreement which insured cultural rights and some degree of local autonomy to the German-speaking population. This agreement was incorporated into the treaty.

The toughest territorial problem was the Italian-Yugoslav boundary. At the end of the war, the enemy territories were divided roughtly between the Allies along the lines to which their respective forces had advanced. The Yugoslavs had overrun most of Venezia Giulia in May 1945, complicating this boundary problem, because the western allies, under the terms of the German surrender, claimed occupation within the 1939 frontiers of Italy. Yugoslavia had never been satisfied with the 1920 frontier and took occasion to make extreme demands which would have left Italy with a frontier less favorable than that of 1914. Unable to agree among themselves, the four allies sent commissions to investigate the situation on the spot, but each proposed a different line. The French proposal was finally accepted as the basis of agreement and became the present western frontier of Yugoslavia. This line is not far from the 1914 frontier. The line agreed upon satisfied no one completely.

Power rivalry was most evident in regard to the city of Trieste. This city is predominantly Italian in population, but it is also the port not only for Yugoslavia, but also for Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Austria. It was finally agreed that Trieste and a small surrounding country should be a free territory with a governor to be appointed by the Security Council after consultation with the Governments of Italy and Yugoslavia. The authorities concerned have not yet been able to agree upon a governor and the Trieste question remains unsettled. The free territory is still divided into two zones—one Italian, occupied by Anglo-American troops; and one Yugoslav, occupied by Tito's troops. In this situation, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France proposed on March 20, 1948, that the treaty be modified to return the territory to Italian sovereignty. No agreement has been reached on this point, so the military governments continue to function.

In other territorial provisions, Italy gave up all her colonial possessions, including the African colonies, her last possessions outside Europe. Although these colonies had never been of economic value nor had they attracted many Italians as immigrants, their loss was felt by Italy as a blow to her prestige. At present, she administers Italian Somaliland as trustee under the U. N. for 10 years. After that, the former Italian colony will become a sovereign state.

The peace treaty provided for the disarmament of Italy. This included the demilitarization of the French and Yugoslav borders and restrictions on military establishments in Sicily and Sardinia and in some sections of the mainland. The army, including Carabinieri, was limited to 250,000 men—185,000 combat and service personnel and 65,000 Carabinieri—the naval and air forces to 25,000 persons each. Except for two battleships, four cruisers, and smaller craft, the navy was turned over to the Allies. The United States declined to accept the vessels allotted to it. Moreover, on March 16, 1948, it transferred to Italy all the Italian ships it had seized during the war. Italy also retained 200 heavy or medium tanks, 200 fighter and reconnaissance planes, and 150 transport and other planes.

Under the economic provisions of the treaty, Italy is required to pay reparations in the following amounts: $100,000,000 to Soviet Russia, $125,000,000 to Yugoslavia, $105,000,000 to Greece, $25,000,000 to Abyssinia, and $5,000,000 to Albania. The Western Allies—the United States, Great Britain, and France—renounced all claims, but Italian property within their territory is to be used to offset damage claims. No part of the above-mentioned reparations was to come from current industrial production for the first 2 years. Thereafter the recipient nations were to furnish the raw materials for the manufactures to be used as reparations. The whole account is to be liquidated in 7 years. There has been no dismantling of the Italian industrial plant.

The terms of the treaty seemed unduly harsh to the Italians and many of their friends abroad. Both Secretary of State Byrnes and President Truman frankly stated that the treaty was unsatisfactory in some respects but was the best obtainable under the circumstances. It was in reality an attempt to reach a modus vivendi between the Eastern and Western Powers. The basis for it was the situation created by military occupation of the territory set up when Germany collapsed and when the principal Allied armies met in Central Europe. Certain demarcation lines, agreed upon for the convenience of military administration, were not intended to be the basis for settlement of final relations between the Allied Powers. They did, however, have a great influence on the provisions of the treaty.

Prior to the landing of troops in Italy, the United States made one pledge to the Italian people. This was that the United States would assure the sovereignty of Italy. This pledge was properly read against the background of the Atlantic Charter. The terms of the treaty certainly do not guarantee that such sovereignty can be preserved. Moreover, the territorial concessions required of Italy are in violation of the provision of the Atlantic Charter which stated that the signers desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

The disarmament clauses of the treaty leave Italy unable to cope with any aggression or to fulfill her obligation under the North Atlantic Treaty of contributing to the full extent of her capability, so far as troops go, to the defense of Western Europe. Denunciation of the Italian Peace Treaty would make it possible for Italy to build her defenses against communism and render effective aid in the defense of Western Europe, thus easing to some extent the burdens of the United States and other signatories to the North Atlantic Pact.

In 1938 Italy's armed forces, including reserves, totaled almost 8,000,000, in comparison with the 250,000 limit imposed by the 1947 treaty. In 1942, Italy had a standing army of almost 3,000,000 which today is limited to 185,000, plus 65,000 Caribinieri. From these figures it is plain that Italy could provide much military aid in terms of manpower if the treaty were repudiated.

After Italy's surrender in 1943, she promptly declared war on Germany, and, as we have said, was granted the status of cobelligerent of the allies against the remaining Axis Powers. In July 1945, Italy declared war on Japan. The Italian fleet engaged in military action in the Mediterranean and suffered severe losses in the Allied cause. Numerous Italian soldiers fought side by side with the Allies in Italy itself. Italian soldiers were engaged in other theaters of the war and aided anti-Nazi partisans in Greece and elsewhere in their activities against the Germans.

Secretary Acheson has recently charged that Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, whose treaties were drawn up simultaneously with that of Italy, have violated peace-treaty limitations on the size of their armed forces. Moreover, the United States is advocating so-called limited rearmament of Japan and Western Germany, convinced that the military helplessness of these countries is an invitation to Communist aggression. Therefore it seems only reasonable to permit Italy to arm herself adequately against the threat of Communist aggression and as an aid to the other members of the North Atlantic Pact.

In the light of the present situation throughout the world, when large forces of the other western allies are engaged in Indochina, Burma, Korea, and elsewhere, surely it is only the part of wisdom and foresight to accept military help from Italy in permitting her to rearm to the greatest extent to which she is able.

Already Russia has nullified the treaty by refusing membership in the U. N. to Italy, as was specifically provided in the treaty. It could hardly be expected in the present relations between Russia and the western powers that Russia would ever agree, even if Italy were admitted to the U. N., to let her increase her army or navy. Therefore denunciation of the treaty seems imperative.

In regard to the economic terms of the treaty, the total reparations do not appear exorbitant, considering the 2-year moratorium and the fact that the recipients are to provide the necessary raw materials. But the $100,000,000 for Russia means just that much more material to build up her war potential, which might easily spell trouble for Italy and the other western powers.

Conditions have changed greatly since the Italian treaty was signed and ratified. It was hoped at that time that a compromise with Soviet Russia might lead to peace. The opposite has proved to be the case. Also today the idea that Italy could be a threat to peace, which is implicit in the treaty, is absurd. On the contrary, she could be a great help toward the maintenance of peace. Let us, therefore, hasten to undo this injustice to the Italian people and to the rest of the western allies and denounce the treaty as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

FAR EASTERN SITUATION

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to ask for this time because of an article appearing in the Washington Post this morning, entitled "'Seize China' 1949 Plan Laid to MacArthur," attributed to our colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

The article read as follows:

"SEIZE CHINA" 1949 PLAN LAID TO MACARTHUR

Representative M. G. BURNSIDE, Democrat, West Virginia, told the House yesterday Gen. Douglas MacArthur advocated not only bombing but American occupation of China in 1949 when the Communists were driving out the last of the Nationalist troops.

BURNSIDE, who visited MacArthur in September 1949, as a member of a special House committee, said MacArthur told the committee the bombing would cost $10,000,000,000 and the occupation $40,000,000,000.

The State Department, in its white paper on China, had already written off the Nationalist Government by August of 1949. Chiang Kai-shek set up his goverment in Formosa in December. BURNSIDE said MacArthur and his intelligence chief, Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, assured the committee "There would be no war in Korea for 2 years and called Chinese Reds 'greatly overrated'." The North Koreans invaded South Korea in June 1950, 9 months later.

BURNSIDE: "General MacArthur advocated the bombing of Chinese cities in 1949 as a solution to the problems confronting us in Asia."

"The general estimated the cost of the bombing at $10,000,000,000 and said it would have to be followed up with an occupation by at least enough American ground troops for occupation purposes," BURNSIDE said. "MacArthur estimated the occupation cost at about $40,000,000,000."

Mr. Speaker, my sole purpose of taking this time is to keep the record straight. I have the highest respect and regard for the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE]. We came to the House together in the Eighty-first Congress. During that session we served on the Expenditures Committee. In August and September of 1949 we did make a trip to Asia and did contact General MacArthur, Major General Willoughby, and others. There were five Members of Congress on that trip, namely, Representative Walter Huber, of Ohio; the chairman, Representative Deane, of North Carolina; Representative Riehlman, of New York; the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE], and myself.

Mr. Speaker, no committee report of that trip was ever made to my knowledge, although such action was suggested time and time again to our chairman, Mr. Huber, of Ohio. It now appears that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE] went to the majority leader, the Speaker, and national defense officials, and that Mr. DEANE went directly to the President with a report of our trip, but that the information they now give out freely was determined at that time to be very dangerous to our international relations and was therefore suppressed.

I want the record to show that I have no personal knowledge of any such purported reports. At no time did the gentlemen from West Virginia or North Carolina ever intimate to me that secret

reports of any kind were being made. When anyone implies that such reports had even the tacit approval of the committee, they are in error.

Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show further that at no time and at no place were we as a committee given any information by anyone that could in the slightest way be considered dangerous to our international relations.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was on that committee with the gentleman from South Dakota. I, too, was shocked this morning when I read in the paper and also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statements made by our colleague from West Virginia for whom I have high respect. I had an opportunity to visit with the same people that the gentleman spoke of. Nowhere did I find any evidence that would prove the statements which were made by our colleague. Nowhere did I find that there was such secretive matter which would involve the security of this great Nation of ours. I very seldom ask for the privilege of speaking on the floor, but this is a problem that has disturbed me terribly. It is true our committee never did write a report, although we asked to have one written on many occasions.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have another reason for asking for this time. I was amazed and surprised when I read the remarks of my good friend from West Virginia. I feel that he has fallen prey to that ill-advised group which is endeavoring to smear one of the greatest generals the United States has ever had. They do this for the sole purpose of attempting to justify, in the eyes of the American people, the President's unprecedented action which was apparently taken in a fit of rage.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what took place when we were not together as a committee, but as far as I am concerned, I want the record to show—

First. That at no time did General MacArthur or General Willoughby advocate the bombing of China or the occupation of China by American forces.

Second. The first time I heard the cost of bombing China would be $10,000,000,000 and $40,000,000,000 more for occupation was when I read the Washington Post and the CONGRESSONAL RECORD.

Third. I emphasize that General MacArthur never advocated starting a war in the Far East. He is not that kind of man.

Fourth. MacArthur did suggest a gift of 500 planes to Chiang Kai-shek. It was my understanding that these planes were to be used for defense.

Fifth. MacArthur did say that Chiang had some corrupt army men but added it must be remembered that Chiang fought communism longer and harder than any other individual.

Sixth. At no time did General Willoughby assure us "that there would be no war in Korea for 2 years." As a matter of fact, I have received information showing that the military intelligence section of General MacArthur's command notified Washington of the impending North Korean attack 3 months before the attack.

Seventh. General Roberts did express grave concern over the Korean situation but that was not over the North Korean divisions referred to by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE] that Syngman Rhee was not being given the military aid that the Congress had provided for.

Mr. Speaker, General Willoughby is on his way to the United States to appear before the House Un-American Activities Committee. I am sure he would welcome a hearing before any congressional committee that desires to hear his testimony.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. I do want to ask the gentleman some questions. In reading the RECORD this morning, I, too, was very much disturbed. I direct the gentleman's attention to the remarks of our colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE] on page 5766 of the RECORD, in which, under questioning by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] he said in reply to Mr. KEATING's question if MacArthur was advocating starting a war in the Far East:

> Well, that was a possibility. You can interpret it. These are exact quotes. I took notes on that when we left and the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DEANE, can substantiate these statements too.

Now I ask the gentleman, did he hear any such quotes?

Mr. LOVRE. Not at all.

Mr. WERDEL. Did you ever see any notes taken in regard to such quotes?

Mr. LOVRE. I did not see any notes taken and I did not have any secretary behind any closed doors.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I want the RECORD to show clearly that I was present at every conference we had with General MacArthur. I sat at the table at luncheon for 2½ hours when this discussion went on, and I was the gentleman who propounded the question about what we could do at that hour to save China. The 500 planes that might be given for defense purposes on Formosa and might be used to stop aggression were mentioned. Never once did General MacArthur advocate that we come back here and urge the Congress of the United States to furnish these 500 planes. It was said to us in confidence in reply to a question that I asked. He never advocated it on his own volition. It came only because of a question that I asked General MacArthur.

Furthermore, I want to say this: That in the presence of the general I do not think there was one man sitting at that table who took down notes. I never would have had the courage. The questions were propounded and the answers were given in strict confidence.

Mr. LOVRE. The gentleman is entirely correct. I was there all the time the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] was and never once did General MacArthur suggest the bombing of China or the sending of American occupation forces to China.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I agree 100 percent in that. I have the highest regard, and I reiterate it, for the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE]. He knows that I have. But the point is this: We had an opportunity to discuss this proposition, and if this was such an important matter to this Congress and to the United States of America, the committee that he was a member of should have then followed our recommendations and written a report. I notice in the RECORD that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE] said he urged writing a report. I have felt all along the need for a bipartisan program. No one has heard me get up here and defend MacArthur or criticize Mr. Acheson openly on this floor although Mr. Acheson surely deserves it for some of the statements he has made in respect to the defense of Korea and Formosa. I have tried to be open-minded on these subjects, but I do not like to see a problem like this brought to light which to me appears to be a smear program, which eliminates the possibility of our cooperation. If this was so important to the President and the Speaker and the majority leader and the defense organization, then the minority should have been taken into confidence the same as the majority.

Mr. LOVRE. I do not want any misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker; the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE] also recommended that a report be made.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to get my mind clarified on this. During the course of the conversations that you gentlemen of the committee had with General MacArthur, did the general suggest that 500 planes be given to General Chennault to bomb the Chinese?

Mr. LOVRE. Not General Chennault, according to my recollection; not for the purpose of bombing China.

Mr. ROONEY. To anyone?

Mr. LOVRE. I reiterate that General MacArthur's answer was given to a question asked in confidence. General MacArthur said it might be advisable to give 500 planes to Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I would like to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. I asked the question myself of the general, What could be done at this late hour to stop Communist aggression in China? He said:

> Well, off the record to you gentlemen, and I do not want to be quoted on it, the only thing I can suggest would be that possibly if 500 airplanes were given to the Chinese Nationalists they might stop the aggression.

He never suggested it; his reply was made to a question.

Mr. ROONEY. Apparently I do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Maybe the gentleman does not understand it, but I understand what I heard from the general. He never advocated it; he answered a question that I had asked him, and he did not come out and tell us that he wanted those planes.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to extend in the Appendix an article entitled "The Sinews of War," commemorating the ninth birthday of the Women's Army Corps, of which Colonel Hallaren is the head.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COST OF LIVING INCREASE IN VETERAN COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I realize it is late, and I am very sorry for the attendants of the House; the Speaker and Members could leave, but the attendants have to stay. I am so sorry to keep them later, but there was no opportunity during the debate on India; the debate was limited to the provisions of the bill, and I am just as sympathetic as anyone for the terrible economic conditions in India. I want none to suffer from hunger, or to starve, but we must not close our eyes to our own problems, the problems of taking care of our own disabled veterans, the problems of taking care of the men from Korea.

I have letters from men in Korea, Mr. Speaker, and later I shall ask unanimous consent to include them as part of my remarks.

In the near future you will be asked to revise the pensions and compensation paid to our veterans, to revise it upwards to meet the tremendous rise in the cost of living. When that proposal is before you I hope no voice will be raised in a plea for economy.

Today President Truman's message to the Congress, just read, asked for approximately $8,000,000,000 more for foreign aid, almost $7,000,000,000 of which will go to Europe. I suggest taking $500,000,000 of that—and that is what it would cost, and give our disabled veterans a straight 15 percent across-the-board increase in their compensation and pensions. I introduced a bill for that purpose, as have others.

There is much talk in and out of Congress about the proposal to increase the pay of automobile workers, Government employees, and others. Undoubtedly their pay will be increased, but the Congress must consider and take similar action in increasing the compensation and pensions of our disabled veterans.

And you must not forget that thousands who are totally disabled and unemployable because of their disabilities are trying to exist on $60 a month. That provided them is not sufficient, but it helped very much when the cost of living index was low. It is woefully inadequate today.

Mr. Speaker, we passed legislation belatedly, very belatedly, giving the Korean war veterans certain hospitalization, pensions, and compensation that World War II veterans have had, hospitalization, and so forth; but we have not yet passed any legislation, although I have asked for hearings on it, giving these Korean veterans automobiles, the amputees, the paraplegics, the most grievously and pitifully disabled. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday 12 of them came to the Capitol with a petition containing 180 signatures which they asked General Devereux to present to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, asking for the passage of legislation which would give them automobiles. I have introduced a bill for that purpose and other Members of this body and the Senate have done likewise.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the guards and the attendants at the Capitol for their friendly greeting, and their eager helpfulness in getting these disabled boys about the Capitol in order that they could present their petitions and ask the Members to see that they get automobiles to transport them about. They make these veterans so welcome. They should feel at home and very welcome here at the Capitol. The Capitol belongs to everyone in the United States, and most of all to the veterans who have paid such a price for it and to keep and preserve it. I have been glad that our disabled know they have the right to come to their Capitol and that they have the right to talk and petition the legislators. These Korean heroes are disabled because they were fighting for freedom and our way of life. The boys are pale from suffering. They have that hospital pallor that comes from long hospitalization. They have to look forward to a future with many operations probably. Those boys cannot understand why they are not given the automobiles that World War II veterans were given. They have felt they should have been given them automatically. Some realize that we must pass additional legislation, but some do not understand and cannot understand why automobiles are not given to them without it.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a very fine thing that the taxicab companies have provided automobiles to bring these boys to the Capitol. Other people have given their time. The police have given their time and have provided a police escort to bring the boys to the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that you will assist in seeing that these boys are given the same benefits that World War II veterans have.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to know what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is asking the Speaker to do?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am asking the Speaker if he will help with the passage of the necessary legislation for these men. I am sure he will assist because he has assisted in the past on numerous occasions.

I was very much shocked at the news given over the radio to the effect that there have been 140,000 casualties in Korea. General Bradley, I have heard, stated that there have been 140,000 casualties thus far as the result of the Korean war. I know we all want to do everything possible for these men.

The people of India are starving and hungry for food. These men, these Korean veterans, have a hunger, too. They do not ask for thanks but just for an understanding of their problems and the fulfillment of their needs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Edward J. Flynn.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in two to include extraneous matter, and in one to include a speech made by him in behalf of the opening of the local campaign in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., for bonds of Israel Government.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a letter sent by President Truman to William M. Boyle.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming, Mr. O'HARA, and Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) were given permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO and Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. RODINO) were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. RODINO) was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain quotations and extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the proceedings of the Panama Canal Society honoring William Howard Taft, notwithstanding the fact that the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $246.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include an editorial in each instance.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an address by Hon. O. K. ARMSTRONG, delivered at Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. SITTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter and various editorials.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in two to include an editorial, and in the third a statement regarding wheat for India addressed to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONAS (at the request of Mr. GROSS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. SCHWABE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a part of a column from the Washington Post.

Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a Memorial Day poem.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at that point in the debate on H. R. 3791 immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] when speaking on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] and also to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. McCARTHY (at the request of Mr. LESINSKI) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LIND, for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, May 24, May 25, and May 26, on account of official business.

To Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, for 7 weeks, on account of being delegate to International Labor Conference, Geneva, Switzerland.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 593. An act for the relief of Cleo C. Reeves, Floyd L. Murphy, and Fabian P. Durand; and

H. R. 3939. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, with respect to telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 28, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

467. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 17, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 19, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 142); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

468. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 23, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Humboldt Bay, Calif., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 143); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

469. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 7, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations on a review of the sections of the report on the Illinois River, Ill., submitted in House Document No. 711, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, which relate to the Nutwood Drainage and Levee District, with a view to determining if the recommendations in regard to reimbursing the said district should be modified in any way at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 5, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 144); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

470. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 4, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Quincy Shore Beach, Mass., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 145); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with eight illustrations.

471. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 15, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Revere Beach, Mass., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 146); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with 11 illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3142. A bill to authorize the settlement by the Attorney General and the payment of certain of the claims filed under the act of July 2, 1948, by persons of Japanese ancestry evacuated under military orders; without amendment (Rept. No. 496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration; with an amendment (Rept. No. 501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 249. An act for the relief of Ruzena Pelantova; with an amendment (Rept. No. 497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Commitee on the Judiciary. S. 277. An act for the relief of Lily Pfannenschmidt; without amendment (Rept. No. 498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 361. An act for the relief of Herk Visnapuu and his wife, Naima; with an amendment (Rept. No. 499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 740. A bill for the relief of John Reginald Leat; with an amendment (Rept. No. 500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4251. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4252. A bill providing instruction of young people in the affairs of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 4253. A bill to save the American system of free elections by outlawing the use of paper ballots in primary elections throughout the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4254. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the establishment of special rectifying plants for the receipt, in bond, of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4255. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, to adjust the salaries of officers and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 4256. A bill to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from Korea for burial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4257. A bill to exempt from income taxation the interest on certain United States savings bonds, and to provide for the issuance of such bonds at an interest rate of 2 percent per annum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 4258. A bill to designate a Floyd B. Olson memorial triangle in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the erection of a memorial plaque in such triangle; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 4259. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Air Force certain property in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4260. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Quartermaster Experimental Fuel Station, Pike County, Mo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4261. A bill to require the Attorney General to compile and maintain a list of subversive organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4262. A bill relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4263. A bill to amend section 1 of the act to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved December 16, 1941; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4264. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4265. A bill to extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4266. A bill to repeal limitations contained in other laws on federally assisted low-rent housing projects authorized by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 4267. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to provide for the licensing of exporters of food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics, and to prescribe standards applicable to such articles when exported; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. J. Res. 262. Joint resolution providing funds for reimbursement to the International Labor Organization of the added expense of holding the 1952 fall session of the governing body of the International Labor Organization in the United States instead of in Geneva, Switzerland, and for payment of incidental expenses incurred by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 237. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and studies authorized by House Resolution 158; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Res. 238. Resolution to provide for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. R. 4268. A bill for the relief of Elvira Zachmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 4269. A bill for the relief of John S. Downing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 4270. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4271. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard G. Adams and legal guardian of Dorothy Margaret Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4272. A bill for the relief of Carlos Maria Ribeiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4273. A bill for the relief of Mario Ratti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 4274. A bill for the relief of the estate of Preston Leon Stubblefield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4275. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth DeCourcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 4276. A bill for the relief of Domenico Peri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4277. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.